# Differentiable Interacting Multiple Model Particle Filtering

John-Joseph Brady<sup>\*a,b</sup>, Yuhui Luo<sup>b</sup>, Wenwu Wang<sup>c</sup>, Víctor Elvira<sup>d</sup>, Yunpeng Li<sup>c,e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Computer Science Research Centre, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, United Kingdom  $b$ Data Science Department, National Physical Laboratory, Teddington, Greater London, United Kingdom

 $c$ <sup>c</sup>Centre for Vision, Speech and Signal Processing, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, United Kingdom <sup>d</sup>School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

 $e$ <sup>e</sup>Centre for Oral, Clinical & Translational Sciences, King's College London, London, United Kingdom

# Abstract

We propose a sequential Monte Carlo algorithm for parameter learning when the studied model exhibits random discontinuous jumps in behaviour. To facilitate the learning of high dimensional parameter sets, such as those associated to neural networks, we adopt the emerging framework of differentiable particle filtering, wherein parameters are trained by gradient descent. We design a new differentiable interacting multiple model particle filter to be capable of learning the individual behavioural regimes and the model which controls the jumping simultaneously. In contrast to previous approaches, our algorithm allows control of the computational effort assigned per regime whilst using the probability of being in a given regime to guide sampling. Furthermore, we develop a new gradient estimator that has a lower variance than established approaches and remains fast to compute, for which we prove consistency. We establish new theoretical results of the presented algorithms and demonstrate superior numerical performance compared to the previous state-of-the-art algorithms.

Keywords: sequential Monte Carlo, differentiable particle filtering, regime

<sup>∗</sup>Corresponding author, j.brady@surrey.ac.uk

## 1. Introduction

There has been longstanding interest in Bayesian filtering for systems exhibiting discontinuous behavioural jumps, typically modelled by ascribing the system a finite number of distinct and indexed regimes. Two systems frequently modelled in this way include financial markets reacting swiftly to economic news [\[1,](#page-25-0) [2\]](#page-25-1), and tracked targets suddenly changing course or acceleration [\[3](#page-25-2), [4](#page-26-0), [5](#page-26-1), [6\]](#page-26-2). Much of this existing work is focused on Markov switching systems where the probability of jumping is allowed to depend only on the index of the current regime.

Particle filters [\[7](#page-26-3), [8\]](#page-26-4) are a class of Monte-Carlo algorithms for estimating the posterior distribution of a Markov hidden signal given noisy observations of it. In the regime-switching setting, if the regime index is modelled as a Markov chain, one may treat it as a component of the hidden signal in a particle filter [\[3](#page-25-2)].

In [\[9](#page-26-5)] the authors developed the regime switching particle filter (RSPF), extending the approach in [\[3](#page-25-2)] to systems where the regime index can depend arbitrarily on its past. They achieved this by having every particle keep a memory of its entire regime history, similar to the fixed-lag smoother of [\[10\]](#page-26-6). The interacting multiple model particle filter (IMMPF), introduced in [\[5\]](#page-26-1), assumes the regime index is a Markov chain, but allows it to depend on the latent state as well as the index at the previous time-step. We show that, under the reformulation of the non-Markov switching model that we develop in this paper, the former problem is a special case of the latter.

In many real world settings, the average number of time-steps a system spends in each regime can be large. This is typically modelled by taking switches to be rare events. Most particle filtering algorithms naturally focus computation on more likely regions of the state space. With a restricted particle count, overtime this can result in the number of particles in all regimes apart from the current one going to zero; so when jumps do occur they are not detected [\[6](#page-26-2), [11\]](#page-26-7). It has become common practice, therefore, in regime switching filters to set the number of particles assigned per regime at each time-step to be equal on average. This is achieved in [\[9\]](#page-26-5) by proposing the regime index uniformly across all regime choices. However, this ignores the probability of each particle adopting the given regime.

The IMMPF takes a more principled approach, it combines the resampling and regime selection steps to improve sampling efficiency. However, the IMMPF is not strictly a particle filter in the sense studied in [\[12,](#page-26-8) [13,](#page-26-9) [14\]](#page-26-10). To the best of our knowledge, no proof of consistency for the IMMPF exists in the literature.

Differentiable particle filters (DPFs) [\[15,](#page-27-0) [16,](#page-27-1) [17\]](#page-27-2) are an emerging class of particle filters designed in such a way that the algorithm is end-to-end differentiable, so that one may obtain accurate gradient estimates for use in gradient based parameter inference. The motivating use case for DPFs is to learn model components as flexible neural networks, typically when the prior knowledge on the functional form of the underlying model is of poor quality. In this case, other parameter inference paradigms fail. For example, the EM algorithm [\[18\]](#page-27-3) requires a specific functional form of the model for the maximisation step to be closed-form; and both derivative-free optimisation and particle Markov chain Monte Carlo [\[19\]](#page-27-4) do not scale well to large dimensional parameter spaces.

The first effort to address switching models in a DPF framework is [\[20\]](#page-27-5), with the regime switching differentiable bootstrap particle filter (RSDBPF). However, the RSDBPF is only capable of learning the individual regimes. The meta-model that controls the switching, henceforth the 'switching dynamic', is required to be known a priori. During inference, the RSDBPF runs a RSPF so does not sample particles as efficiently as the IMMPF. Furthermore, it has an asymptotically biased gradient update.

There are few approaches in the literature that operate under an unknown switching dynamic and, to the best of our knowledge, none in the more challenging parameter estimation framework. In [\[21\]](#page-27-6), a related problem is studied: the system may belong to one of a set of candidate regimes but the regime may not change during a trajectory. Their strategy is to run a separate filter for each regime but assign computational effort, i.e. the number of particles, in proportion to the posterior probability that the system is in each regime. This strategy was generalised in [\[22](#page-27-7)], where the particles are permitted to occasionally exchange between regimes. However, this algorithm cannot provide a consistent estimator in the general case where the regime can switch at any time-step.

In this paper we propose the differentiable multiple model particle filter (DIMMPF), the first DPF approach to filtering regime-switching models where neither the individual models nor the switching dynamic are known. The DIMMPF can be seen as an IMMPF that can return statistically consistent estimates of the gradient of its filtering mean with respect to the model parameters.

The main contributions of this work<sup>[1](#page-3-0)</sup> can be summarised as follows:

- We present the DIMMPF, a novel algorithm for learning to estimate the filtering mean of a general regime-switching model.
- We develop a neural network architecture to parameterise a general unknown switching dynamic.
- We prove that the DIMMPF generates consistent estimators of filtering means and their gradients. Entailing a derivation of, to the best of our knowledge, the first proof that filtering estimates of the IMMPF are consistent.
- We evaluate the DIMMPF on a set of simulated data experiments and demonstrate state-of-the-art performance.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows. In Section [2](#page-3-1) we introduce the problem statement. Section [3](#page-6-0) reviews the relevant background for the paper and explains how this paper builds on previous work. Section [4](#page-10-0) develops our algorithmic contribution, the DIMMPF. Section [5](#page-15-0) presents our main theoretical results. Section [6](#page-20-0) describes the experiments and presents the results. We conclude in Section [7.](#page-24-0)

## <span id="page-3-1"></span>2. Problem Statement

We define a state-space model (SSM) to describe a discrete time system of two parallel processes: a latent Markov process,  $\{\hat{x}_t\}$ ; and their associated observations  $\{\hat{y}_t\}$ , where t is the discrete time index. Every observation  $\hat{y}_t$  is conditionally independent of all other variables at previous time steps given  $\hat{x}_t$ . Algebraically, an SSM is defined as:

<span id="page-3-2"></span>
$$
\hat{x}_0 \sim \hat{M}_0 \left(\hat{x}_0\right),
$$
\n
$$
\hat{x}_{t \ge 1} \sim \hat{M} \left(\hat{x}_t \mid \hat{x}_{t-1}\right),
$$
\n
$$
\hat{y}_t \sim \hat{G} \left(\hat{y}_t \mid \hat{x}_t\right),
$$
\n(1)

<span id="page-3-0"></span><sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>A limited version of this work was presented by the authors in the conference paper [\[23\]](#page-27-8), which presents a simpler version of our methodology that has a biased gradient update. The conference paper contains limited discussion, no theoretical insight, and a more basic set of experiments.



<span id="page-4-0"></span>Figure 1: Bayesian network representation of the considered regime switching model.

for the set of states  $\hat{x}_t \in \mathcal{X}$ , the set of observations  $\hat{y}_t \in \mathcal{Y}$ , the random measure  $\hat{M}_0$ , and the probability kernels  $\hat{M}$  and  $\hat{G}$ .

We consider an SSM where at each time-step the latent and observation processes may, together, adopt one of a set of  $N_{\text{reg}}$  regimes. To model this system, we introduce two additional latent variables: the regime index,  $k_t \in$  $\mathcal{K} := \{1, 2, \ldots, N_{\text{reg}}\};$  and a cache that acts as a memory of previous regimes,  $r_t \in \mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_r}$ , where  $d_r$  is the chosen dimension of the regime cache. We illustrate this system graphically in Fig. [1](#page-4-0) and define it algebraically as:

<span id="page-4-1"></span>
$$
r_0 = R_0^{\theta} (k_0) ,
$$
  
\n
$$
r_{t\geq 1} = R^{\theta} (k_t, r_{t-1}) ,
$$
  
\n
$$
k_0 \sim K_0^{\theta} (k_0) ,
$$
  
\n
$$
k_{t\geq 1} \sim K^{\theta} (k_t | r_{t-1}) ,
$$
  
\n
$$
x_0 \sim M_0^{\theta} (x_0 | k_0) ,
$$
  
\n
$$
x_{t\geq 1} \sim M^{\theta} (x_t | x_{t-1}, k_t) ,
$$
  
\n
$$
y_t \sim G^{\theta} (y_t | x_t, k_t) ,
$$
 (2)

where we have made explicit any dependence on the model parameters  $\theta$ .  $R_0^{\theta}$ and  $R^{\theta}$  are deterministic functions,  $K^{\theta}_{0}$  and  $K^{\theta}$  are categorical distributions. To avoid confusion with the generic SSM Eq. [\(1\)](#page-3-2), SSM model components and variables are denoted by a circumflex (ˆ) whereas components of the studied regime switching model, Eq. [\(2\)](#page-4-1) are not. For notational simplicity we do not make explicit any time dependence of the model components; by treating the time as a series of constants, time dependence can be introduced without change to the theoretical analysis.

