
State Space representation of non-stationary Gaussian Processes

Alessio Benavoli
alessio@idsia.ch

Marco Zaffalon
zaffalon@idsia.ch

Dalle molle institute for artificial intelligence (IDSIA),
Manno, Switzerland

Abstract

The state space (SS) representation of Gaussian processes (GP) has recently gained a lot of interest. The main reason is that it allows to compute GPs based inferences in $\mathcal{O}(n)$, where n is the number of observations. This implementation makes GPs suitable for Big Data. For this reason, it is important to provide a SS representation of the most important kernels used in machine learning. The aim of this paper is to show how to exploit the transient behaviour of SS models to map non-stationary kernels to SS models.

1. Introduction

In machine learning, *Gaussian Processes* (GP) are commonly used modelling tools for Bayesian non-parametric inference [O’Hagan and Kingman, 1978, Neal, 1998, MacKay, 1998, Rasmussen and Williams, 2006, Rasmussen, 2011, Gelman et al., 2013]. For instance in GP regression, $y = f(x)$, the aim is to estimate f from (noisy) observation y . A natural Bayesian way to approach this problem is to place a prior on f and use the observations to compute the posterior of f . Since f is a function, the GP is a natural prior distribution for f [MacKay, 1998, Rasmussen and Williams, 2006]. A GP, denoted as $GP(0, k_{\theta}(x, x'))$, is completely defined by its mean function (usually assumed to be zero) and covariance function (CF) (also called kernel) $k_{\theta}(x, x')$, which depends on a vector of hyperparameters θ . By suitably choosing the kernel function, we can make GPs very flexible and convenient modelling tools. However, a drawback with GPs is

that the direct computation of the posterior of f is computationally demanding. The computational cost is cubic, $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$, in the number of observations. This makes GPs unsuitable for Big Data. Several general sparse approximation schemes have been proposed for this problem, (see for instance Quiñero-Candela and Rasmussen [2005] and [Rasmussen and Williams, 2006, Ch. 8]).

In the case the function f is defined on \mathbb{R} , i.e., $x \in \mathbb{R}$, computational savings can be made by converting the GP into *State Space* (SS) form and make inference using *Kalman filtering*. Note that the case $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is particularly important because it includes time-series analysis (x is time). The connection between GPs and SS models is well known for some basic kernels and recently it has gained a lot of interest. Certain classes of stationary CFs can be directly converted into state space models by representing their spectral densities as rational functions [Särkkä and Hartikainen, 2012, Sarkka et al., 2013, Solin and Sarkka, 2014]. Moreover, an explicit link between periodic (non-stationary) CFs and SS models has also been derived in [Solin and Särkkä, 2014].

The connection between the SS representation of GPs and GPs models used in machine learning is important for many reasons. First, in machine learning, it has been shown that GPs, with a suitable choice of the kernel, are universal function approximators [Rasmussen and Williams, 2006, Williams, 1997]. Moreover, GPs can also be used for classification, with only a slight modification. Second, inferences in SS models can be computed efficiently by processing the observations sequentially. This means that the computational cost of inference in the SS representation of GPs is $\mathcal{O}(n)$. Third, SS models represent GPs through Stochastic Differential Equations (SDE). They return a model that directly explains the time-series and not only fits or predicts it. It is well known that SDEs are basic modelling tools in econometrics, physics etc.. Hence, if we are able to map the most important kernels used in machine learning to the SS representation we can “kill three birds with one stone”, i.e., we can have an explanatory model with a universal function approximation property at a cost of $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

This is the aim of this paper. In particular, the goal is to extend the work [Särkkä and Hartikainen, 2012, Sarkka et al., 2013] by providing a SS representation of the most important kernels used in machine learning.

In particular, we will show that non-stationary kernels can be mapped into SS models by considering the *transient* behaviour. It is well known that the time response of linear SS models is always the superposition of an initial-condition part and a driven part. The response due to initial-conditions is often ignored, because it vanishes in the stationary case (it is transient). However, for non-stationary systems, the transient never vanishes and, thus, it determines the behaviour of the system. Even with a zero initial condition, we can have a transient behaviour due to the driven part. We will show that by taking into account the transient, we can map the linear regression, periodic and spline kernel to SS models. Moreover, we will also study the transient behaviour for stationary systems to show that in this case it vanishes. To reconcile these two cases, we will make use of the Laplace transform that is able to account for the transient behaviour. This is a difference w.r.t. the work by Särkkä and Hartikainen [2012], Sarkka et al. [2013] where they employed the Fourier transform. Then we will show how to map the neural networks kernels to SS models. For this purpose we will use linear time-variant SS, that are intrinsically non-stationary. Finally, by means of simulations we will show the effectiveness of the proposed approach and the computational advantages by applying it to long time-series. In this work, for lack of space, we will assume that the reader is familiar with the machine learning representation of GPs and we will only discuss the SS representation.

2. State Space model

Let us consider the following stochastic linear time-variant (LTV) state space model [Jazwinski, 2007]

$$\begin{cases} d\mathbf{f}(t) &= \mathbf{F}(t)\mathbf{f}(t)dt + \mathbf{L}(t)dw(t), \\ y(t_k) &= \mathbf{C}(t_k)\mathbf{f}(t_k), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{f}(t) = [f_1(t), \dots, f_m(t)]^T$ is the (stochastic) state vector, $y(t_k)$ is the observation at time t_k , $w(t)$ is a one-dimensional Wiener process with intensity $q(t)$ and $\mathbf{F}(t)$, $\mathbf{L}(t)$, $\mathbf{C}(t)$ are known time-variant matrices of appropriate dimensions. We further assume that the initial state $\mathbf{f}(t_0)$ and $w(t)$ are independent for each $t \geq t_0$. It is well known that the solution of the stochastic differential equation in (1) is (see for instance Jazwinski [2007]):

$$\mathbf{f}(t_k) = \boldsymbol{\psi}(t_k, t_0)\mathbf{f}(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t_k} \boldsymbol{\psi}(t_k, \tau)\mathbf{L}(\tau)dw(\tau), \quad (2)$$

with $\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_k, t_0) = \exp(\int_{t_0}^{t_k} \mathbf{F}(t)dt)$ is the state transition matrix, which is obtained as a matrix exponential.¹

Proposition 1. Assume that $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)] = \mathbf{0}$, then the vector of observations $[y(t_1), y(t_2), \dots, y(t_n)]^T$ is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and covariance matrix whose elements are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= \\ &= \mathbf{C}(t_i)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, t_0)E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)](\mathbf{C}(t_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_j, t_0))^T + \\ &\quad \int_{t_0}^{\min(t_i, t_j)} h(t_i, u)h(t_j, u)q(u)du \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where we have exploited the fact that $E[dw(u)dw(v)] = q(u)\delta(u - v)dudv$ and defined $h(t_1, t_2) = \mathbf{C}(t_1)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_1, t_2)\mathbf{L}(t_2)$ ($h(\dots)$ is called impulse response).

