
Entropic Matching for Expectation Propagation of Markov Jump Processes

Bastian Alt **Heinz Koepl**

Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology
Technische Universität Darmstadt
{bastian.alt, heinz.koepl}@tu-darmstadt.de

Abstract

This paper addresses the problem of statistical inference for latent continuous-time stochastic processes, which is often intractable, particularly for discrete state space processes described by Markov jump processes. To overcome this issue, we propose a new tractable inference scheme based on an entropic matching framework that can be embedded into the well-known expectation propagation algorithm. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our method by providing closed-form results for a simple family of approximate distributions and apply it to the general class of chemical reaction networks, which are a crucial tool for modeling in systems biology. Moreover, we derive closed form expressions for point estimation of the underlying parameters using an approximate expectation maximization procedure. We evaluate the performance of our method on various chemical reaction network instantiations, including a stochastic Lotka-Volterra example, and discuss its limitations and potential for future improvements. Our proposed approach provides a promising direction for addressing complex continuous-time Bayesian inference problems.

1 Introduction

Markov jump processes (MJPs) play a crucial role for modeling diverse phenomena in various domains, including finance [1], engineering [2], and biology [3]. In the field of systems biology, MJPs find particular significance, offering powerful modeling capabilities for complex systems, such as chemical reaction networks (CRNs) [3]. By incorporating prior knowledge of the dynamic nature of underlying processes, MJP models can efficiently extract valuable insights and facilitate understanding and control of these intricate systems. This becomes particularly crucial when dealing with latent processes, where only partial information about the desired quantities of interest is available. The resulting inverse problem presents significant challenges, requiring the solution of the underlying Bayesian filtering and smoothing problem.

Traditional approaches to inference in continuous-time stochastic processes often rely on system approximations using ordinary differential equations (ODEs) or stochastic differential equations (SDEs), see, e.g., [4], to perform latent state inference. However, inference methods based on Kalman filtering and RTS smoothing that exploit linearization procedures, such as the linear noise approximation [5], can suffer from the limitations of the underlying non-linear rate function. Similarly, approaches based on the non-linear chemical Langevin equation [6] may yield inaccurate results, especially in scenarios characterized by low counting numbers. In contrast, modeling the process directly using an MJP model captures discrete state transitions and provides a more accurate representation of the underlying dynamics. However, inference in MJPs often requires computationally demanding sampling-based techniques such as sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) [7] or Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) [8] methods. Alternatively, deterministic methods based on variational inference provide valuable tools.

Here, the process is approximated using tractable approximations, such as mean-field variational inference [9] or moment-based variational inference [10].

We take a different path by employing a message passing method in continuous-time. Instead of approximating the distribution on a path-wise level, as seen in variational Bayesian methods, our approach involves approximating the exact message passing scheme. This allows us to accommodate for the MJP dynamics and to embed our method into the expectation propagation algorithm [11]. The accompanying code is publicly available via Git.¹

2 Background

Markov Jump Processes. A Markov jump process (MJP) [12] is a continuous-time Markov process $\{X(t) \in \mathcal{X} \mid t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}$ on a discrete state space \mathcal{X} . The Markov property implies that for all $t' > t$ we have $P(X(t') = x(t') \mid \{X(s) = x(s) \mid s \in [0, t]\}) = P(X(t') = x(t') \mid X(t) = x(t))$. Hence, an MJP is fully described by an initial distribution $p_0(x) = P(X(0) = x)$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, and its rate function

$$\Lambda(x, x', t) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{P(X(t+h) = x' \mid X(t) = x)}{h},$$

for all time points $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and states $x \in \mathcal{X} \neq x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Given these quantities, one can derive a system of ODEs of the time-marginal probability function $p(x, t) := P(X(t) = x)$ of the MJP, which is given by the differential forward Chapman-Kolmogorov equation for $p(x, t)$ with an initial condition at $t = 0$, the *master equation*,

$$p(x, 0) = p_0(x), \quad \frac{d}{dt} p(x, t) = \mathcal{L}_t p(x, t), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (1)$$

where the operator \mathcal{L}_t is given as


$$[\mathcal{L}_t \phi](x) := \sum_{x' \neq x} \Lambda(x', x, t) \phi(x') - \Lambda(x, x', t) \phi(x),$$

for an arbitrary test function ϕ . Additionally, an evolution equation for some arbitrary moment functions can be found, by multiplying Eq. (1) from the left with a moment function $s(x)$ and summing over all elements $x \in \mathcal{X}$, this yields $\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[s(X(t))] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_t^\dagger s(X(t))]$, where \mathcal{L}_t^\dagger is the adjoint operator of \mathcal{L}_t , w.r.t. the inner product $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \phi(x) \psi(x)$ given as

$$[\mathcal{L}_t^\dagger \psi](x) := \sum_{x' \neq x} \Lambda(x, x', t) [\psi(x') - \psi(x)],$$

for an arbitrary test function ψ . For more on MJPs see [4, 12–14].

Chemical Reaction Networks. We focus on chemical reaction networks (CRNs) [3] with the species $\{X_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ and k reactions given as



where $c_j \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the reaction rate of the j th reaction. The substrate and product stoichiometries are given by the matrices $\underline{\nu} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{n \times k}$ and $\bar{\nu} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{n \times k}$, respectively. The state $X(t) \in \mathcal{X}$ of the network at time point t is described by the amount of each of the n species $X(t) = [X_1(t), \dots, X_n(t)]^\top$, with $X_i(t) \in \mathcal{X}_i = \mathbb{N}_0$, $\forall i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\mathcal{X} = \times_{i=1}^n \mathcal{X}_i = \mathbb{N}_0^n$. For CRNs one assumes that the stochastic process $\{X(t) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}$ is an MJP, with rate function

$$\Lambda(x, x', t) = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{1}(x' = x + \nu_j) \lambda_j(x), \quad (2)$$

where the change vector $\nu_j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ corresponding to the j th reaction is $\nu_j = \bar{\nu}_{\cdot j} - \underline{\nu}_{\cdot j}$. We assume that the propensity function $\lambda_j(x)$ corresponding to the j th reaction is given by mass action kinetics as

$$\lambda_j(x) = \bar{c}_j \prod_{i=1}^n \binom{x_i}{\underline{\nu}_{ij}} = c_j \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i!}{(x_i - \underline{\nu}_{ij})!} = c_j \prod_{i=1}^n (x_i)_{\underline{\nu}_{ij}}, \quad (3)$$

¹<https://git.rwth-aachen.de/bcs/projects/ba/public/ep4crns>

where the factors $\{\nu_{1j}!, \dots, \nu_{nj}!\}$ are absorbed in the j th reaction rate coefficient as $c_j = \bar{c}_j / \prod_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij}!$ and $(m)_n := \frac{m!}{(m-n)!} = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (m-k)$ denotes the falling factorial. For more on CRNs see [3, 4, 15].

3 Exact Inference for Latent Markov Jump Processes

We consider continuous-discrete inference [16–18] for latent MJPs. The model is given by the latent MJP $\{X(t) \in \mathcal{X} \mid t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}$ on \mathcal{X} characterized via its rate function $\Lambda(x, x', t)$ and its initial probability distribution $p_0(x)$. The latent state $X(t)$ is not directly observed, rather we consider a discrete-time observation model with N observations $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_N\}$ at time points $t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < \dots < t_N$ as

$$Y_i \mid \{X(t_i) = x\} \sim p(y_i \mid x), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N.$$

The problem of inferring the latent MJP $X(t)$ at time point t given some observations $y_{[0,T]} := \{y_1, \dots, y_N\}$ in a time interval $[0, T]$ is cast as a continuous-time Bayesian filtering and smoothing problem [18–20], similar to the discrete-time setting [21]. To this end, the two elementary objects are the filtering $\pi(x, t)$ and smoothing distribution $\tilde{\pi}(x, t)$, which are defined as

$$\pi(x, t) := \mathbb{P}(X(t) = x \mid y_{[0,t]}), \quad \tilde{\pi}(x, t) := \mathbb{P}(X(t) = x \mid y_{[0,T]}), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

For the filtering distribution $\pi(x, t)$ we condition on the set $y_{[0,t]} := \{y_1, \dots, y_K\}$ of $K = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(t_i \leq t)$ observations in the interval $[0, t]$ up until time point t and for the smoothing distribution $\tilde{\pi}(x, t)$ we consider all observations $y_{[0,T]}$ in the whole interval $[0, T]$ up until time point T . The filtering distribution can be computed recursively. First, it is easy to notice that the filtering distribution at the initial time point $t = 0$ is the initial distribution of the latent MJP, i.e., $\pi(x, 0) = \mathbb{P}(X(0) = x) = p_0(x)$. Additionally, a standard result in continuous-discrete filtering is that the filtering distribution in between observations follows the latent prior dynamics and at the observation time points is subject to discrete-time updates [16, 18]. Hence, we have a system of ODEs with reset conditions as

$$\pi(x, 0) = p_0(x), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \pi(x, t) = \mathcal{L}_t \pi(x, t), \quad \pi(x, t_i) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(y_i \mid x) \pi(x, t_i^-)}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(y_i \mid x') \pi(x', t_i^-)}, \quad (4)$$

