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Abstract
Inhomogeneous Poisson point processes are widely used models of event occurrences. We address adaptive sensing of Poisson Point processes, namely, maximizing the number of captured events subject to sensing costs. We encode prior assumptions on the rate function by modeling it as a member of a known reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS). By partitioning the domain into separate small regions, and using heteroscedastic linear regression, we propose a tractable estimator of Poisson process rates for two feedback models: count-record, where exact locations of events are observed, and histogram feedback, where only counts of events are observed. We derive provably accurate anytime confidence estimates for our estimators for sequentially acquired Poisson count data. Using these, we formulate algorithms based on optimism that provably incur sublinear count-regret. We demonstrate the practicality of the method on problems from crime modeling, revenue maximization as well as environmental monitoring.

1. Introduction
Poisson point processes are widely used for modeling discrete event occurrences, with a rich history in probability theory (Kingman, 2002). Their modeling power is demonstrated by a multitude of applications in engineering (Snyder and Miller, 2012), crime rate modeling (Shirota et al., 2017), measuring genetic biodiversity (Diggle et al., 2013), environmental monitoring (Heikkinen and Arjas, 1999) and pollutant modeling (Diggle, 2013). In this work, we design a sequential algorithm for adaptive sensing of spatio-temporal Poisson processes. Our approach adaptively focuses on particular regions of the space – sensing regions – in order to maximize the number of events captured over time subject to the costs of sensing. Crucially, we allow the rate of event occurrence to vary smoothly over the sensed domain. In particular, we assume the rate function can be modeled as a member of a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) with a known kernel $k$.

As a running example, consider surveying spontaneous taxi requests on a street, e.g., by a visual gesture. Recorded requests over multiple days are depicted in Fig. 1a, along with the inferred intensity. The rate function in this case can be modeled as smooth function. For simplicity, suppose that the intensity is time invariant. As operators, we might be interested in servicing as many requests as possible by allocating taxi cars to different areas. In this application, a sensing action corresponds to such an allocation of sending taxis to a certain region of a city and waiting there for requests. The sensing regions are sets arising from hierarchically splitting the domain (cf. Fig. 1a), corresponding roughly to small city blocks. The cost of each action – sensing region – can be reasonably chosen to be proportional to the area of the sensing as it takes more taxi drivers to cover a larger area.

2. Background
Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact subset. An inhomogeneous spatio-temporal Poisson point process $\mathcal{P}$ is a random process such that for any subset $A \subset \mathcal{D}$, $N(A)$ denotes the random variable representing the number of events in $A$ for a unit duration and $n(A)$ a realization of this random variable. If $A, B \subset \mathcal{D}$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$ then $N(A)$ and $N(B)$ are independent. In addition, the process has an associated intensity function $\lambda(x)$, where the number of events sensed during unit time in $A$ is distributed as,

$$N(A) \sim \text{Poisson} \left( \int_A \lambda(x) dx \right). \quad (1)$$

These conditions fully specify a Poisson process (Snyder and Miller, 2012).

2.1. Sensing Problem: Capturing Events
We consider the problem of adaptive sensing of Poisson processes – capturing of as many events of $\mathcal{P}$ as possible subject to the cost of sensing. We act sequentially by picking sensing regions, obtaining some feedback about the process within them at some cost, with the goal minimize count-regret. Below, we elaborate on these aspects.

Actions In our abstract framework, sensors can be placed to monitor a subset of the domain $\mathcal{D}$ for a certain duration
Fig. 1. a) The estimated rate of taxi requests along with raw observational data in red, as well as a quadtree sensing structure generating rectangular sensing regions. The blue regions are examples of sensing regions - only events inside it are observed. b) An example of binning with $B$: An illustrative rate function is depicted in orange. The difference between the two feedback models is demonstrated in selected regions. c) This figure refers to Section 5. We depict the values of scaled variances due to the heavier tail of Poisson random variables, as a function of the true variance. To construct estimators with confidence set guarantees we need to normalize the residuals of linear regression by scaled variances instead of true variances as is customary. The relation depicts scaled variances $k^* \mu$ as function of true variance $\mu$. We see that as $\mu$ gets larger, no scaling is necessary since Poisson tail behaves Gaussian-like. This scaling depends on norm of feature vectors $U$.

The count-record feedback has been investigated in the context of geostatistics with passively collected data, and health surveillance (Diggle et al., 2013). The histogram feedback can be motivated, e.g., by limitations of the sensing technology, or by privacy reasons, as sometimes it might not be desirable to reveal, e.g., locations of sick individuals. In the taxi pickups example, the taxi driver might not be collecting the exact locations of passengers, but rather just counting the number of passengers in the current city block.

