

Particle-Based Inference for Continuous-Discrete State Space Models

Christopher Stanton

Department of Statistical Science, University College London
and

Alexandros Beskos

Department of Statistical Science, University College London

July 23, 2024

Abstract

This article develops a methodology allowing application of the complete machinery of particle-based inference methods upon what we call the class of *continuous-discrete State Space Models* (CD-SSMs). Such models correspond to a latent continuous-time Itô diffusion process which is observed with noise at discrete time instances. Due to the continuous-time nature of the hidden signal, standard Feynman-Kac formulations and their accompanying particle-based approximations have to overcome several challenges, arising mainly due to the following considerations: (i) finite-time transition densities of the signal are typically intractable; (ii) ancestors of sampled signals are determined w.p. 1, thus cannot be resampled; (iii) diffusivity parameters given a sampled signal yield Dirac distributions. We overcome all above issues by introducing a framework based on carefully designed proposals and transformations thereof. That is, we obtain new expressions for the Feynman-Kac model that accommodate the effects of a continuous-time signal and overcome induced degeneracies. The constructed formulations will enable use of the full range of particle-based algorithms for CD-SSMs: for filtering/smoothing and parameter inference, whether online or offline. Our framework is compatible with guided proposals in the filtering steps that are essential for efficient algorithmic performance in the presence of informative observations or in higher dimensions, and is applicable for a very general class of CD-SSMs, including the case when the signal is modelled as a hypo-elliptic diffusion. Our methods can be immediately incorporated to available software packages for particle-based algorithms.

Keywords: Feynman-Kac Formula, Particle Gibbs, Hypo-Elliptic Diffusion, Guided Proposal.

1 Introduction

This work considers the development of general particle-based Monte Carlo methods for statistical inference within the broad class of what we call *continuous-discrete State Space Models* (CD-SSMs). For such a CD-SSM, the latent process is a continuous-time diffusion process (Oksendal, 2013) defined as the solution of a Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE):

$$dX(s) = b(s, X(s))ds + \sigma(s, X(s))dB(s), \quad X(0) = x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1)$$

for a d_w -dimensional Brownian motion $B = \{B(s)\}_{s \geq 0}$, a drift function $b : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and a diffusion coefficient function $\sigma : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_w}$, with $d \geq 1$, $1 \leq d_w \leq d$. The signal process $X = \{X(s)\}_{s \geq 0}$ is assumed to be indirectly observed at $T \geq 1$ discrete times $0 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_T$, with data $Y_{1:T} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_T)$ such that:

$$Y_t \mid \{X(s)\}_{s \geq 0}, Y_{1:t-1}, Y_{t+1:T} \sim f_t(Y_t \mid X(s_t)), \quad t \in \{1, \dots, T\}, \quad (2)$$

independently over $t = 1, \dots, T$, for a conditional probability density function (pdf) $f_t(\cdot \mid \cdot)$. We define $\mathcal{T} = \{1, \dots, T\}$ and $\Delta_t = s_t - s_{t-1}$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$. For convenience, we often write $X([u, v])$ for $\{X(s)\}_{s \in [u, v]}$, with $0 \leq u < v \leq s_T$. We will take under consideration the full range of particle-based algorithms related with SSMs developed in the literature, including ones that involve filtering, smoothing and parameter estimation (Chopin and Papaspiliopoulos, 2020). For instance, the filtering problem, expressed within the CD-SSM setting, considers inference about $X(s_t) \mid Y_{1:t}$, for each $t \geq 1$, via an online approach. The smoothing problem can be considered as either the offline problem of inferring the joint distribution $X([0, s_T]) \mid Y_{1:T}$, or as the online problem of inferring $X([0, s_t]) \mid Y_{1:t}$ for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$. We note here that the name ‘continuous-discrete SSM’ we use here resembles the terminology in Mider et al. (2021).

A standard Sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) algorithm (namely, a particle filter) is immediately available for the approximation of the smoothing distribution $X([0, s_T]) \mid Y_{1:T}$ whereby iteratively for $t \in \mathcal{T}$:

- (i) particles are sampled in-between observation instances s_{t-1}, s_t , according to some proposal dynamics $M(dX([s_{t-1}, s_t]) \mid X(s_{t-1}))$;
- (ii) sampled particles representing $X([s_{t-1}, s_t])$ are assigned un-normalised weights according to the potential:

$$\frac{dP(\cdot \mid X(s_{t-1}))}{dM(\cdot \mid X(s_{t-1}))}(X([s_{t-1}, s_t])) \cdot f_t(Y_t \mid X(s_t)); \quad (3)$$

- (iii) the weighted particles are resampled.

Here $P(\cdot|\cdot)$ is the probability law corresponding to the dynamics of the signal SDE (1). Improved SMC algorithms provably overcome path degeneracy characterising standard particle filters, by, e.g., updating the ancestors of obtained particles (Godsill et al., 2004; Lindsten et al., 2014). Separate particle-based algorithms are used in the setting when a parameter vector $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, $p \geq 1$, must also be inferred.

A number of challenges arise due to the continuous-time nature of the signal in the CD-SSM model class of interest in this work. The main ones are summarised below:

- (C.i) First, sampling from $X(s_t)|X(s_{t-1})$ is possible via approximate numerical schemes, immediately enabling the use of ‘blind’ proposals in a setting that ignores the continuous-time nature of the signal and only considers its values at the discrete-time observation instances. Non-trivial methods of superior performance do require access to the signal transition density. However, for CD-SSMs, the distribution $P(X(s_t) \in dx'|X(s_{t-1}) = x)$ is typically intractable. As already implied by the particle filter briefly described via steps (i)-(iii) in the previous paragraph, a solution to this problem is to augment the state space by considering the full continuous-time path of the SDE in-between observations. Notice that expression (3) does not require a (finite-time) transition density, and is analytically available via Girsanov’s theorem (Oksendal, 2013).
- (C.ii) Then, a number of particle-based methods developed for smoothing and parameter inference involve updating the ancestors of particles to overcome path degeneracy, e.g. the Forward-Filtering, Backward-Sampling (FFBS) algorithm of Godsill et al. (2004). However, owing to the continuous-time nature of the signal, the ancestor of path $X([s_{t-1}, s_t])$, $t \geq 2$, can only involve particles $X([s_{t-2}, s_{t-1}])$ for which:

$$\mathbf{end}(X([s_{t-2}, s_{t-1}])) \equiv \mathbf{start}(X([s_{t-1}, s_t])). \quad (4)$$

Thus, the overall method will be degenerate. From a probabilistic perspective, this issue arises because the dominating measure of the path-valued proposal for $X([s_{t-1}, s_t])$ depends intrinsically on $X(s_{t-1})$. For the algorithm to be allowed to select any ancestral particle $X([s_{t-2}, s_{t-1}])$, the path proposal for $X([s_{t-1}, s_t])$ – or, more precisely, of a transform of thereof – must have a density w.r.t. a reference measure that will not depend on the previous state via $X(s_{t-1})$. This is infeasible when working with $X([s_{t-1}, s_t])$, but can be made possible via careful transforms of the signal process. Indeed, such a reparameterisation gives rise to a new CD-SSM formulation, for which both target and proposals have densities w.r.t. the common reference measure $\text{Leb} \otimes \mathbb{W}_t$, with $\text{Leb}(\cdot)$ denoting the Lebesgue measure of dimension d and $\mathbb{W}_t[\cdot]$ the distribution of the standard

d_w -dimensional Wiener process (to be fully specified in the sequel). The construction has connections with the transforms of [Chib et al. \(2004\)](#); [Golightly and Wilkinson \(2008\)](#) used in the context of MCMC for SDE models.

(C.iii) The above two challenges are also present when one considers parameter inference for CD-SSMs via application of particle-based MCMC methods (e.g. particle MCMC, particle Gibbs ([Andrieu et al., 2010](#))). Advanced versions of particle Gibbs based on ancestral sampling improve mixing and have provably robust properties w.r.t. T , see e.g. [Godsill et al. \(2004\)](#); [Lindsten et al. \(2014\)](#). Implementation of such sampling approaches in the CD-SSM setting immediately connects with the challenge raised in point (ii) above. In addition, in the CD-SSM setting, the full conditional of $\theta|\{X(s)\}_{s \in [0, s_T]}$ will be a Dirac measure for components of θ appearing in the diffusion coefficient $\sigma(s, X(s))$. This is a standard concern for data augmentation Bayesian methods for discretely observed SDEs ([Roberts and Stramer, 2001](#)).

In this contribution we take under consideration the full spectrum of particle-based algorithms developed for standard SSMs, and produce a methodology that overcomes challenges (C.i)-(C.iii) summarised above, thus making such algorithms available for a large class of CD-SSMs. Our work achieves that by developing careful transformations of the signal and corresponding re-expressions of Feynman-Kac formulae for CD-SSMs.

We briefly summarise the main contributions of our work as follows.

- The developed Feynman-Kac formulae and their Monte-Carlo approximation lead to algorithms that bypass challenges (C.i)-(C.iii) for CD-SSMs. In brief, we present two path proposals (labelled ‘forward’ and ‘backward’) and corresponding transforms for CD-SSMs, and write down the deduced re-expressions of the Feynman-Kac models. Though seemingly closely connected, we illustrate that the produced forward method (FM) has subtle differences compared to the backward one (BM). In particular, FM allows the application of the developed methodology to the important class of hypo-elliptic SDEs.
- Related to the above, we obtain re-expressions of the Feynman-Kac formulae, appropriate for CD-SSMs. The full list of particle-based methods then becomes immediately available for CD-SSMs. The relevant proposals and weights can be seamlessly embedded within available probabilistic programming software. We show a number of numerical applications, including FFBS and particle Gibbs implementations.

We mention that instead of particle-based methods, standard MCMC algorithms have been successfully applied for the class of CD-SSMs as defined herein, see e.g. [Chib et al. \(2004\)](#);

Golightly and Wilkinson (2008) for some of the first developments. If the logarithm of the posterior of parameters and latent variable is differentiable, one can carry out inference for CD-SSMs with standard MCMC (not particle-based) via use of available probabilistic programming software, e.g. Stan (Carpenter et al., 2017). We stress that the signal SDEs (elliptic and hypo-elliptic) upon our methodology develops in this work are meant to serve as a blueprint for the treatment of more general continuous-time model classes, including ones with discontinuous paths, i.e. SDEs with jumps or discrete-valued pure jump-processes, when standard MCMC methods are either inappropriate (e.g., derivative-driven algorithms, including HMC used in Stan) or require complex model-specific development of proposals over ‘blocks’ of signal paths, see e.g. Johannes and Polson (2010) for the case of SDEs with jumps and the references therein. Indicatively, one of the authors has been involved in Yonekura and Beskos (2022), where indeed elliptic SDEs with jumps are considered, and a particle-based algorithm for online parameter inference is proposed. Though that work lacks the general scope of the present one, it does serve to illustrate the potential for the full machinery of particle-based methods to be made available for general continuous-time signals with discontinuities.

