

Non-stationary Stochastic Optimization under $L_{p,q}$ -Variation Measures

Xi Chen¹, Yining Wang², and Yu-Xiang Wang^{2,3}

¹Stern School of Business, New York University

²Machine Learning Department, Carnegie Mellon University

³Amazon, Inc.

May 14, 2018

Abstract

We consider a non-stationary sequential stochastic optimization problem, in which the underlying cost functions change over time under a variation budget constraint. We propose an $L_{p,q}$ -variation functional to quantify the change, which yields less variation for dynamic function sequences whose changes are constrained to short time periods or small subsets of input domain. Under the $L_{p,q}$ -variation constraint, we derive both upper and matching lower regret bounds for smooth and strongly convex function sequences, which generalize previous results in [Besbes et al. \(2015\)](#). Furthermore, we provide an upper bound for general convex function sequences with noisy gradient feedback, which matches the optimal rate as $p \rightarrow \infty$. Our results reveal some surprising phenomena under this general variation functional, such as the curse of dimensionality of the function domain. The key technical novelties in our analysis include affinity lemmas that characterize the distance of the minimizers of two convex functions with bounded L_p difference, and a cubic spline based construction that attains matching lower bounds.

Key words: Non-stationary stochastic optimization, bandit convex optimization, variation budget constraints, minimax regret.

1 Introduction

Non-stationary stochastic optimization studies the problem of optimizing a non-stationary sequence of convex functions on the fly, with either noisy gradient or function value feedback. This problem has important applications in operations research and machine learning, such as dynamic pricing, online recommendation services, and simulation optimization ([Gur, 2014](#); [den Boer & Zwart, 2015](#); [den Boer, 2015](#); [Keskin & Zeevi, 2017](#)). For example, in the case of dynamic pricing, an analyst is given the task of pricing a specific item over a long period of time, with feedback in the form of sales volumes in each time period. As the demand changes constantly over time, the problem can be naturally formulated as non-stationary sequential stochastic optimization, where the analyst adjusts his/her pricing over time based on noisy temporal feedback data.

Formally, consider a sequence of T convex functions $f_1, \dots, f_T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over T epochs, where $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex, compact domain in the d -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d . At each epoch $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, a policy π selects an action $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$, based on *stochastic or noisy feedback* (defined in Sec. 2) of previous epochs $1, \dots, t-1$, and suffers loss $f_t(x_t)$. The objective is to compete with the *dynamic* optimal sequence of actions in hindsight; that is, to minimize regret

$$\mathbb{E}^\pi \left[\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) \right] - \sum_{t=1}^T \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f_t(x).$$

To ensure existence of policy with sub-linear regret (i.e., the non-trivial regret of $o(T)$), constraints are imposed upon function sequences f_1, \dots, f_T such that any pair of consecutive functions f_t and f_{t+1} are sufficiently close, and therefore feedback through previous epochs are informative for later ones. These constraints usually carry strong practical implications. For example, in dynamic pricing problems, an action x represents the price and $f_t(x)$ is the (negative) revenue function at time t in terms of price. Since the demand functions cannot change too rapidly, it is natural to impose a constraint on adjacent pairs of revenue functions (see, e.g., Keskin & Zeevi (2017)).

The question of optimizing regret for non-stationary convex functions with stochastic feedback has received much attention in recent years. One particular interesting instance of non-stationary stochastic convex optimization was considered in Besbes et al. (2015), where sub-linear regret policies were derived when the average L_∞ difference $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_\infty$ is assumed to go to zero as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Optimal upper and lower regret bounds were derived for both noisy gradient and noisy function value feedback settings.

In this work, we generalize the results of Besbes et al. (2015) so that local spatial and temporal changes of functions are taken into consideration. For any measurable function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\|f\|_p := \begin{cases} \left(\frac{1}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} & 1 \leq p < \infty; \\ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f(x)| & p = \infty. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Here, $\text{vol}(\mathcal{X}) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} 1 dx$ is the Lebesgue measure of the domain \mathcal{X} and is finite because of the compactness of \mathcal{X} . We shall refer to $\|f\|_p$ as the L_p -norm of f in the rest of this paper. (Conventionally in functional analysis the L_p norm of a function is defined as the *unnormalized* integration $(\int_{\mathcal{X}} |f(x)|^p dx)^{1/p}$.) Nevertheless, we adopt the volume normalized definition for the convenience of presentation. It is worth noting that this normalization will not affect our results. In particular, because $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a compact domain and $\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})$ is a constant, the regrets using the two definitions of function L_p norm only differ by a multiplicative constant. Moreover, the Minkowski's inequality $\|f + g\|_p \leq \|f\|_p + \|g\|_p$, as well as other basic properties of L_p norm, remains valid. Also, for a sequence of convex functions $f_1, \dots, f_T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define the $L_{p,q}$ -variation functional of $f = (f_1, \dots, f_T)$ as

$$\text{Var}_{p,q}(f) := \begin{cases} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q \right)^{1/q} & 1 \leq p \leq \infty, 1 \leq q < \infty; \\ \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p & 1 \leq p \leq \infty, q = \infty. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Note that in both Eqs. (1) and (2) we restrain ourselves to convex norms $p \geq 1$ and $q \geq 1$. We can then define function classes

$$\mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T) := \{f : \text{Var}_{p,q}(f) \leq V_T\}, \quad (3)$$

which serves as the budget constraint for a function sequence f . The definition of $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}$ is more general than $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,1}$ introduced in Besbes et al. (2015) since it better reflects the spatial and temporal locality of f in the subscripts p and q .

1.1 A motivating example of dynamic pricing

To motivate the $L_{p,q}$ -variation constraint, we use dynamic pricing as a motivating example and illustrate the advantages of the $L_{p,q}$ -variation measure for loss functions with “local” spatial or temporal changes. We also provide guidelines on how p, q values should be set qualitatively.

We consider a stylized dynamic pricing problem of a single item under changing revenue functions. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$ be a collection of T time periods, at each of which the item receives a pricing $x_t, t \in \mathcal{T}$. We normalize the prices so that their range is the unit interval $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$. At time period $t \in \mathcal{T}$, an unknown function $f_t : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ characterizes the negative expected revenue $f_t(x_t)$ a retailer collects by setting the price at $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$. The revenue function f_t is assumed to be non-stationary over the time periods $t \in \mathcal{T}$. The objective of the retailer is to design a pricing policy $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$ such that the aggregated (negative) expected revenue $\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t)$ is minimized.

1.1.1 Spatial (pricing) locality of revenue changes

We first fix $q = 1$ in the $L_{p,q}$ variation framework and show how different values of p reflect degrees of spatial (pricing) locality of the revenue functions f_t . Suppose for all $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, T-1\}$, there exists a short interval $I_t \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with its length $|I_t| \leq w$ such that $|f_t(x) - f_{t+1}(x)| \leq \delta$ for all $x \in I_t$, and $f_t(x) = f_{t+1}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus I_t$. Intuitively, the assumption implies that the changes of the revenue functions f_t, f_{t+1} between consecutive time periods $t, t+1 \in \mathcal{T}$ are “spatially local”, and the revenues are different only at prices in a small range I_t . This is a reasonable assumption in practice since the revenue $f_t(x_t)$ will not be sensitive to all possible prices in \mathcal{X} (e.g., a pair of adjacent revenue function values remain the same when price is very high or very low).

Under the existing $L_{\infty,1}$ variation measure ($p = \infty$), simple calculation shows that $\text{Var}_{\infty,1}(f) \leq \delta$. On the other hand, for $p \in [1, \infty)$, the $L_{p,1}$ variation measure satisfies $\text{Var}_{p,1}(f) \leq w^{1/p}\delta$. When the “locality” level $w = |I_t|$ is much smaller than 1, $\text{Var}_{p,1}(f) \ll \text{Var}_{\infty,1}(f)$. Furthermore, in cases where $\delta = 1$ and $w = o(1)$, we have $\text{Var}_{\infty,1}(f) = \Theta(1)$ and therefore the existing algorithm/analysis in Besbes et al. (2015) cannot achieve sub-linear regret on f ; on the other hand, by considering the $L_{p,1}$ measure, one has $\text{Var}_{p,1}(f) = o(1)$ for all $p \in [1, \infty)$, and therefore by applying algorithm/analysis in this paper we can achieve sub-linear regret on f .

1.1.2 Temporal locality of revenue changes

We next consider $p = \infty$ in the $L_{p,q}$ variation framework and show how different values of q reflect degrees of temporal locality of the revenue function f_t . Suppose there exists a subset of time periods $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, $|\mathcal{S}| = s \ll T = |\mathcal{T}|$ such that $\|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_{\infty} = \delta$ for all $t \in \mathcal{S}$, and $f_{t+1} \equiv f_t$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{S}$. Intuitively, this assumption implies that the revenue function f_t has *local temporal changes*, meaning that the f_t changes only in short time intervals \mathcal{S} and remains the same for most of the other times. This is a relevant assumption when demands of the item have clear temporal correlations, such as seasonal food and clothes.

Simple calculations show that, for $p = \infty$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$, the $L_{\infty,q}$ variation measure of the above described function sequence is $(s/T)^{1/q}\delta$. This demonstrates the effect of the parameter q

in $L_{\infty,q}$ -variation for f with local temporal changes, i.e., a smaller q leads to a smaller variation measure $L_{\infty,q}$ of f when $s \ll T$.

1.1.3 Guidelines on the selection of p, q values

Though the underlying sequence of expected revenue functions $f = (f_1, \dots, f_T)$ is assumed to be unknown, in practice it is common that certain background knowledge or prior information is available regarding f . In this section we discuss how such prior information, especially regarding the magnitude changes of f_{t+1} and f_t in f , can qualitatively help us select the parameters p, q in the variation measure.

We first discuss the selection of p and fix the choice $q = 1$ for the moment. Suppose we have the prior knowledge that each pairs of f_{t+1} and f_t differ significantly on $w \ll 1$ portion of the domain \mathcal{X} by a difference of $\delta \leq 1$, as exemplified in Sec. 1.1.1. Then the $L_{p,1}$ variation of such function sequence is approximately $V_T = \text{Var}_{p,q}(f) \approx w^{1/p} \delta$. According to our results in Theorems 3.1–3.3, the worst-case regret is $T \cdot V_T^{\varrho(p,d)}$ where $\varrho(p,d) \in \{2p/(4p+d), 2p/(6p+d), p/(3p+d)\}$ depending on feedback types (e.g., noisy gradient or function value feedback) and (strong) convexity of f . The regret can be further re-parameterized as $T \cdot w^{\varphi(p,d)} \delta^{\varrho(p,d)}$ where $\varphi(p,d) \in \{2/(4p+d), 2/(6p+d), 1/(3p+d)\}$.

The above analysis leads to the following insights providing qualitative suggestions of p choices:

1. The $w^{\varphi(p,d)}$ term is smaller for smaller p values, because $w \ll 1$ and $\varphi(p,d)$ is a strictly decreasing function in p . This suggests that for function sequences with stronger spatial locality (e.g., revenue functions that only change on a small range of prices), one should use a smaller p value in $L_{p,1}$ -variation measure;
2. The $\delta^{\varrho(p,d)}$ term is smaller for larger p values, because $\delta \leq 1$ and $\varrho(p,d)$ is a strictly increasing function in p . This suggests that for function sequences with smaller absolute amount of perturbation, one should use a larger p in $L_{p,1}$ -variation measure.

We next discuss the selection of q and fix the choice of $p \in [1, \infty]$. Unlike the spatial locality parameter p , our Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 suggest that the optimal worst-case regret is insensitive to the choice of $q \in [1, \infty]$. This might sound surprising, but is the characteristic of the adopted *worst-case* analytical framework. To see this, we note that the worst-case function sequence is the one that evenly distributes the function changes $\|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p$ across all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ (see also the detailed construction in the online supplement), in which case the $L_{p,q}$ -variation measure is the same for all $q \in [1, \infty]$. It should also be noted that the choice of q does not affect our optimization algorithm or its re-starting procedure. Therefore, we simply recommend the selection of $q = 1$ but we choose to include q in our theorem statements for mathematical generality.

1.2 Results and techniques

The main result of this paper is to characterize the optimal regret over function classes $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$, which includes explicit algorithms that are computationally efficient and attain the regret, and a lower bound argument based on Fano's inequality (Ibragimov & Has'minskii, 1981; Yu, 1997; Cover & Thomas, 2006; Tsybakov, 2009) that shows the regret attained is optimal and cannot be further improved. Below is an informal statement of our main result (a formal description is given in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2):

Main result (informal). For smooth and strongly convex function sequences under certain regularity conditions, the optimal regret over $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$ is $T \cdot V_T^{2p/(4p+d)}$ with noisy gradient feedback, and $T \cdot V_T^{2p/(6p+d)}$ with noisy function value feedback, provided that V_T is not too small. In addition, for general convex function sequences satisfying only Lipschitz continuity on function values, we obtain a regret upper bound of $T \cdot V_T^{p/(3p+d)}$ with noisy gradient feedback, provided that V_T is not too small. Here d is the dimension of the domain \mathcal{X} .

We clarify that our results also cover the case of small V_T , i.e., V_T converges to 0 as $T \rightarrow \infty$ at a very fast rate. However, the case of “not too small V_T ” is of more interest. This is because if V_T is very small, meaning that the underlying function sequence $\{f_1, \dots, f_T\}$ is close to a stationary one (i.e., $f_1 = f_2 = \dots = f_T = f$), then one could re-produce the standard $O(\sqrt{T})$ and/or $O(\log T)$ regrets ($O(\sqrt{T})$ for strongly convex and smooth functions with noisy function feedback, $O(\log T)$ for strongly convex and smooth functions with noisy gradient feedback, and $O(\sqrt{T})$ for general convex functions with noisy gradient feedback; see also, e.g., Jamieson et al. (2012); Agarwal et al. (2010); Hazan et al. (2007).) These rates are also known to be optimal (Jamieson et al., 2012; Hazan & Kale, 2014). Technical details of this point are given in the statements of Theorems 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.

More importantly, our result reveals several interesting facts about the regret over function sequences with local spatial and temporal changes. Most surprisingly, the optimal regret suffers from *curse of dimensionality*, as the regret depends *exponentially* on the domain dimension d . Such phenomenon does not occur in previous works on stationary and non-stationary stochastic optimization problems. For example, for the case of f being strongly convex and smooth, as spatial locality in f becomes less significant (i.e., $p \rightarrow \infty$), the optimal regrets approach $T \cdot V_T^{1/2}$ (for noisy gradient feedback) and $T \cdot V_T^{1/3}$ (for noisy function value feedback), which recovers the dimension-independent regret bounds in Besbes et al. (2015) derived for the special case of $p = \infty$ and $q = 1$. Similar phenomenon of curse of dimensionality also appears in the general convex case. We also note that, when V_T is not too small, the obtained regret bound $T \cdot V_T^{p/(3p+d)}$ matches the optimal $O(T \cdot V_T^{1/3})$ rate for $p = \infty$ in Besbes et al. (2015) as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

To obtain results for general $L_{p,q}$ -variation and the optimal regrets for strongly convex case, we make several important technical contributions in this paper, which are highlighted as follows.

1. For noisy function value feedback, instead of using the online gradient descent (OGD) from Besbes et al. (2015), we adopt a regularized ellipsoidal (RE) algorithm from Hazan & Levy (2014) and extend it from exact function value evaluation to the *noisy* version. Our analysis relaxes an important assumption in Besbes et al. (2015) that requires the optimal solution to lie far away from the boundary of \mathcal{X} . Our policy based on the RE algorithm allows the optimal solution to be closer to the boundary of \mathcal{X} as T increases.
2. On the upper bound side, we prove an interesting affinity result (Lemma 4.2) which shows that the optimal solutions x_t^*, x_τ^* of f_t, f_τ cannot be too far apart provided that both f_t, f_τ are smooth and strongly convex functions, and $\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p$ is upper bounded. The affinity result is also generalizable to non-strongly convex functions f_t, f_τ (Lemma C.2), by directly integrating function differences in a close neighborhood of x_t^* (or x_τ^*) without resorting to $\|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|$ (that could be unbounded without strong convexity). Both affinity results are key in deriving upper bounds for our problem, and have not been discovered in previous literatures. They might also be potentially useful for other non-stationary stochastic optimization problems (e.g., adaptivity to unknown parameters (Besbes et al., 2015; Karnin & Anava, 2016)).

