

Multiple Change Point Analysis: Fast Implementation And Strong Consistency

Jie Ding, Yu Xiang, Lu Shen, Vahid Tarokh

Harvard University

Email: jieding@fas.harvard.edu

January 1, 2024

Abstract

Change point analysis is about identifying structural changes for stochastic processes. One of the main challenges is to carry out analysis for time series with dependency structure in a computationally tractable way. Another challenge is that the number of true change points is usually unknown. It therefore is crucial to apply a suitable model selection criterion to achieve informative conclusions. To address the first challenge, we model the data generating process as a segment-wise autoregression, which is composed of several segments (time epochs), each of which modeled by an autoregressive model. We propose a multi-window method that is both effective and efficient for discovering the structure changes. The proposed approach was motivated by transforming a segment-wise autoregression into a multivariate time series that is asymptotically segment-wise independent and identically distributed. To address the second challenge, we further derive theoretical guarantees for almost surely selecting the true number of change points of segment-wise independent multivariate time series. Specifically, under mild assumptions we show that a Bayesian information criterion (BIC)-like criterion gives a strongly consistent selection of the optimal number of change points, while an Akaike information criterion (AIC)-like criterion cannot. Finally, we demonstrate the theory and strength of the proposed algorithms by experiments on both synthetic and real-world data, including the eastern US temperature data and the El Nino data from 1854 to 2015. The experiment leads to some interesting discoveries about temporal variability of the summer-time temperature over the eastern US, and about the most dominant factor of ocean influence on climate.

Keywords: Autoregression; Information criteria; Strong Consistency; Stochastic Process

1. INTRODUCTION

Sequentially obtained data usually exhibits occasional changes in their structure, for example the changes in the stock market due to the financial crisis, or the variations of an EEG signal caused by the mode change in the brain. Change detection analysis tries to identify not only whether a time series is a concatenation of several segments, in which neighboring ones are generated from different probability distributions, but also how many change points there are. There has been a vast amount of work in the field of change point analysis. In the parametric settings, the likelihood function naturally plays a key role, for example in the cumulative sum (Basseville and Nikiforov 1993; Page 1954) and the generalized likelihood ratio (Gustafsson 1996) approaches. Various tests have been developed for tracking changes in time series statistics such as the mean (Vogelsang 1998), the variance (Incln and Tiao 1994; Gombay and Huskova 1996), the autocovariance function (Berkes and Horváth 2009), and the spectrum (Picard 1985). Nonparametric approaches usually rely on kernel density estimation. An active line of research is to perform change detection via estimating the ratio of probability densities directly instead of estimating two densities first (Fishman 1996; Huang and Scholkopf 2007; Sugiyama and Kawanabe 2008). As to the practical implementation of the aforementioned optimization problem, bisection procedure and its extensions (Vostrikova 1981; Scott and Knott 1974; Hawkins 2001; Lavielle and Teyssi re 2006) seem to be the main research focus. Exact search methods such as segment neighborhood (Auger and Lawrence 1989), optimal partitioning (Yao 1984; Jackson, Scargle, Barnes, Arabhi, Alt, Gioumou sis, Gwin, Sangtrakulcharoen, Tan and Tsai 2005) have also been widely used. More detailed references to the literature can be found in remarkable monographs and papers such as (Basseville and Nikiforov 1993; Brodsky and Darkhovsky 1993; Perron 2006). In terms of model selection, in the parametric scenario the two commonly used information criteria are Akaike information criterion (Akaike 1969) and the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) (Schwarz 1978). To the best of our knowledge, though the consistency of BIC in selecting the number of change points for certain change detection models and algorithms have been studied in, e.g., (Yao 1988; Venkatraman 1992), theory of strong consistency for penalized method has not been well studied.

A typical offline multiple change point analysis aims to solve the following problem. Given observations $y_1, \dots, y_N \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$, the goal is to find integers $0 < n_1 < \dots < n_M < N$ that minimize

$$e_M = \sum_{k=1}^{M+1} \mathcal{L}(y_{n_{k-1}+1}, \dots, y_{n_k}), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ is some loss function and by default $n_0 = 0, n_{M+1} = N$. The unknown number of change points M is usually selected using penalized approach. In this work, we address two aspects involved in detecting structural changes in time series:

1) In Section 2, we consider the formulation of change point analysis for a general stochastic process. The basic idea is to assume that the time series data consists of several segments each of which is generated from a finite order autoregressive process. For such dependent data, the loss function of each segment may be naturally defined as twice the negative log-likelihood of that segment of data fit to an autoregression. Any change detection algorithm, e.g. binary segmentation, can be further applied based on that loss function. However, the loss function depends on a particular parametric assumption of the autoregression noises, and it does not always guarantee efficient algorithm to solving (1). In fact, even if the noises are assumed to be Gaussian, the loss function can lead to massive computations, as we will discuss later. To obtain the change points in a robust and computationally efficient manner, we propose an alternative approach which casts the change detection problem for the original time series $\{y_n\}$ into that for segment-wise (asymptotically) independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) multivariate data $\{x_n\}$. We can discover the change points of independent data more easily, and then use the results to infer the change points of the original time series.

2) In Section 3, we show that change points for a segment-wise independent data $\{x_n\}$ can be discovered by minimizing (1) with a simple quadratic loss $\mathcal{L}_q(x_{n_{j-1}+1}, \dots, x_{n_j}) = \sum_{n=n_{j-1}+1}^{n_j} |x_n - \bar{x}|^2$, where \bar{x} is the sample mean of $x_{n_{j-1}+1}, \dots, x_{n_j}$, and $|\cdot|$ denotes the usual ℓ_2 norm of a vector. One reason of using quadratic loss is that it enables efficient k -means type fast implementations. We further show that the number of change points can be correctly chosen via the quadratic loss function and an appropriately designed penalized method. We provide necessary and sufficient conditions under which the unknown true number of change points can be selected for sufficiently

large sample size almost surely. It is worth mentioning that the quadratic loss can be regarded as twice the negative log likelihood of i.i.d. Gaussian random variable with unknown mean and unit variance. But as we shall see, the loss function in its nonparametric form is applicable to wider classes of change point models.

At the end of the paper, we present experimental results to demonstrate the theoretical results and the advantages of the proposed method on both synthetic and real-world datasets. In the study of real-world environmental data, we have used the eastern US summer-time temperature data from 1895 to 2015 and the El Nino data from 1854 to 2015. The experiment leads to some interesting discoveries about temporal variability of the summer-time temperature over the eastern US, and about the most dominant factor of ocean influence on climate. These discoveries are consistent with those have been observed in the field of environmental sciences.

1.1 Notation

Let $D \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ be constant integers. In this paper, change point analysis is based on the following model assumption. A sequence of D -dimensional random variable $\{Y_n : n = 1, \dots, N\}$ consists of $M_0 + 1$ segments, and each pair of neighboring segments have different data generating process. Suppose the segments are $\{Y_n : n = N_{0:k-1} + 1, \dots, N_{0:k}\}, k = 1, \dots, M_0 + 1$, where $N_{0:1} < \dots < N_{0:M_0}$ are referred to as the M_0 change points and by default $N_{0:0} = 0, N_{0:M_0+1} = N$. Let $N_k = N_{0:k} - N_{0:k-1}, k = 1, \dots, M_0 + 1$ denote the size (length) of the k th segment. Clearly, $\sum_{k=1}^{M_0+1} N_k = N$. Throughout the paper, we use \hat{M} to denote the selected number of change points from certain algorithmic procedure unless otherwise stated. Similarly, we represent the detected change points by $\hat{N}_{0:k}, k = 0, \dots, \hat{M} + 1$ and segment sizes by $\hat{N}_k, k = 1, \dots, \hat{M} + 1$.

Let $tr(\cdot)$, \log , \limsup , *a.s.*, *i.o.* respectively denote the trace of a square matrix, natural logarithm, limit superior, almost surely, and infinitely often. We write $\mathcal{G} \sim [\mu, V]$ if distribution \mathcal{G} has mean μ and variance V . We say “ $h(N)$ tends to infinity as N tends to infinity” if $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} 1/h(N) = 0$. We write $h(N) = \Theta(g(N))$ if $c < h(N)/g(N) < 1/c$ for some constant $c \neq 0$ for all sufficiently large N . We write $h(N) = o(g(N))$ if $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} h(N)/g(N) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{N}(\mu, V)$ denote the normal distribution with mean μ variance matrix V . Let C denote a generic constant, and $o_p(1)$ denote any random variable that converges in probability to zero. Throughout the paper, random variables and observed data are respectively represented by capital letters (e.g. X_n) and

small letters (e.g. x_n).

2. CHANGE DETECTION FOR TIME SERIES WITH DEPENDENCY STRUCTURE

In this section, we start by considering a sequence of one-dimensional dependent data. As we shall see, the technical treatment can be easily extended to D -dimensional data. We assume that the data is generated from a segment-wise autoregression:

Assumption 1 *A one-dimensional sequence $\{Y_n : n = 1, \dots, N\}$ consists of $M_0 + 1$ segments, each of which can be described by $Y_n = \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n^T \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)} + \varepsilon_n^{(k)}$, $n = N_{0:k-1} + 1, \dots, N_{0:k}$, $k = 1, \dots, M_0 + 1$, where $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_n = [1, Y_{n-1}, \dots, Y_{n-L}]^T$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)} = [\psi_0^{(k)}, \psi_1^{(k)}, \dots, \psi_L^{(k)}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{L+1}$ (referred to as AR filter), Y_{1-L}, \dots, Y_0 denote known initial values, and $\varepsilon_n^{(k)}$ are i.i.d. random noises within each segment. In addition, $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)} \neq \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k+1)}$, $k = 1, \dots, M_0$.*

It is worth mentioning that even though the change detection model seems to be semi-parametric, as no assumption on how each AR switches to another one was made, the change point analysis can serve as an exploratory study for more parametric settings. For example, the detected change points can be used to set up better initial values of Expectation-Maximization algorithm for complex parametric mixture models such as point process regression models (Sheikhattar, Fritz, Shamma and Babadi 2015) and multi-state autoregressive models (Ding, Noshad and Tarokh 2015b).

An autoregression of order L is also denoted by $\text{AR}(L)$. In the rest part of the paper, we assume that the order L is known as prior knowledge or from exploratory studies. It is natural to define the loss function based on

$$\mathcal{L}_{ar}(y_{n_{j-1}+1}, \dots, y_{n_j}) = \sum_{n=n_{j-1}+1}^{n_j} (y_n - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_n^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}})^2$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ is estimated from $y_{n_{j-1}+1}, \dots, y_{n_j}$ by Yule-Walker equation or least squares method. The above loss is interpreted as the cumulated prediction errors, or rescaled negative log likelihood. The quadratic loss can be regarded as the special case when $L = 0$. Admittedly, we could find change points by solving problem (1) via any existing algorithm such as binary segmentation (Scott and Knott 1974). But an alternative idea is to turn the change detection for segment-wise autoregressive model into that for segment-wise Gaussian independent model.

We explain the motivations below. Consider a sequence of N points that are generated from a single $\text{AR}(L)$, i.e. $Y_n = \boldsymbol{\psi}^\top \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_n + \varepsilon_n$, where $\boldsymbol{\psi} = [\psi_0, \dots, \psi_L]^\top$, $\varepsilon_n \sim [0, \sigma^2]$. Suppose that $\{Y_n : n = 1, \dots, N\}$ is divided into N/w segments of size w , where $w > 2L$ and N/w is assumed to be an integer for brevity. If each segment of data is used to estimate an $\text{AR}(L)$ filter, we obtain N/w estimates of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$, respectively denoted by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^{(N/w)}$. It is well known that if $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^{(i)}$ is estimated by either least squares or Yule Walker methods, $\sqrt{w}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\psi})$ converges in distribution to $\mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma)$ where Γ is a constant matrix depending only on $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ (Box, Jenkins and Reinsel 2008, Appendix 7.5). Thus, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^{(i)}$ can be approximated by Gaussian random variables with mean $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ and variance Γ/w . The asymptotic independence of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, N/w$ is guaranteed by the following theorem.

Assumption 2 *The noises $\varepsilon^{(k)}$ in each segment k satisfies $E[\max\{(\log |\varepsilon^{(k)}|), 0\}] < \infty$ and that the distribution of $\varepsilon^{(k)}$ has a nontrivial absolutely continuous component.*

For example, Gaussian distribution satisfies the above assumption.

