

Parameter Estimation in Switching Markov Systems and Unsupervised Smoothing

Fei Zheng , Stéphane Derrode , and Wojciech Pieczynski 

Abstract—Stationary jump Markov linear systems (JMLSs) model linear systems whose parameters evolve with time according to a hidden finite state Markov chain. We propose an algorithm for parameter estimation of a recent class of JMLSs called conditionally Gaussian pairwise Markov switching models (CGPMSMs). Our algorithm, named Double-EM (DEM), is based on the expectation–maximization (EM) principle applied twice sequentially. The first EM is applied to the couple (switches, observations) temporarily assumed to be a pairwise Markov chain. The second one is used to estimate the remaining conditional transitions and conditional noise matrices of the CGPMSM. The efficiency of the proposed algorithm is studied via unsupervised smoothing on simulated data. In particular, smoothing results, produced with CGPMSM in an unsupervised manner using DEM, can be more efficient than the ones obtained with the nearest classic conditionally Gaussian linear state-space model based on true parameters and true switches.

Index Terms—Conditionally Gaussian pairwise Markov switching models (CGPMSM), expectation–maximization (EM), Markov switching linear systems, unsupervised smoothing.

I. INTRODUCTION

Let us consider three random sequences $\mathbf{X}_1^N = \{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N\}$, $\mathbf{R}_1^N = \{R_1, \dots, R_N\}$, and $\mathbf{Y}_1^N = \{\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_N\}$, with each $\mathbf{X}_n$, R_n , $\mathbf{Y}_n$ take their values in $\mathbb{R}^m$, $\Omega = \{1, \dots, K\}$, and $\mathbb{R}^q$, respectively. $\mathbf{Y}_1^N$ are observed while $\mathbf{R}_1^N$ and $\mathbf{X}_1^N$ are not. The task that we are handling is to estimate the hidden states $\mathbf{X}_1^N$ from only the observed $\mathbf{Y}_1^N$. We will use the Bayesian smoothing method, which consists of estimating $\mathbf{x}_1^N = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$ by $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1^N = (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_N)$, where each $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n$ is given by the conditional expectation: $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_n | \mathbf{y}_1^N]$. Such fixed-interval smoothing of switching Markov models is of interest in different situations. For instance interference suppression of spread spectrum CDMA systems [1], detection of Bernoulli–Gaussian processes with applications to seismic signals processing [2], target tracking and trajectory reconstruction [3], or still stochastic volatility estimation [4].

To model the probabilistic dependencies among $\mathbf{X}_1^N$, $\mathbf{R}_1^N$, and $\mathbf{Y}_1^N$, we adopt the conditionally Gaussian pairwise Markov switching

models (CGPMSMs [5]). The aim of this paper is to propose a parameter estimation method for CGPMSMs from only observations $\mathbf{Y}_1^N$ and to study unsupervised smoothing under the model with the estimated parameters. As the widely used classic conditionally Gaussian linear state-space models” (CGLSSMs [2], [6]–[10]) are actually particular CGPMSMs, the proposed method can be applied to the CGLSSMs-based unsupervised smoothing as well.

Parameter estimation problem is crucial in real applications. Early work [8] developed a pseudo-EM for estimating the parameters of dynamic linear models with switches, in which the process $\mathbf{R}_1^N$ is not a Markov chain, but a nonstationary independent process defined only by time varying probabilities. Cinquemani *et al.* [11] proposed a parameter identification method through matching the empirical statistics computed from data with corresponding statistics predicted by the model. Orguner and Demirekler [12] worked only on the expectation–maximization (EM) estimation of transition probabilities of $\mathbf{R}_1^N$ for CGLSSMs. And later [13], when it comes to nonlinear case, EM has been combined with the particle filter to perform the parameter estimation. In this paper, particle filtering methods are not used, which removes the inherent problems such as particle degeneracy or large deal of particles needed when the state space dimension is high [14]. The contribution is twofold as follows:

- 1) we propose a stationary CGPMSM parameters estimation method, called “Double-EM” (DEM) from only the observations $\mathbf{Y}_1^N = \mathbf{y}_1^N$, of which an initial work has been presented in [15];
- 2) parameters estimated with the DEM are used to perform unsupervised smoothing by two fast approaches: one new defined directly from the DEM-CGPMSM, and another one based on conditionally Gaussian observed Markov switching model (CGOMSM [4], [5], [16]–[18]) associated with the estimated CGPMSM.

Compared to our initial work in [15], this paper improves the unsupervised method and provides richer experiments. More precisely, following can be concluded.

- 1) Smoothing algorithms are improved using $p(r_n | \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ obtained from first EM instead of the estimated $\hat{r}^*$.
- 2) Experiments study the impact of noise levels as well as the influence of $\mathcal{F}^{y,x}$ values of the CGPMSM, and provide comparison with unsupervised DEM-CGLSSM, which are of interest as CGLSSM is a widely used model.

The proposed parameter estimation method opens ways to unsupervised processing (smoothing, filtering, prediction, etc.) in a very general framework. Indeed, the CGPMSM can approximate any stationary (or even asymptotically stationary) Markov non-Gaussian nonlinear systems [4], [16]. The remaining of the paper is organized as follows. Stationary CGPMSMs are recalled, and the new DEM algorithm is proposed in Section II. Two related unsupervised smoothing approaches are described in Section III, and two series of experiment on DEM-based unsupervised smoothing are reported in Section IV regarding various factors of influence. Finally, Section V draws the conclusion and presents some perspectives.

Manuscript received February 15, 2018; revised February 22, 2018; accepted July 14, 2018. Date of publication August 6, 2018; date of current version March 27, 2019. Recommended by Associate Editor E. Zhou. (Corresponding author: Fei Zheng.)

F. Zheng and S. Derrode are with the École Centrale de Lyon, Université de Lyon, LIRIS, CNRS UMR, Lyon 5205, France (e-mail: fei.zheng@doctorant.ec-lyon.fr; stephane.derrode@ec-lyon.fr).

