

Syndrome-based Fusion Rules in Heterogeneous Distributed Quickest Change Detection

Wen-Hsuan Li and Yu-Chih Huang
Institute of Communications Engineering
National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University, Taiwan
E-mail: {vincent, jerryhuang}@nycu.edu.tw

Abstract—In this paper, the heterogeneous distributed quickest change detection (HetDQCD) with 1-bit non-anonymous feedback is studied. The concept of syndromes is introduced and the family of syndrome-based fusion rules is proposed, which encompasses all deterministic fusion rules as special cases. Through the Hasse diagram of syndromes, upper and lower bounds on the second-order performance of expected detection delay as a function of average run length to false alarm are provided. An interesting instance, the weighted voting rule previously proposed in our prior work, is then revisited, for which an efficient pruning method for breadth-first search in the Hasse diagram is proposed to analyze the performance. This in turn assists in the design of the weight threshold in the weighted voting rule. Simulation results corroborate that our analysis is instrumental in identifying a proper design for the weighted voting rule, demonstrating consistent superiority over both the anonymous voting rule and the group selection rule in HetDQCD.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quickest change detection (QCD) focuses on quickly detecting an unknown change time point so that the false alarm is below a tolerance constraint. Several early works [1]–[3] have developed fundamental results for this classical problem. The well-known solution for the criterion in [2], called the cumulative sum (CUSUM) test, was first proposed by Page in [1], which was proved to be asymptotically and exactly optimal by Lorden [2] and Moustakides [3], respectively. Many applications of this problem can be found in statistical analysis and signal processing [4]–[7].

Since the rise of applications on distribution systems such as the internet of things (IoT) and distributed learning/computing, how to efficiently detect abrupt changes in a distributed system has been a crucial issue, motivating the study of distributed QCD (DQCD) [8]. In DQCD problem, the task of detection is commonly carried out by a fusion center through distributed sensors that provide feedback based on their observations/decisions via band-limited links. Several important works of performance analysis on DQCD with limited feedback were made by Mei [9] and Banerjee and Fellouris [10]. However, in the DQCD problem, it is also challenging with the discrepancy between the quality of feedback information. For example, the DQCD problem with feedback discrepancy caused by Byzantine attacks have been studied in [11] and [12]. Another

less extreme example is the heterogeneous distributed QCD (HetDQCD) problem [13], where it was assumed that every sensor is honest, but the observations of each sensor are drawn from an independent but possibly nonidentical distribution to model heterogeneity. Sun et al. demonstrated in the same study that the mixture CUSUM procedure is the optimal anonymous rule when observations are directly available at the fusion center. In [14], the fusion center is assumed to receive unlabeled data samples, and a generalized mixture CUSUM algorithm is proved by Sun et al. to be second-order asymptotically optimal.

In our previous work [15], we addressed the HetDQCD problem with *1-bit feedback* and focused on performance loss due to anonymity. With second-order performance analysis, we proposed the parameters for anonymous voting rule. Moreover, two non-anonymous fusion rules, namely the group selection rule and the weighted voting rule, were proposed. Simulation results therein showed that the knowledge of the identity of feedback may indeed be turned into performance enhancement.

Extending the prior work in [15], we further investigate the non-anonymous setting of HetDQCD. Specifically, we introduce the concept of syndromes and turn every deterministic fusion rule for HetDQCD into a syndrome-based fusion rule. A special type of syndromes called critical syndromes, is identified. With the concept of critical syndromes on the Hasse diagram, the performance bounds of such a syndrome-based fusion rule can be obtained by observing the sufficient and necessary conditions to trigger an alarm at the fusion center. Under the framework of syndrome-based fusion rules, the low-complexity yet very effective weighted voting rule previously proposed in [15] is revisited. To analyze the performance, a pruning algorithm for breadth-first search in the corresponding Hasse diagram is proposed to find its dominant critical syndromes efficiently. This analysis is then exploited to design the weight threshold for the weighted voting rule. Simulation results show that the weighted voting rule with suggested threshold outperforms both the anonymous voting rule and group selection rule.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the system model and the problem formulation. Section III introduces the proposed syndrome-based fusion rules and the performance analysis. Section IV revisits the weighted voting rule under the framework of syndrome-based

This work was supported by the National Science and Technology Council of Taiwan under grants MOST 111-2221-E-A49-069-MY3 and MOST 111-2811-E-A49-519-MY3.

fusion rules. Computer simulations to verify these analytic results are given in Section V, followed by the conclusion in Section VI.

