
Efficient Contextual Bandits in Non-stationary Worlds

Haipeng Luo

University of Southern California
haipengl@usc.edu

Alekh Agarwal

Microsoft Research, NYC
alekha@microsoft.com

John Langford

Microsoft Research, NYC
jcl@microsoft.com

Abstract

Most contextual bandit algorithms minimize regret to the best fixed policy—a questionable benchmark for non-stationary environments ubiquitous in applications. In this work, we obtain efficient contextual bandit algorithms with strong guarantees for alternate notions of regret suited to these non-stationary environments. Two of our algorithms equip existing methods for i.i.d problems with sophisticated statistical tests, dynamically adapting to a change in distribution. The third approach uses a recent technique for combining multiple bandit algorithms, with each copy starting at a different round so as to learn over different data segments. We analyze several notions of regret for these methods, including the first results on dynamic regret for efficient contextual bandit algorithms.

1 Introduction

Algorithms for the contextual bandit problem have been developed for adversarial [4], stochastic [1, 16] and hybrid [18, 20] environments. Despite the specific setting, however, almost all these works minimize the classical notion of regret that compares the reward of the algorithm to the *best fixed policy in hindsight*. This is a natural benchmark when the data generating mechanism is essentially stationary, so that a fixed policy can attain a large reward. However, in many applications of contextual bandits, we are faced with an extremely non-stationary world. For instance, the pool of available news stories or blog articles rapidly evolves in content personalization domains, and people’s preferences typically exhibit trends on daily, weekly and seasonal scales. In such cases, one wants to compete with an appropriately adaptive sequence of benchmark policies, for the baseline to be meaningful.

Prior works in a context-free setting (that is, the multi-armed bandit problem) have studied regret to a sequence of actions, whenever that sequence is *slowly changing* under some appropriate measure (see e.g. [4–6, 15, 21]). A natural generalization to the contextual setting would be to compete with a sequence of policies, all chosen from some policy class, when the sequence of policies is slowly changing. Extension of the prior context-free works to the contextual setting indeed yields algorithms with such guarantees, as we show with a baseline example (Exp4.S). However, the computation and storage of the resulting algorithms are both linear in the cardinality of the policy class, making tractable implementation impossible except for very small policy classes.

To overcome the computational obstacle, all previous works on efficient contextual bandits assume access to an optimization oracle which can find the policy with the largest reward on any dataset containing context-reward pairs [1, 16, 18, 20]. Given such an oracle, however, it is known that no efficient low-regret algorithms exist in the fully adversarial setting [12, Theorem 25], even without any challenges of non-stationarity. Consequently all previous works explicitly rely on assumptions such as i.i.d. contexts, or even i.i.d. context-reward pairs. On the other hand, most prior works in the non-stationary setting adapt algorithms for the adversarial environment (such as Exp3 [4]) to deal with a changing comparator sequence (for example [5, 6]). This creates a fundamental point of departure in contextual bandits from previous works for non-stationary settings. To obtain computationally efficient algorithms, we need to adapt algorithms which were developed under some i.i.d.

Table 1: Comparisons of different results presented in this work. Interval, switching and dynamic regret are explained in text. T is the total number of rounds, L is an algorithm parameter for the longest interval on which regret is measured, S is the number of switches of the competing policy sequence, and Δ (shorthand for Δ_T) is the total variation defined in Section 2. These parameters are assumed to be known for all results in this table except for the last row. See discussions in Sections 3 and 4 for more results when parameters are unknown. Dependence on other parameters (such as number of actions and policies) are omitted. Results with * assume data is (approximately) i.i.d. on intervals where the competitor remains the same. Results with † assume a transductive setting.

Algorithm	Oracle-Efficient?	Interval Regret	Switching Regret	Dynamic Regret
Exp4.S (baseline)	N	\sqrt{L}	\sqrt{TS}	$T^{\frac{2}{3}}\Delta^{\frac{1}{3}} + \sqrt{T}$
ADA-GREEDY	Y	$L^{\frac{2}{3}} *$	$T^{\frac{2}{3}}S^{\frac{1}{3}} *$	$T^{\frac{3}{4}}\Delta^{\frac{1}{4}} + T^{\frac{2}{3}}$
ADA-ILTCB	Y	$\sqrt{L} *$	$\sqrt{TS} *$	N/A
Corralling BISTRO+	Y	$T^{\frac{3}{4}} \dagger$	$T^{\frac{3}{4}}S \dagger$	$T^{\frac{7}{8}}\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} + T^{\frac{3}{4}} \dagger$

assumptions and study appropriate generalizations of regret from i.i.d. to non-stationary environments.

We begin by modifying the simplest contextual bandit algorithm, EPOCH-GREEDY [16], to work in non-stationary settings.¹ We further adapt the statistically and computationally optimal approach of Agarwal et al. [1] to this setting as well. Both of our modifications, ADA-GREEDY and ADA-ILTCB, probe for the longest period in the past over which the data distribution looks *approximately i.i.d.*, and compute a distribution over policies based on that period. The exact test is algorithm-specific and based on verifying certain concentration inequalities which the algorithm relies upon, but the general idea might be applicable to extending other contextual bandit algorithms as well.

In addition, we also propose a very different approach by combining different copies of the BISTRO+ algorithm [20], each of which starts at a different time. This can be seen as a natural generalization of the approach of Hazan and Seshadhri [13], which works in the full information setting. However, there are additional challenges with partial feedback, and we build on recent result of Agarwal et al. [2], which can adaptively pick amongst multiple bandit algorithms and compete with the best of them. Unlike our first two algorithms, BISTRO+ requires no statistical assumption on the rewards and we inherit this robustness in a non-stationary setting, while maintaining computational efficiency. We can also replace BISTRO+ with other contextual bandit algorithms (e.g. the one in [19]).

We present strong theoretical guarantees for the algorithms discussed above, in terms of interval regret, switching regret and dynamic regret (defined in Section 2). A high-level outcome of our analysis is that the algorithms enjoy a regret bound on any time interval that is sufficiently stationary (called interval regret), compared with the best fixed policy for that interval. The precise notion of sufficiently stationary is algorithm-specific and formalized in Section 3. This general result has important corollaries, discussed in Section 4. For example, if the data-generating process is typically i.i.d., except there are *hard switches* in the data distribution every so often, then our algorithms perform as if they knew the change points in advance, up to a small penalty in regret (called switching regret). More generally, if the data distribution is *slowly drifting*, we can still provide meaningful regret bounds (called dynamic regret) when competing to the best policy at each time (instead of a fixed one over all rounds). Importantly, the dynamic regret bound of ADA-GREEDY holds under a *fully adversarial* setting, same as the inefficient baseline Exp4.S.² As far as we know, this is the first result on adversarial and efficient contextual bandits. Our results are summarized in Table 1.

Related work. The idea of testing for an approximately i.i.d. period was studied in [8] and [3] for a very different purpose, and in [15] for a two-armed bandit problem in non-stationary environ-

¹For simplicity, we look at the ϵ -greedy variant of the algorithm which is qualitatively similar.

²Note that this does not contradict with the hardness results in [12] since the bound is data-dependent and could be linear in T in the worst case.

ments,³ all without context. The closest bounds to those in Table 1 are in the non-contextual setting [4–6, 21] as mentioned earlier. Chakrabarti et al. [9] study a context-free setup where action set changes. To the best of our knowledge, oracle-efficient contextual bandit algorithms for non-stationary environments were only studied before in [19], where a reduction from competing with a switching policy sequence to competing with a fixed policy was proposed. However, the reduction cannot be applied to the i.i.d methods [1, 16], and it heavily relies on knowing the number of switches in advance. Additionally, this approach gives no guarantees on interval regret or dynamic regret, unlike our results.

2 Preliminaries

The contextual bandits problem is defined as follows. Let \mathcal{X} be an arbitrary context space and K be the number of actions. Let $[n]$ denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ for any integer n . A mapping $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [K]$ is called a policy and the learner is given a fixed set of policies Π . For simplicity, we assume Π is a finite set but with a large cardinality $N = |\Pi|$. Ahead of time, the environment decides T distributions $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_T$ on $\mathcal{X} \times [0, 1]^K$, and draws T context-reward pairs $(x_t, r_t) \sim \mathcal{D}_t$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$ independently.⁴ Then at each round $t = 1, \dots, T$, the environment reveals x_t to the learner, the learner picks an action $a_t \in [K]$ and observes its reward $r_t(a_t)$. The regret of the learner with respect to a policy π at round t is $r_t(\pi(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)$. Most existing results on contextual bandits focus on minimizing cumulative regret against any fixed policy $\pi \in \Pi$: $\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(\pi(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)$.