W. Pieczynski is with the Télécom SudParis, Université Paris-Saclay, SAMOVAR, CNRS UMR, Paris 5157, France (e-mail: wojciech.pieczynski@telecom-sudparis.eu).

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this paper are available online at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2018.2863651

II. STATIONARY CGPMSM

The proposed parameter estimation method is valid under the stationary CGPMSMs model, defined by:

- 1) the triplet $\mathbf{T}_1^N$, with $\mathbf{T}_n := (\mathbf{X}_n, R_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ for each $n = 1, \dots, N$, is Markovian;
- 2) for each $n = 1, \dots, N-1$

$$p(r_{n+1} | \mathbf{x}_n, r_n, \mathbf{y}_n) = p(r_{n+1} | r_n) \quad (1)$$

(which implies that $\mathbf{R}_1^N$ is Markovian);

- 3) $p(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1 | r_1)$ is Gaussian, and for each $n = 1, \dots, N-1$

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_{n+1} - \mathbf{M}^x(R_{n+1}) \\ \mathbf{Y}_{n+1} - \mathbf{M}^y(R_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix} &:= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{F}^{xx}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1}) & \mathcal{F}^{xy}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1}) \\ \mathcal{F}^{yx}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1}) & \mathcal{F}^{yy}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1}) \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1})} \\ &\quad \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_n - \mathbf{M}^x(R_n) \\ \mathbf{Y}_n - \mathbf{M}^y(R_n) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{n+1} \\ \mathbf{V}_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1})$ is the appropriate system transition matrix. $\mathbf{M}^x(R_n)$ and $\mathbf{M}^y(R_n)$ denote the means of $\mathbf{X}_n$ and $\mathbf{Y}_n$ conditionally on R_n , and $[\mathbf{U}_{n+1}^\top, \mathbf{V}_{n+1}^\top]^\top$ represents the Gaussian zero-mean noise with variance-covariance matrix independent from $\mathbf{T}_1^N$ that

$$\text{cov} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{n+1} \\ \mathbf{V}_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} \right) := \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q}^{xx}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1}) & \mathcal{Q}^{xy}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1}) \\ \mathcal{Q}^{yx}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1}) & \mathcal{Q}^{yy}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1}) \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1})} \quad (3)$$

for simplification, we set

$$\mathbf{Z}_n := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_n \\ \mathbf{Y}_n \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{M}^z(R_n) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}^x(R_n) \\ \mathbf{M}^y(R_n) \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{W}_n := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_n \\ \mathbf{V}_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

so that, (2) can be concisely written as

$$\mathbf{Z}_{n+1} - \mathbf{M}^z(R_{n+1}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1}) (\mathbf{Z}_n - \mathbf{M}^z(R_n)) + \mathbf{W}_{n+1} \quad (5)$$

- 4) $\mathbf{R}_1^N$ is stationary ($p(\mathbf{r}_1^{n+1})$ does not depend on n), and for each $n = 1, \dots, N-1$ and each $\mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}$ in Ω^2

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}^z(r_{n+1}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}) \mathbf{\Gamma}^z(r_n) \mathcal{F}^\top(\mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}) + \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}) \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{\Gamma}^z(r_n) := \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{Z}_n - \mathbf{M}^z(r_n))(\mathbf{Z}_n - \mathbf{M}^z(r_n))^\top | R_n = r_n]$ is the variance-covariance matrix of $\mathbf{Z}_n$ conditionally on $\mathbf{R}_n^{n+1} = \mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}$.

In stationary CGPMSM 1–4, the distributions $p(\mathbf{t}_n, \mathbf{t}_{n+1})$ do not depend on n , thus, the model distribution is defined by $p(\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2)$, given by $p(r_1, r_2)$ and $p(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2 | r_1, r_2)$.

Let us recall the following two particular CGPMSMs (if stationary):

- 1) the classic CGLSSMs are CGPMSMs with $\mathcal{F}^{xy}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = \mathcal{F}^{yx}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = \mathbf{0}$ for each $\mathbf{r}_1^2 \in \Omega^2$;
- 2) the recent conditionally Gaussian observed Markov switching models (CGOMSMs), which are CGPMSMs with $\mathcal{F}^{yx}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = \mathbf{0}$ for each $\mathbf{r}_1^2 \in \Omega^2$.

Comparing to CGLSSMs, CGOMSMs have the advantage that fast exact restorations (filtering and smoothing) are feasible in spite of the existence of unknown switches [5] (CGOMSMs also belongs to the conditionally Markov switching hidden linear models family which allows fast exact restorations in general context, not necessarily to be Gaussian [19]).

The proposed parameter estimation method for the stationary CGPMSMs 1–4 is constructed by the following two steps.

- 1) Assuming that $(\mathbf{R}_1^N, \mathbf{Y}_1^N)$ is a stationary pairwise Markov chain (PMC) [20], apply an extension of the classic EM [21], [22] to estimate the parameters θ^* of its distribution $p^*(\mathbf{r}_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ from $\mathbf{Y}_1^N = \mathbf{y}_1^N$, then use $p^*(\mathbf{r}_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ to estimate $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)^N$ of $\mathbf{r}_1^N$ with maximum posterior mode (MPM) criterion (see Section II-A).
- 2) Estimate the parameters θ of $p(\mathbf{T}_1^N)$ using $((\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ with the proposed switching EM specified in Section II-B.

Such a method will be called DEM from the application of EM principle twice. Let us insist on the fact that $(\mathbf{R}_1^N, \mathbf{Y}_1^N)$ is not Markov in general CGPMSM, and thus, the point 1 above is a temporal approximation. Once $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)^N$ is found, this hypothesis is no longer necessary. To be more precise, we have concluded the following:

- 1) $\mathbf{R}_1^N$ is Markovian in CGPMSMs, CGLSSMs, and CGOMSMs;
- 2) $(\mathbf{R}_1^N, \mathbf{Y}_1^N)$ is Markovian in CGOMSMs, but it is not necessarily Markovian in CGPMSMs;
- 3) $(\mathbf{R}_1^N, \mathbf{X}_1^N)$ is Markovian in CGLSSMs, but it is not necessarily Markovian in CGPMSMs.

