What are Bayesian filtering and smoothing?

The term *optimal filtering* traditionally refers to a class of methods that can be used for estimating the state of a time-varying system which is indirectly observed through noisy measurements. The term *optimal* in this context refers to statistical optimality. Bayesian filtering refers to the Bayesian way of formulating optimal filtering. In this book we use these terms interchangeably and always mean Bayesian filtering.

In optimal, Bayesian, and Bayesian optimal filtering the *state* of the system refers to the collection of dynamic variables such as position, velocity, orientation, and angular velocity, which fully describe the system. The *noise* in the measurements means that they are uncertain; even if we knew the true system state the measurements would not be deterministic functions of the state, but would have a distribution of possible values. The time evolution of the state is modeled as a dynamic system which is perturbed by a certain *process noise*. This noise is used for modeling the uncertainties in the system dynamics. In most cases the system is not truly stochastic, but stochasticity is used for representing the model uncertainties.

Bayesian smoothing (or optimal smoothing) is often considered to be a class of methods within the field of Bayesian filtering. While Bayesian filters in their basic form only compute estimates of the current state of the system given the history of measurements, Bayesian smoothers can be used to reconstruct states that happened before the current time. Although the term *smoothing* is sometimes used in a more general sense for methods which generate a smooth (as opposed to rough) representation of data, in the context of Bayesian filtering the term (Bayesian) smoothing has this more definite meaning.

1.1 Applications of Bayesian filtering and smoothing

Phenomena which can be modeled as time-varying systems of the above type are very common in engineering applications. This kind of model...
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can be found, for example, in navigation, aerospace engineering, space engineering, remote surveillance, telecommunications, physics, audio signal processing, control engineering, finance, and many other fields. Examples of such applications are the following.

- **Global positioning system (GPS)** (Kaplan, 1996) is a widely used satellite navigation system, where the GPS receiver unit measures arrival times of signals from several GPS satellites and computes its position based on these measurements (see Figure 1.1). The GPS receiver typically uses an extended Kalman filter (EKF) or some other optimal filtering algorithm\(^1\) for computing the current position and velocity such that the measurements and the assumed dynamics (laws of physics) are taken into account. Also the ephemeris information, which is the satellite reference information transmitted from the satellites to the GPS receivers, is typically generated using optimal filters.

![Figure 1.1](image)

**Figure 1.1** In the GPS system, the measurements are time delays of satellite signals and the optimal filter (e.g., extended Kalman filter, EKF) computes the position and the accurate time.

- **Target tracking** (Bar-Shalom et al., 2001; Crassidis and Junkins, 2004; Challa et al., 2011) refers to the methodology where a set of sensors such as active or passive radars, radio frequency sensors, acoustic arrays,\(^1\) Strictly speaking, the EKF is only an approximate optimal filtering algorithm, because it uses a Taylor series based Gaussian approximation to the non-Gaussian optimal filtering solution.

---

\(^1\) Strictly speaking, the EKF is only an approximate optimal filtering algorithm, because it uses a Taylor series based Gaussian approximation to the non-Gaussian optimal filtering solution.
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Infrared sensors, and other types of sensors are used for determining the position and velocity of a remote target (see Figure 1.2). When this tracking is done continuously in time, the dynamics of the target and measurements from the different sensors are most naturally combined using an optimal filter or smoother. The target in this (single) target tracking case can be, for example, a robot, a satellite, a car or an airplane.

Figure 1.2 In target tracking, a sensor (e.g., radar) generates measurements (e.g., angle and distance measurements) of the target, and the purpose is to determine the target trajectory.

- Multiple target tracking (Bar-Shalom and Li, 1995; Blackman and Popoli, 1999; Stone et al., 1999; Särkkä et al., 2007b) systems are used for remote surveillance in the cases where there are multiple targets moving at the same time in the same geographical area (see Figure 1.3). This introduces the concept of data association (which measurement was from which target?) and the problem of estimating the number of targets. Multiple target tracking systems are typically used in remote surveillance for military purposes, but their civil applications are, for example, monitoring of car tunnels, automatic alarm systems, and people tracking in buildings.

