

# Advances in Temporal Point Processes: Bayesian, Deep, and LLM Approaches

Feng Zhou<sup>1</sup>, Quyu Kong<sup>2</sup>, Yixuan Zhang<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Applied Statistics and School of Statistics, Renmin University of China

<sup>2</sup>Alibaba Cloud

<sup>3</sup>School of Statistics and Data Science, Southeast University

feng.zhou@ruc.edu.cn, kongquyu@gmail.com, zh1xuan@hotmail.com

## Abstract

Temporal point processes (TPPs) are stochastic process models used to characterize event sequences occurring in continuous time. Traditional statistical TPPs have a long-standing history, with numerous models proposed and successfully applied across diverse domains. In recent years, advances in deep learning have spurred the development of neural TPPs, enabling greater flexibility and expressiveness in capturing complex temporal dynamics. The emergence of large language models (LLMs) has further sparked excitement, offering new possibilities for modeling and analyzing event sequences by leveraging their rich contextual understanding. This survey presents a comprehensive review of recent research on TPPs from three perspectives: Bayesian, deep learning, and LLM approaches. We begin with a review of the fundamental concepts of TPPs, followed by an in-depth discussion of model design and parameter estimation techniques in these three frameworks. We also revisit classic application areas of TPPs to highlight their practical relevance. Finally, we outline challenges and promising directions for future research.

## 1 Introduction

Many application scenarios generate time-stamped event sequences, which can be effectively modeled using temporal point processes (TPPs) [Daley and Vere-Jones, 2007]. Examples include neural spike train data in neuroscience [Linderman and Adams, 2015], ask and bid orders in high-frequency financial trading [Bacry and Muzy, 2014], as well as tweets and retweets on social media [Kong *et al.*, 2023]. These event sequences, composed of asynchronous events, often influence one another and exhibit complex dynamics, making them more challenging to analyze compared to traditional synchronous time series problems. Investigating the underlying dynamic processes of such event sequences not only facilitates the prediction of future events but also helps uncover causal relationships.

In the statistics community, TPPs have a long-standing history of research, with numerous statistical TPP models proposed over the years. Examples include the classic Poisson

process [Kingman, 1992], Hawkes process [Hawkes, 1971], and self-correcting process [Isham and Westcott, 1979], among others. Each of these models is particularly well-suited to specific applications. For instance, the Poisson process was used to model telephone call arrivals, while the Hawkes process, due to its ability to capture self-exciting characteristics, has been widely applied to model earthquakes and aftershocks.

Early TPP models are primarily parametric, requiring explicit specification of the parametric form of the model. However, this imposes limitations on their expressive power. To address these limitations, various nonparametric TPPs have been proposed within the statistics community, including approaches from both the frequentist and Bayesian frameworks, enabling more flexible modeling without the constraints of fixed parametric forms. In recent years, driven by rapid advancements in deep learning, the machine learning community has introduced approaches that combine neural network architectures with TPPs, referred to as neural TPPs. These models further enhance expressive power and are often more intuitive, simpler, and easier to train compared to statistical nonparametric TPPs. Over the past several years, the emergence of large language models (LLMs) has brought transformative changes to the field of artificial intelligence. With their rich contextual understanding and ability to process multimodal data, LLMs offer new possibilities for modeling and analyzing event sequences.

This paper reviews recent advances in TPPs based on Bayesian methods, deep learning, and LLMs, with a focus on model design and parameter estimation. Due to space limitations, we do not aim to cover every method in detail but instead emphasize fundamental principles and core ideas. We also revisit classic applications of TPPs and discuss key challenges and future research directions in the field.

Several surveys on TPPs in machine learning already exist, such as [Yan, 2019] and [Shchur *et al.*, 2021]. The former summarizes advances in statistical TPPs and neural TPPs, while the latter provides a more detailed overview of neural TPPs. Compared to these works, this paper provides a comprehensive update. In the statistical TPPs domain, we focus on recent progress in Bayesian nonparametric TPPs, which has been largely overlooked—most prior reviews, such as [Yan, 2019], primarily cover frequentist approaches. For neural TPPs, [Shchur *et al.*, 2021] reviews works prior to 2020,

but this paper discusses advances from 2020 to 2024. Furthermore, we review the emerging area of LLM-based TPPs, which has gained significant attention in recent years but has yet to be comprehensively reviewed.

## 2 Background of TPPs

[Rasmussen, 2018] provides an excellent tutorial on the fundamentals of TPPs, and many of the concepts discussed below are drawn from this tutorial. A TPP is a stochastic process that models the occurrence of events over a time window  $[0, T]$ . A trajectory from a TPP can be represented as an ordered sequence  $\mathcal{T} = (t_1, \dots, t_N)$ ,  $N(t) = \max\{n : t_n \leq t, t \in [0, T]\}$  represents the associated counting process. Here,  $N$  denotes the random number of events within the interval  $[0, T]$ . TPPs can be defined using different parameterizations. One approach is to specify the distribution of the time intervals between consecutive events. We denote the  $f(t_{n+1} | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})$  to be the conditional density function of  $t_{n+1}$  given the history of previous events  $t_1, \dots, t_n$ . In this work,  $\mathcal{H}_{t^-}$  denotes the history of events up to but excluding time  $t$ , while  $\mathcal{H}_t$  includes whether an event occurs at time  $t$ . The conditional density function sequentially specifies the distribution of all timestamps. Consequently, the joint distribution of all events can be factorized as:

$$f(t_1, \dots, t_N) = \prod_{n=1}^N f(t_n | \mathcal{H}_{t_{n-1}}). \quad (1)$$

A TPP can be defined by specifying the distribution of time intervals. For example, a renewal process assumes that the time intervals are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), i.e.,  $f(t_n | \mathcal{H}_{t_{n-1}}) = g(t_n - t_{n-1})$ , where  $g$  is a probability density function defined on  $(0, \infty)$ . If we further specify  $g(t_n - t_{n-1})$  to follow an exponential distribution, we obtain a homogeneous Poisson process, where each event occurs independently of the past.

