

Degenerate Gaussian factors for probabilistic inference

J.C. Schoeman*, C.E. van Daalen, J.A. du Preez

Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Stellenbosch University, South Africa

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a parametrised factor that enables inference on Gaussian networks where linear dependencies exist among the random variables. Our factor representation is a generalisation of traditional Gaussian parametrisations where the positive-definite constraint (of covariance and precision matrices) has been relaxed. For this purpose, we derive various statistical operations and results (such as marginalisation, multiplication and affine transformations of random variables) which extend the capabilities of Gaussian factors to these *degenerate* settings. By using this principled factor definition, degeneracies can be accommodated accurately and automatically at little additional computational cost. As illustration, we apply our methodology to a representative example involving recursive state estimation of cooperative mobile robots.

Keywords: Gaussian network, inference, linear dependence, degenerate factor, Dirac delta function, recursive state estimation

1. Introduction

Using probability theory to solve problems in engineering and computer science often follows the familiar process of modelling, observation and inference. When dealing with continuous random variables, a popular choice for keeping the inference process tractable is to make the Gaussian assumption [1]. In the case of graphical models such as Bayesian networks and Markov random fields, this means assuming that all prior and conditional distributions, as well as resulting factors, are of the exponential form. Under this assumption, the representation is closed under typical operations required for inference algorithms [2]. This useful property also extends to various applications of graphical models such as Kalman filters used in recursive state estimation [3].

An important (and necessary) constraint for using linear Gaussian models is that the covariance matrix of any multivariate density function must be positive definite [4]. If the covariance were instead only positive *semi*-definite, the

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: jcschoeman@sun.ac.za (J.C. Schoeman), cvdaalen@sun.ac.za (C.E. van Daalen), dupreez@sun.ac.za (J.A. du Preez)

likelihood would not be defined, nor would the precision matrix (i.e. the inverse of the covariance) exist. The latter would be problematic even for basic operations such as multiplication and conditioning on evidence. Such settings of perfect correlation are commonly referred to as *degenerate*, where it is understood that linear dependencies exist among certain random variables [5]. This implies that the density in reality only has support (i.e. is not equal to zero) on a lower-dimensional manifold.

Although certain applications warrant the explicit representation of linear dependencies between random variables, another common manifestation is the result of machine precision limitations [6]. A simple example of the latter is the repeated noisy observation of a constant latent state. Although the uncertainty in the posterior distribution will theoretically only be zero in the limit, this will happen after finite time in practice. Since these transient characteristics are typically a function of model parameters, it can easily lead to numerical errors in certain cases if not handled appropriately.

A straightforward solution to guard against degeneracies is to simply redefine the problem as needed. For example, if a vehicle is moving on a constrained horizontal plane, it is unnecessary to estimate its position in the entire three-dimensional space. Similarly, should two random variables become perfectly correlated due to machine precision effects, one could manually reduce the dimensionality of the space until additive noise once again requires explicit separation. Although this solution is guaranteed to work, it involves repeated human engineering. An alternative approach that can automatically handle degenerate cases is desirable.

Another practical solution is to employ ridge regularisation, where a widely-used strategy is to add a small scalar value to the diagonal terms of the covariance or precision matrix [7]. This not only ensures positive definiteness, but also that the condition number of the matrix remains manageable. Unfortunately, this added robustness often comes at the cost of a decrease in accuracy [8]. Whether this approximation is tolerable usually depends on the particular application.

Summary of contributions. In this paper, we present a generalised representation for Gaussian factors that can handle statistical operations in degenerate cases both automatically and accurately. Our parametric form makes use of a canonical factor with a diagonal precision matrix to express the uncertainty in the (possibly) lower-dimensional manifold and a Dirac delta function to represent any linear dependencies. The bases for the appropriate decomposition into two complementary subspaces are then represented by the columns of two semi-orthogonal matrices. Our representation also explicitly keeps track of the normalisation constant, thereby allowing model comparison and maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation. We subsequently derive typical inference operations for our representation from first principles – applicable to both linear and non-linear models.

Related literature. In their work on Gaussian influence diagrams, Shachter and Kenley [1] recognise that zero variance corresponds to linear dependencies, but do not provide a means to handle such cases automatically. Lauritzen and Jensen [5] also acknowledge possible degeneracies in their definition of conditional Gaussian distributions – a hybrid parametrisation where the joint distribution of continuous random variables given discrete random variables is assumed to be multivariate Gaussian. However, since they employ singular covariance matrices for this purpose, representing more general factors (with singular precision matrices) is not possible.

The approach by Raphael [9] is the only one that represents parametrised degenerate factors explicitly – in that case as the product of an exponential factor and a multivariate indicator function. For this purpose, they define three mutually orthogonal subspaces that form a decomposition of \mathbb{R}^n according to (1) variables associated with finite variance, (2) those that need to satisfy the implied linear constraints, and (3) those that the factor does not depend on. They then derive the necessary operations for inference algorithms (for their representation) and demonstrate its application to an example of automatic musical accompaniment.

In addition to the three subspaces (also represented by bases in the columns of matrices), Raphael’s parametrisation includes an n -dimensional mean vector and two non-negative definite $n \times n$ matrices that are equivalent to the covariance and precision matrices in non-degenerate cases. Although this parametrisation makes the notation and results of some statistical operations more concise, the resulting representation is over-parametrised. More specifically, in comparison to their $3n^2 + n$ scalar parameters, our representation achieves the same expressibility with only $n^2 + 2n$ parameters. In addition, their definition cannot express unnormalised factors (which prohibits model comparison), nor do they provide a method for approximating non-linear models. Finally, although the informal meaning may be clear, their use of an indicator function as one component of a probability density function is not theoretically sound. This is in contrast to our use of the Dirac delta function.

Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we briefly review typical operations required for inference on Gaussian networks. We also present the definition of both the one-dimensional and multidimensional Dirac delta functions, briefly review some relevant linear algebra concepts and provide an overview of linearisation using the unscented transform. In Section 3 we introduce our definition of the degenerate Gaussian factor. We also derive the first- and second-order moments of the generalised density function and cover the affine transformation of random variables. In Section 4 we present the statistical operations (such as marginalisation, multiplication and reduction according to evidence) required for inference with degenerate factors. In Section 5 we present further results that are necessary for performing inference on Bayesian networks. In Section 6 we present a recursive state estimation example that illustrate the advantage of explicitly representing and performing inference with degenerate Gaussian factors. Relevant identities related to canonical factors and Dirac delta functions

are included in Appendix A and the detailed derivations of the main results are documented in Appendix B.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we present the definition of degenerate Gaussian factors, as well as the resulting statistical operations, in the context of probabilistic graphical models. (This does not, however, limit the application of the subsequent developments to this context alone.) For this purpose, we first provide an overview of Gaussian networks and specifically present the necessary operations for performing inference using canonical factors. These operations not only serve as the foundation for Section 4, but are themselves used in various proofs of the main results in Appendix B. We also present the formal definition of both the one-dimensional and multidimensional Dirac delta function, the latter of which forms part of our definition of degenerate factors in Section 3. Next, we briefly discuss concepts from the field of linear algebra that are relevant for our factor parametrisation and used throughout the derivations of the subsequent statistical operations. Finally, we review the unscented transform as a linearisation technique. This forms the foundation for approximating non-linear models in Section 5.

2.1. Gaussian networks and canonical factors

Probabilistic graphical models are a family of statistical techniques that represent the factorisation of a problem using directed or undirected graphs [10]. In the subclass of Bayesian networks, each of the variable nodes are associated with a conditional distribution and the (absence of) edges indicate conditional (in)dependencies among the random variables [11]. In Markov random fields (also called Markov networks), the edges represent a more general factorisation of the joint distribution [12]. We use the term "Gaussian networks" to refer to graphical models where the joint distribution is Gaussian. In this section, the definitions and results only hold for the non-degenerate case.

For representing parametrised factors in Gaussian networks, Koller and Friedman [2] define the canonical factor over an n -dimensional vector \mathbf{x} as

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K, \mathbf{h}, g) \triangleq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T K \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{x} + g\right), \quad (1)$$

where K is a symmetric $n \times n$ precision matrix, \mathbf{h} is an n -dimensional vector and g is a scalar normalisation constant. The factor in (1) is a normalised probability density function if and only if the matrix K is positive definite and

$$g = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{h}^T K^{-1}\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2}\log|2\pi K^{-1}|. \quad (2)$$

Any Gaussian density function with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance matrix Σ can be expressed as a more general canonical factor [2].

Message passing algorithms, such as belief propagation [13] or belief update [14], are a popular choice for performing inference on graphical models. Under these methodologies, the Bayesian or Markov network is converted into a different type of graphical model such as a factor or cluster graph. All observed variables are then treated as evidence and the posterior distribution, or *belief*, over any unobserved variable can be calculated. Depending on the structure of this secondary graph, message passing amounts to a sequence of statistical operations such as multiplication and marginalisation. In a tree-structured graph, inference is exact and messages only need to be computed once. In a graph with loops, however, inference is approximate and requires iteration for convergence [2]. A very useful property of the canonical factor in (1) is that it is closed under typical message passing operations.

Firstly, for the partitioned canonical factor

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{C} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} K_{xx} & K_{xy} \\ K_{yx} & K_{yy} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_x \\ \mathbf{h}_y \end{bmatrix}, g \right), \quad (3)$$

marginalising over \mathbf{y} results in the marginal canonical factor

$$\int \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \, d\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{C} \left(\mathbf{x}; K_{xx} - K_{xy}K_{yy}^{-1}K_{yx}, \mathbf{h}_x - K_{xy}K_{yy}^{-1}\mathbf{h}_y, g + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{h}_y^T K_{yy}^{-1}\mathbf{h}_y + \frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi K_{yy}^{-1}| \right). \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, the *product* of two canonical factors over the same scope \mathbf{x} is given by

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K_1, \mathbf{h}_1, g_1) \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K_2, \mathbf{h}_2, g_2) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K_1 + K_2, \mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2, g_1 + g_2). \quad (5)$$

Similarly, the *quotient* of two canonical factors is given by

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K_1, \mathbf{h}_1, g_1)}{\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K_2, \mathbf{h}_2, g_2)} = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K_1 - K_2, \mathbf{h}_1 - \mathbf{h}_2, g_1 - g_2). \quad (6)$$

Finally, the canonical factor in (3) can be reduced according to available *evidence*. Setting $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_0$ results in

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_0) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K_{xx}, \mathbf{h}_x - K_{xy}\mathbf{y}_0, g + \mathbf{h}_y^T \mathbf{y}_0 - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{y}_0^T K_{yy}\mathbf{y}_0). \quad (7)$$

The results in (4) to (7) form the building blocks for message passing algorithms in Gaussian networks. To perform inference using a more general factor representation that can accommodate degeneracies therefore requires similar results.

2.2. Dirac delta functions

The Dirac delta function is a distribution (or generalised function) that satisfies the two properties

$$\delta(x) = 0, \text{ for } x \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(x) \, dx = 1. \quad (8)$$

It was originally proposed as part of the early development of quantum mechanics [15], but also plays an integral role in Fourier analysis where it is often called the unit impulse [16]. Due to the first property in (8), an informal (but useful) interpretation of the Dirac delta is as imposing a constraint on its argument, i.e. $x = 0$. According to Shankar [17], a possible definition for the one-dimensional Dirac delta that makes use of a Gaussian distribution (with zero mean and variance a) is

$$\delta(x) \triangleq \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{N}(x; 0, a). \quad (9)$$

Three further properties of the Dirac delta function follow from those in (8). Firstly, *multiplying* a function $f(x)$ that is continuous at $x = 0$ with the Dirac delta $\delta(x - a)$ yields

$$f(x) \delta(x - a) = f(a) \delta(x - a). \quad (10)$$

Furthermore, the *sampling* (or *sifting*) property states that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x - a) dx = f(a). \quad (11)$$

Finally, the *scaling* property states that

$$\delta(kx) = \frac{1}{|k|} \delta(x). \quad (12)$$

The multidimensional Dirac delta function over a k -dimensional vector \mathbf{x} is defined as

$$\delta(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^k \delta(x_i). \quad (13)$$

After combining (9) and (13), we can write the multidimensional Dirac delta as

$$\delta(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{0}, aI) = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} (2\pi a)^{-\frac{k}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2a} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}\right). \quad (14)$$

This will be used in Section 3 to model the degenerate component of our novel factor parametrisation. Note that the definition of the Dirac delta as the limit of an exponential term conveniently resembles that of the canonical factor in (1).

2.3. Fundamental subspaces and the singular value decomposition

A useful perspective on the properties of and the operations on a given matrix $A_{m \times n}$ (with m rows and n columns) are what Strang [18] calls its four fundamental subspaces. These are the column space, nullspace, row space and left nullspace. The *column space* (also called the *range*) of A refers to the set of all possible vectors that can be constructed from a linear combination of the columns of A and is denoted by $C(A) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$. The *rank* of A is the number of linearly independent columns of A and is equal to the *dimension* of the column

space of A , i.e. $\text{rank}(A) = \dim(C(A))$. If $\text{rank}(A) = n$, A is said to have *full column rank*. The *nullspace* (also called the *kernel*) of A is the set of all solutions \mathbf{x} to the equation $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ and is denoted by $N(A) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. If $\text{rank}(A) = r$, then $\dim(N(A)) = n - r$. The *row space* and the *left nullspace* of A are simply the column space and nullspace of A^T , i.e. $C(A^T) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $N(A^T) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$.

A subclass of matrices with convenient properties are *orthogonal* matrices. A square matrix Q is orthogonal if and only if $Q^{-1} = Q^T$, and subsequently $Q^T Q = Q Q^T = I$. Two subspaces V and W are said to be orthogonal *complements* if every vector $\mathbf{v} \in V$ is orthogonal to every vector $\mathbf{w} \in W$, i.e. $\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{w} = 0$. For any matrix A , the column space and left nullspace are orthogonal complements, i.e. $C(A) = N(A^T)^\perp$. If Q is not square, but its n columns are still *orthonormal* (such that $\mathbf{q}_i^T \mathbf{q}_j = \delta_{ij}$ where \mathbf{q}_i is the i 'th column of Q and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta), then $Q^T Q = I$ and Q is said to be *semi-orthogonal*. In this case, the product $P = Q Q^T$ (with rank n) is called the *projection matrix* onto $C(Q)$. For a general matrix A with full column rank, the projection onto $C(A)$ is $P = A(A^T A)^{-1} A^T$. Closely-related to its projection matrix is the *pseudo-inverse* $A^+ = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T$ of the matrix A . In an overdetermined system of equations $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ (where $m > n$), the *least squares* solution $\mathbf{x} = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T \mathbf{b}$ makes use of the pseudo-inverse.

