From empirical data to time-inhomogeneous continuous Markov processes

Pedro Lencastre,[1] Frank Raischel,[2] Tim Rogers,[3] and Pedro G. Lind[4,5,*]

[1]*Mathematical Department, FCUL, University of Lisbon, 1749-016 Lisbon, Portugal*

[2]*Instituto Dom Luiz, University of Lisbon, 1749-016 Lisbon, Portugal*

[3]*Centre for Networks and Collective Behaviour, Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, Claverton Down, BA2 7AY, Bath, United Kingdom*

[4]*ForWind—Center for Wind Energy Research, Institute of Physics, Carl-von-Ossietzky University of Oldenburg, DE-26111 Oldenburg, Germany*

[5]*Institut für Physik, Universität Osnabrück, Barbarastrasse 7, 49076 Osnabrück, Germany*

(Received 25 September 2015; revised manuscript received 15 February 2016; published 17 March 2016)

We present an approach for testing for the existence of continuous generators of discrete stochastic transition matrices. Typically, existing methods to ascertain the existence of continuous Markov processes are based on the assumption that only time-homogeneous generators exist. Here a systematic extension to time inhomogeneity is presented, based on new mathematical propositions incorporating necessary and sufficient conditions, which are then implemented computationally and applied to numerical data. A discussion concerning the bridging between rigorous mathematical results on the existence of generators to its computational implementation is presented. Our detection algorithm shows to be effective in more than 60% of tested matrices, typically 80% to 90%, and for those an estimate of the (nonhomogeneous) generator matrix follows. We also solve the embedding problem analytically for the particular case of three-dimensional circulant matrices. Finally, a discussion of possible applications of our framework to problems in different fields is briefly addressed.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.93.032135

I. MOTIVATION

While models describing the evolution of a set of variables are typically continuous, observations and experiments retrieve discrete sets of values. Therefore, to bridge between models and reality one has to know if it is reasonable to assume a continuous "reality" underlying the discrete set of measurements. When the evolution has a non-negligible stochastic contribution, one typically extracts from the set of measurements the distribution $\vec{P}(t)$ of the observed values of the process X at a time t, that is, $P_j(t) = \mathbb{P}(X(t) = j)$. By observing the process again at a future time $t + \tau$ and counting the number of observed transitions between states, one is able to define a transition matrix $\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)$ that satisfies:

$$\vec{P}(t+\tau) = \vec{P}(t)\mathbf{T}(t,\tau), \tag{1}$$

or, in components, $P_k(t+\tau) = \sum_j P_j(t)T_{jk}$. The transition matrix $\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)$ has all its elements T_{jk} in the interval $[0,1]$, has row-sums 1, $\sum_k T_{jk} = 1$, and has non-negative entries, $T_{jk} \geqslant 0$.

In this paper we address the problem of determining whether the evolution of an observed system is governed by a time-continuous Markov master equation. This problem is usually called the embedding problem [1]. Time-continuous Markov processes are, by definition, memoryless stochastic processes: The probability of transition between states at any time does not depend on the history of the process. If the stochastic process is time continuous and Markovian, then the transition matrix can be defined for infinitely small τ, obeying an equation of the form

$$\frac{d\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)}{d\tau} = \mathbf{Q}(t)\mathbf{T}(t,\tau), \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ is called the generator matrix of the process, having zero row-sums and non-negative off-diagonal entries. Notice that the solution $\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)$ of this equation is indeed a transition matrix for all t and τ, i.e., with non-negative real elements and unity row-sums, if and only if it obeys Eq. (2) for some $\mathbf{Q}(t)$[1].

The transition matrix $T(t,\tau)$, solution of Eq. (2), defines the evolution equation, Eq. (1), of the probability density function. Thus, the entries Q_{kj} of the generator matrix represent the transition rate between states j and k at time t. Time continuity is a property that results from the fact that all entries of Q, i.e., all transition rates, are finite, under the overall assumption that the state space if finite. The general solution of Eq. (2) yields the relation between the empirical transition matrix and the "continuous" generator which, in the particular case of a time-homogeneous transition matrix, has the form

$$\mathbf{T}(t,\tau) \equiv \mathbf{T}(\tau) = \exp(\mathbf{Q}\tau), \tag{3}$$

for all times t. In general, the embedding problem reduces to the problem of being able to write the transition matrix $\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)$ as solution of Eq. (2) and typically one considers the particular case of a time-homogeneous solution, Eq. (3).

While time homogeneity is a useful common assumption, it is in several cases too restrictive. Assuming time homogeneity has the advantage of knowing all future evolution of a time-homogeneous Markov process from the law of the change of system's configuration in two distinct instants [see Eq. (3)], one is not able to address simultaneously more realistic cases of nonstationary systems. Some progress in this topic has been made recently, for example, Shintani and Shinomoto have examined an optimized Bayesian rate estimator in cases where the probability density function is not constant in time [2].

In this scope, there are three main reasons for considering an empirical transition matrix to not be time-homogeneous

*pelind@uos.de

embeddable. The first one is when the underlying process is not Markovian. We previously addressed such a scenario [3,4]. One second reason is the statistical error any empirical data set is subjected to. Typically, one defines for these cases an interval of confidence (a distance) beyond which embeddability is rejected. The third reason is, of course, that the underlying process is itself not time homogeneous. In this case, there is no time-homogeneous generator, but there is sill the chance that an inhomogeneous generator exists.

In this paper, we address analytically and numerically the case of time-inhomogeneous generators and test their implementation in one framework to address synthetic numerical data, dealing with statistical error of transition matrices. We will also review the time-homogeneous embedding problem, introduced in 1937 by Elfving [5], providing an analytical example in three dimensions. Since our aim is to provide a framework for applying to empirical data from which transition matrices can be extracted and tested, we will always consider conditions under the assumption that one has a finite state space, i.e., transition matrices have dimension $n \times n$, with n an arbitrary positive integer.

We start in Sec. II by describing the standard time-homogeneous problem with the main mathematical theorems that give the necessary and sufficient conditions for a generator matrix to exist. In Sec. III we illustrate this standard time-homogeneous embedding problem by applying the results to the specific case of a circulant transition matrix. Sections IV and V are the heart of this paper; the former establishes the main mathematical theorems that are still valid for the general case of inhomogeneous generators and the latter describes their implementation in a framework that is then tested with synthetic data. Finally, discussions and conclusions are given in Sec. VI.

II. THE HOMOGENEOUS EMBEDDING PROBLEM

The question of knowing if a time-homogeneous generator $\mathbf{Q}$ [see Eq. (3)] exists is known as homogeneous embedding problem [5] and, from a mathematical point of view, is currently an open problem for matrices with dimension $n \geqslant 3$. The problem in dimension 2 was solved in 1962 by Kingman [6], who proved that, for $n = 2$, a matrix is embeddable if and only if its determinant is positive. More recently, developments in three dimensions have been made with the study of matrices with repeated negative eigenvalues [7].

Part of the difficulty when addressing the embedding problem arises from the fact that the logarithm of a matrix is, in general, not unique. This is crucial when deriving a generator $\mathbf{Q}$, by inverting Eq. (3). Indeed, the logarithm of a matrix has counterintuitive properties, namely:

(i) The product of two embeddable transition matrices $\mathbf{T}_1$ and $\mathbf{T}_2$ is also a transition matrix not necessarily embeddable.

(ii) Having two transition embeddable matrices with generators $\mathbf{Q}_1$ and $\mathbf{Q}_2$, if their product is embeddable, then its generator is not necessarily $\mathbf{Q}_1 + \mathbf{Q}_2$, unless the transition matrices commute.

(iii) It is possible that the product of two matrices, $\mathbf{T}_1\mathbf{T}_2$, is embeddable, but the product $\mathbf{T}_2\mathbf{T}_1$ is not.