The above approach can directly define some classic point process models. However, in general cases, event occurrences may depend on the entire history, making it less convenient to specify the model using the probability density function of time intervals. Instead, the conditional intensity function provides a more convenient way to describe how the occurrence of an event depends on its history. The conditional intensity function is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^*(t)dt &= \frac{f(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})dt}{1 - F(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})} \\ &= \frac{P(t_{n+1} \in [t, t + dt] | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})}{P(t_{n+1} \notin (t_n, t) | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})} \\ &= P(t_{n+1} \in [t, t + dt] | t_{n+1} \notin (t_n, t), \mathcal{H}_{t_n}) \\ &= P(t_{n+1} \in [t, t + dt] | \mathcal{H}_{t^-}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[N([t, t + dt]) | \mathcal{H}_{t^-}], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $F(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})$  denotes the cumulative distribution function corresponding to  $f(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})$ . Following tradition, we use  $*$  to indicate that the conditional intensity function is based on the history. The conditional intensity function has an intuitive interpretation: it specifies the average number of events

in a time interval, conditional on the history up to but not including  $t$ . It is worth noting that the history  $\mathcal{H}_{t_n}$  in the conditional density function differs from the history  $\mathcal{H}_{t^-}$  in the conditional intensity function. This subtle distinction is often overlooked in many TPP works.

The conditional intensity function and the conditional density function are one-to-one<sup>1</sup>. This can be easily proven by inverting Equation (2) to express the conditional density function in terms of the conditional intensity function:

$$\begin{aligned} F(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n}) &= 1 - \exp\left(-\int_{t_n}^t \lambda^*(\tau)d\tau\right), \\ f(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n}) &= \lambda^*(t) \exp\left(-\int_{t_n}^t \lambda^*(\tau)d\tau\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This means we can define new TPP models by specifying a particular form of the conditional intensity function. For example, specifying a constant intensity defines a homogeneous Poisson process, while specifying a time-varying intensity function  $\lambda^*(t) = \lambda(t)$  defines an inhomogeneous Poisson process. We can also define a Hawkes process by specifying a conditional intensity function:

$$\lambda^*(t) = \mu + \sum_{t_n < t} \phi(t - t_n), \quad (4)$$

where  $\mu > 0$  is the baseline intensity, and  $\phi(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is the triggering function<sup>2</sup>. The summation of influences from past events increases the likelihood of future events, making it suitable for modeling self-exciting effects. While many other forms of TPPs exist, we primarily focus on the Poisson process (history-independent) and the Hawkes process (history-dependent) in the following due to their widespread use.

### 2.1 Marked TPPs

The above discussion focuses on the unmarked TPP. However, TPPs can be extended to the marked case, represented as a time-ordered marked sequence  $\mathcal{T} = ((t_1, k_1), \dots, (t_N, k_N))$  over a time window  $[0, T]$ , where  $k_n$  is the mark of the  $n$ -th event. The mark space can be continuous or discrete. In practice, discrete marks are more common, often referred to as multivariate TPPs. Similar to the unmarked case, marked TPPs can also be described using the conditional density function:

$$f((t_1, k_1), \dots, (t_N, k_N)) = \prod_{n=1}^N f(t_n, k_n | \mathcal{H}_{t_{n-1}}), \quad (5)$$

where  $f(t, k | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})$  is the joint density of time and mark, conditional on history. The history  $\mathcal{H}_{t_n}$  now includes information about both the times and marks of past events.

Similarly, the conditional intensity function provides a more convenient way to model how events depend on history. It is defined as:

$$\lambda^*(t, k)dtdk = \frac{f(t, k | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})dtdk}{1 - F(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})} = \mathbb{E}[N(dt \times dk) | \mathcal{H}_{t^-}],$$

<sup>1</sup>The conditional intensity function must satisfy certain conditions.

<sup>2</sup>It requires  $\int_0^\infty \phi(t) dt < 1$  to ensure the Hawkes process does not explode.

where  $F(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})$  is the conditional cumulative distribution function and the mark is marginalized out. The conditional intensity function specifies the average number of events with a mark  $k$  in a time interval, conditional on the history up to but not including  $t$ .

We can also define a marked TPP by specifying a particular conditional intensity function. A classic example is the multivariate Hawkes processes, where the mark  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  represents the event type. The conditional intensity function of multivariate Hawkes processes is given by:

$$\lambda^*(t, k) = \mu_k + \sum_{t_n < t} \phi_{k, k_n}(t - t_n), \quad (6)$$

where  $\mu_k$  represents the baseline intensity for event type  $k$ , and  $\phi_{k, k'}$  captures the triggering effects from events of type  $k'$  on type  $k$ .

## 2.2 Inference

There are various methods for estimating the parameters of TPPs. The most common method is maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). In this section, we introduce MLE and Bayesian inference for parametric TPPs. Assume we observe a trajectory of a marked TPP  $\mathcal{T} = ((t_1, k_1), \dots, (t_N, k_N))$  over the time window  $[0, T]$ . The unmarked case corresponds to the situation where there is only a single mark. Assume the marked TPP is specified by a parametric conditional intensity function  $\lambda_\theta^*(t, k)$ . Then, the likelihood function is given by:

$$f(\mathcal{T}; \theta) = \prod_{n=1}^N \lambda_\theta^*(t_n, k_n) \exp\left(-\int_0^T \lambda_\theta^*(t) dt\right), \quad (7)$$

where  $\lambda_\theta^*(t) = \int \lambda_\theta^*(t, k) dk$  is the ground intensity. The proof of Equation (7) is straightforward. Simply substitute Equation (3) into Equation (1) to verify it for the unmarked case. The proof for the marked case follows a similar procedure. We can use numerical methods to maximize the log-likelihood to obtain parameter estimates.

