



**HAL**  
open science

# MAGMA: Inference and Prediction with Multi-Task Gaussian Processes

Arthur Leroy, Pierre Latouche, Benjamin Guedj, Servane Gey

► **To cite this version:**

Arthur Leroy, Pierre Latouche, Benjamin Guedj, Servane Gey. MAGMA: Inference and Prediction with Multi-Task Gaussian Processes. 2020. hal-02904446v1

**HAL Id: hal-02904446**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-02904446v1>**

Preprint submitted on 22 Jul 2020 (v1), last revised 24 May 2022 (v2)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# MAGMA: Inference and Prediction with Multi-Task Gaussian Processes

**Arthur Leroy**

Universit de Paris, CNRS, MAP5 UMR 8145,  
F-75006 Paris, France  
arthur.leroy.pro@gmail.com

**Pierre Latouche**

Universit de Paris, CNRS, MAP5 UMR 8145,  
F-75006 Paris, France  
pierre.latouche@math.cnrs.fr

**Benjamin Guedj**

Inria, France and  
University College London, United Kingdom  
benjamin.guedj@inria.fr

**Servane Gey**

Universit de Paris, CNRS, MAP5 UMR 8145,  
F-75006 Paris, France  
servane.gey@parisdescartes.fr

July 22, 2020

We investigate the problem of multiple time series forecasting, with the objective to improve multiple-step-ahead predictions. We propose a multi-task Gaussian process framework to simultaneously model batches of individuals with a common mean function and a specific covariance structure. This common mean is defined as a Gaussian process for which the hyper-posterior distribution is tractable. Therefore an EM algorithm can be derived for simultaneous hyper-parameters optimisation and hyper-posterior computation. Unlike previous approaches in the literature, we account for uncertainty and handle uncommon grids of observations while maintaining explicit formulations, by

modelling the mean process in a non-parametric probabilistic framework. We also provide predictive formulas integrating this common mean process. This approach greatly improves the predictive performance far from observations, where information shared across individuals provides a relevant prior mean. Our overall algorithm is called MAGMA (standing for Multi tAsk Gaussian processes with common MeAn), and publicly available as a R package. The quality of the mean process estimation, predictive performances, and comparisons to alternatives are assessed in various simulated scenarios and on real datasets.

**Keywords:** Multi-task learning, Gaussian process, EM algorithm, Common mean process, Functional data analysis.

## 1 Introduction

Gaussian processes (GPs) are a powerful tool, widely used in machine learning (Bishop, 2006; Rasmussen and Williams, 2006). The classic context of regression aims at inferring the underlying mapping function associating input to output data. In a probabilistic framework, a typical strategy is to assume that this function is drawn from a prior GP. Doing so, we may enforce some properties for the function solely by characterising the mean and covariance function of the process, the latter often being associated with a specific kernel. This covariance function plays a central role and GPs are an example of kernel methods. We refer to Álvarez et al. (2012) for a comprehensive review. The mean function is generally set to 0 for all entries assuming that the covariance structure already integrates the desired relationship between observed data and prediction targets. In this paper, we consider a multi-task learning framework with a series of Gaussian processes sharing a common mean function. We demonstrate that modelling this function can be key to obtain relevant predictions.

### Related work

A major drawback of GPs lies in the  $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$  computational cost of the training step, where  $N$  denotes the number of observations in the training sample. Many approaches to mitigate this problem with sparse approximations have been proposed in the last two decades. One of the most popular methods can be found in Snelson and Ghahramani (2006), introducing elegant ideas to select pseudo-inputs, and a subsequent review came in Quiñonero-Candela et al. (2007). Titsias (2009) proposed to use variational inference for sparse GPs, and Hensman et al. (2013) extended the idea for larger data sets, whereas Banerjee et al. (2013) used linear projections onto low-dimensional subspaces. Besides, some state-of-the-art approximations have been theoretically studied in Bauer et al. (2016). Another approach to deal with numerical issues has recently been proposed in Wilson et al. (2020) to sample from GP efficiently in MCMC algorithms. Bijl et al. (2015) proposed an online version of some of the sparse approximations mentioned above, while Clingerman and Eaton (2017) and Moreno-Muñoz et al. (2019) developed continual learning methods for multi-task GP.

The multi-task framework consists in using data from several tasks (or batches of individuals) to improve the learning or predictive capacities compared to an isolated model. It has been introduced by Caruana (1997) and then adapted in many fields of machine learning. GP versions of such models were introduced by Schwaighofer et al. (2004), and they proposed an EM algorithm for learning. Similar techniques can be found in Shi et al.

(2005). Meanwhile, Yu et al. (2005) offered an extensive study of the relationships between the linear model and GPs to develop a multi-task GP formulation. However, since the introduction in Bonilla et al. (2008) of the idea of two matrices modelling covariance between inputs and tasks respectively, the term *multi-task Gaussian process* has mostly referred to the choice made regarding the covariance structure. Some further developments were discussed by Hayashi et al. (2012), Rakitsch et al. (2013) and Zhu and Sun (2014). Let us also mention the work of Swersky et al. (2013) on Bayesian hyper-parameter optimisation in such models. Real applications were tackled by similar models in Williams et al. (2009) and Alaa and van der Schaar (2017).

As we focus on multi-task time series forecasting, there is an immediate connection to the study of multiple curves, or functional data analysis (FDA). As initially proposed in Rice and Silverman (1991), it is possible to model and learn mean and covariance structures simultaneously in this context. We also refer to the monographs (Ramsay and Silverman, 2005; Ferraty and Vieu, 2006). In particular, these books introduced several usual ways to model a set of functional objects in frequentist frameworks, for example by using a decomposition in a basis of functions (such as B-splines, wavelets, Fourier). Subsequently, some Bayesian alternatives were developed in Thompson and Rosen (2008), and Crainiceanu and Goldsmith (2010).

### Our contributions

Our aim is to define a multi-task GP framework with common mean process, allowing reliable probabilistic forecasts even in multiple-step-ahead problems, or for sparsely observed individuals. For this purpose, (i) We introduce a GP model where the specific covariance structure of each individual is defined through a kernel and its associated set of hyper-parameters, whereas a mean function  $\mu_0$  overcomes the weaknesses of classic GPs in making predictions far from observed data. To account for its uncertainty, we propose to define the common mean process  $\mu_0$  as a GP as well. (ii) We derive an algorithm called MAGMA (available as a R package at <https://github.com/ArthurLeroy/MAGMA>) to compute  $\mu_0$ 's hyper-posterior distribution together with the estimation of hyper-parameters in an EM fashion, and discuss its computational complexity. (iii) We enrich MAGMA with explicit formulas to make predictions for a new, partially observed, individual. The hyper-posterior distribution of  $\mu_0$  provides a prior belief on what we expect to observe before seeing any of the new individual's data, as an already-informed process integrating both trend and uncertainty coming from other individuals. (iv) We illustrate the performance of our method on synthetic and two real-life datasets, and obtain state-of-the-art results compared to alternative approaches.

### Outline

The paper is organised as follows. We introduce our multi-task Gaussian process model in Sec. 2, along with notation. Sec. 3 is devoted to the inference procedure, with an Expectation-Maximisation (EM) algorithm to estimate the Gaussian process hyper-parameters. We leverage this strategy in Sec. 4 and derive a prediction algorithm. In Sec. 5, we analyse and discuss the computational complexity of both the inference and prediction procedures. Our methodology is illustrated in Sec. 6, with a series of experiments on both synthetic and real-life datasets, and a comparison to competing state-of-the-art algorithms. On those tasks, we provide empirical evidence that our algorithm outperforms other approaches. Sec. 7 draws perspectives for future work, and we defer all proofs to original results claimed in the paper to Sec. 8.




Figure 1: Graphical model of dependencies between variables in the Multi-task Gaussian Process model.

## 2 The model

### 2.1 Notation

While GPs can be used for many types of data, their continuous nature makes them particularly well suited to study temporal phenomena. Throughout, we use the term *individual* as a synonym of task or batch, and adopt notation and vocabulary of time series to remain consistent with the real datasets application we provide in Sec. 6.5, which addresses young swimmers performances' forecast. These time series are considered as pointwise observations of functions we try to reconstruct thanks to the following generative model.

We are provided with functional data coming from  $M \in \mathcal{J}$  different individuals, where  $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathbb{N}$ . For each individual  $i$ , we observe a set of inputs and outputs  $\left\{ \left( t_i^1, y_i(t_i^1) \right), \dots, \left( t_i^{N_i}, y_i(t_i^{N_i}) \right) \right\}$ , where  $N_i$  is the number of data points for the  $i$ -th individual. Since many objects are defined for all individuals, we shorten our notation as follows: for any object  $x$  existing for all  $i$ , we denote  $\{x_i\}_i = \{x_1, \dots, x_M\}$ . Moreover, as we work in a temporal context, the inputs  $\{t_i^k\}_{i,k}$  are referred to as *timestamps*. In the specific case where all individuals are observed at the same timestamps, we call *common* the grid of observations. On the contrary, a grid of observations is *uncommon* if the timestamps are different in number and/or location among the individuals. Some convenient notation:

- $\mathbf{t}_i = \{t_i^1, \dots, t_i^{N_i}\}$ , the set of timestamps for the  $i$ -th individual,
- $\mathbf{y}_i = y_i(\mathbf{t}_i)$ , the vector of outputs for the  $i$ -th individual,
- $\mathbf{t} = \bigcup_{i=1}^M \mathbf{t}_i$ , the pooled set of timestamps among individuals,
- $N = \#(\mathbf{t})$ , the total number of observed timestamps.

### 2.2 Model and hypotheses

Suppose that a functional data is coming from the sum of a mean process, common to all individuals, and an individual-specific centred process. To clarify relationships in the generative model, we illustrate our graphical model in Fig. 1.

Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the input space, our model is

$$y_i(t) = \mu_0(t) + f_i(t) + \epsilon_i(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad i = 1, \dots, M, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mu_0(\cdot) \sim \mathcal{GP}(m_0(\cdot), K_{\theta_0}(\cdot, \cdot))$  is the mean common process and  $f_i(\cdot) \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, \Sigma_{\theta_i}(\cdot, \cdot))$  the individual specific process. Moreover, the error term is supposed to be  $\epsilon_i(\cdot) \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, \sigma_i^2 I)$ . The following notation is used for parameters:

- $K_{\theta_0}(\cdot, \cdot)$ , a covariance function of hyper-parameters  $\theta_0$ ,
- $\forall i, \Sigma_{\theta_i}(\cdot, \cdot)$ , a covariance function of hyper-parameters  $\theta_i$ ,
- $\sigma_i^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , the noise term for individual  $i$ ,
- $\forall i, \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}(\cdot, \cdot) = \Sigma_{\theta_i}(\cdot, \cdot) + \sigma_i^2 I_d$ ,
- $\Theta = \{\theta_0, \{\theta_i\}_i, \{\sigma_i^2\}_i\}$ , the set of all hyper-parameters of the model.

We also assume that

- $\{f_i\}_i$  are independent,
- $\{\epsilon_i\}_i$  are independent,
- $\forall i, \mu_0$  and  $f_i$  are independent.

It follows that  $\{y_i | \mu_0\}_{i=1, \dots, M}$  are independent from one another, and for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ :

$$y_i(\cdot) | \mu_0(\cdot) \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mu_0(\cdot), \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}(\cdot, \cdot)). \quad (2)$$

Although this model is based on infinite-dimensional GPs, the inference will be conducted on a finite grid of observations. According to the aforementioned notation, we observe  $\{(\mathbf{t}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}_i$ , and the corresponding likelihoods are Gaussian:

$$\mathbf{y}_i | \mu_0(\mathbf{t}_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}_i; \mu_0(\mathbf{t}_i), \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i}), \quad (3)$$

where  $\Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i} = \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}(\mathbf{t}_i, \mathbf{t}_i) = \left[ \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}(k, l) \right]_{k, l \in \mathbf{t}_i}$  is a  $N_i \times N_i$  covariance matrix. Since  $\mathbf{t}_i$  might be different among individuals, we also need to evaluate  $\mu_0$  on the pooled grid  $\mathbf{t}$ :

$$\mu_0(\mathbf{t}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}); m_0(\mathbf{t}), K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}), \quad (4)$$

where  $K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}} = K_{\theta_0}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}) = [K_{\theta_0}(k, \ell)]_{k, \ell \in \mathbf{t}}$  is a  $N \times N$  covariance matrix.

An alternate hypothesis consists in considering hyper-parameters  $\{\theta_i\}_i$  and  $\{\sigma_i\}_i$  equal for all individuals. We call this hypothesis *Common HP* in the Sec. 6. This particular case models a context where individuals represent different trajectories of the same process, whereas different hyper-parameters indicate different covariance structures and thus a more flexible model. For the sake of generality, the remainder of the paper is written with  $\theta_i$  and  $\sigma_i^2$  notation, when there are no differences in the procedure. Moreover, the model above and the subsequent algorithm may use any covariance function parametrised by a finite set (usually small) of hyper-parameters. For example, a common kernel in the GP literature is known as the *Exponentiated Quadratic* kernel (also called sometimes Squared Exponential or Radial Basis Function kernel). It depends only on two hyper-parameters  $\theta = \{v, \ell\}$  and is defined as:

$$k_{\text{EQ}}(x, x') = v^2 \exp\left(-\frac{(x - x')^2}{2\ell^2}\right). \quad (5)$$

The *Exponentiated Quadratic* kernel is simple and enjoys useful smoothness properties. This is the kernel we use in our implementation (see Sec. 6 for details). Note that there is a rich literature on kernel choice, their construction and properties, which is beyond the scope of the paper: we refer to [Rasmussen and Williams \(2006\)](#) or [Duvenaud \(2014\)](#) for comprehensive studies.

## 3 Inference

### 3.1 Learning: An EM algorithm

Several approaches to learn hyper-parameters for Gaussian processes have been proposed in the literature, we refer to [Rasmussen and Williams \(2006\)](#) for a comprehensive study. One classical approach, called *empirical Bayes* ([Casella, 1985](#)), is based on the maximisation of an explicit likelihood to estimate hyper-parameters. This procedure avoids to sample from intractable distributions, usually resulting in additional computational cost and complicating practical use in moderate to large sample sizes. However, since the likelihood of the model depends on  $\mu_0$ , we cannot maximise it directly. Therefore, we propose an EM algorithm (see the pseudocode in Algorithm 1) to learn the hyper-parameters  $\Theta$ . The procedure alternatively computes the hyper-posterior distribution  $p(\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \hat{\Theta})$  with current hyper-parameters, and then optimises  $\Theta$  according to this hyper-posterior distribution. This EM algorithm converges to local maxima ([Dempster et al., 1977](#)), typically in a handful of iterations.

#### E step

For the sake of simplicity, we assume in that section that for all  $i, j$ ,  $\mathbf{t}_i = \mathbf{t}_j = \mathbf{t}$ , i.e. the individuals are observed on a common grid of timestamps. The E-step then consists in computing the hyper-posterior distribution of  $\mu_0(\mathbf{t})$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Assume the hyper-parameters  $\hat{\Theta}$  known from initialisation or estimated from a previous  $M$  step. The hyper-posterior distribution of  $\mu_0$  remains Gaussian:*

$$p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \hat{\Theta}) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}); \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}), \hat{K}^{\mathbf{t}}), \quad (6)$$

with

- $\hat{K}^{\mathbf{t}} = \left( K_{\hat{\theta}_0}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^M \Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1} \right)^{-1}$ ,
- $\hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}) = \hat{K}^{\mathbf{t}} \left( K_{\hat{\theta}_0}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1} m_0(\mathbf{t}) + \sum_{i=1}^M \Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i \right)$ .

**Proof.**

We omit specifying timestamps in what follows since each process is evaluated on  $\mathbf{t}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \hat{\Theta}) &\propto p(\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i | \mu_0, \hat{\Theta}) p(\mu_0 | \hat{\Theta}) \\
&\propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^M p(\mathbf{y}_i | \mu_0, \hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2) \right\} p(\mu_0 | \hat{\theta}_0) \\
&\propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^M \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}_i; \mu_0, \Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}) \right\} \mathcal{N}(\mu_0; m_0, K_{\hat{\theta}_0}).
\end{aligned}$$

The term  $\mathcal{L}_1 = -(1/2) \log p(\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \hat{\Theta})$  may then be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_1 &= -\frac{1}{2} \log p(\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \hat{\Theta}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^M (y_i - \mu_0)^\top \Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}^{-1} (y_i - \mu_0) \\
&\quad + (\mu_0 - m_0)^\top K_{\hat{\theta}_0}^{-1} (\mu_0 - m_0) + C_1 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^M \mu_0^\top \Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}^{-1} \mu_0 - 2 \mu_0^\top \Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i \\
&\quad + \mu_0^\top K_{\hat{\theta}_0}^{-1} \mu_0 - 2 \mu_0^\top K_{\hat{\theta}_0}^{-1} m_0 + C_2 \\
&= \mu_0^\top \left( K_{\hat{\theta}_0}^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^M \Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}^{-1} \right) \mu_0 \\
&\quad - 2 \mu_0^\top \left( K_{\hat{\theta}_0}^{-1} m_0 + \sum_{i=1}^M \Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i \right) + C_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Identifying terms in the quadratic form with the Gaussian likelihood, we get the desired result.

Let us stress here that the above result assumes common timestamps among individuals, which is a simplified setting. We provide a generalisation of this proposition in Sec. 4: Proposition 4.1 holds with uncommon grids of timestamps  $\mathbf{t}_i$ .

The maximisation step depends on the assumptions on the generative model, resulting in two versions for the EM algorithm (the E step is common to both, the branching point is here).

### M step: different hyper-parameters

Assuming each individual has its own set of hyper-parameters  $\{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2\}$ , the M step is given by the following.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Assume  $p(\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$*

*=  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}); \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}), \hat{K}^{\mathbf{t}})$  given by a previous E step. For a set of hyper-parameters  $\Theta = \{\theta_0, \{\theta_i\}_i, \{\sigma_i\}_i\}$ , optimal values are given by*

$$\hat{\Theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\Theta} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i} [p(\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \mu_0(\mathbf{t}) | \Theta)],$$



inducing  $M + 1$  independent maximisation problems:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta}_0 &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta_0} \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{t}}(\hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}); m_0(\mathbf{t}), K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}), \\ (\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2} \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{t}_i}(\mathbf{y}_i; \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}), \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i}), \quad \forall i,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{m}, S) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{m}, S) - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}(\hat{K}^{\mathbf{t}} S^{-1}).$$

**Proof.** One simply has to distribute the conditional expectation in order to get the right likelihood to maximise, and then notice that the function can be written as a sum of  $M+1$  independent (with respect to the hyper-parameters) terms. Moreover, by rearranging, one can observe that each independent term is the sum of a Gaussian likelihood and a correction trace term. See Sec. 8 for details.

### M step: common hyper-parameters

Alternatively, assuming all individuals share the same set of hyper-parameters  $\{\theta, \sigma^2\}$ , the M step is given by the following.

**Proposition 3.3.** Assume  $p(\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$  =  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}); \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}), \hat{K}^{\mathbf{t}})$  given by a previous E step. For a set of hyper-parameters  $\Theta = \{\theta_0, \theta, \sigma^2\}$ , optimal values are given by

$$\hat{\Theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\Theta} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i} [p(\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \mu_0(\mathbf{t}) | \Theta)],$$

inducing two independent maximisation problems:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\theta}_0 &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta_0} \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{t}}(\hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}); m_0(\mathbf{t}), K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}), \\ (\hat{\theta}, \hat{\sigma}^2) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta, \sigma^2} \mathcal{L}_M(\theta, \sigma^2),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_M(\theta, \sigma^2) = \sum_{i=1}^M \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{t}_i}(\mathbf{y}_i; \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}), \Psi_{\theta, \sigma^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i}).$$

**Proof.** We use the same strategy as for Proposition 3.2, see Sec. 8 for details.

In both cases, explicit gradients associated with the likelihoods to maximise are available, facilitating the optimisation with gradient-based methods.

