
Optimizing Through Change: Bounds and Recommendations for Time-Varying Bayesian Optimization Algorithms

Anthony Bardou¹ Patrick Thiran¹

Abstract

Time-Varying Bayesian Optimization (TVBO) is the go-to framework for optimizing a time-varying, expensive, noisy black-box function. However, most of the solutions proposed so far either rely on unrealistic assumptions on the nature of the objective function or do not offer any theoretical guarantees. We propose the first analysis that asymptotically bounds the cumulative regret of TVBO algorithms under mild and realistic assumptions only. In particular, we provide an algorithm-independent lower regret bound and an upper regret bound that holds for a large class of TVBO algorithms. Based on this analysis, we formulate recommendations for TVBO algorithms and show how an algorithm (BOLT) that follows them performs better than the state-of-the-art of TVBO through experiments on synthetic and real-world problems.

1. Introduction

Many real-world problems require the optimization of a noisy, expensive-to-evaluate, black-box objective function $f : \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. When queried on an input $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$, such a function only returns a noisy function value $y(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_0^2)$, but does not come with oracles that provide higher-order information such as $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$ or $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})$. In addition, observing $y(\mathbf{x})$ comes at a cost (time-wise and/or money-wise) that cannot be neglected. Examples of such problems are found in many areas, including robotics (Lizotte et al., 2007), computational biology (González et al., 2014), hyperparameters tuning (Bergstra et al., 2013) or computer networks (Si-Mohammed et al., 2024).

Bayesian Optimization (BO) is a black-box optimization framework that leverages a surrogate model of the objective function f (usually a Gaussian Process (GP)) to simultaneously discover and optimize f . Because it has proven to be

a powerful sample-efficient framework for optimizing black-boxes, BO is actually the go-to solution in a wide and diverse range of applications (Marchant & Ramos, 2012; Bardou & Begin, 2022; Wang et al., 2014). Due to its popularity and efficiency, significant research effort is dedicated to extend the BO framework to difficult contexts such as multi-objectives (Daulton et al., 2022) or high-dimensional input spaces (Bardou et al., 2024a). However, only a handful of papers study Time-Varying Bayesian Optimization (TVBO), where $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is also a function of time in the temporal domain $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. This is surprising given the ubiquity of time-varying black-box optimization problems in a variety of domains such as unmanned aerial vehicles (Melo et al., 2021), online clustering (Aggarwal et al., 2004) or network management (Kim et al., 2019).

Because of its additional temporal dimension, a TVBO task significantly differs from its static counterpart. In particular, recent works have provided empirical evidence that *the response time* $R(n)$, which is a function of the dataset size n and returns the time that separates two consecutive iterations, is a key feature of a TVBO algorithm. As $R(n)$ usually blows up with the dataset size n , finding a trade-off between a large n and a small $R(n)$ can yield significant performance gains (Bardou et al., 2024b). However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no regret analysis that relates $R(n)$ and the asymptotic performance of TVBO algorithms unless restrictive and/or unrealistic assumptions are made (see Section 2 for a detailed discussion).

This paper fills this gap by:

- deriving the first (to the best of our knowledge) algorithm-independent lower asymptotic regret bound that holds under mild assumptions only (Section 3.2),
- deriving the first (to the best of our knowledge) upper asymptotic regret bound that explicitly connects the performance of a large class of TVBO algorithms with their response times $R(n)$ (Section 3.3),
- exploiting these results to make recommendations for TVBO algorithms and embedding them into a new algorithm called BOLT (Sections 3.3, 3.4 and 4),
- providing empirical evidence of the superiority of

¹IC, EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland. Correspondence to: Anthony Bardou <anthony.bardou@epfl.ch>.

BOLT on the state-of-the-art of TVBO (Section 5).

2. Background

2.1. Basics of TVBO

Like the vast majority of BO algorithms, a TVBO algorithm takes advantage of a GP as a surrogate model for the objective function f with observational noise σ_0^2 . A prior GP surrogate with prior mean 0 and covariance function $k : (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T})^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (denoted by $\mathcal{GP}(0, k)$) conditioned on a dataset of n observations $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{o}_1, \dots, \mathbf{o}_n\}$, where $\mathbf{o}_i = ((\mathbf{x}_i, t_i), y_i)$ for any $i \in [1, n]$, yields a posterior model which is still a GP. More precisely, the posterior GP is $\mathcal{GP}(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}, \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{D}})$ where

$$\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{k}((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{\Delta}^{-1} \mathbf{y}, \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{D}}((\mathbf{x}, t), (\mathbf{x}', t')) &= k((\mathbf{x}, t), (\mathbf{x}', t')) \\ &\quad - \mathbf{k}^{\top}((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{\Delta}^{-1} \mathbf{k}((\mathbf{x}', t'), \mathcal{D}), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{\Delta} = \mathbf{K} + \sigma_0^2 \mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{k}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D})$, $\mathbf{k}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = (k((\mathbf{x}_i, t_i), (\mathbf{x}_j, t_j)))_{(\mathbf{x}_i, t_i) \in \mathcal{X}, (\mathbf{x}_j, t_j) \in \mathcal{Y}}$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_i)_{y_i \in \mathcal{D}}$ and where \mathbf{I} is the $n \times n$ identity matrix.

Equations (1) and (2) imply that, for any $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$, $f(\mathbf{x}, t) | \mathcal{D} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t), \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}, t))$ where

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) = \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{D}}((\mathbf{x}, t), (\mathbf{x}, t)). \quad (3)$$

At the k -th iteration occurring at time t_k , a TVBO algorithm looks for a query (\mathbf{x}_k, t_k) that fulfills two objectives: (i) observing $y(\mathbf{x}_k, t_k)$ should improve the quality of the GP regression (exploration) and (ii) $y(\mathbf{x}_k, t_k)$ should be as close as possible to $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{x}, t)$ (exploitation). In the BO framework, the problem of finding a good exploration-exploitation trade-off is addressed by maximizing an acquisition function $\alpha_{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, so that $\mathbf{x}_k = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_k)$. Many acquisition functions have been proposed, the most popular being GP-UCB (Srinivas et al., 2012), Expected Improvement (Mockus, 1994) and Probability of Improvement (Jones et al., 1998).

At the k -th iteration, the instantaneous performance of a TVBO algorithm is measured by the instantaneous regret $r_k = f(\mathbf{x}_k^*, t_k) - f(\mathbf{x}_k, t_k)$, where $\mathbf{x}_k^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{x}, t_k)$. By definition, r_k is nonnegative and measures how far the observed function value at time t_k is from the maximum of f at time t_k . The performance on the entire optimization process is usually measured by the cumulative regret $R_k = \sum_{i=1}^k r_i$.

2.2. State-of-the-Art of TVBO

Despite its huge potential for applications, only a few papers study the TVBO framework. In this section, we review them

and explain how this paper relates to the literature.

A synthetic comparison of all TVBO solutions in the literature is provided in Table 1. It shows that TVBO has been well studied under the assumption that the objective function f follows a simple Markov model. In this setting, it has been shown that any TVBO algorithm incurs a cumulative regret that is at least linear in the number of iterations, and three algorithms with a provable linear upper asymptotic regret bound have been proposed (Bogunovic et al., 2016; Brunzema et al., 2022). For completeness, Table 1 also lists TVBO solutions that assume that the variational budget of f is finite (Zhou & Shroff, 2021; Deng et al., 2022). This setting is very different from the usual setting of TVBO, as it implies that the objective function becomes asymptotically static. Under such a restrictive assumption, sublinear asymptotic upper regret bounds can be derived.

Table 1 also shows that all algorithms that offer regret guarantees make the assumption that their response time is constant and independent of their dataset sizes n . This is unrealistic, as the response time of a TVBO algorithm typically is in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. On real deployments, TVBO algorithms that never remove observations from their datasets will eventually become prohibitive to use. Table 1 lists two algorithms that relax this assumption (Nyikosa et al., 2018; Bardou et al., 2024b). However, since deriving a regret bound is significantly more difficult when the response time of the TVBO algorithm is variable, none of the two algorithms comes with a regret bound.

In this paper, we conduct the first analysis that is free of restrictive, unrealistic assumptions and explicitly refers to the response time of TVBO algorithms. We derive general insights about TVBO algorithms: (i) an algorithm-independent lower asymptotic regret bound and (ii) an upper asymptotic regret bound that holds for a broad class of algorithms. These results allow us to make recommendations for TVBO solutions regarding their maximal dataset sizes and their policies to deal with stale observations. Finally, we design BOLT, a TVBO algorithm that follows our recommendations and demonstrate its superiority over the state-of-the-art of TVBO.

3. Main Results

We now present the main results of our analysis, which relies on tools from functional analysis and signal processing. Additional background on these tools can be found in Appendices A and B, respectively.

3.1. Core Assumptions

In this section, we introduce the core assumptions underpinning this work.

Assumption 3.1 (Surrogate Model). The black-box, time-

Table 1. Comparison of TVBO solutions. The solutions are listed in publishing chronological order and are compared on four different criteria: the assumptions they make (i) on the objective function f or (ii) on the response time of the algorithm, (iii) their handling of stale data and (iv) their regret guarantees. When applicable, the best value for each criterion appears **in bold**. LB stands for Lower Bound, UB for Upper Bound, and an asterisk indicates a problem setting that significantly differs from the usual TVBO setting.

TVBO SOLUTION	ASSUMPTION ON OBJECTIVE f	ASSUMPTION ON RESPONSE TIME	STALE DATA POLICY	REGRET GUARANTEES
TV-GP-UCB (Bogunovic et al., 2016)	Markov Model	Constant	None	Linear LB/UB
R-GP-UCB (Bogunovic et al., 2016)	Markov Model	Constant	Periodic Reset	Linear LB/UB
ABO (Nyikosa et al., 2018)	No	No	None	None
SW-GP-UCB (Zhou & Shroff, 2021)	Finite Variational Budget*	Constant	Sliding Window	Sublinear UB*
WGP-UCB (Deng et al., 2022)	Finite Variational Budget*	Constant	None	Sublinear UB*
ET-GP-UCB (Brunzema et al., 2022)	Markov Model	Constant	Event-Based Reset	Linear UB
W-DBO (Bardou et al., 2024b)	No	No	Relevancy-Based	None
BOLT (Ours)	No	No	Relevancy-Based	Linear LB/UB

varying objective function $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a $\mathcal{GP}(\mu_0, k)$, where $\mathcal{S} = [0, 1]^d$ and $\mu_0 = 0$ without loss of generality and $k : (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T})^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a covariance function.

Assumption 3.1 is used by all GP-based BO papers as it ensures the existence of the surrogate model.

Assumption 3.2 (Covariance Separability). The covariance function k has the following form:

$$k((\mathbf{x}, t), (\mathbf{x}', t')) = \lambda k_S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') k_T(t, t')$$

where λ is the signal variance while $k_S : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $k_T : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ are correlation functions in the spatial and temporal domain, respectively.

Assumption 3.2 is widely used in the TVBO literature (Bogunovic et al., 2016; Nyikosa et al., 2018; Bardou et al., 2024b). It captures spatio-temporal dynamics with two dedicated correlation functions k_S and k_T .

