

APPENDIX D

Offline guarantees

We show here how the guarantee given by Corollary 4 can be immediately used to derive a fully *offline* guarantee for estimation. Recalling Corollary 4 here for clarity:

Corollary 5. *Assume that $|y^{(d+1)}(\xi)| \leq M$ for all $\xi \in [s_0, s_d]$, and that the measurement noise is uniformly bounded by $|e(s_i)| \leq E$ for all $s_i \in \mathcal{D}$. If the subset \mathcal{D} has maximal inter-sample spacing $s_{i+1} - s_i \leq \delta$, then:*

$$\begin{aligned} |y^{(k)}(t) - p^{(k)}(t)| &\leq \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} \left| l_i^{(k)}(t) (y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p(s_i)) \right| \\ &\quad + E \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |l_i^{(k)}(t)| + M\delta^{d-k+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{D.0.1}$$

where $l_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $i = 0, 1, \dots, d$ are the Lagrange basis polynomials for \mathcal{D} :

$$l_i(t) = \prod_{s_j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{s_i\}} \frac{t - s_j}{s_i - s_j}. \tag{D.0.2}$$

D.1 Explicitly bounding residuals

In order to transition the guarantee given by (D.0.1) from one that depends on the online residuals to a fully offline bound, we simply need to bound the worst-case values of these residuals. By assuming a global limit $|y^{(d+1)}(t)| \leq M$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we can immediately derive this bound with a simple application of the Taylor Remainder Theorem.

Corollary 6. *Assume $|y^{(d+1)}| \leq M$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for any time $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the least-squares*

polynomial $p_{LS} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ fit to the window of $N + 1$ data points satisfies the bound:

$$|y^{(k)}(t) - p_{LS}^{(k)}(t)| \leq M \left(\frac{L^{(k)}(t)\delta^{d+1}}{(d+1)!} \sqrt{2S_{2(d+1)} \left(\left\lceil \frac{N+1}{2} \right\rceil \right)} + \delta^{d-k+1} \right) + EL^{(k)}(t) \left(\sqrt{N+1} + 1 \right),$$

where we have defined:

$$L^{(k)}(t) = \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |l_i^{(k)}(t)|.$$

Proof. First, consider any sequence of $N + 1$ measurements, from which we have constructed the least-squares polynomial p_{LS} . Then (D.0.1) states:

$$\begin{aligned} |y^{(k)}(t) - p_{LS}^{(k)}(t)| &\leq \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |l_i^{(k)}(t) (y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p_{LS}(s_i))| + E \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |l_i^{(k)}(t)| + M\delta^{d-k+1} \\ &\leq \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |l_i^{(k)}(t)| \cdot |y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p_{LS}(s_i)| + E \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |l_i^{(k)}(t)| + M\delta^{d-k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1.1})$$

Now we also consider the degree d Taylor approximation to y , denoted $p_T : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, expanded about some time $t_0 \in [s_0, s_d]$. By construction, the Taylor approximation satisfies:

$$y(t) - P_T(t) = \frac{y^{(d+1)}(c)}{(d+1)!} (t - t_0)^{d+1}, \quad (\text{D.1.2})$$

for some $c \in [s_0, s_d]$.

To finish our conversion to an offline bound, we need to characterize the weighted sum of the residual errors in (D.1.1). Consider any single residual from this summation and note:

$$|y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p_{LS}(s_i)| \leq \max_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p_{LS}(s_i)| \quad (\text{D.1.3})$$

$$\leq \max_{i=0,1,\dots,N} |y(t_i) + e(t_i) - p_{LS}(t_i)| \quad (\text{D.1.4})$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |y(t_i) + e(t_i) - p_{LS}(t_i)|^2}, \quad (\text{D.1.5})$$

where the final inequality arises by the fact that the ℓ_2 norm always upper bounds the ℓ_∞ norm. Next we recall that the least-squares polynomial achieves minimal ℓ_2 norm of its residuals, and further that the degree d Taylor polynomial p_T is *feasible* in the associated optimization problem. Therefore, we have the bound:

$$|y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p_{LS}(s_i)| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |y(t_i) + e(t_i) - p_T(t_i)|^2}. \quad (\text{D.1.6})$$

Next, by directly applying (D.1.2) and the triangle inequality for the ℓ_2 norm, we have:

$$|y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p_{LS}(s_i)| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N \left| \frac{y^{(d+1)}(c)}{(d+1)!} (t_i - t_0)^{d+1} + e(t_i) \right|^2} \quad (\text{D.1.7})$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N \left| \frac{y^{(d+1)}(c)}{(d+1)!} (t_i - t_0)^{d+1} \right|^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |e(t_i)|^2} \quad (\text{D.1.8})$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\left(\frac{|y^{(d+1)}(c)|}{(d+1)!} \right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^N |t_i - t_0|^{2(d+1)}} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |e(t_i)|^2} \quad (\text{D.1.9})$$

$$= \frac{|y^{(d+1)}(c)|}{(d+1)!} \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |t_i - t_0|^{2(d+1)}} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |e(t_i)|^2}. \quad (\text{D.1.10})$$

