
LinearAPT: An Adaptive Algorithm for the Fixed-Budget Thresholding Linear Bandit Problem

Yun-Ang Wu

r11944072@ntu.edu.tw

National Taiwan University

Yun-Da Tsai

f08946007@csie.ntu.edu.tw

National Taiwan University

Shou-De Lin

sdlin@csie.ntu.edu.tw

National Taiwan University

Abstract

In this study, we delve into the Thresholding Linear Bandit (TLB) problem, a nuanced domain within stochastic Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) problems, focusing on maximizing decision accuracy against a linearly defined threshold under resource constraints. We present LinearAPT, a novel algorithm designed for the fixed budget setting of TLB, providing an efficient solution to optimize sequential decision-making. This algorithm not only offers a theoretical upper bound for estimated loss but also showcases robust performance on both synthetic and real-world datasets. Our contributions highlight the adaptability, simplicity, and computational efficiency of LinearAPT, making it a valuable addition to the toolkit for addressing complex sequential decision-making challenges.

1 Introduction

Stochastic Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) problems have long been pivotal in machine learning, aimed at optimizing sequential decision-making to maximize cumulative rewards. This domain has expanded to include the Thresholding Bandit Problem (TBP), which focuses on identifying options surpassing a certain performance threshold, catering to a wide array of applications such as binary classification and anomaly detection, and highlighting the importance of decision-making in uncertain environments.

Our research focus on the less explored Thresholding Linear Bandit (TLB) problem, where decisions are assessed against a specific threshold, and the mean rewards of arms adhere to a linear model with undetermined parameters. The study of TLB unfolds under two principal scenarios: the fixed budget setting, where the objective is to identify actions above the threshold within a limited number of trials, and the fixed confidence setting, which aims at minimizing trial numbers to achieve a certain confidence level in decision accuracy.

In addressing the fixed budget scenario of TLB, we introduce a novel algorithm specifically crafted for this context. This method underlines efficient exploration and exploitation within set trial limits, strategically optimizing decision-making under resource constraints. By focusing on the fixed budget scenario, our contribution presents a pragmatic approach to the TLB dilemma, enriching the arsenal for navigating complex sequential decision-making challenges.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce an algorithm, LinearAPT, tailored for the novel fixed-budget thresholding bandit setting, accompanied by a theoretical upper bound for estimated loss.
- Our algorithm demonstrates competitive performance across synthetic and real-world datasets. It exhibits adaptability, simplicity of implementation, and computational efficiency, bolstering its utility and effectiveness.

	Fixed Budget	Fixed confidence
Unstructured	Locatelli et al. (2016)	Chen et al. (2014)
Linear	Our Paper	Degenne et al. (2020)

Table 1: A list of papers presenting results on various variants of the thresholding bandit problem. As per our current knowledge, this paper is the first to provide an upper bound for the fixed budget linear thresholding bandit problem.

2 Related Works

Table 1 succinctly summarizes the landscape of research on various TBP variants, highlighting our contribution as the first to provide an upper bound for the fixed budget linear thresholding bandit problem.

2.1 Unstructured Thresholding Bandit Problems

Both the fixed budget and fixed confidence settings of the unstructured TBP have been extensively explored. Works such as those by [Chen et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#) provide foundational studies in these areas. Additionally, variations of the unstructured TBP, including studies on aggregate regret [Tao et al. \(2019\)](#) and shape-constrained models beneficial for applications like medical trials [Garivier et al. \(2018\)](#); [Cheshire et al. \(2020; 2021\)](#), have expanded the understanding of TBP under specific constraints, such as monotonically increasing mean rewards.

2.2 Structured Thresholding Bandit Problems

The structured TBP, including linear models and graph bandit cases, has seen significant developments. Linear pure exploration [Degenne et al. \(2020\)](#) and graph bandit TBP [LeJeune et al. \(2020\)](#) under both fixed budget and fixed confidence settings have been studied, offering algorithms that are asymptotically optimal in certain scenarios. Notably, our work is the first to address linear TBP in the fixed budget setting, filling a gap in the current literature.

2.3 Level Set Estimation

The study of level set estimation [Gotovos et al. \(2013\)](#) presents another angle on structured TBP, focusing on classifying elements of a domain based on their relation to a threshold. This approach models the underlying function as a sample from a Gaussian process, offering insights into structured TBP where the function exhibits specific characteristics, such as linearity.

