
PAC-Bayesian Offline Contextual Bandits With Guarantees

Otmane Sakhi
Criteo AI Lab
CREST, ENSAE, IPP

Nicolas Chopin
CREST, ENSAE, IPP

Pierre Alquier
RIKEN AIP

Abstract

This paper introduces a new principled approach for offline policy optimisation in contextual bandits. For two well-established risk estimators, we propose novel generalisation bounds able to confidently improve upon the logging policy *offline*. Unlike previous work, our approach does not require tuning hyperparameters on held-out sets, and enables deployment with no prior A/B testing. This is achieved by analysing the problem through the PAC-Bayesian lens; mainly, we let go of traditional policy parametrisation (e.g. softmax) and instead interpret the policies as mixtures of deterministic strategies. We demonstrate through extensive experiments evidence of our bounds tightness and the effectiveness of our approach in practical scenarios.

1 INTRODUCTION

Online industrial systems often try to solve sequential decision problems by interacting with the environment and improving based on the feedback received. The contextual bandit framework formalizes this mechanism, and proved valuable with applications in recommender systems [Li et al., 2010, Valko et al., 2014] and clinical trials [Villar et al., 2015]. Given a certain context, the decision-maker performs an action and receives a feedback. This feedback helps the system learn about its environment. The goal of the decision-maker is to discover an efficient policy, which performs good actions given the different contexts revealed by the environment.

In this paper, we are concerned with the offline formulation of this problem [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a], which is arguably better suited for real-life applications where more control over the deployed policies is needed.

The learning of the policy is performed offline, based on historical data, typically obtained by logging the interactions between an older version of the decision system and the environment. By leveraging this data, our goal is to discover new strategies of greater performance and ideally have offline guarantees on the performance drastically reducing the risk of negative A/B tests.

There are two main paths to address this learning problem. The *direct method* tries to model the feedback function [Sakhi et al., 2020a, Jeunen and Goethals, 2021] and derives a policy according to this model. This approach can be praised for its simplicity [Brandfonbrener et al., 2021] but will often suffer from a bias as the feedback received is complex and the efficiency of the method directly depends on our ability to understand the problem’s structure.

The other path is referred to as IPS: *inverse propensity scoring* [Horvitz and Thompson, 1952] which does not rely on modeling the feedback. Instead, it tries to learn a policy directly from the intrinsically biased historical data which it corrects by different variants of importance sampling [Owen and Zhou, 2000]. Research in this direction focused on either improving the estimators [Dudík et al., 2011, Wang et al., 2017, Su et al., 2020] or attacking the problem with statistical learning tools giving birth to different learning principles [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a, Ma et al., 2019, London and Sandler, 2019, Faury et al., 2020].

We further explore the latter direction and analyse offline contextual bandits from the PAC-Bayesian perspective [McAllester, 1998, Catoni, 2007]. Contrary to previous works where the goal was to suggest learning principles, we aim at providing tight generalization bounds for two widely used risk estimators, that will be optimized directly giving offline certificates on the learned policies. We show that our approach is well suited for offline policy learning as it naturally incorporates information about the old decision system and can confidently improve it offline.

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Setting

We use $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to denote a context and $a \in [K]$ an action, where K denotes the number of available actions. Given a context x , each action is associated with a cost $c(x, a) \in [-1, 0]$, with the convention that better actions have smaller cost. The cost function c is unknown. Our decision system is represented by its policy π which given a context $x \in \mathcal{X}$, defines a probability distribution over the K -dimensional simplex Δ_K . Assuming that the contexts are stochastic and follow an unknown distribution ν , we define the *risk* of the policy π as the expected cost one suffers when playing actions according to π :

$$\text{Risk}(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu, a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} [c(x, a)].$$

The learning problem is to find a policy π which minimizes the risk. This risk can be naively estimated by deploying the policy online and gathering enough samples to construct an accurate estimate. Of course, we do not have this luxury in most real-world problems as the cost of deploying bad policies can be extremely high. We can obtain instead an estimate by exploiting the logged interactions collected by the previous system. Indeed, the previous system is represented by a *logging policy* π_0 (e.g a previous version of a recommender system that the practitioner is trying to improve), which gathered interaction data of the following form:

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \{x_i, a_i \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x_i), c_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \quad \text{with } c_i = c(x_i, a_i).$$

Given this data, one can build various estimators, with the IPS (Inverse Propensity Scoring) the most commonly used. It is constructed based on importance weights [Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983]:

$$\text{IPS}_n(\pi) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_\pi(a_i|x_i) c_i$$

where $\omega_\pi(x, a) = \pi(a|x)/\pi_0(a|x)$. This estimate is unbiased under mild conditions ($\text{supp}(\pi) \subset \text{supp}(\pi_0)$) but can suffer from high variance issues. A simple way to deal with this problem is to use clipping (either clipping the weights or the logging policy probabilities) which introduces a bias-variance trade-off [Ionides, 2008]. We are more interested in clipping the logging probabilities as we need objectives that are linear in the policy π for our study. The clipped IPS or cIPS [Bottou et al., 2013] estimator can be written as:

$$\text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_\pi^\tau(a_i|x_i) c_i$$

with $\omega_\pi^\tau(x, a) = \pi(a_i|x_i) / \max(\pi_0(a|x), \tau)$ and $\tau \in [0, 1]$. Choosing $\tau \ll 1$ reduces the bias of cIPS. We recover the IPS estimator (unbiased) by taking $\tau = 0$.

Another estimator of interest is the doubly robust estimator [Ben-Tal et al., 2013], which uses the importance weights as control variates to reduce further the variance of the IPS/cIPS estimators. We consider a simplified version of this estimator, which replaces the use of a model \hat{c} of the cost by one parameter $\xi \in [-1, 0]$ that can be chosen so as to reduce the empirical variance of the IPS/cIPS estimators. We choose cIPS as our base estimator considering the fact that it generalizes IPS, and we introduce the control variate clipped IPS, or cvcIPS as follows:

$$\text{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi) = \xi + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_\pi^\tau(a_i|x_i) (c_i - \xi).$$

We can obtain the cvcIPS estimator as a special case of the doubly robust estimator when the cost model $\hat{c} = \xi$ is constant and $\tau = 0$. cIPS is recovered by setting $\xi = 0$.

We will provide generalization bounds for both cIPS and cvcIPS estimators. In our setting, cvcIPS with a well chosen $\xi \neq 0$ provide the tightest learning bounds in the majority of scenarios.

2.2 Learning Principles

The literature so far has focused on deriving learning principles from generalization bounds to obtain policies with good online performance. The first line of work in this direction is CRM: Counterfactual Risk minimization [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a] which introduced SVP: Sample Variance Penalization to favor policies with small empirical risk and small induced variance. The intuition behind it is that the variance of cIPS depends on the disparity between π and π_0 , and only taking the empirical risk as a performance certificate is sub-optimal. The analysis only focused on the cIPS estimator and used uniform bounds based on empirical Bernstein inequalities [Maurer and Pontil, 2009] to derive the following learning objective:

$$\arg \min_{\pi} \left\{ \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi) + \lambda \sqrt{\frac{\hat{V}_n(\pi)}{n}} \right\} \quad (1)$$

with λ a tuning parameter and $\hat{V}_n(\pi)$ the empirical variance of the cIPS estimator on the dataset \mathcal{D}_n . A majorization-minimization algorithm was provided in [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a] to solve (1) for parametrized softmax policies.

In the same spirit, [Faury et al., 2020, Sakhi et al., 2020b] generalize SVP using the distributional robustness framework, showing that the CRM principle can be retrieved with a particular choice of the divergence and provide asymptotic coverage results of the true risk. Their objectives are competitive with SVP while providing simple ways to scale its optimization to large datasets.

Another line of research, closer to our work, uses PAC-Bayesian bounds to derive learning objectives in the same fashion as [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a]. Indeed, [London and Sandler, 2019] introduce the Bayesian CRM, motivating the use of L_2 regularization towards the parameter θ_0 of the logging policy π_0 . The analysis uses [McAllester, 2003]’s PAC-Bayesian bound, is conducted on the cIPS estimator and give the following learning objective for parametrized softmax policies:

$$\arg \min_{\theta} \{ \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_\theta) + \lambda \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \}. \quad (2)$$

[London and Sandler, 2019] minimize a convex upper-bound of objective (2) (by taking a log transform of the policy) which is amenable to stochastic optimization, giving better results than (1) while scaling better to the size of the dataset.

Limitations. Even though the objectives defined above are inspired by generalization bounds, one does not get any guarantees on the performance of the policy obtained by minimizing (1) or (2). These objectives also require tuning an additional hyperparameter λ on held-out sets using estimators that are not necessarily aligned with online performance [Gilotte et al., 2018].

2.3 Guaranteed Improvements with Generalization Bounds

Our first concern in most applications is to improve upon the actual system π_0 . As \mathcal{D}_n is collected by π_0 , we can claim having access to $\text{Risk}(\pi_0)$ ¹. Given a new policy π , we want to be confident that the improvement $\mathcal{I}(\pi, \pi_0) = \text{Risk}(\pi_0) - \text{Risk}(\pi)$ is positive before deployment. Let us suppose that we are restricted to a class of policies \mathcal{H} , and have access to a generalization bound that gives the following result with high probability over draws of \mathcal{D}_n :

$$\text{Risk}(\pi) \leq \mathcal{UB}_n(\pi) \quad \forall \pi \in \mathcal{H}.$$

with \mathcal{UB}_n an empirical upper bound that depends on \mathcal{D}_n . For any π , we define $\mathcal{GI}_{\mathcal{UB}_n}(\pi, \pi_0) = \text{Risk}(\pi_0) - \mathcal{UB}_n(\pi)$. We can be sure of improving $\text{Risk}(\pi_0)$ offline if we manage to find $\pi \in \mathcal{H}$ that achieves $\mathcal{GI}_{\mathcal{UB}_n}(\pi, \pi_0) > 0$ as the following result will hold with high probability:

$$\mathcal{I}(\pi, \pi_0) \geq \mathcal{GI}_{\mathcal{UB}_n}(\pi, \pi_0) > 0$$

In the hope of obtaining such policy, we look for the minimizer of \mathcal{UB}_n over the class of policies \mathcal{H} as:

$$\pi_{\mathcal{UB}_n}^* \in \arg \min_{\pi \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{UB}_n(\pi) = \arg \max_{\pi \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{GI}_{\mathcal{UB}_n}(\pi, \pi_0).$$

We also define the best guaranteed risk $\mathcal{GR}_{\mathcal{UB}_n}^* = \mathcal{UB}_n(\pi_{\mathcal{UB}_n}^*)$ and the best guaranteed improvement follows $\mathcal{GI}_{\mathcal{UB}_n}^*(\pi_0) = \text{Risk}(\pi_0) - \mathcal{GR}_{\mathcal{UB}_n}^*$.

