

# Tight Regret Bounds for Stochastic Combinatorial Semi-Bandits

**Branislav Kveton**

*Technicolor Labs*

175 S San Antonio Rd, St 220, Los Altos, CA 94022, United States

BRANISLAV.KVETON@TECHNICOLOR.COM

**Zheng Wen**

*Yahoo Labs*

701 1st Ave, Sunnyvale, CA 94089, United States

ZHENGWEN@YAHOO-INC.COM

**Azin Ashkan**

*Technicolor Labs*

175 S San Antonio Rd, St 220, Los Altos, CA 94022, United States

AZIN.ASHKAN@TECHNICOLOR.COM

**Csaba Szepesvári**

*Department of Computing Science, University of Alberta*

Edmonton, AB T6G 2E8, Canada

SZEPESVA@CS.UALBERTA.CA

**Editor:**

## Abstract

A stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit with linear payoff is a class of sequential learning problems, where at each step a learning agent chooses a subset of ground items subject to some combinatorial constraints, then observes noise-corrupted weights of all chosen items, and receives their sum as payoff. Based on the existing bandit literature, it is relatively straightforward to propose a UCB-like algorithm for this class of problems, which we refer to as CombUCB1. The key advantage of CombUCB1 is its computational efficiency, the method is computationally efficient when the offline variant of the combinatorial optimization problem can be solved efficiently. CombUCB1 has been applied to various problems and it is well established that its  $n$ -step regret is  $O(K^2L(1/\Delta)\log n)$ , where  $L$  is the number of ground items,  $K$  is the maximum number of chosen items, and  $\Delta$  is the gap between the expected weights of the best and second best solutions. In this work, we derive novel upper bounds on the  $n$ -step regret of CombUCB1, most notably a  $O(KL(1/\Delta)\log n)$  gap-dependent upper bound and a  $O(\sqrt{KLn\log n})$  gap-free upper bound. Both bounds are significant improvements over the state of the art. Moreover, we prove that the  $O(KL(1/\Delta)\log n)$  upper bound is tight by showing that it matches a lower bound up to a constant independent of  $K$ ,  $L$ ,  $\Delta$ , and  $n$ ; and that the  $O(\sqrt{KLn\log n})$  upper bound is “almost tight” by showing that it matches a lower bound up to a factor of  $\sqrt{\log n}$ .

## 1. Introduction

We study a *stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit* with linear payoff (Gai et al., 2012), a class of sequential learning problems where at each step a learning agent chooses a subset of *ground items*, subject to some combinatorial constraints, and then observes noise-corrupted weights of each chosen item, a form of a stochastic semi-bandit feedback (Audibert et al., 2014). The reward of the agent is the sum of the observed weights. The goal of the agent is to maximize its total expected reward over time, or equivalently to minimize its expected cumulative regret. Stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits can be viewed as an online variant of combinatorial optimization problems with a linear objective function and binary variables.

We consider a variant of the problem where we are given an *offline optimization oracle* that can find the optimal solution for any given set of weights. We say that the problem is an  $(L, K, \Delta)$  instance when  $L$  is the cardinality of its ground set,  $K$  is the maximum number of items in any of its feasible solutions, and  $\Delta > 0$  is the gap between the expected rewards of the optimal and second best solutions. We say that the problem is an  $(L, K)$  instance if it is an  $(L, K, \Delta)$  instance for some  $\Delta$ . Based on the existing bandit literature (Auer et al., 2002a), it is relatively straightforward to propose a UCB-like algorithm for solving our problem (Gai

et al., 2012), and we refer to this algorithm as CombUCB1. At each step, CombUCB1 uses the offline oracle to find the optimal solution with respect to the optimistic estimates of the expected weights of the items. The best existing upper bound on the regret of CombUCB1 in  $(L, K, \Delta)$  stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits is  $O(K^2 L(1/\Delta) \log n)$  (Chen et al., 2013).

Our main contributions are  $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  and  $O(\sqrt{KLn \log n})$  upper bounds on the  $n$ -step regret of CombUCB1. Both bounds are significant improvements over the state-of-the-art results. We also derive a  $\Omega(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  lower bound that matches the gap-dependent upper bound up to a constant factor, and a  $\Omega(\sqrt{KLn})$  lower bound that matches the gap-free upper bound up to a factor of  $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ .<sup>1</sup> In summary, we show that CombUCB1 achieves near-optimal regret on  $(L, K, \Delta)$  stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits. Note that CombUCB1 can be implemented efficiently when the offline optimization oracle is computationally efficient (Gai et al., 2012). Therefore, we indirectly show that stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits can be solved both computationally and sample efficiently. This problem is still open in the adversarial setting. For example, it is known that online stochastic mirror descent (OSMD) (Audibert et al., 2014) achieves near-optimal regret, but it is not known whether OSMD can be implemented computationally efficiently for all combinatorial optimization problems that can be solved efficiently. Follow the perturbed leader (FPL) with geometric resampling (Neu and Bartók, 2013) fails to achieve the optimal regret of  $O(\sqrt{KLn})$  but is known to be computationally efficient, although less than CombUCB1 because it needs to call the optimization oracle multiple times at each step.

To the best of our knowledge, our analysis is novel. It is based on the idea that it does not happen “too often” that “many” items in a chosen suboptimal solution are observed “insufficiently often”. The reason is that this event happens simultaneously for “many” items, and whenever the event happens, the observation counters of these items increase. Based on this idea, we divide the regret associated with this event among “many” items and do not attribute it independently to each item as in the prior work (Gai et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2013). This is the main idea in our analysis and the key to achieving tight upper bounds.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our learning problem and the algorithm for solving it. In Section 3, we summarize our results and compare them to prior work. In Section 4, we prove a  $O(K^{\frac{4}{3}} L(1/\Delta) \log n)$  upper bound on the regret of CombUCB1. The main idea in the proof of this bound is that we define two events, where many items have not been observed sufficiently often, and the complement of this event. In Section 5, we prove a  $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  upper bound on the regret of CombUCB1. The key idea in the proof of this bound is that we define a sequence of infinitely many events where many items have not been observed sufficiently often. The notions of “many items” and “observed often” are modeled as geometric sequences. In Section 6, we prove a  $\Omega(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  lower bound on the regret in stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits. We also present a short proof of a  $\Omega(\sqrt{KLn})$  gap-free lower bound.

## 2. Setting

Formally, a stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit is a tuple  $B = (E, \Theta, P)$ , where  $E = \{1, \dots, L\}$  is a finite set of  $L > 0$  items,  $\Theta \subseteq 2^E$  is a non-empty set of feasible subsets of  $E$ , and  $P$  is a probability distribution over the unit cube  $[0, 1]^E$ . Borrowing the terminology of combinatorial optimization, we call  $E$  the *ground set*,  $\Theta$  the *feasible set*, and  $A \in \Theta$  a *solution*. We refer to  $w \sim P$  as the *weights* of the items and denote by  $w(e)$  the weight of item  $e \in E$ . The *expected weights* are defined as  $\bar{w} = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim P}[w]$  and we denote by  $\bar{w}(e)$  the expected weight of item  $e \in E$ . Given a weight vector  $w$ , the value of solution  $A$  is:

$$f(A, w) = \sum_{e \in A} w(e).$$

Let  $(w_t)_{t=1}^n$  be an i.i.d. sequence of weights drawn from  $P$ . At time  $t$ , the learning agent chooses a solution  $A_t \in \Theta$  based on its prior observations; incurs the reward of  $f(A_t, w_t)$ ; and observes the weights  $w_t(e)$  of

1. The same gap-free lower bound for the adversarial setting was given by Audibert et al. (2014) in Section 2.1. However, the proof there is based on a different construction than ours and, as we discuss later, this construction does not lead itself easily to a lower bound for the stochastic setting.

