

The Power of Populations in Decentralized Learning Dynamics

John Lazarsfeld
Yale University
john.lazarsfeld@yale.edu

Dan Alistarh
IST Austria
dan.alistarh@ist.ac.at

Abstract

We study a distributed multi-armed bandit setting among a population of n memory-constrained nodes in the gossip model: at each round, every node locally adopts one of m arms, observes a reward drawn from the arm’s (adversarially chosen) distribution, and then communicates with a randomly sampled neighbor, exchanging information to determine its policy in the next round. We introduce and analyze several families of dynamics for this task that are *decentralized*: each node’s decision is entirely local and depends only on its most recently obtained reward and that of the neighbor it sampled. We show a connection between the global evolution of these decentralized dynamics with a certain class of “zero-sum” *multiplicative weights update* algorithms, and we develop a general framework for analyzing the population-level regret of these natural protocols. Using this framework, we derive sublinear regret bounds under a wide range of parameter regimes (i.e., the size of the population and number of arms) for both the stationary reward setting (where the mean of each arm’s distribution is fixed over time) and the adversarial reward setting (where means can vary over time). Further, we show that these protocols can approximately optimize convex functions over the simplex when the reward distributions are generated from a stochastic gradient oracle.

1 Introduction

Multi-armed bandits are a powerful abstraction in online learning [BCB⁺12, Sli19, LS20]; distributed, multi-player variants, in which multiple agents can sample in parallel and coordinate under limited communication have been introduced more than a decade ago [LJP08, LZ10, AMTS11], and have been studied under various constraints on the degree of coordination between agents, e.g. [HKK⁺13, SBFH⁺13, AM14, LSL16, KJG18, BP19, MRKR19, BB20].

One model that has received much less attention is what we call the *decentralized* setting, e.g. [LZZ⁺17], in which individual nodes have limited memory, lack a global view of the set of arms, and can only exchange information via random, direct exchanges. In this context, the goal of the system is to collectively limit its regret at the *population level* by ensuring that larger fractions of nodes consistently choose better arms at each round. This model is well-motivated by distributed settings in which it is impractical for a single node to obtain global information about the system in every round. For concreteness, and to distinguish from other models, we begin by introducing the exact setting and objective in more detail:

Problem Setting (Decentralized Bandit Model). Consider a population of n nodes distributed over a complete communication graph. The n nodes interact with an m -armed bandit instance over a sequence of T rounds, each of which is structured as follows:

- (i) **Arm Adoption:** At the start of each round t , each node $u \in [n]$ must *adopt* one of the m arms.
- (ii) **Reward Generation and Observation:** Then, each arm j generates a *single* stochastic reward $g_j^t \sim \nu_j^t$, where ν_j^t is a distribution supported on $[-\sigma, \sigma]$ with mean $\mu_j^t \in [-1, 1]$, for some $\sigma \geq 1$. Every node adopting arm j subsequently observes the reward g_j^t .
- (iii) **Communication:** Then, each node simultaneously samples a neighbor to receive information from, uniformly at random. Each node subsequently uses this interaction to inform its adoption strategy at round $t + 1$, following a fixed local (randomized) protocol.

Let $\mathbf{p}^t := (p_1^t, \dots, p_m^t) \in \Delta_m$ denote the distribution¹ specifying the *fraction* of the population adopting each arm j at round t , and define $\mathbf{g}^t := (g_1^t, \dots, g_m^t)$ to be the reward vector and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^t := (\mu_1^t, \dots, \mu_m^t)$ as the means vector. The objective of the population is to minimize its expected *population-level regret*

$$R(T) := \max_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle]. \quad (1)$$

When $R(T)/T = o(1)$, we say the regret of the process $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ is *sublinear*. In this decentralized setting, we wish $R(T)/T$ to be vanishing with respect to both T and n . We make some important remarks about this setting:

- From a local perspective, the setting is an (adversarial) m -armed bandit instance. However, from a global perspective, the *full* reward vector \mathbf{g}^t is distributed across the population each round. Thus, globally, this is an instance of *prediction with expert advice* [AHK12], as reflected in the regret objective.
- Other than two standard boundedness conditions², the setting makes no assumptions on how the rewards g_j^t are generated: in particular, the means $\boldsymbol{\mu}^t$ may be adversarially dependent on \mathbf{p}^t , and on the local (randomized) protocol used to determine a node's decision in round $t+1$. For this, we distinguish between a general, *adversarial reward setting*, where each $\boldsymbol{\mu}^t$ can change over rounds, and a *stationary reward setting*, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}^t = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ for all t . In both cases, we assume σ is fixed.
- At round $t = 0$, we assume every node is deterministically given some initial adoption choice $j \in [m]$, and we assume that communication occurs according to the standard synchronous gossip model with uniform neighbor sampling [BGPS06, S⁺09].

Comparison With Related Models The problem setting described above is similar to related models studied in recent work of Celis et al. [CKV17], Su et al. [SZL19], and Sankararaman et al. [SGS19]. However, each of those works consider only a stationary setting where rewards come from fixed-mean Bernoulli distributions. Additionally, the dynamics of each work assume that (a) at any round, a node can choose *to not adopt an arm*, and that either (b) a node can alternate between strategies each round, and, e.g., choose an arm uniformly at random with some small probability [CKV17, SZL19], (c) that node communication is implicitly performed through some centralized coordination to account for nodes that made no adoption choice at the current round [CKV17], or that (d) a node can remember its adoption history from multiple prior rounds [SGS19].

¹We write $\Delta_m := \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|\mathbf{p}\|_1 = 1\}$ to denote the probability simplex over m coordinates.

²In particular, we assume that σ is an absolute constant, which is needed to derive meaningful regret bounds (as otherwise the noise could eliminate any signal from the means). For simplicity, we assume throughout that $\sigma \leq 10$, although our techniques extend to larger value at the expense of worse constants in our regret bounds.

In contrast, the focus in the present work is to design and analyze extremely *simple, memory-constrained dynamics* with the following desired properties: (i) each node can only store its most recent arm choice and reward observation, and that of the neighbor it communicated with; (ii) each node runs an identical protocol that applies the same decision rule at every round; and (iii) nodes do not have enough local memory to maintain reward history over the entire set of arms. In other words, we seek dynamics that are fully *decentralized*, and that are also robust to general adversarial rewards. In particular, note that the three desired properties preclude us from considering a dynamics comprised of simply running a (centralized) bandit algorithm like UCB at every node locally, which requires each node to maintain a distribution over the full set of m arms at every round. Moreover, these desired properties prevent us from considering dynamics that require expensive, gradient-based local computation (e.g., as in [HTT⁺19]).

1.1 Our Contributions

We introduce and analyze families of local dynamics satisfying properties (i), (ii), and (iii) above, for which we prove vanishing average population regret $R(T)/T$, in both the stationary *and* adversarial reward settings. Specifically, our analysis provides bounds highlighting the varying effects of the arm size, population size, and number of rounds on regret:

Adversarial Reward Setting (Theorem 2.8) For general adversarial rewards, our dynamics achieve average regret

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon}\right), \quad (2)$$

for n sufficiently large, but in particular for T at most $(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon) \log_5 n$ rounds, for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Here and throughout, the $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ notation suppresses lower-order logarithmic dependencies on n and m .

We observe that this bound is naturally decomposed into two terms: the first is an *approximation error*, where we bound the regret of a “smoother” version of the $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$, and an *estimation error*, which is incurred by the approximation. In the bound above, the approximation error matches that of the known optimal regret in the (centralized) prediction with expert advice setting [AHK12]. The estimation error can be interpreted as a *cost of decentralization*: in order to achieve vanishing average regret, the population size n must grow sufficiently large with respect to the number of arms m . In the adversarial setting, this estimation error decays at a rate of roughly m/n^ϵ .

In Appendix F, we also show in the adversarial setting that, in the decentralized model, regret can grow linearly with T if the number of rounds is larger than logarithmic in the population size n . For this reason, our result constrains $T = O(\log n)$.

Stationary Reward Setting (Theorem 2.9) In the benign stationary setting, when the mean reward vector is fixed over time, our dynamics provide sharper regret and can tolerate larger time horizons T . In particular, for n sufficiently large, for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and for $T = (\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon) \log_5 n$ rounds, our dynamics obtain average regret

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon \cdot 2\sqrt{\log_5 n}}\right). \quad (3)$$

Moreover, for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$, for longer sequences of $T = n^b$ rounds for any $b > 4\epsilon$, our dynamics obtain average regret

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{1}{n^{b-4\epsilon}}\right). \quad (4)$$

Thus, in the stationary setting, we obtain asymptotically sharper regret over time horizons logarithmic in n (as in the bound of (2)). For arbitrarily larger time horizons polynomial in n , our dynamics continue to achieve sublinear regret.

Overall, our results highlight for the first time the *power of large populations* in decentralized learning: we show that, for a wide range of natural dynamics, increasing the population size yields diminishing regret for both adversarial and stationary reward settings, even though the dynamics are entirely local.

Summary of Techniques Roughly speaking, we obtain these bounds by analyzing the evolution of the sequences $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by our families of dynamics. Surprisingly, we show for each dynamics that the adoption mass p_j^t evolves (in conditional expectation) by multiplicative factors of the form $(1 + F_j(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t))$ for each arm j , and where each F_j is a function depending on \mathbf{p}^t and \mathbf{g}^t that collectively satisfy the key “zero-sum” property of $\sum_{j \in [m]} p_j^t \cdot F_j(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t) = 0$.

We more generally relate processes of this form to a class of (centralized) *zero-sum* multiplicative weights update (MWU) algorithms, and we derive bounds on their regret that may be of independent interest. This connection is then leveraged to establish a general analysis framework for bounding the regret of the original process $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$. In this sense, our technique adds to a growing body of work that analyzes other distributed or gossip dynamics by relating their evolution to centralized optimization algorithms [EBB⁺, MMM18].

Convex Optimization Application Finally, using the known connections between (online) convex optimization and the standard, centralized MWU algorithm (and related processes like mirror descent and the exponentiated gradient method) [H⁺16, AHK12, KW97], we use our dynamics and analysis framework to obtain expected error rates for optimizing a convex function $f : \Delta_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by assuming the reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ is generated by a stochastic gradient oracle. For this, we give an error rate at the *average* iterate $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbf{p}^t$ induced by our protocols that matches (up to some constant factors) the regret bound from the adversarial reward setting above. This result is given formally in Theorem 2.10.

We now proceed to give a technical overview of our dynamics and results. In Section 3, we also provide several sets of simulations that validate our results experimentally. We defer a detailed technical comparison with related works to Section 4, and we conclude with some discussion and by mentioning several open questions.

2 Technical Overview

Notation and Other Preliminaries Throughout, we deal with multiple sequences of vectors indexed over rounds $t \in [T]$, for which we use the short hand notation $\{\mathbf{p}^t\} := \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}^t$. We often compute expectation (resp., probabilities) conditioned on two sequences $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ and $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ (or $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ and $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$) simultaneously, and we denote this double conditioning by $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot]$. When we wish to condition just on a single vector \mathbf{p}^t , we will write $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[\cdot]$. Given $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$, we write $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{p}]$ to

denote the vector $(\mathbb{E}[p_1], \dots, \mathbb{E}[p_m])$. Throughout, we use the fact that for a non-negative random variable x , if $x \leq \alpha$ w.p. at least $1 - \gamma$, then $\mathbb{E}[x] \leq \alpha + \gamma$. We assume all logarithms are natural unless otherwise specified, and we use $\mathbf{1}$ to denote the vector of all ones.

2.1 Families of Local Dynamics

We begin by introducing two simple families of *local dynamics* for the decentralized bandit setting. We call the first family *adoption dynamics*, defined from the perspective of any node u at round t :

Adoption Dynamics: given a non-decreasing *adoption function* $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, for each $u \in [n]$:

- (i) At round t , assume: node u adopted arm j ; u sampled node v ; and v adopted arm $k \in [m]$.
- (ii) At round $t + 1$: node u adopts arm k with probability $f(g_k^t)$ and arm j otherwise.

We call the second family *comparison dynamics*, again defined from the perspective of any node u :

Comparison Dynamics: given a non-decreasing *score function* $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for each $u \in [n]$:

- (i) At round t , assume: node u adopted arm j ; u sampled node v ; and v adopted arm $k \in [m]$.
- (ii) At round $t + 1$: define

$$\rho_j = \frac{h(g_j^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_k = \frac{h(g_k^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)}.$$

Then node u adopts arm j with probability ρ_j and arm k with probability ρ_k .

Remarks and Examples In both families of dynamics, notice that each node's local adoption choice at round $t + 1$ is either its own adoption choice from round t , or that of its randomly sampled neighbor. Thus in both families, each node builds a local probability distribution over these two arms and makes its adoption choice according to this distribution.

In every adoption dynamics, each node's local distribution for round $t + 1$ depends only on the reward g_k^t obtained by its randomly sampled neighbor in round t . The probability of adopting the neighbor's choice in the next round is exactly $f(g_k^t)$ (while the probability of a node repeating its own choice is $1 - f(g_k^t)$), where f is the non-decreasing adoption function. This family can be viewed as generalization of the *sample and adopt* dynamics of Celis et al. [CKV17]. As examples, we consider the following instantiated versions under different choices of f :

- β -adopt is the adoption dynamics using the function $f_\beta(g) := \beta^g \cdot (1 - \beta)^{1 - g}$ for some $\beta \in (0.5, 1)$, and assuming binary rewards (i.e., all $\mathbf{g}^t \in \{0, 1\}^m$).
- β -sigmoid-adopt is the adoption dynamics using the sigmoid function $f_\beta(g) := \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\beta \cdot g)}$ for $\beta \in [0, 1]$, and for general rewards $\mathbf{g}^t \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$.

In contrast, in comparison dynamics, each node's local distribution for round $t + 1$ is now a function of both the reward g_k^t obtained by its randomly sampled neighbor in round t , and also its own reward g_j^t from round t (in particular, the distribution over arms j and k is simply proportional to the *scores* of these rewards under the function h). At a high-level, this strategy shares similarities to the *power-of-two choices* principle, [Mit01], as well as to *pariwise comparison* strategies from evolutionary game theory [AN14, SCS19]. As an example, we consider the following instantiation:

- β -softmax-compare is the comparison dynamics using the score function $h_\beta(g) := \exp(\beta \cdot g)$ for some $\beta \in [0, 1]$, and for general rewards $\mathbf{g}^t \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$.

Evolution in Conditional Expectation Consider the sequence of distributions $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by running any adoption or comparison dynamics with reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$. A natural first step in bounding the population-level regret of $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ is to analyze the coordinate-wise evolution of \mathbf{p}^t . Interestingly, for both families of dynamics, we show in conditional expectation that each p_j^t evolves multiplicatively by a factor roughly proportional to some relative difference between g_j^t and a weighted average of all coordinates of \mathbf{g}^t . For example, for adoption dynamics, we obtain the following proposition (proved in Appendix A):

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ be the sequence induced by running any adoption dynamics with adoption function f and reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] = p_j^t \cdot (1 + f(g_j^t) - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, f(\mathbf{g}^t) \rangle)$$

for every t and $j \in [m]$, where $f(\mathbf{g}^t) \in [0, 1]^m$ denotes the coordinate-wise application of f on \mathbf{g}^t .

Similarly, for comparison dynamics, we obtain a related multiplicative update form. For this, we use quantities ρ_j and ρ_k as given in the definition of comparison dynamics. Then we have the following proposition (also proved in Appendix A):

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ be the sequence induced by running any comparison dynamics with score function h and reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$. Furthermore, for any $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $j \in [m]$, let $H(\mathbf{g}, j) \in [-1, 1]^m$ be the m -dimensional vector whose k 'th coordinate is given by $\rho_j - \rho_k$. Then $\mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] = p_j^t \cdot (1 + \langle \mathbf{p}^t, H(\mathbf{g}^t, j) \rangle)$ for every $t \in [T]$ and $j \in [m]$.*

Thus in adoption dynamics with adoption function f , at each round t , each coordinate j grows according to the strength of $f(g_j^t)$ relative to the weighted average over all $f(g_k^t)$. Similarly, in comparison dynamics with score function h , the j 'th coordinate grows proportionally to the weighted average of differences $h(g_j^t) - h(g_k^t)$ over all other coordinates k .

Letting $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{t+1} := \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{p}^{t+1}]$, notice that Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 both describe multiplicative updates that can be captured in the following, more general form:

$$\hat{p}_j^{t+1} := \mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] = p_j^t \cdot (1 + F_j(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)), \quad (5)$$

where the set of m functions $\{F_j\}_{j=1}^m$ satisfy the *zero-sum* condition $\sum_{j \in [m]} p_j \cdot F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m$ and $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. For adoption dynamics with function f , Proposition 2.1 shows that each $F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}) = f(g_j) - \langle \mathbf{p}, f(\mathbf{g}) \rangle$. For comparison dynamics with score function h , Proposition 2.2 shows $F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}) = \langle \mathbf{p}, H(\mathbf{p}, j) \rangle$.

Now while the coordinates of the distribution $\mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{p}^{t+1}]$ are updated multiplicatively as in (5), the sequence $\{\mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{p}^{t+1}]\}$ is not necessarily *smooth*: these updates are applied w.r.t. the *realized* distribution \mathbf{p}^t , and not $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[\mathbf{p}^t]$. However, to bound the regret of $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$, we leverage properties of the process $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ whose coordinates *do* evolve by composing this update at every iteration, using the same family $\{F_j\}$. We proceed to more formally define such *zero-sum MWU* processes.

2.2 Zero-Sum MWU Processes

Consider sequences of distributions $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ that evolve according to the following definition:

Definition 2.3 (Zero-Sum MWU). Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}$ be a family of m potential functions $F_j : \Delta_m \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ satisfying the *zero-sum condition*

$$\sum_{j \in [m]} q_j \cdot F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) = 0 \quad (6)$$

for all $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$ and $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then initialized from $\mathbf{q}^0 \in \Delta_m$ and given T , we say the sequence $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ is a *zero-sum MWU process* with reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ if for all $t \in [T]$ and $j \in [m]$:

$$q_j^{t+1} = q_j^t \cdot (1 + F_j(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)) . \quad (7)$$

Compared to the standard (linear) versions of multiplicative weights update methods [AHK12], the zero-sum condition (6) always ensures the set of updated weights in (7) remains a distribution, *without* an additional renormalization step (i.e., the simplex Δ_m is invariant to $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$). We remark that zero-sum updates of this form are commonly known as *replicator dynamics* in the continuous time setting, where one considers systems of the form $(dq_j^t/dt) = (u(g_j^t) - \langle \mathbf{q}^t, u(\mathbf{g}^t) \rangle)$ for some utility function u , usually in the context of evolutionary dynamics and game theory [Cab00, SS83, HS+98, PP16].

On the other hand, *discrete-time* MWU processes with update factors satisfying the zero-sum condition in (6) have not been as well-studied, particularly in the context of the prediction with expert advice or multi-armed bandit settings, where one wishes to bound regret with respect to $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ directly (and not with respect to some function of \mathbf{g}^t). In our analysis framework below, we develop such regret bounds for these processes with respect to $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$, where the bounds depend on some *quality measure* of the family \mathcal{F} in distinguishing higher-mean and lower-mean rewards.

2.3 Analysis Framework for Bounding $R(T)$

We now introduce a general analysis framework for bounding the regret of the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by any dynamics with conditionally expected updates as in expression (5). As previously alluded to, our strategy relies on introducing a true zero-sum MWU process $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ that starts at the same initial distribution as $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$, runs on the same reward sequence, and uses the same family \mathcal{F} as follows:

Definition 2.4 (Coupled Trajectories). Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}$ be a family of zero-sum functions as in Definition 2.3. Then given a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$, consider the sequences of distributions $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$, $\{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t\}$, and $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$, each initialized at $\mathbf{p}^0 := \mathbf{1}/m \in \Delta_m$, such that for all $j \in [m]$:

$$q_j^{t+1} := q_j^t \cdot (1 + F_j(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)) , \quad (8)$$

$$\widehat{p}_j^{t+1} := \mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] = p_j^t \cdot (1 + F_j(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)) , \quad (9)$$

and where p_j^t is the average of n i.i.d. indicator random variables, each with conditional mean \widehat{p}_j^t .