Since the logarithm of a matrix is not unique, one defines the so-called principal logarithm of one matrix $\mathbf{T}$ as [8]

$$\log \mathbf{T} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma \log z (z\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{T})^{-1} dz, \tag{4}$$

where γ is a path in the complex plane which does not intersect the negative real semiaxis and encloses all eigenvalues of $\mathbf{T}$. Computationally, one uses the Taylor expansion of the logarithmic function, yielding

$$\log \mathbf{T} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{(\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I})^n}{n}, \tag{5}$$

which is the the principal branch of the complex logarithm in Eq. (4) or other numerical methods, such as Schur decomposition.

To ascertain if the principal logarithm is computable one has the following proposition [9]:

Proposition II.1. Let $S = \max_{\lambda \in \mathrm{spec}(\mathbf{T})} |\lambda - 1|$ be the maximum distance from unity of eigenvalues λ in the spectrum of the transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$. If $S < 1$, then the polynomial series of the $\log \mathbf{T}$, Eq. (5), converges to a matrix with zero row-sums.

While the existence of the logarithm of a transition matrix is necessary for our purposes, it does not solve the full embedding problem. One must assure further that a valid generator exists, i.e., a matrix with non-negative off-diagonal entries and zero row-sums. Moreover, it is also true that if $S > 1$, then one cannot claim that $\mathbf{T}$ has no generator: Another generator may exist in a different branch.

We are interested in the general case of knowing if there is a valid generator, and, if there is, to find it. For that, we need to solve the full embedding problem. The full embedding problem comprises a set of propositions which are separated in four different categories:

(A) Conditions for the convergence of the principal logarithm, as presented above in Proposition II.1, that determine if the matrix defined in Eq. (5) has finite entries Q_{kj}.

(B) Necessary conditions for the existence of a generator.

(C) Sufficient conditions for the existence of a generator.

(D) Uniqueness conditions of the generator for properly defining the underlying continuous process.

The conditions for the convergence of the principal logarithm are mainly included in Proposition II.1. Most of the other known results, comprising categories (B), (C), and (D), are enumerated in the papers by Israel and coworkers [9] and Davies [8]. In the following we present an overview of the most relevant propositions.

Regarding the necessary conditions, important for establishing that a generator cannot exist, there are three highly used propositions that are easy to implement [9]. The first one is:

Proposition II.2. If a transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$ obeys one of the following conditions:

(a) $\mathrm{Det}(\mathbf{T}) \leqslant 0$,

(b) $\mathrm{Det}(\mathbf{T}) > \prod_i T_{ii}$,

(c) $T_{ij} = 0$ and there is an integer n such that $(\mathbf{T}^n)_{ij} \neq 0$,

then no valid generator exists.

For $\mathbf{Q} = \log(\mathbf{T})$, the equality

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{Q}) = \log[\mathrm{Det}(\mathbf{T})] \tag{6}$$

gives the right insight to the property (a) in Proposition II.2 since the logarithm of a real number is defined only for positive values. Property (b) is related with the definition of determinant. As for property (c), suppose that a minimum of m transitions are needed to go from i to j. If the processes is not time continuous and transitions do not occur more than once in a time period Δt, then an entity can only go from i to j in a number of transitions larger than $(m-1)/\Delta t$. This naturally is not true for time-continuous processes, since there is always a nonzero probability of making m transitions between different states over any time window. For a complete proof of Proposition II.2, see Ref. [9].

The second proposition is as follows:

Proposition II.3. For a transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$ with distinct eigenvalues, a generator $\mathbf{Q}$ exists only if, given any eigenvalue of $\mathbf{Q}$ in the form $\lambda = a + ib$, it satisfies the condition $|b| \leqslant |\log(\mathrm{Det}\,\mathbf{T})|$.

Proposition II.3 is related to the previous one. Consider $\mathbf{T}$ embeddable and define $k \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\,(\mathbf{Q}) = \log[\mathrm{Det}\,(\mathbf{T})]$ [see Eq. (6)]. All entries of matrix $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{I}k$ are non-negative and its row-sums are equal to $-k$. From the Perron-Frobenius theorem we know that all eigenvalues of matrix $\mathbf{Q}'$ have an absolute value not smaller than $-k$. Since $\lambda = a + ib$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathbf{Q}$, then $\lambda' = (a-k) + ib$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathbf{Q}'$, yielding $-k > |\lambda'| > |b|$.

A third necessary condition defines the region of the complex plane that contains the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{T}$, if a generator exists:

Proposition II.4. If $\mathbf{T}$ is a $n \times n$ matrix and has a generator, then its eigenvalue spectrum is given by $\lambda_k = r_k \exp(i\theta_k)$, where $-\pi \leqslant \theta \leqslant \pi$ and

$$r \leqslant \exp\left[-\theta \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)\right]. \tag{7}$$

The proof of this proposition, and a general description of the inverse eigenvalue problem, can be found in Refs. [10,11]. It is related with the inverse eigenvalue problem and can also be used when studying the existence of stochastic roots of matrices.

One additional necessary condition for time-homogeneous generators that will be useful below when comparing with time-inhomogeneous generators is the following one:

Proposition II.5. If $\mathbf{T}$ is embeddable, then every negative eigenvalue of $\mathbf{T}$ has even algebraic multiplicity.

In general, Proposition II.5 is useful for the cases when $\mathbf{T}$ has negative real eigenvalues.

Sufficient conditions for the existence of a generator usually deal with considering different branches of the logarithm of the transition matrix and checking if they are valid generators, i.e., if their off-diagonal entries are real and positive and their row-sums are zero. In the particular case when it is known that the only possible generator is the principal logarithm, then computing Eq. (5) gives a complete answer to whether a valid generator exists. If necessary conditions hold, then it is legitimate to raise the hypothesis a generator may exist, but there is still the question regarding whether the generator is unique.

The following two propositions are sufficient conditions for the uniqueness of one homogeneous generator [9]. The first one reads:

Proposition II.6. Let $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be a transition matrix.

(a) If $\mathrm{Det}\,(\mathbf{T}) > \frac{1}{2}$, then $\mathbf{T}$ has at most one generator.

(b) If $\mathrm{Det}\,(\mathbf{T}) > \frac{1}{2}$ and $||\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}|| < \frac{1}{2}$ using any operator norm, then $\log(\mathbf{T})$ is the only possible generator of $\mathbf{T}$.

(c) If $\mathbf{T}$ has distinct eigenvalues, and $\mathrm{Det}\,(\mathbf{T}) > \exp(-\pi)$, then $\log(\mathbf{T})$ is the only possible generator of $\mathbf{T}$.

The second property (b) guarantees that, when there are no repeated eigenvalues, only a finite number of generators exist. Such property is particularly relevant, since in this case it is often possible to find all generators [9].

The second proposition for the uniqueness of one generator is as follows:

Proposition II.7. If $\mathbf{T}$ is a Markov matrix with distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$, then we have that

(a) Only a finite number of solution $e^{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{T}$ can be Markov generators.

(b) If $|\lambda_r| > \exp[-\pi \tan(\frac{\pi}{n})]$ for all r, then the principal logarithm is the only $\mathbf{Q}$ such that $\exp(\mathbf{Q}) = \mathbf{T}$.

The proof of both Propositions II.6 and II.7 can be found in Ref. [9].

III. A EXAMPLE: THE CIRCULANT TRANSITION MATRIX

As a mathematical problem, the embedding problem is still open for a general n-dimensional matrix, but it can be analytically solved for some subclasses of matrices. In this section we address in detail a simple example in three dimensions, namely the embedding of circulant transition matrices of the form:

$$\mathbf{T}_C = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ c & a & b \\ b & c & a \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

or simply $\mathbf{T}_C = \mathrm{circ}(a,b,c)$, with $0 \geqslant a,b,c \geqslant 1$ and $a+b+c=1$. Circulant transition matrices have two independent degrees of freedom: Any pair of values (a,b) can represent a three-dimensional circulant transition matrices if $a+b<1$, $a,b>0$. See the triangular delimited region in Fig. 1.

