

Deep Filtering with DNN, CNN and RNN

Bin Xie¹, Qing Zhang²

Abstract—This paper is about a deep learning approach for general filtering. The idea is to train a neural network with Monte Carlo samples generated from a nominal dynamic model. Then the network weights are applied to Monte Carlo samples from an actual dynamic model. A main focus of this paper is on the deep filters with three major neural network architectures (DNN, CNN, RNN). Our deep filter compares favorably to the traditional Kalman filter in linear cases and outperform the extended Kalman filter in nonlinear cases. Then a switching model with jumps is studied to show the adaptiveness and power of our deep filtering. Among the three major NNs, the CNN outperform the others on average, while the RNN does not seem to be suitable for the filtering problem. One advantage of the deep filter is its robustness when the nominal model and actual model differ. The other advantage of deep filtering is real data can be used directly to train the deep neural network. Therefore, model calibration can be by-passed all together.

Index Terms—Deep Filtering, Neural Network, Switching Model

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is about a deep learning method for filtering with different neural networks. Filtering is concerned with state estimation in systems that are not completely observable. There are many applications of filtering in engineering and financial systems. Traditional approaches focus on least squares estimators with Gaussian distributions. The corresponding filtering problem is to find the conditional mean of the state given the observation up to time n . The best known filter is the Kalman filter for linear models. For some nonlinear models, extended Kalman filters provide good approximations. We refer the reader to Anderson and Moore [1] for background and technical details.

Classical results in nonlinear filtering can be found in Duncan [4] which focuses on conditional densities for diffusion processes; Mortensen [11] that deals with the most probable trajectories; Kushner [13], which derives nonlinear filtering equations, and Zakai [18], which treats equations of unnormalized conditional expectations.

Following these classical work, there are much progresses made in the past decades. For instance, hybrid filtering can be found in Hijab [8] with an unknown constant, Zhang [19] with small observation noise, Miller and Runggaldier [10] with Markovian jump times, Blom and Bar-Shalom [2] for discrete-time hybrid model and the Interactive Multiple Model algorithm, Dufour et al [5], [6] and Dufour and Elliott [7] for models with regime switching. Some later developments along this line can be found in Zhang [19],

[20], [21]. Despite these important progresses, the computation of filtering remains a daunting task. For nonlinear filtering, there have been yet feasible and efficient schemes to mitigate high computational complexity (with infinite dimensionality). Much effort has been devoted to finding computable approximation schemes.

Recently, Wang et al. [15] developed a deep learning framework for general filtering. Given a partially observed system, the idea is to train a deep neural network using Monte Carlo samples generated from the system. The observation process is taken as inputs to the dense neural network and the state from the Monte Carlo samples is used as the target. A least squares loss function of the target and calculated output is to be minimized to determine the weight vectors. Then these weight vectors are applied to a separate set of Monte Carlo samples of the actual dynamic model. Such a state estimation procedure is termed deep filter. In [15], computational experiments with linear, nonlinear, switching models have shown the adaptiveness, robustness, and effectiveness of the deep filter. A major advantage of the DF is its robustness when the nominal model and actual model differ. Another advantage of the deep filtering is that real-world data can be used directly to train the deep neural network. Therefore, model calibration is no longer needed in applications.

We point out that the experiments reported in Wang et al. [15] were only conducted with DNNs. It would be interesting to examine how the filtering schemes work under different neural networks. It is the purpose of this paper to further our studies of deep filtering under convolution neural network (CNN) and recurrent neural network (RNN). We study both linear and non-linear systems and compare the performance of the DF under these different neural networks. We show that the deep filter compares favorably to the Kalman filter in linear cases and outperform the extended Kalman filter in nonlinear cases. A switching model with jumps is studied to show the adaptiveness of the deep filtering. Among the three major NNs, the CNN outperform the others on average. While the RNN does not seem to be suitable for the filtering problem.

The rest of this paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, we present our methodology and various neural networks under consideration. In Section 3, we report our computational experiments. Then in Section 4, we conclude the paper with remarks.

