

SEQRET: Mining Rule Sets from Event Sequences

Aleena Siji[°]
aleena.siji@helmholtz-munich.de
Helmholtz AI
Germany

Osman Ali Mian[°]
osman.mian@uk-essen.de
Institute for AI in medicine IKIM
Germany

Joscha Cüppers
joscha.cueppers@cispa.de
CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security
Germany

Jilles Vreeken
jv@cispa.de
CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security
Germany

ABSTRACT

Summarizing event sequences is a key aspect of data mining. Most existing methods neglect conditional dependencies and focus on discovering sequential patterns only. In this paper, we study the problem of discovering both conditional and unconditional dependencies from event sequence data. We do so by discovering rules of the form $X \rightarrow Y$ where X and Y are sequential patterns. Rules like these are simple to understand and provide a clear description of the relation between the antecedent and the consequent. To discover succinct and non-redundant sets of rules we formalize the problem in terms of the Minimum Description Length principle. As the search space is enormous and does not exhibit helpful structure, we propose the SEQRET method to discover high-quality rule sets in practice. Through extensive empirical evaluation we show that unlike the state of the art, SEQRET ably recovers the ground truth on synthetic datasets and finds useful rules from real datasets.

1 INTRODUCTION

In many applications data naturally takes the form of events happening over time. Examples include industrial production logs, the financial market, device failures in a network, etc. Existing methods for analyzing event sequences primarily focus on mining unconditional, frequent sequential patterns [1, 30, 37]. Loosely speaking, these are subsequences that appear more often in the data than we would expect. Real world processes are often more complex than this, as they often include conditional dependencies. The formation of tropical cyclones (C) in the Bay of Bengal, for example, is often but not always followed by heavy rainfall (R) on the coast. Knowing such a relationship is helpful both in predicting events and in understanding the underlying data generating mechanisms.

In this paper, we are interested in discovering rules of the form $X \rightarrow Y$ from long event sequences, where X and Y are sequential patterns. Existing methods for mining such rules either suffer from the pattern explosion, i.e. are prone to returning orders of magnitude more results than we can possibly analyze [6, 15], or are strongly limited in the expressivity, e.g. require the constituent events to occur in a contiguous order [4].

We aim to discover succinct sets of rules that generalize the data well. We explicitly allow for gaps between the head and the tail of the rule, as well as in the occurrences of X and Y themselves. To ensure we obtain compact and non-redundant results, we formalize

the problem using the Minimum Description Length (MDL) principle [23]. Loosely speaking, we are after that set of sequential rules that together compresses the data best.

However, the problem we so arrive at is computationally challenging. For starters, there exist exponentially many rules, exponentially many rule sets, and then again exponentially many ways to describe the data given a set of rules. Moreover, the search space does not exhibit structure we can use to efficiently obtain the optimal result. To mine good rule sets from data we therefore propose the greedy SEQRET algorithm. We introduce two variants. SEQRET-CANDIDATES constructs a good rule set from a set of candidate patterns by splitting them into high-quality rules. SEQRET-MINE, on the other hand, only requires the data and mines a good rule set from scratch. Starting from a model of singleton rules, it iteratively extends them into more refined rules. To avoid testing all possible extensions, we consider only those extensions that occur significantly more often than expected.

Through extensive evaluation, we show that both variants of SEQRET work well in practice. On synthetic data we show that they are robust to noise and recover the ground truth well. On real-world data, we show that SEQRET returns succinct sets of rules that give clear insight into the data generating process. This in stark contrast to existing methods which either return many thousands of rules [15] or are restricted to rules where events occur contiguously [4].

To summarize, the main contributions are as follows:

- We define a pattern language for fully ordered sequential rules that accommodates for gaps.
- We present SEQRET-CANDIDATES for constructing a high-quality rule set from a given set of sequential patterns.
- We present SEQRET-MINE for mining a high-quality rule set given a database of event sequences.
- We extensively evaluate SEQRET on synthetic and real-world datasets, comparing it to the state-of-the-art.

We make all code and data available online.¹

2 PRELIMINARIES

In this section we introduce basic notation and give a short introduction to the MDL principle.

2.1 Notation

As data we consider a sequence database D of $|D|$ event sequences. A sequence $S \in D$ consists of $|S|$ events drawn from a finite alphabet

[°]Work done while at CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security.

¹<https://eda.rg.cispa.io/prj/seqret/>




Figure 1: Toy example of a rule $ab \rightarrow cd$ in an event sequence. Each occurrence of head ab triggers the rule. The first is followed by tail cd and hence a ‘hit’ whereas the second is not and hence a ‘miss’. $\text{supp}(ab \rightarrow cd) = 1$ and $\text{conf}(ab \rightarrow cd) = 0.5$.

Ω of discrete events $e \in \Omega$. We denote the total number of events in the data as $\|D\|$. We write S_t for the t^{th} sequence in D . To avoid clutter, we omit the subscript whenever clear from context. We write $S[i]$ to refer to the i^{th} event in sequence S , and $S[i, j]$ for the subsequence from the i^{th} up to and including the j^{th} event of S . We denote an empty sequence by ϵ .

A serial episode X is a sequence of $|X|$ events drawn from Ω . A sequential rule r captures the conditional dependence between a serial episode X and a serial episode Y . Intuitively, it expresses that whenever we see X in the data it is more likely that Y will follow soon. We refer to X as the *head* or antecedent of r , denoted $\text{head}(r)$, and to Y as the *tail* or consequent of r , denoted $\text{tail}(r)$. If X is an empty pattern, $X = \epsilon$, we call $X \rightarrow Y$ an *empty head rule*. We refer to empty head rules where $|Y| = 1$ as a *singleton* rule.

A subsequence $S[i, j]$ is a window of pattern X iff X is a subsequence of $S[i, j]$, and subsequently we say $S[i, j]$ *matches* X and vice-versa we say that X occurs in $S[i, j]$. A pattern window $S[i, j]$ is *minimal* for X iff no proper sub-window of $S[i, j]$ matches X . A window of a rule r is a tuple of two pattern windows $S[i, j]$ and $S[k, l]$ when $S[i, j]$ matches $\text{head}(r)$, $j < k$, and $S[k, l]$ matches $\text{tail}(r)$. We denote a rule window by $S[i, j; k, l]$.

We say a window $S[i, j]$ *triggers* rule r when it is a minimal window of $\text{head}(r)$. A rule window $S[i, j; k, l]$ *supports* a rule r if $S[i, j]$ triggers $\text{head}(r)$ and $S[k, l]$ matches $\text{tail}(r)$. We call the number of events that occur in a rule window between the rule head and the rule tail, $k - j - 1$, the *delay* of the rule instance. We give an example in Fig. 1. We denote the number of windows over all sequences $S \in D$ that trigger a rule r as the trigger count $\text{trigs}(r)$. We define the *support* of a rule r as the number of rule windows $S[i, j; k, l]$ in D where $S[k, l]$ is a minimal window of $\text{tail}(r)$ and follows the head with minimum delay. Finally, we define the confidence of a rule r as its support relative to its trigger count, formally $\text{conf}(r) = \text{supp}(r) / \text{trigs}(r)$.

2.2 Minimum Description Length Principle

The Minimum Description Length (MDL) [23, 35] is a computable and statistically well-founded version of Kolmogorov complexity [28]. For a given model class \mathcal{M} it identifies the best model $M \in \mathcal{M}$ as the one that minimizing the number of bits for describing both model and data without loss, or formally, $L(M) + L(D | M)$ with $L(M)$ the length in bits of model M and $L(D | M)$ the length in bits of data D given M . This is known as two-part, or crude MDL—in contrast to one-part, or refined MDL [23], which is not computable for arbitrary model classes. We use two-part MDL because we are interested in the model: the set of rules that describe the data best. In MDL we are never concerned with materialized codes, we only




Figure 2: Toy example showing an encoding of sequence S using rule set R . The encoding consists of three code streams. C_t encodes if a triggered rule *hits* or *misses*. C_d encodes the delay between the trigger and the rule tail. C_g encodes the gaps in the tails. Together, they form a cover C of D given R .

care about code lengths. To use MDL, we have to define a model class and code length functions for models and data given a model.

3 MDL FOR SEQUENTIAL RULES

We now formally define the problem we aim to solve. We consider sets R of sequential rules as our model class \mathcal{R} . By MDL, we are interested in that set of rules $R \in \mathcal{R}$ that best describes data D .

3.1 Decoding an Event Sequence

Before we formally define how we *encode* models and data, we give the main intuition of our score by *decoding* an already encoded sequence. We give an example in Fig. 2.

To decode a symbol, we consider the rules from R that are currently triggered. For those, we read codes from the trigger stream C_t . Initially, the context is empty and hence only empty-head rules trigger. The first trigger code is a *miss* for singleton rule $\epsilon \rightarrow a$. The second trigger code is a *hit* for rule $\epsilon \rightarrow b$. As empty-head rules do not incur delays, we can write b as the first symbol of the sequence.