MLE is a point estimation method that lacks the capability to capture model uncertainty, which limits its applicability in high-risk areas. To address this issue, the Bayesian framework has been incorporated into TPPs [Raftery and Akman, 1986]. In Bayesian TPPs, we impose suitable priors on the model parameters and then compute their posterior distribution, equipping the model with the ability to quantify uncertainty. Specifically, a Bayesian TPP is formally expressed as:

$$f(\theta | \mathcal{T}) = \frac{f(\mathcal{T} | \theta) f(\theta)}{\int f(\mathcal{T} | \theta) f(\theta) d\theta}, \quad (8)$$

where  $f(\mathcal{T} | \theta)$  is the likelihood in Equation (7),  $f(\theta)$  is the prior on model parameters, the denominator is the marginal likelihood, and  $f(\theta | \mathcal{T})$  is the posterior distribution of model parameters. In general, the inference for Bayesian TPPs is more challenging than for frequentist TPPs because the TPP likelihood is not conjugate to any prior. This means that the posterior does not have an analytical expression and can only be obtained through approximation methods, such as Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC), variational inference, and Laplace approximation, among others.

## 3 Bayesian Nonparametric TPPs

Early work on TPPs was limited to parametric models, whether in the frequentist or Bayesian framework. These methods rely heavily on model assumptions, making them inflexible and often performing poorly on complex datasets. To address this limitation, many studies have proposed nonparametric methods. [Yan, 2019] provides a comprehensive description of frequentist nonparametric methods, while this paper focuses on Bayesian nonparametric TPPs, which not only enhance model flexibility but also incorporate the ability to quantify model uncertainty.

### 3.1 Bayesian Nonparametric Poisson Process

Bayesian nonparametric TPPs do not parameterize the intensity function into a fixed form. Instead, they treat the intensity function itself as a model parameter with infinite dimensions and impose suitable prior on it. For instance, in the case of an inhomogeneous Poisson process, the intensity function  $\lambda(t)$  is treated as the parameter, and a prior  $f(\lambda(t))$  is placed on it. The goal is then to compute the posterior distribution. This prior, being a distribution over functions, is commonly modeled using a Gaussian process (GP). The above can be formally expressed as:

$$f(g(t) | \mathcal{T}) = \frac{f(\mathcal{T} | \lambda(t) = l \circ g(t)) \mathcal{GP}(g(t))}{\int f(\mathcal{T} | \lambda(t) = l \circ g(t)) \mathcal{GP}(g(t)) dg}, \quad (9)$$

where  $l(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is a link function ensuring the intensity function is non-negative, e.g., exponential (log Gaussian Cox process), scaled sigmoid (sigmoidal Gaussian Cox process), square (permanental process), etc. It is worth noting that computing Equation (9) is highly challenging, as the posterior is doubly intractable due to an intractable integral over  $t$  in the numerator and another over  $g$  in the denominator.

Many methods have been proposed to solve Equation (9). Some studies focus on utilizing MCMC methods. [Adams *et al.*, 2009] proposed an MCMC inference method for a Poisson process with a sigmoidal GP prior. The core idea is to incorporate latent thinned points to make the posterior tractable. However, this method scales cubically with the number of data and thinned points. Later, [Samo and Roberts, 2015] leveraged inducing points, a common technique in GP for reducing time complexity, to derive an MCMC sampler that reduces the computational cost to linear w.r.t. the number of data points.

Some studies focus on methods based on the Laplace approximation. [Cunningham *et al.*, 2008] proposed a Laplace approximation method that utilizes GP on a fixed grid to estimate the intensity function. However, strictly speaking, grid-based approaches are no longer fully nonparametric. [Walder and Bishop, 2017] proposed a fast Laplace approximation method relying on the Mercer decomposition of the GP kernel. However, its tractability is limited to standard kernels such as the squared exponential kernel. To address this limitation, [Sellier and Dellaportas, 2023] introduced an alternative fast Laplace approximation leveraging the spectral representation of kernels. This approach retains tractability while accommodating a broader range of stationary kernels. Furthermore, [Sun *et al.*, 2024] extended this method to non-stationary kernels.

Another common approach is variational inference. [Lloyd *et al.*, 2015] introduced the first fully variational inference scheme for permanent processes. However, similar to [Walder and Bishop, 2017], its tractability is limited to certain standard types of kernels. [Lian *et al.*, 2015] further extended the method in [Lloyd *et al.*, 2015] to a multitask point process model, leveraging information from all tasks via a hierarchical GP. [John and Hensman, 2018] expanded the approach in [Lloyd *et al.*, 2015] to utilize the Fourier representation of the GP, enabling the use of more general stationary kernels.

It is worth noting that, [Donner and Opper, 2018] introduced the data augmentation method based on Pólya-Gamma variables to the field of Bayesian TPPs. This technique is an improvement and extension of the method proposed by [Adams *et al.*, 2009]. The method augments not only thinned points but also Pólya-Gamma latent variables for all data and thinned points in the likelihood. This enables the augmented likelihood to be conditionally conjugate to the GP prior. By leveraging the conditionally conjugacy, we can derive fully analytical Gibbs sampler, EM algorithm, and mean-field variational inference method. This method was later extended to the heterogeneous multi-task setting [Zhou *et al.*, 2023].

The works discussed above primarily use GP as prior. However, other forms of Bayesian nonparametric priors are also possible. For example, [Kottas, 2006; Kottas and Sansó, 2007] used a Dirichlet process mixture of Beta densities as a prior for the normalized intensity function of a Poisson process.

### 3.2 Bayesian Nonparametric Hawkes Process

For the Hawkes process, as shown in Equation (4), the conditional intensity function consists of the baseline intensity  $\mu(\cdot)$ <sup>3</sup> and the triggering function  $\phi(\cdot)$ . Therefore, the Bayesian nonparametric Hawkes process typically places GP priors on both  $\mu(\cdot)$  and  $\phi(\cdot)$  (we take the unmarked case as an example):

$$\begin{aligned} f(g(t), h(\tau) | \mathcal{T}) &\propto \\ f(\mathcal{T} | \mu(t) = l \circ g(t), \phi(\tau) = l \circ h(\tau)) &\mathcal{GP}(g(t))\mathcal{GP}(h(\tau)), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $l(\cdot)$  is a link function ensuring  $\mu(t)$  and  $\phi(\tau)$  are non-negative, similar to Equation (9). Computing Equation (10) is more challenging than Equation (9) because in the likelihood of Hawkes process,  $\mu(t)$  and  $\phi(\tau)$  are coupled together, which significantly complicates the inference process.

