

Efficient Rare Temporal Pattern Mining in Time Series

Van Ho Long^{1,2}, Nguyen Ho³, Trinh Le Cong⁴, Anh-Vu Dinh-Duc^{1,2}, and Tu Nguyen Ngoc⁵

¹ School of Computer Science and Engineering, International University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

² Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
{hlvan, ddavu}@hcmiu.edu.vn

³ Department of Computer Science, Loyola University Maryland, USA
tnho@loyola.edu

⁴ Department of Mathematics, Quy Nhon University, Vietnam
lecongtrinh@qnu.edu.vn

⁵ TVT Group Corporation Research
tu.nguyen@tvgroup.io

Abstract. Time series data from various domains are increasing continuously. Extracting and analyzing the temporal patterns in these series can reveal significant insights. Temporal pattern mining (TPM) extends traditional pattern mining by incorporating event time intervals into extracted patterns, enhancing their expressiveness but increasing time and space complexities. One valuable type of temporal pattern is known as *rare temporal patterns (RTPs)*, which occur rarely but with high confidence. There exist several challenges when mining rare temporal patterns. The support measure is set very low, leading to a further combinatorial explosion and potentially producing too many uninteresting patterns. Thus, an efficient approach to rare temporal pattern mining is needed. This paper introduces our *Rare Temporal Pattern Mining from Time Series (RTPMfTS)* method for discovering rare temporal patterns, featuring the following key contributions: (1) An end-to-end RTPMfTS process that takes time series data as input and yields rare temporal patterns as output. (2) An efficient *Rare Temporal Pattern Mining (RTPM)* algorithm that uses optimized data structures for quick event and pattern retrieval and utilizes effective pruning techniques for much faster mining. (3) A thorough experimental evaluation of RTPM, showing that RTPM outperforms the baseline in terms of runtime and memory usage.

Keywords: Pattern Mining · Rare Temporal Patterns · Time Series.

1 Introduction

An increasing amount of time series data is being collected from IoT sensors deployed across various environments, such as smart meters, smart plugs, smart appliances for electricity consumption data, and GPS-enabled smartphones for movement data. However, raw data must be transformed into actionable insights to aid decision-making and optimization. Patterns extracted from time series

data, particularly those incorporating temporal information, can provide such valuable knowledge.

A valuable pattern type, known as *rare temporal patterns (RTPs)*, is characterized by low support but high confidence. For instance, in the smart city domain, a rare pattern might be: $([8:00, 10:00] \text{ Snow} \succ [8:15, 8:45] \text{ HighWind} \bowtie [8:20, 9:00] \text{ HighPedestrianInjury})$ (meaning Snow contains HighWind and overlaps HighPedestrianInjury). This pattern suggests that the appearance of snow and strong wind correlates with an increase in traffic accidents within a particular time frame. Although this pattern is rare, it helps transportation coordinators warn about potential traffic accidents in a timely manner.

Challenges of mining rare temporal patterns. Extracting temporal patterns from time series databases is significantly more expensive than extracting sequential patterns. The addition of temporal information not only increases the computational workload but also raises complex event relationships, which contribute an additional exponential factor of $O(3^{h^2})$ to the $O(m^h)$ search space complexity (m represents the number of events and h the length of the temporal patterns), resulting in a total complexity of $O(m^h 3^{h^2})$ (proof is in the full paper). Additionally, the complexity of mining rare temporal patterns is even higher since the support threshold is set very low, leading to a combinatorial explosion and potentially generating a large number of uninteresting patterns. Existing methods to mine rare itemsets [20], [9], [17], [7] and rare sequential patterns [25], [16], [27] do not consider the temporal aspect of items/events. Thus, addressing the explosion problem of rare temporal patterns is still an open problem. To address these issues, we propose our *rare temporal pattern mining* approach, tackling all these challenges into a robust framework for discovering rare temporal patterns.

Contributions. In this paper, we present our comprehensive *Rare Temporal Pattern Mining from Time Series (RTPMfTS) approach* which solves the above challenges. Our key contributions are: (1) We present *end-to-end RTPMfTS process* that receives a set of time series as input, and produces *rare temporal patterns* as output. (2) We propose the *efficient Rare Temporal Pattern Mining (RTPM) algorithm* to mine *rare temporal patterns*. The novelties of RTPM are: a) the use of an efficient data structure, Hierarchical Hash Tables, to enable fast retrieval of events and patterns during the mining process; and b) pruning techniques based on the Apriori principle and the transitivity property of temporal relations to enable faster mining. (3) We perform extensive experiments on real-world datasets, showing that our RTPM significantly outperforms the baselines on both runtime and memory usage.

2 Related work

Temporal pattern mining: Compared to sequential pattern mining, temporal pattern mining (TPM) is rather a new research topic. One of the first papers in this area is of Kam et al. that uses a hierarchical representation to manage temporal relations [18], and based on that mines temporal patterns. However, the approach in [18] suffers from *ambiguity* in relations between events when presenting temporal relations. In [21], Moskovitch et al. design a TPM algorithm

using the transitivity property of temporal relations. They use this property to generate candidates by inferring new relations between events. In comparison, we use the transitivity property for effective pruning. The most recent work addressing TPM is proposed Lee et al [19]. They present Z-Miner that improves the mining efficiency over existing methods by employing two data structures: a hierarchical hash-based structure called Z-Table for time-efficient candidate generation and support count, and Z-Arrangement, a structure to efficiently store event intervals in temporal patterns for efficient memory consumption. However, Z-Miner do not employ the transitivity property of temporal relations. Thus, it is less efficient in runtimes and memory usage when working with large datasets.

Rare pattern mining: In recent years, there has been growing interest in identifying rare patterns that appear infrequently within a database. Techniques for discovering rare patterns in time series, often referred to as rare motifs, are discussed in [30], [11], [3]. However, since time series motifs are essentially repeated subsequences within the time series, these techniques cannot handle temporal events and are inadequate for mining rare temporal patterns. Another related approach involves rare association rules [20], [9], [17], [7], [1], [6], [5], [10], [4], [24], which identify rare associations between items in the database. Nevertheless, these methods are limited to discovering rare association rules among itemsets and cannot address temporal events and the complex temporal relationships between them. Another area of research focuses on rare sequential patterns [25], [16], [27], [26], [31], [23]. However, these methods only account for sequential occurrences between events and cannot capture more complex relationships, such as overlaps or contains between temporal events. To the best of our knowledge, no existing research addresses the mining of rare temporal patterns, specifically targeting the rare occurrences of temporal patterns within a time series database.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Temporal Event and Temporal Relation

Definition 3.1 (Time series) A *time series* $X = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ is a chronologically ordered sequence of data values that measure the same phenomenon during an observation time period.