Assumption 3.3 (Covariance Properties). The correlation function k_S (resp., k_T) is decreasing, isotropic and can therefore be rewritten as $k_S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2)$ for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{S}$ (resp., $k_T(t, t') = k_T(|t - t'|)$ for all $t, t' \in \mathcal{T}$). Furthermore, $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} k_S(\xi) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} k_T(\tau) = 0$. Finally, k_T admits a spectral density S_T with non-bounded support, i.e., $\forall \tau \in \mathbb{R}^+, S_T(\tau) > 0$.

Assumption 3.3 introduces additional properties (isotropy, vanishing correlations) about the correlation functions introduced in Assumption 3.2. It is mild since all the usual kernels (e.g., Matérn, rational quadratic, RBF) satisfy it.

Assumption 3.4 (Lipschitz Continuity). There exists $L > 0$ such that, for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$|f(\mathbf{x}, t) - f(\mathbf{x}', t)| \leq L \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2.$$

Assumption 3.4 introduces some regularity about the objective function in the spatial domain \mathcal{S} . It is also a common assumption, used for most regret proofs in the literature (Srinivas et al., 2012; Bogunovic et al., 2016).

Finally, let us properly define the response time R of a TVBO algorithm in a way that captures its characteristic features: (i) the objective function cannot be observed at an arbitrarily high frequency because its computation requires a positive amount of time c , (ii) the response time is an increasing function of the dataset size n and (iii) when the dataset size n diverges, the response time diverges as well.

Definition 3.5 (Response Time). The response time $R : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a function that returns the time separating two consecutive iterations of a TVBO algorithm with a dataset of size $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It has three properties: (i) $c = R(0) > 0$, (ii) $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, R(n+1) > R(n)$, (iii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R(n) = +\infty$.

3.2. Algorithm-Independent Lower Regret Bound

As Table 1 shows, the question of the existence of a TVBO algorithm with a no-regret guarantee (i.e., $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} R_T/T = 0$) in a non-Markovian setting remains open. In this section, we answer this important question.

Theorem 3.6. *Let f be an objective function that takes c seconds to be observed. Then after T iterations, any TVBO algorithm incurs an expected cumulative regret $\mathbb{E}[R_T] \in \Omega(\epsilon_c T)$ where*

$$\epsilon_c = \sigma_c \frac{\varphi(L\sqrt{d}/\sigma_c)}{1 - \Phi(L\sqrt{d}/\sigma_c)} - L\sqrt{d}, \quad (4)$$

$$\sigma_c^2 = 2\lambda \left(1 + k_S(\sqrt{d})\right) \left(1 - 2 \int_0^{1/c} S_T(z) dz\right), \quad (5)$$

where S_T is the spectral density of k_T , and where φ and Φ are the p.d.f. and the c.d.f. of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, respectively.

The proof of Theorem 3.6 is provided in Appendix C. In essence, we define an oracle that samples f at the maximal allowed frequency of $1/R(0) = 1/c$ Hz and has a lower expected regret than any TVBO algorithm. Under Assumptions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, we use tools from functional analysis




Figure 1. Regret slope ϵ_c (see (4)) with respect to the sampling frequency of the objective function f (i.e., $1/c$, in Hz) and usual temporal covariance functions k_T , on a log-log plot. In this instance, $d = 4$ and $L = l_S = l_T = \lambda = 1$.

to derive closed forms for the oracle inference formulas. Then, we use a circulant matrix approximation to bound the cumulative regret of the oracle from below.

Figure 1 shows how the regret slope ϵ_c (see (4)) varies as a function of the maximal sampling frequency $1/c$ of the objective function. Unsurprisingly, if f is sampled at a higher frequency, ϵ_c decreases for all covariance functions. However, ϵ_c decreases significantly more rapidly with smoother covariance functions. This is explained by the lower bound provided by Theorem 3.6 involving the power spectral distribution $F_T(x) = 2 \int_0^x S_T(z) dz$ of the objective function (see (5)) evaluated at $x = 1/c$ Hz.

Theorem 3.6 yields that under Assumptions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, any TVBO algorithm has a cumulative regret that is at least linear in the number of iterations. This implies that a no-regret TVBO algorithm does not exist, but also that even the best-performing TVBO algorithm could not offer an asymptotic improvement over the simplest one. Indeed, any TVBO algorithm is at most linear since, after T iterations, an obvious upper bound of its expected cumulative regret $\mathbb{E}[R_T]$ when optimizing a bounded objective function f is

$$\mathbb{E}[R_T] \leq \left(\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}, t \in \mathcal{T}} f(\mathbf{x}, t) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}, t \in \mathcal{T}} f(\mathbf{x}, t) \right) T. \quad (6)$$

This leads to the following corollary.

Corollary 3.7. *Under Assumptions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, any TVBO algorithm after T iterations incurs an expected cumulative regret $\mathbb{E}[R_T] \in \Theta(T)$.*

Interestingly, if S_T has a compact support with supremum τ (e.g., k_T is a periodic correlation function or a sinc kernel (Tobar, 2019)), that is $S_T(z) = 0$ for all $z > \tau$, then the power spectral distribution $2 \int_0^{1/c} S_T(z) dz$ evaluated at

$1/c$ is 1 for any $c \leq 1/\tau$ and (5) yields $\sigma_c^2 = 0$. A simple analysis shows that when σ_c^2 approaches 0, ϵ_c (see (4)) also tends to 0 and the bound in Theorem 3.6 boils down to $\mathbb{E}[R_T] \geq 0$. This also implies that the linear regret bound in Corollary 3.7 requires a non-bounded support for S_T (as assumed in Assumption 3.3). In other words, if a no-regret TVBO algorithm exists, Theorem 3.6 predicts that its temporal covariance function has a spectral density with compact support.

3.3. Upper Regret Bound

We now know that under our assumptions, any TVBO algorithm has a linear regret. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to have an upper asymptotic regret bound which is tighter than the obvious bound (6). In this section, we derive such a bound for a broad class of TVBO algorithms.

First, if a TVBO algorithm never removes observations from its dataset (see Table 1 for a comprehensive list) so that $n \rightarrow \infty$, its response time will eventually blow up (see Definition 3.5). This will in turn cause each newly collected observation to be completely uncorrelated with the observations in the dataset because of Assumptions 3.2 and 3.3. In such a regime, the posterior mean (1) and the posterior variance (3) are equal to the prior mean 0 and the prior signal variance λ (see Assumption 3.1). Consequently, a TVBO algorithm that never removes observations from its dataset eventually behaves as an algorithm that has an empty dataset. This leads to poor performance in the long term.

To be able to track the maximal argument of f in the long run, a TVBO algorithm must prevent its dataset size from diverging. The TVBO literature proposes two policies: (i) periodically reset the dataset (Bogunovic et al., 2016; Brunzema et al., 2022), (ii) delete observations on the fly based on a removal budget (Bardou et al., 2024b). The latest empirical evidence shows that the best policy is to remove observations on the fly (Bardou et al., 2024b). Therefore, in this section, we derive an upper asymptotic regret bound for any TVBO algorithm that adopts such a policy to ensure that its dataset size does not exceed a maximal size.

Theorem 3.8. *Let \mathcal{A} be a TVBO algorithm that uses the GP-UCB acquisition function. Let $R(s)$ be the response time of \mathcal{A} for a dataset size $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Let n be the maximal dataset size of \mathcal{A} . Then after T iterations, \mathcal{A} incurs a cumulative regret R_T such that*

$$R_T \leq 2 + \sqrt{4\lambda\beta_T T \left(T - \frac{\lambda k_S^2(\sqrt{d})}{\lambda + \sigma_0^2} \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2 \right)}, \quad (7)$$

where β_T is a constant defined in Appendix D (see (60)) and where

$$\mathbf{u}_n = (k_T(R(n)), k_T(2R(n)), \dots, k_T(nR(n))). \quad (8)$$




Figure 2. Recommended dataset size as the maximal argument of $\|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2$. (Left) Recommended dataset size for several common temporal covariance functions k_T , under the assumption that the response time is $R(n) \in \mathcal{O}(n^3)$. (Right) The recommended dataset size for several response times, under the assumption that k_T is an RBF covariance function.

The proof of Theorem 3.8 is provided in Appendix D. In essence, we start by bounding the immediate regret of the TVBO algorithm from above with an expression that involves the posterior variance of the surrogate model. Then, we derive an upper bound for the posterior variance that involves (8). Finally, we use this bound on the immediate regret to derive (7), an upper bound on the cumulative regret of the TVBO algorithm.

Theorem 3.8 gives us an insight on the maximal dataset size of a TVBO algorithm.

Recommendation 1. To minimize its upper asymptotic regret bound (7), a TVBO algorithm should collect a dataset of size n^* , where

$$n^* = \arg \max_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2 = \arg \max_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i=1}^n k_T^2(iR(n)). \quad (9)$$

Finding a closed form for n^* is difficult. However, it can be easily shown that the relaxed form of the function to maximize in (9), that is $g(x) = \int_1^x k_T^2(sR(x))ds$, has a unique maximum x^* . Consequently, (9) can be found using the finite difference $\Delta u(n) = \|\mathbf{u}_{n+1}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2$. Starting from an initial guess $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence formed by iteratively applying $n_{i+1} = n_i + \text{sign}(\Delta u(n))$ will converge to n^* . More specifically, n^* is reached when the finite difference $\Delta u(n)$ changes sign.

Figure 2 illustrates how $\|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2$ and n^* (see (8) and (9)) behave under different covariance functions and response times. The left panel shows that the smoother temporal covariance functions (e.g., RBF or Rational Quadratic) also yield the largest n^* . This is intuitive since a smoother GP surrogate can extract information from observations collected further in the past. The right panel shows that the

response time of the TVBO algorithm has a significant impact on $\|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2$ and n^* . More specifically, response times that scale slowly with the dataset size n lead to larger n^* . In the most extreme, unrealistic case (i.e., a constant response time $R(n) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$), $\|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2$ is always increasing; therefore, an infinite dataset size is recommended.

3.4. Removal of Irrelevant Observations

In the previous section, we have made a recommendation about the dataset size of a TVBO algorithm, but we have not provided a policy to select observations to remove from the dataset \mathcal{D} . The intuitive policy would be to remove the oldest observations in the dataset, but recent works provide empirical evidence that this is suboptimal.

Instead, Bardou et al. (2024b) propose to remove the observation $\mathbf{o}_i \in \mathcal{D}$ that minimizes the integrated 2-Wasserstein distance (Kantorovich, 1960) between two GP surrogates: $\mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}, \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2)$ conditioned on the dataset \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{GP}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\mu_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}, \sigma_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}^2)$ conditioned on $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{o}_i\}$. However, they do not justify why removing these observations is effective. In this section, we provide a rigorous justification for this policy, under the following assumption.

Assumption 3.9 (Lipschitz Acquisition). At iteration $T \in \mathbb{N}$, the acquisition function $\alpha : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is built from the posterior mean $\mu(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and the posterior standard deviation $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ of the GP surrogate, that is, $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) = g_T(\mu(\mathbf{x}, t), \sigma(\mathbf{x}, t))$ for some function $g_T : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, g_T is a Lipschitz continuous function, that is,

$$|g_T(\mathbf{u}) - g_T(\mathbf{v})| \leq L_T \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_2, \quad \forall \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (10)$$

Assumption 3.9 is satisfied by many acquisition functions. For example, one can easily show that if α is GP-UCB (Srinivas et al., 2012), that is, $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mu(\mathbf{x}, t) + \beta_T^{1/2} \sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$, then Assumption 3.9 holds with $L_T = \sqrt{1 + \beta_T}$.

