
CORRUPTED CONTEXTUAL BANDITS WITH ACTION ORDER CONSTRAINTS

A PREPRINT

Alexander Galozy

Center for Applied Intelligent Systems Research
Halmstad University
Kristian IV:s väg 3, 301 18 Halmstad
alexander.galozy@hh.se

Slawomir Nowaczyk

Center for Applied Intelligent Systems Research
Halmstad University
Kristian IV:s väg 3, 301 18 Halmstad
slawomir.nowaczyk@hh.se

Mattias Ohlsson

Center for Applied Intelligent Systems Research
Halmstad University
Kristian IV:s väg 3, 301 18 Halmstad
mattias.ohlsson@hh.se

October 13, 2021

ABSTRACT

We consider a variant of the novel contextual bandit problem with corrupted context (CBC), where actions exhibit a correlation structure that can be exploited to guide the exploration of viable next actions. Our setting is motivated by adaptive mobile health interventions and related applications, where users might transition through different stages. The context provided by users might not always be informative at every decision point and standard contextual approaches to action selection will incur high regret. We present a meta-algorithm that uses a referee that dynamically combines the policies of a contextual bandit (CB) and multi-armed bandit (MAB), similar to previous work, as well as a correlation mechanism that captures action to action transitions allowing for more efficient exploration of actions exhibiting correlation in time. We show on simulated data that combining CB and MAB policies might incur more regret if both perform similarly over time. Additionally, we illustrate that the proposed algorithm improves upon regret in situations where the performance of both policies varies such that one is superior to the other for a given time period. We evaluate our method on several real world data sets, showing better empirical performance compared to a set of simpler algorithms.

Keywords Multi-Armed-Bandit, Contextual Bandit, Sequential Decision Making, Action Sequence, Nonstationarity

1 Introduction

The multi-armed bandit problem in the area of sequential decision making has attracted significant attention due to its applicability in many real-world areas such as clinical trials [Villar et al. \[2015\]](#), [Bastani and Bayati \[2020\]](#), finance [Shen et al. \[2015\]](#), [Huo and Fu \[2017\]](#), routing networks [Boldrini et al. \[2018\]](#), [Kerkouche et al. \[2018\]](#), online-advertising [Wen et al. \[2017\]](#), [Schwartz et al. \[2017\]](#) and movie [Wang et al. \[2019\]](#) or app recommendation [Baltrunas et al. \[2015\]](#). The goal of the agent is to select from a set of available actions (also known as arms) that would maximize the received cumulative reward, given its past actions and rewards. An alternative but equivalent formulation is to minimize regret, commonly defined as the difference between the cumulative rewards of the agent's strategy and an a priori known best strategy that chooses the action with the highest expected reward at each decision point. Unlike in the full information setting, where the "usefulness" or "utility" of each action is revealed to the agent at each decision point, the so-called *bandit feedback* is prevalent in sequential decision-making applications. The utility of the action

chosen by the agent is revealed, but the utility of other actions remains unknown. This partial feedback mechanism calls for a trade-off between exploitation, where the action that appears to yield the highest possible reward is chosen, and exploration, where the agent actively chooses actions that might appear noncompetitive at the moment, to gather more information about them to update its own beliefs about their true utility. Significant work has been done to design algorithms that provide an optimum or near optimum exploitation/exploration trade-off for a variety of problem settings. Previous works have explored the context-free Multi-Armed-Bandit (MAB) setting such as the stochastic variant using upper confidence bounds (UCB) or the principle of "optimism in the face of uncertainty" [Lai and Robbins \[1985\]](#), [Auer et al. \[2002\]](#) or Bayesian treatments using Thompson sampling [Thompson \[1933\]](#), [Chapelle and Li \[2011\]](#) a so-called probability matching technique.

One fundamental issue for methods that solve the classical MAB problem are situations where the best action may change over time, encountered in nonstationary environments. For example, a user's taste in a particular genre of movie might change, or treatment might not be effective anymore with repeated exposure. Many ways of dealing with nonstationary environments have been explored in the past, but one particular setting has received significant attention, where additional information at each time step effectively turns the nonstationary problem into a stationary one. This extension to the MAB-problem is the Contextual Bandit (CB) problem, also known as the Multi-Armed-Bandit problem with side information or associative reinforcement learning. The learner has additional information that helps in selecting the action that maximizes cumulative reward in problems where the reward distribution of actions are dependent on a latent state which is fully or partially observable through a d -dimensional feature vector, often referred to as context. The long-term goal of the agent is to learn the relationship between context and the action rewards, which allows the agent to estimate the utility of each action and act appropriately. Some notable papers for the stationary contextual bandit problem include Linear Upper-Confidence-Bound (LINUCB) [Chu et al. \[2011\]](#), [Li et al. \[2010\]](#) and Linear Contextual Thompson Sampling (LinTS) [Agrawal and Goyal \[2013\]](#). Particularly, LinUCB has been applied successfully in the contextual setting of news article recommendations [Li et al. \[2010\]](#).

The contextual setting we primarily consider is Mobile Health, where an underlying evolving state partially determines users' needs and wants. Depending on the state, different interventions might be required. For example, some users are significantly affected by stress and may require a particular set of stress coping techniques, while others may experience stress less severely, where general advice might be enough [Abouserie \[1994\]](#). The underlying state may induce a natural ordering of actions as the user transitions through different "levels" or "stages" that require specific interventions. An algorithm that learns these transitions can explore the next promising actions more effectively in cases where contexts are significantly corrupted and thus uninformative for decision making. In our setting, we expect users not to know their state perfectly and often provide us with a context that is a noisy estimate of their underlying state.

Motivated by Mobile Health and similar settings, we consider a setting defined by [Bouneffouf \[2020\]](#), they refer to as the contextual bandit with corrupted context (CBCC), where the agent may not be able to use the provided contexts due to significant corruption. The authors assume the corruption is irreversible and total, unlike in previous work that considers contexts corrupted by random independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) noise [Yun et al. \[2017\]](#). What differentiates our setting from CBCC is that the context received at each time step, i.e., the feature vector the agent uses to make decisions, approximates an underlying state that evolves according to an auto-regressive process, making the context evolution Markovian. This Markovian state evolution introduces a relational property among the actions that can be exploited to minimize regret. Additionally, our setting can include several "users" that can differ in both the dynamics of the state evolution and level of context corruption, requiring the need for an adaptive, potentially individual strategy to provide relevant interventions in a timely manner. Our setting also exhibits similarities to the broader literature on sequence aware recommender systems where action exhibit some underlying ordering structure that can be exploited to predict the next item (action) or set of items [Natarajan et al. \[2013\]](#), [Jannach et al. \[2015\]](#), [Hariri et al. \[2012\]](#), [Bonnin and Jannach \[2014\]](#), [Mobasher et al. \[2002\]](#), [Nakagawa and Mobasher \[2003\]](#). For a comprehensive overview of sequence-aware recommender system literature, we refer to [Quadrana et al. \[2018\]](#).

Our main contributions are as follows: (1) we formulate a variation of the CBCC problem, inspired by but not limited to, the Mobile Health applications, where the correlation of actions in time are determined by a hidden state that satisfies the Markovian property, the so called contextual bandit with corrupted contexts and action correlations (CBCCAC); (2) we propose a meta-algorithm for this setting as well as a UCB instantiation of the meta-algorithm; (3) We analyse the lower bounds of our problem setting and upper bounds of the UCB instantiation of the meta-algorithm in the CBCCAC problem; (4) we evaluate empirically several variants of the UCB instantiation of the meta-algorithm on both simulated and real-world data. Additionally, we show on simulated scenarios that our method provides better empirical regret performance over single algorithm approaches.

We organize our paper as follows: We introduce in section 2 some background on bandits, the CBCC setting and definitions used throughout the paper. Section 3 formalizes the problem setting and notion of regret. We describe our simulation environment for the problem setting in 4. In section 5 we present the meta-algorithm COMBINE and its

upper-confidence-bound (UCB) instantiation COMBINE-UCB. Our theoretical analyses of the regret bounds is shown in section 6. We outline in section 7 the setup of the empirical evaluation of our method on the simulation environment and real-world data and in section 8 we present and discuss the results. In section 9, we conclude this paper.

2 Background

In this section, we elaborate more on the background and refer to previous work relevant to our problems setting, which lies in the intersection of several previously explored settings.

2.1 Stochastic, Nonstationary and Markov Multi-armed Bandit Problem

In the stochastic multi-armed bandit problem [Lai and Robbins \[1985\]](#), [Auer et al. \[2002\]](#), the rewards the agent receives by playing an action are a sequence of i.i.d. random variables. The agent is tasked with the problem of identifying the arm with the highest mean reward. Since the rewards are stochastic, the agent may need to play each arm more than once to identify the best arm, incurring additional regret. The notion of regret is typically the *pseudo-regret*, where the loss is measured against the reward of the action with the highest mean reward. In such a setting, the optimal regret is in the order of $O(K \ln(T))$, where K is the number of arms and T the number of timesteps. In other words, any algorithm will need to select each suboptimal arm at least as often as logarithmic in time t , asymptotically. Several algorithms achieve this lower bound. For example, see [Lai and Robbins \[1985\]](#), [Auer et al. \[2002\]](#), [Kocsis and Szepesvári \[2006\]](#). For the finite time horizon case, [Auer et al. \[2002\]](#) provide *worst case* minimax lower bound of order $O(\sqrt{T})$, when differences in mean reward between actions tend to 0. As pointed out by [Garivier and Moulines \[2011\]](#), in the less pathological cases, the minimax lower bound is more in the order of magnitude of the lower bound for the asymptotic case.

A variety of nonstationary settings, such as switching [Garivier and Moulines \[2011\]](#) or adversarial bandits, have been explored in the past. For stochastic rewards and fixed number of distribution changes, authors of [Garivier and Moulines \[2011\]](#) prove that no algorithm can achieve dynamic regret of order lower than $\Omega(\sqrt{T})$. Their analysis assumes that the reward distribution changes independently for each arm, such that a player may miss the instance where another arm may become the best arm. In our setting, arms are correlated such that the reward distributions of arms change *simultaneously*, therefore detecting a change point may become significantly easier depending on the level of distribution change. In the adversarial bandit setting, the reward distribution of each action is not determined by a fixed probability distribution but can be chosen arbitrarily by an adversary [Auer et al. \[2003\]](#), allowing the analysis in terms of worst-case regret. In this setting, the notion of *adversarial regret* is often adopted, reminiscent of the *pseudo-regret*, the regret compared to the best-fixed expert (or arm/action), defined as

$$R_{adv}(T) = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in A} \sum_{t=1}^T r_{t,a} - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T r_{t,a_t} \right].$$

Where $r_{t,a}$ is the return if the single best single action in hindsight up until horizon T , and r_{t,a_t} is the reward received due to the algorithm’s action selection strategy. The expectation is taken over the algorithm’s randomization. Accordingly, the regret lower bound for such a setting is of order $O(\sqrt{T \ln(K)})$ [Cesa-Bianchi et al. \[1997\]](#). Note that in this work, we consider the optimum *dynamic regret*, that is, the regret of the agent compared to an omniscient policy that chooses the action with the highest reward at each timestep, see section 3.2 for formal definition. For the agent to achieve sublinear regret, the number of distribution changes needs to be of order less than T . Otherwise, the agent may never not choose suboptimal actions, as perfectly predicting a change in distribution is impossible from past experience, given no information of the change in distribution. For our regret definition and in settings where the reward sequence is not completely arbitrary, authors in [Auer \[2003\]](#) show that their EXP3.S algorithm achieves $O(\sqrt{KLT})$ regret, where L is the number of distribution changes known in advance. Without knowing the number of distribution changes in advance, authors in [Yu and Mannor \[2009\]](#) provide an algorithm that achieves dynamic regret of order $O(KL \ln(T))$. Recently it has been shown that for the stochastic nonstationary bandit problem, achieving optimal dynamic regret is possible for the two-armed bandit problem without knowing L in advance, where the authors present an algorithm that achieves the optimal lower bound of order $O(\sqrt{KLT})$ [Auer et al. \[2019\]](#).

Our problem setting has attributes that are reminiscent of switching bandit setting but is most closely related to *rested* [Gittins \[1979\]](#) and *restless* bandits [Whittle \[1988\]](#), particularly when the state dynamics of actions are Markovian defined in the restless Markov bandits problem explored by authors in [Ortner et al. \[2014\]](#). For their problem setting, they prove a regret lower bound of $\Omega(\sqrt{ST})$, where $S := Km$ with K being the number of actions and $m \geq 1$. What separates these problems from ours is a simple restriction: We do not have an independent Markov process for each

action determining the action’s reward distribution, but a common Markov process. A similar setting has been explored by authors in [Zhou et al. \[2021\]](#), but their compare performance to an optimal POMDP policy that knows the transition matrix and reward distribution and their results in terms of regret is not directly applicable.

