Appendices

A. Storvik's filter as a Kalman filter

Let us consider the following model.

$$x_t = \mathbf{A}x_{t-1} + v_t, \ v_t \sim N(0, \mathbf{Q})$$

$$y_t = \mathbf{H}x_t + w_t, \ w_t \sim N(0, \mathbf{R})$$
(17)

We will call the MMSE estimate Kalman filter returns as $x_{t|t} = \mathbb{E}[x_t \mid y_{0:t}]$ and the variance $\mathbf{P}_{t|t} = cov(x_t \mid y_{0:t})$. Then the update for the conditional mean estimate is as follows.

$$x_{t|t} = \mathbf{A}x_{t-1|t-1} + \underbrace{\mathbf{P}_{t|t-1}\mathbf{H}^{T}(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}_{t|t-1}\mathbf{H}^{T} + \mathbf{R})^{-1}}_{\mathbf{K}_{t}}(y_{t} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{A}x_{t-1|t-1})$$

where as for the estimation covariance

$$\mathbf{P}_{t|t-1} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{t-1|t-1}\mathbf{A}^T + \mathbf{Q}$$
$$\mathbf{P}_{t|t} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}_t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{P}_{t|t-1}$$
(18)

Matching the terms above to the updates in equation 6, one will obtain a linear model for which the transition matrix is $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$, the observation matrix is $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{F}_t$, the state noise covariance matrix is $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{0}$, and the observation noise covariance matrix is $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q}$

B. Proof of theorem 1

Let us assume that $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $f_{\theta}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector valued function parameterized by θ . Moreover, due to the assumption of separability $f_{\theta}(x_{t-1}) = l(x_{t-1})^T h(\theta)$, where we assume that $l(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ and $h(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^m$ and m is an arbitrary constant. The stochastic perturbance will have the logpolynomial density $p(v_t) \propto \exp(\mathbf{\Lambda}_1 v_t + v_t^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_2 v_t + \dots)$ Let us analyze the case of $p(v_t) \propto \exp(\mathbf{\Lambda}_1 v_t + v_t^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_2 v_t)$, for mathematical simplicity. Proof.

$$\log p(\theta \mid x_{0:T}) \propto \log p(\theta) + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \log p(x_t \mid x_{t-1}, \theta)$$

$$\propto \log p(\theta) + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{\Lambda}_1 \left(x_t - l(x_{t-1})^T h(\theta) \right) + \left(x_t - l(x_{t-1})^T h(\theta) \right)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_2 \left(x_t - l(x_{t-1})^T h(\theta) \right)$$

$$\propto \log p(\theta) + \underbrace{\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T} -(\mathbf{\Lambda}_1 + 2x_t^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_2) l(x_{t-1})^T \right)}_{\mathbf{S}_1} h(\theta)$$

$$+ h^T(\theta) \underbrace{\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T} l(x_{t-1}) \mathbf{\Lambda}_2 l^T(x_{t-1}) \right)}_{\mathbf{S}_2} h(\theta) + \text{constants}$$

Therefore, sufficient statistics $(\mathbf{S}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times m} \text{ and } \mathbf{S}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m})$ exist. The analysis can be generalized for higher-order terms in v_t in similar fashion.

C. Proof of theorem 2

Proposition 1. Let S(x) be a M + 1 times differentiable function and P(x) its order M Taylor approximation. Let I = (x - a, x + a) be an open interval around x. Let R(x) be the remainder function, so that S(x) = P(x) + R(x). Suppose there exists constant Usuch that

$$\forall y \in I, \quad \left| f^{(k+1)}(y) \right| \le U$$

We may then bound

$$\forall y \in I, \quad |R(y)| \le U \frac{a^{M+1}}{(M+1)!}$$

We define the following terms

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &= U \frac{a^{M+1}}{(M+1)!} \\ Z &= \int_I \exp(S(x)) dx \\ \hat{Z} &= \int_I \exp(P(x)) dx \end{aligned}$$

Since $\exp(\cdot)$ is monotone and increasing and $|S(x) - P(x)| \le \epsilon$, we can derive tight bounds relating Z and \widehat{Z} .

$$\begin{split} Z &= \int_{I} \exp(S(x)) dx \leq \int_{I} \exp(P(x) + \epsilon) dx \\ &= \hat{Z} \exp(\epsilon) \\ Z &= \int_{I} \exp(S(x)) dx \geq \int_{I} \exp(P(x) - \epsilon) dx \\ &= \hat{Z} \exp(-\epsilon) \end{split}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(p||\hat{p}) &= \int_{I} \ln\left(\frac{p(x)}{\hat{p}(x)}\right) p(x) dx \\ &= \int_{I} \left(S(x) - P(x) + \ln(\hat{Z}) - \ln(Z)\right) p(x) dx \\ &\leq \int_{I} \left|S(x) - P(x)\right| p(x) dx \\ &+ \int_{I} \left|\ln(\hat{Z}) - \ln(Z)\right| p(x) dx \\ &\leq 2\epsilon \propto \frac{a^{M+1}}{(M+1)!} \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(M+1)!}} \left(\frac{ae}{M+1}\right)^{M+1} \end{aligned}$$

where the last approximation follows from Stirling's approximation. Therefore, $D_{KL}(p||\hat{p}) \to 0$ as $M \to$ ∞ .