## 3.2 Initialisation

To implement the EM algorithm described above, several constants must be (appropriately) initialised:

- $m_0(\cdot)$ , the mean parameter from the hyper-prior distribution of the mean process  $\mu_0(\cdot)$ . A somewhat classical choice in GP is to set its value to a constant, typically 0 in the absence of external knowledge. Notice that, in our multi-task framework, the influence of  $m_0(\cdot)$  in hyper-posterior computation decreases quickly as  $M$  grows.

- Initial values for kernel parameters  $\theta_0$  and  $\{\theta_i\}_i$ . Those strongly depend on the chosen kernel and its properties. We advise initiating  $\theta_0$  and  $\{\theta_i\}_i$  with close values, as a too large difference might induce a nearly singular covariance matrix and result in numerical instability. In such pathological regime, the influence of a specific individual tends to overtake others in the calculus of  $\mu_0$ 's hyper-posterior distribution.
- Initial values for the variance of the error terms  $\{\sigma_i\}_i$ . This choice mostly depends on the context and properties of the dataset. We suggest avoiding initial values with more than an order of magnitude different from the variability of data. In particular, a too high value might result in a model mostly capturing noise.

As a final note, let us stress that the EM algorithm depends on the initialisation and is only guaranteed to converge to local maxima of the likelihood function (Krishnan and McLachlan, 1997). Several strategies have been considered in the literature to tackle this issue such as simulated annealing and the use of multiple initialisations (Biernacki et al., 2003). In this paper, we choose the latter option.

### 3.3 Pseudocode

We wrap up this section with the pseudocode of the EM component of our complete algorithm, which we call MAGMA (standing for Multi tAsk Gaussian processes with common MeAn). The corresponding code is available at <https://github.com/ArthurLeroy/MAGMA>.

---

#### Algorithm 1 MAGMA: EM component

---

Initialise  $m_0$  and  $\Theta = \{\theta_0, \{\theta_i\}_i, \{\sigma_i\}_i\}$ .

**while** not converged **do**

  E step: Compute the hyper-posterior distribution

$$p(\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \Theta) = \mathcal{N}(\hat{m}_0, \hat{K}).$$

  M step: Estimate hyper-parameter by maximising

$$\hat{\Theta} = \underset{\Theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i} [p(\mu_0, \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i | \Theta)].$$

**end while**

**return**  $\hat{\Theta}, \hat{m}_0, \hat{K}$ .

---

### 3.4 Discussion of EM algorithms and alternatives

Let us stress that even though we focus on prediction purpose in this paper, the output of the EM algorithm already provides results on related FDA problems. The generative model in Yang et al. (2016) describes a Bayesian framework that resembles ours to smooth multiple curves simultaneously. However, modelling variance structure with an Inverse-Wishard process forces the use of an MCMC algorithm for inference or the introduction of a more tractable approximation in Yang et al. (2017). One can think of the learning through MAGMA and applying a single task GP regression on each individual as an *empirical Bayes* counterpart to their approach. Meanwhile,  $\mu_0$ 's hyper-posterior distribution also provides the probabilistic estimation of a mean curve from a set of functional data. The closest method to our approach can be found in Shi et al. (2007) and the following book Shi and Choi (2011), though by several aspects, authors dealt with more general features like multidimensional or non-functional inputs. The authors also work in the context of a

multi-task GP model, and one can retrieve the idea of defining a mean function  $\mu_0$  to overcome the weaknesses of classic GPs in making predictions far from observed data. Since their model uses B-splines to estimate this mean function, thanks to information from multiple individuals, this method only works if all individuals share the same grid of observation, and does not account for uncertainty over  $\mu_0$ .

## 4 Prediction

Once the hyper-parameters of the model have been learned, we can focus on our main goal: prediction at new timestamps. Since  $\hat{\Theta}$  is known and for the sake of concision, we omit conditioning on  $\hat{\Theta}$  in the sequel. Note there are two cases for prediction (referred to as *Type I* and *Type II* in Shi and Cheng, 2014, Section 3.2.1), depending on whether we observe some data or not for any new individual we wish to predict on. We denote by the index  $*$  a new individual for whom we want to make a prediction at timestamps  $\mathbf{t}^p$ . If there are no available data for this individual, we have no  $*$ -specific information, and the prediction is merely given by  $p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}^p) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$ . This quantity may be considered as the 'generic' (or *Type II*) prediction according to the trained model, and only informs us through the mean process. Computing  $p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}^p) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$  is also one of the steps leading to the prediction for a partially observed new individual (*Type I*). The latter being the most compelling case, we consider *Type II* prediction as a particular case of the full *Type I* procedure, described below.

If we observe  $\{\mathbf{t}_*, y_*(\mathbf{t}_*)\}$  for the new individual, the multi-task GP prediction is obtained by computing the posterior distribution  $p(y_*(\mathbf{t}^p) | y_*(\mathbf{t}_*), \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$ . Note that the conditioning is taken over  $y_*(\mathbf{t}_*)$ , as for any GP regression, but also on  $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i$ , which is specific to our multi-task setting. Computing this distribution requires the following steps.

1. Choose a grid of prediction  $\mathbf{t}^p$  and define the pooled vector of timestamps  $\mathbf{t}_*^p$ ,
2. Compute the hyper-posterior distribution of  $\mu_0$  at  $\mathbf{t}_*^p$ :  $p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$ ,
3. Compute the prior distribution  $p(y_*(\mathbf{t}_*^p) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$ ,
4. Compute hyper-parameters  $\theta_*$  of the new individual's covariance matrix (optional),
5. Compute the posterior distribution:  
 $p(y_*(\mathbf{t}^p) | y_*(\mathbf{t}_*), \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$ .

### 4.1 Posterior inference on mean process

As mentioned above, we observed a new individual at timestamps  $\mathbf{t}_*$ . The GP regression consists of arbitrarily choosing a vector  $\mathbf{t}^p$  of timestamps on which we wish to make a prediction. Since a GP is an infinite-dimensional object, we can pick a finite-dimensional vector at any new location. Then, we define new notation for the pooled vector of timestamps  $\mathbf{t}_*^p = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{t}^p \\ \mathbf{t}_* \end{bmatrix}$ , which will serve as a working grid to define the prior and posterior distributions involved in the prediction process. One can note that, although not mandatory in theory, it is often a good idea to include the observed timestamps of training individuals,  $\mathbf{t}$ , within  $\mathbf{t}_*^p$  since they match locations which contain information for the mean process to 'help' the prediction. In particular, if  $\mathbf{t}_*^p = \mathbf{t}$ , the computation of  $\mu_0$ 's hyper-posterior distribution is not necessary since  $p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$  has previously been obtained with the EM algorithm.

However, in general, it is necessary to compute the hyper-posterior  $p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$  at the new timestamps. The idea remains similar to the E step aforementioned, and we obtain the following result.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{t}_*^p$  be a vector of timestamps of size  $\tilde{N}$ . The hyper-posterior distribution of  $\mu_0$  remains Gaussian:*

$$p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p); \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p), \hat{K}_*^p\right), \quad (7)$$

with:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{K}_*^p &= \left( \tilde{K}^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{\Psi}_i^{-1} \right)^{-1}, \\ \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p) &= \hat{K}_*^p \left( \tilde{K}^{-1} m_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p) + \sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{\Psi}_i^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the shortening notation:

- $\tilde{K} = K_{\hat{\theta}_0}(\mathbf{t}_*^p, \mathbf{t}_*^p)$  ( $\tilde{N} \times \tilde{N}$  matrix),
- $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i = (\mathbb{1}_{[t \in \mathbf{t}_i]} \times y_i(t))_{t \in \mathbf{t}_*^p}$  ( $\tilde{N}$ -size vector),
- $\tilde{\Psi}_i = \left[ \mathbb{1}_{[t, t' \in \mathbf{t}_i]} \times \Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}(t, t') \right]_{t, t' \in \mathbf{t}_*^p}$  ( $\tilde{N} \times \tilde{N}$  matrix).

**Proof.** The sketch of the proof is similar to Proposition 3.1 in the E step. The only technicality consists in dealing carefully with the dimensions of vectors and matrices involved, and whenever relevant, to define augmented versions of  $\mathbf{y}_i$  and  $\Psi_{\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i^2}$  with 0 elements at unobserved timestamps' position for the  $i$ -th individual. Note that if we pick a vector  $\mathbf{t}_*^p$  including only some of the timestamps from  $\mathbf{t}_i$ , information coming from  $y_i$  at the remaining timestamps is ignored. We defer details to Sec. 8.

## 4.2 Computing the prior distribution for a new individual

According to our generative model, given the mean process, any new individual  $*$  is modelled as:

$$y_*(\cdot) | \mu_0(\cdot) \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mu_0(\cdot), \Psi_{\theta_*, \sigma_*^2}(\cdot, \cdot)). \quad (8)$$

Therefore, for any finite-dimensional vector of timestamps, and in particular for  $\mathbf{t}_*^p$ ,  $p(y_*(\mathbf{t}_*^p) | \mu_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p))$  is a multivariate Gaussian vector. Moreover, from this distribution and  $\mu_0$ 's hyper-posterior, we can figure out the multi-task prior distribution over  $y_*(\mathbf{t}_*^p)$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *For a set of timestamps  $\mathbf{t}_*^p$ , the multi-task prior distribution of  $y_*$  is given by*

$$p(y_*(\mathbf{t}_*^p) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) = \mathcal{N}\left(y_*(\mathbf{t}_*^p); \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p), \hat{K}_*^p + \Psi_{\theta_*, \sigma_*^2}^{\mathbf{t}_*^p}\right). \quad (9)$$

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  denote the multi-task prior distribution for the new individual at timestamps  $\mathbf{t}_*^p$ . To compute this prior, we need to integrate  $p(y_* | \mu_0, \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$  over the mean process  $\mu_0$ , whereas the multi-task aspect remains through the conditioning over  $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i$ . We omit the writing of timestamps, by using the simplified notation  $\mu_0$  and  $y_*$  instead of  $\mu_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p)$  and

$y_*(\mathbf{t}_*^p)$ , respectively. We first use the assumption that  $\{y_i|\mu_0\}_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \perp\!\!\!\perp y_*|\mu_0$ , *i.e.*, the individuals are independent conditionally to  $\mu_0$ . Then, one can notice that the two distributions involved within the integral are Gaussian, which leads to the explicit Gaussian target distribution after integration.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P} &= p(y_*|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) \\ &= \int p(y_*, \mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) d\mu_0 \\ &= \int p(y_*|\mu_0, \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)p(\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) d\mu_0 \\ &= \int \underbrace{p(y_*|\mu_0)}_{\mathcal{N}(y_*;\mu_0,\Psi_{\theta_*}^p)} \underbrace{p(\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)}_{\mathcal{N}(\mu_0;\hat{m}_0,\hat{K}_*^p)} d\mu_0.\end{aligned}$$

