

Optimal Exploration Strategy for Regret Minimization in Unconstrained Scalar Optimization Problems

Ying Wang, Mirko Pasquini, K  vin Colin, H  kan Hjalmarsson

Abstract—We study the problem of determining the optimal exploration strategy in an unconstrained scalar optimization problem depending on an unknown parameter to be learned from online collected noisy data. An optimal trade-off between exploration and exploitation is crucial for effective optimization under uncertainties, and to achieve this we consider a cumulative regret minimization approach over a finite horizon, with each time instant in the horizon characterized by a stochastic exploration signal, whose variance has to be designed. In this setting, under an idealized assumption on an appropriately defined information function associated with the excitation, we are able to show that the optimal exploration strategy is either to use no exploration at all (called lazy exploration) or adding an exploration excitation only at the first time instant of the horizon (called immediate exploration). A quadratic numerical example is used to illustrate the results.

I. INTRODUCTION

As many systems are too complex to be modelled (only) by physical relationships, control and system optimization procedures often need to employ data, making data-driven decision making a central topic. This topic can be considered as old as control itself. It is not hard to envisage that the flyball governor controlling Watt’s steam engine was adjusted based on observations of the closed-loop operation of the engine. A more modern but still early example is the MIT rule, proposed for adaptive control of aircrafts traversing different flight conditions [1]. Since then several prominent research directions have been pursued, focusing on different aspects of data-driven decision making in a control context. In adaptive control, different controller structures were proposed, such as the self-tuning regulator (STR) and model reference adaptive control (MRAC). These two principles employ data in a somewhat different way. In the STR a model is updated which subsequently is used to update the controller employing the certainty equivalence principle, i.e. the model is assumed to be correct, while in MRAC data directly affects the controller parameters. Establishing closed loop stability of adaptive control schemes (e.g. [2], [3]) is considered one of the breakthroughs in control. We refer to [4], [5], [6] for treatments of adaptive control.

*This work was supported by VINNOVA Competence Center AdBIO-PRO, contract [2016-05181] and by the Swedish Research Council through the research environment NewLEADS (New Directions in Learning Dynamical Systems), contract [2016-06079] and by Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP), funded by Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

The authors are with the Division of Decision and Control Systems, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 10044 Stockholm, Sweden. Mirko Pasquini, K  vin Colin and H  kan Hjalmarsson are also with the Center for Advanced Bio Production AdBIO-PRO, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 10044 Stockholm, Sweden (e-mail: yinwang@kth.se; pasqu@kth.se; kcolin@kth.se; hjalmars@kth.se).

Robust control [7] put the spotlight on the approximative nature of models and the field ”identification for control (I4C)” evolved in the 1990s as a response to the dichotomy between the leading paradigm of the time of using data-driven models as complex as the true system and the fact that simple controllers may successfully control a complex system. Control relevant models (Examples 2.10 and 2.11 in [4] are striking illustrations) and procedures for how to generate data such that despite a systematic error (bias) the identified models fulfilled their task in control design were developed. We refer to [8] for a survey of this work. Another line of research has been to develop systematic experiment design procedures such that the generated data is maximally informative for data-driven model based control design [9], [10], [11]. Interestingly, in [11] it is shown that even if such a design is made for a full order model, the experiments become control-relevant allowing for simplified models to be used as long as they can capture the system properties relevant for control. Other observations made in [11] are that the experimental cost and the required model complexity is highly dependent on the desired control performance. Also relevant to our study is that to cope with the inherent catch that the optimal experiment design depends on the unknown system, adaptive experiment design procedures have been developed supported by theory showing that such procedures do not result in loss in performance results asymptotically [12], [13]. Control performance and the cost of acquiring data have in most work been treated separately. A seminal step for a comprehensive treatment of data-driven decision making for control was taken by Lai and Wei in the mid 1980s when they in an adaptive control context integrated exploration (purposely adding excitation to obtain informative data) and exploitation (achieving good control performance) into one single criterion [14], [15]. The difference between the actual control performance, including both these contributions, and the optimal control performance was called regret. While dormant for long, lately significant developments have been made for the problem of regret minimization for the Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) problem. One of the main outcomes of these efforts has been to establish the rate of growth of the minimal regret as function of the control horizon T . The early work [14] indicated an asymptotic lower bound of $O(\log(T))$ for minimum variance control of ARX-systems. For LQR, the rate $O(\sqrt{T})$ was established in [16] and proven to be the optimal lower bound rate when both state matrix and input matrix are unknown in [17]. This rate can be obtained when systems are excited with white Gaussian noise whose variance decays as $1/\sqrt{t}$ [18]. We will refer to

this type of exploration as decaying. Recently, in [19], it is demonstrated that when both state matrix and input matrix are unknown, the regret can be upper-bounded as $O(\sqrt{T})$; when either state matrix or input matrix is known, it can be upper-bounded as $O(\log(T))$. The exploration cost is also accounted for in [20], who studies a general control problem for a general class of linear systems in a batch-wise setting. The numerical study shows that it is optimal to devote all exploration to the first batch. Even though this setting is somewhat different from the adaptive LQR setting studied in the works referenced above, it is interesting to note that this conclusion is at odds with the decaying exploration proposed in, e.g. [18], [19] and in [21] it is shown that for a given finite horizon T immediate excitation is optimal also in an LQR-setting. By immediate we mean that all exploration takes place at the beginning. The optimal regret still is $O(\sqrt{T})$ but the proportionality constant is smaller than with decaying exploration.

