TECHNISCHE
UNIVERSITÄT
DARMSTADT

Fachbereich Elektrotechnik und Informationstechnik
Bioinspired Communication Systems

Bayesian Inference of Information Transfer in Graph-Based Continuous-Time Multi-Agent Systems

Master-Thesis
Elektro- und Informationstechnik

Eingereicht von

Gizem Ekinci

am
07.07.2020

1. Gutachten: Prof. Dr. techn. Heinz Koeppl
2. Gutachten: Dominik Linzner

Erklärung zur Abschlussarbeit gemäß §22 Abs. 7 und §23 Abs. 7 APB TU Darmstadt

Hiermit versichere ich, Gizem Ekinci, die vorliegende Arbeit gemäß §22 Abs. 7 APB der TU Darmstadt ohne Hilfe Dritter und nur mit den angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmitteln angefertigt zu haben. Alle Stellen, die Quellen entnommen wurden, sind als solche kenntlich gemacht worden. Diese Arbeit hat in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form noch keiner Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegen. Mir ist bekannt, dass im Falle eines Plagiats (§38 Abs.2 APB) ein Täuschungsversuch vorliegt, der dazu führt, dass die Arbeit mit 5,0 bewertet und damit ein Prüfungsversuch verbraucht wird. Abschlussarbeiten dürfen nur einmal wiederholt werden. Bei der abgegebenen Arbeit stimmen die schriftliche und die zur Archivierung eingereichte elektronische Fassung gemäß §23 Abs. 7 APB überein.

English translation for information purposes only:

Thesis statement pursuant to §22 paragraph 7 and §23 paragraph 7 of APB TU Darmstadt:
I herewith formally declare that I, Gizem Ekinci, have written the submitted thesis independently pursuant to §22 paragraph 7 of APB TU Darmstadt. I did not use any outside support except for the quoted literature and other sources mentioned in the paper. I clearly marked and separately listed all of the literature and all of the other sources which I employed when producing this academic work, either literally or in content. This thesis has not been handed in or published before in the same or similar form. I am aware, that in case of an attempt at deception based on plagiarism (§38 Abs. 2 APB), the thesis would be graded with 5,0 and counted as one failed examination attempt. The thesis may only be repeated once. In the submitted thesis the written copies and the electronic version for archiving are pursuant to § 23 paragraph 7 of APB identical in content.

Darmstadt, den 07.07.2020

(Gizem Ekinci)

Abstract

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Etiam lobortis facilisis sem. Nullam nec mi et neque pharetra sollicitudin. Praesent imperdiet mi nec ante. Donec ullamcorper, felis non sodales commodo, lectus velit ultrices augue, a dignissim nibh lectus placerat pede. Vivamus nunc nunc, molestie ut, ultricies vel, semper in, velit. Ut porttitor. Praesent in sapien. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Duis fringilla tristique neque. Sed interdum libero ut metus. Pellentesque placerat. Nam rutrum augue a leo. Morbi sed elit sit amet ante lobortis sollicitudin. Praesent blandit blandit mauris. Praesent lectus tellus, aliquet aliquam, luctus a, egestas a, turpis. Mauris lacinia lorem sit amet ipsum. Nunc quis urna dictum turpis accumsan semper.

Contents

List of Symbols

χ	state space of random variable X
$X(t)$	value of random variable X at time t
$X^{[0,T]}$	discrete valued trajectory of random variable X in time interval $[0,T]$
$\mathbf{X}^T$	transpose of matrix/vector $\mathbf{X}$

List of Figures

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

1.2 Related Work

1.3 Contributions

1.4 Structure of the Thesis

2 Foundations

This chapter presents the theory applied in this thesis. First, the details of the communication problem is described briefly to put the theory into perspective, and then the mathematical theory of the frameworks used to model this problem is introduced.

2.1 Problem Formulation

The communication model considered in this thesis is given in Figure 2.1. The parent nodes, X_1 and X_2, emit messages which carry information about their states. These messages are translated by an observation model, ψ, and agent node, X_3 makes a decision based on this translated message, y. The main objective is to infer the observation model given set of trajectories of nodes.



Figure 2.1: Communication model.

The transition models of the nodes and the dependencies between them are modelled as continuous-time Bayesian network (CTBN), denoted by $\mathbf{X}$. The network $\mathbf{X}$ represents a stohastic process over a structured multivariate state space $\mathcal{X} = [\mathcal{X}_1, ..., \mathcal{X}_n]$.

