
Tight Regret Bounds for Stochastic Combinatorial Semi-Bandits

Branislav Kveton
Technicolor Labs
Los Altos, CA
branislav.kveton@technicolor.com

Zheng Wen
Yahoo Labs
Sunnyvale, CA
zhengwen@yahoo-inc.com

Azin Ashkan
Technicolor Labs
Los Altos, CA
azin.ashkan@technicolor.com

Csaba Szepesvári
Department of Computing Science
University of Alberta
szepesva@cs.ualberta.ca

Abstract

A stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit with a linear payoff is a sequential learning problem where at each step a learning agent chooses a subset of ground items subject to some combinatorial constraints, then observes noisy weights of all chosen items, and finally receives their sum as a payoff. In this work, we close the problem of computationally and sample efficient learning in stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits. In particular, we show that a relatively simple learning algorithm, which is known to be computationally efficient, also achieves near-optimal regret. We refer to this method as CombUCB1, and show that its n -step regret is $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ and $O(\sqrt{KLn \log n})$, where L is the number of ground items, K is the maximum number of chosen items, and Δ is the gap between the expected weights of the best and second best solutions. The $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ upper bound is tight up to a constant and the $O(\sqrt{KLn \log n})$ upper bound is tight up to a factor of $\sqrt{\log n}$.

1 Introduction

A *stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit* with a linear payoff [11] is a sequential learning problem where at each step a learning agent selects a subset of ground items subject to combinatorial constraints and then observes noisy weights of these items, a form of a stochastic semi-bandit feedback

[4]. The reward of the agent is the sum of the weights of the observed items. The goal of the agent is to maximize its expected cumulative 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. Most popular combinatorial optimization problems are of this form [16]. Therefore, stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits have been recently applied to many practical and important problems, including learning spectrum allocations [11], shortest paths [11], routing networks [12], and recommending a set of diverse items [13].

In this work, we consider a variant of the problem where the agent has access to an *offline optimization oracle* that can find the optimal solution for any weights of the items. We say that the problem is a (L, K, Δ) instance if 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 best suboptimal solutions. We say that the problem is a (L, K) instance if it is a (L, K, Δ) instance for some Δ . Based on the existing bandit literature [6], it is relatively easy to propose a UCB-like algorithm for solving our problem [11], and we refer to this algorithm as CombUCB1. At each step, CombUCB1 uses the offline oracle to find the optimal solution with respect to its optimistic estimate of the expected weights of the items. The best existing upper bound on the regret of CombUCB1 in (L, K, Δ) stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits is $O(K^2L(1/\Delta) \log n)$ [10].

Our main contribution is that we derive two upper bounds on the n -step regret of CombUCB1, $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ and $O(\sqrt{KLn \log n})$. Both of these bounds are significant improvements over the state of the art. In addition, we derive a $\Omega(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ lower bound that matches the gap-dependent upper bound up to a constant factor, and

Preliminary work. Under review by AISTATS 2015. Do not distribute.

a $\Omega(\sqrt{KLn})$ lower bound that matches the gap-free upper bound up to a factor of $O(\sqrt{\log n})$. In summary, we show that CombUCB1 achieves near-optimal regret. It is well known that CombUCB1 can be implemented efficiently when the offline optimization oracle is computationally efficient [11]. Therefore, we indirectly show that stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits can be solved both computationally and sample efficiently. This problem remains open in the adversarial setting (Section 8).

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. So when the event happens, the observation counters of “many” items increase. Based on this idea, we divide the regret associated with the event among “many” items and do not attribute it independently to each item as in the prior work [11, 10]. 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. In Section 4, we prove a $O(K^{\frac{4}{3}}L(1/\Delta)\log n)$ upper bound on the regret of CombUCB1. In Section 5, we prove a $O(KL(1/\Delta)\log n)$ upper bound on the regret of CombUCB1. In Section 6, we prove gap-dependent and gap-free lower bounds. In Section 7, we show that the regret of CombUCB1 grows as predicted by our upper bounds. In Section 8, we compare our results to prior work. In Section 9, we discuss several possible extensions of our work. We conclude in Section 10.

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*, Θ 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 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

Algorithm 1 CombUCB1 for stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits.

