

Estimating sample paths of Gauss-Markov processes from noisy data

Benjamin Davies*

Draft version: April 2, 2024

Abstract

I derive the pointwise conditional means and variances of an arbitrary Gauss-Markov process, given noisy observations of points on a sample path. These moments depend on the process's mean and covariance functions, and on the conditional moments of the sampled points. I study the Brownian motion and bridge as special cases.

Keywords: Gaussian process, Markov process, Brownian motion, noisy data

1 Introduction

Suppose we observe data $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ generated by the process

$$y_i = f(x_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

where $x_i \geq 0$ is non-decreasing in i , where $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is unknown, and where the errors ε_i are jointly normally distributed (hereafter "Gaussian") with $E[\varepsilon_i \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] = 0$ independently of $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$. We use \mathcal{D} to construct pointwise estimates

$$\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \equiv E[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}]$$

with mean squared error (MSE)

$$E \left[\left(f(x) - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right] = \text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}). \quad (2)$$

In this note, I derive expressions for $E[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}]$ and $\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D})$ when $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ is a sample path of a Gauss-Markov process. Such processes have two defining properties:

*Department of Economics, Stanford University; bldavies@stanford.edu.

(G) For every finite subset $X \subset [0, \infty)$, the vector $(f(x))_{x \in X} \in \mathbb{R}^{|X|}$ is multivariate Gaussian;

(M) If $x < x' < x''$, then $f(x)$ and $f(x'')$ are conditionally independent given $f(x')$.

Property (G) implies that $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}$ is Gaussian, and so its distribution is fully determined by its mean $E[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}]$ and variance $\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D})$. Theorem 1 expresses these moments in terms of the means and (co)variances of the $f(x_i) \mid \mathcal{D}$. This allows me to construct the estimate $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ and its MSE at all points $x \geq 0$. This estimate optimally extrapolates from, or interpolates between, the observations (x_i, y_i) in \mathcal{D} .¹

I let these observations be noisy, with Gaussian errors $\varepsilon_i = y_i - f(x_i)$. This allows me to extend analyses that assume observations have no noise (e.g., Bardhi, 2024; Callander, 2011; Carnehl and Schneider, 2023).² I also let the sampled points x_i be less or greater than the target point x . This contrasts with Davies (2024), who studies sequential learning from noisy observations of a sample path. Such learning always involves extrapolation, whereas I allow for interpolation.

2 Preliminaries

The data $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ contain noisy observations $y_i = f(x_i) + \varepsilon_i$ of the values $f(x_i)$. These observations equal the sum of two Gaussian random variables and so are Gaussian too. Moreover, by property (G), the vector $(f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_n), f(x))$ is multivariate Gaussian for all $x \geq 0$. It follows that

$$(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n, f(x)) = (f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_n), f(x)) + (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_n, f(x))$$

is also multivariate Gaussian. Consequently, we can construct the conditional distribution of $f(x)$ given y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n using a well-known result about multivariate Gaussian variables:

Lemma 1. *Let $n_1 \geq 1$ and $n_2 \geq 1$ be integers, and let $z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ be multivariate Gaussian with mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2}$ and variance $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1+n_2) \times (n_1+n_2)}$. Partition $z = (z_1, z_2)$ into vectors $z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and $z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$, and let $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and*

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

be the corresponding partitions of μ and Σ . If Σ_{22} is invertible, then

$$z_1 \mid z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_1 + \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}(z_2 - \mu_2), \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\Sigma_{21}\right). \quad (3)$$

¹The estimate is ‘‘optimal’’ in that it minimizes the MSE (2) for all $x \geq 0$.

²Rasmussen and Williams (2006, p. 16) derive expressions for $E[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}]$ and $\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D})$ when $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ follows a Gaussian (but not necessarily Markov) process and the errors ε_i are iid. I impose the Markov property (M) to obtain (relatively) closed-form expressions for $E[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}]$ and $\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D})$. I also allow for arbitrary (co)variances in the ε_i .

See Bishop (2006, p. 87) or DeGroot (2004, p. 55) for proofs of this lemma, and Appendix A for proofs of my other results.