$\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$, where throughout we denote by $\phi(t_i^-) := \lim_{t \nearrow t_i} \phi(t)$ the limit from the left for a left-continuous function ϕ . Note, that the filtering distribution $\pi(x, t)$ is a càdlàg process in time t . There are multiple options to compute an evolution equation for the smoothing distribution. Often a backward-filtering and subsequent forward smoothing approach is used for continuous-time systems, see, e.g., [10, 22, 23]. For completeness, we discuss this approach in Appendix A. However, later on we exploit a different approach, which considers a forward-filtering backward-smoothing scheme. First, it is easy to notice that the smoothing distribution has an end point condition, as the smoothing distribution at time point $t = T$ is equal to the filtering distribution, i.e., $\tilde{\pi}(x, T) = \mathbb{P}(X(T) = x \mid y_{[0,T]}) = \pi(x, T)$. For the forward filtering backward smoothing scheme it is shown in [20] that the smoothing distribution follows an ODE with the filter end-point condition as

$$\tilde{\pi}(x, T) = \pi(x, T), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\pi}(x, t) = -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t \tilde{\pi}(x, t), \quad (5)$$

where the backward smoothing operator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t$ and the corresponding backward smoothing rate function $\tilde{\Lambda}(x', x, t)$ is given as

$$[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t \phi](x) := \sum_{x' \neq x} \tilde{\Lambda}(x', x, t) \phi(x') - \tilde{\Lambda}(x, x', t) \phi(x), \quad \tilde{\Lambda}(x, x', t) = \Lambda(x', x, t) \frac{\pi(x', t)}{\pi(x, t)},$$

where ϕ is an arbitrary test function. The backward smoothing rate function $\tilde{\Lambda}(x', x, t)$ depends on the filtering distribution $\pi(x, t)$. The ratio of filtering distributions appearing in the backward smoothing rate can be seen as a correction factor, when computing the dynamics of a backward Markov process [24, 25], similar to the score correction appearing for continuous state space systems [26]. Therefore, by integrating the filtering distribution forward in time and computing the smoothing distribution backward in time, we can solve the filtering and smoothing problem. However, the substantial down-side of the exact filtering and smoothing equations is that they are intractable. This




Figure 1: Probabilistic graphical model and approximate inference scheme for MJPs. The continuous-time Markov process $X_{[0,T]} = \{X(t) \mid t \in [0, T]\}$ emits the observations $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_N\}$. The approximate inference scheme consists of a continuous-time message passing algorithm, depicted by the dashed lines.

can easily be seen, by noticing that the distributions are defined on the state space \mathcal{X} . Hence, all sums go over $|\mathcal{X}|$ elements and we have to solve the $|\mathcal{X}|$ -dimensional system of ODEs (4) forwards in time and backwards in time in Eq. (5). For example, for CRNs with a state space $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{N}_0^n$ this is even infinite dimensional. Additionally, even when truncating the state space, the complexity still scales exponentially in the dimensionality n . Hence, we are required to use an approximate inference method.

4 Approximate Inference for Latent Markov Jump Processes

We use an approximate inference method to perform latent state inference for MJP models. To this end we approximate both the filtering distribution and the smoothing distribution by using a parametric distribution $q(x \mid \theta)$ as $\pi(x, t) \approx q(x \mid \theta(t))$ and $\tilde{\pi}(x, t) \approx q(x \mid \tilde{\theta}(t))$, where $\theta(t) \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\tilde{\theta}(t) \in \Theta$ are variational parameters for the filtering and smoothing distribution, respectively. To find those variational parameters we use an assumed density method, the entropic matching method of Bronstein and Koepl [27]. Therefore, we derive new approximate filtering and smoothing equations for latent MJPs. Further, we exploit an expectation propagation algorithm [11] for inference and, therefore, extend the method of Cseke *et al.* [28] from diffusion processes to MJPs. A probabilistic graphical model and the approximate inference scheme is depicted in Fig. 1

We find the variational filtering parameters $\theta(t)$ by considering the minimization of the inclusive Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence as $\theta(t+h) = \arg \min_{\theta'} \text{KL}(\pi(x, t+h) \parallel q(x \mid \theta'))$, where $\pi(x, t+h)$ is the propagated filtering distribution and h is a small time step. By considering that the previous filtering distribution at time point t is approximately $q(x \mid \theta(t))$ and taking the continuous-time limit $h \rightarrow 0$ this can be shown [27] to converge to the ODE in parameter space as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) = F(\theta(t))^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\mathcal{L}_t^\dagger \nabla_\theta \log q(X \mid \theta(t)) \right], \quad (6)$$

where $F(\theta) := -\mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta)} [\nabla_\theta \nabla_\theta^\top \log q(X \mid \theta)]$ is the Fisher information matrix of the parametric distribution $q(x \mid \theta)$. At the observation time points, we have discrete-time resets as

$$\theta(t_i) = \arg \min_{\theta'} \text{KL}(p(y_i \mid x) q(x \mid \theta(t_i^-)) \parallel q(x \mid \theta')), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N \quad (7)$$

and the initial condition can be computed as

$$\theta(0) = \arg \min_{\theta'} \text{KL}(p_0(x) \parallel q(x \mid \theta')). \quad (8)$$

The derivation is given for completeness in Appendix B.1. Analogously, we use the entropic matching method backwards in time for the smoother $\tilde{\pi}(x, t) \approx q(x \mid \tilde{\theta}(t))$. Here, we compute for a small time

step h the time-backwards update $\tilde{\theta}(t-h) = \arg \min_{\tilde{\theta}} \text{KL}(\tilde{\pi}(x, t-h) \parallel \text{q}(x \mid \tilde{\theta}))$. Considering again that $\tilde{\pi}(x, t) \approx \text{q}(x \mid \tilde{\theta}(t))$ and carrying out the continuous-time limit $h \rightarrow 0$ we have the corresponding equation for the smoother as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\theta}(t) = -F(\tilde{\theta}(t))^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\text{q}(x \mid \tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^\dagger \nabla_{\theta} \log \text{q}(X \mid \tilde{\theta}(t)) \right], \quad (9)$$

with end-point condition $\tilde{\theta}(T) = \theta(T)$. The full derivation is given in Appendix B.2. This is akin to the diffusion case, which Cseke *et al.* [28] describe in their work as assumed density smoothing.

We can further use the standard expectation propagation algorithm [11, 28–30]. We give here only a brief explanation of the algorithm, for a more detailed explanation we refer the reader to the provided resources. First, we note that the i th update of the filter is given as

$$\theta(t_i) = \theta(t_i^-) + \xi_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (10)$$

where the likelihood contribution ξ_i is given for the filter as $\xi_i = \arg \min_{\theta'} \text{KL}(\text{p}(y_i \mid x) \text{q}(x \mid \theta(t_i^-)) \parallel \text{q}(x \mid \theta')) - \theta(t_i^-)$. The expectation propagation algorithm uses instead of the exact likelihood contributions $\xi_i = \theta(t_i) - \theta(t_i^-)$, pseudo likelihood contributions called *sites*, in form of the site parameters $\xi_i^{(j)}$ at iteration step j of the algorithm, with $i = 1, \dots, N$. The first step to compute these pseudo likelihood contributions is to calculate the *cavity parameters* $\tilde{\theta}_{-i}^{(j)}$, $\forall i = 1, \dots, N$, by excluding the i th likelihood contribution from the current approximate posterior estimate as

$$\tilde{\theta}_{-i}^{(j)} = \tilde{\theta}(t_i^-)^{(j)} - \xi_i^{(j)}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (11)$$

Next, the observation factors are incorporated to yield new approximate posterior parameters $\tilde{\theta}_{\setminus i}^{(j)}$ for the i th factor by computing the *tilted distribution* and projecting it back to the parametric family as

$$\tilde{\theta}_{\setminus i}^{(j)} = \arg \min_{\theta'} \text{KL}(\text{p}(y_i \mid x) \text{q}(x \mid \tilde{\theta}_{-i}^{(j)}) \parallel \text{q}(x \mid \theta')), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (12)$$

Subsequently, a revised site parameter is then found by taking the i th new approximate posterior parameter and removing the remaining observation factors by subtracting the cavity parameter as

$$\tilde{\xi}_i^{(j)} = \tilde{\theta}_{\setminus i}^{(j)} - \tilde{\theta}_{-i}^{(j)}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (13)$$

Finally, to have a convergent algorithm, a damped message passing strategy, with learning rate parameter $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, is performed as

$$\xi_i^{(j+1)} = (1 - \epsilon) \xi_i^{(j)} + \epsilon \tilde{\xi}_i^{(j)}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (14)$$

The algorithm is then iterated by computing the posterior estimates $\tilde{\theta}(t_i^-)^{(j)}$, $\forall i = 1, \dots, N$, and subsequently the new site parameters $\xi_i^{(j+1)}$, $\forall i = 1, \dots, N$, for iteration steps $j = 1, 2, \dots$ until convergence. For the initialization we set the site parameters to zero, i.e., $\xi_1^{(1)} = 0, \dots, \xi_N^{(1)} = 0$, which corresponds to setting the initial approximate posterior to an approximate prior distribution. The expectation propagation algorithm can be shown to be a sensible algorithm, in the sense that it maximizes a tractable approximation of the intractable log marginal likelihood $\log \text{p}(y_{[0,T]})$ [28] in the form of a fixed point equation for a relaxed variational principle of the intractable problem, for more see [29].

