

# Change Detection-Based Procedures for Piecewise Stationary MABs: A Modular Approach

**Yu-Han Huang**

*ECE and CSL, The Grainger College of Engineering  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign  
Urbana, IL 61801-2332, USA*

YUHANHH2@ILLINOIS.EDU

**Argyrios Gerogiannis**

*ECE and CSL, The Grainger College of Engineering  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign  
Urbana, IL 61801-2332, USA*

AG91@ILLINOIS.EDU

**Subhonmesh Bose**

*ECE and CSL, The Grainger College of Engineering  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign  
Urbana, IL 61801-2332, USA*

BOSES@ILLINOIS.EDU

**Venugopal V. Veeravalli**

*ECE and CSL, The Grainger College of Engineering  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign  
Urbana, IL 61801-2332, USA*

VVV@ILLINOIS.EDU

**Editor:** My editor

## Abstract

Conventional Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) algorithms are designed for stationary environments, where the reward distributions associated with the arms do not change with time. In many applications, however, the environment is more accurately modeled as being nonstationary. In this work, piecewise stationary MAB (PS-MAB) environments are investigated, in which the reward distributions associated with a subset of the arms change at some change-points and remain stationary between change-points. Our focus is on the asymptotic analysis of PS-MABs, for which practical algorithms based on change detection (CD) have been previously proposed. Our goal is to modularize the design and analysis of such CD-based Bandit (CDB) procedures. To this end, we identify the requirements for stationary bandit algorithms and change detectors in a CDB procedure that are needed for the modularization. We assume that the rewards are sub-Gaussian. Under this assumption and a condition on the separation of the change-points, we show that the analysis of CDB procedures can indeed be modularized, so that regret bounds can be obtained in a unified manner for various combinations of change detectors and bandit algorithms. Through this analysis, we develop new modular CDB procedures that are order-optimal. We compare the performance of our modular CDB procedures with various other methods in simulations.

**Keywords:** nonstationary bandits, piecewise stationary bandits, quickest change detection, generalized Cumulative Sum (CuSum) test, generalized Shiryaev-Roberts test

©2024 Yu-Han Huang, Argyrios Gerogiannis, Subhonmesh Bose, and Venugopal V. Veeravalli.

License: CC-BY 4.0, see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. Attribution requirements are provided at <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/00-000.html>.

## 1 Introduction

In the Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) problem, an agent chooses between finitely many arms, each of which, when selected, generates a stochastic reward. The goal of the agent is to maximize the reward obtained over a horizon of interest without knowing the actual reward distributions. See Lattimore and Szepesvári (2020); Slivkins et al. (2019) for recent books on the topic.

In the most common setting of the MAB problem, the reward distributions associated with the arms are stationary, meaning that they remain unchanged across the horizon of interest. However, this stationarity assumption may not hold in many practical settings. For instance, in the context of recommendation systems, preferences of users may change over time due to changing fashions and trends.

As the initial step towards addressing nonstationary bandits, multiple prior works have focused on PS-MABs (Kocsis and Szepesvári, 2006) in which the reward distributions associated with a subset of the arms change at specific change-points and remain stationary between change-points. The piecewise stationary model is good approximation for many real-world scenarios (Auer, 2002; Seznec et al., 2020).

For environments that change at every time step gradually, if the nonstationarity (amount of change) at each time step stays strictly bounded away from zero no matter how large the horizon, then the optimal regret (loss in cumulative rewards) is linear (Auer et al., 2019b). In the piecewise stationary setting, it is possible to achieve sublinear regret as long as the number of change-points over a horizon grows sublinearly with the horizon.

There are two main approaches to achieving good performance in PS-MABs. The first approach is based on continuously adapting the bandit algorithm to the changing environment without restarting (Kocsis and Szepesvári, 2006; Garivier and Moulines, 2011). The second approach involves restarting an algorithm (designed for stationary environments) at certain time steps based on some prior knowledge of the non-stationarity or through detecting changes in the environment. Peng and Papadimitriou (2024) recently demonstrated that restarting the learning process in the general non-stationary reinforcement learning problem can be more effective than continuous adaptation. This is because the complexity of the former is often comparable to or even better than the latter in the worst-case scenario. This, therefore, motivates our study and implementation of effective restarting-based solutions in the PS-MAB problem.

Restarting-based approaches fall into two categories: those that follow a predetermined restarting schedule based on knowledge of the non-stationarity (see, e.g., Besbes et al. (2014)), and those that trigger restarts by actively detecting non-stationarity (see, e.g., Auer et al. (2019b); Besson et al. (2022)). Algorithms that we refer to as *Change Detection-based Bandit (CDB) procedures*, employ the second approach by utilizing *quickest change detection* (QCD) tests (Auer et al., 2002; Liu et al., 2018; Cao et al., 2019; Besson et al., 2022). To the best of our knowledge, the *General Likelihood Ratio-Kullback Leiber Upper Confidence Bound* (GLR-klUCB) algorithm proposed by Besson et al. (2022) is the state-of-the-art CDB procedure, which, unlike some of the other CDB procedures, does not require prior knowledge about the changes, other than that a certain condition on the separation between change-points is met (Besson et al., 2022, Assumption 4). In the recent work of Gerogiannis et al. (2024), an empirical comparison was conducted between CDB

procedures and an approach that is based on randomly restarting the algorithm using prior knowledge about the rate of changes. The random-restarting algorithm is order-optimal in performance, when optimally tuned according to rate of changes, assuming that the regret of the bandit algorithm is poly-logarithmic with the horizon. The results in Gerogiannis et al. (2024) demonstrate that, even without prior knowledge of the non-stationarity, CDB procedures outperform the random-restarting approach and the state-of-the-art, black-box approach of Wei and Luo (2021).

CDB procedures are composed of a (quickest) change detector and a stationary bandit algorithm, which can be seen as separate components. This suggests that it should be possible to modularize the regret analyses of CDB procedures by combining the performance analyses of QCD tests with the regret bounds for stationary bandit algorithms. However, there are two reasons why such a modular analysis is challenging. The first is that the change detector and the stationary bandit algorithm share a common history of reward observations. The second reason is that the performance metrics for the design of change detectors for PS-MABS are not obvious to separate out from the regret, and these metrics are different from the classical metrics used in the QCD literature (see also Huang and Veeravalli (2024)).

We study the PS-MABS with sub-Gaussian rewards, and our main contributions are as follows:

- We clearly identify the requirements of the change detection (CD) procedures for use in PS-MABS, and formulate the corresponding QCD problem. We also propose a new change detector, termed as Generalized Shiryaev-Roberts (GSR) test, which attains good performance for the QCD problem.
- We provide a general condition for the regret of stationary bandit algorithms that can be used in CDB procedures for PS-MABS. This condition allows for the use of regret bounds that do not depend on the suboptimality gaps.
- By combining the analyses of CD procedures and stationary bandit algorithms, we provide a modularized regret upper bound for CDB procedures without knowledge of the nonstationarity, except for a condition on the separation between change-points similar to (Besson et al., 2022, Assumption 4). Through this regret analysis, we establish that various adaptive CDB procedures are order-optimal.
- Through our experiments, we show that our CDB procedures achieve regret commensurate with state-of-the-art methodologies.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we define the piecewise stationary sub-Gaussian MAB problem and describe CDB procedures. Section 3 contains the core of the paper, covering the modular analysis of CDB procedures. In Section 4, we provide some experimental results, while in Section 5, we provide some concluding remarks.

## 2 Piecewise Stationary Sub-Gaussian Bandits and CDB Procedures

### 2.1 Problem Formulation

A PS-MAB consists of  $A \in \mathbb{N}$  arms. At each time step (round)  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , the agent pulls arm  $A_t$  and obtains reward  $X_{A_t,t}$ . The agent employs a policy  $\{\pi_t\}_{t=1}^T$  adapted to the filtration generated by the history of actions and observations up to that point, i.e.,  $A_t = \pi_t(A_1, X_{A_1,1}, \dots, A_{t-1}, X_{A_{t-1}})$ . The goal of the agent is to acquire the maximum total accumulated reward over horizon  $T$ . We assume that the rewards  $\{X_{a,t} : a \in \{1, \dots, A\}, t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  are mutually independent and  $\sigma^2$ -sub-Gaussian<sup>1</sup> for some  $\sigma > 0$  known to the agent. The piecewise stationarity of the MAB implies that the reward distributions of the arms remain the same between consecutive change-points, and at each change-point, the reward distributions of one or more arms are abruptly altered (while still remaining  $\sigma^2$ -sub-Gaussian). The details are as follows:

- Let  $N_T$  be the number of change-points over a finite horizon  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $k \in \{1, \dots, N_T\}$ , let  $\nu_k$  be the  $k^{\text{th}}$  change-point, and define  $\nu_0 := 1$  and  $\nu_{N_T+1} = T + 1$ . In addition, we refer to the time steps  $\{\nu_{k-1}, \dots, \nu_k - 1\}$  as the  $k^{\text{th}}$  interval.
- For each  $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, N_T\}$ , the rewards  $(X_{a,t})_{t=\nu_{k-1}}^{\nu_k-1}$  are i.i.d., with the common mean denoted by  $\mu_{a,k}$ .
- Once the change-point  $\nu_k$  occurs, arm  $a$  experiences a mean change of the magnitude  $|\mu_{a,k+1} - \mu_{a,k}|$ , with  $\max_a |\mu_{a,k+1} - \mu_{a,k}| > 0$ .
- Let  $a_k := \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \{1, \dots, A\}} \mu_{a,k}$  be the optimal arm during the  $k^{\text{th}}$  interval for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, N_T\}$ .
- Define  $\Delta_{a,k} := \mu_{a_k,k} - \mu_{a,k}$  to be the suboptimality gap of arm  $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$  during the  $k^{\text{th}}$  interval.

The (dynamic) regret  $R_T$  of policy  $\pi$  over a finite horizon  $T$  can be defined as follows:

$$R_T := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \sum_{t=\nu_{k-1}}^{\nu_k-1} \Delta_{A_t,k} \right]. \quad (1)$$

The goal of the agent is to choose a policy to minimize the regret in (1).

We use the following additional notations in our regret analysis:

- Without loss of generality, we assume that the suboptimality gap is upper bounded by some constant  $C$ , i.e.,  $\Delta_{a,k} \leq C$  for all  $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- We also define  $\Delta_{c,k} = \max_{a \in \{1, \dots, A\}} |\mu_{a,k+1} - \mu_{a,k}|$  to be the change gap at the  $k^{\text{th}}$  change-point. Furthermore, we use  $\Delta_{\text{change}}$  to denote the smallest change gap, i.e.,  $\Delta_{c,k} \geq \Delta_{\text{change}}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

---

1. A random variable  $X$  is said to be  $\sigma^2$ -sub-Gaussian if its cumulant generating function  $\phi_X$  is upper bounded by that of a Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and variance  $\sigma^2$ , i.e., for any  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\phi_X(\theta) \leq \frac{\sigma^2 \theta^2}{2}$ .

We assume that the agent has no knowledge about  $C$  and  $\Delta_{\text{change}}$ . Note that for each change-point, at least one arm undergoes a mean change of magnitude larger than  $\Delta_{\text{change}}$ . Also, we do not assume a lower bound on the suboptimality gaps. This is because, in a non-stationary setting, it is reasonable to assume that the minimum suboptimality gap will change over time. On the other hand, assuming an upper bound on the suboptimality gap is reasonable, since without such a bound, the (worst-case) regret could potentially be infinite.

## 2.2 CDB Procedures

In a fully stationary bandit environment, i.e., a PS-MAB with  $N_T = 0$ , a *stationary bandit algorithm* uses the entire history of observations to decide which arm to pull at the current time step. However, in a PS-MAB environment, the observations prior to a change-point do not necessarily follow the current reward distributions associated with the arms. Therefore, these observations might give false information about current reward distributions, hampering the bandit algorithm from making optimal decisions. Hence, policies for PS-MABs need to forget observations prior to the change-points, at least on arms for which the reward distribution changes.


