

A simple and efficient solution of the identifiability problem for hidden Markov sources

Alexander Schönhuth, Member IEEE

Pacific Institute for the Mathematical Sciences
 School of Computing Science
 Simon Fraser University
 8888 University Drive
 Burnaby, BC, V5A 1S6, Canada
 schoenhuth@cs.sfu.ca

Abstract. A simple and efficient solution of the identifiability problem for hidden Markov sources (HMSs) is presented. The algorithm is based on a novel, general algebraic theory of random sources.

Keywords. Hidden Markov Models, Discrete Random Sources, String Functions

1 INTRODUCTION

A *hidden Markov model (HMM)* $\mathcal{M} = (\Sigma, S, \pi, A, E)$ is specified by a finite set of *output symbols* Σ , a set of *hidden states* $S = \{1, \dots, n\}$, a *transition probability matrix* $A = (A_{ij})_{i,j \in Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, an *initial probability distribution* $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and an *emission probability matrix* $E = (E_{iv})_{i \in S, v \in \Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \Sigma}$. It gives rise to a random source with values in the finite set Σ , referred to as *hidden Markov source (HMS)* in the following (we will use the terms HMM and HMS interchangeably if this does not lead to confusion), by the idea of changing hidden states according to the transition probabilities $A_{ij} = P(i \rightarrow j)$, where the first state is picked according to π , and emitting symbols from the hidden states, as specified by the emission probabilities $E_{ia} = P(a \text{ is emitted from } i)$. See e.g. [4] for a comprehensive review of the related theory.

Identifiability Problem (IP)

Given two HMMs $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$, decide whether the associated random processes p_1, p_2 are equivalent.

The IP was brought up in 1957 [1]. It was formulated for finite functions of Markov chains (FFMCs) that give rise to the same class of random sources as HMMs. Note that a solution of the IP for HMMs trivially applies to that of FFMCs. It was fully solved in 1992 [2]. The corresponding algorithm is exponential in the number of hidden states and therefore impractical for larger models.

The purpose of this work is to present a simple and efficient algorithm that solves the IP. Moreover, by combining the results of [5] with the presented algorithm one obtains an efficient test for ergodicity of HMMs, which had been a prominent open problem so far.

2 String Functions and Prediction Matrices

The efficiency of the algorithm is provided by a novel, vector space based approach to random sources that has been presented in [5].

Let $\Sigma^* = \cup_{t \geq 0} \Sigma^t$ be the strings of finite, but arbitrary length over Σ where, for technical convenience, $\Sigma^0 = \{\square\}$ with $\square$ the *empty word*. As justified by standard arguments, we will view random processes p with values in Σ as string functions $p : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (we also write $p \in \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma^*}$) by

$$p(v = v_0 v_1 \dots v_t) := p(X_0 = v_0, X_1 = v_1, \dots, X_t = v_t) \quad (1)$$

Accordingly, it suffices to check for equality of $p_1(v), p_2(v)$ for all $v \in \Sigma^*$ to solve the IP for two processes p_1, p_2 . We write $wv \in \Sigma^{s+t}$ for the concatenation of two strings $w \in \Sigma^s, v \in \Sigma^t$ and $p(v|w) := p(wv)/p(w)$ ($p(v|w) := 0$ if $p(w) = 0$) for the probability that a source p emits the string v after having emitted the string w . We then consider the infinite-dimensional matrices

$$\mathcal{V}_p := [p(wv)]_{w,v \in \Sigma^*} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*} \cong \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}} \quad (2)$$

for HMSs p . Furthermore, we write

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f_v : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R} & & g_w : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ w \mapsto p(wv) & \text{resp.} & v \mapsto p(wv) \end{array} \quad (3)$$

for the row resp. column vectors of $\mathcal{V}_p$ which are string functions in their own right. Note that $p = g_{\square} = f_{\square}$.

