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Abstract
Gaussian processes have become a promising tool for various safety-critical settings, since the posterior variance can be used to directly estimate the model error and quantify risk. However, state-of-the-art techniques for safety-critical settings hinge on the assumption that the kernel hyperparameters are known, which does not apply in general. To mitigate this, we introduce robust Gaussian process uniform error bounds in settings with unknown hyperparameters. Our approach computes a confidence region in the space of hyperparameters, which enables us to obtain a probabilistic upper bound for the model error of a Gaussian process with arbitrary hyperparameters. We do not require to know any bounds for the hyperparameters a priori, which is an assumption commonly found in related work. Instead, we are able to derive bounds from data in an intuitive fashion. We additionally employ the proposed technique to derive performance guarantees for a class of learning-based control problems. Experiments show that the bound performs significantly better than vanilla and fully Bayesian Gaussian processes.

1 Introduction
Gaussian processes (GPs) have become an often-used tool for regression due to their flexibility and good generalization properties. In addition to being successful at approximating unknown functions, GPs also come equipped with a measure of model uncertainty in the form of the posterior variance (Rasmussen and Williams 2006). This quantity has shown promising results for estimating the error between the posterior mean and the underlying function (Srinivas et al. 2012; Chowdhury and Gopalan 2017a; Lederer, Umlauf, and Hirche 2019; Maddalena, Scharnhorst, and Jones 2020; Sun et al. 2021). Due to this characteristic, GPs have become particularly interesting for safety-critical settings, i.e., whenever safety or performance constraints need to be considered during decision-making. Some examples include controller tuning (Capone and Hirche 2019), Lederer, Capone, and Hirche 2020, estimating safe operating regions (Berkenkamp et al. 2017), as well as recommendation engines (Sun et al. 2015).

Uniform error bounds for Gaussian process regression are typically obtained by scaling the posterior standard deviation, where the scaling factor depends on the number of data, the input domain, as well as regularity assumptions on the unknown function (Srinivas et al. 2012; Chowdhury and Gopalan 2017b; Maddalena, Scharnhorst, and Jones 2020; Lederer, Umlauf, and Hirche 2019). The resulting error bound is generally of a probabilistic nature, i.e., it holds with high probability, with few exceptions (Maddalena, Scharnhorst, and Jones 2020; Wu and Schaback 1993). In Lederer, Umlauf, and Hirche (2019), an error bound is derived under the assumption that the true function is drawn from a GP. The bound is achieved by estimating the error on a finite grid over the input space, and then extending the bound to the whole input space using Lipschitz properties of the GP. In Srinivas et al. (2012), Chowdhury and Gopalan (2017b), Maddalena, Scharnhorst, and Jones (2020), error bounds are derived under the assumption that the underlying function belongs to a reproducing kernel Hilbert space. Additionally, error bounds from methods related to GPs can be directly exploited under weak restrictions. Since radial basis function interpolation yields regressors that are identical to the GP posterior mean for noise-free training data (Kanagawa et al. 2018), deterministic error bounds can be proven using the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (Wu and Schaback 1993; Wendland 2004). Moreover, error bounds from regularized kernel regression, as derived in Mendelson (2002); Shi (2013); Dicker, Foster, and Hsu (2017), can be...
We additionally present a principled way of choosing robust error bounds. To this end, we treat function values as random variables, of which any subset is jointly normally distributed (Rasmussen and Williams 2006). A Gaussian process is fully specified by a mean function \( m : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R} \) and a positive-definite kernel \( k_\phi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R} \). In this paper, we set \( m = 0 \) without loss of generality, and restrict ourselves to stationary kernels with radially non-increasing Fourier transform. This is specified by the following assumption.

**Assumption 1.** The kernel \( k_\phi(\cdot, \cdot) \) is of the form

\[
    k_\phi(x, x') := k\left(\frac{x_1 - x'_1}{\theta_1}, \ldots, \frac{x_d - x'_d}{\theta_d}\right),
\]

with \( k(0, 0) = 1 \). Furthermore, \( k(\cdot) \) has Fourier transform

\[
    \hat{k}(\omega) := \kappa(\|\omega\|) \quad \text{for some non-increasing non-negative function } \kappa : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+.
\]

Here \( \Theta := (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_d)^\top \in \Theta \) denotes the kernel length-scales, which scale the kernel inputs and specify the variability of the underlying function. A similar assumption can be found in other papers that analyze algorithms based on stationary kernels (Bull 2011; Berkenkamp, Schoellig, and Krause 2019). When using this type of kernel, the similarity between any two function evaluations decreases with the weighted distance between the corresponding inputs. Many frequently encountered kernels satisfy these properties. Examples include the Gaussian and Matérn kernels, which are often employed because they satisfy the universal approximation property (Micchelli, Xu, and Zhang 2006). Note that we assume \( k(0, 0) = 1 \) only for the sake of simplicity, and all the results and tools presented in this paper can be straightforwardly extended to the more general case where the scaling factor of \( k(\cdot, \cdot) \), i.e., the signal variance, is also a hyperparameter. This is discussed in Section 3.1.

Given a set of \( N \) (potentially noisy) measurements \( \mathcal{D} = \{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^N \), where \( y_i = f(x_i) + \varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n) \) and \( x_i \in \mathcal{X} \), we are able to condition a Gaussian process on \( \mathcal{D} \) to obtain the posterior distribution of \( f(x^*) \) at an arbitrary test point \( x^* \in \mathcal{X} \). The corresponding distribution is normal \( f(x^*) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\phi(x^*), \sigma_\phi^2(x^*)) \) with mean and variance

\[
    \mu_\phi(x^*) := -k_\phi(x^*)^\top (K_\phi + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} y,
\]

\[
    \sigma_\phi^2(x^*) := k_\phi(x^*, x^*) - k_\phi(x^*)^\top (K_\phi + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} k_\phi(x^*),
\]

where \( k_\phi(x^*) = (k_\phi(x_1, x^*), \ldots, k_\phi(x_N, x^*)) \) and the entries of the covariance matrix \( K_\phi \) are given by \( (K_\phi)_{i,j} = k_\phi(x_i, x_j) \). In the case of stationary kernels, the posterior variance \( \sigma_\phi^2(x^*) \) is typically low for test inputs \( x^* \) that are close to the measurement data \( \mathcal{D} \) and vice versa.