There are mainly two approaches to forgetting the reward samples prior to the latest change-point. The first is to assign low weights to past rewards so that the old observations will be forgotten *passively*, so that the bandit algorithm can continuously adapt to the current environment. For example, the Discounted-UCB (D-UCB) algorithm proposed by Kocsis and Szepesvári (Kocsis and Szepesvári, 2006; Garivier and Moulines, 2011) reduces the effect of past observations on the current action by multiplying the reward samples with a discount factor. The Sliding-Window UCB (SW-UCB) algorithm proposed by Garivier and Moulines (2011) makes decisions based on observations collected within a fixed-size window in the past. These methods require the tuning of parameters, such as the discount factor in D-UCB and the window size in SW-UCB, based on prior knowledge of the number of change-points over a finite horizon, which may not be available in practice.

The second approach involves *actively* detecting changes, and forgetting reward samples prior to the point at which the change is detected (Hartland et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2018; Cao et al., 2019; Besson et al., 2022; Auer et al., 2019a). CDB procedures for PS-MABs employ this approach by integrating a change detector  $\mathcal{D}$  (associated with each arm) with a stationary bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$ . If no changes are detected, the procedure follows the stationary bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$ . In the *global restart* setting, the procedure forgets samples from all arms (Cao et al., 2019; Besson et al., 2022) when a change is detected in any of the arms. In contrast, in the *local restart* setting, only the samples from the arm at which the change is detected are forgotten (Liu et al., 2018; Besson et al., 2022). In this work, we focus on global-restart algorithms, since this enables us to modularize the analysis more easily. Prior works on CDB procedures include the Adapt-EVE (Hartland et al., 2006), the CuSum-UCB (Liu et al., 2018), and the Monitored UCB (M-UCB) (Cao et al., 2019) procedures. Adapt-EVE combines the UCB bandit algorithm with a Page-Hinkley change-detection test (Page, 1954), and CuSum-UCB integrates the UCB bandit algorithm with a two-sided CuSum change-detection test (Lorden, 1971). M-UCB incorporates the UCB bandit algorithm with a test that declares a change once the absolute difference between the empirical means of two windows surpasses some threshold (Cao et al., 2019).

These algorithms, however, consist of tunable parameters that require knowledge of the number of change-points or the magnitude of changes to achieve optimal performance. In contrast, the GLR-klUCB procedure proposed by Besson et al. (2022) and the Adaptive Switching procedure (Adswitch) proposed by Auer et al. (2019a) do not require a priori knowledge of the nonstationarity, except for conditions on the separation between change-points. GLR-klUCB, which integrates the klUCB bandit algorithm and the GLR-CuSum change-detection test, significantly outperforms Adswitch in experiments (Besson et al., 2022).

For stationary bandit algorithms, such as UCB and klUCB, the number of rounds each suboptimal arm is pulled over a finite horizon  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  on a stationary bandit is  $\mathcal{O}(\log(T))$  (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020). This sublinearity of the number of pulls with respect to  $T$  for each suboptimal arm is intuitive, given that the goal of bandit algorithms is to minimize the regret, which requires the algorithm to learn which arm is optimal quickly and to pull suboptimal arms less frequently. However, this sublinearity limits the number of reward samples observed from suboptimal arms, which makes the detection delay large if the reward distribution of one of the suboptimal arm changes. Therefore, CDB procedures require extra *forced exploration* of the arms for the change detector to be effective.

As mentioned earlier, we will restrict our study to global-restart CDB procedures, where the reward history from all arms is forgotten whenever a change in distribution is detected in any of the arms. Let  $\tau_k$  be the  $k^{\text{th}}$  detection time, with  $\tau_0 := 0$ . Let  $\alpha_k \in (0, 1)$  be the *forced exploration frequency* for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  interval. Then, for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, N_T\}$ , and for every  $\lceil \frac{A}{\alpha_k} \rceil$  rounds in  $\{\tau_{k-1} + 1, \dots, \tau_k\}$ , the procedure pulls all  $A$  arms once in a round-robin fashion first and then follows the bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$  afterwards. A general CDB procedure can then be illustrated in Procedure 1. We emphasize that although Procedure 1 requires knowledge of the horizon  $T$ , it can be easily extended to the case where the horizon is unknown using doubling trick (Besson and Kaufmann, 2018).



**Fig. 1.** Illustration of the workflow of Procedure 1.

### 3 Modular Regret Analysis of CDB Learning Procedures

As discussed in Section 2.2, CDB procedures proposed in prior works all combine a stationary bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$  with a change detector  $\mathcal{D}$ . It is desirable to develop a modular analysis that unifies the evaluation of these CDB procedures by integrating the analyses of the two components. However, to the best of our knowledge, no such modular framework has been proposed so far. The main objective in this work is to modularize the regret analysis of CDB procedures. The modular analysis can then be applied seamlessly to various

---

**Procedure 1** Modular Change Detection-based Bandit (CDB) procedure

---

**Input:** change detector  $\mathcal{D}$ , bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$ , forced exploration frequencies  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ , horizon  $T$ , number of arms  $A$

**Initialization:** last restart  $\tau \leftarrow 0$ ,  $\forall a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$ , history list for change detectors  $H_{a,\mathcal{D}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ , history list for stationary bandit algorithm  $H_{\mathcal{B}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ , number of intervals  $k \leftarrow 1$

- 1: **for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
  - 2:   **if**  $\left(t - \tau - 1 \bmod \left\lceil \frac{A}{\alpha_k} \right\rceil\right) + 1 = a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$  **then**
  - 3:      $A_t \leftarrow a$  (forced exploration (for change detector))
  - 4:     Play arm  $A_t$  and receive the reward  $X_{A_t,t}$
  - 5:   **else**
  - 6:      $A_t \leftarrow \mathcal{B}(H_{\mathcal{B}})$  (stationary bandit algorithm)
  - 7:     Play arm  $A_t$  and receive the reward  $X_{A_t,t}$
  - 8:     Add  $(X_{A_t,t}, A_t)$  into the bandit history list  $H_{\mathcal{B}}$
  - 9:   **end if**
  - 10:   Add  $X_{A_t,t}$  into the change detector history list  $H_{A_t,\mathcal{D}}$
  - 11:   **if**  $\mathcal{D}(H_{A_t,\mathcal{D}}) = 1$  (change detected) **then**
  - 12:      $\tau \leftarrow t$
  - 13:      $\forall a \in \{1, \dots, A\}, H_{a,\mathcal{D}} \leftarrow \emptyset$
  - 14:      $H_{\mathcal{B}} \leftarrow \emptyset$
  - 15:      $k \leftarrow k + 1$
  - 16:   **end if**
  - 17: **end for**
-

combinations of change detectors and bandit algorithms, and as we shall show, allow us to develop new CDB procedures that are order-optimal.

### 3.1 Requirements for Stationary Bandit Algorithms and CD procedures

To minimize the regret, a CDB procedure incorporates a stationary bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$  with low regret on stationary bandits and a change detector  $\mathcal{D}$  that detects a change quickly while not raising false alarms too often. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies the following property:

**Property 1** (stationary bandit algorithm regret). *For the stationary bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$  on a fully stationary bandit with  $A$  arms and suboptimality gaps  $\{\Delta_a\}_{a=1}^A$  where  $\Delta_a \leq C$  for any  $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$ , its regret upper bound over  $T$  rounds is expressed as  $R_{\mathcal{B}}(T)$ , which is concave and increases sublinearly with  $T$ .*

This property holds for many well-known bandit algorithms. We emphasize that the regret bound in Property 1 can be instance-independent, meaning that  $R_{\mathcal{B}}(T)$  does not have to depend on the suboptimality gaps. For example, the regret upper bound for UCB, which is independent of the suboptimality gaps, is  $8\sqrt{AT \log(T)} + \mathcal{O}(1)$  (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Theorem 7.2) and satisfies Property 1.

As for the change detector  $\mathcal{D}$ , the goal is to detect changes as soon as possible while not raising false alarms too often over the horizon. Taking cues from the regret analysis in Besson et al. (2022), if the change detector gets falsely triggered or if it detects a change too late, the samples for detecting the next change-point will be insufficient, making the change detector unable to detect the next change. When any of the changes remain undetected over the entire horizon, which is defined as a *missed detection* event, the worst-case regret bound is linear (Besson et al., 2022). It is therefore essential to control the probability of missed detection. Because false alarm events and late detection events could possibly lead to missed detection events, we would like to ensure these events happen with a small probability. In addition, since the suboptimal arms pulled during the detection delay will also lead to linear regret, the threshold for detection delay, referred to as the *latency*, should be small.

Before formally laying out the properties a good change detector should possess, we formulate the general QCD problem associated with our analysis: Let  $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a sequence of independent random variables observed sequentially by the detector. When the change-point occurs at  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$X_n \sim \begin{cases} f_0, & n < \nu \\ f_1, & n \geq \nu \end{cases}. \quad (2)$$

In other words, before the change-point  $\nu$ , the stochastic samples follow the pre-change distribution with density  $f_0$ . The remaining samples follow the post-change distribution with density  $f_1$ . Additionally,  $\mathbb{P}_\nu$  denotes the probability measure under which the change-point occurs at  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ , while  $\mathbb{P}_\infty$  denotes the probability measure under which there is no change-point (i.e.,  $\nu = \infty$ ). We assume that the densities  $f_0$  and  $f_1$  are  $\sigma^2$ -sub-Gaussian with mean  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ , and let  $\Delta_c := |\mu_0 - \mu_1|$ . We also assume that the change detector only knows that the pre- and post- change distributions are  $\sigma^2$ -sub-Gaussian and is agnostic to the



actual densities  $f_0$  and  $f_1$ . Furthermore, we assume that the change-point is deterministic and unknown to the change detector.

Over a finite horizon  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ , the detector samples the random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_T$  sequentially. Every causal change detector  $\mathcal{D}$  can be associated with a stopping time  $\tau$ , at which the detector declares a change. Because  $f_0$  is unknown to the change detector, we need to guarantee that there are enough samples for the change detector to learn sufficient information about the pre-change distribution. Hence, we assume that there exists a *pre-change window*  $m$  in which the change-point does not occur (i.e.,  $\nu > m$ ). Define the *latency*  $d$  to be the delay threshold for which  $\mathbb{P}_\nu(\tau \geq \nu + d)$  is small for all possible change-points  $\nu \in \{m + 1, \dots, T - d\}$ . Then, the goal of the change detector is to minimize the latency  $d$ , while ensuring that the probability of false alarm over the finite horizon  $\mathbb{P}_\infty(\tau \leq T)$  is small as well, which leads to the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\tau}{\text{minimize}} && d, \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{P}_\infty(\tau \leq T) \leq \delta_F, \\ & && \mathbb{P}_\nu(\tau \geq \nu + d) \leq \delta_D, \quad \forall \nu \in \{m + 1, \dots, T - d\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where  $\delta_F, \delta_D \in (0, 1)$ .