3 Problem Definition

3.1 Linear Bandit

Consider \mathcal{A} , a finite subset within the d -dimensional real space \mathbb{R}^d , representing the set of available actions or "arms." Let $K = |\mathcal{A}|$ denote the total number of arms, with $x_1, \dots, x_K = \mathcal{A}$. The terminology "arm x_i " and "arm i " are used interchangeably for simplicity. The expected reward for choosing arm x_i is given by $\mu_i = \langle \theta, x_i \rangle$, which is the inner product of the arm's feature vector x_i and an unknown parameter vector θ .

We introduce the notion of an R -sub-Gaussian distribution, a common assumption in the analysis of bandit algorithms. Formally, a distribution ν is considered R -sub-Gaussian if for any real number t ,

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \nu}[\exp(tX - t\mathbb{E}[X])] \leq \exp\left(\frac{R^2 t^2}{2}\right)$$

K	Number of arms
\mathcal{A}	set of arms
d	Dimension of arm vectors
θ	Regression parameter
$\hat{\theta}_t$	Estimated regression parameter at round t
L	Upper bound of arm vector
ϵ	Precision
τ	Threshold
T	Budget
x_i	Arm vector of arm i
$x_{\phi(t)}$	Arm selected at round t
r_t	Returned reward at round t
μ_i	Mean reward of arm i
$\hat{\mu}_i(t)$	Estimated reward of arm i at round t
Δ_i	Gap for arm i , defined as $ \mu_i - \tau + \epsilon$
$\hat{\Delta}_i(t)$	Estimated gap for arm i at round t , defined as $ \hat{\mu}_i(t) - \tau + \epsilon$
H	Complexity, defined as $\sum_{i=1}^K \Delta_i^{-2}$
$T_i(t)$	Number of pulls up to time t for arm i
$B_i(t)$	$\sqrt{T_i(t-1)\hat{\Delta}_i(t-1)}$

Table 2: Table of Notations used

This condition ensures a controlled behavior of reward distributions, allowing us to derive theoretical guarantees. For the sake of clarity and without loss of generality, we set the variance parameter $R = 1$ throughout our analysis. Upon selecting an arm, the algorithm receives a reward sampled from an R-sub-Gaussian distribution ν_i with mean μ_i . Additionally, we assume that the Euclidean norm of each arm is bounded, specifically, $\forall i \in [K], \|x_i\| \leq L$. This constraint on the arm vectors is crucial for ensuring the feasibility of the learning problem within our defined space.

3.2 Thresholding Bandit

This subsection elucidates the objective within the thresholding bandit problem framework, adhering to the notation conventions established in [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#). The primary goal revolves around categorizing all arm means relative to a specified threshold value. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ represent the threshold, and let $\epsilon \geq 0$ denote the precision level. We define S_u as the subset of arms from \mathcal{A} whose mean values exceed u , i.e., $S_u = \{x_i \in \mathcal{A} | \mu_i \geq u\}$. Conversely, S_u^C comprises those arms with mean values below u . The task is to accurately identify arms within $S_{\tau+\epsilon}$ and $S_{\tau-\epsilon}^C$, thus classifying arms with a precision up to ϵ .

To estimate the set S_u at round t , we introduce $\hat{S}_u(t) = \{x_i \in \mathcal{A} | \hat{\mu}_i(t) \geq u\}$. The effectiveness of an algorithm after T rounds is quantified by its loss, expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}(T) = \mathbb{I}(S_{\tau+\epsilon} \cap \hat{S}_\tau(T)^C \neq \emptyset \vee S_{\tau-\epsilon}^C \cap \hat{S}_\tau(T) \neq \emptyset)$$

which underscores the necessity for precise classification of arms whose mean rewards are either above $\tau + \epsilon$ or below $\tau - \epsilon$. The inherent randomness in arm sampling influences this loss metric. Consequently, minimizing the expected loss, defined as

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(T)] = \mathbb{P}(S_{\tau+\epsilon} \cap \hat{S}_\tau(T)^C \neq \emptyset \vee S_{\tau-\epsilon}^C \cap \hat{S}_\tau(T) \neq \emptyset)$$

becomes the algorithm's overarching objective.