Theorem 1 *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds and $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_N\}$ follows an autoregression with filter $\boldsymbol{\psi}$. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_1 \in \mathcal{R}^L$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_2 \in \mathcal{R}^L$ respectively denote the estimated filters from $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_{N_1}\}$ and $\{Y_{N_1+1}, \dots, Y_N\}$ by least square methods, where N_1 and $N_2 = N - N_1$ tend to infinity as N tends to infinity. Then $\sqrt{N_1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\psi})$ and $\sqrt{N_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_2 - \boldsymbol{\psi})$ converge to two Gaussian random variables that are independent.*

Theorem 1 implies that if a data from the same autoregression is split into two (or more) parts each of which gives an estimate of the true filter, then the estimators are asymptotically independent (up to a rescaling). Its proof is given in the appendix.

Now suppose that the stochastic process consists of two parts: the first N_1 points are generated from one $\text{AR}(L)$ and the rest N_2 are from another $\text{AR}(L)$. If a window size w that satisfies $2L < w < \min\{N_1, N_2\}$ is chosen, the estimated AR filters become independent points containing a change point around the (N_1/w) th point. Here we have assumed that $N_1/w, N_2/w$ are integers for brevity. We propose a multi-window (MW) change detection algorithm that chooses different w 's and collect the information of the detected change points for each w in a proper way, in order to obtain a more accurate estimation of the change points of the stochastic process. From

Algorithm 1 change detection by multi-window method

input $\{y_n \in \mathbb{R}, n = 1, \dots, N\}$, $M_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$, $w_1 > \dots > w_R$ (window sizes), $\tau \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ (tolerance)

output $\hat{cp} = \{\hat{I}_1, \dots, \hat{I}_{\hat{M}}\}$ (ranges containing change points)

1: $s_n^{(0)} = 0, n = 1, \dots, N$ (initialized score)

2: **for** $r = 1 \rightarrow R$ **do**

3: let $N_r = N/w_r$. Estimate $\hat{\psi}_{n_r}$ from $\{Y_n : n = (n_r - 1)w_r + 1, \dots, n_rw_r\}$, $n_r = 1, \dots, N_r$.

4: implement the generic Algo. 2 with input $\hat{\psi}_{n_r} : n_r = 1, \dots, N_r$, M_{\max} , and obtain output $\hat{n}_1, \dots, \hat{n}_M$

5: define $s_n^{(r)} = s_n^{(r-1)} + \mathbf{1}_{n \in I_r}$, where $\mathbf{1}_{n \in I_r}$ equals one if $n \in I_r$ and zero otherwise, and $I_r = \bigcup_{k=1}^M \{\hat{n}_k - 1\} * w_r + 1, \dots, (\hat{n}_k + 1) * w_r\} \cap \{1, \dots, N - 1\}$

6: **end for**

7: Select the “peak ranges” $\hat{cp} = \{\hat{I}_1, \dots, \hat{I}_{\hat{M}}\}$ ($\hat{M} \leq M_{\max}$) with score at least $S - \tau$ where $S = \max_{n=1, \dots, N} \{s_n^{(r)}\}$ is the highest score

a computational point of view, starting from a large w also helps to reduce the cost, which is especially helpful in cases where massive time series data is involved.

A pseudo-code for MW method is included in Algo. 1. We will also provide illustrating experiments in the next section. The algorithm uses a sequence of R window sizes $w_1 > \dots > w_R$ in order to capture any true segment of small size. For each w_r , the original data is turned into a sequence of $L + 1$ dimensional data that can be approximated as independent. Applying the subroutine which is introduced in the next subsection, we obtain a set of change points; by further mapping them back to the original scale $\{1, \dots, N\}$ we obtain several short ranges (each with size w_r) that “probably” contains the desired change points. We repeat the above procedure for different w_r , and combine the information in the following way: the detected ranges of change points from each window size are scored by one, the scores are aggregated, and the ranges with highest score or around the highest score (determined by the tolerance parameter τ) are finally selected. The output of the algorithm is \hat{M} number of “peak” ranges that are most likely to contain the true change points. Some detailed discussions on the input of Algo. 1 is given below.

Window sizes: Intuitively speaking, more reliable change detection results can be obtained by using multiple windows instead of only one. This is because in practice we do not know what are the true segment sizes, so an inappropriately chosen w_r may be too large so that a true segment is “missed”. On the other hand, a small w_r leads to larger variance of AR filter estimates. A properly

designed MW method strikes a tradeoff between estimation accuracy (since larger window reduces variance of the estimated AR filters) and the resolution of the detected change points (since smaller window produces narrower ranges).

Subroutine: The subroutine detects the number and location of change points based on minimizing within-segment quadratic loss. The pseudocode and model selection criterion is outlined in Algo. 2 in the next section (with $D = L + 1$), followed by theoretical analysis.

Tolerance parameter: The main purpose of introducing the tolerance parameter τ in step 8 of Algo. 1 is to ensure that the scoring produces fair comparisons among different ranges. Otherwise, small segments may have been “missed” by some initial large window sizes. For example, suppose that $\tau = 0$, $w_1 = 200$ and there is only one true change point at $N_1 = 50$ out of $N = 1000$ data points. Then it is difficult to discover a change point from $N/w_1 = 5$ estimated filters.

Peak ranges: The code at Step 7 selects the narrow ranges with score at least $S - \tau$, which are most likely to contain change points. It requires an additional pruning stage in order to ensure $\hat{M} \leq M_{\max}$. This can be done by neglecting scores produced by the smallest window sizes, which are less reliable as the estimated AR filters from those windows have larger variances. We use the following procedure to determine the final output of Algo. 1.

for $r = R \rightarrow 1$ **do**

Let $cp = \{I_i = [n_{i1}, \dots, n_{i2}] : s_{n_{i1}}^{(r)} = \dots = s_{n_{i2}}^{(r)} \geq S - \tau, \text{ and there exists } n \text{ between } I_i \text{ and } I_j (\forall j \neq i) \text{ such that } s_n^{(r)} < S - \tau\}$. (The purpose of the last requirement is to obtain “peak” ranges as narrow as possible.)

if number of pieces of cp is no more than M_{\max} **then**

let $\hat{cp} = cp$; break the for loop

end if

end for

It is worth mentioning that the output of MW method is a set of \hat{M} narrow ranges instead of single points. In the cases where \hat{M} exact change points are desired, a practitioner could use the results from Algo. 1 as starting point to further search optimal points within those ranges. In that sense, MW method can serve as a fast prescreening approach. In addition, the multiple windows can be implemented in parallel for massive time series, and it can be applied to independent data

as well.

3. STRONG CONSISTENCY OF PENALIZED METHODS

In this section, we first elaborate on the subroutine used in Algo. 1. The subroutine discovers change points by minimizing the within-segment sum of quadratic loss \hat{e}_k . We will show that when applied to a segment-wise independent data, Algo. 2 is able to output the estimated number of change points \hat{M} that converges almost surely to the truth M_0 .

The program computes \hat{e}_k for each candidate number of change points $k = \{0, \dots, M\}$, where M is determined by the largest candidate number of segments M_{\max} and minimal segment length $\beta(N)$. After that, the optimal number of change points is selected according to a penalized method. Below we elaborate on some input parameters and concepts involved in Algo. 2.

Parameter $\beta(N)$: It is introduced for two purposes: for the technical convenience in deriving asymptotic results, and for faster implementation in practice. Loosely speaking, it should diverge to infinity as N tends to infinity at an appropriate rate. The requirement of $\beta(N)$ depends on what theoretical result is to be achieved, as we shall discuss later.

Penalty function: The common choice of penalty function is a linear function in the form of $kf(N)$, where $f(N)$ is referred to as the penalty term. For brevity we consider the linear function in this paper, but the results can be applied to more general penalty functions. Two commonly used types of penalty terms are related to AIC and BIC. In a parametric change detection problem, if there are k change points and p parameters in each segment, the total number of parameters to appear in AIC and BIC is $k + p(k + 1)$. If the quadratic loss is treated as twice the negative log likelihood of a Gaussian model with variance an identity matrix, the total number of parameters is $k + D(k + 1) = k(D + 1) + \text{constant}$. The penalty terms $f(N) \propto 1$ and $f(N) \propto \log N$ are referred to as the variants of AIC and BIC, respectively.

Strongly consistency: A penalized model selection approach is referred to be strongly consistent if \hat{M} converges almost surely to M_0 . We also say that \hat{M} is strongly consistent. In other words, the true number of change points is selected for sufficiently large N almost surely.

We make the following assumption about a segment-wise independent time series.

Assumption 3 *A sequence of D -dimensional random variable $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, N\}$ are indepen-*

Algorithm 2 (generic) change detection by minimizing the sum of within-segment quadratic loss

input $\{x_n \in \mathbb{R}^D, n = 1, \dots, N\}$, $M = M_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ (the largest candidate number of change points), $f(N)$ (the penalty term), $\beta(N)$ the minimal segment size

output $\hat{M}, \hat{n}_1, \dots, \hat{n}_{\hat{M}}$ (discovered change points).

1: **for** $k = 0 \rightarrow M_{\max}$ **do**

2: define $n_0 = 0, n_{k+1} = N$; minimize over $n_j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$e_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{L}_q(x_{n_{j-1}+1}, \dots, x_{n_j}) \quad (2)$$

and record the optimum $\hat{n}_j : j = 1, \dots, k, \hat{e}_k$

3: **if** the size of the smallest segment is less than $\beta(N)$ **then**

4: let $M = k - 1$; break the for loop

5: **end if**

6: **end for**

7: Choose $\hat{M} = \arg \min_{k=0, \dots, M} (\hat{e}_k + kf(N))$, and $\{\hat{n}_j\}$ to be the solution to (35) under $k = \hat{M}$.

dent. For each $k = 1, \dots, M_0 + 1$, N_k tends to infinity as N tends to infinity (thus a function of N), and $\{X_n : n = N_{0:k-1} + 1, \dots, N_{0:k}\}$ are distributed according to $\mathcal{G}_k \sim [\mu_k, V_k]$. In the case of $M_0 \geq 1$, two neighboring means are not equal, i.e. $\mu_k \neq \mu_{k+1}$, $k = 1, \dots, M_0$.

3.1 Necessary conditions for strongly consistent model selection

We start by examining the case that the true data generating process has no change point.

Theorem 2 Suppose that $M_0 = 0$ and Assumption 3 holds. Then the smallest penalty term $f(N)$ that guarantees strong consistency of \hat{M} produced from Algo. 2 is at least $\Theta(\log \log N)$. If we additionally assume $\beta(N) = \Theta(N)$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ that $f(N) = C \log \log N$ suffices to guarantee strong consistency of \hat{M} .

Next, we consider $f(N) = \Theta(\log \log N)$ for the case where $M_0 > 0$. We define

$$\bar{\Delta}_\mu = \max_{k=1, \dots, M_0} \{|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|\}, \underline{\Delta}_\mu = \min_{k=1, \dots, M_0} \{|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|\} \quad (3)$$

Assumption 4 The largest candidate number of change points M_{\max} is finite and $M_{\max} \geq M_0 + 2$.

The requirement $M_{\max} \geq M_0 + 2$ instead of $M_{\max} \geq M_0$ is for technical convenience in the proof of Theorem 3.

Assumption 5 *The true segment sizes satisfy $\beta(N) \leq N_k/4$, $N_k = \Theta(N)$ for $k = 1, \dots, M_0 + 1$. In addition, $f(N) = o(N)$.*

Theorem 3 *Suppose that Assumptions 3-5 hold and $\beta(N) = \Theta(N)$. Then exists a positive constant C_0 such that under $f(N) \geq C_0 \log \log N$, the selected number \hat{M} satisfies $M_0 \leq \hat{M} \leq 2M_0 - 1$ for sufficiently large N , a.s., namely*

$$\Pr \left\{ \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\hat{M} < M_0) \cup (\hat{M} > 2M_0 - 1) \right\} = 0.$$

Besides this, the distances between the selected change points and true ones satisfy

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \min_{k=1, \dots, \hat{M}} |\hat{N}_{0:k} - N_{0:j}| / \beta(N) \leq 1 \quad a.s. \quad (4)$$

for each $j = 1, \dots, M_0$.

Remark 1 *As a follow-up of Theorem 2, under mild assumptions Theorem 3 shows that $f(N) = \Theta(\log \log N)$ suffices to guarantee no underfitting. Though we cannot prove it avoids overfitting as well, we show that it will not overfit too much (since $\hat{M} \leq 2M_0 - 1$ holds almost surely). In addition, Inequality (4) implies that each true change point is “almost” captured, since its nearest discovered change point is within distance $\beta(N)$, which can be set to arbitrarily small compared with N or each N_j . In the next subsection, we relax the assumption on $\beta(N)$ and obtain strongly consistent \hat{M} by increasing the penalty to a BIC-like one.*

3.2 Sufficient conditions for strongly consistent model selection

In this subsection, we provide sufficient conditions that guarantee strong consistency of the penalized method for model selection. For technical convenience, we narrow our scope to sub-Gaussian random variables. A real-valued random variable X is said to be sub-Gaussian if it has the property that there exists a constant $b > 0$ such that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, one has $E(e^{t\{X - E(X)\}}) \leq e^{b^2 t^2 / 2}$. It is easy to prove using Markov inequality that there is some $c_0 > 0$ such that for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Pr(|\bar{X} - E(X)| \geq a) \leq 2e^{-c_0 a^2 N} \quad (5)$$

where \bar{X} is the mean of i.i.d. random variables $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, N\}$. Assuming that X_n follows a sub-Gaussian distribution, it is possible to prove results stronger than Theorem 3.

