

Barely Random Algorithms for Metrical Task Systems

Romain Cosson
romain.cosson@inria.fr

Laurent Massoulié
laurent.massoulié@inria.fr

Abstract

We consider metrical task systems on general metric spaces with n points, and show that any fully randomized algorithm can be turned into a randomized algorithm that uses only $2 \log n$ random bits, and achieves the same competitive ratio up to a factor 2. This provides the first order-optimal *barely random* algorithms for metrical task systems, i.e. which use a number of random bits that does not depend on the number of requests addressed to the system. We put forward an equivalent view that we call *collective metrical task systems* where k agents in a metrical task system team up, and suffer the average cost paid by each agent. Our results imply that such team can be $O(\log n^2)$ -competitive, as soon as $k \geq n^2$ (in comparison, a single agent is $\Omega(n)$ -competitive at best). We discuss implications on various aspects of online decision making such as: distributed systems, transaction costs, and advice complexity, suggesting broad applicability.

Keywords: Collective algorithms, metrical task system, competitive ratio, transaction costs, advice complexity, barely random, sparse mixed strategy.

1 Introduction

Recent progress on the competitiveness of important online problems, such as the k -server problem, metrical service systems and metrical task systems have relied on the introduction of continuous optimization methods, such as the online primal-dual framework (see e.g. the book of [BN⁺09]), and more recently, the online mirror descent framework [BCL⁺18, BCLL21, BCR22]. By design, these methods assume that the online algorithm is provided with an infinite number of random bits. In this paper, we address the question of whether this requirement is inherent to the online problem, or specific to the methods at hand, by focusing on the influential example of metrical task systems [Sei99, BKRS00, FM00, BCLL21, CL19].

To answer this question, we study the notion of barely random algorithm, introduced by [RWS94] in the early days of competitive analysis of online algorithms: “We call an algorithm that uses a bounded number of random bits regardless of the number of requests *barely random*”. In the case of the metrical task system, we will observe that this notion is particularly fruitful, as it connects various aspects of online decision making such as collective systems, switching costs, and advice complexity.

Metrical task systems. We describe the setting of metrical task systems [BLS92] in a way that highlights the role played by the source of randomness. A metrical task system is defined by a metric space $\mathcal{X} = (X, d)$ where X is a finite set of cardinality $|X| = n$. The input is a sequence of cost vectors $\mathbf{c} = (c(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \in (\mathbb{R}_+^X)^\mathbb{N}$ and the output is a sequence of states $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\rho(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \in X^\mathbb{N}$. The cost associated to each time $t \in \mathbb{N}$ is the sum of the movement cost $d(\rho(t-1), \rho(t))$ and the service

cost $c_{\rho(t)}(t)$. The cost over all time steps therefore writes as follows:

$$\text{Cost}(\boldsymbol{\rho}, \mathbf{c}) = \sum_{t \geq 1} d(\rho(t-1), \rho(t)) + c_{\rho(t)}(t).$$

The offline benchmark, denoted by $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{c})$, is defined as the smallest achievable cost over all possible sequence of states, i.e. $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{c}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\rho} \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathbb{N}}} \text{Cost}(\boldsymbol{\rho}, \mathbf{c})$. An online algorithm \mathcal{A} is a method to define a time-consistent trajectory, i.e. such that the state at some time only depends on prior information. It may use some source of randomness \mathbf{r} which is sampled from a known probability distribution $\mathbf{r} \sim \mathcal{D}$. Formally, the sequence of states $\boldsymbol{\rho}^{\mathcal{A}}$ defined by algorithm \mathcal{A} can be expressed by $\forall t : \rho^{\mathcal{A}}(t) = \mathcal{A}(c(1), \dots, c(t), \mathbf{r})$. The algorithm \mathcal{A} is said to be α -competitive, for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, if it satisfies $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{r} \sim \mathcal{D}}(\text{Cost}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{c})) \leq \alpha \times \text{OPT}(\mathbf{c}) + \beta$ for some fixed $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any $\mathbf{c} \in (\mathbb{R}_+^X)^{\mathbb{N}}$. In this paper, we are interested in the way the competitive ratio scales with the source of randomness \mathcal{D} . When $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}(\{0, 1\}^b)$, or equivalently when $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, 2^b\})$, we say that the algorithm is provided with b random bits. More generally, we consider the case where $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, k\})$ for arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In one extreme, the case of $k = 1$ is known as the *deterministic* variant of the problem and is well understood since the inception of metrical task systems. In the other extreme, the case of $k = +\infty$ (or more formally, $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}(\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}})$) is known as the *randomized* variant of the problem and was solved more recently. Any other value of $k \in \mathbb{N}$ defines the *k-barely random* variant, which is the focus of this paper. For reasons that will soon become apparent to the reader, we will also refer to this setting as the *k-collective* variant.

