

M-STATISTIC FOR KERNEL CHANGE-POINT DETECTION*

BY SHUANG LI, YAO XIE, HANJUN DAI, AND LE SONG

Georgia Institute of Technology

Detecting the emergence of an abrupt change-point is a classic problem in statistics and machine learning. Kernel-based non-parametric statistics have been proposed for this task which make fewer assumptions on the distributions than traditional parametric approach. However, none of the existing kernel statistics has provided a computationally efficient way to characterize the extremal behavior of the statistic. Such characterization is crucial for setting the detection threshold, to control the significance level in the offline case as well as the false alarm rate (captured by the average run length) in the online case. In this paper we focus on the scenario when the amount of background data is large, and propose two related computationally efficient kernel-based statistics for change-point detection, which we call “ M -statistics”. A novel theoretical result of the paper is the characterization of the tail probability of these statistics using a new technique based on change-of-measure. Such characterization provides us accurate detection thresholds for both offline and online cases in computationally efficient manner, without the need to resort to the more expensive simulations such as bootstrapping. Moreover, our M -statistic can be applied to high-dimensional data by choosing a proper kernel. We show that our methods perform well in both synthetic and real world data.

1. Introduction. Detecting emergence of an abrupt change is a fundamental problem in statistics and machine learning. Given a sequence of samples, $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t$ from a domain $\mathcal{X}$, we are interested in detecting a possible change-point τ , such that before the change samples x_i are *i.i.d.* sampled from a null distribution P , and after the change samples x_i are *i.i.d.* from a distribution Q . Here, the time horizon t is either fixed $t = T_0$ (in the offline or fixed-sample setting), or t is not fixed (in the online or sequential setting) since we are getting new samples. In the offline setting, our goal is either to detect the existence, and in the online setting, our goal is to detect the emergence of a change-point as soon as possible after it occurs. Here, we restrict our attention to detecting one change-point, which is the case of monitoring problems. One such instance is seismic event detection (Ross and Ben-Zion, 2014), where we would like to either detect the presence of a weak event in retrospect to better understand geophysical structure, or detect the event as quickly as possible in the online monitoring setting.

Change-point detection problems are related to the classical statistical two-sample test; however, they are usually more difficult in that for change-point detection, we need to search for the unknown change-point location τ . For instance, in the offline case, this corresponds to taking a maximum of a series of statistics each corresponding to one putative change-point location (a similar idea was used in (Harchaoui, Bach and Moulines, 2008) for the offline case), and in the online case, we have to characterize the average run length of the test statistic hitting the threshold, which necessarily results in taking a maximum of the statistics over time. Moreover, the statistics being

*This research was supported in part by CMMI-1538746 and CCF-1442635 to Y.X.; NSF/NIH BIGDATA 1R01GM108341, ONR N00014-15-1-2340, NSF IIS-1218749, NSF CAREER IIS-1350983 to L.S..

Keywords and phrases: Change-point detection, kernel-based tests, nonparametric, tail probability.

maxed over are usually highly correlated. Hence, analyzing the tail probabilities of the test statistic for change-point detection typically requires more sophisticated probabilistic tools.

Ideally, the detection algorithm should also be free of distributional assumptions to have robust detection. However, classic approaches for change-point detection are usually parametric, meaning that they rely on strong assumptions on the distribution. Nonparametric and kernel approaches are distribution free and more robust as they provide consistent results over larger classes of data distributions (they can possibly be less powerful in settings where a clear distributional assumption can be made). A classic non-parametric scheme for change-point detection is (Gordon and Pollak, 1994), which is based on a likelihood ratio formed for a sequence of vectors of signs and ranks of the *scalar* observations. However, it is not suitable for vector observations, since it needs to order the observations. Recently many kernel based statistics have been proposed in the machine learning literature (Harchaoui, Bach and Moulines, 2008; Enikeeva and Harchaoui, 2014; Zou et al., 2014; Kifer, Ben-David and Gehrke, 2004; Liu et al., 2013; Desobry, Davy and Doncarli, 2005), which can be applied to vector observations and typically work better in real data with few distributional assumptions. However, none of these existing kernel statistics has provided a computationally efficient way to characterize the tail probability of the extremal value of these statistics. Characterization such tail probability is crucial for setting the correct detection thresholds for both the offline and online cases.

Furthermore, typically we have a large amount of background data in the change point detection setting (*e.g.*, seismic events are relatively rare), and we want the algorithm to exploit these data while being computationally efficient. However, most kernel based statistics will cost $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ to compute based on a sample of n data points. In the change-point detection case, this translates to a complexity quadratically grows with the number of background observations and the detection time horizon t . Ideally, we want to restructure and sample the background data during the statistical design to retain statistical efficiency while gaining computational efficiency.

In this paper, we design two related statistics for change-point detection based on kernel maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) for two-sample test (Gretton et al., 2012; Harchaoui et al., 2013), which we call “ M -statistics”. Although MMD has a nice unbiased and minimum variance U -statistic estimator (MMD_u), it can not be directly applied since MMD_u costs $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ to compute based on a sample of n data points. Therefore, we adopt a strategy inspired by the recently developed B -test statistic (Zaremba, Gretton and Blaschko, 2013) and design a $\mathcal{O}(n)$ statistic for change-point detection. At a high level, our methods sample N blocks of background data of size B , compute quadratic-time MMD_u of each reference block with the post-change block, and then average the results. However, different from the simple two-sample test case, to provide an accurate change-point detection threshold, the background block needs to be designed in a novel structured way in the offline setting and updated recursively in the online setting.

Besides presenting the new M -statistics, our contributions also include: (1) deriving accurate approximations to the significance level in the offline case, and average run length (ARL) in the online case, for our M -statistics, which enable us to determine thresholds efficiently without recurring to the onerous simulations (*e.g.* repeated bootstrapping); (2) obtaining a closed-form variance estimator which allows us to form the M -statistic easily; (3) developing novel structured ways to design background blocks in the offline setting and rules for update in the online setting, which also leads to desired correlation structures of our statistics that enable accurate approximations for tail probability; (4) we further improve the accuracy of our approximations by including correction terms that take into account the skewness of the kernel-based statistics. To approximate the asymptotic tail probabilities, we adopt a highly sophisticated technique based on change-of-

measure, recently developed in a series of paper by by Yakir and Siegmund et al. (Yakir, 2013). The numerical accuracy of our approximations are validated by numerical examples. We demonstrate the good performance of our method using real speech and human activity data.

Finally, through our study we notice another interesting difference between our change-point detection problem and the fixed sample size two-sample test. In two-sample test, it is always beneficial to increase the block size B as the distribution for the statistic under the null and the alternative will be better separated. However, this is no longer true in online change-point detection, because a larger block size inevitably causes a larger detection delay.

2. Background and Related Work. We briefly review kernel-based methods and the maximum mean discrepancy. A *reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS)* $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ with a kernel $k(x, x')$ is a Hilbert space of functions $f(\cdot) : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$. Its element $k(x, \cdot)$ satisfies the reproducing property: $\langle f(\cdot), k(x, \cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} = f(x)$, and consequently, $\langle k(x, \cdot), k(x', \cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} = k(x, x')$, meaning that we can view the evaluation of a function f at any point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ as an inner product. Commonly used RKHS kernel function includes Gaussian radial basis function (RBF) kernel $k(x, x') = \exp(-\|x - x'\|^2 / 2\sigma^2)$ where $\sigma > 0$ is the kernel bandwidth, and polynomial kernel $k(x, x') = (\langle x, x' \rangle + a)^d$ where $a > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ (Schölkopf and Smola, 2002). RKHS kernels can also be defined for sequences, graph and other structured object (Schölkopf, Tsuda and Vert, 2004). In this paper, if not otherwise stated, we will assume that Gaussian RBF kernel is used.

Assume there are two sets with n observations from a domain $\mathcal{X}$, where $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ are drawn *i.i.d.* from distribution P , and $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$ are drawn *i.i.d.* from distribution Q . The *maximum mean discrepancy (MMD)* is defined as (Zaremba, Gretton and Blaschko, 2013)

$$\text{MMD}_0[\mathcal{F}, P, Q] := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{ \mathbb{E}_x[f(x)] - \mathbb{E}_y[f(y)] \}.$$

An unbiased estimate of MMD_0^2 can be obtained using U -statistic

$$(2.1) \quad \text{MMD}_u^2[\mathcal{F}, X, Y] = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^n h(x_i, x_j, y_i, y_j),$$

where $h(\cdot)$ is the kernel of the U -statistic defined as

$$h(x_i, x_j, y_i, y_j) = k(x_i, x_j) + k(y_i, y_j) - k(x_i, y_j) - k(x_j, y_i).$$

Intuitively, the empirical test statistic MMD_u^2 is expected to be small (close to zero) if $P = Q$, and large if P and Q are far apart. The complexity for evaluating (2.1) is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ since we have to form the so-called Gram matrix for the data. Under H_0 ($P = Q$), the U -statistic is degenerate and distributed the same as an infinite sum of Chi-square variables.

To improve the computational efficiency and obtain an easy-to-compute threshold for hypothesis testing. Recently, an alternative statistic for MMD_0^2 has been proposed, called the B -test (Zaremba, Gretton and Blaschko, 2013). The key idea of the approach is to partition the n samples from P and Q into N non-overlapping blocks, $X_1, \dots, X_N$ and $Y_1, \dots, Y_N$, each of constant size B . Then $\text{MMD}_u^2[\mathcal{F}, X_i, Y_i]$ is computed for each pair of blocks and averaged over the N blocks to result in

$$\text{MMD}_B^2[\mathcal{F}, X, Y] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MMD}_u^2[\mathcal{F}, X_i, Y_i].$$

Since B is constant, $N \sim \mathcal{O}(n)$, and the computational complexity of $\text{MMD}_B^2[\mathcal{F}, X, Y]$ is $\mathcal{O}(B^2n)$, a significant reduction compared to $\text{MMD}_u^2[\mathcal{F}, X, Y]$. Furthermore, by averaging $\text{MMD}_u^2[\mathcal{F}, X_i, Y_i]$ over independent blocks, the B -statistic is asymptotically normal leveraging over the central limit theorem. This latter property also allows a simple threshold to be derived for the two-sample test rather than resorting to more expensive bootstrapping approach. Our proposed M -statistics are inspired by the structure of B -statistic. However, the change-point detection setting requires significant new derivations to obtain the test threshold since one cares about the maximum of $\text{MMD}_B^2[\mathcal{F}, X, Y]$ computed at different point in time. Moreover, the change-point detection case consists of a sum of *highly correlated* MMD statistics, because these MMD_B^2 are formed with a common test block of data. This is inevitable in our change-point detection problems because test data is much less than the reference data. Hence, we cannot use the central limit theorem (even a martingale version), but have to adopt the aforementioned change-of-measure approach.

2.1. Related work. Other nonparametric change-point detection approach has been proposed in the literature. In the offline setting, (Harchaoui, Bach and Moulines, 2008) designs a kernel-base test statistic, based on a so-called running maximum partition strategy to test for the presence of a change-point; (Zou et al., 2014) studies a related problem in which there are s anomalous sequences out of n sequences to be detected and they construct a test statistic using MMD. In the online setting, (Kifer, Ben-David and Gehrke, 2004) presents a meta-algorithm which compares data in some “reference window” to the data in the current window, using some empirical distance measures (not kernel-based); (Desobry, Davy and Doncarli, 2005) detects abrupt changes by comparing two sets of descriptors extracted online from the signal at each time instant: the immediate past set and the immediate future set, and using a soft margin single-class support vector machine (SVM), they build a dissimilarity measure (which is asymptotically equivalent to the Fisher ratio in the Gaussian case) in the feature space between those sets without estimating densities as an intermediate step; (Liu et al., 2013) uses a density-ratio estimation to detect change-points, and models the density-ratio using a non-parametric Gaussian kernel model, whose parameters are updated online through stochastic gradient descent. The above work lack theoretical analysis for the extremal behavior of the statistics or the false alarm rate.