Definition 1. *Let p be an arbitrary random source with values in Σ . Then*

$$\dim p := \text{rk } \mathcal{V}_p = \dim \text{span}\{f_v \mid v \in \Sigma^*\} = \dim \text{span}\{g_w \mid w \in \Sigma^*\} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \quad (4)$$

is referred to as dimension or minimum degree of freedom of the source p . If $\dim p < \infty$ we say that p is a finite-dimensional source (also referred to as a finitary or linearly dependent process in the literature).

In the following,

$$\text{span}\{f_v \mid v \in \Sigma^*\} \quad \text{resp.} \quad \text{span}\{g_w \mid w \in \Sigma^*\} \quad (5)$$

will be referred to as the row resp. column space of the prediction matrix $\mathcal{V}_p$.

2.1 Observable Operators

In the following, we will introduce *observable operators*, acting on the vector space of string functions, and point out that rows resp. columns of the prediction matrix $\mathcal{V}_p$ can be obtained by applying the observable operators to p .

Definition 2. *The linear operators*

$$\rho_v, \tau_w : \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma^*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma^*} \quad (6)$$

for $v, w \in \Sigma^*$ that act on the vector space of string functions by means of the prescription

$$(\rho_v f)(w) := f(wv) \quad \text{resp.} \quad (\tau_w g)(v) := g(wv) \quad (7)$$

for string functions $f, g \in \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma^*}$ are called observable operators.

Note that

$$(\rho_{v_1}(\rho_{v_2}f))(w) = (\rho_{v_2}f)(wv_1) = f(wv_1v_2) = (\rho_{v_1v_2}f)(w) \quad (8)$$

Hence $\rho_{v_1 \dots v_t} = \rho_{v_1} \circ \dots \circ \rho_{v_t}$. Analogously, but in the reverse order on the letters,

$$\tau_{w_1 \dots w_s} = \tau_{w_s} \circ \dots \circ \tau_{w_1}. \quad (9)$$

By definition of f_v and g_w ,

$$f_{v_1 \dots v_t} = \rho_{v_1} \circ \dots \circ \rho_{v_t} p, \quad g_{w_1 \dots w_s} = \tau_{w_s} \circ \dots \circ \tau_{w_1} p. \quad (10)$$

That is, row resp. column vectors of $\mathcal{V}_p$ are generated by iterated application of the ρ_a resp. τ_a for single letters $a \in \Sigma$ to p . The following lemma establishes a key observation.

Lemma 1. *Let p be a random source and let $(g_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ be string functions such that the column resp. row space of $\mathcal{V}_p$ is contained in $\text{span}\{g_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ (hence $\dim p \leq n$). Let $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_m \in \Sigma^*$ such that*

$$(g_1(v_0), \dots, g_n(v_0)) \in \text{span}\{(g_1(v_j), \dots, g_n(v_j)) \mid j = 1, \dots, m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (11)$$

Then it holds that

$$\forall w \in \Sigma^* : f_{wv_0} \in \text{span}\{f_{wv_j} \mid j = 1, \dots, m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \quad (12)$$

resp.

$$\forall w \in \Sigma^* : g_{v_0w} \in \text{span}\{g_{v_jw} \mid j = 1, \dots, m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \quad (13)$$

Proof. We will only prove the column space statement (12), as (13) follows from considerations that are completely analogous while respecting that here, observable operators have to be applied in the reverse order (see (9)).

We choose appropriate $\beta_j, j = 1, \dots, m$ such that, according to (11),

$$(g_1(v_0), \dots, g_n(v_0)) = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j (g_1(v_j), \dots, g_n(v_j)). \quad (14)$$

Let $u \in \Sigma^*$. As the g_i span the column space of $\mathcal{V}_p$ we find $\alpha_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ such that

$$g_u = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i g_i. \quad (15)$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} f_{v_0}(u) &= p(uv_0) = g_u(v_0) \stackrel{(15)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i g_i(v_0) \\ &\stackrel{(14)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j g_i(v_j) = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i g_i(v_j) \\ &\stackrel{(15)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j g_u(v_j) = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j p(uv_j) = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j f_{v_j}(u) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

which, as the β_j had been determined independently of u , translates to

$$f_{v_0} = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j f_{v_j}. \quad (17)$$