Furthermore, acknowledging the varying complexities inherent to different scenarios is critical. Hence, we introduce a measure of problem complexity, inspired by [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#), which

Algorithm 1 LinearAPT

Require: $n \geq 0$ $V_0 \leftarrow I$ $b_0 \leftarrow 0$ $\hat{\theta}_0 \leftarrow 0$ **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do** **if** $t \in [K]$ **then** Pull arm t **else** Pull arm $x_{\phi(t)} = \arg \min_{k \leq K} B_k(t)$ **end if** Observe reward $r_t \sim \nu_{\phi(t)}$ $V_t \leftarrow V_{t-1} + x_{\phi(t)} x_{\phi(t)}^T$ $b_t \leftarrow b_{t-1} + r_t x_{\phi(t)}$ $\hat{\theta}_t \leftarrow V_t^{-1} b_t$ **end for**

is formulated as

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^K \Delta_i^{-2} = \sum_{i=1}^K (|\mu_i - \tau| + \epsilon)^{-2}$$

highlighting how H is contingent upon both the threshold τ and the precision ϵ . This complexity metric serves as a vital parameter in understanding and tackling the thresholding bandit problem.

4 Algorithm

4.1 LinearAPT

We propose our algorithm, LinearAPT, which is derived from the APT (Anytime Parameter-free Thresholding) algorithm [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#). We also provide an upper bound on the expected loss, which will be presented in the next section. Unlike the scenario with unstructured bandit problems where the estimated mean, $\hat{\mu}_s$, is calculated as the sum of all previous rewards, our context requires a more nuanced approach due to the linear relationship between the reward and the arm vector. To this end, after s rounds, given the pairings of arm vectors and rewards, $(x_{\phi(t)}, r_t)_{t \leq s}$, we aim to estimate the hidden parameter θ .

This estimation is achieved by addressing the optimization problem:

$$\hat{\theta}_s = \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sum_{t=1}^s (r_t - \langle \theta, x_{\phi(t)} \rangle)^2 + \lambda \|\theta\|^2 \right)$$

which essentially performs a regularized regression on the available data. The regularization term, $\lambda \|\theta\|^2$, ensures uniqueness of the solution by preventing ill-conditioned outcomes when the set $x_{\phi(1)}, \dots, x_{\phi(s)}$ does not span the entire space \mathbb{R}^d .

The solution to this optimization problem can be efficiently computed in a recursive manner using the following formulations:

$$\begin{aligned} b_0 &= 0, & b_t &= b_{t-1} + r_t x_{\phi(t)} & \text{where } \forall t \ b_t &\in \mathbb{R}^d \\ V_0 &= \lambda I, & V_t &= V_{t-1} + x_{\phi(t)} x_{\phi(t)}^T & \text{where } \forall t \ V_t &\in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \end{aligned}$$

The recursive solution yields $\hat{\theta}_s = V_s^{-1} b_s$ as the optimal estimate for the hidden parameter θ , demonstrating the efficiency and effectiveness of LinearAPT in leveraging linear relationships in bandit problems.

4.2 Theoretical Bound

Before presenting our principal theorem, we introduce several lemmas that lay the foundation for our analysis:

Lemma 1. (*Soare et al. (2014b)*) For any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\forall t \geq 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad |x^T \theta - x^T \hat{\theta}_t| \leq \|x\|_{V_t^{-1}} \left(\sqrt{d \log \left(\frac{1 + tL^2}{\delta} \right)} + \|\theta\| \right)$$

Proof. This is obtained by setting $\lambda = 1$ in Proposition 2 of Soare et al. (2014b). \square

Lemma 2. (*Réda et al. (2021)*) For any $t > 0$, for any $i \in [K]$ such that $T_i(t) > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\|x\|_{(V_t)^{-1}}^2 \leq x^T (I + T_i(t) x_i x_i^T)^{-1} x$$

Proof. This is concluded by setting $\lambda = 1$ in Lemma 11 of Réda et al. (2021). \square

Lemma 3. For any $t > 0$ and for any arm $i \in [K]$ with $T_i(t) > 0$, we have

$$\|x_i\|_{V_t^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_i(t)}}$$

Proof. See Appendix B. \square

With these preliminaries established, we present our main result as follows:

Theorem 1. Assume all arm distribution is 1-sub-gaussian and $\|x_i\| \leq L$, $\|\theta\| < \sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 H}}$ where $\gamma = 4$. Algorithm LinearAPT's expected loss is upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(T)] \leq \exp \left\{ \log(1 + TL^2) - \frac{1}{d} \left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 H}} - \|\theta\| \right)^2 \right\}$$

Proof. See Appendix A. \square

4.3 Analysis

As demonstrated in Table 3, the upper bound derived for our approach does not depend on K , the number of arms. This characteristic aligns with our intuition, as our primary objective involves estimating the underlying parameter rather than the mean of each arm individually. If a reliable approximation of the original parameter is obtained, it enables immediate estimation for any additional arms introduced subsequently. This contrasts sharply with the unstructured scenario, where the absence of auxiliary information necessitates a bound that escalates with K .

