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Abstract—The problem of detecting a few anomalous processes among a large number of data streams is considered. At each time, aggregated observations can be taken from a chosen subset of processes, where the chosen subset conforms to a given binary tree structure. The random observations are drawn from a general distribution that may depend on the size of the chosen subset and the number of anomalous processes in the subset. We propose a sequential search strategy by devising an information-directed random walk (IRW) on the tree-structured observation hierarchy. The sample complexity of the IRW policy is shown to be asymptotically optimal in terms of detection accuracy and order optimal in terms of the number of data streams.

Index Terms—Sequential design of experiments, active hypothesis testing, anomaly detection, noisy group testing, channel coding with feedback.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Searching for the Rare

The problem of searching for a few rare events of interest among a massive number of possibilities is ubiquitous. The rare events may represent opportunities with exceptional returns or anomalies associated with high costs or potential catastrophic consequences. Examples include financial trading opportunities and transmission opportunities in dynamic spectrum access, endogenous extreme events or exogenous attacks in communication and computer networks, structural anomalies on bridges or buildings, and high-risk contingencies in power systems that may lead to cascading failures.

Regardless of the application domain, the problem of searching for the rare has the following defining features: (i) the massive search space; (ii) the need for high detection accuracy, especially in terms of missing a rare event; (iii) the time sensitivity of the problem, either due to the transient nature of opportunities or the urgency for taking recourse measures in the face of anomalies. The goal is thus to detect the rare events as quickly and as reliably as possible when the total number of hypotheses is large and the observations are probabilistic thus inherently ambiguous. The performance measure of interest is sample complexity (the total number of observations which represents the detection delay) with respect to the size of the search space and the required detection accuracy.

B. Main Results

Consider a large number $M$ of processes, among which $L$ are anomalous. The decision maker aims to search for the anomalous processes by taking (aggregated) observations from a subset of processes, where the chosen subset conforms to a given tree structure. The random observations are i.i.d. over time with a general distribution that may depend on the size of the chosen subset and the number of anomalies in the subset. The objective is a sequential search strategy that adaptively determines which node on the tree to probe at each time and when to terminate the search in order to minimize the sample complexity under a constraint on the error probability.

To fully exploit the hierarchical structure of the search space, the key questions are how many samples to obtain at each level of the tree and when to zoom in or zoom out on the hierarchy. Our approach is to devise an information-directed random walk (IRW) on the hierarchy of the search space. The IRW initiates at the root of the tree and eventually arrives and terminates at the targets (i.e., the anomalous processes) with the required reliability. Each move of the random walk is guided by the test statistic of the sum log likelihood ratio

A question of particular interest is whether a sublinear scaling of the sample complexity with respect to the search space is feasible, while achieving the optimal scaling with respect to detection accuracy. In other words, whether accurate detection can be achieved by examining only a diminishing fraction of the search space as the search space grows.

The key to a sublinear scaling in the problem size is to exploit the hierarchical structure of the search space inherent to many applications. For example, financial transactions can be aggregated at different temporal and geographic scales. In computer vision applications such as bridge inspection by UAVs with limited battery capacity, sequentially determining areas to zoom in or zoom out can quickly locate anomalies by avoiding giving each pixel equal attention. In heavy hitter detection for Internet traffic monitoring, traffic flows follow a natural hierarchy based on prefix aggregation of the source or destination IP addresses. Indeed, recent advances in software defined networking (SDN) allow programmable routers to count aggregated flows that match a given IP prefix [2]. The search space of all traffic flows thus follows a binary tree structure.

1It is a common observation that Internet traffic flows are either “elephants” (heavy hitters) or “mice” (normal flows). A small percentage of high-volume flows account for most of the total traffic [1]. Heavy hitters can be defined as the top flows in terms of weight in total network traffic or flows with a weight exceeding a given threshold.
(SLLR) collected from each child of the node currently being visited by the random walk. This local test module ensures that the global random walk is more likely to move toward a target than move away from it and that the walk terminates at a true target with the required probabilistic guarantee on detection accuracy. By constructing a sequence of last passage times of the biased random walk to shrinking subsets of the search space, we show that the sample complexity of the IRW strategy is asymptotically optimal in detection accuracy and logarithmic in \( M \) (thus order optimal as determined by the information-theoretic lower bound). The proposed search strategy is deterministic with search actions explicitly specified at each given time. It involves little online computation beyond calculating the sum log-likelihood ratio and performing simple comparisons.

C. Related Work

The anomaly detection problem considered here falls into the general class of sequential design of experiments pioneered by Chernoff in 1959 \([3]\) in which he posed a binary (i.e., \( M = 2 \) for the problem at hand) active hypothesis testing problem. Compared with the classic sequential hypothesis testing pioneered by Wald \([4]\) where the observation model under each hypothesis is fixed, active hypothesis testing has a control aspect that allows the decision maker to choose different experiments (associated with different observation models) at each time. Chernoff proposed a randomized strategy and showed that it is asymptotically optimal as the error probability approaches zero. Known as the Chernoff test, this randomized strategy chooses, at each time, a probability distribution governing the selection of experiments based on all past actions and observations. The probability distribution is given as a solution to a maxmin problem that can be difficult to solve, especially when the number \( M \) of hypotheses and/or the number of experiments (which is also \( M \) for the problem at hand) is large. Furthermore, the Chernoff test does not address the scaling in \( M \) and results in a linear sample complexity in \( M \) when applied to the problem considered here. A number of variations and extensions of Chernoff’s randomized test have been considered (see, for example, \([5–7]\)). In particular, in \([7]\), Naghshvar and Javidi developed a randomized test that achieves the optimal logarithmic order of the sample complexity in the number of hypotheses under certain implicit conditions. These conditions, however, do not hold for the problem considered here. Furthermore, similar to the Chernoff test, this randomized test is specified only implicitly as solutions to a sequence of maximin problems that can be intractable for general observation distributions and large problem size. The problem considered here also has intrinsic connections with noisy group testing, adaptive sampling, and channel coding with feedback, which we discuss in detail in Section VII.

The problem of detecting anomalies or outlying sequences has been studied under different formulations, assumptions, and objectives (see an excellent survey in \([8]\) and references therein). These studies, in general, do not address the optimal scaling in both the detection accuracy and the size of the search space. This problem is also related to the distilled sensing \([9]\) and search with mixed observation problem \([10]\).

II. Problem Formulation

We first focus on the problem of detection a single anomalous process (referred to as the target) among \( M \) processes. The problem of detecting multiple targets are discussed in Section VII.

Let \( g_0 \) and \( f_0 \) denote, respectively, the distributions of the anomalous processes and the normal processes. Aggregated observations can be obtained from a chosen subset of processes, where the subset relation is encoded by a given tree (consider, for example, counting aggregated flows that match a given IP prefix at a programmable router). For the ease of presentation, we focus on the case of a binary tree structure as illustrated in Fig. 1. Extensions to a general tree structure can be found in Section VI-B.

Let \( g_l \) (\( l = 1, \ldots, \log_2 M \)) denote the distribution of the measurements that aggregate the anomalous process and \( 2^l - 1 \) normal processes, and \( f_l \) (\( l = 1, \ldots, \log_2 M \)) the distribution of the measurements that aggregate \( 2^l \) normal processes (see Fig. 1). The relation between \( \{g_l, f_l\} \) and \( \{g_0, f_0\} \) depends on the specific application. For example, in the case of heavy hitter detection where the measurements are packet counts of an aggregated flow, \( g_l \) and \( f_l \) are given by multi-fold convolutions of \( f_0 \) and \( g_0 \). For Poisson flows, \( g_l \) and \( f_l \) are also Poisson with mean values given by the sum of the mean values of their children at the leaf level. As is the case in practically all applications, we expect that observations from each individual process are more informative than aggregated observations. More precisely, we expect \( D(g_l || f_l) \geq D(g_0 || f_0) \) and \( D(f_0 || g_0) \geq D(f_l || g_l) \) for all \( l > 0 \), where \( D(\cdot || \cdot) \) denotes the KL divergence between two distributions.

We aim to develop an active search strategy that sequentially determines whether to terminate the search and if not, which node on the tree to probe next. Specifically, an active search strategy \( \Gamma = \{(\phi(t))_{\geq 1}, \tau, \delta\} \) consists of a sequence of selection rules \( \{\phi(t)\}_{t \geq 1} \) governing which node to probe at each time, a stopping rule \( \tau \) deciding when to terminate the search, and a declaration rule \( \delta \) deciding which leaf node is the target at the time of stopping.

We adopt a Bayesian approach as in Chernoff’s original work \([3]\) and assign a cost of \( c \in (0, 1) \) for each observation and a loss of 1 for a wrong declaration. Let \( \pi_m \) denote the \( a \ priori \) probability that process \( m \) is anomalous, which is
referred to as hypothesis $H_m$. Let $P_s(\Gamma) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \pi_m \alpha_m(\Gamma)$ be the probability of error under strategy $\Gamma$, where $\alpha_m(\Gamma) = \text{Pr}_m(\delta \neq m|\Gamma)$ is the probability of declaring $\delta \neq m$ when $H_m$ is true. Let $E[\tau|\Gamma] = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \pi_m E_m[\tau|\Gamma]$ be the average sample complexity of $\Gamma$. The average Bayes risk under strategy $\Gamma$ is then given by

$$R(\Gamma) = P_s(\Gamma) + cE[\tau|\Gamma].$$

(1)

The objective is to find a strategy $\Gamma$ that achieves the lower bound of the Bayes risk:

$$R^c = \inf_{\Gamma} R(\Gamma).$$

(2)

We are interested in test strategies that offer the optimal scaling in both $c$ (characterizing the detection accuracy) and $M$. A test $\Gamma$ is said to be asymptotically optimal in $c$ if, for fixed $M$,

$$\lim_{c \to 0} \frac{R(\Gamma)}{R^c} = 1.$$

(3)

A shorthand notation $f \sim g$ will be used for $\lim_{c \to 0} f/g = 1$. A test $\Gamma$ is said to be order optimal in $c$ if, for fixed $M$,

$$\lim_{c \to 0} \frac{R(\Gamma)}{R^c} = O(1).$$

(4)

The asymptotic and order-optimalities in $M$ are similarly defined as the limit of $M$ approaching infinity for all fixed $c$.

