

# High-Dimensional Markov-switching Ordinary Differential Processes

Katherine Tsai<sup>1</sup>, Mladen Kolar<sup>2</sup>, and Sanmi Koyejo<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Illinois  
Urbana-Champaign

<sup>2</sup>Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California

<sup>3</sup>Department of Computer Science, Stanford University

January 3, 2025

## Abstract

We investigate the parameter recovery of Markov-switching ordinary differential processes from discrete observations, where the differential equations are nonlinear additive models. This framework has been widely applied in biological systems, control systems, and other domains; however, limited research has been conducted on reconstructing the generating processes from observations. In contrast, many physical systems, such as human brains, cannot be directly experimented upon and rely on observations to infer the underlying systems. To address this gap, this manuscript presents a comprehensive study of the model, encompassing algorithm design, optimization guarantees, and quantification of statistical errors. Specifically, we develop a two-stage algorithm that first recovers the continuous sample path from discrete samples and then estimates the parameters of the processes. We provide novel theoretical insights into the statistical error and linear convergence guarantee when the processes are  $\beta$ -mixing. Our analysis is based on the truncation of the latent posterior processes and demonstrates that the truncated processes approximate the true processes under mixing conditions. We apply this model to investigate the differences in resting-state brain networks between the ADHD group and normal controls, revealing differences in the transition rate matrices of the two groups.

**Keywords:** high-dimensional time series; ordinary differential equations; regime switchings; latent models; expectation-maximization algorithm

## 1 Introduction

Ordinary differential equations have been widely used to explore the dynamics of complex physical systems, including chemical reactions (Boninsegna et al., 2018), disease progression (Wu, 2005), and neuroscience (Friston et al., 2003). Several data-driven approaches have been proposed in recent years to estimate differential equations (Dattner and Klaassen, 2015; Chen et al., 2017; Pfister et al., 2019). The setting typically consists of the observation of a  $p$ -dimensional continuous function  $X(t) = (X_1(t), \dots, X_p(t))^\top$  and an initial value  $X(0) = x_0$ . The task is to recover the underlying differential equations  $\dot{X}(t) = (f_1(t), \dots, f_p(t))^\top$ . From a practical standpoint, the

continuous function  $X(t)$  is rarely observed, and a discretely sampled and noisy version of  $X(t)$  is observed instead:

$$Y_n = X(t_n) + \varepsilon_n \quad n = 1, \dots, N,$$

where  $\varepsilon_n$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  are independent additive noises. In the context of the data-driven approach, one often parameterizes the function  $X(t)$  with parameter  $\Theta^*$ , namely  $X(t; \Theta^*)$ , and aims to recover the parameter set  $\Theta^*$ . The major interest yet often goes beyond the recovery of the parameter set but uses the parameters as proxies to understand the complex interactions of “nodes”, namely  $X_1, \dots, X_p$ , in dynamical systems. If the differential equation  $f_j(t)$  is a function of  $X_i$ , then the dynamics of  $X_j$  is said to be controlled by  $X_i$ . In the graphical representation, we say that there is an directed edge from  $i$  to  $j$ . Discovering such relations help us better understand the brain network mechanism (Friston et al., 2003) and the gene expression (Chen et al., 1999). However, prior methods (Dattner and Klaassen, 2015; Chen et al., 2017; Pfister et al., 2019) only focus inferring a single graph from the dynamic systems, while in practice, the relationship between nodes often changes over time. For example, there is growing evidence that the brain networks are time-varying (Lurie et al., 2020), necessitating a need to develop more expressive ODE models to capture the complex biological systems.

Our proposal to model the time-varying ODEs is motivated by the neuronal dynamics at the resting-state. Several scientific findings suggest that the dynamics of brain networks follow repetitive patterns, which can be best described as regime switchings (Vidaurre et al., 2017; Park et al., 2021). That is, for each regime,  $\ell$ , there are associated ODEs  $f_i^\ell(t)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  that encode the underlying graph. Oftentimes, the exogenous mechanism that causes the regime switching is unobserved and is naturally formulated as a hidden Markov model. Consequently, we propose a hidden Markov model framework where the emission processes are modeled as ordinary differential processes. Our model differs from prior work in neuroscience applications in the sense that we aim to estimate the directed edges, i.e., the effective connectivity (Friston et al., 2003), compared to most prior work that focuses on measuring the undirected edges, i.e., the functional connectivity (Vidaurre et al., 2017; Tsai et al., 2022, 2024). Such modeling provides deeper understanding about the generation processes of brain signals. Conversely, our modeling perspective resembles Park et al. (2021) which took the Bayesian approach (Friston et al., 2015) and studied the low-dimensional setting. We further allow the differential equations to be non-linear.

We study the high-dimensional setting, where the number of differential equations  $p$  might exceed the number of observed time points  $N$ . Under this scenario, imposing a sparsity related penalty function has shown improved estimation performance empirically and theoretically. Such practice has been employed in several methodologies such as recovering the structures of graphical models (Friedman et al., 2008), principal component analysis (Zou et al., 2006), and linear models (Yuan and Lin, 2006). However, imposing sparsity structures on the ODEs is more challenging as the form of  $f_i^\ell(t)$  is unknown. To address this issue, Henderson and Michailidis (2014); Chen et al. (2017) approximated  $f_i^\ell(t)$  with an additive model, which consequently reduces the computational cost and allows us to directly impose sparse structures. The backbone of our model builds upon Chen et al. (2017) and we integrate it to a Markov-switching framework.

## 1.1 Related work and our contributions

A close sibling to our model is the Markov-switching vector autoregressive model, which has been a popular model in many domains (Krolzig, 2013). In this model, the dynamics of the time-series takes the vector autoregressive form with the underlying autoregressive parameter controlled by a latent finite-state Markov chain. The expectation-maximization algorithm has been widely applied to estimate the log-likelihood in the presence of unobserved latent variables (Dempster et al., 1977; Hamilton, 1989). Similar to the optimization procedure of the Markov-switching autoregressive model, we use the Expectation Maximization (EM) algorithm to estimate the parameters, which is often known as the Baum–Welch algorithm (Baum et al., 1970). Monbet and Ailliot (2017); Chavez-Martinez et al. (2023) extended the standard Markov-switching autoregressive model to the high-dimensional setting by incorporating sparse structures on the parameters. Recently, Li et al. (2022) pushed the field forward by investigating the theoretical properties of the convergence guarantee and the statistical error.

Outside the field of statistics and data science, Markov-switching differential processes, sometimes known as Markov-modulated dynamical systems, have been well-explored in the field of control theory (Khasminskii, 2011). Existing studies (Yin and Zhu, 2010) focus on analyzing the ergodicity and the stability of the system under switchings. Understanding such properties assists in designing control systems that are stable. In contrast, our work focuses on learning the dynamical system from data, i.e., recovering the switching brain networks from fMRI signals. Earlier work from Hahn and Sass (2009) studied parameter recovery from data from the Bayesian perspective. However, to the best of our knowledge, there remains sparse work on the theoretical aspects of this model, in both the low-dimensional and high-dimensional settings.

Our contributions include (i) designing an algorithm with provable convergence guarantees, (ii) analyzing the statistical error under finite sample size, and (iii) investigating the conditions when graph recovery is feasible. Establishing the above theoretical guarantees face several challenges as the observed samples are dependent and hence standard concentration inequalities for *i.i.d.* data can not be applied here. In contrast, there exists rich literature for establishing concentration inequalities for stochastic processes, with prime focus on mixing processes (Vidyasagar, 2013). Yu (1994); Karandikar and Vidyasagar (2002) blocked the sequences into chunks and uses the mixing property to simplify the situation to *i.i.d.* setting. Merlevède et al. (2011) developed a Bernstein type bound for mixing processes. Fortunately, as discussed later, there exists a rich class of Markov-switching ODEs that are mixing. We exploit this property and establish statistical guarantees by adopting and extending the results from Merlevède et al. (2011).

It is known that an EM algorithm typically converges to local optima or saddle points (McLachlan and Krishnan, 2007). Wang et al. (2014); Yi and Caramanis (2015); Balakrishnan et al. (2017) have carefully investigated further when such undesirable behaviors would and would not occur. In particular, Balakrishnan et al. (2017) showed that the EM algorithm exhibits a linear rate of convergence to a neighborhood of the global optimum under a suitable choice of initial estimator and local regularity conditions. However, all this work focuses on the analysis of *i.i.d.* data, which is not applicable in our case. More recently, Yang et al. (2017) studied the convergence of the hidden Markov model with isotropic Gaussian emission, where the sequence of the observed samples become dependent because of the hidden Markov chain; Li et al. (2022) studied the convergence property of the Markov-switching autoregressive model. To derive theories under the dependent

samples setting, both [Yang et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Li et al. \(2022\)](#) employed a truncated EM mechanism to approximate the original EM algorithm. We adopt this idea in our analysis. However, establishing the theoretical guarantees is still non-trivial, as we need several additional steps and sophisticated techniques to show that the truncated EM well approximates the original EM under the proposed log-likelihood function.

The rest of paper is structured as follows. In [Section 2](#), we introduce the setting of the Markov-switching ODEs, the conditions of the underlying data generation process, and finally the problem of interest. In [Section 3](#), we propose a two-step collocation framework to carry out the estimation. The first step is to recover the underlying continuous trajectory from the discrete observations followed by a Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm to estimate the parameters. In [Section 4](#), we derive the convergence guarantee of the proposed algorithm and study the conditions when parameter recovery is feasible. In [section 5](#), we demonstrate that the performance of the proposed model through simulated tasks. In [Section 6](#), we validate the proposed model on real data. We conclude the manuscript by discussing some open problems as future directions in [Section 7](#).

## 2 Background and problem setup

We begin with introducing common notation in [Section 2.1](#). In [Section 2.2](#), we discuss the details of the generation processes of the underlying stochastic processes and introduce the problem. Finally, in [Section 2.2](#), we discuss approximating the differential equations under a slow switching rate.

### 2.1 Notation

Define  $L_2([0, 1])$  be the space of  $L_2$ -integrable functions on  $[0, 1]$ . For any function  $f, g \in L_2([0, 1])$ , define  $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_0^1 f(t)g(t)dt$  and  $\|f\| = (\langle f, f \rangle)^{1/2}$ . Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$  be a vector,  $\|x\|_2 = (\sum_{i=1}^p x_i^2)^{1/2}$ ,  $\|x\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^p |x_i|$ , and  $\|x\|_\infty = \max_{i=1, \dots, p} |x_i|$ . Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be a positive semi-definite matrix, define  $\|x\|_A = (x^\top A x)^{1/2}$ . Let  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $x = (x_1^\top, \dots, x_p^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{pm}$  be a stacked vector and  $A = \{A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} : i = 1, \dots, p\}$  with  $A_i$  being a positive semi-definite matrix. We denote  $\|x\|_{\infty, A} = \max_i \|x_i\|_A$ ,  $\|x\|_{1, A} = \sum_i \|x_i\|_A$ . Denote  $\sigma_{\min}(A)$  as the minimum nonzero singular value of  $A$ , and  $\sigma_{\max}(A)$  as the maximum singular value of  $A$ . Given  $x, y$ , we denote  $x \lesssim y$  if there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $x \leq cy$ .

### 2.2 Setup

To begin, we consider two unobserved continuous-time stochastic processes  $X(t), Z(t)$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$  and one observed discrete stochastic process  $Y_n$  for  $n = 0, \dots, N$ , sampled uniformly across  $[0, 1]$ . We define the sampling period as  $h = 1/N$  and  $t_n = n/N$ . Suppose that  $X(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is the differential process and  $(Z(t))_{t \in [0, 1]}, Z(t) \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  is a finite-state continuous-time Markov chain. In the neuroscience application,  $\{Y_n\}_{n=\{0, \dots, N\}}$  is the observed time-course of fMRI.  $(X(t))_{t \in [0, 1]}$  represents the neuron dynamics ([Friston et al., 2003](#)) filtered by the haemodynamic response ([Rajapakse et al., 1998](#)) and the underlying dynamics are governed by the brain states  $(Z(t))_{t \in [0, 1]}$  ([Vidaurre et al., 2017, 2018](#)). Hence, both  $(X(t))_{t \in [0, 1]}$ , the neuronal activity, and  $(Z(t))_{t \in [0, 1]}$ , the brain state, are unobserved.

Assume that  $(Z(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$  is time-homogeneous, irreducible and positive recurrent, which admits a unique stationary distribution. Define the transition rate matrix as  $Q^\star \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ .

Now let us describe the observed processes. Let  $\{Y_n\}_{n=\{0, \dots, N\}}$ ,  $Y_n = (Y_{n,1}, \dots, Y_{n,p})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$  be the discrete-time noisy observations of the ODE process  $X(t)$ , sampled uniformly at  $0 = t_0, \dots, t_N = 1$ . We study the following Markov-switching additive ODE model:

$$Y_n = X(t_n) + \varepsilon_n \sigma^\star \quad (2.1)$$

$$\dot{X}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{dX_1(t)}{dt} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{dX_p(t)}{dt} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_j f_{1j}^{Z(t)}(X_j(t)) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_j f_{pj}^{Z(t)}(X_j(t)) \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $f_{ij}^\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, p$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$  and  $\varepsilon_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$  is an *i.i.d.* noise variable for  $n = 0, \dots, N$ . Here we assume the differential equation is a nonlinear additive model. The additive model is inspired by [Henderson and Michailidis \(2014\)](#); [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#), which have demonstrated that the nonlinear additive model is a good approximation of the nonparametric differential process  $\dot{X}_i(t) = f_i(X(t))$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  while retaining computational tractability. Our framework is closely related to [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#), which does not consider the switching structure.

It appears that the function  $f_{ij}^\ell(\cdot)$  defined in (2.2) takes an unknown form. We adopt a similar idea from [Henderson and Michailidis \(2014\)](#); [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#) to approximate the unknown function  $f_{ij}^\ell(\cdot)$  with a truncated basis expansion. Consider a finite-dimensional basis  $g(\cdot) = (g_1(\cdot), \dots, g_m(\cdot))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$  where  $g_i$  and  $g_j$  are orthonormal for  $i \neq j$  and

$$f_{ij}^\ell(X_j(t)) = \theta_{ij}^{\ell\star} g(X_j(t)) + \delta_{ij}^\ell(X_j(t)) \quad i, j = 1, \dots, p, \ell = 1, \dots, k, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\theta_{ij}^{\ell\star} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times m}$  is a row vector and  $\delta_{ij}^\ell(X_j(t))$  is the residual function.

**Approximate Additive ODEs under Slow Switching** We have laid out the form of the differential process with parameters  $\theta_{ij}^{\ell\star}$  and the basis functions  $g(\cdot)$ . In this section, we describe the parametric form of the observed process  $\{Y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}$  and its approximation. With simple calculation, we can write the  $i$ -th node of the observed  $Y_n = (Y_{n,1}, \dots, Y_{n,p})^\top$  as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{n,i} &= X_i(t_0) + \sum_{j=1}^p \int_0^{t_n} \theta_{ij}^{Z(u)\star} g(X_j(t)) du + \sum_{j=1}^p \int_0^{t_i} \delta_{ij}^{Z(u)}(X_j(u)) du + \sigma^\star \varepsilon_{n,i} \\ &= X_i(t_{n-1}) + \sum_{j=1}^p \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_i} \theta_{ij}^{Z(u)\star} g(X_j(t)) du + \sum_{j=1}^p \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_i} \delta_{ij}^{Z(u)}(X_j(u)) du + \sigma^\star \varepsilon_{n,i}. \end{aligned}$$

We consider the case that the switching rate is slower than the sampling rate. That is, within two samples, the magnitude of the difference  $\left\| \theta_{ij}^{Z(t_n)\star} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(X_j(t)) du - \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_i} \theta_{ij}^{Z(u)\star} g(X_j(t)) du \right\|_2$  is small for  $i, j = 1, \dots, p$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ . In this case, we can write the generation process of  $Y_{i,n}$  as

$$Y_{n,i} = X_i(t_{n-1}) + \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_{ij}^{Z(t_n)\star} \left\{ \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(X_j(u)) du \right\} + \rho_{n,i} + r_{n,i} + \sigma^\star \varepsilon_{n,i}, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{n,i} &= \sum_{j=1}^p \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \theta_{ij}^{Z(u)\star} g(X_j(t)) du - \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_{ij}^{Z(t_n)\star} \left\{ \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(X_j(u)) du \right\}; \\ r_{n,i} &= \sum_{j=1}^p \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \delta_{ij}^{Z(u)}(X_j(u)) du.\end{aligned}$$

In the neuroscience application, the pattern of  $f_{ij}^{\ell\star}$  encodes the “effective connectivity” of brain networks (Friston et al., 2003). If  $f_{ij}^{\ell\star}$  is not a zero function, then node  $j$  influences the dynamics of node  $i$  under brain state  $\ell$ . Hence, we say that there is a directional effect from  $j$  to  $i$ , denoted as  $j \rightarrow i$ . In order to assess the effective connectivity of brain networks from the observed fMRI signals, we formulate this as a graph recovery problem. At state  $\ell$ , we define the edge set as

$$\tilde{E}^\ell = \{(j, i) : f_{ij}^\ell \neq 0\}.$$

Our primary goal is to recover edge set  $\tilde{E}^\ell$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$  from  $\{Y_n\}_{n=0, \dots, N}$ . As recovering  $f_{ij}^\ell$  is computationally intractable, an alternative is to estimate

$$E^\ell = \{(j, i) : \|\theta_{ij}^{\ell\star}\|_2 > 0\}.$$

According to (2.3), if we choose a good enough number of basis functions,  $f_{ij}^\ell(\cdot)$  is well-approximated by  $\theta_{ij}^{\ell\star}g(\cdot)$ . Hence, we can expect that the difference between  $E^\ell$  and  $\tilde{E}^\ell$ , namely  $(E^\ell \cup \tilde{E}^\ell) - (E^\ell \cap \tilde{E}^\ell)$ , is an empty set or with small cardinality. To be more rigorous, we make the following assumptions.

**Assumption 1.** *There exists a set of basis functions  $\{g_i(\cdot) : i = 1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\tilde{E}^\ell = E^\ell$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ .*

Our goal is to recover the transition rate matrix  $Q^\star \in \Omega_Q$ , where  $\Omega_Q$  is the set of transition rate matrices whose Markov chain is irreducible and positive recurrent, and the parameter set  $\{\theta_{ij}^{\ell\star} : \ell = 1, \dots, k, i, j = 1, \dots, p\}$  under the high-dimensional setting that  $p$  (dimension) is much greater than  $N$  (time points). Define the set of parameters  $\Theta = (Q, \{\theta_{ij}^\ell : \ell = 1, \dots, k, i, j = 1, \dots, p\}, \sigma^2)$  and the true parameter set  $\Theta^\star = (Q^\star, \{\theta_{ij}^{\ell\star} : \ell = 1, \dots, k, i, j = 1, \dots, p\}, \sigma^{\star 2})$ . We define the search space  $\Omega = \Omega_Q \times \{\theta_{ij}^{\ell\star} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \ell = 1, \dots, k, i, j = 1, \dots, p\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ .

## 2.3 Mixing and Stationary Process

Consider the joint discrete sampled process  $(Z(t_n), X(t_n), Y_n)$ , we make the assumption that the joint process exhibit the stationary and geometric  $\beta$ -mixing property, a key component for analyzing the statistical properties later on.

**Assumption 2.** *The joint process  $(Z(t_n), X(t_n), Y_n)$  is strictly stationary; that is, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\begin{aligned}((Z(t_n), X(t_n), Y_n), \dots, (Z(t_{n+n'}), X(t_{n+n'}), Y_{n+n'})) &\stackrel{d.}{=} \\ ((Z(t_{n+\tau}), X(t_{n+\tau}), Y_{n+\tau}), \dots, (Z(t_{n+n'+\tau}), X(t_{n+n'+\tau}), Y_{n+n'+\tau})), &\end{aligned}$$

where  $\stackrel{d.}{=}$  denotes equality in distribution.

From a high-level perspective, the mixing conditions describe the dependency of a stochastic process: given a stochastic process  $\{W_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , if we take any two random variables  $W_n, W_{n'}$  from the process, they will become asymptotically independent as the time difference  $|n - n'|$  goes to infinity. These properties are well-established in the stochastic processes literature (Bradley, 2005; Meyn and Tweedie, 2012) and are standards to apply the concentration inequalities extending from *i.i.d.* settings (Merlevède et al., 2011; Wong et al., 2020). We define the  $\beta$ -mixing property below.

**Definition 1** ( $\beta$ -mixing). *Given  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , the  $\beta$ -mixing coefficient is defined as,*

$$\beta(\ell) = \sup_n \beta(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^n, \mathcal{F}_{n+\ell}^\infty) = \sup_n \|P_{n,\ell} - P_{-\infty}^n \otimes P_{n+\ell}^\infty\|_{TV},$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^n = \sigma(\{X_u : -\infty \leq u \leq n\})$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{n+\ell}^\infty = \sigma(\{X_u : n + \ell \leq u \leq \infty\})$ . The distribution  $P_{n,\ell}$  is associated with the  $\sigma$ -field  $(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^n \vee \mathcal{F}_{n+\ell}^\infty)$ ,  $P_{-\infty}^n$  is associated with the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^n$ , and  $P_{n+\ell}^\infty$  is associated with the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}_{n+\ell}^\infty$ . A stochastic process is said to be absolutely regular, or  $\beta$ -mixing, if  $\beta(\ell) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ .

We say that a  $\beta$ -mixing process is geometrically  $\beta$ -mixing if the coefficient decays at an exponential rate:

**Definition 2** (Geometric  $\beta$ -mixing). *There exists a  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and a constant  $c > 0$  such that*

$$\beta(\ell) \leq 2 \exp(-c\ell).$$

Hence, we make the following assumption.

**Assumption 3.** *The process  $(Z(t_n), X(t_n), Y_n)$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  is geometrically  $\beta$ -mixing; that is, there exist constants  $c > 0$  such that  $\beta(\ell) \leq 2 \exp(-c\ell)$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$*

Perhaps one may wonder if there exists a joint process of (2.2) that satisfies Assumption 2–3. We provide sufficient conditions that the joint process are mixing and describe a few examples below.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Assume that the following properties holds:*

1.  $g(\cdot)$  is locally Lipschitz;
2. There exists a constant  $K_0 > 0$ , such that for each state  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $\|\sum_{i=1}^p \theta_i^\ell g(x_i)\|_2 \leq K_0(1 + \|x\|_2)$ ;
3. For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ ,

$$x^\top \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p \theta_i^{\ell*} g(x_i) \right\} \leq \beta_\ell \|x\|_2^2 + \alpha,$$

for some constants  $\beta_\ell, \alpha$ .

Define  $A = -2\text{diag}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) - Q^*$ . Suppose that  $A$  is an nonsingular  $M$ -matrix. Then, under additional regularity conditions, Assumption 15–17 stated in Appendix, the joint process  $(Z(t_n), X(t_n), Y_n)$  is  $\beta$ -mixing.

The first two conditions in Proposition 2.1 guarantees that the solution is unique and are standard conditions in Markov-switching differential processes (Yin and Zhu, 2010). The third condition and the condition that  $A$  is a nonsingular M-matrix are sufficient conditions for the process to be asymptotically stable (Yuan and Mao, 2003). Together with additional sufficient conditions for the process to be irreducible, Assumption 15–16, we can conclude that the process is  $\beta$ -mixing. Our analysis follows the theories in Meyn and Tweedie (1993), as we construct a Lyapunov function and verify the Foster-Lyapunov criteria. We leave the details of the analysis in Appendix.

In the following, we show that if the diffusion equations are linear and under mild conditions, the joint processes are mixing.

**Proposition 2.2** (Linear Model). *Consider  $X(t) \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\mathcal{X}$  is a compact set. Let the transition rate matrix of  $Z(t)$  be  $Q^\star$  with unique stationary distribution  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k)$ . Consider the linear model*

$$\dot{X}(t) = A_{Z(t)}X(t)dt,$$

where  $A_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ . Let  $G$  be a positive definite matrix and define  $\mu_i = 2^{-1}\lambda_{\max}(GA_\ell G^{-1} + G^{-1}A_\ell^\top G)$ . Suppose that there exists a positive definite matrix  $G$  such that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^k \pi_\ell \mu_\ell < 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Then, under additional regularity conditions, Assumption 15–16, 18, the joint process  $(Z(t_n), X(t_n), Y_n)$  is  $\beta$ -mixing.

The condition (2.5) is a sufficient condition for the system to be asymptotically stable.

### 3 Methodology

In this section, we introduce the algorithm to estimate the parameters  $\Theta^\star$  from observed stochastic process  $\{Y_n\}_{n=0, \dots, N}$ . We adopt the two-step collocation framework that has been widely used in estimating ODEs (Ramsay et al., 2007; Henderson and Michailidis, 2014; Wu et al., 2014; Dattner and Klaassen, 2015; Chen et al., 2017). We briefly outline the procedure: In the first step, we estimate the continuous trajectory  $X(t)$  from the noisy discrete observations  $\{Y_n\}_{n=0, \dots, N}$  using a shrinkage wavelet-smoothing estimator (Donoho and Johnstone, 1994; Brown and Cai, 1998). Since  $Z(t)$  is unobserved, it is natural to adopt the Expectation-Maximization (EM) method. Hence, in the following step, we estimate the parameter set  $\Theta^\star$  using the EM with estimated trajectory from the first step,  $\hat{X}(t)$ , and  $\{Y_n\}_{n=0, \dots, N}$ .

#### 3.1 Step 1: Wavelet-smoothing

Given  $\{Y_n\}_{n=0, \dots, N}$ , our first step is to estimate  $X(t)$  from the discrete observations. For each dimension  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , we estimate the univariate function  $X_i(t)$  from  $\{Y_{n,i}\}_{n=0, \dots, N}$  using the wavelet shrinkage estimator, a wavelet regression estimator with shrinkage (Donoho and Johnstone, 1994; Donoho et al., 1995). The wavelet regression is used as alternative to the local regression

method (Tsybakov, 2008) employed in (Chen et al., 2017), who studied additive ODEs without hidden switching structures. This is because the “switchings” cause the trajectory to be non-smooth; the trajectory at the switching point is non-differentiable, creating “piecewise” smooth structures instead. Hence, we adopt the wavelet method that is locally adaptive.

Let  $\phi$  to be the father wavelet and  $\psi$  to be the mother wavelet function. Define  $\phi_{j\ell}(t) = 2^{j/2}\phi(2^j t - \ell)$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, 2^{j_0}$  and  $\psi_{j\ell}(t) = 2^{j/2}\psi(2^j t - \ell)$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, 2^j$ . The collection  $\{\phi_{j_0\ell}; \ell = 1, \dots, 2^{j_0}; \psi_{j\ell}, j \geq j_0, \ell = 1, \dots, 2^j\}$  is a set of orthonormal basis function on  $L_2([0, 1])$ . We write the projection of  $X_i(t)$  to the basis functions as

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{i,j_0\ell} &= \langle X_i, \phi_{j_0\ell} \rangle = \int_0^1 X_i(t) \phi_{j_0\ell}(t) dt \quad \ell = 1, \dots, 2^{j_0}; \\ \eta_{i,j\ell} &= \langle X_i, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle = \int_0^1 X_i(t) \psi_{j\ell}(t) dt \quad \ell = 1, \dots, 2^j, j \geq j_0.\end{aligned}$$

So we can write the wavelet series expansion of the function  $X_i$  as

$$X_i(t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} \xi_{i,j_0\ell} \phi_{j_0\ell}(t) + \sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^j} \eta_{i,j\ell} \psi_{j\ell}(t).$$

Let  $J$  be an integer such that  $N = 2^J$  and define  $\tilde{X}_i(t) = N^{-1/2} \sum_{n=1}^N Y_{n,i} \phi_{Jn}(t)$ . The estimation procedure of the coefficients  $\xi_{i,j_0\ell}, \eta_{i,j\ell}$  follows from Brown and Cai (1998). Let

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\xi}_{j_0\ell} &= \langle \tilde{X}_i, \phi_{j_0\ell} \rangle \quad \ell = 1, \dots, 2^{j_0}; \\ \tilde{\eta}_{j\ell} &= \langle \tilde{X}_i, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle \quad \ell = 1, \dots, 2^j, j = j_0, \dots, J-1.\end{aligned}$$

We can estimate the coefficient, denoted as  $\tilde{\xi}_{j_0\ell}$  and  $\tilde{\xi}_{j_0\ell}$ , by computing wavelet transforms on  $Y_{i,n}$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Given  $\lambda_{j\ell} = 3\sigma^*(2N^{-1} \log(N/\delta))^{1/2}$  for some  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , where  $\sigma^*$  is the variance of the noise, we threshold the coefficient

$$\hat{\eta}_{i,j\ell} = \text{sgn}(\tilde{\eta}_{i,j\ell})(|\tilde{\eta}_{i,j\ell}| - \lambda_{j\ell})_+. \quad (3.1)$$

Hence, the reconstructed  $\hat{X}_i(t)$  is

$$\hat{X}_i(t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} \hat{\xi}_{i,j_0\ell} \phi_{j_0\ell}(t) + \sum_{j=j_0}^{J-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^j} \hat{\eta}_{i,j\ell} \psi_{j\ell}(t).$$

Repeat the procedure for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , then we complete the first step.

### 3.2 Step 2: Graph estimation via EM method

We describe the EM algorithm for the continuous-time hidden Markov model with discrete observations. Given the observations  $\{Y_n\}_{n=0, \dots, N}$ , the log-likelihood is

$$\mathcal{L}_{0,N}(\tilde{\Theta}) = \log \int p(Y_0^N, Z_0^N; \tilde{\Theta}) dZ_0^N,$$

where we define the shorthand  $Z_0^N = \{Z_n := Z(t_n); n = 0, \dots, N\}$  and  $Y_0^N = \{Y_n; n = 0, \dots, N\}$ . By Jensen's inequality, we can find the lower bound of  $\mathcal{L}_{0,N}$  as

$$\mathcal{L}_{0,N}(\tilde{\Theta}) \geq \underbrace{\int \log p(Y_0^N, Z_0^N; \tilde{\Theta}) dp(Z_0^N | Y_0^N; \Theta)}_{\mathcal{L}_{1,N}(\Theta | \tilde{\Theta})} + \underbrace{\int -\log p(Z_0^N | Y_0^N; \Theta) dp(Z_0^N | Y_0^N; \Theta)}_{H_N(\Theta)}.$$

Given that  $H_n(\Theta)$  does not depend on  $\tilde{\Theta}$ , we want to maximize the  $\mathcal{L}_{1,N}(\Theta | \tilde{\Theta})$  to tighten the lower bound. Hence, the EM algorithm maximizes the lower bound  $\mathcal{L}_{1,N}(\Theta | \tilde{\Theta})$  at each M-step and compute the log-likelihood function at each E-step. In the following, we express the form of  $\mathcal{L}_{1,N}(\Theta | \tilde{\Theta})$ . Note that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(Y_0^N, Z_0^N; \tilde{\Theta}) &= \log p(Y_0^N | Z_0^N; \tilde{\Theta}) + \log p(Z_0^N; \tilde{\Theta}) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \log p(Y_n | Y_{n-1}, Z_n; \tilde{\Theta}) + \log p(Y_0 | Z_0; \tilde{\Theta}) + \log p(Z_0^N; \tilde{\Theta}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Since the second term (3.2) does not depend on  $\tilde{\Theta}$  and  $Z_0 := Z(t_0)$ , its value would affect optimization of  $\tilde{\Theta}$ . We will drop this term. First, we describe the expression of the log-likelihood of the continuous-time Markov chain (Liu et al., 2015), the third term of (3.2). Define  $m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta) := \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]$  be the expected number of transitions of  $Z(t)$  from state  $\ell$  to state  $\ell'$  conditioned on  $Y_0^N$  and the parameter set  $\Theta$ . Similarly, define  $\tau_\ell(Y_0^N; \Theta) := \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]$  be the expected total time that  $Z(t)$  spent at state  $\ell$  conditioned on  $Y_0^N$  and  $\Theta$ . By the time-homogeneous property of the Markov chain  $Z(t)$ , one can express

$$\int \log p(Z_0^N; \tilde{\Theta}) dp(Z_0^N | Y_0^N; \Theta) = \sum_{\ell, \ell'=1}^k m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta) \log \tilde{q}_{\ell\ell'} - \tilde{q}_\ell \tau_\ell(Y_0^N; \Theta), \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\tilde{q}_\ell = \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \tilde{q}_{\ell\ell'}$ .

Next, we describe the conditional log-likelihood of  $Y_n$  conditioned on  $Z(t_n)$  and  $Y_{n-1}$ . With  $\hat{X}_i$  estimated in the last step, we can compute  $\hat{\Psi}_i(t_n) := \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(\hat{X}_i(u)) du$  as an estimate of the unobserved quantity  $\Psi_i(t_n) := \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(X_i(u)) du$ . Hence, this leads to approximate (2.4) as

$$Y_{n,i} \approx Y_{n-1,i} + \sigma^*(\varepsilon_{n,i} - \varepsilon_{n-1,i}) + \sum_j \theta_{ij}^{Z(t_n)^*} \hat{\Psi}_j(t_n),$$

where  $\sigma^*(\varepsilon_{n,i} - \varepsilon_{n-1,i})$  follows the distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, 2(\sigma^*)^2)$ . Hence, the residual follows  $\mathcal{N}(0, 2(\sigma^*)^2)$ . By the Markov Property, we can approximate the log-likelihood  $\int \log p(Y_0^N | Z_0^N, \tilde{\Theta}) dp(Z_0^N | Y_0^N, \Theta)$  as

$$-\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{p}{2} (\log 2\tilde{\sigma}^2 + \log 2\pi) - \frac{1}{4\tilde{\sigma}^2} \sum_{n,\ell,i=1}^{N,k,p} p(Z(t_n) = \ell | Y_0^N; \Theta) \left( Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{\theta}_{ij}^\ell \hat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right)^2. \quad (3.4)$$

Hence  $\mathcal{L}_{1,N}(\tilde{\Theta} | \Theta)$  is approximated by the sum of (3.3)–(3.4). In practice, we add a sparsity regularization term on  $\tilde{\theta}_{ij}^\ell$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, p$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ . This is because if the true function

$f_{ij}^\ell$  is a zero-function, then  $\tilde{\theta}_{ij}^{\ell*}$  is a zero vector. Taking everything together, we can define the empirical log-likelihood as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_N(\tilde{\Theta} | \Theta) &= \sum_{\ell, \ell'=1}^k m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta) \log \tilde{q}_{\ell\ell'} - \tilde{q}_{\ell\ell'} \tau_{\ell}(Y_0^N; \Theta) - \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{p}{2} (\log 2\tilde{\sigma}^2 + \log 2\pi) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\tilde{\sigma}^2} \sum_{n, \ell, i=1}^{N, k, p} p(Z(t_n) = \ell | Y_0^N; \Theta) \left( Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{\theta}_{ij}^\ell \hat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i,j=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N (\tilde{\theta}_{ij}^\ell \hat{\Psi}_j(t_n))^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where  $\lambda > 0$ . At each  $M$ -step, we compute

$$M_n(\Theta) = \underset{\tilde{\Theta}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathcal{L}_N(\tilde{\Theta} | \Theta).$$

Our analysis requires finding the optimal solution within the constraint set  $\Omega = \Omega_Q \times \{\theta_{ij}^{\ell*} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \ell = 1, \dots, k, i, j = 1, \dots, p\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ , where  $\Omega_Q$  is the set of all transition rate matrices whose Markov chain is positive recurrent and irreducible. When implementing the algorithm, we do not restrict the estimates to be in this constraint set to simplify the estimation procedure.