To better deal with non-stationary environments, we consider several related notions of regret. The first one is cumulative regret with respect to a fixed policy on a time interval \mathcal{I} , which we call *interval regret* on \mathcal{I} . Specifically, we use the notation $\mathcal{I} = [s, s']$ for $s \leq s'$ and $s, s' \in [T]$ to denote the set $\{s, s+1, \dots, s'\}$ and call it a time interval (starting from round s to round s'). The regret with respect to a fixed $\pi \in \Pi$ on a time interval \mathcal{I} is then defined as $\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} r_t(\pi(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)$. Thus, a low interval regret for a class of intervals implies competition with the *best fixed policy on each interval in the class* with the freedom to pick different benchmark policies on different intervals when the environment changes. This notion is similar to adaptive and strongly adaptive regret [13, 10]. We use the term interval regret without any specific interval when the choice is clear from context.

As an example, consider a sequence of benchmark policies $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_T \in \Pi$, that switches at most S times, that is, $\sum_{t=2}^T \mathbf{1}\{\pi_t \neq \pi_{t-1}\} \leq S$. This is a natural baseline if the distribution of contexts and rewards changes S times over T rounds (e.g., each time new content is added in a personalization application). Regret against this baseline is called *switching regret* in previous works [19]. Low interval regret implies low switching regret, as we can consider the $S+1$ intervals defined by the switches, where the baseline π_t stays fixed. Results on switching regret are discussed in Section 4.1.

Alternatively, the distributions over contexts and rewards might slowly drift, due to underlying trends. The optimal policy might change slightly very often, but the total change might still be controlled in some appropriate measure. We capture these scenarios by generalizing *dynamic regret* [5] to the contextual setting. Specifically, let $\mathcal{R}_t(\pi) := \mathbb{E}_{(x,r) \sim \mathcal{D}_t} r(\pi(x))$ be the expected reward of policy π and $\pi_t^* := \arg\max_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{R}_t(\pi)$ be the optimal policy at round t . Then dynamic regret is defined as $\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)$. It is well-known that in general no sub-linear dynamic regret is achievable. We therefore generalize the notion of the *variation* of reward distributions in [5] and define $\Delta_T = \sum_{t=2}^T \max_{\pi \in \Pi} |\mathcal{R}_t(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{t-1}(\pi)|$. We aim to derive dynamic regret that depends on Δ_T and is meaningful whenever Δ_T is reasonably small.

All algorithms we consider construct a distribution p_t over actions at round t and then sample $a_t \sim p_t$. The importance weighted reward estimator is defined as $\hat{r}_t(a) = \frac{r_t(a)}{p_t(a)} \mathbf{1}\{a = a_t\}$, $\forall a \in [K]$. For an interval \mathcal{I} , we use $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ to denote the average expected and empirical rewards of π over \mathcal{I} respectively, that is, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{R}_t(\pi)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \hat{r}_t(\pi(x_t))$. The

³That work focuses on adapting to unknown parameters, and the regret bound there has a large independence in T , making the results incomparable.

⁴That is, the data generating process is oblivious to the algorithm.

Algorithm 1: ADA-GREEDY

```
1 Input: largest allowed interval length  $L$  and variation  $\alpha$ , allowed failure probability  $\delta$ 
2 Define  $\mu = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{K}, L^{-\frac{1}{3}} \sqrt{\frac{\ln(N/\delta)}{K}} \right\}$ ,  $B(\ell) = 2\sqrt{\frac{\ln(4T^2N/\delta)}{\mu\ell}} + \frac{\ln(4T^2N/\delta)}{\mu\ell}$  for any  $\ell > 0$ 
3 Play uniformly at random for the first two rounds
4 for  $t = 3, \dots, T$  do
5    $k = 2$ 
6   while  $k < \min\{L, t\}$  do
7      $\hat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]} = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi)$ 
8     for  $\ell = k/2, k/4, \dots, 2$  do
9       if  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\hat{\pi}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}) - \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\hat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]}) > 4B(\ell) + 2\alpha$  then goto Line 11
10     $\pi_t = \hat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]}$ ,  $k \leftarrow 2k$ 
11    Set  $p_t(a) = \mu + (1 - K\mu)\mathbf{1}\{a = \pi_t(x_t)\}$ ,  $\forall a \in [K]$ 
12    Play  $a_t \sim p_t$  and receive  $r_t(a_t)$ 
```

variation on $\mathcal{I} = [s, s']$ is defined as

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{I}} := \sum_{\tau=s+1}^{s'} \max_{\pi \in \Pi} |\mathcal{R}_{\tau}(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{\tau-1}(\pi)|. \quad (1)$$

We use $\mathcal{D}_t^{\mathcal{X}}$ to denote the marginal distribution of \mathcal{D}_t over \mathcal{X} , and \mathbb{E}_t to denote the conditional expectation given everything before round t . Finally, we are interested in efficient algorithms assuming access to an optimization oracle [11, 1]:

Definition 1. *The argmax oracle (AMO) is an algorithm which takes any set \mathcal{S} of context and reward vector pairs $(x, r) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^K$ as inputs and outputs any policy in $\arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{(x, r) \in \mathcal{S}} r(\pi(x))$.*

An algorithm is oracle-efficient if its total running time and the number of oracle calls are both polynomial in T, K and $\ln N$, excluding the running time of the oracle itself.

3 Interval Regret

In this section we present several algorithms with interval regret guarantees. As a starter and a baseline, we first point out that a generalization of the Exp3.S algorithm [4] and Fixed-Share [14] to the contextual bandit setting, which we call Exp4.S, already provides a strong interval regret guarantee as shown by the following theorem. We include the algorithm and the proof in Appendix B. Crucially, Exp4.S requires maintaining weights for each policy and is thus inefficient.

Theorem 1. *Exp4.S with parameter L ensures that for any time interval \mathcal{I} such that $|\mathcal{I}| \leq L$, we have $\mathbb{E} [\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} r_t(\pi(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{LK \ln(NL)})$ for any $\pi \in \Pi$, where the expectation is with respect to the randomness of both the algorithm and the environment.*

Note that in bandit settings, it is impossible to achieve regret $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}|})$ for any interval \mathcal{I} simultaneously, as shown in [10]. Therefore in some sense the above guarantee is the best one can hope for, and in the following subsections we prove similar statements with different oracle-efficient algorithms.

3.1 ADA-GREEDY

The simplest oracle-efficient contextual bandit algorithm is the EPOCH-GREEDY method [16] which assumes an i.i.d. distribution of contexts and rewards. In this section, we will extend the related ϵ -GREEDY algorithm to enjoy a small interval regret on any interval with a small variation.

ϵ -GREEDY plays uniformly at random with a small probability ϵ and otherwise plays according to the empirically best policy $\arg \max_{\pi} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{[1, t-1]}(\pi)$. Instead of finding the best policy using data from all previous rounds, which is counterintuitive in a non-stationary environment, the key idea of

ADA-GREEDY is to search for the largest recent interval with length $k < \min\{L, t\}$, in a doubling manner, such that the data collected on this interval is stationary enough, and then play according to the optimal policy on this interval: $\operatorname{argmax}_{\pi} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi)$ (see Line 6 to 11).

Specifically, it suffices to check whether the empirically optimal policy on $[t-k, t-1]$ has similar performance on subintervals $[t-\ell, t-1]$ for all $\ell = k/2, \dots, 2$ compared to the empirically optimal policies on these subintervals (Line 9). The intuition is that these checks will succeed with high probability if the data on $[t-k, t-1]$ is actually (close to) i.i.d, but even if the data is not i.i.d on this interval and the checks succeed, it would not affect the performance of the algorithm. This intuition is formalized in the proof of Theorem 2.

Oracle-Efficiency. Note that for each new candidate k , we compute $\widehat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]}$ using one call of the AMO oracle (all $\widehat{\pi}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}$ for $\ell = k/2, \dots, 2$ were computed previously). Since we only check $\mathcal{O}(\ln L)$ different k 's, each round the algorithm makes at most $\mathcal{O}(\ln L)$ calls of the oracle.

We prove the following result for ADA-GREEDY, recalling the notation $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}$ in Eq. (1). Note that when $\alpha = O(L^{-\frac{1}{3}})$, the rate of the regret below matches the ordinary regret bound of EPOCH-GREEDY, which is of order $\widetilde{O}(T^{2/3})$ (the standard i.i.d. setting is a special case of $\alpha = 0$).