3. M -statistic. Given a sequence of observations $\{\dots, x_{-2}, x_{-1}, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t\}$, $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$, with $\{\dots, x_{-2}, x_{-1}, x_0\}$ denoting the sequence of background (or reference) data. Assume a large amount of reference data is available. Our goal is to detect the *existence* of a change-point τ , such that before the change-point, samples are *i.i.d.* with a distribution P , and after the change-point, samples are *i.i.d.* with a different distribution Q . The location τ where the change-point occurs is unknown. We may formulate this problem as a hypothesis test, where the null hypothesis states that there is no change-point, and the alternative hypothesis is that there exists a change-point at some time τ . We will construct our kernel-based M -statistic using the maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) to measure the difference between distributions of the reference and the test data.

We denote by Y the block of data which potentially contains a change-point (also referred to as the post-change block or test block). In the offline setting, we assume the size of Y can be up to $B_{\max}$, and we want to search for a location of the change-point B ($2 \leq B \leq B_{\max}$) within Y such that observations after B are from a different distribution Q . In the online setting, we assume the size of Y is fixed to be B_0 and we construct it using a sliding window. In this case, the potential change-point is declared as the end of each block Y . Inspired by the idea of B -test (Zaremba, Gretton and Blaschko, 2013), we form N blocks of reference data with sizes equal to that of Y , and compute our statistics.




Fig 1: Illustration of (a) offline case: data are split into blocks of size $B_{\max}$, indexed backwards from time t , and we consider blocks of size B , $B = 2, \dots, B_{\max}$; (b) online case. Assume we have large amount of reference or background data that follows the null distribution.

The reference blocks and the post-change block are constructed differently in the offline and online cases. In the offline setting, we truncate data into blocks of size $B_{\max}$, which is equivalent to assuming $0 \leq \tau \leq B_{\max}$. We take $(N + 1)$ blocks, treating the last block as post-change data and the remaining N blocks as the reference data. Then take B contiguous samples out of each block, $2 \leq B \leq B_{\max}$ (e.g., we may take the right-most side of the block which corresponds to the most recent data). Compute a quadratic MMD_u^2 for samples from each reference block with samples from the post-change block, and then average them, as illustrated in Fig. 1(a). In the online setting, we truncate data into blocks of a chosen size B_0 , keep the most recent B_0 samples as the post-change block, and use the rest of the data as a pool of reference data. Then take NB_0 samples without replacement (since we assume the reference data are *i.i.d.* with distribution P) from the reference data pool to form N reference blocks, compute the quadratic MMD_u^2 statistics between each reference block with the post-change block, and then average them. When there is a new sample (time moves from t to $t + 1$), we append the new sample to the post-change block, move the oldest sample from the post-change block to the reference pool. The reference blocks are also updated accordingly: the end point of each reference block is moved to the reference pool, and a new point is sampled and appended to the front of each reference block, as shown in Fig. 4(b).

3.1. Offline M -statistic. In the offline setting, we sample N reference blocks of size $B_{\max}$ independently from the reference pool, and index them as $X_i^{B_{\max}}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. In searching for a location B ($2 \leq B \leq B_{\max}$) within Y for a change-point, we form sub-blocks from each reference block by taking B contiguous data points out of that block. Index these sub-blocks as $X_i^{(B)}$. Similarly, form sub-blocks from Y by taking B contiguous data points, and denote them as $Y^{(B)}$ (illustrated in Fig. 1(a)). Then compute MMD_u^2 between $(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)})$, and average over all blocks to form a statistic Z_B

$$(3.1) \quad Z_B = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MMD}_u^2(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)}) = \frac{1}{NB(B-1)} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j,l=1, j \neq l}^B h(X_{i,j}^{(B)}, X_{i,l}^{(B)}, Y_j^{(B)}, Y_l^{(B)}),$$

where $X_{i,j}^{(B)}$ denotes the j th sample in $X_i^{(B)}$, and $Y_j^{(B)}$ denotes the j th sample in $Y^{(B)}$. Due to the property of MMD_u^2 , under the null hypothesis, $\mathbb{E}[Z_B] = 0$. Let $\text{Var}[Z_B]$ denote the variance of Z_B under the null. The variance depends on the block size B and the number of blocks N , as

shown later by Lemma 1. Considering this, we standardize the statistic by dividing the standard deviation, and maximize over all possible values of B to form the *offline M -statistic*.

$$(3.2) \quad M = \max_{B \in \{2, 3, \dots, B_{\max}\}} \underbrace{Z_B / \sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_B]}}_{Z'_B}, \quad \{\text{offline change-point detection}\}$$

where varying the block-size from 2 to $B_{\max}$ corresponds to searching for the unknown change-point location. A change-point is detected whenever the M -statistic (3.2) exceeds a prescribed threshold $b > 0$.

3.2. Online M -statistic. In the online setting, to simplify later theoretical analysis, as an approximation to the change-point location, we set the post-change block size to B_0 . Take NB_0 samples without replacement from the pool of reference data to form N reference blocks. This is reasonable since the reference data are assumed to be *i.i.d.* with distribution P . Then compute the quadratic statistics MMD_u^2 between each reference block and the post-change block, and average them. Using the sliding window scheme described above, we may define an *online M -statistic* by standardizing the average MMD_u^2 between the post-change block in the sliding window and the reference blocks:

$$(3.3) \quad Z_{B_0, t} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MMD}_u^2(X_i^{(B_0, t)}, Y^{(B_0, t)}),$$

where B_0 is the fixed block-size, $X_i^{(B_0, t)}$ is the i th reference block of size B_0 at time t , and $Y^{(B_0, t)}$ is the post-change block of size B_0 at time t . The online change-point detection procedure is a stopping time and an alarm is fired whenever the normalized B -statistic (3.3) exceeds a pre-determined threshold $b > 0$:

$$(3.4) \quad T = \inf\{t : \underbrace{Z_{B_0, t} / \sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_{B_0, t}]}}_{M_t} > b\}. \quad \{\text{online change-point detection}\}$$

The variance of the $Z_{B_0, t}$ only depends on the block size B_0 but independent of t , and can be evaluated efficiently by Lemma 1 in the later section.

There is a tradeoff in choosing the block size B_0 . A small block size has a smaller computational cost, which is ideal for online situations. However, a small B_0 also leads to a lower detection power or a longer detection delay when the change-point is weak.

3.3. Recursive implementation. The online M -statistic can be computed recursively via a simple update scheme. By its construction, when time elapses from t to $(t+1)$, a new sample is added into the post-change block, and the oldest sample is moved to the reference pool. Each reference block is updated similarly by adding one sample randomly drawn from the pool of reference data, and the oldest sample is purged. Hence, only a limited number of entries in the Gram matrix that are due to the new sample need to be updated. The update scheme is illustrated in Fig. 2 and explained in more details therein. The recursive scheme reduces the computational cost of the online M -statistic to be *linear in time*. Similarly, the offline M -statistic can also be computed recursively by utilizing the fact that Z_B for $B \in \{2, \dots, B_{\max}\}$ shares many common terms. The recursive scheme reduces the computational cost of the offline M -statistic to be $\mathcal{O}(NB_{\max}^2)$.




Fig 2: Recursive update scheme to compute the online M -statistics. The online M -statistic is formed with N background blocks and one testing block and, hence, we keep track of N Gram matrices. For illustration purposes, we partition the Gram matrix into four windows (in red, black and blue, as shown on the left panel). At time t , to obtain $\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B_0,t)}, Y^{(B_0,t)})$, we compute the shaded elements and take an average within each window. The diagonal entries in each window are removed to obtain an unbiased estimate. At time $t+1$, we update $X_i^{(B_0,t)}$ and $Y^{(B_0,t)}$ with the new data point and purge the oldest data point, and update the Gram matrix by moving the colored window as shown on the right panel, computing the elements within the new windows, and taking an average. Note that we only need to compute the right-most column and the bottom row.

3.4. *Analytic expression for $\text{Var}[Z_B]$.* We obtain an analytical expression for $\text{Var}[Z_B]$ in (3.2) and (3.4), by utilizing the correspondence between the MMD_u^2 statistics and U -statistic (Serfling, 1980) and known properties of U -statistic. We can also derive the covariance structure for the offline and online M -statistics (Lemma 2), which are used to establish the significance level and the ARL properties.

LEMMA 1 (Variance of Z_B under the null). *Given a fixed block size B and number of blocks N , under the null hypothesis,*

$$(3.5) \quad \text{Var}[Z_B] = \binom{B}{2}^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')] + \frac{N-1}{N} \text{Cov}[h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')] \right],$$

where x, x', x'', x''', y , and y' are i.i.d. with the null distribution P .

Lemma 1 provides a much simpler way to estimate $\text{Var}[Z_B]$ compared to a naive way of using the sample variance of Z_B via bootstrapping, which requires a huge amount of samples. For instance, to generate 10000 instances of Z_B , we need a total of $10000(N+1)B$ samples, since each Z_B needs $(N+1)B$ samples. On the other hand, via Lemma 1, we only need to evaluate $\mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')]$ and $\text{Cov}[h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')]$, which requires much smaller number of samples. For instance, we may draw four samples without replacement from the reference data as x, x', y, y' , evaluate the sampled function value, and then form a Monte Carlo average; the other term $\text{Cov}[h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')]$ can be estimated a similar fashion.

Lemma 1 is quite accurate. We form 10000 instances of Z_B using data sampled from the null distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I_{20})$. Here I_k denotes an identity matrix of size k -by- k . Figs. 3(a)-(b) show the empirical distributions of Z_B when $N = 5$, and $B = 2$ or $B = 200$, respectively. We also plot the Gaussian probability density function with mean equal to the sample mean, and the variance

predicted by Lemma 1, and it matches well with the empirical distribution. Figs. 3(c)-(d) show the Q-Q plot for these two cases. This verifies that Gaussian is a reasonable approximation to the distribution of Z_B , which is a main assumption for our main theoretical results in Theorem 3 and Theorem 4. The moderate skewness of the statistic can be corrected, as discussed in Section 6. Figs. 3(e)-(f) show the percentage difference between estimation by Lemma 1 relative to the sample variance of Z_B . Also, the error decreases with more reference data. Finally, the estimate is reasonably accurate even with moderate amount of reference data.




Fig 3: Accuracy of Lemma 1 in estimating the variance of Z_B when $B = 2$ and $B = 200$.

3.5. *Examples of M-statistic.* In this section, we consider a few examples of the M -statistic.

- Gaussian to Laplace. In Figs. 4(a)-(c), data before the change-point are *i.i.d.* from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. After a change-point at $\tau = 250$, data are *i.i.d.* from a Laplace distribution with zero mean and unit variance. In this case, the mean and variance before and after the change-point are identical and, hence, conventional methods based on mean and variance cannot detect the change. The upper panels show the offline and online M -statistics in different settings, which show that the M -statistic can detect the change-point using the theoretical thresholds obtained from Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 (shown by the red lines).
- Gaussian to Gaussian mixture. For Fig. 4(d), the data before the change are *i.i.d.* multivariate Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$, and after the change point at $\tau = 250$, are *i.i.d.* from a mixture Gaussians:

$0.3\mathcal{N}(0, I_2) + 0.7\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1I_2)$. As shown in Fig. 4(d), the online M -statistic detects the change-point quickly using the theoretical threshold.

- Sequence of graphs. Consider a change-point detection problem in the context of detecting an emergence of a community in the network (Marangoni-Simonsen and Xie, 2015). Assume before the change, each sample is a realization of a Erdős-Rényi random graph with the probability of forming an edge uniform across the graph. After the change, a “community” emerges, which is a subgraph where the edges are formed with much higher probability inside. This models a community where the members inside interacts more often. In Fig. 4(e), our online M -statistic hits the threshold quickly after a community forms.
- Real seismic signal. Consider a segment of a real seismic signal. In Fig. 4(f), our online M -statistic crosses the theoretical threshold and detects the seismic event quickly. Here, we also illustrate the effect of kernel bandwidth. The performance of the M -statistic is affected by the kernel bandwidth. For Gaussian RBF kernel $k(Y, Y') = \exp(-\|Y - Y'\|^2/2\sigma^2)$, the kernel bandwidth $\sigma > 0$ is typically chosen by a “median trick” (Scholkopf and Smola, 2001), where σ is set of the median of the pairwise distances between data points. The accuracy of the median trick is justified by a recent work (Ramdas et al., 2015) empirically and theoretically to certain extend.

4. Theoretical properties under H_0 . The following result characterizes the covariance of online and offline M -statistics under H_0 . This allow us to explicitly capture their correlation structures, and it is crucial in deriving the significant level in Theorem 3 and the average run length (ARL) in Theorem 4.

