

A factor model approach for the joint segmentation with between-series correlation

Xavier Collilieux * Emilie Lebarbier † Stéphane Robin ‡

April 18, 2022

Running title: Segmentation and factor model

Abstract

We consider the segmentation of set of correlated time-series, the correlation being allowed to take an arbitrary form but being the same at each time-position. We show that encoding the dependency in a factor model enables us to use the dynamic programming algorithm for the inference of the breakpoints, which remains one of the most efficient algorithms. We propose a model selection procedure to determine both the number of breakpoints and the number of factors. This proposed method is implemented in the `FASeg` R package, which is available on the CRAN. We demonstrate the performances of our procedure through simulation experiments and an application to geodesic data is presented.

keyword: Segmentation; Multivariate series; Factor model; Dynamic Programming; EM algorithm.

1 Introduction

General segmentation problem Segmentation methods aim at detecting abrupt changes – called breakpoints – in the distribution of a signal. Segmentation problems arise in many areas such as biology for the detection of chromosomal aberrations (Picard *et al.* (2005); Lai *et al.* (2005)), climatology for the detection of instrumental changes (Caussinus and Mestre (2004); Mestre *et al.* (2013)) or geodesy for

*IGN LAREG, Univ Paris Diderot, Paris, France

†AgroParisTech UMR518, Paris 5e and INRA UMR518, Paris 5e, FRANCE. e-mail:lebarbie@agroparistech.fr

‡AgroParisTech UMR518, Paris 5e and INRA UMR518, Paris 5e, FRANCE

the detection of changes in GPS location series either due to instrumental or to environmental changes as earth's crust shifts (Williams (2003)). In many cases, multiple series (several patients (Vert and Bleakley (2010); Nowak *et al.* (2011)), meteorological stations or GPS receivers (Gazeaux *et al.* (2015))) are observed simultaneously and dependence is likely to exist between them due, e.g., to probe effect in genomics (Picard *et al.* (2011b)) or to spatial correlation in geodesy (Dong *et al.* (2006); Amiri-Simkooei (2009)).

The literature on the segmentation of univariate series is too vast to cited here, the segmentation problem of multivariate series is more recent. We focus here on this latter problem, for which most works consider the detection of changes in the first-order or second-order structure of the series. Within this framework, we may still distinguish two types of segmentation.

The first one consists in the detection of breakpoints that are common to all the series and will be referred to as *simultaneous segmentation* in the sequel. Changes in the mean of independent Gaussian series can be detected with a lasso-type approach (Vert and Bleakley , 2010) or generalized likelihood ratio tests (Zhang and Siegmund , 2008), while penalized contrasts (Lavielle and Teyssiere , 2006) or CUSUM-based binary segmentation algorithm (Aue *et al.* , 2009; Cho and Fryzlewicz , 2012) have been proposed to detect changes in the covariance structure. Nonparametric approaches have also been proposed: Mateson and James (2014) optimize a weighted L^2 norm of the characteristic functions using sequential partitioning, while Arlot *et al.* (2016) transform the problem into a least-square segmentation problem using an appropriate kernel. Cabrippedo *et al.* (2016) provide a comparison study of several of these nonparametric breakpoint detection methods.

Not all simultaneous segmentation methods assume that a change actually occurs in each series at each breakpoint. Cho and Fryzlewicz (2015) or Wang and Samworth (2018) introduce some parsimony in the algorithm, so that only a fraction of the series displays a change at each detected breakpoint. In the Bayesian framework, appropriate priors can favor common breakpoints (see Harle *et al.* , 2016; Dobi-geon and Tourneret , 2007).

As opposed to simultaneous segmentation, *joint segmentation* assumes that the breakpoints are series-specific. In this case, segmenting all the series at the same time is of interest only when the series are affected by common effects, such as a probe effect in genomics (Picard *et al.* (2011a)) or atmospheric effects in geodesy (Gazeaux *et al.* (2015)).

The choice between *simultaneous* and *joint* segmentation obviously depends on the application at hand. Simultaneous segmentation makes sense when (a fraction of) the series are expected to be affected by the same changes, whereas joint segmentation should be preferred when each series is expected to be affected by specific changes. Our contribution is about the later case.

We consider here the joint segmentation in the mean of several series collected, say, in different locations and assuming that there is a correlation structure between them. This correlation is not assumed to be affected by the changes, so the problem is not to detect changes in the covariance structure as in

aforementioned *simultaneous* segmentation approaches. To our knowledge, Picard *et al.* (2011b) is the only work proposing a global estimation procedure in this setting. This reference highlights the fact that accounting for between-series correlation avoids false breakpoint detection. The global estimation procedure therein also avoids the opposite effect, that is to embed true breakpoints in the dependence structure when the correlation is estimated prior to segmentation. The dependence structure we consider here differs substantially from Picard *et al.* (2011b) and the overlap between the two models corresponds to a very specific model. This point is detailed and discussed in Section 2.

Algorithmic issues in segmentation Segmentation methods have to deal with an inherent algorithmic complexity. Indeed, the inference requires to search over the space of all possible segmentations, which is prohibitive in terms of computational time when performed in a naive way. The Dynamic Programming (DP) algorithm (Bellman, 1961) and, its recent pruned versions (Killick *et al.*, 2012; Rigail, 2015; Maidstone *et al.*, 2016), are the only algorithms that retrieve the exact solution in a fast way. Unfortunately, DP only applies when the contrast to be optimized is additive with respect to the segments (see Bai and Perron, 2003; Caussinus and Mestre, 2004; Picard *et al.*, 2005). In the sequel, we refer to this condition as the additivity condition. In the specific case of maximum likelihood inference, this condition is satisfied as soon as the data are independent from one segment to another. When dealing with the joint segmentation of multiple correlated series, the additivity condition is not satisfied due to the dependence between segments. The only case where the log-likelihood stays additive is the simultaneous segmentation framework. The goal of this paper is to propose an efficient maximum likelihood inference procedure for joint segmentation. More precisely, we use a generic representation of the between-series correlation that enables us to use DP.