¹ Mathematics Department, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602
bin.xie@uga.edu

² Mathematics Department, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602
qz@uga.edu

2. METHODOLOGY

Let $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1}$ denote the state process with system equation

$$x_{n+1} = f_n(x_n, u_n), \quad x_0 = x, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad (2.1)$$

for some suitable functions $f_n : \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{l_1} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_1}$ and system noise $\{u_n\}$ with $u_n \in \mathbb{R}^{l_1}$. A function of x_n can be observed with possible noise corruption. In particular, the observation process $y_n \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$ is given by

$$y_n = h_n(x_n, v_n), \quad (2.2)$$

with noise $\{v_n\}$, $v_n \in \mathbb{R}^{l_2}$, and $h_n : \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{l_2} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$.

Deep Filter. The DF for (2.1) and (2.2) can be given as follows: Let N_{seed} denote the number of training sample paths and let n_0 denote the training window for each sample path. For any fixed $\kappa = n_0, \dots, N$ with a fixed ω , we take $\{y_\kappa(\omega), y_{\kappa-1}(\omega), \dots, y_{\kappa-n_0+1}(\omega)\}$ as the input vector to the neural network and $x_\kappa(\omega)$ as the target. In what follows, we shall suppress the ω dependence. Fix x_κ , let ξ_ℓ denote the neural network output at iteration ℓ , which depends on the parameter θ . Our goal is to find an NN weight $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{m_3}$ so as to minimize the loss function

$$L(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} E |\xi_\ell - x_\kappa|^2. \quad (2.3)$$

We use the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) method to find the NN parameters θ by minimizing the loss function with learning rate $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n - \gamma \frac{\partial L(\theta_n)}{\partial \theta}. \quad (2.4)$$

Then these weights θ are used to out-of-sample data $\{\tilde{\omega}\}$ with the actual observation $y_n(\tilde{\omega})$ as inputs in the subsequent testing stage which leads to neural network output $\tilde{x}_n(\tilde{\omega})$. Such a state estimation procedure is called deep filter.

A. Network Specifications

Typical neural networks for deep learning applications include dense neural networks (DNN), convolutional neural networks (CNN), and recurrent neural networks (RNN).

In this paper, we first consider the fully connected DNNs. As in Wang et al. [15], we use the DNN with 5 hidden layers (each with 5 neurons). We also use the sigmoid activation function for all hidden layers and the simple activation for the output layer. Figure 1 shows the DNN structure used in this paper.

A CNN is another architecture of NN and it allows to model both time and space correlations in multivariate signals. A CNN utilizes convolution operation to seize the local features with several kernel filters. CNNs are widely used in image classification, image recognition, and computer vision. Figure 2 shows the CNN structure used in this paper.

An RNN is the other architecture of neural network where connections between nodes form a directed graph along a temporal sequence. A CNN is of feed-forward NN that uses filters and pooling layers, whereas a RNN feeds results back into the network. A RNN is often used in speech




Fig. 1. The DNN Structure




Fig. 2. The CNN Architecture

recognition. A popular RNN architecture is the long short-term memory (LSTM). It can process not only single data points, but also entire sequences of data. By setting logic gates in a calculation cell, the LSTM network collect efficient information through the time series. Figure 3 shows the RNN structure used in this paper. For further details on related neural networks, we refer the reader to Chollet [3].




Fig. 3. The LSTM Architecture

3. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

Following the system equations (2.1) and (2.2) for (x_n, y_n) , we generate $N_{\text{seed}} = 5000$ Monte Carlo sample paths (in-sample) for the neural network training. Then we generate a separate set of $N_{\text{seed}} = 5000$ samples (out-of-sample) to test the results. We take the time horizon $N = 1000$ and use the window size $n_0 = 50$ of input to train the network. We use the stochastic gradient descent algorithm with learning rate $\gamma = 0.1$.

The following relative error is used in this paper. Given vectors $\xi^1(\omega) = (\xi_{n_0}^1(\omega), \dots, \xi_N^1(\omega))$ and $\xi^2(\omega) = (\xi_{n_0}^2(\omega), \dots, \xi_N^2(\omega))$, define

$$\|\xi^1 - \xi^2\| = \frac{\sum_{n=n_0}^N \sum_{m=1}^{N_{\text{seed}}} |\xi_n^1(\omega_m) - \xi_n^2(\omega_m)|}{N_{\text{seed}}(N - n_0 + 1)\Sigma},$$

where

$$\Sigma = \frac{\sum_{n=n_0}^N \sum_{m=1}^{N_{\text{seed}}} (|\xi_n^1(\omega_m)| + |\xi_n^2(\omega_m)|)}{N_{\text{seed}}(N - n_0 + 1)}.$$

In this paper, we work with linear, non-linear, and switching models to test deep filtering schemes. We start with linear systems.