---

**Algorithm 1** CombUCB1: UCB1 or stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits.

---

**Input:** Feasible set  $\Theta$

// Initialization  
 $(\hat{w}_1, t_0) \leftarrow \text{Init}(\Theta)$   
 $T_0(e) \leftarrow 1 \quad \forall e \in E$

**for all**  $t = t_0, \dots, n$  **do**  
 // Compute UCBs  
 $U_t(e) \leftarrow \hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e) + c_{t-1, T_{t-1}(e)} \quad \forall e \in E$

// Solve the optimization problem and observe the weights of chosen items  
 $A_t \leftarrow \arg \max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, U_t)$   
 Observe  $\{(e, w_t(e)) : e \in A_t\}$ , where  $w_t \sim P$

// Update statistics  
 $T_t(e) \leftarrow T_{t-1}(e) \quad \forall e \in E$   
 $T_t(e) \leftarrow T_t(e) + 1 \quad \forall e \in A_t$   
 $\hat{w}_{T_t(e)}(e) \leftarrow \frac{T_{t-1}(e)\hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e) + w_t(e)}{T_t(e)} \quad \forall e \in A_t$

**end for**

---

all items  $e$  in  $A_t$ ,  $\{(e, w_t(e)) : e \in A_t\}$ . The agent interacts with the environment  $n$  times. The goal of the agent is to maximize its expected cumulative reward in  $n$  steps,  $\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} [f(A_t, w_t)] = \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} [f(A_t, \bar{w})]$ . If the agent knew the distribution  $P$  a priori, the optimal action would be to choose the *optimal solution*:

$$A^* = \arg \max_{A \in \Theta} \sum_{e \in A} \bar{w}(e)$$

at each step  $t$ . The quality of the agent's policy is measured by its *expected cumulative regret*:

$$R(n) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^n R(A_t, w_t) \right],$$

where  $R(A_t, w_t) = f(A^*, w_t) - f(A_t, w_t)$  is the stochastic regret of the agent at time  $t$ .

## 2.1 Algorithm

[Gai et al. \(2012\)](#) proposed a simple algorithm for solving stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits. This algorithm is motivated by UCB1 ([Auer et al., 2002a](#)) and therefore we refer to it as CombUCB1 (Algorithm 1). The algorithm works as follows. First, at each time  $t$ , CombUCB1 computes the *upper confidence bound (UCB)* on the expected weight of each item  $e$ :

$$U_t(e) = \hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e) + c_{t-1, T_{t-1}(e)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e)$  is the estimate of  $\bar{w}(e)$  from  $T_{t-1}(e)$  observations of  $w(e)$  up to time  $t$  and  $c_{t-1, T_{t-1}(e)}$  is the radius of the confidence interval around this estimate, which is defined as:

$$c_{t,s} = \sqrt{\frac{1.5 \log t}{s}}. \quad (2)$$

---

**Algorithm 2** `Init`: Initialization of CombUCB1.

---

**Input:** Feasible set  $\Theta$

```
 $\hat{w}(e) \leftarrow 0$   $\forall e \in E$   
 $u(e) \leftarrow 1$   $\forall e \in E$   
 $t \leftarrow 1$   
while  $(\exists e \in E : u(e) = 1)$  do  
   $A_t \leftarrow \arg \max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, u)$   
  Observe  $\{(e, w_t(e)) : e \in A_t\}$ , where  $w_t \sim P$   
  for all  $e \in A_t$  do  
     $\hat{w}(e) \leftarrow w_t(e)$   
     $u(e) \leftarrow 0$   
     $t \leftarrow t + 1$   
  end for  
end while
```

**Output:**

Weight vector  $\hat{w}$   
First non-initialization step  $t$

---

Second, CombUCB1 solves the optimization problem on the UCBs:

$$A_t = \arg \max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, U_t).$$

Finally, CombUCB1 observes the weights of all items  $e \in A_t$  and uses them to update its estimate of  $\bar{w}(e)$ .

## 2.2 Initialization

CombUCB1 is initialized by calling method `Init` (Algorithm 2) that returns two variables. The first variable is a weight vector  $\hat{w} \in [0, 1]^E$ , where  $\hat{w}(e)$  is a single observation from the  $e$ -th marginal of  $P$ . The second variable  $t_0$  is the number of initialization steps plus one. The method `Init` repeatedly calls the optimization oracle  $A_t = \arg \max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, u)$  and then observes  $\{(e, w_t(e)) : e \in A_t\}$ , where  $u \in \{0, 1\}^E$  is a vector of auxiliary weights that are initialized to 1. When the item is observed,  $e \in A_t$ , we set  $\hat{w}(e)$  to the observed weight of the item and  $u(e)$  to 0.

Assume that each item  $e \in E$  is contained in at least one feasible solution. Then it follows that at least one weight  $u(e)$  is set to 0 when  $\|u\|_0 > 0$ . Therefore, method `Init` is guaranteed to terminate, and observe each item  $e \in E$  at least once, after at most  $L$  iterations.

## 3. Summary of Main Results

We prove three upper bounds on the expected cumulative regret of CombUCB1 for  $(L, K, \Delta)$  instances. Two of the bounds are gap-dependent, depend on the gap  $\Delta$ , and one is gap-free:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Theorem 5 : } & O(K^{\frac{4}{3}}L(1/\Delta) \log n) \\ \text{Theorem 8 : } & O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n) \\ \text{Theorem 9 : } & O(\sqrt{KLn \log n}). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Both gap-dependent bounds are major improvements over  $O(K^2L(1/\Delta) \log n)$ , which is the best known upper bound on the  $n$ -step regret of CombUCB1 in stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits (Chen et al., 2013).

The bound in Theorem 8 is asymptotically tighter than the bound in Theorem 5, although the latter is better for  $K < 172 \approx (534/96)^3$ . The  $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  upper bound matches a lower bound in Proposition 10, and therefore it is tight. We also prove a gap-free lower bound in Proposition 11. This lower bound matches the gap-free upper bound in Theorem 9 up to a factor of  $\sqrt{\log n}$ .

It is well known that CombUCB1 is computationally efficient when the offline optimization oracle can be implemented efficiently (Gai et al., 2012). In this work, we prove that CombUCB1 is also sample efficient. We believe that this is a major result and therefore state it slightly more formally below.