Factor model, conditional independence and regularization In this article, we propose to encode the dependence between the series in a factor model. Factor models can describe any covariance structure between the series provided the number of factors is large enough. The covariance results from the effect of a set of latent factors that affect all series at the same time. Because of the presence of latent factors, this representation suggests the use of an EM algorithm (Dempster *et al.*, 1977), which takes a simple form in the Gaussian context. The interest of this representation is that the series are independent conditionally on the latent factors. As a consequence, at the M step of the EM algorithm, the contrast to be optimized turns out to be additive so DP applies for the segmentation parameter estimation. Another property of the factor model is that it provides a parsimonious representation of the dependence structure when only few factors are used. The simplest modeling corresponds to one single factor and yields a uniform correlation. The same modeling principle has been successfully applied in another context where very little was known about the correlation structure (see Friguet *et al.*, 2009). Such a regularization is especially desirable when dealing with many series. Note that Barigozzi *et al.* (2016) also use a factor model to model the between-series dependence structure for breakpoint detection, but

in the simultaneous segmentation context.

Model selection In segmentation, model selection traditionally refers to the choice of the number of breakpoints. A huge literature has been devoted to the subject: see e.g. Lebarbier (2005); Lavielle (2005); Zhang and Siegmund (2007) for one series or Caussinus and Mestre (2004) for the multivariate case. In a similar context to ours, Picard *et al.* (2011b) adapted the mBIC criterion proposed by Zhang and Siegmund (2007) to the multivariate case and showed that this criterion achieves the best performances. On the other hand, BIC is the standard criterion to choose the number of factors in the factor model (Lopes and West, 2004). We propose here a heuristic procedure combining these two BIC criteria in order to choose both the number of segments and the number of factors.

Implementation The proposed method has been implemented in the `FASeg` R package, which is available on the CRAN.

Outline The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the proposed model which combines a segmentation model with a factor model. Section 3 gives a graphical model view-point that explains why the factor model structure of the dependence allows to get rid of it during the M-step of the EM algorithm, so that DP applies. The EM algorithm providing the maximum likelihood estimates is described in Section 4. In Section 5, we introduce a model selection procedure for both the number of segments and the number of factors. A simulation study is performed in Section 6 and in Section 7 we apply our method to geodesic data.

2 Model

We now define the joint segmentation (that is, breakpoint detection in the mean of multiple series) model that constitutes our general framework. In this model, the breakpoints are specific to each series and, at any given time, the series are correlated with the same correlation structure along time. This correlation is encoded in a factor model. In the next section, we will show how the representation in terms of factor model allows to break down some dependences.

Joint segmentation model We consider M series with n points each. We note y_{tm} the observed signal of series m at time t . The total number of observations is $N = nM$. The data are gathered in a matrix \mathbf{Y} with dimension $[n \times M]$. For a given matrix \mathbf{A} , we denote by \mathbf{A}_t its t -th row and by \mathbf{A}^m its m -th column. Thus the column \mathbf{Y}^m represents whole series m , while the row \mathbf{Y}_t contains the observations

at time t in all series. We assume that the mean of the series $\mathbf{Y}^m = (Y_{tm})_{t=1..n}$ is subject to $K_m - 1$ specific breakpoints at positions $(t_k^m)_{k=0..K_m}$ (with convention $t_0^m = 0$ and $t_{K_m}^m = n$) and is constant between two breakpoints or within the interval $I_k^m = \llbracket t_{k-1}^m + 1, t_k^m \rrbracket$. We denote by $K = \sum_m K_m$ the total number of segments and $n_k^m = t_k^m - t_{k-1}^m$ the length of segment k from series m ($k = 1, \dots, K_m$). The segmentation model is written as follows:

$$Y_{tm} = \mu_{km} + F_{tm} \quad \forall t \in I_k^m, \quad (1)$$

where the M -dimensional error vectors $\{\mathbf{F}_t\}_{t=1..n}$ are supposed to be i.i.d. Gaussian, centered, with covariance matrix Σ . Observe that simultaneous segmentation corresponds to the special case where $t_k^m \equiv t_k$ and $I_k^m \equiv I_k$.

Factor model We first remind that any symmetric definite positive M -dimensional matrix can be rewritten as

$$\Sigma = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}' + \Psi \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{B} = (b_{mq})$ is a fixed $[M \times Q]$ matrix with $Q = M - 1$ and Ψ is diagonal.

The factor model imposes a specific structure to the covariance matrix, assuming that $Q \leq M - 1$. Writing Σ as in (2) also provides a latent factor interpretation of the covariance structure. Formally, let us consider i.i.d. random centered Gaussian vectors $\mathbf{Z}_t = (Z_{tq})$ with covariance matrix \mathbf{I}_Q and i.i.d. random centered Gaussian vectors $\mathbf{E}_t = (E_{tm})$ with diagonal covariance matrix Ψ and independent from the \mathbf{Z}_t . The error term from Model (1) has the same distribution as a linear combination of the Z_{tq} plus E_{tm} :

$$\forall t, m, \quad F_{tm} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \sum_{q=1}^Q Z_{tq} b_{mq} + E_{tm} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall t, \mathbf{F}_t \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \mathbf{Z}_t \mathbf{B}' + E_t$$

In this representation, the vectors \mathbf{Z}_t are the latent vectors that capture all the dependence between the series. At each time t , the series \mathbf{Y}_t are independent conditionally on Z_t . Note that the assumption $\mathbb{V}(\mathbf{Z}_t) = \mathbf{I}_Q$ is necessary for identifiability reasons. This model is similar to the factor model proposed in Bai and Ng (2002).

Latent factor version of Model (1) With the previous representation, Model (1) can be rewritten as a mixed linear model:

$$Y_{tm} = \mu_{km} + \sum_{q=1}^Q Z_{tq} b_{mq} + E_{tm} \quad \forall t \in I_k^m. \quad (3)$$

We denote by $\mathbb{1}_l$ the $[l \times 1]$ vector with all coordinates equal to one. For a collection of column vectors $(C_i)_{i=1,\dots,I}$, we denote by $\text{Bloc}[C_i]_i$ the block diagonal matrix with blocks $(C_i)_{i=1,\dots,I}$. Hence, the previous linear model can be rephrased in a matrix form:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{T}\boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}' + \mathbf{E}, \quad (4)$$

where, \mathbf{Y} stands for the $[n \times M]$ observed data matrix, \mathbf{T} is the $[n \times K]$ incidence matrix of breakpoints: $T^m = \text{Bloc}[\mathbb{1}_{n_k^m}]_{k=1,\dots,K_m}$ and $\mathbf{T} = [T^1 \ T^2 \ \dots \ T^M]$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the $[K \times M]$ mean matrix (and μ_k^m the mean of segment k in series m) such that $\boldsymbol{\mu}^m = [\mu_1^m \ \mu_2^m \ \dots \ \mu_{K_m}^m]'$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \text{Bloc}[\boldsymbol{\mu}^m]_{m=1,\dots,M}$, \mathbf{Z} has size $[n \times Q]$ and \mathbf{B} has size $[M \times Q]$, and \mathbf{E} has size $[n \times M]$, each of its row being a centered Gaussian with a diagonal covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$. The unknown parameters of this model are gathered into

$$\phi = (\mathbf{T}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}, \mathbf{B}).$$

The main difference between Model (4) and a classical mixed linear model is that both the incidence matrix \mathbf{T} and the factor matrix \mathbf{B} are unknown.