LEMMA 2 (Covariance structure of Z -statistic). *Under the null hypothesis, for the offline case, given $u, v \in [2, B_{\max}]$,*

$$(4.1) \quad r_{u,v} = \text{Cov}(Z'_u, Z'_v) = \sqrt{\binom{u}{2}\binom{v}{2}} / \binom{u \vee v}{2},$$

where $u \vee v = \max\{u, v\}$, and for the online case, given $s \geq 0$,

$$(4.2) \quad r'_{u,v} = \text{Cov}(M_u, M_{u+s}) = \left(1 - \frac{s}{B_0}\right) \left(1 - \frac{s}{B_0 - 1}\right).$$

In the offline setting, the choice of the threshold b involves a tradeoff between two standard performance metrics: (1) the significant level (SL), which is the probability that the M -statistic exceeds the threshold b under the null hypothesis (i.e., when there is no change); and (2) power, which is the probability of the statistic exceeds the threshold under the alternative hypothesis. In the online setting, there are two related performance metrics commonly used (Xie and Siegmund, 2013): (1) the average run length (ARL), which is the expected time before incorrectly announcing a change of distribution when none has occurred; (2) the expected detection delay (EDD), which is the expected time to fire an alarm in the extreme case where a change occurs immediately at $\tau = 0$. The EDD provides an upper bound on the expected delay to detect a change-point when the change occurs later in the sequence of observations. In the following, we present accurate approximations to the SL and ARL of our methods. These approximations are quite useful in controlling the false-alarms. Given a prescribed SL or ARL, we can determine the corresponding threshold value b without having to recurring to the onerous numerical simulations (especially for the high-dimensional non-parametric setting).




Fig 4: Examples of offline and online M -statistic with $N = 5$. All thresholds are theoretical values and are marked in red. (a) and (b): Offline statistic without and with a change-point ($B_{\max} = 500$, and in (b) the maximum is obtained at $B = 263$). (c) Online statistic with a change-point at $\tau = 250$ and we use $B_0 = 50$. The procedure stops at time 268, which corresponds to a detection delay 18. (d) Online statistic with a change-point at $\tau = 250$ and we use $B_0 = 20$. The procedure stops at time 270, which corresponds to a detection delay 20. (e) Online statistic to detect the emergence of community at $\tau = 100$ and we use $B_0 = 10$. The stopping time $T = 102$, which corresponds to a detection delay 2. (f) A real seismic signal with a change-point corresponds to a seismic event. We illustrate M -statistic with different kernel bandwidth, which all detect the event.

4.1. *Significant level (SL) approximation.* Let $\mathbb{P}^\infty$ and $\mathbb{E}^\infty$ denote, respectively, the probability measure and expectation under the null, i.e., when there is no change-point.

THEOREM 3 (SL in offline case). *When $b \rightarrow \infty$ and $b/\sqrt{B_{\max}} \rightarrow c$ for some constant c , the significant level of the offline M -statistic defined in (3.2) is given by*

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbb{P}^\infty \left\{ \max_{B \in \{2, 3, \dots, B_{\max}\}} \frac{Z_B}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_B]}} > b \right\} = b^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}b^2} \cdot \sum_{B=2}^{B_{\max}} \frac{(2B-1)}{2\sqrt{2\pi}B(B-1)} \nu \left(b \sqrt{\frac{2B-1}{B(B-1)}} \right) + o(1),$$

where the special function

$$\nu(u) \approx \frac{(2/u)(\Phi(u/2) - 0.5)}{(u/2)\Phi(u/2) + \phi(u/2)},$$

ϕ is the probability density function and $\Phi(x)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution, respectively.

The derivation of Theorem 3 uses a change-of-measure argument based on the likelihood ratio identity (see, e.g., (Siegmund, 1985; Yakir, 2013)), through a series of steps in which the large deviation part of the probability $e^{-b^2/2}$ is obtained first (derived from the Gaussian approximation for Z_B), followed by refinements that result from the identification of the contributions due to global and local fluctuations. Note that the large deviation part establishes the exponential rate at which the probability converges to zero, but will not be accurate enough. The remaining effort of our analysis produces refined approximations, including polynomial terms and associated constants. More details for the proof can be found in the appendix.

In a nutshell, the likelihood ratio identity relates computing of the tail probability under the null to computing a sum of expectations each under an alternative distribution indexed by a particular parameter value. To illustrate, assume the probability density function (pdf) under the null to be $f(u)$. Given a function $g_\omega(x)$, with ω in some index set Ω , we may introduce a family of alternative distributions with pdf $f_\omega(u) = e^{\theta g_\omega(u) - \psi_\omega(\theta)} f(u)$, where $\psi_\omega(\theta) = \log \int e^{\theta g_\omega(u)} f(u) du$ is the log moment generating function, and θ is the parameter that we assign an arbitrary value. It can be easily verified that $f_\omega(u)$ is a pdf. Using this family of alternatives, we may calculate the probability of an event A under the original distribution f , by calculating a sum of expectations:

$$\mathbb{P}\{A\} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} e^{\ell_\omega}}{\sum_{s \in \Omega} e^{\ell_s}}; A \right] = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathbb{E}_\omega [e^{\ell_\omega}; A],$$

where $\mathbb{E}[U; A] = \mathbb{E}[U \mathbb{I}\{A\}]$, and the indicator function $\mathbb{I}\{A\}$ is one when event A is true and is zero otherwise; $\mathbb{E}_\omega$ is the expectation using pdf $f_\omega(u)$; $\ell_\omega = \log[f(u)/f_\omega(u)] = \theta g_\omega(u) - \psi_\omega(\theta)$ is the log-likelihood ratio and we have the freedom to choose a different θ value for each f_ω .

Specific to our setting, the basic idea of change-of-measure is to treat Z'_B in (3.2) as a random field indexed by B . Relate this to above, Z'_B corresponds to $g_\omega(u)$, B corresponds to ω , and A corresponds to the threshold crossing event. Then to compute the expectations under the alternative measures, we first choose a parameter value θ_B for each measure associated with a parameter value B such that $\psi_B(\theta_B) = b$. This is equivalent to setting the mean under each alternative measure to the threshold b value, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_B[Z'_B] = b$. This allows the local central limit theorem to be applied, since under this alternative measure, boundary cross event occurs with much higher probability. Second, we express the random quantities involved in the expectations as functions of the “local field” $\{\ell_B - \ell_s : s = B, B \pm 1, \dots\}$, as well as the re-centered log-likelihood ratios $\tilde{\ell}_B \triangleq \ell_B - b$. These two quantities are asymptotically independent as $b \rightarrow \infty$ at a rate of $\sqrt{B}$, which further simplifies calculation. The last step is to exploit the covariance structure of the random field (Lemma 2 (4.1)) and approximate it via Gaussian random field. This way we explicitly characterize that the unavoidable correlation in Z'_u and Z'_v involved in our detection statistic, since they share the same post-change block $Y^{(u \wedge v)}$ and reference blocks $X_i^{(u \wedge v)}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. An application of the localization theorem (Theorem 5.2 in (Yakir, 2013)) finalizes the result.

We demonstrate the accuracy of the approximation in Theorem 3 on synthetic and real data. Synthetic data are generated *i.i.d.* $\mathcal{N}(0, I_{20})$ to represent the null distribution. The maximum block size $B_{\max} = 20$, and the number of reference blocks $N = 10$. First, given a prescribed SL value α , we compare the threshold determined by theory and by simulation. To obtain threshold by simulation, we run Monte Carlo trials to generate empirical distributions, and find the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile as the estimated threshold. Tables 1 demonstrates that for various choices of $B_{\max}$, the thresholds predicted by our theory (Theorem 3) matches quite well with those obtained from simulation for the synthetic data. The accuracy can be further improved for smaller α values, by a correction scheme (in Section 6) that utilizes the estimated skewness.

Furthermore, we consider a real-data example generated using the CENSREC-1-C dataset (more details in Section 7). In this case, the null corresponds to the unknown distribution of the background speech signal, and we only have 3000 samples of such speech signals. Hence, we use bootstrap to generate 10000 re-samples to estimate the empirical distribution of the detection statistic. This case is more challenging, because the true distribution of the speech data can be arbitrary. Table 2 demonstrates that the thresholds predicted by theory is accurate even in this case. Also note that the accuracy improves more significantly by skewness correction in this case.

TABLE 1

Comparison of thresholds for the offline case using **synthetic data**, determined by simulation, theory (Theorem 3), and Skewness Correction (SC, Equation (6.4)), respectively, for various SL value α . In the SC column, values in the parentheses represent the standard deviation based on 100 trials.

α	$B_{\max} = 10$			$B_{\max} = 20$			$B_{\max} = 50$		
	b (sim)	b (theory)	b (SC)	b (sim)	b (theory)	b (SC)	b (sim)	b (theory)	b (SC)
0.10	2.29	2.40	2.65 (0.10)	2.47	2.60	2.90 (0.12)	2.70	2.80	3.14 (0.17)
0.05	2.72	2.72	3.02 (0.12)	2.88	2.90	3.25 (0.14)	3.15	3.08	3.46 (0.19)
0.01	3.74	3.30	3.71 (0.16)	3.68	3.46	3.87 (0.16)	4.08	3.62	4.02 (0.19)

TABLE 2

Comparison of thresholds for the offline case using **real speech data**, determined by bootstrapping speech samples, theory (Theorem 3), and Skewness Correction (SC, Equation (6.4)), respectively, for various SL value α . In the SC column, values in the parentheses represent the standard deviation based on 100 trials.

α	$B_{\max} = 10$			$B_{\max} = 20$			$B_{\max} = 50$		
	b (boot)	b (theory)	b (SC)	b (boot)	b (theory)	b (SC)	b (boot)	b (theory)	b (SC)
0.10	2.45	2.40	3.03 (0.11)	3.09	2.60	3.41 (0.16)	3.25	2.80	3.78 (0.17)
0.05	3.17	2.72	3.47 (0.12)	3.84	2.90	3.83 (0.18)	4.01	3.08	4.19 (0.19)
0.01	4.80	3.30	4.32 (0.16)	5.51	3.46	4.67 (0.23)	5.70	3.62	5.01 (0.24)

4.2. Approximation to average run length (ARL).

THEOREM 4 (ARL in online case). *When $b \rightarrow \infty$ and $b/\sqrt{B_0} \rightarrow c'$ for some constant c' , the average run length (ARL) of the stopping time T defined in (3.4) is given by*

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbb{E}^\infty[T] = \frac{e^{b^2/2}}{b^2} \cdot \left\{ \frac{(2B_0 - 1)}{\sqrt{2\pi}B_0(B_0 - 1)} \cdot \nu \left(b \sqrt{\frac{2(2B_0 - 1)}{B_0(B_0 - 1)}} \right) \right\}^{-1} + o(1).$$

Proof for Theorem 4 is similar to that for Theorem 3, due to the fact that for a given $m > 0$, the probability that the procedure defined in (3.4) stops before a constant time $m > 0$ can be written as

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbb{P}^\infty\{T \leq m\} = \mathbb{P}^\infty\left\{ \max_{1 \leq t \leq m} M_t > b \right\}.$$

Hence, we also need to study the tail probability of the maximum of a random field $M_t = Z_{B_0,t}/\sqrt{Z_{B_0,t}}$ for a fixed block size B_0 . A similar change-of-measure approach can be used, except that the covariance structure of M_t in the online case ((4.2) in Lemma 2) is different from the offline case ((4.1) in Lemma 2). The tail probability turns out to be in a form of $\mathbb{P}^\infty\{T \leq$

$m\} = m\lambda + o(1)$. Using similar arguments as those in (Siegmund and Venkatraman, 1995; Siegmund and Yakir, 2008), we may see that T is asymptotically exponentially distributed. Hence, $\mathbb{P}^\infty\{T \leq m\} - [1 - \exp(-\lambda m)] \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently $\mathbb{E}^\infty\{T\} \approx \lambda^{-1}$, which leads to (4.4).