Theorem 3.10. Let α be an acquisition function satisfying Assumption 3.9. Let us denote by $\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}$ (resp., $\alpha_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}$) the acquisition function α exploiting the surrogates $\mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D}}$ (resp., $\mathcal{GP}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}$). Then, on any subset $\mathcal{S}' \times \mathcal{T}'$ of the spatio-temporal domain $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$:

$$\|\alpha_{\mathcal{D}} - \alpha_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}\|_2 \leq L_T W_2(\mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{GP}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}), \quad (11)$$

where $\|\alpha_{\mathcal{D}} - \alpha_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}\|_2$ is the L^2 distance between $\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\alpha_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}$ on $\mathcal{S}' \times \mathcal{T}'$ and $W_2(\mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{GP}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}})$ is the integrated 2-Wasserstein distance between $\mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{GP}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}$ on the same domain $\mathcal{S}' \times \mathcal{T}'$.

Theorem 3.10 is proven in Appendix E. In essence, Assumption 3.9 allows us to upper bound the L^2 distance between $\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\alpha_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}$ on any subset of $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$ in terms of the posterior means and variances of $\mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{GP}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}$, which in turn naturally leads to the integrated Wasserstein distance between the GP surrogates.

Algorithm 1 BOLT

Input: objective $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, acquisition function α , response time $R(n)$, clock \mathcal{C}
 Init dataset $\mathcal{D} = \emptyset$
 Find maximum dataset size n^* with (9)
while true do
 Get current time t from \mathcal{C}
 Find $x_t = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t)$
 Observe $y = f(\mathbf{x}_t, t) + \epsilon$
 $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D} \cup \{(\mathbf{x}_t, t), y\}$
 if $|\mathcal{D}| > n^*$ **then**
 Find $\mathbf{o}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{o} \in \mathcal{D}} W_2(\mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{o}\}})$
 $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{o}^*\}$
 end if
end while

Recommendation 2. If one wants to build an alternative dataset $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i$ by removing the observation \mathbf{o}_i from a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{o}_1, \dots, \mathbf{o}_n\}$, then removing \mathbf{o}_{i^*} , where

$$i^* = \arg \min_{i \in [1, n]} W_2(\mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{GP}_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i}), \quad (12)$$

minimizes the upper bound on the effect of the removal on the acquisition function α . Note that solving (12) is compatible with an online algorithm, as shown in Bardou et al. (2024b).

4. BOLT: Bayesian Optimization in the Long Term

In the previous section, we have made two recommendations about the dataset size and the observation removal policy for TVBO algorithms. These recommendations are only useful if the optimization task is carried out in the long term, that is, over a sufficiently long period of time so that removing observations from \mathcal{D} produces a noticeable effect on performance.

In this section, we propose BOLT, a new TVBO algorithm that follows our recommendations. The pseudocode is provided in Algorithm 1. BOLT follows three simple steps: (i) at time t , find a promising query (\mathbf{x}_t, t) , (ii) observe the noisy $f(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$ and augment \mathcal{D} with the collected observation and (iii) remove stale observations if necessary. The algorithm is based on W-DBO (Bardou et al., 2024b), but replaces the arbitrary budget used by W-DBO to remove stale observations by the principled maximal dataset size deduced from Theorem 3.8. Consequently, BOLT can be used on widely different devices since the maximal dataset size (9) will naturally adapt to the available computing power at hand.

In practice, the response time $R(n)$ can be estimated in a similar way as the GP surrogate hyperparameters (e.g.,

variance λ , spatial and temporal lengthscales for k_S and k_T , noise level σ_0^2). At the beginning of any iteration, let us denote by n the dataset size $|\mathcal{D}|$. The corresponding response time $R(n)$ can be measured as the duration between two consecutive calls to the clock \mathcal{C} used in Algorithm 1 to obtain the current time. Next, the observation $(n, R(n))$ is added to another dataset, denoted by \mathcal{R} , which will be used to model and infer the response time of BOLT. To do so, remember that the computational complexity of GP inference scales with $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. Therefore, we conduct a 3rd-degree polynomial regression on the dataset \mathcal{R} to estimate the response time $R(n)$ used in BOLT.

5. Numerical Results

In this section, we evaluate BOLT against the state-of-the-art of TVBO. All algorithms in the TVBO literature that share our problem setting (i.e., infinite variational budget for the objective function f) are considered, namely ABO (Nyikosa et al., 2018), ET-GP-UCB (Brunzema et al., 2022), W-DBO (Bardou et al., 2024b), TV-GP-UCB and R-GP-UCB (Bogunovic et al., 2016). As a control solution, we also include the vanilla GP-UCB algorithm (Srinivas et al., 2012).

We detail the experimental setting in Section 5.1, then the numerical results and some interesting visualizations are provided and discussed in Section 5.2.

5.1. Experimental Setting

We evaluate the TVBO algorithms on a set of 10 synthetic and real-world benchmarks, which are thoroughly described in Appendix F. Each benchmark is a $(d + 1)$ -dimensional function to optimize. The first d dimensions are viewed as the spatial domain \mathcal{S} , which is normalized in $[0, 1]^d$. The $(d + 1)$ th dimension is viewed as the time dimension, and is scaled in $[0, 600]$ seconds, so that each experiment lasts 10 minutes. To make the benchmarks noisy, each call to the objective function is perturbed with a centered Gaussian noise of variance σ_0^2 , equal to 1% of the signal variance. Moreover, to make the benchmarks expensive to evaluate, each call to the objective function takes c seconds to complete. The values for σ_0^2 and c are unknown to the evaluated TVBO algorithms but are provided in Table 2 for the sake of completeness.

Each experiment begins with a warm-up phase consisting of 15 random queries. Then, at each iteration, the TVBO algorithms must perform the following tasks in real-time:

- Hyperparameters inference:** the variance λ , the spatial lengthscale l_S and the observational noise σ_0^2 must always be inferred. When applicable, the temporal lengthscale l_T and the response time $R(n)$ of the al-

Table 2. Noise variance σ_0^2 and cost of single call c in seconds for each benchmark.

BENCHMARK ($d + 1$)	VARIANCE σ_0^2	COST (S) c
SHEKEL (4)	0.02	0.50
HARTMANN (3)	0.05	1.00
ACKLEY (4)	0.05	0.05
GRIEWANK (6)	0.30	0.05
EGGHOLDER (2)	0.10	0.05
SCHWEFEL (4)	0.25	0.05
HARTMANN (6)	0.05	0.10
POWELL (4)	2.50	1.00
TEMPERATURE (3)	0.16	1.00
WLAN (7)	1.50	0.10

gorithm are also inferred at this stage. Unless requested otherwise by the algorithm, each solution uses a Matérn-5/2 spatial covariance function, and a Matérn-3/2 temporal covariance function.

- **Optimization of the acquisition function:** the acquisition function is always GP-UCB (Srinivas et al., 2012), and the next observation \mathbf{x}_t is found by using multi-start gradient descent.
- **Function observation:** a noisy function value $y_t = f(\mathbf{x}_t, t) + \epsilon$ is observed, and the observation $((\mathbf{x}_t, t), y_t)$ is added to the dataset \mathcal{D} .
- **Dataset cleaning:** when applicable, this is the stage in which some observations in \mathcal{D} might be removed.

Each TVBO algorithm has been implemented with the same BO framework, namely BOTorch (Balandat et al., 2020). Moreover, for the sake of a fair evaluation, the critical, time-consuming stages (i.e., hyperparameters inference and acquisition function optimization) are performed using the same BOTorch routines.

Finally, all experiments have been independently replicated 10 times on a laptop equipped with an Intel Core i9-9980HK @ 2.40 GHz with 8 cores (16 threads). No graphics card was used to speed up GP inference.

5.2. Experimental Results

The average regrets (and their standard errors) for each TVBO algorithm on each benchmark are listed in Table 3. In general, BOLT achieves excellent results: it is either the best or second-best performing TVBO algorithm for each benchmark. This consistency is highlighted by averaging performance across all benchmarks. This aggregation is reported in the last row of Table 3. Figure 3 graphically illustrates the average performance of each TVBO algorithm and confirms the excellent performance of BOLT, which




Figure 3. Normalized average regret across the benchmarks (lower is better). For each benchmark, the best performing TVBO algorithm gets a normalized regret of 0, and the worst performing TVBO algorithm gets a normalized regret of 1. The normalized regrets are then averaged across all the benchmarks.

can be largely explained by the adaptivity of the observation removal policy of BOLT to the landscape of the objective function.

As an example, Figure 4 shows the evolution of the dataset size of each TVBO algorithm for the Eggholder and Powell synthetic functions (please refer to Appendix F for a detailed description of these benchmarks).

When optimizing Eggholder (left plot of Figure 4), BOLT removes a significant number of observations. This is expected since Eggholder is an erratic function with multiple local optima, so that an observation becomes irrelevant to predict the future behavior of the objective function after a short time. This gives a significant advantage to TVBO algorithms that are able to remove observations on the fly (R-GP-UCB, W-DBO, BOLT), as illustrated by the corresponding results in Table 3.

In contrast, when optimizing Powell (right plot of Figure 4), BOLT is able to adapt its policy and behaves similarly to algorithms that never remove an observation from their datasets (GP-UCB, TV-GP-UCB). This is once again an expected behavior, since Powell is much smoother than Eggholder, so that an observation remains relevant to predict the future behavior of the objective function even after a long period of time. The corresponding results reported in Table 3 indicate that W-DBO and BOLT perform significantly better than GP-UCB and TV-GP-UCB, although their dataset sizes are roughly similar. This can be explained by the superior quality of the surrogate models of W-DBO and BOLT, which are governed by the mild Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 only. In contrast, GP-UCB does not capture temporal dynamics, and TV-GP-UCB does so under restrictive assumptions (Markovian setting (Bogunovic et al., 2016)).

Table 3. Comparison of BOLT against state-of-the-art TVBO algorithms. For each experiment and each algorithm, the average regret and its standard error over 10 independent experiments is provided (lower is better). For each experiment, the performance of the best algorithm is written in **bold**, and the performance of algorithms whose confidence intervals overlap the confidence interval of the best performing algorithm are underlined.

BENCHMARK ($d + 1$)	GP-UCB	ET-GP-UCB	R-GP-UCB	TV-GP-UCB	ABO	W-DBO	BOLT
SHEKEL (4)	2.51±0.06	2.57±0.05	2.33±0.03	2.63±0.03	2.25±0.15	2.06±0.09	1.83±0.09
HARTMANN (3)	1.45±0.15	1.45±0.12	0.42±0.01	1.70±0.15	0.54±0.10	0.47±0.08	0.30±0.02
ACKLEY (4)	4.27±0.50	4.39±0.45	4.28±0.20	5.31±0.34	4.76±0.53	3.42±0.46	2.92±0.35
GRIEWANK (6)	0.59±0.01	0.61±0.01	0.61±0.01	0.60±0.01	0.69±0.04	<u>0.57±0.03</u>	0.54±0.04
EGGHOLDER (2)	516±16.6	521±13.1	298±4.4	573±1.6	546±110.1	<u>275±11.5</u>	262±7.1
SCHWEFEL (4)	590±20.9	588±35.3	1024±10.3	543±48.7	793±61.0	615±21.7	524±30.4
HARTMANN (6)	1.66±0.02	1.67±0.01	1.44±0.02	1.72±0.03	1.32±0.17	0.69±0.04	<u>0.74±0.06</u>
POWELL (4)	3669±137	2957±212	2317±99	3022±262	3491±1011	<u>1363±110</u>	1235±30
TEMPERATURE (3)	1.51±0.10	1.20±0.10	0.96±0.03	1.64±0.09	1.68±0.21	1.13±0.06	<u>0.99±0.03</u>
WLAN (7)	20.2±1.58	21.3±1.05	10.4±0.16	35.2±3.22	17.3±1.94	8.9±0.21	8.1±0.21
OVERALL	0.66±0.08	0.68±0.09	0.63±0.08	0.81±0.10	0.40±0.10	0.14±0.03	0.01±0.01




Figure 4. Evolution of the dataset sizes n of the TVBO algorithms on the Eggholder (left) and Powell (right) synthetic functions. The plots are in log scale.