2.2 Contextual Bandit Problem and LinUCB

We model the task of recommending digital interventions in a Mobile Health setting as a multi-armed bandit problem and more specifically as a contextual bandit problem. We follow the definition of the contextual bandit problem from [Langford and Zhang \[2008\]](#) with slight modifications to include information from several users similar to [Li et al. \[2010\]](#). At each time step $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T\}$:

1. The environment reveals a d -dimensional feature vector $\mathbf{x}_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that includes information of a user i .
2. The agent chooses an action a_t^i from a set K of alternatives according to its policy. After playing the action a_t^i , the action’s reward $r_{t,a}^i \in \{0, 1\}$ is revealed.
3. The agent updates its policy using the observations of context \mathbf{x}_t^i , action a_t^i and action-reward $r_{t,a}^i$ to improve action selection in future rounds.

As mentioned, the action is chosen according to the agent’s *policy*. A policy is a function that maps its inputs (the current context) to an action, i.e., $\pi : X \rightarrow A$.

For the contextual bandit setting without uncertainty on features, authors in [Chu et al. \[2011\]](#) provide the lower regret bound:

Theorem 1. [Chu et al. \[2011\]](#) *For the linear contextual bandit problem, for any algorithm choosing action a at time t for K actions, there is a constant $\gamma > 0$, with $T > K > 2$ and $d^2 \leq T$ is a series of d -dimensional context vectors, such that*

$$R(T) \geq \gamma\sqrt{Td}$$

where $R(T)$ As mentioned early, while achieving optimal dynamic regret is impossible for bandit algorithms having no information about the hidden state that determines the reward distribution of actions, this is not true for the contextual bandit setting. Following the argument of [Bouneffouf \[2020\]](#), the probability of getting an uncorrupted context is $1 - p$, that is, the best-case scenario. Any algorithm in our problem setting where the reward distributions can change as often as every timestep, can achieve at most the lower bound on regret stated in [Theorem 1](#). A variety of algorithms have been developed that achieve regret in the order of the lower bound [Auer et al. \[2002\]](#), [Agrawal and Goyal \[2013\]](#), [Chu et al. \[2011\]](#), [Li et al. \[2010\]](#). We discuss a popular one here.

The idea of using UCB methods not only for the context-free MAB problem but also devise algorithms for the CB problem has led to the development of one of the more popular methods called LinUCB [Chu et al. \[2011\]](#), [Li et al. \[2010\]](#). The key challenge for UCB methods is the construction of upper-confidence bounds on the estimated action rewards or payoffs and doing so in an efficient manner. For linear context to action-reward functions, authors in [Li et al., 2010](#) provide an efficient and closed-form computation rule for constructing confidence intervals.

As part of our problem setting, we focus on LinUCB with disjoint linear models described by [Li et al., 2010](#). We assume that the expected reward for each action is linear in the context vector \mathbf{x}_t^i . There exists some coefficient vector $\mu_{i,a}^*$ that maps context to expected action rewards:

$$\mathbb{E}[r_{t,a}^i | \mathbf{x}_{i,t}] = \mathbf{x}_{i,t}^\top \mu_{i,a}^*. \quad (1)$$

Coefficients $\mu_{i,a}^*$ are unknown to the agent and need to be estimated from collected data of user i . The estimated coefficient vector $\hat{\mu}_{i,a}$ can be found via ridge regression:

$$\hat{\mu}_{i,a} = (\mathbf{D}_{i,a}^\top \mathbf{D}_{i,a} + \mathbf{I}_d)^{-1} \mathbf{D}_{i,a}^\top \mathbf{b}_{i,a}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{D}_{i,a}$ is a design matrix with dimension $m \times d$ that contains m training inputs or context for action a previously observed, $\mathbf{b}_{i,a}$ is the reward vector for action a and \mathbf{I}_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix.

At each time step t LinUCB selects actions according to

$$a_{i,t} = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in A} \left(\mathbf{x}_{i,t}^\top \hat{\mu}_{i,a} + \alpha \sqrt{\mathbf{x}_{i,t}^\top \mathbf{A}_{i,a}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{i,t}} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{i,a} = \mathbf{D}_{i,a}^\top \mathbf{D}_{i,a} + \mathbf{I}_d$ and $\alpha = 1 + \sqrt{\ln(2/\delta)}/2$, with $\delta > 0$, is a constant. We note that the equations provided here would train a separate LinUCB model for each user. While perfectly possible, in practice one might want to generalize to several users and use a "global" model. In such a case, one just needs to drop the index i from the equations and treat every arriving context as a data point to estimate the global coefficient vector $\hat{\mu}_a$ for all actions.

The authors of LINUCB note that the confidence interval (second term in equation 3), may also be derived from Bayesian principles using $\hat{\mu}_a$ and \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} as mean and covariance to the gaussian posterior distribution of coefficient vector $\hat{\mu}$. This observation has been utilized in the LinTS algorithm [Agrawal and Goyal \[2013\]](#).

2.3 Contextual Bandit with Corrupted Contexts (CBCC)

Our setting is based on a previously defined problem setting, see [Bouneffouf, 2020](#), where the agent receives a corrupted context that does not contain any information to learn the correct context to action-reward mapping. With probability p , the agent receives a corrupted context. How the context is corrupted is governed by the corruption function $\nu : X \rightarrow X$. This function is arbitrary, unknown to the agent and it is not possible to recover or otherwise compensate for it. The context the agent receives at every time step is defined as

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t = \begin{cases} \nu(\mathbf{x}_t) & \text{with probability } p \\ \mathbf{x}_t & \text{with probability } 1 - p. \end{cases}$$

The CBCC setting follows the protocol:

1. The uncorrupted context \mathbf{x}_t and the arm-reward vector \mathbf{r}_t is drawn (i.i.d.) from a stationary joint distribution $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$.
2. The context is corrupted using function ν with probability p .
3. After receiving the potentially corrupted context, the agent chooses an action
4. The reward for the action is revealed and the agent updates its policy.

3 Problem Setting

In this section, we introduce our problem setting and discuss difficulties and scenarios that might arise. We are primarily concerned with an environment where observations of varying degrees of "usefulness" are available to the agent for decision making. A useful context allows the agent to learn the correct context to action reward mapping, improving its decision-making capabilities. This setting is heavily motivated by mobile health applications, where users provide unreliable or conflicting feedback or exhibit varying degrees of engagement and conscientiousness in reporting their state. The usefulness can be fixed, i.e., the users always provide contexts with some level of corruption that stays constant, but the usefulness of contexts may also vary over time. We investigate the performance of our proposed algorithm for both settings of fixed and changing usefulness.

Besides unreliable contexts, users in a Mobile Health setting may also have specific goals, losing weight, such as requiring the progression through stages or execution of a sequence of task recommended by health professionals to achieve the desired goal. In the absence of any useful contextual information to provide the user with tailored interventions, we could utilize transitions between actions to guide exploration more effectively. We assume that the underlying state of the user induces correlation, or a sequence of actions, such that for a particular context a progression of actions "appropriate" for that context needs to be played by the agent.

Additionally, similar to the full reinforcement learning setting, we acknowledge the possibility of an action influencing the state of the users. Relevant interventions might encourage users to make progress in their goals and, subsequently, often affect what contexts the agent observes. Note that in the standard contextual bandit setting, it is assumed that contexts are i.i.d. sampled, which is different to our setting where contexts arrive in a Markovian manner. Consequently, the agent has additional difficulty generalizing beyond the training distribution. If the assumption of i.i.d. contexts does not hold, the agent often needs to collect additional data, which typically comes with a regret penalty in the short term until the context space for a particular user is sufficiently explored.

Penalties through insufficient context exploration might be mitigated if we combine the information from several users that behave in a similar manner, e.g., have similar health goals. This may allow us to train "global" policies to more efficiently discover the correct context to reward mapping or correlations among actions to guide exploration. Depending on how the policy is implemented, on an individual level or global level, it would be reflected in our policy update strategy. We go into more detail about using global or individual models in section 5, where we define our meta-algorithm.

3.1 Formal Definition of the Problem Setting

In protocol 1, we present a high-level description of our problem setting. At each iteration and for every user, the environment generates the context vector $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ of user i from their underlying scalar state $s_{i,t}$ and corrupts it with probability $p_{i,t}$. The corrupted context is observed by the agent which chooses an action $a_{i,t}$ to play according to its policy. The environment reveals the Bernoulli-distributed action-reward $r_{a_{i,t}}^i \in [0, 1]$, if the best action has been selected and 0 otherwise. The state for user i is updated. Finally, the agent updates its policy π .

Protocol 1 Problem Protocol

- 1: **procedure** PROTOCOL
 - 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 3: **for** user $i \in I$ **do**
 - 4: the environment generates context $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ from state $s_{i,t}$
 - 5: the context is corrupted $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t} = \nu(\mathbf{x}_{i,t})$ with probability $p_{i,t}$
 - 6: the agent chooses an action $a_{i,t} = \pi(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t})$
 - 7: the environment reveals the reward $r_{a_{i,t}}^i \in [0, 1]$
 - 8: the state s_i is updated: $s_{i,t+1} = \phi(a_{i,t}, s_{i,t})$ ▷ "Markovian sampling" of next state
 - 9: policy π of the agent is updated
-

$\phi : R \times X \rightarrow X$ denotes a function determining the next underlying state. We describe this function in more detail in section 4.2. The state $s_{i,t}$, and consequently context $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ is not drawn independently from an underlying stationary distribution but evolves according to a Markov chain and can be affected by actions the agent takes. Note that this action influence on the hidden state is not universal and only happens if the agent chooses an action that provides a reward > 0 , in our case, only for the single best action given the state. As such, we can view the problem setting as a special case of a Markov Decision Process (MDP) where the state transition matrix is defined as

$$P(s_{t+1} | a_t, s_t) = \begin{cases} P(s_{t+1} = s' | a_t = a, s_t = s), & \text{for } a_t = a_t^* \\ P(s_{t+1} = s' | s_t = s) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

implying that the MDP behaves like a Markov chain for sub-optimal actions. Furthermore, the reward distribution of each action is the same for each state but permuted across actions. That implies that the reward distribution of the best action is identical across states, that is, for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $r_{a_1, s_i} = r_{a_k, s_j}$ for some actions $a_1 \neq a_k$ and where a_1 and a_k are the best actions in state s_i and s_j , respectively. As such, our setting does not have a superior state where higher cumulative reward could be achieved, allowing the agent to find the optimum policy by maximizing *immediate reward*, the primary objective of bandit algorithms.

3.2 Notion of Regret

The difference in cumulative reward between the policy that always chooses the optimal action on every time step, and the learned policy π of the agent, is commonly referred to as the *dynamic regret*. We compute the regret as an average over the regret of all users following the definition:

Definition 1 (Average dynamic regret) The average dynamic regret after T time steps over all users in I is given as:

$$R(T) = \frac{1}{|I|} \sum_{i \in I} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T r_{t, a_{i,t}^*}^i - \sum_{t=1}^T r_{t, a_{i,t}}^i \right), \quad (4)$$

where $a_{i,t}^*$ and $a_{i,t} := \pi(\mathbf{x}_{i,t})$ denote the optimal action and the action chosen by the agents policy at time step t for user i , respectively. We note that this definition of regret, our agent competes against the oracle that chooses the best action at every timestep. Given that the hidden state evolution is Markov, an algorithm can perform much better than playing the best arm in terms of mean reward [Ortner et al. \[2014\]](#). We elaborate more on the consequences of the reward definition in theoretical analysis in section 6.

4 Simulation Environment

We created a simple simulation environment that implements the problem setting described in protocol 1. In the following sections, we describe our simulation environment that generates simulated data, allowing us to investigate the performance of our proposed algorithm and other algorithms.

4.1 Action Correlation

We implemented the intuition of different "levels" users might go through by subdividing the space of state s_t into intervals, with each interval having one best action. More formally, given a set of actions K , we define a partition of the compact interval $Q = [0, 1]$ on the real line such that there exists a sequence of sub interval satisfying:

$$0 = q_0 < q_1 < \dots < q_{K-1} = 1, \quad (5)$$

where for every subinterval $[q_k, q_{k+1}]$ there exists a corresponding best action a . In other words, there exists a bijective mapping between action $a \in A$ and a sub-interval of partition q . We do not put any constraints on what action corresponds to what interval, but for simplicity, we assume that subinterval satisfies $[q_{k-1}, q_k] : a_k$, e.g., action a_1 corresponds to subinterval $[q_0, q_1]$, and so forth. This partitioning is the same for all users in the simulation.

