# Online Joint Topology Identification and Signal Estimation from Streams with Missing Data

Bakht Zaman<sup>†</sup>, Member, IEEE, Luis Miguel Lopez-Ramos<sup>\*</sup>, Member, IEEE,

\*WISENET Center, Department of ICT, University of Agder, Grimstad, Norway

<sup>†</sup> Simula Research Laboratory, SimulaMet, Oslo, Norway

Abstract-Identifying the topology that underlies a set of time series is useful for tasks such as prediction, denoising, and data completion. Vector autoregressive (VAR) model-based topologies capture dependencies among time series, and are often inferred from observed spatio-temporal data. When the data are affected by noise and/or missing samples, the tasks of topology identification and signal recovery (reconstruction) have to be performed jointly. Additional challenges arise when i) the underlying topology is time-varying, ii) data become available sequentially, and iii) no delay is tolerated. To overcome these challenges, this paper proposes two online algorithms to estimate the VAR model-based topologies. The proposed algorithms have constant complexity per iteration, which makes them interesting for big data scenarios. They also enjoy complementary merits in terms of complexity and performance. The inexact proximal online gradient descent framework is used to derive a performance guarantee for the most competitive proposed algorithm in the form of a dynamic regret bound. Numerical tests are also presented, showcasing the ability of the proposed algorithms to track the time-varying topologies with missing data in an online fashion.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

In many applications involving complex systems, causal relations among time series are computed and encoded as a graph where each node corresponds to a time series, and oftentimes reveal the topology of e.g. an underlying social, biological, or brain network [1]. A causality graph provides insights about the complex system under analysis, and enables certain tasks such as forecasting [2], signal reconstruction [3], anomaly detection [4], and dimensionality reduction [5]. The assumption that the data are fully observable (every data point providing a reliable value) at every node and time-instant does not hold in certain real-world scenarios [6], [7], due to diverse reasons: For instance, data acquired by a sensor network may be partially observed due to faulty equipment/sensors, network congestion, or energy constraints motivating sporadic observation of certain signals. In social networks, user data may be only partially available due to privacy reasons. In

B. Beferull-Lozano and L-M. López-Ramos are with the WISENET Center, Dept. of ICT, University of Agder, Jon Lilletunsvei 3, Grimstad, 4879 Norway. E-mails:{baltasar.beferull, luismiguel.lopez}@uia.no. B. Beferull-Lozano is also with SimulaMet, Simula Research Laboratory. E-mail: baltasar@simula.no. B. Zaman was with the WISENET Center, Dept. of ICT, University of Agder, at the time this work was completed, and he is now with Simula Research Laboratory. E-mail: bakht@simula.no. ecological networks, variable environmental factors may limit the ability to continuously monitor the abundance of a certain species [8], [9].

1

Streams of data generated at high rates need to be analyzed quickly in order to arrive at actionable intelligence. Another assumption that often does not hold in practice is that interaction patterns among variables remain unchanged: future data may have different underlying properties to current and historic data. This situation, known as *concept drift* [10], invalidates the methods that assume stationarity. Moreover, when past data are not available for multiple access, batch processing is not possible, calling for *online* algorithms which continuously update model parameters after receiving each data sample once. This paper considers the problem of online topology identification with streaming noisy data where some values are missing, simultaneously with the reconstruction of the input signals.

Identifying graphs capturing spatio-temporal "interactions" among time series has attracted great attention in the literature [1], [11]. Among the popular approaches for undirected topologies, correlation and partial correlation graphs [1], Markov random fields [12]–[15], and more recent approaches based on graph signal processing [16]–[18] are adopted in the literature. For directed interactions, one may employ structural equation models (SEM) [19], [20] or Bayesian networks [15, Sec. 8.1]. However, the methods above account only for *memoryless* interactions, meaning that they cannot accommodate (causal) delayed interactions where the value of a time series at a given time instant is related to the past values of other time series.

An important notion of causality among time series is due to Granger [21] based on the optimal prediction error, which is generally difficult to determine optimally [22, p. 33], [23]. Thus, alternative causality definitions based on vector autoregressive (VAR) models are typically preferred [24]–[26]. VAR topologies are estimated assuming stationarity and a Gaussian distribution of the innovations in [27], [28], and additionally assuming sparsity in [29]–[32]. All these approaches assume a model that does not change over time. In many applications, it is preferable to assume time-varying topologies. To identify them, approaches have been devised both for undirected [33]– [35] and directed graphs [36].

All previously discussed approaches process the entire data set at once, and cannot accommodate data arriving sequentially. Hence, their complexity becomes prohibitive for long

and Baltasar Beferull-Lozano<sup>\*†</sup>, Senior Member, IEEE

The work in this paper was supported by the SFI Offshore Mechatronics grant 237896/E30, the PETROMAKS Smart-Rig grant 244205 and the IKTPLUSS Indurb grant 270730/O70 from the Research Council of Norway.

observation windows. The modern approach to tackle these issues is *online* optimization, where an estimate is refined with every new data instance. Existing online topology identification algorithms include [20], [37]–[41] for memoryless interactions, and [42] for nonlinear memory-based dependencies.

The topology identification becomes more challenging when the input data is noisy. In [43], joint signal estimation and topology identification are pursued based on a spatio-temporal smoothness-based graph learning algorithm. This setting can become even more challenging when the data are incomplete. Several batch approaches to identify topologies in the presence of noisy data with missing values are available for undirected [44] and (VAR-based) directed [45], [46] topologies.

The problem of predicting future values of time series in an online fashion with missing data is considered in [47] and [48], where the missing values are imputed by their estimates. Theoretical guarantees in the form of static regret bounds are presented; however, those works adopt a univariate autoregressive (AR) process model, and thus do not extract information about the relations among multiple time series. Moreover, these works consider a static (stationary) model and analyze the static regret. An approach to jointly estimate the signal and topology is presented in [49] for a structural VAR model (SVARM) when the observations contain noisy and missing values; in that work, different batch and online algorithms are proposed, and an identifiability result is stated. However, no performance guarantees showing the tracking capabilities of the proposed online algorithm are presented.

The present work proposes online algorithms to estimate time-varying, *memory-aware* causality graphs from a collection of time series affected by noise and missing data, while reconstructing the input signals (denoising and imputation of missing values). The contributions include two algorithms to track VAR-causality graphs, with fixed computational complexity per sample, i.e., suitable for sequential and bigdata scenarios. The proposed algorithms have complementary merits: the first one has very low computational complexity, and the second one has improved tracking capability and is supported by dynamic regret bounds.

After introducing the basic (batch) formulation of the jointly optimal estimation and reconstruction, the contributions are:

- C1) The formulation of the online estimation and reconstruction task as a sequential decision problem, to account for the impact of decisions in future stages. More specifically, a sequential cost function inspired from [49] is put forth, involving signal mismatch from both the noisy samples and the current prediction, time-variation of the estimated topology parameter estimates, and a sparsity-promoting term.
- C2) The application of well-justified simplifying assumptions to the cost defined in C1, to introduce a loss function that can be tackled with an online convex optimization approach. Based on this, a first algorithm, termed *Joint Signal and Topology Identification via Sparse Online learning* (JSTISO), is presented. Apart from being an improved (robust to missing data) version of the algorithm TISO [50], JSTISO is presented as an intermediate step towards the next proposed algorithm.

- C3) The formulation of a second algorithm, named *Joint Signal and Topology Identification via Recursive Sparse Online learning* (JSTIRSO), to improve the tracking capability of JSTISO at the price of a moderate increase in computation. The difference with respect to JSTISO is that the loss function that JSTIRSO optimizes is augmented with an additional term inspired by recursive least squares (RLS), which improves the tracking capability and facilitates the analysis.
- C4) The derivation of a dynamic regret bound, to characterize the performance of JSTIRSO when the topology is time-varying. The derived dynamic regret bound depends on the properties of the data, the error due to missing values, and the parameters of the algorithm.
- C5) Finally, the empirical validation of the performance of the proposed algorithms through numerical tests.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Sec. II presents the model and a batch formulation for tracking of VAR causality graphs. Sec. III introduces the sequential joint tracking and signal estimation, and reviews the online convex optimization approach. To solve the sequential problem in an online fashion, an approximate loss function is obtained in Sec. IV, and JSTISO is derived. An alternative loss function is presented and used to derive JSTIRSO in Sec. V, which in turn is characterized analytically (dynamic regret analysis) in Sec. VI. Numerical results are presented in Sec. VII, and Sec. VIII concludes the paper.

**Notation.** Bold lowercase (uppercase) letters denote column vectors (matrices). Operators  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ ,  $\partial$ ,  $(\cdot)^{\top}$ ,  $\operatorname{vec}(\cdot)$ , and  $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ , respectively denote expectation, sub-differential, matrix transpose, vectorization, and maximum eigenvalue of a matrix. The operator  $\nabla$  denotes gradient and  $\nabla^s$  represents a subgradient. Symbols  $\mathbf{0}_N$  and  $\mathbf{0}_{N \times N}$ , represent all-zero vector and matrix,  $\mathbf{1}_N$  all-ones vector, and  $\mathbf{I}_N$  identity matrix, all of the given size. Finally,  $[\cdot]_+ \triangleq \max(\cdot, 0)$ , and  $\mathbb{1}$  is the indicator satisfying  $\mathbb{1}\{x\} = 1$  if x is true and  $\mathbb{1}\{x\} = 0$  otherwise.

#### II. MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider a collection of N time series, where  $y_n[t]$ , t = 0, 1, ..., T - 1, denotes the value of the *n*-th time series at time t. A causality graph  $\mathcal{G} \triangleq (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  is a graph where the *n*-th vertex in  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, ..., N\}$  is identified with the *n*-th time series  $y_n[t]$  and there is an edge (or arc) from n' to n  $((n, n') \in \mathcal{E})$  if and only if (iff)  $y_{n'}[t]$  causes  $y_n[t]$  according to a certain causality notion. A prominent notion of causality can be defined using VAR models. To this end, consider the order-P VAR model [51]:

$$\boldsymbol{y}[t] = \sum_{p=1}^{P} \mathbf{A}_{p} \boldsymbol{y}[t-p] + \boldsymbol{u}[t], \qquad (1)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{y}[t] \triangleq [y_1[t], \dots, y_N[t]]^\top$ ,  $\boldsymbol{A}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, p = 1, \dots, P$ , are the matrices of VAR parameters and  $\boldsymbol{u}[t] \triangleq [u_1[t], \dots, u_N[t]]^\top$  is the *innovation process*, generally assumed to be a temporally white, zero-mean stochastic process, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{u}[t]] = \boldsymbol{0}_N$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{u}[t]\boldsymbol{u}^\top[\tau]] = \boldsymbol{0}_{N \times N}$  for  $t \neq \tau$ .

With  $a_{n,n'}^{(p)}$  the n, n'-th entry of  $A_p$ , (1) becomes

$$y_{n}[t] = \sum_{n'=1}^{N} \sum_{p=1}^{P} a_{n,n'}^{(p)} y_{n'}[t-p] + u_{n}[t]$$
$$= \sum_{n' \in \mathcal{N}(n)} \sum_{p=1}^{P} a_{n,n'}^{(p)} y_{n'}[t-p] + u_{n}[t], \qquad (2)$$

for  $n = 1, \ldots, N$ , where  $\mathcal{N}(n) \triangleq \{n' : \boldsymbol{a}_{n,n'} \neq \boldsymbol{0}_P\}$  and

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{n,n'} \triangleq \left[ a_{n,n'}^{(1)}, \dots, a_{n,n'}^{(P)} \right]^{\top}.$$
 (3)

This model allows to introduce the concept of VAR causality [52], with a similar spirit to that of Granger causality, but much less challenging to compute. Given a process order P, it is said that time series  $y_i[t]$  VAR-causes time series  $y_j[t]$  iff the P most recent values of  $y_i[t]$  carry information that allows to reduce the prediction mean square error (MSE) of  $y_j[t]$  (compared to the optimal prediction based on all other time series in the set under consideration). While in the definition of Granger causality the notion of optimal prediction is not clearly specified, the VAR model allows a clear definition of an optimal predictor.