A *symbolic time series* X_S of a time series X uses a mapping function $f: X \rightarrow \Sigma_X$ that maps each value $x_i \in X$ to a symbol $\omega \in \Sigma_X$, results in a sequence of symbols [13]. The *symbol alphabet* Σ_X is the finite set of symbols used to encode X .

For example, let $X = 1.61, 1.25, 0.32, 0.0$ be a time series of the energy usage. The symbolic representation of X is: $X_S = \text{On}, \text{On}, \text{Off}, \text{Off}$.

Definition 3.2 (Symbolic database) Given a set of time series $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$, the set of symbolic representations of the time series in \mathcal{X} forms a *symbolic database* \mathcal{D}_{SYB} .

An example of the symbolic database \mathcal{D}_{SYB} is shown in Table 1. There are 4 time series representing the energy usage of 4 electrical appliances: {Stove, Toaster, Clothes Washer, Iron}. For brevity, we name the appliances respectively as {S, T, W, I}. All appliances have the same alphabet $\Sigma = \{\text{On}, \text{Off}\}$.

Table 1: A Symbolic Database \mathcal{D}_{SYB}

Time	14:00	14:05	14:10	14:15	14:20	14:25	14:30	14:35	14:40	14:45	14:50	14:55	15:00	15:05	15:10	15:15	15:20	15:25	15:30	15:35	15:40	15:45	15:50	15:55	16:00	16:05	16:10	16:15	16:20	16:25	16:30	16:35	16:40	16:45	16:50	16:55	
S	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	On	On	On	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off
T	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	On	On	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	On	On	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off
W	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	On	On	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	On	On	On	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off
I	On	On	On	On	On	On	On	On	On	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	On	On	On	On	On	On	On	On	On	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off

Table 2: Temporal Relations between Events

Follows: $E_{i \triangleright e_i} \rightarrow E_{j \triangleright e_j}$	
Contains: $E_{i \triangleright e_i} \supseteq E_{j \triangleright e_j}$	
Overlaps: $E_{i \triangleright e_i} \overline{\cap} E_{j \triangleright e_j}$	

Table 3: A Temporal Seq. DB \mathcal{D}_{SEQ}

ID	Temporal sequences
1	(SOFF,[14:00,14:40]), (TOFF,[14:00,14:40]), (WOFF,[14:00,14:40]), (ION,[14:00,14:40])
2	(SON,[14:45,14:55]), (TON,[14:45,14:50]), (WON,[14:45,14:50]), (IOFF,[14:45,15:25]), (TOFF,[14:50,15:25]), (WOFF,[14:50,15:25]), (SOFF,[14:55,15:25])
3	(SOFF,[15:30,16:10]), (TOFF,[15:30,16:10]), (WOFF,[15:30,16:10]), (ION,[15:30,16:10])
4	(SOFF,[16:15,16:55]), (TON,[16:15,16:20]), (WON,[16:15,16:25]), (IOFF,[16:15,16:55]), (TOFF,[16:20,16:55]), (WOFF,[16:25,16:55])

Definition 3.3 (Temporal event) A *temporal event* E in a symbolic time series X_S is a tuple $E = (\omega, T)$ where $\omega \in \Sigma_X$ is a symbol, and $T = \{[t_{s_i}, t_{e_i}]\}$ is the set of time intervals during which X_S is associated with the symbol ω .

Instance of a temporal event: An *instance* of the temporal event $E = (\omega, T)$ is a tuple $e = (\omega, [t_{s_i}, t_{e_i}])$. e represents a single occurrence of E during $[t_{s_i}, t_{e_i}]$. We use the notation $E_{\triangleright e}$ to denote that event E has an instance e .

For example, consider the symbolic representation of T in Table 1. The temporal event “Toaster is On” is: (TON, $\{[14:45, 14:50], [16:15, 16:20]\}$).

Relations between Temporal Events: Let E_i and E_j be two temporal events, and $e_i = (\omega_i, [t_{s_i}, t_{e_i}])$ and $e_j = (\omega_j, [t_{s_j}, t_{e_j}])$ be their corresponding instances. We rely on the Allen’s relations model [2] and define three basic temporal relations between E_i and E_j : *Follows*, *Contains*, *Overlaps*. Furthermore, we add the *buffer* ϵ to the relation’s endpoints for flexibility, and ensure that the relations are *mutually exclusive* (proof is in the full paper). Table 2 illustrates the three temporal relations and their conditions, with $\epsilon > 0$ being the buffer size, and d_o be the minimal overlapping duration between two instances in an *Overlaps* relation.

Definition 3.4 (Temporal pattern) Let $\mathfrak{R} = \{\text{Follows, Contains, Overlaps}\}$ be the set of temporal relations. A *temporal pattern* $P = \langle (r_{12}, E_1, E_2), \dots, (r_{(n-1)(n)}, E_{n-1}, E_n) \rangle$ is a list of triples (r_{ij}, E_i, E_j) , each representing a relation $r_{ij} \in \mathfrak{R}$ between two events E_i and E_j .

A temporal pattern that has n events is called an n -event pattern. We use $E_i \in P$ to denote that the event E_i occurs in P , and $P_1 \subseteq P$ to say that a pattern P_1 is a sub-pattern of P .

3.2 Temporal Sequence Database

Definition 3.5 (Temporal sequence) A list of n event instances $S = \langle e_1, \dots, e_i, \dots, e_n \rangle$ forms a *temporal sequence* if the instances are chronologically ordered by their start times. Moreover, S has size n , denoted as $|S| = n$.

Definition 3.6 (Temporal sequence database) A set of temporal sequences forms a *temporal sequence database* \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} where each row i contains a temporal sequence S_i .

Table 3 shows the temporal sequence database \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} , created from the symbolic database \mathcal{D}_{SYB} in Table 1.

Definition 3.7 (Temporal sequence supports a pattern) Let $S = \langle e_1, \dots, e_i, \dots, e_n \rangle$ be a temporal sequence. We say that S *supports* a temporal pattern P , denoted as $P \in S$, iff $|S| \geq 2 \wedge \forall (r_{ij}, E_i, E_j) \in P, \exists (e_i, e_m) \in S$ such that r_{ij} holds between $E_{i \triangleright e_i}$ and $E_{j \triangleright e_m}$.