This convolution of two Gaussians remains Gaussian (Bishop, 2006, Chapter 2.3.3). For any random variable  $X \in \Omega$ , and  $A_X$  depending on  $X$ , let  $\mathbb{E}_{A_X}[X] = \int_{\Omega} x p(A_X) dx$ . The mean parameter is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{y_*|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[y_*] &= \int y_* p(y_*|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) dy_* \\ &= \int y_* \int p(y_*|\mu_0)p(\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) d\mu_0 dy_* \\ &= \int \left( \int y_* p(y_*|\mu_0) dy_* \right) p(\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) d\mu_0 \\ &= \int \mathbb{E}_{y_*|\mu_0}[y_*] p(\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) d\mu_0 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[\mathbb{E}_{y_*|\mu_0}[y_*]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[\mu_0] \\ &= \hat{m}_0.\end{aligned}$$

Following the same idea, the second-order moment is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{y_*|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[y_*^2] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[\mathbb{E}_{y_*|\mu_0}[y_*^2]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[\mathbb{V}_{y_*|\mu_0}[y_*] + \mathbb{E}_{y_*|\mu_0}[y_*]^2] \\ &= \Psi_{\theta_*,\sigma_*^2} + \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[\mu_0^2] \\ &= \Psi_{\theta_*,\sigma_*^2} + \mathbb{V}_{\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[\mu_0] + \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[\mu_0]^2 \\ &= \Psi_{\theta_*,\sigma_*^2} + \hat{K} + \hat{m}_0^2,\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{V}_{y_*|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[y_*] &= \mathbb{E}_{y_*|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[y_*^2] - \mathbb{E}_{y_*|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i}[y_*]^2 \\ &= \Psi_{\theta_*,\sigma_*^2} + \hat{K} + \hat{m}_0^2 - \hat{m}_0^2 \\ &= \Psi_{\theta_*,\sigma_*^2} + \hat{K}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the process  $y_*(\cdot) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i$  is not a GP, although its finite-dimensional evaluation above remains Gaussian. The covariance structure cannot be expressed as a kernel that could be directly evaluated on any vector: the process is known as a *degenerated GP*. In practice however, this does not bear much consequence as an arbitrary vector of timestamps  $\tau$  can still be chosen, then we compute the hyper-posterior  $p(\mu_0(\tau) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$ , which yields the Gaussian distribution  $p(y_*(\tau) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$  as above. For the sake of simplicity, we now rename the covariance matrix of the prior distribution as

$$\widehat{K}_*^p + \Psi_{\theta_*, \sigma_*^2}^{\mathbf{t}_*^p} = \Gamma_*^p = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{pp} & \Gamma_{p*} \\ \Gamma_{*p} & \Gamma_{**} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\Gamma_{x,x'} = \Gamma(\mathbf{t}_x, \mathbf{t}_{x'}) = \widehat{K}_x^{x'} + \Psi_{\theta_*, \sigma_*^2}(\mathbf{t}_x, \mathbf{t}_{x'})$ , for any  $\mathbf{t}_x, \mathbf{t}_{x'} \in \mathcal{T}$ .

### 4.3 Learning hyper-parameters of a new individual

When we collect data points for a new individual, as in the single-task GP setting, we need to learn the hyper-parameters of its covariance function before making predictions. A salient fact in our multi-task approach is that we include this step in the prediction process, for the two following reasons. First, the model is already trained for individuals  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , and this training is general and independent from future individual  $*$  or the choice of prediction timestamps. Since learning these new hyper-parameters requires knowledge of  $\mu(\mathbf{t}_*^p)$  and thus of the prediction timestamps, we cannot compute them beforehand. Secondly, learning these hyper-parameters with the empirical Bayes approach only requires maximisation of a Gaussian likelihood which is negligible in computing time compared to the previous EM algorithm.

As for single-task GP, we have the following estimates for hyper-parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Theta}_* &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\Theta_*} p(y_*(\mathbf{t}_*) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \Theta_*) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\Theta_*} \mathcal{N}(y_*(\mathbf{t}_*); \widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_*), \Gamma_{**}^{\Theta_*}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that this step is optional depending on model: in the common hyper-parameters model (i.e.  $(\theta, \sigma^2) = (\theta_i, \sigma_i^2)$ ), any new individual will share the same hyper-parameters and we already have  $\widehat{\Theta}_* = (\widehat{\theta}_*, \widehat{\sigma}_*^2) = (\widehat{\theta}, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$  from the EM algorithm.

### 4.4 Prediction

We can write the prior distribution, separating observed and prediction timestamps, as:

$$p(y_*(\mathbf{t}_*^p) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) = p(y_*(\mathbf{t}^p), y_*(\mathbf{t}_*) | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) \quad (11)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(y_*(\mathbf{t}_*^p); \widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_*^p), \Gamma_*^p) \quad (12)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{bmatrix} y_*(\mathbf{t}^p) \\ y_*(\mathbf{t}_*) \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}^p) \\ \widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_*) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{pp} & \Gamma_{p*} \\ \Gamma_{*p} & \Gamma_{**} \end{pmatrix}\right). \quad (13)$$

The conditional distribution remains Gaussian (Bishop, 2006), and the predictive distribution is given by

$$p(y_*(\mathbf{t}^p) | y_*(\mathbf{t}_*), \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i) = \mathcal{N}\left(y_*(\mathbf{t}^p); \hat{\mu}_0^p, \hat{\Gamma}^p\right), \quad (14)$$

where:

- $\hat{\mu}_0^p = \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}^p) + \Gamma_{p*} \Gamma_{**}^{-1} (y_*(\mathbf{t}_*) - \hat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_*))$ ,
- $\hat{\Gamma}^p = \Gamma_{pp} - \Gamma_{p*} \Gamma_{**}^{-1} \Gamma_{*p}$ .

## 5 Complexity analysis for training and prediction

Computational complexity is of paramount importance in GPs as it quickly scales with large datasets. The classical cost to train a GP is  $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$ , and  $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$  for prediction (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006) where  $N$  is the number of data points (see aforementioned references in Sec. 1 for sparse approximations). Since MAGMA uses information from  $M$  individuals, each of them providing  $N_i$  observations, these quantities determine the overall complexities of the algorithm. If we recall that  $N$  is the number of distinct timestamps (*i.e.*  $N \leq \sum_{i=1}^M N_i$ ), the training complexity is  $\mathcal{O}(M \times N_i^3 + N^3)$  (*i.e.* the complexity of each EM iteration). As usual with GPs, the cubic costs come from the inversion of the corresponding matrices, and here, the constant is proportional to the number of iterations of the EM algorithm. The dominating term in this expression depends on the values of  $M$ , relatively to  $N$ . For a large number of individuals with many common timestamps ( $MN_i \gtrsim N$ ), the first term dominates. For diverse timestamps among individuals ( $MN_i \lesssim N$ ), the second term becomes the primary burden, as in any GP problem. During the prediction step, the re-computation of  $\mu_0$ 's hyper-posterior implies the inversion of a  $\tilde{N} \times \tilde{N}$  (dimension of  $\mathbf{t}_*$ ) which has a  $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{N}^3)$  complexity while the final prediction is  $\mathcal{O}(N_*^3)$ . In practice, the most computing-expensive steps can be performed in advance to allow for quick on-the-fly prediction when collecting new data. If we observe the training dataset once and pre-compute the hyper-posterior of  $\mu_0$  on a fine grid on which to predict later, the immediate computational cost for each new individual is identical to the one of the single-task GP regression.

## 6 Experimental results

We evaluate our MAGMA algorithm on synthetic data, and two real datasets. The classical GP regression on single tasks separately is used as the baseline alternative for predictions. While it is not expected to perform well on the dataset used, the comparison highlights the interest of multi-task approaches. To our knowledge, the only alternative to MAGMA is the GPFDA algorithm from Shi et al. (2007), Shi and Choi (2011), described in Sec. 3.4, and the associated R package *GPFDA*, which is applied on the examples. Throughout the section, the standard *Exponentiated Quadratic* kernel (see Eq. (5)) is used both for simulating the data and for the covariance structures in the three algorithms. Hence, each kernel is associated with  $\theta = \{v, \ell\}$ ,  $v, \ell \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , a set of, respectively, variance and length-scale hyper-parameters. Each simulated dataset has been drawn from the sampling scheme below:

1. Define a random working grid  $\mathbf{t} \subset [0, 10]$  of  $N = 200$  timestamps, and a number  $M$  of individuals.

2. Define the prior mean for  $\mu_0 : m_0(t) = at + b, \forall t \in \mathbf{t}$ , where  $a \in [-2, 2]$  and  $b \in [0, 10]$ .
3. Draw uniformly hyper-parameters for  $\mu_0$ 's kernel :  $\theta_0 = \{v_0, \ell_0\}$ , where  $v_0 \in [1, e^5]$  and  $\ell_0 \in [1, e^2]$ .
4. Draw uniformly  $\mu_0(\mathbf{t}) \sim \mathcal{N}(m_0(\mathbf{t}), K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}})$ .
5. For all  $i = 1, \dots, M$ ,  $\theta_i = \{v_i, \ell_i\}$ , where  $v_i \in [1, e^5]$ ,  $\ell_i \in [1, e^2]$ , and  $\sigma_i^2 \in [0, 1]$ .
6. For all  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , draw a subset uniformly at random  $\mathbf{t}_i \subset \mathbf{t}$  of  $N_i = 30$  timestamps, and draw  $\mathbf{y}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}_i), \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i})$ .