Given this coupling definition, a straightforward calculation shows that we can over-approximate the regret $R(T)$ of the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ by the quantity

$$\widehat{R}(T) := \max_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] + \sum_{t \in [T]} \sigma \cdot \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{q}^t\|_1 . \quad (10)$$

In Appendix E, we formally establish that $R(T) \leq \widehat{R}(T)$, and thus this over-approximation allows us to decompose $R(T)$ into (a) the regret of the zero-sum MWU process $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ (the difference of the first two terms) and (b) the error of the coupling (the final term). This can be roughly viewed as an *approximation error* and an *estimation error*, respectively. Thus we proceed to describe our techniques to control each of these individual quantities.

Regret Bounds for Zero-Sum MWU Processes To bound the regret of a zero-sum MWU process using the family \mathcal{F} , the key step is to relate the function value $F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})$ in conditional expectation to the quantity $\mu_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle$, which is the relative difference of the j 'th arm's mean to the globally-weighted average. To this end we make the following assumptions on \mathcal{F} :

Assumption 1. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}$ be a family of potential functions satisfying the zero-sum condition from Definition 2.3, and let $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ be a sequence of rewards. For any $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta^m$, let $\mathbf{m}_j^{q,t} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}}[F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}^t)]$. Then we assume there exist $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 < 1/4$, $\delta \in [0, 1]$, and $L > 0$ such that for all j and \mathbf{g}^t :

(i) for all $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$:

$$\frac{\alpha_1}{3} |\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle - \delta| \leq |\mathbf{m}_j^{q,t}| \leq \frac{\alpha_2}{3} |\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle + \delta|$$

(ii) for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$:

$$|F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}^t) - F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}^t)| \leq L \cdot \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1.$$

Intuitively, condition (i) of Assumption 1 specifies a two-sided *multiplicative* correlation between $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}}[F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}^t)]$ and $\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle$, while also allowing for some additive slack δ , and condition (ii) ensures that each F_j is L -Lipschitz. Under this assumption, we prove (in Appendix B) the following bound on the expected regret of a zero-sum MWU process, which is parameterized with respect to α_1 , α_2 , and δ :

Theorem 2.5. Consider a $T \geq 1$ round zero-sum MWU process $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ from Definition 2.3 with reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ and using a family \mathcal{F} that satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters α_1, α_2 and δ . Assume that $q_j^0 \geq \rho > 0$, and define

$$\widetilde{R}(T, j) := \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle].$$

Then for every $j \in [m]$:

$$\widetilde{R}(T, j) \leq \frac{3 \log(1/\rho)}{\alpha_1} + 2 \left(\frac{\alpha_2^2}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\delta \alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \right) T.$$

Here, the sharpness of the regret depends on the tightness of the parameters in Assumption 1. In particular, if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$ and $\delta = 0$, and supposing that $q_j^0 = 1/m$ deterministically, then the right hand side in the theorem recovers the standard (and optimal) MWU regret bounds [AHK12]. Therefore, we generally desire the family \mathcal{F} to satisfy condition (i) of the assumption with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, and $\delta = O(\alpha_1)$, where α_1 has some dependence on a free, tunable parameter. For the examples of dynamics introduced earlier, we show this is exactly the case. For example, we derive for β -softmax-compare the following:

Lemma 2.6. *Let \mathcal{F} be the zero-sum family induced by the β -softmax-compare dynamics. Then for a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ with each $\mathbf{g}^t \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$, the family \mathcal{F} satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \frac{3}{2}\beta$, $\delta = 4\beta\sigma$, and $L = 2$, for any $0 < \beta \leq 1/(4\sigma)$.*

We prove this lemma in Appendix C and also present analogous results for the β -sigmoid-adopt and β -adopt dynamics, whose resulting parameter values similarly share the desired properties.

Controlling The Coupling Error The second step in our framework is to bound the estimation error term $\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{q}^t\|_1$ from expression (10). For this, observe for any t that we can write

$$\mathbb{E}_{t-1} \|\mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1 \leq \mathbb{E}_{t-1} [\|\mathbf{q}^t - \widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t\|_1 + \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1],$$

which follows by the triangle inequality. In the first term, recall that each $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t$ follows a zero-sum MWU step from \mathbf{p}^{t-1} , and that \mathbf{q}^t and $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t$ both depend on the randomness of \mathbf{g}^{t-1} . Thus intuitively, if \mathbf{p}^{t-1} and \mathbf{q}^{t-1} are close, and assuming that the potential function F_j is smooth (in the sense of condition (ii) in Assumption 1), then we also expect $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t$ and \mathbf{q}^t to be close after each process is updated under the same family \mathcal{F} with the same reward \mathbf{g}^{t-1} .

For the latter term $\mathbb{E}_{t-1} \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1$, recall that $\mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{p}^t] = \widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t$ by definition. Therefore, this distance is simply the deviation of \mathbf{p}^t from its (conditional) mean, which we can control using standard concentration bounds. Applying this intuition over all T rounds leads to the following bound (proved in Appendix D):

Lemma 2.7. *Consider the sequences $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$, $\{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t\}$, and $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ from Definition 2.4 with a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ and using a family \mathcal{F} that satisfies Assumption 1 with parameter L . Let $\kappa := (3 + L)$, and assume $n \geq 3c \log n$ for some $c \geq 1$. Then for any $T \geq 1$:*

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1 \leq \tilde{O} \left(\frac{m \cdot \kappa^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{m \cdot T}{n^c} \right).$$

T -Step Regret and Epoch Framework As a consequence of the bounds in Theorem 2.5 and Lemma 2.7, and using the decomposition of $R(T)$ in expression (10), we obtain the following T -step regret bound for the process $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ from Definition 2.4:

$$R(T) \leq O \left(\frac{\log m}{\alpha} + \alpha T \right) + \tilde{O} \left(\frac{\sigma m \kappa^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m T}{n^c} \right),$$

where the bound holds for any $c \geq 1$ and n sufficiently large, and where for simplicity we assume in the above that the family \mathcal{F} satisfies Assumption 1 with $\alpha := \alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, $\delta = O(\alpha)$, and L , where $\kappa := 3 + L$. As mentioned, we interpret the first term of this bound as an approximation error (from the regret of the zero-sum MWU process), and the second term as an estimation error (introduced by the coupling).

Notice that for large T (with respect to n), the estimation error term has an exponential dependence on T . Thus in Appendix E, we show how to tighten the bound by using multiple *epochs* of the analysis (similar in spirit to the technique of Celis et al. [CKV17]). For this, we assume the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ evolves over $T = D\tau$ rounds unaltered, but every τ rounds, the process $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ is reinitialized from the most recent distribution \mathbf{p}^t . The full details of this epoch-based setup and resulting bounds are given in Appendix E.

2.4 Regret Bounds for Local Dynamics

We now formally present the regret bounds obtained by the dynamics from Section 2.1.

2.4.1 Adversarial Rewards

We start by presenting our regret bound for the general, adversarial reward setting obtained using the β -softmax-compare and β -sigmoid-adopt dynamics (proved in Appendix F):

Theorem 2.8. *Consider the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by running the β -softmax-compare or β -sigmoid-adopt dynamics on an (adversarial) reward sequence initialized from $\mathbf{p}^0 = \mathbf{1}/m$. Let $T \leq (0.5 - \epsilon) \log_5 n$ for any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.5)$. Then for appropriate settings of β , for any $c \geq 1$, and n sufficiently large:*

$$\frac{1}{T} \cdot R(T) \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right).$$

Remarks We make several important remarks on interpreting this result:

- First, observe that the bound holds only for $T \leq (0.5 - \epsilon) \log_5 n$ rounds, for some $\epsilon \in (0, 0.5)$. In general, if the number of rounds can grow faster than logarithmically in n , then $R(T)$ can grow linearly in T : for $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by our dynamics, once any p_j^t goes to 0 (which occurs with non-zero probability in each round), this mass remains 0 for all subsequent rounds. Adversarially setting all μ_j^t to be maximal would then result in constant regret per round. Thus we show in Appendix F that enforcing T to be at most logarithmic in n ensures every arm's adoption mass is at least $1/n$ with high probability over all T rounds (i.e., at least one node remains adopting each arm j over all rounds). Thus our constraint on T in this bound corresponds (asymptotically) to the longest time-horizon for which meaningful regret bounds can be given in this adversarial setting.
- As described in Section 2.3, by virtue of our analysis framework, the regret bound is decomposed into an approximation error (first term) and estimation error (second term). Here, the approximation error matches the optimal $\sqrt{(\log m)/T}$ regret in the (centralized) prediction with expert advice setting [AHK12]. Meanwhile, the estimation error can be interpreted as a *cost of decentralization*. In particular, the quantity m/n^ϵ stems from the additive noise incurred by the random neighbor sampling that determines the adoption mass of each of the m coordinates over the at most $T = (0.5 - \epsilon) \log n$ rounds. This noise can be controlled at each round with probability at least $1 - m/n^c$, which yields the second quantity in this error term. Note also that larger values of $c \geq 1$ correspond to requiring sufficiently larger $n \geq 3c \log n$.

Ultimately this means the estimation error is vanishing with respect to n at a rate of roughly m/n^ϵ , for $\epsilon \in (0, 0.5)$. To obtain a sharper rate, one can increase ϵ at the expense of slightly decreasing the constraint on $T = (0.5 - \epsilon) \log_5 n$ rounds. In general, this reveals that in the decentralized setting, regret can be sharpened with larger population sizes, and the regret bound can be viewed as a *sample complexity* constraint on the size of the population: ensuring that the average regret is at most some small constant ρ corresponds to requiring the population size n to be sufficiently large as a function of ρ .

2.4.2 Stationary Rewards

We now present our regret bounds for the stationary reward setting, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}^t = \boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ for all rounds t , and where we assume without loss of generality that $\mu_1 > \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_m$. In this setting, we can leverage the additional, fixed structure in the reward vector to obtain better regret guarantees as compared with the general, adversarial setting. In particular, we obtain the following bounds (proved in Appendix G):

Theorem 2.9. *Consider the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by running the β -softmax-compare or β -sigmoid-adopt protocol in the stationary reward setting initialized from $\mathbf{p}^0 = \mathbf{1}/m$. Then there exist settings of β such that, for any $c \geq 1$ and n sufficiently large, the following bounds hold:*

(i) For any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.5)$ and $T = (0.5 - \epsilon) \log_5 n$:

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon \cdot 2^{\sqrt{\log_5 n}}} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right).$$

(ii) For any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.25]$, and $T = n^b$ for any $b > 4\epsilon$:

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{b-4\epsilon}} + \frac{1}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right).$$

Moreover, when all $\mathbf{g}^t \in \{0, 1\}^m$, the same bounds hold for the β -adopt protocol.

Remarks We again make several important remarks on this result and its comparison with Theorem 2.8.

- First, in part (i) of the theorem, we consider the same constraint on T (logarithmic in n) as in the adversarial regret bound of Theorem 2.8. Again, the $O(\sqrt{\log m/T})$ approximation error in this bound matches the optimal regret in centralized prediction with expert advice settings, and in this stationary setting, we can now improve the estimation error by a factor of roughly $2^{-\sqrt{\log n}}$.

At a high level, this improvement is obtained by establishing a sequence of lower bounds on the adoption mass of the optimal arm that hold simultaneously with high probability, and by then using the epoch-based framework described in Section 2.3 to ensure the coupling error remains small over time.

- In part (ii) of the theorem, we then show that our dynamics can also obtain sublinear regret when the number of rounds T is now (an arbitrarily large) polynomial in n . Roughly speaking, this is obtained by using settings of β that correspond to a zero-sum MWU learning rate of roughly $\alpha = 1/n^{2\epsilon}$ (for α as in Assumption 1), for any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.25]$. Then, using similar techniques as to the proof of part (i), we can establish that after $n^{4\epsilon}$ rounds, the adoption mass of the optimal arm will remain above $1 - O(1/n^\epsilon)$ for every subsequent round with high probability. This naturally bounds the per-round regret of the process by $O(1/n^\epsilon)$ for every remaining round.

However, with this setting of α , the cumulative regret over the initial $n^{4\epsilon}$ rounds can grow linearly. Thus in order to ensure the overall cumulative regret over the $T = n^b$ rounds is sublinear, we need $b > 4\epsilon$. To highlight this tradeoff, the bound in (4) is expressed solely as a vanishing function of n (and not of T).

Ultimately, given the random, pairwise communication mechanism in this decentralized model, we suspect that the average regret of any dynamics in either reward setting is at least $\Omega(m/\sqrt{n})$, and likely even larger in the general, adversarial setting. Establishing lower bounds and optimal rates on average regret in both reward settings is left as future work.

2.5 Application: Convex Optimization Over the Simplex

As an application of our local dynamics and analysis framework (in particular, the regret bounds of Theorem 2.8 for the adversarial setting), we show how our dynamics can approximately optimize convex functions $f : \Delta_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over the simplex when the reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ is generated using a (stochastic) gradient oracle. In particular we assume:

Assumption 2. Given a convex function $f : \Delta_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we assume that:

- (i) f has gradients bounded by $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{q})\|_\infty \leq G$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$, for some $G > 0$.
- (ii) At every round $t \in [T]$, the reward vector \mathbf{g}^t is of the form: $\mathbf{g}^t := -(\nabla f(\mathbf{p}^t)/G) + \mathbf{b}^t$, where each $\mathbf{b}^t \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$.

Observe that condition (ii) ensures that the coordinates of the vector \mathbf{g}^t satisfy the reward distribution conditions of our bandit setting (in particular, with $[-\sigma, \sigma]$ -bounded support, and $[-1, 1]$ -bounded means) and thus our regret bounds from Section 2.4 can be applied. To this end, by adapting standard reductions between MWU algorithms and (online) convex optimization [AHK12, KW97], we can use the more general adversarial regret bound of Theorem 2.8 to derive the following result, proved in Appendix H:

Theorem 2.10. *Given a convex function $f : \Delta_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consider the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by running the β -softmax-compare or β -sigmoid-adopt protocol on a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ generated as in Assumption 2 with gradient bound G . Let $T \leq (0.5 - \epsilon) \log_5 n$ for any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.5)$, and let $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbf{p}^t$. Define $\text{err}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}) := \mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{\mathbf{p}})] - \min_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m} f(\mathbf{p})$. Then for appropriate settings of β , any $c \geq 1$, and n sufficiently large:*

$$\text{err}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}) \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{G^2 \log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(G\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^c} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right)\right).$$

Note that this error rate is equivalent to the regret bound from Theorem 2.8 up to the factor G , which is a standard dependence. Also, the optimization error here is defined *implicitly*: the function f is minimized with respect to the distribution \mathbf{p}^t induced by the local dynamics. This is in contrast to other settings of gossip-based, decentralized optimization (e.g., [KSJ19, SBB⁺17, TGZ⁺18]), where each node $i \in [n]$ has first-order gradient access to an individual local function f_i , and the population seeks to perform empirical risk minimization over the n functions.

3 Experimental Validation

In this section, we present several sets of simulations that validate our results experimentally.

3.1 Regret in the Stationary Reward Setting

To begin, we examine the regret of each of the β -softmax-compare, β -sigmoid-adopt, and β -adopt protocols in a stationary reward setting. For simplicity, and to evaluate all three protocols on the

same reward sequence, we consider rewards drawn from Bernoulli distributions with fixed means.

For this, we started by fixing the population size $n = 16000$ and tracking the average regret of each protocol over an increasing number of arms $m \in \{4, 8, 16\}$, and over an increasing number of rounds T . For each combination of protocol, arm size, and number of rounds T , we simulated 15 iterations of the protocol, and considered the average regret over these iterations (here, the randomness is both in the reward generation *and* in the neighbor sampling).

For the $m = 4$ setting, we fixed the Bernoulli means in evenly-spaced intervals between 0.85 and 0.25; for the $m = 8$ setting, in evenly-spaced intervals between 0.85 and 0.15; and for the $m = 16$ setting, in evenly-spaced intervals between 0.85 and 0.1. For each protocol, we made no rigorous attempt at optimizing the setting of the free β parameter: we set β to be absolute constants of 2, 1, and 0.75 for the β -sigmoid-adopt, β -softmax-compare, and β -adopt protocols, respectively, but we observed similar experimental trends with other settings of β .

Figure 1 shows the results of this first set of simulations. In particular, we observe that for each m and protocol variant, the cumulative regret grows sublinearly over rounds, and, in general, the regret increases for larger m . Recall that this aligns with our bounds from Theorem 2.9, which have increasing dependencies on m when n is fixed.




Figure 1: In the stationary setting with fixed-mean Bernoulli rewards: average regrets over T rounds on populations of $n = 16000$ and increasing arm sizes m , for the three protocols. Each regret value is averaged over 15 random iterations, and the error bars show the first and third quartiles over these iterations. The regret of each protocol grows sublinearly in T , but it increases with m . Each protocol was initialized from $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{1}/m$.

We also examined the opposite scenario, where $m = 4$ is fixed, but where the population size n increases ($n \in \{400, 4000, 40000\}$). For this, we again considered a set of fixed-mean Bernoulli reward distributions, with means evenly-spaced between 0.85 and 0.25. For each protocol, we used the same parameter settings as above, and again considered average regrets over the 15 iterations of each combination of protocol, population size, and rounds T . The results of these simulations are shown in Figure 2.

Similar to Figure 1, in Figure 2 we observe in general that the average regret of each protocol grows sublinearly over rounds at every population size. Although more subtle, we notice a slight downward trend in regret as the population size increases, which reinforces our intuition from Theorem 2.9. However, note from the theorem that for larger n , the (average) regret will be dominated by the $\sqrt{(\log m)/T}$ approximation error term. Thus further increases to n may lead to only negligible decreases in the overall regret if the estimation error is already small.




Figure 2: In the stationary setting with fixed-mean Bernoulli rewards: average regrets over T rounds for increasing population sizes n with a fixed arm size $m = 4$. Each regret value is averaged over 15 random iterations, and the error bars show the first and third quartiles over these iterations. Again, the regrets grows sublinearly in T , and we notice a slight dampening with larger n . Each protocol was initialized from $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{1}/m$.

3.2 “Last Iterate Convergence” in the Stationary Reward Setting

We also experimentally examined the *last iterate convergence* properties of our protocols in the stationary setting, which refers to a protocol inducing an arm adoption sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ that converges (almost surely) to a point mass on the coordinate corresponding to the highest-mean arm. This would imply that the regret of every subsequent round is 0. In the bandit literature this behavior is sometimes referred to as *best-arm identification* [LS20].

In Figure 3, we examined this by tracking the evolution of the adoption distributions in one random run of each of the three protocols on a fixed reward sequence. For this, we considered the same set of $m = 8$ fixed-mean Bernoulli distributions and the same β parameters for the protocols as described above. For each protocol, we observe that the adoption mass of arm 1 (the highest-mean arm) tends toward 1 after sufficiently many rounds, and thus our dynamics seem to exhibit such last-iterate convergence behavior in this reward setting.

We remark that the prior work of Su et al. [SZL19] showed (in a slightly different model) that a similar dynamics results in such best-arm-identification with high probability when taking $T \rightarrow \infty$. However, given the behavior shown in Figure 3, investigating the conditions (i.e., the exact reward distribution structure) that lead to finite-time convergence of this form (and establishing the corresponding rates) would be an interesting line of future work.

3.3 Convex Optimization Error in the Adversarial Reward Setting

To evaluate our dynamics in an adversarial reward setting, we simulated both the β -softmax-compare and β -sigmoid-adopt protocols for a convex optimization task using the reward generation setup of Assumption 2 from Section 2.5. For this, we considered minimizing a three-dimensional convex function $f : \Delta_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{3}{5}p_1^2 + \frac{3}{10}p_2^2 - \frac{5}{6}p_1 + \frac{1}{15}p_3 + \frac{44}{15}, \quad (11)$$

for $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_3$. It is straightforward to verify that f has gradients bounded by 1 over the simplex, and that $\mathbf{p}^* := (\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{9}, \frac{5}{36})$ minimizes f . We thus considered reward distributions of the form $\mathbf{g}^t = -\nabla f(\mathbf{p}^t) + \mathbf{b}^t$, where each \mathbf{b}^t has i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian coordinates with variance σ^2 , and clipped in the range $[-10, 10]$.