Input: Feasible set Θ

// Initialization

$(\hat{w}_1, t_0) \leftarrow \text{Init}(\Theta)$

$T_0(e) \leftarrow 1$

$\forall e \in E$

for all $t = t_0, \dots, n$ **do**

// Compute UCBs

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

$\forall e \in E$

// 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

$T_t(e) \leftarrow T_{t-1}(e)$

$\forall e \in E$

$T_t(e) \leftarrow T_t(e) + 1$

$\forall e \in A_t$

$\hat{w}_{T_t(e)}(e) \leftarrow \frac{T_{t-1}(e)\hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e) + w_t(e)}{T_t(e)}$

$\forall e \in A_t$

its expected cumulative reward in n steps. If the learning agent knew the distribution P a priori, the optimal action would be to choose the *optimal solution*:¹

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

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.* [11] proposed a simple algorithm for solving stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits. This algorithm is motivated by UCB1 [6] and therefore we call it 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

¹If multiple solutions are optimal, we assume that the ties are broken using an arbitrary mechanism.

Algorithm 2 `Init`: Initialization of CombUCB1.

Input: Feasible set Θ

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}(e) &\leftarrow 0 & \forall e \in E \\ u(e) &\leftarrow 1 & \forall e \in E \\ t &\leftarrow 1 \end{aligned}$$

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**
 $\hat{w}(e) \leftarrow w_t(e)$
 $u(e) \leftarrow 0$
 $t \leftarrow t + 1$

Output:

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

is defined as:

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

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 method `Init` (Algorithm 2), which returns two variables. The first variable is a 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 increased by one. The method `Init` repeatedly calls the oracle $A_t = \arg \max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, u)$ and 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 an item $e \in A_t$ is observed, we set $\hat{w}(e)$ to the observed weight of the item and $u(e)$ to 0.

Let each item $e \in E$ be contained in at least one feasible solution. Then 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 regret of CombUCB1. Two of the bounds are gap-dependent, depend on the gap

 Δ , and one is gap-free:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Theorem 3 :} & \quad O(K^{\frac{4}{3}} L(1/\Delta) \log n) \\ \text{Theorem 5 :} & \quad O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n) \\ \text{Theorem 6 :} & \quad O(\sqrt{KLn} \log n). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Both gap-dependent bounds are major improvements over $O(K^2 L(1/\Delta) \log n)$, the best known upper bound on the n -step regret of CombUCB1 [10]. The bound in Theorem 5 is asymptotically tighter than the bound in Theorem 3, but the latter is tighter for $K < 172 \approx (534/96)^3$.

CombUCB1 is known to be computationally efficient when the offline optimization oracle is computationally efficient [11]. In this work, we prove that CombUCB1 is also sample efficient. We believe that this is a major result and we state it slightly more formally below.

Theorem 1. *In any (L, K) stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit, CombUCB1 is computationally and sample efficient when 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 its regret is near optimal. In particular, the $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ upper bound on the regret of CombUCB1 (Theorem 5) matches the lower bound in Proposition 1 up to a constant. Moreover, the $O(\sqrt{KLn} \log n)$ upper bound (Theorem 6) matches the lower bound in Proposition 2 up to a factor of $\sqrt{\log n}$.

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

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

In this section, we prove two $O(K^{\frac{4}{3}} L(1/\Delta) \log n)$ upper bounds on the n -step regret of CombUCB1. In Theorem 2, we assume that the gaps of all suboptimal solutions are the same. In Theorem 3, we relax this assumption.

The *gap* of solution $A \in \Theta$ is $\Delta_A = f(A^*, \bar{w}) - f(A, \bar{w})$. The results in this section are presented for their didactic value. The proofs of these results are simple and allow us to present the key ideas that lead to the near-optimal regret bounds in Section 5.

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

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

The proof of Theorem 2 relies on two lemmas. In the first lemma, we bound the regret associated with the initialization of CombUCB1 and the event that $\hat{w}_{T_{t-1}(e)}(e)$ is far from the mean $\bar{w}(e)$.

