

Local Equivalence Problem in Hidden Markov Model

Masahito Hayashi

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In the hidden Markovian process, there is a possibility that two different transition matrices for hidden and observed variables yield the same stochastic behavior for the observed variables. Since such two transition matrices cannot be distinguished, we need to identify them and consider that they are equivalent, in practice. We address the equivalence problem of hidden Markovian process in a local neighborhood by using the geometrical structure of hidden Markovian process. For this aim, we formulate an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices by using generators. Then, the above equivalence problem is formulated as the equivalence problem of generators. Taking account into this equivalence problem, we derive several concrete parametrizations in several natural cases.

Keywords Hidden Markov · equivalence problem · information geometry · exponential family

1 Introduction

Hidden Markovian process characterizes an observed variable Y that is determined by a hidden variable X subject to Markovian process. That is, a hidden Markovian process is given as a pair of a transition matrix V from the hidden variable X to the observed variable Y and a transition matrix W on the hidden variable X as Fig. 2. However, there is ambiguity for the pair of the function and the transition matrix to express the hidden Markovian process. That is, there is a possibility that two different pairs express the same hidden Markovian process. This problem is called the equivalence problem. When the

M. Hayashi
the Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Japan, Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, RIKEN, Japan, & the Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore
E-mail: e-mail:masahito@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp

transition matrix V is given by a deterministic function f as Fig. 1, it was solved by Ito, Amari and Kobayashi [1]. However, since the asymptotic error is characterized by the local geometrical structure, to discuss the estimation of the hidden Markovian process, we need to consider this problem in the tangent space, which was not addressed in [1]. Indeed, as explained latter, this problem is deeply related to the geometrical structure of hidden Markov process.

As another problem, we address the formulation of information geometrical structure, especially, an exponential family, for hidden Markov process. Indeed, information geometry was established by Amari and Nagaoka [2] as a very powerful method for statistical inference. Nakagawa and Kanaya [3] and Nagaoka [4] addressed its extension to Markovian process and formulated an exponential family for transition matrices. As an advantage of an exponential family for transition matrices, the geometric structure depends only on the transition matrices, and it does not change as the number n of observation increases while the geometry based on the probability distribution changes according to the increase of the number n . Recently, the paper [5] applied this geometrical structure to estimation of Markovian process, and clarified the importance of this kind of exponential family for statistical inference by employing the following two facts; Information geometry of an exponential family for transition matrices is given as Bregman divergence [7,6] of the cumulant generating function $\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. All the asymptotic statistical properties can recovered by the cumulant generating function $\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in the Markovian process [8]. However, the formulation of exponential family for hidden Markovian process was not discussed in these existing papers. This formulation is needed when we extend the idea in [8] to the hidden Markovian process [15].

In this paper, to formulate an exponential family for hidden Markovian process, due to the following reason, we address the model given in Fig 3 for hidden Markovian process, in which, the next hidden variable and the observed variable are correlated even when the previous hidden variable is fixed. Indeed, the model of Fig. 1 is generalized to the model of Fig. 2 by replacing the deterministic function f by another transition matrix V . Both models have a complicated structure to define an exponential family directly. At least, when we employ these models, the definition of an exponential family is not so natural. In contrast, as explained in Remark 3, the model given in Fig 3 is most convenient for the discussion of the equivalence problem, and contains the above two cases. Notice that by extending the hidden system, the model of Fig. 1 includes the model of Fig. 3, which shows equivalence among three models. Hence, we formulate the model of Fig. 3 by introducing a mathematical concept \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix, and define an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices. In this definition, generators play an essential role and express the infinitesimal changes. The local equivalence problem is reduced to the equivalent problem for generators. That is, we derive a necessary and sufficient condition for an infinitesimal change of transition matrix to be distinguished. In this way, we can discuss the above two tasks simultaneously.

Further, we address several concrete examples. For example, we give a concrete parametrization taking account into local equivalence when the hidden

system and the observed system are composed of two states. Also, we apply the definition of an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices to the model given in Fig. 2. Then, we characterize the local equivalence in this special case more concretely. In particular, under a certain natural condition, we give a concrete parametrization under this model.




Fig. 1 The first model: The transition matrix W determines the Markovian process on the set \mathcal{X} of hidden states. The function f of the hidden variable X determines the observed variable Y .




Fig. 2 The second model: The transition matrix W determines the Markovian process on the set \mathcal{X} of hidden states. The transition matrix V determines the observed variable Y with the condition on the hidden variable X .




Fig. 3 The third model: the hidden variable X_i and the observed variable Y_i are correlated even when the previous hidden variable X_{i-1} is fixed.

The remaining of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the notion of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix to describe the model given in Fig. 3, and revisits the equivalence problem of hidden Markovian process under this formulation. Section 3 introduces exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition

matrices, and discusses the local equivalence problem under the model given in Fig. 3. By taking account into local equivalence, Section 4 concretely constructs generators under natural conditions. Section 5 applies these general results to the case when the hidden system and the observed system are composed of two states. Section 6 applies these general results to the model given in Fig. 2, and discusses how to choose the parametrization. This section simplifies the equivalence condition under this model.

2 Hidden Markov model and equivalence

2.1 Notations with \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix

In the hidden Markovian process, there is a possibility that two different transition matrices for hidden and observed variables yield the same stochastic behavior for the observed variables. Since such two transition matrices cannot be distinguished, we need to identify them and consider that they are equivalent, in practice. In this section, we discuss the equivalence problem of hidden Markov process. This subsection prepares notation for this aim.

Usually, a hidden Markovian process is given as the combination of a Markovian chain on a hidden finite state system \mathcal{X} and a function from the hidden system \mathcal{X} to a visible finite state system \mathcal{Y} like Fig. 1. The paper [1] discusses the equivalence problem of hidden Markov process in this formalism. However, it requires a very complicated notation because it does not directly treat the set of observed values. To avoid this problem, in this paper, we treat a hidden Markovian process in a different form. That is, we consider a collection of non-negative matrices $\mathbf{W} = (W_y(x|x'))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ on the hidden system \mathcal{X} with the condition that $\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y$ is a probability transition matrix. In this formulation, when the input is x' , we observe the visible outcome y with probability $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} W_y(x|x')$. This formalism directly expresses the behavior of observed outcomes so that the equivalence problem can be easily addressed. Under this observation $Y = y$, the resultant distribution $P_{X|YX'}$ on \mathcal{X} is $P_{X|YX'}(x|yx') = W_y(x|x') / \sum_{\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}} W_y(\tilde{x}|x')$. Since observed outcome takes values in the system \mathcal{Y} , we call \mathbf{W} a \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix on \mathcal{X} ¹. When the initial distribution P_{X_0} is given, like Fig. 3, we have the joint distribution of the sequence $X_n, Y_n, X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}, \dots, X_1, Y_1, X_0$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{X_n, Y_n, X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}, \dots, X_1, Y_1, X_0}(x_n, y_n, x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, \dots, x_1, y_1, x_0) \\ & := W_{y_n}(x_n|x_{n-1})W_{y_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}|x_{n-2}) \cdots W_{y_1}(x_1|x_0)P_{X_0}(x_0). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

That is, X_n and Y_n are correlated even when X_{n-1} is fixed to a value x_{n-1} .

When we are given a Markovian process W on \mathcal{X} and a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ as the conventional formalism of hidden Markovian process, we have a disjoint

¹ A \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix on \mathcal{X} can be regarded as the classical version of measuring instrument of the quantum setting [9, 10], which describes the quantum measuring process. The recent paper [13] characterizes quantum hidden Markovian process by using measuring instrument.

partition $(\mathcal{X}_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ of \mathcal{X} by defining $\mathcal{X}_y := f^{-1}(y)$. When we define the collection $\mathbf{W} = (W_y(x|x'))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ as

$$W_y(x|x') = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } x \notin \mathcal{X}_y \\ W(x|x') & \text{when } x \in \mathcal{X}_y, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

the collection \mathbf{W} gives a hidden Markovian process under our formalism. Conversely, once a collection $\mathbf{W} = (W_y(x|x'))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ is given, we have a hidden Markovian process W on \mathcal{X}' and a function $f : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ as follows. Define the set $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} := \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ and the map f as $f(x, y) := y$. Then, we can define the transition matrix $\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ by

$$\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}(x, y|x', y') := W_y(x|x'), \quad (3)$$

which yields the joint Markovian process. The pair of $\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}$ and the function f recovers the conventional formalism of hidden Markovian process. In this way, our formalism and the conventional formalism can be converted to each other.

Given a \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix $\mathbf{W} = (W_y(x|x'))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ on \mathcal{X} , we denote the transition matrix $\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y$ on \mathcal{X} by $|\mathbf{W}|$. A \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} is called irreducible when $|\mathbf{W}|$ is irreducible. In this case, the average $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} |\mathbf{W}|^i P$ converges to the stationary distribution $P_{\mathbf{W}}$ for any initial distribution P as n goes to infinity [11, 12]. In the following, for simplicity, we identify \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} with $\{1, \dots, d\}$ and $\{1, \dots, d_Y\}$, respectively. That is, $|\mathcal{X}| = d$ and $|\mathcal{Y}| = d_Y$. Also, we assume that a \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} is irreducible. Even in this assumption, $\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}$ is not necessarily irreducible. Hence, the distribution $P_{\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}}$ is not uniquely defined. However, when we define it as

$$P_{\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}}(x, y) := \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} W_y(x|x') P_{\mathbf{W}}(x'), \quad (4)$$

we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *The distribution $P_{\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}}$ is an eigenvector of $\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}$.*

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}} P_{\mathbf{W}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}}})(x, y) &= \sum_{x', y'} W_y(x|x') \sum_{x''} W_{y'}(x'|x'') P_{\mathbf{W}}(x'') \\ &= \sum_{x'} W_y(x|x') \sum_{x'', y'} W_{y'}(x'|x'') P_{\mathbf{W}}(x'') = \sum_{x'} W_y(x|x') P_{\mathbf{W}}(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

□

Now, we discuss the equivalence relation for \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices on \mathcal{X} . When observe k values on \mathcal{Y} by applying the process described by the \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix $\mathbf{W} = (W_y(x|x'))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ on \mathcal{X} , this process is described by

the \mathcal{Y}^k -valued transition matrix $\mathbf{W}^{(k)} := (W_{y_k} \cdot W_{y_{k-1}} \cdots W_{y_1}(x|x'))_{(y_k, y_{k-1}, \dots, y_1) \in \mathcal{Y}^k}$ on \mathcal{X} . That is, we observe k outcomes in \mathcal{Y} subject to the transition matrix

$$P^k[\mathbf{W}](y_k, \dots, y_1|x') := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} W_{y_k} \cdots W_{y_1}(x|x') \quad (6)$$

and the initial distribution on \mathcal{X} . For the following discussion, we employ the vector space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} := \{v = (v_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}} | v_x \in \mathbb{R}\}$, i.e., the space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is spanned by basis $\{e_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$. Then, the transition matrix $P^k[\mathbf{W}]$ can be regarded as a linear map from $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ to $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{Y}^k} = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\otimes k}$. So, we have $\text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}] \subset \text{Ker } P^{k_0}[\mathbf{W}]$ for $k \geq k_0$. We denote the minimum integer k_0 satisfying the following condition by $k_{\mathbf{W}}$, and call it the *minimum length* of \mathbf{W} :

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}] = \text{Ker } P^{k_0}[\mathbf{W}], \quad (7)$$

where the existence of the minimum is shown in Lemma 2. The dimension $d_{\mathbf{W}} := \dim(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}])$ is called the *minimum degree* of \mathbf{W} .

For any integer k , we can naturally define the map $P^k[\mathbf{W}]$ from $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}]$ to $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{Y}^k}$. That is, the distribution of k outcomes of \mathcal{Y} depends only on the element of the quotient space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}]$.

Lemma 2 *The minimum length $k_{\mathbf{W}}$ of \mathbf{W} satisfies*

$$k_{\mathbf{W}} \leq d \quad (8)$$

$$k_{\mathbf{W}} \leq 1 + \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \text{rank } W_y. \quad (9)$$

This lemma also shows the existence of $k_{\mathbf{W}}$.

Proof Step 1: We will show the following fact; If $\text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}] = \text{Ker } P^{k+1}[\mathbf{W}]$, $\text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}] = \text{Ker } P^{k+l}[\mathbf{W}]$ for any $l \geq 0$. We choose an arbitrary element $v \in \text{Ker } P^{k+l}[\mathbf{W}]$. For $(y_1, \dots, y_{l-1}) \in \mathcal{Y}^{l-1}$, we have $W_{y_{l-1}} \cdots W_{y_1} v \in \text{Ker } P^{k+1}[\mathbf{W}]$, which implies that $W_{y_{l-1}} \cdots W_{y_1} v \in \text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}]$. So, $v \in \text{Ker } P^{k+l-1}[\mathbf{W}]$. Repeating this procedure, we obtain $v \in \text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}]$.

Step 2: Step 1 shows that $d = \dim \text{Ker } P^0[\mathbf{W}] > \dim \text{Ker } P^1[\mathbf{W}] > \dots > \dim \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] \geq 0$, which implies (8), i.e., $d \geq k_{\mathbf{W}}$.

Step 3: For an element $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we choose the integer k_y as the minimum integer k_y satisfying $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{Im } W_y \cap \text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}] = \text{Im } W_y \cap \text{Ker } P^{k_y}[\mathbf{W}]$. Now, we apply the above discussion to the case $\text{Im } W_y$. So, we have $\dim \text{Im } W_y = \dim \text{Im } W_y \cap \text{Ker } P^0[\mathbf{W}] > \dim \text{Im } W_y \cap \text{Ker } P^1[\mathbf{W}] > \dots > \dim \text{Im } W_y \cap \text{Ker } P^{k_y}[\mathbf{W}] \geq 0$, which implies that $\dim \text{Im } W_y \geq k_y$.