**Theorem 1** *CombUCB1 is both computationally and sample efficient in any  $(L, K, \Delta)$  stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit where the oracle  $\arg \max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, w)$  can be implemented efficiently for any  $w \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^E$ .*

**Proof** CombUCB1 is sample efficient because the  $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  upper bound on its regret matches the lower bound in Proposition 10 up to a constant factor. Moreover, the  $O(\sqrt{KLn \log n})$  upper bound matches the lower bound in Proposition 11 up to a factor of  $\sqrt{\log n}$ .

Let  $g(L, K)$  be the time complexity of calling the offline optimization oracle. Then the time complexity of CombUCB1 is  $O((L+n)(g(L, K) + L))$ , because the oracle is called at most  $L+n$  times by CombUCB1 and during its initialization, and all variables are updated in  $O(L)$  steps in each iteration of CombUCB1. It follows that if  $g(L, K)$  is low, for instance a polynomial in  $L$  and  $K$ , so is the time complexity of CombUCB1. ■

Kveton et al. (2014a,b) proved that the regret of CombUCB1 in stochastic matroid and polymatroid bandits is  $O(L(1/\Delta) \log n)$ . This upper bound is a factor of  $K$  tighter than our best result (Theorem 8). However, note that the bound applies only to a special class of stochastic combinatorial bandits, maximization of a modular function on a matroid and polymatroid. The bounds in our paper apply to any stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit and are generally unimprovable in this more general setting.

Our problem can be viewed as a variant of a linear bandit (Auer, 2002), where each feasible solution  $A$  is associated with a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^E$  and the agent observes the individual weights of all chosen items, and not just the sum of the weights as is customary. Because our feedback model is more informative, the regret of CombUCB1 is smaller than that of the existing linear bandit algorithms (Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011).

Another class of provably efficient algorithms for stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits is *Thompson sampling*. Russo and Van Roy (2014) and Wen et al. (2014) proved upper bounds on the *Bayes regret* of Thompson sampling in combinatorial semi-bandits. Though the derived bounds are similar to our gap-free bound, it is worth emphasizing that there are two major differences. First, Bayes regret is a different performance metric and explicitly depends on the prior of Thompson sampling. From the frequentist’s perspective, it is a much weaker performance metric. Second, the derived regret bounds are gap-free bound. In particular, Russo and Van Roy (2014) and Wen et al. (2014) did not derive any  $O(\log n)$  gap-dependent bound on Bayes regret. It remains an interesting research problem whether Thompson sampling enjoys the same (or better) regret-bounds than CombUCB1 for either  $(L, K)$ , or  $(L, K, \Delta)$  instances.

## 4. $O(K^{\frac{4}{3}})$ Upper Bounds

In this section, we prove  $O(K^{\frac{4}{3}}L(1/\Delta) \log n)$  upper bounds on the  $n$ -step regret of CombUCB1. In Theorem 2, we assume that all suboptimal feasible solutions have the same gap. In Theorem 5, we relax this assumption. The *gap* of a solution  $A \in \Theta$  is defined as  $\Delta_A = f(A^*, \bar{w}) - f(A, \bar{w})$ . The results in this section are presented for their didactic value. The proofs of these results are simple. Yet they allow us to present the most essential ideas that lead to the near-optimal regret bounds presented later.

**Theorem 2** *In any  $(L, K, \Delta)$  stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit instance where  $\Delta_A = \Delta$  for all suboptimal  $A$ , the expected cumulative regret of CombUCB1 is bounded as:*

$$R(n) \leq K^{\frac{4}{3}}L \frac{48}{\Delta} \log n + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL.$$

We start with two lemmas that are used in the proof of Theorem 2.

**Lemma 3** Let  $\mathcal{F}_t$  be the event that at time  $t$ :

$$\Delta_{A_t} \leq 2 \sum_{e \in A_t} \sqrt{\frac{1.5 \log n}{T_{t-1}(e)}} \quad (4)$$

holds. Then the expected regret of CombUCB1 is bounded as:

$$R(n) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{R}(n) \right] + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL,$$

where  $\hat{R}(n) = \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ .

**Proof** Let  $R_t = R(A_t, w_t)$  be the stochastic regret at time  $t$ , where  $A_t$  is the solution chosen by CombUCB1 at that time. First, we divide the regret of CombUCB1 into that due to the initialization (Algorithm 2) and the rest:

$$R(n) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{t_0-1} R_t \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=t_0}^n R_t \right],$$

and note that the regret of the initialization is bounded trivially by  $KL$ , because method `Init` terminates in at most  $L$  steps and  $R_t \leq K$  for any  $A_t$  and  $w_t$ .

The remaining regret is bounded as follows. Let  $\mathcal{E}_t$  be the event that the weight  $\bar{w}(e)$  is not in the high-probability confidence interval around  $\hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e)$  for some  $e$ ,  $|\bar{w}(e) - \hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e)| \geq c_{t-1, T_{t-1}(e)}$ . Now note that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=t_0}^n R_t \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{E} [R_t | A_t] \right]$  and we bound  $\sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{E} [R_t | A_t]$  by decomposing it as:

$$\sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{E} [R_t | A_t] \leq K \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} + \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_t, A_t \neq A^*\},$$

where  $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_t$  is the complement of event  $\mathcal{E}_t$ , the event that all  $\bar{w}(e)$  are in high-probability confidence intervals around  $\hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e)$  at time  $t$ ; and we also used that  $\Delta_{A_t} \leq K$  for any solution  $A_t$ .

The expectation of the first term is small because our confidence intervals hold with high probability. In particular, for any  $e, s$ , and  $t$ :

$$P(|\bar{w}(e) - \hat{w}_s(e)| \geq c_{t,s}) \leq 2 \exp[-3 \log t]$$

and therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} \right] &\leq \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^t P(|\bar{w}(e) - \hat{w}_s(e)| \geq c_{t,s}) \leq 2 \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^t \exp[-3 \log t] \\ &= 2 \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{t=1}^n t^{-2} \leq \frac{\pi^2}{3} L. \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the second term. Our upper bound follows from two observations. First, when CombUCB1 chooses a suboptimal solution  $A_t$ ,  $f(A_t, U_t) \geq f(A^*, U_t)$ . Second, when event  $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_t$  happens, it must be true that  $|\bar{w}(e) - \hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e)| < c_{t-1, T_{t-1}(e)}$  for all items  $e$ . These two facts imply that:

$$2 \sum_{e \in A_t} c_{t-1, T_{t-1}(e)} \geq \Delta_{A_t},$$

which further implies (4) because  $\log t \leq \log n$  for all  $t \leq n$ . ■

The key step in our proof is that we partition the event space into two events and then bound the number of times that these events happen when a suboptimal solution is chosen. The events are defined as:

$$G_{1,t} = \left\{ \text{at least } d \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed at most } \alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \text{ times} \right\} \quad (5)$$

and:

$$G_{2,t} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{less than } d \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed at most } \alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \text{ times,} \\ \text{at least one item in } A_t \text{ was observed at most } \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \text{ times} \end{array} \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\alpha \geq 1$  and  $d > 0$  are tunable parameters to be chosen later.