II. BACKGROUND

We first present the heterogeneous sensor network model and the local detection rule used by each sensor. An early result of the simultaneous fusion rule in [15] is then shown below.

A. Problem formulation

We consider a heterogeneous sensor network composed of N sensors and one fusion center. With the help of sensors, the goal of the fusion center is to detect an abrupt change that occurs at time ν . Depending on the heterogeneous types, these N sensors can be divided into L groups, namely $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_L$. Denote \mathcal{G} be the union of all groups. In group $l \in [L]$, we represent the index of the k th sensor by pair (l, k) , and let N_l be the number of sensors in this group. At time t , the sensor (l, k) will observe $X_t^{l,k}$, which is drawn independently following

$$X_t^{l,k} \sim \begin{cases} f_l, & t \leq \nu, \\ g_l, & t > \nu, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

in which f_l and g_l are the pre-change and post-change distributions, respectively, with the positive Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD) $\mathcal{I}_l > 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $0 < \mathcal{I}_1 \leq \mathcal{I}_2 \leq \dots \leq \mathcal{I}_L < \infty$.

At time t , each sensor has the ability to transmit a 1-bit noiseless message to the fusion center. Feedback is said to be non-anonymous if the sensor index (l, k) of the feedback message is known; otherwise, it is said to be anonymous. Subsequently, the fusion center employs a fusion rule ρ to make a decision based on the received feedback. In particular, let ρ be an \mathcal{F}_t -stopping time, where

$$\mathcal{F}_t \equiv \sigma(X_s^{l,k}; s \in [t], k \in [N_l], l \in [L]), \quad (2)$$

is the σ -algebra from all possible observations of all sensors up to time t . Let P_ν represent the underlying probability measure of the event that occurs at time ν . Specifically, in the absence of the event, we assign $\nu = \infty$, and denote the corresponding underlying probability measure as P_∞ . Two metrics, namely the average run length (ARL) to false alarms and the worst-case expected detection delay (EDD), to evaluate the performance of ρ are defined as $\text{ARL}(\rho) = E_\infty[\rho]$ and

$$\text{EDD}(\rho) = \sup_{\nu \geq 0} \text{ess sup } E_\nu[(\rho - \nu)^+ | \mathcal{F}_\nu], \quad (3)$$

respectively, in which E_ν is the expectation under P_ν . By [11, Lemma 3], the above definition can be further simplified to

$$\text{EDD}(\rho) = E_0[\rho], \quad (4)$$

as long as the fusion rule ρ only depends on the local CUSUM statistics. Following Lorden's framework [2], the goal of HetDQCD is to minimize $\text{EDD}(\rho)$ such that $\text{ARL}(\rho) > \gamma$.

B. Local CUSUM and voting rules

Similar to most works in the literature [9]–[11], each sensor makes a local decision according to its CUSUM statistic. Specifically, upon observing $X_t^{l,k}$ at time t , sensor (l, k) recursively computes the CUSUM statistic $W_t^{l,k}$ based on the log-likelihood ratio (LLR) $Z_t^{l,k} \equiv \log(f_l(X_t^{l,k})/g_l(X_t^{l,k}))$ by

$$W_t^{l,k} = \max\{0, W_{t-1}^{l,k}\} + Z_t^{l,k}, \quad W_0^{l,k} \triangleq 0. \quad (5)$$

Limited by the 1-bit bandwidth constraint, the sensor makes the local decision and sends 1-bit feedback on whether $W_t^{l,k} > h_l$ at time t , in which h_l is the threshold for sensors in type $l \in [L]$. The fusion center then makes a global decision on whether there is a change or not. Under non-anonymous feedback, one naive strategy discussed in our previous work [15] only takes feedback from a subset of sensors into account and ignore feedback from all other sensors. Specifically, given the predetermined set \mathcal{D} , the anonymous voting rule M within \mathcal{D} is given by

$$\text{T}_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{D}) = \inf\left\{t : \left|\{(l, k) \in \mathcal{D} : W_t^{l,k} > h_l\}\right| \geq M\right\}. \quad (6)$$

That is, a global decision is reached for the initial occurrence of receiving at least M alarms within \mathcal{D} simultaneously. It will reduce to the anonymous M voting rule [10] by setting $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{G}$ and to the group selection rule by setting $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{G}_L$.