The proof of this proposition is well known (see for instance Jazwinski [2007]), but we have reported the derivations of this proposition (and next propositions/theorems) in appendix for the convenience of the reader. From (3), it is evident that, given the time-varying matrices $\mathbf{A}(t)$, $\mathbf{L}(t)$, $\mathbf{C}(t)$, the CF of a LTV system is completely defined by: (i) the covariance of the initial condition $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)]$; (ii) the CF of the noise $E[dw(u)dw(u)]$.

In case the SS model is *Linear Time-Invariant* (LTI), i.e., $\mathbf{F}(t) = \mathbf{F}$, $\mathbf{L}(t) = \mathbf{L}$, $\mathbf{C}(t) = \mathbf{C}$, $q(t) = q$, we can use the *Laplace transform* to derive (2) and (3) using only algebraic computations. The Laplace transform of a function $x(t)$, defined for $t \geq 0$, is:

$$x(s) = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-st}x(t)dt,$$

where the parameter s is the complex number $s = \sigma + i\omega$, with $\sigma, \omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and i denoting the imaginary unit. The Laplace transform exists provided that the above integral is finite. The values of s for which the Laplace transform exists are called the *Region Of Convergence* (ROC) of the Laplace transform. By using the Laplace transform, we can rewrite the differential equation in (1) in an algebraic form:

$$s\mathbf{f}(s) - \mathbf{f}(t_0) = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{f}(s) + \mathbf{L}w(s), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{f}(s)$, $w(s)$ are the Laplace transforms of $\mathbf{f}(t)$, $w(t)$.² Since $y(s) = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{f}(s)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} y(s) &= \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})^{-1}\mathbf{f}(t_0) + \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})^{-1}\mathbf{L}w(s) \\ &= \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})^{-1}\mathbf{f}(t_0) + H(s)w(s), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $H(s) = \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})^{-1}\mathbf{L}$ is called the transfer function of the linear time-invariant (LTI) SS model and \mathbf{I} is

¹The matrix exponential is $e^A = I + A + A^2/2! + A^3/3! + \dots$

²By defining the Laplace transform (4), we are wrongly considering $w(t)$ as a deterministic input. We use this notation only for convenience, but then we define the correct inverse Laplace transform in (6).

the identity matrix. Since a product in the Laplace domain corresponds to a convolution in time, it follows that

$$y(t_k) = \mathcal{L}^{-1}(\mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{F})^{-1}) \mathbf{f}(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t_k} h(t_k - u) dw(u), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(\cdot)$ denotes the inverse Laplace transform. By computing $E[y(t_i)y(t_j)]$, we obtain again (3). The output of both LTV and LTI systems is clearly completely defined by the SS matrices, the initial condition and the stochastic forcing term $dw(t)$. The aim of the next sections is to show that by suitably choosing these three components we can obtain SS models whose CF coincides with the main kernels used in GPs.

3. Non-stationary CFs defined by LTI SS without forcing term

In this section, we will show that two important CFs used in GPs can be obtained by two LTI SS models without stochastic forcing term. Their output is therefore completely determined by the initial conditions and, thus, the CF they define is non-stationary (it depends on $t_i, t_j \geq t_0$).

3.1. Linear regression kernel

Assume without loss of generality that $t_0 = 0$,

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

$q(t) = 0 \forall t \geq 0^3$ and so there is not forcing term ($dw(t) = 0$). This corresponds to the following LTI SS model:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{df_1}{dt}(t) = f_2(t), \\ \frac{df_2}{dt}(t) = 0, \\ y(t_k) = f_1(t_k). \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

From the equations of this SS model, since $y(t) = f_1(t)$ we derive that $f_1(t) = f(t)$ (it is the function of interest) and $f_2(t) = \frac{df}{dt}(t)$ is its derivative. By computing $\psi(t, t_0) = \exp(\int_{t_0}^t \mathbf{F} dt) = \exp((t - t_0)\mathbf{F})$, we have that

$$\psi(t, t_0) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & t - t_0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and, therefore, $y(t_i) = \mathbf{C}\psi(t_i, t_0)\mathbf{f}(t_0) = f_1(t_0) + (t - t_0)f_2(t_0)$.

Proposition 2. Consider the SS model in (8) and assume that $\mathbf{f}(t_0)$ is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and covariance $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)] = \text{diag}([\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2])$ and $t_0 = 0$. From (2), we have that $[y(t_1), \dots, y(t_k)]$ is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and CF

$$E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 t_i t_j,$$

³Since $q(t) = 0$, the matrix \mathbf{L} is completely superfluous. We have introduced it only because we will use this model later.

for each $t_i, t_j \geq 0$, which corresponds to the linear regression CF [Rasmussen and Williams, 2006, Sec. 4.2.2].

This connection between SS and linear regression is well-known, here we have shown how to derive the CF. Higher order linear regression CFs can be obtained by considering $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)] = \text{diag}([\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_m^2])$ and

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{m-1} & \mathbf{I}_{m-1} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0}_{m-1}^T \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{m-1}^T \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{m-1} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{0}_{m-1}$ is the $(m - 1)$ zero vector.

3.2. Periodic Kernel

Consider the following LTI SS:

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega_k \\ -\omega_k & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

with $q(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. By computing $\psi(t, t_0) = \exp((t - t_0)\mathbf{F})$, we have that

$$\psi(t, t_0) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\omega_k(t - t_0)) & \sin(\omega_k(t - t_0)) \\ -\sin(\omega_k(t - t_0)) & \cos(\omega_k(t - t_0)) \end{bmatrix},$$

and, so

$$\begin{aligned} y(t_i) &= \mathbf{C}\psi(t_i, t_0)\mathbf{f}(t_0) \\ &= \cos(\omega_k(t - t_0))f_1(t_0) + \sin(\omega_k(t - t_0))f_2(t_0) \\ &= a_k \cos(\omega_k(t - t_0)) + b_k \sin(\omega_k(t - t_0)), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where we have written $f_1(t_0) = a_k$ and $f_2(t_0) = b_k$.