This triggers rule $b \rightarrow cde$. We hence read a code from the trigger stream, and find that it is a hit. As this rule does not have an empty head, there may be a delay between the head and its tail and we read a code from the delay stream C_d to determine if this is the case. It is a start code, so we write the first symbol of the tail (c).

This creates a minimal window of bc and hence rule $bc \rightarrow f$ triggers. We read from C_t to find that it hits, and from C_d to find that its tail is delayed. To determine if we may write the next symbol from tail cde , we read from the gap stream C_g . This is a fill code, meaning there is no gap, and hence we write d .

This time, no new rule triggers. Tail cde is not yet completely decoded and f is delayed. For each delayed tail we read a code from C_d , and for each incomplete tail we read a code from C_g . Here, we read a start code for tail f and a gap code for tail cde , we hence write f . Again, no new rule is triggered. Now only tail cde is not yet fully decoded. We read from C_g and as it is a fill code we write e as the last symbol of the sequence.

To summarize, sequences are encoded from left to right, and rules automatically trigger whenever we observe a minimal window of

the head. For each trigger, we encode whether the tail follows using a *hit* or *miss* code. When a rule hits, we encode whether its tail follows immediately or later, using a *start* resp. *delay* code. Finally, we encode whether *gaps* occur in the rule tail using *fill* and *gap* codes. Empty-head rules never incur a delay. To avoid unnecessary triggers, we only encode those of empty-head rules if no other rule encodes the current symbol (e.g. all active tails say ‘gap’).

3.2 Computing the Description Lengths

Now that we have the intuition, we can formally describe how to encode a model, respectively the data given a model.

Encoding a Model. A model $R \in \mathcal{R}$ is a set of rules. To reward structure between rules, e.g. chains where the tail of one rule is the head of another (e.g. $r_1 = \epsilon \rightarrow AB$, and $r_2 = AB \rightarrow CD$), we first encode the set P of all non-empty and non-singleton heads and all non-singleton tails. Formally,

$$P = \{\text{head}(r) \mid \forall r \in R\} \cup \{\text{tail}(r) \mid \forall r \in R\} \setminus (\Omega \cup \epsilon).$$

The encoded length $L(P)$, is defined as

$$L(P) = L_{\mathbb{N}}(|P| + 1) + \sum_{p \in P} L_{\mathbb{N}}(|p|) + |p| \log_2(|\Omega|),$$

where we first encode the number of these patterns using $L_{\mathbb{N}}$ the MDL-optimal encoding for integers [36]. It is defined for $z \geq 1$ as $L_{\mathbb{N}}(z) = \log^* z + \log c_0$ where $\log^* z$ is the expansion $\log z + \log \log z + \dots$ where we only include the positive terms. To ensure this is valid encoding, i.e. one that satisfies the Kraft inequality, we set $c_0 = 2.865064$ [36]. Since P can be empty and $L_{\mathbb{N}}$ is only defined for numbers ≥ 1 we offset it by one. Next, we encode each pattern $p \in P$ where we use $L_{\mathbb{N}}$ to encode its length and then choose each subsequent symbol $e \in p$ out of alphabet Ω .

Now that we have the set of all heads and tails, we have

$$L(R \mid P) = L_{\mathbb{N}}(|R| + 1) + |R|(\log_2(|P| + |\Omega| + 1) + \log_2(|P| + |\Omega|)),$$

as the encoded length in bits of a set of rules. We first encode the number of rules, and as R can be empty, we again offset by one. Next, for each rule $r \in R$, we choose its head from $P \cup \Omega$, and then its tail from $P \cup \Omega$.

Putting this together, the number of bits to describe a rule set $R \in \mathcal{R}$ without loss is

$$L(R) = L(P) + L(R \mid P).$$

Encoding Data given a Model. As we saw in the example, to reconstruct the data we need the three code streams C_t , C_d , and C_g . For an arbitrary database we additionally need to know how many sequences it includes, and how long these are. Formally, the description length of data D given a model R hence is

$$L(D \mid R) = L_{\mathbb{N}}(|D|) + \left(\sum_{S \in D} L_{\mathbb{N}}(|S|) \right) + L(C_t) + L(C_d) + L(C_g).$$

To encode the code streams C_t, C_d, C_g we use prequential codes [23]. These codes are asymptotically optimal without requiring us to make arbitrary choices in how to encode the code distributions. Formally, we have

$$L(C_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{|C_j|} \log_2 \frac{\text{usg}_i(C_j[i] \mid C_j) + c}{i + \text{unique}(C_j) \cdot c},$$

where $\text{usg}_i(C_j[i] \mid C_j)$ denotes the number of times $C_j[i]$ has been used in C_j up to the i^{th} position, $\text{unique}(C_j)$ denotes the number of unique symbols in C_j , and c is a small constant. As is common in prequential coding, we set c to 0.5.

3.3 The Problem, Formally

We can now formalize the problem we aim to solve.

The Sequential Rule Set Mining Problem *Given a sequence database D over alphabet Ω , find the smallest rule set $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and cover C such that the total encoded size*

$$L(R) + L(D \mid R)$$

is minimal.

The search space of this problem is enormous. To begin with, there exist super-exponentially many covers of D given R . The optimal cover depends on the code lengths, which in turn depend on the code usages. Even if the optimal cover is given, the problem of finding the optimal rule set is super-exponential: there exist exponentially many patterns p in the size of the alphabet Ω , exponentially many rules r in the number of patterns, and exponentially many sets of rules. None of these sub-problems exhibit substructure, e.g. monotonicity or submodularity, that we can exploit to efficiently find the optimal solution. Hence, we resort to heuristics.

4 THE SEQRET ALGORITHM

In this section we introduce our method, SEQRET, for discovering high-quality **sequential rule-sets** from data. We break the problem down into two parts: optimizing the description of the data given a rule set, and mining good rule sets. For the latter we propose SEQRET-CANDIDATES for doing so given a set of candidate patterns, and SEQRET-MINE for mining rule sets directly from data.

4.1 Selecting a Good Cover

A lossless description of D using rules R correspond to a set of rule windows such that each event e in D is covered by exactly one window. We are after that *cover* that minimizes $L(D \mid R)$. Finding the optimal cover is infeasible, and hence we instead settle for a good cover and show how to find one greedily.

The main idea is to define an order over the rule windows and greedily select the next best window until the data is completely covered. To minimize the encoded length, we prefer to cover as many events as possible with a single rule with few gaps. Therefore, we prefer using rules with long tails, high confidence, and high support. Similarly, among windows of otherwise equally good rules, we prefer those with lower delays and fewer gaps in the rule tail. As a final tie breaker, we consider the starting position of the rule tail. Combining this, we define the WINDOW ORDER as descending on $|\text{tail}(r)|$, $\text{conf}(r)$, and $\text{supp}(r)$, and finally ascending on $l - j - |\text{tail}(r)|$, and k , where r is a rule, $S[i, j; k, l]$ is a rule window. To avoid searching for all possible rule windows, we start with the best window per rule trigger and look for the next best only if we do not select the former due to conflicts, i.e. its constituent events are already covered by a previously selected window. We define the best rule window per trigger as the one with the fewest gaps

Algorithm 1: COVER

Input: Sequence database D , rule set R
Output: Cover C

```

1  $C \leftarrow \{\}$ ;
2  $W \leftarrow \{\text{BESTRULEWIN}(r, D) \mid \forall r \in R\}$ ;
3 while  $\exists S_t \in D$  where,  $\exists e \in S_t$  not covered by  $C$  do
4    $w \leftarrow \text{next } w \in W$  in WINDOW ORDER;
5    $W \leftarrow W \setminus \{w\}$ ;
6   if  $\nexists z \in C$  that conflicts with  $w$  :
7      $C \leftarrow C \cup \{w\}$ ;
8   else
9      $W \leftarrow W \cup \{\text{NEXTBESTWIN}(w, C, D)\}$ ;
10 return  $C$ 

```

Algorithm 2: SEQRET-CANDIDATES

Input: Sequence database D , set of patterns F
Output: Rule set R

```

1  $R \leftarrow \{\epsilon \rightarrow e \mid \forall e \in \Omega\}$ 
2 for  $p \in F$  ordered descending by  $L(D, F \setminus \{p\}) - L(D, F)$  do
3    $r \leftarrow \arg \max_{r' \in \text{SPLIT}(p)} L(D, R) - L(D, R \cup \{r'\})$ 
4   if  $L(D, R \cup \{r\}) < L(D, R)$  :
5      $R \leftarrow R \cup \{r\}$ ;
6 return  $R$ ;

```

in its rule tail window, and among those with same gap count, the one with the lowest delay.