Finally, Figure 4 suggests that BOLT behaves similarly to W-DBO. That is expected since BOLT builds on W-DBO. Both algorithms share the same assumptions about the surrogate model and the same quantification of observation relevancy (Bardou et al., 2024b). However, both Table 3 and Figure 3 illustrate that BOLT performs significantly better than W-DBO on most benchmarks. This can only be explained by the principled approach that governs the maximal dataset size of BOLT (see Section 3.3). In other words, the superiority of BOLT over W-DBO is a convincing evidence of the empirical validity of Theorem 3.8 and its implications.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed the first regret analysis in the TVBO literature that holds under mild, realistic assumptions. Unlike most theoretical results in the literature, our analysis explicitly accounts for the sampling frequency of the TVBO algorithm, which naturally decreases as its dataset grows.

Our first key result is an algorithm-independent linear lower asymptotic regret bound which implies in particular that a no-regret TVBO algorithm does not exist. Our second key result provides an upper asymptotic regret bound for any TVBO algorithm that ensures a maximal dataset size by removing observations from its dataset on the fly. Also, our analysis suggests that using the quantification of observation relevancy proposed in (Bardou et al., 2024b) minimizes the impact of removing an observation on the acquisition function. Finally we have proposed BOLT, a TVBO algorithm that follows the recommendations formulated from our analysis, and we have established its superiority over the state of the art of TVBO.

In future work, we plan to study the properties of TVBO algorithms when Assumptions 3.2 and 3.3 are relaxed. Considering a non-separable spatio-temporal covariance function or a temporal covariance function that has a spectral density with compact support seem to be particularly interesting research avenues in the search for an asymptotically optimal TVBO algorithm.

References

- Aggarwal, C. C., Han, J., Wang, J., and Yu, P. S. A framework for projected clustering of high dimensional data streams. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth international conference on Very large data bases-Volume 30*, pp. 852–863, 2004.
- Balandat, M., Karrer, B., Jiang, D. R., Daulton, S., Letham, B., Wilson, A. G., and Bakshy, E. BoTorch: A Framework for Efficient Monte-Carlo Bayesian Optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33*, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.06403>.

- Bardou, A. and Begin, T. INSPIRE: Distributed Bayesian Optimization for ImproviNg SPatIal REUse in Dense WLANs. In *Proceedings of the 25th International ACM Conference on Modeling Analysis and Simulation of Wireless and Mobile Systems*, pp. 133–142, 2022.
- Bardou, A., Thiran, P., and Begin, T. Relaxing the additivity constraints in decentralized no-regret high-dimensional bayesian optimization. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024a.
- Bardou, A., Thiran, P., and Ranieri, G. This Too Shall Pass: Removing Stale Observations in Dynamic Bayesian Optimization. In *The 38th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024b.
- Bergstra, J., Yamins, D., and Cox, D. Making a science of model search: Hyperparameter optimization in hundreds of dimensions for vision architectures. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 115–123. PMLR, 2013.
- Bogunovic, I., Scarlett, J., and Cevher, V. Time-varying gaussian process bandit optimization. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 314–323. PMLR, 2016.
- Brunzema, P., von Rohr, A., Solowjow, F., and Trimpe, S. Event-triggered time-varying bayesian optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.10790*, 2022.
- Daulton, S., Eriksson, D., Balandat, M., and Bakshy, E. Multi-objective bayesian optimization over high-dimensional search spaces. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 507–517. PMLR, 2022.
- Deng, Y., Zhou, X., Kim, B., Tewari, A., Gupta, A., and Shroff, N. Weighted gaussian process bandits for non-stationary environments. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 6909–6932. PMLR, 2022.
- González, J., Longworth, J., James, D. C., and Lawrence, N. D. Bayesian optimization for synthetic gene design. In *NIPS Workshop on Bayesian Optimization in Academia and Industry*, 2014.
- Gray, R. M. et al. Toeplitz and circulant matrices: A review. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 2(3):155–239, 2006.
- Jones, D. R., Schonlau, M., and Welch, W. J. Efficient global optimization of expensive black-box functions. *Journal of Global optimization*, 13(4):455–492, 1998.
- Kantorovich, L. V. Mathematical methods of organizing and planning production. *Management science*, 6(4):366–422, 1960.
- Kemperman, J. On the shannon capacity of an arbitrary channel. In *Indagationes Mathematicae (Proceedings)*, volume 77, pp. 101–115. North-Holland, 1974.
- Kim, S., Lee, K., Kim, Y., Shin, J., Shin, S., and Chong, S. Dynamic control for on-demand interference-managed wlan infrastructures. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 28(1):84–97, 2019.
- Lizotte, D., Wang, T., Bowling, M., and Schuurmans, D. Automatic gait optimization with gaussian process regression. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’07*, pp. 944–949, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2007. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Marchant, R. and Ramos, F. Bayesian optimisation for intelligent environmental monitoring. In *2012 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*, pp. 2242–2249. IEEE, 2012.
- Melo, A. G., Pinto, M. F., Marcato, A. L., Honório, L. M., and Coelho, F. O. Dynamic optimization and heuristics based online coverage path planning in 3d environment for uavs. *Sensors*, 21(4):1108, 2021.
- Mockus, J. Application of bayesian approach to numerical methods of global and stochastic optimization. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 4:347–365, 1994.
- Nyikosa, F. M., Osborne, M. A., and Roberts, S. J. Bayesian optimization for dynamic problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.03432*, 2018.
- Si-Mohammed, S., Bardou, A., Begin, T., Lassous, I. G., and Vicat-Blanc, P. NS+ NDT: Smart Integration of Network Simulation in Network Digital Twin, Application to IoT Networks. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 157: 124–144, 2024.
- Srinivas, N., Krause, A., Kakade, S. M., and Seeger, M. W. Information-theoretic regret bounds for gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(5):3250–3265, 2012. doi:10.1109/tit.2011.2182033.
- Tobar, F. Band-limited gaussian processes: The sinc kernel. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Wang, Z., Shakibi, B., Jin, L., and Freitas, N. Bayesian multi-scale optimistic optimization. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1005–1014. PMLR, 2014.
- Ye, K. and Lim, L.-H. Every matrix is a product of toeplitz matrices. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 16:577–598, 2016.

Zhou, X. and Shroff, N. No-regret algorithms for time-varying bayesian optimization. In *2021 55th Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS)*, pp. 1–6. IEEE, 2021.

A. Integral Covariance Operators

A.1. Background on Integral Covariance Operators

A covariance function k is associated with an integral covariance operator $T_k : L^2(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{X})$, where $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the space of L^2 -integrable functions from \mathcal{X} to \mathbb{R} , which is defined as

$$T_k(f)(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})f(\mathbf{u})d\mathbf{u}.$$

This operator is Hilbert-Schmidt, compact, self-adjoint and positive. As such, T_k has a countable infinity of eigenfunctions $\phi_i \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and associated eigenvalues $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ verifying

$$T_k(\phi_i)(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})\phi_i(\mathbf{u})d\mathbf{u} = \lambda_i\phi_i(\mathbf{x}).$$

The eigenfunctions are an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. In particular, this means that

$$\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}, \int_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_i(\mathbf{x})\phi_j(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = \delta_{ij} \quad (13)$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta whose value is 1 if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise.

The operator T_k also admits an inverse $T_k^{-1} = T_{k^{-1}}$ associated with an inverse covariance function $k^{-1} \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{k^{-1}}(T_k(f))(\mathbf{x}) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} k^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})T_k(f)(\mathbf{u})d\mathbf{u} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} k^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})k(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})f(\mathbf{v})d\mathbf{u}d\mathbf{v} \\ &= f(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Such an inverse $T_{k^{-1}}$ has the same eigenvectors $\{\phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ as T_k , but inverse eigenvalues $\{1/\lambda_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$.

A.2. Mercer Representation of k

A positive definite, symmetric kernel k can be expanded as

$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \phi_i(\mathbf{x})\phi_i(\mathbf{x}') \quad (14)$$

where λ_i is the i -th eigenvalue of the integral covariance operator T_k , and ϕ_i the associated eigenfunction. The form (14) is called the Mercer representation of the kernel k .

As an illustrative example, let us derive the Mercer representation of a separable covariance function k satisfying Assumption 3.2. Because k_S and k_T are positive definite, their respective Mercer representations are

$$k_S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \lambda_i^S \phi_i^S(\mathbf{x})\phi_i^S(\mathbf{x}'), \quad (15)$$

$$k_T(t, t') = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \lambda_i^T \phi_i^T(t)\phi_i^T(t'), \quad (16)$$

where λ_i^S (resp., λ_i^T) is the i -th eigenvalue of the integral covariance operator T_{k_S} (resp., T_{k_T}) and ϕ_i^S (resp., ϕ_i^T) its associated eigenfunction. Through simple manipulations, it can be shown that under Assumption 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned} k((\mathbf{x}, t), (\mathbf{x}', t')) &= \lambda k_S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')k_T(t, t') \\ &= \lambda \sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_i^S \lambda_j^T \phi_i^S(\mathbf{x})\phi_j^S(\mathbf{x}')\phi_j^T(t)\phi_j^T(t'). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The Mercer representation of the kernel k^{-1} , associated with T_{k-1} the inverse of the covariance operator T_k , can be easily inferred from (17):

$$k^{-1}((\mathbf{x}, t), (\mathbf{x}', t')) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_i^S \lambda_j^T} \phi_i^S(\mathbf{x}) \phi_i^S(\mathbf{x}') \phi_j^T(t) \phi_j^T(t'). \quad (18)$$

The representations (17) and (18) will be frequently used in the proof of Theorem 3.6, provided in Appendix C.

B. Circulant Matrix Approximation

B.1. Toeplitz and Circulant Matrices

For more details about the notions described in this section, please refer to Gray (2006).

An $n \times n$ symmetric Toeplitz matrix is a matrix of the form

$$\mathbf{T}_n = \begin{pmatrix} t_0 & t_1 & \cdots & t_{n-1} \\ t_1 & t_0 & \cdots & t_{n-2} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_{n-1} & t_{n-2} & \cdots & t_0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Such a matrix arises in many applications (Ye & Lim, 2016), including Bayesian optimization as we shall see in the next section. Unfortunately, some of its properties (e.g., its spectral properties) remain difficult to study in the general case. A common special case of symmetric Toeplitz matrices is called a symmetric circulant matrix. Its particularity is that each of its rows is formed by a right-shift of the previous one:

$$\mathbf{C}_n = \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & c_1 & \cdots & c_{n-1} \\ c_{n-1} & c_0 & \cdots & c_{n-2} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_1 & c_2 & \cdots & c_0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $c_i = c_{n-i}, \forall i \in [0, n-1]$ to ensure symmetry.