Another key advantage of particle-based methods is their scalability w.r.t. the time index T . Karjalainen et al. (2023) prove that a particle Gibbs method that makes use of FFBS to update the signal process allows for a number of particles that scales as $\mathcal{O}(1)$ w.r.t. T , and provides mixing time of $\mathcal{O}(\log T)$. Thus, the overall cost of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(T \log T)$ w.r.t. T (as $\mathcal{O}(T)$ is the computing cost per step), with the number of particles selected independently of T . The above contrast with reported results for standard MCMC, which point at ideal costs of $\mathcal{O}(T^2)$, $\mathcal{O}(T^{4/3})$ and $\mathcal{O}(T^{5/4})$ for RWM, MALA and HMC, respectively (Gelman et al., 1997; Roberts and Rosenthal, 1998; Beskos et al., 2013). Such robustness of particle-based algorithms is achieved precisely due to the fact that careful alteration of ancestors for particles within an FFBS (or similar) method overcomes the path degeneracy of standard particle filter. Our contribution in this work makes such ancestor alteration possible for the class CD-SSMs.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we recall the Feynman-Kac formulism of a SSM. In Section 3 we embed the CD-SSM within the Feynman-Kac framework, in its original form, before consideration of path transforms. In preparation of what follows, we describe forward and backward decompositions of SDE paths. In Section 4 we discuss forward/backward path proposals. In Section 5 we present the full methodology for CD-SSMs, by describing the two path transforms and the corresponding Monte-Carlo methods, FM and BM. We give concluding remarks and outline further research directions in Section 6.

2 Feynman-Kac Model

Given measurable spaces $(\mathbf{X}_t, \mathcal{X}_t)$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$, a Feynman-Kac model (Del Moral, 2004, 2013) can be defined through an initial law $M_1[dx_1]$, the Markov probability kernels $M_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$, $t \geq 2$, and the potential functions $G_1 : \mathbf{X}_1 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $G_t : \mathbf{X}_{t-1} \times \mathbf{X}_t \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $t \geq 2$. One then obtains, via a change of measure, the following probability law on $(\mathbf{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathbf{X}_t, \mathcal{X}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{X}_t)$:

$$\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_{1:t}] = \frac{1}{L_t} \left\{ G_1(x_1) \prod_{i=2}^t G_i(x_{i-1}, x_i) \right\} \times \mathbb{M}_t[dx_{1:t}], \quad t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (5)$$

where we have set:

$$\mathbb{M}_t[dx_{1:t}] = M_1[dx_1] \bigotimes_{i=2}^t M_i[x_{i-1}, dx_i],$$

and we have assumed that the normalising constant $L_t > 0$ is well-defined, that is:

$$L_t = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{M}_t} \left[G_1(X_1) \prod_{i=2}^t G_i(X_{i-1}, X_i) \right] < \infty.$$

It is of interest to approximate integrals w.r.t. the distribution $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_{1:t}]$. In particular, $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_{1:t}]$ corresponds to the *smoothing distribution* of a SSM at time $t \in \mathcal{T}$. We will also work with the *filtering distribution* of a SSM at $t \in \mathcal{T}$, i.e. the marginal of \mathbb{Q}_t at x_t , which we denote $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_t]$. We use the notation $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_{i:j}]$, $1 \leq i \leq j \leq t$, to refer to general marginal laws of $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_{1:t}]$.

Successive filtering laws $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_t]$ are related via the following recursion:

$$\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_{t-1:t}] = \text{const.} \times (\mathbb{Q}_{t-1}[dx_{t-1}] \otimes M_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]) \times G_t(x_{t-1}, x_t). \quad (6)$$

That is, starting from $\mathbb{Q}_{t-1}[dx_{t-1}]$, one obtains the one-step-ahead predictive distribution, and then applies a change of measure, to arrive at the next filtering law $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_t]$. Here, we make use of the convention $M_1[x_0, dx_1] \equiv M_1[dx_1]$ and $G_1(x_0, x_1) \equiv G_1(x_1)$. The same convention is also applied for other transition kernels, potentials and related quantities we use in the sequel. Recursion (6) is analytically intractable except for the case of finite state spaces, or when the Feynman-Kac model corresponds to a linear, Gaussian SSM (LG-SSM). The particle filter (Gordon et al., 1993) provides an effective Monte Carlo approximation of the recursion and, in particular, of the filtering laws $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

The Feynman-Kac distribution $\mathbb{Q}_T[dx_{1:T}]$ is a Markov measure, as it gives rise to the Markov chain $X_{1:T} \sim \mathbb{Q}_T[dx_{1:T}]$. Assume that (with some abuse of notation) $M_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t] = M_t(x_t|x_{t-1})\nu(dx_t)$, where $M_t(\cdot|\cdot)$ is a transition density and $\nu(dx_t)$ is a σ -finite dominating measure, common for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. FFBS (Godsill et al., 2004) is an offline smoothing algorithm, used in this work as representative of particle-based methods of improved efficiency due to

well-designed alterations in ancestors of particles during execution. Starting with a forward pass of the particle filter that delivers Monte Carlo approximations of the filtering laws $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$, FFBS then also carries out a backward pass to generate an approximate sample from the joint smoothing distribution $\mathbb{Q}_T[dx_{1:T}]$. In brief, given current sample $x_{t:T} \sim \mathbb{Q}_T[dx_{t:T}]$, $t \geq 2$, FFBS provides $x_{t-1}|x_{t:T} \sim \mathbb{Q}_T[dx_{t-1}|x_{t:T}]$ via, first, use of the formula:

$$\mathbb{Q}_T[dx_{t-1}|x_{t:T}] \propto M_t(x_t|x_{t-1}) G_t(x_{t-1}, x_t) \times \mathbb{Q}_{t-1}[dx_{t-1}].$$

Then, the filtering distribution $\mathbb{Q}_{t-1}[dx_{t-1}]$ is replaced by its Monte Carlo approximation provided during the forward pass, thus a proxy for $\mathbb{Q}_T[dx_{t-1}|x_{t:T}]$ is obtained by re-weighting the particles representing the filtering law $\mathbb{Q}_{t-1}[dx_{t-1}]$.

For concreteness, Algorithms 1, 2 provide pseudo-code for standard versions of the particle filter and FFBS, respectively. We provide the following explanations for the two pseudo-codes: $N \geq 1$ is the number of particles; operations over j are repeated independently for $j = 1, \dots, N$; operation $\text{Resample}(W^{1:N})$, with $W^j \geq 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^N W^j = 1$, applies multinomial (or some other type of) resampling; operation $\mathcal{M}(W^{1:N})$ samples an index in $1, \dots, N$ according to the probabilities $W^{1:N}$.

Algorithm 1: Particle Filter for Feynman-Kac model in (5).

Input: $M_1[dx_1]$, $M_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ and $G_1(x_1)$, $G_t(x_{t-1}, x_t)$, $t = 2, \dots, T$.

Output: Particles $X_{1:T}^{1:N}$, ancestors $A_{2:T}^{1:N}$, weights $W_{1:T}^{1:N}$.

- 1 Sample: $X_1^j \sim M_1[dx_1]$;
 - 2 Assign weights: $w_1^j \leftarrow G_1(X_1^j)$;
 - 3 Normalise weights: $W_1^j \leftarrow \frac{w_1^j}{\sum_{k=1}^N w_1^k}$;
 - 4 **for** $t = 2, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 5 Sample: $A_t^{1:N} \sim \text{Resample}(W_{t-1}^{1:N})$;
 - 6 Sample: $X_t^j \sim M_t[X_{t-1}^{A_t^j}, dx_t]$;
 - 7 Assign weights: $w_t^j \leftarrow G_t(X_{t-1}^{A_t^j}, X_t^j)$;
 - 8 Normalise weights: $W_t^j \leftarrow \frac{w_t^j}{\sum_{k=1}^N w_t^k}$;
 - 9 **end**
-

Algorithm 2: FFBS for Feynman-Kac model in (5).

Input: Full particle output, $X_{1:T}^{1:N}$, $A_{2:T}^{1:N}$, $W_{1:T}^{1:N}$, from Algorithm 1.

Output: Approximate sample $(X_1^{B_1}, \dots, X_T^{B_T})$ from $\mathbb{Q}_T[dx_{1:T}]$.

```

1 Sample:  $B_T \sim \mathcal{M}(W_T^{1:N})$ ;
2 for  $t = T, \dots, 2$  do
3   Assign weights:  $\hat{w}_{t-1}^j \leftarrow M_t(X_t^{B_t} | X_{t-1}^j) G_t(X_{t-1}^j, X_t^{B_t}) \cdot W_{t-1}^j$ ;
4   Normalise weights:  $\hat{W}_{t-1}^j \leftarrow \frac{\hat{w}_{t-1}^j}{\sum_{k=1}^N \hat{w}_{t-1}^k}$ ;
5   Sample:  $B_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{M}(\hat{W}_{t-1}^{1:N})$ ;
6 end

```

3 Continuous-Discrete SSM

3.1 Preliminaries

We return to the CD-SSM specified via (1)-(2). We introduce the path-valued random variables $V_t = \{V_t(s)\}_{s \in [0, \Delta_t]}$, via use of the time-shift $V_t(s) = X(s + s_{t-1})$. In addition, we consider the end point $E_t = V_t(\Delta_t) \equiv \text{end}(V_t)$. We define the full latent state at step $t \in \mathcal{T}$ as:

$$X_t := (V_t, E_t); \quad X_t \in \mathbf{X}_t := C([0, \Delta_t], \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (7)$$

We write realisations of X_t as $x_t = (v_t, e_t)$.