A popular method for computing orthonormal bases for the fundamental subspaces of a matrix is using the singular value decomposition (SVD) [19]. The SVD of any real matrix $A = U \Sigma V^T$ is a factorisation into an $m \times m$ orthogonal matrix U , an $m \times n$ rectangular diagonal matrix Σ and an $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix V . If A is symmetric, the SVD is equivalent to the eigendecomposition $A = Q \Lambda Q^T$. The scalar values on the diagonal of Σ are called the *singular values* of A and are usually arranged in decreasing order. For a positive-definite matrix (with only positive singular values), the ratio of its largest to its smallest singular value is known as its *condition number* and is denoted by $\kappa(A)$. On machines with finite precision, computations involving matrices with large condition numbers lead to a decrease in accuracy (due to the loss of significant digits) and results in numeric instability beyond a certain value.

The number of non-trivial singular values r of a matrix A is equal to $\text{rank}(A)$. Partitioning the columns of U and V and the diagonal of Σ according to r results in the *compact* SVD $A = U_r \Sigma_r V_r^T$. Since the SVD (with complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$) is numerically stable compared to other matrix decompositions and enjoys efficient implementations across many different platforms, it provides a very effective method to determine orthonormal bases for the column space $C(A) = C(U_r)$ and the nullspace $N(A) = C(V_0)$, where V_0 is the last $n - r$ columns of V . In addition, the SVD can be used to compute the pseudo-inverse $A^+ = V \Sigma^+ U^T$ as well as an orthonormal basis for the orthogonal complement $C(A)^\perp = C(U_0)$. These linear algebra ideas are used throughout the rest of this paper – both in our definition of degenerate factors as well as in the results and proofs for the subsequent statistical operations.

2.4. Linearisation using the unscented transform

Constructing a probabilistic model of a system with continuous random variables usually starts with a given system of equations. These relationships typically have some physical origin (for example differential equations describing the dynamics of a vehicle) and are often non-linear. Since only *linear* transformations of Gaussian random variables are again Gaussian distributed, the latter warrants the use of linearisation techniques to keep the inference tractable. Consider, for example, the non-linear transform $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ and the prior distribution $p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$. Since the exact distribution $p(\mathbf{y})$ will not necessarily be a Gaussian, a standard approach is to use the approximation $p(\mathbf{y}) \approx \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}; \boldsymbol{\mu}', \Sigma')$ obtained through linearisation.

Two of the most popular linearisation techniques that are widely-used are Taylor series expansion and the unscented transform [20]. In the former, the mean of the prior distribution is substituted into partial derivatives of the given non-linear transform and is therefore considered as linearising around a *single* point. On the other hand, *multiple* deterministic samples (known as sigma points) are drawn from the prior distribution and then individually propagated through the non-linear transform in the latter. Although each has its advantages, the performance of the unscented transform has been proven to be at least as good as that of the Taylor approximation on average [21]. Since it also does not require the tedious recalculation of problem-specific partial derivatives, we therefore exclusively focus on the unscented transform in this paper.

For an n -dimensional Gaussian prior, Thrun et al. [22] propose the $2n + 1$ sigma points arranged in the columns of the design matrix

$$\mathcal{X} = [\mathbf{x}^{[0]} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{x}^{[2n]}] = [\mathbf{0}, \quad \gamma\sqrt{\Sigma}, \quad -\gamma\sqrt{\Sigma}] + \boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^T, \quad (15)$$

where the square root of a matrix \sqrt{A} is typically determined using the Cholesky decomposition. γ is a scaling parameter that determines how far the sigma points are distributed from the mean and consequently what the relative weight of each sample should be. Thrun et al. [22] define two weights

$$w_m^{[i]} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{n}{\gamma^2}, & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \frac{1}{2\gamma^2}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad w_c^{[i]} = \begin{cases} 4 - \frac{n}{\gamma^2} - \frac{\gamma^2}{n}, & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \frac{1}{2\gamma^2}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

for this purpose. The i 'th sigma point is then propagated through the non-linear transformation to yield $\mathbf{y}^{[i]} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})$, which is in turn used to calculate the mean and covariance according to

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}' = \sum_{i=0}^{2n} w_m^{[i]} \mathbf{y}^{[i]} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma' = \sum_{i=0}^{2n} w_c^{[i]} (\mathbf{y}^{[i]} - \boldsymbol{\mu}') (\mathbf{y}^{[i]} - \boldsymbol{\mu}')^T. \quad (17)$$

This idea of approximating moments using sigma points is extended to the case of degenerate distributions in Section 5. Having discussed the necessary preliminaries, we now proceed to our definition of degenerate Gaussian factors.

3. Degenerate Gaussian factors

A popular approach for performing inference on graphical models with continuous random variables is to employ parametrised factors. In the special case of Gaussian networks, the canonical factor in (1) is a good example. In this section, we combine a canonical factor with a Dirac delta function to form a novel parametrised factor that can express possible degeneracies (i.e. settings where linear dependencies exist among the random variables). We also discuss the requirements for this factor to be a normalised density function and derive its moments. Since our definition is a generalisation of traditional parametrisations, non-degenerate Gaussian densities can still be represented. Finally, we show that explicitly representing degeneracies within a joint density also enables affine transformations of Gaussian random variables to higher-dimensional spaces.

3.1. Definition and parameterisation

Using the definitions in (1) and (14), we represent a degenerate Gaussian factor over an n -dimensional vector \mathbf{x} (with k degrees of degeneracy) as the product

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q, R, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g) \triangleq \mathcal{C}(Q^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, g) \delta(R^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}). \quad (18)$$

In this parametrisation, Λ is a non-negative¹, diagonal precision matrix describing the uncertainty in the $(n - k)$ -dimensional affine space where the factor is non-zero. The vector \mathbf{h} and normalisation constant g determine the location and height of the maximum point in this space, respectively. The vector \mathbf{c} in turn describes the minimum (perpendicular) offset from the coordinate origin to the affine space. For convenience, the column spaces of $Q_{n \times (n-k)}$ and $R_{n \times k}$ are constrained to be orthogonal complements. Some of these properties are illustrated in Figure 1.

3.2. The degenerate density function

For the special case where the factor in (18) is a valid density function $p(\mathbf{x})$, we require that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}(Q^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, g) \delta(R^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}) \, d\mathbf{x} = 1. \quad (19)$$

(In addition, we require that the density function is non-negative, but this is already true for the general factor in (18).) This integral can be rewritten using the substitutions $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = Q^T \mathbf{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta} = R^T \mathbf{x}$. Since Q and R are orthogonal

¹We restrict our parametrisation to positive semi-definite precision matrices. Negative-definite precision matrices that may occur due to approximations (as for example in expectation propagation [23]) should be handled in a similar way as for non-degenerate representations.




Figure 1: (a) A visualisation of a degenerate factor in \mathbb{R}^3 subject to the linear constraint $x_1 + x_2 = a$. The variation in shading represents the scalar value of the canonical factor in the affine space and the dashed lines indicate the principle axes. Away from this plane (along the vector \mathbf{r}) the degenerate factor evaluates to zero. The shortest (perpendicular) distance from the origin in \mathbb{R}^3 to the plane is c . (b) From a view perpendicular to the affine plane, we see that the vectors \mathbf{q}_1 and \mathbf{q}_2 have been chosen to align with the principal axes. The corresponding standard deviations are related to the precisions according to $\sigma_1 = 1/\sqrt{\lambda_1}$ and $\sigma_2 = 1/\sqrt{\lambda_2}$.

complements, this change of variables is orthogonal and (since the integral over a Dirac delta is unity) we therefore require that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}; \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, g) \delta(\boldsymbol{\eta} - \mathbf{c}) d\boldsymbol{\epsilon} d\boldsymbol{\eta} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}; \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, g) d\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = 1. \quad (20)$$

Consequently, we can use the result in (2) to see that

$$g = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{h}^T \Lambda^{-1} \mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi \Lambda^{-1}|. \quad (21)$$

This also requires that Λ is non-singular. Note that, since Λ is diagonal, the matrix inverse in (21) is straightforward and can be computed in linear time. This computational advantage is applicable to many operations throughout the rest of this paper.

We can determine the moments (specifically the mean and the covariance) of a degenerate Gaussian density by substituting the definition of the Dirac delta function in (14) into (18), resulting in

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}, Q\Lambda^{-1}Q^T + aRR^T). \quad (22)$$

(The extended derivation of (22) is given in Result 3 in Appendix A). For the mean, we can use (22) to calculate the expected value

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} (Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}) = Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}. \quad (23)$$

For the covariance, we obtain

$$\text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}] = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} (Q\Lambda^{-1}Q^T + aRR^T) = Q\Lambda^{-1}Q^T. \quad (24)$$

For k degrees of degeneracy, the covariance will therefore have rank $n - k$.

Conveniently, any non-degenerate Gaussian density function with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance matrix Σ can still be expressed as a degenerate Gaussian factor such that

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q, R, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g). \quad (25)$$

In this non-degenerate case, $C(Q) = \mathbb{R}^n$ and subsequently $C(R) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. The other extreme where $C(Q) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $C(R) = \mathbb{R}^n$ in turn relates to zero uncertainty and n degrees of degeneracy. Although a subset of the parameters in (18) will be empty in both of these cases, the degenerate factor is still well defined under the convention that canonical factors and Dirac delta functions with empty arguments equate to unity.

Returning to the unknown parameters in (25), we can use (24) to write

$$\Sigma = Q\Lambda^{-1}Q^T. \quad (26)$$

Since Σ is symmetric and positive definite, Q and Λ can be calculated directly using the SVD. With the values of Q and Λ in (25) known, we proceed to calculate the quantities \mathbf{h} and g . Note that in the non-degenerate case (i.e. when $k = 0$), the factor in (18) as well as the expectation in (23) no longer depend on the empty arguments R and \mathbf{c} . Since Q is orthogonal, the reduced form of the latter yields

$$\mathbf{h} = (Q\Lambda^{-1})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu} = \Lambda Q^T \boldsymbol{\mu}. \quad (27)$$

Finally, substituting (27) followed by (26) into (21) yields

$$g = -\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\mu}^T Q\Lambda Q^T \boldsymbol{\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi\Lambda^{-1}| = -\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu} - \log \sqrt{(2\pi)^n |\Sigma|}, \quad (28)$$

which is equivalent to the normalisation constant in traditional parametrisations. (25) illustrates the idea that our representation for degenerate Gaussian factors is a generalisation of existing parametrisations that relaxes positive definiteness constraints.

3.3. Affine transformations of degenerate random variables

Among the many useful properties of Gaussian random variables is the fact that affine transformations

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} \quad (29)$$

thereof are still Gaussian-distributed. However, one important condition for the use of traditional parametrisations to express the resulting density function is, once again, that the resulting covariance matrix must be positive definite. Since

$\text{Cov}[\mathbf{y}] = A \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}] A^T$, this in turn restricts the matrix A to have full row rank. By instead using the parametrisation in (18) to express the prior density

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q, R, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g), \quad (30)$$

we can relax this constraint and represent the density $p(\mathbf{y})$ for *any* matrix A .

Since an affine transformation only alters the respective subspaces associated with (1) jointly Gaussian-distributed random variables and (2) linear dependencies, $p(\mathbf{y})$ will also be a degenerate Gaussian density with parameters Q' , R' , Λ' , \mathbf{h}' , \mathbf{c}' and g' . The procedure to calculate these parameters – derived through moment matching using the results in (23) and (24) – is summarised in Algorithm 1. The detailed derivation is included in Appendix B. In this as well as future algorithms we use the tuple $\theta = (Q, R, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g)$ as a shorthand for the parameters.

Algorithm 1 AffineTransformation

Input: θ, A, \mathbf{b} such that $p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$ and $\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}$

Output: θ' such that $p(\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{y}; \theta')$

- 1: $Q', \Sigma', - \leftarrow \text{CompactSVD}(AQ\Lambda^{-1}Q^T A^T)$
 - 2: $\Lambda' \leftarrow \Sigma'^{-1}$
 - 3: $R' \leftarrow \text{Complement}(Q')$
 - 4: $\boldsymbol{\mu}' \leftarrow A(Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}$
 - 5: $\mathbf{c}' \leftarrow R'^T \boldsymbol{\mu}'$
 - 6: $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow \Lambda' Q'^T \boldsymbol{\mu}'$
 - 7: $g' \leftarrow -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{h}'^T \Lambda'^{-1} \mathbf{h}' - \frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi \Lambda'^{-1}|$
-

Since the resulting covariance matrix might only be positive semi-definite, the quantities Q' and Λ' are calculated (in lines 1 and 2 of Algorithm 1) using the compact SVD. Note that the resulting degree of degeneracy in $p(\mathbf{y})$ depends on the mutual properties of A and Q . Next, the semi-orthogonal matrix R' is computed (in line 3) such that $C(R') = C(Q')^\perp$. The mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}' = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}]$ is calculated (in line 4) by substituting the expectation in (23) into (29). As in (27), \mathbf{c}' and \mathbf{h}' are then calculated (in lines 5 and 6) by exploiting the mutual orthogonality of R' and Q' . Since the resulting density $p(\mathbf{y})$ will be normalised, g' is calculated (in line 7) by direct application of (21).

In summary, our definition of degenerate Gaussian factors in (18) can express $k \in [0, n]$ degeneracies. It comprises a canonical factor and Dirac delta component, as necessary. For the degenerate factor to represent a normalised density function, the canonical factor must be normalised as in (21). The mean of a degenerate density in (23) is then the sum of two orthogonal vectors in the respective subspaces and the rank of the covariance matrix in (24) is equal to $n - k$. Any non-degenerate Gaussian density can be converted to the degenerate parametrisation as in (25). Finally, affine transformations of degenerate (or non-degenerate) Gaussian random variables are also distributed according to a degenerate Gaussian density.

4. Statistical operations on degenerate factors

To use degenerate Gaussian factors for inference, the appropriate statistical operations need to be derived. In the context of message passing algorithms, these include marginalisation, multiplication, division, and reduction according to available evidence. Following the notion that the degenerate factor is a generalisation of the canonical factor, the results in this section mirror those in Section 2.1. We show a procedure to perform each operation in the form of an algorithm and provide visualisations of simple examples where appropriate. The detailed derivations of the results are included in Appendix B. As always, it is desirable that the factor representation is closed under these operations, i.e. that the result of each operation is once again a degenerate Gaussian factor parametrised according to (18).

4.1. Marginalisation

For the partitioned degenerate factor

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{D} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} Q_x \\ Q_y \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} R_x \\ R_y \end{bmatrix}, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g \right), \quad (31)$$

marginalising over \mathbf{y} results in the marginal factor

$$\int \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \, d\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}', g'), \quad (32)$$

where the parameters Q' , R' , Λ' , \mathbf{h}' , \mathbf{c}' and g' are determined according to Algorithm 2. Since marginalisation amounts to projecting to a subspace, we use an appropriate orthogonal decomposition (according to the properties of the four block matrices Q_x , Q_y , R_x and R_y) to handle possible degeneracies before marginalising the resulting canonical factor as in (4).