In this contribution we broaden this line of research by turning to the optimization of non-linear static systems where the performance measure can be a non-linear function of the input. To study essential aspects of the problem, we limit our attention to static input-output relationships described by one unknown parameter and assume that we have access to noisy measurements of the output response. This does not preclude that the system may be dynamic, only that we are interested in optimizing its static behaviour and that we assume that the response to a constant input can be measured (for a stable system the latter may be achieved after transients have died out). The setting thus closely relates to the steady-state optimization problems faced in Real-Time Optimization (RTO) [22], [23] where the goal is to optimize a plant operating condition, despite such plant's input-output steady-state map being partially unknown, e.g. as it depends on an unknown parameter to be learned with noisy measurements. Although the concept of exploration-exploitation trade-off has been central in the context of decision making under uncertainty, only few works in the literature of RTO account for this. A notable exception is [24] which employs a Bayesian Optimization framework, so that exploration is accounted for by means of an acquisition function. To the best of our knowledge, a regret minimization framework was, for this type of setting, first studied in [25]. However, there the long-term effect of the additional excitation is neglected as only the regret in the next time instant is considered. Contrary to this, we derive an approximation for the cumulative regret over the entire time horizon T , based on which we are able to derive an optimal exploration strategy. Aligning with the numerical results of [20] for batch-wise regret minimization and the theoretical results of [26], [21] for the LQR-problem, we show that optimal exploration is either lazy (no exploration at all) or immediate (only explore at the first time instant), depending on the problem at hand.

In Section II, we present the regret minimization problem, while we derive an approximate expression of the regret, with an upper bound for this approximation in Section III.

In Section IV, we conclude that either lazy or immediate exploration is optimal for a class of regret minimization problems. In Section V we consider a numerical example to illustrate that our theoretical results hold despite the approximations made in Section III. Finally, we provide a conclusion and future perspectives in Section VI.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Many important control problems can be phrased as iterative optimization of the input. One example is medium optimization in bioprocessing applications for pharmaceuticals production [27]. More broadly, this is the scope of real-time optimization, where the operating condition of a partially unknown plant is optimized by iteratively solving a sequence of optimization problems. Here we consider the problem of unconstrained optimization of a scalar cost function Φ where the dependency on the underlying system is modeled by a scalar parameter θ_0 , i.e. $\Phi = \Phi(u, \theta_0)$ where u denotes the scalar input to be optimized and θ_0 denotes the true parameter. The optimal input is given by

$$u_0^* = \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \Phi(u, \theta_0) \quad (1)$$

We use the function $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to explicitly describe the relationship between the system parameter and the optimal input defined by (1), i.e. $u_0^* = U(\theta_0)$. A key aspect of our problem is that exact knowledge about θ_0 is unknown and is only available indirectly by way of measurements of some output of the system subject to measurement errors. Formally, we express this by the measurement equation

$$y_t = h(u_t, \theta_0) + e_t \quad (2)$$

where y_t and u_t are the output and input at time instant t respectively and e_t is zero-mean Gaussian noise with variance σ^2 . We will base our method on the Certainty Equivalence Principle (CEP), i.e. after having collected $\{u_1, \dots, u_{t-1}\}$ and $\{y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}\}$ from (2), we approximate u_0^* by replacing the unknown θ_0 by an estimate $\hat{\theta}_t$ using those measurements, resulting in the input

$$u_t^* = \arg \min_u \Phi(u, \hat{\theta}_t) \quad (3)$$

We remark that the use of CEP is very common in data-driven control [4], [18], [16].

From (1) and (3) we see that $u_t^* = U(\hat{\theta}_t)$. Thus, attaining an accurate estimate is instrumental for the CEP to give a satisfactory result. To this end the CEP may not work well as the input may not be very informative. Consider for example the extreme case for which $u = u_0^*$ gives $y = 0$, i.e. no information on θ_0 is obtained.

To address this, following e.g. [18], exploration is achieved by incorporating an additional excitation term α_t , to the input u_t^* to improve the accuracy of estimation, as illustrated in Fig. 1. For future reference we will refer to u_t^* and α_t as exploitation and exploration inputs respectively. However, the introduction of α_t presents a dilemma, as it tends to perturb u_t^* , the input that minimizes $\Phi(u, \hat{\theta}_t)$. This perturbation leads




Fig. 1. The iterative framework for the input optimization problem based on the CEP as well as the exploitation and exploration idea

to an increase in the cost. Thus, a trade-off exists between exploitation and exploration when we design α_t .

Regret is a widely used criterion for obtaining an optimal balance between exploitation and exploration. It is defined as the cumulative performance degradation from the optimal cost achieved with u_0^* , when the input $u_t = u_t^* + \alpha_t$ is employed instead. In a finite horizon T , the cumulative regret is expressed as $\sum_{t=1}^T [\Phi(u_t^* + \alpha_t, \theta_0) - \Phi(u_0^*, \theta_0)]$ which can be used to guide the design of the exploration α_t .

The presence of random noise e_t , as described in equation (2), makes both $\hat{\theta}_t$ and the subsequently generated u_t^* stochastic. Inspired by the literature on regret minimization for linear quadratic adaptive control [18], [19], [21], we assume that the exploration sequence $\{\alpha_t\}$ is zero-mean white noise with a time-varying variance denoted by x_t . Thus, our further analysis will focus on the expected cumulative regret (in what follows we will use regret for short for this quantity) defined as follows, taking into consideration the randomness in both the noise and the exploration action,

$$\bar{R} = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_t^* + \alpha_t, \theta_0) - \Phi(u_0^*, \theta_0)] \quad (4)$$

Here the expectation $\mathbb{E}$ is taken with respect to (w.r.t.) both the noise $\{e_t\}$ and the exploration signal $\{\alpha_t\}$. This reflects the average performance loss of the exploration strategy when the same experiment is repeated multiple times with the same way of generating the stochastic e_t and α_t .

In general it is very difficult to compute the regret in (4). In the next section we will develop an approximate expression of $\bar{R}$ which will allow us to conclude on the structure of the optimal exploration sequence $\{\alpha_t\}$.