When u[t] is a zero-mean and temporally white stochastic process, the term  $\hat{y}_n[t] \triangleq \sum_{n' \in \mathcal{N}(n)} \sum_{p=1}^{P} a_{n,n'}^{(p)} y_{n'}[t-p]$ in (2) is the minimum mean square error estimator of  $y_n[t]$ given the previous values of all time series  $\{y_{n'}[\tau], n' =$  $1, \ldots, N, \tau < t$ ; see e.g. [23, Sec. 12.7]. The set  $\mathcal{N}(n)$ therefore collects the indices of those time series that participate in this optimal predictor of  $y_n[t]$ ; in other words, the information provided by time series  $y_{n'}[t]$  with  $n' \notin \mathcal{N}(n)$ is not informative to predict  $y_n[t]$ . This allows us to express the definition of VAR causality in a clearer and more compact way:  $y_{n'}[t]$  VAR-causes  $y_n[t]$  whenever  $n' \in \mathcal{N}(n)$ . Equivalently,  $y_{n'}[t]$  VAR-causes  $y_n[t]$  if  $a_{n,n'} \neq \mathbf{0}_P$ . VAR causality relations among the N time series can be represented using a causality graph where  $\mathcal{E} \triangleq \{(n, n') : a_{n,n'} \neq \mathbf{0}_P\}$ . Clearly, in such a graph,  $\mathcal{N}(n)$  is the in-neighborhood of node n. To quantify the strength of these causality relations, a weighted graph can be constructed by assigning e.g. the weight  $\|a_{n,n'}\|_2$ to the edge (n, n').

So far we have considered a static VAR model. However, to analyze dynamic systems in practical applications, a timevarying VAR model (often associated with a dynamic topology) is introduced:

$$\boldsymbol{y}[t] = \sum_{p=1}^{r} \mathbf{A}_{p}^{(t)} \boldsymbol{y}[t-p] + \boldsymbol{u}[t], \qquad (4)$$

where the parameters  $\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P$  follow a certain law of motion such as introduced in [53, Ch. 18]. With these definitions, the problem can be formally stated as: given the observations  $\{y[t]\}_{t=0}^{T-1}$  (in *batch* form) and the VAR process order, P, find the time-varying VAR coefficients  $\{\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P\}_{t=P}^{T-1}$  such that it yields sparse topology at each time instant. Without assumptions on the variations of the topologies, the problem involves more unknown variables than data and is ill-posed. In this case, we assume that the variations in the topology are constrained, so that the cumulative norm difference between consecutive sets of parameters does not exceed a given budget B. The formulation in [29] can be extended to a time-varying model as follows:

$$\arg \min_{\{\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(\tau)}\}_{p=1}^{P}\}_{\tau=P}^{T-1}} \frac{1}{2(T-P)} \sum_{t=P}^{T-1} \left\| \boldsymbol{y}[t] - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \, \boldsymbol{y}[t-p] \right\|_{2}^{2} + \sum_{t=P}^{T-1} \Omega\left( \left\{ \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \right\}_{p=1}^{P} \right)$$
(5a)

s. t. 
$$\sum_{t=P+1}^{T-1} \left\| \operatorname{vec}\left( \{ \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \}_{p=1}^{P} \right) - \operatorname{vec}\left( \{ \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t-1)} \}_{p=1}^{P} \right) \right\|_{2}^{2} \leq B,$$
(5b)

where the first term in the cost function is the least-squares loss, and the second term is a group sparsity-promoting regularization function defined as

$$\Omega\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) \triangleq \lambda \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{n'=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}\{n' \neq n\} \left\|\boldsymbol{a}_{n,n'}^{(t)}\right\|_{2}, \quad (6)$$

where  $a_{n,n'}^{(t)}$  has the same structure as (3) with time-varying VAR parameters. The regularization function  $\Omega$  promotes sparse edges in the causality graphs. The parameter  $\lambda$  is a user-defined constant that controls the sparsity in the edges of the graph. The constraint (5b) restricts the amount of variation in the VAR parameters, and is necessary for the problem to have a meaningful solution (otherwise it would be very ill-posed).

To formulate the problem of estimating the causality graphs when observations are affected by noise and some values are missing, consider a subset of  $\mathcal{V}$  where the signal is observed, given by  $\mathcal{M}_t \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ . The (random) pattern of missing values is collected in the masking vector  $\boldsymbol{m}[t] \in \mathbb{R}^N$  where  $m_n[t], n =$  $1, \ldots, N$ , are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables taking value 1 with probability  $\rho$  and 0 with probability  $1 - \rho$ . Let  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t]$  be the observation obtained at time t, given by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t] = \boldsymbol{m}[t] \odot (\boldsymbol{y}[t] + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}[t]), \tag{7}$$

where  $\odot$  denotes element-wise product, and  $\epsilon[t]$  is the observation noise vector.

In batch setting, the problem of estimating time-varying topologies with missing values is stated as: given the noisy observations  $\{\tilde{y}[t]\}_{t=0}^{T-1}$  with missing values, and the VAR process order P, find the coefficients  $\{\{\hat{A}_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P\}_{t=P}^{T-1}$  such that it yields a sparse topology. However, thanks to VAR model, is easier to estimate the topology from the observation vector directly if the missing values are reconstructed (imputed), and the topology (VAR parameters) helps in such reconstruction. Thus, a natural approach is to jointly estimate the signal and the topology.

In batch setting, the approach advocated in [49] is to solve the following problem, which includes joint estimation of the signal and the VAR coefficients :

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t], \left\{ \hat{\boldsymbol{A}}_{p}^{(t)} \right\}_{p=1}^{P} \right\}_{t=P}^{T-1} = \\ \underset{\left\{ \boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{ \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \right\}_{p=1}^{P} \right\}_{t=P}^{T-1}}{\arg\min} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=P}^{T-1} \left\| \boldsymbol{y}[t] - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \, \boldsymbol{y}[t-p] \right\|_{2}^{2} \\ + \sum_{t=P}^{T-1} \frac{\nu}{2|\mathcal{M}_{t}|} \left\| \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t] - \boldsymbol{m}[t] \odot \boldsymbol{y}[t] \right\|_{2}^{2} + \sum_{t=P}^{T-1} \Omega \left( \left\{ \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \right\}_{p=1}^{P} \right) \\ + \beta \sum_{t=P}^{T-1} \sum_{p=1}^{P} \left\| \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t-1)} \right\|_{F}^{2}, \quad (8) \end{cases}$$

where the first term is a least-squares (LS) fitting error for all time instants (where the *t*-th term in the summation fits the signal based on the P previous observations and the VAR coefficients at time t), the second term penalizes the mismatch between the observation vector and the reconstructed signal (recall that  $|\mathcal{M}_t|$  is the number of nodes where the signal is observed<sup>1</sup>), the third term is a regularization function that promotes sparsity in the edges, and the fourth term limits the variations in the coefficients (it comes from the dualization of the constraint in (5)). The parameter  $\nu > 0$  is a constant to control the trade-off between the prediction error based on the VAR coefficients and the mismatch between the measured samples and the signal reported after the reconstruction. The parameter  $\lambda$  controls the sparsity in the edges while  $\beta$  controls the magnitude of the cumulative norm of the difference between consecutive coefficients. The resulting problem in (8) is (separately) convex in  $\{\boldsymbol{y}[t]\}_{t=P}^{T-1}$  and in  $\{\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^{P}\}_{t=P}^{T-1}\},\$ but not jointly convex. A stationary point of (8) can be found via alternating minimization [49, Corollary 1]. Each subproblem in alternating minimization can be solved via proximal gradient descent.

In the next section, we describe how to solve this problem in an online fashion where the data are coming sequentially.

#### III. ONLINE SIGNAL RECONSTRUCTION AND TOPOLOGY INFERENCE

The batch formulation in (8) uses information from all time instants to produce a sequence of reconstructed signal values and VAR parameter (topology) estimates. On the other hand, an online formulation should allow us to produce such a sequence with minimum delay and with fixed complexity (at the price of lower accuracy). Specifically, here we are interested in an algorithm that, at each time instant t, produces an estimate of  $\boldsymbol{y}[t]$  and  $\{\boldsymbol{A}_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P$  as soon as the partial observation  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t]$  is received.

To this end, we design an online criterion such that its sum over time matches the batch objective in (8). As a preliminary step, define

$$\ell_{t}\left(\{\boldsymbol{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}, \boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) \triangleq$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|\boldsymbol{y}[t] - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \boldsymbol{y}[t-p]\right\|_{2}^{2} + \frac{\nu}{2|\mathcal{M}_{t}|} \left\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t] - \boldsymbol{m}[t] \odot \boldsymbol{y}[t]\right\|_{2}^{2}.$$
(9)

Now we can use the expression above<sup>2</sup>, and the definition of  $\Omega(\cdot)$  from (6), to define the dynamic cost function:

$$c_{t}\left(\{\boldsymbol{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t}, \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}, \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t-1)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) \triangleq$$

$$\ell_{t}\left(\{\boldsymbol{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}, \boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) + \Omega\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right)$$

$$+ \beta \sum_{t=P}^{T-1} \sum_{p=1}^{P} \|\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t-1)}\|_{F}^{2}. \quad (10)$$

The objective function in (8) can be rewritten as  $\sum_{t} c_t(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ . It becomes clear that producing an estimate of  $\boldsymbol{y}[t]$  and  $\{\boldsymbol{A}_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P$  does not only have an impact on  $c_t(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ , but also on  $\{c_{\tau}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)\}_{\tau=t}^{t+P}$ . Such a coupling in time is taken into account in the framework of dynamic programming (or reinforcement learning), where the goal is to find a policy  $\pi$  of the form

$$\pi : \mathbb{R}^{PN} \times \mathbb{R}^{N^2 P} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{N^2 P}$$
$$\pi \left( \{ \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau] \}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}, \{ \hat{\boldsymbol{A}}_p^{(t-1)} \}_{p=1}^P, \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t], \boldsymbol{m}[t] \right) \rightsquigarrow \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t], \{ \hat{\boldsymbol{A}}_p^{(t)} \}_{p=1}^P$$
(11)

such that the cumulative cost is minimized in expectation. Learning such a policy (via e.g., deep reinforcement learning) would be computationally intensive and require a high amount of data, and it is left out of the scope of the present paper. Instead, we propose to approximate such a policy using the much more tractable framework of online convex optimization (reviewed next). Fortunately enough, the structure of (10) resembles that of the composite problems that can be efficiently dealt with via proximal online gradient descent (OGD). In the next section, an approximation of the cost function discussed above will be taken in a way such that we can derive a proximal OGD update over  $\{A_p^{(t-1)}\}_{p=1}^{P}$ .

In the remainder of this section, the theoretical background of proximal OGD and inexact proximal OGD (IP-OGD) will be introduced. In Sec. IV, we will explain the approximations we take in order to be able to apply the IP-OGD framework [54] to the online problem at hand.

#### A. Theoretical background: composite problems

In the sequel, we present a framework to solve compositeobjective optimization problems in an online fashion.