Applying the linear operator ρ_w to (17) yields

$$f_{v_0 w} = \rho_w(f_{v_0}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \rho_w(f_{v_j}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j f_{v_j w} \quad (18)$$

which implies (12). $\diamond$

The lemma is the key ingredient for the efficient algorithm presented in the next section. In the following we will point out how to obtain the generating systems (g_i) for HMMs, which is needed to apply lemma 1 in the following.

2.2 Hidden Markov Models

HMMs are well studied, see e.g. [4] for a comprehensive review of the related theory. We restrict ourselves to recall that the probabilities $p_{\mathcal{M}}(v = v_1 \dots v_t)$ of the HMS $p_{\mathcal{M}}$ associated with the HMM, viewed as a string function as outlined above, are computed as

$$p_{\mathcal{M}}(v = v_1 \dots v_t) = \sum_{i_1 \dots i_t \in S^t} \pi(i_1) E_{i_1 v_1} A_{i_1 i_2} E_{i_2 v_2} \cdot \dots \cdot A_{i_{t-1} i_t} E_{i_t v_t}. \quad (19)$$

We obtain the following lemma that renders lemma 1 applicable to HMMs.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathcal{M} = (\Sigma, S, \pi, A, E)$ be an HMM with n hidden states, that is, $|Q| = n$. Let $(e_i = (0, \dots, 0, \underset{i}{1}, 0, \dots, 0))_{i=1, \dots, n}$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let g_i be the string function defined by*

$$g_i(v = v_1 \dots v_t) = \sum_{i_2 \dots i_t \in S^{t-1}} E_{i v_1} A_{i i_2} E_{i_2 v_2} \cdot \dots \cdot A_{i_{t-1} i_t} E_{i_t v_t}. \quad (20)$$

That is, g_i is the HMS associated with the HMM (Σ, S, e_i, A, E) , which can be considered as a copy of $\mathcal{M}$ with the difference that the output symbol generation procedure always starts from hidden state i . Then it holds that the g_i span the column space of $\mathcal{V}_{p_{\mathcal{M}}}$, the prediction matrix of the HMS $p_{\mathcal{M}}$ associated with the HMM $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Obviously,

$$p_{\mathcal{M}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \pi(i) g_i. \quad (21)$$

Let $w = w_1 \dots w_s \in \Sigma^*$ and g_w the column vector in $\mathcal{V}_{p_{\mathcal{M}}}$ indexed by w . We have to show that

$$g_w = \tau_w p_{\mathcal{M}} \in \text{span}\{g_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}. \quad (22)$$

Combining (21) with $\tau_w p_{\mathcal{M}} = \tau_{w_s} \circ \dots \circ \tau_{w_1} p_{\mathcal{M}}$ reveals that it suffices to show that

$$\tau_w g_i \in \text{span}\{g_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\} \quad (23)$$

for a single letter $w \in \Sigma$. Therefore, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_w g_i(v = v_1 \dots v_t) &= g_i(w v_1 \dots v_t) \\ &= \sum_{i_1 \dots i_t \in S^t} E_{i_1 w} A_{i_1 i_1} E_{i_1 v_1} A_{i_1 i_2} E_{i_2 v_2} \dots A_{i_{t-1} i_t} E_{i_t v_t} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n E_{i_1 w} A_{i_1 j} \sum_{\substack{i_2 \dots i_t \\ \in S^{t-1}}} E_{j v_1} A_{j i_2} E_{i_2 v_2} \dots A_{i_{t-1} i_t} E_{i_t v_t} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n E_{i_1 w} A_{i_1 j} g_j(v). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

◇

3 The Algorithm

3.1 Minimal Representation

The algorithm presented here and also the previous versions rely on the following well known result. It gives rise to a general idea for a solution of the IP. Our approach to the inherent key computation which is based on the ideas presented in section 2 will yield an efficient and also simpler algorithm.