We give the pseudocode of COVER as Algorithm 1. We start by initializing cover C with the empty set and window set W with for each rule the best rule windows per trigger (lines 1-2). We then greedily add rule windows to C in order of WINDOW ORDER. If a window conflicts with an already selected window (line 6), we skip it and search for the next best rule window for the corresponding trigger and add it to W (line 9). We continue this process until all events in D are covered. To avoid evaluating hopeless windows, we limit ourselves to those within a user-set *max delay* ratio and *max gap* ratio. We provide further details and pseudo code for BESTRULEWIN and NEXTBESTWIN procedures in Appx. B.1.

The worst case time complexity of COVER depends on the number of rules in R , total number of events in D , and the lengths of the heads and tails per rule. In Appx. C.2 we show the complexity of COVER is $O(|R| \cdot ||D|| (h + t^3 + t \log_2(|R| \cdot ||D|| t)))$, where h is the max head length and t the max tail length.

Next, we consider the problem of discovering good rule sets.

4.2 Selecting Good Rule Sets

We first propose an approach that does so given a set of sequential patterns as input. We start from the intuition that, if the ground truth includes a sequential rule $a \rightarrow bc$, a good sequential pattern miner will return abc . This means we can reconstruct ground truth rules by considering splits of candidate patterns XY into candidate rules $X \rightarrow Y$ and using our score to select the best split.

To this end, we propose SEQRET-CANDIDATES, for which we give the pseudocode as Algorithm 2. We initialize the rule set with all

singleton rules (line 1) to ensure we can encode the data without loss. We then iterate over each candidate pattern (line 2) in descending order of contribution to compression [38]. We split each pattern into candidate rules – for example, pattern abc generates candidate rules $\epsilon \rightarrow abc, a \rightarrow bc$, and $ab \rightarrow c$ – and choose the candidate rule that minimizes our score (line 3). We add it to our model if it improves the score (line 5) and iterate until all patterns are considered.

The run time is dominated by the number of cover computations, i.e. how many times we have to compute $L(D|R)$. We have to compute a new cover for each rule we test, and each pattern p can be split into $|p|$ rules. We test each $p \in F$ as such the complexity of SEQRET-CANDIDATES is $O(|F|(\max_{p \in F} |p|))$.

4.3 Generating Good Rules

Next, we move our attention to generating good rule sets directly from data. The first step is to generate good candidate rules. Given a rule r from the current model, we consider extending it with events $e \in \Omega$ that occur significantly more often within or directly adjacent to the rule windows of r . A rule has $|r| + 1$ such gap positions, i.e. before its first event, between its constituent events, and after its last event. For example, rule $ab \rightarrow cde$ has 6 gap positions,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} & a & & b & & \rightarrow & c & & d & & e & & . \\ \wedge & \wedge & & \wedge & & & \wedge & & \wedge & & \wedge & & \wedge \\ g_0 & g_1 & & g_2 & & & g_3 & & g_4 & & g_5 & & \end{array}$$

For each rule r we test for every gap position g_i if $e \in \Omega$ is more frequent than expected in its rule windows. Our null hypothesis is

$$H_0 : \sum_{w \in B} \mathbb{1}(e \in g(i, w)) \leq \sum_{w \in B} \Pr(e \in g(i, w))$$

where B is the set of best rule windows of r , $B = \text{BESTRULEWIN}(r, D)$, $w \in B$ is a window of rule r , and $g(i, w)$ a function that returns gap i from window w .

When computing the probability of an event e in gap g_i , we have to account for differences in lengths of gaps between different windows. The probability of e occurring in gap g_i of a rule window w_p is given by

$$\Pr(e \in g(i, w_p)) = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{\text{supp}(\epsilon \rightarrow e)}{|D|}\right)^{|g(i, w_p)|}$$

To test for statistical significance, we can model the expected neighborhood as a Poisson binomial distribution [42]. That is, the trials are the rule windows, and the success probability per trial is decided by the length of the gap at the position of interest. Computing the CDF of the Poisson binomial distribution is expensive [24, 27, 40]. As a fast approximation, we use the normal approximation with continuity correction [24] for cases where the number of trials, i.e. $\text{supp}(r)$, is greater than 10. If less than or equal to 10, we simply check if the actual count of occurrences is greater than the expected count by more than one.

If event e is measured to be significantly more frequent in g_i than expected, we generate a new rule by inserting e at the position of g_i in the rule. We give the pseudo-code in Appx. B.3.

4.4 Mining Good Rule Sets

Finally, we describe SEQRET-MINE for mining good rule sets directly from data. We provide the pseudocode as Algorithm 3. We initialize

rule set R with all the singleton rules (line 1). Next, we consider adding candidates based on the rules already in the model (line 3). As we want to generate the most promising candidate rules first, we start with rules with high support and high confidence. We define a greedy EXTEND ORDER as $1 \uparrow \text{supp}(r), 2 \uparrow \text{conf}(r), 3 \uparrow |\text{tail}(r)|$ and $4 \uparrow |\text{head}(r)|$, where \uparrow indicates that higher values are preferred. For each we generate a set of candidate rules as described above, we test them for addition in the order of their p -values (line 4).

We add those rules into the model whose inclusion results in a significant reduction in the total encoded size (line 5). We use the no-hypercompression inequality [3, 23] to test for significance at level α , writing \ll_{α} for “significantly less”². In case adding a candidate rule r' to the model does not improve compression, we test if replacing the rule r we generated it from by r' leads to a better compression (line 7 and 8). To ensure we can always describe the data without loss, we never remove singleton rules.

After adding a new rule, SEQRET-MINE performs a pruning step to remove existing rules that may have become redundant or obsolete (line 10). The PRUNE method iterates over the non-singleton rules in the model and removes those whose exclusion reduces the total encoded size. We do so in PRUNE ORDER where we consider rules in order of lowest usage, highest encoded size, and lowest tail length.

We repeat generating candidate rules, adding them, and pruning redundant rules until convergence. Convergence is guaranteed as our score is lower bounded by 0. The worst case time complexity of one iteration of SEQRET-MINE is, $O(|R||\Omega|(h+t))$. We provide the full derivation in Appx. C.2.

Algorithm 3: SEQRET-MINE

Input: Sequence database D over Ω , significance level α

Output: Rule set R

```

1  $R \leftarrow \{\epsilon \rightarrow e \mid \forall e \in \Omega\}$ ;
2 do
3   for  $r \in R$  in EXTEND ORDER do
4     for  $r' \in \text{CANDRULES}(D, r)$  in order of  $p$ -value do
5       if  $L(D, R \cup \{r'\}) \ll_{\alpha} L(D, R)$  :
6          $R \leftarrow R \cup \{r'\}$ ;
7       else if  $r \notin \{\epsilon \rightarrow e \mid \forall e \in \Omega\}$  and
8          $L(D, R \cup \{r'\} \setminus \{r\}) \ll_{\alpha} L(D, R)$  :
9          $R \leftarrow (R \setminus \{r\}) \cup \{r'\}$ ;
9       if  $R$  updated :
10         $R \leftarrow \text{PRUNE}(D, R)$ ;
11        continue with next  $r$ 
12 while  $R$  updated;
13 return  $R$ 

```

5 RELATED WORK

Classical methods for mining sequential patterns focus on extracting all frequent patterns and therewith suffer from the well-known pattern explosion leading to excessively many, largely redundant, and often spurious results [18]. Mining closed frequent patterns

²In our experiments we set α to 0.05, which by the no-hypercompression inequality corresponds to a minimum gain of 5 bits.

alleviates this problem, but is sensitive to noise [41, 44]. Mining significant patterns [26, 29, 33, 39] changes the objective to patterns of which the frequency is significant under a null hypothesis, usually that events occur independent from each other.

Pattern set mining avoids the pattern explosion by instead scoring *sets* of patterns. The Minimum Description Length principle has been shown to be a robust criterion for identifying good patterns sets in practice [10, 21, 38]. For event sequences, different pattern languages, scores, and methods have been proposed. There exist those that allow for gaps [38], interleaved patterns [2, 9], generalized patterns [12], and periodic patterns [22].

Classical rule miners for event sequences operate similar to frequent pattern mining, but in addition to the frequency requirement also impose a minimum confidence threshold. Various approaches have been proposed to address different data modalities, such as rules over itemsets ordered by time [16, 17, 19], or rules over events in sequences [7, 14, 45]. The former generally count the number of sequences containing a rule as its support, whereas the latter use sliding or minimal windows to capture multiple rule occurrences within a sequence.

Rules can be further categorized into partially ordered rules [6, 15] where the rule tail follows the rule head but the constituent events of the rule head and the rule tail may appear in any order, and sequential rules where the order both between the rule head and the rule tail as well as within the rule head and the rule tail has to match [45]. Each of the above approaches consider the quality of individual patterns and hence suffer from the pattern explosion. To address this, Fournier-Viger and Tseng propose TNS [20], a method that reports the top- k non redundant rules, it uses a strict notion of redundancy and is not able to avoid semantically redundant rules.