Consider a sequence of functions, each of them split into two parts (a loss function and a regularization function). Generally, each function in the sequence is given by

$$h_t(\boldsymbol{a}) \triangleq f_t(\boldsymbol{a}) + \Omega_t(\boldsymbol{a}), \tag{12}$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>For those time instants where  $|\mathcal{M}_t| = 0$ , the term affected by the fraction will not be considered in the optimization, so division-by-zero error is avoided.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The splitting of the arguments of  $\ell_t$  into present and past samples will become useful in subsequent sections.

where  $f_t : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$  is a general convex loss function, and  $\Omega_t : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$  is a convex regularization function, with  $\mathcal{X}$  being a convex set. Note that the function  $\Omega_t(\cdot)$  can vary with time, however, in this work, it will remain constant.

Given such a sequence of functions, the online learning setting requests to generate, at each time t, a hypothesis or estimate a[t], given the previous functions  $\{h_{\tau}\}_{\tau=0}^{t-1}$ . The quality of the proposed estimate a[t] will be assessed by  $h_t(a[t])$ . Since the estimate must be delivered before  $h_t$  is made available, the possibility of generating good estimates is subject to certain assumptions on how much the sequence of optimal estimates (which is only known in hindsight) changes over time. In the context of this work, a[t] corresponds to the VAR parameters, and the online learning task corresponds to the tracking of the time-varying topologies, subject to the assumption that the topology changes slowly over time.

The performance metric usually considered in online learning algorithms for static problems is the static regret, which compares the algorithm's performance with a static (constant in time) hindsight solution. Although online algorithms with sublinear regret [55] can be applied to track slowly timevarying solutions, the static regret is not an adequate metric for quantifying how well an algorithm infers time-varying models. To characterize the performance of online algorithms in time-varying scenarios, dynamic regret has become popular for problems where the hindsight solution is also time-varying [56]. Mathematically, the dynamic regret is defined as

$$R_d[T] \triangleq \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left[ h_t(\boldsymbol{a}[t]) - h_t(\boldsymbol{a}^*[t]) \right], \tag{13}$$

where a[t] is the estimate of the online algorithm and  $a^*[t]$  is the optimal solution<sup>3</sup> at time t, given by  $a^*[t] \triangleq \arg \min_a h_t(a)$ . Note that optimal solutions are time-varying. Next, we present an online algorithm to solve the composite problem given in (12). It is well known that composite problems can be efficiently solved via proximal methods [57], [58], which are based on the so-called proximity operator, which we briefly discuss next. The proximity (prox) operator of a scaled function  $\eta \Psi$  at point v is defined by [57]:

$$\mathbf{prox}_{\Psi}^{\eta}(\boldsymbol{v}) \triangleq \underset{\boldsymbol{x} \in \text{dom } \Psi}{\arg\min} \left[ \Psi(\boldsymbol{x}) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{v}\|_{2}^{2} \right], \quad (14)$$

where  $\Psi(\cdot)$  is minimized together with a quadratic proximal term, which makes the minimization objective strongly convex. The prox operator of a function at point v can be interpreted as minimizing the function while being close to v, and the parameter  $\eta$  controls the trade-off between the two objectives. Based on this prox operator, there are various algorithms which work under very general conditions. Usually, the proximal algorithms are used to solve composite problems (differentiable plus non-differentiable term) and they exhibit good convergence guarantees. Some of the existing algorithms such as gradient descent, projected gradient descent, etc. can be shown to be special cases of proximal algorithms.

An extremely popular algorithm for solving composite problems is proximal gradient descent (PGD) [57]. At each iteration, a gradient descent step is performed on the differentiable component of the objective and then the prox operator of the non-differentiable function at the resultant vector is performed. This process is repeated until convergence. In its online version, namely proximal OGD, only one iteration of the proximal gradient is performed at each time instant based on the available data sample, instead of running until convergence. In many cases, the full information about the cost function is not available to the algorithm. To deal with this issue, IP-OGD [54] assumes that an inexact gradient is available and the analysis of the algorithm includes the error between the true gradient and the available inexact gradient. The IP-OGD algorithm enjoys solid theoretical guarantees regarding its performance in tracking time-varying parameters.

#### IV. DERIVING AN APPROXIMATE LOSS FUNCTION

The expressions in the previous section [cf. (10)] represent the problem of joint estimation and reconstruction from a rather ideal point of view because, even though the optimal policy would allow the best possible tracking, finding such a policy is nearly intractable. Fortunately, adding a few simple assumptions can give rise to a composite objective problem that can be solved using the approach described in Sec. III-A.

Notice that at time t, considering the underlying observation noise and random missing data, the previous P reconstructed samples,  $\{\hat{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}$ , can be considered as realizations of random variables. This allows to replace the deterministic cost function  $c_t(\cdot)$  for the batch formulation by the following random cost function for the online problem:

$$C_{t}\left(\boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) = \ell_{t}\left(\left\{\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau]\right\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}, \boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) + \Omega\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) + \beta\sum_{p=1}^{P} \|\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{A}}_{p}^{(t-1)}\|_{F}^{2}, \quad (15)$$

which is jointly convex in its arguments, and where  $\{\hat{A}_{p}^{(t-1)}\}_{p=1}^{P}$  have been previously estimated at time t-1. Notice that, if  $\{\hat{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}$  and  $\tilde{y}[t]$  were equal to the true (yet unobservable) signals  $\{y[\tau]\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t}$ , this setting would be the same that is dealt with in [50], by direct application of proximal OGD. Since the aforementioned signal estimates are inexact versions of the true signals, in the present work we will use the IP-OGD framework discussed in [54] to analyze the regret of the resulting algorithm.

Before proceeding to the formulation of the online algorithm, two remarks are in order.

**Remark 1:** The cost function has as inputs the signal estimate and the VAR parameters. It is assumed that the VAR parameters change smoothly with time, but we cannot assume that the signals vary smoothly with time. Recall that in each proximal OGD iteration, a minimization is solved involving a first-order approximation of the loss  $\ell_t$ , the regularizer  $\Omega$  (not linearized), and a proximal term that ensures that the variable estimated at time t is close in norm to its previous estimate at time t - 1. This proximal term should involve  $\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P$ ,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>For simplicity of exposition,  $h_t(\cdot)$  is usually assumed to have a unique minimizer, which is verified by the loss function presented in Sec. V.

but not  $\boldsymbol{y}[t]$ .

**Remark 2:** As a consequence of the variable decoupling introduced in (15), the function  $C_t(\cdot)$  becomes separable across nodes.

The joint optimization over  $\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P$  and y[t] can be reformulated into an optimization only over  $\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P$  as follows. Note first that minimizing it can be split into first minimizing over y[t] and then over  $\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P$ . The first minimization admits a closed form, which in turn is convex in  $\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P$ . Specifically, we can write

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}} C_{t}\left(\boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) = \min_{\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}} \mathcal{L}_{t}\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right),$$
(16)

where

$$\mathcal{L}_{t}\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) \triangleq \min_{\boldsymbol{y}[t]} \ell_{t}\left(\left\{\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau]\right\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}, \boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right),\tag{17}$$

and the analytical minimization in (17) is shown in Sec. IV-A. Once a closed form is available for  $\mathcal{L}_t$ , IP-OGD can be applied. The inexactness comes from the previously estimated (reconstructed)  $\{\hat{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}$ . Recall that we model such estimates as random variables from the point of view of the agent that estimates  $\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^P$  at time t. That is what makes  $\mathcal{L}_t$ a random function, more specifically an inexact version of the "true" loss function which would be given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{t}^{\text{true}}\left(\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) \triangleq \min_{\boldsymbol{y}[t]} \ell_{t}\left(\{\boldsymbol{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}, \boldsymbol{y}[t], \{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^{P}\right),$$

but is unavailable because the true signal values  $\{y[\tau]\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}$  would be needed to evaluate it.

Observe that the loss function in (17) is separable across nodes, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{t}\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_{t}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t])$$
$$= \sum_{n=1}^{N} \min_{y_{n}[t]} \ell_{t}^{(n)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t], y_{n}[t], \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]), \quad (18)$$

where

$$\ell_t^{(n)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t], y_n[t], \boldsymbol{a}_n[t]) \triangleq \\ \frac{1}{2} \left( (y_n[t] - \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]^\top \boldsymbol{a}_n[t])^2 + \frac{\nu \, m_n[t]}{|\mathcal{M}_t|} (y_n[t] - \tilde{y}_n[t])^2 \right) \quad (19)$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \triangleq \operatorname{vec}\left(\left[\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t-1],\ldots,\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t-P]\right]^{\top}\right),$$
 (20)

$$\mathcal{L}_t^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_n[t]) \triangleq \min_{y_n[t]} \ell_t^{(n)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t], y_n[t], \boldsymbol{a}_n[t]).$$
(21)

To arrive at the loss function, the minimizer (signal reconstruction) will be derived; then, a closed-form expression for  $\mathcal{L}_t^{(n)}$  will be obtained.

#### A. Signal reconstruction and loss function in closed form

We discuss here the (sub)problem of estimating the signal from a noisy observation vector with missing values given a (fixed) topology. The resulting estimator is a convex combination of the signal prediction via the VAR process and the values present in the observation vector. More formally, the reconstruction subproblem consists in estimating  $\boldsymbol{y}[t]$  given  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t], \boldsymbol{m}[t], \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t], \text{ and } \{\mathbf{A}_p^{(t)}\}_{p=1}^{P}$ . Notice from (9) that  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t]$  and  $\boldsymbol{m}[t]$  are implicit in the definition of  $\ell_t(\cdot)$ :

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t] = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{y}[t]} \ell_t(\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t], \boldsymbol{y}[t], \boldsymbol{a}_n[t]).$$
(22)

The solution for the *n*-th entry of  $\hat{y}[t]$  is  $\hat{y}_n[t] = \arg \min_{y_n[t]} \ell_t^{(n)}(\hat{g}[t], y_n[t], a_n[t])$ , which has a closed form given by

$$\hat{y}_n[t] = (1 - U_n[t])\,\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]^\top \boldsymbol{a}_n[t] + U_n[t]\tilde{y}_n[t],\qquad(23)$$

where

$$U_n[t] \triangleq \frac{\nu}{|\mathcal{M}_t| + \nu} m_n[t]. \tag{24}$$

Observe that  $U_n[t] \in [0, \nu/(1+\nu)]$  holds  $\forall t, n$ .

After substituting (23) into (21) and simplifying, the loss function can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}_{t}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]) = \frac{1}{2} U_{n}[t] (\tilde{y}_{n}[t] - \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t] \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t])^{2}, \qquad (25)$$

and it will be used in Sec. IV-B to derive the IP-OGD iterates. Proximal OGD involves linearizing part of the objective, in this case  $\mathcal{L}_t^{(n)}(\cdot)$ , which requires computing the gradient. The latter is given by

$$\nabla \mathcal{L}_t^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_n[t]) = U_n[t] \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^\top[t] \boldsymbol{a}_n[t] - \tilde{y}_n[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \right).$$
(26)

B. Application of IP-OGD to Joint Signal and Topology Estimation

The gradient defined in (26) depends on  $\hat{g}[t]$ , which is conformed using the estimates  $\{\hat{y}[t-p]\}_{p=1}^{P}$ , which in turn will generally differ from the true signals. This is translated into an error in the gradient and this is why IP-OGD is advocated here.