Costs Each of the actions $A$ has an associated cost $w_t(A, \Delta)$, where the cost function $w_t: A \to \mathbb{R}$ is known and potentially time dependent. A reasonable assumption in practice is that the cost is time uniform and $w(A, \Delta) = w(|A|, \Delta)$ depends on the volume (area) of the sensed set and the duration of sensing. We will fix $\Delta_t = \Delta$ to be a fixed minimum sensing time duration. Should a longer sensing duration be desired, the action can be repeated if the costs permit. Now, we mention three important classes of costs: a) uniform costs: $w(A) \propto |A|$, a natural notion modeling that the cost of monitoring a sensing region $A$ is proportional to its size. b) Concave costs: $w(A) \propto g(|A|)$, where $g$ is monotone concave. This class of costs allows to model, e.g., fixed setup costs, and puts preference over larger sets. Without concave cost structure, sensing the smallest regions of $A$ is always preferred over any other strategy using larger sets. When including, e.g., a fixed cost to sensing, it can be beneficial to first sense large sets before narrowing down to promising regions. Lastly, we introduce c) one-off costs: $w_t(A) = |A| + \mathbb{1}_{A_{\Delta_t} \subseteq \Delta}$, where $\mathbb{1}$ is an indicator function of whether we sensed that region already. The cost is infinite for any region that we already sensed. This covers a practically important scenario, where regions cannot be sensed multiple times.$^2$

Count-Regret We want to spend our budget in the most effective way by minimizing the following count-regret,

$$R_T := \sum_{t=1}^T \Delta_t \left( w_t(A_t, \Delta_t) \frac{\mathbb{E}[|N(A_t)|]}{w_t(A_t, \Delta_t)} - \mathbb{E}[|N(A_t)|] \right),$$

where $R_T$ is a function of $\{(A_t, \Delta_t)\}_{t=1}^T$. This regret represents the average number of missed events due to investment of the budget $\{w_t(A_t)\}_{t=1}^T$ to potentially suboptimal actions, in terms of their expected count to cost ratio. The above expression (2) simplifies significantly when cost is proportional to the sensed duration $\Delta_t$ — which is why we use it in our work. In case of the one-off costs,

$^2$A similar cost is studied in the context of valuable item discovery in Vanchinathan et al. (2015), but with a different regret measure and sub-Gaussian noise.
the best sensing action at time $t$, $A_t^*$ depends on the prior choices of the algorithm. In that sense, with this cost, we measure whether eventually the future choices are made in a cost-effective way. For uniform and concave costs it is time invariant, i.e., $A_t^* = A^*$.

**Challenges** The goal of this work is to design a sequential algorithm that is no-regret, meaning that $R_T/T \to 0$ as $T \to \infty$, and exploits the regularity that the RKHS assumption imposes. There are three technical challenges that are specific to our setting: 1) the intensity function $\lambda$ needs to be positive everywhere in $D$ – a constraint we need to efficiently enforce. 2) The Poisson random variables are naturally heteroscedastic, since their mean and variance are equal – which we need to take into account. 3) In order to prove the no-regret property, we need to design confidence sets that deal with the tail of the Poisson distribution which is heavier than that of any sub-Gaussian random variable, for which adaptive confidence sets are known.

**2.2. Contributions**

1) We show that approaches to enforce positivity via finite constraints such as positive bases or positive trace-regression can be treated jointly in our framework of Poisson sensing. 2) By carefully designing an appropriate super-martingale process, we are the first to derive valid anytime confidence sets for Poisson responses for heteroscedastic linear regression. 3) Using these estimators and confidence sets, we formulate an optimistic algorithm CAPTURE-UCB. It can be used with histogram as well as count-record feedback, and both provably suffer count-regret bounded by $O(\sqrt{T})$ (up to log factors) for finite rank kernels, and we propose an extension for general kernels. 4) We demonstrate the broad applicability of our algorithms on several practically relevant problems.

**3. Modeling and Algorithmic protocol**

**Binning** To address the problem, we adopt a regression perspective, where we regress on the observed counts that fall into separate parts of the domain. This treatment does not permit us to directly use the exact locations of the event occurrences in the count-record feedback. Instead, we partition $D$ to a set $B$ of small disjoint regions, obtained, e.g., by hierarchically splitting the domain (as in Fig. 1a). Then, we model the counts falling into each $B \in B$ as $N(B) \sim \text{Poisson} \left( \int_B \lambda(x)dx \right)$. With count-record feedback, we obtain multiple observations in each sensing round, for each $B \subset A$ where $B \in B$. To denote the observed number of counts, instead of random variables, we use the notation $n(A) = \sum_{B \subset A} n(B \cap A)$.

Count-record feedback is often referred to as semi-bandit feedback in bandit literature, which provides superior information to just observing $n(A)$, often denoted bandit feed-back to differentiate them. In Figure 1b, we illustrate the two different feedback models with partition $B$. The size of the partition $B$ influences the information we can extract from the location data, but as we will see in later sections it cannot be chosen arbitrarily small. For now, assume a partition is given.

