Duality-based inference for state-space models

Guillaume KON KAM KING¹ Andrea PANDOLFI² Omiros PAPASPILIOPOULOS² Marco PIRETTO3 Matteo RUGGIERO^{4,5}

Université Paris-Saclay, INRAE, MaIAGE, France Department of Decision Sciences, Bocconi University, Milano, Italy BrandDelta University of Torino, Italy Collegio Carlo Alberto, Torino, Italy

> "Statistique au Sommet" Rochebrune, 25 Mars 2024

A hidden Markov (diffusion) model: example

Cox-Ingersoll-Ross (CIR) process with Poisson observations Inference taking into account **underlying dynamics**.

$$
X_1 \sim \pi(X_1)
$$

$$
X_n|(X_{n-1} = x_{n-1}) \sim f^{\theta}(x_n|x_{n-1})
$$

$$
Y_n|(X_n = x_n) \sim g^{\theta}(y_n|x_n)
$$

Inference targets: *p*(*xn*|*y*1:*n*) (*filtering*) *p*(*x*1:*n*|*y*1:*n*) (*smoothing*) *p*($\theta | y_{1:n}$), *p*($\theta, x_{1:n} | y_{1:n}$)

Recursive relation for filtering

$$
p(x_n|y_{1:n}) = \frac{g(y_n|x_n)\int_X p(x_{n-1}|y_{1:n-1})f(x_n|x_{n-1})dx_{n-1}}{p(y_n|y_{1:n-1})}
$$

Prediction: $\psi(\xi)(dx) = \int_X \xi(x)f(x|x')dx'$
Update: $\phi_{y_n}(\xi)(dx) = \frac{g(y_n|x)\xi(dx)}{\int_X g(y_n|x')\xi(x')dx'}$

Filtering recurrence: $p(x_n|y_{1:n}) = \phi_{y_n}(\psi(p(x_{n-1}|y_{1:n-1})))$

Optimal Filtering: intractable prediction

Optimal filtering is **almost always an intractable problem**, notably because prediction is intractable in general :

Prediction: $\psi(\xi)(dx) = \int$ χ $\mathcal{E}(x) f(x|x') dx' = \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}(X_n)|X_{n-1} = x']$

Cox-Ingersoll-Ross diffusion:

$$
dX_t = a(b - X_t) dt + \sigma \sqrt{X_t} dB_t
$$

$$
f(x|x') = \sum_{k \ge 0} \text{Poisson}(k|cx') \text{Gamma}(x|d + k, e)
$$

• Wright-Fisher diffusion:

$$
dX_t = \frac{1}{2} (\theta_1(1 - X_t) - \theta_2 X_t) dt + \sqrt{X_t(1 - X_t)} dB_t
$$

$$
f(x|x') = \sum_{k \ge 0} q_k^{\theta} \sum_{l \ge 0}^k Bin(l|k, x') Beta(x | \theta_1, \theta_2)
$$

with q_k^{θ} available only as an infinite series.

Optimal Filtering: tractable approaches and particle approximations

In intractable cases, if **sampling from** $f(x|x')$ is possible, one can use a **particle approximation**:

$$
x'_{k} \sim \xi
$$

\n
$$
x_{k} | x'_{k} \sim f(x_{k} | x'_{k})
$$

\n
$$
k = 1, \cdots, n
$$

\n
$$
\psi(\xi)(dx) \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{x_{k}}(dx)
$$

Discrete state-space case is a **tractable exception**:

$$
\xi = \sum_{j \in \chi} \alpha_j \delta_j \qquad \psi(\xi)(i) = \sum_{j \in \chi} \xi(j) f(i|j)
$$

We present **duality** as another approach to obtain tractable solutions

Dual Processes

What if there were another process *Dⁿ* such that for a class of functions *h*:

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[h\left(X_n,d\right) \mid X_0 = x\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[h\left(x,D_n\right) \mid D_0 = d\right]
$$
?

Xn, *Dⁿ* are said to be in duality w.r.t. *h*.

Hope: Take *h* to (almost) be a filtering distribution and compute prediction using the more convenient dual process.

Prediction, now involving $E[h(x, Dn) | D_0 = d]$, may become more tractable:

- **Pure death** dual process on a discrete state space: prediction involves a **finite sum**, tractable¹.
- **Birth-Death** dual process: prediction involves a **infinite sum**, **intractable** but easy to truncate/sample from.
- **Other duals ?**: some may be easier to handle/sample than the original process, this may even depend on the parameters/data at hand.

Remark: following [Papaspiliopoulos and Ruggiero \(2014\)](#page-19-0), the dual is determined by the choice of *h* function.