A symmetric circulant matrix is entirely characterized by its first row (c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) and is simpler to study than a general symmetric Toeplitz matrix. In particular, all symmetric circulant matrices share the same eigenvectors which are, with ϕ_j denoting the j -th eigenvector,

$$\phi_j = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} e^{-\frac{2\pi i j l}{n}} \right)_{l \in [0, n-1]} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1, e^{-\frac{2\pi i j}{n}}, e^{-\frac{4\pi i j}{n}}, \dots, e^{-\frac{2(n-1)\pi i j}{n}} \right). \quad (20)$$

The $n \times n$ matrix \mathbf{Q} whose columns are the normalized eigenvectors $\{\phi_j\}_{0 \leq j \leq n-1}$, i.e., $\mathbf{Q} = (\phi_0, \dots, \phi_{n-1})$, is an orthonormal matrix. Both the set of its columns and the set of its lines form an orthonormal set. Recall that a set of elements $\{\mathbf{v}_j\}_{0 \leq j \leq n-1}$ from a vector space equipped with the dot product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is orthonormal when, for any $j, k \in [0, n-1]$,

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{v}_k \rangle = \delta_{jk} \quad (21)$$

where δ_{jk} is the Kronecker delta with value 1 if $j = k$ and 0 otherwise.

Along with any eigenvector ϕ_j comes its associated eigenvalue λ_j . For a symmetric circulant matrix, λ_j is a discrete Fourier transform of the first row of \mathbf{C}_n

$$\lambda_j = \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} c_l e^{-\frac{2\pi i j l}{n}}. \quad (22)$$

It is possible to build an equivalence relation between sequences of matrices of growing sizes (Gray et al., 2006). In particular, two sequences of matrices $\{\mathbf{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\mathbf{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are *asymptotically equivalent*, denoted $\mathbf{A}_n \sim \mathbf{B}_n$, if

(i) \mathbf{A}_n and \mathbf{B}_n are uniformly upper bounded in operator norm $\|\cdot\|$, that is, $\|\mathbf{A}_n\|, \|\mathbf{B}_n\| \leq M < \infty, n = 1, 2, \dots$,

(ii) $\mathbf{A}_n - \mathbf{B}_n = \mathbf{D}_n$ goes to zero in the Hilbert-Schmidt norm $|\cdot|$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that is, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbf{D}_n| = 0$.

Asymptotic equivalence is particularly useful, mainly because of the guarantees it provides on the spectrum of asymptotically equivalent sequences of Hermitian matrices. In fact, if $\{\mathbf{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\mathbf{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are sequences of Hermitian matrices and if $\mathbf{A}_n \sim \mathbf{B}_n$, then it is known that the spectrum of \mathbf{A}_n and the spectrum of \mathbf{B}_n are asymptotically absolutely equally distributed (Gray et al., 2006).

Consequently, asymptotic equivalence drastically simplifies the study of symmetric Toeplitz matrices as their sizes go to infinity. In fact, given any symmetric Toeplitz matrix \mathbf{T}_n (e.g., see (19)), the circulant matrix \mathbf{C}_n with first row (c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) where for all $j \in [0, n-1]$,

$$c_j = \begin{cases} t_0 & \text{if } j = 0 \\ t_j + t_{n-j} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is asymptotically equivalent to \mathbf{T}_n , that is, we have $\mathbf{T}_n \sim \mathbf{C}_n$.

B.2. Circulant Approximation of \mathbf{K}_T

As an illustrative example, let us derive the circulant matrix approximation of the $n \times n$ kernel matrix \mathbf{K}_T built from time instants (t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}) , with $t_j = jc, c > 0$. In that particular case, the kernel matrix

$$\mathbf{K}_T = \begin{pmatrix} k_T(0) & k_T(c) & \cdots & k_T((n-1)c) \\ k_T(c) & k_T(0) & \cdots & k_T((n-2)c) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ k_T((n-1)c) & k_T((n-2)c) & \cdots & k_T(0) \end{pmatrix}$$

is a Hermitian Toeplitz matrix. Its circulant approximation is formed by building the alternative kernel matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_T^{(n)} = \left(\tilde{k}_T^{(n)}(t_i, t_j) \right)_{i,j \in [0, n-1]}$ where the alternative temporal kernel is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{k}_T^{(n)}(t_i, t_j) &= \begin{cases} k_T(0) & \text{if } i = j, \\ k_T(|t_i - t_j|) + k_T(|t_{n-1} - t_0| - |t_i - t_j|) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} k_T(0) & \text{if } i = j, \\ k_T(c|i - j|) + k_T(c(n - |i - j|)) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

As mentioned in Section B.1, $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_T^{(n)}$ and \mathbf{K}_T are asymptotically equivalent and therefore share the same spectrum when

$n \rightarrow \infty$. Because of (22), for all $0 \leq j \leq n-1$, the j -th eigenvalue of $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_T^{(n)}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_j &= \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \tilde{k}_T^{(n)}(t_0, t_l) e^{\frac{-2\pi i j l}{n}} \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} k_T(cl) e^{\frac{-2\pi i j l}{n}} + \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} k_T(c(n-l)) e^{\frac{-2\pi i j l}{n}} - k_T(cn) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{c} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} c k_T(cl) e^{\frac{-2\pi i j cl}{nc}} + \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} c k_T(c(n-l)) e^{\frac{-2\pi i j lc}{nc}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{c} \left(\int_0^{+\infty} k_T(t) e^{\frac{-2\pi i j t}{nc}} dt + \int_0^{+\infty} k_T(cn-t) e^{\frac{-2\pi i j t}{nc}} dt \right) \quad (25)$$

$$= \frac{1}{c} \left(\int_0^{+\infty} k_T(t) e^{\frac{-2\pi i j t}{nc}} dt + e^{\frac{-2\pi i j nc}{nc}} \int_0^{+\infty} k_T(u) e^{\frac{-2\pi i j u}{nc}} du \right) \quad (26)$$

$$= \frac{2}{c} \int_0^{+\infty} k_T(t) e^{-2\pi i t \frac{j}{nc}} dt \quad (27)$$

$$= \frac{2}{c} S_T \left(\frac{j}{nc} \right) \quad (28)$$

where (24) holds when n is large enough due to $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} k_T(x) = 0$ as assumed in Assumption 3.3, (25) holds when n is large enough and c is small enough using the quadrature rule $\int_0^{+\infty} f(x) dx \approx \sum_{l=0}^{+\infty} \Delta x f(l\Delta x)$ with $\Delta x = c$, (26) is due to the change of variable $u = n - t$ and (27) uses $\exp(-2\pi i j nc / nc) = 1$. Finally, S_T in (28) is the spectral density (i.e., the Fourier transform) of k_T .

C. Algorithm-Independent Lower Regret Bound

Theorem 3.6 is established by analyzing the asymptotic regret of an oracle. In this appendix, we describe this oracle and prove Theorem 3.6.

A TVBO algorithm seeks to optimize a black-box objective function f with signal variance λ (see Assumption 3.2). In real-world problems, the observation of any function value consumes some non-zero amount of time c , as captured by our definition of the response time R (see Definition 3.5). This sets an upper bound for the sampling frequency of any TVBO algorithm. In fact, if f requires c seconds to be observed, then a TVBO algorithm can sample it at most at $1/c$ Hz.

The Oracle. We consider an idealized TVBO algorithm that is able to sample f at $1/c$ Hz (formally, for any dataset size $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $R(n) = c$). Using the same idea as in Bogunovic et al. (2016), we assume that when the oracle queries a point (\mathbf{x}, t) in space-time $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$, it is able to observe exactly (i.e., without any noise) the entire objective function at that time, that is, $f(\cdot, t)$. Figure 5 illustrates why the oracle has a significant advantage over any regular BO algorithm. Unlike Bogunovic et al. (2016), f is not assumed to evolve in a Markovian setting where $f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) | f(\cdot, t_{n-1})$ is independent from any observation made at time $t' < t_{n-1}$. Concretely, this means that all the past observations (i.e., not only the last one) bring useful information to the surrogate model.

Let us start by deriving the inference formulas provided by the GP surrogate of the oracle at time t_n .

Lemma C.1. *Let $\mathcal{D} = \{f(\cdot, t_j)\}_{j \in [0, n-1]}$ be the oracle dataset after n observations, where $t_j = jc$. Then, $f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) | \mathcal{D} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n), \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}, t_n))$ where*

$$\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n) = \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}), \quad (29)$$

$$\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{D}}((\mathbf{x}, t_n), (\mathbf{x}', t_n)) = \lambda k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2) (1 - \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{k}_T(t_n, \mathcal{D})), \quad (30)$$

where $\mathbf{K}_T = \mathbf{k}_T(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D})$, $\mathbf{k}_T(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = (k_T(t_i, t_j))_{t_i \in \mathcal{X}, t_j \in \mathcal{Y}}$, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}) = (f(\mathbf{x}, t_i))_{t_i \in \mathcal{D}}$ and λ is the signal variance.

Proof. The expressions for the posterior mean (1) and the posterior covariance (2) hold only under a finite set of observations in space and time. Because the oracle's dataset \mathcal{D} contains continuous observations in the spatial domain \mathcal{S} , new closed




Figure 5. Comparison between a regular BO algorithm and the oracle built in this appendix. The temporal (resp., spatial) domain is represented by the x (resp., y)-axis. An arbitrary objective function f is depicted in the background by a colored contour plot. The present running time is shown as a black vertical dashed line. (Left) At each iteration, a regular BO algorithm is allowed to observe a function value $f(\mathbf{x}, t)$ at a specific location in space-time $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$ shown as red crosses. (Right) At each iteration, the oracle also queries a point (\mathbf{x}, t) in space-time (shown with red crosses), but is allowed to observe the whole function $f(\cdot, t)$ on the spatial domain (shown with red vertical lines).

forms for continuous observations in \mathcal{S} but discrete observations in \mathcal{T} must be derived. Their analytic forms are

$$\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k((\mathbf{x}, t_n), (\mathbf{u}, t_i)) k^{-1}((\mathbf{u}, t_i), (\mathbf{v}, t_j)) f(\mathbf{v}, t_j) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{D}}((\mathbf{x}, t_n), (\mathbf{x}', t_n)) &= k((\mathbf{x}, t_n), (\mathbf{x}', t_n)) - \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k((\mathbf{x}, t_n), (\mathbf{u}, t_i)) k^{-1}((\mathbf{u}, t_i), (\mathbf{v}, t_j)) k((\mathbf{x}', t_n), (\mathbf{v}, t_j)) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} \\ &= \lambda k_{\mathcal{S}}(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2) - \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k((\mathbf{x}, t_n), (\mathbf{u}, t_i)) k^{-1}((\mathbf{u}, t_i), (\mathbf{v}, t_j)) k((\mathbf{x}', t_n), (\mathbf{v}, t_j)) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where k^{-1} is the kernel associated with the integral covariance operator $T_{k^{-1}}$, which is the inverse of the integral covariance operator T_k associated with the kernel k (see Appendix A for a detailed discussion on this operator). Equation (32) follows from both points in space-time (\mathbf{x}, t_n) and (\mathbf{x}', t_n) sharing the same time coordinate t_n .