**Estimators** Suppose that there are $t$ sensing sessions during which we sensed regions $A_j$ and observed counts $n(A_j)$ for $j \in [t]$. With the count-record feedback, we use the regression estimate $\hat{\lambda}$ as:

$$\arg\min_{\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_k, \lambda \geq 0} \sum_{j=1}^{t} \sum_{B \subset A_j} \frac{n(B \cap A_j) - \int_B \lambda(x)dx)^2}{\sigma_j(B)^2} + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\lambda\|^2_k,$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ denotes the positivity constraint, $\|\lambda\|^2_k$ is the associated norm to $\mathcal{H}_k$, $\gamma$ is the penalization constant, and $\sigma_j$ are the estimated variances that we will describe in later sections. In the absence of the location feedback, we only obtain tuples of $A$ and their counts $n(A)$. The estimator $\lambda$ is the solution to:

$$\arg\min_{\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_k, \lambda \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{\int_{A_i} \lambda(x)dx - n(A_i))^2}{\sigma_i^2} + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\lambda\|^2_k.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Poisson processes have an associated likelihood. The penalized likelihood estimator might thus seem to be an appropriate estimator, since it enforces the property that the mean prediction of $N(A)$ is equal to its variance. However, as we explain in Section 5.2, confidence sets for these estimators are difficult to control to facilitate regret analysis.

**Algorithm Protocol** We design an algorithm that first estimates the rate function $\hat{\lambda}$ using the estimator in (3). Then, based on a utility function, it chooses the most suitable sensing region and subsequently receives feedback in form of observations. As we are interested in maximizing the number of counts subject to the cost, we adopt the principle of optimism (Auer, 2002; Srinivas et al., 2010), and design an algorithm which optimizes a $(1 - \delta)$ confidence upper bound on the number of counts per cost. We call the algorithm CAPTURE-UCB and report it in Algorithm 1. In order to apply the algorithm, we need to perform efficient estimation, as well as construct $1 - \delta$ confidence sets, which we address in the following sections.

**Organization** We organize our contributions as follows: in Section 4, we explain how we efficiently enforce positivity; in Section 5, we design a novel way to construct confidence set for heteroscedastic linear regression with Poisson counts; and lastly in Section 6, we provide a regret analysis of CAPTURE-UCB followed by experimental results.

Throughout this work, we utilize a technical assumption that the kernel can be approximated by a finite rank kernel up
to an arbitrary precision. We make this assumption for two reasons: a) in order to enforce positivity, we use estimators which are of this form; and b) the mathematical tools used to prove confidence sets require Euclidean structure.

General RKHSs can be treated by picking a sufficiently large basis which incurs negligible approximation error in comparison to the desired optimization accuracy. We provide a more detailed discussion in Section 6.

**Assumption 1 (Finite rank representation).** We assume that \( \lambda \in \mathcal{H}_k \), where \( \lambda : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \), where \( \mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \), \( \lambda \) has bounded norm \( \|\lambda\|_k \leq u \) for a known value \( u \). Also, \( \lambda(x) \geq l > 0 \), where \( l \) can be arbitrarily small. Further, there exists a basis \( \{\phi_k\} \) s.t. kernel \( k(x,y) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \phi(x)^\top \phi_k(y) \), and \( \sqrt{\sum_k \phi_k(x)^2} \leq U \) for all \( x \) with \( U \) known.

**4. Efficient Estimators**

Efficient estimators of the rate function need to impose the positivity constraint in a tractable form, allow us to efficiently perform the integrations \( \int_A \lambda(x)dx \), and allow us to construct and optimize over confidence sets. We present two variants that fulfill this goal that we found practical.

**4.1. Linear Model with Positive Basis**

Our first estimator category are linear models, i.e., \( f \approx \sum_{j=1}^{m} \phi_i(x)^\top \theta_i \), where \( f \in \mathcal{H}_k \) can be represented up to a truncation error by positive basis functions \( \phi(x) \geq 0 \) for all \( x \in \mathcal{D} \) and positive parameters \( \theta_i \geq 0 \). They satisfy that as \( m \rightarrow \infty \) the approximation error decreases. With this basis, the positivity can be simply enforced by the constraint \( \theta \geq 0 \). There are many examples of such bases with Bernstein polynomials and positive Hermite splines being perhaps the oldest (Papp and Alizadeh, 2014). In this work, we use the positive basis due to Maatouk and Bay (2016); Cressie and Johannesson (2008) which we call triangle basis.