This paper addresses the problem of accurately estimating filtering means,  $\mathbb{E}^{\theta}[x_t | y_{0:t}]$ . Unlike previous work [\[9](#page-26-5), [20](#page-27-5), [22\]](#page-27-7), our formulation allows all of the dynamic model,  $M_0^{\theta}$ ,  $M^{\theta}$ ; the observation model,  $G^{\theta}$ ; and the switching dynamic,  $R_0^{\theta}$ ,  $R^{\theta}$ ,  $K_0^{\theta}$ ,  $K^{\theta}$ , to depend simultaneously on the learned parameters θ. However, we require that the number of regimes  $N_{reg}$  be given; efficiently determining  $N_{\text{reg}}$  is left for future work.

## Problem analysis

The advantage of our formulation is that the joint hidden process  $\{x_t, k_t, r_t\}$ is explicitly Markov. Identifying  $\{x_t, k_t, r_t\}$  with  $\{\hat{x}_t\}$  and  $\{y_t\}$  with  $\{\hat{y}_t\}$  it is clear that our model [\(2\)](#page-4-1) is a special case of an SSM [\(1\)](#page-3-2). Existing results and algorithms concerning SSMs, i.e. particle filters, can be applied directly in our setting.

It is instructive to demonstrate a pair of special cases of our model. Taking

<span id="page-5-0"></span>
$$
R_0^{\theta}(k_0) = k_0, R^{\theta}(k_t, r_{t-1}) = k_t,
$$
\n(3)

one recovers the popular Markov switching model [\[1,](#page-25-0) [4,](#page-26-0) [24](#page-27-9)]. Alternatively taking

<span id="page-5-1"></span>
$$
R_0^{\theta}(k_0) = \{k_0\}, R^{\theta}(k_t, r_{t-1}) = (\{k_t\} \cup r_{t-1}) \setminus \{k_{t-\tau}\},
$$
\n(4)

for some fixed  $\tau$ , one obtains the a model with perfect memory of its regimes for a fixed lag, similar to the strategy of [\[25\]](#page-27-10). Taking  $\tau$  to be larger than the trajectory length gives the model with perfect regime memory, as considered by [\[9](#page-26-5), [20](#page-27-5)].

It is well known that, as a consequence of the resampling step, particle filters suffer from path degeneracy [\[26](#page-28-0)], wherein late-time particles are descended from only a small subset of the early time particles. In the perfect memory formulation this means that late-time particles will form a poor quality sample of the early time regime indices, so keeping full trajectories is not useful.  $R^{\theta}$  can be thought of a caching function that keeps the useful information in the regime history. Moreover, myriad practical challenges arise in trying to store and utilise a linearly growing amount of information.

Since the regime may take only one of  $N_{\text{reg}}$  values for each time-step, at time t,  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq N_{\text{reg}}^{t+1}$ , with  $|\mathcal{R}|$  being the cardinality of the set  $\mathcal{R}$ . However, an  $\mathbb{R}^{d_r}$  representation is more convenient for a neural network implementation.

## <span id="page-6-0"></span>3. Background

## 3.1. Sequential multiple importance sampling

In this section, we introduce a generalisation of the standard particle filtering algorithm as described in [\[7,](#page-26-3) [8](#page-26-4)], which we term sequential multiple importance sampling (SMIS). The SMIS paradigm for analysing particle filters was introduced in [\[27](#page-28-1)]. We extend their framework to include SMC algorithms that do not reduce to the auxiliary particle filter [\[28](#page-28-2)]. At each discrete time-step  $t$ , the population of particles are sampled from a mixture conditional on the population of particles at the previous time-step, and accordingly importance weighted. We illustrate this procedure in Algorithm [1.](#page-6-1) In this paper, we are interested in the filtering problem, so we focus the analysis on the class of SMIS algorithms where the particles form an empirical measure of the filtering distribution.

<span id="page-6-1"></span>Algorithm 1 Sequential Multiple Importance Sampling. All operations indexed by *n* should be repeated for all  $n \in \{1, ..., N\}$ .

**Input:** target distributions  $\mu_0, \mu_t$  time extent T sampling mixtures  $\lambda_0, \lambda_t$  particle count N 1:  $\hat{x}_0^n \sim \lambda_0 \left( \hat{x}_0^n \right);$ 2:  $w_0^n \leftarrow$  $\mu_0\big(\hat{x}_0^n\big)$  $\frac{\mu_0(x_0)}{\lambda_0(\hat{x}_0^n)}$ ;  $: \bar{w}_0^n \leftarrow$  $\frac{\overset{\circ}{w_0^n}}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_0^i};$ 4: for  $t = 1$  to  $T$  do 5:  $\hat{x}_t^n \sim \lambda_t \left( \hat{x}_t^n \right)$ 6:  $w_t^n \leftarrow c \frac{\mu_t(\hat{x}_t^n)}{\lambda_t(\hat{x}_t^n)}$  $\frac{\mu_t(x_t^{\cdot})}{\lambda_t(\hat{x}_t^n)}$ 7:  $\bar{w}_t^n \leftarrow$  $\frac{w_t^{n}}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_t^i};$ 8: end for 9:  ${\bf return} \;\; \hat{x}_{0:T}^{1:N},\; w_{0:T}^{1:N},\; \bar{w}_{0,T}^{1:N}.$ 

In most cases of interest, it will only be possible to evaluate the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $\frac{\mu_t(\hat{x}_t^n)}{\lambda_t(\hat{x}_t^n)}$  $\frac{\mu_t(x_i^x)}{\lambda_t(x_i^x)}$  up to a constant factor, which we notate, in Algorithm [1,](#page-6-1) with unknown factor c.

For the filtering case, ideally

$$
\mu_t\left(\hat{x}_t\right) = p\left(\hat{x}_t \mid \hat{y}_{0:t}\right). \tag{5}
$$

However, at  $t > 0$  the true posterior is not typically available. Assuming that at  $t-1$  the particles form an empirical approximation of  $p(\hat{x}_t | \hat{y}_{0:t})$  the posterior can be approximated as

<span id="page-7-0"></span>
$$
\mu_{t\geq 1}(\hat{x}_t) \approx \frac{\hat{G}(\hat{y}_t \mid \hat{x}_t) \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{w}_{t-1}^i \hat{M}(\hat{x}_t \mid \hat{x}_{t-1}^i)}{p(\hat{y}_t \mid \hat{y}_{0:t-1})}.
$$
(6)

The conditional likelihood  $p(\hat{y}_t | \hat{y}_{0:t-1})$  is not known, but can be treated as a normalisation constant and absorbed into c in line 6 of Algorithm [1.](#page-6-1) In this article, we only consider SMIS algorithms with the target distribution given in Eq.  $(6)$ .

## 3.2. Differentiable particle filtering

A diverse taxonomy of strategies exist to estimate the parameters of SSMs. We refer the readers to [\[18\]](#page-27-3) for an overview of SMC approaches. Our problem differs from the classical cases in two respects: using neural networks, our parameter space is very high-dimensional; and with the flexibility we allow for, the latent system is not identifiable from the observations alone. With modern automatic differentiation, the ubiquitous-in-machine-learning, gradient-based schemes are an attractive choice. They perform well when the parameter space is high-dimensional and generalise readily to specialised loss functions. However, standard SMC algorithms are not differentiable.

The *differentiable particle filter* (DPF) refers, in the literature, to any SMC filtering algorithm that is designed to return estimates of the gradients of its outputs. The first DPF [\[15](#page-27-0)] used the well known reparameterisation trick to differentiate sampling from the proposal. But it did not pass gradients through resampling, setting them to zero, so that gradients are not propagated over time-steps. In [\[16](#page-27-1)], a differentiable approximation to resampling known as soft-resampling was proposed. Soft-resampling resamples from the desired distribution with probability  $\alpha$  and uniformly with probability  $(1 - \alpha)$ . The hyper-parameter  $\alpha$  can be thought of as trading-off between unbiased gradients ( $\alpha = 0$ ) and efficient sampling ( $\alpha = 1$ ). To account for drawing from a different distribution, the process incurs an extra importance weighting factor that is a function of the entire population of weights at the previous time-step and may be differentiated.

In [\[29](#page-28-3)], the first fully differentiable particle filter is proposed. Their strategy is to find a differentiable transport map from the particle approximation of  $p(x_t, y_{0:t-1})$  to  $p(x_t, y_{0:t})$ . This results in unbiased gradient estimates. However, it is computationally costly and can suffer from numerical issues if not carefully tuned. The use of the REINFORCE gradient estimator [\[30](#page-28-4), [31](#page-28-5)], was pioneered for particle filters in [\[32\]](#page-28-6). REINFORCE has the attractive properties of not requiring an altered filtering algorithm whilst providing unbiased gradient estimates. However, it suffers from high variance.