The first step (in lines 1 and 2 of Algorithm 2) is to find orthonormal bases for the nullspaces of the four block matrices. As mentioned in Section 2.3, this can be achieved using the SVD. Depending on the degree of degeneracy k , the dimension n' of the vector \mathbf{x} and the rank of each respective block matrix, some of these bases could be trivial. The degree of degeneracy k' in the marginal factor is equal to the number of original linear dependencies that can be expressed using only elements in \mathbf{x} , i.e. $k - \text{rank}(R_y)$. Since $R_y V = 0$, $R_x V$ (in line 3) is the k' -dimensional basis for the marginal degeneracy in $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$, where the corresponding offset (in line 4) is $V^T \mathbf{c}$. The two ad-hoc matrices F_x and G_y (in line 5) are computed such that the coordinate-aligned bases F and G (with $F_y = 0$ and $G_x = 0$) complete the decomposition of \mathbb{R}^n together with QA , QB , RU and RV . This means that $Q_x B$, $R_x V$ and F_x form an orthogonal decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$, and therefore $C(Q') = C \left(\begin{bmatrix} Q_x B & F_x \end{bmatrix} \right)$. The three auxiliary matrices P , M and S (in lines 6, 7 and 8) make the rest of the notation more concise. The resulting full-rank precision matrix is diagonalised using the SVD (in line 9). The corresponding orthogonal matrix Z is then used to determine the $(n' - k')$ -dimensional basis for the marginal support (in line 10) in $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$. Finally, the

Algorithm 2 Marginalise

Input: θ such that $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \theta\right)$

Output: θ' such that $\int \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; \theta')$

- 1: $A \leftarrow \text{Nullspace}(Q_x), B \leftarrow \text{Nullspace}(Q_y)$
- 2: $U \leftarrow \text{Nullspace}(R_x), V \leftarrow \text{Nullspace}(R_y), W \leftarrow \text{Complement}([U \ V])$
- 3: $R' \leftarrow R_x V$
- 4: $\mathbf{c}' \leftarrow V^T \mathbf{c}$
- 5: $F_x \leftarrow \text{Complement}([Q_x B \ R_x V]), G_y \leftarrow \text{Complement}([Q_y A \ R_y U])$
- 6: $P \leftarrow Q_y^T G_y (W^T R_y^T G_y)^{-1} W^T$
- 7: $M \leftarrow (Q_x^T - P R_x^T) F_x$
- 8: $S \leftarrow A (A^T \Lambda A)^{-1} A^T$
- 9: $Z, \Lambda', _ \leftarrow \text{SVD}\left([B \ M]^T (\Lambda - \Lambda S \Lambda) [B \ M]\right)$
- 10: $Q' \leftarrow [Q_x B \ F_x] Z$
- 11: $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow Z^T [B \ M]^T (I - \Lambda S)(\mathbf{h} - \Lambda P \mathbf{c})$
- 12: $g' \leftarrow g + (\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda P \mathbf{c})^T P \mathbf{c} + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{h} - \Lambda P \mathbf{c})^T S (\mathbf{h} - \Lambda P \mathbf{c}) + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{|2\pi(A^T \Lambda A)^{-1}|}{|W^T R_y^T G_y|^2}$

vector \mathbf{h}' and normalisation constant g' are also calculated (in lines 11 and 12, respectively). Figure 2 illustrates various aspects of Algorithm 2 for a simple example.

4.2. Multiplication

The product of two degenerate factors over the same scope \mathbf{x} is given by

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q_1, R_1, \Lambda_1, \mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{c}_1, g_1) \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q_2, R_2, \Lambda_2, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{c}_2, g_2) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}', g'). \quad (33)$$

where the parameters $Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}'$ and g' are determined according to Algorithm 3. Since each degenerate factor only has support on a lower-dimensional manifold, the affine space of the product will be the intersection of those of the two original factors. We therefore reduce each factor to this intersection and then multiply the resulting canonical factors as in (5).

The first step (in line 1 of Algorithm 3) is to find an orthonormal basis V for the column space of the projection of R_2 onto $N(R_1^T) = C(Q_1)$. This represents the additional degeneracy due to the second factor and, together with R_1 , forms the orthonormal basis (in line 2) for the resulting degenerate space in \mathbb{R}^n . The offset \mathbf{b} (in line 3) is determined by the intersection of the affine spaces of the two degenerate factors and this forms the second component of the offset \mathbf{c}' (in line 4). In the edge case where $C(R_1) \cap C(R_2) \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$, the matrix $R_2^T V$ will not be square and consequently its pseudo-inverse $(V^T R_2 R_2^T V)^{-1} V^T R_2$ should be used instead². The orthonormal basis U (in line 5) is then used to

²This will only be necessary when the same prior degeneracy exists in both factors and




Figure 2: (a) A visualisation of a degenerate factor in \mathbb{R}^3 subject to the linear constraint $x + y_1 + y_2 = k$. The three vectors \mathbf{f} (which lies on the x -axis), \mathbf{g} (which lies in the y_1 - y_2 plane) and $Q\mathbf{a}$ (which is parallel to the affine plane and lies in the y_1 - y_2 plane) form the orthogonal decomposition of \mathbb{R}^3 necessary for calculating the marginal factor over x . (For this example, the bases B , U and V are trivial.) (b) From a view perpendicular to the plane, we see the 2-D point \mathbf{pc} . In \mathbb{R}^3 , this point lies at the intersection of the vector \mathbf{g} and the affine plane. The orthogonal 2-D vectors \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{a} align with the x -axis and the edge of the linear constraint in the y_1 - y_2 plane, respectively. (Since the x -axis does not reflect its true length, \mathbf{m} is not a unit vector.) This describes an appropriate transformation within the affine plane based on the required marginalisation in the coordinate axes. The marginal factor over x is then indicated by the dashed 1-D curve, where the corresponding origin is the projection of the point \mathbf{pc} (where $x = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^3).

determine the resulting full-rank precision matrix, which is in turn diagonalised using the SVD (in line 6). As was the case in Algorithm 2, the corresponding orthogonal matrix Z is used to determine the basis for the support (in line 7) in \mathbb{R}^n . Finally, the vector \mathbf{h}' and normalisation constant g' are also calculated (in lines 8 and 9, respectively). In the case where $R_2^T V$ is not square, the determinant $|V^T R_2 R_2^T V|$ should be used instead of $|R_2^T V|^2$. Figure 3 illustrates various aspects of Algorithm 3 for a simple example.

4.3. Division

The quotient of two degenerate factors over the same scope \mathbf{x} is given by

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q_1, R_1, \Lambda_1, \mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{c}_1, g_1)}{\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q_2, R_2, \Lambda_2, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{c}_2, g_2)} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}', g'), \quad (34)$$

where the parameters Q' , R' , Λ' , \mathbf{h}' , \mathbf{c}' and g' are determined according to Algorithm 4. Due to the usual context of the division operation as part of the belief

simplifies to $(R_2^T V)^{-1}$ otherwise.

Algorithm 3 Multiply

Input: θ_1, θ_2 such that $\phi_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; \theta_1)$ and $\phi_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; \theta_2)$ **Output:** θ' such that $\phi_1(\mathbf{x}) \times \phi_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; \theta')$

- 1: $V \leftarrow \text{Columnspace}(Q_1 Q_1^T R_2)$
 - 2: $R' \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} R_1 & V \end{bmatrix}$
 - 3: $\mathbf{b} \leftarrow (R_2^T V)^{-1}(\mathbf{c}_2 - R_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1)$
 - 4: $\mathbf{c}' \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \\ \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix}$
 - 5: $U \leftarrow \text{Complement}(R')$
 - 6: $Z, \Lambda', - \leftarrow \text{SVD}(U^T(Q_1 \Lambda_1 Q_1^T + Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T)U)$
 - 7: $Q' \leftarrow UZ$
 - 8: $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow Q'^T(Q_1(\mathbf{h}_1 - \Lambda_1 Q_1^T V \mathbf{b}) + Q_2(\mathbf{h}_2 - \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R' \mathbf{c}'))$
 - 9: $g' \leftarrow g_1 + g_2 + (\mathbf{h}_1 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_1 Q_1^T V \mathbf{b})^T Q_1^T V \mathbf{b} + (\mathbf{h}_2 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R' \mathbf{c}')^T Q_2^T R' \mathbf{c}' - \frac{1}{2} \log |R_2^T V|^2$
-

update algorithm [14] (where the numerator is a product of the denominator and other factors), we assume that $C(R_2) \subseteq C(R_1)$ and that $\mathbf{c}_2 = R_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1$, i.e. that a trivial denominator implies a trivial numerator³. By choosing the affine space of the quotient to be the subspace of that of the numerator which is orthogonal to that of the denominator, we consequently reduce the denominator to the affine space of the numerator before dividing the resulting canonical factors as in (6). Except for the different computation of R' (in line 1 of Algorithm 4) and Q' (in line 4), Algorithm 4 follows a similar procedure to Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 4 Divide

Input: θ_1, θ_2 such that $\phi_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; \theta_1)$ and $\phi_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; \theta_2)$ **Output:** θ' such that $\phi_1(\mathbf{x})/\phi_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; \theta')$

- 1: $R' \leftarrow \text{Complement}(\begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & R_2 \end{bmatrix})$
 - 2: $\mathbf{c}' \leftarrow R'^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1$
 - 3: $Z, \Lambda_+, - \leftarrow \text{SVD}(\Lambda_1 - Q_1^T Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1)$
 - 4: $Q' \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 Z & R_2 \end{bmatrix}$
 - 5: $\Lambda' \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_+ & \theta \\ \theta & \theta \end{bmatrix}$
 - 6: $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow Q'^T(Q_1 \mathbf{h}_1 - Q_2(\mathbf{h}_2 - \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1))$
 - 7: $g' \leftarrow g_1 - g_2 - (\mathbf{h}_2 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1)^T Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1$
-

³In addition, the results in Algorithm 4 are only valid if Λ' is non-negative as required by our definition of degenerate factors in (18).




Figure 3: (a) A visualisation of two degenerate factors in \mathbb{R}^3 subject to the linear constraints $x + y = k$ and $y + z = k$, respectively. The intersection of the two affine planes is the line that goes through the points $(0, k, 0)$ and $(k, 0, k)$ – along the vector $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{q}'$. The vectors \mathbf{r}_1 (which is also perpendicular to the z -axis) and \mathbf{r}_2 (which is also perpendicular to the x -axis) are perpendicular to the respective planes. These three vectors are anchored at the point on the intersection with the minimum distance to the origin in \mathbb{R}^3 . (b) From a view where this anchor point aligns with the origin, we see the true length of the vector \mathbf{u} . (From this perspective, the vectors \mathbf{r}_1 and \mathbf{r}_2 do not reflect their true lengths.) Each reduced factor along \mathbf{u} is indicated by a dashed 1-D curve, where the product of these is equal to the product of the two degenerate factors along the line of intersection.

4.4. Reduction

The partitioned degenerate factor in (31) can also be reduced according to available evidence. Setting $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_0$ results in

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_0) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}', g'), \quad (35)$$

where the parameters Q' , R' , Λ' , \mathbf{h}' , \mathbf{c}' and g' are determined according to Algorithm 5. Since evidence can be regarded as imposing an additional linear constraint in the original space, we treat reduction as a special case of multiplication. Consequently, since the support of this product will be independent of the variables in \mathbf{y} , the lower-dimensional reduced factor is readily obtained through partitioning.

The first step (in line 1 of Algorithm 5) is to find an orthonormal basis for the resulting degenerate space in $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$, where n' is the dimension of the vector \mathbf{x} . The corresponding offset \mathbf{c}' (in line 2) is determined by the intersection of the original affine space and the additional constraint $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_0$. In the edge case where the block matrix R_x does not have full column rank, the matrix $R_x^T R'$ will not be square and consequently its pseudo-inverse $(R'^T R_x R_x^T R')^{-1} R'^T R_x$ should be used instead⁴. The orthonormal basis U_x (in line 3) is then used to

⁴This will only be necessary when a prior degeneracy is again included in the evidence and

Algorithm 5 Reduce

Input: θ, \mathbf{y}_0 such that $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{D} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \theta \right)$
Output: θ' such that $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_0) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; \theta')$

- 1: $R' \leftarrow \text{Columnspace}(R_x)$
- 2: $\mathbf{c}' \leftarrow (R_x^T R')^{-1} (\mathbf{c} - R_y^T \mathbf{y}_0)$
- 3: $U_x \leftarrow \text{Complement}(R')$
- 4: $Z, \Lambda', - \leftarrow \text{SVD}(U_x^T Q_x \Lambda Q_x^T U_x)$
- 5: $Q' \leftarrow U_x Z$
- 6: $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow Q'^T Q_x \left(\mathbf{h} - \Lambda Q^T \begin{bmatrix} R' \mathbf{c}' \\ \mathbf{y}_0 \end{bmatrix} \right)$
- 7: $g' \leftarrow g + \left(\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda Q^T \begin{bmatrix} R' \mathbf{c}' \\ \mathbf{y}_0 \end{bmatrix} \right)^T Q^T \begin{bmatrix} R' \mathbf{c}' \\ \mathbf{y}_0 \end{bmatrix} - \frac{1}{2} \log |R_x^T R'|^2$

determine the resulting full-rank precision matrix, which is in turn diagonalised using the SVD (in line 4). As was the case in Algorithms 2, 3 and 4, the corresponding orthogonal matrix Z is once again used to determine the basis for the support (in line 5) in $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$. Finally, the vector \mathbf{h}' and normalisation constant g' are also calculated (in lines 6 and 7, respectively). In the case where $R_x^T R'$ is not square, the determinant $|R'^T R_x R_x^T R'|$ should be used instead of $|R_x^T R'|^2$. Figure 4 illustrates various aspects of Algorithm 5 for a simple example.

4.5. Computational complexity

Due to our use of the SVD, the asymptotic time complexity of the operations in Algorithms 2 to 5 is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. This is similar to that for Raphael's [9] representation. In comparison, the multiplication, division and reduction operations for Koller and Friedman's [2] (non-degenerate) canonical factors require only $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$. However, due to the necessary matrix inversion⁵, their marginalisation operation also requires $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ and therefore often dominates the computational time in practice. The expressiveness of degenerate factors therefore comes at little additional computational cost.

5. Inference on Bayesian networks

In addition to the four operations on degenerate factors discussed in Section 4, we present further results that are necessary for performing inference on Bayesian networks. These include correctly manipulating degenerate factors with different scopes, modelling stochastic systems by representing conditional densities (associated with both linear and non-linear dependencies) and checking

simplifies to $(R_x^T R')^{-1}$ otherwise.

⁵Matrix inversion can be done in $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.807})$ [24] or even $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.376})$ [25], although the large constant coefficient in the latter renders it impractical for typical matrices.