### 2.1 Choosing Hyperparameters

By far the most common technique for choosing the hyperparameters of a Gaussian process is maximizing the log marginal likelihood of the measurements given the hyperparameters

\[
    \log p(y | X, \theta) = -\frac{1}{2} \log |K_\phi + \sigma^2 I| - \frac{N}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} y^\top (K_\phi + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} y. \tag{1}
\]
By maximizing (1), we obtain a trade-off between model complexity and data fit. Coupled with the fact that the gradient of (1) can be computed analytically, choosing hyperparameters in this manner yields many practical benefits. Furthermore, if the marginal likelihood is well peaked, then the true hyperparameters are likely to be situated near the selected ones. However, if this is not the case, then this approach can lead to overconfident hyperparameters, as the marginal likelihood can decrease slowly away from the maximum, implying that the lengthscales are potentially smaller than the ones obtained. This type of behavior is particularly frequent if little data has been observed, as both short and long lengthscales explain the data consistently (Rasmussen and Williams 2006). Less common approaches for choosing the Gaussian process hyperparameters include the cross validation (Cressie 2015) and log-pseudo likelihood maximization (Sundararajan and Kecskés 2001). In some settings, the hyperparameters are chosen based on prior knowledge about the system (Kirschner et al. 2019).

3 Uniform Error Bounds for Unknown Hyperparameters

We now introduce a modified version of standard GP error bounds that aims to overcome the limitations mentioned in the previous chapter. The proofs of all results stated here can be found in the appendix.

In the Gaussian process regression literature, there are typically two different types of assumptions that can be made for analysis. On the one hand, the Bayesian case can be considered, where we assume the unknown function $f(\cdot)$ to be sampled from a Gaussian process (Sun et al. 2021). On the other hand, the frequentist setting can be considered, where $f(\cdot)$ is assumed to have a bounded RKHS norm (Srinivas et al. 2012). Improved error bounds can be obtained if we are only interested in samples $f(x)$ that satisfy a predefined Lipschitz continuity requirement (Lederer, Umlauf, and Hirsch 2019). Additionally, if we assume the input space to be finite, then $\beta(\cdot)$ is a constant, i.e., does not depend on $\theta$ (Srinivas et al. 2012).

Our approach is then based on the following result.

**Lemma 1.** Let $k(\cdot)$ be a kernel, $\theta', \theta''$, $\gamma > 0$ with $\gamma^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{d} \frac{d}{\tau_i}$. Then

$$\sigma_{\theta}(x) \leq \gamma \sigma_{\theta'}(x)$$

holds for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

In essence, Lemma 1 states that the scaled posterior variance decreases with the lengthscales. In some cases, the scaling factor $\gamma$ specified in Lemma 1 can be somewhat crude. However, in practice the unscaled posterior variance often decreases with the lengthscale and $\gamma \approx 1$ can be chosen. This is illustrated in Section 5. As a direct consequence, if a pair of bounding hyperparameters $\theta', \theta''$ is available, we can use Lemma 1 to construct an error bound that contains all error bounds corresponding to lengthscales within then interval $\theta' \leq \theta \leq \theta''$. This is specified in the following result.

**Theorem 1.** Let Assumptions 2 and 3 hold. Let $\theta', \theta''$, $\theta' \leq \theta \leq \theta''$. Furthermore, let $\mu_{\theta_0}(\cdot)$ denote the posterior mean for

![Figure 2: The uniform error bound obtained with bounding vectors $\theta', \theta''$ for a posterior mean with working hyperparameters $\theta_0$, in blue/light blue, fully contains that of the Gaussian process with lengthscales $\theta$, shown in red/light red, provided that $\theta' \leq \theta, \theta_0 \leq \theta''$. This yields Theorem 1]

**Assumption 2 (Bayesian setting).** The unknown function $f(\cdot)$ corresponds to a sample from a Gaussian process with kernel $k_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$, where the hyperparameters $\theta$ are drawn from a hyperprior $p(\theta)$.

This assumption is not very restrictive, and is often encountered in control and reinforcement learning settings (Kocijan et al. 2005, Hewing, Kabzan, and Zeilinger 2019). The choice of prior $p(\theta)$ can be based on any prior beliefs about the underlying function, e.g., Lipschitz continuity, which can be encoded into the prior using a chi-squared or uniform distribution.

We also assume to have a scaling function that specifies a uniform error bound for an arbitrary fixed vector of hyperparameters $\theta$ with high probability.

**Assumption 3 (Scaling function).** There exists a known positive function $\beta: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that for any vector of

$$\beta(\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \beta_i(\gamma_i)$$

holds in the Bayesian setting, as described in the following assumption.
arbitrary lengthscales $\vartheta_0$ with $\vartheta' \leq \vartheta_0 \leq \vartheta''$. Define
\[
\tilde{\beta} = \gamma \left( \frac{2}{2 + 2\sigma_n^{-2}\|y\|_2^2} + \max_{\vartheta' \leq \vartheta \leq \vartheta''} \beta(\vartheta) \right) \]
Then,
\[
|f(x) - \mu_{\vartheta_0}(x)| \leq \tilde{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\vartheta_0}(x)
\]
holds for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with probability at least $(1 - \rho)$.