Proposition 3. Consider the SS model in (10) and assume that $[a_k, b_k]$ are Gaussian distributed with zero mean, variances $E[a_k^2]$, $E[b_k^2]$ and uncorrelated $E[a_k b_k] = 0$. From (2), we have that $[y(t_1), \dots, y(t_n)]$ is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and CF

$$\begin{aligned} E[y(t_1)y(t_2)] &= E[a_k^2] \cos(\omega_k(t_1 - t_0)) \cos(\omega_k(t_2 - t_0)) \\ &\quad + E[b_k^2] \sin(\omega_k(t_1 - t_0)) \sin(\omega_k(t_2 - t_0)). \\ &= E[a_k^2] \cos(\omega_k(t_2 - t_1)) \end{aligned}$$

for each $t_i, t_j \geq t_0$, where last equality holds if $E[a_k^2] = E[b_k^2]$.

This SS model defines a periodic CF. However, it is evident (see in particular (11)) that it can only represent sinusoidal type periodic functions. However, we know that any periodic function $f(t)$ in $[-p_e, p_e]$, that is integrable, can be approximated by Fourier series:

$$f(t) \approx \sum_{k=1}^J \left[a_k \cos\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{p_e}\right) + b_k \sin\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{p_e}\right) \right], \quad (12)$$

where $a_k, b_k \in \mathbb{R}$ are the coefficients of the Fourier series, which depend on $f(t)$, and $J \in \mathbb{N}$ is the order of the

approximation.⁴ Therefore, we can approximate any periodic function by a sum of J SS models of type (10) with $\omega_k = \frac{2\pi k}{p_e}$. For instance, for $J = 2$, we can consider the SS model

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega_1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\omega_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_2 \\ 0 & 0 & -\omega_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Its transfer function $\phi(t_i, t_0)$ is a diagonal block matrix with blocks

$$\begin{bmatrix} \cos(\omega_k(t - t_0)) & \sin(\omega_k(t - t_0)) \\ -\sin(\omega_k(t - t_0)) & \cos(\omega_k(t - t_0)) \end{bmatrix},$$

for $k = 1, 2$. Hence, from (3), we have that

$$E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = \sum_{k=1}^2 E[a_k^2] \cos(\omega_k(t_i - t_0)) \cos(\omega_k(t_j - t_0)) + E[b_k^2] \sin(\omega_k(t_i - t_0)) \sin(\omega_k(t_j - t_0)), \quad (14)$$

where we have assumed that $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)]$ is a block diagonal matrix with blocks

$$\begin{bmatrix} E[a_k^2] & 0 \\ 0 & E[b_k^2] \end{bmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

for $k = 1, 2$. In Fourier series, the function $f(t)$ is known and so the coefficients a_k, b_k can be computed based on $f(t)$. In GP regression, we do not know $f(t)$ and so we do not know a_k, b_k . We must estimate these coefficients from data.⁵ This is the reason we have assumed a prior distribution on these coefficients. This prior is completely defined by the variances $E[a_k^2], E[b_k^2]$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, J$. If we further assume that $E[a_k^2] = E[b_k^2] = q_k^2$ then we have only J parameters to specify, the q_k . We can further assume that all the parameters are functions of a single parameter $\ell \geq 0$; and penalize high order frequencies. For instance, if we choose $q_k^2 = 2 \exp(-\ell^{-2}) \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{J-k}{2} \rfloor} \frac{(2\ell^2)^{-k-i}}{(k+i)!i!}$, it can be shown that

$$E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = \sum_{k=0}^J q_k^2 \cos\left(\frac{2\pi k}{p_e}(t_j - t_i)\right) \xrightarrow{J \rightarrow \infty} \exp\left(-\frac{2}{\ell^2} \sin\left(\frac{\pi(t_j - t_i)}{p_e}\right)^2\right),$$

which is the periodic CF used in GPs [Rasmussen and Williams, 2006, Sec. 4.2.3]. This result has been derived by Solin and Särkkä [2014], here we have highlighted more extensively the transient analysis and the connection with the Fourier series.

⁴We can also include the constant term ($k = 0$) in the series.

⁵When the period p_e is unknown, we can estimate it from data.

4. Non-stationary CFs defined by LTI SS with zero initial conditions

In this section, we will show that an important CF used in GPs can be obtained by a LTI SS model with stochastic forcing term and zero initial conditions.

4.1. Spline kernel

We derive the CF for the cubic smoothing splines. Consider the LTI SS model in (7), but this time assume that $q(t) = 1 \forall t \geq t_0$, $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)] = \mathbf{0}$ and $t_0 = 0$, then

$$y(t_i) = \int_0^{t_i} \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, \tau)\mathbf{L}(\tau) dw(\tau) = \int_0^{t_i} (t_i - \tau) dw(\tau) \quad (16)$$

and so, from (2), $E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = \int_0^{\min(t_i, t_j)} (t_i - \tau)(t_j - \tau) d\tau$.

Proposition 4. Consider the LTI SS model in (7), but this time assume that $q(t) = 1 \forall t \geq 0$ and $E[\mathbf{f}(0)\mathbf{f}^T(0)] = \mathbf{0}$. Then, from (2), we derive that $[y(t_1), \dots, y(t_n)]$ is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and CF

$$E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = |t_i - t_j| \frac{\min(t_i, t_j)^2}{2} + \frac{\min(t_i, t_j)^3}{3}, \quad (17)$$

for each $t_i, t_j \geq 0$, which is the kernel for the cubic smoothing splines [Rasmussen and Williams, 2006, Sec. 6.3.1].

Higher order splines can be obtained considering SS models as in (9). The connection between SS and smoothing splines has been first derived in Kohn and Ansley [1987]. Here, we have highlighted the connection with GPs and computed the CF (17).