In Table 3, consider the temporal sequence S at the second sequence, including the two event instances $e_1 = (\text{SON}, [14:45, 14:55])$, $e_2 = (\text{TOn}, [14:45, 14:50])$. Here, S supports a 2-event pattern $P = \langle (\text{Contains}, \text{SON}_{\triangleright e_1}, \text{TOn}_{\triangleright e_2}) \rangle$.

3.3 Rare Temporal Pattern

Given a temporal sequence database \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} , we want to find patterns that occur rarely but with high confidence in \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} . We use *support* and *confidence* [22] to measure the frequency and the likelihood of a pattern.

Definition 3.8 (Support of a temporal pattern) The *support* of a pattern P is the number of sequences $S \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{SEQ}}$ that support P .

$$\text{supp}(P) = |\{S \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{SEQ}} \text{ s.t. } P \in S\}| \quad (1)$$

The support of a group of events (E_1, \dots, E_n) , denoted as $\text{supp}(E_1, \dots, E_n)$, is defined similarly to that of a temporal pattern.

Definition 3.9 (Confidence of a temporal pattern) The *confidence* of a temporal pattern P in \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} is the fraction between $\text{supp}(P)$ and the support of its most frequent event:

$$\text{conf}(P) = \frac{\text{supp}(P)}{\max_{1 \leq k \leq |P|} \{\text{supp}(E_k)\}} \quad (2)$$

where $E_k \in P$ is a temporal event. Since the denominator in Eq. (2) is the maximum support of the events in P , the confidence computed in Eq. (2) is the *minimum confidence* of a pattern P in \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} , which is also called the *all-confidence* as in [22].

The confidence of an event pair (E_i, E_j) , denoted as $\text{conf}(E_i, E_j)$, is defined similarly to that of a temporal pattern. The *support* of event(s)/ pattern(s) defined in Eqs. (1) follows the same intuition as the traditional support concept, indicating how frequently an event/ pattern occurs in a given database, the *confidence* computed in Eq. (2) instead represents the minimum likelihood of an event pair/ pattern, knowing the likelihood of its most frequent event.

Rare Temporal Pattern Mining. Given a set of univariate time series $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$, let \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} be the temporal sequence database obtained from \mathcal{X} , and σ_{\min} , σ_{\max} and δ be the minimum support, the maximum support and the minimum confidence thresholds, respectively. The Rare Temporal Pattern Mining from Time Series (RTPMfTS) problem aims to find all temporal patterns P in \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} so that: $\sigma_{\min} \leq \text{supp}(P) \leq \sigma_{\max} \wedge \text{conf}(P) \geq \delta$.

Algorithm 1: Rare Temporal Pattern Mining

Input: Temporal sequence database \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} , minimum support threshold σ_{min} , maximum support threshold σ_{max} , minimum confidence threshold δ

Output: The set of rare temporal patterns P

//Mining single events

```

1: foreach event  $E_i \in \mathcal{D}_{SEQ}$  do
2:   Compute  $supp(E_i)$ ;
3:   if  $supp(E_i) \geq \sigma_{min}$  then
4:     Insert  $E_i$  to  $1Event$ ;

```

//Mining rare 2-event patterns

```

5:  $EventPairs \leftarrow Cartesian(1Event, 1Event)$ ;
6:  $FilteredPairs \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
7: foreach  $(E_i, E_j)$  in  $EventPairs$  do
8:   Compute  $supp(E_i, E_j)$ ;
9:   if  $supp(E_i, E_j) \geq \sigma_{min}$  then
10:     $FilteredPairs \leftarrow Apply\_Lemma4(E_i, E_j)$ ;
11: foreach  $(E_i, E_j)$  in  $FilteredPairs$  do
12:   Retrieve event instances;
13:   Check relations against  $\sigma_{min}, \sigma_{max}, \delta$ ;

```

//Mining rare k-event patterns

```

14:  $Filtered1Freq \leftarrow Transitivity\_Filtering(1Freq)$ ;
15:  $kEvents \leftarrow Cartesian(Filtered1Freq, (k-1)Freq)$ ;
16:  $FilteredkEvents \leftarrow Apriori\_Filtering(kEvents)$ ;
17: foreach  $kEvents$  in  $FilteredkEvents$  do
18:   Retrieve relations;
19:   Iteratively check relations against  $\sigma_{min}, \sigma_{max}, \delta$ ;

```

4 Temporal Pattern Mining

4.1 Overview of RTPMfTS Mining Process

The RTPMfTS process consists of 2 phases. The first phase, *Data Transformation*, converts a set of time series \mathcal{X} into a symbolic database \mathcal{D}_{SYB} , and then converts \mathcal{D}_{SYB} into a temporal sequence database \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} . The second phase, *Rare Temporal Pattern Mining (RTPM)*, mines rare patterns which includes 3 steps: (1) *Single Event Mining*, (2) *Rare 2-Event Pattern Mining*, and (3) *Rare k-Event Pattern Mining* ($k > 2$). The final output is a set of all rare patterns in \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} .

4.2 Rare Temporal Pattern Mining

We now present our RTPM to mine rare temporal patterns from \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} . The main novelties of RTPM are: a) the use of the *Hierarchical Lookup Hash* structure [15], to enable fast retrieval of events and patterns during the mining process, and b) the proposal of two pruning techniques based on the Apriori principle and the temporal transitivity property. Algorithm 1 provides the pseudo-code of RTPM.

4.3 Mining Single Events

Hierarchical lookup hash structure HLH_1 : Fig. 1 illustrates the hierarchical lookup hash structure HLH_1 . HLH_1 consists of two hash tables: the *single event*



Fig. 1: The HLH_1 structureFig. 2: The $HLH_k (k \geq 2)$ structure

Fig. 3: A hierarchical lookup hash tables for the running example

hash table EH , and the event sequence hash table SH . Each hash table has a list of $\langle \text{key}, \text{value} \rangle$ pairs. In EH , the key is the event symbol $\omega \in \Sigma_X$ representing the event E_i , and the value is the set of sequences where E_i occurs, arranged in an increasing order. In SH , the key is taken from the value component of EH , while the value stores event instances of E_i that appear at the corresponding sequence in \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} . The HLH_1 structure enables fast retrieval of event sequences and instances when mining k -event patterns.

