
Bayesian Nonparametric Poisson Process Allocation

Hongyi Ding

The University of Tokyo, Japan
hongyi@ms.k.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Issei Sato

The University of Tokyo, Japan
sato@k.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Masashi Sugiyama

RIKEN / The University of Tokyo
sugi@k.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

Analyzing the structure of multiple point process observations provides insight into the understanding of complex networks and human activities. In this work, we present Bayesian nonparametric Poisson process allocation (BNPPA), a generative model to automatically infer the number of latent groups in temporal data based on the previous point estimation model, latent Poisson process allocation (LPPA). We derive a variational inference algorithm when incorporating a Dirichlet process prior and adding an integral constraint. Finally, we demonstrate the usefulness of this Bayesian nonparametric model through experiments on both synthetic and real-world data sets.

1 Introduction

In recent decades, the booming of the Internet provides us a great opportunity to collect a huge amount of temporal data, or time sequences. Each sequence consists of a set of time points recording the arrival of events. When given a set of such sequences, a natural need is "to separate this data set into clusters, and yet allow the groups to remain linked to share statistical strength" [18]. This need has already found its applications in many other fields, such as document topic modeling [4] and recommendation systems [16].

A Cox process, also known as a doubly-stochastic Poisson process, is commonly used to model the intensity or frequency of arrivals in time sequences. Previous works model the intensity function as a proper transformation of a random realization of a Gaussian process. Based on the Gaussian Cox processes, various inference methods have been proposed, including Monte Carlo sampling [1, 19], Laplace approximation [7] and variational inference [12].

Latent Poisson process allocation (LPPA) [11] is designed to infer the underlying structure of multiple point process observations. In LPPA, the intensity function is modeled as a linear combination of a set of basis intensity functions, where the weights of combination are point-estimated. However, point estimation is prone to over-fitting when the number of latent groups is set to a large value. One could determine the desired dimensionality by testing the performance on a held-out validation data set. But it is not computationally efficient when the data set is large.

Bayesian nonparametric method is an appealing choice to automatically determine the number of latent groups. Some of the most widely-used tools in Bayesian nonparametric methods are Dirichlet processes [6], beta processes and gamma processes [13]. In this work, we propose a Bayesian nonparametric Poisson process allocation (BNPPA) model, in which we incorporate a Dirichlet process prior into the LPPA framework to automatically determine the number of latent groups.

The application of Dirichlet processes as a prior for the allocation parameter to estimate a single intensity function or density function has been explored by previous work [10], where they used the

beta distribution as a mixture component and used a separate variable to control the count distribution. However, the shape of the beta distribution limits the description ability of mixture components. Our work is also related to a series of works on infinity mixture of Gaussian processes [15, 17]. In these works, they studied the conjugate regression problem and used additional indicator variables for each point in a sequence, while in our case it is a non-conjugate intensity estimation problem and we implicitly collapse the indicator variables.

The main contributions of our work are two folds: 1) We introduce a fully Bayesian framework to automatically learn the number of latent groups from multiple point process observations; 2) We propose to impose an equality constraint on the variational distribution of the Gaussian process and the resulting variational distribution behaves more like a probability measure.

2 Preliminaries

First we review Cox processes and latent Poisson process allocation (LPPA) which are the background of the algorithm in Section 3 and 4.

2.1 Cox process

A Cox process is a type of inhomogeneous Poisson process, whose intensity is drawn from another stochastic process [9]. It is defined via a stochastic intensity function $\lambda(x) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. Given the intensity function $\lambda(x)$, the number of events $N(\mathcal{T})$ within a specified region \mathcal{T} is a Poisson-distributed random variable and its mean value is $\int_{\mathcal{T}} \lambda(x) dx$. The probability of the model given a set of observations $\{\mathbf{t}_n\}_{n=1}^N$ in the region \mathcal{T} is

$$P(\{\mathbf{t}_n\}_{n=1}^N | \lambda(x)) = \exp\left(-\int_{\mathcal{T}} \lambda(x) dx\right) \prod_{n=1}^N \lambda(\mathbf{t}_n). \quad (1)$$

In the following sections, without specification we are studying the intensity function in the region \mathcal{T} . We denote a Gaussian process as GP and a Poisson process as PP.