Comparison with Picard *et al.* (2011b) In this paragraph, we discuss the differences between the model proposed in Picard *et al.* (2011b) and the model we consider, which mostly lie in the dependence structure. To emphasize the difference, we stack the M vectors $(\mathbf{Y}^m)_m$ into a one single vector defined as

$$\text{vec}(\mathbf{Y}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y}^1 \\ \mathbf{Y}^2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Y}^M \end{bmatrix}.$$

The model proposed by Picard *et al.* (2011b) writes

$$\text{vec}(\mathbf{Y}) = \mathbf{T}\boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{E},$$

where \mathbf{E} is a centered Gaussian $[N \times 1]$ vector with diagonal covariance matrix \mathbf{R} , \mathbf{Z} is the $[N \times n]$ incidence matrix which associates each entry of \mathbf{Y} with its respective observation time $t \in [1; n]$, \mathbf{U} is a centered Gaussian $[n \times 1]$ vector with covariance matrix \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{E} are supposed independent. Because of the forms of \mathbf{Z} and \mathbf{U} , each random effect U_t affects all series at time t in the same way. The two models yield the following covariance structures:

	Picard <i>et al.</i> (2011b)	Our model
$\mathbb{V}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{Y}))$	$\mathbf{I}_M \otimes \mathbf{G} + \mathbf{R}$	$(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}') \otimes \mathbf{I}_n + \boldsymbol{\Psi} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n =: \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n + \tilde{\mathbf{R}}$
$\mathbb{V}(Y_{tm})$	$G_{tt} + R_{tm,tm}$	$\tilde{B}_{mm} + \tilde{R}_{tm,tm}$
$\text{Cov}(Y_{tm}, Y_{tm'})$	G_{tt}	$\tilde{B}_{mm'}$
$\text{Cov}(Y_{tm}, Y_{t'm})$	$G_{tt'}$	0

As a consequence, in Picard *et al.* (2011b), at a given time t , the correlation between all the series is the same, as $G_{tt'}$ does not depend on (m, m') . Conversely, in our model this covariance $\tilde{B}_{mm'}$ depends on each pair of series, without any specific structure: this why we name it 'arbitrary'. Moreover, Picard *et al.* (2011b) can account for correlation between different times (through the term $G_{tt'}$), whereas our model does not.

As a consequence, the two modelings do not overlap in general. The only case that we found where the models coincide is quite specific:

Picard *et al.* (2011b): $\mathbf{G} = \sigma_U^2 \mathbf{I}_n$ (no time dependence), $\mathbf{R} = \Psi \otimes \mathbf{I}_n$ (constant residual variance within each series);

Our model: $\mathbf{B} = \sigma_U \mathbf{1}_M$ (one single factor with constant coefficient) so $\Sigma = \sigma_U^2 \mathbf{J}_M + \Psi$.

In both case, we get $\mathbb{V}(Y_{tm}) = \sigma_U^2 + \psi_{mm}$, $\mathbb{Cov}(Y_{tm}, Y_{tm'}) = \sigma_U^2$ and $\mathbb{Cov}(Y_{tm}, Y_{t'm}) = 0$.

3 A graphical model point-of-view

In the present section, we explain how the use of the latent factors enables us to use DP to retrieve the maximum-likelihood segmentation in an efficient way. We illustrate this point based on both the likelihood and the graphical representation (given in Figure 1) of Models (1) and (3).

Model (1) The likelihood of Model (1) is given by

$$-2 \log \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Y}; \phi) = N \log(2\pi) + n \log(|\Sigma|) + \sum_{t=1}^n \|\mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t\|_{\Sigma^{-1}}^2$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t$ is the vector of the means of all series at time t . Because Σ is not diagonal the observations from all series at a given time t are not independent. As consequence time-overlapping segments from different series are not independent either. This is illustrated in Figure 1 (a) where the left segment of series M is correlated to the right segment of series 1 and m . This dependence hampers the use of DP. Note that, even in the case where Σ is known, the problem would remain.

DP only applies in the case where the breakpoints are the same in all series (Figure 1 (b)), which corresponds to simultaneous segmentation.

Model (3) The graphical representation of the factor model (3) is given in Figure 1 (c), which reminds that the dependence between all series at time t is induced only by \mathbf{Z}_t . The likelihood of this model is




Figure 1: Graphical representation of the considered models. Edges and arrows depict dependencies as defined in Lauritzen (1996). The dashed blocks represent the segments. For the sake of readability, Y_{tm} is denoted Y_t^m . (a) Model (1); (b) special case of Model (1) when the breakpoints are the same in all series (simultaneous segmentation); (c) Model (3); (d) conditional dependencies of $\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z}$ in Model (3).

$\log \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}; \phi) = \sum_t \log \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Z}_t) + \log \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Y}_t | \mathbf{Z}_t; \phi)$ where only the second term depends on the parameter ϕ . We further have

$$-2 \sum_t \log \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Y}_t | \mathbf{Z}_t; \phi) = N \log(2\pi) + n \log(|\Psi|) + \sum_{t=1}^n \|\mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t - \mathbf{Z}_t \mathbf{B}'\|_{\Psi^{-1}}^2 \quad (5)$$

Because Ψ is diagonal, the last term is written as

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \|\mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t - \mathbf{Z}_t \mathbf{B}'\|_{\Psi^{-1}}^2 = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{K_m} \sum_{t=t_{k-1}^m+1}^{t_k^m} (Y_{tm} - \mu_{km} - \sum_q Z_{tq} b_{qm})^2 / \psi_{mm}$$

where the third sum involves all the observations from the k -th segment from series m , and only them. $\sum_{t=1}^n \|\mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t - \mathbf{Z}_t \mathbf{B}'\|_{\Psi^{-1}}^2$ is therefore additive with respect to the segments. If \mathbf{Z} was observed (see Figure 1 (d)), DP could estimate the segmentation parameters $(\mathbf{T}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$. As \mathbf{Z} is not observed we will use an EM algorithm that will take advantage of this property.