Figure 3: In the stationary setting with fixed-mean Bernoulli rewards: the evolution of the arm adoption distribution for each protocol on one random run with $n = 1600$ and an arm set of size $m = 8$. For each protocol, the adoption mass of the highest-mean reward (arm 1) approaches 1 after around 30 rounds, which highlights a “last iterate convergence” phenomenon induced by our dynamics in the stationary setting. Each protocol was initialized from $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{1}/m$.




Figure 4: In the adversarial setting with reward distributions generated via a stochastic gradient oracle: optimization error of the function $f : \Delta_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (expression (11)) induced by the β -softmax-compare and β -sigmoid-adopt dynamics on a population of $n = 3000$, initialized from the distribution $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{1}/3$, and for increasingly noisy gradient oracles (larger σ). The error of both protocols after T rounds is averaged over 15 iterations, and the error bars show the first and third quartiles. We notice that the optimization error approaches 0 for both protocols after enough rounds, but this convergence is slower with larger σ .

In Figure 4, we show the function error between \mathbf{p}^* and the average iterate $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbf{p}^t$ induced by the β -softmax-compare and β -sigmoid-adopt protocols for this optimization task over increasing magnitudes of σ , and on a population of size $n = 3000$. Similar to the previous plots, at each combination of protocol, σ , and T , we take the average error over 15 iterations of the process, and the error bars show the range of the first and third quartiles over these iterations.

Notice in each subplot that the error of both protocols goes to 0 with the number of rounds, which highlights the robustness of our dynamics to reward sequences whose means vary over time. However, as expected, this error tends to increase for larger σ (given that this corresponds to noisier stochastic gradients). This aligns with the intuition from the expected error rate of Theorem 2.10 in this setting.

4 Related Work

In this section, we provide a more detailed comparison with several related works: specifically, the works of Celis et al. [CKV17], Su et al. [SZL19], and Sankararaman et al. [SGS19]. We also mention

some connections with other distributed consensus, opinion, and evolutionary game dynamics.

4.1 Comparison with Celis et al. [CKV17]

As mentioned in Section 1, Celis et al. considered a related distributed bandit model: they assume of population of n nodes and an m -armed bandit instance, where the rewards are generated from fixed-mean Bernoulli distributions, and where nodes utilize a two-step uniform neighbor *sampling* and arm *adoption* process in each round. Specifically, they assume the following steps:

- (i) At round t , each node either (a) with probability $(1 - \mu)$ samples a uniformly random neighbor and observes its most recent adoption choice and reward, or (b) with probability $\mu > 0$ selects an arm uniformly at random and observes its most recently generated reward.
- (ii) Given the reward g_c^t observed by a node in the previous step, that node adopts arm $c \in [m]$ in the subsequent round with probability $\beta^{g_c^t} \cdot (1 - \beta)^{1 - g_c^t}$, and otherwise makes *no* adoption.

We make several remarks on this process and how it relates to our own model and dynamics. First, note that by definition of this process, at any given round a node will make *no adoption* with some non-zero probability. On the other hand, the authors assume that each arm-adoption distribution \mathbf{p}^t is computed by *normalizing* with respect to the set of nodes that *do* make an adoption in round t .

However, their analysis relies on the assumption that in step (i.a) above, a node samples a neighbor that previously adopted arm j with probability p_j^t . Note that this implies that the uniform neighbor sampling (with probability $1 - \mu$) is *only* uniform over the set of neighbors in the population that made an adoption decision in the previous round. This could be implemented, for example, by a central coordinator that can generate samples from this subset of the population, but it *cannot* be performed in a *purely distributed fashion* by letting each node select any neighbor uniformly at random. Thus the exact model considered by Celis et al. differs from the one described in Section 1, and this precludes a direct comparison of their results with ours.

On the other hand, we remark that the adoption probability expression in step (ii) above is reminiscent of the β -adopt protocol from Section 2, and is what inspired that specific adoption dynamics instantiation. However, the dynamics of Celis et al. include the additional component in step (i) of allowing each node with probability $\mu > 0$ to, rather than receiving information from a random neighbor, observe the most recent reward of an arm selected uniformly at random. In their analysis, this small non-negative probability is used to establish an adoption mass lower bound for the optimal arm in the stationary, Bernoulli reward setting.

We note that this uniform arm sampling can be advantageous in reducing the likelihood that the entire adoption mass converges to a “fixed-point” sub-optimal arm decision. However, this same mechanism can thus also slow down convergence (or slightly increase regret) when a sufficiently large majority of the population mass is already accumulated the coordinate of the highest-mean arm.

Thus, an interesting line of future work would be to better quantify the exact tradeoffs between dynamics that use such uniform arm-sampling mechanisms (as in the work Celis et al.), and dynamics that do not (as in the present work).

4.2 Comparisons with Su et al. [SZL19] and Sankararaman et al. [SGS19]

We also make some comparisons with the works of Su et al. [SZL19] and Sankararaman et al. [SGS19], although the exact settings in those are less similar than that of Celis et al. to the present paper.

The key similarity with our work is that communication between nodes occurs in a pairwise manner, but both works consider a related *asynchronous* gossip model [BGPS06], where individual communications occur according to the arrivals of a Poisson clock with rate n . Note in expectation that n total communications occur per time unit in this model, and thus it can be viewed as the natural, continuous time analog of the discrete-time, synchronous model in the present work.

However, besides from the similarity in pairwise node communication, the bandit settings and problem objective of both works vary from ours. Su et al. consider fixed-mean Bernoulli reward distributions and are concerned mainly with the *best arm identification* task, which asks whether every node will eventually adopt the highest-mean arm in perpetuity (note that the authors refer to this in their work as *learnability*). The dynamics proposed by Su et al. can be viewed similarly to an instantiation of an adoption dynamics, but their main result quantifies the probability that the population eventually identifies the highest-mean arm, rather than deriving a quantitative bound on the population-level regret achieved by their protocol.

On the other hand, the results of Su et al. apply to more general, non-complete communication graphs (that are sufficiently well-connected). Their results thus motivate the question of whether the dynamics and regret bounds of the present paper also transfer to non-complete graph topologies.

Similar to Su et al., Sankararaman et al. also consider Bernoulli reward distributions with fixed means, and they also assume that nodes generate independent samples from arm distributions upon each adoption. In this sense, the total number of independent arm pulls across the population per time unit can be as large as n in expectation. This model difference is also reflected in their regret objective, which is to minimize the *individual* cumulative regrets aggregated across all nodes in the population. In contrast, our results consider a *population-level* regret defined with respect to the *global* arm adoption distributions. The authors also assume that nodes have the ability to remember their full history of previous adoption choices and observed rewards, and this allows for designing local protocols that adapt classic UCB approaches from centralized bandit settings [LS20, BCB⁺12].

However, a key constraint in the dynamics proposed by Sankararaman et al. is that upon node communications, nodes can exchange only the *index* of an arm (rather than any recently observed rewards from that arm) and in general, the authors are concerned with limiting the total number of per-node communications over rounds. This motivates the question of whether the dynamics of the present paper can be adapted to only consider arm *index* information, and to study the resulting impact on regret. This could be of interest in systems where nodes can only communicate a limited number of bits, and thus communicating previously observed rewards to full precision is infeasible.

As mentioned in the introduction, we remark that multi-node bandit algorithms have been studied in other distributed settings, including those rely on gossip-style communication, e.g., [SBFH⁺13, HKK⁺13, KJG18, MRKR19]. However, as the exact problem setting constraints and objectives in each of these works vary significantly from ours, exact comparisons cannot be made.

4.3 Relation to Consensus and Opinion Dynamics and Evolutionary Game Dynamics

We remark that our families of dynamics (particularly for the stationary reward setting) are more generally related to distributed *consensus* and *opinion* dynamics, which have been studied extensively in both synchronous and asynchronous gossip-based models [DGM⁺11, GL18, BCN⁺14b, BCN⁺14a, BCN20, AAB⁺23]. In these settings, the goal of the population is to eventually agree on one of m opinions, and local interaction rules that involve a node adopting (or refraining from adopting) the opinion of its randomly sampled neighbor (i.e., similar in spirit to our adoption and comparison dynamics) are usually at the foundation of such protocols [BCN⁺14a, AAB⁺23].

Our dynamics are also related to evolutionary game dynamics on graphs [AN14, CGK⁺15, SCS19]. In these settings, one usually considers m *strategies*, and each node maintains one such strategy in each time step. Interactions between nodes then correspond to two-player games, where each node plays according to its current strategy and receives some reward according to a fixed payoff matrix. In general, dynamics in this setting allow better strategies to *reproduce* (more nodes adopt these strategies), and for less-optimal strategies to become *extinct*. Here, the focus is usually on characterizing various properties of the equilibria of such processes. Our adoption and comparison dynamics from the present work can be viewed as similar evolutionary game processes, especially given the earlier-mentioned similarity between zero-sum MWU processes and the classical replicator dynamics [SS83, Cab00].

Establishing a more rigorous and quantitative relationship between our dynamics for the bandit setting and previously studied consensus and evolutionary game dynamics in related gossip models is thus left as future work.

5 Conclusion

To conclude, we introduced several families of dynamics for the *decentralized* bandit problem, whose regret in both stationary and adversarial reward settings we show grows sublinearly over rounds. In particular, relative to prior related work [CKV17, SZL19, SGS19], these are the first such dynamics that can tolerate rewards whose means are non-stationary. As an application, we showed how these dynamics can approximately optimize convex functions over the simplex at a population level. We also presented simulations that validate our results experimentally.

Finally, we mention several additional directions for future work: first, it remains open to establish optimal regret bounds in both the stationary and adversarial settings (specifically, deriving lower bounds on the “cost of decentralization,” which we expect to be larger in adversarial settings). Second, it would be interesting to investigate whether our dynamics exhibit a stronger “last-iterate-convergence” behavior in the stationary setting (i.e., where \mathbf{p}^t converges to a point mass at the coordinate of the highest-mean arm). This type of result was shown asymptotically by Su et al. [SZL19] in a related model, but obtaining quantitative rates for this phenomenon in the present setting is open. Finally, analyzing these dynamics over a non-complete communication graph (in particular, understanding how mixing properties of the graph affect regret) is left as future work.

References

- [AAB⁺23] Talley Amir, James Aspnes, Petra Berenbrink, Felix Biermeier, Christopher Hahn, Dominik Kaaser, and John Lazarsfeld. Fast convergence of k -opinion undecided state dynamics in the population protocol model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12508*, 2023.
- [AHK12] Sanjeev Arora, Elad Hazan, and Satyen Kale. The multiplicative weights update method: a meta-algorithm and applications. *Theory Comput.*, 8(1):121–164, 2012.
- [AM14] Orly Avner and Shie Mannor. Concurrent bandits and cognitive radio networks. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2014, Nancy, France, September 15-19, 2014. Proceedings, Part I 14*, pages 66–81. Springer, 2014.
- [AMTS11] Animashree Anandkumar, Nithin Michael, Ao Kevin Tang, and Ananthram Swami. Distributed algorithms for learning and cognitive medium access with logarithmic regret. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 29(4):731–745, 2011.
- [AN14] Benjamin Allen and Martin A Nowak. Games on graphs. *EMS surveys in mathematical sciences*, 1(1):113–151, 2014.
- [BB20] Sébastien Bubeck and Thomas Budzinski. Coordination without communication: optimal regret in two players multi-armed bandits. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 916–939. PMLR, 2020.
- [BCB⁺12] Sébastien Bubeck, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, et al. Regret analysis of stochastic and non-stochastic multi-armed bandit problems. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 5(1):1–122, 2012.
- [BCN⁺14a] Luca Becchetti, Andrea Clementi, Emanuele Natale, Francesco Pasquale, and Riccardo Silvestri. Plurality consensus in the gossip model. In *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 371–390. SIAM, 2014.
- [BCN⁺14b] Luca Becchetti, Andrea Clementi, Emanuele Natale, Francesco Pasquale, Riccardo Silvestri, and Luca Trevisan. Simple dynamics for plurality consensus. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, pages 247–256, 2014.
- [BCN20] Luca Becchetti, Andrea Clementi, and Emanuele Natale. Consensus dynamics: An overview. *ACM SIGACT News*, 51(1):58–104, 2020.
- [BGPS06] Stephen Boyd, Arpita Ghosh, Balaji Prabhakar, and Devavrat Shah. Randomized gossip algorithms. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 52(6):2508–2530, 2006.
- [BP19] Etienne Boursier and Vianney Perchet. Sic-mmab: synchronisation involves communication in multiplayer multi-armed bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [Cab00] Antonio Cabrales. Stochastic replicator dynamics. *International Economic Review*, 41(2):451–481, 2000.

- [CGK⁺15] Jurek Czyzowicz, Leszek Gasieniec, Adrian Kosowski, Evangelos Kranakis, Paul G Spirakis, and Przemyslaw Uznański. On convergence and threshold properties of discrete lotka-volterra population protocols. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming: 42nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, pages 393–405. Springer, 2015.
- [CKV17] L. Elisa Celis, Peter M. Krafft, and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. A distributed learning dynamics in social groups. In *PODC*, pages 441–450. ACM, 2017.
- [DGM⁺11] Benjamin Doerr, Leslie Ann Goldberg, Lorenz Minder, Thomas Sauerwald, and Christian Scheideler. Stabilizing consensus with the power of two choices. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures*, pages 149–158, 2011.
- [EBB⁺] Mathieu Even, Raphaël Berthier, Francis R. Bach, Nicolas Flammarion, Hadrien Hendrikx, Pierre Gaillard, Laurent Massoulié, and Adrien B. Taylor. Continuiized accelerations of deterministic and stochastic gradient descents, and of gossip algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*.
- [GL18] Mohsen Ghaffari and Johannes Lengler. Nearly-tight analysis for 2-choice and 3-majority consensus dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 305–313, 2018.
- [H⁺16] Elad Hazan et al. Introduction to online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, 2(3-4):157–325, 2016.
- [HKK⁺13] Eshcar Hillel, Zohar S Karnin, Tomer Koren, Ronny Lempel, and Oren Somekh. Distributed exploration in multi-armed bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 26, 2013.
- [HS⁺98] Josef Hofbauer, Karl Sigmund, et al. *Evolutionary games and population dynamics*. Cambridge university press, 1998.
- [HTT⁺19] Chaoyang He, Conghui Tan, Hanlin Tang, Shuang Qiu, and Ji Liu. Central server free federated learning over single-sided trust social networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04956*, 2019.
- [KJG18] Ravi Kumar Kolla, Krishna Jagannathan, and Aditya Gopalan. Collaborative learning of stochastic bandits over a social network. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 26(4):1782–1795, 2018.
- [KSJ19] Anastasia Koloskova, Sebastian U. Stich, and Martin Jaggi. Decentralized stochastic optimization and gossip algorithms with compressed communication. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3478–3487. PMLR, 2019.

- [KW97] Jyrki Kivinen and Manfred K Warmuth. Exponentiated gradient versus gradient descent for linear predictors. *information and computation*, 132(1):1–63, 1997.
- [LJP08] Lifeng Lai, Hai Jiang, and H Vincent Poor. Medium access in cognitive radio networks: A competitive multi-armed bandit framework. In *2008 42nd Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, pages 98–102. IEEE, 2008.
- [LS20] Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [LSL16] Peter Landgren, Vaibhav Srivastava, and Naomi Ehrich Leonard. Distributed cooperative decision-making in multiarmed bandits: Frequentist and bayesian algorithms. In *2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 167–172. IEEE, 2016.
- [LZ10] Keqin Liu and Qing Zhao. Distributed learning in multi-armed bandit with multiple players. *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, 58(11):5667–5681, 2010.
- [LZZ⁺17] Xiangru Lian, Ce Zhang, Huan Zhang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, Wei Zhang, and Ji Liu. Can decentralized algorithms outperform centralized algorithms? a case study for decentralized parallel stochastic gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [Mit01] Michael Mitzenmacher. The power of two choices in randomized load balancing. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 12(10):1094–1104, 2001.
- [MMM18] Frederik Mallmann-Trenn, Cameron Musco, and Christopher Musco. Eigenvector computation and community detection in asynchronous gossip models. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Christos Kaklamani, Dániel Marx, and Donald Sannella, editors, *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2018, July 9-13, 2018, Prague, Czech Republic*, volume 107 of *LIPICs*, pages 159:1–159:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [MRKR19] David Martínez-Rubio, Varun Kanade, and Patrick Rebeschini. Decentralized cooperative stochastic bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [MU05] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. *Probability and Computing: Randomized Algorithms and Probabilistic Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [PP16] Ioannis Panageas and Georgios Piliouras. Average case performance of replicator dynamics in potential games via computing regions of attraction. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 703–720, 2016.
- [S⁺09] Devavrat Shah et al. Gossip algorithms. *Foundations and Trends[®] in Networking*, 3(1):1–125, 2009.
- [SBB⁺17] Kevin Scaman, Francis R. Bach, Sébastien Bubeck, Yin Tat Lee, and Laurent Massoulié. Optimal algorithms for smooth and strongly convex distributed optimization in networks. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August*

- 2017, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3027–3036. PMLR, 2017.
- [SBFH⁺13] Balazs Szorenyi, Róbert Busa-Fekete, István Hegedus, Róbert Ormándi, Márk Jelasity, and Balázs Kégl. Gossip-based distributed stochastic bandit algorithms. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19–27. PMLR, 2013.
- [SCS19] Laura Schmid, Krishnendu Chatterjee, and Stefan Schmid. The evolutionary price of anarchy: Locally bounded agents in a dynamic virus game. In *23rd International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems (OPODIS 2019)*, volume 153, page 21. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [SGS19] Abishek Sankararaman, Ayalvadi Ganesh, and Sanjay Shakkottai. Social learning in multi agent multi armed bandits. *Proc. ACM Meas. Anal. Comput. Syst.*, 3(3):53:1–53:35, 2019.
- [Sli19] Aleksandrs Slivkins. Introduction to multi-armed bandits. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 12(1-2):1–286, 2019.
- [SS83] Peter Schuster and Karl Sigmund. Replicator dynamics. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 100(3):533–538, 1983.
- [SZL19] Lili Su, Martin Zubeldia, and Nancy A. Lynch. Collaboratively learning the best option on graphs, using bounded local memory. *Proc. ACM Meas. Anal. Comput. Syst.*, 3(1):11:1–11:32, 2019.
- [TGZ⁺18] Hanlin Tang, Shaoduo Gan, Ce Zhang, Tong Zhang, and Ji Liu. Communication compression for decentralized training. In Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Kristen Grauman, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, pages 7663–7673, 2018.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Technical Overview	4
3	Experimental Validation	12
4	Related Work	15
5	Conclusion	18
A	Details on Evolution of Local Dynamics	24
B	Details on Zero-Sum Multiplicative Weights Update	29
C	Details on (α, δ, L) Parameters for Local Dynamics	32
D	Details on Coupling Error Analysis	38
E	Details on Analysis Framework	41
F	Details on Regret Bounds for Adversarial Rewards	45
G	Details on Regret Bounds for Stationary Rewards	47
H	Details on Convex Optimization Application	56

A Details on Evolution of Local Dynamics

In this appendix, we derive the conditionally expected evolution of the adoption dynamics (Appendix A.1) and comparison dynamics (Appendix A.2) that were introduced in Section 2. Then, in Appendix A.3, we also introduce a third family of *two-neighbor comparison dynamics* that generalizes comparison dynamics to a setting in which each node samples two neighbors at every round. We show this family also yields a similar form of zero-sum multiplicative updates in conditional expectation.