By simple algebraic computation, the optimal solution of each  $M$ -step update with respect to  $\Theta$  is

$$\begin{aligned} M_{n, q_{\ell\ell'}}(\Theta) &= \frac{m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta)}{\tau_{\ell}(Y_0^N; \Theta)} \quad \ell \neq \ell', \quad M_{n, q_{\ell\ell'}}(\Theta) = - \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} M_{n, q_{\ell\ell'}}(\Theta); \\ M_{n, \theta_{ij}^\ell}(\Theta) &= \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N p(Z(t_n) = \ell | Y_0^N; \Theta) \left( Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j \neq j'} \theta_{ij'}^\ell \hat{\Psi}_{j'}(t_n) \right) \hat{\Psi}_j^\top(t_n) \right\} \times \\ &\quad \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N (\lambda + p(Z(t_n) = \ell | Y_0^N; \Theta)) \hat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \hat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^\top \right\}^{-1}; \\ M_{n, \sigma^2}(\Theta) &= \frac{1}{2pN} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^p p(Z(t_n) = \ell | Y_0^N; \Theta) \left( Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_{ij}^\ell \hat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

After obtaining  $M_n(\Theta)$ , in the  $E$ -step, we compute the log-likelihood function  $M_n(\Theta) \mapsto \mathcal{L}_N(\cdot | M_n(\Theta))$ . Specifically,  $p(Z(t_n) = \ell | Y_0^N; \Theta)$  and  $p(Z(t_{n-1}) = \ell, Z(t_n) = \ell' | Y_0^N; \Theta)$ , namely the smoothed probability, can be computed using the forward-backward algorithm commonly used for estimating hidden Markov models (Baum et al., 1970).

It remains to compute the two quantities,  $m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta)$  and  $\tau_{\ell}(Y_0^N; \Theta)$  in (3.5). These steps are standards in estimating continuous-time Markov chain (Bladt and Sørensen, 2005; Hobolth and Jensen, 2005; Liu et al., 2015). The following decomposition is followed by the fact that  $m_{\ell\ell'}$  is

conditionally independent to  $Y_0^N$  given  $Z_0^N$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta) &:= \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(1) \mid Y_0^N; \Theta] \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i,j=1}^k p(Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j \mid Y_0^N; \Theta) \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(t_n - t_{n-1}) \mid Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j; \Theta] \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i,j=1}^k p(Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j \mid Y_0^N; \Theta) \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) \mid Z(0) = i, Z(h) = j; \Theta], \quad (3.6)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from time-homogeneity of the Markov chain. The quantity  $\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) \mid Z(0) = i, Z(h) = j; \Theta]$  means the expected number of transition from state  $\ell$  to state  $\ell'$  during the time interval  $h$  given that the Markov chain starts at state  $i$  and ends at state  $j$  at time  $h$ . Furthermore, from [Hobolth and Jensen \(2005\)](#), we can decompose:

$$\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) \mid Z(0) = i, Z(h) = j; \Theta] = \frac{q_{\ell\ell'}}{P_{ij}(h)} \int_0^h P_{i\ell}(u) P_{\ell'j}(h-u) du, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $P_{ij}(t) = [\exp(Qt)]_{ij}$ . As [Liu et al. \(2015\)](#) have discussed, there are several ways to compute the analytical solution of the integral on the right hand side of (3.7). In the manuscript, we adopt the integration method developed in [Van Loan \(1978\)](#).

Similarly, we can express

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_\ell(Y_0^N; \Theta) &:= \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell \mid Y_0^N; \Theta] \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i,j=1}^k p(Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j \mid Y_0^N; \Theta) \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell(t_n - t_{n-1}) \mid Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j; \Theta] \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i,j=1}^k p(Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j \mid Y_0^N; \Theta) \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell(h) \mid Z(0) = i, Z(h) = j; \Theta], \quad (3.8)
\end{aligned}$$

where by [Hobolth and Jensen \(2005\)](#):

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell(h) \mid Z(0) = i, Z(h) = j; \Theta] = \frac{1}{P_{ij}(h)} \int_0^h P_{i\ell}(u) P_{\ell j}(h-u) du.$$

Given an initial estimate  $\Theta^0$ , we iterate between  $E$ -step and  $M$ -step until the log-likelihood converges. The complete algorithm is described in [Algorithm 1](#). After obtaining  $\widehat{\Theta}$  by running [Algorithm 1](#), we can compute the estimated edge set as

$$\widehat{E}^\ell = \left\{ (j, i) : \|\widehat{\theta}_{ij}^\ell\|_2 > \epsilon_t \right\} \quad \ell = 1, \dots, k,$$

for a threshold  $\epsilon_t > 0$ .

### 3.3 Step 3: Model selection

In this section, we describe how to select parameters. We assume that the father and mother wavelet function  $\phi, \psi$  in step 1 described in [Section 3.1](#) and the family of projection basis function  $\{g_i(\cdot) : i \in$

---

**Algorithm 1** Graph Estimation

---

Input: data:  $\{Y_n; n = 0, \dots, N\}$ ,  $\{\widehat{\Psi}_i(t_n); i = 1, \dots, p, n = 1, \dots, N\}$ ; initial parameter  $\Theta^0$ ; regularization parameter  $\lambda$ ; threshold parameter  $\epsilon_t$

Output: parameter set  $\widehat{\Theta}$

$j \leftarrow 0$

**while**  $\mathcal{L}_N$  not converged **do**

    Compute  $p(Z(t_n), Z(t_{n-1}) \mid Y_0^N; \Theta^j)$ ,  $p(Z(t_n) \mid Y_0^N; \Theta)$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$

    Compute  $m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta^j)$  for  $\ell \neq \ell'$  using (3.6)

    Compute  $\tau_\ell(Y_0^N; \Theta^j)$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$  using (3.8)

$\Theta^{j+1} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{\widetilde{\Theta} \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}_N(\widetilde{\Theta} \mid \Theta^j)$

$\widehat{\Theta} \leftarrow \Theta^{j+1}$

---

$\mathbb{N}$  are given in Section 3.2. There are four parameters to select: the threshold coefficient  $\lambda_{j\ell}$ , the number of hidden states  $k$ , the number of basis functions  $m$ , and the sparsity regularization function  $\lambda$ . The threshold coefficient is  $\lambda_{j\ell} = 3\sigma^* \{(\log N/\delta)/N\}^{1/2}$  where  $N$  is the number of sample size,  $\delta$  is a small constant that controls the probability of the recovery of the trajectory  $X_i$  in Proposition 4.1 and  $\sigma^*$  is the noise variance. In practice, the variance of the noise is often unknown. We adopt the method developed in Section 4.2 of Donoho and Johnstone (1994) to estimate  $\sigma^*$ . Under the Gaussian noise assumption, the estimated  $\sigma$  is the median of the wavelet coefficients at the finest level  $J$ , where  $N = 2^J$ , divided by 0.6745, the inverse of the the cumulative distribution function of the standard Gaussian distribution at 0.75. To select the remaining parameters  $k, m, \lambda$ , we use grid search with the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). Let  $\widehat{\Theta}$  be the output of Algorithm 1 with fixed  $k, m, \lambda$ , we compute the BIC as

$$\left( k^2 - k + \sum_{i,j}^{\ell} \|\widehat{\theta}_{ij}^{\ell}\|_0 \right) \log N - 2 \left[ \mathcal{L}_N(\widehat{\Theta} \mid \widehat{\Theta}) + \lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i,j=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N (\widehat{\theta}_{ij}^{\ell} \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n))^2 \right\}^{1/2} \right].$$

Here  $k^2 - k$  denotes the degree of freedom of the transition rate matrix. The second term of the above equation is the empirical log-likelihood without the sparsity regularization term. We employ a two-stage method to select the parameters. First, we fix  $k$  in the grid search, we find the minimum BIC across all candidates of  $m$  and  $\lambda$ , then we employ the ELBO method to select the number of states  $k$ . Then, in the following stage, given  $k$ , we find the optimal  $m, \lambda$  with minimal BIC score.

## 4 Theory

Our goal is to assess the quality of the estimation  $\widehat{\Theta}$  output from Algorithm 1 as compared to the true parameter  $\Theta^*$ . We can investigate this by studying whether the fixed point is close to the global optima of the empirical log-likelihood, or ultimately close to the global optima of the population log-likelihood. To begin with, we first study the convergence behavior of the EM algorithm for the idealized population log-likelihood. Once the convergence guarantee is established, we ask whether a similar guarantee holds for the empirical log-likelihood under the proper choice of the regularization term  $\lambda_n$ . Intuitively, the empirical log-likelihood will be close to the population log-likelihood given large enough samples. However, analysis under finite sample size is challenging as

samples are dependent. The secret is that when the processes are mixing, i.e., under Assumption 3, the truncated smoothed probability is close to the original smoothed probability in total variation distance. As an alternative, we can utilize such property and prove the convergence guarantee under the truncated sequence Section 4.3.

#### 4.1 Recovery of $X(t)$

In this section, we discuss the estimation error of  $X(t)$  using shrinkage wavelet regression introduced in Section 3.1. Our analysis follows from Brown and Cai (1998) where we extend the analysis on convergence in expectation to studying the behavior of the tail bound. In this paper, we consider the piecewise Hölder function classes: between two switchings of the hidden Markov chain  $Z(t)$ , the trajectory of  $X_i(t)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  is in a Hölder function class. We introduce the following conditions.

**Definition 3.** A piecewise Hölder class  $\Lambda^\alpha(M, B, d)$  on  $[0, 1]$  with  $d$  discontinuous jumps consists of functions  $f$  satisfying the following conditions:

1. The function  $f$  is bounded by  $B$ , that is,  $|f| \leq B$ .
2. There exist  $l \leq d$  points  $0 \leq a_1 < \dots < a_l \leq 1$  such that, for  $a_i \leq x, y < a_{i+1}$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, l$  with  $a_0 = 0$  and  $a_{l+1} = 1$ ,
  - (a)  $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq M |x - y|^\alpha$  if  $\alpha \leq 1$ ;
  - (b)  $|f^{[\alpha]}(x) - f^{[\alpha]}(y)| \leq M |x - y|^{\alpha - [\alpha]}$  if  $\alpha > 1$ .

This function class contains trajectories with inhomogeneous temporal structures, adaptive to local fluctuations between two switching points.

**Assumption 4.** There exists some finite constants  $M, B, d \geq 0$  such that  $X_i \in \Lambda^\alpha(M, B, d)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ .

The following proposition demonstrates the error rate of the estimator discussed in Section 3.1.

**Proposition 4.1.** Given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $\hat{X}_i$  be soft-threshold wavelet estimator with threshold  $3\sigma^* \{(\log N/\delta)/N\}^{1/2}$  discussed in Section 3.1. Suppose that the wavelet is  $r$ -regular. Under Assumption 4, then the estimator  $\hat{X}_i$  is near optimal

$$\|\hat{X}_i - X_i\|^2 \leq C \{\log(N/\delta)/N\}^{2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)},$$

with probability at least  $1 - 3\delta$ , for all  $1 \leq \alpha \leq r$  and all  $d \leq CN^\gamma$  with constants  $C > 0$  and  $0 < \gamma < 1/(1 + 2\alpha)$ .

The convergence rate is the same as Theorem 3 in Brown and Cai (1998), where they showed convergence in expectation. Furthermore, it is within a  $\log N$  factor of the minimax rate of the nonparametric function without switchings,  $O(N^{-2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)})$  (Tsybakov, 2008).

## 4.2 Convergence of the population EM

We start the analysis with the population log-likelihood and then generalize the results to the empirical log-likelihood. This is a common analysis approach when studying the convergence property of empirical risks (Loh and Wainwright, 2013; Yi and Caramanis, 2015; Balakrishnan et al., 2017). We define the the population log-likelihood as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\Theta} | \Theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\ell, \ell'=1}^k m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta) \log \tilde{q}_{\ell\ell'} - \tilde{q}_{\ell\ell'} \tau_{\ell}(Y_0^N; \Theta) - \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{p}{2} (\log 2\tilde{\sigma}^2 + \log 2\pi) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{4\tilde{\sigma}^2} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^p p(z(t_n) = \ell | Y_0^N; \Theta) \left( Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{\theta}_{ij}^{\ell} \Psi_j(t_n) \right)^2 \right], \quad (4.1) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Psi_i(t_n) = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(X_i(u)) du$ ,  $m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta)$  is the expected number of transitions of  $Z(t)$  from state  $\ell$  to state  $\ell'$  conditioned on the observations  $Y_0^N$  and parameters  $\Theta$ , and  $\tau_{\ell}(Y_0^N; \Theta)$  is the expected time that  $Z(t)$  stay in state  $\ell$  and  $\Theta$ . In order to ensure running EM algorithm with the population log-likelihood 4.1 guarantee, the true parameter  $\Theta^*$  must satisfy the self-consistency property:

$$\Theta^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\tilde{\Theta} \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\Theta} | \Theta^*).$$

The idea behind the analysis is that if the geometric landscape of  $\mathcal{L}(\cdot | \Theta^*)$  at the neighborhood of  $\Theta^*$  satisfies some local regularity conditions, and if the initial point is within this local region, we can ensure that each EM-update pulls the estimate closer to  $\Theta^*$  (Balakrishnan et al., 2017; Li et al., 2022). To define the local region, we first define the distance metric.

**Definition 4.** Given three constants  $r_0, r_q, r_{\sigma}$ , we define the distance between two parameters as

$$\operatorname{dist}(\Theta, \bar{\Theta}) = \underbrace{\sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^p \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell} - \bar{\theta}_{i\cdot}^{\ell}\|_2}_{\leq r_0} + \underbrace{\sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} |q_{\ell\ell'} - \bar{q}_{\ell\ell'}|}_{\leq r_q} + \underbrace{|\sigma^2 - \bar{\sigma}^2|}_{\leq r_{\sigma}}.$$

We formally define the local region of  $\Theta^*$  as  $B(r_0, r_q, r_{\sigma}, \Theta^*) = \{\Theta \in \Omega; \operatorname{dist}(\Theta^*, \Theta) \leq kr_0 + r_q + r_{\sigma}\}$ . Let us define

$$M(\Theta) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\tilde{\Theta} \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\Theta} | \Theta).$$

Then it follows that the maximum log-likelihood update is

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{q_{\ell\ell'}}(\Theta) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta)]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{\ell}(Y_0^N; \Theta)]} \quad \ell \neq \ell', \quad M_{q_{\ell\ell}}(\Theta) = - \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} M_{q_{\ell\ell'}}(\Theta); \\
M_{\theta_{ij}^{\ell}}(\Theta) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N p(z(t_n) = \ell \mid Y_0^N; \Theta) \left( Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j \neq j'} \theta_{j'}^{\ell} \Psi_{j'}(t_n) \right) \Psi_j^{\top}(t_n) \right] \times \\
&\quad \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} [p(z(t_n) = \ell \mid Y_0^N; \Theta) \Psi_j(t_n) \Psi_j(t_n)^{\top}] \right\}^{-1}; \\
M_{\sigma^2}(\Theta) &= \frac{1}{2pN} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ p(z(t_n) = \ell \mid Y_0^N; \Theta) \left\| Y_n - Y_{n-1} - \sum_{i=1}^p \theta_i^{\ell} \Psi_i(t_n) \right\|_2^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We introduce the following local regularity assumption.

**Assumption 5.** *There exists a constant  $\kappa$  such that for any  $\Theta' \in B(r_0, r_q, r_{\sigma}, \Theta^*)$*

$$\max \left\{ \left| \frac{\partial M(\Theta)}{\partial \sigma^2} \Big|_{\Theta=\Theta'} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial M(\Theta)}{\partial q_{\ell\ell'}} \Big|_{\Theta=\Theta'} \right|, \left\| \frac{\partial M(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_{ij}^{\ell}} \Big|_{\Theta=\Theta'} \right\|_2; \ell \neq \ell', i = 1, \dots, p \right\} \leq \kappa.$$

To provide high-level intuition, this assumption implies that  $M(\Theta)$  is a continuous function within the ball  $B(r_0, r_q, r_{\sigma}, \Theta^*)$  and the change with respect to  $\Theta$  is bounded by  $\kappa$ . This is equivalent to Assumption 2 in [Li et al. \(2022\)](#) that studied the Markov-switching autoregressive model.

**Proposition 4.2** (One-step Update of Population Log-likelihood). *Under Assumption 5, we have*

$$\text{dist}(M(\Theta), \Theta^*) \leq \kappa \text{dist}(\Theta, \Theta^*).$$

*Specifically, for each  $\ell, \ell'$  and  $i$*

$$\|M_{\theta_{ij}^{\ell}}(\Theta) - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\|_2 \leq \kappa \|\theta_{ij}^{\ell} - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\|_2, \quad |M_{q_{\ell\ell'}}(\Theta) - q_{\ell\ell'}^*| \leq \kappa |q_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*|, \quad |M_{\sigma^2}(\Theta) - \sigma^{*2}| \leq \kappa |\sigma^2 - \sigma^{*2}|.$$

This proposition implies that if  $\Theta \in B(r_0, r_q, r_{\sigma}, \Theta^*)$ , then at each update  $M(\Theta) \in B(r_0, r_q, r_{\sigma}, \Theta^*)$ . Hence, if the initial guess  $\Theta^0 \in B(r_0, r_q, r_{\sigma}, \Theta^*)$ , then after  $\ell$  iterates of EM steps, we can guarantee that  $\text{dist}(M(\Theta^{\ell-1}), \Theta^*) \leq \kappa^{\ell} \text{dist}(\Theta, \Theta^*)$ . Ultimately, the EM algorithm would converge to the  $\Theta^*$  as  $\ell$  goes to infinity.

### 4.3 Truncated EM

We now turn to study the convergence properties of the empirical log-likelihood (3.5). The major challenge for extending the result to empirical risk is that the data are not *i.i.d.* and hence requires more technical efforts to do the analysis. Our approach is inspired from ([Yang et al., 2017](#); [Li et al., 2022](#)) that we construct an  $r$ -truncated function to approximate the original function (3.5). First, we show the convergence property with the  $r$ -truncated function.

Let us define the truncated probability of  $p(Z(t_n) \mid Y_0^N; \Theta)$  as

$$p\left(Z(t_n) = \ell \mid Y_{(n-r) \vee 0}^{(n+r) \wedge N}; \Theta\right) = \widehat{w}_{\ell, \Theta}(t_n) \quad n = 1, \dots, N.$$

We replace  $p(Z(t_n) | Y_0^N; \Theta)$  in (3.5) with  $\widehat{w}_{\ell, \Theta}(t_n)$  and define the new empirical log-likelihood as  $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N(\widetilde{\Theta} | \Theta)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N(\widetilde{\Theta} | \Theta) &= \sum_{\ell, \ell'=1}^k m_{\ell \ell'}(Y_0^N; \Theta) \log \widetilde{q}_{\ell \ell'} - \widetilde{q}_{\ell} \tau_{\ell}(Y_0^N; \Theta) - \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{p}{2} (\log 2\widetilde{\sigma}^2 + \log 2\pi) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\widetilde{\sigma}^2} \sum_{n, \ell, i=1}^{N, k, p} \widehat{w}_{\ell, \Theta}(t_n) \left( Y_{n, i} - Y_{n-1, i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \widetilde{\theta}_{ij}^{\ell} \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \lambda_n \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i, j=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N (\widetilde{\theta}_{ij}^{\ell} \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n))^2 \right\}^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Define  $\widetilde{M}_n(\Theta) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\widetilde{\Theta} \in \Omega} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N(\widetilde{\Theta} | \Theta)$  and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{M}_{n, \theta_{ij}^{\ell}}(\Theta) &= \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\ell, \Theta}(t_n) \left( Y_{n, i} - Y_{n-1, i} - \sum_{j \neq j'} \theta_{ij'}^{\ell} \widehat{\Psi}_{j'}(t_n) \right) \widehat{\Psi}_j^{\top}(t_n) \right\} \times \\ &\quad \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N (\lambda_n + \widehat{w}_{\ell, \Theta}(t_n)) \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^{\top} \right\}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we want to show the contraction result of executing one run of the EM step on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ . Here, we fix a index  $i$  and for each  $\theta_{ij}^{\ell}$ , we drop the state index  $\ell$ , the row index  $i$  and  $j$  to reduce the overhead on notation. We define  $\theta = (\theta_{i1}^{\ell \top}, \dots, \theta_{ip}^{\ell \top}) \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times pm}$ , where  $\theta_{ij}^{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Furthermore, we define  $\widehat{\Theta} = \operatorname{argmax} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N(\widetilde{\Theta} | \Theta)$  and  $\widehat{\theta} = (\widehat{\theta}_{i1}^{\ell \top}, \dots, \widehat{\theta}_{ip}^{\ell \top})$ . Similarly, define the population optimal condition on  $\Theta$  as  $\check{\Theta} = M(\Theta) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\Theta'} \mathcal{L}(\Theta' | \Theta)$  and  $\check{\theta} = (\check{\theta}_{i1}^{\ell \top}, \dots, \check{\theta}_{ip}^{\ell \top})$ ;  $\theta^{\star} = (\theta_{i1}^{\ell \star \top}, \dots, \theta_{ip}^{\ell \star \top})$  for  $\Theta^{\star} = \operatorname{argmax} \mathcal{L}_{\check{\Theta} \in \Omega}(\check{\Theta} | \Theta^{\star})$ .

Define  $\Psi(t_n) = (\Psi_1^{\top}(t_n), \dots, \Psi_p^{\top}(t_n)) \in \mathbb{R}^{pm}$  and  $\widehat{\Psi}(t_n) = (\widehat{\Psi}_1^{\top}(t_n), \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_p^{\top}(t_n)) \in \mathbb{R}^{pm}$ . Let  $\|\theta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}} = \sum_{j=1}^p \|\theta_{ij}^{\ell}\|_{\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}}$  and  $\|\theta\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}} = \max_j \|\theta_{ij}^{\ell}\|_{\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}}$ , where  $\|\theta_{ij}^{\ell}\|_{\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}} = \{\theta_{ij}^{\ell \top} \widehat{K}_{\Psi_j} \theta_{ij}^{\ell}\}^{1/2}$  and  $\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j} = N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^{\top}$ . Note that the dual norm of  $\|\cdot\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}}$  is  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}^*}$ .

We study the guarantee of the lasso estimation under two well-known conditions: the restricted eigenvalue condition and the deviation bound condition (Agarwal et al., 2012; Loh and Wainwright, 2012). We make slight modifications to the conditions in (Loh and Wainwright, 2012) to tailor for the structured  $\ell_1$ -norm,  $\|\cdot\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}}$ , and  $\ell_{\infty}$ -norm,  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}^*}$  used in our case.

**Assumption 6** (Restricted Eigenvalue). *For any  $\Theta \in \Omega$  and  $\Delta \in \Omega$ , there exists  $\alpha, \tau > 0$  such that*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ \Delta \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \right\}^2 \geq \alpha \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \tau \|\Delta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}}^2, \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\alpha \geq 50 \max_j \sigma_{\max}^2(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) s \tau$ .

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\varepsilon = \Delta_\varepsilon(\Theta) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_j \theta_{ij}^{\ell*} \Psi_j(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_j \theta_{ij}^{\ell*} \Psi_j(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

$$\Delta_\Psi = \Delta_\Psi(\Theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ \Psi(t_n) \Psi(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)^\top \right\}; \quad (4.5)$$

$$\Delta_w = \Delta_w(\Theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) - w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \right\} \left\{ Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_j \theta_{ij}^{\ell*} \Psi_j(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right]. \quad (4.6)$$

Recall that  $m$  is the number of basis function,  $h$  is the sampling interval,  $\sigma$  is the variance of the noise, and  $r$  is the truncation length.

**Assumption 7** (Deviation Bound). *For any  $\Theta \in \Omega$ , there exists a deterministic function  $\mathbb{Q}$  such that*

$$\max \left\{ \|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*}, \|\theta^* \Delta_\Psi\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*}, \|\Delta_w\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \right\} \leq \mathbb{Q}(N, p, s, m, r, \delta_1).$$

With the restricted eigenvalue and deviation condition, we are now ready to show the contraction result of running one EM update on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose that Assumption 6, 7 hold and*

$$\lambda \geq 4 \max \left\{ 3\mathbb{Q}(N, p, s, m, r, \delta_1), \frac{4}{\sqrt{s}} \frac{\sigma_{\max}(K_\Psi)}{\max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \right\}.$$

Then, we have

$$\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \leq \frac{4}{\alpha} \left( 5\lambda \max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\psi_j}) \sqrt{s} + \sigma_{\max}(K_\Psi) \|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \right).$$

This lemma shows that  $\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2$  is bounded by a statistical error governed by  $\mathbb{Q}(N, p, s, m, r, \delta_1)$  and  $\|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2$ . As Proposition 4.2 demonstrates, at each iterate of EM on the population log-likelihood  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $\|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2$  contracts. This piece of result shows that running EM on the truncated log-likelihood  $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$  tends to move the estimates toward  $\theta^*$  under proper condition of  $\mathbb{Q}(N, p, s, m, r, \delta_1)$ .

A natural question is how practical Assumption 6-7 are? What is the minimum number of samples required for these assumptions to hold true? While variants these two assumptions are standards in high-dimensional sparse regression (Loh and Wainwright, 2012) and sparse additive model (Ravikumar et al., 2009), the main challenge to verify the assumptions is that the right hand side of (4.3) as well as (4.4)–(4.6) are sums of dependent variables. Hence, standard concentration inequality for *i.i.d.* data can not be applied. Our proof strategy is to show that under Assumption 3, individual summands in (4.3)–(4.6) are  $\beta$ -mixing as well. Consequently, we can apply concentration inequality for mixing process (Merlevède et al., 2011) to verify Assumption 6–7. We leave the theoretical results and discussion on the applicability of Assumption 6–7 in Lemma G.1 and Lemma F.1, respectively.

Finally, the contraction result of  $|\widehat{q}_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*|$  for  $\ell \neq \ell'$  and  $|\sigma^2 - \sigma^{2*}|$  by running one iterate of EM on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$  are discussed in Lemma E.1–E.2. We leave the results to the Appendix.

#### 4.4 Main results

As discussed in Section 4.2–4.3, under suitable regularity conditions in the local region  $B(r_0, \Theta^*)$ , one can show that each EM iterate on both  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  pulls the estimates toward  $\Theta^*$ . The concern is how likely we are to observe similar contraction behaviors if we run EM algorithm on  $\mathcal{L}_N$ ? In this section, we show that under the reversible, mixing, stationary conditions, and an additional eigenvalue condition, this question can be resolved.

In addition to Assumption 3, we provide a sufficient condition for the continuous-time Markov chain  $Z(t)$  to be mixing following the condition introduced in (van Handel, 2008; Yang et al., 2017). Recall that  $h$  is the sampling period and define  $P = \exp(Qh)$  for a transition rate matrix  $Q$ . Furthermore, we assume that the set  $\Omega_Q$  is confined to the set whose underlying chain is reversible. The reversibility of Markov chain implies the following.

**Assumption 8.** *For every  $Q \in \Omega_Q$ , let  $\pi$  be the invariant distribution such that  $\pi Q = 0$ . For every  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$ , assume that*

$$\pi(i)Q(i, j) = \pi(j)Q(j, i).$$

Let  $\{Z(t_n)\}_{n=0, \dots, N}$  be the sampled Markov chain of  $(Z(t))_{t \in [0, 1]}$  associated with the transition probability matrix  $P : P(h) = \exp(Qh)$ . It is well-known that the sampled Markov chain is also reversible.

**Assumption 9** (Mixing Condition). *There exists some constant  $\zeta = \zeta(h) \in (0, 1]$  such that for any  $Q \in \Omega_Q$  and for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$*

$$\zeta \leq \frac{P_{ij}}{\pi_j} \leq \zeta^{-1}. \quad (4.7)$$

Noting that if the continuous-time Markov chain is irreducible then it follows that  $P_{ij} > 0$  for any  $h > 0$  as discussed in Proposition 6.1 of (Lalley, 2012), and hence there exists a sufficiently small  $\zeta$  that satisfies (4.7). As Yang et al. (2017) showed that this condition is an sufficient condition for the sampled Markov chain  $Z(t_n)$  to be geometrically  $\beta$ -mixing. Assumption 8, 9 are common in Markov chains and are key components for the statistical analysis later on: with them, we can validate that underlying conditional filtered/smoothing processes exhibit geometric mixing property.

Now we define the minimum stationary probability as

$$\pi_{\min} = \min_{Q \in \Omega_Q} \min_{\ell=1, \dots, k} \pi_\ell, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\pi Q = 0$  is the stationary distribution. Furthermore,  $\pi_{\min} > 0$  implies that every state has nontrivial occurrence probability when the Markov chain reaches to the stationary state. This holds true because any  $Q \in \Omega_Q$  is irreducible and positive recurrent and hence the stationary distribution will be strictly positive for all states.

The following two lemmas show that the truncated probability is close to the original probability in the absolute value.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose that  $\delta_{\min} = \min_{\Theta \in \Omega} \min_{n=1, \dots, N} P(Z_n, Y_n; \Theta) > 0$  and let  $C$  be an absolute constant. Under Assumption 8, 9, we have*

$$\left| P\left(Z_n = \ell, Z_{n+1} = \ell' \mid Y_{(n-r) \vee 0}^{(n+r) \wedge N}\right) - P\left(Z_n = \ell, Z_{n+1} = \ell' \mid Y_0^N\right) \right| \leq C \delta_{\min}^{-1} \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} (1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2)^{r-1}.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\left| P(Z_n = \ell \mid Y_0^N) - P\left(Z_n = \ell \mid Y_{(n-r) \vee 0}^{(n+r) \wedge N}\right) \right| \leq \frac{10}{\delta_{\min}} \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1},$$

for any  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ .

We see that as  $r$  increases, the absolute difference between the truncated filtered probability and the original probability decays geometrically. Given that the Markov chain has finite state, it is easy to see that the total variation distance of two probability distributions also decays geometrically. With the results from Lemma 4.4, we build the intuition that the empirical log-likelihood  $\mathcal{L}_N$  in (3.5) shall be close to (4.2) for  $r$  reasonably large. Hence, we can expect that running EM on  $\mathcal{L}_N$  would give us similar outcome compared to running EM on  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ .

For each  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , define  $K_{\Psi_j} = N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\Psi_j(t_n) \Psi_j^\top(t_n)]$  and  $\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j} = N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}_j^\top(t_n)$ . We make the following assumption.

**Assumption 10.** *For each  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , there exist a finite constant  $c_\Psi > 0$  such that*

$$c_\Psi \leq \sigma_{\min}(K_{\Psi_j}) \leq \sigma_{\max}(K_{\Psi_j}) \leq c_\Psi^{-1}.$$

Furthermore, for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ ,

$$\sigma_{\min} \left( N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \Psi_j(t_n) \Psi_j^\top(t_n)] \right) \geq c_\Psi.$$

Now combine the theoretical results from Section 4.1–4.3, we are ready to show the convergence guarantee for running EM algorithm on  $\mathcal{L}_N$  in (3.5).

**Theorem 4.5.** *Suppose that Assumption 2–5, 8–10 hold and additionally  $\kappa \in [0, 1)$ . Furthermore,  $\widehat{X}(t)$  is obtained using the method discussed in Section 3.1 with threshold  $3\sigma^* \{(\log N + 3 \log p - \log \delta_e)/N\}$ . Let*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \max_{i, j} |g_j(X_i(t))| \leq B, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \max_{i, j} |\dot{g}_j(X_i(t))| \leq D,$$

for some absolute constants  $B, D > 0$ . Suppose that  $N \gtrsim \{m^4 (\log p)^4 \vee m^{5/2} s^{5/2}\}$  and  $N/(\log N + \log p) \gtrsim m^{(2\alpha+1)/\alpha}$ . Let  $C_1, \dots, C_7$  be some constants, given the initial guess  $\Theta^{(0)} \in B(r_0, r_q, r_\sigma, \Theta^*)$  and

$$\lambda \geq \sqrt{m} \max \left\{ C_1 (1 - \zeta \pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1}, C_1 \sqrt{ms} \left( \frac{\log N + \log p}{N} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)}, C_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{ms}} \max_{i, \ell} \|\theta_i^{\ell(0)} - \theta_i^{\ell*}\| \right\}.$$

Suppose that  $r$  is a constant and if additionally  $80c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa + \kappa^2 < 1$  and  $C_3 c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa < 1$ , then we have

1.

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell(L)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|_2 &\leq (C_3 c_{\Psi}^{-2} \kappa)^L \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell(0)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|_2 \\ &+ \frac{C_4}{1 - C_3 c_{\Psi}^{-2} \kappa} \left\{ \frac{m\sqrt{s \log p}}{\sqrt{N}} + ms \left( \frac{\log N + \log p}{N} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)} + \sqrt{ms} (1 - \zeta^2 \pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1} \right\}; \end{aligned}$$

$$2. \left| \sigma^{(L)^2} - \sigma^{\star 2} \right| \leq \kappa^L \left| \sigma^{(0)^2} - \sigma^{\star 2} \right| + \frac{1}{1-\kappa} \left[ \frac{C_5 c_{\Psi}^{-2} m s r_0^2}{\sqrt{N}} + C_6 k \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} \right];$$

$$3. \sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \left| q_{\ell\ell'}^{(L)} - q_{\ell\ell'}^{\star} \right| \leq \sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \kappa^L |\check{q}_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^{\star}| + \frac{1}{1-\kappa} \frac{C_7 k(k-1)}{\sqrt{N}},$$

with probability at least  $1 - 4\delta_e$  and  $\delta_e$  is some small constant stated in (H.1).

