

Adaptive sequential Monte Carlo for multiple changepoint analysis

Melissa J. M. TURCOTTE*

Advanced Computing Solutions and the Center for Nonlinear Studies,
Los Alamos National Laboratory

and

Nicholas A. HEARD

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London

September 29, 2015

Abstract

Process monitoring and control requires detection of structural changes in a data stream in real time. This article introduces an efficient sequential Monte Carlo algorithm designed for learning unknown changepoints in continuous time. The method is intuitively simple: new changepoints for the latest window of data are proposed by conditioning only on data observed since the most recent estimated changepoint, as these carry most of the information about the state of the process prior to the update. The proposed method shows improved performance over the current state of the art.

Another advantage of the proposed algorithm is that it can be made adaptive, varying the number of particles according to the apparent local complexity of the target changepoint probability distribution. This saves valuable computing time when changes in the changepoint distribution are negligible, and enables re-balancing of the importance weights of existing particles when a significant change in the target distribution is encountered.

The plain and adaptive versions of the method are illustrated using the canonical continuous time changepoint problem of inferring the intensity of an inhomogeneous Poisson process. Performance is demonstrated using both conjugate and non-conjugate Bayesian models for the intensity.

Keywords: Adaptive sample size; Particle filters; Online inference; Markov chain Monte Carlo methods

*The first author gratefully acknowledges support from the EPSRC and the Institute for Security Science and Technology, Imperial College London.

1 Introduction

Let $\{y(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be a continuous time stochastic process on \mathbb{R}^+ , where the law of $y(t)$ is governed by a second underlying stochastic process $\theta(t) \in \Theta$. A changepoint model for y assumes an unknown number of changepoints $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots$ that partition \mathbb{R}^+ into disjoint, homogeneous segments $[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$ such that $\forall t \in [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}), \theta(t) = \theta_i$ for some constant parameter value θ_i . Changepoint detection is concerned with finding the number and location of changepoints in $\theta(t)$ over a finite observation period $[0, T]$, and in a sequential setting, detecting each change soon after it has occurred.

The motivation behind the sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) algorithm proposed here is detecting changepoints in continuous time, previously considered by Whiteley et al. (2011) under the name *piecewise deterministic processes*. The process data $y(\cdot)$ are assumed to arrive as a continuous stream, while inferences about $\theta(\cdot)$ are made at a discrete sequence of observation times $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots$. At each observation time $t_n, n \geq 1$, the posterior distribution for changepoints in the interval $[0, t_n]$ is sought in order to make such inferences.

The SMC algorithm of Whiteley et al. (2011) is a direct application of the SMC samplers methodology of Del Moral et al. (2006), which is a more general SMC technique for sampling sequentially from *any* sequence of target distributions defined on a common space. The generality of the SMC samplers method is achieved by augmenting the target distributions to ever increasing dimensions in order to avoid the need to integrate over a general transition kernel; whilst that provides the basis for a very general class of samplers, applicable in a broad variety of contexts, the aim of this article is to propose a more bespoke SMC algorithm designed specifically for changepoint analysis.

In the wider literature of SMC for changepoint detection, but within the context of discrete time changepoint analysis, Fearnhead and Liu (2007) make sequential inference on data where filtering recursions are used to sample exactly from the distribution of the most recent changepoint, and consequently the joint distribution of all changepoints; the computational cost of exact simulation increases linearly with time and so an approximation using particle filtering is proposed. Chopin (2007) and Fearnhead and Clifford (2003) approach discrete changepoint detection in time series by reformulating the changepoint problem as a hidden Markov model and use particle filters to propagate forward the distribution of the time since the most recent changepoint. Car-

rying forward inferences about the most recent changepoint is also an important element of the proposed method.

The next section outlines the Bayesian changepoint model. Section 3 proposes an efficient new SMC algorithm for changepoint problems; Section 4 demonstrates how this algorithm can easily be made adaptive, automatically varying the number of particles according to the complexity of the target, which can potentially be valuable when performing inference on a number of sequences of target distributions in parallel.

2 Bayesian changepoint model

In all of the examples in this article, the arrivals of changepoints in $\theta(t)$ will be assumed to be a homogeneous Poisson process with rate $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Following the notation of Whiteley et al. (2011), let k_n be the number of changepoints over $[0, t_n]$, and define $\tau_0 = 0$ and $\tau_{k_n+1} = t_n$. If $k_n = 0$ then let $\tau_{1:k_n} = 0$, otherwise let $\tau_{1:k_n} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{k_n})$ denote the ordered locations of these changepoints, so that $\tau_{1:k_n} \in \mathbb{T}_{n,k_n}$ where $\mathbb{T}_{n,k_n} = \{\tau_{1:k_n} : 0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_{k_n} < t_n\}$. Defining $\boldsymbol{\tau}_n = (k_n, \tau_{1:k_n})$ the prior density on $[0, t_n]$ implied by the Poisson process is

$$p(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n) = \nu^{k_n} \exp(-\nu t_n) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_{n,k_n}}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{k_n}).$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n = \theta_{0:k_n} = (\theta_0, \dots, \theta_{k_n}) \in \Theta^{k_n+1}$ be the vector of corresponding parameters for the $k_n + 1$ segments of the partition of $[0, t_n]$ created by the changepoints $\tau_{1:k_n}$. Denote by $y([0, t_n])$ the sample path $y(t)$ over $[0, t_n]$. Assuming a likelihood function $f(y([0, t_n])|\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n)$ for the sample path which is known pointwise, and a prior distribution for the model parameters $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|\boldsymbol{\tau}_n)$, the joint density of the changepoints, the parameters and the sample path is immediately available as

$$\gamma_{[0,t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, y([0, t_n])) = f(y([0, t_n])|\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_n|\boldsymbol{\tau}_n) p(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n). \quad (1)$$

The posterior density for the changepoints and parameters is then known up to proportionality by

$$\pi_{[0,t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n|y([0, t_n])) \propto \gamma_{[0,t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, y([0, t_n])). \quad (2)$$