1.1 Main contributions

Our main technical result is the following,

Theorem 1.1 (Section 3). *For any metric space $\mathcal{X} = (X, d)$ with n points, if there exists an α -competitive randomized algorithm for metrical task systems on \mathcal{X} , then there exists a 2α -competitive k -barely random algorithm, for any $k \geq n^2$.*

This result is proved in Section 3 using a potential function method that share some similarities with first order optimization methods, as well as a reduction described in Section 2. In light of the above description of barely random algorithms, and of the $\mathcal{O}(\log n^2)$ -competitive algorithm of [BCLL21], Theorem 1.1 has the following consequence:

Proposition 1.2. *For any metrical task system $\mathcal{X} = (X, d)$ with n points, there is a $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$ -competitive algorithm that only requires $2 \log n$ random bits.*

This result is nearly tight in the number of random bits, as observed in Section 4. For the well-studied case of the uniform metric space,

Proposition 1.3 (Section 4). *Any $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$ -competitive algorithm for metrical task systems on a metric space of n points requires at least $\log n - \mathcal{O}(\log \log n)$ random bits. In the uniform metric space with n points, there is a $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ -competitive algorithm that only requires $\lceil \log n \rceil$ random bits.*

The other contribution of the paper is that we display how the aforementioned results shed light on other aspects of online decision making, that we now describe.

Collective metrical task systems. We introduce the setting of collective metrical task systems, in which a team of k agents is collectively confronted to a metrical task system. The cost of the team is defined as the average of the costs endured by its constituents, and the goal is to design a deterministic algorithm such that their cost remains bounded by a constant times the cost of a

single agent that knows the requests in advance (i.e. the offline optimal benchmark). A simple biological illustration of this setting could be a colony of k ants tasked to collectively gather a large amount of food, while limiting the collective energy spent (modeled by the movement costs). This problem is (clearly) equivalent to aforementioned k -barely random variant of the metrical task system problem, with $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, k\})$, if we assume that the agents are allowed full coordination. Theorem 1.1 thus implies that if the number of ants in the colony k is larger than n^2 , they can collectively be $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$ competitive, which is order optimal. In Section 2, we show how this problem is in fact also equivalent to the k -barely fractional variant of metrical task systems, which plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Informally, we will have:

Proposition 1.4 (Informal, see Section 2). *The k -barely random variant and the k -collective variant are both equivalent to the k -barely fractional variant.*

Fractional metrical task systems, with fixed transaction costs. In the (classical) fractional view of metrical task systems, the player may divide its stakes in quantities $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ represents the set of distributions over \mathcal{X} . In this case, the cost at time t is defined by the service cost $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \sim \mathbf{x}(t)}(c_\rho(t))$ and the movement cost $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t))$, where OT denotes the optimal transport cost in \mathcal{X} . A possible illustration of this setting is in portfolio management, where X represents the different assets, and \mathbf{c} reflects the dividends yielded by each stock¹. In this setting, note that the transport cost is proportional to the probability mass being transferred, and thus represents a *variable* transaction cost. It is thus tempting to consider an additional *fixed* transaction cost that the player should pay for converting any amount of stock ρ into stock ρ' . We propose to set this cost equal to $\tau d(\rho, \rho')$ for some constant $\tau > 0$ and a direct consequence of our results (for which a displaced mass is always greater than $1/n^2$) is the following proposition:

Proposition 1.5. *Adding fixed transaction cost τ to the fractional variant of metrical task systems does not affect its asymptotic competitive ratio, provided that $\tau \leq 1/n^2$.*

Advice complexity. The notion of barely random algorithm is tightly connected to the notion of advice complexity. Advice complexity was introduced by [DKP08] to measure the information content of online problems. In our context, one could ask the following question: What amount of information about the the sequence of cost vectors suffices to improve the deterministic competitive ratio of metrical task systems (which is equal to $2n - 1$)? Since bits of advice are at least as useful as random bits (see [KK11] for more details), we have:

Proposition 1.6. *There exists a deterministic algorithm for the metrical task system on metric spaces with n points that is $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$ -competitive, using only $\lceil 2 \log n \rceil$ bits of advice.*

1.2 Related works.

Metrical task systems were introduced by [BLS92]. In this initial work, they resolved the deterministic competitive ratio, which is of $2n - 1$ for any metric space with n points; as well as the randomized competitive ratio on the uniform metric space, which is in $\Theta(\log n)$. The randomized competitive ratio on general metric spaces of size n remained open until [BCLL21] proposed a $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$ -competitive algorithm and [BCR23] obtained a matching lower-bound, thereby closing a long line of research (see e.g. [Sei99, BKRS00, FM00, CL19] and references therein).

Metrical task systems are deeply connected (both, in results and methods) to the classical machine learning setting of learning with expert advice, as observed by [BB97]. The few differences are the

¹The dividends are assumed to not be reinvested, otherwise the composition of the cost would be multiplicative, rather than additive.

following (1) there is a (movement) cost associated to switching from one expert to another (2) the offline benchmark is the best moving strategy as opposed to the best fixed strategy (3) the goal is to obtain a multiplicative guarantee (competitive ratio) rather than an additive (regret) guarantee, see also [CL19].

The notion of barely random (online) algorithms was introduced by [RWS94]. In this paper, they present an algorithm that is 1.75-competitive for the list update problem, using exactly n random bits, where n is the length of the list. Such algorithms are further developed in the celebrated book of [BEY05]. [KK11] later investigated barely random algorithms for paging, and for job-shop scheduling. The notion also had some echo in the literature on scheduling, see [ENS⁺01] and references therein.

