

Stop Relying on No-Choice and Don't Repeat the Moves: Optimal, Efficient and Practical Algorithms for Assortment Optimization

Aadirupa Saha*

Pierre Gaillard†

Abstract

We address the problem of active online assortment optimization problem with preference feedback, which is a framework for modeling user choices and subsetwise utility maximization. The framework is useful in various real-world applications including ad placement, online retail, recommender systems, fine-tuning language models, amongst many. The problem, although has been studied in the past, lacks an intuitive and practical solution approach with simultaneously efficient algorithm and optimal regret guarantee. E.g., popularly used assortment selection algorithms often require the presence of a ‘strong reference’ which is always included in the choice sets, further they are also designed to offer the same assortments repeatedly until the reference item gets selected—all such requirements are quite unrealistic for practical applications. In this paper, we designed efficient algorithms for the problem of regret minimization in assortment selection with *Plackett Luce* (PL) based user choices. We designed a novel concentration guarantee for estimating the score parameters of the PL model using ‘*Pairwise Rank-Breaking*’, which builds the foundation of our proposed algorithms. Moreover, our methods are practical, provably optimal, and devoid of the aforementioned limitations of the existing methods. Empirical evaluations corroborate our findings and outperform the existing baselines.

1 Introduction

Studies have shown that it is often easier, faster and less expensive to collect feedback on a relative scale rather than asking ratings on an absolute scale. E.g., to understand the liking for a given pair of items, say (A,B), it is easier for the users to answer preference-based queries like: “Do you prefer Item A over B?”, rather than their absolute counterparts: “How much do you score items A and B in a scale of [0-10]?”. Due to the widespread applicability and ease of data collection with relative feedback, learning from preferences has gained much popularity in the machine-learning community, especially the active learning literature which has applications in Medical surveys, AI tutoring systems, Multi-player sports/games, or any real-world systems that have ways to collect feedback in terms of preferences.

The problem is famously studied as the *Dueling-Bandit* (DB) problem in the active learning community [2, 34–37], which is an online learning framework for identifying a set of ‘good’ items from a fixed decision-space (set of items) by querying preference feedback of actively chosen item-pairs.

Consequently, the generalization of Dueling-Bandits, with *subset-wise* preferences has also been developed into an active field of research. For instance, in applications like web search, online shopping, recommender systems typically involve users expressing preferences by clicking on/choosing one result (or a handful of results) from a subset of offered items and often the objective of the

*Apple. This work started when the author was at TTI, Chicago; aadirupa@ttic.edu.

†Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Inria, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LJK, 38000 Grenoble, France.; pierre.gaillard@inria.fr.

system is to identify the ‘most-profitable’ subset to offer to their users. The problem, popularly termed as ‘Assortment Optimization’ is studied in many interdisciplinary literature, e.g. Online learning and bandits [8], Operations research [1, 33], Game theory [13], RLHF [18, 26], to name a few.

Problem (Informal): Active Optimal Assortment (AOA) Active Assortment Optimization (a.k.a. Utility Maximization with Subset Choices) [1, 11, 20, 21] is an active learning framework for finding the ‘optimal’ profit-maximizing subset. Formally, assume we have a decision set of $[K] := \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ of K items, with each item being associated with the score (or utility) parameters $\theta := (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_K > 0)$ (without loss of generality assume $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2 \geq \dots \geq \theta_K$). At each round $t = 1, 2, \dots$, the learner or the algorithm gets to query an assortment (typically subsets containing up to m -items) $S_t \subseteq [K]$, upon which it gets to see some (noisy) relative preferences across the items in S_t , typically generated according to some underlying choice models based on the utilities θ . Further, to allow the occurrence of the event where no items are selected, we also model a No-Choice (NC) item, indexed by item-0, with its corresponding PL parameter $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

(Objective 1.) Top- m -AOA: One simplest objective could be to just identify the top- m item-set: $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$, for some $m \in [1, K]$.

(Objective 2.) Wtd-Top- m -AOA: A more general objective could also consider a weight (or price) $r_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ associated with the item $i \in [K]$, and the goal could be to identify the assortment (subset) with maximum weighted utility¹. Precise technical details are provided in Sec. 2.

Related Works and Limitations: As stated above, the problem of AOA is fundamental in many practical scenarios, and thus widely studied in multiple research areas, including Online ML/learning theory and operations research.

- In the Online ML literature, the problem is well-studied as *Multi-Dueling Bandits* [12, 32], or *Battling Bandits* [9, 29, 30], which is an extension of the famous *Dueling Bandit* problem [35, 36]. The main limitation of this line of work is the lack of practical objectives, which either aim to identify the ‘best-item’ $1 (= \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \theta_i)$ within a PAC (probably approximately correct) framework [15, 16, 27, 31] or quantifying regret against the best items [10, 30]. Note the latter actually leads to the optimal subset choice of repeatedly selecting the optimal item, $\arg \max_i \theta_i$, m times, i.e. $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$, which is highly unrealistic from the viewpoint of real-world system design. Selecting an assortment of distinct top- m items (Top- m -AOA) or maximum expected utility (Wtd-Top- m -AOA) makes more sense.

- On the other hand, a similar line of the problem has been studied in operations research and dynamic assortment selection literature, where the goal is to offer a subset of items to the customers in order to maximize expected revenue. The problem has been studied under different user choice models, e.g. PL or Multinomial-Logit models [1], Mallows and mixture of Mallows [20], Markov chain-based choice models [21], single transition model [24] etc. While these works indeed consider a more practical objective of finding the best assortment (subset) with the highest expected utility for a regret minimization objective, (1) a major drawback in their approach lies in the algorithm design which *requires to keep on querying the same set multiple times*, e.g. [1, 17, 25]. Such design techniques could be impractical to be deployed in real systems where users could easily get annoyed if the same items are shown again and again. (2) The second major drawback of this line of work lies in the *structural assumption of their underlying choice models which requires the existence of a reference/default item, that needs to be every part assortment S_t* . This leads to assuming a No-Choice item, typically denoted as item-0, which is a default choice of any assortment S_t . Further a stronger and more unrealistic assumption lies in the fact that they require to assume that the above pivot is stronger than the rest of the K items, i.e. $\theta_0 \geq \max_{i \in [K]} \theta_i$, i.e. the No-Choice (NC)

¹This is equivalent to finding the set with maximum expected revenue when r_i s represents the price of item i [1]

action is the most likely outcome of any assortment S_t ! This is rather unintuitive and often does not hold good in practice. The requirement of this assumption in the literature [1] primarily stems from a theoretical need: Without this, their proposed algorithms fail to maintain effective estimation and concentration bounds of the PL parameters θ . Of course, this is not a justifiable reason.

Considering the limitations of the above line of works in the existing literature AOA, we set to answer two questions:

- (1) Can we consider a general AOA model where the default item, like the NC item defined above, is not necessarily the strongest one, i.e. $\theta_0 \geq \max_{i \in [K]} \theta_i$?
- (2) Can we still design a practical and regret optimal algorithm for this AOA framework, which need not have to play repetitive actions and yet converge to the optimal assortment efficiently?

We answer the questions in the affirmative and present best of all scenarios: *We design practical algorithms on practical AOA framework with practical objectives*—Unlike the existing approaches of the assortment optimization literature [1, 17], we do not have to keep playing the same assortment multiple times, neither require a strongest default item (like NC satisfying $\theta_0 \geq \max_{i \in [K]} \theta_i$). On the other hand, unlike the Online ML and Bandits literature, our objectives do not require us to converge to a multiset of replicated arms like $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$, but converge to the utility-maximizing set of distinct items.

Our Contributions:

1. **A General AOA Setup:** We work with a general problem of AOA for PL model, which requires no additional structural assumption of the θ parameters such as $\theta_0 \geq \max_i \theta_i$, unlike the existing works. We designed algorithms for two separate objectives Top- m and Wtd-Top- m as discussed above.
2. **Practical, Efficient and Optimal Algorithm:** In Sec. 3, we give a practical, efficient and provably optimal algorithm for MNL Assortment (up to logarithmic factors and the magnitude of θ_{\max} which is problem-dependent constant). The regret bound of our proposed algorithm AOA-RB_{PL} (Alg. 1) yields $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{KT})$ regret for both Top- m and Wtd-Top- m objective. Our algorithms use a novel parameter estimation technique for discrete choice models based on the concept of *Rank-Breaking* (RB) which is one of our key contributions towards designing the efficient and optimal algorithm. This enables our algorithm to not require the No-Choice item to be the strongest of the lot, unlike [1]. Lem. 8 details the key concept of our parameter estimation technique exploiting the concept of RB. Consequently, our resulting algorithm plays optimistically based on the UCB estimates of PL parameters and does not require repeating the same subset multiple times, justifying our title.
3. **Further Improvement with Adaptive Pivots:** In Sec. 4, we further refined the regret analyses of Alg. 1 exploring the novel idea of ‘adaptive pivots’ and proposed AOA-RB_{PL}-Adaptive. Performance-wise this removes the asymptotic dependence on $\theta_{\max} = \max_i \theta_i / \theta_0$ in the regret analysis. This enables the algorithm to work effectively in scenarios where the No-Choice item is less likely to be selected, i.e., $\theta_{\max} \gg 1$. This in fact, leads to a huge improvement in our algorithm performances, especially in the range of low θ_0 where AOA-RB_{PL}-Adaptive outperforms drastically over the existing baseline.
4. **Empirical Analysis.** Finally, we corroborate our theoretical results with empirical evaluations (Sec. 5), which certify the superior performance of our algorithm for the general AOA setups.