4.1 Parameter Learning

For estimating the parameters of the system, we aim for an expectation maximization (EM) algorithm, see, e.g., [30]. Since we exploit the previously discussed approximate latent state inference, this leads to an approximate EM algorithm, similar to the discrete-time case [31]. Therefore, we estimate the parameters ϕ of the system by maximizing a lower bound L of the marginal likelihood as

$$\log \text{p}(y_{[0,T]} \mid \phi) \geq L(\phi) := \mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}} \left[\log \frac{d\text{P}}{d\text{Q}}(X_{[0,T]}, y_{[0,T]}, \phi) \right],$$

where $\frac{d\text{P}}{d\text{Q}}$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the path measure $\text{P}(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot, Y_{[0,T]} \in \cdot \mid \phi)$ for the latent paths $X_{[0,T]} := \{X(t) \mid t \in [0, T]\}$ and all observations $Y_{[0,T]}$ w.r.t. an approximating

probability measure $Q(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot)$ over latent paths and the Lebesgue measure over all observations $Y_{[0,T]}$. Note, that compared to the discrete-time case, we have to express this bound in terms of the Radon-Nikodym derivative, compared to an expression using probability densities w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure, since we have an uncountable number of random variables $\{X(t) \mid t \in [0, T]\}$ for which there is no Lebesgue measure, see, e.g., [32]. A standard result, see, e.g., [30], is that the bound can be iteratively maximized by computing an expectation step (E-step) and a maximization step (M-step). To compute the bound one has to exploit Girsanov's theorem [33, 34], but also other derivations can be found in the literature, e.g., [9, 35]. We compute this bound in Appendix C in terms of the smoothing and filtering distribution, $\tilde{\pi}(x, t)$ and $\pi(x, t)$, respectively. Hence, by replacing these with the approximate filtering and smoothing distribution, $q(x \mid \tilde{\theta}(t))$ and $q(x \mid \theta(t))$, respectively, we can compute the M-step of the algorithm. This is achieved by maximizing the bound L which computes to

$$\begin{aligned} L(\phi) = & \mathbb{E}_{q(x,0)} \left[\log \frac{p_0(X \mid \phi)}{q(X, 0)} \right] + \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \left\{ \Lambda(X, x', t) \frac{q(x' \mid \tilde{\theta}(t))}{q(X \mid \tilde{\theta}(t))} \frac{q(X \mid \theta(t))}{q(x' \mid \theta(t))} \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. \cdot \log \frac{\Lambda(X, x', t \mid \phi)}{\Lambda(X, x', t)} - \Lambda(X, x', t \mid \phi) \right\} \right] dt + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t_i))} [\log p(y_i \mid X, \phi)] + C, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\Lambda(x, x', t)$ are the rates of the approximating distribution Q independent of ϕ , $\Lambda(x, x', t \mid \phi)$ are the parameter dependent rates of the measure P and C is parameter independent constant. Therefore, the approximate EM algorithm can be achieved by carrying out the E-step, which consists of computing the approximate distributions $q(x \mid \theta(t))$ and $q(x \mid \tilde{\theta}(t))$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, keeping the parameters ϕ fixed. The M-step then consists of optimizing Eq. (15) w.r.t. the parameters ϕ , keeping the approximating distributions $q(x \mid \theta(t))$ and $q(x \mid \tilde{\theta}(t))$ fixed. For more details, see Appendix C.

5 Application to Latent Chemical Reaction Networks

In this section, we apply the approximate inference algorithm to CRNs. Therefore, we consider systems, where the rate function can be expressed as in Eq. (2) with mass action kinetics as in Eq. (3). Throughout we will assume an exponential family form for the variational distribution as

$$q(x \mid \theta) = h(x) \exp(\theta^\top s(x) - A(\theta)),$$

with base measure $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, sufficient statistics $s : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and log-partition function $A : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Note, that $F(\theta) = \nabla_\theta \nabla_\theta^\top A(\theta)$ and $\nabla_\theta \log q(x \mid \theta) = s(x) - \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta)}[s(X)]$. As an instantiation we use a product Poisson distribution

$$q(x \mid \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{Pois}(x_i \mid \exp \theta_i) = h(x) \exp(\theta^\top s(x) - A(\theta)).$$

Hence, we have base-measure $h(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i!}$, sufficient statistics $s(x) = x$, natural parameters or log rate parameters $\theta = [\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n]^\top$ and log-partition function $A(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\theta_i)$. For the measurements we assume a linear Gaussian measurement model for the latent state, i.e., we assume the observation likelihood $p(y_i \mid x) = \mathcal{N}(y_i \mid Hx, \Sigma)$, with the i th observation $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the observation model matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and observation noise covariance $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Note, that the following derivations can also be applied to general non-linear observation models $H(x)$, by following a linearization procedure, as in extended Kalman filtering approaches, see, e.g., [21].

For approximate inference, we first consider the initialization step, see Eq. (8). Here, we assume that $p_0(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{Pois}(x_i \mid \exp(\theta_{i,0}))$, with given initial log rate parameters $\{\theta_{1,0}, \dots, \theta_{n,0}\}$. Hence, Eq. (8) computes to the initial parameter $\theta(0) = [\theta_{1,0}, \dots, \theta_{n,0}]^\top$. Next, we compute the prediction step for the filtering distribution in Eq. (6). For CRNs, the product Poisson variational distribution leads to closed-form updates, see Appendix D.1, for the prior drift as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) = F(\theta(t))^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{ij} \theta_i(t) \right),$$

where the inverse Fisher information matrix of the product Poisson distribution is $F(\theta)^{-1} = \text{diag}([\exp(-\theta_1), \dots, \exp(-\theta_n)]^\top)$. For the update step as of the required discrete-time resets in Eq. (7) we have to incorporate at the i th reset the observation y_i and to compute a new parameter $\theta^* = \theta(t_i^-)$ given an old parameter $\theta = \theta(t_i^-)$ as

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta'} \text{KL}(p(y_i | x) q(x | \theta) \parallel q(x | \theta')).$$

The optimal new parameter θ^* can be found by computing the derivative of the KL divergence and setting it to zero. Assuming an exponential family distribution for $q(x | \theta)$ this leads to a moment matching condition as $\mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta^*)}[s(X)] = \mathbb{E}_{p(x|y_i)}[s(X)]$, where $p(x | y_i) = p(y_i|x) q(x|\theta) / \sum_{x'} p(y_i|x') q(x'|\theta)$ is the new posterior distribution. Since the Gaussian likelihood $p(y_i | x)$ is not conjugate to the product of Poisson prior distribution $q(x | \theta)$ the computation of the exact posterior $p(x | y_i)$ is generally intractable. However, we can find a conjugate update, by assuming a Gaussian distribution at the observation time points as $q(x | \theta) \approx \mathcal{N}(x | m, P)$. By first performing a minimization of the KL divergence $\text{KL}(q(x | \theta) \parallel \mathcal{N}(x | m, P))$, w.r.t. the parameters m and P of the Gaussian distribution, we can find an approximation to the product Poisson distribution $q(x | \theta)$. This yields the standard Gaussian approximation of the Poisson distribution, with parameters $m = [\exp \theta_1, \dots, \exp \theta_n]^\top$ and $P = \text{diag}([\exp \theta_1, \dots, \exp \theta_n]^\top)$. This then leads to conjugate updates, as for the new mean parameter $m^* = \mathbb{E}_{p(x|y_i)}[X]$ in the update equations for the Kalman filter, see, e.g., [21], as

$$m^* = m + PH^\top (HPH^\top + \Sigma)^{-1} (y_i - Hm).$$

We can project the new Gaussian distribution back to a product of Poisson distribution, by considering another moment matching condition. Note, that the mean of the Gaussian can be negative, as such we truncate it at a small value $0 < \epsilon_\lambda \ll 1$. Hence, the full approximate conjugate update in the natural parameter space can be written as

$$\xi_i = \log \left(\max \left\{ \exp \theta + F(\theta) H^\top (H F(\theta) H^\top + \Sigma)^{-1} (y_i - H \exp \theta), \epsilon_\lambda \right\} \right) - \theta, \quad (16)$$

where we set $\epsilon_\lambda = 10^{-6}$ and the exponential and logarithm function operating on vectors is applied component wise, e.g., $\exp \theta = [\exp \theta_1, \dots, \exp \theta_n]^\top$.