- Inertial navigation (Titterton and Weston, 1997; Grewal et al., 2001) uses inertial sensors such as accelerometers and gyroscopes for computing the position and velocity of a device such as a car, an airplane, or a missile. When the inaccuracies in sensor measurements are taken into account the natural way of computing the estimates is by using an op-
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Figure 1.3 In multiple target tracking the data association problem has to be solved, because it is impossible to know without any additional information which target produced which measurement.

Optimal filter or smoother. Also, in sensor calibration, which is typically done in a time-varying environment, optimal filters and smoothers can be applied.

- **Integrated inertial navigation** (Grewal et al., 2001; Bar-Shalom et al., 2001) combines the good sides of unbiased but inaccurate sensors, such as altimeters and landmark trackers, and biased but locally accurate inertial sensors. A combination of these different sources of information is most naturally performed using an optimal filter such as the extended Kalman filter. This kind of approach was used, for example, in the guidance system of the Apollo 11 lunar module (Eagle), which landed on the moon in 1969.

- **GPS/INS navigation** (Grewal et al., 2001; Bar-Shalom et al., 2001) is a form of integrated inertial navigation where the inertial navigation system (INS) is combined with a GPS receiver unit. In a GPS/INS navigation system the short term fluctuations of the GPS can be compensated by the inertial sensors and the inertial sensor biases can be compensated by the GPS receiver. An additional advantage of this approach is that it is possible to temporarily switch to pure inertial navigation when the GPS receiver is unable to compute its position (i.e., has no fix) for some reason. This happens, for example, indoors, in tunnels and in other cases.
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when there is no direct line-of-sight between the GPS receiver and the satellites.

- **Brain imaging** methods such as electroencephalography (EEG), magnetoencephalography (MEG), parallel functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and diffuse optical tomography (DOT) (see Figure 1.4) are based on reconstruction of the source field in the brain from noisy sensor data by using minimum norm estimates (MNE) and its variants (Hauk, 2004; Tarantola, 2004; Kaipio and Somersalo, 2005; Lin et al., 2006). The minimum norm solution can also be interpreted in the Bayesian sense as a problem of estimating the field with certain prior structure from Gaussian observations. With that interpretation the estimation problem becomes equivalent to a statistical inversion or generalized Gaussian process regression problem (Tarantola, 2004; Kaipio and Somersalo, 2005; Rasmussen and Williams, 2006; Särkkä, 2011). Including dynamical priors then leads to a linear or non-linear spatio-temporal estimation problem, which can be solved with Kalman filters and smoothers (see Hiltunen et al., 2011; Särkkä et al., 2012b). The same can be done in inversion based approaches to parallel fMRI such as inverse imaging (InI, Lin et al., 2006).

![Figure 1.4](image)

**Figure 1.4** Brain imaging methods such as EEG and MEG are based on estimating the state of the brain from sensor readings. In dynamic case the related inversion problem can be solved with an optimal filter or smoother.
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- **Spread of infectious diseases** (Keeling and Rohani, 2007) can often be modeled as differential equations for the number of susceptible, infected, and recovered/dead individuals. When uncertainties are introduced into the dynamic equations, and when the measurements are not perfect, the estimation of the spread of the disease can be formulated as an optimal filtering problem (see, e.g., Särkkä and Sottinen, 2008).

- **Biological processes** (Murray, 1993) such as population growth, predator–prey models, and several other dynamic processes in biology can also be modeled as (stochastic) differential equations. Estimation of the states of these processes from inaccurate measurements can be formulated as an optimal filtering and smoothing problem.

- **Telecommunications** is also a field where optimal filters are traditionally used. For example, optimal receivers, signal detectors, and phase-locked loops can be interpreted to contain optimal filters (Van Trees, 1968, 1971; Proakis, 2001) as components. Also the celebrated Viterbi algorithm (Viterbi, 1967) can be seen as a method for computing the maximum a posteriori (MAP) Bayesian smoothing solution for the underlying hidden Markov model (HMM).

- **Audio signal processing** applications such as audio restoration (Godsill and Rayner, 1998) and audio signal enhancement (Fong et al., 2002) often use TVAR (time-varying autoregressive) models as the underlying audio signal models. These kinds of model can be efficiently estimated using optimal filters and smoothers.