5. Stationary CFs defined by LTI SS models

A stationary CF is a CF that only depends on $t_j - t_i$. In this section we will present SS models whose CF corresponds to stationary kernels used in GPs. Since stationary CFs satisfy $k(\tau) = k(-\tau)$ for $\tau = t_j - t_i$, i.e., they are even functions defined on \mathbb{R} , it is convenient to introduce the bilateral Laplace transform:

$$\mathcal{B}(f(\tau)) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-s\tau} f(\tau) d\tau,$$

that is defined for functions that take values in \mathbb{R} . When the ROC includes the imaginary axis, then for $s = i\omega$, the bilateral Laplace transform reduces to the Fourier transform. Assume that the CF is stationary. The Wiener-Khintchine theorem [Chatfield, 2013] states that the CF is completely

defined by its Fourier transform (its bilateral Laplace transform computed for $s = i\omega$) (when it exists) and vice versa:

$$k(\tau) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} S_y(i\omega) e^{2\pi i\omega\tau} d\omega, \quad S_y(i\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} k(\tau) e^{-2\pi i\omega\tau} d\tau,$$

where $S_y(i\omega)$ is the Fourier transform of $k(\tau)$ also called the *spectral density*.

Theorem 1 (Representation theorem). *Define $S_y(i\omega) = S_y(s)$ and assume that $S_y(s)$ that is a (proper) rational function of s . Then there exists a stable LTI system with the impulse response h such that*

$$y(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t h(t-u) dw(u) \quad (18)$$

where w is a stationary process with uncorrelated increments and spectral density $S_w(s) = q > 0$. In the Laplace domain this can be written as

$$S_y(s) = H(s)H(-s)q, \quad (19)$$

where $H(s) = b(s)/a(s)$ is a rational function whose denominator $a(s)$ has all roots with negative real parts, $b(s)$ has no roots with positive real part and q is a positive real constant.⁶

This is standard result for LTI systems. By interpreting q as the Bilateral Laplace transform of the noise $dw(t)$ ($S_w(s) = q$), then Equation (19) relates the spectral functions of the output of a SS model described by the transfer function $H(s)$ with that of the input (the noise $w(t)$) through the transfer function of the SS model $H(s)$. We can use (19) to derive the SS model that is related to $S_y(s)$. These are the steps: (i) find the zeroes and poles of $S_y(s)$; (ii) take all the poles p_i with real negative part and zeroes with non-positive real part; (iii) decompose $H(s)$ as

$$H(s) = \frac{\prod_i (s - z_i)}{\prod_i (s - p_i)} = \frac{b_0 s^n + b_1 s^{n-1} + \dots + b_{n-1} s + b_n}{s^n + a_1 s^{n-1} + \dots + a_{n-1} s + a_n},$$

and derive the (observable canonical) LTI SS model:

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \vdots & 1 \\ -a_n & -a_{n-1} & -a_{n-2} & \dots & -a_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \\ \vdots \\ r_{n-1} \\ r_n \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{C} = [1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad 0], \quad (20)$$

where

$$\begin{bmatrix} r_0 \\ r_1 \\ \vdots \\ r_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & \\ a_1 & 1 & & & \\ \dots & & \ddots & & \\ a_n & \dots & & a_1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} b_0 \\ b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_n \end{bmatrix}$$

The above LTI system has CF $k(\tau)$.

⁶Since $S_y(s)$ is a real even functions, the zeroes and poles are symmetric w.r.t. the real axis and mirrored in the imaginary axis.

5.1. Matérn kernel for $\nu = 3/2$

Let us consider again the stationary Matérn kernel for $\nu = 3/2$, i.e., $E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = k(\tau) = \frac{1}{4\lambda^3} e^{-\lambda|\tau|}(1 + \lambda|\tau|)$ for $\tau = t_2 - t_1$ [Rasmussen and Williams, 2006, Sec. 4.2.1]. The bilateral Laplace transform of $k(\tau)$ is

$$\mathcal{B}(R(\tau)) = \frac{1}{(\lambda - s)^2(\lambda + s)^2},$$

which is a rational function. We can then apply Theorem 1 and, in this case, $H(s) = 1/(\lambda + s)^2$ and $S_w(s) = 1$. Using (20) we can derive the SS model:

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\lambda^2 & -2\lambda \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{C} = [1 \quad 0], \quad (21)$$

$q(t) = 1 \quad \forall t \geq t_0$. Its impulse response is $h(t) = t \exp(-\lambda t)$ for $t \geq t_0$.

Proposition 5. *Consider (21) and assume that $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)] = 0$. Then, from (2), we obtain that $[y(t_1), \dots, y(t_n)]$ is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and CF*

$$E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = \frac{e^{-\lambda|t_j - t_i|}(1 + \lambda|t_j - t_i|)}{4\lambda^3} - \frac{e^{-\lambda(-2t_0 + t_i + t_j)}(1 + \lambda(-2t_0 + t_i + t_j) + \lambda^2(t_0 - t_i)(t_0 - t_j))}{4\lambda^3}$$

for each $t_i, t_j \geq t_0$.

It can be observed that for $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$, the second term goes to zero and we obtain the Matérn CFs for $\nu = 3/2$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{3}/\ell$. Other Matérn CFs for $\nu = 3/2, 5/2, \dots$ can be obtained via LTI SS models in a similar way. This connection between LTI SS models and Matérn kernel has been firstly discussed in Sarkka et al. [2013]. Here, we have reported the CF for t_0 finite (non-stationary case) and shown that the CF becomes stationary for $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$.

5.2. Square Exponential kernel

Let us now consider the stationary square exponential kernel $E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = k(\tau) = \exp(-\frac{\tau^2}{2\ell^2})$ for $\tau = t_j - t_i$ [Rasmussen and Williams, 2006, Sec. 4.2.1]. Its bilateral Laplace transform is $S_y(s) = \sqrt{2\pi}\ell \exp(\frac{\ell^2 s^2}{2})$, whose ROC is $\text{Re}(s) = 0$ and, hence, $s = i\omega$. $S_y(s)$ is not a rational function, so we cannot directly apply Theorem 1. However, it is a real-valued positive function (it is positive and non-zero) and it is analytic, so we can approximate $1/S_y(s)$ with its Taylor expansion in zero and obtain:

$$S_y(s) \approx \sqrt{2\pi}\ell d! 2^d \frac{1}{d! 2^d + d! 2^{d-1} \ell^2 s^2 + \dots + \ell^{2d} s^{2d}}. \quad (22)$$

We can find $H(s)$ by determining the roots of the polynomial at the denominator that have negative real part. This can be done numerically, but the next result is useful.