Theorem 4 also shows that ARL is $\mathcal{O}(e^{b^2})$ and, hence, b is $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log \text{ARL}})$. On the other hand, EDD is typically on the order of b/Δ using the Wald's identity (Siegmund, 1985), where Δ is the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the null and alternative distributions (a constant). Hence, given a desired ARL (typically on the order of 5000 or 10000), the error made in the estimated threshold will only be translated linearly to EDD. This is a blessing as it means typically a reasonably accurate b will cause little performance loss in EDD. Similarly, Theorem 3 shows that SL is $\mathcal{O}(e^{-b^2})$ and a similar argument can be made for the offline case.

We compare the thresholds obtained by Theorem 4 with that obtained from simulation. Consider several cases of null distributions, the standard normal $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, exponential distribution with mean 1, a Erdős-Rényi random graph with 10 nodes and probability of 0.2 of forming random edges, as well as Laplace distribution with zero mean and unit variance. The simulation method for determining threshold for a given ARL uses 5000 Monte Carlo trials. Note that the ARL predicted by Theorem 4 only depends on the number of blocks and is independent of the true underlying null distribution. This is verified by our simulation in Fig. 5 as the thresholds predicted by Theorem 4 is reasonably accurate for all cases of null distributions.

Fig. 5 also demonstrated that theory is quite accurate for various block sizes (especially for larger B_0). However, we also note that theory tends to underestimate the thresholds. This is especially pronounced for small B_0 , e.g., $B_0 = 10$. The accuracy of the theoretical results can be improved by skewness correction, shown by black lines in Fig. 5, and are discussed later in Section 6.

5. Power and EDD under H_1 . In this section, we compare the power of the offline M -statistic and the EDD of the online M -statistic with alternative methods when there is a change-point.

5.1. Offline: comparison with parametric tests. We compare our offline M -statistics with two commonly used parametric tests, the Hotelling's T^2 and the generalized likelihood ratio (GLR). Given a batch of observations $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ with $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, *i.i.d.* from a distribution P (note that n corresponds to $B_{\max}$ in our setting). For any possible change-point k , the Hotelling's T^2 statistic is defined as

$$T^2(k) = \frac{k(n-k)}{n} (\bar{x}_k - \bar{x}_k^*)^T \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} (\bar{x}_k - \bar{x}_k^*),$$

where, $\bar{x}_k = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i/k$, $\bar{x}_k^* = \sum_{i=k+1}^n x_i/(n-k)$ and

$$\hat{\Sigma} = (n-2)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (x_i - \bar{x}_i)(x_i - \bar{x}_i)^T + \sum_{i=k+1}^n (x_i - \bar{x}_i^*)(x_i - \bar{x}_i^*)^T \right).$$

The the Hotelling's T^2 detects a change whenever $\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} T^2(k)$ exceeds a threshold. The GLR statistic is defined as

$$\ell(k) = n \log |\hat{\Sigma}_n| - k \log |\hat{\Sigma}_k| - (n-k) \log |\hat{\Sigma}_k^*|,$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}_k = k^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (x_i - \bar{x}_i)(x_i - \bar{x}_i)^T \right)$, and $\hat{\Sigma}_k^* = (n-k)^{-1} \sum_{i=k+1}^n (x_i - \bar{x}_i^*)(x_i - \bar{x}_i^*)^T$. The GLR test detects a change whenever $\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \ell(k)$ exceeds a threshold.




Fig 5: For a range of ARL values of the online M -statistic, comparison of thresholds b determined from simulation, versus b from Theorem 4 and from the skewness correction (6.4) under various null distributions.

In the examples, we use $n = B_{\max} = 200$, let the change-point occurs at $\tau = 100$, and choose the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Thresholds for the offline M -statistic is obtained from Theorem 3, and for the other two methods are obtained from simulations. Consider the following six cases:

- Case 1 (mean-shift): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(0.1 \cdot \mathbf{1}, I_{20})$;
- Case 2 (mean-shift): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(0.2 \cdot \mathbf{1}, I_{20})$;
- Case 3 (variance-change): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$, where $[\Sigma]_{11} = 2$ and $[\Sigma]_{ii} = 1$, $i = 2, \dots, 20$;
- Case 4 (mean and variance change): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(0.2 \cdot \mathbf{1}, \Sigma)$, where $[\Sigma]_{11} = 2$ and $[\Sigma]_{ii} = 1$, $i = 2, \dots, 20$;
- Case 5 (model for sparse slope change (Cao, Xie and Gebraeel, 2015) and the post-change mean increases with a constant rate), distribution shifts from x_i i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$, $i = 1, \dots, 100$, to x_i i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(\mu_i, I_{20})$, $i = 101, \dots, 150$, with $[\mu_i]_j = 0.02(i - 100)$, if $j \in \mathcal{S}$, for a set $\mathcal{S}$ with

TABLE 3
Power, offline, thresholds for all methods are calibrated so that $\alpha = 0.05$.

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6
M -statistic	0.71 (0.45)	1.00 (1.00)	0.26 (0.20)	1.00 (1.00)	0.37 (0.31)	0.44 (0.30)
Hotelling's T^2	0.18	0.88	0.07	0.87	0.19	0.03
GLR	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.12	0.04	0.04

cardinality $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$;

- Case 6 (Gaussian to Laplace): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ to Laplace distribution with zero mean and unit variance. In this one-dimensional case we compare against the Shewhart control chart (which corresponds to the one-dimensional version of Hotelling's T^2).

Above, $\mathbf{0}$ denotes a vector of all zeros, $\mathbf{1}$ denotes a vector of all ones, and $[\Sigma]_{ij}$ denotes the ij th element of a matrix Σ .

We evaluate the power for each case using 100 Monte Carlo trials. Table 3 shows that the M -statistic has higher power than the Hotelling's T^2 statistic and the GLR statistic in all cases. The GLR statistic performs the worst, especially in the high-dimensional instances, since it needs to estimate the post-change covariance matrix from a very limited number of samples.

5.2. *Online: comparison with Hotelling's T^2 .* We fix ARL for all procedures to be 5000 and the block-size $B_0 = 20$. We compare the online M -statistic with a modified Hotelling's T^2 statistic¹, which is given by

$$T^2(t) = B_0(\bar{x}_t - \hat{\mu})^T \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}(\bar{x}_t - \hat{\mu}),$$

where $\bar{x}_t = (\sum_{i=B_0+1}^t x_i)/B_0$, and $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}$ are estimated from reference data. A change-point is detected whenever $T^2(t)$ exceeds a threshold for the first time. The threshold for online M -statistic is obtained from Theorem 4, and from simulations for the Hotelling's T^2 statistic. To simulate EDD, let the change occur at the first point of the testing data. Consider the following cases:

- Case 1 (mean shift): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(0.2 \cdot \mathbf{0}, I_{20})$;
- Case 2 (mean shift): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(0.3 \cdot \mathbf{1}, I_{20})$;
- Case 3 (covariance change): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$, where $[\Sigma]_{ii} = 2$, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ and $[\Sigma]_{ii} = 1$, $i = 6, \dots, 20$;
- Case 4 (covariance change): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, 2 \cdot I_{20})$;
- Case 5 (slope change): similar to the offline case, we randomly choose two dimensions with mean increasing at rate 0.01;
- Case 6 (slope change): similar to Case 5, except that the mean increasing at rate 0.02;
- Case 7 (Gaussian to Gaussian mixture): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to mixture Gaussian $0.3\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20}) + 0.7\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, 0.1 \cdot I_{20})$;
- Case 8 (Gaussian to Laplace): distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ to Laplace distribution with zero mean and unit variance.

We evaluate the EDD for each case using 500 Monte Carlo trials. Note that since $B_0 = 20$, the EDD of both methods will be at least 20. The results are summarized in Table 4. Note that in detecting changes in either Gaussian mean or covariance, the online M -statistic performs competitively with Hotelling's T^2 , which is tailored to the Gaussian distribution. In the more challenging

¹Note that we do not compare the online M -statistic with the GLR statistic, since Hotelling's T^2 consistently outperforms GLR in the high-dimensional setting.

TABLE 4
EDD, online, $B_0 = 20$, thresholds for all methods are calibrated so that $ARL = 5000$.

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7	Case 8
M -statistic	67.47	24.20	29.10	20.00	83.00	49.18	33.81	20.00
Hotelling's T^2	77.67	22.47	45.46	21.27	92.77	53.76	×	×

scenarios such as Case 7 and Case 8, the Hotelling's T^2 completely fails to detect the change-point where as the online M -statistic can still detect the change fairly quickly.

5.3. *Online: EDD of M -statistic versus block-size B_0 .* Lastly, we investigate the dependence of EDD of the M -statistic on the pre-defined block size B_0 . This example may also shed some light on how to choose B_0 in practice. The rationale is that, on the one-hand, the detection delay (DD) is greater than B_0 , since we need at least B_0 samples to compute one M -statistic. Hence, a large B_0 will artificially impose a longer EDD. On the other hand, when block size is too small, we do may not pool enough post-change samples and the statistical power of the M -statistic is weak, which will also result in a large EDD. Hence, there should be an optimal choice for B_0 that minimizes the EDD. This is validated by our numerical example. Consider the distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(\mu, I_{20})$, with μ being element-wise equal to a non-zero constant. In Figure 6(a), the shift size of the mean is 0.2, where the minimum EDD is achieved by $B_0 = 28$. Figure 6(b) shows the optimal block sizes for a range of values of the mean shift size (from 0.1 to 1.2).




Fig 6: Online M -statistic for a case where the distribution shifts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, I_{20})$ to $\mathcal{N}(\mu, I_{20})$, with μ being element-wise equal to a non-zero constant. (a) $\log(\text{EDD})$ versus block size and the optimal block size $B_0 = 28$ corresponds to a minimum EDD; (b) optimal block sizes versus the size of the mean shift.

6. Skewness correction. Although our approximations to SL and ARL assuming Z'_B being a standard normal works fairly well, in fact, Z'_B does not converge to normal distribution in any sense. Below we first illustrate this fact, and then present some improved approximations by taking into account the skewness of Z'_B .

6.1. *Z'_B does not converge to standard normal.* The distribution of Z_B (unnormalized Z'_B) can be fairly well approximated by a normal, as demonstrated earlier in Figure 3. However, Z'_B does not converge to normal distribution even when B is large and it has a non-vanishing skewness that we

will characterize. Recall that Z_B is zero-mean. Hence, the skewness of Z'_B is related to the variance and third-order moment of Z_B via

$$(6.1) \quad \kappa(Z'_B) = \mathbb{E}[Z_B^3] = \text{Var}[Z_B]^{-3/2} \mathbb{E}[Z_B^3].$$

First, we obtain an analytic expression of the third order moment.

LEMMA 5 (Third-order moment of Z_B under the null).

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_B^3] = & \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x'', x, y'', y)] \right. \\ & + \frac{3(N-1)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x''', x''''', y'', y)] \\ & + \left. \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x'', x''', y', y'') h(x''''', x''''', y'', y)] \right\} \\ & + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^3] \right. \\ & + \frac{3(N-1)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^2 h(x'', x''', y, y')] \\ & + \left. \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x'', x''', y, y') h(x''''', x''''', y, y')] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5 leads to the fact the skewness of Z'_B is non-zero. This is because the third-order moment of Z_B scales as $\mathcal{O}(B^{-3})$ (due to (6.2)), but when dividing via (6.1) by its variance which scales as $\mathcal{O}(B^{-2})$, the skewness becomes a constant with respect to B . Furthermore, examining the Taylor expansion of moment generating function at $\theta = 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Z'_B}] = 1 + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[Z'_B]}_0 \theta + \frac{\theta^2}{2} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[(Z'_B)^2]}_1 + \frac{\theta^3}{6} \mathbb{E}[(Z'_B)^3 e^{\theta Z'_B}] + o(\theta^3).$$

Recall that the moment generating function of a standard normal Z is given by $\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Z}] = 1 + \frac{\theta^2}{2} + o(\theta^3)$. The difference between the two moment generating functions is given by

$$(6.3) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Z'_B}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Z}] \right| = \frac{|\theta|^3}{6} |\mathbb{E}[(Z'_B)^3 e^{\theta' Z'_B}]| + o(\theta^3) > \frac{|\theta|^3}{6} c |\mathbb{E}[(Z'_B)^3]| + o(\theta^3),$$

where the inequality is due to the fact that $e^{\theta' Z'_B} > 0$ and we may assume it is larger than an absolute constant c . From (6.1), the first term on the right hand side of (6.3) is given by $(c\theta^3/6)\text{Var}[Z_B]^{-3/2}|\mathbb{E}[Z_B^3]|$, which is clearly bounded away from zero. Hence,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Z'_B}] - \left(1 + \frac{\theta^2}{2}\right) \right| > \frac{|\theta|^3}{6} \gamma + o(\theta^3)$$

for some constant $\gamma > 0$. This shows that the difference between the moment generating functions of Z'_B and a standard normal is always non-zero and, hence, Z'_B does not converge to a standard normal in any sense.