Let us rewrite (31) with the Mercer representations of the kernels $k_{\mathcal{S}}$ and k^{-1} derived in Appendix A (see (15) and (18)). Using the orthonormality property (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k_T(|t_n - t_i|) \sum_{l,m,p=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_l^{\mathcal{S}}}{\lambda_m^{\mathcal{S}} \lambda_p^{\mathcal{T}}} \phi_l^{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) \phi_p^{\mathcal{T}}(t_i) \phi_p^{\mathcal{T}}(t_j) \underbrace{\int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_l^{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{u}) \phi_m^{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}_{\delta_{lm}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_m^{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{v}, t_j) d\mathbf{v} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k_T(|t_n - t_i|) \underbrace{\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_p^{\mathcal{T}}} \phi_p^{\mathcal{T}}(t_i) \phi_p^{\mathcal{T}}(t_j)}_{k_T^{-1}(t_i, t_j)} \underbrace{\int_{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \phi_l^{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) \phi_l^{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{v}, t_j) d\mathbf{v}}_{f(\mathbf{x}, t_j)} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k_T(|t_n - t_i|) k_T^{-1}(t_i, t_j) f(\mathbf{x}, t_j), \quad (34)$$

where δ_{lm} is the Kronecker delta and (33) and (34) come directly from properties of eigenfunctions and Mercer representations. The remaining inverse kernel k_T^{-1} is defined over the discrete set $\{t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}\}$, hence $k_T^{-1}(t_i, t_j)$ is the element at the i -th row and the j -th column of \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} . Writing (34) in its matrix form yields the oracle posterior mean (29).

Let us finish with the integrals involved in (32) with the Mercer representations of k_S and k^{-1} (see (15) and (18)):

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_S \int_S \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k((\mathbf{x}, t_n), (\mathbf{u}, t_i)) k^{-1}((\mathbf{u}, t_i), (\mathbf{v}, t_j)) k((\mathbf{x}', t_n), (\mathbf{v}, t_j)) d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} \\ &= \lambda \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k_T(|t_n - t_i|) k_T(|t_n - t_j|) \sum_{l,m,p,q=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_l^S \lambda_q^S}{\lambda_m^S \lambda_p^T} \phi_l^S(\mathbf{x}) \phi_q^S(\mathbf{x}') \phi_p^T(t_i) \phi_p^T(t_j) \underbrace{\int_S \phi_l^S(\mathbf{u}) \phi_m^S(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}_{\delta_{lm}} \underbrace{\int_S \phi_m^S(\mathbf{v}) \phi_q^S(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}}_{\delta_{mq}} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$= \lambda \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k_T(|t_n - t_i|) k_T(|t_n - t_j|) \underbrace{\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \lambda_l^S \phi_l^S(\mathbf{x}) \phi_l^S(\mathbf{x}')}_{k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2)} \underbrace{\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_p^T} \phi_p^T(t_i) \phi_p^T(t_j)}_{k_T^{-1}(t_i, t_j)} \quad (36)$$

$$= \lambda k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k_T(|t_n - t_i|) k_T^{-1}(t_i, t_j) k_T(|t_n - t_j|), \quad (37)$$

where δ_{lm} and δ_{mq} are Kronecker deltas and (35), (36) and (37) come directly from properties of eigenfunctions and Mercer representations. Again, since k_T^{-1} is defined over the discrete set $\{t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}\}$, $k_T^{-1}(t_i, t_j)$ is the element at the i -th row and the j -th column of \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} . Rewriting (37) in its matrix form, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{D}}((\mathbf{x}, t_n), (\mathbf{x}', t_n)) &= \lambda k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2) - \lambda k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2) \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{k}_T(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \\ &= \lambda k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2) (1 - \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{k}_T(t_n, \mathcal{D})), \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired result. \square

Note that Lemma C.1 allows to retrieve the oracle inference formulas derived in Appendix F of Bogunovic et al. (2016), but is more general as it can be used for any arbitrary isotropic covariance functions k_S and k_T and an arbitrary number of observations. We now use Lemma C.1 to provide results about the expected instantaneous regret of the oracle.

Lemma C.2. *Let $r_{t_n} = f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) - f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n)$ be the instantaneous regret of the oracle at time t_n , where $\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$, $\mathbf{x}_{t_n} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$ and where $\alpha_{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an acquisition function. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}[r_{t_n}] = \mu_r + \sigma_r \frac{\varphi(-\mu_r/\sigma_r)}{1 - \Phi(-\mu_r/\sigma_r)} \quad (38)$$

where φ (resp., Φ) is the p.d.f. (resp., c.d.f.) of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and

$$\mu_r = \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, \mathcal{D}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, \mathcal{D})) \leq 0, \quad (39)$$

$$\sigma_r^2 = 2\lambda (1 + k_S(\|\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^* - \mathbf{x}_{t_n}\|_2)) (1 - \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{k}_T(t_n, \mathcal{D})). \quad (40)$$

Proof. Let us start by studying the difference between two function values $f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) - f(\mathbf{x}', t_n)$ located at the same point in time $t_n \in \mathcal{T}$, but at different points in space $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{S}$.¹ Because f is a GP, $f(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$ and $f(\mathbf{x}', t_n)$ are jointly Gaussian, with marginals $f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n), \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}, t_n))$ and $f(\mathbf{x}', t_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}', t_n), \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}', t_n))$. Therefore, $(f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) - f(\mathbf{x}', t_n)) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_r, \sigma_r^2)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_r &= \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n) - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}', t_n) \\ &= \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}', \mathcal{D})), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_r^2 &= \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}, t_n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}', t_n) + 2\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{D}}((\mathbf{x}, t_n), (\mathbf{x}', t_n)) \\ &= 2\lambda (1 + k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2)) (1 - \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{k}_T(t_n, \mathcal{D})), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

and where (41) and (42) follow directly from Lemma C.1.

¹The trivial case $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}'$ is excluded since $f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) - f(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$ is always 0.

The instantaneous regret r_{t_n} is precisely defined as the difference $f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) - f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n)$, but it comes with an additional piece of information. In fact, because $\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$, we know that $f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) \geq f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n)$. Therefore, $r_{t_n} = (f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) - f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n))$ conditionally to $f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) \geq f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n)$. Because $f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) - f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n)$ is Gaussian, r_{t_n} follows a Gaussian distribution truncated on the interval $[0, +\infty)$. Moments of this distribution are well-known and, in particular

$$\mathbb{E}[r_{t_n}] = \mu_r + \sigma_r \frac{\varphi(-\mu_r/\sigma_r)}{1 - \Phi(-\mu_r/\sigma_r)}$$

where μ_r and σ_r^2 are given by (41) and (42) applied to $\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*$ and \mathbf{x}_{t_n} , and where φ (resp., Φ) is the p.d.f. (resp., c.d.f.) of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. \square

Let us further comment on the sign of μ_r . The acquisition function $\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}$ exploits the posterior mean $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ and variance $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2$ to find a trade-off between exploration and exploitation. However, the oracle posterior variance computed in Lemma C.1 (see (30)) yields that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$, $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}, t_n) = \lambda k_S(0) (1 - \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{k}_T(t_n, \mathcal{D}))$, which does not depend on \mathbf{x} . Therefore, the best exploration-exploitation trade-off is necessarily pure exploitation, which boils down to maximizing $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ (see (29)). Formally, $\mathbf{x}_{t_n} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$. Therefore, since $\mu_r = \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n)$, $\mu_r \leq 0$.

Lemma C.2 provides the expectation of the regret as a function of the number of observations n . Let us now provide an asymptotic lower bound on (38) as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma C.3.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[r_{t_n}] \geq \sigma_c \frac{\varphi(L\sqrt{d}/\sigma_c)}{1 - \Phi(L\sqrt{d}/\sigma_c)} - L\sqrt{d}$$

where

$$\sigma_c^2 = 2\lambda \left(1 + k_S(\sqrt{d})\right) \left(1 - 2 \int_0^{1/c} S_T(z) dz\right), \quad (43)$$

S_T is the spectral density of k_T and where φ (resp., Φ) is the p.d.f. (resp., c.d.f.) of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

Proof. A simple analysis shows that (38) is minimized when both μ_r and σ_r are minimized. Let us find lower bounds for these two quantities. In the following, we will make a heavy use of the circulant approximation $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_T^{(n)}$ of the kernel matrix \mathbf{K}_T and its associated kernel (23). Please see Appendix B for a detailed discussion.

Let us find a lower bound for μ_r . From (39), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_r &= \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, \mathcal{D}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, \mathcal{D})) \\ &\geq -L \|\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^* - \mathbf{x}_{t_n}\|_2 \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{1} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

$$\geq -L\sqrt{d} \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{1} \quad (45)$$

$$\approx -L\sqrt{d} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_T^{(n)}(t_n, \mathcal{D})\right)^\top \left(\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_T^{(n)}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \quad (46)$$

$$= -L\sqrt{d} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_T^{(n)}(t_n, \mathcal{D})\right)^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{1}, \quad (47)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the conformable vector of all ones, (44) follows from the Lipschitz continuity of the objective (see Assumption 3.4), (45) follows from Assumption 3.1, (46) comes from the circulant approximation (23) when n is large enough and (47) is obtained from the spectral decomposition of $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_T^{(n)}$, with $\mathbf{Q} = (\phi_0, \dots, \phi_{n-1})$ the orthogonal matrix whose i -th column is the i -th eigenvector of $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_T^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1})$ the diagonal matrix of the corresponding eigenvalues. Please refer to (20) and (28) for closed-form expressions of these quantities.

Let us denote the product $\left(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_T^{(n)}(t_n, \mathcal{D})\right)^\top \mathbf{Q}$ by $\mathbf{v} = (v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$. Its j -th element v_j is therefore

$$v_j = \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \tilde{k}_T^{(n)}(t_n, t_l) \phi_{j,l} \quad (48)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \tilde{k}_T^{(n)}(t_n, t_l) e^{-\frac{2\pi i j l}{n}} \quad (49)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} k_T(c l) e^{-\frac{2\pi i j l}{n}} + \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} k_T(c(n-l)) e^{-\frac{2\pi i j l}{n}} \right) \quad (50)$$

$$= \frac{\lambda_j}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (51)$$

where (49) comes from the closed-form expression of the eigenvector ϕ_j given in (20), (50) holds when n is large enough using similar expressions as in (24)-(28), and (51) is due to the expression of λ_j given in (28). Therefore, the product $\left(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_T^{(n)}(t_n, \mathcal{D})\right)^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1}$ in (47) becomes $\mathbf{v} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} = \mathbf{1}^\top / \sqrt{n}$. We can now lower bound μ_r :

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_r &\geq -\frac{L\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1} \\ &= -\frac{L\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \phi_{j,l} \\ &= -\frac{L\sqrt{d}}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} e^{-\frac{2\pi i j l}{n}} \quad (52) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\frac{L\sqrt{d}}{n} \left(n + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{1 - e^{-2\pi i j}}{1 - e^{-\frac{2\pi i j}{n}}} \right) \\ &= -L\sqrt{d}. \quad (53) \end{aligned}$$

where (52) comes from the closed-form expression of the eigenvector ϕ_j given in (20) and (53) follows from $\exp(-2\pi i j) = 1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n-1$.