3. On the lower bound side, we present a systematic framework to prove lower bounds by first reducing the non-stationary stochastic optimization problem to an estimation problem with active queries, and then applying the Fano’s inequality with a “sup-argument” similar in spirit to [Castro & Nowak \(2008\)](#) that handles the active querying component. To adapt Fano’s inequality, we also design a new construction of adversarial function sets, which is quite different from the one in [Besbes et al. \(2015\)](#). More specifically, to prove that the regret exhibits “curse of dimensionality”, one needs to construct functions f_1, f_2 that not only have different minima but also “localized” difference (meaning that $f_1(x) = f_2(x)$ for most $x \in \mathcal{X}$) such that $\|f_1 - f_2\|_p$ is small. To construct such adversarial functions, we use the idea of “smoothing splines” from nonparametric statistics that connects two pieces of quadratic functions using a *cubic* function to ensure the smoothness and strong convexity of the constructed functions. Our analytical framework and spline-based lower bound construction could inspire new lower bounds for other online and non-stationary optimization problems.

1.3 Related work

In addition to the literature discussed in the introduction, we briefly review a few additional recent works from machine learning and optimization communities.

Stationary stochastic optimization. The stationary stochastic optimization problem considers a stationary function sequence $f_1 = f_2 = \dots = f_T = f$, and aims at finding a near-optimal solution $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $f(x)$ is close to $f^* = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$. When only noisy function evaluations are available at each epoch, the problem is also known as *zeroth-order optimization* and has received much attention in the optimization and machine learning community. Classical approaches include confidence-band methods ([Agarwal et al., 2013](#)) and pairwise comparison based methods ([Jamieson et al., 2012](#)), both of which achieve $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret with polynomial dependency on domain dimension d . Here in $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ notation we drop poly-logarithmic dependency on T . The tight dependency on d , however, remains open. In the more restrictive *statistical optimization* setting $f(x) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim P}[F(z, x)]$, optimal dependency on d can be attained by the so-called “two-point query” model ([Shamir, 2015](#)).

Online convex optimization. In online convex optimization, an *arbitrary* convex function sequence f_1, \dots, f_T is allowed, and the regret of a policy π is compared against the optimal *stationary* benchmark $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x)\}$ in hindsight. Unlike the stochastic optimization setting, in online convex optimization the full information of f_t is revealed to the optimizing algorithm after epoch t , which allows for exact gradient methods. It is known that for unconstrained online convex optimization, the simplest gradient descent method attains $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret for convex functions, and $O(\log T)$ regret for strongly convex and smooth functions, both of which are optimal in the worst-case sense ([Hazan, 2016](#)). For constrained optimization problems, projection-free methods exist following mirror descent or follow-the-regularized-leader (FTRL) methods ([Hazan & Levy, 2014](#)). [Zinkevich \(2003\)](#); [Hall & Willett \(2015\)](#) considered the question of online convex optimization by competing against the optimal dynamic *solution sequence* x_1^*, \dots, x_T^* subject to certain smoothness constraints like $\sum_t \|x_{t+1}^* - x_t^*\| \leq C$. [Jadbabaie et al. \(2015\)](#); [Mokhtari et al. \(2016\)](#) further imposed the constraint on both solution sequences and function sequences in terms of $L_{\infty,1}$ -variation

and showed that adaptivity to the unknown smoothness parameter V_T is possible with noiseless gradient and the information of $\|f_t - f_{t-1}\|_\infty$. [Daniely et al. \(2015\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2017\)](#) also designed algorithms that *adapt* to the unknown smoothness parameter, under the model that the entire function f_t is revealed after time t . However, the adaptation still remains an open problem in the “bandit” feedback setting considered in our paper, in which only noisy evaluations of $f_t(x_t)$ or $\nabla f_t(x_t)$ are revealed. Under the bandit feedback setting, the function perturbations (e.g., $\|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_\infty$) cannot be easily estimated, making it unclear whether adaptation to V_T is possible.

Bandit convex optimization. Bandit convex optimization is a combination of stochastic optimization and online convex optimization, where the stationary benchmark in hindsight of a sequence of arbitrary convex functions $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x)\}$ is used to evaluate regrets. At each time t , only the function evaluation at the queried point $f_t(x_t)$ (or its noisy version) is revealed to the learning algorithm. Despite its similarity to stochastic and/or online convex optimization, convex bandits are considerably harder due to its lack of first-order information and the arbitrary change of functions. [Flaxman et al. \(2005\)](#) proposed a novel finite-difference gradient estimator, which was adapted by [Hazan & Levy \(2014\)](#) to an ellipsoidal gradient estimator that achieves $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret for constrained smooth and strongly convex bandits problems. For the non-smooth and non-strongly convex bandits problem, the recent work of [Bubeck et al. \(2017\)](#) attains $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret with an explicit algorithm whose regret and running time both depend polynomially on dimension d .

1.4 Notations and basic properties of $\text{Var}_{p,q}$

For a d -dimensional vector we write $\|x\|_p = (\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i|^p)^{1/p}$ to denote the ℓ_p norm of x , for $0 < p < \infty$, and $\|x\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |x_i|$ to denote the ℓ_∞ norm of x . Define $\mathbb{B}_d(r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_2 \leq r\}$ and $\mathbb{S}_d(r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_2 = r\}$ as the d -dimensional ball and sphere of radius r , respectively. We also abbreviate $\mathbb{B}_d = \mathbb{B}_d(1)$ and $\mathbb{S}_d = \mathbb{S}_d(1)$. For a d -dimensional subset $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, denote $\mathcal{X}^\circ = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \exists r > 0, \forall z \in \mathbb{B}_d(r), x + z \in \mathcal{X}\}$ as the *interior* of \mathcal{X} , $\bar{\mathcal{X}} = \{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n : \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{X}\}$ as the *closure* of \mathcal{X} , and $\partial\mathcal{X} = \bar{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}^\circ$ as the *boundary* of \mathcal{X} . For any $r > 0$, we also define $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ = \{x \in \mathcal{X}^\circ : \forall z \in \mathbb{B}_d(r), x + z \in \mathcal{X}\}$ as the “strict interior” of \mathcal{X} , where every point in \mathcal{X}_r° is guaranteed to be at least r away from the boundary of \mathcal{X} .

We note that the $\text{Var}_{p,q}$ defined in (2) is monotonic in p and q , as shown below:

Proposition 1.1. *For any $1 \leq p \leq p' \leq \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq q' \leq \infty$ it holds that $\text{Var}_{p,q}(f) \leq \text{Var}_{p',q'}(f)$. In addition, for any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ we have $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}_{p,q}(f) = \text{Var}_{p,\infty}(f)$, and similarly for any $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ we have $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}_{p,q}(f) = \text{Var}_{\infty,q}(f)$, assuming all functions in f are continuous.*

The proof of Proposition 1.1 is deferred to Section D.1 in the online supplement.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the problem formulation. Section 3 contains the main results and describes the policies. Section 4 presents the proof of our main positive result. The concluding remarks and future works are discussed in Section 6. Additional proofs can be found in the online supplement.

2 Problem formulation

Suppose f_1, \dots, f_T are a sequence of unknown convex differentiable functions supported on a bounded convex set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. At epoch $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, a policy selects a point $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$ (i.e., makes an action) and suffers loss $f_t(x_t)$. Certain feedback $\phi_t(x_t, f_t)$ is then observed which can guide the decision of actions in future epochs. Two types of feedback structures are considered in this work:

- *Noisy gradient feedback*: $\phi_t^G(x_t, f_t) = \nabla f_t(x_t) + \varepsilon_t$, where $\nabla f_t(x_t)$ is the gradient of f_t evaluated at x_t , and ε_t are independent d -dimensional random vectors such that each component ε_{ti} is a random variable with $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{ti}|x_t] = 0$; furthermore, ε_{ti} conditioned on x_t is a sub-Gaussian random variable with parameter σ^2 , meaning that $\mathbb{E}[\exp(a\varepsilon_{ti})|x_t] \leq \exp(a^2\sigma^2/2)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$;
- *Noisy function value feedback*: $\phi_t^F(x_t, f_t) = f_t(x_t) + \varepsilon_t$, where ε_t are independent univariate random variables that satisfy $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t|x_t] = 0$; furthermore, ε_t conditioned on x_t is a sub-Gaussian random variable with parameter σ^2 , meaning that $\mathbb{E}[\exp(a\varepsilon_t)|x_t] \leq \exp(a^2\sigma^2/2)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Both feedback structures are popular in the optimization literature and were considered in previous work on online convex optimization and stochastic bandits (e.g., Hazan (2016) and references therein). For notational convenience, we shall use $\phi_t(x_t, f_t)$ or simply ϕ to refer to a general feedback structure without specifying its type, which can be either $\phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$ or $\phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$.

Apart from \mathcal{X} being closed convex and f_1, \dots, f_T being convex and differentiable, we also make the following additional assumptions on the domain \mathcal{X} and functions f_1, \dots, f_T :

- (A1) (*Bounded domain*): there exists constant $D > 0$ such that $\sup_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}} \|x - x'\|_2 \leq D$;
- (A2) (*Bounded function and gradient*): there exists constant $H > 0$ such that $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f_t(x)| \leq H$ and $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|\nabla f_t(x)\|_2 \leq H$;
- (A3) (*Unique interior optimizer*): there exists unique $x_t^* \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $f_t(x_t^*) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f_t(x)$. Furthermore, the interior of \mathcal{X} is a non-empty set (i.e., $\mathcal{X}^\circ \neq \emptyset$) and there exists $\nu > 0$ such that $\{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|z - x_t^*\|_2 \leq \nu/T\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.
- (A4) (*Smoothness*): there exists constant $L > 0$ such that $f_t(x') \leq f_t(x) + \nabla f_t(x)^\top (x' - x) + \frac{L}{2} \|x' - x\|_2^2$ for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$.
- (A5) (*Strong convexity*): there exists constant $M > 0$ such that $f_t(x') \geq f_t(x) + \nabla f_t(x)^\top (x' - x) + \frac{M}{2} \|x' - x\|_2^2$ for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$.

The assumptions (A1), (A2) are standard assumptions that were imposed in previous works on both stationary and non-stationary stochastic optimization (Flaxman et al., 2005; Agarwal et al., 2013; Shamir, 2015; Besbes et al., 2015). The condition (A3) assumes that the optimal solution x_t^* is not too close to the boundary of the domain \mathcal{X} . Compared to similar assumptions in existing work (Flaxman et al., 2005; Besbes et al., 2015), our assumption is considerably weaker since x_t^* can be within $\Omega(1/T)$ distance to the boundary; while in Flaxman et al. (2005); Besbes et al. (2015), x_t^* must be $\Omega(1)$ distance away from the boundary (i.e., away from the boundary by at least a constant). Finally, the conditions (A4) and (A5) concern second-order properties of f_t and enable smaller regret rates for gradient descent algorithms. We note that the condition $MI_d \preceq \nabla^2 f_t(x) \preceq$

$LI_d, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}$ in Besbes et al. (2015) (see Eq. (10) in Besbes et al. (2015)) is stronger and implies our (A4) and (A5) since we do not assume that f_t is twice differentiable. We also consider parameters D, ν, H, L, M in (A1)–(A5) and domain dimensionality d as constants throughout the paper and omit their (polynomial) multiplicative dependency in regret bounds. In Section 3.2, we further relax the assumptions (A3)–(A5) and provide upper bound results for general convex function sequences.

Let U be a random quantity defined over a probability space. A policy π that outputs a sequence of x_1, \dots, x_T is *admissible* if it is a measurable function that can be written in the following form:

$$x_t = \begin{cases} \pi_1(U), & t = 1; \\ \pi_t(U, x_1, \phi_1(x_1, f_1), \dots, x_{t-1}, \phi_{t-1}(x_{t-1}, f_{t-1})), & t = 2, \dots, T, \end{cases}$$

Let \mathcal{P}_T^π denote the class of all admissible policies for T epochs. A widely used metric for evaluating the performance of an admissible policy π is the regret against dynamic oracle $\{x_t^*\}_{t=1}^T$:

$$\sup_{f=(f_1, \dots, f_T) \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)} R_\phi^\pi(f) := \mathbb{E}^\pi \left[\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) \right] - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t^*), \quad x_t^* = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f_t(x). \quad (4)$$

Here ϕ is either the noisy gradient feedback $\phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$ or the noisy function feedback $\phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$. Note that a unique minimizer $x_t^* \in \mathcal{X}$ exists due to the strong convexity of f_t (condition A5). The goal of this paper is to characterize the optimal regret:

$$\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_T^\pi} \sup_{f=(f_1, \dots, f_T) \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)} R_\phi^\pi(f), \quad (5)$$

and find policies that achieve the rate-optimal regret, i.e., attain the optimal regret up to a polynomial of $\log(T)$ factor. The optimal regret in (5) is also known as the *minimax regret* in the literature, because it minimizes over all admissible policies and maximizes over all convex function sequences $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$.

3 Main results

We establish theorems giving both upper and lower bounds on worst-case regret for both noisy gradient feedback $\phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$ and noisy function feedback $\phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$ over $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$. The policies for achieving the following upper bound result will be introduced in the next section.

Theorem 3.1 (Upper bound for strongly-convex function sequences). *Fix arbitrary $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q < \infty$. Suppose (A1) through (A5) hold, and $0 \leq V_T \leq 1$. Then there exists a computationally efficient policy π and $C_1 = g_1(\log T, \log V_T, d, D, \nu, L, H, M) > 0$ for some function g_1 that is a polynomial function in $\log T$ and $\log V_T$, such that*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)} R_\phi^\pi(f) \leq C_1 \cdot \max \left\{ T \cdot V_T^{2p/(4p+d)}, \log T \right\} \quad \text{for noisy gradient feedback } \phi = \phi_t^G(x_t, f_t).$$

For the noisy function value feedback, there exists another computationally efficient policy π' and $C_2 = g_2(\log T, \log V_T, d, D, \nu, L, H, M) > 0$ for some function g_2 that is a polynomial function in $\log T$ and $\log V_T$, such that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)} R_{\phi'}^{\pi'}(f) \leq C_2 \cdot \max \left\{ T \cdot V_T^{2p/(6p+d)}, \sqrt{T} \right\} \quad \text{for noisy function value feedback } \phi = \phi_t^F(x_t, f_t).$$

Theorem 3.2 (Minimax lower bound for strongly-convex function sequences). *Suppose the same conditions hold as in Theorem 3.1. Then there exists a constant $C_3 = g_3(d, D, \nu, L, H, M) > 0$ independent of T and V_T such that*

$$\inf_{\pi} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)} R_{\phi}^{\pi}(f) \geq C_3 \cdot \begin{cases} \max\{T \cdot V_T^{2p/(4p+d)}, \log T\} & \text{for } \phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}(x_t, f_t); \\ \max\{T \cdot V_T^{2p/(6p+d)}, \sqrt{T}\} & \text{for } \phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t). \end{cases}$$

In Theorem 3.1, the quantities C_1 and C_2 depend on T and V_T only via poly-logarithmic factors and these poly-log factors are usually not the focus of studying the regret. In Theorem 3.2 the quantity C_3 is independent of T and V_T . The other problem dependent parameters are treated as constants throughout the paper. The proof of Theorem 3.1 is given in Sec. 4, while the proofs of Theorem 3.2 is relegated to the online supplement.

The condition $V_T \leq 1$ in both Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 is necessary for obtaining a non-trivial sub-linear regret. In particular, the lower bound results in Theorem 3.2 show that for $V_T = \Omega(1)$, no algorithm can achieve sub-linear regret in either feedback models. On the other hand, a trivial algorithm that outputs $x_1 = \dots = x_T = x_0$ for an arbitrary $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ leads to a linear regret.

Both upper and lower regret bounds in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 consist of two terms. The $\log T$ term for $\phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}(x_t, f_t)$ and \sqrt{T} term for $\phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t)$ arise from regret bounds for *stationary* stochastic optimization problems (i.e., $V_T = 0$), which were proved in Jamieson et al. (2012); Hazan & Kale (2014). The other terms involving polynomial dependency on V_T are the main regret terms for typical dynamic function sequences whose perturbation V_T is not too small.

We also remark that the q parameter does *not* affect the optimal rate of convergence in Theorem 3.2 (provided that $q \geq 1$ is assumed for convexity of the norms). While this appears counter-intuitive, this is a property of our worst-case analytical framework, as the function sequence that leads to the worst-case regret is the one that distributes function changes $\|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p$ evenly across all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ (see for example our detailed construction of adversarial function sequences in the online supplement), in which case the $L_{p,q}$ -variation measure is the same for all $q \in [1, \infty]$.