Although the result above is discouraging, the difference between the moment generating functions of Z'_B and the standard normal distribution is not very large and can be upper bounded. By applying a result on Page 220 of (Yakir, 2013), we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Z'_B}] - \left(1 + \frac{\theta^2}{2}\right) \right| \leq \min \left\{ \frac{|\theta|^3}{6} \mathbb{E}[|Z'_B|^3], \theta^2 \mathbb{E}[|Z'_B|^2] \right\}.$$

and if considering the skewness $\kappa(Z_B^3)$

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Z'_B}] - \left(1 + \frac{\theta^2}{2} + \frac{\theta^3 \kappa(Z_B^3)}{6}\right) \right| \leq \min\left\{\frac{\theta^4}{24} \mathbb{E}[|Z'_B|^4], \frac{1}{3} |\theta|^3 \mathbb{E}[|Z'_B|^3]\right\}.$$

6.2. Skewness correction for significance level and ARL. By taking into account of the skewness of Z_B , we can improve the accuracy of the approximations for SL in Theorem 3 and for ARL in 4. Recall that when deriving approximations using change-of-measurement, we choose parameter θ_B such that the moment generating function $\dot{\psi}_B(\theta_B) = b$. If Z'_B is assumed to be a standard normal, $\psi_B(\theta) = \theta^2/2$, and hence $\theta_B = b$. Skewness correction can be achieved by incorporating an additional term for the log moment generating function when solving for θ_B :

$$\dot{\psi}_B(\theta) \approx \theta + \mathbb{E}[Z_B^3] \theta^2/2 = b.$$

This will change the leading exponent term in (4.3) from $e^{-b^2/2}$ to be $e^{\psi'_B(\theta'_B) - \theta'_B b}$. For instance, the approximation for SL of the offline M -statistic with the skewness correction is given by

$$(6.4) \quad \mathbb{P}^\infty \left\{ \max_{B \in \{2, 3, \dots, B_{\max}\}} \frac{Z_B}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_B]}} > b \right\} = \sum_{B=2}^{B_{\max}} e^{\psi_B(\theta_B) - \theta_B b} \cdot b^2 \cdot \frac{(2B-1)}{2\sqrt{2\pi}B(B-1)} \nu \left(b \sqrt{\frac{2B-1}{B(B-1)}} \right) + o(1).$$

A similar correction can be done for the ARL approximation in Theorem 4. The skewness correction can be important, since it appears in the exponent of the expressions. We found that the skewness correction is especially useful when SL is small (e.g. $\alpha = 0.01$) for the offline case or when block size B_0 is small (see Table 1, 2 and Fig. 5).

Another consequence of Lemma 5 is that we can estimate the skewness $\kappa(Z_B)$ efficiently and avoid the onerous direct sampling of Z_B . Lemma 5 and (6.1) reduce the skewness estimation to evaluating eight simpler terms in (6.2). For instance, to evaluate $\mathbb{E}[h(x, x', y, y')h(x', x'', y', y'')h(x'', x, y'', y)]$, we may use direct Monte Carlo: draw a group of six samples without replacement from the reference data, treat them as x, x', x'', y, y' and y'' , evaluate the sampled function value, repeat and then form an average.

7. Real-data. We also test the performance of our M -statistics on real data. Our datasets include: (1) CENSREC-1-C: a real-world speech dataset in the Speech Resource Consortium (SRC) corpora provided by National Institute of Informatics (NII)²; (2) Human Activity Sensing Consortium (HASC) challenge 2011 data³. We compare our M -statistic with a baseline algorithm, the relative density-ratio (RDR) estimate (Liu et al., 2013). One limitation of the RDR algorithm, however, is that it is not suitable for high-dimensional data because estimating density ratio in the high-dimensional setting is an ill-posed problem. To achieve reasonable performance for the RDR algorithm, we adjust the bandwidth and the regularization parameter at each time step and, hence, the RDR algorithm is computationally more expensive than using M -statistics. We adopt the Area Under Curve (AUC) (Liu et al., 2013) (the larger the better) as a performance metric.

Our M -statistics have very competitive performance compared with the baseline RDR algorithm on the real data. Here we report the main results and omit the details due to space limit but they can be found in Appendix A. For speech data, our goal is to online detect the onset of a speech signal emergent from the background. The backgrounds are taken from real acoustic signals, such

²Available from <http://research.nii.ac.jp/src/en/CENSREC-1-C.html>

³Available from <http://hasc.jp/hc2011>

as noise in highway, airport and subway stations. The overall AUC for the M -statistic is **0.8014** and for the baseline algorithm is **0.7578**. For human activity detection data, our goal is to detect a transition from one activity to another as quickly as possible. Each data consists six possible of human activity data collected by portable three-axis accelerometers. The overall AUC for the M -statistic is **0.8871** and for the baseline algorithm is **0.7161**.

8. Discussions. There are a few possible directions to extend our M -statistics. (1) Currently, we assume that data are *i.i.d.* from a null distribution P and when the change happens, data are *i.i.d.* from an alternative distribution Q . Under these assumptions, we have developed the offline and online change-point detection method based on the kernel two-sample test statistic MMD. Our M -statistic can detect the existence of such a change powerfully and quickly. Moreover, the M -statistic can also pinpoint the change-point accurately. One may relax the temporal independence assumption and extend M -statistics for dependent data by incorporating ideas from (Chwialkowski and Gretton, 2014). (2) We have demonstrated how the number of blocks and block size affect the performance of M -statistics. One can also explore how kernel bandwidth as well as the dimensionality of the data would affect the performance. An empirical observation is that the performance of MMD statistic degrades with the increasing dimensions in data. Some recent results for kernel based test can be found in (Ramdas et al., 2015). We may adopt the idea of (Ramdas et al., 2015) to extend our M -statistics for detecting change in the dependence. (3) Lastly, for really high dimensional dataset with large Gram matrix, one can perform random subsampling to reduce complexity similar to (Xie, Liang and Song, 2015).

References.

- CAO, Y., XIE, Y. and GEBRAEEL, N. (2015). Multi-sensor slope change detection. *arXiv:1509.00114*.
- CHWIALKOWSKI, K. and GRETTON, A. (2014). A kernel independence test for random processes. *arXiv:1402.4501*.
- DESOBRY, F., DAVY, M. and DONCARLI, C. (2005). An online kernel change detection algorithm. *IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc.*
- ENIKEEVA, F. and HARCHAOU, Z. (2014). High-dimensional change-point detection with sparse alternatives. *arXiv:1312.1900*.
- GORDON, L. and POLLAK, M. (1994). An efficient sequential nonparametric scheme for detecting a change of distribution. *Annals of Statistics* **22** 763-804.
- GRETTON, A., BORWARDT, K. M., RASCH, M. J., SCHÖLKOPF, B. and SMOLA, A. (2012). A kernel two-sample test. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **13** 723-773.
- HARCHAOU, Z., BACH, F. and MOULINES, E. (2008). Kernel change-point analysis. In *Adv. in Neural Information Processing Systems 21 (NIPS 2008)*.
- HARCHAOU, Z., BACH, F., CAPPE, O. and MOULINES, E. (2013). Kernel-based methods for hypothesis testing. *IEEE Sig. Proc. Magazine* 87-97.
- KIFER, D., BEN-DAVID, S. and GEHRKE, J. (2004). Detecting change in data streams. In *Proc. of the 30th VLDB Conf.*
- LIU, S., YAMADA, M., COLLIER, N. and SUGIYAMA, M. (2013). Change-point detection in time-series data by direct density-ratio estimation. *Neural Networks* **43** 72-83.
- MARANGONI-SIMONSEN, D. and XIE, Y. (2015). Sequential changepoint approach for online community detection. *Signal Processing Letters, IEEE* **22** 1035-1039.
- RAMDAS, A., JAKKAM REDDI, S., PÓCZOS, B., SINGH, A. and WASSERMAN, L. (2015). On the decreasing power of kernel and distance based nonparametric hypothesis tests in high dimensions. In *Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- ROSS, Z. E. and BEN-ZION, Y. (2014). Automatic picking of direct P , S seismic phases and fault zone head waves. *Geophys. J. Int.*
- SCHOLKOPF, B. and SMOLA, A. J. (2001). *Learning with kernels: support vector machines, regularization, optimization, and beyond*. MIT press.
- SCHÖLKOPF, B. and SMOLA, A. J. (2002). *Learning with Kernels*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- SCHÖLKOPF, B., TSUDA, K. and VERT, J. P. (2004). *Kernel Methods in Computational Biology*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

- SERFLING, R. J. (1980). *U-Statistics. Approximation theorems of mathematical statistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- SIEGMUND, D. (1985). *Sequential analysis: tests and confidence intervals*. Springer.
- SIEGMUND, D. and VENKATRAMAN, E. S. (1995). Using the generalized likelihood ratio statistic for sequential detection of a change-point. *Ann. Statist.* 23 255-271.
- SIEGMUND, D. and YAKIR, B. (2008). Detecting the emergence of a signal in a noisy image. *Stat. Interface* 1 3-12.
- XIE, B., LIANG, Y. and SONG, L. (2015). Scale Up Nonlinear Component Analysis with Doubly Stochastic Gradients. *Advances in neural information processing systems (NIPS)*.
- XIE, Y. and SIEGMUND, D. (2013). Sequential multi-sensor change-point detection. *Annals of Statistics* 41 670-692.
- YAKIR, B. (2013). *Extremes in random fields: A theory and its applications*. Wiley.
- ZAREMBA, W., GRETTON, A. and BLASCHKO, M. (2013). *B*-test: low variance kernel two-sample test. In *Adv. Neural Info. Proc. Sys. (NIPS)*.
- ZOU, S., LIANG, Y., POOR, H. V. and SHI, X. (2014). Nonparametric detection of anomalous data via kernel mean embedding. *arXiv:1405.2294*.

APPENDIX A: MORE DETAILS FOR REAL-DATA EXPERIMENTS

A.1. CENSREC-1-C Speech dataset. CENSREC-1-C is a real-world speech dataset in the Speech Resource Consortium (SRC) corpora provided by National Institute of Informatics (NII)⁴. This dataset contains two categories of data: (1) Simulated data. The simulated speech data are constructed by concatenating several utterances spoken by one speaker. Each concatenated sequence is then added with 7 different levels of noise from 8 different environments. So there are totally 56 different noise. Each noise setting contains 104 sequences from 52 males and 52 females speakers. (2) Recording data. The recording data is from two real-noisy environments (in university restaurant and in the vicinity of highway), and with two Signal Noise Ratio (SNR) settings (lower and higher). Ten subjects were employed for recording, and each one has four speech sequence data.

Experiment Settings. We will compare our algorithm with the baseline algorithm from (Liu et al., 2013). (Liu et al., 2013) only utilized 10 sequences from “STREET_SNR_HIGH” setting in recording data. Here we will use all the settings in recording data, the SNR level 20db and clean signals from simulated data. See Figure 7 for some examples of the testing data, as well as the statistics computed by our algorithm. For each sequence, we decompose it into several segments. Each segment consists of two types of signals (noise vs speech). Given the reference data from noise, we want to detect the point where the signal changes from noise to speech.

Evaluation Metrics. We use Area Under Curve (AUC) to evaluate the computed statistics, like in (Liu et al., 2013). Specifically, for each test sequence that consists of two signal distributions, we will mark the points as change-points whose statistics exceed the given threshold. If the distance between detected point and true change-point is within the size of detection window, then we consider it as True Alarm (True Positive). Otherwise it is a False Alarm (False Positive).

We use 10% of the sequences to tune the parameters of both algorithms, and use the rest 90% for reporting AUC. The kernel bandwidth is tuned in $\{0.1d_{med}, 0.5d_{med}, d_{med}, 2d_{med}, 5d_{med}\}$, where d_{med} is the median of pairwise distances of reference data. Block size is fixed to 50, and the number of blocks is simply tuned in $\{10, 20, 30\}$.