Now we prove that under the assumption that  $\Delta_{A_t} > 0$ ,  $G_{1,t}$  and  $G_{2,t}$  are mutually exclusive. To prove this claim, we introduce new notation. In particular, we denote by:

$$S_t = \left\{ e \in A_t : T_{t-1}(e) \leq \alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \right\} \quad (7)$$

the set of items in  $A_t$  that were not observed ‘‘sufficiently often’’ up to time  $t$ . Our main lemma is stated and proved below.

**Lemma 4** *Let  $\alpha \geq 1$ ,  $d > 0$ , and  $t$  be any time when  $\Delta_{A_t} > 0$  and inequality (4) holds. Then either event  $G_{1,t}$  or event  $G_{2,t}$  happens.*

**Proof** By the definition of  $S_t$ , the following three events:

$$\begin{aligned} \{|S_t| \geq d\} &= G_{1,t} \\ \left\{ |S_t| < d, \left( \exists e \in A_t : T_{t-1}(e) \leq \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \right) \right\} &= G_{2,t} \\ \left\{ |S_t| < d, \left( \forall e \in A_t : T_{t-1}(e) > \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \right) \right\} &= \bar{G}_t \end{aligned}$$

are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The first two events are  $G_{1,t}$  and  $G_{2,t}$ . Therefore, to prove that either  $G_{1,t}$  or  $G_{2,t}$  must happen, it suffices to show that  $\bar{G}_t$  cannot happen. Suppose that  $\bar{G}_t$  happens. Then by the assumption that inequality (4) holds and from the definition of  $\bar{G}_t$ , it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{A_t} &\leq 2 \sum_{e \in A_t} \sqrt{\frac{1.5 \log n}{T_{t-1}(e)}} \\ &= 2 \sum_{e \in A_t \setminus S_t} \sqrt{\frac{1.5 \log n}{T_{t-1}(e)}} + 2 \sum_{e \in S_t} \sqrt{\frac{1.5 \log n}{T_{t-1}(e)}} \\ &< 2 \underbrace{(|A_t| - |S_t|)}_{\leq K} \sqrt{\frac{1.5 \log n}{\alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n}} + 2 \underbrace{|S_t|}_{\leq d} \sqrt{\frac{1.5 \log n}{\frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n}} \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta_{A_t}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} + \frac{\Delta_{A_t}(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \\ &= \Delta_{A_t}. \end{aligned}$$

This is clearly a contradiction. Therefore, event  $\bar{G}_t$  cannot happen, and as a result either event  $G_{1,t}$  or event  $G_{2,t}$  must happen. ■

**Proof** [Theorem 2] By Lemma 3, it remains to bound  $\hat{R}(n) = \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_t$  is the event that inequality (4) holds at time  $t$ . By Lemma 4 and from the assumption that  $\Delta_{A_t} = \Delta$  for all suboptimal  $A_t$ , it follows that:

$$\hat{R}(n) \leq \Delta \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} = \Delta \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{1}\{G_{1,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} + \Delta \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{1}\{G_{2,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\}.$$

To bound the above quantity, it is sufficient to bound the number of times that events  $G_{1,t}$  and  $G_{2,t}$  happen. Then we set the tunable parameters  $d$  and  $\alpha$  such that these two counts are of the same magnitude.

**Claim 1** *Event  $G_{1,t}$  happens at most  $\frac{\alpha}{d} K^2 L \frac{6}{\Delta^2} \log n$  times.*

**Proof** Recall that event  $G_{1,t}$  can happen only if at least  $d$  chosen items are not observed “sufficiently often” up to time  $t$ ,  $T_{t-1}(e) \leq \alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta^2} \log n$  for at least  $d$  items  $e \in A_t$ . After the event happens, the observation counters of these items,  $T_{t-1}(e)$ , increase by one. Therefore, after the event happens  $\frac{\alpha}{d} K^2 L \frac{6}{\Delta^2} \log n$  times, all items must be observed more than  $\alpha K^2 L \frac{6}{\Delta^2} \log n$  times and  $G_{1,t}$  cannot happen anymore. ■

**Claim 2** *Event  $G_{2,t}$  happens at most  $\frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} L \frac{6}{\Delta^2} \log n$  times.*

**Proof** Event  $G_{2,t}$  can happen only if there exists  $e \in A_t$  such that  $T_{t-1}(e) \leq \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \frac{6}{\Delta^2} \log n$ . After the event happens, the observation counter of item  $e$ ,  $T_{t-1}(e)$ , increases by one. Therefore, the total number of times that event  $G_{2,t}$  can happen is bounded trivially by  $\frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} L \frac{6}{\Delta^2} \log n$ . ■

Based on Claims 1 and 2,  $\hat{R}(n)$  is bounded as:

$$\hat{R}(n) \leq \left( \frac{\alpha}{d} K^2 + \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \right) L \frac{6}{\Delta} \log n.$$

Finally, we choose  $\alpha = 4 (\geq 1)$  and  $d = K^{\frac{2}{3}} (> 0)$ ; and it follows that the regret is bounded as:

$$R(n) \leq \mathbb{E} [\hat{R}(n)] + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL \leq K^{\frac{4}{3}} L \frac{48}{\Delta} \log n + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL. \quad \blacksquare$$

Next we consider the case when the gaps are different. We define  $\Delta_{e,\min}$  as the minimum of the gaps of suboptimal solutions that contain item  $e$ :

$$\Delta_{e,\min} = \min_{A \in \Theta: e \in A, \Delta_A > 0} \Delta_A \left( = f(A^*, \bar{w}) - \max_{A \in \Theta: e \in A, \Delta_A > 0} f(A, \bar{w}) \right). \quad (8)$$

Note that  $\Delta_{e,\min}$  is ill defined when item  $e$  does not appear in any suboptimal solution. Therefore, in the rest of our analysis, we only consider  $\Delta_{e,\min}$  for  $e \in \tilde{E}$ , where  $\tilde{E} \subseteq E$  is a set of items that appear in at least one suboptimal solution.



**Theorem 5** *In any  $(L, K)$  stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit instance, the expected cumulative regret of CombUCB1 is bounded as:*

$$R(n) \leq \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} K^{\frac{4}{3}} \frac{96}{\Delta_{e,\min}} \log n + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL.$$

**Proof** Let  $\mathcal{F}_t$  be the event that inequality (4) holds at time  $t$ . By Lemmas 3 and 4, it remains to bound:

$$\hat{R}(n) \leq \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} = \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{G_{1,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} + \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{G_{2,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\}.$$

In the next step, we define item-specific counterparts of events  $G_{1,t}$  (5) and  $G_{2,t}$  (6), and then associate the regret at time  $t$  with these events. In particular, let:

$$G_{e,1,t} = G_{1,t} \cap \left\{ e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq \alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \right\} \quad (9)$$

$$G_{e,2,t} = G_{2,t} \cap \left\{ e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \right\} \quad (10)$$

be the events that item  $e$  is not observed ‘‘sufficiently often’’ under events  $G_{1,t}$  and  $G_{2,t}$ , respectively. Then from the definitions of the above events, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}\{G_{1,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} &\leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \mathbb{1}\{G_{e,1,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} \\ \mathbb{1}\{G_{2,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} &\leq \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \mathbb{1}\{G_{e,2,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{E} \subseteq E$  is a set of items that appear in at least one suboptimal solution; and we bound  $\hat{R}(n)$  as:

$$\hat{R}(n) \leq \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{1}\{G_{e,1,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} \frac{\Delta_{A_t}}{d} + \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{1}\{G_{e,2,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} \Delta_{A_t}.$$