Theorem 2. *The roots of the denominator in (22) can be obtained by computing the roots for $\ell = 1$ and then dividing them for ℓ . This gives $H(s)$, while $S_w(s) = \sqrt{2\pi}\ell \frac{\ell^{d/2}}{\ell^{2d}}$.*

This result is useful because it allows us to compute offline the solutions of (22) even when the hyperparameter ℓ is unknown. Let us consider for instance the case $d = 2$

$$S_y(s) \approx 8\sqrt{2\pi}\ell \frac{1}{\omega^4\ell^4 + 4\omega^2\ell^2 + 8}.$$

The roots of the denominator for $\ell = 1$ are $s = \pm\sqrt{2 \pm i2}$.⁷ Hence, the roots corresponding to the stable part are $-\sqrt{2 \pm i2} \approx -1.5538 \pm i0.6436$ and so

$$H(s) = \frac{1}{(s+a)^2 + (b)^2},$$

with $a = 1.5538$ and $b = 0.6436$, which can be represented by the following LTI SS model:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -(a^2 + b^2) & -2a \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{C} &= [1 \quad 0], \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

with $q(t) = 8\sqrt{2\pi}/\ell^3$. The inverse Laplace transform of $H(s)$ is $h(t) = \frac{\exp(-at)\sin(bt)}{b}$.

Proposition 6. *Consider (23) and assume that $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)] = 0$. Then, from (2), we obtain that $[y(t_1), \dots, y(t_n)]$ is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and CF*

$$\begin{aligned} E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= 8\sqrt{2\pi} \\ &\int_{t_0}^{\min(t_i, t_j)} \frac{\exp(-a(t_i - u))\sin(b(t_i - u))}{b} \\ &\cdot \frac{\exp(-a(t_j - u))\sin(b(t_j - u))}{b} du \end{aligned}$$

for each $t_i, t_j \geq t_0$. For $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$, it only depends on $|t_2 - t_1|$.

This connection between LTI SS models and squared exponential kernels has been derived in [Sarkka et al., 2013] and in [Sarkka and Piché, 2014] they have studied the convergence property of the Taylor series. Here, we have derived the new result in Theorem 2, computed the CF for a finite t_0 (non-stationary case) and shown that the CF becomes stationary for $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$ (see appendix for the proof).

6. LTV systems

Up to now, we have only worked with LTI SS models. Hereafter, we will show that moving from LTI to LTV allows us to map two fundamental non-stationary kernels [Williams, 1997] to SS models.

6.1. Non-stationary SE kernel

Let us consider this CF:

$$E[y(t_1)y(t_2)] = e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_m^2}t_1^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_s^2}(t_1-t_2)^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_m^2}t_2^2} \quad (24)$$

where σ_m^2, σ_s^2 are hyper-parameters. This CF is clearly non-stationary. However, its central term is the square exponential CF and, therefore, it can be approximated by a LTV SS that is a simple variant of the LTI SS that defines the square exponential CF. For instance, for $\sigma_s = \sigma_m = 1$ this LTV SS model is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -(a^2 + b^2) & -2a \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{C} &= \begin{bmatrix} e^{-t^2/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The impulse response is $h(t, u) = e^{-t^2/2} \frac{\exp(-a(t-u))\sin(b(t-u))}{b}$ for $u < t$ and the CF

$$\begin{aligned} E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= 8\sqrt{2\pi}e^{-t_1^2/2}e^{-t_2^2/2} \\ &\int_{t_0}^{\min(t_i, t_j)} \frac{\exp(-a(t_i - u))\sin(b(t_i - u))}{b} \\ &\cdot \frac{\exp(-a(t_j - u))\sin(b(t_j - u))}{b} du \end{aligned}$$

This is the $d = 2$ approximation. For $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$, the integral term depends only on $|t_2 - t_1|$. This CF is used in neural networks research and the connection with GPs has been discussed by Williams [1997].

6.2. LTV system defining the neural network kernel

Let us consider the following LTV SS model

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{-\mathbf{t}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C} = [1 \quad 0], \quad (26)$$

with $q(t) = 0 \forall t > 0$, $\mathbf{t} = [1, t]^T$, $\mathbf{r} = [r_0, r_1]^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma_0^2, \sigma_1^2)$ is a definite positive definite matrix. Its transfer function is

$$\phi(t_i, t_0) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}) - \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_0^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}))}{2r_1\sigma_1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} y(t_i) &= \mathbf{C}\psi(t_i, t_0)\mathbf{f}(t_0) \\ &= f_1(t_0) + \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}) - \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_0^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}))}{2r_1\sigma_1} f_2(t_0) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= \\ &= \mathbf{C}(t_i)\psi(t_i, t_0)E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)](\mathbf{C}(t_j)\psi(t_j, t_0))^T \\ &= \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r})\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_j^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where we have assumed that $\mathbf{f}(t_0)$ is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and covariance matrix $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)] = [\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_0^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}), \frac{2r_1\sigma_1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}]^T [\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_0^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}), \frac{2r_1\sigma_1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}]$. Therefore,

⁷By dividing them for ℓ we obtain the roots for $\ell \neq 1$.

from (27), it is evident that (26) models erf like functions. We can add expressivity to the model as follows

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{-\mathbf{t}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-\mathbf{t}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{C} = [1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0] / \sqrt{2}.$$

Its transfer function $\phi(t_i, t_0)$ is a diagonal block matrix with elements

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k) - \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_0^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k))}{2r_{1k}\sigma_1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

for $k = 1, 2$. Hence, we have that

$$y(t_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{k=1}^2 f_{1k}(t_0) + \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k) - \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_0^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k))}{2r_{1k}\sigma_1} f_{2k}(t_0), \quad (29)$$

where $\mathbf{f}(t_0) = [f_{11}(t_0), f_{21}(t_0), f_{12}(t_0), f_{22}(t_0)]^T$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= \\ &= \mathbf{C}(t_i)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, t_0)E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)](\mathbf{C}(t_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_j, t_0))^T \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^2 \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k)\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_j^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where we have assumed that $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)]$ is a block diagonal matrix with elements $[\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_0^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k), \frac{2r_{1k}\sigma_1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}]^T [\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_0^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k), \frac{2r_{1k}\sigma_1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}]$. If we increase the number of elements k and keep this block-diagonal structure, we have that

$$E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^J \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k)\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_j^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k). \quad (31)$$

Theorem 3. Assume that the vectors \mathbf{r}_k are sampled from a standard Gaussian distribution, then

$$\begin{aligned} E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^J \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k)\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_j^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k) \\ &\xrightarrow{J \rightarrow \infty} \int \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r})\text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_j^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{r})N(\mathbf{r}; 0, \mathbf{I})d\mathbf{r} \\ &\propto \frac{2}{\pi} \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{2\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{t}_j}{\sqrt{(1+2\mathbf{t}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{t}_i)(1+2\mathbf{t}_j^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{t}_j)}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

which is the neural network CF [Williams, 1997].