Since the change is easier to detect as  $\Delta_c$  increases, the pre-change window  $m$  and the latency  $d$  should decrease as  $\Delta_c$  grows. Hence, we can assume that a good change detector in problem (3) should have the following property:

**Property 2** (change detector latency). *For a change detector  $\mathcal{D}$  with parameter  $\delta_F \in (0, 1)$  over an arbitrary finite horizon  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a latency  $d$  and a pre-change window  $m$  such that the probability of false alarm over a finite horizon is upper bounded by  $\delta_F$ , i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{P}_\infty(\tau \leq T) \leq \delta_F. \tag{4}$$

*In addition, for any  $\delta_D \in (0, 1)$ , the probability of detection delay exceeding the latency is upper bounded by  $\delta_D$  for any  $\nu \in \{m + 1, \dots, T - d\}$ , i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu(\tau \geq \nu + d) \leq \delta_D \tag{5}$$

*where  $d$  and  $m$  are decreasing with  $\Delta_c$  and increasing with  $T$ . Furthermore,  $d + m = \mathcal{O}(\log T)$ , matching the lower bound on the latency in Huang and Veeravalli (2024).*

### 3.2 Modularized Regret Analysis

As described in Property 2 in Section 2, a change detector needs at least  $m$  pre-change samples and  $d$  post-change samples to detect changes quickly with high probability. For the CDB procedures, however, each arm is not pulled every time step. With the forced exploration frequency  $\alpha_k$ , the change detector is guaranteed to obtain one sample from each arm every  $\lceil \frac{A}{\alpha_k} \rceil$  rounds. Then, we define the latency and the pre-change window for a CDB procedure at the  $k^{\text{th}}$  change-point as:

$$m_k := \lceil A/\alpha_k \rceil m(\Delta_{\text{change}}), \tag{6}$$

$$d_k := \lceil A/\alpha_k \rceil d(\Delta_{\text{change}}). \tag{7}$$

where we have written  $d$  and  $m$  explicitly as a function of  $\Delta_{\text{change}}$ , the minimum change gap. For notational convenience, we define  $d_0 := 0$ .

With Properties 1 and 2 being satisfied, we have the following result that characterizes the modular regret upper bound for CDB procedures, whose proof is given in the Appendix A.

**Theorem 1** (modular regret upper bound for CDB procedures). *Consider a CDB procedure (Procedure 1) using a change detector  $\mathcal{D}$  with parameters  $\delta_{\text{F}}$  and  $\delta_{\text{D}}$ , stationary bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$  (with suboptimality gap upper bound  $C$ ), and forced exploration frequencies  $(\alpha_k)_{k=1}^{N_T+1}$ . Suppose further that the following condition holds:*

$$d_{k-1} + m_k \leq \nu_k - \nu_{k-1}, \text{ for all } k \in \{1, \dots, N_T\} \quad (8)$$

where  $m_k$  and  $d_k$  are as defined in (6) and (7), respectively. Then, for sufficiently large  $T$ , the regret is upper bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} R_T \leq & CTA(N_T + 1)\delta_{\text{F}} + CTN_T\delta_{\text{D}} + (N_T + 1)R_{\mathcal{B}}\left(\frac{T}{N_T + 1}\right) \\ & + C\sum_{k=1}^{N_T} d_k + C[\bar{\alpha}T + (N_T + 1)A]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $\bar{\alpha} := \max_{k=1, \dots, N_T+1} \alpha_k$ .

Condition (8) in Theorem 1 guarantees that the  $k^{\text{th}}$  change-point will not happen during the pre-change window, given that the  $(k-1)^{\text{th}}$  change is detected within  $d_k$ . A similar condition (see (Besson et al., 2022, Assumption 4)) is also imposed in the regret analysis for the GLR-klUCB algorithm. Without this condition, a careful analysis of the regret would require bounding more precisely the effect of missing a change on the detection of subsequent changes, which can be a challenging task.

There are five different components contributing to the regret bound in Theorem 1. The first term  $CTA(N_T + 1)\delta_{\text{F}}$  stems from false alarm events, in which the number of intervals is  $N_T + 1$ , and the probability of false alarm on each arm during each interval is  $\delta_{\text{F}}$ . Each false alarm event then leads to linear regret  $CT$  in the analysis. The second term  $CTN_T\delta_{\text{D}}$  results from late detection events, in which the number of change-points is  $N_T$  and the probability that all arms fail to detect within the latency is  $\delta_{\text{D}}$ . The late detection event also leads to linear regret  $CT$  in the analysis. The third term  $(N_T + 1)R_{\mathcal{B}}(T/(N_T + 1))$  results from the stationary bandit algorithm. The intuition is that the regret during each interval is upper bounded by  $R_{\mathcal{B}}(\nu_k - \nu_{k-1})$ , and the summation of these regret upper bounds is maximized when  $\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}$  is approximately  $T/(N_T + 1)$  for each  $k$ . The fourth term  $C\sum_{k=1}^{N_T} d_k$  represents the regret during delays, for which the latency  $d_k$  associated with change-point  $\nu_k$  is smaller than  $d_k$ . The forced exploration leads to the fifth term  $C\bar{\alpha}T + C(N_T + 1)A$ , for which, over the finite horizon  $T$ , the procedure executes forced exploration for approximately at most  $\bar{\alpha}T$  rounds, and  $C(N_T + 1)A$  bounds the round-off errors.

**Remark 1.** *Although the bound in Theorem 1 appears to be linear with respect to  $T$ , we stress that we can set  $\delta_{\text{F}}$ ,  $\delta_{\text{D}}$ , and  $\{\alpha_k\}$  in a manner to make the regret upper bound in (9)*

a sublinear function of  $T$ . These choices of  $\delta_F$ ,  $\delta_D$  and  $\{\alpha_k\}$  are described in Corollary 1 in the next subsection.

**Remark 2.** In Procedure 1, we do not allow the stationary bandit algorithm to observe the samples acquired from forced exploration. If the stationary bandit algorithm were to have access to all samples, as is the case in Besson et al. (2022),  $R_B$  could not be plugged directly into our regret analysis, thereby breaking the modularity of the regret upper bound (see also step (a) in (37) in the proof of Theorem 1). On the other hand, letting the change detector having access to samples obtained from stationary bandit algorithms does not affect the modularity.

### 3.3 Application to Various Combinations of Change Detectors and Stationary Bandit Algorithms

Theorem 1 allows us to study regret upper bounds for CDB procedures that combine different stationary bandit algorithms with different change detection algorithms. Consider any stationary bandit algorithm for which the regret satisfies Property 1 and scales with  $T$  as at most  $\sqrt{T \log(T)}$ . Examples include UCB (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020) and klUCB (Cappé et al., 2013), for which we have the following (instance-independent) regret upper bounds:

$$R_{\text{UCB}}(T) = 8\sqrt{\sigma^2 AT \log(T)} + \mathcal{O}(1), \quad R_{\text{klUCB}}(T) := 2\sqrt{2\sigma^2 AT \log(T)} + \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (10)$$

Next, we consider change detection procedures that satisfy Property 2. The first candidate we study is a generalized likelihood ratio (GLR) based QCD test designed for sub-Gaussian observation statistics, which is similar to the GLR QCD test for sub-Bernoulli statistics used in Besson et al. (2022). For any desirable false alarm probability  $\delta_F \in (0, 1)$ , define

$$\beta(n, \delta_F) := 6 \log(1 + \log(n)) + \frac{5}{2} \log\left(\frac{4n^{3/2}}{\delta_F}\right) + 11. \quad (11)$$

The stopping time of the GLR test is given by

$$\tau := \inf \{n \in \mathbb{N} : G_n \geq \beta(n, \delta_F)\} \quad (12)$$

where the GLR statistics  $G_n$  is

$$G_n := \sup_{1 \leq s \leq n} \log \left( \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\theta}(X_i)} \right) \quad (13)$$

in which  $f_{\theta}$  is the density of a Gaussian random variable with mean  $\theta\sigma^2$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ .

The GLR test can be considered as a generalization of the CuSum test (Veeravalli and Banerjee, 2013). A well-known alternative to the CuSum test for QCD problems is Shiryaev-Roberts (SR) test (Veeravalli and Banerjee, 2013), and we can construct a generalization of this test, which we call the generalized Shiryaev-Roberts (GSR) test, which is characterized by the stopping rule,

$$\tau := \inf \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \log W_n \geq \beta(n, \delta_F) + \log n\} \quad (14)$$

where the GSR statistic  $W_n$  is given by

$$W_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \left( \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\theta}(X_i)} \right). \quad (15)$$

We note that such a generalization of the SR test has not been previously studied in the QCD literature.

The properties of these two change detectors are summarized in our next result, whose proof is given in the Appendix B.

**Proposition 1.** *Consider the GLR and GSR change detectors. For any  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\nu \in \{m+1, \dots, T-d\}$ , the false alarm probability and the latency satisfy  $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\tau \leq T) \leq \delta_{\text{F}}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\nu}(\tau \geq \nu + d) \leq \delta_{\text{D}}$ , with*

$$m \geq \frac{8\sigma^2}{\Delta_c^2} \beta_{\star}(T, \delta_{\text{F}}), \quad d := \left\lceil \max \left\{ \frac{8\sigma^2 m \beta_{\star}(T, \delta_{\text{F}})}{\Delta_c^2 m - 8\sigma^2 \beta_{\star}(T, \delta_{\text{F}})}, \frac{\delta_{\text{F}}^{2/3}}{2^{16/15} \delta_{\text{D}}^{4/15}} - m \right\} \right\rceil, \quad (16)$$

where  $\beta_{\star}(T, \delta_{\text{F}}) = \beta(T, \delta_{\text{F}})$  for GLR and  $\beta_{\star}(T, \delta_{\text{F}}) = \beta(T, \delta_{\text{F}}) + \log T$  for GSR.

Thus, both the GLR and GSR change detectors satisfy Property 2, and are efficient in the use of observations in that  $m$  and  $d$  grow linearly in  $\beta_{\star}$  (and hence logarithmically in  $T$ ).

Given this characterization of the GLR and the GSR change detectors, Theorem 1 now allows us to deduce the regret upper bound on CDB procedures that combine efficient stationary bandit algorithms, such as UCB and klUCB, with efficient change detection procedures, such as GLR and GSR.

Before we present our formal regret analysis, we take a detour and search for parameters for CDB procedures that yield a regret bound that is  $\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{AN_T T \log(T)}\right)$  according to Theorem 1, with a *time-uniform* exploration policy, i.e.,  $\alpha_k = \alpha$ , for all  $k$ . This detour will serve as a prelude to the parameter choices made in Corollary 1 in which the exploration policy is non-uniform over time. Our choice of the  $\sqrt{AN_T T \log(T)}$  rate is motivated by Besson et al. (2022), where it is shown that this rate is achieved for a specific GLR-klUCB procedure, albeit with an analysis that is not modularized as in the current work. In addition, the rate of  $\sqrt{AN_T T \log(T)}$  is also provably almost optimal, given the regret lower bound of  $\Omega(\sqrt{AN_T T})$  in Garivier and Moulines (2011); Auer et al. (2019b); Seznec et al. (2020).