Assumption 6 $\mathcal{G}_k, k = 1, \dots, M_0 + 1$ are marginally sub-Gaussian. In other words, there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that (5) holds for each marginal distribution of \mathcal{G}_k .

Examples are Gaussian and bounded random variables.

Theorem 4 Suppose that

$$f(N) \geq 36\bar{\Delta}_\mu^2 m^*(N), \quad (6)$$

where

$$m^*(N) = \frac{160Dc^{M_0-1}}{c_0\bar{\Delta}_\mu^2} \log N, \quad c = 4/(\sqrt{2} - 1)^2,$$

and that Assumptions 3-6 hold. Then \hat{M} is strongly consistent. In addition, the distance between each true change point with its nearest detected change point is less than $m^*(N)$ for sufficiently large N almost surely. In other words, for each $k = 1, \dots, M_0$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \hat{M} = M_0, \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\hat{N}_{0:k} - N_{0:k}|}{m^*(N)} \leq 1, \quad a.s.$$

Remark 2 From the conditions of Theorem 4, both the minimal distance and the minimal penalty required for strong consistency are no more than $\Theta(\log N)$. The constant term for $f(N)$ is proportional to the dimension D and the ratio $\bar{\Delta}_\mu^2/\underline{\Delta}_\mu^2$. Intuitively, higher dimension and larger variance require stronger penalties. Besides this, it is interesting to observe that $f(N)$ depends on the ratio $\bar{\Delta}_\mu^2/\underline{\Delta}_\mu^2$ which is scale invariant, while $m^*(N)$ only depends on the smallest distance between two neighboring distributions (in terms of the means).

3.3 The Implementation of Algorithm 2

The algorithm we are going to introduce in the next section relies on the implementation of Algo. 2. Thus, we briefly mention the implementation issue of Algo. 2. Admittedly, it can be implemented using popular methods such as binary segmentation (Scott and Knott 1974), segment neighborhood (Auger and Lawrence 1989), and optimal partitioning (Yao 1984; Jackson et al. 2005). But since our loss function is quadratic, it is possible to have an algorithm that takes full advantage of that

fact. We propose such a computationally efficient algorithm, which is similar but different with the usual k-means algorithm in that each segment (cluster) contains points with consecutive indices. It can be regarded as an “ordered k-means” algorithm. The algorithm reduces the within-segment quadratic loss in each step by moving the change points based on the following observation.

Lemma 1 *Suppose that $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, N_1\}$ and $\{X_n : n = N_1 + 1, \dots, N_1 + N_2\}$ are two segments. Consider the operation that shifts the change point from N_1 to $N_1 - t$ where $0 < t < N_1$: the two segments become $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, N_1 - t\}$ and $\{X_n : n = N_1 - t + 1, \dots, N_1 + N_2\}$. The within-segment quadratic loss will be reduced after the operation if and only if*

$$\frac{N_1 |\bar{X}_{0, N_1} - \bar{X}_{N_1-t, N_1}|^2}{N_1 - t} > \frac{N_2 |\bar{X}_{N_1, N_1+N_2} - \bar{X}_{N_1-t, N_1}|^2}{N_2 + t},$$

where \bar{X}_{n_1, n_2} denotes the sample mean of $\{X_n : n = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2\}$.

From the above lemma, to decide whether a subsequence of data should be moved from one segment to its neighboring one, it only suffices to compute its mean and the means of the original two segments. On the other hand, by iteratively applying operations in the above lemma, a local optimum of step 2 in Algo. 2 could be achieved.

4. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we present experimental results to demonstrate the theoretical results and the advantages of MW method on both synthetic and real-world datasets. The algorithms are implemented in Matlab, run on a PC with 3.1 GHz dual-core CPU. The codes and related data will be made public online in the future. In the experiments, we rescale the penalty term $kf(N)$ in Algo. 2 to $\text{var}(X)kf(N)$. Though it does not affect theoretical results, it is convenient in practice to tune the function $f(N)$.

4.1 The independent data

In a synthetic data experiment, we generated data of two change points: $X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma^2)$, $n = 1, \dots, 0.2N$, $X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \sigma^2)$, $n = 0.2N + 1, \dots, 0.8N$, $X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_3, \sigma^2)$, $n = 0.8N + 1, \dots, N$. Let $[\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \sigma^2] = [-1, 0, 1, 1]$, $M_{\max} = 10$, $f(N) = 2 \log N$, $\beta(N) = \log \log N$. For illustration purpose, an example dataset with $N = 100$ is plotted in Fig. 1(a). For each $N = 100, 500, 1000$,




Figure 1: (a) an example sequence of independent data that contains two change points, and (b) the frequencies of discovered change points for each $N = 100, 300, 1000$

we generate 100 independent datasets and summarize the detected change points (normalized by N) in Fig. 1(b). We also summarized the frequencies of $\hat{M} < 2$, $\hat{M} = 2$, and $\hat{M} > 2$, respectively denoted by $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$. They are $f = (38, 60, 2)$ for $N = 100$, $f = (0, 89, 11)$ for $N = 300$, and $f = (0, 95, 5)$ for $N = 1000$. The results show that both the discovered number and locations of change points become more and more accurate as the sample size grows.

4.2 The dependent data

In a synthetic data experiment for dependent data, we generated data of two change points at $0.1N$ and $0.3N$. Data is generated from a zero mean autoregression in each of the three segments, and the associated AR filters are respectively $[\psi_1^{(1)}, \psi_2^{(1)}] = [0.8, -0.3]$, $[\psi_1^{(2)}, \psi_2^{(2)}] = [-0.5, 0.1]$, $[\psi_1^{(3)}, \psi_2^{(3)}] = [0.5, -0.5]$. Suppose that the noises are $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $M_{\max} = 5$, $f(N) = \log N$, $\tau = 1$. Fig. 2(a) illustrates one dataset with $N = 1000$. We set window sizes to be $[w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4] = [100, 50, 20, 10]$ and apply Algo. 1 to that dataset. The score is plotted in Fig. 2(b).

Next, we compare MW method with the commonly used binary segmentation (BS) method. The BS method first scans all the points and find a single change point that minimizes the sum of




Figure 2: (a) an example time series that consists of three segments of autoregressions, and (b) its score plot

within-segment loss, and then extends to multiple change points discovery by iteratively repeating the method on different subsets of the series. This procedure is repeated until the maximal number of change points is reached or no more change point is detected. By assuming that L is a constant, the complexity of BS algorithm for segment-wise AR of size N is calculated to be in the order of $\Theta(N^2)$, while MW method is of $\Theta(N + N^2/w_R^2)$ (w_R is the smallest window size). To compare the performance of MW and BS, we repeat the above experiment for 50 iterations. In each iteration, we generated three autoregressive filters of order $L = 2$ that are independent and uniformly distributed in the space of all stable AR(2) filters.¹ The change points are still $0.1N$ and $0.3N$. The number of points is $N = 10^4$. The discovered change points are plotted in Fig. 3(a). In order to compare the computational speed, we repeat the above experiment for each $N = [10^3, 5 \times 10^3, 10^4, 5 \times 10^4, 10^5]$. For the MW method, we use fixed number of windows $\{w_r\}_{r=1}^4 = N/10, N/20, N/50, N/100$ and tolerance $\tau = 2$. We set the minimal length for BS method to be $10L$ (which is used to guarantee

¹In general, for a stationary AR(L) processes with coefficients $\boldsymbol{\psi} = [\psi_1, \dots, \psi_L]$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ sits in a bounded subspace $S_L \subset \mathbb{R}^L$. For the purpose of fair comparison, in the experiment we draw AR filters that are uniformly distributed on S_L , using the technique proposed in (Ding, Noshad and Tarokh 2015a).




Figure 3: (a) the frequencies of discovered change points (or its ranges) by BS and MW methods, and (b) the log-log plot of computation time on multiple change points analysis

stability involved in matrix computations). For both methods, $M_{\max} = 4$. The comparison is plotted in Fig. 3(b). The average numbers of detected change points (with standard deviation inside the parenthesis) under each N are respectively 2.48(0.88), 1.98(0.31), 1.98(0.23), 1.98(0.31) for MW method, and 2.56(0.88), 3.2(0.75), 3.46(0.97), 3.7(0.97) for BS method. Here, if a discovered range has size no larger than twice the smallest window size and it contains a true change point, it is regarded as a successfully detected change point.

The simulation results shows that MW is more robust and computationally efficient than BS method. As was pointed out in the previous section, MW is robust because it looks into the data at different resolutions, thus reducing the risks of overfitting or underfitting which BS method suffers.

4.3 The eastern US temperature from 1895 to 2015

In this subsection, we investigate the temporal variability of the summertime temperature over the eastern US for 1895-2015 (plotted in Fig. 4(a)) with the change detection algorithm. The temperature data is obtained from National Climatic Data Center (NCDC, <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/>) and averaged over the eastern US (east of 100°W). Fig. 4 shows the data and its sample partial autocorrelations, from which we recognize the data as independent. We choose $M_{\max} = 7$, and try a range of penalty terms $f(N) = j \log \log N, j = 1, \dots, 5$. We start with $j = 1, 2$; the penalty is so small that it gives the maximally possible 7 change points. Then we increase $f(N)$ to $3 \log \log N$, and obtain 5 change points at years 1901, 1929, 1944, 2009, 2012 (marked in solid lines in Fig. 5(a)).




Figure 4: (a) the 1895-2015 summertime temperature over the eastern US (unit: $^{\circ}\text{C}$), and (b) its sample partial autocorrelations

If $f(N)$ is increased to $4 \log \log N$, the change points are the years 1929, 1944, 2004 (marked in dashed lines in Fig. 5(a)). If $f(N)$ is further increased to $j \log \log N, j \geq 5$, there is no change point detected. The segmentation of the time series of the eastern US temperature over the past century matches the phase shift of the Atlantic Multi-decadal Oscillation (AMO), defined as the North Atlantic sea surface temperature after removing the long-term warming trend (Sutton and Hodson 2005). As seen from Fig. 5(b), since the early 20th century, there are warm phases from 1929 to 1960 and from 1990 to 2015, and cool phases from 1901 to 1929 and from 1965 to 1990, in synchrony with the segmentation of the eastern US temperature time series defined by the change points. As the ocean has much larger heat capacity than the continent, this implies that the multi-decadal variability of eastern US temperature is modulated by the AMO. The dynamic link between AMO and eastern US climate has previously been reported. For example, using a global climate model, (Sutton and Hodson 2005; Sutton and Hodson 2007) indicated that the AMO plays an important role in driving the summertime temperature in the eastern US, which validates our postulation here from the change point algorithm.




Figure 5: (a) the discovered change points of the eastern US temperature, and (b) the phase shift of the AMO

4.4 The El Nino data from 1854 to 2015

As the largest climate pattern, El Nino serves as the most dominant factor of oceanic influence on climate. The NINO3 index, defined as the area averaged sea surface temperature from 5°S - 5°N and 150°W - 90°W , is calculated from HadISST1 from 1854 to 2015 (Rayner, Parker, Horton, Folland, Alexander, Rowell, Kent and Kaplan 2003), as shown in Fig. 6(a) (with 1944 points). By looking at the partial autocorrelation of the complete dataset in Fig.6(b), we tentatively set autoregression order ² $L = 2$. We apply Algo. 1 with window sizes 300, 250, 200, 150, 100, 50, and³ $M_{\max} = \lfloor N/3001 \rfloor = 5$. We start with $f(N) = 2 \log \log N$ and obtain the score plot as shown in Fig. 7(a). The plots show that the time period from June 1979 to September 1987 most likely contains one change point. We change the penalty to smaller or larger values, or use other window sizes, and found that the range is detected most of the time. In fact, we can trace how the AR coefficients change in Fig. 7(b), where each point is the AR coefficient estimated

²In fact, we also experimented the cases $L = 3, 4, 5$ and the final results did not differ much.

³Here, $\lfloor a \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer that is no larger than a .