¹We have a small approximation error of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$.

A *theoretically-grounded* strategy to improve π_0 will be to only deploy $\pi_{\mathcal{UB}_n}^*$ if we obtain $\mathcal{GI}_{\mathcal{UB}_n}^*(\pi_0) > 0$, otherwise continue collecting data with the current system π_0 .

It means that the tightness of \mathcal{UB}_n will play a drastic role in efficiently improving our system. If we fix \mathcal{D}_n and π_0 , $\mathcal{GI}_{\mathcal{UB}_n}^*(\pi_0)$ will only depend on the minimization of \mathcal{UB}_n , motivating the construction of upper bounds that achieve the smallest minimum possible. So far, the bounds used in the literature to derive learning principles [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a, London and Sandler, 2019] can provide guarantees only when the number of samples n is very large. In this regard, the PAC-Bayesian framework can be considered the perfect candidate to tackle this problem as it gives non-vacuous bounds in difficult settings [Dziugaite and Roy, 2017] and is capable of improving the previous system π_0 by incorporating information about it in the form of a prior; see [Alquier, 2021] for a recent review.

Contributions. We leverage PAC-Bayesian tools to construct tight generalization bounds that hold beyond the i.i.d. setting for both cIPS and cvcIPS estimators. By using a particular class of policies, we show that our bounds can guarantee improvement over the previous system in practical scenarios, without the need for hyperparameter search or designing offline testing experiments.

3 PAC-BAYESIAN ANALYSIS

In the contextual bandit setting, the policy that minimizes the expected cost is deterministic; always choosing the item that has the minimum cost. As the function c is unknown, we instead learn a parametric score function $f_\theta \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta = \{f_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$ that encodes the action’s relevance to a context x . We define a decision rule d_θ over f_θ by:

$$d_\theta(a|x) = \mathbb{1}[\arg \max_{a'} f_\theta(x, a') = a].$$

We give the expression of cvcIPS (as it generalizes cIPS) with the parametric decision rule d_θ :

$$\text{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(d_\theta) = \xi + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d_\theta(a_i|x_i)}{\max(\pi_0(a_i|x_i), \tau)} (c_i - \xi).$$

As discussed in the previous section, clipping the logging propensities allows us to obtain a linear estimator in d_θ . By linearity, one can see that any expectation of our estimator, taken under a distribution over \mathcal{F}_Θ can be transferred over the decision rule, resulting in a mixture of decision rules, smoothing them into a policy. This interpretation of policies was first introduced in [Seldin et al., 2011] and later used by [London and Sandler, 2019]. Let Q be a distribution over \mathcal{F}_Θ . For the pair (x, a) , we adopt the notations of

[London and Sandler, 2019] and define a policy²:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_Q(a|x) &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q} [d_\theta(a|x)] \\ &= P_{\theta \sim Q} \left(\operatorname{argmax}_{a'} f_\theta(x, a') = a \right).\end{aligned}$$

Defining policies as *mixtures of deterministic decision rules* does not restrict the class of policies our study applies to. Indeed, if the family \mathcal{F}_Θ is rich enough (e.g, neural networks), for any policy π , we can find a distribution Q over \mathcal{F}_Θ that satisfies $\pi = \pi_Q$. This is further discussed in Appendix A.1. From the definition of π_Q , we have by linearity:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q} [\operatorname{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(d_\theta)] = \operatorname{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi_Q).$$

As the PAC-Bayesian framework studies the average risk of randomized parameters [Alquier, 2021], in the next section, we intend to leverage its tools to analyse the average of *cvcIPS* estimator with deterministic decision rules d_θ ; $\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q} [\operatorname{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(d_\theta)]$ consequently $\operatorname{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi_Q)$, to obtain generalisation bounds on $\operatorname{Risk}(\pi_Q)$.

The PAC-Bayesian Paradigm. Before we dive into the analysis, we want to explain³ why the PAC-Bayesian paradigm is well suited to tackle the offline contextual bandit problem. This learning framework proceeds as follows: Given a class of functions \mathcal{F}_Θ , we fix a prior (reference distribution) P on \mathcal{F}_Θ before seeing the data, then, we receive some data \mathcal{D}_n which help us learn a new distribution Q over \mathcal{F}_Θ . With the previous formulation of policies, the prior P , even if it can be anything⁴, will be our logging policy (i.e. $\pi_0 = \pi_P$), and we will use the data \mathcal{D}_n to learn a distribution Q , thus a new policy π_Q that improves π_0 .

3.1 PAC-Bayesian Bounds

3.1.1 The i.i.d. case

If we suppose that $\mathcal{D}_n = \{x_i, a_i, c_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ is i.i.d., we can already state the first PAC-Bayesian bound applied to the *cIPS* estimator ($\xi = 0$).

Proposition 1. *Given a prior P on \mathcal{F}_Θ , $\tau \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$. We have with probability $1 - \delta$ over draws of $\mathcal{D}_n \sim (\nu, \pi_0)^n$: for any Q that is P -continuous, any $\lambda > 0$:*

$$\operatorname{Risk}(\pi_Q) \leq \frac{1}{\tau(e^\lambda - 1)} \left(1 - e^{-\tau \lambda \Gamma_n^\tau(Q, \lambda, \delta)} \right)$$

with $\Gamma_n^\tau(Q, \lambda, \delta) = \operatorname{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) + \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{\tau \lambda n}$ and $KL[Q||P] = \mathbb{E}_Q [\ln Q/P]$.

This is a direct application of [Catoni, 2007]’s bound to the bounded loss *cIPS* and exploiting the fact that its bias is

negative. A full derivation can be found in Appendix A.2. Note that Proposition 1 cannot be applied naively to the *cvcIPS* estimator, because once $\xi \neq 0$, the bias of the estimator, an intractable quantity that depends on the unknown distribution ν , can be positive and needs to be incorporated in the bound.

[London and Sandler, 2019] used [McAllester, 2003]’s bound to derive the learning objective in their study. We state it in Proposition 2 for the *cIPS* estimator as this bound also fails to handle the *cvcIPS* estimator ($\xi \neq 0$) for the same reasons mentioned before.

Proposition 2. *Given a prior P on \mathcal{F}_Θ , $\tau \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$. We have with probability $1 - \delta$ over draws of $\mathcal{D}_n \sim (\nu, \pi_0)^n$: For any Q that is P -continuous:*

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Risk}(\pi_Q) &\leq \operatorname{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) + \frac{2(KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})}{\tau n} \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{2[\operatorname{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) + \frac{1}{\tau}](KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})}{\tau n}}.\end{aligned}$$

The bound can give tight results in the $[0, 1]$ -bounded loss [McAllester, 2003] when the empirical risk is close to 0 as one obtains fast convergence rates in $O(1/n)$. However, its use in the case of offline contextual bandits is far from being optimal. Indeed, to achieve a fast rate in this context, one needs $\operatorname{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) + \frac{1}{\tau} \approx 0$. This is never the case in practice as τ is often chosen to be $\tau = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$ [Ionides, 2008], which makes $\frac{1}{\tau} \gg 1$ and $\operatorname{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) \in [-1, 0]$ especially when n is sufficiently large or π_Q is close to π_0 . In addition, we give the following Theorem which proves that the bound given by Proposition 1 will always give tighter results than Proposition 2.

Theorem 1. *We fix $\mathcal{D}_n \sim (\mu, \pi_0)^n$. For any distributions P, Q that is P -continuous, $\tau \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_n(Q, P, \delta, \tau) &\leq \operatorname{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) + \frac{2(KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})}{\tau n} \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{2[\operatorname{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) + \frac{1}{\tau}](KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})}{\tau n}}\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathcal{M}_n(Q, P, \delta, \tau) = \min_{\lambda > 0} \frac{1 - e^{-\tau \lambda \Gamma_n^\tau(Q, \lambda, \delta)}}{\tau(e^\lambda - 1)}$.

This result can be derived from Theorem 3 in [Letarte et al., 2019]. A full proof can be found in Appendix A.3. This means that, if our main interest is to provide tight guarantees on $\operatorname{Risk}(\pi_Q)$, we should never consider Proposition 2 as it will always produce a looser bound compared to Proposition 1.

3.1.2 Going beyond i.i.d.: Multiple Interactions

In a multitude of applications, the i.i.d. assumption made on $\{x_i, a_i, c_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ can be violated. Indeed, a decision system can interact with the same context x_i multiples times,

²Called Bayesian policies in [London and Sandler, 2019].

³A similar discussion motivates [London and Sandler, 2019].

⁴As long as it does not depend on \mathcal{D}_n .




Figure 1: The "Multiple Interactions" Setting.

trying different actions and logging the feedbacks as represented in Figure 1. Let m_i be the number of times the system interacted with context x_i . The logged dataset in this case can be represented by

$$\mathcal{D}_{n_c}^{\{m_i\}_{i \in [n_c]}} = \left\{ x_i, \{a_i^j, c_i^j\}_{j \in [m_i]} \right\}_{i \in [n_c]}$$

with n_c representing the number of contexts and $n = \sum_i^{n_c} m_i$ the total number of datapoints. As soon as we have an $m_{i_0} > 1$, the i.i.d. assumption does not hold anymore as the samples $\{x_{i_0}, \{a_{i_0}^j, c_{i_0}^j\}_{j=1}^{m_{i_0}}\}$ share the same observation x_{i_0} and thus are dependent. In this case, the cvcIPS estimator will be written as:

$$\text{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi_Q) = \xi + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \frac{\omega_{\pi_Q}^{\tau}(a_i^j | x_i)(c_i^j - \xi)}{n_c m_i}$$

We recover the i.i.d. case by taking $m_i = 1 \forall i$. Under this weaker assumption, [Catoni, 2007] or any classical PAC-Bayesian bound cannot be applied directly.