Linear Systems. We consider the linear system

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = F_n x_n + G_n u_n, & x_0 = x, \\ y_n = H_n' x_n + v_n, & n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

for some matrices F_n , G_n , and H_n of appropriate dimensions. Here u_n and v_n are independent random vectors having Gaussian distributions with mean zero and $E(u_n u_l') =$

$\delta_{nl}I$, $E(v_n v_l') = \delta_{nl}I$, for $n, l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where $\delta_{nl} = 1$ if $n = l$ and 0 otherwise.

1D Linear Model. In particular, the one-dimensional system is given as follows :

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = (1 + 0.1\eta)x_n + \sqrt{\eta} \sigma u_n, & x_0 = 1, \\ y_n = x_n + \sigma_0 v_n, & n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

with u_n and v_n which are independent Gaussian $N(0, 1)$ random variables. We take $\sigma = 0.7$, $\sigma_0 = 0.5$, and the step size $\eta = 0.005$.

2D Linear Model. In two-dimensional setting, we consider the system

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = (1 + 0.1\eta F_n^0)x_n + \sqrt{\eta} G_n^0 u_n, & x_0 = [1, 1], \\ y_n = H_n' x_n + \sigma_0 v_n, & n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

with u_n and v_n being independent 2D normal random variables.

We take $\eta = 0.005$, $\sigma_0 = 0.5$, $G_n^0 = I$, $H_n = I$ and $F_n^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

With these parameters, the corresponding numerical relative errors are included in Table I. The DF with neural networks perform comparable to the KF except the one with the RNN in two-dimensional case. The DF with the CNN produces a little better relative errors.

| | KF | DNN | CNN | RNN |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|
| 1D Linear | 4.17 | 4.51 | 4.17 | 4.50 |
| 2D Linear | 4.45 | 4.43 | 4.24 | 8.26 |

TABLE I
RELATIVE ERRORS (IN %) FOR LINEAR MODELS

Robustness of Deep Filtering. In this section, we examine the robustness of deep filtering. We consider separately the nominal model and the actual model. A nominal model (NM) is an estimated model. It deviates from real data for different applications. In this paper, it is used to train our NNs, i.e., a selected mathematical model is used to generate Monte Carlo sample paths to train the NN. The coefficients of the mathematical model are also used in Kalman filtering equations for comparison.

An actual model (AM), on the other hand, is about the simulated (Monte Carlo based) environment. It is used in this paper for testing purposes. In real world applications, the observation process is the actual process obtained from real physical process. To test the model robustness, we consider the case when the NM's observation noise differs from the AM's observation noise.

To examine the robustness of the DF, we fix $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{NM} = 2$ and vary $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{AM}$. The relative errors for the one-dimensional model case are reported in Table II. Again, the DF with each NN perform close to the KF. The DF with the CNN does a little better while the one with the RNN falls behind.

The results for the 2D linear model with $F_n^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ are provided in Table III. The robustness of the DF is comparable to that of the KF.

| σ_0^{AM} | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|
| KF | 5.91 | 6.28 | 6.93 | 7.85 | 8.94 | 10.13 |
| DNN 1D Lin | 6.48 | 6.57 | 7.09 | 8.25 | 9.88 | 11.74 |
| CNN 1D Lin | 5.69 | 5.88 | 6.59 | 7.75 | 9.19 | 10.80 |
| RNN 1D Lin | 6.11 | 6.32 | 7.32 | 9.33 | 12.12 | 15.38 |

TABLE II

RELATIVE ERRORS (IN %) FOR DIFFERENT σ_0^{AM} (1D LINEAR MODELS)
WITH $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{NM} = 2$

| σ_0^{AM} | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| KF | 6.87 | 6.97 | 7.26 | 7.73 | 8.35 | 9.07 |
| DNN 2D Lin | 5.61 | 5.82 | 6.45 | 7.44 | 8.68 | 10.07 |
| CNN 2D Lin | 8.49 | 7.55 | 7.09 | 7.49 | 8.48 | 9.81 |
| RNN 2D Lin | 6.60 | 6.63 | 6.98 | 7.76 | 8.89 | 10.26 |