Substituting $z_1 = f(x)$ and $z_2 = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$ into (3) provides expressions for the moments of $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D} = z_1 \mid z_2$. I refine these expressions by imposing properties (G) and (M).

Property (G) comes from $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ being a sample path of a Gaussian process.³ This process can be characterized by

1. A mean function $m : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $m(x) \equiv E[f(x)]$ for all $x \geq 0$, and
2. A covariance function $C : [0, \infty)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $C(x, x') \equiv \text{Cov}(f(x), f(x'))$ for all $x, x' \geq 0$.

For convenience, I define a variance function $V : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $V(x) \equiv C(x, x)$ for all $x \geq 0$. The values of $m(x)$, $V(x)$, and $C(x, x')$ are known for all $x, x' \geq 0$, but the values of $f(x)$ are not.

Property (M) comes from $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ being a sample path of a Markov process. It allows me to focus on the conditional distribution of $f(x)$ given at most two values $f(x_i)$: those with x_i closest to x . Lemma 2 characterizes this conditional distribution.

Lemma 2. *Let $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ be a sample path of a Gauss-Markov process, let $x, x', x'' \geq 0$ be arbitrary, and define*

$$w(x, x', x'') \equiv \frac{1}{V(x')V(x'') - C(x', x'')^2} \begin{bmatrix} C(x, x')V(x'') - C(x, x'')C(x', x'') \\ C(x, x'')V(x') - C(x, x')C(x', x'') \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Then $f(x) \mid f(x')$ is Gaussian with mean

$$E[f(x) \mid f(x')] = m(x) + \frac{C(x, x')}{V(x')} (f(x') - m(x')) \quad (5)$$

and variance

$$\text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x')) = V(x) - \frac{C(x, x')^2}{V(x')}, \quad (6)$$

and $f(x) \mid f(x'), f(x'')$ is Gaussian with mean

$$E[f(x) \mid f(x'), f(x'')] = m(x) + w(x, x', x'')^T \begin{bmatrix} f(x') - m(x') \\ f(x'') - m(x'') \end{bmatrix}$$

and variance

$$\text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x'), f(x'')) = V(x) - w(x, x', x'')^T \begin{bmatrix} C(x, x') \\ C(x, x'') \end{bmatrix}.$$

For example, suppose $x_k \leq x \leq x_{k+1}$ for some $k < n$. Lemma 2 characterizes the distributions of $f(x) \mid f(x_{k+1})$ and $f(x) \mid f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})$ when the values of $f(x_k)$ and $f(x_{k+1})$ are known. However, variation in the errors ε_i makes the values of $f(x_k)$ and $f(x_{k+1})$ unknown. So the conditional

³Gaussian processes are stochastic processes satisfying by property (G). For more information on these processes and their applications, see Section 6.4 of Bishop (2006) or Chapter 2 of Rasmussen and Williams (2006).

means of $f(x) \mid f(x_{k+1})$ and $f(x) \mid f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})$ given \mathcal{D} are random. But their conditional variances given \mathcal{D} are *not* random; by Lemma 2, these variances depend on only the known values of the variance function $V : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and covariance function $C : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

3 Conditional moments of a Gauss-Markov process

Theorem 1 refines Lemma 1 by imposing properties (G) and (M). Specifically, it characterizes the mean and variance of $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}$ when $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ is a sample path of an arbitrary Gauss-Markov process. These moments depend on the location of x relative to the points x_i at which \mathcal{D} contains noisy observations y_i of $f(x_i)$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ be a sample path of a Gauss-Markov process. Suppose $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ is generated by the process (1), where $x_i \geq 0$ is non-decreasing in i and the errors $\varepsilon_i = y_i - f(x_i)$ are jointly Gaussian with $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] = 0$ independently of $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$. Then $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}$ is Gaussian for all $x \geq 0$. Moreover:*

(i) *If $x \leq x_1$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}] = m(x) + \frac{C(x_1, x)}{V(x_1)} (\mathbb{E}[f(x_1) \mid \mathcal{D}] - m(x_1))$$

and

$$\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}) = \left(\frac{C(x_1, x)}{V(x_1)} \right)^2 \text{Var}(f(x_1) \mid \mathcal{D}) + \text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x_1)).$$