Remark 3.1 (Comparing with Besbes et al. (2015)). Besbes et al. (2015) considered the special case of $p = \infty$ and $q = 1$, and established the following result:

$$\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_T^{\pi}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)} R_{\phi}^{\pi}(f) \asymp \begin{cases} T \cdot V_T^{1/2}, & \phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}(x_t, f_t) \\ T \cdot V_T^{1/3}, & \phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t) \end{cases} \quad \text{for } p = \infty, q = 1. \quad (6)$$

Note that in Eq. (6) we adopt a slightly different notation from Besbes et al. (2015). In particular, the parameter V_T in our paper is $1/T$ times the parameter V_T in (Besbes et al., 2015). Such normalization is for presentation clarity only (to single out the T term in the regret bounds).

It is clear that our results reduce to Eq. (6) as $p \rightarrow \infty$ for both $\phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}(x_t, f_t)$ and $\phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t)$. In particular, for fixed domain dimension d we have that $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} 2p/(4p+d) = 1/2$ and $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} 2p/(6p+d) = 1/3$, matching regrets in Eq. (6). Therefore, the result from Besbes et al. (2015) (for strongly convex function sequences) is a special case of our results.

Remark 3.2 (Curse of dimensionality). A significant difference between $p = \infty$ and $p < \infty$ settings is the *curse of dimensionality*. In particular, when $p < \infty$ the (optimal) regret depends *exponentially* on dimension d , while for $p = \infty$ the dependency on V_T is independent of d on the exponent. The curse of dimensionality is a well-known phenomenon in non-parametric statistical estimation (Tsybakov, 2009).

Below we first introduce the policies, which is based on a “meta-policy” in Besbes et al. (2015).

3.1 Policies

We first describe a “meta-policy” proposed in [Besbes et al. \(2015\)](#) based on a re-starting procedure:

META-POLICY (RESTARTING PROCEDURE): input parameters T and Δ_T ; sub-policy π_s .

1. Divide epochs $\{1, \dots, T\}$ into $J = \lceil T/\Delta_T \rceil$ batches B_1, \dots, B_J such that $B_1 = \{\underline{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_1\}$, $B_2 = \{\underline{b}_2, \dots, \bar{b}_2\}$, etc., with $\underline{b}_1 = 1$, $\bar{b}_J = T$ and $\underline{b}_{\ell+1} = \bar{b}_\ell + 1$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, J-1$. The epochs are divided as evenly as possible, so that $|B_\ell| \in \{\Delta_T, \Delta_T + 1\}$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, J$.
2. For each batch B_ℓ , $\ell = 1, \dots, J$, do the following:
 - (a) Run sub-policy π_s with \underline{b}_ℓ and \bar{b}_ℓ , corresponding to $f_{\underline{b}_\ell}, f_{\underline{b}_\ell+1}, \dots, f_{\bar{b}_\ell}$.

The key idea behind the meta-policy is to “restart” certain sub-policy π_s after Δ_T epochs. This strategy ensures that the sub-policy π_s has sufficient number of epochs to exploit feedback information, while at the same time avoids usage of outdated feedback information. For the noisy gradient feedback $\phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$, we set $\Delta_T = T$ if $V_T = O(T^{-(4p+d)/2p})$ and $\Delta_T \asymp V_T^{-2p/(4p+d)}$ otherwise; for the noisy function value feedback $\phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$, we set $\Delta_T = T$ if $V_T = O(T^{-(6p+d)/4p})$ and $\Delta_T \asymp V_T^{-4p/(6p+d)}$ otherwise. Motivations of our scalings are given in [Sec. 4](#) in which we prove [Theorem 3.1](#).

The sub-policy π_s is carefully designed to exploit information provided from different types of feedback structures. For noisy gradient feedback $\phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$, a simple online gradient descent (OGD, see, e.g., [Besbes et al. \(2015\)](#); [Hazan \(2016\)](#)) policy is used:

SUB-POLICY π_s^G (OGD): input parameters $\underline{b}_\ell, \bar{b}_\ell$; step sizes $\{\eta_t\}_{t=1}^T$.

1. Select arbitrary $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$.
2. For $t = 0$ to $\bar{b}_\ell - \underline{b}_\ell$ do the following:
 - (a) Suffer loss $f_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}(x_t)$ and obtain feedback $\hat{g}_t = \phi_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}^G(x_t, f_{\underline{b}_\ell+t})$.
 - (b) Compute $x_{t+1} = P_{\mathcal{X}}(x_t - \eta_t \hat{g}_t)$, where $P_{\mathcal{X}}(x) = \arg \min_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \|z - x\|_2$.

For noisy function value feedback $\phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$, the classical approach is to first obtain an estimator of the gradient $\nabla f_t(x_t)$ by perturbing x_t along a random coordinate $e_j = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This idea originates from the seminal work of [Yudin & Nemirovskii \(1983\)](#) and was applied to convex bandits problems (e.g., [Flaxman et al. \(2005\)](#); [Besbes et al. \(2015\)](#)). Such an approach, however, fails to deliver the optimal rate of regret when the optimal solution x_t^* lies particularly close to the boundary of the domain \mathcal{X} . Here we describe a regularized ellipsoidal (RE) algorithm from [Hazan & Levy \(2014\)](#), which attains the optimal rate of regret even when x_t^* is very close to $\partial\mathcal{X}$.

The RE algorithm in [Hazan & Levy \(2014\)](#) is based on the idea of *self-concordant barriers*:

Definition 3.1 (self-concordant barrier). *Suppose $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is convex and $\mathcal{X}^\circ \neq \emptyset$. A convex function $\varphi : \mathcal{X}^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a κ -self-concordant barrier of \mathcal{X} if it is three times continuously differentiable on*

\mathcal{X}° and has the following properties:

1. For any $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\circ$, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \in \partial\mathcal{X}$ then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n) = +\infty$.
2. For any $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}^\circ$ it holds that $|\nabla^3\varphi(x)[z, z, z]| \leq 2|z^\top \nabla^2\varphi(x)z|^{3/2}$ and $|z^\top \nabla\varphi(x)| \leq \kappa^{1/2}|z^\top \nabla^2\varphi(x)z|^{1/2}$, where $\nabla^3\varphi(x)[z, z, z] = \frac{\partial^3}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2 \partial t_3} \varphi(x + t_1 z + t_2 z + t_3 z) \Big|_{t_1=t_2=t_3=0}$.

It is well-known that for any convex set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with non-empty interior \mathcal{X}° , there exists a κ -self-concordant barrier function φ with $\kappa = O(d)$, and furthermore for bounded \mathcal{X} the barrier φ can be selected such that it is strictly convex; i.e., $\nabla^2\varphi(x) \succ 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}^\circ$ (Nesterov & Nemirovskii, 1994; Boyd & Vandenberghe, 2004). For example, for linear constraints $\mathcal{X} = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$ with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, a logarithmic barrier function $\varphi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m -\log(b_i - a_i x)$ can be used to satisfy all the above properties (note that a_i denotes the i -th row of A).

We are now ready to describe the RE sub-policy that handles noisy function value feedback. The policy is similar to the algorithm proposed in Hazan & Levy (2014), except that *noisy* function value feedback is allowed in our policy, while Hazan & Levy (2014) considered only exact function evaluations. The analysis of our policy is also more involved for dealing with noise.

SUB-POLICY $\pi_s^{\mathcal{F}}$ (RE): input parameters $\underline{b}_\ell, \bar{b}_\ell$; constant step size η ; self-concordant barrier φ ;

1. Select $y_0 = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(y)$;
2. For $t = 0$ to $\bar{b}_\ell - \underline{b}_\ell$ do the following:
 - (a) Compute $A_t = (\nabla^2\varphi(y_t) + \eta M(t+1)I_d)^{-1/2}$, where I_d is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.
 - (b) Sample u_t from the uniform distribution on the unit d -dimensional sphere \mathbb{S}_d .
 - (c) Select $x_{\underline{b}_\ell+t} = y_t + A_t u_t$; suffer loss $f_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}(x_{\underline{b}_\ell+t})$ and obtain feedback $\phi_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}^{\mathcal{F}}(x_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}, f_{\underline{b}_\ell+t})$.
 - (d) Compute gradient estimate $\hat{g}_t = d \cdot \phi_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}^{\mathcal{F}}(x_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}, f_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}) \cdot A_t^{-1} u_t$.
 - (e) FTRL update: $y_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \{\hat{g}_\tau^\top y + \frac{M}{2} \|y - y_\tau\|_2^2\} + \eta^{-1} \varphi(y)$.

In step 2(d), the gradient estimate $\hat{g}_t = d \cdot \phi_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}^{\mathcal{F}}(x_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}, f_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}) \cdot A_t^{-1} u_t$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_t] \approx \nabla f_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}(y_t)$ by the change-of-variable formula and the smoothness of $f_{\underline{b}_\ell+t}$. In step 2(e), instead of the projected gradient step, a Follow-The-Regularized-Leader (FTRL) step is executed to prevent y_{t+1} from being too close to the boundary of \mathcal{X} . The FTRL step is essentially a mirror descent, which uses a regularization term ($\varphi(\cdot)$ in our policy) and its associated Bregman divergence to improve the convergence rates of optimization algorithms measured in non-standard metric. It was shown in McMahan (2017) (Sec. 6) that the FTRL step is equivalent to mirror descent under minimal regularity conditions. Finally, step 2(c) is a random perturbation step originally considered in (Hazan & Levy, 2014). An important aspect of step 2(c) is the clever choice of the matrix A_t , which ensures the optimal regret bound even if the optimal solution x_t^* is very close to the boundary of \mathcal{X} . More specifically, the following proposition shows that $x_{\underline{b}_\ell+t} = y_t + A_t u_t$ always belongs to the domain \mathcal{X} , justifying the correctness of policy $\pi_s^{\mathcal{F}}$. Its proof is given in the online supplement.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose φ is strictly convex on \mathcal{X}^o . Then for any $x \in \mathcal{X}^o$, $\delta \geq 0$ and $u \in \mathbb{S}_d$, $x + (\nabla^2 \varphi(x) + \delta I_d)^{-1/2} u \in \mathcal{X}$.*

3.2 Extension to general convex function sequences

In this section we show that for the noisy gradient feedback case $\phi_t = \phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}$, our upper bound can be extended to *general* convex functions that do not necessarily satisfy smoothness (A4) or strong convexity (A5). The assumption (A3) that requires unique interior minimizer can also be removed. Our result is summarized in the following theorem:

Theorem 3.3 (Upper bound for general convex function sequences). *Fix arbitrary $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q < \infty$. Suppose (A1) through (A2) hold, and $0 \leq V_T \leq 1$. Also suppose that the meta-policy is carried out with the OGD sub-policy $\pi_s^{\mathcal{G}}$ and step sizes $\eta_t = 1/\sqrt{t}$. Then there exists $C_4 = g_4(\log T, \log V_T, d, D, \nu, H) > 0$ for some function g_4 that is also a polynomial function in $\log T$ and $\log V_T$, such that*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)} R_{\phi}^{\pi}(f) \leq C_4 \cdot \max \left\{ T \cdot V_T^{p/(3p+d)}, \sqrt{T} \right\}.$$

We remark that as $p \rightarrow \infty$, the regret upper bound derived in Theorem 3.3 approaches $T \cdot V_T^{1/3}$, which matches the result in Besbes et al. (2015) for the $p = \infty, q = 1$ case. Since $T \cdot V_T^{1/3}$ is proved to be optimal for the $p = \infty, q = 1$ case in Besbes et al. (2015), this implies the optimality of our Theorem 3.3 for the $p = \infty, q = 1$ case as well. However, for $1 \leq p < \infty$, it is still an open question on establishing a tight minimax lower bound.

The structure of the proof of Theorem 3.3 is similar to the one for Theorem 3.1. It is important to note that since strong convexity is no longer assumed, the important ‘‘affinity lemma’’ cannot be proved by analyzing $\|x_t^* - x_{\tau}^*\|_2$. Instead, we prove another version of ‘‘affinity lemma’’ (see Lemma C.2 in Sec. C) by developing new strategies that directly bound perturbation of function values. The proof of Theorem 3.3 is provided in Sec. C in the supplement.

Also note that for the general convex setting with noisy function value feedback, even the case of $p = \infty$ remains a challenging open problem (see Besbes et al. (2015)); which is left as future work.

4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

In this section we provide the complete proof of our main positive result (upper bound) in Theorem 3.1 for strongly smooth and convex function sequences f_1, \dots, f_T . Due to space constraints, the proofs of Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 as well as Lemma 4.1 are presented in the online supplement.

Our proof of Theorem 3.1 is roughly divided into three steps. In the first step, we review existing results for the OGD and the RE algorithms on upper bounding the weak regret against *stationary* benchmarks. In the second step, we present a novel local integration analysis that upper bounds the gap between regret against stationary and dynamic benchmarks using the L_p -norm difference between two smooth and strongly convex functions. Finally, we use a sequence of Hölder’s inequality to analyze the restarting procedure in the meta-policy described in the previous section.

4.1 Regret against stationary benchmarks.

For a sequence of convex functions $f = (f_1, \dots, f_{T'})$, an admissible policy π and a feedback structure ϕ , the *weak regret* against any stationary point $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ is defined as

$$S_\phi^\pi(f; x^*) := \mathbb{E}^\pi \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T'} f_t(x_t) \right] - \sum_{t=1}^{T'} f_t(x^*). \quad (7)$$

Compared to the regret against dynamic solution sequence R_ϕ^π defined in Eq. (5), in S_ϕ^π the benchmark solution x^* is forced to be *stationary* among all T' epochs, resulting in smaller regret. In fact, it always holds that $S_\phi^\pi(f; x^*) \leq R_\phi^\pi(f)$ for any f and $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$. In the remainder of this section, we shall refer to S_ϕ^π as the “weak regret” and R_ϕ^π as the “strong regret”.

The next lemma states existing results on upper bounding the weak regret of both OGD and RE policies for *adversarial* function sequences f . The result for OGD is folklore and documented in Hazan (2016); Besbes et al. (2015). For the RE algorithm, we extend the weak regret bound in Hazan & Levy (2014) from the exact function value feedbacks to noisy feedbacks and establish the following lemma. The proof of Lemma 4.1 is deferred to Section A in the online supplement.

Lemma 4.1. *Fix $1 \leq T' \leq T$. Let $f = (f_1, \dots, f_{T'})$ be an arbitrary sequence of smooth and strongly convex functions satisfying (A1) through (A5). For noisy gradient feedback and the OGD policy, the following holds with $\eta_t = 1/Mt$:*

$$S_\phi^\pi(f; x^*) = O(\log T'), \quad \text{for } \phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}(x_t, f_t), \quad \pi = \pi_s^{\mathcal{G}} \text{ and all } x^* \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (8)$$

In addition, for noisy function value feedback and the RE policy, suppose φ is a strictly convex κ -self-concordant barrier of \mathcal{X} , with $\kappa = O(d)$, and $\eta = d(H + 10\sigma\sqrt{\log T})/\sqrt{2T'}$. Then

$$S_\phi^\pi(f; x^*) = O(\sqrt{T' \log T}), \quad \text{for } \phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t), \quad \pi = \pi_s^{\mathcal{F}} \text{ and all } x^* \in \mathcal{X}_{\nu/T}^o. \quad (9)$$

Recall the definition that $\mathcal{X}_{\nu/T}^o := \{x \in \mathcal{X}^o : \forall z \in \mathbb{B}_d(\nu/T), x + z \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is the strict interior of \mathcal{X} that is at least ν/T apart from $\partial\mathcal{X}$. Also, in both results we omit dependency on σ, d, D, ν, H, L and M .

We note that when using this Lemma 9 in our later proofs, we will replace x^* in (8) and (9) by x_t^* , which is the minimizer of f_t . For (8), it is easy to see that $x_t^* \in \mathcal{X}$; and for (9), by Assumption (A3) and the definition of $\mathcal{X}_{\nu/T}^o$, we have $x_t^* \in \mathcal{X}_{\nu/T}^o$.