Let each item  $e$  be contained in  $N_e$  suboptimal solutions and  $\Delta_{e,1} \geq \dots \geq \Delta_{e,N_e}$  be the gaps of these solutions, ordered from the largest gap to the smallest one. Then  $\hat{R}(n)$  can be further bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}(n) &\leq \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbb{1}\{G_{e,1,t}, \Delta_{A_t} = \Delta_{e,k}\} \frac{\Delta_{e,k}}{d} + \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbb{1}\{G_{e,2,t}, \Delta_{A_t} = \Delta_{e,k}\} \Delta_{e,k} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbb{1}\left\{ e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq \alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{e,k}^2} \log n, \Delta_{A_t} = \Delta_{e,k} \right\} \frac{\Delta_{e,k}}{d} + \\ &\quad \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbb{1}\left\{ e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \frac{6}{\Delta_{e,k}^2} \log n, \Delta_{A_t} = \Delta_{e,k} \right\} \Delta_{e,k} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \frac{6\alpha K^2 \log n}{d} \left[ \Delta_{e,1} \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,1}^2} + \sum_{k=2}^{N_e} \Delta_{e,k} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k}^2} - \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k-1}^2} \right) \right] + \\ &\quad \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \frac{6\alpha d^2 \log n}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \left[ \Delta_{e,1} \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,1}^2} + \sum_{k=2}^{N_e} \Delta_{e,k} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k}^2} - \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k-1}^2} \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{<} \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \left( \frac{\alpha}{d} K^2 + \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \right) \frac{12}{\Delta_{e,\min}} \log n, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where inequality (a) follows from the definitions of events  $G_{e,1,t}$  and  $G_{e,2,t}$ , inequality (b) follows from the solution to the optimization problem:

$$\max_{A_1, \dots, A_n} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbb{1} \left\{ e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq \frac{C}{\Delta_{e,k}^2}, \Delta_{A_t} = \Delta_{e,k} \right\} \Delta_{e,k} \quad (12)$$

for appropriate  $C$ , and inequality (c) follows from Lemma 4 of [Kveton et al. \(2014b\)](#):

$$\left[ \Delta_{e,1} \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,1}^2} + \sum_{k=2}^{N_e} \Delta_{e,k} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k}^2} - \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k-1}^2} \right) \right] < \frac{2}{\Delta_{e,N_e}} = \frac{2}{\Delta_{e,\min}}. \quad (13)$$

Finally, we choose  $\alpha = 4(\geq 1)$  and  $d = K^{\frac{2}{3}}(> 0)$ ; and it follows that the regret is bounded as:

$$R(n) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{R}(n) \right] + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL \leq \sum_{e \in \bar{E}} K^{\frac{4}{3}} \frac{96}{\Delta_{e,\min}} \log n + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL.$$

■

## 5. $O(K)$ Upper Bounds

In this section, we prove  $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  upper bounds on the  $n$ -step regret of CombUCB1. In Theorem 7, we assume that the gaps of all suboptimal solutions are identical. In Theorem 8, we relax this assumption.

The key step in our results is that we define a sequence of infinitely-many mutually-exclusive events and then bound the number of times that these events happen when a suboptimal solution is chosen. The events are parametrized by two decreasing sequences of constants:

$$1 = \beta_0 > \beta_1 > \beta_2 > \dots > \beta_k > \dots \quad (14)$$

$$\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots > \alpha_k > \dots \quad (15)$$

such that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \beta_i = 0$ . We define:

$$m_{i,t} = \alpha_i \frac{K^2}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n$$

and assume that  $m_{i,t} = \infty$  when  $\Delta_{A_t} = 0$ . The events at time  $t$  are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{1,t} &= \left\{ \text{at least } \beta_1 K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed at most } m_{1,t} \text{ times} \right\}, \\ G_{2,t} &= \left\{ \text{less than } \beta_1 K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed at most } m_{1,t} \text{ times,} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{at least } \beta_2 K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed at most } m_{2,t} \text{ times} \right\}, \\ &\vdots \\ G_{i,t} &= \left\{ \text{less than } \beta_1 K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed at most } m_{1,t} \text{ times,} \right. \\ &\quad \dots, \\ &\quad \left. \text{less than } \beta_{i-1} K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed at most } m_{i-1,t} \text{ times,} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{at least } \beta_i K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed at most } m_{i,t} \text{ times} \right\}, \\ &\vdots \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The following lemma is the key to proving the bounds in this section.

**Lemma 6** *Let  $(\alpha_i)$  and  $(\beta_i)$  be defined as in (14) and (15), respectively; and let:*

$$\sqrt{6} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i}{\sqrt{\alpha_i}} \leq 1 \quad (17)$$

*hold. Let  $t$  be any time when  $\Delta_{A_t} > 0$  and inequality (4) holds. Then event  $G_{i,t}$  happens for some  $i$ .*

**Proof** We fix  $t$  such that  $\Delta_{A_t} > 0$ . Since  $t$  is fixed, we use shorthands  $G_i = G_{i,t}$  and  $m_i = m_{i,t}$ . Let:

$$S_i = \{e \in A_t : T_{t-1}(e) \leq m_i\} \quad (18)$$

be the set of items that are not observed ‘‘sufficiently often’’ under event  $G_i$ . Then event  $G_i$  can be written as  $G_i = \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \{|S_j| \leq \beta_j K\}\right) \cap \{|S_i| > \beta_i K\}$ . Similarly to Lemma 4, to prove that  $G_i$  happens for some  $i$ , it suffices to show that the event that none of the events  $G_i$  happen cannot happen. This event can be written compactly as:

$$\bar{G} = \overline{\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} G_i} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \left[ \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \{|S_j| > \beta_j K\} \right) \cup \{|S_i| \leq \beta_i K\} \right] = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \{|S_i| \leq \beta_i K\}.$$