To address this issue, a common approach is to augment a branching latent variable into the Hawkes process likelihood to indicate whether each event is triggered by itself via the baseline intensity or by a previous event via the triggering function. The branching variable  $\mathbf{X}$  is a lower triangular matrix with Bernoulli entries, where  $x_{nm}$  indicates whether the

$n$ -th event is triggered by itself or a previous event  $m$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x_{nn} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if event } n \text{ is a background event,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ x_{nm} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if event } n \text{ is caused by event } m, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

After augmenting the branching latent variable, the joint likelihood is expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{X} | \mu(t), \phi(\tau)) &= \underbrace{\prod_{n=1}^N \mu(t_n)^{x_{nn}} \exp\left(-\int_0^T \mu(t) dt\right)}_{\text{baseline intensity part}} \cdot \\ &\underbrace{\prod_{n=2}^N \prod_{m=1}^{n-1} \phi(t_n - t_m)^{x_{nm}} \prod_{n=1}^N \exp\left(-\int_0^{T_\phi} \phi(\tau) d\tau\right)}_{\text{triggering function part}}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the support of triggering function is assumed to be  $[0, T_\phi]$ . If the branching variable  $\mathbf{X}$  is marginalized out, we obtain the original likelihood. It is clear that, after augmenting the branching variable, the joint likelihood is decoupled into two independent factors. Since each factor can be treated as an independent Poisson process, we can directly apply the methods discussed in Section 3.1 to compute the posterior of  $\mu(t)$  and  $\phi(\tau)$ . Consequently, we can construct an iterative algorithm where, at each iteration, the posterior of  $\mathbf{X}$  is used to update the posteriors of  $\mu(t)$  and  $\phi(\tau)$ , and vice versa.

In recent years, many Bayesian nonparametric Hawkes process studies have adopted this iterative framework. [Zhang *et al.*, 2019] derived a Gibbs sampler and a maximum a posteriori (MAP) EM algorithm to estimate a nonparametric triggering function. [Zhang *et al.*, 2020b] extended the variational inference method from [Lloyd *et al.*, 2015] to the Hawkes process for estimating a nonparametric triggering function. Further, [Zhou *et al.*, 2021] applied variational inference to simultaneously estimate the nonparametric baseline intensity and triggering function. [Zhou *et al.*, 2020] extended the data augmentation method based on Pólya-Gamma variables from [Donner and Opper, 2018] to the Hawkes process. This work derived fully analytical Gibbs sampler, EM algorithm, and mean-field variational inference method. This approach was subsequently extended to nonlinear Hawkes processes [Zhou *et al.*, 2022a].

## 4 Neural TPPs

Benefiting from the rapid development of deep learning, another way to enhance the flexibility of TPPs is by using deep models to model TPPs. Compared to frequentist/Bayesian nonparametric TPPs, neural TPPs offer more intuitive and straightforward modeling and parameter estimation. [Shchur *et al.*, 2021] provided a comprehensive review of neural TPPs, but it focuses on work prior to 2020. This paper focuses more on the latest advancements from 2020 to 2024. In the following, we will categorize neural TPPs into several types and introduce each in detail.

<sup>3</sup>Some studies treat the baseline intensity as a constant, but here we consider it as a more general function.

## 4.1 Recurrent Neural TPPs

The earliest work on neural TPPs can be traced back to [Du *et al.*, 2016], which was the first to use a recurrent neural network (RNN) to model TPPs. In that work, each event in  $\{(t_n, k_n)\}_{n=1}^N$  is represented as a feature vector  $\mathbf{y}_n$ . Then, at each recurrence step, the history embedding is updated based on the feature of the current event:

$$\mathbf{h}_n = \text{Update}(\mathbf{h}_{n-1}, \mathbf{y}_n). \quad (12)$$

Finally, the history embedding  $\mathbf{h}_n$  is used to parameterize the conditional distribution of the next event. In [Du *et al.*, 2016],  $\mathbf{h}_n$  is used to represent the conditional intensity function. However, as discussed in Section 2, other parameterizations for characterizing the conditional distribution of the next event are also feasible.

Due to the gradient vanishing or exploding problems of traditional RNNs, [Mei and Eisner, 2017] proposed a long short-term memory (LSTM) based TPP model. This method addresses the issues associated with traditional RNNs and achieves better performance. [Xiao *et al.*, 2017b] introduced a dual-LSTM framework, where one LSTM models the TPP and the other models a time-series covariate. The history embeddings from both networks are then fused to predict the next event. By leveraging the additional information from covariates, TPPs can achieve improved prediction performance. [Yang *et al.*, 2018] further extended the LSTM-based point process model to the spatio-temporal domain.

The main advantage of recurrent models is their computational efficiency: during the prediction phase, the time complexity of predicting the next event is  $O(1)$ , while during training, the time complexity is  $O(N)$  since the history embedding  $\mathbf{h}_n$  is iteratively updated. The primary drawback of recurrent models is that they cannot be trained in parallel due to the inherently sequential nature of RNNs, leading to inefficient training, and they are unable to capture long-range dependencies, which can degrade performance.

It is worth noting that in recent years, several powerful recurrent architectures have been proposed in the field of sequential models, such as the Receptance Weighted Key Value (RWKV) [Peng *et al.*, 2023] and Mamba [Gu and Dao, 2023]. These works aim to design efficient recurrent architectures to replace Transformers, as Transformers have a high time complexity of  $O(N^2)$  in training and  $O(N)$  in prediction. All these models are recurrent architectures, so they share the same advantages as RNNs, such as  $O(1)$  time complexity for prediction and  $O(N)$  time complexity for training. However, their key distinction from RNN lies in their ability to support parallelized training and capture long-range dependencies. Integrating these novel and efficient recurrent architectures with TPPs is an important future research direction. This integration could significantly enhance the scalability of neural TPPs for training and prediction on large-scale datasets. Currently, works in this area are limited. [Gao *et al.*, 2024] and [Chang *et al.*, 2024] explored the idea of combining Mamba or deep state space models with TPPs, offering a promising path forward for scalable TPP modeling.

Property	Recurrent Model	Autoregressive Model
Parallel Training	✗	✓
Long-range Dependency	✗	✓
Time Complexity (training)	$O(N)$	$O(N^2)$
Time Complexity (prediction)	$O(1)$	$O(N)$

Table 1: The advantages and disadvantages of autoregressive models and recurrent models.