Next, we recall our global bounds, in particular that $|y^{(d+1)}(t)| \leq M$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and also that the measurement errors are bounded, $|e(t_i)| \leq E$ for all t_i . We immediately recover the following:

$$|y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p_{LS}(s_i)| \leq \frac{M}{(d+1)!} \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |t_i - t_0|^{2(d+1)}} + \sqrt{(N+1)E^2} \quad (\text{D.1.11})$$

$$= \frac{M}{(d+1)!} \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |t_i - t_0|^{2(d+1)}} + E\sqrt{N+1}. \quad (\text{D.1.12})$$

Lastly, we note that we may only claim the inequality given by Corollary 4 when considering a $t \in [s_0, s_d]$. We may place the expansion point for our Taylor approximation t_0 anywhere in our window of interest, and by lazily selecting t_0 to be the median in the window of $N+1$

points, we can bound:

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |t_i - t_0|^{2(d+1)}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{N+1}{2} \rceil} 2(i \cdot \delta)^{2(d+1)}} \quad (\text{D.1.13})$$

$$\leq \delta^{d+1} \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{N+1}{2} \rceil} i^{2(d+1)}}. \quad (\text{D.1.14})$$

since the maximal inter-sample spacing is δ . We note here that the final summation is a *power sum*, typically denoted by:

$$S_{2(d+1)} \left(\left\lceil \frac{N+1}{2} \right\rceil \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{N+1}{2} \rceil} i^{2(d+1)}, \quad (\text{D.1.15})$$

for which various closed-form expressions exist. A more naive (and definitively looser) bound for these terms could easily be derived by bounding every term $|t_i - t_0|$ by the maximal window length, instead deriving the bound:

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |t_i - t_0|^{2(d+1)}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N (N\delta)^{2(d+1)}} \quad (\text{D.1.16})$$

$$= \sqrt{N+1} (N\delta)^{(d+1)}. \quad (\text{D.1.17})$$

Finally, we return to our bound for a single term (D.1.12), applying the power sum bound (D.1.15) and find:

$$|y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p_{LS}(s_i)| \leq \frac{M}{(d+1)!} \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^N |t_i - t_0|^{2(d+1)} + E\sqrt{N+1}} \quad (\text{D.1.18})$$

$$\leq \frac{M\delta^{d+1}}{(d+1)!} \sqrt{2S_{2(d+1)} \left(\left\lceil \frac{N+1}{2} \right\rceil \right) + E\sqrt{N+1}}. \quad (\text{D.1.19})$$

Or alternatively, choosing the looser bound (D.1.17):

$$|y(s_i) + e(s_i) - p_{LS}(s_i)| \leq \frac{M\sqrt{N+1}(N\delta)^{d+1}}{(d+1)!} + E\sqrt{N+1}. \quad (\text{D.1.20})$$

Finally, we can return to the full weighted sum (D.1.1) to find:

$$|y^{(k)}(t) - p_{LS}^{(k)}(t)| \leq \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |l_i^{(k)}(t)| \cdot \left[\frac{M\delta^{d+1}}{(d+1)!} \sqrt{2S_{2(d+1)} \left(\left\lceil \frac{N+1}{2} \right\rceil \right)} + E\sqrt{N+1} \right] \quad (\text{D.1.21})$$

$$+ E \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |l_i^{(k)}(t)| + M\delta^{d-k+1}. \quad (\text{D.1.22})$$

For notational cleanliness, we define $L^{(k)}(t) = \sum_{s_i \in \mathcal{D}} |l_i^{(k)}(t)|$, and re-arrange terms to see:

$$|y^{(k)}(t) - p_{LS}^{(k)}(t)| \leq M \left(\frac{L^{(k)}(t)\delta^{d+1}}{(d+1)!} \sqrt{2S_{2(d+1)} \left(\left\lceil \frac{N+1}{2} \right\rceil \right)} + \delta^{d-k+1} \right) \quad (\text{D.1.23})$$

$$+ EL^{(k)}(t) (\sqrt{N+1} + 1). \quad (\text{D.1.24})$$

□

The exact algebraic form of the bound in Corollary 6 is complicated, but it does exhibit some key behaviors we would expect. For example, higher derivative orders have weaker guarantees. In particular, the value of δ^{d-k+1} increases and the values of $L^{(k)}(t)$ increase monotonically with increasing k . Additionally, as the sampling time decreases (δ shrinks), the guarantees become tighter.