In what follows, we summarize the theoretical analysis of the performance of $\text{T}_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{D})$ ¹ in [15], which will be crucial to the analysis in this work.

Theorem 1. Let $\mathbf{h} = [\mathcal{I}_1 h, \dots, \mathcal{I}_L h]^T$. Assume that

$$\sigma_t^2 \equiv E_0 \left[\left(Z_t^{l,k} - \mathcal{I}_l \right)^2 \right] < \infty \text{ for all } l, k. \quad (7)$$

And define $\lambda : [N] \rightarrow [L]$ by

$$\lambda(m) = l \text{ if } \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} N_j \leq m \leq \sum_{j=1}^l N_j. \quad (8)$$

Then as $h \rightarrow \infty$,

$$E_\infty[\text{T}_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G})] \sim \Theta(1) e^{\sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{I}(\lambda(m)) h}, \quad (9)$$

$$E_0[\text{T}_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G})] = h + \xi_M \sqrt{h} (1 + o(1)), \quad (10)$$

²where ξ_M is the expected value of M -th order statistics of independent (but not necessarily identical) Gaussian random variables $G_{l,k} \sim N(0, \sigma_l^2/\mathcal{I}_l^2)$ for $1 \leq k \leq N_l$ and $1 \leq l \leq L$. In particular, if $h = h_\gamma$ leads to $E_\infty[\text{T}_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G})] = \gamma$, then as $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$,

$$h_\gamma \sim \frac{\log \gamma}{\sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{I}_{\lambda(m)}}. \quad (11)$$

III. SYNDROME-BASED FUSION RULE

In this section, we propose a family of fusion rules, called syndrome-based fusion rules, for non-anonymous HetDQCD.

¹We present the result with $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{G}$, which can be straightforwardly adapted to any subset \mathcal{D} by replacing the network parameters.

²Only \leq in (10) was proved in [15]. We extend it to equality in Appendix A.




Fig. 1: An example of general fusion rule. Any positive feedback from (2, 1) or the consensus decision from group 1 will trigger the fusion center.

We first note that since the feedbacks are binary, every simultaneous deterministic fusion rule can actually be expressed as a combination of Boolean operations that map all possible received feedbacks to trigger or not. We call the pattern of received feedbacks a syndrome that triggers the fusion center. The general syndrome-based fusion rule can be expressed as the following:

$$\rho_\Omega(\mathbf{h}) = \inf\{t : \exists \omega \in \Omega \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{1}\{(l, k) \in \omega : W_t^{l,k} > h_l\} = 1\}, \quad (12)$$

where ω 's are the syndromes that can trigger fusion center, and Ω is the collection of all the syndromes. Apparently, this general fusion rule contains *every* deterministic non-anonymous fusion rule. Moreover, it subsumes the anonymous M voting rule as a special case, by setting

$$\Omega = \{\omega : |\omega| \geq M\}. \quad (13)$$

Since the best decision made by the origin network is always more reliable than its subnetwork, we make the following assumptions of Ω by nature:

- $\emptyset \notin \Omega$ and $\cup_{l=1}^L \mathcal{G}_l \in \Omega$.
- If $\omega_1 \in \Omega$ and $\omega_1 \subseteq \omega_2$, then $\omega_2 \in \Omega$.

Thus, these assumptions induce a partial order of set inclusion between syndromes. More specifically, given a general fusion rule Ω , the syndromes form a connected subgraph on the Hasse diagram [16] of power sets. An example is shown in Fig. 1. With directed and acyclic properties, we can identify syndromes with no input edges, reflecting the necessary conditions to trigger the fusion center. A formal definition of these syndromes is given below.

Definition 1. Let Ω be a collection of syndromes. A syndrome $\omega \in \Omega$ is called a critical syndrome if any subset of ω is not in Ω . Denote by $\partial\Omega$ the collection of critical syndromes in Ω .