## 4.2 Autoregressive Neural TPPs

As stated in Section 4.1, due to the limitations of RNNs, such as the inability to support parallel training and capture long-range dependencies, a large number of studies since 2020 have explored using Transformer architectures to model TPPs. The earliest works include [Zuo *et al.*, 2020] and [Zhang *et al.*, 2020a], which share similar ideas but differ slightly in certain details.

First, each event in  $\{(t_n, k_n)\}_{n=1}^N$  is represented as a feature vector  $\mathbf{y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^M$ . For the temporal component, trigonometric function-based positional encodings are used, while for the mark, an embedding layer is applied, similar to [Du *et al.*, 2016]. Next, all event features  $\mathbf{y}_n$  are stacked into a feature matrix  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ . The matrix is then multiplied by corresponding weight matrices to compute the query, key, and value matrices:  $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{W}_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M_K}$ ,  $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{W}_K \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M_K}$ ,  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{W}_V \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M_V}$ . Finally, the attention score is computed as:

$$\mathbf{S} = \text{softmax} \left( \frac{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^\top}{\sqrt{M_K}} \right) \mathbf{V}. \quad (13)$$

The attention score is then used to generate the history embedding  $\mathbf{h}_n$  which is used to parameterize the conditional distribution of the next event. To ensure causality and prevent future events from affecting past events, it applies a mask to the upper triangular entries of  $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^\top$ . In [Zuo *et al.*, 2020; Zhang *et al.*, 2020a],  $\mathbf{h}_n$  is used to represent the conditional intensity function. However, other parameterizations for characterizing the conditional distribution of the next event are also feasible. For example, [Panos, 2024] used the history embedding  $\mathbf{h}_n$  obtained from the Transformer to model the conditional density function of the next event  $f(t | \mathbf{h}_n)$ . This approach makes sampling the next event more efficient.

The advantages and disadvantages of autoregressive models are the exact opposite of those of recurrent models. The main advantage of autoregressive models is that they can be trained in parallel and are able to capture long-range dependencies. However, the primary drawback is their high time complexity: during training, the time complexity is  $O(N^2)$ , and during prediction, the time complexity of predicting the next event is  $O(N)$ , assuming no acceleration techniques like KV-caching are used. In Table 1, we summarize the advantages and disadvantages of autoregressive models and recurrent models for comparison.

Between 2020 and 2024, numerous studies have proposed improvements to Transformer TPP models. For instance, [Zhu *et al.*, 2021] modified the computation of the attention score in Equation (13), replacing the commonly used dot-product attention with a flexible non-linear attention score

based on Fourier kernels, enabling the capture of more complex event similarities. [Zhou *et al.*, 2022b] extended the Transformer point process model to the spatio-temporal domain. [Li and Sun, 2023] proposed a sparse Transformer TPP model based on a sliding window mechanism to reduce the quadratic time and space complexity of Transformers. [Meng *et al.*, 2024] introduced improvements in the combination of time and mark embeddings, the computation of  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{K}$  matrices, and the modeling of the conditional intensity function. These enhancements allowed the Transformer Hawkes process to perfectly align with statistical nonlinear Hawkes processes, thereby improving its interpretability.

### 4.3 Differential Equation-based Neural TPPs

Recurrent and autoregressive neural TPPs share a significant limitation: as discrete-time models, they can only model the history embedding  $\mathbf{h}_n$  and the conditional intensity function  $\lambda^*(t_n)$  at event points. However, they cannot directly obtain the conditional intensity function over event intervals. Many works address this limitation by using (approximately) linear extrapolation to estimate the conditional intensity function over intervals.

Differential equation-based TPPs represent another line of research. These models, being continuous-time, can model the conditional intensity function over continuous time, thus avoiding the above issue. Specifically, these models utilize differential equations (often stochastic differential equations (SDEs)) to describe a history-dependent left-continuous hidden state  $\mathbf{h}^*(t)$  over  $[0, T]$  with an initial state  $\mathbf{h}^*(0)$ . For instance, in [Jia and Benson, 2019], the SDE is defined as:

$$d\mathbf{h}^*(t) = \text{NN}_{\theta_1}(\mathbf{h}^*(t), t)dt + \text{NN}_{\theta_2}(\mathbf{h}^*(t), t)dN(t), \quad (14)$$

where we take the unmarked case as an example. The functions  $\text{NN}_{\theta_1}$  and  $\text{NN}_{\theta_2}$  are two neural networks that govern the flow and jump of  $\mathbf{h}^*(t)$ , respectively.  $N(t)$  is the counting process that records the number of events up to time  $t$ . When no event occurs,  $\mathbf{h}^*(t)$  evolves smoothly according to  $\text{NN}_{\theta_1}$ . When an event occurs,  $\mathbf{h}^*(t)$  undergoes a jump at the event’s timestamp, governed by  $\text{NN}_{\theta_2}$ . Then, the history-dependent left-continuous hidden state  $\mathbf{h}^*(t)$  is used to define the conditional intensity function as  $\lambda^*(t) = \text{NN}_{\theta_3}(\mathbf{h}^*(t))$ , where  $\text{NN}_{\theta_3}$  is another neural network ensuring a non-negative output. Finally, we use MLE to estimate the model parameters.

A contemporaneous work is [Rubanova *et al.*, 2019], which combines ordinary differential equations (ODEs) with RNNs. When no event occurs,  $\mathbf{h}^*(t)$  evolves smoothly according to the ODE. When an event occurs,  $\mathbf{h}^*(t)$  undergoes a jump at the event’s timestamp, governed by the RNN. The core idea is similar to [Mei and Eisner, 2017], but it is more general, as [Mei and Eisner, 2017] assumes that  $\mathbf{h}^*(t)$  can only evolve on event interval according to an exponential law. This kind of model was later extended to the spatio-temporal domain [Chen *et al.*, 2021]. Recently, [Zhang *et al.*, 2024] proposed a new SDE-based TPP modeling approach. Instead of using an SDE to model the hidden state and then mapping it to the conditional intensity function, they directly model the conditional intensity function using an SDE and theoretically analyze the existence and uniqueness of its solution.