Suppose that  $\delta_{\text{F}} = \delta_{\text{D}} = T^{-\gamma}$  for some  $\gamma > 1$ . With our choices of  $\delta_{\text{D}}, \delta_{\text{F}}$ , we have  $\beta_{\star}(T, \delta_{\text{F}}) = \mathcal{O}(\log(T/\delta_{\text{F}})) = \mathcal{O}(\log(T))$ , which yields  $m = \mathcal{O}(\log(T))$ , ignoring integrality of parameters. Then,  $d$  in (16) scales as

$$\begin{aligned} d &= \max \left\{ \frac{8\sigma^2 m \beta_{\star}(T, \delta_{\text{F}})}{\Delta_{\text{change}}^2 m - 8\sigma^2 \beta_{\star}(T, \delta_{\text{F}})}, \frac{\delta_{\text{F}}^{2/3}}{2^{16/15} \delta_{\text{D}}^{4/15}} - m \right\} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O} \left( \max \left\{ \beta_{\star}(T, \delta_{\text{F}}), T^{-2\gamma/5} \right\} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\log(T)). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The terms in the regret upper bound of Theorem 1 then behave as follows for large  $T$ .

$$CTA(N_T + 1)\delta_F \simeq AT^{1-\gamma}N_T, \quad (18a)$$

$$CTN_T\delta_D \simeq T^{1-\gamma}N_T, \quad (18b)$$

$$(N_T + 1)R_B\left(\frac{T}{N_T + 1}\right) \simeq N_T\sqrt{A\frac{T}{N_T}\log\left(\frac{T}{N_T}\right)} = \sqrt{ATN_T\log\left(\frac{T}{N_T}\right)}, \quad (18c)$$

$$C\bar{\alpha}T + C(N_T + 1)A \simeq \alpha T + AN_T \quad (18d)$$

$$C\sum_{k=1}^{N_T}d_k \simeq N_T\frac{A}{\alpha}\log(T). \quad (18e)$$

Can we choose  $\alpha$  to achieve an overall regret upper bound of  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{ATN_T\log(T)})$ ? Among the five terms, the first two do not matter as they go to zero with growing  $T$ , since  $N_T \leq T$  and  $\gamma > 1$ . The third term already satisfies the desired growth rate. The fourth term must satisfy

$$\alpha T \lesssim \sqrt{AN_T T \log(T)} \implies \alpha \lesssim \sqrt{AN_T \log(T)/T}. \quad (19)$$

The fifth term must satisfy

$$N_T\frac{A}{\alpha}\log(T) \lesssim \sqrt{AN_T T \log(T)} \implies \alpha \gtrsim \sqrt{AN_T \log(T)/T}. \quad (20)$$

Interestingly, the last two conditions identify the required asymptotic growth rate of  $\alpha$ , i.e., that  $\alpha \simeq \sqrt{AN_T \log(T)/T}$ . However, implementation of such an algorithm requires the knowledge of  $N_T$ . To circumvent the same, a simple modification comes to the rescue, which is to replace the constant exploration policy with a non-uniform one, where  $\alpha_k \simeq \sqrt{Ak \log(T)/T}$  for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  interval. The regret analysis for the non-uniform exploration policy follows along the same lines, and is formally encapsulated in the following result.

**Corollary 1.** *Consider a modular CDB procedure (Procedure 1) combining a stationary bandit algorithm with regret bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{AT \log(T)})$ , and with GLR or GSR change detectors, on a piecewise-stationary MAB problem. Suppose  $\delta_F = \delta_D = T^{-\gamma}$  for some  $\gamma > 1$ ,  $\alpha_k = \alpha_0 \sqrt{kA \log(T)/T}$ ,  $m = \left\lceil \frac{16\sigma^2}{\Delta_{\text{change}}^2} \beta_{\star}(T, \delta_F) \right\rceil$ , and let  $d$  be as defined in (16). Then, if condition (8) holds,  $R_T = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{AN_T T \log(T)}\right)$ .*

*Proof.* The proof steps remain the same as in uniform exploration case in (18), with the following two exceptions. First,

$$C\bar{\alpha}T + C(N_T + 1)A = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{AN_T T \log(T)}\right). \quad (21)$$

Secondly, since  $d_k$  varies as  $Ad/\alpha_k$ , we obtain

$$C\sum_{k=1}^{N_T}d_k = \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N_T}A \log(T)\sqrt{\frac{T}{Ak \log(T)}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{AN_T T \log(T)}\right). \quad (22)$$

This calculation yields the desired upper bound on the overall regret  $R_T$ . ■

As long as the number of change-points grows sublinearly with the horizon, e.g.,  $N_T = \mathcal{O}(T^\xi)$  for  $\xi \in (0, 1)$ , the CDB procedures in the corollary have regret that is sublinear in  $T$  asymptotically.

An important message we would like to emphasize is the necessity of forced exploration. Most good stationary bandit algorithms (such as klUCB and UCB) pull suboptimal arms at a logarithmic rate. Although the latencies for the GLR and GSR tests are  $\mathcal{O}(\log(T))$ , the CDB procedures constructed from these tests would need  $\mathcal{O}(T)$  time steps to obtain  $\mathcal{O}(\log(T))$  samples for suboptimal arms *without forced exploration*. This would make the delay  $\mathcal{O}(T)$  and thus lead to linear regret. To achieve order-optimal regret, we set  $\alpha_k = \alpha_0 \sqrt{kA \log(T)}/T$ . This choice of  $\alpha_k$  guarantees that the number of pulls from a suboptimal arm is  $\Omega(\sqrt{T \log(T)})$ , making the delay sublinear. In addition, the regret due to delay and the regret due to forced exploration match the order of the regret due to stationary bandit algorithm, making the overall regret order-optimal (with an extra  $\sqrt{\log T}$  factor). Finally, it is apparent from this discussion that a CDB procedure should not need forced exploration when the stationary bandit algorithm pulls suboptimal arms at a rate of the order  $\sqrt{T \log(T)}$ . Consequently, one could deliberately make the stationary bandit algorithm learn at a slower rate to gather more information about the suboptimal arms. However, such a modification to the bandit algorithm is unnecessary and runs counter to the plug-and-play modularization of the analysis of the regret of CDB procedures, which is the main goal of this paper.

## 4 Experimental Study

In our experiments, we perform numerical simulations on synthetic data. These simulations aim to compare the efficacy of our approach by combining different change detectors and stationary bandit algorithms. We also benchmark our proposed CDB procedures against representative methods from prior works.

### 4.1 Experimental Benchmark

The model for the change-points that we assumed in our analysis is a *deterministic* model. However, it is not clear *a priori* how the change-points should be placed for the simulation of a realistic PS-MAB environment. One could try and find a worst-case placement of change-points, but such a worst-case placement may be different for different choices of the magnitudes of the changes at the change-points, and for different procedures. Therefore, we design a PS-MAB environment with *stochastic* change-points, where the intervals between change-points are i.i.d. geometric random variables. Such a stochastic model naturally introduces variability in the placement of change-points, enabling a broader evaluation across scenarios. This helps assess performance in environments where change-points occur unpredictably as would be the case in practice. The geometric change-point model is straightforward to implement, making it a practical tool for generating diverse experimental scenarios and testing robustness under varying conditions.

Specifically, we simulate environments where the number of arms  $A = 5$ , the horizon  $T = 100000$ , and the intervals between change points are i.i.d. geometric with parameter  $\rho$ , where  $\rho = T^{\xi-1}$ , for  $\xi \in \{0.7, 0.6, 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2\}$ . Note that the expected number of

change-points is  $\rho T = T^\xi$ , which is sublinear in  $T$  for all the values of  $\xi$  considered. The regret is averaged over 4000 independent trials. In addition, all of the rewards are in  $[0, 1]$ , while the magnitude of the change is uniformly sampled from  $[0.1, 0.4]$ .

**Remark 3.** *In Section 3.3, we showed that the proposed CDB procedures are order-optimal under condition (8). However, for our geometric change-point model, condition (8) may not always hold. While condition (8) is required to facilitate the theoretical analysis, the failure of this condition does not appear to adversely affect the regret, as we see in the simulations. This is because in the theoretical analysis, missing a single change-point causes the derived regret bound to be linear, whereas in reality, the change-detector is able to quickly recover from this error and keep the regret down by restarting the bandit algorithm after subsequent changes.*

## 4.2 Algorithms and Parameters

To demonstrate the modularity of our method, different change detectors are combined with various bandit algorithms. For the change detectors, we utilize both the Bernoulli and Gaussian variants of the GSR and GLR tests. The stationary bandit algorithms that we use include UCB, MOSS (Audibert et al., 2009) and klUCB.

Regarding approaches from prior works, we include some that are designed for non-stationary settings, with others that are designed for stationary environments. More specifically, we provide the approach of GLR-klUCB (Besson et al., 2022) with global restarts, for both the Bernoulli GLR and the Gaussian GLR versions, M-klUCB (Cao et al., 2019), CUSUM-klUCB (Liu et al., 2018), klUCB (Garivier and Cappé, 2011) without change detection and UCB (Auer et al., 2002) without change detection, which correspond to the first six rows in Table 1. The parameterizations of these methods are done in accordance with the original works. We emphasize that the GLR-klUCB in Besson et al. (2022), uses a common history for the klUCB algorithm and the GLR test, while in our CDB procedure with klUCB and GLR, the klUCB algorithm does not use the forced exploration samples.

Regarding the forced exploration frequencies, Besson et al. (2022) suggests scaling the exploration frequency as  $\alpha_k = 0.1\sqrt{kA\log(T)/T}$ . In the CDB procedures, choosing the exploration frequency parameter  $\alpha_0 = 0.05$  yielded better performance.

## 4.3 Practical Tuning of QCD Tests

Our simulations show that the threshold function provided in (11) is conservative. Thereupon, to mitigate this issue in practice as done in Besson et al. (2022), we set  $\beta(n, \delta_F) = \log\left(\frac{4n^{3/2}}{\delta_F}\right)$ . The GLR and GSR tests are computationally intensive, and therefore we adopt the down-sampling scheme proposed in (Besson et al., 2022) for practical implementation. We conduct the GLR test every 10 time steps and examine every 5 observations for a potential change-point. In contrast, we apply the GSR test every 10 time steps only, as further down-sampling is not possible for the observations.

Finally, regarding the selection of the parameter  $\gamma$  for  $\delta_F$  and  $\delta_D$ , for the GLR-klUCB, Besson et al. (2022) use the value of  $\gamma = 1/2$ . In our simulations, we found that choosing  $\gamma > 1$  for our CDB procedures tends to be conservative. Thus, to ensure a fair comparison across methods, we also set  $\gamma = 1/2$  in our experiments.

#### 4.4 Experimental Results

Algorithm	$\xi=0.7$	$\xi=0.6$	$\xi=0.5$	$\xi=0.4$	$\xi=0.3$	$\xi=0.2$
UCB	17036±758	15063±1379	13871±2234	12733±3050	10768±3542	7621±3734
klUCB	19539±1228	17779±2096	16324±2857	14686±3567	12207±3925	8504±4103
CUSUM-klUCB	23310±269	19038±465	14310±697	10118±1055	6919±1470	4494±1962
M-klUCB	23007±286	17805±436	12156±525	7808±671	5142±1066	3464±1606
GLR-klUCB Bern	13724±290	9821±345	6446±401	3810±457	2045±497	1007±519
GLR-klUCB Gauss	14200±306	10293±363	6818±427	4112±494	2231±542	1102±597
CDB:B-GLR+klUCB	13636±295	<b>9740±356</b>	<b>6393±416</b>	<b>3796±510</b>	<b>2052±610</b>	<b>998±627</b>
CDB:B-GLR+UCB	13008±178	10966±208	8695±259	6123±339	3745±416	2036±423
CDB:B-GLR+MOSS	14188±290	10442±341	6936±418	4066±498	2136±545	1031±612
CDB:B-GSR+klUCB	13572±300	10017±357	6893±434	4277±548	2353±667	1155±767
CDB:B-GSR+UCB	12875±202	10588±225	8339±280	5933±348	3714±432	2058±448
CDB:B-GSR+MOSS	14573±327	10748±391	7194±472	4284±561	2283±619	1109±650
CDB:G-GLR+klUCB	14115±309	10209±372	6779±442	4109±545	2233±621	1090±723
CDB:G-GLR+UCB	<b>12794±201</b>	10358±236	8104±285	5815±349	3679±412	2053±423
CDB:G-GLR+MOSS	14548±308	10734±372	7170±449	4275±534	2285±615	1094±625
CDB:G-GSR+klUCB	14105±328	10499±377	7274±457	4569±577	2568±706	1258±758
CDB:G-GSR+UCB	12960±237	10216±259	7854±309	5615±374	3621±440	2070±466
CDB:G-GSR+MOSS	14996±350	11144±418	7521±493	4562±600	2482±689	1206±743

Table 1: Mean regret of the algorithms for different values of  $\xi$  with  $T = 100000$ , averaged over 4000 trials and with  $A = 5$ . CDB corresponds to our modularized approach.