It is easy to check that all necessary conditions in Proposition II.2 for a generator to exist are fulfilled if $0 < a^3 + b^3 + c^3 - 3abc \leqslant a^3$. Further, according to Proposition II.3, a generator may exist if the argument of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{T}_C$ are not larger than $\log(a^3+b^3+c^3-3abc)$.

For the particular case of the circulant transition matrix, only Proposition II.4 matters, since in this case it turns out to be a necessary and sufficient condition as we next prove.

To that end, we write the transition matrix as $\mathbf{T}_C = \exp \mathbf{Q}_C$, since the exponential of a circulant matrix with real entries is itself a circulant matrix with real entries and consider $\mathbf{Q}_C$ in the form $\mathbf{Q}_C = \mathrm{circ}(-\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$. For $\mathbf{Q}_C$ to be a generator we need to prove that $\alpha,\beta,\gamma > 0$.

The row-sums of $\mathbf{T}_C$ are equal to 1 by definition and this can only happen if the row-sums of $\mathbf{Q}_C$ are equal to zero. Thus, the equality $\alpha = \beta + \gamma$. Moreover, it can be shown that, computing the principal logarithm of $\mathbf{T}_C$, yields a matrix with negative diagonal elements. Thus we take $\alpha > 0$.

Since $\alpha > 0$ and all entries of the generator $\mathbf{Q}$ are real, we need only to prove that β and γ are both non-negative. Since



FIG. 1. (a) Region in parameter space of transition matrix $\mathbf{T}_C$, Eq. (8), for which a generator $\mathbf{Q}_C$ exists. The triangular region (line) is the one for which matrix $\mathbf{T}_C$ is a transition matrix, $a,b,c > 0$ and $a+b+c=1$. The dark gray (blue) region indicates the region of parameter values for which only one generator exists, while the light gray (yellow) region indicates a region where two generators exist. (b) Zooming into this region shows a region where three generators exist (dark gray), and (c) continuing to zoom shows smaller and smaller regions, where a larger number of generators exist (see text).

$\alpha = \beta + \gamma$, either β or γ must be positive. Therefore we only need to prove that $\beta\gamma > 0$.

Proposition II.4 gives a condition for the eigenvalues of the transition matrix $\mathbf{T}_C$ to have a generator matrix. It can be proven [12] that such a condition holds if and only if an equivalent condition for $\mathbf{Q}_C$ holds, namely:

$$\left|\frac{\mathrm{Im}(\lambda_i)}{\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_i)}\right| < \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right), \tag{9}$$

where λ_i with $i = 1,2,3$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{Q}_C$ [13]:

$$\lambda_1 = 0, \tag{10a}$$
$$\lambda_2 = -\beta - \gamma + \beta k + \gamma k^*, \tag{10b}$$
$$\lambda_3 = -\beta - \gamma + \beta k^* + \gamma k = \lambda_2^*, \tag{10c}$$

with $k = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}$ and k^* its complex conjugate.

Using λ_2 in Eq. (10b) and substituting in Eq. (9) yields

$$\left|\frac{\lambda_2 - \lambda_2^*}{\lambda_2 + \lambda_2^*}\right| < \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right) \tag{11}$$

and through algebraic manipulation one arrives at

$$\left|\frac{\beta - \gamma}{\beta + \gamma}\right| < 1. \tag{12}$$

The last inequality implies necessarily that $\beta\gamma > 0$. A similar result is obtained by substituting in Eq. (9) one of the other eigenvalues λ_0 and λ_2.

Hence, in our particular case of a circulant matrix, Proposition II.4 is also a sufficient condition and one needs only to determine the inequality in Eq. (7) as a function of the degrees of freedom in matrix $\mathbf{T}_C$ for all its three eigenvalues

$$\lambda_1^{(T)} = 1, \tag{13a}$$
$$\lambda_2^{(T)} = \frac{1}{2}(2-3b-3c) + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(b-c)i, \tag{13b}$$
$$\lambda_3^{(T)} = \frac{1}{2}(2-3b-3c) - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(b-c)i. \tag{13c}$$

The first eigenvalue is independent of the parameters. The other two are complex conjugate, having the same norm r and symmetric arguments θ. Thus, we only need to consider one eigenvalue, say, $\lambda_3^{(T)} = r\exp(i\theta)$, which, according to Proposition II.4, for $\mathbf{T}_C$ to be embeddable, must fulfill $r \leqslant \exp(-\sqrt{3}\theta)$ with

$$r = \tfrac{1}{2}\{[2-3(b+c)]^2 + 3(b-c)^2\}^{1/2} \tag{14}$$

and

$$\theta = \begin{cases} \arctan\tilde{\theta} & \Leftarrow \quad c < \frac{2}{3} - b, \\ \arctan\tilde{\theta} + \mathrm{sgn}\,(b-c)\pi & \Leftarrow \quad c > \frac{2}{3} - b, \\ \frac{\pi}{2}\,\mathrm{sgn}\,(b-c) & \Leftarrow \quad c = \frac{2}{3} - b, \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where $\tilde{\theta} = \sqrt{3}(b-c)/(2-3b-3c)$.

Figure 1 shows the region within the triangle $1-b-c > 0$, $b > 0$, and $c > 0$ where the circulant transition matrix $\mathbf{T}_C$ has a generator, i.e., the region where $a = 1-b-c$ and b and c obey the inequality in Eqs. (7), (14), and (15). The number of valid generators of $\mathbf{T}_C$, a three-dimensional circulant transition matrix, can also be determined from its eigenvalues; namely it is given by the largest integer smaller than $\{\sqrt{3}\log[\mathrm{Re}^2(\lambda^{(T)}) + \mathrm{Im}^2(\lambda^{(T)})]\}/(4\pi)$.

Figure 1(a) shows one dark gray (blue) region and one smaller light gray (yellow) region. While the dark gray (blue) region indicates the set of parameter values for b and c for which only one generator exists, the light gray (yellow) region comprehends the set of parameter values for which $\mathbf{T}_C$ has two or more generators. By zooming in this region, smaller and smaller regions appear, Figs. 1(b) and 1(c), near the crossing point between the diagonal $c = b$ and the line $c = \frac{2}{3} - b$, where a larger number of generators exist.

IV. THE TIME-INHOMOGENEOUS EMBEDDING PROBLEM

In this section we show which of the known theorems for time-homogeneous embedding problem hold when both transition matrix and its generator depend explicitly on time. In this scope, we provide three new conditions, two necessary and one sufficient, for the existence of a time-inhomogeneous generator. We also provide two additional necessary and sufficient conditions which enable the possibility for testing equivalent matrices.

There are several differences between the time-homogeneous and the time-inhomogeneous problem:

(i) In the time-inhomogeneous problem there is no finite set of possible generators, as is usually the case in the time-homogeneous counterpart, namely when the transition matrix has no repeated eigenvalues [9]. If there is a nonhomogeneous generator, then there is an infinite number of them.

(ii) The product of two homogeneous embeddable matrices might not be time-homogeneous embeddable, whereas the product of two time-inhomogeneous matrices is always embeddable.

(iii) In the inhomogeneous case, the existence of a real-valued logarithm is not a necessary condition for being embeddable.

(iv) The necessary conditions of the time-homogeneous problem concerning the eigenvalues of the transition matrix, Propositions II.4 and II.5, are not necessary conditions for the time-inhomogeneous problem.