A dual formulation of the problem is to minimize the sample complexity subject to an error constraint $\epsilon$, i.e.,

$$\Gamma^* = \arg \inf_{\Gamma} \mathbb{E}[\tau|\Gamma], \quad \text{s.t.} \quad P_s(\Gamma) \leq \epsilon.$$  

(5)

In the Bayes risk given in (1), $c$ can be viewed as the inverse of the Lagrange multiplier, thus controls the detection accuracy of the test that achieves the minimum Bayes risk. Following the same lines of argument in (1), (2), one can obtain the solution of (5) once the solution of the Bayesian formulation is found.

III. INFORMATION-DIRECTED RANDOM WALK

In this section, we introduce the IRW policy for detection the target. The proposed policy consists of a global random walk on the tree interwoven with a local test at each node of the tree to guide the random walk. Below we detail each of the two modules.

A. The Global Biased Random Walk Module

The IRW policy induces a biased random walk that initiates at the root of the tree and eventually arrives at the target with required reliability.

Each move in the random walk is guided by the output of a local test carried on each child of the node currently being visited by the random walk. Specifically, for each run of the global random walk, assume that the policy is currently at node $i$ on level $l > 0$ (i.e., an upper level above the leaves). If the output of the local test indicate the left (right) child contains the target, the policy zoom into the left (right) child. If the output of the local test indicates neither of the children contains the target the policy goes back to the parent of node $i$.

Note that we define the parent of the root node as itself.

The local test module ensures that the global random walk is more likely to move toward the target than move away from it and that the random walk terminates at a true target with a sufficiently high probability.

Once arriving at a leaf node, the local test at a leaf node is performed until the policy declares the node as a target or goes back to the parent of this node.

B. The Local Test Module

1) Local Tests at an Upper-level Node: To specify the local test module, suppose first that the random walk is currently at a node on a higher level $l > 0$. The objective of the local test is to correctly distinguish three hypotheses - $H_0$ that this node does not contain the target and $H_1$ ($H_2$) that the left (right) child of this node contains the target with probability no smaller than 0.5 under each hypothesis. This problem is a miniature version ($M = 2$) of the problem described in the previous section but with the addition of hypothesis $H_0$. We now introduce three kinds of local tests.

a) Fixed-sample Test: For a node on level $l$, $K_l$ samples are taken from the children of the node for deciding whether to zoom in or zoom out. The sum log-likelihood ratio (SLLR) of each child is computed from these $K_l$ samples $(y(n))_{n=1}^{K_l}$:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{K_l} g_{l-1}(y(n)) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{K_l} f_{l-1}(y(n)).$$

(6)

If the SLLRs of both children are negative, go back to the parent of node $i$; otherwise, zoom into the child whose SLLR is larger. Note that we define the parent of the root node as itself. $K_l$ is chosen to ensure that the random walk has a higher probability of moving closer than moving away from the target. Specifically, as illustrated in Fig. 3 at each non-leaf node, the random walk may go up to its parent node, go to its left child node, or go to its right child node. The probabilities for each of the three events are determined by the relative location of this node to the target and $g_{l-1}$ and $f_{l-1}$ (observation distributions of its children). In particular, at level $l$, the probability of moving closer to the target is either $p_{l}^{(g)}$ or $p_{l}^{(f)}$ depending on whether this node contains the target or not (see Fig. 3).

Let $Y_n$ and $Z_n$ denote i.i.d. random variables with distribution $g_{l-1}$ and $f_{l-1}$, respectively. It is not difficult to show that $p_{l}^{(g)}$ and $p_{l}^{(f)}$ are given by

$$\text{Pr} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{K_l} \log \frac{g_{l-1}(Y_n)}{f_{l-1}(Y_n)} > \max \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{K_l} \log \frac{g_{l-1}(Z_n)}{f_{l-1}(Z_n)}, 0 \right\} \right),$$

$$\text{Pr} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{K_l} \log \frac{g_{l-1}(Z_n)}{f_{l-1}(Z_n)} < 0 \right)^2,$$

(7)

respectively. The parameter $K_l$ ($l = 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M$) is chosen as the minimum value that ensures $p_{l}^{(g)} > \frac{1}{2}$ and $p_{l}^{(f)} > \frac{1}{2}$. Note that the value of $K_l$ can be computed offline and simple upper bounds suffice.
b) Passive Sequential Test: We now introduce an sequential local test plan based on the Sequential Probability Ratio Testing (SPRT) \[13\]. For each child of a node on level \( l \), we have two hypotheses which are \( H_a \): the node does not contain the target and \( H_b \): the node contains the target. The observation distribution of each child node will follow \( f_{l-1} \) and \( g_{l-1} \) under hypothesis \( H_a \) and \( H_b \) respectively. Let \( p_{tp} \) denote the probability of declaring \( H_b \) when \( H_a \) is true; and let \( p_{tn} \) denote the probability of declaring \( H_a \) when \( H_b \) is true. The local test first take samples from the left child node. After taking each sample, the SLLR \( S_L \) of the left node is updated based on (6).

The test of the left node stops as soon as the \( S_L > \gamma_1 \) or \( S_L < \gamma_0 \), where
\[
\gamma_1 = \frac{1 - p_{tn}}{p_{tp}}, \quad \gamma_0 = \frac{p_{tn}}{1 - p_{tp}}.
\] (8)

The settings of the two thresholds in (8) can guarantee any desired \( p_{tp} \) and \( p_{tn} \). If \( S_L > \gamma_1 \), \( H_1 \) is declared, and the IRW policy zooms into the left child. If \( S_L < \gamma_0 \), the local test declare that the left child does not contain the target and switch to the right child. The test on the right child is the same as left child and to detect whether it contains the target with the same setting of thresholds. If the SLLR of the right child becomes greater than \( \gamma_1 \), the local test declare the right child contains the target. If the SLLR of the right child become smaller than \( \gamma_0 \), the local test declare that neither of the two children contains the target. In order to generate the biased random walk, \( p_{tp} \) and \( p_{tn} \) are chosen to ensure \( p_t^{(f)} = (1 - p_{tp})^2 > 0.5 \) and \( p_t^{(g)} = (1 - p_{tn})(1 - p_{tn}) > 0.5 \).

c) Active Test: Now we present the active version of the local test, which sequentially determines from which child to draw the next sample to best distinguish the three hypotheses.

The Sum Log-likelihood ratios (SLLRs), \( S_L \) and \( S_R \), of the left and right children nodes are updated separately with their own samples based on (6).

The SLLRs of two nodes start from 0. At each time, the active local testing takes one sample from the node which has a larger log-likelihood ratio. If \( S_L = S_R \), the sample can be taken from either of the nodes. The active local testing stops as soon as \( \max\{S_L, S_R\} \leq \nu_0 \), and we then declare \( H_0 \) is true; or when \( \max\{S_L, S_R\} \geq \nu_1 \), and we then declare \( H_1 \) is true if \( S_L \geq \nu_1 \) or \( H_2 \) is true if \( S_R \geq \nu_1 \).

Let \( p_{ab} \) denote the probability of declaring hypothesis \( H_b \) when \( H_a \) is the true one. It can be shown that the following setting of the thresholds
\[
\nu_1 = \log \frac{p_{11}}{p_{01}}, \quad \nu_0 = \log \frac{p_{10}}{p_{00}}
\] (9)
can guarantees any desire \( p_{11} \) and \( p_{00} \) which are required to be greater than 0.5 for the IRW policy.

2) Local Tests at a Leaf Node: Once the policy arrives at a leaf node, say node \( m \) (\( m = 1, \ldots, M \)), samples are drawn one by one. The sum log-likelihood ratio (SLLR) of the node is computed from these samples \( \{y(n)\}_{n=1}^{K} \):
\[
S_m = \sum_{n=1}^{K} \log \frac{g_0(y(n))}{f_0(y(n))}.
\] (10)

The policy continues sampling node \( m \) as long as \( S_m(t) > 0 \). The moment \( S_m(t) \) becomes negative, the policy goes back to the parent of node \( m \) and carries out the steps specified above for upper level nodes. The policy declare the node as a target when the SLLR \( S_m(t) \) of the currently probed leaf node exceeds the threshold of \( \log \frac{M}{c} \). The policy then restart from the root node of the tree to find the next target. The entire searching process terminates when there are \( L \) leaf nodes have been declared as the targets.

IV. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF IRW POLICY

We now analyze the scaling behavior of the sample complexity and the Bayes risk of the IRW policy in terms of both \( M \) and \( c \) when there is a single target on the tree.

The key to the analysis of IRW lies in the realization that the test leads to a biased random walk on the tree with random sojourn times at leaf nodes. The random walk starts at the root node and terminates at a leaf node. At each leaf node, the random walk stays for a random sojourn time and then either moves to its parent node (when the SLLR becomes negative) or terminates (when the SLLR exceeds \( \log \frac{M}{c} \)). Let \( D_g \) and \( D_f \) denote, respectively, the sojourn times at the target and a normal leaf node; they have different distributions determined by \( g_0 \) and \( f_0 \), respectively.