Distributing the actions space over discret intervals of the context space will lead to a nonlinear context to action-reward mapping, resulting in sub-par performance of the algorithms that assume linear realizability. To allow linear models to perform well such that deciding between CB and MAB becomes nontrivial, we construct linear features of the context, i.e., we represent the context as the one-hot encoding of the best action given the corrupted context. As mentioned in problem protocol 1, our simulation environment "generates" context vector $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ from $s_{i,t}$ by one-hot encoding the best action given the state $s_{i,t}$. In our setting, we assume that choosing the correct action given the context has a "positive" (downwards) effect on the underlying state, resulting in "better" health or state of being that promotes positive health outcomes.

4.2 Context Corruption and Hidden State Update

As mentioned earlier in the previous section, the context the agent receives at each iteration has a chance of being arbitrarily corrupted such that it becomes useless for decision making. For our experiments, we corrupt the context $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ by simply drawing a random state from a uniform distribution on the interval $[0, 1]$ and transform it into the corrupted context.

After the action is played by the agent, the hidden state is updated. The users hidden state is scalar defined on the domain $[0, 1]$. The function ϕ maps the current state to a new state for time step $t + 1$. ϕ is composed of two functions f and g : $\phi(r_t, s_t) = f(s_t) + g(r_{a_t})$, with $f(s_t)$ being a truncated random walk model limited to the domain $[0, 1]$ and $g(r_{a_t})$ a influence term. The hidden state s at time $t + 1$ is updated as:

$$s(t + 1) = f(s_t) + g(r_{a_t}). \quad (6)$$

s_{t+1} being further limited to $[0, 1]$ after addition of g , avoiding the negation of action influence due to the random walk model for states close to 0 or 1. We describe functions f and g in more detail in the following paragraphs.

$f(s_t) \in [0, 1]$ defines a truncated random walk model and simulates the natural evolution of the state. In our simulations, it can be interpreted as the natural change of the "health" state of the patient that may require specific interventions at particular "levels" or values of the state s_t . At environment initialization, T independent realizations are drawn from a Bernoulli distributed random variable $Z_t \sim \mathcal{B}(p)$ constituting set \mathbf{Z} , where p denotes the probability of success, i.e., $P(Z = 1) = p$. For our simulations, we consider $p = 0.5$. Function $f(s_t)$ transforms the state s_t according to:

$$f(s_t) = \begin{cases} s_t + c & \text{if } Z_t = 1 \\ s_t - c & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $\{Z_t \in \mathbf{Z} : t \in T\}$ and where $c \in [0, 1]$ is a constant. c determines the dynamics of the state in each time step and may be different for different users. Once chosen for each user, it stays fixed for the whole simulation.

The influence function $g(r_{a_t})$ perturbs the hidden state by adding an influence factor l which is common across users:

$$g(r_{a_t}) = \begin{cases} l & \text{if } r_{a_t} = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

with $l \in [-1, 0]$, since we assume lower levels correspond to better health. Choosing the correct action affects the random walk model trend and, as a consequence, the sequence of best actions changes over time. If the value of the constant l is zero, then the agent’s actions do not influence the next state. Thus the setting reduces to a contextual bandit problem with non-i.i.d. context sampling.

5 Meta-Algorithm: Competing Bandits with Corrupted Context and Action Correlations

Algorithm 1 Competing Bandits with Corrupted Context and Action Correlations

```

1: procedure COMBINE
2:   Input: Algorithm Parameters, Policies: CB, MAB and referee, action set, user set
3:   Initialize: Book-keeping variables for CB, MAB and referee
4:   for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  do
5:     for user  $i \in I$  do
6:       Observe context  $\hat{x}_{i,t}$ 
7:       Sample Policy  $\pi(t)$  from referee
8:       if  $\pi_{i,t} = \text{CB policy}$  then
9:         choose action using CB policy
10:      else
11:        choose action using MAB policy from subset  $\mathcal{U}_i$ 
12:      Observe reward for chosen action
13:      if previous best action is not equal to the current chosen action then
14:        Update Adjacency matrix  $\Lambda_i$ 
15:      if CB was chosen as a policy then
16:        Update CB policy
17:      else
18:        Update MAB policy
19:      Update referee
20:      if reward = 1 then
21:        Update best current action
22:      else
23:        Update best previous action
24:      choose action subset  $\mathcal{U}_i$  to sample from next

```

We present the high-level overview of the meta-algorithm COMpeting BandIts with corrupted coNtext and action correlations (COMBINE) in algorithm 1, and its UCB variant, in the algorithm 2. At each time step, the agent observes the possibly corrupted context \hat{x}_t and decides to use either the CB or MAB policies to select the action to play (line 6). The decision to play the CB or MAB is made by another bandit policy, the so-called referee.

If the referee chooses the MAB policy, the actions are selected from an action-subset \mathcal{U} that is dynamically computed and represents a candidate set of next promising actions. If the CB policy is chosen, the algorithm selects the action according to the context. The action is played and the agent observes the reward.

If the CB policy was chosen for the action selection, its policy is updated with the new reward (line 15). Otherwise, we update the MAB policy (line 18). The reasoning for this is that if the referee does not trust the context it receives, the CB may not gain anything by learning from that data point. As determined by the referee, discarding useless information is expected to lead to more efficient learning of the context to action-reward mapping. Similarly, if the MAB has difficulty selecting the appropriate action, it may only harm its estimates of true action rewards in cases of high nonstationarity. The referee is then updated using the reward and the choice of policy.

The algorithm keeps track of action transitions through an action to action adjacency matrix that contains the number of observed transitions between actions. The matrix is updated after the reward is observed (line 13). The MAB uses the adjacency matrix to explore the next promising action in cases where contexts are uninformative or highly corrupted. As part of the adjacency matrix update, depending on the reward, the best previous action or the current best action is updated (line 20). The best previous action and current best action are used to record what action leads into another

such that the adjacency matrix can be updated appropriately. Finally, the action subset \mathcal{U} is updated to play in the next round (line 24).

We assume that we receive information from several users at each time step. Additionally, we assume that the learned action to reward mapping from each user can be generalized to other users. We allow the possibility to include an individual model and a global model for the CB, MAB and referee. We choose a global model for the CB and individual models for both MAB and referee in our example. Both our MAB policy and the referee can adjust to each user, e.g., depending on the corruption level of one user, we might favor the MAB policy more without affecting the policy selection of other users. We also investigate a global or "common" variant of the MAB policy where we learn a common adjacency matrix used for decision making for all users. More details on the individual and common variants is described in section 5.2.

5.1 Competing Bandits with Corrupted Context and Action Correlations UCB (COMBINE-UCB)

Algorithm 2 Competing Bandits with Corrupted Context and Action Correlations UCB

```

1: procedure COMBINE-UCB
2:   Input:  $\alpha \in (0, \infty]$ ,  $\alpha_B \in [0, \infty]$ ,  $\gamma \in (0, \infty]$ ,  $\delta_R \in (0, \infty]$ , action set  $A$ , user set  $I$ 
3:   Initialize:  $H = \{0\}^{|I| \times 2}$ ,  $\bar{R} = \{0\}^{|I| \times |A|}$ ,  $n = \{0\}^{|I| \times |A|}$ ,  $a^+ = \{NaN\}^{|I| \times 1}$ ,  $a^- = \{NaN\}^{|I| \times 1}$ ,
    $\beta = \{1\}^{|I| \times 1}$ ,  $\mathcal{U}^{|I| \times |A|} = A$ ,  $\Lambda^i = \{1\}^{|A| \times |A|}$ ,  $\forall a \in A : \mathbf{A}_a = \mathbf{I}_d$ ,  $\forall a \in A : \mathbf{b}_a = \{0\}^{d \times 1}$ 
4:   for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  do
5:     for user  $i \in I$  do
6:       Observe context  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t}$ 
7:        $pb_i = \frac{e^{H_i}}{\sum e^{H_i}}$  ▷ Compute probability of choosing either CB or MAB
8:       Sample policy  $\pi_{i,t} \sim \mathcal{B}(pb_{i,t})$ 
9:       if  $\pi_{i,t} = \pi_0$  then ▷ Choose contextual bandit
10:        for action  $a = 1, \dots, K$  do
11:           $\hat{\mu}_a \leftarrow \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} \mathbf{b}_a$  ▷ Update weight vectors of global CB
12:           $a_{i,t} = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t}^\top \hat{\mu}_a + \alpha \sqrt{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t}^\top \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t}}$ 
13:        else ▷ Choose Bandit
14:           $a_{i,t} = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{U}_i} \theta_{i,a}$ 
15:        Observe reward  $r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i$  for action  $a_{i,t}$ 
16:        if  $a_i^- \neq a_{i,t}$  then ▷ Update adjacency matrix
17:           $\Lambda_{a_i^-, a_{i,t}}^i = \Lambda_{a_i^-, a_{i,t}}^i + r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i$ 
18:        if  $\pi_{i,t} = \pi_0$  then ▷ Update global CB if it was chosen as a policy
19:           $\mathbf{A}_a \leftarrow \mathbf{A}_a + \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t}^\top$ 
20:           $\mathbf{b}_a \leftarrow \mathbf{b}_a + r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t}$ 
21:        else
22:           $\bar{R}_{i,a_{i,t}} = \bar{R}_{i,a_{i,t}} + \gamma (r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i - \bar{R}_{i,a_{i,t}})$  ▷ Update average action reward
23:           $n_{i,a_{i,t}} = n_{i,a_{i,t}} + 1$  ▷ Update action count for chosen action
24:           $\theta_{i,a_{i,t}} \leftarrow \bar{R}_{i,a_{i,t}} + \alpha_B \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln(t)}{n_{i,a_{i,t}}}}$  ▷ Update action scores
25:           $H_{i,\pi_{i,t}} \leftarrow H_{i,\pi_{i,t}} + \delta_R (r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i - pb_{i,\pi_{i,t}})$  ▷ Update gradient bandit for  $\pi_{i,t}$ 
26:           $H_{i,\neg\pi_{i,t}} \leftarrow H_{i,\neg\pi_{i,t}} + \delta_R (1 - 2r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i) (1 - pb_{i,\pi_{i,t}})$  ▷ Update gradient bandit for  $\pi \neq \pi_{i,t}$ 
27:          if  $r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i = 1$  then
28:             $a_i^+ \leftarrow a_{i,t}$  ▷ Update best current action
29:          else
30:             $a_i^- \leftarrow a_i^+$  ▷ Update best previous action
    $\mathcal{U}_i \leftarrow \operatorname{AdjSelect}(a_i^-, \Lambda^i, \beta_i, r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i)$  ▷ Choose action subset to sample from next

```

The UCB instantiation of the meta-algorithm presented in the previous section is shown in algorithm 2. At every time step, the agent observes a (possibly corrupted) version of context $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t}$. The probability pb_i of choosing the CB or the MAB is computed from the gradient bandits Sutton and Barto [2018] preference values H_i (line 6) using the softmax

Algorithm 3 Select Action Subset

```

1: procedure ADJSELECT
2:   Input: best previous action  $a_i^-$ , adjacency matrix  $\Lambda_i$ , reach  $\beta_i$ , reward  $r_{a_i,t}$ 
3:   if  $\forall a : \theta_{i,a} = 0$  or  $a_i^- = NaN$  then           ▷ Never have played an action before, or no previous best action
4:     return  $A$                                          ▷ Return complete actions space
5:   else
6:     if  $r_{a_i,t} = 1$  then
7:        $\beta_i \leftarrow 0$                                ▷ Reset reach
8:     else
9:        $\beta_i \leftarrow \min\{\beta_i + 1, K\}$            ▷ Increase reach
10:    Sort row entries of Adjacency matrix  $\Lambda_{a_i^-}^i$  in descending order, creating set  $S_{a_i^-}^i$ 
11:    Select top  $\beta_i$  entries  $S_{a_i^-, \{1, \dots, 1+\beta\}}^i := \mathcal{U}_i$ 
12:    return  $\mathcal{U}_i$ 

```

distribution. For example, for $H_i = \{1, -2\}$, the probability of choosing the CB (policy π_0) is $pb_{i,\pi_0} = \frac{e^1}{e^1 + e^{-2}} \sim 95\%$. We modified the update equation of the gradient bandit presented in [Sutton and Barto \[2018\]](#):

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{i,\pi_{i,t}} &\leftarrow H_{i,\pi_{i,t}} + \delta_R(r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i - pb_{i,\pi_{i,t}}), \\
H_{i,\neg\pi_{i,t}} &\leftarrow H_{i,\neg\pi_{i,t}} + \delta_R(1 - 2r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i)(1 - pb_{i,\pi_{i,t}}).
\end{aligned}$$

We omitted comparing the received reward r_t and average reward \bar{R}_t . Furthermore, the factor $(1 - \pi_{i,t})$ in the original definition of $H_{i,\pi_{i,t}}$ may favor algorithms with strong initial performance in the update, thus reducing adaptability in non-stationary environment due to vanishing gradients when probabilities are close to 1 [Mei et al. \[2020\]](#). Our formulation would punish policies more strongly for mistakes if they were chosen more often. In this way, the gradient bandit can adapt much more quickly to changes in reward performance of the action selection policies, albeit with the caveat being potentially more susceptible to reward noise. Note that the reward the gradient bandit receives depends on the performance of the chosen policy. Thus credit is assigned via the joint referee and policy action.