Figure 6: (a) the monthly El Nino (Nino3) index from 1854 to 2015, and (b) its sample partial autocorrelations

from a sliding window of size 300 and sliding step size 20. In other words, the windows are $\{X_1, \dots, X_{300}\}, \{X_{21}, \dots, X_{320}\}, \dots, \{X_{1641}, \dots, X_{1941}\}$. The green diamond, blue star, and red circle indicate respectively the first 37 windows, the second 37 windows, and the last 9 windows. As illustrated from the plot, the red circles deviate nontrivially from other points, which means that the data has a structural change after 74 windows, and that time is exactly the year 1979. The shift of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) from a long cold phase (1940-1978) to a warm phase (1979-present) is likely to explain why this year is unique in the past 150 years. The PDO can have a strong influence on the climate in the northern hemisphere, including the drought frequency in the North America (McCabe, Palecki and Betancourt 2004), ecosystem productivity (Francis, Hare, Hollowed and Wooster 1998), as well as the Bermuda High pressure system in Atlantic ocean (Li, Li and Kushnir 2012) .




Figure 7: (a) the score plot of El Nino data obtained from Algo. 1 which indicates the ranges of change points, and (b) the trace plot that illustrates how the coefficients of AR(2) vary with time

5. CONCLUSION

Though some work has focused on the consistency issues involved in multiple change points analysis, few attention has been paid to the strong consistency. This work investigates the necessary and the sufficient conditions under which a model selection criterion is strongly consistent. Though our analysis is carried out under assumptions such as the independence of data and the quadratic loss function, we hope, and it seems promising, that the proposed technical tools can be applied to relevant study for other data structure or change detection procedures. In the second part of this paper, we model a general stochastic process by segment-wise autoregressions and propose an effective and efficient multi-window technique. The idea is to turn the change detection problem into that of independent data studied in the first part by windowing. Different window sizes are used and properly combined to achieve a balance between estimation accuracy and the resolution of detection. Generalization to other loss functions or procedures are possible, but it is beyond the scope of this paper and we leave it for future work.

6. APPENDIX

In this appendix we first provide some technical lemmas. We then prove Theorems 1-5. In proving Theorem 4, we need several additional technical lemmas. We need the following notations to proceed.

We define the within-segment sum $S_{n_1:n_2}^{(k)} = \sum_{n=N_{0:k-1}+n_1+1}^{N_{0:k-1}+n_2} (X_n - \mu_k)$, and let $S^{(k)}$ denote $S_{0:N_k}^{(k)}$. We define the cross-segment summations: $S_{n_1:n_2}^{(k_1,k_2)} = S_{n_1:N_{k_1}}^{(k_1)} + S^{(k_1+1)} + \dots + S^{(k_2-1)} + S_{0:n_2}^{(k_2)}$ for $k_1 < k_2$ and $S_{n_1:n_2}^{(k_1,k_2)} = S_{n_1:n_2}^{(k_1)}$ for $k_1 = k_2$; We define the within-segment loss $Q_{n_1:n_2}^{(k)} = \mathcal{L}_q(x_{N_{0:k-1}+n_1+1}, \dots, x_{N_{0:k-1}+n_2})$, and the cross-segment loss $Q_{n_1:n_2}^{(k_1,k_2)} = \mathcal{L}_q(x_{N_{0:k_1}-n_1+1}, \dots, x_{N_{0:k_2-1}+n_2})$.

We define

$$g_{n_1,n_2,n_3}^{(k_1,k_2,k_3)} = Q_{n_1:n_3}^{(k_1,k_3)} - (Q_{n_1:n_2}^{(k_1,k_2)} + Q_{n_2:n_3}^{(k_2,k_3)}) \quad (7)$$

which is referred to as the breaking gain. In the case of $k_1 = k_2 < k_3, n_2 = N_{k_1}$, i.e. the splitting point coincides with the true change point between the k_1 th and $k_1 + 1$ th segments, $g_{n_1,n_2,n_3}^{(k_1,k_2,k_3)}$ is simplified to $g_{n_1,n_3}^{(k_1,k_3)}$; In the case of $k_1 = k_2 = k_3, g_{n_1,n_2,n_3}^{(k_1,k_2,k_3)}$ is simplified to $g_{n_1,n_2,n_3}^{(k_1)}$; in other words, we define

$$\begin{aligned} g_{n_1,n_2,n_3}^{(k)} &= Q_{n_1:n_3}^{(k)} - (Q_{n_1:n_2}^{(k)} + Q_{n_2:n_3}^{(k)}), \\ g_{n_1,n_2}^{(k,k+1)} &= \mathcal{L}_q(x_{N_{0:k}-n_1+1}, \dots, x_{N_{0:k}+n_2}) - (Q_{N_k-n_1:N_k}^{(k)} + Q_{0:n_2}^{(k+1)}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

If $n_1 \geq n_2$ or $n_2 \geq n_3$ in the above definitions, the corresponding values are understood to be zero. For each $d = 1, \dots, D$, let $X_{n,d}$ and $S_{n_1:n_2,d}^{(k)}$ denote the d th component of X_n and $S_{n_1:n_2}^{(k)}$, respectively.

6.1 Lemmas

Lemma 2 *Suppose that $n_2 \geq n_1 \geq 34$. Then*

$$\frac{n_1}{n_1 + n_2} \log \log(n_2) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log \log(n_1).$$

Proof 1 Define $h(x) = x \log \log(n - x) / \{n \log \log(x)\}$ where $3 \leq x \leq n/2$. By simple calculation, $dh(x)/dx \geq 0$ is equivalent to $y \log(y) \geq (2 * [1 - \{\log(x)\}^{-2}])^{-1}$ which is guaranteed by $y \log(y) \geq (2 * [1 - (\log 3)^{-2}])^{-1}$, where $y = \log(n - x) \geq \log(n/2)$. Thus, for $n \geq 34$, $h(x)$ is an increasing function on $x \in [3, n/2]$ with maximum $1/2$. Lemma 2 follows from taking $n = n_1 + n_2, x = n_1$.

Lemma 3 Suppose that $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, N_1\}$ and $\{X_n : n = N_1 + 1, \dots, N\}$ are independent random variables from the same distribution \mathcal{G} , with mean μ and variance V . Assume that N_1 and $N_2 = N - N_1$ tend to infinity as N . Then $g_{0,N_2}^{(1,2)}$ (the breaking gain) satisfies

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g_{0,N_2}^{(1,2)}}{\log \log(\min\{N_1, N_2\})} = C \quad a.s. \quad (9)$$

for some positive constant $C \leq 8 \operatorname{tr}(V)$.

Proof 2 Denote $P = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, $P_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, N_1\}$, $P_2 = \{N_1 + 1, 2, \dots, N\}$. By calculation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g_{0,N_2}^{(1,2)} &= \left(\sum_{n \in P} |X_n|^2 - N \left| \frac{\sum_{n \in P} X_n}{N} \right|^2 \right) - \left(\sum_{n \in P_1} |X_n|^2 - N_1 \left| \frac{\sum_{n \in P_1} X_n}{N_1} \right|^2 + \sum_{n \in P_2} |X_n|^2 - N_1 \left| \frac{\sum_{n \in P_2} X_n}{N_2} \right|^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N_1} \left| \sum_{n \in P_1} X_n \right|^2 + \frac{1}{N_2} \left| \sum_{n \in P_2} X_n \right|^2 - \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n \in P} X_n \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N_1 N_2 N} \left\{ N_2^2 \sum_{n \in P_1} |X_n|^2 + N_1^2 \sum_{n \in P_2} |X_n|^2 + 2N_2^2 \sum_{n, n' \in P_1, n \neq n'} \langle X_n, X_{n'} \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2N_1^2 \sum_{n, n' \in P_2, n \neq n'} \langle X_n, X_{n'} \rangle - 2N_1 N_2 \sum_{n \in P_1, n' \in P_2} \langle X_n, X_{n'} \rangle \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{N_1 N_2 N} \left| N_2 \sum_{n \in P_1} X_n - N_1 \sum_{n' \in P_2} X_{n'} \right|^2 = \left| \sqrt{\frac{N_2}{N}} \frac{S_{0:N_1}^{(1)} + N_1 \mu_1}{\sqrt{N_1}} - \sqrt{\frac{N_2}{N}} \frac{S_{0:N_2}^{(2)} + N_2 \mu_2}{\sqrt{N_2}} \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$= \left| \sqrt{\frac{N_2}{N}} Y_N^{(1)} - \sqrt{\frac{N_1}{N}} Y_N^{(2)} \right|^2 \quad (11)$$

where $Y_N^{(k)} = S_{0:N_k}^{(k)} / \sqrt{N_k}$, $k = 1, 2$. By the law of the iterated logarithm,

$$\limsup_{N_k \rightarrow \infty} Y_{N,d}^{(k)} / \sqrt{2V_{dd} \log \log N_k} = 1, \quad a.s., \quad k = 1, 2, d = 1, \dots, D. \quad (12)$$

Note that

$$\left| \sqrt{\frac{N_2}{N}} Y_{N,1}^{(1)} - \sqrt{\frac{N_1}{N}} Y_{N,1}^{(2)} \right|^2 \leq g_{0,N_2}^{(1,2)} \leq \sum_{d=1}^D \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{N_2}{N}} |Y_{N,d}^{(1)}| + \sqrt{\frac{N_1}{N}} |Y_{N,d}^{(2)}| \right\}^2$$

where the second inequality is from triangle inequality. We infer from (12) that for any fixed

$\delta \in (0, 1)$, almost surely

$$g_{0,N_2}^{(1,2)} \geq \left(\sqrt{\frac{2N_2}{N}(1-\delta)V_{11} \log \log N_1} + \sqrt{\frac{2N_1}{N}(1-\delta)V_{11} \log \log N_2} \right)^2 \quad i.o. \quad (13)$$

$$\limsup_{N_k \rightarrow \infty} g_{0,N_2}^{(1,2)} \left[\sum_{d=1}^D \left(\sqrt{\frac{2N_2}{N}V_{dd} \log \log N_1} + \sqrt{\frac{2N_1}{N}V_{dd} \log \log N_2} \right)^2 \right]^{-1} \leq 1 \quad a.s. \quad (14)$$

From (13), it is easy to observe (with $\delta = 1/2$) that

$$g_{0,N_2}^{(1,2)} > V_{11} \log \log(\min\{N_1, N_2\}) \quad i.o. \quad (15)$$

From (14) and Lemma 2, we get

$$\limsup_{N_k \rightarrow \infty} g_{0,N_2}^{(1,2)} \left[8 \operatorname{tr}(V) \log \log(\min\{N_1, N_2\}) \right]^{-1} \leq 1 \quad a.s. \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, since $V_{dd} > 0$, Inequalities (15) and (16) imply the desired equality (9).

Lemma 4 Under Assumption 3, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, M_0\}$ and n_1, n_2 satisfying $1/c \leq n_1/N_j, n_2/N_{j+1} \leq 1$, where $c > 1$ is some constant and n_1, n_2 may or may not depend on $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, N\}$, it holds for sufficiently large N that

$$g_{n_1, n_2}^{(j, j+1)} > \frac{1}{3} |\mu_j - \mu_{j+1}|^2 \min\{n_1, n_2\} \quad a.s. \quad (17)$$

In other words, for each ω from a set of probability one, there exists a positive constant N_ω such that Inequality (17) holds for all $N > N_\omega$.