(ii) *If $x_k \leq x \leq x_{k+1}$ for some $k < n$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}] = m(x) + w(x, x_k, x_{k+1})^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[f(x_k) \mid \mathcal{D}] - m(x_k) \\ \mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{D}] - m(x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}) &= w(x, x_k, x_{k+1})^T \text{Var} \left(\begin{bmatrix} f(x_k) \\ f(x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathcal{D} \right) w(x, x_k, x_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + \text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})) \end{aligned}$$

with $w(x, x_k, x_{k+1})$ defined as in Lemma 2.

(iii) *If $x \geq x_n$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}] = m(x) + \frac{C(x_n, x)}{V(x_n)} (\mathbb{E}[f(x_n) \mid \mathcal{D}] - m(x_n))$$

and

$$\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}) = \left(\frac{C(x_n, x)}{V(x_n)} \right)^2 \text{Var}(f(x_n) \mid \mathcal{D}) + \text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x_n)).$$

If $x \leq x_1$, then the estimate $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \equiv \mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}]$ of $f(x)$ is linear in the estimate $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_1)$ of $f(x_1)$. Conversely, if $x \geq x_n$, then $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ is linear in the estimate $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_n)$ of $f(x_n)$. In both cases, we can construct $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ in two steps:

1. Use \mathcal{D} to estimate the “boundary” values $f(x_1)$ and $f(x_n)$;
2. Extrapolate $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ from the closest boundary estimate.

For example, suppose $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_1, y_1)\}$ contains one observation $y_1 = f(x_1) + \varepsilon_1$ with error $\varepsilon_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$. Then

$$f(x_1) \mid \mathcal{D}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}\left(m(x_1) + \frac{V(x_1)}{V(x_1) + \sigma_\varepsilon^2}(y_1 - m(x_1)), \left(\frac{1}{V(x_1)} + \frac{1}{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}\right)^{-1}\right)$$

by Lemma 1, and so

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x) &= m(x) + \frac{C(x_1, x)}{V(x_1)}(\mathbb{E}[f(x_1) \mid \mathcal{D}] - m(x_1)) \\ &= m(x) + \frac{C(x_1, x)}{V(x_1) + \sigma_\varepsilon^2}(y_1 - m(x_1)) \end{aligned}$$

is linear in the deviation $(y_1 - m(x_1))$ of y_1 from its mean $m(x_1)$. Intuitively, this deviation provides information about the difference $(f(x_1) - m(x_1))$, which the factor $C(x_1, x)/(V(x) + \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$ translates into information about the difference $(f(x) - m(x))$. This factor is larger when the covariance $C(x_1, x)$ of y_1 and $f(x)$ is larger, and when the variance $V(x) + \sigma_\varepsilon^2$ of y_1 is smaller.

If $n > 1$ and $x_1 \leq x \leq x_n$, then we can construct $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ in three steps:

1. Find an index $k < n$ for which $x_k \leq x \leq x_{k+1}$;
2. Use \mathcal{D} to estimate the values of $f(x_k)$ and $f(x_{k+1})$;
3. Interpolate $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ from the estimates $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_k)$ and $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_{k+1})$.

The interpolant $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ is a weighted sum of the mean $m(x)$, the deviation $(\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_k) - m(x_k))$, and the deviation $(\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_{k+1}) - m(x_{k+1}))$. The weights on the two deviations depend on the (co)variances of $f(x)$, $f(x_k)$, and $f(x_{k+1})$, as well as the (co)variances of ε_k and ε_{k+1} .

Theorem 1 expresses the moments of $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}$ in terms of the moments of the $f(x_i) \mid \mathcal{D}$. The latter moments can be computed analytically if n is small (e.g., as in the case with $n = 1$ above), or numerically if n is large. The expressions in Theorem 1 reveal how changing the moments of the $f(x_i) \mid \mathcal{D}$ changes the moments of $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}$.