Lemma 1. 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 regret of CombUCB1 is bounded as:

$$R(n) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{R}(n) \right] + \left(\frac{\pi^2}{3} + 1 \right) KL, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\hat{R}(n) = \sum_{t=t_0}^n \Delta_{A_t} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{F}_t\}. \quad (6)$$

Proof. The claim is proved in Appendix A.1. ■

It remains to bound the regret associated with events \mathcal{F}_t , the items in a suboptimal solution were not observed “sufficiently often” up to time t . To bound the regret, we define two events:

$$G_{1,t} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{at least } d \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed} \\ \text{at most } \alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \text{ times} \end{array} \right\} \quad (7)$$

and:

$$G_{2,t} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{less than } d \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed} \\ \text{at most } \alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \text{ times,} \\ \text{at least one item in } A_t \text{ was observed} \\ \text{at most } \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \text{ times} \end{array} \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where $\alpha \geq 1$ and $d > 0$ are parameters to be chosen later. Event $G_{1,t}$ happens when “many” chosen items, at least d , were not observed “sufficiently often” up to time t , at most $\alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n$ times.

Events $G_{1,t}$ and $G_{2,t}$ are obviously mutually exclusive. In the next lemma, we prove that the events are also exhaustive when $\Delta_{A_t} > 0$ and \mathcal{F}_t happens. To prove the claim, we introduce new notation. We denote by:

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

the set of items in A_t that were not observed “sufficiently often” up to time t . The proof that events $G_{1,t}$ and $G_{2,t}$ are exhaustive is below.

Lemma 2. 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 events:

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

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:

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

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

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof. A detailed proof is in Appendix A.2. The key idea is to bound the number of times that events $G_{1,t}$ and $G_{2,t}$ happen. Based on these bounds, the regret associated with events $G_{1,t}$ and $G_{2,t}$ 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 $\alpha = 4$ and $d = K^{\frac{2}{3}}$, and substitute the above upper bound into inequality (5). ■

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 :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{e,\min} &= \min_{A \in \Theta: e \in A, \Delta_A > 0} \Delta_A \\ &= f(A^*, \bar{w}) - \max_{A \in \Theta: e \in A, \Delta_A > 0} f(A, \bar{w}). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Note that $\Delta_{e,\min}$ is undefined 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 such that each appears in at least one suboptimal solution.

Theorem 3. *In any (L, K) stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit, the 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. A detailed proof is in Appendix A.3. The key idea is to define item-specific variants of events $G_{1,t}$ and $G_{2,t}$, $G_{e,1,t}$ and $G_{e,2,t}$; and associate $\frac{\Delta_{A_t}}{d}$ and Δ_{A_t} regret with $G_{e,1,t}$ and $G_{e,2,t}$, respectively. Then, for each item e , we order the events from the largest gap to the smallest, and show that the total regret is bounded as:

$$\hat{R}(n) < \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} \left(\frac{\alpha}{d} K^2 + \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \right) \frac{12}{\Delta_{e,\min}} \log n.$$

Finally, we choose $\alpha = 4$ and $d = K^{\frac{2}{3}}$, and substitute the above upper bound into inequality (5). ■

5 $O(K)$ Upper Bounds

In this section, we prove two $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ upper bounds on the n -step regret of CombUCB1. In Theorem 4, we assume that the gaps of all suboptimal solutions are the same. In Theorem 5, we relax this assumption.

The key step in our analysis is that we define a cascade 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:

$$1 = \beta_0 > \beta_1 > \beta_2 > \dots > \beta_k > \dots \quad (10)$$

$$\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots > \alpha_k > \dots \quad (11)$$

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:

$$G_{1,t} = \{ \text{at least } \beta_1 K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed} \\ \text{at most } m_{1,t} \text{ times} \}, \quad (12)$$

$$G_{2,t} = \{ \text{less than } \beta_1 K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed} \\ \text{at most } m_{1,t} \text{ times,} \\ \text{at least } \beta_2 K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed} \\ \text{at most } m_{2,t} \text{ times} \},$$

⋮

$$G_{i,t} = \{ \text{less than } \beta_1 K \text{ items in } A_t \text{ were observed} \\ \text{at most } m_{1,t} \text{ times,}$$

⋮, ⋮,

less than $\beta_{i-1} K$ items in A_t were observed
at most $m_{i-1,t}$ times,

at least $\beta_i K$ items in A_t were observed
at most $m_{i,t}$ times} ,

⋮

The following lemma establishes a sufficient condition under which events $G_{i,t}$ are exhaustive. This is the key step to proving the bounds in this section.