TABLE III

RELATIVE ERRORS (IN %) FOR DIFFERENT σ_0^{AM} (2D LINEAR MODELS)
WITH $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{NM} = 2$

| σ_0^{AM} | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 |
|-----------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| EKF | 8.80 | 9.05 | 9.75 | 10.76 | 11.97 | 13.33 |
| DNN 1D NL | 9.54 | 9.47 | 9.87 | 11.29 | 13.51 | 16.04 |
| CNN 1D NL | 8.27 | 8.40 | 9.26 | 10.77 | 12.68 | 14.86 |
| RNN 1D NL | 8.54 | 8.81 | 10.24 | 13.19 | 17.13 | 21.51 |

TABLE V

RELATIVE ERRORS (IN %) FOR DIFFERENT σ_0^{AM} (NON-LINEAR
MODELS) WITH $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{AM} = 2$

| σ_0^{AM} | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 |
|-----------------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| EKF | 9.19 | 9.34 | 9.78 | 10.44 | 11.28 | 12.25 |
| DNN 2D NL | 7.08 | 7.31 | 8.07 | 9.32 | 10.95 | 12.81 |
| CNN 2D NL | 11.12 | 9.84 | 9.12 | 9.53 | 10.74 | 12.40 |
| RNN 2D NL | 7.82 | 7.88 | 8.33 | 9.34 | 10.74 | 12.43 |

TABLE VI

RELATIVE ERRORS (IN %) FOR DIFFERENT σ_0^{AM} (NON-LINEAR
MODELS) WITH $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{NM} = 2$

Non-Linear Systems. We consider nonlinear models and compare the results of three kinds of neural networks with the corresponding extended Kalman filter.

1D Non-Linear Model. First, we consider the following 1D model:

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = x_n + \eta \sin(5x_n) + \sqrt{\eta} \sigma u_n, & x_0 = 1, \\ y_n = x_n + \sigma_0 v_n, & n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

with u_n and v_n which are independent Gaussian $N(0, 1)$ random variables.

2D Non-Linear Model. The 2D model is given by:

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = x_n + \eta \sin(5F_n^0 x_n) + \sqrt{\eta} G_n^0 u_n, & x_0 = [1, 1]^T, \\ y_n = H_n^l x_n + \sigma_0 v_n, & n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

with u_n and v_n which are independent 2D normal random variables. We take $\eta = 0.005$, $\sigma_0 = 0.5$, and $F_n^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

In Table IV, it can be seen that the DF with each NN outperforms the EKF in both the one-dimensional and two dimensional cases.




| | EKF | DNN | CNN | RNN |
|---------------|-------|------|------|------|
| 1D Non-Linear | 10.04 | 6.16 | 5.68 | 6.40 |
| 2D Non-Linear | 8.87 | 5.27 | 5.13 | 5.37 |

TABLE IV

RELATIVE ERRORS (IN %) OF NOMINAL MODEL FOR NON-LINEAR
MODELS

The corresponding robustness comparisons are reported in Tables V and VI. In both the one and two dimensional cases, the DF with each NN shows similar robustness as the EKF except with the RNN which under performers the rest.

In Figures 4-7, a sample of x_n in the one-dimensional system with $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{NM} = 2$ is given along with the corresponding DF \tilde{x}_n with DNN, CNN, and RNN. According to these pictures, it appears that the DF with CNN provides smoother path. This is consistent with the results included in Table IV.

Fig. 4. A Sample Path of x_n in 1D Non-Linear ModelFig. 5. The Corresponding DF \tilde{x}_n with DNNFig. 6. The Corresponding DF \tilde{x}_n with CNN




Fig. 7. The Corresponding DF \tilde{x}_n with RNN

Switching Models. Next, we consider a switching model with jumps and apply the DF to these models. For the jump case, neither the KF nor the EKF can be applied due to the presence of the switching process and lack of recursive dynamic equations.