This result shows that the distance of the intermediate estimate at  $L$ -th iterate of EM is upper bounded by a geometric decaying term, a statistical error, and a truncation error due to the truncated smoothing probability. Note that the first term decays geometrically as  $L$  increases, suggesting to fast (linear) rate of convergence to bounded distance away from the  $\Theta^{\star}$ . The statistical error contains the non-parametric error rate  $(\log N + \log p/N)^{\alpha/2\alpha+1}$ , which is propagated down by error induced from the wavelet regression as stated in Proposition 4.1. This is due to the error of the terms  $\widehat{\Psi}_i(t_n) = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(\widehat{X}_i(u)) du$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  and  $i = 1, \dots, p$  in  $\mathcal{L}_N$ . One might be able to improve the statistical error rate by redesigning the estimation procedure of  $\Psi_i(t_n) = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(X_i(u)) du$  and we leave this as a future direction. Here we assume that the truncated sequence  $r$  is constant, and hence the truncation error is a constant. Although this is the case, graph recovery is still possible if the magnitude of  $\theta_{ij}^{\ell\star}$  is large enough, as shown in the following corollary.

Finally, recall that our goal is to show the recovery of the graphs and the transition rate matrix, namely  $\Theta^{\star}$ . The following corollary shows that recovery of  $\Theta^{\star}$  is possible when  $\text{dist}(\widehat{\Theta}, \Theta^{\star})$ , where  $\widehat{\Theta}$  is the output of Algorithm 1, is small.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Under the conditions stated in Theorem 4.5. Suppose that the threshold parameter  $\epsilon_t$  in Algorithm 1 is selected such that*

$$\epsilon_t = \frac{2}{3} \min_{i,j,\ell} \|\theta_{ij}^{\ell\star}\|_2.$$

If  $N, r$  satisfy

$$\epsilon_t \geq \frac{C_4}{4(1 - C_3 c_{\Psi}^{-2} \kappa)} \left\{ \frac{m\sqrt{s \log p}}{\sqrt{N}} + ms \left( \frac{\log N + \log p}{N} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)} + \sqrt{ms} (1 - \zeta^2 \pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1} \right\},$$

and  $L \geq \log(\epsilon_t/4r_0)/\log(C_3 c_{\Psi}^{-2} \kappa)$ . Then for each  $\ell$ , we can recover  $E^{\ell}$  with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ . If Assumption 1 holds, then we can recover  $\widetilde{E}^{\ell}$  with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ .

## 5 Simulations

We demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed model with simulated tasks by evaluating both the quality of the parameter estimations and the ROC. Our program is implemented in Python and we use package *scikit-image* (Van der Walt et al., 2014) for running the wavelet regression in Section 3.1 and the package *skglm* (Bertrand et al., 2022) (formerly *group-lasso*) for computing the M-step update of  $\theta_{ij}^\ell$  via maximization of  $\mathcal{L}_N(\tilde{\Theta} | \Theta)$ . In Section 5.1, we first describe the evaluation metric and the estimation techniques.

### 5.1 Experiment setup

In this section, we discuss the general setup of the simulations and the implementation tactics that would result in improved and stable performance. We then discuss the evaluation metric for the simulated task.

For the data generation, we first generate the continuous trajectories from true ODE parameters, true transition rate matrix, and the initial conditions. Then we sample the trajectories evenly over the time frame. The observed samples is corrupted with *i.i.d.* centered Gaussian noise. To sample the latent process  $Z(t)$ , the initial state is sampled from the stationary distribution  $\pi$  such that  $\pi Q^* = 0$ . With  $Z(t)$  and the true parameters  $\Theta^*$ , we can generate  $X(t)$  and  $\{Y_n\}$ . We will discuss the details of the simulated parameters in the following section.

For estimation, we first apply wavelet regression as discussed in Section 3.1 and select the threshold parameter using the method discussed in Section 3.3. We use Daubechies 3 wavelets (Daubechies, 1992) in all experiments. Then we approximate the numerical integral  $\hat{\Psi}_i(t_n) = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(\hat{X}_i(u))du$  with  $\{g(\hat{X}_i(t_n)) + g(\hat{X}_i(t_{n-1}))\}/2N$ . In the following tasks, we use polynomial basis function:  $g_i(t) = t^i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Then, we randomly initialize the parameters  $\Theta^0$ . We initialize  $q_{\ell\ell} \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 0)$  for  $\ell \neq \ell'$  and  $\theta_{ij}^\ell \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ . Although Theorem 4.5 requires the initial guess to be within  $B(r_0, \Theta^*)$ , we empirically find out that sweeping across all candidates of  $\lambda$  with the practice of the warm start converges to good optima and gives consistent results. That is, we first take 100 uniform samples over  $[-7, -1]$  and then take the exponential over the samples as the candidate set for  $\lambda$ . Then, we start executing Algorithm 1 with the largest  $\lambda = \exp(-1)$  and random initial point  $\Theta^0$  stated above. After the convergence of the loop in Algorithm 1, we will get  $\hat{\Theta}$ . We use the estimated parameter,  $\hat{\Theta}$ , as the initial parameter for executing Algorithm 1 with the next smaller  $\lambda$ . In addition, at each M-step of Algorithm 1, updating  $\theta_{ij}^\ell$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, p$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, \ell$  is equivalent as solving a variant of the linear model with group lasso constraint. In this case, we find out that practicing the warm start when running the EM algorithm, using the estimate at the previous M-step as the initial guess, also boosts the performance compared to without using the warm start.

### 5.2 Data generation processes

We consider two data generation processes, one is non-linear model and the other is linear. In both simulated tasks, we set the number of states to be  $k = 2$  and

$$Q^* = \begin{pmatrix} -0.27 & 0.27 \\ 0.18 & -0.18 \end{pmatrix}, \sigma^* = 0.01.$$

**Data generation process 1.** In the following, we consider similar additive ODEs as discussed in Section 5.1 of [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#) with  $p = 10$ :

$$\dot{X}_{2i-1}(t) = \theta_{2i-1,2i-1}^{\ell*}g(X_{2i-1}(t)) + \theta_{2i-1,2i}^{\ell*}g(X_{2i}(t)); \quad (5.1)$$

$$\dot{X}_{2i}(t) = \theta_{2i,2i-1}^{\ell*}g(X_{2i-1}(t)) + \theta_{2i,2i}^{\ell*}g(X_{2i}(t)), \quad (5.2)$$

for  $t \in [0, 40]$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 5$ , and  $\ell = 1, 2$  and initial  $X(0) = (-2, 2, 2, -2, -1.5, 1.5, -1, 1, 1, -1)^\top$ . In this case, we use  $g(t) = (t, t^2, t^3)^\top$ . The details about the parameters are discussed in [Appendix J.1](#). The graphs of the underlying generation process is presented in [Figure 7–8](#), and the trajectories of  $X(t)$  and  $\{Y_n\}$  is presented in [Figure 9](#).

**Data generation process 2.** In the second task, we consider two different graphs: star graphs and a ring graph. The number of nodes is  $p = 20$  in this case. In state  $\ell = 1$ , we consider the following system:

$$\dot{X}_{5i+j}(t) = \theta_{5i+j,5i+1}^{1*}g(X_{5i+1}(t)), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad j = 2, 3, 4, 5; \quad (5.3)$$

$$\dot{X}_{5i+1}(t) = \sum_{j=2}^5 \theta_{5i+1,5i+j}^{1*}g(X_{5i+j}(t)), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (5.4)$$

for  $t \in [0, 40]$  and  $g(t) = t$  in this case. Here,  $\theta_{5i+j,5i+1}^{1*} = -0.8\pi$  and  $\theta_{5i+1,5i+j}^{1*} = 0.8\pi$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ ,  $j = 2, 3, 4, 5$ . In state  $\ell = 2$ , we have the following system:

$$\dot{X}_i(t) = \theta_{i,i-1}^{2*}g(X_{i-1}(t)) + \theta_{i,i+1}^{2*}g(X_{i+1}(t)), \quad i = 2, \dots, 19; \quad (5.5)$$

$$\dot{X}_1(t) = \theta_{1,20}^{2*}g(X_{20}(t)) + \theta_{1,2}^{2*}g(X_2(t)); \quad (5.6)$$

$$\dot{X}_{20}(t) = \theta_{20,1}^{2*}g(X_1(t)) + \theta_{20,19}^{2*}g(X_{19}(t)). \quad (5.7)$$

for  $t \in [0, 40]$  and  $g(t) = t$  in this case. Here, we have  $\theta_{i,i-1}^{2*} = -0.8\pi$  and  $\theta_{i,i+1}^{2*} = 0.8\pi$  for  $i = 2, \dots, 19$ . Similarly, we have  $\theta_{1,20}^{2*} = \theta_{20,19}^{2*} = -0.8\pi$  and  $\theta_{20,1}^{2*} = \theta_{1,2}^{2*} = 0.8\pi$ . The graphs of the underlying generation process is presented in [Figure 10–11](#), and the trajectories of  $X(t)$  and  $\{Y_n\}$  is presented in [Figure 12](#).

### 5.3 Model selection and estimation error

This section demonstrates the model selection procedure introduced in [Section 3.3](#) and assesses the quality of the estimates. We want to evaluate under what conditions, the procedure could recover the true hyper parameters, i.e., number of states and number of basis functions. Then, we evaluate the quality of the estimates by computing the  $\ell_2$  distance of the estimates to the true parameters.

We evaluate the model selection procedure with various samples size and test on 10 independent runs. We perform grid search to find the optimal parameters: we search over  $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  for the number of states,  $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  for the number of basis, and the exponential of 100 uniform samples at the interval of  $[-7, -1]$  for  $\lambda$ . The results are shown in [Fig 1](#). The procedure is able to select the correct number of basis in both simulated examples despite the small sample size. When the sample size is sufficient large (greater than 160), the procedure is able to select the correct number




Figure 1: The box plots of model selection procedure introduced in Section 3.3. The orange line denotes the median, the upper line of the box denotes the third quartile (Q3), and the lower line of the box denotes the first quartile (Q1). The whiskers extend from the box toward  $Q3 + 1.5IQR$  and  $Q1 - 1.5IQR$ , where  $IQR$  is the inter-quartile range. The dots denote the outliers that lie outside the ends of the whiskers. The true number of states are 2 for both cases and the true number of basis is 3 for case 1 and 1 for case 2. The results indicate that when the sample size is sufficient large, the model selection procedure is able to select the true number of states and the number of basis. Furthermore, the optimal  $\lambda$  decrease with the increase of sample size, whose trend matches the result of Theorem 4.5.

of basis most of the time. When the sample size is greater than 80, it appears that when the sample size increases, the optimal  $\lambda$  decreases.

After selecting  $k, m, \lambda$ , we compute the distance of the estimates to the ground truth, as defined in Definition 4. To compute the distance, we need to match the  $\ell$ -th state's estimates to the true  $\ell$ -th state parameters. Since the order of the states is unknown, we find the permutation of the states that minimizes the following objective function. Let  $\mathcal{P}(k)$  be the collection of all permutations of  $1, \dots, k$  and define

$$\Xi_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\tilde{\Xi} \in \mathcal{P}(k)} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i,j=1}^p \left\| \hat{\theta}_{ij}^{\tilde{\Xi}(\ell)} - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*} \right\|_2, \quad \Xi_2 = \operatorname{argmin}_{\tilde{\Xi} \in \mathcal{P}(k)} \sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \left| \hat{q}_{\tilde{\Xi}(\ell)\tilde{\Xi}(\ell')} - q_{\ell\ell'}^* \right|$$

We let  $\Xi = \Xi_1$  if  $\Xi_1$  is identical to  $\Xi_2$ . In the case that  $\Xi_1$  is not identical to  $\Xi_2$ , which implies that the optimal permutations are not aligned, we can not compare the estimation result with the




Figure 2: The  $\ell_2$  distance of the estimated parameters to the ground truth. The top row shows the result of case 1, and there is a drop of distance when the sample size is greater than 160. The bottom row shows the result of case 2. The distance of  $\{\theta_{ij}^\ell\}$  and  $\sigma^2$  consistently decrease as the sample size increases.

ground truth parameter. Hence, we drop the estimate of that particular  $\lambda$ . We empirically find out that this situation rarely happens so long as we have enough sample size  $N$ . After obtaining the optimal permutation set, we compute the  $\ell_2$  distances of the estimates matched to the ground truths. The distance to  $Q^*$ ,  $\{\theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\}$ ,  $\sigma^{2*}$  are respectively defined as

$$\|\widehat{Q}(\Xi) - Q^*\|_2, \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i,j=1}^p \|\theta_{ij}^{\Xi(\ell)} - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\|_2, |\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{2*}|.$$

where  $\widehat{Q}(\Xi) = [q_{\Xi(i)\Xi(j)}]_{i,j}$ . The results are presented in Fig 2. The estimator do not provide consistent results under small sample size as the confidence intervals of the distance metrics are larger.

#### 5.4 ROC with varying sample size

To assess the performance, we assume that the number of states  $k$ , and the number of basis function is given. We compute the average ROC curve under varying regularization parameters  $\lambda$  over 10 runs of independently generated batch of samples. We sweep across  $\lambda$  from the natural exponential of 100 uniform samples from  $[-7, -1]$ . At each run, we observe a sequence  $\{Y_n\}$  with

State N	Data Generation Process 1				Data Generation Process 2			
	Proposed Method		Oracle Method		Proposed Method		Oracle Method	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
40	0.49(0.020)	0.51(0.013)	0.89(0.011)	0.89(0.009)	0.53(0.014)	0.61(0.006)	–	–
80	0.55(0.065)	0.62(0.133)	0.91(0.011)	0.91(0.014)	0.65(0.030)	0.82(0.009)	0.79(0.014)	0.92(0.004)
120	0.67(0.090)	0.52(0.025)	0.91(0.011)	0.91(0.014)	0.87(0.015)	0.95(0.002)	0.94(0.009)	1.00(0.001)
160	0.92(0.018)	0.87(0.021)	0.93(0.009)	0.97(0.014)	0.92(0.019)	0.98(0.001)	0.98(0.002)	1.00(0.000)
200	0.95(0.018)	0.86(0.027)	0.94(0.020)	0.97(0.004)	0.96(0.006)	0.98(0.001)	1.00(0.003)	1.00(0.000)

Table 1: The AUC of the simulated task in Figure 3. Each value in the cell is the average AUC over 10 independent runs and the value inside the parenthesis is the standard deviation. The oracle method is assumed that the latent state is known. In this case,  $X(t)$  is unknown and we get the estimates,  $\hat{X}(t)$ , by using the wavelet smoothing method discussed in Section 3.1.

$Y_n = X(t_n) + \sigma\varepsilon_n$  for  $\varepsilon_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$ . The additive noise sequence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}$  is different across runs while  $X(t)$  is the same. For each run and given fixed  $\lambda$ , we obtain  $\hat{E}^{\Xi(\ell)}$ , the estimated edge set, where  $\Xi$  is the optimal permutation of the index set  $\{1, \dots, k\}$ . We proceed to compute the true positive rate (TPR) and false positive rate (FPR). The TPR of state  $\ell$  is

$$\text{TPR}(\ell) = \frac{|\{(i, j) : (i, j) \in \hat{E}^{\Xi(\ell)}\} \cap \{(i, j) : (i, j) \in E^\ell\}|}{|E^\ell|}.$$

Similarly, the FPR of state  $\ell$  is defined as

$$\text{FPR}(\ell) = \frac{|\{(i, j) : (i, j) \in \hat{E}^{\Xi(\ell)}\} - \{(i, j) : (i, j) \in E^\ell\}|}{p^2 - |E^\ell|}.$$

Finally, we collect the TPR and FPR for each eligible outcome, the result associated with a  $\lambda$  such that  $\Xi_1 \equiv \Xi_2$  and plot the ROC curve for each run.

Given fixed time interval, we demonstrate the performance of the algorithm under different sampling frequencies, resulting in different number of sample size. We experiment with  $T = 40, 80, 120, 160, 200$ . The results are presented in Figure 3–4 and Table 1–2. The oracle method assumes that the latent process  $Z(t)$  is given, and hence we do not need to compute the E-step. Figure 3 demonstrates the results running Algorithm 1 with  $\hat{X}(t)$  estimated using the method developed in Section 3.1. In contrast, Figure 4 demonstrates the results running Algorithm 1 with true  $X(t)$ . Perhaps not surprisingly, under small sample size, i.e.,  $N = 40, 80, 120$ , the proposed method has higher AUC, shown in Table 1–2, if  $X(t)$  is given. However, under larger sample size, i.e.,  $N = 160, 180$ , there is no big difference between using  $\hat{X}(t)$  or  $X(t)$ . Similar conclusion also holds for the oracle method. When comparing the proposed method to the oracle method, we can see that the oracle method has higher AUC given fixed sample size. This is not surprising as getting the estimated smoothing probability close to the true probability is challenging under small sample size.




Figure 3: The average ROC of the simulated tasks over 10 independent runs with  $X(t)$  estimated using the procedure developed in Section 3.1. **Top row.** Results of the proposed method. The AUC consistently increases as the sample size increases for all for graphs. **Bottom row.** Results of the oracle method, where the latent process  $Z(t)$  is assumed to be known. When the latent state is known, the AUC is larger compared to the AUC of the proposed method given same sample size.

State N	Data Generation Process 1				Data Generation Process 2			
	Proposed Method		Oracle Method		Proposed Method		Oracle Method	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
40	0.47(0.037)	0.50(0.010)	0.91(0.009)	0.80(0.014)	0.52(0.012)	0.84(0.005)	0.86(0.003)	0.90(0.002)
80	0.95(0.025)	0.83(0.014)	0.94(0.012)	0.92(0.008)	0.82(0.016)	0.98(0.001)	1.00(0.000)	1.00(0.000)
120	0.95(0.025)	0.83(0.014)	0.94(0.012)	0.92(0.008)	0.95(0.016)	0.98(0.000)	1.00(0.000)	1.00(0.000)
160	0.95(0.008)	0.90(0.015)	0.97(0.014)	0.93(0.012)	0.69(0.142)	0.98(0.001)	1.00(0.000)	1.00(0.000)
200	0.96(0.009)	0.86(0.021)	0.97(0.013)	0.96(0.010)	0.96(0.009)	0.98(0.000)	1.00(0.000)	1.00(0.000)

Table 2: The AUC of the simulated task in Figure 4. Each value in the cell is the average AUC over 10 independent runs and the value inside the parenthesis is the standard deviation. In the case when true  $X(t)$  is given, the proposed method achieves good performance when  $N \geq 80$ ; the oracle method achieves good performance even when the sample size is only  $N = 40$ .




Figure 4: The average ROC of the simulated tasks over 10 independent runs with ground truth  $X(t)$  given. **Top row.** Results of the proposed method. **Bottom row.** Results of the oracle method, where the latent process  $Z(t)$  is assumed to be known. When  $X(t)$  is given, both methods can get good result when  $N \geq 80$ .

## 6 Experiments

We apply the proposed model to characterize Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), one of the complex neurological disorders developed in early childhood. Specifically, we focus on finding the group differences of brain networks from Typically Developed Children (TDC) and ADHD-combined (ADHD-C) type, a common subtype of ADHD that presents both inattentiveness and hyperactivity/impulsivity. Shappell et al. (2021); Park et al. (2021) have found that resting-state brain networks of ADHD-C and TDC exhibit distinct group differences in connectivity states and transition rates. Shappell et al. (2021) modeled the resting-state fMRI as an HMM with independent Gaussian emissions, and both ADHD and TDC patients share the same graphs. The results indicate that ADHD patients spend more time in the hyperconnected state and less time in anticorrelated states compared to TDC. Motivated by these findings, we propose to model real-world data by estimating shared graphs  $\{\theta_{ij}^\ell\}$  with group-specific transition rate matrices:  $Q_{\text{ADHD}}$  and  $Q_{\text{TDC}}$ . To analyze the difference of  $Q_{\text{ADHD}}$  and  $Q_{\text{TDC}}$ , we can compare the average dwell time differences at state  $\ell$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ .

We analyze the resting-state fMRI from NYU ADHD dataset (Castellanos et al., 2008) released in the ADHD200 Initiative (Bellec et al., 2017). We use the standard Athena preprocessing pipeline (Bellec et al., 2017) and select the subjects that pass the quality control test. To mitigate the age effects contributed to the development of ADHD, we select subjects within the age range from 7 to 10 following the criterion discussed in (Park et al., 2021). Then, we parcellate the time-series using the Automated Anatomical atLas (AAL) (Tzourio-Mazoyer et al., 2002),

which has 116 regions of interest ( $p = 116$ ). Each session has  $N = 172$  recorded time points uniformly sampled within a 6-minute time frame. Thus, for each test subject, we have 172 sample points to estimate graphs of size  $p^2 \times m \times k$ , resulting in unreliable estimates. Motivated by the prior method (Shappell et al., 2021), we concatenate the time-series and employ a joint estimator. Specifically, we concatenate 15 TDC subjects and 15 ADHD-C subjects, resulting in a time-series of length 5160. In the estimation step, we modify the proposed algorithm to estimate two  $Q_{\text{ADHD}}$  and  $Q_{\text{TDC}}$  in the M-step and then use the estimated  $Q_{\text{ADHD}}$  and  $Q_{\text{TDC}}$  to compute the latent probability at E-step separately. For model selection, we search the optimal number of states from  $\{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  and find the optimal  $\lambda$  from the exponential 10 uniform samples within the interval of  $[-6, -9]$ . For parsimony and ease of interpretation, we use the linear basis function.

After model selection, we obtain 3 as the optimal number of states, and the optimal  $\lambda$  is  $3.355 \times 10^{-4}$ . The results are shown in Figure 5. To compare the differences between the ADHD-C group and TDC group, we calculate the average dwell time of the subjects at each state. This is calculated as

$$\tau_{\ell, \text{group}} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{group}}} \sum_{u=1}^{n_{\text{group}}} \tau_{\ell} \left( \{Y_n^{(u)}\}_{n=\{0, \dots, N\}}; Q_{\text{group}}, \{\theta_{ij}^{\ell}\} \right),$$

where the group is either ADHD-C or TDC. The formula of  $\tau_{\ell}$  is defined in (3.8). The result in Table 3 indicates that ADHD-C group spends significantly more time at state 1, while the TDC group spends significantly more time at state 2. Both groups spend a comparable amount of time at state 3, which qualitatively matches previous observations of dwell time differences across groups Shappell et al. (2021); Park et al. (2021).

	group	state 1	state 2	state 3
total time	TDC	2332.72	2063.35	1003.93
	ADHD-C	2949.61	1409.28	1041.12
average time ( $\tau_{\ell, \text{group}}$ )	TDC	155.51(31.645)	137.56(38.819)	66.93(33.188)
	ADHD-C	196.64(50.811)	93.95(33.913)	69.41(22.549)

Table 3: The average dwell time of each group.

## 7 Discussion

Given the increasing interest in modeling real-world stochastic processes, which are more complicated than stationary and linear structures, we provide a more flexible framework to model the complex interactions with guarantees and provide the statistical guarantees of the algorithm. There are several interesting directions for further exploration. Our approach assumes the slow-switching nature of the latent process and proposes an approximation procedure. An interesting direction would be studying how the transition rate, the values of  $Q$ , versus the observed sampling rate, affects the estimation quality. Under the high switching rate, one potential remedy is to integrate a second data modality that features a much higher sampling frequency. Motivated by the technological advances in the biomedical domain, we are able to obtain concurrent measurements of fMRI




Figure 5: (a)–(c) are the connectomes of each state. The red arrow indicates that  $\theta_{ij}^\ell$  is positive and the blue arrow indicates that  $\theta_{ij}^\ell$  is negative. The darker the color is, the larger the absolute value of  $\theta_{ij}^\ell$  is. (d) shows estimated transition rate matrix. (e) Each figure is the probability map  $P(Z(t_n) | Y_0^N; Q_{\text{group}}, \{\theta_{ij}^\ell\})$  of each subject. The x-axis is the time point and the y-axis is accumulated probability that sums to 1. Left column shows the probability maps of all subject from TDC group and right column shows the probability maps of all subject from ADHD-C group.

and EEG data, where EEG data has a much higher sampling frequency than that of fMRI. fMRI, in contrast, features high spatial resolution compared to EEG (Debener et al., 2006), enabling us to obtain a fine-grained graph from the brain. Hence, one direction for future work is to use one modal (EEG) to uncover the hidden process and another modal (fMRI) to estimate the graph. The question is, then, how to conduct faithful joint estimations. Additionally, we model an ordinary differential process with additive observed noise. One direction to pursue is to understand under what conditions, graph recovery is feasible when the observations are generated from stochastic dif-

ferential equations. This enables a broader understanding of causal structures from data generated from dynamical systems ([Hansen and Sokol, 2014](#); [Mogensen et al., 2018](#)).

## **Acknowledgement**

Katherine Tsai is supported in part by NSF Graduate Research Fellowship. Mladen Kolar is supported in part by NSF ECCS-2216912. Additionally, this work is partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grants No. 2046795, 1934986, 2205329, NIH 1R01MH116226-01A, NIFA award 2020-67021-32799, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

## References

- A. Agarwal, S. Negahban, and M. J. Wainwright. Fast global convergence of gradient methods for high-dimensional statistical recovery. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(5):2452 – 2482, 2012.
- S. Balakrishnan, M. J. Wainwright, and B. Yu. Statistical guarantees for the EM algorithm: From population to sample-based analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(1):77 – 120, 2017.
- L. E. Baum, T. Petrie, G. Soules, and N. Weiss. A maximization technique occurring in the statistical analysis of probabilistic functions of markov chains. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 41(1):164–171, 1970.
- P. Bellec, C. Chu, F. Chouinard-Decorte, Y. Benhajali, D. S. Margulies, and R. C. Craddock. The neuro bureau adhd-200 preprocessed repository. *Neuroimage*, 144:275–286, 2017.
- Q. Bertrand, Q. Klopfenstein, P.-A. Bannier, G. Gidel, and M. Massias. Beyond ll: Faster and better sparse models with skglm. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- M. Bladt and M. Sørensen. Statistical inference for discretely observed markov jump processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 67(3):395–410, 2005.
- L. Boninsegna, F. Nüske, and C. Clementi. Sparse learning of stochastic dynamical equations. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 148(24), 2018.
- R. C. Bradley. Basic Properties of Strong Mixing Conditions. A Survey and Some Open Questions. *Probability Surveys*, 2(none):107 – 144, 2005.
- L. D. Brown and T. T. Cai. Wavelet shrinkage for nonequispaced samples. *The Annals of Statistics*, 26(5):1783–1799, 1998.
- F. X. Castellanos, D. S. Margulies, C. Kelly, L. Q. Uddin, M. Ghaffari, A. Kirsch, D. Shaw, Z. Shehzad, A. Di Martino, B. Biswal, et al. Cingulate-precuneus interactions: a new locus of dysfunction in adult attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Biological psychiatry*, 63(3):332–337, 2008.
- G. Chavez-Martinez, A. Agarwal, A. Khalili, and S. E. Ahmed. Penalized estimation of sparse markov regime-switching vector auto-regressive models. *Technometrics*, 65(4):553–563, 2023.
- S. Chen, A. Shojaie, and D. M. Witten. Network reconstruction from high-dimensional ordinary differential equations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(520):1697–1707, 2017.
- T. Chen, H. L. He, and G. M. Church. Modeling gene expression with differential equations. In *Biocomputing’99*, pages 29–40. World Scientific, 1999.
- I. Dattner and C. A. Klaassen. Optimal rate of direct estimators in systems of ordinary differential equations linear in functions of the parameters. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9(2):1939–1973, 2015.
- I. Daubechies. Ten lectures on wavelets. *Society for industrial and applied mathematics*, 1992.

- S. Debener, M. Ullsperger, M. Siegel, and A. K. Engel. Single-trial eeg–fmri reveals the dynamics of cognitive function. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 10(12):558–563, 2006.
- A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the em algorithm. *Journal of the royal statistical society: series B (methodological)*, 39(1):1–22, 1977.
- D. L. Donoho and I. M. Johnstone. Ideal spatial adaptation by wavelet shrinkage. *biometrika*, 81(3):425–455, 1994.
- D. L. Donoho, I. M. Johnstone, G. Kerkycharian, and D. Picard. Wavelet shrinkage: asymptopia? *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(2):301–337, 1995.
- J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. *Biostatistics*, 9(3):432–441, 2008.
- K. Friston, P. Zeidman, and V. Litvak. Empirical bayes for dcm: a group inversion scheme. *Frontiers in systems neuroscience*, 9:164, 2015.
- K. J. Friston, L. Harrison, and W. Penny. Dynamic causal modelling. *Neuroimage*, 19(4):1273–1302, 2003.
- M. Hahn and J. Sass. Parameter estimation in continuous time markov switching models: A semi-continuous markov chain monte carlo approach. *Bayesian Analysis*, 4(1):63–84, 2009.
- J. D. Hamilton. A new approach to the economic analysis of nonstationary time series and the business cycle. *Econometrica: Journal of the econometric society*, pages 357–384, 1989.
- N. Hansen and A. Sokol. Causal interpretation of stochastic differential equations. 2014.
- J. Henderson and G. Michailidis. Network reconstruction using nonparametric additive ode models. *PloS one*, 9(4):e94003, 2014.
- A. Hobolth and J. L. Jensen. Statistical inference in evolutionary models of dna sequences via the em algorithm. *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, 4(1), 2005.
- R. L. Karandikar and M. Vidyasagar. Rates of uniform convergence of empirical means with mixing processes. *Statistics & probability letters*, 58(3):297–307, 2002.
- R. Khasminskii. *Stochastic stability of differential equations*, volume 66. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- H.-M. Krolzig. *Markov-switching vector autoregressions: Modelling, statistical inference, and application to business cycle analysis*, volume 454. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- S. P. Lalley. Continuous time markov chains. *Lecture Notes, University of Chicago*, page 34, 2012.
- X. Li, A. Safikhani, and A. Shojaie. Estimation of high-dimensional markov-switching var models with an approximate em algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07456*, 2022.

- Y.-Y. Liu, S. Li, F. Li, L. Song, and J. M. Rehg. Efficient learning of continuous-time hidden markov models for disease progression. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- P.-L. Loh and M. J. Wainwright. High-dimensional regression with noisy and missing data: Provable guarantees with nonconvexity. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(3):1637 – 1664, 2012.
- P.-L. Loh and M. J. Wainwright. Regularized m-estimators with nonconvexity: Statistical and algorithmic theory for local optima. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 26, 2013.
- D. J. Lurie, D. Kessler, D. S. Bassett, R. F. Betzel, M. Breakspear, S. Kheilholz, A. Kucyi, R. Liégeois, M. A. Lindquist, A. R. McIntosh, et al. Questions and controversies in the study of time-varying functional connectivity in resting fmri. *Network neuroscience*, 4(1):30–69, 2020.
- G. J. McLachlan and T. Krishnan. *The EM algorithm and extensions*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- F. Merlevède, M. Peligrad, and E. Rio. A bernstein type inequality and moderate deviations for weakly dependent sequences. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 151(3-4):435–474, 2011.
- S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. Stability of markovian processes iii: Foster–lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 25(3):518–548, 1993.
- S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. *Markov chains and stochastic stability*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- S. W. Mogensen, D. Malinsky, and N. R. Hansen. Causal learning for partially observed stochastic dynamical systems. In *UAI*, pages 350–360, 2018.
- V. Monbet and P. Ailliot. Sparse vector markov switching autoregressive models. application to multivariate time series of temperature. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 108:40–51, 2017.
- H.-J. Park, J. Eo, C. Pae, J. Son, S. M. Park, and J. Kang. State-dependent effective connectivity in resting-state fmri. *Frontiers in neural circuits*, 15:719364, 2021.
- N. Pfister, S. Bauer, and J. Peters. Learning stable and predictive structures in kinetic systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(51):25405–25411, 2019.
- J. C. Rajapakse, F. Kruggel, J. M. Maisog, and D. Yves von Cramon. Modeling hemodynamic response for analysis of functional mri time-series. *Human brain mapping*, 6(4):283–300, 1998.
- J. O. Ramsay, G. Hooker, D. Campbell, and J. Cao. Parameter estimation for differential equations: a generalized smoothing approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 69(5):741–796, 2007.
- P. Ravikumar, J. Lafferty, H. Liu, and L. Wasserman. Sparse additive models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 71(5):1009–1030, 2009.

- H. M. Shappell, K. A. Duffy, K. S. Rosch, J. J. Pekar, S. H. Mostofsky, M. A. Lindquist, and J. R. Cohen. Children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder spend more time in hyperconnected network states and less time in segregated network states as revealed by dynamic connectivity analysis. *NeuroImage*, 229:117753, 2021.
- K. Tsai, M. Kolar, and O. Koyejo. A nonconvex framework for structured dynamic covariance recovery. *Journal of machine learning research*, 23(200):1–91, 2022.
- K. Tsai, B. Zhao, S. Koyejo, and M. Kolar. Latent multimodal functional graphical model estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- A. Tsybakov. Introduction to nonparametric estimation. In *Springer Series in Statistics*, 2008.
- N. Tzourio-Mazoyer, B. Landeau, D. Papathanassiou, F. Crivello, O. Etard, N. Delcroix, B. Mazoyer, and M. Joliot. Automated anatomical labeling of activations in spm using a macroscopic anatomical parcellation of the mni mri single-subject brain. *Neuroimage*, 15(1):273–289, 2002.
- S. Van der Walt, J. L. Schönberger, J. Nunez-Iglesias, F. Boulogne, J. D. Warner, N. Yager, E. Gouillart, and T. Yu. scikit-image: image processing in python. *PeerJ*, 2:e453, 2014.
- R. van Handel. Hidden markov models. *Unpublished lecture notes*, 2008.
- C. Van Loan. Computing integrals involving the matrix exponential. *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, 23(3):395–404, 1978.
- D. Vidaurre, S. M. Smith, and M. W. Woolrich. Brain network dynamics are hierarchically organized in time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(48):12827–12832, 2017.
- D. Vidaurre, R. Abeysuriya, R. Becker, A. J. Quinn, F. Alvaro-Almagro, S. M. Smith, and M. W. Woolrich. Discovering dynamic brain networks from big data in rest and task. *Neuroimage*, 180: 646–656, 2018.
- M. Vidyasagar. *Learning and generalisation: with applications to neural networks*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Z. Wang, Q. Gu, Y. Ning, and H. Liu. High dimensional expectation-maximization algorithm: Statistical optimization and asymptotic normality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.8729*, 2014.
- K. C. Wong, Z. Li, and A. Tewari. Lasso guarantees for  $\beta$ -mixing heavy-tailed time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):1124 – 1142, 2020.
- H. Wu. Statistical methods for hiv dynamic studies in aids clinical trials. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 14(2):171–192, 2005.
- H. Wu, T. Lu, H. Xue, and H. Liang. Sparse additive ordinary differential equations for dynamic gene regulatory network modeling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(506): 700–716, 2014.
- F. Yang, S. Balakrishnan, and M. J. Wainwright. Statistical and computational guarantees for the baum-welch algorithm. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):4528–4580, 2017.