**Triangle basis** This representation is merely a finite basis approximation to the original kernel \( k \), which can be made as accurate as we need by increasing the basis size \( m \). We follow the exposition of López-Lopera et al. (2019). Given a domain \( \mathcal{D} = [-1, 1] \), we create a finite dimensional approximation \( \lambda = \Phi(x)^\top \theta \) where \( \Phi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^m \). Let us define the individual triangle basis functions \( \phi_j \) for \( j \in [m] \):

\[
\phi_j(x) = \begin{cases}
1 - \frac{|x-t_j|m}{2} & \text{if } \frac{|x-t_j|m}{2} \leq 1 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

In order to enforce the same norm constraint under the approximated basis, \( \Phi(x)^\top \Phi(y) \) needs to be close to the kernel \( k(x,y) \). This can be enforced by transforming the above basis functions to obtain \( \Phi(x) = \Gamma^{1/2} \phi(x) \), with \( \Gamma_{ij} = k(t_i, t_j) \), where \( t_i \) for \( i \in [m] \) corresponds to the nodes. This basis has the property that at \( x = t_i \), \( i \in [m] \), the approximation is exact while in between the nodes \( t \) it linearly interpolates. The constraints \( l \leq \lambda(x) \leq u \) can be represented as linear constraints on \( \theta : l \leq \Gamma^{1/2} \theta \leq u \). Cartesian products of the basis generalize this construction to arbitrary dimension, albeit increasing the basis size exponentially with the dimension. Due to the simple form of the basis, the integrals \( \varphi_A := \int_A \Phi(x)dx \) can be easily evaluated.

**5. Confidence Sets**

We now derive ellipsoidal adaptive confidence sets for the estimator in (3). The analysis easily extends to the *count-record* estimator by substitution. We rely on the theory of self-normalized martingales, and identify a super-martingale \( M_t \) that upper-bounds the error process generating residuals in our estimation problem and subsequently apply Ville’s
We present the solution to the first problem. It turns out Ville’s inequality (5) to obtain high probability bounds. In Assumption 2 (Constraints)

\[
\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^p \quad \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^q
\]

exists a finite \( \mu \) where \( \maximization \) or a covering argument.

Both estimators in Section 4 satisfy these conditions as it is intuitive, since the excess kurtosis of the Poisson distribution decreases as \( \frac{1}{p} \). In Appendix B, we provide a detailed analysis of limiting values of \( k^* \) detailing the intuition from Fig. 1c.

The above Lemma is the key to finding anytime confidence sets via pseudo-maximization. The difference to the classical treatment (see Szepesvari and Lattimore (2019)) arises because our super-martingale \( M_t(x) \) is defined only for \( \text{bounded} \ |x|_2 \leq 1 \) instead on the whole \( \mathbb{R}^m \) – a challenge already encountered by de la Peña et al. (2009) and Faury et al. (2020). By using arguments as in Faury et al. (2020), we can show anytime confidence sets for our estimator.

**Theorem 1.** Let \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), under Assumption 1 and 2, the solution to (6) satisfies for all \( t \geq 0 \)

\[
\|
\hat{\theta} - \theta \|_V^2 \leq \beta_t(\delta) := \text{bias}(\xi, \gamma) + \zeta_t(\delta) \tag{9}
\]

with probability \( 1 - \delta \), where \( \mathbf{V}_t = \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{\varphi A_i \varphi A_i^\top}{\sigma_i} + \gamma \mathbf{I} \),

\[
\zeta_t(\delta) = \left( \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{2} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \log(\frac{1}{\delta}) \right)^{1/2} + \frac{2m}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \log(2) \right)^2,
\]

bias \( (\xi, \gamma) = \gamma \|\theta\|_2^2 + \|\xi^\top \Lambda\|_{V_t}^{-1} \), \( \sigma_t^2 \) is such that \( \sigma_t^2 \geq k_t \mu_t \) as in Lemma 1, \( \mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^2 | F_{t-1}] = \sigma_t^2, M_t(x) \) is super-martingale for \( |x|_2 \leq 1 \), with \( \Lambda_0 = 1 \). Let \( c_i = \frac{U}{\mu_i} \).

The smallest such \( k^*_t \) can be found by solving:

\[
\min_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k} \left( -c_i^2 - 2c_i + \left( \exp \left( \frac{c_i}{k} \right) - 1 \right) \right) \leq 0.
\]

Notice that each variance is scaled individually, depending on \( \mu_i \). In Figure 1c, we can see the value of \( k^* \) for different \( U \) over the ground-truth variance \( \mu \) (purple). For large enough \( \mu \), no increase is needed, thus \( k^* \approx 1 \). This is intuitive, since the excess kurtosis of the Poisson distribution decreases as \( \frac{1}{p} \). In Appendix B, we provide a detailed analysis of limiting values of \( k^* \) detailing the intuition from Fig. 1c.

