SUC. 1.1 SMC summay 1

Good. Focusing on shale space nodels (SSMs) summare the doordopnont from sagnertial importance sompling to analogy postule. Ellow.

Cowell setting

SSM, Markon model for state xt, xt, xt, x)

state Xt | Xt, = xt, ~ P (xt | xt, | 0)

wensue and Xt | Xt = xt ~ P (xt | xt, | 0)

Typically two distributions of interest

filtering distributions p (xt | x, | 0)

Joint filtering distributions p (xt | x, | 0)

The lasts that p(xo; y|0) = p (xy | xy, | 0)

The lasts that p(xo; y|0) = p (xy | xy, | 0)

The lasts that p(xo; y|0) = p (xy | xy, | 0)

The lasts that p(xo; y|0) = p (xy | xy, | 0) p(xo; y|0) = first lasts points for x, | xt, | y, | 0)

p(x++, /y++,0) = Sp(x++, x+/y, +,0)dx+= = Sp(x++,1x+,0)p(x+/y,+,0)dx+

Additionedy: (and powerless from now or.) $\rho(x_0, x_1, \chi_1, y_2) = \rho(x_1, \chi_2 + |x_0, y_2, |\chi_1, y_2, |) \rho(x_0, y_2, |\chi_1, y_2, |)$ conditioned $\rho(x_0, x_1, \chi_1, y_2) = \rho(x_1, \chi_2 + |x_0, y_2, |\chi_1, y_2, |) \rho(x_2 + |x_1, \chi_1, y_2, |)$ conditioned $\rho(x_0, x_1, \chi_1, y_2) = \rho(x_1 + |x_2, |\chi_1, y_2, |) \rho(x_2 + |x_2, |\chi_1, |) \rho(x_2 + |x_2, |) \rho(x_2 + |x_2, |\chi_2, |\chi_2, |) \rho(x_2 + |\chi_2, |\chi_2,$

Don't Sibrey Libbbon

p(x1; 1) = p(x1, 1) =

The joint filtering distribution has a some chot casion recursion than the filtery distribution

unomelized density and I is the nomelisation constant, (et #(x) = \(\frac{\infty}{2}\) , More # is a galf, & is the By choosing an appropriate proposal clausely of Important sampling Le com oppreximate

= /2 { f(x) · J(x) · n (x) dx ETET3 = 2 S P(x) x(x)dx =

There integuls and be solved via Monte Carlo methods by replacing of (x) by 2 & Exi(x) It also holds that 2 = 5 w(x)y, (x)dx. where $X' \sim \eta(x)$.

This leads to

E+C+3 = 2 & f(xi) ~ (xi) and

2 ~ 2 ~ (xi).
Self-noundesing IS: Replace & by approximation

[f] & Z S(x) P(xi) (nonnelized)
whose S(xi) = Z S(xi) (nonnelized)

p(x+1x12) & p(x+1x+) (p(x+1x+1)p(x+1)p(x+1)x+1)dx+1 Replace po(x0) ~ p(x,1x,1) & wo p(x,1x0). Hore: \(\gamma_1(x_1) \) approx. \(\gamma_1 | \x_1) \) \(\frac{\pi}{2} \) \(\gamma_0 | \gamma_1 | \x_2) \) We want to use the securive propart of Applying this idea to play byin! (1) p(x0 | x1,0) = p(x0) = 20(x0) the tough downity;

(hoose proposed m_1 , then $\omega_{\lambda} = \frac{\chi_{\lambda}(x_{\lambda})}{\chi_{\lambda}(x_{\lambda})} \quad \text{there} \quad \chi_{\lambda}^{1} \sim \chi_{\lambda}^{1} (.)$ $\text{The coin closse } \chi_{\lambda}^{1} (x_{\lambda}) = \frac{N}{2} \widetilde{\omega}_{\delta}^{1} \rho(x_{\lambda}^{1} | x_{\delta}^{1}).$ That, borever, is known as the boolshaps This introduces terempty and propagation. pendide filler. Applying the IS iden to SMC. 1.3]
the joint filtering distribution: p(x0+1/x1+)
Try to make use of recursion again:
p(x0+1/x1+) & p(x+1/x+1)·p(x+1/x+1)·p(x0+1/x1+1)

1) $p(x_0, 0 \mid y_{1,0}) = p(x_0) \mid y_{1,0}$ Choose $m_0(x_0) = p(x_0)$ then $p(x_0) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{Z}_i \delta_{x_i}(x_0)$ $\delta_i = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{x_i}(x_0)$

2) p(x0;1 | x;1) & p(x, |x,) p(x, |x,) p(x, 0) Assume 2, (x0;1) = n(x, |x0) 20(x0)
Ue con reuse the souples for 20 from step 1

Use converse he souples for no from shop 1.

Let { \(\tilde{\pi_0} \) \(\tilde{\pi_0

As we have som, this look to the degenerary of the wights: Most of them almost zone and only one or vary few close to 1.

Irobben: Wi = &u (x,,, x,) uis

Resompting from Expired a coconding to of wind answer

This algorithm is some times called the "Sequential Importance Resemply".

We arrived at a natural SUC.1.4

proposed for the bilbony problem, that lead to the tookshop postide filter and already contained recomply to the complete step, the recompling step, the recomplication step, the recompling step, the recompling step, the

In case of the joint filtery problem, we inhoduced a posemply step as ~ Cat(1 wins) and used

the proposed yn(xoin) = yn(xulxun) p(xoinn |ynun)

i.e. xi ~ m.(. | xun) p(xoinn | ynun)

Mehing the resompting explicit, re got m (xo:u, au) = m (xu | au) p(au) = = mu(xu | xum) p(xo:um) p(xo:um) · win

15 a proposed for p(xu|xu) p(xu|xun) p(xu|xun) p(au).

Alles some none generally in the proposed for the MAF.

and in SIR.

no (xon, an) = no (xu | xun,) Can p(xo, -1) / yun)

We then god for the use wights populari) p(xi |xii)
Filhing prother: wir = very p(xu |xi) p(xi |xii)
Gradles York Filhing

This makes the particle fill along used to downthis used to downty exactly equal.

Exemple Tentide Film
Choose vin x win p(xh | xhen) , i= 1,-, N

Yn(xn | xn-n) = p(xn | xn-n | xn)

The win = 2 for all i= 1,-, N and all is

Usk:

Lose of the filting poly

Loget p(xn, and yrm) ap(yn | xn) p(xn, on | yrm)

= p(yn | xn) \frac{2}{2} p(xn, xn, qn | yrm) =

= p(yn | xn) \frac{2}{2} p(xn, xn, qn | yrm) =

= p(yn | xn) \frac{2}{2} p(xn, xn, qn | yrm) =

The idea belond the contrary particle filts is to incoporate the ancestor intex into the postlem and to antime that we can close past stokes only from the annieste are, thus bould to a stylelly different drups distribution. For large N both thould salve the same problem.