Engineering a neural network architecture to parameterise a state space model is crucial for performant learning. The DPF architecture can be designed to incorporate domain knowledge along with flexible neural network components. Common architectures include convolutional layers to extract features from images [\[15,](#page-27-0) [16,](#page-27-1) [29\]](#page-28-3), normalising flows to learn arbitrary probability distributions [\[33](#page-28-7)], and recurrent structures adapted to propagating information across time-steps [\[29](#page-28-3)]. For a broad overview of this aspect of differentiable particle filtering we refer the reader to [\[17](#page-27-2)].

## <span id="page-8-1"></span>3.3. Previous work in particle filtering for regime-switching models

Much of the previous work has focused on Markov-switching systems [\[2,](#page-25-1) [34](#page-28-8)], also known as jump-Markov systems in the target tracking literature. The first particle filtering algorithm that was proposed to handle non-linear, non-Gaussian Markov-switching systems is found in [\[3\]](#page-25-2). Their strategy, the multiple model bootstrap filter, is equivalent to running a bootstrap particle filter on latent state  $\{x_t, k_t, r_t\}$  using Eq. [\(3\)](#page-5-0). The regime switching particle filter [\[9](#page-26-5)] (RSPF), extends the multiple model bootstrap filter by permitting arbitrary dependence of the model index on its past, i.e. they use the perfect memory form of Eq. [\(2\)](#page-4-1), Eq. [\(4\)](#page-5-1) with  $\tau = \infty$ . Both these algorithms run a bootstrap particle filter [\[7\]](#page-26-3) on a special case of the state space model, Eq.  $(1)$ , with

<span id="page-8-0"></span>
$$
\hat{x}_t \leftarrow \{x_t, k_t, r_t\}, \n\hat{y}_t \leftarrow y_t, \n\hat{M}_0 \leftarrow M_0^{\theta} \otimes \delta_{R_0^{\theta}} \otimes K_0^{\theta}, \n\hat{M} \leftarrow M^{\theta} \otimes \delta_{R^{\theta}} \otimes K^{\theta}, \n\hat{G} \leftarrow G^{\theta},
$$
\n(7)

where  $\delta_{\phi}$  is the Dirac-measure at  $\phi$ , and ⊗ represents composition of probability measures into their joint measure.

In many models of practical interest, there are regimes that are switched into only rarely. On such occasions, under the naïve strategy of running a particle filter on the joint process, Eq. [\(7\)](#page-8-0), there is a risk that when a rare jump occurs, too few particles will be assigned to the new regime to detect it  $[6, 9, 11]$  $[6, 9, 11]$  $[6, 9, 11]$ . In  $[9]$ , it is suggested to address this issue by sampling the model index,  $k$ , either uniformly, or systematically setting the number of particles resampled for each model to be the same. Then, importance weighting each particle by the true probability of being in its chosen regime, thereby sampling the latent state from proposal distributions:

$$
\hat{Q}_0 \leftarrow M_0^{\theta} \otimes \delta_{R_0^{\theta}} \otimes \text{Uniform from } \{1, \dots, N_{\text{reg}}\},
$$
  
\n
$$
\hat{Q} \leftarrow M^{\theta} \otimes \delta_{R^{\theta}} \otimes \text{Uniform from } \{1, \dots, N_{\text{reg}}\},
$$
\n(8)

in the uniform sampling case. However, this scheme is blind to the switching probabilities when proposing, leading to poor sampling efficiency. In [\[5](#page-26-1)] the authors suggest a more principled approach: each regime is sampled uniformly but the particles within each regime are sampled in proportion to their resampling probabilities given its new regime. The motivation behind their approach, the interacting multiple model particle filter (IMMPF), is to include generalised Markov switching systems where the latent state and model index may have arbitrary interdependence. Our formulation, Eq. [\(2\)](#page-4-1), is a special case of the more general problem solved by the IMMPF.

However, to the best of our knowledge, no proof for the consistency of the estimates given by the IMMPF exists. We demonstrate asymptotic convergence of IMMPF filtering estimates by expressing the IMMPF as an SMIS algorithm (see Section [5](#page-15-0) for the proof). The IMMPF algorithm is expressed naturally as an SMIS procedure with  $\mu(\hat{x}_t)$  set to the usual filtering target  $(Eq. (6))$  $(Eq. (6))$  $(Eq. (6))$ , and proposal:

<span id="page-9-0"></span>
$$
\lambda(\hat{x}_t) = \sum_{k'=1}^{N_{\text{reg}}} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \bar{w}_{t-1}^n K^{\theta}\left(k' \mid r_{t-1}^n\right) \left[M\left(x_t \mid x_{t-1}^n, k'\right) \mathbb{1}_{k'}\left(k_t\right) \delta_{R^{\theta}\left(r_{t-1}^n, k'\right)}\left(r_t^n\right)\right]}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} K^{\theta}\left(k' \mid r_{t-1}^n\right)}.
$$
 (9)

To avoid introducing additional notation, we have expressed explicitly the inclusion of the regime cache. However, it could be absorbed into the latent state to obtain the proposal in [\[5](#page-26-1)].

In [\[5\]](#page-26-1), it is not recommended to sample the regime indices uniformly, but to deterministically set the number of particles per regime to be the same. The resultant algorithm then bears strong resemblance to the generalised multiple importance samplers discussed in [\[35\]](#page-28-9).

Regime switching filtering is extended to the machine learning framework of [\[15](#page-27-0)] in [\[20\]](#page-27-5) with the RSDBPF. The RSDBPF modifies the RSPF by sampling from the dynamic model with the reparameterisation trick and training the model components by gradient descent. However, it still assumes that the switching dynamic is known a priori.

### <span id="page-10-0"></span>4. The Differentiable Interacting Multiple Model Particle Filter

The core algorithmic contribution of this work is to develop the IMMPF into a differentiable variant, the DIMMPF, so that it can be included into an end-to-end machine learning framework.

## 4.1. Parameterising the model

For the dynamic and observation models, the choice is problem dependent, so we do not make any specific recommendations; the architectures used in our experiments can be found in Section [6.2.](#page-22-0) We take inspiration from long short term memory networks (LSTMs) [\[36](#page-28-10)] to design the parameterisation of  $R^{\theta}$ . It is well known that SSMs, for which the latent process does not forget its past in some sense result in poorly performing SMC algorithms. Existing bounds on the stability of filtering algorithms typically rely on either conditions that lead to strong mixing [\[14](#page-26-10)], or a related drift condition [\[37\]](#page-28-11). Furthermore, there are SSMs that do not obey these assumptions for which it can be shown that their associated particle filter diverges exponentially (or worse) in mean squared error with  $T$  [\[13\]](#page-26-9).

For this reason, we include forget gates in our parameterisation of the switching dynamic; *i.e.* we set  $r_t = r_{t-1} \odot a + b$ , where every element of vector a is between 0 and 1, and b is a function only of  $k_t$ . We desire that this has the effect of decreasing the weight of information from past states at each time-step before introducing information from the noisy  $k_t$ . Algebraically, the model can be expressed as,

$$
r_{t} = R^{\theta} (k_{t}, r_{t-1})
$$
  
=\sigma (\Theta\_{1} r\_{t-1}) \odot \sigma (\Theta\_{2} k'\_{t}) \odot r\_{t-1} + \tanh (\Theta\_{3} k'\_{t}), (10a)

$$
r_0 = R_0^{\theta}(k_0) = R^{\theta}\left(k_0, \vec{0}\right), \qquad (10b)
$$

$$
K^{\prime\theta}\left(k_t^{\prime} \mid r_{t-1}\right) = \left|\Theta_4 \tanh\left(\Theta_5 r_{t-1}\right)\right| \cdot k_t^{\prime},\tag{10c}
$$

$$
K^{\theta}\left(k'_{t} \mid r_{t-1}\right) = \frac{K^{\prime \theta}_{t}\left(k'_{t} \mid r_{t-1}\right)}{\sum_{c \in \mathcal{K}} K^{\prime \theta}\left(c' \mid r_{t-1}\right)},\tag{10d}
$$

where  $k'_t$  is the one hot encoding of  $k_t$ ,  $\odot$  is the Hadamard product, and  $\Theta_{1:5}$ are learned matrices,  $\vec{0}$  is the zero vector, and  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is the sigmoid function.  $K_0^{\theta}$  is represented by a learned vector of regime probabilities.

## <span id="page-10-1"></span>4.2. Estimating the gradient of the DIMMPF

The large majority of DPFs proposed [\[15,](#page-27-0) [16](#page-27-1), [29,](#page-28-3) [33](#page-28-7), [38](#page-29-0)] take derivatives with respect to the proposal distribution's parameters by the low variance



Figure 2: Graphical representation of our proposed switching dynamic. Blue nodes are input/outputs. Purple nodes are fully connected network layers with the specified activation. Yellow nodes are non-learned functions. The switching probability mass,  $K^{\theta}(k_{t+1} | r_t)$ , is the value at the  $k_{t+1}^{\text{th}}$  index of the model output  $K^{\theta}$ .

reparameterisation trick. However, for our case where the state space has a discrete component no reparameterisation function exists. Furthermore, the model index,  $k$ , is categorical rather than atomic so continuous relaxations such as the one used in [\[39\]](#page-29-1) do not apply.