Results. Table 5 shows the AUC of two algorithms on different background settings. Our algorithm surpasses the baseline on most cases. Both algorithms are performing quite well on the simulated clean data, since the difference between speech signals and background is more significant than the noisy ones. The averaged AUC of our algorithm on all these settings is **.8014**, compared to **.7578** achieved by baseline algorithm. See the ROC curves in Figure 8 for a better comparison.

A.2. HASC human activity dataset. This data is from *Human Activity Sensing Consortium (HASC) challenge 2011*⁵. Each data consists of human activity information collected by portable three-axis accelerometers. Following the setting in (Liu et al., 2013), we use the ℓ_2 -norm of 3-dimensional data (i.e., the magnitude of acceleration) as the signals.

We use the ‘RealWorldData’ from HASC Challenge 2011, which consists of 6 kinds of human activities (walk/jog, stairUp/stairDown, elevatorUp/elevatorDown, escalatorUp/escalatorDown, movingWalkway, stay). We make pairs of signal sequences from different activity categories, and remove the sequences which are too short. We finally get 381 sequences. We tune the parameters using the same way as in CENSREC-1-C experiment. The AUC of our algorithm is **.8871**, compared to **.7161** achieved by baseline algorithm, which greatly improved the performance.

Examples of the signals are shown in Figure 9. Some sequences are easy to find the change-point, like Figure 9a, and 9d. Some pairs of the signals are hard to distinguish visually, like

⁴Available from <http://research.nii.ac.jp/src/en/CENSREC-1-C.html>

⁵<http://hasc.jp/hc2011>




Fig 7: Examples of speech dataset. The red vertical bar shown in the upper part of each figure is the ground truth of change-point; The green vertical bar shown in the lower part is the change-point detected by our algorithm (the point where the statistic exceeds the threshold). We also plot the threshold as a red dash horizontal line in each figure. Once the statistics touch the threshold, we will stop the detection.

Figure 9b and 9c. The examples show that our algorithm can tell the change-point from walk to stairUp/stairDown, or from stairUp/stairDown to escalatorUp/escalatorDown. There are some cases when our algorithm raises false alarm. See Figure 9h. It find a change-point during the activity ‘elevatorUp/elevatorDown’. It is reasonable, since this type of action contains the phase from acceleration to uniform motion, and the phase from uniform motion to acceleration.

APPENDIX B: PROOFS

We start with proving Lemma 6 and Lemma 7, which are useful in proving Lemma 1 and Lemma 2.

LEMMA 6 (Variance of MMD, under the null.). *Under null hypothesis,*

$$(B.1) \quad \text{Var} \left[\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)}) \right] = \binom{B}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')], \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 6. For notational simplicity, we drop the superscript B . Furthermore, under the null hypothesis all data follow the same distribution, we can represent $X_{i,l}$ and $X_{i,j}$ as x and x' , and Y_l and Y_j as y and y' , respectively. For any $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, by definition of U-statistic, we




Fig 8: AUC comparison on speech dataset

TABLE 5

AUC results in CENSREC-1-C speech dataset. Simulated data are from 8 noise categories, and with two different noise levels (clean(C) and SNR 20db (S)); Recording data are from RESTAURANT_SNR_HIGH (RH), RESTAURANT_SNR_LOW (RL), STREET_SNR_HIGH (SH) and STREET_SNR_LOW (SL).

(a) Recording data

	RH	RL	SH	SL
Ours	0.7800	0.7282	0.6507	0.6865
Baseline	0.7503	0.6835	0.4329	0.6432

(b) Simulate clean data

	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8
Ours	0.9413	0.9446	0.9236	0.9251	0.9413	0.9446	0.9236	0.9251
Baseline	0.9138	0.9262	0.8691	0.9128	0.9138	0.9216	0.8691	0.9128

(c) Simulated data with SNR=20db

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8
Ours	0.7048	0.7160	0.7126	0.7129	0.7094	0.7633	0.6796	0.7145
Baseline	0.7083	0.6681	0.6490	0.7119	0.6994	0.6815	0.6487	0.6541

have

(B.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y)] &= \text{Var} \left[\binom{B}{2}^{-1} \sum_{l < j} h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, Y_l, Y_j) \right] \\ &= \binom{B}{2}^{-2} \left[\binom{B}{2} \binom{2}{1} \binom{B-2}{2-1} \text{Var} [\mathbb{E}_{x_i y} [h(x, x', y, y')]] + \binom{B}{2} \binom{2}{2} \binom{B-2}{2-2} \text{Var} [h(x, x', y, y')] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Under null distribution, $\mathbb{E}_{x_i y} [h(x, x', y, y')] = 0$. Thus, $\text{Var} [\mathbb{E}_{x_i y} [h(x, x', y, y')]] = 0$, and

$$\text{Var} [h(x, x', y, y')] = \mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')] - \mathbb{E}[h(x, x', y, y')]^2 = \mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')].$$

Substitute these results in (B.2), we obtain the desired result (B.1). □

LEMMA 7 (Covariance of MMD, under the null, same block size.). *For $s \neq 0$, under null hypothesis*

$$\text{Cov} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)}), \text{MMD}^2(X_{i+s}^{(B)}, Y^{(B)})] = \binom{B}{2}^{-1} \text{Cov} [h(x_i, x'_i, y, y'), h(x_{i+s}, x'_{i+s}, y, y')].$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 7. For notational simplicity, we drop the superscript B . For $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$,




Fig 9: Examples of HASC dataset. The markers in this figure are the same as in Figure 7.

and $s = (1 - i), (2 - i), \dots, (N - i), s \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Cov} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y), \text{MMD}^2(X_{i+s}, Y)] \\
&= \text{Cov} \left[\binom{B}{2}^{-1} \sum_{l < j} h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, Y_l, Y_j), \binom{B}{2}^{-1} \sum_{p < q} h(X_{i+s,p}, X_{i+s,q}, Y_p, Y_q) \right] \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-2} \binom{B}{2} \binom{2}{1} \binom{B-2}{2-1} \text{Cov} [h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, y, Y_j), h(X_{i+s,p}, X_{i+s,q}, Y_p, Y_q)] \\
&\quad + \binom{B}{2}^{-2} \binom{B}{2} \binom{2}{2} \binom{B-2}{2-2} \text{Cov} [h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, y, y'), h(X_{i+s,p}, X_{i+s,q}, y, y')] .
\end{aligned}$$

Under null distribution,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Cov} [h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, y, Y_j), h(X_{i+s,p}, X_{i+s,q}, y, Y_q)] \\
&= \int \mathbb{P}[X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, y, Y_j, X_{i+s,p}, X_{i+s,q}, y, Y_q] h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, y, Y_j) h(X_{i+s,p}, X_{i+s,q}, y, Y_q) \\
&= \int \mathbb{P}[X_{i,l}, y] \mathbb{P}[X_{i+s,p}, y] \int \mathbb{P}[X_{i,j}, Y_j] h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, y, Y_j) \int \mathbb{P}[X_{i+s,q}, Y_q] h(X_{i+s,p}, X_{i+s,q}, y, Y_q) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have:

$$\text{Cov} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y), \text{MMD}^2(X_{i+s}, Y)] = \left(\frac{B}{2}\right)^{-1} \text{Cov} [h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, y, y'), h(X_{i+s,p}, X_{i+s,q}, y, y')] .$$

Under null hypothesis, $X_{i,l}$, $X_{i,j}$, $X_{i+s,p}$, and $X_{i+s,q}$ are independent and they follow the same null distribution, so we may replace them with x , x' , x'' , x''' respectively. Finally

$$\text{Cov} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y; B), \text{MMD}^2(X_{i+s}, Y; B)] = \left(\frac{B}{2}\right)^{-1} \text{Cov} [h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')] .$$

□

PROOF FOR LEMMA 1. For notational simplicity, we drop the superscript B . Using results in Lemma 6 and Lemma 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[Z_B] &= \text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \left[N \text{Var}[\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y)] + \sum_{i \neq j} \text{Cov} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y; B), \text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y)] \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{B}{2}\right)^{-1} \mathbb{E}[h^2(x_i, x'_i, y, y')] + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i \neq j} \left(\frac{B}{2}\right)^{-1} \text{Cov} [h(x_i, x'_i, y, y'), h(x_j, x'_j, y, y')] \\
&= \left(\frac{B}{2}\right)^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')] + \frac{N-1}{N} \text{Cov} [h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')] \right] .
\end{aligned}$$

□

PROOF OF LEMMA 2. For the offline case, we have that the correlation

$$r_{B, B+v} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_B]}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_{B+v}]}} \text{Cov} [Z_B, Z_{B+v}] ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov} (Z_B, Z_{B+v}) &= \text{Cov} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)}), \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^n \text{MMD}^2(X_j^{(B+v)}, Y^{(B+v)}) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \text{Cov} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)}), \text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B+v)}, Y^{(B+v)})] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i \neq j} \text{Cov} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)}), \text{MMD}^2(X_j^{(B+v)}, Y^{(B+v)})] .
\end{aligned}$$

Using results from Lemma 6 and Lemma 7, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(Z_B, Z_{B+v}) &= \frac{1}{N} \binom{B \vee (B+v)}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')] \\ &\quad + \frac{N-1}{N} \binom{B \vee (B+v)}{2}^{-1} \text{Cov}[h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')] \\ &= \binom{B \vee (B+v)}{2}^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')] + \frac{N-1}{N} \text{Cov}[h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, plugging in the expressions for $\text{Var}[Z_B]$ and $\text{Var}[B+v]$, we have (4.1) for the offline case.

For the online case we need to analyze $r' = \text{Cov}(M_t, M_{t+s})$. Without loss of generality, assume $s > 0$. We may use the covariance result above for a fixed block size B_0 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B_0, t)}, Y^{(B_0, t)}), \text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B_0, t+s)}, Y^{(B_0, t+s)})) \\ \text{(B.3)} \quad = \binom{B}{2}^{-2} \binom{B-s}{2} \text{Var}[h(x, x', y, y')], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B_0, t)}, Y^{(B_0, t)}), \text{MMD}^2(X_j^{(B_0, t+s)}, Y^{(B_0, t+s)})) \\ \text{(B.4)} \quad = \binom{B}{2}^{-2} \binom{B-s}{2} \text{Cov}(h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(Z_{B_0, t}, Z_{B_0, t+s}) \\ \text{(B.5)} \quad = \text{Cov}\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B_0, t)}, Y^{(B_0, t)}), \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{MMD}^2(X_j^{(B_0, t+s)}, Y^{(B_0, t+s)})\right) \\ = \binom{B_0}{2}^{-2} \binom{B_0-s}{2} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Var}(h(x, x', y, y')) + \frac{N-1}{N} \text{Cov}(h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')) \right] \end{aligned}$$

We have:

$$\text{(B.6)} \quad r'_{t, t+s} = \frac{\binom{B_0-s}{2}}{\binom{B_0}{2}} = \left(1 - \frac{s}{B_0}\right) \left(1 - \frac{s}{B_0-1}\right).$$

□

LEMMA 8 (Covariance of MMD, under the null, different block sizes, same block index.). *For blocks with the same index i but with distinct block sizes, under the null hypothesis we have*

$$\text{(B.7)} \quad \text{Cov}[\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y; B), \text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y; B+v)] = \binom{B \vee (B+v)}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')]$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 8. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Cov} \left[\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)}), \text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B+v)}, Y^{(B+v)}) \right] \\
&= \text{Cov} \left[\binom{B}{2}^{-1} \sum_{l < j}^B h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, Y_l, Y_j), \binom{B+v}{2}^{-1} \sum_{p < q}^{B+v} h(X_{i,p}, X_{i,q}, Y_p, Y_q) \right] \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-1} \binom{B+v}{2}^{-1} \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{l < j}^B h(X_{i,l}, X_{i,j}, Y_l, Y_j), \sum_{p < q}^{B+v} h(X_{i,p}, X_{i,q}, Y_p, Y_q) \right] \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-1} \binom{B+v}{2}^{-1} \binom{B \wedge (B+v)}{2} \text{Var}[h(x, x', y, y')] \\
&= \binom{B \vee (B+v)}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[h^2(x, x', y, y')],
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality is due to a similar argument as before to drop block indices as they are *i.i.d.* under the null. $\square$