- **Stochastic optimal control** (Maybeck, 1982a; Stengel, 1994) considers control of time-varying stochastic systems. Stochastic controllers can typically be found in, for example, airplanes, cars, and rockets. Optimal, in addition to the statistical optimality, means that the control signal is constructed to minimize a performance cost, such as the expected time to reach a predefined state, the amount of fuel consumed, or the average distance from a desired position trajectory. When the state of the system is observed through a set of sensors, as it usually is, optimal filters are needed for reconstructing the state from them.

- **Learning systems** or adaptive systems can often be mathematically formulated in terms of optimal filters and smoothers (Haykin, 2001) and they have a close relationship with Bayesian non-parametric modeling, machine learning, and neural network modeling (Bishop, 2006). Methods similar to the data association methods in multiple target tracking are also applicable to on-line adaptive classification (Andrieu et al., 2002). The connection between Gaussian process regression (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006) and optimal filtering has also been recently discussed.
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in Särkkä et al. (2007a), Hartikainen and Särkkä (2010) and Särkkä and Hartikainen (2012).

- Physical systems which are time-varying and measured through non-ideal sensors can sometimes be formulated as stochastic state space models, and the time evolution of the system can be estimated using optimal filters (Kaipio and Somersalo, 2005). These kinds of problem are often called inverse problems (Tarantola, 2004), and optimal filters and smoothers can be seen as the Bayesian solutions to time-varying inverse problems.

1.2 Origins of Bayesian filtering and smoothing

The roots of Bayesian analysis of time-dependent behavior are in the field of optimal linear filtering. The idea of constructing mathematically optimal recursive estimators was first presented for linear systems due to their mathematical simplicity, and the most natural optimality criterion in both the mathematical and modeling points of view was the least squares optimality. For linear systems the optimal Bayesian solution (with minimum mean squared error, MMSE, loss) coincides with the least squares solution, that is, the optimal least squares solution is exactly the posterior mean.

The history of optimal filtering starts from the Wiener filter (Wiener, 1950), which is a frequency domain solution to the problem of least squares optimal filtering of stationary Gaussian signals. The Wiener filter is still important in communication applications (Proakis, 2001), digital signal processing (Hayes, 1996) and image processing (Gonzalez and Woods, 2008). The disadvantage of the Wiener filter is that it can only be applied to stationary signals.

The success of optimal linear filtering in engineering applications is mostly due to the seminal article of Kalman (1960b), which describes the recursive solution to the optimal discrete-time (sampled) linear filtering problem. One reason for the success is that the Kalman filter can be understood and applied with very much lighter mathematical machinery than the Wiener filter. Also, despite its mathematical simplicity and generality, the Kalman filter (or actually the Kalman–Bucy filter; Kalman and Bucy, 1961) contains the Wiener filter as its limiting special case.

In the early stages of its history, the Kalman filter was soon discovered to belong to the class of Bayesian filters (Ho and Lee, 1964; Lee, 1964; Jazwinski, 1966, 1970). The corresponding Bayesian smoothers (Rauch, 1963; Rauch et al., 1965; Leondes et al., 1970) were also developed soon after the invention of the Kalman filter. An interesting historical detail is
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Figure 1.5 In optimal filtering and smoothing problems a sequence of hidden states $x_k$ is indirectly observed through noisy measurements $y_k$.

that while Kalman and Bucy were formulating the linear theory in the United States, Stratonovich was doing the pioneering work on the probabilistic (Bayesian) approach in Russia (Stratonovich, 1968; Jazwinski, 1970).

As discussed in the book of West and Harrison (1997), in the 1960s, Kalman filter like recursive estimators were also used in the Bayesian community and it is not clear whether the theory of Kalman filtering or the theory of dynamic linear models (DLM) came first. Although these theories were originally derived from slightly different starting points, they are equivalent. Because of the Kalman filter’s useful connection to the theory and history of stochastic optimal control, this book approaches the Bayesian filtering problem from the Kalman filtering point of view.