2 Problem Setup

Notation. We write the set $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. $\mathbf{1}(\varphi)$ denotes an indicator variable that takes the value 1 if the predicate φ is true, and 0 otherwise. $\mathbb{P}(A)$ is used to denote the probability of event A , in a probability space that is clear from the context. The symbol \lesssim , employed in the proof sketches, represents a coarse inequality.

2.1 Formulation

We consider the sequential decision-making problem of Active Optimal Assortment (AOA), with preference/choice feedback. Formally, the learner (algorithm) is given $[K]$, a finite set of K items ($K > 2$). At each decision round $t = 1, 2, \dots$, the learner selects a subset $S_t \subseteq [K]$ of up to m items, and receives some (stochastic) feedback about the item preferences of S_t , drawn according to some unknown underlying Plackett-Luce (PL) choice model with parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_K)$. An interested reader may check App. A.1 for a detailed discussion on PL models, the precise formulation of the choice feedback is described in Section 2.2. Given any assortment S_t we also consider the possibility of ‘no-selection’ of any items given an S_t . Following the literature of [1], we model this mathematically as a No-Choice (NC) item, indexed by item-0, and its corresponding PL utility parameter θ_0 .

Remark 1. *It is important to note that, unlike the existing literature on assortment selection, we are not required to assume the NC-item to be the strongest i.e. $\theta_0 \not\geq \max_{i \in [K]} \theta_i$, or NC is not the most likely outcome assortment. Further, since the PL model is scale independent, without loss of generality, we always set $\theta_0 = 1$ and scale the rest of the PL parameters around that.*

We assume $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2 \geq \dots \geq \theta_K$ without loss of generality.

2.2 Feedback model

The feedback model formulates the information received (from the ‘environment’) once the learner plays a subset $S_t \subseteq [K]$ of at most m items. Given S_t we consider the algorithm receives a winner feedback (or index of an item) $i_t \in S_t \cup \{0\}$, drawn according to the underlying PL choice model as:

$$\mathbb{P}(i_t = i | S_t) = \frac{\theta_i}{\theta_0 + \sum_{j \in S_t} \theta_j} \quad \forall i \in S_t. \quad (1)$$

2.3 Performance Objectives:

We consider the following two objectives:

Objective 1. Top- m -AOA Regret: One simplest objective could be to just identify the top- m item-set: $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$, for some $m \in [1, K]$. Formally the performance objective of the learner can be captured through the following regret minimization objective:

$$Reg_T^{\text{top}} := \sum_{t=1}^T (\Theta_{S^*} - \Theta_{S_t}) / m,$$

where $S^* := \operatorname{argmax}_S \Theta_S$ is the (maximum) PL-Choice utility $\Theta_S := \sum_{i \in S} \theta_i$ of the set of top- m items.

Objective 2. Wtd-Top- m -AOA Regret: In this case, we consider a more general setting, where each item- i might be also associated with a weight (for example price) $r_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and the goal is to

identify the set of size at most m with maximum weighted utility. One could measure the regret of the learner as the utility difference between the optimal set and cumulative utility of the learner:

$$Reg_T^{\text{wtd}} := \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathcal{R}(S^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \boldsymbol{\theta})),$$

where for any S , we define by

$$\mathcal{R}(S, \boldsymbol{\theta}) := \sum_{i \in S} \frac{r_i \theta_i}{\theta_0 + \sum_{j \in S} \theta_j} \quad (2)$$

the weighted PL-choice utility of the subset S , and $S^* := \operatorname{argmax}_{S \subseteq [K] \mid |S| \leq m} \mathcal{R}(S, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ denotes the optimal utility-maximizing subset.

3 AOA with PL: A Practical and Efficient Algorithm for Reg^{top} and Reg^{wtd} Objective

In this section, we propose our first algorithm for the two objectives: Top- m and Wtd-Top- m . The crux of our novelty lies in our PL parameter estimation technique which shows how one can maintain an estimate of pairwise scores of $p_{ij} = \frac{\theta_i}{\theta_i + \theta_j}$ for each pair of item (i, j) , $i, j \in [K] \cup \{0\}$ using the idea of *Rank-Breaking* (RB). We discussed the details of the RB idea in App. A.2. Combining the concept of RB along with a key lemma of [30], we estimate the PL parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and manage to maintain a tight concentration interval for each θ_i , $i \in [K]$. Given these reasonable estimates of the PL parameters, we play the assortments S_t optimistically at each round t . The key algorithmic ideas are detailed below. We analyze its regret guarantees for both Top- m and Wtd-Top- m objective, respectively in Thm. 4 and Thm. 6.

3.1 Algorithm Design

Maintaining Pairwise Estimates. At each time t , our algorithm maintains a pairwise preference matrix $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_t \in [0, 1]^{n \times n}$, whose (i, j) -th entry $\hat{p}_{ij,t}$ records the empirical probability of i having beaten j in a pairwise duel, and a corresponding upper confidence bound $p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}}$ for each pair (i, j) , for each pair $(i, j) \in [\tilde{K}] \times [\tilde{K}]$, where $[\tilde{K}] := [K] \cup \{0\}$. We estimate $\hat{p}_{ij,t} := \frac{w_{ij,t}}{n_{ij,t}}$, where $w_{ij,t} = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{1}\{i_s = i, j \in S_s\}$ denotes the number of pairwise wins of item- i over j upon *rank breaking* (RB), and $n_{ij,t} = w_{ij,t} + w_{ji,t}$ being the number of times (i, j) has been compared upon RB. The algorithm further maintains UCB estimates, $p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}}$ of each (i, j) pair, defined as

$$p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} := \hat{p}_{ij,t} + \sqrt{\frac{2\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1 - \hat{p}_{ij,t})x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{3x}{n_{ij,t}}. \quad (3)$$

Further by deriving intuition from Lem. 8 we also establish a tight concentration of the true pairwise preferences $p_{ij} = \frac{\theta_i}{\theta_i + \theta_j}$ in terms of $p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}}$.

Estimate upper-confidence-bounds θ_t^{ucb} from Pairwise Estimates. The above UCB estimates $p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}}$ are further used to design UCB estimates of the PL parameters θ_i as follows

$$\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} = \frac{p_{i0,t}^{\text{ucb}}}{(1 - p_{i0,t}^{\text{ucb}})_+}.$$

Optimistic Assortment Selection: The above estimates of $\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}}$ s are further used to select the set S_t , that maximizes the underlying objective. This optimization problem transforms into a static

assortment optimization problem with upper confidence bounds $\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}}$ as the parameters, and efficient solution methods for this case are available (see e.g., [6, 19, 28]).

Algorithm 1 AOA for PL model with RB (AOA-RB_{PL})

- 1: **input:** $x > 0$
 - 2: **init:** $\tilde{K} \leftarrow K + 1$, $[\tilde{K}] = [K] \cup \{0\}$, $\mathbf{W}_1 \leftarrow [0]_{\tilde{K} \times \tilde{K}}$
 - 3: **for** $t = 1, 2, 3, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 4: Set $\mathbf{N}_t = \mathbf{W}_t + \mathbf{W}_t^\top$, and $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_t = \frac{\mathbf{W}_t}{\mathbf{N}_t}$. Denote $\mathbf{N}_t = [n_{ij,t}]_{\tilde{K} \times \tilde{K}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_t = [\hat{p}_{ij,t}]_{\tilde{K} \times \tilde{K}}$.
 - 5: Define for all i , $p_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} = \frac{1}{2}$ and for all $i, j \in [\tilde{K}]$, $i \neq j$

$$p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} = \hat{p}_{ij,t} + \left(\frac{2\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1-\hat{p}_{ij,t})x}{n_{ij,t}} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{3x}{n_{ij,t}}$$
 - 6: $\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} := p_{i0,t}^{\text{ucb}} / (1 - p_{i0,t}^{\text{ucb}})_+$
 - 7: $S_t \leftarrow \begin{cases} \text{Top-}m \text{ items from } \text{argsort}(\{\theta_{1,t}^{\text{ucb}}, \dots, \theta_{K,t}^{\text{ucb}}\}), \\ \text{for Top-}m \text{ objective} \\ \text{argmax}_{S \subseteq [K] \parallel |S| \leq m} \mathcal{R}(S, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}), \\ \text{for Wtd-Top-}m \text{ objective} \end{cases}$
 - 8: Play S_t
 - 9: Receive the winner $i_t \in [\tilde{K}]$ (drawn as per (1))
 - 10: Update: $\mathbf{W}_{t+1} = [w_{ij,t+1}]_{\tilde{K} \times \tilde{K}}$ s.t. $w_{i_t j, t+1} \leftarrow w_{i_t j, t} + 1 \quad \forall j \in S_t \cup \{0\}$
 - 11: **end for**
-

3.2 Analysis: Concentration Lemmas

We start the analysis by providing three technical lemmas that provide confidence bounds for the p_{ij} and θ_i . The proofs are based on Bernstein concentration bounds and are deferred to the appendix.