- X. Yi and C. Caramanis. Regularized em algorithms: A unified framework and statistical guarantees. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- G. Yin and C. Zhu. *Hybrid Switching Diffusions: Properties and Applications*, volume 63. Springer, 2010.
- B. Yu. Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 94–116, 1994.
- C. Yuan and X. Mao. Asymptotic stability in distribution of stochastic differential equations with markovian switching. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 103(2):277–291, 2003.
- M. Yuan and Y. Lin. Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 68(1):49–67, 2006.
- H. Zou, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. Sparse principal component analysis. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, 15(2):265–286, 2006.

## A Tail bound of the Wavelet Shrinkage

This section discusses the proof of Proposition 4.1. We begin with stating the main proof, followed by auxiliary lemmas.

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* The proof is inspired by Theorem 3 in Brown and Cai (1998), and we extend the concentration result on the expectation to the tail bound.

Here, we drop the index  $i = 1, \dots, p$  of  $X_i$  for simplicity and study the univariate function. By orthogonality of the wavelet basis and Parseval's identity, we can decompose the objective function as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{X} - X\|^2 &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} \left( \widehat{\xi}_{j_0\ell} - \xi_{j_0\ell} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=j_0}^{J-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^j} (\widehat{\eta}_{j\ell} - \eta_{j\ell})^2 + \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^j} \eta_{j\ell}^2 \\ &= T_1 + T_2 + T_3, \end{aligned}$$

where  $J = \log_2 N$ . Hence, the goal is to find the upper bounds for  $T_1, T_2, T_3$ . To bound  $T_1, T_2, T_3$ , we will introduce additional terms. Recall that we first interpolate the discrete samples with the basis function  $\Phi_{J_n}$  to construct the continuous function:

$$\widetilde{X}(t) = N^{-1/2} \sum_{n=1}^N Y_n \phi_{J_n}(t).$$

Now, define that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(t) &= N^{-1/2} \sum_{n=1}^N X(t_n) \phi_{J_n}(t) - X(t); \\ r(t) &= N^{-1/2} \sigma^* \sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_n \phi_{J_n}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\phi_{J_n} = 2^{J/2} \phi(2^J t - n)$ . It follows that

$$\widetilde{X}(t) = X(t) + \Delta(t) + r(t).$$

Denote the subspace  $V_J$  to be the closed linear subspace of  $\{\phi_{J_n}, n = 1, \dots, 2^J = N\}$ . The projection to  $V_J$  of  $\widetilde{X}$ , denoted as  $\widetilde{X}_J = P_{V_J} \widetilde{X}$ , can be decomposed as

$$\widetilde{X}_J(t) = X_J(t) + \Delta_J(t) + r_J(t),$$

where  $X_J = P_{V_J} X$ ,  $\Delta_J = P_{V_J} \Delta$ , and  $r_J = P_{V_J} r$ . Hence, by construction, we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\xi}_{j_0\ell} &= \langle X_J, \phi_{j_0\ell} \rangle + \langle \Delta_J, \phi_{j_0\ell} \rangle + \langle r_J, \phi_{j_0\ell} \rangle \\ &= \xi_{j_0\ell} + d'_{j_0\ell} + r'_{j_0\ell}, \end{aligned} \quad \ell = 1, \dots, 2^{j_0}.$$

Furthermore, for  $j = j_0, \dots, J-1$

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\eta}_{j\ell} &= \langle X_J, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle + \langle \Delta_J, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle + \langle r_J, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle \\ &= \eta_{j\ell} + d_{j\ell} + r_{j\ell}, \end{aligned} \quad \ell = 1, \dots, 2^j. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

For each  $j$ , we define the set

$$\Xi_j = \{\ell : \text{supp}(\psi_{j\ell}) \text{ contains at least one jump point of } X(t)\}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma A.1, we can bound  $T_3$  as

$$\begin{aligned} T_3 &= \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell \in \Xi_j} \eta_{j\ell}^2 + \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell \notin \Xi_j} \eta_{j\ell}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} L(d+2)C^2 2^{-j} + \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell \notin \Xi_j} C^2 2^{-j(1+2\alpha)} \\ &= o\left(N^{-2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $L$  is the length of the support of the mother wavelet and  $d$  is the number of switchings.

To find the upper bound of  $T_1$ , we can write

$$T_1 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} \left(\widehat{\xi}_{j_0\ell} - \xi_{j_0\ell}\right)^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} (r'_{j_0\ell} + d'_{j_0\ell})^2 \leq 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} (r'_{j_0\ell})^2 + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} (d'_{j_0\ell})^2.$$

Since  $r'_{j_0\ell} = N^{-1/2}\sigma^* \sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_n \langle \phi_{Jn}, \phi_{j_0\ell} \rangle$ , where  $\varepsilon_n$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  are *i.i.d.* standard Gaussian and the basis function can be decomposed as  $\phi_{j_0\ell} = \sum_{n=1}^N \langle \phi_{Jn}, \phi_{j_0\ell} \rangle \phi_{Jn}$ . It follows that  $r'_{j_0\ell} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N^{-1}(\sigma^*)^2)$ . Using the Gaussian tail bound, for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, 2^{j_0}$ , we have

$$P\left(|r'_{j_0\ell}| \geq \sigma^* \sqrt{\frac{2 \log N/\delta}{N}}\right) \leq \frac{2\delta}{N}.$$

Taking the union bound across  $\ell = 1, \dots, 2^{j_0}$ , we have

$$P\left(\max_{\ell=1, \dots, 2^{j_0}} |r'_{j_0\ell}| \geq \sigma^* \sqrt{\frac{2 \log N/\delta}{N}}\right) \leq \frac{2^{j_0+1}\delta}{N}.$$

We denote the event  $\mathcal{E}_1$  as the event that  $\max_{\ell=1, \dots, 2^{j_0}} |r'_{j_0\ell}| \leq \sigma^* \sqrt{2 \log(N/\delta)/N}$ . Since  $2^{j_0+1} \leq N$ , it follows directly that  $\mathcal{E}_1$  happens with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . Conditioned on event  $\mathcal{E}_1$ , we have  $T_1$

$$T_1 \leq 2^{j_0+1}(\sigma^*)^2 \frac{\log N/\delta}{N} + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} (d'_{j_0\ell})^2.$$

By Lemma A.2, it follows that

$$\|\Delta_J\|^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} (d'_{j_0\ell})^2 + \sum_{j=j_0+1}^{J-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^j} (d_{j\ell})^2 = o(N^{-2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Hence,

$$T_1 \leq 2^{j_0+1}\sigma^2 \frac{\log N/\delta}{N} + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^{j_0}} (d'_{j_0\ell})^2 = o\left(\{\log(N/\delta)/N\}^{2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)}\right).$$

To bound  $T_2$ , we decompose into two terms

$$T_2 = \sum_{j=j_0}^{J-1} \sum_{\ell \in \Xi_j} (\eta_{j\ell} - \widehat{\eta}_{j\ell})^2 + \sum_{j=j_0}^{J-1} \sum_{\ell \notin \Xi_j} (\eta_{j\ell} - \widehat{\eta}_{j\ell})^2 = T_{21} + T_{22}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Before proceeding, we consider the event  $\mathcal{E}_2$  be the event that

$$\max_{j,\ell} |r_{j\ell}| \leq C\sigma^* \sqrt{\frac{2 \log N/\delta}{N}} = \frac{1}{3} \lambda_{j,\ell}.$$

We can write

$$\max_{j,\ell} |r_{j\ell}| = \max_{j,\ell} \left| N^{-1/2} \sigma^* \sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_n \langle \phi_{Jn}, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle \right|.$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\leq N^{-1/2} \sigma^* \max_n |\varepsilon_n| \max_{j,\ell} \sum_{n'=1}^N |\langle \phi_{Jn'}, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle|. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Note that  $\psi_{j\ell}(t) = 2^{j/2} \psi(2^{j/2}t - \ell)$ , and hence we can apply Lemma A.1 and obtain that

$$|\langle \psi_{j\ell}, \phi_{Jn'} \rangle| \leq C 2^{j/2 - J(1/2 + \alpha)}.$$

Summing over  $n' = 1, \dots, 2^J = N$ , we can write

$$\sum_{n'=1}^N |\langle \psi_{j\ell}, \phi_{Jn'} \rangle| \leq C 2^{j/2 + J/2 - J\alpha}.$$

Since  $j \leq J$  and  $\alpha \geq 1$ , then it follows that

$$\max_{j,\ell} \sum_{n'=1}^N |\langle \phi_{Jn'}, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle| \leq C,$$

is bounded by a constant  $C$ . Therefore, we can bound (A.4) as

$$\max_{j,\ell} |r_{j\ell}| \leq CN^{-1/2} \sigma^* \max_n |\varepsilon_n|.$$

Therefore, event  $\mathcal{E}_2$  holds true if

$$\max_n N^{-1/2} \sigma^* |\varepsilon_n| \leq \sigma^* \sqrt{\frac{2 \log N/\delta}{N}}.$$

For each  $N^{-1/2} \sigma^* |\varepsilon_n|$ , we can apply the Gaussian tail bound and obtain

$$P \left( N^{-1/2} \sigma^* |\varepsilon_n| \geq \sigma^* \sqrt{\frac{2 \log N/\delta}{N}} \right) \leq 2 \frac{\delta}{N}.$$

Taking union bound of  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , we have

$$P \left( \max_n N^{-1/2} \sigma^* |\varepsilon_n| \geq \sigma^* \sqrt{\frac{2 \log N / \delta}{N}} \right) \leq 2\delta.$$

Therefore, we can conclude that event  $\mathcal{E}_2$  happens with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ . Since  $\alpha > 1/2$ , by (A.2), we have  $|d_{j\ell}| \leq \sigma^* (2 \log(N/\delta)/N)^{1/2} = 3^{-1} \lambda_{j\ell}$ . On the event  $\mathcal{E}_2$ , we can apply Lemma A.3 to (A.3) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T_{21} &= \sum_{j=j_0}^{J-1} \sum_{\ell \in \Xi_j} (\eta_{j\ell} - \hat{\eta}_{j\ell})^2 = \sum_{j=j_0}^{J-1} L(d+2) \left( \frac{10}{3} \lambda_{j\ell}^2 + 3d_{j\ell}^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{11}{3} \sum_{j=j_0}^{J-1} L(d+2) \lambda_{j\ell}^2 = o \left( (\log(N/\delta)/N)^{2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda_{j\ell} = 3\sigma^* \sqrt{(2 \log N / \delta) / N}$ .

Finally, to find the upper bound of  $T_{22}$ , we consider further splitting it into two terms:

$$T_{22} = \sum_{j=j_0}^{J_1-1} \sum_{\ell \notin \Xi_j} (\eta_{j\ell} - \hat{\eta}_{j\ell})^2 + \sum_{j=J_1}^{J-1} \sum_{\ell \notin \Xi_j} (\eta_{j\ell} - \hat{\eta}_{j\ell})^2,$$

where

$$J_1 = C' \left\lfloor \frac{1}{1+2\alpha} \log_2 \frac{N}{2(\sigma^*)^2 \log(N/\delta)} \right\rfloor,$$

where  $C'$  is an absolute constant. Note that, conditioned on event  $\mathcal{E}_2$ , for the first term of  $T_{22}$ , we can apply Lemma A.3 again and obtain

$$\sum_{j=j_0}^{J_1-1} \sum_{\ell \notin \Xi_j} (\eta_{j\ell} - \hat{\eta}_{j\ell})^2 \leq \sum_{j=j_0}^{J_1-1} 2^j \left( \frac{10}{3} \lambda_{j\ell}^2 + d_{j\ell}^2 \right) = O \left( (\log(N/\delta)/N)^{2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)} \right).$$

Finally, for  $j \geq J_1$  and  $\ell \notin \Xi_j$ , apply Lemma A.1, we have

$$|\eta_{j\ell}| \leq \sigma^* \sqrt{\frac{2 \log N / \delta}{N}}.$$

Conditioned on the event  $\mathcal{E}_2$  and  $d_{j\ell} \leq \sigma^* (2 \log N / \delta)^{1/2}$ , we can conclude that

$$|\tilde{\eta}_{j\ell}| \leq 3\sigma^* \sqrt{\frac{2 \log N / \delta}{N}} = \lambda_{j\ell}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Since  $\hat{\eta}_{j\ell} = \text{sgn}(\tilde{\eta}_{j\ell})(|\tilde{\eta}_{j\ell}| - \lambda_{j\ell})_+$ , we can conclude that

$$(\hat{\eta}_{j\ell} - \eta_{j\ell})^2 = \eta_{j\ell}^2,$$

for  $j \geq J_1$  and  $\ell \notin \Xi_j$ . Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{j=J_1}^{J-1} \sum_{\ell \notin \Xi_j} (\eta_{j\ell} - \hat{\eta}_{j\ell})^2 = \sum_{j=J_1}^{J-1} \sum_{\ell \notin \Xi_j} \eta_{j\ell}^2 \leq C \sum_{j=J_1}^{J-1} 2^j 2^{-j(1+2\alpha)} = O(N^{-2\alpha}). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Combining results of (A.5)–(A.6), we have  $T_2 = O(\{\log(N/\delta)/N\}^{2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)})$ . Conditioned on events  $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ , we can conclude that

$$\|\widehat{X} - X\|^2 = T_1 + T_2 = T_3 = C \left( \frac{\log N - \log \delta}{N} \right)^{2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)}.$$

Furthermore,  $P(\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2) \geq 1 - 3\delta$ . □

**Lemma A.1** (Lemma 1 in [Brown and Cai \(1998\)](#)). *Let  $f \in \Lambda^\alpha(M, B, d)$ . Suppose that the wavelet function  $\psi$  is  $r$ -regular with  $r \geq \alpha$ . Then:*

1. *If  $\text{supp}(\psi_{j\ell})$  does not contain any jump points of  $f$ , then*

$$\eta_{j\ell} = |\langle f, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle| \leq C2^{-j(1/2+\alpha)}.$$

2. *If  $\text{supp}(\psi_{j\ell})$  contains jump points of  $f$ , then*

$$\eta_{j\ell} = |\langle f, \psi_{j\ell} \rangle| \leq C2^{-j/2}.$$

**Lemma A.2** (Adapted from Theorem 1 in [Brown and Cai \(1998\)](#)). *Suppose that an uniformly sampled function  $\{f(t_n), n = 1, \dots, N\}$  is given with  $t_n = n/N$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Let the wavelet function  $\psi$  be  $r$ -regular with  $r \geq \alpha$ . Define  $\widehat{f}(t) = N^{-1/2} \sum_{n=1}^N f(t_n) \phi_{J_n}(t)$ . Then, the approximation error satisfies*

$$\sup_{f \in \Lambda^\alpha(M, B, d)} \|\widehat{f} - f\|^2 = o(N^{-2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)}).$$

*Proof of Lemma A.2.* The proof is a special case of Theorem 1 in [Brown and Cai \(1998\)](#), where the cumulative density function  $H$  we use here is an identify function. □

**Lemma A.3.** *Recall the definitions of  $r_{j\ell}$  and  $d_{j\ell}$  in (A.1). Suppose that  $|r_{j\ell}| \leq 3^{-1}\lambda_{j\ell}$  and  $|d_{j\ell}| \leq 3^{-1}\lambda_{j\ell}$ , then*

$$(\widehat{\eta}_{j\ell} - \eta_{j\ell})^2 \leq \frac{10}{3}\lambda_{j\ell}^2 + 3d_{j\ell}^2.$$

*Proof of Lemma A.3.* Recall the soft thresholding estimator defined (3.1):

$$\widehat{\eta}_{i,j\ell} = \text{sgn}(\widetilde{\eta}_{i,j\ell})(|\widetilde{\eta}_{i,j\ell}| - \lambda_{j\ell})_+.$$

We consider three cases.

*Case 1.* Suppose that  $|\eta_{j\ell}| < 3^{-1}\lambda_{j\ell}$ , we have

$$|\widetilde{\eta}_{j\ell}| = |\eta_{j\ell} + r_{j\ell} + d_{j\ell}| \leq |\eta_{j\ell}| + |r_{j\ell}| + |d_{j\ell}| \leq \lambda_{j\ell}.$$

Hence

$$(\widehat{\eta}_{j\ell} - \eta_{j\ell})^2 = \eta_{j\ell}^2 \leq \frac{1}{9}\lambda_{j\ell}^2.$$

*Case 2.* Suppose that  $|\eta_{j\ell}| > (5/3)\lambda_{j\ell}$ . In this case, we have

$$|\widetilde{\eta}_{j\ell}| \geq |\eta_{j\ell}| - |r_{j\ell}| - |d_{j\ell}| \geq \lambda_{j\ell}.$$

Hence

$$(\widehat{\eta}_{j\ell} - \eta_{j\ell})^2 = (d_{j\ell} + r_{j\ell} - \text{sgn}(\widetilde{\eta}_{j\ell})\lambda_{j\ell})^2 \leq 3d_{j\ell}^2 + \frac{10}{3}\lambda_{j\ell}^2.$$

*Case 3.* Suppose that  $(1/3)\lambda_{j\ell} \leq |\eta_{j\ell}| \leq (5/3)\lambda_{j\ell}$ . In this case,

$$(\widehat{\eta}_{j\ell} - \eta_{j\ell})^2 \leq (3d_{j\ell}^2 + \frac{10}{3}\lambda_{j\ell}^2) \vee \frac{1}{9}\lambda_{j\ell}^2 \leq 3d_{j\ell}^2 + \frac{10}{3}\lambda_{j\ell}^2.$$

Hence, we can conclude the results.  $\square$

## B The $\beta$ -mixing Markov processes

This manuscript focuses on the analysis of  $\beta$ -mixing Markov processes. Hence, it is important to understand the sufficient conditions for a Markov process to be strictly stationary and  $\beta$ -mixing. It is known that the positive recurrent process has a unique stationary distribution (Yin and Zhu, 2010, Theorem 4.3). The path to check whether a process is  $\beta$ -mixing, is often not straightforward and consists of several steps. Our method is built on the integration of several pieces of foundational studies (Meyn and Tweedie, 1992, 1993a,b, 2012). Instead of directly verifying the  $\beta$ -mixing property, we start with checking the ergodicity of a process. The ergodicity describes a process converging to a unique stationary distribution in the total variation distance. In the case of the Markov process, this property is closely connected to the  $\beta$ -mixing property, which characterizes the (in)dependency of two time points separated by an infinite number of time points. This is because once the process enters the stationary state, the initial condition does not matter to the state of the current process and hence the independence of two time points is granted. Davydov (1974) first formalized the relationship between mixing and ergodicity coefficients. As a result, our proof steps start with verifying the Foster-Lyapunov inequality for the generator of the process, which leads to the verification of the geometric ergodicity property (Meyn and Tweedie, 1993a). Finally, with geometric ergodicity and other conditions, one can verify the  $\beta$ -mixing property. To begin with, we review useful tools for the theories. Section B.1 introduces the generator of a Markov process; Section B.2 discusses the details of mixing and ergodic process.

### B.1 Markov processes and their generators

In this section, we will review the basic properties of Markov processes with a focus on the construction of a Markov process. First, we introduce the definition of the Markov Process.

**Definition 5** (Markov Process). *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the  $\sigma$ -field Borel sets in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . A stochastic process  $X(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , defined for  $t \geq 0$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, P)$  is a Markov process, if for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $0 \leq s < t$ ,*

$$P(X(t) \in A \mid \sigma(\{X(u), u \leq s\})) = P(X(t) \in A \mid X(s)),$$

where  $\sigma(\{X(u), u \leq s\})$  is the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $\{X(u), u \leq s\}$ .

Hence, the ODE process:

$$dx = f(x_t)dt, \tag{B.1}$$

can be shown as a Markov process (Khasminskii, 2011). Furthermore, it is easy to see that the joint processes (2.1)–(2.2) are Markov processes (Yin and Zhu, 2010).

Now let us stick with the simpler Markov process of the form (B.1). From Definition 5, we can define a transition probability function as

$$P(X(t) \in A \mid X(s) = x) = p(s, x, t, A),$$

which satisfies the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation:

$$p(s, x, t, A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} p(s, x, u, dy)p(u, y, t, A), \quad s < u < t. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

With the transition probability function, we can construct the Markov process with any initial distribution. A time-homogeneous Markov process is a process with the transition function independent of  $s$ :  $p(s, x, t, A) = p(s+u, x, t+u, A)$  for any  $u > 0$ . Hence, we can write  $p(s, x, t, A) = p(x, t-s, A)$ .

Now, suppose that  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is a homogeneous Markov process with transition probability function  $p(x, t, A)$ . Then we define the operator  $T_t$ :

$$T_t V(x) = \int p(x, t, dy)V(y) = \mathbb{E}^x[V(X(t))]. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Furthermore, by (B.2), we see that  $T_{t+s} = T_t T_s$  and hence  $T_t$  is a homogeneous semigroup. Then the generator is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}V(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \frac{T_t V(x) - V(x)}{t}.$$

With the generator, one can uniquely define the continuous transition probability function (Khasminskii, 2011, Chapter 3).

**Generator of the Markov-switching ODE process.** Now, let us work on the switching ODE process discussed in this manuscript:

$$dx = f(x_t, z_t)dt,$$

where  $z_t \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  for  $t \geq 0$  takes on a discrete value. Essentially  $(Z(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is a continuous-time Markov chain with generator matrix  $Q$ . The underlying transition function  $P(X(t) \in A, Z(t) \in B \mid X(0) = x, Z(0) = z) = p((x, z), t, (A, B))$  is time-homogeneous. Then the generator is defined similarly as:

$$\mathcal{L}V(x, z) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \frac{T_t V(x, z) - V(x, z)}{t},$$

with  $T_t V(x, z) = \int p((x, z), t, (dy, dw))V(y, w)$ .

If  $V(\cdot, \ell)$  for each  $\ell$  is a sufficiently smooth function, then the generator operator of such process is defined as the following (Yin and Zhu, 2010, Chapter 2):

$$\mathcal{L}V(x, \ell) = \mathcal{A}V(\cdot, \ell)(x) + \mathcal{Q}V(x, \cdot)(\ell), \quad (\text{B.4})$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}V(\cdot, \ell)(x) = \nabla_x V(\cdot, \ell)^\top f(x, \ell), \quad \mathcal{Q}V(x, \cdot)(\ell) = \sum_{\ell'=1}^k q_{\ell\ell'} V(x, \ell').$$

With the generator, we can also determine the stability, ergodicity, and mixing properties of the Markov process. We selectively review the results that are most pertinent to our analysis. We refer Khasminskii (2011); Meyn and Tweedie (2012) for more comprehensive discussions.

## B.2 Mixing and ergodicity of Markov processes

This section introduces the connection of the mixing property and the ergodicity property of a Markov process. First, we define the  $\beta$ -mixing property. From a high-level perspective, the mixing property describes the dependency of a stochastic process: if we take any two random variables  $X(s)$ ,  $X(t)$  from a stochastic process, they will become asymptotically independent as the time difference  $|t - s|$  goes to infinity. Definition 1 defines the  $\beta$ -mixing for discrete stochastic processes, here we define similarly for continuous-time stochastic processes.

**Definition 6** ( $\beta$ -mixing for continuous-time process). *Given  $\ell \geq 0$ , the  $\beta$ -mixing coefficient is defined as,*

$$\beta(\ell) = \sup_t \beta(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^t, \mathcal{F}_{t+\ell}^\infty) = \sup_t \|P_{t,\ell} - P_{-\infty}^t \otimes P_{t+\ell}^\infty\|_{TV},$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^t = \sigma(\{X(u) : u \in (\infty, t]\})$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{t+\ell}^\infty = \sigma(\{X(u) : u \in [t + \ell, \infty)\})$ .  $P_{t,\ell}$  associates with the  $\sigma$ -field  $(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^t \vee \mathcal{F}_{t+\ell}^\infty)$ ,  $P_{-\infty}^t$  associates with the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^t$ , and  $P_{t+\ell}^\infty$  associates with the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}_{t+\ell}^\infty$ . A stochastic process is said to be absolutely regular, or  $\beta$ -mixing, if  $\beta(\ell) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ .

Hence, we say that a stochastic process is geometric  $\beta$ -mixing if  $\beta(\ell) \leq \exp(-c\ell)$  for some positive constant  $c$ .

Oftentimes, given a stochastic process, it is hard to verify the  $\beta$ -mixing property. As an alternative, we can first verify whether the process is ergodic or not, which can be checked using Foster-Lyapunov criterion. Let us define the ergodicity of a Markov process in the following.

**Definition 7.** *A Markov process is called ergodic if a stationary distribution  $\pi$  exists and*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|p(x, t, \cdot) - \pi\|_{TV} = 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

It is known that if a process is positive recurrent and if any discrete-sampled chain is irreducible, then the process ergodic (Meyn and Tweedie, 1992, Theorem 6.1). As mentioned earlier, if a Markov process is ergodic, then it is also mixing under additional mild conditions. The following lemma formalizes the relation between ergodicity and  $\beta$ -mixing (Davydov, 1974; Masuda, 2007).

**Lemma B.1** (Lemma 3.9 in Masuda (2007)). *Let  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  be a Markov process. Let  $\eta$ ,  $(p(\cdot, t, \cdot))_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\beta_X(t)$  respectively denote initial distribution, transition function, and  $\beta$ -mixing coefficient of  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ . Suppose that there exist probability measure  $\pi$  on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}))$ , measurable function  $B$ , and deterministic sequence  $(\delta(t))_{t \geq 0}$  tending to 0 as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for which*

1.  $\|p(x, t, \cdot) - \pi\|_{TV} \leq B(x)\delta(t)$  for which  $t \geq 0$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ;
2.  $\kappa := \sup_{s \geq 0} \int B(x)\eta p(\cdot, s, dx) < \infty$ .

Then  $\beta_X(t) \leq 2\kappa\delta(t)$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , that is,  $X$  is  $\beta$ -mixing at rate  $\delta(t)$ .

Hence, to show that a process is geometric  $\beta$ -mixing, it suffices to show that a process is geometric ergodicity defined in the following.

**Definition 8** (Geometric Ergodicity). *Suppose that the diffusion process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is positive recurrent and it has an unique stationary distribution  $\pi$ . We say that  $X(t)$  is geometrically ergodic if there exists a constant  $\gamma > 0$  and a real valued function  $B$  such that for all  $t > 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ :*

$$\|p(x, t, \cdot) - \pi\|_{TV} \leq B(x) \exp(-\gamma t).$$

### B.2.1 Foster-Lyapunov criterion

Now, we have shown the connection between ergodicity and mixing. The next step is to understand what characterizes a stochastic process to be geometric ergodic. [Meyn and Tweedie \(1993a\)](#) showed that one can apply the Foster-Lyapunov criterion to check the geometric ergodicity of a stochastic process. We first introduce the criterion. Recall in [Section B.1](#) that  $\mathcal{L}$  is a generator of a Markov process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ .

**Assumption 11.** *There exists a function  $V \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$  and  $V(x) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , and for some  $c > 0$ ,  $d < \infty$  such that*

$$\mathcal{L}V(x) \leq -cV(x) + d.$$

Assumption 11 is a special case of (CD3) in [Meyn and Tweedie \(1993a\)](#). (CD3) is defined on the extended generator  $\mathcal{L}_m$  on the stopped process (see [Meyn and Tweedie \(1993a\)](#) for the definition) whereas Assumption 11 is defined on the generator of the process  $\mathcal{L}$ . However, under the condition that  $V \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{L})$ , we have  $\mathcal{L}V = \mathcal{L}_mV$ . Having Assumption 11 alone is not sufficient to show the geometric ergodicity. Instead, we need to ensure that there exists a discrete-sampled chain of the original continuous process that behaves nicely on every compact set of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ , known as the petite set ([Meyn and Tweedie, 1992](#)). Before stating the theorem, we introduce three additional terms.

**Definition 9** (Skeleton). *The  $\tilde{h}$ -skeleton chain of  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is  $X_n^{(\tilde{h})} = X(n\tilde{h})$  for a constant  $\tilde{h} > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ .*

Hence, by definition,  $\{X_n^{(\tilde{h})}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a discrete-time Markov chain. Now, for simplicity of notation, suppose that a discrete-time Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  taking values in  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$  be the Borel sets of  $\mathcal{X}$ . We define the one-step transition probability function as  $p(x, A) := p(x, h, A)$  for  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ . We define a distribution  $a = \{a(n)\}$  on  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  as the sampling distribution that samples the time points of  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . We call this sampled chain as  $X_n^a$  associated with the transition kernel function:

$$K_a(x, A) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p^n(x, A)a(n). \tag{B.5}$$

**Definition 10** (Petite Set, adapted from [Section 5.5.2](#) in [Meyn and Tweedie \(2012\)](#)). *A set  $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$  is  $\nu_a$  petite if the transition kernel function of the sampled chain satisfies:*

$$K_a(x, B) \geq \nu_a(B),$$

for all  $x \in C$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ , where  $\nu_a$  is a non-trivial measure on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ .

Finally, we define the  $f$ -norm in the following.

**Definition 11** ( $f$ -norm). *For any positive measurable function  $f \geq 1$  and any signed measure:*

$$\|\mu\|_f = \sup_{|g| \leq f} |\mu(g)|.$$

Under this definition, the total variation norm is equivalent as the  $f$ -norm with constant function  $f = 1$ . With the definitions of skeleton, petite set, and  $f$ -norm, we introduce the theory.

**Lemma B.2** (Theorem 6.1 of [Meyn and Tweedie \(1993a\)](#)). *Suppose that  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is a right process, and that all compact sets are petite for some skeleton chain. If Assumption 11 holds, then there exists  $\gamma > 0$  and  $B < \infty$  such that*

$$\|p(x, t, \cdot) - \pi\|_f \leq Bf(x) \exp(-\gamma t), \quad t \geq 0, x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

with  $f = V + 1$ , where  $V$  is defined in Assumption 11.

It is easy to see that  $\|p(x, t, \cdot) - \pi\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \|p(x, t, \cdot) - \pi\|_{V+1}$  and hence if (B.6) holds true, then the process is geometric ergodic. Hence, to check the geometric ergodicity of a stochastic process, one can verify whether Assumption 11 holds true. Additionally, to verify that the conditions all compact sets are petite for a skeleton chain, we can apply Theorem 3.4 in ([Meyn and Tweedie, 1992](#)). We review them in the next section.

### B.2.2 Petite set and skeleton chain

This section introduces the conditions when all compact sets are petite, required by Lemma B.2. As Lemma B.3 indicates, there is a close connection between the Feller property and the irreducibility of a Markov chain to the petite sets. Let  $p(\cdot, \cdot)$  be the transition kernel of a discrete chain. For example, the transition kernel of a  $h$ -skeleton chain is defined as  $p(x, A) = p(x, h, A)$  for  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ . Define the quantity

$$G(x, A) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p^n(x, A).$$

If  $G(x, A) > 0$ , it implies that starting from  $x$ ,  $A$  is reachable with positive probability. We introduce the following definition from ([Meyn and Tweedie, 1992](#)).

**Definition 12** ( $\varphi$ -irreducibility).  *$\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is  $\varphi$ -irreducible if there exists a finite measure  $\varphi$  such that  $G(x, A) > 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  whenever  $\varphi(A) > 0$ .  $\varphi$  is called a irreducible measure.*

The Feller property characterizes the continuity of the transition kernel.

**Definition 13.** *If the transition kernel  $p(\cdot, \cdot)$  maps bounded continuous functions to bounded continuous functions, then it is weak Feller. If the transition kernel  $p(\cdot, \cdot)$  maps all bounded measurable functions to bounded continuous functions, then it is strong Feller.*

**Lemma B.3** (Theorem 3.4 in ([Meyn and Tweedie, 1992](#))). *Suppose that a Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  taking values in  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\varphi$ -irreducible. Then either of the conditions implies that all compact subsets of  $\mathcal{X}$  are petite:*

1.  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Feller and an open  $\varphi$ -positive petite set exists
2.  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Feller and  $\text{supp}(\varphi)$  has non-empty interior.

Hence if either the conditions in Lemma B.3 holds, we can fulfill partial requirements of Lemma B.2. The Feller property of a stochastic process is fairly straightforward to check. In contrast, to check the  $\varphi$ -irreducibility required by Lemma B.3, one way is to verify whether the Markov chain is a  $T$ -chain and there exists a reachable point  $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ . To make our statement more concrete, we define the  $T$ -chain and reachable point using the definitions in Section 6 of [Meyn and Tweedie \(2012\)](#).

**Definition 14** (T-chain).  $T$  is a continuous component of  $K_a$  defined in (B.5) if

$$K_a(x, A) \geq T(x, A), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}),$$

where  $T(\cdot, A)$  is a lower semicontinuous function for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ . If  $T(x, \mathcal{X}) > 0$  for all  $x$ , then  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a  $T$ -chain.

Therefore, to verify a that the kernel  $T(\cdot, A)$  is lower semicontinuous for every  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ , one can check the following two properties.

**Lemma B.4** (Lemma 3.1 in Cline and Huay-min (1998)). Assume  $\mathcal{X}$  is locally compact and  $T : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a kernel and  $\mu$  is a bounded measure on compact sets of  $\mathcal{X}$ . If

1. for each  $\varepsilon$  and compact set  $K_1, K_2$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $A \subset K_2$  and  $\mu(A) < \delta$ , then  $\sup_{y \in K_1} T(y, A) < \varepsilon$ .
2.  $T(\cdot, O)$  is lower semicontinuous for all (relatively compact) open sets,

then  $T(\cdot, A)$  is lower semicontinuous for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ .

**Definition 15** (Reachable point). A point  $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$  is reachable if for every open neighborhood of  $x^*$ , denoted as  $O \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ ,

$$\sum_n p^n(x, O) > 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

**Lemma B.5** (Proposition 6.2.1 in (Meyn and Tweedie, 2012)). If  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a  $T$ -chain, and  $\mathcal{X}$  contains one reachable point  $x^*$ , then  $X_n$  is  $\varphi$ -irreducible with  $\varphi = T(x^*, \cdot)$ .

In conclusion, we summarize the steps to check the  $\beta$ -mixing property of a Markov process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ . By Lemma B.1, geometrically ergodicity implies geometric  $\beta$ -mixing. To show that the process is geometrically ergodic, we can apply Lemma B.2, which subsequently leads to verifying Assumption 11 and Lemma B.3. We can verify Lemma B.3 by subsequently verifying the conditions required by Lemma B.5. In the next section, we use this workflow to construct a few examples of the switching ODEs that are geometric  $\beta$ -mixing.

### B.2.3 Mixing property of the observed process

In the previous two sections, we introduce the tools to show that the joint process  $(Z(t), X(t))$  is mixing. If  $(Z(t), X(t))$  is mixing, then it is more straightforward to show that the observation  $Y_n$  is mixing. To see why, we introduce the following properties.