4 Conditional moments of a Brownian motion

I now consider a specific Gauss-Markov process: a Brownian motion with known drift $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and scale $\sigma \geq 0$, and unknown initial value $f(0) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$.⁴ This process has mean and covariance functions defined by

$$m(x) = \mu_0 + \mu x$$

and

$$C(x, x') = \sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 \min\{x, x'\}$$

for all $x, x' \geq 0$.⁵ Substituting these expressions into Theorem 1 yields the following result.

Corollary 1. *Let $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ be a sample path of a Brownian motion with drift $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, scale $\sigma \geq 0$, and initial value $f(0) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$. Define $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ as in Theorem 1. Then $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}$ is Gaussian for all $x \geq 0$. Moreover:*

(i) *If $x \leq x_1$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}] = \mu_0 + \mu x + \frac{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x_1} (\mathbb{E}[f(x_1) \mid \mathcal{D}] - \mu_0 - \mu x_1)$$

and

$$\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}) = \left(\frac{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x_1} \right)^2 \text{Var}(f(x_1) \mid \mathcal{D}) + \left(\frac{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x_1} \right) \sigma^2 (x_1 - x).$$

(ii) *If $x_k \leq x \leq x_{k+1}$ for some $k < n$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}] = \frac{x_{k+1} - x}{x_{k+1} - x_k} \mathbb{E}[f(x_k) \mid \mathcal{D}] + \frac{x - x_k}{x_{k+1} - x_k} \mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{D}]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}) = & \frac{1}{(x_{k+1} - x_k)^2} \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} - x \\ x - x_k \end{bmatrix}^T \text{Var} \left(\begin{bmatrix} f(x_k) \\ f(x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathcal{D} \right) \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} - x \\ x - x_k \end{bmatrix} \\ & + \frac{\sigma^2 (x_{k+1} - x)(x - x_k)}{x_{k+1} - x_k}. \end{aligned}$$

⁴So the sample path $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ solves the stochastic differential equation

$$df(x) = \mu dx + \sigma dW(x),$$

where $\{W(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ is an unknown sample path of a (standard) Wiener process. This process has initial value $W(0) = 0$ and iid Gaussian increments $dW(x) \equiv W(x + dx) - W(x) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, dx)$.

⁵Thus $V(x) = \sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x$ for all $x \geq 0$.




Figure 1: Learning about a Brownian motion from noisy and noise-free observations

Notes: Red lines show sample path $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ of Brownian motion with drift $\mu = 0$, scale $\sigma = 1$, and initial value $f(0) = 0$. Black dots represent observations (x_i, y_i) with $x_i = 2^{i-1}$ and $y_i = f(x_i) + \varepsilon_i$. Black lines represent estimates $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ of $f(x)$ when $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^4$. Gray regions represent 90% confidence intervals, constructed analytically from the conditional variances defined in Corollary 1. Left panel has $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ iid; right panel has $\varepsilon_i = 0$ for each i .

(iii) If $x \geq x_n$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}] = \mathbb{E}[f(x_n) \mid \mathcal{D}] + \mu(x - x_n)$$

and

$$\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}) = \text{Var}(f(x_n) \mid \mathcal{D}) + \sigma^2(x - x_n).$$

If $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ is a sample path of a Brownian motion, then the estimate $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \equiv \mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}]$ of $f(x)$ is piecewise linear in $x \geq 0$. For example, consider the canonical case in which the initial value $f(0) = \mu_0$ is known. As x increases from zero, the estimate

$$\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x) = \begin{cases} \mu_0 + \frac{x}{x_1} (\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_1) - \mu_0) & \text{if } x < x_1 \\ \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_k) + \frac{x - x_k}{x_{k+1} - x_k} (\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_{k+1}) - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_k)) & \text{if } x_k \leq x < x_{k+1} \text{ for some } k < n \\ \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_n) + \mu(x - x_n) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

interpolates linearly between $(0, \mu_0)$ and $(x_1, \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_1))$, then between $(x_1, \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_1))$ and $(x_2, \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_2))$, then between $(x_2, \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_2))$ and $(x_3, \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_3))$, and so on until $(x_n, \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_n))$. Beyond this point, the data \mathcal{D} provide no information about $f(x)$. Consequently, the estimate $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ treats $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq x_n}$ as a Brownian motion with drift μ , scale σ , and (possibly random) initial value $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x_n)$.