Although the original derivation of the Kalman filter was based on the least squares approach, the same equations can be derived from pure probabilistic Bayesian analysis. The Bayesian analysis of Kalman filtering is well covered in the classical book of Jazwinski (1970) and more recently in the book of Bar-Shalom et al. (2001). Kalman filtering, mostly because of its least squares interpretation, has widely been used in stochastic optimal control. A practical reason for this is that the inventor of the Kalman filter, Rudolph E. Kalman, has also made several contributions (Kalman, 1960a) to the theory of linear quadratic Gaussian (LQG) regulators, which are fundamental tools of stochastic optimal control (Stengel, 1994; Maybeck, 1982a).

1.3 Optimal filtering and smoothing as Bayesian inference

In mathematical terms, optimal filtering and smoothing are considered to be statistical inversion problems, where the unknown quantity is a vector valued time series $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ which is observed through a set of
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Figure 1.6 An example of time series, which models a discrete-time resonator. The actual resonator state (signal) is hidden and only observed through the noisy measurements.

noisy measurements \( \{y_1, y_2, \ldots \} \) as illustrated in Figure 1.5. An example of this kind of time series is shown in Figure 1.6. The process shown is a noisy resonator with a known angular velocity. The state \( x_k = (x_k, \dot{x}_k)^T \) is two dimensional and consists of the position of the resonator \( x_k \) and its time derivative \( \dot{x}_k \). The measurements \( y_k \) are scalar observations of the resonator position (signal) and they are corrupted by measurement noise.

The purpose of the statistical inversion at hand is to estimate the hidden states \( x_{0:T} = \{x_0, \ldots, x_T\} \) from the observed measurements \( y_{1:T} = \{y_1, \ldots, y_T\} \), which means that in the Bayesian sense we want to compute the joint posterior distribution of all the states given all the measurements. In principle, this can be done by a straightforward application of Bayes’ rule

\[
p(x_{0:T} \mid y_{1:T}) = \frac{p(y_{1:T} \mid x_{0:T}) p(x_{0:T})}{p(y_{1:T})},
\]

where

- \( p(x_{0:T}) \), is the prior distribution defined by the dynamic model,
- \( p(y_{1:T} \mid x_{0:T}) \) is the likelihood model for the measurements,
What are Bayesian filtering and smoothing?

- $p(y_{1:T})$ is the normalization constant defined as
  \begin{equation}
  p(y_{1:T}) = \int p(y_{1:T} \mid x_{0:T}) \, p(x_{0:T}) \, dx_{0:T}.
  \end{equation}

Unfortunately, this full posterior formulation has the serious disadvantage that each time we obtain a new measurement, the full posterior distribution would have to be recomputed. This is particularly a problem in dynamic estimation (which is exactly the problem we are solving here!), where measurements are typically obtained one at a time and we would want to compute the best possible estimate after each measurement. When the number of time steps increases, the dimensionality of the full posterior distribution also increases, which means that the computational complexity of a single time step increases. Thus eventually the computations will become intractable, no matter how much computational power is available. Without additional information or restrictive approximations, there is no way of getting over this problem in the full posterior computation.

However, the above problem only arises when we want to compute the full posterior distribution of the states at each time step. If we are willing to relax this a bit and be satisfied with selected marginal distributions of the states, the computations become an order of magnitude lighter. To achieve this, we also need to restrict the class of dynamic models to probabilistic Markov sequences, which is not as restrictive as it may at first seem. The model for the states and measurements will be assumed to be of the following type.

- **An initial distribution** specifies the prior probability distribution $p(x_0)$ of the hidden state $x_0$ at the initial time step $k = 0$.
- **A dynamic model** describes the system dynamics and its uncertainties as a Markov sequence, defined in terms of the transition probability distribution $p(x_k \mid x_{k-1})$.
- **A measurement model** describes how the measurement $y_k$ depends on the current state $x_k$. This dependence is modeled by specifying the conditional probability distribution of the measurement given the state, which is denoted as $p(y_k \mid x_k)$.

Thus a general probabilistic state space model is usually written in the following form:

\begin{align}
  x_0 &\sim p(x_0), \\
x_k &\sim p(x_k \mid x_{k-1}), \\
y_k &\sim p(y_k \mid x_k).
\end{align}