**Lemma B.6** (Lemma 3.6 in Vidyasagar (2013)). Suppose a real-valued stochastic process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is  $\alpha$ -,  $\beta$ -, or  $\phi$ -mixing, and that  $Y(t) = f(X(t))$  where  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $(Y(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is also  $\alpha$ -,  $\beta$ -, or  $\phi$ -mixing, as appropriate.

**Lemma B.7** (Lemma 3.7 in Vidyasagar (2013)). Suppose  $X_n$  is  $\beta$ -mixing, and that  $\{U_n\}$  is i.i.d. and also independent of  $\{X_n\}$ . Suppose  $Y_n = f(X_n, U_n)$ , where  $f$  is a fixed measurable function. Then  $\{Y_n\}$  is also  $\beta$ -mixing.

### B.3 Switching-diffusion processes

In previous sections, we have discussed the tools to check the mixing properties of a stochastic process. In this section, we apply these tools to check the Foster-Lyapunov condition. We provide two examples such that there exist some functions  $V$  satisfying  $\mathcal{L}V \leq -cV + d$ .

#### B.3.1 Linear model

We first consider a linear model. Let  $A_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ . We define

$$\dot{X}(t) = A_{Z(t)}X(t)dt.$$

We make the following assumption.

**Assumption 12.**  $Z(t)$  has a unique stationary distribution  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k)$ . Let  $G$  be positive definite matrix and define  $\mu_\ell = 2^{-1}\lambda_{\max}(GA_\ell G^{-1} + G^{-1}A_\ell^\top G)$ . There exists a positive definite matrix  $G$  such that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^k \pi_\ell \mu_\ell < 0$$

As we will see soon, Assumption 12 is a sufficient condition for  $\mathcal{L}V(x) \leq -bV(x) + c$  for some  $V$ . Assumption 12 required for the switching system is weaker than the single dynamical system. It says, the weighted average of the maximum eigenvalue, where the weight is the stationary distribution, should be negative. This implies that some systems associated with the state  $\ell$  can be unstable, namely the maximum eigenvalue is positive.

**Lemma B.8.** Let  $A_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ . We define

$$\dot{X}(t) = A_{Z(t)}X(t)dt.$$

Suppose that Assumption 12 holds and  $x = 0$  is the equilibrium point and  $\mathcal{X}$  is compact. Let  $\mathcal{C}^1$  be the set of continuously differentiable function. Then there exists a  $V(x, \ell)$  such that  $V(\cdot, \ell) \in \mathcal{C}^1$  for each  $\ell$ , constants  $c_1, d > 0$  and

$$\mathcal{L}V(x, \ell) \leq -c_1V(x, \ell) + d, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

*Proof of Lemma B.8.* Our proof closely follows the proof of Theorem 8.8 in Yin and Zhu (2010), where it studies the stability of the switching ODE process. Define  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$ ,  $v = -\sum_{\ell=1}^k \pi_\ell \mu_\ell$ . Let  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_k)$  be the solution to  $Qc = \mu + v\mathbf{1}$ . First, we consider the Lyapunov function

$$V(x, \ell) = (1 - \gamma c_\ell)(x^\top G^2 x)^{\gamma/2}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, k,$$

where  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $1 - \gamma c_\ell > 0$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ . Then it follows that

$$\nabla_x V(x, \ell) = (1 - \gamma c_\ell)(x^\top G^2 x)^{\gamma/2-1} \gamma G^2 x.$$

Hence, following (B.4) and  $q_{\ell\ell} = -\sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} q_{\ell\ell'}$ , for  $x \neq 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V(x, \ell) &= (1 - \gamma c_\ell) \gamma (x^\top G^2 x)^{\gamma/2-1} x^\top G^2 (A_\ell x) - \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} q_{\ell\ell'} (x^\top G^2 x)^{\gamma/2} \gamma (c_{\ell'} - c_\ell) \\ &= (1 - \gamma c_\ell) \gamma (x^\top G^2 x)^{\gamma/2} \left\{ \frac{x^\top G A_\ell x}{x^\top G^2 x} - \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} q_{\ell\ell'} \frac{c_{\ell'} - c_\ell}{1 - \gamma c_\ell} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} q_{\ell\ell'} \frac{c_{\ell'} - c_\ell}{1 - \gamma c_\ell} &= \sum_{\ell'=1}^k q_{\ell\ell'} c_{\ell'} - \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} q_{\ell\ell'} \frac{c_\ell (1 - c_{\ell'})}{1 - \gamma c_\ell} \gamma \\ &= \sum_{\ell'=1}^k q_{\ell\ell'} c_{\ell'} + O(\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

where  $O(\gamma) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ .

Let  $y = Gx$  and write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x^\top G^2 A_\ell x}{x^\top G^2 x} &= \frac{x^\top (G^2 A_\ell + A_\ell^\top G^2) x}{2x^\top G^2 x} \\ &= \frac{y^\top G^{-1} (G^2 A_\ell + A_\ell^\top G^2) G^{-1} y}{2y^\top y} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\max}(G^{-1} (G^2 A_\ell + A_\ell^\top G^2) G^{-1}) = \mu_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that

$$\mathcal{L}V(x, \ell) \leq \gamma V(x, \ell) \left\{ \mu_\ell - \sum_{\ell'=1}^k q_{\ell\ell'} c_{\ell'} + O(\gamma) \right\}.$$

Since  $Qc = \mu + v\mathbf{1}$ , it follows that  $\mu_\ell - \sum_{\ell'=1}^k q_{\ell\ell'} c_{\ell'} = -v < 0$ . Hence

$$\mathcal{L}V(x, \ell) \leq -(v\gamma)V(x, \ell) + \gamma V(x, \ell)O(\gamma)$$

For a fixed  $\gamma$ , we then define  $c_1 = v\gamma > 0$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is bounded and one can choose a proper  $\gamma$  such that there exists a constant  $d > 0$  such that  $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \gamma V(x, \ell)O(\gamma) < d$ .  $\square$

### B.3.2 General setting

We now consider a more general setting. The following two assumptions are common in studying the dynamical systems (Skorokhod, 2009; Yin and Zhu, 2010).

**Assumption 13.** *If  $x = 0$ , then  $g(x) = 0$ . Additionally,  $g$  is locally Lipschitz.*

**Assumption 14.** *There exists a constant,  $K_0 > 0$  such that for each state  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ ,*

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^p \theta_i^\ell g(x_i) \right\|_2 \leq K_0 (1 + \|x\|_2),$$

where  $\theta_i^\ell = [\theta_{ji}^\ell] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$

Assumption 13–14 guarantee the uniqueness of the solution (Skorokhod, 2009; Yin and Zhu, 2010).

**Lemma B.9.** *Suppose that Assumption 13–14 hold. Given  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ , assume that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$  such that*

$$x^\top \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p \theta_i^{\ell*} g(x_i) \right\} \leq \beta_\ell \|x\|_2^2 + \alpha,$$

for some constants  $\beta_\ell, \alpha$ . If

$$A = -2\text{diag}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) - Q^*,$$

is an nonsingular M-matrix. Then, there exists a  $V(x, \ell)$  such that  $V(\cdot, \ell) \in \mathcal{C}^1$  for each  $\ell$ , constants  $c_1, d > 0$  and

$$\mathcal{L}V(x, \ell) \leq -c_1 V(x, \ell) + d, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

*Proof.* This analysis is inspired by Theorem 5.1 in Yuan and Mao (2003), where it discusses the stability of the Markov-switching SDEs. Here, we use their idea to construct the Lyapunov functions. By the property of nonsingular M-matrix, there exists a positive vector, where all the entries are positive values,  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_k)^\top$  such that

$$\tilde{c} = Av,$$

and entries of  $\tilde{c}$  are all positive. Define the function

$$V(x, \ell) = v_\ell \|x\|_2^2.$$

Then, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V(x, \ell) &= 2v_\ell x^\top \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p \theta_i^{\ell*} g(x_i) \right\} + \sum_{\ell'=1}^k q_{\ell\ell'}^* v_\ell \|x\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \left( 2v_\ell \beta_\ell + \sum_{\ell'=1}^k q_{\ell\ell'}^* v_\ell \right) \|x\|_2^2 + 2\alpha v_\ell \\ &= -\tilde{c}_\ell \|x\|_2^2 + 2\alpha v_\ell \\ &= -\frac{\tilde{c}_\ell}{v_\ell} v_\ell \|x\|_2^2 + 2\alpha v_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $c_1 = \min \tilde{c}_\ell v_\ell^{-1}$  and  $d = \max_\ell 2\alpha v_\ell$ , then the above term can be bounded as

$$\leq -c_1 V(x, \ell) + d.$$

Then, we complete the proof. □

## B.4 Irreducible chain

In this section, we discuss the properties that the joint stochastic process  $W(t) = (Z(t), X(t))$  for  $t \geq 0$  is irreducible. We make the following assumptions.

**Assumption 15.** For every  $(x, \ell)$  with  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ , we have  $p((x', \ell'), h, (O, \ell)) > 0$  for every open neighbor  $O \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$  of  $x$  for every  $(x, \ell')$  with  $x' \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\ell' = 1, \dots, k$ .

**Assumption 16.** There exists a  $\tilde{h}$  such that for every compact set  $K \in \mathcal{X}$ , the density function  $p((x, \ell), h, (y, \ell'))$  is bounded for  $x \in K$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\ell, \ell' = 1, \dots, k$ .

**Lemma B.10.** Assume that Assumption 13–16 hold. Then, all compact sets are petite.

*Proof of Lemma B.10.* Define the joint stochastic processes  $W(\cdot) = (Z(\cdot), X(\cdot))$  and the underlying  $\tilde{h}$ -skeleton processes  $W(\tilde{h}) = (Z(\tilde{h}), X(\tilde{h}))$  for some  $\tilde{h} > 0$ . From Theorem 2.18 in Yin and Zhu (2010), under Assumption 13–14, it follows that  $W(\cdot)$  is weak-Feller. Hence, the  $\tilde{h}$ -skeleton  $W(\tilde{h})$  is also weak-Feller.

Next, we want to verify that the  $\varphi$ -irreducibility of  $W(\tilde{h})$  for some finite measure  $\varphi$  whose support has non-empty interior. To check this property, under Assumption 15, we can apply Lemma B.5, which leads to verifying that  $W(\tilde{h})(\cdot)$  is a  $T$ -chain.

We want to verify that  $W(\tilde{h})(\cdot)$  is a  $T$ -chain with  $T(\cdot, (A, \ell)) = p(\cdot, \tilde{h}, (A, \ell))$ , where  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ . To this end, it suffices to check the two conditions in Lemma B.4. Note that, by the weak-Feller condition,  $p(\cdot, \tilde{h}, (O, \ell))$  is lower semicontinuous (see Meyn and Tweedie (2012, Chapter 6)) for every open set  $O \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ . Hence the second condition of Lemma B.4 is verified.

Given a compact set  $K_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ , let  $C$  be a constant depending on  $K_1$ . Let  $\mu$  be a measure on  $\mathcal{X}$ . To verify the first condition, under Assumption 16, we have

$$\sup_{x \in K_1, x' \in \mathcal{X}, \ell, \ell' = 1, \dots, k} p((x, \ell), \tilde{h}, (x', \ell')) \leq C.$$

Let  $\delta = \varepsilon/C$ . For any compact set  $K_2$  such that  $A \subset K_2$  and  $\mu(A) < \delta$ , then

$$\sup_{x \in K_1, \ell, \ell' = 1, \dots, k} p((x, \ell), \tilde{h}, (A, \ell')) = \sup_{x \in K_1, \ell, \ell' = 1, \dots, k} \int_A p((x, \ell), \tilde{h}, (dy, \ell')) \leq C\mu(A) < \varepsilon.$$

Then, we have verified the first condition of Lemma B.4.

To summarize, under Assumption 15–16,  $W(\tilde{h})$  is a  $T$ -chain, defined in Definition 14, corresponding to a continuous component  $p(\cdot, \tilde{h}, \cdot)$ . Then, applying Lemma B.5, we can conclude that  $W(\tilde{h})$  is  $p((x, \ell), \tilde{h}, \cdot)$ -irreducible for every  $(x, \ell) \in \mathcal{X} \times [k]$ . Finally, applying Lemma B.3, all compact sets are petite.  $\square$

## B.5 Proof of Proposition 2.1

Let  $p(\cdot, s, \cdot)$  be the transition function, and  $\eta$  be the initial distribution of  $(X(t), Z(t))$ .

**Assumption 17.** There exist positive constants  $v_\ell$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$  such that

$$\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int (v_\ell \|x\|_2^2 + 1) \eta p(\cdot, s, (dx, \ell)) < \infty,$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.1.* The analysis is similar to the proof of Proposition 2.2. In the first step, under Assumption 13–14, 15–16, we can apply Lemma B.10. The second step is to apply Lemma B.2 using the result from Lemma B.9 and Assumption 17. The third step is the same as Step 3 in the proof of Proposition 2.2. Then, we complete the proof.  $\square$

## B.6 Proof of Proposition 2.2

Recall that  $p(\cdot, s, \cdot)$  is the transition function, and  $\eta$  is the initial distribution of  $(X(t), Z(t))$ .

**Assumption 18.** *There exists a constant  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that  $1 - \gamma c_\ell > 0$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ . There exists a positive definite matrix  $G$  such that*

$$\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int \left\{ (1 - \gamma c_\ell) (x^\top G^2 x)^{\gamma/2} + 1 \right\} \eta p(\cdot, s, (dx, \ell)) < \infty.$$

Assumption 18 is the technical assumption required to verify the Condition 2 in Lemma B.1.

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* Our proof consists of three steps. The first two steps are to show the requirements for Lemma B.2 are fulfilled under the conditions stated in Proposition 2.2.

*Step 1.* Since the diffusion process is linear,  $\sum_i \theta_i^{\ell*} g(X_i(t)) = A_\ell$ , Assumption 13–14 are satisfied. Together with Assumption 15–16, we can apply Lemma B.10. This completes showing the first requirement of Lemma B.2: all compact sets are petite.

*Step 2.* Using the results from Lemma B.8 and *Step 1*, it follows from Lemma B.2 that

$$\|p((x, \ell), t, \cdot) - \pi\|_{TV} \leq \|p((x, \ell), t, \cdot) - \pi\|_{V+1} \leq C(V(x, \ell) + 1) \exp(-ct), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

for  $C > 0$  and  $c > 0$ . Combining (B.7) with Assumption 18, we can apply Lemma B.1. Hence, we see that  $(Z(t), X(t))$  is exponentially  $\beta$ -mixing.

*Step 3.* Since  $(Z(t), X(t))$  is exponentially  $\beta$ -mixing, it follows that the discrete sampled process is  $\beta$ -mixing as well. Then, we can apply Lemma B.7, and show that the joint process  $(Z(t_n), X(t_n), Y_n)$  is  $\beta$ -mixing and hence we complete the proof.  $\square$

## C Proof of Proposition 4.2

By the mean value theorem, we have


$$\begin{aligned} |M_{\sigma^2}(\Theta) - \sigma^{2*}| &= |M_{\sigma^2}(\Theta) - M_{\sigma^2}(\Theta^*)| \leq \kappa |\sigma^2 - \sigma^{2*}|; \\ |M_{q_{\ell\ell'}}(\Theta) - q_{\ell\ell'}^*| &= |M_{q_{\ell\ell'}}(\Theta) - M_{q_{\ell\ell'}}(\Theta^*)| \leq \kappa |q_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*| \quad \ell \neq \ell' = 1, \dots, k; \\ \|M_{\theta_i^\ell}(\Theta) - \theta_i^{\ell*}\|_2 &= \|M_{\theta_i^\ell}(\Theta) - M_{\theta_i^\ell}(\Theta^*)\|_2 \leq \kappa \|\theta_i^\ell - \theta_i^{\ell*}\|_2 \quad i = 1, \dots, p, \ell = 1, \dots, k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\text{dist}(M(\Theta), \Theta^*) \leq \kappa \text{dist}(\Theta, \Theta^*).$$

## D Truncated Continuous-time Markov Chain

In this section, we will show that under the mixing condition, the filtered/smoothing probabilities are close to the truncated filtered/smoothing probabilities in total variation distance. Then, in the later section, we will establish the statistical guarantees on the truncated filtered/smoothing probabilities. We can view the sequences of filtered/smoothing probabilities as discrete-time stochastic processes taking values in  $[0, 1]$ . The reason of performing an additional truncation step is because



(a) Hidden Markov Model discussed in (Yang et al., 2017)

(b) Proposed Model

Figure 6: Two Hidden Markov Models

the long-range dependence of such processes poses challenge in establishing statistical properties like restricted eigenvalue condition and the deviation bound. In contrast, by construction, the truncated filtered/smoothing processes are mixing, whose concentration bounds for sample mean is known (Yu, 1994; Merlevède et al., 2011).

Our proof techniques are built upon van Handel (2008) and Yang et al. (2017) where we extend and prior results to joint conditional processes  $P(Z(t_n), Z(t_{n+1}) \mid Y_0, \dots, Y_N)$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Since the structures of the Hidden Markov model discussed in Yang et al. (2017) is different than ours, as shown in Figure 6, it requires new analysis to show the mixing property. In Appendix D.1–D.2, we respectively define the forward operator and the backward operator. Then using these operators, we can analyze the properties of truncated smoothing probabilities in Appendix D.3.

### D.1 Truncated Forward Probability

For shorthand of notation we define  $Z_n = Z(t_n)$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  and  $Y_{n_1}^{n_2} = \{Y_{n_1}, \dots, Y_{n_2}\}$  for  $n_1 < n_2$ . Recall that the transition matrix is  $P = e^{Qh}$  with  $i, j$ -th entry being  $P_{ij}$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$ . Following similarly to the technique developed in Chapter 5 of van Handel (2008), we define  $F_n$  as the operator of the  $n$ -th iteration for  $n \geq 1$ :

$$(F_n \nu)(j) = \frac{\sum_i P(Y_n \mid Z_n = j, Y_{n-1}) P_{ij} \nu(i)}{\sum_{i,j} P(Y_n \mid Z_n = j, Y_{n-1}) P_{ij} \nu(i)}$$

Then, we can express the filtered probability as

$$\begin{aligned} P(Z_n = j \mid Y_0^n) &= \frac{\sum_i P(Y_n \mid Z_n = j, Y_{n-1}) P_{ij} P(Z_{n-1} = i \mid Y_0^{n-1})}{\sum_{i,j} P(Y_n \mid Z_n = j, Y_{n-1}) P_{ij} P(Z_{n-1} = i \mid Y_0^{n-1})} \\ &= F_n P(Z_{n-1} \mid Y_0^{n-1})(j). \end{aligned}$$

Iterate for  $n - 1$  times, we obtain  $P(Z_n = j \mid Y_0^n) = F_n \cdots F_2 P(Z_1 \mid Y_0^1)$ .

Additionally, for  $n > \ell \geq 1$ , we define the transition kernel operator as

$$K_{\ell|n}(i, j) = P(Z_\ell = j \mid Z_{\ell-1} = i, Y_{\ell-1}^n).$$

Then, for  $n' < \ell \leq n$  we have

$$P(Z_\ell = j \mid Y_{n'}^n) = \sum_i K_{\ell|n}(i, j) P(Z_{\ell-1} = i \mid Y_{n'}^n).$$

For  $\ell' \leq n$ , we define

$$\nu_{\ell'|n} = \frac{P(Y_{\ell'+1}^n | Z_{\ell'} = \cdot, Y_{\ell'})\nu(\cdot)}{\sum_j P(Y_{\ell'+1}^n | Z_{\ell'} = j, Y_{\ell'})\nu(j)}.$$

Define

$$\nu_{\ell'|n}^\top K_{\ell'+1|n} = \sum_i \nu_{\ell'|n}(i) K_{\ell'+1|n}(i, \cdot).$$

With simple computation, it leads to

$$F_n \cdots F_{\ell'+1} \nu = \nu_{\ell'|n}^\top K_{\ell'+1|n} \cdots K_{n|n}.$$

The following lemma shows that the dependence of the filtered probability on the initial distribution decays geometrically.

**Lemma D.1** (Adapted from Lemma 13 in [Yang et al. \(2017\)](#)). *If Assumption 9 is satisfied, then for probability distribution  $\nu, \nu'$  and  $n \geq \ell$ , we have*

$$\|F_n \cdots F_{\ell+1}(\nu - \nu')\|_\infty \leq \zeta^{-2}(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^{n-\ell} \|\nu - \nu'\|_1.$$

Additionally, we have

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, k} |p(Z_n = i | Y_1^n) - p(Z_n = i | Y_{n-\ell}^n)| \leq 2\zeta^{-2}(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^\ell.$$

*Proof of Lemma D.1.* The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 13 in [Yang et al. \(2017\)](#), except that the transition kernel operator and the forward operator defined in this manuscript are different from the ones introduced in [Yang et al. \(2017\)](#). We study the case that the observation distribution  $P(Y_n | Z_n, Y_{n-1})$  depends on the previous observation  $Y_{n-1}$ , whereas the observation distribution defined in [Yang et al. \(2017\)](#) is independent to the previous observation  $Y_{n-1}$  given  $Z_n$ . Despite the differences, under Assumption 9, [Yang et al. \(2017\)](#) showed that  $K_{\ell|n} \geq (\zeta\pi_{\min})P_{\ell|n}$  with

$$P_{\ell|n} = \frac{\pi(j)P(Y_{n+1}^{n'} | Y_n, Z_n = j)P(Y_n | Z_n = j, Y_{n-1})}{\sum_j \pi(j)P(Y_{n+1}^{n'} | Y_n, Z_n = j)P(Y_n | Z_n = j, Y_{n-1})}.$$

Hence, following the Doeblin minorization condition, we can decompose the transition kernel operator as

$$K_{\ell|n} = \zeta\pi_{\min}P_{\ell|n} + (1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})Q_{\ell|n},$$

where  $Q_{\ell|n}$  is some transition kernel operator. Then, the rest follows similarly to the proof of Lemma 13 in [Yang et al. \(2017\)](#).  $\square$

The mixing property, Assumption 9 also guarantees that the conditional probability  $P(Y_{\ell+1}^n | Z_\ell = \cdot, Y_\ell)$  is well-behaved.

**Lemma D.2.** *Under Assumption 9 and  $n \geq \ell$ , the following inequality holds:*

$$\frac{\max_i P(Y_{\ell+1}^n | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)}{\min_i P(Y_{\ell+1}^n | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)} \leq \zeta^{-2}.$$

*Proof of Lemma D.2.* Write

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y_{\ell+1}^n | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) &= \sum_{z_n, \dots, z_{\ell+1}} P(Y_n | z_n, Y_{n-1}) P(z_n | z_{n-1}) \cdots P(Y_{\ell+1} | z_{\ell+1}, Y_\ell) P(z_{\ell+1} | Z_\ell = i) \\ &\leq \zeta^{-1} \sum_{z_n, \dots, z_{\ell+1}} P(Y_n | z_n, Y_{n-1}) P(z_n | z_{n-1}) \cdots P(Y_{\ell+1} | z_{\ell+1}, Y_\ell) \pi(z_{\ell+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where the last line follows from Assumption 9. Similarly, we have

$$P(Y_{\ell+1}^n | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) \geq \zeta \sum_{z_n, \dots, z_{\ell+1}} P(Y_n | z_n, Y_{n-1}) P(z_n | z_{n-1}) \cdots P(Y_{\ell+1} | z_{\ell+1}, Y_\ell) \pi(z_{\ell+1}) \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Taking the maximum with respect to  $i$  on the left side of (D.1) and minimum with respect to  $i$  on the left side of (D.2), we can conclude that

$$\frac{\max_i P(Y_{\ell+1}^n | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)}{\min_i P(Y_{\ell+1}^n | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)} \leq \zeta^{-2}.$$

□

## D.2 Truncated Backward Probability

To define the backward recursion, we first look at

$$P(Z_n | Z_{n+1}, Y_n) = \frac{P(Z_n | Y_n) P(Z_{n+1} | Z_n, Y_n)}{P(Z_{n+1} | Y_n)} = \frac{P(Z_n | Y_n) P(Z_{n+1} | Z_n)}{P(Z_{n+1} | Y_n)},$$

where the equality follows by the fact that  $Z_{n+1} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_n | Z_n$ . With this equality, let  $N \geq n' > n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y_{n+1}^{n'}, Y_n, Z_{n+1}, Z_n) &= P(Z_n | Z_{n+1}, Y_n) P(Y_n | Y_{n+1}, Z_{n+1}) P(Y_{n+1}^{n'}, Z_{n+1}) \\ &= \frac{P(Z_n | Y_n) P(Z_{n+1} | Z_n)}{P(Z_{n+1} | Y_n)} P(Y_n | Z_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}) P(Y_{n+1}^{n'}, Z_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can write the backward recursion formula as

$$P(Z_n = i | Y_{n+1}^{n'}) = \frac{\sum_j \frac{P(Z_n=i|Y_n)}{P(Z_{n+1}=j|Y_n)} P(Y_n | Z_{n+1} = j, Y_{n+1}) P_{ij} P(Z_{n+1} = j | Y_{n+1}^{n'})}{\sum_{i,j} \frac{P(Z_n=i|Y_n)}{P(Z_{n+1}=j|Y_n)} P(Y_n | Z_{n+1} = j, Y_{n+1}) P_{ij} P(Z_{n+1} = j | Y_{n+1}^{n'})}.$$

Hence, we define  $\tilde{F}_n$  similarly as  $F_n$ :

$$(\tilde{F}_n \tilde{\nu})(i) = \frac{\sum_j \frac{P(Z_n=i|Y_n)}{P(Z_{n+1}=j|Y_n)} P_{ij} P(Y_n | Z_{n+1} = j, Y_{n+1}) \tilde{\nu}(j)}{\sum_{i,j} \frac{P(Z_n=i|Y_n)}{P(Z_{n+1}=j|Y_n)} P_{ij} P(Y_n | Z_{n+1} = j, Y_{n+1}) \tilde{\nu}(j)}.$$

We immediately get  $P(Z_n | Y_n^N) = \tilde{F}_n \cdots \tilde{F}_{N-1} P(Z_N | Y_N)$ . Additionally, for  $n \leq \ell \leq n'$ , we define the backward transition kernel operator as

$$\tilde{K}_{n|\ell}(j, i) = \frac{P_{ij} P(Y_{\ell+1} | Z_{\ell+1} = j, Y_\ell) P(Z_\ell = i, Y_n^\ell)}{\sum_i P_{ij} P(Y_{\ell+1} | Z_{\ell+1} = j, Y_\ell) P(Z_\ell = i, Y_n^\ell)} = P(Z_\ell = i | Z_{\ell+1} = j, Y_n^{\ell+1}),$$

which leads to

$$P(Z_\ell | Y_n^{n'}) = \sum_j \tilde{K}_{n|\ell}(j, \cdot) P(Z_{\ell+1} = j | Y_n^{n'}).$$

More generally, define

$$\tilde{\nu}_{n|\ell} = \frac{P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = \cdot, Y_\ell) \tilde{\nu}(\cdot)}{\sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\nu}(j)}.$$

Then, we define

$$\tilde{\nu}_{n|\ell}^\top \tilde{K}_{n|\ell-1} = \sum_j \tilde{\nu}_{n|\ell}(j) \tilde{K}_{n|\ell-1}(j, \cdot).$$

Finally, we have

$$\tilde{F}_n \cdots \tilde{F}_{\ell-1} \tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\nu}_{n|\ell}^\top \tilde{K}_{n|\ell-1} \cdots \tilde{K}_{n|n}. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

**Lemma D.3.** *Under Assumption 8, 9, and for any probability distributions  $\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{\mu}$  and  $n \leq \ell$ , we have*

$$\|\tilde{F}_n \cdots \tilde{F}_{\ell-1}(\tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\mu})\|_\infty \leq 2(\pi_{\min} \zeta)^{-2} \{1 - (\pi_{\min} \zeta)^2\}^{\ell-n} \|\tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\mu}\|_1.$$

Furthermore,

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, k} \left| p(Z_n = i | Y_n^N) - p(Z_n = i | Y_n^\ell) \right| \leq 4(\pi_{\min} \zeta)^{-2} \{1 - (\pi_{\min} \zeta)^2\}^{\ell-n}.$$

*Proof of Lemma D.3.* The proof follows similarly to the proof of Lemma D.1. To show the first statement, it suffices to show the contraction of the transition kernel operator  $\tilde{K}_{n|\ell}$  following (D.3). Under Assumption 9–8, we have

$$\zeta \pi_{\min} \pi(i) \leq P_{ij} \leq (\zeta \pi_{\min})^{-1} \pi(i). \quad (\text{D.4})$$

With this fact,  $\tilde{K}_{n|\ell}$  is lower bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}_{n|\ell}(j, i) &= \frac{P_{ij} P(Y_{\ell+1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) P(Z_\ell = i, Y_n^\ell)}{\sum_i P_{ij} P(Y_{\ell+1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) P(Z_\ell = i, Y_n^\ell)} \\ &\geq (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2 \frac{\pi(i) P(Y_{\ell+1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) P(Z_\ell = i, Y_n^\ell)}{\sum_i \pi(i) P(Y_{\ell+1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) P(Z_\ell = i, Y_n^\ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\tilde{P}_{n|\ell}(j, i) = \frac{\pi(i) P(Y_{\ell+1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) P(Z_\ell = i, Y_n^\ell)}{\sum_i \pi(i) P(Y_{\ell+1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) P(Z_\ell = i, Y_n^\ell)},$$

for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$ . Then, we can write

$$\tilde{K}_{n|\ell} = (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2 \tilde{P}_{n|\ell} + \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2\} \tilde{Q}_{n|\ell},$$

where  $\tilde{Q}_{n|\ell}$  is a transition kernel operator.

Note that for any  $\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{\mu}$ , we have  $\tilde{\nu}_{n|\ell+1}^\top \tilde{P}_{n|\ell} = \tilde{\mu}_{n|\ell+1}^\top \tilde{P}_{n|\ell}$ . Iterate over  $n - \ell$  iterations, we have

$$\tilde{F}_n \cdots \tilde{F}_{\ell-1}(\tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\mu}) = \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2\}^{\ell-n} (\tilde{\nu}_{n|\ell} - \tilde{\mu}_{n|\ell})^\top \tilde{Q}_{n|\ell-1} \cdots \tilde{Q}_{n|n}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{F}_n \cdots \tilde{F}_{\ell-1}(\tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\mu})\|_\infty &= \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{\ell-n} \|(\tilde{\nu}_{n|\ell} - \tilde{\mu}_{n|\ell})^\top \tilde{Q}_{n|\ell-1} \cdots \tilde{Q}_{n|n}\|_\infty \\ &\leq \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{\ell-n} \|\tilde{\nu}_{n|\ell} - \tilde{\mu}_{n|\ell}\|_2 \prod_{i=n}^{\ell} \|\tilde{Q}_{n|i}\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\tilde{Q}_{n|i}$  is a transition kernel operator, it follows that  $\|\tilde{Q}_{n|i}\|_2 \leq 1$  for all  $i = n, \dots, \ell$ . Then, we can further bound the above display as

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{\ell-n} \|\tilde{\nu}_{n|\ell} - \tilde{\mu}_{n|\ell}\|_2 \\ &\leq \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{\ell-n} \left\| \frac{P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = \cdot, Y_\ell)}{\sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\nu}(j)} (\tilde{\nu}(\cdot) - \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)) \right\|_2 \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{1}{\sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\nu}(j)} - \frac{1}{\sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\mu}(j)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \|P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = \cdot, Y_\ell) \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)\|_2.\end{aligned}\tag{D.5}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = \cdot, Y_\ell)}{\sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\nu}(j)} (\tilde{\nu}(\cdot) - \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)) \right\|_2 &\leq \left\| \frac{P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = \cdot, Y_\ell)}{\sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\nu}(j)} (\tilde{\nu}(\cdot) - \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)) \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{\max_i P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)}{\min_i P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)} \|\tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\mu}\|_1.\end{aligned}\tag{D.6}$$

Furthermore,

$$\left( \frac{1}{\sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\nu}(j)} - \frac{1}{\sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\mu}(j)} \right) \|P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = \cdot, Y_\ell) \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)\|_2.$$

Applying the fact that  $\|P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = \cdot, Y_\ell) \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)\|_2 \leq \|P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = \cdot, Y_\ell) \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)\|_1$ , we can further bound the above display as

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \frac{1}{\sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\nu}(j)} \left( \sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\mu}(j) - \sum_j P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = j, Y_\ell) \tilde{\nu}(j) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\max_i P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)}{\min_i P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)} \|\tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\nu}\|_1.\end{aligned}\tag{D.7}$$

Plugging (D.6)–(D.7) into (D.5), we arrive at

$$\|\tilde{F}_n \cdots \tilde{F}_{\ell-1}(\tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\mu})\| \leq 2 \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{\ell-n} \left( \frac{\max_i P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)}{\min_i P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)} \|\tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\mu}\|_1 \right).\tag{D.8}$$

Note that we have  $(\zeta\pi_{\min})C_0 \leq P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) \leq (\zeta\pi_{\min})^{-1}C_0$ , where

$$C_0 = \sum_{z_n, \dots, z_{\ell-1}} P(z_n | z_{n+1}, Y_n) P(Y_n | Y_{n+1}, z_{n+1}) \cdots P(z_{\ell-2} | z_{\ell-1}, Y_{\ell-2}) P(Y_{\ell-2} | z_{\ell-1}, Y_{\ell-1}) \\ \times \frac{P(z_{\ell-1} | Y_{\ell-1})}{P(z_\ell | Y_{\ell-1})} P(Y_{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell) \pi(i).$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\max_i P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)}{\min_i P(Y_n^{\ell-1} | Z_\ell = i, Y_\ell)} \leq (\zeta\pi_{\min})^{-2}.$$

Applying the above inequality to (D.8), we conclude the first statement. The second statement is shown by choosing  $\tilde{\nu} = P(Z_\ell | Y_\ell)$ ,  $\tilde{\mu} = P(Z_\ell | Y_\ell^N)$  and using the fact that  $\|\tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\mu}\|_1 \leq 2$ .  $\square$

### D.3 Truncated Smoothing Probability

*Proof of Lemma 4.4.* First, we can express

$$P\left(Z_n, Z_{n+1}, Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \\ = P\left(Z_n, Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right) P(Z_{n+1} | Z_n) P(Y_{n+1} | Z_{n+1}, Y_n) P\left(Y_{n+2}^{(n+r)\wedge N} | Z_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}\right) \\ = P\left(Z_n | Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right) P\left(Z_{n+1} | Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) P(Z_{n+1} | Z_n) P(Y_{n+1} | Z_{n+1}, Y_n) \\ \times \frac{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) P\left(Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right)}{P(Z_{n+1}, Y_{n+1})}.$$

This implies that

$$P\left(Z_n = i, Z_{n+1} = j | Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \\ = P\left(Z_n | Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right) P\left(Z_{n+1} | Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \frac{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} | Y_n\right)}{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} | Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right)} \frac{P_{ij} P(Y_{n+1} | Z_{n+1}, Y_n) P(Y_n)}{P(Z_{n+1}, Y_{n+1})}.$$

Similarly, we can write

$$P\left(Z_n = i, Z_{n+1} = j | Y_1^N\right) = P\left(Z_n | Y_1^n\right) P\left(Z_{n+1} | Y_{n+1}^N\right) \frac{P\left(Y_{n+1}^N | Y_n\right)}{P\left(Y_{n+1}^N | Y_0^n\right)} \frac{P_{ij} P(Y_{n+1} | Z_{n+1}, Y_n) P(Y_n)}{P(Z_{n+1}, Y_{n+1})}.$$

Define  $a_{ij} = P_{ij} P(Y_{n+1} | Z_{n+1}, Y_n) P(Y_n) / P(Z_{n+1}, Y_{n+1})$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$  and

$$B = \left| \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^N) P(Y_0^n)}{P(Y_0^N)} \frac{P\left(Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right)}{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) P\left(Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right)} - 1 \right| \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| P\left(Z_n = i, Z_{n+1} = j \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) - P\left(Z_n = i, Z_{n+1} = j \mid Y_1^N\right) \right| \\
& \leq a_{ij} \left\{ \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_n)}{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_0^n)} \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_0^n) P(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^N) - P\left(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right) P\left(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + B \frac{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} \mid Y_n\right)}{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right)} P\left(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right) P\left(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \right\} \\
& \leq \delta_{\min}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_n)}{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_0^n)} \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_0^n) P(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^N) - P\left(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right) P\left(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + B \frac{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} \mid Y_n\right)}{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right)} P\left(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right) P\left(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \right\}. \tag{D.10}
\end{aligned}$$

First we note that

$$\frac{P(Y_{n+1}^N)}{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_0^n)} = \frac{\sum_i P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Z_n = i, Y_n) P(Z_n = i \mid Y_n)}{\sum_i P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Z_n = i, Y_n) P(Z_n = i \mid Y_0^n)} \leq \frac{\max_i P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Z_n = i, Y_n)}{\min_i P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Z_n = i, Y_n)} \leq \zeta^{-2}, \tag{D.11}$$

where the last inequality follows Lemma D.2. Similarly, it can be shown that

$$\frac{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} \mid Y_n\right)}{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right)} \leq \zeta^{-2}. \tag{D.12}$$

Secondly, by Lemma D.1 and Lemma D.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_0^n) P(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^N) - P\left(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right) P\left(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \right| \\
& \leq \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_0^n) - P\left(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right) \right| + \left| P(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^N) - P\left(Z_{n+1} \mid Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \right| \\
& \leq 2\zeta^{-2}(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^r + 4(\zeta\pi_{\min})^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} \leq 6(\zeta\pi_{\min})^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1}. \tag{D.13}
\end{aligned}$$

Collecting the results from (D.11)–(D.13) and Lemma D.4, we can bound (D.10) as

$$\left| P\left(Z_n = i, Z_{n+1} = j \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) - P\left(Z_n = i, Z_{n+1} = j \mid Y_1^N\right) \right| \leq C\delta_{\min}^{-1}\zeta^{-8}\pi_{\min}^{-2}(1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2)^{r-1},$$

where  $C$  is some constant.

