

Robust Quickest Change Detection with Sampling Control

Yingze Hou^a, Hoda Bidkhori^b and Taposh Banerjee^{a*}

^a Industrial Engineering, University of Pittsburgh

^b Computational and Data Sciences, George Mason University

Abstract

The problem of quickest detection of a change in the distribution of a sequence of random variables is studied. The objective is to detect the change with the minimum possible delay, subject to constraints on the rate of false alarms and the cost of observations used in the decision-making process. The post-change distribution of the data is known only within a distribution family. It is shown that if the post-change family has a distribution that is least favorable in a well-defined sense, then a computationally efficient algorithm can be designed that uses an on-off observation control strategy to save the cost of observations. In addition, the algorithm can detect the change robustly while avoiding unnecessary false alarms. It is shown that the algorithm is also asymptotically robust optimal as the rate of false alarms goes to zero for every fixed constraint on the cost of observations. The algorithm's effectiveness is validated on simulated data and real public health data.

Keywords: Change detection, Data-efficient, Observation control, Robust optimality

1 Introduction

In the Quickest Change Detection (QCD) problem for independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) data, a decision maker observes a sequence of random variables, $\{X_n\}$. Before a change point, denoted by ν , these random variables are i.i.d. with a fixed density f . Following the change at ν , the sequence X_n becomes i.i.d. with a different density g . The objective of QCD is to detect the shift in distribution from f to g , as quickly as possible, while avoiding false alarms. As a result, stochastic optimization problems are solved to find a QCD algorithm, where the goal is to minimize a metric on the average detection delay subject to a constraint on a metric of false alarms. The QCD problem has applications in event detection or anomaly detection problems in finance, sensor networks, statistical process control, and public health (Poor and Hadjiliadis (2009); Veeravalli and Banerjee (2014); Tartakovsky et al. (2014))

In the Bayesian setting of the QCD problem, where the change point ν is treated as a random variable with a known prior distribution, the optimal solution is obtained by minimizing the average detection delay (averaged over the prior on the change point) subject to a constraint on the probability of false alarm. The optimal solution in this setting is the Shiryaev test where a change is declared the first time the *a-posteriori* probability that the change has already occurred crossed a well-designed threshold (Shiryaev (1963); Tartakovsky and Veeravalli (2005)). Some recent results on QCD in the Bayesian setting can be found in (Veeravalli and Banerjee (2014); Tartakovsky et al.

*CONTACT: Taposh Banerjee. Email: taposh.banerjee@pitt.edu

(2014); Tartakovsky (2019); Banerjee et al. (2021); Guo et al. (2023); Naha and Dey (2024); Hou et al. (2024b)).

Without prior knowledge of the distribution for the change point ν , the change point is regarded as an unknown constant. In this non-Bayesian setting, the concept of conditional delay (conditioned on the change point) is introduced, with the average detection delay depending on the timing of the change. Consequently, a minimax approach is adopted, to minimize the worst-case delay across all possible change points. The QCD problem is examined under two different minimax frameworks in (Pollak (1985)) and (Lorden (1971)). An optimal solution in this setting, for both minimax formulations, is the Cumulative Sum (CUSUM) algorithm, where the alarm is raised when an accumulated version of the log-likelihood ratios crosses a threshold (Page (1954); Lorden (1971); Moustakides (1986); Lai (1998)). A comprehensive review of the literature, along with recent advances in the non-Bayesian setting, can be found in (Veeravalli and Banerjee (2014); Tartakovsky et al. (2014); Tartakovsky (2019); Liang et al. (2022); Brucks et al. (2023)).

When the post-change distribution is unknown, optimal algorithms are generally developed using three main approaches: (1) generalized likelihood ratio (GLR) tests, in which we replace the unknown post-change parameter with its maximum likelihood estimate (Lorden (1971); Lai (1998); Tartakovsky et al. (2014); Lau et al. (2018); Tartakovsky (2019)); (2) mixture-based tests, in which we assume a prior model for the post-change parameters and integrate the likelihood ratio over this prior (Pollak (1987); Lai (1998); Tartakovsky et al. (2014); Tartakovsky (2019)); and (3) robust tests, in which we design optimal tests using a least favorable distribution (Unnikrishnan et al. (2011); Oleyaemotlagh et al. (2023); Hou et al. (2024b)). Among these, only the robust approach yields test statistics that are computationally efficient and can be calculated recursively.

In several applications of QCD, acquiring data or observations for decision-making is costly. The cost could be associated with the labor required to conduct experiments and collect data, the loss of revenue while performing a particular test (e.g., destructive testing), or the cost of computation, energy, or battery to process observations. This issue is amplified when changes occur rarely. In traditional statistical process control, the cost of taking observation is minimized by performing sampling control (Reynolds Jr and Stoumbos (2004)). In a series of papers (Banerjee and Veeravalli (2012, 2013, 2015)), the problem of QCD with sampling control has been studied. In these works, optimal algorithms were obtained to minimize the detection delay, subject to constraints on the rate of false alarms and the average number of observations used before the change point. An optimal QCD algorithm with sampling control in these papers has two thresholds. The higher threshold is used for stopping and the lower threshold for on-off observation control. One remarkable fact proven in these papers is that these two-threshold algorithms have the same asymptotic delay and false alarm performances as the classical QCD algorithms without sampling control. In addition, one can achieve any arbitrary, but fixed, constraint on the sampling control.

One key limitation in the works Banerjee and Veeravalli (2012, 2013) is that to achieve optimality, one needs to know the precise pre- and post-change densities. This issue was partially addressed in the follow-up work Banerjee and Veeravalli (2015) where it was assumed that the post-change law is unknown and a GLR or a mixture approach was taken for QCD with sampling control. As discussed earlier, one major limitation of a GLR-based algorithm is that, although it allows us to achieve uniform optimality over all possible post-change parameters, it is computationally hard to implement.

In this paper, we take a robust approach to QCD with sampling control when the post-change distribution is unknown. We obtain a computationally efficient algorithm using which we can avoid false alarms and save the cost of observations. In addition, the algorithm is robust in the sense that,

under certain stochastic boundedness assumptions, it can detect all possible post-change scenarios. We also formally prove the robust optimality of the algorithm for a robust problem formulation.