Step 4: The relation $v \in \text{Ker } P^{k+1}[\mathbf{W}]$ holds if and only if $W_y v \in \text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}]$ for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. So, we have $\max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} k_y + 1 \geq k_{\mathbf{W}}$. Combining Step 3, we have (9). \square

In the following, we regard a distribution P on \mathcal{X} as an element of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Then, $[P]$ denotes an element of the quotient space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}]$ whose representative is P . Given a distribution P on \mathcal{X} and a positive integer k , we define the subspace $\mathcal{V}^k(P)$ of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}]$ spanned by $\{[W_{y_{k'}} \cdots W_{y_1} P] | y_j \in \mathcal{Y}\}$

$\mathcal{Y}, k' \leq k$. We denote the minimum integer k_0 satisfying the following condition by $k_{(P, \mathbf{W})}$, and call it the *minimum length* of (P, \mathbf{W}) :

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}^k(P) = \mathcal{V}^{k_0}(P), \quad (10)$$

where the existence of the minimum is shown in Lemma 4.

Lemma 3 *The space $\mathcal{V}^k(P_{\mathbf{W}})$ is spanned by $\{[W_{y_k} \cdots W_{y_1} P_{\mathbf{W}}] | y_j \in \mathcal{Y}\}$.*

Proof It is enough to show that an element $[W_{y_{k-1}} \cdots W_{y_1} P_{\mathbf{W}}]$ is written as a linear combination of $\{[W_{y_k} \cdots W_{y_1} P_{\mathbf{W}}] | y_j \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. Since $\sum_y W_y P_{\mathbf{W}} = P_{\mathbf{W}}$, we have $\sum_y [W_{y_{k-1}} \cdots W_{y_1} W_y P_{\mathbf{W}}] = [W_{y_{k-1}} \cdots W_{y_1} P_{\mathbf{W}}]$. \square

Lemma 4 *The minimum length $k_{(P, \mathbf{W})}$ of \mathbf{W} exists and satisfies*

$$k_{(P, \mathbf{W})} \leq d - \dim \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] \quad (11)$$

$$k_{(P, \mathbf{W})} \leq 1 + \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \dim(\text{Im } W_y / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}]). \quad (12)$$

Proof Step 1: We show the following fact; If $\mathcal{V}^k(P) = \mathcal{V}^{k+1}(P)$, $\mathcal{V}^k(P) = \mathcal{V}^{k+l}(P)$ for any $l \geq 0$. We choose an arbitrary element $v \in \mathcal{V}^{k+l}(P)$. Choose an element $[W_{y_{k+l}} \cdots W_{y_1} P]$. Due to the assumption, we have an element $[W_{y_{k+1}} \cdots W_{y_1} P] = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \bigcup_{k'=1}^k \mathcal{Y}^{k'}} c_{\mathbf{y}} [W_{\mathbf{y}} P]$. So,

$$[W_{y_{k+l}} \cdots W_{y_1} P] = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \bigcup_{k'=1}^k \mathcal{Y}^{k'}} c_{\mathbf{y}} [W_{y_{k+l}} \cdots W_{y_{k+2}} W_{\mathbf{y}} P] \in \mathcal{V}^{k+l-1}(P).$$

Repeating this procedure, we have $\mathcal{V}^k(P) = \mathcal{V}^{k+l}(P)$.

Step 2: Step 1 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] &\geq \dim \mathcal{V}^{k_{(P, \mathbf{W})}}(P) \\ &> \dim \mathcal{V}^{k_{(P, \mathbf{W})}-1}(P) > \dots > \dim \mathcal{V}^1(P) > \dim \mathcal{V}^0(P) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (11), i.e., $\dim \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] \geq k_{(P, \mathbf{W})}$.

Step 3: For an element $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we choose the integer k'_y as the minimum integer k'_y satisfying $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} [W_y] \mathcal{V}^k(P) = [W_y] \mathcal{V}^{k'_y}(P)$. Replacing $\mathcal{V}^k(P)$ by $[W_y] \mathcal{V}^k(P)$ in the above discussion, we have $\dim \text{Im } W_y / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] \geq k'_y$.

Step 4: We have $k_{(P, \mathbf{W})} \leq 1 + \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} k'_y$. Combining Step 3, we have (12). \square

Lemma 5 *The relation*

$$W_y \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] \subset \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] \quad (13)$$

holds for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Due to Lemma 5, using W_y , we can define the linear map $[W_y]$ on the quotient space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}]$. We also define $d_{(P, \mathbf{W})} := \dim \mathcal{V}^{k_{(P, \mathbf{W})}}(P)$. Hence, the definition of $\mathcal{V}^{k_{(P, \mathbf{W})}}(P)$ and Lemma 5 imply the following lemma.

Lemma 6

$$[W_y]\mathcal{V}^{k(P,\mathbf{W})}(P) \subset \mathcal{V}^{k(P,\mathbf{W})}(P). \quad (14)$$

Proof of Lemma 5: Assume that there exist elements $v \in \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{W}}[\mathbf{W}]$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $W_y v$ does not belong to $\text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{W}}[\mathbf{W}]$. Hence, $P^{k\mathbf{W}}[\mathbf{W}]W_y v$ is not 0. Thus, $P^{k\mathbf{W}+1}[\mathbf{W}]v$ is not 0, which contradicts the assumption. That is, we obtain (13). \square

Lemma 7 *The relations $\text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{W}}[\mathbf{W}] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{kP,\mathbf{W}}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ hold almost everywhere with respect to \mathbf{W} and P . Also, the relations $\text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{W}}[\mathbf{W}] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{kP,\mathbf{W}}(P_{\mathbf{W}}) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ hold almost everywhere with respect to \mathbf{W} .*

Proof We show the first desired statement when $|\mathbf{W}|$ and P are fixed, which is sufficient for both statements. For an element $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we can choose W_y freely with the constraint that $|\mathbf{W}| - W_y$ is a positive matrix. We choose k to be $d-1$. Since W_y is freely chosen, the d vectors $|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle, W_y^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle, \dots, (W_y^k)^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ are linear independent almost everywhere with respect to the choice of W_y . In this case, we have $\text{Ker } P^k[\mathbf{W}] = \{0\}$, which implies the relation $\text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{W}}[\mathbf{W}] = \{0\}$. Similarly, the vectors $P, W_y P, \dots, W_y^k P$ are linear independent almost everywhere with respect to the choice of W_y . In this case, since $\mathcal{V}^k(P)$ contains $P, W_y P, W_y^2 P, \dots, W_y^k P$ and $\text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{W}}[\mathbf{W}] = \{0\}$, we have $\mathcal{V}^k(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$, which implies that $\mathcal{V}^{kP,\mathbf{W}}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$. \square

Remark 1 The major part of this section is the reformulation of the result in [1]. Hence, some of the obtained statements are essentially given in [1]. For example, a statement similar to Lemma 4 are given as [1, Lemma 3]. Since [1, Lemma 3] shows that $k_{(P,\mathbf{W})} \leq d$, but essentially shows (11) while their formulation is different from ours. However, they did not show (12). Since the paper [1] did not consider k_P , Lemma 2 is novel.

2.2 Equivalence relation

In this subsection, we consider how can we distinguish the pair of a \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} on \mathcal{X} and a distribution P on \mathcal{X} from another pair of a \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W}' on \mathcal{X}' and a distribution P' on \mathcal{X}' from observed outcomes. We say that the pair of \mathbf{W} and P is equivalent to the pair of \mathbf{W}' and P' when $P^k[\mathbf{W}] \cdot P = P^k[\mathbf{W}'] \cdot P'$ for any integer k .

Theorem 1 *Assume that two distributions P, P' on \mathcal{X} are full-rank, i.e., the supports of two distributions P, P' are \mathcal{X} . The following conditions for two collections of non-negative matrices \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W}' and two distributions P, P' on \mathcal{X} are equivalent.*

- (1) There exists an invertible map T from $\mathcal{V}^{k(P, \mathbf{w})}(P)$ to $\mathcal{V}^{k(P', \mathbf{w}')} (P')$ such that the relation $T[W_y] = [W'_y]T$ holds for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and the equation $T[P] = [P']$ holds.
- (1)' (1) holds, and the relations $k_{\mathbf{w}} = k_{\mathbf{w}'}$, $k_{(P, \mathbf{w})} = k_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}$, and $d_{(P, \mathbf{w})} = d_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}$ hold.
- (2) The pair of \mathbf{W} and P is equivalent to the pair of \mathbf{W}' and P' .
- (3) The relations $k_{\mathbf{w}} = k_{\mathbf{w}'}$, $k_{(P, \mathbf{w})} = k_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}$, and $P^{k_{\mathbf{w}} + k_{(P, \mathbf{w})} + 1}[\mathbf{W}] \cdot P = P^{k_{\mathbf{w}'} + k_{(P', \mathbf{w}')} + 1}[\mathbf{W}'] \cdot P'$ hold.
- (4) The relation $P^k[\mathbf{W}] \cdot P = P^k[\mathbf{W}'] \cdot P'$ holds for $k = \max(k_{\mathbf{w}}, k_{\mathbf{w}'}) + \max(k_{(P, \mathbf{w})}, k_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}) + 1$.

Here, $[P]$ denotes an element of the quotient space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{w}}}[\mathbf{W}]$ whose representative is P , and $[W_y]$ denotes the linear map on the quotient space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{w}}}[\mathbf{W}]$ that is defined from W_y .

Proof We notice that the relations (1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (4), and (1)' \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4) are trivial. Assume (1), since T is invertible, we can show the relations $k_{\mathbf{w}} = k_{\mathbf{w}'}$, $k_{(P, \mathbf{w})} = k_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}$, and $d_{(P, \mathbf{w})} = d_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}$. So, we have (1) \Rightarrow (1)'. Hence, it is enough to show that (4) \Rightarrow (1).

Assume (4). Now, we denote the d -dimensional linear space by \mathbb{R}^d . Let $k_1 := \max(k_{(P, \mathbf{w})}, k_{(P', \mathbf{w}')})$ and $k_2 := \max(k_{\mathbf{w}}, k_{\mathbf{w}'})$. We choose elements $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}} \in \cup_{k \leq k_1} \mathcal{Y}^k$ such that $[W_{\mathbf{y}_1}^{k_1} \cdot P], \dots, [W_{\mathbf{y}_{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}}^{k_1} \cdot P]$ are linear independent and span $\mathcal{V}^{k_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}(P)$. The $d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}$ elements $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}$ of $\cup_{k \leq k_1} \mathcal{Y}^k$ gives an invertible linear map U_1 from $\mathcal{V}^{k_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}(P)$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}$.

We regard $P^{k_2 + k_1}[\mathbf{W}] \cdot P$ as the joint distribution on \mathcal{Y}^{k_2} and \mathcal{Y}^{k_1} , which can be regarded as a $|\mathcal{Y}|^{k_1} \times |\mathcal{Y}|^{k_2}$ matrix M . Also, the matrix M can be regarded a linear map from $\mathcal{V}^{k_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}(P)$ to $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{Y}^{k_2}}$. So, we find that the rank of the matrix M is $d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}$.

That is, $\mathcal{V}^{k_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}(P)$ is isomorphic to the image of the matrix M . Also, when the domain of M is restricted to the subspace spanned by the $d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}$ elements $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}$, the matrix M can be regarded as a linear map from $\mathbb{R}^{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}$ to the image of the matrix M . This linear map is denoted by V .

In the same way, due to Condition (4), we find that the rank of the matrix M is $d_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}$. That is, $d_{(P, \mathbf{w})} = d_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}$. We denote the invertible linear map from $\mathcal{V}^{k_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}}(P')$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}$ defined by the $d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}$ elements $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}$ of \mathcal{Y}^{k_1} , by U_2 .

When we choose a suitable linear combination of $[W_{\mathbf{y}_1}^{k_1} \cdot P], \dots, [W_{\mathbf{y}_{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}}^{k_1} \cdot P]$, we have $[P]$. Here, the coefficients are determined by the matrix M . Due to Condition (4), the element $[P']$ of $\mathcal{V}^{k_{(P', \mathbf{w}')}}(P')$ is given with the same linear combination of $[W'_{\mathbf{y}_1}{}^{k_1} \cdot P'], \dots, [W'_{\mathbf{y}_{d_{(P, \mathbf{w})}}}{}^{k_1} \cdot P']$. So, we have $U_1[P] = U_2[P']$, i.e.,

$$U_2^{-1}U_1[P] = [P']. \quad (15)$$

For $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we define the $|\mathcal{Y}|^{k_1} \times |\mathcal{Y}|^{k_2}$ matrix M_y by $(M_y)_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}'} := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} W_{\mathbf{y}}^{k_2} W_y W_{\mathbf{y}'}^{k_1} \cdot P(x)$. So, we have $M_y = VU_1[W_y]U_1^{-1}$. In the same way, due to Condi-

tion (4), we find that $M_y = VU_2[W'_y]U_2^{-1}$. Since the map V is invertible, $U_1[W_y]U_1^{-1} = U_2[W'_y]U_2^{-1}$. Defining $T := U_2^{-1}U_1$, we have $T[W_y] = [W'_y]T$. Combining (15), we have Condition (1). \square

Now, we assume that \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{W}' are irreducible \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' . So, we say that \mathbf{W} is equivalent to \mathbf{W}' when the pair of \mathbf{W} and $P_{\mathbf{W}}$ is equivalent to the pair of \mathbf{W}' and $P_{\mathbf{W}'}$. Then, as a special case of Theorem 1, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1 *The following conditions for two \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{W}' are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists an invertible map T from $\mathcal{V}^{k(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})}(P_{\mathbf{W}})$ to $\mathcal{V}^{k(P_{\mathbf{W}'}, \mathbf{W}')}(P_{\mathbf{W}'})$ such that the relation $T[W_y] = [W'_y]T$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ holds as a linear map on the quotient space $\mathcal{V}^{k(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})}(P_{\mathbf{W}})$.*
- (1') *The conditions $k_{\mathbf{W}} = k_{\mathbf{W}'}$, $k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})} = k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}'}, \mathbf{W}')}$, and $d_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})} = d_{(P_{\mathbf{W}'}, \mathbf{W}')}$ hold as well as the condition (1).*
- (2) *\mathbf{W} is equivalent to \mathbf{W}' .*
- (3) *The relations $P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}+k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})}+1}[\mathbf{W}] \cdot P_{\mathbf{W}} = P^{k_{\mathbf{W}'}+k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}'}, \mathbf{W}')}+1}[\mathbf{W}'] \cdot P_{\mathbf{W}'}$, $k_{\mathbf{W}} = k_{\mathbf{W}'}$, and $k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})} = k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}'}, \mathbf{W}')}$ hold.*
- (4) *The relation $P^k[\mathbf{W}] \cdot P_{\mathbf{W}} = P^k[\mathbf{W}'] \cdot P_{\mathbf{W}'}$ holds for $k = \max(k_{\mathbf{W}}, k_{\mathbf{W}'}) + \max(k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})}, k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}'}, \mathbf{W}')}) + 1$.*

Remark 2 Theorem 1 is similar to the main result of [1]. However, our treatment is different from that of [1]. Since the paper [1] discusses only the equivalence condition in terms of the space $\mathcal{V}^k(P)$, it treats only the integer $k_{P, \mathbf{W}}$ not the integer $k_{\mathbf{W}}$. Therefore, it does not consider the condition using the integer $k_{\mathbf{W}}$. That is, it shows only the equivalence between the conditions (1) and (2) in Theorem 1. Hence, the discussion in [1] cannot evaluate how large memory size k is required to distinguish non-equivalent \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices. However, to employ the partial observation model to estimate the hidden Markovian process, we need to evaluate this number. We discuss this number even with the first derivative of the observed joint distribution.