I illustrate this behavior in Figure 1. It shows how $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ varies with $x \geq 0$ when $(\mu_0, \mu, \sigma_0, \sigma) = (0, 0, 0, 1)$ and the data contain $n = 4$ observations with iid errors. Figure 1 also shows the 90%

confidence interval around $\hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$, constructed analytically from the conditional variances defined in Corollary 1. This interval expands as x moves away from the sampled points x_i .⁶

Suppose the data are *not* noisy (i.e., $\varepsilon_i = 0$ for each i) and $x_k \leq x \leq x_{k+1}$ for some $k < n$. Then the distribution of $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}$ coincides with the distribution obtained by assuming $\{f(x)\}_{x_k \leq x \leq x_{k+1}}$ is a sample path of a Brownian bridge with scale σ , known initial value $f(x_k)$, and known terminal value $f(x_{k+1})$.⁷ Corollary 1(ii) generalizes to Brownian bridges with *unknown* initial and terminal values. For example, suppose $x_1 \leq x \leq x_2$ and that

$$\begin{bmatrix} f(x_1) \\ f(x_2) \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathcal{D} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & \rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 \\ \rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 & \sigma_2^2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

for some means $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, variances $\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2 \geq 0$, and correlation $\rho \in [-1, 1]$. Then $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}$ has mean

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}] = \mu_1 + \frac{x - x_1}{x_2 - x_1}(\mu_2 - \mu_1)$$

and variance

$$\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}) = \frac{(1-x)^2\sigma_1^2 + 2x(1-x)\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 + x^2\sigma_2^2}{(x_2 - x_1)^2} + \frac{\sigma^2(x_2 - x)(x - x_1)}{x_2 - x_1}.$$

Choosing $\sigma_1 = 0$ and $\sigma_2 = 0$ yields the mean and variance for the Brownian bridge on $[x_1, x_2]$ with $f(x_1) = \mu_1$ and $f(x_2) = \mu_2$.

References

- Bardhi, A. (2024). Attributes: Selective Learning and Influence. *Econometrica*, 92(2):311–353.
- Bishop, C. M. (2006). *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. Springer, New York.
- Callander, S. (2011). Searching and Learning by Trial and Error. *American Economic Review*, 101(6):2277–2308.
- Carnehl, C. and Schneider, J. (2023). A Quest for Knowledge.
- Davies, B. (2024). Learning about a changing state.
- DeGroot, M. H. (2004). *Optimal Statistical Decisions*. Wiley, first edition.
- Karatzas, I. and Shreve, S. E. (1988). *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer New York, New York, NY.
- Rasmussen, C. E. and Williams, C. K. I. (2006). *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

⁶If $f(0)$ is known (i.e., $\sigma_0^2 = 0$) and the observations y_i have no noise (i.e., $\varepsilon_i = 0$ for each i), then the MSE

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(x) - \hat{f}_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right] = \sigma^2 \begin{cases} \frac{x(x_1 - x)}{x_1} & \text{if } x < x_1 \\ \frac{(x_{k+1} - x)(x - x_k)}{x_{k+1} - x_k} & \text{if } x_k \leq x < x_{k+1} \text{ for some } k < n \\ x - x_n & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

attains its piecewise maxima at the midpoint of each piece.

⁷See, e.g., Section 5.6.B of Karatzas and Shreve (1988) for more information about Brownian bridges.