The policy is sampled from a Bernoulli distribution with parameter $p = pb_i$. If the referee picks the contextual bandit (policy π_0), the agent chooses the action that maximizes the expected reward plus an upper confidence term like in standard LinUCB [Li et al. \[2010\]](#) (line 9) using a global model. Otherwise, the agent selects the action based on a nonstationary MAB-UCB strategy (line 12) of the particular user. Before choosing the action with the highest score $(\theta_{i,a})$, the subset of potential action candidates for exploration is computed by algorithm 3 using the individual action-to-action adjacency matrix for every user. After playing an action and observing reward $r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i$, we update the parameters of the policy chosen by the referee (line 18). Finally, we update the preference values H_i (line 25) depending on the received reward. For example, if the CB policy was chosen, that is, $\pi_{i,t} = \pi_0$ and a reward $r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i = 1$ was received, we increase the preference $H_{i,\pi_{i,t}}$ for choosing the CB while decreasing the preference for the MAB policy $H_{i,\neg\pi_{i,t}}$.

Algorithm 3 operationalizes a simple strategy that dynamically adapts the subset of action to explore or exploit in each round. Using reach β the algorithm selects the top β entries of the a_i^- th row of individual adjacency matrix Λ^i sorted in descending order. In essence, the algorithm treats actions with a higher priority that show correlations in a first-order Markov chain. The algorithm greedily chooses the action subset (see line 6 and 7), but adapts quickly to changing reward distributions by increasing β rapidly, thus including actions with less strong correlation to ensure sufficient exploration by the action selection algorithms.

5.2 Updating the Adjacency Matrix of COMBINE

We investigate four different ways of updating and utilizing the adjacency matrix for use in the multi-armed bandit part of COMBINE, described in the following subsections.

5.2.1 Simple Adjacency Matrix

Each user has their adjacency matrix, which the agent uses to select promising next actions given that the context is determined to be corrupted. The two bookkeeping variables, previous best action denoted as a_i^- and current best action denoted as a_i^+ , are used to record what action comes after the next. If the previous best action is not equal to the current

action, the algorithm did not receive a reward in the previous time step (a transition occurred potentially) and may need to explore. We then update the adjacency matrix according to:

$$\Lambda_{a_i^-, a_{i,t}}^i = \Lambda_{a_i^-, a_{i,t}}^i + r_{a_{i,t}}^i. \quad (7)$$

If the agent received a reward for the currently played action, we set $a_i^+ \leftarrow a_{i,t}$, otherwise we set $a_i^- \leftarrow a_i^+$.

Alternatively, there might be cases where users behave similarly over time, where we can learn the adjacency matrix jointly by combining the experience from multiple users. We investigate a variant where each user contributes to a common adjacency matrix. Referring back to the meta-algorithm, adjacency matrix Λ (line 14 in algorithm 1) would constitute a global model of the action transitions. The common adjacency matrix Λ_{com} is computed as the sum over all adjacency matrices at time t for users in I :

$$\Lambda_{com,t} = \sum_{j=1}^{|I|} \Lambda_t^j. \quad (8)$$

5.2.2 Softmax Variation

We investigate a variant where we model transition probabilities for each action pair as the softmax distribution of a vector of action preferences. The adjacency matrix Λ becomes an action preference matrix Λ^* and is updated iteratively in the following manner:

$$\Lambda_{a_i^-, a_{i,t}}^* = \Lambda_{a_i^-, a_{i,t}}^* + \alpha_S \left(r_{a_{i,t}} - \frac{e^{\Lambda_{a_i^-, a_{i,t}}^*}}{\sum_{b=1}^{|A|} e^{\Lambda_{a_i^-, b}^*}} \right), \quad (9)$$

where $\alpha_S \in (0, \text{inf}]$ is a step size parameter that modulates the rate of change of the preference matrix between timesteps. The higher the value of this parameter, the larger to update towards the new preference matrix. Instead of simply adding the number of occurrences of some arbitrary transition $a_t \rightarrow a_{t+1}$ with $a_t \neq a_{t+1}$, particular transitions given the best previous actions are more or less "preferred" by the agent. Subsequently, line 14 in algorithm 2 changes from the *argmax* over actions to sampling from a probability distribution over the transition preferences. The probability of choosing action a_t at time t then becomes:

$$P(a_t | a_i^-) = \frac{e^{\Lambda_{a_i^-, a_t}^*}}{\sum_{b=1}^{|A|} e^{\Lambda_{a_i^-, (b)}^*}},$$

where the column-indices (next possible actions) of Λ^* are limited by reach β and can vary from time step to time step, resulting in action preference vector $\Lambda_{a_i^-}^{\beta_i}$.

As with the common adjacency matrix described above, we define a common preference matrix Λ_{com}^* , which is computed as a weighted sum of individual preference matrices using the hamming product:

$$\Lambda_{com,t}^* = \sum_{j=1}^{|I|} \Lambda_t^{*j} \circ \Lambda_t^j \oslash \Lambda_{com,t}, \quad (10)$$

where \oslash denotes the element-wise division. The more we observe a particular transition from a user, the more we are sure about said transition for all users under the assumption that users behave similarly. We encode this fact by using the adjacency matrix Λ_t^j , which gives more weight to the user where the agent has observed a particular transition more often.

6 Theoretical Analysis

This section analyses the problem setting and the algorithm in terms of regret lower and upper bounds, respectively. Our problem setting exhibits both CB and MAB properties, context corruption, and action are correlated in time due

to the Markovian transitions of the underlying (or hidden) state. Both bounds depend highly on the dynamics of this hidden state in combination with the corruption level. Therefore, we analyze the setting by first considering each of context corruption and action correlation individually before providing arguments on regret when these two components interact.

6.1 Regret Lower Bound of the Contextual Bandit Problem with Corrupted Context and Action Correlations (CBCCAC)

Given the high flexibility of our problem setting, the regret lower bound of any algorithm is dependent on the exact instantiation. For our analysis, we consider two defining aspects: context corruption and state instability. Context corruption affects the agent’s ability to detect changes in the underlying state of the environment and thus changes in the reward distribution of actions. The level of state instability, also interpretable as the transition probabilities of the Markov chain, influences the number of state changes over time.

We generally expect the number of state changes to be of order less than T , justified by the domain-specific phenomenon that people recurrently traverse different stages of behavior change, spending longer and longer time in the "Maintenance" or "Terminal" stage [Prochaska et al. \[2015\]](#). This assumption is essential for context-free algorithms to achieve sublinear regret. It is particularly relevant in our setting with corrupted contexts, where we may need to rely on context-free algorithms to make decisions.

In essence, our problem setting exhibits both properties of the contextual bandit problem and switching (or restless) Markov bandit problem. This implies that depending on the context of corruption and state change dynamics, we expect that either the contextual bandit lower bound or switching Markov bandit lower bound holds. We analyze the contextual and context-free setting separately first and combine them later in our final result.

We begin with the switching bandit. While our problem setting provides information about the current state via the context, corruption of said context will force agents to make decisions without precise knowledge about the current state, thus needing to detect changes in the reward distribution and adjust the policy. In order for an algorithm to detect whether the empirical mean reward of the action a has changed by the amount $\epsilon > \Delta$, with Δ being the difference in mean reward between arm a and the current best arm, there have to be at least, up to logarithmic factors, $1/\epsilon^2$ samples of the arm a [Auer et al. \[2019\]](#). Regarding our problem setting, since all arms are correlated in time, an algorithm can use the change in mean reward of the current best arm to detect a state change.

The scenario above is reminiscent of the "consecutive sampling" strategy in [Auer et al. \[2019\]](#), but it is built into our problem setting. Their results show that depending on the number of state changes L up to time T and number of actions K , a non-trivial lower regret bound can be achieved $O(\sqrt{KLT})$, thus lower bounding the regret for the setting where a state change may come with an arbitrary change in reward distribution of actions. This arbitrary change in action reward distribution forces an algorithm to *relearn* the action reward after each switch. In contrast, in our problem setting, the number of states is limited and they come with a fixed action reward distribution each. Thus, the setting is similar to "restless Markov bandits" introduced in [Ortner et al. \[2014\]](#), and the lower regret bound provided there applies to our problem setting with some modifications:

Theorem 2. *For any context-free algorithm, the regret after T time steps in the CBCCAC setting with any $K > 1$, traversed states V and number of state changes L , is lower bounded by*

$$\sum_{i=1}^V \sqrt{KTp_i} + \sum_{i=1}^L n_\epsilon \Delta_i$$

Sketch of Proof Similar to the argument of [Ortner et al. \[2014\]](#), the agent faces S distinct learning problems. While correlations between actions exist, these correlations are not known before starting. Thus, the learner still needs to infer the mean rewards for all actions in each state. Imagine a scenario where the learner goes through all states and stays for T/S time steps in each of them. In this case, each problem can be made to force a regret of order $\Omega(\sqrt{KT/S})$ in the T/S steps the learner faces a MAB problem to find the best one among K actions. Summing over all states S gives the bound $\Omega(\sqrt{SKT})$. However, this lower bound does not include the regret penalty associated with detecting a switch in the state. We expect an additional regret to be incurred, depending on the change in the average reward. As mentioned earlier, up to logarithmic factors, $n_\epsilon = O(1/\epsilon^2)$ samples are needed to detect the change, such that additional regret incurred is $n_\epsilon \Delta$, where Δ is the sub-optimally gap between selected action and the best action in the current state. This leads to additional regret $\sum_{i=1}^L n_\epsilon \Delta_i$ for L state switches. Now, assuming that the information about the action reward distributions for each visited state is stored, additionally to the regret penalty incurred for detecting the switch stated, the lower bound is $\sum_{i=1}^V \sqrt{KTp_i}$, with $\sum p_i = 1$, where V is the set of traversed states and p_i is the proportion of time spend in state i . Putting these two points together concludes the proof. ■

We now consider the case where policies can exploit the context, therefore “detecting” changes in the reward distributions of actions. For the case where $p = 0$, the context is perfectly reliable way of detecting whether the state has changed. This is reminiscent of the contextual bandit setting with a lower regret bound provided in theorem 1, that is, $R(T) \geq \gamma\sqrt{Td}$. When the probability of context corruption is $p > 0$, this lower bound still holds trivially but ignores the fact that is impossible to select the best action in each state if the contexts is corrupted, thus incurring additional regret. The lower regret bound for the contextual setting is stated in the following theorem:

Theorem 3. *For the corrupted contextual bandit problem with action correlations, for any algorithm choosing action a at time t for K actions and probability of context corruption p , there is a constant $\gamma > 0$, with $T > K > 2$ and for $d^2 \leq T$ a series of d -dimensional context vectors $x_{i,t}$, such that*

$$R(T) \geq \gamma\sqrt{(1-p)Td} + p \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{a_t \in A} P(a_t|a_{t-1})\Delta_{a_t}$$

Sketch of Proof For $(1-p)T$ timesteps, the lower bound in theorem 1 holds. If the contexts are corrupted the unbiased strategy would select a random action, incurring Δ_a regret for the chosen action a . Thus, the agent incurs additional expected regret of $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{a \in A} \Delta_a$. Now, in the contextual bandit setting, it is assumed that contexts arrive i.i.d., which is not necessarily the case in our problem setting. Therefore, the knowledge about action correlation reduces the amount of regret incurred. Thus taking the expectation over correlated actions where the probability of an action a_t depends on the previous action a_{t-1} , resulting in additional incurred regret for corrupted contexts of: $p \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{a_t \in A} P(a_t|a_{t-1})\Delta_{a_t} \leq \frac{pT}{K} \sum_{a \in A} \Delta_a$. where the expected number of times a corrupted context is received over T timesteps is pT , since contexts are corrupted independently of previous states or contexts. ■

Combining the results from the analysis of context-free and contextual settings, we arrive at our final result. For the CBCCAC setting, the lower bound depends on the probability of context corruption p , context size d , number of actions K and set of traversed states V and total number of state switches L . The lower bound is then dominated by either the contextual or the context-free case. Thus, up to constant factors:

$$R(T) \geq \min \left\{ \gamma\sqrt{(1-p)Td} + p \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{a_t \in A} P(a_t|a_{t-1})\Delta_{a_t}, \sum_{i=1}^V \sqrt{KTp_i} + \sum_{i=1}^L n_\epsilon \Delta_i \right\}$$

6.2 Regret Upper Bound of COMBINE-UCB

Our proposed algorithm combines two algorithms using a gradient bandit strategy. The upper bound of COMBINE depends on the algorithms used. We analyze COMBINE for the UCB instantiation, that is, COMBINE-UCB. It uses a gradient bandit to select between the LinUCB algorithm and a nonstationary UCB bandit algorithm we call NUCB for the remainder of this section. Depending on the instantiation of our setting, we expect different upper regret bounds. We start with the typical case followed by several extreme cases here. The typical case, where context corruption is $0 < p < 1$ and the state changes with frequency $< 1/T$, mainly characterizes the dynamics of our problem setting. In this case, identifying the action to action correlation can help reduce regret of the NUCB policy. The regret of COMBINE-UCB is determined by a dynamic equilibrium between LinUCB and NUCB, where the NUCB policy explores using the adjacency matrix, restricting exploration to a subset of actions. The reach β determines the size of the exploration set and its expected value depends on the average reward payoff of actions for each state and the policy. Therefore β , may improve regret performance by reducing the problem with K action into a problem with $\mathbf{E}[\beta] < K$ actions.