A.1 Evolution of Adoption Dyanmics

For adoption dynamics, we provide the proof of Proposition 2.1, which is restated for convenience:

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ be the sequence induced by running any adoption dynamics with adoption function f and reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] = p_j^t \cdot (1 + f(g_j^t) - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, f(\mathbf{g}^t) \rangle)$$

for every t and $j \in [m]$, where $f(\mathbf{g}^t) \in [0, 1]^m$ denotes the coordinate-wise application of f on \mathbf{g}^t .

Proof. First, letting $c_u^{t+1} \in [m]$ denote the arm adopted by node $u \in [n]$ in round $t + 1$, observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u \in [n]} \mathbb{P}_t[c_u^{t+1} = j],$$

which follows from the fact that p_j^{t+1} is the average of the n indicators $\mathbf{1}\{c_u^{t+1} = j\}$. By the local symmetry of the dynamics, $\mathbb{P}_t[c_u^{t+1} = j]$ is equal for all nodes u . However, this value is dependent on c_u^t (i.e., the adoption decision of u at the previous round t).

Thus using the law of total probability, for any node u we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t[c_u^{t+1} = j] &= \mathbf{1}\{c_u^t = j\} \cdot \mathbb{P}_t[c_u^{t+1} = j | c_u^t = j] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} \mathbf{1}\{c_u^t = k\} \cdot \mathbb{P}_t[c_u^{t+1} = j | c_u^t = k]. \end{aligned}$$

Now fix node u , and let $v \in [n]$ denote the node the u samples in round t . Now recall from the definition of the dynamics that if $c_u^t = k \neq j$, then $c_u^{t+1} = j$ with probability $f(g_j^t)$ only if node v adopted arm j in round t , i.e., $c_v^t = j$. On the other hand, if $c_u^t = j$, then $c_u^{t+1} = j$ either if $c_v^t = j$, or if $c_v^t = k \neq j$ and node u *rejects* adopting arm k with probability $1 - f(g_k^t)$.

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t[c_u^{t+1} = j | c_u^t = j] &= p_j^t + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} p_k^t \cdot (1 - f(g_k^t)) \\ \text{and } \mathbb{P}_t[c_u^{t+1} = j | c_u^t = k] &= p_j^t \cdot f(g_j^t) \text{ for } k \neq j. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these cases, noting also that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{u \in [v]} \mathbf{1}\{c_u^t = k\} = p_k^t$ for any $k \in [m]$, and using the fact

that $\sum_{k \in [m]} p_k^t = 1$, we can then write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] &= p_j^t \cdot (p_j^t + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} p_k^t \cdot (1 - f(g_k^t))) + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} p_k^t \cdot (p_j^t \cdot f(g_j^t)) \\ &= p_j^t \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} p_k^t \cdot (f(g_j^t) - f(g_k^t))\right) \\ &= p_j^t \cdot \left(1 + f(g_j^t) - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, f(\mathbf{g}^t) \rangle\right), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Importantly, we also verify that such multiplicative updates in every coordinate j still lead to a proper distribution: for this, it is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in [m]} \mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] &= \sum_{j \in [m]} p_j^t \cdot \left(1 + f(g_j^t) - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, f(\mathbf{g}^t) \rangle\right) \\ &= \sum_{j \in [m]} p_j^t + \langle \mathbf{p}^t, f(\mathbf{g}^t) \rangle - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, f(\mathbf{g}^t) \rangle = 1, \end{aligned}$$

which holds since \mathbf{p}^t is a distribution.

Finally, recall from Section 2.1 that when the adoption function f is a sigmoid function with parameter β we call the resulting protocol β -sigmoid-adopt. Stated formally:

Local Protocol 1 (β -sigmoid-adoption). Let β -sigmoid-adopt be the adoption dynamics protocol instantiated by the adoption function $f_\beta(g) := \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\beta \cdot g)}$ for $\beta \in [0, 1]$ and any $g \in \mathbb{R}$.

Similarly, in the case when all rewards \mathbf{g}^t are binary, and we have the following β -adopt protocol:

Local Protocol 2 (β -adoption). Let β -adopt be the adoption dynamics protocol instantiated by the adoption function $f_\beta(g) := \beta^g \cdot (1 - \beta)^{1-g}$ for $\beta \in (0.5, 1)$ and $g \in \{0, 1\}^m$.

A.2 Evolution of Comparison Dynamics

For comparison dynamics, we develop the proof of Proposition 2.2, which is restated here:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ be the sequence induced by running any comparison dynamics with score function h and reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$. Furthermore, for any $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $j \in [m]$, let $H(\mathbf{g}, j) \in [-1, 1]^m$ be the m -dimensional vector whose k 'th coordinate is given by $\rho_j - \rho_k$. Then $\mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] = p_j^t \cdot (1 + \langle \mathbf{p}^t, H(\mathbf{g}^t, j) \rangle)$ for every $t \in [T]$ and $j \in [m]$.*

Proof. Fix $j \in [m]$ and $t \in [T]$. Again let $c_i^t \in [m]$ denote the arm adopted by node $i \in [n]$ at round t . Then observe that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(\mathbf{1}\{c_i^t = j\} \cdot \mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j \mid c_i^t = j] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} \mathbf{1}\{c_i^t = k\} \cdot \mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j \mid c_i^t = k] \right). \end{aligned}$$

In the case that $c_i^t = j$, note that $c_i^{t+1} = j$ with probability 1 if node i samples a neighbor u that also pulled arm j in round t . Otherwise, if u pulled some arm $k \neq j$, then node i adopts j with probability $1 - h(g_k^t)/(h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t))$. Together, this means that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j \mid c_i^t = j] &= p_j^t + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} p_k^t \left(1 - \frac{h(g_k^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} \right) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} p_k^t \cdot \frac{h(g_k^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the other case when $c_i^t = k \neq j$, then $c_i^{t+1} = j$ only when node i samples a neighbor that pulled arm j in round t , and thus

$$\mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j \mid c_i^t = k] = p_j^t \cdot \frac{h(g_j^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)}. \quad (13)$$

Now observe that for any $k \in [m]$, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{1}\{c_i^t = k\} = p_k^t$ by definition. Then together with expression (12) and (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] &= p_j^t \left(1 - \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} p_k^t \cdot \frac{h(g_k^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} \right) + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} p_k^t \cdot p_j^t \frac{h(g_j^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} \\ &= p_j^t \cdot \left[1 + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} p_k^t \cdot \frac{h(g_j^t) - h(g_k^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} \right] \\ &= p_j^t \cdot \left[1 + \langle \mathbf{p}^t, H(\mathbf{g}^t, j) \rangle \right], \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Again, we also verify that for any $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m$ and $\mathbf{g} \in [0, 1]^m$, the family of functions $\{\langle \mathbf{p}, H(\mathbf{g}, j) \rangle\}_{j \in [m]}$ satisfies the zero-sum property $\sum_{j \in [m]} p_j \cdot \langle \mathbf{p}, H(\mathbf{g}, j) \rangle = 0$. To see this, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in [m]} p_j \cdot \langle \mathbf{p}, H(\mathbf{g}, j) \rangle &= \sum_{j \in [m]} p_j \cdot \sum_{k \in [m]} p_k \cdot \frac{h(g_j^t) - h(g_k^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} \\ &= \sum_{(j,k) \in [m] \times [m]} p_j \cdot p_k \cdot \left(\frac{h(g_j^t) - h(g_k^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} + \frac{h(g_k^t) - h(g_j^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, recall that when the score function h is an exponential with parameter β , we call the resulting protocol β -softmax-compare. Defined formally:

Local Protocol 3 (β -softmax-comparison). Let β -softmax-compare denote the comparison dynamics protocol instantiated with the score function $h_\beta(g) := \exp(\beta \cdot g)$ for some $\beta \in [0, 1]$.

A.3 Two-Neighbor Comparison Dynamics

We now introduce a third family of dynamics that assumes a slight generalization on the model specified in Section 1. In particular, we now suppose in step (ii) of the model that each node u can receive information from *two* randomly sampled neighbors. Node u can then incorporate the most recent adoption choice and reward of both neighbors to determine its own decision in the next round.

With this model variation, we state a family of natural *two-neighbor comparison* dynamics. For this, let $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a non-decreasing score function applied to a reward $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}$. Given h , these dynamics (stated from the perspective of any fixed node $u \in [n]$ at round $t + 1$ of the process) proceed as follows:

Two-Neighbor Comparison Dynamics:

Given a non-decreasing score function $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for each $u \in [n]$:

- (i) *At round t , assume:* node u adopted arm j ; u sampled nodes $v \in [n]$ and $w \in [n]$; and node v adopted arm $k \in [m]$, and node w adopted arm $\ell \in [m]$.
- (ii) *At round $t + 1$:* for $c \in \{j, k, \ell\}$, define $\rho_c = \frac{h(g_c^t)}{\sum_{b \in \{j, k, \ell\}} h(g_b^t)}$.

Then node u adopts arm $c \in \{j, k, \ell\}$ with probability ρ_c .

In other words, these dynamics simply extend the logic of (single-neighbor) comparison dynamics to the case when each node samples information from two neighbors.³

Similarly to the adoption and comparison protocols from above, we again show that under these dynamics, the coordinate-wise evolution of the distribution \mathbf{p}^t takes on a “zero-sum” form in conditional expectation:

Lemma A.1. *Let $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ be the sequence induced by running any two-neighbor comparison dynamics with score function h and reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$. Furthermore, for any $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and each $j \in [m]$, let $\mathbf{H}_j(\mathbf{g}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be the symmetric matrix whose entries are specified by:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_j(\mathbf{g})_{j,j} &= 0 \\ \mathbf{H}_j(\mathbf{g})_{k,k} &= \frac{2(h(g_j) - h(g_k))}{h(g_j) + 2h(g_k)} \quad \text{for } k \neq j \in [m] \\ \mathbf{H}_j(\mathbf{g})_{j,k} &= \frac{h(g_j) - h(g_k)}{2h(g_j) + h(g_k)} \quad \text{for } k \neq j \in [m] \\ \text{and } \mathbf{H}_j(\mathbf{g})_{k,\ell} &= \frac{h(g_j) - (h(g_k) + h(g_\ell))}{h(g_j) + h(g_k)h(g_\ell)} \quad \text{for } k \neq \ell \neq j \in [m]. \end{aligned}$$

Then for all $t \in [T]$:

$$\mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] = p_j^t \cdot \left(1 + \langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{H}_j(\mathbf{g}^t) \mathbf{p}^t \rangle \right).$$

³For simplicity, we assume these samples are independent and with replacement, and recall from Section 1 that we assume the communication graph contains self-loops.

Proof. The proof of the lemma follows similarly to those of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, but with more cases to handle the two-neighbor sampling. Again, we write $c_u^t \in [m]$ to denote the arm adopted by a node $u \in [n]$ at round $t \in [T]$, and again our strategy is to compute $\mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j]$ in two cases: (i) when $c_i^t = j$, and when $c_i^t = k \neq j$.

For the first case, when $c_i^t = j$, consider the following combinations of neighbor sampling outcomes (at round t) and adoption probabilities that could result in node $i \in [n]$ (re)adopting arm j :

1. Node i samples two nodes that both adopted arm j in round t , which occurs with probability $(p_j^t)^2$. Then node i subsequently adopts arm j in round $t + 1$ with probability 1.
2. Node i samples two neighbors that both adopted arm $k \neq j \in [m]$, which occurs with probability $(p_k^t)^2$. Then node i subsequently adopts arm j with probability $1 - h(g_k^t)/(h(g_j^t) + 2h(g_k^t))$.
3. Node i samples one neighbor that adopted arm j , and one that adopted arm $k \neq j$, which occurs with probability $2p_j^t p_k^t$. Then node i subsequently adopts arm j with probability $1 - h(g_k^t)/(2h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t))$.
4. Node i samples two neighbors that adopted arms $k \neq j$ and $\ell \neq k \neq j$ respectively, which occurs with probability $p_k^t p_\ell^t$. Then node i subsequently adopts arm j with probability $1 - (h(g_k^t) + h(g_\ell^t))/(h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t) + h(g_\ell^t))$.

Then combining each of these three cases means that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j | c_i^t = j] &= (p_j^t)^2 + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} (p_k^t)^2 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2h(g_k^t)}{h(g_j^t) + 2h(g_k^t)}\right) \\ &+ \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} 2p_j^t p_k^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{h(g_k^t)}{2h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)}\right) \\ &+ \sum_{(k, \ell); k \neq \ell \neq j \in [m]} 2p_k^t p_\ell^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{h(g_k^t) + h(g_\ell^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t) + h(g_\ell^t)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider a similar decomposition in the case when $c_i^t = k \neq j$:

1. Node i samples two nodes that both adopted arm j in round t with probability $(p_j^t)^2$, and node i subsequently readopts arm j with probability $2h(g_j^t)/(2h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t))$.
2. Node i samples one neighbor that adopted arm j , and another neighbor that adopted arm k with probability $2p_j^t p_k^t$. Then node i subsequently adopts arm j with probability $h(g_j^t)/(h(g_j^t) + 2h(g_k^t))$.
3. Node i samples one neighbor that adopted arm j and one neighbor that adopted arm $\ell \neq k \neq j \in [m]$ with probability $2p_j^t p_\ell^t$. Then node i subsequently adopts arm j with probability $h(g_j^t)/(h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t) + h(g_\ell^t))$.

Using these scenarios, we can then compute for each $k \neq j \in [m]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j | c_i^t = k] &= (p_j^t)^2 \cdot \frac{2h(g_j^t)}{2h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} + 2p_j^t p_k^t \cdot \frac{h(g_j^t)}{h(g_j^t) + 2h(g_k^t)} \\ &+ \sum_{\ell \neq k \neq j \in [m]} 2p_j^t p_\ell^t \cdot \frac{h(g_j^t)}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t) + h(g_\ell^t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then in the multiplying by p_j^t in the first case, and summing over $p_k^t \cdot \mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j | c_i^t = k]$ for each $k \neq j \in [m]$ in the second case (which converts the conditional probabilities into joint expectations), and adding the two expressions and simplifying gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j] &= p_j^t \cdot \left(\left(\sum_{k \in [m]} p_k^t \right)^2 + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} 2p_k^t p_j^t \cdot \left(\frac{h(g_j^t) - h(g_k^t)}{2h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \neq j \in [m]} (p_k^t)^2 \cdot \left(\frac{2h(g_j^t) - 2h(g_k^t)}{h(g_j^t) + 2h(g_k^t)} \right) \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{(k, \ell); k \neq \ell \neq j \in [m]} 2p_k^t p_\ell^t \cdot \left(\frac{h(g_j^t) - (h(g_k^t) + h(g_\ell^t))}{h(g_j^t) + h(g_k^t) + h(g_\ell^t)} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the binomial theorem to simplify and extract the the term $\left(\sum_{k \in [m]} p_k^t \right)^2$, which is equal to 1 given that \mathbf{p}^t is a distribution. Then using the summation form of a symmetric quadratic form, and using the definition of the entries of $\mathbf{H}_j(\mathbf{g})$ from the lemma statement, we can further simplify to write

$$\mathbb{P}_t[c_i^{t+1} = j] = p_j^t \cdot \left(1 + \langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{H}_j(\mathbf{g}) \mathbf{p}^t \rangle \right),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

B Details on Zero-Sum Multiplicative Weights Update

In this section, we prove the regret bound on the zero-sum MWU process from Theorem 2.5, restated here:

Theorem 2.5. *Consider a $T \geq 1$ round zero-sum MWU process $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ from Definition 2.3 with reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ and using a family \mathcal{F} that satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters α_1, α_2 and δ . Assume that $q_j^0 \geq \rho > 0$, and define*

$$\tilde{R}(T, j) := \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle].$$

Then for every $j \in [m]$:

$$\tilde{R}(T, j) \leq \frac{3 \log(1/\rho)}{\alpha_1} + 2 \left(\frac{\alpha_2^2}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\delta \alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \right) T.$$

For convenience, we also restate Assumption 1:

Assumption 1. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}$ be a family of potential functions satisfying the zero-sum condition from Definition 2.3, and let $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ be a sequence of rewards. For any $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta^m$, let $\mathbf{m}_j^{q,t} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}}[F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}^t)]$. Then we assume there exist $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 < 1/4$, $\delta \in [0, 1]$, and $L > 0$ such that for all j and \mathbf{g}^t :

(i) for all $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$:

$$\frac{\alpha_1}{3} |\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle - \delta| \leq |\mathbf{m}_j^{q,t}| \leq \frac{\alpha_2}{3} |\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle + \delta|$$

(ii) for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$:

$$|F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}^t) - F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}^t)| \leq L \cdot \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1 .$$

Roughly speaking, condition (i) of the assumption allows us to relate each $F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})$ to g_j in (conditional) expectation. From there, we can leverage standard approaches to proving MWU regret bounds (i.e., in the spirit of Arora et al. [AHK12]), but with some additional bookkeeping to account for the α_1, α_2 , and δ parameters. We also allow for a probabilistic lower bound on the initial mass at the j 'th coordinate, which is useful for deriving the epoch-based regret bounds from Section 2.4.

Proof (of Theorem 2.5). Fix $j \in [m]$ and $t \in [T]$. Recall that in round t , both \mathbf{q}^t and \mathbf{g}^t are random variables, where \mathbf{q}^t depends on the randomness in both $\{\mathbf{q}^{t-1}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{g}^{t-1}\}$. Then conditioning on both of these sequences (which is captured in the notation $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[\cdot]$), we can use the definition of the update rule in expression (7) to write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[q_j^t] &= \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[q_j^t \cdot (1 + F_j(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t))] \\ &= q_j^t \cdot \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[1 + F_j(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)] = q_j^t \cdot (1 + \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[F_j(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)]) . \end{aligned}$$

Here, the second equality comes from the fact that \mathbf{q}^t is a constant when conditioning on $\{\mathbf{q}^{t-1}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{g}^{t-1}\}$, and thus $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[q_j^t] = q_j^t$. Now for readability, let us define

$$m_j^t := \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[F_j(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)] ,$$

and that m_j^t is deterministic (meaning $\mathbb{E}[m_j^t] = m_j^t$), since the only remaining randomness after the conditioning is with respect to \mathbf{g}^t . Thus using the law of iterated expectation, we can ultimately write

$$\mathbb{E}[q_j^{t+1}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[q_j^{t+1}]] = \mathbb{E}[q_j^t] \cdot (1 + m_j^t) .$$

By repeating the preceding argument for each of $\mathbb{E}[q_j^{t-1}], \dots, \mathbb{E}[q_j^1]$, and setting $T = t + 1$, we find that

$$\mathbb{E}[q_j^T] = q_j^0 \cdot \prod_{t \in [T-1]} (1 + m_j^t) . \quad (14)$$

From here, we roughly follow a standard multiplicative weights analysis: first, define the sets M_j^+ and M_j^- as

$$\begin{aligned} M_j^+ &= \{t \in [T-1] : m_j^t \geq 0\} \\ \text{and } M_j^- &= \{t \in [T-1] : m_j^t < 0\} , \end{aligned}$$

where clearly $M_j^+ \cup M_j^- = [T]$. Then we can rewrite expression (14) as

$$\mathbb{E}[q_j^T] = q_j^0 \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^+} (1 + m_j^t) \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^-} (1 + m_j^t) .$$

Now for each t , define $\Delta_j^t := \mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle \in [-2, 2]$. Using this notation, observe that Assumption 1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} m_j^t &\geq \frac{\alpha_1}{3} \cdot (\Delta_j^t - \delta) \quad \text{when } m_j^t \geq 0 \\ \text{and } m_j^t &\geq \frac{\alpha_2}{3} \cdot (\Delta_j^t - \delta) \quad \text{when } m_j^t < 0 . \end{aligned}$$

Note that when $m_j^t < 0$, the latter inequality implies that $\Delta_j^t - \delta < 0$. On the other hand, when $m_j^t \geq 0$, the first inequality provides no further information on the sign of $\Delta_j^t - \delta$. Thus we define the additional two sets G_j^+ and G_j^- as

$$G_j^+ = \{t \in [T-1] : \Delta_j^t - \delta \geq 0\}$$

and $G_j^- = \{t \in [T-1] : \Delta_j^t - \delta < 0\}$.