III. REGRET APPROXIMATION AND MODEL UNCERTAINTIES

A. Regret approximation

Assuming that a reasonable amount of data and a reasonable estimator $\hat{\theta}_t$ are available, we may assume that u_t^* is in the vicinity of u_0^* and we can use a Taylor expansion of (4) around u_0^* . This gives

$$\bar{R} \approx \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(u_t^* + \alpha_t - u_0^*)J_u + \frac{H_u}{2}(u_t^* + \alpha_t - u_0^*)^2]$$

where $J_u = \frac{\partial \Phi(u, \theta_0)}{\partial u}|_{u=u_0^*}$ and $H_u = \frac{\partial^2 \Phi(u, \theta_0)}{\partial u^2}|_{u=u_0^*}$. Here, $J_u = 0$ since u_0^* is a minimum of Φ . For simplicity we will assume that $H_u > 0$. Since $H_u/2$ is just a scaling

factor we will omit it and study the scaled expected regret $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(u_t^* + \alpha_t - u_0^*)^2]$, which can be expanded into

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(u_t^* - u_0^*)^2 + 2(u_t^* - u_0^*)\alpha_t + \alpha_t^2] \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, both the actual input u_0^* and the approximate counterpart u_t^* are determined by the function U . The former requires the unknown actual parameter θ_0 , while the latter utilizes the estimated parameter $\hat{\theta}_t$. We here approximate the difference between u_0^* and u_t^* with the Taylor approximation

$$u_t^* - u_0^* \approx (\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_0)J_\theta \quad (6)$$

where $J_\theta = \frac{dU(\theta)}{d\theta}|_{\theta=\theta_0}$. This gives the following approximation of the regret in (5)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R} &:= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_0)^2 J_\theta^2 + 2(\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_0)J_\theta \alpha_t + \alpha_t^2] \\ &= J_\theta^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_0)^2] + \sum_{t=1}^T x_t \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the equality holds because the current exploration action α_t and the estimate error $\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_0$ (determined by the input and output before time t) are independent, together with the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_t] = 0$. The approximation (7) indicates that the performance degradation over horizon T is incurred by the model uncertainty and the exploration input in an additive way. Next we will study the model uncertainty and its relation to the exploration input.

B. Model uncertainty

The Cramér-Rao inequality establishes a lower bound for the variance of an unbiased estimator in terms of the inverse of the Fisher information [28]. Here we will use the idealized assumption that we have an estimator which is unbiased and efficient, meaning that it attains this lower bound¹. Thus, the quantity $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta}_t - \theta_0)^2]$ in (7) is given by the inverse of the Fisher information denoted by $\mathbb{I}_{t-1}$, where the index is $t-1$ since the model uncertainty will depend on all the inputs up to, but not including, time t . As shown in Appendix A, the Fisher information at time t is given by

$$\mathbb{I}_t = \mathbb{I}_0 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E} \left[\left. \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta} \right|_{u_s = u_s^* + \alpha_s}^2 \right]_{\theta = \theta_0} \quad (8)$$

where the initial information, denoted as $\mathbb{I}_0$, is obtained from prior experiments. In (8), the input u_s consists of two parts, the exploration input α_s and the exploitation input u_s^* as illustrated in Fig. 1. We will introduce here an example that is useful to continue our discussion and which will be further developed in Section V.

Example 1. Let us consider the following quadratic cost function and input-output relationship

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(u, \theta_0) &= u^2 + 2(\theta_0 + 1)u \\ y &= h(u, \theta_0) + e = \theta_0 u^2 + e \end{aligned}$$

¹This holds when h is linear in θ under no feedback but is otherwise an idealization. For large t under sufficient excitation it holds in general.

where e is zero-mean white Gaussian noise with $\sigma^2 = 1$. The optimal, but unknown, input u_0^* for the quadratic function Φ is given by $u_0^* = U(\theta_0) = -(\theta_0 + 1)$. We consider the iterative framework presented in Fig 1, where the input u_t applied at iteration t is composed of an exploitation input $u_t^* = -(\hat{\theta}_t + 1)$ (via the CEP) and an exploration input α_t . With the notation of Section III-A, we notice that in this case J_θ is constant since $J_\theta = \frac{dU(\theta)}{d\theta}|_{\theta=\theta_0} = -1$. Then, under the assumption that the estimator is unbiased and efficient, following (7) and (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R} &= \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\mathbb{I}_{t-1}} + \sum_{t=1}^T x_t = \frac{1}{\mathbb{I}_0} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{\mathbb{I}_t} + \sum_{t=1}^T x_t \quad (9) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{I}_0} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{\mathbb{I}_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}[u_s^4 | u_s = u_s^* + \alpha_s]} + \sum_{t=1}^T x_t \end{aligned}$$

For the white noise exploration input α_t , let us choose a zero-mean Gaussian distribution with time-varying variance x_t . The sequence $\{x_t\}$ contains the decision variables to be designed for regret minimization. We can now expand the following term

$$\mathbb{E}[(u_s^* + \alpha_s)^4] = \mathbb{E}[(u_0^* + (\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0)J_\theta + \alpha_s)^4]$$

where the equality comes from the Taylor approximation in (6) which in this example is exact since $u_s^* = -(\hat{\theta}_s + 1)$ is linear w.r.t. $\hat{\theta}_s$. By expanding the right hand side of the latter, using the independence assumption between α_s and the estimate error $\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0$ (determined by the input before time s), and recalling that α_s is zero-mean Gaussian with variance x_s , and that $\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0$ is zero-mean Gaussian (this holds when there is no feedback), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &3x_s^2 + [6\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0)^2] + 6(u_0^*)^2]x_s + \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0)^4] \\ &+ 6(u_0^*)^2\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0)^2] + (u_0^*)^4 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by recalling that $\hat{\theta}_s$ is assumed to be an efficient unbiased estimator for θ_0 which implies that the variance of $\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0$ is equal to $1/\mathbb{I}_{s-1}$ and every odd moment of $\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0$ is zero, we get the final expression for $\mathbb{E}[(u_s^* + \alpha_s)^4]$

$$3x_s^2 + [6\mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-1} + 6(u_0^*)^2]x_s + 3\mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-2} + 6(u_0^*)^2\mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-1} + (u_0^*)^4 \quad (10)$$

We can then rewrite (9) as

$$\tilde{R} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{I}_0} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{\mathbb{I}_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t \mathcal{I}(x_s, \mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-1})} + \sum_{t=1}^T x_t$$

where $\mathcal{I}(x_s, \mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-1})$ is the expression (10), which is a function of the exploration variance at time instant s and the inverse of the Fisher information at time instant $s - 1$.