Next we prove that event  $\bar{G}$  cannot happen. Let  $\bar{S}_i = A_t \setminus S_i$  and  $S_0 = A_t$ . Now note that  $m_i$  decreases as  $i$  increases, and therefore  $|S_i|$  decreases and  $|\bar{S}_i|$  increases. Moreover,  $m_i \rightarrow 0$  because  $\alpha_i \rightarrow 0$ , and therefore  $A_t = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bar{S}_i \setminus \bar{S}_{i-1}$ . Finally,  $T_{t-1}(e) > m_i$  for all  $e \in \bar{S}_i$ . Now suppose that event  $\bar{G}$  happens. Then:

$$\sum_{e \in A_t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_{t-1}(e)}} < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{e \in \bar{S}_i \setminus \bar{S}_{i-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_i}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\bar{S}_i| - |\bar{S}_{i-1}|}{\sqrt{m_i}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i)K}{\sqrt{m_i}},$$

where the last step is due to Lemma 12 in Appendix. In addition, let inequality (4) hold. Then:

$$\Delta_{A_t} \leq 2 \sum_{e \in A_t} \sqrt{\frac{1.5 \log n}{T_{t-1}(e)}} < 2\sqrt{1.5 \log n} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i)K}{\sqrt{m_i}} \leq \Delta_{A_t} \sqrt{6} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i}{\sqrt{\alpha_i}} \leq \Delta_{A_t},$$

where the last inequality is due to our assumption (17). The above is clearly a contradiction. Therefore, we conclude that event  $\bar{G}$  cannot happen, and as a result event  $G_i$  must happen for some  $i$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 7** *In any  $(L, K, \Delta)$  stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit instance where  $\Delta_A = \Delta$  for all suboptimal  $A$ , the expected cumulative regret of CombUCB1 is bounded as:*

$$R(n) \leq KL \frac{267}{\Delta} \log n + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL.$$

**Proof** The first step of the proof is identical to that of Theorem 2. In particular, by Lemma 3, it remains to bound  $\hat{R}(n) = \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_t$  is the event that inequality (4) holds at time  $t$ . By Lemma 6 and from the assumption that  $\Delta_{A_t} = \Delta$  for all suboptimal  $A_t$ , it follows that:

$$\hat{R}(n) \leq \Delta \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} = \Delta \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}\{G_{i,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\}.$$

Note that when  $\Delta_{A_t} > 0$ ,  $m_{i,t} = m_i \doteq \alpha_i \frac{K^2}{\Delta^2} \log n$ , independently of  $t$ . Hence, for any given  $i$ , event  $G_{i,t}$  cannot happen more than  $\frac{Lm_i}{\beta_i K}$  times, because at least  $\beta_i K$  items that were observed at most  $m_i$  times have their observation counters incremented in each event  $G_{i,t}$ . Therefore:

$$\hat{R}(n) \leq \Delta \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{Lm_i}{\beta_i K} = KL \frac{\log n}{\Delta} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i} \right]. \quad (19)$$

It remains to choose  $(\alpha_i)$  and  $(\beta_i)$  so that:

- $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \beta_i = 0$ ;
- Monotonicity conditions in (14) and (15) hold;
- Condition (17) holds,  $\sqrt{6} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i}{\sqrt{\alpha_i}} \leq 1$ ;
- $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i}$  is minimized.

We choose  $\beta_i = \beta^i$  and  $\alpha_i = d\alpha^i$  for some  $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$  and  $d > 0$ . Then  $\alpha_i \rightarrow 0$  and  $\beta_i \rightarrow 0$ , and also the monotonicity conditions are satisfied. Moreover, if  $\beta < \sqrt{\alpha}$ , we have:

$$\sqrt{6} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i}{\sqrt{\alpha_i}} = \sqrt{6} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta^{i-1} - \beta^i}{\sqrt{d\alpha^i}} = \sqrt{\frac{6}{d}} \frac{1 - \beta}{\sqrt{\alpha - \beta}} \leq 1 \quad (20)$$

provided that  $d \geq 6 \left( \frac{1 - \beta}{\sqrt{\alpha - \beta}} \right)^2$ . Furthermore, if  $\alpha < \beta$ , we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d\alpha^i}{\beta^i} = \frac{d\alpha}{\beta - \alpha}. \quad (21)$$

So given our assumptions, the best choice of  $d$  is  $6 \left( \frac{1 - \beta}{\sqrt{\alpha - \beta}} \right)^2$  and the problem of minimizing the constant in our regret bound can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\alpha, \beta} & 6 \left( \frac{1 - \beta}{\sqrt{\alpha - \beta}} \right)^2 \frac{\alpha}{\beta - \alpha} \\ \text{s.t.} & 0 < \alpha < \beta < \sqrt{\alpha} < 1; \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We solve the above problem numerically, and get  $\alpha = 0.1459$  and  $\beta = 0.2360$ . For these values of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ,  $6 \left( \frac{1 - \beta}{\sqrt{\alpha - \beta}} \right)^2 \frac{\alpha}{\beta - \alpha} < 267$ . We substitute this value into the bound in (19) and get the desired result.  $\blacksquare$

Next we prove an upper bound without any constraints on the gaps.

**Theorem 8** *In any  $(L, K)$  stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit instance, the expected cumulative regret of CombUCB1 is bounded as:*

$$R(n) \leq \sum_{e \in E} K \frac{534}{\Delta_{e, \min}} \log n + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL,$$

where  $\Delta_{e, \min}$  is the minimum gap of suboptimal solutions that contain item  $e$  and is defined in (8).

**Proof** Let  $\mathcal{F}_t$  be the event that inequality (4) holds at time  $t$ . By Lemmas 3 and 6, it remains to bound:

$$\hat{R}(n) \leq \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} = \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{G_{i,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\}.$$

In the next step, we define item-specific counterparts of events  $G_{i,t}$  (16) and then associate the regret at time  $t$  with these events. In particular, let:

$$G_{e,i,t} = G_{i,t} \cap \{e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq m_{i,t}\} \quad (23)$$

be the event that item  $e$  is not observed ‘‘sufficiently often’’ under event  $G_{i,t}$ . Then it follows that:

$$\mathbb{1}\{G_{i,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} \leq \frac{1}{\beta_i K} \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \mathbb{1}\{G_{e,i,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\},$$

because at least  $\beta_i K$  items are not observed ‘‘sufficiently often’’ under event  $G_{i,t}$ . Therefore, we can bound  $\hat{R}(n)$  as:

$$\hat{R}(n) \leq \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \mathbb{1}\{G_{e,i,t}, \Delta_{A_t} > 0\} \frac{\Delta_{A_t}}{\beta_i K}. \quad (24)$$

Let each item  $e$  be contained in  $N_e$  suboptimal solutions and  $\Delta_{e,1} \geq \dots \geq \Delta_{e,N_e}$  be the gaps of these solutions, ordered from the largest gap to the smallest one. Then  $\hat{R}(n)$  can be further bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}(n) &\leq \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbb{1}\{G_{e,i,t}, \Delta_{A_t} = \Delta_{e,k}\} \frac{\Delta_{e,k}}{\beta_i K} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbb{1}\left\{e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq \alpha_i \frac{K^2}{\Delta_{e,k}^2} \log n, \Delta_{A_t} = \Delta_{e,k}\right\} \frac{\Delta_{e,k}}{\beta_i K} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i K \log n}{\beta_i} \left[ \Delta_{e,1} \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,1}^2} + \sum_{k=2}^{N_e} \Delta_{e,k} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k}^2} - \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k-1}^2} \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{<} \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i K \log n}{\beta_i} \frac{2}{\Delta_{e,\min}} \\ &= \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} K \frac{2}{\Delta_{e,\min}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i} \right] \log n, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where inequality (a) follows from the definition of event  $G_{e,i,t}$ , inequality (b) follows from the solution to the optimization problem:

$$\max_{A_1, \dots, A_n} \sum_{t=t_0}^n \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbb{1}\left\{e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq \alpha_i \frac{K^2}{\Delta_{e,k}^2} \log n, \Delta_{A_t} = \Delta_{e,k}\right\} \frac{\Delta_{e,k}}{\beta_i K}, \quad (26)$$

and inequality (c) follows from (13). For the same  $(\alpha_i)$  and  $(\beta_i)$  as in Theorem 7, we have  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i} \leq 267$  and it follows that the regret is bounded as:

$$R(n) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{R}(n) \right] + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL \leq \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} K \frac{534}{\Delta_{e,\min}} \log n + \left( \frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL. \quad \blacksquare$$

We also prove a gap-free bound.