The sample complexity of the IRW policy is analyzed by examining the trajectory of the resulting random walk. As expected, with high probability, the random walk will concentrate on a smaller and smaller portion of the tree containing the target and eventually probes the target only. Our approach is to partition the tree into \( \log_2 M + 1 \) half trees \( \mathcal{T}_{\log_2 M}, \mathcal{T}_{\log_2 M - 1}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_0 \) with decreasing size, and bound the time the random walk spent in each half tree. As illustrated in Fig. 2 for \( M = 8 \), \( \mathcal{T}_1 \) is the halve tree (including the root) rooted at level \( l \) (\( l = \log_2 M, \log_2 M - 1, \ldots, 1 \)) that does not contain the target and \( \mathcal{T}_0 \) consists of only the target node. The entire search process, or equivalently, each sample path of the resulting random walk, is then partitioned into \( \log_2 M + 1 \) stages by the successively defined last passage time to each of the half trees in the shrinking sequence. In particular, the first stage with length \( \tau_{\log_2 M} \) starts at the beginning of the search process and ends at the last passage time to the first half tree \( \mathcal{T}_{\log_2 M} \) in the sequence, the second stage with length
τ_{log_2 M - 1} starts at τ_{log_2 M + 1} and ends at the last passage time to \( \mathcal{T}_{log_2 M - 1} \), and so on. Note that if the random walk terminates at a half tree \( \mathcal{T}_l \) with \( l > 0 \) (i.e., a detection error occurs), then \( \tau_j = 0 \) for \( j = l - 1, \ldots, 0 \) by definition. It is easy to see that, for each sample path, we have the total time of the random walk equal to \( \sum_{l=0}^{log_2 M} \tau_l \).

Next, we consider two different scenarios regarding the quality of the aggregated observations and provide the sample complexity analysis based on the approach outlined above.

A. Informative Observations at All Levels

We first consider the scenario where the KL divergence between aggregated observations in the presence and the absence of anomalous processes is bounded away from zero at all levels of the tree structure, i.e., there exists a constant \( \delta > 0 \) independent of \( M \) such that \( D(g_l \| f_l) > \delta \) and \( D(f_l \| g_l) > \delta \) for all \( l = 1, 2, \ldots, log_2 M \) and for all \( M \). We further assume that the distributions of \( g_0(Z_0) \) and \( f_0(Z_0) \) are light-tailed, where \( Y_0 \) and \( Z_0 \) are random variables with the distributions \( g_0 \) and \( f_0 \), respectively. The theorem below characterizes the Bayes risk of the IRW policy.

**Theorem 1:** Suppose that \( D(g_l \| f_l) \) and \( D(f_l \| g_l) \) are bounded away from zero for all \( l \). For all \( M \) and \( c \), we have

\[
R(\Gamma_{IRW}) \leq cB \log_2 M + \frac{c \log_2 M}{\log_c(g_0 \| f_0)} + O(c),
\]

where \( B \) is a constant independent of \( c \) and \( M \). Furthermore, the Bayes risk of IRW is order optimal in \( M \) for all \( c \) and asymptotically optimal in \( c \) for all \( M \) greater than a finite constant \( M_0 \).

**Proof:** See Appendix A.

The optimality of the Bayes risk of IRW in both \( c \) and \( M \) directly carries through to the sample complexity of IRW. Specifically, from (11), we have the following upper bound on the sample complexity of the IRW policy

\[
E(\tau | \Gamma_{IRW}) \leq B \log_2 M + \frac{\log_2 M}{\log_c(g_0 \| f_0)} + O(1).
\]

We readily have

\[
E(\tau | \Gamma_{IRW}) \sim \frac{-\log c}{D(g_0 \| f_0)}, \quad E(\tau | \Gamma_{IRW}) = O(\log_2 M).
\]

In other words, the sample complexity of IRW is asymptotically optimal in \( c \) and order optimal in \( M \).

B. Aggregated Observations Decaying to Pure Noise

Using Bernoulli distribution as a case study, we examine the scenario where higher level observations decay to pure noise as \( M \) grows. We establish sufficient conditions on the decaying rate of the quality of the hierarchical observations under which the proposed strategy achieves a sublinear sample complexity in \( M \).

We assume that \( f_l \) and \( g_l \) follow Bernoulli distributions with parameters \( u_l \) and \( 1 - u_l \), respectively. In other words, the false alarm and miss detection probabilities at level \( l \) are given by \( u_l \). The KL divergence between \( g_l \) and \( f_l \) is

\[
D(f_l \| g_l) = (1 - 2\mu_l) \log \frac{1 - \mu_l}{\mu_l}.
\]

We consider the case that \( \mu_l \) increases with \( l \) and converges to \( 0.5 \) as \( M \) approaches infinity. In this case, both \( D(g_l \| f_l) \) and \( D(f_l \| g_l) \) converge to zero, which leads to unbounded \( K_l \). The following two theorems characterize the sample complexity of IRW when \( \mu_l \) converges to \( 0.5 \) in polynomial order and exponential order, respectively.

**Theorem 2:** Assume that \( \mu_l = 0.5 - (0.5 - \mu_0)(l + 1)^{-\alpha} \) \((l = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M)\) for some \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) and \( \mu_0 < 0.5 \). The sample complexity of the IRW policy is upper bounded by:

\[
E(\tau | \Gamma_{IRW}) \leq O((\log_2 M)^{2\alpha + 1}) + \frac{\log_2 M}{D(g_0 \| f_0)} + O(1).
\]

**Proof:** See Appendix A.

From Theorem 3, we conclude that, for any fixed \( c \), the IRW policy has a sample complexity that is sublinear in \( M \):

\[
E(\tau | \Gamma_{IRW}) = O((\log_2 M)^{2\alpha + 1}) = o(M), \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+.
\]

**Theorem 3:** Assume that \( \mu_l = 0.5 - (0.5 - \mu_0) \cdot \alpha^{-l} \) \((l = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M)\) for some \( \alpha > 1 \) and \( \mu_0 < 0.5 \). The sample complexity of the IRW policy is upper bounded by:

\[
E(\tau | \Gamma_{IRW}) \leq B M^{\log_2 \alpha^2} + \frac{\log_2 M}{D(g_0 \| f_0)} + O(1),
\]

where \( B \) is a constant independent of \( c \) and \( M \).

**Proof:** See Appendix A.

From Theorem 5, we conclude that, for any fixed \( c \), the IRW policy has a sample complexity that is sublinear in \( M \) provided that \( 1 < \alpha < \sqrt{2} \), i.e.,

\[
E(\tau | \Gamma_{IRW}) = O(M^{\log_2 \alpha^2}) = o(M), \quad \text{for } 1 < \alpha < \sqrt{2}.
\]

In the case that the aggregated observations decay to pure noise, the IRW policy should be modified to start at a middle level \( l^* \) rather than the root node.

V. IRW Policy for Multiple Targets Detection

We now extend the IRW policy for the multiple targets detection.

Consider the problem of detecting \( L \) anomalous processes among \( M \) processes. A example with \( M = 8 \) and \( L = 3 \) is shown in Figure 3. Let \( h_i^d \) \((l = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M, d \leq \min\{L, 2^l\})\) denote the distribution of the measurements that aggregate \( d \) anomalous processes and \( 2^l - d \) normal processes. The objective is an active search strategy \( \Gamma \) for detecting the \( L \) anomalous processes. Let \( H_L \) denote the hypothesis that \( L \), a set of \( L \) processes, contains all the anomalous processes, and \( \pi_L \) denote the a priori probability of \( H_L \). The probability of error under strategy \( \Gamma \) is then given by \( P_e(\Gamma) = \sum_{L \subseteq \Gamma} \pi_L \alpha_{\pi_L} \), where \( \alpha_{\pi_L} \) is the probability of declaring \( \delta \neq L \) when \( H_L \) is true.

The proposed IRW policy can be easily extended to detect the multiple targets, which keeps the order optimality in \( M \) and asymptotic optimal in \( c \). Below we discuss details about the extended IRW policy.

\( ^2 \)Results in this work apply to cases when only an upper bound on the number of anomalous processes is known. Detailed discussion is given in Section V.E.A.
A. The Global Biased Random Walk for Multiple Targets Detection

The IRW policy locates the \(L\) targets one by one\(^3\). Similar to the one target case, it induces a biased random walk that initiates at the root of the tree and eventually arrives at a target with required reliability (referred to as one run of the random walk). The random walk is then reset to the root until \(L\) targets have been declared.

The global random walk is guided by the local tests which indicate which of the children contains at least one undeclared targets or neither of the children contains undeclared targets. The local test module ensures that the global random walk is more likely to move toward the undeclared targets than move away from them and that the random walk arrive at an undeclared target with a sufficiently high probability. Once arriving at a leaf node, the local test at a leaf node is performed until the policy declares the node as a target or goes back to the parent of this node.

B. The Local Tests for Multiple Targets Detection

The local tests on the leaf nodes keeps that same as introduced in Section III-B 2 We now extend all the three local tests on the upper-level nodes introduced in Section III-B for the multiple targets detection case. When there are multiple targets on the trees, the local test becomes a composite hypothesis testing problem, since both the left and right children may contain more than one targets. For a node on a higher level \(l > 0\), there are four hypotheses \(H_0\) that this node does not contain the target, \(H_1\) (\(H_2\)) that only the left (right) child of this node contains undeclared target(s), and \(H_3\) that both the left and right children contain undeclared targets. The objective of the local test is to correctly distinguish \(H_0\) against \(H_1\), \(H_2\) and \(H_3\) with probability no smaller than 0.5 when \(H_0\) is true; and declare either of the left and right children contains undeclared target(s) with probability no smaller than 0.5 when the child truly has undeclared targets under either \(H_1\), \(H_2\) or \(H_3\).

1) Fixed-sample Test for Multiple Targets Detection: For the fixed-size local tests, \(K_i^{(d)}\) are taken from the child node which already has \(\hat{d}\) declared targets, and the SLLR of this child node is computed as

\[
K_i^{(d)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\hat{d}+1} \log \frac{h_{i-1}^{(d)}(y(n))}{h_{i-1}^{(}\nu_1)}.
\]

Notice that since now \(K_i^{(d)}\) is a function of \(\hat{d}\), it may be different for the two children. Let \(K_i^{(d_L)}\) and \(K_i^{(d_R)}\) denote the sample sizes for the left and right children nodes, respectively. After taking \(K_i^{(d_L)}\) from the left child and \(K_i^{(d_R)}\) from the right child, if the SLLRs of both children are negative, the policy goes back to the back to the parent of node \(i\); otherwise, it zooms into the child whose SLLR is larger. The values of \(K_i^{(d_L)}\) and \(K_i^{(d_R)}\) are chosen to ensure the probabilities of zooming out if neither of the two children contains undeclared targets and zooming into either of the node which contains at least one undeclared target are both greater than 0.5. Since the number of targets (\(L\)) is finite, we can always select a \(K_i\) to make the local test be a uniformly most powerful (UMP) test, which guarantees the probability of detection no matter how many undeclared targets exist on the subtree as long as it is greater than or equal to 1.