Let  $f_t^{(n)}$  be a general loss function, and let  $\mathcal{F}_t^{(n)}$  be a random function that is an inexact version of  $f_t^{(n)}$ . Using  $\mathcal{F}_t^{(n)}$  and  $\Omega^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_n)$  in (12), with a constant step size  $\alpha$ , the IP-OGD iteration is:

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] = \mathbf{prox}_{\Omega^{(n)}}^{\alpha} \left( \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t-1] - \alpha \nabla \mathcal{F}_{t}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t-1]) \right).$$
(27)

Let 
$$\boldsymbol{a}_{n}^{\mathrm{f}}[t] \triangleq \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t-1] - \alpha \nabla \mathcal{F}_{t}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t-1]), \text{ and}$$
  
$$\boldsymbol{a}_{n}^{\mathrm{f}}[t] = [(\boldsymbol{a}_{n,1}^{\mathrm{f}}[t])^{\top}, \dots, (\boldsymbol{a}_{n,N}^{\mathrm{f}}[t])^{\top}]^{\top}, \qquad (28)$$

which enables us to write the above update expression as

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] = \operatorname{prox}_{\Omega^{(n)}}^{\alpha} \left( \boldsymbol{a}_{n}^{\mathrm{f}}[t] \right)$$
  
=  $\operatorname{arg\,min}_{\boldsymbol{z}_{n}} \left( \Omega^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{z}_{n}) + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left\| \boldsymbol{z}_{n} - \boldsymbol{a}_{n}^{\mathrm{f}}[t] \right\|_{2}^{2} \right).$ 

Using the regularizing function  $\Omega^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_n) \triangleq \lambda \sum_{n'=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}\{n \neq n'\} \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n,n'}\|_2$ , [cf. (6) that  $\Omega = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \Omega^{(n)}$ ], the update yields

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\{\boldsymbol{z}_{n,n'}\}_{n'=1}^{N}} \left( \lambda \sum_{n'=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}\{n \neq n'\} \|\boldsymbol{z}_{n,n'}\|_{2} + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \sum_{n'=1}^{N} \|\boldsymbol{z}_{n,n'} - \boldsymbol{a}_{n,n'}^{\mathrm{f}}[t]\|_{2}^{2} \right).$$

which is separable across n' and the solution to the n'-th subproblem is given by the group soft-thresholding:

Г

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{n,n'}[t] = \underset{\boldsymbol{z}_{n,n'}}{\arg\min} \left[ \mathbbm{1}\{n \neq n'\} \| \boldsymbol{z}_{n,n'} \|_{2} + \frac{1}{2\alpha\lambda} \| \boldsymbol{z}_{n,n'} - \boldsymbol{a}_{n,n'}^{\mathrm{f}}[t] \|_{2}^{2} \right]$$
$$= \boldsymbol{a}_{n,n'}^{\mathrm{f}}[t] \left[ 1 - \frac{\alpha\lambda\mathbbm{1}\{n \neq n'\}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}_{n,n'}^{\mathrm{f}}[t]\|_{2}} \right]_{+}, \quad (29)$$

(recall that  $a_{n,n'}^{f}[t]$  is a subvector of  $a_{n}^{f}[t]$  as defined in (28)). The algorithm JSTISO, which is intended at minimizing  $C_t(\cdot, \cdot)$  in (15), is obtained when  $\mathcal{F}_t^{(n)}$  is set to be  $\mathcal{L}_t^{(n)}$ . All required steps are summarized in Procedure 1. It only requires  $\mathcal{O}(N^2P)$  memory entries to store the previous P reconstructed samples, and each update requires  $\mathcal{O}(N^2P)$  arithmetic operations, which is in the same order as the number of parameters to be estimated.

**Remark 3:** For those time instants and nodes where an entry is missing,  $\nabla_{a_n[t]} \mathcal{L}_t^{(n)} = \mathbf{0}_{NP}$ , but **Procedure 1** applies the soft-thresholding operator (29) to the corresponding coefficients. While this may seem counterintuitive, the shrinking is justified by the model at hand. The time-varying parameters are modeled as a random walk whose innovations are compound by a) a Gaussian distributed term, plus b) a term that attracts the VAR parameters towards 0 (which is the source of sparsity). The term a) justifies the Frobenius norm in (8) and the term b) justifies the presence of  $\Omega$  in the same equation.

**Remark 4:** The proposed algorithm only differs from TISO [50] in the estimate refinement (line 11). Actually, if line 3 is modified to obtain  $\hat{g}[t]$  directly from the observations, the resulting parameter estimates  $\{a_n[t]\}_{n=1}^N$  will coincide with those of TISO.

## V. AN ALTERNATIVE LOSS FUNCTION FOR IMPROVED TRACKING

The loss function in the previous approach is an instantaneous loss, which only depends on the current sample. While this keeps the complexity of the iterations very low, and may be sufficient for online estimation of a static VAR model, it is sensitive to noise and input variability, and thus it is expected to perform poorly when attempting at tracking a time-varying model. In [50], a running average loss function is designed drawing inspiration from the relation between least mean squares (LMS) and recursive least squares (RLS) to improve the tracking capabilities of TISO. In this paper,

Procedure 1 Tracking time-varying topologies with missing data via JSTISO

**Input parameters:**  $P, \lambda, \alpha, \nu$ **Initialization:**  $\{\hat{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=0}^{P-1}, \{a_n[P-1]\}_{n=1}^N$ 1: for t = P, P + 1, ... do Receive observation  $\tilde{y}[t]$  and masking vector m[t]2: Obtain  $\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]$  from  $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t-p]\}_{p=1}^{P}$  via (20) 3: for n = 1, ..., N do 4: Obtain  $U_n[t]$  via (24) 5:  $a_n^{\rm f}[t] = a_n[t-1] - \alpha \nabla \mathcal{L}_t^{(n)}(a_n[t-1])$  [cf. (26)] for  $n' = 1, 2, \dots, N$  do 6: 7: Compute  $a_{n,n'}[t]$  via (29) 8: 9: end for  $\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{a}_{n,1}^{\top}[t], \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n,N}^{\top}[t] \end{bmatrix}^{\top}$ Compute  $\hat{y}_{n}[t]$  via (23) 10: 11: end for 12: Output  $\{\boldsymbol{a}_n[t]\}_{n=1}^N, \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t]$ 13: 14: end for

similar steps will lead to a second approach, where a running average loss function is adopted, which depends on the past reconstructed signal values. In this second approach, the loss function is set as  $P = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n$ 

$$\tilde{\ell}_{t} \left( \{ \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau] \}_{\tau=0}^{t-1}, \boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{ \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \right\}_{p=1}^{P} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{y}[t] - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \, \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t-p] \right\|_{2}^{2} + \frac{\nu}{2|\mathcal{M}_{t}|} \left\| \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t] - \boldsymbol{m}[t] \odot \boldsymbol{y}[t] \right\|_{2}^{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau=P}^{t-1} \gamma^{t-\tau} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau] - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \, \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau-p] \right\|_{2}^{2}, \quad (30)$$

where  $\gamma$  is a user-selected forgetting factor which controls the weight of past (reconstructed) samples of  $\boldsymbol{y}[t]$ . The modeling principles in the previous section (treating the previously reconstructed samples as a random variable, and minimizing over  $\boldsymbol{y}[t]$ ) are applied to the alternative deterministic loss  $\tilde{\ell}_t$ , enabling to define the random loss function  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t$  as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) \triangleq \min_{\boldsymbol{y}[t]} \tilde{\ell}_{t}\left(\left\{\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau]\right\}_{\tau=0}^{t-1}, \boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right),$$
(31)

which can be rewritten in terms of  $\ell_t$  as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) = \min_{\boldsymbol{y}[t]} \ell_{t}\left(\left\{\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau]\right\}_{\tau=t-P}^{t-1}, \boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) \\ + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\tau=P}^{t-1} \gamma^{t-\tau} \left\|\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau] - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau-p]\right\|_{2}^{2}.$$
 (32)

Regarding the signal reconstruction, the minimizer of (31) is:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t] = \underset{\boldsymbol{y}[t]}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \quad \tilde{\ell}_{t} \left( \{ \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[\tau] \}_{\tau=0}^{t-1}, \boldsymbol{y}[t], \left\{ \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \right\}_{p=1}^{P} \right)$$
$$= \underset{\boldsymbol{y}[t]}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \frac{1}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{y}[t] - \sum_{p=1}^{P} \boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)} \, \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t-p] \right\|_{2}^{2}$$
$$+ \frac{\nu}{2|\mathcal{M}_{t}|} \left\| \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}[t] - \boldsymbol{m}[t] \odot \boldsymbol{y}[t] \right\|_{2}^{2}. \tag{33}$$

Observe that (33) coincides with the reconstruction problem in (22) and, therefore, its solution is given by (23).

Next, to derive the closed-form solution for  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_t$  in this approach, we substitute the closed-form expression of  $\hat{y}[t]$  from (23) into (31):

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}\left(\left\{\boldsymbol{A}_{p}^{(t)}\right\}_{p=1}^{P}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\left[U_{n}[t](\tilde{y}_{n}[t] - \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t]\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t])^{2}\right] + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\left(\sum_{\tau=P}^{t-1}\gamma^{t-\tau}\hat{y}_{n}^{2}[\tau] + \gamma\boldsymbol{a}_{n}^{\top}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1]\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] - 2\gamma\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}^{\top}[t-1]\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\right), \quad (34)$$

where

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t] \triangleq \sum_{\tau=P}^{\iota} \gamma^{t-\tau} \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[\tau] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[\tau], \qquad (35a)$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t] \triangleq \sum_{\tau=P}^{t} \gamma^{t-\tau} \hat{y}_{n}[\tau] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[\tau].$$
(35b)

The variables above can be efficiently computed via recursive expressions<sup>4</sup>. Note that  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t$  is also separable across nodes, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t(\cdot) = \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}(\cdot), \qquad (36)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}) \triangleq \mathcal{L}_{t}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}) + \sum_{\tau=P}^{t-1} \gamma^{t-\tau} \hat{y}_{n}^{2}[\tau] + \gamma \boldsymbol{a}_{n}^{\top} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] \boldsymbol{a}_{n} - 2\gamma \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}^{\top}[t-1] \boldsymbol{a}_{n}.$$
 (37)

The algorithm JSTIRSO is obtained when  $\mathcal{F}_t^{(n)}$  is set to be  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}$ , following similar steps to those in Sec. IV-B. The gradient of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}$  w.r.t.  $\boldsymbol{a}_n[t]$  is given by

$$\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]) = U_{n}[t] \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t] \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] - \tilde{y}_{n}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \right) + \gamma \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] - \gamma \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]. \quad (38)$$

All required steps are summarized in Procedure 2. The computational complexity of JSTIRSO is dominated by step 8 of **Procedure 2**, which is  $\mathcal{O}(N^3P^2)$  operations per t. The initial values for  $\hat{\Phi}[P-1]$  and  $\hat{r}_n[P-1]$  can be set depending on available prior information; if no such information is available, one can choose a small  $\sigma$  and set  $\hat{\Phi}[P-1] = \sigma^2 I$ , and  $\hat{r}_n[P-1] = \mathbf{0} \forall n$ . A schematic diagram illustrating the variables involved in the generation, (partial) observation of signal entries, and estimation via JSTISO/JSTIRSO is given in Fig. 1 (in the supplementary material). The figure shows that how the present estimate of topology parameters and the present estimate of signal are dependent on the previous estimates of topology and signal in a sequential manner.

#### VI. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

To analyze the performance of JSTIRSO, we present analytical results in this section. First, the assumptions considered in the analysis are stated and then, two Lemmas followed by the main theorem about the dynamic regret bound of JSTIRSO are presented. Moreover, a third lemma stating a bound on

<sup>4</sup>The recursive expressions are explicited in lines 4 and 6 in Procedure 2.