The remaining option is REINFORCE. Under the IMMPF proposal it is natural to combine the model selection steps and the resampling steps. So, in this work we develop a gradient estimator that is a hybrid between the REINFORCE and reparameterisation gradients:

<span id="page-11-1"></span><span id="page-11-0"></span>
$$
\tilde{w}_t^n = \sum_{m=1}^N \bar{w}_{t-1}^m K^\theta \left( k_t^n \mid r_{t-1}^m \right) \perp \left[ M^\theta \left( x_t^n \mid x_{t-1}^m, k_t^n \right) \right],\tag{11a}
$$

<span id="page-11-2"></span>
$$
w_t^n = \frac{\tilde{w}_t^n G^\theta \left( y_t \mid x_t^n, k_t^n \right) \perp \left[ \sum_{l=1}^N K^\theta \left( k_t^n \mid r_{t-1}^l \right) \right]}{\perp \left[ \tilde{w}_t^n \right]},
$$
\n(11b)

where we use  $\perp \left[ \cdot \right]$  to denote the stop gradient operator, which is defined to be the operation that is the identity on the forward pass, but sets the gradient of the enclosed quantity to zero. In modern auto-differentiation libraries, this is easy to implement and computationally cheap by detaching the operand from the computation graph. Our estimator is related to the generalised reparameterisation trick of [\[40\]](#page-29-2). We refer the reader to [\[41](#page-29-3)] for an expansive overview of Monte Carlo gradient estimation.

The choice of where to collapse the gradient estimator to a single path is not unique. We could have done this earlier in the process and taken  $\tilde{w}_t^n$  to be only the sampled term of the sum in Eq. [\(11a\)](#page-11-0), or later, and simulated from every dynamic kernel,  $M^{\theta}$ , in the sum. The former estimator would only track gradients through the sampled path and has time-complexity  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ . The chosen estimator, described in Eq. [\(11\)](#page-11-1), accounts for a particle having any ancestor in the contribution to the gradient due to the previous weights and the regime index selection, but not for the gradient contribution from the dynamic kernel. Our estimator has a time complexity  $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ . Sampling from all dynamic kernels would fully account for the genealogical possibilities from one time-step in the past, but requires sampling  $N^2$  particles. The three options represent trading off computational effort for improved variance. The middle option is our recommended balance since calculation of each  $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ term required to calculate the sum in Eq. [\(11a\)](#page-11-0) for each particle in the population can, on a sufficiently powerful GPU, be achieved in parallel. As our modifications to the IMMPF [\[5](#page-26-1)] only affect the gradient estimates, during inference one may use the  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  IMMPF with the learned model.

## 4.3. Training the DIMMPF

Consider two approaches to train a particle filter when there is access to the ground truth latent state during training. The first is to estimate the latent state and minimise some distance between the estimator and the ground truth. The second is to maximise the joint likelihood of the observations and their associated ground truth latent state. We find the best results are obtained when optimising a loss that combined the two strategies. A related strategy is recommended in [\[15\]](#page-27-0) where the optimisation objective is a combination of the MSE of filtering estimates and a loss on the measurement and observation models individually.

In our case, the MSE of filtering estimates is obtained by Algorithm [2.](#page-14-0) To estimate the joint likelihood, we re-partition the model so that during training the available quantities  $\{x_t, y_t\}$  are taken as observations and  $\{r_t, k_t\}$  are the latent state estimated by filtering. Since the observations now depend on each other, this formulation does not strictly satisfy the usual definition of an SSM, described in Eq. [\(1\)](#page-3-2). However, in particle filtering, the observations are treated as a sequence of non-random constants so the algorithm generalises freely to situations where the observations have arbitrary backwards-in-time interdependence. To account for this interdependence, we replace the conditional likelihood in Eq. [\(1\)](#page-3-2), with

$$
\hat{y}_t \sim \hat{G}\left(\hat{y}_t \mid \hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_{0:t-1}\right). \tag{12}
$$

Directly optimising the likelihood leads to high variance so instead we optimise the mean log-likelihood which provides a Jensen's inequality lower bound on the log of the mean likelihood. We refer to this quantity as the evidence lower bound (ELBO) due to its relation to the ELBO-loss common in variational inference [\[42,](#page-29-4) [43,](#page-29-5) [44\]](#page-29-6).

Needing to run two filters incurs an extra computational cost. However, for the second filter the conditional likelihood only depends on the state through the discrete model index, so one can precompute all the conditional likelihoods for each choice of model index using GPU parallelism. Then the only neural network we need to evaluate per-particle during filtering is  $R^{\theta}(k_t, r_{t-1}).$ 

# 4.4. The full algorithm and practical considerations

We present the full DIMMPF algorithm<sup>[2](#page-13-0)</sup> in pseudo-code in Algorithm [2.](#page-14-0) It can be checked that the filtering loop of Algorithm [2](#page-14-0) is equivalent, in the forward pass, to running Algorithm [1](#page-6-1) with target [\(6\)](#page-7-0) and proposal [\(9\)](#page-9-0), with the model indices deterministically chosen rather than sampled uniformly. When computing the data likelihood, Algorithm [2](#page-14-0) is modified such that the distribution of  $x_t$  is accounted for in the weights instead of being sampled from.

In practice, it is common to use a variance-reduced scheme to resample the particle indices in lieu of multinomial sampling. One such scheme is the systematic resampling of [\[45\]](#page-29-7) and its closely related variants, which are found to work well empirically. The increased stability offered by systematic resampling is of increased importance in the context of DPFs, where it stabilises gradient updates as well as the forward pass [\[46\]](#page-29-8). However, under systematic resampling the particles are no longer sampled i.i.d., so the central limit theorems used to prove Theorems [1](#page-15-1) and [3](#page-20-1) no longer hold. We make the recommendation that practitioners use systematic resampling based on our empirical results.

<span id="page-13-0"></span><sup>2</sup>Our implementation, including the code to run the experiments in this paper can be found at https://github.com/John-JoB/DIMMPF.

<span id="page-14-0"></span>Algorithm 2 Differentiable Interacting Multiple Model Particle Filter. All operations indexed by n should be repeated for all  $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$  and those by q for  $q \in \{1, \ldots, N_{\text{reg}}\}$ .  $\beta$  is the learning rate according to optimiser choice.

	<b>Input:</b> priors $M_0^{\theta}$	dynamic models $M^{\theta}$			
	regime prior $K_0^{\theta}$	switching dynamic $K^{\theta}$			
	observation models $G^{\theta}$	encoding functions $R^{\theta}$			
	time length $T$	particle count $N$			
	$\cos$ coefficient $\lambda$	observations $y_{0:T}$			
	ground truth $x_{0:T}$	number of regimes $N_{\text{reg}}$			
<b>Output:</b> model parameters $\theta$					
1: $k_0^n \leftarrow \lfloor \frac{n}{N_{\text{max}}} \rfloor$					
2: Sample $x_0^n \sim M_0^{\theta} (x_0^n   k_0^n)$					
	3: $r_0^n = R^{\theta}\left(k_0^n, \vec{0}\right)$				
	4: $w_0^n = \frac{G^{\theta}(y_0 x_0^n, k_0^n)}{\perp G^{\theta}(y_0 x_0^n, k_0^n)}$				
	5: $\bar{w}_0^n = \frac{w_0^n}{\sum_{m=1}^N w_0^m}$				
	6: for $t = 1$ to T do				
	7: $k_t^n \leftarrow \lfloor \frac{n}{N_{\text{res}}} \rfloor$				
8:	$\hat{w}_t^{n,q} \leftarrow \frac{\bar{w}_{t-1}^n K^{\theta}(q r_{t-1}^n)}{\sum_{l=1}^N K^{\theta}(q r_{t-1}^m)}$				
9:		Sample ancestor indices $A_t^n = m$ with probability equal to $\hat{w}_t^{m,k_t^n}$			
10:	Sample $x_t^n \sim M^{\theta}\left(x_t^n \mid x_{t-1}^{A_t^n}, k_t^n\right)$				
11:	$r_t^n \leftarrow R^{\theta}\left(k_t^n, r_{t-1}^{A_t^n}\right);$				
12:	Calculate $w_t^n$ from Eq. (11)				
13:	$\bar{w}_t^n = \frac{w_t^n}{\sum_{m=1}^N w_t^m};$				
	14: end for				
	15: $\tilde{x}_t \leftarrow \sum_{m=1}^{N} x_t^m \bar{w}_t^m$				
	16: $\mathcal{L}_{MSE} = \sum_{t=0}^{T} (\tilde{x}_t - x_t)^2$				
	17: return $\mathcal{L}_{MSE}$				

#### <span id="page-15-0"></span>5. Theoretical Results

In this section, we present the main theoretical results of this paper. We prove consistency for the filtering estimates and their derivatives for the DIMMPF. For simplicity, we provide detailed proofs for the case where the regimes are sampled uniformly, however, the consistency results also hold when the regime indices are chosen deterministically. This can be shown by applying the result that the normalised multiple importance sampler with deterministic sampling is unbiased [\[35\]](#page-28-9) as an extra step in the derivation of the central limit theorems used.

## 5.1. Consistency of the IMMPF

We have shown in Section [3.3](#page-8-1) that the IMMPF is a special case of the SMIS, when the regime indices are sampled uniformly rather than chosen deterministically. We demonstrate that the filtering estimates obtained from the SMIS are consistent, so the IMMPF with uniform sampling is consistent.