3 Exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices

3.1 Definition of exponential family

To give a suitable parametrization, we define an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices. Firstly, we fix an irreducible \mathcal{Y} -transition matrix $\mathbf{W} = (W_y(x|x'))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ on \mathcal{X} . Then, we denote the support of \mathbf{W} by $(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}} := \cup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \{y\} \times \mathcal{X}_{W_y}^2$. Also, we denote the linear space of real-valued functions $\{g(y, x, x')\}$ defined on $(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}$ by $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. Additionally, $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ expresses the subspace of functions $g(y, x, x')$ with form $f(x) - f(x') + c$.

Now, we denote the vector $\{f(x)\}$ by $|f\rangle$. Also, we denote $\{1\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ and $\{1\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ by $u_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $u_{\mathcal{Y}}$. So, the element of $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ is written as $|u_{\mathcal{Y}}\rangle(c|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle + |f\rangle\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}| - |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle\langle f|)$ by using a function f on \mathcal{X} and a constant c .

We define the linear map \mathbf{W}_* on $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ as

$$(\mathbf{W}_*g)(y, x, x') := g(y, x, x')W_y(x|x') \quad (16)$$

for $g \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. Then, we define the subspaces of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{1, \mathbf{W}} &:= \left\{ (B_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) \mid \sum_y B_y^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0 \right\} \\ \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) &:= \mathbf{W}_*^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{1, \mathbf{W}}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Then, as shown in the following lemma, $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ can be identified with the quotient space $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})/\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$.

Lemma 8 *For any element $[g']$ of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})/\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$, there uniquely exists an element g of $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ such that $[g'] = [g]$, i.e., g is a representative of $[g']$. Therefore, we can regard the space $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ as the quotient space $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})/\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$.*

Proof Step 1: We will show that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{W}} := \{(\mathbf{W}_*g)^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle \mid g \in \mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})\}. \quad (18)$$

Here, we regard an element of $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ as a matrix on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$.

For this purpose, we will show that the function $|f\rangle - \langle f|P_{\mathbf{W}}\rangle |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ belongs to the RHS of (18) for any function f . Since

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\mathbf{W}_*(-|f\rangle\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}| + |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle\langle f|)u_{\mathcal{X}})_{x'}) \\ &= \sum_x |\mathbf{W}|(x|x')(-f(x) + f(x')) \\ &= f(x') - \sum_x f(x)|\mathbf{W}|(x|x') = f(x') - (|\mathbf{W}|^T |f\rangle)_{x'}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$|f\rangle - |\mathbf{W}|^T |f\rangle$ belongs to the set $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{W}}$. So, $|f\rangle - |\mathbf{W}|^T |f\rangle + |\mathbf{W}|^T |f\rangle - |\mathbf{W}|^T |\mathbf{W}|^T |f\rangle = |f\rangle - |\mathbf{W}|^T |\mathbf{W}|^T |f\rangle$ belongs to the set $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{W}}$. Repeating this procedure, we see that $|f\rangle - (|\mathbf{W}|^T)^n |f\rangle$ belongs to the set $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{W}}$. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_x f(x) |\mathbf{W}|^i(x|x') = \sum_x f(x) P_{|\mathbf{W}|}(x) = \langle f|P_{|\mathbf{W}|}\rangle$ for any $x' \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |f\rangle - (|\mathbf{W}|^T)^i |f\rangle = |f\rangle - \langle f|P_{|\mathbf{W}|}\rangle |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$, i.e., $|f\rangle - \langle f|P_{|\mathbf{W}|}\rangle |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ belongs to the set $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{W}}$. Since

$$(\mathbf{W}_* |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|) |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle_{x'} = \sum_x |\mathbf{W}|(x|x') = 1 = |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle_{x'}, \quad (20)$$

$|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ belongs to the set $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{W}}$. Thus, any function f belongs to the set $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{W}}$, which implies (18).

Step 2: Given $g' \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$, we can choose an element $g'' \in \mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ such that $(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\mathbf{W}_* g')_y)^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = (\mathbf{W}_* g'')^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$. That is, when we choose $g := g' - \frac{1}{d_{\mathcal{Y}}} g''$, Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\mathbf{W}_* g)_y^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\mathbf{W}_* g')_y^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle - \frac{1}{d_{\mathcal{Y}}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbf{W}_* g''^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\mathbf{W}_* g')_y^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle - \mathbf{W}_* g''^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Hence, g belongs to $\mathcal{G}_{1,W}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. \square

When functions $g_1, \dots, g_l \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ are linearly independent as elements of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})/\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$, for $\boldsymbol{\theta} := (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^l) \in \mathbb{R}^l$, we define the matrix $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x|x') := \sum_y e^{\sum_{j=1}^l \theta^j g_j(y,x,x')} W_y(x|x')$, and denote the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue by $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Also, we denote the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of the transpose $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^T$ by $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^3$.

Then, we define the \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix $\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (W_{\boldsymbol{\theta},y})_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ on \mathcal{X} as $W_{\boldsymbol{\theta},y}(x,x') := \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^3(x) e^{\sum_{j=1}^l \theta^j g_j(y,x,x')} W_y(x,x') \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^3(x')^{-1}$, and $\{\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is called an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices on \mathcal{X} generated by the generators $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^l$. Since a \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} can be regarded as a transition matrix on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ as (3), $\{\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ forms an exponential family of transition matrices on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.

Here, we check that the exponential family defined here coincides with the exponential family on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. We regard the functions g_i as functions on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^2$ as $g_i(x,y,x'y') := g_i(x,y,x')$. Then, we can define the non-negative matrix $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}},\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$. When $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^3$ is regarded as a vector on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ in the sense $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^3(x,y) = \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^3(x)$, $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^3$ is also the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of the transpose of the non-negative matrix $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}},\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Then, we find that $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is also the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of the non-negative matrix $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}},\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Therefore, the exponential family $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}},\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ satisfies that $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}},\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x,y|x',y') = W_{\boldsymbol{\theta},y}(x,x')$ because $\mathbf{W}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}},\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x,y|x',y') = \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^3(x) e^{\sum_{j=1}^l \theta^j g_j(y,x,x')} W_y(x|x') \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^3(x')^{-1}$. The eigenvector of $\mathbf{W}_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}},\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is given by the relation (4).

In this sense, we call $\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \log \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ the potential function. Then, we define the divergence between two \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices as

$$D(\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \| \mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'|\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}) = \sum_{j=1}^d (\theta^j - \theta'^j) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \theta^j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}'), \quad (22)$$

which is a special case of divergence between two transition matrices on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ defined in [3,4]. So, we call an element of the space $\mathcal{G}_{1,W}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ and the quotient space $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})/\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ the e -representation, and call an element of $\mathcal{L}_{1,W}$ the m -representation.

² For the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue and Perron-Frobenius eigenvector, see the references [11, Theorem 3.1.][14].

Example 1 We consider the full model, i.e., the set of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices \mathbf{W} satisfying that all the components of W_y are non zero, i.e., $(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}} := \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2$. Hence, we choose a \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} satisfying this condition. Since the dimension of $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ is d and the dimension of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ is $d^2 \cdot d_Y$, the dimension of the quotient space given in (24) is $l := d^2 \cdot d_Y - d = d \cdot (d \cdot d_Y - 1)$.

Unfortunately, it is not easy to choose elements g_1, \dots, g_l to be elements of $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ as generators of an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices. Hence, in the following, we choose l functions g_1, \dots, g_l to be elements of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. In this case, we can easily find the generators as follows. Here, we do not necessarily choose the generators from $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. That is, it is sufficient to choose them as elements of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. We define $g_{j+(i-1)d_Y+(i'-1)(d_Y-1)}$ for $i, i' = 1, \dots, d$ and $j = 1, \dots, d_Y$ as follows. However, when $i = d$, the index j runs from 1 to $d_Y - 1$.

$$g_{j+(i-1)d_Y+(i'-1)(d_Y-1)}(y, x, x') := \delta_{y,j} \delta_{x,i} \delta_{x',i'} \quad (23)$$

Then, we obtain an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices generated by g_1, \dots, g_l at \mathbf{W} . Among l generators, we can directly observe l' generators at most. Since the dimension of the quotient space generated by $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathbf{W}}$ is $d_Y - 1$.

3.2 Local equivalence

Although we give an example of an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices, we cannot necessarily distinguish element of this exponential family from observed data in \mathcal{Y} due to the equivalence problem. To discuss this equivalence relation among generators, we introduce other subspaces as follows. For this am, we denote the set of linear maps on \mathcal{V}_1 by $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_1)$, and we identify an element of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ with a vector taking values in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}})$. Then, for a distribution P on \mathcal{X} , we define the subspaces $\mathcal{L}_{2,\mathbf{W}}$, $\mathcal{L}_{P,\mathbf{W}}$, and $\mathcal{L}_{2,P,\mathbf{W}}$ of the linear space composed of vectors taking values in the matrix space $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}})$;

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{2,\mathbf{W}} &:= \{(\alpha_y(A))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mid A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}), c \in \mathbb{R}, A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = c |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle\} \\ &= \{(\alpha_y(A))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mid A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}), A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0\} \\ \mathcal{L}_{P,\mathbf{W}} &:= \left\{ (B_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{L}_{1,\mathbf{W}} \mid \begin{array}{l} B_y(\mathcal{V}^{k(P,\mathbf{W})}(P) + \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{W}}[\mathbf{W}]) \subset \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{W}}[\mathbf{W}] \\ (\sum_y B_y)^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0 \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,P,\mathbf{W}} := \{(\alpha_y(A))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mid A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}) \text{ such that } A|P\rangle = 0, A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0\},$$

where $\alpha_y(A) := [W_y, A]$. So, we define $\mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) := \mathbf{W}_*^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{2,\mathbf{W}})$, $\mathcal{N}_P((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) := \mathbf{W}_*^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{P,\mathbf{W}})$, $\mathcal{N}_{2,P}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) := \mathbf{W}_*^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{2,P,\mathbf{W}})$. Since the following theorems show that the infinitesimal change of an element of these subspaces cannot be distinguished from the observed data, these subspaces are called *indistinguishable subspaces*.

Theorem 2 *Given an irreducible \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} , and a distribution P on \mathcal{X} , the following conditions are equivalent for functions $g_1, \dots, g_l \in \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ and a vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^l$, where $\{\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is the exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices on \mathcal{X} generated by the generators $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^l$.*

- (1) *The function $\sum_{j=1}^l a^j g_j \in \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ belongs to $\mathcal{N}_P((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{2,P}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$.*
- (2) *The relation $\sum_{j=1}^l a^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j} P^k[\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] \cdot P \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=0} = 0$ holds for any positive integer k .*
- (3) *The relation $\sum_{j=1}^l a^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j} P^{k_{\mathbf{W}} + k_{(P, \mathbf{W})} + 1}[\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] \cdot P \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=0} = 0$ holds.*
- (4) *The relation $\sum_{j=1}^l a^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j} P^k[\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] \cdot P \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=0} = 0$ holds with a certain integer $k \geq k_{(W, V)} + k_{(P_{(W, V)}, (W, V))} + 1$.*

Theorem 2 is shown in Appendix A. Therefore, when the vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^l$ is identified with $\sum_{j=1}^l a^j g_j$, the local equivalence class at θ with the initial distribution P is given as the space

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) / (\mathcal{N}_P((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{2,P}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})) \\ &= \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) / (\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_P((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{2,P}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})). \end{aligned}$$

The above discussion addresses the equivalence when the initial distribution is fixed to be P . However, in the asymptotic case, the distribution converges to the stationary distribution $P_{\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}$. To address this case, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3 *Given an irreducible \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} , the following conditions are equivalent for functions $g_1, \dots, g_l \in \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ and a vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^l$ under the same condition as Theorem 2.*

- (1) *The function $\sum_{j=1}^l a^j g_j \in \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ belongs to $\mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$.*
- (2) *The relation $\sum_{j=1}^l a^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j} P^k[\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] \cdot P_{\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=0} = 0$ holds for any positive integer k .*
- (3) *The relation $\sum_{j=1}^l a^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j} P^{k_{\mathbf{W}} + k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})} + 1}[\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] \cdot P_{\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=0} = 0$ holds.*
- (4) *The relation $\sum_{j=1}^l a^j \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j} P^k[\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] \cdot P_{\mathbf{W}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=0} = 0$ holds with a certain integer $k \geq k_{(W, V)} + k_{(P_{(W, V)}, (W, V))} + 1$.*

Theorem 3 is shown in Appendix B. Due to this theorem, under the above identification, the local and asymptotic equivalence class at θ is given as the space

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) / (\mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})) \\ &= \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) / (\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})) \\ &= \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) / (\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})), \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where

$$\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) := \mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}). \quad (25)$$

When the generators of our exponential family are not linearly independent in the sense of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})/(\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$, the parametrization around \mathbf{W} does not express distinguishable information. That is, the parametrization is considered to be redundant.