Figure 4: (a) A visualisation of a degenerate factor in \mathbb{R}^3 subject to the linear constraint $x_1 + x_2 + y = k$. The evidence $y = y_0$ can be regarded as a horizontal plane and its intersection with the affine plane is indicated by the dashed line (along the vector \mathbf{u}). (b) From a view along the y -axis (and perpendicular to the x_1 - x_2 plane), we see the orthogonal 2-D components \mathbf{r}_x and $\mathbf{u}_x = \mathbf{q}'$ (where the latter is a unit vector). The reduced factor over $\{x_1, x_2\}$ then has uncertainty along \mathbf{q}' as indicated by the dashed 1-D curve and is equal to zero away from the dashed line (in the direction of \mathbf{r}' with corresponding offset c').

for convergence of message passing algorithms. The detailed derivations are once again included in Appendix B where applicable.

5.1. Extending and rearranging factor scopes

Performing inference on graphical models often amounts to multiplying (or dividing) two factors with different scopes. This is true even for the simple case of computing the joint density $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x})$, where the scope of the second factor is a subset of that of the first. In such cases, we need to extend the scope of each factor in the product to be the union of all the scopes. For this purpose, we can extend the scope of a given degenerate factor with scope \mathbf{x} to include the vector \mathbf{y} , such that

$$\mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}, g\right) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q, R, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g). \quad (36)$$

A choice for the parameters that conforms to the definition of the degenerate factor in (18) is

$$Q' = \begin{bmatrix} Q & \emptyset \\ \emptyset & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad R' = \begin{bmatrix} R \\ \emptyset \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Lambda' = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \emptyset \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{h}' = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (37)$$

Note that Λ' is diagonal and that $C(Q') = C(R')^\perp$ as required.

Another operation that is necessary for a message passing implementation is rearranging the scope of a given factor. For instance, consider a degenerate

Gaussian factor with scope $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\}$ where the matrices Q and R are partitioned accordingly. We can determine another factor with scope $\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}\}$, such that

$$\mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix}; Q', R', \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g\right) = \mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} Q_x \\ Q_y \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} R_x \\ R_y \end{bmatrix}, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g\right), \quad (38)$$

by simply rearranging the rows of the two matrices

$$Q' = \begin{bmatrix} Q_y \\ Q_x \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad R' = \begin{bmatrix} R_y \\ R_x \end{bmatrix}. \quad (39)$$

This operation is necessary to insure that, prior to applying any statistical operations, the scopes of multiple factors not only have the same dimension but are also aligned.

5.2. Conditional density functions for linear dependencies

To model a stochastic system using a Bayesian network, it is necessary to represent conditional density functions – in our case as parametrised degenerate factors. Given the affine transformation

$$\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{w} \quad (40)$$

subject to (possibly degenerate) independent noise

$$\mathbf{w} \sim \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{w}; Q, R, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g), \quad (41)$$

we can represent the conditional density

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}', g'\right), \quad (42)$$

where the parameters Q' , R' , Λ' , \mathbf{h}' , \mathbf{c}' and g' are determined according to Algorithm 6. By treating the vector \mathbf{x} as constant, we use an affine transformation of the random vector \mathbf{w} (according to Algorithm 1) to express $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ as a factor over \mathbf{y} . We then rewrite this factor as a parametrised degenerate factor with scope $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\}$.

The first step (in line 2 of Algorithm 6) is to use the auxiliary matrix F (in line 1) to find an orthonormal basis R' for the resulting degenerate space in $\mathbb{R}^{n_x+n_y}$, where the matrix A has shape $n_y \times n_x$. The corresponding k -dimensional offset \mathbf{c}' (in line 4) is then determined using the auxiliary matrix Z (in line 3). To ensure that $C(Q') \perp C(R')$, the projection matrix (in line 5) is applied before the compact SVD (in line 6). This yields the basis Q_+ corresponding to the $n_y - k$ non-trivial singular values Λ_+ , where we use the same subscripts as Raphael [9]. The remainder of the orthogonal decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^{n_x+n_y}$ corresponding to the n_x trivial singular values is then determined (in line 7) and used to augment Q' and Λ' (in lines 8 and 9, respectively). Finally, the vector \mathbf{h}' and normalisation constant g' are also calculated (in lines 10 and 11, respectively). Figure 5 illustrates various aspects of Algorithm 6 for a simple example.

Algorithm 6 RepresentConditional

Input: θ, A, \mathbf{b} such that $p(\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{w}; \theta)$ and $\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{w}$

Output: θ' such that $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \theta'\right)$

- 1: $F \leftarrow [-A \quad I]$
 - 2: $R' \leftarrow \text{Columnspace}(F^T R)$
 - 3: $Z \leftarrow R'^T F^T R (R^T (I + AA^T) R)^{-1}$
 - 4: $\mathbf{c}' \leftarrow Z(\mathbf{c} + R^T \mathbf{b})$
 - 5: $P \leftarrow (I - R' R'^T)$
 - 6: $Q_+, \Lambda_+, - \leftarrow \text{CompactSVD}(P F^T Q \Lambda Q^T F P)$
 - 7: $Q_\infty \leftarrow \text{Complement}([Q_+ \quad R'])$
 - 8: $Q' \leftarrow [Q_+ \quad Q_\infty]$
 - 9: $\Lambda' \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_+ & \theta \\ \theta & \theta \end{bmatrix}$
 - 10: $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow Q'^T F^T Q(\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T(\mathbf{b} - F R' \mathbf{c}'))$
 - 11: $g' \leftarrow g - (\mathbf{h} + \frac{1}{2} \Lambda Q^T \mathbf{b})^T Q^T \mathbf{b} + (\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T(\mathbf{b} - \frac{1}{2} F R' \mathbf{c}'))^T Q^T F R' \mathbf{c}' + \frac{1}{2} \log |Z|^2$
-

5.3. Conditional density functions for non-linear dependencies

Now consider the more general non-linear transformation

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) \quad (43)$$

and suppose that we once again need to represent the conditional density

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \approx \mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}', g'\right). \quad (44)$$

In the non-linear case, just as in Section 2.4, we need to resort to approximation through linearisation. For this purpose, we use the unscented transform and sigma points drawn from the prior distribution

$$p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) = p(\mathbf{x}) p(\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{bmatrix}; Q, R, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g\right). \quad (45)$$

Note that for statistically independent random vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{w} , the joint factor in (45) can easily be computed using the extension operation in (37) on each marginal factor followed by (a special case of) the multiplication operation in Algorithm 3.

The goal is to obtain an equivalent affine transformation $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{y}$, given by

$$\mathbf{y} \approx \tilde{A}\mathbf{x} + \tilde{\mathbf{b}} + \tilde{\mathbf{w}} \quad (46)$$

and where the affine transform noise is

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \sim \mathcal{D}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \tilde{Q}, \tilde{R}, \tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \tilde{\mathbf{c}}, \tilde{g}). \quad (47)$$




Figure 5: (a) A visualisation of a degenerate factor in \mathbb{R}^2 subject to the linear constraint $w_1 + w_2 = k$. The dashed 1-D density function indicates the uncertainty along the constraint (and in the direction of the vector \mathbf{q}). Away from this line (in the direction of \mathbf{r}) the factor is equal to zero. (b) The constructed degenerate factor $p(y_1, y_2|x)$ in \mathbb{R}^3 , where $y_1 = w_1 + x$ and $y_2 = w_2$. The factor is consequently subject to the linear constraint $y_1 + y_2 - x = k$ and the vector \mathbf{r}' is perpendicular to the resulting affine plane. In contrast, the vectors \mathbf{q}_+ and \mathbf{q}_∞ lie in the plane, where the factor is invariant to any change along the latter.

This is achieved in Algorithm 7 through moment-matching of the joint density $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ resulting from each transformation in (43) and (46). Once the parameters in (46) and (47) have been calculated, we can approximate the conditional density in (44) using Algorithm 6.

The first step (in line 1 of Algorithm 7) is to draw $2(n - k)$ sigma points from the prior distribution $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$, where k is the degree of degeneracy and γ is a scaling parameter. Each sigma point is then propagated through the non-linear transform (in line 3). As in (17), the mean (in line 5) and covariance (in line 6) of the joint density $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ are approximated using the sigma points and corresponding weights. By partitioning the moments according to \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} and making use of the pseudo-inverse, the matrix \tilde{A} is determined (in line 7). This value of \tilde{A} is then used to determine that of $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}$ (in line 8) as well as in the compact SVD of the noise covariance (in line 9). The quantities $\tilde{\Lambda}$ (in line 10) and \tilde{R} (in line 11) are determined as in Algorithm 1. Without loss of generality, the noise $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ can be chosen as zero-mean, which implies that $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} = \mathbf{0}$ (in line 12). Finally, the normalisation constant (in line 13) is calculated according to (21).

5.4. Kullback-Leibler divergence

As mentioned in Section 2.1, inference on graphs containing loops is approximate. In addition, even for tree-structured graphs, approximations could be introduced due to linearisation. For message passing algorithms, this implies

Algorithm 7 EquivalentTransformation

Input: $\theta, \mathbf{f}(\cdot)$ such that $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{bmatrix}; \theta\right)$ and $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$

Output: $\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{A}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}$ such that $p(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) = \mathcal{D}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}; \tilde{\theta})$ and $\mathbf{y} \approx \tilde{A}\mathbf{x} + \tilde{\mathbf{b}} + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$

- 1: $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X} \\ \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix} \leftarrow [\mathbf{0}, \quad \gamma Q\sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}}, \quad -\gamma Q\sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}}] + (Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c})\mathbf{1}^T$
 - 2: **for** $i = 0, 2(n-k)$ **do**
 - 3: $\mathbf{y}^{[i]} \leftarrow \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}, \mathbf{w}^{[i]})$
 - 4: **end for**
 - 5: $\boldsymbol{\mu} \leftarrow \sum_{i=0}^{2(n-k)} w_m^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{y}^{[i]} \end{bmatrix}$
 - 6: $\Sigma \leftarrow \sum_{i=0}^{2(n-k)} w_c^{[i]} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{y}^{[i]} \end{bmatrix} - \boldsymbol{\mu}' \right) \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{y}^{[i]} \end{bmatrix} - \boldsymbol{\mu}' \right)^T$
 - 7: $\tilde{A} \leftarrow \Sigma_{xy}^T \Sigma_{xx}^+$
 - 8: $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}_y - \tilde{A}\boldsymbol{\mu}_x$
 - 9: $\tilde{Q}, \tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{\cdot} \leftarrow \text{CompactSVD}(\Sigma_{yy} - \tilde{A}\Sigma_{xy})$
 - 10: $\tilde{\Lambda} \leftarrow \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}$
 - 11: $\tilde{R} \leftarrow \text{Complement}(\tilde{Q})$
 - 12: $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}, \tilde{\mathbf{c}} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$
 - 13: $\tilde{g} \leftarrow -\frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1}|$
-

that messages typically need to be computed iteratively until convergence. A popular method to check for convergence of such an algorithm is to use the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) \triangleq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(\mathbf{x}) \log \left(\frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} \right) d\mathbf{x} = \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{x})} [\log p(\mathbf{x}) - \log q(\mathbf{x})]. \quad (48)$$

This provides a measure of the relative entropy from density Q to density P , and $D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) = 0$ only when $p(\mathbf{x}) = q(\mathbf{x})$.

In the case of two degenerate Gaussian densities

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q_1, R_1, \Lambda_1, \mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{c}_1, g_1) \quad \text{and} \quad q(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q_2, R_2, \Lambda_2, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{c}_2, g_2), \quad (49)$$

the KL divergence can be calculated according to

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{tr} (Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1 \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T) + \mathbf{h}_1^T \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1 \Lambda_1^{-1} \mathbf{h}_1 + \right. \\ \left. \mathbf{h}_1^T \Lambda_1^{-1} \mathbf{h}_1 - n + k \right) - \mathbf{h}_1^T \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T Q_2 \mathbf{h}_2 + g_1 - g_2. \quad (50)$$

Note, however, that this result is only valid when the two degenerate densities have support on the same lower-dimensional manifold, i.e. if $C(R_1) = C(R_2)$ and $R_1 \mathbf{c}_1 = R_2 \mathbf{c}_2$. Conversely, if these conditions are not satisfied, the KL

divergence will instead be infinite. In the context of message passing algorithms, however, this should not be the case near convergence.

This concludes the definitions and results of typical statistical operations on degenerate Gaussian factors.

6. An example: Recursive state estimation for autonomous robots

To illustrate the advantages of performing inference with degenerate factors, we consider a representative example. More specifically, we demonstrate a scenario where it is essential to account for degeneracies in modelling and computation – both due to the problem definition as well as due to machine precision limitations. For this purpose, we first provide an overview of recursive state estimation – specifically in the context of mobile robotics. In order to keep the discussion pertinent yet not overly complex, we choose to model the estimation problem with a tree-structured graph. Since we perform inference on a non-linear model using the belief propagation algorithm, all the operations outlined in Sections 4 and 5 except for division are relevant. We also comment on the shortcomings of existing approaches using appropriate qualitative and quantitative results.

6.1. Recursive state estimation

Recursive state estimation (or Bayesian filtering) refers to a setting where the posterior distribution over a time-dependent latent state must be inferred using noisy measurements thereof. Common applications are found in mobile robotics [22], where accurate control of a vehicle heavily relies on a good estimate of its state. In these contexts, the estimation usually occurs online and in real time.

The standard Markovian formulation of the estimation problem consists of a *motion* model – a discrete-time, non-linear function

$$\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{w}_k) \quad (51)$$

relating the current state \mathbf{x}_k to the previous state \mathbf{x}_{k-1} , the control inputs \mathbf{u}_k and the process noise \mathbf{w}_k – and a *measurement* model – a function

$$\mathbf{z}_k = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) \quad (52)$$

relating the measurement \mathbf{z}_k to the state \mathbf{x}_k and the measurement noise \mathbf{v}_k . In addition, the prior distributions over the process noise \mathbf{w}_k and measurement noise \mathbf{v}_k are known. The aim of the estimator is then to calculate what Thrun et al. [22] call the *belief* – the posterior distribution

$$\text{bel}(\mathbf{x}_k) \triangleq p(\mathbf{x}_k | \mathbf{u}_{1:k}, \mathbf{z}_{1:k}) \quad (53)$$

over the state \mathbf{x}_k given all the control inputs $\mathbf{u}_{1:k}$ and measurements $\mathbf{z}_{1:k}$ up to time k – for every time step $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. (Under the Markov assumption, the estimate in (53) can be calculated recursively.) The Bayesian network and

subsequent factor graph representing this inference problem are shown in Figure 6, where we distinguish between motion factors

$$\psi_k(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) \triangleq p(\mathbf{x}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k) \quad (54)$$

and measurement factors

$$\rho_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{z}_k) \triangleq p(\mathbf{z}_k | \mathbf{x}_k) \quad (55)$$

in the latter. Due to the non-linear models in (51) and (52), it is generally necessary to approximate the factors in (54) and (55) using a linearisation technique such as the unscented transform.