4 Estimation using the EM algorithm

As mentioned above, we resort to maximum likelihood procedure to infer the parameter ϕ , the number of factors Q and the number of segments K being fixed. We remind that the dependence structure is encoded in the latent factors \mathbf{Z} . The EM algorithm (Dempster *et al.*, 1977) is a classical tool for maximum likelihood inference in presence of latent (or missing) variables (see, e.g. van Dyk (2000) for linear mixed models or (Rubin and Thayer, 1982) for factor models). We remind that the key quantity in the EM algorithm is the expectation of the log-likelihood of the complete data conditionally on the observed data Y , namely $Q(\phi; \phi^{(h)}) := \mathbb{E}_{\phi^{(h)}} \{\log \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}; \phi) | \mathbf{Y}\}$. As seen in the previous section, only the conditional distribution of \mathbf{Y} given \mathbf{Z} needs be considered to estimate the ϕ . According to equation (5), $-2Q(\phi; \phi^{(h)})$ is

$$n \log |\Psi| + \sum_{t=1}^n \left[\|\mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t - \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t^{(h)} \mathbf{B}'\|_{\Psi^{-1}}^2 + \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{B}' \Psi^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{W}_t^{(h)} \right) \right],$$

where $\phi^{(h)}$ is the value of ϕ at iteration (h) , $\mathbb{E}_{\phi} \{\cdot\}$ is the expectation calculated with ϕ as the parameter value and $\mathbb{V}_{\phi} \{\cdot\}$ the corresponding variance, $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t^{(h)} = \mathbb{E}_{\phi^{(h)}} \{\mathbf{Z}_t | \mathbf{Y}\}$, and $\mathbf{W}_t^{(h)} = \mathbb{V}_{\phi^{(h)}} \{\mathbf{Z}_t | \mathbf{Y}\}$. $\text{Tr}(A)$ stands for the trace of matrix A and $|A|$ for its determinant.

The EM algorithm is iterative and each iteration consists of two steps: the E-step and the M-step. At iteration $(h+1)$, we have

E-step: it consists in the calculation of the conditional expectation $Q(\phi; \phi^{(h)})$ which requires the conditional moments $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$ and \mathbf{W} . Denoting $\widetilde{\mathbf{Y}}_t^{(h)} = \mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(h)}$, we get

$$\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t^{(h+1)} = \widetilde{\mathbf{Y}}_t^{(h)} \boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(h)-1} \mathbf{B}^{(h)} \mathbf{W}_t^{(h)}, \quad \mathbf{W}_t^{(h+1)} = \left(\mathbf{I}_Q + \mathbf{B}'^{(h)} \boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(h)-1} \mathbf{B}^{(h)} \right)^{-1}.$$

M-step: it consists in the estimation of the parameters by maximizing the obtained conditional expectation. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}^{(h+1)} &= \left[\sum_{t=1}^n (\mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(h)})' \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t^{(h+1)} \right] \left[\sum_{t=1}^n (\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t^{(h+1)} \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t^{(h+1)} + \mathbf{W}_t^{(h+1)}) \right]^{-1}, \\ \boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(h+1)} &= \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\Psi}} Q(\phi; \mathbf{T}^{(h)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(h)}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}, \mathbf{B}^{(h+1)}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (\mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(h)})' \mathbf{E}_t^{(h)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{E}_t^{(h)} = \mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(h)} - \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t^{(h+1)} \mathbf{B}'^{(h+1)}$. In the case where $\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_M$, as we consider in the simulation study and the application, we get $\sigma^{2,(h+1)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^n \left[\mathbf{E}_t^{(h)} \mathbf{E}_t'^{(h)} + \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{B}'^{(h)} \mathbf{B}^{(h)} \mathbf{W}_t^{(h+1)} \right) \right]$ and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(h+1)} = \sigma^{2,(h+1)} \mathbf{I}_M$.

As for the segmentation parameters $\mathbf{T}\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ being diagonal, we have that

$$\left\{ \mathbf{T}^{(h+1)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(h+1)} \right\} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{T}, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{K_m} \sum_{t=t_{k-1}^m+1}^{t_k^m} (\check{\mathbf{Y}}_{tm} - \mu_{km})^2 / \psi_{mm}^{(h+1)}. \quad (6)$$

where $\check{\mathbf{Y}}_t = \mathbf{Y}_t - \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_t^{(h+1)} \mathbf{B}'^{(h+1)}$. This turns into a classical segmentation problem for which DP applies, the cost of segment $\llbracket t_{k-1}^m + 1, t_k^m \rrbracket$ from series m being $\sum_{t=t_{k-1}^m+1}^{t_k^m} (\check{\mathbf{Y}}_{tm} - \mu_{km})^2 / \psi_{mm}^{(h+1)}$. In the case where $\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_M$ (homoscedastic noise case), the quantity to be minimized is a residual sum of squares. In the heteroscedastic noise case, the sum of squares to be minimized is a weighted version of it. In practice, we use the two-stage DP proposed by Picard *et al.* (2011b,a), which is a fast version of DP dedicated to the joint segmentation of multiple series.

Time complexity As mentioned in Picard *et al.* (2011b), the two-stage DP algorithm reduces the algorithmic complexity from $\mathcal{O}(n^2 M^2 K)$, which one would get with the classical DP, to $\mathcal{O}(Kn^2 + K^2 M)$. The complexity of all other steps is at most $\mathcal{O}(nM)$ so the global complexity of the algorithm is this of the segmentation part.

5 Model selection

Both the number of factors Q and the number of segments K have to be estimated. This joint model selection issue is not standard and the difficulty arises from the different nature of the parameters at hand.

Indeed the likelihood function is continuous with respect to the loadings \mathbf{B} of the latent vectors, so the classical framework for the BIC approximation holds. This is not true for the segmentation parameters and a specific BIC approximation needs to be derived, as observed and proposed by Zhang and Siegmund (2007). Furthermore, the two resulting criteria do not share the same form, so they can not be combined into a single criterion. We propose here a two-step heuristic to select these two parameters.