2.2 Latent Poisson process allocation

In the data set, there are D different sequences $\{\mathbf{y}_d\}_{d=1}^D$, each of which is a set of points $\{\mathbf{t}_n^d\}_{n=1}^{N_d}$, $\mathbf{t}_n^d \in \mathbb{R}^R$. Each sequence has an underlying intensity function $\lambda_d(t)$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and these D sequences share the same set of basis intensity functions $\{f_k^2(t)\}_{k=1}^K$.

Lloyd et al. [11] assume that the functions $\{f_k(t)\}_{k=1}^K$ are independent Gaussian process distributed random functions with automatic relevance determination (ARD) covariance kernel. Since there exists a correlation between $f_k^2(t)$ and θ_{dk} , they do not optimize the hyper-parameter γ .

$$H_k(x, x') = \gamma \prod_{r=1}^R \exp\left(-\frac{(x_{ir} - x_{jr})^2}{2a_{rk}}\right).$$

Each basis intensity function is conditioned on the same set of inducing points $\{\mathbf{t}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ to reduce inference complexity as in [20]. Let the function value at these points be $f_{k,M} \sim N(g, H_k)$. Conditioned on these inducing points, the function value at points $\{\mathbf{t}_n\}_{n=1}^N$ can be evaluated by $f_{k,N} \sim GP(u_k, B_k)$, where $u_k = H_{k,NM} H_{k,MM}^{-1} f_{k,M}$ and $B_k = H_{k,NN} - H_{k,NM} H_{k,MM}^{-1} H_{k,MN}$.

For the mixture modeling, the intensity function $\lambda_d(t)$ is a linear combination of the basis intensity functions $f_k^2(t)$ as in Equation 2 and the mixture weights θ_{dk} are point-estimated.

$$\lambda_d(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \theta_{dk} f_k^2(t), \quad \theta_{dk} \in [0, \infty). \quad (2)$$

Let K , N , M and D denote the number of latent groups, the average number of points in a sequence, the number of inducing points and the number of sequences, respectively. The time complexity for the training process in LPPA is roughly $O(KDNM^2)$ which is determined by evaluating $f_{k,N}$. If we want to use cross-validation to determine the number of latent groups, it will not be computationally efficient.

3 Model

To automatically infer the number of latent groups, we could incorporate a Dirichlet process prior which is used in Bayesian nonparametric learning to determine the structure automatically [3]. We decompose the intensity function $\lambda_d(t)$ as in Equation 3.

$$\lambda_d(t) = s_d \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \theta_{dk} f_k^2(t), \quad s_d \in [0, \infty), \theta_{dk} \in [0, 1], t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (3)$$

Equation 3 differs from 2 in that we separate θ_{dk} in Equation 2 into two parts, s_d and θ_{dk} , which control the count distribution and the allocation behavior, respectively. This kind of decomposition is similar to the structure in [10]. We use separate hyper-parameters for the Gamma distribution and the stick-breaking prior, since in our problem there is no direct connection between the count distribution and the allocation behavior. The generative process for the data set $\{\mathbf{y}_d\}_{d=1}^D$ is as follows.

1. Draw $f_k(t) \sim GP(g, H_k)$ for $k = 1, \dots, \infty$.
2. For each sequence $d = 1, \dots, D$
 - Draw $s_d \sim \text{Gamma}(a_0, b_0)$.
 - Draw $\theta'_{dk} \sim \text{Beta}(1, \alpha)$ for $k = 1, \dots, \infty$.
 - Calculate $\theta_{dk} = \theta'_{dk} \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} (1 - \theta'_{dl})$.
 - Draw the points $\mathbf{y}_d \sim PP(s_d \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \theta_{dk} f_k^2(t))$.

However, since we use a separate variables s_d to model the count distribution, we are implicitly assuming that the remaining parts $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \theta_{dk} f_k^2(t), \forall d$ are normalized. This further implies each basis intensity function $f_k^2(t)$ should behave more like a probability measure in the region \mathcal{T} rather than an unnormalized one, and consequently we should impose the constraint $\int_{\mathcal{T}} f_k^2(t) dt = 1$ on $f_k(t)$.

In practice, it is difficult to impose an integral constraint on a Gaussian process prior, although we could use Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling [14] to perform nonparametric Bayesian density estimation. However, its computation complexity is $O(N^3)$ where N is the number of data points and the convergence of MCMC is hard to determine [5]. And therefore, we impose a constraint with the aid of variational distribution.

$$h_k(\Theta) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}_q[f_k^2(s)] ds - 1 = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (4)$$

4 Inference

In this section, we will provide the variational inference framework when there is no equality constraint in Equation 4 and then show how the constraint will affect the framework.