Figure 6: (a) A Bayesian network that models the recursive state estimation problem (as adapted from Thrun et al. [22]). Round nodes represent random variables (where a shaded node indicates that the variable is observed) and directed edges indicate causal dependencies. For each discrete time step (as indicated by the subscript k), the state \mathbf{x}_k is latent while the control inputs \mathbf{u}_k and measurement \mathbf{z}_k are observed. (b) The corresponding factor graph. Dark squares indicate factors, where each factor is connected to all the random variables in its scope via undirected edges. We distinguish between motion factors ψ_k and measurement factors ρ_k .

To solve the estimation problem (i.e. to calculate the belief over every state \mathbf{x}_k), we subsequently construct the cluster graph shown in Figure 7. (Note, however, that this choice of cluster graph is not unique.) According to the belief propagation algorithm, the rightward, leftward, downward and upward messages are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_k^{\rightarrow}(\mathbf{x}_k) &= \int \psi_k(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) \xi_{k-1}^{\rightarrow}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \xi_k^{\uparrow}(\mathbf{x}_k) d\mathbf{x}_{k-1} \\ \xi_k^{\leftarrow}(\mathbf{x}_k) &= \int \psi_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{u}_{k+1}) \xi_{k+1}^{\leftarrow}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \xi_{k+1}^{\uparrow}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) d\mathbf{x}_{k+1} \\ \xi_k^{\downarrow}(\mathbf{x}_k) &= \int \psi_k(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) \xi_{k-1}^{\rightarrow}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \xi_k^{\leftarrow}(\mathbf{x}_k) d\mathbf{x}_{k-1} \\ \xi_k^{\uparrow}(\mathbf{x}_k) &= \rho_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{z}_k), \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

respectively. The computations in the first three cases each makes use of two multiplication operations followed by a single marginalisation operation. In addition, all four computations make use of a reduction operation based on either the available control inputs \mathbf{u}_k or the observed measurement \mathbf{z}_k . Once all of the messages have been computed (usually through iteration until convergence), the posterior distribution

$$p(\mathbf{x}_k | \mathbf{u}_{1:K}, \mathbf{z}_{1:K}) = \xi_k^{\rightarrow}(\mathbf{x}_k) \xi_k^{\leftarrow}(\mathbf{x}_k) \quad (57)$$

can be determined for each time step. Note the slight difference in conditioning between (53) (known as filtering) and (57) (known as smoothing). Although the former inference problem can also be solved using (56) and (57) by simply omitting all leftward messages ξ_k^{\leftarrow} , we will only consider the latter going forward as it is a more natural context for graphical models.




Figure 7: A possible cluster graph corresponding to the model of the recursive state estimation problem in Figure 6, where each factor has been placed in its own cluster. Each cluster potential is therefore equal to the appropriate motion or measurement factor. The sepsets are indicated by rectangular nodes and are connected to the clusters via undirected edges. Messages are indicated by arrows and are differentiated (by their labels) according to both their scopes and their directions.

Even though the computations in (56) and (57) are valid for any factor representation, the advantages of Gaussian factors (for example the fact that they are closed under the required operations) make them a popular approximation in robotics applications. The most natural context that further warrants the use of *degenerate* Gaussian factors is one where the models in (51) and (52) include deterministic relationships between a subset of the variables. Note, however, that if a given degeneracy is present for all time steps, it could be sufficient to construct an equivalent, lower-dimensional model of the system without requiring degenerate factors. An appropriate example to illustrate the advantages of degenerate factors is therefore one with time-dependent models, where degeneracies arise inconsistently and unpredictably.

6.2. Cooperative robots in a warehouse

Consider a scenario where a fleet of mobile robots need to work together to transport objects on a warehouse floor. Suppose that these objects can vary in shape and size, and consequently multiple and varying subsets of robots cooperate at any given time. Since each robot operates independently for the majority of the time, we use the odometry motion model

$$\mathbf{x}_k^i = \begin{bmatrix} x_k^i \\ y_k^i \\ \theta_k^i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{k-1}^i + r_k^i \cos(\theta_{k-1}^i + \alpha_k^i) \\ y_{k-1}^i + r_k^i \sin(\theta_{k-1}^i + \alpha_k^i) \\ \theta_{k-1}^i + \alpha_k^i + \beta_k^i \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{w}_k^i \quad (58)$$

as proposed by Thrun et al. [22], where the i 'th robot has position (x_k^i, y_k^i) and orientation θ_k^i and where the corresponding control inputs comprise a rotation α_k^i followed by a translation r_k^i and another rotation β_k^i . Suppose that each robot also receives a noisy measurement (of its position)

$$\mathbf{z}_k^i = \begin{bmatrix} x_k^i \\ y_k^i \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{v}_k^i \quad (59)$$

at every time step and that the noise distributions

$$p(\mathbf{w}_k^i) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}_k^i; \mathbf{0}, \Sigma_w) \quad \text{and} \quad p(\mathbf{v}_k^i) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{v}_k^i; \mathbf{0}, \Sigma_v) \quad (60)$$

are Gaussian. To keep this model consistent with the one in Figure 6, we then combine the states (and similarly the measurements and controls) of all the individual robots into a single state vector \mathbf{x}_k (and measurement vector \mathbf{z}_k and control vector \mathbf{u}_k).

Now consider a moment in time k' when a group of N robots $\{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_N\}$ are transporting an object. If the shape of the object is known, this provides additional information that would be useful for estimating the states of the robots. In this example, we assume that the distances between these robots as well as their relative orientations are specified exactly⁶. This additional information can therefore be included in a noiseless *auxiliary* measurement $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{k'}$, where its n 'th component is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{k'}^n = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{(x_{k'}^{j_n} - x_{k'}^{j_{n-1}})^2 + (y_{k'}^{j_n} - y_{k'}^{j_{n-1}})^2} \\ \theta_{k'}^{j_n} - \theta_{k'}^{j_{n-1}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (61)$$

The *augmented* measurement model for time step k' then appends all of the auxiliary measurements in (61) to the default measurements in (59) to produce a single measurement vector $\mathbf{z}_{k'}$.

A closer look at the necessary inference operations (as outlined in Section 6.1) reveals the need for computing with degenerate factors in this example.

⁶For the sake of simplicity, we only consider translations of the object (as opposed to rotations as well).

Since the augmented measurement model contains noiseless components, the covariance of the measurement noise will be rank deficient and consequently the measurement factor $\rho_{k'}$ in (55) cannot be represented using non-degenerate parametrisations. We therefore need to represent the noise distribution using a degenerate factor as in (41). Furthermore, the upward message $\xi_{k'}^\uparrow$ as computed in (56) will also be degenerate and will in turn be used to compute other messages (for example $\xi_{k'}^\rightarrow$ and $\xi_{k'-1}^\leftarrow$). This requires the reduction, multiplication and marginalisation operations as outlined in Section 4. Even the context for linearising the motion factor $\psi_{k'+1}$ – typically the message $\xi_{k'}^\rightarrow$ – will be degenerate. In summary, once degeneracies arise during inference, it is necessary that *all* of the downstream operations handle such cases appropriately.

6.3. Experiments and results

The estimated beliefs for a group of three robots and a single object is shown in Figure 8. By computing with degenerate factors, we are able to handle cases where the motion of the three robots are independent (first and last 10 time steps) as well as highly-correlated (middle 20 time steps) – both automatically and without encountering numerical errors. In comparison, using ridge regularisation (i.e. adding a small scalar value λ to the diagonal terms of the covariance matrix) as an approximate solution results in more uncertain beliefs.




Figure 8: State estimation for three robots transporting a triangular object (from left to right) on a 2-D warehouse floor when using (a) degenerate factors and (b) canonical factors with ridge regularisation. The object’s initial and final positions are indicated by the lighter and darker triangles, respectively. At each time step, the robots’ actual positions are represented with solid dots and the inferred beliefs with 67% confidence ellipses.

Figure 9 shows the trade-off between high accuracy for small regularisation values and well-conditioned matrices for larger values. Although the critical point when too large a condition number results in numerical errors depends on the machine precision and other application-specific details, it is worth noting that even for this example there is a limited range of regularisation values that achieve acceptable accuracy without affecting the conditioning of the problem adversely. This is in contrast to our principled solution using degenerate factors, where the condition numbers are determined by the problem definition alone, as opposed to worsened by unnecessary approximations.

Since the degenerate parametrisation proposed by Raphael [9] does not include a procedure for approximating non-linear models, we need to convert to




Figure 9: The effect of ridge regularisation (for varying values of λ) on the maximum condition number κ (indicated by the line with circular markers) as well as on the model likelihood Z (indicated by the line with x-shaped markers). The standard deviation for the latter (based on multiple experiments with different control inputs and noise values) are indicated by the shaded region.

(and from) our parametrisation to enable a comparison. The more significant drawback of the former, however, is the absence of normalisation constants due to their use of indicator functions (as opposed to our use of Dirac delta functions) for representing degeneracies. The implication is that, although the first- and second-order moments of the computed beliefs are equivalent in both cases, model comparison is only possible with our parametrisation (where the messages remain unnormalised).

To illustrate this advantage, suppose that the time when the object was picked up is unknown but of interest. By considering multiple hypotheses (i.e. one for each time step), performing inference for each model and then extracting the model likelihood using the normalisation information, we are able to identify the correct model. This is shown in Figure 10(a), where the peak at $k' = 10$ corresponds to the true time step when the object was picked up in Figure 8. Similarly, Figure 10(b) illustrates an alternative context where the transported object could be any one out of a finite set of candidates and the relative size of the object is correctly identified (as $A = 1$) using the model likelihood.

7. Conclusions

Probabilistic inference involving Gaussian factors is only valid for positive-definite covariance and precision matrices. In positive *semi*-definite settings, linear dependencies among the random variables instead warrant the explicit representation of generalised *degenerate* Gaussian factors. To this end, this paper introduced a parametrisation comprised of a lower-dimensional non-degenerate component as well as a Dirac delta function describing possible degeneracies. We further derived typical statistical operations and results such that all the capabilities of non-degenerate factors (such as model comparison and linearisation) are




Figure 10: Model comparison for the state estimation problem in Figure 8 to determine (a) the time step k' when the object was picked up and (b) the size A of the object (relative to the true object's size). In both cases, the mean and standard deviation of the model likelihood Z are indicated by the solid line and shaded region, respectively. The peak where the model likelihood is a maximum (and therefore corresponding to the most-likely model) is indicated by the dashed line.

preserved. This enables accurate and automatic inference in (possibly) degenerate settings at little additional computational cost. In contrast, approximate solutions sacrifice either accuracy or numerical stability as illustrated by the recursive state estimation example. Finally, by utilising the lower-dimensional, diagonal precision matrix of our representation as part of an optimised implementation, future work could reduce the computational cost of performing inference on models with a significant degree of degeneracy.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

J.C. Schoeman: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal analysis, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing. **C.E. van Daalen:** Conceptualization, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision. **J.A. du Preez:** Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by grants from the Wilhelm Frank Bursary Fund as administered by Stellenbosch University from 2017 to 2019.

Appendix A. Identities related to canonical factors and Dirac delta functions

Result 1. *A canonical factor with scope $A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}$ can be expressed over scope \mathbf{x} according to*

$$\mathcal{C}(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}; K, \mathbf{h}, g) = \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbf{x}; A^T K A, A^T(\mathbf{h} - K\mathbf{b}), g + \left(\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2}K\mathbf{b}\right)^T \mathbf{b}\right). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. Using the definition of a canonical factor in (1) we can write

$$\phi = \mathcal{C}(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}; K, \mathbf{h}, g) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})^T K(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{h}^T(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}) + g\right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Rearranging terms yields

$$\phi = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T A^T K A \mathbf{x} + (\mathbf{h} - K\mathbf{b})^T A \mathbf{x} + g + \left(\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2}K\mathbf{b}\right)^T \mathbf{b}\right). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

This concludes the proof for Result 1. \square

Result 2. *A normalised canonical factor can be expressed as a Gaussian density with covariance parametrisation according to*

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K, \mathbf{h}, g) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; K^{-1}\mathbf{h}, K^{-1}). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Proof. By substituting the condition for a normalised factor in (2) into the definition of a canonical factor in (1) we can write

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K, \mathbf{h}, g) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T K \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{h}^T K^{-1}\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2}\log|2\pi K^{-1}|\right). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Rearranging terms and moving the normalisation constant out of the exponent yields a factor in the covariance form, i.e.

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; K, \mathbf{h}, g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|2\pi K^{-1}|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - K^{-1}\mathbf{h})^T K(\mathbf{x} - K^{-1}\mathbf{h})\right). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

This concludes the proof for Result 2. \square

Result 3. *A normalised degenerate factor can be expressed as the limit of a non-degenerate Gaussian density according to*

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q, R, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g) = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}, Q\Lambda^{-1}Q^T + aRR^T). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Proof. By substituting the result in (A.4) as well as the definition of a multidimensional Dirac delta in 14 into the definition of a degenerate factor in (18) we can write

$$\phi = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q, R, \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c}, g) = \mathcal{N}(Q^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h}, \Lambda^{-1}) \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{N}(R^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}; \mathbf{0}, aI). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

By moving the first term into the limit and expressing the factored product as a joint density, (A.8) becomes

$$\phi = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{bmatrix} Q^T \\ R^T \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}; \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda^{-1} \mathbf{h} \\ \mathbf{c} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & aI \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Since $\mathcal{N}(U^T \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; U\boldsymbol{\mu}, U\Sigma U^T)$ for an orthogonal transformation U , (A.9) can further be simplified according to

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{N} \left(\mathbf{x}; [Q \ R] \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda^{-1} \mathbf{h} \\ \mathbf{c} \end{bmatrix}, [Q \ R] \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & aI \end{bmatrix} [Q \ R]^T \right) \\ &= \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}, Q\Lambda^{-1}Q^T + aRR^T). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

This concludes the proof for Result 3. \square

Result 4. *Using the definition in (13) we can use element-wise arguments to show that similar properties (to those in (10) and (11)) hold for the multidimensional Dirac delta function, i.e.*

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}) = f(\mathbf{a}) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}) \quad (\text{A.11})$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\mathbf{x}) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}) d\mathbf{x} = f(\mathbf{a}). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Result 5. *For an $n \times n$ non-singular matrix A , we can write*

$$\delta(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|A|^2}} \delta(\mathbf{x} + A^{-1}\mathbf{b}). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