Lemma 9 *The space $\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ is characterized as*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{W}_*(\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})) \\ &= \{(\alpha_y(A) + cW_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mid c \in \mathbb{R}, A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}), \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | A | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Proof of Lemma 9: For a function f on \mathcal{X} , we define the diagonal matrix D_f on $V_{\mathcal{X}}$ whose diagonal element is $f(x)$. Then, an element $|u_{\mathcal{Y}}\rangle \otimes (c|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}| + |f\rangle\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}| - |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle\langle f|) \in \mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ satisfies that

$$\mathbf{W}_*(|u_{\mathcal{Y}}\rangle \otimes (c|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}| + |f\rangle\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}| - |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle\langle f|)) = ([W_y, -D_f] + cW_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}. \quad (27)$$

Therefore, any element of LHS of (26) can be written as $([W_y, A - D_f] + cW_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ by using a function f on \mathcal{X} , $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and a matrix $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying $A^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$. Since the matrix $A' := A - D_f - \frac{1}{d^2}\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|(A - D_f)|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|$ satisfies $\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|A'|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$ and $[W_y, A - D_f] = [W_y, A']$. Then, we obtain the desired statement. \square

4 Construction of linearly independent generators

In this section, we construct generators for the full model such that they are linear independent in the sense of the quotient space $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})/(\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$.

For this aim, we consider the following conditions for \mathbf{W} .

E1 $\text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W}}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$.

E2 The all of components of W_y are non zero, i.e., $(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}} := \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2$.

Lemma 7 guarantees that Condition E1 holds almost everywhere.

Under these conditions, using the notations $d := d$ and $d_{\mathcal{Y}} := |\mathcal{Y}|$, we consider the full parameter model, and choose k to be greater than or equal to $k_{\mathbf{W}}$. So, E1 implies $\mathcal{L}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W}} = \{0\}$, i.e., $\mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = \{0\}$. E2 guarantees that the dimension of $\mathcal{L}_{2, \mathbf{W}}$ is $d^2 - d$. So, E2 guarantees that the dimension of $\mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ is $d^2 - d$. Since the dimension of $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ is d and the dimension of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ is $d^2 \cdot d_{\mathcal{Y}}$, the dimension of the quotient space given in (24) is $l := d^2 \cdot d_{\mathcal{Y}} - (d^2 - d) - d = d^2 \cdot (d_{\mathcal{Y}} - 1)$. Since Condition E2 holds almost everywhere as well, when we fix \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , these discussions show

that the dimension of the tangent space $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})/(\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$ is $d^2 \cdot (d_Y - 1)$ almost everywhere. However, in several points, the dimension is strictly smaller than this value. We call such points *singular points*.

Next, at the neighborhood of a non-singular point, we give generators. For this aim, in addition to Conditions E1 and E2, we assume the following condition.

E3 There exist two elements $y_0, y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that (1) the map α_{y_0} is injective on the set $\{A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}) | A^T | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\}$ and (2) the map $A \mapsto (\alpha_{y_0}(A), \alpha_{y_1}(A))$ is injective on the set $\{A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}) | \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | A | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\}$.

For Condition E3, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 10 *Assume that $W_{y_0}^T$ and $W_{y_1}^T$ have d distinct eigenvalues and their eigenvectors f_1, \dots, f_d and f'_1, \dots, f'_d , respectively. Also, assume that $u_{\mathcal{X}} = \sum_{j=1}^d a^j f_j$ and $a^j \neq 0$ for any j . Then, the condition (1) of Condition E3 holds. Additionally, we assume that the eigenvectors f'_1, \dots, f'_d are distinct from the eigenvectors f_1, \dots, f_d . Then, the condition (2) of Condition E3 holds.*

Unfortunately, it is not easy to choose elements g_1, \dots, g_l to be elements of $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ as generators of an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices. Hence, in the following, we choose l functions g_1, \dots, g_l to be elements of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ under Conditions E1, E2, and E3.

For $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$, we choose d functions $\bar{g}_{1,y_0}, \dots, \bar{g}_{d,y_0} \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2)_{W_{y_0}})$ such that any non-zero linear combination of $\bar{g}_{1,y_0}, \dots, \bar{g}_{d,y_0}$ does not belong to the $d^2 - d$ -dimensional space

$$\{W_{y_0}(x|x')^{-1} \alpha_{y_0}(A)(x|x') | A^T | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\},$$

and satisfies $\sum_{x,x'} P_{\mathbf{W}}(x') W_y(x|x') h(x|x') \neq 0$. For $y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$, we choose $d^2 - d$ functions $\bar{g}_{1,y_1}, \dots, \bar{g}_{d^2-d,y_1} \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2)_{W_{y_1}})$ such that any non-zero linear combination of $\bar{g}_{1,y_1}, \dots, \bar{g}_{d^2-d,y_1}$ does not belong to the d -dimensional space

$$\{W_{y_1}(x|x')^{-1} \alpha_{y_1}(A)(x|x') + c | A \in \text{Ker } \alpha_{y_0}, c \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

For remaining elements $y (\neq y_0, y_1) \in \mathcal{Y}$, we choose d^2 functions $\bar{g}_{1,y}, \dots, \bar{g}_{d^2,y}$ in $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2)_{W_y})$ such that $\sum_{x,x'} P_{\mathbf{W}}(x') W_y(x|x') \hat{g}_{j,y}(x|x') \neq 0$. Hence, we have $d^2(d_Y - 1)$ functions with the forms $g_{j,y}$, totally.

Then, we define $l = d^2(d_Y - 1)$ functions $\hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_l$ by renumbering the above l functions $\bar{g}_{j,y}$ as follows. We identify $y_0 = 0$ and $y_1 = 1$. Then, we define

$$\hat{g}_{i+(j-2)d^2}(y, x, x') := \begin{cases} \delta_{y_0,y} \bar{g}_{i,y_0}(x|x') & \text{when } j = 2, i = 1, \dots, d \\ \delta_{y_1,y} \bar{g}_{i-d,y_1}(x|x') & \text{when } j = 2, i = d+1, \dots, d^2 \\ \delta_{j,y} \bar{g}_{i,j}(x|x') & \text{when } j = 3, \dots, d_Y, i = 1, \dots, d^2 \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, d^2$ and $j = 2, \dots, d_Y$.

When \hat{g}_j is defined from $\bar{g}_{j',y}$, it is defined as $\hat{g}_j(y', x, x') := \bar{g}_{j',y}(x|x') \delta_{y,y'}$. This construction satisfies the following lemma.

Lemma 11 *The space spanned by the above given generators $\hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_l$ has intersection $\{0\}$ with $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = \mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$.*

This lemma gives a canonical construction of generators of hidden Markov process at non-singular points.

Next, we discuss what kinds of generator can be chosen by considering the linear combinations g_1, \dots, g_l of $\hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_l$. That is, we consider elements $g_1, \dots, g_{l'} \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) \cap \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{W}}) = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{W}})$ and $g_{l'+1}, \dots, g_l \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) \setminus \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{W}})$ such that $g_1, \dots, g_{l'}$ are linearly independent of $g_{l'+1}, \dots, g_l$ and any non-zero linear combination of $g_{l'+1}, \dots, g_l$ is not contained in $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{W}})$. Hence, among l generators, we can directly observe l' generators at most. Since the dimension of the quotient space generated by $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathbf{W}}$ is $d_Y - 1$, l' is calculated as

$$l' := d_Y - 1. \quad (29)$$

5 Two-state case

5.1 Two-state observation case

As the simplest example, we consider the case with $d = d_Y = 2$. So, we denote \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} by $\{0, 1\}$. We assume that the transition matrix $|\mathbf{W}|$ on \mathcal{X} is irreducible and ergodic. Moreover, all of components of $|\mathbf{W}|$ are assumed to be strictly positive, i.e., Condition E2 holds. In this case, we have

$$\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = \left\{ \left(\left(\begin{array}{cc} a_1 & a_1 + a_2 \\ a_1 - a_2 & a_1 \end{array} \right) \right)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \right\}_{(a_1, a_2)}. \quad (30)$$

Since $\dim \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = 8$ and $\dim \mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = 2$, we see that $\dim \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = \dim \mathcal{L}_{1, \mathbf{W}} = 6$. In the following, we mainly discuss the tangent space with the m -representation.

5.1.1 Non-singular points

First, we assume that the relation $P_{Y|X'}(0|0) = P_{Y|X'}(0|1)$, i.e.,

$$W_0(0|0) + W_0(1|0) = W_0(0|1) + W_0(1|1) \quad (31)$$

does not hold. This condition is equivalent to $P_{Y|X'=0} \neq P_{Y|X'=1}$. So, E3 holds, and we find that $k_{\mathbf{W}} = k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})} = 1$. Then, $\dim \mathcal{V}^{k(P, \mathbf{W})}(P_{\mathbf{W}}) = 2$ and $\dim \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] = 0$, i.e., E2 hold. So, we have $\dim \mathcal{L}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W}} = 0$ and

$$\mathcal{L}_{2, \mathbf{W}} = \left\{ \left(\left[W_0, \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ -a_1 & -a_2 \end{pmatrix} \right], \left[W_1, \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ -a_1 & -a_2 \end{pmatrix} \right] \right) \right\}_{(a_1, a_2)}.$$

Further $\left[W_0, \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ -a_1 & -a_2 \end{pmatrix} \right]$ is zero if and only if $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, which implies $\dim \mathcal{L}_{2,\mathbf{W}} = 2$. We apply the construction of generators given in Section 4. Thus, we notice that $l' = 1$ and $l = 3$. That is, the dimension of the model is 3.

The relation (31) holds if and only if the matrix $\left[W_0, \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ -a_1 & -a_2 \end{pmatrix} \right]$ is given as a scalar times of $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ for any vector $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The matrix $\left[W_0, \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ -a_1 & -a_2 \end{pmatrix} \right]$ is traceless. So, we can choose $\bar{g}_{1,0}, \bar{g}_{2,0} \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2)_{W_0})$ as

$$W_{0*}(\bar{g}_{1,0}) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_{0*}(\bar{g}_{2,0}) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (32)$$

Also, we can choose $\bar{g}_{1,1}, \bar{g}_{2,1} \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2)_{W_1})$ as

$$W_{1*}(\bar{g}_{1,1}) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_{1*}(\bar{g}_{2,1}) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

So, we have the following descriptions of $g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4 \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) \setminus (\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$;

$$g_1 = \left(\begin{pmatrix} W_0(0|0)^{-1} & W_0(0|1)^{-1} \\ -W_0(1|0)^{-1} & -W_0(1|1)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad (34)$$

$$g_2 = \left(\begin{pmatrix} W_0(0|0)^{-1} & W_0(0|1)^{-1} \\ W_0(1|0)^{-1} & W_0(1|1)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad (35)$$

$$g_3 = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} W_1(0|0)^{-1} & 0 \\ -W_1(1|0)^{-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad (36)$$

$$g_4 = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & W_1(0|1)^{-1} \\ 0 & -W_1(1|1)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right). \quad (37)$$

So, the four generators $[g_1], [g_2], [g_3], [g_4]$ span the linear space $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) / (\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$.

5.1.2 Singular points

Next, we assume that the relation (31) holds. We find that $k_{\mathbf{W}} = 1$ and $\text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] = \{(a, -a)^T\}$ and that $\mathcal{V}^k(P_{\mathbf{W}})$ is the one-dimensional space spanned by $P_{\mathbf{W}}$. Then, $k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})} = 1$, $\dim \mathcal{V}^{k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})}}(P_{\mathbf{W}}) = 1$, and $\dim \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] = 1$. Since the condition E1 nor E3 does not hold, we need to construct the generators in a way different from the construction of generators given in Section 4. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,\mathbf{W}} = \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_1 \\ -a_1 & -a_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_1 \\ -a_1 & -a_1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\}_{a_1}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W}} = \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ -a_1 & -a_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a_3 & a_4 \\ -a_3 & -a_4 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\}_{(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)},$$

which implies that $\mathcal{L}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W}}$ contains $\mathcal{L}_{2, \mathbf{W}}$. Also,

$$\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_1 + a_2 \\ a_1 - a_2 & a_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_1 + a_2 \\ a_1 - a_2 & a_1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\}_{(a_1, a_2)}. \quad (38)$$

So, we can choose elements $g_1 \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathbf{W}} \setminus (\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$ and $g_2 \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}} \setminus (\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$ as

$$g_1 := (E_1, -E_1), \quad g_2 := (E_2, -E_2), \quad (39)$$

where

$$E_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (40)$$

So, we have $l' = 1$ and $l = 2$. That is, the local dimension at \mathbf{W} is 2. The function g_1 expresses the variation in side of the set of singular points, and the function g_2 expresses the variation of the direction orthogonal to the set of singular points.

5.2 General case

Next, we consider the case when $d = 2$ but $d_Y > 2$. So, we denote \mathcal{Y} by $\{0, 1, \dots, d_Y - 1\}$. Similarly, we assume that all of components of $|\mathbf{W}|$ are assumed to be strictly positive, i.e., Condition E2 holds. Hence, we have (30). Since $\dim \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = 4d_Y$ and $\dim \mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = 2$, we see that $\dim \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = \dim \mathcal{L}_{1, \mathbf{W}} = 4d_Y - 2$.

5.2.1 Non-singular points

First, we assume that there exists an element $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that the relation $P_{Y|X'}(y_0|0) = P_{Y|X'}(y_0|1)$, i.e.,

$$W_{y_0}(0|0) + W_{y_0}(1|0) = W_{y_0}(0|1) + W_{y_0}(1|1) \quad (41)$$

does not hold. So, we find that there exists another element $y_1 (\neq y_0) \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that the relation (41) does not hold. So, E3 holds, and we find that $k_{\mathbf{W}} = k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})} = 1$ and $\dim \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] = 0$, i.e., E2 holds. Then, $\dim \mathcal{V}^{k_{(P, \mathbf{W})}}(P_{\mathbf{W}}) = 2$. So, we have $\dim \mathcal{L}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W}} = 0$ and

$$\mathcal{L}_{2, \mathbf{W}} = \left\{ \left(\left[W_{y_1}, \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ -a_1 & -a_2 \end{pmatrix} \right] \right)_y \right\}_{(a_1, a_2)}.$$

In the same way as Subsection 5.1, we can show that $\dim \mathcal{L}_{2, \mathbf{W}} = 2$. We apply the construction of generators given in Section 4. So, we find that $l' = d_Y - 1$ and $l = 4d_Y - 2 - 2 = 4(d_Y - 1)$. That is, the dimension of the model is $4(d_Y - 1)$.