We summarize our contributions here:

1. We propose a robust QCD algorithm capable of sampling control where the post-change distribution is unknown. We design the algorithm using the notion of least favorable law (LFL) to be made precise below. See Section 3.
2. We show that the proposed algorithm can consistently detect all post-change scenarios. We also provide design guidelines to satisfy constraints on false alarms and the cost of observations. See Section 4.
3. We propose a robust QCD formulation taking into account sampling control and show that our algorithm is asymptotically optimal with respect to the proposed problem formulation. See Section 2 and Section 4.
4. We demonstrate the effectiveness of the algorithm on both simulated and real data. In particular, when applied to detect the onset of a pandemic, the robust algorithm, which selectively skips observations, showed nearly comparable performance to the robust CUSUM test that does not skip observations (see Section 6).

2 Problem Formulation

We observe a sequence of random variables $\{X_n\}$ with the following property:

$$X_n \sim \begin{cases} f, & \forall n < \nu, \\ g, & \forall n \geq \nu. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Thus, before a time ν , the random variables have density f (with distribution F) and after ν , the random variables have density g (with distribution G). The variables are independent conditioned on the time ν . The density g , or equivalently the distribution G , is unknown. However, we assume that G belongs to a known family of distributions \mathcal{G} :

$$\mathcal{G} = \{G : G \text{ is a possible post-change distribution}\}.$$

We wish to detect the change in density from f to g as quickly as possible while avoiding false alarms. However, not all observations can be used for decision-making because there is a cost associated with collecting observations. To control the cost of observations, we choose the mechanism of on-off observation control. It will be shown later in the paper that on-off observation controls are sufficient to achieve strong optimality results. Let M_n be the indicator random variable such that

$$M_n = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } X_n \text{ is used for decision-making,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The information available at time n is denoted by

$$\mathcal{I}_n = [M_1, \dots, M_n, X_1^{(M_1)}, \dots, X_n^{(M_n)}],$$

where $X_i^{(M_i)} = X_i$ if $M_i = 1$, otherwise X_i is absent from the information vector \mathcal{I}_n . Also, \mathcal{I}_0 is an empty set. The control M_{n+1} is a function of the information available at time n . Namely,

$$M_{n+1} = \phi_{n+1}(\mathcal{I}_n),$$

where ϕ_{n+1} is some possibly time-dependent function. Thus, the decision on whether to take the observation at time $n + 1$ is taken based on information available at time n .

When a change is detected, the observation process is stopped. This time of stopping τ is also a part of the decision-making process. We choose τ as a stopping time on the information sequence $\{\mathcal{I}_n\}$. This means that the indicator function $\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau=n\}}$ will be a function of \mathcal{I}_n . More formally, the event $\{\tau \leq n\}$ is part of the sigma-algebra generated by \mathcal{I}_n . Our policy for QCD with sampling control is

$$\Psi = \{\tau, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_\tau\}.$$

To find an optimal policy, we now define the metrics on delay, false alarm, and the cost of observations. For delay, we consider the minimax formulation of (Lorden (1971)):

$$\text{WADD}^G(\Psi) := \sup_k \text{ess sup } \mathbb{E}_k^G[(\tau - k + 1)^+ | \mathcal{I}_{k-1}]. \quad (2.2)$$

Here, we use \mathbb{P}_n^G to denote the law of the observation process $\{X_n\}$ when the change occurs at $\nu = n$ and the post-change law is given by G , and \mathbb{E}_n^G for the corresponding expectation. When there is no change (change occurring at $\nu = \infty$), we use $\mathbb{P}_\infty^G = \mathbb{P}_\infty$ and $\mathbb{E}_\infty^G = \mathbb{E}_\infty$ to denote the correspond measure and expectation. The essential supremum operation $\text{ess sup } X$ gives the smallest constant C such that $\mathbb{P}(X \leq C) = 1$. The supremum over $k \geq 1$ is taken, since the change point $\nu = k$ is treated as an unknown constant. Therefore, we consider the worst-case delay over the change points and past realizations. While it may appear overly pessimistic, WADD is the only delay metric studied in the literature for which strong optimality results have been developed in both minimax and robust settings (Unnikrishnan et al. (2011); Hou et al. (2024b,a)).

For the false alarm metric, without prior statistical knowledge of the change point, we consider the mean-time to a false alarm (assuming no change happens) or its reciprocal, the false alarm rate (Lorden (1971)):

$$\text{FAR}(\Psi) := \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_\infty[\tau]}. \quad (2.3)$$

For a metric on the cost of observations, we use the Pre-change Duty Cycle (PDC) metric first introduced in (Banerjee and Veeravalli (2013)):

$$\text{PDC}(\Psi) := \limsup_k \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}_k^G \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} M_i \mid \tau \geq k \right] = \limsup_k \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}_\infty \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} M_i \mid \tau \geq k \right]. \quad (2.4)$$

The PDC is the average of the fraction of observations used before the change point $\nu = k$, $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} M_i$ when the change occurs at a far horizon ($k \rightarrow \infty$), and there is no false alarm ($\tau \geq k$). Clearly, $\text{PDC} \leq 1$. The expectation \mathbb{E}_∞ is used because the fraction $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} M_i$ only depends on the data used before the change point $\nu = k$.

The minimax formulation studied in Banerjee and Veeravalli (2013), where the post-change law g is assumed known, is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\Psi} \text{WADD}^G(\Psi) \\ & \text{subject to } \text{FAR}(\Psi) \leq \alpha, \\ & \text{and } \text{PDC}(\Psi) \leq \beta, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where α is a constraint on the false alarm rate and β is a constraint on the PDC. With $\beta = 1$, problem (2.5) reduces to the minimax formulation of Lorden (1971).

However, since the post-change law G is not exactly known to the decision-maker, we consider a robust version of the problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\Psi} \sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \text{WADD}^G(\Psi) \\ & \text{subject to } \text{FAR}(\Psi) \leq \alpha, \\ & \text{and } \text{PDC}(\Psi) \leq \beta. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

We say that a policy $\Psi = \{\tau, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_\tau\}$ is robust optimal if it is a solution to the problem in (2.6). We say that a policy is asymptotically robust optimal if it is a solution to the problem in (2.6), as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, for a fixed β .