4.1 Variational inference

Let $\mathbf{y} = \{\mathbf{y}_d\}$, $\mathbf{s} = \{s_d\}$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\theta_{dk}\}$, $\mathbf{f} = \{f_k\}$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \{\lambda_d\}$ and $\mathbf{H} = \{H_k\}$. The joint distribution over the variables can be expressed as:

$$p(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{f} | \mathbf{H}, a_0, b_0, \alpha) = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} p(f_k | H_k) \prod_{d=1}^D p(s_d | a_0, b_0) \prod_{d=1}^D \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} p(\theta_{dk} | \alpha) \prod_{d=1}^D p(\mathbf{y}_d | \mathbf{f}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_d, s_d).$$

We follow the tradition in [3] to truncate the number of basis intensity functions to K . K is usually selected to be larger than the expected number of basis functions used by the data. Then the model

would automatically generate a sparse structure. We choose the following variational distributions:

$$\begin{aligned} q(s_d) &= \delta_{\eta_d}, \\ q(\theta'_{dk}) &= \begin{cases} \text{Gamma}(\tau_{dk,0}, \tau_{dk,1}), & k < K, \\ \delta_1, & k = K, \\ p(\theta'_{dk}), & k > K, \end{cases} \\ q(\mathbf{f}_{k,M}) &= \begin{cases} N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \Sigma_k), & k \leq K, \\ N(0, H_k), & k > K. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

And the entire variational distribution is

$$q(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{f}) = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} p(\mathbf{f}_{k,N} | \mathbf{f}_{k,M}) q(\mathbf{f}_{k,M}) \prod_{d=1}^D q(s_d) \prod_{d=1}^D \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} q(\theta_{dk}).$$

Note that we use the true $p(\mathbf{f}_{k,N} | \mathbf{f}_{k,M})$ as in [20]. Further note that we select delta function as the variational distribution of \mathbf{s} . In this case, the prior on s_d acts as smoothing parameters. Using Jensen's inequality, we bound the marginal log likelihood of the observed sequence $\{\mathbf{y}_d\}$. Hereafter we omit hyper-parameters a_0, b_0, α in $\ln p(\mathbf{y} | a_0, b_0, \alpha)$ for simplicity.

$$\begin{aligned} \ln p(\mathbf{y}) &= \ln \left[\int \left(\prod_{d=1}^D p(\mathbf{y}_d | \boldsymbol{\theta}_d, s_d, \mathbf{f}) p(s_d) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}'_d) \right) \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} p(\mathbf{f}_{k,N} | \mathbf{f}_{k,M}) p(\mathbf{f}_{k,M}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}'_d d\mathbf{f} \right] \\ &\geq \sum_{d=1}^D \mathbb{E} \ln p(\mathbf{y}_d | \boldsymbol{\theta}_d, s_d, \mathbf{f}) + \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \ln p(\theta'_{dk}) + \sum_{d=1}^D \mathbb{E} \ln p(s_d) + \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \ln p(\mathbf{f}_{k,M}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{E} \ln q(\theta'_{dk}) - \sum_{d=1}^D \mathbb{E} \ln q(s_d) - \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \ln q(\mathbf{f}_{k,M}) \triangleq \mathcal{L}_0(q). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Because $f(\mathbf{x}) = \ln \sum_{k=1}^K \exp(x_k)$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is convex, we could further bound the first term to allow for a practical variational inference. Using Equation 1 and Jensen's inequality, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \ln p(\mathbf{y}_d | \boldsymbol{\theta}_d, s_d, \mathbf{f}) &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_d} \left(\ln \eta_d + \mathbb{E} \ln \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp(\ln \theta_{dk} + \ln f_k^2(t)) \right) - \eta_d \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \theta_{dk} f_k^2(s) ds \\ &\geq \sum_{n=1}^{N_d} \left(\ln \eta_d + \ln \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp(\mathbb{E} \ln \theta_{dk} + \mathbb{E} \ln f_k^2(t)) \right) - \eta_d \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \theta_{dk} f_k^2(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Using Equation 6, we implicitly collapse the indicator variables and obtain the collapsed variational inference result in [11]. We denote the final evidence lower bound as $\mathcal{L}_1(q)$. The two expectations related to Gaussian processes can be computed as in [11].