Mining Single Events: The first step in RTPM is to find single events (Alg. 1, lines 1-4). For each event E_i , the support $\text{supp}(E_i)$ is computed by first scanning \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} , and determine if $\text{supp}(E_i) \geq \sigma_{\min}$, then E_i is inserted into $1Event$. Note that for single events, we do not consider the constraints on the confidence, since confidence of single events is always 1 and on maximum support σ_{\max} because of the following lemma.

Lemma 1 Let P be a temporal pattern and E_i be a single event such that $E_i \in P$. Then $\text{supp}(P) \leq \text{supp}(E_i)$.

Proof. Detailed proofs of all lemmas in this article can be found in the Appendix of the full paper.

From Lemma 1, a single event E_i whose support $\text{supp}(E_i) > \sigma_{\max}$ can form a pattern P that has $\text{supp}(P) \leq \sigma_{\max}$. Thus, the constraint on σ_{\max} is not considered for single events to avoid the loss of potential temporal patterns.

We provide an example of HLH_1 in Fig. 3 using data in Table 3, with $\sigma_{\min} = 0.2$. Here, we have 8 events in HLH_1 .

4.4 Mining Rare 2-event Patterns

The hierarchical lookup hash structure HLH_k : Fig. 2 illustrates the hierarchical lookup hash structure HLH_k ($k \geq 2$) to maintain k -event groups and patterns. The HLH_k contains three hash tables: the k -event hash table EH_k , the

pattern hash table PH_k , and the *pattern sequence hash table* SH_k . Each hash table has a list of <key, value> pairs. In EH_k , *key* is the list of symbols $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k)$ representing the k-event group (E_1, \dots, E_k) , and *value* is an *object* which consists of two components: (1) the list of sequences where (E_1, \dots, E_k) occurs (arranged in increasing order), and (2) a list of k-event temporal patterns created from the k-event group (E_1, \dots, E_k) . In PH_k , *key* is the pattern P which takes the *value* component of EH_k , while *value* is the list of sequences that support P . In SH_k , *key* is the list of sequences supporting P which takes the *value* component of PH_k , while *value* is the list of event instances from which the temporal relations in P are formed. The HLH_k hash structure helps speed up the k-event group mining through the use of the list of sequences in EH_k , and enables fast search for temporal relations between k events using the information in PH_k and SH_k .

Two-steps filtering approach Given the huge set of pattern candidates, it is expensive to check their support and confidence. We propose a *filtering approach* to reduce the unnecessary candidate checking. Specifically, the mining process is divided into two steps: (1) it first finds k-event groups that satisfy the σ_{\min} and δ constraints, (2) it then generates temporal patterns from those k-event groups. The correctness of this filtering approach is based on the Apriori-inspired lemmas below.

Lemma 2 *Let P be a 2-event pattern formed by an event pair (E_i, E_j) . Then, $\text{supp}(P) \leq \text{supp}(E_i, E_j)$.*

From Lemma 2, the support of a pattern is at most the support of its events. Thus, event pairs that do not satisfy the minimum support σ_{\min} cannot create patterns satisfying σ_{\min} and thereby, can be safely pruned.

Lemma 3 *Let (E_i, E_j) be a pair of events occurring in a 2-event pattern P . Then $\text{conf}(P) \leq \text{conf}(E_i, E_j)$.*

From Lemma 3, the confidence of a pattern P is always at most the confidence of its events. Thus, a low-confidence event pair cannot form any high-confidence patterns and therefore, can be safely pruned. Applying Lemmas 2 and 3 to the first filtering step will remove low-support or low-confidence event pairs, reducing the candidate patterns of RTPM. Moreover, the constraint on σ_{\max} is not considered in this filtering step to avoid the loss of 2-event patterns, since event pairs that do not satisfy the σ_{\max} constraint can still form 2-event patterns satisfying σ_{\max} (Lemma 2).

Step 2.1. Mining event pairs considering σ_{\min} and δ : This step finds event pairs in \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} satisfying σ_{\min} and δ , using the set *1Event* found in HLH_1 (Alg. 1, lines 5-10). First, RTPM generates all possible event pairs by calculating the Cartesian product $\text{1Event} \times \text{1Event}$. Next, for each pair (E_i, E_j) , the set S_{ij} (representing the set of sequences where both events occur) is computed by taking the *intersection* between the set of sequences S_i of E_i in HLH_1 and the set of sequences S_j of E_j in HLH_1 . Finally, we compute the support $\text{supp}(E_i, E_j)$, and comparing against σ_{\min} . If $\text{supp}(E_i, E_j) \geq \sigma_{\min}$, (E_i, E_j) is further filtered

using Lemma 3: (E_i, E_j) is selected only if its confidence is at least δ . After this step, only event pairs satisfying σ_{\min} and δ are kept in EH_2 of HLH_2 .

Step 2.2. Mining rare 2-event patterns: This step finds 2-event patterns from the event pairs found in step 2.1 (Alg. 1, lines 11-13), considering three constraints σ_{\min} , σ_{\max} , and δ . For each event pair (E_i, E_j) , we use the set of sequences \mathcal{S}_{ij} to check relations between E_i and E_j . Specifically, for each sequence $S \in \mathcal{S}_{ij}$, the pairs of event instances (e_i, e_j) are extracted. The support and confidence of each relation $r(E_{i \triangleright e_i}, E_{j \triangleright e_j})$ are compared against σ_{\min} and δ thresholds, after which only relations satisfying these two constraints are selected and stored in PH_2 , while their event instances are stored in SH_2 . Examples of the relations in HLH_2 can be seen in Fig. 3, e.g., event pair (SON, TON). Next, we check the satisfaction of each relation $r(E_{i \triangleright e_i}, E_{j \triangleright e_j})$ against σ_{\max} . If it satisfies σ_{\max} , then it is a rare temporal pattern. We also emphasize that HLH_2 only stores patterns that satisfy the two constraints σ_{\min} and δ .

4.5 Mining Rare k-event Patterns

Mining rare k-event patterns ($k \geq 3$) follows a similar process as rare 2-event patterns, with additional prunings based on the transitivity property of temporal relations.

Step 3.1. Mining k-event combinations considering σ_{\min} and δ (Alg. 1, lines 14-16).