The random variables $(X_{1:T}, Y_{1:T})$ form a discrete-time SSM, with joint distribution:

$$P[X_{1:T} \in dx_{1:T}, Y_{1:T} \in dy_{1:T}] = \left[\bigotimes_{t=1}^T f_t(y_t | e_t) dy_{1:T} \right] \otimes \mathbb{P}_T[dx_{1:T}], \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbb{P}_T[dx_{1:T}]$ is the Markov measure on $\mathbf{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathbf{X}_T$ corresponding to the distribution of time-shifted segments of the latent SDE model in (1) on the time intervals $[0, \Delta_t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$. That is, we write:

$$\mathbb{P}_T[dx_{1:T}] = P_1[dx_1] \bigotimes_{t=2}^T P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t],$$

for accordingly defined kernels $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$, such that $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t] \equiv P_t[e_{t-1}, dx_t]$, since the distribution of X_t depends on X_{t-1} only through the end-point E_{t-1} . As done here, we will often replace argument $x_t = (v_t, e_t)$ with e_t in probability expressions when these only depend on e_t without further mention. From (8), we obtain the conditional law:

$$P[X_{1:T} \in dx_{1:T} | Y_{1:T} \in dy_{1:T}] = \frac{1}{f_T(y_{1:T})} \left[\prod_{t=1}^T f_t(y_t | e_t) \right] \times \mathbb{P}_T[dx_{1:T}], \quad (9)$$

with $f_T(\cdot)$ denoting the marginal pdf of $Y_{1:T}$.

A main contribution of the paper is to provide effective particle-based algorithms for the approximation of the target smoothing measure (9), and of related distributions arising when working with CD-SSMs (e.g. filtering distributions, posterior laws of static parameters). In particular, we aim to develop tailored Feynman-Kac models via careful transformations of the variates involved in (9), so that important challenges arising due to the continuous-time nature of the signal can be overcome – see challenges (C.i)-(C.iii) stated in the Introduction. Once we appropriately define the Feynman-Kac model, we will obtain access to the complete toolkit of state-of-the-art particle-based methods for carrying out statistical inference for SSMs.

3.2 Feynman-Kac Formulations

We begin by writing down the ‘forward decomposition’ for $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$:

$$\text{F-Decomposition:} \quad P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t] = P_t[e_{t-1}, dv_t] \otimes \delta_{\text{end}(v_t)}(de_t). \quad (10)$$

The kernel $P_t[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$ corresponds to the law of the time-shifted process $V_t = \{X_t(s)\}_{s \in [0, \Delta_t]}$. Note that $X_t(s)$ is an diffusion process with drift function $b_t(s, x) = b(s_{t-1} + s, x)$ and diffusion $\sigma_t(s, v) = \sigma(s_{t-1} + s, v)$. I.e., V_t is obtained as the solution of the following SDE on $[0, \Delta_t]$:

$$P_t[e_{t-1}, dv_t] : \quad dX_t(s) = b_t(s, X_t(s))ds + \sigma_t(s, X_t(s))dB(s), \quad X_t(0) = e_{t-1}. \quad (11)$$

Expression (10) involves the distribution of the path V_t given the starting point E_{t-1} , along with that of the ending point E_t , the latter being fully determined by V_t in the construction shown so far.

An alternative ‘backward decomposition’ of $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ can be constructed by instead considering first the distribution of the ending point E_t given the starting point E_{t-1} and then the distribution of $V_t|E_{t-1}, E_t$, that latter variate being a *diffusion bridge* conditioned to start at E_{t-1} and end at E_t . In a probabilistic language, this second construction provides the following expression for $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B-Decomposition:} \quad P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t] &= P_t[e_{t-1}, de_t] \otimes P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] \\ &= (p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})de_t) \otimes P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here, $p_t(\cdot|e_{t-1})$ is the (typically intractable) pdf of $X_t(\Delta_t)|X_t(0) = e_{t-1}$ and $P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ is the law of the bridge of the signal SDE (1) between times s_{t-1} and s_t , pinned at the starting point e_{t-1} and the ending point e_t . Under regularity conditions, such a bridge is known to correspond to the path-valued process defined as the solution of the SDE:

$$P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] : \quad dX_t(s) = b_t(s, X_t(s); e_t)ds + \sigma_t(s, X_t(s))dB_s, \quad X_t(0) = e_{t-1}, \quad (13)$$

for the following drift function (∇_x denotes the vector of partial derivatives w.r.t. argument x):

$$b_t(s, x; e_t) = b_t(s, x) + \sigma_t(s, x)\sigma_t^\top(s, x)\nabla_x \log(p_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x)), \quad (14)$$

where we have made use of the following function related with the SDE transition density:

$$p_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x) = P[X_t(\Delta_t) \in de_t | X_t(s) = x] / \text{Leb}(de_t), \quad (s, x) \in [0, \Delta_t] \times \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (15)$$

The bridge SDE determined via (13)-(14) can be obtained via use of Doob's h -transform, see e.g. [Mider et al. \(2021\)](#) for a recent exposition.

3.3 Bootstap Particle Filter

Given the above sequence $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$, the targeted conditional law (9) of the CD-SSM has been written in the form of the Feynman-Kac formula (5), with Markov kernels $M_t \equiv P_t$ and weights given by $G_t(x_{t-1}, x_t) \equiv f_t(y_t|e_t)$. For such a specification, the probability law $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_{1:t}]$ in (5) coincides with the conditional distribution of $X_{1:t}|Y_{1:t}$, as given in (9) for $t = T$.

We stress that, as discussed in the Introduction, the above construction can provide a non-degenerate particle filter that targets our CD-SSM via execution of Algorithm 1. However, attempts to use this construct within FFBS in Algorithm 2, and related smoothing-based algorithms, will lead to a degenerate methodology. Even in the context of a particle filter, greater flexibility is desirable and can be made possible with the selection of 'guided' proposal kernels. We present such a guided formalism in the next section, where we target the conditional distribution $X_{1:t}|Y_{1:t}$, by making use of proposal kernels that are non-blind to the data.

4 Guided Feynman-Kac Formulae for CD-SSMs

For a 'guided' Feynman-Kac formalism of a SSM (see e.g. [Chopin and Papaspiliopoulos \(2020\)](#)) we can assume the selection of a Markov measure $\mathbb{M}_T[dx_{1:T}]$ in our Feynman-Kac formulation that does not coincide with the prior dynamics of the latent signal, $\mathbb{P}_T[dx_{1:T}]$. That is, the Feynman-Kac expression will now involve the following weights:

$$G_t(x_{t-1}, x_t) = \frac{dP_t[x_{t-1}, \cdot]}{dM_t[x_{t-1}, \cdot]}(x_t) \times f_t(y_t|x(s_t)). \quad (16)$$

Given that absolute continuity $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t] \ll M_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ holds, the weights in (16) will be well-defined.

We outline two different approaches for the selection of guided proposals that take the data point y_t into account. We will refer to our first construct as the 'forward proposal', as it can be thought as building upon the forward decomposition (10) of $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$. We call the second

the ‘backward proposal’, as it is based on the corresponding backward decomposition (12). Though seemingly similar, it will turn out that these two constructs have subtle differences. In particular, the backward proposal will allow for the derivation of a Feynman-Kac formula (and access to all accompanying particle-based algorithms) in the case of hypo-elliptic SDEs, when the diffusion coefficient is degenerate. That is not possible for the forward construct. The forward construct resembles several standard approaches followed in the literature in the context of MCMC algorithms and particle filters. The backward construct has not appeared before in the literature, to the best of our knowledge.

Remark 1. *In the context of the forward proposal, and the forward method (FM) that we will later on obtain via use of such a proposal, we will henceforth be assuming that $d_w \equiv d$, and that $\sigma_t(s, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is invertible for all $(s, x) \in [0, \Delta_t] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. That is, FM will only be applicable to elliptic SDEs. In contrast, we allow full generality, with $d_w \leq d$ in the setting of the backward proposal, and the backward method (BM), so that BM will also cover the important class of hypo-elliptic SDEs.*

4.1 Forward Proposal

4.1.1 Construction of Forward Proposal

We define the forward proposal $M_t^\rightarrow[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ as follows:

$$\text{F-Proposal:} \quad M_t^\rightarrow[x_{t-1}, dx_t] = M_t^\rightarrow[e_{t-1}, dv_t] \otimes \delta_{\text{end}(v_t)}(de_t), \quad (17)$$

where we assume that $P_t[e_{t-1}, dv_t] \ll M_t^\rightarrow[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$. The proposal kernel $M_t^\rightarrow[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$ corresponds to the solution of an SDE with the same diffusion coefficient as the target $P_t[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$ in (11), and a drift function given as $b_t^\rightarrow(\cdot, \cdot; y_t) : [0, \Delta_t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. In particular, the drift function of the proposal SDE aims to take into account information from the observation y_t . We thus define the proposal SDE and its corresponding law as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_t^\rightarrow[e_{t-1}, dv_t] : \quad dX_t(s) &= b_t^\rightarrow(s, X_t(s); y_t)ds + \sigma_t(s, X_t(s))dB(s), \\ X_t(0) &= e_{t-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

We set $\Sigma_t = \sigma_t \sigma_t^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Recall that we assume that $\Sigma_t = \Sigma_t(s, x)$ is invertible for all $(s, x) \in [0, \Delta_t] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Girsanov’s theorem (Oksendal, 2013) states that, under regularity conditions, we

have the following Radon-Nikodym derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{dP_t[e_{t-1}, \cdot]}{dM_t^\rightarrow[e_{t-1}, \cdot]}(v_t) \\ &= \exp \left[\int_0^{\Delta_t} \{(b_t - b_t^\rightarrow)^\top \Sigma_t^{-1}\}(s, v_t(s); y_t) dv_t(s) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Delta_t} \{(b_t - b_t^\rightarrow)^\top \Sigma_t^{-1} (b_t + b_t^\rightarrow)\}(s, v_t(s); y_t) ds \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In brief, sufficient regularity conditions involve global Lipschitz continuity and linear or slower growth for the drifts and diffusion coefficient, together with Novikov's condition (Oksendal, 2013). The likelihood (19) can be evaluated up-to time-discretisation.

Upon choosing a tractable drift function $b_t^\rightarrow(s, x; y_t)$, one can sample from $M_t^\rightarrow[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$. The corresponding potential $G_t^\rightarrow(x_{t-1}, x_t)$ of the generated Feynmac-Kac model writes as:

$$\text{F-Weight:} \quad G_t^\rightarrow(x_{t-1}, x_t) = \frac{dP_t[x_{t-1}, \cdot]}{dM_t^\rightarrow[x_{t-1}, \cdot]}(x_t) \times f_t(y_t|x(s_t)), \quad (20)$$

where the involved Radon-Nikodym derivative is the one given in (19).