$$\mathbb{E}[\ln f_k^2(t_n^d)] = -G\left(-\frac{u_{k,n}^2}{2B_{k,nn}}\right) - C + \ln\left(\frac{B_{k,nn}}{2}\right), \quad (7)$$

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}[f_k^2(s)] ds = \gamma |\mathcal{T}| - \text{tr}(H_k^{-1} \Phi_k) + \text{tr}(H_k^{-1} \Phi_k H_k^{-1} (\Sigma_k + \mu_k \mu_k^T)). \quad (8)$$

In 7, $G(\cdot)$ is a specialized version of a partial derivative of the confluent hyper-geometric function and can be calculated by a precomputed look-up table. C is the Euler constant and $C \approx 0.5772156$. In Equation 8, $\Phi_k(z, z') = \int_{\mathcal{T}} H_k(z, x) H_k(x, z') dx$. The computation of $\mathcal{L}_1(q)$ can be found in the supplementary material. If there is no constraint, we could maximize $\mathcal{L}_1(q)$ using coordinate ascent with regard to the parameters $\Theta = \{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, a_0, b_0, \alpha\}$ within the expectation maximization framework.

4.2 Optimization with equality constraint

Given that we have k equality constraints in Equation 4, the optimization objective is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize } \mathcal{L}_1(q) \\ & \text{s.t. } h_k(\Theta) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}_q[f_k^2(s)] ds - A = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

For numerical stability concern, we modify the constraint by changing the value of A from 1 to any positive value. If A is set too small, the confluent hyper-geometric function in Equation 7 may suffer from low accuracy. This modification will not change the value of intensity function. Intuitively, if we multiply all s_d by A and divide all $f_k(t)$ by \sqrt{A} in Equation 3, $\lambda_d(t)$ will still be the same.

Since Problem 9 is an optimization problem with equality constraints, we resort to the augmented Lagrangian method in [2]. And then Problem 9 is reduced to a series of related optimization problems in Equation 10. $0 < v_{ik} \leq v_{i(k+1)}$ and $\{w_{ik}\}$ are bounded.

$$\text{maximize } L_{v_i}(\Theta, \mathbf{w}_i) = \mathcal{L}_1(q) - \sum_{k=1}^K \left(w_{ik} h_k(\Theta) + \frac{1}{2} v_{ik} h_k^2(\Theta) \right), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}^+. \quad (10)$$

We should notice that for each optimization problem, $L_{v_i}(\Theta, \mathbf{w}_i)$ is still upper bounded by the following theorem. And thus if we use coordinate ascent on Θ , the algorithm is bound to arrive at a local maximum. The proof of Theorem 1 and the details of the modified variational inference are provided in the supplementary materials.

Theorem 1. *Each optimization problem in Equation 10 is upper bounded.*

$$L_{v_i}(\Theta, \mathbf{w}_i) \leq \ln p(\mathbf{y}) + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{w_{ik}^2}{2v_{ik}}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

After adding the constraint, the optimization problem in Equation 10 does not become significantly more expensive, since we also have to compute the integral and corresponding gradient in original LPPA. Moreover, we could reuse the final value Θ_{i-1} of the previous optimization as the starting value for i -th round [2] and the convergence of L_{v_i} is rather fast. And thus the computation complexity is still $O(KDNM^2)$.

5 Experiments

We evaluate Bayesian nonparametric Poisson process allocation (BNPPA) and compare this algorithm with the original latent Poisson process allocation (LPPA). We also test the efficacy of the constraints by removing the augmented Lagrangian penalty function and we call this algorithm BNPPA-. We test these algorithms on three data sets, one synthetic data set and two real-world ones.

- **Synthetic data set.** We sample $d = 200$ sequences from $\lambda_d(t) = s_d \sum_{k=1}^4 \theta_{dk} f_k(t)$, where s_d, θ_d are drawn from $Dir(1.2, 1, 0.8, 0.6)$ and $Gamma(2, 3)$, respectively. We use function $f_k(t) \propto \exp(-(t - 15 + 10k)^2/10) + \exp(-(t - 55 + 10k)^2/10)$, $k = 1, \dots, 4$, $t \in [0, 60]$ as basis intensity functions and each $f_k(t)$ is normalized by its integral. In this data set we use 18 inducing points and the average number of points in a sequence is 87.
- **Microblog data set.** We downloaded tweets and all retweets of each tweet from 7 publishers on Sina micro-blog platform through official API¹. Due to the difference of the publishing time, the retweet time will have a different pattern [8]. We study retweets that fall in the region $1 \leq t \leq 11$, where t is the elapsed time since the original tweet. We leave out tweets with less than 20 retweets and we have a subset of 500 tweets. In this data set we use 30 inducing points and the average number of points in a sequence is 139.