Lemma 3. *Let (α_i) and (β_i) be defined as in (10) and (11), respectively; and let:*

$$\sqrt{6} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i}{\sqrt{\alpha_i}} \leq 1 \quad (13)$$

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:

$$S_i = \{ e \in A_t : T_{t-1}(e) \leq m_i \} \quad (14)$$

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 2, 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:

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

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:

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

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

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

where the last inequality is due to our assumption (13). The above is clearly a contradiction. Therefore, event \bar{G} cannot happen, and G_i must happen for some i . ■

Theorem 4. *In any (L, K, Δ) stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit where $\Delta_A = \Delta$ for all suboptimal solutions A , the regret of CombUCB1 is bounded as:*

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

Proof. A detailed proof is in Appendix A.4. The key idea is to show that event $G_{i,t}$ does not happen more than $\frac{Lm_i}{\beta_i K}$ times for any given i . Based on this bound, the total regret due to all events $G_{i,t}$ is bounded as:

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

where $\hat{R}(n)$ is defined in (6). Finally, we select appropriate (α_i) and (β_i) , and substitute the above upper bound into inequality (5). ■

Now we generalize Theorem 4 to arbitrary gaps.

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

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

where $\Delta_{e,\min}$ is the minimum gap of suboptimal solutions that contain item e (9).

Proof. A detailed proof is in Appendix A.5. The key idea is to define item-specific events $G_{e,i,t}$, and associate $\frac{\Delta_{A_t}}{\beta_i K}$ regret with each of these events. Then, for each item e , we order the events from the largest gap to the smallest, and show that the total regret is bounded as:

$$\hat{R}(n) < \sum_{e \in \bar{E}} K \frac{2}{\Delta_{e,\min}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i} \right] \log n,$$

where $\hat{R}(n)$ is defined in (6). Finally, we select appropriate (α_i) and (β_i) , and substitute the above upper bound into inequality (5). ■

We also prove a gap-free bound.

Theorem 6. *In any (L, K) stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit, the regret of CombUCB1 is bounded as:*

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

Proof. The proof is in Appendix A.6. The key idea is to decompose the regret of CombUCB1 into two parts, where the gaps are larger than ϵ and at most ϵ . We analyze each part separately and then set ϵ to get the desired result. ■

6 Lower Bounds

In this section, we prove two lower bounds on the n -step regret in stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits, one gap-dependent and one gap-free.

Both lower bounds are proved on a *length- K path semi-bandit*, which is illustrated in Figure 1a. Without loss of generality, we assume that L/K is an integer and that there are L/K paths between the starting and end points. Each of these paths contains K edges. At each time t , only one path is chosen. So the ground set E are the edges and Θ is the set of the L/K paths, each of length K . We assume that P is a distribution where the weights of the items in different paths are distributed independently of each other, but the weights of the items in the same path are equal. The marginal distribution of $w(e)$ is a Bernoulli distribution with mean:

$$\bar{w}(e) = \begin{cases} 0.5 & \text{item } e \text{ belongs to path 1} \\ 0.5 - \Delta/K & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

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

The key observation is that our problem is equivalent to a (L/K) -arm Bernoulli bandit scaled by K when the learning agent knows that the weights of the items in the same path are equal. In other words, our problem is at least as




Figure 1: **a.** The length- K path semi-bandit problem in Section 6. The red and blue nodes are the starting and end points of the paths, respectively. The optimal path is marked in red. **b.** The grid-path problem in Section 7. The red and blue nodes are the starting and end points of the paths, respectively. The optimal path is marked in red. **c.** The n -step regret of CombUCB1 on the grid-path problem.

difficult as a Bernoulli bandit. As a result, we can derive lower bounds based on the existing literature [14, 8, 7].

The gap-dependent lower bound is proved for *consistent* algorithms. We say that an algorithm is consistent if for any combinatorial semi-bandit, any suboptimal solution A , and any $\alpha > 0$, $\mathbb{E}[T_A(n)] = o(n^\alpha)$, where $T_A(n)$ is the number of times that solution A is chosen in n steps. In our work, we focus only on consistent algorithms. This is without loss of generality. In particular, by definition, an inconsistent algorithm performs poorly on some problems, and therefore cannot achieve logarithmic regret on all instances of (L, K, Δ) combinatorial semi-bandits.