Notice that the \( \mu_i \), which are needed in order to rescale the confidence ellipsoid \( \mathbf{V}_t \), are not known. Therefore in order
to use the above theorem, we need to estimate them. As the mean and variance prediction are identical for Poisson responses, and the scaled variance \( \sigma_i \) is an increasing function of \( \mu_i \) (Lemma 7 in Appendix), we take a pragmatic approach and use the upper bound on the mean to estimate the scaling variance:

\[
\sigma_i^2(A) = \text{ucb}_{t-1}(A) k^s(\text{ucb}_{t-1}(A)).
\]

At time \( t = 0 \), we use the worst case estimates \( \text{ucb}_0(A) = u \int_A dx \). Notice that the sequence of variances needs to be deterministic when conditioned on the past data \( \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \). The above upper-bound fulfills this condition since the estimates from previous round \( (t - 1) \) are used. The positivity constraints \( A \) appears as bias similarly as other sources of bias appear in related works studying confidence sets (Mutný et al., 2020).

### 5.2. Likelihood and Likelihood Ratios

Confidence sets for adaptively collected data with known likelihood function can be calculated with a similar procedure as above by noting that the likelihood ratio is a super-martingale under the true distribution (Robbins et al., 1972). Consequently, the \( 1 - \delta \) confidence set \( C(\theta) \) can be constructed as \( C(\theta) = \{ \theta : \sum_{i=1}^t \log \left( \frac{p(\theta_{i+1}, x_i, z_i)}{p(\theta, x_i, z_i)} \right) \leq \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \} \); where \( p \) is the likelihood and \( \hat{\theta}_i \) is the estimate at time \( i \). While appealing, these confidence sets are difficult to approximate or cover in terms of a tractable convex set, e.g., an ellipsoid. For example, a common approach to approximate these confidence sets is to use Taylor’s theorem and expand around the maximum likelihood estimate up to the second order. This is known as Laplace approximation, in the context of Bayesian estimators. In particular, short calculation reveals that the approximate covariance is:

\[
\text{V}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^\top} \log p(\theta, x_i, z_i) \right|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_i}. 
\]

This approximation, however suffers from a pathology: in region \( A \) with very small rate \( \varphi_A \), the counts are mostly zero, but observing \( n_i = 0 \) does not increase \( V_i \) and hence does not shrink the confidence set. Therefore, on problems with small counts (small \( l \)), it is reasonable to expect that this approach fails as the algorithm believes the uncertainty is high despite sensing multiple times – a scenario which we observe in numerical experiments in Section 7. If we were to lower bound the likelihood ratio, and hence maintain coverage, the dependence on \( n_i \) stays. Nevertheless, as long as \( l > 0 \), an approach based on such confidence sets would converge, albeit slowly, as it does not extract information from not observing events \( (n_i = 0) \).

Penalized likelihood does not in fact differ much from least-squares regression. Its optimality conditions have exactly the same form as Equation (6), with the notable difference that instead of \( \sigma_i^2 \) on diagonal of \( \Sigma \), they contain empirical variances \( \varphi_A \), \( \hat{\theta} \). In light of this, it might make sense to use the confidence sets derived for the regression estimator with the likelihood estimator to achieve best of both worlds in practice: an approach we explore numerically.

### 6. Regret Analysis

#### 6.1. Information Gain

Our regret bound that we establish in Section 6.2 will depend on the representational capacity of \( \mathcal{H}_k \), which can be loosely interpreted as its dimensionality of the Hilbert space. We will state our results in terms of information gain (Srinivas et al., 2010), a common notion in the kernelized bandits literature, which also appears in our confidence parameter \( \beta_i(\delta) \) as \( \log(\det(V_i)/\det(I_\gamma)) \). It is more commonly defined in its dual formulation due to Weinstein–Aronszajn identity,

\[
\gamma_T(A) = \log \det(\mathbf{K}_T + \Sigma_T) - \log \det(\Sigma_T) \tag{10}
\]

where \( (\mathbf{K}_T)_{i,j} = \int_{A_j} \int_{A_i} k(x, z) dx dz = \kappa(A_i, A_j) \), and diagonal \( (\Sigma_T)_{ii} = \gamma \sigma_i^2 \). Notably, in our setting, the kernel function measures similarity between Borel sets. This is in contrast to point-wise similarity as common for kernel methods. The argument of the information gain indicates that the form of \( \gamma_T \) differs for count-record (with \( B \)) and histogram (with \( A \)) feedback due to different inputs to the kernel matrix \( k \).

To give some intuition behind this quantity, for any finite rank RKHS, as in Assumption 1, we can immediately give a bound

\[
\gamma_T \leq m \log \left( 1 + \frac{T u}{\gamma \rho^2} \right) \tag{11}
\]

with \( \rho^2 = \min_i \sigma_i^2 \). This means that it has logarithmic dependence on \( T \) and linear dependence on \( m \). While this bound is satisfactory for finite rank RKHS – or linear bandits – with fixed features \( \Phi(x) \) or \( \Psi(x) \), it might be less so for kernelized bandits where \( m \) can grow arbitrarily large.