We propose a **novel Bernstein-type** PAC-Bayesian bound based on a decomposition of the expectation to obtain results holding for the "multiple interactions" setting and the cvcIPS estimator. To simplify notations, we provide it below for the case where $m_i = m$ (same number of interactions for all contexts x_i , giving $n = mn_c$). We state the more general version in Appendix A.4.

Proposition 3. *Given a prior P on \mathcal{F}_{Θ} , $\xi \in [-1, 0]$, $\tau \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and a set of strictly positive scalars $\Lambda = \{\lambda_i\}_{i \in [n_{\Lambda}]}$. We have with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over draws of $\mathcal{D}_{n_c}^m \sim \prod_{i=1}^{n_c} (\nu, \pi_0^m)$: For any Q that is P -continuous, any $\lambda \in \Lambda$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Risk}(\pi_Q) &\leq \text{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi_Q) - \xi \mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}(\pi_Q) \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{4\sqrt{n_c}}{\delta}}{2n_c}} + \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2n_{\Lambda}}{\delta}}{\lambda} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda L(\xi)}{n} g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{n}\right) \mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau}(\pi_Q) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{with } g : u &\rightarrow \frac{\exp(u) - 1 - u}{u^2}, L(\xi) = \max(\xi^2, (1 + \xi)^2), M(\xi) = \frac{1 + \xi}{\tau} - \xi, \\ \mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}(\pi) &= \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\cdot | x_i)} \left[\mathbb{1}[\pi_0(a | x_i) < \tau] \left(1 - \frac{\pi_0(a | x_i)}{\tau} \right) \right] \\ \text{and } \mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau}(\pi) &= \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\cdot | x_i)} \left[\frac{\pi_0(a | x_i)}{\max(\tau, \pi_0(a | x_i))^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We set $\Lambda = \{a + \frac{i}{n_{\Lambda}}(b - a)\}_{i \in [n_{\Lambda}]}$ with $b = 2n/M(\xi)$ and

$a = \sqrt{2\tau n \ln \frac{1}{\delta} / 5L(\xi)}$. The choice of Λ as well as the full proof of Proposition 3 will be discussed in Appendix A.4.

Proposition 3 presents **three** main advantages over the previous ones. It covers the general cvcIPS estimator ($\xi \neq 0$), it applies to the multiple interactions setting, and it is decomposable into a sum, making it amenable to stochastic first order optimization [Robbins and Monro, 1951]. However, minimizing it requires to access the logging policy π_0 . This is reasonable as π_0 represents the currently deployed decision system, which we want to improve. Let us analyse our proposed bound:

The $\mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}$ term. When $\xi \neq 0$, an upper bound $-\xi \mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}$ on the true bias appears. It is tractable in this case as we condition on the observed contexts x_i (no need to know ν) and have access to π_0 .

The $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau}$ term. $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau}$ is derived as an upper bound to the conditional variance of our estimator, with $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau} \leq 1/\tau$. We expect our bound to give tight results⁵ for π_Q when $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau}(\pi_Q) \ll 1/\tau$. However, once π_0 is uniform and $\tau = 1/K$, we can never have the previous condition as $\forall \pi_Q \mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau}(\pi_Q) = 1/\tau$. We will make sure to address this setting in the experiments.

The number of interactions m . To simplify our analysis, let us say that $\lambda = a = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ with $n = mn_c$. Intuitively, increasing $m \rightarrow \infty$ should make the uncertainty on the outcomes given x_i vanish. Our bound translates that as $m \rightarrow \infty$ makes terms in $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$ disappear leaving only terms in $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n_c})$ (uncertainty over the contexts). Of course, increasing $n_c \rightarrow \infty$ makes the bound converge, meaning that for a fixed budget $n = mn_c$, we would prefer increasing n_c than m , this is however more costly in many applications (e.g. surveys) where it is easier to find a limited number of contexts x_i (n_c fixed) and interact with them multiple times ($m > 1$) than interact with $n = mn_c$ independent contexts x_i just once.

The impact of ξ . We can get an intuition of the influence of ξ in the tightness of the bound directly from Proposition 3. $\xi \neq 0$ introduces a new bias-variance tradeoff. For the cost of a positive bias represented by $\mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}$, one can reduce the dependence on the variance-like term $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau}$ since, for a fixed λ , the function $\xi \rightarrow \frac{\lambda L(\xi)}{n} g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{n}\right)$ reaches its maximum at $\xi = 0$. In particular, we are interested in two values of ξ which lead to different behaviours for the above bound:

- $\xi = 0$ retrieves the cIPS estimator. It gets rid of $\mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}$ but results in an upper bound with the highest dependence on $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau}$.
- $\xi = -1/2$ makes use of the cvcIPS estimator. One gets to suffer half $\mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}$ in the bound but reduces the dependence on $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^{\tau}$ by a factor of 4 at least.

⁵Similar principle to [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a].

3.2 Deriving practical policies

Our PAC-Bayesian bounds hold for any distribution Q and any form of score function f_θ (thus for any policy). However, we need to take into account some constraints that are necessary to obtain policies of practical use. There are some desired properties that we want our policies to have, and that can be summarized in the points below.

Sampling. Being able to sample actions from our policy is crucial as the decisions taken by our online system boil down to sampling. For a given context x , we have:

$$a \sim \pi_Q(\cdot|x) \iff a = \operatorname{argmax}_{a'} f_\theta(x, a'), \theta \sim Q.$$

The complexity of sampling from π_Q depends on how easy it is to sample from the distribution Q .

Computing propensities. Computing propensities for a given pair (x, a) is essential when we want to evaluate the policy offline or compute importance weights after deployment. A naive estimate can be obtained by:

$$\hat{\pi}_Q^{\text{naive}}(a|x) = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i=1}^S d_{\theta_i}(a|x)$$

with $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^S$ samples from Q . This simple estimator behaves fine when we deal with small action spaces K and low-dimensional parameters. Once we are not in that use case, we will need to take a huge number of samples S to estimate the propensities with decent precision. Ideally, we would like to exploit the family of distributions Q considered and the form of the function f_θ to come up with a better behaved estimator for the propensities.

Computing Gradients. If we restrict our study to a family of parametric distributions $\mathcal{Q}_\Psi = \{Q_\psi, \psi \in \Psi\}$, computing gradients will be essential to minimising the bounds stated before. For a given pair (x, a) , we can compute for any parameterized distribution Q_ψ the score function gradient estimator [Williams, 1992] of $\pi_{Q_\psi}(a|x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\psi \pi_{Q_\psi}(a|x) &= \nabla_\beta \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q_\psi} [d_\theta(a|x)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q_\psi} [d_\theta(a|x) \nabla_\psi \log Q_\psi(\theta)]. \end{aligned}$$

In general, this gradient suffers from a variance problem [Xu et al., 2019] and we might need to choose a specific family of distributions \mathcal{Q}_Ψ , or/and specify a form of f_θ to obtain $\psi \rightarrow \pi_{Q_\psi}(a|x)$ with better behaved gradients.

3.3 Linear Independent Gaussian Policies

As mentioned in the previous section, even if our analysis is valid for all distributions Q and any form of f_θ , we need to restrict our space to obtain practical policies. We begin by restricting f_θ to:

$$\forall x, a \quad f_\theta(x, a) = \phi(x)^T \theta_a \quad (3)$$

with ϕ a fixed transform over the contexts. This form of f_θ is widely used in this context [Fauray et al., 2020, Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a]. This results in a parameter θ of dimension $d = p \times K$ with p the dimension of the features $\phi(x)$ and K the number of actions.

We also restrict the family of distributions $\mathcal{Q}_{d+1} = \{Q_{\mu, \sigma} = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I_d), \mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma > 0\}$ to independent Gaussians with shared scale. With these choices of f_θ and \mathcal{Q} , the induced $\pi_{\mu, \sigma}$, that we call **LIG: Linear Independent Gaussian** policies, will provide fast sampling and easily computable propensities and gradients. Indeed, sampling from $\pi_{\mu, \sigma}$ will reduce to sampling from $\theta \sim Q_{\mu, \sigma}$ and computing $a = \operatorname{argmax}_{a'} f_\theta(x, a')$. When it comes to estimating the propensity of a given x , we can suggest another expression of $\pi_{\mu, \sigma}(a|x)$ that reduces the computation to a one dimensional integral:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\mu, \sigma}(a|x) &= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \left[\prod_{a' \neq a} \Phi \left(\epsilon + \frac{\phi(x)^T (\mu_a - \mu_{a'})}{\sigma \|\phi(x)\|} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} [G_{\mu, \sigma}(\epsilon, a, x)] \end{aligned}$$

with Φ the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal. See Appendix A.5 for a full derivation and further discussion of this choice of policies. The computation of $\pi_{\mu, \sigma}(a|x)$ becomes easier as one dimensional standard normal integrals can be approximated with great precision. The gradient can also be derived from this new expression:

$$\nabla_{\mu, \sigma} \pi_{\mu, \sigma}(a|x) = \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} [\nabla_{\mu, \sigma} G_{\mu, \sigma}(\epsilon, a, x)]$$

which can be seen as a one dimensional reparametrization trick gradient, and is known to behave better than the score function gradient estimator [Xu et al., 2019].

Optimising the bounds. For their practicality, we focus on the class of **LIG** policies to optimise the bounds. We also adopt Gaussian priors⁶ $P = \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \sigma_0 I_d)$ to obtain an analytical expression for $KL[Q||P]$. We state the bounds for **LIG** policies with Gaussian priors in Appendix A.6.

Let us suppose that π_0 collected $\mathcal{D}_{n_c}^m$, if $m = 1$, Proposition 1 can be applied. We call $\mathcal{C}(\pi_{\mu, \sigma}, \lambda)$ the upper bound stated in Proposition 1 for **LIG** policies $\pi_{\mu, \sigma}$. The best guaranteed risk defined in **Section 2.3** is given by:

$$\mathcal{GR}_{\mathcal{C}}^* = \min_{\pi_{\mu, \sigma}} \min_{\lambda > 0} \mathcal{C}(\pi_{\mu, \sigma}, \lambda). \quad (4)$$

Proposition 3 holds for any $m \geq 1$ and any $\xi \in [-1, 0]$. We call $\mathcal{CBB}(\pi_{\mu, \sigma}, \lambda, \xi, m)$ the upper bound given by Proposition 3 for **LIG** policies $\pi_{\mu, \sigma}$. We similarly have:

$$\mathcal{GR}_{\mathcal{CBB}}^*(\xi, m) = \min_{\pi_{\mu, \sigma}} \min_{\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_\lambda} \mathcal{CBB}(\pi_{\mu, \sigma}, \lambda, \xi, m). \quad (5)$$

The best guaranteed improvement $\mathcal{GI}^*(\pi_0)$ with these bounds follows as the difference between $R(\pi_0)$ and \mathcal{GR}^* . We will not consider the bound given by Proposition 2 as we already know that it is sub-optimal (see Theorem 1).