Lemma 1. *Let $(i, j) \in [K] \times [K]$. Let $T \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$. Then, with probability at least $1 - 3Te^{-x}$,*

$$p_{ij} \leq p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} \leq p_{ij} + 2\sqrt{\frac{2p_{ij}(1-p_{ij})x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{11x}{n_{ij,t}}, \quad (4)$$

simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$.

Lemma 2. *Let $T \geq 1$ and $x > 0$. Then, with probability at least $1 - 3KTe^{-x}$, then simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$ and $i \in [K]$: $\theta_i \leq \theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}}$ and one of the following two inequalities is satisfied*

$$n_{i0,t} < 69x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)$$

or

$$\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} \leq \theta_i + 4(\theta_0 + \theta_i) \sqrt{\frac{2\theta_0\theta_i x}{n_{i0,t}}} + \frac{22x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2}{n_{i0,t}}.$$

The above lemma depends on $n_{i0,t}$ the number of times items i have been compared with item 0 up to round t . The latter is controlled using the following lemma:

Lemma 3. *Let $T \geq 1$ and $x > 0$. Then, with probability at least $1 - KTe^{-x}$*

$$\tau_{i,t} < 2x(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})^2 \quad \text{or} \quad n_{i0,t} \geq \frac{(\theta_0 + \theta_i)\tau_{i,t}}{2(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})}, \quad (5)$$

simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$ and $i \in [K]$.

3.3 Analysis: Top- m Objective:

We are now ready to provide the regret upper bound for Algorithm 1 with Top- m objective.

Theorem 4 (AOA-RB_{PL}: Regret Analysis for Top- m Objective). *Let $\theta_{\max} \geq 1$. Consider any instance of PL model on K items with parameters $\theta \in [0, \theta_{\max}]^K$, $\theta_0 = 1$. The regret of AOA-RB_{PL} (Alg. 1) with parameter $x = 2 \log T$ is bounded as*

$$\text{Reg}_T^{\text{top}} = O(\theta_{\max}^{3/2} \sqrt{KT \log T}) \quad \text{when } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Noting θ_{\max} is a problem-dependent constant, the above rate of $\tilde{O}(KT)$ is optimal (up to log-factors), as a lower bound can be straightforwardly derived from standard multi-armed bandits [4, 5]. We only state here a sketch of the proof of Thm. 4. The detailed proof is deferred to the appendix.

Proof Sketch of Thm. 4. Let us define for any $S \subseteq [K]$,

$$\Theta_S = \sum_{i \in S} \theta_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_S^{\text{ucb}} := \sum_{i \in S} \theta_i^{\text{ucb}}.$$

Let \mathcal{E} be the high-probability event such that both Lemma 2 and 3 holds true. Then, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - 4TKe^{-x}$. Let us first assume that \mathcal{E} holds true. Then, by Lemma 2, $\Theta_{S^*} \leq \Theta_{S^*}^{\text{ucb}} \leq \Theta_{S_t}^{\text{ucb}}$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_T^{\text{top}} &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \Theta_{S^*} - \Theta_{S_t} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \Theta_{S_t}^{\text{ucb}} - \Theta_{S_t} \\ &\leq O(\log T) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in S_t} (\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i) \mathbb{1}\{\tau_{i,t} \geq \tau_0\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_0 = 138x(m+1)^2\theta_{\max}^2$ corresponds to an exploration phase needed for the confidence upper bounds of Lem 2 and 3 to be satisfied and $O(\log T)$ is the cost of that exploration.

Then, noting that if \mathcal{E} holds true, we can show by Lemma 3, that

$$\mathbb{1}\{\tau_{i,t} \geq \tau_0\} \leq \mathbb{1}\{n_{i0,t} \geq 69x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)\}.$$

Therefore, we can apply Lemma 2 that entails,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in S_t} (\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i) \mathbb{1}\{\tau_{i,t} \geq \bar{n}_{i0}\} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in S_t} \left((\theta_0 + \theta_i) \sqrt{\frac{\theta_0 \theta_i x}{n_{i0,t}}} \mathbb{1}\{\tau_{i,t} \geq \tau_0\} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lem. 3}}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in S_t} \theta_{\max}^{3/2} \sqrt{\frac{mx}{\tau_{i,t}}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^K \theta_{\max}^{3/2} \sqrt{mx \tau_{i,t}}, \\ &\lesssim \theta_{\max}^{3/2} \sqrt{xKT}. \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\sum_{i=1}^n 1/\sqrt{i} \leq 2\sqrt{n}$ and $\sum_i \tau_{i,t} = mT$ together with Jensen's inequality in the last inequality. We thus have under the event \mathcal{E} that

$$\text{Reg}_T^{\text{top}} \leq O(\theta_{\max}^{3/2} \sqrt{xKT})$$

The proof is concluded by taking the expectation and by setting $x = 2 \log T$ to control $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c)$. \square

3.4 Analysis: Wtd-Top- m Objective

We turn now to the analysis of the Wtd-Top- m objective that aims to optimize $\mathcal{R}(S, \theta)$ as defined in (2). We start by stating a lemma from [1] that shows that the expected utility $\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta)$ that corresponds to the optimal assortment $S^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{S \subset [K], |S| \leq m} \mathcal{R}(S, \theta)$ is non-decreasing in the parameters θ .

Lemma 5 (Lemma A.3 of [1]). *If $\theta^{\text{ucb}} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is such that $\theta_i^{\text{ucb}} \geq \theta_i$ for all $i \in [K]$, we have $\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) \leq \mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta^{\text{ucb}})$.*

Theorem 6 (AOA-RB_{PL}: Regret Analysis for Wtd-Top- m Objective). *Let $\theta_{\max} \geq 1$. For any instance of the PL model on K items with parameter $\theta \in [0, \theta_{\max}]^K$ and weights $\mathbf{r} \in [0, 1]^K$, the weighted regret of AOA-RB_{PL} (Alg. 1) with $x = 2 \log T$ is bounded as*

$$\text{Reg}_T^{\text{wtd}} = O(\sqrt{\theta_{\max}KT} \log T)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

The rate $\Omega(KT)$ is optimal as proved by the lower bound established by [14] for MNL bandit problems.

Remark 2. *Our result recovers (up to a factor $\sqrt{\log T}$) the one of [1] when $\theta_{\max} = 1$. However, their algorithm relies on more sophisticated estimators that necessitate epochs repeating the same assortment until the No-Choice item is selected. Note for our problem setting, where it is possible to have $\theta_{\max} \gg \theta_0 = 1$, the length of these epochs could be of $O(K\theta_{\max})$, which could be potentially very large when $\theta_{\max} \gg 1$. This consequently reduces the number of effective epochs, leading to poor estimation of the PL parameters. We see this tradeoff in our experiments (Sec. 5) where the MNL-UCB algorithm of [1] yields linear $O(T)$ regret for such choice of the problem parameters.*

We provide below the sketch of the proof of the theorem. The complete proof is postponed to the appendix.

Proof sketch of Thm. 6. Let \mathcal{E} be the high-probability event such that both Lemma 2 and 3 are satisfied. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_T^{\text{wtd}} &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}] + T\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}] + T\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

because $\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) \geq \mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) \geq \mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta)$ under the event \mathcal{E} by Lemma 5. We now upper-bound the first term of the right-hand-side

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i \in S_t} \frac{r_i \theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t,t}} - \frac{r_i \theta_i}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i \in S_t} \frac{r_i (\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i)}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Because $\Theta_{S_t,t}^{\text{ucb}} \geq \Theta_{S_t}$ under the event \mathcal{E} by Lemma 2. Then, using $r_i \leq 1$, we further upper-bound using an exploration parameter $\tau_0 = O(\log(T))$ so that the upper-confidence-bounds in Lemmas 2 and 3 are satisfied

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{|\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right) \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t, \mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &\lesssim O(\tau_0) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{|\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t, \tau_{i,t} \geq \tau_0, \mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &\lesssim O(\tau_0) + \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\theta_i \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right]} \times \\ &\quad \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right)^2 \theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t} \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t, \tau_{i,t} \geq \tau_0, \mathcal{E}\}}{\theta_i} \right]} \tag{7} \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad =: A_T(i) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Now, the term $A_T(i)$ above may be upper-bounded using Lemmas 2 and 3,

$$\begin{aligned} A_T(i) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i)^2}{\theta_i (\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t})} \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t, \tau_{i,t} \geq \tau_0, \mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2 x}{n_{i0,t} (\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t})} \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\} \right] \\ &\lesssim \theta_{\max} x \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\theta_0 + \theta_i) \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}) n_{i0,t}} \right] \\ &= \theta_{\max} x \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i_t \in \{i, 0\}, i \in S_t\}}{n_{i0,t}} \right] \\ &\lesssim \theta_{\max} x \log T \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used that $\sum_{n=1}^T n^{-1} \leq 1 + \log T$. Substituting into (7), Jensen's inequality entails,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \lesssim O(\tau_0) + \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\theta_{\max} x \log T} \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\theta_i \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}} \right]. \quad (8)$$

The proof is finally concluded by applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality which yields:

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\theta_i \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}} \leq \sqrt{K \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\sum_{i=1}^K \theta_i \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}} \leq \sqrt{KT}.$$

Finally, combining the above result with (6) and (8) concludes the proof

$$\text{Reg}_T^{\text{wt d}} \lesssim TP(\mathcal{E}^c) + O(\tau_0) + \sqrt{\theta_{\max} x KT \log T}.$$

Choosing $x = 2 \log T$ ensures $TP(\mathcal{E}^c) \leq O(1)$ and $\tau_0 \leq O(\log T)$. \square

4 Generalization: Improved dependance on θ_{\max} with Adaptive Pivot Selection

A problem with Algorithm 1 stems from estimating all θ_i based on pairwise comparisons with item 0. When $\theta_{\max} \gg \theta_0 = 1$, item 0 may not be sampled enough as the winner, leading to poor estimators. This deficiency contributes to the suboptimal dependence on θ_{\max} observed in Theorems 4 and 6. A similar issue arises in prior work, such as [1], which remedies this assuming $\theta_0 = \theta_{\max} = 1$, which is however a very strong assumption.