The messages that are emitted by the parent nodes X_1 and X_2 are modelled as independent homogeneous continuous-time Markov processes $X_i(t)$, with state space $\mathcal{X}_i = \{x_1, x_2, ..., x_n\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

The agent node X_3 does not have a direct access to the messages, but observes a translation of them. The observation model is defined as the likelihood of a translation given the parent messages.

$$\psi := p(y(t) \mid X_1(t), X_2(t)) \tag{2.1}$$

The agent X_3 is modelled as inhomogenouos continuous-time Markov process with state space $\mathcal{X}_3 = \{x_1, x_2, ..., x_n\}$ and set of actions $a \in \{a_0, a_1, ..., a_k\}$ to choose from.

Given the observation, the agent forms a belief over the parent states, $b(x_1, x_2; t)$, that summarizes the past observations.[1] The policy of the agent, $\pi(a \mid b)$, is assumed to be shaped by evolution (close) to optimality. Based on the belief state, the agent takes an action, which in the setting described above means to change its internal dynamics.

2.2 Continuous Time Bayesian Networks

A continuous-time Bayesian network (CTBN) is a graphical model that represents a collection of nodes whose values evolve continuously over time. In CTBN framework, through a directed graph, the dependencies of a set of Markov processes (MPs) can be modelled efficiently relying on two assumptions. First assumption is that only one node can transition at a time. Secondly, the instantenous dynamics of each node depends only on its parent nodes. [2, 3]

2.2.1 Continuous Time Markov Processes

A continuous-time Markov process (CTMP) is a continuous-time stochastic process which satisfies Markov property, namely, the probability distribution over the states at a future time is conditionally independent of the past states given the current state.[2] Let X be a CTMP with state space $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, ..., x_n\}$. Then the Markov property can be written as follows:

$$\Pr\left(X^{(t_k)} = x_{t_k} | X^{(t_{k-1})} = x_{t_{k-1}}, \ldots, X^{(t_0)} = x_{t_0}\right) = \Pr\left(X^{(t_k)} = x_{t_k} | X^{(t_{k-1})} = x_{t_{k-1}}\right) \quad (2.2)$$

A CTMP is represented by its transition intensity matrix, $\mathbf{Q}$. In this matrix, the intensity q_i represents the instantaneous probability of leaving state x_i and $q_{i,j}$ represents the instantaneous probability of switching from state x_i to x_j.

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} -q_1 & q_{1,2} & \cdots & q_{1,n} \\ q_{2,1} & -q_2 & \cdots & q_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ q_{n,1} & q_{n,2} & \cdots & -q_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.3)$$

where $q_i = \sum_{i \neq j} q_{i,j}$.[3]

2.2.1.1 Homogenous Continuous Time Markov Processes

A continuous-time Markov process is time-homogenous when the transition intensities do not depend on time. Let X be a homogenous CTMP, with transition intensity matrix $\mathbf{Q}_X$. Infinitesimal transition probability from state x_i to x_j in terms of the transition intensities $q_{i,j}$ can be written as [2]:

$$p_{i,j}(h) = \delta_{ij} + q_{i,j}h + o(h) \quad (2.4)$$

where $p_{i,j}(h) \equiv Pr(X(t+h) = x_j \mid X(t) = x_i)$ are Markov transition functions, $\delta_{i,j} = \delta(x_i, x_j)$ is Kronecker delta and o(.) is a function decaying to zero faster than its argument.

The *master equation* is then derived as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_j(t) &= \Pr(X(t) = x_j) \\
&= \sum_{\forall i} p_{i,j}(h) p_i(t-h) \\
\lim_{h\to 0} p_j(t) &= \lim_{h\to 0} \sum_{\forall i} \left[\delta_{ij} + q_{i,j}h + o(h)\right] p_i(t-h) \\
&= \lim_{h\to 0} p_j(t-h) + \lim_{h\to 0} h \sum_{\forall i} q_{i,j} p_i(t-h) \\
\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{p_j(t) - p_j(t-h)}{h} &= \lim_{h\to 0} \sum_{\forall i} q_{i,j} p_i(t-h) \\
\frac{d}{dt} p_j(t) &= \sum_{\forall i} q_{i,j} p_i(t) \qquad (2.5)
\end{aligned}
$$

Equation 2.5 can be written in matrix form:

$$
\frac{d}{dt} p(t) = p(t)\mathbf{Q} \qquad (2.6)
$$

where the time-dependent probability distribution $p(t)$ is a row vector with entries $p_i(t)_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}}$. The solution of this ODE is,

$$
p(t) = p(0)\exp(t\mathbf{Q}) \qquad (2.7)
$$

with initial distribution $p(0)$.