⁶The prior uses the parameters of the logging policy π_0 .

4 EXPERIMENTS

We are interested in studying the effectiveness of the proposed bounds in providing guaranteed improvement of the previously deployed system π_0 after collecting $\mathcal{D}_{n_c}^m$. For the sake of comparison, we include in our experiments the bound derived in [London and Sandler, 2019] for softmax policies of the form:

$$\pi_{\mu}^S(a|x) \propto \exp(\phi(x)^T \mu_a).$$

We first begin by stating the generalization bound:

Proposition 4. *We fix a prior $P_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} = \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \sigma_0 I_d)$, $\tau \in (0, 1]$ and assume that $\forall x \|\phi(x)\| \leq 1$. For any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, we have with probability $1 - \delta$ over draws of $\mathcal{D}_n \sim (\nu, \pi_0)^n$: $\forall Q_{\mu, \sigma} = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma I_d)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Risk}(\pi_{\mu}^S) \leq & L(2\sigma) \left[\text{cIPS}_n^{\tau}(\pi_{\mu}^S, \sigma) + \frac{2(KL[Q|P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})}{\tau n} \right. \\ & \left. + \sqrt{\frac{2[\text{cIPS}_n^{\tau}(\pi_{\mu}^S, \sigma) + \frac{1}{\tau}(KL[Q|P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})]}{\tau n}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

with $\text{cIPS}_n^{\tau}(\pi_{\mu}^S, \sigma) = L(\sigma) \text{cIPS}_n^{\tau}(\pi_{\mu}^S)$ and $L(\sigma) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)$.

This bound is a direct combination of Lemma 3 and Theorem 3 both in [London and Sandler, 2019]. If the data collected by π_0 is i.i.d. ($m = 1$), we can use the learning bound from Proposition 4. We call $\mathcal{LS}(\pi_{\mu}^S, \sigma)$ the upper bound stated in Proposition 4. We write:

$$\mathcal{GR}_{\mathcal{LS}}^* = \min_{\pi_{\mu}^S} \min_{\sigma > 0} \mathcal{LS}(\pi_{\mu}^S, \sigma). \quad (6)$$

The computation of $\mathcal{GT}_{\mathcal{LS}}^*(\pi_0)$ follows directly.

To be fair to Proposition 4, we use $\pi_{\mu_0}^S$, a softmax logging policy of parameter μ_0 to generate the logged data and fix the same prior $P = \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, I_d)$ for all bounds. We adopt the standard supervised-to-bandit conversion to simulate logged data in all of our experiments [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a]. We use two multiclass datasets: **FashionMNIST** [Xiao et al., 2017] and **EMNIST-b** [Cohen et al., 2017], alongside two multilabel datasets: **NUS-WIDE-128** [Chua et al., 2009] with 128-VLAD features [Spyromitros-Xioufis et al., 2014] and **Mediamill** [Snoek et al., 2006]. The statistics of the datasets are described in Table 1; N the size of the training split, K the number of actions and p the dimension of the features $\phi(x)$. We take a small fraction (5%) of the training data that will only be used to learn the logging policy parameter μ_0 in a supervised manner.

With μ_0 obtained, we introduce an inverse temperature parameter α to our softmax logging policy $\pi_{\alpha \mu_0}^S$ giving a prior $P = \mathcal{N}(\alpha \mu_0, I_d)$. Changing α allows us to cover logging policies with different entropies ($\alpha \approx 0$ gives a uniform π_0 and $\alpha \approx 1$ gives a peaked π_0). We run $\pi_{\alpha \mu_0}$ on

Datasets	N	K	p
FashionMNIST	60 000	10	784
EMNIST-b	112 800	47	784
NUS-WIDE-128	161 789	81	128
Mediamill	30 993	101	120

Table 1: The statistics of the datasets used

the rest ($n_c = 0.95N$) of the training data to generate $\mathcal{D}_{n_c}^m$. For a context x and an action a , we define in our setting the cost as $c = -\mathbb{1}[a \in y]$ with y the set of true labels for x .

Learning μ_0 on a split different than the one logged allows us to use the previous bounds as the parameter μ_0 (and thus the prior) does not depend on the logged interactions. We set the allowed uncertainty to $\delta = 0.05$. For all datasets, τ will be set to $\tau = 1/K$ to get no bias when the logging policy is close to uniform. We experiment with two values for $m \in \{1, 2\}$. When $m = 1$, the i.i.d. assumption holds and we can use all the bounds. When $m > 1$, the i.i.d. assumption breaks and we can only use Proposition 3 to have viable guarantees. We also investigate the impact of $\xi \in \{0, -1/2\}$ on the behavior of the bound.

We use Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2014] with a learning rate of 10^{-3} for 20 epochs to optimize the bounds w.r.t their parameters. For Equation (4), we treat λ as a parameter and we look for the minimum of the bound with respect to μ, σ and λ . For Equation (5), we choose the size of Λ to be $n_{\Lambda} = 100$ and for each iteration j of the optimisation procedure, we take $\lambda_j \in \Lambda$ that minimizes the estimated bound and proceed to compute the gradient w.r.t μ and σ with λ_j . For any π , we compute its true risk $\text{Risk}(\pi)$ on the test sets as we have access to the true labels⁷. After optimizing each bound (Equations (4), (5) and (6)), we plot the guaranteed risk \mathcal{GR}^* , the true risk of the bound’s minimizer $\text{Risk}(\pi^*)$ as well as the guaranteed improvement by the bound $\max(\mathcal{GT}^*, 0)$ only if it is positive. The results are shown in Figure 2. The next paragraphs discuss the performance of the bounds and identify regimes where each bound produces the largest guaranteed improvement \mathcal{GT}^* over the previous system π_0 .

(a) Plotting $\text{Risk}(\pi^*)$. In real-world problems, we cannot have access to $\text{Risk}(\pi^*)$. As we can compute it in our experiments, we want to make sure that bounds giving low guaranteed risk \mathcal{GR}^* will produce policies π^* with low true risk $\text{Risk}(\pi^*)$. This will confirm that the gap between the bounds is not linked to constants but to quantities valuable to learning π^* . Figure 2 validates this as bounds with the best \mathcal{GR}^* reliably give the best $\text{Risk}(\pi^*)$ in all settings.

(b) \mathcal{LS} Bound. The bound derived from results in [London and Sandler, 2019] does not provide any guaranteed improvement ($\max(\mathcal{GT}_{\mathcal{LS}}^*, 0) = 0$) in all the setting

⁷We have a small approximation error of $\sqrt{-\ln \delta / n_{test}}$.




Figure 2: Behavior of the guaranteed risk \mathcal{GR}^* (\downarrow is better), the risk of the minimizer $\text{Risk}(\pi^*)$ (\downarrow is better) and the guaranteed improvement \mathcal{GI}^* (\uparrow is better) given by the bounds while changing π_0 .

considered. It’s guaranteed risk $\mathcal{GR}_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}}^*$ is always less than $\text{Risk}(\pi_0)$ and is even vacuous ($\mathcal{GR}_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}}^* \geq 0$) for larger action space datasets. One can also observe that the true risk of the policy derived from optimizing this bound $\text{Risk}(\pi_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{S}}^*)$ matches or improves only slightly on $\text{Risk}(\pi_0)$ making the bound not viable for offline policy optimization.

(c) \mathcal{C} Bound. This bound only applies to the case when $m = 1$ so it is only fair to compare it with bounds working in the same setting. We can observe that the \mathcal{C} bound gives great results when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ (logging policy π_0 is close to uniform) consistently beating $\mathcal{CBB}(0, 1)$ and being comparable to $\mathcal{CBB}(-\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. But once π_0 is peaked enough ($\alpha \rightarrow 1$), the \mathcal{C} bound fails sometimes at improving the logging policy and one can observe that in the context of **FashionMNIST** and **EMNIST-b**.

(d) \mathcal{CBB} Bound. This bound is valid for any $m \geq 1$. For the same value of m , we can see that choosing $\xi = -1/2$ consistently give the best results as it reduces considerably the dependency on $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^\tau$. Note that \mathcal{CBB} with $\xi = -1/2$ never fails to produce guaranteed improvement across all settings. For logging policies π_0 close to uniform, $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^\tau$ reaches its highest value $1/\tau$ as discussed in **Section 3.1.2**. This reduces the benefit of using a variance sensitive bound and we can see that on Figure 2. For small values of α , and when $m = 1$, $\mathcal{CBB}(0, 1)$ is always worse than \mathcal{C}

and $\mathcal{CBB}(-\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ fails at beating \mathcal{C} in the **NUS-WIDE-128** dataset in terms of \mathcal{GI}^* . Once we drift away from uniform logging policies ($\alpha \rightarrow 1$), the $\mathcal{CBB}(\cdot, 1)$ bound, especially with $\xi = -1/2$ dominates the competition on all the datasets considered always giving the largest \mathcal{GI}^* .

When increasing m , the \mathcal{CBB} bound gets tighter, we hence obtain better guarantees and better policies $\pi_{\mathcal{CBB}}^*$ across all settings. That is to be expected as we have more interactions with the contexts x_i to learn as well as a reduced dependence on the variance term $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^\tau$.

These experiments confirm that the policies π^* obtained by optimising our bounds improve, with high confidence, the logging policies π_0 . The results also suggest the use of $\mathcal{CBB}(-1/2, \cdot)$, a variance sensitive bound, combined with the cvcIPS estimator with $\xi = -0.5$ for its consistent results across the different scenarios considered.

5 CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduce a new principled approach for offline policy optimisation in contextual bandits. Leveraging PAC-Bayesian tools, we provide novel generalization bounds that work beyond the i.i.d. assumption, giving practitioners a new strategy to confidently improve over the previous decision system π_0 offline. Even if we focused

on discrete actions policies, the results given by our analysis can nicely be extended to learning efficient policies over slates [Swaminathan et al., 2017] or continuous action policies [Kallus and Zhou, 2018]. We believe that our work is a step towards learning policies offline with performance certificates, considerably reducing the chance of obtaining negative results after deployment.