4.2 Gap between weak and strong regret.

By definition, the gap between S_ϕ^π and R_ϕ^π is independent of policy π :

$$R_\phi^\pi(f) - S_\phi^\pi(f; x_\tau^*) = \sum_{t=1}^{T'} f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_t^*), \quad \forall \tau \in \{1, \dots, T'\}. \quad (10)$$

Eq. (10) shows that it is possible to upper bound the regret gap by the two-point difference of each function f_t evaluated at the optimal solution x_t^* of f_t and the optimal solution x_τ^* of f_τ , for arbitrary




Figure 1: The left figure illustrates how two functions f and g can have very different L_p and L_∞ differences ($1 \leq p < \infty$). Both functions are defined on $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$, with $f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\epsilon}} \exp\left\{-\frac{(x-0.5)^2}{2\epsilon^2}\right\}$ and $g \equiv 0$. Because f is the pdf of a univariate Normal distribution with zero mean and ϵ^2 variance, f and g are essentially the same outside of $[0.5 - 3\epsilon, 0.5 + 3\epsilon]$, leading to $\|f - g\|_p \leq O(\epsilon^{1/p}) \cdot \|f - g\|_\infty = O(\epsilon^{(1-p)/p})$, which can be arbitrarily smaller than $\|f - g\|_\infty = \Omega(\epsilon^{-1})$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$ and ϵ sufficiently small. The right figure provides a graphical explanation of the key argument in the proof of Lemma 4.2. It shows that when x_t^* is far away from x_τ^* , f_t and f_τ would have a large difference in a neighborhood around x_t^* , because of the strong convexity of f_τ and the smoothness of f_t . Since such difference is upper bounded by $\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p$ on the entire domain \mathcal{X} , one can conclude that x_t^* and x_τ^* cannot be too far apart.

$\tau \in \{1, \dots, T'\}$. Such differences, however, can be large as x_t^* could be far away from x_τ^* as the functions drift. In the special case of $p = \infty$, Besbes et al. (2015) observes

$$f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_t^*) = f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_\tau(x_\tau^*) + f_\tau(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_t^*) \leq f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_\tau(x_\tau^*) + f_\tau(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_t^*) \quad (11)$$

and further bounds both $|f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_\tau(x_\tau^*)|$ and $|f_\tau(x_t^*) - f_t(x_t^*)|$ with $\|f_t - f_\tau\|_\infty$. Such arguments, however, meet significant challenges in the more general setting when $1 \leq p < \infty$, because the difference between two functions at one point can be arbitrarily larger than the L_p -norm of the difference of the two functions. We give an illustrative example in Figure 1, where two functions f and g are presented, with $\|f - g\|_p / |f(x) - g(x)| \rightarrow 0$ for $x = 0.5$ and $p < \infty$.

In this paper we give an alternative analysis that directly upper bounds the left-hand side of Eq. (11), $f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_t^*)$ (i.e., the difference of the same function f_t at two points) using $\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p$. The following is our key affinity lemma:

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Fix $1 \leq p < \infty$, $t \neq \tau$ and let x_t^*, x_τ^* be the minimizers of f_t and f_τ , respectively. Then under (A1) through (A5) we have that*

$$\max\{|f_t(x_t^*) - f_t(x_\tau^*)|, |f_\tau(x_t^*) - f_\tau(x_\tau^*)|\} = O(\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^r) \quad \text{where } r = \frac{2p}{2p + d} \in (0, 1).$$

Proof. Proof of Lemma 4.2. Without loss of generality we assume $f_t(x_t^*) \leq f_\tau(x_\tau^*)$ throughout this proof. Define $\delta = \|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^{r/2}$. We first prove that $\|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|_2 \leq 2C\delta$, where $C = \max\{\sqrt{(4D^{d/p} + 2L)/M}, 1\}$.

Assume by way of contradiction that $\|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|_2 > 2C\delta$. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}^\circ$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ define $\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x) := \{x + \rho(y - x) : 0 \leq \rho \leq \alpha, y \in \partial\mathcal{X}\}$. It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\sup_{x' \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha(x)} \|x' - x\|_2 \leq \alpha D$ (recall that $D = \sup_{y, y' \in \mathcal{X}} \|y - y'\|_2$ is the diameter of \mathcal{X}). In addition, $\text{vol}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x)) \geq \alpha^d \cdot \text{vol}(\mathcal{X})$, because $\mathcal{X} - x \subseteq \alpha^{-1}[\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x) - x]$, where $\mathcal{X} - x = \{z - x : z \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is the deflation of \mathcal{X} by a specific vector, and similarly $\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x) - x = \{z - x : z \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha(x)\}$. Now set $\alpha = \delta/D$, and note that $\alpha < 1/2$ because $D \geq \|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|_2 > 2C\delta \geq 2\delta$. By strong convexity of f_τ , we have $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*)$,

$$f_\tau(x) \geq f_\tau(x_\tau^*) + \frac{M}{2} \|x_\tau^* - x\|_2^2 \geq f_t(x_t^*) + \frac{M}{2} \|x_\tau^* - x\|_2^2 \quad (12)$$

$$\geq f_t(x_t^*) + \frac{M}{2} (2C\delta - \delta)^2 \geq f_t(x_t^*) + \frac{MC^2}{2} \delta^2. \quad (13)$$

Here Eq. (12) holds because $f_\tau(x_\tau^*) \geq f_t(x_t^*)$, and Eq. (13) is true because $\|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|_2 > 2C\delta$ and $\|x - x_t^*\|_2 \leq \alpha D = \delta \leq C\delta$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*)$. On the other hand, by smoothness of f_t , we have that

$$f_t(x) \leq f_t(x_t^*) + \frac{L}{2} \|x - x_t^*\|_2^2 \leq f_t(x_t^*) + L\delta^2 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*). \quad (14)$$

Combining Eqs. (13,14) we have that, for arbitrary $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*)$

$$|f_\tau(x) - f_t(x)|^p \geq \left| \left(f_t(x_t^*) + \frac{MC^2}{2} \delta^2 \right) - (f_t(x_t^*) + L\delta^2) \right|^p \geq (MC^2/2 - L)^p \delta^{2p}, \quad (15)$$

provided that $L \leq MC^2/2$, which holds true because $C \geq \sqrt{2L/M}$ by definition. Integrating both sides of Eq. (15) on $\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*)$ and recalling the definition of $\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^p &= \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |f_t(x) - f_\tau(x)|^p dx \geq \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \int_{\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*)} |f_t(x) - f_\tau(x)|^p dx \\ &\geq \frac{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*))}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{X})} \cdot (MC^2/2 - L)^p \delta^{2p} \geq \frac{\delta^d}{D^d} \cdot (MC^2/2 - L)^p \delta^{2p} \\ &\geq \frac{(MC^2/2 - L)^p}{D^d} \delta^{2p+d} = \frac{(MC^2/2 - L)^p}{D^d} \|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^p, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because $\delta = \|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^{r/2}$ and $(2p + d) \cdot r/2 = p$. With $C \geq \sqrt{(4D^d/p + 2L)/M}$, we have that $(MC^2/2 - L)^p/D^d \geq 2^d > 1$ and hence the contradiction.

We have now established that $\|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|_2 \leq 2C\delta \leq O(\delta)$. By smoothness of f_t and f_τ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(x_t^*) &\leq f_t(x_\tau^*) \leq f_t(x_t^*) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|_2^2 \leq f_t(x_t^*) + O(\delta^2); \\ f_\tau(x_\tau^*) &\leq f_\tau(x_t^*) \leq f_\tau(x_\tau^*) + \frac{L}{2} \|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|_2^2 \leq f_\tau(x_\tau^*) + O(\delta^2). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 4.2 is then completed by plugging in $\delta = \|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^{r/2}$. \square

4.3 Analysis of the re-starting procedure.

We focus on the noisy gradient feedback $\phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}(x_t, f_t)$ first and briefly remark at the end of this section on how to handle noisy function value feedback. Recall that the T epochs are divided into J batches

B_1, \dots, B_J in the meta-policy, with each batch having either Δ_T or $\Delta_T + 1$ epochs. Applying Lemmas 4.1, 4.2 together with Eq. (10) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_\phi^\pi(f) &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^J \inf_{\tau \in B_\ell} \left\{ S_\phi^\pi(f_{\underline{b}_\ell}, \dots, f_{\bar{b}_\ell}; x_\tau^*) + \sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell} f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_t^*) \right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^J O(\log |B_\ell|) + |B_\ell| \cdot \sup_{t, \tau \in B_\ell} |f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_t^*)| \\
&\leq O\left(\frac{T}{\Delta_T} \cdot \log \Delta_T\right) + O(\Delta_T) \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^J \sup_{t, \tau \in B_\ell} \|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^r \\
&\leq O\left(\frac{T \log T}{\Delta_T}\right) + O(\Delta_T) \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^J \left(\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p \right)^r. \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality holds because (assuming without loss of generality that $\underline{b}_\ell \leq t \leq \tau \leq \bar{b}_\ell$) $\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p \leq \sum_{k=t}^{\tau-1} \|f_{k+1} - f_k\|_p \leq \sum_{k=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{k+1} - f_k\|_p$.

We next present another key lemma that upper bounds the critical summation term in Eq. (16) using J , Δ_T and $\text{Var}_{p,q}(f)$. The proof is based on consecutively applying the Hölder's inequality.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose $\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq J} |B_\ell| \leq \Delta_T + 1$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $\text{Var}_{p,q}(f) \leq V_T$. Then*

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^J \left(\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p \right)^r \leq \Delta_T^{r-r/q} \cdot J^{1-r/q} \cdot T^{r/q} \cdot V_T^r.$$

Proof. Proof of Lemma 4.3. By Hölder's inequality, for any d -dimensional vector x we have that

$$\|x\|_\alpha \leq \|x\|_\beta \leq d^{1/\beta-1/\alpha} \|x\|_\alpha \quad \forall 0 < \beta \leq \alpha \leq \infty. \tag{17}$$

Apply Eq. (17) with $\alpha = q$ and $\beta = 1$ on $x = (\|f_{\underline{b}_\ell+1} - f_{\underline{b}_\ell}\|_p, \dots, \|f_{\bar{b}_\ell} - f_{\bar{b}_\ell-1}\|_p) \in \mathbb{R}^{|B_\ell|-1}$:

$$\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p = \|x\|_1 \leq |B_\ell - 1|^{1-1/q} \|x\|_q \leq \Delta_T^{1-1/q} \cdot \left(\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

Subsequently,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^J \left(\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p \right)^r \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^J \Delta_T^{r-r/q} \cdot \left(\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q \right)^{r/q}. \tag{18}$$

We next consider $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_J) \in \mathbb{R}^J$, where $\tilde{x}_\ell = \sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q$. Apply Eq. (17) with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = r/q$ on \tilde{x} ($\beta < 1$ because $r \in (0, 1)$ and $q \geq 1$):

$$\left[\sum_{\ell=1}^J \left(\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q \right)^{r/q} \right]^{q/r} = \|\tilde{x}\|_{r/q} \leq J^{1/\beta-1/\alpha} \cdot \|\tilde{x}\|_1 = J^{q/r-1} \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^J \sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q.$$

Raise both sides of the inequality to the power of r/q and note that $\sum_{\ell=1}^J \sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q = \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q \leq T \cdot V_T^q$. We then have

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^J \left(\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p \right)^{r/q} \leq J^{1-r/q} \cdot \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^J \sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q \right)^{r/q} \leq J^{1-r/q} T^{r/q} V_T^r. \quad (19)$$

Combining Eqs. (18,19) we proved the desired lemma. \square

4.4 Completing the proof

We now prove Theorem 3.1 by combining Lemmas 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 with Eq. (16) and setting Δ_T appropriately. First consider the noisy gradient feedback case $\phi_t^G(x_t, f_t) = \nabla f_t(x_t) + \varepsilon_t$. By Eq. (16),

$$R_\phi^\pi(f) \leq O\left(\frac{T \log T}{\Delta_T}\right) + O(\Delta_T) \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^J \left(\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p \right)^r.$$

Subsequently invoking Lemma 4.3 we have

$$R_\phi^\pi(f) \leq O(J \log T) + O(\Delta_T^{1+r-r/q} J^{1-r/q} T^{r/q} V_T^r),$$

where $J = O(T/\Delta_T)$. If $V_T = O(T^{-(4p+d)/2p})$, then we set $\Delta_T = T$, $J = 1$ and obtain regret $O(\log T) + O(T^{1+r} V_T^r) = O(\log T)$. Otherwise, when $V_T = \omega(T^{-(4p+d)/2p})$, one selects $\Delta_T \asymp V_T^{-r/(r+1)} = V_T^{-2p/(4p+d)}$ and notes that $\Delta_T = o(T)$. This yields a regret of $\tilde{O}(T \cdot V_T^{2p/(4p+d)})$, where in $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ we drop poly-logarithmic dependency on T .

Finally we describe how the above analysis can be generalized to the noisy function value feedback case $\phi_t^F(x_t, f_t) = f_t(x_t) + \varepsilon_t$. By Lemma 4.1, $S_\phi^\pi(f_{\underline{b}_\ell}, \dots, f_{\bar{b}_\ell}; x_\tau^*) \leq O(\sqrt{|B_\ell| \log T}) \leq O(\sqrt{\Delta_T \log T})$ for $\phi = \phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$. Subsequently,

$$R_\phi^\pi(f) \leq O(J \sqrt{\Delta_T \log T}) + O(\Delta_T^{1+r-r/q} J^{1-r/q} T^{r/q} V_T^r).$$

If $V_T = O(T^{-(6p+d)/4p})$, then we set $\Delta_T = T$, $J = 1$ and obtain regret $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T}) + O(T^{1+r} V_T^r) = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$. Otherwise, when $V_T = \omega(T^{-(6p+d)/4p})$, one selects $\Delta_T \asymp V_T^{-2r/(2r+1)} = V_T^{-4p/(6p+d)}$ and observes that $\Delta_T = o(T)$. This yields a regret of $\tilde{O}(T \cdot V_T^{2p/(6p+d)})$.

5 Numerical results

We compare our restarting procedure under $L_{p,q}$ -variation measure with the algorithm in Besbes et al. (2015). We choose $V_T = 1/T$, $q = 1$, and let p take values in $\{1, 2\}$ to demonstrate performance in terms of the accumulated regret. The underlying function sequence $f = (f_1, \dots, f_T)$ is constructed using the adversarial construction in Sec. B which is also used to prove our lower regret bound (see Theorem 3.2). In particular, we use the function constructions in Eqs. (29,30,32) and its multi-variate extension in Eq. (33) in the online supplement.

In our simulations, both the OGD and the RE algorithm (after each restarting point) are initialized at $x_0 = (1/2d, \dots, 1/2d)$, making it at the center of the domain $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \geq 0, 1^\top x \leq 1\}$.




Figure 2: Accumulated regret for the OGD method (left column) using noisy gradient feedback, and the RE method (right column) using noisy function value feedback. The red curve corresponds to restarted OGD/RE with our defined L_p variation measure, with $p \in \{1, 2\}$ depending on how the underlying function sequence is synthesized; the blue curve corresponds to restarted OGD/RE using only the L_∞ variation measure in (Besbes et al., 2015). From top to bottom three different synthesis settings of the underlying function sequence are considered: univariate functions with L_1 variation, bivariate functions with L_1 variation, and univariate functions with L_2 variation.

For OGD, the step size is set as $\eta_t = 1/(t + 1)$; for the RE algorithm, we use the log-barrier function $\varphi(x) = -\sum_{i=1}^d \log(x_i) - \log(1 - \mathbf{1}^\top x)$ with step size rules $\eta = 50/\sqrt{T' + 1}$, where T' is the number of iterations between two restarting points. For the restarting OGD/RE algorithm with L_p -variation (red lines in Figure 2), the restarting points are selected using V_T and p directly (more specifically, $\Delta_T = \lceil V_T^{-2p/(4p+d)} \rceil$ or $\Delta_T = \lceil V_T^{-4p/(6p+d)} \rceil$). For the restarting OGD/RE algorithm in Besbes et al. (2015), we first utilize the knowledge of the underlying function sequence to calculate the L_∞ -variation measure $\tilde{V}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_\infty$, and then set the restarting points using the rules $\Delta_T = \lceil \tilde{V}_T^{-1/2} \rceil$ or $\Delta_T = \lceil \tilde{V}_T^{-2/3} \rceil$ according to Besbes et al. (2015).