The amount of time staying in a state x_i is exponentially distributed with parameter q_i. The probability density function f and cumulative distribution function F for staying in the state x_i [3]:

$$
f(t) = q_i \exp(-q_i t), t \geq 0 \qquad (2.8)
$$

$$
F(t) = 1 - \exp(-q_i t), t \geq 0 \qquad (2.9)
$$

Given the transitioning from state x_i, the probability of landing on state x_j is $q_{i,j}/q_i$.

Likelihood Function Consider a single transition denoted as $d =< x_i, x_j, t >$, where transition occurs from state x_i to x_j after spending t amount of time at state x_i. The likelihood of this transition is the product of the probability of having remained at state x_i for that long, and the probability of transitioning to x_j.

$$
\Pr(d \mid \mathbf{Q}) = (q_i exp(-q_i t))\left(\frac{q_{i,j}}{q_i}\right) \qquad (2.10)
$$

The likelihood of a trajectory sampled from a homogenous CTMC, $X^{[0,T]}$, can be decomposed as the product of the likelihood of single transitions. The sufficient statistics summarizing this trajectory can be written as $T[x_i]$, total amount of time spent in state x_i, $M[x_i, x_j]$ total number of transitions from state x_i to x_j. Then the likelihood of a trajectory $X^{[0,T]}$ can be written as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pr(X^{[0,T]} \mid \mathbf{Q}) &= \prod_{d \in X^{[0,T]}} \Pr(d \mid \mathbf{Q}) \\
&= \left(\prod_i q_i^{M[x_i]} \exp\left(-q_i T[x_i]\right) \right) \left(\prod_i \prod_{j \neq i} \left(\frac{q_{i,j}}{q_i} \right)^{M[x_i,x_j]} \right) \\
&= \prod_{j \neq i} exp(-q_{i,j} T[x_i]) \; q_{i,j}^{M[x_i,x_j]}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}
$$

where $M[x_i] = \sum_{j \neq i} M[x_i, x_j]$ is the total number transitions leaving state x_i.

2.2.1.2 Conditional Markov Processes

A continuous-time Markov process is *time-inhomogenous* when the transition intensities changes over time. In a CTBN, while every node is a Markov process, the leaf nodes are characterized as *conditional* Markov processes, a type of inhomogeneous MP, where the intensities change over time, but not as a function of time rather as a function of parent states. [3]

Let X be a conditional Markov process, with a set of parents $\mathbf{U} = Par(X)$. Its intensity matrix, *conditional intensity matrix*, $\mathbf{Q}_{X \mid \mathbf{U}}$ can be viewed as a set of homogenous intensity matrices $\mathbf{Q}_{X \mid \mathbf{u}}$, with entries $q_{i,j|\mathbf{u}}$ (similar to Equation 2.3), for each instantiation of parent nodes $\mathbf{U}(t) = \mathbf{u}$.[3] As a result, given a trajectory of parent nodes, X has a trajectory of intensity matrix as a combination of these homogenous matrices.

$$
\mathbf{Q}^{[0,T]} = [\mathbf{Q}_{X \mid \mathbf{U}(t_0)}, \mathbf{Q}_{X \mid \mathbf{U}(t_1)}, ..., \mathbf{Q}_{X \mid \mathbf{U}(t_N)}], \;\; 0 < t_0 < t_1 < ... < t_N \leq T \tag{2.12}
$$

Markov transition function for a conditional Markov process can be written as follows:

$$
\Pr(X(t+h) = x_j \mid X(t) = x_i, \mathbf{U}(t) = u, \mathbf{Q}_{X \mid \mathbf{u}}) = \delta(i,j) + q_{i,j|\mathbf{u}} h + o(h) \tag{2.13}
$$

Likelihood Function Given the instantiation of its parents, the complete information on the dynamics of X is obtained. Then the likelihood of a trajectory drawn from a conditional MP X can be written similar to Equation 2.11,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pr(X^{[0,T]} \mid \mathbf{Q}_{X \mid \mathbf{U}}) &= \left(\prod_{\mathbf{u}} \prod_i q_{i|\mathbf{u}}^{M[x_i|\mathbf{u}]} \exp\left(-q_{i|\mathbf{u}} T[x_i \mid \mathbf{u}]\right) \right) \left(\prod_{\mathbf{u}} \prod_i \prod_{j \neq i} \left(\frac{q_{i,j|\mathbf{u}}}{q_{i|\mathbf{u}}} \right)^{M[x_i,x_j|\mathbf{u}]} \right) \\
&= \prod_{\mathbf{u}} \prod_{j \neq i} exp(-q_{i,j|\mathbf{u}} T[x_i \mid \mathbf{u}]) \; q_{i,j|\mathbf{u}}^{M[x_i,x_j|\mathbf{u}]}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}
$$

with the sufficient statistics introduced in section 2.2.1.1 are also conditioned on parent nodes.