More generally, let $(\mathbf{G}_1^N, \mathbf{H}_1^N)$ be a stationary time-reversible Markov pairwise process. Necessary and sufficient conditions for Markovianity of $\mathbf{G}_1^N$ (or $\mathbf{H}_1^N$) can be seen in [23].

Remark 2.1: $(\mathbf{R}_1^N, \mathbf{Y}_1^N)$ is not Markovian in general CGPMSM, assuming it Markovian in the first EM could possibly appear as a strong approximation. We performed some experiments to assess how replacing the true $\mathbf{r}_1^N$ with the estimated one obtained by the first EM affects the smoothing. Result, not reported here due to the limited space, shows that this approximation does not deteriorate the performance significantly, and the method so obtained is even the best one (except the optimal one) among all the studied methods.

Let us detail steps 1 and 2 above.

A. EM for Pairwise Markov Chain

The parameters θ^* to be estimated are, for each $j, k \in \Omega$, $p_{j,k} := p^*(r_1 = j, r_2 = k)$; mean $\mathbf{M}_{j,k}^{y_1^2}$ and variance $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{j,k}^{y_1^2}$ of Gaussian density $f_{j,k}(\mathbf{y}_1^2) := p^*(\mathbf{y}_1^2 | r_1 = j, r_2 = k)$. According to the EM principle, to iteratively get the next parameters $(\theta^*)^{(i+1)}$ from the current ones $(\theta^*)^{(i)}$, we need to compute $\psi_n(j, k) := p^*(r_n = j, r_{n+1} = k | \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_n(j, k) &= \frac{\alpha_n(j) p(r_{n+1} = k, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} | r_n = j, \mathbf{y}_n) \beta_{n+1}(k)}{\sum_{(l_1, l_2) \in \Omega^2} \alpha_n(l_1) p(r_{n+1} = l_2, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} | r_n = l_1, \mathbf{y}_n) \beta_{n+1}(l_2)} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with $\alpha_n(j) := p(r_n = j | \mathbf{y}_1^N)$, $\beta_n(j) := \frac{p(\mathbf{y}_{n+1}^N | r_n = j, \mathbf{y}_n)}{p(\mathbf{y}_{n+1}^N | \mathbf{y}_1^N)}$ represent the normalized “forward,” “backward” probabilities [24]. They are calculated from the following recursions:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1(j) &= p(r_1 = j | \mathbf{y}_1) \\ \alpha_{n+1}(j) &= \frac{\sum_{l \in \Omega} \alpha_n(l) p(r_{n+1} = j, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} | r_n = l, \mathbf{y}_n)}{\sum_{(l_1, l_2) \in \Omega^2} \alpha_n(l_1) p(r_{n+1} = l_2, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} | r_n = l_1, \mathbf{y}_n)} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\beta_N(j) = 1$$

$$\beta_n(j) = \frac{\sum_{l \in \Omega} \beta_{n+1}(l) p(r_{n+1} = l, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} | r_n = j, \mathbf{y}_n)}{\sum_{(l_1, l_2) \in \Omega^2} \alpha_n(l_1) p(r_{n+1} = l_2, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} | r_n = l_1, \mathbf{y}_n)}. \quad (9)$$

Thus, the next parameters $(\theta^*)^{(i+1)}$ is obtained by (10) as shown at the bottom of this page. To find initial $(\theta^*)^{(0)}$, we use simply the empirical estimation based on the classified $\mathbf{y}_1^N$ obtained through classic K-means. EM is stopped after the change of the likelihood between two iterations is considered small enough. Then, having $\phi_n(j) := p^*(r_n = j | \mathbf{y}_1^N) = \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_n(j, k)$ got from the last iteration, $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N = (\hat{r}_1^*, \dots, \hat{r}_N^*)$ is obtained by $\hat{r}_n^* = \arg \max_j \phi_n(j)$ adopting the MPM criterion.

B. Switching EM

Knowing the switches, a CGPMSM is actually a varying parameter pairwise Gaussian Markov model (PGMM [5]). In this section, we assume that $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N$ are the true switches, and extend the constant parameter PGMM-based EM algorithm proposed in [25] to the varying parameter case. We call this extension switching EM.

The function that EM updates under the assumption is

$$\theta^{(l+1)} = \arg \max_{\theta} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\theta^{(l)}} \left[\ln p_{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_1^N, (\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N) \mid (\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N \right] \right] \quad (11)$$

with the complete data likelihood given by

$$\begin{aligned} \ln p_{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_1^N, (\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N) &= \ln(p_{\theta}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)) + \ln(p_{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{y}_1 | \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1^*)) \\ &+ \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \ln(p_{\theta}(\hat{r}_{n+1}^* | \hat{r}_n^*)) + \ln(p_{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} | \mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{y}_n, \hat{r}_n^*, \hat{r}_{n+1}^*)). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{(l+1)} &= \arg \max_{\theta} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\theta^{(l)}} \left[\ln(p_{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{y}_1 | \hat{r}_1^*)) \right. \right. \\ &\left. \left. + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \ln(p_{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} | \mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{y}_n, \hat{r}_n^*, \hat{r}_{n+1}^*)) \mid (\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N \right] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

1) *E-step*: As no confusion will be introduced, we temporarily remove the dependency notation related to $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N$. The solution of (13) is function of $p(\mathbf{x}_n | \mathbf{y}_1^N) = \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|N}, \mathbf{P}_{n|N})$. Let us recall how it is computed from the forward recursion followed by a backward one.