<span id="page-15-1"></span>**Theorem 1.** Defining  $\mathcal{F}_t(\psi)$ , and  $\mathbb{P}_t(\psi)$ , to be the filtering estimator and posterior mean of some test function  $\psi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ , respectively. Then under the sufficient, but not necessary, set of assumptions that  $|\psi|$  is upper bounded and the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $\frac{\mu_t}{\lambda_t}$  is both finitely upper and lower bounded:

<span id="page-15-2"></span>
$$
\mathcal{F}_{t}(\psi) \xrightarrow{prob} \mathbb{P}_{t}(\psi) . \tag{13}
$$

Proof. This proof is based in part on the proofs found in Chapters 8 and 11 of [\[13](#page-26-9)]. Convergence in the MSE sense implies convergence in probability.

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathcal{F}_{t}\left(\psi\right)-\mathbb{P}_{t}\left(\psi\right)\right)^{2}\right]
$$
\n
$$
=\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathcal{F}_{t}\left(\psi\right)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\mu_{t}\left(d\hat{x}_{t}\right)\psi\left(\hat{x}_{t}\right)+\int_{\mathcal{X}}\mu_{t}\left(d\hat{x}_{t}\right)\psi\left(\hat{x}_{t}\right)-\mathbb{P}_{t}\left(\psi\right)\right)^{2}\right]
$$
\n
$$
\leq 2\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathcal{F}_{t}\left(\psi\right)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\mu_{t}\left(d\hat{x}_{t}\right)\psi\left(\hat{x}_{t}\right)\right)^{2}\right]+\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}}\mu_{t}\left(d\hat{x}_{t}\right)\psi\left(\hat{x}_{t}\right)-\mathbb{P}_{t}\left(\psi\right)\right)^{2}\right]\right\}.\tag{14}
$$

The first term can be bounded using the convergence result for an auto-

normalised importance sampler.

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathcal{F}_{t}\left(\psi\right)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\mu_{t}\left(d\hat{x}_{t}\right)\psi\left(\hat{x}_{t}\right)\right)^{2}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\left(\mathcal{F}_{t}\left(\psi\right)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\mu_{t}\left(d\hat{x}_{t}\right)\psi\left(\hat{x}_{t}\right)\right)\right\|_{\infty}^{2} \mid \hat{x}_{t-1}^{1:N}, w_{t-1}^{1:N}\right] \leq \frac{1}{N}c_{t}.
$$
\n(15)

For some factor  $c_t$  that is independent of N, we have used the fact that the particles are conditionally i.i.d. given the particles at the previous time-step. For  $t = 0$ , the second term in Eq. [\(14\)](#page-15-2) is zero, so MSE convergence is guaranteed *i.e.* Theorem [1](#page-15-1) holds for  $t = 0$ . For  $t > 0$ , we may bound the MSE by induction with  $t = 0$  as the base case. To perform the inductive step we first introduce the identity:

<span id="page-16-0"></span>
$$
\mathbb{P}_{t-1}\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi\left(\hat{x}_t\right)p\left(d\hat{x}_t\mid\hat{x}_{t-1},\hat{y}_t\right)\right)=\mathbb{P}_t\left(\psi\right),\tag{16}
$$

which may be proved using basic probability rules and the conditional independence structure of the SSM  $(Eq. (1))$  $(Eq. (1))$  $(Eq. (1))$ . One may write:

$$
\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mu_t (d\hat{x}_t) \psi(\hat{x}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{w}_{t-1}^i \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(\hat{x}_t) p(d\hat{x}_t | \hat{x}_{t-1}^i, \hat{y}_{0:t})
$$
\n
$$
= \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(\hat{x}_t) p(d\hat{x}_t | \hat{x}_{t-1}, \hat{y}_t) \right).
$$
\n(17)

This implies, using Eq. [\(16\)](#page-16-0), that the second term in [\(14\)](#page-15-2) is bounded assum-ing that Theorem [1](#page-15-1) holds for  $t - 1$ . Then, the MSE becomes the sum of two bounded terms. So, it is bounded.  $\Box$ bounded terms. So, it is bounded.

#### 5.2. Consistency of the DIMMPF

This section establishes consistency for the DIMMPF, Theorem [2](#page-17-0) demonstrates that the forward pass of the DIMMPF is identical to that of the IMMPF, so by Theorem [1,](#page-15-1) the DIMMPF produces consistent filtering estimates. The rest of this section is devoted to proving consistency for the filtering gradient estimates.

Throughout the following derivations we abuse notation to use the gradient operator  $\nabla_{\theta}$  to additionally denote differentiation of a random variable, where we define  $\nabla_{\theta}A$  for some random variable A to be exactly the gradient obtained by back-propagation. We justify this notation by the truth that, under the Monte-Carlo gradient estimation schemes used in this paper, the derivative of a random variable is unbiased under the same composition rules as the usual gradient operator. We use this assumption implicitly in the following proofs, see [\[47\]](#page-29-9) for detail.

<span id="page-17-0"></span>Theorem 2. The weighting function Eqs. [\(11a\)](#page-11-0) and [\(11b\)](#page-11-2), reduces to the same value as the weights obtained using the IMMPF proposal Eq. [\(9\)](#page-9-0) on the forward pass.

Proof. In the forward pass, Eq. [\(11b\)](#page-11-2) simplifies to:

<span id="page-17-2"></span>
$$
w_t^n = G^{\theta} \left( y_t^n \mid x_t^n, k_t^n \right) \sum_{l=1}^N K^{\theta} \left( k_t^n \mid r_{t-1}^l \right) . \tag{18}
$$

Evaluating Eq. [\(9\)](#page-9-0) for a given latent state gives:

<span id="page-17-1"></span>
$$
\lambda (x_t^n, k_t^n, r_t^n) = \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{N_{\text{reg}}} \bar{w}_{t-1}^m K^\theta \left(k_t^n \mid r_{t-1}^m\right) M^\theta \left(x_t^n \mid x_{t-1}^m, k_t^n\right)}{\sum_{l=1}^N K^\theta \left(k_t^n \mid r_{t-1}^l\right)}.
$$
(19)

Then calculating  $w_n^t$  as in Algorithm [1](#page-6-1) from Eq. [\(19\)](#page-17-1), gives the same result as derived from Eq. [\(11b\)](#page-11-2) in Eq. [\(18\)](#page-17-2).  $\Box$ 

<span id="page-17-4"></span>**Lemma 1.** Define the notation  $X^{(N)} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} X^n$  for some sequence of *i.i.d.* random variables  $\{X\}$ . Given averages of N *i.i.d.* random variables  $A_{1:2}^{(N)}$ ,  $B_{1:3}^{(N)}$ , such that  $\mathbb{E}[A_i^1] = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[B_j^1] = B_j \neq 0$ , then:

<span id="page-17-3"></span>
$$
\sqrt{N} \frac{A_1^{(N)} B_1^{(N)} - A_2^{(N)} B_2^{(N)}}{B_3^{(N)}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{A_1^1 B_1 - A_2^1 B_2}{B_3}\right)^2\right]\right). \tag{20}
$$

Proof. From the central limit theorem for averages of random vectors:

$$
\sqrt{N} \left( A_1^{(N)}, A_2^{(N)} \right)^T \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left( (0, 0)^T, \Sigma \right) , \tag{21a}
$$

$$
\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}\left[ \left( A_1^1 \right)^2 \right] & \mathbb{E}\left[ A_1^1 A_2^1 \right] \\ \mathbb{E}\left[ A_1^1 A_2^1 \right] & \mathbb{E}\left[ \left( A_2^1 \right)^2 \right] \end{pmatrix} . \tag{21b}
$$

By the weak law of large numbers:

$$
B_j^N \xrightarrow{\text{prob.}} B_j \,.
$$

Then Eq. [20](#page-17-3) follows by several applications of the continuous mapping theorem.  $\Box$ 

The following Lemma establishes a central limit theorem for estimates of the gradient of an auto-normalised importance sample. For clarity we take the one dimensional case, with test function  $\psi(x^n) : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$  but this analysis can be extended to multi-dimensional cases.

## <span id="page-18-4"></span>Lemma 2. Define:

$$
\bar{\psi}(x) = \psi(x) - \mathbb{E}_{x' \sim \mu} \left[ \psi(x') \right]. \tag{23}
$$

Assuming that:

<span id="page-18-2"></span>
$$
\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \lambda} \left[ \nabla_{\theta} \left\{ w \left( x \right) \bar{\psi} \left( x \right) \right\} \right] = 0, \tag{24a}
$$

<span id="page-18-0"></span>
$$
\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \lambda} \left[ \left\{ w \left( x \right) \bar{\psi} \left( x \right) \right\} \right] = 0; \tag{24b}
$$

.

and taking  $\bar{w}(x^n) = \frac{w(x^n)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} w(n)}$  $\frac{w(x^n)}{\sum_{m}^N w(x^m)}$  then:

$$
\sqrt{N}\left(\nabla_{\theta}\sum_{n=0}^{N}\bar{w}(x^{n})\psi(x^{n})-\nabla_{\theta}\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mu}[\psi(x)]\right)
$$

$$
\xrightarrow{d_{\omega}}\mathcal{N}\left(0,\frac{\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\lambda}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\lambda}\left[w\left(x\right)\right]\nabla_{\theta}\left[w\left(x\right)\bar{\psi}\left(x\right)\right]-w\left(x\right)\bar{\psi}\left(x\right)\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\lambda}\left[\nabla_{\theta}w\left(x\right)\right]\right)^{2}\right]}{\left\{\mathbb{E}_{x\sim\lambda}\left[w\left(x\right)\right]\right\}^{4}}\right).
$$
\n(25)

Proof.