---

3The operator \( M \) takes vector into a matrix form to be consistent with trace regression formulation.

4The \( \gamma_T \) with the time subscript should not be confused with \( \gamma \) without a subscript, which denotes regularization parameter.
In light of this, we show that by using either the triangle basis or QFF of Mutný and Krause (2018) for stationary kernels, $\gamma_T$, as function of $m$ has a finite limit related to the original kernel $k$. The formal statement of this result along with its proof can be found Appendix in C.2 and C.4.

Secondly, previous results bounding $\gamma_T$ assume point evaluations, and do not extend trivially to integral actions. We show that these can be related to the standard bounds on $\gamma_T$ at cost of changing the regularization parameter (which can also lead to improvements). Importantly, this change does not impact the asymptotic scaling in $T$ for stationary kernels, e.g., for the squared exponential kernel used in our experiments, $\gamma_T \leq O((\log T)^d)$, (more details in C.4 and C.5).

6.2 Regret Bound

Classical bandit proof techniques yields the following result as a consequence of Theorem 1.

**Theorem 2.** For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, under Assumptions 1, 2, and cost function $w$ such that the best sensing action is time invariant, CAPTURE-UCB suffers for $T > 0$:

$$R_T \leq \min \left\{ \frac{O(\sqrt{\rho_H T \Delta} \beta_T(\delta, A) \gamma_T(A))}{O(\sqrt{\rho_C T \Delta} \beta_T(\delta, B) \gamma_T(B))} \right\} \text{ if histogram}$$

$$\text{with probability } 1 - \delta. \text{ Hereby, } \beta(\delta) \text{ is a function of } \gamma_T$$

and is as in Theorem 1, and $\rho_H = \max_{t \in T} \sigma_t^2(A)$, $\rho_C = \max_{t \in T} \max_{x \in B} \sigma_t^2(B)$.

The values of $\rho_H$ and $\rho_C$ are finite and depend only on $U$ and $u$. As $l \to 0$ (lower bond on the intensity) $\rho$ is well-behaved and decreases towards zero, where the decrease depend only on $U$ and $u$ as one can see in Lemma 4 in Appendix.

Inspecting the direct dependence of $\beta_T$ with $\gamma = m$, we conclude that the overall regret is $O(\sqrt{T \gamma_T \sqrt{m}})$ involving the basis size $m$. Using (11), we can refine this bound and express it only in terms of $m$ and $T$ as $O(\sqrt{m \log T})$, i.e., the same as for sub-Gaussian random noise up to a logarithmic factor of $T$. The effect of Poisson noise is captured in the value of $\rho_C$ and $\rho_H$, which are the scaled variances and they depend only on the values of $U$, $u$ and $\Delta$ in the worst case.

**Extension to general RKHS** While the rate of regret $R_t$ is optimal (up to logarithmic factors) for any finite rank bandit algorithm, $m$ does not always represent the true intrinsic statistical difficulty of the problem. The appropriate complexity measure instead is $\gamma_T$. It remains an important open problem to express the results of Theorem 1 solely in terms of $\gamma_T$. Instead, we discuss an approach based on finite approximations. Namely, for any time $t$, suppose we want to optimize the regret up to precision $\epsilon = 1/t^2$. This is sufficient, since we cannot hope to have better estimation accuracy than $t^{-1/2}$. Using the Mercer decomposition of the kernel, we use for computation $\kappa = \Phi(x)\Phi(x)$, where, for $\Phi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we construct a truncated version, where only eigenvalues above $\epsilon$ are considered. To construct the Mercer decomposition, we require a measure, which in this case is the uniform measure over the action set. Let us denote the number of eigenvalues above $\epsilon$ by $m_\epsilon$. This number is upper-bounded by twice the effective dimension (Bach, 2017), which is itself upper-bounded by $\gamma_T$. We can then serve the confidence results with $m_1/\epsilon$ playing effectively role of $\gamma_T$, since it can be bounded by it (with regularization constant $\epsilon$). Under this supposition, the overall regret for $T \leq T$ is bounded by $O(\sqrt{T \gamma_T})$, again recovering the best known complexity for kernelized bandits with sub-Gaussian noise assumption. Notice that we had to drop the anytime assumption, since the regularization parameter needs to scale with $T$.

The previous theorem is proved under the assumption that the true function can be represented via finite rank approximation. We did not empirically study the effect of the approximation error, but this error can be reduced arbitrarily by increasing $m$, and as we already established that $\gamma_T$ of the approximated RKHS converges to the true $\gamma_T$ from below, the bound remains valid.