Remark 2. *The proposal $M_t^\rightarrow[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ is defined via the forward decomposition (17), in agreement with a similar expression for the signal kernel $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ in (10). Notice though that $M_t^\rightarrow[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ also admits a backward-type decomposition, as one can write:*

$$M_t^\rightarrow[x_{t-1}, dx_t] = M_t^\rightarrow[e_{t-1}, dx_t] = (m_t^\rightarrow(e_t|e_{t-1})de_t) \otimes M_t^\rightarrow[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]. \quad (21)$$

In (21), $m_t^\rightarrow(\cdot|\cdot)$ is the, typically intractable, transition density from time 0 to Δ_t of the proposal SDE (18), and $M_t^\rightarrow[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ is the distribution of the bridge of SDE (18). Expression (21) will be relevant when presenting the complete Forward Method (FM) in the sequel.

4.1.2 Choice of Forward Proposals

We give some guidance over the choice of the drift function $b_t^\rightarrow(s, x; y_t)$ in the proposal SDE (18) that takes the observation y_t into account. Sottinen and Särkkä (2008) develop proposal SDEs for the case of state-independent diffusion coefficient by using expressions from a continuous-discrete extended Kalman Filter to form the drift function. Alternative proposal SDEs can be obtained by adapting ideas for diffusion bridges (in settings of observations without noise) to the case of noisy observations (Delyon and Hu, 2006; Llopis et al., 2018).

We present in more detail approaches based on the 'optimal' proposal SDE and its approximation, following the recent developments in Schauer et al. (2017); Mider et al. (2021) – the relevant methodology provides a flexible framework that provides proposal SDEs for a

broad class of diffusion models. The optimal proposal minimises the variance of the incremental weights (Doucet et al., 2000) and is obtained by conditioning the signal dynamics on the observation y_t . That is:

$$M_t^{\rightarrow, \text{opt}}[e_{t-1}, dv_t] \propto P_t[e_{t-1}, dv_t] \times f_t(y_t|e_t).$$

Under conditions, the distribution $M_t^{\rightarrow, \text{opt}}[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$ coincides with the law of an SDE with the following drift function (see Mider et al. (2021) for a proof):

$$b_t^{\rightarrow, \text{opt}}(s, x; y_t) = b_t(s, x) + \Sigma_t(s, x) \nabla_x (\log \rho_{\Delta_t, y_t}(s, x)), \quad (22)$$

where we make use of the density function:

$$\rho_{\Delta_t, y_t}(s, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_t(y_t|x') p_{\Delta_t, x'}(s, x) dx', \quad (s, x) \in [0, \Delta_t] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (23)$$

for $p_{\Delta_t, x'}(s, x)$ as defined in (15).

The expression for ρ_{Δ_t, y_t} is typically intractable, as it involves an integral w.r.t. the transition density of the signal SDE. Following the approach of Mider et al. (2021), a reasonable choice can be obtained by replacing $\rho_{\Delta_t, y_t}(s, x)$ in (22) with an appropriate proxy $\tilde{\rho}_{\Delta_t, y_t}(s, x)$. Thus, one makes use of the following drift function:

$$b_t^{\rightarrow}(s, x; y_t) = b_t(s, x) + \Sigma_t(s, x) \nabla_x (\log \tilde{\rho}_{\Delta_t, y_t}(s, x)). \quad (24)$$

Function $\tilde{\rho}_{\Delta_t, y_t}$ can be obtained by replacing $p_{\Delta_t, x'}(s, x)$ in the integral (23) with a corresponding proxy $\tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, x'}(s, x)$. If $x' \mapsto \tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, x'}(s, x)$ is Gaussian and the observation operator for y_t is linear (the latter being a very common case in applications), then the integral (23) is tractable. In Mider et al. (2021), $\tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, x'}(s, x)$ is chosen via use of the transition density of a member within a class of linear SDEs.

Remark 3. Consider the following linear SDE:

$$d\tilde{X}_t(s) = \{\tilde{b}_0(s) + \tilde{b}_1(s)\tilde{X}_t(s)\}ds + \tilde{\sigma}(s)dB(s), \quad (25)$$

for $\tilde{b}_0 : [0, \Delta_t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\tilde{b}_1 : [0, \Delta_t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\tilde{\sigma} : [0, \Delta_t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_w}$, with $d_w \leq d$. Such a linear SDE has an analytical solution that writes as follows, for $s \in [0, \Delta_t]$ and $\tilde{X}_t(s) = x \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\tilde{X}_t(\Delta_t) = \Phi(\Delta_t, s)x + \int_s^{\Delta_t} \Phi(\Delta_t, \tau)\tilde{b}_0(\tau) d\tau + \int_s^{\Delta_t} \Phi(\Delta_t, \tau)\tilde{\sigma}(\tau) dB(\tau),$$

where, for $s \in [0, \Delta_t]$, we set $\Phi(s, u) = \Phi(s)\Phi(u)^{-1}$, with $\Phi(\cdot)$ obtained from the solution of the ODE specified as $d\Phi(t) = \tilde{b}_1(t)\Phi(t)dt$, $\Phi(0) = \text{I}_d$. Thus, the conditional law of $\tilde{X}_t(\Delta_t)|\tilde{X}_t(s) = x$ corresponds to a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu(x), \text{V})$, with:

$$\mu(x) = \Phi(\Delta_t, s)x + \int_s^{\Delta_t} \Phi(\Delta_t, \tau)\tilde{b}_0(\tau) d\tau; \quad \text{V} = \int_s^{\Delta_t} \Phi(\Delta_t, \tau)(\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\sigma}^\top)(\tau)\Phi(\Delta_t, \tau)^\top d\tau.$$

One aims to choose $\tilde{b}_0(s)$, $\tilde{b}_1(s)$, and $\tilde{\sigma}(s)$ so that the linear SDE (25) approximates the dynamics $P_t[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$ of the signal SDE. A strategy for specifying (25) can involve linearisation of the drift of the signal SDE (11), or the following simpler approaches (Mider et al., 2021):

$$\tilde{b}_0(s) = b_t(0, e_{t-1}), \tilde{b}_1(s) = 0, \tilde{\sigma}(s) = \sigma_t(0, e_{t-1}); \quad \tilde{b}_0(s) = 0, \tilde{b}_1(s) = 0, \tilde{\sigma}(s) = \mathbb{I}_d.$$

4.2 Backward Proposal

4.2.1 Construction of Backward Proposal

Recall that we now allow for $d_w \leq d$, as we cover both the elliptic and hypo-elliptic case for the signal SDE in (1).

In this direction, we define the backward proposal $M_t^{\leftarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ as follows:

$$\text{B-Proposal:} \quad M_t^{\leftarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t] = (m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})de_t) \otimes M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]. \quad (26)$$

The density $m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$ is user-specified, under the requirements that one can evaluate it and sample from it. Then, $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ is a proposal for the target bridge law $P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ in (13) connecting e_{t-1} and e_t , chosen so that $P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] \ll M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$. In such a case, the potential $G_t^{\leftarrow}(x_{t-1}, x_t)$ for the induced Feynman-Kac model is expressed in the form of the following product:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B-Weight:} \quad G_t^{\leftarrow}(x_{t-1}, x_t) &= \frac{dP_t[e_{t-1}, \cdot]}{dM_t^{\leftarrow}[e_{t-1}, \cdot]}(v_t) \\ &= \frac{p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})}{m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})} \times \frac{dP_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{dM_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(v_t) \times f_t(y_t|e_t). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

4.2.2 Choice of Backward Proposals

We provide some details on the specification of the backward proposal so that y_t is taken into account.

Choice of $m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$ – Elliptic and Hypo-Elliptic Case:

The optimal proposal (Doucet et al., 2000), as also discussed in the forward setting of Section 4.1, denoted here as $m_t^{\leftarrow, \text{opt}}$, is obtained from the true conditional distribution of (e_t, v_t) given e_{t-1} and y_t . Thus, in the current backward setting, we can write that:

$$M_t^{\leftarrow, \text{opt}}[e_{t-1}, dx_t] = (m_t^{\leftarrow, \text{opt}}(e_t|e_{t-1})de_t) \otimes P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t], \quad (28)$$

where the optimal proposal for the end point e_t , is given by:

$$m_t^{\leftarrow, \text{opt}}(e_t|e_{t-1}) \propto f_t(y_t|e_t)p_t(e_t|e_{t-1}). \quad (29)$$

The expression for $m_t^{\leftarrow, \text{opt}}$ involves the typically intractable transition density of the SDE model for the latent signal. From this point onwards, one can follow an approach similar to the one set out within Section 4.1, where the true transition density needed within the drift of the optimal SDE proposal is replaced by a tractable proxy. Thus, in the current setting, to obtain an alternative to $m_t^{\leftarrow, \text{opt}}(e_t|e_{t-1})$ in (29), one can replace $p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})$ with a proxy, $\tilde{p}_t(e_t|e_{t-1})$, so that:

$$m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1}) \propto f_t(y_t|e_t)\tilde{p}_t(e_t|e_{t-1}). \quad (30)$$

In the scenario when $e_t \mapsto \tilde{p}_t(e_t|e_{t-1})$ in a Gaussian pdf and the observation operator providing y_t is linear in e_t , then one obtains a Gaussian density for $m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$.

Proceeding as in the discussion for the forward proposal in Section 4.1, one can construct proxies $\tilde{p}_t(e_t|e_{t-1})$ that are Gaussian conditionally on e_{t-1} , by utilising the transition density of the linear SDE (25). We consider here in detail SDE (25) as specified by a linearisation of the drift $b_t(s, x; y_t)$ of the signal SDE (11), as its transition density will be non-degenerate even for hypo-elliptic SDEs. That is, applying a first-order Taylor expansion around e_{t-1} upon the x -component of the drift function $b_t(s, x)$, one obtains the following linear proxy of the true drift:

$$b_t(0, e_{t-1}) + (D_x b_t)(0, e_{t-1})(x - e_{t-1}),$$

where $(D_x b_t)(s, x') \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with $(D_x b_t)(s, x')_{i,j} = (\partial_{x_j} b_t^i)(s, x')$, $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Thus, in the notation of (25), we have:

$$\tilde{b}_0(s) = b_t(0, e_{t-1}) - (D_x b_t)(0, e_{t-1})e_{t-1}; \quad \tilde{b}_1(s) = (D_x b_t)(0, e_{t-1})x; \quad \tilde{\sigma}(s) = \sigma_t(0, e_{t-1}).$$

The transition density $\tilde{p}_t(e_t|e_{t-1})$ can now be obtained via the formulae in Remark 3. In combination with a linear observation operator, standard calculations will yield a Gaussian density for $m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$ in (30). We note that simpler choices for $\tilde{p}_t(e_t|e_{t-1})$ can also be considered. These can range from a standard Euler scheme in the elliptic case, to schemes tailored to particular classes of hypo-elliptic SDEs, see for example Pokern et al. (2009); Ditlevsen and Samson (2019).