Proof 3 From the derivation of (10), we obtain $g_{n_1, n_2}^{(j, j+1)} = |\sqrt{n_2/n}Y_n^{(1)} - \sqrt{n_1/n}Y_n^{(2)} + \sqrt{n_1 n_2/n}(\mu_j - \mu_{j+1})|^2$, where $n = n_1 + n_2$, $Y^{(1)} = \sum_{i=N_j-n_1+1}^{N_j} (X_i - \mu_j)/\sqrt{n_1}$, $Y^{(2)} = \sum_{i=N_j+1}^{N_j+n_2} (X_i - \mu_{j+1})/\sqrt{n_2}$. By triangle inequality $g_{n_1, n_2}^{(j, j+1)} \geq (|B| - |A|)^2$, where $A = \sqrt{n_2/n}Y^{(1)} - \sqrt{n_1/n}Y^{(2)}$, $B = \sqrt{n_1 n_2/n}(\mu_j - \mu_{j+1})$. By Strassen's theorem, for each individual ω in a set of probability one, for each $d = 1, \dots, D$

$$\limsup_{N_j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=N_j-n_1(\omega)+1}^{N_j} (X_{i,d}(\omega) - \mu_{j,d})}{\sqrt{2V_{j,dd}N_j \log \log N_j}} \leq 1, \quad \limsup_{N_{j+1} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=N_j+1}^{N_j+n_2(\omega)} (X_{i,d}(\omega) - \mu_{j+1,d})}{\sqrt{2V_{j+1,dd}N_{j+1} \log \log N_{j+1}}} \leq 1$$

which implies that

$$\frac{Y_d^{(1)}(\omega)}{\sqrt{2V_{j,dd} \log \log n_1}} = \frac{\sqrt{n_1} Y_d^{(1)}(\omega)}{\sqrt{2V_{j,dd}N_j \log \log N_j}} \frac{\sqrt{N_j \log \log N_j}}{\sqrt{n_1 \log \log n_1}} \leq \sqrt{c+1}, \quad \frac{Y_d^{(2)}(\omega)}{\sqrt{2V_{j+1,dd} \log \log n_2}} \leq \sqrt{c+1}$$

for sufficiently large N (thus N_j, N_{j+1}). For brevity, we have simplified $n_1(\omega), n_2(\omega)$ to n_1, n_2 . From the above inequalities and Lemma 2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|A|^2 &\leq \sum_{d=1}^D \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n}} \sqrt{2(c+1)V_{j,dd} \log \log n_1} + \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n}} \sqrt{2(c+1)V_{j+1,dd} \log \log n_2} \right)^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{d=1}^D 2(c+1) \max\{V_{j,dd}, V_{j+1,dd}\} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n} \log \log n_1} + \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n} \log \log n_2} \right)^2 \\
&< \sum_{d=1}^D 8(c+1) \max\{V_{j,dd}, V_{j+1,dd}\} \log \log(\min\{n_1, n_2\})
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for sufficiently large N , a.s. It follows from $|B| = \sqrt{n_1 n_2 / n} |\mu_j - \mu_{j+1}| \geq \sqrt{\min\{n_1, n_2\}/2} |\mu_j - \mu_{j+1}|$ that $g_{n_1, n_2}^{(j, j+1)} > |\mu_j - \mu_{j+1}|^2 \min\{n_1, n_2\}/3$ for sufficiently large N a.s.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Choose N'_1, N'_2 such that $N'_1/N_1, N'_2/N_2 \rightarrow 1, N_1 - N'_1, N_2 - N'_2 \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\hat{\psi}'_1, \hat{\psi}'_2 \in \mathcal{R}^L$ respectively denote the estimated filters from $\{X_1, \dots, X_{N'_1}\}$ and $\{X_{N-N'_2+1}, \dots, X_N\}$ using the least squares method. It is well known that $\sqrt{N'_1}(\hat{\psi}'_1 - \psi), \sqrt{N'_2}(\hat{\psi}'_2 - \psi)$ respectively converge in distribution to $Z_1, Z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, R_L^{-1})$ where R_L is the covariance matrix of order L (Box et al. 2008, Appendix 7.5). Because X_n is strongly mixing under Assumption 2 (Athreya and Pantula 1986), $\sqrt{N'_1}(\hat{\psi}'_1 - \psi)$ and $\sqrt{N'_2}(\hat{\psi}'_2 - \psi)$ are asymptotically independent, namely Z_1 and Z_2 are independent. It remains to prove that $\sqrt{N_1}(\hat{\psi}_1 - \psi) = \sqrt{N'_1}(\hat{\psi}'_1 - \psi) + o_p(1)$ and $\sqrt{N_2}(\hat{\psi}_2 - \psi) = \sqrt{N'_2}(\hat{\psi}'_2 - \psi) + o_p(1)$. We prove the former equation since the latter one can be similarly proved. Since $\hat{\psi}_1$ is estimated from least squares method, it can be written in the matrix form (Box et al. 2008, Appendix 7.5) $\hat{\psi}_1 = (Z_1^T Z_1)^{-1} Z_1^T W_1$, where

$$Z_1 = \begin{pmatrix} y_{N_1-1} & \cdots & y_{N_1-L} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ y_L & \cdots & y_1 \end{pmatrix}, W_1 = \begin{pmatrix} y_{N_1} \\ \vdots \\ y_{L+1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We similarly define Z'_1, W'_1 , and write $\hat{\psi}'_1 = ((Z'_1)^T Z'_1)^{-1} (Z'_1)^T W'_1$. Therefore,

$$\sqrt{N_1} \hat{\psi}_1 = \left(\frac{Z_1^T Z_1}{N_1} \right)^{-1} \frac{Z_1^T W_1}{\sqrt{N_1}} = \left(\frac{Z_1^T Z_1}{N_1} \right)^{-1} \frac{(Z'_1)^T W'_1}{\sqrt{N_1}} + o_p(1) \tag{19}$$

where the last equality is because $N'_1/N_1 = 1 + o(1)$, $\frac{(Z'_1)^T W'_1}{\sqrt{N'_1}}$ converges in probability to $\sigma^2 \Gamma_L$, and $(Z_1^T Z_1/N_1)^{-1}$ converges in probability to Γ_L , where Γ_L is the covariance matrix of order L (Box et al. 2008). Furthermore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{N_1}(\hat{\psi}_1 - \psi) - \sqrt{N'_1}(\hat{\psi}'_1 - \psi) &= \{\sqrt{N_1}(\hat{\psi}_1 - \psi) - \sqrt{N'_1}(\hat{\psi}_1 - \psi)\} + \{\sqrt{N'_1}(\hat{\psi}_1 - \psi) - \sqrt{N'_1}(\hat{\psi}'_1 - \psi)\} \\
&= o_p(1) + \sqrt{N'_1}(\hat{\psi}_1 - \hat{\psi}'_1) \\
&= o_p(1) + (\sqrt{N'_1} - \sqrt{N_1})\hat{\psi}_1 + (\sqrt{N_1}\hat{\psi}_1 - \sqrt{N'_1}\hat{\psi}'_1) \\
&= o_p(1) + o_p(1) + \left(\frac{Z_1^T Z_1}{N_1}\right)^{-1} \frac{(Z'_1)^T W'_1}{\sqrt{N_1}} - \left(\frac{(Z'_1)^T (Z'_1)}{N'_1}\right)^{-1} \frac{(Z'_1)^T W'_1}{\sqrt{N'_1}} \\
&= o_p(1) + \left(\frac{Z_1^T Z_1}{N'_1}\right)^{-1} \frac{(Z'_1)^T W'_1}{\sqrt{N'_1}} - \left(\frac{(Z'_1)^T (Z'_1)}{N'_1}\right)^{-1} \frac{(Z'_1)^T W'_1}{\sqrt{N'_1}}
\end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof, it suffices to prove that

$$\left(\frac{Z_1^T Z_1}{N'_1}\right)^{-1} - \left(\frac{(Z'_1)^T (Z'_1)}{N'_1}\right)^{-1} = o_p(1).$$

In fact, the above matrix equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{(Z'_1)^T (Z'_1)}{N'_1}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{(Z'_1)^T (Z'_1) - Z_1^T Z_1}{N'_1}\right) \left(\frac{Z_1^T Z_1}{N'_1}\right)^{-1} \\
&= -\frac{N_1 - N'_1}{N'_1} \left(\frac{(Z'_1)^T (Z'_1)}{N'_1}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{Z_1^T Z_1 - (Z'_1)^T (Z'_1)}{N_1 - N'_1}\right) \left(\frac{Z_1^T Z_1}{N'_1}\right)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

which is $o_p(1)$, because the last three terms on the right hand side converge in probability to (stochastically bounded) random variables.

6.3 Proof of Theorem 2

We first prove that $f(N)$ should be at least the order of $\log \log N$ to ensure strong consistency. The event $\hat{M} = 0$ implies the event $Q_{0:N/2}^{(1)} + Q_{N/2,N}^{(1)} + f(N) \geq Q_{0:N}^{(1)}$. In other words, $g_{0,N/2,N}^{(1)} > f(N)$ implies the event $\hat{M} \neq 0$. By Lemma 3, there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that $g_{0,N/2,N}^{(1)} \geq C_1 \log \log N$ *i.o.* This implies that if $f(N) < C_1 \log \log N$, then $g_{0,N/2,N}^{(1)} > f(N)$ *i.o.* and thus $\hat{M} \neq M$ *i.o.*

On the other hand, the event $\hat{M} > 0$ implies the event that there exist $0 < n_1 < n_2$ such that $g_{0,n_1,n_2}^{(1)} \geq f(N)$ and that $n_1, n_2 - n_1 \geq \beta(N) = \Theta(N)$. Via a similar derivation of (18) in Lemma 3, we can show that for sufficiently large N

$$g_{0,n_1,n_2}^{(1)} < 8(c+1)tr(V_1) \log \log N \quad a.s. \tag{20}$$

where $c > 1$ is some constant. Thus, given that $f(N) = C_2 \log \log N$ for large enough $C_2 > 0$, $g_{0,n_1,n_2}^{(1)} < f(N)$ for sufficiently large N almost surely. This implies that \hat{M} converges almost surely to 0.

6.4 Proof of Theorem 3

We first prove that there is no under-fitting, i.e. $\hat{M} \geq M_0$. It suffices to prove that for each ω from a set of probability one, there exists a positive integer N_ω such that for all $N > N_\omega$, $\hat{M} \neq m$ for each $m = 1, \dots, M_0 - 1$. For each $m < M_0$, there exists at least one detected segment that consists of points from at least two neighboring segments, say the $(j-1)$ th and j th, and that the numbers of points from the two segments are at least $N_{j-1}/2$ and $N_j/2$, respectively. In other words, the points $\{X_n : n = N_{0:j-1} - N_{j-1}/2, \dots, N_{0:j-1} + N_j/2\}$ are contained in the k th detected segment for some $k = 1, \dots, m+1$. As in (35), let \hat{e}_m denote the minimal within-segment quadratic loss given m segments. We consider another configuration of change points: for the set of change points that give \hat{e}_m , keep all other segments except for the k th segment unchanged, and split the k th segment into four segments the middle two of which are $\{X_n : n = N_{0:j-1} - N_{j-1}/4, \dots, N_{0:j-1}\}$ and $\{X_n : n = N_{0:j-1} + 1, \dots, N_{0:j-1} + N_j/4\}$. Then the number of segments will increase from m to $m+3$, and we obtain from Lemma 4 that for sufficiently large N , $\hat{e}_m - \hat{e}_{m+3} > C_1 \max\{N_{j-1}, N_j\}$ *a.s.* where the constant $C_1 = \underline{\Delta}_\mu^2/12$. On the other hand, because $m+3 \leq M_{\max}$ and the condition in step 3 of Algo. 1 is satisfied by the fact that each new segment is at least $\min_{k=1, \dots, M_0+1} N_k/4 \geq \beta(N)$ for sufficiently large N , the event $\hat{M} = m$ implies the event $e_m - e_{m+3} \leq 3f(N)$. In addition, $3f(N) < C_1 \max\{N_{j-1}, N_j\}$ for sufficiently large N (under Assumption 5). Therefore, $\hat{M} \neq m$ for sufficiently large N *a.s.* By similar reasoning we can prove Inequality (4).

Second, we prove the over-fitting part. Suppose that $\hat{M} = m > 2M_0 - 1$, by the pigeonhole principle there are two detected segments that are adjacent and that belong to the same true segment. Without loss of generality, suppose that $\{X_n, n = \tau + 1, \dots, \tau + n_1\}$ and $\{X_n, n = \tau + n_1 + 1, \dots, \tau + n_2\}$ are from distribution \mathcal{G}_k . We consider the configuration that merges the aforementioned two segments into one while keeping other segments unchanged. Since $n_1, n_2 \geq \beta(N) = \Theta(N)$, via a similar derivation of (18) using Strassen's invariance principle, we obtain that

for sufficiently large N

$$s_{m-1} - s_m < C_0 \log \log N \quad a.s. \quad (21)$$

for some constant $C_0 > 1$. On the other hand, the event $\hat{M} = m$ implies that $s_{m-1} - s_m \geq f(N) \geq C_0 \log \log(N)$. Therefore, from (21) we obtain

$$\Pr \left\{ \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\hat{M} > 2M_0 - 1) \right\} \leq \Pr \left\{ \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (s_{m-1} - s_m \geq C_0 \log \log N) \right\} = 0.$$

6.5 Proof of Theorem 4

To prove Theorem 4, we need the following additional technical lemmas.

Lemma 5 *For each $k = 1, 2, \dots, M_0 + 1$, let $E_{k,N}$ denote the event that Algorithm 1 produces two neighboring segments that are both subsets of $\{X_n, n \in P_k\}$, the true k th segment. In other words,*

$$E_{k,N} = \left\{ \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ such that } 0 \leq n_1 < n_2 < n_3 \leq N_k, \text{ and} \right. \\ \left. \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_1 + 1, n_1 + 2, \dots, n_2\}, \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_2 + 1, n_2 + 2, \dots, n_3\} \text{ are two detected segments.} \right\}$$

Assume that

$$f(N) \geq C \log N \quad (22)$$

where $C > 16D/c_0$ is a constant. Then $\Pr(\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} E_{k,N}) = 0$. In other words, for each outcome ω that is from a set of probability one, event $E_{k,N}$ will not happen for sufficiently large N .