**Procedure 2** Tracking time-varying topologies with missing data via JSTIRSO

**Input:**  $P, \lambda, \alpha, \nu, \gamma, \sigma^2$ Initialization:  $\{\hat{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=0}^{P-1}, \{a_n[P-1], \hat{r}_n[P-1]\}_{n=1}^N, \}$  $\mathbf{\Phi}[P-1]$ 1: for t = P, P + 1, ... do Receive observation  $\tilde{y}[t]$  and masking vector m[t]2: Obtain  $\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]$  from  $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t-p]\}_{p=1}^{P}$  via (20) 3:  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t] = \gamma \, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] + \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t]$ for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  do 4: 5:  $\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_n[t] = \gamma \, \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_n[t-1] + \tilde{y}_n[t] \, \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]$ 6: Obtain  $U_n[t]$  via (24) 7:  $\tilde{a}_{n}^{f}[t] = \tilde{a}_{n}[t-1] - \alpha \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_{n}[t-1]) \text{ [cf. (38)]}$ for n' = 1, 2, ..., N do 8: 9:  $ilde{oldsymbol{a}}_{n,n'}[t] = ilde{oldsymbol{a}}_{n,n'}^{\mathrm{f}}[t] \left[ 1 - rac{lpha \lambda \ \mathbbm{1}\{n 
eq n'\}}{\left\| ilde{oldsymbol{a}}_{n,n'}^{\mathrm{f}}[t] 
ight\|_2} 
ight]$ 10: end for 11:  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t] = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n,1}^{\top}[t], \dots, \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n,N}^{\top}[t] \end{bmatrix}^{\top}$ Compute  $\hat{y}_{n}[t]$  via (23) 12: 13: 14: end for Output  $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_n[t]\}_{n=1}^N, \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t]$ 15: 16: end for

the error in the gradient is presented and discussed. Finally, a corollary with a simpler dynamic regret bound is presented.

To quantify the inexactness in our algorithm, we need to define the following quantities:

$$\boldsymbol{g}[t] \triangleq \operatorname{vec}\left(\left[\boldsymbol{y}[t-1],\ldots,\boldsymbol{y}[t-P]\right]^{\top}\right),$$
 (39a)

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}[t] \triangleq \sum_{\tau=P} \gamma^{t-\tau} \boldsymbol{g}[\tau] \boldsymbol{g}^{\top}[\tau], \qquad (39b)$$

$$\boldsymbol{r}_{n}[t] \triangleq \sum_{\tau=P}^{t} \gamma^{t-\tau} \tilde{y}_{n}[\tau] \boldsymbol{g}[\tau], \qquad (39c)$$

which can be thought as the true versions of  $\hat{\Phi}[t]$  and  $\hat{r}_n[t]$ .

The following assumptions will be considered for the characterization of JSTIRSO:

- A1. Bounded samples: There exists  $B_y > 0$  such that  $|y_n[t]|^2 \le B_y$ ,  $|\hat{y}_n[t]|^2 \le B_y$ , and  $|\tilde{y}_n[t]|^2 \le B_y \forall n, t$ . A2. Bounded minimum eigenvalue of  $\Phi[t]$  and  $\hat{\Phi}[t]$ : There
- A2. Bounded minimum eigenvalue of  $\Phi[t]$  and  $\Phi[t]$ : There exists  $\beta_{\ell} > 0$  such that  $\lambda_{\min}(\Phi[t]) \geq \beta_{\ell}$  and  $\lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Phi}[t]) \geq \beta_{\ell}, \ \forall t \geq P$ .
- A3. Bounded maximum eigenvalue of  $\Phi[t]$  and  $\hat{\Phi}[t]$ : There exists L > 0 such that  $\lambda_{\max}(\Phi[t]) \leq L$  and  $\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Phi}[t]) \leq L, \forall t \geq P$ .
- A4. Bounded errors in  $g, \Phi, r_n$  due to noise, missing values:

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] - \boldsymbol{g}[t]\|_2 \le B_{\boldsymbol{q}} \quad \forall \ t \tag{40a}$$

$$\lambda_{\max}\left(\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}[t] - \mathbf{\Phi}[t]\right) \le B_{\mathbf{\Phi}} \quad \forall \ t \tag{40b}$$

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_n[t] - \boldsymbol{r}_n[t]\|_2 \le B_{\boldsymbol{r}} \quad \forall \ n, t.$$
 (40c)

A1 entails no loss of generality since data are bounded in real-world applications. A2 holds in practice unless the data is redundant (meaning that some time series can be obtained as a linear combination of the others), that is, it will be satisfied for a sufficiently large number of samples. Thus, A2 is a reasonable assumption in real-world applications. A3 is fulfilled when the true signal values and their corresponding reconstructed values are bounded. A4 sets a limit on the magnitude of error introduced in various quantities due to noise and missing values. A4 is satisfied when the noise and number of missing values are limited such that the errors in  $g, \Phi, r_n$  after the signal estimation step is always bounded by the given constants.

The forthcoming results depend on the error in the gradient, given by

$$\boldsymbol{e}^{(n)}[t] \triangleq \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]) - \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)\text{true}}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]), \qquad (41)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)\text{true}}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]) \triangleq \min_{y_{n}[t]} \tilde{\ell}_{t}^{(n)} \left( \{\boldsymbol{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=0}^{t-1}, y_{n}[t], \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \right)$ is the true (exact) gradient (where  $\{\boldsymbol{y}[\tau]\}_{\tau=0}^{t-1}$  are the (unobservable) true signal values), and  $\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{a}_{n})$  is the inexact gradient defined in (38). The latter is inexact due to the error in the reconstructed entries of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}$ , and the error in  $\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}$  comes in turn from the missing values and noisy observations.

Dynamic regret analysis is generally expressed in terms of metrics that express how challenging tracking becomes, e.g., how fast the optimal parameters vary. Specifically in our case, the dynamic regret will be expressed in terms of the variation in consecutive optimal solutions (often referred to as path length [56]) and the error in the gradient [54]. If we define  $\tilde{h}_t^{(n)} \triangleq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)} + \Omega^{(n)}$ , and let  $\tilde{a}_n^{\circ}[t] \triangleq \arg\min_{a_n} \tilde{h}_t^{(n)}(a_n)$  be the time-varying optimal solution, the path length is given by

$$W^{(n)}[T] \triangleq \sum_{t=P+1}^{T} \|\tilde{a}_{n}^{\circ}[t] - \tilde{a}_{n}^{\circ}[t-1]\|_{2}.$$
(42)

Also, we define the cumulative (norm of the) gradient error as

$$E^{(n)}[T] \triangleq \sum_{t=P}^{T} \left\| \boldsymbol{e}^{(n)}[t] \right\|_{2}.$$
(43)

The dynamic regret for JSTIRSO corresponding to the n-th node is:

$$\tilde{R}_{d}^{(n)}[T] \triangleq \sum_{t=P}^{T} \left[ \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t]) - \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t]) \right], \qquad (44)$$

where  $\tilde{a}_n[t]$  is the JSTIRSO topology estimate. Next, we present two lemmas that will be instrumental to derive the dynamic regret of JSTIRSO.

Lemma 1: Under assumptions A1 and A3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t])\right\|_{2} &\leq \\ \frac{\nu}{1+\nu} \left(PNB_{y} + 2\sqrt{PNB_{y}}B_{\boldsymbol{g}} + B_{\boldsymbol{g}}^{2} + \gamma L\frac{1+\nu}{\nu}\right) \times \\ \frac{1}{\beta_{\ell}\gamma} \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\sqrt{PN}B_{y} + \frac{\sqrt{PN}B_{y}}{1-\gamma}\right) + \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu} + \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\right)\sqrt{PN}B_{y} \\ &\triangleq B_{\boldsymbol{v}} \end{aligned}$$

$$(45)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix A in the supplementary material. *Lemma 2:* All the subgradients of the regularization function  $\Omega^{(n)}$  are bounded by  $\lambda\sqrt{N}$ , i.e.,  $\|\boldsymbol{u}_t\|_2 \leq \lambda\sqrt{N}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{u}_t \in \partial \Omega^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_n[t])$ .

*Proof:* See the proof of Theorem 5 in [50].

Theorem 1: Under assumptions A1, A2, A3, and A4, let  $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_n[t]\}_{t=P}^T$  be generated by JSTIRSO (**Procedure 2**) with a constant step size  $\alpha \in (0, 1/L]$ . If there exists  $\sigma$  such that

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t] - \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t-1]\|_{2} \le \sigma, \ \forall t \ge P+1,$$

$$(46)$$

then the dynamic regret of JSTIRSO satisfies:

$$\tilde{R}_{d}^{(n)}[T] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha\beta_{\ell}} \Big[ B_{\boldsymbol{v}} + \lambda\sqrt{N} \Big] \Big( \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[P] - \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[P]\|_{2} + W^{(n)}[T] + \alpha E^{(n)}[T] \Big), \quad (47)$$

where  $B_{v}$  is defined in (45).

*Proof:* In order to derive the dynamic regret of JSTIRSO, since  $\tilde{h}_t$  is convex, we have by definition

$$\tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_{n}^{\circ}[t]) \geq \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_{n}[t]) + \left(\nabla^{s}\tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_{n}[t])\right)^{\top} \left(\tilde{a}_{n}^{\circ}[t] - \tilde{a}_{n}[t]\right),$$

$$\overset{(48)}{\forall \tilde{a}_{n}^{\circ}[t], \tilde{a}_{n}[t], \text{ where a subgradient of } \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)} \text{ is given by}}$$

 $\nabla^{s} \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_{n}[t]) = \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_{n}[t]) + u_{t}$  with  $u_{t} \in \partial \Omega^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_{n}[t])$ . Rearranging (48) and summing both sides of the inequality from t = P to T results in:

$$\sum_{t=P}^{T} \left[ \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t]) - \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t]) \right] \leq \sum_{t=P}^{T} \left( \nabla^{s} \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t]) \right)^{\top} \left( \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t] - \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t] \right). \quad (49)$$

By applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on each term of the summation in the r.h.s. of the above inequality, we obtain

$$\sum_{t=P}^{T} \left[ \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t]) - \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t]) \right] \leq \sum_{t=P}^{T} \left\| \nabla^{s} \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t]) \right\|_{2} \cdot \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t] - \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t]\|_{2}.$$
(50)

The next step is to derive an upper bound on  $\|\nabla^s \tilde{h}_t^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_n[t])\|_2$ . From the definition of  $\nabla^s \tilde{h}_t^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_n[t])$  and by the triangular inequality, we have

$$\|\nabla^{s} \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_{n}[t])\|_{2} \leq \|\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_{n}[t])\|_{2} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_{t}\|_{2}.$$
 (51)

From Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we have  $\|\nabla^s \tilde{h}_t^{(n)}(\tilde{a}_n[t])\|_2 \leq B_v + \lambda \sqrt{N}$ . Substituting this bound into (50) leads to:

$$\sum_{t=P}^{T} \left[ \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t]) - \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t]) \right]$$
$$\leq \sum_{t=P}^{T} \left[ B_{\boldsymbol{v}} + \lambda \sqrt{N} \right] \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t] - \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t]\|_{2}. \quad (52)$$

Next, we apply Lemma 2 in [54] in order to bound  $\sum_{t=P}^{T} \|\tilde{a}_n[t] - \tilde{a}_n^{\circ}[t]\|_2$  in (52). The hypotheses of Lemma

2 are Lipschitz smoothness of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}$ , Lipschitz continuity of  $\Omega^{(n)}$ , and strong convexity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}$ . Lipschitz continuity of  $\Omega^{(n)}$  is proved in Lemma 2 whereas strong convexity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}$  is implied by the assumption A2. To verify that  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}$  is Lipschitz-smooth, it suffices to realize that  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}$  is twice-differentiable, and thus assumption A3 is equivalent to saying that  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}$  is *L*-Lipschitz smooth.