Proposition 1. *For any L and K such that L/K is an integer, and any Δ such that $0 < \Delta/K < 0.5$, the regret of any consistent algorithm on the length- K path semi-bandit problem 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:

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R(n)}{\log n} &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} K \sum_{k=2}^{L/K} \frac{\Delta/K}{\text{kl}(0.5 - \Delta/K, 0.5)} \\ &= \left(\frac{L}{K} - 1 \right) \frac{\Delta}{\text{kl}(0.5 - \Delta/K, 0.5)} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{(L - K)K}{4\Delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\text{kl}(0.5 - \Delta/K, 0.5)$ is the KL divergence between two Bernoulli variables with the means of $0.5 - \Delta/K$ and 0.5 . Inequality (a) follows from the fact that our problem is equivalent to a (L/K) -arm Bernoulli bandit scaled by K and an existing lower bound for Bernoulli bandits [14]. Inequality (b) is due to $\text{kl}(p, q) \leq \frac{(p-q)^2}{q(1-q)}$, and then we use $p = 0.5 - \Delta/K$ and $q = 0.5$. ■

The gap-free lower bound is derived based on the lower bound of Auer *et al.* [7].

Proposition 2. *For any L and K such that L/K is an integer, and any $n > 0$, there exists a (L, K) semi-bandit and $c > 0$ such that the regret of any algorithm is:*

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

Proof. If the agent knows that the weights of the items in the same path are equal, the length- K path semi-bandit is equivalent to a (L/K) -arm Bernoulli bandit scaled by K . By the lower bound of Auer *et al.* [7], there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the regret of any algorithm is at least $cK \min(\sqrt{(L/K)n}, n) = c \min(\sqrt{KLn}, Kn)$. The lower bound of Auer *et al.* [7] is stated for the adversarial setting. However, because the worst-case environment in the proof is stochastic, it also applies in our case. ■

7 Experiments

In this experiment, we show that the regret of CombUCB1 scales as implied by our $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ upper bound. We experiment with a stochastic longest-path problem on a grid of $(m + 1) \times (m + 1)$ nodes (Figure 1b). The ground set E are $2m(m + 1)$ edges, between all neighboring nodes. All paths start at the upper left corner, end at the bottom right corner, and can move only in the direction of the arrows. It is easy to see that all paths contain $K = 2m$ edges. The weight of each edge is drawn i.i.d. from a Bernoulli distribution, independently of the other edges. The expected weights of the leftmost and bottommost edges are $0.5 + \sigma/2$, where $0 < \sigma < 1$ is a tunable parameter. The expected weights of all other edges are $0.5 - \sigma/2$. The optimal solution A^* is the path that contains all leftmost and bottommost edges (Figure 1b).

The sample complexity of our problem is characterized by $|\tilde{E}| = 2m(m + 1) - 2$ gaps $\Delta_{e, \min}$, which range from 2σ

to $2m\sigma$. Excluding the sides of the grid, which contain $4m$ items, it is easy to see that $\Delta_{e,\min} = i\sigma$ in at most $2(i-1)$ items e . As a result, the $(\log n)$ -term in our gap-dependent upper bound can be bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in \tilde{E}} K \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,\min}} \log n &< \frac{8m^2 \log n}{\sigma} + 2m \sum_{i=2}^{2m} \frac{2i}{i\sigma} \log n \\ &< \frac{16m^2 \log n}{\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Now we validate the dependence on m and σ empirically. We fix $n = 10^5$, and vary m and σ .

Our results are shown in Figure 1c. We observe two major trends. First, the regret of CombUCB1 grows linearly with the number of items L , which grows quadratically with m , $L = 2m(m+1)$. Second, the regret is linear in $1/\sigma$. Both of these trends are suggested by our upper bound (16).

8 Related Work

Gai *et al.* [11] proposed CombUCB1 and analyzed it. Chen *et al.* [10] proved a $O(K^2 L(1/\Delta) \log n)$ upper bound on the n -step regret of CombUCB1. In this work, we prove that the n -step regret of CombUCB1 is $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$, a factor of K improvement over the result of Chen *et al.* [10]. This upper bound is tight. We also prove a gap-free upper bound and show that it is nearly tight.

COMBAND [9], online stochastic mirror descent (OSMD) [4], and follow-the-perturbed-leader (FPL) with geometric resampling [15] are three recently proposed algorithms for adversarial combinatorial semi-bandits. OSMD achieves the optimal regret but is not guaranteed to be computationally efficient [4]. FPL is guaranteed to be computationally efficient but fails to achieve the optimal regret. It is an open question whether adversarial combinatorial semi-bandits can be solved both computationally and sample efficiently. In this work, we show that CombUCB1 is computationally and sample efficient in the stochastic setting.