Proof 4 Since $E_{k,N}$ implies the event that the loss of merging the two segments into one is larger than $f(N)$, we obtain from (10) and the union bound that

$$\Pr(E_{k,N}) \leq \Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < n_3 \leq N_k} \left| \sqrt{\frac{n_3 - n_2}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} - \sqrt{\frac{n_2 - n_1}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:n_3}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_3 - n_2}} \right|^2 > f(N) \right\} \\ \leq \sum_{1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < n_3 \leq N_k} \Pr \left\{ \left| \sqrt{\frac{n_3 - n_2}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} - \sqrt{\frac{n_2 - n_1}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:n_3}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_3 - n_2}} \right|^2 > f(N) \right\} \quad (23)$$

For any tuple (n_1, n_2, n_3) ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr \left\{ \left| \sqrt{\frac{n_3 - n_2}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} - \sqrt{\frac{n_2 - n_1}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:n_3}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_3 - n_2}} \right|^2 > f(N) \right\} \\
& \leq \Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{d=1}^D \left\{ \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_3 - n_2}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2,d}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} - \sqrt{\frac{n_2 - n_1}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:n_3,d}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_3 - n_2}} \right)^2 > \frac{f(N)}{D} \right\} \right\} \\
& \leq \sum_{d=1}^D \Pr \left\{ \left(\sqrt{\frac{n_3 - n_2}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2,d}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} - \sqrt{\frac{n_2 - n_1}{n_3 - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:n_3,d}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_3 - n_2}} \right)^2 > \frac{f(N)}{D} \right\} \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

besides this, from triangular inequality and $n_3 - n_2, n_2 - n_1 < n_3 - n_1$, each term in the summation of (24) is further upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{\substack{(n', n'')=(n_1, n_2) \\ \text{or } (n_2, n_3)}} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_{n'+1:n'',d}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n'' - n'}} \right| > \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{f(N)}{D}} \right\} \right\} \leq \sum_{\substack{(n', n'')=(n_1, n_2) \\ \text{or } (n_2, n_3)}} \Pr \left\{ \left| \frac{S_{n'+1:n'',d}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n'' - n'}} \right| > \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{f(N)}{D(n'' - n')}} \right\} \\
& < 2 \exp \left\{ -c_0(n'' - n') \frac{1}{4V_{dd}^{(k)}} \frac{f(N)}{D(n'' - n')} \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_0 f(N)}{4D} \right\} \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

Bringing (24) and (25) into (23) we obtain

$$\Pr(E_{k,N}) \leq N_k^3 (2D) \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_0 f(N)}{4D} \right\} \leq 2DN^3 \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_0 f(N)}{4D} \right\} \leq 2DN^{-C'}$$

for a constant $C' > 1$, where the last inequality is from (22). Therefore $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Pr(E_{k,N}) < \infty$ and by Borel-Cantelli lemma $\Pr(\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} E_{k,N}) = 0$.

Lemma 6 Suppose that $M_0 > 0$. For each $k = 1, 2, \dots, M_0$, let $E_{k,N}$ denote the event that Algorithm 1 produces two neighboring segments the first of which is a subset of $\{X_n, n \in P_k\}$ and the second of which consists of points from $\{X_n, n \in P_k\}$ and at most m points $\{X_n, n \in P_{k+1}\}$, where $1 \leq m \leq N_{k+1}$. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{k,N} = & \left\{ \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ such that } 1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < N_k, 1 \leq n_3 \leq m, \text{ and} \right. \\
& \left. \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2\}, \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_2 + 1, \dots, N_k\} \cup \{X_n^{(k+1)} : n = 1, \dots, n_3\} \right. \\
& \left. \text{are two detected segments.} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Assume that

$$f(N) \geq \max\{16|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2 m, C \log N\} \tag{26}$$

where $C > 64D/c_0$ is a constant. Then

$$\text{pr}(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{k,N}) = 0. \quad (27)$$

If we define the event

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{k,N} = & \left\{ \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ such that } 1 \leq n_1 < n_2 \leq N_k, 1 \leq n_3 \leq m, \text{ and} \right. \\ & \left. \{X_n^{(k-1)} : n = N_{k-1} - n_3 + 1, \dots, N_{k-1}\} \cup \{X_n^{(k)} : n = 1, \dots, n_1\}, \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2\} \right. \\ & \left. \text{are two detected segments.} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq m \leq N_{k-1}$. Assume that $f(N) \geq \max\{16|\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k|^2 m, C \log N\}$, where $C > 64D/c_0$ is a constant. Then

$$\text{pr}(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{E}_{k,N}) = 0. \quad (28)$$

Proof 5 We prove (27). The proof of (28) is similar. Since $E_{k,N}$ implies the event that the loss of merging the two segments into one is larger than $f(N)$ we obtain from (10) and the union bound that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr}(E_{k,N}) & \leq \text{pr} \left\{ \bigcup_{\substack{1 \leq n_1 < n_2 \leq N_k \\ 1 \leq n_3 \leq m}} \left| \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2 + n_3}{N_k - n_1 + n_3}} \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)} + \mu_k(n_2 - n_1)}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} - \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \sqrt{\frac{n_3}{N_k - n_1 + n_3}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)} + (N_k - n_2)\mu_1 + S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)} + n_3\mu_{k+1}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} \right|^2 > f(N) \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq n_1 < n_2 \leq N_k \\ 1 \leq n_3 \leq m}} \text{pr} \left\{ \left| \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2 + n_3}{N_k - n_1 + n_3}} \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} - \sqrt{\frac{n_3}{N_k - n_1 + n_3}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)} + S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sqrt{\frac{n_2 - n_1}{(N_k - n_1 + n_3)(N_k - n_2 + n_3)}} n_3(\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) \right|^2 > f(N) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Since $n_2 - n_1 < N_k - n_1 + n_3, n_3 < N_k - n_2 + n_3$, we obtain

$$\left| \sqrt{\frac{n_2 - n_1}{(N_k - n_1 + n_3)(N_k - n_2 + n_3)}} n_3(\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k) \right| < \sqrt{n_3} |\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k| \leq \sqrt{m} |\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k| = \frac{\sqrt{f(N)}}{4} \quad (30)$$

where the last inequality is from (26). Combining the above result, the inequalities

$$\sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2 + n_3}{N_k - n_1 + n_3}} < 1, \quad \sqrt{\frac{n_3}{N_k - n_1 + n_3}} \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} < 1, \quad \sqrt{\frac{n_3}{N_k - n_1 + n_3}} \sqrt{\frac{n_3}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} < 1$$

with Inequality (29) and using the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\text{pr}(E_{k,N}) \leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < N_k \\ 1 \leq n_3 \leq m}} \text{pr} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}}{\sqrt{n_3}} \right| > \frac{3\sqrt{f(N)}}{4} \right\} \quad (31)$$

Using the union bound similar to (25),

$$\text{pr} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}}{\sqrt{n_3}} \right| > \frac{3\sqrt{f(N)}}{4} \right\}$$

can be upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k', n', n''} \text{pr} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_{n'+1:n''}^{(k')}}{\sqrt{n'' - n'}} \right| > \frac{\sqrt{f(N)}}{4} \right\} &\leq \sum_{k', n', n''} \sum_{d=1}^D \text{pr} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_{n'+1:n'',d}^{(k')}}{n'' - n'} \right| > \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{f(N)}{D(n'' - n')}} \right\} \\ &< 3D \cdot 2 \exp \left\{ -c_0(n'' - n') \frac{1}{16V_{dd}^{(k)}} \frac{f(N)}{D(n'' - n')} \right\} \leq 6D \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_0 f(N)}{16D} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the summation is taken over a tuple (k', n', n'') of three possible values: (k, n_1, n_2) , (k, n_2, N_k) , or $(k+1, 1, n_3)$. Bringing (32) into (31) we obtain

$$\text{pr}(E_{k,N}) \leq N_k^2 m (6D) \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_0 f(N)}{16D} \right\} < 6DN^3 \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_0 f(N)}{16D} \right\} \leq N^{-C'}$$

for a constant $C' > 1$, where the last inequality is from (26). Therefore $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{pr}(E_{k,N}) < \infty$ and by Borel-Cantelli lemma $\text{pr}(\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} E_{k,N}) = 0$.

Remark 3 Lemma 5 shows that if there are two neighboring segments that consist of points from the same underlying true segment, then Algorithm 1 will merge them almost surely. As a follow up result of Lemma 5, Lemma 6 shows that if there are at most m points from another true segment involved, then Algorithm 1 will still merge them almost surely as long as m is small relative to the penalty induced by adding an extra segment/change point.

Lemma 7 Suppose that $M_0 > 0$. For each $k = 1, 2, \dots, M_0$, let $E_{k,N}$ denote the event that Algorithm 1 produces two neighboring segments the first of which is a subset of $\{X_n, n \in P_k\}$ and the second of which consists of points from $\{X_n, n \in P_k\}$ and at most m points $\{X_n, n \in P_{k+1}\}$,

where $1 \leq m \leq N_k$. In other words,

$$E_{k,N} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3, s \text{ such that} \\ N_k - m \leq n_1 < n_2 < N_k, 1 \leq s \leq M_0 + 1 - k, 1 \leq n_3 \leq N_{k+s}, \\ \text{and } \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2\}, \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_2 + 1, \dots, N_k\} \cup \dots \cup \{X_n^{(k+s)} : n = 1, \dots, n_3\} \\ \text{are two detected segments.} \end{array} \right\}$$

Assume that

$$f(N) \geq \max\{(s+1)^2 \Delta_\mu^2 m, C \log N\} \quad (33)$$

where $C > 4(s+1)^2 D/c_0$ is a constant. Then

$$\Pr(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{k,N}) = 0. \quad (34)$$

If for each $k = 2, \dots, M_0 + 1$ we define the event

$$\tilde{E}_{k,N} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ such that } 1 \leq n_1 < n_2 \leq m, 1 \leq s \leq k-1, 1 \leq n_3 \leq N_{k-s}, \text{ and} \\ \{X_n^{(k-s)} : n = N_{k-s} - n_3 + 1, \dots, N_{k-s}\} \cup \dots \cup \{X_n^{(k)} : n = 1, \dots, n_1\}, \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2\} \\ \text{are two detected segments.} \end{array} \right\}$$

where $1 \leq m \leq N_k$. Assume that

$$f(N) \geq \max\{(s+1)^2 \bar{\Delta}_\mu^2 m, C \log N\} \quad (35)$$

where $C > 4(s+1)^2 D/c_0$ is a constant. Then

$$\Pr(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{E}_{k,N}) = 0. \quad (36)$$

Proof 6 Similar to Inequality (29) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(E_{k,N}) \leq & \sum_{\substack{1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < N_k \\ 1 \leq n_3 \leq m}} \Pr \left\{ \left| \sqrt{\frac{N_{1:k+s-1} - N_{1:k-1} - n_2 + n_3}{N_{1:k+s-1} - N_{1:k-1} - n_1 + n_3}} \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} \right. \right. \\ & - \sqrt{\frac{n_2 - n_1}{N_{1:k+s-1} - N_{1:k-1} - n_1 + n_3}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)} + \dots + S_{1:n_3}^{(k+s)}}{\sqrt{N_{1:k+s-1} - N_{1:k-1} - n_2 + n_3}} \\ & \left. \left. + \sqrt{\frac{(N_{1:k+s-1} - N_{1:k-1} - n_2 + n_3)(n_2 - n_1)}{N_{1:k+s-1} - N_{1:k-1} - n_1 + n_3}} (\mu_k - \mu^*) \right|^2 > f(N) \right\} \quad (37) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mu^* = \frac{(N_k - n_2)\mu_k + \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{k+s-1} N_\ell \mu_\ell + n_3 \mu_{k+s}}{(N_k - n_2) + \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{k+s-1} N_\ell + n_3}$$

The last term in the above summation can be bounded by

$$\left| \sqrt{\frac{(N_{1:k+s-1} - N_{1:k-1} - n_2 + n_3)(n_2 - n_1)}{N_{1:k+s-1} - N_{1:k-1} - n_1 + n_3}} (\mu_k - \mu^*) \right|^2 \leq \sqrt{n_2 - n_1} |\mu_k - \mu^*| \leq \sqrt{m} \bar{\Delta}_\mu = \frac{\sqrt{f(N)}}{3+s}.$$

Following similar proof in Inequalities (31)-(32), we get

$$\text{pr}(E_{k,N}) \leq 2sDN^3 \exp\left\{-\frac{c_0 f(N)}{(s+1)^2 D}\right\},$$

which implies $\text{pr}(\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} E_{k,N}) = 0$ from Condition (33) and Borel-Cantelli lemma.