This procedure provides a synthetic data set  $\{\mathbf{t}_i, \mathbf{y}_i\}_i$ , and its associated mean process  $\mu_0(\mathbf{t})$ . Those quantities are used to train the model, make predictions with each algorithm, and then compute errors in  $\mu_0$  estimation and forecasts. We recall that the MAGMA algorithm enables two different settings depending on the model's assumption over hyper-parameters (HP), and we refer to them as *Common HP* and *Different HP* in the following. In order to test these two contexts, differentiated datasets have been generated, by drawing *Common HP data* or *Different HP data* for each individual at step 5. We previously presented the idea of the model used in GPFDA, and, although the algorithm has many features (in particular about the type and number of input variables), it is not yet usable when timestamps are different among individuals. Therefore, two frameworks are considered, *Common grid* and *Uncommon grid*, to take this specification into account. Thus, the comparison between the different methods can only be performed on data generated under the settings *Common HP* and *Common grid*, and the effect of the different settings on MAGMA is analysed separately. Moreover, without additional knowledge, the initialisation for the prior mean function,  $m_0(\cdot)$ , is set to be equal to 0 for each algorithm. Except in some experiments, where the influence of the number of individuals is analysed, the generic value is  $M = 20$ . In the case of prediction on unobserved timestamps for a new individual, the first 20 data points are used as observations, and the remaining 10 are taken as test values.

## 6.1 Illustration on a simple example

To illustrate the multi-task approach of MAGMA, Fig. 2 displays a comparison between single GP regression and MAGMA on a simple example, from a dataset simulated according to the scheme above. Given the observed data (in black), values on a thin grid of unobserved timestamps are predicted and compared, in particular, with the true test values (in red). As expected, GP regression provides a good fitting close to the data points and then dives rapidly to the prior 0 with increasing uncertainty. Conversely, although the initialisation for the prior mean was also 0 in MAGMA, the hyper-posterior distribution of  $\mu_0$  (dashed line) is estimated thanks to all individuals in the training dataset. This process acts as an informed prior helping GP prediction for the new individual, even far from its own observations. More precisely, 3 phases can be distinguished according to the level of information coming from the data: in the first one, close to the observed data ( $t \in [1, 7]$ ), the two processes behave similarly, except a slight increase in the variance for MAGMA, which is logical since the prediction also takes uncertainty over  $\mu_0$  into account (see Eq. (9)); in the second one, on intervals of unobserved timestamps containing data points from the training dataset ( $t \in [0, 1] \cup [7, 10]$ ), the prediction is guided by the information coming from other individuals through  $\mu_0$ . In this context, the mean






Figure 2: Prediction curves (blue) for a new individual with associated 95% credible intervals (grey) for GP regression (left) and MAGMA (right). The dashed line represents the mean function of the mean process’s hyper-posterior  $p(\mu_0 | \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$ . Observed data points are in black, and testing data points are in red. The colourful backward points are the observations from the training dataset, each colour corresponding to a different individual.

**Table 1** Average MSE (sd) and average  $CI_{95}$  coverage (sd) on 100 runs for GP, GPFDA and MAGMA. ( $\star$  : 99.6 (2.8), the measure of incertitude from the GPFDA package is not a genuine credible interval)

	Prediction		Estimation $\mu_0$	
	MSE	$CI_{95}$	MSE	$CI_{95}$
MAGMA	<b>18.7 (31.4)</b>	<b>93.8 (13.5)</b>	<b>1.3 (2)</b>	<b>94.3 (11.3)</b>
GPFDA	31.8 (49.4)	90.4 (18.1)	2.4 (3.6)	$\star$
GP	87.5 (151.9)	74.0 (32.7)		

trajectory remains coherent and the uncertainty increases only slightly. In the third case, where no observations are available neither from new individual nor from training dataset ( $t \in [10, 12]$ ), the prediction behaves as expected, with a slow drifting to the prior mean 0, with highly increasing variance. Overall, the multi-task framework provides reliable probabilistic predictions on a wider range of timestamps, potentially outside of the usual scope for GPs.

## 6.2 Performance comparison on simulated datasets

We confront the performance of MAGMA to alternatives in several situations and for different datasets. In the first place, the classical GP regression (GP), GPFDA and MAGMA are compared through their performance in prediction and estimation of the true mean process  $\mu_0$ . In the prediction context, the performances are evaluated according to the following indicators:

- the mean squared error (MSE) which compares the predicted values to the true test values of the 10 last timestamps:

$$\frac{1}{10} \sum_{k=21}^{30} \left( y_i^{pred}(t_i^k) - y_i^{true}(t_i^k) \right)^2,$$




Figure 3: MSE with respect to the number  $M$  of training individuals (100 runs in each case). *Left*: prediction error on 10 testing points. *Right*: estimation error of the true mean process  $\mu_0$ .




Figure 4: MSE prediction error on the 10 last testing points with respect to the increasing number  $N$  of observed timestamps, among the first 20 points (100 runs in each case).

- the ratio of  $CI_{95}$  coverage, i.e. the percentage of unobserved data points effectively lying within the 95% credible interval defined from the predictive posterior distribution  $p(y_*(\mathbf{t}^p)|y_*(\mathbf{t}_*), \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$ :

$$100 \times \frac{1}{10} \sum_{k=21}^{30} \mathbb{1}_{\{y_i^{true} \in CI_{95}\}}.$$

The ratio of  $CI_{95}$  coverage gives an approximation of the predictive variance reliability and should be as close to the value 95% as possible. Other values would indicate a tendency to underestimate or overestimate the uncertainty. Let us recall that GPFDA uses B-splines to estimate the mean process and does not account for uncertainty, contrarily to a probabilistic framework as MAGMA. However, a measure of uncertainty based on an empirical variance estimated from training curves is proposed (see [Shi and Cheng, 2014](#), Section 3.2.1). In practice, this measure constantly overestimates the true variance, and the  $CI_{95}$  coverage is generally equal or close to 100%.

In the estimation context, the performances are evaluated thanks to another MSE, which compares the estimations to the true values of  $\mu_0$  at all timestamps:

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \left( \mu_0^{pred}(t_i^k) - \mu_0^{true}(t_i^k) \right)^2.$$

Table 1 presents the results obtained over 100 datasets, where the model is trained on  $M = 20$  individuals, each of them observed on  $N = 30$  common timestamps. As expected, both multi-task methods lead to better results than GP. However, MAGMA outperforms GPFDA, both in estimation of  $\mu_0$  and in prediction performance. In terms of error as well as in uncertainty quantification, MAGMA provides more accurate results, in particular with a  $CI_{95}$  coverage close to the 95% expected value. Each method presents a quite high standard deviation for MSE in prediction, which is due to some datasets with particularly difficult values to predict, although most of the cases lead to small errors. This behaviour is reasonably expected since the forecast of 10-ahead-timestamps might sometimes be tricky. It can also be noticed on Fig. 3 that MAGMA consistently provides lower errors as well as less pathological behaviour, as it may sometimes occur with the B-splines modelling used in GPFDA.

To highlight the effect of the number of individuals  $M$  on the performance, Fig. 3 provides the same 100 runs trial as previously, for different values of  $M$ . The boxplots exhibit, for each method, the behaviour of the prediction and estimation MSE as information is added in the training dataset. Let us mention the absence of discernible changes as soon as  $M > 200$ . As expected, we notice on the right panel that adding information from new individuals improves the estimation of  $\mu_0$ , leading to shallow errors for high values of  $M$ , in particular for MAGMA. Meanwhile, the left panel exhibits reasonably unchanged prediction performance with respect to the values of  $M$ , excepted some random fluctuations. This property is expected for GP regression, since no external information is used from the training dataset in this context. For both multi-tasks algorithms though, the estimation of  $\mu_0$  improves the prediction by one order of magnitude below the typical errors, even with only a few training individuals. Furthermore, since a new individual behaves independently through  $f_*$ , it is natural for a 10-points-ahead forecast to present intrinsic variations, despite an adequate estimation of the shared mean process.

To illustrate the advantage of multi-task methods, even for  $M = 20$ , we display on Fig. 4 the evolution of MSE according to the number of timestamps  $N$  that are assumed to be observed for the new individual on which we make predictions. These predictions remain computed on the last 10 timestamps, although in this experiment, we only observe the first 5, 10, 15, or 20 timestamps, in order to change the volume of information and the distance from training observations to targets. We observe on Fig. 3 that, as expected in a GP framework, the closer observations are to targets, the better the results. However, for multi-tasks approaches and in particular for MAGMA, the prediction remains consistently adequate even with few observations. Once more, sharing information across individuals significantly helps the prediction, even for small values of  $M$  or few observed data.

### 6.3 Magma specific settings

As we previously discussed, different settings are available for MAGMA according to the nature of data and the model hypotheses. First, the *Common grid* setting corresponds to cases where all individuals share the same timestamps, whereas *Uncommon grid* is used otherwise. Moreover, MAGMA enables to consider identical hyper-parameters for all individuals or specific ones, as previously discussed in Sec. 2.2. To evaluate the effect of the different settings, performances in prediction and  $\mu_0$ 's estimation are evaluated in the following cases in Table 2:

- *Common HP*, when data are simulated with a common set of hyper-parameters for all individuals, and Proposition 3.3 is used for inference in MAGMA,
- *Different HP*, when data are simulated with its own set of hyper-parameters for each individual, and Proposition 3.2 is used for inference in MAGMA,
- *Common HP on different HP data*, when data are simulated with its own set of hyper-parameters for each individual, and Proposition 3.3 is used for inference in MAGMA.