A Proofs

Proof of Lemma 2. Now $f(x)$, $f(x')$, and $f(x'')$ are jointly Gaussian by property (G). Therefore, by Lemma 1, both $f(x) | f(x')$ and $f(x) | f(x'), f(x'')$ are (univariate) Gaussian. Choosing $z_1 = f(x)$ and $z_2 = f(x')$ in the statement of Lemma 1 yields (5) and (6), while choosing $z_2 = (f(x'), f(x''))$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(x) | f(x'), f(x'')] &= m(x) + \begin{bmatrix} C(x, x') \\ C(x, x'') \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} V(x') & C(x', x'') \\ C(x', x'') & V(x'') \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} f(x') - m(x') \\ f(x'') - m(x'') \end{bmatrix} \\ &= m(x) + w(x, x', x'')^T \begin{bmatrix} f(x') - m(x') \\ f(x'') - m(x'') \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f(x) | f(x'), f(x'')) &= V(x) - \begin{bmatrix} C(x, x') \\ C(x, x'') \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} V(x') & C(x', x'') \\ C(x', x'') & V(x'') \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} C(x, x') \\ C(x, x'') \end{bmatrix} \\ &= V(x) - w(x, x', x'')^T \begin{bmatrix} C(x, x') \\ C(x, x'') \end{bmatrix}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1. The $y_i = f(x_i) + \varepsilon_i$ are sums of (jointly) Gaussian random variables, so they are also jointly Gaussian. Thus $(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n, f(x))$ is multivariate Gaussian. It follows from Lemma 1 that $f(x) | \mathcal{D} = f(x) | (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$ is (univariate) Gaussian.

By property (M) and the errors' independence of $\{f(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$, we know $f(x)$ is conditionally independent of \mathcal{D} given the values $f(x_i)$ with x_i closest to x . I use this fact to prove cases (i)–(iii):

(i) Suppose $x \leq x_1$. Then $f(x)$ is conditionally independent of \mathcal{D} given $f(x_1)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(x) | \mathcal{D}] &\stackrel{\star}{=} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f(x) | \mathcal{D}_n, f(x_1)] | \mathcal{D}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f(x) | f(x_1)] | \mathcal{D}] \\ &\stackrel{\star\star}{=} \mathbb{E}\left[m(x) + \frac{C(x_1, x)}{V(x_1)}(f(x_1) - m(x_1)) | \mathcal{D}\right] \\ &= m(x) + \frac{C(x_1, x)}{V(x_1)}(\mathbb{E}[f(x_1) | \mathcal{D}] - m(x_1)), \end{aligned}$$

where \star holds by the law of total expectation and $\star\star$ holds by Lemma 2. Likewise

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f(x) | \mathcal{D}) &\stackrel{\star}{=} \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[f(x) | \mathcal{D}, f(x_1)] | \mathcal{D}) + \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(f(x) | \mathcal{D}, f(x_1)) | \mathcal{D}] \\ &= \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[f(x) | f(x_1)] | \mathcal{D}) + \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(f(x) | f(x_1)) | \mathcal{D}] \\ &\stackrel{\star\star}{=} \text{Var}\left(m(x) + \frac{C(x_1, x)}{V(x_1)}(f(x_1) - m(x_1)) | \mathcal{D}\right) + \text{Var}(f(x) | f(x_1)) \\ &= \left(\frac{C(x_1, x)}{V(x_1)}\right)^2 \text{Var}(f(x_1) | \mathcal{D}) + \text{Var}(f(x) | f(x_1)), \end{aligned}$$

where \star holds by the law of total variance and $\star\star$ holds by Lemma 2.

(ii) Now suppose $x_k \leq x \leq x_{k+1}$ for some $k < n$. Then $f(x)$ is conditionally independent of \mathcal{D} given $f(x_k)$ and $f(x_{k+1})$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}] &\stackrel{\star}{=} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}_n, f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})] \mid \mathcal{D}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})] \mid \mathcal{D}] \\ &\stackrel{\star\star}{=} \mathbb{E}\left[m(x) + w(x, x_k, x_{k+1})^T \begin{bmatrix} f(x_k) - m(x_k) \\ f(x_{k+1}) - m(x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathcal{D}\right] \\ &= m(x) + w(x, x_k, x_{k+1})^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[f(x_k) \mid \mathcal{D}] - m(x_k) \\ \mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{D}] - m(x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where \star holds by the law of total expectation and $\star\star$ holds by Lemma 2. Likewise