### 4.4 Parametrization of Neural TPPs

Both recurrent and autoregressive neural TPPs extract a history embedding  $\mathbf{h}$  from past event information and use it to model the conditional distribution of the next event. As discussed in Section 2, there are multiple ways to represent the conditional distribution of the next event, such as the conditional density function  $f(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})$  in Equation (1), the cumulative distribution function  $F(t | \mathcal{H}_{t_n})$  in Equation (2), the conditional intensity function  $\lambda^*(t)$  in Equation (2), and the cumulative intensity function  $\Lambda^*(t) = \int_0^t \lambda^*(\tau)d\tau$ . All of these parametrizations are equivalent and can be used to characterize the conditional distribution of the next event.

Most of the works discussed above model the conditional intensity function. The main advantage of this method lies in its simplicity, as it generally only requires the model’s output to be non-negative. However, a drawback is that MLE involves computing the integral of the conditional intensity function, which often lacks an analytical solution. This necessitates numerical integration for approximation, impacting both accuracy and efficiency.

In recent years, many works have explored alternative parameterizations. For instance, [Shchur *et al.*, 2020a; Panos, 2024] used the history embedding to model the conditional density function, expressed as a mixture of log-normal densities. This approach eliminates the need for numerical integration during training and facilitates efficient sampling. [Taieb, 2022] modeled the inverse of the cumulative distribution function using the history embedding with monotonic rational-quadratic splines. This method also avoids numerical integration and supports efficient sampling. [Omi *et al.*, 2019; Shchur *et al.*, 2020b; Liu, 2024] used the history embedding to model the cumulative intensity function using monotonic neural networks or splines. When training with MLE, this parameterization avoids numerical integration by transforming the integration in log-likelihood into differentiation, which can be efficiently handled using automatic differentiation.

### 4.5 LLM-based TPPs

LLM-based TPPs are essentially neural TPPs. However, given the significant impact of LLMs in recent years, we dedicate a separate section to this topic. Recent studies have explored integrating LLMs into TPPs.

[Xue *et al.*, 2023] proposed PromptTPP, which incorporates continual learning into neural TPPs, enabling efficient adaptation to streaming event data. This framework was inspired by recent advances in prompt learning methods for LLMs where learnable prompt parameters, dubbed temporal prompts, are prepended to the input tokens to improve the model prediction performance. They further applied tools from the LLM field by introducing the prompt pool and the retrieval prompt pool for modeling temporal information from different domains. Instead of direct application of concepts from LLM literature, [Shi *et al.*, 2024] introduced a framework that leverages pretrained LLMs for abductive reasoning to improve future event prediction. In particular, they instructed LLMs to find causal relationships between predicted event candidates and past events through few-shot

learning. [Liu and Quan, 2024] developed an approach that combines LLMs with TPPs, utilizing textual event descriptions and temporal embeddings to enhance sequence modeling. Specifically, they proposed to model event types as textual inputs to LLMs, employed the conventional temporal positional encoding strategy [Zuo *et al.*, 2020] to process event times. For next-event prediction, they applied dedicated layers for predicting event times and types.

Overall, this research direction is still in its early stages, with relatively few existing works and ample room for further exploration.

## 4.6 Model Training

For TPP training, the goal is essentially to match the data distribution  $P(\mathcal{T})$  and the model distribution  $P_\theta(\mathcal{T})$ . This involves defining a distance (divergence) between the two distributions and minimizing it:

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} D(P(\mathcal{T}) || P_\theta(\mathcal{T})), \quad (15)$$

where  $D$  represents the chosen distance (divergence), with several possible options:

- **KL Divergence:** This is the most common choice. Minimizing  $KL(P(\mathcal{T}) || P_\theta(\mathcal{T}))$  is equivalent to performing MLE, as the two are well-known to be equivalent.
- **Wasserstein Distance:** [Xiao *et al.*, 2017a] proposed using the Wasserstein distance to measure the difference between  $P(\mathcal{T})$  and  $P_\theta(\mathcal{T})$ , leveraging a WGAN-based framework for optimization.
- **Noise Contrastive Estimation:** [Mei *et al.*, 2020] proposed treating observed TPP data as “real” and generated noisy TPP data as “fake”, training a binary classifier to distinguish them and estimate the model parameters.
- **Fisher Divergence:** [Zhang *et al.*, 2023; Cao *et al.*, 2024] used Fisher divergence to quantify the distance between  $P(\mathcal{T})$  and  $P_\theta(\mathcal{T})$ , employing score matching or denoising score matching methods for estimation.

Among these choices, only KL divergence (MLE) requires computing the integral of the conditional intensity function. The other approaches avoid this issue, thereby eliminating approximation errors and potentially improving training efficiency. Theoretically, all these estimators are consistent, but in terms of asymptotic normality, they are inferior to MLE.

## 5 Applications

TPPs have a wide range of applications, including in seismology, finance, neuroscience, social networks, and epidemiology. Broadly speaking, these applications can be categorized into two main types: event prediction and causal discovery.

**Event Prediction:** This involves predicting the timing, frequency, and types of future events based on historical data. Such applications are common in fields like social networks and epidemiology. For example, in shopping recommendation systems, one can predict a user’s future shopping times and item types based on their past purchase history, enabling targeted promotional strategies [Mei and Eisner, 2017;

Meng *et al.*, 2024]. Similarly, in epidemiology, past infection times and locations of patients can be used to predict the approximate number and regions of new cases in the upcoming month [Rizoiu *et al.*, 2018].

**Causal Discovery:** This involves learning the relationships between different event types from observational data. Applications in this category are prevalent in neuroscience and finance. Here, the focus is not on predicting future events but on uncovering dependencies between event types, often referred to as Granger causality. For example, in neuroscience, each neuron can be considered as an event type, and its spike train forms a univariate point process. The spike trains of multiple neurons naturally constitute a multivariate point process. The goal is to determine whether there exists functional connectivity between neurons [Linderman and Adams, 2015; Zhou *et al.*, 2022a]. Similarly, in high-frequency financial trading, a large number of asks (sell orders) and bids (buy orders) occur within short periods. Here, all sell orders are treated as one event type, and all buy orders as another. The primary interest lies in understanding the mutual influence between buy and sell orders in the order book [Bacry and Muzy, 2014].