2) Sequential and Active Local Tests for Multiple Targets Detection: For both the passive sequential test and the active test, the testing plan remains the same as the one target case except the updating of the SLLR of the children nodes now is based on

\[
\log \frac{h_{i-1}^{(d+1)}(y(n))}{h_{i-1}^{(d)}(y(n))},
\]

where \(\hat{d}\) is the number of already declared targets that are descendants of the tested child.

Specifically, for the passive sequential test, the left and right children are tested separated. The local test first samples the left child to declare whether it contains any undeclared target(s). If not, it then samples the right child. The stopping thresholds of the SLLR keep the same as in (9).

For the multiple targets detection, the active test still samples the child with higher SLLR when \(\nu_0 < \max \{S_{L}, S_{R}\} < \nu_1\). When \(\max \{S_{L}, S_{R}\} \leq \nu_0\), the local test declare \(H_0\). When \(\max \{S_{L}, S_{R}\} \geq \nu_1\), the test declare the node with larger SLLR have undeclared targets. \(\nu_0\) and \(\nu_1\) are the same as defined in (2). It can be shown that as long as the family of the distribution \(h_{i}^{(d)}\) satisfies the Monotone Likelihood-ratio (MLR) Criterion\(^4\), the active local test is a Uniformly Most Powerful (UMP) test. i.e., the setting of the thresholds for the one target case in (8) and (9) for the passive sequential and active test, respectively, still work for the multiple targets detection which guarantee any desire \(p\) which are required to be greater than 0.5 for the IRW policy no matter how many undeclared targets exist on the subtree. If the UMP test does not exist for certain distributions, some other local tests for the composite hypothesis testing such as the UMP Invariant Test and Generalized Likelihood Ratio Tests can be considered. As long as the probability of approaching the targets can be

\[\text{Fig. 3. A binary tree observation model with multiple targets.}\]
greater than 0.5, the IRW policy can guarantee to find the targets with sufficient high probability.

C. Performance Analysis of IRW for Multiple Targets Detection

We now analyze the scaling behavior of the sample complexity and the Bayes risk of the IRW policy in terms of both $M$ and $c$.

We focus on the cases when observations are informative at all levels. In the other words, we consider the scenario where the KL divergence between $h_{l-1}^{(d+k)}$ and $h_{l-1}^{(d)}$ is bounded away from zero at all levels of the tree structure, i.e., there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ independent of $M$ such that $D(h_{l}^{(d+k)} \parallel h_{l}^{(d)}) > \delta$ for all $l = 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M$, $d = 0, 1, \ldots, \min\{L, 2^l\}$, and $-d \leq k \leq \min\{L, 2^l\} - d$. We also assume that the distributions of $\log g_0(z_i)$ and $\log f_0(z_i)$ are light-tailed, where $Y_0$ and $Z_0$ are random variables with the distributions $g_0$ and $f_0$, respectively. The following theorem characterizes the Bayes risk of the IRW policy.

**Theorem 4:** Suppose that $D(h_{l}^{(d+k)} \parallel h_{l}^{(d)})$ is bounded away from zero for all $l$, $d = 0, 1, \ldots, \min\{L, 2^l\}$, and $-d \leq k \leq \min\{L, 2^l\} - d$. For all $M > 0$, $c < 1$, and a fixed constant $L > 0$, we have

$$R(\Gamma_{IRW}) \leq cLB \log_2 M + \frac{cL \log_2 M}{D(y_0 || f_0)} + O(c^2 \log_2 M),$$

where $B$ is a constant independent of $c$ and $M$. Furthermore, the Bayes risk of IRW is order optimal in $M$ for all $c$ and asymptotically optimal in $c$ for all $M$ sufficiently large.

**Proof:** We now provided the proof sketch of Theorem 4. Detailed proof can be found in Appendix B.

The proof relies on the biased random walk generated by the IRW policy. As illustrated in Fig. 4 for the example with $M = 8$ and $L = 3$, our approach is to partition the tree into $\log_2 M + 1$ disjoint sets of nodes. For all $l = 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M$, $\mathcal{T}_l$ is the union of all the nodes on level $l$ that contains at least one target leaf node, and their entire left or right subtree if the subtree has no target. $\mathcal{T}_l$ consists of all the target nodes. The detection process of finding any one of the targets is then partitioned into $\log_2 M + 1$ stages by the successively defined last passage time to each of these sets from upper level to lower level.

We numerate all the targets with index 1 to $L$ from left to right. For any upper level node $v$ on the tree, the random walk variable is defined as $D_{\min}(v) = \min_{i=1,\ldots,L} \{D_i(v)\}$, where $D_i(v)$ is the distance on the tree between current node $v$ to the $i$th target. It can be shown that because of the biased random walk probability, the expected value of $D_{\min}(v)$ is always decreasing after each local test. By applying the Chernoff bound, for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M$, the number of samples taken on each set of the nodes is upper bounded by a constant which is independent on $M$. Therefore, the total sampling complexity is in logarithm order with $M$. The sample complexity on $\mathcal{T}_l$ equals the threshold $\log_2 M$ divided by $D(y_0 || f_0)$, which ensures the asymptotically optimality in $c$. Since there are multiple targets on the tree, detection errors may have happened in previous run of IRW policy. When there are detection errors on the tree, the proof is similar but much more complex. Due to the space limitation, we skip the detailed proof here.

The sample complexity of finding each target can be bounded by $cBL \log_2 M + \frac{cL \log_2 M}{D(y_0 || f_0)}$. The error probability is bounded by $O(c)$. Based on this, it is not difficult to get Theorem 4 on Bayes risk.

VI. Extensions

A. Detecting an Unknown Number of Targets

We now extend the IRW policy for the cases when only an upper bound on the number of processes is known. We consider the scenario where the KL divergence are bounded away from zero at all levels of the tree structure. Assume that the number of targets $L$ is upper bounded by $U$. The policy still locates all the targets one by one. A simple modification of the IRW policy at the root node of tree will work for the unknown number of targets.

Specifically, for each run of the IRW policy, when the random walk current at the root node of the tree, an extra sample is taken from the root node when one sample is taken from either of the children. The SLLR of the root node is updated from zero with all its samples taken in current run of the IRW policy. The LLR of each sample is computed as

$$\log \frac{h_{l}^{(d+1)}(y(n))}{h_{l}^{(d)}(y(n))},$$

where $l_r$ is the level index of the root node and $d$ is the number of already declared targets on the tree. The current run as well as the entire IRW policy terminates as soon as the SLLR of the root node is less than $\log c$. Otherwise, the IRW policy works as usual as described in Section III until a targets been found and restart from the root node for next run.

**Theorem 5:** When the number of targets $L$ is unknown and upper bounded by a constant $U$, suppose that $D(h_{l}^{(d+k)} \parallel h_{l}^{(d)})$ is bounded away from zero for all $l$, $d = 0, 1, \ldots, \min\{L, 2^l\}$, and $-d \leq k \leq \min\{L, 2^l\} - d$. For all $M > 0$, $c < 1$, and a fixed constant $L > 0$, we have

$$R(\Gamma_{IRW}) \leq cBL \log_2 M + \frac{cL \log_2 M}{D(y_0 || f_0)} + \frac{- \log c}{D(h_{l}^{(d)}(y(n)))} + O(c^2 \log_2 M),$$

Fig. 4. A biased random walk on the tree with multiple targets.
where $B$ is a constant independent of $c$ and $M$. Furthermore, the Bayes risk of IRW is order optimal in $M$ for all $c$ and asymptotically optimal in $c$ for all $M$ sufficiently large.

**Proof:** It is not difficult to see that, when there are undeclared targets on the tree, the extra samples taken from the root node can be upper bounded by a constant independent of $c$ and $M$. After all the targets have been found, the IRW policy takes approximately

$$\frac{-\log c}{D \left( h_{i_L}^{(L)} \right)}$$

samples before terminating. Following the similar lines of arguments in the proof of Theorem 4, we have the following theorem characterizes the Bayes risk of the IRW policy when the number of targets is unknown.

**B. General Tree Structure**

Consider a general tree with bounded degree as shown in Fig. 5 as an example. We assume that each leaf of the tree follows either the distribution $g_0$ (target) or $f_0$ (non-target), though the path length from the each leaf to the root may be different. The observations at any node of the tree follows the distribution that aggregates all leaf-nodes that rooted at this node. Let $h_{a,b}$ denote the distribution of the measurements that aggregated $a$ anomalous processes and $b$ normal processes.

The IRW policy for the general tree follows the similar idea as described in Section III. On each node of the tree, the objective of the local test is to guide the global walk zoom into the child that contains undeclared targets with probability greater than 0.5. We focus on the IRW with the active local testing for the general tree structure. At each level of the tree, the SLLRs of all the children start from 0. At each time, the local test takes one sample form the node which has a largest SLLR. When there are multiple targets have the largest SLLR, the test pick up arbitrarily pick up one node from these children to test. After taking each sample, the SLLR of sampled child is updated by

$$\log \frac{h_{\hat{d}+1,w-\hat{d}-1}(y(n))}{h_{\hat{d},w-\hat{d}}(y(n))}, \quad (20)$$

where $\hat{d}$ is the number of declared targets and $w$ is the number of the leaf nodes that rooted at the current tested node. The local test stops when the SLLR of one child is greater than $\hat{v}_1$ and declares this child contains undeclared targets; or when the SLLRs of all the children are smaller than $\hat{v}_0$. The thresholds $\hat{v}_1$ and $\hat{v}_0$ are chosen to make sure the probability of zooming into the children that contain undeclared targets and the probability of zooming out of the tested node if no children contains undeclared targets are both greater than 0.5.