2.2.2 The CTBN Model

Evidently, a homogenouos CTMP can be considered as a conditional MP whose set of parents is empty. Thus, a CTBN can be formed as a set of conditional Markov processes.

Let $\mathbf{X}$ be a CTBN with local variables X_n, $n \in \{1, ...N\}$, each with a state space $\mathcal{X}_n$. Given the dependencies of each variable as set of its parents $\mathbf{U}_n = Par(X_n)$, the transition model of each local variable X_n is modelled as conditional Markov processes. [3] In the following the set of all conditional transition intensity matrices are denoted as $\boldsymbol{Q}$.

Consider a trajectory drawn from CTBN $\mathbf{X}$, such that $\mathbf{X}^{[0,T]} = \left\{X_1^{[0,T]}, X_2^{[0,T]}, ..., X_N^{[0,T]}\right\}$. Following Equation 2.14, the likelihood of this trajectory can be written as follows.

$$\Pr(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{Q}) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \prod_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{U}_n} \prod_{x_i\in\mathcal{X}_n} \prod_{x_j\in\mathcal{X}_n\setminus x_i} \exp\left[q^n_{i,j|\mathbf{u}} T_n[x_i \mid \mathbf{u}]\right] (q^n_{i,j|\mathbf{u}})^{M_n[x_i,x_j|\mathbf{u}]} \tag{2.15}$$

where $T_n[.]$ and $M_n[.]$ indicates the sufficient statistics for X_n.

2.3 Belief State in Partially Observable Markov Decision Processes

Partially observable Markov decision process (POMDP) framework provides a model of an agent which interacts with its environment, but unable to obtain certain information about its state. Instead, the agent gets an observation which is a stochastic function of the true state. The main goal, as similar to Markov decision processes (MDPs), is to learn a policy solving a task by optimizing a reward function. The problem of decision making under uncertainty can be decomposed into two parts for the agent. The first is *state estimator* to keep a belief state which is a sufficient statistic of its past experiences, and the second is the *optimal policy* which will give an action based on the belief state. [4, 1]

In the problem considered in this thesis, the agent node X_3 cannot observe the incoming messages directly, rather a summary of them. This presents a POMDP problem. However, since the optimal policy of the agent is assumed to be given, the theory for policy optimization is skipped. In this section, update methods for belief state is introduced.

In the following, belief state refers to the posterior probability distribution over the environment states.

2.3.1 Exact/Bayes(?) Belief State Update

Consider a POMDP problem, with discrete state space S, action space A, observation space Ω. In a scneario where a compact representation of the *transition model*, $T(s, a, s')$, and *observation model*, $O(s', a, o)$, is available, the belief state update can be obtain via Bayes' theorem [1]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
b'(s') &= \Pr(s'|o,a,b) \\
&= \frac{\Pr(o|s',a,b)\Pr(s'|a,b)}{\Pr(o|a,b)} \\
&= \frac{\Pr(o|s',a)\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}}\Pr(s'|a,b,s)\Pr(s|a,b)}{\Pr(o|a,b)} \\
&= \frac{O(s',a,o)\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}}T(s,a,s')\,b(s)}{\Pr(o|a,b)}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.16}
$$

2.3.2 Filtering for CTMP

Equation 2.16 is discrete-time solution of belief state. However, since in the model described in Section 2.1, the parent nodes are modelled as CTMPs, thus the environment state for the agent is the state of a CTMP, the belief state should be solved in continuous-time. This is achieved by the inference of posterior probability of CTMP. [5]

Filtering problem in statistical context, as opposed to deterministic digital filtering, refers to inference of the conditional probability of the true state of the system at some point in time, given the history of observations. [6]