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}) &\stackrel{\star}{=} \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}, f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})] \mid \mathcal{D}) + \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}(f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}, f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})) \mid \mathcal{D}] \\ &= \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})] \mid \mathcal{D}) + \text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})) \\ &\stackrel{\star\star}{=} \text{Var}\left(m(x) + w(x, x_k, x_{k+1})^T \begin{bmatrix} f(x_k) - m(x_k) \\ f(x_{k+1}) - m(x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathcal{D}\right) \\ &\quad + \text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})) \\ &= w(x, x_k, x_{k+1})^T \text{Var}\left(\begin{bmatrix} f(x_k) \\ f(x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathcal{D}\right) w(x, x_k, x_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + \text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})), \end{aligned}$$

where \star holds by the law of total variance and $\star\star$ holds by Lemma 2.

(iii) Finally, suppose $x \geq x_n$. Then $f(x)$ is conditionally independent of \mathcal{D} given $f(x_n)$. The result follows from similar arguments used to prove case (i). \square

Proof of Corollary 1. The Brownian motion is a Gauss-Markov process, so $f(x) \mid \mathcal{D}$ is Gaussian by Theorem 1. We can also use that theorem to prove cases (i)–(iii).

Consider cases (i) and (iii). By Lemma 2 and the definitions of m and C , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x')) &= \sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x - \frac{(\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 \min\{x, x'\})^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x'} \\ &= \frac{\sigma_0^2 \sigma^2 (x + x' - 2 \min\{x, x'\}) + \sigma^4 (x x' - \min\{x, x'\}^2)}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x'} \\ &= \frac{\sigma_0^2 \sigma^2 |x - x'| + \sigma^4 \min\{x, x'\} |x - x'|}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x'} \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 \min\{x, x'\}}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x'} \right) \sigma^2 |x - x'| \\ &= \sigma^2 |x - x'| \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x'} & \text{if } x \leq x' \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

for all $x' \geq 0$. Cases (i) and (iii) follow from substituting (7), along the definitions of m and C , into the statement of Theorem 1.

Now consider case (ii). Define $w(x, x_k, x_{k+1})$ as in Lemma 2. If $x_k \leq x \leq x_{k+1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, x_k, x_{k+1}) &\equiv \frac{1}{V(x_k)V(x_{k+1}) - C(x_k, x_{k+1})^2} \begin{bmatrix} C(x, x_k)V(x_{k+1}) - C(x, x_{k+1})C(x_k, x_{k+1}) \\ C(x, x_{k+1})V(x_k) - C(x, x_k)C(x_k, x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{V(x_k)V(x_{k+1}) - V(x_k)^2} \begin{bmatrix} V(x_k)V(x_{k+1}) - V(x)V(x_k) \\ V(x)V(x_k) - V(x_k)V(x_k) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{x_{k+1} - x_k} \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} - x \\ x - x_k \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

because $C(x', x'') = V(\min\{x', x''\})$ for all $x', x'' \geq 0$ by the definitions of C and V . So

$$\begin{aligned} &w^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[f(x_k) \mid \mathcal{D}] - m(x_k) \\ \mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{D}] - m(x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{x_{k+1} - x_k} \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} - x \\ x - x_k \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[f(x_k) \mid \mathcal{D}] \\ \mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{D}] \end{bmatrix} - \frac{1}{x_{k+1} - x_k} \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} - x \\ x - x_k \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \mu_0 + \mu x_k \\ \mu_0 + \mu x_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{(x_{k+1} - x)\mathbb{E}[f(x_k) \mid \mathcal{D}] + (x - x_k)\mathbb{E}[f(x_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{D}]}{x_{k+1} - x_k} - \mu_0 - \mu x \end{aligned}$$

by the definition of m , and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f(x) \mid f(x_k), f(x_{k+1})) &= V(x) - w(x, x_k, x_{k+1})^T \begin{bmatrix} C(x, x_k) \\ C(x, x_{k+1}) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x - \frac{1}{x_{k+1} - x_k} \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} - x \\ x - x_k \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x_k \\ \sigma_0^2 + \sigma^2 x \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2(x_{k+1} - x)(x - x_k)}{x_{k+1} - x_k} \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2. The result follows from Theorem 1(ii). □