Most closely related to our approach are existing methods that use MDL to select or mine rules [4, 5, 8, 13]. OMEN [8] is a supervised method for mining ‘predictive patterns’. It is not applicable in our setting as it requires a target. Existing rule set miners for event sequences either filter down an existing set of rules [5], or do not allow for gaps [4]. As such, none of the existing methods directly addresses the problem we consider.

6 EXPERIMENTS

In this section we empirically evaluate SEQRET-CANDIDATES and SEQRET-MINE. We implement both in Python and provide the source code, synthetic data generator, and real-world data online.³

We compare SEQRET to POERMA [15] and POERMH [6] as representatives of frequent rule mining, to TNS [20] as a top k non-redundant rule set miner, to COSSU [4] as an MDL-based rule set miner, and to SQS [38] and SQUISH [2] as MDL-based sequential pattern miners.

As candidate patterns for SEQRET-CANDIDATES we use the output of SQS [38] because SQUISH crashes regularly. For TNS we set k to the number of rules, and for POERMA and POERMH, the minimum support and minimum confidence values according to the ground truth when known. In the case of real datasets where the ground truth is unknown, we set k for TNS as the number of rules returned by SEQRET-MINE. For POERMA and POERMH we use a minimum support threshold of 10 where feasible, and 20 otherwise. We allow all methods a maximum runtime of 24 hours. With the exception

³<https://eda.rg.cispa.io/prj/seqret/>




Figure 3: [Higher is better] $F1$ scores for synthetic data. We observe that `SEQUEST` is robust against (a) high noise, (b) rule confidence, (c) number of true rules, (d) rule tail length, and (e) large alphabets. In (f) we evaluate rule recovery where heads and tails are only as frequent as by chance, `SEQUEST-MINE` still picks up the ground truth.

of `Cossu`, which we allow a maximum runtime of 48 hours, as it generally took longer to complete. We provide additional details in Appx. A.1.

6.1 Synthetic Data

We first consider data with known ground truth. To this end, we generate synthetic data from a randomly generated rule set R . For a given alphabet size, number of rules, sizes of the heads and tails, and confidence, we generate rule heads and the rule tails by selecting events from alphabet Ω uniformly at random with replacement.

Generating Data. We generate event sequences S as follows. We first generate background noise by sampling uniformly at random from the alphabet. Next, we plant patterns, i.e. the empty-head rules from R . We sample uniformly from all empty-head rules in the model and write the tails to S at random positions while making sure we do not overwrite existing rules. Finally, we go over the generated sequence and wherever a non-empty-head rule is triggered, we sample according to the desired confidence of the rule whether the trigger is a hit or a miss. If it is a hit, we sample the delay and then insert the corresponding rule tail. For all tails we so plant, we sample gap events too. The probability of delay and gaps are set as input parameters. We provide additional details of synthetic data generation in Appx. A.2.

Unless stated otherwise, we generate sequences of length 10 000 over alphabets of size 500, rule sets of size 20 with rule confidence 0.75. We generate 20 datasets per configuration in each experiment.

Evaluation Metric. As evaluation metric, we consider the $F1$ score. To reward partial discovery, we compute recall and precision based on the similarity between the discovered rules and the ground truth rules. We evaluate the similarity between any two rule heads or rule tails using the Levenshtein edit distance without substitution, i.e. the longest common subsequence distance [31]. To keep the similarities comparable between rules we normalize by the combined

lengths. Formally, we have $\text{sim}(X, U) = 1 - \text{lcsd}(X, U) / (|X| + |U|)$, where $\text{lcsd}(X, U) = |X| + |U| - 2|\text{lcs}|$. To reward recall of rule heads, rule tails, and complete rules, we evaluate each similarity between all parts separately. The similarity between two rules is then a weighted average, $\text{sim}(X \rightarrow Y, U \rightarrow V) = \text{sim}(XY, UV) / 2 + \text{sim}(X, U) / 4 + \text{sim}(Y, V) / 4$. We then compute recall and precision following Cüppers et al. [11]. To compute recall, we sum the highest similarity per rule in the true model for the mined rules, and divide the sum by the number of rules in the true model. To compute precision, to avoid rewarding redundancy, we limit the sum to T rules with highest similarity scores, where T is the number of rules in the rule model. We provide additional details in Appx. A.3.

Sanity Check. We first evaluate if our score indeed prefers rules over other patterns. To this end, we generate synthetic data using a ground truth rule set consisting of 6 pairs of the form $\{\epsilon \rightarrow X, X \rightarrow Y\}$. We then compare the encoded sizes of the ground truth model against alternative models of the form $\{\epsilon \rightarrow X, \epsilon \rightarrow Y\}$, $\{\epsilon \rightarrow XY\}$ resp. $\{\epsilon \rightarrow X, \epsilon \rightarrow XY\}$. We find that our score always prefers the ground truth. Next, we evaluate on data without structure. We find that for 60 trials on sequences varying in size from 5 000 to 15 000, `SEQUEST-MINE`, in 51 instances correctly reports no rules. In 9 instances, it returns a single, rule with a true confidence between 10% and 40%.

Destructive Noise. Next, we evaluate robustness against destructive noise. To this end, we generate data as above and then add noise by flipping individual events $e \in S$ with probability ranging from 20% to 100%. We show the results in Figure 3a. We observe that `SEQUEST` is robust against noise and still recovers the ground truth well even at 80% noise. At 100% noise, there is no structure in the data and all methods except `TNS` correctly discovers no rules. Throughout all synthetic experiments `POERMA` performs better than `POERMH`, we hence omit `POERMH` from the synthetic experiments

results. Further, as `SQUISH` regularly crashes, we report averages over finished runs only.

Rule Confidence. Next, we evaluate recovery under different rule confidence levels. We vary the rule confidence from 0.1 to 0.9. We show the results in Figure 3b. We observe that `SECRET` is robust against low confidence rules and outperforms the state-of-the-art methods by a clear margin.

Varying Size. Next, we evaluate how `SECRET` performs for ground truth models, alphabets, resp. rule tails of different sizes. First, we consider data with 10 to 50 ground truth rules. We show the results in Fig. 3c. `SECRET` works consistently well across all model sizes. Next, we vary the alphabet from 100 to 1000 unique events. We give the results in Fig. 3e and observe that `SECRET` recovers the ground truth consistently well. Finally, we vary the length of the rule tails from 1 to 11. We show the results in Figure 3d. We observe that, except for the case where the rule tail size is 1, `SECRET` recovers the rules well and outperforms the competition by a large margin.

Random Rule Triggers. Finally, we evaluate if `SECRET` can recover conditional dependencies even when the rule heads and rule tails are infrequent in the data. For this, we consider the case where the rule heads occur only by chance. To this end, we generate synthetic data where no rule heads are planted. We insert the rule tails wherever the corresponding rules have triggered. To ensure that the rule heads do occur in the data, we limit its size to 1. We also limit the size of the tail to 1 to ensure they do not stand out as patterns by themselves. We show the results in Figure 3f. `SECRET-MINE` is able to consistently recover the rules. Here, `SECRET-CANDIDATES` performs significantly worse because `SQS` is not able to find good patterns in this challenging setting.

6.2 Experiments on Real Datasets

In this section, we examine if `SECRET` mines insightful rules from real world data. We first discuss the datasets and then the results.

Datasets. We use eight datasets drawn from five different domains. We consider two text datasets, `JMLR`, which contains abstracts from the `JMLR` journal, and `Presidential`, which contains addresses delivered by American presidents [38]. `POS` contains sequences of parts-of-speech tags obtained by using the Stanford NLP tagger on the book “History of Julius Caesar” by Jacob Abbott [34]. `Ordonez` [32] and `Lifelog`⁴ contains the daily activities logged by a person over several days. `Rolling Mill` contains the process logs from a steel manufacturing plant [43]. `Ecommerce` contains the purchase history from an online store for several users over 7 months.⁵ Finally, `Lichess` contains sequences of moves from chess games played online.⁶ In Table 1 we provide statistics on all datasets, as well as on the results of the different methods.

General Observations. Overall, we observe that frequency-based methods like `POERMA` and `POERMH` discover a high number of rules, making interpretation difficult up to impossible. `TNS` produces largely redundant rules. `Cossu` is limited by its restrictive rule

language and discovers only very few rules. `SQS` is a sequential pattern miner that identifies meaningful patterns that permit examination by hand, but does not capture conditional dependencies that `SECRET` does successfully model. This difference is evident when comparing the compression achieved by different methods: `SQS` compresses the data less effectively than `SECRET`, likely because `SECRET` is more expressive. `SECRET-CANDIDATES` improves upon `SQS` but still compresses worse than `SECRET-MINE`.