**VII. DISCUSSIONS**

We discuss below the connections between the active search problem studied in this work and several other problems that are mostly studied in different application domains. The IRW policy developed here provides an attractive solution to these problems as well.

**A. Noisy Group Testing and Compressed Sensing**

In group testing problem, the objective is to identify defective items in a large population by performing tests on subsets of items that reveal whether the tested group contains any defective items (classic Boolean group testing) or the number of defective items in the tested group (quantitative group testing). Most work on Boolean group testing assumes error-free test outcomes. There are several recent studies on noisy group testing that assume the presence of one-sided noise [15], [16] or the symmetric case with equal size-independent false alarm and miss detection probabilities [17], [18]. In some extended group testing models such as the noisy quantitative group testing [19] and threshold group testing [20], the issue of sample complexity in terms of detection accuracy is absent in the basic formulation. Similar to the group testing problem, the objective of the compressed sensing problem [15] is to recover a sparse signal with aggregated observations. The existing results on noisy group testing as well as the compressed sensing focus on non-adaptive open-loop strategies that determine all actions in one shot \textit{a priori}. The disadvantages of non-adaptive test plans lie in the computational complexity of the coding/decoding processes and high storage requirement.

The above various formulations of group testing and the compressed sensing problems can be reduced to the active search problem with specific observation distributions (e.g., Bernoulli distribution for noisy Boolean group testing, sum-observation model for the quantitative and threshold group testing). The proposed IRW policy for the active hypothesis testing problem provides a sequential and adaptive solutions to solve the group testing and compressed sensing with little offline or online computation. The inherent tree structure of the test plan also leads to low memory requirement. It is thus particularly attractive for online applications such as real-time heavy hitter detection where $n$ and $d$ are not prefixed and computational, memory, and counter resources are stringent. More importantly, the policy works for general noise observation models. Although adaptive group testing strategies do not necessarily conform to a predetermined tree structure, the proposed IRW policy offers asymptotic optimality in both population size and reliability constraint.
B. Adaptive Sampling with Noisy Response

In the adaptive sampling problem [21–24], the objective is estimating a step function in $[0, 1]$ or the location of an target point in $[0, 1]$ using adaptive sampling with noisy response. We limit the input space to be one-dimensional in order to demonstrate the main idea. The main body of work on the adaptive sampling is based on a Bayesian approach with binary noise of a known model. A popular Bayesian strategy, the Probabilistic Bisection Algorithm, which updates the posterior distribution of the step location after each sample (based on the known model of the noisy response) and chooses the next sampling to be the median point of the posterior distribution.

Several variations of the method have been extensively studied in the literature [21–24]. However, the size of the search space is extremely large when $M \rightarrow \infty$, especially when there are multiple targets ($L > 1$) the size of possible hypotheses grows exponentially with $L$. After taking each sample, the update of the posterior beliefs as well as the sorting of the posterior distribution is extremely costly.

Partioning the $[0, 1]$ interval into small intervals and sampling the group of intervals, we can map the adaptive sampling problem to the target search problem where the target is the small interval containing the location of the target.

For problem of estimating a step function in $[0, 1]$, the hypothesis class, denoted by $\mathcal{H}$, is the set of all step functions on $[0, 1]$ interval

$$\mathcal{H} = \{h_z : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, h_z(x) = \mathbb{I}_{\{z, 1\}}(x), z \in (0, 1)\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

Each hypothesis $h_z$ assigns a binary label to each element of the input space $[0, 1]$. There is a true hypothesis $h^*_z$ that determines the ground truth labels for the input space. The learner is allowed to make sequential observations by adaptively sampling $h^*_z$. The observations are however noisy. The goal is to design a sequential sampling strategy aiming at minimizing the sample complexity required to obtain a confidence interval of length $\delta$ for $z^*$ with required reliability. Specifically, the learner chooses the sampling point $x$ at each time $t$ and receives a noisy sample of the true hypothesis.

Without loss of generality, we assume $\delta = 1/M$, where $M$ is a power of two. Let each leaf node on a binary tree represent an interval $\left[\frac{i}{M}, \frac{i+1}{M}\right]$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, M - 1$. The interval corresponding to each upper-level node on the tree is the union of the intervals corresponding to its children. Examining larger intervals (consisting of several smaller intervals) induces a hierarchical structure of the noisy responses. The proposed IRW policy can be applied to search the interval contains the target. In the local test module, the test on each node is corresponding to the test that takes samples from the left and right boundaries of the interval, of which the objective is to determine whether the observation from the left boundary is 0 and from the right boundary is 1, i.e., the target point is in current interval. The probability of zooming into the intervals is guaranteed to be greater than 0.5. The proposed IRW strategy is deterministic with search actions explicitly specified at each given time provides an efficient way to solve the active sampling problem. It involves little online computation beyond calculating the sum log-likelihood ratio and performing simple comparisons.

C. Channel Coding with Feedback

In the channel coding with feedback, a message need to be transmitted through a channel with state and feedback [25]. The channel state is changing over time and known at both the encoder and the decoder. As shown in Fig. 6 the encoder is trying transmit a message $\theta$ out of $M$ messages to the decoder. Before any transmissions, we assume the prior of the messages is uniformly distributed to the decoder. After each transmission, the decoder updates the posterior distribution of the messages until having the required reliability to declare the true message. Due to the existing of the noiseless feedback, the encoder send symbols adaptively based on previous received symbols, of whom the objective is to transmit the message quickly and reliably.

The coding problem can be reduced to an active hypothesis testing problem. The message that needed to be transmitted corresponds to a target among $M$ nodes. The noisy channel can be mapped to the observation models of an active hypothesis testing problem with certain action space. i.e., Any action $a$ with observation distribution $f_a$ corresponds to sending a corresponding symbol through the channel and the receiving symbol at the decode end follows the distribution $f_a$.

![Fig. 6. A channel coding with noiseless feedback.](image)

We use a binary symmetric channel (BSC) with feedback as an example to show the reduction. Consider a BSC with crossover probability $p$. The transmission problem can be reduced to an active hypothesis testing problem with size-independent Bernoulli distribution observation model. In the AHT problem, there is one target among $M$ nodes. The decision maker can take observations from each node or aggregated observations from any combinations of these $M$ nodes. When the target node is contained in the tested group, the observation follows $\text{Ber}(1 - p)$, i.e., the Bernoulli distribution with probability of observing 1 equals $1 - p$. If the target node is not contained in the tested group, the observation follows $\text{Ber}(p)$. It is not difficult to see the actions that samples the set contains the target is corresponding to sending 1 through the BSC, and the other actions is corresponding to sending 0 through the BSC. A policy for the AHT problem can be directly mapped to a coding scheme for the transmission problem.

When applying the proposed IRW policy to the transmission problem, the source coding and channel coding are separated. The binary tree splitting generates a source coding for the location of the target with the codeword length equals $\log_2 M$. The test on each level of the tree corresponds to sending the
next bit or correct the previous bit of the source code. Using
the fixed-size local test as an example, if the left child of
current node contains the target, the sender would send \(K_l\)
symbol 1’s following by \(K_l\) symbol 0’s through the channel.
If the right child contains the target, the sender would send \(K_l\)
symbol 0’s following by \(K_l\) symbol 1’s through the channel.
If neither of the children contains the target, which means the
previous bit transmitted of the source is transmitted incorrectly.
In this case, the sender would send \(2K_l\) symbol 0’s to ask
the encoder to correct the previous bit. After each local test
(several channel usages), a bit is sent correctly with probability
greater than 0.5. If a bit is sent incorrectly, it can also be
revisited and corrected later with probability greater than 0.5.
When the policy arrives at a leaf node, since the full codeword
has been transmitted, the following local tests on a leaf node
can be viewed as sending the confirmation bits until the belief
at the decoder is sufficiently high.

Another related problem is the problem of reliably trans-
mittin a real-valued random vector through a digital noisy
channel [22]. For simplicity, consider the problem of trans-
mittin a real-valued point \(x\) on the interval \([0, 1]\) through
a digital noisy channel. The transmission scheme consists of an
encoder and a sequential decoder. The encoder is a family
of maps \(E_t : \theta \to \mathcal{X}\) specifying the symbol transmitted
through the channel at time \(t\). The decoder is a family of
maps \(D_t : Y_t \to \theta\), describing the estimate \(\hat{\theta}_t = D_t(\{y_m\}_{m=1}^t)\)
of \(\theta\) from the sequence \(\{y_m\}_{m=1}^t\) that has been received through
the channel until time \(t\). The objective is to find a transmission
scheme to make the root mean squared error converge to zero
with degree \(\alpha\) and rate \(\beta\), i.e.,
\[
\Delta_t := \left( \mathbb{E}[\|\theta - \hat{\theta}_t\|^2] \right)^{1/2} \leq p(t)2^{-\beta t^\alpha}, \tag{22}
\]
for some constants \(\beta > 0\) and \(0 < \alpha \leq 1\). Similarly, the
proposed IRW policy can be applies to transmit the point on
the interval \([0, 1]\). The binary tree structure is a Tree-Structured
Vector Quantization of the real-point [28]. It has been show n
that if \(Q : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}\) is a quantizer assuming \(m\) values then
\[
(\mathbb{E}[\|\theta - Q(\theta)\|^2])^{1/2} \geq Cm^{-1}. \tag{23}
\]
This shows that \(\Delta_t \geq C2^{-t}\). We apply the IRW policy to the
case with binary symmetric channel with crossover probability
0.3. Fig. 7 shows the order optimality of the root mean squared
error when \(M = 2^{25}\).

VIII. SIMULATION EXAMPLES

A. Improvement of the Sequential Local Test

We now compare the sampling complexity of IRW policy
with fixed-size local test, SPRT and active local testing in
numerical examples. In the following numerical example, there
is one target on the tree and the observation on each level of
the tree follows Bernoulli distribution with probabilities 0.6 or
0.4 to observing 1 when the node contains the target or not,
respectively. For all the three local tests, we set the probability
of approaching the target to be 0.5625. The value of \(K_l\) for the
fixed-size local test, \(\gamma_0\) and \(\gamma_1\) for the passive sequential test,
and \(\nu_0\) and \(\nu_1\) are set accordingly. The comparison is shown in
Fig. 8 where we can find that the two sequential local tests
have much better performance than the fixed size local test
and the active local testing has the best performance among
the three.