Figure 1 shows the contourplot of the CF for different J . It is evident that at the increase of J converges to the NN CF. To increase the convergence speed, we can choose the vectors \mathbf{r}_k in a deterministic way (smart sampling). We follow the approach proposed by Huber and Hanebeck [2008]. Figure 2 shows the contourplot of the CF for the deterministic sampling. it is evident that for $J = 20$ the approximation is already very good (compare it with the last plot in Figure 1 relative to $J = \infty$).




FIGURE 1. Contour plot of the NN CF for $J = 15, 30, 50, \infty$ (from left to right).




FIGURE 2. Contour plot of the NN CF using deterministic sampling for $J = 10, 20$ (from left to right).

7. Scaling and measurement noise

In the previous derivations, we have assumed that there is not measurement noise. We can add a measurement noise to the measurement equation as follows

$$y(t_i) = \mathbf{C}(t_i)\mathbf{x}(t_i) + v(t_i), \quad (33)$$

where $v(t_i) = N(0, \sigma_v^2)$ is assumed to be independent to the process noise and initial condition. Under these assumptions, for each CF = (...) computed in the above sections, we have now that

$$E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] = (\dots) + \sigma_v^2.$$

Moreover, sometimes it is desirable to have a positive scaling parameter that multiplies the CF. This can be included by rescaling either the stochastic forcing term or the initial condition (for SS without forcing term). Finally, note that different kernels can be combined in an additive way, by simply stacking SS models in block-diagonal matrices as shown for the periodic or NN SS model.

8. Estimates

Once we have defined the SS model for a given CF, we aim to estimate the state of the model given the measurements. Given the hyperparameters of the CF, this can be carried out in three steps:

(a) Discretize the continuous-time SDE to obtain a

discrete-time SDE. This step basically consists on applying (2).

(b) Compute the probability density function (PDF) $p(\mathbf{x}(t_k)|y(t_1), \dots, y(t_k))$, that is Gaussian. The mean and covariance matrix of this Gaussian PDF can be computed efficiently by using Kalman filtering.

(c) Compute the Gaussian posterior PDF $p(\mathbf{x}(t_k)|y(t_1), \dots, y(t_n))$. The mean and covariance matrix of this PDF can be computed very efficiently by smoothing the estimates obtained by the Kalman filter.

The last step return the estimates of the state given all observations. The last two steps have both complexity $\mathcal{O}(n)$. To estimate the hyperparameters of the CF, we adopt a Bayesian approach. We place a prior on the hyperparameters and then we estimate them using a Monte Carlo approach. In practice, we employ a Rao-Blackwellised particle filtering [Smith et al., 2013, Ch. 24]. We have reported the steps of the whole inference scheme in appendix.

9. Example sawtooth wave and Gaussian

Consider the following two functions

$$y_a(t) = S(10\pi(t+0.1)) + v_a(t), \quad y_b(t) = N(4t, 0, 1) + v_b(t)$$

with $S(t) = t - \lfloor t \rfloor$, $v_a(t) \sim N(0, 0.1)$ and $v_b(t) \sim N(0, 0.05)$. The first is a sawtooth wave with period 0.2. The second is a Gaussian density. We have generated 100 observation from the above regression model considering $t \in [0 : 0.01 : 1]$ in the first case and randomly generated $t \sim 4Unif[0, 1] - 2$ in the second case. Our goal is to employ the periodic SS model and, respectively, NN SS model to estimate the two functions. The result is shown in Figure 3. In particular, the two paired plots report the posterior mean and relative credible region for two different orders of the periodic and NN SS model. Consider the sawtooth case. The first plot shows the estimate based on the periodic SS model of order one (only one cosine component). This SS model can estimate exactly only periodic cosine-type function, but the unknown function is a periodic sawtooth wave. To improve the estimate, we can increase the number of cosine terms. For $J = 6$, it is evident that we already obtain an accurate estimate of the sawtooth wave. A similar comment holds also for the NN SS model. At the increasing of the approximation order, the SS posterior estimate gets closer to the true function (it better models the tails of the Gaussian PDF that has generated the data).

9.1. Big Data: sunspots number

Finally, to show the computational efficiency of the proposed approach, we have applied the SS model for inferences in a long time-series. In particular, we have considered the sunspot time series – a daily time series that reports the number of sunspots from 1820 to 2015. After treated




FIGURE 3. Sawtooth inference with SS periodic model of order $J = 2, 6$. Gaussian inference with SS NN model for $J = 10, 20$.




FIGURE 4. Sunspots number

the missing data, the number of observations is 58'306. For inferences we have applied the periodic SS models with the goal of estimating the period of sunspot activity cycle, that is about eleven years. Figure 4 reports the observations (the time has been normalized in $[0, 1]$ and the number of sunspots have been standardized) and the posterior mean computed using the periodic SS model with $J = 8$ components. The estimated period for the sunspot cycle was 10.36 years. The time to run the SS model on this time series was 1.5 hours on standard laptop with a model implemented in Matlab.

10. Conclusions

In this paper we have shown that, by exploiting the transient behaviour of SS models, it is possible to map non-stationary Gaussian Processes (GP) kernels to state space models (SS). In particular, we have shown how to map to SS models the neural network kernels. This is important because SS models allows to reduce the computational complexity of inferences with GPs from cubic to linear in

the number of observations. As future work, we plan to continue to study the relationship between the SS model representation and GPs as well as we plan to extend this work to multivariate regression problems.