Generally interest centers on estimating the posterior density for the changepoints, whereas the

parameters θ_n are regarded as nuisance parameters. If the conditional density of the parameters given the changepoints is the conjugate prior to the likelihood model, then the parameters θ_n can be marginalised out. The posterior density for the changepoints then has the form

$$\pi_{[0,t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n | y([0, t_n])) \propto \gamma_{[0,t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, y([0, t_n])), \quad (3)$$

where the joint density in (3) is a marginal of (1) with respect to the parameter vector θ_n . The sequence of these posterior densities has support over nested transdimensional spaces $E_n \subset E_{n+1}$ where

$$E_n = \bigcup_{k_n=0}^{\infty} \{k_n\} \times \mathbb{T}_{n,k_n}.$$

3 Sequential Monte Carlo algorithm for changepoint distributions

To make a computationally fast SMC algorithm for changepoint problems, the proposal distributions for the sequence of target distributions $\pi_{[0,t_n]}$, for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, will sample the changepoints for each update interval $(t_{n-1}, t_n]$ without reference to the sampled changepoints from the previous intervals, but will instead condition on the data observed since an earlier time $t_{n-1}^* \leq t_{n-1}$, where t_{n-1}^* should be interpreted as some convenient estimate of $\tau_{k_{n-1}}$, the most recent changepoint in $[0, t_{n-1}]$ (*cf.* Chopin, 2007; Fearnhead and Clifford, 2003). Here, t_{n-1}^* will be the posterior mean of $\tau_{k_{n-1}}$ estimated from the weighted SMC sample at t_{n-1} . Other choices are possible: the straightforward choice of $t_{n-1}^* = t_{n-1}$ was also tested, but led to reduced performance in all examples.

The motivation behind the proposed algorithm is as follows: If new changepoints within $(t_{n-1}, t_n]$ are to be sampled and appended to the existing changepoint vectors for each particle, then for constructing a good proposal distribution it might be sufficient to retain only those data that have been observed since the last changepoint in $[0, t_n]$, as these data provide all of the available information on the current state of $\theta(t)$ as the process enters $(t_{n-1}, t_n]$. The diversity of the particles in terms of their earlier changepoints in $[0, t_{n-1}]$ has no future bearing.

Let $\tilde{k}_n \leq k_n$ be a random variable for the number of changepoints in the *update interval*

$(t_{n-1}, t_n]$ and let $\tilde{\tau}_n = (\tilde{k}_n, \tilde{\tau}_{1:\tilde{k}_n})$. Define

$$\pi_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}(\tilde{\tau}_n | y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n])) \propto \gamma_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}(\tilde{\tau}_n, y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n])), \quad (4)$$

as the local posterior distribution of changepoints on the subspace

$$\tilde{E}_n = \bigcup_{\tilde{k}_n=0}^{\infty} \{\tilde{k}_n\} \times \{\tilde{\tau}_{1:\tilde{k}_n} : t_{n-1} < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \dots < \tilde{\tau}_{\tilde{k}_n} < t_n\}$$

when conditioning only on the data observed in the extended interval $(t_{n-1}^*, t_n]$.

Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo (RJMCMC) (Green, 1995) sampling from the densities (4) will provide the proposals in the SMC algorithm. Importantly, convergence of RJMCMC on the subintervals $(t_{n-1}, t_n]$ will be very fast if the update intervals are small, as the prior probability that there would be more than one changepoint is $o(t_n - t_{n-1})$.

Extending a vector of changepoints in the case of a conjugate Bayesian model, with target density (3), is the most straightforward case and will be considered first. Second, the non-conjugate case will be addressed, with extended target density (2). This latter case is more difficult for two reasons: firstly, sampling from more highly parameterized models is generally more cumbersome and inefficient, but secondly and more importantly, when appending changepoint vectors from the update interval there is a spare *intercept* parameter that needs to be properly handled.

3.1 Conjugate models

Algorithm 1 presents the most straightforward form of the SMC algorithm being proposed, when assuming a conjugate Bayesian model for $y(t)$ within each changepoint segment.

At time t_{n-1} , the algorithm assumes a set of N importance weighted particles $\{\tau_{n-1}^{(i)}, w_{n-1}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ that approximate $\pi_{[0, t_{n-1}]}(\tau_{n-1} | y([0, t_n]))$. Let

$$t_{n-1}^* = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w_{n-1}^{(i)} \tau_{k_{n-1}}^{(i)}}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_{n-1}^{(i)}}$$

be the Monte Carlo estimate of the posterior mean of $\tau_{k_{n-1}}$. Then at time t_n , N new sub-particles

Algorithm 1 SMC algorithm for changepoint detection

- 1: Sample $\{\tau_1^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N \sim \pi_{[0,t_1]}(\tau_1|y([0,t_1]))$ via RJMCMC and set $w_1^{(i)} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$
 - 2: Set $n = 2$
 - 3: Calculate $t_{n-1}^* = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{n-1}^{(i)} \tau_{k_{n-1}}^{(i)} / \sum_{i=1}^N w_{n-1}^{(i)}$
 - 4: Sample $\{\tilde{\tau}_n^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N \sim \pi_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}(\tilde{\tau}_n|y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n]))$ via RJMCMC
 - 5: Draw a random permutation σ uniformly from S_N , the symmetric group on N symbols
 - 6: Combine the particles, $\{\tau_n^{(i)} = (k_{n-1}^{(i)} + \tilde{k}_n^{(i)}, \tau_1^{(i)}, \dots, \tau_{k_{n-1}}^{(i)}, \tilde{\tau}_1^{\sigma(i)}, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_{\tilde{k}_n}^{\sigma(i)})\}_{i=1}^N$
 - 7: Update the importance weights $\{w_n^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ according to (5)
 - 8: Calculate the effective sample size $\text{ESS} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{n-1}^{(i)2} / (\sum_{i=1}^N w_{n-1}^{(i)})^2$
 - 9: **if** $\text{ESS} < \text{ESS}_T = N/3$ **then**
 - 10: Resample $\{\tau_n^{(i)}, w_n^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ according to the weights to obtain unweighted particles $\{\tau_n^{(i)}, 1\}_{i=1}^N$
 - 11: Optionally move each particle according to a $\pi_{[0,t_n]}$ invariant kernel and retain the same importance weights
 - 12: **end if**
 - 13: $n \leftarrow n + 1$
 - 14: **goto** 3
-