Lemma 8 Suppose that $M_0 > 1$. For each $k = 2, \dots, M_0$ and $1 \leq m \leq \min\{N_{k-1}, N_{k+1}\}$, define

$$E_{k,N} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ such that } 1 \leq n_1 \leq N_k, 1 \leq n_2, n_3 \leq m \text{ and} \\ \{X_n^{(k-1)} : n = N_{k-1} - n_3 + 1, \dots, N_{k-1}\} \cup \{X_n^{(k)} : n = 1, \dots, n_1\}, \\ \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_1 + 1, \dots, N_k\} \cup \{X_n^{(k+1)} : n = 1, \dots, n_2\} \\ \text{are two detected segments.} \end{array} \right\}$$

Assume that

$$f(N) \geq \max\{36|\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k|^2 m, C \log N\} \quad (38)$$

where $C > 144D/c_0$ is a constant. Then $\text{pr}(\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} E_{k,N}) = 0$.

Proof 7 The proof is similar to that of Lemma 6.

Lemma 9 Suppose that $M_0 > 0$. For each $k = 1, 2, \dots, M_0$, define the event

$$E_{k,N} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ such that } 1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < N_k, 1 \leq n_3 \leq N_{k+1}, \text{ and} \\ \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2\}, \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_2 + 1, \dots, N_k\} \cup \{X_n^{(k+1)} : n = 1, \dots, n_3\} \\ \text{are two detected segments.} \end{array} \right\}$$

and then event $A_{k,N} = \{\min\{N_k - n_2, n_3\} > q_1(N)\}$ where

$$q_k(N) = \frac{160D \log N}{c_0 |\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2}. \quad (39)$$

Then

$$\Pr\{\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (A_{k,N} \mid E_{k,N})\} = 0 \quad (40)$$

Similarly, for each $k = 2, \dots, M_0 + 1$ we define the event

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{k,N} = & \left\{ \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ such that } 1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < N_k, 1 \leq n_3 \leq N_{k-1}, \text{ and} \right. \\ & \left. \{X_n^{(k-1)} : n = N_{k-1} - n_3 + 1, \dots, N_{k-1}\} \cup \{X_n^{(k)} : n = 1, \dots, n_1\}, \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2\} \right. \\ & \left. \text{are two detected segments.} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and $\tilde{A}_{k,N} = \{\min\{n_1, n_3\} > \tilde{q}_k(N)\}$, $\tilde{q}_k(N) = 160D \log N / (c_0 |\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k|^2)$, then

$$\Pr\{\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{A}_{k,N} \mid \tilde{E}_{k,N})\} = 0. \quad (41)$$

Proof 8 We prove (40). The proof of (41) is similar. The two detected segments in $E_{k,N}$ contributed to the loss $\mathcal{L}_1 = Q_{n_1:n_2}^{(k)} + Q_{n_2:n_3}^{(k,k+1)}$. Consider the postulation that the two detected segments are $\{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_1 + 1, \dots, N_k\}, \{X_n^{(k+1)} : n = 1, \dots, n_3\}$ instead. Correspondingly, its contributed loss is $\mathcal{L}_2 = Q_{n_1:N_k}^{(k)} + Q_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}$. Using Equality (8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 &= Q_{n_1:n_2}^{(k)} + (Q_{n_2:N_k}^{(k)} + Q_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)} + g_{n_2,n_3}^{(k,k+1)}) \\ \mathcal{L}_2 &= (Q_{n_1:n_2}^{(k)} + Q_{n_2:N_k}^{(k)} + g_{n_1,n_2,N_k}^{(k,k,k)}) + Q_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

where $g_{n_2,n_3}^{(k,k+1)}, g_{n_2,n_3,N_k}^{(k,k,k)}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{n_2,n_3}^{(k,k+1)} &= \left| \sqrt{\frac{n_3}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)} + (N_k - n_2)\mu_k}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} - \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} \frac{S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)} + n_3\mu_{k+1}}{\sqrt{n_3}} \right| \\ &= \left| \sqrt{\frac{n_3}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} - \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} \frac{S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}}{\sqrt{n_3}} + \sqrt{\frac{n_3(N_k - n_2)}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} (\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}) \right| \\ g_{n_1,n_2,N_k}^{(k,k,k)} &= \left| \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2}{N_k - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} - \sqrt{\frac{n_2 - n_1}{N_k - n_1}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} \right| \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Since event $E_{k,N}$ implies that $\mathcal{L}_1 \leq \mathcal{L}_2$, we get

$$g_{n_2,n_3}^{(k,k+1)} \leq g_{n_2,n_3,N_k}^{(k,k,k)}.$$

Let $\bar{n} = \min\{N_k - n_2, n_3\}$. From (42) and triangle inequality we further obtain

$$\sqrt{\frac{\bar{n}}{2}}|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}| \leq \sqrt{\frac{n_3(N_k - n_2)}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}}|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}| \leq \left| \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} \right| + 2 \left| \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}}{\sqrt{n_3}} \right|$$

Therefore,

$$\text{pr}(A_{k,N} \mid E_{k,N}) \leq \text{pr} \left\{ \bigcup_{\substack{1 \leq n_1 < n_2 \leq N_k \\ 1 \leq n_3 \leq N_{k+1}}} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} \right| + 2 \left| \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}}{\sqrt{n_3}} \right| > \sqrt{\frac{\bar{n}}{2}}(\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}) \right\} \right\}$$

Using similar techniques as in (32) we obtain

$$\text{pr}(A_{k,N} \mid E_{k,N}) \leq 8DN^3 \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_0}{16D} \frac{\bar{n}|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2}{2} \right\} \leq N^{-2}$$

where the last inequality is due to condition (39). Finally, by Borel-Cantelli lemma $\text{pr}\{\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (A_{k,N} \mid E_{k,N})\} = 0$.

Remark 4 Lemma 9 shows that for each ω from a set of probability one, event $A_{k,N}$ will not happen given that $E_{k,N}$ happens for sufficiently large N . Intuitively speaking, Lemma 9 shows each true change point can not be too far away from the detected change point nearest to it. In view of the above Lemma 6 and 2, it shows that if there are two neighboring segments that consist of points from one true segment and at most m points from another true segment, then m cannot be very large. The following Lemma 10 is similar to Lemma 9 but in a slightly different scenario.

Lemma 10 Suppose that $M_0 > 1$ and m is an integer that satisfies $1 \leq m \leq N_{k-1}$. For each $k = 2, \dots, M_0$, define the event

$$E_{k,N} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ such that } 1 \leq n_1 \leq m, 1 \leq n_2 \leq N_k, 1 \leq n_3 \leq N_{k+1}, \text{ and} \\ \{X_n^{(k-1)} : n = N_{k-1} - n_1 + 1, \dots, N_{k-1}\} \cup \{X_n^{(k)} : n = 1, \dots, n_2\}, \\ \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_2 + 1, \dots, N_k\} \cup \{X_n^{(k+1)} : n = 1, \dots, n_3\} \\ \text{are two detected segments.} \end{array} \right\}$$

and the event

$$A_{k,N} = \left\{ \min\{N_k - n_2, n_3\} \geq \max \left\{ \frac{4m}{(\sqrt{2} - 1)^2} \frac{|\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k|^2}{|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2}, 2q_k(N) \right\} \right\}. \quad (43)$$

Then

$$\Pr\{\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty}(A_{k,N} \mid E_{k,N})\} = 0 \quad (44)$$

Similarly, if we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{k,N} = & \left\{ \text{there exist integers } n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ such that } 1 \leq n_1 \leq N_{k-1}, 1 \leq n_2 \leq N_k, 1 \leq n_3 \leq m, \text{ and} \right. \\ & \{X_n^{(k-1)} : n = N_{k-1} - n_1 + 1, \dots, N_{k-1}\} \cup \{X_n^{(k)} : n = 1, \dots, n_2\}, \\ & \{X_n^{(k)} : n = n_2 + 1, \dots, N_k\} \cup \{X_n^{(k+1)} : n = 1, \dots, n_3\} \\ & \left. \text{are two detected segments.} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and } \tilde{A}_{k,N} = \left\{ \min\{n_1, n_2\} \geq \max\{4m|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2 / \{(\sqrt{2} - 1)^2 |\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k|^2\}, 2\tilde{q}_k(N)\} \right\}. \text{ Then}$$

$$\Pr\{\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty}(\tilde{A}_{k,N} \mid \tilde{E}_{k,N})\} = 0 \quad (45)$$

Proof 9 We prove (44). The proof of (45) is similar. Similar to the proof of Lemma 9, the event $E_{k,N}$ implies that $\mathcal{L}_1 \leq \mathcal{L}_2$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 &= Q_{N_{k-1}-n_1+1:n_2}^{(k-1,k)} + (Q_{n_2:N_k}^{(k)} + Q_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)} + g_{n_2,n_3}^{(k,k+1)}) \\ \mathcal{L}_2 &= (Q_{N_{k-1}-n_1+1:n_2}^{(k-1,k)} + Q_{n_2:N_k}^{(k)} + g_{N_{k-1}-n_1+1,n_2,N_k}^{(k-1,k,k)} + Q_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}). \end{aligned}$$

where $g_{n_2,n_3}^{(k,k+1)}$ is given in (42) and $g_{N_{k-1}-n_1+1,n_2,N_k}^{(k-1,k,k)}$ can be expressed (similar to (29)) as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{N_{k-1}-n_1+1,n_2,N_k}^{(k-1,k,k)} &= \left| \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2}{N_k + n_1}} \frac{S_{N_{k-1}-n_1+1:N_{k-1}}^{(k-1)} + n_1\mu_{k-1} + S_{1:n_2}^{(k)} + n_2\mu_k}{\sqrt{n_1 + n_2}} - \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sqrt{\frac{n_1 + n_2}{N_k + n_1}} \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)} + (N_k - n_2)\mu_k}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{S_{N_{k-1}-n_1+1:N_{k-1}}^{(k-1)}}{\sqrt{n_1 + n_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_1 + n_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} \right| \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2}{(N_k + n_1)(n_1 + n_2)}} n_1 |\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k| \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Since event $E_{k,N}$ implies that $\mathcal{L}_1 \leq \mathcal{L}_2$, we get

$$g_{n_2,n_3}^{(k,k+1)} \leq g_{N_{k-1}-n_1+1,n_2,N_k}^{(k-1,k,k)}. \quad (47)$$

From (42), (46), (47), and triangle inequality we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{n_3(N_k - n_2)}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} |\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}| &\leq \left| \frac{S_{N_{k-1}-n_1+1:N_{k-1}}^{(k-1)}}{\sqrt{n_1 + n_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_1 + n_2}} \right| + 2 \left| \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}}{\sqrt{n_3}} \right| \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2}{(N_k + n_1)(n_1 + n_2)}} n_1 |\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k| \end{aligned}$$

Let $\bar{n} = \min\{N_k - n_2, n_3\}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{n_3(N_k - n_2)}{N_k - n_2 + n_3}} |\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}| &\geq \sqrt{\frac{\bar{n}}{2}} |\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}| \\ \sqrt{\frac{N_k - n_2}{(N_k + n_1)(n_1 + n_2)}} n_1 |\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k| &\leq \sqrt{n_1} |\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k| \end{aligned}$$

and $\sqrt{\bar{n}/2} |\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}| - \sqrt{n_1} |\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k| > \sqrt{\bar{n}} |\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|/2 \geq \sqrt{2q_k(N)} |\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|/2$ (from (43))

$$\text{pr}(A_{k,N} \mid E_{k,N}) \leq \text{pr} \left\{ \bigcup_{\substack{1 \leq n_1 \leq N_{k-1} \\ 1 \leq n_2 \leq N_k \\ 1 \leq n_3 \leq m}} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_{n_1+1:n_2}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{n_2 - n_1}} \right| + 2 \left| \frac{S_{n_2+1:N_k}^{(k)}}{\sqrt{N_k - n_2}} \right| + \left| \frac{S_{1:n_3}^{(k+1)}}{\sqrt{n_3}} \right| \geq \frac{\sqrt{2q_k(N)}}{2} |\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}| \right\} \right\}.$$

Using similar techniques as in (32) we obtain

$$\text{pr}(A_{k,N} \mid E_{k,N}) \leq 8DN^3 \exp \left\{ -\frac{c_0 q_k(N) |\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2}{32D} \right\} = 8DN^{-2}$$

Finally, by Borel-Cantelli lemma $\text{pr}\{\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (A_{k,N} \mid E_{k,N})\} = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 4:

It has been proved that there is no underfitting for sufficiently large N almost surely. To prove the strong consistency, it remains to prove that there is no overfitting. We prove in three steps:

Step 1) If Algorithm 1 is applied to $X_{1:N_1+m_1}$ where $0 \leq m_1 \leq \min\{N_2, m_1(N)\}$, then almost surely there is no change point detected as N tends to infinity. Simply speaking, when the data consists of one true segment and at most $m(N)$ extra points from another segment at the end, there is no spurious discovery of change points.