Given the filtering distribution we can then find a closed form expression for the backward smoothing step in Eq. (9) as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\theta}(t) = F(\tilde{\theta}(t))^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t) \right) \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} (\tilde{\theta}_i(t) - \theta_i(t)) \right),$$

for the derivation see Appendix D.2. Finally, for expectation propagation we use the site parameter update as in Eq. (13), where we compute $\tilde{\xi}_i^{(j)}$ as in Eq. (16) by setting $\theta = \tilde{\theta}_{-i}^{(j)}$ and the cavity parameters are found as in Eq. (11).

5.1 Parameter Learning


For the given approximation of a CRN model, we can find closed form solutions for the M-step of the EM algorithm. Here, we consider the initial parameters $\{\theta_{1,0}, \dots, \theta_{n,0}\}$, the effective rate parameters $\{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$ and the observation model parameters H and Σ , i.e., $\phi = \{\{\theta_{i,0}\}_{i=1}^n, \{c_j\}_{j=1}^k, H, \Sigma\}$. In Appendix E we show how to compute the bound in Eq. (15) w.r.t. the individual parameters ϕ in closed form. Additionally, we derive closed-form coordinate-wise update schemes for the individual parameters ϕ depending on some summary statistics as

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{i,0} &= \tilde{\theta}_i(0), \quad c_j = \hat{\gamma}_j \hat{\lambda}_j^{-1}, \quad H = \hat{M}_{XY} \hat{M}_{XX}^{-1}, \quad \Sigma = \hat{M}_{YY} - H \hat{M}_{XY}^\top - \hat{M}_{XY} H^\top + H \hat{M}_{XX} H^\top, \\ \hat{\gamma}_j &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T c_j^{\text{old}} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t) \right) c_j^{\text{old}} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} (\tilde{\theta}_i(t) - \theta_i(t)) \right) dt, \\ \hat{\lambda}_j &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T c_j^{\text{old}} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t) \right) dt, \quad \hat{M}_{XY} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i \exp \left(\tilde{\theta}^\top(t_i) \right), \\ \hat{M}_{XX} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{diag} \{ \exp(\tilde{\theta}(t_i)) \} + \exp(\tilde{\theta}(t_i)) \exp(\tilde{\theta}^\top(t_i)), \quad \hat{M}_{YY} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i y_i^\top, \end{aligned}$$

where c_j^{old} is the previous rate of reaction j used in the E-step, for more see Appendix E.

6 Experiments

Lotka-Voltera Model. The Lotka-Voltera or predator-prey model, see, e.g., [15], is one of the most well-known models in population dynamics. It describes the dynamic evolution of a prey species X_1 and a predator species X_2 . The model can be described by three reactions involving the two species as



These reactions reflect the prey growth, the predator reproduction and the predator decline, with rates c_1 , c_2 , and c_3 , respectively. We model the reaction network system using an MJP with mass-action kinetics as in Eqs. (2) and (3). We simulate the system using the Doob-Gillespie algorithm [36, 37] and consider that both species are observed at non-equidistant discrete time points subject to independent Gaussian noise. For inference, we exploit the discussed entropic matching method with expectation propagation, using a product Poisson approximation. In this example, we only evaluate the performance on inferring the latent state path $X_{[0,T]}$ conditioned on the observations Y_1, \dots, Y_N , while keeping the parameters fixed at their respective ground truth values, to keep the evaluation simple. The qualitative results are depicted in Fig. 2.




Figure 2: Simulation of a Lotka-Voltera model. Solid lines denote variational posterior mean, dashed lines denote ground truth trajectory, and the background indicates the inferred marginal state probabilities.

We notice that the inferred posterior mean tracks the qualitative behavior of the system dynamics. This is achieved as the entropic matching method in between observation points tracks the approximate dynamics of the prior evolution. Though the ground truth trajectory can not be recovered errorless, the Poisson approximation gives a measure of uncertainty, indicated in the plot as the background. However, though it is fitting in this example, we want to note, that the Poisson approximation is rather limited, as it only supplies one degree of freedom per species and therefore, only can model an increase in variance by an increase in mean.

Closed Loop Reaction Network. As a second more challenging example, we consider a four species closed loop reaction network as



This network, naturally keeps the total number of species $\sum_{i=1}^4 X_i(t)$ constant over time. In this example, we only observe discrete-time measurements of the fourth species X_4 subject to Gaussian noise, i.e., we set the observation matrix to $H = [0, 0, 0, 1]$. Additionally, to the problem of inferring the latent state trajectories $\{X_i(t) \mid t \in [0, T]\}$ for all species $i = 1, \dots, 4$, we estimate the rate parameters c_1, \dots, c_4 using the approximate EM procedure. The results are depicted in Fig. 3.

We observe that the overall dynamic trend of the reaction network is captured by the approximate inference method and the ground truth trajectory for the latent species X_4 is captured by the Poisson approximation. We see that the species X_1 can still be tracked satisfactory, however, the species X_2 and X_3 have rather large errors, w.r.t. the posterior mean. This is a result of structure of the reaction network, as well as the approximate inference method used. It is also interesting to note, that it is clear from the system dynamics, that when a species X_4 is produced it is implied that a species of X_1 was converted into it. However, this causality is not captured by the the product form approximation used for the posterior distribution.




Figure 3: A four species closed loop reaction network, with noisy observation of the fourth species schematically depicted on the left. The right plots show the time evolution of the ground-truth trajectories (dashed lines) together with the inferred posterior mean of the Poisson approximation. The background indicates the inferred marginal state probabilities. The observations of the fourth species are denoted by crosses.





Figure 4: Three selected species from the motility model adapted from [38, 39], where only the species SigD is noisily observed (crosses). Posterior means and ground-truth trajectories are shown as solid and dashed lines, respectively.

Motility Model. The motility model introduced by Wilkinson [38] is a model for bacterial gene regulation. The model consist of a total of nine species and twelve reactions as



In this setup we consider the parameters of c_3, c_9 , and c_{10} to be unknown and hence, they have to be estimated based only on noisy observations of SigD. We again exploit a Poisson approximation for the posterior distribution and estimate the latent state. The results for three of the nine species are depicted in Fig. 4. The additional trajectories can be found in Appendix F.

We observe that the trajectories for the noisily observed SigD and the fully latent Hag can be tracked rather satisfactory. However, one drawback is again the rather limited expressiveness of the Poisson distribution, which can be seen in the reconstruction of hAg. Here, the posterior mean tracks roughly the time-average of the ground-truth signal. However, since for this species the effective realizations are very low, the Poisson approximation only yields a rather poor approximation for the ground-truth signal. Here, it might be interesting to use a finite categorical approximating distribution instead.

7 Conclusion

We presented a principled inference framework for MJPs based on an entropic matching method embedded into an expectation propagation algorithm. The new method arrives at closed-form results for the important class of CRNs used within the field of systems biology. The analytic nature of

the closed-form message passing scheme make the method very scalable and fast. However, as shown in the experiments, future work should consider more expressive variational distributions. A potential candidate could be an energy based model [40], which would yield an expressive class for the approximate posterior distribution. This would go well beyond the presented setup of using a product form posterior distribution with only one parameter per dimension. Though closed-form analytic updates might not be possible anymore, we think that advanced MCMC methods [41] could still lead to a scalable algorithm. Additionally this would enable for rather complex observation likelihoods, which have for example also been discussed in the context of discrete-time systems [42] and within the expectation propagation framework [43].