LEMMA 9 (Covariance of MMD, under the null, different block sizes and different block indices.).
Under the null we have

$$\text{Cov} \left[\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)}), \text{MMD}^2(X_{i+s}^{(B+v)}, Y^{(B+v)}) \right] = \binom{B \vee (B+v)}{2}^{-1} \text{Cov} [h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')].$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 9. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Cov} \left[\text{MMD}^2(X_i^{(B)}, Y^{(B)}), \text{MMD}^2(X_{i+s}^{(B+v)}, Y^{(B+v)}) \right] \\
&= \text{Cov} \left[\binom{B}{2}^{-1} \sum_{l < j}^B h(X_{i,l}^{(B)}, X_{i,j}^{(B)}, Y_l^{(B)}, Y_j^{(B)}), \binom{B+v}{2}^{-1} \sum_{p < q}^{B+v} h(X_{i+s,p}^{(B+v)}, X_{i+s,q}^{(B+v)}, Y_p^{(B+v)}, Y_q^{(B+v)}) \right] \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-1} \binom{B+v}{2}^{-1} \text{Cov} \left[\sum_{l < j}^B h(X_{i,l}^{(B)}, X_{i,j}^{(B)}, Y_l^{(B)}, Y_j^{(B)}), \sum_{p < q}^{B+v} h(X_{i+s,p}^{(B+v)}, X_{i+s,q}^{(B+v)}, Y_p^{(B+v)}, Y_q^{(B+v)}) \right] \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-1} \binom{B+v}{2}^{-1} \binom{B \wedge (B+v)}{2} \text{Cov} [h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')] \\
&= \binom{B \vee (B+v)}{2}^{-1} \text{Cov} [h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')],
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality is due to a similar argument as before to drop block indices as they are *i.i.d.* under the null. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.. Define $Z'_B = Z_B / \sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_B]}$. We would like to study

$$\mathbb{P}^\infty \left\{ \max_{B \in [2, M]} Z'_B > b \right\}.$$

Recall that ξ_B is set to the solution to $\dot{\psi}_B(\theta) = b$ and $\psi_B(\theta) = \log \mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Z'_B}]$ is the log moment generating function. Under null hypothesis, we may approximate the distribution $Z'_B \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Hence, $\psi_B(\theta_B) = \theta^2/2$, and the solution θ_B to $\dot{\psi}(\theta) = b$ becomes

$$\theta_B = b, \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_B(\theta_B) = b^2/2.$$

In the following we will use the “likelihood ratio identity” trick, which computes a probability of an event formulated in some distribution by reformulating it as an expectation in the context of an alternative distribution (Siegmund, 1985; Yakir, 2013). We use the notation $\mathbb{E}_B[U; A]$ to indicate that the expectation involves the product between the random variable U and the indicator of the event A . Associate with each B , $B \in [2, B_{\max}]$ a log-likelihood ratio of the form

$$(B.8) \quad \ell_B = \theta_B Z'_B - \psi_B(\theta_B) = b Z'_B - b^2/2.$$

With the aid of such log-likelihood ratios we may produce the likelihood ratio identity:

$$(B.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^\infty \left\{ \max_{B \in [2, B_{\max}]} Z'_B > b \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{\frac{\sum_{B=2}^{B_{\max}} e^{\ell_B}}{\sum_{s=2}^{B_{\max}} e^{\ell_s}}}_{=1}; \max_{B \in [2, B_{\max}]} Z'_B > b \right] \\ &= \sum_{B=2}^{B_{\max}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{\ell_B}}{\sum_s e^{\ell_s}}; \max_{B \in [2, B_{\max}]} Z'_B > b \right] = \sum_{B=2}^{B_{\max}} \mathbb{E}_B \left[\frac{1}{\sum_s e^{\ell_s}}; \max_{B \in [2, B_{\max}]} Z'_B > b \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_B$ is the alternative distribution that is associated with the likelihood ratio ℓ_B , and

$$\mathbb{E}_B[U] = \mathbb{E}[U e^{\theta Z'_B - \phi(\theta)}].$$

A local random field is produced by the consideration of difference between the log-likelihood ratio at B and the log-likelihood ratios at other parameter values for the block size. Using (B.8), the components of the local field are:

$$(B.10) \quad \ell_s - \ell_B = b(Z'_s - Z'_B).$$

Our approximation will depend on the summation and maximization statistics of the local field:

$$M_B = \max_{B \in [2, B_{\max}]} e^{\ell_s - \ell_B}, \quad \text{and} \quad S_B = \max_{B \in [2, B_{\max}]} e^{\ell_s - \ell_B}.$$

Also introduce the re-centered log-likelihood ratio:

$$\tilde{\ell}_B := \theta_B(Z'_B - \dot{\psi}(\theta_B)) = b(Z'_B - b),$$

By introducing and subtracting or dividing terms in (B.9), we may write it in a form that is convenient to apply Theorem 5.2 in (Yakir, 2013):

$$(B.11) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sum_{B=2}^{B_{\max}} e^{\psi_B(\theta_B) - \theta_B b} \mathbb{E}_B \left[\frac{e^{\theta_B \max_{s \in [2, B]} \{Z'_s - Z'_B\}} e^{-\theta_B [Z'_B - b + \max_{s \in [2, B_{\max}]} \{Z'_s - Z'_B\}]} }{\sum_{s \in [2, B_{\max}]} e^{\theta_B Z'_s - \psi_B(\theta_B)}}; \right. \\ &\quad \left. Z'_B - b + \max_{s \in [2, B_{\max}]} \{Z'_s - Z'_B\} \geq 0 \right] \\ &= e^{-b^2/2} \sum_{B=2}^{B_{\max}} \mathbb{E}_B \left[\frac{M_B}{S_B} e^{-[\tilde{\ell}_B + \log M_B]}; \tilde{\ell}_B + \log M_B \geq 0 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

To apply the localization theorem (Theorem 5.2 in (Yakir, 2013)), we need to identify the local limit distribution of $\tilde{\ell}_B$ and of the local field $\{\ell_s - \ell_B : s \in [2, B_{\max}]\}$ and prove asymptotic independence between them. The analysis of the limiting distributions should be done under the alternative distribution $\mathbb{P}_B$. Under the alternative distribution $\mathbb{P}_B$, we get that $\mathbb{E}_B[\tilde{\ell}_B] = 0$, since $\mathbb{E}_B[\ell_B] = b$, and the variance is $\text{Var}_B(\tilde{\ell}_B) = b^2 \text{Var}_B(\ell_B) = b^2 \ddot{\psi}_B(\theta_B) = b^2$, since $\psi_B(\theta) = \theta^2/2$. On the other hand, using a decomposition technique similar to that is used for the proof of Lemma 10, the covariance between the local field $\{\ell_s - \ell_B\}$ and the re-centered log-likelihood ratio $\tilde{\ell}_B$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\ell_s - \ell_B, \tilde{\ell}_B) &= \mathbb{E}_B[b(Z'_s - Z'_B) \cdot b(Z'_B - b)] = -b^2(1 - r_{s,B})\mathbb{E}_B[Z'_B(Z'_B - b)] \\ (B.12) \quad &= -b^2(1 - r_{s,B}) \approx -b^2 \frac{1}{2} \frac{2(B-1)}{B(B-1)} |B - s|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the asymptotic independence between the local field and the re-centered log-likelihood ratio follows from the fact that, when $b \rightarrow \infty$ and $b/\sqrt{B} \rightarrow c$ for some constant c , if $|B - s|$ is small, the covariance between $\ell_s - \ell_B$ and $\tilde{\ell}_B$ is on the order of a constant. However, the standard deviation of $\tilde{\ell}_B$ diverges to infinity proportional to b . Consequently, the correlation between the global term and local fields tends to 0.

We will approximate the limit joint distribution of the local field and the global term is Gaussian. Computation of the expectation and covariance structure are sufficient for obtain the final approximation. Lemma 10 shows that the asymptotic distribution of $\{\ell_s - \ell_B\}$, for $s = B + j$ and $|j|$ not too large, is a two-sided Gaussian random walk with a negative drift. The variance of an increment of this random walk is μ^2 .

Using the localization theorem (Theorem 5.2 in (Yakir, 2013)), since the local field and the re-centered log-likelihood ratio are asymptotically independent when $b \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$(B.13) \quad \mathbb{E}_B \left[\frac{M_B}{S_B} e^{-[\tilde{\ell}_B + \log M_B]}, \tilde{\ell}_B + \log M_B \geq 0 \right] \approx \frac{\mu^2}{2} \nu(\mu) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \ddot{\psi}(\theta_B)}} = \frac{\mu^2 \nu(\mu)}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

Finally, combine the results above we obtain (4.3). $\square$

LEMMA 10 (Offline, analysis of mean and variance of local field.). *The mean and variance of the local field $\{\ell_{B+v} - \ell_B\}$, for $v = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$, are related by*

$$(B.14) \quad \mathbb{E}_B[\ell_{B+v} - \ell_B] = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Var}_B[\ell_{B+v} - \ell_B].$$

Moreover, given $\mu = b\sqrt{\frac{2B-1}{B(B-1)}}$,

$$(B.15) \quad \mathbb{E}_B[\ell_{B+v} - \ell_B] \approx -\frac{\mu^2}{2}|v|, \quad \text{Var}_B[\ell_{B+v} - \ell_B] \approx \mu^2|v|.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 10. From the definition of the local field (10), we have that for $s = B + v$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_B[\ell_{B+v} - \ell_B] &= \mathbb{E}_B[b(Z'_{B+v} - Z'_B)] = \mathbb{E} \left[b(Z'_{B+v} - Z'_B) e^{bZ'_B - b^2/2} \right] \\ (B.16) \quad &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(-b(1 - r_{B+v,B})Z'_B + b\sqrt{1 - r_{B+v,B}^2}W \right) e^{bZ'_B - b^2/2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The above representation results from the regression of Z'_{B+v} on Z'_B :

$$Z'_{B+v} = r_{B+v,B} Z'_B + \sqrt{1 - r_{B+v,B}^2} W,$$

with W being the standardized residual of the regression, and $r = \text{Cov}(Z'_B, Z'_{B+v})$. Since W is zero-mean and independent of Z'_B , (B.16) becomes

$$(B.17) \quad \mathbb{E}_B[\ell_{B+v} - \ell_B] = -b(1-r) \mathbb{E} \left[Z'_B e^{bZ'_B - b^2/2} \right] = -b^2(1-r),$$

and the last equality follows from the Gaussianity $Z'_B \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$:

$$(B.18) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[Z'_B e^{bZ'_B - \frac{1}{2}b^2} \right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int u e^{bu - b^2/2} \cdot e^{-u^2/2} du = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int u e^{-\frac{(u-b)^2}{2}} = b.$$

Similarly, we can compute the variance of the local field under the transformed measure

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_B[\ell_{B+v} - \ell_B] &= \text{Var}_B [b(Z'_{B+v} - Z'_B)] = \text{Var}_B \left[brZ'_B + b \left[\sqrt{1 - r^2} W \right] - Z'_B \right] \\ &= \text{Var}_B \left[b\sqrt{1 - r^2} W \right] + \text{Var}_B [b(r-1)Z'_B] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_B[b^2(1-r^2)W^2] - \mathbb{E}_B[b\sqrt{1-r^2}W]^2 + \mathbb{E}_B[b^2(r-1)^2(Z'_B)^2] - \mathbb{E}_B[b(r-1)Z'_B]^2 \\ &= b^2(1-r^2) + b^2(r-1)^2 = 2b^2(1-r). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have the desired result (B.14).