Let $(k-1)Event$ be the set of $(k-1)$ -event combinations found in HLH_{k-1} , and $1Event$ be the set of single events in HLH_1 . To generate all k-event combinations, the typical process is to compute the Cartesian product: $(k-1)Event \times 1Event$. However, using $1Event$ to generate k-event combinations at HLH_k can create redundancy, since $1Event$ might contain events that when combined with $(k-1)Event$, the combinations cannot form any patterns satisfying the σ_{\min} constraint. For example, consider the event ION at HLH_1 in Fig. 3. Here, ION can be combined with event pairs in HLH_2 such as (SON, TON) to create a 3-event combination (SON, TON, ION). However, (SON, TON, ION) cannot form any 3-event patterns whose support is greater than σ_{\min} , since ION is not present in any 2-event patterns in HLH_2 . The combination (SON, TON, ION) should not be created in the first place. We rely on the *transitivity property* of temporal relations to identify such event combinations.

Lemma 4 *Let $S = \langle e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} \rangle$ be a temporal sequence that supports an $(n-1)$ -event pattern $P = \langle (r_{12}, E_{1 \triangleright e_1}, E_{2 \triangleright e_2}), \dots, (r_{(n-2)(n-1)}, E_{n-2 \triangleright e_{n-2}}, E_{n-1 \triangleright e_{n-1}}) \rangle$. Let e_n be a new event instance added to S to create the temporal sequence $S' = \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$. The set of temporal relations \mathcal{R} is transitive on S' : $\forall e_i \in S', i < n, \exists r \in \mathcal{R}$ s.t. $r(E_{i \triangleright e_i}, E_{n \triangleright e_n})$ holds.*

Lemma 4 says that given a temporal sequence S , a new event instance added to S will form at least one temporal relation with existing instances in S .

Lemma 5 *Let $N_{k-1} = (E_1, \dots, E_{k-1})$ be a $(k-1)$ -event combination, and E_k be a single event. The combination $N_k = N_{k-1} \cup E_k$ can form k-event temporal patterns whose support is at least σ_{\min} if $\forall E_i \in N_{k-1}, \exists r \in \mathcal{R}$ s.t. $r(E_i, E_k)$ is a temporal relation satisfying σ_{\min} .*

From Lemma 5, only single events in HLH_1 that occur in HLH_{k-1} should be used to create k-event combinations. Using this result, a filtering on $1Event$ is performed before calculating the Cartesian product. Specifically, from the events in HLH_{k-1} , we extract the distinct single events D_{k-1} , and *intersect* them with $1Event$ to remove redundant single events: $Filtered1Event = D_{k-1} \cap 1Event$. Next, the Cartesian product $(k-1)Event \times Filtered1Event$ is calculated to generate k-event combinations. Finally, we apply Lemmas 2 and 3 to select k-event combinations $kEvent$ which upheld the σ_{min} and δ constraints.

Step 3.2 Mining rare k-event patterns: This step finds rare k-event patterns (Alg. 1, lines 17-19). Unlike 2-event patterns, determining the relations in a k-event combination ($k \geq 3$) is much more expensive, as it requires to verify the frequency of $\frac{1}{2}k(k-1)$ triples. To reduce the cost of relation checking, we propose an iterative verification method that relies on the *transitivity property* and the Apriori principle.

Lemma 6 *Let P and P' be two temporal patterns. If $P' \subseteq P$, then $conf(P') \geq conf(P)$.*

Lemma 7 *Let P and P' be two temporal patterns. If $P' \subseteq P$ and $\frac{supp(P')}{\max_{1 \leq k \leq |P|} \{supp(E_k)\}_{E_k \in P}} \leq \delta$, then $conf(P) \leq \delta$.*

Lemma 6 says that, the confidence of a pattern P is always at most the confidence of its sub-patterns. Consequently, from Lemma 7, a temporal pattern P cannot be high-confidence if any of its sub-patterns are low-confidence.

Let $N_{k-1} = (E_1, \dots, E_{k-1})$ be a (k-1)-event combination in H_{k-1} , $N_1 = (E_k)$ be an event in HLH_1 , and $N_k = N_{k-1} \cup N_1 = (E_1, \dots, E_k)$ be a k-event combination in HLH_k . To find k-event patterns for N_k , we first retrieve the set P_{k-1} containing (k-1)-event patterns of N_{k-1} . Each $p_{k-1} \in P_{k-1}$ is a list of $\frac{1}{2}(k-1)(k-2)$ triples: $\{(r_{12}, E_{1 \triangleright e_1}, E_{2 \triangleright e_2}), \dots, (r_{(k-2)(k-1)}, E_{k-2 \triangleright e_{k-2}}, E_{k-1 \triangleright e_{k-1}})\}$. We iteratively verify the possibility of p_{k-1} forming a k-event pattern with E_k as follows. We first check whether the triple $(r_{(k-1)k}, E_{k-1 \triangleright e_{k-1}}, E_{k \triangleright e_k})$ satisfies the constraints of σ_{min} and δ . If the triple does not satisfy the σ_{min} (using Lemmas 4 and 5) or δ (using Lemmas 4, 6, and 7), the verifying process stops immediately for p_{k-1} . Otherwise, it continues on the triple $(r_{(k-2)k}, E_{k-2 \triangleright e_{k-2}}, E_{k \triangleright e_k})$, until it reaches $(r_{1k}, E_{1 \triangleright e_1}, E_{k \triangleright e_k})$. Finally, to determine rare k-event patterns, we select only k-event patterns in PH_k that satisfy the constraint σ_{max} .

5 Experimental Evaluation

Due to space limitations, we only present here the most important results, and discuss other findings in the Appendix of the full paper.

5.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets: We use three real-world datasets from three application domains: smart energy, smart city, and health. For smart energy (SE), we use energy data from electrical appliances in residential households [12]. For the *smart city* (SC), we use weather and vehicle collision data obtained from NYC Open Data Portal [8]. For *health*, we combine the *influenza* (INF) dataset [28] and weather data [29] from Kawasaki, Japan.

Table 4: Summary of Interesting Rare Patterns

Patterns	σ_{\min} (%)	δ (%)	σ_{\max} (%)
(P1) Heavy Rain \succ Unclear Visibility \succ Overcast Cloudiness \rightarrow High Motorist Injury	5	30	9
(P2) Heavy Rain \diamond Strong Wind \rightarrow High Motorist Injury	2	40	6
(P3) Very Strong Wind \rightarrow High Motorist Injury	5	40	9
(P4) Strong Wind \diamond High Pedestrian Injury	4	30	8
(P5) Extremely Unclear Visibility \succ High Snow \succ High Pedestrian Injury	3	45	7
(P6) Frost Temperature \diamond High Snow \succ High Influenza	1	42	6
(P7) Low Temperature \succ High Influenza	1	42	6
(P8) Heavy Rain \succ High Influenza	3	35	8

Baseline methods: Since our work is the first that studies rare temporal pattern mining, there is not an exact baseline to compare against RTPM. However, we adapt the state-of-the-art method for frequent temporal pattern mining Z-Miner [19] to find rare temporal patterns. The Adapted Rare Z-Miner is referred to as ARZ-Miner.