References

- [1] R. S. Mamon and R. J. Elliott, *Hidden Markov models in finance*. Springer, 2007, vol. 4.
- [2] G. Bolch, S. Greiner, H. De Meer, and K. S. Trivedi, *Queueing networks and Markov chains: modeling and performance evaluation with computer science applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- [3] D. F. Anderson and T. G. Kurtz, *Stochastic analysis of biochemical systems*. Springer, 2015, vol. 674.
- [4] C. W. Gardiner *et al.*, *Handbook of stochastic methods*. Springer Berlin, 1985, vol. 3.
- [5] M. Komorowski, B. Finkenstädt, C. V. Harper, and D. A. Rand, “Bayesian inference of biochemical kinetic parameters using the linear noise approximation,” *BMC bioinformatics*, vol. 10, pp. 1–10, 2009.
- [6] D. T. Gillespie, “The chemical Langevin equation,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, vol. 113, no. 1, pp. 297–306, 2000.
- [7] A. Golightly and D. J. Wilkinson, “Bayesian parameter inference for stochastic biochemical network models using particle Markov chain Monte Carlo,” *Interface focus*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 807–820, 2011.
- [8] V. Rao and Y. W. Teg, “Fast MCMC sampling for Markov jump processes and extensions.,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 14, no. 11, 2013.
- [9] M. Opper and G. Sanguinetti, “Variational inference for Markov jump processes,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 20, 2007.
- [10] C. Wildner and H. Koepl, “Moment-based variational inference for Markov jump processes,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2019, pp. 6766–6775.
- [11] T. P. Minka, “A family of algorithms for approximate Bayesian inference,” Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2001.
- [12] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz, *Markov processes: characterization and convergence*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- [13] J. R. Norris, *Markov chains*. Cambridge university press, 1998.
- [14] P. Del Moral and S. Penev, *Stochastic Processes: From Applications to Theory*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2017.
- [15] D. J. Wilkinson, *Stochastic modelling for systems biology*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2018.
- [16] L. Huang, L. Pauleve, C. Zechner, M. Unger, A. S. Hansen, and H. Koepl, “Reconstructing dynamic molecular states from single-cell time series,” *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, vol. 13, no. 122, p. 20160533, 2016.
- [17] P. S. Maybeck, *Stochastic models, estimation, and control*. Academic press, 1982.
- [18] S. Särkkä and A. Solin, *Applied stochastic differential equations*. Cambridge University Press, 2019, vol. 10.
- [19] E. Pardoux, “Non-linear filtering, prediction and smoothing,” in *Stochastic Systems: The Mathematics of Filtering and Identification and Applications: Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute held at Les Arcs, Savoie, France, June 22–July 5, 1980*, Springer, 1981, pp. 529–557.
- [20] B. D. Anderson and I. B. Rhodes, “Smoothing algorithms for nonlinear finite-dimensional systems,” *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, vol. 9, no. 1-2, pp. 139–165, 1983.
- [21] S. Särkkä, *Bayesian filtering and smoothing*. Cambridge university press, 2013.
- [22] C. Archambeau and M. Opper, “Approximate inference for continuous-time Markov processes,” *Bayesian Time Series Models*, pp. 125–140, 2011.
- [23] M. Mider, M. Schauer, and F. Van der Meulen, “Continuous-discrete smoothing of diffusions,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 4295–4342, 2021.
- [24] R. Elliott, “Reverse-time Markov processes (corresp.),” *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 290–292, 1986.
- [25] R. Van Handel, “Filtering, stability, and robustness,” Ph.D. dissertation, California Institute of Technology, 2007.

- [26] B. D. Anderson, “Reverse-time diffusion equation models,” *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 313–326, 1982.
- [27] L. Bronstein and H. Koeppl, “A variational approach to moment-closure approximations for the kinetics of biomolecular reaction networks,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, vol. 148, no. 1, p. 014 105, 2018.
- [28] B. Cseke, D. Schnoerr, M. Opper, and G. Sanguinetti, “Expectation propagation for continuous time stochastic processes,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 49, no. 49, p. 494 002, 2016.
- [29] M. J. Wainwright, M. I. Jordan, *et al.*, “Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference,” *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 1, no. 1–2, pp. 1–305, 2008.
- [30] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. Springer, vol. 4.
- [31] T. Heskes, O. Zoeter, and W. Wiegierinck, “Approximate expectation maximization,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 16, 2003.
- [32] A. G. d. G. Matthews, J. Hensman, R. Turner, and Z. Ghahramani, “On sparse variational methods and the Kullback-Leibler divergence between stochastic processes,” in *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, PMLR, 2016, pp. 231–239.
- [33] C. Kipnis and C. Landim, *Scaling limits of interacting particle systems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998, vol. 320.
- [34] F. B. Hanson, *Applied stochastic processes and control for jump-diffusions: Modeling, analysis and computation*. SIAM, 2007.
- [35] I. Cohn, T. El-Hay, N. Friedman, and R. Kupferman, “Mean field variational approximation for continuous-time Bayesian networks,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 11, pp. 2745–2783, 2010.
- [36] J. L. Doob, “Markoff chains—denumerable case,” *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 58, pp. 455–473, 1945.
- [37] D. T. Gillespie, “A general method for numerically simulating the stochastic time evolution of coupled chemical reactions,” *Journal of computational physics*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 403–434, 1976.
- [38] D. J. Wilkinson, “Parameter inference for stochastic kinetic models of bacterial gene regulation: A Bayesian approach to systems biology,” in *Proceedings of 9th Valencia International Meeting on Bayesian Statistics*, 2010, pp. 679–705.
- [39] A. Golightly and D. J. Wilkinson, “Bayesian inference for Markov jump processes with informative observations,” *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 169–188, 2015.
- [40] Y. Du and I. Mordatch, “Implicit generation and modeling with energy based models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [41] H. Sun, H. Dai, B. Dai, H. Zhou, and D. Schuurmans, “Discrete Langevin samplers via wasserstein gradient flow,” in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, PMLR, 2023, pp. 6290–6313.
- [42] M. J. Johnson, D. K. Duvenaud, A. Wiltchko, R. P. Adams, and S. R. Datta, “Composing graphical models with neural networks for structured representations and fast inference,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [43] A. Vehtari *et al.*, “Expectation propagation as a way of life: A framework for Bayesian inference on partitioned data,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 577–629, 2020.

Entropic Matching for Expectation Propagation of Markov Jump Processes

— Supplementary Material —

Bastian Alt Heinz Koepl

Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology
Technische Universität Darmstadt
{bastian.alt, heinz.koepl}@tu-darmstadt.de

A Some Notes on Exact Filtering and Smoothing

To find the smoothing distribution $\tilde{\pi}(x, t)$ we have multiple options. It can be shown [16, 19, 20] that the smoothing distribution can be factorized as

$$\tilde{\pi}(x, t) = \frac{\pi(x, t)\beta(x, t)}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(x', t)\beta(x', t)}, \quad (17)$$

where $\beta(x, t)$ is the backward-filtering distribution given by $\beta(x, t) := \mathbb{P}(y_{(t, T]} | X(t) = x)$, where $y_{(t, T]} := \{y_i | i \in \{1, \dots, N\} : t_i \in (t, T]\}$ are only the “future” observations. Note that, $\tilde{\pi}(x, T) = \mathbb{P}(X(T) = x | y_{[0, T]}) = \pi(x, T)$, hence we have $\beta(x, T) = 1$. The backward-filtering distribution in between observation time points follows the differential form of the backward Chapman-Kolmogorov equation [4] and is updated at observation time points [16], hence, we have

$$\beta(x, T) = 1, \quad \frac{d}{dt}\beta(x, t) = -\mathcal{L}_t^\dagger \beta(x, t), \quad \beta(x, t_i^-) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(y_i | x)\beta(x, t_i)}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(y_i | x')\beta(x', t_i)}.$$

Note, that $\beta(x, t)$ is càglàd in t . Therefore, we can compute the smoothing distribution $\tilde{\pi}(x, t)$, by first computing the filtering distribution $\pi(x, t)$ forwardly in time, subsequently, computing the backward-filtering distribution $\beta(x, t)$ backwardly in time and then use Eq. (17) to compute $\tilde{\pi}(x, t)$.

Another way is to note that an initial condition for the smoothing distribution is given by $\tilde{\pi}(x, 0) \propto p_0(x)\beta(x, 0)$. Differentiating Eq. (17) by time, then gives rise to the forward smoothing dynamics [16, 20]

$$\tilde{\pi}(x, 0) = \frac{p_0(x)\beta(x, 0)}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} p_0(x')\beta(x', 0)}, \quad \frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\pi}(x, t) = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_t \tilde{\pi}(x, t), \quad (18)$$

where the forward smoothing operator $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_t$ for an arbitrary test function ϕ and the forward smoothing rate function $\bar{\Lambda}(x, x', t)$ are given as

$$[\bar{\mathcal{L}}_t \phi](x) := \sum_{x' \neq x} \bar{\Lambda}(x', x, t)\phi(x') - \bar{\Lambda}(x, x', t)\phi(x), \quad \bar{\Lambda}(x, x', t) = \Lambda(x, x', t) \frac{\beta(x', t)}{\beta(x, t)}. \quad (19)$$

Hence, the smoothing distribution $\tilde{\pi}(x, t)$ can also be calculated by solving the backwards filtering distribution $\beta(x, t)$ backwardly in time and subsequently solving for the smoothing distribution $\tilde{\pi}(x, t)$ using the forward smoothing dynamics in Eq. (18).