References

- Chris Chatfield. *The analysis of time series: an introduction*. CRC press, 2013.
- Andrew Gelman, John B Carlin, Hal S Stern, David B Dunson, Aki Vehtari, and Donald B Rubin. *Bayesian data analysis*. CRC press, 2013.
- Marco F Huber and Uwe D Hanebeck. Gaussian filter based on deterministic sampling for high quality nonlinear estimation. In *Proceedings of the 17th IFAC World Congress (IFAC 2008)*, volume 17, 2008.
- Andrew H Jazwinski. *Stochastic processes and filtering theory*. Courier Corporation, 2007.
- Robert Kohn and Craig F Ansley. A new algorithm for spline smoothing based on smoothing a stochastic process. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 8(1):33–48, 1987.
- David JC MacKay. Introduction to Gaussian processes. In *Bishop, C. M., editor, Neural Networks and Machine Learning*, pages 133–166, 1998.
- R. M. Neal. Regression and classification using gaussian process priors. In *in Bernardo, JM and Berger, JO and Dawid, AP and Smith, AFM editors, Bayesian Statistics 6: Proceedings of the sixth Valencia international meeting*, volume 6, page 475, 1998.
- A. O’Hagan and J. F. C. Kingman. Curve fitting and optimal design for prediction. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 40(1):pp. 1–42, 1978.
- Joaquin Quiñero-Candela and Carl Edward Rasmussen. A unifying view of sparse approximate gaussian process regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6:1939–1959, 2005.
- Carl Edward Rasmussen. The gaussian processes web site, February 2011. URL <http://www.gaussianprocess.org/>.
- Carl Edward Rasmussen and CKI Williams. Gaussian processes for machine learning. 2006. *The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA*, 38:715–719, 2006.
- Simo Särkkä and Jouni Hartikainen. Infinite-dimensional kalman filtering approach to spatio-temporal gaussian process regression. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 993–1001, 2012.
- Simo Sarkka and Robert Piché. On convergence and accuracy of state-space approximations of squared exponential covariance functions. In *Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP), 2014 IEEE International Workshop on*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2014.
- Simo Sarkka, Arno Solin, and Jouni Hartikainen. Spatiotemporal learning via infinite-dimensional bayesian filtering and smoothing: A look at gaussian process regression through kalman filtering. *Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE*, 30(4):51–61, 2013.
- Adrian Smith, Arnaud Doucet, Nando de Freitas, and Neil Gordon. *Sequential Monte Carlo methods in practice*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Arno Solin and Simo Särkkä. Explicit link between periodic covariance functions and state space models. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 33, pages 904–912, 2014.
- Arno Solin and Simo Sarkka. Gaussian quadratures for state space approximation of scale mixtures of squared exponential covariance functions. In *Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP), 2014 IEEE International Workshop on*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2014.
- Christopher KI Williams. Computing with infinite networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 295–301, 1997.

Appendix A. Proofs

A.1. Proposition 1

By definition of covariance, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= \\
\mathbf{C}(t_i)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, t_0)E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)](\mathbf{C}(t_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_j, t_0))^T &+ \\
\int_{t_0}^{t_i} \int_{t_0}^{t_j} \mathbf{C}(t_i)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, u)\mathbf{L}(u)E[dw(u)dw(v)] & \\
\cdot \mathbf{L}^T(v)\boldsymbol{\psi}^T(t_j, v)\mathbf{C}^T(t_j) & \\
= \mathbf{C}(t_i)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, t_0)E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)](\mathbf{C}(t_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_j, t_0))^T &+ \\
\int_{t_0}^{\min(t_i, t_j)} \mathbf{C}(t_i)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, u)\mathbf{L}(u)\mathbf{L}^T(u)\boldsymbol{\psi}^T(t_j, u)\mathbf{C}^T(t_j)q(u)du & \\
= \mathbf{C}(t_i)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, t_0)E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)](\mathbf{C}(t_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_j, t_0))^T &+ \\
\int_{t_0}^{\min(t_i, t_j)} h(t_i, u)h(t_j, u)q(u)du & \\
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where we have exploited that $E[dw(u)dw(v)] = q(u)\delta(u-v)dudv$ and defined $h(t, u) = \mathbf{C}(t)\boldsymbol{\psi}(t, u)\mathbf{L}(u)$.

A.2. Proposition 2

Since $y(t_i) = \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, t_0)\mathbf{f}(t_0) = f_1(t_0) + (t - t_0)f_2(t_0)$. and $\mathbf{f}(t_0)$ is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and covariance $E[\mathbf{f}(t_0)\mathbf{f}^T(t_0)] = \text{diag}([\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2])$, from (2), we have that for $t_0 = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= E[(f_1(0) + t_i f_2(0))(f_1(0) + t_j f_2(0))] \\
&= \sigma_0^2 + t_i t_j \sigma_1^2
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

for each $t_i, t_j \geq 0$.

A.3. Proposition 3

The proof is similar to that of Proposition 2 but considering that

$$\begin{aligned}
y(t_i) &= \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_i, t_0)\mathbf{f}(t_0) \\
&= \cos(\omega_k(t - t_0))f_1(t_0) + \sin(\omega_k(t - t_0))f_2(t_0)
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

A.4. Proposition 4

In this case, we have that $h(t, u) = h(t - u) = (t - u)$ and so from (2),

$$\begin{aligned}
E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= \int_{t_0}^{\min(t_i, t_j)} h(t_i, u)h(t_j, u)q(u)du \\
&= \int_0^{\min(t_i, t_j)} (t_i - u)(t_j - u)du, \\
&= |t_i - t_j| \frac{\min(t_i, t_j)^2}{2} + \frac{\min(t_i, t_j)^3}{3},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have exploited the fact that $q(u) = 1$.

A.5. Proposition 5

$$\begin{aligned}
E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= \\
\int_{t_0}^{\min(t_i, t_j)} (t_i - u)e^{-\lambda(t_i - u)}(t_j - u)e^{-\lambda(t_j - u)}du & \\
\frac{e^{-\lambda|t_j - t_i|}(1 + \lambda|t_j - t_i|)}{4\lambda^3} & \\
- \frac{e^{-\lambda(-2t_0 + t_i + t_j)}(1 + \lambda(-2t_0 + t_i + t_j) + \lambda^2(t_0 - t_i)(t_0 - t_j))}{4\lambda^3} &
\end{aligned}$$

for each $t_i, t_j \geq t_0$. It can be observed that for $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$, the second term goes to zero.