3 Algorithm for Robust QCD with Adaptive Sampling Control

In this section, we propose a computationally efficient QCD algorithm with sampling control that can be implemented without precisely knowing the post-change density g . In the next section, we will show that the proposed algorithm is asymptotically robust optimal for the problem in (2.6). To define the algorithm, we need the following definitions.

Definition 1 (Stochastic boundedness). Consider random variable Z_1 with density f_1 and random variable Z_2 with density f_2 . We say f_1 is stochastically bounded by f_2 , and use the notation $f_2 \succ f_1$ or $Z_2 \succ Z_1$ if

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_2 \geq t) \geq \mathbb{P}(Z_1 \geq t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Definition 2 (Least Favorable Law (LFL)). We say the family of post-change laws \mathcal{G} is stochastically bounded by a law $\bar{G} \in \mathcal{G}$ if

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\log \frac{\bar{g}(X)}{f(X)}, G\right) \succ \mathcal{L}\left(\log \frac{\bar{g}(X)}{f(X)}, \bar{G}\right), \quad \forall G \in \mathcal{G},$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\phi(X), G)$ denotes the law or distribution of $\phi(X)$ when X has distribution G . We refer to \bar{G} or its density \bar{g} as the least favorable law.

Definition 3. The Kullback-Leibler divergence between two densities g and f is defined as

$$D_{\text{KL}}(g \parallel f) := \int g(x) \log \frac{g(x)}{f(x)} dx.$$

Assumption 1. *In the rest of the paper, we will make the following assumptions:*

1. *An LFL \bar{g} exists.*
2. *All the likelihood ratios appearing in the paper are continuous and have finite positive moments up to second order.*

We now define our algorithm, called the Robust Data-Efficient Cumulative Sum (RDE-CUSUM) algorithm, using the LFL \bar{g} .

Algorithm 3.1 (RDE-CUSUM Policy or Algorithm: $\bar{\Psi}_{\text{RDC}}(A, \mu, h)$). *Fix $A > 0$, $\mu > 0$, and $h \geq 0$. The RDE-CUSUM statistic $\{\bar{D}_n\}$ and the corresponding sampling control $\{\bar{M}_n\}$ are defined as follows:*

1. *Sampling control:*

$$\bar{M}_{n+1} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \bar{D}_n \geq 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \bar{D}_n < 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Thus, we use the variable X_{n+1} only when the past statistic \bar{D}_n is non-negative.

2. *Statistic calculation: Start with $\bar{D}_0 = 0$ and calculate $\{\bar{D}_n\}$ as follows:*

$$\bar{D}_{n+1} = \begin{cases} \left(\bar{D}_n + \log \frac{\bar{g}(X_{n+1})}{f(X_{n+1})} \right)^{h+}, & \text{if } \bar{M}_{n+1} = 1, \\ \min\{\bar{D}_n + \mu, 0\}, & \text{if } \bar{M}_{n+1} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

When X_{n+1} is used for decision making ($\bar{M}_{n+1} = 1$), we update the test statistic using the usual CUSUM update, except we allow it to go below zero through the operation $(x)^{h+} := \max\{x, -h\}$. If the statistic \bar{D}_{n+1} goes below zero because of this operation, the next sample will be skipped. When a sample is skipped, the statistic is updated by adding a carefully chosen constant μ to the current value of the statistic.

3. *Stopping rule: Stop at*

$$\bar{\tau}_{\text{rdc}} = \inf\{n \geq 1 : \bar{D}_n \geq A\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Thus, we stop the first time the statistic \bar{D}_n crosses a carefully designed threshold A .

Overall, the algorithm works as follows. We start with $\bar{D}_0 = 0$. Thus, the first sample is always taken $M_1 = 1$ and the statistic is updated using $\bar{D}_1 = \max\{\bar{D}_0 + \log[\bar{g}(X_1)]/f(X_1)\}, -h\}$. As long as the statistic $\bar{D}_n \geq 0$, this update is repeated for every collected sample. Once \bar{D}_n goes below zero, a number of consecutive samples are skipped based on the undershoot of the statistic. This undershoot is truncated at $-h$ for mathematical convenience (although h can be any arbitrary but fixed value). Since the undershoot distribution depends on the given pre- and post-change laws, it cannot be directly controlled. Thus, to control the average number of observations used, a parameter $\mu > 0$ is used to skip $\lceil \text{undershoot}/\mu \rceil$ number of observations, where $\lceil x \rceil$ represents the smallest integer bigger than x . Thus, the smaller the value of μ , the larger the number of consecutive samples skipped for any fixed undershoot value. As with most standard change detection algorithms, a change is declared when the statistic is above some threshold A —a large value of A results in a

lower value of the rate of false alarms. We will later show that the constraints on FAR and PDC can be met approximately independently of each other.

We now compare the structure of the RDE-CUSUM algorithm with other standard algorithms in the literature. When $\mu = 0, h = 0$, the RDE-CUSUM algorithm reduces to the robust CUSUM algorithm introduced in Unnikrishnan et al. (2011). When the post-change law is precisely known, the post-change family is a singleton, i.e., $\mathcal{G} = \{\bar{g}\}$, and $\mu > 0, h > 0$, then the RDE-CUSUM algorithm reduces to the DE-CUSUM algorithm introduced in Banerjee and Veeravalli (2013). Finally, when $\mathcal{G} = \{\bar{g}\}$ and $\mu = 0, h = 0$, the RDE-CUSUM algorithm reduces to the classical CUSUM algorithm.

4 Asymptotic Optimality of RDE-CUSUM Algorithm

To prove the asymptotic optimality of the RDE-CUSUM algorithm, we first establish a universal lower bound on the performance of any policy.