Theorem 1 implies that we can obtain a uniform error bound using the scaled posterior variance corresponding to the smallest vector of lengthscales $\vartheta'$. The term $2\sigma_n^{-2}\|y\|_2^2$, which we add to $\beta(\cdot)$ in Theorem 1, originates from the discrepancy between the posterior mean of the working lengthscales \( \vartheta_0 \) and those of the bounding lengthscales $\vartheta'$, $\vartheta''$. Note that the probabilistic nature of Theorem 1 stems from Assumption 1 also being probabilistic, and no additional uncertainty is introduced when deriving Theorem 1. In other words, the confidence region generated by the robust uniform error bound fully contains all confidence regions corresponding to $\vartheta$ with $\vartheta' \leq \vartheta \leq \vartheta''$. This is illustrated in Figure 3.

In order to be able to apply Theorem 1 in the more general setting where the bounding vectors $\vartheta'$, $\vartheta''$ are not given a priori, the next step is to determine permissible $\vartheta'$, $\vartheta''$. Since we are in a Bayesian scenario, an intuitive approach is to choose the bounding lengthscales $\vartheta'$, $\vartheta''$ such that they form a $1 - \delta$ confidence interval for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Note that deriving a similar technique in the frequentist setting, e.g., as in Chowdhury and Gopalan (2017b) or Srinivas et al. (2012), is not straightforward since the corresponding tools are not directly compatible with a distribution over the hyperparameters.

Formally, our approach consists of obtaining a pair of hyperparameters $\vartheta'$, $\vartheta''$ that lies within the set
\[
\mathcal{P}_\delta = \left\{ (\vartheta', \vartheta'') \in \Theta^2 \mid \int_{\vartheta' \leq \vartheta \leq \vartheta''} p(\vartheta | D) \, d\vartheta \geq 1 - \delta \right\},
\]
where the posterior over the lengthscales $\vartheta$ given the data $D = (\mathbf{X}, y)$ is computed using Bayes’ rule as
\[
p(\vartheta | y, \mathbf{X}) = \frac{p(y | \mathbf{X}, \vartheta) p(\vartheta)}{p(y | \mathbf{X})},
\]
and the posterior $p(y | \mathbf{X}, \vartheta)$ is computed similarly to (1). The normalizing factor $p(y | \mathbf{X})$ is then given by
\[
p(y | \mathbf{X}) = \int_{\Theta} p(y | \mathbf{X}, \vartheta) p(\vartheta) \, d\vartheta.
\]

By choosing the bounding lengthscales $\vartheta'$, $\vartheta''$ in this fashion, a vector of lengthscales $\vartheta$ sampled from the posterior distribution $p(\vartheta | D)$ lies within the interval $\vartheta' \leq \vartheta \leq \vartheta''$ with high probability. We are then able to estimate the error in the setting with unknown hyperparameters by applying Theorem 1 obtaining the following result.

**Theorem 2.** Let Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. Let $\vartheta'$, $\vartheta_0$, $\vartheta'' \in \Theta$ be vectors of lengthscales with $(\vartheta', \vartheta'') \in \mathcal{P}_\delta$ and choose $\beta$ as in Theorem 1. Furthermore, let $\vartheta \sim p(\vartheta | D)$, and let $\vartheta_0$ be a sample from a Gaussian process with kernel $k_0(\cdot, \cdot)$ as specified by Assumption 2. Then
\[
|f(x) - \mu_{\vartheta_0}(x)| \leq \tilde{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\vartheta_0}(x)
\]
holds for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with probability $(1 - \delta)(1 - \rho)$.

### 3.1 Extension to Noise and Signal Variance

So far, we discussed the setting where the signal and noise variance are constant and known. However, the proposed tools extend straightforwardly to the setting where they are also unknown, provided that a corresponding prior distribution is also available. This is because the posterior variance $\sigma_\vartheta^2(\cdot)$ increases with the noise and signal variance, hence a result of the form of Theorem 2 can be easily obtained.

### 3.2 Choosing Bounding Hyperparameters

Typically, the set of bounding pairs $\mathcal{P}_\delta$ contains more than one element. Hence, Theorem 2 allows some flexibility when deriving the uniform error bound, since we can choose any pair $(\vartheta', \vartheta'')$ that lies within $\mathcal{P}_\delta$. In the following, we derive a heuristic that aims to approximate the smallest possible $1 - \delta$ confidence region around the working hyperparameters $\vartheta_0$, which would automatically meet the requirements to apply Theorem 2. Formally, this is achieved by solving the optimization problem
\[
\min_{\vartheta', \vartheta'' \in \Theta} \|\vartheta'' - \vartheta'\|_2
\]
subject to
\[
\int_{\vartheta' \leq \vartheta \leq \vartheta''} p(\vartheta | D) \, d\vartheta \geq 1 - \delta.
\]
In other words, we aim to choose the pair of bounding hyperparameters $(\vartheta', \vartheta'') \in \mathcal{P}_\delta$ that deviate the least from $\vartheta_0$.

### 3.3 Discussion

Although the integrals in Equation (2) and (4) generally cannot be computed analytically, we can resort to different approximations. In low-dimensional settings, we can solve the
We consider an $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ where Theorem 2 can be employed straightforwardly to derive safety guarantees in different settings. In the following, we show experimental results in Section 5. We note, however, that this is an advantage of the proposed technique compared to fully Bayesian GPs, which typically require some form of MCMC approach. Moreover, after computing the bounding hyperparameters $\vartheta', \vartheta''$, the computational complexity of evaluating the error bound is only twice that of a standard GP, whereas in a fully Bayesian GP a potentially high number of GFs has to be evaluated per prediction. A further advantage compared to fully Bayesian GPs is that, in practice, it is reasonable to expect better error estimates, particularly if we choose a low risk parameter $\delta$ and a sufficiently smooth prior $p(\vartheta)$. This is because the marginal likelihood is typically well behaved in the hyperparameter space, and the fully Bayesian posterior mean and variance will lie within the uniform error bound computed with Theorem 2. This is supported by the experimental results in Section 5. We note, however, that the proposed approach can also be combined with a fully Bayesian GP, i.e., by using the fully Bayesian posterior mean only for regression, and the presented techniques to bound the regression error.