The notion of collective algorithm is more commonly studied by the literature on distributed algorithms. For instance, in collective tree exploration, a team of k agents is tasked to go through all edges of some unknown tree as fast as possible [FGKP06]. The connections observed in [CM24] between this problem and randomized algorithms for metrical service systems were an inspiration for this aspect of the present paper. We note that the interpretation of a probability distribution as a continuous swarm of infinitesimal agents is not novel, see e.g. [BC22], and is directly connected to the so-called fractional formulation of the metrical task system. The novelty of our methods lies in the rigorous discretization of this fractional view, and leads to applications to collective and barely random algorithms. We note that another surprising aspect of our method is that it does not rely on a tree-embedding of the metric space, but seems naturally adapted to the general setting, thanks to the very general properties coming from optimal transport, such as the Birkhoff-von Neuman theorem. Our proof also involve a non-trivial (though concise) first-order descent method that could be of interest for future works.

1.3 Notations, definitions and preliminaries

In the following, $\mathcal{X} = (X, d)$ is a finite metric space, i.e. d is positive, symmetric and satisfies the triangle inequality. We denote by n the cardinality of X , i.e. $n = |X|$.

We denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ the set of all distributions on \mathcal{X} . For any two such distributions $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we call the optimal transport cost from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{x}' and we denote by $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ the quantity,

$$\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \inf_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')} \sum_{\rho, \rho'} \pi(\rho, \rho') d(\rho, \rho')$$

where $\Gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \{\pi \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} : \forall \rho, \sum_{\rho' \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(\rho, \rho') = x_\rho \text{ and } \forall \rho', \sum_{\rho} \pi(\rho, \rho') = x'_{\rho'}\}$ is the set of couplings from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{x}' . Classically, $\Gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ can be viewed as the probability distributions on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ with its marginals respectively equal to \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' . The optimal transport cost (also known as the Wasserstein distance) defines a distance between probability distributions on \mathcal{X} . In particular, it satisfies positivity, symmetry and the triangle inequality.

For some point $\rho \in \mathcal{X}$, we denote by $\mathbf{e}_\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ the probability distribution on \mathcal{X} that has a full mass on ρ . Note that \mathbf{e}_ρ can alternatively be seen as a vector of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$. Denoting by \otimes the Kronecker product (or equivalently, the outer product) between vectors of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$, we have, for any $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{X}$ that $\mathbf{e}_\rho \otimes \mathbf{e}_{\rho'}$ is an optimal coupling from \mathbf{e}_ρ to $\mathbf{e}_{\rho'}$

For an arbitrary constant $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $\mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$ the set of all distributions on \mathcal{X} that only take their values in $\{0, 1/k, \dots, 1\}$. Such distributions will sometimes be called 'configurations' to distinguish them from their continuous counterparts. Following the celebrated Birkhoff-von

Neumann theorem (the extremal points of the coupling polytope are permutation matrices), we have that for any two distributions $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$, there is an associated optimal coupling π that only takes its values in $\{0, 1/k, \dots, 1\}$, i.e. which follows the discrete formulation of optimal transport by Monge. We call such a (discretized) coupling, an optimal transport plan.

For an integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, k\})$ the uniform probability distribution over $\{1, \dots, k\}$. For an arbitrary distribution \mathcal{D} , we denote by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{r} \sim \mathcal{D}}(\cdot)$ the expectation when the variable \mathbf{r} is sampled following \mathcal{D} . All logarithms, denoted by $\log(\cdot)$, are in base 2.

Paper outline. Section 2 justifies the equivalence between k -collective strategies, k -barely random strategies and k -barely fractional strategies. Section 3 provides the proof of Theorem 1.1, using arguments from the theory of optimal transport and a potential function method. Section 4 provides some additional proofs, including the lower-bound as well as refined guarantees for the uniform metric space, and discussions. The conclusion highlights some interesting open directions towards making further connections between online algorithms and distributed/collective systems.

2 Barely fractional strategies for metrical task systems

In the introduction, we gave the definition of metrical task systems by [BLS92], while highlighting the role played by the source of randomness \mathcal{D} . In the literature, a variant called the *fractional* formulation is known to be equivalent to the fully randomized variant (where $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}(\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}})$). We start by recalling this fractional formulation and the equivalence. We then introduce the notion of *k-barely fractional* strategies and we show their equivalence with the aforementioned settings of k -barely random strategies and k -collective strategy. In contrast to classical results, this equivalence relies on an argument from optimal transport, the Birkhoff-von Neumann theorem.

2.1 (Fully) fractional strategies for metrical task systems

Fractional Metrical Task System. In the fractional variant of metrical task systems, at any instant t , a fractional algorithm (further denoted by $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$) maintains a distribution $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ over the states, that only depends on the information available before time t , i.e. $\mathbf{x}(t) = f(c(1), \dots, c(t))$ for some deterministic function f . The cost paid by the algorithm at time t is defined as the sum of a transport cost $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t))$ and an expected service cost $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \sim \mathbf{x}(t)}(c) = \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{X}} x_{\rho}(t) c_{\rho}(t)$. In a slight abuse of notation, denote by $\text{Cost}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c})$ the total cost associated to the sequence of distributions given by $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$, i.e.

$$\text{Cost}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) = \sum_{t \geq 1} \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t)) + \mathbb{E}_{\rho \sim \mathbf{x}(t)}(c_{\rho}(t)).$$

The interest of this fractional formulation comes from the following reduction, which is standard in the literature (see also e.g. [BCLL21]),

Proposition 2.1. *For any fractional algorithm for the metrical task system, there is a randomized algorithm that achieves the same cost, and reciprocally.*

Proof. Consider a randomized algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \mathbf{r})$ with $\mathbf{r} \sim \mathcal{U}(\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}})$ for the metrical task system and define $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ by setting $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ to be the probability distribution associated to the point chosen by \mathcal{A} at time t . It is clear that the service cost of the fractional algorithm equals the (expected) service cost of the randomized algorithm. Also observe that the expected movement

cost at time t corresponds to a transport cost from $\mathbf{x}(t-1)$ to $\mathbf{x}(t)$ and is thus greater or equal to $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t))$.