Next, using results from Lemma 2, we have that

$$(B.19) \quad r_{B,B+v} = \text{Cov} [Z'_B, Z'_{B+v}] = \sqrt{\binom{B}{2} \binom{B+v}{2} / \binom{B \vee (B+v)}{2}}.$$

We will linearize r in terms of small increment v . For $v > 0$, using Taylor's expansion $(1+u)^{-1} = 1 - u + o(u)$:

$$(B.20) \quad r_{B,B+v} = \sqrt{\frac{B(B-1)}{(B+v)(B+v-1)}} = \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{v}{B}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{v}{B-1}\right)^{-1}} \approx \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{v}{B}\right) \left(1 - \frac{v}{B-1}\right)},$$

and for $v < 0$,

$$(B.21) \quad r_{B,B+v} = \sqrt{\frac{(B+v)(B+v-1)}{B(B-1)}} = \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{v}{B}\right) \left(1 + \frac{v}{B-1}\right)}.$$

Combine these two cases, we have

$$(B.22) \quad r_{B,B+v} = \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{|v|}{B}\right) \left(1 - \frac{|v|}{B-1}\right)} + o(|v|) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{2B-1}{B(B-1)} |v| + o(|v|).$$

Substitute this in (B.17), we have that

$$(B.23) \quad \mathbb{E}_B[\ell_{B+v} - \ell_B] = -\frac{b^2}{2} \frac{2B-1}{B(B-1)} |v| + o(|v|) = -\frac{\mu^2}{2} |v| + o(|v|).$$

□

LEMMA 11 (Tail of statistics under the null). *When $b \rightarrow \infty$,*

(B.24)

$$\mathbb{P}^\infty \{T < m\} = \mathbb{P}^\infty \left\{ \max_{0 < t \leq m} \frac{Z_{B_0,t}}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_{B_0,t}]}} > b \right\} = m e^{-\frac{1}{2}b^2} \cdot \frac{b^2(2B-1)\nu\left(b\sqrt{\frac{2(2B-1)}{B(B-1)}}\right)}{B(B-1)\sqrt{2\pi}} + o(1).$$

PROOF FOR THEOREM 4. Let $Z'_t := Z_{B_0,t}/\sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_{B_0,t}]}$. We start with finding the tail probability of the online detection statistic. Note that

$$(B.25) \quad \mathbb{P}^\infty(T < m) = \mathbb{P}^\infty \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq m} M_t > b \right) = \mathbb{P}^\infty \left\{ \max_{1 \leq t \leq m} \frac{Z_{B_0,t}}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[Z_{B_0,t}]}} > b \right\}$$

Since the block size is fixed to be B_0 , using Lemma 1, we have that

(B.26)

$$\text{Var}(Z'_t) = \text{Var}(Z'_{t+s}) = \binom{B_0}{2}^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Var}(h(x, x', y, y')) + \frac{N-1}{N} \text{Cov}(h(x, x', y, y'), h(x'', x''', y, y')) \right]$$

Similar to previous analysis, we analyze the local field $\{\ell'_{t+s} - \ell'_t\}$ where

$$(B.27) \quad \ell'_t := bZ'_t - b^2/2, \quad \ell'_{t+s} := bZ'_{t+s} - b^2/2.$$

Use a similar change-of-measure argument, for the sequential problem, we have that (B.25) can be written as

$$(B.28) \quad e^{-\frac{1}{2}b^2} \sum_{t=1}^m \mathbb{E}_t \left(\frac{\mathcal{M}_t}{\mathcal{S}_t} e^{-[\tilde{\ell}'_t + m_t]}; \tilde{\ell}'_t + m_t \geq 0 \right),$$

where the maximum and the sum of the local fields are

$$(B.29) \quad \mathcal{M}_t = \max_{t \in [1, m]} e^{\ell_m - \ell_t}, \quad \mathcal{S}_t = \sum_{t \in [1, m]} e^{\ell_m - \ell_t}$$

and the re-centered log-likelihood ratio is given by

$$(B.30) \quad \tilde{\ell}_t = \ell_t - b, \quad m_t = \log \mathcal{M}_t.$$

From Lemma 2, $r'_{t,t+s} \approx 1 - \frac{2B_0-1}{B_0(B_0-1)}s$. With similar analysis as for the offline case, we can also show that the mean and the variance of the local field terms are

$$(B.31) \quad \mathbb{E}_t\{\ell_{t+s} - \ell_t\} = -b^2(1 - r'_{t+s,t}) = -\underbrace{b^2 \frac{2B-1}{B(B-1)}}_{\mu^2/2} |s|, \quad \text{Var}_t\{\ell_{t+s} - \ell_t\} = \underbrace{b^2 \frac{2(2B-1)}{B(B-1)}}_{\mu^2} |s|$$

And similar, we may show that the local field terms and the re-centered log-likelihood ratio are asymptotically independent. Then using the localization theorem (Theorem 5.2 in (Yakir, 2013)), we can write (B.28) as

$$(B.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^\infty \{T \leq m\} &\approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}b^2} \sum_{t=1}^m \frac{b^2(2B-1)}{B(B-1)} \cdot \nu \left(b\sqrt{\frac{2(2B-1)}{B(B-1)}} \right) \\ &= m \cdot \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}b^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{b^2(2B-1)}{B(B-1)} \cdot \nu \left(b\sqrt{\frac{2(2B-1)}{B(B-1)}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation is due to the fact that the terms inside the sum are constants that are independent of t . Using similar arguments as those in (Siegmund and Venkatraman, 1995; Siegmund and Yakir, 2008), we may see that T is asymptotically exponentially distributed and is uniformly integrable. Hence, if λ denotes the factor multiplying m on the right-hand side of (B.32), then for still larger m , in the range where $m\lambda$ is bounded away from 0 and ∞ , $\mathbb{P}^\infty\{T \leq m\} - [1 - \exp(-\lambda m)] \rightarrow 0$. Consequently $\mathbb{E}^\infty\{T\} \sim \lambda^{-1}$, which is equivalent to (4.4). $\square$

The following three lemmas 12, 13, and 14 are used to derive the final expression for the skewness of the statistic:

LEMMA 12. *Under null hypothesis,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^3 \right] \\ &= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x'', x, y'', y)] + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^3]. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 12.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^3 \right] = \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{a < b} h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b) \right)^3 \right] = \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \sum_k C_k \mathbb{E} [h_{ab} h_{cd} h_{ef}],$$

where for simplicity we write $h_{ab} = h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b)$ and define C_k the corresponding number of combination under specific structure. Most of the $\mathbb{E} [h_{ab} h_{cd} h_{ef}]$ vanish under the null. By enumerating all the combinations, only two terms are nonzero: $\mathbb{E} [h_{ab} h_{bc} h_{ca}]$ and $\mathbb{E} [h_{ab} h_{ab} h_{ab}]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^3 \right] = \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \binom{B}{2} 2(B-2) \mathbb{E} [h_{ab} h_{bc} h_{ca}] + \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \binom{B}{2} \mathbb{E} [h_{ab} h_{ab} h_{ab}] \\ &= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b) h(X_{i,b}, X_{i,c}, Y_b, Y_c) h(X_{i,c}, X_{i,a}, Y_c, Y_a)] \\ & \quad + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b)^3] \\ &= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x'', x, y'', y)] + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^3]. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

LEMMA 13. *Under null hypothesis,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^2 \text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y) \right]_{i \neq j} \\ &= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x''', x''', y'', y)] + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^2 h(x'', x''', y, y')]. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 13.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^2 \text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y) \right]_{i \neq j} \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{a < b} h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b) \right)^2 \left(\sum_{a < b} h(X_{j,a}, X_{j,b}, Y_a, Y_b) \right) \right] \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \sum_k C_k \mathbb{E} [h_{i,ab} h_{i,cd} h_{j,ef}],
\end{aligned}$$

where for simplicity we write $h_{i,ab} = h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b)$ and define C_k the corresponding number of combination under specific structure. Similarly, most of the $\mathbb{E} [h_{i,ab} h_{i,cd} h_{j,ef}]$ vanish under the null. By enumerating all the combinations, only two terms are nonzero: $\mathbb{E} [h_{i,ab} h_{i,bc} h_{j,ca}]$ and $\mathbb{E} [h_{i,ab} h_{i,ab} h_{j,ab}]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^2 \text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y) \right]_{i \neq j} \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \binom{B}{2} 2(B-2) \mathbb{E} [h_{i,ab} h_{i,bc} h_{j,ca}] + \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \binom{B}{2} \mathbb{E} [h_{i,ab} h_{i,ab} h_{j,ab}] \\
&= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b) h(X_{i,b}, X_{i,c}, Y_b, Y_c) h(X_{j,c}, X_{j,a}, Y_c, Y_a)] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b)^2 h(X_{j,a}, X_{j,b}, Y_a, Y_b)] \\
&= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x''', x''', y'', y)] + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^2 h(x'', x''', y, y')].
\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 14. *Under null hypothesis,*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [MMD^2(X_i, Y) MMD^2(X_j, Y) MMD^2(X_r, Y)]_{i \neq j \neq r} \\
&= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x'', x''', y', y'') h(x''', x''', y'', y)] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x'', x''', y, y') h(x''', x''', y, y')].
\end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 14. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [MMD^2(X_i, Y) MMD^2(X_j, Y) MMD^2(X_r, Y)]_{i \neq j \neq r} \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{a < b} h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b) \right) \left(\sum_{c < d} h(X_{j,c}, X_{j,d}, Y_c, Y_d) \right) \left(\sum_{e < f} h(X_{r,e}, X_{r,f}, Y_e, Y_f) \right) \right] \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \sum_k C_k \mathbb{E} [h_{i,ab} h_{j,cd} h_{r,ef}].
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, most of the $\mathbb{E}[h_{i,ab}h_{j,cd}h_{r,ef}]$ vanish under the null. By enumerating all the combinations, only two terms are nonzero: $\mathbb{E}[h_{i,ab}h_{j,bc}h_{r,ca}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[h_{i,ab}h_{j,ab}h_{r,ab}]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y)\text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y)\text{MMD}^2(X_r, Y)]_{i \neq j \neq r} \\
&= \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \binom{B}{2} 2(B-2) \mathbb{E}[h_{i,ab}h_{j,bc}h_{r,ca}] + \binom{B}{2}^{-3} \binom{B}{2} \mathbb{E}[h_{i,ab}h_{j,ab}h_{r,ab}] \\
&= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E}[h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b)h(X_{j,b}, X_{j,c}, Y_b, Y_c)h(X_{r,c}, X_{r,a}, Y_c, Y_a)] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E}[h(X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}, Y_a, Y_b)h(X_{j,a}, X_{j,b}, Y_a, Y_b)h(X_{r,a}, X_{r,b}, Y_a, Y_b)] \\
&= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E}[h(x, x', y, y')h(x'', x''', y', y'')h(x''', x''''', y'', y)] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E}[h(x, x', y, y')h(x'', x''', y, y')h(x''', x''''', y, y')] .
\end{aligned}$$

□

PROOF OF LEMMA. 5 We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Z_B^3] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y) \right)^3 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N^3} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y) \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y) \right) \left(\sum_{r=1}^N \text{MMD}^2(X_r, Y) \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N^3} N \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^3 \right] + \frac{1}{N^3} \binom{3}{2} \binom{N}{1} \binom{N-1}{1} \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^2 \text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y) \right]_{i \neq j} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N^3} \binom{N}{1} \binom{N-1}{1} \binom{N-2}{1} \mathbb{E} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y) \text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y) \text{MMD}^2(X_r, Y)]_{i \neq j \neq r} \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^3 \right] + \frac{3(N-1)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left[(\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y))^2 \text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y) \right]_{i \neq j} \\
&\quad + \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [\text{MMD}^2(X_i, Y) \text{MMD}^2(X_j, Y) \text{MMD}^2(X_r, Y)]_{i \neq j \neq r} \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \left\{ \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x'', x, y'', y)] + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^3] \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{3(N-1)}{N^2} \left\{ \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x''', x''', y'', y)] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^2 h(x'', x''', y, y')] \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \left\{ \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x'', x''', y', y'') h(x''', x''', y'', y)] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x'', x''', y, y') h(x''', x''', y'', y)] \right\} \\
&= \frac{8(B-2)}{B^2(B-1)^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x'', x, y'', y)] \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{3(N-1)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x', x'', y', y'') h(x''', x''', y'', y)] \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x'', x''', y', y'') h(x''', x''', y'', y)] \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{B^2(B-1)^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^3] \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{3(N-1)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y')^2 h(x'', x''', y, y')] \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} [h(x, x', y, y') h(x'', x''', y, y') h(x''', x''', y'', y)] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Done. □

S. LI
Y. XIE
H. MILTON STEWART SCHOOL OF INDUSTRIAL AND SYSTEMS ENGINEERING
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ATLANTA, GA, 30332, USA
E-MAIL: sli370@gatech.edu; yao.xie@isye.gatech.edu

H. DAI
L. SONG
COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ATLANTA, GA, 30332, USA
E-MAIL: hanjundai@gatech.edu; lsong@cc.gatech.edu