Step 2) Suppose that $M_0 > 1$. If Algorithm 1 is applied to $X_{1:N_1:k+m_k}$ where k, m_k are integers such that $1 \leq k \leq M_0, 0 \leq m_k \leq m_k(N)$, then almost surely there are $k - 1$ change point detected, and the largest deviation of each true change point with its nearest detected change point is less than $m_k(N)$. Simply speaking, when the data consists of k true segment plus at most $m_k(N)$ points

from the $k + 1$ th true segment, the number of true change points $k - 1$ is correctly selected.

Step 3) Suppose that $M_0 > 1$. If Algorithm 1 is applied to $X_{1:N}$, then almost surely there are M_0 change point detected.

To prove each step, we define a sequence of M_0 ($M_0 > 0$) of positive integers $m_k(N), k = 1, \dots, M_0$ below:

$$m_k(N) = \max \left\{ \frac{4m_{k+1}(N)}{(\sqrt{2} - 1)^2} \frac{|\mu_{k+1} - \mu_{k+2}|^2}{|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2}, 2\tilde{q}_{k+1}(N) \right\}, \quad k = 1, \dots, M_0 - 1 \quad (48)$$

$$m_{M_0}(N) = \tilde{q}_{M_0+1}(N) \quad (49)$$

where $\tilde{q}_k(N)$ have been defined in Lemmas 9. Recall that

$$2\tilde{q}_k = \frac{320D \log N}{c_0 |\mu_{k-1} - \mu_k|^2}.$$

By simple calculation, for each $k = 1, \dots, M_0 - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} m_k(N) &= \max \left\{ \bigcup_{\tilde{k}=k, \dots, M_0-2} \left\{ 2\tilde{q}_{\tilde{k}+2}(N) \prod_{\ell=k}^{\tilde{k}} \left(c \frac{|\mu_{\ell+1} - \mu_{\ell+2}|^2}{|\mu_\ell - \mu_{\ell+1}|^2} \right) \right\}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cup \{2\tilde{q}_{k+1}(N)\} \cup \left\{ m_{M_0}(N) \prod_{\ell=k}^{M_0-1} \left(c \frac{|\mu_{\ell+1} - \mu_{\ell+2}|^2}{|\mu_\ell - \mu_{\ell+1}|^2} \right) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \frac{320D \log N}{c_0} \max \left\{ \bigcup_{\tilde{k}=k, \dots, M_0-2} \left\{ \frac{c^{\tilde{k}-k+1}}{|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{c^{M_0-k}}{2|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}|^2} \right\} \right\} \\ &\leq m^*(N). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Step 1):

If there is at least one change point produced by Algorithm 1, then its location (in terms of the subscript of X_n) belongs to either $\{1, \dots, N_1\}$ or $\{N_1 + 1, \dots, N_1 + m_1\}$. However, the former case will not happens i.o. due to Lemma 6, under Condition (26) (with $E_{k,N}$); and the latter case will not happen i.o. due to Lemma 7 under Condition (35) (with $\tilde{E}_{k,N}$, $s = 1$). We note that (26) and (35) are guaranteed by Condition (6).

Proof of Step 2):

Suppose that the last two change points discovered by Algorithm 1 are denoted by y, z , i.e. X_{y+1}, \dots, X_z and X_{z+1}, \dots, X_N are the last two segments.

The case $k = 1$ has been proved in Step 1). Assume that $k > 1$ and the statement is true for each \tilde{k} such that $1 \leq \tilde{k} < k$. We prove that the statement holds for $\tilde{k} = k$ as well. We consider the three possible events: z belongs to either $\{1, \dots, N_{1:k-1}\}$, $\{N_{1:k-1} + 1, \dots, N_{1:k}\}$ or $\{N_{1:k} + 1, \dots, N_{1:k} + m_k(N)\}$, and prove that almost surely k change points are discovered conditioning on each event.

(E1) z belongs to $\{1, \dots, N_{1:k-1}\}$. Then the above assumption guarantees that at most $k - 2$ change points are discovered from $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, z\}$. Thus, there are at most $k - 1$ change points in total.

(E2) z belongs to $\{N_{1:k-1} + 1, \dots, N_{1:k}\}$. There are three possible events: (E2.1) $y \leq N_{1:k-2}$; (E2.2) $N_{1:k-2} + 1 \leq y \leq N_{1:k-1}$ (E2.3) $N_{1:k-1} + 1 \leq y < z$.

Given (E2.1), since the above assumption guarantees that at most $k - 3$ change points are discovered from $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, y\}$, there are at most $k - 1$ change points in total.

Given (E2.2), from Lemma 10 (with $\tilde{E}_{k,N}$) and the way $m_{k-1}(N)$ was constructed, we obtain $\min\{N_{1:k-1} - y, z - N_{1:k-1}\} \leq m_{k-1}(N)$ for all sufficiently large N a.s.

Consider two sub events of (E2.2): (E2.2.1) $1 \leq z - N_{1:k-1} \leq m_{k-1}(N)$, from assumption, at most $k - 1$ change points are discovered from $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, z\}$, so there are at most k change points in total; (E2.2.2) $N_{1:k-1} - y \leq m_{k-1}(N)$, it will not happen i.o. by using Lemma 8 (in which Condition (38) is guaranteed by (6)).

For (E2.3), it will not happen i.o. by applying Lemma 6 (with $E_{k,N}$ and Condition (26) which is guaranteed by (6)).

(E3) z belongs to $\{N_{1:k} + 1, \dots, N_{1:k} + m_k(N)\}$. Four sub events are (E3.1) $y \leq N_{1:k-2}$, (E3.2) $N_{1:k-2} + 1 \leq y \leq N_{1:k-1}$, (E3.3) $N_{1:k-1} + 1 \leq y \leq N_{1:k}$, and (E3.4) $N_{1:k} + 1 \leq y \leq z$.

For (E3.1), the assumption guarantees that at most $k - 2$ change points are discovered from $\{X_n : n = 1, \dots, y\}$, so there are at most $k - 1$ change points in total. Both the events (E3.2) and (E3.3) will not happen i.o. by applying Lemma 7 (with $\tilde{E}_{k,N}$, $s = 1, 2$, and Condition (35) which is guaranteed by (6)). By applying Lemma 5 (with $E_{k+1,N}$), the event (E3.4) will not happen i.o.

To complete the proof, it remains to prove that the largest deviation of each true change point with its nearest detected change point is less than $m^*(N)$. This can be proved in similar fashion as above.

Remark 5 *The key part of the proof is Step 2) which builds a induction on k , the number of underlying true segments (despite a small amount of extra points). Such induction is achieved through events $(E1)$, $(E2.1)$, $(E2.2.1)$, and $(E3.1)$ at each k . We note that the method differs from the usual mathematical induction in that the number of induction steps is finite, i.e. $k = 1, \dots, M_0$. Because of that, for each ω from a set of probability one, those finite number of events that happen with zero probability will not happen for all sufficiently large N .*

REFERENCES

- Akaike, H. (1969), “Fitting autoregressive models for prediction,” *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 21(1), 243–247.
- Athreya, K. B., and Pantula, S. G. (1986), “A note on strong mixing of ARMA processes,” *Statistics and probability letters*, 4(4), 187–190.
- Auger, I. E., and Lawrence, C. E. (1989), “Algorithms for the optimal identification of segment neighborhoods,” *Bulletin of mathematical biology*, 51(1), 39–54.
- Basseville, M., and Nikiforov, V. (1993), *Detection of Abrupt Changes: Theory and Application* Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- Berkes, I., G. E., and Horváth, L. (2009), “Testing for Changes in the Covariance Structure of Linear Processes,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 139, 2044–2063.
- Box, G. E., Jenkins, G. M., and Reinsel, G. C. (2008), *Time series analysis: forecasting and control (fourth edition)*, Vol. 734 John Wiley & Sons.
- Brodsky, B., and Darkhovsky, B. (1993), *Nonparametric Methods in Change-Point Problems* PKluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ding, J., Noshad, M., and Tarokh, V. (2015a), “Data-driven learning of the number of states in multi-state autoregressive models,” *53rd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, .

- Ding, J., Noshad, M., and Tarokh, V. (2015*b*), “Learning the Number of Autoregressive Mixtures in Time Series Using the Gap Statistics,” *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, .
- Fishman, G. S. (1996), *Monte Carlo: Concepts, Algorithms, and Applications* Springer-Verlag, Berline.
- Francis, R. C., Hare, S. R., Hollowed, A. B., and Wooster, W. S. (1998), “Effects of interdecadal climate variability on the oceanic ecosystems of the NE Pacific,” *Fisheries Oceanography*, 7(1), 1–21.
- Gombay, E., H. L., and Huskova, M. (1996), “Estimators and Tests for Change in Variances,” *Statistics and Decisions*, 14, 145–159.
- Gustafsson, F. (1996), “The marginalized likelihood ratio test for detecting abrupt changes,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 41(1), 66–78.
- Hawkins, D. M. (2001), “Fitting Multiple Change-Point Models to Data,” *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 37, 323–341.
- Huang, J., S. A. G. A. B. K. M., and Scholkopf, B. (2007), Correcting sample selection bias by unlabeled data,, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Incln, C., and Tiao, G. C. (1994), “Use of Cumulative Sums of Squares for Retrospective Detection of Change of Variance,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89, 913–923.
- Jackson, B., Scargle, J. D., Barnes, D., Arabhi, S., Alt, A., Gioumousis, P., Gwin, E., Sangtrakulcharoen, P., Tan, L., and Tsai, T. T. (2005), “An algorithm for optimal partitioning of data on an interval,” *Signal Processing Letters, IEEE*, 12(2), 105–108.
- Lavielle, M., and Teyssi re, G. (2006), “Detection of Multiple Change-Points in Multivariate Time Series,” *Lithuanian Mathematical Journal*, 46, 287–306.
- Li, L., Li, W., and Kushnir, Y. (2012), “Variation of the North Atlantic subtropical high western ridge and its implication to Southeastern US summer precipitation,” *Climate Dynamics*, 39(6), 1401–1412.

- McCabe, G. J., Palecki, M. A., and Betancourt, J. L. (2004), “Pacific and Atlantic Ocean influences on multidecadal drought frequency in the United States,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 101(12), 4136–4141.
- Page, E. (1954), “Continuous Inspection Schemes,” *Biometrika*, 41, 100–115.
- Perron, P. (2006), *Dealing With Structural Breaks* in Palgrave Handbook of Econometrics, Vol. 1: Econometric Theory, eds. K. Patterson and T. C. Mills, Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 278–352.
- Picard, D. (1985), “Testing and Estimating Change-Points in Time Series,” *Advances in Applied Probability*, 17, 841–867.
- Rayner, N., Parker, D. E., Horton, E., Folland, C., Alexander, L., Rowell, D., Kent, E., and Kaplan, A. (2003), “Global analyses of sea surface temperature, sea ice, and night marine air temperature since the late nineteenth century,” *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 108(D14).
- Schwarz, G. (1978), “Estimating the dimension of a model,” *Ann. Statist.*, 6(2), 461–464.
- Scott, A., and Knott, M. (1974), “A cluster analysis method for grouping means in the analysis of variance,” *Biometrics*, pp. 507–512.
- Sheikhattar, A., Fritz, J., Shamma, S., and Babadi, B. (2015), “Recursive Sparse Point Process Regression with Application to Spectrotemporal Receptive Field Plasticity Analysis,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, .
- Sugiyama, M., S. T. N. S. K. H. v. B. P., and Kawanabe, M. (2008), “Direct importance estimation for covariance shift adaptation,” *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 60(4).
- Sutton, R. T., and Hodson, D. L. (2005), “Atlantic Ocean forcing of North American and European summer climate,” *Science*, 309(5731), 115–118.
- Sutton, R. T., and Hodson, D. L. (2007), “Climate response to basin-scale warming and cooling of the North Atlantic Ocean,” *Journal of Climate*, 20(5), 891–907.

- Venkatraman, E. S. (1992), Consistency results in multiple change-point problems, PhD thesis, to the Department of Statistics.Stanford University.
- Vogelsang, T. (1998), “Testing for a Shift in Mean Without Having to Estimate Serial-Correlation Parameters,” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 16, 73–80.
- Vostrikova, L. (1981), “Detection Disorder in Multidimensional Random Processes,” *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, 24, 55–59.
- Yao, Y.-C. (1984), “Estimation of a noisy discrete-time step function: Bayes and empirical Bayes approaches,” *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 1434–1447.
- Yao, Y.-C. (1988), “Estimating the number of change-points via Schwarz’criterion,” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 6(3), 181–189.