As a further simplification we will approximate the terms in (8) using the approximation of u_s^* as introduced in (6) to get the approximate Fisher information

$$\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_t = \mathbb{I}_0 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left. \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right]_{\substack{\theta=\theta_0 \\ u_s=u_0^*+(\hat{\theta}_s-\theta_0)J_\theta+\alpha_s}} \quad (11)$$

As we saw in Example 1, each term in the sum of the approximate information (11) (which was exact in Example 1) is dependent on the exploration variance x_s and the inverse of the Fisher information $\mathbb{I}_{s-1}$. This justifies the formal introduction of the incremental information function $\mathcal{I} : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, defined as

$$\mathcal{I}(x_s, \mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-1}) := \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left. \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 \right]_{\substack{\theta=\theta_0 \\ u_s=u_0^*+(\hat{\theta}_s-\theta_0)J_\theta+\alpha_s}} \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbb{R}_+$ is the set of non-negative real scalars.

Remark 1. Example 1 presented the case of an incremental information function $\mathcal{I}$ dependent on the exploration variance x_s and the inverse of Fisher information at time instant $s - 1$. We argue that this is the case in general, as the square of the partial derivative in (12) can either be directly expanded, or approximated with arbitrary precision with Taylor expansion, to be a polynomial function, consisting of terms proportional to $\alpha_s^n (\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0)^m$, where n and m are all possible exponents combinations. When taking the expectation in (12), the independence between the action α_s and the estimate error $\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0$ (determined by the inputs before time s), allows to further simplify this expression by using $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_s^n (\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0)^m] = \mathbb{E}[\alpha_s^n] \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\theta}_s - \theta_0)^m]$. This, together with the assumptions of considering a Gaussian distributed unbiased and efficient estimator, justifies the dependency of the incremental information function on the action variances x_s and the inverse of the Fisher information at time $s - 1$, i.e. $\mathbb{I}_{s-1}$.

From (12) we can rewrite the approximate Fisher information in (11) as

$$\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_t = \mathbb{I}_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t \mathcal{I}(x_s, \mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-1}) = \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{t-1} + \mathcal{I}(x_t, \mathbb{I}_{t-1}^{-1}) \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{t-1} = \mathbb{I}_0 + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathcal{I}(x_s, \mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-1})$, which in turn gives the following approximation of the regret (7)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R} &= \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{J_\theta^2}{\mathbb{I}_{t-1}} + \sum_{t=1}^T x_t \approx \frac{J_\theta^2}{\mathbb{I}_0} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{J_\theta^2}{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_t} + \sum_{t=1}^T x_t \\ &= \frac{J_\theta^2}{\mathbb{I}_0} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{J_\theta^2}{\mathbb{I}_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t \mathcal{I}(x_s, \mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-1})} + \sum_{t=1}^T x_t \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

The nonlinear dynamics of the approximate Fisher information in (13) presents the main challenge in devising the optimal exploration strategy with minimizing the regret.

The incremental information function $\mathcal{I}$ varies with the cost function $\Phi(u, \theta_0)$ and the input-output relationship $h(u, \theta_0)$. In the following we will focus on the case where the incremental information function $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies the following assumption (which is verified, e.g., in Example 1).

Assumption 1. $\mathcal{I}$ is non-negative, monotonically increasing and convex w.r.t. the first argument. Furthermore, $\mathcal{I}$ is monotonically increasing w.r.t. the second argument.

Under Assumption 1 it holds that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_t = \mathbb{I}_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t \mathcal{I}(x_s, \mathbb{I}_{s-1}^{-1}) > \mathbb{I}_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t \mathcal{I}(x_s, 0).$$

Using this, the approximate regret in (14) can be upper-bounded by

$$R_{ub} := \frac{J_\theta^2}{\mathbb{I}_0} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{J_\theta^2}{\mathbb{I}_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t \mathcal{I}(x_s, 0)} + \sum_{t=1}^T x_t \quad (15)$$

In what follows, we will use the upper bound of the approximate regret as design criterion for the external excitation. In the numerical example in the next section we will show that the approximations made do not influence the structure of the optimal solution. Before this we will simplify the expression for R_{ub} slightly. Given that $\mathcal{I}$ in (15) has a constant second argument, we define a new information function $i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $i(x_s) := \mathcal{I}(x_s, 0)/J_\theta^2$, which inherits the properties of $\mathcal{I}$ w.r.t. its first argument, i.e. non-negative, monotonically increasing and convex. Besides, we notice that x_T only appears in the last sum in (15) and therefore it is optimal to take $x_T = 0$. By defining $i_0 := \mathbb{I}_0/J_\theta^2$, the upper bound (15) is rewritten as

$$R_{ub} = \frac{1}{i_0} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t i(x_s)} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} x_t \quad (16)$$

IV. THEORETICAL RESULT

Our next task is to minimize (16) w.r.t. the vector $x = [x_1, \dots, x_{T-1}]$, which consists of the non-negative variances of the exploration input at each time step. We notice that the first term in (16) is constant and can be omitted. Before stating a theorem for this problem, we introduce two families of excitation signals.