Combining the pieces above, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[q_j^T] &\geq q_j^0 \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^+} \left(1 + \alpha_1 \frac{(\Delta_j^t - \delta)}{3}\right) \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^-} \left(1 + \alpha_2 \frac{(\Delta_j^t - \delta)}{3}\right) \\ &= q_j^0 \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} \left(1 + \alpha_1 \frac{(\Delta_j^t - \delta)}{3}\right) \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} \left(1 + \alpha_1 \frac{(\Delta_j^t - \delta)}{3}\right) \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^-} \left(1 + \alpha_2 \frac{(\Delta_j^t - \delta)}{3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe also that each $|\Delta_j^t - \delta| \in [-3, 3]$ by the definition of Δ_j^t and by the assumption that $\delta \in [0, 1]$. Thus we can then use the facts that $(1 + \alpha x) \geq (1 + \alpha)^x$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, and that $(1 + \alpha x) \geq (1 - \alpha)^{-x}$ for $x \in [-1, 0]$, which allows us to further simplify and write

$$\mathbb{E}[q_j^T] \geq q_j^0 \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} (1 + \alpha_1)^{\frac{(\Delta_j^t - \delta)}{3}} \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} (1 - \alpha_1)^{-\frac{(\Delta_j^t - \delta)}{3}} \cdot \prod_{t \in M_j^-} (1 - \alpha_2)^{-\frac{(\Delta_j^t - \delta)}{3}}.$$

Now using the fact that $q_j^T \leq 1$, taking logarithms, and multiplying through by 3, we find

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq 3 \log q_j^0 + \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} \log(1 + \alpha_1)(\Delta_j^t - \delta) \\ &\quad - \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} \log(1 - \alpha_1)(\Delta_j^t - \delta) - \sum_{t \in M_j^-} \log(1 - \alpha_2)(\Delta_j^t - \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

By definition, recall that $(\delta_j^t - \delta)$ is non-negative for $t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+$, and negative for $t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-$ and $t \in M_j^-$. Thus using the identities $\log(1 + x) \geq x - x^2$ and $-\log(1 - x) \leq x + x^2$, which both hold for all $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we can further bound expression (15) and rearrange to find

$$\begin{aligned} &3 \log(1/q_j^0) \\ &\geq \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_1^2)(\Delta_j^t - \delta) + \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} (\alpha_1 + \alpha_1^2)(\Delta_j^t - \delta) + \sum_{t \in M_j^-} (\alpha_2 + \alpha_2^2)(\Delta_j^t - \delta) \\ &= \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1 - \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1^2 - \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} \delta(\alpha_1 - \alpha_1^2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1 + \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1^2 - \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} \delta(\alpha_1 + \alpha_1^2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t \in M_j^-} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1 + \sum_{t \in M_j^-} \Delta_j^t (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) + \sum_{t \in M_j^-} \Delta_j^t \alpha_2^2 - \sum_{t \in M_j^-} \delta(\alpha_2 + \alpha_2^2). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Now in expression (16), there are seven summations which we collect into four groups, bound, and simplify as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(i)} \quad & \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1 + \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1 + \sum_{t \in M_j^-} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1 = \alpha_1 \sum_{t \in [T]} \Delta_j^t \\
\text{(ii)} \quad & - \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1^2 + \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} \Delta_j^t \alpha_1^2 + \sum_{t \in M_j^-} \Delta_j^t \alpha_2^2 \geq -\alpha_2^2 \sum_{t \in [T]} |\Delta_j^t| \\
\text{(iii)} \quad & + \sum_{t \in M_j^-} \Delta_j^t (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) \geq -(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) \sum_{t \in [T]} |\Delta_j^t| \\
\text{(iv)} \quad & - \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^+} \delta (\alpha_1 - \alpha_1^2) - \sum_{t \in M_j^+ \cap G_j^-} \delta (\alpha_1 + \alpha_1^2) - \sum_{t \in M_j^-} \delta (\alpha_2 + \alpha_2^2) \geq -2\alpha_2 \sum_{t \in [T]} \delta .
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, we use the fact that $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \implies \alpha_1^2 \leq \alpha_2^2$ (for (ii) and (iv)) and that $\Delta_j^t \geq -|\Delta_j^t|$ for any t (for (ii), (iii), and (iv)).

Substituting these groups back into expression (16), we ultimately find that

$$\begin{aligned}
3 \log(1/q_j^0) & \geq \alpha_1 \sum_{t \in [T]} \Delta_j^t - \left((\alpha_2^2 + (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)) \sum_{t \in [T]} |\Delta_j^t| + 2\alpha_2 \sum_{t \in [T]} \delta \right) \\
& \geq \alpha_1 \sum_{t \in [T]} \Delta_j^t - ((\alpha_2^2 + (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)) + \delta \alpha_2) \cdot 2T ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality comes from the fact that $|\Delta_j^t| \leq 2$ and the assumption that $\delta \leq 1$. Thus using the definition $\Delta_j^t = \mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle$, we can rearrange to write

$$\alpha_1 \sum_{t \in [T]} (\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle) \leq 3 \log(1/q_j^0) + 2(\alpha_2^2 + (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) + \delta \alpha_2) \cdot T .$$

Finally, observe for each $t \in [T]$ that $\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle = \langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}^t] \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}^t}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle]$, and recall also by assumption that $q_j^0 \geq \rho > 0$, for every j , with probability at least $1 - \gamma$. Thus with this same probability:

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}^t}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] \leq \frac{3 \log(1/\rho)}{\alpha_1} + 2 \left(\frac{\alpha_2^2}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\delta \alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \right) \cdot T .$$

Then taking expectations on both sides and using the law of iterated expectation, we find

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] \leq \frac{3 \log(1/\rho)}{\alpha_1} + 2 \left(\frac{\alpha_2^2}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\delta \alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \right) \cdot T + \gamma ,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

C Details on (α, δ, L) Parameters for Local Dynamics

In this section, we derive estimates of the parameter values α_1 , α_2 , δ , and L for our local dynamics β -softmax-compare and β -sigmoid-adopt that are needed to satisfy Assumption 1. Recall that this assumption says the following:

Assumption 1. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}$ be a family of potential functions satisfying the zero-sum condition from Definition 2.3, and let $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ be a sequence of rewards. For any $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta^m$, let $\mathbf{m}_j^{q,t} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}}[F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}^t)]$. Then we assume there exist $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 < 1/4$, $\delta \in [0, 1]$, and $L > 0$ such that for all j and \mathbf{g}^t :

(i) for all $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$:

$$\frac{\alpha_1}{3} |\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle - \delta| \leq |\mathbf{m}_j^{q,t}| \leq \frac{\alpha_2}{3} |\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle + \delta|$$

(ii) for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$:

$$|F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}^t) - F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}^t)| \leq L \cdot \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1.$$

We derive such satisfying constants for β -softmax-compare and β -sigmoid-adopt in Sections C.1 and C.2 respectively.

C.1 Parameters for β -softmax-compare

Recall β -softmax-compare (Local Protocol 3) is the instantiation of the comparison dynamics where h is the following exponential function:

$$h_\beta(g) = \exp(\beta \cdot g) \quad \text{for all } g \in \mathbb{R},$$

for some $\beta \in (0, 1]$. Then for each $j \in [m]$, we can define (for a given β):

$$F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) := \sum_{k \in [m]} q_k \cdot \left(\frac{e^{\beta g_j} - e^{\beta g_k}}{e^{\beta g_j} + e^{\beta g_k}} \right). \quad (17)$$

We will now develop the proof of Lemma C.1, which was stated in Section 2.3. For convenience, we restate the lemma here:

Lemma C.1. *Let \mathcal{F} be the zero-sum family induced by the β -softmax-compare dynamics. Then for a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ with each $\mathbf{g}^t \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$, the family \mathcal{F} satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \frac{3}{2}\beta$, $\delta = 4\beta\sigma$, and $L = 2$, for any $0 < \beta \leq 1/(4\sigma)$.*

To start, we will first develop the proof the the following lemma, which gives the α_1 , α_2 , and δ estimates for β -softmax-compare. Note that throughout, the function F_j refers specifically to the one induced by the β -softmax-compare dynamics from expression (17).

Lemma C.2. *For any $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$ and $\mathbf{g} \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$, where $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}] = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\sigma \in [1, 10]$, it holds for all $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ that*

$$\frac{\beta}{2} \cdot |\mu_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle - 4\beta\sigma| \leq |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}}[F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})]| \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot |\mu_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle + 4\beta\sigma|.$$

Note that in the above, and as mentioned in the problem setting from Section 1, we assume $\sigma \in [1, 10]$ for simplicity (and given that the means $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ are all bounded in $[-1, 1]$). Our technique yields similar bounds for larger σ at the expense of worse constants, and we omit the details.

The key step in proving Lemma C.2 is to first derive almost sure bounds on each term in F_j . Specifically, we first prove the following proposition, which “linearizes” the exponential differences.

Proposition C.3. For any $\beta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ and for all $g_j, g_k \in [-10, 10]$:

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - 2\beta\right)\beta \cdot |g_j - g_k| \leq \left| \frac{e^{\beta g_j} - e^{\beta g_k}}{e^{\beta g_j} + e^{\beta g_k}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}\beta \cdot |g_j - g_k|.$$

In the proof, we leverage concavity (and convexity) properties of the exponential differences to derive linear approximations that have the appropriate upper or lower bound property.

Proof. We begin by proving the upper bound (right hand inequality). For readability, let $x = g_j$, $y = g_k$, and define

$$\Phi(x, y) := \frac{e^{\beta x} - e^{\beta y}}{e^{\beta x} + e^{\beta y}}$$

Our goal is to show that $|\Phi(x, y)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\beta|x-y|$, and by symmetry, it suffices to prove $\Phi(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{2}\beta(x-y)$ for all $x \geq y$ when $x \in [-10, 10]$.

Fixing y , we reduce this task to a one-dimensional argument in x . Differentiating, we find

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} = \frac{2\beta e^{\beta(x+y)}}{(e^{\beta x} + e^{\beta y})^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} = \frac{-2\beta^2 e^{\beta(x+y)}(e^{\beta x} - e^{\beta y})}{(e^{\beta x} + e^{\beta y})^3}.$$

Now observe that for $x \geq y$, this second derivative is always non-positive, meaning that $\Phi(x, y)$ is concave as a function of x . Then by concavity, the tangent line (with respect to x) through $x = y$ is an upper bound on Φ for all $x \geq y$. To define this tangent line, we can evaluate $\partial\Phi/\partial x$ at $x = y$, which gives a slope of $\beta/2$. Passing the line through the point $(y, \Phi(y, y)) = (y, 0)$ gives an intercept at $-(\beta/2)y$. Together, this implies the line $\frac{\beta}{2}(x - y)$ is an upper bound on $\Phi(x, y)$ for all $x \geq y$. Since this bound holds uniformly for any fixed y , it holds in general for all pairs $x \geq y$.

We now prove the lower bound (left hand inequality) from the lemma statement. For this, we start with the case when $\Phi(x, y) \geq 0$ (meaning $x \geq y$) and again fix some $y \in [-10, 10]$. Then recall from the proof of the right hand inequality above that $\Phi(x, y)$ is concave with respect to x in this domain. Thus when $x \geq y$, it follows by concavity that any secant line (with respect to x) passing through $(y, 0)$ and $(z, \Phi(z, y))$ (for $z \geq y$) is a lower bound on Φ .

Now consider the line $f(x, y) = ((1/2) - 2\beta) \cdot \beta(x - y)$, which is one such secant through $(y, 0)$. To show that $f(x, y)$ is a lower bound on $\Phi(x, y)$ when $-10 \leq y \leq x \leq 10$, it suffices to show that $\Phi(10, y) \geq f(10, y)$ for any $\beta \geq 0$, as this would imply (by concavity) that the intersection of $f(x, y)$ and $\Phi(x, y)$ occurs at some $x \geq 10$. For this, we can take the difference

$$\Phi(10, y) - f(10, y) = \frac{e^{\beta \cdot 10} - e^{\beta y}}{e^{\beta \cdot 10} + e^{\beta y}} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - 2\beta\right) \cdot \beta(10 - y)$$

and differentiate with respect to β to find that for any $-10 \leq y \leq x$, this difference is increasing for all $0 \leq \beta \leq 1/4$. Moreover, we observe that for all y , setting $\beta = 0$ yields $\Phi(10, y) - f(10, y) = 0$. Together, this implies that the difference is non-negative for all $-10 \leq y \leq x \leq 10$ and $0 \leq \beta \leq 1/4$, and the bound holds uniformly over all such x and y .

Now in the case that $\Phi(x, y)$ is negative (meaning $x < y$), our goal is to show $\Phi(x, y) \leq ((1/2) - 2\beta) \cdot \beta(y - x)$. This can be accomplished by an identical argument as in the non-negative case, but instead leveraging the convexity (rather than concavity) of $\Phi(x, y)$ with respect to x in the domain $x < y$. We thus omit these repeated steps. Combining both cases, we conclude that $|\Phi(x, y)| \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - 2\beta\right) \cdot \beta \cdot |x - y|$ for all $x, y \in [-10, 10]$. \square

Using the bounds in Proposition C.3, we can now prove Lemma C.2.

Proof (of Lemma C.2). We begin with the upper bound (right-hand side inequality). For this, fix $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$, $\mathbf{g} \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$, $j \in [m]$, and $\beta \leq 1/4$, and again define

$$\Phi(x, y) := \frac{e^{\beta x} - e^{\beta y}}{e^{\beta x} + e^{\beta y}}.$$

To start, assume $F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) \geq 0$ and define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} C^+ &= \{k \in [m] : \Phi(g_j, g_k) \geq 0\} \\ C^- &= \{k \in [m] : \Phi(g_j, g_k) < 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can write

$$F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) = \sum_{k \in [m]} q_k \cdot \Phi(g_j, g_k) = \sum_{k \in C^+} q_k \cdot \Phi(g_j, g_k) - \sum_{k \in C^-} q_k \cdot \Phi(g_k, g_j).$$

Now recall by definition that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Phi \geq 0$ iff $x \geq y$. Then using the bounds on Φ from Proposition C.3 (which hold for $|g_j|, |g_k| \leq \sigma \leq 10$), observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(g_j, g_k) &\leq \frac{\beta}{2}(g_j - g_k) \quad \text{for } k \in C^+ \\ \text{and } \Phi(g_k, g_j) &\geq \frac{\beta}{2}(1 - 4\beta)(g_k - g_j) \quad \text{for } k \in C^-. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that we can bound F_j and rearrange to find

$$\begin{aligned} F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) &\leq \sum_{k \in C^+} q_k \cdot \frac{\beta}{2}(g_j - g_k) - \sum_{k \in C^-} q_k \cdot \frac{\beta}{2}(1 - 4\beta)(g_k - g_j) \\ &= g_j \left(\sum_{k \in C^+} q_k \frac{\beta}{2} + \sum_{k \in C^-} q_k \frac{\beta}{2}(1 - 4\beta) \right) - \left(\sum_{k \in C^+} q_k g_k \cdot \frac{\beta}{2} + \sum_{k \in C^-} q_k g_k \frac{\beta}{2}(1 - 4\beta) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot g_j - \frac{\beta}{2}(1 - 4\beta) \cdot \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where in the final inequality we use the fact that $1 - 4\beta \leq 1$. Then simplifying further and using Hölder's inequality gives

$$F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot \left(g_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g} \rangle + 4\beta \cdot \|\mathbf{g}\|_\infty \right),$$

which holds (almost surely) for $\mathbf{g} \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$ for $\sigma \in [1, 10]$. Then taking expectation conditioned on \mathbf{q} , we conclude

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}}[F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})] \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot \left(\mu_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle + 4\beta\sigma \right).$$

In the case where $F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})$ is negative, we can apply the same argument to $-F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})$, which then proves the right-hand (upper bound) inequality of the lemma statement.

To prove the left-hand (lower bound) inequality of the lemma, a similar strategy as above will find (almost surely) that

$$F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) \geq \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot (g_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g} \rangle - 4\beta \cdot |g_j|) \quad \text{when } F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) \geq 0$$

and $F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) \leq -\frac{\beta}{2} \cdot (g_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g} \rangle - 4\beta \cdot |g_j|) \quad \text{when } F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) < 0,$

for all $j \in [m]$ under the assumptions on \mathbf{g} and β from the lemma statement. Then taking expectation conditioned on \mathbf{q} and noting that all $|g_j| \leq \sigma$ yields the desired left-hand bound. \square

With Proposition C.2 in hand, we can now prove Lemma C.1:

Proof (of Lemma C.1). Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j \in [m]}$ be the family induced by the β -softmax-compare dynamics, where each F_j is as defined in expression (17). Then using Lemma C.2, we can factor out a 3 to find that condition (i) of Assumption 1 is satisfied with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = (3/2)\beta$, and $\delta = 4\sigma\beta$. We assume that $\beta \leq 1/6$ and $\beta \leq 1/(4\sigma)$, which ensures that both $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \leq 1/4$, and that $\delta \leq 1$.

For part (ii) of the assumption, observe that the range of each exponential difference, as defined in expression (17), is bounded in $[-2, 2]$, and thus $|F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) - F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g})| \leq 2\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}\|_1$ for any $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m$ and each $j \in [m]$. Thus setting $L = 2$ allows the assumption to be satisfied. \square

C.2 Parameters for β -sigmoid-adopt

Recall that β -sigmoid-adopt (Local Protocol 1) is the instantiation of an adoption dynamics with the following sigmoid adoption function $f_\beta(g) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\beta \cdot g)}$, where $\beta \in (0, 1]$. Then for each $j \in [m]$, we have from Proposition 2.1 that

$$F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}) := \sum_{k \in [m]} q_k \cdot \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta \cdot g_j}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta \cdot g_k}} \right). \quad (18)$$

Then the following lemma establishes the parameter values under which β -sigmoid-adopt satisfies Assumption 1.

Lemma C.4. *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j \in [m]}$ be the zero-sum family induced by the β -sigmoid-adopt protocol. Then for a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ with each $\mathbf{g}^t \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$, the family \mathcal{F} satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 := \frac{3}{4}\beta$, $\delta := 4\beta\sigma$, and $L := 2$, for any $\beta \leq \min\{\frac{1}{4\sigma}, \frac{1}{3}\}$.*

We start by deriving the parameters α_1, α_2 and δ . For this, in the following proposition, we establish (almost surely) two-sided bounds on the sigmoid function that are linear in g_j (analogous to the linear bounds on the softmax differences from Proposition C.3).

Proposition C.5. *For any $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$:*

$$\frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{\beta}{4} - \beta^2\right) \cdot x \leq \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta \cdot x}} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{4} \cdot x \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 10]$$

$$\frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{\beta}{4} - \beta^2\right) \cdot x \geq \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta \cdot x}} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{4} \cdot x \quad \text{for } x \in [-10, 0].$$

Proof. The proof technique is similar to that of Proposition C.3. We will verify the bounds for $x \in [0, 10]$ as the bounds for $x \in [-10, 0)$ will follow by symmetry.

Thus consider $x \in [0, 10]$. For the upper bound, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{4}x - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta x}} \geq 0$$

for all $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$. Observe that the difference is exactly 0 when $\beta = 0$, and by differentiating with respect to β , one can verify that the difference is increasing for $\beta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ when $x \geq 0$. This establishes the upper bound.