are sampled independently from $\pi_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}(\tilde{\tau}_n|y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n]))$ (4) via RJMCMC. Then setting $\tau_n = (\tau_{n-1}, \tilde{\tau}_n)$, the implied importance distribution on $[0, t_n]$ from combining the two sets of particles is known only up to proportionality through

$$q_{[0,t_n]}(\tau_n) = \gamma_{[0,t_1]}(\tau_1, y([0,t_1])) \prod_{j=2}^n \gamma_{(t_{j-1}, t_j]}(\tilde{\tau}_j, y((t_{j-1}^*, t_j))).$$

Since RJMCMC is used to sample from $\pi_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}(\tilde{\tau}_n|y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n]))$ in each update, there will be autocorrelation in each batch of samples. To negate this, before joining the particles together step 5 of the algorithm permutes the labels of the sample from the new interval, to break the autocorrelation of the combined particles.

The importance weights are then updated to account for the discrepancy between the importance distribution and the changepoint posterior distribution (3). For $n > 1$ the weight for the i th particle is given by

$$w_n(\tau_n^{(i)}) = \frac{\gamma_{[0,t_n]}(\tau_n^{(i)}, y([0,t_n]))}{q_{[0,t_n]}(\tau_n^{(i)})} = w_{n-1}(\tau_{n-1}^{(i)}) \bar{w}_n(\tau_n^{(i)}), \quad (5)$$

where the incremental weight

$$\bar{w}_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}) = \frac{\gamma_{[0,t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, y([0, t_n]))}{\gamma_{[0,t_{n-1}]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}^{(i)}, y([0, t_{n-1}]))\gamma_{(t_{n-1},t_n]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n^{(i)}, y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n]))}, \quad (6)$$

is computationally simple to calculate; for example, in the special case of $t_{n-1}^* = t_{n-1}$ this is analogous to calculating the probability of accepting a reversible jump death move for a changepoint at t_{n-1} .

Note that the entire SMC scheme is equivalent to sequential importance sampling on a sequence of distributions defined on a common space with a transition kernel

$$K_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n | \boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}') \propto \delta_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}'}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1})\gamma_{(t_{n-1},t_n]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n, y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n))).$$

When the *effective sample size* (ESS) (Liu, 1996) of the particles drops below a threshold, commonly taken to be $N/3$, the systematic resampling approach (Kitagawa, 1996) is used (Algorithm 1, Step 8 to 10). Additionally, a sweep of RJMCMC moves is applied to the particle set after resampling (Algorithm 1, Step 11), as adopted in both Del Moral et al. (2006) and Whiteley et al. (2011).

3.2 Non-conjugate models

The SMC algorithm for non-conjugate models follows the steps of Algorithm 1, with the exception that the marginal posteriors $\pi_{[0,t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n | y([0, t_n]))$ from (3) are unavailable. Changepoints are sampled at each update via RJMCMC, but from the joint distribution of changepoints and parameters $\pi_{(t_{n-1},t_n]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n | y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n)))$.

Assume at t_{n-1} a weighted sample of changepoints and parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n-1}^{(i)}, w_{n-1}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ has been obtained from $\pi_{[0,t_{n-1}]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n-1} | y([0, t_{n-1}]))$, and subsequently at time t_n a sample $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n^{(i)}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ is drawn from $\pi_{(t_{n-1},t_n]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n | y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n)))$. Combining the particles from these two samples is now less straightforward, as there is an extra, redundant parameter for $\theta(t)$ for the segment $(\tau_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\tau}_1]$. The implied proposal distribution would be over-parameterized, so the parameter pair $(\theta_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\theta}_0)$ needs to be combined to form a single parameter θ_n^* . Let $s_1(\theta_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\theta}_0)$ be a suitably chosen function to combine the two model parameters into a single value θ_n^* .

As the marginal distribution of θ_n^* implied by the proposal density and s_1 is unlikely to have an analytic solution, a joint change of variables is required. Let $s_2(\theta_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\theta}_0)$ be a second transformation such that the pair

$$(\theta_n^*, u_{n-1}) = s(\theta_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\theta}_0) = (s_1(\theta_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\theta}_0), s_2(\theta_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\theta}_0))$$

comprise a one to one mapping $(\theta_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\theta}_0) \mapsto (\theta_n^*, u_{n-1})$, and let $|\mathbf{J}_s|$ be the determinant of the Jacobian of s .

The implied proposal density, following the change of variable s , known up to a constant of proportionality satisfies

$$q_{[0, t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, u_{1:n-1}) = q_{[0, t_{n-1}]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n-1}, u_{1:n-2}) \gamma_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n, y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n])) |\mathbf{J}_s|,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_n = (\theta_0, \dots, \theta_{k_{n-1}-1}, \theta_n^*, \tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_k)$. This proposal density generates suitable parameters to correspond to the combined changepoints, but also the nuisance parameters $u_{1:n-1}$. To accommodate these nuisance parameters, a general solution is to extend the target distribution so that

$$\pi_{[0, t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n, u_{1:n-1} | y([0, t_n])) \triangleq \pi_{[0, t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n | y([0, t_n])) \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \tilde{\pi}(u_j | \boldsymbol{\tau}_j, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j) \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{\pi}$ can be *any* density with the correct support for u_j . As the true target (2) is a marginal of (7), standard importance sampling estimates obtained in the extended space can still be used to give an approximation for the true target distribution and its normalizing constant.