Theorem 1 ([2,3,5]). *Let p be a finite-dimensional random source, that is, $d := \dim p < \infty$. Then there are $\pi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $T_a \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ for each $a \in \Sigma$ such that*

$$p(v = v_0 v_1 \dots v_t) = \mathbf{1}_d^T T_{v_t} \dots T_{v_1} T_{v_0} \pi_0 \quad (25)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_d = (1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The ensemble $(\mathbb{R}^d, (T_a)_{a \in \Sigma}, \pi_0)$ is referred to as a minimal representation of p . Minimal representations can be computed as follows:

1. Determine words $v_1, \dots, v_d$ and $w_1, \dots, w_d$ such that for

$$V := [p(v_i|w_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} : \quad \text{rk } V = \dim p \quad (26)$$

As $\text{rk } V = \text{rk } [p(v_i|w_j)] = \text{rk } [p(w_j v_i)]$ this translates to that the f_{v_i} resp. g_{w_j} span the row resp. the column space of $\mathcal{V}_p$.

2. For each $a \in \Sigma$, compute matrices

$$W_a := [p(av_i|w_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}. \quad (27)$$

3. A minimal representation of p is then given by

$$((V^{-1}W_a)_{a \in \Sigma}, V^{-1}(p(v_1), \dots, p(v_d))^T). \quad (28)$$

This yields the following general algorithm to solve the IP, given two finite-dimensional processes p_1, p_2 . Note that one can, without loss of generality, assume that output symbol sets coincide for p_1, p_2 .

1. Determine matrices V_1, V_2 for p_1, p_2 according to (26). If $\text{rk } V_1 \neq \text{rk } V_2$, which translates to $\dim p_1 \neq \dim p_2$, output **'Not identical'**.
2. If $d = \text{rk } V_1 = \text{rk } V_2$ put

$$V_3 := [p_2(v_i|w_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}, \quad (29)$$

that is, V_3 is the matrix for p_2 referring to the strings of V_1 . If $V_1 \neq V_3$, output **'Not identical'**.

3. For both processes, p_1, p_2 , according to (27), compute matrices W_{1a}, W_{2a} for all $a \in \Sigma$, all referring to the strings of V_1 . Furthermore, determine

$$\pi_1 \leftarrow (p_1(v_1), \dots, p_1(v_d)), \pi_2 \leftarrow (p_2(v_1), \dots, p_2(v_d)). \quad (30)$$

If $W_{1a} = W_{2a}$ for all a as well as $\pi_1 = \pi_2$, output **'Identical'**. Else, output **'Not identical'**.

In the last step, the positive answer is justified by that, according to (28), the minimal representations of the two HMMs are identical which implies that their processes are. Efficiency of steps 2 and 3 is immediate for HMSs p_1, p_2 (probabilities $p_1(v), p_2(v)$ can be computed by the forward algorithm). The idea of viewing V as part of the matrix $\mathcal{V}_p$ and generating row and column vectors by linear operators will finally deliver an efficient subroutine to deliver matrices of the type (26) which had caused inefficiency in the extant approaches.

3.2 Efficient Computation of V

In the following, let p be random source, viewed as string function, We define $f_p(k)$ to be the runtime necessary for computation of $p(v)$ for strings of length k .