However, our upper bound incorporates a term $-1/d$, which emerges from the \sqrt{d} component found in Proposition 2 of Soare et al. (2014a). Previous studies have illuminated that this term represents a compromise for achieving adaptability within the proposition. The essence of this trade-off lies in the observation that as the dimensionality increases, the estimated parameter encapsulates diminishing informational value, necessitating a larger budget to ensure the precision of the estimation.

Moreover, our proposed algorithm exhibits computational efficiency. The primary computational demand arises from the inversion of a $d \times d$ matrix required during the update of the estimated parameter $\hat{\theta}$. Consequently, the overall computational complexity of our algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(Td^\phi)$, where ϕ is contingent upon the specific matrix inversion technique employed. This feature underscores the practicality of our algorithm, especially in contexts where computational resources are a consideration.

Scenario	Upper bound
Unstructured Locatelli et al. (2016)	$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(T)] \asymp \left(-\frac{T}{H} + \log(\log(T)K)\right)$
Graph LeJeune et al. (2020)	$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(T)] \asymp \left(-\frac{T}{H} + d_T \log(T)\right)$
Linear	$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(T)] \asymp \left(-\frac{T}{dH} + \log(T)\right)$

Table 3: A comparison on theoretical upper bound with other paper solving different variants of thresholding bandit problem.

5 Experiments

5.1 Setup

To empirically estimate $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(T)]$, the expected loss over time T , we employ an experimental approximation method defined as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(T)] \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}_i(T)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_i(T)$ denotes the loss observed in the i th simulation. In our experiments, we have chosen $N = 10,000$ to ensure statistical significance. The failure rate obtained through this method serves as an estimate of our algorithm’s performance.

5.2 Dataset

Our evaluation compares the effectiveness of our algorithm against established baseline methods across two synthetic datasets and two real-world datasets. This approach allows us to rigorously assess our algorithm’s adaptability and performance in both controlled and practical scenarios.

Synthetic Dataset All arm vector $\{x_1, \dots, x_K\} = \mathcal{X}$ is sampled from the uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}([-1, 1]^d)$. The parameter θ is also random sampled from the same distribution. We set $K = 20, \tau = 0$ and $\epsilon = 0.01$. We measure the performance of algorithms at $T = 40, 80, 120, 160, 200$. To understand the effect of dimension on the algorithm’s performance, we perform experiments on $d = 5, 20$ respectively.

Real-world Dataset For our experiment, we use a modified version of iris and wine dataset from sklearn. While these two datasets were initially designed for classification tasks, we can transform them into linear regression datasets by sampling a random linear function. This approach follows the methodology commonly used in the literature, as seen in [Dudík et al. \(2011\)](#); [Tsai et al. \(2022; 2023; 2024\)](#). For example, a data instance in iris has the shape of $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times \{1, 2, 3\}$ where x is the feature and y is the label. A synthetic parameter θ is randomly sampled from $\mathcal{U}([-1, 1]^4)$, the pseudo reward for x is then defined as $\langle x, \theta \rangle$. The point is the distribution of arm is more natural when the dataset is constructed in this way. We set the threshold as the mean value of the rewards $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \theta, x_i \rangle$ and the precision $\epsilon = 0.1$. The budget is $T = 200, 250, 300, 350, 400$.

5.3 Baseline

We first introduce two baselines, Random and APT. As explained in the following section, linear-APT can be viewed as an composition of these two algorithm. This makes important to compare linearAPT with these two algorithm, as it serves like an ablation study for linearAPT.

Random This algorithm has a random arm selection rule, that is, the next exempld arm is determined by a random sample from $[K]$. the algorithm also exploit the knowledge of the underlying

linear structure by estimating the hidden parameter θ by solving the optimization problem mentioned earlier. In other words, the only difference between Random and LinearAPT is the selection rule in line 8.