Choice of $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$:

We now proceed to the choice of the proposal $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ for the bridge. Recall that the true diffusion bridge is given by (13)-(14), with a drift that involves the intractable transition density of the signal SDE. A general expression for a proposal bridge SDE can be follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] : \quad & dX_t(s) = b_t^{\leftarrow, br}(s, X_t(s); e_t)ds + \sigma_t(s, X_t(s))dB(s), \\ & X_t(0) = e_{t-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The drift $b_t^{\leftarrow, br}(s, x; e_t)$ appearing above must have a particular structure, as it must force paths to terminate at point e_t at time Δ_t , while preserving absolute continuity w.r.t. the law of the bridge of the latent SDE (1) in the CD-SSM. The works in [Delyon and Hu \(2006\)](#); [Schauer et al. \(2017\)](#); [Bierkens et al. \(2020\)](#) provide detailed analytical studies into the theme of diffusion bridges. The latter of these ([Bierkens et al., 2020](#)) covers both elliptic and hypoelliptic SDEs. We briefly summarise some standard choices for SDE bridges that one can sample from, and for which analytical expressions of Radon-Nikodym derivatives w.r.t. target SDE bridges have been obtained. We stress that further options can be directly integrated within the framework of our methodology.

Choice of $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ – Elliptic Case, [Delyon and Hu \(2006\)](#):

In the context of elliptic SDEs, with $d_w = d$ and $\sigma_t(s, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ assumed positive-definite, a simple choice used in the literature is the Delyon-Hu bridge ([Delyon and Hu, 2006](#)), when:

$$b_t^{\leftarrow, br}(s, x; e_t) = \frac{e_t - x}{\Delta_t - s},$$

in which case the bridge SDE (31) writes as follows:

$$M_t^{\leftarrow, \text{DH}}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] : \quad dX_t(s) = \frac{e_t - X_t(s)}{\Delta_t - s} ds + \sigma_t(s, X_t(s)) dB(s), \quad X_t(0) = e_{t-1}. \quad (32)$$

Under regularity conditions, [Delyon and Hu \(2006\)](#) obtain the following Radon-Nikodym derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{dP_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{dM_t^{\leftarrow, \text{DH}}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(v_t) \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{N}(e_t; e_{t-1}, \Sigma_t(0, e_{t-1}))}{p_t(e_t | e_{t-1})} \sqrt{\frac{\det(\Sigma_t(0, e_{t-1}))}{\det(\Sigma_t(\Delta_t, e_t))}} \times \exp \{ \phi_t(v_t) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where we have defined the following functional:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t(v_t) &= \int_0^{\Delta_t} (b_t^\top \Sigma_t^{-1})(s, v_t(s)) dv_t(s) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Delta_t} (b_t^\top \Sigma_t^{-1} b_t)(s, v_t(s)) ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Delta_t} \frac{e_t - v_t(s)}{\Delta_t - s} \diamond d\{ \Sigma_t^{-1}(s, v_t(s))(e_t - v_t(s)) \}. \end{aligned}$$

In brief, the integral with ‘ \diamond ’ is defined by taking sums on sub-intervals that partition $[0, \Delta_t]$ and replacing the integrand in each summand with its right-side value, before taking the limit for vanishing length of the sub-intervals (when Itô integrals use left-side values). We note that the normalising constant in the above Radon-Nikodym derivative is omitted in [Delyon and Hu \(2006\)](#), but can be obtained via use of Bayes’ theorem, see e.g. ([van der Meulen and](#)

Schauer, 2017, Section 4.1). Use of (33) within (27) provides an analytical expression of the potential $G_t^{\leftarrow}(x_{t-1}, x_t)$ for the induced Feynman-Kac model. The intractable transition density $p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})$ appearing in (27) will cancel out when obtaining $G_t^{\leftarrow}(x_{t-1}, x_t)$ as it also appears as a denominator in the density expression for the diffusion bridges in (33). All remaining terms in the formula for $G_t(x_{t-1}, x_t)$ can be analytically evaluated, up-to time-discretisation. Note that the above choice of proposal bridge does not take into account the drift of the signal SDE.

Choice of $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ – Elliptic Case, Schauer et al. (2017):

Schauer et al. (2017) develop a class of ‘guided proposals’ for diffusion bridges, in the setting of elliptic SDEs, that are of the following form:

$$M_t^{\leftarrow, G}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] : \quad \begin{aligned} dX_t(s) &= b_t^G(s, X_t(s); e_t)ds + \sigma_t(s, X_t(s))dB(s), \\ X_t(0) &= e_{t-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where we have defined:

$$b_t^G(s, x; e_t) = b_t(s, x) + \Sigma_t(s, x)\nabla_x \log(\tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x)), \quad (35)$$

for a transition density $\tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x)$, used as a proxy to the true $p_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x)$. In Schauer et al. (2017), $\tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x)$ is chosen to correspond to the transitions of a linear SDE as given in (25), with constituent functions $\tilde{b}_0(s)$, $\tilde{b}_1(s)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(s)$, and corresponding mean $\mu(x)$, variance V and matrix $\Phi(\Delta_s, s)$, involved in expression of the Gaussian transition density of the linear SDE, as specified in Remark 3. We define:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Sigma}(s) &= \tilde{\sigma}(s)\tilde{\sigma}(s)^\top; \\ \tilde{r}(s, x) &= \nabla_x \log \tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x) \equiv \Phi(\Delta_t, s)^\top V^{-1}(e_t - \mu(x)); \\ \tilde{H}(s) &= -(\nabla_x \nabla_x^\top) \log \tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x) \equiv \Phi(\Delta_t, s)^\top V^{-1}\Phi(\Delta_t, s). \end{aligned}$$

Schauer et al. (2017) show that, under the main ‘matching’ requirement that:

$$\tilde{\Sigma}(\Delta_t) \equiv \Sigma_t(\Delta_t, e_t), \quad (36)$$

and given that additional regularity conditions are satisfied, then the law for the class of SDEs defined in (34)-(35), with $\tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x)$ obtained via the linear SDE (25), dominates the law of the diffusion bridge $P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$, with a Radon-Nikodym derivative:

$$\frac{dP_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{dM_t^{\leftarrow, G}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(v_t) = \frac{p_t^G(e_t|e_{t-1})}{p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})} \exp \left\{ \int_0^{\Delta_t} \phi(s, v_t(s))ds \right\}, \quad (37)$$

with $p_t^G(de_t|e_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(e_t - \mu, \Delta_t I_d)$, where we have defined the function:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(s, x) &= (b_t(s, x) - \tilde{b}(s, x))^\top \tilde{r}(s, x) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \text{trace} \left((\Sigma_t(s, x) - \tilde{\Sigma}(s)) (\tilde{H}(s) - \tilde{r}(s, x)\tilde{r}(s, x)^\top) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Specific choices of $\tilde{b}_0(s)$, $\tilde{b}_1(s)$, and $\tilde{\sigma}(s)$ are discussed in [van der Meulen and Schauer \(2017\)](#). E.g., a simple linear SDE satisfying the matching condition (36) is deduced when:

$$d\tilde{X}_t(s) = \sigma_t(\Delta_t, e_t)dB(s), \quad \tilde{X}_t(0) = e_{t-1},$$

which yields the transition density $p_t^G(e_t|e_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(e_t; e_{t-1}, \Delta_t \Sigma_t(\Delta_t, e_t))$ to be used in (37). Note, that the drift of the guided proposal in this case writes as:

$$b_t^G(s, x; e_t) = b_t(s, x) + \Sigma_t(s, x) \Sigma_t(\Delta_t, e_t)^{-1} \frac{e_t - x}{\Delta_t - s}.$$

Choice of $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ – Hypo-Elliptic Case, [Bierkens et al. \(2020\)](#):

The methodology developed in [Bierkens et al. \(2020\)](#) follows along the lines of the elliptic case. That is, a guided proposal is constructed as in (34)-(35), with a proxy $\tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x)$ of the true transition density $p_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x)$ used within the drift function. The tractable density $\tilde{p}_{\Delta_t, e_t}(s, x)$ derives from the dynamics of the linear SDE (25), however in the hypo-elliptic setting extra care is required on the specification of the drift $\tilde{b}_0(s) + \tilde{b}_1(s)x$ to yield absolute continuity between the constructed proposal and the bridge of the signal SDE. ‘Matching’ restrictions must now be placed both upon $\tilde{\sigma}(s)$ and the linear drift $\tilde{b}_0(s) + \tilde{b}_1(s)x$. Under conditions (some of which we briefly discuss below) one has absolute continuity between target and proposal bridge, with a density given as in (37), with terms as defined therein. Note, the Radon-Nikodym derivative (37) is well-defined for coefficient matrices $\sigma_t(s, x), \tilde{\sigma}(s) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_w}$, $d_w \leq d$, even if these are non-rectangular.

5 Reparameterised Feynman-Kac Formulae

Assume now that we have chosen a kernel $M_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ within the guided Feynman-Kac formula framework, either by using a forward proposal $M_t^{\rightarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ or a backward one $M_t^{\leftarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ as in (17) or (26), respectively. The corresponding potentials are then given by $G_t^{\rightarrow}(x_{t-1}, x_t)$ in (20) or $G_t^{\leftarrow}(x_{t-1}, x_t)$ in (27), so that the induced Feynman-Kac model delivers the conditional distributions of the signal $X_{1:t}|Y_{1:t}$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$, for the CD-SSM of interest. One can immediately apply particle-based methods to approximate the filtering distributions, using e.g. the standard version of a particle filter as described in Algorithm 1. In contrast, and as already explained in the Introduction, due to the continuous-time nature of the signal, the derivations so far provided will lead to degenerate particle-based smoothing and parameter inference methods, as will be the case for FFBS described in Algorithm 2. We repeat here that in a probabilistic language this matter relates directly with the fact that the proposal kernel $M_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$, as

defined so far, does not have a density w.r.t. a common reference measure that will not depend on the starting point e_{t-1} . The critical practical consequence of such a property is that the ancestor x_{t-1} of a particle x_t cannot be altered within any of the many algorithms that involve a smoothing approximation procedure.