As recalled in Lopes and West (2004), BIC is the most popular criterion to choose the number of factors in a factor model. Following this line, we propose to use this criterion to choose the number of factors Q for a fixed number of segments K . We define:

$$BIC_K(Q) = 2 \log \mathcal{L}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}\boldsymbol{\mu}_K, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_Q) - D_Q \log(n),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_Q$ is the covariance matrix for a given Q , $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}\boldsymbol{\mu}_K$ are the segmentation parameters for a given K , $\log \mathcal{L}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}\boldsymbol{\mu}_K, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_Q)$ is the maximized log-likelihood for K segments and Q factors, and D_Q is the number of parameters in a model with Q factors, that is: $D_Q = Q(2M - Q + 1)/2 + 1$ in the case where $\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_M$. Indeed \mathbf{B} contains MQ parameters but, due to orthogonality constraints, only $MQ - Q(Q - 1)/2$ of them need to be estimated. The additional parameter is σ^2 .

Symmetrically, for a given Q , we select the number of segments K using the modified BIC criterion proposed by Zhang and Siegmund (2007) and adapted to the joint segmentation of multiple series by Picard *et al.* (2011b). This criterion can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} mBIC_Q(K) &= \left(\frac{K - M}{2} \right) \log \left(\frac{SS_{\text{all}}}{2} \right) + \left(\frac{N - K}{2} + 1 \right) \log \left(1 + \frac{SS_{\text{bg}}(\hat{t})}{SS_{\text{wg}}(\hat{t})} \right) \\ &+ \log \left[\Gamma \left(\frac{N - K}{2} + 1 \right) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^{K_m} \log \hat{n}_k^m - (K - M) \log(N), \end{aligned}$$

with $SS_{\text{wg}}(\hat{t}) = \sum_{t=1}^n (\mathbf{Y}_t - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_t) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_Q^{-1} (\mathbf{Y}_t - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_t)'$, $SS_{\text{all}} = \sum_{t=1}^n (\mathbf{Y}_t - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_Q^{-1} (\mathbf{Y}_t - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})'$, $SS_{\text{bg}}(\hat{t}) = SS_{\text{all}} - SS_{\text{wg}}(\hat{t})$ and where \hat{n}_k^m is the length of segment k in series m ($\hat{n}_k^m = \hat{t}_k^m - \hat{t}_{k-1}^m$), $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_t = \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{k(t)}$ is a vector of size M with the component m is $\bar{y}_{mk} = (\hat{n}_k^m)^{-1} \sum_{t=\hat{t}_{k-1}^m+1}^{\hat{t}_k^m} y_m(t)$ if $t \in \hat{I}_k^m$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Y}} = (\sum_{t,m} Y_{tm})/N \mathbf{1}_M$. Part of the simulation study of Picard *et al.* (2011b) is devoted to the comparison of different model selection criteria (cf Lebarbier, 2005; Lavielle, 2005; Zhang and Siegmund, 2007; Caussinus and Mestre, 2004) adapted to the joint segmentation context. The main conclusion is that the modified BIC criterion performs best.

We end-up the following two-stage heuristic: choose the best Q for each K , then select the best K among them:

$$\widehat{Q}_K = \arg \max_Q BIC_K(Q), \quad \widehat{K}_{\widehat{Q}_K} = \arg \max_K mBIC_{\widehat{Q}_K}(K), \quad \widehat{Q} = \widehat{Q}_{\widehat{K}}.$$

6 Simulation study

In this section, we illustrate the importance of accounting for the dependence and we study the behavior of our model selection heuristic for K and Q and its impact on the estimation of all parameters.

6.1 Simulation design and quality criteria

Simulation design We consider different number of series $M \in \{5, 10\}$ with different lengths $n \in \{50, 100\}$. For each series \mathbf{Y}^m , the number of breakpoints ($K_m - 1$) is Poisson distributed with mean \bar{k} ($\bar{k} = 3$ for $n = 50$ and $\bar{k} = 5$ for $n = 100$) and their positions are uniformly distributed. Because the breakpoint locations are independent from one series to another, the comparison with simultaneous breakpoint detection methods is irrelevant. The mean value within each segment alternates between 0 and one value picked in $\{-2, -1, +1, +2\}$. We consider different residual standard deviations $\sigma \in \{.2, .5, 1\}$ and a spatial-type correlation between series: distances d are simulated as distances between Gaussian bivariate random vectors and the covariance matrix Σ is defined as $\Sigma_{mm'} = \sigma^2((1 - \alpha)\rho^{d_{mm'}} + \alpha\mathbb{I}\{m = m'\})$ with $\alpha = 0.2$ and $\rho \in \{0.2, 0.8\}$. As a consequence, the true value of Q is $M - 1$. The parameter ρ controls the intensity of the dependence between series. Each configuration is simulated 100 times.

We performed additional separate simulations to study the robustness of the proposed method to (i) non-normality and (ii) variance heterogeneity. For these studies, we consider the design with $M = 10$, $n = 100$, $\sigma = 0.2$ and $\rho = 0.8$. For (i), we consider a heavy tailed distribution for the errors $\{\mathbf{F}_t\}_t$, namely a multivariate student distribution with covariance matrix Σ and degrees of freedom $\nu = \{50, 10, 6, 3\}$ ($\nu = 50$ being the closest Gaussian case). For (ii), we simulate heterogeneous covariance matrices $\{\mathbf{S}_t\}_t$ as i.i.d. copies from a $\mathcal{W}(\Sigma, \nu)$ Wishart distribution, taking $\nu = \{10, 100, 1000\}$. We then simulate independent, centered, Gaussian residual vectors \mathbf{F}_t with respective variance \mathbf{S}_t .

Quality criteria To assess the quality of the estimation of the covariance matrix, we use the root mean squared distance between the true parameter and its estimate: $\text{RMSE}(\Sigma) = \left[M^{-2} \sum_{m,m'=1}^M (\hat{\Sigma}_{mm'} - \Sigma_{mm'})^2 \right]^{1/2}$. For the segmentation parameters, we consider both the proportion of erroneously detected breakpoints among detected breakpoints (false positive rate, FPR) and the proportion of detected true breakpoints among true breakpoints (true positive rate, TPR). A perfect segmentation results in null FPR and TPR equals to 1. For each configuration we consider the average of these criteria over the 100 simulations. We also compare our results to the results obtained when the dependence is not taken into account in the segmentation procedure, which corresponds to $Q = 0$.




Figure 2: FPR on the left and TPR on the right for $\rho = 0.2$ (top) and $\rho = 0.8$ (bottom) using \hat{K} . We distinguish the cases $Q = \hat{Q}$ (denoted Qest on the graph) and $Q = 0$ (e.g. the segmentation only). x -axis: σ . Box: first, second and third quartiles.