The generator $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ is now considered to explicitly depend on time t, as well as its corresponding transition matrix $\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)$. As stated in the Introduction, a transition matrix is solution of Eq. (2), i.e., it has a generator if and only if it describes a time-continuous and Markov process, besides having the properties of a transition matrix (non-negative entries and unitary row-sums).

For time-inhomogeneity, the general solution of Eq. (2) is given by:

$$\mathbf{T}(t,\tau) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Z_k(t-\tau), \tag{16}$$

with $Z_0(t-\tau) \equiv Z_0 = \mathbf{I}$ and

$$Z_{k+1}(t-\tau) = \int_{t-\tau}^{t} Z_k(s)\mathbf{Q}(s)ds. \tag{17}$$

Equation (17) is known as the Peano-Baker series [14]. In the particular case that $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ and $\mathbf{Q}(t')$ commute for all t and t' solution (16) reads

$$\mathbf{T}(t,\tau) = \exp\left[\int_{t-\tau}^{t} \mathbf{Q}(s)ds\right]. \tag{18}$$

The first necessary proposition for time-inhomogeneous generators follows simply from the fact that $\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)$ is a transition matrix:

Proposition IV.1. If a transition matrix $\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)$ has a negative determinant, then no generator $\mathbf{Q}(s)$ exists, for $t < s < t+\tau$.

Proof. To prove the positiveness of the determinant we start by assuming that a generator $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ exists. Then, letting the arguments of $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$ drop for simplicity, it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\operatorname{Det}\mathbf{T} = \operatorname{Det}\mathbf{T}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}^{-1}\frac{d\mathbf{T}}{dt}\right), \tag{19a}$$

$$\frac{d\log(\operatorname{Det}\mathbf{T})}{dt} = \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{T}^{-1}\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{T}), \tag{19b}$$

$$\frac{d\log(\operatorname{Det}\mathbf{T})}{dt} = \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}^{-1}), \tag{19c}$$

$$\operatorname{Det}\mathbf{T} = \exp\left(\int_{t-\tau}^{t} \operatorname{Tr}\mathbf{Q}ds\right) > 0. \tag{19d}$$

The final inequality stands true since the trace of $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ is always a real (negative) value. ■

The second necessary proposition deals also with the fact that $\mathbf{T}$ is a transition matrix, namely that its entries are probabilities:

Proposition IV.2. If a transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$ fulfills $\operatorname{Det}\mathbf{T} > \prod_i T_{ii}$, then no generator exists.

Proof. If $\mathbf{T}$ has a generator, then

$$\frac{dT_{kk}(t,\tau)}{dt} = \sum_j Q_{kj}(t)T_{jk}(t,\tau), \tag{20}$$

and, since for $k \neq j$, $T_{kj} > 0$, and $Q_{kj} \geqslant 0$, one arrives at

$$\frac{dT_{kk}(t,\tau)}{dt} \geqslant Q_{kk}(t)T_{kk}(t,\tau). \tag{21}$$

Since $T_{kk}(t,0) = 1$, we can integrate the differential equation in Eq. (20), yielding

$$T_{kk}(t,\tau) \geqslant \exp\left(\int_{t-\tau}^{t} Q_{kk}(s)ds\right), \tag{22}$$

where Grönwall's inequality is used [15], and, finally, from Eq. (19d), one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_k T_{kk}(t,\tau) &\geqslant \prod_k \exp\left(\int_{t-\tau}^{t} Q_{kk}(s)ds\right)\\ &= \exp\left(\sum_k \int_{t-\tau}^{t} Q_{kk}(s)ds\right)\\ &= \exp\left(\int_{t-\tau}^{t} \operatorname{Tr}(Q_{kk}(s))ds\right)\\ &= \operatorname{Det}[\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)].\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

■

The sufficient condition we will implement afterwards deals with the particular case of a Lower-Upper (LU) decomposition:

Proposition IV.3. If $\mathbf{T}$ has a LU decomposition with $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{U}$ having only non-negative elements, then $\mathbf{T}$ has an inhomogeneous generator $\mathbf{Q}(t)$.

Proof. To prove this proposition, it is important to know an auxiliary result, Proposition A.1 in Appendix, from which it follows that the property of having a time-dependent generator is preserved under multiplication. We use this results from proving that a matrix having an LU decomposition, with $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{U}$ with non-negative entries, can be modeled through a time-dependent generator. For that, it suffices to prove that the matrix $\mathbf{T}$ has an LU decomposition with $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{U}$ transition matrices.

Let us first define a diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D}$ with entries $D_{ii} = (\sum_j U_{ij})^{-1}$. Thus, $\mathbf{T}$, with dimension $n \times n$, can be written as $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{L}'\mathbf{U}'$, with $\mathbf{L}' = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{D}^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{U}' = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}$ triangular matrices that have all non-negative elements since they are a multiplication of one diagonal matrix with one triangular matrix, all of them with non-negative elements.

Furthermore their row-sums are one, since

$$\sum_j U'_{ij} = \sum_j \sum_k D_{ik} U_{kj} = \sum_k D_{ik} \left(\sum_j U_{kj} \right) = D_{ii} \left(\sum_j U_{ij} \right) = \left(\sum_k U_{ik} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_j U_{kj} \right) = 1, \tag{24}$$

for all i. Analogously, since $\sum_j T_{ij} = 1$ for i, one has

$$\sum_j T_{ij} = \sum_j \sum_k L'_{ik} U'_{kj} = \sum_k L'_{ik} \left(\sum_j U'_{kj} \right) = \sum_k L'_{ik} = 1 \tag{25}$$

and therefore

$$\sum_k L'_{ik} = \underline{1}, \tag{26}$$

where $\underline{1}$ is a column vector with all entries 1. ■

Notice that in the LU factorization there are usually $n^2 + n$ variables and n^2 equations. By imposing the row-sums equal to 1, we get $n^2 + n$ equations, and, consequently, the LU decomposition defined in this way is unique.

As an illustrative example consider the matrix:

$$\mathbf{T}_E = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1179 & 0.0890 & 0.7931 \\ 0.0100 & 0.1000 & 0.8900 \\ 0.8901 & 0.0010 & 0.1089 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{27}$$

The matrix $\mathbf{T}_E$ is, according to Proposition IV.3, time-inhomogeneous embeddable, since it is a product of matrices that have a positive LU decomposition. However, it is not time-homogeneous embeddable, since it has distinct negative eigenvalues, $\{1, -0{,}001490, -0{,}671710\}$, and thus it has no real-valued logarithm [16]. Moreover, the conditions in both Propositions II.4 and II.5 are not fulfilled.

Regarding Proposition II.2, we have shown that conditions (a) and (b) are necessary conditions for the more general case of time-inhomogeneous generators. As for condition (c), one can show that there is also a limit number of zero entries for the time-inhomogeneous case. See Proposition A.2 in Appendix.

To end this section we introduce two additional propositions, which are necessary and sufficient for both time-homogeneous and -inhomogeneous cases. They are useful when implementing the computational framework for detecting generators, since they help to handle cases where the application of the above propositions do not provide satisfactory output for the embedding problem. With these equivalent matrices one aims to derive a class of matrices that are embeddable if and only if the "original" transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$ is embeddable, which expands the set of possible matrices one may properly test.

The first proposition uses the similarity of matrices through permutation matrices:

Proposition IV.4. Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{T} \mathbf{P}$, where $\mathbf{P}$ is a permutation matrix and $\mathbf{T}$ is a transition matrix. $\mathbf{T}$ is embeddable if and only if $\mathbf{A}$ is also embeddable.

Proof. To prove this proposition, we will consider a relabeling of the states i, j, and so on. Notice that, under such relabeling, the properties of the transition matrix do not change. Therefore, since changing the transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$ by $\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{T} \mathbf{P}$ one is, in fact, just relabeling the states, one intuitively concludes that if $\mathbf{T}$ is embeddable, then $\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{T} \mathbf{P}$ should also be embeddable.