<span id="page-18-1"></span>
$$
\nabla_{\theta} \sum_{n=0}^{N} \bar{w} (x^{n}) \psi (x^{n}) - \nabla_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} [\psi (x)]
$$
  
=  $\nabla_{\theta} \left\{ \frac{N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{N} w (x^{n}) \bar{\psi} (x^{n})}{N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{N} w (x^{n})} \right\}$   
=  $\frac{N^{-2} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \nabla_{\theta} [w (x^{n}) \bar{\psi} (x^{n})] \sum_{m=1}^{N} w (x^{m}) - N^{-2} \sum_{n=1}^{N} w (x^{n}) \bar{\psi} (x^{n}) \sum_{m=1}^{N} \nabla_{\theta} [w (x^{m})]}{N^{-2} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{N} w (x^{n}) \right)^{2}}$ (26)

Under assumptions  $(24)$  and Eq.  $(26)$ , the CLT is proved by direct application of Lemma [1.](#page-17-4)  $\Box$ 

<span id="page-18-3"></span>**Lemma 3.** Given that  $x_t^n$  is sampled from  $M^{\theta}\left(x_t^n \mid x_{t-1}^m, k_t^n\right)$  via the repa-rameterisation trick, for our weight function [\(11b\)](#page-11-2), proposal [\(9\)](#page-9-0), and target [\(6\)](#page-7-0), the following identity holds:

$$
\mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \lambda} \left[ \nabla_{\theta} \left\{ w \left( x_t \right) \bar{\psi} \left( x_t \right) \right\} \right] = \nabla_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mu} \left[ \frac{1}{c} \bar{\psi} \left( x_t \right) \right] \n c := \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \lambda} \left[ w \left( x_t \right) \right].
$$
\n(27)

Proof.

$$
\nabla_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mu} \left[ \frac{1}{c} \bar{\psi}(x_t) \right]
$$
\n
$$
= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{k_t=1, n=1}^{K,N} \nabla_{\theta} \left[ \bar{\psi}(x_t, k_t) \, \bar{w}_{t-1}^n K^{\theta} \left( k_t \mid r_{t-1}^n \right) M^{\theta} \left( x_t \mid x_{t-1}^n, k_t \right) dx_t \right].
$$
\n
$$
= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{k_t=1, n=1}^{K,N} \nabla_{\theta} \left[ \bar{\psi}(x_t, k_t) \, \bar{w}_{t-1}^n K^{\theta} \left( k_t \mid r_{t-1}^n \right) \right] M^{\theta} \left( x_t \mid x_{t-1}^n, k_t \right) dx_t
$$
\n
$$
+ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{k_t=1, n=1}^{K,N} \bar{\psi}(x_t, k_t) \, \bar{w}_{t-1}^n K^{\theta} \left( k_t \mid r_{t-1}^n \right) \nabla_{\theta} \left[ M^{\theta} \left( x_t \mid x_{t-1}^n, k_t \right) \right] dx_t,
$$
\n(28b)

<span id="page-19-0"></span>where we have absorbed the conditional likelihood,  $G(y_t | x_t, k_t)$ , into the function  $\bar{\psi}(x_t, k_t)$  for clarity. Due to our use of the reparameterisation trick  $\nabla_{\theta}\left[M^{\theta}\left(x_t \mid x_{t-1}^n, k_t\right)\right] = 0$ , the second term in Eq. [\(28b\)](#page-19-0) vanishes.

$$
\mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \lambda} \left[ \nabla_{\theta} \left\{ w \left( x_t \right) \bar{\psi} \left( x_t \right) \right\} \right]
$$
\n
$$
= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{k_t=1, n=1}^{K,N} \nabla_{\theta} \left[ \bar{\psi} \left( x_t, k_t \right) \bar{w}_{t-1}^n K^{\theta} \left( k_t \mid r_{t-1}^n \right) \perp M^{\theta} \left( x_t \mid x_{t-1}^n, k_t \right) dx_t \right]
$$
\n
$$
= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{k_t=1, n=1}^{K,N} \nabla_{\theta} \left[ \bar{\psi} \left( x_t, k_t \right) \bar{w}_{t-1}^n K^{\theta} \left( k_t \mid r_{t-1}^n \right) \right] M^{\theta} \left( x_t \mid x_{t-1}^n, k_t \right) dx_t \tag{29}
$$
\n
$$
= \nabla_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mu} \left[ \frac{1}{c} \bar{\psi} \left( x_t \right) \right]. \tag{29}
$$

<span id="page-19-1"></span>**Lemma 4.** Given that  $x_t^n$  is sampled from  $M^{\theta}\left(x_t^n \mid x_{t-1}^m, k_t^n\right)$  via the reparameterisation trick, assumptions Eq. [\(24\)](#page-18-0) hold for our weight function Eq. [\(11b\)](#page-11-2) and an arbitrary test function  $\psi$ .

Proof. Theorem [2](#page-17-0) demonstrates that Eq. [\(11b\)](#page-11-2) reduces to the regular autonormalised importance sampling weight in the forward pass, for which [\(24b\)](#page-18-0) holds, see e.g. chapter 8 of [\[13\]](#page-26-9). To show Eq. [\(24a\)](#page-18-2) holds, we apply Lemma [3](#page-18-3) and conclude by noting that  $c$  is independent of  $x_t$  and using the definition of  $\bar{\psi}$ :

$$
\mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \lambda} \left[ \nabla_{\theta} \left\{ w \left( x_t \right) \bar{\psi} \left( x_t \right) \right\} \right] = \nabla_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mu} \left[ \frac{1}{c} \bar{\psi} \left( x_t \right) \right] = 0. \tag{30}
$$

<span id="page-20-1"></span>Theorem 3. In the backwards pass, Eq. [\(11b\)](#page-11-2) provides consistent, but biased, gradient estimates:

$$
\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{F}_t \left( \psi \right) \xrightarrow{prob.} \nabla_{\theta} \mathbb{P}_t \left( \psi \right) . \tag{31}
$$

In addition to the bounding assumptions used to establish Theorem [1.](#page-15-1) We also require that the absolute values of the gradients of  $\psi(x)$  and  $w(x)$  with respect to the particles at the previous time step and the model parameters at the current time-step are bounded from above.

Proof.

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{F}_{t}\left(\psi\right)-\nabla_{\theta}\mathbb{P}_{t}\left(\psi\right)\right)^{2}\right] \n\leq 2\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{F}_{t}\left(\psi\right)-\nabla_{\theta}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi\left(x_{t}\right)\mu_{t}\left(dx_{t}\right)\right)^{2}\right] \n+\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\nabla_{\theta}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi\left(x_{t}\right)\mu_{t}\left(dx_{t}\right)-\nabla_{\theta}\mathbb{P}_{t}\left(\psi\right)\right)^{2}\right]\right\}.
$$
\n(32)

Each term can be bounded in a similar manner to the MSE of the filtering estimates in Theorem [1.](#page-15-1) The first term given the population of the particles at the previous time-step is the gradient of an auto-normalised importance sample which is proved to follow the CLT in Lemma [2,](#page-18-4) given certain assumptions which we demonstrated hold in our case in Lemma [4.](#page-19-1) We conclude the proof by applying the tower property of conditional expectation.

We prove the second term again by induction, in the  $t = 0$  case it is exactly zero. For subsequent time-steps, via the same steps taken to prove Theorem [1,](#page-15-1) it can be shown that this term is upper bounded by a quantity proportional to  $N^{-1}$  if Theorem [3](#page-20-1) holds at the previous time-step.

We conclude the proof by noting that the sum of two quantities upper bounded by a term of order  $N^{-1}$  is itself upper bounded by a term of the same order.  $\Box$ 

## <span id="page-20-0"></span>6. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present the results from a set of numerical experiments.

#### 6.1. Simulated environments

We repeat the test environment of [\[9,](#page-26-5) [20](#page-27-5)], in which the dynamic and observation models of each regime are uni-variate and Gaussian.

$$
M_0(x_0) = \mathcal{U}(-0.5, 0.5) , \qquad (33a)
$$

$$
M(x_t|x_{t-1}, k_t) = \mathcal{N}(a_{k_t}x_{t-1} + b_{k_t}, \sigma^2), \qquad (33b)
$$

$$
G(y_t|x_t, k_t) = \mathcal{N}\left(a_{k_t}\sqrt{|x_t|} + b_{k_t}, \sigma^2\right),\qquad(33c)
$$

$$
[a_1, \ldots, a_8] = [-0.1, -0.3, -0.5, -0.9, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.9], \qquad (33d)
$$

$$
[b_1, \ldots, b_8] = [0, -2, 2, -4, 0, 2, -2, 4], \qquad (33e)
$$

$$
\sigma^2 = 0.1 \,. \tag{33f}
$$

This model poses some challenges to state estimation. Because the observation location depends on the state only through its absolute value, it is impossible to estimate the state using the observations alone. Furthermore, the coefficients  $a_i, b_i$  are chosen so that it is hard to identify the current regime over short sequences, for example, regimes 1 and 5 have identical data likelihoods when each is run in isolation. It is therefore required that all of the observation model, the dynamic model and the switching dynamic are well-learned.

We include three different switching dynamics. The first is a Markov switching system where the probability of remaining in the same regime is 0.8; switching to the next regime, with regimes 9 and 1 identified, is 0.15; and all other regimes have probability  $\frac{1}{120}$ . Algebraically:

$$
K\left(k_t|k_{0:t-1}\right) = \left(\mathbf{k}'_{t-1}\right)^T B \mathbf{k}'_t, \tag{34a}
$$

$$
B = \begin{pmatrix} 0.8 & 0.15 & \rho & \dots & \rho \\ \rho & 0.8 & 0.15 & \dots & \rho \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (34b)
$$

$$
= \begin{bmatrix} \rho & 0.8 & 0.15 & \dots & \rho \\ \vdots & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \rho & \rho & \dots & 0.8 & 0.15 \\ 0.15 & \rho & \dots & \rho & 0.8 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad (34b)
$$

$$
\rho = \frac{1}{120},\tag{34c}
$$

where  $k'_t$  are the one-hot encodings of the regime index.