B. Numerical Example of IRW Policy for Multiple Targets

We now provide the numerical examples of the IRW policy
with active local test for search multiple targets on the tree
as well as the comparison with the Chernoff test and the
DGF test developed in [29]. In this example, we consider
detecting five heavy hitters \((L = 5)\) among Poisson flows and
the measurements are exponentially-distributed packet inter-
arrival times. For the leaf-node, \(g_0\) and \(f_0\) are exponential
distributions with parameters \(\lambda_0 = 10\) and \(\lambda_f = 0.001\),
respectively. The aggregated flows follow the corresponding
exponential distributions with the parameters equal to the sum
of the parameters of their children at the leaf level.

Under the same action space given by all nodes on the
tree, the resulting Chernoff test, however, probes only the leaf
nodes. Specifically, at each time $t$, all the leaf nodes are sorted based on their SLLRs. If
\[
D(g_0 || f_0)/L \geq D(f_0 || g_0)/(M - L),
\]
the Chernoff test randomly and uniformly selects one node from the ones with the largest SLLR to the $L$th largest SLLR; if
\[
D(g_0 || f_0)/L < D(f_0 || g_0)/(M - L),
\]
the Chernoff test randomly and uniformly selects one node from the ones with the $(L + 1)$th largest SLLR to the smallest SLLR. Under condition (24), the DGF test probes the node with the $L$th largest SLLR. Under condition (25), the DGF test probes the node with the $(L + 1)$th largest SLLR. Both the Chernoff test and the DGF test update the SLLR of leaf nodes with each corresponding sample and terminate when the SLLR difference between the $L$th largest and the $(L + 1)$th largest nodes exceeds the threshold $-\log c$; then declare the node with the largest SLLR as the target.

Fig. 9 shows a simulation example comparing the sample complexity of the Chernoff test, the DGF policy, and the IR W policy as a function of $M$. The sample complexity of the Chernoff test and the DGF test increase linearly with $M$, while the sample complexity of the IR W policy increases in a logarithmic-order with $M$. The number of sampling in each local tests is relative large comparing to $M$ when $M$ is small, therefore IR W does not outperform DGF at the beginning. However, the advantage of the IR W policy in terms of the sample complexity is significant as $M$ increases.

IX. CONCLUSION

In the paper, we considered the problem of detecting a few anomalous processes among a large number $M$ of processes under a tree observation model. The Bayes risk of the proposed active search strategy with the global random walk and local test modules is shown to be order optimal with the search space size $M$ under certain conditions on the observation model and asymptotic optimality in terms of the reliability constraint. In this work, the stochastic models of all processes are assumed known. An extension of the IR W policy to anomaly detection under unknown models can be found in [30].

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF ONE TARGET DETECTION

In the Appendix, we give the proofs of Theorem 3 to Theorem 4. Without loss of generality (due to the symmetry of the binary tree structure), we assume that the left-most leaf is the target. We focus on the IR W with fixed-sample local tests. The proof can be easily extended to the IR W with sequential and active local tests by showing that the expected number of samples taken in each local test is upper bounded with Wald’s Identity. Also from the simulation in Section VIII-A, we see that the upper bound for the Bayes risk of the fixed-sample local test should work for the sequential and active tests.

The random walk on the tree can be divided into two states. The first state is the random walk on upper level nodes of the binary tree. In this state, at each time, after taking $K_l$ samples, we either zoom-in to one child node or zoom-out to the parent node. i.e., the distance between the current node to the target is defined as the sum of the discrete distance to the target node on the tree and the threshold $\log_{\log M}$, which will either minus one (zoom-in) or plus one (zoom-out) every after every $2K_l$ samples from the children. Once arriving at a leaf node, the test arrives at the second state, where samples are taken one by one from the current node until the cumulative SLLR exceeds the threshold or becomes negative. The cumulative SLLR can be viewed as a discrete time random walk with random continuous step size which is the log-likelihood ratio of each sample. For all the non-target leaf-nodes, we define the distance between the node to the target as the sum of the discrete distance on the tree, the cumulative SLLR of current node, and the threshold. For the target node, we define the distance to the target as the difference between the threshold and the current cumulative SLLR of the target node. During the search process, these two different states happen consecutively in Phase I of IR W policy.

Let $W_n$ denote the random variable of the step size of the random walk at time $n$. When the IR W is in the first state (random walk on the high-level nodes), depending on the current level $l > 0$, $W_n$ will have the distribution
\[
\Pr(W_n) = \begin{cases} 
  p_l^{(g)} & \text{for } W_n = -1 \\
  1 - p_l^{(g)} & \text{for } W_n = 1
\end{cases} 
\]
if the node is located at a sub-tree contains the target, or
\[
\Pr(W_n) = \begin{cases} 
  p_l^{(f)} & \text{for } W_n = -1 \\
  1 - p_l^{(f)} & \text{for } W_n = 1
\end{cases} 
\]
if the node is located at a sub-tree does not contain the target. Since $p_l^{(g)} > 0.5$ and $p_l^{(f)} > 0.5$ for all $l = 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M$, we have
\[
\mathbb{E}[W_n] = 1 - 2p_l^{(g)} \text{ or } 1 - 2p_l^{(f)},
\]
which are both less than 0.

For the second state, let $Y_0$ and $Z_0$ denote the random variables with the distributions $g_0$ and $f_0$, respectively. The

Fig. 9. Performance comparison of three test plans ($-\log c = 10$).
LLR will be either $-\log \frac{g_0(Y_0)}{f_0(Y_0)}$ or $-\log \frac{g_0(Z_0)}{f_0(Z_0)}$. It is not difficult to see that for the target node, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n] = \mathbb{E} \left[ -\log \frac{g_0(Y_0)}{f_0(Y_0)} \right] = -D(g_0||f_0) < 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

and for all the non-target node, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n] = \mathbb{E} \left[ -\log \frac{g_0(Z_0)}{f_0(Z_0)} \right] = -D(f_0||g_0) < 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

We further assume that the distribution of $-\log \frac{g_0(Y_0)}{f_0(Y_0)}$ and $-\log \frac{g_0(Z_0)}{f_0(Z_0)}$ are light-tailed distributions.

Now we are ready to present the following lemma that characterizes the distributions of $\tau_i$.

**Lemma 1**: For all $\tau_i$ with $i = 1, \ldots, \log_2 M$, there exist an $\alpha > 0$ and a $\gamma > 0$ which are independent of $M$ and $c$, such that

$$\Pr(\tau_i \geq n) \leq \alpha e^{-\gamma n}, \forall n \geq 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)

**Proof**: We first prove this lemma for $\tau_{\log_2 M}$ which is the last passage time of the sub-tree at the root that does not contain the target.

Let $S_t$ denote the distance to the target at time $t$. The IRW policy starts at the root node, therefore the initial distance to the target is $S_0 = \log_2 M + \log_2 \frac{M}{e}$. Define

$$\tau^* = \sup \{ t \geq 0 : S_t \geq S_0 \}$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)

as the last time when the search approach has the distance to the target greater than $S_0$. It is not difficult to see that

$$\tau_{\log_2 M} \leq \tau^*.$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

Therefore, we have

$$\Pr(\tau_{\log_2 M} \geq n) \leq \Pr(\tau^* \geq n).$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

Based on the definition of $\tau^*$, we have

$$\Pr(\tau^* > n) = \Pr(\sup \{ t \geq 0 : S_t \geq S_0 \} > n) \leq \sum_{t=n}^{\infty} \Pr(S_t \geq S_0) = \sum_{t=n}^{\infty} \Pr \left( \sum_{j=1}^{t} W_j \geq 0 \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

Let $\mu_j$ denote the mean value for each $W_j$, where $\mu_j < 0$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, t$. Applying the Chernoff bound to the sum of independent random variables $\sum_{j=1}^{t} W_j$, for all $s > 0$ we have

$$\Pr \left( \sum_{j=1}^{t} W_j \geq 0 \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{s \sum_{j=1}^{t} W_j} \right] = \prod_{j=1}^{t} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{s W_j} \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

Note that the moment generating function (MGF) of each $W_j$ is equal to one at $s = 0$. Furthermore, since $\mathbb{E}[W_j] < 0$ is strictly negative for all $j \geq 1$, differentiating the MGFs of all $W_j$ with respect to $s$ yields strictly negative derivatives at $s = 0$. Because all $W_j$’s are light-tailed distributions, as a result, for all possible distributions of $W_j$, there exist $s > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{s W_j} \right]$ is strictly less than $e^{-\gamma} < 1$. Hence, from (35), we have

$$\Pr \left( \sum_{j=1}^{t} W_j \geq 0 \right) \leq e^{-\gamma t}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

Due to (34), we have

$$\Pr(\tau^* > n) \leq \sum_{t=n}^{\infty} \Pr \left( \sum_{i=1}^{t} W_i \geq 0 \right) \leq \sum_{t=n}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma t} = \frac{e^{-\gamma n}}{1 - e^{-\gamma}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

Let $\alpha = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\gamma}}$, with (33), we eventually get Lemma 1 proved for $\tau_{\log_2 M}$.

Because of the recursive definitions of $\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_{\log_2 M}$, the proofs of all the other $\tau_i$ will follow the same procedure.

Based on Lemma 1 we can easily get the following lemma that characterizes the expected value of $\tau_i$.