We propose the following fix to optimize the pivot. For all $i, j \in [K] \cup \{0\}$ we define $\gamma_{ij} = \frac{\theta_i}{\theta_j}$, and the estimators:

$$\gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} = \frac{p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}}}{(1 - p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}})_+} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{ii,t}^{\text{ucb}} = 1,$$

where $p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}}$ are defined in (3). Note that with this definition we have $\theta_t^{\text{ucb}} = \gamma_{i0,t}^{\text{ucb}}$. For all rounds t , the algorithm AOA-RB_{PL}-Adaptive computes the upper-confidence-bounds:

$$\hat{\theta}_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} := \min_{j \in [K] \cup \{0\}} \gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} \gamma_{j0,t}^{\text{ucb}}.$$

The algorithm then selects

$$S_t = \underset{|S| \leq m}{\text{argmax}} \mathcal{R}(S, \hat{\theta}_t^{\text{ucb}}).$$

We offer below a regret bound that underscores the value of optimizing the pivot when $\theta_{\max} \gg K$. In the experimental section (Sec. 5), we show that this version surpasses the performance of the state-of-the-art algorithm for AOA. *It is important to note that while we present the algorithm and analysis specifically for the weighted objective with winner feedback, it can be readily adapted to other objectives. This adaptation involves replacing $\mathcal{R}(S, \theta)$ with the new objective in the analysis, as long as Lem. 5 remains valid.*

Theorem 7. *Let $\theta_{\max} \geq 1$. For any instance of PL model on K items with parameter $\theta \in [0, \theta_{\max}]^K$ and weights $\mathbf{r} \in [0, 1]^K$, the procedure described above has a regret upper-bounded as*

$$\text{Reg}_T^{\text{wt d}} = O(\sqrt{\min\{\theta_{\max}, K\} KT \log T})$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$ for the choice $x = 2 \log T$ (when defining $p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}}$).

Remark 3. It is noteworthy that asymptotically, when θ_{\max} is constant, the regret is $O(K\sqrt{T}\log T)$, eliminating any dependence on θ_{\max} in the asymptotic regime. This allows for handling scenarios where the No-Choice item is highly unlikely, which is not achievable in previous works such as [1]. The latter heavily relies on the regular selection of the No-Choice item to construct their estimators.

The proof is deferred to the appendix, with a key step relying on selecting the pivot $j_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in S_t \cup \{0\}} \theta_j$. The use of $|\hat{\theta}_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i| \leq |\gamma_{ij_t,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|$ provides confidence upper-bounds with an improved dependence on θ_{\max} , leveraging the fact that $\theta_{j_t} \geq \theta_i$. Due to the varying pivot over time, a telescoping argument introduces an additive factor \sqrt{K} .

5 Experiments

We run extensive simulations to compare our methods with the state-of-the-art MNL-Bandit algorithm [1] and provide a comparative empirical evaluation based on different experimental setups and choice of PL parameters θ . The details of our empirical results are given below:

Algorithms. We evaluate the performance of our main algorithm (1). **AOA-RB_{PL}-Adaptive** (Sec. 4) with adaptive pivot, referred as “**Our Alg-1 (Adaptive Pivot)**”, with the following two algorithms: (2). **AOA-RB_{PL}** (Sec. 3) referred as “**Our Alg-2 (No-Choice Pivot)**”, (3). **MNL-UCB**: The proposed algorithm in [1] in Algorithm-1.

Different PL (θ) Environments. We report our experiment results on two PL datasets with $K = 50$ items: (1) Arith50 with PL parameters $\theta_i = 1 - (i - 1)0.2$, $\forall i \in [50]$. (2) Bad50 with PL parameters $\theta_i = 0.6$, $\forall i \in [50] \setminus \{25\}$ and $\theta_{25} = 0.8$. For simplicity of computing the assortment choices S_t , we assume $r_i = 1$, $\forall i \in [K]$.

Remark 4. Note in our PL environments, we set $\theta_{\max} = 1$ (to avoid scaling of $\text{Reg}_T^{\text{top}}$ with θ_{\max}). Since the choice probabilities of PL models are scale-independent, our choice of parameters is equivalent to assuming another choice model $(\theta'_1, \theta'_2, \dots, \theta'_K)$, $\theta'_0 = 1$ and adjusting $\theta'_i = \theta_i/\theta_0$, $\forall i \in [K]$.

In all the experiments, we report the averaged performance of the algorithms across 100 runs.

(1). **Averaged Regret with weak NC ($\theta_{\max}/\theta_0 \gg 1$) (Fig. 1):** In our first set of experiments we report the average performance of the above three algorithms against Top- m -AOA Regret ($\text{Reg}_T^{\text{top}}$) and Wtd-Top- m -AOA Regret ($\text{Reg}_T^{\text{wtd}}$). We set $m = 5$ and $\theta_0 = 0.01$ for this set of experiments.




Figure 1: Averaged Regret for $m = 5$, $\theta_0 = 0.01$

Fig. 1 shows that our algorithm AOA-RB_{PL}-Adaptive (with adaptive pivot) performs best, with a wide performance margin to the rest of the two algorithms, while our algorithm AOA-RB_{PL} with no-choice (NC) pivot still outperforms MNL-UCB. But overall both of them perform poorly for $\theta_0 = 0.01$, as also expected since θ_{\max} is large compared to θ_0 for these instances.

(2). **Averaged Regret vs No-Choice PL Parameter (θ_0) (Fig. 2):** In this experiment, we evaluate the regret performance of our algorithm AOA-RB_{PL}-Adaptive. We report the experiment on Artith50 PL dataset and set the subsetsize $m = 6$, $\theta_0 = \{1, 0.5, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01, 0.005, 0.001\}$. Fig. 1 shows, the performance gap between our algorithm AOA-RB_{PL}-Adaptive (with adaptive

pivot) increases with decreasing θ_0 – this is expected since the estimates of MNL-UCB strongly depends on the fact that θ_0 needs to be maximum of $\{\theta_i\}_{i \in [K]}$ without which the algorithm performs increasingly suboptimally due to poor estimation of the PL parameters.




Figure 2: Comparative performances of the algorithms for varying strength of NC (θ_0) for $m = 5$

(3). Averaged Regret vs Length of the rank-ordered feedback (k) (Fig. 3): We also run a thought experiment to understand the tradeoff between learning rate with k -length rank-ordered feedback, where given any assortment $S_t \subseteq [K]$ of size m , the learner gets to see the top- k draws ($k \leq m$) from the PL model without replacement. Clearly, this is a stronger feedback than the winner (i.e. top-1 for $k = 1$) feedback and one would expect a faster learning rate with increasing k as the learner gets to observe more information from the PL model each time. We report the experiment on Arith50 PL dataset and set the subset size $m = 30$ with $k = 1, 2, 4, 8$. As expected, we see a multiplicative reduction on both Top- m -AOA Regret (Reg_T^{top}) and Wtd-Top- m -AOA Regret (Reg_T^{wtd}) with increasing k , as reflected in Fig. 3.




Figure 3: Tradoff: Averaged Regret vs length of the k rank-ordered feedback for $k = 1, 2, 4, 8$, $m = 30$

6 Conclusion

We address the Active Optimal Assortment Selection problem with PL choice models, introducing a versatile framework (AOA) that eliminates the need for a strong default item, typically assumed as the No-Choice (NC) item in the existing literature. Our proposed algorithms employ a novel ‘Rank-Breaking’ technique to establish tight concentration guarantees for estimating the score parameters of the PL model. Our algorithmic approach stands out for its practicality and avoids the suboptimal practice of repeatedly selecting the same set of items until the default item prevails. This is particularly beneficial when the default item’s quality (θ_0) is significantly lower than the quality of the best item (θ_{\max}). Our algorithms are efficient to implement, provably optimal (up to log factors), and free from unrealistic assumptions on the default item. In summary, this work pioneers an efficient and optimal assortment selection approach for PL choice models without imposing restrictive conditions.