In the same way as Subsection 5.1, we can choose $\bar{g}_{1,y_0}, \bar{g}_{2,y_0} \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2)_{W_{y_0}})$ and $\bar{g}_{1,y_1}, \bar{g}_{2,y_1} \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2)_{W_{y_1}})$ as (32) and (33), respectively. For other elements $y (\neq y_0, y_1) \in \mathcal{Y}$, we can choose $\bar{g}_{1,y}, \bar{g}_{2,y}, \bar{g}_{3,y}, \bar{g}_{4,y} \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2)_{W_y})$ as

$$W_{y,*}(\bar{g}_{1,y}) = \begin{pmatrix} W_y(0|0) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_{y,*}(\bar{g}_{2,y}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ W_y(1|0) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (42)$$

$$W_{y,*}(\bar{g}_{3,y}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & W_y(0|1) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_{y,*}(\bar{g}_{4,y}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & W_y(1|1) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (43)$$

Using the same method as (28) in Section 4, we define the three generators $g_1, \dots, g_{4(d_Y-1)}$, which span the linear space $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) / (\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$.

5.2.2 Singular points

Next, we assume that the relation (41) holds for all points $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. We find that $k_{\mathbf{W}} = 1$ and $\text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] = \{(a, -a)^T\}$ and that $\mathcal{V}^k(P_{\mathbf{W}})$ is the one-dimensional space spanned by $P_{\mathbf{W}}$. Then, $k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})} = 1$, $\dim \mathcal{V}^{k_{(P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W})}}(P_{\mathbf{W}}) = 1$, and $\dim \text{Ker } P^{k_{\mathbf{W}}}[\mathbf{W}] = 1$. Since the condition E1 nor E3 does not hold, we need to construct the generators in a way different from the construction of generators given in Section 4. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{2, \mathbf{W}} = \left\{ \left(\left(\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_1 \\ -a_1 & -a_1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \right)_{a_1} \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W}} = \left\{ \left(\left(\begin{pmatrix} a_{1,y} & a_{2,y} \\ -a_{1,y} & -a_{2,y} \end{pmatrix} \right)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \right)_{(a_{1,y}, a_{2,y})} \right\},$$

which implies that $\mathcal{L}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{W}}$ contains $\mathcal{L}_{2, \mathbf{W}}$. Hence, we find that $l = 4d_Y - 2 - 2d_Y = 2d_Y - 2$. So, we can choose elements $g_1, \dots, g_{d_Y-1} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathbf{W}} \setminus (\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$ and $g_{d_Y}, \dots, g_{2d_Y-2} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}} \setminus (\mathcal{N}_3((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}))$ as

$$g_j := (b_y^j E_1)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}, \quad g_{d_Y-1+j} := (b_y^j E_2)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \quad (44)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, d_Y - 1$, where the vectors $(b_y^j)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ ($j = 1, \dots, d_Y - 1$) are linearly independent. So, we have $l' = d_Y - 1$ because $l' \leq d_Y - 1$.

Since the set of singular points are given as the set of points satisfying the condition (41) for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, the functions g_1, \dots, g_{d_Y-1} express the variations inside of the set of singular points, and the functions $g_{d_Y}, \dots, g_{2d_Y-2}$ express the variations of the direction orthogonal to the set of singular points.

6 Independent case

6.1 Equivalence problem

Sections 2-5 discussed the case when X_n and Y_n are correlated even with a fixed value $X_{n-1} = x_{n-1}$. Now, we consider the special case when X_n and Y_n are conditionally independent with a fixed value $X_{n-1} = x_{n-1}$, which is illustrated in Fig. 2. In this case, the \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix $\mathbf{W} = (W_y(x|x'))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ is given as $W_y(x|x') = W(x|x')V_y(x') = WD(V_y)(x|x')$ where $W(x|x')$ is a transition matrix on \mathcal{X} , $V(y|x')$ is a transition matrix with the input \mathcal{X} and the output \mathcal{Y} , V_y is the vector satisfying $V_y(x') = V(y|x')$, and $D(v)$ is the diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are given by a vector v . We call the above type of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix, and denote it by (W, V) . Also, we define the vector $V_{*,x'}$ as $V_{*,x'}(y) := V(y|x')$ for an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) .

Here, we rewrite the notations defined in Subsection 2.1 by using the pair of transition matrices W, V . The transition matrix $P^k[(W, V)]$ is given as

$$\begin{aligned} P^k[(W, V)](y_k, \dots, y_1|x') &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} WD(V_{y_k})W \cdots WD(V_{y_1})(x|x') \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} D(V_{y_k})W \cdots WD(V_{y_1})(x|x'). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The integer $k_{(W, V)}$ is the minimum integer k_0 to satisfy the condition $\text{Ker } P^{k_0}[(W, V)] = \bigcap_k \text{Ker } P^k[(W, V)]$. For a distribution P on \mathcal{X} , the subspace $\mathcal{V}^k(P)$ is the subspace of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k(w, v)}[(W, V)]$ spanned by $\{[WD(V_{y_k})W \cdots WD(V_{y_1})P] | y_j \in \mathcal{Y}, k' \leq k\}$, where $[v]$ expresses the element of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k(w, v)}[(W, V)]$ whose representative is $v \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Then, the integer $k_{(P, (W, V))}$ is the minimum integer k_1 to satisfy the condition $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}^k(P) = \mathcal{V}^{k_1}(P)$.

The kernel $\text{Ker } P[(W, V)]$ is characterized follows.

Lemma 12 *Given an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) on \mathcal{X} and a distribution P on \mathcal{X} , we assume that the vectors $\{V_{*,x'}\}_{x' \in \mathcal{X}}$ are linearly independent. Then, $\text{Ker } P^1[(W, V)] = \{0\}$ and $k_{(W, V)} = 1$.*

Proof Since $\{V_{*,x'}\}_{x' \in \mathcal{X}}$ are linearly independent, the rank of the matrix $P^1[(W, V)](y|x') = V(y|x')$ is d . Hence, $\text{Ker } P^1[(W, V)] = \{0\}$, which implies the relation $k_{(W, V)} = 1$. \square

Under a similar condition, the equivalent conditions are characterized as follows.

Lemma 13 *Given an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) on \mathcal{X} and a distribution P on \mathcal{X} , we assume that the vectors $V_{*,x'}$ are linearly independent and the support of P is \mathcal{X} . When the pair of an independent-type*

\mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W', V') and a distribution P' is equivalent to the pair of the independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) on \mathcal{X} and a distribution P on \mathcal{X} , there exists a permutation g among the elements of \mathcal{X} such that $W' = g^{-1}Wg$, $V' = Vg$, and $P' = Pg$.

This lemma shows that the above assumption guarantees that there is no equivalent pair of an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix and a distribution except for a permuted one.

Proof Since the vectors $V_{*,x'}$ are linearly independent, we find that $\text{Ker } P^1[(W, V)] = \{0\}$. There exists a linear map T on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ such that

$$TWD(V_y) = W'D(V'_y)T \quad (46)$$

for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Since

$$TW = \sum_y TWD(V_y) = \sum_y W'D(V'_y)T = W'T, \quad (47)$$

we have

$$TWT^{-1}TD(V_y) = W'TT^{-1}D(V'_y)T = TWT^{-1}D(V'_y)T, \quad (48)$$

which implies that

$$TD(V_y) = D(V'_y)T. \quad (49)$$

Hence, T is a permutation on \mathcal{X} , which yields the desired statement. \square

Although we introduce independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices, it is not so trivial to clarify whether a given \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix is equivalent to an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix. The following lemma answers this question.

Lemma 14 *The following conditions are equivalent for a \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix $\mathbf{W} = (W_y(x|x'))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ when $|\mathbf{W}|$ is invertible.*

G1 *There exists an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) equivalent to the \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} .*

G2 *The following three conditions hold.*

G2-1 *The characteristic polynomial U_y has no multiple root, and the eigenvalues of U_y are non-negative real numbers, where $U_y := |\mathbf{W}|^{-1}W_y$.*

G2-2 *The matrices $\{U_y\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ have a common eigenvector system $\{t_i\}$, where t_i is normalized so that $\langle u_X | t_i \rangle = 1$.*

G2-3 *The matrix $T|\mathbf{W}|T^{-1}$ has non-negative entries, where the matrix T is given as $T(i|x) := t_i(x)$.*

Proof Assume G1. Then, there exists a matrix T on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ such that

$$TW_y = WD(V_y)T \quad (50)$$

$$T^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle. \quad (51)$$

Thus,

$$WT = \sum_y WD(V_y)T = \sum_y WD(V_y)T = \sum_y TW_y = T|\mathbf{W}|. \quad (52)$$

Hence,

$$WD(V_y)T = TW_y = T|\mathbf{W}|U_y = WTU_y. \quad (53)$$

Since $|\mathbf{W}|$ is invertible,

$$D(V_y)T = TU_y, \quad (54)$$

which implies G2-1. We choose t_i as the i -th row matrix of T . The relations (51) and (54) guarantee G2-2. Then, (52) implies G2-3.

Assume G2. G2-2 guarantees (51). Hence, G2-3 guarantees that the matrix $W := T|\mathbf{W}|T^{-1}$ is a probability transition matrix. Due to G2-1 and G2-2, we can choose the vector V_y to satisfy (54). So, we obtain (50). Thus, we obtain G1. \square

It is not so easy to satisfy the condition G2. However, when $|\mathcal{Y}| = 2$, it is not so difficult to satisfy the condition G2. In this case, once G2-1 is satisfied, G2-2 is automatically satisfied.

Although Lemma 12 guarantees the relation $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \{0\}$ under a certain condition for the transition matrix V , the condition is too strong because it does not hold when $d_Y < d$. Even when $d_Y < d$, we can expect the relations $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k_P, (w,v)}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ under some natural condition. The following lemma shows how frequently these conditions hold.

Lemma 15 *We fix a transition matrix V , and assume the existence of $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that V_y is not a scalar times of $u_{\mathcal{X}}$. The relations $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k_P, (w,v)}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ hold almost everywhere with respect to W and P . Also, the relations $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k_P, (w,v)}(P_W) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ hold almost everywhere with respect to W .*

Proof We show the desired statement when P and $P_W = P'$ are fixed and we impose the condition $WP' = P'$, which is sufficient for both statements. We fix $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that V_y is not a scalar times of $u_{\mathcal{X}}$. We choose k to be $d-1$, and choose linearly independent $k+1$ vectors $|v_0\rangle, \dots, |v_k\rangle$ in the dual space of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ such that $|v_0\rangle$ is a scalar times of $|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ and $\langle v_0|P'\rangle = 1$. We choose $a_{i,j}$ such that $W^T|v_j\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^k a_{i,j}|v_i\rangle$. The condition $WP' = P'$ is equivalent to the condition $\sum_{i=0}^k a_{i,j} = 1$, i.e., $a_{0,j} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^k a_{i,j}$. Hence, we can freely choose

the coefficients $a_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ with the constraint that W is a positive matrix. Hence, the k vectors $D(V_y)|_{u_{\mathcal{X}}}, W_y^T D(V_y)|_{u_{\mathcal{X}}}, \dots, (W_y^T)^{k-1} D(V_y)|_{u_{\mathcal{X}}}$ are linear independent on the quotient space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \langle |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle \rangle$ almost everywhere with respect to the above choice of W , where $\langle |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle \rangle$ is the one-dimensional space spanned by $|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$. Since $W^T|_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} = |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$, the d vectors $D(V_y)W^T|_{u_{\mathcal{X}}}, W_y^T D(V_y)W^T|_{u_{\mathcal{X}}}, \dots, (W_y^T)^{k-1} D(V_y)W^T|_{u_{\mathcal{X}}}, |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ spans the dual space of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$, which implies the relation $\text{Ker } P^k[(W, V)] = \{0\}$, i.e., $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \{0\}$.

Next, we choose $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $D(V_y)P$ is not a scalar times of P' . If the above choice of $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ does not satisfy this condition, we choose another $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $D(V_y)P$ is not a scalar times of P' because $\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} D(V_y) = I$. We replace the roles of P' and $|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ in the above discussion. Hence, the k vectors $D(V_y)P, W_y D(V_y)P, \dots, W_y^{k-1} D(V_y)P$ are linear independent on the quotient space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \langle P' \rangle$ almost everywhere with respect to the above choice of W . Further, $W^{k'}P$ is close to P' when k' is sufficiently large. Hence, $\mathcal{V}^{k'}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$, i.e., $\mathcal{V}^{k_{P,(w,v)}}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$. \square

6.2 Exponential family

Next, to give a suitable parametrization, we consider the exponential family of independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices. Firstly, we fix an irreducible independent-type \mathcal{Y} -transition matrix (W, V) on \mathcal{X} . Then, we denote the support of (W, V) by $(\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)} := \mathcal{X}_W^2 \cup (\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_V$. Then, we denote the linear space of real-valued functions $g = (g_a(x, x'), g_b(y, x'))$ defined on $(\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}$ by $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$. Here, for an element $(x, x') \in \mathcal{X}^2$, the function is given as $g_a(x, x')$, and for an element $(y, x') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}$, the function is given as $g_b(y, x')$. Now, we denote the \mathcal{Y} -transition matrix given by (W, V) , by \mathbf{W} . Then, $(g_a(x, x'), g_b(y, x'))$ is identified with the function $(x, x', y) \mapsto g_a(x, x') + g_b(y, x')$, which is an element of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. However, using a function $\bar{f}(x')$, we introduce other functions $(\bar{g}_a(x, x'), \bar{g}_b(y, x'))$ as $\bar{g}_a(x, x') := g_a(x, x') - \bar{f}(x')$ and $\bar{g}_b(y, x') := g_b(y, x') + \bar{f}(x')$. Then, the other pair of function $(\bar{g}_a(x, x'), \bar{g}_b(y, x'))$ corresponds to the same element of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$ as $(g_a(x, x'), g_b(y, x'))$. To avoid this problem, we impose the condition $\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} V(y|x')g_b(y, x') = 0$ for $x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence, we denote the linear space of real-valued functions $g = (g_a(x, x'), g_b(y, x'))$ defined on $(\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}$ with this constraint by $\mathcal{G}_0((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$. Hence, the space $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$ can be regarded as a subspace of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. Additionally, the subspace $\mathcal{N}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) := \mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) \cap \mathcal{G}_0((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$ equals the subspace $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$, which is composed of functions with form $f(x) - f(x') + c$. That is, an element $g = (g_a(x, x'), g_b(y, x'))$ of the subspace $\mathcal{N}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$ has the form $g_a(x, x') = f(x) - f(x') + c$ and $g_b(y, x') = 0$.