Theorem 4.1 (Universal Lower Bound). *Let Ψ be any policy for QCD with sampling control that satisfies the $\text{FAR}(\Psi) \leq \alpha$ and $\text{PDC}(\Psi) \leq \beta$, for any fixed $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $0 < \beta < 1$. Then,*

$$\sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \text{WADD}^G(\Psi) \geq \frac{|\log \alpha|}{\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\bar{g} \| f)}(1 + o(1)), \quad (4.1)$$

where the $o(1)$ term goes to zero as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Note that

$$\sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \text{WADD}^G(\Psi) \geq \text{WADD}^{\bar{G}}(\Psi)$$

When the pre-change law is f and the post-change law is \bar{g} , it is well-known (Lai (1998); Lorden (1971)) that

$$\text{WADD}^{\bar{G}}(\Psi) \geq \frac{|\log \alpha|}{\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\bar{g} \| f)}(1 + o(1)). \quad (4.2)$$

□

Note that for any fixed β , the lower bound only depends on the FAR constraint α and does not depend on β .

To show that the proposed algorithm RDE-CUSUM achieves the lower bound, we first prove a theorem on its FAR and PDC performances.

Theorem 4.2. *The RDE-CUSUM algorithm $\bar{\Psi}_{RDC}$ satisfies the following FAR and PDC bounds.*

1. *False Alarm Rate constraint α : For any fixed h and μ , setting $A = |\log \alpha|$ guarantees that*

$$\text{FAR}(\bar{\Psi}_{RDC}) \leq \alpha.$$

Thus, the FAR constraint can be met irrespective of the choices for h and μ to satisfy the PDC constraint β .

2. *Pre-change duty cycle constraint β* : For any choice of the threshold $A > 0$ and parameter $h > 0$, there are constants C_1 and $C_2(h)$ (that are not a function of A) such that setting

$$\mu \leq \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \frac{C_2(h)}{C_1}$$

guarantees that

$$\text{PDC}(\bar{\Psi}_{RDC}) \leq \beta.$$

Here we use $C_2(h)$ to denote that the constant C_2 depends on h . Thus, the PDC constraint can be met irrespective of the choice of threshold A chosen to satisfy the FAR constraint α .

Proof. See Appendix A. □

We remark that the FAR bound is universal and does not depend on the LFL \bar{g} . However, the choice of μ to satisfy the PDC constraint depends on \bar{g} through the constants C_1 and C_2 appearing in the theorem.

When $A \rightarrow \infty$ and $h \rightarrow \infty$, the choice of μ is considerably simplified.

Corollary 4.3 (Simple Choice of μ). *If $A \rightarrow \infty$ and $h \rightarrow \infty$, then by selecting μ such that*

$$\mu \leq \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(f \parallel \bar{g}), \quad (4.3)$$

the PDC constraint of β can be satisfied in that asymptotic regime, or asymptotically satisfied.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Next, we provide a delay analysis of the RDE-CUSUM algorithm and obtain an upper bound on $\sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \text{WADD}^G(\bar{\Psi}_{RDC})$ for any choice of threshold A .

Theorem 4.4. *If Assumption 1 is satisfied, then for any fixed choices for A, μ, h , the delay of the RDE-CUSUM algorithm satisfies*

$$\sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \text{WADD}^G(\bar{\Psi}_{RDC}) \leq \frac{A}{\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\bar{g} \parallel f)} (1 + o(1)), \quad (4.4)$$

where the $o(1)$ term goes to zero as $A \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. See Appendix B. □

Based on the results above, we can now state and prove the result on the asymptotic robust optimality of the RDE-CUSUM algorithm.

Theorem 4.5 (Asymptotic robust optimality of RDE-CUSUM). *If Assumption 1 is satisfied, then the RDE-CUSUM algorithm is asymptotically robust optimal for each fixed β , as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.2, the FAR constraint α is satisfied if we set the threshold $A = |\log \alpha|$. Fix any $0 < h < \infty$. By setting $\mu \leq \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \frac{C_2(h)}{C_1}$, the PDC constraint is satisfied. Thus, both FAR and PDC constraint can be met and for $A = |\log \alpha|$, Theorem 4.4 shows that

$$\sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \text{WADD}^G(\bar{\Psi}_{RDC}) \leq \frac{A}{\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\bar{g} \parallel f)} (1 + o(1)) = \frac{|\log \alpha|}{\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\bar{g} \parallel f)} (1 + o(1)). \quad (4.5)$$

By Theorem 4.1, the obtained upper bound is also the lower bound. This proves the asymptotic robust optimality of the RDE-CUSUM algorithm. □

5 Examples of Least Favorable Law

In this section, we provide examples of LFL from Gaussian and Poisson families. For more similar and more general examples, we refer the readers to Unnikrishnan et al. (2011); Hou et al. (2024a,b).

Example 1 (Gaussian LFL). Let the pre-change density be given by $f = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and the post-change densities be given by

$$g = \mathcal{N}(\mu, 1), \quad \mu \geq \bar{\mu},$$

where the mean is not known but is believed to be lower bounded by some known $\bar{\mu}$. We show that $\bar{g} = \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mu}, 1)$ is LFL. Since

$$\log \frac{\bar{g}(X)}{f(X)} = \bar{\mu}X - \frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} X \sim \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mu}, 1) &\implies \log \frac{\bar{g}(X)}{f(X)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2}, \bar{\mu}^2\right), \\ X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, 1) &\implies \log \frac{\bar{g}(X)}{f(X)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\bar{\mu} \cdot \mu - \frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2}, \bar{\mu}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu \geq \bar{\mu}$, we have $\bar{\mu} \cdot \mu - \frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2} \geq \frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2}$. Thus, $\mathcal{N}\left(\bar{\mu} \cdot \mu - \frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2}, \bar{\mu}^2\right)$ dominates $\mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2}, \bar{\mu}^2\right)$ in stochastic order Hou et al. (2024a,b).