Figure 2 plots the accumulated regret of our compared algorithms for different underlying function sequences. For the OGD algorithms with noisy gradient feedback, the time horizon (T) ranges from 10^5 to 10^6 ; for the RE algorithms, we took T to range from 10^6 to 10^7 since convergence is slower with only noisy function value feedback. Each algorithm is given 20 independent runs and the median accumulated regret is reported. It is observed that our algorithm (the red lines) always achieve smaller regret and outperform its competitor for constructed function sequences.

6 Concluding remarks and open questions

We considered optimal regret of non-stationary stochastic optimization with local spatial and temporal changes. An important open question is to study the optimal regret for the case of *general* convex functions. In Theorem 3.3 we proved an upper regret bound of $T \cdot V_T^{p/(3p+d)}$ for general convex function sequences with access to noisy gradient oracles, which matches the tight rate of $T \cdot V_T^{1/3}$ in (Besbes et al., 2015) as $p \rightarrow \infty$. However, for $p < \infty$, it is not clear whether our bound $T \cdot V_T^{p/(3p+d)}$ is tight even for the univariate case of $d = 1$. To further improve the learning algorithm with sharper upper bounds or to develop matching lower bound will be a future direction of research.

Acknowledgement

The authors are very grateful to three anonymous referees, the associate editor, and the area editor for their detailed and constructive comments that considerably improved the quality of this paper. We would also like to thank Prof. Assaf Zeevi for helpful discussions.

A Proof of Lemma 4.1

To simplify notations we assume $\underline{b}_\ell = 0$ throughout this proof. We first consider the noisy gradient feedback case $\phi = \phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$. Fix arbitrary $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ and abbreviate $g_t(x_t) = \nabla f_t(x_t)$, $\hat{g}_t(x_t) = \phi_t^G(x_t, f_t) = \nabla f_t(x_t) + \varepsilon_t$. By strong convexity of f_t , we have that

$$2(f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*)) \leq 2g_t(x_t)^\top (x_t - x^*) - M\|x_t - x^*\|_2^2. \quad (20)$$

On the other hand, because $x_{t+1} = \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{X}(x_t - \eta_t \hat{g}_t(x_t))$ by definition and $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{X}$ is a contraction, we have

$$\|x_{t+1} - x^*\|_2^2 = \|\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{X}(x_t - \eta_t \hat{g}_t(x_t)) - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \|x_t - \eta_t \hat{g}_t(x_t) - x^*\|_2^2.$$

Using Pythagorean's theorem and the fact that $\|g_t(x_t)\|_2 \leq H$, $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t|x_t] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_t^\top \varepsilon_t|x_t] \leq \sigma^2$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\|x_{t+1} - x^*\|_2^2] \leq \mathbb{E} [\|x_t - x^*\|_2^2] + \eta_t^2(H^2 + \sigma^2) - 2\eta_t g_t(x_t)^\top (x_t - x^*).$$

Subsequently,

$$2\mathbb{E} \left[g_t(x_t)^\top (x_t - x^*) \right] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|x_t - x^*\|_2^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|x_{t+1} - x^*\|_2^2]}{\eta_t} + \eta_t(H^2 + \sigma^2). \quad (21)$$

Combining Eqs. (20,21) and summing over $t = 0, \dots, T'$, and defining $1/\eta_{-1} := 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T'} f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*) \right] &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} [\|x_t - x^*\|_2^2] \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\eta_t} - \frac{1}{\eta_{t-1}} - M \right) + (H^2 + \sigma^2) \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \eta_t \\ &\leq 0 + (H^2 + \sigma^2) \sum_{t=1}^{T'} \frac{1}{M(t+1)} \\ &= O(\log T'). \end{aligned}$$

Because $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $S_\phi^\pi(f; x^*) = O(\log T')$ for $\pi = \pi_S^{\mathcal{G}}$, $\eta_t = 1/Mt$ and all $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$.

We next consider the noisy function value feedback case $\phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t)$. Abbreviate $\hat{f}_t(x_t) = \phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t) = f_t(x_t) + \varepsilon_t$ and define, for any invertible $d \times d$ matrix A , that

$$\tilde{f}_t^A(x) := \mathbb{E}_{v_t \sim \mathbb{B}_d} [f_t(x + Av)], \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X},$$

where v_t is uniformly distributed on the d -dimensional unit ball $\mathbb{B}_d = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|z\|_2 \leq 1\}$. It is easy to verify that \tilde{f}_t remains strongly convex with parameter M and $\hat{g}_t = d \cdot \phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(y_t + A_t u_t, f_t) \cdot A_t^{-1} u_t$ is an unbiased estimator of $\nabla \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_t] &= d \cdot \mathbb{E} [\phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(y_t + A_t u_t, f_t) \cdot A_t^{-1} u_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{u_t \sim \mathbb{S}_d} [df_t(y_t + A_t u_t) A_t^{-1} u_t] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \nabla \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t). \end{aligned}$$

Here in (a) we invoke Corollary 6 of (Hazan & Levy, 2014).

Recall the definition that $x_t = y_t + A_t u_t \in \mathcal{X}$, the point in \mathcal{X} at which loss is suffered and feedback is obtained. For any $x^* \in \mathcal{X}_{\nu/T}^o$, decompose the regret $S_\phi^\pi(f; x^*) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T'} f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*) \right]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} S_\phi^\pi(f; x^*) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T'} f_t(x_t) - f_t(y_t) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T'} f_t(y_t) - \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t) \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T'} f_t(x^*) - \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(x^*) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T'} \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t) - \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(x^*) \right]. \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

The first three terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (22) are easy to bound. In particular, because $\|A_t\|_2 \leq 1/\sqrt{\eta M(t+1)}$ almost surely, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[f_t(x_t) - f_t(y_t)] &= \mathbb{E}_{y_t} \mathbb{E}_{u_t \sim \mathcal{S}_d} \left[f_t(y_t + A_t u_t) - f_t(y_t) \middle| y_t \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{L}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|A_t\|_2^2] \leq \frac{L}{2M\eta(t+1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Here in (b) we use the fact that f_t is smooth (A4) with parameter $G > 0$. Similarly,

$$-\mathbb{E}\left[f_t(x^*) - \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(x^*)\right] = \mathbb{E}_{v_t \sim \mathbb{B}_d} [f_t(x^* + A_t v_t) - f_t(x^*)] \leq \frac{L}{2M\eta(t+1)}.$$

In addition, because f_t is convex, by Jensen's inequality we have $\mathbb{E}[f_t(x + A_t v)] \geq f_t(x + \mathbb{E}[A_t v]) = f_t(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and hence

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f_t(y_t) - \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t)\right] = \mathbb{E}_{y_t} \mathbb{E}_{v_t \sim \mathbb{B}_d} \left[f_t(y_t) - f_t(y_t + A_t v_t) \middle| y_t \right] \leq 0.$$

We next upper bound the final term in the right-hand side of Eq. (22). For $t = 0, \dots, T'$ and $a \in \mathcal{X}^o$ define $\|a\|_t^* := \sqrt{a^\top (\nabla^2 \varphi(y_t) + \eta M(t+1)I)^{-1} a}$. Also define $\check{f}_t(x) := \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t) + \hat{g}_t^\top (x - y_t) + \frac{M}{2} \|x - y_t\|_2^2$. It is obvious that \check{f}_t is strongly convex with parameter M , and that $y_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \{\check{f}_\tau(y)\} + \eta^{-1} \varphi(y)$ agrees with the definition of y_{t+1} in step 2(e) of sub-policy $\pi_S^{\mathcal{F}}$, because both $\tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t)$ and $-g_t^\top y_t$ terms are independent of y to be optimized. We then have the following lemma, which is similar to Lemma 11 in (Hazan & Levy, 2014).

Lemma A.1. *Suppose $\eta \|\hat{g}_t\|_t^* \leq 1/2$ for all $t = 0, \dots, T'$. Then*

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T'} \check{f}_t(y_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \check{f}_t(x^*) \leq 2\eta \sum_{t=0}^{T'} (\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^*)^2 + \frac{1}{\eta} (\varphi(x^*) - \varphi(y_0)), \quad \forall x^* \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (23)$$

The verification of the condition $\eta \|\hat{g}_t\|_t^* \leq 1/2$ and an proof of Lemma A.1 is technical and will be presented later in this section. Taking expectations on both sides of Eq. (23) and noting that $\check{f}_t(y_t) = \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t)$ and $\check{f}_t(x^*) = \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t) + \hat{g}_t^\top (x^* - y_t) + \frac{M}{2} \|x^* - y_t\|_2^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E}[\check{f}_t(y_t) - \check{f}_t(x^*)] &= - \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{g}_t^\top (x^* - y_t) + \frac{M}{2} \|x^* - y_t\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} - \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t)^\top (x^* - y_t) + \frac{M}{2} \|x^* - y_t\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 2\eta \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^{*2}] + \frac{1}{\eta} (\varphi(x^*) - \varphi(y_0)).\end{aligned}$$

Here (c) holds because $\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_t | y_t] = \nabla \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t)$ and in (d) we invoke Lemma A.1.

On the other hand, because $\tilde{f}_t^{A_t}$ is strongly convex with parameter M , it holds that $\tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(x^*) \geq \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t) + \nabla \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t)^\top (x^* - y_t) + \frac{M}{2} \|x^* - y_t\|_2^2$ and hence

$$-\sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t)^\top (x^* - y_t) + \frac{M}{2} \|x^* - y_t\|_2^2 \right] \geq \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t) - \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(x^*) \right].$$

Subsequently,

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t) - \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(x^*) \right] \leq 2\eta \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^{*2}] + \frac{1}{\eta} (\varphi(x^*) - \varphi(y_0)).$$

It then remains to upper bound the expectation of $\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^*$ and the discrepancy of self-concordant barrier functions $\varphi(x^*) - \varphi(y_0)$. By assumption (A2), we have that $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f_t(x)| \leq H$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^{*2}] = \mathbb{E} \left[d^2(f_t(y_t + A_t u) + \varepsilon_t)^2 u^\top A_t^{-1} (\nabla^2 \varphi(y_t) + \eta M(t+1)I)^{-1} A_t u \right] \leq d^2(H^2 + \sigma^2).$$

To bound the discrepancy in self-concordance barrier terms, we cite Lemma 4 from (Hazan & Levy, 2014), which asserts that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}^o$,

$$\varphi(y) - \varphi(x) \leq \kappa \log \frac{1}{1 - \pi_x(y)},$$

where κ is the self-concordance parameter of φ and $\pi_x(y)$ is defined as $\pi_x(y) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : x + t^{-1}(y - x) \in \mathcal{X}\}$. It is easy to verify that, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}^o$ and $y \in \mathcal{X}_{\nu/T}^o$, $\varphi(y) - \varphi(x) = O(\kappa \log T)$ because $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}^o} \sup_{y \in \mathcal{X}_{\nu/T}^o} \pi_x(y) \leq 1/(1 + \nu/(DT)) \leq 1 - O(\nu/(DT))$. Consequently, by Assumption (A2) and the fact that $y_0 \in \mathcal{X}^o$ (because $\lim_{x \rightarrow \partial \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x) = +\infty$) we have that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(y_t) - \tilde{f}_t^{A_t}(x^*) \right] \leq O(\eta T' + \eta^{-1} \log T'), \quad \forall x^* \in \mathcal{X}_{\nu/T}^o.$$

Combining all upper bounds on the terms in Eq. (22) we obtain

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} [f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*)] \leq O(\eta T' + \eta^{-1} \log T'), \quad \forall x^* \in \mathcal{X}_{\nu/T}^o.$$

With $\eta \asymp \sqrt{\log T'/T'}$ we complete the proof of Lemma 4.1.

A.1 Verification of condition $\eta \|\hat{g}_t\|_t^* \leq 1/2$

We have that $\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^* \leq d(H + \varepsilon_t)$. By standard concentration results for sub-Gaussian random variables, we know that $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\varepsilon_t| \leq 10\sigma \sqrt{\log T}$ with probability at least $1 - O(T^{-2})$. Let \mathcal{A} denote the event that $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\varepsilon_t| \leq 10\sigma \sqrt{\log T}$. By the law of total expectation,

$$S_\phi^\pi(f; x^*) = \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} [f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*) | \mathcal{A}] \Pr[\mathcal{A}] + \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} [f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*) | \mathcal{A}^c] \Pr[\mathcal{A}^c]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} [f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*) | \mathcal{A}] + 2T'H \cdot T^{-2} \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \mathbb{E} [f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*) | \mathcal{A}] + O(T^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the second inequality holds because $\Pr[\mathcal{A}^c] \leq T^{-2}$ and $|f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*)| \leq 2H$ due to assumption (A3). This term can then be upper bounded by $O(T^{-1})$ and essentially neglected in the final regret bound. For the main term conditioned on \mathcal{A} , we have $\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^* \leq d(H + 10\sigma\sqrt{\log T})$ for all $t = 0, \dots, T$. Therefore, by setting $\eta = d(H + 10\sigma\sqrt{\log T})/2\sqrt{T'}$ we have that $\eta\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^* \leq 1/2$ conditioned on \mathcal{A} .

A.2 Proof of Lemma A.1

By definition of \check{f}_t , we have that $\check{f}_t(y_t) - \check{f}_t(x^*) \leq \hat{g}_t^\top(y_t - x^*)$. By standard analysis of mirror descent we have that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T'} \hat{g}_t^\top(y_t - x^*) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{T'} \hat{g}_t^\top(y_t - y_{t+1}) + \frac{1}{\eta}(\varphi(x^*) - \varphi(y_0)).$$

It remains to upper bound $\hat{g}_t^\top(y_t - y_{t+1})$. For $a \in \mathcal{X}^o$ define $\|a\|_t := \sqrt{a^\top(\nabla^2\varphi(y_t) + \eta M(t+1)I)a}$ and recall that $\|a\|_t^* := \sqrt{a^\top(\nabla^2\varphi(y_t) + \eta M(t+1)I)a}$. By definition, $\|\cdot\|_t$ and $\|\cdot\|_t^*$ are dual norms and hence by Hölder's inequality

$$\hat{g}_t^\top(y_t - y_{t+1}) \leq \|\hat{g}_t\|_t^* \|y_t - y_{t+1}\|_t. \tag{24}$$

Denote $\Phi_t(x) := \eta \sum_{\tau=0}^t \check{f}_\tau(x) + \varphi(x) = C + \eta \sum_{\tau=0}^t \hat{g}_\tau^\top x + \varphi_t(x)$, where C is a constant that does not depend on x and $\varphi_t(x) := \varphi(x) + \frac{\eta M}{2} \sum_{\tau=0}^t \|x - y_\tau\|_2^2$. Recall the definition of

$$\|a\|_x := \sqrt{a^\top \nabla^2 \Phi_t(x) a}, \quad \|a\|_x^* := \sqrt{a^\top \{\nabla^2 \Phi_t(x)\}^{-1} a} \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}^o$$

in classical self-concordance analysis. It is easy to verify that $\|a\|_x = \|a\|_t$ and $\|a\|_x^* = \|a\|_t^*$, because $\nabla^2 \Phi_t(x) = \nabla^2 \varphi_t(x) = \nabla^2 \varphi(x) + \eta M(t+1)I$. The following lemma is standard in analysis of Newton's method for self-concordant functions:

Lemma A.2. *Suppose Φ_t is κ -self-concordant and $\|\nabla \Phi_t(x)\|_x^* \leq 1/2$. Then*

$$\left\| x - \arg \min_z \Phi_t(z) \right\|_x \leq 2 \|\nabla \Phi_t(x)\|_x^*.$$

Note that because φ is self-concordant, Φ_t is also self-concordant and $\nabla^2 \Phi_t = \nabla^2 \varphi_t$. In addition, because y_t is the minimizer of Φ_{t-1} ,¹ $\nabla \Phi_{t-1}(y_t) = 0$ and therefore

$$\nabla \Phi_t(y_t) = \nabla \left[\Phi_{t-1}(x) + \eta \hat{g}_t^\top x + \frac{\eta M}{2} \|x - y_t\|_2^2 \right] \Big|_{x=y_t} = \hat{g}_t.$$

¹ Φ_{-1} is defined as $\Phi_{-1}(x) = \varphi(x)$.

Therefore $\|\nabla\Phi_t(x)\|_x^* = \eta\|\hat{g}_t\|_x^* = \eta\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^*$. Invoking Lemma A.2 we have that, under the condition that $\eta\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^* \leq 1/2$,

$$\|y_t - y_{t+1}\|_t = \|y_t - \operatorname{argmin}_z \Phi_t(z)\|_x \leq 2\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^*. \quad (25)$$

Combining Eqs. (24,25) we have that $\hat{g}_t(y_t - y_{t+1}) \leq 2\|\hat{g}_t\|_t^{*2}$. The proof of Lemma A.1 is then complete.