For the lower bound, we apply the same reasoning to the difference

$$\frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta x}} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\beta}{4}x + \beta^2 x \geq 0$$

for all $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$, when $0 \leq x \leq 10$. Again observe that the difference is 0 when $\beta = 0$, and we can differentiate with respect to β to find that the difference is increasing for all $\beta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ when $x \leq 10$. \square

Using Proposition C.5, we can then state the following inequalities with respect to $|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}}[F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})]|$:

Lemma C.6. *Consider the family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j \in [m]}$, where each F_j is defined as in expression (18) with parameter β . Then for any $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$ and $\mathbf{g} \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$, where $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}] = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\sigma \in [1, 10]$, it holds for all $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ that*

$$\frac{\beta}{4} \cdot |\mu_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle - 4\beta\sigma| \leq |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}}[F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})]| \leq \frac{\beta}{4} \cdot |\mu_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle + 4\beta\sigma|.$$

The key step in the proof is to observe that for fixed β any $-\sigma \leq g_j \leq g_k \leq \sigma$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta g_j}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta g_k}} &\leq \frac{\beta}{4}(g_j - g_k) + \beta^2 \sigma \\ \text{and } \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta g_j}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta g_k}} &\geq \frac{\beta}{4}(g_j - g_k) - \beta^2 \sigma, \end{aligned}$$

which follows (almost surely) from Proposition C.5. From here, we use an identical strategy as in Lemma C.2 to account for the positive and negative terms in the summation in F_j , and then take conditional expectations to derive the final bounds. As the remainder of the proof follows identically to that of Lemma C.2, we omit these details.

With Lemma C.6 in hand, the proof of Lemma C.4 follows identically to that of Lemma C.1:

Proof (of Lemma C.4). First, we use the inequalities of Lemma C.6 and factor out a 3 to establish the $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and δ parameters. Then, we again use the observation that the range of each sigmoid difference is bounded in $[-2, 2]$, and thus setting $L = 2$ suffices to satisfy condition (ii) of the assumption. \square

C.3 Parameters for β -adopt

We now consider the β -adopt protocol, which is the instantiation of an adoption dynamics with adoption function $f_\beta(g) = \beta^g(1 - \beta)^{1-g}$ for some $\beta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and where $g \in \{0, 1\}$. Recall that running this protocol induces the family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j \in [m]}$ where (by Proposition 2.1)

$$F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}) = \sum_{k \in [m]} p_j \cdot (f_\beta(g_j) - f_\beta(g_k)) \quad (19)$$

for each $j \in [m]$. We show that β -adopt satisfies Assumption 1 as follows:

Lemma C.7. *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}$ be the zero-sum family induced by the β -adopt protocol. Then for a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ where each $\mathbf{g}^t \in \{0, 1\}^m$, the family \mathcal{F} satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 := 3(2\beta - 1)$, $\delta := 0$, and $L := 2$, for any $1/2 < \beta \leq 7/8$.*

Proof. To derive the α_1 , α_2 and δ settings, observe that for a binary reward g with mean μ :

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}}[f_\beta(g)] = \mu f_\beta(1) + (1 - \mu)f_\beta(0) = \mu(f_\beta(1) - f_\beta(0)) + f_\beta(0).$$

Then applying this to every term of F_j as in expression (19), we find for any $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m$, $\mathbf{g} \in \{0, 1\}^m$ and all $j \in [m]$ that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}}[F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g})] = (f_\beta(1) - f_\beta(0)) \cdot (\mu_j - \langle \mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle),$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}] = \boldsymbol{\mu}$. For $f_\beta(g) = \beta^g(1 - \beta)^{1-g}$, it follows that $f_\beta(1) - f_\beta(0) = 2\beta - 1$. After factoring out a 3, this establishes that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 3(2\beta - 1)$ and $\delta = 0$ allows \mathcal{F} to satisfy part (i) of Assumption 1 (so long as $1/2 < \beta \leq 7/8$ to ensure that $\alpha_2 \leq 1/4$).

Also, notice that $|f_\beta(g_j) - f_\beta(g_k)| \leq 2$ for any $g_j, g_k \in \{0, 1\}$, and thus a similar argument as to the proofs of Lemmas C.1 and C.4 shows setting $L = 2$ is sufficient to satisfy condition (ii) of the assumption. \square

D Details on Coupling Error Analysis

In this appendix, we develop the proof of Lemma 2.7 (restated below) which bounds the error on the coupling from Definition 2.4:

Lemma 2.7. *Consider the sequences $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$, $\{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t\}$, and $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ from Definition 2.4 with a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ and using a family \mathcal{F} that satisfies Assumption 1 with parameter L . Let $\kappa := (3 + L)$, and assume $n \geq 3c \log n$ for some $c \geq 1$. Then for any $T \geq 1$:*

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1 \leq \tilde{O} \left(\frac{m \cdot \kappa^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{m \cdot T}{n^c} \right).$$

We start by sketching an overview of the argument. First, recall by the law of iterated expectation that for each $t \in [T]$:

$$\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 \right].$$

Then by the triangle inequality and linearity of expectation, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}\|_1 + \mathbb{E}_t \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}\|_1 + \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Here, the final equality is due to the fact that both $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}$ and \mathbf{p}^{t+1} are functions of $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ and $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$, which means $\mathbb{E}_t \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 = \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1$ for each t .

Thus in expression (20), we have decomposed the error (in conditional expectation) at each round $t+1$ as the sum of the distances between \mathbf{q}^{t+1} and $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}$ and \mathbf{p}^{t+1} . For the former, recall that \mathbf{q}^{t+1} and $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}$ are related under the randomness of \mathbf{g}^t and the same zero-sum family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j \in [m]}$. Thus if \mathbf{q}^t and \mathbf{p}^t are close, we intuitively expect \mathbf{q}^{t+1} and $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}$ to also be close. For the latter, observe that this distance is simply the deviation of \mathbf{p}^{t+1} from its (conditional) mean $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}$, which can be controlled using a Chernoff bound. We make this intuition precise via the following two propositions:

Proposition D.1. *For every $t \geq 1$: $\mathbb{E}_t \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1} - \mathbf{q}^{t+1}\|_1 \leq (2 + L) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \|\mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{q}^t\|_1$.*

Proposition D.2. *For any $c \geq 1$ and $n \geq 3c \log n$, it holds for every $t \in [T]$ simultaneously that*

$$\|\mathbf{p}^t - \widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t\|_1 \leq m \cdot \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{2mT}{n^c}$.

Granting both propositions true for now, we can then prove the main lemma:

Proof (of Lemma 2.7). Fix $c \geq 1$ and assume $n \geq 3c \log n$. By substituting the bound of Proposition D.2 into expression (20), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 &\leq \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}\|_1 + \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}\|_1 + \frac{m\sqrt{3c \log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

for all $t \in [T]$ simultaneously with probability at least $1 - \frac{2(T+1)}{n^c}$. Then substituting the bound of Proposition D.1 into expression (21), for each t we find

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 \leq (2 + L) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \|\mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1 + \frac{m\sqrt{3c \log n}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

simultaneously with probability at least $1 - \frac{2(T+1)}{n^c}$. Now recall by definition that $\mathbf{p}^0 = \mathbf{q}^0$, which implies $\mathbb{E}_0[\mathbf{q}^1] = \mathbb{E}_0[\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^1]$. Then unrolling the recurrence yields

$$\mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{q}^{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^{t+1}\|_1 \leq (3 + L)^t \cdot \frac{m\sqrt{3c \log n}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

for each $t \in [T]$, again with probability at least $1 - \frac{2(T+1)}{n^c}$. Reindexing and summing over all t yields with probability at least $1 - \frac{2T}{n^c}$:

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \|\mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1 \leq \sum_{t \in [T]} (3+L)^{t-1} \cdot \frac{m\sqrt{3c \log n}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq (3+L)^T \cdot \frac{m\sqrt{3c \log n}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Finally, taking expectations, we conclude

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1 \leq (3+L)^T \cdot \frac{m\sqrt{3c \log n}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2mT}{n^c}.$$

Hiding the leading constants and logarithmic dependence on n in the $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ expression completes the proof of the lemma. \square

It now remains to prove Propositions [D.1](#) and [D.2](#), which we do in the following subsections.

D.1 Proof of Proposition [D.1](#)

For convenience, we restate the proposition:

Proposition D.1. *For every $t \geq 1$: $\mathbb{E}_t \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1} - \mathbf{q}^{t+1}\|_1 \leq (2+L) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \|\mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{q}^t\|_1$.*

Proof. Recall by definition that

$$\begin{aligned} q_j^{t+1} &= q_j^t \cdot (1 + F_j(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)) \\ \text{and } \widehat{p}_j^{t+1} &= p_j^t \cdot (1 + F_j(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)) \end{aligned}$$

for all $j \in [m]$. For readability we will write $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}', \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}'$ for $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^{t+1}, \mathbf{p}^{t+1}, \mathbf{q}^{t+1}$, and $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}$ for $\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t$, respectively. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}' - \mathbf{q}'\|_1 &= \sum_{j \in [m]} \mathbb{E}_t |p_j - q_j + p_j \cdot F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}) - q_j \cdot F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})| \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in [m]} \mathbb{E}_t |p_j - q_j| + \mathbb{E}_t |(p_j - q_j) \cdot F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g})| + \mathbb{E}_t |q_j \cdot (F_j(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{g}) - F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g}))| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1 + \sum_{j \in [m]} \mathbb{E}_t |p_j - q_j| + q_j (L \cdot \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1) \\ &= (2+L) \cdot \mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first line follows from two applications of the triangle inequality, and the second line comes from applying the boundedness and L -Lipschitz property of each F_j from Definition [2.3](#) and part (ii) of Assumption [1](#).

Finally, because $\mathbf{p}^t = \mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}^t = \mathbf{q}$ are functions only of $\{\mathbf{p}^{t-1}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{g}^{t-1}\}$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}_t \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1 = \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1$. Thus we conclude that $\mathbb{E}_t \|\widehat{\mathbf{p}}' - \mathbf{q}'\|_1 \leq (2+L) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1$. \square

D.2 Proof of Proposition D.2

For convenience, we restate the proposition:

Proposition D.2. *For any $c \geq 1$ and $n \geq 3c \log n$, it holds for every $t \in [T]$ simultaneously that*

$$\|\mathbf{p}^t - \hat{\mathbf{p}}^t\|_1 \leq m \cdot \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{2mT}{n^c}$.

Proof. Using a standard multiplicative Chernoff bound [MU05, Corollary 4.6], we have for each $j \in [m]$ and $t \in [T]$ that

$$\mathbb{P}_{t-1} \left(\left| p_j^t - \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[p_j^t] \right| \geq \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[p_j^t] \cdot \delta \right) \leq 2 \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{n}{3} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[p_j^t] \cdot \delta^2 \right),$$

for any $0 < \delta \leq 1$. Fix $c \geq 1$, and consider the case when $\sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \leq \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[p_j^t] \leq 1$. Then setting $\delta = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[p_j^t]} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \leq 1$ implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{t-1} \left(\left| p_j^t - \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[p_j^t] \right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \right) \leq 2 \cdot \exp \left(\frac{-c \log n}{\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[p_j^t]} \right) \leq \frac{2}{n^c}.$$

On the other hand, when $0 \leq \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[p_j^t] < \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}$, setting $\delta = 1$ implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{t-1} \left(\left| p_j^t - \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[p_j^t] \right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \right) \leq 2 \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{1}{3} \cdot \sqrt{3cn \log n} \right) \leq \frac{2}{n^c},$$

where the final inequality holds for all $n \geq 3c \log n$.

Summing over all m coordinates, T rounds, and taking a union bound concludes the proof. \square

Note that as a useful corollary, we can state Proposition D.2 just with respect to a single coordinate $j \in [m]$, and decrease the error distance and probability both by a factor of m :

Corollary D.3. *Fix $j \in [m]$ and any $T \geq 1$. For any $c \geq 1$ and $n \geq 3c \log n$, it holds for every $t \in [T]$ simultaneously that*

$$|p_j^t - \hat{p}_j^t| \leq \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{2T}{n^c}$.

E Details on Analysis Framework

In this section, we provide more details on the analysis framework from Section 2.3.

E.1 Decomposition of $R(T)$

To start, we show how to approximate the regret $R(T)$ in the context of the coupling from Definition 2.4. For convenience, we first restate this coupling definition:

Definition 2.4 (Coupled Trajectories). Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}$ be a family of zero-sum functions as in Definition 2.3. Then given a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$, consider the sequences of distributions $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$, $\{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}^t\}$, and $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$, each initialized at $\mathbf{p}^0 := \mathbf{1}/m \in \Delta_m$, such that for all $j \in [m]$:

$$q_j^{t+1} := q_j^t \cdot (1 + F_j(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)), \quad (8)$$

$$\widehat{p}_j^{t+1} := \mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}] = p_j^t \cdot (1 + F_j(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)), \quad (9)$$

and where p_j^t is the average of n i.i.d. indicator random variables, each with conditional mean \widehat{p}_j^t .

Now recall from expressions (1) and (10) that we define

$$R(T) := \max_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle]$$

and $\widehat{R}(T) := \max_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] + \sum_{t \in [T]} \sigma \cdot \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{q}^t\|_1,$

where we assume $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ and $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ are specified by the coupling from Definition 2.4. Here, we show that $R(T) \leq \widehat{R}(T)$, which was stated without proof in Section 2.3.

Proposition E.1. *Consider any sequences $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ and $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ as in Definition 2.4. Then $R(T) \leq \widehat{R}(T)$ with respect to any reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ where each $\mathbf{g}^t \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$.*

Proof. First, observe that for every $t \in [T]$, we can write

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] = \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle].$$

Now recall from the definition of the problem setting that the randomness of \mathbf{g}^t is independent from that of both \mathbf{q}^t and \mathbf{p}^t . Thus together with Hölder's inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} R(T) &= \max_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] + \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] \\ &\leq \max_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] + \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{g}^t\|_\infty]. \end{aligned}$$

Now by the assumption that for each $t \in [T]$, every coordinate g_j^t of \mathbf{g}^t is drawn from a distribution whose support is bounded in $[-\sigma, \sigma]$, we have $\|\mathbf{g}^t\|_\infty \leq \sigma$. Thus we conclude

$$R(T) \leq \max_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] + \sum_{t \in [T]} \sigma \cdot \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1 =: \widehat{R}(T),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

E.2 T -Step Regret Bound

Recall from Section 2.3 that for a sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ as defined in the coupling of Definition 2.4, we can use the zero-sum MWU regret bound of Theorem 2.5 and the coupling error bound of Lemma 2.7 to derive an overall T -round regret bound. We state this bound more formally, which leverages the fact (expression (10) and Proposition E.1) that $R(T) \leq \widehat{R}(T)$:

Proposition E.2. *Consider the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ as defined in the coupling of Definition 2.4 and using a family \mathcal{F} that satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \delta$, and L . Let $\kappa := 2 + L$, and moreover assume that $\alpha = \alpha_2 = \alpha$, that $\delta = O(\alpha)$, and that the reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ is such that each $\mathbf{g}^t \in [-\sigma, \sigma]^m$. Then initialized from $\mathbf{p}^0 = \mathbf{1}/m$, for any $T \geq 1$:*

$$R(T) \leq O\left(\frac{\log m}{\alpha} + \alpha T\right) + \widetilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m \kappa^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m T}{n^c}\right).$$

The proof of the proposition follows directly from applying the zero-sum MWU regret bound of Theorem 2.5 and the coupling error bound of Lemma 2.7 to expression (10). We also make the following remarks:

Remark E.3. *In the statement of the proposition, the dependence on σ comes from the regret decomposition in expression (10), and that the $\widetilde{O}(\cdot)$ notation hides only a $\sqrt{\log n}$ in the first term, and a $\sqrt{\log m}$ dependence in the second term, both of which we assume are dominated by their respective denominators. Additionally, while we assume the (α, δ) parameters of \mathcal{F} have certain “nice” properties (which are satisfied by the corresponding families induced by our local dynamics), one can derive similar T -round regret bounds using this framework for any zero-sum family \mathcal{F} , but with different (larger) dependencies on α_1, α_2 , and δ . Thus given some family \mathcal{F} , if one can establish tighter two-sided bounds on the magnitude of each $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}}[F_j(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{g})]$ with respect to $\mu_j - \langle \mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle$ (i.e., showing $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 = 0$ and that δ is small), then tighter regret bounds can be obtained.*

Remark E.4 (Applying the Bound to j 'th Arm Regret). *We remark that the T -round regret bound in Proposition E.2 (as well as the zero-sum MWU regret bound of Theorem 2.5) can also be stated more generally with respect to any arm j that initially satisfies the requisite mass lower bound constraint (i.e., $p_j^t \geq 1/\rho$). To see this, observe that the only dependence on j in the decomposition of $\widehat{R}(T)$ (i.e., from Proposition E.1) comes from the zero-sum MWU bound on $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$, which requires a lower bound ρ on the initial mass q_j^0 . Thus if ρ is a (probabilistic) uniform lower bound on the mass of every coordinate j at round 0, then it follows that the bound in Proposition E.2 also applies more generally to the “ j -th-arm regret” of $\sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle]$.*

E.3 Epoch-Based Regret Bound

As mentioned in Section 2.3, given that the T -step regret bound in Proposition E.2 has an exponential dependence on T , we can tighten the overall regret for larger T by repeating the coupling from Definition 2.4 over a sequence of D epochs. With this approach, we obtain the following epoch-based regret bound, the proof of which we will develop further below:

Lemma E.5 (Epoch-Based Regret). *Let $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ be a sequence as in Definition 2.4 with rewards $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$, and using a family \mathcal{F} satisfying Assumption 1 with parameters $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$, $\delta = O(\alpha)$, and L . Consider a series of D epochs, each consisting of τ rounds, and set $T = D \cdot \tau$. Let*

$j := \arg \max_{k \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t$, let $\mathbf{p}^{\tau d}$ be the initial distribution of epoch $d \in [D]$, and assume each $p_j^{\tau d} > 0$. Then letting $\kappa = 3 + L$, for any $c \geq 1$ and $n \geq 3c \log n$, the regret of $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ is at most:

$$R(T) \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \sum_{d \in [D]} \log(1/p_j^{d\tau}) + \alpha T\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m \kappa^\tau \cdot D}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T}{n^c}\right).$$

Structure of Epochs: We now describe the D -epoch structure, which follows somewhat similarly to the approach used by Celis et al. [CKV17]. Specifically, we assume each epoch $d \in [D]$ consists of τ rounds with the following properties:

- (i) For each $d \in [D]$, let the d 'th epoch \mathcal{E}_d be the set of rounds $\mathcal{E}_d := \{d\tau, \dots, (d+1)\tau - 1\}$.
- (ii) Set $\mathbf{p}^0 = \mathbf{q}^0 = \mathbf{1} \cdot \frac{1}{m}$.
- (iii) For $d \geq 1$, set $\mathbf{q}^{d\tau} = \mathbf{p}^{d\tau}$.
- (iv) Then in each epoch, run the coupling as in Definition 2.4 for τ rounds.

In other words, at the start of each epoch, the trajectory of \mathbf{q}^t is initialized at the most recent point \mathbf{p}^t from the end of the previous epoch. This allows for a tighter coupling of $\{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ and $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ over all T rounds, as we can guarantee that the trajectories stay closer when the number of rounds τ is smaller than T . Using the machinery of the analysis framework (in particular, the T -step bound from Proposition E.2), we can bound the overall regret $R(T)$ by the sum of (upper bounds on) the regret of each epoch. Concretely, we note the following:

Proposition E.6. Let $j := \arg \max_{k \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t$. For each epoch $d \in [D]$ consisting of rounds \mathcal{E}_d , define

$$\widehat{R}(\mathcal{E}_d) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_d} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_d} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_d} \sigma \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{q}^t - \mathbf{p}^t\|_1.$$

Then $R(T) \leq \widehat{R}(T) = \sum_{d \in [D]} \widehat{R}(\mathcal{E}_d)$, where $\widehat{R}(T)$ is as defined in expression (10).