It is also worth noting that there is no direct analogy between the approach presented in this paper and robust uniform error bounds in the frequentist setting, i.e., where the unknown function $f(\cdot)$ is assumed to be fixed with a bounded RKHS norm. We believe this to be a strong argument in favor of employing a Bayesian perspective instead of a frequentist one when performing regression.

4 Control with Performance Guarantees

Theorem 2 can be employed straightforwardly to derive safety guarantees in different settings. In the following, we show how to apply it in a learning-based control setting with a commonly encountered system structure.

4.1 Control Problem

We consider an $m$-dimensional dynamical system of the form

\[
\dot{x}_1 = f_1(x_1) + g(x_1)x_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 = f_2(x_2, x_2) + g(x_1, x_2)x_3 \\
\vdots \\
\dot{x}_m = f_m(x_1, \ldots, x_m) + g(x_1, \ldots, x_m)u,
\]

where $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the system’s states and control input, respectively. The functions $f_i : \mathbb{R}^i \to \mathbb{R}$ are unknown and modeled using GPs, whereas we assume to know $g_i : \mathbb{R}^i \to \mathbb{R}$. These assumptions are common in this setting (Kwan and Lewis 2000, Capone and Hirche 2019).

Our goal is to design a control law $u$ that steers the subsystem $\dot{x}_1 = f_1(x_1) + g(x_1)x_2$ towards a desired time-dependent trajectory $x_d(t)$. In other words, we aim to reduce the norm of the time-dependent error $e_1(t) = x_1(t) - x_d(t)$. In the following, we assume that $x_d(t)$ is $m$ times continuously differentiable, and that all its derivatives are bounded, which is not a restrictive assumption. For the sake of simplicity, we henceforth use the notation $f_i := f_i(x_1, \ldots, x_i)$ and $g_i := g_i(x_1, \ldots, x_i)$.

In order to provide performance guarantees for (7), we require some additional smoothness assumptions with respect to the kernels used to model the functions $f_i$. This is expressed formally in the following.

Assumption 4. Each function $f_i$ is drawn from a Gaussian process with $m - i$ times differentiable kernel $k_{m,i}((\cdot), (\cdot))$.

Assumption 4 implies that the functions $f_i$ are $m - i$ times differentiable, which is not a restrictive assumption, as it applies for many systems of the form given by (7), e.g., robotic manipulators, jet engines, and induction motors (Kwan and Lewis 2000).

4.2 Backstepping Control

In order to track the desired trajectory $x_d(t)$, we employ a backstepping technique similar to the one proposed in Capone and Hirche (2019). The idea behind backstepping is to recursively design fictitious control inputs $x_{i+1,d}$ for each subsystem $\dot{x}_i = f_i + g_ix_{i+1,d}$, which we then aim to track by means of the true control input $u$. For more details, the reader is referred to (Krstic, Kokotovic, and Kanellakopoulos 1995).

To model the unknown functions $f_i(\cdot)$, we assume to have $N$ noisy measurements $\{x_{i-1,j}, f_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^N$. The control input $u$ can then be computed recursively using

\[
x_{2,d} = g_1^{-1}(-\mu_1 + \hat{x}_d - C_1^1 e_1) \\
\vdots \\
x_{i,d} = g_i^{-1}(-\mu_{i-1} + \hat{x}_{i-1,d} - C_{i-2}^i e_{i-2}) \\
u = g_m^{-1}(-\mu_m + \hat{x}_{m,d} - e_m - g_{m-1}e_{m-1}),
\]

where $\mu_i$ denotes the posterior mean of the $i$-th Gaussian process, $e_i = x_i - x_{i,d}$ the tracking error of the $i$-th subsystem, and $C_i : \mathbb{R}^i \to \mathbb{R}$ are state-dependent control gains.

The stability analysis of the closed-loop system is carried out using Lyapunov theory. By using a quadratic Lyapunov function, it is straightforward to show that there exists an ultimate upper bound $\varepsilon$ for the tracking error $e_d(t)$, i.e., $e_d(t) \leq \varepsilon$ holds for large enough $t$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ depends on the control gains $C_i$ (Capone and Hirche 2019, Lemma 2). By using this result and Theorem 2 we are able to determine adaptive control gains $C_i$ that yield a tracking error smaller or equal than a predetermined value $\varepsilon_d$, which is crucial in safety-critical applications. This is formally stated in the following result.

Theorem 3. Let Assumptions 4 and 2 hold, and let the control input $u$ be given by (8). Furthermore, let $(\vartheta'_1, \vartheta''_1), \ldots, (\vartheta'_m, \vartheta''_m)$ be bounding hyperparameters for the subsystems $1, \ldots, m$, obtained with (6) and risk parameters $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and let $\beta_i(\cdot)$ be the corresponding scaling
functions. Choose $\varepsilon_d > 0$, $\bar{\beta}$, as in Theorem[1] and choose each state-dependent control gain as
\[
C_i(x) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon_d} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \bar{\beta}_j \sigma_j^2 \vartheta_j(x),
\]
(9)
where $\gamma_j$ are chosen as in Lemma[1]. Then, with probability $(1 - \rho)^N (1 - \delta)^m$, there exists a $T > 0$, such that
\[
\|\mathbf{x}(t) - x_d(t)\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_d
\]
holds for all $t > T$.