To overcome the above issue, we now construct new Feynman-Kac formulae, via a transform of the models we have so far defined. That is, we carefully set-up new proposal kernels $\bar{M}_t[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ and potentials $\bar{G}_t(z_{t-1}, z_t)$, on corresponding measurable spaces $(\mathbf{Z}_t, \mathcal{Z}_t)$, so that we overcome challenges (C.i)-(C.iii) for CD-SSMs stated in the Introduction. Such constructions will lead to a new sequence of target distributions $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_t[dz_{1:t}]$ on $(\mathbf{Z}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbf{Z}_t, \mathcal{Z}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Z}_t)$, through the standard Feynman-Kac expression:

$$\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_t[dz_{1:t}] = \frac{1}{\bar{L}_t} \left\{ \bar{G}_1(z_1) \prod_{i=2}^t \bar{G}_i(z_{i-1}, z_i) \right\} \times \bar{\mathbb{M}}_t[dz_{1:t}], \quad t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (38)$$

We will sometimes refer to the Feynman-Kac model given by (38) as the ‘transformed Feynman-Kac formula/model’ of a CD-SSM. The key elements of this construction (yet to be defined) are summarised as follows:

- i. We can sample from the kernels $\bar{M}_t[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$, up-to time-discretisation.
- ii. The kernels $\bar{M}_t[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ have a tractable density w.r.t. a common reference measure that does not depend on the ancestor z_{t-1} . The densities can be evaluated, up-to time-discretisation.
- iii. The potentials $\bar{G}_t(z_{t-1}, z_t)$ can be evaluated, up-to time-discretisation.
- iv. The transform is obtained via maps $\mathbf{Z}_t \mapsto \mathbf{X}_t$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$. The image of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_t[dz_{1:t}]$ under such maps gives back $\mathbb{Q}_t[dx_{1:t}]$ from the original Feynman-Kac model.

Given such a transformed Feynman-Kac model, one will be able to implement the full spectrum of particle-based inference methods for the class of CD-SSMs.

We now provide the details for the construction of the transformed model (38). Following the development of the forward and backward proposals in Section 4, we will also present two different definitions for $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_t[dz_{1:t}]$. We refer to the first as the ‘forward transform’, as it is applicable to the case when the original Feynman-Kac model builds upon forward proposals, as described in Section 4.1. This reparameterisation affords high flexibility in the choice of corresponding proposals, but will only be applicable when the diffusion coefficient $\sigma_t(s, x)$ is invertible. We refer to the second construct as the ‘backward transform’, as it is applicable to for the Feynman-Kac models that make use of the backward proposals in Section 4.2. This

direction does not require invertibility of $\sigma_t(s, x)$ and will be applicable to a broader class of signal SDEs for the CD-SSM, including hypoelliptic SDEs.

5.1 Defining \bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow} : Forward Transform

We consider the setting of the forward proposal $M_t^{\rightarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ in Section 4.1. Recall from (17) that this kernel derives from the law of the proposal SDE in (18), extended with the end point. We will define a new kernel $\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$, obtained from the forward proposal $M_t^{\rightarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ via use of an invertible map, the latter defined via an auxiliary bridge SDE.

The construction of this map will relate with the backwards decomposition of $M_t^{\rightarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ discussed in Remark 2 and expressed in (21) in terms of the transition density $m_t^{\rightarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$ for the ending point and a connecting SDE bridge $M_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$. Indeed, we define an auxiliary bridge SDE with distribution $R_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ that dominates the law of the bridge of the forward proposal, that is, $M_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] \ll R_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$. The auxiliary bridge SDE writes as follows:

$$R_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] : \quad dX_t(s) = a_t^{br}(s, X_t(s); y_t) + \sigma_t(s, X_t(s))dB(s), \quad X_t(0) = e_{t-1}, \quad (39)$$

for a drift function $a_t^{br}(\cdot, \cdot; y_t) : [0, \Delta_t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. This drift must be such so that the solution of (39) is forced to hit the ending point e_t . Following the earlier discussion about the Delyon-Hu bridge, a simple choice of drift is the following:

$$a_t^{br, DH}(s, x; y_t) = \frac{e_t - x}{\Delta_t - s}. \quad (40)$$

We denote the corresponding bridge distribution for this choice as $R_t^{DH}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$.

Remark 4. *The bridge SDE law $R_t^{DH}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ coincides with $M_t^{\leftarrow, DH}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ defined in the context of setting up a backward proposal in Section 4.2. We note though that this bridge SDE will now take up a very different role compared to the one in Section 4.2. That is, here bridge SDE (39) will provide the means for a transform of paths of the proposal SDE (18). In contrast, in Section 4.2, $M_t^{\leftarrow, DH}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ formed part of the proposal.*

Following Delyon and Hu (2006), we obtain a density function which is as the one in (33), with the difference that we now work with the bridge $M_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ of the proposal SDE (18) rather than the bridge of the signal SDE, $P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$. That is, under the drift choice (40), and regularity conditions, we have:

$$\frac{dM_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{dR_t^{DH}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(v_t) = \frac{\mathcal{N}(e_t; e_{t-1}, \Sigma_t(0, e_{t-1}))}{m_t^{\rightarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})} \sqrt{\frac{\det(\Sigma_t(0, e_{t-1}))}{\det(\Sigma_t(\Delta_t, e_t))}} \times \exp\{\phi_t(v_t)\}, \quad (41)$$

for the functional:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_t(v_t) &= \int_0^{\Delta_t} ((b_t^{\rightarrow})^\top \Sigma_t^{-1})(s, v_t(s)) dv_t(s) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Delta_t} ((b_t^{\rightarrow})^\top \Sigma_t^{-1} b_t^{\rightarrow})(s, v_t(s)) ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Delta_t} \frac{e_t - v_t(s)}{\Delta_t - s} \diamond d\{\Sigma_t^{-1}(s, v_t(s))(e_t - v_t(s))\}.\end{aligned}$$

It is now important to consider the auxiliary bridge SDE (39) as the means for obtaining a map $\mathfrak{F}_t(\cdot; e_{t-1}, e_t) : \mathbf{U}_t \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_t(e_t)$ from the driving noise $B_t = \{B(s)\}_{s \in [0, \Delta_t]}$ to the solution $X_t = \{X_t(s)\}_{s \in [0, \Delta_t]}$ of (39), so that:

$$B_t \mapsto X_t = \mathfrak{F}_t(B_t; e_{t-1}, e_t). \quad (42)$$

We have defined spaces \mathbf{U}_t and $\mathbf{X}_t(e_t)$, so that the former corresponds to the set of realisations of a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion on $[0, \Delta_t]$ and the latter to realisations of the solution of (39), thus emphasising that paths must terminate at e_t in the case of $\mathbf{X}_t(e_t)$. Recall that in the setting of the forward approach we only consider $d_w = d$.

Assumption 1. *The diffusion coefficient matrix $\sigma_t(s, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is invertible for all $(s, x) \in [0, \Delta_t] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Under Assumption 1, we can make use of the inverse of map \mathfrak{F}_t to transform paths from the proposal SDE (18). That is, for $v_t \sim M_t^{\rightarrow}[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$ we set $e_t = \mathbf{end}(v_t)$ and define the map $\mathfrak{F}_t^{-1} : \mathbf{X}_t(e_t) \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_t$, given e_{t-1}, e_t , as follows:

$$u_t := \mathfrak{F}_t^{-1}(v_t; e_{t-1}, e_t). \quad (43)$$

Note that u_t is, in practice, obtained via recursive application of the following expression:

$$du_t(s) = \sigma_t(s, v_t(s))^{-1} \{dv_t(s) - a_t^{br}(s, v_t(s)) ds\}. \quad (44)$$

We now have all necessary ingredients for the definition of the transformed proposal kernel $\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$. In particular, we have that:

$$z_t = (u_t, e_t) \in \mathbf{Z}_t = \mathbf{U}_t \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Then, given $z_{t-1} = (u_{t-1}, e_{t-1})$, we have that the variate $z_t = (u_t, e_t) \sim \bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ is obtained as follows:

- i. Sample $v_t \sim M_t^{\rightarrow}[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$, with the kernel defined via the proposal SDE (18) and set $e_t = \mathbf{end}(v_t)$.

ii. Retrieve $u_t = \mathfrak{F}_t^{-1}(v_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)$ via use of (44).

From the above specification of the reparameterised kernel $\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$, one can obtain the following expression for its backward decomposition:

$$\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t] = (m_t^{\rightarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})de_t) \otimes \bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), du_t]. \quad (45)$$

Recall that $m_t^{\rightarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$ is the transition density of the forward proposal SDE (18). Then, the kernel $\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), du_t]$ is defined as the distribution of $u_t \sim \mathfrak{F}_t^{-1}(v_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)$, for the path-variable $v_t \sim M_t^{\rightarrow}[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$ and for $e_t = \text{end}(v_t)$. This definition of u_t has connections with the ‘innovation process’ used in the context of MCMC algorithms, e.g. in Chib et al. (2004); Golightly and Wilkinson (2008).

Let \mathbb{W}_t denote the law of a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion on $[0, \Delta_t]$. Notice that application of the map $\mathfrak{F}_t(\cdot; e_{t-1}, e_t)$ to a Brownian motion B_t (resp. to $u_t \sim \bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), du_t]$) will yield a random path distributed according to the solution of the bridge SDE (39) (resp. distributed according to $M_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$). Thus, we immediately obtain the following density, due to the 1–1 transformation of the random variates involved:

$$\frac{d\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{d\mathbb{W}_t}(u_t) = \frac{dM_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{dR_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(\mathfrak{F}_t(u_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)). \quad (46)$$

For the case when the Delyon-Hu drift function (40) is used in the derivations, the density on the right-hand-side of (46) is as provided in (41). Continuing from (46), the complete proposal kernel $\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ admits the following Radon-Nikodym derivative (recall that $z_t = (e_t, u_t)$):

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}(z_t|z_{t-1}) &= \frac{\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]}{\text{Leb}(de_t) \otimes \mathbb{W}_t[du_t]} \\ &= m_t^{\rightarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1}) \times \frac{dM_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{dR_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(\mathfrak{F}_t(u_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Notice that the transition density $m_t^{\rightarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$ of the proposal SDE (18) cancels out when taking the product in the right-hand-side of (47), in the case $R_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] = R_t^{\text{DH}}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$, thus the provided density for $\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ is analytically tractable.

5.2 Defining \bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow} : Backward Transform

We present a method for the construction of a transform $\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ of the backward proposal $M_t^{\leftarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$, the latter specified via the backward decomposition in (26), consisted of the kernels $m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$ and $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$.