6.3. Refinement problem: Count-record

The regret of the count-record feedback depends on the domain partition $B$ we choose. If the partition is very small, then so are the counts falling into the individual sets $B$. We know that the concentration properties of the Poisson distribution lead to larger corrections for moderate variances, but overall they decrease to zero, albeit slowly. In other words, $\rho_C = \max_{t \in T} \max_{x \in A} \sigma_t^2(B)$ decreases with decreasing size of partitioning even if the correction $k^*$ grows. The overall variance $\sigma^2(B) = k^* \mathbb{E}[N(B)]$ converges to 0 as the variance of $N(B)$ goes to zero (Lemma 4), which is necessarily an effect of partitioning more finely. On the other hand, $\gamma_T(B) \geq \gamma_T(A)$ for the same set of chosen actions, since the elements of $(K_T)_{ij}$ are $\kappa(B_i, B_j)$ for $B_i, B_j \in B$ instead of the actions $A_i, A_j$ as for histogram feedback, and these can be shown to be smaller (formal statement in Appendix C.9). Hence, one should choose a level of partition such that the two aspects are balanced – local information and adaptivity. We call this the refinement problem. Unfortunately, as our assumptions are very general, optimal partitioning depends non-trivially on the kernel $k$, the action set $A$ and the past data. While it is theoretically conceivable to search over all $B$ for each $A \in A$ to find the smallest $ucb$, this procedure is practically infeasible. Perhaps a practical balance is to calculate a sequence of bounds for each $A$ based on sequential splitting of the domain (quadtree in two dimensional case), and stop splitting once $ucb$ does not decrease, or to fix a sufficiently
fine binning, an approach we use in our experiments and in theory. The exact analysis of this refinement problem on the regret is an interesting direction for future research.

7. Experiments and Applications

In our experiments, we investigate both feedback models as well as different cost models: uniform cost \( w(A) = |A| \), concave cost \( w(A) = |A| + 0.01 \), and one-off cost. We compare: \( \epsilon \)-greedy, CAPTURE-UCB, and the Thompson sampling algorithm of Grant et al. (2019), which does not exploit correlation between sensing regions. We also report a variant of our approach called Information Directed Sampling CAPTURE-IDS, which we explain in Appendix A.2. It has a similar flavor as UCB but uses a different utility function. Additionally, we compare with algorithms based on penalized likelihood: UCB-\( \mathcal{L} \) and IDS-\( \mathcal{L} \) using the same confidence set as our heteroscedastic estimator. We also report UCB-LAP – a UCB algorithm with quadratic approximation of the likelihood ratio confidence set. This approximation is equivalent to Laplace approximation in the Bayesian formulation with a Gaussian prior. The algorithm \( \epsilon \)-greedy simply plays the current best estimate with 1 – \( \epsilon \) probability, and with \( \epsilon = O(t^{-1/2}) \) probability a random sensing region is selected. To predict the best region, \( \epsilon \)-greedy uses the RKHS model.

Confidence parameter We relax the theoretical requirements of the confidence sets, and simply use \( \beta = 4 \), as well as tweak the past, by which we mean we tweak the past variances with the new estimates of \( \lambda \), causing \( \sigma_t^2 \) to be no longer adapted. This is not warranted by theory but nearly always improves the performance in practice. We study these two aberrations from the theory on a toy problem: \( \lambda(x) = 4 \exp(-(x + 1)) \sin(2x\pi)^2 \) with \( \delta = 0.5 \). In Fig. 2a), we see that both changes improve the finite time performance with the most impact due to different choice of \( \beta \). While tweaking improves, the overall behavior is similar. This result is consistent with the observations from the bandit literature, where \( \beta \) is viewed as a tuning parameter. The remaining experiments are with tweaking, \( \beta = 4 \) and \( \gamma = 1 \). Additionally, the Poisson counts are superimposable – this means that sensing the same regions multiple times can be merged together as they contain the same amount of information. While the likelihood estimator automatically implements this feature, we need to enforce it with regression perspective, which can be done in connection with tweaking.

Summary There are three main overall messages from the benchmarks: 1) All algorithms utilizing the RKHS structure substantially outperform algorithms that do not use this structure, such as Grant et al. (2019). 2) The confidence sets stemming from Laplace approximation fail, as evident in, e.g., Fig. 2. 3) Both feedback models, as well as all cost models do not have qualitative performance effect on the algorithm and are handled equally well. Now we discuss the modeling and setup for each experiment separately.

7.1. Benchmarks

Taxis Suppose we have to dispatch 5 taxi cars each to a distinct block of a city, and the goal is maximize the number of serviced passengers. We use histogram feedback and hierarchically split the domain as in Fig. 1a. We use the triangle basis with squared exponential kernel, uniform costs, \( \Delta = 60 \) min, and report the results in Fig. 2b).

Crime surveillance We use a crime dataset released by the San Francisco police department to estimate the intensity of burglary occurrences over space (see Fig. in Appendix D). The sensing duration is set to \( \Delta = 30 \) days corresponding roughly to placing a mobile camera to that region. We report the results with count-record feedback, triangle basis and squared exponential kernel in Fig. 2c).