Example 2 (Poisson LFL). Let the pre-change density be given by $f = \text{Pois}(\lambda_0)$ and the post-change densities be given by

$$g = \text{Pois}(\lambda_1), \quad \lambda_1 \geq \bar{\lambda}_1,$$

where the mean is not known but is believed to be lower bounded by some known $\bar{\lambda}_1$. We show that $\bar{g} = \text{Pois}(\bar{\lambda}_1)$ is LFL. Since

$$\log \frac{\bar{g}(X)}{f(X)} = \log \left[\left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_0} \right)^X e^{-\bar{\lambda}_1 + \lambda_0} \right] = X \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_0} \right) - \bar{\lambda}_1 + \lambda_0,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} X \sim \text{Pois}(\bar{\lambda}_1) &\implies \log \frac{\bar{g}(X)}{f(X)} \sim \text{Pois}\left(\bar{\lambda}_1 \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_0} \right) - \bar{\lambda}_1 + \lambda_0\right), \\ X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda_1) &\implies \log \frac{\bar{g}(X)}{f(X)} \sim \text{Pois}\left(\lambda_1 \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_0} \right) - \bar{\lambda}_1 + \lambda_0\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda_1 \geq \bar{\lambda}_1$, we have

$$\lambda_1 \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_0} \right) - \bar{\lambda}_1 + \lambda_0 \geq \bar{\lambda}_1 \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_0} \right) - \bar{\lambda}_1 + \lambda_0.$$

Thus, $\text{Pois}\left(\lambda_1 \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_0} \right) - \bar{\lambda}_1 + \lambda_0\right)$ stochastically dominates $\text{Pois}\left(\bar{\lambda}_1 \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_0} \right) - \bar{\lambda}_1 + \lambda_0\right)$ Hou et al. (2024a,b).

6 Numerical Studies

We demonstrate the effectiveness of the RDE-CUSUM algorithm on both simulated and real data. First, we compare the detection time of robust algorithms across different values of β in the PDC constraint, using simulated continuous and discrete data processes, Gaussian and Poisson. Next, we validate its effectiveness through extensive simulations. We also apply the RDE-CUSUM algorithm to detect the onset of a pandemic. The results indicate that the RDE-CUSUM algorithm, which adaptively skips observations, performs nearly as effectively as the robust CUSUM test, which does not skip observations.

6.1 RDE-CUSUM Algorithm on Simulated Data with Unknown Density

We first consider a Gaussian example:

$$f = \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad g = \mathcal{N}(\theta, 1), \quad \theta \geq 0.5. \quad (6.1)$$

As discussed in Section 5, the LFL is $\bar{g} = \mathcal{N}(0.5, 1)$. In Figure 1 (right), we compare the detection delays (WADD) of three schemes:

1. the RDE-CUSUM algorithm,
2. the robust CUSUM algorithm (the RDE-CUSUM algorithm with no observation control), and
3. the fractional sampling scheme, where the robust CUSUM statistic is updated based on a fair coin toss: if a head is obtained, the new observation is incorporated to update the robust CUSUM statistic; otherwise, the previous statistic value is retained. The first observation is always included.

For the RDE-CUSUM algorithm (3.3), $h = 10$ and μ is chosen according to (4.3). We compare




Figure 1: Comparison of RDE-CUSUM algorithm, robust CUSUM algorithm, and the fractional sampling scheme-based robust CUSUM algorithm for Gaussian data processes (6.1) with $\theta = 1$.

the WADD across different false alarm rates. Each point represents an empirical average from

5000 simulations, with carefully chosen thresholds to ensure comparable false alarm rates. The shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. When $\beta = 0.5$, the detection delay of the RDE-CUSUM algorithm closely matches that of the robust CUSUM, the robust optimal solution with known distribution that uses all the observations. For smaller β values, WADD increases, but it remains lower than that of the fraction sample algorithm. The plot shows that one can skip 50% of the observations used in the detection process without significantly affecting the detection delay and without knowing the post-change distribution.

In Figure 2, we report a similar result for Poisson data:

$$f = \text{Pois}(0.5), \quad g = \text{Pois}(\lambda), \quad \lambda \geq 1, \quad (6.2)$$

for which $\bar{g} = \text{Pois}(1)$.




Figure 2: Comparison of RDE-CUSUM algorithm, robust CUSUM algorithm, and the fractional sampling scheme-based robust CUSUM algorithm for Gaussian data processes (6.2) with $\lambda = 1.5$.

6.2 Robust DE-CUSUM Test on Detecting Pandemic Onset

In this section, we apply the RDE-CUSUM algorithm, the robust CUSUM, and the fractional sampling scheme-based robust CUSUM algorithm to detect the onset of a pandemic using publicly available U.S. COVID-19 infection data.

In Figure 3 (Left) and Figure 4 (Left), we selected two U.S. counties with similar population sizes, Allegheny in PA and St. Louis in MO. The daily case counts for the first 200 days (starting from 2020/1/22) are shown, with $\text{Pois}(1)$ noise added to the data. This data generation process emulates scenarios requiring the detection of a pandemic onset amidst daily infections caused by other viruses or the emergence of a new variant. Therefore, the data represents the detection of deviations from an established baseline.

In Figure 3 (Right) and Figure 4 (Right), since the actual number of infections is unknown, we take a robust approach, designing the CUSUM test with a post-change LFL given by $\text{Pois}(2)$. The threshold is set to $6.9 = \log(1000)$ to ensure an expected time to false alarm exceeding 1000. Both the robust CUSUM and robust DE-CUSUM algorithm (with $h = 10$) detect the change promptly




Figure 3: Robust test for detecting COVID-19 outbreak in Allegheny County. [Left] Daily increase of confirmed infection cases with $\text{Pois}(1)$ noise added. [Right] To detect the pandemic outbreak, robust CUSUM test is designed with pre-change density $f = \text{Pois}(1)$ and post-LFL $\bar{g} = \text{Pois}(2)$. The threshold is chosen to be $6.9 = \log(1000)$ to guarantee an expected time to false alarm greater than 1000 days.




Figure 4: Robust test for detecting COVID-19 outbreak in St. Louis County. [Left] Daily increase of confirmed infection cases with $\text{Pois}(1)$ noise added. [Right] To detect the pandemic outbreak, robust CUSUM test is designed with pre-change density $f = \text{Pois}(1)$ and post-LFL $\bar{g} = \text{Pois}(2)$. The threshold is chosen to be $6.9 = \log(1000)$ to guarantee an expected time to false alarm greater than 1000 days.