APT APT is the algorithm introduced by [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#). Since this algorithm solves the unstructured version of TBP, it is easy to assume that linearAPT performs better under datasets with linear structure. linearAPT coincides with APT when the estimated mean is calculated by the average of the reward history of the target arm, not by the inner product between the arm vector and the estimated parameter.

UCBE We also follow [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#) and include UCB-type algorithm as our baseline. The UCBE algorithm was introduced as a baseline in [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#). The selection rule in line 8 of our algorithm was changed into $\arg \min_k \hat{\Delta}_k - \sqrt{\frac{a}{T_k(t)}}$. similar to [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#), we set $a = 4^i \frac{T-K}{H}$ for $i = \{-1, 0, 4\}$. Note that in a realistic scenario, it is not possible to calculate a using i since we do not have access to the complexity H .





Figure 3: LinearAPT demonstrates competitive performance in the experiment results on synthetic data. The y-axis represents the logarithm of the probability of failure. The left and right figures represent the experimental results for $d = 5$ and $d = 20$ respectively. When d is large, the performance of unstructured algorithms improves.

5.4 Results

The performance of LinearAPT across various settings, as depicted in the figures, showcases its competitiveness. To ensure a thorough evaluation, the budget for each dataset was intentionally set to exceed the total number of arms, accommodating our algorithm’s prerequisite for sampling each arm at least once. Specifically, for a synthetic dataset with $K = 20$ arms, the budget commenced at $T = 40$. Similarly, for the Iris and Wine datasets, featuring $K = 150$ and 178 arms respectively, the starting budget was established at $T = 200$.

With carefully tuned hyperparameter i , UCBE can compete with our algorithm’s performance. In 3 out of 4 of our experiments, UCBE(-1) can compete with LinearAPT, and in 3 out of 4 of our experiments, UCBE(0) can compete with LinearAPT. The problem is when facing an unseen problem, we usually do not know which hyperparameter i is better. Secondly, even if we have knowledge about which i is better, we cannot calculate $a = 4^i \frac{T-K}{H}$ without access to complexity H . We can view LinearAPT as a one-for-all universal solution to this problem.

In the synthetic dataset scenario, illustrated in 3, we observe that as the dimensionality increases from 5 to 20, the APT algorithm begins to rival our LinearAPT approach. This aligns with the earlier



(a) Modified version of iris dataset

(b) Modified version of wine dataset

Figure 6: LinearAPT demonstrates competitive performance on real-world data. The left and right figures represent the experimental results for the iris and wine datasets, respectively. Similar behavior to the synthetic data can be observed.

discussion that higher dimensions necessitate a greater number of samples before the estimation of the parameter becomes sufficiently accurate. The presence of a $-d/T$ term in our upper bound suggests that LinearAPT excels when this term is significant. This pattern is also evident in real-world datasets, where the dimensionality of the action space is 4 for the Iris dataset and 13 for the Wine dataset, indicating a similar trend in performance across varying dimensions.

Additionally, an interesting observation arises when comparing the random algorithm to UCBE in low-dimensional settings ($d = 5$). In such cases, any arbitrary direction contributes to refining the estimation of the regression parameter, rendering the random algorithm surprisingly competitive. This highlights the nuanced interplay between dimensionality and algorithm performance, underscoring the adaptability of LinearAPT in both synthetic and real-world environments.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce LinearAPT, a theoretically justified algorithm that addresses a novel variant of a classic bandit pure exploration problem. The algorithm demonstrates competitive performance on both synthetic and real-world datasets and is computationally efficient. Its computational complexity and theoretical upper bound scale well with the dataset size, making it a practical choice for handling large datasets.

The theoretical lower bound of the fixed confidence TLB problem was established by previous work [Dejenne et al. \(2020\)](#). However, as of our current knowledge, the lower bound of the fixed-budget TLB problem remains unknown. We also lack knowledge on whether the lower bound for the fixed confidence case can be transformed into our setting. Further investigation has been left for future work.

For the algorithm design and proof, we draw significant inspiration from [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#) and [LeJeune et al. \(2020\)](#). Exploring whether similar techniques generalize to other structured bandit settings represents a promising avenue for future research.