Proof. The proof follows directly from expression (10) and Proposition E.1. \square

Thus for each epoch $d \in [D]$ that starts from an initial distribution $\mathbf{p}^{d\tau}$, we will use Proposition E.2 to bound $\widehat{R}(\mathcal{E}_d)$, and we will subsequently obtain an overall bound on $R(T)$ after summing over all $\widehat{R}(\mathcal{E}_d)$:

Proof (of Lemma E.5). By the single-epoch regret bound in Proposition E.2 and using the definition of $\widehat{R}(\mathcal{E}_d)$ from Proposition E.6, we have for each epoch $d \in [D]$ of τ rounds that

$$\widehat{R}(\mathcal{E}_d) \leq O\left(\frac{\log(1/p_j^{d\tau})}{\alpha} + \alpha \cdot \tau\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m \kappa^\tau}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m \tau}{n^c}\right).$$

Then summing over all D epochs yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d \in [D]} \widehat{R}(\mathcal{E}_d) &\leq O\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{d \in [D]} \log(1/p_j^{d\tau}) + D \cdot \tau \alpha\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m \kappa^\tau \cdot D}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot D \tau}{n^c}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{d \in [D]} \log(1/p_j^{d\tau}) + \alpha T\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m \kappa^\tau \cdot D}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T}{n^c}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we use the fact that $T = D \cdot \tau$ by definition. Applying Proposition E.6 then yields the statement of the lemma. \square

F Details on Regret Bounds for Adversarial Rewards

In this section, we develop the proof of Theorem 2.8 (restated below), which gives a regret bound for the β -softmax-compare and β -sigmoid-adopt dynamics in the general, adversarial reward setting:

Theorem 2.8. *Consider the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by running the β -softmax-compare or β -sigmoid-adopt dynamics on an (adversarial) reward sequence initialized from $\mathbf{p}^0 = \mathbf{1}/m$. Let $T \leq (0.5 - \epsilon) \log_5 n$ for any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.5)$. Then for appropriate settings of β , for any $c \geq 1$, and n sufficiently large:*

$$\frac{1}{T} \cdot R(T) \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right).$$

For the proof of the theorem, we simply apply the T -step, single-epoch bound of Proposition E.2 using the constraint on T from the theorem statement, and we then tune the free parameter of our protocols accordingly:

Proof (of Theorem 2.8). We use the T round regret bound from Proposition E.2. Recall from Appendix C that the protocols β -softmax-compare and β -sigmoid-adopt both induce families \mathcal{F} that satisfy Assumption 1 with parameters $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = O(\beta)$, $\delta = O(\beta)$ and $L = 2$.

Thus applying the bound from Proposition E.2 with $\alpha = O(\beta)$ and dividing by T shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \cdot R(T) &\leq O\left(\frac{\log m}{T \cdot \beta} + \beta\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m \kappa^T}{T \sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m T}{n^c}\right) \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{\log m}{T \cdot \beta} + \beta\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m T}{n^c}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the final line comes from the assumption that $T \leq ((1/2) - \epsilon) \log_\kappa n$ for some $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and for $\kappa = 3 + L = 5$, and thus $\kappa^T / (T \sqrt{n}) \leq O(1/n^\epsilon)$. Finally setting $\beta := \sqrt{(\log m)/T}$, dividing by T , and simplifying yields

$$\frac{1}{T} \cdot R(T) \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m T}{n^c}\right),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

We reiterate that the theorem restricts T to be at most logarithmic in n . As discussed in Section 2.4, this constraint on the growth of T corresponds asymptotically to the longest time-horizon for which the adoption mass of every arm remains non-zero with high probability, and thus for which any meaningful regret bound can be given in this general reward setting. We demonstrate this argument more rigorously below:

Worst Case Mass Decay for any Arm Unlike the stationary mean setting, when we have no additional assumptions about how the reward sequence is generated, we can only make a very pessimistic estimate about the size of the adoption mass of any arm j . In particular, even for the arm c maximizing $\max_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t$, the weight p_c^{t+1} can be maximally decreasing with respect to p_c^t at any given round. Thus in the following lemma, we quantify this worst-case decay at any coordinate after t iterations.

Proposition F.1. *Consider the trajectory $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ from Definition 2.4 with an arbitrary reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ running with a family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j \in [m]}$ that satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters α_1, α_2 , and δ . Then for any $t \geq 1$ and $c \geq 1$ it holds for any $j \in [m]$ that*

$$p_j^{t+1} \geq p_j^0 \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^t - \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{2t}{n^c}$ when $n \geq 3c \log n$.

Proof. Fix $j \in [m]$. We use the update rule of $\mathbb{E}_t[p_j^{t+1}]$ and take expectation with respect to \mathbf{g}^t to write

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[p_j^{t+1}] = p_j^t \cdot \left(1 + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[F_j(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)]\right) \geq p_j^t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_2}{3} |\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle + \delta|\right),$$

where the inequality follows from the (worst-case) assumption that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[F_j(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t)] < 0$ and applying the bound from Assumption 1. Now under the assumptions that $|\mu_j^t| \leq 1$ and $\delta \leq 1$, it follows that $|\mu_j^t - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle + \delta| \leq 3$ for any \mathbf{p}^t and \mathbf{g}^t . Together with the fact that $\alpha_2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$ by assumption, we can write

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[p_j^{t+1}] \geq p_j^t \cdot \left(1 - \alpha_2\right) \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot p_j^t,$$

and by a Chernoff bound argument (i.e., applying the argument of Proposition D.2 at a single coordinate), we find that

$$p_j^{t+1} \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot p_j^t - \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{2}{n^c}$ for any $c \geq 1$ when $n \geq 3c \log n$. Then starting from the vector \mathbf{p}^0 at round $t = 0$, we can repeat this argument t times to find

$$p_j^{t+1} \geq p_j^0 \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^t - \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [t]} \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{i-1}\right) \geq p_j^0 \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^t - \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}},$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{2t}{n^c}$, where the second inequality follows by underestimating the negative term by an infinite geometric series. \square

Using this worst-case decay, we can derive a (pessimistic) upper bound on the number of rounds T for which, with high probability, $p_j^T \geq \frac{1}{n}$ (i.e., at least one node adopts every arm):

Proposition F.2. *Consider the trajectory $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ from Definition 2.4 with an arbitrary reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ running with a family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j \in [m]}$ that satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters α_1, α_2 , and δ . Assume that $\mathbf{p}^0 = \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}$ with probability 1. Then for any $T \leq 0.5 \cdot \log\left(\frac{3n}{192cm^2 \log n}\right)$, it holds for every $j \in [m]$ and $t \in [T]$ that $p_j^{t+1} \geq \frac{1}{n}$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{2tm}{n^c}$, for any $c \geq 1$ and $n \geq 3c \log n$.*

Proof. Using Proposition F.1, we have for any $j \in [m]$ that

$$p_j^{t+1} \geq \frac{1}{m} \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^t - \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}, \quad (22)$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{2t}{n^c}$. Now suppose that we have t , n , and m satisfying

$$\frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \leq \frac{1}{2m} \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^t. \quad (23)$$

Then it follows from expression (22) that $p_j^{t+1} \geq \frac{1}{n}$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{2t}{n^c}$ as long as $t \leq \log\left(\frac{n}{2m}\right)/\log(4/3) =: T_a$. Now checking the constraint induced by (23), we find that

$$t \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log\left(\frac{3n}{192cm^2 \log n}\right) =: T_b$$

is sufficient to ensure this inequality holds. Thus observing that $T_b \leq T_a$ for all $n, m, c \geq 1$, it follows that constraining $t \leq T_b$ is sufficient to ensure that $p_j^{t+1} \geq \frac{1}{n}$ with probability at least $1 - (2t/n^c)$. Taking a union bound over all m coordinates then yields the statement of the lemma. \square

G Details on Regret Bounds for Stationary Rewards

In this section, we develop the proof of Theorem 2.9, which gives regret bounds for the β -softmax-compare, β -sigmoid-adopt, and β -adopt protocols in the stationary reward setting. We restate the theorem here:

Theorem 2.9. *Consider the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by running the β -softmax-compare or β -sigmoid-adopt protocol in the stationary reward setting initialized from $\mathbf{p}^0 = \mathbf{1}/m$. Then there exist settings of β such that, for any $c \geq 1$ and n sufficiently large, the following bounds hold:*

(i) For any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.5)$ and $T = (0.5 - \epsilon) \log_5 n$:

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon \cdot 2^{\sqrt{\log_5 n}}} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right).$$

(ii) For any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.25]$, and $T = n^b$ for any $b > 4\epsilon$:

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{b-4\epsilon}} + \frac{1}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right).$$

Moreover, when all $\mathbf{g}^t \in \{0, 1\}^m$, the same bounds hold for the β -adopt protocol.

We develop the proof of each part of theorem separately: in Appendix G.1 for the smaller T in part (i), and in Appendix G.2 for the larger T in part (ii). For convenience and readability, we establish the setting required by both theorems in the following assumption:

Assumption 3. Consider the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ from Definition 2.4 with a zero-sum family \mathcal{F} and a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ generated by a stationary mean reward vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$, and where (without loss of generality) $\mu_1 > \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_m$. Moreover, assume the family \mathcal{F} satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \delta$, and L , such that (i) $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$; (ii) $\delta \leq a \cdot \alpha$ for some constant $a > 0$; and (iii) $L = 2$.

Remark G.1. We remark that each of that β -softmax-compare, β -sigmoid-adopt and β -adopt dynamics can be made to satisfy properties (i), (ii), and (iii) of Assumption 3. In particular, summarizing Lemmas C.1, C.4, and C.7, the families \mathcal{F} induced by these protocols yield the following parameters:

- For β -softmax-compare, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \frac{3}{2}\beta$, $\delta = 4\beta\sigma$, and $L = 2$.
- For β -sigmoid-adopt, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \frac{3}{4}\beta$, $\delta = 4\beta\sigma$, and $L = 2$.
- For β -adopt (assuming binary rewards), $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha = 3(2\beta - 1)$, $\delta = 0$, and $L = 2$.

Thus for convenience, in the development of the proof of Theorem 2.9, we consider explicit settings of α , L and a . However, for each of the three local dynamics mentioned, the corresponding setting of β can be inferred from the list above, and each dynamics also satisfies the assumption that $L = 2$ and $\delta \leq \alpha$.

G.1 Bounds for Small T

We start by proving part (i) of Theorem 2.9, which considers T logarithmic in n . For clarity, we reformulate the claim of part (i) in the following, separate theorem, which simply assumes the setting of Assumption 3.

Theorem G.2. Consider the setting of Assumption 3. Fix any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and let $T := (\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon) \log_5 n$. Then setting $\alpha := \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}$, it holds for any $c \geq 1$ and sufficiently large n that

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon \cdot 2^{\sqrt{\log_5 n}}} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right).$$

Compared to the regret bound of Theorem 2.8 for general adversarial rewards, the approximation error term in Theorem G.2 improves asymptotically by a multiplicative factor of $2^{-\sqrt{\log_5 n}}$.

The first step in the proof is to establish a sequence of lower bounds on the adoption mass of the optimal arm over an initial set of rounds. For this, we first present the following proposition, which controls the growth of the p_1^t under the setting of T and α :

Proposition G.3. Consider the settings of Assumption 3. For any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, let $b := \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$. Set $T := b \log_5 n$ and $\alpha := \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}$. Define $T_1 := \sqrt{\frac{b \log_5 n}{\log m}} \cdot \log\left(\frac{4m}{9}\right)$. Then for any $c \geq 1$ and sufficiently large n , the following two statements hold simultaneously with probability at least $1 - \frac{2T_1}{n^c}$:

- (i) $p_1^{T_1} \leq \frac{8}{9}$
- (ii) $p_1^{t+1} \geq \frac{1}{2m} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\rho \sqrt{\log m}}{\sqrt{b \log_5 n}}\right)^t$ for all $t \in [T_1]$,

where $\rho > 0$ is some absolute constant.

Proof. We start by proving statement (i). For this, note that by Assumption 1 and Assumption 3, we have in conditional expectation that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[p_1^{t+1}] \leq p_1^t \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{3} |\mu_1 - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle + \delta|\right).$$

Using the assumption that $\mu_1 > \dots > \mu_m$, that all $|\mu_j| \leq 1$, and that $\delta \leq a\alpha$, we can further simplify and write

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[p_1^{t+1}] \leq p_1^t(1 + \alpha) + \frac{a\alpha^2}{3}.$$

Now by Corollary D.3, we have with probability at least $1 - \frac{2T_1}{nc}$ simultaneously for all $t \in [T_1]$ that $p_1^{t+1} \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[p_1^{t+1}] + \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}$, and thus

$$p_1^{t+1} \leq p_1^t(1 + \alpha) + \frac{a\alpha^2}{3} + \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}.$$

Using the setting of $\alpha := \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}} = \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}}$, observe that

$$\frac{a\alpha^2}{3} + \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \leq \frac{a}{3} \cdot \frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n} + \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \leq \frac{2a}{3} \cdot \frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n} \quad (24)$$

for n sufficiently large, where the constraint on n grows larger for greater values of the constant c . It follows that

$$p_1^{t+1} \leq p_1^t(1 + \alpha) + \frac{2a}{3} \cdot \frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}.$$

Now for readability, we set $\Phi := \frac{2a}{3} \cdot \frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}$. Then starting from $p_1^0 = 1/m$ and unrolling the recurrence, we find

$$p_1^{t+1} \leq \frac{1}{m}(1 + \alpha)^t + \Phi \cdot \left(\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 + \alpha)^i \right) \quad (25)$$

$$= \frac{1}{m}(1 + \alpha)^t + \Phi \cdot \left(\frac{(1 + \alpha)^t - 1}{\alpha} \right) \quad (26)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{m}(1 + \alpha)^t + \Phi \cdot \left(\frac{(1 + \alpha)^t}{\alpha} \right) = (1 + \alpha)^t \cdot \left(\frac{1}{m} + \frac{\Phi}{\alpha} \right), \quad (27)$$

where in the second line we used the formula for the sum of a finite geometric series. By the settings of α and Φ , we have

$$\frac{\Phi}{\alpha} = \frac{2a}{3} \cdot \frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{b \log_5 n}}{\sqrt{\log m}} = \frac{2a}{3} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}} \leq \frac{2}{m}$$

for n sufficiently large. Thus we can further write

$$p_1^{t+1} \leq \frac{2}{m} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}} \right)^t.$$

Then using the fact that $1 + x \leq e^x$, we have that

$$p_1^{T_1} \leq \frac{2}{m} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}} \right)^{T_1} \leq \frac{2}{m} \exp \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}} \cdot T_1 \right) \leq \frac{8}{9}$$

so long as $T_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{b \log_5 n}{\log m}} \cdot \log\left(\frac{4m}{9}\right)$, which is sufficient to prove claim (i) of the proposition.

To prove claim (ii), we follow similarly to start, but work in the other direction. For this, we again use Assumptions 1 and 3 to write

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[p_1^{t+1}] \geq p_1^t \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{3} |\mu_1 - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle - \delta|\right) \geq p_1^t \left(1 + \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)\alpha(1 - p_1^t)}{3}\right) + \frac{a\alpha^2}{3}, \quad (28)$$

where we used the fact that $\mu_1 - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle \geq (\mu_1 - \mu_2)(1 - p_1^t)$ by the ordering of the coordinates of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Then again using Corollary D.3, we have with the same simultaneous probability as in the proof of claim (i) that $p_1^{t+1} \geq \mathbb{E}_{p_1^t}[p_1^{t+1}] - \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}$ for all $t \in [T_1]$. Combined with the bound in expression (24), we can then write

$$\begin{aligned} p_1^{t+1} &\geq p_1^t \left(1 + \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \cdot \alpha(1 - p_1^t)}{3}\right) + \frac{2a}{3} \cdot \frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n} \\ &\geq p_1^t \left(1 + \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \cdot \alpha}{27}\right) + \frac{2a}{3} \cdot \frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n} \\ &= p_1^t \left(1 + \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{27} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}}\right) + \frac{2a}{3} \cdot \frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the second inequality comes from claim (i) of the proposition, where we showed that $p_1^t \leq 8/9$ during the first T_1 rounds under the same probability, and the final equality comes from the setting of α . Now again for readability we define

$$\lambda := \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{27} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi := \frac{2a}{3} \cdot \frac{\log m}{b \log_5 n}.$$

Then starting from $p_1^0 = 1/m$ and using a similar calculation as in expressions (25) through (27), we find

$$p_1^{t+1} \geq (1 + \lambda)^t \cdot \left(\frac{1}{m} - \frac{\Phi}{\lambda}\right).$$

Now by the settings of λ and ϕ , observe that

$$\frac{1}{m} - \frac{\Phi}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{m} - \frac{18a}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{b \log_5 n}}{\sqrt{\log m}} \leq \frac{1}{2m}$$

for n sufficiently large. Then setting $\rho := \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{27}$ yields

$$p_1^{t+1} \geq \frac{1}{2m} \left(1 + \frac{\rho \cdot \sqrt{\log m}}{\sqrt{b \log_5 n}}\right)^t,$$

which concludes the proof of claim (ii). □

We are now ready to prove Theorem G.2.

Proof (of Theorem G.2). Let $b := \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$. Our strategy proceeds as follows:

- (1) First, we consider a phase of $T_1 = \sqrt{\frac{b \log_5 n}{\log m}} \cdot \log\left(\frac{4m}{9}\right)$ rounds. By Proposition G.3, we can control the growth of p_1^t during this sequence of rounds, which allows us to obtain a cumulative regret bound using the epoch-based framework of Lemma E.5 using short epoch lengths.
- (2) Then, we consider a final phase of $T_2 = T - T_1 \leq b \log_5 n - \sqrt{\frac{b \log_5 n}{\log m}}$ rounds, and apply the cumulative regret bound of Proposition E.2.

Summing up the cumulative regrets of both phases and dividing by T will then yield the statement of the theorem.

We start with the bound for the first phase in step (1). For this, consider a sequence of D epochs of length τ , where $D \cdot \tau = T_1$. Then applying Proposition G.3, we have with probability at least $1 - \frac{2T_1}{n^c}$ simultaneously for all epochs $d \in [D]$ that

$$p_1^{\tau d} \geq \frac{1}{2m} \left(1 + \frac{\rho \cdot \sqrt{b \log_5 n}}{\sqrt{\log m}} \right)^{(\tau d)}.$$

Then with this same probability, we have

$$\sum_{d \in [D]} \log\left(\frac{1}{p_1^{\tau d}}\right) \leq \sum_{d \in [D]} \log(2m) - \log\left(1 + \frac{\rho \cdot \sqrt{\log m}}{\sqrt{b \log_5 n}}\right)^{(\tau d)} \quad (29)$$

$$\leq D \log(2m) - D^2 \cdot \tau \log\left(1 + \frac{\rho \cdot \sqrt{\log m}}{\sqrt{b \log_5 n}}\right). \quad (30)$$

Setting $D := \sqrt{\frac{b \log_5 n}{\log m}}$ and $\tau := \log\left(\frac{4m}{9}\right)$ (so that $D\tau = T_1$), one can verify that the right hand side of expression (30) is at most $O(\log m)$ for sufficiently large n , with a leading constant depending on b and ρ , (which we also assume are absolute constants). Let $R(\mathcal{P}_1)$ denote the cumulative regret over the first T_1 rounds. Then applying the epoch-based cumulative regret bound from Lemma E.5 for these first T_1 rounds, this means

$$\begin{aligned} R(\mathcal{P}_1) &\leq O\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \sum_{d \in [D]} \log\left(\frac{1}{p_1^{\tau d}}\right) + \alpha \cdot T_1\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m 5^\tau \cdot D}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m T_1}{n^c}\right) \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{\log m}{\alpha} + \alpha \cdot T_1\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m T_1}{n^c}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

In the final line, we applied the aforementioned bound on expression (30) in the first term and hide the lower-order logarithmic dependencies in the second term that arise from the settings of D and τ .