Definition 1. We say that $x \in \mathbb{R}^{T-1}$ is an *immediate excitation* if $x_1 > 0$ and $x_2 = \dots = x_{T-1} = 0$, and a *lazy excitation* if $x_k = 0$, $k = 1, \dots, T-1$.

Theorem 1. Consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_1, \dots, x_{T-1}} \quad & \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t i(x_s)} + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} x_t \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x_k \geq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, T-1 \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

and assume that the information function $i(\cdot)$ is non-negative, monotonically increasing and convex in the domain $[0, \infty)$. Let x^* be the optimal solution of (17). Then x^* is either a lazy or an immediate excitation (see Definition 1). Moreover, if the following inequality holds

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{i'(0)}{[i_0 + t \cdot i(0)]^2} > 1. \quad (18)$$

then x^* is an immediate exploration solution.

Proof. See Appendix B.

Remark 2. The intuitive interpretation of Theorem 1 is that when exploration is necessary, it is best to do it as early as

possible since the reward in terms of lower cost, due to a better model, then accumulates over the entire horizon T , rather than a portion of it. The reduction in cost that can be achieved is also higher early on since the information in data then is less than later on (recall that the information at a certain time depends on data up to that time point).

Moreover, the findings of Theorem 1 strongly resonate with the numerical results of [20] and the theory in [21], [26] for the LQR problem where the optimal exploration strategy is either a lazy or an immediate excitation. Theorem 1 goes beyond these works since the Fisher information is not restricted to be linear w.r.t. the exploration decision variable as is the case in [20], [21], [26].

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE (CONTINUED)

A. Objectives of the example

In this section, we return to Example 1. The purpose is to check if a design of the exploration based on R_{ub} in (16) (by taking advantage of the results of Theorem 1) leads to satisfactory performance for the actual regret $\bar{R}$ in (4). We will consider explorations of the form:

$$\alpha_t = \sqrt{x_t} \bar{\alpha}_t \quad (19)$$

where $\{\bar{\alpha}_t\}$ is a zero-mean white noise and $\{x_t\}$ is the variance sequence to be designed. We consider the following four particular cases of such kind of excitation

- immediate Gaussian: each $\bar{\alpha}_t$ is drawn from a zero-mean normal distribution with unit variance, $x_2 = \dots = x_T = 0$ and $x_1 = x_g$ where $x_g \geq 0$ is to be tuned.
- immediate binary: each $\bar{\alpha}_t$ is drawn from a zero-mean binary distribution whose two possible values are -1 and 1 , $x_2 = \dots = x_T = 0$ and $x_1 = x_b$ where $x_b \geq 0$ is to be tuned.
- lazy exploration: $x_1 = \dots = x_T = 0$.
- decaying Gaussian: each $\bar{\alpha}_t$ is drawn from a zero-mean normal distribution with unit variance and x_t decays as $x_t = ct^p$ where $c \geq 0$ and $p < 0$. This choice is frequently used in the LQR literature [18], [19].

To validate the optimal exploration strategy based on R_{ub} in Theorem 1, we compare the actual regret $\bar{R}$ obtained with these four exploration strategies with well-tuned values x_g , x_b , c and p by:

- minimizing R_{ub} .
- directly minimizing the actual regret $\bar{R}$.

The purpose of design (b) is to illustrate the error incurred by the exploration design with minimizing R_{ub} instead of with $\bar{R}$. The term R_{ub} has the form (16) where the information function $i(x_s)$ for this example is given by:

- $i(x_s) = 3x_s^2 + 6(u_0^*)^2 x_s + (u_0^*)^4$ when $\bar{\alpha}_t$ in (19) is drawn from a zero-mean Gaussian distribution.
- $i(x_s) = x_s^2 + 6(u_0^*)^2 x_s + (u_0^*)^4$ when $\bar{\alpha}_t$ in (19) is drawn from a zero-mean binary distribution.

In both cases the information function $i(x_s)$ is a non-negative, monotonically increasing and convex function in $[0, +\infty)$. Hence, according to Theorem 1, the optimal exploration vector $x^* = [x_1^*, \dots, x_{T-1}^*]$ minimizing R_{ub} is either lazy or immediate for both distribution choices for $\{\bar{\alpha}_t\}$.

B. Simulation details

We will consider a horizon of $T = 50$ and choose $\sigma^2 = 1$ assumed to be known². In order to implement the proposed scheme, we require an initial estimate for θ_0 and the initial Fisher information $\mathbb{I}_0$. For this purpose, we perform an initial identification with one input-output data pair collected on the system excited with a deterministic input equal to 1.

We conduct the simulation on 10 different systems, each characterized by a different parameter θ_0 with the following values $\{-2, -0.7, -0.5, -0.4, -0.3, 0.2, 0.4, 0.7, 1, 3\}$.

For both designs (a) and (b), we will consider a gridding approach in order to search for the optimal x_g, x_b, c and p with the following grid specifications:

- Constants x_g, x_b and c : 301 points log-regularly spaced between 10^{-3} and 10^2 .
- Exponent p : 21 points log-regularly spaced between -20 and -0.1 .

We will consider $N_{mc} = 1000$ Monte Carlo simulations to approximate $\bar{R}$ in (4), which involves an expectation w.r.t. both $\{e_t\}$ and $\{\alpha_t\}$. To ensure a fair comparison between all the exploration strategies, we use *the same* N_{mc} realizations of a zero-mean white Gaussian noise with unit variance for e_t . Similarly, for the two distribution choices of $\{\bar{\alpha}_t\}$, we use *the same* N_{mc} zero-mean white Gaussian noise realizations with unit variance and *the same* N_{mc} binary sequences with unit variance.