1D Switching Model. As in Wang et al.[15] we consider the following model:

$$\begin{cases} x_n = \sin(n\eta\alpha_n + \sigma u_n), & n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \\ y_n = x_n + \sigma_0 v_n. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

We take $\alpha(t) \in \{1, 2\}$ to be a continuous-time Markov chain with generator $Q = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 2 \\ 2 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$, Using step size $\eta = 0.005$ to discretize $\alpha(t)$ to get $\alpha_n = \alpha(n\eta)$. We also take $\sigma = 0.1$ and $\sigma_0 = 0.3$.

2D Switching Model. We consider the following 2D switching system:

$$\begin{cases} x_n = \sin(n\eta\alpha_n + \sigma u_n), & n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \\ \tilde{x}_n = \cos(n\eta\alpha_n + \sigma u_n), & n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \end{cases}$$

The observation

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_n \\ \tilde{y}_n \end{pmatrix} = H \begin{pmatrix} x_n \\ \tilde{x}_n \end{pmatrix} + \sigma_0 u_n, \quad (3.11)$$

with u_n as 2D white noise. We take $\eta = 0.005$, $\sigma = 0.3$, and $H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. We choose nominal model $\sigma_0^{NM} = 2$ for the NNs training,

In these examples, the KF (or the ETF) would not apply due to lack of recursive dynamic systems. We only compare the robustness of the DF with various NNs. In Table VII, the DF with the DNN exhibits better robustness while the one with the RNN underperforms.

| σ_0^{AM} | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| DNN 1D Swt | 12.67 | 12.64 | 12.92 | 14.28 | 16.79 | 19.62 |
| CNN 1D Swt | 18.01 | 17.34 | 16.90 | 17.74 | 19.80 | 22.52 |
| RNN 1D Swt | 13.81 | 14.23 | 16.45 | 21.31 | 27.61 | 33.92 |

TABLE VII

RELATIVE ERRORS (IN %) FOR DIFFERENT σ_0^{AM} (1D SWITCHING MODEL) WITH $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{NM} = 2$

The robustness of the DF under the two-dimensional switching model is given in Table VIII. In this case, the DNN outperforms while the RNN drags much behind.

In Figures 8-11, a sample of x_n in the one-dimensional switching model with $\sigma_0^{NM} = \sigma_0^{AM} = 2$ is plotted along

| σ_0^{AM} | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| DNN 2D Swt | 37.24 | 36.99 | 36.92 | 37.83 | 39.29 | 40.75 |
| CNN 2D Swt | 16.36 | 15.38 | 15.48 | 17.16 | 19.68 | 22.47 |
| RNN 2D Swt | 12.01 | 11.94 | 11.85 | 12.66 | 17.27 | 99.37 |

TABLE VIII

RELATIVE ERRORS (IN %) FOR DIFFERENT σ_0^{AM} (2D SWITCHING MODELS) WITH $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{NM} = 2$

with the corresponding DF \tilde{x}_n with DNN, CNN, and RNN. In this case, the CNN appears doing better than others.




Fig. 8. A Sample Path of x_n in the 1D Switching Model




Fig. 9. The Corresponding DF \tilde{x}_n with DNN




Fig. 10. The Corresponding DF \tilde{x}_n with CNN

Remark 1: Note that the RNN performs poorly when $\sigma_0^{AM} = 2.5$. This appears due to the LSTM's over fitting feature in the 2D case. One way to reduce such over fitting is to stop early to avoid loss function blowups. By and large, the early stopping will halt the NN's training by monitoring the loss function and exit when the loss value no longer improves in several consecutive epochs. We refer the reader to Jason [9] for further details. Using such an early stopping technique, the corresponding relative errors are given in Table IX.

Remark 2: In this paper, an iMac desktop with Intel Core i5 processor (3.2 GHz Quad-core, 24G DDR3) with Keras




Fig. 11. The Corresponding DF \tilde{x}_n with RNN

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| σ_0^{AM} | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 |
| RNN 2D Swt | 12.06 | 11.89 | 11.81 | 12.56 | 14.54 | 17.73 |

TABLE IX

RELATIVE ERRORS (IN %) OF EARLY STOPPING FOR DIFFERENT σ_0^{AM}
(SWITCHING MODELS) WITH $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0^{NM} = 2$

library of Python 3 was used for all numerical experiments. In Table X, the CPU time for one step calculation with various network architectures are given. The DNN and CNN consume similar amount of time, while the RNN runs much longer.

| Time | 1D Lin | 1D NL | 1D Swt | 2D Lin | 2D NL | 2D Swt |
|------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| DNN | 11.0 | 10.5 | 11.1 | 14.1 | 13.5 | 14.7 |
| CNN | 12.5 | 12.1 | 12.5 | 19.5 | 18.6 | 18.8 |
| RNN | 17.5 | 17.5 | 10.6 | 185.5 | 175.0 | 182.2 |

TABLE X

RUNNING TIME (IN SECONDS)

We would like to comment that the network training is the most time consuming part. Nevertheless, this will not affect much in real time filtering because the training can be done offline.