**Lemma 2**: For all $\tau_i$ with $i = 1, \ldots, \log_2 M$, there exists a constant $\beta > 0$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_i] \leq \beta.$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)

**Proof**: Based on the tail-sum formula of expectation of the non-negative random variables, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_i] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Pr(\tau_i > n) \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha e^{-\gamma n} = \frac{\alpha}{1 - e^{-\gamma}} = \frac{1}{(1 - e^{-\gamma})^2} = \beta.$$  \hspace{1cm} (39)

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1. Based on Lemma 2, it is not difficult to show that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau] \leq 2K_{\max} \sum_{i=1}^{\log_2 M} \mathbb{E}[\tau_i] + \mathbb{E} [\tau_0] \leq 2\beta K_{\max} \log_2 M + \mathbb{E}[\tau_0].$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

Since in Theorem 1, $K_{\max}$ is assumed to be bounded by a constant, the first term in (40) is upper bounded by $B \log_2 M$, where $B$ is a constant greater than $2\beta K_{\max}$.

For the last stage, $\tau_0$ is a stopping time with respect to the i.i.d. sequence of the log-likelihood ratio \(\left\{\log \frac{g_0(Y_n)}{f_0(Y_n)} : n \geq 1\right\}\), where $X_n$ denote i.i.d. random variable with distribution $g_0$.

Due to the Wald’s Equation [13], we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{\tau_0} \log \frac{g_0(Y_n)}{f_0(Y_n)} \right] = \mathbb{E}[\tau_0] \mathbb{E} \left[ \log \frac{g_0(Y_n)}{f_0(Y_n)} \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)

i.e.,

$$\log \frac{M}{c} + R_b = \mathbb{E}[\tau_0] D(g_0||f_0),$$  \hspace{1cm} (42)

where $R_b$ is the overshooting at the threshold. Due to Lorden’s inequality [31], we have

$$\mathbb{E}[R_b] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \log \frac{g_0(Y_n)}{f_0(Y_n)} \right]^2}{\mathbb{E} \left[ \log \frac{g_0(Y_n)}{f_0(Y_n)} \right]}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (43)
Assuming that the first two moments of log-likelihood ratio are finite, then we have
\[ E[\tau_0] = \log \frac{\log_2 M}{D(\theta_0 | f_0)} + O(1). \] (44)

The following lemma characterizes the error probability of the IRW policy.

**Lemma 3:** The error probability of the IRW policy is upper bounded by:
\[ P_e \leq \beta c = O(c). \] (45)

**Proof:** When the IRW policy arrives a non-target node, say node \( j \), the probability of error (accepting \( H_j \)) equals to 
\[ \Pr(S_j \geq \log \frac{\log_2 M}{c}) \]. The Wald’s approximation [44] gives
\[ \Pr(S_j \geq \log \frac{\log_2 M}{c}) \leq \exp \left[ -\log \frac{\log_2 M}{c} \right] = \frac{c}{\log_2 M}. \] (46)

Let \( N \) denote the random number of times of visiting these non-target leaf nodes in the IRW policy. The conditional error probability is upper bounded by \( \frac{\log_2 M}{\log_2 M} \). Based on the proof of Theorem [1], the expected value of \( N \) is upper bounded by \( \beta \log_2 M \). Therefore, by taking expectation, the error probability is bounded by
\[ P_e \leq \frac{c}{\log_2 M} \cdot E[N] \leq \frac{c}{\log_2 M} \cdot \beta \log_2 M = \beta c = O(c). \] (47)

Thus we immediately have Theorem [1].

For Theorem [2] and Theorem [3], we still have the sample complexity of the last stage \( \tau_0 \) satisfy [43]. We now give the upper bound of the sample complexity of the first \( \log_2 M \) stages.

We focus on the Bernoulli distribution model, where \( g_l \) and \( f_l \) are Bernoulli distribution with false negative and false positive rates equal to \( \mu_l \). In order to get the relation between \( K_l \) and \( \mu_l - 1 \), we first introduce the following lemma [32].

**Lemma 4:** Let \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) be independent Poisson trials such that \( \Pr(X_i) = p_i \). Let \( X = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \) and \( \nu = E[X] \). Then the following Chernoff bounds hold for \( 0 < \delta \leq 1 \),
\[ \Pr(X \geq (1 + \delta)\nu) \leq e^{-\nu\delta^2/3}, \] (48)
\[ \Pr(X \leq (1 - \delta)\nu) \leq e^{-\nu\delta^2/3}. \] (49)

By applying Lemma [4], it is not difficult to show in order to have \( p_l^{(0)} \) and \( p_l^{(1)} \) define in [7] greater than 0.5 for all \( l = 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M \), we can choose \( K_l \) greater than
\[ \max \left\{ \frac{12(1 - \mu_{l-1}) \log(1 - \eta)^{-1}}{(1 - 2\mu_{l-1})^2}, \frac{12\mu_{l-1} \log(1 - \lambda)^{-1}}{(1 - 2\mu_{l-1})^2} \right\}, \] (50)
where \( \eta \) and \( \lambda \) can be any value in \( (\frac{1}{\log_2 M}, 1) \) such that \( \eta \cdot \lambda > 0.5 \) and \( \lambda > 0.5 \). Since \( \mu_l < 0.5 \), w.l.o.g., we choose
\[ K_l = \frac{12(1 - \mu_{l-1}) \log(1 - \eta)^{-1}}{(1 - 2\mu_{l-1})^2}. \] (51)

It is not difficult to find that \( K_l \) increases with \( \mu_{l-1} \). For any stage \( l \), when \( l = 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M \), the sample complexity in this stage is upper bounded by \( 2K_l \cdot E[\tau_l] \). Due to Lemma [2], the total sample complexity from Stage 1 to Stage \( \log_2 M \) is thus upper bounded by
\[ E[\tau] \leq \sum_{l=1}^{\log_2 M} 2K_l \cdot E[\tau_l] \leq \sum_{l=1}^{\log_2 M} 2\beta K_l. \] (52)

Thus Theorem [2] was proved.

Similarly, for Theorem [3] if \( \mu_l = 0.5 - (0.5 - \mu) \cdot (l + 1)^{-\alpha} \), due to [51] and [52], we have
\[ E[\tau] \leq B' \sum_{l=1}^{\log_2 M} l^{2\alpha}, \] (53)
where \( B' = \frac{6\beta \log((1 - \eta)^{-1})}{(0.5 - \mu)^2} \) is a constant. By using the Faulhaber’s formula, we have
\[ \sum_{l=1}^{\log_2 M} l^{2\alpha} = O((\log_2 M)^{2\alpha+1}). \] (54)

By summing up the geometric terms in [54], we can show that
\[ E[\tau] \leq \tilde{B}(\alpha^2) \log_2 M = \tilde{B}M^{\frac{\alpha^2-2}{\alpha^2-1}}, \] (55)
where \( \tilde{B} = \frac{1}{\alpha^2-1} B' \). Thus Theorem [3] is proved.

**APPENDIX B**

**PROOF OF MULTIPLE TARGET DETECTION**

To show [17], we first show the sample complexity of the IRW policy satisfies
\[ E[\tau | \Gamma_{\text{IRW}}] \leq LB \log_2 M + \frac{L \log \frac{\log_2 M}{c}}{D(\theta_0 | f_0)} + o(L \log \frac{M}{c}). \] (56)

In the one-target detection proof, we defined the random walk as the distance from the current testing node to the target. Because of the random walk is biased, i.e., the IRW policy guarantees the probability of approaching the target is always greater than 0.5, the expectation of each step of the random walk is always approaching the target. By using Chernoff bound, we show that the last passage time \( E[\tau_l] \) on the tree \( \mathcal{T}_l \) for all \( l = 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M \) is upper bounded by a constant. Then sample complexity in the first \( \log_2 M \) stages are in logarithmic-order. For the last stage on \( \mathcal{T}_6 \), it can be shown that \( E[\tau_6] = \frac{\log \frac{\log_2 M}{c} \log \frac{\log_2 M}{c}}{D(\theta_0 | f_0)} + O(1) \).

The basic idea to prove [56] is similar to the one target case. For multiple targets detection, we need to find a proper random variable that defines a random walk. The desired property of the random variable is that the expectation of the changing of the random variable is negative at each step of the random walk. i.e., as the IRW policy approaching the targets, the random variable has the trend to keeps decrease to zero until the targets been found. By using the Chernoff bound, we will get similar upper bound to the detection delay of the multiple-targets case.
The IRW policy is designed to find the targets one by one. As the process going, there may be detection errors in the previous round. We split the proof of the overall detection delays into two cases, which are the detection delays with or without detection errors on the tree respectively.

A. Detection delay without detection errors on the tree

Different with the one targets detection, we modify the definition of $\mathcal{I}_l$ for all $l = 1, 2, \ldots, \log_2 M$ for the multiple targets detection case. As illustrated in Fig. [3] for $M = 8$ and $L = 3$, our approach is to partition the tree into $\log_2 M + 1$ disjoint sets of nodes. Similar to the one target case, the detection process of finding any one of the targets is then partitioned into $\log_2 M + 1$ stages by the successively defined last passage time to each of the set of nodes from upper level to lower level.

We now give the proof of the detection delay of finding the first target. The random walk on the tree also has two states. The first state is the random walk on the upper level nodes of the binary tree. Once arriving at a leaf node, the test arrives at the second state, where samples are taken one by one from the current node until the cumulative SLLR exceeds the threshold or becomes negative. Without loss of generality, we numerate all the targets with index 1 to $L$ from left to right. For any node $v$ on the tree, we define $D_{\min}(v)$ as

$$D_{\min}(v) := \min_{i=1,\ldots,L} \{D_i(v)\},$$

where $D_i(v)$ is the distance on the tree between current node $v$ to the $i$th target.

For all the non-target leaf-nodes $v$, we define the distance between the node to the target as the sum of $D_{\min}(v)$, the cumulative SLLR of current node, and the threshold $\log \log_2 M$. For the target node, we define the distance to the target as the difference between the threshold and the current cumulative SLLR of the target node.