Let X be a CTMP with transition intensity matrix $\mathbf{Q}$. Assume discrete-time observations denoted by $y_1 = y(t_1), ..., y_N = y(t_N)$. The belief state can be written as:

$$b(x_i; t_N) = \Pr(X(t_N) = x_i \mid y_1, ..., y_N) \tag{2.17}$$

From the master equation given in Equation 2.5, it follows that:

$$\frac{d}{dt} b(x_j; t) = \sum_{\forall i} q_{i,j} b(x_i; t) \tag{2.18}$$

The time-dependent belief state $b(t)$ is a row vector with $\{b(x_i; t)_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}}\}$. This posterior probability can be described by a system of ODEs:

$$\frac{db(t)}{dt} = b(t)\mathbf{Q} \tag{2.19}$$

where the initial condition $b(0)$ is row vector with $\{b(x_i; t)_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}}\}$ [5]. The solution to this ODE is

$$b(t) = b(0)exp(t\mathbf{Q}). \tag{2.20}$$

The belief state update at discrete times of observation y_t is derived as

$$\begin{aligned}
b(x_i;t_N) &= \Pr(X(t_N)=x_i, \mid y_1,...,y_N) \\
&= \frac{\Pr(y_1,...,y_N,X(t_N)=x_i)}{\Pr(y_1,...,y_N)} \\
&= \frac{\Pr(y_N \mid y_1,...,y_{N-1},X(t_N)=x_i)}{\Pr(y_N \mid y_1,...,y_{N-1})} \frac{\Pr(y_1,...,y_{N-1},X(t_N)=x_i)}{\Pr(y_1,...,y_{N-1})} \\
&= Z_N^{-1} \; \Pr(y_N \mid X(t_N)=x_i) \; \Pr(X(t_N)=x_i \mid y_1,...,y_{N-1}) \\
&= Z_N^{-1} \; \Pr(y_N \mid X(t_N)=x_i) \; b(x_i;t_N^-)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

where $Z_N = \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}} \Pr(y_N \mid X(t_N)=x_i) \; b(x_i;t_N^-)$ is the normalization factor [5].

2.3.3 Belief State Update using Particle Filter

In a more realistic scenario, the exact update of belief state may not be feasible for several reasons. The computation of Bayes belief update is expensive for large state spaces. Moreover, a problem with continuous state spaces require a belief state represented as probability distributions over infinite state space rather than a collection of probabilities as given in Sec.2.3.1. [7] Another reason could be lack of compact representation of transition and/or observation models. Under such circumstances, the belief state is obtained using sample-based approximation methods. [7]

It should be noted that, since the belief state is nothing but the contidional probability of true states given the observations, the problem at hand poses a filtering problem as described in Section 2.3.2.

2.3.3.1 Particle Filtering

Particle filtering is one of the most commonly used Sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) algorithms. The popularity of this method thrives from the fact that, unlike other approximation methods such as Kalman Filter, it does not assume a linear Gaussion model. This advantage offers a great flexibility and finds application in a wide range of areas.[8]

The key idea in particle filtering is to approximate a target distribution $p(x)$ by a set of samples (particles) drawn from that distribution. This is achieved sequentially updating the particles through two steps. First step is *importance sampling.* Since the target distribution is not available, the particles are generated from a *proposal distribution* $q(x)$ and weighted in the account of the difference between target and proposal distributions. The second step is to resample the particles using these weights. [6]

In this application, the particles to represent the belief state are drawn from marginalized CTBN.

2.3.3.2 Marginalized Continuous Time Markov Process

Let $\mathbf{X}$ be a CTBN with local variables X_n, $n \in \{1, ..., N\}$, and set of conditional intensity matrices $\boldsymbol{Q}$. In the following, it is assumed that every non-diagonal entry in $\mathbf{Q}_n \mid \mathbf{u}$ is Gamma distributed with shape and rate parameters, $\alpha^n_{i,j|\mathbf{u}}$ and $\beta^n_{i,j|\mathbf{u}}$.

The marginal process description of $\mathbf{X}$ considering a single trajectory in interval $[0, t)$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr(X_n(t+h) = x_j \mid X_n(t) = x_i, \mathbf{U}_n(t) = \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{X}^{[0,t)}) \\
&\quad = \int \Pr(X_n(t+h) = x_j \mid X_n(t) = x_i, \mathbf{U}_n(t) = \mathbf{u}, Q_{n|\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{X}^{[0,t)}) p(Q_{n|\mathbf{u}}) dQ_{n|\mathbf{u}} \\
&\quad = \delta_{i,j} + \mathbb{E}[q_{i,j|\mathbf{u}} \mid \mathbf{X}^{[0,t]} = \mathbf{x}^{[0,t]}]\ h + o(h),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

By integrating out the intensity matrix $Q_{n|\mathbf{u}}$, the parameter is replaced by its expected value given the history of the process. It should be noted that by doing so, the process becomes parameter-free, and thus self-exciting.