From the results in Table 1 and Figure 2, we see that our modularized CDB procedures compare favorably with the state-of-the-art GLR-klUCB approach of Besson et al. (2022) in terms of regret minimization, and surpass the latter’s performance in many instances. Notably, the efficacy of our modularized approach is closely tied to the chosen bandit algorithm. This observation aligns with our expectations, and it underscores the flexibility in the choice of bandit algorithms based on the specific application and available computational resources. For example, employing UCB or MOSS as the bandit algorithm offers a significant speedup compared to employing klUCB, as shown in Figure 3, while at times it outperforms in terms of the regret (see, e.g., UCB for  $\xi = 0.7$  in Table 1).

For the CDB procedure, the variance of the regret depends on the selection of the stationary bandit algorithm, with UCB exhibiting the lowest value. Even though GLR-klUCB consistently delivers robust results in terms of variance, the range of the mean regret for the adaptive CDB procedure with Bernoulli GLR test and klUCB is lower compared to GLR-klUCB.


A noteworthy observation is that UCB without change detection (row 1) consistently outperforms klUCB without change detection (row 2). While this may seem counterintuitive, given that klUCB performs better in stationary settings, it has been shown that UCB pulls suboptimal arms more frequently as the horizon increases (Garivier and Cappé, 2011). In a nonstationary setting, this higher rate of exploration enables better adaptation to changes, which also explains why the CDB procedure achieves the lowest regret with UCB under high nonstationarity ( $\xi = 0.7$ ).

A final key result concerns the performance of the CDB procedures in scenarios with high nonstationarity. Specifically, when  $\xi \geq 0.5$ , condition (8) is likely to fail often due to the high average number of change-points within the horizon. Remarkably, even under such challenging conditions, the CDB procedures demonstrate excellent performance.





(a) Comparison of representative methods of Table 1.




(b) Comparison of best performing methods in Figure 2a.

**Fig. 2.** Regret plots versus the time steps for  $T = 100000$ , averaged over 4000 runs.

To summarize, it is evident that our CDB procedure exhibits strong performance across varying rates of nonstationarity. While GLR-kiUCB provides consistently reliable results across settings, our modularized approach offers a flexible, efficient and equivalently optimal alternative when the degree of the nonstationarity is unknown.

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper, we studied CDB procedures, a collection of procedures for piecewise-stationary MABS that meaningfully marry efficient stationary MAB algorithms with efficient change detectors. While a good learning algorithm for the stationary variant should quickly learn an optimal arm and favor pulling said arm over time, detection of changes in the reward structures in other arms requires pulling sub-optimal arms often enough (forced exploration) for change detectors to function effectively. We formulated a QCD problem tailored to such



**Fig. 3.** Average running times of representative methods of Table 1,  $T = 100000$ , 4000 runs.

PS-MAB environments that clearly identifies the requirements for change detectors for CDB procedures. Furthermore, we showed that an existing change detector (GLR) and a new change detector (GSR) that we proposed meet these requirements. We also identified the requirements for the stationary MAB algorithms to be used in CDB procedures. The key contribution of this work is a modular approach to the regret analysis of CDB procedures. Using this modular approach, along with an appropriately designed forced exploration policy, we derived order optimal regret bounds (up to logarithmic factors) for an array of CDB procedures. Our experiments demonstrated the efficacy and robustness of these CDB procedures for PS-MABs.

In this work, the contributions are centered on PS-MABs, where the changes occur abruptly and with sufficiently low frequency. It is clearly of interest to extend these results to more general nonstationary MABs with possibly slowly-changing environments. In recent work, Wei and Luo (2021) provided a general procedure for a general class of nonstationary reinforcement learning problems that can tackle both piecewise stationary environments and slowly-changing ones. However, it was recently shown that the regret bound given in Wei and Luo (2021), while being order optimal (disregarding polylog factors), is loose for a critical range of finite horizons Gerogiannis et al. (2024). Furthermore, it was shown in Gerogiannis et al. (2024) that for the (special) case of PS-MABs, the procedure given in Wei and Luo (2021) performs poorly compared to CDB procedures. Therefore, developing efficient procedures for slowly changing nonstationary MAB environments remains largely an open problem.

## Acknowledgement

This work was supported in part by a grant from the C3.ai Digital Transformation Institute, and in part by the Army Research Laboratory under Cooperative Agreement W911NF-17-2-0196, through the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

## References

- Jean-Yves Audibert, Sébastien Bubeck, et al. Minimax policies for adversarial and stochastic bandits. In *COLT*, volume 7, pages 1–122, 2009.
- Peter Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):397–422, 2002.
- Peter Auer, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, and Paul Fischer. Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine learning*, 47:235–256, 2002.
- Peter Auer, Yifang Chen, Pratik Gajane, Chung-Wei Lee, Haipeng Luo, Ronald Ortner, and Chen-Yu Wei. Achieving optimal dynamic regret for non-stationary bandits without prior information. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 159–163. PMLR, 2019a.
- Peter Auer, Pratik Gajane, and Ronald Ortner. Adaptively tracking the best bandit arm with an unknown number of distribution changes. In Alina Beygelzimer and Daniel Hsu, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 99 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 138–158. PMLR, 25–28 Jun 2019b.
- Omar Besbes, Yonatan Gur, and Assaf Zeevi. Stochastic multi-armed-bandit problem with non-stationary rewards. In Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2014/file/903ce9225fca3e988c2af215d4e544d3-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2014/file/903ce9225fca3e988c2af215d4e544d3-Paper.pdf).
- Lilian Besson and Emilie Kaufmann. What doubling tricks can and can’t do for multi-armed bandits, 2018.
- Lilian Besson, Emilie Kaufmann, Odalric-Ambrym Maillard, and Julien Seznec. Efficient change-point detection for tackling piecewise-stationary bandits. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1):3337–3376, 2022.
- Yang Cao, Zheng Wen, Branislav Kveton, and Yao Xie. Nearly optimal adaptive procedure with change detection for piecewise-stationary bandit. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 418–427. PMLR, 2019.
- Olivier Cappé, Aurélien Garivier, Odalric-Ambrym Maillard, Rémi Munos, and Gilles Stoltz. Kullback-leibler upper confidence bounds for optimal sequential allocation. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1516–1541, 2013.
- Aurélien Garivier and Olivier Cappé. The kl-ucb algorithm for bounded stochastic bandits and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 24th annual conference on learning theory*, pages 359–376. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.

- Aurélien Garivier and Eric Moulines. On upper-confidence bound policies for switching bandit problems. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 174–188. Springer, 2011.
- Argyrios Gerogiannis, Yu-Han Huang, and Venugopal V. Veeravalli. Is prior-free black-box non-stationary reinforcement learning feasible?, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.13772>.
- Cédric Hartland, Sylvain Gelly, Nicolas Baskiotis, Olivier Teytaud, and Michèle Sebag. Multi-armed Bandit, Dynamic Environments and Meta-Bandits. working paper or preprint, November 2006. URL <https://hal.science/hal-00113668>.
- Yu-Han Huang and Venugopal V Veeravalli. High probability latency quickest change detection over a finite horizon. In *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1047–1052. IEEE, 2024.
- Emilie Kaufmann and Wouter M Koolen. Mixture martingales revisited with applications to sequential tests and confidence intervals. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):11140–11183, 2021.
- Levente Kocsis and Csaba Szepesvári. Discounted ucb. In *2nd PASCAL Challenges Workshop*, volume 2, pages 51–134, 2006.
- Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Fang Liu, Joohyun Lee, and Ness Shroff. A change-detection based framework for piecewise-stationary multi-armed bandit problem. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 32(1), Apr. 2018. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v32i1.11746. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/11746>.
- Gary Lorden. Procedures for reacting to a change in distribution. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 1897–1908, 1971.
- Ewan S Page. Continuous inspection schemes. *Biometrika*, 41(1/2):100–115, 1954.
- Binghui Peng and Christos Papadimitriou. The complexity of non-stationary reinforcement learning. In Claire Vernade and Daniel Hsu, editors, *Proceedings of The 35th International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, volume 237 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 972–996. PMLR, 25–28 Feb 2024.
- Julien Seznec, Pierre Menard, Alessandro Lazaric, and Michal Valko. A single algorithm for both restless and rested rotting bandits. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3784–3794. PMLR, 2020.
- Aleksandrs Slivkins et al. Introduction to multi-armed bandits. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 12(1-2):1–286, 2019.
- V. V. Veeravalli and T. Banerjee. Quickest change detection. In *Academic press library in signal processing: Array and statistical signal processing*. Academic Press, Cambridge, MA, 2013.

Jean Ville. *Etude critique de la notion de collectif*. Gauthier-Villars Paris, 1939.


Chen-Yu Wei and Haipeng Luo. Non-stationary reinforcement learning without prior knowledge: An optimal black-box approach. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 4300–4354. PMLR, 2021.

## Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 1

Consider a PS-MAB environment satisfying Condition (8), and recall that  $\nu_0 := 1$  and  $\nu_{N_T+1} := T + 1$ . We define the “good event”  $\mathcal{E}_T$  as the event where all changes are detected within the latency, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}_T := \{\forall k \in \{1, \dots, N_T\}, \tau_k \in \{\nu_k, \dots, \nu_k + d_k - 1\}, \tau_{N_T+1} > \nu_{N_T+1}\}. \quad (23)$$

The event  $\mathcal{E}_T$  is illustrated in Figure 4.



**Fig. 4.** Illustration of the event  $\mathcal{E}_T$

Then, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} R_T &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \sum_{t=\nu_{k-1}}^{\nu_k-1} \Delta_{A_t,k} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T^c) \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \sum_{t=\nu_{k-1}}^{\nu_k-1} \Delta_{A_t,k} \middle| \mathcal{E}_T^c \right] + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T) \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \sum_{t=\nu_{k-1}}^{\nu_k-1} \Delta_{A_t,k} \middle| \mathcal{E}_T \right] \quad (24) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} C T \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T^c) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \sum_{t=\nu_{k-1}}^{\nu_k-1} \Delta_{A_t,k} \middle| \mathcal{E}_T \right] \end{aligned}$$

where step (a) results from the fact that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T) \leq 1$  and that  $\Delta_{a,k} \leq C$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$ . Next, we define the “good event” up to the  $k^{\text{th}}$  detection point  $\mathcal{C}_k$  for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, N_T\}$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}_k := \{\forall l \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \tau_l \in \{\nu_l + 1, \dots, \nu_l + d_l\}\}. \quad (25)$$

For notational convenience, we define  $\mathcal{C}_0$  to be the universal space. In Figure 4, the second (false alarm) event corresponds to  $\mathcal{C}_2$ , whereas the third (late detection) event corresponds

to  $\mathcal{C}_1$ . The probability of bad event  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T^c)$  is upper bounded by the following modified union bound, which decomposes the bad event into false alarm events and late detection events:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T^c) &= \mathbb{P}(\{\exists k \in \{1, \dots, N_T\}, \tau_k \notin \{\nu_k, \dots, \nu_k + d_k - 1\}\} \cup \{\tau_{N_T+1} \leq \nu_{N_T+1}\}) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_T} \mathbb{P}(\tau_k \notin \{\nu_k, \dots, \nu_k + d_k - 1\}, \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_{N_T+1} \leq T, \mathcal{C}_{N_T}) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_T} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \mathbb{P}(\tau_k \notin \{\nu_k, \dots, \nu_k + d_k - 1\} \mid \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{N_T}) \mathbb{P}(\tau_{N_T+1} \leq T \mid \mathcal{C}_{N_T}) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^{N_T} \mathbb{P}(\tau_k \notin \{\nu_k, \dots, \nu_k + d_k - 1\} \mid \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_{N_T+1} \leq T \mid \mathcal{C}_{N_T}) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(\tau_k < \nu_k \mid \mathcal{C}_{k-1})}_{\Phi_1} + \sum_{k=1}^{N_T} \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(\tau_k \geq \nu_k + d_k \mid \mathcal{C}_{k-1})}_{\Phi_2}
 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where (a) is due to the fact that  $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{C}_{k-1}\} \leq 1$ . We then separately bound  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$ . • *Upper-Bounding  $\Phi_1$* : Recall that  $H_{a,\mathcal{D}}$  is the change detector history list associated with arm  $a$ , and that  $\tau_0$  is defined to be 1. For any  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}(t)$  be the number of detections that occurred before  $t$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{T}(t) := \sup \{l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : \tau_l \leq t\}. \tag{27}$$