Theorem 2. Let p be a random source over the alphabet Σ for which there are string functions $g_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ such that

$$\text{span}\{g_w \mid w \in \Sigma^*\} \subset \text{span}\{g_i \mid i = 1, \dots, m\} \quad (31)$$

or

$$\text{span}\{f_v \mid v \in \Sigma^*\} \subset \text{span}\{g_i \mid i = 1, \dots, m\} \quad (32)$$

hold. Let $d := \dim p$ ((31,32) imply $d \leq m$). Then there is an algorithm of runtime $O(f_p(2m)m|\Sigma|)$ that determines words $v_i, w_j, i, j = 1, \dots, d$ such that

$$\text{rk}(V := [p(v_i|w_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}) = d. \quad (33)$$

Proof. The statement of the theorem is provided by the following algorithm:

DETERMINATION OF V :

- 1: Let g_i as in lemma 1 and define $h(v) := (g_1(v), \dots, g_n(v)) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- 2: $A_{row} \leftarrow \{\square\}, B_{row} \leftarrow \{h(\square)\}, C_{row} \leftarrow \Sigma$.
- 3: **while** $C_{row} \neq \emptyset$ **do**
- 4: Choose $v \in C_{row}$.
- 5: **if** $h(v)$ is linearly independent of B_{row} **then**
- 6: $A_{row} \leftarrow A_{row} \cup \{v\}, B_{row} \leftarrow B_{row} \cup \{h(v)\}$
 $C_{row} \leftarrow C_{row} \cup \{av \mid a \in \Sigma\}$
- 7: **end if**
- 8: **end while**
- 9: Define $q(w) := (p(wv), v \in A_{row}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|A_{row}|}$.
- 10: $A_{col} \leftarrow \{\square\}, B_{col} \leftarrow \{q(\square)\}, C_{col} \leftarrow \Sigma$
- 11: **while** $C_{col} \neq \emptyset$ **do**
- 12: Choose $v \in C_{col}$.
- 13: **if** $h(v)$ is linearly independent of B_{row} **then**
- 14: $A_{col} \leftarrow A_{col} \cup \{v\}, B_{col} \leftarrow B_{col} \cup \{q(w)\}$
 $C_{col} \leftarrow C_{col} \cup \{va \mid a \in \Sigma\}$
- 15: **end if**
- 16: **end while**
- 17: **if** $|A_{row}| > |A_{col}|$ **then**
- 18: Eliminate $|A_{col}| - |A_{row}|$ many strings from A_{row} such that $[p(wv)]_{v \in A_{row}, w \in A_{col}}$ is regular for the remaining $v \in A_{row}$.
- 19: **end if**
- 20: **output** $V := [p(v|w) = p(wv)/p(w)]_{v \in A_{row}, w \in A_{col}}$.

Claim 1: During the first while loop of steps 3 to 8, the algorithm collects strings v into A_{row} such that the corresponding f_v span the row space of $\mathcal{V}_p$ where $|v| \leq m$ for all $v \in A_{row}$.

Proof of Claim 1: We assume the contrary, meaning that there is $v_0 \in \Sigma^*$ such that f_{v_0} is linearly independent of $(f_v)_{v \in A_{row}}$. Applying lemma 1 in the reverse order yields that also

$$h(v_0) \notin \text{span}\{h(v) \mid v \in A_{row}\}. \quad (34)$$

Clearly, the algorithm can only miss a linearly independent v_0 with (34) only if it had been left out for being checked which, due to the selection of strings into C_{row} in step 6, happens only in case that there is a $w_0 \in \Sigma^*$ such that w_0 of v_0 (i.e. $v_0 = v_1 w_0$ for some $v_1 \in \Sigma^*$) and $h(w_0)$ had been found to linearly dependent of $(h(v))_{v \in A_{row}}$. However, this is a contradiction to lemma 1, which states that in such a case f_{v_0} is linearly dependent of $(f_v)_{v \in A_{row}}$. As $|A_{row}| \leq m$, and the algorithm does only examine strings of length k that have a suffix v_0 of length $k - 1$, which refers to a linearly independent $h(v_0)$, there are no strings of length greater than m in A_{row} .

Claim 2: In the second while loop, strings w are collected into A_{col} such that $(g_w)_{w \in A_{col}}$ is a basis of the column space of $\mathcal{V}_p$. Moreover, $|w| \leq m$ for all $w \in A_{col}$.