The analysis of critical syndromes is important since they can immediately induce a performance bound of Ω fusion rule by comparing to the voting rule within certain subnetworks:

Theorem 2. For a general fusion rule Ω , denote

$$m_\Omega = \min_{\omega \in \Omega} |\omega| \text{ and } \mathcal{I}_\Omega = \min_{\omega \in \partial\Omega} \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega} \mathcal{I}_l.$$

Suppose that $h = h_{\gamma, \Omega}$ leads to $E_\infty[\rho_\Omega(\mathbf{h})] = \gamma$. As $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$, for any pair $(M_\Omega, \mathcal{D}_\Omega)$ such that the syndromes of $\mathcal{T}_{M_\Omega}(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{D}_\Omega)$ lie in Ω , it follows that

$$h_{\gamma, \Omega} \sim \frac{\log \gamma}{\mathcal{I}_\Omega}, \quad (14)$$

$$h_{\gamma, \Omega} + \xi_{m_\Omega} \sqrt{h_{\gamma, \Omega}}(1 + o(1)) \leq E_0[\rho_\Omega(\mathbf{h})] \leq h_{\gamma, \Omega} + \xi_{M_\Omega, \mathcal{D}_\Omega} \sqrt{h_{\gamma, \Omega}}(1 + o(1)), \quad (15)$$

in which $\xi_{M_\Omega, \mathcal{D}_\Omega}$ is the expected value of M_Ω -th order statistics of independent (but not necessarily identical) Gaussian random variables $G_{l,k} \sim N(0, \sigma_l^2 / \mathcal{I}_l^2)$ for $(l, k) \in \mathcal{D}_\Omega$.

Proof: See Appendix B ■

Although Theorem 2 provides a performance bound to the general case of simultaneous fusion, it is very difficult to design a proper fusion rule according to this theorem, due to the large number of combinations to choose syndromes. Even for a specific collection of syndromes Ω , solving optimization problems corresponding to m_Ω and \mathcal{I}_Ω in Theorem 2 is NP-hard, not to mention the variation of $(M_\Omega, \mathcal{D}_\Omega)$. In what follows, we return to examine the weighted M voting rule, which leads us to an explicit design of the parameters m_Ω , M_Ω and \mathcal{D}_Ω .

IV. WEIGHTED M VOTING RULE

For a trackable analysis, we carry on the concept of syndrome in Section III to analyze the weighted M voting rule previously proposed in [15], which is an intuitive (yet efficient) way to apply the knowledge of the feedback identity to the voting rule. It admits extremely low fusion complexity as the fusion center only needs to compute the weighted sum of the feedback.

Recall that for the anonymous M voting rule, the fusion center will treat each feedback equally. For a non-anonymous scenario, once the fusion center obtains the knowledge for KLD of each group, the confidence of each feedback can be weighted, which induces the following weighted sum version of the fusion rule:

$$\bar{\rho}_M(\mathbf{h}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \inf \left\{ t : \sum_{l,k} \alpha_{l,k} \mathbf{1}\{W_t^{l,k} > h_l\} \geq M \right\}, \quad (16)$$

in which $\alpha_{l,k}$ is the weight for the (l, k) sensor, and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = [\alpha_{1,1}, \dots, \alpha_{L, N_L}]^T$. The performance of the weighted voting rule M can be maintained by properly choosing the weight and the trigger threshold M . An extreme way of weight design is the anonymous voting rule within \mathcal{D} reviewed in Section II-B by setting

$$\alpha_{l,k} = \begin{cases} 1, & (l, k) \in \mathcal{D}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

To better utilize feedback from all the sensors, in [15] we provided a heuristic setting for the weight to be proportional to KLD and set $\alpha_{l,k} = 1$ for $1 \leq k \leq N_L$, or equivalently, we set

$$\alpha_{l,k} = \mathcal{I}_l / \mathcal{I}_L \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq N_L \text{ and } 1 \leq l \leq L. \quad (18)$$

Under these weights, we establish the connection between the weighted M voting rule and the syndrome-based fusion. More specifically, we show that the performance of the weighted M voting rule strongly depends on the critical syndromes determined by M . These critical syndromes obey the following conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega} \mathcal{I}_l \geq M\mathcal{I}_L, \\ \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega'} \mathcal{I}_l < M\mathcal{I}_L, \text{ for all } \omega' \subsetneq \omega. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

With a slight abuse of notation, let ∂M be the collection of the above critical syndromes. With this connection, we can then apply Theorem 2 to the following result.