References

- [Alquier, 2021] Alquier, P. (2021). User-friendly introduction to PAC-Bayes bounds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11216*.
- [Ben-Tal et al., 2013] Ben-Tal, A., Den Hertog, D., De Waegenare, A., Melenberg, B., and Rennen, G. (2013). Robust solutions of optimization problems affected by uncertain probabilities. *Management Science*, 59(2):341–357.
- [Bottou et al., 2013] Bottou, L., Peters, J., Quiñero-Candela, J., Charles, D. X., Chikering, D. M., Portugaly, E., Ray, D., Simard, P., and Snelson, E. (2013). Counterfactual Reasoning and Learning Systems: The Example of Computational Advertising. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(65):3207–3260.
- [Brandfonbrener et al., 2021] Brandfonbrener, D., Whitney, W., Ranganath, R., and Bruna, J. (2021). Offline contextual bandits with overparameterized models. In Meila, M. and Zhang, T., editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1049–1058. PMLR.
- [Catoni, 2007] Catoni, O. (2007). PAC-Bayesian supervised classification: The thermodynamics of statistical learning. *IMS Lecture Notes Monograph Series*, page 1–163.
- [Chua et al., 2009] Chua, T.-S., Tang, J., Hong, R., Li, H., Luo, Z., and Zheng, Y. (2009). Nus-wide: A real-world web image database from national university of singapore. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Image and Video Retrieval*, CIVR ’09, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Cohen et al., 2017] Cohen, G., Afshar, S., Tapson, J., and van Schaik, A. (2017). EMNIST: an extension of MNIST to handwritten letters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.05373*.
- [Dudík et al., 2011] Dudík, M., Langford, J., and Li, L. (2011). Doubly Robust Policy Evaluation and Learning. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1097–1104.
- [Dziugaite and Roy, 2017] Dziugaite, G. K. and Roy, D. M. (2017). Computing nonvacuous generalization bounds for deep (stochastic) neural networks with many more parameters than training data. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*.
- [Fauray et al., 2020] Fauray, L., Tanielan, U., Vasile, F., Smirnova, E., and Dohmatob, E. (2020). Distributionally Robust Counterfactual Risk Minimization. In *Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [Gilotte et al., 2018] Gilotte, A., Calauzènes, C., Nedelec, T., Abraham, A., and Dollé, S. (2018). Offline a/b testing for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. ACM.
- [Horvitz and Thompson, 1952] Horvitz, D. G. and Thompson, D. J. (1952). A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 47(260):663–685.
- [Ionides, 2008] Ionides, E. L. (2008). Truncated importance sampling. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 17(2):295–311.
- [Jeunen and Goethals, 2021] Jeunen, O. and Goethals, B. (2021). Pessimistic reward models for off-policy learning in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, RecSys ’21, page 63–74, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Kallus and Zhou, 2018] Kallus, N. and Zhou, A. (2018). Policy evaluation and optimization with continuous treatments. In *AISTATS*.
- [Kingma and Ba, 2014] Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. (2014). Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- [Kuzborskij et al., 2021] Kuzborskij, I., Vernade, C., Gyorgy, A., and Szepesvari, C. (2021). Confident off-policy evaluation and selection through self-normalized importance weighting. In Banerjee, A. and Fukumizu, K., editors, *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 640–648. PMLR.
- [Letarte et al., 2019] Letarte, G., Germain, P., Guedj, B., and Laviolette, F. (2019). Dichotomize and generalize: PAC-Bayesian binary activated deep neural networks. In Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Beygelzimer, A., d’Alché-Buc, F., Fox, E., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.

- [Li et al., 2010] Li, L., Chu, W., Langford, J., and Schapire, R. E. (2010). A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 661–670.
- [London and Sandler, 2019] London, B. and Sandler, T. (2019). Bayesian counterfactual risk minimization. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R., editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4125–4133. PMLR.
- [Ma et al., 2019] Ma, Y., Wang, Y.-X., and Narayanaswamy, B. (2019). Imitation-regularized offline learning. In Chaudhuri, K. and Sugiyama, M., editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 89 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2956–2965. PMLR.
- [Maurer and Pontil, 2009] Maurer, A. and Pontil, M. (2009). Empirical Bernstein bounds and sample-variance penalization. In *COLT*.
- [McAllester, 2003] McAllester, D. (2003). Simplified PAC-Bayesian margin bounds. In Schölkopf, B. and Warmuth, M. K., editors, *Learning Theory and Kernel Machines*, pages 203–215, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [McAllester, 1998] McAllester, D. A. (1998). Some PAC-Bayesian theorems. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory, COLT '98*, page 230–234, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [McDiarmid, 1998] McDiarmid, C. (1998). Concentration. In *Probabilistic methods for algorithmic discrete mathematics*, pages 195–248. Springer.
- [Owen and Zhou, 2000] Owen, A. and Zhou, Y. (2000). Safe and effective importance sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(449):135–143.
- [Robbins and Monro, 1951] Robbins, H. and Monro, S. (1951). A Stochastic Approximation Method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(3):400 – 407.
- [Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983] Rosenbaum, P. R. and Rubin, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55.
- [Sakhi et al., 2020a] Sakhi, O., Bonner, S., Rohde, D., and Vasile, F. (2020a). BLOB: A probabilistic model for recommendation that combines organic and bandit signals. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '20*, page 783–793, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Sakhi et al., 2020b] Sakhi, O., Faury, L., and Vasile, F. (2020b). Improving offline contextual bandits with distributional robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06835*.
- [Seldin et al., 2011] Seldin, Y., Auer, P., Shawe-taylor, J., Ortner, R., and Laviolette, F. (2011). PAC-Bayesian analysis of contextual bandits. In Shawe-Taylor, J., Zemel, R., Bartlett, P., Pereira, F., and Weinberger, K., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 24. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [Seldin et al., 2012] Seldin, Y., Cesa-Bianchi, N., Auer, P., Laviolette, F., and Shawe-Taylor, J. (2012). Pac-bayes-bernstein inequality for martingales and its application to multiarmed bandits. In Glowacka, D., Dorard, L., and Shawe-Taylor, J., editors, *Proceedings of the Workshop on On-line Trading of Exploration and Exploitation 2*, volume 26 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 98–111, Bellevue, Washington, USA. PMLR.
- [Snoek et al., 2006] Snoek, C. G. M., Worring, M., van Gemert, J. C., Geusebroek, J.-M., and Smeulders, A. W. M. (2006). The challenge problem for automated detection of 101 semantic concepts in multimedia. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Multimedia, MM '06*, page 421–430, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Spyromitros-Xioufis et al., 2014] Spyromitros-Xioufis, E., Papadopoulos, S., Kompatsiaris, I. Y., Tsoumikas, G., and Vlahavas, I. (2014). A comprehensive study over VLAD and product quantization in large-scale image retrieval. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 16(6):1713–1728.
- [Su et al., 2020] Su, Y., Dimakopoulou, M., Krishnamurthy, A., and Dudik, M. (2020). Doubly robust off-policy evaluation with shrinkage. In III, H. D. and Singh, A., editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 9167–9176. PMLR.
- [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a] Swaminathan, A. and Joachims, T. (2015a). Batch Learning from Logged Bandit Feedback through Counterfactual Risk Minimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(52):1731–1755.
- [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015b] Swaminathan, A. and Joachims, T. (2015b). The Self-Normalized Estimator for Counterfactual Learning. In *Proceedings*

of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2, NIPS'15, page 3231–3239, Cambridge, MA, USA. MIT Press.

- [Swaminathan et al., 2017] Swaminathan, A., Krishnamurthy, A., Agarwal, A., Dudík, M., Langford, J., Jose, D., and Zitouni, I. (2017). Off-policy evaluation for slate recommendation. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [Valko et al., 2014] Valko, M., Munos, R., Kveton, B., and Kocák, T. (2014). Spectral Bandits for Smooth Graph Functions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 46–54.
- [Villar et al., 2015] Villar, S. S., Bowden, J., and Wason, J. (2015). Multi-armed bandit models for the optimal design of clinical trials: benefits and challenges. *Statistical science: a review journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics*, 30(2):199.
- [Wang et al., 2017] Wang, Y.-X., Agarwal, A., and Dudík, M. (2017). Optimal and adaptive off-policy evaluation in contextual bandits. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML'17*, page 3589–3597. JMLR.org.
- [Williams, 1992] Williams, R. J. (1992). Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine Learning*, 8(3):229–256.
- [Xiao et al., 2017] Xiao, H., Rasul, K., and Vollgraf, R. (2017). Fashion-MNIST: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*.
- [Xu et al., 2019] Xu, M., Quiroz, M., Kohn, R., and Sisson, S. A. (2019). Variance reduction properties of the reparameterization trick. In Chaudhuri, K. and Sugiyama, M., editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 89 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2711–2720. PMLR.

PAC-Bayesian Offline Contextual Bandits with Guarantees: Supplementary Materials

A DISCUSSIONS AND PROOFS

A.1 Policies as mixtures of deterministic decision rules

As described in the paper, a policy π takes a context $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and defines a probability distribution over the K -dimensional simplex Δ_K . In our work, we reinterpret policies as mixtures of deterministic decision rules.

Let f be the function that encodes the relevance of the action to the context x . Given a distribution Q over the functions $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta = \{f_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$, we define a policy as:

$$\forall x, a \quad \pi_Q(a|x) = \mathbb{E}_{f \sim Q} \left[\mathbb{1} \left[\operatorname{argmax}_{a'} f(x, a') = a \right] \right].$$

A natural question is: can any policy π be written in this form?