Case Studies. Next, we present illustrative examples to highlight how the results from `SECRET` differ from those of state-of-the-art methods. To better understand the results, we examine a phrase from the `JMLR` dataset, ‘*support vector machine*’, that all methods identify in some form. `SECRET-MINE` discovers the rule $\langle \epsilon \rightarrow \text{support, vector} \rangle$ as well as the rule $\langle \text{support, vector} \rightarrow \text{machine} \rangle$ which expresses that $\langle \text{support, vector} \rangle$ is a pattern, and that whenever it occurs it increases the probability of but is *not necessarily* followed by *machine*. In contrast, `SECRET-CANDIDATES` and `SQS` both treat the entire phrase as a single pattern, $\langle \text{support, vector, machine} \rangle$, failing to capture the independent existence of $\langle \text{support, vector} \rangle$ and the conditional dependency involved. On the other end of the spectrum, `POERMA` and `TNS` discover 12 resp. 14 rules involving either *support* or *vector*, many of which are semantically redundant.

In the `POS` dataset, `SECRET` discovers common sentence structures, such as the pattern $\langle \text{to, verb-base-form} \rangle$, and the pattern $\langle \text{determiner, cardinal number} \rangle$ capturing phrases such as “the first”. `SECRET` also captures rules, e.g. $\langle \text{to, verb-base-form} \rightarrow \text{personal-pronoun} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{to, verb-base-form} \rightarrow \text{possessive-pronoun} \rangle$. These rules correctly identify how either personal pronouns or possessive pronouns tend to follow phrases like “to tell” or “to give”. `Cossu`, the method closest to our approach, fails to find any of the rules discussed. Meanwhile, `SQS` finds these structures as several independent patterns disregarding the conditional dependency. The frequency-based methods again return overly many and highly redundant rules.

On the `Rolling Mill` data, `SECRET` discovers rules that clearly represent different parts of the production process. For example, $\langle \text{stab, gies, sort} \rightarrow \text{brwa, lmb, tmbr} \rangle$ captures the transition from steel mill (where hot iron is casted and sorted to slabs) to the rolling mill (where slabs are rolled to plates). This demonstrates the power of rules and patterns in the same set, as there are instances where $\langle \text{stab, gies, sort} \rangle$ is not followed by $\langle \text{brwa, lmb, tmbr} \rangle$ but such instances are rare. `SQS` again finds several patterns involving parts of $\langle \text{stab, gies, sort, brwa, lmb, tmbr} \rangle$ but does not explicitly model the conditional dependency. `Cossu` fares better than in other datasets but nevertheless misses many important dependencies resulting in poor compression.

For the `Lichess` dataset, `SECRET` finds the well known “King’s Pawn Game” opening move, as the pattern $\langle \text{white:e4, black:e5} \rangle$. In addition, it discovers 12 rules with rule head $\langle \text{white:e4, black:e5} \rangle$, capturing the different variations that often follow. For example the rule $\langle \text{white:e4, black:e5} \rightarrow \text{white:Nf3} \rangle$, we show this rule in Figure 4a, the red arrows corresponds to move $\langle \text{white:e4} \rangle$, green to $\langle \text{black:e5} \rangle$, and blue to $\langle \text{white:Nf3} \rangle$. `SQS`, on the other hand, needs several partly redundant patterns, i.e. repeating moves $\langle \text{white:e4, black:e5} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{white:Nf3} \rangle$, to explain the same dependencies.

⁴<https://quantifiedawesome.com/>

⁵<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/mkechinov/ecommerce-behavior-data-from-multi-category-store>

⁶<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/datasnaek/chess>

Dataset	D	D	Ω	SEQRET-CANDS			SEQRET-MINE			SQS		POERMA	POERMH	TNS	COSSU	
				P	R	%L	P	R	%L	P	%L	R	R	R	R	%L
Ordenez	739	2	10	2	0	11.45	1	5	16.85	2	11.45	95923	113337	6	2	-2.42
JMLR	14501	155	1920	62	9	1.90	2	203	3.33	116	1.61	127	1282442	205	-	-
Rollingmill	18416	350	446	158	50	52.22	9	313	56.33	247	50.46	-	-	247	46	20.56
Lichess	20012	350	2273	81	18	2.42	11	326	4.57	113	2.13	4326	2068	348	-	-
Ecommerce	30875	4001	127	77	10	13.72	89	130	27.87	95	13.59	43513	231824	219	6	-0.09
Lifelog	40520	1	78	36	6	8.85	16	79	9.97	59	6.51	2001521	1932296	95	5	-1.66
POS	45531	1761	36	65	6	18.36	38	33	18.12	160	12.64	-	-	71	5	-0.52
Presidential	62010	30	3973	30	4	0.46	2	129	0.96	58	0.38	57	90552	131	-	-

Table 1: Results on real-world data. We report the number of discovered patterns (non-empty-head rules) P and rules R . For SEQRET, sqs and COSSU, we report the percentage of bits saved against the SEQRET null model as %L. Failed runs, e.g. because of excessive runtime (COSSU) or out-of-memory errors (POERMA and POERMH), are indicated by ‘-’.




Figure 4: Rules discovered on the Lichess dataset: In (a) we show the rule $\langle \text{white:e4 (red arrow), black:e5 (green arrow)} \rightarrow \text{white:Nf3 (blue arrow)} \rangle$. In (b) we show black castling $\langle \text{black:O-O} \rangle$. Castling is a special chess move where the king moves two squares toward a rook, and the rook jumps over the king to the adjacent square.

Diving deeper into results on *Lichess*, SEQRET discovers rules involving “King’s side castling” (denoted by O-O and shown in Figure 4b) which despite being insightful conditional dependencies are missed by SQS. Examples are $\langle \text{black:O-O} \rightarrow \text{black:Re8} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{black:O-O} \rightarrow \text{white:Qe2} \rangle$. The former captures black moving its rook to e8, a position originally occupied by the King and made available only after castling. The latter captures white moving its queen to e2 following black castling, as a deterrence to black rook (as e8 is in the line of attack of the queen). Another example is the pattern $\langle \text{black:Nf6, black:O-O} \rangle$ which makes sense as moving the knight away is a prerequisite for castling. For frequency-based methods, we find anywhere between 128 and 1370 rules involving castling, most of which are redundant.

7 CONCLUSION

We considered the problem of mining a succinct set of rules from event sequences. We formalized the problem in terms of the MDL principle and presented the SEQRET-CANDIDATES and SEQRET-MINE algorithms. We evaluated both on synthetic and real-world data. On synthetic data we saw that SEQRET recovers the ground truth well and is robust against noise, low rule confidence, different alphabet

sizes, and rule set sizes. On real-world data SEQRET found meaningful rules and provides insights that existing methods cannot provide.

As future work, we consider it highly interesting to study the causal aspects of sequential rules. Our approach lends itself to a causal framework by mapping the rule heads and tails to temporal variables and re-modeling the rules as structural equations involving these variables. Moreover, the MDL principle as used in this paper nicely maps to the Algorithmic Markov Condition [25] criterion to choose a plausible causal model.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Agrawal and R. Srikant. Mining sequential patterns. In *ICDE*, pages 3–14, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 1995. IEEE Computer Society.
- [2] A. Bhattacharyya and J. Vreeken. Efficiently summarising event sequences with rich interleaving patterns. In N. V. Chawla and W. Wang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2017 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining, Houston, Texas, USA, April 27-29, 2017*, pages 795–803. SIAM, 2017.
- [3] P. Bloem and S. de Rooij. Large-scale network motif analysis using compression. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 34:1421–1453, 2020.
- [4] E. Bourrand, L. Galarraga, E. Galbrun, E. Fromont, and A. Termier. Discovering useful compact sets of sequential rules in a long sequence. In *2021 IEEE 33rd International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI)*, pages 1295–1299, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, nov 2021. IEEE Computer Society.
- [5] X. Chen, W. Gan, S. Wan, and T. Gu. Mdl-based compressing sequential rules. *ArXiv, abs/2212.10252*, 2022.
- [6] Y. Chen, P. Fournier-Viger, F. Nouioua, and Y. Wu. Mining partially-ordered episode rules with the head support. In *Big Data Analytics and Knowledge Discovery: 23rd International Conference, DaWaK 2021, Virtual Event, September 27–30, 2021, Proceedings 23*, pages 266–271. Springer, 2021.
- [7] B. Cule and B. Goethals. Mining association rules in long sequences. In *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining: 14th Pacific-Asia Conference, PAKDD 2010, Hyderabad, India, June 21-24, 2010. Proceedings. Part I 14*, pages 300–309. Springer, 2010.
- [8] J. Cüppers, J. Kalofolias, and J. Vreeken. Omen: discovering sequential patterns with reliable prediction delays. *Knowl. Inf. Syst.*, 64(4):1013–1045, 2022.
- [9] J. Cüppers, P. Krieger, and J. Vreeken. Discovering sequential patterns with predictable inter-event delays. In M. J. Wooldridge, J. G. Dy, and S. Natarajan, editors, *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, Thirty-Sixth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2024, Fourteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2014, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, pages 8346–8353. AAAI Press, 2024.
- [10] J. Cüppers, A. Schoen, G. Blanc, and P.-F. Gimenez. Flowchronicle: Synthetic network flow generation through pattern set mining. *Proceedings of the ACM on Networking*, 2(CoNEXT4):1–20, 2024.
- [11] J. Cüppers and J. Vreeken. Just wait for it... mining sequential patterns with reliable prediction delays. In C. Plant, H. Wang, A. Cuzzocrea, C. Zaniolo, and X. Wu, editors, *20th IEEE International Conference on Data Mining, ICDM 2020, Sorrento, Italy, November 17-20, 2020*, pages 82–91. IEEE, 2020.