B Derivation for the Filtering and Smoothing Variational Parameters

B.1 Computing the Filtering Distribution

Here, we find the variational parameters $\theta(t)$ by considering

$$\theta(t+h) = \arg \min_{\theta'} \text{KL}(\pi(x, t+h) \parallel \mathbb{q}(x | \theta')),$$

where $\pi(x, t + h)$ is the filtering distribution that is propagated for a small time step h . We get an recursive algorithm by considering that the filtering distribution at time point t has the initial distribution $q(x | \theta(t))$, i.e., we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\pi(x, t) = \mathcal{L}_t\pi(x, t), \quad \pi(x, t) = q(x | \theta(t)).$$

Hence, we can write

$$\pi(x, t + h) = q(x | \theta(t)) + h\mathcal{L}_t q(x | \theta(t)) + o(h),$$

with $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} o(h)/h = 0$. For the KL divergence we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{KL}(\pi(x, t + h) \parallel q(x | \theta')) \\ &= \text{KL}(q(x | \theta(t)) + h\mathcal{L}_t q(x | \theta(t)) + o(h) \parallel q(x | \theta')) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi(x, t+h)} \left[\log \frac{q(X | \theta(t)) + h\mathcal{L}_t q(X | \theta(t)) + o(h)}{q(X | \theta')} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi(x, t+h)} [\log(q(X | \theta(t)) + h\mathcal{L}_t q(X | \theta(t)) + o(h)) - \log q(X | \theta')] \end{aligned}$$

Using a Taylor series around $h = 0$, we can find that for some coefficients a and b , we have

$$\log(a + bh + o(h)) = \log a + h\frac{b}{a} + o(h).$$

Hence, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{KL}(\pi(x, t + h) \parallel q(x | \theta')) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi(x, t+h)} [\log(q(X | \theta(t)) + h\mathcal{L}_t q(X | \theta(t)) + o(h)) - \log q(X | \theta')] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi(x, t+h)} \left[\log q(X | \theta(t)) + h\frac{\mathcal{L}_t q(X | \theta(t))}{q(X | \theta(t))} + o(h) - \log q(X | \theta') \right] \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(x, t + h) \left[\log q(x | \theta(t)) + h\frac{\mathcal{L}_t q(x | \theta(t))}{q(x | \theta(t))} + o(h) - \log q(x | \theta') \right] \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (q(x | \theta(t)) + h\mathcal{L}_t q(x | \theta(t)) + o(h)) \\ & \quad \cdot \left[\log q(x | \theta(t)) + h\frac{\mathcal{L}_t q(x | \theta(t))}{q(x | \theta(t))} + o(h) - \log q(x | \theta') \right] \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ q(x | \theta(t)) \log \frac{q(x | \theta(t))}{q(x | \theta')} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + h \left[q(x | \theta(t)) \frac{\mathcal{L}_t q(x | \theta(t))}{q(x | \theta(t))} + \mathcal{L}_t q(x | \theta(t)) \log \frac{q(x | \theta(t))}{q(x | \theta')} \right] + o(h) \right\} \\ &= \text{KL}(q(x | \theta(t)) \parallel q(x | \theta')) \\ & \quad + h \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\frac{\mathcal{L}_t q(X | \theta(t))}{q(X | \theta(t))} + \frac{\mathcal{L}_t q(X | \theta(t))}{q(X | \theta(t))} \log \frac{q(X | \theta(t))}{q(X | \theta')} \right] + o(h). \end{aligned}$$

By assuming that for small h the parameter $\theta' = \theta(t + h)$ is close to the parameter $\theta = \theta(t)$, we can exploit a series expansion in $\theta - \theta'$ up to second order of the KL divergence as

$$\text{KL}(q(x | \theta) \parallel q(x | \theta')) = \frac{1}{2}(\theta' - \theta)^\top F(\theta)(\theta' - \theta),$$

where $F(\theta) := -\mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta)} [\nabla_\theta \nabla_\theta^\top \log q(X | \theta)]$ is the Fisher information matrix. Hence, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \nabla_{\theta'} \text{KL}(\pi(x, t + h) \parallel q(x | \theta'))|_{\theta'=\theta(t+h)} \\ &= F(\theta(t))(\theta(t + h) - \theta(t)) - h \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\nabla_{\theta'} \log q(X | \theta(t + h)) \frac{\mathcal{L}_t q(X | \theta(t))}{q(X | \theta(t))} \right] + o(h) \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by h and taking the limit $h \rightarrow 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= F(\theta(t)) \frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) - \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \log q(X | \theta(t)) \frac{\mathcal{L}_t q(X | \theta(t))}{q(X | \theta(t))} \right] \\
&= F(\theta(t)) \frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) - \sum_x q(x | \theta(t)) \nabla_{\theta} \log q(x | \theta(t)) \frac{\mathcal{L}_t q(x | \theta(t))}{q(x | \theta(t))} \\
&= F(\theta(t)) \frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) - \sum_x \nabla_{\theta} \log q(x | \theta(t)) \mathcal{L}_t q(x | \theta(t)) \\
&= F(\theta(t)) \frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) - \sum_x q(x | \theta(t)) \mathcal{L}_t^{\dagger} \nabla_{\theta} \log q(x | \theta(t)) \\
&= F(\theta(t)) \frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) - \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\mathcal{L}_t^{\dagger} \nabla_{\theta} \log q(X | \theta(t)) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) = F(\theta(t))^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\mathcal{L}_t^{\dagger} \nabla_{\theta} \log q(X | \theta(t)) \right]$$

and

$$\theta(t_i) = \arg \min_{\theta'} \text{KL}(p(y_i | x) q(x | \theta(t_i^-)) \parallel q(x | \theta')),$$

with initial condition $\theta(0) = \theta_0$ given by

$$\theta_0 = \arg \min_{\theta'} \text{KL}(p_0(x) \parallel q(x | \theta')).$$

B.2 Computing the Smoothing Distribution

Similar to the filtering approximation, we use the entropic matching method backwards in time for the smoother

$$\tilde{\pi}(x, t) \approx q(x | \tilde{\theta}(t)).$$

Here, we compute

$$\tilde{\theta}(t-h) = \arg \min_{\tilde{\theta}} \text{KL}(\tilde{\pi}(x, t-h) \parallel q(x | \tilde{\theta})).$$

Further, we assume that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\pi}(x, t) = -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t \tilde{\pi}(x, t), \quad \tilde{\pi}(x, t) = q(x | \tilde{\theta}(t)).$$

For the smoothing distribution we can compute the evolution backwards in time by

$$\tilde{\pi}(x, t-h) = q(x | \tilde{\theta}(t)) + h \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t q(x | \tilde{\theta}(t)) + o(h).$$

Hence, similar to the derivation of the approximate filter we have

$$0 = F(\tilde{\theta}(t)) (\tilde{\theta}(t-h) - \tilde{\theta}(t)) - h \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\nabla_{\tilde{\theta}} \log q(X | \tilde{\theta}(t-h)) \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t q(X | \tilde{\theta}(t))}{q(X | \tilde{\theta}(t))} \right] + o(h).$$

Dividing both sides by h and taking the limit $h \rightarrow 0$ we arrive analog to the above derivation at

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\theta}(t) = -F(\tilde{\theta}(t))^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{\dagger} \nabla_{\tilde{\theta}} \log q(X | \tilde{\theta}(t)) \right],$$

with end-point condition $\tilde{\theta}(T) = \theta(T)$.