The importance weights given in (5) for the non-conjugate case with this extended target are

$$\begin{aligned} w_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n^{(i)}, u_{1:n-1}^{(i)}) &= \frac{\gamma_{[0, t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n^{(i)}, u_{1:n-1}^{(i)}, y([0, t_n]))}{q_{[0, t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n^{(i)}, u_{1:n-1}^{(i)})} \\ &= w_{n-1}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n-1}^{(i)}, u_{1:n-2}^{(i)}) \bar{w}_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n^{(i)}, u_{n-1}^{(i)}), \end{aligned}$$

with the incremental weight

$$\bar{w}_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n^{(i)}, u_{n-1}^{(i)}) = \frac{\gamma_{[0, t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n^{(i)}, y([0, t_n])) \tilde{\pi}(u_{n-1}^{(i)} | \boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n^{(i)})}{\gamma_{[0, t_{n-1}]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n-1}^{(i)}, y([0, t_{n-1}])) \gamma_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n^{(i)}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n^{(i)}, y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n])) |\mathbf{J}_s^{(i)}|}.$$

The particular parameter transformation s_1 should be chosen such that if $\theta_{k_{n-1}}$ and $\tilde{\theta}_0$ are samples from the corresponding conditional posterior distributions, then $\theta_n^* = s_1(\theta_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\theta}_0)$ should approximate a draw from the posterior for the joined segment. The transformation s_2 is less critical, but should have a distribution that can be loosely identified so as to guide how to extend the target distribution. An example is provided in Section 3.3.2.

3.3 Illustrative examples

Two examples are now presented where $y(t)$ is a Poisson process. In the first example the proposed changepoint SMC algorithm (referred to as SMCcp) is demonstrated on the coal-mining disaster data analyzed by Raftery and Akman (1986), Green (1995) and Del Moral et al. (2006) among others. Performance is compared with the SMC samplers algorithm used in Del Moral et al. (2006). The second example demonstrates the non-conjugate extension of the algorithm using data simulated from a shot noise cox process taken from Whiteley et al. (2011); performance is compared with the piecewise deterministic processes(PDP) particle filter of Whiteley et al. (2011) when applied to the same model.

For both examples, standard RJMCMC is used as an alternative method to sample from the sequence of posteriors $\pi_{[0,t_n]}(\tau_n | y([0, t_n]))$, with the *maximum a posteriori* sample obtained from $\pi_{[0,t_{n-1}]}$ used as a starting value for sampling from $\pi_{[0,t_n]}$. For gauging performance, this “sequential MCMC” (denoted SMCMC) approach can be considered as a *gold standard* way to generate samples from the posterior given the data from $[0, t_n]$, although carrying a much higher computational cost than SMC.

3.3.1 Coal data

The coal mining disaster data consist of the times of coal-mining disasters in the UK between 1851 and 1962 and are a popular data set for applying changepoint analysis. In a sequential time frame these data were analyzed in Del Moral et al. (2006), and a comparison will be made with results from the SMC samplers (SMCs) algorithm in that article using the code provided for this example therein. It is assumed that the disasters follow an inhomogeneous Poisson process with piecewise constant intensity, and the piecewise constant intensity is estimated sequentially.

Define the parameter vector $\lambda_n = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{k_n})$, such that $\lambda(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_n} \lambda_i \mathbb{I}_{(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}(t)$, where

$\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the intensity of the process between τ_i and τ_{i+1} . The likelihood of the observed process data is

$$f(y([0, t_n]) | \boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n) = \prod_{i=0}^{k_n} \lambda_i^{r_i} \exp\{-\lambda_i(\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i)\},$$

where $r_i = \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_{i+1}} dy(t)$ is the number of events between τ_i and τ_{i+1} .

The $(k_n + 1)$ intensity levels λ_i are initially assumed to follow independent conjugate $\Gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ priors,

$$p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n | \boldsymbol{\tau}_n) = \prod_{i=0}^{k_n} \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \lambda_i^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta \lambda_i). \quad (8)$$

For posterior inference the intensities $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n$ can then be integrated out to obtain the posterior distribution for the changepoints (3), which is known only up to proportionality through

$$\gamma_{[0, t_n]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n, y([0, t_n])) = \nu^{k_n} \exp(-\nu t_n) \prod_{i=0}^{k_n} \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + r_i)}{(\beta + \tau_{i+1} - \tau_i)^{\alpha + r_i}}, \quad (9)$$

since the normalizing constant does not have an analytic solution. Conditional on the changepoints $\boldsymbol{\tau}_n$, the intensity levels λ_i have known independent posterior distributions

$$\lambda_i | \boldsymbol{\tau}_n, y([0, t_n]) \sim \Gamma(\alpha + r_i, \beta + \tau_{i+1} - \tau_i). \quad (10)$$

Del Moral et al. (2006) also assumes the changepoints are a Poisson process, but has a non-conjugate prior $p_{\text{SMCs}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n | \boldsymbol{\tau}_n)$ for the intensities by assuming $\lambda_0 \sim \Gamma(\alpha_{\text{SMCs}}, \beta_{\text{SMCs}})$ and $\lambda_i | \lambda_{i-1} \sim \Gamma(\lambda_{i-1}^2 / \chi, \lambda_{i-1} / \chi)$.

To make directly comparable inference under the proposed SMC algorithm, whilst still adopting the conjugate priors for the intensity levels (8) for ease of sampling, the following particle re-weighting is proposed: Given a weighted sample of changepoints $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, w_n^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ obtained from Algorithm 1, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^{(i)}$ can first be sampled for each changepoint segment directly from (10), to give a weighted sample of changepoints and intensities $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^{(i)}, w_n^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$. Second, this augmented sample can then be simply reweighted to give an approximate sample from the non-conjugate model of Del Moral et al. (2006), with new weights $\bar{w}_n^{(i)}$ given by

$$\bar{w}_n^{(i)} = w_n^{(i)} \frac{p_{\text{SMCs}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^{(i)} | \boldsymbol{\tau}_n)}{p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^{(i)} | \boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)})}. \quad (11)$$




Figure 1: Online estimated intensity function for the coal-mining disaster data

Note that for the sequential MCMC method (SMCMC) to be used as a benchmark for comparison, after first performing efficient RJMCMC on the conjugate model, the same sampling of intensities and reweighting strategy is used.