Nothing needs to be done about $m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$. Moving to kernel $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$ corresponding to the proposal bridge SDE (31), we define the map $\mathfrak{H}_t(\cdot; e_{t-1}, e_t) : \mathcal{U}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_t(e_t)$ that

projects the driving noise $B_t = \{B(s)\}_{s \in [0, \Delta_t]}$ of (31) onto the solution of (31). We now denote the solution of the bridge SDE (31) as $X_t^{\leftarrow, br} = \{X(s)^{\leftarrow, br}\}_{s \in [0, \Delta_t]}$ for clarity. That is, we have:

$$B_t \mapsto X_t^{\leftarrow, br} = \mathfrak{H}_t(B_t; e_{t-1}, e_t).$$

The definition resembles the one of $\mathfrak{F}_t(\cdot; \cdot)$ in (42), used in the case of the forward reparameterisation. For $v_t \sim M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$, the backward reparameterisation considers instead the driving Wiener noise, u_t , in the construction of v_t via $v_t = \mathfrak{H}(u_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)$. In this case: (i) one simply has that $u_t \sim \mathbb{W}_t$; (ii) no inversion of $u_t \mapsto \mathfrak{H}(u_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)$ is required. This second characteristic of the backward approach is important, as it sidesteps the requirement for invertibility of the diffusion coefficient in the SDE (1) for the latent signal, thus allowing application of the backward method to hypo-elliptic models.

Overall, we define $\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ as follows, for $z_t = (e_t, u_t)$ given $z_{t-1} = (e_{t-1}, u_{t-1})$:

$$\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t] = (m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})de_t) \otimes \mathbb{W}_t[dz_t]. \quad (48)$$

The definition of $\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ immediately implies that one can sample from this kernel, by independently generating a proposed Brownian motion path $z_t \sim \mathbb{W}_t$ and a proposed end-point $e_t \sim m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$. Further, this proposal kernel has a tractable density given by:

$$\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}(z_t|z_{t-1}) = \frac{\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]}{\text{Leb}(de_t) \otimes \mathbb{W}_t[du_t]} = m_t(v_t|v_{t-1}). \quad (49)$$

Remark 5. We note a main difference between backward and forward proposals, $M_t^{\rightarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ and $M_t^{\leftarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$, that ultimately leads to the method based on $M_t^{\leftarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ being applicable for a non-invertible diffusion coefficient $\sigma_t(s, x)$. Kernel $M_t^{\leftarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ is constructed in (26) via direct consideration of the backward decomposition of the target $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ in (12). That is, one selects tractable laws $m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})$ and $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$, both for the proposed ending point e_t and the proposed bridge SDE. Then, the transform $(e_t, v_t) \mapsto (e_t, u_t)$, with (e_t, u_t) admitting a density w.r.t. the reference measure $\text{Leb}(de_t) \otimes \mathbb{W}_t[du_t]$, is obtained by working with the noise used to sample $v_t \sim M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$. Kernel $M_t^{\rightarrow}[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ in (17) relates to the forward decomposition of $P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ in (10), thus one must now work with $v_t \sim M_t^{\rightarrow}[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$. However, use of the driving noise for v_t cannot lead to non-degenerate particle-based smoothing methods. Instead, one must rely to the auxiliary bridge SDE, of law $R_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$, which serves to transform the signal $(e_t, v_t) \mapsto (e_t, u_t)$, via a map that indeed requires the inverse of $\sigma_t(s, x)$.

5.3 Potentials \bar{G}_t^{\rightarrow} , \bar{G}_t^{\leftarrow}

We have now defined two classes of tractable kernels $\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$, $\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ that we can sample from, and which have analytical densities, given in (47) and (49) w.r.t. the reference

measure $\text{Leb}(de_t) \otimes \mathbb{W}_t[du_t]$. Critically, the reference measure does not involve the end-point e_{t-1} . We now complete our construction of the transformed Feynman-Kac models, by determining the corresponding potentials, denoted $\bar{G}_t^{\rightarrow}(z_{t-1}, z_t)$ and $\bar{G}_t^{\leftarrow}(z_{t-1}, z_t)$.

5.3.1 Forward Method, \bar{G}_t^{\rightarrow}

Recall that we work with the dynamics of the proposal SDE (18) to obtain the path-valued variate $v_t \sim M_t^{\rightarrow}[e_{t-1}, dv_t]$. Upon taking $u_t = \mathfrak{F}_t^{-1}(v_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)$ with $e_t = \text{end}(v_t)$, one obtains $z_t = (e_t, v_t) \sim \bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$. The transform:

$$x_t = (e_t, v_t) \mapsto z_t = (e_t, u_t); \quad u_t = \mathfrak{F}_t^{-1}(v_t; e_{t-1}, e_t),$$

when applied on the target signal variate $x_t \sim P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$ itself will similarly give rise to a probability law $\bar{P}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, dz_t]$ on the z -space. Thus, the potential $\bar{G}_t^{\rightarrow}(z_{t-1}, z_t)$ on the z -space is equal to:

$$\bar{G}_t^{\rightarrow}(z_{t-1}, z_t) = \frac{d\bar{P}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, \cdot]}{d\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, \cdot]}(z_t) \times f_t(y_t|e_t), \quad (50)$$

for the Radon-Nikodym derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{P}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, \cdot]}{d\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[z_{t-1}, \cdot]}(z_t) &= \frac{p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})}{m_t^{\rightarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})} \times \frac{d\bar{P}_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{d\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(u_t) \\ &= \frac{p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})}{m_t^{\rightarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})} \times \frac{dP_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{dM_t^{\rightarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(\mathfrak{F}_t(u_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)) \\ &\equiv \frac{dP_t[e_{t-1}, \cdot]}{dM_t^{\rightarrow}[e_{t-1}, \cdot]}(\mathfrak{F}_t(u_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

The expression in the last line of (51) can be analytically evaluated up-to time-discretisation via use of the Girsanov density in (19).

5.3.2 Backward Method, \bar{G}_t^{\leftarrow}

In this case, we work with the transform:

$$z_t = (e_t, u_t) \mapsto x_t = (e_t, v_t); \quad v_t = \mathfrak{H}_t(u_t; e_{t-1}, e_t).$$

When considering the target signal path $x_t \sim P_t[x_{t-1}, dx_t]$, we have that $x_t = (e_t, v_t)$ with laws $e_t \sim p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})de_t$ and $v_t \sim P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$. Then, $u_t \sim \bar{P}_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), du_t]$, with this latter distribution being defined via the requirement $v_t = \mathfrak{H}_t(u_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)$ must follow $P_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$.

Thus, the potential on the z -space writes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{G}_t^{\leftarrow}(z_{t-1}, z_t) &= \frac{d\bar{P}_t^{\leftarrow}[z_{t-1}, \cdot]}{d\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}[z_{t-1}, \cdot]}(z_t) \times f_t(y_t|e_t) \\
&= \frac{p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})}{m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})} \times \frac{d\bar{P}_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{d\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(u_t) \times f_t(y_t|e_t) \\
&= \frac{p_t(e_t|e_{t-1})}{m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t|e_{t-1})} \times \frac{dP_t[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}{dM_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), \cdot]}(\mathfrak{F}_t(u_t; e_{t-1}, e_t)) \times f_t(y_t|e_t). \tag{52}
\end{aligned}$$

The Radon-Nikodym derivative appearing on the right-hand-side of the last line in the above expression is given in (33) for proposal $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] = M_t^{\leftarrow, \text{DH}}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$, and in (37) for the case when $M_t^{\leftarrow}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t] = M_t^{\leftarrow, \text{G}}[(e_{t-1}, e_t), dv_t]$.

5.4 Complete Forward and Backward Methods

We provide in Algorithms 3 and 4 pseudo-codes for the particle filter and FFBS based on the the Forward Method. Then, Algorithms 5 and 6 provide similar pseudo-codes for the Backward Method.

Algorithm 3: Particle Filter for CD-SSM in (1)-(2) – under Forward Method

Input: CD-SSM in (1)-(2).

Output: Particles $z_{1:T}^{1:N} = (e_t^{1:N}, u_t^{1:N})_{t \in [1:T]}$, $x_{1:T}^{1:N} = (e_t^{1:N}, v_t^{1:N})_{t \in [1:T]}$, ancestors $A_{2:T}^{1:N}$, weights $W_{1:T}^{1:N}$.

```

1 for  $t = 1, \dots, T$  do
2   If  $t = 1$ , set  $A_t^j \leftarrow j$ ; else  $A_t^j \sim \text{Resample}(W_{t-1}^{1:N})$ ;
3   Sample  $v_t^j$  from the proposal SDE (18) with starting point  $e_{t-1}^{A_t^j}$ ;
4   Set  $e_{t-1}^j = \text{start}(v_t^j)$  and  $e_t^j = \text{end}(v_t^j)$ ;
5   Apply transform:  $u_t^j = \mathfrak{F}_t^{-1}(v_t^j; e_{t-1}^j, e_t^j)$ ;
6   Collect particles:  $z_t^j = (e_t^j, u_t^j)$ ,  $x_t^j = (e_t^j, v_t^j)$ ;
7   Assign weights:  $w_t^j = \bar{G}_t^{\rightarrow}(z_{t-1}^{A_t^j}, z_t^j)$  using the expressions in (50)-(51) for  $\bar{G}_t^{\rightarrow}(\cdot, \cdot)$ ;
8   Normalise weights:  $W_t^j = \frac{w_t^j}{\sum_{k=1}^N w_t^k}$ ;
9 end

```

Remark 6. A key point in the implementation of Algorithm 6 is the calculation of the backward weights \hat{w}_{t-1}^j for the current particle $z_t^{B_t} = (e_t^{B_t}, u_t^{B_t})$. Implementation of the methodology has allowed for all particles $z_{t-1}^j = (e_{t-1}^j, u_{t-1}^j)$ to be given positive backward weights.

Algorithm 4: FFBS for CD-SSM in (1)-(2) – under Forward Method

Input: Output $z_{1:T}^{1:N} = (e_t^{1:N}, u_t^{1:N})_{t \in [1:T]}$, $A_{2:T}^{1:N}$, $W_{1:T}^{1:N}$, from Algorithm 3.

Output: Approximate sample $(x_1^{B_1} = (e_1, v_1)^{B_1}, \dots, x_T^{B_T} = (e_T, v_T)^{B_T})$ from the smoothing distribution $P[X_{1:T} \in dx_{1:T} | Y_{1:T} = y_{1:T}]$.