In the second setting, the regimes follow a Pólya-urn distribution where the sampled regimes are more likely to appear at later time-steps:

$$
K(k_t|k_{0:t-1}) = \frac{1 + \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{1}(k_s = k_t)}{8 + t}.
$$
\n(35)

The Pólya-urn setting has frequent switching and often the distribution of model indices looks close to uniform, making it simpler to approximate but harder to perform inference on than the Markov setting. In both cases we set  $K_0(k_0) = \frac{1}{8}$ .

To demonstrate the versatility of our algorithm, we introduce a more challenging switching dynamic than has been used in previous work. For the third setting, the time between regime switches is approximately Erlang distributed. The order of the Erlang distribution is equal to the number of periods for which the system has been in the current regime. Once the Erlang distributed period is finished, the system jumps randomly to one of the two adjacent regimes. However, we include a small probability that at any time-step the system jumps to any regime. This system is most simply expressed algebraically as

$$
m_t \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.01) , \qquad (36a)
$$

$$
n_t \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.2) \tag{36b}
$$

$$
c(k_{0:t},k) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{1}((k_s = k) \land (\neg (k_{s+1} = k) \lor (m_s = 1))) ,
$$
 (36c)

$$
l_t = \begin{cases} l_{t-1}, & n_t = 0l_{t-1} - 1, \quad \neg(l_{t-1} = 0) \land (n_t = 1), \\ c(k_{0:t}, k_t), & (l_{t-1} = 0) \land (n_t = 1), \end{cases}
$$
 (36d)

$$
\alpha_t = (n_t = 1) \land (l_{t-1} = 0) , \qquad (36e)
$$

$$
K(k_t|k_{0:t-1}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{N_{\text{reg}}}, & m_t = 1, \\ 1(k_t = k_{t-1}), & (m_t = 0) \land \neg \alpha_t, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0.61(k_t = k_{t-1} + 1(\text{mod } N_{\text{reg}})) \\ +0.41(k_t = k_{t-1} - 1(\text{mod } N_{\text{reg}})) \end{pmatrix}, & (m_t = 0) \land \alpha_t. \end{cases}
$$
(36f)

We choose this dynamic because of its complexity to learn. There are both strong dependence between the index at successive time-steps, like the Markov setting; and long term dependencies, like the Pólya setting.

## <span id="page-22-0"></span>6.2. Experiment details

In addition to the our DIMMPF, we present a number of baseline approaches. The problem of sequential state estimation can be described as learning to predict a sequence of latent states from a sequence of observations, so any available sequence-to-sequence techniques can apply. We choose to use a transformer[\[48\]](#page-29-10) and an LSTM [\[36\]](#page-28-10) as baseline approaches as they represent the state-of-the-art in sequence-to-sequence prediction. The transformer is encoder only and the LSTM is unidirectional so that only past

information is used. We also compare to the regime learning particle filter (RLPF), a preliminary version of our methodology that we presented in the conference paper [\[23](#page-27-8)]. Finally we include two variants on the DIMMPF: the DIMMPF-OT that uses a transport map based resampler [\[29\]](#page-28-3) to be differentiable, instead of the gradient estimator developed in Section [4.2;](#page-10-1) and the DIMMPF-N that uses the  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  gradient estimator described in Section [4.2.](#page-10-1)

All filtering based models parameterise both the measurement and dynamic models with fully connected neural networks of two hidden layers containing 11 nodes each. During training we use a population of 200 total particles, which we increase to 2000 for testing. This is reduced to 80 particles in training and 800 in testing for the DIMMPF-OT due to memory constraints. We generate 2000 trajectories of 51 time-steps and use them in ratio 2 : 1 : 1 for training, validation and testing, respectively. We train in mini-batches of 100 trajectories, but test on the full 500 trajectory batches. Each experiment is repeated 20 times with independent data generations. All experiments are performed using an NVIDA RTX 3090 GPU.

<span id="page-23-0"></span>

Algorithm	Markov MSE	Pólya MSE	Erlang
Transformer (baseline)	$1.579 \pm 0.169$	$1.508 \pm 0.112$	$1.614 \pm 0.160$
LSTM (baseline)	$0.732 \pm 0.083$	$0.667 \pm 0.053$	$0.978 \pm 0.103$
RLPF (baseline)	$0.536 \pm 0.143$	$0.509 \pm 0.071$	$0.771 \pm 0.110$
$\overline{\mathrm{DIMMPF-OT}}$ (baseline)	$0.891 \pm 0.128$	$0.866 \pm 0.134$	$\sqrt{0.873} \pm 0.122$
$\overline{\mathrm{DIMMPF\text{-}N}}$ (baseline)	$0.751 \pm 0.0694$	$0.741 \pm 0.071$	$0.742 \pm 0.072$
DIMMPF (ours)	$0.500 \pm 0.100$	$0.490 \pm 0.052$	$0.712 \pm 0.115$
IMMPF (oracle)	$0.274 \pm 0.019$	$0.408 \pm 0.014$	$0.473 \pm 0.025$

Table 1: Filtering accuracy for the discussed algorithms. Reported values are the achieved mean squared filtering error and averaged across 20 independent training runs.

Table 2: Average computation times per training epoch (10 batches of 100 parallel filters of 200 particles each) and testing run (1 batch of 500 parallel filters of 2000 particles each) on the Pólya experiment.

<span id="page-24-1"></span>

Algorithm	Av. train epoch time (s)	Av. test time (s)
Transformer (baseline)	0.182	0.00310
LSTM (baseline)	0.0145	0.000792
RLPF (baseline)	5.98	0.814
DIMMPF-OT (baseline)	425	Out of memory
$\overline{\mathrm{DIMMP}}$ F-N (baseline)	8.56	0.773
DIMMPF (Ours)	10.5	0.759

#### 6.3. Results

We present the main results in Table [1,](#page-23-0) and the computation times in Table [2.](#page-24-1) The DIMMPF is the best performing algorithm in all experiments. The filtering approaches far outperform the generic sequence-to-sequence techniques in mean accuracy, however, the LSTM is computationally the cheapest. In training, the DIMMPF is faster than the DIMMPF-OT. But, it is slower than the DIMMPF-N due requiring more terms to be computed. The RLPF further saves time through ignoring gradient terms that the DIMMPF and DIMMPF-N evaluate. During inference, the DIMMPF and DIMMPF-N are equivalent so achieve similar timings.

## <span id="page-24-0"></span>7. Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented a novel differentiable particle filter, the DIMMPF, that addresses the problem of learning to estimate the state of a regime switching state space process. Our algorithm improves over the previous state-of-the-art, the RSDBPF, in three respects. Firstly, the RSDBPF required that the switching dynamic be fully known a priori, whereas our algorithm can learn it from data. Secondly, the DIMMPF takes account of assigned regime when resampling particles, thereby concentrating computation on more promising regions. Thirdly, the gradient estimates returned by the DIMMPF are consistent.

We evaluated our algorithm on a set of numerical experiments. The three settings, Markov, Pólya, and Erlang are designed to test the learning of short-term strong dependency, long-range weak dependency, and both simultaneously, respectively. The proposed DIMMPF leads to the smallest

filtering errors on all three settings. The DIMMPF is computationally expensive during training, both compared to its simpler variants and especially out-of-the-box sequence-to-sequence techniques. However, during inference it achieves a similar speed to the other DPF approaches.

An important direction for future work is towards more challenging environments, including real-world data. We propose a simple architecture to parameterise the switching dynamic; future work might consider more advanced design patterns such as attention.

## 8. CRediT author statement

John-Joseph Brady: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Software, Formal Analysis, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing. Yuhui Luo: Supervision, Writing - Review & Editing. Wenwu Wang: Supervision, Writing - Review & Editing. Víctor Elvira: Writing - Review & Editing. Yunpeng Li: Conceptualisation, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision.

## 9. Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge funding from the UK Department for Science, Innovation and Technology through the 2024 National Measurement System programme. JJ. Brady is supported through the National Physical Laboratory and University of Surrey partnership via an Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council studentship. The work of V. E. is supported by ARL/ARO under grant W911NF-22-1-0235.