Future Works. Among many interesting questions to address in the future, it will be interesting to understand the role of the No-Choice (NC) item in the algorithm design, precisely, can we design efficient algorithms without the existence of NC items with a regret rate still linear in θ_{\max} ? Further, it will be interesting to extend our results to more general choice models beyond the PL model [17, 20, 21]. What is the tradeoff between the subset size m and the regret for such general choice

models? Extending our results to large (potentially infinite) decision spaces and contextual settings would also be a very useful and practical contribution to the literature of assortment optimization.

References

- [1] Shipra Agrawal, Vashist Avadhanula, Vineet Goyal, and Assaf Zeevi. Mnl-bandit: A dynamic learning approach to assortment selection. *Operations Research*, 67(5):1453–1485, 2019.
- [2] Nir Ailon, Zohar Karnin, and Thorsten Joachims. Reducing dueling bandits to cardinal bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 856–864. PMLR, 2014.
- [3] Jean-Yves Audibert, Rémi Munos, and Csaba Szepesvári. Exploration–exploitation tradeoff using variance estimates in multi-armed bandits. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(19): 1876–1902, 2009.
- [4] Peter Auer. Using upper confidence bounds for online learning. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2000. Proceedings. 41st Annual Symposium on*, pages 270–279. IEEE, 2000.
- [5] Peter Auer, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, and Paul Fischer. Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine learning*, 47(2-3):235–256, 2002.
- [6] Vashist Avadhanula, Jalaj Bhandari, Vineet Goyal, and Assaf Zeevi. On the tightness of an lp relaxation for rational optimization and its applications. *Operations Research Letters*, 44(5): 612–617, 2016.
- [7] Hossein Azari, David Parkes, and Lirong Xia. Random utility theory for social choice. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 126–134, 2012.
- [8] Viktor Bengs, Róbert Busa-Fekete, Adil El Mesaoudi-Paul, and Eyke Hüllermeier. Preference-based online learning with dueling bandits: A survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2021.
- [9] Viktor Bengs, Róbert Busa-Fekete, Adil El Mesaoudi-Paul, and Eyke Hüllermeier. Preference-based online learning with dueling bandits: A survey. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22:7–1, 2021.
- [10] Viktor Bengs, Aadirupa Saha, and Eyke Hüllermeier. Stochastic contextual dueling bandits under linear stochastic transitivity models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1764–1786. PMLR, 2022.
- [11] Gerardo Berbeglia and Gwenaél Joret. Assortment optimisation under a general discrete choice model: A tight analysis of revenue-ordered assortments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01371*, 2016.
- [12] Brian Brost, Yevgeny Seldin, Ingemar J. Cox, and Christina Lioma. Multi-dueling bandits and their application to online ranker evaluation. *CoRR*, abs/1608.06253, 2016.
- [13] Niladri S Chatterji, Aldo Pacchiano, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. On the theory of reinforcement learning with once-per-episode feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14363*, 2021.
- [14] Xi Chen and Yining Wang. A note on a tight lower bound for mnl-bandit assortment selection models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.06109*, 2017.

- [15] Xi Chen, Sivakanth Gopi, Jieming Mao, and Jon Schneider. Competitive analysis of the top-k ranking problem. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1245–1264. SIAM, 2017.
- [16] Xi Chen, Yuanzhi Li, and Jieming Mao. A nearly instance optimal algorithm for top-k ranking under the multinomial logit model. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2504–2522. SIAM, 2018.
- [17] Xi Chen, Chao Shi, Yining Wang, and Yuan Zhou. Dynamic assortment planning under nested logit models. *Production and Operations Management*, 30(1):85–102, 2021.
- [18] Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [19] James Davis, Guillermo Gallego, and Huseyin Topaloglu. Assortment planning under the multinomial logit model with totally unimodular constraint structures. *Work in Progress*, 2013.
- [20] Antoine Désir, Vineet Goyal, Srikanth Jagabathula, and Danny Segev. Assortment optimization under the mallows model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4700–4708, 2016.
- [21] Antoine Désir, Vineet Goyal, Danny Segev, and Chun Ye. Capacity constrained assortment optimization under the markov chain based choice model. *Operations Research*, 2016.
- [22] Minje Jang, Sunghyun Kim, Changho Suh, and Sewoong Oh. Optimal sample complexity of m-wise data for top-k ranking. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1685–1695, 2017.
- [23] Ashish Khetan and Sewoong Oh. Data-driven rank breaking for efficient rank aggregation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(193):1–54, 2016.
- [24] Kameng Nip, Zhenbo Wang, and Zizhuo Wang. Assortment optimization under a single transition model. 2017.
- [25] Mingdong Ou, Nan Li, Shenghuo Zhu, and Rong Jin. Multinomial logit bandit with linear utility functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.02971*, 2018.
- [26] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- [27] Wenbo Ren, Jia Liu, and Ness B Shroff. PAC ranking from pairwise and listwise queries: Lower bounds and upper bounds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.02970*, 2018.
- [28] Paat Rusmevichientong, Zuo-Jun Max Shen, and David B Shmoys. Dynamic assortment optimization with a multinomial logit choice model and capacity constraint. *Operations research*, 58(6):1666–1680, 2010.
- [29] Aadirupa Saha and Aditya Gopalan. Active ranking with subset-wise preferences. *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2018.

- [30] Aadirupa Saha and Aditya Gopalan. Combinatorial bandits with relative feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [31] Aadirupa Saha and Aditya Gopalan. PAC Battling Bandits in the Plackett-Luce Model. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 700–737, 2019.
- [32] Yanan Sui, Vincent Zhuang, Joel Burdick, and Yisong Yue. Multi-dueling bandits with dependent arms. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, UAI’17*, 2017.
- [33] Kalyan Talluri and Garrett Van Ryzin. Revenue management under a general discrete choice model of consumer behavior. *Management Science*, 50(1):15–33, 2004.
- [34] Yisong Yue, Josef Broder, Robert Kleinberg, and Thorsten Joachims. The k -armed dueling bandits problem. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 78(5):1538–1556, 2012.
- [35] Masrour Zoghi, Shimon Whiteson, Remi Munos, Maarten de Rijke, et al. Relative upper confidence bound for the k -armed dueling bandit problem. In *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, number 32, pages 10–18. JMLR, 2014.
- [36] Masrour Zoghi, Shimon A Whiteson, Maarten De Rijke, and Remi Munos. Relative confidence sampling for efficient on-line ranker evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*, pages 73–82. ACM, 2014.
- [37] Masrour Zoghi, Zohar S Karnin, Shimon Whiteson, and Maarten De Rijke. Copeland dueling bandits. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 307–315, 2015.

Supplementary: Stop Relying on No-Choice and Don't Repeat the Moves: Optimal, Efficient and Practical Algorithms for Assortment Optimization

A Preliminaries: Some Useful Concepts for PL choice models

A.1 Plackett-Luce (PL): A Discrete Choice Model

A discrete choice model specifies the relative preferences of two or more discrete alternatives in a given set. A widely studied class of discrete choice models is the class of *Random Utility Models* (RUMs), which assume a ground-truth utility score $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for each alternative $i \in [n]$, and assign a conditional distribution $\mathcal{D}_i(\cdot|\theta_i)$ for scoring item i . To model a winning alternative given any set $S \subseteq [n]$, one first draws a random utility score $X_i \sim \mathcal{D}_i(\cdot|\theta_i)$ for each alternative in S , and selects an item with the highest random score.

One widely used RUM is the *Multinomial-Logit (MNL)* or *Plackett-Luce model (PL)*, where the \mathcal{D}_i s are taken to be independent Gumbel distributions with parameters θ'_i [7], i.e., with probability densities

$$\mathcal{D}_i(x_i|\theta'_i) = e^{-(x_i-\theta'_i)} e^{-e^{-(x_i-\theta'_i)}}, \quad \theta'_i \in \mathbb{R}, \forall i \in [n].$$

Moreover assuming $\theta'_i = \ln \theta_i$, $\theta_i > 0 \forall i \in [n]$, it can be shown in this case the probability that an alternative i emerges as the winner in the set $S \ni i$ becomes: $\mathbb{P}(i|S) = \frac{\theta_i}{\sum_{j \in S} \theta_j}$.

Other families of discrete choice models can be obtained by imposing different probability distributions over the utility scores X_i , e.g. if $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})$ are jointly normal with mean $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$ and covariance $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, then the corresponding RUM-based choice model reduces to the *Multinomial Probit (MNP)*.

A.2 Rank Breaking

Rank breaking (RB) is a well-understood idea involving the extraction of pairwise comparisons from (partial) ranking data, and then building pairwise estimators on the obtained pairs by treating each comparison independently [22, 23], e.g., a winner a sampled from among a, b, c is rank-broken into the pairwise preferences $a \succ b$, $a \succ c$. We use this idea to devise estimators for the pairwise win probabilities $p_{ij} = \mathbb{P}(i|\{i, j\}) = \theta_i/(\theta_i + \theta_j)$ for our problem setting. We used the idea of RB in both our algorithms (AOA-RB_{PL} and AOA-RB_{PL}-Adaptive) to update the pairwise win-count estimates $w_{i,j,t}$ for all the item pairs $(i, j) \in [K] \times [K]$, which is further used for deriving the empirical pairwise preference estimates $\hat{p}_{ij,t}$, at any time t .