The forward recursion gives $p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1} | \mathbf{y}_1^{n+1}) = \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1|n+1}, \mathbf{P}_{n+1|n+1})$ from $p(\mathbf{x}_n | \mathbf{y}_1^n) = \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|n}, \mathbf{P}_{n|n})$ and ends at $p(\mathbf{x}_N | \mathbf{y}_1^N) = \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|N}, \mathbf{P}_{N|N})$. Then, the backward recursion gives $p(\mathbf{x}_n | \mathbf{y}_1^N) = \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|N}, \mathbf{P}_{n|N})$ from $p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1} | \mathbf{y}_1^N) = \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1|N}, \mathbf{P}_{n+1|N})$ and ends with $p(\mathbf{x}_1 | \mathbf{y}_1^N) = \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{1|N}, \mathbf{P}_{1|N})$. More precisely, they run as follows. Define $\mathbf{N}_{n+1}^x$ and $\mathbf{N}_{n+1}^y$ the items linked to the means that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{N}_{n+1}^x(\mathbf{R}_{n+1}^n) \\ \mathbf{N}_{n+1}^y(\mathbf{R}_{n+1}^n) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}^x(\mathbf{R}_{n+1}) \\ \mathbf{M}^y(\mathbf{R}_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix} - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{R}_{n+1}^n) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}^x(\mathbf{R}_n) \\ \mathbf{M}^y(\mathbf{R}_n) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_{n|n+1} &:= \mathbf{Q}^{yy} + \mathcal{F}^{yx} \mathbf{P}_{n|n} (\mathcal{F}^{yx})^{\top} \\ \mathbf{K}_{n|n+1} &:= \mathbf{P}_{n|n} (\mathcal{F}^{yx})^{\top} (\mathbf{S}_{n|n+1})^{-1} \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{n+1|n} &:= \mathcal{F}^{yx} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|n} + \mathcal{F}^{yy} \mathbf{y}_n + \mathbf{N}_{n+1}^y \\ \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{n+1|n} &:= \mathbf{y}_{n+1} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{n+1|n} \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|n+1} &= \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|n} + \mathbf{K}_{n|n+1} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{n+1|n} \\ \mathbf{P}_{n|n+1} &= \mathbf{P}_{n|n} - \mathbf{K}_{n|n+1} \mathbf{S}_{n|n+1} (\mathbf{K}_{n|n+1})^{\top}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1|n+1} &= \mathcal{A} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|n+1} + \mathcal{B}_n \\ \mathbf{P}_{n+1|n+1} &= \mathbf{Q}_2 + \mathcal{A} \mathbf{P}_{n|n+1} \mathcal{A}^{\top} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

in which

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &:= \mathcal{F}^{xx} - \mathbf{Q}^{xy} (\mathbf{Q}^{yy})^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{yx} \\ \mathcal{B}_n &:= \mathbf{Q}^{xy} (\mathbf{Q}^{yy})^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{n+1} - \mathbf{Q}^{xy} (\mathbf{Q}^{yy})^{-1} \mathbf{N}_{n+1}^y \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{F}^{xy} - \mathbf{Q}^{xy} (\mathbf{Q}^{yy})^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{yx}) \mathbf{y}_n + \mathbf{N}_{n+1}^x \\ \mathbf{Q}_2 &:= \mathbf{Q}^{xx} - \mathbf{Q}^{xy} (\mathbf{Q}^{yy})^{-1} \mathbf{Q}^{yx}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Regarding the backward recursion, $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|N}, \mathbf{P}_{n|N})$ is computed from $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1|N}, \mathbf{P}_{n+1|N})$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|N} &= \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1|N} + \mathbf{K}_{n|N} (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1|N} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1|n+1}) \\ \mathbf{P}_{n|N} &= \mathbf{P}_{n+1|N} + \mathbf{K}_{n|N} (\mathbf{P}_{n+1|N} - \mathbf{P}_{n+1|n+1}) (\mathbf{K}_{n|N})^{\top} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $\mathbf{K}_{n|N} = \mathbf{P}_{n|n+1} \mathcal{A}^{\top} (\mathbf{P}_{n+1|n+1})^{-1}$.

For later use, we also calculate the covariance $\mathbf{C}_{n+1,n|N}$ of $\mathbf{X}_{n+1}$ and $\mathbf{X}_n$ conditional on $\mathbf{y}_1^N$, given by

$$\mathbf{C}_{n+1,n|N} = \mathbf{P}_{n+1|N} (\mathbf{K}_{n|N})^{\top}. \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (p_{j,k})^{(i+1)} &= \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \psi_n(j, k) \\ (\mathbf{M}_{j,k}^{y_1^2})^{(i+1)} &= \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \psi_n(j, k) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_n \\ \mathbf{y}_{n+1} \end{bmatrix}}{\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \psi_n(j, k)} \\ (\mathbf{r}_{j,k}^{y_1^2})^{(i+1)} &= \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \psi_n(j, k) \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_n \\ \mathbf{y}_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} - (\mathbf{M}_{j,k}^{y_1^2})^{(i+1)} \right) \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_n \\ \mathbf{y}_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} - (\mathbf{M}_{j,k}^{y_1^2})^{(i+1)} \right)^{\top}}{\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \psi_n(j, k)}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We should notice that this computation is of difference from the ones in [25] and [26], because there is a “shift” of the pair from $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_{n-1})$ in the model handled in these two articles to $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ in the model (2). Moreover, the model considers that the means of $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ change with the switches.

2) *M-step*: For maximization, let us set $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N = \mathbf{r}_1^N$ for simplification. Besides, when dealing with the optimization problem of (11), one may replace the quantities $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ with the centered ones, for which we set $\mathbf{Z}'_n = \mathbf{Z}_n - \mathbf{M}^z(R_n)$. Defining