Theorem 2. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, for any time interval \mathcal{I} such that $|\mathcal{I}| \leq L$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}} \leq \alpha$, ADA-GREEDY with parameters L, α and δ guarantees for any $\pi \in \Pi$,⁵*

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} r_t(\pi(x_t)) - r_t(a_t) \leq \widetilde{O} \left(L\alpha + L^{\frac{2}{3}} \sqrt{K \ln(N/\delta)} + K \ln(N/\delta) \right).$$

Proof. Recall $\widehat{r}_t(a) = \frac{r_t(a)}{p_t(a)} \mathbf{1}\{a = a_t\} \leq 1/\mu$ and $\mathbb{E}_t[\widehat{r}_t(\pi(x_t))] = \mathcal{R}_t(\pi)$, $\mathbb{E}_t[\widehat{r}_t(\pi(x_t))^2] \leq 1/\mu$. By Freedman's inequality (included in Appendix A) and a union bound, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, for any policy π and any time interval \mathcal{I}' ,

$$\left| \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}'}(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}'}(\pi) \right| \leq B(|\mathcal{I}'|). \quad (2)$$

The rest of the proof conditions on this event. We will also use the fact (proven in Lemma 3 of Appendix C) that by the condition $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}} \leq \alpha$, we have for any $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2 \subset \mathcal{I}$ and $\pi \in \Pi$,

$$|\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}_1}(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}_2}(\pi)| \leq \alpha. \quad (3)$$

Now let s be the first round of \mathcal{I} . Consider any fixed round $t \in \mathcal{I}$ with $t \geq s + 2$, and let k'_t be such that $\pi_t = \widehat{\pi}_{[t-k'_t, t-1]}$ where π_t is the one used in Line 11. We first point out that k'_t is large enough in the sense that $k'_t \geq k_t := 2^{\lfloor \log_2(t-s) \rfloor}$, so that π_t is computed with enough approximately i.i.d. data. This fact is proven in Lemma 4 of Appendix C, and the high level idea is that the statistical check we perform in Line 9 is designed to fail when data is approximately i.i.d. and concentration holds.

Therefore, for any $\pi \in \Pi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_t(\pi) &\leq \mathcal{R}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}(\pi) + \alpha \leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}(\pi) + \alpha + B(k_t) && \text{(by (3) and (2))} \\ &\leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}(\widehat{\pi}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}) + \alpha + B(k_t) && \text{(by optimality of } \widehat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]}) \\ &\leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}(\pi_t) + 3\alpha + 5B(k_t) && \text{(by Line 9 and } k_t \leq k'_t) \\ &\leq \mathcal{R}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}(\pi_t) + 3\alpha + 6B(k_t) \leq \mathcal{R}_t(\pi_t) + 4\alpha + 6B(k_t). && \text{(by (2) and (3))} \end{aligned}$$

Put together, the sum of conditional expected regrets $\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{E}_t[r_t(\pi(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)]$ is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O} \left(L\alpha + LK\mu + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} B(k_t) \right) = \widetilde{O} \left(L\alpha + LK\mu + \sqrt{\frac{L \ln(N/\alpha)}{\mu}} + \frac{\ln(N/\delta)}{\mu} \right).$$

Finally, applying Hoeffding-Azuma inequality and plugging our choice of μ finishes the proof. \square

Algorithm 2: ADA-ILTCB

```

1 Input: largest allowed interval length  $L$ , allowed failure probability  $\delta$ 
2 Define:6 $\mu = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2K}, \sqrt{\frac{\ln(8T^2N^2/\delta)\ln(L)}{LK}} \right\}$ ,  $C_1 = 4$ ,  $C_2 = 2.4 \times 10^5$ ,  $C_3 = 41$ ,  $C_4 = 600$ 
3 Play uniformly at random for the first 2 rounds
4 for  $t = 3, \dots, T$  do
5    $k = 2$ 
6   while  $k < \min\{L, t\}$  do
7     for  $\ell = k/2, k/4, \dots, 2$  do
8       if  $\max_{\pi \in \Pi} \left( \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\pi) - C_1 \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi) \right) > \frac{C_2 L K \mu}{\ell}$  then goto Line 14
9       if  $\max_{\pi \in \Pi} \left( \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi) - C_1 \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\pi) \right) > \frac{C_2 L K \mu}{\ell}$  then goto Line 14
10      Let  $Q$  be a solution to (OP) with data from  $[t-k, t-1]$  and minimum probability  $\mu$ 
11      for  $\ell = k/2, k/4, \dots, 2$  do
12        if  $\max_{\pi \in \Pi} \left( \widehat{V}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(Q, \pi) - C_3 \widehat{V}_{[t-k, t-1]}(Q, \pi) \right) > \frac{C_4 L K}{\ell}$  then goto Line 14
13       $p_t \leftarrow Q^\mu(\cdot | x_t)$ ,  $k \leftarrow 2k$ 
14   Play  $a_t \sim p_t$  and receive  $r_t(a_t)$ 

```

3.2 ADA-ILTCB

Although being fairly simple, ADA-GREEDY is suboptimal just as EPOCH-GREEDY is suboptimal for stationary environments. In this section we propose ADA-ILTCB, a variant of ILOVETOCONBANDITS [1], which achieves the optimal regret rate while also being oracle-efficient. The idea is similar to ADA-GREEDY, but the statistical checks are more involved. For simplicity, we focus on intervals within which the data is i.i.d., that is, \mathcal{D}_t remains the same.

For a policy π and an interval \mathcal{I} , we denote the expected and empirical regret of π by $\text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) = \max_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi') - \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ and $\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) = \max_{\pi' \in \Pi} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi') - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ respectively. For a context x and a distribution over the policies $Q \in \Delta^\Pi := \{Q \in \mathbb{R}_+^N : \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} Q(\pi) = 1\}$, the projected distribution over the actions is denoted by $Q(\cdot | x)$ such that $Q(a | x) = \sum_{\pi: \pi(x)=a} Q(\pi)$, $\forall a \in [K]$. The smoothed projected distribution with a minimum probability μ is defined as $Q^\mu(\cdot | x) = \mu \mathbf{1} + (1 - K\mu)Q(\cdot | x)$ where $\mathbf{1}$ is the all-one vector. Like [1], we keep track of the variance of the reward estimates and define for a policy π , an interval \mathcal{I} and a distribution $Q \in \Delta^\Pi$

$$\widehat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \left[\frac{1}{Q^\mu(\pi(x_t) | x_t)} \right], \quad V_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_t^x} \left[\frac{1}{Q^\mu(\pi(x) | x)} \right].$$

As in ADA-GREEDY, at each round we search for the largest recent interval where the environment is stationary enough. There are two steps in checking an interval $[t-k, t-1]$. At the first step (Lines 8 and 9), we check for all π whether the empirical regret of π on $[t-k, t-1]$ and all subintervals $[t-\ell, t-1]$ ($\ell = k/2, \dots$) are close. If so, we proceed to the second step (Line 10 to 12), where we solve the optimization problem (OP) defined in [1] (and included in Appendix D) using data from $[t-k, t-1]$, to obtain a *sparse* distribution Q . We then check whether the variances $\widehat{V}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(Q, \pi)$ are bounded in terms of $\widehat{V}_{[t-k, t-1]}(Q, \pi)$ ($\ell = k/2, \dots$) for all π . If this is also true, we move on to check the interval $[t-2k, t-1]$. Otherwise we play according to the previous solution of (OP).

Oracle-Efficiency. Note that Lines 8, 9 and 12 can all be implemented by one call of the AMO oracle each, given that for each new k we first use an extra oracle call to compute $\max_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{R}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi')$. Specifically, let $\mathcal{S} = \{(x_i, -\frac{1}{\ell} \widehat{r}_i)\}_{i \in [t-\ell, t-1]} \cup \{(x_i, \frac{C_1}{k} \widehat{r}_i)\}_{i \in [t-k, t-1]}$, then the left hand side of the inequality in Line 8 can be rewritten as $\max_{\pi} \sum_{(x, r) \in \mathcal{S}} r(\pi(x)) +$

⁵We use notation \widetilde{O} to suppress dependence on logarithmic factors in L, T, K and $\ln(N/\delta)$.

⁶These loose constants are partially inherited from [1] and we did not make an effort to tighten them.

$\max_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{R}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\pi') - C_1 \max_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{R}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi')$, where clearly the first term can be computed by one oracle call and the rests are precomputed already. Similarly, Line 12 can be computed by feeding the oracle with examples $\{(x_i, \frac{1}{\ell} \frac{1}{Q^\mu(\cdot|x_t)})\}_{i \in [t-\ell, t-1]} \cup \{(x_i, -\frac{C_3}{k} \frac{1}{Q^\mu(\cdot|x_t)})\}_{i \in [t-k, t-1]}$. Moreover, as shown in [1], the optimization problem (OP) can be solved by $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{KL/\ln(N/\delta)})$ oracle calls and the solution has only $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{KL/\ln(N/\delta)})$ non-zero coordinates. Since we only check $\ln L$ different k 's, in total ADA-ILTCB makes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{KL/\ln(N/\delta)})$ oracle calls per round.