C Parameter Learning

For parameter learning we use an approximate EM scheme. For the derivation of the EM algorithm, we consider that instead of maximizing the intractable marginal likelihood $p(y_{[0,T]} | \phi)$ w.r.t. some parameters ϕ , a tractable lower bound $L(\phi)$ as

$$\log p(y_{[0,T]} | \phi) \geq L(\phi) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\log \frac{dP}{dQ}(X_{[0,T]}, y_{[0,T]}, \phi) \right],$$

where $\frac{dP}{dQ}$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the path measure $P(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot, Y_{[0,T]} \in \cdot | \phi)$ for the latent paths $X_{[0,T]} := \{X(t) | t \in [0, T]\}$ and all observations $Y_{[0,T]}$ w.r.t. an approximating probability measure $Q(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot)$ over latent paths and the Lebesgue measure over all observations $Y_{[0,T]}$. Optimizing this bound w.r.t. the approximate probability measure yields the exact posterior probability measure $Q(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot) = P(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot | y_{[0,T]}, \phi)$. We note that the bound $L(\phi)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} L(\phi) &= \mathbb{E}_Q \left[\log \frac{dP}{dQ}(X_{[0,T]}, y_{[0,T]}, \phi) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Q \left[\log \left(p(y_{[0,T]} | X_{[0,T]}, \phi) \frac{dP}{dQ}(X_{[0,T]}, \phi) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Q \left[\log \frac{dP}{dQ}(X_{[0,T]}, \phi) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(x, t_i)} [\log p(y_i | X, \phi)] \\ &= -\text{KL}(Q(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot) \parallel P(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot | \phi)) + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(x, t_i)} [\log p(y_i | X, \phi)], \end{aligned}$$

where we denote by $q(x, t) := Q(X(t) = x)$ the time point-wise marginal of the approximate path measure. Note that both the approximate path measure $Q(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot)$ and the prior path measure $P(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot | \phi)$ are path measures induced by an MJP. For the prior path measure $P(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot | \phi)$ this is easy to note, since $\{X(t)\}$ is an MJP. For the approximate posterior path-measure $Q(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot) = P(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot | y_{[0,T]}, \phi)$ this can be seen, as the equations for its time point-wise marginals $q(x, t) = Q(X(t) = x) = P(X(t) = x | y_{[0,T]}, \phi) = \tilde{\pi}(x, t)$ are given by the evolution of the smoothing distribution in Eq. (18). This evolution equation has the form of a master equation with the rate function $\bar{\Lambda}(x, x', t)$ as defined in Eq. (19), and therefore, the posterior process is also an MJP. The KL divergence for two MJPs, which is the expected log Radon-Nikodym derivative, has been derived in the literature multiple times, see, e.g., [9, 33–35]. The KL divergence computes to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(Q(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot) \parallel P(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot | \phi)) &= \text{KL}(q(x, 0) \parallel p_0(x | \phi)) \\ &+ \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_{q(x, t)} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \bar{\Lambda}(X, x', t) \log \frac{\bar{\Lambda}(X, x', t)}{\Lambda(X, x', t | \phi)} - (\bar{\Lambda}(X, x', t) - \Lambda(X, x', t | \phi)) \right] dt, \end{aligned}$$

where only the prior rates $\Lambda(x, x', t | \phi)$ depend on the parameters ϕ . Note, that the forward posterior rates $\bar{\Lambda}(x, x', t)$ in Eq. (19) can be written in terms of the filtering and smoothing distribution by exploiting Eq. (17) as

$$\bar{\Lambda}(x, x', t) = \Lambda(x, x', t) \frac{\beta(x', t)}{\beta(x, t)} = \Lambda(x, x', t) \frac{\tilde{\pi}(x', t) \pi(x, t)}{\tilde{\pi}(x, t) \pi(x', t)}.$$

Therefore, we arrive at the following expression for the bound as

$$\begin{aligned} L(\phi) &= \mathbb{E}_{q(x, 0)} \left[\log \frac{p_0(X | \phi)}{q(X, 0)} \right] + \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_{q(x, t)} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \Lambda(X, x', t) \frac{\tilde{\pi}(x', t) \pi(X, t)}{\tilde{\pi}(X, t) \pi(x', t)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \log \frac{\Lambda(X, x', t | \phi)}{\Lambda(X, x', t)} - \Lambda(X, x', t | \phi) \right] dt + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(x, t_i)} [\log p(y_i | X, \phi)] + \text{const.} \end{aligned}$$

Since, the computation $Q(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot) = P(X_{[0,T]} \in \cdot | y_{[0,T]}, \phi)$ of the exact posterior probability measure is intractable, we replace its time-point wise marginals with the approximate filtering and smoothing distribution as $p(x, t | y_{[0,T]}, \phi) = \tilde{\pi}(x, t) \approx q(x | \tilde{\theta}(t))$ and $\pi(x, t) \approx q(x | \theta(t))$,

respectively. We keep these distributions fixed and this yields an expression for the bound as

$$\begin{aligned} L(\phi) = & \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(0))} \left[\log \frac{p_0(X | \phi)}{q(X | \tilde{\theta}(0))} \right] + \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \Lambda(X, x', t) \frac{q(x' | \tilde{\theta}(t))}{q(X | \tilde{\theta}(t))} \frac{q(X | \theta(t))}{q(x' | \theta(t))} \right. \\ & \left. \cdot \log \frac{\Lambda(X, x', t | \phi)}{\Lambda(X, x', t)} - \Lambda(X, x', t | \phi) \right] dt + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t_i))} [\log p(y_i | X, \phi)] + \text{const.} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Therefore, we can find the optimal parameters, by iteratively computing the filtering and smoothing distribution $\{q(x | \theta(t)) | t \in [0, T]\}$ and $\{q(x | \tilde{\theta}(t)) | t \in [0, T]\}$, respectively, and optimizing Eq. (20) w.r.t. the parameters ϕ .

D Derivation for Chemical Reaction Networks

D.1 Filtering Distribution

The evolution of the approximate filtering distribution is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) = F(\theta(t))^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\mathcal{L}_t^\dagger \nabla_\theta \log q(X | \theta(t)) \right].$$

We assume a product Poisson variational distribution $q(x | \theta)$ and the adjoint operator \mathcal{L}_t^\dagger is characterized by CRN dynamics with mass action kinetics. Therefore, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\mathcal{L}_t^\dagger \nabla_\theta \log q(X | \theta(t)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \Lambda(X, x', t) (\nabla_\theta \log q(x' | \theta(t)) - \nabla_\theta \log q(X | \theta(t))) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \Lambda(X, x', t) (x' - X) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{1}(x' = X + \nu_j) \lambda_j(X) (x' - X) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\sum_{j=1}^k \nu_j \lambda_j(X) \right] = \sum_{j=1}^k \nu_j \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} [\lambda_j(X)] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\theta(t))} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n (X_i)^{\nu_{ij}} \right] = \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \prod_{i=1}^n (\exp \theta_i(t))^{\nu_{ij}} \end{aligned}$$

The last line is computed, by noting that the Poisson random variables are independent and the m th factorial moment of a Poisson random variable with mean λ is given as $\mathbb{E}[(X)_m] = \lambda^m$. By writing this results in the natural parameterization, we arrive at

$$\frac{d}{dt} \theta(t) = F(\theta(t))^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \theta_i(t)\right).$$

D.2 Smoothing Distribution

For the derivation to the smoothing distribution we compute

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\theta}(t) = -F(\tilde{\theta}(t))^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^\dagger \nabla_\theta \log q(X | \tilde{\theta}(t)) \right].$$

The expectation on the r.h.s. computes to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^\dagger \nabla_\theta \log \mathbf{q}(X | \tilde{\theta}(t)) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \tilde{\Lambda}(X, x', t) (x' - X) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \Lambda(x', X, t) \frac{\pi(x', t)}{\pi(X, t)} (x' - X) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \Lambda(x', X, t) \frac{\mathbf{q}(x' | \theta(t))}{\mathbf{q}(X | \theta(t))} (x' - X) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{1}(X = x' + \nu_j) \lambda_j(x') \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{X_i!}{x'_i!} \exp((x'_i - X_i) \theta_i(t)) \right\} (x' - X) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(X - \nu_j) \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{X_i!}{(X_i - \nu_{ij})!} \exp(-\nu_{ij} \theta_i(t)) \right\} (-\nu_j) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(X - \nu_j) \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n (X_i)_{\nu_{ij}} \right\} \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \theta_i(t) \right) (-\nu_j) \right] \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \theta_i(t) \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n (X_i - \nu_{ij})_{\nu_{ij}} \right\} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n (X_i)_{\nu_{ij}} \right\} \right] \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \theta_i(t) \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n (X_i - \nu_{ij})_{\underline{\nu}_{ij}} (X_i)_{\nu_{ij}} \right] \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \theta_i(t) \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n (X_i - \nu_{ij})_{\underline{\nu}_{ij}} (X_i)_{\nu_{ij}} \right] \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \theta_i(t) \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n (X_i)_{\nu_{ij} + \underline{\nu}_{ij}} \right] \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \theta_i(t) \right) \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(t)^{\nu_{ij} + \underline{\nu}_{ij}} \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \theta_i(t) \right) \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\nu_{ij} + \underline{\nu}_{ij}) \tilde{\theta}_i(t) \right) \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \underline{\nu}_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t) \right) \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} (\tilde{\theta}_i(t) - \theta_i(t)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This yields the smoothing dynamics as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\theta}(t) = F(\tilde{\theta}(t))^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nu_j \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \underline{\nu}_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t) \right) \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} (\tilde{\theta}_i(t) - \theta_i(t)) \right).$$

E Parameter Learning for Latent Chemical Reaction Networks

Here, we give an expression for the bound $L(\phi)$ for the case of a product Poisson approximation for the filtering and smoothing distributions, for dynamics given as a CRN with mass action kinetics, and a linear Gaussian observation model. For the parameters we consider the initial condition parameters $\{\theta_{i,0}\}_{i=0}^n$, the effective rate parameters $\{c_j\}_{j=1}^k$, and the linear observation

model parameter H and observation noise covariance Σ . Therefore, the full set of parameters are $\phi = \{\{\theta_{i,0}\}_{i=0}^n, \{c_j\}_{j=1}^k, H, \Sigma\}$.