For any  $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$  and  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ , we also define  $l_a(t)$  to be the number of times that arm  $a$  is pulled from the latest detection point to time  $t$ , which is the number of samples in  $H_{a,\mathcal{D}}$  at the end of time step  $t$ , i.e.,

$$l_a(t) := \sum_{s=\tau_{\mathcal{T}(t)}+1}^t \mathbf{1}\{A_s = a\}. \tag{28}$$

We also use  $\tau_{a,k}$  to denote the stopping time of the change detector associated with arm  $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$  after the  $(k-1)$ <sup>th</sup> detection point. Then, for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(\tau_k < \nu_k \mid \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) &= \mathbb{P}(\exists a \in \{1, \dots, A\}, \tau_{a,k} \in \{1, \dots, l_a(\nu_k - 1)\} \mid \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{a=1}^A \mathbb{P}(\tau_{a,k} \in \{1, \dots, l_a(\nu_k - 1)\} \mid \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{a=1}^A \mathbb{P}_\infty\{\tau \leq T\} \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{a=1}^A \delta_F \\
 &= A\delta_F
 \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where step (a) results from a union bound. Step (b) follows because of the independence of the rewards across time and arms, and the fact that  $\{1, \dots, l_a(\nu_k - 1)\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, T\}$ . Since the samples are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian, we apply (4) in Property 2 to obtain step (c).

• *Upper Bounding  $\Phi_2$* : Recall that  $l_a(t)$  is the number of times arm  $a$  has been pulled from the latest detection to  $t$  (see (28)). Then, for any  $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$  and  $i, j \in \{\tau_{k-1} + 1, \dots, \tau_k\}$  where  $i < j$ , we observe that due to forced exploration,

$$\begin{aligned} l_a(j) - l_a(i) &= \sum_{t=i+1}^j \mathbb{1}\{A_t = a\} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{t=i+1}^j \mathbb{1}\left\{\left(t - \tau_k - 1 \bmod \left\lceil \frac{A}{\alpha_k} \right\rceil\right) + 1 = a\right\} \\ &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{j - i}{\lceil A/\alpha_k \rceil} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

In step (a), we use the fact that the number of samples obtained from the CDB procedures is lower bounded by only the samples obtained from forced exploration. Then, for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, N_T\}$ , given  $\mathcal{C}_{k-1}$ , if  $\tau_k > \nu_k + d_k - 1$ , we have  $\nu_k - 1, \nu_k + d_k - 1 \in \{\tau_{k-1} + 1, \dots, \tau_k\}$ . Therefore, from (30) it follows that:

$$l_a(\nu_k + d_k - 1) - l_a(\nu_k - 1) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{d_k}{\lceil A/\alpha_k \rceil} \right\rfloor = d(\Delta_{c,k}). \quad (31)$$

Furthermore, we observe that  $\nu_k - \nu_{k-1} \geq d_{k-1} + m_k$  due to Condition (8). Then,

$$\nu_k - 1 - \tau_{k-1} \geq \nu_k - \nu_{k-1} - d_{k-1} \geq m_k \quad (32)$$

due to the fact that  $\tau_{k-1} \leq \nu_{k-1} + d_{k-1} - 1$  given  $\mathcal{C}_{k-1}$ . Hence, we can show that given  $\mathcal{C}_{k-1}$ , if  $\tau_k \geq \nu_k + d_k$ , then for any  $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$ ,

$$l_a(\nu_k - 1) = l_a(\nu_k - 1) - l_a(\tau_{k-1}) \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \left\lfloor \frac{\nu_k - 1 - \tau_{k-1}}{\lceil A/\alpha_k \rceil} \right\rfloor \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \left\lfloor \frac{m_k}{\lceil A/\alpha_k \rceil} \right\rfloor = m(\Delta_{c,k}) \quad (33)$$

where step (a) results from (30) and step (b) results from (32). Furthermore, without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\nu_k \leq T - d_k$ . Otherwise, there is no need to detect the change because the horizon will end soon after the change occurs. In the case where  $\nu_k > T - d_k$ , the regret for not detecting the change  $\nu_k$  is at most  $Cd_k$ , which is also incurred when the change is detected within the latency. Therefore, we have

$$l_a(\nu_k - 1) \leq \nu_k - 1 < T - d_k < T - d_k = T - \left\lceil \frac{A}{\alpha_k} \right\rceil d(\Delta_{c,k}) \leq T - d(\Delta_{c,k}). \quad (34)$$

We define  $a_{c,k}$  to be the arm that changes the most at the  $k^{\text{th}}$  change-point, i.e.,  $a_{c,k} := \operatorname{argmax}_{a=1, \dots, A} |\mu_{a,k+1} - \mu_{a,k}|$  for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . By (33) and (34),  $l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k - 1) \in \{m(\Delta_{c,k}) + 1, \dots, T - d(\Delta_{c,k})\}$  given  $\mathcal{C}_{k-1}$ . Then, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_k > \nu_k + d_k - 1 | \mathcal{C}_{k-1})$$



$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \mathbb{P}(\forall a \in \{1, \dots, A\}, \tau_{a,k} > l_a(\nu_k + d_k - 1) | \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}(\tau_{a_{c,k},k} > l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k + d_k - 1) | \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}(\tau_{a_{c,k},k} > l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k - 1) + d(\Delta_{c,k}) | \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_{a_{c,k},k} > l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k - 1) + d(\Delta_{c,k}), l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k - 1) \in \{m(\Delta_{c,k}) + 1, \dots, T - d(\Delta_{c,k})\} | \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k - 1) \in \{m(\Delta_{c,k}) + 1, \dots, T - d(\Delta_{c,k})\} | \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \\
 &\quad \cdot \mathbb{P}(\tau_{a_{c,k},k} > l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k - 1) + d(\Delta_{c,k}) | l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k - 1) \in \{m(\Delta_{c,k}) + 1, \dots, T - d(\Delta_{c,k})\}, \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tau_{a_{c,k},k} > l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k - 1) + d(\Delta_{c,k}) | l_{a_{c,k}}(\nu_k - 1) \in \{m(\Delta_{c,k}) + 1, \dots, T - d(\Delta_{c,k})\}, \mathcal{C}_{k-1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \mathbb{P}_\nu(\tau \geq \nu + d) \quad \text{for some } \nu \in \{m(\Delta_{c,k}) + 1, \dots, T - d(\Delta_{c,k})\} \\
 &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \delta_D
 \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where step (a) comes from the fact that  $\{a_{c,k}\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, A\}$ , and step (b) stems from (31). Step (c) follows because of the independence of the rewards across time and arms. Step (d) is due to (5) in Property 2. This completes bounding  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$ .

Plugging (29) and (35) into (26), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_T^c\} \leq A(N_T + 1)\delta_F + N_T\delta_D. \tag{36}$$

This bounds the first term in (24). To bound the second term, recall that  $H_{\mathcal{B}}$  is the stationary bandit history list and that  $\nu_{N_T+1} := T + 1$ . For any  $k \in \{1, \dots, N_T + 1\}$ , if  $(t - \tau_{k-1} - 1 \bmod \lceil \frac{A}{\alpha} \rceil) + 1 \notin \{1, \dots, A\}$ , then  $A_t = \mathcal{B}(H_{\mathcal{B}})$ , where  $\mathcal{B}(H_{\mathcal{B}})$  denotes the action determined by the stationary bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{B}$  with history  $H_{\mathcal{B}}$ . Thus, the second term in (24) can then be decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \sum_{t=\nu_{k-1}}^{\nu_k-1} \Delta_{A_t,k} \middle| \mathcal{E}_T \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} C \sum_{k=0}^{N_T} d_k + \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \left\lceil \frac{\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}}{\lceil A/\alpha_k \rceil} \right\rceil AC + \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} R_{\mathcal{B}}(\nu_k - \nu_{k-1} - d_{k-1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} C \sum_{k=0}^{N_T} d_k + \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} C[\alpha_k(\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}) + A] + \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} R_{\mathcal{B}}(\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}) \\
 &\leq C \sum_{k=0}^{N_T} d_k + \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} C \left[ \max_{k=1, \dots, N_T+1} \alpha_k(\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}) + A \right] + (N_T + 1) \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \frac{1}{N_T + 1} R_{\mathcal{B}}(\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} C \sum_{k=1}^{N_T} d_k + C\bar{\alpha}T + C(N_T + 1)A + (N_T + 1)R_{\mathcal{B}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \frac{\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}}{N_T + 1} \right) \\
 &= C \sum_{k=1}^{N_T} d_k + C\bar{\alpha}T + C(N_T + 1)A + (N_T + 1)R_{\mathcal{B}} \left( \frac{T}{N_T + 1} \right)
 \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where in step (a), the first term bounds the regret due to the delay of the change detector, the second term bounds the regret incurred due to forced exploration, and the third term

bounds the regret of the stationary bandit <sup>2</sup>. In steps (b) and (c), we apply Property 1, utilizing the fact that  $R_{\mathcal{B}}(T)$  is increasing with  $T$ , and applying Jensen's inequality to the concave function  $R_{\mathcal{B}}$ , respectively. Plugging (36) and (37) into (24) completes the proof of Theorem 1.

## Appendix B. Proof of Proposition 1

To prove Proposition 1, we have to prove the results for GLR and GSR tests, respectively. For each test, there are two parts to prove in Proposition 1: the false alarm constraint  $\mathbb{P}_{\infty}(\tau \leq T)$  and the detection delay performance  $\mathbb{P}_{\nu}(\tau \geq \nu + d)$ . To prove these two inequalities for the GLR test, we first associate the GLR statistics with the empirical mean of the sub-Gaussian observations, so that we can exploit the sub-Gaussianity to construct concentration inequalities in a manner similar to the approach in Kaufmann and Koolen (2021); Besson et al. (2022).

Let  $\hat{\mu}_{t:t'}$  be the empirical mean of samples  $\{X_t, \dots, X_{t'}\}$  for any  $t < t' \in \mathbb{N}$ . Recall that  $f_{\theta}$  is the density of a Gaussian random variable with mean  $\theta\sigma^2$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ . We use the following lemma to represent the GLR statistics using the empirical mean of the observations.