- [12] J. Cüppers and J. Vreeken. Below the surface: Summarizing event sequences with generalized sequential patterns. In A. K. Singh, Y. Sun, L. Akoglu, D. Gunopulos, X. Yan, R. Kumar, F. Ozcan, and J. Ye, editors, *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD 2023, Long Beach, CA, USA, August 6-10, 2023*, pages 348–357. ACM, 2023.
- [13] J. Cüppers, S. Xu, A. Musa, and J. Vreeken. Causal discovery from event sequences by local cause-effect attribution. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [14] B. Dalmas, P. Fournier-Viger, and S. Norre. Twinkle: A constrained sequential rule mining algorithm for event logs. *Procedia computer science*, 112:205–214, 2017.
- [15] P. Fournier-Viger, Y. Chen, F. Nouioua, and J. C.-W. Lin. Mining partially-ordered episode rules in an event sequence. In *Intelligent Information and Database Systems: 13th Asian Conference, ACIIDS 2021, Phuket, Thailand, April 7–10, 2021, Proceedings 13*, pages 3–15. Springer, 2021.
- [16] P. Fournier-Viger, U. Faghihi, R. Nkambou, and E. M. Nguifo. Cmrules: Mining sequential rules common to several sequences. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 25(1):63–76, 2012.
- [17] P. Fournier-Viger, T. Gueniche, S. Zida, and V. S. Tseng. Erminer: sequential rule mining using equivalence classes. In *Advances in Intelligent Data Analysis XIII: 13th International Symposium, IDA 2014, Leuven, Belgium, October 30–November 1, 2014. Proceedings 13*, pages 108–119. Springer, 2014.
- [18] P. Fournier-Viger, J. C.-W. Lin, R. U. Kiran, Y. S. Koh, and R. Thomas. A survey of sequential pattern mining. *Data Science and Pattern Recognition*, 1(1):54–77, 2017.
- [19] P. Fournier-Viger, R. Nkambou, and V. S.-M. Tseng. Rulegrowth: mining sequential rules common to several sequences by pattern-growth. In *Proceedings of the 2011 ACM symposium on applied computing*, pages 956–961, 2011.
- [20] P. Fournier-Viger and V. S. Tseng. Tns: mining top-k non-redundant sequential rules. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, pages 164–166, 2013.
- [21] E. Galbrun. The minimum description length principle for pattern mining: A survey. *Data mining and knowledge discovery*, 36(5):1679–1727, 2022.
- [22] E. Galbrun, P. Cellier, N. Tatti, A. Termier, and B. Crémilleux. Mining periodic patterns with a MDL criterion. In *ECMLPKDD18*, pages 535–551. Springer, 2018.
- [23] P. Grünwald. *The Minimum Description Length Principle*. MIT Press, 2007.
- [24] Y. Hong. On computing the distribution function for the poisson binomial distribution. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 59:41–51, 2013.
- [25] D. Janzing and B. Schölkopf. Causal inference using the algorithmic markov condition. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(10):5168–5194, Oct. 2010.
- [26] S. Jenkins, S. Walzer-Goldfeld, and M. Riondato. SPEck: Mining statistically-significant sequential patterns efficiently with exact sampling. *Data Min Knowl Disc*, 36(4):1575–1599, July 2022.
- [27] L. Le Cam. An approximation theorem for the poisson binomial distribution. 1960.
- [28] P. Li and M. Vitányi. *An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications*. Springer, 1997.
- [29] C. Low-Kam, C. Raissi, M. Kaytoue, and J. Pei. Mining Statistically Significant Sequential Patterns. In *ICDM*, pages 488–497, Dallas, TX, USA, Dec. 2013. IEEE.
- [30] H. Mannila and C. Meek. Global partial orders from sequential data. In *KDD*, pages 161–168, 2000.
- [31] G. Navarro. A guided tour to approximate string matching. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 33(1):31–88, mar 2001.
- [32] F. J. Ordóñez, P. De Toledo, and A. Sanchis. Activity recognition using hybrid generative/discriminative models on home environments using binary sensors. *Sensors*, 13(5):5460–5477, 2013.
- [33] F. Petitjean, T. Li, N. Tatti, and G. I. Webb. Skopus: Mining top-k sequential patterns under leverage. *DAMI*, 30(5):1086–1111, Sept. 2016.
- [34] Y. J. M. Pokou, P. Fournier-Viger, and C. Moghrabi. Authorship attribution using small sets of frequent part-of-speech skip-grams. In *The Twenty-Ninth International Flairs Conference*, 2016.
- [35] J. Rissanen. Modeling by shortest data description. *Automatica*, 14(5):465–471, 1978.
- [36] J. Rissanen. A universal prior for integers and estimation by minimum description length. *Annals Stat.*, 11(2):416–431, 1983.
- [37] N. Tatti. Significance of episodes based on minimal windows. In *ICDM*, pages 513–522, 2009.
- [38] N. Tatti and J. Vreeken. The long and the short of it: summarising event sequences with serial episodes. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '12*, page 462–470, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [39] A. Tonon and F. Vandin. Permutation Strategies for Mining Significant Sequential Patterns. In *ICDM*, pages 1330–1335, Beijing, China, Nov. 2019. IEEE.
- [40] A. Y. Volkova. A refinement of the central limit theorem for sums of independent random indicators. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 40(4):791–794, 1996.
- [41] J. Wang and J. Han. BIDE: Efficient mining of frequent closed sequences. In *ICDE*, pages 79–90, 2004.
- [42] Y. H. Wang. On the number of successes in independent trials. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 295–312, 1993.
- [43] B. Wiegand, D. Klakow, and J. Vreeken. Mining easily understandable models from complex event data. *SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*, SIAM, 2021.
- [44] X. Yan, J. Han, and R. Afshar. CloSpan: Mining: Closed sequential patterns in large datasets. In *SDM*, pages 166–177. SIAM, 2003.
- [45] M. J. Zaki. Spade: An efficient algorithm for mining frequent sequences. *Machine learning*, 42:31–60, 2001.

APPENDIX

A SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL: EXPERIMENTS

A.1 Setup

We ran all experiments on an Intel Xeon Gold 6244 @ 3.6 GHz, with 256GB of RAM. For the methods POERMA and POERMH, the JVM max heap size was increased upto 64 GB. Both these methods discover partially ordered rules from long event sequences, albeit with different definitions of rule support. To ensure fair comparison, we constraint our synthetic data generation to rules where constituent events appear in lexicographical order, and re-arrange the partially-ordered rules found to this order. We set a time limit of 24 hours for all methods except COSSU. As COSSU took a very long time to complete across all experiments, we increased the time limit for COSSU alone to 48 hours. Across all synthetic experiments except where the rule tail size was varied, SECRET-MINE completed within a few seconds to 1 hour max. In experiment varying rule tail size, SECRET-MINE took upto 3 hours in a few instances indicating that data with highly interleaved rules take up more time in rule search. We report the runtimes on real datasets in Table 2.

A.2 Synthetic Data Generation

Given an alphabet as input, we first generate a random rule set. We take in as parameters the rule set size, the rule-head size, the rule-tail size and the rule confidences. We also parameterize whether or not the rule heads occur as independent patterns, i.e for a rule $X \rightarrow Y$, whether $\epsilon \rightarrow X$ exists or not. If $\epsilon \rightarrow X$ doesn't exist, then X is only as frequent as expected by chance. Given these parameters, we randomly select events from the alphabet to form the rule heads and the rule tails, and add them to the rule set.

Next, using the rule set as ground truth, we generate the sequence database. We first generate an initial sequence using all the empty-head rules, and then insert the rule tails wherever the non-empty-head rules have triggered. We take in as parameters an initial sequence size and noise percentage. By noise, we mean the events in the sequence that can be covered only using one of the singleton rules. Therefore, given a noise percentage, we uniformly sample from the singleton rules, i.e the alphabet, to generate the stipulated percentage of the initial sequence size. Following this, we uniformly sample from the empty-head non-singleton rules and fill them into random positions to generate the remaining sequence. Finally, we go over the generated sequence, identify rules that have been triggered and insert the corresponding rule tails as per the specified rule confidences.

As for the delays and gaps, we take in as parameters a delay probability, i.e probability with which the data generation algorithm skips positions following a rule trigger, and a gap probability, i.e probability with which the data generation algorithm skips positions within rule tails. Note that the insertion of rule tails will alter the sequence size and the noise percentage. We keep the gap and delay probabilities low at 0.1 and 0.2 respectively. To run SECRET, we set the *max delay* and the *max gap* both to 2.