**Theorem 9** *In any  $(L, K)$  stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit instance, the expected cumulative regret of CombUCB1 is bounded as:*

$$R(n) \leq 47\sqrt{KLn \log n} + \left(\frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1\right) KL.$$

**Proof** The key idea is to decompose the regret of CombUCB1 into two parts, where the gaps are larger than  $\epsilon$  and at most  $\epsilon$ . We analyze each part separately and then set  $\epsilon$  to get the desired result.

By Lemma 3, it remains to bound  $\hat{R}(n) = \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_t$  is the event that inequality (4) holds at time  $t$ . We partition  $\hat{R}(n)$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}(n) &\leq \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t, \Delta_{A_t} < \epsilon\} + \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t, \Delta_{A_t} \geq \epsilon\} \\ &\leq \epsilon n + \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t, \Delta_{A_t} \geq \epsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

The second term can be bounded in the same way as  $\hat{R}(n)$  in the proof of Theorem 8, except that we only need to consider the gaps  $\Delta_{e,k} \geq \epsilon$ . Therefore,  $\Delta_{e,\min} \geq \epsilon$  and we get:

$$\sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t, \Delta_{A_t} \geq \epsilon\} \leq \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} K \frac{534}{\epsilon} \log n \leq KL \frac{534}{\epsilon} \log n.$$

Based on the above inequalities:

$$R(n) \leq \frac{534KL}{\epsilon} \log n + \epsilon n + \left(\frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1\right) KL.$$

Finally, we choose  $\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{534KL \log n}{n}}$  and get:

$$R(n) \leq 2\sqrt{534KLn \log n} + \left(\frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1\right) KL < 47\sqrt{KLn \log n} + \left(\frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1\right) KL, \quad (27)$$

which concludes our proof. ■

## 6. Lower Bounds

In this section, we prove two lower bounds, one gap-dependent and one gap-free. Our first result is a lower bound of  $\Omega(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ , which matches the  $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  upper bound in Theorem 8.

Specifically, we prove the lower bound on a *length- $K$  path* semi-bandit problem, which is illustrated in Figure 1. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $L/K$  is an integer and that there are  $L/K$  paths between *source* and *destination* nodes, each of which contains  $K$  items. At each time  $t$ , only one of the paths is chosen, so  $\Theta$  consists of the edges of the  $L/K$  paths. We consider the distribution  $P$  where the weights of the items in different paths are distributed independently, but the weights of the items in the same path are always equal. In particular, the marginal distribution of  $w(e)$  is a Bernoulli distribution with mean:

$$\bar{w}(e) = \begin{cases} 0.5 & \text{if } e \text{ is in path one} \\ 0.5 - \Delta/K & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

where  $\Delta > 0$ . Obviously, for any item  $e$  in a path  $j \neq 1$ ,  $\Delta_{e,\min} = \Delta$ .




Figure 1: Length- $K$  path semi-bandit.

The key observation is that if the agent has the additional information that the weights of the items in the same path are always equal, then this semi-bandit problem is equivalent to an  $(L/K)$ -arm Bernoulli bandit scaled up by  $K$ . In other words, this semi-bandit problem is at least as difficult as that bandit problem. Hence, we can derive a lower bound based on the existing lower bound in the bandit literature (Lai and Robbins, 1985; Bubeck and Cesa-Bianchi, 2012). To formalize the result, we need the notion of *consistent* algorithms. We say that a combinatorial semi-bandit algorithm is consistent if for any combinatorial semi-bandit, any sub-optimal  $A$ , and any  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[T_A(n)] = o(n^\alpha)$ , where  $T_A(n)$  is the number of times that  $A$  is chosen in  $n$  steps. In the rest of this section, we focus only on consistent algorithms. This is without loss of generality, since by definition, an inconsistent algorithm performs poorly on some problems (e.g., compared to CombUCB1, which achieves logarithmic regret on all instances). Our main claim is below.

**Proposition 10** *For any  $L$  and  $K$  such that  $L/K$  is an integer, and for any  $\Delta$  such that  $0 < \Delta/K < 0.5$ , the expected regret of any consistent algorithm on any of the length- $K$  path semi-bandit with distribution  $P$  is bounded from below as:*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R(n)}{\log n} \geq \frac{(L - K)K}{4\Delta}.$$

**Proof** The proposition is proved as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R(n)}{\log n} &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} K \sum_{k=2}^{L/K} \frac{\Delta/K}{\text{kl}(0.5 - \Delta/K, 0.5)} \\ &= \left( \frac{L}{K} - 1 \right) \frac{\Delta}{\text{kl}(0.5 - \Delta/K, 0.5)} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{(L - K)K}{4\Delta}, \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where  $\text{kl}(0.5 - \Delta/K, 0.5)$  is the KL-divergence between two Bernoulli variables with mean  $0.5 - \Delta/K$  and  $0.5$ . Inequality (a) follows from the fact that with the additional information that the weights of the items in the same path are always equal, the length- $K$  path semi-bandit is equivalent to a  $(L/K)$ -arm Bernoulli

bandit scaled up by  $K$ , and an existing lower bound for Bernoulli bandits (Lai and Robbins, 1985). The second inequality is due to  $\text{kl}(p, q) \leq \frac{(p-q)^2}{q(1-q)}$  and then using  $p = 0.5 - \Delta/K$  and  $q = 0.5$ . ■

A minimax lower bound for the adversarial  $(L, K)$  semi-bandits was given by Audibert et al. (2014). However, this lower bound uses a construction ( $K$  parallel bandit problems with  $L/K$  arms in each) that does not directly result in a lower bound for *stochastic* semi-bandits due to the subtle issue that the worst-case environment over the  $K$  bandit problems has to be chosen simultaneously for all of the bandits, and it is unclear whether this can be done without extra work.<sup>2</sup> However, using length- $K$  path semi-bandits, we can easily reduce  $(L, K)$  stochastic semi-bandits to scaled bandits with  $L/K$  arms in each, giving the following result:

**Proposition 11** *There exists  $c > 0$  such that for any  $L$  and  $K$  such that  $L/K$  is an integer, for any algorithm and  $n > 0$ , there exist a  $(L, K)$  semi-bandit problem such that:*

$$R(n) \geq c \min(\sqrt{KLn}, Kn).$$

**Proof** As noted before, with the additional information that the weights of the items in the same path are always equal, the length- $K$  path semi-bandit is equivalent to a  $(L/K)$ -arm Bernoulli bandit scaled up by a factor of  $K$ . Hence, by the lower bound of Auer et al. (2002b),<sup>3</sup> there exists a numerical constant  $c > 0$  such that the worst-case expected regret of any algorithm over the class of  $(L, K)$  stochastic semi-bandit instances is at least  $cK \min(\sqrt{(L/K)n}, n) = c \min(\sqrt{KLn}, Kn)$ . ■

## 7. Conclusions

We derived novel upper bounds on the regret of a well-known algorithm for stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits (Gai et al., 2012),  $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  and  $O(\sqrt{KLn} \log n)$ . We also derive a gap-dependent lower bound, which matches the upper bound, and a gap-free lower bound, which matches the upper bound up to a polylogarithmic factor. The analyzed algorithm can be implemented efficiently if the offline variant of the combinatorial optimization problem can be solved efficiently. Therefore, we indirectly show that stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits can be solved both computationally and sample efficiently.