To give the relation between the e -representation and the m -representation, we define the linear map $(W, V)_*$ on $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)})$ as

$$((W, V)_*g)_a(x, x') := g_a(x, x')W(x|x') \quad (55)$$

$$((W, V)_*g)_b(y, x') := g_b(y, x')V(y|x') \quad (56)$$

for $g \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)})$. To discuss the relation between the m -representations of the independent-type and the general case, we define the linear map $(W, V)^*$ from $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)})$ to $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{(W, V)})$ as

$$((W, V)^*g)(y, x, x') := g_a(x, x')V(y|x') + W(x|x')g_b(y, x') \quad (57)$$

for $g \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)})$. In the following, the function $g_a(x, x')$ is written as a matrix B on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$, and $g_b(y, x')$ is written as a collection of vectors $(C_y)_y$, which belong to $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$. That is, the map $(W, V)^*$ is rewritten as

$$((W, V)^*(B, C))_y = BD(V_y) + WD(C_y). \quad (58)$$

Hence, when $(B, C) \in (W, V)^*\mathcal{G}_0((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)})$ satisfies $\sum_y C_y = 0$.

Define

$$\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)}) := \mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) \cap \mathcal{G}_0((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)}) \quad (59)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{1, W, V}^I := (W, V)_*\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)}). \quad (60)$$

Then, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 16

$$\mathcal{L}_{1, W, V}^I = \left\{ (B, C) \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)}) \mid B^T|_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} = 0, \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} C_y = 0 \right\}. \quad (61)$$

Proof For $(B, C) \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W, V)})$, $(B, C) \in \mathcal{L}_{1, W, V}^I$ if and only if

$$\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} C_y = 0, \quad \left(\sum_y ((W, V)^*(B, C))_y \right)^T |_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} = 0. \quad (62)$$

Since $W^T|_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} = |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_y ((W, V)^*(B, C))_y \right)^T |_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} = \left(\sum_y BD(V_y) + WD(C_y) \right)^T |_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} \\ & = (B + W \sum_y D(C_y))^T |_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} = (B^T + \sum_y D(C_y)W^T) |_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} \\ & = (B^T + \sum_y D(C_y)) |_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} = B^T |_{u_{\mathcal{X}}} + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} C_y. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Hence, we obtain the desired statement.

The space $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$ equals the space $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{(W,V)}) \cap \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$. The space $\mathcal{L}_{1,W,V}^l$ equals the space $(W,V)^* \mathcal{L}_{1,(W,V)} \cap (W,V)^* \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$.

Assume that functions $g_1, \dots, g_l \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$ are linearly independent as elements of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})/\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$ for $\theta := (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^l) \in \mathbb{R}^l$. We define the transition matrix

$$V_\theta(y|x') := e^{\sum_{j=1}^l \theta^j g_{j,b}(y,x')} V(y|x') / \sum_{y'} e^{\sum_{j=1}^l \theta^j g_{j,b}(y',x')} V(y'|x').$$

That is, for each $x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $V_\theta(y|x')$ forms an exponential family of distributions on \mathcal{Y} . Also, we define the matrix

$$\overline{W}_\theta(x|x') := \sum_y e^{\sum_{j=1}^l \theta^j (g_{j,a}(x,x') + g_{j,b}(y,x'))} V(y|x') W(x|x'),$$

and denote its Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue by λ_θ . Also, we denote the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of the transpose \overline{W}_θ^T by \overline{P}_θ^3 . Then, we define the transition matrix $W_\theta(x|x') := \lambda_\theta^{-1} \overline{P}_\theta^3(x) \overline{W}_\theta(x|x') \overline{P}_\theta^3(x')^{-1}$ on \mathcal{X} . The \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix generated by g_1, \dots, g_l is given as

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\theta,y}(x|x') &= \lambda_\theta^{-1} \overline{P}_\theta^3(x) e^{\sum_{j=1}^l \theta^j (g_{j,a}(x,x') + g_{j,b}(y,x'))} V(y|x') W(x|x') \overline{P}_\theta^3(x')^{-1} \\ &= \lambda_\theta^{-1} \overline{P}_\theta^3(x) \overline{W}_\theta(x|x') \overline{P}_\theta^3(x')^{-1} V_\theta(y|x') = W_\theta(x|x') V_\theta(y|x'). \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

That is, the family (W_θ, V_θ) coincides with the exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices on \mathcal{X} generated by g_1, \dots, g_l . Hence, the family (W_θ, V_θ) is called an exponential family of independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices. Since an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices is a special case of an exponential family of transition matrices on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, an exponential family of independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices is a special case of an exponential family of transition matrices on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.

Example 2 As an example, we consider the full parameter model of independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices on \mathcal{X} . That is, we assume that the support $(\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}$ is $\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}$ and W is irreducible. The tangent space of the model is given by the space $\mathcal{L}_{1,W,V}^l$, whose dimension is $l := d^2 - d + dd_Y - d = d(d + d_Y - 2)$. In this case, we can easily find the generators as follows. Here, we do not necessarily choose the generators from $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$. That is, it is sufficient to choose them as elements of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$. For simplicity, we assume that $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, d_Y\}$. We choose the functions $g_{j,a}$ and $g_{j,b}$ for $1 \leq j \leq d_Y - 1$, the functions $g_{i(d_Y-1)+j,a}$ and $g_{i(d_Y-1)+j,b}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d - 1, 1 \leq j \leq d_Y - 1$, and the functions $g_{d(d_Y-1)+(i-1)(d-1)+j,a}$ and

$g_{d(d_Y-1)+(i-1)(d-1)+j,b}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq d-1$ as

$$g_{j,a}(x, x') := 0 \quad (65)$$

$$g_{j,b}(y, x') := \delta_{y,j} \quad (66)$$

$$g_{i(d_Y-1)+j,a}(x, x') := 0 \quad (67)$$

$$g_{i(d_Y-1)+j,b}(y, x') := \delta_{x',i} \delta_{y,j} \quad (68)$$

$$g_{d(d_Y-1)+(i-1)(d-1)+j,a}(x, x') := \delta_{x',i} \delta_{x,j} \quad (69)$$

$$g_{d(d_Y-1)+(i-1)(d-1)+j,b}(y, x') := 0. \quad (70)$$

Then, the functions $g'_i = (g'_{i',a}, g'_{i',b})$ are linearly independent. We can parametrize the full model of independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices by using this generators. In particular, the first $d_Y - 1$ functions belong to $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{W}})$. That is, the maximum number l' of observed generators is $d_Y - 1$ similar to (29) because this number is upper bounded by $d_Y - 1$.

Then, we obtain the exponential family of independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices $\{(W_{\theta}, V_{\theta})\}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^l}$, which is generated by the above generators g_1, \dots, g_l at (W, V) . While the set $\{(W_{\theta}, V_{\theta})\}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^l}$ contains elements equivalent to each other, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 17 *When the independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices (W, V) satisfies Condition $(\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)} = \mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}$, the above defined set $\{(W_{\theta}, V_{\theta})\}_{\theta}$ equals the set of independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices (W', V') on \mathcal{X} satisfying the relation $(\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W',V')} = \mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof When we freely choose the parameters $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d(d_Y-1)}$, the set of V_{θ} equals the set of transition matrices from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} with full support. Next, we fix the parameters $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d(d_Y-1)}$ and freely choose the remaining parameters $\theta_{d(d_Y-1)+1}, \dots, \theta_{d(d_Y-1)+d^2-d}$. Then, the set $\{W_{\theta}\}$ forms the exponential family generated by $g_{d(d_Y-1)+1,a}, \dots, g_{d(d_Y-1)+d^2-d,a}$ at $W_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d(d_Y-1)}, 0, \dots, 0}$. Hence, the set $\{W_{\theta}\}$ equals the set of transition matrices on \mathcal{X} with full support. \square

6.3 Local equivalence

Next, we address the local equivalence problem at a given independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) . This is because we cannot necessarily distinguish all the elements of the above exponential family because due to the local equivalence problem. Based on (W, V) , we define the subspaces as

$$(W, V)^* \mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I := \mathcal{L}_{2,(W,V)} \cap (W, V)^* \mathcal{L}_{1,W,V}^I \quad (71)$$

$$(W, V)^* \mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I := \mathcal{L}_{P,(W,V)} \cap (W, V)^* \mathcal{L}_{1,W,V}^I \quad (72)$$

$$(W, V)^* \mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I := \mathcal{L}_{2,P,(W,V)} \cap (W, V)^* \mathcal{L}_{1,W,V}^I. \quad (73)$$

Then, we define $\mathcal{N}_2^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) := (W, V)_*^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{2,\mathbf{W}}^I)$, $\mathcal{N}_P^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) := (W, V)_*^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{P,\mathbf{W}}^I)$, $\mathcal{N}_{2,P}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) := (W, V)_*^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{2,P,\mathbf{W}}^I)$.

By using $\mathcal{N}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$ and these spaces, Theorems 2 and 3 characterize generators of the following condition; the derivative of the direction of the generator vanishes in the observed distribution. That is, the infinitesimal changes of the direction of the generator cannot be observed.

Then, $\mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I$ is written as follows.

$$\mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = \left\{ (B, C) \in \mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) \mid \text{Conditions (75) and (76) hold.} \right\}, \quad (74)$$

where Conditions (75) and (76) are defined as

$$B^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0, \quad (75)$$

$$(WD(C_y) + BD(V_y))(\mathcal{V}^{k(P,(W,V))}(P) + \text{Ker } P^{k(W,V)}[(W,V)]) \subset \text{Ker } P^{k(W,V)}[(W,V)]. \quad (76)$$

Here, $\mathcal{V}^{k(P,(W,V))}(P) + \text{Ker } P^{k(W,V)}[(W,V)]$ expresses the subspace of $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ generated by $\text{Ker } P^{k(W,V)}[(W,V)]$ and the representatives of $\mathcal{V}^{k(P,(W,V))}(P)$ while $\mathcal{V}^{k(P,(W,V))}(P)$ is a subspace of the quotient space $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}} / \text{Ker } P^{k(W,V)}[(W,V)]$.

To characterize other spaces $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I$ and $\mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I$, for an element $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we define the subset $S(V)_x \subset \mathcal{X}$ by $S(V)_x := \{x' \in \mathcal{X} \mid V_{*,x} = V_{*,x'}\}$. For a subset $S \subset \mathcal{X}$, we define the subspace $\mathcal{V}_S \subset \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ as the set of functions whose support is included in S . The projection to \mathcal{V}_S is denoted by I_S . Then, the spaces $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I$ and $\mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I$ are characterized in the following theorem.

Theorem 4 *For an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) , we have the following relations as subspaces of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$:*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I = \{([W, A], C) \mid A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0, W[D(V_y), A] = WD(C_y)\} \quad (77)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I = \{([W, A], C) \mid A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0, A|P\rangle = 0, W[D(V_y), A] = WD(C_y)\}. \quad (78)$$

Proof For an element $(B, C) \in \mathcal{L}_{1,(W,V)}^I$, $(B, C) \in \mathcal{L}_{2,(W,V)}^I$ if and only if there exists A such that

$$A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0 \quad (79)$$

$$WD(V_y)A - AWD(V_y) = BD(V_y) + WD(C_y). \quad (80)$$

Since $\sum_y D(V_y) = I$ and $\sum_y C_y = 0$, taking the sum of (80) with respect to y , we have

$$\begin{aligned} [W, A] &= W\left(\sum_y D(V_y)\right)A - AW\left(\sum_y D(V_y)\right) = \sum_y WD(V_y)A - AWD(V_y) \\ &= \sum_y BD(V_y) + WD(C_y) = B\left(\sum_y D(V_y)\right) + WD\left(\sum_y C_y\right) = B. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Combining (80) and (81), we have

$$W[D(V_y), A] = WD(C_y). \quad (82)$$

Conversely, (81) and (82) imply (80) and $\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} C_y = 0$. Further, (79) and (81) imply $B^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$. Hence, we obtain the relation (77).

Since $\mathcal{L}_{2,P,(W,V)}$ is given from $\mathcal{L}_{2,(W,V)}$ by adding the condition $A|P\rangle = 0$, we obtain the relations (78). \square

Based on Theorem 4, we can characterize the subspaces $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I$ and $\mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I$ as the following two corollaries.

Corollary 2 *For an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) , we assume that W is invertible. Then, we have the following relations as subspaces of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$:*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I = \{([W, A], 0) | A^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0, [I_{S(V)_x}, A] = 0\} \quad (83)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I = \{([W, A], 0) | A^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0, A|P\rangle = 0, [I_{S(V)_x}, A] = 0\}. \quad (84)$$

Proof We choose A and C such that

$$A^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0 \quad (85)$$

$$W[D(V_y), A] = WD(C_y). \quad (86)$$

Since W is invertible, $[D(V_y), A] = D(C_y)$. Since the diagonal elements of $[D(V_y), A]$ are zero, we have

$$D(V_y)A = AD(V_y), \quad (87)$$

$$C_y = 0. \quad (88)$$

When the (x, x') component of A is not zero for $x \neq x'$, we have $V(y|x) = V(y|x')$, which implies the relation $x' \in S(V)_x$. Hence, we have

$$[I_{S(V)_x}, A] = 0. \quad (89)$$

Conversely, the combination of (88) and (89) implies (86). Hence, we obtain the relation (83). Since $\mathcal{L}_{2,P,(W,V)}$ is given from $\mathcal{L}_{2,(W,V)}$ by adding the condition $A|P\rangle = 0$, we obtain the relations (84). \square

Corollary 3 *For an independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) , we assume that $W(x|x') = \frac{1}{d}$. Then, we have the following relations as subspaces of $\mathcal{G}((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$:*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I = \{([W, A], A^T V_y) | A^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0\} \quad (90)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I = \{([W, A], A^T V_y) | A^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0, A|P\rangle = 0\}. \quad (91)$$

Proof The condition $W[D(V_y), A] = WD(C_y)$ is equivalent to the condition $([D(V_y), A])^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = D(C_y)|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$. Since $A^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$, this condition is equivalent to $A^T V_y = C_y$. Hence, the desired statement.