We next present the interval regret guarantee of ADA-ILTCB, which improves from $\tilde{O}(L^{\frac{2}{3}})$ to $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{L})$ compared to ADA-GREEDY (see Appendix D for the proof).

Theorem 3. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, for any interval \mathcal{I} such that $|\mathcal{I}| \leq L$ and \mathcal{D}_t is identical for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$, ADA-ILTCB with parameters L and δ guarantees for any $\pi \in \Pi$,*

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} r_t(\pi(x_t)) - r_t(a_t) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{LK \ln(N/\delta)}\right).$$

3.3 Corraling BISTRO+

One drawback of the results in the previous two subsections is that \mathcal{D}_t has to be (almost) identical for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$. In this section, we allow the distributions to be arbitrary, but only require a transductive setting where the contexts x_1, \dots, x_T are all revealed to the learner ahead of time. We propose another oracle-efficient algorithm in this setting with similar interval regret guarantees. The high level idea is to combine several copies of the BISTRO+ algorithm [20], which achieves $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ regret on the whole interval $[1, T]$ in the transductive setting.⁷

The idea of using an expert algorithm to combine different copies of a base algorithm to achieve interval regret is well-studied in the full information setting and can be achieved in a black-box manner without losing rates in the regret [13, 17, 10]. However, in the bandit setting, it is much harder to do this without hurting the performance due to the lack of feedback to supply to each algorithm which potentially suggests different actions. In a recent work [2], an algorithm called CORRAL was proposed to combine bandit algorithms in a black-box manner and shown to provide better guarantees than previous works under certain mild conditions. We thus propose to use CORRAL with different copies of BISTRO+, each of which starts at a different time, and show that it achieves the following guarantee (the actual algorithm and the proof are deferred to Appendix E due to space constraints):

Theorem 4. *In the transductive setting, CORRAL with $T^{\frac{1}{4}}K^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\ln N)^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ copies of BISTRO+ as base algorithms guarantees that for any policy π and interval \mathcal{I} , we have $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} r_t(\pi(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] \leq \tilde{O}(T^{\frac{3}{4}}K^{\frac{1}{2}}(\ln N)^{\frac{1}{4}})$.*

4 Implications

In this section we discuss the implications of interval regret guarantees on switching regret and dynamic regret, both of which are meaningful performance measures for non-stationary environments.

4.1 Switching Regret

The implication on switching regret is pretty straightforward. We take Exp4.S as an example and state the results below (see Appendix B for the proof), but one can easily generalize the results to the other three algorithms we have presented with different conditions and regret rates (see Table 1).

Corollary 1. *Exp4.S with parameter L ensures that for any $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_T \in \Pi$ such that $\sum_{t=2}^T \mathbf{1}\{\pi_t \neq \pi_{t-1}\} \leq S$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(\pi_t(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] \leq \tilde{O}\left(\left(\frac{T}{\sqrt{L}} + S\sqrt{L}\right)\sqrt{K \ln N}\right)$.*

If S is known, then one can set $L = T/S$ and obtain regret bound $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{TSK \ln N})$. Otherwise setting L with different values leads to different bounds that are incomparable. For example, setting $L = T$ leads to $\tilde{O}(S\sqrt{TK \ln N})$ while setting $L = \sqrt{T}$ leads to $\tilde{O}((T^{\frac{3}{4}} + ST^{\frac{1}{4}})\sqrt{K \ln N})$.

⁷ As in [20], our results also hold if \mathcal{D}_t^x 's are known ahead of time (instead of x_t 's).

4.2 Dynamic Regret

All results with efficient algorithms presented so far require some additional conditions to obtain meaningful bounds. We now drop any of these assumptions and move on to bounding dynamic regret in terms of the variation $\Delta_T = \sum_{t=2}^T \max_{\pi \in \Pi} |\mathcal{R}_t(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{t-1}(\pi)|$. We first point out that previous works [6, 22] have studied a reduction from dynamic regret to interval regret, restated below:

Lemma 1. *Let $\{\mathcal{I}_i = [s_i, t_i]\}_{i \in [n]}$ be time intervals that partition $[1, T]$. We have*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_t [r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_i} \mathbb{E}_t [r_t(\pi_{s_i}^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] + 2\Delta_T \max_{i \in [n]} |\mathcal{I}_i|.$$

We include the proof in Appendix F for completeness. Partitioning $[1, T]$ into intervals with length $L' \leq L$, applying this lemma and Theorem 1 directly lead to the following result for Exp4.S.

Corollary 2. *Exp4.S with parameter L ensures that $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t) \right] \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\min_{0 \leq L' \leq L} \frac{T}{L'} \sqrt{LK \ln N} + L' \Delta_T \right)$.*

Again, if a bound Δ on Δ_T is known, one can tune L optimally to get a bound $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{\frac{2}{3}}(\Delta K \ln N)^{\frac{1}{3}} + \sqrt{TK \ln N})$, which is similar to the optimal dynamic regret in multi-armed bandits [5]. When Δ is unknown, different values of L gives different and in general incomparable bounds. For example, setting $L = T^{\frac{2}{3}}$ leads to $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{\frac{2}{3}}\sqrt{\Delta_T}(K \ln N)^{\frac{1}{4}} + T^{\frac{2}{3}}\sqrt{K \ln N})$ (with $L' = \min\{T^{2/3}, T^{2/3}(K \ln N)^{1/4}/\sqrt{\Delta_T}\}$ in this case).

Note that the exact same argument above does not apply to ADA-GREEDY directly since its interval regret guarantee requires $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}} \leq \alpha$. It turns out, however, one can simply set $\alpha = B(L)$ and partition $[1, T]$ in a more careful way to obtain the following result that holds in a complete adversarial setting.

Corollary 3. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, ADA-GREEDY with parameter L , δ and $\alpha = B(L)$ ensures that⁸*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\left(\frac{T}{L^{\frac{1}{3}}} + L \Delta_T \right) K \ln(N/\delta) \right).$$

Specifically, if Δ_T is known, setting $L = \min\{(T/\Delta_T)^{\frac{3}{4}}, T\}$ gives $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}((T^{\frac{3}{4}}\Delta_T^{\frac{1}{4}} + T^{\frac{2}{3}})K \ln(N/\delta))$; otherwise, setting $L = T^{\frac{3}{4}}$ gives $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{\frac{3}{4}}(\Delta_T + 1)K \ln(N/\delta))$.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 2 shows that with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, ADA-GREEDY ensures that for any interval \mathcal{I} such that $|\mathcal{I}| \leq L$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}} \leq B(L)$, we have $\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{E}_t [r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(L^{\frac{2}{3}} \sqrt{K \ln(N/\delta)} + K \ln(N/\delta) \right)$. We can thus first partition $[1, T]$ evenly into T/L intervals, then within each interval, further partition it sequentially into several largest subintervals so that for each of them the variation is at most $B(L)$. Since the total variation is Δ_T , it is clear that this results in at most $T/L + \Delta_T/B(L)$ subintervals, each of which satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2. Applying Lemma 1 and Hoeffding-Azuma inequality then lead to the claimed bound. \square

It is not surprising that the dynamic regret of ADA-GREEDY is again worse than the one of Exp4.S. It is not clear though whether (variants) of ADA-ILTCB could achieve similar results as Exp4.S. It appears that not only the variation of $\mathcal{R}_t(\pi)$, but also the variation of $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_t^x} [\frac{1}{Q(\pi(x)|x)}]$ matters in this case. We leave this problem as a future direction.

Similarly one can also obtain dynamic regret bounds for CORRAL with BISTRO+. Unfortunately the bound is weaker and also requires a transductive setting. We include the result in Table 1 and the proof in Appendix E for completeness.

⁸For simplicity, in this bound the dependence on the term $K \ln(N\delta)$ is slightly loose and could be tightened.

5 Conclusions

In this work we propose several efficient algorithms for contextual bandits in non-stationary environments, under different notions of regret suited to these environments. Our algorithms come from two high-level recipes for robustness in such settings. The first tests for approximately i.i.d periods, while the second combines multiple copies of an algorithm started at various times. The first approach transforms i.i.d. assumption based methods and is particularly attractive, since the bulk of the algorithmic development for contextual bandits has happened in the stochastic setting. While our tests are algorithm-specific, we anticipate that the framework also extends to other approaches such as Thompson sampling and LinUCB-style algorithms.