**Lemma 1.** *For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $s \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have:*

$$\log \left( \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\theta}(X_i)} \right) = \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}; \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) + (n-s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}; \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) \quad (38)$$

where  $\text{kl}(x; y) := \frac{(x-y)^2}{2\sigma^2}$  is the KL-divergence between two Gaussian distributions with common variance  $\sigma^2$  and different means  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof of Lemma 1.* We can show that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $s \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \left( \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\theta}(X_i)} \right) \\ &= \log \left( \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp \left( -\frac{(X_i - \theta_0\sigma^2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp \left( -\frac{(X_i - \theta_1\sigma^2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp \left( -\frac{(X_i - \theta\sigma^2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)} \right) \\ &= \log \left( \frac{\exp \left( -\inf_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{(X_i - \theta_0\sigma^2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \exp \left( -\inf_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=s+1}^n \frac{(X_i - \theta_1\sigma^2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{\exp \left( -\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(X_i - \theta\sigma^2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

---

2. It is worth noting what would happen if we allow the stationary bandit algorithm to have access to samples obtained from forced exploration as is done in Besson et al. (2022). Suppose  $\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{B}}$  is the regret of the stationary bandit that uses the forced exploration samples, then the second and third terms in the bound in step (a) will be replaced by  $\sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(\nu_k - \nu_{k-1} - d_{k-1})$ , which is  $\geq \sum_{k=1}^{N_T+1} R_{\mathcal{B}}(\nu_k - \nu_{k-1} - d_{k-1})$  since the forced exploration is a suboptimal way to pull the arms for the stationary bandit. This would make it difficult to upper bound the bandit regret in a manner similar to step (b) and the regret bound will no longer be modular.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \log \left( \frac{\exp \left( -\sum_{i=1}^s \frac{(X_i - \hat{\mu}_{1:s})^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \exp \left( -\sum_{i=s+1}^n \frac{(X_i - \hat{\mu}_{s+1:n})^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{\exp \left( -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(X_i - \hat{\mu}_{1:n})^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)} \right) \\
 & = \log \left( \frac{\exp \left( -\sum_{i=1}^s \frac{X_i^2 - 2X_i \hat{\mu}_{1:s} + \hat{\mu}_{1:s}^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \exp \left( -\sum_{i=s+1}^n \frac{X_i^2 - 2X_i \hat{\mu}_{s+1:n} + \hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{\exp \left( -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_i^2 - 2X_i \hat{\mu}_{1:n} + \hat{\mu}_{1:n}^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)} \right) \\
 & = \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{2X_i \hat{\mu}_{1:s} - \hat{\mu}_{1:s}^2}{2\sigma^2} + \sum_{i=s+1}^n \frac{2X_i \hat{\mu}_{s+1:n} - \hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}^2}{2\sigma^2} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2X_i \hat{\mu}_{1:n} - \hat{\mu}_{1:n}^2}{2\sigma^2} \\
 & = s \frac{\hat{\mu}_{1:s}^2}{2\sigma^2} + (n-s) \frac{\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}^2}{2\sigma^2} - n \frac{\hat{\mu}_{1:n}^2}{2\sigma^2} \\
 & = s \frac{\hat{\mu}_{1:s}^2}{2\sigma^2} + (n-s) \frac{\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}^2}{2\sigma^2} + s \frac{\hat{\mu}_{1:n}^2}{2\sigma^2} + (n-s) \frac{\hat{\mu}_{1:n}^2}{2\sigma^2} - 2 \frac{s \hat{\mu}_{1:s} \hat{\mu}_{1:n}}{2\sigma^2} - 2 \frac{(n-s) \hat{\mu}_{s+1:n} \hat{\mu}_{1:n}}{2\sigma^2} \\
 & = s \frac{(\hat{\mu}_{1:s} - \hat{\mu}_{1:n})^2}{2\sigma^2} + (n-s) \frac{(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n} - \hat{\mu}_{1:n})^2}{2\sigma^2} \\
 & = \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}; \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) + (n-s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}; \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) \tag{39}
 \end{aligned}$$

where step (a) follows from the fact that  $\sum_{i=t}^{t'} (X_i - a)^2$  is minimized when  $a = \hat{\mu}_{t:t'}$ .  $\blacksquare$

For proving the false alarm probability in Proposition 1, we use the following lemma as our concentration inequality:

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $(X_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  to be an i.i.d.  $\sigma^2$ -sub-Gaussian sequence with mean  $\mu$ , then for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists n \in \mathbb{N} : n \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:n}, \mu) - 3 \log(1 + \log(n)) > \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right) \leq \delta. \tag{40}$$

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Let  $Y(n) := n \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:n}, \mu) - 3 \log(1 + \log(n))$ . To prove this lemma, we associate the random process  $\{Y(n)\}$  with a supermartingale, so that we can apply Ville's inequality. To this end, we use the following lemma derived in Kaufmann and Koolen (2021) to construct the associated supermartingale.

**Lemma 3** (Lemma 13 from Kaufmann and Koolen (2021)). *Let  $c := \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{\pi^2/3}{(\log(5/4))^2} \right)$ . For any  $x > 0$ , there exists a nonnegative (mixture) martingale  $Z(t)$  such that  $Z(0) = 1$  and for any  $x > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\{Y(n) - c \geq x\} \subseteq \left\{ Z(n) \geq e^{\frac{4x}{5}} \right\}. \tag{41}$$

Continuing with the proof of Lemma 2, for any  $\lambda > 0$  and  $z > 1$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\{ e^{\lambda[Y(n)-11/2]} \geq z \right\} &\stackrel{(a)}{\subseteq} \left\{ e^{\lambda[Y(n)-c]} \geq z \right\} \\
 &= \left\{ Y(n) - c \geq \frac{\log(z)}{\lambda} \right\} \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\subseteq} \left\{ Z(n) \geq e^{\frac{4 \log(z)}{5\lambda}} \right\} \\
 &= \left\{ Z(n) \geq z^{\frac{4}{5\lambda}} \right\} \\
 &= \left\{ (Z(n))^{5\lambda/4} \geq z \right\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where step (a) is owing to the fact that  $\frac{11}{2} \geq c$ , and step (b) is due to (41). When  $\lambda \leq \frac{4}{5}$ , because  $g(x) = x^{5\lambda/4}$  is a concave function,  $(Z(n))^{5\lambda/4}$  is a supermartingale. Hence, for any  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{4}{5}]$ , and  $y > 11/2$ , we have the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}_\infty(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : Y(n) > y) &= \mathbb{P}_\infty(\cup_{n=1}^\infty \{Y(n) > y\}) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_\infty\left(\cup_{n=1}^\infty \left\{ e^{\lambda Y(n)} > e^{\lambda y} \right\}\right) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_\infty\left(\cup_{n=1}^\infty \left\{ e^{\lambda[Y(n)-11/2]} > e^{\lambda(y-11/2)} \right\}\right) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\infty\left(\cup_{n=1}^\infty \left\{ (Z(n))^{5\lambda/4} > e^{\lambda(y-11/2)} \right\}\right) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_\infty\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : (Z(n))^{5\lambda/4} > e^{\lambda(y-11/2)}\right) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_\infty\left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (Z(n))^{5\lambda/4} > e^{\lambda(y-11/2)}\right) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} e^{-\lambda(y-11/2)}
 \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where step (a) is due to (42) and step (b) comes from Ville's inequality Ville (1939). By minimizing (43) over  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{4}{5}]$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_\infty(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : Y(n) > y) \leq e^{-\frac{4}{5}(y-11/2)}. \tag{44}$$

Then, by letting  $\delta = e^{-\frac{4}{5}(y-11/2)}$ , we can see that for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\infty\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : Y(n) > \frac{5}{4} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{11}{2}\right) \leq \delta. \tag{45}$$

■

Continuing with the proof of the false alarm constraint in Proposition 1, recall that  $\mu_0$  is the pre-change mean of the sample sequence  $(X_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ . By Lemmas 1 and 2, for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{P}_\infty(\tau_{\text{GLR}} \leq T) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}_\infty(\tau_{\text{GLR}} < \infty)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists n \in \mathbb{N} : \sup_{1 \leq s \leq n} \log \left( \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_\theta(X_i)} \right) \geq \beta(n, \delta_F) \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists n \in \mathbb{N} : \sup_{1 \leq s \leq n} \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) + (n-s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}, \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) \geq \beta(n, \delta_F) \right) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_\infty (\exists s \leq n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) + (n-s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}, \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) > \beta(n, \delta_F)) \\
 &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists s \leq n \in \mathbb{N} : \inf_{\mu'} \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \mu') + (n-s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}, \mu') > \beta(n, \delta_F) \right) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}_\infty (\exists s \leq n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \mu_0) + (n-s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}, \mu_0) > \beta(n, \delta_F)) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists s, r \in \mathbb{N} : \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \mu_0) + r \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:s+r}, \mu_0) > 6 \log(1 + \log(s+r)) + \frac{5}{2} \log \left( \frac{4(s+r)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\delta_F} \right) + 11 \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists s, r \in \mathbb{N} : \left\{ \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \mu_0) > 3 \log(1 + \log(s+r)) + \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4(s+r)^{3/2}}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right\} \cup \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left\{ r \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:s+r}, \mu_0) > 3 \log(1 + \log(s+r)) + \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4(s+r)^{3/2}}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right\} \right) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \left\{ \exists s, r \in \mathbb{N} : \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \mu_0) > 3 \log(1 + \log(s+r)) + \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4(s+r)^{3/2}}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right\} \cup \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left\{ \exists s, r \in \mathbb{N} : r \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:s+r}, \mu_0) > 3 \log(1 + \log(s+r)) + \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4(s+r)^{3/2}}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right\} \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \left\{ \exists s \in \mathbb{N} : \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \mu_0) > 3 \log(1 + \log(s)) + \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right\} \cup \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left\{ \exists s, r \in \mathbb{N} : r \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:s+r}, \mu_0) > 3 \log(1 + \log(r)) + \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4s^{3/2}}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right\} \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(e)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists s \in \mathbb{N} : \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \mu_0) > 3 \log(1 + \log(s)) + \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right) + \\
 &\quad \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists s, r \in \mathbb{N} : r \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:s+r}, \mu_0) > 3 \log(1 + \log(r)) + \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4s^{3/2}}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists s \in \mathbb{N} : \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \mu_0) - 3 \log(1 + \log(s)) > \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right) + \\
 &\quad \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \bigcup_{s=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \exists r \in \mathbb{N} : r \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:s+r}, \mu_0) - 3 \log(1 + \log(r)) > \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4s^{3/2}}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right\} \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(f)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists s \in \mathbb{N} : \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \mu_0) - 3 \log(1 + \log(s)) > \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4}{\delta_F} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right) +
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\infty} \left( \exists r \in \mathbb{N} : r \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:s+r}, \mu_0) - 3 \log(1 + \log(r)) > \frac{5}{4} \log \left( \frac{4s^{3/2}}{\delta_{\text{F}}} \right) + \frac{11}{2} \right) \\
 & \stackrel{(g)}{\leq} \frac{\delta_{\text{F}}}{4} + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_{\text{F}}}{4s^{3/2}} \\
 & \leq \delta_{\text{F}}
 \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where step (a) is due to Lemma 1 and step (b) is owing to the fact that  $\inf_{\mu'} s (\hat{\mu}_{1:s} - \mu')^2 + (n-s) (\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n} - \mu')^2 = s (\hat{\mu}_{1:s} - \hat{\mu}_{1:n})^2 + (n-s) (\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n} - \hat{\mu}_{1:n})^2$ . Step (c) is due to the fact that  $x + y > 2a$  implies  $x > a$  or  $y > a$ . Step (d) stems from the fact that  $\beta(n, \delta)$  is increasing with  $n$ . Steps (e) and (f) are owing to the union bound. By Lemma 2, we obtain step (g). This completes the proof of the false alarm constraint in Proposition 1.