B Proof of Theorem 3.2

Let us first consider the simpler univariate case ($d = 1$). The first step is to reduce the problem of lower bounding regret to the problem of lower bounding success probability of testing sequences of functions, for which tools from information theory such as Fano's lemma (Ibragimov & Has'minskii, 1981; Yu, 1997; Cover & Thomas, 2006; Tsybakov, 2009) could be applied. We then present a novel construction of two functions satisfying (A1) through (A5) and demonstrate that such construction leads to matching lower bounds as presented in Theorem 3.2. Finally, we extend the lower bound construction to multiple dimensions ($d > 1$) via a change-of-variable argument and complete the proof of general cases in Theorem 3.2.

Before introducing the proof we first give the definition of an important concept that measures the ‘‘discrepancy’’ between two functions $f, \tilde{f} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$\chi(f, \tilde{f}) := \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max \left\{ f(x) - f^*, \tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}^* \right\} \quad \text{where } f^* = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x), \tilde{f}^* = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{f}(x).$$

Intuitively, $\chi(f, \tilde{f})$ characterizes the best regret $f(x) - f^*$ one could achieve *without* knowing whether f or \tilde{f} is the underlying function. This quantity plays a central role in our reduction from regret minimization to testing problems, as well as construction of indistinguishable functions pairs.

B.1 From regret minimization to testing.

Consider a *finite* subset $\Theta = \{f_1, \dots, f_M\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$. The following lemma shows that if there exists an admissible policy π that achieves small regret over $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$, then it leads to a hypothesis testing procedure that identifies the true function sequence f in Θ with large probability:

Lemma B.1. *Fix $1 \leq p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $V_T > 0$. Let $\phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t)$ or $\phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}(x_t, f_t)$ be either the noisy function or noisy gradient feedback. Let $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$ be a finite subset of sequences of convex functions. Suppose there exists an admissible policy π such that*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)} R_\phi^\pi(f) \leq \frac{1}{9} \cdot \inf_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_t, \tilde{f}_t), \quad (26)$$

then there exists an estimator $\{\phi_t(x_t, f_t)\}_{t=1}^T \mapsto \hat{f}$ such that

$$\sup_{f \in \Theta} \Pr_f \left[f \neq \hat{f} \right] \leq 1/3, \quad (27)$$

where \Pr_f denotes the probability distribution parameterized by the underlying true function sequence $f \in \Theta$.

The proof of Lemma B.1 is technical and given later. At a higher level, when there exists an admissible policy π that achieves small regret over $\mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$ (and hence small regret over $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$ too), then one can correctly identify the underlying function sequence $f \in \Theta$ with large probability by searching all function sequences in Θ and selecting the one that has the smallest regret.

Reduction to testing is a standard approach for proving minimax lower bounds in stochastic estimation and optimization problems (Besbes et al., 2015; Agarwal et al., 2012; Raskutti et al., 2011). Motivations behind such reduction are a well-established class of tools that provide lower bounds on failure probability in testing problems (Yu, 1997; Ibragimov & Has'minskii, 1981; Tsybakov, 2009). Let $\text{KL}(P\|Q) = \int \log \frac{dP}{dQ} dP$ denote the Kullback-Leibler divergence between two distributions P and Q . We introduce the following version of the Fano's inequality,

Lemma B.2 (Fano's inequality). *Let $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M\}$ be a finite parameter set of size M . For each $\theta \in \Theta$, let P_θ be the distribution of observations parameterized by θ . Suppose there exists $0 < \beta < \infty$ such that $\text{KL}(P_\theta\|P_{\theta'}) \leq \beta$ for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$. Then*

$$\inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \Pr \left[\hat{\theta} \neq \theta \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\beta + \log 2}{\log M}. \quad (28)$$

With Lemmas B.1 and B.2, the question of proving Theorem 3.2 is reduced to finding a ‘‘hard’’ subset $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$ such that the minimum discrepancy $\inf_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_t, \tilde{f}_t)$ is lower bounded and the maximum KL divergence $\sup_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \text{KL}(P_f\|P_{\tilde{f}})$ is upper bounded. More precisely, the upper bound on the maximum KL divergence will provide a lower bound for right hand side of Eq. (28), which contradicts Eq. (27) in Lemma B.1. Therefore, the inequality in (26) will not hold, which implies a lower bound on the regret. The construction of such a ‘‘worst-case example’’ Θ is highly non-trivial and involves complex design of cubic splines, as we explain in Figure 3(a) and the next paragraph. Below we first give such a construction for the univariate ($d = 1$) case and later extend the construction to higher dimensions.

B.2 Univariate constructions.

Fix $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$ and $1/8T^2 \leq h \leq 1/8$. Define $F_0, F_1 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$F_0(x) := \begin{cases} x^2, & 0 \leq x < \sqrt{h}; \\ \frac{4}{\sqrt{h}}x^3 - 11x^2 + 12\sqrt{h}x - 4h, & \sqrt{h} \leq x < 2\sqrt{h}; \\ 8(x - \sqrt{h})^2, & 2\sqrt{h} \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

$$F_1(x) := \begin{cases} (x - \sqrt{h})^2, & 0 \leq x < \sqrt{h}; \\ 8(x - \sqrt{h})^2, & \sqrt{h} \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Further define

$$F_\lambda := F_0 + \lambda(F_1 - F_0), \quad \lambda \in [0, 1] \quad (31)$$

as a convex combination of F_0 and F_1 . Figure 3(a) gives a graphical sketch of F_0 , F_1 and F_λ . The key insight in the constructions of F_0 and F_1 is to use a cubic function to connect two quadratic functions of different curvatures, and hence allow F_λ to be the same on a wide region of \mathcal{X} (in particular $[2\sqrt{h}, 1]$) and produce small L_p difference $\|F_0 - F_1\|_p$. In contrast, the lower bound




Figure 3: Figure 3(a) gives a graphical depiction of functions constructed in the lower bound, with thick solid lines corresponding to F_0 and F_1 , and thin dashed lines corresponding to F_λ with intermediate values $\lambda = 0.25$ and $\lambda = 0.75$. For the sake of better visualization, the regions $0 \leq x \leq \sqrt{h}$ (I_1) and $\sqrt{h} \leq x \leq 2\sqrt{h}$ (I_2) are greatly exaggerated. In the actual construction both regions are very small compared to the entire domain $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$. Figure 3(b) shows the two constructions of function sequences f on $J = 3$ batches, according to Eq. (32). At the beginning and the end of each batch the function is always $F_{0.5}$, while within each batch the values of λ first increase and then decrease, or vice versa, depending on the coding $i_j \in \{0, 1\}$ for the particular batch. Also note that λ will never be over 0.75 nor under 0.25 throughout the entire construction of the function sequence.

construction in existing work (Besbes et al., 2015) uses quadratic functions only, which are not capable of producing smooth functions that differ locally and therefore only applies to the special case of $p = \infty$.

The following lemma lists some properties of F_λ . Their verification is left to Section B.5 in the online supplement.

Lemma B.3. *The following statements are true for all $\lambda, \mu \in [1/4, 3/4]$.*

1. F_λ satisfies (A1) through (A5) with $D = 2$, $\nu = 1/64$, $H = 16$, $L = 26$ and $M = 2$.
2. $\|F_\lambda - F_\mu\|_\infty \leq |\lambda - \mu| \cdot O(h)$ and $\|F'_\lambda - F'_\mu\|_\infty \leq |\lambda - \mu| \cdot O(\sqrt{h})$.
3. $\|F_\lambda - F_\mu\|_p \leq |\lambda - \mu| \cdot O(h^{(2p+1)/2p})$ for all $1 \leq p < \infty$.
4. $\chi(F_\lambda, F_{1-\lambda}) = |1/2 - \lambda|^2 \cdot h/4$.

We are now ready to describe our construction of a “hard” subset $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$. Note that $\mathcal{F}_{p,\infty}(V_T) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$ for all $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ due to the monotonicity of $\text{Var}_{p,q}(f)$ (see Proposition 1.1). Therefore we shall focus solely on the $q = \infty$ case, whose construction is automatically valid for all $1 \leq q \leq \infty$.

Let $1 \leq J \leq T$ be a parameter to be determined later, and define $\Delta_T = \lfloor T/J \rfloor$. Again partition the entire T time epochs into J disjoint batches B_1, \dots, B_J , where each batch consists of either Δ_T or $\Delta_T + 1$ consecutive epochs. Let $\{0, 1\}^J$ be the class of all binary vectors of length J and let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^J$ be a certain subset of $\{0, 1\}^J$ to be specified later. The subset $\Theta \in \mathcal{F}_{p,\infty}(V_T)$ is

constructed so that each function sequence $f_i \in \Theta$ is indexed by a unique J -dimensional binary vector $i \in \mathcal{I}$, with $f_i = (f_{i,1}, \dots, f_{i,T})$ defined as

$$f_{i,(j-1)\Delta_T+\ell} = \begin{cases} F_{0.5+0.5\ell/|B_j|}, & i_j = 0, 1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor |B_j|/2 \rfloor; \\ F_{0.75-0.5\ell/|B_j|}, & i_j = 0, \lfloor |B_j|/2 \rfloor < \ell \leq |B_j|; \\ F_{0.5-0.5\ell/|B_j|}, & i_j = 1, 1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor |B_j|/2 \rfloor; \\ F_{0.25+0.5\ell/|B_j|}, & i_j = 1, \lfloor |B_j|/2 \rfloor < \ell \leq |B_j|. \end{cases} \quad 1 \leq j \leq J. \quad (32)$$

Figure 3(b) gives a visual illustration of the change pattern of f_i and $f_{i'}$ by plotting the values of λ for each function in the constructed sequences. For a particular batch B_j , when $i_j = i'_j$ then f_i and $f_{i'}$ are exactly the same within B_j ; on the other hand, if $i_j = 0$ then f_i will drift towards the function F_0 and if $i'_j = 1$ the functions $f_{i'}$ will drift towards F_1 , creating gaps between f_i and $f_{i'}$ within batch B_j . For regularity reasons, we constrain the λ value to be within the range of $(0.25, 0.75)$ regardless of i_j values. We also note that f_i and $f_{i'}$ always agree on the first and the last epochs within each batch. This property makes repetition of constructions across all J batches possible. The following lemma lists some key quantities of interest between f_i and $f_{i'}$:

Lemma B.4. *Suppose $\varepsilon_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ for $\phi = \phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$ and $\varepsilon_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_d(0, I)$ for $\phi = \phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$. For any $i, i' \in \{0, 1\}^J$ consider f_i and $f_{i'}$ as defined in Eq. (32). Then the following statements are true:*

1. (Variation). $\text{Var}_{p,q}(f) \leq \text{Var}_{p,\infty}(f) \leq O(h^{(2p+1)/2p}/\Delta_T)$, for all $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$.
2. (Discrepancy). $\sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_{i,t}, f_{i',t}) \geq \Delta_H(i, i') \cdot \Omega(h\Delta_T)$, where $\Delta_H(i, i') = \sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{I}[i_j \neq i'_j]$ is the Hamming distance between i and i' .
3. (KL divergence). Let $P_{f_i}^{\phi,\pi}$ be the distribution of $\{\phi_t(x_t, f_{i,t})\}_{t=1}^T$, with $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ selected by an admissible policy π . Then for any such policy π we have that

$$\text{KL}(P_{f_i}^{\phi,\pi} \| P_{f_{i'}}^{\phi,\pi}) \leq \begin{cases} \Delta_H(i, i') \cdot O(h\Delta_T), & \phi = \phi_t^G(x_t, f_t); \\ \Delta_H(i, i') \cdot O(h^2\Delta_T), & \phi = \phi_t^F(x_t, f_t). \end{cases}$$

The proof of Lemma B.4 is deferred to Section B.6 in the online supplement.

Finally, we describe the construction of $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^J$ and the choices of J, Δ_T and h that give rise to matching lower bounds. For simplicity we restrict ourselves to J being an even number. The construction of \mathcal{I} is based on the concept of *constant-weight codings*, where each code $i \in \mathcal{I}$ has exactly $J/2$ ones and $J/2$ zeros, and each pair of codes $i, i' \in \mathcal{I}$ have large Hamming distance $\Delta_H(i, i') \geq J/16$. The construction of constant-weight codings originates from (Graham & Sloane, 1980), and Wang & Singh (2016) gave an explicit lower bound on the size of \mathcal{I} , which we cite below:

Lemma B.5 (Wang & Singh (2016), Lemma 9). *Suppose $J \geq 2$ and J is even. There exists a subset $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^J$ such that $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \sum_{j=1}^J i_j = J/2$, and $\forall i, i' \in \mathcal{I}, \Delta_H(i, i') \geq J/16$. Furthermore, $\log |\mathcal{I}| \geq 0.0625J$.*

The univariate case of Theorem 3.2 can then be proved by appropriately setting the scalings of h, Δ_T and invoking Lemmas B.3, B.4 and B.5. Because $\Omega(\log T)$ and $\Omega(\sqrt{T})$ regret lower bounds for *stationary* stochastic online optimization are known (see, for example, (Hazan & Kale, 2014;

(Jamieson et al., 2012)), we only need to prove the lower bound with the additional assumption that $V_T = \Omega(T^{-(4p+d)/2p})$ for noisy gradient feedback $\phi_t = \phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$ and/or $V_T = \Omega(T^{-(6p+d)/4p})$ for noisy function value feedback $\phi_t = \phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$. More specifically, for noisy gradient feedback $\phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$ we set $h \asymp V_T^{2p/(4p+1)}$, $\Delta_T \asymp V_T^{-2p/(4p+1)}$, and for noisy function feedback $\phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$ we set $h \asymp V_T^{2p/(6p+1)}$ and $\Delta_T \asymp V_T^{-4p/(6p+1)}$. It is easy to verify that with the additional lower bound on V_T , $\Delta_T = o(T)$ and $h \gtrsim 1/T^2$, and therefore the constructions are valid. A complete proof is given in Sec. B.3 after we introduce our adversarial construction of $d > 1$, which includes the univariate setting ($d = 1$) as a special case.

B.3 Extension to higher dimensions

The lower bound construction can be extended to higher dimensions $d > 1$ to obtain a matching lower bound of $V_T^{2p/(4p+d)} \cdot T$ for noisy gradient feedback and $V_T^{2p/(6p+d)} \cdot T$ for noisy function value feedback. Let $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a d -dimensional vector with all components equal to 1. We consider $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \geq 0, \mathbf{1}^\top x \leq 1\}$. Define $\bar{F}_\lambda : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\bar{F}_\lambda(x) := F_\lambda(\mathbf{1}^\top x) + \|x\|_2^2, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1], x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (33)$$

Here F_λ is the univariate function defined in Eq. (31). Intuitively, the multi-variate function \bar{F} is constructed by “projecting” a d -dimensional vector x onto a 1-dimensional axis supported on $[0, 1]$, and subsequently invoking existing univariate construction of adversarial functions. An additional quadratic term $\|x\|_2^2$ is appended to ensure the strong convexity of \bar{F}_λ without interfering with the structure in F_λ . The following lemma lists the properties of \bar{F} , which are rigorously verified in Section B.7 in the online supplement.

Lemma B.6. *Suppose $1/8T^2 \leq h \leq 1/8$. The following statements are true for any fixed $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\lambda, \mu \in [1/4, 3/4]$.*

1. \bar{F}_λ satisfies (A1) through (A5) with $D = 2$, $\nu = 1/16\sqrt{d+1}$, $H = 16\sqrt{d}+2$, $L = 26\sqrt{d}+2$ and $M = 2$.
2. $\|\bar{F}_\lambda - \bar{F}_\mu\|_\infty \leq |\lambda - \mu| \cdot O(h)$ and $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|\nabla \bar{F}_\lambda(x) - \nabla \bar{F}_\mu(x)\|_2 \leq |\lambda - \mu| \cdot O(\sqrt{h})$.
3. $\|\bar{F}_\lambda - \bar{F}_\mu\|_p \leq |\lambda - \mu| \cdot O(h^{(2p+d)/2p})$ for all $1 \leq p < \infty$.
4. $\chi(\bar{F}_\lambda, \bar{F}_{1-\lambda}) = \frac{d}{d+1} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda\right)^2 \cdot h$.