A.6. Proposition 6

The result of the integral is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(e^{-a(-2\min(t_i, t_j) + t_i + t_j)} \left(a(b \sin(b(-2\min(t_i, t_j) + t_i + t_j)) \right. \right. \\
&- a \cos(b(-2\min(t_i, t_j) + t_i + t_j))) + (a^2 + b^2) \cos(b(t_i - t_j)) \Big) \\
&- e^{-a(-2t_0 + t_i + t_j)} \left((a^2 + b^2) \cos(b(t_i - t_j)) \right. \\
&+ a(b \sin(b(-2t_0 + t_i + t_j)) - a \cos(b(-2t_0 + t_i + t_j))) \Big) \Big) \\
&(4ab^2(a^2 + b^2))^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

The second term that multiplies $e^{-a(-2t_0 + t_i + t_j)}$ vanishes for $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$ and so we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{-a|t_j - t_i|} \left(a(b \sin(b|t_j - t_i|) \right. \\
&- a \cos(b|t_j - t_i|) + (a^2 + b^2) \cos(b|t_j - t_i|) \Big) \\
&(4ab^2(a^2 + b^2))^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have exploited the fact that $-2\min(t_i, t_j) + t_i + t_j = |t_j - t_i|$ and cosine is an even function.

A.7. Theorem 2

This result is obvious by noticing that in

$$\sqrt{2\pi} \ell d! 2^d \frac{1}{d! 2^d + d! 2^{d-1} \ell^2 s^2 + \dots + \ell^{2d} s^{2d}}$$

the variable s^o always appears multiplied by ℓ^o with the same power o . Then by redefining $x = s\ell$ we can prove the theorem.

A.8. Theorem 3

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} E[y(t_i)y(t_j)] &= \frac{1}{J} \sum_{k=1}^J \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k) \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_j^T \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{r}_k) \\ &\xrightarrow{J \rightarrow \infty} \int \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_i^T \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{r}) \text{erf}(\mathbf{t}_j^T \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{r}) N(\mathbf{r}; 0, \mathbf{I}) d\mathbf{r} \\ &\propto \frac{2}{\pi} \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{2\mathbf{t}_i^T \Sigma \mathbf{t}_j}{\sqrt{(1+2\mathbf{t}_i^T \Sigma \mathbf{t}_i)(1+2\mathbf{t}_j^T \Sigma \mathbf{t}_j)}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

the first equality follows from the Strong Law of Large Numbers. The second equality can be proven by a change of variables $\mathbf{z} = \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{r}$ and exploiting a result proven by Williams [1997].

Appendix B. Kalman filtering and smoothing

Consider the discretized linear system

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= Ax_t + Lw_t \\ y_t &= Cx_t + v_t \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where $w_t \sim N(0, \Sigma_w)$, $v_t \sim N(0, \Sigma_v)$, and $x_0 \sim N(x_{0|-1}, P_{0|-1})$. Note that $x \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$ means

$$P(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{|\Sigma|^{1/2}}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-\mu)^T \Sigma^{-1}(x-\mu)}.$$

We also have: $E(x) = \mu$ and $E(x - \mu)(x - \mu)^T = \Sigma$.

We will use the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_{t|t} &= E[x_t | y_{0:t}] \\ P_{t|t} &= E[(x_t - \hat{x}_{t|t})(x_t - \hat{x}_{t|t})^T | y_{0:t}] \\ \hat{x}_{t+1|t} &= E[x_{t+1} | y_{0:t}] \\ P_{t+1|t} &= E[(x_{t+1} - \hat{x}_{t+1|t})(x_{t+1} - \hat{x}_{t+1|t})^T | y_{0:t}] \end{aligned}$$

Note that because $x_{t|t}$ is a Gaussian random variable, it is sufficient to only keep track of the mean and covariance. We can do so by the following computations at each time

t :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_{t+1|t} &= A\hat{x}_{t|t} + Bu_t \\ P_{t+1|t} &= AP_{t|t}A^T + \Sigma_w \\ \hat{x}_{t+1|t+1} &= \hat{x}_{t+1|t} + K_{t+1}(y_{t+1} - C\hat{x}_{t+1|t}) \\ K_{t+1} &= P_{t+1|t}C^T(CP_{t+1|t}C^T + \Sigma_v)^{-1} \\ P_{t+1|t+1} &= P_{t+1|t} - P_{t+1|t}C^T(CP_{t+1|t}C^T + \Sigma_v)^{-1}CP_{t+1|t} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

These are the equations of the Kalman filter and return $p(x(t_k)|y(t_1), \dots, y(t_k))$.

B.1. Kalman Smoother

The filtered estimate of $x(t_k)$ only takes into account the ‘‘past’’ information relative to $x(t_k)$. By incorporating the ‘‘future’’ observations relative to $x(t_k)$, we can obtain a more refined state estimate.

Estimators that take into account both past and future are often called ‘‘smoothers.’’ The Kalman smoother estimates $p(x(t_k)|y(t_1), \dots, y(t_n))$.

The Kalman smoother equations here:

$$\hat{x}_{t|T} = \hat{x}_{t|t} + L_t(x_{t+1|T} - \hat{x}_{t+1|T}) \quad (39)$$

$$P_{t|T} = P_{t|t} + L_t(P_{t+1|T} - P_{t+1|t})L_t^T \quad (40)$$

$$L_t = P_{t|t}A^T P_{t+1|t}^{-1} \quad (41)$$

Before running the smoother, we must first run the filter. The smoother then proceeds backward in time.

Note that $P_{t+1|T} - P_{t+1|t} < 0$ as the uncertainty over x_{t+1} is smaller when conditioned on all observations, than when only conditioned on past observations.

B.2. Particle filter

The Kalman filter and Smoother assume that the matrices A, C, L , the variances of the process and measurement noises are completely known. In the GPs, they may include the hyperparameters that we aim to estimate from data. There are many ways to estimate these parameters. We use a pure Bayesian approach. We place a prior on the hyperparameters and then we estimate them using a Monte Carlo approach. In practice, we employ a Rao-Blackwellised particle filtering [Smith et al., 2013, Ch. 24], by exploiting the fact that the system is linear given the hyperparameters and so we can run the Kalman filter and Smoother and then update the hyperparameters. It is exactly like computing inferences in a hierarchical model. In all the experiments we have used a uniform prior for the hyperparameters in $[0, 10]$.