We defer two main questions to future work. The first is an empirical study evaluating various methods. The second is whether it is possible to obtain the exact same dynamic regret as Exp4.S using an oracle-efficient algorithm under a fully adversarial setting, without using more restrictive notions of variation that appears to be necessary for ADA-ILTCB.

References

- [1] Alekh Agarwal, Daniel Hsu, Satyen Kale, John Langford, Lihong Li, and Robert Schapire. Taming the monster: A fast and simple algorithm for contextual bandits. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2014.
- [2] Alekh Agarwal, Haipeng Luo, Behnam Neyshabur, and Robert E Schapire. Corraling a band of bandit algorithms. In *30th Annual Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2017.
- [3] Peter Auer and Chao-Kai Chiang. An algorithm with nearly optimal pseudo-regret for both stochastic and adversarial bandits. In *29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2016.
- [4] Peter Auer, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, and Robert E Schapire. The nonstochastic multiarmed bandit problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 32(1):48–77, 2002.
- [5] Omar Besbes, Yonatan Gur, and Assaf Zeevi. Stochastic multi-armed-bandit problem with non-stationary rewards. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27*, 2014.
- [6] Omar Besbes, Yonatan Gur, and Assaf Zeevi. Non-stationary stochastic optimization. *Operations Research*, 63(5):1227–1244, 2015.
- [7] Alina Beygelzimer, John Langford, Lihong Li, Lev Reyzin, and Robert E. Schapire. Contextual bandit algorithms with supervised learning guarantees. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2011.
- [8] Sébastien Bubeck and Aleksandrs Slivkins. The best of both worlds: Stochastic and adversarial bandits. In *25th Annual Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2012.
- [9] Deepayan Chakrabarti, Ravi Kumar, Filip Radlinski, and Eli Upfal. Mortal multi-armed bandits. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 273–280, 2009.
- [10] Amit Daniely, Alon Gonen, and Shai Shalev-Shwartz. Strongly adaptive online learning. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015.
- [11] M. Dudík, D. Hsu, S. Kale, N. Karampatziakis, J. Langford, L. Reyzin, and T. Zhang. Efficient optimal learning for contextual bandits. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2011.
- [12] Elad Hazan and Tomer Koren. The computational power of optimization in online learning. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, 2016.
- [13] Elad Hazan and C. Seshadhri. Adaptive algorithms for online decision problems. In *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)*, volume 14, 2007.
- [14] Mark Herbster and Manfred K Warmuth. Tracking the best expert. *Machine learning*, 32(2):151–178, 1998.
- [15] Zohar S Karnin and Oren Anava. Multi-armed bandits: Competing with optimal sequences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, 2016.
- [16] John Langford and Tong Zhang. The epoch-greedy algorithm for multi-armed bandits with side information. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2008.
- [17] Haipeng Luo and Robert E. Schapire. Achieving All with No Parameters: AdaNormalHedge. In *28th Annual Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2015.
- [18] Alexander Rakhlin and Karthik Sridharan. Bistro: An efficient relaxation-based method for contextual bandits. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016.
- [19] Vasilis Syrgkanis, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Robert E Schapire. Efficient algorithms for adversarial contextual learning. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016.
- [20] Vasilis Syrgkanis, Haipeng Luo, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Robert E Schapire. Improved regret bounds for oracle-based adversarial contextual bandits. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016.
- [21] Chen-Yu Wei, Yi-Te Hong, and Chi-Jen Lu. Tracking the best expert in non-stationary stochastic environments. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, 2016.
- [22] Lijun Zhang, Tianbao Yang, Rong Jin, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Strongly adaptive regret implies optimally dynamic regret. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.07570*, 2017.

A Freedman's Inequality

Lemma 2 ([7]). *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of random variables such that $X_i \leq R$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_i | X_{i-1}, \dots, X_1] = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1/R]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \leq (e - 2)\lambda V + \frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{\lambda}$$

where $V = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i^2 | X_{i-1}, \dots, X_1]$. Specifically, picking $\lambda = \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{V}}, \frac{1}{R} \right\}$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \leq 2\sqrt{V \ln(1/\delta)} + R \ln(1/\delta)$.

B Exp4.S Algorithm and Proofs

Algorithm 3: Exp4.S

Input: largest interval length of interest L

Define $\eta = \sqrt{\ln(NL)/LK}$ and $\mu = 1/NL$

Initialize $P_t \in \Delta^\Pi$ to be the uniform distribution over policies.

for $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**

see x_t , play $a_t \sim p_t$ where $p_t(a) = \sum_{\pi: \pi(x_t)=a} P_t(\pi)$, $\forall a \in [K]$
 receive $r_t(a_t)$ and construct $\hat{c}_t(a) = \frac{1-r_t(a)}{p_t(a)} \mathbf{1}\{a = a_t\}$, $\forall a \in [K]$
 set $\tilde{P}_{t+1}(\pi) \propto P_t(\pi) \exp(-\eta \hat{c}_t(\pi(x_t)))$, $\forall \pi \in \Pi$
 set $P_{t+1}(\pi) = (1 - N\mu)\tilde{P}_{t+1}(\pi) + \mu$, $\forall \pi \in \Pi$

The Exp4.S algorithm is presented in Algorithm 3, which is a direct generalization of Exp3.S [4]. Note that we use loss estimates \hat{c}_t instead of reward estimate \hat{r}_t in the multiplicative update, and naturally we define $c_t = \mathbf{1} - r_t$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Using the fact $e^{-y} \leq 1 - y + y^2$ for any $y \geq 0$, $\ln(1 + y) \leq y$ and $c_t(a) \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \left(\sum_{\pi' \in \Pi} P_t(\pi') \exp(-\eta \hat{c}_t(\pi'(x_t))) \right) &\leq \ln \left(\sum_{\pi' \in \Pi} P_t(\pi') (1 - \eta \hat{c}_t(\pi'(x_t)) + \eta^2 \hat{c}_t(\pi'(x_t))^2) \right) \\ &= \ln(1 - \eta c_t(a_t) + \eta^2 \hat{c}_t(a_t) c_t(a_t)) \leq -\eta c_t(a_t) + \eta^2 \hat{c}_t(a_t). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have for any fixed π ,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \left(\sum_{\pi' \in \Pi} P_t(\pi') \exp(-\eta \hat{c}_t(\pi'(x_t))) \right) &= \ln \left(\frac{P_t(\pi) \exp(-\eta \hat{c}_t(\pi(x_t)))}{\tilde{P}_{t+1}(\pi)} \right) \\ &= \ln \left(\frac{P_t(\pi)(1 - N\mu)}{P_{t+1}(\pi) - \mu} \right) - \eta \hat{c}_t(\pi(x_t)) \\ &\geq \ln(1 - N\mu) + \ln \left(\frac{P_t(\pi)}{P_{t+1}(\pi)} \right) - \eta \hat{c}_t(\pi(x_t)) \\ &\geq -2N\mu + \ln \left(\frac{P_t(\pi)}{P_{t+1}(\pi)} \right) - \eta \hat{c}_t(\pi(x_t)) \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is by the fact $N\mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and thus $\ln(\frac{1}{1-N\mu}) = \ln(1 + \frac{N\mu}{1-N\mu}) \leq \ln(1 + 2N\mu) \leq 2N\mu$. Combining the above two displayed equations, summing over $t \in \mathcal{I}$, telescoping and rearranging gives

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} c_t(a_t) - \hat{c}_t(\pi(x_t)) \leq \frac{\ln(1/\mu) + 2LN\mu}{\eta} + \eta \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \hat{c}_t(a_t).$$

Taking the expectation on both sides, using the fact $\mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim p_t}[\hat{c}_t(a_t)] \leq K$, and plugging $c_t(a) = 1 - r_t(a)$, η and μ finish the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 1. We first partition $[1, T]$ evenly into T/L intervals, then within each interval, further partition it into several subintervals so that π_t remains the same on each subinterval. Since the number of switches is at most S , this process results in at most $T/L + S$ subintervals, each with length at most L . We can now apply Theorem 1 to each subinterval and sum up the regrets to get the claim bounds. \square

C Technical Lemmas for Theorem 2

Lemma 3. *For any interval \mathcal{I} such that $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}} \leq \alpha$, we have for any sub-intervals $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and any $\pi \in \Pi$,*

$$|\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}_1}(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}_2}(\pi)| \leq \alpha.$$