To apply [54, Lemma 2], one can set the variable K in that context as T - P + 1,  $g_k$  as  $\Omega^{(n)}$ , and  $f_k$  as  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{P+k-1}^{(n)}$ , and it follows that  $\boldsymbol{x}_k$  in [54] equals  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_n[P+k-1]$  and  $\boldsymbol{x}_k^{\circ}$  equals  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_n^{\circ}[P+k-1]$ . Then, since we have already shown above that the hypotheses of Lemma 2 in [54] hold in our case, applying it to bound  $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_n[t] - \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_n^{\circ}[t]\|_2$  in (52) yields:

$$\sum_{t=P}^{T} \left[ \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t]) - \tilde{h}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[t]) \right] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha\beta_{\ell}} \left[ B_{\boldsymbol{v}} + \lambda\sqrt{N} \right] \left( \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[P] - \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[P]\|_{2} + W^{(n)}[T] + \alpha E^{(n)}[T] \right)$$
(53)

This concludes the proof (note that initializing  $\tilde{a}_n[P] = \mathbf{0}_{NP}$  can lead to further simplification).

The bound on the dynamic regret for JSTIRSO depends on  $W^{(n)}[T]$  and  $E^{(n)}[T]$ , which formalizes how much the variability and uncertainty affect the parameter estimation. This has been verified also experimentally, as it is shown in Fig. 4, in the Section of numerical results, which shows that for a higher missing probability, the normalized dynamic regret achieves higher values, as expected. Moreover, when there is a model transition at T/2 = 1500, suddenly, the normalized regret starts to increase. It should be noticed that the theoretical assumptions under which the dynamic regret becomes sub-linear in T (sublinear path length  $W^{(n)}[T]$ , and sub-linear cumulative error  $E^{(n)}[T]$ ) may not hold in practice when the model parameters are changing all the time, and in the presence of observation noise and missing data; however, the rate of growth of the regret can be used as a benchmark to compare different approaches.

The cumulative error  $E^{(n)}[T]$  can be bounded as a function of the quantities introduced in A4 (related to the inexactness of the reconstructed samples). The following lemma establishes that under such assumptions, the error on the gradient (i.e.,  $\|e^{(n)}[t]\|_2$ ) is always bounded.

*Lemma 3:* Under assumptions A1 and A4, let  $\{\tilde{a}_n[t]\}_{t=P}^T$  be generated by JSTIRSO (**Procedure 2**) with a constant step size  $\alpha \in (0, 1/L]$ . Then, the error associated with the inexact gradient [cf. (41)] is bounded as  $\|e^{(n)}[t]\|_2 \leq B_e$ , where

$$B_{\boldsymbol{e}} \triangleq \left(\gamma B_{\boldsymbol{\Phi}} + \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\right) \left(2\sqrt{PNB_{\boldsymbol{y}}}B_{\boldsymbol{g}} + B_{\boldsymbol{g}}^{2}\right)\right) \times \frac{\sqrt{PNB_{\boldsymbol{y}}}}{\beta_{\ell}} \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu} + \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right) + \gamma B_{\boldsymbol{r}} + \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\right) B_{\boldsymbol{g}}\sqrt{B_{\boldsymbol{y}}}.$$
(54)

*Proof:* See Appendix B in the supplementary material. ■ This bound depends on three kinds of quantities: a) bounds related to the inexactness of the reconstructed signal, b) simple properties of the data time series, and c) the hyperparameters  $\nu$  and  $\gamma$ . Note that  $\|e^{(n)}[t]\|_2$  and  $E^{(n)}[T]$  are related via (43). In those cases where the sources of uncertainty are such that  $\|e^{(n)}[t]\|_2$  does not vanish, the above bound can be used to replace  $E^{(n)}[T]$  in the regret bound in (47) with an expression that depends on the quantities expressed in A4.

*Corollary 1:* Under the hypotheses in Theorem 1, the dynamic regret of JSTIRSO satisfies:

$$\tilde{R}_{d}^{(n)}[T] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha\beta_{\ell}} \Big[ B_{\boldsymbol{v}} + \lambda\sqrt{N} \Big] \Big( \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[P] - \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}^{\circ}[P]\|_{2} + W^{(n)}[T] + \alpha TB_{\boldsymbol{e}} \Big).$$
(55)

Observe that the above regret bound is linear in T, and this case was commented after Theorem 1. The growth rate of the dynamic regret is  $\alpha B_e$ .

Intuitively, the dynamic regret characterizes the ability to predict the next signal observation from the estimated parameters and reconstructed signals. A remaining challenge is to determine under which conditions the algorithms are able to identify parameters and signals. This is important because, under identifiability conditions, one could claim that the lower the regret bound is, the closer the reconstructed signals will be to the true signals. Consequently, apart from obtaining a smaller value of  $B_g$ , also  $\{\hat{\Phi}[t], \hat{r}_n[t]\}$  will become closer to the (not observable)  $\{\Phi[t], r_n[t]\}$ , which will be associated with smaller values of the quantities  $B_{\Phi}, B_r$ . The dependency of these bounds on the regret and the interaction between such bounds are topics that lie out of the scope of the present work, and could give rise to improved regret bounds.

#### VII. NUMERICAL TESTS

In order to analyze the performance of the proposed algorithms, we evaluate both the prediction normalized mean squared error (NMSE) for the signal, which is given by:

$$\operatorname{NMSD}_{s}[t] = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\|\boldsymbol{y}[t] - \hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t]\|_{2}^{2}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\|\boldsymbol{y}[t]\|_{2}^{2}\right]},$$
(56)

where  $\boldsymbol{y}[t]$  is the true signal while  $\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}[t]$  is the predicted signal, as well as the performance of the topology estimation, which is evaluated by the topology normalized mean squared deviation (NMSD). The NMSD for the graph (topology) is defined as:

$$\mathbf{NMSD}_{g}[t] \triangleq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{n=1}^{N} \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] - \boldsymbol{a}_{n}^{\mathrm{true}}(t)\|_{2}^{2}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{n=1}^{N} \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}^{\mathrm{true}}(t)\|_{2}^{2}\right]}, \quad (57)$$

which measures the difference between the estimates  $\{a_n[t]\}_t$ and the time-varying true VAR coefficients  $\{a_n^{true}(t)\}_t$ .

### A. Synthetic Data

1) Data generation: We consider a dynamic VAR model where the coefficients change abruptly in two specific points in time. To generate the synthetic data, an Erdős-Rényi random graph is generated with edge probability  $p_e$  and self-loop probability 1. This random graph underlies the data generation, and its binary adjacency matrix determines which entries of the matrices  $\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=0}^P$  are zero for all t. The rest of the entries are drawn i.i.d. from a standard normal distribution. Each of the matrices  $\{\{A_p^{(t)}\}_{p=0}^P\}_{t=1}^T$  is then scaled down by



Figure 2: NMSD for topology estimation vs. time, Simulation parameters:  $N = 10, P = 3, T = 3000, \sigma_u = 0.01, \sigma_e = 0.01, \gamma = 0.8, \rho = 0.75, p_e = 0.25, \alpha = \zeta/L, \zeta \in (0, 1]$ , number of Monte Carlo iterations = 100, JISGoT iterations = 20.



Figure 3: NMSD of JSTIRSO for topology estimation for various missing probabilities vs. time. Simulation parameters:  $N = 8, P = 3, T = 3000, p_e = 0.2, \sigma_u = 0.01, \sigma_e = 0.01, \gamma = 0.9, \alpha = \zeta/L, \zeta \in (0, 1]$ , number of Monte Carlo iterations = 100.

a constant that ensures that the VAR process is stable [51]. The innovation process samples are drawn independently as  $u[t] \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_N, \sigma_u^2 \mathbf{I}_N)$ . At t = T/3 and t = 2T/3, the model changes abruptly from one model to another model. This is performed by generating each time a new set of VAR coefficients while keeping the binary adjacency matrix fixed.

2) Competing Alternatives: The performance of JSTISO (Procedure 1) and JSTIRSO (Procedure 2) is evaluated and compared with that corresponding to two competing alternatives. The first alternative is a simple procedure based on TIRSO [50], where the missing values are imputed directly as their predicted values via the VAR model (1), and the noisy samples are not refined: this procedure is referred to as 'NaiveTIRSO'. The second alternative is an adaptation of the JISGoT algorithm [49, Algorithm 4], which is, to the best of our knowledge, the state of the art in joint signal and topology estimation. The JISGoT algorithm refines the previous P signal estimates and runs several iterations at each time instant,



Figure 4: Cumulative dynamic regret (normalized by the number of instants for which there are no missing values), given by  $R_d[T] = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tilde{R}_d^{(n)}[T] / \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{t=P}^{T} \mathbb{1}\{m_n[t] = 1\}$  of JSTIRSO for topology estimation for various missing probabilities vs. time. Simulation parameters:  $N = 8, P = 3, T = 3000, p_e = 0.2, \sigma_u = 0.01, \sigma_e = 0, \gamma = 0.9, \alpha = \zeta/L, \zeta \in (0, 1]$ , number of Monte Carlo iterations = 30.

incurring a computational complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(KN^3P^2)$  per time instant, where K is the number of iterations used in the inner loop that refines the signal estimates. The values for the parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\nu$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\lambda$  in JSTISO, JSTIRSO, and JISGOT are selected via grid search to minimize the squared deviation for a validation signal.

3) Discussion of results: In Fig. 2, the NMSD for the topology estimation [cf. (57)] is presented for the four algorithms that are considered. It can be observed that JSTISO tracks the topology more slowly after t = 1000 than the other three algorithms in Fig. 2, as expected, since this procedure disregards the past completely. Both JSTIRSO and JISGoT outperform NaiveTIRSO in terms of topology estimation as the NMSD of NaiveTIRSO saturates at a certain level. JSTIRSO achieves a lower level of NMSD eventually as compared to JISGoT. Notice also that JSTIRSO requires less computation than JISGoT. As an additional note, NaiveTIRSO exhibits a decently good adaptivity after abrupt changes, but its  $NMSD_a$ saturates earlier than that of the other algorithms. JSTIRSO achieves a lower NMSD after a sufficient number of time instants following an abrupt change. As it is also expected, due to the special choice of loss function in JSTIRSO, it attains a lower level of NMSD<sub>q</sub> than that of JISGoT, despite JSTIRSO does not perform any refining of the previous signal estimates.

Fig. 3 presents a comparison of JSTIRSO applied to different data sets generated using various missing probabilities in the observations. The performance of JSTIRSO for multiple values of missing probability is compared with that of zero missing probability. As expected, the figure shows that the higher the missing probability in the observations is, the higher the NMSD for the graph estimation is. In Fig. 4, for the sake of simplicity in the illustration, a transition point at T/2 is considered, and the cumulative normalized dynamic regret (normalized by the number of instants when the value is not missing), given by  $R_d[T] = \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{R}_d^{(n)}[T] / \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{t=P}^T \mathbb{1}\{m_n[t] = 1\}$ , is presented for JSTIRSO for different values of missing probabilities. As expected, the result in Fig. 4 shows that when the value of the missing probability is decreased, the cumulative normalized dynamic regret has also lower values. Note that after the transition point at T/2, the same trend is followed.

#### B. Real Data

In this section, we present the results obtained using real data. The real data is taken from Lundin's offshore oil and gas (O&G) platform Edvard-Grieg<sup>5</sup>. In this section, we use a dataset containing 24 time series corresponding to the main 24 variables of the decantation system that separates oil, gas and water. Here, each node corresponds to a temperature, pressure or oil-level sensor placed in the aforementioned subsystem. The assumption considered here is that causal relations among these time series are present since the measured time series are physically coupled due to the pipelines connecting the various system parts and due to the inherent internal control systems therein. Topology identification is motivated to predict the short-term future values of the time series corresponding to temperature, pressure, and oil-level sensors and to unveil dependencies that cannot be inferred by simple human inspection. All time series are re-sampled to a common set of equally-spaced sampling instants using linear interpolation. Since the data was quantized and compressed using a lossy scheme, a significant amount of noise is expected. Each time series is also normalized to have zero mean and unit sample standard deviation.