Hence, we can use (6) to obtain the control gains required for the control performance specification $\varepsilon_d$.

5 Results

We now present experimental results where the performance of the proposed error bound is compared to that of vanilla and fully Bayesian GPs. We first showcase the prediction error on regression benchmarks, then apply the proposed technique to design a learning-based control law. A Gaussian kernel is used in all cases except the Mauna Loa experiments, and we also consider uncertainty in the signal and noise variances, as discussed in Section[3]. In all except the Sarcos experiments, the fully Bayesian GPs and integral expression in (6) are approximated using the No-U-Turn Sampler algorithm for MCMC (Hoffman, Gelman et al. 2014). The implementations are carried out using GPyTorch (Gardner et al. 2018).

The values for $\beta$ proposed in theory are typically very conservative (Srinivas et al. 2012), which makes their use impractical. Similarly, the scaling factor $\beta$ proposed by Theorem[2] assumes very high values. In many safety-critical applications, it is common to choose the scaling factor as $\beta = 2$, independently of the hyperparameters $\vartheta$. Berkenkamp et al. (2017), Umlauft et al. (2017). Moreover, empirical results indicate that Lemma[1] holds with $\gamma = 1$ in the case of a Gaussian kernel, i.e., the error bound will be at least as robust as that of the vanilla GP for $\beta = \beta$. Hence, to obtain a fair and not overly conservative comparison, we set $\bar{\beta} = \beta = 2$ in the following experiments. The working hyperparameters $\vartheta$ are chosen by maximizing the log marginal likelihood (1). We employ a confidence parameter of $\delta = 0.05$ for (6), and compute the integral expressions using Monte Carlo integration. We assume uniform distributions as hyperpriors $p(\vartheta)$. Note that even though this imposes hard bounds on the hyperparameters, these are still very large.

5.1 Regression - Toy Problem and Benchmarks

In the regression experiments, to additionally illustrate the behavior of the proposed technique as more data becomes available, we train the GPs with data sets of varying sizes $N$.

We first investigate how the proposed technique performs
when estimating the regression error of a function $f(\cdot)$ that is sampled from a GP. The results can be seen in Figure 4. Our approach always captures the behavior of the underlying sample $f(\cdot)$. Both the vanilla GP error bound and the fully Bayesian error bound fail to do so if little data is available (Figure 4a) or if the data is sparse (Figure 4b). The estimated error is only accurate for the vanilla and fully Bayesian GPs if the data covers the state space sufficiently well (Figure 4c).

We now apply the proposed technique to estimate the regression error of the Boston house prices data set (Pedregosa et al. 2011), the UCI wine quality data set (Cortez et al. 2009), the Mauna Loa CO$_2$ time series, and the Sarcos data set. For the Mauna Loa data set, we employ a spectral mixture kernel with 20 mixtures (Wilson and Adams 2013), which consists of a sum of 20 Gaussian kernels multiplied with sinusoidal kernels. It is straightforward to show that its Fourier transform increases with the lengthscales, hence we are able to apply Theorem 2. The mixture means, which specify the frequency of the periodic components, are assumed to be fixed except for the fully Bayesian case. For the two largest Sarcos data sets, we perform a Laplace approximation around the maximum of the posterior, which yields a normal distribution (MacKay 2002). To ensure that the corresponding covariance matrix is positive definite, we employ an empirical Bayes approach and specify a quadratic hyperprior around the log likelihood maximum. The bounding hyperparameters are then obtained by computing the corresponding rectangular confidence region as in (ˇSid´ak 1967).

We run each scenario multiple times and select the $N$ training and $N_{\text{test}}$ test points randomly every time. The Sarcos experiments are repeated 10 times due to high computational requirements, all other experiments are repeated 100 times. To evaluate performance, we check how often the error bound is incorrect, which corresponds to the measuring the quantity

$$\frac{1}{N_{\text{test}}} \sum_{m=1}^{N_{\text{test}}} \mathbb{I} \left(g_m - \mu_{\theta}(a_{m}^{\text{test}}) - \beta \frac{\sigma_{\theta}(a_{m}^{\text{test}})}{\beta} \right),$$

where the superscript test denotes test inputs/outputs, and

$$\mathbb{I}(z) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } z \leq 0 \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is the indicator function. Note that this essentially corresponds to the calibration error metric for regression suggested by (Kuleshov, Fenner, and Ermon 2018).

The results are summarized in Table 1. As can be seen, our bound is always more accurate than that of vanilla or fully Bayesian GPs, particularly in low-data regimes. This is to be expected, as the marginal likelihood function is known to be poorly peaked for small $N$ (MacKay 1999).

5.2 Control Design with Little Data

We now apply the proposed technique to design a control law for a safety-critical setting, where a one-link planar manipulator with motor dynamics is to be steered towards the origin using the method presented in Section 4 and $N = 10$ training data points. Note that $N = 10$ is not very small for control purposes in the proposed setting, since good performance can already be achieved with as little as $N = 50$ data points (Capone and Hirche 2019). The data is obtained using a low-gain sinusoidal input.

The manipulator dynamics are given by

$$D\ddot{\varphi} + B\dot{\varphi} + G\sin(\varphi) = \tau$$

$$M\ddot{\varphi} + \tau + H\tau + Z\dot{\varphi} = u,$$

where $\varphi$ and $\tau$ are the system’s angle and torque, respectively, $u$ is the motor voltage, which we can control directly, and $D$, $B$, $G$, $M$, $H$, $Z$ are system parameters. By approximating the differential equation of each state $\varphi$, $\dot{\varphi}$, $\tau$ using a separate Gaussian process, we are able to employ a backstepping technique to track a desired trajectory, as described in Section 4. We then use Theorem 3 to choose the control gains $C_i(x)$, $i = 1, \ldots, 3$, by setting the desired error to $\epsilon_{\text{max}} = 1$.