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}^{n,n,(l)} &:= \mathbb{E}_{\theta^{(l)}} [\mathbf{Z}'_n (\mathbf{Z}'_n)^\top | \mathbf{r}_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|N} - \mathbf{M}^x(r_n) \\ \mathbf{y}_n - \mathbf{M}^y(r_n) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|N} - \mathbf{M}^x(r_n) \\ \mathbf{y}_n - \mathbf{M}^y(r_n) \end{bmatrix}^\top + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}_{n|N} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}^{n+1,n,(l)} &:= \mathbb{E}_{\theta^{(l)}} [\mathbf{Z}'_{n+1} (\mathbf{Z}'_n)^\top | \mathbf{r}_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1|N} - \mathbf{M}^x(r_{n+1}) \\ \mathbf{y}_{n+1} - \mathbf{M}^y(r_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n|N} - \mathbf{M}^x(r_n) \\ \mathbf{y}_n - \mathbf{M}^y(r_n) \end{bmatrix}^\top \\ &\quad + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}^{n+1,n|N} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Solutions $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}^{(l+1)} = \mathcal{F}^{(l+1)}(r_n = j, r_{n+1} = k)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{j,k}^{(l+1)} = \mathcal{Q}^{(l+1)}(r_n = j, r_{n+1} = k)$ of (11) for each $j, k \in \Omega$ verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{F}_{j,k}} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}_{\theta^{(l)}} [p_\theta(\mathbf{z}'_{n+1} | \mathbf{z}'_n) | \mathbf{r}_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N] &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{Q}_{j,k}} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}_{\theta^{(l)}} [p_\theta(\mathbf{z}'_{n+1} | \mathbf{z}'_n) | \mathbf{r}_1^N, \mathbf{y}_1^N] &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

with $p_\theta(\mathbf{z}'_{n+1} | \mathbf{z}'_n) = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{r}_n^{n+1})\mathbf{z}'_n, \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}))$. Setting $\delta_n(j, k) := \mathbb{1}(r_n = j, r_{n+1} = k)$ and $\text{Card}(j, k) := \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \delta_n(j, k)$, we get the expressions of $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}^{(l+1)}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{j,k}^{(l+1)}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{j,k}^{(l+1)} &= \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{z}'_{n+1}, \mathbf{z}'_n} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{j,k}^{n,n,(l)} \right)^{-1} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{j,k}^{(l+1)} &= \frac{1}{\text{Card}(j, k)} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{j,k}^{n+1,n+1,(l)} - \mathcal{F}_{j,k}^{(l+1)} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{j,k}^{n+1,n,(l)} \right)^\top \right) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

in which

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{j,k}^{n,n,(l)} &:= \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \delta_n(j, k) \mathbf{C}^{n,n,(l)} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{j,k}^{n+1,n,(l)} &:= \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \delta_n(j, k) \mathbf{C}^{n+1,n,(l)} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{j,k}^{n+1,n+1,(l)} &:= \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \delta_n(j, k) \mathbf{C}^{n+1,n+1,(l)}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Remark 2.2: Although CGOMSM seems naturally fit for the assumption that we need to estimate $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N$, it is unidentifiable through EM. So, the DEM can work for general CGPMSMs except the very CGOMSM case.

III. APPROXIMATED UNSUPERVISED SMOOTHING

As fast exact smoothing is not feasible in CGPMSMs, we propose to study the performance of the DEM with two smoothing approaches.

The first one, called DEM-CGOMSM, uses the parameters estimated through DEM and modified into CGOMSM to have $\mathcal{F}^{y^x}(\mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}) = 0$




Fig. 1. Dependence graph of $(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{Y}_2)$ conditional on $(r_n = j, r_{n+1} = k)$.

for all $\mathbf{r}_n^{n+1} \in \Omega^2$, so that fast smoothing is workable under the approached CGOMSM model [5].

The second one, called DEM-CGPMSM, uses the classic approximation, replacing Gaussian mixtures $p(\mathbf{x}_n | r_n, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ and $p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1} | r_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ by Gaussian distributions with the same means and variances in recursive computations. However, the originality of DEM-CGPMSM is that the distributions $p(r_{n+1} | r_n, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ and $p(r_{n+1} | r_n, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ needed are those estimated by EM for PMC in DEM. In detail, assuming that $p(\mathbf{x}_n | r_n, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ is Gaussian, mean and variance of Gaussian $p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1} | \mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_1^{n+1})$ can be computed by (16). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1} | r_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_1^{n+1}) &= \sum_{r_n} p(r_n | r_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_1^{n+1}) \\ &\quad \times p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1} | \mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_1^{n+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Similarly, $p(\mathbf{x}_n | \mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ is computed from $p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1} | r_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ (assumed Gaussian) using the backward recursion (18), and then

$$p(\mathbf{x}_n | r_n, \mathbf{y}_1^N) = \sum_{r_{n+1}} p(r_{n+1} | r_n, \mathbf{y}_1^N) p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1} | \mathbf{r}_n^{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_1^N). \quad (26)$$

Probabilities $p(r_n | r_{n+1}, \mathbf{y}_1^{n+1})$ and $p(r_{n+1} | r_n, \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ in these two equations above are computable because of the assumed Markovianity of $(\mathbf{R}_1^N, \mathbf{Y}_1^N)$ in the DEM. Finally, the smoothing result is given by $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n = \sum_{r_n} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_n | r_n, \mathbf{y}_1^N] p(r_n | \mathbf{y}_1^N)$ for each $n = 1, \dots, N$.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

Two experiments are conducted to test the performance of the DEM algorithm on simulated data under CGPMSMs, and to study the two proposed unsupervised smoothing approaches based on the DEM parameter estimation. The first experimental series regards different noise levels, and the second one considers the impact of the conditional mean value $\mathbf{M}^y(R_n)$.