In the worst case, the upper regret bound of COMBINE-UCB is determined by the regret of the policy (LinUCB or NUCB) that performs worse in our problem setting, that is, $R(T) \leq \max\{R_{LinUCB}(T), R_{NUCB}(T)\}$. Naturally, the gradient bandit will place more weight on the policy that exhibits better performance on average, such that the regret typically falls between the regret of both policies. We can therefore express the upper bound the regret by:

$$R(T) \leq R_{LinUCB}(\tau_1) + R_{NUCB}(\tau_2), \tag{11}$$

with τ_1 being the number of timesteps LinUCB is chosen, and $\tau_2 := T - \tau_1$ being the number of timesteps the NUCB algorithm is chosen.

Recent results by Sutton and Barto, 2018 have demonstrated that the maximum convergence rate for a simple gradient bandit algorithm using the softmax policy is of order $1/t$. Therefore, the number of times the inferior strategy is

selected converges with $\ln(T)$ irrespective of the sub-optimality gap [Mei et al. \[2020\]](#). In contrast, our gradient bandit formulation converges to an optimal ratio, causing the intermittent regret between LinUCB and NUCB, later shown in our experiments in section 7.

For COMBINE-UCB, we use the LinUCB algorithm, for which [Chu et al., 2011](#) provide regret bound of order $O(\sqrt{T d \ln^3(KT \ln(T)/\delta)})$. Furthermore, our nonstationary bandit can be interpreted as an instance of the discounted-UCB (D-UCB) algorithm. [Garivier and Moulines, 2011](#) provide upper regret bounds for the algorithm in the switching bandit setting. For a suitable discount factor γ , they show that D-UCB incurs regret of order $O(K\sqrt{T L \ln(T)})$. Thus, with equation 11, we have, for the upper regret bound of COMBINE-UCB, up to some constant factors:

Theorem 4. *The regret of COMBINE-UCB using LinUCB and D-UCB, with probability $1 - \delta$, is upper bounded by:*

$$R(T) \leq \sqrt{(\tau_1) d \ln^3(KT \ln(\tau_1)/\delta)} + \mathbf{E}[\beta] \sqrt{(T - \tau_1) L \ln(T - \tau_1)}.$$

τ_1 and τ_2 are determined by the learning dynamics of our gradient bandit. These dynamics that can be described by a solution the following nonlinear differential equation, see appendix A for the derivation:

$$\frac{dp^*(t)}{dt} = \delta_R p^*(t) (\Delta_R - r^* + p^*(t) (2p^*(t) - 3) (\Delta_R p^*(t) - r^* + 1) + 1), \quad (12)$$

where r^* is the average reward of the superior policy, $p^*(t)$ is the probability of choosing the superior policy at time t and Δ_R is the gap in average reward between the two policies. There does not exist an explicit solution for $p^*(t)$, but for a constant Δ_R we can approximate it rather well by an exponential function. Thus, the convergences goes with approximately $e^{-t\delta_R c}$, where $c > 0$ is some constant, reaching the following stationary probability of choosing the better performing policy:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} p^*(t) = (\Delta_R + 2r^* + \sqrt{9\Delta_R^2 - 4\Delta_R r^* + 4\Delta_R + 4r^{*2} - 8r^* + 4} - 2) / (4\Delta_R) = C_\infty. \quad (13)$$

Equation 13 follows readily from setting the LHS of equation 12 to 0 and solving for $p^*(t)$. Thus, using equation 13, we let $p^*(t)$ be approximately:

$$p^*(t) \sim (C_\infty - p^*(0))(1 - e^{-t\delta_R c}) + p^*(0)$$

with $\Delta_R > 0$ and some problem-dependent constant $c \neq 0$. We integrate over T to get the number of times the superior policy is chosen, that is

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^* \sim \int_0^T (C_\infty - p^*(0))(1 - e^{-t\delta_R c}) + p^*(0) dt = \\ \frac{1}{c\delta_R} [e^{-T\delta_R c} (C_\infty (1 - e^{T\delta_R c}) + p^*(0)(e^{T\delta_R c} - 1))] + C_\infty T \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the number of timesteps the inferior policy is chosen is sublinear in T when C_∞ converges to 1 eventually. From this analysis, we see that our gradient bandit does not commit as readily to the best policy, compared to the vanilla formulation by [Sutton and Barto \[2018\]](#). Instead, it is preserving fast adaptability in a changing environment, with the caveat that COMBINE-UCB may incur additional regret in scenarios where Δ_R is small, and consequently $C_\infty < 1$.

No context corruption and i.i.d. state change In this scenario, the state changes as often as every timesteps, such that the setting is reminiscent of the contextual bandit setting where contexts and rewards are drawn i.i.d. from a joint context reward distribution. Here LinUCB will have significantly better performance than NUCB. For a rapidly changing environment, we expect the NUCB algorithm to behave quasi-randomly, that is, actions are chosen with uniform probability $1/K$. Therefore the expected regret of NUCB is linear in T . With Equation 11, we get for the upper regret bound of COMBINE-UCB:

$$R(T) \leq \sqrt{(\tau_1) d \ln^3(KT \ln(\tau_1)/\delta)} + \frac{T - \tau_1}{K} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \Delta_a,$$

where τ_1 is determined in the same fashion as we have demonstrated in our earlier analysis.

Complete context corruption and no state change In this scenario, the CB cannot rely on the context to make decisions, such that the problems setting degenerates to the standard stochastic MAB setting. In such a setting, both LinUCB and MAB can achieve sublinear regret for adequate tuning of the hyperparameters. To see this, let us discuss a small illustrative example:

Assume a stochastic MAB setting with unique optimal action. In this setting, it is known that the UCB algorithm will incur regret of order $O(K \ln(T))$ Auer et al. [2002], plus a problem-dependent constant. For LinUCB, instead of constructing a confidence estimate on the mean reward of each action, it is done on the weight vector $\hat{\mu}_a$ of each action. At every timestep, a randomly corrupted context arrives irrespective of state or previous action, leading to the same expected decrease in estimation uncertainty of $\hat{\mu}_a$ for all actions. That is, the confidence term $\alpha \sqrt{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t}^\top \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i,t}}$ decreases similarly for all actions, effectively being a function of how often an action is chosen independent of the actual context. As such, we can expect an exploration behavior similar to the UCB algorithm, where the exploration bonus decreases $\sim \sqrt{1/n_a}$, where n_a is the number of times actions a was chosen so far.

Naturally, COMBINE-UCB will also incur additional regret in this setting, given a performance difference between the LinUCB and NUCB algorithm.

Complete context corruption and rapid state change Both LinUCB and nonstationary UCB algorithms will incur linear regret, settling for the best overall action depending on the states traversed, thus effectively selecting actions at random from the regret perspective. The performance of both algorithms will be similar, therefore the gradient bandit will converge to a dynamic equilibrium. For such a pathological example, the expected upper bound of COMBINE-UCB is trivially $R(T) \leq \frac{T}{K} \sum_{a \in A} \Delta_a$.

7 Experimentation

In this section, we describe on the experimental setup for the simulation and real-world data sets.

7.1 Experimental Setup for the Simulation Environment

First, we investigate the performance of the proposed algorithm on a set of users that exhibit extremes in terms of context corruption and fast state change. Users in group A have no context corruption but change their hidden state rapidly, and group B provides a useless context, but the hidden state (and best action) changes very slowly. An example of a user from both groups and the effect of influence level on the state is shown in figure 1a. We expect the CB to perform quite well on group A, while the MAB would perform better on group B. Given this set of users, we investigate the performance of the algorithms as the number of actions and the influence of actions on the hidden state increases. We run the algorithm on both groups at the same time. The regret is measured over 2500 time steps since the rank order of performances did not change for longer simulations. The challenge here is, of course, to perform well on both groups of users.

Additionally, we carry out experiments over a range of corruption levels and degrees of state influence to illustrate the performance in scenarios where corruption levels and action influence on the hidden state might vary. Unlike the mixed user scenario, we set corruption levels and influence to the same values for all users and carry out these experiments over a range of number of actions.

For the simulation, we set the algorithm parameters to: $\delta_R = 0.5$, $\alpha = 1$, $\alpha_B = 1$ and $\gamma = 0.1$, $\alpha_S = 10$, if not otherwise mentioned. For LinTS, we set the algorithm specific parameter $v = 0.2$.

7.2 Experimental Setup for Real-World Datasets

We investigate the performance of the proposed algorithm on real-world data sets from the UCI Machine Learning Repository¹. We primarily focused on time series or sequential data sets that exhibit ordering among classes (actions) in time, fitting well within the problem setting described in 1. Given that these datasets are collected after the fact, the property of action influence cannot be evaluated here and is reserved for the simulation experiments. We evaluate the proposed algorithm on these data sets in particular: Activities of Daily Living Recognition Using Binary Sensors (ADL), Beijing Multi-Site Air-quality Data Set (BAQ) and Localization Data from Person Activity Data Set (Local).

For experimentation, we require the data to arrive in streams. We, therefore, sample each context (features) sequentially. At each round the agent provides its choice from the pool of actions (classes). We then reveal through the reward

¹<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets.html>




Figure 1: (a) State evolution for one user for each of the two groups. Users in group A exhibit a highly dynamic and rapidly changing state while having no corruption on the context(not shown). The state of users in group B changes only slowly but their context is drawn from independent uniform noise. (b) State evolution of one user in group B at different levels of action influence on the hidden state. Results of the random policy are shown.

whether the instance was classified correctly (1) or not (0). We note that in this setup, actions do not affect the incoming contexts. This would be similar to our simulation experiments with state influence equal to zero. We evaluate the algorithm’s performance over a range of corruption levels using the same notion of regret defined in 3.2. As with the simulation, we set the algorithm parameters to: $\delta_R = 0.5$, $\alpha = 1$, $\alpha_B = 1$ and $\gamma = 0.1$, $\alpha_S = 10$ and the LinTS specific parameter $v = 0.2$.

All data sets underwent some preprocessing. In the next paragraphs, we explain in more detail what we did for each data set.

Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) Data Set The ADLs dataset contains activities and corresponding sensor events for two people (A and B) in an intelligent home environment. The data recorded contains timestamps of several activities the users do within the day. The data constitute ca. 320 and 500 samples for persons A and B, respectively. To increase the number of samples, we re-sampled the data to every minute and padded the gaps between events by forward imputation. This increases the number of instances to 19517 for person A and 30208 for person B. The context is represented as a one-hot encoding of the sensor information. There are a total of 9 Sensors for person B and 11 for person A. We combined (summed) the representation of sensor events that happened simultaneously during an activity and capped the resulting vectors between the values 0 and 1. In case of context corruption, we draw a sensor event (index of a sensor) uniformly at random and generate the one-hot representation. We study the performance on the data set of each individual and combine the performance for the summary results. We run experiments with five different random seeds and ten random starting locations of the data in the first 3000 time-steps. The regret is evaluated for the first 15000 time steps.