To show the second statement, we can write

$$P(Z_n \mid Y_0^N) = P(Z_n \mid Y_n^N) P(Z_n \mid Y_0^n) \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_n)}{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_0^n)} \frac{1}{P(Z_n \mid Y_n)}$$

Similarly, we have

$$P\left(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) = P(Z_n \mid Y_n^{(n+r)\wedge N})P(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n) \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} \mid Y_n)}{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n)} \frac{1}{P(Z_n \mid Y_n)}.$$

Hence, we can obtain the following upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_0^N) - P\left(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{P(Z_n \mid Y_n)} \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_n)}{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_0^n)} \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_n^N)P(Z_n \mid Y_0^n) - P(Z_n \mid Y_n^{(n+r)\wedge N})P(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n) \right| \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{P(Z_n \mid Y_n)} \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N} \mid Y_n)}{P(Y_{n+1}^N \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n)} B P(Z_n \mid Y_n^{(n+r)\wedge N})P(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n), \end{aligned}$$

where  $B$  is defined in (D.13). Note that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_n^N)P(Z_n \mid Y_0^n) - P(Z_n \mid Y_n^{(n+r)\wedge N})P(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n) \right| \\ & \leq \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_n^N) - P(Z_n \mid Y_n^{(n+r)\wedge N}) \right| + \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_0^n) - P(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n) \right| \\ & \leq 4(\zeta\pi_{\min})^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^r + 2\zeta^{-2}(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^r \\ & \leq 6(\zeta\pi_{\min})^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^r. \end{aligned} \tag{D.14}$$

Collecting the results from (D.11)–(D.12), (D.14) and Lemma D.4, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| P(Z_n \mid Y_0^N) - P\left(Z_n \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right) \right| & \leq \frac{10}{P(Z_n = i \mid Y_n)} \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{(1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2)^r \vee (1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^{r-1}\} \\ & \leq \frac{10}{\delta_{\min}} \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma D.4.** *Under Assumption 9 and given  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have*

$$\left| \frac{P\left(Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right)}{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right)P\left(Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right)} \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^N)P(Y_0^n)}{P(Y_0^N)} - 1 \right| \leq 4\zeta^{-4}k(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^{r-1} \{\zeta^{-2}(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min}) \vee 1\}. \tag{D.15}$$

*Proof of Lemma D.4.* We consider four cases.

*Case 1:*  $n+r > N$ ,  $n-r < 0$ . It follows that

$$\frac{P\left(Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right)}{P\left(Y_{n+1}^{(n+r)\wedge N}\right)P\left(Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^n\right)} \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^N)P(Y_0^n)}{P(Y_0^N)} = 1.$$

Case 2:  $n+r < N$ ,  $n-r > 0$ . We can write the left hand side of (D.15) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_{n-r}^n) P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_{n+1}^{n+r})}{P(Y_{n+1}^N | Y_0^n)} - 1 \right| &= \left| \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_{n-r}^n) P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_{n+1}^{n+r})}{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r}) P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_0^n)} - 1 \right| \\
&\leq \frac{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_{n+1}^{n+r})}{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r})} \left| \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_{n-r}^n) - P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_0^n)}{P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_0^n)} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \frac{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_{n+1}^{n+r}) - P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r})}{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r})} \right|. \tag{D.16}
\end{aligned}$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_{n-r}^n) - P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_0^n)}{P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_0^n)} \right| \\
&= \frac{|\sum_i P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Z_n = i, Y_n) \{P(Z_n = i | Y_{n-r}^n) - P(Z_n = i | Y_1^n)\}|}{\sum_i P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Z_n = i, Y_n) P(Z_n = i | Y_0^n)} \\
&\leq \frac{\max_i P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Z_n = i, Y_n)}{\min_i P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Z_n = i, Y_n)} \left| \sum_i P(Z_n = i | Y_{n-r}^n) - P(Z_n = i | Y_1^n) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Apply Lemma D.1– D.2, we can upper bound the above display as

$$\leq 2\zeta^{-4}k(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^r \tag{D.17}$$

Similarly, we can use the same technique to show that

$$\left| \frac{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_{n+1}^{n+r}) - P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r})}{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r})} \right| \leq 2\zeta^{-4}k(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^{r-1}. \tag{D.18}$$

Apply Lemma D.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_{n+1}^{n+r})}{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r})} &= \frac{\sum_i P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Z_n = i, Y_{n+r}) P(Z_n = i | Y_{n+1}^{n+r})}{\sum_i P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Z_n = i, Y_{n+r}) P(Z_n = i | Y_1^{n+r})} \\
&\leq \frac{\max_i P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Z_{n+r} = i, Y_{n+r})}{\min_i P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Z_{n+r} = i, Y_{n+r})} \leq \zeta^{-2}. \tag{D.19}
\end{aligned}$$

Plug the results (D.17)– (D.19) back into (D.16) and we can conclude that

$$\left| \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r} | Y_{n-r}^n) P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_{n+1}^{n+r})}{P(Y_{n+1}^N | Y_0^n)} - 1 \right| \leq 4\zeta^{-4}k(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^{r-1} \{\zeta^{-2}(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min}) \vee 1\}.$$

Case 3:  $n+r > N$ ,  $n-r > 0$ . In this case, we can express the left hand side of (D.15) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{P(Y_{n+1}^N | Y_{n-r}^n)}{P(Y_{n+1}^N | Y_0^n)} - 1 \right| &= \frac{|P(Y_{n+1}^N | Y_{n-r}^n) - P(Y_{n+1}^N | Y_0^n)|}{P(Y_{n+1}^N | Y_0^n)} \\
&\leq \frac{\max_i P(Y_{n+1}^N | Z_n = i, Y_n)}{\min_i P(Y_{n+1}^N | Z_n = i, Y_n)} \sum_i |P(Z_n = i | Y_{n-r}^n) - P(Z_n = i | Y_0^n)| \\
&\leq 2\zeta^{-4}k(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^r.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 4:  $n+r < N$ ,  $n-r < 0$ . In this case, we can express the left hand side of (D.15) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{P(Y_0^{n+r})P(Y_{n+1}^N)}{P(Y_{n+1}^{n+r})P(Y_0^N)} - 1 \right| &= \left| \frac{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_{n+1}^{n+r})}{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r})} - 1 \right| \\
&= \frac{|P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_{n+1}^{n+r}) - P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r})|}{P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Y_0^{n+r})} \\
&\leq \frac{\max_i P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Z_{n+r} = i, Y_{n+r})}{\min_i P(Y_{n+r+1}^N | Z_{n+r} = i, Y_{n+r})} \\
&\quad \times \sum_i |P(Z_{n+r} = i | Y_{n+1}^{n+r}) - P(Z_{n+r} = i | Y_0^{n+r})| \\
&\leq 2\zeta^{-4}k(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min})^{r-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the results from Case 1-4, we can conclude (D.15).  $\square$

## E Proof Sketch of one-step update

In this section, we show the contraction of the distance between the estimated parameter to the true parameter via one update of EM algorithm. In Section E.1, we discuss the one-step update of  $\theta_i^\ell$ ; in Section E.2, we discuss the one-step update of  $\sigma^2$ ; in Section E.3, we discuss the one-step update of  $Q$ .

### E.1 Proof of Lemma 4.3

Recall the notation introduced in Section 4.3. The quantity of interest is  $\Delta = \hat{\theta} - \theta^*$  and  $Y_n^\Delta = Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i}$ . In the following, we show the contraction of  $\Delta$  at each iterate of the EM algorithm. By construction, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta \hat{\Psi}(t_n) \right\}^2 + \lambda \|\theta\|_{1, \hat{K}_\Psi} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^* \hat{\Psi}(t_n) \right\}^2 + \lambda \|\theta^*\|_{1, \hat{K}_\Psi}.$$

By rearranging the above equation, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left( \Delta \hat{\Psi}(t_n) \right)^2 \\
&\leq \lambda \left( \|\theta^*\|_{1, \hat{K}_\Psi} - \|\theta\|_{1, \hat{K}_\Psi} \right) + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^* \hat{\Psi}(t_n) \right\} \hat{\Psi}(t_n)^\top \Delta^\top. \quad (\text{E.1})
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\check{\Theta} = M(\Theta) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\Theta'} \mathcal{L}(\Theta' | \Theta)$ . Then using the fact that  $\nabla_{\check{\Theta}} \mathcal{L}(\check{\Theta} | \Theta) = 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \check{\theta} \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right] = 0. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

Therefore, we can rearrange

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^\star \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \right\} \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)^\top \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^\star \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \right\} \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)^\top - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^\star \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^\star \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^\star \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^\star \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right] - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^\star \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^\star \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right] - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \check{\theta} \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last term is zero following (E.2). Define the following quantity

$$K_\Psi^w = K_\Psi^w(\Theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \Psi(t_n) \Psi(t_n)^\top \right]. \quad (\text{E.3})$$

Then, we can write

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta^\star \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \right\} \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)^\top = \theta^\star \Delta_\Psi + \Delta_w + \Delta_\varepsilon + (\check{\theta} - \theta^\star) K_\Psi^w, \quad (\text{E.4})$$

where  $\Delta_\Psi$  is defined in (4.5),  $\Delta_w$  is defined in (4.6), and  $\Delta_\varepsilon$  is defined in (4.4). Plug the result (E.4) back to (E.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left( \Delta \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \right)^2 &\leq \lambda \left( \|\theta^\star\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} - \|\theta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} \right) + 2\sigma_{\max}(K_\Psi^w) \|\Delta\|_2 \|\check{\theta} - \theta^\star\|_2 \\
&\quad + 2\|\Delta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} \left( \|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} + \|\Delta_w\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} + \|\theta^\star \Delta_\Psi\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} \right), \quad (\text{E.5})
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} = \max_{j=1, \dots, p} \|\Delta_{\varepsilon, j}\|_{\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}^\star}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}^\star}$  is the dual norm of  $\|\cdot\|_{\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}}$ .

Define  $S$  to be the support set of  $\theta^\star$  and  $S^c$  be the complement of  $S$ . Using the fact that

$$\lambda \geq 4 \left( \|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} + \|\Delta_w\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} + \|\theta^\star \Delta_\Psi\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} \right),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lambda \left( \|\theta^\star\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} - \|\theta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} \right) + 2\|\Delta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} \left( \|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} + \|\Delta_w\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} + \|\theta^\star \Delta_\Psi\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^\star} \right) \\
&\leq \lambda \left( \|\theta^\star\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} - \|\theta^\star + \Delta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} \right) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\Delta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} \\
&= \lambda \left( \|\theta_S^\star\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} - \|(\theta^\star + \Delta)_S\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} - \|\Delta_{S^c}\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda}{2} \left( \|\Delta_S\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} + \|\Delta_{S^c}\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{3\lambda}{2} \|\Delta_S\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\Delta_{S^c}\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi}. \quad (\text{E.6})
\end{aligned}$$

From the result of (E.6) and the facts that (i) the left hand side of (E.6) is lower bounded by 0 and (ii)

$$\lambda \geq \frac{4}{\sqrt{s}} \frac{\sigma_{\max}(K_{\Psi})}{\max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2,$$

we can conclude that

$$\frac{\lambda}{2} \|\Delta_{S^c}\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}} \leq \frac{3\lambda}{2} \|\Delta_S\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}} + 2\sigma_{\max}(K_{\Psi}^w) \|\Delta\|_2 \|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2.$$

Define  $K_{\Psi} = N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\Psi(t_n)\Psi(t_n)^{\top}]$  and it follows that  $\sigma_{\max}(K_{\Psi}^w) \leq \sigma_{\max}(K_{\Psi})$ . Therefore, we can upper bound the above display as

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{3\lambda}{2} \|\Delta_S\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}} + 2\sigma_{\max}(K_{\Psi}) \|\Delta\|_2 \|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{3\lambda}{2} \max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \sqrt{s} \|\Delta\|_2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \sqrt{s} \|\Delta\|_2 \\ &= 2\lambda \max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \sqrt{s} \|\Delta\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\|\Delta_S\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}} + \|\Delta_{S^c}\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}} = \|\Delta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}} \leq 5 \max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \sqrt{s} \|\Delta\|_2. \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Hence, combining (E.6), we can write (E.5) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left( \Delta \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \right)^2 &\leq 2\lambda \|\Delta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}} + 2\sigma_{\max}(K_{\Psi}^w) \|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \|\Delta\|_2 \\ &\leq 2\|\Delta\|_2 \left\{ 5\lambda \max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \sqrt{s} + \sigma_{\max}(K_{\Psi}) \|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.8})$$

Under Assumption 6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ \Delta \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \right\}^2 &\geq \alpha \|\Delta\|_2^2 - \tau \|\Delta\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}}^2 \\ &\geq \alpha \|\Delta\|_2^2 - 25 \max_j \sigma_{\max}^2(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) s \tau \|\Delta\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\Delta\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above result with (E.8), we can conclude that

$$\|\Delta\|_2 \leq \frac{4}{\alpha} \left( 5\lambda \max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \sqrt{s} + \sigma_{\max}(K_{\Psi}) \|\check{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \right).$$

## E.2 One-step update of $\sigma^2$

Define

$$\widehat{R}_{n, \ell} = \sum_{i=1}^p \left( Y_{n, i} - Y_{n-1, i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_{ij}^{\ell} \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right)^2, \quad R_{n, \ell} = \sum_{i=1}^p \left( Y_{n, i} - Y_{n-1, i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_{ij}^{\ell} \Psi_j(t_n) \right)^2. \quad (\text{E.9})$$

**Lemma E.1.** *Suppose that Assumption 8, 9 hold. Assume that there exists a constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $\widehat{R}_{n,\ell}, R_{n,\ell} \leq c_0^2 p$ . Define  $\delta_1 = \max_i \|X_i - \widehat{X}_i\|_2$ ,*

$$\delta_2 = \left| \frac{1}{Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \{ \widehat{w}_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) R_{n,\ell} - \mathbb{E} [ \widehat{w}_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) R_{n,\ell} ] \} \right|.$$

*Suppose that for each  $\ell$ , the difference  $\sum_{i,j} \|\theta_{ij}^\ell - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\|_2^2 \leq r_0^2$ . Suppose that  $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \max_{ij} |\dot{g}_j(X_i(t))| \leq D$ ,  $\pi_{\min} = \min_{Q \in \Omega} \min_{\ell} \pi_{\ell}$ , and  $\delta_{\min} = \min_{\Theta \in \Omega} \min_{n=1, \dots, N} P(Z_n, Y_n; \Theta) > 0$ . Given  $\Theta$ , define  $\widehat{\Theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\widetilde{\Theta} \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}_N(\widetilde{\Theta} | \Theta)$  and  $\check{\Theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\widetilde{\Theta} \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}(\widetilde{\Theta} | \Theta)$ . Then,*

$$|\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{\star 2}| \leq \frac{C\sqrt{m}sk\delta_1}{N} \max_j \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} + \delta_2 + C'k\zeta^{-8}\pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} + |\check{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{\star 2}|,$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending on  $(\Theta^*, r_0, c_0, D)$  and  $C'$  is a constant depending on  $(c_0, \delta_{\min})$ .

*Proof of Lemma E.1.* Fixing parameters  $Q$ ,  $\theta^\ell$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ , the optimal parameter  $\sigma^2$  can be represented as

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 = \operatorname{argmax}_{\sigma'^2} -\frac{pN}{2} \log 2\sigma'^2 - \frac{1}{4\sigma'^2} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \widehat{w}_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) \sum_{i=1}^p \left( Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_{ij}^\ell \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right)^2.$$

This implies that

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{2Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \widehat{w}_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) \sum_{i=1}^p \left( Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_{ij}^\ell \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right)^2.$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} |\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{\star 2}| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \widehat{w}_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) (\widehat{R}_{n,\ell} - R_{n,\ell}) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \widehat{w}_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) R_{n,\ell} - \mathbb{E} [\widehat{w}_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}] \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \mathbb{E} [\widehat{w}_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}] - \mathbb{E} [w_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}] \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k (\mathbb{E} [w_{\ell,\Theta}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}]) - \sigma^{\star 2} \right| \\ &= T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4. \end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, we bound each term separately. First, we write

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= \frac{1}{Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) (\widehat{R}_{n,\ell} - R_{n,\ell}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) (\widehat{R}_{n,\ell}^{1/2} + R_{n,\ell}^{1/2}) \left\| \sum_i \theta_i^\ell (\widehat{\Psi}_i(t_n) - \Psi_i(t_n)) \right\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\theta_i^\ell = (\theta_{1i}^{\ell\top}, \dots, \theta_{pi}^{\ell\top})$ . Using the fact that  $\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell} \leq 1$  and  $R_{n, \ell}^{1/2}, \widehat{R}_{n, \ell}^{1/2} \leq c_0 p$ , the above display can be bounded as

$$\leq \frac{2c_0}{N} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{n=1}^N \left\| \sum_i \theta_i^\ell \left( \widehat{\Psi}_i(t_n) - \Psi_i(t_n) \right) \right\|_2. \quad (\text{E.10})$$

We can apply Hölder's inequality and obtain the following upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_i \theta_i^\ell \left( \widehat{\Psi}_i(t_n) - \Psi_i(t_n) \right) \right\|_2 &= \sqrt{\sum_{i'} \left\{ \sum_i \theta_{i'i}^\ell \left( \widehat{\Psi}_i(t_n) - \Psi_i(t_n) \right) \right\}^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i'} \|\theta_{i'}^\ell\|_1^2 \max_{i,j} \left| \Psi_{ij}(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}_{ij}(t_n) \right|}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.11})$$

where  $\theta_{i'}^\ell = (\theta_{i'1}^{\ell\top}, \dots, \theta_{i'p}^{\ell\top})$ . Note that

$$\|\theta_{i'}^{\ell\star} - \theta_{i'}^\ell\|_1 \leq \max_j \frac{\sqrt{m}}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \|\theta_{i'}^{\ell\star} - \theta_{i'}^\ell\|_{1, \widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}} \leq 5 \max_j \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \sqrt{ms} \|\theta_{i'}^{\ell\star} - \theta_{i'}^\ell\|_2, \quad (\text{E.12})$$

where the last inequality follows from (E.7). Therefore, we have

$$\|\theta_{i'}^\ell\|_1 \leq \|\theta_{i'}^{\ell\star}\|_1 + 5 \max_j \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \sqrt{ms} \|\theta_{i'}^{\ell\star} - \theta_{i'}^\ell\|_2,$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i'} \|\theta_{i'}^\ell\|_1^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{i'} \left\{ \|\theta_{i'}^{\ell\star}\|_1^2 + 25ms \max_j \left( \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \right)^2 \|\theta_{i'}^{\ell\star} - \theta_{i'}^\ell\|_2^2 \right\} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i'} \|\theta_{i'}^{\ell\star}\|_1^2 + 50ms \max_j \left( \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \right)^2 r_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Apply (E.23) to (E.11) and plug the results back to (E.10), we have

$$T_1 \leq \frac{C\sqrt{m}sk\delta_1}{N} \max_j \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})},$$

where  $C = C(r_0, c_0, \Theta^\star, D)$ ,  $m$  is the number of basis functions,  $k$  is the number of states and  $\delta_1 = \max_i \|X_i - \widehat{X}_i\|_2$ .

Note that by assumption, we have  $T_2 \leq \delta_2$ . Apply Lemma 4.4, we can bound  $T_3$  as

$$\begin{aligned} T_3 &= \left| \frac{1}{Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \mathbb{E}[\{\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) - w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n)\} R_n] \right| \\ &\leq C' k \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C' = C'(c_0, \delta_{\min})$ . Recall that  $\check{\Theta} = \arg \max_{\Theta'} \mathcal{L}(\Theta' | \Theta)$  and we have  $\check{\sigma}^2$

$$\check{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{Np} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^k \mathbb{E}[w_{\ell, \Theta}(t_n) R_{n, \ell}].$$

Therefore,  $T_4 = |\check{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2|$ . Combining the results from  $T_1$  to  $T_4$ , we have

$$|\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{*2}| \leq \frac{C\sqrt{msk}\delta_1}{N} \max_j \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} + \delta_2 + C'k\zeta^{-8}\pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} + |\check{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{*2}|.$$

□

### E.3 One-step update of $Q$

This section shows the one-step update of the transition rate matrix  $Q$ . We begin with stating the main result.

**Lemma E.2.** *Suppose that  $Z(t)$  is strictly stationary and irreducible and  $Z(0)$  is sampled from the stationary distribution. Given  $\Theta$ , let  $\check{\Theta} = \arg \max_{\Theta'} \mathcal{L}(\Theta' | \Theta^*)$  and  $\hat{\Theta} = \arg \max_{\tilde{\Theta} \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}_N(\tilde{\Theta} | \Theta)$ , and*

$$\delta_3 = \max_{i,j} \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta, ij}(t_n)] \right|.$$

Then, there exists a constant  $C = C(Q, Y_0^N) < \infty$  such that for  $\ell \neq \ell'$  we have

$$|\widehat{q}_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*| \leq C\delta_3 + |\check{q}_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*|.$$

*Proof of Lemma E.2.* From [Bladt and Sørensen \(2005\)](#); [Liu et al. \(2015\)](#), the expected number of transition from  $\ell$  state to  $\ell'$  state given the observations can be written as:

$$\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(1) | Y_0^N; \Theta] = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i,j} w_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(t_n - t_{n-1}) | Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j; Q],$$

where  $m_{\ell\ell'}(t)$  is the number of transition from state  $\ell$  to  $\ell'$  in time  $[0, t]$ . We define the similar version for the truncated version:

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'}(1) | Y_0^N; \Theta] = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i,j} \widehat{w}_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(t_n - t_{n-1}) | Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j; Q].$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tau_{\ell}(1) | Y_0^N; \Theta] &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i,j} w_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) \mathbb{E}[\tau_{\ell}(t_n - t_{n-1}) | Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j; Q]; \\ \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_{\ell}(1) | Y_0^N; \Theta] &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i,j} \widehat{w}_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) \mathbb{E}[\tau_{\ell}(t_n - t_{n-1}) | Z(t_{n-1}) = i, Z(t_n) = j; Q]. \end{aligned}$$

Fixing parameters of  $\theta_{ij}^\ell$  and  $\sigma^2$ , the optimal  $\widehat{Q}$  that optimize  $\mathcal{L}_N(\Theta' | \Theta)$  is

$$\widehat{q}_{\ell\ell'} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'}(1) | Y_0^N; \Theta]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell(1) | Y_0^N; \Theta]},$$

for  $\ell \neq \ell'$  and  $\widehat{q}_{\ell\ell} = -\sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \widehat{q}_{\ell\ell'}$ . For notation simplicity, starting from below, we express  $\tau_\ell(1)$  as  $\tau_\ell$ ,  $\widehat{\tau}_\ell(1)$  as  $\widehat{\tau}_\ell$ ,  $\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'}(1)$  as  $\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'}$ ,  $m_{\ell\ell'}(1)$  as  $m_{\ell\ell'}$ . Hence, for each  $\ell \neq \ell'$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{q}_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*| &\leq \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]]} \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]]} \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]]} - q_{\ell\ell'}^* \right| \\ &= T_5 + T_6 + T_7. \end{aligned}$$

First, we can decompose  $T_5$  into two terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]]} \right| &\leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell; \Theta]} |\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]]| \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell; \Theta] \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]} |\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta] - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell; \Theta]|. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the time-homogeneity of Markov chain and  $t_n - t_{n-1} = h$ , we can write

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta] = \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) | Z(h) = i, Z(0) = j; Q] \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n).$$

By Fubini's theorem, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]] = \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) | Z(h) = i, Z(0) = j; Q] \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)].$$

Combining above two terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} | Y_0^N; \Theta]]| &\leq \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) | Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q] \\ &\quad \times \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n) - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)] \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.13})$$

Similarly, apply the time-homogeneity property of Markov-chain again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell | Y_0^N; \Theta]]| &\leq \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell(h) | Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q] \\ &\quad \times \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n) - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)] \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.14})$$

Combining the results of (E.13)–(E.14), we can upper bound  $T_5$  as

$$T_5 \leq \sum_{i,j} \frac{\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) \mid Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q] + \hat{q}_{\ell\ell'} \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell(h) \mid Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q]}{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_\ell; \Theta]} \times \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)] \right|, \quad (\text{E.15})$$

where  $\hat{q}_{\ell\ell'} = \mathbb{E}[\hat{m}_{\ell\ell'} \mid Y_0^N; \Theta] / \mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_\ell \mid Y_0^N; \Theta]$ . Furthermore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)] &= \int P\left(Z(t_n) = j, Z(t_{n-1}) = i \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}; \Theta\right) P\left(Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}; \Theta\right) dY_{(n-r)\vee 0} \cdots dY_{(n+r)\wedge N} \\ &= P(Z(t_n) = j, Z(t_{n-1}) = i; Q) \\ &= P(Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q), \end{aligned}$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . The last equality follows because  $Z(t)$  for  $t \geq 0$  is stationary. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_\ell; \Theta] &= N \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell(h) \mid Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q] P(Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell; \Theta] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell \mid Z(0) = i; \Theta] \pi_i \\ &> \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell \mid Z(0) = \ell; \Theta] \pi_\ell \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell \mid Z(0) = \ell; \Theta]$  is greater than minimum of the expected holding time of  $Z(t)$  at state  $\ell$  and 1. Since the holding time of  $Z(t)$  at state follows a exponential distribution with rate  $-q_{\ell\ell} = \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} q_{\ell\ell'}$ , we know that the expected holding time is  $-1/q_{\ell\ell}$ . Hence the above term is further lower bounded as

$$> \left( \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} q_{\ell\ell'}} \wedge 1 \right) \pi_{\min} > 0. \quad (\text{E.16})$$

Therefore, we can ensure that

$$\sum_{i,j} \frac{\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) \mid Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q] + \hat{q}_{\ell\ell'} \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell(h) \mid Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q]}{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_\ell; \Theta]},$$

is finite and well behaved. Compute the exact upper bound with respect to  $Q, Y_0^N$  would throw us into technical weeds, we hence assume there is a constant  $C = C(Q, Y_0^N)$  such that

$$\sum_{i,j} \frac{\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) \mid Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q] + \hat{q}_{\ell\ell'} \mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell(h) \mid Z(h) = j, Z(0) = i; Q]}{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_\ell; \Theta]} \leq C.$$

As a result, we can write (E.15) as

$$T_5 \leq C \left\{ \max_{i,j} \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)] \right| \right\} \leq C\delta_3. \quad (\text{E.17})$$

Next, we want to show that  $T_6 = 0$ . This is because

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)] &= \int P\left(Z(t_n) = j, Z(t_{n-1}) = i \mid Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}; \Theta\right) P(Y_{(n-r)\vee 0}^{(n+r)\wedge N}) dY_{(n-r)\vee 0} \cdots dY_{(n+r)\wedge N} \\ &= P(Z(t_n) = j, Z(t_{n-1}) = i; \Theta) = \mathbb{E}[w_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)],\end{aligned}$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{m}_{\ell\ell'} \mid Y_0^N; \Theta]\right] &= \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) \mid Z(h) = i, Z(0) = j; Q] \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)] \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'}(h) \mid Z(h) = i, Z(0) = j; Q] \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[w_{\Theta,ij}(t_n)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'} \mid Y_0^N; \Theta]\right].\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\tau}_\ell \mid Y_0^N; \Theta]\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell \mid Y_0^N; \Theta]\right].$$

Hence, we have  $T_6 = 0$ .

Finally, recall that  $\check{\Theta} = \arg \max_{\Theta'} \mathcal{L}(\Theta' \mid \Theta)$  and it follows that

$$\check{q}_{\ell\ell'} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[m_{\ell\ell'} \mid \Theta]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_\ell \mid \Theta]}.$$

Hence  $T_7 = |\check{q}_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*|$ . Combining  $T_5$  to  $T_7$  together, we arrive at

$$|\widehat{q}_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*| \leq C\delta_3 + |\check{q}_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*|.$$

□

#### E.4 Auxiliary Lemmas for the analysis of one-step update

**Lemma E.3.** *Given a fixed  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , define  $Y_n^\Delta = Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i}$  for  $n = 2, \dots, N$ . Let  $\max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \max_{n=1,\dots,N} |Y_n^\Delta - \theta_i^\ell \Psi(t_n)| = c_0$  and  $|g_j(X_i(t))| \leq B$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Recall that  $\Theta = \{\theta_{ij}^\ell; i, j = 1, \dots, p, \ell = 1, \dots, k\} \cup \{Q\}$  and suppose that  $Q$  satisfies Assumption 9. Define the coefficient*

$$C = \left( \max_j \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \right) B c_0 \frac{10}{\delta_{\min}} \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2},$$

where  $\zeta$  is the mixing coefficient defined in (4.7),  $\delta_{\min}$  is defined in Lemma 4.4 and  $\pi_{\min}$  is defined in (4.8). Then, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \{\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) - w_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n)\} \{Y_n^\Delta - \theta_i^{\ell*} \Psi(t_n)\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}^*} \leq C\sqrt{m} \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min}^2)\}^{r-1}.$$

*Proof of Lemma E.3.* Write

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_w\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} &= \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \{\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) - w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n)\} \{Y_n^\Delta - \theta_i^{\ell*} \Psi(t_n)\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N |\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) - w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n)| |Y_n^\Delta - \theta_i^{\ell*} \Psi(t_n)| \|\Psi(t_n)^\top\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{E.18})$$

Note that

$$\|\Psi(t_n)^\top\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \leq \max_j \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \|\Psi_j(t_n)\|_2 \leq \max_j \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} B\sqrt{m}.\quad (\text{E.19})$$

Apply (E.19) to (E.18), we can obtain

$$\|\Delta_w\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \leq \left( \max_j \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \right) \frac{Bc_0\sqrt{m}}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N |\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) - w_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n)|$$

Apply Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\|\Delta_w\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \leq \left( \max_j \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \right) Bc_0\sqrt{m} \frac{10}{\delta_{\min}} \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min}^2)\}^{r-1}.$$

□

**Lemma E.4.** *Observe two stochastic processes  $X_t$  and  $\widehat{X}_t$  on  $[0, 1]$ . Suppose that  $\max_{j=1, \dots, p} \|X_i - \widehat{X}_i\|_2 = \delta$ , and  $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |g_j(X_i(t))| \leq B$ ,  $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |g'_j(X_i(t))| \leq D$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $k = 1, \dots, m$ . Assume that  $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times pm}$  is  $ms$ -sparse with  $s \leq p$ . Then,*

$$\left\| \theta^* \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) \Psi(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)^\top\} \right\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \leq \max_j \frac{2}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \|\theta^*\|_2 B D \delta m \sqrt{s}.$$

*Proof of Lemma E.4.* Write

$$\begin{aligned}& \left\| \theta^* \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) \Psi(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)^\top\} \right\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \\ &= \max_j \left\| \theta^* \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^\top\} \right\|_{\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}^*} \\ &\leq \max_j \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \left\| \theta^* \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^\top\} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \max_j \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \underbrace{\left\| \theta^* \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)\} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top \right\|_2}_{T_1} \\ &\quad + \max_j \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \underbrace{\left\| \theta^* \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \{\Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^\top\} \right\|_2}_{T_2}.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{E.20})$$

Note that by triangle inequality, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= \left\| \theta^\star \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)\} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top \right\|_2 \leq \left| \theta^\star \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)\} \right| \|\Psi_j(t_n)^\top\|_2 \\ &\leq \left| \theta^\star \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)\} \right| B\sqrt{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.21})$$

Define the support of  $\theta^\star$  as  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then, (E.21) is equivalent as

$$\left| \theta^\star \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)\} \right| B\sqrt{m} = \left| \theta_{\mathcal{S}}^\star \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) [\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)]_{\mathcal{S}} \right| B\sqrt{m}$$

Apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we can further bound the above term as

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \|\theta_{\mathcal{S}}^\star\|_2 \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) [\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)]_{\mathcal{S}} \right\|_2 B\sqrt{m} \\ &\leq Bm\sqrt{s} \|\theta_{\mathcal{S}}^\star\|_2 \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) [\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)]_{\mathcal{S}} \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq Bm\sqrt{s} \|\theta^\star\|_2 \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N [\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)] \right\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.22})$$

Note that for each  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \Psi_{ij}(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}_{ij}(t_n) \right| &= \sum_{n=1}^N \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \left| g_{ij}(X_{i,u}) - g_{ij}(\widehat{X}_{i,u}) \right| du \\ &= \int_0^1 \left| g_{ij}(X_{j,u}) - g_{ij}(\widehat{X}_{i,u}) \right| du \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \left| D(X_{i,u} - \widehat{X}_{i,u}) \right| du \\ &\leq \left( \int_0^1 D^2 du \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \int_0^T (X_{i,u} - \widehat{X}_{i,u})^2 du \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= D \|X_i - \widehat{X}_i\|_2 \leq D\delta \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.23})$$

Plug the result of (E.23) into (E.22) and then into (E.21), we obtain

$$T_1 = \left\| \theta^\star \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{\Psi(t_n) - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)\} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top \right\|_2 \leq BD\delta m\sqrt{s} \|\theta^\star\|_2. \quad (\text{E.24})$$

Similarly, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 &= \left\| \theta^* \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \{ \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^\top \} \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \max_n \left| \theta^* \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \right| \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^\top \right| \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \max_n \left| \theta_S^*(t_n) [\widehat{\Psi}(t_n)]_S \right| \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^\top \right| \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\theta^*\|_2 B \sqrt{sm} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n)^\top \right| \right\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Plug result of (E.23) into the above term, we arrive at

$$\leq \|\theta^*\|_2 B \sqrt{sm} D \delta \tag{E.25}$$

Once we obtain the upper bound of  $T_1$  in (E.24), and  $T_2$  in (E.25), we can bound the right hand side of (E.20) and arrive at

$$\left\| \theta^* \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \{ \Psi(t_n) \Psi(t_n)^\top - \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \widehat{\Psi}(t_n)^\top \} \right\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \leq \max_j \frac{2}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \|\theta^*\|_2 B D \delta m \sqrt{s}.$$

□

**Lemma E.5.** *Suppose that  $N > 4$ , then for some universal constants  $C_1, C_2$ , we have*

$$P \left( \max_{i,j} \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) - w_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) \right| > C_1 \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}} \right) \leq k^2 \exp(-C_2).$$

*Proof of Lemma E.5.* The proof of Lemma F.1 explains that  $\widehat{w}_{\ell, \Theta}(t_n)$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  are stationary mixing process with sub-Weibull(2) norm bounded by 1 and the decay coefficient  $\gamma_1 = 1$ . Therefore,  $1/\gamma = 1/\gamma_1 + 1/\gamma_2 = 2/3$ . Apply Lemma I.2, we have

$$P \left( \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) - w_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) \right| > C_1 \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}} \right) \leq \exp(-C_2).$$

Taking the maximum over  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$  and apply union bound on the right side of the above equation, we have

$$P \left( \max_{i,j} \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) - w_{\Theta, ij}(t_n) \right| > C_1 \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}} \right) \leq k^2 \exp(-C_2).$$

□

**Lemma E.6.** Let  $\kappa = \max_j \left\{ \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) / \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \right\}$  and assume  $\sum_{i,j} \|\theta_{ij}^\ell - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\|_2^2 \leq r_0^2$ ,  $N > 4$ . Then, we have

$$P \left( \frac{1}{Np} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell} - \mathbb{E} [\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}] \right| > \frac{C_1(2\sigma^2 + \rho^2 + m\kappa r_0^2 B^2)}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \leq \exp(-C_2),$$

for some absolute constants  $C_1, C_2$ .