A. Experiment of Varying Noise Level

Let us consider a simple case of the CGPMSM, where $m = q = 1$, $\Omega = \{1, 2\}$, and with joint probabilities of $\mathbf{R}_1^N$ given by $p_{1,1} = p_{2,2} = 0.45$, $p_{1,2} = p_{2,1} = 0.05$. The means of $\mathbf{X}_1^N$ and $\mathbf{Y}_1^N$ of both switch classes are set to be zero (the means of $\mathbf{X}_1^N$ are assumed to be known, since it cannot be recovered), while the variance covariance matrices of $p(\mathbf{X}_1^2, \mathbf{Y}_1^2 | r_1 = j, r_2 = k)$, $j, k \in \Omega$ are of the form (27) (see also the dependence graph in Fig. 1)

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{z}_1^2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & b_j & a_{j,k} & d_{j,k} \\ b_j & 1 & e_{j,k} & c_{j,k} \\ a_{j,k} & e_{j,k} & 1 & b_k \\ d_{j,k} & c_{j,k} & b_k & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Gamma}_j^{\mathbf{z}_1} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2} \\ (\mathbf{\Sigma}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2})^\top & \mathbf{\Gamma}_k^{\mathbf{z}_1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

TABLE I
PARAMETERS OF FIVE DIFFERENT NOISE CASES

Case	b_1	b_2	$e_{j,1}$	$e_{j,2}$	$d_{1,1}$	$d_{1,2}$	$d_{2,1}$	$d_{2,2}$
1	0.00	0.20	0.40	0.10	0.30	0.30	0.39	0.47
2	0.10	0.30	0.50	0.20	0.35	0.39	0.42	0.54
3	0.20	0.40	0.60	0.30	0.39	0.47	0.45	0.61
4	0.30	0.50	0.70	0.40	0.42	0.54	0.48	0.68
5	0.40	0.60	0.80	0.50	0.45	0.61	0.49	0.73

TABLE II
 $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}$, $\mathcal{Q}_{j,k}$ AND THEIR DEM ESTIMATES (CASE 3 OF TABLE I)

	$\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$	$\mathcal{F}_{1,2}$	$\mathcal{F}_{2,1}$	$\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$
True	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.02 & 0.60 \\ 0.30 & 0.44 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.46 & 0.21 \\ 0.30 & 0.84 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.17 & 0.67 \\ 0.30 & 0.38 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.45 & 0.12 \\ 0.30 & 0.78 \end{bmatrix}$
DEM	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.01 & 0.98 \\ 0.17 & 0.30 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -0.04 & 0.56 \\ -0.01 & 0.74 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.61 & 0.08 \\ 0.33 & 0.74 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.58 & 0.06 \\ 0.17 & 0.84 \end{bmatrix}$
	$\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}$	$\mathcal{Q}_{1,2}$	$\mathcal{Q}_{2,1}$	$\mathcal{Q}_{2,2}$
True	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.64 & -0.09 \\ -0.09 & 0.66 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.71 & 0.00 \\ 0.00 & 0.10 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.62 & -0.06 \\ -0.06 & 0.67 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.74 & 0.02 \\ 0.02 & 0.11 \end{bmatrix}$
DEM	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.55 & 0.09 \\ 0.09 & 0.80 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.27 & 0.19 \\ 0.19 & 0.29 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1.15 & 0.02 \\ 0.02 & 0.17 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.62 & 0.02 \\ 0.02 & 0.15 \end{bmatrix}$

Then, the equivalent parameters $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{j,k}$ are given by

$$\mathcal{F}_{j,k} = \left(\Sigma_{j,k}^{z_1, z_2} \right)^T \left(\Gamma_j^z \right)^{-1}; \quad \mathcal{Q}_{j,k} = \Gamma_j^z - \mathcal{F}_{j,k} \Sigma_{j,k}^{z_1, z_2}. \quad (28)$$

And conversely, using Lyapunov equation [27], (28) implies

$$\Gamma_j^z = \text{argvec} \left[\left(\mathbf{I} - \mathcal{F}_{j,j} \otimes \mathcal{F}_{j,j} \right)^{-1} \text{vec} \left(\mathcal{Q}_{j,j} \right) \right] \quad (29)$$

$$\Sigma_{j,k}^{z_1, z_2} = \left(\mathcal{F}_{j,k} \Gamma_j^z \right)^T$$

where $\text{argvec}(\cdot)$ denotes the inverse function of the operator $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ that stacks the columns of a matrix, and $\otimes$ represents the Kronecker product. We fix the value of $a_{j,1} = 0.1$, $a_{j,2} = 0.5$; $c_{j,1} = 0.5$, $c_{j,2} = 0.9$, while the other parameters in $\Gamma_{j,k}^{z_1}$ are set as given in Table I, regarding five cases with decreasing noise level. Then, six smoothing methods are considered for comparison, among which, three are based on true parameters and three on DEM estimated ones.

The three true parameter-based methods denoted with “TR” are as follows.

- 1) *TR-CGPMSM*: Optimal reference smoothing based on CGPMSM with true parameters and true switches $\mathbf{R}_1^N = \mathbf{r}_1^N$.
- 2) *TR-CGOMSM*: Optimal smoothing based on CGOMSM obtained from CGPMSM by replacing $d_{j,k}$ with $d_{j,k}^* = c_{j,k} b_j$, for all $j, k \in \Omega$, which gives $\mathcal{F}^{yx}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = \mathbf{0}$.
- 3) *TR-CGLSSM*: Optimal smoothing based on true switches $\mathbf{R}_1^N = \mathbf{r}_1^N$ and CGLSSM obtained from CGPMSM by replacing $d_{j,k}$, $e_{j,k}$, $c_{j,k}$ with $d_{j,k}^* = a_{j,k} b_k$, $e_{j,k}^* = a_{j,k} b_j$, $c_{j,k}^* = b_j a_{j,k} b_k$, for all $j, k \in \Omega$ which gives $\mathcal{F}^{xy}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = \mathcal{F}^{yy}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = \mathbf{0}$.

The three unsupervised DEM-based smoothing methods are as follows.

- 4) *DEM-CGPMSM*: Smoothing based on parameters from DEM with details given in Section III.
- 5) *DEM-CGOMSM*: Smoothing based on parameters from DEM, and modified to become a CGOMSM (with same modifications as in TR-CGOMSM).
- 6) *DEM-CGLSSM*: Smoothing based on parameters from DEM, and modified to become a CGLSSM (with same modifications as in TR-CGLSSM).

All experiments are carried out on $N = 10\,000$ samples, with 100 iterations for first EM, and 500 iterations for switching EM (assuming convergence of the algorithms), the initial value $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{j,k}^{(0)}$ are




Fig. 2. Restoration MSE of Series 1 ($\mathcal{F}^{yx}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = 0.3$).