Infrastructure: We use a VM with 32 AMD EPYC cores (2GHz), 64 GB RAM, and 1 TB storage.

5.2 Qualitative Evaluation

Table 4 shows several interesting rare temporal patterns extracted. Patterns P1-P5 are from SC and P6-P8 are from INF. Analyzing these patterns can reveal some rare but interesting relations between temporal events. For example, P1-P5 show there exists an association between extreme weather conditions and high accident numbers, such as high pedestrian injury during a heavy snowing day, which is very important to act on even though it occurs rarely.

5.3 Baseline comparison on real world datasets

We compare RTPM with the adapted baseline ARZ-Miner in terms of runtime and memory usage. Figs. 4 and 5 show the comparison results on SC. As shown in Fig. 4, RTPM has better runtime than the baseline. The range and average speedups of RTPM compared to the baseline is [2.9-24.7] and 7.4 on average. In terms of memory consumption, as shown in Fig. 5, RTPM uses less memory than the baseline. RTPM uses [4.6-61.8] (on average 14.7) times less memory than ARZ-Miner.

5.4 Evaluation of different pruning techniques in RTPM

We evaluate the following combinations of RTPM pruning techniques: (1) No-Prune: RTPM with no pruning, (2) Apriori: RTPM with Apriori-based pruning (Lemmas 2, 3), (3) Trans: RTPM with transitivity-based pruning (Lemmas 4, 5, 6, 7), and (4) All: RTPM applied both pruning techniques.

We use 3 different scenarios that vary: the minimum support, the minimum confidence, and the maximum support. Fig. 6 shows the results. We see that (All)-RTPM has the best performance of all versions, with a speedup over (NoPrune)-RTPM ranging from 14 up to 68, depending on the configurations. Thus, the proposed prunings are very effective in improving RTPM performance. Furthermore, (Trans)-RTPM delivers a larger speedup than (Apriori)-RTPM, with the average speedup between 11 and 25 for (Trans)-RTPM, and between 6 and 17 for (Apriori)-RTPM, but applying both yields the best speedup.




Fig. 4: Runtime Comparison on SC




Fig. 5: Memory Usage Comparison on SC




Fig. 6: Runtimes of RTPM on SC

6 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper presents our comprehensive Rare Temporal Pattern Mining from Time Series (RTPMfTS) solution that offers: (1) an end-to-end RTPMfTS process to mine rare temporal patterns from time series, (2) an efficient Rare Temporal Pattern Mining (RTPM) algorithm that employs efficient data structures and multiple pruning techniques to achieve fast mining. Extensive experiments conducted on real world datasets show that our algorithm outperforms the baseline in runtime and memory usage. In future work, we plan to use the correlation measurement such as mutual information to prune uncorrelated time series, thereby further improve the performance.

References

1. Alipourchavary, E., Erfani, S.M., Leckie, C.: Mining rare recurring events in network traffic using second order contrast patterns. In: International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN). IEEE (2021)
2. Allen, J.F.: Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals. *Communications of the ACM* **26** (1983)
3. Begum, N., Keogh, E.: Rare time series motif discovery from unbounded streams. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* **8**(2) (2014)
4. Biswas, S., Mondal, K.C.: Dynamic fp tree based rare pattern mining using multiple item supports constraints. In: Computational Intelligence, Communications, and Business Analytics (CICBA). Springer (2019)
5. Borah, A., Nath, B.: Rare association rule mining from incremental databases. *Pattern Analysis and Applications* **23** (2020)
6. Bouasker, S., Inoubli, W., Yahia, S.B., Diallo, G.: Pregnancy associated breast cancer gene expressions: new insights on their regulation based on rare correlated patterns. *Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* **18**(3) (2020)
7. Cai, S., Chen, J., Chen, H., Zhang, C., Li, Q., Sosu, R.N.A., Yin, S.: An efficient anomaly detection method for uncertain data based on minimal rare patterns with the consideration of anti-monotonic constraints. *Information Sciences* **580** (2021)
8. City, N.Y.: Nyc opendata (2019), <https://opendata.cityofnewyork.us/>
9. Cui, Y., Gan, W., Lin, H., Zheng, W.: Fri-miner: fuzzy rare itemset mining. *Applied Intelligence* (2022)
10. Fournier-Viger, P., Yang, P., Li, Z., Lin, J.C.W., Kiran, R.U.: Discovering rare correlated periodic patterns in multiple sequences. *Data & Knowledge Engineering* **126** (2020)
11. Gao, Y., Lin, J.: Efficient discovery of time series motifs with large length range in million scale time series. In: IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM). IEEE (2017)
12. Healy, W., Omar, F., Ng, L., Ullah, T., Payne, W., Dougherty, B., Fanney, A.H.: Net zero energy residential test facility instrumented data (2018), <https://pages.nist.gov/netzero/index.html/>
13. Ho, V.L., Ho, N., Pedersen, T.B.: Efficient temporal pattern mining in big time series using mutual information. vol. 15. *VLDB Endowment* (2022)
14. Ho, V.L., Ho, N., Pedersen, T.B.: Efficient temporal pattern mining in big time series using mutual information (2023), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.03653>
15. Ho, V.L., Ho, N., Pedersen, T.B.: Mining seasonal temporal patterns in time series. In: IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE). IEEE (2023)
16. Iqbal, M., Wulandari, C.P., Yunanto, W., Sari, G.I.P.: Mining non-zero-rare sequential patterns on activity recognition. *Jurnal Matematika MANTIK* **5**(1) (2019)
17. Ji, Y., Ohsawa, Y.: Mining frequent and rare itemsets with weighted supports using additive neural itemset embedding. In: International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN). IEEE (2021)
18. Kam, P.s., Fu, A.W.C.: Discovering temporal patterns for interval-based events. In: Data Warehousing and Knowledge Discovery (DaWak) (2000)
19. Lee, Z., Lindgren, T., Papapetrou, P.: Z-miner: an efficient method for mining frequent arrangements of event intervals. In: Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining (2020)
20. Li, Y., Cai, S.: Detecting outliers in data streams based on minimum rare pattern mining and pattern matching. *Information Technology and Control* **51**(2) (2022)