(within a week) after daily infections start to rise significantly (a few days past the 50th day in both counties). Given its lower observation cost, the data-efficient algorithm may be preferable for such public health monitoring. The fractional sampling scheme also detects the outbreak and is notably responsive in St. Louis County. However, it does not consistently match the timely detection of the RDE-CUSUM algorithm, aligning with the results in Figure 2 (right).

7 Conclusion

We proposed the RDE-CUSUM algorithm that uses the likelihood ratio of the data to detect the change and execute an on-off observation control. Since the post-change law is not precisely known, the likelihood ratios are computed using the LFL. A change is declared when the accumulated likelihood ratios cross a threshold. When the accumulated likelihood ratio goes below zero, consecutive samples are skipped based on the undershoot and using a design parameter. After the skipped

samples, the accumulation of the likelihood ratios starts again by ignoring the past observations. We showed that the RDE-CUSUM algorithm can be designed to meet the constraints on the false alarm rate and the pre-change duty cycle independently. The algorithm is also asymptotically robust optimal for every fixed constraint on the pre-change duty cycle as the rate of false alarms goes to zero. We showed through simulations that the RDE-CUSUM algorithm can skip a fixed but large fraction of samples without significantly affecting the detection delay and performs comparatively with the robust CUSUM algorithm that uses all the observations. Since the RDE-CUSUM algorithm adaptively skips samples, it performs better than a fractional sampling scheme where observations are skipped based on a coin toss. Finally, we applied the algorithm to detect the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic without using a significant number of samples before the onset.

A Proof of Theorem 4.2 and Corollary 4.3

It follows from the arguments given in the proof of Lemma 4 in Banerjee and Veeravalli (2013) that

$$\text{FAR}(\bar{\Psi}_{\text{RDC}}(A, \mu, h)) \leq \text{FAR}(\bar{\Psi}_{\text{RDC}}(A, 0, 0)), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\bar{\Psi}_{\text{RDC}}(A, 0, 0)$ is the RDE-CUSUM algorithm with parameters $\mu = h = 0$. As discussed earlier, this corresponds to the robust CUSUM algorithm from Unnikrishnan et al. (2011). Since robust CUSUM algorithm is the classical CUSUM algorithm with pre-change f and post-change \bar{g} , it follows from the classical analysis of the CUSUM algorithm (Lorden (1971)) that $A = |\log \alpha|$ guarantees that

$$\text{FAR}(\bar{\Psi}_{\text{RDC}}(A, 0, 0)) \leq \alpha.$$

We refer the readers to Banerjee and Veeravalli (2013) to understand why (A.1) is true.

To prove the result on the PDC, we need some definitions. We first define the stopping time for a sequential probability ratio test using densities f and \bar{g} :

$$\lambda_A := \inf \left\{ n \geq 1 : \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{\bar{g}(X_i)}{f(X_i)} \notin [0, A] \right\}.$$

It follows from the definitions that

$$\bar{D}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{\bar{g}(X_i)}{f(X_i)}, \text{ for } n < \lambda_A.$$

Thus,

$$\lambda_A = \inf \{ n \geq 1 : \bar{D}_n \notin [0, A] \}.$$

When $A = \infty$, we get

$$\lambda_\infty := \inf \left\{ n \geq 1 : \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{\bar{g}(X_i)}{f(X_i)} < 0 \right\}.$$

Since $0 < D_{\text{KL}}(f \parallel \bar{g}) < \infty$, it follows from Woodroffe (1982) (see Corollary 2.4) that

$$\mathbf{E}_\infty[\lambda_\infty] < \infty,$$

Next, to capture the sojourn time below 0, we define for $x < 0$,

$$T(x) := \left\lceil \frac{|(x)^{h+}|}{\mu} \right\rceil.$$

It follows from Theorem 5.1 in Banerjee and Veeravalli (2013) that for fixed values of A , h , and $\mu > 0$, if $0 < D_{\text{KL}}(f \parallel \bar{g}) < \infty$, then

$$\text{PDC}(\bar{\Psi}_{\text{RDC}}(A, \mu, h)) = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_A | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0]}{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_A | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0] + \mathbb{E}_{\infty}[T(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A}) | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0]}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Define

$$\bar{Z}(X) = \log(\bar{g}(X)/f(X)).$$

Then, it follows from Lemma 1 in Banerjee and Veeravalli (2013) that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_A | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_{\infty}]}{\mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\bar{Z}(X_1) < 0)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Also, it follows from Lemma 2 in Banerjee and Veeravalli (2013) that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[T(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A}) | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0] \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\infty} \left[|\bar{Z}(X_1)^{h+}| \mid \bar{Z}(X_1) < 0 \right]}{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\bar{Z}(X_1) < 0). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Note that these bounds do not depend on the false alarm threshold A . Using these bounds, we obtain an upper bound on the PDC that is not a function of the threshold A . Specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PDC}(\bar{\Psi}_{\text{RDC}}(A, \mu, h)) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_A | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0]}{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_A | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0] + \mathbb{E}_{\infty}[T(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A}) | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0]} \\ &\leq \frac{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_{\infty}]}{\mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\bar{Z}(X_1) < 0)}}{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_{\infty}]}{\mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\bar{Z}(X_1) < 0)} + \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\infty} \left[|\bar{Z}(X_1)^{h+}| \mid \bar{Z}(X_1) < 0 \right]}{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\bar{Z}(X_1) < 0)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_{\infty}]}{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_{\infty}] + \frac{1}{\mu} \mathbb{E}_{\infty} \left[|\bar{Z}(X_1)^{h+}| \mid \bar{Z}(X_1) < 0 \right] \mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\bar{Z}(X_1) < 0)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Thus, to satisfy

$$\text{PDC}(\bar{\Psi}_{\text{RDC}}(A, \mu, h)) \leq \beta,$$

we must have a μ that satisfies

$$\mu \leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\infty} \left[|\bar{Z}(X_1)^{h+}| \mid \bar{Z}(X_1) < 0 \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\bar{Z}(X_1) < 0)^2}{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_{\infty}]}.$$

To prove the theorem, it is enough to set

$$C_1 := \mathbb{E}_{\infty}[\lambda_{\infty}], \quad C_2 := \mathbb{E}_{\infty} \left[|\bar{Z}(X_1)^{h+}| \mid \bar{Z}(X_1) < 0 \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\bar{Z}(X_1) < 0)^2. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