References

Shouyuan Chen, Tian Lin, Irwin King, Michael R Lyu, and Wei Chen. Combinatorial pure exploration of multi-armed bandits. In Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K.Q. Weinberger (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran As-

-
- sociates, Inc., 2014. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2014/file/e56954b4f6347e897f954495eab16a88-Paper.pdf.
- James Cheshire, Pierre Menard, and Alexandra Carpentier. The influence of shape constraints on the thresholding bandit problem. In Jacob Abernethy and Shivani Agarwal (eds.), *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1228–1275. PMLR, 09–12 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v125/cheshire20a.html>.
- James Cheshire, Pierre Menard, and Alexandra Carpentier. Problem dependent view on structured thresholding bandit problems. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang (eds.), *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1846–1854. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/cheshire21a.html>.
- Rémy Degenne, Pierre Menard, Xuedong Shang, and Michal Valko. Gamification of pure exploration for linear bandits. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh (eds.), *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2432–2442. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/degenne20a.html>.
- Miroslav Dudík, John Langford, and Lihong Li. Doubly robust policy evaluation and learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1103.4601*, 2011.
- Aurélien Garivier, Pierre Ménard, Laurent Rossi, and Pierre Menard. Thresholding bandit for dose-ranging: The impact of monotonicity, 2018.
- Alkis Gotovos, Nathalie Casati, Gregory Hitz, and Andreas Krause. Active learning for level set estimation. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, IJCAI ’13, pp. 1344–1350. AAAI Press, 2013. ISBN 9781577356332.
- Daniel LeJeune, Gautam Dasarathy, and Richard Baraniuk. Thresholding graph bandits with graph. In Silvia Chiappa and Roberto Calandra (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2476–2485. PMLR, 26–28 Aug 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v108/lejeune20a.html>.
- Andrea Locatelli, Maurilio Gutzeit, and Alexandra Carpentier. An optimal algorithm for the thresholding bandit problem. In Maria Florina Balcan and Kilian Q. Weinberger (eds.), *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1690–1698, New York, New York, USA, 20–22 Jun 2016. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v48/locatelli16.html>.
- Clémence Réda, Emilie Kaufmann, and Andrée Delahaye-Duriez. Top-m identification for linear bandits. In Arindam Banerjee and Kenji Fukumizu (eds.), *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1108–1116. PMLR, 13–15 Apr 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v130/reda21a.html>.
- Marta Soare, Alessandro Lazaric, and Rémi Munos. Best-arm identification in linear bandits. *CoRR*, abs/1409.6110, 2014a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.6110>.
- Marta Soare, Alessandro Lazaric, and Remi Munos. Best-arm identification in linear bandits. In Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K.Q. Weinberger (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014b. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2014/file/f387624df552cea2f369918c5e1e12bc-Paper.pdf.

Chao Tao, Saúl Blanco, Jian Peng, and Yuan Zhou. Thresholding bandit with optimal aggregate regret. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/9a0684d9dad4967ddd09594511de2c52-Paper.pdf.

Tzu-Hsien Tsai, Yun-Da Tsai, and Shou-De Lin. lil'hdoc: An algorithm for good arm identification under small threshold gap. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15879*, 2024.

Yun-Da Tsai, Shou-De Lin, and Shou-De Lin. Fast online inference for nonlinear contextual bandit based on generative adversarial network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08867*, 2022.

Yun-Da Tsai, Tzu-Hsien Tsai, and Shou-De Lin. Differential good arm identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07154*, 2023.

A Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. The proof of theorem 1 follows a similar structure of [Locatelli et al. \(2016\)](#) and [LeJeune et al. \(2020\)](#). Our proof is divided into four steps:

Step 1: High probability bound Assume $\|\theta\| < \sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 H}}$ and set

$$\delta = \exp \left\{ \log(1 + TL^2) - \frac{1}{d} \left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 H}} - \|\theta\| \right)^2 \right\}$$

Then for any arm i and any $t > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| &= |x_i^T \theta - x_i^T \hat{\theta}_t| \\ &\leq \|x_i\|_{V_i^{-1}} \left(\sqrt{d \log \left(\frac{1 + tL^2}{\delta} \right)} + \|\theta\| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_i(t)}} \left(\sqrt{d \log \left(\frac{1 + TL^2}{\delta} \right)} + \|\theta\| \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 T_a(t) H}} \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: Characterization of a helpful arm There exists an arm k at time T such that $T_k(T) \geq \frac{T}{H\Delta_k^2}$. Otherwise we get