If A is orthogonal and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$, the result reduces to

$$\delta(A\mathbf{x}) = \delta(\mathbf{x}). \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Proof. By using the definition of the multidimensional Dirac delta in (14), the SVD $A = U\Sigma V^T$, and the fact that $U^T U = I$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(A\mathbf{x}) &= \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} (2\pi a)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2a} \mathbf{x}^T A^T A \mathbf{x} \right) \\ &= \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} (2\pi a)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2a} \mathbf{x}^T V \Sigma^T \Sigma V^T \mathbf{x} \right) = \delta(\Sigma V^T \mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Since Σ is diagonal, we can use (13) to write

$$\delta(\Sigma V^T \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \delta(\sigma_i \mathbf{v}_i^T \mathbf{x}), \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where σ_i is the i th (positive) singular value of A and \mathbf{v}_i is the i th column of V . Using the scaling property of the Dirac delta function in (12), we can combine (A.15) and (A.16) to write

$$\delta(A\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \delta(\sigma_i \mathbf{v}_i^T \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|\sigma_i|} \delta(\mathbf{v}_i^T \mathbf{x}) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|\sigma_i|} \right) \delta(V^T \mathbf{x}). \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Using the definition in (14), and since $VV^T = I$ and $|A| = |\Sigma| = \prod \sigma_i$, we can further expand the Dirac delta in (A.17) to write

$$\delta(A\mathbf{x}) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|\sigma_i|} \right) \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} (2\pi a)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2a} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|A|^2}} \delta(\mathbf{x}). \quad (\text{A.18})$$

The more general result for a non-zero offset \mathbf{b} is obtained by substituting $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} + A^{-1}\mathbf{b}$ into (A.18) and if A is orthogonal, $|A| = 1$. This concludes the proof for Result 5. \square

Appendix B. Derivations of main results

Appendix B.1. Affine transformations of degenerate random variables

To determine the parameters of the degenerate factor representing the density $p(\mathbf{y})$ as calculated according to Algorithm 1, we can use (23), (24) and (29) to calculate the mean

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}] = A \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] + \mathbf{b} \implies Q' \Lambda'^{-1} \mathbf{h}' + R' \mathbf{c}' = A(Q\Lambda^{-1} \mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

and covariance

$$\text{Cov}[\mathbf{y}] = A \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}] A^T \implies Q' \Lambda'^{-1} Q'^T = A Q \Lambda^{-1} Q^T A^T. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The quantities Q' and Λ' can then be calculated directly from (B.2) using the compact SVD. By definition, $C(R') = C(Q')^\perp$, and R' can be determined accordingly. With these quantities known, \mathbf{h}' and \mathbf{c}' can be determined from (B.1) by exploiting the mutual orthogonality of Q' and R' , where we can write

$$R'^T (Q' \Lambda'^{-1} \mathbf{h}' + R' \mathbf{c}') = \mathbf{c}' = R'^T (A(Q\Lambda^{-1} \mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}) \quad (\text{B.3})$$

and

$$\Lambda' Q'^T (Q' \Lambda'^{-1} \mathbf{h}' + R' \mathbf{c}') = \mathbf{h}' = \Lambda' Q'^T (A(Q\Lambda^{-1} \mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{b}). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Finally, since the resulting density $p(\mathbf{y})$ will be normalised, g' is calculated by direct application of (21). This concludes the derivation of Algorithm 1.

Appendix B.2. Marginalisation

To determine the parameters of the marginal factor $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ as calculated according to Algorithm 2, we need to evaluate the integral

$$\mathcal{J} = \int \mathcal{C} \left(\begin{bmatrix} Q_x^T & Q_y^T \\ \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, g \right) \delta \left(\begin{bmatrix} R_x^T & R_y^T \\ \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{c} \right) d\mathbf{y}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

The first step is to define an appropriate substitution. This is achieved by determining orthogonal bases A , B , U and V for the nullspaces of the four block matrices Q_x , Q_y , R_x and R_y , respectively. Concretely, we can write

$$C(A) = N(Q_x), \quad C(B) = N(Q_y), \quad C(U) = N(R_x) \quad \text{and} \quad C(V) = N(R_y). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Since the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} Q & R \end{bmatrix}$ has full rank, $N(Q_x) \perp N(Q_y)$ and $N(R_x) \perp N(R_y)$, although the pairs are not necessarily orthogonal complements. This is because there could for example be a vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ such that $\mathbf{w} \notin N(Q_x)$ and $\mathbf{w} \notin N(Q_y)$. The implication is that the matrices $\begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} U & V \end{bmatrix}$ have orthonormal columns, but are not necessarily square. We therefore need additional bases to guarantee an orthogonal decomposition of \mathbb{R}^n together with QA , QB , RU and RV . For this purpose, we define two ad-hoc matrices F and G such that $F_y = 0$ and $G_x = 0$. Using the definitions in (B.6), the orthogonal matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} QA & QB & RU & RV & F & G \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q_x B & 0 & R_x V & F_x & 0 \\ Q_y A & 0 & R_y U & 0 & 0 & G_y \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

reveals that

$$C(F_x) = (C(Q_x B) + C(R_x V))^\perp \quad \text{and} \quad C(G_y) = (C(Q_y A) + C(R_y U))^\perp. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Returning to the integral in (B.5) and using the substitution

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} QA & QB & RU & RV & F & G \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta} \\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \\ \boldsymbol{\rho} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

as well as the fact that $Q^T R = 0$, we can write

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q_x^T & Q_y^T \\ \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B & Q_x^T F_x & Q_y^T G_y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \\ \boldsymbol{\rho} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_x^T & R_y^T \\ \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} U & V & R_x^T F_x & R_y^T G_y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta} \\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \\ \boldsymbol{\rho} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

The next step is to decompose the Dirac delta in (B.5) into three convenient components. This is achieved by multiplying its argument with the orthogonal matrix $[U \ V \ W]^T$, where

$$C(W) = (C(U) + C(V))^\perp. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Using the substitution in (B.11) and the result in (A.14), the Dirac delta becomes

$$\delta\left(\begin{bmatrix} R_x^T & R_y^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{c}\right) = \delta\left(\begin{bmatrix} \gamma - U^T \mathbf{c} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta} - V^T \mathbf{c} \\ W^T R_x^T F_x \boldsymbol{\omega} + W^T R_y^T G_y \boldsymbol{\rho} - W^T \mathbf{c} \end{bmatrix}\right). \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Note that $U^T R_x^T F_x = 0$ and $V^T R_y^T G_y = 0$ from (B.6) and $U^T R_y^T G_y = 0$ and $V^T R_x^T F_x = 0$ from (B.8). By also using the substitution in (B.10) and the definition in (13), and since $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is independent of the variables of integration and the integral over a Dirac delta is unity, the integral in (B.5) becomes

$$\mathcal{J} = \delta(\boldsymbol{\theta} - V^T \mathbf{c}) \int \mathcal{C} \left(\begin{bmatrix} A & B & Q_x^T F_x & Q_y^T G_y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \\ \boldsymbol{\rho} \end{bmatrix}; \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, g \right) \times \\ \delta(W^T R_x^T F_x \boldsymbol{\omega} + W^T R_y^T G_y \boldsymbol{\rho} - W^T \mathbf{c}) \, d\boldsymbol{\alpha} \, d\boldsymbol{\rho}. \quad (\text{B.14})$$

The next step is to use the sifting property in (A.12). For this purpose, we first use (A.13) to express the argument of the Dirac delta inside the integral in terms of $\boldsymbol{\rho}$, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{|W^T R_y^T G_y|^2}} \delta\left(\boldsymbol{\rho} + (W^T R_y^T G_y)^{-1} W^T (R_x^T F_x \boldsymbol{\omega} - \mathbf{c})\right). \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Substituting this expression into the integral in (B.14) and using the sifting property in (A.12) yields

$$\mathcal{J} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|W^T R_y^T G_y|^2}} \delta(\boldsymbol{\theta} - V^T \mathbf{c}) \int \mathcal{C} \left(\begin{bmatrix} A & B & M \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \end{bmatrix} + P\mathbf{c}; \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, g \right) \, d\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \quad (\text{B.16})$$

where we made use of the matrix definitions

$$P = Q_y^T G_y (W^T R_y^T G_y)^{-1} W^T \quad (\text{B.17})$$

and

$$M = Q_x^T F_x - P R_x^T F_x = (Q_x^T - P R_x^T) F_x. \quad (\text{B.18})$$

Next, the canonical factor inside the integral in (B.16) can be rewritten to have scope $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ according to (A.1), namely

$$\mathcal{C} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} A^T \\ B^T \\ M^T \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \begin{bmatrix} A^T \\ B^T \\ M^T \end{bmatrix}^T, \begin{bmatrix} A^T \\ B^T \\ M^T \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{h} - \Lambda P \mathbf{c}), g + \left(\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda P \mathbf{c} \right)^T P \mathbf{c} \right). \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Using the result for marginalisation of a canonical factor in (4), the integral in (B.16) becomes

$$\mathcal{J} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|W^T R_y^T G_y|^2}} \delta(\boldsymbol{\theta} - V^T \mathbf{c}) \mathcal{C} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\beta} \\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \end{bmatrix}; \hat{K}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g} \right), \quad (\text{B.20})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{K} &= [B \ M]^T (\Lambda - \Lambda S \Lambda) [B \ M] \\ \hat{\mathbf{h}} &= [B \ M]^T (I - \Lambda S) (\mathbf{h} - \Lambda P \mathbf{c}) \\ \hat{g} &= g + \left(\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda P \mathbf{c} \right)^T P \mathbf{c} + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{h} - \Lambda P \mathbf{c})^T S (\mathbf{h} - \Lambda P \mathbf{c}) + \frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi (A^T \Lambda A)^{-1}| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.21})$$

and where we have made use of the matrix definition

$$S = A (A^T \Lambda A)^{-1} A^T. \quad (\text{B.22})$$

The precision matrix in (B.21) can be diagonalised using the SVD

$$\hat{K} = Z \hat{\Lambda} Z^T. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

Reversing the change of variables in (B.9) and substituting (B.23) into (B.20) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|W^T R_y^T G_y|^2}} \delta(V^T R_x^T \mathbf{x} - V^T \mathbf{c}) \mathcal{C} \left([Q_x B \ F_x]^T \mathbf{x}; Z \hat{\Lambda} Z^T, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{C} \left(Z^T [Q_x B \ F_x]^T \mathbf{x}; \hat{\Lambda}, Z^T \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g} - \frac{1}{2} \log |W^T R_y^T G_y|^2 \right) \delta(V^T R_x^T \mathbf{x} - V^T \mathbf{c}) \\ &= \mathcal{D} \left(\mathbf{x}; [Q_x B \ F_x] Z, R_x V, \hat{\Lambda}, Z^T \hat{\mathbf{h}}, V^T \mathbf{c}, \hat{g} - \frac{1}{2} \log |W^T R_y^T G_y|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.24})$$

Note that since both $[Q_x B \ F_x]$ and Z have orthonormal columns, so does their product (as required). This concludes the derivation of Algorithm 2.

Appendix B.3. Multiplication

To determine the parameters of the resulting degenerate factor $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ as calculated according to Algorithm 3, we need to compute the product

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{C}(Q_1^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda_1, \mathbf{h}_1, g_1) \delta(R_1^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_1) \mathcal{C}(Q_2^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda_2, \mathbf{h}_2, g_2) \delta(R_2^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_2). \quad (\text{B.25})$$

We start by finding an orthonormal basis for the column space of R' , which is

$$C(R') = C(R_1) + C(R_2). \quad (\text{B.26})$$

In general, this basis is not unique. However, a convenient choice is to have the $n - k_1$ columns of R_1 as part of the basis. This will always be possible since the columns of R_1 are orthonormal per definition and $\text{rank}(R') \geq \text{rank}(R_1)$. The rest of the basis vectors of $C(R')$ can be obtained by projecting the columns of R_2 onto $N(R_1^T) = C(Q_1)$ and computing its column space. Since Q_1 has orthonormal columns, the necessary projection matrix is $Q_1 Q_1^T$. By defining the matrix V (with orthonormal columns) such that

$$C(V) = C(Q_1 Q_1^T R_2), \quad (\text{B.27})$$

the columns of the matrix $[R_1 \ V]$ form an orthonormal basis for $C(R')$. As with the marginalisation operation, we now define a convenient orthogonal change of variables

$$\mathbf{x} = [U \ V \ R_1] \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{B.28})$$

where

$$C(U) = (C(V) + C(R_1))^\perp. \quad (\text{B.29})$$

Also note that $C(Q_1) = (C(U) + C(V))$. Returning to the product in (B.25) and using the substitution in (B.28) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \mathcal{C}(Q_1^T(U\boldsymbol{\alpha} + V\boldsymbol{\beta}); \Lambda_1, \mathbf{h}_1, g_1) \delta(\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{c}_1) \times \\ &\quad \mathcal{C}(Q_2^T(U\boldsymbol{\alpha} + V\boldsymbol{\beta} + R_1\boldsymbol{\gamma}); \Lambda_2, \mathbf{h}_2, g_2) \delta(R_2^T(V\boldsymbol{\beta} + R_1\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - \mathbf{c}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.30})$$

Note that $R_2^T U = 0$ because, from (B.26), $C(R_2) \subseteq C(R') = C(U)^\perp$. Using the property in (A.11) followed by the result in (A.13), we can express the product of the two Dirac delta functions in (B.30) as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{c}_1) \delta(R_2^T V\boldsymbol{\beta} + R_2^T R_1\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{c}_2) &= \delta(\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{c}_1) \delta(R_2^T V\boldsymbol{\beta} + R_2^T R_1\mathbf{c}_1 - \mathbf{c}_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|R_2^T V|^2}} \delta(\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{c}_1) \delta(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{b}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.31})$$

where

$$\mathbf{b} = (R_2^T V)^{-1} (\mathbf{c}_2 - R_2^T R_1\mathbf{c}_1). \quad (\text{B.32})$$

Substituting (B.31) into the product in (B.30) and using the property in (A.11) once again, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \mathcal{C}(Q_1^T(U\boldsymbol{\alpha} + V\mathbf{b}); \Lambda_1, \mathbf{h}_1, g_1) \mathcal{C}(Q_2^T(U\boldsymbol{\alpha} + V\mathbf{b} + R_1\mathbf{c}_1); \Lambda_2, \mathbf{h}_2, g_2) \times \\ &\quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{|R_2^T V|^2}} \delta\left(\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \\ \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.33})$$

Each of the two canonical factors can then be rewritten to have scope $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ according to (A.1) and can be combined using the result in (5), yielding

$$\mathcal{P} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|R_2^T V|^2}} \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \hat{K}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g}) \delta \left(\begin{bmatrix} \gamma \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \\ \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad (\text{B.34})$$

where we have made use of the definitions

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{K} &= U^T (Q_1 \Lambda_1 Q_1^T + Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T) U \\ \hat{\mathbf{h}} &= U^T (Q_1 (\mathbf{h}_1 - \Lambda_1 Q_1^T V \mathbf{b}) + Q_2 (\mathbf{h}_2 - \Lambda_2 Q_2^T (V \mathbf{b} + R_1 \mathbf{c}_1))) \\ \hat{g} &= g_1 + g_2 + \left(\mathbf{h}_1 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_1 Q_1^T V \mathbf{b} \right)^T Q_1^T V \mathbf{b} + \\ &\quad \left(\mathbf{h}_2 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_2 Q_2^T (V \mathbf{b} + R_1 \mathbf{c}_1) \right)^T Q_2^T (V \mathbf{b} + R_1 \mathbf{c}_1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.35})$$

The precision matrix in (B.35) can be diagonalised using the SVD

$$\hat{K} = Z \hat{\Lambda} Z^T. \quad (\text{B.36})$$

Reversing the change of variables in (B.28) and substituting (B.36) into (B.34) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|R_2^T V|^2}} \mathcal{C}(U^T \mathbf{x}; Z \hat{\Lambda} Z^T, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g}) \delta \left(\begin{bmatrix} R_1 & V \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{x} - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \\ \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{C} \left(Z^T U^T \mathbf{x}; \hat{\Lambda}, Z^T \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g} - \frac{1}{2} \log |R_2^T V|^2 \right) \delta \left(\begin{bmatrix} R_1 & V \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{x} - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \\ \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{D} \left(\mathbf{x}; UZ, \begin{bmatrix} R_1 & V \end{bmatrix}, \hat{\Lambda}, Z^T \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \\ \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix}, \hat{g} - \frac{1}{2} \log |R_2^T V|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.37})$$

Note that since both U and Z have orthonormal columns, so does their product (as required). This concludes the derivation of Algorithm 3.