Beijing Multi-Site Air-quality Data Set (BAQ) This data set includes measurement from 12 nationally-controlled air-quality monitoring sites collected between 2013-2017. The data is recorded hourly and all substations have the same amount of data. We run the algorithms on all 12 stations simultaneously (corresponding to "users"). We divided the particulate matter measurement (PM2.5) into five classes using equal frequency binning. We converted categorical features into their one-hot encoding and used a random forest classifier to select the top 10 predictive features, all of them numeric except the South-West (SW) wind direction, which is binary. For the corrupted context, similar to the ADL dataset, we draw a random context from the uniform distribution with dimension $d=9$ on the domain $[0, 1]$ and the SW wind direction from a binomial distribution with $p=0.5$. The data set constitutes ca. 35000 instances. We run experiments with five different random seeds. The regret is measured over 35000 time steps.

Localization Data from Person Activity Data Set (Local) The data set contains data from five different people performing a sequence of 11 activities, each five times in a row. We combine the x, y, and z coordinates of each of the four sensors into one set of features, constituting 12 features. We combine the data of all subjects (concatenation) for a

Table 1: Regret performance on the simulated data. The regret is averaged over number of actions and state influence for both group A and group B. The Mean and standard deviation are shown.

Method	Group A	Group B	Total
UCBBanditNS	1960(\pm 189.0)	1605(\pm 491.5)	1783(\pm 411.6)
UCBBanditS	2075(\pm 131.7)	196.6(\pm 121.8)	1136(\pm 950.7)
LinUCB	48.82(\pm 66.77)	1992(\pm 169.4)	1021(\pm 983.4)
LinTS	34.93(\pm 43.98)	2037(\pm 148.8)	1036(\pm 1010)
LinUCB+UCBBanditNS	74.35(\pm 70.20)	206.0(\pm 128.9)	140.2(\pm 122.7)
LinTS+UCBBanditNS	76.75(\pm 75.16)	207.1(\pm 131.5)	141.9(\pm 125.2)
COMBINE-UCB	23.75(\pm 9.545)	181.2(\pm 141.7)	102.5(\pm 127.5)
COMBINE-UCB common	23.82(\pm 9.206)	155.0(\pm 132.8)	89.42(\pm 114.6)
COMBINE-softmax	24.98(\pm 9.597)	161.8(\pm 121.2)	93.40(\pm 109.8)
COMBINE-softmax common	25.35(\pm 10.29)	127.7(\pm 91.27)	76.51(\pm 82.61)

total of and ca. 35800 instances. As before, the corruption function constitutes random sampling of the context from a uniform distribution on the domain $[0, 1]$ with $d = 12$. We run experiments with five different random seeds and ten random starting locations of the data in the first 3000 time steps. The regret is measured over 30000 time steps.

7.3 Investigated Algorithms

We compare the performance of the proposed algorithm with a stationary (**UCBBanditS**) and nonstationary (**UCBBanditNS**) UCB bandit as well as two contextual bandits, **LinUCB** Li et al. [2010] and **LinTS** Agrawal and Goyal [2013]. UCBBanditS uses the UCB1 algorithm Auer et al. [2002]. UCBBanditNS uses UCB1 but computes the average action rewards as a discounted sum, similar to D-UCB Garivier and Moulines [2011] and identical to COMBINE-UCB, shown in algorithm 1, line 22.

We also compare different combinations of CB and MABs: LinUCB and Non-stationary UCB (**LinUCB + UCB-BanditNS**), LinTS and Nonstationary UCB (**LinTS + UCBBanditNS**). Both without reach parameter β . We test these against four versions of the meta-algorithm: **COMBINE-UCB**, **COMBINE-UCB common** (COMBINE-UCB with common adjacency matrix for all users), **COMBINE-softmax** (using a preference matrix for each user) and **COMBINE-softmax common** (a common preference matrix for all users).

8 Results

In this section, we show the results. We start with the simulated data, followed by the results on the real-world data sets.

8.1 Simulation analysis

Table 1 shows the regret over 2500 time steps of the investigated algorithms averaged over actions and state influence for both groups of users. We investigated 5, 10 and 15 actions as well as state influence levels of 0.0, 0.025, 0.05, 0.1 and 0.2. For each combination of the parameters, we run five different random seeds and ten different initializations of the state per group, i.e., there are ten users in each group.

All algorithms performed well on group A, which is somewhat expected given that these users exhibit no context corruption, and therefore the context to action mapping is quickly learned. The regret on users B is significantly worse for the competing algorithms since the context is highly corrupted, prohibiting the learning of expected reward for each action effectively. The combination approach works best on both groups of users as we dynamically adapt the chosen strategy based on how the MAB and CB perform during learning. The softmax variant performs the best overall since the next promising action is selected through a more greedy procedure than UCB that might continue to explore and incur additional regret.

Figure 2 shows the regret of the algorithms for our simulation study over a different number of actions and levels of influence. Hybrid methods consistently outperform pure algorithms such as MABs or LinUCB overall. However, the effect of the interaction between the number of actions and influence level on regret is not straightforward for every algorithm. In general, increasing the number of actions leads to an expected increase of regret for all influence levels on both groups A and B.




Figure 2: Regret for all investigated algorithms over actions and state influence level for both groups A and B (log scale). Shaded areas show the standard deviation. (Top) An increase in the number of actions results in an expected increase in incurred regret for all algorithms and both groups A and B. An increase in state influence levels increases regret for standard and combination algorithms on group A, with all versions of COMBINE as the exception. An increase in state influence has the opposite effect on group B, reducing regret, for COMBINE and combination algorithms. (Bottom) The same experimental setup but COMBINE trains on all data without ignoring noisy data points. We observe that COMBINE is now sensitive to influence levels, particularly for group A.

For group A, notable exceptions from this rule are the single CB and combination approaches (excluding COMBINE). We see that an increase in the number of actions does not necessarily lead to strictly worse average regret and depends on the level of influence. For the combination approaches, we note that the algorithms perform worse on average for five actions, mainly due to significant variance in performance for different random seeds. Additional tuning of the algorithms did not change the ranking in regret nor reduce variance significantly. For more actions, the algorithms perform much more consistently with LinTS and LinUCB outperforming combination approaches for low influence levels.

As the influence level increases, we observe a corresponding increase in regret for the standard algorithms. This can be partially explained by the use of a global model for CB action selection. COMBINE includes a mechanism that does not train the global model on data that come from noisy users, i.e., Group B. Combination algorithms that do not have such a mechanism (LinUCB/TS + UCBAnditNS) suffer similar additional regret as influence levels increase as they need to balance CB performance for group A and B. For higher influence levels, the algorithm receives slightly more reward for users in Group B, which will train LinUCB/LinTS on more noisy data resulting in additional regret on Group A.

For group B, we observe that increased state influence reduces regret for combination algorithms and nonstationary MABs. Intuitively, this can be attributed to the effect we observe in figure 1b. The faster the lowest state is reached, the less regret the algorithm incurs, driven by the fact that the best action rarely changes after that state is reached, since action influences bias the random walk model to lower state values. How much the influence level could affect the performance can be seen for the stationary bandit UCBAnditS for five actions. Without state influence, the optimal action rarely changes such that the regret stays relatively low. With only slight state influence, the problem exhibits enough nonstationarity that incurred regret increases significantly.

We note that combination approaches mostly outperform single algorithms on Group B that exhibits high context corruption but low state change. On group A, on the other hand, we observe that combining might not always lead to the lowest incurred regret. Especially for low state influence, we observe that LinUCB and LinTS outperform COMBINE. We attribute this performance deficit to the referee that needs to decide between CB and MAB. In principle, COMBINE should accumulate similar regret to LinTS or LinUCB given that the referee can decide between them rapidly. Additionally, this shows the potential limitations of COMBINE when environmental assumptions break down. High state fluctuations effectively result in i.i.d.-like sampling of the context turning the problem into the standard contextual bandit setting. In such a setting, COMBINE may incur more regret due to the initial exploration of the referee, especially if there is no or little context noise.

To illustrate the referee’s influence on regret, we ran additional experiments over a range of state instabilities and corruption levels. In settings where a general level of corruption on contexts or state instability exists, choosing between MAB or CB might lead to higher overall regret as both exhibit periods of worse better performance such that the referee biases action selection to one or the other intermittently. This "indecision" or switching by the referee comes with an




Figure 3: Regret over corruption levels and state instability for five actions, average over several influence levels. Notice the deteriorating performance of the nonstationary bandit as instability levels increase, providing a pseudo upper bound on the regret for the MAB components of the combination algorithms. A combination of high state instability (rapid change of actions within a time period) and high corruption levels leads to sub-par performance due to the dynamics of the referee. The final regret incurred is determined by the ratio of CB to MAB selections. Shaded areas show standard deviation.




Figure 4: Probability of choosing CB over time for different corruption levels and state instability. Results are shown for 10 actions as an average over all influence levels. Relative performance of both MAB and CB determine the dynamic equilibrium between the two policies that are used for action selection. Shaded areas show standard deviation.

additional cost where the pure CB achieves lower regret in total compared to the combination. Figure 3 illustrates this fact, showing the average regret over several levels of influence for five actions.

To investigate this point further, we explore the switching dynamics of the referee. We primarily focus on the simulation where all users exhibit the same levels of corruption and state instability, i.e., all users are the same. We observe that, in the setting of high instability and low corruption, the bandit is overtaken by the CB as expected. However, even slight corruption or inaccuracies in learning the mapping between contexts and action rewards will lead to the MAB taking over.

Figure 4 shows the dynamics of the referee over time, corruption levels and state stability for five actions. The referee acts relatively greedily such that it can respond to changes in corruption levels or state instability quickly, behaving like a nonstationary bandit. It is only concerned about the performance of either CB or MAB in the most recent time steps. This allows the agent to react fast to changes but also leads to some drawbacks. We observe that the probability of choosing either the CB or the MAB falls into a dynamic equilibrium. This equilibrium exhibits higher variance in areas where either the CB or MAB show higher short term performance. Given that, for the simulated setting, neither CB or MAB exhibits strictly higher performance on average, it is doubtful that a combination of both would yield superior performance compared to using a CB or MAB individually.

We expect the users might change in terms of the stability of their underlying state or reporting behavior of the context, resulting in varying degrees of state instability and context corruption. If the environment contains periods where either the CB or the MAB would yield strictly better performance, the fast adaptability will reduce regret compared to using either CB or MAB separately. To investigate this in a more controlled manner, we ran additional experiments




Figure 5: Regret curves for the changing simulation environment. The corruption level changes every 835 time steps (two times within a simulation). Hybrid methods outperform the normal CB. Best results are achieved for the softmax bandit variant. We observe that when the best action changes every 15 time steps, the softmax bandit exhibits a level of short term performance that may rival the CB and as such, it becomes increasingly hard to decide between CB and MAB, in turn increasing overall regret. Values are capped at 800 regret to show differences between algorithms more clearly. Shaded areas show standard deviation.

where corruption levels change from no corruption to 90% corruption at specific points in time. We observe that combination approaches outperform single solutions. Our proposed algorithm outperforms other solutions for most of the investigated instability levels. Figure 5 shows the regret curves over a number of state instability levels for ten actions. We note that for longer periods between action changes, the softmax version of COMBINE expectantly falls behind in regret performance up to the first switch (time step 835) as the frequency of action changes reduces. The reasons for this is the performance of the MAB: the stronger relative performance of the MAB will lead the referee to choose the MAB more often, increasing incurred regret.

Overall, at appropriate levels of corruption and state instability, the agents can decide between either contextual bandit or MAB as one performs better than the other over time. If both perform similarly, the referee settles for a dynamic equilibrium that results in an average regret depending on the ratio between choosing the CB or MAB. In scenarios where corruption levels may change over time, hybrid methods can outperform non-combination approaches for the scenarios investigated.

8.2 Real life data sets analysis

Table 2 illustrates the average results for the three investigated data sets. As can be seen, our algorithm with the softmax bandit variant performs the best overall on the data sets when averaged over the five corruption levels investigated. On the BAQ data set, we can also observe that the performance difference between the algorithms is the least significant compared to the ADL and Local data sets. This can be explained by high state permanence in both data sets (ADL and Local), allowing the agent to learn the state transition matrix effectively. The BAQ data set exhibits strong fluctuations between actions and nonlinear correlations between context and pollution level, violating the linear realizability assumption. This makes it quite tricky for the CB as well as MAB to perform well. We observe that both UCBBanditS and UCBBanditNS perform relatively poorly on their own, and the CBs have a better chance of incurring less regret. For high corruption levels, we see that our algorithm with the softmax bandit variant performs the best. We attribute the better performance to using the action transition probabilities instead of the upper confidence bound of action rewards, resulting in less exploration of actions that do not follow sequentially.