The third property in Lemma B.6 deserves special attention, which is a key property that is significantly different from Lemma B.3 for the univariate case, because the dependency of $\|\bar{F}_\lambda - \bar{F}_\mu\|_p$ on h has an extra term involving the domain dimension d in the exponent. At a higher level, the presence of the $O(h^{2p/(2p+d)})$ term comes from the *concentration of measure* phenomenon in high dimensions.

We then have the next corollary, by following the same construction of $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p,q}(V_T)$ in the univariate case and invoking Lemma B.6:

Corollary B.1. *Suppose $1 \leq J \leq T$ is even, $\Delta_T = \lfloor T/J \rfloor$ and $1/8T^2 \leq h \leq 1/8$. Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^J$ be constructed according to Lemma B.5, and $\Theta = \{f_i : i \in \mathcal{I}\}$, where f_i is defined in Eq. (32) except that F_λ is replaced with its high-dimensional version \bar{F}_λ defined in Eq. (33). Then the following holds:*

1. (Variation). $\sup_{f \in \Theta} \text{Var}_{p,q}(f) \leq O(h^{(2p+d)/2p}/\Delta_T)$ for all $1 \leq p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$.
2. (Discrepancy). $\inf_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_t, \tilde{f}_t) \geq \Omega(hT)$.
3. (KL-divergence). For all admissible policy π , $\sup_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \text{KL}(P_f^{\phi, \pi} \| P_{\tilde{f}}^{\phi, \pi}) \leq O(hT)$ for $\phi = \phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$ and $\sup_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \text{KL}(P_f^{\phi, \pi} \| P_{\tilde{f}}^{\phi, \pi}) \leq O(h^2T)$ for $\phi = \phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$.

We now prove the multi-dimensional case based on Corollary B.1. First consider the noisy gradient feedback $\phi_t^G(x_t, f_t)$. Set $h \asymp V_T^{2p/(4p+d)}$ and Δ_T accordingly such that $\text{Var}_{p,\infty}(f) \leq O(h^{(2p+d)/2p}/\Delta_T) = V_T$. This yields $\Delta_T \asymp V_T^{-2p/(4p+d)}$ and $J = T/\Delta_T \asymp TV_T^{2p/(4p+d)}$. The KL divergence is then upper bounded by $O(hT) = O(TV_T^{2p/(4p+d)})$ and $\log |\Theta| = \Omega(J) = \Omega(TV_T^{2p/(4p+d)})$. By carefully selecting constants in the asymptotic notations, one can make the right-hand side of Eq. (28) to be lower bounded by $1/2$. Subsequently invoking Lemma B.1, we conclude that there does not exist an admissible policy π such that $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{p,\infty}(V_T)} R_\phi^\pi(f) \leq 1/9 \cdot \inf_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_t, \tilde{f}_t)$. The lower bound proof is then completed by the discrepancy claim in Corollary B.1 that $\inf_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_t, \tilde{f}_t) \geq \Omega(hT) = \Omega(TV_T^{2p/(4p+d)})$.

The proof for the noisy function value feedback $\phi_t^F(x_t, f_t)$ is similar. The only difference is that the KL divergence is upper bounded by $O(h^2T)$, for which we should set $h \asymp V_T^{2p/(6p+d)}$ that leads to $\Delta_T \asymp V_T^{-4p/(6p+d)}$ and $J \asymp TV_T^{4p/(6p+d)}$. We then have that $\text{KL} \leq O(TV_T^{4p/(6p+d)})$ and $\log |\Theta| \geq \Omega(J) = \Omega(TV_T^{4p/(6p+d)})$. Using the same argument, the regret for any admissible policy is lower bounded by $\inf_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_t, \tilde{f}_t) \geq \Omega(hT) = \Omega(TV_T^{2p/(6p+d)})$.

B.4 Proof of Lemma B.1

Let π be a policy that attains the minimax rate. By Markov's inequality, with probability $2/3$ it holds that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - f_t(x_t^*) \leq \frac{1}{3} \cdot \inf_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_t, \tilde{f}_t), \quad \forall f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta. \quad (34)$$

Define $\hat{f} := \arg \min_{\tilde{f} \in \Theta} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_t(x_t) - \hat{f}_t(\hat{x}_t^*)$, where \hat{x}_t^* is the (unique) minimizer of \hat{f}_t . Let $\hat{f}_t^* = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{f}_t(x)$ and $f_t^* = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f_t(x)$. Because \hat{f} minimizes the ‘‘empirical’’ regret on $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$, it holds that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_t(x_t) - \hat{f}_t^* \leq \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - f_t^*.$$

Subsequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(\hat{f}_t, f_t) &= \sum_{t=1}^T \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max \left\{ \hat{f}_t(x) - \hat{f}_t^*, f_t(x) - f_t^* \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \max \left\{ \hat{f}_t(x_t) - \hat{f}_t^*, f_t(x_t) - f_t^* \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_t(x_t) - \hat{f}_t^* + f_t(x_t) - f_t^* \\
&\leq 2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - f_t^* \right) \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot \inf_{f, \tilde{f} \in \Theta} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_t, \tilde{f}_t).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we must have $\hat{f} = f$ conditioned on Eq. (34), which completes the proof.

B.5 Proof of Lemma B.3

We verify the properties separately.

Verification of property 1: (A1) is obvious because $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$. We next focus (A3), (A4) and (A5). It is easy to check that if two functions f and g satisfy (A3) through (A5), then their convex combination $f + \lambda(g - f)$ for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ also satisfies (A3) through (A5). Therefore we only need to verify these conditions for F_0 and F_1 , respectively. We first prove that both F_0 and F_1 are differentiable. Because both F_0 and F_1 are differentiable within each piece, to prove the global differentiability we only need to show that the left and right function values and derivatives of F_0 and F_1 at $x = \sqrt{h}$ and $x = 2\sqrt{h}$ are equal. Define $F(x^+) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} F(x+t)$, $F(x^-) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} F(x+t)$, $F'(x^+) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{F(x+t) - F(x)}{t}$ and $F'(x^-) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{F(x+t) - F(x)}{t}$. We then have that $F_1(\sqrt{h}^+) = F_0(\sqrt{h}^-) = h$, $F_0(2\sqrt{h}^+) = F_0(2\sqrt{h}^-) = 8h$, $F'_0(\sqrt{h}^+) = F'_0(\sqrt{h}^-) = 2\sqrt{h}$, $F'_0(2\sqrt{h}^+) = F'_0(2\sqrt{h}^-) = 16\sqrt{h}$, $F_2(\sqrt{h}^+) = F_1(\sqrt{h}^-) = 0$, $F'_1(\sqrt{h}^+) = F'_1(\sqrt{h}^-) = 0$. Therefore, both F_0 and F_1 are differentiable on $[0, 1]$. It is then easy to check that $\sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \max\{|F_0(x)|, |F_1(x)|\} \leq 8$ and $\sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \max\{|F'_0(x)|, |F'_1(x)|\} \leq 16$. Therefore (A3) is satisfied with $H = 16$.

To verify (A4) and (A5) we need to compute the second-order derivatives of F_0 and F_1 . By construction, $F''_0(x) = F''_1(x) = 2$ for $x \in [0, \sqrt{h}]$, $F''_0(x) = F''_1(x) = 8$ for $x \in [\sqrt{h}, 1]$, and $2 \leq F''_0(x) \leq 26$ for $x \in [\sqrt{h}, 2\sqrt{h}]$. Therefore, F_0 and F_1 satisfy (A4) and (A5) with $L = 26$ and $M = 2$. Note that F_0 and F_1 are *not* twice differentiable at $x = \sqrt{h}$ and $x = 2\sqrt{h}$: however, this does not affect the smoothness and strong convexity of both functions.

Finally we check (A2). Let x_λ^* be the unique minimizer of $F_\lambda = F_0 + \lambda(F_1 - F_0)$. Elementary algebra yields that $x_\lambda^* = \lambda\sqrt{h}$. Because $h \geq 1/8T^2$, we know that F_λ satisfies (A2) with $\nu = 1/32$ for $\lambda \in [1/4, 3/4]$.

Verification of property 2: It is easy to see that $\|F_\lambda - F_\mu\|_p = |\lambda - \mu| \cdot \|F_0 - F_1\|_p$ and $\|F'_\lambda - F'_\mu\|_p \leq |\lambda - \mu| \cdot \|F'_0 - F'_1\|_p$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Thus we only need to consider $\lambda = 0$ and $\mu = 1$. It is easy to verify that $\|F_0 - F_1\|_\infty = |F_0(0) - F_1(0)| = \sqrt{h}$ and $\|F'_0 - F'_1\|_\infty = |F'_0(0) - F'_1(1)| = 2h$.

Verification of property 3: Similarly we only need to consider $\lambda = 0$ and $\mu = 1$. Because F_0 and F_1 only differ on $[0, 2\sqrt{h}]$, we have that

$$\|F_0 - F_1\|_p = \left(\int_0^{2\sqrt{h}} |F_0(x) - F_1(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} = O(h^{1/2p}) \cdot \|F_0 - F_1\|_\infty = O(h^{(2p+1)/2p}).$$

Verification of property 4: We have that $x_\lambda^* = \lambda\sqrt{h}$ and $F_\lambda^* = F_\lambda(x_\lambda^*) = \lambda(1-\lambda)h$. Subsequently, $\chi(F_\lambda, F_{1-\lambda}) = F_\lambda(\sqrt{h}/2) - F_\lambda^* = (1/2 - \lambda)^2 \cdot h/4$.

B.6 Proof of Lemma B.4

Fix an arbitrary interval I_j for some $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$. Without loss of generality assume $|I_j| = \Delta_T$ (the extra one function in some intervals can be safely neglected as both T and Δ_T are large). Then

$$\sup_{t \in I_j} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p = \frac{1}{\Delta_T} \cdot O(h^{(2p+1)/2p}).$$

Subsequently,

$$\text{Var}_{p,\infty}(f) = \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p = O(h^{(2p+1)/2p}/\Delta_T).$$

For the discrepancy term, again fix I_j for some $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$ such that $i_j \neq i'_j$. We then have,

$$\sum_{t \in I_j} \chi(f_{i,t}, f_{i',t}) \geq 2 \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor \Delta_T/2 \rfloor} \chi(F_{0.5+t/\Delta_T}, F_{0.5-t/\Delta_T}) \geq 2 \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor \Delta_T/2 \rfloor} \left(\frac{t}{\Delta_T}\right)^2 \cdot \Omega(h) = \Omega(h\Delta_T).$$

Subsequently, summing over all intervals with $i_j \neq i'_j$ we have that $\sum_{t=1}^T \chi(f_{i,t}, f_{i',t}) \geq \Delta_H(i, i') \cdot \Omega(h\Delta_T)$.

Finally we compute the KL divergence $\text{KL}(P_{f_i}^{\phi,\pi} \| P_{f_{i'}}^{\phi,\pi})$. We first consider the noisy function value feedback $\phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t)$. Let $y_t = \phi_t^{\mathcal{F}}(x_t, f_t)$ be the random variables of the feedbacks and denote $x^t = (x_1, \dots, x_t)$ and $y^t = (y_1, \dots, y_t)$. For any admissible policy π , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(P_{f_i}^{\phi,\pi} \| P_{f_{i'}}^{\phi,\pi}) &= \mathbb{E}_{f_i, \pi} \left[\log \frac{P_{f_i}^{\phi,\pi}(x^T, y^T)}{P_{f_{i'}}^{\phi,\pi}(x^T, y^T)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{f_i, \pi} \left[\log \frac{P_{f_i}^{\phi}(y^T | x^T) \cdot \prod_{t=1}^T P_{\pi}(x_t | y^{t-1}, x^{t-1})}{P_{f_{i'}}^{\phi}(y^T | x^T) \cdot \prod_{t=1}^T P_{\pi}(x_t | y^{t-1}, x^{t-1})} \right] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{f_i, \pi} \left[\log \frac{P_{f_i, t}^{\phi}(y_t | x_t)}{P_{f_{i'}, t}^{\phi}(y_t | x_t)} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{KL}(P_{f_i, t}^{\phi}(\cdot | x) \| P_{f_{i'}, t}^{\phi}(\cdot | x)). \end{aligned}$$

Here the third identity holds because ε_t are independent. For $y_t = \phi_t(x_t, f_t) \sim \mathcal{N}(f_t(x_t), 1)$, it holds that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{KL}(P_{f_i, t}^{\phi}(\cdot | x) \| P_{f_{i'}, t}^{\phi}(\cdot | x)) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f_{i, t}(x) - f_{i', t}(x)|^2 = \|f_{i, t} - f_{i', t}\|_{\infty}^2 = O(h^2). \quad (35)$$

where in the last inequality we invoke Lemma B.3. Summing over $t = 1$ to T we have that $\text{KL}(P_{f_i}^{\phi,\pi} \| P_{f_{i'}}^{\phi,\pi}) = O(h^2 T)$.

The noisy gradient feedback case $\phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}(x_t, f_t)$ can be handled by following the same argument, except that Eq. (35) should be replaced by

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{KL}(P_{f_i, t}^{\phi}(\cdot | x) \| P_{f_{i'}, t}^{\phi}(\cdot | x)) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f'_{i, t}(x) - f'_{i', t}(x)|^2 = \|f'_{i, t} - f'_{i', t}\|_{\infty}^2 = O(h).$$

Therefore, $\text{KL}(P_{f_i}^{\phi,\pi} \| P_{f_{i'}}^{\phi,\pi}) = O(hT)$.

B.7 Proof of Lemma B.6

We verify the properties separately.

Verification of property 1: Because $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\|x\|_1 \leq 1$, we have that $\|x - y\|_2 \leq \|x - y\|_1 \leq 2$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and therefore \mathcal{X} satisfies (A1) with $D = 2$.

We next verify (A3). Because F_λ is convex differentiable, it holds that $\bar{F}_\lambda(x) = F_\lambda(1^\top x) + \|x\|_2^2$ is also convex differentiable because convexity is preserved with affine transform. In particular, $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \bar{F}_\lambda(x) \leq \|F_\lambda\|_\infty + 1 \leq 9$ and $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|\bar{F}_\lambda(x)\|_2 \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |F_\lambda(1^\top x)| \cdot \|1\|_2 + 2\|x\|_2 \leq 16\sqrt{d} + 2$. Therefore, (A3) is satisfied with $H = 16\sqrt{d} + 2$.

To verify (A4) and (A5), note that \bar{F}_λ is twice differentiable except at points $\{x : 1^\top x = \sqrt{h}\} \cup \{x : 1^\top x = 2\sqrt{h}\}$. Furthermore, $\nabla^2 \bar{F}_\lambda(x) = F_\lambda''(1^\top x) \cdot 11^\top + 2I_d$. Subsequently, on points $x \in \mathcal{X}$ where \bar{F}_λ is twice differentiable, we have that $\nabla^2 \bar{F}_\lambda(x) \preceq (\|F_\lambda''\|_\infty \sqrt{d} + 2)I = (26\sqrt{d} + 2)I$ and $\nabla^2 \bar{F}_\lambda(x) \succeq 2I$. Therefore, (A4) and (A5) are satisfied with $L = 26\sqrt{d} + 2$ and $M = 2$.

Finally we check (A2). Let x_λ^* be the unique minimizer of \bar{F}_λ on \mathcal{X} . It is clear that x_λ^* must take the form of $x_\lambda^* = (\bar{x}_\lambda^*, \dots, \bar{x}_\lambda^*)$, which gives the smallest $\|x\|_2^2$ without changing the value of $F_\lambda(1^\top x)$. Completing the squares in \bar{F}_λ we have that

$$\bar{F}_\lambda(\bar{x}_\lambda) = d(d+1) \left[\bar{x} - \frac{\lambda\sqrt{h}}{d+1} \right]^2 + \lambda h \left[1 - \frac{\lambda d}{d+1} \right]. \quad (36)$$

Subsequently, $\bar{x}_\lambda^* = \frac{\lambda\sqrt{h}}{d+1}$. It is easy to verify that for $h \leq 1/8$, $\inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{x}_\lambda^* + tu \in \mathcal{X} \forall u \in \mathbb{B}_d(1)\} \geq \|\bar{x}_\lambda^*\|_2 \geq \lambda\sqrt{h}/(d+1)$. Therefore, for all $\lambda \in [1/4, 3/4]$ and $1/8T^2 \leq h \leq 1/8$ the condition (A2) holds with $\nu = 1/16\sqrt{d} + 1$.