Note that the first line of the table (*Common grid / Common HP*) of Table 2 is identical to the corresponding results in Table 1, providing reference values, significantly better than for other methods. The results obtained in Table 2 indicates that the MAGMA performance are not significantly altered by the settings used, or the nature of the simulated data. In order to confirm the robustness of the method, the setting *Common HP* was applied to data generated by drawing different values of hyper-parameters for each individual (*Different HP data*). In this case, performance in prediction and estimation of  $\mu_0$  are slightly deteriorated, although MAGMA still provides quite reliable forecasts. This experience also highlights a particularity of the *Different HP* setting: looking at the estimation of  $\mu_0$  performance, we observe a significant decrease in the  $CI_{95}$  coverage, due to numerical instability in some pathological cases. Numerical issues, in particular during matrix inversions, are classical problems in the GP literature and, because of the potentially large number of different hyper-parameters to train, the probability for at least one of them to lead to a nearly singular matrix increases. In this case, one individual might overwhelm others in the calculus of  $\mu_0$ 's hyper-posterior (see Proposition 4.1), and thus lead to an underestimated posterior variance. This problem does not occur in the *Common HP* settings, since sharing the same hyper-parameters prevents the associated covariance matrices from running over each other. Thus, except if one specifically wants to smooth multiple curves presenting really different behaviours, keeping *Common HP* as a default setting appear as a reasonable choice. Let us notice that the estimation of  $\mu_0$  is slightly

**Table 2** Average MSE (sd) and average  $CI_{95}$  coverage (sd) on 100 runs for the different settings of MAGMA.

		Prediction		Estimation of $\mu_0$	
		MSE	$CI_{95}$	MSE	$CI_{95}$
Common HP	Common grid	18.7 (31.4)	93.8 (13.5)	1.3 (2)	94.3 (11.3)
	Uncommon grid	19.2 (43)	94.6 (13.1)	2.9 (2.6)	93.6 (9.2)
Different HP	Common grid	19.9 (54.7)	91.6 (17.8)	0.5 (0.4)	70.8 (24.3)
	Uncommon grid	14.5 (22.4)	89.1 (17.9)	2.5 (4.5)	81.1 (15.9)
Common HP on different HP data	Common grid	21.7 (36)	91 (19.8)	1.5 (1.2)	91.1 (13)
	Uncommon grid	18.1 (33)	92.5 (15.9)	3.2 (4.5)	93.4 (9.8)

better for common than for uncommon grid, since the estimation problem on the union of different timestamps is generally more difficult. However, this feature only depends on the nature of data.

#### 6.4 Running times comparisons

The counterpart of the more accurate and general results provided by MAGMA is a natural increase in running time. Table 3 exhibits the raw and relative training times for GPFDA and MAGMA (prediction times are negligible and comparable in both cases), with varying values of  $M$  on a *Common grid* of  $N = 30$  timestamps. The algorithms were run under the 3.6.1 R version, on a laptop with a dual-core processor cadenced at 2.90GHz and an 8Go RAM. The reported computing times are in seconds, and for small to moderate datasets ( $N \simeq 10^3$ ,  $M \simeq 10^4$ ) the procedures ran in few minutes to few hours. The difference between the two algorithms is due to GPFDA modelling  $\mu_0$  as a deterministic function through B-splines smoothing, whereas MAGMA accounts for uncertainty. The ratio of computing times between the two methods tends to decrease as  $M$  increases, and stabilises around 2 for higher numbers of training individuals. This behaviour comes from the E step in MAGMA, which is incompressible and quite insensitive to the value of  $M$ . Roughly speaking, one needs to pay twice the computing price of GPFDA for MAGMA to provide (significantly) more accurate predictions and uncertainty over  $\mu_0$ .

Table 4 provides running times of MAGMA according to its different settings, with  $M = 20$ . Because the complexity is linear in  $M$  in each case, the ratio in running times would remain roughly similar no matter the value of  $M$ . Prediction time appears negligible compared to training time, and generally takes less than one second to run. Besides, the *Different HP* setting increases the running time, since in this context  $M$  maximisations (instead of one for *Common HP*) are required at each EM iteration. In this case, the prediction also takes slightly longer because of the necessity to optimise hyper-parameters for the new individual. Although the nature of the grid of timestamps does not matter in itself, a key limitation lies in the dimension  $N$  of the pooled set of timestamps, which tends to get bigger when individuals have different timestamps from one another.

**Table 3** Average (sd) training time (in seconds) for MAGMA and GPFDA for different numbers  $M$  of individuals in the training dataset. The relative running time between MAGMA and GPFDA is provided on the line *Ratio*.

	5	10	50	100
MAGMA	5.2 (2.7)	7.6 (3.2)	24.2 (11.1)	42.8 (10)
GPFDA	1 (0.3)	2.1 (0.6)	10.7 (2.4)	23.1 (5.3)
Ratio	<b>5.2</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.9</b>

**Table 4** Average (sd) training and prediction time (in seconds) for different settings of MAGMA.

		Train	Predict
Common HP	Common grid	12.6 (3.5)	0.1 (0)
	Uncommon grid	16.5 (11.4)	0.2 (0.1)
Different HP	Common grid	42.6 (20.5)	0.6 (0.1)
	Uncommon grid	40.2 (17)	0.6 (0.1)

## 6.5 Application of Magma on swimmers' progression curves

### Data and problematic

We consider the problem of performance prediction in competition for french swimmers. The French Swimming Federation (FFN) provided us with an anonymised dataset, compiling the age and results of its members between 2000 and 2016. For each competitor, the race times are registered for competitions of 100m freestyle (50m swimming-pool). The database contains results from 1731 women and 7876 men, each of them compiling an average of 22.2 data points (min = 15, max = 61) and 12 data points (min = 5, max = 57) respectively. In the following, age of the  $i$ -th swimmer is considered as the input variable (timestamp  $t$ ) and the performance (in seconds) on a 100m freestyle as the output ( $y_i(t)$ ). For reasons of confidentiality and property, the raw dataset cannot be published. The analysis focuses on the youth period, from 10 to 20 years, where the progression is the most noticeable. In order to get relevant time series, we retained only individuals having a sufficient number of data points on the considered time period.

For a young swimmer, observed during its first years of competition, we aim at modelling its progression curve and make predictions on its future performance in the subsequent years. Since we consider a decision-making problem involving irregular time series, the GP probabilistic framework is a natural choice to work on. Thereby, assuming that each swimmer in the database is a realisation  $y_i$  defined as previously, we expect MAGMA to provide multi-task predictions for a new young swimmer, that will benefit from information of other swimmers already observed at older ages. To study such modelling, and validate its efficiency in practice, we split the individuals into a training and testing datasets with respective sizes:

- $M_{train}^F = 1039$ , for the female training set,
- $M_{test}^F = 692$ , for the female testing set,
- $M_{train}^M = 4726$ , for the male training set,
- $M_{test}^M = 3150$ , for the male testing set.

Inference on the hyper-parameters is performed thanks to the training dataset in both cases. Considering the different timestamps and the relative monotony of the progression curves, the settings *Uncommon grid/Common HP* has been used for MAGMA. The overall training lasted around 2 hours with the same hardware configuration as for simulations. To compute MSE and the  $CI_{95}$  coverage, the data points of each individual in the testing set has been split into *observed* and *testing* timestamps. Since each individual has a different number of data points, the first 80% of timestamps are taken as *observed*, while the remaining 20% are considered as *testing* timestamps. MAGMA’s predictions are compared with the true values of  $y_i$  at testing timestamps.

As previously, both GP and MAGMA have been initialised with a constant 0 mean function. Initial values for hyper-parameters are also similar for all  $i$ ,  $\theta_0^{ini} = \theta_i^{ini} = (e^1, e^1)$  and  $\sigma_i^{ini} = 0.4$ . Those values are the default in MAGMA and remain adequate in the context of these datasets.

**Results and interpretation** The overall performance and comparison are summarised in Table 5.

**Table 5** Average MSE (sd) and average  $CI_{95}$  coverage (sd) for prediction on french swimmer testing datasets.

		MSE	$CI_{95}$ Cover
Women	MAGMA	<b>3.8 (10.3)</b>	<b>95.3 (15.9)</b>
	GP	25.3 (97.6)	72.7 (37.1)
Men	MAGMA	<b>3.7 (5.3)</b>	<b>93.9 (15.3)</b>
	GP	22.1 (94.3)	78.2 (30.4)

We observe that MAGMA still provides excellent results in this context, and naturally outperform predictions provided by a single GP regression. The progression curves presenting relatively monotonic variations, and thus avoiding pathological behaviours that could occur with synthetic data, the MSE in prediction remains very low. The  $CI_{95}$  coverage sticks close to the 95% expected value for MAGMA, indicating an adequate quantification of uncertainty. To illustrate these results, an example is displayed on Fig. 5 for both men and women. For a randomly chosen testing individual, we plot its predicted progression curve (in blue), where we used its first 15 data points as observations (in black), while the remaining true data points (in red) are displayed for comparison purpose. As previously observed in the simulation study, the simple GP quickly drifts to the prior 0 mean, as soon as data lack. However, for both men and women, the MAGMA predictions remain close to the true data, which also lie within the 95% credible interval. Even for long term forecast, where the mean prediction curve tends to overlap the mean process (dashed line), the true data remain in our range of uncertainty, as the credible interval widens far from observations. For clarity, we displayed only a few individuals from the training dataset (colourful points) in the background. The mean process (dashed line) seems to represent the main trend of progression among swimmers correctly, even though we cannot numerically compare  $\mu_0$  to any real-life analogous quantity. In a more sport-related perspective, we can note that both genders present similar patterns of progression. However, while performances are roughly similar in mean trend before the age of 14, they start to differentiate afterwards and then converge to average times with approximately a 5 seconds gap. Interestingly, the difference between world records in 100 freestyle for men




Figure 5: Prediction curves (blue) for a testing individual with associated 95% credible intervals (grey) for GP regression (left) and MAGMA (right), for both women (top) and men (bottom). The dashed lines represent the mean functions of the hyper-posterior mean process  $\mu_0 | \{y_i\}_i$ . Observed data points are in black, and testing data points are in red. The colourful backward points are observations from the training dataset, each colour corresponding to a different individual.



and women is currently 4.8 seconds (46.91 versus 51.71). These results, obtained under reasonable hypotheses on several hundreds of swimmers, seem to indicate that MAGMA would give quite reliable predictions for a new young swimmer. Furthermore, the uncertainty provided through the predictive posterior distribution offers an adequate degree of caution in a decision-making process.

## 7 Discussion

We have introduced a unified non-parametric multi-task framework integrating a mean Gaussian process prior in the context of GP regression. While we believe that this process is an interesting object in itself, it also allows individuals to borrow information from each other and provide more accurate predictions, even far from data points. Furthermore, our method accounts for uncertainty in the mean process and remains applicable no matter the observational grid of data. Both on simulated and real-life datasets, we exhibited the adequacy of such an approach, and studied some of its properties and possible settings. MAGMA outperforms the alternatives in estimation of the mean process as well as in prediction, and gives a reliable quantification of uncertainty. We also displayed evidence of its predictive efficiency for real-life problems and provided some insights on practical interpretation about the mean process.