We applied a slight smoothing to the features and target variable (second-order Savitzky-Golay-filter, windows size 151). This improved the performance of all algorithms slightly without making the problem significantly easier to solve for the CB on average. The most significant change can be observed for the softmax bandit, where we see a reduction in regret by 50% to 75% depending on corruption level compared to the non-smoothed version.

Figure 6 shows the regret curves of all algorithms over different levels of corruption of the context. For nearly all levels of corruption and all data sets, the softmax bandit variant of our algorithm outperforms other combination or non-combination algorithms consistently over time. Notable exceptions are on the BAQ data set where we see a performance advantage only for higher state corruption levels above 5% compared to LinTS or LinUCB. Neither CB and MAB do perform well on this data set leading to a dynamic equilibrium of the referee similar to the simulations. This results in additional incurred regret for combination algorithms. For higher corruption levels, the referee has an easier time deciding between policies and COMBINE-softmax can incur the least regret.

Figure 7 shows the learned adjacency matrix of the softmax bandit for all data sets. In most cases, using the softmax version leads to more sparse matrices and, therefore, less exploration when choosing the next promising actions. This works well for the ADL and Local data sets. The BQA data set exhibits significant fluctuations in the target variable




Figure 6: The softmax bandit version of COMBINE consistently outperforms other algorithms over all time steps. **6a** Combined regret curves of both users in ADL data set. The softmax bandit version of our algorithm performs best mainly due to the good performance of the MAB component. **6b** Similar to the ADL data set, the softmax bandit variant of our algorithm performs the best. The algorithm quickly converges to using the soft-max bandit for action selection, incurring the least regret. **6c** BAQ data set. For the non-smoothed version, the level of pollution can change rapidly between time steps resulting in sub-par performance. Only for high corruption levels, we observe the MAB having an advantage. **6d** Slight smoothing applied significantly improves performance. Shaded areas show standard deviation.

Table 2: Performance on real world data sets. Average over corruption levels. The number in the parenthesis indicates the number of time steps the regret is measured over. Mean and standard deviation shown.

Method	ADL(15000)	Local(30000)	BAQ(35000)	BAQ smoothed(35000)
MAB	9108(\pm 481.0)	20690(\pm 469)	26708(\pm 412.0)	23419(\pm 285.0)
NSMAB	4601(\pm 1215)	21027(\pm 59.00)	25202(\pm 163.0)	19344(\pm 37.00)
LinUCB	4915(\pm 2592)	13670(\pm 3536)	19513(\pm 278.0)	17013(\pm 4358)
LinTS	5058(\pm 948.0)	13579(\pm 3654)	20115(\pm 281.0)	18774(\pm 5020)
LinUCB+UCBBanditNS	4084(\pm 2592)	10839(\pm 1089)	19684(\pm 133.0)	14267(\pm 1862)
LinTS+UCBBanditNS	4121(\pm 948.0)	10761(\pm 1139)	19824(\pm 254.0)	14309(\pm 1901)
COMBINE-UCB	4189(\pm 1064)	12806(\pm 2763)	19709(\pm 165.0)	15912(\pm 2624)
COMBINE-UCB common	4171(\pm 1015)	12762(\pm 2638)	19657(\pm 212.0)	15994(\pm 2473)
COMBINE-softmax	1326(\pm 112.0)	2784(\pm 33.00)	16106(\pm 165.0)	3828(\pm 33.00)
COMBINE-softmax common	1295(\pm118.0)	2655(\pm 35.00)	15584(\pm 154.0)	3568(\pm 60.00)




Figure 7: Adjacency Matrix for all data sets of COMBINE-UCB (top), COMBINE using the softmax bandit variation (middle) and the respective ground truth (GT) (bottom). The adjacency matrix has been split for the ADL data set into user A and user B. For most data sets, we observe that the algorithm learns the adjacency matrix, leading to more targeted action selection and less regret incurred. A notable exception is the BAQ data set without smoothing, where the agent did not approximate the true adjacency matrix particularly well.

and less pure action-to-action transition probabilities. Smoothing the more significant spikes helps in sparsification of the adjacency matrix, and therefore more predictable transitions, leading to significantly improved regret performance.

Figure 8 shows the dynamics of the referee on the real-world data sets. The ADL data set exhibits strong ordering as well as low action frequency such that the MAB variants of the algorithms can achieve low regret without knowing the context. This is further exacerbated when adding corruption to the context, destroying any advantage the normal CB would have had.

Similarly to the ADL dataset, the MAB outperforms the CB early on the Local data set. We note that our algorithm’s non-softmax version performs comparatively worse on this data set due to the MAB component being noncompetitive.




Figure 8: Probability of choosing the Contextual bandit over the MAB for the different real-world data sets. **8a** The ADL data almost universally favor the MAB, with the stationary MAB experiencing periods where the CB is preferred, mostly in regions of action transition. **8b** The MAB approach outperforms the CB quickly on the Local data set. As a failure case, the MAB component of COMBINE-UCB does not perform well, resulting in additional regret. **8c** Neither CB nor MAB performs exceptionally well, resulting in fluctuating behavior of the referee. **8d** Smoothing the BAQ data set reduces sporadic action changes and allows the MAB to outperform the CB. Shaded areas show standard deviation.

We attribute this to the fact that the MAB component still uses UCB to select actions. Given that we do not update the MAB if it was not chosen by the referee for actions selection, UCB might explore more often, incurring additional regret and increasing reach parameter β rapidly. This may effectively lead to 1) the whole actions space being available for exploration and 2) The "over-exploitation" of rare actions that, due to β , rarely have been tried before. These actions receive a large exploration bonus due to the large upper-confidence-bound estimate (line 24 in algorithm 2), and it may require a significant number of trails to reduce said bonus.

We observe a significant change in behavior of the referee for all algorithms on the BAQ data set. Contexts (and therefore actions) can frequently change, coupled with the nonlinear context that does not allow a good mapping from contexts to actions, the performance of all algorithms suffer. Interestingly, the softmax version does seem to provide enough advantage over the CB to be chosen more frequently, further amplified by corrupting the context. Smoothing the data set allows the MAB to overtake the CB rapidly, reducing regret, particularly for the softmax variation of our algorithm.




Figure 9: Regret over a range of α_B values of the MAB component of each algorithm. Each data set has a unique optimum value. The softmax bandit version performs best even after tuning the other MAB agents. Shaded areas show standard deviation.




Figure 10: Regret over a range of α_S values for algorithms using the adjacency matrix. Best results are obtained for sufficiently large α_S , e.g., in 5 – 10 range.

8.2.1 Tuning the MAB exploration parameter α_B

As we have mentioned in earlier sections, the non-softmax MAB components explore actions in a manner that does not allow comparative regret performance to the softmax variant. All combination algorithms have a UCB MAB in their core component, and as such, we need to tune the α_B parameter for optimal exploration and exploitation. We briefly investigate the effect of the exploration parameter α_B to see if we can improve upon regret.

Figure 9 shows the regret achieved over a range of values of the parameter for the investigated data sets. The performance of the algorithms slightly improves for an optimal α_B unique to each data set. Even with tuning, the softmax bandit variation of our algorithm outperforms all other investigated methods with the added benefit of not needing any tuning. Even when tuning the exploration rate from very high to very low exploration, we do not significantly improve performance such that we are on par with the softmax MAB variant.

8.2.2 Tuning the incremental update parameter α_S

Figure 10 shows the regret for various values of α_S for the algorithms that use the adjacency matrix for action selection. The most significant effect on regret can be observed for low values between 0 – 20. The softmax-bandit variant of COMBINE shows the highest sensitivity to this parameter, which is not surprising since updates to the preference matrix can significantly affect the resulting probability distribution over actions, biasing action selection towards promising next actions with fewer iterations, effectively resulting in more “greedy” action selection. The effect on COMBINE-UCB version of the algorithm is less significant given that the ranking of the actions is not influenced as strongly by α_S .

9 Conclusions

We considered previously defined contextual multi-armed bandit formulation, the so-called Contextual Bandit with Corrupted Contexts (CBCC), where the set of features or context could be corrupted. In this setting, the agent cannot trust its observations and might fall back to a classical multi-armed bandit for action selection. We introduced a novel variant where arriving contexts are determined by an underlying state that evolves in a Markovian manner. This state evolution allows the incorporation of knowledge about the order of actions that can be exploited to guide the exploration and exploitation of actions. We propose a meta-algorithm, called COMBINE, and an instantiation based on upper-confidence bound combined with one-step transition probabilities that solve the CBCCAC. We show improved performance compared to competing solutions through empirical evaluation of the algorithm on simulated

and real-world data, mainly when using the softmax variant of COMBINE. On simulated data, we observe that for the extrema of high action fluctuations and low context corruption or low action fluctuations and high context corruption, using a simple agent approach, i.e., either a CB or MAB, might minimize incurred regret. In most settings, when there is enough exploitable information for the agent to make decisions, the COMBINE approach significantly outperforms single methods. In cases where state corruption and action change frequencies are mixed and can vary over time, adjusting to one policy over the other in the short term can reduce regret compared to using CB and MAB algorithms individually.

References

- S. S. Villar, J. Bowden, and J. Wason. Multi-armed Bandit Models for the Optimal Design of Clinical Trials: Benefits and Challenges. *Stat Sci*, 30(2):199–215, 2015. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/14-STS504>.
- Hamsa Bastani and Mohsen Bayati. Online decision making with high-dimensional covariates. *Operations Research*, 68(1):276–294, 2020. doi: 10.1287/opre.2019.1902. URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2019.1902>.
- Weiwei Shen, Jun Wang, Yu-Gang Jiang, and Hongyuan Zha. Portfolio choices with orthogonal bandit learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’15*, page 974–980. AAAI Press, 2015. ISBN 9781577357384.
- Xiaoguang Huo and Feng Fu. Risk-aware multi-armed bandit problem with application to portfolio selection. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4(11):171377, 2017. doi: 10.1098/rsos.171377. URL <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/abs/10.1098/rsos.171377>.
- Stefano Boldrini, Luca De Nardis, Giuseppe Caso, Mai Le, Jocelyn Fiorina, and Maria-Gabriella Di Benedetto. mumab: A multi-armed bandit model for wireless network selection. *Algorithms*, 11(2):13, Jan 2018. ISSN 1999-4893. doi: 10.3390/a11020013. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/a11020013>.
- R. Kerkouche, R. Alami, R. Féraud, N. Varsier, and P. Maillé. Node-based optimization of lora transmissions with multi-armed bandit algorithms. In *2018 25th International Conference on Telecommunications (ICT)*, pages 521–526, 2018. doi: 10.1109/ICT.2018.8464949.
- Zheng Wen, Branislav Kveton, Michal Valko, and Sharan Vaswani. Online influence maximization under independent cascade model with semi-bandit feedback. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, pages 3022–3032. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/7137debd45ae4d0ab9aa953017286b20-Paper.pdf>.
- Eric Schwartz, Eric Bradlow, and Peter Fader. Customer acquisition via display advertising using multi-armed bandit experiments. *Marketing Science*, 36, 04 2017. doi: 10.1287/mksc.2016.1023.
- Q. Wang, C. Zeng, W. Zhou, T. Li, S. S. Iyengar, L. Shwartz, and G. Y. Grabarnik. Online interactive collaborative filtering using multi-armed bandit with dependent arms. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 31(8):1569–1580, 2019. doi: 10.1109/TKDE.2018.2866041.
- Linas Baltrunas, Karen Church, Alexandros Karatzoglou, and Nuria Oliver. Frappe: Understanding the usage and perception of mobile app recommendations in-the-wild. *CoRR*, abs/1505.03014, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.03014>.
- T.L. Lai and Herbert Robbins. Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 6(1):4 – 22, 1985. ISSN 0196-8858. doi: 10.1016/0196-8858(85)90002-8. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0196885885900028>.
- Peter Auer, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Paul Fischer. Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine Learning*, 47:235–256, 05 2002. doi: 10.1023/A:1013689704352.
- William R. Thompson. On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples. *Biometrika*, 25(3/4):285–294, 1933. ISSN 00063444. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2332286>.
- Olivier Chapelle and Lihong Li. An Empirical Evaluation of Thompson Sampling. In J. Shawe-Taylor, R. S. Zemel, P. L. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Neural Information Processing*, pages 2249–2257. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011. URL <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/4321-an-empirical-evaluation-of-thompson-sampling.pdf>.
- Wei Chu, Lihong Li, Lev Reyzin, and Robert Schapire. Contextual bandits with linear payoff functions. volume 15 of *Machine Learning Research*, pages 208–214, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA, 11–13 Apr 2011. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v15/chu11a.html>.