We now move on to proving the detection delay performance  $\mathbb{P}_{\nu}(\tau_{\text{GLR}} \geq \nu + d)$  in Proposition 1. To this end, we use the following lemma borrowed from Besson et al. (2022) as our concentration inequality:

**Lemma 4** (Lemma 10 in Besson et al. (2022)). *Let  $\hat{\mu}_{i,s}$  be the empirical mean of  $s$  i.i.d.  $\sigma^2$ -sub-Gaussian samples with mean  $\mu_i$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then,  $\forall s, r \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \frac{sr}{s+r} ((\hat{\mu}_{0,s} - \hat{\mu}_{1,r}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 > u \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{u}{2\sigma^2} \right). \tag{47}$$

Continuing with the proof of the latency, for convenience in notation, using Lemma 1, we can show that for any  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\delta_{\text{D}}, \delta_{\text{F}} \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\Delta_{\text{c}} > 0$ ,  $m > \frac{8\sigma^2}{\Delta_{\text{c}}^2} \beta(T, \delta_{\text{F}})$ , and  $\nu \in \{m+1, \dots, T-d\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}_{\nu}(\tau_{\text{GLR}} \geq \nu + d) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_{\nu} \left( \forall n \in \{1, \dots, \nu + d - 1\} : \sup_{1 \leq s \leq n} \log \left( \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\theta}(X_i)} \right) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. < \beta(n, \delta_{\text{F}}) \right) \\
 & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{P}_{\nu} \left( \forall n \in \{1, \dots, \nu + d - 1\} : \sup_{1 \leq s \leq n} \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) + (n-s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}, \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) < \beta(n, \delta_{\text{F}}) \right) \\
 & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{1 \leq s \leq \nu+d-1} \text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu+d-1}) + (\nu + d - 1 - s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:\nu+d-1}, \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu+d-1}) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. < \beta(\nu + d - 1, \delta_{\text{F}}) \right) \\
 & \leq \mathbb{P}_{\nu} \left( (\nu - 1) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1}, \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu+d-1}) + d \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}, \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu+d-1}) < \beta(\nu + d - 1, \delta_{\text{F}}) \right) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_{\nu} \left( \frac{\nu - 1}{2\sigma^2} \left( \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \frac{(\nu - 1) \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} + d \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}}{\nu + d - 1} \right)^2 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \frac{d}{2\sigma^2} \left( \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1} - \frac{(\nu - 1) \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} + d \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}}{\nu + d - 1} \right)^2 < \beta(\nu + d - 1, \delta_{\text{F}}) \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} (\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1})^2 < \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right) \quad (48)$$

where step (a) comes from Lemma 1 and step (b) results from  $\{\nu+d\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, \nu+d\}$ .

Recall that  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  are the pre- and post-change means, and that the definition of  $d$  is given in (16). For applying Lemma 4, we need to convert  $(\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1})^2$  in the last line of (48) into  $((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2$ . To this end, we show that for any  $\nu \in \{m+1, \dots, T-d\}$ ,  $\left\{ \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} (\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1})^2 < \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right\}$  implies  $\left\{ \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right\}$  with the choice of  $m$  and  $d$  in (16) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} (\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1})^2 < \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right\} \\ & \cap \left\{ \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 < \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right\} \\ & = \left\{ |\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}| < \left( \frac{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)}{(\nu-1)d} \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & \cap \left\{ |(\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1)| < \left( \frac{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)}{(\nu-1)d} \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\subseteq} \left\{ |\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}| < \left( \frac{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)}{(\nu-1)d} \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & \cap \left\{ |\mu_0 - \mu_1| - |\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}| < \left( \frac{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)}{(\nu-1)d} \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & = \left\{ |\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}| < \left( \frac{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)}{(\nu-1)d} \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & \cap \left\{ |\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}| > \Delta_c - \left( \frac{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)}{(\nu-1)d} \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & \subseteq \left\{ \Delta_c < 2 \left( \frac{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)}{(\nu-1)d} \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & = \left\{ \Delta_c^2 < 8\sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{\nu-1} + \frac{1}{d} \right) \beta(\nu+d-1, \delta_F) \right\} \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\subseteq} \left\{ \Delta_c^2 < 8\sigma^2 \left( \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d} \right) \beta(T, \delta_F) \right\} \\ & = \left\{ \left( \frac{\Delta_c^2}{8\sigma^2\beta(T, \delta_F)} - \frac{1}{m} \right)^{-1} > d \right\} \\ & = \left\{ \frac{8\sigma^2 m \beta(T, \delta_F)}{\Delta_c^2 m - 8\sigma^2 \beta(T, \delta_F)} > \left[ \max \left\{ \frac{8\sigma^2 m \beta(T, \delta_F)}{\Delta_c^2 m - 8\sigma^2 \beta(T, \delta_F)}, \frac{\delta_F^{2/3}}{2^{16/15} \delta_D^{4/15}} - m \right\} \right] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \emptyset \tag{49}$$

where step (a) is due to triangle inequality and step (b) is due to the fact that  $\nu \geq m + 1$  and  $\nu \leq T - d$ . Hence, the late detection probability can be bounded using Lemma 4 and we obtain that for any  $\nu \in \{m + 1, \dots, T - d\}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\nu (\tau_{\text{GLR}} \geq \nu + d) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu - 1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu + d - 1)} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq \beta(\nu + d - 1, \delta_{\text{F}}) \right) \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu - 1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu + d - 1)} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq \beta(m + d, \delta_{\text{F}}) \right) \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu - 1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu + d - 1)} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq \frac{5}{2} \log \left( \frac{4(m + d)^{3/2}}{\delta_{\text{F}}} \right) \right) \\ & = \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu - 1)d}{\nu + d - 1} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq 2\sigma^2 \log \left( \frac{32(m + d)^{15/4}}{\delta_{\text{F}}^{5/2}} \right) \right) \\ & \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{\delta_{\text{F}}^{5/2}}{16(m + d)^{15/4}} \\ & \leq \frac{\delta_{\text{F}}^{5/2}}{16 \left( \delta_{\text{F}}^{5/2} 2^{-16/15} \delta_{\text{D}}^{-4/15} \right)^{15/4}} \\ & = \delta_{\text{D}} \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where step (a) is due to the fact that  $\beta(n, \delta_{\text{F}})$  is increasing with  $n$ , whereas step (b) is owing to the fact that  $\beta(n, \delta_{\text{F}}) \geq \frac{5}{2} \log(4n^{3/2}/\delta_{\text{F}})$ . Step (c) comes from Lemma 4.

Next, we prove the results for GSR detector: To prove the upper bound on false alarm probability, we use our results for the false alarm probability of the GLR test (46). Similarly, the proof for the upper bound on the late detection probability  $\mathbb{P}_\nu (\tau_{\text{GSR}} \geq \nu + d)$  uses the concentration inequality in Lemma 4, and the steps are analogous to those used in the proof for  $\mathbb{P}_\nu (\tau_{\text{GLR}} \geq \nu + d) \leq \delta_{\text{D}}$ .

We first prove  $\mathbb{P}_\infty (\tau_{\text{GSR}} \leq T)$  using (46) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\infty (\tau_{\text{GSR}} \leq T) \\ & = \mathbb{P}_\infty (\exists n \in \{1, \dots, T\} : \log W_n \geq \beta(n, \delta_{\text{F}}) + \log n) \\ & = \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists n \in \{1, \dots, T\} : \right. \\ & \quad \left. \sum_{s=1}^n \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\theta}(X_i)} \geq n \exp(\beta(n, \delta_{\text{F}})) \right) \\ & = \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists n \in \{1, \dots, T\} : \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\theta}(X_i)} \geq \exp(\beta(n, \delta_{\text{F}})) \right) \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
 & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists n \in \{1, \dots, T\} : \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \sup_{1 \leq s \leq n} \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_\theta(X_i)} \geq \exp(\beta(n, \delta_F)) \right) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_\infty \left( \exists n \in \{1, \dots, T\} : \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \sup_{1 \leq s \leq n} \log \left( \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_\theta(X_i)} \right) \geq \beta(n, \delta_F) \right) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_\infty (\exists n \in \{1, \dots, T\} : G_n \geq \beta(n, \delta_F)) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_\infty (\tau_{\text{GLR}} \leq T) \\
 & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \delta_F \tag{51}
 \end{aligned}$$

where step (a) results from the fact that  $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i \leq a$  implies  $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \leq na$ , whereas (b) stems from (46).

Next, we prove the upper bound on the late detection probability  $\mathbb{P}_\nu(\tau_{\text{GSR}} \geq \nu + d)$ : For any  $T \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\delta_D, \delta_F \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\Delta > 0$ ,  $m > \frac{8\sigma^2}{\Delta^2} \beta_\star(T, \delta_F)$ , and  $\nu \in \{m + 1, \dots, T - d\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}_\nu(\tau_{\text{GSR}} \geq \nu + d) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_\nu(\forall n < \nu + d : \log W_n < \beta(n, \delta_F) + \log n) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \forall n < \nu + d : \log \left( \sum_{s=1}^n \frac{\sup_{\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^s f_{\theta_0}(X_i) \sup_{\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=s+1}^n f_{\theta_1}(X_i)}{\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_\theta(X_i)} \right) < \beta_\star(n, \delta_F) \right) \\
 & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \forall n \in \{1, \dots, \nu + d - 1\} : \log \left( \sum_{s=1}^n \exp(\text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \hat{\mu}_{1:n}) + (n - s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:n}, \hat{\mu}_{1:n})) \right) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. < \beta_\star(n, \delta_F) \right) \\
 & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \log \left( \sum_{s=1}^{\nu+d-1} \exp(\text{skl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:s}, \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu+d-1}) + (\nu + d - 1 - s) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{s+1:\nu+d-1}, \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu+d-1})) \right) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. < \beta_\star(\nu + d - 1, \delta_F) \right) \\
 & \leq \mathbb{P}_\nu((\nu - 1) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1}, \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu+d-1}) + d \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}, \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu+d-1}) < \beta_\star(\nu + d - 1, \delta_F)) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{\nu - 1}{2\sigma^2} \left( \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \frac{(\nu - 1) \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} + d \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}}{\nu + d - 1} \right)^2 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \frac{d}{2\sigma^2} \left( \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1} - \frac{(\nu - 1) \hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} + d \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}}{\nu + d - 1} \right)^2 < \beta_\star(\nu + d - 1, \delta_F) \right) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu - 1) d}{2\sigma^2(\nu + d - 1)} (\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1})^2 < \beta_\star(\nu + d - 1, \delta_F) \right) \tag{52}
 \end{aligned}$$

where step (a) stems from Lemma 1 and step (b) results from  $\{\nu + d\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, \nu + d\}$ . Recall that  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  are the pre- and post-change means, and that the definition of  $d$  is given in (16). For applying Lemma 4, we need to convert  $(\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1})^2$  in the last line of (52) into  $((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2$ . Following the same steps in (49), we can show that the event  $\left\{ \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} (\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1})^2 < \beta_\star(\nu + d - 1, \delta_F) \right\}$  implies the event  $\left\{ \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq \beta_\star(\nu + d - 1, \delta_F) \right\}$  for any  $\nu \in \{m + 1, \dots, T - d\}$  with the choice of  $m$  and  $d$  in (16) and  $\beta_\star(n, \delta_F) = \beta(n, \delta_F) + \log n$ . Hence, for any  $\nu \in \{m + 1, \dots, T - d\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}_\nu(\tau_{\text{GSR}} \geq \nu + d) \\
 & \leq \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq \beta_\star(\nu + d - 1, \delta_F) \right) \\
 & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq \beta_\star(m + d, \delta_F) \right) \\
 & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu-1)d}{2\sigma^2(\nu+d-1)} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq \frac{5}{2} \log \left( \frac{4(m+d)^{3/2}}{\delta_F} \right) \right) \\
 & = \mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \frac{(\nu-1)d}{\nu+d-1} ((\hat{\mu}_{1:\nu-1} - \hat{\mu}_{\nu:\nu+d-1}) - (\mu_0 - \mu_1))^2 \geq 2\sigma^2 \log \left( \frac{2^5(m+d)^{15/4}}{\delta_F^{5/2}} \right) \right) \\
 & \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{\delta_F^{5/2}}{16(m+d)^{15/4}} \\
 & \leq \frac{\delta_F^{5/2}}{16 \left( \delta_F^{5/2} 2^{-16/15} \delta_D^{-4/15} \right)^{15/4}} \\
 & = \delta_D
 \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where step (a) is due to the fact that  $\beta_\star(n, \delta_F)$  is increasing with  $n$ , whereas step (b) is owing to the fact that  $\beta_\star(n, \delta_F) \geq \frac{5}{2} \log(4n^{3/2}/\delta_F)$ . Step (c) comes from Lemma 4.