A.3 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate a method, we compare the rule set retrieved by it the against the ground truth in terms of recall and precision. To measure the similarity between rules quantitatively, we define a metric based on the LCS distance measure [31]. As the LCS distance is upper bounded by the sum of lengths of the patterns and lower bounded by zero, we can compute the similarity between any two patterns A and B as

$$\text{sim}(A, B) = 1 - \frac{d(A, B)}{|A| + |B|},$$

where $d(A, B)$ refers to the LCS distance. Further, we define the similarity measure between two rules $A \rightarrow B$ and $C \rightarrow D$ where either A or C is non-empty as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sim}(A \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow D) &= 0.5 * \text{sim}(AB, CD) \\ &+ 0.25 * \text{sim}(A, C) \\ &+ 0.25 * \text{sim}(B, D) \end{aligned}$$

Using this similarity measure, we calculate recall and precision. To compute recall, we sum up the similarity measure of each true rule with respect to the best matching mined rule, and normalize the sum. Formally, given a true model T and a mined model M , we define

$$\text{recall}(T, M) = \frac{\sum_{t \in T} \max_{m \in M} \text{sim}(t, m)}{|T|}.$$


Similarly, to compute precision, we use the similarity measures of the mined rules with respect to their best matching true rules. To penalize redundancy in the mined model, we should ideally choose a non-redundant subset of the mined model that maximizes the total similarity measure. However, this is not trivial to solve. Therefore, we resort to a heuristic measure as proposed in OMEN [11], and choose the top $|T|$ maximum similarity measures from the mined model. Given true model T and mined model M ,

$$\text{precision}(T, M) = \frac{\sum_{m' \in M'} \text{sim}(t, m')}{|M'|},$$

where $M' \subseteq \{\max_{t \in T} \text{sim}(t, m) \mid \forall m \in M\}$ such that M' contains the max $|T|$ elements. Finally, we use precision and recall to compute the F1 score.

Dataset	Runtime
<i>JMLR</i>	4 h
<i>Presidential</i>	8 h
<i>POS</i>	3 h
<i>Lifelog</i>	2 h
<i>Ordonez</i>	3 s
<i>Ecommerce</i>	11 h
<i>Rollingmill</i>	22 h
<i>Lichess</i>	17 h

Table 2: Runtime of SEQRET-MINE for different datasets.


 Figure 5: An illustration of potential rule windows for the rule $ab \rightarrow cd$. We pick the nearest minimal window of the rule tail as our preferred window.

B SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL: ALGORITHMS

B.1 Rule Windows

A rule window $S[i, j; k, l]$ captures the positions at which a rule occurs in a sequence S . Here, $S[i, j]$ is the window within which the rule head occurs and $S[k, l]$ is the window within which the rule tail occurs such that $j \leq k$. To avoid double counting and minimize gaps, we use minimal windows to identify the rule head patterns that trigger the rules. But what about the rule windows? For each rule head, we prefer the nearest minimal window of the rule tail pattern to complete the rule window. We prefer minimal windows as they minimize the gaps and treat the rule tail as a cohesive unit. If multiple minimal windows of the rule tail exist following the trigger, then we pick the nearest one so as to minimize the delay. Further, we restrict the search to windows that follow a user-set *max delay* ratio such that $k - j - 1/|tail(r)| \leq max\ delay$, and a *max gap* ratio such that $l - k + 1/|tail(r)| \leq max\ gap$ and $j - i - 1/|head(r)| \leq max\ gap$.

Algorithm 4 outlines the pseudo-code to find the best rule windows for a given rule.

The BESTRULEWIN method, however, assumes that none of the events forming the preferred windows for different rules have already been covered. As we start covering the sequence with these windows, however, it may happen that, at some point, events that are common to multiple rule tails have already been covered. In such cases, we look for the next best rule window. The next best rule window is the nearest minimal window of the rule tail following the trigger such that the events forming the rule tail are not already covered. Algorithm 5 outlines the pseudo-code for the NEXTBESTWIN method.

As an example, consider the sequence $\langle a, a, b, b, c, c, d, d \rangle$ in Figure 5 and rule $ab \rightarrow cd$. The minimal window $S[1, 2]$ captures the rule head that triggers the rule. Assuming none of the events in the sequence have already been covered, we pick $S[5, 6]$ as the rule tail window. The alternate windows for the rule tail are considered if and only if positions 5 or 6 have already been covered by other rules.

Algorithm 4: BESTRULEWIN

Input: $rule, D$

Output: $windows$

- 1 $windows \leftarrow \{\}$;
 - 2 $triggers \leftarrow \{S[i, j] \mid S \in D, (j - i + 1) - |head(rule)| \leq max\ gap * |head(rule)|\}$,
 - 3 where $S[i, j]$ is a minimal window of $head(rule)$;
 - 4 **for** $S[i, j] \in triggers$ **do**
 - 5 $k, l \leftarrow$ indices of first minimal window $S[k, l]$ of $tail(rule)$ such that $(k - j - 1) \leq max\ delay * |tail(rule)|$ and $(l - k + 1) - |tail(rule)| \leq max\ gap * |tail(rule)|$;
 - 6 **if** $S[k, l]$ exists :
 - 7 $windows \leftarrow windows \cup \{(rule, S[i, j; k, l])\}$;
 - 8 **return** $windows$
-

Algorithm 5: NEXTBESTWIN

Input: $win, cover, D$
Output: win'

/ win contains a pointer to the rule (win.rule) and the window in the format $S[i, j; k, l]$ */*

- 1 $k', l' \leftarrow$ indices of first minimal window $S[k', l']$ of $tail(win.rule)$ such that $\forall e \in \{e \mid S[k', l'] \text{ covers } e\}, \nexists w \in cover$ where w covers e and $(k' - j - 1) \leq max\ delay * |tail(win.rule)|$ and $(l' - k' + 1) - |tail(win.rule)| \leq max\ gap * |tail(win.rule)|$;
- 2 $win' \leftarrow (win.rule, S[i, j; k', l'])$;
- 3 **return** win'

B.2 Prune Algorithm

The Algorithm 6 shows the pseudo-code for the PRUNE procedure.

Algorithm 6: PRUNE

Input: D, R
Output: pruned R

- 1 **for** $r \in R$ ordered by PRUNE ORDER **do**
- 2 **if** r is not a singleton rule :
- 3 **if** $L(D, R \setminus \{r\}) < L(D, R)$:
- 4 $R \leftarrow R \setminus \{r\}$;
- 5 **return** R

B.3 CandRules Algorithm

The Algorithm 7 shows the pseudo-code for the CANDRULES procedure.

Algorithm 7: CANDRULES

Input: $D, \Omega, rule$
Output: $candidates$

- 1 $candidates \leftarrow \{\}$;
- 2 $windows \leftarrow BESTRULEWIN(rule, D)$;
- 3 **for** $position \in \{h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{|head(rule)|}\} \cup \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{|tail(rule)|}\}$ **do**
/ h represents rule head and t represents rule tail */*
- 4 **for** $e \in \Omega$ **do**
- 5 $count \leftarrow |\{w \in windows \mid w \text{ contains } e \text{ in the gap at } position\}|$;
- 6 $p_{e^c} \leftarrow 1 - \frac{supp(\epsilon \rightarrow e)}{|D|}$; */* e^c refers to the complement of e */*
- 7 $expected \leftarrow |windows| - \sum_{w \in windows} (p_{e^c})^{|g_w|}$;
/ g_w refers to the gap in w at $position$ */*
- 8 **if** $count$ significantly greater than $expected$:
/ see section 4.3 for details of significance test */*
- 9 $candidates \leftarrow candidates \cup \{INSERT(rule, e, position)\}$ */* Insert inserts e to rule at $position$ */*
- 10 **return** $candidates$

B.4 Split Algorithm

The Algorithm 8 shows the pseudo-code for the SPLIT procedure.

C TIME COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS**C.1 Time Complexity of the Rule-Set Mining Problem**

To evaluate the time complexity of the problem, let us split the problem into two parts - one, to find the optimal cover given a rule set, and two, to find the optimal rule set. For simplicity, let us assume a single long sequence S in the database, drawn from the alphabet Ω .