We now bound the regret of the second phase, which consists of the next $T_2 = T - T_1$ rounds. Let $R(\mathcal{P}_2)$ denote the cumulative regret of this second phase of rounds. Now observe that the claim (ii) of Proposition G.3 implies that p_1^t is non-decreasing for each of the first T_1 rounds with high probability. Thus it follows at the first round $t = T_1 + 1$ of this second phase that $p^t \geq 1/m$ with this same probability. Then applying the (single-epoch) bound from Proposition E.2, we have

$$R(\mathcal{P}_2) \leq O\left(\frac{\log m}{\alpha} + \alpha \cdot T_2\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m 5^{T_2}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T_2}{n^c}\right).$$

Now observe that $T_2 = T - T_1 \leq b \log_5 n - \sqrt{\frac{b \log_5 n}{\log m}}$ and $b = \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$, and thus

$$\frac{5^{T_2}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{5^T \cdot 5^{(-T_1)}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \cdot 5^{-\sqrt{(b \log_5 n)/\log m}}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{1}{n^\epsilon \cdot 5^{\sqrt{(b \log_5 n)/\log m}}}$$

Then it follows that we can write

$$R(\mathcal{P}_2) \leq O\left(\frac{\log m}{\alpha} + \alpha \cdot T_2\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon \cdot 5^{\sqrt{(b \log_5 n)/\log m}}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T_2}{n^c}\right).$$

Then summing the cumulative regrets over both phases yields

$$\begin{aligned} R(\mathcal{P}_1) + R(\mathcal{P}_2) &\leq O\left(\frac{\log m}{\alpha} + \alpha \cdot T\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon \cdot 5^{\sqrt{(b \log_5 n)/\log m}}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T}{n^c}\right) \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{\log m}{\alpha} + \alpha \cdot T\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon \cdot 5^{\sqrt{(b \log_5 n)/\log m}}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T}{n^c}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, substituting the setting of $\alpha := \sqrt{\log m/T}$ and dividing by $T \geq 1$ shows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R(T)}{T} &\leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon \cdot 5^{\sqrt{(b \log_5 n)/\log m}}} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right) \\ &\leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon \cdot 2^{\sqrt{\log_5 n}}} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $5^{-\sqrt{(b \log_5 n)/\log m}} = o(2^{-\sqrt{\log_5 n}})$ which completes the proof. \square

G.2 Bounds for Large T

We now consider the case when T is polynomial in n , and prove part (ii) of Theorem 2.9. Again, we restate this as a separate theorem under the setting of Assumption 3.

Theorem G.4. *Consider the setting of Assumption 3. Fix any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.25]$, and let set $\alpha := \frac{1}{n^{2\epsilon}}$. Then consider any $T := n^b$, for any $b > 4\epsilon$. Then for any $c \geq 1$ and sufficiently large n :*

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{b-4\epsilon}} + \frac{1}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right).$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem G.2, we start by proving the following proposition, which, analogously to Proposition G.3 for the small T regime, establishes the growth of p_1^t under the setting of α from the theorem statement.

Proposition G.5. *Consider the settings of Assumption 3. Fix any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.25]$, and set $\alpha := \frac{1}{n^{2\epsilon}}$. Define*

$$\gamma := \frac{\rho \cdot m \sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^\epsilon},$$

where $\rho > 0$ is some absolute constant, and let $T_1 := 2n^{2\epsilon} \log(2m(1-\gamma))$. Consider any total number of rounds $T \geq T_1$. Then for any $c \geq 1$ and sufficiently large n , the following statements hold simultaneously with probability at least $1 - \frac{2T}{n^c}$:

(i) $p_1^{t+1} \geq \min\{p_1^t, 1 - \gamma\}$ for all $t \in [T]$.

(ii) $p_1^{T_1+1} \geq 1 - \gamma$.

Proof. The start of the proof follows similarly as to that of claim (ii) in Proposition G.3. There, in equation (28), we showed that, under the settings of Assumptions 1 and 3, in conditional expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[p_1^{t+1}] \geq p_1^t(1 + \frac{\alpha}{3}|\mu_1 - \langle \mathbf{p}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle - \delta|) \geq p_1^t \left(1 + \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)\alpha(1 - p_1^t)}{3}\right) + \frac{a\alpha^2}{3}. \quad (32)$$

Together with the Chernoff bound from Corollary D.3, we have with probability at least $1 - \frac{2T}{nc}$ simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$ that $p_1^{t+1} \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[p_1^{t+1}] - \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}$, and thus

$$p_1^{t+1} \geq p_1^t \left(1 + \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \cdot \alpha(1 - p_1^t)}{3}\right) - \frac{a\alpha^2}{3} - \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}. \quad (33)$$

We start by proving claim (i) of the proposition. For this, note that expression (33) is concave and increasing in $p_1^t \in [0, 1]$ under the constraints of the parameters and sufficiently large n . Thus suppose $p_1^t = 1 - \gamma$ and the right hand side of (33) is no less than $1 - \gamma$ (and therefore $p_1^{t+1} \geq 1 - \gamma$). Then this also implies that $p_1^{t+1} \geq 1 - \gamma$ when $p_1^t > 1 - \gamma$. So to prove claim (ii), it suffices to check that $p_1^{t+1} \geq p_1^t$ for $1/m \leq p_1^t \leq 1 - \gamma$.

For this, it is sufficient to establish that

$$\frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \cdot \alpha \cdot p_1^t(1 - p_1^t)}{3} \geq \frac{a\alpha^2}{3} + \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}}. \quad (34)$$

Now by the setting of $\alpha = 1/n^{2\epsilon}$ and the constraint $p_1^t \leq 1 - \gamma$, observe that the left hand side of expression (34) is at least

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \cdot \alpha(1 - p_1^t)}{3} &\geq \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{3} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n^\epsilon}\right) \left(\frac{\rho \cdot m \sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^\epsilon}\right) \\ &= \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{3} \cdot \left(\frac{\rho \cdot m \sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^{2\epsilon}}\right) \\ &= \frac{4 \cdot m \sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^{2\epsilon}}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where in the last line we set $\rho := 12/(\mu_1 - \mu_2)$. Moreover, again using the setting of $\alpha = 1/n^{2\epsilon}$ and the fact that $\epsilon \in (0, 0.25]$, we can bound the right hand side of (34) by

$$\frac{a\alpha^2}{3} + \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \leq \frac{a}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{2\epsilon}} + \sqrt{\frac{3c \log n}{n}} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^{2\epsilon}} \quad (36)$$

for n sufficiently large. Then combining these two bounds, we have that equation (34) is satisfied for any $m \geq 2$, which concludes the proof of claim (i).

Now to prove claim (ii) of the proposition, we again assume in the worst case that $p_1^t \leq 1 - \gamma$ for all $t \in [T_1]$. Otherwise, by claim (i), $p_1^{t'} \geq 1 - \gamma$ for all subsequent $t' > t$ and claim (ii) trivially holds.

Thus in the case that $p_1^t \leq 1 - \gamma$, we can combine expressions (33), (35), and (36) to write

$$p_1^{t+1} \geq p_1^t \left(1 + \frac{4 \cdot m \sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^{2\epsilon}} \right) - \frac{2\sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^{2\epsilon}}. \quad (37)$$

For readability, we let

$$\lambda := \frac{4 \cdot m \sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^{2\epsilon}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi := \frac{2\sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^{2\epsilon}},$$

which means we can rewrite equation (37) as

$$p_1^{t+1} \geq p_1^t (1 + \lambda) - \Phi, \quad (38)$$

and recall that this bound holds with probability at least $1 - \frac{T}{n^c}$ simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$.

Then starting at $p_1^0 = 1/m$ and using a similar calculation as in expressions (25) through (27) in the proof of Proposition G.3, we unroll the recurrence to find that

$$p_1^{t+1} \geq \frac{1}{m} (1 + \lambda)^t - \Phi \cdot \left(\frac{(1 + \lambda)^t}{\lambda} \right) = (1 + \lambda)^t \cdot \left(\frac{1}{m} - \frac{\Phi}{\lambda} \right). \quad (39)$$

By definition, it follows that $\frac{\Phi}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{2m}$ and $\lambda \geq \frac{m\sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^{2\epsilon}}$, and thus we can further simplify expression (39) by

$$p_1^{t+1} \geq \frac{1}{2m} \cdot (1 + \lambda)^t \geq \frac{1}{2m} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{m\sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^{2\epsilon}} \right)^t \geq \frac{1}{2m} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{n^{2\epsilon}} \right)^t.$$

Now using this lower bound on the growth of p_1^t , we show that $p_1^{T_1+1}$ is at least $1 - \gamma$. For this, recall the identity that $e^{x/2} \leq 1 + x$ for all $x \in (0, 1)$. Then we can estimate

$$p_1^{T_1+1} \geq \frac{1}{2m} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{n^{2\epsilon}} \right)^{T_1} \geq \frac{1}{2m} \cdot \exp \left(\frac{T_1}{2n^{2\epsilon}} \right).$$

Thus to prove claim (ii), it is sufficient to check that

$$\frac{1}{2m} \cdot \exp \left(\frac{T_1}{2n^{2\epsilon}} \right) \geq 1 - \gamma.$$

Rearranging and taking logarithms, observe this constraint is satisfied so long as

$$T_1 \geq 2n^{2\epsilon} \log(2m(1 - \gamma)),$$

which holds by the setting of T_1 from the statement of the proposition. This completes the proof. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem G.4.

Proof (of Theorem G.4). Recall from the statement of the theorem that we fix $\epsilon \in (0, 0.25]$ and set

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{n^{2\epsilon}} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma := \frac{\rho \cdot m \sqrt{3c \log n}}{n^\epsilon},$$

and recall that $T := n^b$ for any $b > 4\epsilon$. Our strategy in bounding $R(T)/T$ then proceeds in three phases:

- (1) First, we consider a phase of $T_1 = 2n^{2\epsilon} \log(2m(1 - \gamma))$ rounds. We use the epoch-based bound from Lemma E.5 with small epoch lengths to bound the cumulative regret during this phase of steps. By Proposition G.5, we can establish that after T_1 steps, $p_1^{t+1} \geq 1 - \gamma$ for all subsequent $T_1 \leq t \leq T$ with high probability. Thus while the average regret over the first T_1 steps is not sublinear, a straightforward calculation then shows that the per-round regret $\mu_1 - \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle]$ is at most γ for every subsequent round with high probability. We will denote the cumulative regret over the first T_1 steps by $R(\mathcal{P}_1)$.
- (2) Thus, we consider a second phase of $T_2 = n^{4\epsilon} - T_1$ rounds, where by the guarantees mentioned above, the average regret over this next phase of steps is at most γ . We will denote the cumulative regret over the next T_2 steps by $R(\mathcal{P}_2)$.
- (3) Finally, we consider a final phase of the $T_3 = T - T_1 - T_2$ steps, and again we establish that the average regret over this final phase of steps is at most γ . We denote the cumulative regret over the final T_3 steps by $R(\mathcal{P}_3)$.

Summing up $R(\mathcal{P}_1) + R(\mathcal{P}_2) + R(\mathcal{P}_3)$ and dividing by T will then yield the statement of the theorem. We thus start by bounding $R(\mathcal{P}_1)$. For this, we take $\tau = O(1)$ and $D = O(n^{2\epsilon} \log(2m))$ such that $D\tau = T_1$. Observe that Proposition G.5 implies $p_1^t \geq 1/m$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{2T_1}{n^c} \geq 1 - \frac{2mT_1}{n^c}$. Then by the epoch-based regret bound of Lemma E.5, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
R(\mathcal{P}_1) &\leq O\left(\frac{D \log m}{\alpha} + \alpha \cdot T_1\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T_1}{n^c}\right) \\
&\leq O\left(n^{4\epsilon} \log^2 m + \frac{n^{2\epsilon} \log(2m)}{n^{2\epsilon}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T_1}{n^c}\right) \\
&\leq \tilde{O}\left(n^{4\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T_1}{n^c}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we plugged in the settings of α , T_1 and D .

Now in the stationary reward setting, note by definition that we can write the cumulative regret $R(\mathcal{P}_2)$ as

$$R(\mathcal{P}_2) = T_2 \cdot \mu_1 - \sum_{t=T_1+1}^{T_2} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle].$$

By the ordering of coordinates of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, it follows for any round t that

$$\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle = \sum_{j \in [m]} p_j^t \mu_j \geq p_1^t \mu_1 + (1 - p_1^t) \mu_m = (\mu_1 - \mu_m) p_1^t + \mu_m.$$

By Proposition G.5, we have with probability at least $1 - 2T/n^c$ simultaneously over all $T_1 < t \leq T$ that $p_1^t \geq 1 - \gamma$, and thus it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
R(\mathcal{P}_2) &\leq T_2 \cdot (\mu_1 - ((\mu_1 - \mu_m) p_1^t + \mu_m)) + \frac{2T}{n^c} \\
&= T_2 \cdot (\mu_1 - \mu_m)(1 - p_1^t) + \frac{2T}{n^c} \\
&\leq O\left(T_2 \cdot \gamma + \frac{2T}{n^c}\right) \leq \tilde{O}\left(n^{3\epsilon} + \frac{2T}{n^c}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the final line we used the fact that $T_2 = n^{4\epsilon} - T_1 \leq n^{4\epsilon}$ and the setting of $\gamma = \tilde{O}(1/n^\epsilon)$.

For the third phase of $T_3 = T - T_1 - T_2 \leq T$ rounds, an identical argument to that of the second phase yields

$$R(\mathcal{P}_2) \leq \tilde{O}\left(T \cdot \gamma + \frac{T}{n^c}\right).$$

In total, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} R(T) &= R(\mathcal{P}_1) + R(\mathcal{P}_2) + R(\mathcal{P}_3) \\ &\leq \tilde{O}\left(n^{4\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T_1}{n^c}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(n^{3\epsilon} + \frac{2T}{n^c}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(T \cdot \gamma + \frac{T}{n^c}\right) \\ &\leq \tilde{O}\left(n^{4\epsilon} + T \cdot \gamma + \frac{\sigma m \cdot T}{n^c}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then dividing by $T = n^b$ and recalling that $\gamma = \tilde{O}(1/n^\epsilon)$, we find

$$\frac{R(T)}{T} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{b-4\epsilon}} + \frac{1}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

H Details on Convex Optimization Application

Here, we develop the proof of Theorem 2.10, which gives an error rate on the regret obtained using our comparison and adoption dynamics to approximately optimize a convex function $f : \Delta_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ when the reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ is generated using a stochastic gradient oracle as specified in Assumption 2. For convenience, we restate the theorem here:

Theorem 2.10. *Given a convex function $f : \Delta_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consider the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ induced by running the β -softmax-compare or β -sigmoid-adopt protocol on a reward sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ generated as in Assumption 2 with gradient bound G . Let $T \leq (0.5 - \epsilon) \log_5 n$ for any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.5)$, and let $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbf{p}^t$. Define $\text{err}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}) := \mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{\mathbf{p}})] - \min_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m} f(\mathbf{p})$. Then for appropriate settings of β , any $c \geq 1$, and n sufficiently large:*

$$\text{err}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}) \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{G^2 \log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(G\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m}{n^c}\right)\right).$$

First, we note that this error rate is equivalent to our regret bound from the adversarial setting up to the factor G , which is a standard dependence. Note also that the optimization error is defined *implicitly*: the function f is being minimized with respect to the distribution \mathbf{p}^t induced by the local dynamics. This is contrast to other settings of gossip-based, decentralized optimization (e.g., [KSJ19, SBB⁺17, TGZ⁺18]), where each node $i \in [n]$ has first-order gradient access to an individual local function f_i , and the population seeks to perform empirical risk minimization over the n functions.

Now in order to prove the theorem, we first require relating the regret of the trajectory $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ to the expected primal gap $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{p}^t) - f(\mathbf{p}^*)]$ where $\mathbf{p}^* \in \Delta_m$ is a function minimizer of f . For this, we give the following lemma, which follows similarly to that of Arora et al. [AHK12, Theorem 3.11], but is adapted to handle stochastic rewards.

Lemma H.1. Let $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ be a sequence of distributions, and let $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ be a sequence of rewards generated as in Assumption 2 with respect to a convex function f and gradient bound G . Then for any $T \geq 1$, letting $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbf{p}^t$ and $\mathbf{p}^* := \arg \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m} f(\mathbf{p})$:

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{\mathbf{p}})] - f(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq G \sum_{j \in [m]} p_j^* \cdot \left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] \right).$$

Proof. First, recall by the first-order definition of convexity that for any $\mathbf{p}^t \in \Delta_m$:

$$f(\mathbf{p}^*) \geq f(\mathbf{p}^t) + \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{p}^t), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}^t \rangle.$$

Rearranging and summing over all t gives

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} f(\mathbf{p}^t) - f(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq \sum_{t \in [T]} \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{p}^t), \mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle.$$

Now taking expectations on both sides, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{p}^t) - f(\mathbf{p}^*)] &\leq \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{p}^t), \mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle] \\ &= \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{p}^t), \mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle]] \\ &= \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[\nabla f(\mathbf{p}^t)], \mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle], \end{aligned}$$

where we applied the law of iterated expectation. Now recall that under Assumption 2, each reward \mathbf{g}^t is of the form: $\mathbf{g}^t = -(\nabla f(\mathbf{p}^t)/G) + \mathbf{b}^t$, where \mathbf{b}^t is a zero-mean random vector. Thus for every t , it follows that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}^t}[\nabla f(\mathbf{p}^t)] = -G \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}^t]$. This allows us to further simplify and write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{p}^t) - f(\mathbf{p}^*)] &\leq \sum_{t \in [T]} -G \cdot \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{g}^t, \mathbf{p}^t - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle] \\ &= G \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] = G \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle]. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Given that \mathbf{p}^* is fixed, observe for every t that $\mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] = \langle \mathbf{p}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^t \rangle = \sum_{j \in [m]} p_j^* \cdot \mu_j^t$, and substituting this back into (40) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{p}^t) - f(\mathbf{p}^*)] &\leq G \sum_{t \in [T]} \left(\sum_{j \in [m]} p_j^* \cdot \mu_j^t \right) - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] \\ &= G \sum_{j \in [m]} p_j^* \cdot \left(\sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Here, the last line follows from the fact that $\sum_{j \in [m]} p_j^* = 1$ and that $\mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle]$ has no dependence on j . Now on the other hand, given that f is convex, observe also by Jensen's inequality that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} f(\mathbf{p}^t) \geq f\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbf{p}^t\right) = f(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}),$$

which holds given that $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ is a convex combination of points. Thus taking expectation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{\mathbf{p}})] - f(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{p}^t)] - f(\mathbf{p}^*). \quad (42)$$

Finally, multiplying expression (41) by $\frac{1}{T}$ and combining it with expression (42) yields the statement of the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.10

Given the sequence $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$, observe that Lemma H.1 allows us to upper bound the minimization error at the point $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ by a convex combination of the “arm- j regret,” i.e., the quantity $\sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle]$. Now recall from the points made in Remark E.4 that if we have an initial uniform lower bound on the adoption mass p_j^t at every arm j , then the regret bound from Proposition E.2 can also be used to bound the quantity $\sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle]$ for each j .

Note that in the context of Assumption 2, we assume that the reward generation sequence $\{\mathbf{g}^t\}$ is adversarial in the sense that the means $\boldsymbol{\mu}^t$ will vary with time. For this reason, we require the same set of constraints on T as in Theorem 2.8 for the general, adversarial reward setting (i.e., T can grow at most logarithmically in n). Then we can similarly apply the regret bound from Proposition E.2 with T constrained as in Theorem 2.8, and starting from the uniform distribution $\mathbf{p}^0 = \mathbf{1}/m$.

Thus using a similar calculation as in Theorem 2.8, using the arguments above from Remark E.4, and subject to the constraints on T , we have for each $j \in [m]$:

$$\frac{1}{T} \cdot \sum_{t \in [T]} \mu_j^t - \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{g}^t \rangle] \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{T}}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sigma m}{n^\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma m T}{n^c}\right).$$

where $\{\mathbf{p}^t\}$ is the sequence induced using the β -softmax-compare or β -sigmoid-adopt protocols with appropriately tuned β (in particular, the same settings as in Theorem 2.8).

Now because the right hand side of this expression is uniform over all $j \in [m]$, taking a convex combination of this inequality with respect to \mathbf{p}^* , multiplying both sides by G , and applying the reduction from Lemma H.1 yields the statement of Theorem 2.8.