It remains to find a lower bound on σ_r (see (40)). Using similar proof techniques as above, we obtain the following expansion for the quadratic form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{k}_T(t_n, \mathcal{D}) &\approx \left(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_T^{(n)}(t_n, \mathcal{D})\right)^\top \left(\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_T^{(n)}\right)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_T^{(n)}(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \\ &= \left(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_T^{(n)}(t_n, \mathcal{D})\right)^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_T^{(n)}(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \\ &= \mathbf{v} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{v}^\top \quad (54) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{v_j^2}{\lambda_j} \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} S_T\left(\frac{j}{nc}\right) \frac{1}{nc} \quad (55) \end{aligned}$$

$$\approx 2 \int_0^{1/c} S_T(z) dz \quad (56)$$

where (54) uses the vector \mathbf{v} introduced in (48), (55) comes from the closed-form expressions for λ_j and v_j obtained in (28) and (51) respectively, and (56) holds when n is large enough using the quadrature rule $\int_0^{n\Delta x} f(x)dx \approx \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \Delta x f(j\Delta x)$ with $\Delta x = 1/nc$. Observe that (56) is the power spectral distribution of the objective function f evaluated at the frequency $1/c$, which is precisely the frequency at which the oracle samples f . We are now ready to lower bound σ_r . From (40) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_r^2 &= 2\lambda \left(1 + k_S (\|\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^* - \mathbf{x}_{t_n}\|_2)\right) \left(1 - \mathbf{k}_T^\top(t_n, \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{K}_T^{-1} \mathbf{k}_T(t_n, \mathcal{D})\right) \\ &\approx 2\lambda \left(1 + k_S (\|\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^* - \mathbf{x}_{t_n}\|_2)\right) \left(1 - 2 \int_0^{1/c} S_T(z) dz\right) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

$$\geq 2\lambda \left(1 + k_S (\sqrt{d})\right) \left(1 - 2 \int_0^{1/c} S_T(z) dz\right). \quad (58)$$

where (57) comes from (56) and (58) follows from Assumptions 3.1 and 3.3. This concludes our proof. \square

Combining Lemmas C.1, C.2 and C.3, we obtain Theorem 3.6.

D. Upper Regret Bound

In this appendix, we provide all the details required to prove Theorem 3.8. For the sake of completeness, we start by deriving the usual instantaneous regret bound provided in most regret proofs that involve GP-UCB (Srinivas et al., 2012; Bogunovic et al., 2016).

Lemma D.1. *Let $r_{t_n} = f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) - f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n)$ be the instantaneous regret at the n -th iteration of the TVBO algorithm \mathcal{A} , where $\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$, $\mathbf{x}_{t_n} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$ and where $\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}$ is GP-UCB computed on the dataset \mathcal{D} . Pick $\delta > 0$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$r_{t_n} \leq 2\beta_n^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n) + \frac{1}{n^2} \quad (59)$$

where $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n) = \sqrt{\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}, t_n)}$ is the posterior standard deviation (see (3)) and where

$$\beta_n = 2d \log(Ldn^2/6\delta) + 4 \log(\pi n). \quad (60)$$

Proof. For the sake of consistency with the literature, we will reuse, whenever appropriate, the notations in Bogunovic et al. (2016).

Let us set a discretization \mathcal{S}_n of the spatial domain $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [0, 1]^d$. \mathcal{S}_n is of size τ_n^d and satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{x} - [\mathbf{x}]_n\|_1 \leq \frac{d}{\tau_n}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (61)$$

where $[\mathbf{x}]_n = \arg \min_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}_n} \|\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{x}\|_2$ is the closest point in \mathcal{S}_n to \mathbf{x} . Note that a uniform grid on \mathcal{S} ensures (61).

Let us now fix $\delta > 0$ and condition on a high-probability event. If $\beta_n = 2 \log \frac{\tau_n^d \pi^2 n^2}{6\delta}$, then

$$|f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n)| \leq \beta_n^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_n \quad (62)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. This directly comes from $f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n), \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n))$ and from the Chernoff concentration inequality applied to Gaussian tails $\mathbb{P}(|f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n)| \leq \sqrt{\beta_n} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n)) \geq 1 - e^{-\beta_n/2}$. Therefore, our choice of β_n ensures that for a given n and a given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $|f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n)| \leq \beta_n^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$ occurs with a probability at least $1 - \frac{6\delta}{\pi^2 n^2 \tau_n^d}$. The union bound taken over $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_n$ establishes (62) with probability $1 - \delta$.

Recall that Assumption 3.4 ensures that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ and all $t_n \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) - f([\mathbf{x}]_n, t_n)| &\leq L \|\mathbf{x} - [\mathbf{x}]_n\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{Ld}{\tau_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, setting $\tau_n = Ldn^2$ yields that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ and all $t_n \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$|f(\mathbf{x}, t_n) - f([\mathbf{x}]_n, t_n)| \leq \frac{1}{n^2}. \quad (63)$$

Because $\tau_n = Ldn^2$, β_n becomes $2d \log(Ldn^2/6\delta) + 4 \log(\pi n)$. Using the triangle inequality and combining (62) with (63), we get that $\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}([\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*]_n, t_n)| &\leq |f([\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*]_n, t_n) - \mu_{\mathcal{D}}([\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*]_n, t_n)| + |f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) - f([\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*]_n, t_n)| \\ &\leq \beta_n^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}([\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*]_n, t_n) + \frac{1}{n^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

We can now upper bound the instantaneous regret of the TVBO algorithm \mathcal{A} :

$$\begin{aligned} r_{t_n} &= f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*, t_n) - f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n) \\ &\leq \mu_{\mathcal{D}}([\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*]_n, t_n) + \beta_t^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}([\mathbf{x}_{t_n}^*]_n, t_n) + \frac{1}{n^2} - f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n) \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

$$\leq \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n) + \beta_t^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n) + \frac{1}{n^2} - f(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n) \quad (66)$$

$$\leq 2\beta_t^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}_{t_n}, t_n) + \frac{1}{n^2}, \quad (67)$$

where (65) follows directly from (64), (66) from the definition of $\mathbf{x}_{t_n} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n) + \beta_t^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t_n)$ and (67) from (62). \square

Lemma D.1 shows that the posterior variance of the surrogate GP (3) plays a key role in the regret bound. At this stage, the vast majority of regret proofs seek to upper bound the mutual information, following an original idea from Srinivas et al. (2012). Let us take a different path, by focusing directly on an upper bound of $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2$. In particular, we will study the performance of TVBO algorithms that do not become prohibitive to use asymptotically with time, i.e., that set a maximal size for the dataset they maintain in memory.

Lemma D.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a TVBO algorithm with dataset \mathcal{D} , a fixed maximal dataset size n and a response time $R(n)$. Let $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2$ be the posterior variance of the GP surrogate. Then,*

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq \lambda \left(1 - \frac{1}{n(\lambda + \sigma_0^2)} \lambda k_S^2(\sqrt{d}) \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2 \right) \quad (68)$$

where λ is the signal variance (see Assumption 3.2), σ_0^2 is the observational noise and where

$$\mathbf{u}_n = (k_T(R(n)), k_T(2R(n)), \dots, k_T(nR(n))).$$

Proof. Let us start by recalling the definition of the posterior variance in (3):

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) &= k((\mathbf{x}, t), (\mathbf{x}, t)) - \mathbf{k}^T((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{\Delta}^{-1} \mathbf{k}((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}) \\ &= \lambda - \mathbf{k}^T((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{\Delta}^{-1} \mathbf{k}((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}). \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where (69) comes from Assumptions 3.2 and 3.3.

Finding an upper bound on $\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2$ boils down to finding a lower bound on the quadratic form $q_n = \mathbf{k}^T((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{\Delta}^{-1} \mathbf{k}((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D})$. Let us first consider the kernel vector $\mathbf{k}((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D})$. Because the dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1, y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_n, t_n, y_n)\}$ of \mathcal{A} has a fixed maximal dataset size n , for every iteration $m > 2n$:

$$\mathbf{k}^T((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}) = (\lambda k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_n\|_2) k_T(R(n)), \dots, \lambda k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_1\|_2) k_T(nR(n))). \quad (70)$$

The expression (70) is due to \mathcal{A} having a response time of $R(n)$ with a dataset size n . Therefore, during the first n iterations, \mathcal{A} fills its dataset and has a response time that goes from $R(1)$ to $R(n)$. Next, \mathcal{A} samples at a constant response time $R(n)$ and the first observations get progressively deleted. After n additional iterations, the kernel vector verifies (70).

Then, consider $\mathbf{\Delta} = \mathbf{k}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}) + \sigma_0^2 \mathbf{I}$. Because it is positive definite, its spectral decomposition $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ exists, where $\mathbf{Q} = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ is the orthogonal matrix whose columns are the eigenvectors of $\mathbf{\Delta}$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1 + \sigma_0^2, \dots, \lambda_n + \sigma_0^2)$ is the diagonal matrix comprising the associated eigenvalues.

The quadratic form q_n becomes

$$\begin{aligned} q_n &= \mathbf{k}^\top((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}) \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{k}((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D}) \\ &= \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{v} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{v_i^2}{\lambda_i} \\ &\geq \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n v_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i + \sigma_0^2} \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

$$= \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n v_i)^2}{n(\lambda + \sigma_0^2)} \tag{72}$$

where $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{k}((\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{D})$, where (71) is a direct application of Titu's lemma², and where (72) is due to $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{\Delta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda + \sigma_0^2) = n(\lambda + \sigma_0^2)$. We now focus on the sum on the numerator of (72):

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n v_i \right)^2 &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{n-j+1}\|_2) k_T(jR(n)) \phi_{ij} \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^n k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{n-j+1}\|_2) k_T(jR(n)) \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{ij} \right)^2 \\ &= \lambda^2 \sum_{j,l=1}^n k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{n-j+1}\|_2) k_T(jR(n)) k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{n-l+1}\|_2) k_T(lR(n)) \sum_{i,m=1}^n \phi_{ij} \phi_{ml} \\ &= \lambda^2 \sum_{j,l=1}^n k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{n-j+1}\|_2) k_T(jR(n)) k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{n-l+1}\|_2) k_T(lR(n)) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{ij} \phi_{il} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq i}}^n \phi_{ij} \phi_{ml}}_{\geq 0} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

$$\geq \lambda^2 \sum_{j,l=1}^n k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{n-j+1}\|_2) k_T(jR(n)) k_S(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{n-l+1}\|_2) k_T(lR(n)) \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{ij} \phi_{il}}_{\delta_{jl}} \tag{74}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \lambda^2 \sum_{j=1}^n k_S^2(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{n-j+1}\|_2) k_T^2(jR(n)) \\ &\geq \lambda^2 k_S^2(\sqrt{d}) \sum_{j=1}^n k_T^2(jR(n)) \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

$$= \lambda^2 k_S^2(\sqrt{d}) \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2 \tag{76}$$

where δ_{jl} is the Kronecker delta and (74) follows from the double sum in (73) being always non-negative up to a flipping (i.e., a scaling by -1) of either ϕ_j or ϕ_l and from the orthonormality of the eigenvectors. Finally, (75) follows from Assumptions 3.1 and 3.3. Combining (72) with (76) concludes the proof. \square

²For any real numbers a_1, \dots, a_n and any positive real numbers b_1, \dots, b_n , $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2/b_i \geq (\sum_{i=1}^n a_i)^2 / (\sum_{i=1}^n b_i)$.