Appendix B.4. Division

To determine the parameters of the resulting degenerate factor $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ as calculate according to Algorithm 4, we need to compute the quotient

$$\mathcal{Q} = \frac{\mathcal{C}(Q_1^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda_1, \mathbf{h}_1, g_1) \delta(R_1^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_1)}{\mathcal{C}(Q_2^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda_2, \mathbf{h}_2, g_2) \delta(R_2^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_2)} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}', g'). \quad (\text{B.38})$$

Since multiplication of Dirac delta functions is better defined than division, a more precise formulation is to calculate the quantities Q' , R' , Λ' , \mathbf{h}' , \mathbf{c}' and g' such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \mathcal{C}(Q'^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', g') \delta(R'^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}') \mathcal{C}(Q_2^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda_2, \mathbf{h}_2, g_2) \delta(R_2^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_2) \\ &= \mathcal{C}(Q_1^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda_1, \mathbf{h}_1, g_1) \delta(R_1^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.39})$$

This is similar to the product in (B.25), where the x' -superscripts and x_1 -subscripts have been reversed. Therefore, just as in (B.26), (B.39) requires that

$$C(R_1) = C(R') + C(R_2). \quad (\text{B.40})$$

This satisfies the assumption in Section 4.3 that $C(R_2) \subseteq C(R_1)$ and consequently $Q_1^T R_2 = \theta$. To prove that the proposed parameters

$$\begin{aligned} R' &= \text{Complement}([Q_1 \ R_2]) \\ \mathbf{c}' &= R'^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1 \\ Q' &= [Q_1 Z \ R_2] \\ \Lambda' &= \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_+ & \theta \\ \theta & \theta \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{h}' &= Q'^T (Q_1 \mathbf{h}_1 - Q_2 (\mathbf{h}_2 - \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1)) \\ g' &= g_1 - g_2 - \left(\mathbf{h}_2 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1 \right)^T Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.41})$$

(where $Z\Lambda_+Z^T = \Lambda_1 - Q_1^T Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1$) satisfy (B.39), we use the results in Algorithm 3, with the x_1 -subscripts replaced by x' -superscripts and the latter in turn replaced by x'' -superscripts. Since $V = R_2$ and $U = Q_1$, this yields

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{C}(Q''^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda'', \mathbf{h}'', g'') \delta(R''^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}''), \quad (\text{B.42})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
R'' &= [R' \quad R_2] \\
\mathbf{c}'' &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}' \\ \mathbf{c}_2 - R_2^T R' \mathbf{c}' \end{bmatrix} = [R' \quad R_2]^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1 \\
\Lambda'' &= Q_1^T \left([Q_1 Z \quad R_2] \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_+ & \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \emptyset \end{bmatrix} [Q_1 Z \quad R_2]^T + Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T \right) Q_1 \\
&= Q_1^T (Q_1 (\Lambda_1 - Q_1^T Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1) Q_1^T + Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T) Q_1 \\
&= \Lambda_1 \\
Q'' &= Q_1 \\
\mathbf{h}'' &= Q_1^T \left([Q_1 Z \quad R_2] \left([Q_1 Z \quad R_2]^T (Q_1 \mathbf{h}_1 - Q_2 (\mathbf{h}_2 - \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1)) - \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_+ & \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \emptyset \end{bmatrix} [Q_1 Z \quad R_2]^T R_2 \mathbf{c}_2 \right) + Q_2 (\mathbf{h}_2 - \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R' \mathbf{c}'') \right) \\
&= \mathbf{h}_1 \\
g'' &= g_1 - g_2 - \left(\mathbf{h}_2 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1 \right)^T Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1 + g_2 + \\
&\quad \left(\mathbf{h}' - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda' Q'^T R_2 \mathbf{c}_2 \right)^T Q'^T R_2 \mathbf{c}_2 + \left(\mathbf{h}_2 - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R' \mathbf{c}'' \right)^T Q_2^T R' \mathbf{c}'' \\
&= g_1 + \begin{bmatrix} Z^T Q_1^T (Q_1 \mathbf{h}_1 - Q_2 (\mathbf{h}_2 - \Lambda_2 Q_2^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1)) \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{c}_2 \end{bmatrix} \\
&= g_1. \tag{B.43}
\end{aligned}$$

This reveals that the product of the canonical factors in (B.39) is correct. Since $C(R_1) = C([R' \quad R_2]) = C(Q_1)^\perp$, by multiplying its argument with $R_1^T [R' \quad R_2]$ and using the result in (A.14), we can further express the Dirac delta in (B.42) as

$$\delta \left([R' \quad R_2]^T \mathbf{x} - [R' \quad R_2]^T R_1 \mathbf{c}_1 \right) = \delta (R_1^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_1). \tag{B.44}$$

This concludes the derivation of Algorithm 4.

Appendix B.5. Reduction

To determine the parameters of the resulting degenerate factor $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ as calculated according to Algorithm 5, we need to substitute the evidence \mathbf{y}_0 into (31) to obtain $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_0)$ and then express this factor over scope \mathbf{x} . To this end, we start by defining an auxiliary factor with scope $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\}$, namely

$$\phi_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \delta(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_0). \tag{B.45}$$

This multiplication of the joint factor with a Dirac delta can be interpreted as imposing an additional linear constraint due to the evidence $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_0$. If we

further multiply by a carefully-chosen vacuous canonical factor (with $K = 0$, $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{0}$ and $g = 0$) and rearrange the factors, (B.45) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}; 0, \mathbf{0}, 0) \delta(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_0) \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ &= \mathcal{C}\left([I \quad 0] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; 0, \mathbf{0}, 0\right) \delta\left([0 \quad I] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{y}_0\right) \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{C}\left([Q_x^T \quad Q_y^T] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \Lambda, \mathbf{h}, g\right) \delta\left([R_x^T \quad R_y^T] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{c}\right). \quad (\text{B.46})\end{aligned}$$

The motivation for this expansion becomes apparent when comparing (B.25) and (B.46). In particular, note that the evidence operation for degenerate Gaussian factors becomes a special case of the multiplication operation, where $Q_1 = [I \quad 0]^T$, $R_1 = [0 \quad I]^T$ and $\mathbf{c}_1 = \mathbf{y}_0$. We can therefore use the results from (B.37) to determine the product in (B.46). Returning to the definition of the matrix V in (B.27), however, we see that in this case

$$C(V) = \mathcal{C}\left(\begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} [I \quad 0] \begin{bmatrix} R_x \\ R_y \end{bmatrix}\right) = \mathcal{C}\left(\begin{bmatrix} R_x \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}\right). \quad (\text{B.47})$$

This means that $V_y = 0$. Therefore, the expression for the vector \mathbf{b} in (B.32) can be simplified to

$$\mathbf{b} = (R_x^T V_x)^{-1}(\mathbf{c} - R_y^T \mathbf{y}_0). \quad (\text{B.48})$$

Furthermore, since $C(U) \perp C([0 \quad I]^T)$, $U_y = 0$. This means that

$$UZ = \begin{bmatrix} U_x \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} Z = \begin{bmatrix} U_x Z \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad U^T Q = \begin{bmatrix} U_x \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} Q_x \\ Q_y \end{bmatrix} = U_x^T Q_x. \quad (\text{B.49})$$

Using (B.37) (where $\Lambda_1 = 0$, $\mathbf{h}_1 = \mathbf{0}$ and $g_1 = 0$) and substituting (B.47) to (B.49), (B.46) becomes

$$\phi_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{D}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} U_x Z \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & V_x \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_0 \\ \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix}, \hat{g}\right), \quad (\text{B.50})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}Z \hat{\Lambda} Z^T &= \text{SVD}(U_x^T Q_x \Lambda Q_x^T U_x) \\ \hat{\mathbf{h}} &= Z^T U_x^T Q_x \left(\mathbf{h} - \Lambda Q^T \begin{bmatrix} V_x \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{y}_0 \end{bmatrix}\right) \\ \hat{g} &= g + \left(\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda Q^T \begin{bmatrix} V_x \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{y}_0 \end{bmatrix}\right)^T Q^T \begin{bmatrix} V_x \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{y}_0 \end{bmatrix} - \frac{1}{2} \log |R_x^T V_x|^2. \quad (\text{B.51})\end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of the degenerate factor in (18) and that of the multidimensional Dirac delta function in (13), (B.50) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \mathcal{C}\left([Z^T U_x^T \quad 0] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; \hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g}\right) \delta\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ V_x^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_0 \\ \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{C}\left(Z^T U_x^T \mathbf{x}; \hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g}\right) \delta(V_x^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) \delta(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_0). \quad (\text{B.52})\end{aligned}$$

Substituting $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_0$ into (B.52) yields

$$\phi_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_0) = \mathcal{C} \left(Z^T U_x^T \mathbf{x}; \hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g} \right) \delta(V_x^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) \delta(\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}_0). \quad (\text{B.53})$$

However, using (B.45), we also obtain

$$\phi_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_0) = \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_0) \delta(\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{y}_0). \quad (\text{B.54})$$

By comparing (B.53) and (B.54), we can conclude that

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_0) = \mathcal{C} \left(Z^T U_x^T \mathbf{x}; \hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{g} \right) \delta(V_x^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; U_x Z, V_x, \hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{b}, \hat{g}). \quad (\text{B.55})$$

This concludes the derivation of Algorithm 5.

Appendix B.6. Conditional density functions

To determine the parameters of the degenerate factor representing the conditional density $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ as calculated according to Algorithm 6, we rewrite (40) as

$$\mathbf{y} = I\mathbf{w} + (A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}). \quad (\text{B.56})$$

Using the results in Algorithm 1 for the special case of the identity matrix, we can then express the conditional density as

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{y}; Q, R, \Lambda, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, \hat{g}), \quad (\text{B.57})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{c}} &= R^T ((Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}) + (A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})) = \mathbf{c} + R^T(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}) \\ \hat{\mathbf{h}} &= \Lambda Q^T ((Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c}) + (A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})) = \mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}) \\ \hat{g} &= -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}))^T \Lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})) - \frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi\Lambda^{-1}| \\ &= g - \frac{1}{2}(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})^T Q \Lambda Q^T (A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}) - \mathbf{h}^T Q^T (A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.58})$$

and where we have made use of the result in (21) in the last line. We can then use the definition of the degenerate factor in (18) to expand (B.57) according to

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{C} \left(Q^T \mathbf{y}; \Lambda, \mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}), \hat{g} \right) \delta \left(R^T \mathbf{y} - (\mathbf{c} + R^T(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})) \right). \quad (\text{B.59})$$

By using the definition in (1) and rearranging terms, the canonical factor in (B.59) can further be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T Q \Lambda Q^T \mathbf{y} + (\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T(A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}))^T Q^T \mathbf{y} + \hat{g} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} -A & I \end{bmatrix}^T Q \Lambda Q^T \begin{bmatrix} -A & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} + \right. \\ & \quad \left. (\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T \mathbf{b})^T Q^T \begin{bmatrix} -A & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} + g - (\mathbf{h} + \frac{1}{2} \Lambda Q^T \mathbf{b})^T Q^T \mathbf{b} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.60})$$

Similarly, the Dirac delta in (B.59) can be rewritten as

$$\delta \left(R^T (\mathbf{y} - A\mathbf{x}) - (\mathbf{c} + R^T \mathbf{b}) \right) = \delta \left(R^T \begin{bmatrix} -A & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - (\mathbf{c} + R^T \mathbf{b}) \right). \quad (\text{B.61})$$

To guarantee that the basis R' has orthonormal columns, we define the basis U such that

$$C(U) = C \left(\begin{bmatrix} -A & I \end{bmatrix}^T R \right). \quad (\text{B.62})$$

Since the two corresponding projection matrices are also equal, we multiply the argument of the Dirac delta in (B.61) by the carefully-chosen matrix

$$Z = U^T \begin{bmatrix} -A & I \end{bmatrix}^T R (R^T (I + AA^T) R)^{-1} \quad (\text{B.63})$$

and use (A.13) to write

$$\delta \left(R^T \begin{bmatrix} -A & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - (\mathbf{c} + R^T \mathbf{b}) \right) = \sqrt{|Z|^2} \delta \left(R'^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{c}' \right), \quad (\text{B.64})$$

where

$$R' = U \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{c}' = Z(\mathbf{c} + R^T \mathbf{b}). \quad (\text{B.65})$$

To find the remainder of the parameters Q' , Λ' , \mathbf{h}' and g' , the quadratic term in the exponent in (B.60) should be expanded according to

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}^T S \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} &= -\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}^T (I - R'R'^T) S (I - R'R'^T) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}^T R'R'^T S R'R'^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}^T R'R'^T S \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.66})$$

where we made use of the matrix definitions

$$S = F^T Q \Lambda Q^T F \quad \text{and} \quad F = \begin{bmatrix} -A & I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.67})$$

Substituting (B.60), (B.61), (B.64) and (B.66) into (B.59) and using the multiplicative property in (A.11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) &= \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}^T (I - R'R'^T) S (I - R'R'^T) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{c}'^T R'^T S R' \mathbf{c}' - \mathbf{c}'^T R'^T S \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} + (\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T \mathbf{b})^T Q^T F \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. g - (\mathbf{h} + \frac{1}{2} \Lambda Q^T \mathbf{b})^T Q^T \mathbf{b} + \frac{1}{2} \log |Z|^2 \right) \delta \left(R'^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{c}' \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.68})$$