1 Sample $B_T \sim \mathcal{M}(W_T^{1:N})$;

2 **for** $t = T, \dots, 2$ **do**

3 | Assign weights: $\hat{w}_{t-1}^j \leftarrow \bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}(z_t^{B_t} | z_{t-1}^j) \bar{G}_t^{\rightarrow}(z_{t-1}^j, z_t^{B_t}) \cdot W_{t-1}^j$ using expression (47) for $\bar{M}_t^{\rightarrow}(\cdot | \cdot)$;

4 | Normalise weights: $\hat{W}_{t-1}^j = \frac{\hat{w}_{t-1}^j}{\sum_{k=1}^N \hat{w}_{t-1}^k}$;

5 | $B_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{M}(\hat{W}_t^{1:N})$;

6 **end**

7 Return $x_1^{B_1} = (e_1^{B_1}, \mathfrak{F}_1(u_1^{B_1}; e_0, e_1^{B_1}))$, $x_2^{B_2} = (e_2^{B_2}, \mathfrak{F}_2(u_2^{B_2}; e_1^{B_1}, e_2^{B_2}))$, \dots ,
 $x_T^{B_T} = (e_T^{B_T}, \mathfrak{F}_T(u_T^{B_T}; e_{T-1}^{B_{T-1}}, e_T^{B_T}))$.

Algorithm 5: Particle Filter for CD-SSM in (1)-(2) – under Backward Method

Input: CD-SSM in (1)-(2).

Output: Particles $z_{1:T}^{1:N} = (e_t^{1:N}, u_t^{1:N})_{t \in [1:T]}$, $x_{1:T}^{1:N} = (e_t^{1:N}, v_t^{1:N})_{t \in [1:T]}$, ancestors $A_{2:T}^{1:N}$, weights $W_{1:T}^{1:N}$.

1 **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**

2 | If $t = 1$ set $A_t^j \leftarrow j$; else $A_t^j \sim \text{Resample}(W_{t-1}^{1:N})$;

3 | Sample $e_t^j \sim m_t^{\leftarrow}(e_t | e_{t-1}^{A_t^j})$ and $u_t^j \sim \mathbb{W}_t[du_t]$;

4 | Obtain the path: $v_t^j \leftarrow \mathfrak{h}_t(u_t^j; e_{t-1}^{A_t^j}, e_t^j)$;

5 | Collect particles: $z_t^j = (e_t^j, u_t^j)$, $x_t^j = (e_t^j, v_t^j)$;

6 | Assign weights: $w_t^j = \bar{G}_t^{\leftarrow}(z_{t-1}^{A_t^j}, z_t^j)$ using the expression in (52) for $\bar{G}_t^{\leftarrow}(\cdot, \cdot)$;

7 | Normalise weights: $W_t^j = \frac{w_t^j}{\sum_{k=1}^N w_t^k}$;

8 **end**

6 Conclusions

We have presented a comprehensive methodology over particle-based algorithms for carrying out effective statistical inference for CD-SSMs. By allowing for careful alternation of ancestors within algorithmic executions, our particle-based methods for CD-SSMs overcome path degeneracy characterising standard approaches. Further advances in the development of guided proposals for the filtering problem for CD-SSMs can be directly incorporated in our framework, see e.g. [Mider et al. \(2021\)](#); [Chopin et al. \(2023\)](#) for some recent contributions in this direction.

Algorithm 6: FFBS for CD-SSM in (1)-(2) – under Backward Method

Input: Full output, $z_{1:T}^{1:N} = (e_t^{1:N}, u_t^{1:N})_{t \in [1:T]}$, $A_{2:T}^{1:N}$, $W_{1:T}^{1:N}$, from Algorithm 5.

Output: Approximate sample $(x_1^{B_1} = (e_1, v_1)^{B_1}, \dots, x_T^{B_T} = (e_T, u_T)^{B_T})$ from the smoothing distribution $P[X_{1:T} \in dx_{1:T} | Y_{1:T} = y_{1:T}]$.

```
1 Sample  $B_T \sim \mathcal{M}(W_T^{1:N})$ ;  
2 for  $t = T, \dots, 2$  do  
3   Assign weights:  $\hat{w}_{t-1}^j \leftarrow \bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}(z_t^{B_t} | z_{t-1}^j) \bar{G}_t^{\leftarrow}(z_{t-1}^j, z_t^{B_t}) \cdot W_{t-1}^j$  using the expression in  
   (49) for  $\bar{M}_t^{\leftarrow}(\cdot | \cdot)$ ;  
4   Normalise weights:  $\hat{W}_{t-1}^j = \frac{\hat{w}_{t-1}^j}{\sum_{k=1}^N \hat{w}_{t-1}^k}$ ;  
5    $B_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{M}(\hat{W}_t^{1:N})$ ;  
6 end  
7 Return  $x_1^{B_1} = (e_1^{B_1}, \mathfrak{H}_1(u_1^{B_1}; e_0, e_1^{B_1}))$ ,  $x_2^{B_2} = (e_2^{B_2}, \mathfrak{H}_2(u_2^{B_2}; e_1^{B_1}, e_2^{B_2}))$ ,  $\dots$ ,  
 $x_T^{B_T} = (e_T^{B_T}, \mathfrak{H}_T(u_T^{B_T}; e_{T-1}^{B_{T-1}}, e_T^{B_T}))$ .
```

We have focused on continuous-time stochastic signals defined via SDEs, and have allowed the latter to be members of the elliptic or hypoelliptic class of diffusion processes. We aim to extend our approach to signals determined by more general classes of continuous-time processes, including SDEs with jumps and discrete-values pure-jump processes.

References

- Andrieu, C., Doucet, A., and Holenstein, R. (2010). Particle Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 72(3):269–342. 4
- Beskos, A., Pillai, N., Roberts, G., Sanz-Serna, J.-M., and Stuart, A. (2013). Optimal tuning of the hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm. *Bernoulli*, 19(5A):1501–1534. 5
- Bierkens, J., Van Der Meulen, F., and Schauer, M. (2020). Simulation of elliptic and hypoelliptic conditional diffusions. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 52(1):173–212. 16, 18
- Carpenter, B., Gelman, A., Hoffman, M. D., Lee, D., Goodrich, B., Betancourt, M., Brubaker, M., Guo, J., Li, P., and Riddell, A. (2017). Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 76(1). 5
- Chib, S., Pitt, M. K., and Shephard, N. (2004). Likelihood based inference for diffusion driven models. 4, 22

- Chopin, N., Fulop, A., Heng, J., and Thiery, A. H. (2023). Computational Doob h-transforms for online filtering of discretely observed diffusions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5904–5923. PMLR. [26](#)
- Chopin, N. and Papaspiliopoulos, O. (2020). *An introduction to sequential Monte Carlo*, volume 4. Springer. [2](#), [10](#)
- Del Moral, P. (2004). *Feynman-Kac formulae: genealogical and interacting particle systems with applications*. Springer. [6](#)
- Del Moral, P. (2013). Mean field simulation for Monte Carlo integration. *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*, 126:26. [6](#)
- Delyon, B. and Hu, Y. (2006). Simulation of conditioned diffusion and application to parameter estimation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 116(11):1660–1675. [12](#), [16](#), [20](#)
- Ditlevsen, S. and Samson, A. (2019). Hypocoelliptic diffusions: filtering and inference from complete and partial observations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 81(2):361–384. [15](#)
- Doucet, A., Godsill, S., and Andrieu, C. (2000). On sequential Monte Carlo sampling methods for Bayesian filtering. *Statistics and Computing*, 10:197–208. [13](#), [14](#)
- Gelman, A., Gilks, W. R., and Roberts, G. O. (1997). Weak convergence and optimal scaling of random walk Metropolis algorithms. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 7(1):110–120. [5](#)
- Godsill, S. J., Doucet, A., and West, M. (2004). Monte Carlo smoothing for nonlinear time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(465):156–168. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- Golightly, A. and Wilkinson, D. J. (2008). Bayesian inference for nonlinear multivariate diffusion models observed with error. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(3):1674–1693. [4](#), [5](#), [22](#)
- Gordon, N. J., Salmond, D. J., and Smith, A. F. (1993). Novel approach to nonlinear/non-Gaussian Bayesian state estimation. In *IEE proceedings F (radar and signal processing)*, volume 140, pages 107–113. IET. [6](#)
- Johannes, M. and Polson, N. (2010). MCMC methods for continuous-time financial econometrics. In *Handbook of Financial Econometrics: Applications*, pages 1–72. Elsevier. [5](#)
- Karjalainen, J., Lee, A., Singh, S. S., and Vihola, M. (2023). Mixing time of the conditional backward sampling particle filter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17572*. [5](#)

- Lindsten, F., Jordan, M. I., and Schon, T. B. (2014). Particle Gibbs with ancestor sampling. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15:2145–2184. [3](#), [4](#)
- Llopis, F. P., Kantas, N., Beskos, A., and Jasra, A. (2018). Particle filtering for stochastic Navier–Stokes signal observed with linear additive noise. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 40(3):A1544–A1565. [12](#)
- Mider, M., Schauer, M., and Van der Meulen, F. (2021). Continuous-discrete smoothing of diffusions. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(2):4295–4342. [2](#), [10](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [26](#)
- Oksendal, B. (2013). *Stochastic Differential Equations: An introduction with applications*. Springer Science & Business Media. [2](#), [3](#), [11](#), [12](#)
- Pokern, Y., Stuart, A. M., and Wiberg, P. (2009). Parameter estimation for partially observed hypoelliptic diffusions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 71(1):49–73. [15](#)
- Roberts, G. O. and Rosenthal, J. S. (1998). Optimal scaling of discrete approximations to Langevin diffusions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 60(1):255–268. [5](#)
- Roberts, G. O. and Stramer, O. (2001). On inference for partially observed nonlinear diffusion models using the Metropolis–Hastings algorithm. *Biometrika*, 88(3):603–621. [4](#)
- Schauer, M., Van Der Meulen, F., and Van Zanten, H. (2017). Guided proposals for simulating multi-dimensional diffusion bridges. *Bernoulli*, 23(4A):2917–2950. [12](#), [16](#), [17](#)
- Sottinen, T. and Särkkä, S. (2008). Application of Girsanov theorem to particle filtering of discretely observed continuous-time non-linear systems. *Bayesian Analysis*, 3(3):555–584. [12](#)
- van der Meulen, F. and Schauer, M. (2017). Bayesian estimation of discretely observed multi-dimensional diffusion processes using guided proposals. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 11(1):2358–2396. [16](#), [18](#)
- Yonekura, S. and Beskos, A. (2022). Online smoothing for diffusion processes observed with noise. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 31(4):1344–1360. [5](#)