We start by assuming that $\mathbf{T}$ is embeddable,

$$\mathbf{T} = \exp(\mathbf{Q}) = \sum \frac{\mathbf{Q}^n}{n!}, \tag{28}$$

where $\mathbf{Q}$ is the generator of $\mathbf{T}$. Since $e^{\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{P}} = \mathbf{P}^\top e^{\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{T} \mathbf{P}$, we only need to prove that $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{P}$ is a valid generator, i.e., it must have zero row-sums and non-negative off-diagonal entries.

Since $\mathbf{Q}$ is a valid generator one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j Q'_{ij} &= \sum_j \sum_k \sum_l P^\top_{il} Q_{lk} P_{kj} \\ &= \sum_k \sum_l P^\top_{il} Q_{lk} \left(\sum_j Pkj \right) \\ &= \sum_k \sum_l P^\top_{il} Q_{lk} \\ &= \sum_l P^\top_{il} \sum_k Q_{lk} \\ &= \sum_l P^\top_{il} \times 0 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

To prove that matrix $\mathbf{Q}'$ has non-negative off-diagonal entries we write for $k \neq l$ the off-diagonal entry $Q'_{kl} = \sum_{nm} P_{kn} Q_{nm} (P^\top)_{ml}$ and note that, since the matrix $\mathbf{P}$ has only one nonzero element per column and per row. Thus, being that column i and row j, one has $Q'_{kl} = P_{ki} Q_{ij} (P^\top)_{jl}$.

If $k \neq l$ and $i = j$, then $P_{ki} = 1$ and $(P^\top)_{il} = P_{li} = 1$ which contradicts the fact that $\mathbf{P}$ is a permutation matrix. Thus, if $k \neq l$ then $i \neq j$, and so there is a direct correspondence between off-diagonal elements of $\mathbf{Q}'$ and those of $\mathbf{Q}$: If all Q_{ij} are non-negative so are all Q'_{kl}.

Conversely, if $\mathbf{A}$ is embedabble, one just writes $\mathbf{T} = (\mathbf{P}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}^{-1} = (\mathbf{P}')^\top \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{P}')^\top$ with $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}^{-1}$ and applies the same arguments as above. ■

The second proposition uses renormalization and transposition of the "original" transition matrix:

Proposition IV.5. Let $\mathbf{T}$ be a transition matrix with nonzero determinant and consider $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{T}^\top$, where $\mathbf{D}$ is the diagonal matrix $D_{ii} = (\sum_j T^\top_{ij})^{-1}$. $\mathbf{T}$ is embeddable if and only if $\mathbf{B}$ is also embeddable.

Proof. It is easy to see that if $\mathbf{T}$ is a transition matrix so is $\mathbf{B}$, since $\mathbf{B}$ is always normalized to have row-sums 1, and if $\mathbf{T}$ has all its elements non-negative, so has $\mathbf{B}$. Notice that, while T yields the transition probabilities from a given present state to each accessible future states, B gives the transition probabilities *to* a given present state from each possible past states. It was proven that for a fixed time t, a matrix $\mathbf{T}(t, \tau)$ has all its entries non-negative, $T_{ij}(t, \tau) > 0$, for all τ and is time continuous, i.e., for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is one δ for which,

if $|\tau_1 - \tau_2| < \delta$, then $||\mathbf{T}(t,\tau_1) - \mathbf{T}(t,\tau_2)|| < \epsilon$ if and only if there is a valid generator associated with $\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)$. Since $\mathbf{B}$ is the product of two matrices that are time continuous, $\mathbf{B}$ is also time continuous. ■

Notice that in Proposition IV.5, if the transition matrix T has zero determinant, one falls in the trivial case with no generator; thus, for all cases where a generator exist, T is invertible.

V. COMPUTATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION: HOW "EMBEDDABLE" IS A MATRIX?

The mathematical conditions for the existence of a homogeneous generator from the embedding problem are useful more at a theoretical than at a computational level. They give a bivalent result that does not take into consideration either noise generated from finite samples or how distant an empirical process is from having a constant generator.

In this section we will describe how to adapt our mathematical results to be meaningful to empirical transition matrices in real situations. First, in Sec. V A, we describe how we generate 200 different "test" transition matrices from which 200 different sets of data are extracted to test the implemented approach. In Sec. V B a metric is proposed for each proposition above that measures how "close" the empirical transition matrix is from satisfying the corresponding proposition. Finally, in Sec. V C, if one arrives at the conclusion that the transition matrix is indeed embeddable we describe how to estimate a corresponding generator.

A. Generating data from inhomogeneous transition matrices

In general, for deriving an inhomogeneous generator, one solves the Peano-Baker series [Eq. (16)]. Assume $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ can be modeled as a polynomial of degree N, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{Q}_N(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \mathbf{B}_n t^n, \tag{30}$$

where each matrix $\mathbf{B}_n$ is constant over time and $0 \leqslant t < 1$. Naturally, we need to make sure that no off-diagonal entry in $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ ever become negative in $t \in [0,1[$. To derive the transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$, we impose $t = 1$ in Eq. (30), substituting it in Eq. (17) and afterwards in (16), yielding

$$Z_{k+1}(t) = \sum_{n_1,\ldots,n_k} \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^{k} \frac{B_{n_k}}{\ell + \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} n_m} \right) t^{k+\sum_{m=1}^{\ell} n_m}, \tag{31}$$

which is easily checked by induction, and thus

$$\mathbf{T} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n_1,\cdots,n_k} \prod_{l=1}^{k} \frac{\mathbf{B}_{n_k}}{l + \sum_{m=1}^{l} n_m}. \tag{32}$$

We will restrict our attention here to the case $N = 1$, representing a simple linear trend in transition rates over time. For generating one transition matrix, we first choose matrices $\mathbf{B}_n$ in the following way: Each off-diagonal entry, B_{ij} with $i \neq j$, is randomly chosen according to the positive part of a Gaussian distribution and the diagonal entries are, afterwards, given by $B_{ii} = -\sum_{j \neq i} B_{ij}$. From matrices $\mathbf{B}_n$ one then computes the generator $\mathbf{Q}_N$ and its corresponding transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$, according to Eqs. (30) and (32), respectively. Finally, introducing the transition matrix in Eq. (1) and considering the initial condition $\vec{P}(0)$ as a normalized uniform distribution (equal probability for all states), one obtains the iterated distribution $\vec{P}(\tau)$ from which the data set is extracted.

Before proceeding, we make two important remarks. First, it is necessary to describe how to estimate the transition matrix directly from data series and then explain how to resample the transition matrix which will be necessary for evaluating if it is embeddable. Among several algorithms [17,18], we concentrate ion the so-called cohort method, which counts the number N_{kj} of transitions from state k to state j in the desired time interval $[t,t+\tau]$, defining the entries of the transition matrices as

$$T_{kj}(t) = \frac{N_{kj}(t)}{\sum_j N_{kj}(t)}, \tag{33}$$

with the associated error

$$\sigma_{T_{kj}} = \sqrt{\frac{T_{kj}(1 - T_{kj})}{N_{kj}}}. \tag{34}$$

Second, in order to implement the set of propositions with an associated statistical error, we propose a method of resampling a given empirical transition matrix $\mathbf{T}(t,\tau)$. The set of resampling matrices obtained is then used to quantify the error associated to the estimates on the transition matrix: Each metric that is applied to the empirical transition matrix retrieves a set of metric values when applied to the full set of resampling matrices, and the standard deviation of that value distribution is then taken as the error or uncertainty associated to the metric estimation.

More specifically, one generates series from the distribution of states $P(X,t)$ at time t until the distribution $P(X,t+\tau)$ at $t+\tau$ and estimates the corresponding resampling matrix through the cohort method. See Eq. (33).