6.2 Results

Only the results with $M = 10$ and $n = 100$ are presented as the results for the other configurations lead to same conclusions. In the graphs displayed in this section, we label the true parameters with '*' and the estimated ones with 'est'.

Accounting for the dependence Figure 2 compares the selected segmentation when the dependence is considered ($Q = \hat{Q}$) or not ($Q = 0$). Whatever the difficulty of the detection problem (different values of σ), accounting for the dependence increases the performance of the segmentation (smaller FPR and larger TPR). The performances most differ when the dependence is high ($\rho = 0.8$, bottom of the figure). Differences in terms of FDR and TPR are significant except for $\sigma = 0.2$.




Figure 3: $\hat{K} - K^*$ obtained with $Q = \hat{Q}$ (left) and $Q = Q^*$ (right) for $\rho = (0.2, 0.8)$ (denoted r on the graph). Box: first, second and third quartiles.

Discussion on the selection of K Figure 3 shows that, whatever the level of the dependence, when the noise is small ($\sigma = 0.2$), the selected number of segments is close to the true one and the breakpoints are well positioned (see Figure 4). When the detection problem gets difficult (σ large), the selection procedure tends to underestimate the number of segments leading to a better precision on the breakpoints positioning compared to the true number of segments (smaller FPR).

Discussion on the selection of Q The number of factors is strongly underestimated (see Table 1) (close to 1 in average for $\rho = 0.2$ and for the different values of σ , not shown) meaning that only few factors are needed to capture the dependence structure. This underestimation does not alter much the estimation of Σ nor the choice of the number of segments, represented in Figure 3, when compared to the true number of factors. This underestimation acts as a regularization and that turns out to increase the power of procedure in terms of breakpoint positioning (in terms of FPR and TPR).

Moreover, the selected number of factors decreases slightly with the difficulty of the detection problem (with σ) leading to a decreasing precision of the estimation of Σ .

Confounding between \hat{K} and $\hat{\Sigma}$ As observed in Figure 4, the true number of segments $K = K^*$ leads to numerous false positive breakpoints. In some sense, K^* is too large for the data at hand. The consequence of this over-segmentation is that no factor are selected for $\sigma = 0.5, 1$, meaning that the dependence is captured by the segmentation (results not shown).




Figure 4: FPR (left) and TPR (right) with $Q = \hat{Q}$, $\rho = 0.8$ for $K = K^*$ and $K = \hat{K}$. x -axis: σ . Box: first, second and third quartiles.

σ	(\hat{Q}, \hat{K})			(Q^*, \hat{K})		
	0.2	0.5	1	0.2	0.5	1
mean of Q	3.37	2.74	2.39	9		
RMSE(Σ)	0.005	0.032	0.119	0.0048	0.032	0.124
FPR	0.016	0.110	0.288	0.039	0.175	0.413
TPR	0.93	0.69	0.34	0.93	0.597	0.262

Table 1: Mean of Q , RMSE(Σ), FPR and TPR for $\rho = 0.8$ where Q^* is the true number of factors.

Robustness studies Figure 5 displays the results of the Student simulation (*i*), which is about the robustness to non-normality. We observe that the results are quite stable when the degree of freedom (df) varies in terms of \hat{K} , \hat{Q} and TPR. In the extreme case $df=3$, as expected, the estimated number of segments is greater than in the other cases, resulting in a higher FPR. The other consequence is a slight degradation in the quality of the estimation of both Σ and $\mathbf{T}\mu$. The results of the Wishart simulation (*ii*) about heterogeneous covariances are given in Figure 6. The results are even more stable than in the Student simulation.

Overall, these simulations indicate a good behavior of the proposed procedure in presence of a reasonable deviation from normality and variance homogeneity.




Figure 5: Student simulation (*i*): Boxplots. Top: $\widehat{K} - K^*$ (left), $\widehat{Q} - Q^*$ (center), $\text{RMSE}(\Sigma)$ (right). Bottom: FPR (left), TPR (center), $\text{RMSE}(\mathbf{T}\mu)$ (right).




Figure 6: Wishart simulation (ii): same legend as in Figure 5.

7 Application

Data description Scientific permanent Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS) instruments continuously track electromagnetic signals from GPS satellites. Their data are generally collected by scientific, private or public services in near-real time or after getting a few days of observations to derive accurate coordinates. These coordinates are used to determine precise velocities of points located on the crust that constrain tectonic models and Earth’s crust/mantle parameters, to infer mass transfer in the fluid layers of the Earth or for positioning applications (terrestrial reference frame).

We consider here the coordinate time series from five GNSS stations, located in the Michigan and Ohio States in USA. They were computed by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) and can be downloaded at sideshow.jpl.nasa.gov/post/series.html. The stations are labeled MPLE, ADRI, BAYR, BRIG and DEFI. Only the longitude component has been investigated here: from the February 2002 to June 2013, 3776 longitude coordinates are available per station. Because they are separated by less than 250 km, their coordinate time series show similarities related to common ground deformation and correlated processing errors. The predominant effect in this component is the tectonic motion of the North American plate, which is about -16 mm/yr. When making difference of coordinate series from close stations, we can hope that this effect is canceled. Only residual differential motion as well as residual noise still remains in addition to sudden changes often related to equipment or environmental changes in one of the two stations. In this example, we use the station MPLE as the reference series and form four time series from the four other slave series, denoted ADRI-MPLE, BAYR-MPLE, BRIG-MPLE and DEFI-MPLE.

In addition to the coordinate series, we also have access to some of recorded changes that occurred in each station (see Table 2). These known events can be used to partially validate the inferred breakpoints.

Accounting for dependence The proposed model selection procedure leads to select $\hat{Q} = 1$ factor, which means that a dependence between the series does exist. The same procedure selects $\hat{K} = 46$ segments. When the series are assumed to be independent ($Q = 0$), the selected number of segments 70, which is significantly larger. Figures 8 and 7 give the four series with the estimated breakpoint positions (vertical lines) obtained with and without dependence. The comparison with Table 2 shows that the breakpoints arising when the dependence is omitted do not correspond to known events. This suggest that the inclusion of dependence avoids false positive detections.

Breakpoint interpretation Two categories can be distinguished among the estimated breakpoints.