## 6 Challenges

While TPPs have made significant progress in recent years, they still face several major challenges. [Shchur *et al.*, 2021] has reviewed experimental issues in the field, so here we focus on challenges related to models and applications.

**Model Interpretability:** Traditional statistical TPPs, though relatively simple, provide clear physical meanings. Neural TPPs, while more expressive, lack interpretability due to their black-box nature. Although some recent works have aimed to improve the interpretability of neural TPPs, this direction remains underexplored.

**Model Scalability:** Most neural TPPs rely on Transformer architectures, which have high time and space complexity, limiting their scalability to large datasets. Exploring architectures with lower complexity, such as Mamba, is an emerging direction but still in its infancy.

**Sampling Efficiency:** Existing works mainly focus on enhancing expressiveness and training efficiency, often neglecting sampling efficiency. Current sampling methods, whether based on conditional intensity function or conditional density function, are inherently sequential. Developing efficient parallel sampling algorithms is a promising research direction.

**Model Multimodality:** Most existing TPPs are designed to handle and predict simple event information, such as time and type. However, the success of multimodal models on text and images highlights the need for TPPs to integrate multimodal data, enabling them to process and predict rich multimodal information. LLM-based TPPs represent a promising research direction in the field of multimodal TPPs.

## References

- [Adams *et al.*, 2009] Ryan Adams, Iain Murray, and David MacKay. Tractable nonparametric Bayesian inference in Poisson processes with Gaussian process intensities. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2009.

- [Bacry and Muzy, 2014] Emmanuel Bacry and Jean-François Muzy. Hawkes model for price and trades high-frequency dynamics. *Quantitative Finance*, 14(7):1147–1166, 2014.
- [Cao *et al.*, 2024] Haoqun Cao, Zizhuo Meng, Tianjun Ke, and Feng Zhou. Is score matching suitable for estimating point processes? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [Chang *et al.*, 2024] Yuxin Chang, Alex Boyd, Cao Xiao, Taha Kass-Hout, et al. Deep linear Hawkes processes. *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2021] Ricky TQ Chen, Brandon Amos, and Maximilian Nickel. Neural spatio-temporal point processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [Cunningham *et al.*, 2008] John P Cunningham, Krishna V Shenoy, and Maneesh Sahani. Fast Gaussian process methods for point process intensity estimation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2008.
- [Daley and Vere-Jones, 2007] Daryl J Daley and David Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes: volume II: general theory and structure*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [Donner and Opper, 2018] Christian Donner and Manfred Opper. Efficient Bayesian inference of sigmoidal Gaussian Cox processes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):2710–2743, 2018.
- [Du *et al.*, 2016] Nan Du, Hanjun Dai, Rakshit Trivedi, Utkarsh Upadhyay, Manuel Gomez-Rodriguez, and Le Song. Recurrent marked temporal point processes: embedding event history to vector. In *International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2016.
- [Gao *et al.*, 2024] Anningzhe Gao, Shan Dai, and Yan Hu. Mamba hawkes process. *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [Gu and Dao, 2023] Albert Gu and Tri Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [Hawkes, 1971] Alan G Hawkes. Spectra of some self-exciting and mutually exciting point processes. *Biometrika*, 58(1):83–90, 1971.
- [Isham and Westcott, 1979] Valerie Isham and Mark Westcott. A self-correcting point process. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 8(3):335–347, 1979.
- [Jia and Benson, 2019] Junteng Jia and Austin R Benson. Neural jump stochastic differential equations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [John and Hensman, 2018] ST John and James Hensman. Large-scale Cox process inference using variational Fourier features. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- [Kingman, 1992] John Frank Charles Kingman. *Poisson processes*, volume 3. Clarendon Press, 1992.
- [Kong *et al.*, 2023] Quyu Kong, Pio Calderon, Rohit Ram, Olga Boichak, and Marian-Andrei RizoIU. Interval-censored Transformer Hawkes: Detecting information operations using the reaction of social systems. In *The Web Conference*, 2023.
- [Kottas and Sansó, 2007] Athanasios Kottas and Bruno Sansó. Bayesian mixture modeling for spatial Poisson process intensities, with applications to extreme value analysis. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 137(10):3151–3163, 2007.
- [Kottas, 2006] Athanasios Kottas. Dirichlet process mixtures of Beta distributions, with applications to density and intensity estimation. In *Workshop on Learning with Non-parametric Bayesian Methods, ICML*, 2006.
- [Li and Sun, 2023] Zhuoqun Li and Mingxuan Sun. Sparse Transformer Hawkes process for long event sequences. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, 2023.
- [Lian *et al.*, 2015] Wenzhao Lian, Ricardo Henao, Vinayak Rao, Joseph Lucas, and Lawrence Carin. A multitask point process predictive model. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015.
- [Linderman and Adams, 2015] Scott W Linderman and Ryan P Adams. Scalable Bayesian inference for excitatory point process networks. *arXiv preprint*, 2015.
- [Liu and Quan, 2024] Zefang Liu and Yinzhu Quan. TPP-LLM: Modeling temporal point processes by efficiently fine-tuning large language models. *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [Liu, 2024] Bingqing Liu. Cumulative hazard function based efficient multivariate temporal point process learning. *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [Lloyd *et al.*, 2015] Chris Lloyd, Tom Gunter, Michael Osborne, and Stephen Roberts. Variational inference for Gaussian process modulated Poisson processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015.
- [Mei and Eisner, 2017] Hongyuan Mei and Jason Eisner. The neural Hawkes process: A neurally self-modulating multivariate point process. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [Mei *et al.*, 2020] Hongyuan Mei, Tom Wan, and Jason Eisner. Noise-contrastive estimation for multivariate point processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- [Meng *et al.*, 2024] Zizhuo Meng, Ke Wan, Yadong Huang, Zhidong Li, Yang Wang, and Feng Zhou. Interpretable Transformer Hawkes processes: Unveiling complex interactions in social networks. In *International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2024.
- [Omi *et al.*, 2019] Takahiro Omi, Naonori Ueda, and Kazuyuki Aihara. Fully neural network based model for general temporal point processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [Panos, 2024] Aristeidis Panos. Decomposable Transformer point processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.