¹<http://open.weibo.com/wiki/Oauth/en>




Figure 1: Rows 1: Test likelihood for three algorithms on three data sets. Rows 2: Computation time in seconds for three algorithms on three data sets.

- Citation data set.** From KDDcup 2016 ², we obtain the Microsoft academic graph before February 5th, 2016. We study the pattern of citation within 20 years after publication. We use a subset of this data set with 600 papers which were published more than 20 years before and were cited at least 20 times. In this data set we use 30 inducing points and the average number of points in a sequence is 351.

Experimental Settings. For all three algorithms we use variational inference method. For LPPA, the algorithm is given in [11]. We change the number of latent groups in LPPA and for BNPPA/BNPPA-, this means changing the truncation number K . Each setting is repeated five times.

We use random initialization for the allocation matrix θ and τ . For hyper-parameters in BNPPA/BNPPA-, we fit the gamma distribution to the counts $\{N_d\}_{d=1}^D$ and use the results as the initial value for a_0, b_0 . We initialize $\alpha = 1$ and set $A = \sum_{d=1}^D N_d/D$ in Equation 9. For the augmented Lagrangian method in BNPPA, we follow the advice in [2] and use $v_{i+1} = 4v_i, w_{i+1} = w_i + v_i h(\Theta_i)$. We initialize $v_{1k} = 4, w_{1k} = 1, \forall k$.

For LPPA, BNPPA- and each optimization problem in BNPPA, we terminate the training process when the relative change in lower bound is less than 10^{-3} . For BNPPA, we stop increasing i when the relative change between $L_{v_i}(\Theta_i, w_i)$ and $L_{v_{i+1}}(\Theta_{i+1}, w_{i+1})$ is less than 10^{-3} .

Testing. For each sequence in data set, we divide it into two halves by allocating each point into either half with probability 0.5. One half is used for training and the other is for testing.

Following [12], we use Equation 11 as the evaluation metric. This can be seen as a lower bound of the true test likelihood. For LPPA, allocation variable $\tilde{\theta}_{dk}$ is the inferred weight. For BNPPA and BNPPA-, we draw samples of $\tilde{\theta}_{dk}$ from the variational distribution $q(s_d, \theta_d)$ to approximate $\tilde{\theta}_{dk} = s_d \theta_{dk}$. We also record the computation time for comparison.

$$\mathcal{L}_{test} = \sum_{n=1}^{N_d} \log \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{\theta}_{dk} \exp \left[\mathbb{E}_q(\log f_k^2(t_n^d)) \right] - \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{\theta}_{dk} \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}_q[f_k^2(s)] ds. \quad (11)$$

Experimental Results. The comparisons of test likelihood and computation time are given in Figure 1. We could notice that for LPPA, the test likelihood drops with the increase of the number of latent

²<https://kddcup2016.azurewebsites.net/>




Figure 2: Rows 1: Inferred weights for LPPA (left), BNPPA (middle) and BNPPA- (right) and each weight θ_{dk} is normalized by the sum $\sum_{k=1}^K \theta_{dk}$. Rows 2: Inferred basis intensity functions for LPPA (left), BNPPA (middle) and BNPPA- (right) and the digits near each curve correspond to latent group number.

groups K , but BNPPA remains relatively stable. Both BNPPA- and BNPPA take more computation time but are still comparable to LPPA.

To better demonstrate the difference among three algorithms, we plot the inferred allocation weight matrix θ and $f_k(t)$ for synthetic and micro-blog data set in Figure 2 and 3, respectively. The result for citation data set is given in the supplementary material. In Figure 2, both BNPPA- and BNPPA can learn a sparse structure, but in BNPPA-, except the first four components, all the other intensity functions are driven to zero. In Figure 3, we could notice that LPPA will treat all latent groups equally and the allocation matrix θ is rather dense, while BNPPA and BNPPA- tend to use fewer groups and this leads to a sparse result. In BNPPA-, however, the basis intensity functions are not comparable. For example, the 3rd basis function is smaller than others. If we have two sequences whose underlying intensity functions are $\lambda_1(t) = \eta_1 f_3^2(t)$ and $\lambda_2(t) = \eta_2 f_3^2(t)$, since $f_2(t)$ and $f_3(t)$ are not comparable in integral, the count distribution parameter η_1 and η_2 will be incomparable. In BNPPA, after adding the constraint, this problem is alleviated.