Reciprocally, assume that we are given a fractional algorithm for the metrical task system represented by the time-varying distribution $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})^{\mathbb{N}}$. We aim to design a randomized algorithm \mathcal{A} that uses a random source $\mathbf{r} \sim \mathcal{D}(\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}})$. Observe that we can make the seemingly stronger (but obviously equivalent, since \mathbb{N} is countable and $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is uncountable) assumption that $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}([0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}})$. This reformulation allows to have access to one fresh (independent) random real in $\mathcal{U}([0, 1])$ at each time-step $t \in \mathbb{N}$, which we denote by $r(t) \in [0, 1]$. We assume that at time $t-1$, the algorithm is in some state $\rho(t-1)$. Upon arrival of the cost vector for time t , which we denote by $c(t)$, the algorithm considers the optimal transport plan π associated to $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t))$ and samples the state $\rho(t)$ following the probability distribution proportional to $(\pi(\rho(t-1), \rho))_{\rho \in \mathcal{X}}$. This can easily be done using only the sample $r(t) \in \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$, by inversion sampling. If $\rho(t-1)$ was sampled following $\mathbf{x}(t-1)$ and is independent from $r(t)$, it is clear that $\rho(t)$ follows $\mathbf{x}(t)$. Further, the expected movement cost $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{r}}(d(\rho(t-1), \rho(t)))$ is exactly equal to $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t))$. We then conclude the proof by induction on t . \square

2.2 Barely fractional strategies for metrical task systems

Barely Fractional Metrical Task System. We now present a discretization of fractional metrical task systems. We shall define a k -barely fractional strategy $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$. The definitions are the same as in the fully fractional variant above, except that at all times, the distribution $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is constrained to belong to the set $\mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$ of distributions taking values in $\{0, 1/k, \dots, 1\}$ (see Notations). We now show that this formulation enjoys an equivalence with the barely random variant of metrical task systems, when the source of randomness is limited to $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, k\})$.

Proposition 2.2. *For any k -barely fractional algorithm for metrical task system, there is a k -barely random algorithm that achieves the same cost, and reciprocally. The same hold from k -collective algorithms.*

Proof. We first observe the (direct) equivalence between k -barely random and k -collective strategies. Each individual in the team of k agent of the collective strategy can decide to follow one of the k realization of the random source \mathbf{r} in the randomized strategy. Reciprocally, given a k -collective strategy, one can define a k -barely random strategy by using $\mathbf{r} \sim \mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, k\})$ to choose uniformly at random one member of the team. We note that the aforedefined barely random and collective strategies have the exact same costs.

We now assume that we are given a k -barely random algorithm \mathcal{A} and define as above the fractional strategy $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ associating $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ to the distribution over $\rho(t) = \mathcal{A}(c(1), \dots, c(t), \mathbf{r})$. We showed in Section 2.1 that this fractional strategy had a smaller cost than its randomized counterpart. We now observe that since $\mathbf{r} \sim \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}(\{0, 1/k, \dots, 1\})$, it must be the case that $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$. Therefore, $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ is a valid k -barely random strategy.

The reverse reduction uses an ingredient from the theory of optimal transport: the Birkhoff-von Neumann theorem, which states that the optimal transport between $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$ always admits an optimal coupling π taking its values in $\{0, 1/k, \dots, 1\}$, that we call an optimal transport plan (see Section Notations, Definitions and Preliminaries). Given a configuration $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$, we define a k -collective strategy that will always match $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$ (up to the renormalization by $1/k$). We initially distribute the k agents following $\mathbf{x}(0)$. Now, we assume as our induction hypothesis that the team at time $t-1$ is distributed exactly following $\mathbf{x}(t-1)$ and we show

that we can deterministically redistribute the members of the team to follow $\mathbf{x}(t)$, while paying a moment cost of $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t))$. Using the aforementioned Birkhoff-von Neumann theorem, there exists an optimal coupling between $\mathbf{x}(t-1) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$ that takes its values in $\{0, 1/k, \dots, 1\}$. Concretely, from the collective point of view, this means that we can move the agents from distribution $\mathbf{x}(t-1)$ to distribution $\mathbf{x}(t)$ using this coupling, without having to split any agent. We use this coupling to reassign the agents deterministically to their new destination (we assume that agents have arbitrary identifiers and the ability to communicate, in order to break the possible ties). Clearly, since the coupling is optimal, the average movement cost in the collective strategy will equal the expected movement cost in the barely random strategy, and since the distribution of the agents is consistent with the distribution of the randomized algorithm, the collective service cost equals the randomized movement cost of the barely random variant. \square