In general, the answer depends on the set $\mathcal{F}_\Theta = \{f_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$ we are considering. When the class \mathcal{F}_Θ is rich enough, answer is yes, as proven by the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let us fix a policy π . Let*

$$\mathcal{G} = \{g : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \text{ such that } \forall x, \exists! a, g(x, a) = 1\}.$$

Then, there is a σ -algebra \mathcal{S} on \mathcal{G} and a probability distribution Q_π on $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{S})$ such that

$$\forall x, a \quad \pi(a|x) = \mathbb{E}_{f \sim Q_\pi} \left[\mathbb{1} \left[\operatorname{argmax}_{a'} f(x, a') = a \right] \right].$$

Proof: Fix a policy π . Define the set $\Omega = [K]^{\mathcal{X}}$. That is, an element ω of Ω is a family of elements of $[K]$ indexed by \mathcal{X} : $\omega = (\omega_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$. Define the set of cylinders

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ A \subset \Omega : A = \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} A_x \text{ and } \text{card}(\{x : A_x \neq [K]\}) < \infty \right\}.$$

For such a set $A = \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} A_x$ we define

$$P_\pi(A) = \prod_{x: A_x \neq \Omega} \left[\sum_{a \in A_x} \pi(a|x) \right].$$

Note in particular that, for a fixed $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $a \in [K]$, we have

$$P_\pi(\{\omega \in \Omega : \omega_x = a\}) = \pi(a|x). \quad (7)$$

Then, Kolmogorov extension theorem guarantees that there is a unique extension of P_π to the σ -field \mathcal{D} generated by \mathcal{C} , that is $\mathcal{D} = \sigma(\mathcal{C})$. We have thus built a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{D}, P_\pi)$.

Now, for any $\omega = (\omega_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, we define the function $f_\omega : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by $f_\omega(x, a) = \mathbb{1}[\omega_x = a]$. Define, for any $C \in \mathcal{D}$, $S_C := \{f_\omega, \omega \in C\}$ and $Q_\pi(S_C) = P_\pi(C)$, and finally put $\mathcal{S} = \{S_C, C \in \mathcal{D}\}$. As the function $F : \omega \mapsto f_\omega$ is a bijection from Ω to \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{S} is a σ -field and Q_π is a probability distribution. We have thus equipped \mathcal{G} with a σ -field \mathcal{S} and a probability Q_π : $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{S}, Q_\pi)$ is a probability space.

Now, we check that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{f \sim Q_\pi} \left[\mathbb{1} \left[\underset{a'}{\operatorname{argmax}} f(x, a') = a \right] \right] &= Q_\pi \left(\left\{ f \in \mathcal{G} : \underset{a'}{\operatorname{argmax}} f(x, a') = a \right\} \right) \\ &= P_\pi \left(\left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \underset{a'}{\operatorname{argmax}} f_\omega(x, a') = a \right\} \right) \\ &= P_\pi(\{\omega \in \Omega : \omega_x = a\}) \\ &= \pi(a|x) \end{aligned}$$

thanks to (7). This ends the proof.

A.2 Proof of Proposition 1

Proposition 1 is a direct application of [Catoni, 2007]'s bound (see Theorem 3 in [Letarte et al., 2019]) to the rescaled cIPS $0 \leq 1 + \tau \cdot \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\cdot) \leq 1$ with deterministic decision functions d_θ . Let us fix a prior P over \mathcal{F}_Θ and $\tau \in (0, 1]$. For any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over draws of $\mathcal{D}_n \sim (\nu, \pi_0)^n$: for any Q that is P -continuous, any $\lambda > 0$:

$$1 + \tau \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q} [\mathbb{E}_{(\nu, \pi_0)} [\text{cIPS}_n^\tau(d_\theta)]] \leq \frac{1}{(1 - e^{-\lambda})} \left(1 - \exp \left[-\lambda \cdot (1 + \tau \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q} [\text{cIPS}_n^\tau(d_\theta)]) - \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{n} \right] \right)$$

with $KL[Q||P] = \mathbb{E}_Q [\ln Q/P]$.

By linearity of the expectation and $\text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\cdot)$, we get:

$$1 + \tau \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(\nu, \pi_0)} [\text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q)] \leq \frac{1}{(1 - e^{-\lambda})} \left(1 - \exp \left[-\lambda \cdot (1 + \tau \cdot \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q)) - \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{n} \right] \right).$$

Rearranging the terms gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(\nu, \pi_0)} [\text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q)] &\leq \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{\tau(1 - e^{-\lambda})} \left(1 - \exp \left[-\lambda \cdot \tau \cdot \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) - \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{n} \right] \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\tau(e^\lambda - 1)} \left(1 - \exp \left[-\lambda \cdot \tau \cdot \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) - \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{n} \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

The last step is to exploit the fact that the bias of $\text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\cdot)$ is negative (because the cost $c \leq 0$), we have for any π :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu, a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x)} [\text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi)] &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu, a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x)} \left[\frac{\pi(a|x)}{\max(\pi_0(a|x), \tau)} c(x, a) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu, a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x)} \left[\frac{\pi(a|x)}{\pi_0(a|x)} c(x, a) \right] = \text{Risk}(\pi) \end{aligned}$$

which gives the result stated in Proposition 1:

$$\text{Risk}(\pi_Q) \leq \frac{1}{\tau(e^\lambda - 1)} \left(1 - \exp \left[-\lambda \cdot \tau \cdot \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) - \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{n} \right] \right).$$

A.3 Proof of Theorem 1

We fix $\mathcal{D}_n \sim (\mu, \pi_0)^n$, $\tau \in (0, 1]$. To prove Theorem 1, we use the equality stated in Theorem 3 from [Letarte et al., 2019] applied to the rescaled cIPS $0 \leq \hat{\mathcal{L}}_n(\cdot) = 1 + \tau \cdot \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\cdot) \leq 1$. For any distribution P , any distribution Q that is P -continuous, $\delta \in (0, 1]$, we have:

$$\sup_{0 \leq p \leq 1} \left\{ p : kl(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_n(\pi_Q)||p) \leq \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{n} \right\} = 1 + \tau \cdot \mathcal{M}_n(Q, P, \delta, \tau)$$

with $\mathcal{M}_n(Q, P, \delta, \tau) := \min_{\lambda > 0} \frac{1 - e^{-\tau \lambda \Gamma_n^\tau(Q, \lambda, \delta)}}{\tau(e^\lambda - 1)}$, $\Gamma_n^\tau(Q, \lambda, \delta) = \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) + \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{\tau \lambda n}$ and $kl(q||p) = q \log(\frac{q}{p}) + (1 - q) \log(\frac{1-q}{1-p})$, the KL divergence between two Bernoulli variables of parameters p and q . This means that:

$$kl(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_n(\pi_Q)||1 + \tau \cdot \mathcal{M}_n(Q, P, \delta, \tau)) \leq \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{n}.$$

By leveraging the following inequality: $p \leq q + \sqrt{2qkl(q||p)} + 2kl(q||p)$ for $p \leq q$, we get:

$$1 + \tau \mathcal{M}_n(Q, P, \delta, \tau) \leq 1 + \tau \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) + \sqrt{\frac{2[1 + \tau \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q)](KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})}{n}} + \frac{2(KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})}{n}.$$

Giving the result of Theorem 1:

$$\mathcal{M}_n(Q, P, \delta, \tau) \leq \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q) + \sqrt{\frac{2[\frac{1}{\tau} + \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_Q)](KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})}{\tau n}} + \frac{2(KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta})}{\tau n}.$$

A.4 Proposition 3

A.4.1 Proof of Proposition 3

In this section, we begin by stating Proposition 3 for the more general case where we have a logged dataset $\mathcal{D}_{n_c}^{\{m_i\}_{i \in [n_c]}}$, the cvcIPS estimator in this case is written as:

$$\text{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi) = \xi + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \frac{\omega_\pi^\tau(a_i^j | x_i) (c_i^j - \xi)}{n_c m_i}.$$

Proposition 5. Given a prior P on \mathcal{F}_Θ , $\xi \in [-1, 0]$, $\tau \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and a set of strictly positive scalars $\Lambda = \{\lambda_i\}_{i \in [n_\Lambda]}$. We have with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over draws of $\mathcal{D}_{n_c}^{\{m_i\}_{i \in [n_c]}} \sim \prod_{i=1}^{n_c} (\nu, \pi_0^{m_i})$: For any Q that is P -continuous, any $\lambda \in \Lambda$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Risk}(\pi_Q) &\leq \text{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi_Q) - \xi \mathcal{B}_{n_c}^\tau(\pi_Q) + \sqrt{\frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{4\sqrt{n_c}}{\delta}}{2n_c}} \\ &\quad + \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2n_\Lambda}{\delta}}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda L(\xi)}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \frac{1}{m_i n_c} g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{m_i n_c}\right) \mathcal{V}^{\tau, i}(\pi_Q) \end{aligned}$$

with $g : u \rightarrow \frac{\exp(u)-1-u}{u^2}$, $L(\xi) = \max(\xi^2, (1+\xi)^2)$, $M(\xi) = \frac{1+\xi}{\tau} - \xi$, $\mathcal{V}^{\tau, i}(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\frac{\pi_0(a|x_i)}{\max(\tau, \pi_0(a|x_i))^2} \right]$ and $\mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}(\pi) = \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\mathbb{1}[\pi_0(a|x_i) < \tau] \left(1 - \frac{\pi_0(a|x_i)}{\tau} \right) \right]$.

We use a decomposition similar to [Kuzborskij et al., 2021] and rewrite the difference $\text{Risk}(\pi_Q) - \text{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi_Q) = D_1(\pi_Q) + D_2(\pi_Q) + D_3(\pi_Q)$ with:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(\pi_Q) &= \text{Risk}(\pi_Q) - \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \text{Risk}(\pi_Q|x_i) \\ D_2(\pi_Q) &= \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \text{Risk}(\pi_Q|x_i) - \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \xi + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\omega_{\pi_Q}^{\tau}(a_i^j|x_i)(c(a, x_i) - \xi) \right] \\ D_3(\pi_Q) &= \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \xi + \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\omega_{\pi_Q}^{\tau}(a|x_i)(c(a, x_i) - \xi) \right] - \text{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi_Q). \end{aligned}$$

For the first difference D_1 , we use [McAllester, 1998] bound for the $[0, 1]$ -bounded loss using $0 \leq 1 + \text{Risk}(\pi_Q|x_i) \leq 1$. We get with probability at least $1 - \delta$, For any Q that is P -continuous:

$$D_1(\pi_Q) \leq \sqrt{\frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n_c}}{\delta}}{2n_c}}. \quad (8)$$

The second difference quantifies the bias of our estimator given the contexts $\{x_i, \dots, x_{n_c}\}$. Even if we cannot compute it, we can give an upper bound for D_2 . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} D_2(\pi_Q) &= \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \text{Risk}(\pi_Q|x_i) - \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \xi + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\omega_{\pi_Q}^{\tau}(a|x_i)(c(a, x_i) - \xi) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} \left[(\omega_{\pi_Q}^0(a|x_i) - \omega_{\pi_Q}^{\tau}(a|x_i))(c(a, x_i) - \xi) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\mathbb{1}[\pi_0(a|x_i) < \tau] \left(\frac{\pi_Q(a|x_i)}{\pi_0(a|x_i)} - \frac{\pi_Q(a|x_i)}{\tau} \right) (c(a, x_i) - \xi) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_Q(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\mathbb{1}[\pi_0(a|x_i) < \tau] \left(1 - \frac{\pi_0(a|x_i)}{\tau} \right) (c(a, x_i) - \xi) \right] \quad (c \leq 0) \\ &\leq -\frac{\xi}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_Q(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\mathbb{1}[\pi_0(a|x_i) < \tau] \left(1 - \frac{\pi_0(a|x_i)}{\tau} \right) \right] = -\xi \mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}(\pi_Q). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain $-\xi \mathcal{B}_{n_c}^{\tau}(\pi_Q)$, an empirical upper bound to $D_2(\pi_Q)$.