Theorem 3. For the weighted M voting rule, denote $\bar{m} = \min_{\omega \in \partial M} |\omega|$ and $\bar{M} = \max_{\omega \in \partial M} |\omega|$. Suppose that $h = \bar{h}_{\gamma, M}$ leads to $E_\infty[\bar{\rho}_M(\mathbf{h}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})] = \gamma$. As $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that

$$\bar{h}_{\gamma, M} \leq \frac{\log \gamma}{M\mathcal{I}_L} (1 + o(1)), \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{h}_{\gamma, M} + \xi_{\bar{M}} \sqrt{\bar{h}_{\gamma, M}} (1 + o(1)) &\leq E_0[\bar{\rho}_M(\mathbf{h}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})] \\ &\leq \bar{h}_{\gamma, M} + \xi_{\bar{M}, \bar{\mathcal{D}}} \sqrt{\bar{h}_{\gamma, M}} (1 + o(1)), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

in which $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ is a set of (l, k) such that for any $(l_1, k_1), \dots, (l_{\bar{M}}, k_{\bar{M}})$ in $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$, $\sum_{m=1}^{\bar{M}} \mathcal{I}_{l_m} \geq M\mathcal{I}_L$.

Proof: See Appendix C. ■

Remark 1. The range between \bar{m} and \bar{M} , and the maximal achieved set $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ give a sketch of the selection of syndrome and the tightness of the bounds in (21). For example, if $\bar{m} = \bar{M}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ contains all sensors, then the weighted M voting rule is just the anonymous \bar{M} voting rule. This can be proved by comparing the critical syndromes of the two fusion rules. For a general case, by setting

$$\omega^* = \arg \min_{\omega \in \partial M, |\omega| = \bar{M}} \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega} \mathcal{I}_l, \quad (22)$$

the set $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ can be chosen by

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}} = \omega^* \cup \left\{ (l, k) \mid l \geq \max_{(l', k') \in \omega^*} l' \right\}. \quad (23)$$

Remark 2. With the asymptotic results (20) and (21) in Theorem 3, we have

$$E_0[\bar{\rho}_M(\mathbf{h}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})] \leq \left(\frac{\log \gamma}{M\mathcal{I}_L} + \xi_{\bar{M}, \bar{\mathcal{D}}} \sqrt{\frac{\log \gamma}{M\mathcal{I}_L}} \right) (1 + o(1)). \quad (24)$$

A proper choice of M can be obtained by minimizing the second-order approximation in (24). Following (21) and (24), the performance of the weighted M voting rule highly depends on the parameters \bar{m} and \bar{M} of critical syndromes. With the condition in (19), these parameters can be obtained by solving the following 0-1 integer programming:

$$\bar{m} = \min_{\omega \in \partial M} \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega} 1, \quad \bar{M} = \max_{\omega \in \partial M} \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega} 1. \quad (25)$$

Algorithm 1 Pruning Algorithm for \bar{M}

Input: The weights for all sensors $\alpha_{l,k}$ and the threshold M

Output: The maximum amount \bar{M} of the elements for critical syndromes in ∂M and its corresponding syndrome $\omega_{\bar{M}}$.

- 1: Set parent syndrome set $\Omega_f = \{(1, 1), \dots, (L, N_L)\}$, child syndrome set $\Omega_c = \emptyset$ and candidate set Ω_{cs} .
 - 2: Set iteration index $i = N$ and $i_{min} = 1$.
 - 3: **while** $i > i_{min}$ **do**
 - 4: $i = i - 1$.
 - 5: For each parent syndrome $\omega_f \in \Omega_f$ that contains sensors from group l_1, l_2, \dots, l_J :
 - Find \bar{m}_{ω_f} s.t. its least \bar{m}_{ω_f} weight sum meets (27).
 - Run the top-selection algorithm on ω_f to get ω_f^{ts} that satisfies (26). Let Ω_{cs} obtain ω_f^{ts} .
 - Let ω_{fj} be the syndrome that drops the sensor of ω_f from group l_j with the largest index, $1 \leq j \leq J$. Include ω_{fj} into Ω_c if $\omega_f^{ts} \not\subseteq \omega_{fj}$ and the sum weight of ω_{fj} is greater than M .
 - 6: Assign Ω_f to Ω_c and i_{min} to $\max_{\omega_f \in \Omega_f} \bar{m}_{\omega_f}$.
 - 7: **end while** if $i \leq i_{min}$ or there exists ω_f^{ts} s.t. $|\omega_f^{ts}| = i$.
 - 8: Set $\omega_{\bar{M}} = \arg \max_{\omega \in \Omega_{cs}} |\omega|$, $\bar{M} = i$.
-