21. Moskovitch, R., Shahar, Y.: Fast time intervals mining using the transitivity of temporal relations. *Knowledge and Information Systems* **42** (2015)
22. Omiecinski, E.R.: Alternative interest measures for mining associations in databases. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (TKDE)* **15**(1) (2003)
23. Ouyang, W.: Mining rare sequential patterns in large transaction databases. In: *International Conference on Computer Science and Electronic Technology*. Atlantis Press (2016)
24. Piri, S., Delen, D., Liu, T., Paiva, W.: Development of a new metric to identify rare patterns in association analysis: The case of analyzing diabetes complications. *Expert Systems with Applications* **94** (2018)
25. Rahman, A.: Rare sequential pattern mining of critical infrastructure control logs for anomaly detection. Ph.D. thesis, Queensland University of Technology (2019)
26. Rahman, A., Xu, Y., Radke, K., Foo, E.: Finding anomalies in scada logs using rare sequential pattern mining. In: *Network and System Security*. Springer (2016)
27. Samet, A., Guyet, T., Negrevergne, B.: Mining rare sequential patterns with asp. In: *International Conference on Inductive Logic Programming* (2017)
28. city infectious disease surveillance system, K.: Kidss (2021), <https://kidss.city.kawasaki.jp/>
29. Weather, O.: Open weather (2021), <https://openweathermap.org/>
30. Wu, S.Y., Chen, Y.L.: Mining nonambiguous temporal patterns for interval-based events. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (TKDE)* **19** (2007)
31. Zhu, J., Wang, K., Wu, Y., Hu, Z., Wang, H.: Mining user-aware rare sequential topic patterns in document streams. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (TKDE)* **28**(7) (2016)

A Appendix A: Detailed Proofs of Complexities, Lemmas

A.1 Mutual exclusive property of temporal relations

Property 1. (*Mutual exclusive*) Consider the set of temporal relations $\mathcal{R} = \{\text{Follows}, \text{Contains}, \text{Overlaps}\}$. Let E_i and E_j be two temporal events, and e_i occurring during $[t_{s_i}, t_{e_i}]$, e_j occurring during $[t_{s_j}, t_{e_j}]$ be their corresponding event instances, and ϵ be the tolerance buffer. The relations in \mathcal{R} are mutually exclusive on E_i and E_j .

Proof. * **Case 1:** Assume the relation **Follows**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds between E_i and E_j . Thus, we have:

$$t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon \leq t_{s_j} \quad (3)$$

and:

$$t_{s_j} < t_{e_j} \Rightarrow t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon < t_{e_j} \quad (4)$$

Hence, **Contains**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) cannot exist between E_i and E_j , since **Contains**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds iff $(t_{s_i} \leq t_{s_j}) \wedge (t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon \geq t_{e_j})$ (contradict Eq. (4)).

Similarly, **Overlaps**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) cannot exist between E_i and E_j since **Overlaps**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds iff $(t_{s_i} < t_{s_j}) \wedge (t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon < t_{e_j}) \wedge (t_{e_i} - t_{s_j} \geq d_o \pm \epsilon)$ (contradict Eq. (3)).

In conclusion, if **Follows**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds between E_i and E_j , then the two remaining relations cannot exist between E_i and E_j .

* **Case 2:** Assume the relation **Contains**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds between E_i and E_j . Thus, we have:

$$t_{s_i} \leq t_{s_j} \quad (5)$$

$$t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon \geq t_{e_j} \quad (6)$$

Hence, **Follows**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) cannot exist between E_i and E_j since **Follows**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds iff $t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon < t_{e_j}$ (contradict Eq. (6)).

Similarly, **Overlaps**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) cannot exist between E_i and E_j , since **Overlaps**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds iff $(t_{s_i} < t_{s_j}) \wedge (t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon < t_{e_j}) \wedge (t_{e_i} - t_{s_j} \geq d_o \pm \epsilon)$ (contradict Eq. (6)).

In conclusion, if **Contains**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds between E_i and E_j , then the two remaining relations cannot exist between E_i and E_j .

* **Case 3:** Assume the relation **Overlaps**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds between E_i and E_j . Thus, we have:

$$t_{s_i} < t_{s_j} \quad (7)$$

$$t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon < t_{e_j} \quad (8)$$

$$t_{e_i} - t_{s_j} \geq d_o \pm \epsilon \Rightarrow t_{s_j} \leq t_{e_i} - d_o \pm \epsilon \quad (9)$$

Hence, **Follows**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) cannot exist between E_i and E_j , since **Follows**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds iff $t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon < t_{s_j}$ (contradict Eq. (9)).

Similarly, **Contains**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) cannot exist between E_i and E_j , since **Contains**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds iff $t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon \geq t_{e_j}$ (contradict Eq. (8)).

In conclusion, if **Overlaps**($E_{i_{\triangleright e_i}}, E_{j_{\triangleright e_j}}$) holds between E_i and E_j , then the two remaining relations cannot exist between E_i and E_j .

A.2 The search space of RTPM

Let m be the number of distinct events in \mathcal{D}_{SEQ} , and h be the longest length of a temporal pattern. The total number of temporal patterns is $O(m^h 3^{h^2})$.

Proof. The number of single events is: $N_1 = m \sim O(m)$. For mining event pairs, the number of permutations of m distinct events taken 2 at a time is: $P(m, 2)$. However, since the same event can form a pair of events with itself, e.g., (SON, SON), the total number of event pairs is: $N_2 = P(m, 2) + m \sim O(m^2)$. Each event pair in N_2 can form 3 different temporal relations, and thus, the total number of 2-event patterns is: $N_2 \times 3^1 \sim O(m^2 3^1)$. Similarly, the number of 3-event combinations is: $N_3 = P(m, 3) + P(m, 2) + m \sim O(m^3)$, and the number of 3-event patterns is: $N_3 \times 3^3 \sim O(m^3 3^3)$. For mining h -event combinations, the number of h -event combinations is $O(m^h)$, while the number of h -event patterns is $O(m^h \times 3^{\frac{1}{2}h(h-1)}) \sim O(m^h 3^{h^2})$. Therefore, the total number of temporal patterns is $O(m) + O(m^2 3^1) + O(m^3 3^3) + \dots + O(m^h 3^{h^2}) \sim O(m^h 3^{h^2})$.