3 Potential function method for barely fractional strategies

In this section we provide the proof of the main theorem of the paper, Theorem 1.1, which is restated below this paragraph. It claims that any randomized algorithm can be made k -barely random as soon as $k \geq n^2$, while only losing a factor 2 in the competitive ratio. Following the reductions from Section 2, it appears that it suffices to ‘discretize’ a fully fractional strategy $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$ into a k -barely fractional strategy $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ to transform a fully random strategy into a barely random strategy. This deceitfully simple approach hides the main difficulty: the cost of $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ must be bounded by a constant times the cost of $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$, if we hope to preserve its competitiveness. The informal reason why such guarantee is difficult to obtain is that the adversary *knows exactly* the discretization method used by the team (by adversary, we mean the designer of the sequence of costs $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$, and by the team, we mean the swarm constituting $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$). For instance, the naive rounding strategy which would be define at all times $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})} \text{OT}(\mathbf{y}(t), \mathbf{x})$ does not achieve this goal. This is because because infinitesimal movements of $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$ could induce large (order $1/k$) movements of $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$. A good discretization strategy must therefore display a hysteresis phenomenon, in the sense that it does not undo the move of an agent in the team right after that move has been decided. This is precisely the idea behind our strategy in Equation (2) that employs a potential function $D(\cdot, \cdot)$ to insure that $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ remains sufficiently close to $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$ and an additional term in $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t))$ to limit the movement cost of $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$. We note that the method presents some similarities with first order optimization techniques, which have been successful in several areas of online decision making.

Theorem. *Consider a metric space $\mathcal{X} = (X, d)$ with n points. If there exists an α -competitive randomized algorithm for metrical task systems on \mathcal{X} , then for any $k \geq n^2$, there exists a 2α -competitive k -barely random algorithm.*

Proof. We fix k any integer satisfying $k \geq n^2$. Consider some α -competitive fractional strategy $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$. We shall define (in an online manner) a 2α -competitive k -barely fractional strategy $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$, using $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$. The reduction of Section 2.2 then allows to conclude.

For any pair of distributions $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ we call the potential between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} and denote by $D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ the quantity

$$D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 2\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}/2 + 1/(2n)\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{y}) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the vector of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$ with all its values equal to 1. The correctness of this definition stems from the fact that we will always have $\mathbf{x}/2 + 1/(2n)\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, because $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$.

We consider the state of the game at some instant t , upon arrival of request $c(t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{X}}$ and define the value of $\mathbf{x}(t)$. Remember that $\mathbf{y}(t-1)$ denotes the (fully) fractional distribution at time $t-1$

and that $\mathbf{y}(t)$ denotes the (fully) fractional distribution at time t . The choice of $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is done with the following rule,

$$\mathbf{x}(t) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})} D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}), \quad (2)$$

where ties are broken in favor of some \mathbf{x} which maximizes $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x})$. Lemma 3.2 implies that at all times $\mathbf{x}(t)$ satisfies that for any other configuration $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$,

$$D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) < D(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{x}'). \quad (3)$$

We now aim to bound the service and movement costs of the aforesaid strategy $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$. The service cost of $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ will be bounded by twice the service cost of $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$ and the movement cost of $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ will be bounded by twice the movement cost of $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$ (plus a constant).

Service costs. We shall show that at all times and for any point $\rho \in \mathcal{X} : x_\rho(t) \leq 2y_\rho(t)$. This readily proves that the service cost of $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ is at most twice that of $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$. Assume by contradiction that the converse holds, i.e. for some $\rho \in \mathcal{X}$, $x_\rho(t)/2 + 1/(2n) > y_\rho(t) + 1/(2n)$. By applying Lemma 3.1 to the distributions $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}(t)/2 + 1/(2n)\mathbb{1}$ and $\mathbf{y}(t)$, with $\alpha = 1/(2k)$, we obtain that there exists some $\rho' \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{z} + \alpha(\mathbf{e}_{\rho'} - \mathbf{e}_\rho)$ satisfies $\text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}(t)) = \text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') + \text{OT}(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{y}(t))$, where $\text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') = \alpha d(\rho, \rho')$. We then consider the distribution $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}(t) + 2\alpha(\mathbf{e}_{\rho'} - \mathbf{e}_\rho)$, which will provide the contradiction by forming a violation of (3). First note that $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$ because $x_\rho(t) > 2y_\rho(t) \geq 0$, so $x_\rho(t) \geq 1/k = 2\alpha$ and furthermore $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$. Also, by definition $\mathbf{x}' \neq \mathbf{x}(t)$. Finally, $D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) = 2\text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}(t)) = 2\text{OT}(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{y}(t)) + 2\alpha d(\rho, \rho') = D(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}(t)) + 2\alpha d(\rho, \rho') = D(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{x}')$, which provides the contradiction.

Movement Cost. We now aim to bound the sum of all movement costs. We decompose the change of the potential $P(t) = D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t))$ between time $t-1$ and time t as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} P(t) - P(t-1) &= D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) - D(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t-1)) \\ &= D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) - D(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t)) + D(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t)) - D(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t-1)), \\ &\leq -\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t)) + 2\text{OT}(\mathbf{y}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality $D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) - D(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t)) \leq -\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t))$ comes from the optimality of $\mathbf{x}(t)$ in (2) and the other inequality $D(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t)) - D(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t-1)) \leq 2\text{OT}(\mathbf{y}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t))$ is a direct application of the triangle inequality for optimal transport. Taking the sum over the course of the game, and denoting the total movement cost of a strategy over the course of the game by Mvt , we obtain the desired bound on the movement cost of $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mvt}(\mathbf{x}(\cdot)) &= \sum_{t \geq 1} \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t)) \\ &\leq \sum_{t \geq 1} P(t-1) - P(t) + 2\text{OT}(\mathbf{y}(t-1), \mathbf{y}(t)) \\ &\leq P(0) + 2\text{Mvt}(\mathbf{y}(\cdot)), \end{aligned}$$

where $P(0) = D(\mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{y}(0))$ is a constant bounded by the diameter of \mathcal{X} .