For each value of θ_0 and for each exploration strategy across all possible values of x_g, x_b, c and p , we compute the average of the regret $\sum_{t=1}^T (\Phi(u_t^* + \alpha_t, \theta_0) - \Phi(u_0^*, \theta_0))$ obtained with the different realizations and the corresponding R_{ub} . Then, we select the optimal parameters x_g, x_b, c and p that minimize R_{ub} in design (a) and $\bar{R}$ in design (b).

C. Results on the 10 systems

For the 10 systems, we observe the following:

- The lazy exploration never minimized $\bar{R}$. This is in line with our expectation, since for all θ_0 values, the sufficient condition (18) for the optimality of immediate excitation in Theorem 1 was satisfied.
- Immediate binary provided the optimal regret $\bar{R}$ regardless of the design (a) or (b).

For 8 systems out of 10, decaying Gaussian exploration gave a lower regret $\bar{R}$ than immediate Gaussian exploration, for both designs (a) and (b). This seems to be in contradiction with our theory. Nevertheless, the value of the exponent p which was picked for these 8 cases was -2.402 which gives a very fast decrease of the variance x_t and so the optimal decaying Gaussian exploration closely mimics the immediate Gaussian exploration.

For the two remaining systems with $\theta_0 = 0.4$ and -0.6 , decaying Gaussian and immediate Gaussian exploration gave the same regret with both designs (a) and (b) and the exponent p which was picked was -20 in both cases. Hence, the optimal decaying Gaussian exploration is very close to an immediate Gaussian exploration.

²It can be estimated together with $\hat{\theta}_t$ if not known.

TABLE I
REGRET $\bar{R}$ OBTAINED WITH THE FOUR EXPLORATIONS TUNED FOLLOWING DESIGNS (a) AND (b).

$\bar{R}$	Design (a)	Design (b)
Lazy	10.676	10.676
Immediate Gaussian	9.408	9.338
Immediate Binary	7.070	7.039
Decaying Gaussian	9.408	9.338




Fig. 2. Time evolution of the regret with lazy (black solid line), decaying Gaussian (magenta lines), immediate Gaussian (blue lines) and immediate binary (red lines) explorations, tuned with both designs (a) (solid lines) and (b) (dashed lines). The magenta and blue lines are on top of each other.

D. Analysis of a particular system

In this paragraph, we show the results for one particular system with $\theta_0 = 0.4$. In Table I, we give the regret $\bar{R}$ obtained with the four explorations tuned following designs (a) and (b). First, we observe that, for each exploration, both designs give regret which are close to each other, showing that R_{ub} is not far from the actual regret $\bar{R}$ and so minimizing R_{ub} is a good practice in order to minimize the regret $\bar{R}$. It is also clear that immediate binary exploration provides a much lower regret than using immediate Gaussian exploration.

In Figure 2, we depict the time evolution of the average of the costs $\sum_{k=1}^t (\Phi(u_k^* + \alpha_k, \theta_0) - \Phi(u_0^*, \theta_0))$ obtained from the 1000 Monte Carlo simulations when the immediate and decaying exploration strategies are optimized for horizon $T = 50$ following designs (a) and (b). We notice that lazy exploration is outperformed by immediate exploration already after only half of the design horizon T has elapsed. This illustrates Remark 2, i.e. it is advantageous to momentarily degrade the regret with a large exploration at the beginning as it will eventually pay off due to the lower regrets obtained after the exploration (notice that the slopes of the regrets for the immediate explorations are lower than for the lazy exploration). By comparing the time evolution of the regret obtained with design (a) (solid lines) and (b) (dashed lines), we observe that the difference vanishes at the end of the horizon, which justifies our methodology on optimizing R_{ub} .

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we analyzed the problem of designing optimal exploration strategies based on regret minimization in the framework of unconstrained scalar optimization of non-linear static systems. We proposed several approximations to solve this hard problem and we showed that for the obtained approximation there are only two possible optimal exploration strategies: lazy and immediate exploration. This result was supported by a numerical example where we illustrated that minimizing the approximate regret upper bound provides satisfactory performances for the minimization of the actual regret and that immediate exploration generated from a zero-mean binary white noise is better than using zero-mean Gaussian white noise. This strategy also outperformed classical white noise Gaussian exploration with decaying variance used in the LQR literature.

For future work, we will pursue further analysis on the choice of the distribution of the exploration signal, as well as considering deterministic exploration signals, and delve into the asymptotic analysis of our exploration strategies. Moreover, given the property that the information increases over time, we notice that a lower-bound analysis can be approached using the same tools we developed. The consequences of this need to be further explored. Finally, further developments are required to obtain a practically useful method to handle the parameter dependency of the approximation of the regret used for the exploration design.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Whitaker, J. Yamron, and A. Kezer, "Design of model-reference adaptive control systems for aircraft," Report R-164, Instrumentation Laboratory, MIT, Cambridge, MA, Tech. Rep., 1958.
- [2] B. Egardt, *Stability of Adaptive Controllers*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [3] G. Goodwin, P. Ramadge, and P. Caines, "Discrete-time multivariable adaptive control," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 449–456, 1980.
- [4] K. Åström and B. Wittenmark, *Adaptive Control*, second edition ed. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1995.
- [5] K. Åström, *History of Adaptive Control*. London: Springer London, 2014, pp. 1–9.
- [6] P. Ioannou and J. Sun, *Robust Adaptive Control*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1996.
- [7] J. C. Doyle, K. Glover, P. P. Khargonekar, and B. A. Francis, "State-space solutions to standard h_2 and h_∞ control problems," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 34, no. 8, pp. 831–847, 1989.
- [8] H. Hjalmarsson, "From experiment design to closed loop control," *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 393–438, March 2005.
- [9] M. Gevers and L. Ljung, "Optimal experiment designs with respect to the intended model application," *Automatica*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 543–554, 1986.
- [10] X. Bombois, G. Scorletti, M. Gevers, P. M. J. Van den Hof, and R. Hildebrand, "Least costly identification experiment for control," *Automatica*, vol. 42, no. 10, pp. 1651–1662, 2006.
- [11] H. Hjalmarsson, "System identification of complex and structured systems," *European Journal of Control*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 275–310, 2009, plenary address. European Control Conference.
- [12] L. Gerencsér, H. Hjalmarsson, and J. Mårtensson, "Identification of ARX systems with non-stationary inputs - asymptotic analysis with application to adaptive input design," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 623–633, March 2009.
- [13] L. Gerencsér, H. Hjalmarsson, and L. Huang, "Adaptive input design for LTI systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2390–2405, May 2016.