B. Embeddability metrics

The propositions of the embedding problem do not take in consideration the uncertainty in the estimation of $\mathbf{T}$, and thus we need to develop methods to determine, beyond statistical uncertainty, whether a generator exists. Notice that embeddability determines only if the process *can possibly* be modeled as a time-continuous Markov process; of course, a positive answer does not guarantee that it *actually is* one. Thus, for each proposition separately, we will use a proper null hypothesis: In the case of Propositions IV.1 and IV.2, the null hypothesis states that a generator exists, while for Proposition IV.3 the null hypothesis states that such a generator does *not* exist. For Propositions IV.1 and IV.2, whenever the null hypothesis is not rejected, or, for Proposition IV.3, whenever it is, one estimates the generator of the transition matrix, as described in next Sec. V C.

To test all the metrics introduced above we generate a set of 200 samples of 10^4 points, each one from a different inhomogeneous transition matrix having an inhomogeneous generator, as described above. We then compute numerically the transition matrix from each sample and apply all three metrics d_{N1}, d_{N2}, and d_{S1}. The results, summarized in Table I, clearly show that in above 60% of the cases the framework

TABLE I. Test results of the inhomogeneous framework detection for a set of 200 samples, each one with 10^4 points. When one of the metrics is larger than $d_{\text{th}} \sim 1.64$, the threshold obtained for the one-sided normal test, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected (see text).

Metric	d_{N1} (Prop.IV.1)	d_{N2} (Prop. IV.2)	d_{S1} (Prop. IV.3)
$> d_{\text{th}}$	13%	1%	**62.5%**
$< d_{\text{th}}$	**87%**	**99%**	37.5%

is able to correctly detect the inhomogeneity of an existing generator.

To evaluate if the condition of Proposition IV.1 is fulfilled for a given transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$, we compute the following quantity:

$$d_{N_1} = -\frac{\det(\mathbf{T})}{\sigma_{\det}}, \tag{35}$$

where $\sigma_{\det}$ is the standard deviation from the sample of the determinants calculated for each resampling matrix. If $d_{N_1} \geqslant d_{\text{th}}$, then we assume that the determinant of $\mathbf{T}$ is negative and the distribution of the resampled determinants are all negative within a threshold number of standard deviations, which for a one-sided normal test is given by $d_{\text{th}} = 2 - \frac{1}{e} \sim 1.64$. In this case we reject the null hypothesis, i.e., no generator exists. As we can see from Table I, 62.5% of the 200 transition matrices constructed from a generator (see next section) do not reject the null hypothesis.

Regarding the condition in Proposition IV.2, we use the following metric:

$$d_{N_2} = -\frac{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}}}{\sigma_{\Delta}}, \tag{36}$$

where $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}} = \prod_i T_{ii} - \det(\mathbf{T})$ and σ_{Δ} is the standard deviation associated to the variable $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}}$ according to the expression in Eq. (34). Again, if $d_{N_2} \geqslant d_{\text{th}}$, then no generator exists. This necessary condition is much better than the previous one: Almost all (99%) of the 200 transition matrices do not reject the null hypothesis for Proposition IV.2.

Concerning the sufficient condition of the LU decomposition with non-negative elements, Proposition IV.3, we can use the following distance:

$$d_{S_1} = \min\{m_L, m_U\}, \tag{37}$$

with

$$m_L = \min_{i,j}\left\{\frac{L_{ij}}{\sigma_{L_{ij}}}\right\}, \tag{38a}$$

$$m_U = \min_{i,j}\left\{\frac{U_{ij}}{\sigma_{U_{ij}}}\right\}, \tag{38b}$$

where L_{ij} and U_{ij} represent the entries of the matrices $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{U}$, respectively, and σ_{Lij} and σ_{Uij} are their corresponding standard deviations. The quantities $\sigma_{L_{ij}}$ and $\sigma_{U_{ij}}$ are calculated solving the same system of equations of the LU decomposition but using the uncertainties in the estimation of T_{ij} with the rules of error propagation. Since it is a sufficient condition, if $d_{S_1} > d_{\text{th}}$, then we reject the null hypothesis, i.e., we assume, contrary to the two necessary conditions above, that a generator exists. From the full sample of transition matrices with generators, only 62.5% fulfill this condition.

Applying these three metrics to one transition matrix, if the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, we estimate a generator matrix as described in the Sec. V C. To ascertain if the estimated generator matrix yields a transition matrix sufficiently close to the empirical transition matrix, we use it to generate auxiliary transition matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}$. If the auxiliary matrices are typically close to the empirical transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$, then we assume that the estimate is good. To that end, we introduce one additional metric to assert if the matrix $\mathbf{T}$ is close enough to a auxiliary matrix, $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}$, originated from a time-continuous Markov process with a generator $\mathbf{Q}(t)$, is to compute the quantity,

$$d_{\text{est}} = \frac{1}{R}\sum_{k=1}^{R}\Theta\big(||\mathbf{T} - \tilde{\mathbf{T}}||_F - ||\mathbf{T}' - \tilde{\mathbf{T}}||_F\big), \tag{39}$$

where R is the number of auxiliary matrices, $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside function, and $||\mathbf{X}||_F = (\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$ is the Frobenius norm of matrix $\mathbf{X}$. We assume that the empirical process, observed for the estimation $\mathbf{T}'$, is not close to the time-continuous Markov process with a transition matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}$ if $d_{\text{est}} < 0.10$, i.e., if less than 10% of the auxiliary matrices are outside a confidence interval with significance value $p = d_{\text{est}}$.

If the distance d_{est} is too small, then a new matrix is generated within the conditions of Propositions IV.4 and IV.5. In case that the new matrices pass the tests above, these propositions guarantee that the original matrix also passes.

C. Modeling the generator matrix Q(t)

In case the null hypothesis cannot be rejected (i.e., that a valid generator exists), we then derive an estimate $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ able to model the empirical process. Unlike the case of the time-homogeneous embedding problem, here we need to estimate a matrix which changes in time and therefore a different procedure is necessary.

Basically, to estimate the inhomogeneous generator one needs to invert Eq. (32). To invert Eq. (32), however, is very cumbersome and computationally expensive. In this subsection, we propose an alternative for estimating inhomogeneous generators that is accurate and easily implementable.

Our procedure is based in the assumption that the original transition matrix is a product of a finite number of embeddable matrices, $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}_1^* \ldots \mathbf{T}_n^*$ with each $\mathbf{T}_i^*$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$ having a homogeneous generator.

One starts with a decomposition of the form

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{A}_1 \ldots \mathbf{A}_n \mathbf{T}_0^* \mathbf{A}_{n+1} \ldots \mathbf{A}_{2n}, \tag{40}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_i$ are embeddable matrices having one off-diagonal positive term. The objective here is to find an embeddable matrix $\mathbf{T}_0^*$ from the empirical matrix $\mathbf{T}$ through the multiplication by matrices $\mathbf{A}_i$. If $\mathbf{T} = e^{\mathbf{Q}}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$ has one negative off-diagonal entry, $Q_{ij} < 0$, then we can try "correct" that entry by multiplying $\mathbf{T}$ by two matrices, $\mathbf{A}_l$ and $\mathbf{A}_{l+n}$, such that $(A_l)_{ik} > 0$ and $(A_{l+n})_{kj} > 0$ for a fixed index k. Intuitively, if there are transitions from a state k to a state j

and only afterwards from another state i to state k, then a time-inhomogeneous process might correspond to a logarithm with a negative off-diagonal entry if $Q_{ij} < 0$. Hence, one derives a first estimate $\mathbf{T}_0^*$ of the transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$. In case there is more than one negative off-diagonal element of $\mathbf{Q}$ one proceeds similarly for each element separately.