A.3 Parameter Estimation with PL based preference data

Lemma 8 (Pairwise win-probability estimates for the PL model [29]). *Consider a Plackett-Luce choice model with parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$, and fix two items $i, j \in [n]$. Let S_1, \dots, S_T be a sequence of (possibly random) subsets of $[n]$ of size at least 2, where T is a positive integer, and i_1, \dots, i_T a sequence of random items with each $i_t \in S_t$, $1 \leq t \leq T$, such that for each $1 \leq t \leq T$, (a) S_t depends only on S_1, \dots, S_{t-1} , and (b) i_t is distributed as the Plackett-Luce winner of the subset S_t , given $S_1, i_1, \dots, S_{t-1}, i_{t-1}$ and S_t , and (c) $\forall t : \{i, j\} \subseteq S_t$ with probability 1. Let $n_i(T) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{P}(i_t = i)$ and $n_{ij}(T) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{P}(\{i_t \in \{i, j\}\})$. Then, for any positive integer v , and $\eta \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{n_i(T)}{n_{ij}(T)} - \frac{\theta_i}{\theta_i + \theta_j} \geq \eta, n_{ij}(T) \geq v\right) &\leq e^{-2v\eta^2}, \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{n_i(T)}{n_{ij}(T)} - \frac{\theta_i}{\theta_i + \theta_j} \leq -\eta, n_{ij}(T) \geq v\right) &\leq e^{-2v\eta^2}.\end{aligned}$$

B Omitted proofs

B.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof of Lemma 1. Let $T \geq 1$, $x > 0$ and $i, j \in [K]$. Applying Thm. 1 of [3], with probability at least $1 - \beta(x, T)$, we get simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$,

$$|\hat{p}_{ij,t} - p_{ij}| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1 - \hat{p}_{ij,t})x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{3x}{n_{ij,t}}, \quad (9)$$

where $\beta(x, T) = 3 \inf_{1 < \alpha \leq 3} \min\left\{\frac{\log T}{\log \alpha}, T\right\} e^{-x/\alpha} \leq 3Te^{-x}$. Note that the inequality holds true although $n_{ij,t}$ is a random variable. This, shows the first inequality

$$p_{ij} \leq p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}}.$$

For the second inequality, (9) implies

$$\begin{aligned}p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} &= \hat{p}_{ij,t} + \sqrt{\frac{2\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1 - \hat{p}_{ij,t})x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{3x}{n_{ij,t}} \\ &\leq p_{ij} + 2\sqrt{\frac{2\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1 - \hat{p}_{ij,t})x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{6x}{n_{ij,t}}.\end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Furthermore, because $x \mapsto x(1 - x)$ is 1-Lipschitz on $[0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1 - \hat{p}_{ij,t}) - p_{ij}(1 - p_{ij})| &\leq |\hat{p}_{ij,t} - p_{ij}| \\ &\stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{2\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1 - \hat{p}_{ij,t})x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{3x}{n_{ij,t}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1 - \hat{p}_{ij,t}) &\leq p_{ij}(1 - p_{ij}) + \sqrt{\frac{2\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1 - \hat{p}_{ij,t})x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{3x}{n_{ij,t}} \\ &\leq \left(\sqrt{p_{ij}(1 - p_{ij})} + \sqrt{\frac{3x}{n_{ij,t}}}\right)^2,\end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\sqrt{\hat{p}_{ij,t}(1 - \hat{p}_{ij,t})} \leq \sqrt{p_{ij}(1 - p_{ij})} + \sqrt{\frac{3x}{n_{ij,t}}}. \quad (11)$$

Plugging back into (10), we get

$$p_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{2p_{ij}(1 - p_{ij})x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{11x}{n_{ij,t}}.$$

□

B.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. Let $i \in [K]$ and $x > 0$. Then, by a union bound on Lemma 1 and 3, with probability at least $1 - 4Te^{-x}$, (4) and (5) hold true for all $t \in [T]$. We consider this high-probability event in the rest of the proof. Define the function $f : x \mapsto x/(1-x)_+$ on $[0, 1]$ (with the convention $f(1) = +\infty$), so that $\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} = f(p_{i0,t}^{\text{ucb}})$ and $\theta_i = f(p_{i0})$. Because f is non-decreasing, and $p_{i0,t}^{\text{ucb}} \geq p_{i0}$ by (4), we have

$$\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} \geq \theta_i. \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, denote

$$\Delta_{i,t} := 2\sqrt{\frac{2p_{ij}(1-p_{ij})x}{n_{i0,t}}} + \frac{11x}{n_{i0,t}} = 2\sqrt{\frac{2\theta_0\theta_i x}{(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2 n_{i0,t}}} + \frac{11x}{n_{i0,t}}. \quad (13)$$

In the rest of the proof we assume, $n_{i0,t} \geq 69x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)$. Then, using that $\theta_0\theta_i \leq \theta_0 + \theta_i$ since $\theta_0 = 1$, it implies

$$(\theta_0 + \theta_i)\Delta_{i,t} \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{2\theta_0\theta_i x}{n_{i0,t}}} + \frac{11x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)}{n_{i0,t}} \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

and

$$p_{i0} + \Delta_{i,t} = \frac{\theta_i}{\theta_0 + \theta_i} + \Delta_{i,t} \leq \frac{\theta_i + 1/2}{\theta_i + 1} < 1.$$

Thus, because f is non-decreasing

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i &= f(p_{i0,t}^{\text{ucb}}) - f(p_{i0}) \\ &\stackrel{(4)}{\leq} f(p_{i0} + \Delta_{i,t}) - f(p_{i0}) \\ &= \frac{p_{i0} + \Delta_{i,t}}{1 - p_{i0} - \Delta_{i,t}} - \frac{p_{i0}}{1 - p_{i0}} \\ &= \frac{\Delta_{i,t}}{(1 - p_{i0})(1 - p_{i0} - \Delta_{i,t})} \\ &= \frac{(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2 \Delta_{i,t}}{1 - (\theta_0 + \theta_i)\Delta_{i,t}} \\ &\leq 2(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2 \Delta_{i,t} \\ &\stackrel{(13)}{\leq} 4(\theta_0 + \theta_i) \sqrt{\frac{2\theta_0\theta_i x}{n_{i0,t}}} + \frac{22x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2}{n_{i0,t}}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

B.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. Let $T \geq 1$ and $i \in [K]$. Recall that $\tau_{i,t} = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{1}\{i_s \in S_s\}$ is the number of times i was played at the start of round t and $n_{i0,t} = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{1}\{i_t \in \{i, 0\}, i \in S_t\}$ is the number of times i or 0 won up to round t when played together. When i is played the probability of 0 or i to win is

$$\mathbb{P}(i_t \in \{i, 0\} | S_t) = \frac{\theta_0 + \theta_i}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \geq \frac{\theta_0 + \theta_i}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*}}.$$

Therefore, applying Chernoff-Hoeffding inequality together with a union bound (to deal with the fact that $\tau_{i,t}$ is random), we have with probability at least $1 - Te^{-x}$

$$n_{i0,t} \geq \frac{\theta_0 + \theta_i}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*}} \tau_{i,t} - \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{i,t} x}{2}}$$

simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$. Noting that

$$\frac{\theta_0 + \theta_i}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*}} \tau_{i,t} - \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{i,t} x}{2}} \geq \frac{\theta_0 + \theta_i}{2(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})} \tau_{i,t}$$

if $\tau_{i,t} \geq 2x(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})^2 \geq \frac{2x(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})^2}{(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2}$ concludes the proof. \square

B.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Let us define for any $S \subseteq [K]$,

$$\Theta_S = \sum_{i \in S} \theta_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_S^{\text{ucb}} := \sum_{i \in S} \theta_i^{\text{ucb}}.$$

Let \mathcal{E} be the high-probability event such that both Lemma 2 and 3 holds true. Then, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - 4TKe^{-x}$. Let us first assume that \mathcal{E} holds true. Then, by Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_T^{\text{top}} &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \Theta_{S^*} - \Theta_{S_t} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \min \left\{ \Theta_{S^*}, \Theta_{S_t}^{\text{ucb}} - \Theta_{S_t} \right\} && \leftarrow \text{because } \Theta_{S^*} \leq \Theta_{S^*}^{\text{ucb}} \leq \Theta_{S_t}^{\text{ucb}} \text{ under the event } \mathcal{E} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \min \left\{ \Theta_{S^*}, \sum_{i \in S_t} \theta_i^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \Theta_{S^*} \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{\tau}_{i0} + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in S_t} (\theta_i^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i) \mathbb{1}\{\tau_{i,t} \geq \bar{\tau}_{i0}\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\tau}_{i0} = 2x(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*}) \max\{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*}, 69\} \leq 138x(m+1)^2 \theta_{\max}^2$, where $\theta_{\max} := \max_i \theta_i$. Then, noting that if \mathcal{E} holds true, by Lemma 3, we also have $n_{i0,t} \geq \frac{1}{2(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})} (\theta_0 + \theta_i) \tau_{i,t}$, which yields

$$\mathbb{1}\{\tau_{i,t} \geq \bar{\tau}_{i0}\} \leq \mathbb{1}\{n_{i0,t} \geq 69x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)\}.$$