*Proof of Lemma E.6.* Write  $\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell} &= \widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) \sum_{i=1}^p \left( Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_{ij}^\ell \Psi_j(t_n) \right)^2 \\ &= \widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) \sum_{i=1}^p \left( X_i(t_n) + \varepsilon_{n,i} - X_i(t_{n-1}) - \varepsilon_{n-1,i} - \sum_{j=1}^p \theta_{ij}^\ell \Psi_j(t_n) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall the definition of  $\rho_{n,i}$  in (F.1), the above term is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &= \widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) \sum_{i=1}^p \left\{ \varepsilon_{n,i} + \varepsilon_{n-1,i} + \rho_{n,i} + \sum_j (\theta_{ij}^\ell - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}) \Psi_j(t_n) \right\}^2 \\ &\leq 4\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) \sum_{i=1}^p \left( \varepsilon_{n,i}^2 + \varepsilon_{n-1,i}^2 + \rho_{n,i}^2 + \|\theta_{i\cdot}^\ell - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell*}\|_1^2 \|\Psi(t_n)\|_\infty^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|\Psi(t_n)\|_\infty \leq B$ . From (E.12), we can further bound

$$\|\theta_{i\cdot}^\ell - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell*}\|_1 \leq 5 \max_j \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \sqrt{ms} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^\ell - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell*}\|_2 \leq 5\kappa \sqrt{ms} r_0.$$

Hence, apply Lemma I.3 twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}\|_{\psi_{2/3}} &\leq C \|\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}\|_{\psi_2} \sum_i \left( \|\varepsilon_{n,i}\|_{\psi_2}^2 + \|\varepsilon_{n-1,i}\|_{\psi_2}^2 + \|\rho_{n,i}\|_{\psi_2}^2 + \|\theta_{i\cdot}^\ell - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell*}\|_1^2 \|\Psi(t_n)\|_\infty^2 \right) \\ &\leq Cp (2\sigma^2 + \rho^2 + m\kappa^2 r_0^2 B^2). \end{aligned}$$

Apply Lemma I.4 and triangular inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{p} \|\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell} - \mathbb{E} \widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}\|_{\psi_{2/3}} \leq 2C (2\sigma^2 + \rho^2 + m\kappa^2 r_0^2 B^2).$$

Note that the sequence  $\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is  $\beta$ -mixing and stationary following the argument in Lemma F.1. Therefore, we can apply Lemma I.2 with  $1/\gamma = 1/\gamma_1 + 1/\gamma_2 = 1 + 3/2 = 5/2$ ,  $N > 4$  and obtain

$$P \left( \frac{1}{Np} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell} - \mathbb{E} [\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n) R_{n,\ell}] \right| > \frac{C_1(2\sigma^2 + \rho^2 + m\kappa r_0^2 B^2)}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \leq \exp(-C_2).$$

□

## F Proof of deviation bound

The goal is to show that the Assumption 7 hold with the desired  $\lambda, \alpha, \tau$  by applying Lemma I.2. We begin with stating the main result followed by the analysis.

**Lemma F.1.** *Suppose that  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is a stationary and  $\beta$ -mixing process with rate  $\beta(\ell) \leq c_1 \exp(-c\ell)$  for some absolute constants  $c, c_1 > 0$ . Let  $N \gtrsim m^4(\log p)^4$ . Given a fixed  $i$ , assume that  $Z(t_n) = \ell$  and define  $\rho_n = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \theta_i^{Z(u)\star} g(X_u) du - \theta_i^{\ell\star} \Psi(t_n)$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Suppose that  $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |g_j(X_i(t))| \leq B$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$   $\max_n |\rho_n| \leq \rho$ . Let  $r$  be a positive integer,  $c_2, c_3$  be absolute constants. and  $Y_n^\Delta = Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i}$ . Define*

$$\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) = P(Z(t_n) = \ell \mid Y_{(n+r) \wedge N}, Y_{\{(n+r) \wedge N\}-1}, \dots, Y_n, \dots, Y_{\{(n-r) \vee 0\}+1}, Y_{(n-r) \vee 0}).$$

Then, we can define

$$\Delta_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta_i^{\ell\star} \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ Y_n^\Delta - \theta_i^{\ell\star} \Psi(t_n) \right\} \Psi(t_n)^\top \right].$$

Then,

$$\|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \geq \max_{i=1, \dots, p} \frac{c_2 \sqrt{m} B (2\sigma^\star + \rho)}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_i})} \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}},$$

with probability smaller than  $6 \exp(-c_3 m \log p)$ .

### F.1 Proof of Lemma F.1

Recall that

$$Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \theta_i^{\ell\star} \Psi(t_n) = \varepsilon_{n,i} + \varepsilon_{n-1,i} + \underbrace{\sum_j \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \theta_{ij}^{Z(u)\star} g(X_j(u)) du - \theta_i^{\ell\star} \Psi(t_n)}_{:= \rho_{n,i}}. \quad (\text{F.1})$$

In the following, since we only consider single index  $i$ , we drop the index  $i$  in  $\rho_{n,i}$  as  $\rho_n$  for simplicity.

First, we decompose

$$\Delta_\varepsilon = \Delta_{\varepsilon_1} + \Delta_{\varepsilon_2} + \Delta_\rho,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\varepsilon_1} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi(t_n)^\top - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi(t_n)^\top]; \\ \Delta_{\varepsilon_2} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n-1,i} \Psi(t_n)^\top - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n-1,i} \Psi(t_n)^\top]; \\ \Delta_\rho &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \rho_n \Psi(t_n)^\top - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \rho_n \Psi(t_n)^\top]. \end{aligned}$$

The last term is the error due to approximation. Since

$$\|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \leq \|\Delta_{\varepsilon_1}\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} + \|\Delta_{\varepsilon_2}\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} + \|\Delta_\rho\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*}, \quad (\text{F.2})$$

we can bound  $\|\Delta_{\varepsilon_1}\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}^*}$ ,  $\|\Delta_{\varepsilon_2}\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}^*}$ , and  $\|\Delta_{\rho}\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_{\Psi}^*}$  separately by applying Lemma F.2. To apply the lemma, we verify the following conditions.

*Step 1: Control the tail behavior of  $\Delta_{\varepsilon_1}$ .* Let  $\gamma = 2/3$ , for each  $n = 1, \dots, N$  and  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top]\|_{\psi_\gamma} &\leq \|\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top\|_{\psi_\gamma} \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top]\|_{\psi_\gamma} \\ &\leq 2\|\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top\|_{\psi_\gamma}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.3})$$

where the last inequality follows by Lemma I.4. Apply Lemma I.3, we have

$$\|\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top\|_{\psi_\gamma} \leq 2^{3/2} \|\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n)\|_{\psi_2} \|\varepsilon_{n,i}\|_{\psi_2} \|\Psi_j(t_n)^\top\|_{\psi_2}. \quad (\text{F.4})$$

Since  $\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $\|\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n)\|_{\psi_2} \leq 1$ .  $\varepsilon_{n,i}$  is a centered Gaussian random variable with variance  $(\sigma^*)^2$  and hence it follows that  $\|\varepsilon_{n,i}\|_{\psi_2} \leq C\sigma^*$  for some constant  $C > 0$ . Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_j(t_n)\|_{\psi_2} &= \sup_{\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \|\nu^\top \Psi_j(t_n)\|_{\psi_2} \\ &= \sup_{\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \sup_{p \geq 1} p^{-1/2} \{\mathbb{E}|\nu^\top \Psi_j(t_n)|^p\}^{1/p} \\ &\leq \sup_{\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \sup_{p \geq 1} p^{-1/2} \{\mathbb{E}\|\nu\|_1^p \|\Psi_j(t_n)\|_\infty^p\}^{1/p} \leq B\sqrt{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.5})$$

Collecting the above results (F.3)–(F.5), we arrive at

$$\|\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top]\|_{\psi_\gamma} \leq C_1 \sigma^* \sqrt{m} B,$$

for some absolute constant  $C_1 > 0$ . Hence we can conclude that for each  $n = 1, \dots, N$  and  $j = 1, \dots, p$ ,  $\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top]$  is a sub-Weibull(2/3) random variable with sub-Weibull norm bounded by  $C_1 \sigma^* \sqrt{m} B$ .

*Step 2: Statistical properties of  $\Delta_{\varepsilon_1}$ .* In the following step, we verify the mixing and stationary conditions.

We first show that the product process  $\{\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top]\}_{n=1, \dots, N}$  is strictly stationary. Recall that for each  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , we have  $\Psi_i(t_n) = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(X_i(u)) du$ . Apply Lemma I.7, we have  $\Psi(t_n)$  is a strictly stationary process. Since two stochastic processes  $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n=1, \dots, N}$  and  $\{X(t_n)\}_{n=1, \dots, N}$  are independent, and hence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n=1, \dots, N}$  and  $\{\Psi(t_n)\}_{n=1, \dots, N}$  are independent. Therefore, the joint process

$$\{(X(t_{n'}), \varepsilon_{n'}, \Psi(t_{n'}); n' = (n-r) \vee 1, \dots, (n+r) \wedge N)\}_{n=1, \dots, N},$$

is strictly stationary process.

Recall that  $Y_n = X(t_n) + \varepsilon_n$  and note that the process  $\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n)$  is a measurable mapping of  $(Y_{(n-r) \vee 1}, \dots, Y_{(n+r) \wedge N})$ , and therefore, the process  $\{\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top\}_{n=1, \dots, N}$  is strictly stationary. By definition of the stationary process, the expectation  $\mathbb{E}\{\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top\}$  is a constant across  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Hence, we can conclude that  $\{\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \varepsilon_{n,i} \Psi_j(t_n)^\top]\}_{n=1, \dots, N}$  is strictly stationary.

In the next step, we verify the mixing property. Define the filtration  $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,n}^\varepsilon = \sigma(\{\varepsilon_j : j \leq n\})$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{n,\infty}^\varepsilon = \sigma(\{\varepsilon_j : j \geq n\})$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,t}^X = \sigma(\{X(u) : u \leq t\})$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_{t,\infty}^X = \sigma(\{X(u) : u \geq t\})$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,n} = \sigma(\{\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_j)\varepsilon_{j,i}\Psi(t_j)^\top : j \leq n\})$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{n,\infty} = \sigma(\{\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_j)\varepsilon_{j,i}\Psi(t_j)^\top : j \geq n\})$ . It follows that for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,n} &\subseteq \mathcal{F}_{-\infty,t_{n+r}}^X \vee \mathcal{F}_{-\infty,n+r}^\varepsilon; \\ \mathcal{F}_{n+j,\infty} &\subseteq \mathcal{F}_{t_{n+j-r},\infty}^X \vee \mathcal{F}_{n+j-r,\infty}^\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from Definition 6, we have

$$\beta(j) := \sup_n \beta(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,n}, \mathcal{F}_{n+j,\infty}) \leq \sup_n \beta\left(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,t_{n+r}}^X \vee \mathcal{F}_{-\infty,n+r}^\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{t_{n+j-r},\infty}^X \vee \mathcal{F}_{n+j-r,\infty}^\varepsilon\right).$$

Apply Lemma I.5, above display can be further bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \sup_n \beta\left(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,t_{n+r}}^X, \mathcal{F}_{t_{n+j-r},\infty}^X\right) + \sup_n \beta\left(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,n+r}^\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{n+j-r,\infty}^\varepsilon\right) \\ &= \sup_n \beta\left(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,t_{n+r}}^X, \mathcal{F}_{t_{n+j-r},\infty}^X\right) + 0 \\ &\leq C_3 \exp(-C_2(j-2r)) \\ &= C_3 \exp(C_2r) \exp(-C_2j).\end{aligned}$$

If  $r$  is a constant, then  $\exp(C_2r)$  is well-behaved. Therefore, we can conclude that the sequence  $\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n)\varepsilon_{n,i}\Psi(t_n) - \mathbb{E}\{\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n)\varepsilon_{n,i}\Psi(t_n)\}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is geometrically  $\beta$ -mixing.

*Step 3: Uniform concentration of  $\Delta_{\varepsilon_1}$ .* Using the results from Step 1–2, we can apply Lemma F.2: Compute  $1/\gamma = 1 + 3/2 = 5/2$  and note that  $N = C_0(m \log p)^4$ , we have

$$P\left(\|\Delta_{\varepsilon_1}\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \geq \max_{i=1,\dots,p} \frac{C_5\sqrt{m}B\sigma^*}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_i})} \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}}\right) \leq 2 \exp(-C_6 m \log p). \quad (\text{F.6})$$

*Step 4: Uniform concentration of  $\Delta_{\varepsilon_2}$*  We can find the bound for  $\|\Delta_{\varepsilon_2}\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*}$  similarly and obtain

$$P\left(\|\Delta_{\varepsilon_2}\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \geq \max_{i=1,\dots,p} \frac{C_5\sqrt{m}B\sigma^*}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_i})} \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}}\right) \leq 2 \exp(-C_6 m \log p). \quad (\text{F.7})$$

*Step 5: Uniform concentration of  $\Delta_\rho$ .* The steps to show uniform concentration property of  $\Delta_\rho$  follows exactly the same as Step 1–3, where we show the uniform concentration of  $\Delta_{\varepsilon_1}$ . It is easy to verify that for each  $j = 1, \dots, p$  and  $n = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n)\rho_n\Psi(t_n)^\top - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{w}_{\Theta,\ell}(t_n)\rho_n\Psi(t_n)^\top]$  is sub-Weibull(2/3) with sub-Weibull norm bounded by  $C_4\sqrt{m}B\rho$ . Therefore, we can apply Lemma F.2 and obtain

$$P\left(\|\Delta_\rho\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \geq \max_{i=1,\dots,p} \frac{C_7\sqrt{m}B\rho}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_i})} \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}}\right) \leq 2 \exp(-C_8 m \log p). \quad (\text{F.8})$$

*Step 6: Take the union bound.* Combining the results from (F.2), (F.6)–(F.8), we can conclude that

$$P\left(\|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \geq \max_{i=1,\dots,p} \frac{c_2\sqrt{m}B(2\sigma^* + \rho)}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_i})} \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}}\right) \leq 6 \exp(-c_3 m \log p).$$

**Lemma F.2.** Let  $A = \{A_1, \dots, A_p\}$  be a set of  $m \times m$  positive definite matrices, with  $\max_i \sigma_{\max}(A_i) < c_0$ . Define  $\|W\|_{\infty, A} = \max_{i=1, \dots, p} (W_i^\top A_i W_i)^{1/2}$ , with  $W = (W_1^\top, \dots, W_p^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{pm}$  being a stacked vector and  $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ . Let Suppose that  $(W_n \in \mathbb{R}^{pm})_{n=1, \dots, N}$  is strictly stationary, geometrically  $\beta$ -mixing with rate  $\gamma_1$  and is zero-mean. For each  $i = 1, \dots, p$ ,  $W_i$  is sub-Weibull( $\gamma_2$ ) with sub-Weibull norm bounded by  $K_1$ . Define  $1/\gamma = 1/\gamma_1 + 1/\gamma_2$ . There exist constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  depending on  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  such that if  $N = C_1(m \log p)^{2/\gamma-1}$  then

$$P \left( \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N W_n \right\|_{\infty, A} \geq C_2 K_1 c_0 \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}} \right) \leq 2 \exp(-C_3 m \log p).$$

*Proof of Lemma F.2.* Define  $S_W = N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N W_n$  and  $S_{W_i} = N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N W_{n,i}$ , we can write

$$\|S_W\|_{\infty, A} \leq c_0 \|S_W\|_{\infty, 2} = c_0 \max_i \|S_{W_i}\|_2$$

Let  $\mathcal{N}(1/2)$  be the  $1/2$ -net( See chapter 5 of [Wainwright \(2019\)](#)) of a unit ball on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . It follows that for each  $i$ , we can write

$$\|S_{W_i}\|_2 = \sup_{\|u\|_2 \leq 1} u^\top S_{W_i} \leq \sup_{u \in \mathcal{N}(1/2)} |u^\top S_{W_i}| + \frac{1}{2} \|S_{W_i}\|_2. \quad (\text{F.9})$$

Moving the last term in the right hand side to the left hand side, we yield

$$\|S_{W_i}\|_2 \leq 2 \sup_{u \in \mathcal{N}(1/2)} |u^\top S_{W_i}|.$$

Hence, for any  $t > 0$

$$P(\|S_{W_i}\|_2 > 2t) \leq P \left( \sup_{u \in \mathcal{N}(1/2)} |u^\top S_{W_i}| > t \right). \quad (\text{F.10})$$

Since  $\|u^\top S_{W_i}\|_{\psi_{\gamma_2}} \leq \|S_{W_i}\|_{\psi_{\gamma_2}} \leq K_1$  for any  $u \in \mathcal{N}(1/2)$ , we can apply Lemma [I.2](#) and obtain that

$$P(|u^\top S_{W_i}| > t) \leq N \exp \left( -\frac{(tN)^\gamma}{K_1^\gamma C_4} \right) + \exp \left( -\frac{t^2 N}{K_1^2 C_2} \right).$$

Since  $|\mathcal{N}(1/2)| \leq 5^m$ , taking the union bound over all  $u \in \mathcal{N}(1/2)$ , we have

$$P \left( \sup_{u \in \mathcal{N}(1/2)} |u^\top S_{W_i}| > t \right) \leq N 5^m \exp \left( -\frac{(tN)^\gamma}{K_1^\gamma C_4} \right) + 5^m \exp \left( -\frac{t^2 N}{K_1^2 C_2} \right).$$

Then, combining the results of [\(F.9\)](#) and [\(F.10\)](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\|S_W\|_{\infty, A} > 2c_0 t) &\leq P \left( \max_i \sup_{u \in \mathcal{N}(1/2)} |u^\top S_{W_i}| > t \right) \\ &\leq N 5^m p \exp \left( -\frac{(tN)^\gamma}{K_1^\gamma C_4} \right) + 5^m p \exp \left( -\frac{t^2 N}{K_1^2 C_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Select

$$t = K_1 \max \left\{ C_2 \sqrt{\frac{m \log(5p)}{N}}, \frac{C_4}{N} (m \log 5NP)^{1/\gamma} \right\}, \quad (\text{F.11})$$

then we have

$$P(\|S_W\|_{\infty, A} > 2c_0 t) \leq 2 \exp(-c' m \log p),$$

for some constant  $c' > 0$ . Note that if  $N = C_1 (m \log p)^{2/\gamma-1}$ , then the first term in (F.11) dominates because

$$C_2 \sqrt{\frac{m \log(5p)}{N}} \geq \frac{C_4}{N} (m \log 5p)^{1/\gamma}, \quad C_2 \sqrt{\frac{m \log(5p)}{N}} \geq \frac{C_4}{N} (\log N)^{1/\gamma}.$$

Hence, if  $C_1$  is large enough, we have

$$C_2 \sqrt{\frac{m \log(5p)}{N}} \geq \frac{C_4}{N} (m \log 5NP)^{1/\gamma}.$$

Then, we complete the proof.  $\square$

## G Proof of restricted eigenvalue condition

In this section, we want to verify that Assumption 6 holds under mild conditions. We begin with stating the main result.

**Lemma G.1.** *Under the same conditions in Lemma F.1, and let*

$$\mu = \sigma_{\min} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \Psi(t_n) \Psi(t_n)^\top \right] \right).$$

Define  $C_0, C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$  be universal constants and suppose that

$$N \geq \max \left\{ \frac{C_0 B^2 m^4 (\log p)^3}{\mu}, C_1 B^5 \left( \frac{sm}{\mu} \right)^{5/2} \right\}.$$

Then for any  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{pm}$ , with probability at least  $1 - N \exp(-C_2 ms \log p)$  that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \left\{ \nu \widehat{\Psi}(t_n) \right\}^2 \geq \alpha \|\nu\|_2^2 - \tau \|\nu\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi}^2,$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{\mu}{2}, \quad \tau = C_3 m \alpha \left\{ \frac{(\log p)^3 B^2}{\mu N} \right\}^{1/4} \max_{i=1, \dots, p} \sigma_{\min}^{-2}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_i}).$$

## G.1 Proof of Lemma G.1

*Step 1: Uniform concentration over sparse vectors.* Define the set  $\mathcal{K}(s) = \{\nu : \|\nu\|_0 \leq s, \|\nu\|_2 \leq 1\}$ . Let  $W(t_n, \nu) = \sqrt{\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n)} \nu^\top \Psi(t_n)$  for  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}(2sm)$ . By Lemma I.3, we have

$$\|W^2(t_n, \nu)\|_{\psi_{1/2}} \leq 2^2 \|W(t_n, \nu)\|_{\psi_1}^2.$$

Apply Lemma I.3 again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|W(t_n, \nu)\|_{\psi_1} &\leq 2 \|\widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}^{1/2}(t_n)\|_{\psi_2} \|\nu^\top \Psi(t_n)\|_{\psi_2} \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}(2sm)} \sup_{p \geq 1} p^{-1/2} (\mathbb{E} |\nu^\top \Psi(t_n)|^p)^{1/p} \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}(2sm)} \sup_{p \geq 1} p^{-1/2} (\mathbb{E} \|\nu\|_1^p \|\Psi(t_n)\|_\infty^p)^{1/p} \\ &\leq 2B\sqrt{2sm}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can conclude that  $W^2(t_n, \nu) - \mathbb{E}[W^2(t_n, \nu)]$  is a Sub-Weibull( $\gamma_2$ ) variable with  $\gamma_2 = 1/2$  and

$$\|W^2(t_n, \nu) - \mathbb{E}[W^2(t_n, \nu)]\|_{\psi_{1/2}} \leq 2 \|W^2(t_n, \nu)\|_{\psi_{1/2}} \leq 64B^2 sm.$$

Furthermore, following similar argument as *Step 2* in the proof of Lemma F.1,  $W(t_n, \nu)$  is  $\beta$ -mixing with rate  $\gamma_1 = 1$ . Hence, we can compute  $1/\gamma = 1/\gamma_1 + 1/\gamma_2 = 1 + 2 = 3$ . Apply Lemma I.2, we have

$$P \left( \left| N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N W^2(t_n, \nu) - \mathbb{E}[W^2(t_n, \nu)] \right| \geq 2t \right) \leq N \exp \left\{ \frac{-(2tN)^\gamma}{(64B^2 sm)^\gamma C_1} \right\} + \exp \left\{ \frac{-4t^2 N}{(64B^2 sm)^2 C_2} \right\}.$$

Define  $\mathcal{N}(1/2, \pi)$  be a  $1/2$ -net on a support  $\pi \in \Pi = \{\iota \subset \{i : i = 1, \dots, p\} : |\iota| = 2sm\}$ . It follows that  $|\Pi| = \binom{p}{2sm}$ . Then taking union bound over all the possible  $\nu$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \left( \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{N}(1/2, \pi)} \left| N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N W^2(t_n, \nu) - \mathbb{E}[W^2(t_n, \nu)] \right| \geq t \right) &\leq \binom{p}{2sm} 5^{2sm} N \exp \left\{ \frac{-(tN)^\gamma}{(32B^2 sm)^\gamma C_1} \right\} \\ &\quad + \binom{p}{2sm} 5^{2sm} \exp \left\{ \frac{-t^2 N}{(32B^2 sm)^2 C_2} \right\} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{5ep}{2sm} \right)^{2sm} N \exp \left\{ \frac{-(tN)^\gamma}{(32B^2 sm)^\gamma C_1} \right\} \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{5ep}{2sm} \right)^{2sm} \exp \left\{ \frac{-t^2 N}{(32B^2 sm)^2 C_2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} P \left( \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}(2sm)} \left| N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N W^2(t_n, \nu) - \mathbb{E}[W^2(t_n, \nu)] \right| \geq t \right) &\leq N \exp \left\{ \frac{-(tN)^\gamma}{(32B^2 s)^\gamma C_1} + C_3 sm \log p \right\} \\ &\quad + \exp \left\{ \frac{-t^2 N}{(32B^2 s)^2 C_2} + C_3 sm \log p \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C_3 > 0$ .

*Step 2: Uniform concentration over all vectors.* To find the uniform concentration on all vectors, we apply Lemma 12 in [Loh and Wainwright \(2012\)](#), restated in Lemma I.8 and obtain that

$$N^{-1} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N W^2(t_n, \nu) - \mathbb{E}[W^2(t_n, \nu)] \right| \geq 27t \left( \|\nu\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{sm} \|\nu\|_1^2 \right), \quad (\text{G.1})$$

for any  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{pm}$  with probability at least

$$1 - N \exp \left\{ \frac{-(tN)^\gamma}{(32B^2sm)^\gamma C_1} + C_3 sm \log p \right\} - \exp \left\{ \frac{-t^2 N}{(32B^2sm)^2 C_2} + C_3 sm \log p \right\}. \quad (\text{G.2})$$

Recall that  $\sigma_{\min}(N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\hat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \Psi(t_n) \Psi(t_n)^\top]) \leq \mu$ , we can obtain the following inequality from (G.1):

$$N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N W^2(t_n, \nu) \geq \mu \|\nu\|_2^2 - 27t \left( \|\nu\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{sm} \|\nu\|_1^2 \right).$$

Select  $t = \mu/54$ , the above display is equal to

$$= \frac{\mu}{2} \|\nu\|_2^2 - \frac{\mu}{2sm} \|\nu\|_1^2.$$

Note that  $\|\nu\|_1 \leq \sqrt{m} \|\nu\|_{1,2} \leq \max_i (\sqrt{m}/\sigma_{\min}(\hat{K}_{\Psi_i})) \|\nu\|_{1, \hat{K}_{\Psi}}$ , and hence we can further lower bound the above display as

$$\geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|\nu\|_2^2 - \frac{\mu}{2s} \max_{i=1, \dots, p} \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}^2(\hat{K}_{\Psi_i})} \|\nu\|_{1, \hat{K}_{\Psi}}^2.$$

*Step 3: Select parameters.* We want

$$\frac{(tN)^\gamma}{(32B^2sm)^\gamma C_1} \leq \frac{t^2 N}{(32B^2sm)^2 C_2},$$

which implies that

$$N \geq \left( \frac{32B^2sm}{t} \right)^{(2-\gamma)/(1-\gamma)} \left( \frac{C_2}{C_1} \right)^{1/(1-\gamma)} = C_4 B^5 \left( \frac{sm}{\mu} \right)^{5/2},$$

where the last equality follows by plugging  $\gamma = 1/3$  and  $t = \mu/54$  and  $C_4 = (24\sqrt{3})^5 (C_2/C_1)^{3/2}$ . Furthermore, we want

$$2C_3 sm \log p = \frac{(tN)^\gamma}{(32B^2sm)^\gamma C_1}$$

so that (G.2) is at least  $1 - 2N \exp(-C_3 sm \log p)$ . This implies

$$\frac{1}{s} = m(24C_1 C_3)^{3/4} \left\{ \frac{(\log p)^3 B^2}{\mu N} \right\}^{1/4}.$$

Setting  $s \geq 1$ , we have

$$N \geq \frac{C_5 B^2 m^4 (\log p)^3}{\mu},$$

where  $C_5 = (24C_1C_3)^3$ . Finally, let

$$N \geq \max \left\{ \frac{C_5 B^2 m^4 (\log p)^3}{\mu}, C_4 B^5 \left( \frac{sm}{\mu} \right)^{5/2} \right\}.$$

Then,

$$N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N W^2(t_n, \nu) \geq \alpha \|\nu\|_2^2 - \tau \|\nu\|_{1, \widehat{K}_\Psi}^2,$$

where  $\alpha = \mu/2$ ,  $\tau = m\alpha \{C_5 (\log p)^3 B^2 / (\mu N)\}^{1/4} \max_i \sigma_{\min}^{-2}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_i})$  and with probability at least

$$1 - 2N \exp(-C_3 ms \log p).$$

## H Proof of Theorem 4.5

*Proof of Theorem 4.5.* Before the start, we define a quantity

$$\delta_e = \max \{ Nk \exp(-C_8 ms \log p), k \exp(-C_9 m \log p), (Npk + 1) \exp(-C_{10}), k^2 \exp(-C_{11}) \}. \quad (\text{H.1})$$

*Step 1. Recovery of functions.* First, given fixed  $i = 1, \dots, p$  we choose  $\delta = \delta_e/3p$  for some constant  $C_0$  and apply Proposition 4.1

$$P \left( \|\widehat{X}_i - X_i\|^2 > C_0 \left( \frac{\log N + \log p}{N} \right)^{2\alpha/(1+2\alpha)} \right) \leq \frac{\delta_e}{p}.$$

Taking the union bound over all  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , we have

$$P \left( \max_{i=1, \dots, p} \|\widehat{X}_i - X_i\| > C_0 \left( \frac{\log N + \log p}{N} \right)^{\alpha/(1+2\alpha)} \right) \leq \delta_e.$$

Since  $N$  satisfies

$$\frac{N}{\log N + \log p} \gtrsim \left( \frac{BDm}{c_\Psi} \right)^{(2\alpha+1)/\alpha}.$$

Then, we have

$$P \left( \max_{i=1, \dots, p} \|\widehat{X}_i - X_i\| > \frac{c_\Psi}{BDm} \right) \leq \delta_e.$$

*Step 2. Induction on  $\theta_{ij}^\ell$ .* Now, we want to apply Lemma H.1. Suppose that we start with a point  $\Theta^0$  such that  $\Theta^{(0)} \in B(r_0, r_q, r_\sigma, \Theta^*)$ . Given proposed choice of  $N$  and  $r$ , we want to apply Lemma H.1. Define  $\check{\Theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\check{\Theta} \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}(\check{\Theta} \mid \Theta^{(0)})$  and  $\check{\theta}_i^\ell = (\check{\theta}_{i1}^{\ell\top}, \dots, \check{\theta}_{ip}^{\ell\top})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ . We define similarly  $\theta_i^{\ell*} = (\theta_{i1}^{\ell*\top}, \dots, \theta_{ip}^{\ell*\top})$ ,  $\theta_i^{\ell(0)} = (\theta_{i1}^{\ell(0)\top}, \dots, \theta_{ip}^{\ell(0)\top})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ . Denote  $\Theta^{(1)} = M_n(\Theta^{(0)})$  and apply Lemma 4.2, we arrive at

$$\|\check{\theta}_i^\ell - \theta_i^{\ell*}\|_2 < \|\theta_i^{\ell(0)} - \theta_i^{\ell*}\|_2.$$

Taking the maximum on both side,

$$\max_{i,\ell} \|\check{\theta}_{i\cdot}^\ell - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|_2 < \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell(0)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|_2.$$

Therefore, the choice of  $\lambda$  satisfies the condition required by Lemma H.1. Applying Lemma H.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell(1)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|_2 &\leq C_3 c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell(0)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|_2 \\ &+ C_4 \left\{ \frac{m\sqrt{s \log p}}{\sqrt{N}} + ms \left( \frac{\log N + \log p}{N} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)} + \sqrt{ms} (1 - \zeta^2 \pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_\epsilon$ . When  $N, r$  is large enough, we can guarantee that the right hand side is smaller than  $p^{-1/2}r_0$ . Therefore, we can apply Lemma H.1 once more.