6 Conclusions and future work

We have considered the task of automatically inferring the number of latent groups for multiple point process observations. We have proposed a method to incorporate a Dirichlet process prior into LPPA and have imposed an equality constraint on the variational distribution of the Gaussian process, which makes the resulting variational distribution behave more like a probability measure. For future work, we are considering to adopt stochastic variational inference, which could reduce $O(KDNM^2)$ computation complexity when dealing with a large data set. Besides, finding a fully Bayesian method to incorporate the integral constraint on the Gaussian process prior would also be an interesting and challenging direction.

References

- [1] Ryan Prescott Adams, Iain Murray, and David JC MacKay. Tractable nonparametric bayesian inference in poisson processes with gaussian process intensities. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9–16. ACM, 2009.




Figure 3: Rows 1: Inferred weights for LPPA (left), BNPPA (middle) and BNPPA- (right) and each weight θ_{dk} is normalized by the sum $\sum_{k=1}^K \theta_{dk}$. Rows 2: Inferred basis intensity functions for LPPA (left), BNPPA (middle) and BNPPA- (right) and the digits near each curve correspond to latent group number.

- [2] Dimitri P Bertsekas. *Constrained optimization and Lagrange multiplier methods*. Academic press, 2014.
- [3] David M Blei, Michael I Jordan, et al. Variational inference for dirichlet process mixtures. *Bayesian analysis*, 1(1):121–143, 2006.
- [4] David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3(Jan):993–1022, 2003.
- [5] Mary Kathryn Cowles and Bradley P Carlin. Markov chain monte carlo convergence diagnostics: a comparative review. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91(434):883–904, 1996.
- [6] Thomas S Ferguson. A bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems. *The annals of statistics*, pages 209–230, 1973.
- [7] Seth Flaxman, Andrew Wilson, Daniel Neill, Hannes Nickisch, and Alex Smola. Fast kronecker inference in gaussian processes with non-gaussian likelihoods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 607–616, 2015.
- [8] Shuai Gao, Jun Ma, and Zhumin Chen. Modeling and predicting retweeting dynamics on microblogging platforms. In *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 107–116. ACM, 2015.
- [9] John Frank Charles Kingman. *Poisson processes*. Wiley Online Library, 1993.
- [10] Athanasios Kottas. Dirichlet process mixtures of beta distributions, with applications to density and intensity estimation. In *Workshop on Learning with Nonparametric Bayesian Methods, 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2006.
- [11] Chris Lloyd, Tom Gunter, Tom Nickson, Michael A Osborne, and Stephen J Roberts. Latent poisson process allocation. In *AISTATS*, volume 41, pages 389–397, 2016.
- [12] Chris Lloyd, Tom Gunter, Michael Osborne, and Stephen Roberts. Variational inference for gaussian process modulated poisson processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1814–1822, 2015.
- [13] Kurt Tadayuki Miller. *Bayesian nonparametric latent feature models*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2011.
- [14] Iain Murray, David MacKay, and Ryan P Adams. The gaussian process density sampler. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 9–16, 2009.

- [15] Carl E Rasmussen and Zoubin Ghahramani. Infinite mixtures of gaussian process experts. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 881–888, 2002.
- [16] Ruslan Salakhutdinov and Andriy Mnih. Bayesian probabilistic matrix factorization using markov chain monte carlo. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 880–887. ACM, 2008.
- [17] Shiliang Sun and Xin Xu. Variational inference for infinite mixtures of gaussian processes with applications to traffic flow prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 12(2):466–475, 2011.
- [18] Yee W Teh, Michael I Jordan, Matthew J Beal, and David M Blei. Sharing clusters among related groups: Hierarchical dirichlet processes. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1385–1392, 2005.
- [19] Yee W Teh and Vinayak Rao. Gaussian process modulated renewal processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2474–2482, 2011.
- [20] Michalis K Titsias. Variational learning of inducing variables in sparse gaussian processes. In *AISTATS*, volume 5, pages 567–574, 2009.