Environmental Monitoring We use two datasets from Baddeley et al. (2015), one containing locations of an African tree shrub Beilschmiedia, and one containing Gorilla nesting locations in a Cameroon rain forest. These examples can be motivated by species monitoring from satellites or an airplane. Each sensing action corresponds to zooming onto a specific region in order to identify the objects of interest. In the first case, we implement the one-off constraint and use the trace regression estimator, where the features \( \Psi \) are modeled as Fourier features of the squared exponential kernel. The squared exponential kernel takes as input the value of slope \( s(x,y) \) and height \( h(x,y) \) at location \( (x, y) \), since we believe these to be predictive of habitat. We report captured events with count-record feedback in Fig. 2d). In Fig. 2e), we report the regret on the Gorillas dataset with count-record feedback, concave costs, squared exponential kernel and triangle basis. More details along with the fitted models are presented in Appendix D.

8. Related Work

The intensity of Poisson point processes is typically estimated either via smoothing kernels (Berman and Diggle, 1989) or via kernelized estimators (Lloyd et al., 2015). Kernelized estimators need to enforce the positivity constraint either via a link function (Adams et al., 2009; John and Hensman, 2018), by enforcing it at sufficiently many points in the domain (Agrell, 2019; Aubin-Frankowski and Szabó, 2020) or using specially constructed positive bases such as positive splines, Bernstein polynomials (Papp and Alizadeh, 2014) or the simpler non-polynomial triangle basis (Maatouk and Bay, 2016; López-Lopera et al., 2018). Positive bases have been used for Cox process inference by López-Lopera et al. (2019) and Alizadeh et al. (2008). We use estimators based on positive bases or using constrained formulations as in (Marteau-Ferey et al., 2020) or (Aubin-Frankowski and Szabó, 2020).

Confidence sets Confidence sets for adaptively collected data with sub-Gaussian noise dependence are analyzed via self-normalized processes (de la Peña et al., 2009), as
in the seminal work of Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2011) for linear bandits. This theory can be extended to other noise generating processes by identifying the right non-negative super-martingale (Howard et al., 2018). Faury et al. (2020) present adaptive confidence bounds using the self-normalized technique for bounded noise. We also exploit self-normalized martingales with similar techniques.

Adaptive Sensing  Grant et al. (2019; 2020) study adaptive sensing of Poisson point processes with sensing costs. They bin the domain, and sequentially refine estimators of bins with truncated gamma priors to design a regret minimizing algorithm. Importantly, the regret authors study is different to \textit{count-regret} studied here – the cost is additive in their work while here the cost enters as a ratio. Crucially, their bins are considered to be independent, while we exploit correlation via the RKHS assumption. The binning is done in order to address the refinement problem as their collection action set $A$ is not finite. Grant and Szechtman (2020) study a related problem constrained to sense a region of increasing volumes.

After binning, regression based estimators tailored for heavy tailed noises, e.g., based on median on means are applicable. However, these methods do not adapt to a particular noise model nor they adapt to heteroscedasticity (Medina and Yang, 2016; Shao et al., 2018) of the Poisson distribution, and have worst-case flavor. In the bandit literature, there are methods that adapt to \textit{a priori known} heteroscedasticity with sub-Gaussian noise (Kirschner and Krause, 2018), or to semi-bandit feedback (György et al., 2007; Kirschner et al., 2020).

Generalized Linear Models  For count data, the textbook approach (Cameron and Trivedi, 2013) suggests log-linear models: $E[N(A)] = \exp(\eta^T \psi(A))$ – an instance of generalized linear models (GLMs) McCullagh (2018). However, this approach cannot be easily reconciled with the linear Poisson process structure and the RKHS assumption. We explain this in more detail in Appendix A.1. Without the RKHS assumption and instead using the log-linear model with specially constructed $\psi(A)$, Filippi et al. (2010); Jun et al. (2017) propose bandit algorithms for GLMs. However they do not cover Poisson noise, since they assume bounded and sub-Gaussian noise, respectively.

9. Future Work and Conclusion

Future Works  There are several issues that we did not address in this paper that warrant further study and open new avenues of research. Among many others, we did not allow for $\Delta$ to be time varying nor did we analyze the approximation properties of finite bases. Perhaps the biggest open question is the derivation of \textit{anytime} confidence sets independent of finite rank $m$ only scaling with respect to $\gamma T$.

Conclusion  We introduced the problem of sensing inhomogeneous Poisson point processes. We derived adaptive confidence sets for heteroscedastic linear regression for Poisson count data with properly scaled variances. Applying these, we proposed algorithms that minimize the \textit{count regret} based on optimism and information directed sampling. We proved that our optimistic algorithm is no-regret, and demonstrate the applicability of the approach on several real-world problems. We discussed several practical implementation improvements, and compared to algorithms based on Laplace approximation confidence sets.
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