The results in Fig. 5 represent the performance of JSTIRSO for different missing probabilities of observations in the real data, by presenting the prediction NMSE for each case. First, the hyperparameters of JSTIRSO are cross-validated via grid search. Then, using the cross-validated hyperparameters, the prediction NMSE versus time is plotted corresponding to each value of missing probability in the observations. The missing values are synthetically introduced to the real data using the model in (7). The results show that when the missing probability increases, the prediction NMSE of JSTIRSO also increases, as expected.

Fig. 6 (in the supplementary material due to 13-pages space limitation) displays the average graphs estimated via JSTIRSO by thresholding the average of the estimated VAR coefficients across the intervals [k/(3T), (k + 1)/(3T)], k = 0, 1, 3 for missing probabilities 0, 0.05, 0.15 and 0.2. One can observe that the average estimated graph changes with time since the underlying system is dynamic. Moreover, the results illustrate that the proposed algorithm JSTIRSO is robust and can estimate the graph when the data contains the missing values in the observations.

#### VIII. CONCLUSIONS

To track time-varying topologies from noisy observations in the presence of missing data, two online algorithms, i.e.,



Figure 5: Prediction NMSE for JSTIRSO vs. time using real data from Lundin (Edvard Grieg Platform). Simulation parameters:  $N = 24, P = 6, T = 360, \sigma_u = 0.01, \sigma_e = 0.01, \gamma = 0.9$ .

JSTISO and JSTIRSO have been proposed by minimizing an online joint optimization criterion. Thanks to a carefully formulated loss function, joint signal and topology estimation can be carried out efficiently (especially in the case of the lowcomplexity JSTISO); moreover, the performance of JSTIRSO has been characterized theoretically. To this end, a dynamic regret bound has been derived as a function of the path length (which quantifies the variation in the topologies) and cumulative error on the gradient (which quantifies the effect of noise and missing values). The error on the gradient is in turn bounded [cf. Lemma 3] as a function of the maximum deviation of the inexact variables  $\hat{g}, \hat{\Phi}[t], \hat{r}[t]$  from their associated true values. The bound on the dynamic regret becomes sublinear in scenarios where the variation in the time-varving topologies, the probability of missing data, and the observation noise level are vanishing with time. Numerical results have shown that JSTISO and JSTIRSO can track the time-varying topologies from noisy observations with missing values. Future research avenues include the combination of the proposed strategy with tools related to Kalman filtering and smoothing [49] to ascertain its improvement in terms of performance.

## Appendix A

# PROOF OF LEMMA 1

To bound  $\|\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_n[t])\|_2$ , taking the norm on both sides of (38) and applying the triangular inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t])\right\|_{2} \\ &\leq \left\|U_{n}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t]\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\right\|_{2} + \left\|\tilde{U}_{n}[t]\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{n}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\right\|_{2} \\ &+ \left\|\gamma \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1]\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\right\|_{2} + \left\|\gamma \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]\right\|_{2} \\ &\leq U_{n}[t]\lambda_{\max}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t]\right)\left\|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\right\|_{2} + U_{n}[t]\left\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{n}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\right\|_{2} \\ &+ \gamma\lambda_{\max}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1]\right)\left\|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\right\|_{2} + \left\|\gamma \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]\right\|_{2}. \end{aligned}$$
(58)

Next, using assumptions A1 and A4, it can be easily shown that  $\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t]) \leq PNB_y + 2\sqrt{PNB_y}B_{\boldsymbol{g}} + B_{\boldsymbol{q}}^2$ . Substi-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>https://www.lundin-petroleum.com/operations/production/norway-edvardgrieg



Figure 6: A simplified flow diagram of JSTISO/JSTIRSO.

tuting this bound in the above expression and using assumption A3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t]) \right\|_{2} \\ &\leq U_{n}[t] \left( PNB_{y} + 2\sqrt{PNB_{y}}B_{\boldsymbol{g}} + B_{\boldsymbol{g}}^{2} \right) \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\|_{2} \\ &+ U_{n}[t]\sqrt{PN}B_{y} + \gamma L \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\|_{2} + \|\gamma \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]\|_{2}. \end{aligned}$$
(59)

Next, an upper bound of  $\hat{r}_n[t-1]$  is derived. By the definition of  $\hat{r}_n[t]$  and assumption A1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]\|_{2} &= \left\| \sum_{\tau=P}^{t-1} \gamma^{t-1-\tau} \hat{y}_{n}[\tau] \, \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[\tau] \right\|_{2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \left\| \sum_{\tau=P}^{t-1} \gamma^{t-\tau} \sqrt{B_{y}} \sqrt{B_{y}} \mathbf{1}_{NP} \right\|_{2} \end{aligned} \tag{60a} \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} B_{y} \sqrt{PN} \gamma^{t} \sum_{\tau=P}^{t-1} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\right)^{\tau} \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} B_{y} \sqrt{PN} \frac{\gamma(1-\gamma^{t-P})}{1-\gamma} \leq \frac{\sqrt{PN} B_{y}}{1-\gamma}. \end{aligned} \tag{60b}$$

Using the above bound in (59), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{t}^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_{n}[t]) \right\|_{2} \\ &\leq U_{n}[t] \left( PNB_{y} + 2\sqrt{PNB_{y}}B_{\boldsymbol{g}} + B_{\boldsymbol{g}}^{2} \right) \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\|_{2} \\ &+ U_{n}[t]\sqrt{PN}B_{y} + \gamma L \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\|_{2} + \frac{\gamma\sqrt{PN}B_{y}}{1-\gamma} \end{aligned}$$
(61a)

$$\leq \frac{\nu}{1+\nu} \left( PNB_y + 2\sqrt{PNB_y}B_g + B_g^2 + \gamma L \frac{1+\nu}{\nu} \right) \|\boldsymbol{a}_n[t]\|_2 + \frac{\nu}{1+\nu} \sqrt{PNB_y} + \frac{\gamma\sqrt{PNB_y}}{1-\gamma}.$$
(61b)

The next step is to derive a bound on  $\|\boldsymbol{a}_n[t]\|_2$ . To this end, from (29) and (38), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t+1]\|_{2} \\ &\leq \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}^{\mathrm{f}}[t]\|_{2} \\ &= \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] - \alpha_{t}\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_{n}[t]\|_{2} \\ &= \left\|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] - \alpha_{t}\left(U_{n}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t]\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] - U_{n}[t]\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{n}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\right) \\ &+ \hat{\gamma}\Phi[t-1]\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] - \gamma\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]\right)\right\|_{2} \\ &= \left\|\left(\boldsymbol{I} - \alpha_{t}\gamma\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] - \alpha_{t}U_{n}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t]\right)\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \\ &+ \alpha_{t}U_{n}[t]\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{n}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] + \alpha_{t}\gamma\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]\right\|_{2}. \end{aligned}$$
(62)

Applying triangular inequality and by assumption A2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t+1]\|_{2} \\ &\leq \lambda_{\max} \left( \boldsymbol{I} - \alpha_{t} \gamma \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] - \alpha_{t} U_{n}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t] \right) \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\|_{2} \\ &+ \alpha_{t} \|U_{n}[t] \tilde{y}_{n}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\|_{2} + \alpha_{t} \gamma \|\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]\|_{2} \quad (63a) \\ &= 1 - \alpha_{t} \gamma \lambda_{\min} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] + \alpha_{t} U_{n}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t] \right) \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\|_{2} \\ &+ \alpha_{t} \|U_{n}[t] \tilde{y}_{n}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\|_{2} + \alpha_{t} \gamma \|\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]\|_{2} \quad (63b) \\ &\leq 1 - \alpha_{t} \gamma \lambda_{\min} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] \right) \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\|_{2} + \alpha_{t} \|U_{n}[t] \tilde{y}_{n}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\|_{2} \\ &+ \alpha_{t} \gamma \|\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]\|_{2} \quad (63c) \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha_{t} \gamma \beta_{\ell}) \|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\|_{2} + \alpha_{t} \|U_{n}[t] \tilde{y}_{n}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\|_{2} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \alpha_t \gamma \|\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_n[t-1]\|_2.$$
(63d)

Substituting the bound on  $\|\hat{r}_n[t-1]\|_2$  from (60b) into the above expression, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t+1]\|_{2} \leq (1-\alpha_{t}\beta_{\ell}\gamma)\|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t]\|_{2} + \alpha_{t}\Big(U_{n}[t]\sqrt{PN}B_{y} + \frac{\sqrt{PN}B_{y}}{1-\gamma}\Big).$$
(64)

Setting  $\alpha_t = \alpha$  and for  $0 < \alpha \le 1/L$ , it can be proven by recursively substituting into (63d) (similar steps to those in the proof of [50, Theorem 5]), that

$$\|\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t+1]\|_{2} \leq \frac{1}{\beta_{\ell}\gamma} \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\sqrt{PN}B_{y} + \frac{\sqrt{PN}B_{y}}{1-\gamma}\right) \quad \forall t.$$
(65)

Substituting the above bound into (61b) completes the proof.

# APPENDIX B

# PROOF OF LEMMA 3

The error in the gradient for JSTIRSO is given by (41) and can be rewritten as:

$$\boldsymbol{e}^{(n)}[t] = U_n[t](\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t] - \boldsymbol{g}[t]\boldsymbol{g}^{\top}[t])\boldsymbol{a}_n[t] + U_n[t]\tilde{y}_n[t](\boldsymbol{g}[t] - \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]) + \gamma(\boldsymbol{r}_n[t-1] - \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_n[t-1]) + \gamma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] - \boldsymbol{\Phi}[t-1])\boldsymbol{a}_n[t].$$
(66)

Next, we take the norm on both sides of the above equation

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \boldsymbol{e}^{(n)}[t] \right\|_{2} &\leq \left\| U_{n}[t](\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t] - \boldsymbol{g}[t]\boldsymbol{g}^{\top}[t])\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \right\|_{2} \\ &+ \left\| \gamma(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] - \boldsymbol{\Phi}[t-1])\boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \right\|_{2} \\ &+ \left\| \gamma(\boldsymbol{r}_{n}[t-1] - \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{n}[t-1]) \right\|_{2} + \left\| U_{n}[t]\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{n}[t](\boldsymbol{g}[t] - \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]) \right\|_{2} \\ &\leq \gamma\lambda_{\max} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}[t-1] - \boldsymbol{\Phi}[t-1] \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \right\|_{2} + U_{n}[t]\lambda_{\max} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t] \\ &- \boldsymbol{g}[t]\boldsymbol{g}^{\top}[t] \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \right\|_{2} + \gamma B_{\boldsymbol{r}} + U_{n}[t] \left\| \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{n}[t] \right\| \left\| \boldsymbol{g}[t] - \hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t] \right\|_{2}, \end{aligned}$$
(67)

where the first inequality holds because of the triangular inequality and the second inequality holds because of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Besides, combining A1 and (40a) it can be proven that

$$\lambda_{\max}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}[t]\hat{\boldsymbol{g}}^{\top}[t] - \boldsymbol{g}[t]\boldsymbol{g}^{\top}[t]\right) \leq 2\sqrt{PNB_y}B_{\boldsymbol{g}} + B_{\boldsymbol{g}}^2.$$
 (68)