The derivation of the conditional expectation for marginal CTBN follows from the Bayes's rule:

$$p\left(\mathbf{Q}|\mathbf{X}_{[0,t]}\right) = \frac{p\left(\mathbf{X}_{[0,t]}|\mathbf{Q}\right) p(\mathbf{Q})}{p\left(\mathbf{X}_{[0,t]}\right)} \tag{2.23}$$

Equation 2.23, written for single trajectory $\mathbf{X}_{[0,t]}$, can be extended for multiple trajectories. Consider K trajectories drawn from CTBN $\mathbf{X}$, denoted by $\xi_t = \left\{\mathbf{X}^{[0,t],1}, \mathbf{X}^{[0,t],2}, ..., \mathbf{X}^{[0,t],K}\right\}$. Since the trajectories are conditionally independent, given $\mathbf{Q}$, using Equation 2.15 the likelihood of set ξ_t is written as,

$$\Pr(\xi_t|\boldsymbol{Q}) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \prod_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{U}_n} \prod_{x_i\in\mathcal{X}_n} \prod_{x_j\in\mathcal{X}_n\setminus x_i} \exp\left[q^n_{i,j|\mathbf{u}} T_n[x_i \mid \mathbf{u}]\right] (q^n_{i,j|\mathbf{u}})^{M_n[x_i,x_j|\mathbf{u}]} \tag{2.24}$$

where the joint sufficient statistics of X_n over all K trajectories are denoted by $T_n[x_i \mid \mathbf{u}] = \sum_{k=1}^{K} T_n^k[x_i \mid \mathbf{u}]$ and $M_n[x_i, x_j \mid \mathbf{u}] = \sum_{k=1}^{K} M_n^k[x_i, x_j \mid \mathbf{u}]$.

Given independent Gamma-priors on transition intensities, the expectation in Equation 2.22 can be evaluated as following:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[q^n_{i,j|\mathbf{u}}|\xi_t\right] = \frac{\alpha^n_{i,j|\mathbf{u}} + M_n[x_i, x_j \mid \mathbf{u}]}{\beta^n_{i,j|\mathbf{u}} + T_n[x_i \mid \mathbf{u}]} \tag{2.25}$$

The algorithm for marginal process is given in the following chapter.

3 Experimental Setup

This chapter presents the methodology used in this thesis. First, it is explained how different frameworks introduced in chapter 2 are put into use. Then, the algorithms used in data generation and inference is given in detail. The results from these experiments are presented in the succeeding chapter.

3.1 The Model

A detailed graphical model explored in this thesis is given in the Figure 3.1. This model presents an intersection of continuous-time Bayesian network and partially observable Markov decision process frameworks.

- The transition models of the nodes X_1, X_2 and X_3, and the dependencies between them are modelled as CTBN.
- The interaction of agent node X_3 and its environment is modelled as POMDP.



Figure 3.1: Hierarchical model.

3.1.1 CTBN Model

The transition models of the nodes and the dependencies between them are modelled as continuous-time Bayesian network (CTBN), denoted by $\mathbf{X}$. The network $\mathbf{X}$ represents a stohastic process over a structured multivariate state space $\mathcal{X} = [\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_3]$.

The parent nodes X_1 and X_2 emits their states as messages. The dynamics of these nodes are modelled as independent homogeneous continuous-time Markov processes $X_i(t)$, with binary-valued states $\mathcal{X}_i = \{0, 1\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. These processes are defined by transition intensity matrices $\mathbf{Q}_i$, which are in the following forms and assumed to be gamma distributed with shape and rate parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = [\alpha_0, \alpha_1]$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\beta_0, \beta_1]$, respectively.

$$\mathbf{Q}_i = \begin{bmatrix} -q_0^i & q_0^i \\ q_1^i & -q_1^i \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.1}$$
$$\mathbf{Q}_i \sim Gam(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^i) \quad for\ i \in \{1, 2\}$$

It should be noted that in Equation 3.1, the suffixes are simplified using the fact that $q_i = \sum_{i \neq j} q_{i,j}$.

The agent X_3 is modelled as inhomogenouos continuous-time Markov process with binary states $\mathcal{X}_3 = \{0, 1\}$ and set of actions $a \in \{a_0, a_1\}$, and set of transition intensity matrices which contains one matrix corresponding to each action, $\boldsymbol{Q}_3 = \{\mathbf{Q}_{a_0}, \mathbf{Q}_{a_1}\}$.