Therefore, we can apply Lemma 2 that entails,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in S_t} (\theta_i^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i) \mathbb{1}\{\tau_{i,t} \geq \bar{\tau}_{i0}\} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lem. 2}}{\leq} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in S_t} \left(4(\theta_0 + \theta_i) \sqrt{\frac{2\theta_0 \theta_i x}{n_{i0,t}}} + \frac{22x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2}{n_{i0,t}} \right) \mathbb{1}\{n_{i0,t} \geq 69x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)\} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lem. 3}}{\leq} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in S_t} \left(8 \sqrt{\frac{(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})(\theta_0 + \theta_i) \theta_0 \theta_i x}{\tau_{i,t}}} + \frac{44x(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})(\theta_0 + \theta_i)}{\tau_{i,t}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^K 16 \sqrt{(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})(\theta_0 + \theta_i) \theta_0 \theta_i x \tau_{i,T}} + 44x(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*}) \sum_{i=1}^K (\theta_0 + \theta_i) (1 + \log(\tau_{i,T})), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\sum_{i=1}^n 1/\sqrt{i} \leq 2\sqrt{n}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n i^{-1} \leq 1 + \log n$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_T^{\text{top}} &\leq 138x(m+1)^2 K \theta_{\max}^3 + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^K 16\theta_{\max}^{3/2} \sqrt{(m+1)x\tau_{i,T}} + 44x(m+1)(1+\theta_{\max})^2 \sum_{i=1}^K (1+\log(\tau_{i,T})) \\ &\leq 138x(m+1)^2 K \theta_{\max}^3 + 16\theta_{\max}^{3/2} \sqrt{2xKT} + 88x(m+1)K\theta_{\max}^2 \left(1 + \log\left(\frac{mT}{K}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}_T^{\text{top}}] \leq 12\sqrt{2}xmK\theta_{\max}^3 + 16\theta_{\max}^{3/2}\sqrt{2xKT} + 88xmK\theta_{\max}^2 \left(1 + \log\left(\frac{mT}{K}\right)\right) + 4mKT^2 e^{-x}\theta_{\max}.$$

Choosing $x = 2 \log T$ concludes the proof. \square

B.5 Proof of Theorem 6

Proof. Let \mathcal{E} be the high-probability event such that Lemma 2 and 3 are satisfied, so that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - 4KTe^{-x}$. Then, denoting $x \wedge y := \min\{x, y\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_T^{\text{wtd}} &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)] = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta))\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} + (\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta))\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}^c\}] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge \mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta)\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} + \mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}^c\}\right] \end{aligned}$$

because $\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) \geq \mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) \geq \mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta)$ under the event \mathcal{E} by Lemma 5. Then, using $\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) \leq \max_i r_i \leq 1$, we get

$$\text{Reg}_T^{\text{wtd}} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} + \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}^c\}\right] \leq 4T^2 K e^{-x} + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right]. \quad (14)$$

Let us upper-bound the second term of the right-hand-side

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left(\sum_{i \in S_t} \frac{r_i \theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t,t}^{\text{ucb}}} - \frac{r_i \theta_i}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}\right) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left(\sum_{i \in S_t} \frac{r_i(\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i)}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}\right) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] && \text{because } \Theta_{S_t,t}^{\text{ucb}} \geq \Theta_{S_t} \text{ under } \mathcal{E} \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left(\sum_{i \in S_t} \frac{|\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}\right) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] && \text{because } r_i \leq 1 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{|\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{i \in S_t\}\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] \\ &\leq 138xm^2 K \theta_{\max}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{|\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \mathbf{1}\{i \in S_t, \tau_{i,t} \geq 138x(m+1)^2 \theta_{\max}^2\}\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] \\ &\leq 138xm^2 K \theta_{\max}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(\theta_0 + \theta_i)\mathbf{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}\right]} \end{aligned}$$

$$\times \underbrace{\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{|\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right)^2 \frac{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}{\frac{\theta_0}{m} + \theta_i} \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t, \tau_{i,t} \geq 138x(m+1)^2 \theta_{\max}^2\} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right]}}_{=: A_T(i)} \quad (15)$$

where the last inequality is by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Now, the term $A_T(i)$ above may be upper-bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned} A_T(i) &:= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{|\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right)^2 \frac{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}{\frac{\theta_0}{m} + \theta_i} \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t, \tau_{i,t} \geq 138x(m+1)^2 \theta_{\max}^2\} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\theta_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i)^2}{\left(\frac{\theta_0}{m} + \theta_i\right) \theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t, \tau_{i,t} \geq 138x(m+1)^2 \theta_{\max}^2\} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since under the event \mathcal{E} by Lemma 3, $\tau_{i,t} \geq 138x(m+1)^2 \theta_{\max}^2$ implies

$$n_{i0,t} \geq 69x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)(m+1)\theta_{\max} \geq 69x(\theta_0 + \theta_i).$$

Therefore, we can apply Lemma 2, which further upper-bounds

$$\begin{aligned} A_T(i) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{2^6(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2 x}{n_{i0,t}} + \frac{2(22x)^2(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^4}{n_{i0,t}^2 \left(\frac{\theta_0}{m} + \theta_i\right)} \right) \times \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t, \tau_{i,t} \geq 138x(m+1)^2 \theta_{\max}^2\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{2^6(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2 x}{n_{i0,t}} + \frac{15x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^3}{n_{i0,t} \theta_{\max}(\theta_0 + m\theta_i)} \right) \times \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where we used $n_{i0,t} \geq 69x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)m\theta_{\max}$ in the last inequality. Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A_T(i) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{(\theta_0 + \theta_i)^2 x}{n_{i0,t}} + \frac{30x(\theta_0 + \theta_i)}{n_{i0,t}} \right) \times \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &\leq (94 + 64\theta_i)x \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\theta_0 + \theta_i) \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}) n_{i0,t}} \right] \\ &= (94 + 64\theta_i)x \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i_t \in \{i, 0\}, i \in S_t\}}{n_{i0,t}} \right] \\ &= (94 + 64\theta_i)x \mathbb{E} \left[1 + \log(n_{i0}(T)) \right] \\ &\leq 158\theta_{\max}x(1 + \log T). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting into (15), we then obtain using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge 1 \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ &\leq 138xm^2 K \theta_{\max}^2 + 13\sqrt{\theta_{\max}x(1 + \log T)} \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\frac{\theta_0}{m} + \theta_i) \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right]} \\ &\leq 138xm^2 K \theta_{\max}^2 + 13\sqrt{\theta_{\max}x(1 + \log T)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[K \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\sum_{i=1}^K (\frac{\theta_0}{m} + \theta_i) \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right]} \end{aligned}$$

$$= 138xm^2K\theta_{\max}^2 + 13\sqrt{\theta_{\max}x(1 + \log T)KT}.$$

Finally, replacing into Inequality (14) yields

$$Reg_T^{\text{wd}} \leq 4T^2Ke^{-x} + 138xm^2K\theta_{\max}^2 + 13\sqrt{\theta_{\max}x(1 + \log T)KT}.$$

Choosing $x = 2 \log T$ concludes the proof. \square

B.6 Proof of Theorem 7

The proof follows the one of Theorem 6, except that the concentration lemmas should be generalized to any pairs (i, j) instead of only with respect to item 0, whose proofs are left to the reader and closely follows the one of Lemma 2 and 3. For simplicity, this proof is performed up to universal multiplicative constants, using the rough inequality \lesssim .