One key behavior exhibited in the bound from Corollary 6 is that it consists of two terms, one which is proportional to the measurement error bound E , and one which is proportional to the “ill-conditioning” of the target function M . This type of bound not only makes sense, but has its theoretical roots in ill-posed inverse problem theory [Dio07, Kir11].

D.2 Directly using least-squares

A final observation is that we could have derived the offline guarantee in Corollary 6 through the lens of a pure least-squares analysis.

In particular, Savitzky-Golay filtering solves the least squares problem:

$$\underset{a \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|Y + Z - Fa\|_2^2, \quad (\text{D.2.1})$$

where $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ denote the measurement and noise vectors, and $F \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1 \times d+1}$ is the relevant *Vandermonde* matrix of polynomial regression coefficients. Explicitly, these matrices are:

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} y(t_0) \\ y(t_1) \\ \dots \\ y(t_N) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Z = \begin{pmatrix} e(t_0) \\ e(t_1) \\ \dots \\ e(t_N) \end{pmatrix}, \quad F = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t_0 & t_0^2 & \dots & t_0^d \\ 1 & t_1 & t_1^2 & \dots & t_1^d \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & t_N & t_N^2 & \dots & t_N^d \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{D.2.2})$$

The solution of this optimization problem is a set of coefficients $a_{LS} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ for the least-squares polynomial. To evaluate it and its derivatives at a point, we may consider the “evaluation matrix” $B(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d+1}$:

$$B(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t & t^2 & \dots & t^d \\ 0 & 1 & 2t & \dots & dt^{d-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & d! & \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{D.2.3})$$

which is built such that $B(t)a_{LS} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ produces a vector containing the Savitzky-Golay filter estimates of the d derivatives of y at the time t .

As we did in the proof of Corollary 6, we note that the degree d Taylor approximating polynomial expanded about some t_0 is also feasible for the optimization problem (D.2.1). The Taylor approximation corresponds to a set of coefficients $a_T \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, and in particular we know (via the Taylor Remainder Theorem) that:

$$Y = Fa_T + R_T, \quad (\text{D.2.4})$$

where the errors R_T are derived from (D.1.2). We actually know from our work in Corollary 6 that these bounds will consist of two terms, one relating to the $d+1$ derivative bound M and one relating to the measurement noise bound E , with powers of the inter-sample spacing δ .

Using this simple observation, we can directly derive a simple offline bound.

Lemma 12. *Let the vector of remainders for a degree d Taylor approximation of y about $t \in \mathbb{R}$ be defined as R_T (as we did in (D.2.4)). Then the least-squares estimator has error bounded by:*

$$|y^{(k)}(t) - \hat{y}^{(k)}(t)| = |y^{(k)}(t) - [B(t)a_{LS}]_k| \leq |B_k(t)F^\dagger|_\infty (|R_T|_\infty + E), \quad (\text{D.2.5})$$

where $F^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1 \times N+1}$ denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse of the matrix F .

Proof. Directly computing:

$$|y^{(k)}(t) - [B(t)a_{LS}]_k| = |y^{(k)}(t) - [B(t)a_T]_k + [B(t)a_T]_k - [B(t)a_{LS}]_k|. \quad (\text{D.2.6})$$

Because we have considered the Taylor series expanded about the time t , the error in its approximation of $y^{(k)}(t)$ is exactly zero for all orders $k \leq d$. Then, using our definition of the residual vector in (D.2.4) and the closed form expression for the least-squares solution to the optimization problem (D.2.1), we have:

$$|y^{(k)}(t) - [B(t)a_{LS}]_k| = |[B(t)F^\dagger(Y + R_T)]_k - [B(t)F^\dagger(Y + Z)]_k| \quad (\text{D.2.7})$$

$$\leq |[B(t)F^\dagger(R_T - Z)]_k| \quad (\text{D.2.8})$$

$$\leq \|B(t)F^\dagger(R_T - Z)\|_\infty \quad (\text{D.2.9})$$

$$\leq \|B(t)F^\dagger\|_\infty \|R_T - Z\|_\infty \quad (\text{D.2.10})$$

$$\leq \|B(t)F^\dagger\|_\infty (\|R_T\|_\infty + \|Z\|_\infty) \quad (\text{D.2.11})$$

$$\leq \|B(t)F^\dagger\|_\infty (\|R_T\|_\infty + E), \quad (\text{D.2.12})$$

where we slightly abused notation to use $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ to denote the ℓ_∞ vector norm and also the operator infinity norm of a matrix. \square

These guarantees, while very direct, obfuscate the roles of the relevant design parameters. In particular, the smoothing properties of least-squares and the roles of the residual are all hidden within the complicated pseudo-inverse of the Vandermonde matrix F . We opted for the form of guarantees in the main body of this work because they provide a more explicit characterization of the tradeoffs between various design parameters in the estimator.