Overall, since the movement and service costs of $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ are always bounded by twice those of $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$, it is clear that the α -competitiveness of $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$ implies the 2α -competitiveness of $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$. \square

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ be two distributions on a metric space \mathcal{X} with n points. Assume that for some real $\alpha > 0$ and some point $\rho \in \mathcal{X}$ one has $z_\rho \geq y_\rho + n\alpha$. Then, there is*

another distribution $\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, taking the form $\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{z} + \alpha(\mathbf{e}_{\rho'} - \mathbf{e}_{\rho})$ for some other point $\rho' \in \mathcal{X}$, which satisfies $\text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) = \text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') + \text{OT}(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{y})$, where $\text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') = \alpha d(\rho, \rho')$.

Proof. By the triangle inequality of the transport distance, for any three distributions $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}', \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we have $\text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') + \text{OT}(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{y})$, therefore it will suffice to show the converse inequality.

We consider an optimal coupling from \mathbf{z} to \mathbf{y} denoted by $\pi = (\pi(\rho_1, \rho_2))_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{X}^2}$. By definition, $z_{\rho} - y_{\rho} = \sum_{\rho_1 \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(\rho, \rho_1) - \pi(\rho_1, \rho) \geq n\alpha$. In this sum of n terms, at least one term has to exceed α . This allows to define one point $\rho' \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\pi(\rho, \rho') \geq \alpha$.

Next we consider the distribution $\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{z} + \alpha(\mathbf{e}_{\rho'} - \mathbf{e}_{\rho})$. First, observe that this distribution is well-defined, since $z_{\rho} \geq \alpha$. Then, we note that $\pi' = \pi + \alpha(\mathbf{e}_{\rho'} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{\rho} - \mathbf{e}_{\rho} \otimes \mathbf{e}_{\rho'})$ defines a coupling from \mathbf{z}' to \mathbf{y} and thus,

$$\text{OT}(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{y}) \leq \sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2} d(\rho_1, \rho_2) \pi'(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) - \text{OT}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}'),$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.2. *At any time t , the configuration $\mathbf{x}(t)$ that is selected by Equation (2) and the associated tie-breaking rule satisfies that for any $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathbf{x}' \neq \mathbf{x}(t)$, we have Equation (3),*

$$D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) < D(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{x}').$$

Proof. Recall that we denote by $\mathbf{x}(t-1)$ is the configuration which immediately preceded $\mathbf{x}(t)$. Consider and some arbitrary configuration $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathcal{X})$. Since $\mathbf{x}(t)$ achieves the minimum of (2), we have

$$D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t)) \leq D(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}').$$

Using the triangle inequality of optimal transport, we also have

$$\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}') \leq \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{x}').$$

The combination of both inequalities, proves a non-strict version of Equation (3),

$$D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) \leq D(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{x}'). \quad (4)$$

We now explain why this inequality is in fact strict for any $\mathbf{x}' \neq \mathbf{x}(t)$. We note that equality can be met in (4) only if equality is also met in both of the aforementioned components of the inequality. We assume that the equality is met for some \mathbf{x}' and will now show that $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}(t)$. We have that,

$$\begin{cases} D(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t)) = D(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}'), \\ \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}') = \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t)) + \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{x}'). \end{cases}$$

By the tie-breaking rule of (2), the first of these two inequalities implies that $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}') \leq \text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t-1), \mathbf{x}(t))$ which allows to conclude, using the second equality that $\text{OT}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{x}') \leq 0$, and thus that $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}(t)$. This relies on the positivity of the optimal transport distance, which follows from the positivity of the distance in the original metric space \mathcal{X} . \square

4 Discussion, lower-bound and open directions

4.1 Case of the uniform metric space

The uniform metric space is a notoriously simple special case of metrical task systems. We call \mathcal{X} the uniform metric space if all of its n points are at the same distance $\forall \rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{X}, \rho \neq \rho' \implies d(\rho, \rho') = 1$. Since the inception of the problem [BLS92], the (fully) randomized competitive ratio of metrical task system on the uniform metric space is known to lie between H_n and $2H_n$, where H_n is the n -th harmonic number.

In this section, we show that $\lceil \log n \rceil$ bits of randomness are in fact sufficient to achieve an order optimal competitive ratio on the uniform metric space. The proof is much closer in spirit to the classical strategies for metrical task systems than the arguments of Section 3. It can be seen as a discretization of the algorithm of [BLS92], and as an application of the ‘game of balls and urns’ in [CMV23].