Algorithm 8: SPLIT

Input: Pattern p
Output: Set of rules R

```

1  $R \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2  $i \leftarrow 0$ 
3 while  $i < |p|$  do
4    $R \leftarrow R \cup (p[0, i], p[i + 1, |p|])$ 
5    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
6 return  $R$ 

```

Given a rule set R , we know that a cover is a many-to-one mapping between the events in S to rules in R . In other words, it is a permutation with replacement of the rules in R over $|S|$ events. Therefore, we can compute the number of possible covers as $|R|^{|S|}$. The worst-case time complexity of the first part of our problem is

$$O(|R|^{|S|}) .$$

Now let us compute the time complexity of the second part of our problem. The longest rule that can occur in S would be of length $|S|$. The total number of rules possible would be the sum of the number of rules possible per size, with size ranging from 1 to $|S|$. Considering that rules can be built from sequential patterns, let us first compute the number of sequential patterns possible for size k . A sequential pattern is a permutation of the alphabet with replacement. Therefore, for size k we get $|\Omega|^k$ possible sequential patterns. Now, including the possibility of an empty-head, we can choose k positions to split the pattern into a rule head and a rule tail. Thus, for size k , we can compute the number of rules possible as $k * |\Omega|^k$. The total number of rules possible is then given by

$$\sum_{k=1}^{|S|} k * |\Omega|^k .$$

A rule set being a subset of all possible rules, we can compute the number of possible rule sets as the size of the power-set. Since we retain the singleton rules in every possible rule set, we can compute the number of valid rule sets as $2^{\sum_{k=1}^{|S|} k * |\Omega|^k - |\Omega|}$. The worst-case time complexity of the second part of our problem is then given by

$$O(2^{\sum_{k=1}^{|S|} k * |\Omega|^k - |\Omega|}) \approx O(2^{|\Omega|^{|S|}}) .$$

C.2 Time Complexity of SECRET-MINE

Let us now analyze the time complexity of our solution. We will analyze each part of the problem separately. We consider the worst-case where all the events in the database occur as a single long sequence S . The set of distinct events form the alphabet Ω .

Time Complexity of COVER. Given a rule set R , we first compute the complexity of finding the rule windows. To do so, the method looks for all rule triggers and for each rule trigger, finds the nearest minimal window of the rule tail. Iterating over S and looking for triggers of each rule $r \in R$ results in a worst-case time complexity of $O(|S| * \sum_{r \in R} |head(r)| * max_gap)$. Ignoring the *max_gap* parameter that stays constant irrespective of the problem size and upper bounding the size of any rule head by $\max_{r \in R} |head(r)|$, denoted by *max_head_size*, we can rewrite the same as

$$O(|S| * |R| * max_head_size) .$$

To complete the rule window for each trigger, `BESTRULEWIN` next looks for the nearest minimal window of the rule tail until the maximum allowed delay. Given a trigger, looking for a rule tail, for any rule r , requires computational time in the order of $O(|tail(r)| * max_delay * |tail(r)| * max_gap)$. Once again ignoring the constant parameters and using *max_tail_size* to upper bound the size of a rule tail, we can rewrite this as $O(max_tail_size^2)$. Thus, we can compute the worst-case time complexity of `BESTRULEWIN` as

$$O(|S| * |R| * (max_head_size + max_tail_size^2)) .$$

As triggers are bounded by minimal windows, and only one minimal window can exist per starting or ending position, the number of triggers per rule is upper bounded by $|S|$. Since `BESTRULEWIN` finds only the one nearest minimal window of the rule tail for each trigger, we can upper bound the total number of rule windows returned to $|R| * |S|$. The next step in `COVER` is to sort the rule windows in `WINDOW ORDER`. This incurs a time complexity of

$$O(|R| * |S| * \log_2(|R| * |S|)) .$$

The final step in `COVER` is to consider each rule window in the sorted order and cover the sequence. However, there could arise cases where the considered rule windows are in conflict with previous rule windows which already covered the same events. This in turn leads to the execution of `NEXTBESTWIN`. Each time `NEXTBESTWIN` is called for a rule trigger, it looks for the next nearest minimal window of the rule tail until the maximum allowed delay. If such a rule window is found, then it is added to the sorted list of rule windows maintaining the

order. A single call to `NEXTBESTWIN` for a trigger of rule r , in the worst-case, incurs computational time in the order of $|tail(r)|^2$ to find the next nearest minimal window of the rule tail (ignoring the parameters max_gap and max_delay). Suppose W denotes the sorted list of rule windows at any point in time. Once (if) the next best rule window is found, the method incurs additional computational time in the order of $\log_2(|W|)$ to find the position of insertion using a binary search.

The question is how many such calls to `NEXTBESTWIN` could happen in the worst case. We could also upper bound the size of W by the same value. To answer this question, let us consider when `NEXTBESTWIN` is called. It is called whenever an event that participates in a rule window is already covered by a previous rule window. From the point of view of a rule trigger, each event following it until a limit determined by max_delay and max_gap times the rule tail, can potentially participate in a rule window. The `SECRET` starts with one such rule window and looks for the next best rule window if and only if any of the participating events is already covered. Further, the next best rule window omits the previously covered events. Therefore, the maximum number of times `NEXTBESTWIN` gets called is limited by the number of events following the rule trigger, given by $|tail(r)| * (max_delay + max_gap + 1)$. Ignoring the constants for the purpose of complexity analysis, we can rewrite it as $|tail(r)|$. Over all triggers for all rules, we can then compute the worst-case time complexity of finding the next best windows and adding them to the sorted list of rule windows as

$$O\left(\sum_{r \in R} |S| * |tail(r)| * \left(|tail(r)|^2 + \log_2(|W|)\right)\right),$$

where W is the list of rule windows. Once again, as worst-case, we use max_tail_size to rewrite the same. Further, we can limit the size up to which W can grow by the number of times `NEXTBESTWIN` gets called, i.e in the order of $|R| * |S| * max_tail_size$. Putting it all together, we find the total computational time for all calls to `NEXTBESTWIN` to be in the order of

$$O(|R| * |S| * max_tail_size * \log_2(|R| * |S| * max_tail_size) + |R| * |S| * max_tail_size^3)$$

Finally, using the ordered list of rule windows W , we cover the sequence S . As singleton rules are also included in R , it is guaranteed to cover the entire sequence in one iteration over all the rule windows in W (in practice, it will be much lesser as many events get covered by a single rule window). Therefore, we can compute the worst-case time complexity to loop over the list of rule windows and cover the sequence S as

$$O(|R| * |S| * max_tail_size).$$

Thus, from equations C.2, C.2, C.2 and C.2, we can compute the total worst-case time complexity of `COVER` as

$$\begin{aligned} &O(|R| * |S| * (max_head_size + max_tail_size^2) \\ &+ |R| * |S| * \log_2(|R| * |S|) \\ &+ |R| * |S| * max_tail_size \\ &+ |R| * |S| * max_tail_size * \log_2(|R| * |S| * max_tail_size) \\ &+ |R| * |S| * max_tail_size^3). \end{aligned}$$

Considering only the dominating terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &O(|R| * |S| * (max_head_size \\ &+ max_tail_size^3 \\ &+ max_tail_size * \log_2(|R| * |S| * max_tail_size))). \end{aligned}$$

Time Complexity of SECRET-MINE. Next, we analyze the time complexity of the greedy miner, `SECRET-MINE`. Let us consider a single iteration of the miner. Let R' be the candidate rule set at that time point. Then, `SECRET-MINE` grows the rule set by searching for a new rule that improves the encoding cost by extending each rule, at each position, with their significant neighbors. As worst-case, let us assume that the miner had to search over all rules, at all positions. Further, let us assume that all events in the alphabet Ω are significant (although this is impossible). To simplify the computations, we use $\max_{r' \in R'} |head(r')|$ as the max_head_size and $\max_{r' \in R'} |tail(r')|$ as the max_tail_size to upper bound the lengths of $head(r')$ and $tail(r')$ for any $r' \in R'$. Then, the computational time of the search will be in the order of $O(|R'| * (max_head_size + max_tail_size) * |\Omega|)$. Once a new rule is added to the rule set, `SECRET-MINE` tries to prune the rule set by removing each non-singleton rule. The computational time required by `PRUNE` will be in the order of $|R'| - |\Omega|$. Considering only the dominating term, we can thus conclude the worst-case time complexity of each iteration as

$$O(|R'| * (max_head_size + max_tail_size) * |\Omega|),$$

where R' denotes the candidate rule set at that time point. Next, we try to analyze the number of iterations possible before the algorithm converges.

We know that in each iteration, `SECRET-MINE` adds a new rule to the current rule set only if the addition improves the encoding cost. Similarly, a rule is pruned from the current rule set only if the removal improves the encoding cost. If the encoding cost cannot be improved anymore, then the algorithm halts. In other words, `SECRET-MINE` will never revert back to a rule set from which it grew in the past. Therefore, the maximum number of iterations is upper bounded by the number of unique rule sets possible. In Section C.1, we saw that the number of possible rule sets is in the order of $O(2^{|\Omega| * |S|})$.

Caching for Faster Runtime. In practice, however, we observe the number of rule sets considered by the greedy approach to be much smaller. Further, we cache the rule windows found for each rule as and when they are first encountered. Therefore, if the same rule is present in a future rule set, we do not recompute the rule windows. In other words, `BESTRULEWIN` is invoked only once per rule. The same is true for `CANDRULES`. We cache the neighbors found for each rule as and when they are first encountered. As a result, the time complexity in practice would be much lower, even if `SECRET-MINE` attempted the worst-case possibility of all unique rule sets before converging. Further, we do not reconsider rules once pruned in the future iterations.