To evaluate the control performance, we run 100 simulations for each setting, where the initial conditions of the manipulator are randomly sampled from a normal distribution. The norm of the resulting tracking error is displayed in Figure 5. As can be seen, the gains obtained using the proposed approach perform considerably better than the ones obtained with vanilla and fully Bayesian GPs. This is because the posterior variance of the Gaussian process decreases too slowly away from the collected data points, expressing too much confidence in the posterior mean.

6 Conclusion

We have presented robust uniform error bounds for Gaussian processes with unknown hyperparameters. Our approach is applicable for stationary radially non-decreasing kernels, which are commonly employed in practice. It hinges on computing a confidence region for the hyperparameters, which does not require pre-specified bounds for the hyperparameters. The presented theoretical results make them flexible and easily applicable to safety-critical scenarios, where theoretical guarantees are often required. In numerical regression benchmarks, the proposed error bound was shown to outperform the error bound obtained with standard and fully Bayesian Gaussian processes. Furthermore, the presented tool resulted in better control performance in a control problem, indicating better suitability for safety-critical settings.
7 Appendices

A Proofs

We begin by listing some well-known results required to prove the main statements from the paper.

**Lemma 2** (Wendland 2004, Theorem 6.11). Suppose that \( k \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^d) \) is a continuous function. Then \( k(\cdot) \) is positive definite if and only if its Fourier transform is nonnegative and nonvanishing.

**Lemma 3** (Rao et al. 1973, p. 70). Let \( A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) be two symmetric positive-definite matrices, such that \( A - B \) is symmetric positive-definite. Then \( B^{-1} - A^{-1} \) is symmetric positive-definite.

The following result is a direct consequence of the block matrix inversion formula, which can be found, e.g., in Horn and Johnson 2012, p. 18.

**Lemma 4** (Horn and Johnson 2012, p. 18). Let

\[
K = \begin{pmatrix} K & k \\ k^\top & k \end{pmatrix}
\]

be an \( N \times N \) non-singular partitioned matrix. Then the lower-right entry of its inverse is given by

\[
[K^{-1}]_{N,N} = (k - k^\top K^{-1}k)^{-1}.
\]

By putting Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 together, we obtain the following statement.

**Lemma 5.** Let

\[
K_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{K}_1 & k_1 \\ k_1^\top & k_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad K_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{K}_2 & k_2 \\ k_2^\top & k_2 \end{pmatrix}
\]

be \( N \times N \) symmetric positive definite partitioned matrices, such that \( K_1 - K_2 \) is also positive definite. Then

\[
k_1 - k_1^\top \tilde{K}_1^{-1}k_1 \geq k_2 - k_2^\top \tilde{K}_2^{-1}k_2.
\]

**Proof.** From Lemma 3 we obtain \( K_2^{-1} \geq K_1^{-1} \). In particular, for \( q = (0, \cdots, 0, 1)^\top \), this implies, together with Lemma 4

\[
(k_2 - k_2^\top \tilde{K}_2^{-1}k_2)^{-1} = q^\top K_2^{-1}q \geq q^\top K_1^{-1}q = (k_1 - k_1^\top \tilde{K}_1^{-1}k_1)^{-1},
\]

i.e., \( k_1 - k_1^\top \tilde{K}_1^{-1}k_1 \geq k_2 - k_2^\top \tilde{K}_2^{-1}k_2 \). \( \square \)

Using Lemma 3 we then obtain the following.

**Lemma 6.** Let \( k_\vartheta(\cdot, \cdot), k_{\vartheta'}(\cdot, \cdot) \) be two kernels with length-scales \( \vartheta > \vartheta' \), let \( D \) denote a measurement data set of an unknown function \( f(\cdot) \), and let \( K_\vartheta \) and \( K_{\vartheta'} \) denote the corresponding covariance matrices. Then the matrix

\[
K_{\vartheta'} \triangleq -\prod_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{\vartheta_{i}} K_\vartheta
\]

is positive semi-definite.

**Proof.** For an arbitrary \( \vartheta \in \Theta \), define \( T := \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\vartheta_1}, \cdots, \frac{1}{\vartheta_d}) \). By Assumption 1 the Fourier transform of \( k_\vartheta(\cdot, \cdot) \) is given by

\[
\hat{k}_\vartheta(\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} k(Tx)e^{-i2\pi x^\top \omega}dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} k(z)e^{-i2\pi z^\top T^{-1} \omega}dz = (\prod_{i=1}^d \vartheta_i) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} k(z)e^{-i2\pi z^\top T^{-1} \omega}dz = (\prod_{i=1}^d \vartheta_i) \hat{R}(T^{-1} \omega)
\]

Since \( \kappa(\cdot) \) is non-increasing, for any pair of length-scales \( \vartheta, \vartheta' \in \Theta \) with \( \vartheta > \vartheta' \),

\[
\kappa(||T^{-1} \omega||_2) \geq \kappa(||T^{-1} \omega||_2)
\]

holds, where \( T' := \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\vartheta'}, \cdots, \frac{1}{\vartheta'}) \). Hence, (11) implies

\[
\prod_{i=1}^d \frac{\vartheta_i}{\vartheta_i'} \hat{k}_{\vartheta'}(\omega) - \hat{k}_\vartheta(\omega) \geq 0
\]

for all \( \omega \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Since \( \gamma \geq \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{\vartheta_i}{\vartheta_i'} \), it then follows from Lemma 2 that

\[
\prod_{i=1}^d \frac{\vartheta_i}{\vartheta_i'} \hat{k}_{\vartheta'}(\cdot, \cdot) - k_{\vartheta'}(\cdot, \cdot)
\]

is a positive definite function, which implies the desired result. \( \square \)

**Proof of Lemma 7.** The result follows directly from Lemma 5 and Lemma 6. \( \square \)

In order to prove Theorem 2 we aim to bound the difference between posterior means \( \mu_\vartheta(x) - \mu_{\vartheta'}(x) \). To this end, we employ the two following results.