To prove the corollary, we take $A \rightarrow \infty$ and $h \rightarrow \infty$ in the expression of the PDC to get

$$\text{PDC}(\bar{\Psi}_{\text{RDC}}(A, \mu, h)) = \frac{\mathbf{E}_\infty[\lambda_A | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0]}{\mathbf{E}_\infty[\lambda_A | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0] + \mathbf{E}_\infty[T(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A}) | \bar{D}_{\lambda_A} < 0]} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{\mathbf{E}_\infty[\lambda_\infty]}{\mathbf{E}_\infty[\lambda_\infty] + \mathbf{E}_\infty[\lceil |\bar{D}_{\lambda_\infty}| / \mu \rceil]} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\leq \frac{\mathbf{E}_\infty[\lambda_\infty]}{\mathbf{E}_\infty[\lambda_\infty] + \mathbf{E}_\infty[\lceil \bar{D}_{\lambda_\infty} / \mu \rceil]} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$= \frac{\mu}{\mu + \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(f \parallel \bar{g})}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Here, the last equality follows from Wald's lemma Woodroffe (1982) which gives

$$\mathbf{E}_\infty[\lceil \bar{D}_{\lambda_\infty} \rceil] = \mathbf{E}[\lambda_\infty] \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(f \parallel \bar{g}).$$

This completes the proof of the corollary.

B Proof of Theorem 4.4

We first obtain a bound on

$$\text{WADD}^G(\bar{\tau}_{rdc}) = \sup_k \text{ess sup} \mathbf{E}_k^G[(\bar{\tau}_{rdc} - k + 1)^+ | \mathcal{I}_{k-1}] \quad (\text{B.1})$$

for any fixed $G \in \mathcal{G}$. For a fixed k , the conditional expectation $\mathbf{E}_k^G[(\bar{\tau}_{rdc} - k + 1)^+ | \mathcal{I}_{k-1}]$ depends on the past history \mathcal{I}_{k-1} only through the value of the statistic \bar{D}_{k-1} at time $k-1$. As a result, by repeating the arguments similar to those used in Lemma 5 of Banerjee and Veeravalli (2013), it follows that

$$\mathbf{E}_k^G[(\bar{\tau}_{rdc} - k + 1)^+ | \mathcal{I}_{k-1}] \leq \mathbf{E}_1^G[\bar{\tau}_{rdc}] + \lceil h/\mu \rceil.$$

Since this upper bound no longer depends on the past history or hypothesized change point k , we have

$$\text{WADD}^G(\bar{\tau}_{rdc}) \leq \mathbf{E}_1^G[\bar{\tau}_{rdc}] + \lceil h/\mu \rceil. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Let τ_{rc} be the robust CUSUM stopping rule of Unnikrishnan et al. (2011) and let \bar{W}_n be the corresponding statistic:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{W}_{n+1} &= (\bar{W}_n + \log[\bar{g}(X_{n+1})/f(X_{n+1})])^+, \quad \bar{W}_0 = 0, \\ \tau_{rc} &= \inf\{n \geq 1 : \bar{W}_n \geq A\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

We note that the evolution of RDE-CUSUM statistic \bar{D}_n and the Robust CUSUM statistic \bar{W}_n are statistically identical, except of the sojourns of the statistic \bar{D}_n below zero. Also, each time the statistic \bar{D}_n goes below zero, the number of consecutive samples skipped is bounded by $\lceil h/\mu \rceil$. Also, each time \bar{D}_n comes above zero after being below zero, it restarts at 0 leading to a new renewal cycle. From here onward, as long as the statistic is above zero, the evolution of \bar{D}_n is statistically identical to the evolution of \bar{W}_n . Consequently, if

$$\lambda_A = \inf\{n \geq 1 : \bar{D}_n \notin [0, A]\}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

then the number of times the RDE-CUSUM statistic will go below zero, before hitting the threshold A before hitting zero under the post-change regime, is a geometric random variable with probability

$$P_1^G(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A} \geq A).$$

Thus, the mean number of cycles below zero of the RDE-CUSUM statistic is the mean of this geometric random variable:

$$\frac{1}{P_1^G(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A} \geq A)}.$$

Substituting this in (B.2) we get

$$\text{WADD}^G(\bar{\tau}_{rdc}) \leq E_1^G[\bar{\tau}_{rdc}] + \lceil h/\mu \rceil \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\leq E_1^G[\bar{\tau}_{rc}] + \frac{\lceil h/\mu \rceil}{P_1^G(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A} \geq A)} + \lceil h/\mu \rceil. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Thus,

$$\sup_G \text{WADD}^G(\bar{\tau}_{rdc}) \leq \sup_G E_1^G[\bar{\tau}_{rc}] + \frac{\lceil h/\mu \rceil}{\inf_G P_1^G(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A} \geq A)} + \lceil h/\mu \rceil. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Now, because of Assumption 1, we have (see Unnikrishnan et al. (2011))

$$\sup_G E_1^G[\bar{\tau}_{rc}] = E_1^{\bar{G}}[\bar{\tau}_{rc}]. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Also by the same Assumption 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_1^G(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A} \geq A) &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} P_1^G(\bar{D}_n \geq 0, \text{ for all } n) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_1^G(\bar{D}_n \geq 0, \text{ for all } n \leq N) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_1^G \left(\max_{1 \leq n \leq N} \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \sum_{i=k}^n \log[\bar{g}(X_i)/f(X_i)] \geq 0 \right) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\geq} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_1^{\bar{G}} \left(\max_{1 \leq n \leq N} \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \sum_{i=k}^n \log[\bar{g}(X_i)/f(X_i)] \geq 0 \right) \\ &= P_1^{\bar{G}} \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \sum_{i=k}^n \log[\bar{g}(X_i)/f(X_i)] \geq 0, \text{ for all } n \right) \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{>} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