The last step is to control the difference D_3 . Before doing this, we need to state two lemmas that will help us control the difference D_3 .

Lemma 1. *Change of measure: Let f be a function of the parameter θ and data S , for any distribution Q that is P continuous, for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, we have with probability $1 - \delta$:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q}[f(\theta, S)] \leq KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{\Psi_f}{\delta} \quad (9)$$

with $\Psi_f = \mathbb{E}_S \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim P}[e^{f(\theta, S)}]$.

Lemma 1 is the backbone of many PAC Bayes bounds. It is proven in many references, see for example [Alquier, 2021] or Lemma 1.1.3 in [Catoni, 2007]. We will combine it with an inequality on the moment generating function to prove a Bernstein-like PAC-Bayes bound [Seldin et al., 2012].

Lemma 2. *Let W be a r.v with $\mathbb{E}[W^2] < \infty$, we suppose that $\mathbb{E}[W] - W \leq B$. Let $g : u \rightarrow \frac{\exp(u)-1-u}{u^2}$, we have for all $\eta \geq 0$:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\eta(\mathbb{E}[W] - W) - \eta^2 g(\eta B) \mathbb{V}[W])] \leq 1. \quad (10)$$

Lemma 2 is stated and proven in [McDiarmid, 1998].

Combining both lemmas allows us to control the difference D_3 with a conditional Bernstein PAC-Bayesian bound:

Corollary 1. *Conditional Bernstein PAC-Bayesian Bound: Let's fix a $\lambda > 0$ and a prior P , for any distribution Q that is P continuous, for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$:*

$$D_3(\pi_Q) \leq \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda L(\xi)}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \frac{1}{m_i n_c} g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{m_i n_c}\right) \mathcal{V}^{\tau, i}(\pi_Q) \quad (11)$$

with $L(\xi) = \max(\xi^2, (1 + \xi)^2)$, $M(\xi) = \frac{1+\xi}{\tau} - \xi$, $\mathcal{V}^{\tau, i}(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\frac{\pi_0(a|x_i)}{\max(\tau, \pi_0(a|x_i))^2} \right]$.

Proof: Let us fix a context x_i and an action a_i^j and let $\theta \sim P$. We have:

$$D_i^j(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} [\omega_{d_\theta}^\tau(a|x_i)(c(a, x_i) - \xi)] - \omega_{d_\theta}^\tau(a_i^j|x_i)(c(a_i^j, x_i) - \xi) \leq M(\xi) = \frac{1 + \xi}{\tau} - \xi.$$

We fix a λ and choose:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta, S) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \left[\frac{\lambda}{m_i n_c} D_i^j(\theta) - \left(\frac{\lambda}{m_i n_c} \right)^2 g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{m_i n_c}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} [D_i(\theta)^2] \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} [\Delta_i^j(\theta)]. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2 and because the prior P does not depend on the data, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_f &= \mathbb{E}_{\prod_i \pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim P} [e^{f(\theta, S)}] = \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim P} \mathbb{E}_{\prod_i \pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} [e^{f(\theta, S)}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim P} \prod_i (\mathbb{E}_{\pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} [e^{\Delta_i^0(\theta)}])^{m_i} \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

It means that $\ln \Psi_f \leq 0$. Using this in Lemma 1, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} D_3(\pi_Q) &\leq \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \frac{\lambda}{(m_i n_c)^2} g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{m_i n_c}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} [\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q} [D_i(\theta)^2]] \\ &= \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \frac{1}{m_i n_c} g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{m_i n_c}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim Q} [\mathbb{E}_{\pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} [D_i(\theta)^2]]. \end{aligned}$$

we also use the following inequality to upper bound $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} [D_i(\theta)^2]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} [D_i(\theta)^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\frac{d_\theta(a|x_i)}{\max(\pi_0(a|x_i), \tau)^2} (c(a, x_i) - \xi)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \max(\xi^2, (1 + \xi)^2) \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x_i)} \left[\frac{d_\theta(a|x_i)}{\max(\pi_0(a|x_i), \tau)^2} \right] \quad \text{because both } c, \xi \in [-1, 0] \\ &= L(\xi) \mathcal{V}^{\tau, i}(d_\theta). \end{aligned}$$

As the quantity $\mathcal{V}^{\tau, i}$ is linear in d_θ , the result in Corollary 1 follows:

$$D_3(\pi_Q) \leq \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda L(\xi)}{n_c} \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} \frac{1}{m_i n_c} g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{m_i n_c}\right) \mathcal{V}^{\tau, i}(\pi_Q).$$

Finally, We take a union bound of Corollary 1 over Λ , a discrete set with cardinal n_Λ , and combine its result with the bound giving (8) through another union bound to obtain Proposition 5.

A.4.2 Choice of Λ when $m_i = m$

When the number of interactions m is constant across all contexts, the result in Corollary 1 becomes for a fixed λ :

$$D_3(\pi_Q) \leq \frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda L(\xi)}{n} g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{n}\right) \mathcal{V}_{n_c}^\tau(\pi_Q)$$

where $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^\tau(\pi_Q)$ was defined in Proposition 3.

We would like to choose a λ that minimizes the bound on D_3 . Unfortunately, we cannot do it because the minimizer λ^* depends on Q . Instead, we build an interval in which λ^* can be found.

The function $g : u \rightarrow \frac{\exp(u)-1-u}{u^2}$ behaves like $\frac{\exp(u)}{u^2}$ when u is big enough, meaning that we should control the values of g , and thus λ by an upper bound. Choosing $\lambda \leq b = \frac{2n}{M(\xi)}$ allows us to control the function $g\left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{n}\right) \leq g(2) \leq 1.1$.

Now that an upper bound is found, we still need to find the lowest possible value for λ^* . Of course, choosing the interval $[0, b]$ can be enough but we want to do more than that. λ^* verifies the following equality:

$$\lambda^* = \sqrt{\frac{KL[Q||P] + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\frac{L(\xi)}{n} g\left(\frac{\lambda^* M(\xi)}{n}\right) \mathcal{V}_{n_c}^\tau(\pi_Q) + \frac{\lambda^* L(\xi) M(\xi)}{n^2} g'\left(\frac{\lambda^* M(\xi)}{n}\right) \mathcal{V}_{n_c}^\tau(\pi_Q)}}.$$

Let's assume that $\lambda^* \leq b$. (If not, we can still restrict to $\lambda \in [a, b]$, with the value of a found below.) We have that $KL[Q||P] \geq 0$, and $\mathcal{V}_{n_c}^\tau \leq \frac{1}{\tau}$. As the function g is increasing and convex (g' increasing), we get the following inequality:

$$\lambda^* \geq \sqrt{\frac{n\tau \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{L(\xi)g(2) + 2L(\xi)g'(2)}}.$$

Using the fact that $g'(2) = 1/2$ and $g(2) + 1 \leq 5/2$, we get:

$$\lambda^* \geq \sqrt{\frac{n\tau \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{L(\xi)g(2) + L(\xi)}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2n\tau \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{5L(\xi)}} = a.$$

We now have an interval $\lambda^* \in [a, b]$. One can observe that the optimal $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n}) \leq \lambda^* \leq \mathcal{O}(n)$.

We choose the set Λ to be a linear discretisation of $[a, b]$ giving $\Lambda = \{a + i(b - a)\}_{i \in [n_\Lambda]}$.

A.5 Linear Independent Gaussian Policies

To obtain these policies, we restrict f_θ to:

$$\forall x, a \quad f_\theta(x, a) = \phi(x)^T \theta_a \tag{12}$$

with ϕ a fixed transform over the contexts. This results in a parameter θ of dimension $d = p \times K$ with p the dimension of the features $\phi(x)$ and K the number of actions. We also restrict the family of distributions $\mathcal{Q}_{d+1} = \{Q_{\mu, \sigma} = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I_d), \mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma > 0\}$ to independent Gaussians with shared scale.

Estimating the propensity of a given x reduces the computation to a one dimensional integral:

$$\pi_{\mu, \sigma}(a|x) = \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \left[\prod_{a' \neq a} \Phi \left(\epsilon + \frac{\phi(x)^T (\mu_a - \mu_{a'})}{\sigma \|\phi(x)\|} \right) \right]$$

with Φ the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal.