**Lemma 7.** Let \( ||\cdot||_{k_\vartheta} \) denote the RKHS norm with respect to a kernel \( k_\vartheta \), and consider a function \( \mu(\cdot) \) with bounded RKHS norm \( ||\mu||_{k_\vartheta} \leq \infty \). Then, for all \( x \in \mathcal{X} \),

\[
||\mu(\mathcal{X})||^2 \leq \sigma^2_\vartheta(x)
\]

holds, where \( \sigma^2_\vartheta \) is the noise variance and \( x_1, \ldots, x_N \) are the measurement inputs.

**Proof.** See Srinivas et al. 2012, Appendix B, eq. (11). \( \square \)

**Lemma 8** (Bui 2011). Let \( \mu(\cdot) \) be a function with bounded reproducing kernel Hilbert space norm \( ||\mu||_{k_\vartheta} \) with respect to the kernel \( k_\vartheta \). Then, for all \( \vartheta' \leq \vartheta \),

\[
||\mu||^2_{k_{\vartheta'}} \leq \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{\vartheta_i}{\vartheta_i'} ||\mu||^2_{k_\vartheta}.
\]
We are now able to bound the difference between the means of two Gaussian processes conditioned on the same data, as described in the next statement.

**Lemma 9.** Let Assumption 7 hold, let \( \vartheta', \vartheta'', \vartheta, \vartheta_0 \in \Theta \) be vectors of lengthscales with \( \vartheta' \leq \vartheta_0, \vartheta \leq \vartheta'' \), and let \( \mu_{\vartheta_0}(x), \mu_{\vartheta}(x) \) denote GP posterior means conditioned on some measurement data set \( D = \{X, y\} \). Then

\[
|\mu_{\vartheta_0}(x) - \mu_{\vartheta}(x)|^2 \leq \sigma_{\vartheta_0}^2 (x) \sigma_{\vartheta}^2 (x) \left( 2 + \frac{2\|y\|^2_2}{\sigma_n^2} \right)
\]

holds for all \( x \in X \), where \( \sigma_n \) is the noise variance, \( \gamma \) and \( \nu \) the measurement data.

**Proof.** Define \( \tilde{K}_{\vartheta} := K_{\vartheta} + \sigma_n I \). From Lemma 7 we have

\[
|\mu_{\vartheta_0}(x) - \mu_{\vartheta}(x)|^2 \leq \sigma_{\vartheta_0}^2 (x) \left( \|\mu_{\vartheta_0} - \mu_{\vartheta} \|_{k_{\vartheta}}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\mu_{\vartheta}(x_i) - \mu_{\vartheta_0}(x_i))^2}{\sigma_n^2} \right)
\]

Now, the RKHS norm with respect to \( k_{\vartheta} \) of a posterior mean function \( \mu_{\vartheta} \) can be upper-bounded as

\[
\|\mu_{\vartheta}\|_{k_{\vartheta}}^2 = y^T \tilde{K}_{\vartheta}^{-1} K_{\vartheta} \tilde{K}_{\vartheta}^{-1} y \leq y^T \tilde{K}_{\vartheta}^{-1} y \leq \frac{\|y\|^2_2}{\sigma_n^2},
\]

where the first inequality is due to the eigenvalues of \( \tilde{K}_{\vartheta}^{-1} K_{\vartheta} \tilde{K}_{\vartheta}^{-1} \) being smaller or equal to one, whereas the last inequality holds because the eigenvalues of \( \tilde{K}_{\vartheta} \) are greater or equal to \( \sigma_n^2 \). Furthermore, the summation in (12) can be bounded as

\[
\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\mu_{\vartheta}(x_i) - \mu_{\vartheta_0}(x_i))^2}{\sigma_n^2} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2} \|K_{\vartheta} \tilde{K}_{\vartheta}^{-1} y - K_{\vartheta_0} \tilde{K}_{\vartheta_0}^{-1} y\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2} \|K_{\vartheta} \tilde{K}_{\vartheta}^{-1} y\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2} \|K_{\vartheta_0} \tilde{K}_{\vartheta_0}^{-1} y\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2\|y\|^2_2}{\sigma_n^2}.
\]

Plugging this into (12) together with Lemma 8 yields \( \gamma > 1 \)

\[
|\mu_{\vartheta_0}(x) - \mu_{\vartheta}(x)|^2 \leq \sigma_{\vartheta_0}^2 (x) \left( \|\mu_{\vartheta_0} - \mu_{\vartheta} \|_{k_{\vartheta}}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\mu_{\vartheta}(x_i) - \mu_{\vartheta_0}(x_i))^2}{\sigma_n^2} \right) \]

\[
\leq \sigma_{\vartheta_0}^2 (x) \left( \|\mu_{\vartheta_0} \|_{k_{\vartheta}}^2 + \|\mu_{\vartheta} \|_{k_{\vartheta}}^2 + \frac{2\|y\|^2_2}{\sigma_n^2} \right) \]

\[
\leq \sigma_{\vartheta_0}^2 (x) \left( \gamma^2 \|\mu_{\vartheta_0} \|_{k_{\vartheta}}^2 + \gamma^2 \|\mu_{\vartheta} \|_{k_{\vartheta}}^2 + \frac{2\|y\|^2_2}{\sigma_n^2} \right) \]

\[
\leq \sigma_{\vartheta_0}^2 (x) \gamma^2 \left( 2 + \frac{2\|y\|^2_2}{\sigma_n^2} \right).
\]