In the above equation, inequality (a) is obvious. The equality (b) follows from the continuity of probability. The equality (c) follows from the definition of RDE-CUSUM statistic, which is the same as the robust CUSUM statistic of Unnikrishnan et al. (2011) when the statistic never goes below zero. The inequality (d) is true because of Lemma III.1 in Unnikrishnan et al. (2011) as the max and sum operations are monotone increasing in its arguments and because \bar{G} is the LFL. Finally, the last inequality (e) showing that the probability $P_1^{\bar{G}}(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \sum_{i=k}^n \log[\bar{g}(X_i)/f(X_i)] \geq 0, \text{ for all } n)$ is

strictly positive follows from the property of a random walk under positive drift Woodroffe (1982). Define

$$q := \mathbb{P}_1^{\bar{G}} \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \sum_{i=k}^n \log[\bar{g}(X_i)/f(X_i)] \geq 0, \text{ for all } n \right) > 0. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Then (B.9) shows that

$$\inf_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{P}_1^G(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A} \geq A) \geq q > 0, \quad (\text{B.11})$$

where q depends on \bar{G} and not on any other particular G . Substituting (B.8), (B.9), (B.10), and (B.11) in (B.7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_G \text{WADD}^G(\bar{\tau}_{rdc}) &\leq \sup_G \mathbb{E}_1^G[\bar{\tau}_{rc}] + \frac{\lceil h/\mu \rceil}{\inf_G \mathbb{P}_1^G(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A} \geq A)} + \lceil h/\mu \rceil \\ &= \mathbb{E}_1^{\bar{G}}[\bar{\tau}_{rc}] + \frac{\lceil h/\mu \rceil}{\inf_G \mathbb{P}_1^G(\bar{D}_{\lambda_A} \geq A)} + \lceil h/\mu \rceil \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_1^{\bar{G}}[\bar{\tau}_{rc}] + \frac{\lceil h/\mu \rceil}{q} + \lceil h/\mu \rceil \\ &\leq \frac{A}{D_{\text{KL}}(\bar{g} \parallel f)}(1 + o(1)) + \frac{\lceil h/\mu \rceil}{q} + \lceil h/\mu \rceil. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Here the last inequality follows from the analysis of the CUSUM algorithm. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.4.

Acknowledgment

Taposh Banerjee was supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation under grant 2427909. Hoda Bidkhori was supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation under grant 2427910.

References

- Banerjee, T., Gurram, P., and Whipps, G. T. (2021). A Bayesian theory of change detection in statistically periodic random processes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(4):2562–2580.
- Banerjee, T. and Veeravalli, V. V. (2012). Data-efficient quickest change detection with on-off observation control. *Sequential Analysis*, 31(1):40–77.
- Banerjee, T. and Veeravalli, V. V. (2013). Data-efficient quickest change detection in minimax settings. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 59(10):6917–6931.
- Banerjee, T. and Veeravalli, V. V. (2015). Data-efficient minimax quickest change detection with composite post-change distribution. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(9):5172–5184.
- Brucks, T., Banerjee, T., and Mishra, R. (2023). Modeling and quickest detection of a rapidly approaching object. *To appear in Sequential Analysis*.

- Guo, J., Yan, H., and Zhang, C. (2023). A bayesian partially observable online change detection approach with thompson sampling. *Technometrics*, 65(2):179–191.
- Hou, Y., Bidkhori, H., and Banerjee, T. (2024a). Robust quickest change detection in multi-stream non-stationary processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04493*.
- Hou, Y., Oleyaemotlagh, Y., Mishra, R., Bidkhori, H., and Banerjee, T. (2024b). Robust quickest change detection in nonstationary processes. *Sequential Analysis*, 43(3):275–300.
- Lai, T. L. (1998). Information bounds and quick detection of parameter changes in stochastic systems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(7):2917–2929.
- Lau, T. S., Tay, W. P., and Veeravalli, V. V. (2018). A binning approach to quickest change detection with unknown post-change distribution. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(3):609–621.
- Liang, Y., Tartakovsky, A. G., and Veeravalli, V. V. (2022). Quickest change detection with non-stationary post-change observations. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(5):3400–3414.
- Lorden, G. (1971). Procedures for reacting to a change in distribution. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 42(6):1897–1908.
- Moustakides, G. V. (1986). Optimal stopping times for detecting changes in distributions. *Annals of Statistics*, 14(4):1379–1387.
- Naha, A. and Dey, S. (2024). Bayesian quickest change-point detection with an energy harvesting sensor and asymptotic analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*.
- Oleyaemotlagh, Y., Banerjee, T., Taha, A., and John, E. (2023). Quickest change detection in statistically periodic processes with unknown post-change distribution. *Sequential Analysis*, 42(4):404–437.
- Page, E. S. (1954). Continuous inspection schemes. *Biometrika*, 41(1/2):100–115.
- Pollak, M. (1985). Optimal detection of a change in distribution. *Annals of Statistics*, 13(1):206–227.
- Pollak, M. (1987). Average run lengths of an optimal method of detecting a change in distribution. *Annals of Statistics*, 15(2):749–779.
- Poor, H. V. and Hadjiliadis, O. (2009). *Quickest detection*. Cambridge University Press.
- Reynolds Jr, M. R. and Stoumbos, Z. G. (2004). Control charts and the efficient allocation of sampling resources. *Technometrics*, 46(2):200–214.
- Shiryayev, A. N. (1963). On optimum methods in quickest detection problems. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 8:22–46.
- Tartakovsky, A. (2019). *Sequential change detection and hypothesis testing: general non-iid stochastic models and asymptotically optimal rules*. CRC Press.
- Tartakovsky, A. G., Nikiforov, I. V., and Basseville, M. (2014). *Sequential Analysis: Hypothesis Testing and Change-Point Detection*. Statistics. CRC Press.

- Tartakovsky, A. G. and Veeravalli, V. V. (2005). General asymptotic Bayesian theory of quickest change detection. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 49(3):458–497.
- Unnikrishnan, J., Veeravalli, V. V., and Meyn, S. P. (2011). Minimax robust quickest change detection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(3):1604 –1614.
- Veeravalli, V. V. and Banerjee, T. (2014). *Quickest Change Detection*. Academic Press Library in Signal Processing: Volume 3 – Array and Statistical Signal Processing.
- Woodroffe, M. (1982). *Nonlinear renewal theory in sequential analysis*. SIAM.