Theorems 7 and 8 are proved quite generally, for arbitrary sequences of constants  $(\alpha_i)$  and  $(\beta_i)$  subject to constraints. At the end of the proofs, we choose  $(\alpha_i)$  and  $(\beta_i)$  to be geometric sequences. This is sufficient for our purpose. However, we note that this choice is likely suboptimal and may lead to larger constants in the upper bounds than is necessary. We leave the problem of choosing better  $(\alpha_i)$  and  $(\beta_i)$  for future work.

Our work leaves several open questions. For instance, our  $\Omega(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  lower bound is proved on a problem where the gaps of all suboptimal solutions are identical. Therefore, technically, we show that our  $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$  upper bound is tight only on this subclass of problems. It is an open question how tight our upper bound is on  $(L, K)$  combinatorial semi-bandits with arbitrary gaps.

Our  $O(\sqrt{KLn} \log n)$  upper bound matches the  $\Omega(\sqrt{KLn})$  lower bound only up to a factor of  $\sqrt{n}$ . We believe that this factor can be eliminated by modifying the confidence radii in CombUCB1 (Equation 2) along the lines of Audibert and Bubeck (2009). We leave this for future work.

In Algorithm 1, we assume that the optimization problem  $A_t \leftarrow \arg \max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, U_t)$  is solved exactly, which is considered to be computationally intractable if that problem is NP-hard. On the other hand, there may exist a computationally efficient approximation or a randomized algorithm ALG for that problem. It is straightforward to propose a variant of CombUCB1 with ALG (Chen et al., 2013). Let  $\hat{A}$  be the output of ALG

2. We nevertheless believe that a lower bound similar to the one stated below should also be available for this class of stochastic semi-bandit problems.

3. Although the lower bound proved by Auer et al. (2002b) is stated for the adversarial multi-armed bandit problem, since the worst environment is stochastic, the result also applies to the stochastic case.



when it is applied to the optimization problem  $\max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, \bar{w})$ . Then, based on the analysis techniques introduced in this paper, it is straightforward to derive similar regret bounds on CombUCB1 with ALG, if the regret is measured with respect to  $\bar{A}$  instead of  $A^*$ .

Thompson sampling (Thompson, 1933) often performs better in practice than UCB1 (Auer et al., 2002a). We would like to point out that CombUCB1 (Algorithm 1) can be relatively straightforwardly modified to use Thompson sampling, by replacing the UCBs with sampling from the posterior on the means of the weights. The frequentist analysis of the regret of Thompson sampling (Agrawal and Goyal, 2012) resembles that of UCB1. Based on this fact, we believe that the analysis in our paper can be extended to Thompson sampling. We postulate that the regret of Thompson sampling on  $(L, K, \Delta)$  instances of combinatorial semi-bandits is  $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ .

## References

- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Dávid Pál, and Csaba Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24*, pages 2312–2320, 2011.
- Shipra Agrawal and Navin Goyal. Analysis of thompson sampling for the multi-armed bandit problem. In *Proceeding of the 25th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 39.1–39.26, 2012.
- Jean-Yves Audibert and Sébastien Bubeck. Minimax policies for adversarial and stochastic bandits. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, 2009.
- Jean-Yves Audibert, Sébastien Bubeck, and Gábor Lugosi. Regret in online combinatorial optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(1):31–45, 2014.
- Peter Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:397–422, 2002.
- Peter Auer, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, and Paul Fischer. Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine Learning*, 47:235–256, 2002a.
- Peter Auer, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, and Robert E. Schapire. The nonstochastic multiarmed bandit problem. *SIAM Journal of Computing*, 32(1):48–77, 2002b.
- Sébastien Bubeck and Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi. Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 2012.
- Wei Chen, Yajun Wang, and Yang Yuan. Combinatorial multi-armed bandit: General framework, results and applications. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 151–159, 2013.
- Yi Gai, Bhaskar Krishnamachari, and Rahul Jain. Combinatorial network optimization with unknown variables: Multi-armed bandits with linear rewards and individual observations. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 20(5):1466–1478, 2012.
- Branislav Kveton, Zheng Wen, Azin Ashkan, Hoda Eydgahi, and Brian Eriksson. Matroid bandits: Fast combinatorial optimization with learning. In *Proceedings of the 30th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 420–429, 2014a.
- Branislav Kveton, Zheng Wen, Azin Ashkan, Hoda Eydgahi, and Michal Valko. Polymatroid bandits. *CoRR*, abs/1405.7752, 2014b.
- T. L. Lai and Herbert Robbins. Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 6(1):4–22, 1985.

Gergely Neu and Gábor Bartók. An efficient algorithm for learning with semi-bandit feedback. In *24th International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory (ALT)*, volume 8139 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 234–248. Springer, 2013.

Daniel Russo and Benjamin Van Roy. An information-theoretic analysis of thompson sampling. *CoRR*, abs/1403.5341, 2014.

William. R. Thompson. On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples. *Biometrika*, 25(3-4):285–294, 1933.

Zheng Wen, Azin Ashkan, Hoda Eydgahi, and Branislav Kveton. Efficient learning in large-scale combinatorial semi-bandits. *CoRR*, abs/1406.7443, 2014.

## Appendix A. Technical Lemmas

**Lemma 12** *Let  $S_i$ ,  $\bar{S}_i$ , and  $m_i$  be defined as in Lemma 6; and  $|S_i| \leq \beta_i K$  for all  $i$ . Then:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\bar{S}_i| - |\bar{S}_{i-1}|}{\sqrt{m_i}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i)K}{\sqrt{m_i}}.$$

**Proof** The lemma is proved as:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|\bar{S}_i| - |\bar{S}_{i-1}|) \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_i}} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|S_{i-1}| - |S_i|) \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_i}} \\ &= \frac{|S_0|}{\sqrt{m_1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |S_i| \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_{i+1}}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_i}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{|\beta_0 K|}{\sqrt{m_1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\beta_i K| \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_{i+1}}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_i}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i) K \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_i}}. \end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from the definition of  $\bar{S}_i$ . The second and last equalities are due to rearranging the sum. The inequality follows from the fact that  $|S_i| \leq \beta_i K$  for all  $i$ . ■