- [Peng *et al.*, 2023] Bo Peng, Eric Alcaide, Quentin Gregory Anthony, Alon Albalak, et al. RWKV: Reinventing RNNs for the Transformer era. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023.
- [Raftery and Akman, 1986] Adrian E Raftery and Volkan E Akman. Bayesian analysis of a Poisson process with a change-point. *Biometrika*, pages 85–89, 1986.
- [Rasmussen, 2018] Jakob Gulddahl Rasmussen. Lecture notes: Temporal point processes and the conditional intensity function. *arXiv preprint*, 2018.
- [Rizoiu *et al.*, 2018] Marian Andrei Rizoiu, Swapnil Mishra, Quyu Kong, Mark Carman, and Lexing Xie. Sir-hawkes: on the relationship between epidemic models and Hawkes point processes. In *The Web Confernce*, 2018.
- [Rubanova *et al.*, 2019] Yulia Rubanova, Ricky TQ Chen, and David K Duvenaud. Latent ordinary differential equations for irregularly-sampled time series. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [Samo and Roberts, 2015] Yves-Laurent Kom Samo and Stephen Roberts. Scalable nonparametric Bayesian inference on point processes with Gaussian processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015.
- [Sellier and Dellaportas, 2023] Jeremy Sellier and Petros Dellaportas. Sparse spectral Bayesian permanental process with generalized kernel. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2023.
- [Shchur *et al.*, 2020a] Oleksandr Shchur, Marin Bilos, and Stephan Günnemann. Intensity-free learning of temporal point processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [Shchur *et al.*, 2020b] Oleksandr Shchur, Nicholas Gao, Marin Bilos, and Stephan Günnemann. Fast and flexible temporal point processes with triangular maps. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2020.
- [Shchur *et al.*, 2021] Oleksandr Shchur, Ali Caner Türkmen, Tim Januschowski, and Stephan Günnemann. Neural temporal point processes: A review. *arXiv preprint*, 2021.
- [Shi *et al.*, 2024] Xiaoming Shi, Siqiao Xue, Kangrui Wang, Fan Zhou, James Zhang, Jun Zhou, Chenhao Tan, and Hongyuan Mei. Language models can improve event prediction by few-shot abductive reasoning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2024] Zicheng Sun, Yixuan Zhang, Zenan Ling, Xuhui Fan, and Feng Zhou. Nonstationary sparse spectral permanental process. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [Taieb, 2022] Souhaib Ben Taieb. Learning quantile functions for temporal point processes with recurrent neural splines. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2022.
- [Walder and Bishop, 2017] Christian J Walder and Adrian N Bishop. Fast Bayesian intensity estimation for the permanental process. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.
- [Xiao *et al.*, 2017a] Shuai Xiao, Mehrdad Farajtabar, Xiaojing Ye, Junchi Yan, et al. Wasserstein learning of deep generative point process models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [Xiao *et al.*, 2017b] Shuai Xiao, Junchi Yan, Xiaokang Yang, Hongyuan Zha, and Stephen Chu. Modeling the intensity function of point process via recurrent neural networks. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.
- [Xue *et al.*, 2023] Siqiao Xue, Yan Wang, Zhixuan Chu, Xiaoming Shi, et al. Prompt-augmented temporal point process for streaming event sequence. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [Yan, 2019] Junchi Yan. Recent advance in temporal point process: from machine learning perspective. *SJTU Technical Report*, 2019.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2018] Guolei Yang, Ying Cai, and Chandan K Reddy. Recurrent spatio-temporal point process for check-in time prediction. In *International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, 2018.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2019] Rui Zhang, Christian J. Walder, Marian-Andrei Rizoiu, and Lexing Xie. Efficient non-parametric Bayesian Hawkes processes. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2020a] Qiang Zhang, Aldo Lipani, Ömer Kirnap, and Emine Yilmaz. Self-attentive Hawkes process. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2020b] Rui Zhang, Christian Walder, and Marian-Andrei Rizoiu. Variational inference for sparse Gaussian process modulated Hawkes process. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023] Yixuan Zhang, Quyu Kong, and Feng Zhou. Integration-free training for spatio-temporal multimodal covariate deep kernel point processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024] Shuai Zhang, Chuan Zhou, Yang Aron Liu, Peng Zhang, Xixun Lin, and Zhi-Ming Ma. Neural jump-diffusion temporal point processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2020] Feng Zhou, Zhidong Li, Xuhui Fan, Yang Wang, Arcot Sowmya, and Fang Chen. Efficient inference for nonparametric Hawkes processes using auxiliary latent variables. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(241):1–31, 2020.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2021] Feng Zhou, Simn Luo, Zhidong Li, Xuhu Fan, Yang Wang, Arcot Sowmya, and Fang Chen. Efficient EM-variational inference for nonparametric Hawkes process. *Statistics and Computing*, 31(4):46, 2021.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2022a] Feng Zhou, Quyu Kong, Zhijie Deng, Jichao Kan, Yixuan Zhang, Cheng Feng, and Jun Zhu. Efficient inference for dynamic flexible interactions of neural populations. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(211):1–49, 2022.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2022b] Zihao Zhou, Xingyi Yang, Ryan Rossi, Handong Zhao, and Rose Yu. Neural point process for

learning spatiotemporal event dynamics. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, 2022.

[Zhou *et al.*, 2023] Feng Zhou, Quyu Kong, Zhijie Deng, Fengxiang He, Peng Cui, and Jun Zhu. Heterogeneous multi-task Gaussian Cox processes. *Machine Learning*, 112(12):5105–5134, 2023.

[Zhu *et al.*, 2021] Shixiang Zhu, Minghe Zhang, Ruyi Ding, and Yao Xie. Deep fourier kernel for self-attentive point processes. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2021.

[Zuo *et al.*, 2020] Simiao Zuo, Haoming Jiang, Zichong Li, Tuo Zhao, and Hongyuan Zha. Transformer Hawkes process. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.