Fig. 3. Restoration MSE of Series 1 ($\mathcal{F}^{yx}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = 0.1$).

set as

$$\mathcal{F}_{j,1}^{(0)} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.5 & 1.0 \\ 0.2 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \mathcal{F}_{j,2}^{(0)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0.1 \\ 0.2 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{j,k}^{(0)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The experiments are conducted with python 3.6 programming language on a 3.7 GHz CPU. The entire DEM parameter estimation takes about 29 min (3 min for first EM for PMC, and 26 min for the following switching EM). It takes 11 s for the later smoothing using DEM-CGPMSM and 20 s using DEM-CGOMSM. All results are averages of 100 independent experiments. The smoothing results related to different methods are illustrated in Fig. 2. The estimated parameters $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{j,k}$ under case three are reported in Table II, while the estimated means are $\mathbf{M}^y(r_n = 1) = 0.002$; $\mathbf{M}^y(r_n = 2) = 0.001$, and the estimated joint probabilities of switches are $p_{1,1} = 0.40$; $p_{1,2} = p_{2,1} = 0.06$; $p_{2,2} = 0.48$.

Moreover, a parallel experiment is conducted with $\mathcal{F}^{yx}(\mathbf{r}_1^2)$ set to be 0.1 by changing the setting $d_{j,k}$ in Table I using (29). The smoothing results are reported in Fig. 3. Then, from this series of experiments, we can summarize the following.

- 1) Comparing TR-CGPMSM, TR-CGOMSM, and TR-CGLSSM show how models are “far” from each other when smoothing is concerned. As expected, TR-CGOMSM can be




Fig. 4. Restoration MSE of Series 2 ($\mathcal{F}^{y^x}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = 0.3$).

close to TR-CGPMSM if $\mathcal{F}^{y^x}(\mathbf{r}_1^2)$ is small. TR-CGLSSM is to be avoided as MSE is often about 50% larger than that obtained by TR-CGPMSM.

- 2) The main conclusion is that DEM-CGPMSM is of interest when it comes to unsupervised smoothing. In general, the decrease of smoothing efficiency with respect to the optimal TR-CGPMSM is acceptable, and its performance has even the chance to surpass TR-CGOMS and TR-CGLSSM.

B. Experiment of Varying Mean

In this experimental series, we vary the means of observation conditionally on switches to adjust the difficulty for EM for PMC to find a suitable $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N$ instead of the true switches. All the simulation conditions and model parameters are set the same as the Case 3 with $\mathcal{F}^{y^x}(\mathbf{r}_1^2) = 0.3$ in previous series, except a change on $\mathbf{M}^y(r_n)$ values. More precisely, we range $|\mathbf{M}^y|$ from 0.0 to 2.5, where $|\mathbf{M}^y|$ represents the absolute value of $\mathbf{M}^y(r_n)$, and $\mathbf{M}^y(r_n = 1) = -\mathbf{M}^y(r_n = 2)$. For example, $|\mathbf{M}^y| = 2.5$ indicates that $\mathbf{M}^y(r_n = 1) = 2.5$ and $\mathbf{M}^y(r_n = 2) = -2.5$. Restoration MSE through the six smoothing methods is illustrated in Fig. 4.

With the increase of $|\mathbf{M}^y|$, $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N$ got from EM is closer to the true $\mathbf{r}_1^N$ (when $|\mathbf{M}^y| = 0.0$, the error ratio of $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N$ comparing to $\mathbf{r}_1^N$ is around 20%, while when $|\mathbf{M}^y| = 2.5$, it is nearly 0%, which means the observations are well classified for switching EM to estimate the remaining model parameters. The tendency of the smoothing MSE through all methods with unknown $\mathbf{r}_1^N$ with respect to $|\mathbf{M}^y|$ are not monotone. This phenomenon is caused by the introduced error from removing the mean of each individual wrong classification of $\mathbf{y}_1^N$ in the switching EM process. Larger $|\mathbf{M}^y|$ introduces more error if $\mathbf{y}_1^N$ is classified in $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_n^* \neq r_n$. However, generally speaking, the 20% error ratio of $(\hat{\mathbf{r}}^*)_1^N$ to $\mathbf{r}_n$ does not have too much influence on smoothing result as illustrated in Fig. 4, which indicates the mildness of the Markovian assumption on $(\mathbf{R}_1^N, \mathbf{Y}_1^N)$ in the overall DEM-CGPMSM algorithm.

V. CONCLUSION

Considering the problem of unsupervised smoothing in presence of unknown switches, we proposed a general parameter estimation method—called DEM—from observations only for CGPMSMs [5], [19]. This model extends simultaneously the classic CGLSSMs [6], [8], [9], [28] and the recent CGOMSs [4], [5], [16]. Experiments on unsupervised smoothing based on parameters estimated from DEM show the good behavior of the proposed method. In particular, con-

sidering data which follows CGPMSM, the smoothing method based on parameters estimated by DEM is competitive, or even better than smoothing based on real parameters, real switches, and the CGLSSM.

Let us mention some perspectives of extensions or applications. The Markov switching model governing switches of this paper can be extended to a semi-Markov one, as recently studied in [29]–[33]. Otherwise, Gaussian noise can probably be extended to any kind of noise by the use of copulas, as recently proposed in [34]. Finally, any stationary non-Gaussian nonlinear Markov system can be approximated by a CGPMSM, as proposed in [16] and applied to smoothing in [4]. Thus, DEM and subsequent unsupervised smoothing can be used once we are faced with data produced by stationary Markov system—with or without switches—of any form.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