Proof. The proof involves noticing for that any two rounds $s, t \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\pi \in \Pi$, $|\mathcal{R}_s(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_t(\pi)| \leq \alpha$. This is easily seen using triangle inequality, since assuming $s < t$,

$$|\mathcal{R}_s(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_t(\pi)| \leq \sum_{\tau=s+1}^t |\mathcal{R}_\tau(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{\tau-1}(\pi)| \leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{I}} |\mathcal{R}_\tau(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{\tau-1}(\pi)| \leq \alpha.$$

The lemma is now immediate, since

$$|\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}_1}(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}_2}(\pi)| \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_1|} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_2|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{I}_1} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_2} |\mathcal{R}_s(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_t(\pi)| \leq \alpha.$$

\square

Lemma 4. *Recalling the notation from the proof of Theorem 2, we have $k_t \leq k'_t$.*

Proof. For any $k \leq k_t$ and $\ell \in \{k/2, \dots, 2\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\widehat{\pi}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}) &\leq \mathcal{R}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\widehat{\pi}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}) + B(\ell) && \text{(by Eq. (2))} \\ &\leq \mathcal{R}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\widehat{\pi}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}) + B(\ell) + \alpha && \text{(by Eq. (3))} \\ &\leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\widehat{\pi}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}) + 2B(\ell) + \alpha && \text{(by Eq. (2) and } B(k) \leq B(\ell)) \\ &\leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\widehat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]}) + 2B(\ell) + \alpha && \text{(by optimality of } \widehat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{R}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\widehat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]}) + 3B(\ell) + \alpha && \text{(by Eq. (2) and } B(k) \leq B(\ell)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{R}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\widehat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]}) + 3B(\ell) + 2\alpha && \text{(by Eq. (3))} \\ &\leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\widehat{\pi}_{[t-k, t-1]}) + 4B(\ell) + 2\alpha. && \text{(by Eq. (2))} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the condition in Line 9 is never satisfied for $k \leq k_t$ and thus $k'_t \geq k_t$. \square

D Omitted Details for ADA-ILTCB

The optimization problem (OP) needed for ADA-ILTCB is included in Figure 1. It is almost identical to the one proposed in [1] except: 1) Instead of returning a sub-distribution, our version returns an exact distribution. However, as discussed in [1] this makes no real difference since given a sub-distribution which satisfies Eq. (4) and Eq. (5), one can always put all the remaining weight on the empirical best policy $\arg\max_{\pi} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ to obtain a distribution that still satisfies those two constraints. 2) The constant B used in [1] is 100. It is also clear from the proof of [1] that the value of this constant does not affect the feasibility of (OP) nor the efficiency of finding the solution.

<p>Optimization Problem (OP)</p> <p>Given a time interval \mathcal{I} and minimum probability μ, find $Q \in \Delta^\Pi$ such that for constant $B = 5 \times 10^5$:</p> $\sum_{\pi \in \Pi} Q(\pi) \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) \leq 2BK\mu \quad (4)$ $\forall \pi \in \Pi: \widehat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi) \leq 2K + \frac{\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)}{B\mu} \quad (5)$	
---	--

Figure 1: A subroutine for ADA-ILTCB, adapted from [1]

Notation. Let $d = \ln(8T^2N^2/\delta) \ln(L)$. Without loss of generality, below we assume $L \geq 4Kd$ so that $\mu = \min\{\frac{1}{2K}, \sqrt{\frac{d}{KL}}\} = \sqrt{\frac{d}{LK}}$. Indeed, if $L < 4Kd$, then the bound in Theorem 3 holds trivially since $L \leq 2\sqrt{LKd}$. The fact $d/\mu = LK\mu$ will be used frequently. We use V_t as a shorthand for $V_{\{t\}}$, that is, $V_t(Q, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_t^x} \left[\frac{1}{Q^\mu(\pi(x)|x)} \right]$, and we denote by Q_t the distribution from which p_t (in Line 14) is induced.

We first state two lemmas on the concentration of empirical reward and empirical variance.

Lemma 5. *With probability at least $1 - \delta/4$, ADA-ILTCB ensures that for all distributions $Q \in \Delta^\Pi$, all $\pi \in \Pi$, all intervals \mathcal{I} , and constants $D_1 = 6.4$ and $D_2 = 80$,*

$$\widehat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi) \leq D_1 V_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi) + \frac{D_2 LK}{|\mathcal{I}|}, \quad V_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi) \leq D_1 \widehat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi) + \frac{D_2 LK}{|\mathcal{I}|}. \quad (6)$$

Proof. This is a consequence of the contexts being drawn independently. A similar argument of [1, Lemma 10] shows that with probability at least $1 - \delta/4$, the differences $\widehat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi) - D_1 V_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi)$ and $V_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi) - D_1 \widehat{V}_{\mathcal{I}}(Q, \pi)$ are both bounded by

$$\frac{75 \ln(N)}{\mu^2 |\mathcal{I}|} + \frac{6.3 \ln(8T^2N^2/\delta)}{\mu |\mathcal{I}|} \leq \frac{75 LK}{|\mathcal{I}|} + \frac{6.3d}{\mu |\mathcal{I}|} = \frac{75 LK}{|\mathcal{I}|} + \frac{6.3 LK \mu}{|\mathcal{I}|} \leq \frac{80 LK}{|\mathcal{I}|},$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6. *With probability at least $1 - \delta/4$, ADA-ILTCB ensures that for all $\pi \in \Pi$ and all intervals \mathcal{I} ,*

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)| \leq \frac{\mu}{|\mathcal{I}| \ln(L)} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} V_t(Q_t, \pi) + \frac{LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}|}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. By [1, Lemma 11], for any choice of $\lambda \in [0, \mu]$, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta/4$, for all $\pi \in \Pi$ and all intervals \mathcal{I} ,

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) - \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)| \leq \frac{\lambda}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} V_t(Q_t, \pi) + \frac{\ln(8T^2N/\delta)}{\lambda |\mathcal{I}|}.$$

Picking $\lambda = \mu/\ln(L)$ and using the fact $\ln(8T^2N/\delta) \ln(L) \leq d$ and $d/\mu = LK\mu$ complete the proof. \square

We now let \mathcal{E} be the event that both Eq. (6) and (7) hold for all $\pi \in \Pi$, all intervals \mathcal{I} and all $Q \in \Delta^\Pi$, which happens with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$. Next we prove the following key lemma on the concentration of empirical regrets.

Lemma 7. *Conditioning on the event \mathcal{E} , for any $\pi \in \Pi$, any interval \mathcal{I} such that \mathcal{D}_t is identical for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$ (that is, data is i.i.d on \mathcal{I}), and constant $D_3 = 8 \times 10^4$, we have*

$$\text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) \leq 2\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) + \frac{D_3 LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}|}, \quad \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) \leq 2\text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) + \frac{D_3 LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}|}. \quad (8)$$

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on the length of \mathcal{I} . For the base case $|\mathcal{I}| = 1$, the bounds hold trivially since both $\text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ and $\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ are bounded by $1/\mu = LK\mu/d \leq D_3LK\mu$. Now assuming that the statement holds for any \mathcal{I}' such that $|\mathcal{I}'| \leq L' < L$, we prove below it holds for any \mathcal{I} such that $|\mathcal{I}| = L' + 1$ too.

Let s be the first round of \mathcal{I} . We first show that for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$, we have for $D_4 = 9500$ and all $\pi \in \Pi$,

$$V_t(Q_t, \pi) \leq \frac{\text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)}{2\mu} + \frac{D_4LK}{t-s+1} \quad (9)$$

Again, for $t < s + 2$, the bound above holds trivially since $V_t(Q_t, \pi) \leq 1/\mu \leq D_4LK/2$. For $t \geq s + 2$, define $k_t = 2^{\lfloor \log_2(t-s) \rfloor}$ and let k'_t be such that Q_t is computed with data from $[t - k'_t, t - 1]$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 2, we show $k'_t \geq k_t$ so that Q_t is computed with enough i.i.d. data. We will do so by invoking the inequalities maintained by the algorithm, in addition to the inductive assumption to appropriately chosen intervals \mathcal{I}' . Indeed, for any $\ell, k \in \{2, \dots, k_t\}$ such that $\ell < k$, the following bounds hold for all π and all $Q \in \Delta^\Pi$ (where the inductive assumption is used with either $\mathcal{I}' = [t - \ell, t - 1] \subset \mathcal{I}$ or $\mathcal{I}' = [t - k, t - 1] \subset \mathcal{I}$),