- The breakpoints being common to most of the four series (Figure 8, red dotted lines): these breakpoints can be due to changes in the reference series MPLE. The one at day 54228 is known to be

Serie	date (time in week)	
ADRI	2004-12-02 (53341)	2005-09-15 (53628)
BAYR	2004-12-02 (53341)	2005-08-31 (53613)
BRIG	2004-12-02 (53341)	2005-09-12 (53625)
DEFI	2006-10-11 (54019 ^a)	2009-04-07 (54928)
	2011-01-26 (55587)	2012-08-02 (56141 ^a)
		2012-11-05 (56236 ^a)
MPLE	2004-12-02 (53341)	2005-09-14 (53627)
	2006-12-28 (54097)	2007-05-08 (54228 ^b)
		2007-10-05 (54378)

Table 2: Known changes in the five series. All changes corresponds to a change of receiver, except (^a): change of antenna and (^b) change of both receiver and antenna.

due to antenna and receiver changes (see Table 2).

- The series-specific breakpoints: some of them are due to known instrumental changes (black dashed lines). The change at day 53620 in series 4 (DEFI-MPLE) can be due to the known change in MPLE (see Table 2). The remaining ones (black solid lines) are still unexplained, even if some are close to known events.

Although it is not referred as known event, the change detected in series 2 (BAYR-MPLE) at day 55077 but is very well marked. Series 4 (DEFI-MPLE) displays a periodic behavior, which is compensated by a large number of estimated breakpoints. This behavior is likely to result from the large distance between stations BAYR and MPLE: because of this large distance, the tectonic motion part is not completely corrected by the difference.

Simultaneous segmentation Because of the presence of common breakpoints, we applied a simultaneous segmentation (with between-series correlation) to the four series. The results are given in Figure 9. The proposed procedure selects $\hat{Q} = 2$ hidden factors and $\hat{K} = 27$ common segments. A visual inspection (and a comparison with Figures 7 and 8) reveals that some are shared by at least two series and several others are only obvious in one series (especially the last one). Simultaneous segmentation does not provide any insight to distinguish between common and series-specific breakpoints.




Figure 7: Estimated breakpoints for the 4 series obtained with the segmentation only. From bottom to top, the series are ADRI-MPLE, BAYR-MPLE, BRIG-MPLE and DEFI-MPLE.




Figure 8: Estimated breakpoints for the 4 series when the dependence is taken into account. Dotted lines (in red): common breakpoints among almost the 4 series. Solid line (in blue): series-specific breakpoints. Dashed lines (in black): known series-specific breakpoints. From bottom to top, the series are ADRI-MPLE, BAYR-MPLE, BRIG-MPLE and DEFI-MPLE.




Figure 9: Estimated breakpoints for the 4 series obtained with the simultaneous segmentation. From bottom to top, the series are ADRI-MPLE, BAYR-MPLE, BRIG-MPLE and DEFI-MPLE.




Figure 10: Left: Estimation of Σ according to the distance between series. Right: Normal QQ-plot of the residual (one color per series, black=random Student sample with $df=10$).

Covariance structure The choice $\hat{Q} = 1$ seems to be sufficient to capture the dependence structure among series. Σ well captures the spatial dependence between series as shown in Figure 10 (left). We observe that the estimated correlation decreases as the distance increases, although this structure has not been imposed when estimating Σ .

Goodness of fit To assess the goodness of fit of our model, we checked the distribution of the residuals (see Figure 10 (right)). We observe a departure from the normality, similar to this of a Student distribution with about 10 degrees of freedom. The Student simulation study (i) from Section 6 suggests that the proposed methodology is robust to this type of departure.

8 Discussion

Joint segmentation procedure We proposed a comprehensive framework for maximum likelihood segmentation of multiple series in presence of between-series correlation. The procedure involves an EM algorithm for parameter inference and a model selection procedure for choosing the number of hidden factors and the number of segments. The use of a factor model allows the use of the Dynamic Programming algorithm, which results in an efficient algorithm. The time-efficiency could probably be improved, combining the two-stage DP algorithm from Picard *et al.* (2011b,a) with the pruned version of DP proposed by Rigaiil (2015). The combination with improved version from Killick *et al.* (2012) would be more complex as this method embeds the selection of the number of segments.

Covariance regularization The factor model is not only useful to design an efficient algorithm. It also acts as a regularization for the estimation of the between-series covariance matrix. We showed that this regularization significantly improves the breakpoint detection. In the simulation study, the selected number of factors is drastically reduced with respect to the true one. This regularization goes along with a similar number of true breakpoint detections and a reduced number of false detections.

Within-series dependence The factor model we consider enables us to break the between-series dependence but not the within-series dependence. The proposed model does not account for such a dependence, although it may exist. Still, in the one-series segmentation case, the least-square estimate (that is equivalent to maximum-likelihood for an independent Gaussian signal) has been shown to be consistent, even in presence of long-range dependence (see Lavielle and Moulines (2000)). However, in the non-asymptotic framework, time dependence may affect the segmentation results. Recently, Chakar *et al.* (2017) proposed a two-stage whitening strategy that allows the use of Dynamic Programming preserving the statistical guaranties. The introduction of time dependence in our model will be considered in a further work.

Acknowledgements This work has been partly supported by mathamsud 16-MATH-03 SIDRE project.

References

- AMIRI-SIMKOOEI, A. R. (2009). Noise in multivariate gps position time-series. *Journal of Geodesy*. **83** 175–187.
- ARLOT, S., CELISSE, A. and HARCHAOUI, Z. (2016). A kernel multiple change-point algorithm via model selection.
- AUE, A., HÖRMANN, S., HORVÁTH, L., and REIMHERR, M. (2009). Break detection in the covariance structure of multivariate time series models. *Annals of Statistics*. **37** 40464087.
- BAI, J. and PERRON, P. (2003). Computation and analysis of multiple structural change models. *J. Appl. Econ.* **18** 1–22.
- BAI, J. and NG, S. (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica*. **70** (1) 191–221.
- BARIGOZZI, M., CHO, H. and FRYZLEWICZ, P. (2016), Simultaneous multiple change-point and factor analysis for high-dimensional time series. Technical report, arXiv:1612.06928.