Lemma 9. *Let $T \geq 1$ and $x > 0$. Then, with probability at least $1 - 3K(K+1)Te^{-x}$, simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$ and $i \neq j$ in $[K]$: $\gamma_{ij} := \frac{\theta_i}{\theta_j} \leq \gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}}$ and one of the following two inequalities is satisfied*

$$n_{ij,t} < 69x(1 + \gamma_{ij}) \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} \leq \gamma_{ij} + 4(\gamma_{ij} + 1)\sqrt{\frac{2\gamma_{ij}x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{22x(\gamma_{ij} + 1)^2}{n_{ij,t}}.$$

Lemma 10. *Let $T \geq 1$ and $x > 0$. Then, with probability at least $1 - 3K(K+1)Te^{-x}$, simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$ and $i \in [K]$: $\hat{\theta}_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} := \min_j \gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} \gamma_{j0,t}^{\text{ucb}} \geq \theta_i$ and for all j one of the following two inequalities is satisfied*

$$n_{ij,t} \lesssim x(1 + \gamma_{ij}) \quad \text{or} \quad n_{j0,t} \lesssim x(1 + \theta_j)^2 \theta_j^{-1}$$

or

$$\gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} \gamma_{j0,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i \lesssim \sqrt{(\gamma_{ij} + 1)\theta_i x} \left(\sqrt{\frac{(\theta_i + \theta_j)}{n_{ij,t}}} + \sqrt{\frac{(1 + \theta_j)}{n_{j0,t}}} \right) + (\gamma_{ij} + 1) \frac{(\theta_i + \theta_j)x}{n_{ij,t}} + \frac{\gamma_{ij}(1 + \theta_j)^2 x}{n_{j0,t}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 10. The proof follows from Lemma 9. If $n_{ij,t} > Cx(1 + \gamma_{ij})$ and $n_{j0,t} > Cx(1 + \theta_j)$ for some large enough constant C , we have

$$\gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} \leq \gamma_{ij} + 4(\gamma_{ij} + 1)\sqrt{\frac{2\gamma_{ij}x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{22x(\gamma_{ij} + 1)^2}{n_{ij,t}}$$

and

$$\gamma_{j0,t}^{\text{ucb}} \leq \gamma_{j0} + 4(\gamma_{j0} + 1)\sqrt{\frac{2\gamma_{j0}x}{n_{j0,t}}} + \frac{22x(\gamma_{j0} + 1)^2}{n_{j0,t}} \leq 2\gamma_{j0}.$$

This implies,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} \gamma_{j0,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i &= \gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} \gamma_{j0,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \gamma_{ij} \gamma_{j0} = (\gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \gamma_{ij}) \gamma_{j0,t}^{\text{ucb}} + \gamma_{ij} (\gamma_{j0,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \gamma_{j0}) \\ &\leq 2(\gamma_{ij,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \gamma_{ij}) \gamma_{j0} + \gamma_{ij} (\gamma_{j0,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \gamma_{j0}) \\ &\leq 8\gamma_{j0}(\gamma_{ij} + 1)\sqrt{\frac{2\gamma_{ij}x}{n_{ij,t}}} + \frac{44x\gamma_{j0}(\gamma_{ij} + 1)^2}{n_{ij,t}} + 4\gamma_{ij}(\gamma_{j0} + 1)\sqrt{\frac{2\gamma_{j0}x}{n_{j0,t}}} + \frac{22x\gamma_{ij}(\gamma_{j0} + 1)^2}{n_{j0,t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Replacing $\gamma_{ij} = \theta_i/\theta_j$ and $\gamma_{j0} = \theta_j$ concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 11. *Let $T \geq 1$ and $x > 0$. Then, with probability at least $1 - K(K+1)Te^{-x}$*

$$\tau_{ij,t} < 2x \frac{(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})^2}{\theta_i + \theta_j} \quad \text{or} \quad n_{ij,t} \geq \frac{(\theta_i + \theta_j)\tau_{ij,t}}{2(\theta_0 + \Theta_{S^*})}, \quad (16)$$

where $\tau_{ij,t} := \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{1}\{\{i, j\} \subseteq S_s\}$ simultaneously for all $t \in [T]$ and $i \neq j \in [K]$.

Proof of Theorem 7. Let \mathcal{E} be the high-probability event of Lemmas 10 and 11 are satisfied, so that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - 4K^2Te^{-x}$. First, note that since we have under the event \mathcal{E} , $\widehat{\theta}_t^{\text{ucb}} \leq \theta_t^{\text{ucb}}$, our procedure also satisfies the regret upper-bound

$$\text{Reg}_T^{\text{wtd}} \leq O(\sqrt{\theta_{\max}KT} \log T)$$

of Theorem 6. Indeed, all upper-bounds of the proof of Theorem 6 remain valid upper-bounds except the probability of the event \mathcal{E}^c which is $O(T^{-1})$ for $x = 2 \log T$.

Let us now prove that we also have $R_T \leq O(K\sqrt{T} \log T)$ with no asymptotic dependence on θ_{\max} when $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_T^{\text{wtd}} &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)] = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta))\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} + (\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta))\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}^c\}] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \widehat{\theta}_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge \mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta)\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} + \mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}^c\}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using $\mathcal{R}(S^*, \theta) \leq \max_i r_i \leq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_T^{\text{wtd}} &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \widehat{\theta}_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} + \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}^c\}\right] \\ &\leq 4T^2K(K+1)^2e^{-x} + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \widehat{\theta}_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right]. \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

Follow the proof of Theorem 6, we upper-bound the second term of the right-hand-side of (17):

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \widehat{\theta}_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] \quad (18) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left(\min_{j \in [K]} \sum_{i \in S_t} \frac{r_i \widehat{\theta}_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}}}{1 + \sum_{j \in S_t} \widehat{\theta}_{j,t}^{\text{ucb}}} - \frac{r_i \theta_i}{1 + \sum_{j \in S_t} \theta_j}\right) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left(\sum_{i \in S_t} \frac{r_i(\widehat{\theta}_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i)}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}\right) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] \quad \text{because } \sum_{i \in S_t} \widehat{\theta}_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} \geq \Theta_{S_t} \text{ under } \mathcal{E} \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left(\sum_{i \in S_t} \frac{|\widehat{\theta}_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}}\right) \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] \quad \text{because } r_i \leq 1 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{|\widehat{\theta}_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{i \in S_t\}\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{|\gamma_{ij_t,t}^{\text{ucb}} \gamma_{j_t 0,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \wedge 1\right)\mathbf{1}\{i \in S_t\}\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}\right] \end{aligned}$$

where $j_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in S_t \cup \{0\}} \theta_j$, where the last inequality is by definition of $\hat{\theta}_{i,t}^{\text{ucb}}$. Now, from Lemma 10, paying an additive exploration cost to ensure that $n_{ij,t} \gtrsim x(1 + \gamma_{ij})$ and $n_{j_0,t} \gtrsim x(1 + \theta_j)^2 \theta_j$ for all $j \in S_t$ such that $\theta_j \geq \theta_0$. From Lemma 11, this is satisfied if for some constant $C > 0$

$$\tau_{ij,t} > Cm^2 \theta_{\max}^2 x.$$

Such a condition can be wrong for a couple $(i, j) \in S_t^2$ at most during $CK^2 m^2 \theta_{\max}^2 x = O(\log T)$ rounds (since $\tau_{ij,t}$ increases then). Thus, for C large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \hat{\theta}_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge 1 \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ & \leq O(\log T) + \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{|\gamma_{ij_t,t}^{\text{ucb}} \gamma_{j_t 0,t}^{\text{ucb}} - \theta_i|}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t, \tau_{ij_t,t} \wedge \tau_{j_t,t} \geq Cm^2 \theta_{\max}^2\} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ & \lesssim O(\log T) + \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sqrt{(\gamma_{ij_t} + 1)\theta_i} x \left(\sqrt{\frac{(\theta_i + \theta_{j_t})}{n_{ij_t,t}}} + \sqrt{\frac{(1 + \theta_j)}{n_{j_t 0,t}}} \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + (\gamma_{ij_t} + 1) \frac{(\theta_i + \theta_{j_t})x}{n_{ij_t,t}} + \frac{\gamma_{ij_t}(1 + \theta_{j_t})^2 x}{n_{j_t 0,t}} \right) \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right] \\ & \leq O(\log T) + \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \sqrt{(\gamma_{ij_t} + 1)\theta_i} x \left(\sqrt{\frac{(\theta_i + \theta_{j_t})}{n_{ij_t,t}}} + \sqrt{\frac{(1 + \theta_{j_t})}{n_{j_t 0,t}}} \right) \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is because using that $\{i, j_t, 0\} \subseteq S_t$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1 + \theta_{j_t}}{(1 + \Theta_{S_t}) n_{j_t 0,t}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i_t \in \{j, 0\}\}}{n_{j_0,t}} \mathbb{1}\{j = j_t\} \right] \leq K(1 + \log T).$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\theta_i + \theta_{j_t}}{(1 + \Theta_{S_t}) n_{ij_t,t}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i_t \in \{j, i\}\}}{n_{j_0,t}} \mathbb{1}\{j = j_t\} \right] \leq K(1 + \log T).$$

Then, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we further get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left((\mathcal{R}(S_t, \hat{\theta}_t^{\text{ucb}}) - \mathcal{R}(S_t, \theta)) \wedge 1 \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \right] \\ & \lesssim O(\log T) + \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{(\gamma_{ij_t} + 1)\theta_i \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\} x}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{(\theta_i + \theta_{j_t})}{n_{ij_t,t}} + \frac{(1 + \theta_{j_t})}{n_{j_t 0,t}} \right) \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\}}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right]} \\ & \lesssim O(\log T) + \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{(\gamma_{ij_t} + 1)\theta_i \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\} x}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right]} \sqrt{K \log T} \\ & \lesssim O(\log T) + \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\theta_i \mathbb{1}\{i \in S_t\} x}{\theta_0 + \Theta_{S_t}} \right]} \sqrt{K \log T} \quad \text{because } \gamma_{ij_t} \leq 1 \text{ by definition of } j_t \\ & \leq O(K \sqrt{T x \log T}) = O(K \sqrt{T} \log T), \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where the last inequality is by Jensen's inequality and the equality by setting $x = 2 \log T$ to control the probability that \mathcal{E}^c occurs. This concludes the proof. \square