Del Moral et al. (2006) chose to perform inference annually, which implies a sequence of 112 changepoint densities where the n th density concerns the date range $[1851, 1851+n]$. The chosen prior parameter for the number of changepoints $\nu = 2/112$; for the priors for the non-conjugate model, following Del Moral et al. (2006) $\alpha_{\text{SMCs}} = 4.5$ and $\beta_{\text{SMCs}} = 1.5$, and $\chi = 5$; for the conjugate model uninformative priors are chosen, $\alpha = \beta = 0.1$. Again following Del Moral et al. (2006), the overall number of particles $N = 10,000$. For SMCMC, 1,000,000 samples are drawn from each posterior to give reliable posterior estimates.

Figure 1 shows the online or filtered intensity function for the non-conjugate model, estimated each year using SMCcp, SMCs and SMCMC. The SMCcp method perfectly tracks the target SMCMC curve, which represents the best possible inference. In particular, SMCcp performs much better than SMCs for the first fifty years of densities, after that from 1900 the performance of both algorithms are more comparable. Figure 2 shows the ESS for both algorithms, for SMCcp




Figure 2: Effective sample size. Left: SMCcp Right: SMCs

the ESS shows good stability across the 112 year period, whereas SMCs initially suffers from persistent weight degeneracy. In total SMCs performs resampling due to the ESS dropping below the threshold 26 times, where 19 of the times are before 1900, compared with SMCcp performing resampling only 8 times in total. This could partly be due to the initialization of the particles from the prior in SMCs and the high uncertainty in the target distributions in the first few years.

3.3.2 Shot noise Cox process

Now suppose $y(t)$ is a shot noise Cox process, where changepoints $\tau_{1:k_n}$ now correspond to shots (positive jumps) in the intensity function

$$\lambda(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_n} \lambda_i \exp\{-\kappa(t - \tau_i)\} \mathbb{I}_{(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}(t),$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is a fixed decay parameter for the decrease in intensity between shots. The parameters $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n = \lambda_{0:k_n}$ are the random intensity levels immediately after the shots, $\lambda_i \triangleq \lambda(\tau_i)$ and are constrained such that the shots are always positive; that is, $\lambda_i > \lambda_i^-$ where $\lambda_i^- \triangleq \lambda_{i-1} \exp\{-\kappa(\tau_i - \tau_{i-1})\}$ is the intensity just before τ_i .

Following Whiteley et al. (2011), the prior density for the intensity levels is

$$p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n | \boldsymbol{\tau}_n) = \alpha^{k_n+1} \exp(-\alpha \lambda_0) \prod_{i=1}^{k_n} \exp\{-\alpha(\lambda_i - \lambda_i^-)\} \mathbb{I}_{(\lambda_i^-, \infty)}(\lambda_i). \quad (12)$$

The likelihood of the observed process data is

$$f(y([0, t_n]) | \boldsymbol{\tau}_n, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n) = \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=0}^{k_n} (\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}^-) / \kappa + \int_{t=0}^{t_n} \log \lambda(t) dy(t) \right\}.$$

A conjugate model approximation to the shot noise Cox process would need to forgo the constraint $\lambda_i > \lambda_i^-$. Particularly for low values of κ , which constitute the harder inference problems, reweighting samples from the unconstrained conjugate model in SMC would be an unreliable approach, since the proportion of particles obeying the required constraint, and therefore having non-zero weight according to the target model, would diminish over time. So for this application the non-conjugate algorithm of Section 3.2 is favored.

When performing a “birth” move in RJMCMC, the location of the new changepoint is drawn from the proposal distribution specified in Whiteley et al. (2011). This simply puts higher probability of proposing a changepoint at regions in the process $y(\cdot)$ where an increased rate of occurrence of events was observed, which might correspond to a shot. To follow the non-conjugate SMC algorithm, the intensity parameters λ_i are also sampled during RJMCMC. Note that, conditional on all other parameters, the λ_i corresponding to interior changepoints ($0 < i < n$) have both lower and an upper constraints: Necessarily, $\lambda_i \in (\lambda_i^-, \exp\{\kappa(\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i)\} \lambda_{i+1})$. Under (12), the full conditional distribution of λ_i is a truncated gamma distribution

$$\pi(\lambda_i | \cdot) \propto \lambda_i^{r_i} \exp\{-(\alpha\kappa + 1)z_i \lambda_i\} \mathbb{I}_{(\lambda_i^-, \exp\{\kappa(\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i)\} \lambda_{i+1})}(\lambda_i),$$

where r_i is the number of y events in $(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]$ and $z_i = [1 - \exp\{-\kappa(\tau_i - \tau_{i-1})\}] / \kappa$.

For the SMC algorithm, it can be supposed that two sets of particles have been obtained at time t_n :

- $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n-1}^{(i)}, w_{n-1}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$, a weighted sample from $\pi_{[0, t_{n-1}]}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{n-1}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n-1} | y([0, t_{n-1}]))$;
- $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n^{(i)}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$, sampled from $\pi_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n | y((t_{n-1}^*, t_n]))$.