The following fact describes bounds of \bar{m} and \bar{M} , which will enable us to compute \bar{m} and \bar{M} with low complexity:

Fact 4. Let ω_m^T be the collection of the sensors with the top m weights among all the network. If

$$\sum_{(l,k) \in \omega_{m-1}^T} \mathcal{I}_l < M\mathcal{I}_L \leq \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega_m^T} \mathcal{I}_l, \quad (26)$$

then $\omega_m^T \in \partial M$. Moreover, $\bar{m} = m$. Also, let ω_m^L be the collection of the sensors with the m least weights among all the network. If

$$\sum_{(l,k) \in \omega_{m-1}^L} \mathcal{I}_l < M\mathcal{I}_L \leq \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega_m^L} \mathcal{I}_l, \quad (27)$$

then $\bar{M} \leq m$.

Proof: See Appendix D. ■

First, \bar{m} can be obtained quickly by a top-selection algorithm based on (26). Moreover, to obtain \bar{M} , we leverage (27) and the structure of the Hasse diagram to develop a pruning method for breadth-first search algorithm, as shown in Algorithm 1. In particular, the complexity of the algorithm is limited by the maximum amount of possible critical syndromes in ∂M , as shown in the following fact.

Fact 5. The total number of iterations in Algorithm 1 of parent syndromes is less than $C_{L-1}^{L-1+\lceil n/2 \rceil}$.

Proof: See Appendix E. ■

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

Our analytical results are verified by numerical simulations. We consider that there are three groups of sensors in total




Fig. 2: (a) Second-order approximation of $E_0(\bar{\rho}_M(\mathbf{h}, \alpha))$ in case 1. (b) Comparison of $\bar{\rho}_M(\mathbf{h}, \alpha)$, $T_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G})$ and $T_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G}_L)$ in case 1. The proposed M for weighted M voting rule is by (a).




Fig. 3: (a) Second-order approximation of $E_0(\bar{\rho}_M(\mathbf{h}, \alpha))$ in case 2. (b) Comparison of $\bar{\rho}_M(\mathbf{h}, \alpha)$, $T_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G})$ and $T_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G}_L)$ in case 2. The proposed M for weighted M voting rule is by (a).

($L = 3$). The number of sensors in each group are $N_1 = 4$ and $N_2 = N_3 = 3$. The pre-change distributions of each sensor are assumed to be standard normal. To show the different heterogeneity, we set two cases of the post-change distributions:

- Case 1 (High heterogeneity): $g_l \sim N(m_l, 1)$, in which $(m_1, m_2, m_3) = (0.35, 0.75, 1)$.
- Case 2 (Low heterogeneity): $g_l \sim N(m_l, 1)$, in which $(m_1, m_2, m_3) = (0.75, 0.85, 1)$.

For the weighted M voting rule, the proposed M is obtained by minimizing the second-order approximation (24), which requires parameters \bar{M} and \bar{D} . Among all possible M , we first determine \bar{M} by Algorithm 1, and then \bar{D} can be obtained by (23). Fig. 2-(a) and Fig. 3-(a) plot the second-order approximation versus M when γ in (24) is set to 10^3 , where the yellow stars point out the suggested choice of M . Fig. 2-(b) and Fig. 3-(b) further compare the performance between the weighted M voting rule with the proposed M , the anonymous M voting rule with the best choice of M and the best case of the M voting rule with the group \mathcal{G}_3 . Both simulation results demonstrate that the weighted M voting rule with the parameter M suggested by our analysis steadily