Using Corollary 2, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4 *We assume that all the vectors $V_{*,x}$ are different and the relations $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k(p,w)}(P) = \mathcal{V}_X$. Then, $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I = \mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I = \mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = \{0\}$.*

Proof Since all the vectors $V_{*,x}$ are different, we have $S(V)_x = \{x\}$. In this case, the condition $A^T|u_X\rangle = 0$, $[I_{S(V)_x}, A] = 0$ implies that $A = 0$. Due to Corollary 2, this assumption guarantees that $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I$ and $\mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I$ are $\{0\}$, i.e., $\dim \mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I = \dim \mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I = 0$. The relations $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k(p,w)}(P) = \mathcal{V}_X$ imply the relation $\dim \mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = 0$. \square

Theorem 4 means that the indistinguishable subspaces $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I, \mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I$, and $\mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I$ vanish in a usual case. More precisely, since all the vectors $V_{*,x}$ are different almost everywhere with respect to V , Lemma 15 and Theorem 4 guarantee the relation $\dim \mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I = \dim \mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I = \dim \mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = 0$ almost everywhere with respect to W, V . Hence, Theorem 4 guarantees that Example 2 has dimension $d^2 \cdot (d_Y - 1)$ except for a measure-zero set. Remember that, as shown in Lemma 17, Example 2 characterizes all of independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices with full support. Hence, we call an element of such a measure-zero set *an independent-type singular point*. Since the full model without the independent-type condition has the dimension $d^2 \cdot (d_Y - 1)$ at non-singular points, we have the inequality $d(d + d_Y - 2) \leq d^2 \cdot (d_Y - 1)$, and the equality holds only when $d_Y = 2$. Hence, we can expect that the condition of Lemma 14 holds with non-zero measure with respect to V, W when $d_Y = 2$.

Remark 3 Here, we compare the notations of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} (Fig. 3), independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, V) (Fig. 2), and independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix (W, f) (Fig. 1), where the third case express the transition matrix V is given as a deterministic function f . Although $P^k[\mathbf{W}](y_k, \dots, y_1|x')$ is given as (6) in the first case, it is written as (45) in the second case. In the third case, it is described as $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} I_{f^{-1}(y_k)} W \cdots W I_{f^{-1}(y_1)}(x|x')$. Clearly, the description (6) of the first case is shortest.

Indeed, due to this simplicity, we can easily find that an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices is a special case of an exponential family of transition matrices. It is not so easy to find that an exponential family of independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices is a special case of an exponential family of transition matrices without considering the relation between independent-type \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix and \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix. These comparisons express the merit of notation of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix \mathbf{W} (Fig. 3).

7 Two-hidden-state case

We consider the case with $d = 2$. In this case, since the subspace $\mathcal{N}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)})$ equals the subspace $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$, it is given by (30).

7.1 Non-singular points

First, we assume that W is invertible and the relation

$$V(y|0) = V(y|1) \text{ for } \forall y \in \mathcal{Y} \quad (92)$$

does not hold. In this case, $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k(P,(w,v))}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = \{0\}$. Corollary 4 guarantees that $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I = \mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I = \mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = \{0\}$. Hence, the above condition guarantees that the point is non-singular. Then, $l' = d_Y - 1$ and $l = 2d_Y$. The generators are chosen as in Example 2.

7.2 Singular points

The subset of singular elements equals the set of non-memory cases, which has two cases. As the three case, we assume that the relation (92) does not hold and W is not invertible, i.e., $W = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$. In this case, $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k(P,(w,v))}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = \{0\}$. The dimensions of $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I$ and $\mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I$ are given by the dimensions of A satisfying the constraint given in Corollary 3. Hence, $\dim \mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I = 2$. When P is the stationary distribution, i.e., the uniform distribution, $\dim \mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I = 2$. Otherwise, it is 1. The dimension of the quotient space $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) / (\mathcal{N}_2^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_W}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}))$ is $2d_Y - 2$. In this case, the initial $l' = d_Y - 1$ generators given in (65) and (66) of Example 2 express the variation in side of the set of singular points. The remaining $d_Y - 1$ generators express the difference from this set of singular point. When P is the stationary distribution, the quotient space $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) / (\mathcal{N}_{2,P}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) + \mathcal{N}_P^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}))$ has the same structure as the above case. When P is not the stationary distribution, the quotient space $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) / (\mathcal{N}_{2,P}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) + \mathcal{N}_P^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}))$ has the dimension $2d_Y - 1$. The same initial $d_Y - 1$ generators express the variation in side of the set of singular points, and the remaining d_Y generators express the difference from this set of singular point.

As the second case, we consider the case with the relation (92) with invertible W . Choosing $v_1 := e_1 + e_2$ and $v_2 := e_1 - e_2$, we have $\text{Ker } P^{k(w,v)}[(W, V)] = \langle v_2 \rangle$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k(P,(w,v))}(P) = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Hence, $(B, C) \in \mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I$ if and only if the matrix $WD(C_y) + BD(V_y)$ has the form $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -a & -b \end{pmatrix}$. Also, the matrix B has the form $\begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2 \\ -b_1 & -b_2 \end{pmatrix}$. $D(V_y)$ is a scalar times of the identity matrix. When $C_y = \begin{pmatrix} c \\ -c \end{pmatrix}$, the matrix $WD(C_y)$ has the form $\begin{pmatrix} cW(0|0) & -cW(0|1) \\ cW(1|0) & -cW(1|1) \end{pmatrix}$. Since

$W(x|x') \geq 0$, the real number c needs to be 0. Hence, we find that

$$\mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2 \\ -b_1 & -b_2 \end{pmatrix}, 0 \right) \right\}. \quad (93)$$

Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = \{(B, 0) | B^T | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\}$ because the space $\{(B, 0) | B^T | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\}$ has dimension 2. Due to the RHSs of (83) and (84), we have $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I, \mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I \subset \{(B, 0) | B^T | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\} = \mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I$. The dimension of the quotient space $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) / (\mathcal{N}_2^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) + \mathcal{N}_{P,W}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}))$ is $2d_Y - 2$. The initial $d_Y - 1$ generators given in (65) and (66) of Example 2 express the variation in side of the set of singular points. The remaining $d_Y - 1$ generators in (67) and (68) of Example 2 express the difference from this set of singular point. The quotient space $\mathcal{G}_1((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) / (\mathcal{N}_{2,P}^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}) + \mathcal{N}_P^I((\mathcal{X}^2 \cup \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X})_{(W,V)}))$ has the same structure as the above case, regardless of P .

As the third case, we consider the case with the relation (92) and $W = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$. Then, we have $\text{Ker } P^{k(W,V)}[(W, V)] = \langle v_2 \rangle$ and $\mathcal{V}^{k(P,(W,V))}(P) = \langle v_1 \rangle$. Hence, $(B, C) \in \mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I$ if and only if the matrix $WD(C_y) + BD(V_y)$ has the form $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -a & -b \end{pmatrix}$. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I = \{(B, 0) | B^T | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\}$. In this case, V_y is a scalar times of $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Hence, Corollary 3 guarantees that $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^I, \mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^I \subset \{(B, 0) | B^T | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\} = \mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^I$. Hence, the remaining discussion is the same as the second case.

7.3 Parametrization

In this subsection, we employ the parametrization given in Example 2.

7.3.1 Case with $d_Y = 2$

When $d_Y = 2$, we choose W and V as

$$W = V = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (94)$$

The subset of singular elements equals the set of non-memory cases, which can be characterized as $\theta_2 = 0$ or $\theta_3 = \theta_4 = 0$. In the former case, the parameters θ_3 and θ_4 are redundant parameters, and in the latter case, the parameter θ_2 is a redundant parameter. Both cases are equivalent to the binomial distribution. Hence, the set of non-singular elements are given as $\mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\})$, which can be divided into two connected components $\mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \times (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\})$ and $\mathbb{R} \times (-\infty, 0) \times (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\})$. Each connected component has a one-to-one correspondence to non-singular elements divided by the equivalence class.

7.3.2 Case with $d_Y \geq 3$

When $d_Y \geq 3$, we choose W and V as

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{d_Y} & \frac{1}{d_Y} \\ \frac{1}{d_Y} & \frac{1}{d_Y} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{d_Y} & \frac{1}{d_Y} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (95)$$

The subset of singular elements equals the set of non-memory cases, which can be characterized as $\theta_{d_Y} = \cdots = \theta_{2d_Y-2} = 0$ or $\theta_{2d_Y-1} = \theta_{2d_Y} = 0$. In the former case, the parameters θ_{2d_Y-1} and θ_{2d_Y} are redundant parameters, and in the latter case, the parameters $\theta_{d_Y}, \dots, \theta_{2d_Y-2}$ are redundant parameters. We denote the set $(\mathbb{R}^{d_Y-1} \times \{(0, \dots, 0)\} \times \mathbb{R}^2) \cup (\mathbb{R}^{2d_Y-2} \times \{(0, 0)\})$ by Θ_{NM} . That is, the set $\mathbb{R}^{2d_Y} \setminus \Theta_{NM} = \mathbb{R}^{d_Y-1} \times (\mathbb{R}^{d_Y-1} \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}) \times (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\})$ equals to the set of non-singular elements. However, it is impossible to divide the set $\mathbb{R}^{2d_Y} \setminus \Theta_{NM}$ into components satisfying the following conditions. (1) Each component is an open set. (2) Each component gives a one-to-one parametrization for non-singular elements. This is because the set $\mathbb{R}^{2d_Y} \setminus \Theta_{NM}$ is connected. Hence, we need to adopt duplicated parametrization when the parametric space is needed to be open.

8 Conclusion

In Section 2, we have introduced the concept of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix to describe hidden Markovian process, which is a more general formulation than the conventional formulation for hidden Markovian process. In fact, as explained in Remark 3, this notion is more useful to describe the equivalence problem. Then, in Section 3, we have formulated an exponential family of \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices as a special case of an exponential family of transition matrices. In this definition, the generators are given as functions of hidden and observed states. Then, we have introduced an equivalence relation for generators, which is equivalent to the distinguishability of infinitesimal changes based on the observed data (See Theorem 3). In Section 4, based on this equivalence relation, we have proposed a method to choose the parametrization of the transition matrix to describe the hidden Markov process. In this parametrization, we have shown that only in a measure-zero point, the number of independent generators is smaller than other points. We define singular points as such measure-zero points.

In addition, in Section 5, we have clarified the structure of the tangent space of all points including singular points when the number of hidden state is 2. Next, In Section 6, we have applied obtained results to the conventional case, which is called independent-type and is characterized by a pair of transition matrices. We have derived a necessarily and sufficient condition for being independent-type. Also, we have clarified the forms of an exponential family of

\mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices and the local equivalence condition in this case. Based on this equivalence relation, we have proposed a method to choose the parametrization of the transition matrix for this case.

We have several open problems as follows. First, while we have shown that the dimension of non-singular points in the independent-type case is the same as that in the case of general \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrices when the number of observed states is 2, we could not clarify whether there exists a general \mathcal{Y} -valued transition matrix that cannot be reduced to an independent-type one in this case. This is a future problem. Another remaining problem is characterization of the tangent space when the transition matrix V is given as a deterministic function f . In this case, due to Corollary 2, the indistinguishable subspaces $\mathcal{L}_{2,W,V}^f$ and $\mathcal{L}_{2,P,W,V}^f$, and $\mathcal{L}_{P,W,V}^f$ do not vanish. Hence, the structure of the tangent space is complicated. The determination of the parametrization of this case with taking account into the local equivalence is another future problem.

Acknowledgment

The author is very grateful to Professor Takafumi Kanamori, Professor Vincent Y. F. Tan, and Dr. Wataru Kumagai for helpful discussions and comments. The works reported here were supported in part by the JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) No. 16KT0017, (A) No.17H01280, the Okawa Research Grant and Kayamori Foundation of Informational Science Advancement.

A Proof of Theorem 2

It is enough to discuss the one-parameter case. Since (2) \Rightarrow (3) is trivial, we will show only (1) \Rightarrow (2) and (3) \Rightarrow (1).

(1) \Rightarrow (2): Assume (1). There exist $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}})$ and $(B_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{L}_{2,\mathbf{W}}$ such that $A|P\rangle = 0$, $A^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$, $B_y(\mathcal{V}^{k(P,\mathbf{W})}(P) + \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{w}}[\mathbf{W}]) \subset \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{w}}[\mathbf{W}]$, $(\sum_y B_y)^T|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$, and $\frac{d}{d\theta}W_{\theta,y}|_{\theta=0} = B_y + [W_y, A]$ for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{d\theta}P^k[\mathbf{W}_{\theta}] \cdot P(y_1, \dots, y_k)|_{\theta=0} = \frac{d}{d\theta}(\langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|W_{\theta,y_k}W_{\theta,y_{k-1}} \dots W_{\theta,y_1}|P\rangle)|_{\theta=0} \\ & = \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|(\frac{d}{d\theta}W_{\theta,y_k}|_{\theta=0})W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1}|P\rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|W_{y_k}(\frac{d}{d\theta}W_{\theta,y_{k-1}}|_{\theta=0}) \dots W_{y_1}|P\rangle \\ & \quad + \dots + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|W_{y_k}W_{y_{k-1}} \dots (\frac{d}{d\theta}W_{\theta,y_1}|_{\theta=0})|P\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|B_{y_k}W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1}|P\rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|W_{y_k}B_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1}|P\rangle \\ & \quad + \dots + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|W_{y_k}W_{y_{k-1}} \dots B_{y_1}|P\rangle \\ & \quad + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|[W_{y_k}, A]W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1}|P\rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|W_{y_k}[W_{y_{k-1}}, A] \dots W_{y_1}|P\rangle \\ & \quad + \dots + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|W_{y_k}W_{y_{k-1}} \dots [W_{y_1}, A]|P\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} - \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|AW_{y_k}W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1}|P\rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}}|W_{y_k}W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1}A|P\rangle \stackrel{(b)}{=} 0, \quad (98)$$

where (a) follows from the fact that the image of B_y is included in $\text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{w}}[\mathbf{W}]$, and (b) follows from the properties of A . So, we obtain (2).