To combine the two intensity parameters $\lambda_{k_{n-1}}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_0$ to a single intensity parameter λ_n^* for the merged interval $(\tau_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\tau}_1]$, an attractive function would be

$$s_1(\lambda_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\lambda}_0) = \frac{[\lambda_{k_{n-1}}(1 - \exp\{-\kappa(t_{n-1} - \tau_{k_{n-1}})\}) + \tilde{\lambda}_0(1 - \exp\{-\kappa(\tilde{\tau}_1 - t_{n-1})\})]}{(1 - \exp\{-\kappa(\tilde{\tau}_1 - \tau_{k_{n-1}})\})},$$

which preserves the cumulative intensity over $(\tau_{k_{n-1}}, \tilde{\tau}_1]$. However, this function might propose an illegal intensity according to the constraints of the model. To ensure a legitimate proposal, it is easiest to work with the parameterization provided by the shots, $\theta_i = \lambda_i - \lambda_i^-$. Working in this parameter space, to guarantee a legitimate move the simplest choice of s is then the bivariate identity function, implying $\theta_n^* = \theta_{k_{n-1}} = \lambda_{k_{n-1}} - \lambda_{k_{n-1}}^-$ and $u_{n-1} = \tilde{\theta}_0 = \tilde{\lambda}_0$. This proposal has the potential to work well, since the proposal density for changepoints in $(t_{n-1}, t_n]$ assumes the last shot in $[0, t_{n-1}]$ was at t_{n-1}^* , and carries forward the data from $t > t_{n-1}^*$.

Finally, to extend the target distribution, $\tilde{\pi}(u_{n-1} | \tau_{1:k_n}, \lambda_{0:k_n})$ can be defined to be the full conditional from which the parameter $\tilde{\theta}_0$ was originally proposed.

Viewed from the intensity parameterization, the proposed parameters for the whole interval will be:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\boldsymbol{\tau}_n^{(i)} &= (\tau_1^{(i)}, \dots, \tau_{k_{n-1}}^{(i)}, \tilde{\tau}_1^{(i)}, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_{\tilde{k}_n}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N \\ \{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^{(i)} &= (\lambda_0^{(i)}, \dots, \lambda_{k_{n-1}}^{(i)}, \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(i)} + \delta_n^{(i)}, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{\tilde{k}_n}^{(i)} + \delta_n^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_n^{(i)} = \lambda_{k_{n-1}}^{(i)} \exp\{-\kappa(\tilde{\tau}_1^{(i)} - \tau_{k_{n-1}}^{(i)})\} - \tilde{\lambda}_0^{(i)} \exp\{-\kappa(\tilde{\tau}_1^{(i)} - t_{n-1})\}$.

For a true comparison against the piecewise deterministic process (SMCpdp) algorithm in Whiteley et al. (2011), the same shot noise parameter values are used: $\nu = 1/40$, $\kappa = 1/100$ and $\alpha = 2/3$. The data obtained from the code provided in Whiteley et al. (2011) are simulated over $[0, 2000]$, with 40 update intervals each of length 50. The total number of particles $N = 500$ and the ESS resampling threshold is set to 200. Again as a comparison to both SMC algorithms, the slower but accurate SMCMC algorithm is used to provide a ‘‘gold standard’’ of inference.

Figure 3 shows the online filtering estimate for the intensity function using the three different algorithms SMCcp, SMCpdp and SMCMC for the shot noise Cox process as well as a histogram of the data over the time period. Although both SMC algorithms perform well, the SMCcp algorithm tracks the SMCMC curve more reliably, with SMCpdp slightly overestimating some of the shots in the intensity.

Figure 4 shows the ESS at each time point for both SMCcp and SMCpdp, and SMCcp shows much better stability in terms of the variability of the weights. The proposal distribution specified in Whiteley et al. (2011) only allows birth of changepoints within each update interval, so initially the algorithm may be overfitting changepoints causing high variability in the weights.




Figure 3: Online estimated intensity function

Whiteley et al. (2011) also plotted the number of unique particles, over time, that eventually survived to the final iteration of the SMC algorithm. Figure 5 plots this quantity both before and after resampling, as although there may be many unique particles the importance weights may have high variance, implying a low quality particle approximation, Whiteley et al. (2011). SMCcp shows much more of a diverse particle set further back in time than SMCpdp both before and after resampling.

4 Adaptive sequential Monte Carlo

In many applications such as finance or security, there can be cause to make sequential inference about many independent target probability distributions in parallel. In finance, such problems could arise in automated trading, where beliefs about the future prices of many stocks will be continually updated; and in security, statistical models can be used for monitoring each entity in a large network for unusual behavior. Notationally, suppose there is a collection of m sequences of target distributions $\{\pi_{[0,t_n]}^j\}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, such that inference is to be made about each target




Figure 4: Effective sample size. Left: SMCcp Right: SMCpdp




Figure 5: Unique particles at the final iteration versus time. Left: SMCcp Right: SMCpdp. Solid:pre-resampling. Dotted:post-resampling

distribution $\pi_{[0,t_n]}^j$ at the same sequence of update times $t_1 < t_2 < \dots$

For SMC algorithms, when updating beliefs about each of these target distributions it is desirable to allocate more computational resource to those target distributions that appear to have changed the most. For existing SMC methods this idea is problematic and has not been explored, since the number of particles N is fixed from the start; these particles are either refined or resampled as the target distribution evolves, but the same number of particles is always maintained. Indeed, the effective sample size typically drops at precisely those times when the target distribution undergoes the most change, and resampling is required to ensure that the N particles are still relevant, at the cost of a loss of diversity of the particles.

As a prequel to this article, Heard and Turcotte (2015) derived a sequential approach to determining sample sizes during sampling, based on the apparent relative entropy of the different distributions. By estimating the Kullback-Leibler divergence of each sample from its target, sam-

ples can be allocated to the target distribution with the highest discrepancy. In this work, the adaptive sample size strategy is applied at each update when sampling from the proposal distributions $\pi_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}^j(\tilde{\tau}_n | y((t_{n-1}^{*j}, t_n]))$.