Kveton *et al.* [12, 13] studied a special case of our problem, matroid and polymatroid bandits, and showed that the n -step regret of CombUCB1 is $O(L(1/\Delta) \log n)$. This bound is a factor of K tighter than our $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ upper bound. However, note that our bound is more general and applies to any stochastic combinatorial semi-bandit.

Our problem can be viewed as a linear bandit [5, 1], where each solution A is associated with an indicator vector $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^E$ and the agent observes the individual weights of its non-zero components, and not the sum of the weights as is common in linear bandits. Because our feedback model is more informative, our problem has lower sample complexity. This can be seen from our lower bounds. In particular, our $\Omega(\sqrt{KLn})$ lower bound is a factor of \sqrt{K} smaller than that in Theorem 4.1 of Audibert *et al.* [4], which is proved

on a specific combinatorial linear bandit. The lower bound of Audibert *et al.* [4] is stated for the adversarial setting. However, because the worst-case environment in the proof is stochastic, it also applies to our problem.

Russo and Van Roy [17], and Wen *et al.* [19], proved upper bounds on the *Bayes regret* of *Thompson sampling* in stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits. These bounds have a similar form as our gap-free upper bound (Theorem 6). Therefore, we would like to emphasize two major differences. First, the Bayes regret is a different performance metric, which explicitly depends on the prior of Thompson sampling. From the frequentist perspective, it is a weaker performance metric. Second, all of the derived bounds are $O(\sqrt{n})$ and no $O(\log n)$ bounds are given.

9 Extensions

In Algorithm 1, we assume that the optimization problem $\arg \max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, U_t)$ is solved exactly. This may be computationally intractable if the problem is NP-hard. On the other hand, there may exist a computationally efficient approximation ALG for the problem. It is straightforward to propose a variant of CombUCB1 with ALG [10]. Let \tilde{A} be the output of ALG when applied to $\arg \max_{A \in \Theta} f(A, \bar{w})$. Then, based on this work, it is easy to derive regret bounds for CombUCB1 with ALG, if the regret is measured with respect to \tilde{A} instead of A^* .

Thompson sampling [18] often performs better in practice than UCB1 [6]. It is straightforward to propose a variant of CombUCB1 that uses Thompson sampling, by replacing the UCBs in Algorithm 1 with sampling from the posterior on the mean of the weights. The frequentist analysis of regret in Thompson sampling [2] closely resembles that of UCB1. Based on this, we believe that the analysis in this work can be extended to Thompson sampling. We postulate that the regret of Thompson sampling on (L, K, Δ) combinatorial semi-bandits is $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$.

Finally, note that any feasible solution A can be represented as a vector $\mathbf{x}_A \in \{0, 1\}^E$ such that $\mathbf{x}_A(e) = \mathbb{1}\{e \in A\}$. Our analysis does not rely on the assumption that $\mathbf{x}_A(e)$ is integral. Therefore, it can be easily extended to the cases where $\mathbf{x}_A \in [0, 1]^E$, such as learning variants of minimum-cost maximum flows [16].

10 Conclusions

In this work, we derive novel upper bounds on the regret of a well-known algorithm for stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits [11], $O(KL(1/\Delta) \log n)$ and $O(\sqrt{KLn} \log n)$. Furthermore, we derive a gap-dependent lower bound that matches the upper bound, and a gap-free lower bound that matches the upper bound up to a polylogarithmic factor. It is well known that the analyzed algorithm is computationally efficient whenever the offline variant of the com-

binatorial optimization problem can be solved efficiently. Therefore, we indirectly show that stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits can be solved both computationally and sample efficiently.

Theorems 4 and 5 are proved quite generally, for arbitrary sequences of constants (α_i) and (β_i) subject to constraints. At the end of the proofs, we choose (α_i) and (β_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 (α_i) and (β_i) for future work.

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

Our $O(\sqrt{KLn \log n})$ upper bound matches the $\Omega(\sqrt{KLn})$ lower bound only up to a factor of $\sqrt{\log n}$. We believe that this factor can be eliminated by modifying the confidence radii in CombUCB1 (2) along the lines of Audibert *et al.* [3]. We leave this for future work.