By substituting (40) and (68) into (67), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \boldsymbol{e}^{(n)}[t] \right\|_{2} \\ &\leq \gamma B_{\boldsymbol{\Phi}} \left\| \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \right\|_{2} + U_{n}[t] \left( 2\sqrt{PNB_{y}}B_{\boldsymbol{g}} + B_{\boldsymbol{g}}^{2} \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \right\|_{2} \\ &+ \gamma B_{\boldsymbol{r}} + U_{n}[t]B_{\boldsymbol{g}}\sqrt{B_{y}} \end{aligned} \tag{69a}$$

$$\leq \gamma B_{\mathbf{\Phi}} \left\| \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \right\|_{2} + \left( \frac{\nu}{1+\nu} \right) \left( 2\sqrt{PNB_{y}}B_{\boldsymbol{g}} + B_{\boldsymbol{g}}^{2} \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{a}_{n}[t] \right\|_{2}$$

$$+\gamma B_{r} + \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\right) B_{g} \sqrt{B_{y}} \tag{69b}$$

$$\left(-P_{r} + \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\right) \left(2\sqrt{P_{r} + P_{r}^{2}} + P_{r}^{2}\right)\right) \parallel - \left[\psi \parallel \right]$$

$$= \left(\gamma B_{\mathbf{\Phi}} + \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\right) \left(2\sqrt{PNB_y}B_{\mathbf{g}} + B_{\mathbf{g}}^2\right)\right) \|\boldsymbol{a}_n[t]\|_2 + \gamma B_{\mathbf{r}} + \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}\right) B_{\mathbf{g}}\sqrt{B_y},$$
(69c)

where the final result comes from substituting an upper bound on  $U_n[t]$  and rearranging terms. We can use here the same bound on  $||a_n[t]||_2$  that was derived in the proof of Lemma 1 [cf. (65)]:

$$\|\boldsymbol{a}_n[t+1]\|_2 \le \frac{\sqrt{PN}B_y}{\beta_\ell} \left(\frac{\nu}{1+\nu} + \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right) \quad \forall \ t; \quad (70)$$

substituting the above bound into (69c) completes the proof.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] E. D. Kolaczyk, Statistical Analysis of Network Data: Methods and Models, Springer, New York, 2009.
- [2] E. Isufi, A. Loukas, N. Perraudin, and G. Leus, "Forecasting time series with varma recursions on graphs," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08581*, 2018.
- [3] P. D. Lorenzo, S. Barbarossa, P. Banelli, and S. Sardellitti, "Adaptive least mean squares estimation of graph signals," *IEEE Trans. Signal Info. Process. Netw.*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 555–568, Dec. 2016.

- [4] C. Liu, S. Ghosal, Z. Jiang, and S. Sarkar, "An unsupervised spatiotemporal graphical modeling approach to anomaly detection in distributed CPS," in ACM/IEEE Int. Conf. Cyber-Physical Syst., Apr. 2016, pp. 1–10.
- [5] Y. Shen, P. A. Traganitis, and G. B. Giannakis, "Nonlinear dimensionality reduction on graphs," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Workshop Comput. Advan. Multi-Sensor Adapt. Process.*, Curacao, Netherlands Antilles, Dec. 2017.
- [6] R. J. A. Little and D. B. Rubin, *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., USA, 2014.
- [7] E. Pavez and A. Ortega, "Covariance matrix estimation with non uniform and data dependent missing observations," arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.00667, 2019.
- [8] Jean-Yves Humbert, L Scott Mills, Jon S Horne, and Brian Dennis, "A better way to estimate population trends," *Oikos*, vol. 118, no. 12, pp. 1940–1946, 2009.
- [9] James S Clark and Ottar N Bjørnstad, "Population time series: process variability, observation errors, missing values, lags, and hidden states," *Ecology*, vol. 85, no. 11, pp. 3140–3150, 2004.
- [10] Henrique Hoeltgebaum, Niall Adams, and Cristiano Fernandes, "Estimation, forecasting, and anomaly detection for nonstationary streams using adaptive estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2021.
- [11] G. Mateos, S. Segarra, A. G. Marques, and A. Ribeiro, "Connecting the dots: Identifying network structure via graph signal processing," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 16–43, 2019.
- [12] D. Angelosante and G. B. Giannakis, "Sparse graphical modeling of piecewise-stationary time series," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust.*, *Speech, Signal Process.*, Prague, Czech Republic, 2011, pp. 1960–1963.
- [13] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani, "Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso," *Biostatistics*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 432–441, 2008.
- [14] S. L. Lauritzen, Graphical Models, vol. 17, Clarendon Press, 1996.
- [15] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*, Information Science and Statistics. Springer, 2006.
- [16] X. Dong, D. Thanou, P. Frossard, and P. Vandergheynst, "Learning Laplacian matrix in smooth graph signal representations," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 64, no. 23, pp. 6160–6173, Dec. 2016.
- [17] S. Segarra, A. G. Marques, G. Mateos, and A. Ribeiro, "Network topology inference from spectral templates," *IEEE Trans. Signal Info. Process. Netw.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 467–483, Sep. 2017.
- [18] R. Shafipour and G. Mateos, "Online topology inference from streaming stationary graph signals with partial connectivity information," *Algorithms*, vol. 13, no. 9, pp. 228, 2020.
- [19] R. B. Kline, Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling, Guilford Publications, 2015.
- [20] Y. Shen, B. Baingana, and G. B. Giannakis, "Tensor decompositions for identifying directed graph topologies and tracking dynamic networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 65, no. 14, pp. 3675–3687, Jul. 2017.
- [21] C. W. J. Granger, "Some recent development in a concept of causality," J. Econometrics, vol. 39, no. 1-2, pp. 199–211, Sep. 1988.
- [22] A. Zellner, "Causality and econometrics," in Carnegie-Rochester Conference series on Public Policy. Elsevier, 1979, vol. 10, pp. 9–54.
- [23] S. M. Kay, Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing, Vol. I: Estimation Theory, Prentice-Hall, 1993.
- [24] R. Goebel, A. Roebroeck, D.S. Kim, and E. Formisano, "Investigating directed cortical interactions in time-resolved fmri data using vector autoregressive modeling and Granger causality mapping," *Magnet. Reson. Imag.*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 1251–1261, 2003.
- [25] S. Basu, A. Shojaie, and G. Michailidis, "Network Granger causality with inherent grouping structure.," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 417–453, Mar. 2015.
- [26] A. Tank, I. Covert, N. Foti, A. Shojaie, and E. Fox, "Neural Granger causality for nonlinear time series," arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05842, 2018.
- [27] F. R. Bach and M. I. Jordan, "Learning graphical models for stationary time series," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 2189–2199, Aug. 2004.
- [28] J. Songsiri and L. Vandenberghe, "Topology selection in graphical models of autoregressive processes," J. Mach. Learn. Res., vol. 11, pp. 2671–2705, Oct. 2010.
- [29] A. Bolstad, B. D. Van Veen, and R. Nowak, "Causal network inference via group sparse regularization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 2628–2641, Jun. 2011.
- [30] J. Songsiri, "Sparse autoregressive model estimation for learning Granger causality in time series," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust.*, *Speech, Signal Process.*, Vancouver, BC, May 2013, pp. 3198–3202.

15



Figure 7: Average estimated graphs via JSTIRSO. The rows of the sub-figures correspond to missing probabilities 0, 0.05, 0.15, and 0.2. respectively. All the hyperparameters of the algorithm are computed via grid search. Simulation parameters:  $N = 24, P = 6, T = 360, \sigma_u = 0.01, \sigma_e = 0.01, \gamma = 0.9$ .

- [31] J. Mei and J. M. F. Moura, "Signal processing on graphs: Causal modeling of unstructured data," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 2077–2092, Apr. 2017.
- [32] M. Ayazoglu, M. Sznaier, and N. Ozay, "Blind identification of sparse dynamic networks and applications," in *IEEE Conf. Decision Control Eur. Control Conf.*, 2011, pp. 2944–2950.
- [33] M. Kolar, L. Song, A. Ahmed, and E. P. Xing, "Estimating time-varying networks," *Ann. Appl. Statist*, pp. 94–123, 2010.
- [34] J. Lee, G. Li, and J. D. Wilson, "Varying-coefficient models for dynamic networks," arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.03632, 2017.
- [35] K. Yamada, Y. Tanaka, and A. Ortega, "Time-varying graph learning with constraints on graph temporal variation," 2020.
- [36] L. M. Lopez-Ramos, D. Romero, B. Zaman, and B. Beferull-Lozano, "Dynamic network identification from non-stationary vector autoregressive time series," in *Proc. IEEE Global Conf. Signal Inf. Process.*, 2018, pp. 773–777.
- [37] D. Hallac, Y. Park, S. Boyd, and J. Leskovec, "Network inference via the time-varying graphical lasso," in *Proc. ACM SIGKDD Int. Conf. Knowl. Discov. Data Min.*, 2017, pp. 205–213.
- [38] B. Baingana, G. Mateos, and G. B. Giannakis, "Proximal-gradient algorithms for tracking cascades over social networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 563–575, Aug. 2014.
- [39] M. G. Rodriguez, J. Leskovec, and B. Schölkopf, "Structure and dynamics of information pathways in online media," in *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. Web Search Data Mining*, 2013, pp. 23–32.
- [40] B. Zaman, L. M. Lopez-Ramos, and B. Beferull-Lozano, "Dynamic regret analysis for online tracking of time-varying structural equation model topologies," arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08145, 2020.
- [41] R. Shafipour, A. Hashemi, G. Mateos, and H. Vikalo, "Online topology inference from streaming stationary graph signals," in *IEEE Data Sci. Workshop*, Jun. 2019, pp. 140–144.
- [42] Y. Shen and G. B. Giannakis, "Online identification of directional graph topologies capturing dynamic and nonlinear dependencies," in *IEEE Data Sci. Workshop*, 2018, pp. 195–199.
- [43] Y. Liu, L. Yang, G. Wenbin, T. Peng, and W. Wang, "Spatiotemporal smoothness-based graph learning method for sensor networks," in *IEEE Wireless Commun. Network. Conf.*, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [44] P. Berger, G. Hannak, and G. Matz, "Efficient graph learning from noisy and incomplete data," *IEEE Trans. Signal Info. Process. Netw.*, vol. 6, pp. 105–119, 2020.
- [45] M. Rao, T. Javidi, Y. C. Eldar, and A. Goldsmith, "Estimation in autoregressive processes with partial observations," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process.*, 2017, pp. 4212–4216.
- [46] P. L. Loh and M. J. Wainwright, "High-dimensional regression with noisy and missing data: Provable guarantees with nonconvexity," *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 1637–1664, 2012.
- [47] O. Anava, E. Hazan, and A. Zeevi, "Online time series prediction with missing data," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, Lille, France, 2015, pp. 2191–2199.
- [48] H. Yang and Q. Pan, Z.and Tao, "Online learning for time series prediction of ar model with missing data," *Neural Process. Lett.*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 2247–2263, 2019.
- [49] V. N. Ioannidis, Y. Shen, and G. B. Giannakis, "Semi-blind inference of topologies and dynamical processes over dynamic graphs," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 2263–2274, May 2019.
- [50] B. Zaman, L. M. Lopez Ramos, D. Romero, and B. Beferull-Lozano, "Online topology identification from vector autoregressive time series," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 69, pp. 210–225, 2021.
- [51] H. Lütkepohl, New Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis, Springer, 2005.
- [52] P. Geiger, K. Zhang, B. Schoelkopf, M. Gong, and D. Janzing, "Causal inference by identification of vector autoregressive processes with hidden components," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, 2015, pp. 1917–1925.
- [53] L. Kilian and H. Lütkepohl, Structural Vector Autoregressive Analysis, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [54] R. Dixit, A. S. Bedi, R. Tripathi, and K. Rajawat, "Online learning with inexact proximal online gradient descent algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 1338–1352, Mar. 2019.
- [55] S. Shalev-Shwartz, "Online learning and online convex optimization," *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 107–194, 2011.
- [56] M. Zinkevich, "Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, 2003, pp. 928– 936.
- [57] N. Parikh and S. Boyd, "Proximal algorithms," Found. Trends Optim., vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 127–239, 2014.
- [58] A. Beck, *First-Order Methods in Optimization*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2017.