outperforms the other two fusion rules.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we studied how to employ the knowledge of feedback identity in the HetDQCD problem with 1-bit feedback. In view of feedback syndrome, a general expression of simultaneous fusion rules had been discussed. Inspired by the Hasse diagram, the performance of these fusion rules can be derived via analyzing their critical syndromes. To concretely develop the syndrome-based fusion rule, we revisited the weighted M voting rule, which only selects syndromes according to the weighted sum. A second-order approximation of weighted M voting rule was obtained following the concept of syndromes. The threshold M is then suggested from optimizing the second-order approximation, in which the coefficients are obtained by an efficient pruning algorithm that utilizes the properties of the Hasse diagram. The simulation results supported the weighted voting rule with proposed parameter setting, which is robust to both heterogeneous and homogeneous environments. Potential future works include investigating non-simultaneous fusion rules and the heterogeneity metric corresponding to the performance loss by anonymity.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. S. Page, "Continuous inspection schemes," *Biometrika*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 100–115, 1954.
- [2] G. Lorden, "Procedures for reacting to a change in distribution," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 1897–1908, Dec. 1971.
- [3] G. V. Moustakides, "Optimal stopping times for detecting changes in distributions," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1379–1387, Dec. 1971.
- [4] L. Lai, Y. Fan, and H. V. Poor, "Quickest detection in cognitive radio: A sequential change detection framework," in *IEEE GLOBECOM 2008*, 2008, pp. 1–5.
- [5] A. Lakhina, M. Crovella, and C. Diot, "Diagnosing network-wide traffic anomalies," *ACM SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 219–230, 2004.
- [6] F. Nizam, S. Chaki, S. A. Mamun, and M. S. Kaiser, "Attack detection and prevention in the cyber physical system," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Comput. Commun. Informat. (ICCCI)*, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [7] Q. Zhang, Z. Sun, L. C. Herrera, and S. Zou, "Data-driven quickest change detection in hidden markov models," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2023, pp. 2643–2648.
- [8] L. Xie, S. Zou, Y. Xie, and V. V. Veeravalli, "Sequential (quickest) change detection: Classical results and new directions," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 494–514, 2021.
- [9] Y. Mei, "Information bounds and quickest change detection in decentralized decision systems," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 2669–2681, Jul. 2005.
- [10] S. Banerjee and G. Fellouris, "Decentralized sequential change detection with ordered CUSUMs," in *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Jul. 2016, pp. 36–40.
- [11] G. Fellouris, E. Bayraktar, and L. Lai, "Efficient Byzantine sequential change detection," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 5, p. 3346–3360, Jul. 2018.
- [12] Y.-C. Huang, Y.-J. Huang, and S.-C. Lin, "Asymptotic optimality in Byzantine distributed quickest change detection," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 5942–5962, Sep. 2021.
- [13] Z. Sun, S. Zou, R. Zhang, and Q. Li, "Quickest change detection in anonymous heterogeneous sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 70, pp. 1041–1055, 2022.
- [14] Z. Sun and S. Zou, "Quickest anomaly detection in sensor networks with unlabeled samples," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 71, pp. 873–887, 2023.
- [15] W.-H. Li and Y.-C. Huang, "Bandwidth-constrained distributed quickest change detection in heterogeneous sensor networks: Anonymous vs non-anonymous settings," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2023, pp. 1384–1389.
- [16] J. Gross, J. Yellen, and M. Anderson, *Graph Theory and Its Applications*. CRC Press, 2018.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Equation (10)

Proof: Given the predetermined set \mathcal{D} of selecting sensors, in [15] we defined another fusion rule $\mathbf{T}^{(M)}$ called M -th alarm within \mathcal{D} by

$$\mathbf{T}^{(M)}(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{D}) = \inf \left\{ t : |\{(l, k) \in \mathcal{D} : \max_t W_t^{l,k} > h_l\}| \geq M \right\}.$$

And in [15, Theorem 3], we proved that for $h \rightarrow \infty$,

$$E_0[\mathbf{T}^{(M)}(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G})] = h + \xi_M \sqrt{h}(1 + o(1)) \quad (28)$$

$$E_0[\mathbf{T}_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G})] \leq h + \xi_M \sqrt{h}(1 + o(1)). \quad (29)$$

Therefore, equation (10) holds by extending (29) to equality, which follows from the fact that $\mathbf{T}^{(M)}(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G}) \leq \mathbf{T}_M(\mathbf{h}, \mathcal{G})$ and equation (28). ■

B. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof: We first prove (14). Notice that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, the consensus rule on the subnetwork $\mathbf{T}_{|\omega|}(\mathbf{h}, \omega)$ always suffices to trigger the Ω fusion rule, leading to

$$E_\infty(\mathbf{T}_{|\omega|}(\mathbf{h}, \omega)) \geq E_\infty(\rho_\Omega(\mathbf{h})). \quad (30)$$

By setting

$$\omega = \arg \min_{\omega \in \partial\Omega} \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega} \mathcal{I}_l,$$

according to (9) we have

$$h_{\gamma, \Omega} \geq \frac{\log \gamma}{\mathcal{I}_\Omega} (1 + o(1)).$$

Also, from the definition of critical syndrome in Definition 1 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P_\infty(\rho_\Omega(\mathbf{h}) \leq z) &\leq \sum_{\omega \in \partial\Omega} \prod_{(l,k) \in \omega} P_\infty(W_z^{l,k} \geq \mathcal{I}_l h) \\ &\leq |\partial\Omega| \max_{\omega \in \partial\Omega} \prod_{(l,k) \in \omega} P_\infty(W_z^{l,k} \geq \mathcal{I}_l h) \\ &\leq |\partial\Omega| \cdot e^{-\mathcal{I}_\Omega h} \equiv \gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} E_\infty[\rho_\Omega(\mathbf{h})] &= \int_0^\infty P_\infty(\rho_\Omega(\mathbf{h}) \geq z) dz \\ &\geq \int_0^{1/\gamma} P_\infty(\rho_\Omega(\mathbf{h}) \geq z) dz \\ &\geq \int_0^{1/\gamma} (1 - \gamma) dz = \frac{1}{\gamma} - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

and thus

$$h_{\gamma, \Omega} \leq \frac{\log \gamma}{\mathcal{I}_\Omega} (1 + o(1)). \quad (33)$$

Hence (14) holds from (31) and (33). It remains to prove (15). Notice that $\mathbf{T}_{|\omega|}(\mathbf{h}, \omega)$ and the anonymous m_Ω voting rule are the necessary and sufficient conditions to trigger the Ω fusion rule, respectively. The bounds of (15) thus follow by applying (10) to both fusion rules. ■

C. Proof of Theorem 3

Proof: It is basically following Theorem 2. Notice that for any syndrome ω that triggers weighted M voting rule, it follows that

$$\sum_{(l,k) \in \omega} \mathcal{I}_l \geq M \mathcal{I}_L. \quad (34)$$

Therefore (20) is obtained by replacing \mathcal{I}_Ω to $M \mathcal{I}_L$ in (14). ■

D. Proof of Fact 4

Proof: For any syndrome ω such that $|\omega| = m$, it follows that

$$\sum_{(l,k) \in \omega_m^T} \mathcal{I}_l \geq \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega} \mathcal{I}_l \geq \sum_{(l,k) \in \omega_m^L} \mathcal{I}_l. \quad (35)$$

Therefore, if (26) holds, any collection with less than m sensors cannot be the syndrome of weighted M voting rule. Since (26) also implies that ω_m^T obeys the condition of critical syndrome (19), this suffices to prove the first part of this fact. Similarly, if (27) holds, every collection with not less than m sensors must be the syndrome of weighted M voting rule, which supports the second part of this fact. ■

E. Proof of Fact 5

Proof: Notice that in Algorithm 1, all parent syndromes will generate unique critical syndromes via the top-selection algorithm. For each child ω_{fj} of ω_f , define by n_{l_j} the amount of sensors chosen from group l_j . With the setting of algorithm, the composition of ω_{fj} must be

$$\omega_{fj} = \{(l_1, 1), \dots, (l_1, n_{l_1}), \dots, (l_J, 1), \dots, (l_J, n_{l_J})\}.$$

Therefore the critical syndromes in Ω_{cs} must follow the above form, too. This implies that each critical syndrome obtained by this algorithm is fixed once the amount of sensors from each group is determined. Since all critical syndromes cannot contain each other, the case of maximal critical syndromes occurs if they all contain exactly $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ sensors. Hence, the number of iterations in this algorithm is eventually bounded by the number of the $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ combination with repetitions from L groups, which is $C_{L-1}^{L-1 + \lceil n/2 \rceil}$. ■