The dependencies are represented by set of parents for each node $\mathbf{U}_{X_n} = Par(X_n)$ and for the model shown in Figure 3.1 can be written as follows:

$$\mathbf{U}_{X_1}, \mathbf{U}_{X_2} = \emptyset$$
$$\mathbf{U}_{X_3} = \{X_1, X_2\}$$

3.1.2 POMDP Model

In a conventional POMDP scenario, there are two problem to be addressed, one is belief state update and the other is policy optimization. As mentioned in section 2.3, in the problem at hand, the policy of agent X_3 is assumed to be optimal and given. Thus, the POMDP model of the agent only consists of belief state update. A detailed view of the agents interaction from POMDP framework perspective is given in the Figure 3.2.
SHOULD I ADD 'inspired by ...' WITH CITATION TO POMDP PAPER?



Figure 3.2: Closer look to agent-environment interaction from the perspective of POMDP framework.

The agent node X_3 does not have a direct access to the messages, but observes a translation of them. The observation model is defined as the likelihood of a translation given the parent messages.

$$\psi := \Pr(y(t) \mid X_1(t), X_2(t)) \tag{3.2}$$

The state estimator (labelled as SE in Figure 3.2) forms a belief over the parent states, $b(x_1, x_2; t)$.

$$b(x_1, x_2; t) = \Pr(X_1(t) = x_1, X_2(t) = x_2 \mid y_1, ..., y_t) \tag{3.3}$$

Given the optimal policy, $\pi(b(t))$, the agent takes an action based on the belief state. In the setting described above, taking an action means to change its internal dynamics to the transition intensity matrix corresponding to that action.

$$a(t) = \pi(b(t)) \tag{3.4}$$
$$\mathbf{Q}_3(t) = \boldsymbol{Q}_3[a(t)] \tag{3.5}$$

WORK ON THESE NOTATIONS

3.1.2.1 POMDP Model with Exact Belief State Update

Given the transition intensity matrices of parent nodes, $\mathbf{Q}_1$ and $\mathbf{Q}_2$, the belief state update poses a filtering problem for CTMPs (subsection 2.3.2).

Consider a subsystem of CTBN model, consisting of only the parent nodes, X_1 and X_2. These two processes can be represented as one single *joint* process, P, with joint state space $P = \{(x_1, x_2)\} = \{(0,0), (0,1), (1,0), (1,1)\}$. The transition intensity matrix of the new joint system, $\mathbf{Q}_P$ is obtained by amalgamation operation between $\mathbf{Q}_1$ and $\mathbf{Q}_2$ [3].

$$\mathbf{Q}_P = \mathbf{Q}_1 * \mathbf{Q}_2 \tag{3.6}$$

AMALGAMATION EXPLANATION AT APPENDIX?
Consider discrete-time observations, denoted by $y_1 = y(t_1), ..., y_N = y(t_N)$. Following Equation 2.20 and Equation 2.21, the belief state update is evaluated as

$$b(t) = b(0) \exp(t\mathbf{Q}_P) \tag{3.7}$$

with reset condition at discrete times of observation y_t

$$b(x_i; t_N) = Z_N^{-1} \Pr(y_N \mid X(t_N) = x_i)\ b(x_i; t_N^-) \tag{3.8}$$
$$= Z_N^{-1}\ \psi\ b(x_i; t_N^-) \tag{3.9}$$

where $Z_N = \sum_{x_i \in X} \Pr(y_N \mid X(t_N) = x_i)\ b(x_i; t_N^-)$ is the normalization factor.

3.1.2.2 POMDP Model with Belief State Update Using Particle Filter

---

Algorithm 1: Marginal particle filter

Input: Measurement data y_k at time t_k, set of particles $\mathbf{p}^{k-1}$, estimated $\hat{Q}$
Result: New set of particles $\mathbf{p}^k$, representing $b(t_k)$

for $p_m \in \mathbf{p}^{k-1}$ **do**
  $p_m = \left\{x_m, \hat{Q}\right\} \leftarrow$ *Propagate particle through marginal process model from* t_{k-1} *to* t_k
  $w_m \leftarrow p(y_k \mid X(t_k) = x_m)$ `// observation likelihood`
  $\hat{Q} \leftarrow$ *sufficient statistics added from* $p_m[t_{k-1}, t_k]$
end for
$w_m \leftarrow \frac{w_m}{\sum_m w_m}$ `// normalize weights`
for $p_m \in \mathbf{p}_k$ **do**
  $p_m \leftarrow$ *Sample from* p_k *with probabilities* w_m *with replacement*
end for