Verification of property 2: $\|\bar{F}_\lambda - \bar{F}_\mu\|_\infty = \|F_\lambda - F_\mu\|_\infty = O(h)$. In addition, $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|\nabla \bar{F}_\lambda(x) - \nabla \bar{F}_\mu(x)\|_2 = \|F'_\lambda - F'_\mu\|_\infty \cdot \|1\|_2 = O(\sqrt{hd})$. Omitting the dependency on d we obtain property 2.

Verification of property 3: Define $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_d(r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \geq 0, \|x\|_1 \leq r\}$. It is easy to verify that $\text{vol}(\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_d(r_1))/\text{vol}(\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_d(r_2)) = (r_1/r_2)^d$. Subsequently, for any $1 \leq p < \infty$ we have that

$$\|\bar{F}_0 - \bar{F}_1\|_p \leq \left[\frac{\text{vol}(\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_d(2\sqrt{h}))}{\text{vol}(\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_d(1))} \cdot \|\bar{F}_0 - \bar{F}_1\|_\infty^p \right]^{1/p} = O(h^{(2p+d)/2p}).$$

Verification of property 4: From previous derivations we know that $x_\lambda^* = (\bar{x}_\lambda^*, \dots, \bar{x}_\lambda^*)$ with $\bar{x}_\lambda^* = \frac{\lambda\sqrt{h}}{d+1}$ and $\bar{F}_\lambda^* = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \bar{F}_\lambda(x) = \lambda h \left(1 - \frac{\lambda d}{d+1}\right)$. Subsequently,

$$\chi(\bar{F}_\lambda, \bar{F}_{1-\lambda}) = \bar{F}_\lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sqrt{h}}{d+1} \right) = \frac{d}{d+1} \left| \frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right|^2 \cdot h.$$

C Proof of Theorem 3.3

We give the proof of Theorem 3.3 that establishes an upper regret bound for functions that are merely convex; i.e., do not satisfy smoothness (A4) or strong convexity (A5). The meta-policy remains the same, and the sub-policy is also the OGD algorithm, but with a slightly different step size rule. The following lemma then upper bounds the regret against *stationary* benchmarks. It is a standard result in online convex optimization, whose proof can be found in, e.g., (Bubeck et al., 2012).

Lemma C.1. Fix $1 \leq T' \leq T$. Let $f = (f_1, \dots, f_{T'})$ be an arbitrary sequence of convex functions satisfying (A1) through (A3). For noisy gradient feedback and the OGD policy, the following holds with $\eta_t = 1/\sqrt{t}$:

$$S_\phi^\pi(f; x^*) = O(\sqrt{T'}), \quad \text{for } \phi = \phi_t^{\mathcal{G}}(x_t, f_t), \quad \pi = \pi_s^{\mathcal{G}} \text{ and all } x^* \in \mathcal{X}.$$

We next derive a decomposition of the strong regret and an affinity lemma, similar to Eq. (11) and Lemma 4.2. However, because strong convexity of f_t is no longer assumed, it is technically challenging to upper bound $|f_t(x_t^*) - f_t(x_\tau^*)|$ as in Lemma 4.2. To overcome such difficulties, we gave an alternative decomposition of the strong regret, which can then be upper bounded for general convex functions.

For any sequence of convex functions $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^{T'}$ let x_t^* be the minimizer of f_t . Then for any $\tau \in [T']$, the gap between strong and weak regret can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} R_\phi^\pi(f) - S_\phi^\pi(f, x_\tau^*) &= \sum_{t=1}^{T'} f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_t^*) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T'} f_\tau(x_t^*) - f_\tau(x_\tau^*) + f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_t^*) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{T'} |f_\tau(x_t^*) - f_t(x_t^*)| + |f_\tau(x_\tau^*) - f_t(x_\tau^*)| \leq 2T' \cdot \max_{1 \leq t, \tau \leq T'} |f_t(x_t^*) - f_\tau(x_t^*)|. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Here the second inequality holds because x_τ^* is the minimizer of f_τ , and therefore $f_\tau(x_t^*) \geq f_\tau(x_\tau^*)$ for all $x_t^* \in \mathcal{X}$. We then have the following affinity lemma that upper bounds $|f_\tau(x_t^*) - f_t(x_t^*)|$ using $\|f_\tau - f_t\|_p$.

Lemma C.2. Suppose $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Fix $1 \leq p < \infty$, $t \neq \tau$ and let x_t^*, x_τ^* be the minimizers of f_t and f_τ , respectively. Then under (A1) through (A3) we have that

$$\max \{ |f_t(x_t^*) - f_\tau(x_t^*)|, |f_t(x_\tau^*) - f_\tau(x_\tau^*)| \} = O \left(\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^{r'} \right) \quad \text{where } r' = \frac{p}{p+d} \in (0, 1).$$

While Lemmas C.2 and 4.2 appear similar, their proofs are actually different. Unlike the proof of Lemma 4.2 that analyzes $\|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|_2$ and uses the strong convexity of f_t and f_τ in an essential way, in the proof of Lemma C.2 we directly analyze the behavior of f_t and f_τ in a small neighborhood of x_t^* (or x_τ^*) without resorting to $\|x_t^* - x_\tau^*\|_2$. Thus, Lemma C.2 works for non-smooth and non-strongly convex functions. We give the complete proof of Lemma C.2 in Sec. C.1.

Combining Lemmas C.1, C.2 and Eq. (37) we can prove the desired upper bound in Theorem 3.3 using the same analysis in the proof of Theorem 3.1. More specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\phi^\pi(f) &\leq O(T/\sqrt{\Delta_T}) + O(\Delta_T) \cdot \max_{t, \tau \in \{\underline{b}_\ell, \dots, \bar{b}_\ell - 1\}} \|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^{r'} \\ &\leq O(T/\sqrt{\Delta_T}) + O(\Delta_T) \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^J \left(\sum_{t=\underline{b}_\ell}^{\bar{b}_\ell - 1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p \right)^{r'} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq O(T/\sqrt{\Delta_T}) + O(\Delta_T) \cdot \Delta_T^{r'-r'/q} J^{1-r'/q} T^{r'/q} V_T^{r'} = O(T/\sqrt{\Delta_T} + \Delta_T^{r'} T V_T^{r'}).$$

The critical parameter Δ_T should then be set as $\Delta_T = T$ if $V_T = O(T^{-(3p+d)/2p})$ and $\Delta_T \asymp V_T^{-2r'/(2r'+1)} = V_T^{-p/(3p+d)}$ otherwise.

C.1 Proof of Lemma C.2

Because of symmetry we only need to prove $|f_t(x_t^*) - f_\tau(x_t^*)| = O(\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^{r'})$. Recall the definition $\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x) := \{x + \rho(y - x) : 0 \leq \rho \leq \alpha, y \in \partial\mathcal{X}\}$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}^o$ and the properties that $\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, $\sup_{x' \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha(x)} \|x' - x\|_2 \leq \alpha D$ and $\text{vol}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x)) \geq \alpha^d \cdot \text{vol}(\mathcal{X})$.

Now set $\alpha = \delta/D$ for some $\delta \in (0, D)$ to be specified later. Because f_τ is Lipschitz continuous, we have $f_\tau(x) \leq f_\tau(x_t^*) + O(\delta)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*)$. On the other hand, $f_t(x) \geq f_t(x_t^*)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ because x_t^* is the minimizer of f_t . Combining both inequalities we have

$$|f_t(x_t^*) - f_\tau(x_t^*)|^p \leq C \cdot [|f_t(x) - f_\tau(x)|^p + O(\delta^p)] \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*).$$

Here $C > 0$ is a constant that only depends on H, D and p . Integrating both sides of the above inequality on $\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x_t^*)$ and noting that $\text{vol}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha(x)) \geq \alpha^d \cdot \text{vol}(\mathcal{X}) = \Omega(\delta^d)$, we have

$$\delta^d |f_t(x_t^*) - f_\tau(x_t^*)|^p \leq C \|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^p + O(\delta^{pd}).$$

Subsequently, $|f_t(x_t^*) - f_\tau(x_t^*)| \leq O(\delta^{-d/p} \|f_t - f_\tau\|_p + \delta^p)$. Taking $\delta = \min\{\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^{r'}, D/2\}$ where $r' = p/(p+d)$ we have $|f_t(x_t^*) - f_\tau(x_t^*)| \leq \max\{O(\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^{r'}), O(\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p)\}$. Because both f_t and f_τ are uniformly bounded (thanks to assumption (A2)) on a compact domain \mathcal{X} , we have that $\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p = O(1)$ and therefore the $\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p$ term is dominated by $\|f_t - f_\tau\|_p^{r'}$, because $r' < 1$.

D Proofs of other technical propositions

D.1 Proof of Proposition 1.1

By monotonicity of L_p -space, we know that for any measurable function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} |f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \leq \text{vol}(\mathcal{X})^{1/p-1/p'} \cdot \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} |f(x)|^q dx \right)^{1/q}, \quad \forall 0 < p \leq p' \leq \infty,$$

provided that integration on both sides of the inequality (or there limits) exist. Hence, $\|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p \leq \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_{p'}$ for all $1 \leq p \leq p' \leq \infty$ and therefore $\text{Var}_{p,q}(f) \leq \text{Var}_{p',q}(f)$.

By Hölder's inequality, we know that for any d -dimensional vector x it holds that

$$\|x\|_{q'} \leq \|x\|_q \leq d^{1/q-1/q'} \|x\|_{q'}, \quad \forall 0 < q \leq q' \leq \infty, \quad (38)$$

where $\|x\|_q = (\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i|^q)^{1/q}$ for $0 < q < \infty$ and $\|x\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |x_i|$ for $q = \infty$ is the ℓ_q norm of vector x . Applying Eq. (38) on the T -dimensional vector $(\|f_2 - f_1\|_p, \dots, \|f_T - f_{T-1}\|_p, 0)$ we have that

$$\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^q \right)^{1/q} \leq T^{1/q-1/q'} \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|f_{t+1} - f_t\|_p^{q'} \right)^{1/q'}.$$

Multiplying both sides of the above inequality by $T^{-1/q}$ we have that $\text{Var}_{p,q}(f) \leq \text{Var}_{p,q'}(f)$.

D.2 Proof of Proposition 3.1

For any $x \in \mathcal{X}^o$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ define $\|z\|_x := \sqrt{z^\top \nabla^2 \varphi(x) z}$. The *Dikin ellipsoid* $W_1(x)$ is defined as $W_1(x) := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|z - x\|_x \leq 1\}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}^o$. It is a well-known fact that $W_1(x) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}^o$ (Abernethy et al., 2008; Saha & Tewari, 2011; Hazan & Levy, 2014). It remains to verify that $z = x + (\nabla^2 \varphi(x) + \delta I_d)^{-1/2} u$ is in $W_1(x)$. To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|z - x\|_x^2 &= u^\top (\nabla^2 \varphi(x) + \delta I_d)^{-1/2} \nabla^2 \varphi(x) (\nabla^2 \varphi(x) + \delta I_d)^{-1/2} u \\ &= \|u\|_2^2 - \delta \|(\nabla^2 \varphi(x) + \delta I_d)^{-1/2} u\|_2^2 \leq \|u\|_2^2 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $z \in W_1(x) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

References

- Abernethy, J., Hazan, E., & Rakhlin, A. (2008). Competing in the dark: An efficient algorithm for bandit linear optimization. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*.
- Agarwal, A., Bartlett, P. L., Ravikumar, P., & Wainwright, M. J. (2012). Information-theoretic lower bounds on the oracle complexity of stochastic convex optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(5), 3235–3249.
- Agarwal, A., Dekel, O., & Xiao, L. (2010). Optimal algorithms for online convex optimization with multi-point bandit feedback. In *Proceedings of Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*.
- Agarwal, A., Foster, D. P., Hsu, D., Kakade, S. M., & Rakhlin, A. (2013). Stochastic convex optimization with bandit feedback. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(1), 213–240.
- Besbes, O., Gur, Y., & Zeevi, A. (2015). Non-stationary stochastic optimization. *Operations Research*, 63(5), 1227–1244.
- Boyd, S., & Vandenberghe, L. (2004). *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press.
- Bubeck, S., Cesa-Bianchi, N., et al. (2012). Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 5(1), 1–122.
- Bubeck, S., Eldan, R., & Lee, Y. T. (2017). Kernel-based methods for bandit convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*.
- Castro, R. M., & Nowak, R. D. (2008). Minimax bounds for active learning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(5), 2339–2353.
- Cover, T., & Thomas, J. (2006). *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley, 2 ed.
- Daniely, A., Gonen, A., & Shalev-Shwartz, S. (2015). Strongly adaptive online learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, (pp. 1405–1411).
- den Boer, A. V. (2015). Dynamic pricing and learning: Historical origins, current research, and new directions. *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science*, 20(1), 1–18.

- den Boer, A. V., & Zwart, B. (2015). Dynamic pricing and learning with finite inventories. *Operations Research*, 63(4), 965–978.
- Flaxman, A. D., Kalai, A. T., & McMahan, H. B. (2005). Online convex optimization in the bandit setting: gradient descent without a gradient. In *Proceedings of the Annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms (SODA)*.
- Graham, R., & Sloane, N. (1980). Lower bounds for constant weight codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 26(1), 37–43.
- Gur, Y. (2014). *Sequential Optimization in Changing Environments: Theory and Application to Online Content Recommendation Services*. Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University.
- Hall, E. C., & Willett, R. M. (2015). Online convex optimization in dynamic environments. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 9(4), 647–662.
- Hazan, E. (2016). Introduction to online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends in Optimization*, 2(3-4), 157–325.
- Hazan, E., Agarwal, A., & Kale, S. (2007). Logarithmic regret algorithms for online convex optimization. *Machine Learning*, 69(2), 169–192.
- Hazan, E., & Kale, S. (2014). Beyond the regret minimization barrier: Optimal algorithms for stochastic strongly-convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15, 2489–2512.
- Hazan, E., & Levy, K. (2014). Bandit convex optimization: Towards tight bounds. In *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*.
- Ibragimov, I. A., & Has'minskii, R. Z. (1981). *Statistical Estimation: Asymptotic Theory*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Jadbabaie, A., Rakhlin, A., Shahrampour, S., & Sridharan, K. (2015). Online optimization: Competing with dynamic comparators. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, (pp. 398–406).
- Jamieson, K. G., Nowak, R., & Recht, B. (2012). Query complexity of derivative-free optimization. In *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*.
- Karnin, Z. S., & Anava, O. (2016). Multi-armed bandits: Competing with optimal sequences. In *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*.
- Keskin, N. B., & Zeevi, A. (2017). Chasing demand: Learning and earning in a changing environment. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 42(2), 277–307.
- McMahan, H. B. (2017). A survey of algorithms and analysis for adaptive online learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18, 1–50. ArXiv preprint arXiv:1403.3465.
- Mokhtari, A., Shahrampour, S., Jadbabaie, A., & Ribeiro, A. (2016). Online optimization in dynamic environments: Improved regret rates for strongly convex problems. In *Decision and Control (CDC), 2016 IEEE 55th Conference on*, (pp. 7195–7201). IEEE.

- Nesterov, Y., & Nemirovskii, A. (1994). *Interior-point polynomial algorithms in convex programming*. SIAM.
- Raskutti, G., Wainwright, M. J., & Yu, B. (2011). Minimax rates of estimation for high-dimensional linear regression over ℓ_q -balls. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(10), 6976–6994.
- Saha, A., & Tewari, A. (2011). Improved regret guarantees for online smooth convex optimization with bandit feedback. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*.
- Shamir, O. (2015). An optimal algorithm for bandit and zero-order convex optimization with two-point feedback. ArXiv preprint arXiv:1507.08752.
- Tsybakov, A. B. (2009). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York.
- Wang, Y., & Singh, A. (2016). Noise-adaptive margin-based active learning and lower bounds under tsybakov noise condition. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*.
- Yu, B. (1997). Assouad, fano, and le cam. In *Festschrift for Lucien Le Cam*, (pp. 423–435). Springer.
- Yudin, D., & Nemirovskii, A. (1983). *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Zhang, L., Yang, T., Jin, R., & Zhou, Z.-H. (2017). Strongly adaptive regret implies optimally dynamic regret. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.07570*.
- Zinkevich, M. (2003). Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-03)*, (pp. 928–936).