We now use Lemmas D.1 and D.2 to prove Theorem 3.8.

Proof. At iteration T , consider the cumulative regret of a TVBO algorithm \mathcal{A} with a fixed maximal dataset size n :

$$\begin{aligned} R_T &= \sum_{i=1}^T r_{t_i} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^T 2\beta_i^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}_{t_i}, t_i) + \frac{1}{i^2} \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

$$= \frac{\pi^2}{6} + \sum_{i=1}^T 2\beta_i^{1/2} \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}_{t_i}, t_i) \quad (78)$$

$$\leq 2 + \sqrt{T \sum_{i=1}^T 4\beta_i \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}_{t_i}, t_i)} \quad (79)$$

$$\leq 2 + \sqrt{T \sum_{i=1}^T 4\beta_i \lambda \left(1 - \frac{1}{n(\lambda + \sigma_0^2)} \lambda k_S^2(\sqrt{d}) \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2\right)} \quad (80)$$

$$\leq 2 + \sqrt{4\lambda\beta_T T \left(T - \frac{T\lambda k_S^2(\sqrt{d})}{T(\lambda + \sigma_0^2)} \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2\right)} \quad (81)$$

$$= 2 + \sqrt{4\lambda\beta_T T \left(T - \frac{\lambda k_S^2(\sqrt{d})}{\lambda + \sigma_0^2} \|\mathbf{u}_n\|_2^2\right)},$$

where (77) uses Lemma D.1, (78) follows from Euler's solution to the Basel problem, (79) holds because for any vector \mathbf{v} of size T , $\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{T}\|\mathbf{v}\|_2$ and $\pi^2/6 \leq 2$, (80) is follows from Lemma D.2 and (81) holds when $T \geq n$ and because $\{\beta_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence (see (60)). \square

E. Recommended Stale Data Management Policy

In this appendix, we prove Theorem 3.10 by connecting the L^2 -distance between Lipschitz-continuous acquisition functions and the integrated 2-Wasserstein distance between GP posteriors.

Proof. Let us start by considering the effect of Assumption 3.9 on the distance at a single point $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$.

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \alpha_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t)| &\leq \|(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t), \sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \sigma_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t))\|_2 L_T \\ &= \sqrt{(\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t))^2 + (\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \sigma_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t))^2} L_T. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

We can now bound the squared L^2 distance between the two acquisition functions $\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\alpha_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}$ on any subset $\mathcal{S}' \times \mathcal{T}'$ of the spatio-temporal domain $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha_{\mathcal{D}} - \alpha_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}\|_2^2 &= \oint_{\mathcal{S}'} \int_{\mathcal{T}'} (\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \alpha_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t))^2 d\mathbf{x} dt \\ &\leq \oint_{\mathcal{S}'} \int_{\mathcal{T}'} L_T^2 \left((\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t))^2 + (\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \sigma_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t))^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} dt \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= L_T^2 \oint_{\mathcal{S}'} \int_{\mathcal{T}'} \left((\mu_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mu_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t))^2 + (\sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \sigma_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{x}, t))^2 \right) d\mathbf{x} dt \\ &= L_T^2 W_2^2(\mathcal{GP}_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{GP}_{\bar{\mathcal{D}}}), \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

where (83) is due to (82) and (84) comes from the definition of the integrated 2-Wasserstein distance on the domain $\mathcal{S}' \times \mathcal{T}'$. Applying a square-root on both sides yields the desired result. \square




Figure 6. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Schwefel synthetic function. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Schwefel synthetic function.




Figure 7. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Eggholder synthetic function. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Eggholder synthetic function.

F. Benchmarks

We provide here a detailed description of each implemented benchmark and the associated figures. There are two figures associated with each benchmark, showing their average regrets and the size of their datasets throughout the experiment.

In the following, the synthetic benchmarks will be described as functions of a point \mathbf{z} in the $d + 1$ -dimensional spatio-temporal domain $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$. More precisely, the point \mathbf{z} is explicitly given by $\mathbf{z} = (x_1, \dots, x_d, t)$. Also, we will write $d' = d + 1$ for the sake of brevity.

Schwefel. The Schwefel function is d' -dimensional, and has the form

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = 418.9829d' - \sum_{i=1}^{d'} z_i \sin(\sqrt{|z_i|}).$$

For the numerical evaluation, we set $d' = 4$ and we optimized the function on the domain $[-500, 500]^{d'}$. The results are provided in Figure 6.

Eggholder. The Eggholder function is 2-dimensional, and has the form

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = -(z_2 + 47) \sin\left(\sqrt{|z_2 + \frac{z_1}{2} + 47|}\right) - z_1 \sin\left(\sqrt{|z_1 - z_2 - 47|}\right).$$

For the numerical evaluation, we optimized the function on the domain $[-512, 512]^2$. The results are provided in Figure 7.




Figure 8. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Ackley synthetic function. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Ackley synthetic function.




Figure 9. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Shekel synthetic function. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Shekel synthetic function.

Ackley. The Ackley function is d' -dimensional, and has the form

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = -a \exp \left(-b \sqrt{\frac{1}{d'} \sum_{i=1}^{d'} z_i^2} \right) - \exp \left(\frac{1}{d'} \sum_{i=1}^{d'} \cos(cz_i) \right) + a + \exp(1).$$

For the numerical evaluation, we set $a = 20$, $b = 0.2$, $c = 2\pi$, $d' = 4$ and we optimized the function on the domain $[-32, 32]^{d'}$. The results are provided in Figure 8.

Shekel. The Shekel function is 4-dimensional, and has the form

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = - \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^4 (z_j - C_{ji})^2 + \beta_i \right)^{-1}.$$

For the numerical evaluation, we set $m = 10$, $\beta = \frac{1}{10} (1, 2, 2, 4, 4, 6, 3, 7, 5, 5)$,

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 1 & 8 & 6 & 3 & 2 & 5 & 8 & 6 & 7 \\ 4 & 1 & 8 & 6 & 7 & 9 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 3.6 \\ 4 & 1 & 8 & 6 & 3 & 2 & 5 & 8 & 6 & 7 \\ 4 & 1 & 8 & 6 & 7 & 9 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 3.6 \end{pmatrix},$$

and we optimized the function on the domain $[0, 10]^4$. The results are provided in Figure 9.




Figure 10. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Griewank synthetic function. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Griewank synthetic function.




Figure 11. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Hartmann-3 synthetic function. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Hartmann-3 synthetic function.

Griewank. The Griewank function is d' -dimensional, and has the form

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d'} \frac{x_i^2}{4000} - \prod_{i=1}^{d'} \cos\left(\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{i}}\right) + 1$$

For the numerical evaluation, we set $d' = 6$ and we optimized the function on the domain $[-600, 600]^{d'}$. The results are provided in Figure 10.

Hartmann-3. The Hartmann-3 function is 3-dimensional, and has the form

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = -\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^3 A_{ij}(z_j - P_{ij})^2\right).$$

For the numerical evaluation, we set $\alpha = (1.0, 1.2, 3.0, 3.2)$,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 10 & 30 \\ 0.1 & 10 & 35 \\ 3 & 10 & 30 \\ 0.1 & 10 & 35 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{P} = 10^{-4} \begin{pmatrix} 3689 & 1170 & 2673 \\ 4699 & 4387 & 7470 \\ 1091 & 8732 & 5547 \\ 381 & 5743 & 8828 \end{pmatrix},$$

and we optimized the function on the domain $[0, 1]^3$. The results are provided in Figure 11.




Figure 12. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Hartmann-6 synthetic function. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Hartmann-6 synthetic function.




Figure 13. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Powell synthetic function. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the optimization of the Powell synthetic function.

Hartmann-6. The Hartmann-6 function is 6-dimensional, and has the form

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = -\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^6 A_{ij}(z_j - P_{ij})^2\right).$$

For the numerical evaluation, we set $\alpha = (1.0, 1.2, 3.0, 3.2)$,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 10 & 3 & 17 & 3.50 & 1.7 & 8 \\ 0.05 & 10 & 17 & 0.1 & 8 & 14 \\ 3 & 3.5 & 1.7 & 10 & 17 & 8 \\ 17 & 8 & 0.05 & 10 & 0.1 & 14 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{P} = 10^{-4} \begin{pmatrix} 1312 & 1696 & 5569 & 124 & 8283 & 5886 \\ 2329 & 4135 & 8307 & 3736 & 1004 & 9991 \\ 2348 & 1451 & 3522 & 2883 & 3047 & 6650 \\ 4047 & 8828 & 8732 & 5743 & 1091 & 381 \end{pmatrix},$$

and we optimized the function on the domain $[0, 1]^6$. The results are provided in Figure 12.

Powell. The Powell function is d' -dimensional, and has the form

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d'/4} (z_{4i-3} + 10z_{4i-2})^2 + 5(z_{4i-1} - z_{4i})^2 + (z_{4i-2} - 2z_{4i-1})^4 + 10(z_{4i-3} - z_{4i})^4.$$

For the numerical evaluation, we set $d' = 4$ and we optimized the function on the domain $[-4, 5]^{d'}$. The results are provided in Figure 13.




Figure 14. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the Temperature real-world experiment. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the Temperature real-world experiment.




Figure 15. (Left) Average response time and average regrets of the TVBO solutions during the WLAN real-world experiment. (Right) Dataset sizes of the TVBO solutions during the WLAN real-world experiment.

Temperature. This benchmark comes from the temperature dataset collected from 46 sensors deployed at Intel Research Berkeley. It is a famous benchmark, used in other works such as (Bogunovic et al., 2016; Brunzema et al., 2022). The goal of the TVBO task is to activate the sensor with the highest temperature, which will vary with time. To make the benchmark more interesting, we interpolate the data in space-time. With this interpolation, the algorithms can activate any point in space-time, making it a 3-dimensional benchmark (2 spatial dimensions for a location in Intel Research Berkeley, 1 temporal dimension).

For the numerical evaluation, we used the first day of data. The results are provided in Figure 14.

WLAN. This benchmark aims at maximizing the throughput of a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN). 27 moving end-users are associated with one of 6 fixed nodes and continuously stream a large amount of data. As they move in space, they change the radio environment of the network, which should adapt accordingly to improve its performance. To do so, each node has a power level that can be tuned for the purpose of reaching the best trade-off between serving all its users and not causing interference for the neighboring nodes.

The performance of the network is computed as the sum of the Shannon capacities for each pair of node and associated end-users. The Shannon capacity (Kempnerman, 1974) sets a theoretical upper bound on the throughput of a wireless communication. We denote it $C(i, j)$, we express it in bits per second (bps). It depends on S_{ij} the Signal-to-Interference plus Noise Ratio (SINR) of the communication between node i and end-user j , as well as on W , the bandwidth of the radio channel (in Hz):

$$C_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, t) = W \log_2(1 + S_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, t)).$$

Then, the objective function is

$$f(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{i=1}^6 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} C_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, t),$$

with \mathcal{N}_i the end-users associated with node i .

For the numerical evaluation, we optimized the power levels \mathbf{x} in the domain $[10^{0.1}, 10^{2.5}]^6$. For this experiment, the TVBO solutions were evaluated with a Matérn-5/2 for the spatial covariance function and a Matérn-1/2 for the temporal covariance function. The results are provided in Figure 15.