(3) \Rightarrow (1): Assume (3). We define $\mathbf{W}'_{\theta,y} := \mathbf{W}_y + \theta \frac{d}{d\theta} \mathbf{W}_{\theta,y}|_{\theta=0}$. So, we have $P^{k\mathbf{w}+k(P,\mathbf{w})+1}[\mathbf{W}'_{\theta}] \cdot P = P^{k\mathbf{w}+k(P,\mathbf{w})+1}[\mathbf{W}] \cdot P$ and

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{W}_{\theta,y} - \mathbf{W}'_{\theta,y}}{\theta} = 0. \quad (99)$$

Theorem 1 guarantees that the pair of \mathbf{W} and P is equivalent to the pair of \mathbf{W}'_{θ} and P . Thus, Theorem 1 guarantees that there exist an invertible map T_{θ} on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $(B_{\theta,y})_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{L}_{2,\mathbf{w}}$ such that $T_{\theta}P = P$, $B_{\theta,y}(\mathcal{V}^{k(P,\mathbf{w})}(P) + \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{w}}[\mathbf{W}]) \subset \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{w}}[\mathbf{W}']$ and $\mathbf{W}'_{\theta,y} = T_{\theta}^{-1}(W_y + B_{\theta,y})T_{\theta}$.

Now, taking the derivative at $\theta = 0$, we have $\frac{d}{d\theta} \mathbf{W}'_{\theta,y}|_{\theta=0} = [W_y, A] + B_y$, where $A := \frac{d}{d\theta} T_{\theta}|_{\theta=0}$ and $B_y := \frac{d}{d\theta} B_{\theta,y}|_{\theta=0}$. The condition $T_{\theta}P = P$ implies that

$$A|P\rangle = 0. \quad (100)$$

Using (99), we have

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} \mathbf{W}_{\theta,y}|_{\theta=0} = [W_y, A] + B_y. \quad (101)$$

Since the relation $(\mathbf{W}_{\theta,y})^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ implies $(\sum_y \frac{d}{d\theta} \mathbf{W}_{\theta,y}|_{\theta=0})^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$, $(\sum_y [W_y, A] + B_y)^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$. Since $B_y^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$, we have $([\sum_y W_y, A])^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0$. So, $(\sum_y W_y)^T A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = A^T (\sum_y W_y)^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$. That is, $A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ is an eigenvector of $(\sum_y W_y)^T$ with eigenvalue 1. So, $A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ is written as $c|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle$ with a constant c , i.e.,

$$A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = c|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle. \quad (102)$$

Now, we calculate $\frac{d}{d\theta} P^k[\mathbf{W}_{\theta}] \cdot P(y_1, \dots, y_k)|_{\theta=0}$ by using the same discussion as (98). So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{d\theta} P^k[\mathbf{W}_{\theta}] \cdot P(y_1, \dots, y_k)|_{\theta=0} \\ &= -\langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | A W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} | P \rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} A | P \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} -c \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} | P \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where (a) follows from (100) and (102). Since $\langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} | P \rangle > 0$ and the LHS is zero, we have $c = 0$. Thus, we obtain (1).

B Proof of Theorem 3

It is enough to discuss the one-parameter case. Since (2) \Rightarrow (3) is trivial, we will show only (1) \Rightarrow (2) and (3) \Rightarrow (1).

(1) \Rightarrow (2): Assume (1). There exist a real number $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}})$, and $(B_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{L}_{2,\mathbf{w}}$ such that

$$A^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = c|u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle, \quad (104)$$

$$B_y(\mathcal{V}^{k(P,\mathbf{w})}(P) + \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{w}}[\mathbf{W}]) \subset \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{w}}[\mathbf{W}], \quad (105)$$

$$\left(\sum_y B_y \right)^T |u_{\mathcal{X}}\rangle = 0 \quad (106)$$

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} W_{\theta,y}|_{\theta=0} = B_y + [W_y, A] \quad (107)$$

for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Define the vector $Q := \frac{d}{d\theta} P_{\mathbf{W}_\theta} |_{\theta=0}$. Since

$$\left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_{\theta,y} |P_{\mathbf{W}_\theta} \right) = |P_{\mathbf{W}_\theta} \rangle, \quad (108)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y |P_{\mathbf{W}} \right) + \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y A |P_{\mathbf{W}} \right) - A |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle + \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y |Q \right) \\ \stackrel{(a)}{=} & \left(\left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y \right) + \left(\left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) A - A \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) \right) \right) |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle + \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) |Q \rangle \\ = & \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y + [W_y, A] \right) |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle + \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) |Q \rangle \\ \stackrel{(b)}{=} & |Q \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

where (a) and (b) follow from (108) and its derivative, respectively.

That is,

$$\left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) \left(|Q \rangle + A |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \right) = \left(|Q \rangle + A |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \right) - \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y \right) |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle. \quad (110)$$

Since $\left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y \right) |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle = 0$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) \left(|Q \rangle + A |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle - \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y \right) |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \right) = \left(|Q \rangle + A |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle - \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y \right) |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \right). \quad (111)$$

Due to the uniqueness of the eigenvector of $\left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right)$ with eigenvalue 1, we have

$$|Q \rangle + A |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle - \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y \right) |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle = c' |P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \quad (112)$$

with a constant $c' \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since

$$\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | W_{\theta,y} |P_{\mathbf{W}_\theta} \rangle = 1, \quad (113)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& c' - c \\
&= c' \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle - c \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} c' \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle - \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | A | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \\
&= \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) \left(c' | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle - A | P_{\mathbf{W}} \right) + \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y \right) | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) | Q \rangle \\
&= \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | A | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle - \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | A | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) | Q \rangle \\
&= \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \left(\left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) A - A \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \right) \right) | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y | Q \rangle \\
&= \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y + [W_y, A] | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y | Q \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{d}{d\theta} W_{\theta, y} |_{\theta=0} | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W_y \left| \frac{d}{d\theta} P_{\mathbf{W}_\theta} \right|_{\theta=0} \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{=} 0, \tag{114}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a), (b), (c), and (d) follow from (104), (112), (107), and (113), respectively.

Similar to (98), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{d\theta} P^k[\mathbf{W}_\theta] \cdot P_{\mathbf{W}_\theta}(y_1, \dots, y_k) |_{\theta=0} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} - \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | A W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} A | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} | Q \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} - c \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} A | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | W_{y_k} W_{y_{k-1}} \dots W_{y_1} \left(c' | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle - A | P_{\mathbf{W}} \right) + \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} B_y \right) | P_{\mathbf{W}} \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} 0. \tag{115}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, (a) follows from a derivation similar to (98). That is, we need to care about the derivative of $|P_{\mathbf{W}_\theta}\rangle$. (b) follows from (104) and (112), and (c) does from (114). So, we obtain (2).

(3) \Rightarrow (1): Assume (3). We define $\mathbf{W}'_{\theta, y}$ in the same way as the proof of Theorem 2. So, similar to the proof of Theorem 2, there exist an invertible map T_θ on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $(B_{\theta, y})_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{L}_{2, \mathbf{W}}$ such that $T_\theta P_{\mathbf{W}} = P_{\mathbf{W}'_\theta}$, $B_{\theta, y}(\mathcal{V}^{k(P, \mathbf{W})}(P) + \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{w}}[\mathbf{W}]) \subset \text{Ker } P^{k\mathbf{w}}[\mathbf{W}']$ and $\mathbf{W}'_{\theta, y} = T_\theta^{-1}(W_y + B_{\theta, y})T_\theta$.

Choosing A and B_y in the same way as the proof of Theorem 2, we have

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} \mathbf{W}_{\theta, y} |_{\theta=0} = [W_y, A] + B_y. \tag{116}$$

Then, in the same way as the proof of Theorem 2, we obtain (102). Thus, we obtain (1).

C Proofs of Lemmas 11 and 10

To show Lemma 11, we prepare Lemma 18.

Lemma 18 *Let \mathcal{V}_1 be the direct sum space $\mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_3$ of two vector spaces \mathcal{V}_2 and \mathcal{V}_3 with the condition $\mathcal{V}_2 \cap \mathcal{V}_3 = \{0\}$. Let \mathcal{V}_4 (\mathcal{V}_5) be a subspace of \mathcal{V}_2 (\mathcal{V}_3). Assume that a linear map α_1 (α_2) from \mathcal{V}_6 to \mathcal{V}_2 (\mathcal{V}_3) satisfies that (1) $\alpha_1(\mathcal{V}_1) \cap \mathcal{V}_4 = \{0\}$ and (2) $\alpha_2(\text{Ker } \alpha_1) \cap \mathcal{V}_5 = \{0\}$. Define $\alpha_3(v) := \alpha_1(v) + \alpha_2(v)$. Then, $\alpha_3(\mathcal{V}_1) \cap (\mathcal{V}_4 + \mathcal{V}_5) = \{0\}$.*

Proof of Lemma 18: Assume that $\alpha_1(v_1) = v_4$ and $\alpha_2(v_1) = v_5$ for $v_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1$, $v_4 \in \mathcal{V}_4$, and $v_5 \in \mathcal{V}_5$. Condition (1) implies that $\alpha_1(v_1) = 0$. So, $v_1 \in \text{Ker } \alpha_1$. Condition (2) and $\alpha_2(v_1) = v_5$ yield that $\alpha_2(v_1) = v_5 = 0$, which is the desired statement. \square

Proof of Lemma 11: Now, we check that the space spanned by $\hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_{l_2+l_3}$ has intersection $\{0\}$ with $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_{P_{\mathbf{W}}}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. For this purpose, we make preparation. We choose the matrix \tilde{A} as a diagonal matrix with diagonal entry $f(x)$. So, we have $\tilde{W}_y(x|x')(f(x) - f(x')) = [W_y, \tilde{A}]$. We can restrict function f so that $\sum_x f(x) = 0$. Since $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = \{(f(x) - f(x') + c)_{x,x'}\}$ and $\langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | \tilde{A} | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{2, \mathbf{W}} + \mathbf{W}_* \mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) = \{(cW_y)_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}\} + \{(\alpha_y(A))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} | \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | A | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\}. \quad (117)$$

To prove the above issue, it is sufficient to show that a nonzero element of the space spanned by $\hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_{l_2+l_3}$ is not contained in the space $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. If a non-zero element is contained in the space, its matrix components with $y = y_0, y_1$ are given as those of the element of the space $\mathcal{N}((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{N}_2((\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}^2)_{\mathbf{W}})$. To deny this statement, we regard \bar{g}_{j,y_0} and \bar{g}_{j,y_1} as elements of $\mathcal{G}(\{y_0, y_1\}, \mathcal{X}^2)$. Then, due to (117), it is sufficient to show that the space spanned by $\bar{g}_{1,y_0}, \dots, \bar{g}_{d,y_0}, \bar{g}_{1,y_1}, \dots, \bar{g}_{d^2-d,y_1}$ has intersection $\{0\}$ with the space $\{(\alpha_{y_0}(A), \alpha_{y_1}(A)) | \langle u_{\mathcal{X}} | A | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\}$. To show this statement, we apply Lemma 18 to the case when \mathcal{V}_2 and \mathcal{V}_3 are the set of traceless matrices, \mathcal{V}_4 is the space spanned by $\bar{g}_{1,y_0}, \dots, \bar{g}_{d,y_0}$, \mathcal{V}_5 is the space spanned by $\bar{g}_{1,y_1}, \dots, \bar{g}_{d^2-d,y_1}$, α_1 is the map α_{y_0} , and α_2 is the map α_{y_1} . Since α_{y_0} is injective on $\{A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}}) | A^T | u_{\mathcal{X}} \rangle = 0\}$ whose dimension is the same as that of the image of α_{y_0} , due to the construction of g_{j,y_0} , we find that the map α_{y_0} satisfies the condition for α_1 . So, we obtain the desired statement. \square

Proof of Lemma 10: Assume the condition $[W_{y_0}, A] = 0$. Then, A^T needs to have common eigenvectors with W_{y_0} . Due to the condition $a^j \neq 0$ for any j , the eigenspace of A^T including $u_{\mathcal{X}}$ needs to be the whole space. So, A^T is zero, which implies the condition (1) of Condition E3.

Let A be an element of the kernel of the map $A \mapsto ([W_{y_0}, A], [W_{y_1}, A])$. Then, an eigenspace of A^T is spanned by a subset of $\{f_i\}$. It also is spanned by a subset of $\{f'_i\}$. To realize both conditions, the eigenspace needs to be the whole space. So, A^T is zero, which implies the condition (2) of Condition E3. \square

References

1. H. Ito, S. -I. Amari, and K. Kobayashi, "Identifiability of Hidden Markov Information Sources and Their Minimum Degrees of Freedom," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. 38, No. 2, 324-333, (1992).
2. S. Amari and H. Nagaoka, *Methods of Information Geometry*. Oxford University Press (2000).

3. K. Nakagawa and F. Kanaya, "On the converse theorem in statistical hypothesis testing for markov chains," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 629-633 (1993).
4. H. Nagaoka, "The exponential family of Markov chains and its information geometry" Proceedings of The 28th Symposium on Information Theory and Its Applications (SITA2005), Okinawa, Japan, Nov. 20-23, (2005).
5. M. Hayashi and S. Watanabe, "Information Geometry Approach to Parameter Estimation in Markov Chains," *Annals of Statistics*, Volume 44, Number 4, 1495-1535 (2016).
6. S. Amari, " α -Divergence Is Unique, Belonging to Both f -Divergence and Bregman Divergence Classes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. 55, No. 11, 4925-4931 (2009).
7. L. Bregman, "The relaxation method of finding a common point of convex sets and its application to the solution of problems in convex programming," *Comput. Math. Phys. USSR*, vol. 7, pp. 200-217, 1967.
8. S. Watanabe and M. Hayashi, "Finite-length analysis on tail probability for Markov chain and application to simple hypothesis testing," *Annals of Applied Probability* vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 811-845, (2017).
9. M. Hayashi, *Quantum Information Theory*, Graduate Texts in Physics, Springer (2017).
10. M. Ozawa, "Quantum measuring processes of continuous observables," *J. Math. Phys.*, **25** 79 (1984).
11. A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni, *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*, 2nd ed. Springer (1998).
12. J. G. Kemeny and J. L. Snell, *Finite Markov Chains*, Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York Berlin Heidelberg Tokyo (1960).
13. M. Hayashi and Y. Yoshida, "Asymptotic Analysis for Hidden Markovian Process with Quantum Hidden System," arXiv:1801.09158 (2018).
14. E. Seneta, *Non Negative Matrix and Markov Chains*, Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition (1981).
15. M. Hayashi, "Information Geometry Approach to Parameter Estimation in Hidden Markov Model," arXiv:1705.06040 (2017).