Proof: We rewrite the definition of $\pi_{\mu,\sigma}$ as a probability and exploit the stability of the Gaussian distribution.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi_{\mu,\sigma}(a|x) &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I_d)} [\mathbb{1}[\arg\max_{a'} \phi(x)^T \theta_{a'} = a]] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}_{S \sim \mathcal{N}(\phi(x)^T \mu, \sigma^2 \|\phi(x)\|^2 I_K)} [\mathbb{1}[\arg\max_{a'} S_{a'} = a]] \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_{S \sim \mathcal{N}(\phi(x)^T \mu, \sigma^2 \|\phi(x)\|^2 I_K)} (\arg\max_{a'} S_{a'} = a) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_{S \sim \mathcal{N}(\phi(x)^T \mu, \sigma^2 \|\phi(x)\|^2 I_K)} (S_a \geq S_{a'}, \quad \forall a' \neq a) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_{Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0_K, I_K)} \left(Z_a + \frac{\phi(x)^T (\mu_a - \mu_{a'})}{\sigma \|\phi(x)\|} \geq Z_{a'}, \quad \forall a' \neq a \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

We condition on Z_a to obtain independent events as for all a , the random variables Z_a are independent.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi_{\mu,\sigma}(a|x) &= \mathbb{P}_{Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0_K, I_K)} \left(Z_a + \frac{\phi(x)^T (\mu_a - \mu_{a'})}{\sigma \|\phi(x)\|} \geq Z_{a'}, \quad \forall a' \neq a \right) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \left[\mathbb{P}_{Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0_K, I_K)} \left(\epsilon + \frac{\phi(x)^T (\mu_a - \mu_{a'})}{\sigma \|\phi(x)\|} \geq Z_{a'}, \quad \forall a' \neq a \mid Z_a = \epsilon \right) \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \left[\prod_{a' \neq a} \mathbb{P}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \left(z \leq \epsilon + \frac{\phi(x)^T (\mu_a - \mu_{a'})}{\sigma \|\phi(x)\|} \right) \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \left[\prod_{a' \neq a} \Phi \left(\epsilon + \frac{\phi(x)^T (\mu_a - \mu_{a'})}{\sigma \|\phi(x)\|} \right) \right] \quad \square.
 \end{aligned}$$

Why not Mixed Logit Policies? [London and Sandler, 2019] used in their analysis Mixed Logit Policies to derive learning principles (not guarantees) for softmax policies. Mixed Logit Policies can be written as:

$$\pi_{\mu,\sigma}^{ML}(a|x) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I_d)} [\text{softmax}_K(\phi(x)^T \theta_a)].$$

Even if these policies can behave properly (reparametrization trick gradient for instance), they are not ideal for learning with guarantees in the context of Offline Contextual Bandits. Indeed, we know that the solution of the problem is a deterministic decision function d_{μ^*} , always choosing the action with the minimum cost. Let us suppose that we have access to its parameter μ^* .

To recover d_{μ^*} with **LIG** policies, we need to have the scale parameter small enough $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ as :

$$\pi_{\mu^*,\sigma}(a|x) \xrightarrow{\sigma \rightarrow 0} d_{\mu^*}(a|x) \quad \forall x, a.$$

For **Mixed Logit** policies however, having $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ is not enough as:

$$\pi_{\mu^*,\sigma}^{ML}(a|x) \xrightarrow{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \text{softmax}_K(\phi(x)^T \mu_a^*) \quad \forall x, a.$$

One should also increase the norm of μ^* enough ($\|\mu^*\| \rightarrow \infty$) to obtain d_{μ^*} .

Let us suppose that we start with the same prior $P = \mathcal{N}(\mu^*, I_d)$ in our bounds. The price to pay in terms of complexity $KL(Q_{\mu,\sigma} \| P)$ to obtain the solution; a deterministic policy, will be much higher for **Mixed Logit** policies (as we should decrease σ and increase the norm of μ) than **LIG** policies (only decrease σ and let $\mu = \mu^*$). This means that for a fixed number of samples n , we will always get better results with **LIG** policies than **Mixed Logit** policies.

A.6 The bounds stated for LIG policies

In this section, we want to state the previous Propositions 1 and 3 (valid for any policy) for the class of **LIG** policies. This class of policies uses Independent Gaussian distributions with shared scale so we will begin by stating the KL divergence between $P = \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \sigma_0 I_d)$ and $Q = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma I_d)$. We have:

$$KL[Q \| P] = D[\mu, \sigma, \mu_0, \sigma_0] = \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2}{2\sigma_0^2} + d \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2\sigma_0^2} + \ln \frac{\sigma_0}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

We write the bounds slightly differently by taking the minimum over the considered λ (if the bound is true for any λ , it is true for the minimum of the bound over λ).

We state Catoni's bound for **LIG** policies:

Corollary 2. *LIG policies with Catoni's bound*

Given a Gaussian prior $P = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \sigma_0 I_d)$, $\tau \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$. We have with probability $1 - \delta$ over draws of $\mathcal{D}_n \sim (\nu, \pi_0)^n$:

$\forall \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma > 0$:

$$\text{Risk}(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}) \leq \min_{\lambda > 0} \frac{1}{\tau(e^\lambda - 1)} \left[1 - \exp \left(-\tau \lambda \text{cIPS}_n^\tau(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}) + \frac{D[\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \sigma_0] + \ln \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\delta}}{n} \right) \right]$$

We call $\mathcal{C}_n(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma})$ the upper bound stated by this corollary. We get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{GR}_\mathcal{C}^* &= \min_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}} \mathcal{C}_n(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}) \\ \pi_\mathcal{C}^* &= \arg \min_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}} \mathcal{C}_n(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}) \\ \mathcal{GI}_\mathcal{C}^* &= \text{Risk}(\pi_0) - \mathcal{GR}_\mathcal{C}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we state our variance sensitive bound for **LIG** policies:

Corollary 3. *LIG policies variance sensitive bound.*

Given a Gaussian prior $P = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \sigma_0 I_d)$, $\xi \in [-1, 0]$, $\tau \in (0, 1]$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and a set of strictly positive scalars $\Lambda = \{\lambda_i\}_{i \in [n_\Lambda]}$. We have with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over draws of $\mathcal{D}_{n_c}^m \sim \prod_{i=1}^{n_c} (\nu, \pi_0^m)$:

$\forall \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Risk}(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}) &\leq \text{cvcIPS}_n^{\tau, \xi}(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}) - \xi \mathcal{B}_{n_c}^\tau(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}) + \sqrt{\frac{D[\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \sigma_0] + \ln \frac{4\sqrt{n_c}}{\delta}}{2n_c}} \\ &+ \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left\{ \frac{D[\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \sigma_0] + \ln \frac{2n_\Lambda}{\delta}}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda L(\xi)}{n} g \left(\frac{\lambda M(\xi)}{n} \right) \mathcal{V}_{n_c}^\tau(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We call $\mathcal{CBB}_n(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}, \xi, m)$ the upper bound stated by this corollary. Similarly we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{GR}_{\mathcal{CBB}(\xi, m)}^* &= \min_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}} \mathcal{CBB}_n(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}, \xi, m) \\ \pi_{\mathcal{CBB}(\xi, m)}^* &= \arg \min_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}} \mathcal{CBB}_n(\pi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}, \sigma}, \xi, m) \\ \mathcal{GI}_{\mathcal{CBB}(\xi, m)}^* &= \text{Risk}(\pi_0) - \mathcal{GR}_{\mathcal{CBB}(\xi, m)}^*. \end{aligned}$$

B EXPERIMENTS

B.1 Detailed Statistics of the dataset splits used

As described in the experiments section, we use the supervised to bandit conversion to simulate logged data as previously adopted in the majority of the literature [Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015a, Swaminathan and Joachims, 2015b, London and Sandler, 2019, Faury et al., 2020, Sakhi et al., 2020b]. In this procedure, you need a split D_l (of size n_l) to train the logging policy π_0 , another split D_c (of size n_c) to generate the logging feedback with π_0 , and finally a test split D_{test} (of size n_{test}) to compute the true risk $\text{Risk}(\pi)$ of any policy π . In our experiments, we split the training split D_{train} (of size N) of the four datasets considered into D_l ($n_l = 0.05N$) and D_c ($n_c = 0.95N$) and use their test split D_{test} . The detailed statistics of the different splits can be found in Table 2.

Datasets	N	n_l	n_c	n_{test}	K	p
FashionMNIST	60 000	3000	57 000	10 000	10	784
EMNIST-b	112 800	5640	107 160	18 800	47	784
NUS-WIDE-128	161 789	8089	153 700	107 859	81	128
Mediamill	30 993	1549	29 444	12 914	101	120

Table 2: Detailed statistics of the splits used.

B.2 Detailed hyperparameters

Contrary to previous work, our method does not require tuning any loss function hyperparameter over a hold out set. We do however need to choose parameters to optimize the policies.

The logging policy π_0 . π_0 is trained on D_l (supervised manner) with the following parameters:

- We use L_2 regularization of 10^{-6} . This is used to prevent the logging policy π_0 from being close to deterministic, allowing efficient learning with importance sampling.
- We use Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2014] with a learning rate of 10^{-1} for 10 epochs.

Optimising the bounds. All the bounds are optimized with the following parameters:

- The clipping parameter τ is fixed to $1/K$ with K the action size of the dataset.
- We use Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2014] with a learning rate of 10^{-3} for 20 epochs.
- For the bounds optimized over **LIG** policies, the gradient is a one dimensional integral, and is approximated using $S = 32$ samples.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\mu, \sigma}(a|x) &= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \left[\prod_{a' \neq a} \Phi \left(\epsilon + \frac{\phi(x)^T (\mu_a - \mu_{a'})}{\sigma \|\phi(x)\|} \right) \right] \\ &\approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \prod_{a' \neq a} \Phi \left(\epsilon_s + \frac{\phi(x)^T (\mu_a - \mu_{a'})}{\sigma \|\phi(x)\|} \right) \quad \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_S \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1). \end{aligned}$$

B.3 Impact of changing the number of interactions m

The bound proposed in Proposition 3 can work beyond the i.i.d. setting and applies to the "multiple interactions" case. Intuitively, adding more interactions with the contexts x allows us to reduce the uncertainty on the cost and thus learn better policies. In Figure 2, we can already see that the *CB* bound gets better when we increase the number of interactions to $m = 2$.

We want to explore this even further in Figure 3. We construct with π_0 a logged dataset with the number of interactions $m \in \{1, 2, 4, 8\}$ using both **FashionMNIST** and **Mediamill** datasets. Once $m > 1$, we can only use the *CB* bound. We stick to the values of ξ previously used $\xi \in \{0, -1/2\}$.

We can observe that increasing the number of m consistently give better results, in terms of guarantees and also the quality of the policy π^* minimizing the bounds. We can also observe that even though m reduces the gap between the two estimators ($\xi = 0$ compared to $\xi = -1/2$), the cvcIPS estimator with $\xi = -1/2$ still gives the best results.




Figure 3: Behavior of the guaranteed risk $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{R}^*$ (\downarrow is better), the risk of the minimizer $Risk(\pi^*)$ (\downarrow is better) and the guaranteed improvement $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{I}^*$ (\uparrow is better) given by changing the number of interactions m and π_0 .