This reveals the motivation behind the expansion in (B.66), namely that, for the compact SVD of the quadratic coefficient in (B.68)

$$Q_+ \Lambda_+ Q_+^T = (I - R'R'^T) S (I - R'R'^T), \quad (\text{B.69})$$

we ensure that $C(Q_+) \perp C(R')$. However, if the density function over the vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$ in (41) has k degrees of degeneracy, then

$$\text{rank}(R') = \text{rank}(R) = k \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rank}(Q_+) = \text{rank}(Q) = n_y - k \quad (\text{B.70})$$

and consequently $C(Q_+) + C(R') \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x+n_y}$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$. We therefore define a third orthonormal basis Q_∞ (with dimension n_x) to complete the decomposition such that

$$C(Q_\infty) = (C(Q_+) + C(R'))^\perp. \quad (\text{B.71})$$

For such an orthogonal decomposition, we can relate the respective projection matrices according to

$$I - R'R'^T = Q_+Q_+^T + Q_\infty Q_\infty^T = [Q_+ \quad Q_\infty] [Q_+ \quad Q_\infty]^T. \quad (\text{B.72})$$

Similar to (B.66), we now expand the linear term in the exponent in (B.68) according to

$$\mathbf{w}^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{w}^T (I - R'R'^T) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{w}^T R'R'^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{B.73})$$

where we have made use of the definition

$$\mathbf{w} = F^T Q(\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T \mathbf{b}) - SR'\mathbf{c}' = F^T Q(\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T (\mathbf{b} - FR'\mathbf{c}')). \quad (\text{B.74})$$

Finally, substituting (B.69) and (B.73) followed by (B.72) into (B.68) and once again using the multiplicative property in (A.11) yields

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}; [Q_+ \quad Q_\infty], R', \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_+ & \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \emptyset \end{bmatrix}, [Q_+ \quad Q_\infty]^T \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{c}', g' \right), \quad (\text{B.75})$$

where

$$g' = g - (\mathbf{h} + \frac{1}{2}\Lambda Q^T \mathbf{b})^T Q^T \mathbf{b} + (\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T (\mathbf{b} - \frac{1}{2}FR'\mathbf{c}'))^T Q^T FR'\mathbf{c}' + \frac{1}{2} \log |Z|^2 \quad (\text{B.76})$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}SR'\mathbf{c}' + \mathbf{w} &= \frac{1}{2}F^T Q \Lambda Q^T FR'\mathbf{c}' + F^T Q(\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T (\mathbf{b} - FR'\mathbf{c}')) \\ &= F^T Q \left(\mathbf{h} + \Lambda Q^T \left(\mathbf{b} - \frac{1}{2}FR'\mathbf{c}' \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.77})$$

This concludes the derivation of Algorithm 6.

Appendix B.7. Equivalent affine transformations

To determine the parameters of the equivalent affine transformation in (46) as well as that of the degenerate factor representing the transform noise in (47) as calculated according to Algorithm 7, we start by approximating the moments

of the joint density $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ using the unscented transform. However, since the prior distribution in (45) is degenerate and the Cholesky decomposition for a positive semi-definite matrix is not defined, the $2n + 1$ sigma points in (15) cannot be used directly. Instead, we propose adapting the result by Thrun et al. [22] to draw $2(n - k) + 1$ sigma points

$$\mathcal{E} = [\mathbf{0}, \quad \gamma\sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}}, \quad -\gamma\sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}}] + \Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h}\mathbf{1}^T \quad (\text{B.78})$$

from only the canonical component of the degenerate factor in (18), where k is the degree of degeneracy and where we have made use of the substitution

$$Q^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{bmatrix} = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}. \quad (\text{B.79})$$

Since all samples (with non-zero likelihood) from the prior distribution in (45) must satisfy

$$R^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{c}, \quad (\text{B.80})$$

the $2k$ sigma points corresponding to the Dirac delta component of the degenerate factor and the basis R are not necessary. By combining (B.79) and (B.80), and since $C(Q) = C(R)^\perp$, we can then write

$$QQ^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{bmatrix} + RR^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{bmatrix} = Q\boldsymbol{\epsilon} + R\mathbf{c}. \quad (\text{B.81})$$

This can in turn be used to transform the sigma points in (B.78) to correspond to the prior $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$, i.e.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X} \\ \mathcal{W} \end{bmatrix} = [\mathbf{0}, \quad \gamma Q\sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}}, \quad -\gamma Q\sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}}] + (Q\Lambda^{-1}\mathbf{h} + R\mathbf{c})\mathbf{1}^T. \quad (\text{B.82})$$

Each of the sigma point pairs $\mathbf{x}^{[i]}$ and $\mathbf{w}^{[i]}$ are then propagated through the non-linear transformation in (43) to yield $\mathbf{y}^{[i]} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}, \mathbf{w}^{[i]})$. Similar to (17), the moments of the joint density $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ can be approximated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} &\approx \sum_{i=0}^{2(n-k)} w_m^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{y}^{[i]} \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{Cov} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} &\approx \sum_{i=0}^{2(n-k)} w_c^{[i]} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{y}^{[i]} \end{bmatrix} - \boldsymbol{\mu}' \right) \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{y}^{[i]} \end{bmatrix} - \boldsymbol{\mu}' \right)^T. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.83})$$

For the equivalent affine transformation in (46), the moments involving \mathbf{y} are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] &= \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}] \tilde{A}^T \\ \text{Cov}[\mathbf{y}] &= \tilde{A} \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}] \tilde{A}^T + \text{Cov}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}] \\ \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}] &= \tilde{A} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] + \tilde{\mathbf{b}} + \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.84})$$

where $\text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]$ are already specified according to (45). Therefore, given the moments in (B.83), the three equations in (B.84) can be used to determine \tilde{A} , $\text{Cov}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}]$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}$, respectively. Specifically, if we let the marginal density $p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q_x, R_x, \Lambda_x, \mathbf{h}_x, \mathbf{c}_x, g_x)$, we can use the first part of (B.84) to write

$$\text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = Q_x \Lambda_x^{-1} Q_x^T \tilde{A}^T \implies Q_x^T \tilde{A}^T = \Lambda_x Q_x^T \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]. \quad (\text{B.85})$$

Now defining the decomposition $\tilde{A}^T = \tilde{A}_Q^T + \tilde{A}_R^T$ such that $C(\tilde{A}_Q^T) \subseteq C(Q_x)$ and $C(\tilde{A}_R^T) \subseteq C(R_x)$, multiplying on both sides of (B.85) by Q_x yields

$$Q_x Q_x^T (\tilde{A}_Q^T + \tilde{A}_R^T) = Q_x \Lambda_x Q_x^T \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] \implies \tilde{A}_Q = \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]^T \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}]^+, \quad (\text{B.86})$$

where we have made use of the pseudo-inverse of the SVD for short. With this value of \tilde{A}_Q known, the second part of (B.84) can be used to write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}] &= \text{Cov}[\mathbf{y}] - (\tilde{A}_Q^T + \tilde{A}_R^T) Q_x \Lambda_x^{-1} Q_x^T (\tilde{A}_Q^T + \tilde{A}_R^T)^T \\ &= \text{Cov}[\mathbf{y}] - \tilde{A}_Q \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}] \tilde{A}_Q^T, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.87})$$

which clearly does not depend on \tilde{A}_R . Finally, the third part of (B.84) can be used to write

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}} + \tilde{A}_R \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] + \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}] - \tilde{A}_Q \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]. \quad (\text{B.88})$$

Since this is an underdetermined system of equations, we are free to choose $\tilde{A}_R = \theta$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}] = \mathbf{0}$, without loss of generality. The former implies that $\tilde{A} = \tilde{A}_Q$ and the latter that $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} = \mathbf{0}$. The remainder of the parameters \tilde{Q} , \tilde{R} , $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and \tilde{g} can then be obtained by computing the compact SVD of (B.87) and calculating the normalisation constant according to (21). This concludes the derivation of Algorithm 7.

Appendix B.8. Kullback-Leibler divergence

To calculate the KL divergence in (48) for the two degenerate densities in (49), we need to calculate the expectation

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) = \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{x})} \left[\log \frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} \right]. \quad (\text{B.89})$$

According to Algorithm 4, for the quotient of two degenerate densities

$$\frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{x}; Q', R', \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', \mathbf{c}', g') \quad (\text{B.90})$$

where $C(R_1) = C(R_2)$, $C(R') = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. The expectation in (B.89) (with respect to the density P) therefore becomes

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) = \mathbb{E} [\log \mathcal{C}(Q'^T \mathbf{x}; \Lambda', \mathbf{h}', g')] = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{x}^T Q' \Lambda' Q'^T \mathbf{x}] + \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{x}^T Q' \mathbf{h}' + g']. \quad (\text{B.91})$$

(Since the Dirac delta components of the two densities are equivalent, we are effectively only comparing their canonical components.) The next step is to calculate the three terms in (B.91). By using the results in Algorithm 4, and since the matrix Z is orthogonal and $C(Q_1) = C(Q_2)$, we can write

$$Q'\Lambda'Q'^T = Q_1(\Lambda_1 - Q_1^T Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1) Q_1^T \quad \text{and} \quad Q'\mathbf{h}' = Q_1 \mathbf{h}_1 - Q_2 \mathbf{h}_2. \quad (\text{B.92})$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}^T A \mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]^T A \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] + \text{tr}(A \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}]), \quad (\text{B.93})$$

we use the first part of (B.92) and the results in (23) and (24) to calculate

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]^T Q'\Lambda'Q'^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}] = \mathbf{h}_1^T \Lambda_1^{-1} (\Lambda_1 - Q_1^T Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1) \Lambda_1^{-1} \mathbf{h}_1 \quad (\text{B.94})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(Q'\Lambda'Q'^T \text{Cov}[\mathbf{x}]) &= \text{tr}(Q_1(\Lambda_1 - Q_1^T Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1) Q_1^T Q_1 \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T) \\ &= \text{tr}(Q_1 Q_1^T - Q_1 Q_1^T Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1 \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T) \\ &= \text{tr}(Q_1 Q_1^T) - \text{tr}(Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1 \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T Q_1 Q_1^T) \\ &= n - k - \text{tr}(Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1 \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.95})$$

In the second-to-last line of (B.95) we used the fact that $\text{tr}(AB) = \text{tr}(BA)$ and in the last line that the trace of an orthogonal projection matrix is equal to its rank. Next, by using the second part of (B.92), we can write

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}]^T Q'\mathbf{h}' = (Q_1 \Lambda_1^{-1} \mathbf{h}_1 + R_1 \mathbf{c}_1)^T (Q_1 \mathbf{h}_1 - Q_2 \mathbf{h}_2) = \mathbf{h}_1^T \Lambda_1^{-1} (\mathbf{h}_1 - Q_1^T Q_2 \mathbf{h}_2). \quad (\text{B.96})$$

Finally, since $g' = g_1 - g_2$, we can substitute (B.94), (B.95) and (B.96) into (B.91) to yield

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{tr}(Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1 \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T) + \mathbf{h}_1^T \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T Q_2 \Lambda_2 Q_2^T Q_1 \Lambda_1^{-1} \mathbf{h}_1 + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbf{h}_1^T \Lambda_1^{-1} \mathbf{h}_1 - n + k \right) - \mathbf{h}_1^T \Lambda_1^{-1} Q_1^T Q_2 \mathbf{h}_2 + g_1 - g_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.97})$$

This concludes the derivation of the KL divergence in (50).

References

References

- [1] R. D. Shachter, C. R. Kenley, Gaussian influence diagrams, *Management Science* 35 (5) (1989) 527–550. doi:10.1287/mnsc.35.5.527.
- [2] D. Koller, N. Friedman, *Probabilistic Graphical Models: Principles and Techniques* (Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning series), The MIT Press, 2009.

- [3] R. E. Kalman, A New Approach to Linear Filtering and Prediction Problems, *Journal of Basic Engineering* 82 (1) (1960) 35–45. doi:10.1115/1.3662552.
- [4] P. Z. Peebles, *Probability, random variables, and random signal principles*, McGraw Hill, 1987.
- [5] S. L. Lauritzen, F. Jensen, Stable local computation with conditional Gaussian distributions, *Statistics and Computing* 11 (2) (2001) 191–203. doi:10.1023/A:1008935617754.
- [6] R. Fitzgerald, Divergence of the Kalman filter, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 16 (6) (1971) 736–747. doi:10.1109/TAC.1971.1099836.
- [7] A. E. Hoerl, R. W. Kennard, Ridge regression: Biased estimation for nonorthogonal problems, *Technometrics* 12 (1) (1970) 55–67. doi:10.1080/00401706.1970.10488634.
- [8] C. Cortes, M. Mohri, A. Talwalkar, On the impact of kernel approximation on learning accuracy, in: *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, 2010, pp. 113–120.
- [9] C. Raphael, Bayesian networks with degenerate Gaussian distributions, *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability* 5 (2) (2003) 235–263. doi:10.1023/A:1024565903746.
- [10] D. Barber, *Bayesian reasoning and machine learning*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [11] J. Pearl, Fusion, propagation, and structuring in belief networks, *Artificial Intelligence* 29 (3) (1986) 241–288. doi:10.1016/0004-3702(86)90072-X.
- [12] R. Kindermann, *Markov random fields and their applications*, American mathematical society, 1980.
- [13] P. P. Shenoy, G. Shafer, Propagating belief functions with local computations, *IEEE Expert* 1 (3) (1986) 43–52. doi:10.1109/MEX.1986.4306979.
- [14] S. L. Lauritzen, D. J. Spiegelhalter, Local computations with probabilities on graphical structures and their application to expert systems, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 50 (2) (1988) 157–194. doi:10.1111/j.2517-6161.1988.tb01721.x.
- [15] P. A. M. Dirac, *The principles of quantum mechanics*, no. 27, Oxford university press, 1981.
- [16] B. P. Lathi, *Modern digital and analog communication systems*, Oxford university press, 1998.

- [17] R. Shankar, Principles of quantum mechanics, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [18] G. Strang, Introduction to Linear Algebra, 4th Edition, Wellesley-Cambridge Press, Wellesley, MA, 2009.
- [19] G. W. Stewart, On the early history of the singular value decomposition, SIAM review 35 (4) (1993) 551–566. doi:10.1137/1035134.
- [20] S. J. Julier, J. K. Uhlmann, New extension of the Kalman filter to nonlinear systems, in: Signal Processing, Sensor Fusion, and Target Recognition VI, Vol. 3068, International Society for Optics and Photonics, 1997, pp. 182 – 193. doi:10.1117/12.280797.
- [21] E. A. Wan, R. Van Der Merwe, The unscented Kalman filter for nonlinear estimation (2000). doi:10.1109/ASSPCC.2000.882463.
- [22] S. Thrun, W. Burgard, D. Fox, Probabilistic robotics, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 2005.
- [23] T. P. Minka, Expectation propagation for approximate Bayesian inference, in: Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, 2001, pp. 362–369. doi:10.5555/2074022.2074067.
- [24] V. Strassen, Gaussian elimination is not optimal, Numerische mathematik 13 (4) (1969) 354–356. doi:10.1007/BF02165411.
- [25] D. Coppersmith, S. Winograd, Matrix multiplication via arithmetic progressions, in: Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '87, 1987, p. 1–6. doi:10.1145/28395.28396.