Similarly, denote  $\Theta^{(2)} = M_n(\Theta^{(1)})$ ,  $\Theta^{(1)} = M_n(\Theta^{(0)})$  and  $\check{\Theta}^{(1)} = M(\Theta^{(1)})$ . First we want to check that  $\lambda$  satisfies the condition required by Lemma H.1. We denote

$$\lambda^{(1)} \geq \sqrt{m} \max \left\{ C_1 (1 - \zeta \pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1}, C_1 \sqrt{ms} \left( \frac{\log N + \log p}{N} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)}, C_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{ms}} \max_{i,\ell} \|\check{\theta}_{i\cdot}^{\ell(1)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\| \right\}.$$

We want to verify that  $\lambda^{(1)} \leq \lambda$ . This is equivalent as checking

$$\lambda \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \max_{i,\ell} \|\check{\theta}_{i\cdot}^{\ell(1)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|. \quad (\text{H.2})$$

Apply Proposition 4.2, We can write

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \|\check{\theta}_{i\cdot}^{\ell(1)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\| \leq \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{s}} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell(1)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|.$$

Similar to (H.8), we can apply Lemma 4.3 and (H.6) and obtain the upper bound:

$$\leq \kappa 8c_\Psi^{-2} \left( 10\lambda + \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \|\check{\theta}_{i\cdot}^\ell - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\| \right).$$

Apply Proposition 4.2 once more, we can upper bound the above term as

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \kappa 8c_\Psi^{-2} \left( 10\lambda + \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{s}} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell(0)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\| \right) \\ &\leq (80c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa + \kappa^2) \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that  $80c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa + \kappa^2 < 1$  and taking the maximum on both side, we can conclude (H.2).

Iterate the EM-algorithm once more and apply Lemma H.1, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell(2)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|_2 &\leq (C_3 c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa)^2 \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell(0)} - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell\star}\|_2 \\ &+ (1 + C_3 c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa) C_4 \left\{ \frac{m\sqrt{s \log p}}{\sqrt{N}} + ms \left( \frac{\log N + \log p}{N} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)} + \sqrt{ms} (1 - \zeta^2 \pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ .

Hence, if we update the EM-algorithm for  $L$  times, we will have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_i^{\ell(L)} - \theta_{i,\cdot}^{\ell*}\|_2 &\leq (C_3 c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa)^L \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_i^{\ell(0)} - \theta_{i,\cdot}^{\ell*}\|_2 \\ &+ \frac{C_4}{1 - C_3 c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa} \left\{ \frac{m\sqrt{s \log p}}{\sqrt{N}} + ms \left( \frac{\log N + \log p}{N} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)} + \sqrt{ms} (1 - \zeta^2 \pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ .

*Step 3. Induction on  $\sigma$ .* Apply Lemma H.2 and Proposition 4.2, we arrive at

$$\left| \sigma^{(1)2} - \sigma^{*2} \right| \leq \frac{C_5 c_\Psi^{-2} m s r_0^2}{\sqrt{N}} + C_6 k \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} + \kappa \left| \sigma^{(0)2} - \sigma^{*2} \right|,$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta_e$ . Since, from *Step 2*, we know that  $\sum_i \|\theta_i^{\ell(1)} - \theta_{i,\cdot}^{\ell*}\|_2^2 \leq r_0^2$  with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ . Therefore we can apply Lemma H.2 and Proposition 4.2 again. Repeat the steps for  $L - 2$  times, we will have

$$\left| \sigma^{(L)2} - \sigma^{*2} \right| \leq \kappa^L \left| \sigma^{(0)2} - \sigma^{*2} \right| + \frac{1}{1 - \kappa} \left[ \frac{C_5 c_\Psi^{-2} m s r_0^2}{\sqrt{N}} + C_6 k \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} \right],$$

with probability at least  $1 - 3\delta_e$ .

*Step 4. Induction on  $Q$ .* Apply Lemma E.5 to Lemma E.2, we see that

$$\sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \left| q_{\ell\ell'}^{(1)} - q_{\ell\ell'}^* \right| \leq \frac{C_7 k(k-1)}{\sqrt{N}} + \sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} |\check{q}_{\ell\ell'} - q_{\ell\ell'}^*|. \quad (\text{H.3})$$

with probability at least  $1 - k^2 \exp(-C_5) \leq 1 - \delta_e$ . Note that, we can apply Proposition 4.2 to the right hand side of (H.3), and obtain

$$\sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \left| q_{\ell\ell'}^{(1)} - q_{\ell\ell'}^* \right| \leq \frac{C_7 k(k-1)}{\sqrt{N}} + \sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \kappa \left| q_{\ell\ell'}^{(0)} - q_{\ell\ell'}^* \right|, \quad (\text{H.4})$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta_e$ . Noting that  $N$  is selected large enough such that the right hand side of (H.4) is bounded by  $r_q$ . Hence repeat the above steps to analyze the distance of  $\Theta^{(2)} = M_n(\Theta^{(1)})$  to  $\Theta^*$ . Then, we repeat the above steps for  $L - 2$  more times, we arrive at

$$\sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \left| q_{\ell\ell'}^{(L)} - q_{\ell\ell'}^* \right| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \kappa} \frac{C_7 k(k-1)}{\sqrt{N}} + \sum_{\ell \neq \ell'} \kappa^L \left| q_{\ell\ell'}^{(0)} - q_{\ell\ell'}^* \right|,$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta_e$ . □

## H.1 Proof of Corollary 4.6

*Proof of Corollary 4.6.* Since

$$L \geq \frac{\log \epsilon_t - \log 4r_0}{\log(C_3 c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa)},$$

and under the assumptions of Corollary 4.6, it follows that

$$\max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_{i,\ell}^{\ell(L)} - \theta_{i,\ell}^{\ell*}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_t,$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ . This implies that

$$\|\theta_{ij}^{\ell(L)} - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\|_2 \geq \|\theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\|_2 - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_t,$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ . Note that if  $\|\theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\| \neq 0$ , namely  $(j, i) \in E^\ell$ , then  $\|\theta_{ij}^{\ell*}\| \geq (3/2)\epsilon_t$  by construction of  $\epsilon_t$ . Therefore, for every  $(j, i) \in E^\ell$ , then

$$\|\theta_{ij}^{\ell(L)}\|_2 \geq \epsilon_t,$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ . Hence,  $(j, i) \in \widehat{E}^\ell$  with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ . In contrast, for every  $(j, i) \notin E^\ell$

$$\|\theta_{ij}^{\ell(L)}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_t,$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_e$ . □

## H.2 Proof of Lemma H.1

**Lemma H.1.** *Assume Assumption 2, 3, 5, 8–10 hold and let  $C_1, \dots, C_6$  to be some universal constants. Suppose that  $Z(0)$  is sampled from the stationary distribution. Define  $\check{\Theta} = \arg\max_{\check{\Theta} \in \Omega} \mathcal{L}(\check{\Theta} | \Theta)$  and  $\check{\theta}_i^\ell = (\check{\theta}_{i1}^{\ell\top}, \dots, \check{\theta}_{ip}^{\ell\top})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ . Let*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \max_{i,j} |g_j(X_i(t))| \leq B, \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \max_{i,j} |\dot{g}_j(X_i(t))| \leq D,$$

for some absolute constants  $B, D > 0$ . Suppose that  $N \gtrsim \{m^4(\log p)^3 \vee m^{5/2}s^{5/2}\}$ ,  $\max_i \|\widehat{X}_i - X_i\| = \delta_1 \leq c_\Psi(4BDm)^{-1}$  and

$$\lambda \geq C_1 \sqrt{m} \max \left\{ (1 - \zeta \pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1}, \sqrt{ms} \delta_1, \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}} \right\} \vee \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{s}} \max_{i,\ell} \|\check{\theta}_i^\ell - \theta_{i,\ell}^{\ell*}\|$$

Then, we have

$$\max_{i,\ell} \|\widehat{\theta}_i^\ell - \theta_{i,\ell}^{\ell*}\|_2 \leq C_3 c_\Psi^{-2} \kappa \max_{i,\ell} \|\theta_{i,\ell}^\ell - \theta_{i,\ell}^{\ell*}\|_2 + C_4 \left\{ \frac{m \sqrt{s \log p}}{\sqrt{N}} + ms \delta_1 + \sqrt{ms} (1 - \zeta^2 \pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1} \right\},$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2k \max\{N \exp(-C_5 ms \log p), \exp(-C_6 m \log p)\}$ .

*Proof of Lemma H.1.* Define  $C_j$  for  $j = 0, \dots, 9$  be some universal constants. Before the start, we define a quantity

$$\delta_{e_0} = \max \{N \exp(-C_0 m s \log p), 6 \exp(-C_1 m \log p)\}. \quad (\text{H.5})$$

*Step 1. The deviation bound and restricted eigenvalue.* To apply Lemma 4.3, we want to check Assumption 6 holds. Note that since  $\delta_1 \leq c_\Psi (4BDm)^{-1}$ , then by Lemma H.3, we have

$$\max_j \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \geq \frac{c_\Psi}{2}, \quad \max_j \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \leq 2c_\Psi^{-1}. \quad (\text{H.6})$$

This implies that

$$\max_j \frac{\sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j})} \leq 4c_\Psi^{-2}. \quad (\text{H.7})$$

With the above result and under the sample size assumption that  $N \gtrsim \{m^4(\log p)^3 \vee m^{5/2}s^{5/2}\}$ , we can apply Lemma G.1. Then, it follows that Assumption 6 holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta_{e_0}$ .

Next, to verify Assumption 7, we want to show that each of the term  $\|\Delta_w\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*}$ ,  $\|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*}$ ,  $\|\theta^* \Delta_\Psi\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*}$  is well controlled. Lemma E.3 implies that

$$\|\Delta_w\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \leq C\sqrt{m} \{1 - \zeta\pi_{\min}^2\}^{r-1}.$$

Lemma E.4 implies that

$$\|\theta^* \Delta_\Psi\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \leq \frac{4}{c_\Psi} \|\theta^*\|_2 B D m \delta_1 \sqrt{s}.$$

Lastly, Lemma F.1, implies that

$$\|\Delta_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, \widehat{K}_\Psi^*} \leq \frac{C\sqrt{m}B(\sigma + \rho)}{c_\Psi} \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}},$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta_{e_0}$ . Therefore, we can choose

$$\mathbb{Q}(N, p, s, m, r, \delta_1) = C_2 \sqrt{m} \max \left\{ (1 - \zeta\pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1}, \sqrt{ms}\delta_1, \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}} \right\}.$$

Note that  $\mathbb{Q}$  becomes small if we (i) increase  $r$ , (ii) have small enough  $\delta_1$ , which is the error of the nonparametric regression and depends on the sample size  $N$ , and (iii) have large enough sample size  $N$ . We can then conclude that  $\mathbb{Q}$  is well controlled.

*Step 2. Selecting  $\lambda$ .* With the results in the previous step, we are able to select  $\lambda$  as

$$\lambda \geq \sqrt{m} \max \left\{ C_2 (1 - \zeta\pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1}, \sqrt{ms}C_2\delta_1, C_2 \sqrt{\frac{m \log p}{N}}, \frac{C_3}{\sqrt{ms}} \max_{i,\ell} \|\widehat{\theta}_i^\ell - \theta_i^{\ell*}\| \right\},$$

where  $C_2, C_3 > 0$  are some universal constants. Apply Lemma 4.3 and (H.6), we have

$$\|\widehat{\theta}_i^\ell - \theta_i^{\ell*}\|_2 \leq \frac{4c_\Psi^{-1}}{\alpha} \left( 10\lambda\sqrt{s} + \|\widehat{\theta}_i^\ell - \theta_i^{\ell*}\|_2 \right), \quad (\text{H.8})$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta_{e_0}$  and  $\alpha = 2^{-1}\sigma_{\min} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \widehat{w}_{\Theta, \ell}(t_n) \Psi(t_n) \Psi(t_n)^\top \right] \right)$ . Take the maximum over  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , then

$$\max_{i, \ell} \|\widehat{\theta}_{i, \ell}^\ell - \theta_{i, \ell}^{\ell*}\|_2 \leq \frac{4c_\Psi^{-1}}{\alpha} \left( 10\lambda\sqrt{s} + \max_{i, \ell} \|\check{\theta}_{i, \ell}^\ell - \theta_{i, \ell}^{\ell*}\|_2 \right),$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2pk\delta_{e_0}$ .

*Step 3. Combining results.* By definition of  $\lambda$ , we can bound the term  $10\lambda\sqrt{s}$  as

$$10\lambda\sqrt{s} \leq \max \left\{ C_4\sqrt{ms}(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1}, C_4ms\delta_1, C_4m\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{N}}, C_5 \max_{i, \ell} \|\check{\theta}_{i, \ell}^\ell - \theta_{i, \ell}^{\ell*}\| \right\}.$$

Therefore, plug the above equation to (H.8), we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{i, \ell} \|\widehat{\theta}_{i, \ell}^\ell - \theta_{i, \ell}^{\ell*}\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{4c_\Psi^{-1}}{\alpha} \left\{ C_4 \left( \sqrt{ms}(1 - \zeta\pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1} + ms\delta_1 + m\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{N}} \right) + (C_5 + 1) \max_{i, \ell} \|\check{\theta}_{i, \ell}^\ell - \theta_{i, \ell}^{\ell*}\| \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2pk\delta_{e_0}$ .

Apply Lemma 4.2 and under Assumption 10, we can further obtain

$$\max_{i, \ell} \|\widehat{\theta}_{i, \ell}^\ell - \theta_{i, \ell}^{\ell*}\|_2 \leq C_6c_\Psi^{-2}\kappa \max_{i, \ell} \|\theta_{i, \ell}^\ell - \theta_{i, \ell}^{\ell*}\|_2 + C_7 \left\{ \frac{m\sqrt{s \log p}}{\sqrt{N}} + ms\delta_1 + \sqrt{ms} (1 - \zeta^2\pi_{\min}^2)^{r-1} \right\},$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2k \max\{N \exp(-C_8ms \log p), \exp(-C_9m \log p)\}$ .  $\square$

### H.3 Proof of Lemma H.2

**Lemma H.2.** *Under Assumption 2, 3, 5, 8–10. Suppose that  $Z(0)$  is sampled from the stationary distribution. Suppose that  $N \gtrsim \{m^4(\log p)^3 \vee m^{5/2}s^{5/2}\}$ ,  $\max_i \|\widehat{X}_i - X_i\| = \delta_1 \leq c_\Psi(4BDm)^{-1}$  and  $C_0, \dots, C_2 > 0$  be some constants. If  $\sum_{i,j} \|\theta_{i,j}^\ell - \theta_{i,j}^{\ell*}\|_2^2 \leq r_0^2$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ , we have*

$$|\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{*2}| \leq \frac{C_0c_\Psi^{-2}msr_0^2}{\sqrt{N}} + C_1k\zeta^{-8}\pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta\pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} + |\check{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{*2}|,$$

with probability at least  $1 - Npk \exp(-C_2)$ .

*Proof of Lemma H.2.* We want to verify that there exist a valid constant  $c_0$  such that  $R_{n, \ell}, \widehat{R}_{n, \ell}$  defined in (E.9) satisfy  $R_{n, \ell}, \widehat{R}_{n, \ell} \leq c_0^2p$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$  and  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Then, we can apply Lemma E.1. It suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{i, n, \ell} \left| Y_{n, i} - Y_{n-1, i} - \sum_j \theta_{i, j}^\ell \Psi_j(t_n) \right| \leq c_0; \\ & \max_{i, n, \ell} \left| Y_{n, i} - Y_{n-1, i} - \sum_j \theta_{i, j}^\ell \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right| \leq c_0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we can decompose

$$Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_j \theta_{ij}^\ell \Psi_j(t_n) = \varepsilon_{n,i} - \varepsilon_{n-1,i} + \rho_{n,i} - \sum_j (\theta_{ij}^\ell - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}) \Psi_j(t_n).$$

The first two variables are independent centered Gaussian random variables with variance  $2\sigma^{*2}$ . The third variable is  $\rho_{n,i}$  is the bias induced by approximation and is bounded by  $\rho$ . Under the assumptions, (H.7) holds. Hence, we can upper bound the last term of the above equation using Hölder inequality as

$$\left| \sum_j (\theta_{ij}^\ell - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}) \Psi_j(t_n) \right| \leq \|\theta_{i\cdot}^\ell - \theta_{i\cdot}^{\ell*}\|_1 \|\Psi_j(t_n)\|_\infty \leq 20c_\Psi^{-2} \sqrt{msr_0} B,$$

where the last inequality follows from plugging (H.7) into (E.12). Similarly, we have

$$\left| \sum_j (\theta_{ij}^\ell - \theta_{ij}^{\ell*}) \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right| \leq 20c_\Psi^{-2} \sqrt{msr_0} B.$$

Then, there exist a valid finite constant  $c_0 = C_1\sigma^* + \rho + 20c_\Psi^{-2} \sqrt{msr_0} B$  for some universally constant  $C_1$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} P \left( \left| Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_j \theta_{ij}^\ell \Psi_j(t_n) \right| < c_0 \right) &\geq \exp(-C_2); \\ P \left( \left| Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_j \theta_{ij}^\ell \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right| < c_0 \right) &\geq \exp(-C_2). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the union bound over all  $\ell, i, n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \left( \max_{i,n,\ell} \left| Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_j \theta_{ij}^\ell \Psi_j(t_n) \right| > c_0 \right) &\leq 1 - Npk \exp(-C_2); \\ P \left( \max_{i,n,\ell} \left| Y_{n,i} - Y_{n-1,i} - \sum_j \theta_{ij}^\ell \widehat{\Psi}_j(t_n) \right| > c_0 \right) &\leq 1 - Npk \exp(-C_2). \end{aligned}$$

Along with this piece of result and Lemma E.6, we can apply Lemma E.1 and arrive at

$$|\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{*2}| \leq \frac{C_0 \sqrt{sk} c_\Psi^{-1}}{NBD\sqrt{m}} + \frac{(\sigma^*)^2 + \rho^2 + c_\Psi^{-2} msr_0^2 B^2}{\sqrt{N}} + C_1 k \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} + |\check{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{*2}|,$$

with probability at least  $1 - Npk \exp(-C_2)$ . Note that the second term of the above equation dominates the first term, and hence we can simplify the above results as

$$|\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{*2}| \leq \frac{C_0 c_\Psi^{-2} msr_0^2}{\sqrt{N}} + C_1 k \zeta^{-8} \pi_{\min}^{-2} \{1 - (\zeta \pi_{\min})^2\}^{r-1} + |\check{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^{*2}|, \quad (\text{H.9})$$

where  $C_0$  is a constant that depends on  $\sigma^*, \rho, B$ .

□

**Lemma H.3** (Adapted from Lemma 3 in [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#)). *Suppose that Assumption 10 holds, and  $\max_i \|\widehat{X}_i - X_i\| = \max_i \{\int_0^1 (\widehat{X}_i(t) - X_i(t))^2 dt\}^{1/2} = \delta_1$ . Assume that  $|g_j(X_i(t))| \leq B$  and  $|g'_j(X_i(t))| \leq D$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Then,*

$$c_\Psi - 2BDm\delta_1 \leq \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \leq \sigma_{\max}(\widehat{K}_{\Psi_j}) \leq c_\Psi^{-1} + 2BDm\delta_1.$$

## I Useful Lemmas

**Lemma I.1** (Lemma 5 in [Wong et al. \(2020\)](#)). *Let  $X$  be a random variable. Then the following statements are equivalent for every  $\gamma > 0$ . The constants  $K_1, K_2, K_3$  differ from each other at most by a constant depending only on  $\gamma$ .*

1. *The tails of  $X$  satisfy*

$$P(|X| > t) \leq 2 \exp\{-(t/K_1)^\gamma\}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

2. *The moments of  $X$  satisfy*

$$\|X\|_p := (\mathbb{E}|X|^p)^{1/p} \leq K_2 p^{1/\gamma}, \quad p \geq \min(1, \gamma).$$

3. *The moment generating function of  $|X|^\gamma$  is finite:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(|X|/K_3)^\gamma] \leq 2.$$

**Lemma I.2** (Adapted from Lemma 13 in [Wong et al. \(2020\)](#) and Theorem 1 in [Merlevède et al. \(2011\)](#)). *Let  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a strictly stationary sequence of zero mean random variables that are sub-Weibull( $\gamma_2$ ) with sub-Weibull norm  $K$ . Suppose that  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is  $\beta$ -mixing with coefficients satisfying  $\beta(n) \leq 2 \exp(-cn^{\gamma_1})$ . Let  $S_N = \sum_{n=1}^N X_n$  and define  $1/\gamma = 1/\gamma_1 + 1/\gamma_2$ . Assume  $\gamma < 1$ . Then for  $N > 4$  and any  $t > 1/N$ ,*

$$P(|N^{-1}S_N| > t) \leq N \exp\left(-\frac{(tN)^\gamma}{K^\gamma C_1}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{t^2 N}{K^2 C_2}\right),$$

where the constants  $C_1, C_2$  depend only on  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  and  $c$ .

**Definition 16.** *For every  $\gamma > 0$ , the sub-Weibull norm is defined as*

$$\|X\|_{\psi_\gamma} := \sup_{p \geq 1} (\mathbb{E}|X|^p)^{1/p} p^{-1/\gamma}.$$

**Lemma I.3.** *Let  $X$  be a sub-Weibull( $\alpha$ ) random variable and  $Y$  be a sub-Weibull( $\beta$ ) random variable. Let  $1/\gamma = 1/\alpha + 1/\beta$ . Then  $XY$  is a sub-Weibull( $\gamma$ ) random variable with sub-Weibull norm bounded by*

$$\|XY\|_{\psi_\gamma} \leq \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} \|Y\|_{\psi_\beta}.$$

*Proof.* First, by Hölder inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|XY|^p \leq \left(\mathbb{E}|X|^{p\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}} \left(\mathbb{E}|Y|^{p\frac{\beta}{\gamma}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta}}.$$

By taking root- $p$  on both side, we obtain the inequality

$$\|XY\|_p \leq \|X\|_{p\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}} \|Y\|_{p\frac{\beta}{\gamma}}.$$

By definition of the sub-Weibull norm, we can further bound the above term as

$$\|XY\|_p \leq \|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} p^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|Y\|_{\psi_\beta} \left(\frac{\beta}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} p^{\frac{1}{\beta}} = p^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} \|Y\|_{\psi_\beta}.$$

Hence

$$\|XY\|_{\psi_\gamma} = \sup_{p \geq 1} p^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \|XY\|_p \leq \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} \|Y\|_{\psi_\beta}.$$

□

**Lemma I.4.** *Let  $X$  be a sub-Weibull( $\gamma$ ) random variable, we have*

$$\|\mathbb{E}X\|_{\psi_\gamma} \leq \|X\|_{\psi_\gamma}$$

*Proof of Lemma I.4.* Write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}X\|_{\psi_\gamma} &\leq |\mathbb{E}X| \\ &= \|X\|_1 \\ &\leq \|X\|_{\psi_\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma I.5** (Theorem 5.1 in [Bradley \(2005\)](#)). *Suppose that  $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  are  $\sigma$ -fields, The  $\sigma$ -fields  $\sigma(\{\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n\})$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  are independent. Then,*

$$\beta(\sigma(\{\mathcal{A}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}), \sigma(\{\mathcal{B}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\})) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \beta(\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n).$$

**Lemma I.6** (Measurable Mapping of Stationary Process). *Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}))$  and  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}))$  be two measurable spaces and  $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$  denotes the Borel  $\sigma$ -field. Let  $(X_t \in \mathcal{X})_{t \geq 0}$  be a strictly stationary process and  $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be a Borel measurable function. Then,  $(g(X_t) \in \mathcal{Y})_{t \geq 0}$  is strictly stationary.*

*Proof of Lemma I.6.* A stochastic process is called strictly stationary if for any finite set of random variables,  $X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_k}$ , from the stochastic process, the following equation is satisfied

$$(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_k}) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_{t_1+\tau}, \dots, X_{t_k+\tau}), \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

That is, the joint distribution of any finite set of random variables are invariant to times shifts.

Let  $Y_t = g(X_t)$  and write

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y_{t_1} \in B_1, \dots, Y_{t_k} \in B_k) &= P(X_{t_1} \in g^{-1}(B_1), \dots, X_{t_k} \in g^{-1}(B_k)) \\ &= P(X_{t_1+\tau} \in g^{-1}(B_1), \dots, X_{t_k+\tau} \in g^{-1}(B_k)) \\ &= P(Y_{t_1+\tau} \in B_1, \dots, Y_{t_k+\tau} \in B_k). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we complete the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma I.7** (Strictly Stationary Markov Process). *Suppose that  $(X_t \in \mathcal{X})_{t \geq 0}$  is a time-homogeneous Markov process with stationary distribution  $\pi$ . Let  $x_0$  be the initial point sampled from the stationary distribution  $\pi$ . Then, the stochastic process  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  with  $X_0 = x_0$  is a strictly stationary process. Additionally, let  $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be a Borel measurable function. Define the stochastic process  $(Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  as  $Y_n = \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} g(X_u) du$ , where  $t_n - t_{n-1} = h$  for some fixed  $h > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then,  $(Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a strictly stationary process.*

*Proof of Lemma I.7.* To show the first statement, we use the Markov property. Without the loss of generality, assume  $t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_k$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_k}) &= P(X_{t_k} | X_{t_{k-1}}) P(X_{t_{k-1}} | X_{t_{k-2}}) \cdots P(X_{t_2} | X_{t_1}) P(X_{t_1}) \\ &= P(X_{t_k+\tau} | X_{t_{k-1}+\tau}) P(X_{t_{k-1}+\tau} | X_{t_{k-2}+\tau}) \cdots P(X_{t_2+\tau} | X_{t_1+\tau}) P(X_{t_1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $P(X_0) = \pi$ , we have  $P(X_{t_1}) = P(X_{t_1+\tau}) = \pi$ , therefore we can write the above term as

$$\begin{aligned} &= P(X_{t_k+\tau} | X_{t_{k-1}+\tau}) P(X_{t_{k-1}+\tau} | X_{t_{k-2}+\tau}) \cdots P(X_{t_2+\tau} | X_{t_1+\tau}) P(X_{t_1+\tau}) \\ &= P(X_{t_1+\tau}, \dots, X_{t_k+\tau}). \end{aligned}$$

To show the second statement, we first condition on  $X_{t_0} = x$  and write

$$P(Y_1, \dots, Y_k | X_{t_0} = x) = P\left(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} X_u du, \dots, \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} X_u du \mid X_{t_0} = x\right).$$

Apply the time-homogeneous Markov property, we can write the above term as

$$\begin{aligned} &= P\left(\int_{t_s}^{t_{s+1}} X_u du, \dots, \int_{t_{s+k-1}}^{t_{s+k}} X_u du \mid X_{t_s} = x\right) \\ &= P(Y_{s+1}, \dots, Y_{s+k} | X_{t_s} = x) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $P(X_{t_0}) = P(X_{t_s})$ , we can write

$$P(Y_1, \dots, Y_k | X_{t_0}) P(X_{t_0}) = P(Y_{s+1}, \dots, Y_{s+k} | X_{t_s}) P(X_{t_s}).$$

Marginalize both side, we obtain

$$P(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) = P(Y_{s+1}, \dots, Y_{s+k}).$$

$\square$

**Lemma I.8** (Lemma 12 in [Loh and Wainwright \(2012\)](#)). Denote the set  $\mathbb{K}(s) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|v\|_0 \leq s, \|v\|_2 \leq 1\}$ . Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  be a fixed matrix,  $\delta > 0$  be the tolerance. Suppose that

$$|\nu^\top A \nu| \leq \delta \quad \forall \nu \in \mathbb{K}(2s).$$

Then

$$|\nu^\top A \nu| \leq 27\delta (\|\nu\|_2^2 + s^{-1}\|\nu\|_1^2).$$

## J Details about data generation process

In this section, we provide details about the data generation process.

### J.1 Details of data generation process

The parameters of (5.1)–(5.2) are discussed in below. In state  $\ell = 1$ , for each  $i = 1, \dots, 10$ , we have the following parameter:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{11}^{1\star} &= (1.2, 0.3, -0.6), \theta_{12}^{1\star} = (0.1, 0.2, 0.2); \\ \theta_{21}^{1\star} &= (-2.0, 0.0, 0.4), \theta_{22}^{1\star} = (0.5, 0.2, -0.3); \\ \theta_{33}^{1\star} &= (0.0, 0.0, 0.0), \theta_{34}^{1\star} = (-0.3, 0.4, 0.1); \\ \theta_{43}^{1\star} &= (0.2, -0.1, -0.2), \theta_{44}^{1\star} = (0.0, 0.0, 0.0); \\ \theta_{55}^{1\star} &= (0.0, 0.0, 0.0), \theta_{56}^{1\star} = (0.1, 0.0, -0.8); \\ \theta_{65}^{1\star} &= (0.0, 0.0, 0.5), \theta_{66}^{1\star} = (0.0, 0.0, 0.0). \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining parameters, we have  $\theta_{ij}^{1\star} = (0.0, 0.0, 0.0)$ . The graph associated with state  $\ell = 1$  is presented in Figure 7. In the second state  $\ell = 2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{55}^{2\star} &= (1.2, 0.3, -0.6), \theta_{56}^{2\star} = (0.1, 0.2, 0.2); \\ \theta_{65}^{2\star} &= (-2.0, 0.0, 0.4), \theta_{66}^{2\star} = (0.5, 0.2, -0.3); \\ \theta_{77}^{2\star} &= (0.0, 0.0, 0.0), \theta_{78}^{2\star} = (-0.3, 0.4, 0.1); \\ \theta_{87}^{2\star} &= (0.2, -0.1, -0.2), \theta_{88}^{2\star} = (0.0, 0.0, 0.0); \\ \theta_{99}^{2\star} &= (0.0, 0.0, 0.0), \theta_{910}^{2\star} = (0.1, 0.0, -0.8); \\ \theta_{10}^{2\star} &= (0.0, 0.0, 0.5), \theta_{1010}^{2\star} = (0.0, 0.0, 0.0). \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining parameters, we have  $\theta_{ij}^{2\star} = (0.0, 0.0, 0.0)$ . The graph associated with state  $\ell = 1$  is presented in Figure 8. Given the initial state  $X(0)$  and  $Q^\star$  stated in Section 5, the simulated trajectories are presented in Figure 9.




Figure 7: The graph associated with state  $\ell = 1$  has self-loops on nodes  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , and bidirectional edge between nodes  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ ,  $X_3$  and  $X_4$ ,  $X_5$  and  $X_6$ .




Figure 8: The graph associated with state  $\ell = 2$  has self-loops on nodes  $X_5$  and  $X_6$ , and bidirectional edge between nodes  $X_5$  and  $X_6$ ,  $X_7$  and  $X_8$ ,  $X_9$  and  $X_{10}$ .




Figure 9: The simulated trajectories associated with the data generation process 1 defined in (5.1)–(5.2) and parameters defined in Section J.1. The blue solid lines denote  $X_i(t)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 10$ , the black dots denote the discrete noisy observations of  $Y_{n,i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 10$  and  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , and the grey dashed lines denote the time that the hidden Markov chain  $Z(t)$  switches states.




Figure 10: The graph of state 1 of the data generation process 2.




Figure 11: The graph of state 2 of the data generation process 2.




Figure 12: The simulated trajectories associated with the data generation process 2 defined in (5.3)–(5.7) and parameters defined in Section J.1. We plot the first half of the session  $T = [0, 20]$  of the entire session  $T = [0, 40]$  and the first 10 nodes of the entire set of nodes  $p = 20$ . The blue solid lines denote  $X_i(t)$ , the black dots denote the discrete noisy observations of  $Y_{n,i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 10$  and  $n = 1, \dots, N/2$ , and the grey dashed lines denote the time that the hidden Markov chain  $Z(t)$  switches states.

## References

- M. Bladt and M. Sørensen. Statistical inference for discretely observed markov jump processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 67(3):395–410, 2005.
- R. C. Bradley. Basic Properties of Strong Mixing Conditions. A Survey and Some Open Questions. *Probability Surveys*, 2(none):107 – 144, 2005.
- L. D. Brown and T. T. Cai. Wavelet shrinkage for nonequispaced samples. *The Annals of Statistics*, 26(5):1783–1799, 1998.
- S. Chen, A. Shojaie, and D. M. Witten. Network reconstruction from high-dimensional ordinary differential equations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(520):1697–1707, 2017.
- D. B. Cline and H. P. Huay-min. Verifying irreducibility and continuity of a nonlinear time series. *Statistics & probability letters*, 40(2):139–148, 1998.
- Y. A. Davydov. Mixing conditions for markov chains. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 18(2):312–328, 1974.
- R. Khasminskii. *Stochastic stability of differential equations*, volume 66. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.

- Y.-Y. Liu, S. Li, F. Li, L. Song, and J. M. Rehg. Efficient learning of continuous-time hidden markov models for disease progression. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- P.-L. Loh and M. J. Wainwright. High-dimensional regression with noisy and missing data: Provable guarantees with nonconvexity. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(3):1637 – 1664, 2012.
- H. Masuda. Ergodicity and exponential  $\beta$ -mixing bounds for multidimensional diffusions with jumps. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 117(1):35–56, 2007.
- F. Merlevède, M. Peligrad, and E. Rio. A bernstein type inequality and moderate deviations for weakly dependent sequences. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 151(3-4):435–474, 2011.
- S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. Stability of markovian processes i: Criteria for discrete-time chains. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 24(3):542–574, 1992.
- S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. Stability of markovian processes iii: Foster–lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 25(3):518–548, 1993a.
- S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. Stability of markovian processes ii: Continuous-time processes and sampled chains. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 25(3):487–517, 1993b.
- S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. *Markov chains and stochastic stability*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- A. V. Skorokhod. *Asymptotic methods in the theory of stochastic differential equations*, volume 78. American Mathematical Soc., 2009.
- R. van Handel. Hidden markov models. *Unpublished lecture notes*, 2008.
- M. Vidyasagar. *Learning and generalisation: with applications to neural networks*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- M. J. Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- K. C. Wong, Z. Li, and A. Tewari. Lasso guarantees for  $\beta$ -mixing heavy-tailed time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):1124 – 1142, 2020.
- F. Yang, S. Balakrishnan, and M. J. Wainwright. Statistical and computational guarantees for the baum-welch algorithm. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):4528–4580, 2017.
- G. Yin and C. Zhu. *Hybrid Switching Diffusions: Properties and Applications*, volume 63. Springer, 2010.
- B. Yu. Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 94–116, 1994.
- C. Yuan and X. Mao. Asymptotic stability in distribution of stochastic differential equations with markovian switching. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 103(2):277–291, 2003.