- [14] T. L. Lai and C.-Z. Wei, "Extended least squares and their applications to adaptive control and prediction in linear systems," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 31, pp. 898–906, 1986.
- [15] T. L. Lai, "Asymptotically efficient adaptive control in stochastic regression models," *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 23–45, 1986.
- [16] H. Mania, S. Tu, and B. Recht, "Certainty equivalence is efficient for linear quadratic control," in *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [17] M. Simchowitz and D. Foster, "Naive exploration is optimal for online LQR," in *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, H. D. III and A. Singh, Eds., vol. 119. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020, pp. 8937–8948.
- [18] F. Wang and L. Janson, "Exact asymptotics for linear quadratic adaptive control," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 22, no. 265, pp. 1–112, 2021.
- [19] Y. Jedra and A. Proutiere, "Minimal expected regret in linear quadratic control," in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 10234–10321.
- [20] M. Forgone, X. Bombois, and P. V. den Hof, "Data-driven model improvement for model-based control," *Automatica*, vol. 52, pp. 118–124, 2015.
- [21] K. Colin, H. Hjalmarsson, and X. Bombois, "Optimal exploration strategies for finite horizon regret minimization in some adaptive control problems," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 2564–2569, 2023.
- [22] A. G. Marchetti, G. François, T. Faulwasser, and D. Bonvin, "Modifier adaptation for real-time optimization—methods and applications," *Processes*, vol. 4, no. 4, p. 55, 2016.
- [23] B. Srinivasan and D. Bonvin, "110th anniversary: a feature-based analysis of static real-time optimization schemes," *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, vol. 58, no. 31, pp. 14 227–14 238, 2019.
- [24] E. A. del Rio Chanona, P. Petsagkourakis, E. Bradford, J. A. Graciano, and B. Chachuat, "Real-time optimization meets bayesian optimization and derivative-free optimization: A tale of modifier adaptation," *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, vol. 147, p. 107249, 2021.
- [25] M. Pasquini and H. Hjalmarsson, "E2-RTO: An exploitation-exploration approach for real time optimization," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 1423–1430, 2023.
- [26] K. Colin, H. Hjalmarsson, and X. Bombois, "Finite-time regret minimization for linear quadratic adaptive controllers: an experiment design approach," 2023, Available on HAL with id hal-04360490.
- [27] Y. Wang, M. Pasquini, V. Chotteau, H. Hjalmarsson, and E. W. Jacobsen, "Iterative learning robust optimization - with application to medium optimization of CHO cell cultivation in continuous monoclonal antibody production," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 137, p. 103196, 2024.
- [28] L. Ljung, *System identification, Theory for the user*, 2nd ed., ser. System sciences series. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 1999.
- [29] B. Efron and D. V. Hinkley, "Assessing the accuracy of the maximum likelihood estimator: Observed versus expected Fisher information," *Biometrika*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 457–482, 1978.
- [30] D. A. S. Fraser, "Ancillaries and conditional inference," *Statistical Science*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 333–351, 2004.

APPENDIX

A. Fisher information

We will compute the Fisher information for the system in Fig. 1. The first step is to establish the likelihood function representing the probability of observing $\{u^t, y^t\}$ generated from $y_t = h(u_t, \theta) + e_t$ in iterative optimization with $u_t = u_t^* + \alpha_t$. Here the superscript t denotes all past data up to and including t . Using several successive chain rules,

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(u^t, y^t; \theta) &= p(y_t | u^t, y^{t-1}; \theta) p(u_t, y^{t-1}; \theta) \\
 &= p_\epsilon(y_t - h(u_t, \theta)) p(u_t | u^{t-1}, y^{t-1}; \theta) p(u^{t-1}, y^{t-1}; \theta) \\
 &= p_\epsilon(y_t - h(u_t, \theta)) p_\alpha(u_t - u_t^*) p(u^{t-1}, y^{t-1}; \theta) \\
 &= \cdots = \prod_{s=1}^t [p_\epsilon(y_s - h(u_s, \theta)) p_\alpha(u_s - u_s^*)]
 \end{aligned}$$

where the notation $p(a|b)$ refers to the conditional distribution of a after observing b , p_ϵ and p_α are the probability density functions of the model residual and the exploration input, respectively. Note that the second term $p_\alpha(u_s - u_s^*)$ is independent of θ . The score function is defined as the gradient w.r.t. θ of the log-likelihood function:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p(u^t, y^t; \theta) &= \sum_{s=1}^t \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p_\epsilon(y_s - h(u_s, \theta)) \\ &= - \sum_{s=1}^t \frac{p'_\epsilon(y_s - h(u_s, \theta))}{p_\epsilon(y_s - h(u_s, \theta))} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta}\end{aligned}$$

