



Figure 1: The distribution of feasibility values given the approach.

### 0.0.1 Results

With all the configurations in mind we compare the distribution of the dataset with the distribution drawn from samples from the distribution. The configuration which best represent the data distribution is the best candidate for the next experimental steps. For this purpose, compute we the feasibility values for the Log’s cases for the whole training dataset. Additionally, we sample the same number of values using our distributional approach. We show their distributions in Figure 1.

As the figure is difficult to interpret, we also compute various distances using the same subsets of data. The Kolgomorov-Smirnoff Test (KST) is particularly interesting as it is a common method to compute the difference between two distributions.

Table 1 shows that the third approach yields lower distances accross all distance methods employed.

### 0.0.2 Discussion

As the best configuration seems to be the **CountBased-Grouped- $\chi^2$**  approach, we continue with this configuration for the subsequent experiments.

However, it is important to stress that the proposed way of estimating the data distribution is one of many. The markovian approach explicitly removes

Table 1: The computation of various distances. Showing that the combination of Countbased Transition Estimation and the Grouped- $\chi^2$  approach consistently yields lower distances.

Eval-Method	Transition Approach	Emmision Approach	value
KS-Test	CountBased	GroupedMixture	0.411523
KS-Test	CountBased	GroupedMixture- $\chi^2$	0.353909
KS-Test	CountBased	IndependentMixture	0.419753
L2	CountBased	GroupedMixture	0.000004
L2	CountBased	GroupedMixture- $\chi^2$	0.000000
L2	CountBased	IndependentMixture	0.000004
L1	CountBased	GroupedMixture	0.000033
L1	CountBased	GroupedMixture- $\chi^2$	0.000000
L1	CountBased	IndependentMixture	0.000031
Correlation	CountBased	GroupedMixture	1.004166
Correlation	CountBased	GroupedMixture- $\chi^2$	1.004104
Correlation	CountBased	IndependentMixture	1.010678

the effect of past and future states. It is needless to say, a process step does not have to depend on its immediate previous state. A process outcome may be influenced by all past or future events. For instance, if one has to approve a loan in a second stage, one might be more inclined to approve something that a trusted employee already approved. Likewise, one might apply more scrutiny, knowing that a certain supervisor is going to approve the third stage.

Furthermore, this approach assumes strictly sequential processes. If the sequence has events running in parallel, we also have to record in greater detail which event has triggered a subsequent event in a given sequence. Often this knowledge is not even available.

**Mention to Discuss issue with underflow**