Proof of Claim 2: As the $f_v, v \in A_{row}$ span the row space, one obtains, by applying lemma 1 such that the g_i correspond to the f_v and following the same line of argumentation as for Claim 1, that the $g_w, w \in A_{col}$ generate the column space. Moreover, the g_w had been picked only if the corresponding $q(w) = (p(wv))_{v \in A_{row}}$ had been linearly independent of the $q(w)$ having been collected so far. By the definition of $\dim p$, there can at most be $\dim p$ linearly independent $q(w)$, which confirms the assertion of Claim 2. $|w| \leq m$ for all $w \in A_{col}$ follows from the considerations that are analogous to those for proving Claim 1.

As a consequence of the possible situation that $\dim p < \dim \text{span}\{g_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$, one might have that $|A_{row}| > |A_{col}|$. Therefore, in Step 13, the algorithm eliminates $|A_{row}| - \dim p$ strings from A_{row} such that the remaining $f_v, v \in A_{row}$ still span the row space of $\mathcal{V}_p$.

Due to lemma 1, vectors $h(uv)$ resp. $q(wu)$ (for arbitrary $u \in \Sigma^*$) of linearly dependent $h(v)$ resp. $q(w)$ do not have to be tested for linear dependency. Therefore, the while loops consist of at most $n \cdot |\Sigma|$ iterations, referring to the $|\Sigma|$ many continuations of each of the at most n linearly independent strings.

Finally note that only probabilities $p(wv)$ for strings w, v of length at most m have to be calculated which completes the proof. $\diamond$

Corollary 1. *In case of p being induced by HMMs, there is an algorithm that, efficiently in terms of the parameterizations of the HMM, determines words $v_i, w_j, i, j = 1, \dots, d$ such that*

$$\text{rk}(V := [p(v_i|w_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}) = d \quad (35)$$

where $d = \dim p$.

Proof. We obtain a family of string functions g_i that span the column space of $\mathcal{V}_p$ from lemma 2 (HMMs). Application of theorem 2 then yields an algorithm of runtime $O(f_p(2m)m|\Sigma|)$ where m is the number of hidden states in case of HMMs. What remains to show is that $f_p(k)$ is a polynomial in terms of the underlying parameterizations. This is guaranteed by the well known forward algorithm [4]. $\diamond$

Corollary 2. *If p_1, p_2 are induced by HMMs one can determine, efficiently in terms of the underlying parameterizations, whether $p_1 = p_2$ or not.*

Proof. Consider the core procedure of ssec. 3.1. Efficiency of 1 is provided by cor. 1. The efficiency of 2 and 3 follows from the efficiency of computing probabilities $p(v)$, as outlined in the proof of cor. 1. $\diamond$

FINAL REMARKS: Note that plugging the subroutine to determine V into the core algorithm at the end of the page before results in a truly simple algorithm. **Ergodicity** of an HMM, according to [5], is equivalent to that the dimension of the eigenspace of $M := V^{-1}(\sum_{a \in \Sigma} W_a)$ (see (26),(27)) to the eigenvalue 1 is one. Hence, by means of the presented algorithm, it can be efficiently tested.

References

1. D. Blackwell and L. Koopmans: "On the identifiability problem for functions of finite Markov chains", *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 28, pp. 1011–1015, 1957.
2. H. Ito, S.-I. Amari and K. Kobayashi: "Identifiability of hidden Markov information sources and their minimum degrees of freedom", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 38(2), pp. 324–333, 1992.
3. H. Jäger: "Observable operator models for discrete stochastic time series", *Neural Computation*, vol. 12(6), pp. 1371–1398, 2000.
4. Y. Ephraim, N. Merhav, "Hidden Markov processes", *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, vol. 48(6), pp. 1518–1569, 2002.
5. A. Schönhuth and H. Jäger: "Characterization of ergodic hidden Markov sources", <http://www.zaik.uni-koeln.de/~paper/index.html?show=zaik2008-573>, submitted to *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*