A.3 Lemma 1

Lemma 1. Let P be a temporal pattern and E_i be a single event such that $E_i \in P$. Then $\text{supp}(P) \leq \text{supp}(E_i)$.

Proof. Derived directly from Defs. 3.4, 3.5, and 3.8.

A.4 Lemma 2

Lemma 2. Let P be a 2-event pattern formed by an event pair (E_i, E_j) . Then, $\text{supp}(P) \leq \text{supp}(E_i, E_j)$.

From Lemma 2, the support of a pattern is at most the support of its events. Thus, infrequent event pairs (those which do not satisfy minimum support) cannot form frequent patterns and thereby, can be safely pruned.

Proof. Derived directly from Defs. 3.4, 3.5, and 3.8.

A.5 Lemma 3

Lemma 3. Let (E_i, E_j) be a pair of events forming a 2-event pattern P . Then $\text{conf}(P) \leq \text{conf}(E_i, E_j)$.

From Lemma 3, the confidence of a pattern P is always at most the confidence of its events. Thus, a low-confidence event pair cannot form any high-confidence patterns and therefore, can be safely pruned.

Proof. Can derived directly from Def. 3.9.

A.6 Lemma 4

Lemma 4. *Let $S = \langle e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} \rangle$ be a temporal sequence that supports an $(n-1)$ -event pattern $P = \langle (r_{12}, E_{1 \triangleright e_1}, E_{2 \triangleright e_2}), \dots, (r_{(n-2)(n-1)}, E_{n-2 \triangleright e_{n-2}}, E_{n-1 \triangleright e_{n-1}}) \rangle$. Let e_n be a new event instance added to S to create the temporal sequence $S' = \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$.*

The set of temporal relations \mathfrak{R} is transitive on S' : $\forall e_i \in S', i < n, \exists r \in \mathfrak{R}$ s.t. $r(E_{i \triangleright e_i}, E_{n \triangleright e_n})$ holds.

Lemma 4 says that given a temporal sequence S , a new event instance added to S will always form at least one temporal relation with existing instances in S . This is due to the temporal transitivity property, as the time interval of new event instance will have a temporal order with the time intervals of existing instances.

Proof. Since $S' = \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$ is a temporal sequence, the event instances in S' are chronologically ordered by their start times. Then, $\forall e_i \in S', i \neq n: t_{s_i} \leq t_{s_n}$. We have:

- If $t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon \leq t_{s_n}$, then $E_{i \triangleright e_i} \rightarrow E_{n \triangleright e_n}$.
- If $(t_{s_i} \leq t_{s_n}) \wedge (t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon \geq t_{e_n})$, then $E_{i \triangleright e_i} \succcurlyeq E_{n \triangleright e_n}$.
- If $(t_{s_i} < t_{s_n}) \wedge (t_{e_i} \pm \epsilon < t_{e_n}) \wedge (t_{e_i} - t_{s_n} \geq d_o \pm \epsilon)$ where d_o is the minimal overlapping duration, then $E_{i \triangleright e_i} \not\bowtie E_{n \triangleright e_n}$.

A.7 Lemma 5

Lemma 5. *Let $N_{k-1} = (E_1, \dots, E_{k-1})$ be a $(k-1)$ -event combination and E_k be a single event, both satisfying the σ_{\min} constraint. The combination $N_k = N_{k-1} \cup E_k$ can form k -event temporal patterns whose support is at least σ_{\min} if $\forall E_i \in N_{k-1}, \exists r \in \mathfrak{R}$ s.t. $r(E_i, E_k)$ is a frequent temporal relation.*

Proof. Let p_k be any k -event pattern formed by N_k . Then p_k is a list of $\frac{1}{2}k(k-1)$ triples (E_i, r_{ij}, E_j) where each represents a relation $r(E_i, E_j)$ between two events. In order for p_k to be frequent (satisfying σ_{\min}), each of the relations in p_k must be frequent (Defs. 3.4 and 3.8, and Lemma 4).

A.8 Lemma 6

Lemma 6. *Let P and P' be two temporal patterns. If $P' \subseteq P$, then $\text{conf}(P') \geq \text{conf}(P)$.*

Lemma 6 says that the confidence of a pattern P is always at most the confidence of its sub-patterns.

Proof. Can be derived directly from Def. 3.9.

A.9 Lemma 7

Lemma 7. *Let P and P' be two temporal patterns. If $P' \subseteq P$ and*

$$\frac{\text{supp}(P')}{\max_{1 \leq k \leq |P|} \{\text{supp}(E_k)\}} \leq \delta, \text{ then } \text{conf}(P) \leq \delta.$$

From Lemma 7, a temporal pattern P cannot be high-confidence if any of its sub-patterns are low-confidence.

Proof. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{conf}(P) &= \frac{\text{supp}(P)}{\max_{1 \leq k \leq |P|} \{\text{supp}(E_k)\}} \\ &\leq \frac{\text{supp}(P')}{\max_{1 \leq k \leq |P|} \{\text{supp}(E_k)\}} \leq \delta \end{aligned}$$

B Appendix B: Additional Experimental Results

B.1 Baselines comparison on real world datasets

Figs. 7, 8, 9, and 10 show the comparison results among RTPM and the baseline on the INF and SE datasets. RTPM achieves the best performance (both runtime and memory usage) than the baseline. The speedup of RTPM compared to the baseline is [3.1-26.5] and 9.2 on average.

On average, RTPM consumes ~ 5.3 times less memory than the baseline.

B.2 Evaluation of different pruning techniques in RTPM

Figs. 11 and 12 show the results for the pruning techniques in RTPM on the INF and SE datasets. We see that (All)-RTPM has the best performance of all versions, with a speedup over (NoPrune)-RTPM ranging from 10 up to 62, depending on the configurations. Thus, the proposed prunings are very effective in improving RTPM performance. Furthermore, (Trans)-RTPM delivers a larger speedup than (Apriori)-RTPM, with the average speedup between 7 and 24 for (Trans)-RTPM, and between 5 and 15 for (Apriori)-E-RTPM, but applying both yields the best speedup.




Fig. 7: Runtime Comparison on INF




Fig. 8: Runtime Comparison on SE




Fig. 9: Memory Usage Comparison on INF




Fig. 10: Memory Usage Comparison on SE




Fig. 11: Runtimes of RTPM on INF




Fig. 12: Runtimes of RTPM on SE