**Proof of Theorem 7.** By applying Assumption 3 and Lemmas 1 and 9 we obtain

\[
|f(x) - \mu_{\vartheta_0}(x)| \leq |f(x) - \mu_{\vartheta}(x)| + |\mu_{\vartheta}(x) - \mu_{\vartheta_0}(x)| \leq \left( \max_{\vartheta \leq \vartheta' \leq \vartheta''} \beta \vartheta \right) \gamma \sigma_{\vartheta}(x) + \gamma \left( 2 + \frac{2\|y\|^2_2}{\sigma_n^2} \right) \sigma_{\vartheta}(x).
\]

**Proof of Theorem 2.** It follows from the definition of \( T_\delta \) that \( \vartheta' \leq \vartheta \leq \vartheta'' \) holds with probability at least \((1 - \delta)\). Theorem 2 is then a direct consequence of Theorem 1.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** The dynamics of the control error can be written in the compact form (Capone and Hirche 2019)

\[
\dot{e} = \dot{x} - \dot{x}_d = \Delta f - (C + G)e,
\]

where \( \Delta f := (f_1 - \mu_1, \ldots, f_d - \mu_d), C := \text{diag}(C_1(\vartheta, \ldots, C_d(\vartheta))) \).

Consider then the Lyapunov function \( V(e) = \frac{1}{2} e^T e \). The corresponding time derivative can then be bounded using Theorem 2 with probability \((1 - \delta)^m (1 - \rho)^n\) as

\[
\dot{V}(e) = e^T \Delta f e - e^T C e \leq \|e\|_2 \left( \|\Delta f\|_2 - \|e\|_2 \min_i C_i(x) \right) \leq \|e\|_2 C_i(x) \left( \|e_d\| - \|e\|_2 \right),
\]

which is negative for \( \|e\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_d \), implying that the norm of \( e \) does not grow beyond \( \varepsilon_d \) after a specific time \( T \) (Khalil 1996).

**B Experiments**

The hyperpriors in all cases except the Sarcos experiments with more than \( N = 850 \) training inputs are uniform distributions. The corresponding upper and lower bounds are shown in Table 2.

**B.1 Laplace approximation and Empirical Bayes**

We now detail the Laplace approximation and empirical Bayes approach used for the two largest Sarcos data sets.

The Laplace approximation of the posterior is typically obtained by computing the Hessian of the posterior around its maximum, and then treating the negative Hessian, which should be positive definite, as the covariance matrix of the corresponding Gaussian approximation (MacKay 2002).

In our setting, using uniform hyperpriors would lead to the Hessian of the posterior being the Hessian of the log likelihood, since the derivatives of the uniform hyperprior
We employ a command-filtered backstepping approach to $\vartheta$ with respect to $\hat{\vartheta}$ = estimated maximum of the log likelihood $\vartheta$.

Table 2: Lower/upper bounds of uniform distributions used as hyperpriors. BSTN stands for Boston (house prices), ML for Mauna Loa, and SRCS for Sarcos. Control refers to the backstepping control experiment in Section 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>BSTN</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>WINE</th>
<th>SRCS</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAL VARIANCE</td>
<td>[1, 50]</td>
<td>[10^{-10}, 10^5]</td>
<td>[10^{-2}, 10^2]</td>
<td>[10^{-1}, 10^3]</td>
<td>[10^{-6}, 10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENGTHScales</td>
<td>[10^{-1}, 10^2]</td>
<td>[10^{-10}, 5 \times 10^{12}]</td>
<td>[10^{-2}, 10]</td>
<td>[10^{-1}, 50]</td>
<td>[10^{-15}, 10^{-2}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE VARIANCE</td>
<td>[10^{-1}, 10^2]</td>
<td>[10^{-5}, 10^2]</td>
<td>[10^{-2}, 1]</td>
<td>[10^{-2}, 80]</td>
<td>[10^{-5}, 10^{-1}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are zero almost everywhere. However, the Hessian of the log likelihood is not always negative definite due to numerical issues or premature termination of the optimization algorithm.

Hence, we consider an empirical Bayes approach, where the prior is chosen based on the data (Robbins 2020). In our case, this is achieved by specifying a normal hyperprior around the (estimated) maximum of the log likelihood $\vartheta_0$, i.e.,

$$
\log p(\vartheta) \approx -(\vartheta - \vartheta_0)^T H_p (\vartheta - \vartheta_0),
$$

where $\approx$ denotes equality up to a constant, and $H_p = h_p I$ is a diagonal matrix such that the Hessian of the log posterior

$$
H_\vartheta (\log p(\vartheta | y, X)) = -H_p + H_\vartheta (\log p(y | X, \vartheta))
$$

is negative definite. Here $H_\vartheta (\cdot)$ denotes the Hessian operator with respect to $\vartheta$. Note that increasing $h_p$ results in a less conservative set of bounding hyperparameters $\vartheta_\ell, \vartheta_\ell$, since it implies more confidence in the estimated maximum $\vartheta_0$.

In the Sarcos experiments, we set $h_p$ to the the maximum diagonal entry of $-H_\vartheta (\log p(y | X, \vartheta))$.

### B.2 Control Problem

The dimensionless parameters of the dynamical system are given by $M = 0.05, B = D = 1, G = Z = 10, H = 0.5$.

We employ a command-filtered backstepping approach to bypass the computation of the control input, which has no practical impact on the results if a corresponding filtering parameter is chosen high enough. For more details, see (Farrell et al. 2009; Capone and Hirche 2019).
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