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\pi) &\leq 2\text{Reg}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\pi) + \frac{D_3LK\mu}{\ell} && \text{(by inductive assumption)} \\ &\leq 2\text{Reg}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi) + \frac{D_3LK\mu}{\ell} && \text{(by i.i.d. assumption)} \\ &\leq 4\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi) + \frac{2D_3LK\mu}{k} + \frac{D_3LK\mu}{\ell} && \text{(by inductive assumption)} \\ &\leq C_1\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi) + \frac{C_2LK\mu}{\ell}, && \text{(by } C_1 = 4 \text{ and } 3D_3 \leq C_2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi) &\leq 2\text{Reg}_{[t-k, t-1]}(\pi) + \frac{D_3LK\mu}{k} && \text{(by inductive assumption)} \\ &\leq 2\text{Reg}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\pi) + \frac{D_3LK\mu}{k} && \text{(by i.i.d. assumption)} \\ &\leq 4\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\pi) + \frac{2D_3LK\mu}{\ell} + \frac{D_3LK\mu}{k} && \text{(by inductive assumption)} \\ &\leq C_1\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(\pi) + \frac{C_2LK\mu}{\ell}, && \text{(by } C_1 = 4 \text{ and } 3D_3 \leq C_2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{V}_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(Q, \pi) &\leq D_1V_{[t-\ell, t-1]}(Q, \pi) + \frac{D_2LK}{\ell} && \text{(by Eq. (6))} \\ &\leq D_1V_{[t-k, t-1]}(Q, \pi) + \frac{D_2LK}{\ell} && \text{(by i.i.d. assumption)} \\ &\leq D_1^2\widehat{V}_{[t-k, t-1]}(Q, \pi) + \frac{D_1D_2LK}{k} + \frac{D_2LK}{\ell} && \text{(by Eq. (6))} \\ &\leq C_3\widehat{V}_{[t-k, t-1]}(Q, \pi) + \frac{C_4LK}{\ell}. && \text{(by } D_1^2 \leq C_3 \text{ and } (D_1 + 1)D_2 \leq C_4) \end{aligned}$$

Put together, this implies that the “goto” commands in Lines 8, 9 and 12 are never executed for $k \leq k_t$. Therefore we have $k'_t \geq k_t$ and Eq. (9) holds because $V_t(Q_t, \pi)$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& D_1 \widehat{V}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}(Q_t, \pi) + \frac{D_2 LK}{k_t} && \text{(by Eq. (6))} \\
& \leq C_3 D_1 \widehat{V}_{[t-k'_t, t-1]}(Q_t, \pi) + (C_4 D_1 + D_2) \frac{LK}{k_t} && \text{(by Line 12 and } k_t \leq k'_t) \\
& \leq \frac{C_3 D_1}{B\mu} \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-k'_t, t-1]}(\pi) + (2C_3 D_1 + C_4 D_1 + D_2) \frac{LK}{k_t} && \text{(by Eq. (5) and } L \geq k_t) \\
& \leq \frac{C_1 C_3 D_1}{B\mu} \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}(\pi) + \left(\frac{C_2 C_3 D_1}{B} + 2C_3 D_1 + C_4 D_1 + D_2 \right) \frac{LK}{k_t} && \text{(by Line 9)} \\
& \leq \frac{2C_1 C_3 D_1}{B\mu} \text{Reg}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}(\pi) + \left(\frac{C_1 C_3 D_1 D_3 + C_2 C_3 D_1}{B} + 2C_3 D_1 + C_4 D_1 + D_2 \right) \frac{LK}{k_t} && \text{(by inductive assumption)} \\
& \leq \frac{\text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)}{2\mu} + \frac{D_4 LK}{t-s+1}. && \text{(by i.i.d. assumption, plugging constants and } t-s+1 \leq 2k_t)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, let $\pi_{\mathcal{I}}^* = \arg\max_{\pi} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ and $\widehat{\pi}_{\mathcal{I}} = \arg\max_{\pi} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$. We will now establish the inductive hypothesis. For any π , $\text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) - \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi_{\mathcal{I}}^*) - \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)) - (\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi_{\mathcal{I}}^*) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)) && \text{(by optimality of } \widehat{\pi}_{\mathcal{I}}) \\
& \leq \frac{\mu}{|\mathcal{I}| \ln(L)} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} (V_t(Q_t, \pi) + V_t(Q_t, \pi_{\mathcal{I}}^*)) + \frac{2LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}|} && \text{(by Lemma 6)} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) + \left(\frac{2D_4 LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}| \ln(L)} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{t-s+1} \right) + \frac{2LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}|} && \text{(by Eq. (9) and } \text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi_{\mathcal{I}}^*) = 0) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) + \frac{(4D_4 + 2)LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging and noticing $(8D_4 + 4) \leq D_3$ proves the first statement of Eq. (8). Similarly, we can bound $\text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) - \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\widehat{\pi}_{\mathcal{I}}) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)) - (\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\widehat{\pi}_{\mathcal{I}}) - \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi)) && \text{(by optimality of } \pi_{\mathcal{I}}^*) \\
& \leq \frac{\mu}{|\mathcal{I}| \ln(L)} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} (V_t(Q_t, \pi) + V_t(Q_t, \widehat{\pi}_{\mathcal{I}})) + \frac{2LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}|} && \text{(by Lemma 6)} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} (\text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) + \text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\widehat{\pi}_{\mathcal{I}})) + \left(\frac{2D_4 LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}| \ln(L)} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{t-s+1} \right) + \frac{2LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}|} && \text{(by Eq. (9))} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) + \frac{(D_3/2 + 4D_4 + 2)LK\mu}{|\mathcal{I}|},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is by applying the first statement of Eq. (8) (which has been proven above) to $\widehat{\pi}_{\mathcal{I}}$ and using the fact $\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\mathcal{I}}(\widehat{\pi}_{\mathcal{I}}) = 0$. Rearranging and noticing $D_3/2 + 4D_4 + 2 \leq D_3$ proves the second statement of Eq. (8), which completes the induction. \square

We can now prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. With notation s , k_t and k'_t from the proof of Lemma 7, for any $t \in \mathcal{I}$ and $t \geq s + 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\pi \in \Pi} Q_t(\pi) \text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) &\leq 2 \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} Q_t(\pi) \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-k_t, t-1]}(\pi) + \frac{D_3 L K \mu}{k_t} && \text{(by Lemma 7)} \\
&\leq 2C_1 \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} Q_t(\pi) \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{[t-k'_t, t-1]}(\pi) + (2C_2 + D_3) \frac{L K \mu}{k_t} && \text{(by Line 8)} \\
&\leq 4BC_1 K \mu + (2C_2 + D_3) \frac{L K \mu}{k_t} && \text{(by Eq. (4))} \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{L K \mu}{t - s + 1} \right). && (L \geq k_t \geq (t - s + 1)/2)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the sum of conditional expected regrets $\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{E}_t[r_t(\pi(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)]$ is bounded by

$$L K \mu + (1 - K \mu) \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} Q_t(\pi) \text{Reg}_{\mathcal{I}}(\pi) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(L K \mu) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\sqrt{L K \ln(N/\delta)} \right).$$

The theorem now follows by an application of the Hoeffding-Azuma inequality. \square

E Omitted Details for Corraling BISTRO+

Algorithm 4: Corraling BISTRO+

- 1 **Input:** Contexts x_1, \dots, x_T .
 - 2 Define $M = \lceil T^{\frac{1}{4}} K^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\ln N)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \rceil$, $\gamma = 1/T$, $\beta = e^{\frac{1}{\ln T}}$, $\eta = 1/(K \sqrt{T \ln N})$
 - 3 Initialize $m = 1$, $\eta_1(i) = \eta$, $\rho_1(i) = 2M$ for all $i \in [M]$, $w_1 = \bar{w}_1 = \frac{1}{M}$, $q_1 \in \Delta^M$ s.t. $q_1(1) = 1$
 - 4 Initialize \mathcal{B}_1 , a new copy of BISTRO+
 - 5 **for** $t = 1$ **to** T **do**
 - 6 Receive suggested action a_t^i from base algorithm \mathcal{B}_i for each $i \in [m]$
 - 7 Sample $i_t \sim q_t$, play $a_t = a_t^{i_t}$, receive reward $r_t(a_t)$
 - 8 Construct estimated losses $\ell_t(i) = \frac{1-r_t(a_t)}{q_t(i_t)} \mathbf{1}\{i = i_t\} + (1 - r_t(a_t)) \mathbf{1}\{i > m\}$, $\forall i \in [M]$
 - 9 Send feedback $\ell_t(i)$ to \mathcal{B}_i for each $i \in [m]$
 - 10 Compute $w_{t+1} \in \Delta^M$ s.t. $\frac{1}{w_{t+1}(i)} = \frac{1}{w_t(i)} + \eta_t(i)(\ell_t(i) - \lambda)$ where λ is a normalization factor
 - 11 Set $\bar{w}_{t+1} = (1 - \gamma)w_{t+1} + \gamma \frac{1}{M}$
 - 12 **for** $i = 1$ **to** M **do**
 - 13 **if** $\frac{1}{\bar{w}_{t+1}(i)} > \rho_t(i)$ **then** set $\rho_{t+1}(i) = \frac{2}{\bar{w}_{t+1}(i)}$, $\eta_{t+1}(i) = \beta \eta_t(i)$
 - 14 **else** set $\rho_{t+1}(i) = \rho_t(i)$, $\eta_{t+1}(i) = \eta_t(i)$
 - 15 **if** t is a multiple of $\lceil T/M \rceil$ **then**
 - 16 Update $m \leftarrow m + 1$
 - 17 Initialize \mathcal{B}_m , a new copy of BISTRO+
 - 18 Set $q_{t+1}(i) = \frac{\bar{w}_{t+1}(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^m \bar{w}_{t+1}(j)}$, $\forall i \in [m]$
-