where $-p'_\epsilon(y_s - h(u_s, \theta)) \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta}$ is the derivative of $p_\epsilon(y_s - h(u_s, \theta))$ w.r.t. θ using the chain rule, with p'_ϵ being the derivative of p_ϵ w.r.t. its argument $y_s - h(u_s, \theta)$. The Fisher information, denoted by $\mathbb{I}_t$, is a measure of the information that the observed data $\{u^t, y^t\}$ provides about the parameter. It is calculated by squaring the score function and taking its expected value w.r.t. the random variables $\{e_t\}$ and $\{\alpha_t\}$ ³ at the true parameter θ_0 , which implies $\epsilon_s = y_s - h(u_s, \theta_0) = e_s$ and thus we use the known noise distribution p_e to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{I}_t &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p(u^t, y^t; \theta_0) \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log p(u^t, y^t; \theta_0) \right)^T \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{r=1}^t \frac{p'_\epsilon(e_s)}{p_\epsilon(e_s)} \frac{p'_\epsilon(e_r)}{p_\epsilon(e_r)} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta} \bigg|_{\substack{\theta=\theta_0 \\ u_s=u_s^*+\alpha_s}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta} \bigg|_{\substack{\theta=\theta_0 \\ u_r=u_r^*+\alpha_r}} \right]\end{aligned}$$

Since $\{e_t\}$ is a zero-mean white noise, we have independence between e_s and e_r for every $s \neq r$. Besides, recalling that $\{e_t\}$ is Gaussian with variance σ^2 , we get

$$\mathbb{I}_t = \sum_{s=1}^t \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left. \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\substack{\theta=\theta_0 \\ u_s=u_s^*+\alpha_s}}^2 \right]$$

which is the second term in the expression (8).

B. Proof of Theorem 1

We start by proving the following Lemma.

Lemma 1. Consider the problem (17) and denote with $x^* = [x_1^*, \dots, x_{T-1}^*]$ its solution. Assume that the function i is non-negative and monotonically increasing in the domain $[0, \infty)$. Then $x_1^* \geq x_2^* \geq \dots \geq x_{T-1}^* \geq 0$.

Proof: Consider the vector $x = [x_1, \dots, x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{T-1}]$ and the vector $\tilde{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_{j+1}, x_j, \dots, x_{T-1}]$ built from x by swapping x_j and x_{j+1} . Assume $x_j \geq x_{j+1}$. Denote with $C : \mathbb{R}_+^{T-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ the objective function of Problem (17). By comparing the cost induced by x and $\tilde{x}$ we get that $C(x) - C(\tilde{x})$ equals to

$$\frac{1}{i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^{j-1} i(x_s) + i(x_j)} - \frac{1}{i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^{j-1} i(x_s) + i(x_{j+1})} \leq 0$$

due to the fact that $x_j \geq x_{j+1}$ and that the information function i is monotonically increasing in the domain $[0, \infty)$.

³From a statistical perspective, α_t is an ancillary statistic meaning that it contains no information about θ . Still such a statistic may heavily influence the properties of an estimator and the Fisher information should be conditioned on such a statistic (see, e.g., [29], [30]).

This means that $x_j \geq x_{j+1}$ should be kept to obtain the minimized value. The result we want to prove follows from the observation that we can obtain an ordered vector through a finite number of swaps of consecutive elements. Thus $x_1^* \geq x_2^* \geq \dots \geq x_{T-1}^* \geq 0$. $\square$

Now we prove Theorem 1 based on Lemma 1. Firstly, we prove that the optimal solution x^* of Problem (17) satisfies $x_2^* = \dots = x_{T-1}^* = 0$, which implies that the optimal solution is either a lazy excitation with $x_1^* = 0$ or an immediate excitation with $x_1^* > 0$. We will then discuss a sufficient condition for an immediate excitation to be optimal.

We start with defining the Lagrangian function for Problem (17) as follows

$$L(x, \lambda) = \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left[\frac{1}{i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t i(x_s)} + x_t + \lambda_t(-x_t) \right]$$

where the vector $\lambda = [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_T]$ consists of KKT multipliers. Since the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions are necessary for optimality, at the solution x^* it holds

$$1 - \sum_{t=k}^{T-1} \frac{i'(x_k^*)}{[i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t i(x_s^*)]^2} = \lambda_k^*, k = 1, \dots, T-1 \quad (20)$$

$$\lambda_k^* \geq 0, x_k^* \geq 0, k = 1, \dots, T-1 \quad (21)$$

$$\lambda_k^* x_k^* = 0, k = 1, \dots, T-1 \quad (22)$$

where λ_k^* is the optimal KKT multiplier. Due to $x_1^* \geq x_k^*$ for $k = 2, \dots, T-1$ (from Lemma 1) and the convexity of the information function i , which has increasing derivative, we obtain

$$i'(x_k^*) \leq i'(x_1^*) \Rightarrow -i'(x_k^*) \geq -i'(x_1^*) \quad (23)$$

Also, for $k = 2, \dots, T-1$, it holds that

$$\sum_{t=k}^{T-1} \frac{1}{[i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t i(x_s^*)]^2} < \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{[i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t i(x_s^*)]^2} \quad (24)$$

since all the terms in the sum on the right-hand side of (24) are positive. From (23) and (24) it follows

$$1 - \sum_{t=k}^{T-1} \frac{i'(x_k^*)}{[i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t i(x_s^*)]^2} > 1 - \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{i'(x_1^*)}{[i_0 + \sum_{s=1}^t i(x_s^*)]^2}$$

which together with (20) suggests that for the KKT multipliers it holds $\lambda_k^* > \lambda_1^* \geq 0$, for all $k \geq 2$, which together with the slackness complementary condition in (22), implies $x_2^* = \dots = x_{T-1}^* = 0$. Thus we proved that the optimal solution x^* is either a lazy or an immediate excitation.

Now assume that the solution x^* is a lazy excitation. Then, according to (20) and (21), it should hold

$$1 - \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{i'(0)}{[i_0 + t \cdot i(0)]^2} \geq 0 \quad (25)$$

which proves that the violation of (25), i.e. condition (18), is sufficient for immediate excitation, since we know that the solution must be either immediate or lazy. $\square$