The algorithm proceeds then as follows:

(1) Compute $\mathbf{Q}_0^* = \log \mathbf{T}_0^*$ and verify it is a valid generator. Note that, during the algorithm, we must always use the same branch of the complex logarithm.

(2) If the generator is not valid, i.e., it has at least one negative off-diagonal entry $(Q_0^*)_{ij}$, then one finds a suitable integer k for which two matrices, $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_{n+1}$, have entries $(A_1)_{kj} > 0$ and $(A_{n+1})_{ik} > 0$.

(3) One considers the new estimate $\mathbf{T}_1^* = \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{T}_0^* \mathbf{A}_{n+1}$ and computes the generator estimate $\mathbf{Q}_1^* = \log \mathbf{T}_1^*$ and verifies if it is now a valid generator.

(4) One proceeds recursively until, for a certain recursive step, $i\mathbf{Q}_i^* = \log \mathbf{T}_i^*$ has no negative off-diagonal entries.

(5) The final estimate at step i is identified as the k-factor $\mathbf{T}_k^*$ in the assumed decomposition $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}_1^* \dots \mathbf{T}_n^*$.

(6) One computes now $\mathbf{T}_{k+1}^* = (\mathbf{T}_1^* \dots \mathbf{T}_k^*)^{-1}\mathbf{T}$ and repeats the procedure.

(7) The full algorithm ends when the last estimated matrix in the decomposition is either an embeddable matrix or a matrix sufficiently close to the identity. More specifically, when the matrix norm of the difference between the matrix and identity matrix is at least one order of magnitude smaller than the matrix norm of the estimated matrix. Alternatively, when the number of iterations exceeds a prefixed maximum number of iterations, typically a few thousand, the algorithm stops.

We tested 1000 matrices with principal logarithms having only one negative off-diagonal entry and a valid generator was found 945 times. If the number of negative entries is not too large, then at each step of the recursive procedure above ($<n^2$) similar results are obtained, which indicates an accuracy of around 90 and 95%.



FIG. 2. Histogram of Δ values, Eq. (41), from a sample matrices (see text).

To evaluate the accuracy of the estimates, we compare the modeled transition matrix $\mathbf{T}_{\text{mod}}(t,\tau)$ with the empirical one, $\mathbf{T}_{\text{emp}}(t,\tau)$, estimated in Sec. V A. The comparison is based in a normalized distance given by the fraction of the matrix norm of the difference between both matrices and the matrix norm of the difference between the modeled matrix and the identity matrix (initial state):

$$\Delta = \frac{||\mathbf{T}_{\text{mod}}(t,\tau/2) - \mathbf{T}_{\text{emp}}(t,\tau/2)||_F}{||\mathbf{T}_{\text{mod}}(t,\tau/2) - \mathbf{Id}||_F}, \tag{41}$$

where $||\cdot||_F$ is the Frobenius norm. Figure 2 shows a histogram of computed values of the normalized distance Δ in Eq. (41) for all estimates. Typically, the deviations are not larger than 40% of the deviations from the initial state, where no transition occur.

This procedure closes the computational framework for uncovering Markov continuous processes from empirical data sets.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have extend some theoretical results on the inhomogeneous embedding problem and established a framework which can evaluate empirical data for detecting the existence of continuous Markov processes. Eight new propositions were presented and demonstrated concerning the general case of processes having a time-inhomogeneous generator. While it was also recently proven that the problem of deriving a general algorithm capable of solving the embedding problem for any finite dimension n is NP-hard [19], our implemented algorithm presents acceptable results: When applied to synthetic data generated from pregiven generators, our framework is able to detect at least 80% of them and, moreover, returns a good estimate of the generator underlying the data set. Thus, our algorithm enables one to find a time-inhomogeneous generator of transition matrices with a real-valued logarithms.

Concerning the new proposition demonstrated above for inhomogeneous transition matrices, there are, e.g., some extensions of the LU decomposition theorem, Proposition IV.3, that can be interesting for future work. Namely, the quasi LU decomposition [20], the ULU decomposition [21] ("U" for upper and "L" for lower), and the LULU factorization [22].

This framework is now able to be straightforwardly applied to specific sets of data for evaluating hidden continuous Markov processes. Indeed, since the transition matrix defines a specific Markov chain, our framework can be taken as a possibility for accessing continuous hidden processes in (time-dependent) Markov chains found in many application areas, including, for example, models for polymer growth processes or enzyme activity.

For specific applications, our framework can be used for three types of stochastic data sets: (i) one where only the initial and final configuration of the system is given, (ii) one where all possible state transitions are defined through a probability value between the start and end of the observation period, and (iii) the transition between the beginning of intermediate instants until the end of the observation. In this paper we dealt typically with type (ii) data sets, while in previous works [3,4] we considered mainly type (iii). Type (i) is typically not well defined and additional cautions must be taken.

One important interdisciplinary application is, of course, in economics and finance, when addressing rating matrices: If ratings do indeed reflect a natural (continuous) economic process, then the extracted rating matrices must have a proper generator [23]. This problem was already addressed by us [3,4] in the particular case of homogeneous transition matrices derived by rating agencies. Further, our methodology could be extended to other situations where correlation matrices are taken for describing the macroscopic state of a financial system [24]. With a proper normalization such correlation matrices can be taken, in an algebraic sense, as transition matrices and therefore the framework described above is applicable. The computational code is available as open access code under request to and agreement of the authors and assuming the proper citation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank *Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst* (DAAD) and *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (FCT) for support from bilateral collaboration DRI/DAAD/1208/2013. F.R. thanks FCT for financial support (Grant No. SFRH/BPD/65427/2009). T.R. acknowledges support from the Royal Society. P.G.L. thanks the German Environment Ministry (Grant No. 0325577B) and the German Foundation for Research (DFG) for financial support (Grant No. MA 1636/9-1).

APPENDIX: ADDITIONAL RESULTS ON THE TIME-INHOMOGENEOUS EMBEDDABLE PROBLEM

Here we present additional results concerning the existence of inhomogeneous generators. These results serve for proving the theorems implemented above and provide theoretical consistency to our framework. The first result is a sufficient condition concerning a possible decomposition of transition matrices:

Proposition A.1: If $\mathbf{T}$ is an n-dimensional triangular transition matrix, then it has an inhomogeneous generator, which can be defined from a decomposition of the transition matrix as $\mathbf{T} = e^{\mathbf{Q}_1} \cdots e^{\mathbf{Q}_{n-1}}$, where $\mathbf{Q}_i$ are time-homogeneous generators of some elementary transition matrix.

Proof. The proof is given by induction. For $n = 2$, the triangular transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$ can be parameterized by one single parameter $p \in]0,1[$:

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-p & p \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A1}$$

It is straightforward to see that $\mathbf{T} = e^{\mathbf{Q}}$ with

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \log(1-p) & -\log(1-p) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{A2}$$

Since $\log(1-p) < 0$, $\mathbf{Q}$ is indeed a generator matrix.