Interestingly, despite the extensive literature on these aspects of GPs, our model does not yet include sparse approximations or on-line extensions. While these aspects are beyond the scope of the present paper, we aim to integrate such existing approaches in our model to widen its applicability. The combination of the covariance structures used in classical multi-task GP (Bonilla et al., 2008; Hensman et al., 2013) with the common mean process we introduced would also open a promising path for future work. Another possible avenue is an adaptation to the classification context, which is presented in Rasmussen and Williams (2006, Chapter 3). Besides, this work leaves the door open to improvement as we only tackled the problem of unidimensional regression: enabling either multidimensional or mixed type of inputs as in Shi and Choi (2011) would be of interest. To conclude, the hypothesis of a unique underlying mean process might be considered as too restrictive for some datasets, and enabling cluster-specific mean processes would be a relevant extension.

## 8 Proofs

The proof below gives details for the calculus of  $\mu_0$ 's hyper-posterior distribution, involved in the E step of the EM algorithm and during the prediction process. Although the main idea is similar to the proof given for common timestamps, there are some cautions to take when working in the general case. Note that the proof of Proposition 3.1 is a particular case of the proof below, where  $\tau = \mathbf{t}$  exactly (where  $\tau$  is the set of timestamps the hyper-posterior is to be computed on). Moreover, in order to keep an analytical expression for  $\mu_0$ 's hyper-posterior distribution, we discard the superfluous information contained in  $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i$  at timestamps on which the hyper-posterior is not to be computed. Hence, the proof below states that the remaining data points are observed on subsets  $\{\tau_i\}_i$  of  $\tau$ .

**Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 4.1.**

Let  $\tau$  be a finite vector of timestamps, and  $\{\tau_i\}_i$  such as  $\forall i = 1, \dots, M, \tau_i \subset \tau$ . We define convenient notation:

- $\mu_0^\tau = \mu_0(\tau)$ ,

- $\mathbf{m}_0^\tau = m_0(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ ,
- $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau_i} = \mu_0(\boldsymbol{\tau}_i), \forall i = 1, \dots, M$ ,
- $\mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i} = y_i(\boldsymbol{\tau}_i), \forall i = 1, \dots, M$ ,
- $\Psi_i = \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_i, \boldsymbol{\tau}_i), \forall i = 1, \dots, M$ ,
- $K = K_{\theta_0}(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ .

Moreover, for a covariance matrix  $C$ , and  $u, v \in \boldsymbol{\tau}$ , we note  $[C]_{uv}^{-1}$  the element of the inverse matrix at row associated with timestamp  $u$ , and column associated with timestamp  $v$ . We also ignore the conditionings over  $\widehat{\Theta}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  to maintain simple expressions. By construction of the models, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau | \{\mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i}\}_i) &\propto p(\{\mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i}\}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau) p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau) \\
&\propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^M p(\mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i} | \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau_i}) \right\} p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau) \\
&\propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^M \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau_i}, \Psi_i) \right\} \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau; \mathbf{m}_0^\tau, K).
\end{aligned}$$

The term  $\mathcal{L}_1 = -(1/2) \log p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau | \{\mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i}\}_i)$  associated with the hyper-posterior remains quadratic and we may find the corresponding Gaussian parameters by identification:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^M (\mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau_i})^\top \Psi_i^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau_i}) + C_i \\
&\quad + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau - \mathbf{m}_0^\tau)^\top K^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau - \mathbf{m}_0^\tau) + C_0 \\
&= \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau \top} K^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau + \sum_{i=1}^M \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau_i \top} \Psi_i^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau_i} \\
&\quad - 2 \left( \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau \top} K^{-1} \mathbf{m}_0^\tau + \sum_{i=1}^M \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\tau_i \top} \Psi_i^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i} \right) + C \\
&= \sum_{u \in \boldsymbol{\tau}} \sum_{v \in \boldsymbol{\tau}} \mu_0(u) [K]_{uv}^{-1} \mu_0(v) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{u \in \boldsymbol{\tau}_i} \sum_{v \in \boldsymbol{\tau}_i} \mu_0(u) [\Psi_i]_{uv}^{-1} \mu_0(v) \\
&\quad - 2 \sum_{u \in \boldsymbol{\tau}} \sum_{v \in \boldsymbol{\tau}} \mu_0(u) [K]_{uv}^{-1} m_0(v) \\
&\quad - 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{u \in \boldsymbol{\tau}_i} \sum_{v \in \boldsymbol{\tau}_i} \mu_0(u) [\Psi_i]_{uv}^{-1} y_i(v) + C,
\end{aligned}$$

where we entirely decomposed the vector-matrix products. We factorise the expression according to the common timestamps between  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ . Since for all  $i, \boldsymbol{\tau}_i \subset \boldsymbol{\tau}$ , let us introduce a dummy indicator function  $\mathbb{1}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} = \mathbb{1}_{\{u, v \in \boldsymbol{\tau}_i\}}$  to write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{u \in \tau_i} \sum_{v \in \tau_i} A(u, v) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{u \in \tau} \sum_{v \in \tau} \mathbb{1}_{\tau_i} A(u, v) \\
&= \sum_{u \in \tau} \sum_{v \in \tau} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{\tau_i} A(u, v),
\end{aligned}$$

subsequently, we can gather the sums such as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_1 &= \sum_{u \in \tau} \sum_{v \in \tau} \left( \mu_0(u) [K]_{uv}^{-1} \mu_0(v) \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{\tau_i} \mu_0(u) [\Psi_i]_{uv}^{-1} \mu_0(v) \\
&\quad - 2\mu_0(u) [K]_{uv}^{-1} m_0(v) \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{\tau_i} \mu_0(u) [\Psi_i]_{uv}^{-1} y_i(v) \right) + C \\
&= \sum_{u \in \tau} \sum_{v \in \tau} \left( \mu_0(u) \left( [K]_{uv}^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{\tau_i} [\Psi_i]_{uv}^{-1} \right) \mu_0(v) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2\mu_0(u) \left( [K]_{uv}^{-1} m_0(v) + \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{\tau_i} [\Psi_i]_{uv}^{-1} y_i(v) \right) \right) + C \\
&= \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau \left( K^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{\Psi}_i^{-1} \right) \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau \\
&\quad - 2\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau \left( K^{-1} \mathbf{m}_0^\tau + \sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{\Psi}_i^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i^\tau \right) + C,
\end{aligned}$$

where the  $\mathbf{y}_i$  and  $\Psi_i$  are completed by zeros:

- $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i^\tau = \mathbb{1}_{\tau_i} y_i(\tau)$ ,
- $[\tilde{\Psi}_i]_{uv}^{-1} = \mathbb{1}_{\tau_i} [\Psi_i]_{uv}^{-1}$ ,  $\forall u, v \in \tau$ .

By identification of the quadratic form, we reach:

$$p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau | \{\mathbf{y}_i^{\tau_i}\}_i) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\tau; \hat{m}_0(\tau), \hat{K}),$$

with,

- $\hat{K} = \left( K^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{\Psi}_i^{-1} \right)^{-1}$ ,
- $\hat{m}_0(\tau) = \hat{K} \left( K^{-1} \mathbf{m}_0^\tau + \sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{\Psi}_i^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i^\tau \right)$ .

**Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.3.**

Since the central part of the proofs is similar for both propositions, we detail the calculus denoting  $\Theta = \{\theta_0, \{\theta_i\}_i, \{\sigma_i\}_i\}$  for generality and dissociate the two cases only when necessary. Before considering the maximisation, we notice that the joint density can be developed as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= p(\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i, \mu_0(\mathbf{t})|\Theta) \\ &= p(\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i|\mu_0(\mathbf{t}), \Theta) p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t})|\Theta) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^M \{p(\mathbf{y}_i|\mu_0(\mathbf{t}), \theta_i, \sigma_i^2)\} p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t})|\theta_0) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^M \left\{ \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}_i; \mu_0(\mathbf{t}), \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}) \right\} \mathcal{N}(\mu_0(\mathbf{t}); m_0(\mathbf{t}), K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}).\end{aligned}$$

The expectation is taken over  $p(\mu_0(\mathbf{t})|\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_i)$  though we write it  $\mathbb{E}$  for simplicity. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}f(\Theta) &= \mathbb{E} [\log \mathcal{L}] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mu_0(\mathbf{t}) - m_0(\mathbf{t}))^\top K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1} (\mu_0(\mathbf{t}) - m_0(\mathbf{t})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^M (\mathbf{y}_i - \mu_0(\mathbf{t}_i))^\top \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i}{}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_i - \mu_0(\mathbf{t}_i)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \log |K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1}| - \sum_{i=1}^M \log |\Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i}{}^{-1}| \right] + C_1.\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 8.1.** *Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^N$  be a random Gaussian vector  $X \sim \mathcal{N}(m, K)$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , and  $S$ , a  $N \times N$  covariance matrix. Then:*

$$\begin{aligned}E &= \mathbb{E}_X [(X - b)^\top S^{-1} (X - b)] \\ &= (m - b)^\top S^{-1} (m - b) + \text{Tr}(KS^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 8.1.**

$$\begin{aligned}E &= \mathbb{E}_X [\text{Tr}(S^{-1}(X - b)(X - b)^\top)] \\ &= \text{Tr}(S^{-1}\mathbb{V}_X(X - b)) + \text{Tr}(S^{-1}(m - b)(m - b)^\top) \\ &= (m - b)^\top S^{-1}(m - b) + \text{Tr}(KS^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

As we note that  $X$  and  $b$  play symmetrical roles in the calculus of the conditional expectation, we can apply the lemma regardless to the position of  $\mu_0$  in the  $M+1$  equalities involved. Applying Lemma 8.1 to our previous expression of  $f(\Theta)$ , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\Theta) = & -\frac{1}{2} \left[ (\widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}) - m_0(\mathbf{t}))^\top K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1} (\widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}) - m_0(\mathbf{t})) \right. \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^M (\mathbf{y}_i - \widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_i))^\top \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i}{}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_i - \widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_i)) \\
& + \text{Tr} \left( \widehat{K}^{\mathbf{t}} K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^M \text{Tr} \left( \widehat{K}^{\mathbf{t}_i} \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i}{}^{-1} \right) \\
& \left. - \log |K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1}| - \sum_{i=1}^M \log |\Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i}{}^{-1}| + C_1 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We recall that, at the M step,  $\widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t})$  is a known constant, computed at the previous E step. Thus, we identify here the characteristic expression of several Gaussian likelihoods and associated correction trace terms. Moreover, each set of hyper-parameters is merely involved in independent terms of the whole function to maximise. Hence, the global maximisation problem can be separated into several maximisations of sub-functions according to the hyper-parameters getting optimised. Regardless to additional assumptions, the hyper-parameters  $\theta_0$ , controlling the covariance matrix of the mean process, appears in a function which is exactly a Gaussian likelihood  $\mathcal{N}(\widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}), m_0(\mathbf{t}), K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}})$ , added to a corresponding trace term  $-\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( \widehat{K}^{\mathbf{t}} K_{\theta_0}^{\mathbf{t}}{}^{-1} \right)$ . This function can be maximised independently from the other parameters, giving the first part of the results in Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.3.