References

- [1] 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.
- [2] 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.
- [3] Jean-Yves Audibert and Sébastien Bubeck. Minimax policies for adversarial and stochastic bandits. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, 2009.
- [4] Jean-Yves Audibert, Sébastien Bubeck, and Gábor Lugosi. Regret in online combinatorial optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(1):31–45, 2014.
- [5] Peter Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:397–422, 2002.
- [6] Peter Auer, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, and Paul Fischer. Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine Learning*, 47:235–256, 2002.
- [7] Peter Auer, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, and Robert E. Schapire. The nonstochastic multiarmed bandit problem. *SIAM Journal of Computing*, 32(1):48–77, 2002.
- [8] Sébastien Bubeck and Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi. Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 2012.
- [9] Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi and Gabor Lugosi. Combinatorial bandits. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 78(5):1404–1422, 2012.
- [10] 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.
- [11] 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.
- [12] 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, 2014.
- [13] Branislav Kveton, Zheng Wen, Azin Ashkan, Hoda Eydgahi, and Michal Valko. Polymatroid bandits. *CoRR*, abs/1405.7752, 2014.
- [14] T. L. Lai and Herbert Robbins. Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 6(1):4–22, 1985.
- [15] 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.
- [16] Christos Papadimitriou and Kenneth Steiglitz. *Combinatorial Optimization*. Dover Publications, Mineola, NY, 1998.
- [17] Daniel Russo and Benjamin Van Roy. An information-theoretic analysis of thompson sampling. *CoRR*, abs/1403.5341, 2014.
- [18] 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.
- [19] Zheng Wen, Azin Ashkan, Hoda Eydgahi, and Branislav Kveton. Efficient learning in large-scale combinatorial semi-bandits. *CoRR*, abs/1406.7443, 2014.

A Proofs of Main Theorems

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

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 sub-optimal 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 $t \leq n$.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

By Lemma 1, 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 2 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 α 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:

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

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Let \mathcal{F}_t be the event that inequality (4) holds at time t . By Lemmas 1 and 2, 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 $G_{1,t}$ (7) and $G_{2,t}$ (8), and then associate the regret at time t with these events. In particular, let:

$$G_{e,1,t} = G_{1,t} \cap \left\{ e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq \alpha K^2 \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \right\} \quad (17)$$

$$G_{e,2,t} = G_{2,t} \cap \left\{ e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq \frac{\alpha d^2}{(\sqrt{\alpha} - 1)^2} \frac{6}{\Delta_{A_t}^2} \log n \right\} \quad (18)$$

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:

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

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:

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

for appropriate C , and inequality (c) follows from Lemma 4 of [12]:

$$\left[\Delta_{e,1} \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,1}^2} + \sum_{k=2}^{N_e} \Delta_{e,k} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k}^2} - \frac{1}{\Delta_{e,k-1}^2} \right) \right] < \frac{2}{\Delta_{e,N_e}} = \frac{2}{\Delta_{e,\min}}. \quad (19)$$

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

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

A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

The first step of the proof is identical to that of Theorem 2. In particular, by Lemma 1, 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 3 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:

$$\hat{R}(n) \leq \Delta \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{Lm_i}{\beta_i K} = KL \frac{1}{\Delta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i} \right] \log n. \quad (20)$$

It remains to choose (α_i) and (β_i) so that:

- $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \beta_i = 0$;
- Monotonicity conditions in (10) and (11) hold;
- Condition (13) 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:

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

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

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

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:

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

We solve the above problem numerically, and get $\alpha = 0.1459$ and $\beta = 0.2360$. For these values of α and β , $6 \left(\frac{1 - \beta}{\sqrt{\alpha - \beta}} \right)^2 \frac{\alpha}{\beta - \alpha} < 267$. We substitute this value into the bound in (20) and get the desired result.

A.5 Proof of Theorem 5

Let \mathcal{F}_t be the event that inequality (4) holds at time t . By Lemmas 1 and 3, 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 $G_{i,t}$ (12) and then associate the regret at time t with these events. In particular, let:

$$G_{e,i,t} = G_{i,t} \cap \{e \in A_t, T_{t-1}(e) \leq m_{i,t}\} \quad (21)$$

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

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

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:

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

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:

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

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

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

and inequality (c) follows from (19). For the same (α_i) and (β_i) as in Theorem 4, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i} \leq 267$ and it follows that the regret is bounded as:

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

A.6 Proof of Theorem 6

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

By Lemma 1, 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 5, 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:

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

which concludes our proof.

B Technical Lemmas

Lemma 4. Let S_i , \bar{S}_i , and m_i be defined as in Lemma 3; 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 . ■