¹Filtering, smoothing and full Bayesian inference on $p(\theta, x_{1:n} | y_{1:n})$ described in [Kon Kam King et al. \(2021\)](#page-19-1)

Dual process on a discrete space χ

Let $\xi(\mathrm{d} x) = h(x, d')\pi(\mathrm{d} x)$. Then:

$$
\psi(h(x, d')\pi(\mathrm{d}x)) = \sum_{d \in \chi} p_D(d|d')h(x, d)\pi(\mathrm{d}x)
$$

with p_D transition probabilities for the dual process D_n .

Pure death dual: finite number of *d* such that $f(d|d') \neq 0$

Particle filtering on the discrete dual space

In the case where an infinite number of states in χ can be reached from a state *d* ′ , we can use a **particle approximation**.

We assume here *(e.g. consequence of a convenient prior)* that: $\xi(\mathrm{d}x) = \sum w_d h(x, d) \pi(\mathrm{d}x)$

$$
d\in \chi
$$

We form an *N*-particle approximation:

$$
\xi(\mathrm{d}x)\approx\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N h(x,d'_i)\pi(\mathrm{d}x),\qquad d'_i\sim\sum_{d\in\mathbb{N}}w_d\delta_d
$$

Propagation of the particles via the dual process[√]

$$
d_i \sim p_D(d_i|d_i') \quad \Rightarrow \quad \psi(\xi)(dx) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(x, d_i) \pi(dx)
$$

Akin to particle approximation of the (discrete) mixing measure !

Can be cast into a Feynman-Kac process -> usual asymptotic guarantees

Let's consider a Cox-Ingersoll-Ross diffusion *X^t* with Poisson(*Xt*) observations.

- Pure death dual: **inhomogeneous** death process with instantaneous rate $(d \rightarrow d - 1)$: $\lambda_d \propto d\Theta(t)$
	- Simulation not trivial (time rescaling/thinning)
	- **Closed form** expression available for arbitrary time transition
- Birth-Death dual: **homogeneous** process jumping from:

 $d \rightarrow d + 1$ with rate λ_d

 $d \rightarrow d - 1$ with rate μ_d

- Easy to simulate (Gillespie algorithm), slow if high rate
- **Closed form** expression for arbitrary time transition (linear BD process, Tavaré 2018).

Comparison of various CIR dual predictions

- BD: Birth-Death particle approx, PD: Pure Death particle approx, BPF: Bootstrap Particle Filter
- **•** Pure death and Birth-Death duals with 100 particles on a par with Bootstrap Particle filtering 1500

Filtering performance comparison

- Pure Death particle approximation seems more efficient
- Would need to take timing into account
- Dataset/parameter value dependent

Let's consider a Wright-Fisher diffusion *X^t* with multinomial(*Xt*) observations.

- Pure death dual (Kingman's coalescent): **homogeneous** death process with instantaneous rate $(d \rightarrow d - 1)$: λ_d
	- Easy to simulate, slow if high rate
	- **Closed form** expression available for arbitrary time transition (numerical stability is challenging, faster for **equal time steps**)
- Birth-Death dual: **homogeneous** process jumping from:

 $d \rightarrow d + 1$ with rate λ_d $d \rightarrow d - 1$ with rate μ_d

- Easy to simulate, slow if high rate
- **No closed form** expression for arbitrary time transition.
- May be approximated by a Wright-Fisher diffusion

Summary

Prediction in hidden diffusion processes may be performed using a *dual* process:

- may lead to tractable prediction, filtering, smoothing, inference
- may provide good approximation strategies
- depends on the properties of the chosen dual:
	- easier to simulate than the original process
	- approximation on a different (dual) space

Main motivation: diffusion processes for which only

Birth-Death dual exist

- Jacobi diffusion
- Wright-Fisher with selection

Thanks for your attention ! Want further details ? Check out the ISBA-BNP series seminar of April 5th, 2023 <https://bnp-isba.github.io/webinars.html>

contact: guillaume.konkamking@inrae.fr _{1/3}

Boone, E. L., Merrick, J. R., and Krachey, M. J. (2014). A Hellinger distance approach to MCMC diagnostics. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 84(4):833–849.

- Jansen, S. and Kurt, N. (2014). On the notion (s) of duality for Markov processes. *Probability surveys*, 11:59–120.
- Jenkins, P. A. and Spano, D. (2017). Exact simulation of the Wright–Fisher diffusion. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(3):1478–1509.
- Kon Kam King, G., Papaspiliopoulos, O., and Ruggiero, M. (2021). Exact inference for a class of hidden Markov models on general state spaces. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(1):2832–2875.
- Papaspiliopoulos, O. and Ruggiero, M. (2014). Optimal filtering and the dual process. *Bernoulli*, 20(4):1999–2019.

Papaspiliopoulos, O., Ruggiero, M., and Spano, D. (2016). Conjugacy properties of time-evolving Dirichlet and gamma random measures. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(2):3452–3489.