#### References

- <span id="page-25-0"></span>[1] M. Guidolin, Missing Data Methods: Time-Series Methods and Applications, Emerald Group Publishing Ltd., 2011.
- <span id="page-25-1"></span>[2] J. D. Hamilton, A new approach to the economic analysis of nonstationary time series and the business cycle, Econometrica 57 (2) (1989) 357–384.
- <span id="page-25-2"></span>[3] S. McGinnity, G. Irwin, Multiple model bootstrap filter for maneuvering target tracking, IEEE Tran. Aero. Electr. Syst. 36 (3) (2000) 1006–1012.
- <span id="page-26-0"></span>[4] H. A. Blom, An efficient decision-making-free filter for processes with abrupt changes, in: Proc. IFAC/IFORS Symp. on Ident. and Syst. Param. Est., York, UK, 1985.
- <span id="page-26-1"></span>[5] H. A. Blom, E. A. Bloem, Exact bayesian and particle filtering of stochastic hybrid systems, IEEE Tran. Aero. Elect. Syst. 43 (1) (2007) 55–70.
- <span id="page-26-2"></span>[6] Y. Boers, J. Driessen, Interacting multiple model particle filter, IEE Proc. Radar, Sonar Nav. 150 (2003) 344–349.
- <span id="page-26-3"></span>[7] N. Gordon, D. Salmond, A. Smith, Novel approach to nonlinear/nongaussian bayesian state estimation, IEEE Proc. F, Radar Sig. Processing 140 (2) (1993) 107–113.
- <span id="page-26-4"></span>[8] A. Doucet, A. Johansen, A tutorial on particle filtering and smoothing: Fifteen years later, 2009.
- <span id="page-26-5"></span>[9] Y. El-Laham, L. Yang, P. M. Djurić, M. F. Bugallo, Particle filtering under general regime switching, in: Proc. Euro. Sig. Process. Conf. (EU-SIPCO), Amsterdam, NL, 2021, pp. 2378–2382.
- <span id="page-26-6"></span>[10] A. Doucet, S. Sénécal, Fixed-lag sequential monte carlo, in: Proc. Europe. Sig. Process. Conf. (EUSIPCO), Vienna, Austria, 2004, pp. 861– 864.
- <span id="page-26-7"></span>[11] N. J. Gordon, S. Maskell, T. Kirubarajan, Efficient particle filters for joint tracking and classification, in: Sig. Data Process. Small Targets, 2002, pp. 439–449.
- <span id="page-26-8"></span>[12] D. Crisan, A. Doucet, A survey of convergence results on particle filtering methods for practitioners, IEEE Tran. Sig. Process. 50 (3) (2002) 736–746.
- <span id="page-26-9"></span>[13] N. Chopin, O. Papaspiliopoulos, An Introduction to Sequential Monte Carlo, Springer International Publishing, New York, USA, 2020.
- <span id="page-26-10"></span>[14] P. Del Moral, Feynman-Kac Formulae: Genealogical and Interacting Particle Systems with Applications, Springer, New York, NY, USA, 2004.
- <span id="page-27-0"></span>[15] R. Jonschkowski, D. Rastogi, O. Brock, Differentiable particle filters: End-to-end learning with algorithmic priors, in: Proc. Robot.: Sci. Syst., Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 2018.
- <span id="page-27-1"></span>[16] P. Karkus, D. Hsu, W. S. Lee, Particle filter networks with application to visual localization, in: Proc. Conf. Robot Learn., PMLR, Zurich, CH, 2018, pp. 169–178.
- <span id="page-27-2"></span>[17] X. Chen, Y. Li, An overview of differentiable particle filters for dataadaptive sequential bayesian inference, Foundations of Data Sci. (2023).
- <span id="page-27-3"></span>[18] N. Kantas, A. Doucet, S. Singh, J. Maciejowski, An overview of sequential monte carlo methods for parameter estimation in general state-space models, in: IFAC Proc. Volumes, Vol. 42, Saint-Malo, FR, 2009, pp. 774–785.
- <span id="page-27-4"></span>[19] C. Andrieu, A. Doucet, R. Holenstein, Particle markov chain monte carlo methods, J. Royal Stat. Soc. Series B: Stat. Method. 72 (3) (2010).
- <span id="page-27-5"></span>[20] W. Li, X. Chen, W. Wang, V. Elvira, Y. Li, Differentiable bootstrap particle filters for regime-switching models, in: Proc. IEEE Stat. Sig. Process. Workshop (SSP), Hanoi, Vietnam, 2023, pp. 200–204.
- <span id="page-27-6"></span>[21] I. Urteaga, M. F. Bugallo, P. M. Djurić, Sequential monte carlo methods under model uncertainty, in: Proc. IEEE Stat. Sig. Process. Workshop (SSP), Palma de Mallorca, Spain, 2016, pp. 1–5.
- <span id="page-27-7"></span>[22] L. Martino, J. Read, V. Elvira, F. Louzada, Cooperative parallel particle filters for online model selection and applications to urban mobility, Digit. Sig. Process. 60 (2017) 172–185.
- <span id="page-27-8"></span>[23] J.-J. Brady, Y. Luo, W. Wang, V. Elvira, Y. Li, Regime learning for differentiable particle filters, arXiv:2405.04865 (2024).
- <span id="page-27-9"></span>[24] S. Mcginnity, G. Irwin, A multiple model extension to the bootstrap filter for manoeuvring targets, in: IFAC Proc. Workshop Alg. Arch. Real Time Contr. (AARTC), Cancun, Mexico, 1998, pp. 23–28.
- <span id="page-27-10"></span>[25] E. Chouzenoux, V. Elvira, Graphical inference in non-markovian lineargaussian state-space models, in: Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoustics, Speech Sig. Process (ICASSP), Seoul, South Korea, 2024.
- <span id="page-28-0"></span>[26] C. Andrieu, A. Doucet, V. Tadic, On-line parameter estimation in general state-space models, in: Proc. Conf. Decision Control, Seville, Spain, 2005, pp. 332–337.
- <span id="page-28-1"></span> $[27]$  V. Elvira, L. Martino, M. F. Bugallo, P. M. Djurić, Elucidating the auxiliary particle filter via multiple importance sampling, IEEE Sig. Process. Magazine 36 (6) (2019) 145–152.
- <span id="page-28-2"></span>[28] M. K. Pitt, N. Shephard, Filtering via simulation: Auxiliary particle filters, J. American Stat. Assoc. 94 (446) (1999) 590–599.
- <span id="page-28-3"></span>[29] A. Corenflos, J. Thornton, G. Deligiannidis, A. Doucet, Differentiable particle filtering via entropy-regularized optimal transport, in: Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learn. (ICML), Online, 2021, pp. 2100–2111.
- <span id="page-28-4"></span>[30] R. J. Williams, Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning, Machine Learning 8 (1992) 229–256.
- <span id="page-28-5"></span>[31] J. Foerster, et al., DiCE: The infinitely differentiable Monte Carlo estimator, in: Proc. Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML), Vol. 80, 2018.
- <span id="page-28-6"></span>[32] A. Scibior, F. Wood, Differentiable particle filtering without modifying ´ the forward pass, arXiv:2106.10314 (2021).
- <span id="page-28-7"></span>[33] X. Chen, Y. Li, Normalising flow-based differentiable particle filters, arXiv:2403.01499 (2024).
- <span id="page-28-8"></span>[34] H. A. Blom, Y. Bar-Shalom, The interacting multiple model algorithm for systems with markovian switching coefficients, IEEE Tran Auto. Contr. 33 (1988) 780–783.
- <span id="page-28-9"></span>[35] V. Elvira, L. Martino, D. Luengo, M. F. Bugallo, Generalized multiple importance sampling, Stat. Sci. 34 (1) (2019) 129–155.
- <span id="page-28-10"></span>[36] H. Sak, A. Senior, F. Beaufays, Long short-term memory based recurrent neural network architectures for large vocabulary speech recognition, arXiv:1402.1128 (2014).
- <span id="page-28-11"></span>[37] N. Whiteley, Stability properties of some particle filters, Annals App. Prob. 23 (6) (2013) 2500 – 2537.
- <span id="page-29-0"></span>[38] A. Younis, E. Sudderth, Differentiable and stable long-range tracking of multiple posterior modes, in: Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS), Vol. 36, New Orleans, LA, USA, 2023.
- <span id="page-29-1"></span>[39] B. Cox, et al., End-to-end learning of gaussian mixture proposals using differentiable particle filters and neural networks, in: IEEE Int. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Sig. Process. (ICASSP), Seoul, South Korea, 2024, pp. 9701–9705.
- <span id="page-29-2"></span>[40] F. R. Ruiz, T. R. AUEB, D. Blei, et al., The generalized reparameterization gradient, in: Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS), Vol. 29, Barcelona, Spain, 2016.
- <span id="page-29-3"></span>[41] S. Mohamed, M. Rosca, M. Figurnov, A. Mnih, Monte carlo gradient estimation in machine learning, J. Mach. Learn. Research 21 (132) (2020).
- <span id="page-29-4"></span>[42] C. Naesseth, S. Linderman, R. Ranganath, D. Blei, Variational sequential monte carlo, in: Proc. Int. Conf. Art. Int. and Stat. (AISTATS), PMLR, Lanzarote, Canary Islands, 2018, pp. 968–977.
- <span id="page-29-5"></span>[43] T. Le, M. Igl, T. Rainforth, T. Jin, F. Wood, Auto-encoding sequential monte carlo, in: Proc. Int. Conf. Learn Represent. (ICLR), Vancouver, Canada, 2018.
- <span id="page-29-6"></span>[44] C. J. Maddison, et al., Filtering variational objectives, in: Proc. Adv. in Neural Info. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS), Long Beach, CA, USA, 2017.
- <span id="page-29-7"></span>[45] J. Carpenter, P. Clifford, P. Fearnhead, Improved particle filter for nonlinear problems, in: IEE Proc. Radar, Sonar and Navi., Vol. 146, 1999.
- <span id="page-29-8"></span>[46] M. Zhu, K. P. Murphy, R. Jonschkowski, Towards differentiable resampling, arXiv:2004.11938 (2020).
- <span id="page-29-9"></span>[47] J. Schulman, N. Heess, T. Weber, P. Abbeel, Gradient estimation using stochastic computation graphs, in: Proc. Adv. in Neural Info. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS), Vol. 28, Montréal, Canda, 2015.
- <span id="page-29-10"></span>[48] A. Vaswani, et al., Attention is all you need, in: Proc. Adv. in Neural Info. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS), Long Beach, CA, USA, 2017.