Proposition 4.1. *If \mathcal{X} is the uniform metric space with n points, there is a n -barely random algorithm solving metrical task systems on \mathcal{X} that is $2H_n + 6$ -competitive.*

Proof. Following [BLS92], we decompose the time in discrete phases, in order to obtain a lower bound on $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{c})$. The 0-th phase starts at $t_0 = 0$ and for $r \in \mathbb{N}$, the r -th phase begins at time t_r and ends right before t_{r+1} which is defined as the first instant satisfying that $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{X} : \sum_{t_r \leq t < t_{r+1}} c_\rho(t) \geq 1$. Without loss of generality we can assume for simplicity that there always exist a state ρ_r such that $\sum_{t_r \leq t < t_{r+1}} c_{\rho_r}(t) = 1$ and that $\forall \rho : c_\rho(t_{r+1}) = 0$ (consider the continuous-time variant of metrical task systems, as in [BCLL21]). We denote by r^* the total number of phases, which only depends on the cost vectors \mathbf{c} . We observe that $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{c}) \geq r^*$, because the cost incurred by any fixed strategy is at least one during a given phase, and the cost of any mobile strategy is also at least one (since movements costs are equal to one).

The idea of [BLS92] is to define a randomized algorithm that incurs a cost of at most $2H_n$ in a given phase, and which is thus $2H_n$ -competitive. In a given phase r , the strategy consists in assigning $\mathbf{x}(t)$ to be the uniform probability distribution over the states in $\{\rho \in \mathcal{X} : \sum_{t_r \leq \tau < t} c_\rho(\tau) < 1\}$, which are the non-saturated states. This strategy suffers a movement cost of at most $1 + 1/n + 1/(n-1) \cdots + 1/2 = H_n$, where H_n denotes the n -th harmonic number. Also, the service cost of this strategy is at most equal to its movement cost (this follows from its monotony), so it is $2H_n$ -competitive. However, it is not n -barely fractional, because it takes values in $\{1/n, 1/(n-1), \dots, 1\}$ which are not all multiples of $1/n$.

Instead, we consider a straightforward discretization of this strategy, which does not suffer from the caveat described in the introduction of Section 3, thanks to the monotony of the initial strategy (note that this monotony is very specific to the uniform metric space, and to the decomposition in phases). This discretization is in fact an application of the analysis of the ‘game of balls and urns’ which was used to design a collective tree exploration algorithm in [CMV23]. We recall the definition of the game. The game starts with n balls each located in one of n urns. In discrete rounds, an adversary picks an urn which contains a ball and the player has to move one ball in that urn to any other urn. The game ends when all urns have been chosen at least once by the adversary, and the cost of the player is the number of rounds before the end of the game, re-normalized by $1/n$. The simple strategy for the player that simply consists in relocating selected balls to the least loaded urn is known to induce a cost of at most $\ln(n) + 3 \leq H_n + 3$. This models the movement cost a corresponding n -barely fractional strategy in a given phase (in which each

ball represent a probability mass of $1/n$ and each urn represents a point of the metric space). Also, since the service cost is (again) bounded by the movement cost in a given phase, the strategy is $2H_n + 6$ -competitive. \square

4.2 Lower-bound on the number of random bits

In this paragraph, we explain why $\Omega(\log n)$ random bits are required to obtain a competitive ratio that is asymptotically optimal. In fact, we show the stronger result that any k -barely random algorithm for metrical task systems is at most $(2n - 1)/k$ -competitive, and thus that we must have $k \geq cst \times n/(\log n)^2$ – which corresponds to a lower-bound of $\log k \geq \log n - \mathcal{O}(\log \log n)$ in the number of random bits.

Proposition 4.2. *The competitive ratio of k -barely random algorithms for metrical task systems is at least $(2n - 1)/k$.*

Proof. Consider a barely random algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \mathbf{r})$, for $\mathbf{r} \sim \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, k\})$. Consider the deterministic metrical task system algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\cdot, 1)$, which is sampled with probability $1/k$. By the $2n - 1$ lower-bound of [BLS92] on the competitive ratio of deterministic strategies for metrical task systems, there exists an instance $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\text{Cost}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^{\mathcal{A}(\cdot, 1)}, \mathbf{c}) \geq (2n - 1)\text{OPT}(\mathbf{c})$. Taking the expectation over the source of randomness, we get $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{r}}(\text{Cost}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^{\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \mathbf{r})}, \mathbf{c})) \geq \frac{(2n-1)}{k}\text{OPT}(\mathbf{c})$. \square

We observe that the question of whether an order optimal randomized competitive ratio can be achieved with $k = O(n)$ instead of $k \geq n^2$ remains open on general metric spaces (i.e. with $\log n$ random bits instead of $2 \log n$ random bits, like as proposed for the uniform metric space). A good start could be to show that this is the case on weighted stars, which are known to admit a $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ competitive strategies, just like the uniform metric space (see e.g. [BCLL21]). It seems likely that the algorithm of [BN⁺09] for that setting could be effectively discretized to take values in $\{0, 1/n, \dots, 1\}$ – because it uses a decomposition in discrete phases and it is monotonous inside a given phase, since it relies on an online covering formulation. It also seems possible that some other metric spaces do require $k = \Omega(n^2)$ to allow an order-optimal competitive ratio. Exhibiting such cutoff for barely random algorithms would nicely echo the cutoff between $\Theta(\log n)$ and $\Theta((\log n)^2)$ that is observed in the competitive ratio.

4.3 Conclusion and open directions for collective algorithms

In this work we presented the first collective algorithm for metrical task systems, using arguments from optimal transport and an appropriate potential method which echoes descent methods in first-order optimization.