Initial Condition Parameters. First, we note that for the KL divergence

$$\text{KL}\left(\mathbb{q}(x | \tilde{\theta}(0)) \parallel p_0(x | \phi)\right) = -\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(0))} \left[\log \frac{p_0(X | \phi)}{\mathbb{q}(X | \tilde{\theta}(0))} \right]$$

in Eq. (20) can be computed in closed form, as both distributions are given by a product of Poisson distributions as $\mathbb{q}(x | \tilde{\theta}(0)) = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{Pois}(x_i | \exp(\tilde{\theta}_i(0)))$ and $p_0(x | \phi) = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{Pois}(x_i | \exp(\theta_{i,0}))$. Therefore, the KL divergence between two product Poisson distributions computes to

$$\text{KL}\left(\mathbb{q}(x | \tilde{\theta}(0)) \parallel p_0(x | \phi)\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\theta_{i,0}) - \exp(\tilde{\theta}_i(0)) + \exp(\tilde{\theta}_i(0)) \log \frac{\exp(\tilde{\theta}_i(0))}{\exp(\theta_{i,0})}.$$

Hence, for the bound w.r.t. the i th initial condition parameter $\theta_{i,0}$ we have

$$L(\theta_{i,0}) = -\exp(\theta_{i,0}) + \exp(\tilde{\theta}_i(0))\theta_{i,0} + \text{const.}$$

Hence, computing the derivative $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta_{i,0}}$ and setting it to zero yields the optimal initial parameter as

$$\theta_{i,0} = \tilde{\theta}_i(0).$$

Rate Parameters. For optimizing the effective rate parameters $\{c_j\}_{j=1}^k$, we have to compute the expectation in Eq. (20) over the MJP rates, which is

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \Lambda(X, x', t) \frac{\mathbb{q}(x' | \tilde{\theta}(t)) \mathbb{q}(X | \theta(t))}{\mathbb{q}(X | \tilde{\theta}(t)) \mathbb{q}(x' | \theta(t))} \log \frac{\Lambda(X, x', t | \phi)}{\Lambda(X, x', t)} - \Lambda(X, x', t | \phi) \right] dt. \quad (21)$$

First, we note that we can compute the ratios of smoothing and filtering distributions as

$$\frac{\mathbb{q}(x' | \tilde{\theta}(t)) \mathbb{q}(x | \theta(t))}{\mathbb{q}(x | \tilde{\theta}(t)) \mathbb{q}(x' | \theta(t))} = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\exp((x'_i - x_i)\tilde{\theta}_i(t))}{\exp((x'_i - x_i)\theta_i(t))} = \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (x'_i - x_i)(\tilde{\theta}_i(t) - \theta_i(t))\right).$$

For the rate functions $\Lambda(x, x', t)$ and $\Lambda(x, x', t | \phi)$ we use the equations for a CRN model finding

$$\Lambda(x, x', t) = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{1}(x' = x + \nu_j) c_j^{\text{old}} \prod_{i=1}^n (x_i)_{\nu_{ij}},$$

$$\Lambda(x, x', t | \phi) = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{1}(x' = x + \nu_j) c_j \prod_{i=1}^n (x_i)_{\nu_{ij}},$$

where we denote by $\{c_j^{\text{old}}\}_{j=1}^k$ the set of old rate parameters, over which we do not optimize. This yields for the expectation in Eq. (21)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{x' \neq X} \Lambda(X, x', t) \frac{\mathbb{q}(x' | \tilde{\theta}(t)) \mathbb{q}(X | \theta(t))}{\mathbb{q}(X | \tilde{\theta}(t)) \mathbb{q}(x' | \theta(t))} \log \frac{\Lambda(X, x', t | \phi)}{\Lambda(X, x', t)} - \Lambda(X, x', t | \phi) \right] dt \\ &= \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{q}(x|\tilde{\theta}(t))} \left[\sum_{j=1}^k c_j^{\text{old}} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n (X_i)_{\nu_{ij}} \right\} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij}(\tilde{\theta}_i(t) - \theta_i(t))\right) \log\left(\frac{c_j}{c_j^{\text{old}}}\right) \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - c_j \prod_{i=1}^n (X_i)_{\nu_{ij}} \right] dt \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^T \left\{ c_j^{\text{old}} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t)\right) \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij}(\tilde{\theta}_i(t) - \theta_i(t))\right) \log\left(\frac{c_j}{c_j^{\text{old}}}\right) \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - c_j \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t)\right) \right\} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the bound $L(c_j)$ w.r.t. the j th rate parameter c_j , can be computed as

$$L(c_j) = \int_0^T c_j^{\text{old}} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t)\right) \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} (\tilde{\theta}_i(t) - \theta_i(t))\right) \log c_j \\ - c_j \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t)\right) dt + \text{const.}$$

By introducing the summary propensity statistics

$$\hat{\gamma}_j = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T c_j^{\text{old}} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t)\right) c_j^{\text{old}} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} (\tilde{\theta}_i(t) - \theta_i(t))\right) dt, \\ \hat{\lambda}_j = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T c_j^{\text{old}} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij} \tilde{\theta}_i(t)\right) dt,$$

we write the bound as

$$L(c_j) = \frac{T}{c_j^{\text{old}}} \hat{\gamma}_j \log c_j - \frac{T}{c_j^{\text{old}}} \hat{\lambda}_j c_j + \text{const.}$$

Hence, computing the derivative $\frac{\partial L}{\partial c_j}$ and setting it to zero yields the optimal rate parameter as

$$c_j = \hat{\gamma}_j \hat{\lambda}_j^{-1}.$$

Observation Model Parameters. The observation model parameters can be found by computing

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t_i))} [\log p(y_i | X, \phi)] = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t_i))} [\log \mathcal{N}(y_i | HX, \Sigma)] \\ = \sum_{i=1}^N -\frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi\Sigma| - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \Sigma^{-1} \left(y_i y_i^\top - y_i \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t_i))} [X^\top] H^\top - H \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t_i))} [X] y_i^\top \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + H \mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t_i))} [XX^\top] H^\top \right) \right\}.$$

By using the product Poisson distribution $q(x | \tilde{\theta}(t_i)) = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{Pois}(x_i | \exp(\tilde{\theta}(t_i)))$, we compute the moments as $\mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t_i))} [X] = \exp(\tilde{\theta}(t_i))$ and $\mathbb{E}_{q(x|\tilde{\theta}(t_i))} [XX^\top] = \text{diag}\{\exp(\tilde{\theta}(t_i))\} + \exp(\tilde{\theta}(t_i)) \exp(\tilde{\theta}^\top(t_i))$. Therefore, we have the lower bound

$$L(H, \Sigma) = -\frac{N}{2} \log |2\pi\Sigma| - \frac{N}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \Sigma^{-1} \left(\hat{M}_{YY} - \hat{M}_{XY} H^\top - H \hat{M}_{XY}^\top + H \hat{M}_{XX} H^\top \right) \right\} + \text{const},$$

where we introduce the shorthands $\hat{M}_{YY} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i y_i^\top$, $\hat{M}_{XY} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i \exp(\tilde{\theta}^\top(t_i))$ and $\hat{M}_{XX} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{diag}\{\exp(\tilde{\theta}(t_i))\} + \exp(\tilde{\theta}(t_i)) \exp(\tilde{\theta}^\top(t_i))$. Hence, computing the derivatives $\frac{\partial L}{\partial H}$ and $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \Sigma}$, and setting them to zero yield the optimal observation model parameters as

$$H = \hat{M}_{XY} \hat{M}_{XX}^{-1}, \quad \Sigma = \hat{M}_{YY} - \hat{M}_{XY} H^\top - H \hat{M}_{XY}^\top + H \hat{M}_{XX} H^\top.$$

Note that, this is very similar to the case of a linear Gaussian state space model, for more see [21].

F Additional Experiments

The additional results of the motility model experiment are depicted in Fig. 5.




Figure 5: Additional results of the motility model.