3.1.2.3 Optimal Policy

The optimal policy is defined as a polynomial function of belief state.

$$\pi(b(t)) = \mathbf{w}\ b(t)^T \tag{3.10}$$

where $\mathbf{w}$ is a row vector of weights.
INCONSISTENT WITH NOTATION USED BEFORE

3.2 Data Generation

3.2.1 Sampling Trajectories

3.2.1.1 Gillespie Algorithm

3.2.1.2 Thinning Algorithm

3.3 Inference of Observation Model

Our dataset contains a number of trajectories from all the nodes involved in the communication. $\mathbf{D} = \{D_1, ..., D_N\}$. Every trajectory comprises of state transitions in time interval $[0, T]$, and the times of these transitions.

3.4 Parameters

3.4.0.0.1 Marginalized Likelihood Function Let X be a homogenous CTMP. For convenience, it is assumed to be binary-valued, $\mathcal{X} = \{x_0, x_1\}$. The transition intensity matrix can be written in the following form:

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} -q_0 & q_0 \\ q_1 & -q_1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.11}$$

where the transition intensities q_0 and q_1 are gamma-distributed with parameters α_0, β_0 and α_1, β_1, respectively. The marginal likelihood of a sample trajectory $X^{[0,T]}$ can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(X^{[0,T]}) &= \int P(X^{[0,T]} \mid Q)P(Q)dQ \\
&= \int_0^\infty \left(\prod_x \exp(-q_x T_x) \prod_{x'} q_{xx'}^{M[x,x']} \right) \frac{\beta_{xx'}^{\alpha_{xx'}} q_{xx'}^{\alpha_{xx'}-1} \exp(-\beta_{xx'} q_{xx'})}{\Gamma(\alpha_{xx'})} \, dq_{xx'} \\
&= \prod_{i \in 0,1} \int_0^\infty q_i^{M[x_i]} \, \exp(-q_i T[x_i]) \, \frac{\beta_i^{\alpha_i} \, q_i^{\alpha_i - 1} \, \exp(-\beta_i q_i)}{\Gamma(\alpha_i)} \, dq_i \\
&= \prod_{i \in 0,1} \frac{\beta_i^{\alpha_i}}{\Gamma(\alpha_i)} \int_0^\infty q_i^{M[x_i]+\alpha_i-1} \, \exp(-q_i(T[x_i] + \beta_i)) \, dq_i && (3.12) \\
&= \prod_{i \in 0,1} \frac{\beta_i^{\alpha_i}}{\Gamma(\alpha_i)} \Big(-(T_i + \beta_i)^{M[x_i]+\alpha_i} \, \Gamma(M[x_i] + \alpha_i, \; q_i(T[x_i] + \beta_i)) \Big) \Big|_0^\infty && (3.13) \\
&= \prod_{i \in 0,1} \frac{\beta_i^{\alpha_i}}{\Gamma(\alpha_i)} \Big((T[x_i] + \beta_i)^{M[x_i]+\alpha_i} \, \Gamma(M[x_i] + \alpha_i) \Big) && (3.14)
\end{aligned}$$

.

4 Experimental Results and Evaluation

4.1 Results

4.2 Evaluation

5 Conclusion

5.1 Discussion

5.2 Future Work

Bibliography

[1] L. P. Kaelbling, M. L. Littman, and A. R. Cassandra, "Planning and acting in partially observable stochastic domains," *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 101, no. 1, pp. 99–134, 1998.

[2] I. Cohn, T. El-Hay, N. Friedman, and R. Kupferman, "Mean Field Variational Approximation for Continuous-Time Bayesian Networks," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 11, pp. 2745–2783, 2010.

[3] U. Nodelman, C. R. Shelton, and D. Koller, "Continuous Time Bayesian Networks," 1995.

[4] K. P. Murphy, "A survey of POMDP solution techniques," *Environment*, vol. 2, no. September, p. X3, 2000.

[5] L. Huang, L. Paulevé, C. Zechner, M. Unger, A. Hansen, and H. Koeppl, "Supporting Information for Reconstructing dynamic molecular states from single-cell time series," 2016.

[6] S. Godsill, "PARTICLE FILTERING: THE FIRST 25 YEARS AND BEYOND," pp. 7760–7764, 2019.

[7] S. Thrun, "Monte Carlo POMDPs," vol. 40, no. 10, pp. 117–151, 1904.

[8] A. Doucet and A. M. Johansen, "A tutorial on particle filtering and smoothing: Fifteen years later," *Handbook of Nonlinear Filtering*, no. December, pp. 4–6, 2009.