Let $W_n$ denote one step of the global random walk at time $n$. When the IRW is in the first state, given the current node $v$, $W_n = \Delta D_{\min}(v)$ can be either 1 or −1, which has the distribution

$$\Pr(W_n) = \Pr(\Delta D_{\min}(v)) = \begin{cases} p_l(v) & \text{for } W_n = \Delta D_{\min}(v) = -1; \\ 1 - p_l(v) & \text{for } W_n = \Delta D_{\min}(v) = 1. \end{cases}$$

In IRW policy, for a node $v$ on level $l$, after taking $K_l$ samples, the random walk will have probability $p_l(v)$ greater than 0.5 to approach the targets in the tree rooted at current node or have $p_l(v) > 0.5$ to zoom out of the current node if it contains no targets. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta D_{\min}(v)] = 1 - 2p_l(v) < 0,$$

which shows that, by applying IRW policy, the expectation of the each step of the random is to approach at least one of the targets on the tree.

In the second state, similar to the one target detection process, we have (28) for the target nodes and (29) for all the non-target leaves.

Similarly, let $\tau_i$ denote the last passage time to set $\mathcal{I}_i$. More specifically, $\tau_i$ is also the last time that the random walk have distance greater or equal to $i + \log \log_2 M$ to all the targets. i.e., after $\tau_i$, the random walk will have distance less than $i + \log \log_2 M$ to at least one of the targets. Then use the same arguments in the proof of one target detection, we have for all $\tau_i$ with $i = 1, \ldots, \log_2 M$, there exists a constant $\beta > 0$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_i] \leq \beta.$$  \hfill (59)

Therefore, the detection delay $\mathbb{E}[\tau]$ of finding a target in the first round is upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau] \leq B \log_2 M + \log \log_2 M \mathbb{E}[\tau_i] + O(1).$$  \hfill (60)

Similarly, the error probability is bounded by

$$P_e \leq \beta c = O(c).$$

For the subsequent $L - 1$ rounds to finding the remaining $L - 1$ targets, as long as there are no detection errors happen in the detection, the detection delay of each round can be bounded as in (60). Applying the union bound, the overall probability of error is bounded by

$$P_e \leq L \beta c = O(Lc).$$

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - O(Lc)$, the detection delay of finding all the $L$ targets is upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_{all}] \leq LB \log_2 M + \log \log_2 M \mathbb{E}[\tau_i] + O(L).$$  \hfill (61)

B. Detection delay with detection errors on the tree

We now show the detection delay when there are detection errors on the tree. Assume there are total $L$ targets remaining to be detected and there are total $E$ detection errors. Due to the detection errors on the tree, the preference of the IRW policy to approaching the targets may changes on part of the tree.

![Fig. 10. A biased random walk on the tree with detection errors.](image)

In Fig. [10] we illustrate an example with $M = 8$, $L = 3$, and $E = 1$. Assume that after the first round of the test, there is an detection error happened on level $l = 0$ node $B$. In the next round of test, when applying the IRW policy and starting from the root node, the probability of approaching the
two targets on the right half tree is always greater than 0.5. However, on the left half tree, due to the detection error, the observation on the higher level nodes would make the decision maker think that there is no more undeclared targets on the left half tree. The probability of approaching the left-most target is less than 0.5 before the random walk entering the subtree $R_1$ as shown in Fig. 10. But once the random walk enters the subtree $R_1$, the probability of approaching the left-most target becomes greater than 0.5 since the detection error will not affect the observation from the true target anymore. In the other word, for all the nodes below node $A$ on level $l = 1$, the random walk will have higher probability of approaching the leftmost target; for all the nodes above node $A$ on level $l - 1$, the random walk will have higher probability of leaving the left target. We call $R_1$ as the affected subtree, the node $A$ on level $l = 1$ as changing point, and the left-most target as the affected target.

For the general case, we provide the definition of these terminologies as follows. Since the affected trees may be in a nested structure, it will be defined in a recursive way.

**Definition 1:** If an undeclared target has a detection error as sibling, the subtree formed by these two nodes and their parent node will be an affected subtrees. Starting from the lower level to upper level, any minimum subtrees that contain at least one undeclared target node which is not covered by any other lower level affected trees and contains more or equal number of declaration errors than the undeclared targets are also called affected subtrees.

**Definition 2:** Roots of the affected subtrees are called changing points.

**Definition 3:** All the undeclared targets in an affected subtree are called affected targets.

There may be multiple affected subtrees in the detection and they are possibly in a nested structure. We illustrate another example in Fig. 11, where $R_1$ and $R_2$ are two affected trees in a nested structure.

Our objective is to show the detection delay of the IRW policy is upper bound when there are detection errors in the tree. The proof idea is similar as before, we need to find a proper random variable that has negative expectation (approaching the targets) at each step of the random walk.

Let $\mathcal{V}$ denote the set of all the target nodes; $\mathcal{C}$ denote the set of all targets that have already been correctly declared; $\mathcal{A}$ denote the set of the undeclared targets which are affected by the declaration errors; $\mathcal{U}$ denote the set of the undeclared targets which are not affected by the declaration errors. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{C}, A$ and $\mathcal{U}$ are disjoint and $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{C} \cup A \cup \mathcal{U}$.

For any node $v$ on the tree, depending on whether the node is on an affected tree, we consider the following two cases.

a) If $v$ is not on any affected trees: Define

$$D_{\text{min}}(v) := \min_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \{D_i(v)\},$$

which is the minimum distance on the tree from $v$ to the undeclared targets which are not affected by the declaration errors.

b) If $v$ is on an affected tree: Since the affected trees may be in a nested structure, $D_{\text{min}}(v)$ can be defined in a recursive way. Let $v_c$ denote the changing point of the affected subtree and $D_c$ denote the minimum distance from the change point to the undeclared targets on this affected tree.

We define $D_{\text{min}}(v)$ for the node $v$ from larger affected subtrees to smaller affected subtrees from higher level to lower level. For the highest level changing point $v$ of the largest affected subtree, the parent of $v$ must not be on any affected trees, of which the $D_{\text{min}}$ is defined in the previous bullet. We define a constant $Z$ as

$$Z := D_{\text{min}}(\text{parent node of } v_c) - D_c - 1. \quad (63)$$

It is not difficult to see that $Z \geq 0$.

Within all the nodes on current affected subtree which are not covered by any lower level nested subtrees, let $V_R$ and $V_T$ denote the sets of all tree nodes and all the undeclared targets, respectively. For any node $v \in V_T$, $D_{\text{min}}(v)$ is defined as

$$D_{\text{min}}(v) = Z + \min_{i \in V_R} \{D_i(v)\}. \quad (64)$$

For the nodes on all the lower level/nested affected trees, we use the (63) and (64) recursively to find $D_{\text{min}}(v)$. It is not difficult to see that if there are no detection errors on the tree, $D_{\text{min}}(v)$ will coincide with $D_{\text{min}}(v)$ defined in (57).

We now apply the definitions in (63) and (64) to some examples. As shown in Fig 10 $D_{\text{min}}(v)$ of node $A$ on level $l = 2$ is 4 based on (62). For the affected subtree $R_1$, $Z$ equals 2. Therefore, $D_{\text{min}}(v)$ of node $A$ on level $l = 1$ is 3. For the example in Fig 11 there are two affected subtrees $R_1$ and $R_2$. For $R_1$, $Z$ equals 6. Therefore, $D_{\text{min}}(v)$ for the node $A$ on level $l = 3$ is 9 and for the node $A$ on $l = 2$ is 10. For $R_2$, $Z$ equals 8, which makes $D_{\text{min}}(v)$ for the node $A$ on level $l = 1$ be 9.

![Fig. 11. A biased random walk on the tree with detection errors: nested affected trees.](image)

By applying the IRW policy given the current node $v$, it is not difficult to see that after each step of the random walk variable $W_n = \Delta D_{\text{min}}(v)$ will have the distribution

$$\Pr(W_n) = \Pr(\Delta D_{\text{min}}(v))$$

$$= \begin{cases} p_l(v) & \text{for } W_n = \Delta D_{\text{min}}(v) = -1; \\ 1 - p_l(v) & \text{for } W_n = \Delta D_{\text{min}}(v) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (65)$$

The IRW policy guarantees that $p_l(v)$ is always greater than 0.5. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta D_{\text{min}}(v)] = 1 - 2p_l(v) < 0.$$
Similar to the detection delay without detection errors, let \( \tau_i \) also denote the last time that the random walk have distance greater or equal to \( i + \log \frac{M}{e} \) to all the targets. i.e., after \( \tau_i \), the random walk will have distance less than \( i + \log \frac{M}{e} \) to at least one of the targets. However, due to the definition the maximum value of \( D_{\min} \) can be as large as \( 2 \log_2 M \). Use the same arguments in the proof of one target detection, we have for all \( \tau_i \) with \( i = 1, \ldots, 2 \log_2 M \), there exists a constant \( \beta > 0 \), such that
\[
E[\tau_i] \leq \beta. \tag{66}
\]

Because of the add-on constant \( Z \) in the definition of \( \hat{D}_{\min} \) in (55), the first state of the random walk may stop before \( \sum_{i=1}^{2 \log_2 M} t_i \). In this case, the detection delay of the random walk on the first state will still be bounded. Therefore, when there are detection errors on the tree, the detection delay \( E[\tau] \) of finding a target is upper bounded by
\[
E[\tau] \leq 2B \log_2 M + \frac{\log \log M}{D(\|0\|/\|f_0\|)} + O(1). \tag{67}
\]

With probability at most \( O(Lc) \), the detection delay of finding all the \( L \) targets when there are detection errors happened is upper bounded by
\[
E[\tau_{\text{all}}] \leq 2LB \log_2 M + \frac{L \log \log M}{D(\|0\|/\|f_0\|)} + O(L). \tag{68}
\]

Combining (61) and (67), we have the detection delay of applying the IRW policy to the \( L \)-targets detection problem be upper bounded by
\[
E[\tau | \Gamma_{\text{IRW}}] \leq (1 - L/\beta c)E[\tau_{\text{all}}] + L\beta c E[\tau_{\text{all}}] \\
= LB \log_2 M + \frac{L \log \log M}{D(\|0\|/\|f_0\|)} + L^2 B \beta c \log_2 M. \tag{68}
\]
Theorem 4 can be therefore proved.
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