We now consider an triangular transition matrix of arbitrary dimension n and treat the rightmost column separately, yielding

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \underline{a} \\ \underline{0}^\top & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{A3}$$

where $\mathbf{A}$ is an $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ triangular matrix, $\underline{a}$ is a column-vector with $n-1$ non-negative entries, and $\underline{0}^\top$ is a row-vector of $n-1$ zeros. Since $\mathbf{T}$ is a transition matrix, for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ one has

$$\sum_j A_{ij} = 1 - a_i. \tag{A4}$$

Introducing a $(n-1)$-dimensional triangular transition matrix $\mathbf{T}'$ with entries $T'_{ij} = \frac{A_{ij}}{1-a_i}$, one reads

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} - \mathrm{diag}(\underline{a}) & \underline{a} \\ \underline{0}^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{T}' & \underline{0} \\ \underline{0}^\top & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{A5}$$

where $\mathrm{diag}(\underline{a})$ is the $(n-1)$-dimensional diagonal matrix with entries taken from vector $\underline{a}$. The first matrix above is embeddable since

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} - \mathrm{diag}(\underline{a}) & \underline{a} \\ \underline{0}^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \exp \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{diag}(\log(\underline{1} - \underline{a})) & -\log(\underline{1} - \underline{a}) \\ \underline{0}^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{A6}$$

and the second matrix can be further decomposed as

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} - \mathrm{diag}(\underline{a}) & \underline{a} \\ \underline{0}^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} - \mathrm{diag}(\underline{b}) & \underline{b} & 0 \\ \underline{0}^\top & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{T}' & \underline{0} & \underline{0} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \underline{0}^\top & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A7}$$

Therefore, we arrive at a decomposition of the form $\mathbf{T} = e^{\mathbf{Q}'_1} \cdots e^{\mathbf{Q}'_{n-1}}$ for generator matrices $\mathbf{Q}'_1, \ldots, \mathbf{Q}'_{n-1}$ with

$$\mathbf{Q}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{diag}[\log(\underline{1} - \underline{a})] & -\log(\underline{1} - \underline{a}) \\ \underline{0}^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{A8}$$

and

$$\mathbf{Q}_k = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q}'_{k-1} & \underline{0} \\ \underline{0}^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{A9}$$

for $k = 2, \ldots, n-1$. ■

One could implement Proposition A.1 by finding a product of n-dimensional square matrices $\prod_i \mathbf{A}^{(i)}$ where each matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(i)}$ has only one off-diagonal nonzero element and if for matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(k)}$ one has $A^{(k)}_{ij} \neq 0$, then for all other matrices $\mathbf{A}^{(l)}$ $(l \neq k)$ one has $A^{(l)}_{ij} = 0$. If that product has $m = n(n-1)$ terms, then we can solve $\prod_i \mathbf{A}^{(i)} = \mathbf{T}$ as a linear system of equations with n equations and n unknowns. Having this, we define the following distance for the $\mathbf{A}$ factorization:

$$d_{S_2} = \min_k \left\{ \min_{i,j} \left\{ \frac{A^k_{ij}}{\sigma_{A^k_{ij}}} \right\} \right\}, \tag{A10}$$

where $\sigma_{A^n_{ij}}$ is the dispersion associated with the entry A^n_{ij}. If $d_{S_2} > 2$, then we statistically infer that a generator exists. Notice that it is possible to prove that the LU decomposition is a particular case of the factorization in Eq. (A10).

One additional necessary condition that may be useful in some cases is the following one:

Proposition A.2. An irreducible matrix $\mathbf{T}$, i.e., it cannot be placed into block upper-triangular form by simultaneous row or column permutations, is time-inhomogeneous embeddable only if, for at least in one row, there is more than one nonzero off-diagonal entry.

Proof. If $\mathbf{T}$ is time-inhomogeneous embeddable, then from Proposition A.1, $\mathbf{T}$ can be written as a product n of embeddable matrices $\mathbf{P}^{(k)} = \exp \mathbf{Q}^{(k)}$. Assume, without loss of generality, that all matrices $\mathbf{P}^{(k)}$ are time-homogeneous embeddable.

Since no matrix $\mathbf{P}^{(i)}$ has no zeros in the diagonal entries, from Propositions IV.1 and IV.2, the product of an irreducible matrix by an embeddable matrix is always irreducible. Notice that if any of the matrices $\mathbf{P}^{(k)}$ is time-homogeneous embeddable, then from Proposition II.2(c), $\mathbf{T}$ will have no zero entries.

Let us consider $\mathbf{P}^{(k)}$ such that the product $\mathbf{P}^{(1)} \dots \mathbf{P}^{(k)}$ is irreducible but $\mathbf{P}^{(1)} \dots \mathbf{P}^{(k-1)}$ is not. Since we assume, without loss of generality that $\mathbf{P}^{(k)}$ is not the identity matrix, $P^{(k)}_{ij} > 0$ for at least one $j \neq i$. Then, for $m \leqslant k$, there is one l for which $P^{(m)}_{li} > 0$. Thus $T_{ij} > 0$ and $T_{lj} > 0$. ■

Proposition A.2 is not a condition we can evaluate for empirical systems. Nonetheless, it might be useful if one has some *a priori* knowledge about the dynamics of the system.

Another sufficient condition for time-inhomogeneous generators concerns situations when the matrices have non-negative entries:

Proposition A.3. Totally non-negative transition matrices, i.e., matrices $\mathbf{T}(t)$ for which all submatrices have positive determinant, have an inhomogeneous generator $\mathbf{Q}(t)$.

Proof. It was proved [25] that the LU factorization of any totally non-negative matrix is composed of a totally non-negative lower diagonal matrix $\mathbf{L}$ and a totally non-negative upper diagonal $\mathbf{U}$. If a matrix is totally non-negative, then it has only non-negative elements; thus in particular $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{U}$ are matrices with non-negative elements. ■

[1] N. Privault, *Understanding Markov Chains: Examples and Applications* (Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, 2013).

[2] T. Shintani and S. Shinomoto, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 041139 (2012).

[3] P. Lencastre, F. Raischel, P. G. Lind, and T. Rogers, *New Trends in Stochastic Modeling and Data Analysis* (ISAST, London, 2015), pp. 189–198.

[4] P. Lencastre, F. Raischel, and P. G. Lind, J. Physics: Conf. Ser. **574**, 012151 (2015).

[5] G. Elfving, *Zur theorie der Markoffschen ketten*, Acta Societatis scientiarum Fennicae, Nova series A, T.2, 8 (Harrassowitz, Leipzig, 1937).

[6] J. Kingman, Probab. Theor. Relat. Fields **1**, 14 (1962).

[7] Y. Chen and J. Chen, J. Theor. Probab. **24**, 928 (2011).

[8] E. Davies, Electron. J. Probab. **15**, 1474 (2010).

[9] R. Israel, J. Rosenthal, and J. Wei, Math. Financ. **11**, 245 (2001).

[10] F. I. Karpelevich, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk. Seriya Mat. **15**, 361 (1951).

[11] N. J. Higham and L. Lin, Linear Algeb. Appl. **435**, 448 (2011).

[12] J. Runnenberg, Proc. KNAW **65**, 536 (1962).

[13] R. M. Gray, Commun. Inform. Theor. **2**, 155 (2005).

[14] M. Baake and U. Schlägel, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. **275**, 155 (2011).

[15] B. Pachpatte, *Inequalities for Differential and Integral Equations* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1998).

[16] N. J. Higham, *Functions of Matrices: Theory and Computation* (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2008).

[17] C. Sherlaw-Johnson, S. Gallivan, and J. Burridge, J. Operat. Res. Soc. **46**, 405 (1995).

[18] Y. Jafry and T. Schuermann, J. Bank. Financ. **28**, 2603 (2004).

[19] T. S. Cubitt, J. Eisert, and M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 120503 (2012).

[20] M. Bueno and C. Johnson, Linear Algeb. Appl. **427**, 99 (2007).

[21] T. Toffoli, Linear Algeb. Appl. **259**, 31 (1997).

[22] G. Strang, Linear Algeb. Appl. **265**, 165 (1997).

[23] A. Metz and R. Cantor, *Introducing Moody's Credit Transition Model* (Moody's Analytics, New York, 2007).

[24] M. Münnix, T. Shimada, R. Schäfer, F. Leyvraz, T. Seligman, T. Guhr, and H. Stanley, Sci. Rep. **2**, 644 (2012).

[25] C. W. Cryer, Linear Algebra Appl. **7**, 83 (1973).