The rationale behind this approach is as follows. By conditioning on all data since the estimated most recent changepoint t_{n-1}^{*j} , the proposal density $\pi_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}^j(\tilde{\tau}_n | y((t_{n-1}^{*j}, t_n]))$ was chosen such that

$$\pi_{[0, t_n]}^j(\cdot, \cdot | y([0, t_n])) \approx \pi_{[0, t_{n-1}]}^j(\cdot, \cdot | y([0, t_{n-1}])) \pi_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}^j(\cdot, \cdot | y((t_{n-1}^{*j}, t_n]))$$

Hence this proposal density will have higher entropy when more probability is assigned to the existence of multiple new changepoints of uncertain location within $(t_{n-1}, t_n]$, which in turn implies a larger distance between the old and new target distributions. So by taking more samples during the current update interval, the uncertainty surrounding the new changepoints will be better captured. Whereas if another target distribution j' strongly appears to have no new changepoints during the same update window, it will be acceptable to take fewer samples to represent this portion of the distribution.

At time t_{n-1} , suppose there were N^j weighted samples approximating the j th target distribution $\pi_{[0, t_{n-1}]}^j$. Then, following the algorithm of Heard and Turcotte (2015) or some other adaptive strategy, suppose M^j samples are obtained from $\pi_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}^j(\tau_n | y((t_{n-1}^{*j}, t_n]))$, the update proposal at time t_n . Typically $M^j \neq N^j$, so at step 6 of the SMC Algorithm 1 there are two unequal sized groups of particles to combine. To redress this imbalance, copies need to be made of some particles in the smaller sample so that the two sample sizes are equal. When $N^j < M^j$, this task of replicating particles can be used advantageously to reduce the variability of the weights of the old particles and increase the effective sample size. The next section outlines a simple procedure for determining how many copies to make of each particle, and how the particles are consequently reweighted. It can be noted that the same algorithm can equally be applied for increasing the number of new particles when $N^j > M^j$, but this trivially reduces to assigning $\tau_n^{(i)} = \tau_n^{(i \bmod M^j)}$ for $i > M^j$.

4.1 Replicating particles

Suppose there are currently N particles for the region $[0, t_{n-1}]$ that need to be paired with $M > N$ particles from $(t_{n-1}, t_n]$ following an increased sampling allocation. When considering duplicating particles from the weighted particle set, it is important to note that there may already be duplicated particles, perhaps from previous iterations. For continuous time changepoints, duplicates also arise when particles with no changepoints are sampled. For simplicity of notation, assume now that the weighted particle set has been labeled such that the first $N' < N$ particles are unique. For $1 \leq i \leq N$, let $m_0^{(i)}$ be the number of replicates of $\tau_{n-1}^{(i)}$ in the N particles, and define $\bar{w}^{(i)} = w_{n-1}^{(i)} m_0^{(i)}$. Then note that $\{\tau_{n-1}^{(i)}, \bar{w}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{N'}$ is an equivalent representation of the full weighted particle set, since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N'} \bar{w}^{(i)} \delta_{\tau_{n-1}^{(i)}}(\tau_{n-1}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N w_{n-1}^{(i)} \delta_{\tau_{n-1}^{(i)}}(\tau_{n-1}).$$

It is necessary to work with this reduced representation, as otherwise the algorithm would admit the possibility of making different numbers of copies of the same particle. Assume that each unique particle i will be replicated $m^{(i)}$ times, so that $\sum_{i=1}^{N'} m^{(i)} = M$. Then in order to minimize the sum of the squared weights and ensure that any Monte Carlo estimates are the same after the particle set has been increased, the revised weight for particle i is $\bar{w}^{(i)}/m^{(i)}$. The important implication here is that replicating highly weighted particles will reduce those weights, which will make the weights more uniform and therefore boost the effective sample size in step 8 of Algorithm 1.

Choosing optimal values $\{m^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{N'}$, so that the resulting sum of squared weights is minimized is a complex optimization problem, and solving this directly would add too much computational burden to the overall SMC algorithm. So instead, Algorithm 2 presents a sequential optimization method.

The quantity δ_i , calculated in step 2, represents the decrease in the sum of the squared weights if the i th particle is replicated once, and this is used to identify the next particle to replicate, i^* . The number of replicates of particle i^* that are then made, $x_{N'}$, calculated in step 6, is the largest

Algorithm 2 Increasing particle set from N to M

- 1: Set $m^{(i)} = m_0^{(i)}$ and $\bar{w}^{(i)} = m_0^{(i)} w^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N'$. Let $m = \sum_{i=1}^{N'} m^{(i)} = N$
- 2: Calculate $\delta_i = (\bar{w}^{(i)})^2 / \{(m^{(i)} + 1)m^{(i)}\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N'$
- 3: Let $i^* = \operatorname{argmax}_i \{\delta_i : i = 1, \dots, N'\}$
- 4: **while** $m < M$ **do**
- 5: Let $i^{**} = \operatorname{argmax}_i \{\delta_i : i = 1, \dots, N', i \neq i^*\}$
- 6: Let $x_{N'} = \min \left(M - m, \lceil \sqrt{(\bar{w}^{(i^*)})^2 / \delta_{i^{**}} + 0.25} - 0.5 - m^{(i^*)} \rceil \right)$
- 7: Let $m^{i^*} = m^{i^*} + x_{N'}$ and $m = m + x_{N'}$
- 8: Let $\delta_{i^*} = (\bar{w}^{(i^*)})^2 / \{(m^{(i^*)} + 1)m^{(i^*)}\}$
- 9: Let $i^* = i^{**}$
- 10: **end while**
- 11: Let $i' = 1$
- 12: **for** $i = 1 : N'$ **do**
- 13: **for** $j = 1 : m^{(i)}$ **do**
- 14: $\tau_{n-1}^{*(i')} = \tau_{n-1}^{(i)}$
- 15: $w_{n-1}^{*(i')} = \bar{w}^{(i)} / m^{(i)}$
- 16: $i' = i' + 1$
- 17: **end for**
- 18: **end for**
- 19: $(\tau_{n-1}^{(i)}, w_{n-1}^{(i)}) \leftarrow (\tau_{n-1}^{*(i)}, w_{n-1}^{*(i)})$ for $i = 1, \dots, M$

integer solving the inequality

$$\frac{(\bar{w}^{(i^*)})^2}{(m^{(i^*)} + x_{N'} + 1)(m^{(i^*)} + x_{N'})} < \delta_{i^{**}},$$

since this is the smallest number of replicates that are required for i^* not to remain the optimal particle to replicate.