D. Proof of theorem 3

Proof.

$$\log \hat{p}(\theta \mid x_{0:T}) = \log \left(p(\theta) \prod_{k=0}^{T} \hat{p}(x_k \mid x_{k-1}, \theta) \right)$$
$$= \log p(\theta) + \sum_{k=0}^{T} \log \hat{p}(x_k \mid x_{k-1}, \theta)$$

We can calculate the form of $\log \hat{p}(x_k \mid x_{k-1}, \theta)$ explicitly.

. . . .

0

$$\log \hat{p}(x_{k} \mid x_{k-1}, \theta) = \log \mathcal{N}(\hat{f}(x_{k-1}, \theta), \sigma^{2})$$

$$= -\log(\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}) - \frac{(x_{k} - \hat{f}(x_{k-1}, \theta))^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}$$

$$= -\log(\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}) - \frac{x_{k}^{2} - 2x_{k}\hat{f}(x_{k-1}, \theta) + \hat{f}(x_{k-1}, \theta)^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}$$

$$= -\log(\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}) - \frac{x_{k}^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}} - \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{M} x_{k}H^{i}(x_{k-1})\theta^{i}}{\sigma^{2}}$$

$$+ \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{2M} J_{x_{k-1}}^{i}\theta^{i}}{2\sigma^{2}}$$

Using this expansion, we calculate

$$\log \hat{p}(\theta \mid x_{0:T}) = \log p(\theta) + \sum_{k=0}^{T} \log \hat{p}(x_k \mid x_{k-1}, \theta)$$
$$= \log p(\theta) - (T+1) \log(\sigma \sqrt{2\pi})$$
$$- \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{T} x_k^2\right) - T(\theta)^T \eta(x_0, \dots, x_T)$$

where we expand $T(\theta)^T \eta(x_0, \ldots, x_T)$ as in 3. The form for $\log \hat{p}(\theta \mid x_{0:T})$ is in the exponential family. \Box

E. Proof of theorem 4

Proof. Assume that function f has bounded derivatives and bounded support I. Then the maximum error satisfies $\left| f_{\theta}(x_{k-1}) - \hat{f}_{\theta}(x_{k-1}) \right| \leq \epsilon_k$. It follows that $\hat{f}_{\theta}(x_{k-1})^2 - f_{\theta}(x_{k-1})^2 = -\epsilon_k^2 - 2\hat{f}_{\theta}(x_{k-1})\epsilon_k \approx$ $-2\hat{f}_{\theta}(x_{k-1})\epsilon_k.$

Then the KL-divergence between the real posterior and the approximated posterior satisfies the following formula.

$$D_{KL}(p_T || \hat{p}_T)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta}} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{k=1}^T \epsilon_k (x_k - \hat{f}_{\theta}(x_{k-1})) \right) p_T(\theta | x_{0:T}) d\theta$$
(19)

Moreover, recall that as $T \to \infty$ the posterior shrinks to $\delta(\theta - \theta^*)$ by the assumption of identifiability. Then we can rewrite the KL-divergence as (assuming Taylor approximation centered around θ_c)

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} D_{KL}(p_T || \hat{p}_T)$$
(20)
= $\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \lim_{T \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \epsilon_k \int_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta}} (x_k - \hat{f}_{\theta}(x_{k-1})) p_T(\theta | x_{0:T}) d\theta$
= $\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \lim_{T \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \epsilon_k.$ (21)
 $\left(x_k - \sum_{i=0}^M H^i(x_{k-1}) \int_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta}} (\theta - \theta_c)^i p(\theta | x_{0:T}) d\theta \right)$
= $\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \lim_{T \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \epsilon_k \left(x_k - \sum_{i=0}^M H^i(x_{k-1})(\theta^* - \theta_c)^i \right)$

If the center of the Taylor approximation θ_c is the true parameter value θ^* , we can show that

m

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} D_{KL}(p_T || \hat{p}_T) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \lim_{T \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \epsilon_k \left(x_k - f_{\theta^*}(x_{k-1}) \right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \lim_{T \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^T \epsilon_k v_k = 0$$
(22)

where the final statement follows from law of large numbers. Thus, as $T \to \infty$, the Taylor approximation of any order will converge to the true posterior given that $\theta_c = \theta^*$. For an arbitrary center value θ_c ,

$$D_{KL}(p_T || \hat{p}_T) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{k=1}^T \epsilon_k \left(x_k - \sum_{i=0}^M H^i(x_{k-1})(\theta^* - \theta_c)^i \right)$$
(23)

Notice that $\epsilon_k \propto \frac{1}{(M+1)!}$ (by our assumptions that f has bounded derivative and is supported on interval I) and $H^i(\cdot) \propto \frac{1}{M!}$. The inner summation will be bounded since $M! > a^M, \forall a \in \mathbb{R}$ as $M \to \infty$. Therefore, as $M \to \infty$, $D_{KL}(p||\hat{p}) \to 0$.