- Lihong Li, Wei Chu, John Langford, and Robert E. Schapire. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. *International conference on World wide web - WWW '10*, 2010. doi: 10.1145/1772690.1772758. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1772690.1772758>.
- Shipra Agrawal and Navin Goyal. Thompson sampling for contextual bandits with linear payoffs. volume 28 of *Machine Learning Research*, pages 127–135, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 17–19 Jun 2013. PMLR. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v28/agrawal13.html>.
- Reda Abouserie. Sources and levels of stress in relation to locus of control and self esteem in university students. *Educational Psychology*, 14(3):323–330, 1994. doi: 10.1080/0144341940140306. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144341940140306>.
- Djallel Bouneffouf. Online learning with Corrupted context: Corrupted Contextual Bandits. Number NeurIPS, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.15194>.
- Se-Young Yun, Jun Hyun Nam, Sangwoo Mo, and Jinwoo Shin. Contextual Multi-armed Bandits under Feature Uncertainty. pages 1–25, 2017. doi: 10.2172/1345927. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.01347>.
- Nagarajan Natarajan, Donghyuk Shin, and Inderjit S. Dhillon. Which app will you use next? collaborative filtering with interactional context. In *ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, RecSys '13, page 201–208, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450324090. doi: 10.1145/2507157.2507186. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2507157.2507186>.
- Dietmar Jannach, Lukas Lerche, and Iman Kamehkhosh. Beyond "hitting the hits": Generating coherent music playlist continuations with the right tracks. In *ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, RecSys '15, page 187–194, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450336925. doi: 10.1145/2792838.2800182. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2792838.2800182>.
- Negar Hariri, Bamshad Mobasher, and Robin Burke. Context-aware music recommendation based on latent topic sequential patterns. In *ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, RecSys '12, page 131–138, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450312707. doi: 10.1145/2365952.2365979. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2365952.2365979>.
- Geoffroy Bonnin and Dietmar Jannach. Automated generation of music playlists: Survey and experiments. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 47(2), November 2014. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/2652481. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2652481>.
- B. Mobasher, Honghua Dai, Tao Luo, and M. Nakagawa. Using sequential and non-sequential patterns in predictive web usage mining tasks. In *IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 669–672, 2002. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/1184025>.
- Miki Nakagawa and Bamshad Mobasher. Impact of site characteristics on recommendation models based on association rules and sequential patterns. 05 2003. URL https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228479790_Impact_of_site_characteristics_on_recommendation_models_based_on_association_rules_and_sequential_patterns.
- Massimo Quadrana, Paolo Cremonesi, and Dietmar Jannach. Sequence-aware recommender systems. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 51(4), July 2018. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3190616. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3190616>.
- Levente Kocsis and Csaba Szepesvári. Discounted ucb. *2nd PASCAL Challenges Workshop*, 2006. URL <https://www.lri.fr/~sebag/Slides/Venice/Kocsis.pdf>.
- Aurélien Garivier and Eric Moulines. On upper-confidence bound policies for switching bandit problems. In Jyrki Kivinen, Csaba Szepesvári, Esko Ukkonen, and Thomas Zeugmann, editors, *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 174–188, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-642-24412-4.
- Peter Auer, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, and Robert E. Schapire. The nonstochastic multiarmed bandit problem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 32(1):48–77, January 2003. ISSN 0097-5397. doi: 10.1137/S0097539701398375. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539701398375>.
- Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, David Haussler, David P. Helmbold, Robert E. Schapire, and Manfred K. Warmuth. How to use expert advice. *J. ACM*, 44(3):427–485, May 1997. ISSN 0004-5411. doi: 10.1145/258128.258179. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/258128.258179>.
- Peter Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 3(null):397–422, March 2003. ISSN 1532-4435.
- Jia Yuan Yu and Shie Mannor. Piecewise-stationary bandit problems with side observations. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML '09, page 1177–1184, New York, NY, USA, 2009. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781605585161. doi: 10.1145/1553374.1553524. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1553374.1553524>.

- Peter Auer, Pratik Gajane, and Ronald Ortner. Adaptively tracking the best bandit arm with an unknown number of distribution changes. In Alina Beygelzimer and Daniel Hsu, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 99 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 138–158, Phoenix, USA, 25–28 Jun 2019. PMLR. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v99/auer19a.html>.
- J. Gittins. Bandit processes and dynamic allocation indices. *Journal of the royal statistical society series b-methodological*, 41:148–164, 1979.
- P. Whittle. Restless bandits: Activity allocation in a changing world. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 25:287–298, 1988. ISSN 00219002. doi: 10.2307/3214163. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3214163>.
- Ronald Ortner, Daniil Ryabko, Peter Auer, and Rémi Munos. Regret bounds for restless markov bandits. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 558:62–76, 2014. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: 10.1016/j.tcs.2014.09.026. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030439751400704X>. Algorithmic Learning Theory.
- Xiang Zhou, Yi Xiong, Ningyuan Chen, and Xuefeng Gao. Regime switching bandits, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.09390>.
- John Langford and Tong Zhang. The epoch-greedy algorithm for multi-armed bandits with side information. In J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. Roweis, editors, *Neural Information Processing*, volume 20, pages 817–824. Curran Associates, Inc., 2008. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2007/file/4b04a686b0ad13dce35fa99fa4161c65-Paper.pdf>.
- Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. A Bradford Book, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2018. ISBN 0262039249.
- Jincheng Mei, Chenjun Xiao, Csaba Szepesvari, and Dale Schuurmans. On the global convergence rates of softmax policy gradient methods, 2020.
- James O Prochaska, Colleen A Redding, Kerry E Evers, et al. The transtheoretical model and stages of change. *Health behavior: Theory, research, and practice*, 97, 2015.

A Derivation of the gradient bandit learning dynamics

We iterate the update equations for our gradient bandit formulation:

$$H_{i,\pi_{i,t}} \leftarrow H_{i,\pi_{i,t}} + \delta_R (r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i - pb_{i,\pi_{i,t}}), \quad (14)$$

$$H_{i,-\pi_{i,t}} \leftarrow H_{i,-\pi_{i,t}} + \delta_R (1 - 2r_{t,a_{i,t}}^i) (1 - pb_{i,\pi_{i,t}}). \quad (15)$$

First, we are looking for the change in probability pb of choosing a policy depending on the change in weights of the softmax policy and the change of the weights H_π over time, that is:

$$\frac{dpb_{i,\pi}}{dt} = \frac{dpb_{i,\pi}}{dH_{i,\pi}} \times \frac{dH_{i,\pi}}{dt}. \quad (16)$$

The derivative of the softmax policy with respect to weights $H_{i,\pi}$ is simply [Sutton and Barto \[2018\]](#):

$$\frac{dpb_{i,k}}{dH_{i,j}} = pb_i (I_{k,j} - pb_j), \quad (17)$$

where I is the indicator function being 1 if $k = j$ and 0 otherwise. We now derive the expression $\frac{dH_{i,\pi}}{dt}$. For the derivation, we assume that the gradient bandit needs to decide between two policies and assume Bernoulli distributed rewards. Furthermore, we omit the subscript i for ease of notation. Thus, given the update equations above, we have to consider the following four cases:

Case 1 : $H_{\pi_t} = \pi_0 \wedge r_{t,a_t} = 1$:

$$H_{\pi_0} \leftarrow H_{\pi_0} + \delta_R (1 - pb_{\pi_0})$$

$$H_{\pi_1} \leftarrow H_{\pi_1} - \delta_R (1 - pb_{\pi_0})$$

Case 2 : $H_{\pi_t} = \pi_0 \wedge r_{t,a_t} = 0$:

$$H_{\pi_0} \leftarrow H_{\pi_0} - \delta_R pb_{\pi_0}$$

$$H_{\pi_1} \leftarrow H_{\pi_1} + \delta_R (1 - pb_{\pi_0})$$

Case 3 : $H_{\pi_t} = \pi_1 \wedge r_{t,a_t} = 1$:

$$H_{\pi_0} \leftarrow H_{\pi_0} - \delta_R pb_{\pi_0}$$

$$H_{\pi_1} \leftarrow H_{\pi_1} + \delta_R pb_{\pi_0}$$

Case 4 : $H_{\pi_t} = \pi_1 \wedge r_{t,a_t} = 0$:

$$H_{\pi_0} \leftarrow H_{\pi_0} + \delta_R pb_{\pi_0}$$

$$H_{\pi_1} \leftarrow H_{\pi_1} - \delta_R (1 - pb_{\pi_0})$$

Note the second term on the RHS of each of these update equations can be interpreted as a case dependent derivative of the respective weights. Note that we have expressed all probabilities in terms of one policy π_0 , which we can do since $pb_1 := 1 - pb_0$.

First note that for each case, given average reward r_{π_0} for policy π_0 and average reward r_{π_1} for policy π_1 , we construct an expectation over derivatives by an weighted average for each of the cases above. We start with derivative $\frac{dH_{\pi_0}}{dt}$. If $\pi_t = \pi_0$, as a first step, consider the weighted sum of all the update equations for H_{π_0} where $r_{t,a_t} = 1$ or $r_{t,a_t} = 0$. The weights in the sum are determined by the average reward r_{π_0} . For $r_{t,a_t} = 1$ we weight the update with r_{π_0} and for $r_{t,a_t} = 0$ with $(1 - r_{\pi_0})$ leading to the partial term:

$$r_{\pi_0} \delta_R (1 - pb_{\pi_0}) - (1 - r_{\pi_0}) \delta_R pb_{\pi_0}. \quad (18)$$

Now H_{π_0} is also updated when $\pi_t = \pi_1$. The weights are now determined by the average reward r_{π_1} , thus we get for the second partial term:

$$-r_{\pi_1}\delta_R pb_{\pi_0} + (1-r_{\pi_1})\delta_R pb_{\pi_0}. \quad (19)$$

For the final result, we need to consider the probability of these two events happening. This is determined by probabilities pb_{π_0} and pb_{π_1} . We multiply equations 18 and 19 with the respective probabilities getting:

$$pb_{\pi_0} \left(r_{\pi_0}\delta_R(1-pb_{\pi_0}) - (1-r_{\pi_0})\delta_R pb_{\pi_0} \right), (1-pb_{\pi_0}) \left(-r_{\pi_1}\delta_R pb_{\pi_0} + (1-r_{\pi_1})\delta_R pb_{\pi_0} \right), \quad (20)$$

where we substituted $pb_1 = (1-pb_0)$. $\frac{dH_{\pi_1}}{dt}$ can be derived in a similar fashion. We then have for the derivatives of the weights H_{π} :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dH_{\pi_0}}{dt} = pb_{\pi_0} (r_{\pi_0}\delta_R(1-pb_{\pi_0}) - (1-r_{\pi_0})\delta_R pb_{\pi_0}) \\ + (1-pb_{\pi_0}) (-r_{\pi_1}\delta_R pb_{\pi_0} + (1-r_{\pi_1})\delta_R pb_{\pi_0}), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dH_{\pi_1}}{dt} = pb_{\pi_0} (-r_{\pi_0}\delta_R(1-pb_{\pi_0}) + (1-r_{\pi_0})\delta_R(1-pb_{\pi_0})) \\ + (1-pb_{\pi_0}) (r_{\pi_1}\delta_R pb_{\pi_0} - (1-r_{\pi_1})\delta_R(1-pb_{\pi_0})). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We now derive the final expression in equation 16, we focus on $\frac{dpb_{\pi_0}}{dt}$, since the change in probability of π_1 follows directly by the fact $\frac{dpb_{\pi_1}}{dt} = -\frac{dpb_{\pi_0}}{dt}$. In order to describe $\frac{dpb_{\pi_0}}{dt}$ we need to consider the total differential:

$$\frac{dpb_{\pi_0}}{dt} = \frac{dpb_{\pi_0}}{dH_{\pi_0}} \times \frac{dH_{\pi_0}}{dt} + \frac{dpb_{\pi_0}}{dH_{\pi_1}} \times \frac{dH_{\pi_1}}{dt}. \quad (23)$$

Putting equations 17, 21 and 22 in 23, we get after some simplification:

$$\frac{dp^*(t)}{dt} = \delta_R p^*(t) (\Delta_R - r^* + p^*(t)(2p^*(t) - 3)(\Delta_R p^*(t) - r^* + 1) + 1), \quad (24)$$

where $\Delta_R = r_{\pi_0} - r_{\pi_1}$, $r^* = r_{\pi_0}$ and $p^*(t) = pb_{\pi_0}(t)$.