4.2 Example: The VAST data

The IEEE VAST 2008 Challenge data are synthetic data comprising information of mobile call records for a small community of 400 mobile phones, over a 10 day period. The challenge was aimed at social network analysis, with the aim of uncovering anomalous behavior within the social network. The data can be obtained from <http://www.cs.umd.edu/hcil/VASTchallenge08>.

A successful approach taken in (Heard et al., 2010) is to monitor the incoming call patterns of each phone to detect changes from their normal patterns, and thereby obtain a much smaller

subset of potentially anomalous IDs that can further be investigated. After correcting for diurnal effects on normal behavior as in Heard et al. (2010), this approach reduces to the online detection of changepoints of 400 processes which can be assumed to follow a Poisson process with a conjugate prior for the intensity as detailed in Section 3.3.1. Furthermore, it was later shown in Heard and Turcotte (2015) that for a fixed computational effort, more accurate inference could be obtained from the Poisson process model of these data by using the adaptive sampling strategy presented in that paper.

The SMC Algorithm 1 can be deployed to simulate a real time changepoint analysis of the incoming call data for each phone number in the network. Each phone number is reanalyzed each hour over the ten days of data, which corresponds to 240 update intervals. Furthermore, to illustrate the adaptive version of the SMC algorithm, a variable number of particles are assigned to each process in each update window according to the complexities of their distributions using the Algorithm given in Heard and Turcotte (2015). On each interval, each process is given a minimum of 500 particles, but the total number of samples to be adaptively allocated across the processes $m^* = 4,000,000$; so equal sample sizes would correspond to 10,000 particles for each process.

Figure 6 shows a box plot of the sample sizes N^j allocated to each of the 400 processes over each update window. The dotted line shows the sample size that would be allocated to each process under a fixed sample size strategy, where $N^j = 10,000$. It is apparent that at night, when most of the actors are quiet, the sample sizes allocated are similar to that of an equal sample size strategy; whereas during the day the sample sizes allocated are far more varied as actors become more active, to varying degrees. The few processes that receive larger sample sizes at night most often correspond to those actors that surprisingly become active at night, suggesting a more complicated distribution during that update interval.

In Ye et al. (2008) it shown that the main anomalous activity was identified as involving four actors that change their handsets on the eighth day of the data period. Community members who initially communicated with phone IDs 1, 2, 3 and 5 (Group A) switched to communicating with IDs 309, 397, 360 and 306 (Group B) so that there is a decrease (and corresponding increase) in the call patterns for the handset IDs in Group A (and B). The impact of the locally anomalous behavior on sample size allocation can be seen clearly in Figure 7, which shows the total allocated




Figure 6: Box plot of the sample sizes N^j allocated to each individual on each of the 240 update intervals. Dotted line corresponds to $N^j = 10,000$.

sample sizes for both groups over each of the update intervals. Particularly for Group A, their highest sample sizes are observed at the time of the anomaly, meaning more statistical effort is being correctly afforded to the most interesting cases.

5 Conclusion

A new SMC algorithm for changepoint analysis has been presented, and shown to outperform existing SMC methods. The computational effort of the algorithm does not increase over time. Effective sample size (ESS) thresholding has been used to control diversity of the particles in all examples; other standard techniques for improving SMC performance can also be applied to Algorithm 1, such as the Resample-Move algorithm of Gilks and Berzuini (2001), where MCMC transition kernels are applied to the particle set after ESS resampling to introduce diversity. The algorithm has also been shown to be adaptive in the number of particles used over time, which




Figure 7: Total allocated sample sizes for each update interval for the processes corresponding to the unique phone IDs in Group A(left) and Group B(right). The histogram is the total number of incoming calls for the interval. The red line corresponds to the fixed sample size strategy of $N^j = 10,000$.

further improves upon the computational savings that SMC methods offer.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The C++ code and the data for the examples in Section 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 is available to download from <https://github.com/mjmt05/rjmcmc.git>.

References

- Chopin, N. (2007). Dynamic detection of change points in long time series. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 59:349–366.
- Del Moral, P., Doucet, A., and Jasra, A. (2006). Sequential Monte Carlo samplers. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 68:411–436.
- Fearnhead, P. and Clifford, P. (2003). On-line inference for hidden Markov models via particle filters. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 65:887–899.
- Fearnhead, P. and Liu, Z. (2007). On-line inference for multiple changepoint problems. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 69:589–605.

- Gilks, W. R. and Berzuini, C. (2001). Following a moving target - Monte Carlo inference for dynamic Bayesian models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 63:127–146.
- Green, P. J. (1995). Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo computation and Bayesian model determination. *Biometrika*, 82:711–732.
- Heard, N. and Turcotte, M. (2015). Convergence of Monte Carlo distribution estimates from rival samplers. *Statistics and Computing, to appear*.
- Heard, N. A., Weston, D. J., Platanioti, K., and Hand, D. J. (2010). Bayesian anomaly detection methods for social networks. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4:645–662.
- Kitagawa, G. (1996). Monte carlo filter and smoother for non-gaussian nonlinear state space models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 5(1):1–25.
- Liu, J. S. (1996). Metropolized independent sampling with comparisons to rejection sampling and importance sampling. *Statistics and Computing*, 6:113–119.
- Raftery, A. E. and Akman, V. E. (1986). Bayesian analysis of a Poisson process with a change-point. *Biometrika*, 73:85–89.
- Whiteley, N., Johansen, A. M., and Godsill, S. (2011). Monte Carlo filtering of piecewise deterministic processes. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 20(1):119–139.
- Ye, Q., Zhu, T., Hu, D., Wu, B., Du, N., and Wang, B. (2008). Cell Phone Mini Challenge Award: Social Network Accuracy - Exploring temporal communication in mobile call graphs. In *Proceedings of IEEE VAST Symposium*, pages 207–208. IEEE.