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^K T_i(T) < \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{T}{H\Delta_i^2} = T$$

Consider the last time $t^* \leq T$ the arm k was pulled. then

$$T_k(t^*) = T_k(T) \geq \frac{T}{H\Delta_k^2}$$

Step 3: Bounding other arms using the helpful arm From the triangle inequality and the definitions we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \mu(i)| &= |(\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \tau) - (\mu_i - \tau)| \\ &\geq ||\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \tau| - |\mu_i - \tau|| \\ &= |(|\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \tau| + \epsilon) - (|\mu_i - \tau| + \epsilon)| \\ &= |\hat{\Delta}_i(t) - \Delta_i| \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the bound we get in step 1 we get

$$\Delta_i - \sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 T_i(t) H}} \leq \hat{\Delta}_i(t) \leq \Delta_i + \sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 T_i(t) H}}$$

By the construction of the algorithm, we know that at time t^* , for any arm $i \in [K]$,

$$B_k(t^*) \leq B_i(t^*)$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
B_i(t) &= \hat{\Delta}_i \sqrt{T_i(t)} \\
&\leq \left(\Delta_i + \sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 T_i(t) H}} \right) \sqrt{T_i(t)} \\
&\leq \Delta_i \sqrt{T_i(t)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{T}{H}}
\end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
B_k(t) &\geq \hat{\Delta}_k(t) \sqrt{T_k(t)} \\
&\geq \left(\Delta_k - \sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 T_k(t) H}} \right) \sqrt{T_k(t)} \\
&\geq \left(\Delta_k - \frac{1}{\gamma} \Delta_k \right) \sqrt{\frac{T}{H \Delta_k^2}} \\
&= \left(\frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma} \right) \sqrt{\frac{T}{H}}
\end{aligned}$$

Combine these three inequalities, we get

$$\left(\frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma} \right) \sqrt{\frac{T}{H}} \leq B_k(t^*) \leq B_i(t^*) \leq \Delta_i \sqrt{T_i(t^*)} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{T}{H}}$$

We get a lower bound on $T_i(T)$ from this

$$\left(\frac{\gamma - 2}{\gamma} \right)^2 \frac{T}{H \Delta_i^2} \leq T_i(t^*) \leq T_i(T)$$

Step 4: Conclusion The last inequality in step 3 yields

$$\sqrt{\frac{T}{T_i(T) H}} \leq \Delta_i \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma - 2} \right)$$

Combine this with the bound on the mean and the estimated mean yields

$$|\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma^2 T_i(t) H}} \leq \Delta_i \left(\frac{1}{\gamma - 2} \right) = \frac{\Delta_i}{2}$$

For arms such that $\mu_i \geq \tau + \epsilon$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mu}_i - \tau &\geq \mu_i(T) - \tau - \frac{\Delta_i}{2} \\
&\geq \mu_i - \tau - \frac{1}{2} (\mu_i - \tau + \epsilon) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} (\mu_i - \tau - \epsilon) \\
&\geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

Similar argument holds for arms with $\mu_i < \tau - \epsilon$. We conclude that with high probability $1 - \delta$, all arms are correctly identified by the algorithm. As for the remaining event with probability δ , we do not know whether the loss is 0 or not. This yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(T)] \leq \delta$$

□

B Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. When $x_i = 0$, the above inequality is trivial. Assume $x_i \neq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_i\|_{V_t}^2 &\leq \|x_i\|_{(I+T_i(t)x_i x_i^T)^{-1}}^2 && \text{By lemma 1} \\ &= x_i^T (I + T_i(t)x_i x_i^T)^{-1} x_i \\ &= \|x_i\|^2 - \frac{x_i^T T_i(t)x_i x_i^T x_i}{1 + T_i(t)\|x_i\|^2} && \text{By sherman-morrison formula} \\ &= \|x_i\|^2 - \frac{T_i(t)\|x_i\|^4}{1 + T_i(t)\|x_i\|^2} \\ &= \frac{\|x_i\|^2 + T_i(t)\|x_i\|^4 - T_i(t)\|x_i\|^4}{1 + T_i(t)\|x_i\|^2} \\ &= \frac{\|x_i\|^2}{1 + T_i(t)\|x_i\|^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\|x_i\|^2}{T_i(t)\|x_i\|^2} = \frac{1}{T_i(t)} \end{aligned}$$

□