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied the deep filter with different neural network architectures. The DF performs similarly as the Kalman filter in linear models and outperforms the KF in nonlinear models, In addition, the CNN outperforms the DNN and RNN on average. The DF is applicable to general dynamic systems and it does not require any model specifications. To implement the DF, real data can be used directly to train the deep neural network. Therefore, model calibration can be eliminated all together.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported in part by the Simons Foundation (849576).

REFERENCES

- [1] B.D.O Anderson and J.B. Moore, *Optimal Filtering*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1979.
- [2] H. A. P. Blom and Y. Bar-Shalom, "The interacting multiple model algorithm for systems with Markovian switching coefficients," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 33, pp. 780-783, 1988.
- [3] F. Chollet, *Deep learning with Python*, Manning New York, 2018.
- [4] T.E. Duncan, *Probability densities for diffusion processes with applications to nonlinear filtering theory and detection theory*, PhD Diss., Stanford Univ. (1967).

- [5] F. Dufour, P. Bertrand, and R. J. Elliott, "Filtering for linear systems with jump parameters and high signal-to-noise ratio," *Proc. 13th IFAC World Congress*, San Francisco, CA, pp. 445-450, 1996.
- [6] F. Dufour, P. Bertrand, and R. J. Elliott, "Optimal filtering and control of linear systems with Markov perturbations," *Proc. 35th IEEE CDC*, Kobe, Japan, pp. 4065-4070, 1996.
- [7] F. Dufour and R. J. Elliott, "Adaptive control of linear systems with Markov perturbations," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 43, pp. 351-372, 1997.
- [8] O. Hijab, "The adaptive LQG problem -Part I," *IEEE, Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 28, pp. 171-178, 1983.
- [9] B. Jason, "Better deep learning: train faster, reduce overfitting, and make better predictions," *Machine Learning Mastery*, 2018.
- [10] B. M. Miller and W. J. Runggaldier, "Kalman filtering for linear systems with coefficients driven by a hidden Markov jump process," *Systems & Control Lett.*, vol. 31, pp. 93-102, 1997.
- [11] R. E. Mortensen, "Maximum-likelihood recursive nonlinear filtering," *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 2, pp. 386-394, 1968.
- [12] M. Nielsen. Neural networks and deep learning, michaelnielsen.org.
- [13] H.J. Kushner, On the differential equations satisfied by conditional probability densities of Markov processes, with applications, *J. SIAM Control Ser. A.*, vol. 2, pp. 106-119, (1964).
- [14] H.J. Kushner and G. Yin, *Stochastic Approximation Algorithms and Applications*, Springer, New York, (1997).
- [15] L.Y. Wang, G. Yin, and Q. Zhang, Deep filtering, *Communications in Information and Systems*, Vol. 21, pp. 651-667, (2021).
- [16] G. Welch and G. Bishop, *An introduction to the Kalman filter*, Chapel Hill, NC, (1995).
- [17] G. Yin and Q. Zhang, *Continuous-Time Markov Chains and Applications: A Two-Time Scale Approach*, Second Edition, Springer, New York, 2013.
- [18] M. Zakai, On the optimal filtering of diffusion processes, *Zeitschrift fur Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, Vol 11, pp. 230-243, (1969).
- [19] Q. Zhang, "Nonlinear filtering and control of a switching diffusion with small observation noise," *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.*, vol. 36, pp. 1738-1768, 1998.
- [20] Q. Zhang, Optimal filtering of discrete-time hybrid systems, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, Vol. 100, No. 1, pp. 123-144, (1999).
- [21] Q. Zhang, Hybrid filtering for linear systems with non-Gaussian disturbances, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 50-61, (2000).