- BELLMAN, R. (1961). On the approximation of curves by line segments using dynamic programming. *Commun. ACM.* **4** (6) 284.
- CABRIPPETO, J., TUERLINCKX, F., KUPPENS, P., GRASSMANN, M. and CEULEMANS, E. (2016). Detecting correlation changes in multivariate time series: A comparison of four non-parametric change-point detection methods. In *Behavior Research Methods*, (M. Jones, ed.), 1–18. Springer.
- CAUSSINUS, H. and MESTRE, O. (2004). Detection and correction of artificial shifts in climate series. *JRSS-C.* **53** (3) 405–425.
- CHAKAR, S., LEBARBIER, E., LÉVY-LEDUC, C., ROBIN, S. *et al.* (2017). A robust approach for estimating change-points in the mean of an AR(1) process. *Bernoulli.* **23** (2) 1408–1447.
- CHO, H. and FRYZLEWICZ, P. (2012). Multiscale and multilevel technique for consistent segmentation of nonstationary time series. *Statistica Sinica.* **22** 207–229.
- CHO, H. and FRYZLEWICZ, P. (2015). Multiple-change-point detection for high dimensional time series via sparsified binary segmentation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology).* **77** (2) 475–507.
- DEMPSTER, A. P., LAIRD, N. M. and RUBIN, D. B. (1977). Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B.* **39** 1–38.
- DOBIGEON, N. and TOURNERET, J. (2007). Joint segmentation of piecewise constant autoregressive processes by using a hierarchical model and a bayesian sampling approach. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing.* **55** (4) 1251–1263.
- DONG, D., FANG, P., BOCK, Y., WEBB, F., PRAWIRODIRDJO, L., KEDAR, S., and JAMASON, P. (2006). Spatiotemporal filtering using principal component analysis and karhunen-loeve expansion approaches for regional gps network analysis. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Solid Earth).* 111–3405.
- VAN DYK, D. (2000). Fitting mixed-effects models using efficient EM-type algorithms. *Jour. Comp. and Graph. Statistics.* **9** 78–98.
- FRIGUET, C., KLOAREG, M. and CAUSEUR, D. (2009). A factor model approach to multiple testing under dependence. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **488** 1406–15.
- GAZEAUX, J., LEBARBIER, E., COLLILIEUX, X. and MÉTIVIER, L. (2015). Joint segmentation of multiple GPS coordinate series. *Journal de la Société Française de Statistique.* **156** (4) 163–179.
- HARLE, F., CHATELAIN, F., GOUY-PAILLER, C. and ACHARD, S. (2016). Bayesian model for multiple change-points detection in multivariate time series. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing.* **64** (16) 4351–4362.

- KILLICK, R., FEARNHEAD, P. and ECKLEY, I. (2012). Optimal detection of changepoints with a linear computational cost. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. **107 (500)** 1590–1598.
- LAI, W., JOHNSON, M., KUCHERLAPATI, R. and PARK, P. J. (2005). Comparative analysis of algorithms for identifying amplifications and deletions in array CGH data. *Bioinformatics*. **0 (0)** 1–8.
- LAURITZEN, S. L. (1996). *Graphical Models*. Oxford Statistical Science Series. Clarendon Press.
- LAVIELLE, M. (2005). Using penalized contrasts for the change-point problem. *Signal Processing*. **85 (8)** 1501–1510.
- LAVIELLE, M. and MOULINES, E. (2000). Least-squares estimation of an unknown number of shifts in a time series. *Journal of time series analysis*. **21 (1)** 33–59.
- LAVIELLE, M. and TEYSSIERE, G. (2006). Detection of multiple change-points in multivariate time series. *Lithuanian Mathematical Journal*. **46** 287–306.
- LEBARBIER, E. (2005). Detecting multiple change-points in the mean of gaussian process by model selection. *Signal Proc.* **85** 717–36.
- LOPES, H. F. and WEST, M. (2004). Bayesian model assessment in factor analysis. *Statistica Sinica*. **14 (1)** 41–68.
- MAIDSTONE, R., HOCKING, T., RIGAILL, G. and FEARNHEAD, P. (2016). On optimal multiple changepoint algorithms for large data. *Statistics and Computing*. 1–15.
- MATTESON, D. and JAMES, N. (2014). A nonparametric approach for multiple change point analysis of multivariate data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. **109 (505)** 334–345.
- MESTRE, O., DOMONKOS, P., PICARD, F., AUER, I., ROBIN, S., LEBARBIER, E., BHM, R., AGUILAR, E., GUIJARRO, J., VERTACHNIK, G., KLANCAR, M., DUBUISSON, B. and STEPANEK, P. (2013). Homer : a homogenization software - methods and applications. *Quarterly Journal of the Hungarian Meteorological Service*. **117 (1)** 47–67.
- NOWAK, G., HASTIE, T., POLLACK, J. and TIBSHIRANI, R. (2011). A fused lasso latent feature model for analyzing multi-sample acgh data. *Biostatistics*. **0 (0)** 126.
- PICARD, F., ROBIN, S., LAVIELLE, M., VAISSE, C. and DAUDIN, J.-J. (2005). A statistical approach for array CGH data analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*. **6 (27)** 1.
- PICARD, F., LEBARBIER, E., HOEBEKE, M., RIGAILL, G., THIAM, B. and ROBIN, S. (2011a). Joint segmentation, calling and normalization of multiple cgh profiles. *Biostatistics*. **12 (3)** 413–428.
- PICARD, F., LEBARBIER, E., BUDINSKA, E. and ROBIN, S. (2011b). Joint segmentation of multivariate gaussian processes using mixed linear models. *Comput. Statist. and Data Analysis*. **(2)** 1160–70.

- RIGAILL, G. (2015). A pruned dynamic programming algorithm to recover the best segmentations in 1 to k max changes. *numero special du Journal de la SFdS sur la detection de ruptures*. **156 (4)** 180–205.
- RUBIN, D. B. and THAYER, D. T. (1982). EM algorithms for ml factor analysis. *Psychometrika*. **47 (1)** 69–76.
- VERT, J. and BLEAKLEY, K. (2010). Fast detection of multiple change-points shared by many signals using group lars. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. **23** 2343–2351.
- WANG, T. and SAMWORTH, R. J. (2018). High dimensional change point estimation via sparse projection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*. **80 (1)** 57–83.
- WILLIAMS, S. (2003). Offsets in global positioning system time series. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*. **108** 2310.
- ZHANG, N. R. and SIEGMUND, D. O. (2007). A modified Bayes information criterion with applications to the analysis of comparative genomic hybridization data. *Biometrics*. **63 (1)** 22–32.
- ZHANG, N. and SIEGMUND, O. (2008). Detecting simultaneous change-points in multiple sequences. *Biometrika*. **0 (0)** 118.