F. Zheng would like to thank the China Scholarship Council for providing a scholarship to pursue her Ph.D. in France.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Logothetis and V. Krishnamurthy, "Expectation maximization algorithms for MAP estimation of jump Markov linear systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 2139–2156, Aug. 1999.
- [2] A. Doucet and C. Andrieu, "Iterative algorithms for state estimation of jump Markov linear systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 49, no. 6, pp. 1216–1227, Jun. 2001.
- [3] H. A. P. Blom and Y. Bar-Shalom, "Time-reversion of a hybrid state stochastic difference system with a jump-linear smoothing application," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 836–847, Jul. 1990.
- [4] I. Gorynin, S. Derrode, E. Monfrini, and W. Pieczynski, "Fast smoothing in switching approximations of non-linear and non-Gaussian models," *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, vol. 114, pp. 38–46, 2017.
- [5] N. Abbassi, D. Benboudjema, S. Derrode, and W. Pieczynski, "Optimal filter approximations in conditionally Gaussian pairwise Markov switching models," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 1104–1109, Apr. 2015.
- [6] O. Cappé, E. Moulines, and T. Ryden, *Inference in Hidden Markov Models* (Springer Series in Statistics). Secaucus, NJ, USA: Springer, 2005.
- [7] A. Doucet, N. J. Gordon, and V. Krishnamurthy, "Particle filters for state estimation of jump Markov linear systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 613–624, Mar. 2001.
- [8] R. H. Shumway and D. S. Stoffer, "Dynamic linear models with switching," *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.*, vol. 86, no. 415, pp. 763–769, 1991.
- [9] N. S. Kim, T. G. Kang, S. J. Kang, C. W. Han, and D. H. Hong, "Speech feature mapping based on switching linear dynamic system," *IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech, Signal Proc.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 620–631, Feb. 2012.
- [10] B. Ristic, S. Arulampalam, and N. Gordon, *Beyond the Kalman Filter: Particle Filters for Tracking Appl.* Norwood, MA, USA: Artech House, 2004.
- [11] E. Cinquemani, R. Porreca, G. Ferrari-Trecate, and J. Lygeros, "A general framework for the identification of jump Markov linear systems," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*, 2007, pp. 5737–5742.
- [12] U. Orguner and M. Demirekler, "Maximum likelihood estimation of transition probabilities of jump Markov linear systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 10, pp. 5093–5108, Oct. 2008.
- [13] E. Ozkan, F. Lindsten, C. Fritsche, and F. Gustafsson, "Recursive maximum likelihood identification of jump Markov nonlinear system," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 754–765, Feb. 2015.
- [14] K. Kamatani, "Local degeneracy of Markov chain Monte Carlo methods," *ESAIM, Probability Stat.*, vol. 18, pp. 713–725, 2014.
- [15] F. Zheng, S. Derrode, and W. Pieczynski, "Parameter estimation in conditionally Gaussian pairwise Markov switching models and unsupervised smoothing," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Workshop Mach. Learn. Signal Process.*, Sep. 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [16] I. Gorynin, S. Derrode, E. Monfrini, and W. Pieczynski, "Fast filtering in switching approximations of nonlinear Markov systems with applications to stochastic volatility," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 853–862, Feb. 2017.

- [17] S. Derrode and W. Pieczynski, "Exact fast computation of optimal filter in Gaussian switching linear systems," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 701–704, Jul. 2013.
- [18] Y. Petetin and F. Desbouvries, "A class of fast exact Bayesian filters in dynamical models with jumps," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 62, no. 14, pp. 3643–3653, Jul. 2014.
- [19] W. Pieczynski, "Exact filtering in conditionally Markov switching hidden linear models," *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, vol. 349, no. 9/10, pp. 587–590, 2011.
- [20] S. Derrode and W. Pieczynski, "Signal and image segmentation using pairwise Markov chains," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 2477–2489, Sep. 2004.
- [21] P. Lanchantin, "Chaînes de Markov triplets et segmentation non supervisée de signaux," Ph.D. dissertation, Institut National des Télécommunications, Evry, France, 2006.
- [22] R. H. Shumway and D. S. Stoffer, "An approach to time series smoothing and forecasting using the EM algorithm," *J. Time Ser. Anal.*, vol. 3, pp. 253–264, 1982.
- [23] P. Lanchantin, J. Lapuyade-Lahorgue, and W. Pieczynski, "Unsupervised segmentation of randomly switching data hidden with non-Gaussian correlated noise," *Signal Process.*, vol. 91, no. 2, pp. 163–175, 2011.
- [24] L. E. Baum, T. Petrie, G. Soules, and N. Weiss, "A maximization technique occurring in the statistical analysis of probabilistic functions of Markov chains," *Ann. Math. Stat.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 164–171, 1970.
- [25] B. A. El Fquih and F. Desbouvries, "Unsupervised signal restoration in partially observed Markov chains," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process.*, 2006, vol. 3, pp. III13–III16.
- [26] V. Nemesin and S. Derrode, "Robust blind pairwise Kalman algorithms using QR decompositions," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 5–9, Jan. 2013.
- [27] J. Hamilton, *Time Series Analysis*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton Univ. Press, 1994. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.fr/books?id=B8_1UBmqVUoC
- [28] C. Kim, "Dynamic linear models with Markov-switching," *J. Econometrics*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 1994.
- [29] M. Faraji-Niri and M.-R. Jahed-Motlagh, "Stochastic stability and stabilization of semi-Markov jump linear systems with uncertain transition rates," *Inf. Technol. Control*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 37–52, 2017.
- [30] Z. Hou, H. Dong, and P. Shi, "Asymptotic stability in the distribution of nonlinear stochastic systems with semi-Markovian switching," *ANZIAM J.*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 231–241, 2007.
- [31] J. Huang and Y. Shi, "Stochastic stability and robust stabilization of semi-Markov jump linear systems," *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 23, no. 18, pp. 2028–2043, 2013.
- [32] L. Zhang, Y. Leng, and P. Colaneri, "Stability and stabilization of discrete-time semi-Markov jump linear systems via semi-Markov kernel approach," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 503–508, Feb. 2016.
- [33] L. Zhang, T. Yang, and P. Colaneri, "Stability and stabilization of semi-Markov jump linear systems with exponentially modulated periodic distributions of sojourn time," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 2870–2885, Jun. 2017.
- [34] S. Derrode and W. Pieczynski, "Unsupervised classification using hidden Markov chain with unknown noise copulas and margins," *Signal Process.*, vol. 128, pp. 8–17, 2016.