We describe the idea of using CORRAL with BISTRO+ as base algorithms (see Algorithm 4 for the pseudocode). Conceptually we always maintain M base algorithms, and use CORRAL almost in a black-box manner as in [2]. However, crucially the i -th copy of the base algorithm only starts after the end of round $(i - 1)\lceil T/M \rceil$, in order to provide regret guarantee starting from that round (or close to that round). Therefore, the extra work here is to make sure CORRAL does not pick algorithms that have not started, and also to come up with “virtual rewards” for algorithms before they start.

More concretely, at each time we maintain $m \leq M$ copies of the base algorithm and a distribution q_t over them (note that although q_t is in the simplex $\Delta^M := \{q \in \mathbb{R}_+^M : \sum_{i=1}^M q(i) = 1\}$, the algorithm always ensure $q_t(i) = 0$, $\forall i > m$). First we receive suggested actions a_t^i from each base algorithm \mathcal{B}_i . Then we sample a base algorithm $i_t \sim q_t$ and play according to its action, that is, $a_t = a_t^{i_t}$. After

receiving its reward $r_t(a_t)$ (or equivalently its cost $1 - r_t(a_t)$), we construct estimated loss for each of the M algorithms: for algorithms that have started, this is simply the importance weighted loss; for algorithms that have not started, this is the actual loss of the picked action (see Line 8). Next, we send the estimated losses to the m algorithms that have started, and update several variables that CORRAL itself maintains, including the distributions w_t and \bar{w}_t and the thresholds ρ_t (Line 10 to 14). Finally, we re-normalize the weights \bar{w}_{t+1} over the started algorithms (including possibly a newly started one) to obtain q_{t+1} and proceed to the next round.

We next prove Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. For any time interval $\mathcal{I} = [s, t]$, if $|\mathcal{I}| \leq T/M$ then the regret bound holds trivially. Otherwise, there must be a round $s' \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $s' - s \leq T/M$, and there is a new copy of BISTRO+ added to the pool at round s' . Denote this new copy by \mathcal{B}_{i^*} . The interval regret on \mathcal{I} is then clearly bounded by T/M plus the interval regret on $[s', t]$.

Let $c_t(a) = 1 - r_t(a)$, $\forall a \in [K]$ and m_τ be the value of m at round τ before Line 15. Then for any policy π , we rewrite the interval regret on $[s', t]$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau=s'}^t r_\tau(\pi(x_\tau)) - r_\tau(a_\tau) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau=s'}^t c_\tau(a_\tau) - \ell_\tau(i^*) + \ell_\tau(i^*) - c_\tau(\pi(x_\tau)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau=1}^t c_\tau(a_\tau) - \ell_\tau(i^*) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau=s'}^t c_\tau(a_\tau^{i^*}) - c_\tau(\pi(x_\tau)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^{m_\tau} q_\tau(i) \ell_\tau(i) - \ell_\tau(i^*) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau=s'}^t c_\tau(a_\tau^{i^*}) - c_\tau(\pi(x_\tau)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^M \bar{w}_\tau(i) \ell_\tau(i) - \ell_\tau(i^*) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau=s'}^t c_\tau(a_\tau^{i^*}) - c_\tau(\pi(x_\tau)) \right] \quad (*) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses the fact $c_\tau(a_\tau) = \ell_\tau(i^*)$ for $\tau < s'$ and $\mathbb{E}_{i_\tau \sim q_\tau}[\ell_\tau(i^*)] = c_\tau(a_\tau^{i^*})$ for $\tau \geq s'$, and the last equality holds because

$$\sum_{i=1}^M \bar{w}_\tau(i) \ell_\tau(i) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_\tau} \bar{w}_\tau(i) \right) \sum_{i=1}^{m_\tau} q_\tau(i) \ell_\tau(i) + \left(\sum_{i=m_\tau+1}^M \bar{w}_\tau(i) \right) \sum_{i=1}^{m_\tau} q_\tau(i) \ell_\tau(i) = \sum_{i=1}^{m_\tau} q_\tau(i) \ell_\tau(i).$$

Here the first equality follows since $q_\tau(i) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_\tau} \bar{w}_\tau(j) \right) = \bar{w}_\tau(i)$ for $i \leq m_\tau$ and $\ell_\tau(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_\tau} q_\tau(j) \ell_\tau(j)$ for $i > m_\tau$ by definitions. Now we can bound the two terms in (*) using Lemma 12 and 15 of [2] respectively, and then proceed similarly as the proof of Theorem 6 of [2] to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau=s'}^t r_\tau(\pi(x_\tau)) - r_\tau(a_\tau) \right] &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{M}{\eta} + T\eta \right) - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\rho_{T,i}}{40\eta \ln T} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\rho_{T,i}^{1/3} \right] (TK)^{\frac{2}{3}} (\ln N)^{\frac{1}{3}} \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{M}{\eta} + T\eta + TK \sqrt{\eta \ln N} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, adding back the extra T/M term discussed above, and plugging in the value of η and M complete the proof. \square

We finally include the dynamic regret guarantee for this algorithm.

Theorem 5. *In the transductive setting, CORRAL with $T^{\frac{1}{4}} K^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\ln N)^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ copies of BISTRO+ as base algorithms guarantees*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t) \right] = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(T^{\frac{7}{8}} \Delta_T^{\frac{1}{2}} K^{\frac{1}{4}} (\ln N)^{\frac{1}{8}} + T^{\frac{3}{4}} K^{\frac{1}{2}} (\ln N)^{\frac{1}{4}} \right).$$

Proof. For any $L \leq T$, by partitioning $[1, T]$ evenly into T/L intervals and applying Theorem 4 and Lemma 1, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t) \right] = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{T}{L} \cdot T^{\frac{3}{4}} K^{\frac{1}{2}} (\ln N)^{\frac{1}{4}} + L \Delta_T \right).$$

Setting $L = \min\{T, T^{\frac{7}{8}} \Delta_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} K^{\frac{1}{4}} (\ln N)^{\frac{1}{8}}\}$ completes the proof. \square

F Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. It suffices to show that for any $i \in [n]$,

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_i} \mathbb{E}_t [r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] \leq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_i} \mathbb{E}_t [r_t(\pi_{s_i}^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] + 2|\mathcal{I}_i| \Delta_{\mathcal{I}_i}$$

The theorem follows by summing up the regrets over all intervals, and realizing $\sum_{i \in [n]} \Delta_{\mathcal{I}_i} \leq D$.

Indeed, one can rewrite the regret as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_i} \mathbb{E}_t [r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_i} \mathbb{E}_t [r_t(\pi_{s_i}^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_i} \mathbb{E}_t [r_t(\pi_t^*(x_t)) - r_t(\pi_{s_i}^*(x_t))] \\ &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_i} \mathbb{E}_t [r_t(\pi_{s_i}^*(x_t)) - r_t(a_t)] + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_i} (\mathcal{R}_t(\pi_t^*) - \mathcal{R}_t(\pi_{s_i}^*)). \end{aligned}$$

The last term can be further decomposed as:

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_i} \left(\mathcal{R}_{s_i}(\pi_t^*) - \mathcal{R}_{s_i}(\pi_{s_i}^*) + \sum_{\tau=s_i+1}^t (\mathcal{R}_\tau(\pi_t^*) - \mathcal{R}_{\tau-1}(\pi_t^*)) + \sum_{\tau=s_i+1}^t (\mathcal{R}_{\tau-1}(\pi_{s_i}^*) - \mathcal{R}_\tau(\pi_{s_i}^*)) \right)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{s_i}(\pi_t^*) \leq \mathcal{R}_{s_i}(\pi_{s_i}^*)$ by definition and the rest is bounded by $2\Delta_{\mathcal{I}_i}$. This finishes the proof. \square