Although the idea is analogous for the remaining hyper-parameters, we have to discriminate here regarding the assumption on the model. If each individual is supposed to have its own set  $\{\theta_i, \sigma_i\}$ , which thus can be optimised independently from the observations and hyper-parameters of other individuals, we identify a sum of  $M$  Gaussian likelihoods  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}_i, \widehat{m}_0(\mathbf{t}_i), \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i})$  and the corresponding trace terms  $-\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( \widehat{K}^{\mathbf{t}_i} \Psi_{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2}^{\mathbf{t}_i}{}^{-1} \right)$ . This results on  $M$  independent maximisation problems on corresponding functions, proving Proposition 3.2. Conversely, if we assume that all individuals in the model shares their hyper-parameters and  $\{\theta, \sigma^2\} = \{\theta_i, \sigma_i^2\}, \forall i$ , we can no longer divide the problem into  $M$  sub-maximisations, and the whole sum on all individual should be optimised thanks to observations from all individuals. This case corresponds to the second part of Proposition 3.3.

### Availability of data

The synthetic data and table of results are available at <https://github.com/ArthurLeroy/MAGMA/tree/master/Simulations>

### Code availability

The R code associated with the present work is available at <https://github.com/ArthurLeroy/MAGMA>

## Bibliography

- Ahmed M. Alaa and Mihaela van der Schaar. Bayesian Inference of Individualized Treatment Effects using Multi-task Gaussian Processes. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, pages 3424–3432. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- Mauricio A. Álvarez, Lorenzo Rosasco, and Neil D. Lawrence. Kernels for Vector-Valued Functions: A Review. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 4(3):195–266, 2012. ISSN 1935-8237, 1935-8245. doi: 10.1561/22000000036.
- Anjishnu Banerjee, David B. Dunson, and Surya T. Tokdar. Efficient Gaussian process regression for large datasets. *Biometrika*, 100(1):75–89, 2013. ISSN 0006-3444. doi: 10.1093/biomet/ass068.
- Matthias Bauer, Mark van der Wilk, and Carl Edward Rasmussen. Understanding Probabilistic Sparse Gaussian Process Approximations. In D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 1533–1541. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- C. Biernacki, G. Celeux, and G. Govaert. Choosing starting values for the EM algorithm for getting the highest likelihood in multivariate gaussian mixture models. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 41(3-4):561–575, 2003.
- Hildo Bijl, Jan-Willem van Wingerden, Thomas B. Schön, and Michel Verhaegen. Online sparse Gaussian process regression using FITC and PITC approximations. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 48(28):703–708, 2015. ISSN 2405-8963. doi: 10.1016/j.ifacol.2015.12.212.
- Christopher M. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer, New York, 2006. ISBN 978-0-387-31073-2.
- Edwin V Bonilla, Kian M. Chai, and Christopher Williams. Multi-task Gaussian Process Prediction. In J. C. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. T. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, pages 153–160. Curran Associates, Inc., 2008.
- Rich Caruana. Multitask Learning. *Machine Learning*, 28(1):41–75, July 1997. ISSN 1573-0565. doi: 10.1023/A:1007379606734.
- George Casella. An Introduction to Empirical Bayes Data Analysis. *The American Statistician*, 39(2):83–87, 1985. ISSN 0003-1305. doi: 10.2307/2682801.
- Christopher Clingerman and Eric Eaton. Lifelong Learning with Gaussian Processes. In Michelangelo Ceci, Jaakko Hollmén, Ljupčo Todorovski, Celine Vens, and Sašo Džeroski, editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, volume 10535, pages 690–704. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017. ISBN 978-3-319-71245-1 978-3-319-71246-8. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-71246-8\_42.
- Ciprian M. Crainiceanu and A. Jeffrey Goldsmith. Bayesian Functional Data Analysis Using WinBUGS. *Journal of statistical software*, 32(11), 2010. ISSN 1548-7660.
- A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin. Maximum Likelihood from Incomplete Data via the EM Algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 39(1):1–38, 1977. ISSN 0035-9246.

- David Duvenaud. *Automatic Model Construction with Gaussian Processes*. Thesis, University of Cambridge, November 2014.
- Frédéric Ferraty and Philippe Vieu. *Nonparametric Functional Data Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006. ISBN 978-0-387-36620-3.
- Kohei Hayashi, Takashi Takenouchi, Ryota Tomioka, and Hisashi Kashima. Self-measuring Similarity for Multi-task Gaussian Process. *Transactions of the Japanese Society for Artificial Intelligence*, 27(3):103–110, 2012. ISSN 1346-8030, 1346-0714. doi: 10.1527/tjsai.27.103.
- James Hensman, Nicolo Fusi, and Neil D. Lawrence. Gaussian Processes for Big Data. *arXiv:1309.6835 [cs, stat]*, September 2013.
- Thriyambakam Krishnan and GJ McLachlan. *The EM algorithm and extensions*. John Wiley, New York, 1997.
- Pablo Moreno-Muñoz, Antonio Artés-Rodríguez, and Mauricio A. Álvarez. Continual Multi-task Gaussian Processes. *arXiv:1911.00002 [cs, stat]*, 2019.
- J. Quiñero-Candela, C. E. Rasmussen, and C. K. I. Williams. *Approximation Methods for Gaussian Process Regression*. MIT Press, 2007. ISBN 978-0-262-02625-3.
- Barbara Rakitsch, Christoph Lippert, Karsten Borgwardt, and Oliver Stegle. It is all in the noise: Efficient multi-task Gaussian process inference with structured residuals. In C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 1466–1474. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- James O. Ramsay and Bernard W. Silverman. *Functional Data Analysis*. Springer, 2005.
- Carl Edward Rasmussen and Christopher K. I. Williams. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, 2006. ISBN 978-0-262-18253-9.
- John A. Rice and B. W. Silverman. Estimating the Mean and Covariance Structure Nonparametrically When the Data are Curves. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 53(1):233–243, 1991. ISSN 0035-9246.
- Anton Schwaighofer, Volker Tresp, and Kai Yu. Learning Gaussian Process Kernels via Hierarchical Bayes. *NIPS*, page 8, 2004.
- J. Q. Shi, B. Wang, R. Murray-Smith, and D. M. Titterton. Gaussian Process Functional Regression Modeling for Batch Data. *Biometrics*, 63(3):714–723, 2007. ISSN 1541-0420. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-0420.2007.00758.x.
- Jian Qing Shi and Yafeng Cheng. Gaussian Process Function Data Analysis R Package ‘GPFDA’. *Manual of the GPFDA Package*, page 33, 2014.
- Jian Qing Shi and Taeryon Choi. *Gaussian Process Regression Analysis for Functional Data*. CRC Press, 2011. ISBN 978-1-4398-3773-3.
- J.Q. Shi, R. Murray-Smith, and D.M. Titterton. Hierarchical Gaussian process mixtures for regression. *Statistics and Computing*, 15(1):31–41, 2005. ISSN 0960-3174, 1573-1375. doi: 10.1007/s11222-005-4787-7.

- Edward Snelson and Zoubin Ghahramani. Sparse Gaussian Processes using Pseudo-inputs. *NIPS*, page 8, 2006.
- Kevin Swersky, Jasper Snoek, and Ryan P Adams. Multi-Task Bayesian Optimization. In C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 2004–2012. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- Wesley K. Thompson and Ori Rosen. A Bayesian Model for Sparse Functional Data. *Biometrics*, 64(1):54–63, 2008. ISSN 1541-0420. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-0420.2007.00829.x.
- Michalis K Titsias. Variational Learning of Inducing Variables in Sparse Gaussian Processes. *AISTATS*, page 8, 2009.
- Christopher Williams, Stefan Klanke, Sethu Vijayakumar, and Kian M. Chai. Multi-task Gaussian Process Learning of Robot Inverse Dynamics. In D. Koller, D. Schuurmans, Y. Bengio, and L. Bottou, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 21*, pages 265–272. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.
- James T. Wilson, Viacheslav Borovitskiy, Alexander Terenin, Peter Mostowsky, and Marc Peter Deisenroth. Efficiently sampling functions from Gaussian process posteriors. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2020.
- Jingjing Yang, Hongxiao Zhu, Taeryon Choi, and Dennis D. Cox. Smoothing and Mean–Covariance Estimation of Functional Data with a Bayesian Hierarchical Model. *Bayesian Analysis*, 11(3):649–670, 2016. ISSN 1936-0975, 1931-6690. doi: 10.1214/15-BA967.
- Jingjing Yang, Dennis D. Cox, Jong Soo Lee, Peng Ren, and Taeryon Choi. Efficient Bayesian hierarchical functional data analysis with basis function approximations using Gaussian-Wishart processes. *Biometrics*, 73(4):1082–1091, 2017. ISSN 0006-341X. doi: 10.1111/biom.12705.
- Kai Yu, Volker Tresp, and Anton Schwaighofer. Learning Gaussian Processes from Multiple Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 22Nd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML ’05*, pages 1012–1019, New York, NY, USA, 2005. ACM. ISBN 978-1-59593-180-1. doi: 10.1145/1102351.1102479.
- Jiang Zhu and Shiliang Sun. Multi-task Sparse Gaussian Processes with Improved Multi-task Sparsity Regularization. In *Pattern Recognition*, pages 54–62. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014. doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-45646-0\_6.