The term ‘collective algorithm’ used in this paper is borrowed from the literature on distributed algorithms, and particularly from the problem of collective tree exploration which was initially proposed by [FGKP06]. We believe that highlighting situations in which a team of agent can be efficient/intelligent in a way that no single agent could be, is an interesting research direction. As displayed in this paper, such situations would firstly echo the well-studied competitive gap between randomized and deterministic strategies for online algorithms [BDBK⁺94]. But collective settings can also come with considerations that go beyond their analogy with barely-random algorithms. For instance, one can study the competitiveness of collective algorithms under: restricted communications (such as the write-read model of [FGKP06] or the local model of [DDK⁺15]), asynchronous movements (such as in the model of mobile computing of [Cos24]), capacity constraints (where the

number of agent at a given position is limited, like in [BC22] or in the game of [CMV23]) or even under agents with some degree of selfishness or maliciousness (then involving a price of anarchy for selfish agents as defined by [KP99], or some degree of robustness to byzantine faults for malicious agents as defined by [LSP82]).

References

- [BB97] Avrim Blum and Carl Burch. On-line learning and the metrical task system problem. In *Proceedings of the tenth annual conference on Computational learning theory*, pages 45–53, 1997.
- [BC22] Nikhil Bansal and Christian Coester. Online metric allocation and time-varying regularization. In *30th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2022)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [BCL⁺18] Sébastien Bubeck, Michael B Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, James R Lee, and Aleksander Madry. K-server via multiscale entropic regularization. In *Proceedings of the 50th annual ACM SIGACT symposium on theory of computing*, pages 3–16, 2018.
- [BCLL21] Sébastien Bubeck, Michael B Cohen, James R Lee, and Yin Tat Lee. Metrical task systems on trees via mirror descent and unfair gluing. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 50(3):909–923, 2021.
- [BCR22] Sébastien Bubeck, Christian Coester, and Yuval Rabani. Shortest paths without a map, but with an entropic regularizer. In *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1102–1113. IEEE, 2022.
- [BCR23] Sébastien Bubeck, Christian Coester, and Yuval Rabani. The randomized k-server conjecture is false! In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 581–594, 2023.
- [BDBK⁺94] Shai Ben-David, Allan Borodin, Richard Karp, Gabor Tardos, and Avi Wigderson. On the power of randomization in on-line algorithms. *Algorithmica*, 11:2–14, 1994.
- [BEY05] Allan Borodin and Ran El-Yaniv. *Online computation and competitive analysis*. cambridge university press, 2005.
- [BKRS00] Avrim Blum, Howard Karloff, Yuval Rabani, and Michael Saks. A decomposition theorem for task systems and bounds for randomized server problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 30(5):1624–1661, 2000.
- [BLS92] Allan Borodin, Nathan Linial, and Michael E Saks. An optimal on-line algorithm for metrical task system. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 39(4):745–763, 1992.
- [BN⁺09] Niv Buchbinder, Joseph Seffi Naor, et al. The design of competitive online algorithms via a primal–dual approach. *Foundations and Trends[®] in Theoretical Computer Science*, 3(2–3):93–263, 2009.
- [CL19] Christian Coester and James R Lee. Pure entropic regularization for metrical task systems. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 835–848. PMLR, 2019.

- [CM24] Romain Cosson and Laurent Massoulié. Collective tree exploration via potential function method. In *15th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2024)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2024.
- [CMV23] Romain Cosson, Laurent Massoulié, and Laurent Viennot. Efficient collaborative tree exploration with breadth-first depth-next. In *37th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2023)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [Cos24] Romain Cosson. Breaking the $k/\log k$ barrier in collective tree exploration via tree-mining. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 4264–4282. SIAM, 2024.
- [DDK⁺15] Dariusz Dereniowski, Yann Disser, Adrian Kosowski, Dominik Pajak, and Przemysław Uznański. Fast collaborative graph exploration. *Information and Computation*, 243:37–49, 2015.
- [DKP08] Stefan Dobrev, Rastislav Kráľovič, and Dana Pardubská. How much information about the future is needed? In *International Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science*, pages 247–258. Springer, 2008.
- [ENS⁺01] Leah Epstein, John Noga, Steve Seiden, Jiří Sgall, and Gerhard Woeginger. Randomized on-line scheduling on two uniform machines. *Journal of Scheduling*, 4(2):71–92, 2001.
- [FGKP06] Pierre Fraigniaud, Leszek Gasieniec, Dariusz R Kowalski, and Andrzej Pelc. Collective tree exploration. *Networks: An International Journal*, 48(3):166–177, 2006.
- [FM00] Amos Fiat and Manor Mendel. Better algorithms for unfair metrical task systems and applications. In *Proceedings of the thirty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 725–734, 2000.
- [KK11] Dennis Komm and Richard Kráľovič. Advice complexity and barely random algorithms. *RAIRO-Theoretical Informatics and Applications*, 45(2):249–267, 2011.
- [KP99] Elias Koutsoupias and Christos Papadimitriou. Worst-case equilibria. In *Annual symposium on theoretical aspects of computer science*, pages 404–413. Springer, 1999.
- [LSP82] Leslie Lamport, Robert Shostak, and Marshall Pease. The byzantine generals problem. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 4(3):382–401, 1982.
- [RWS94] Nick Reingold, Jeffery Westbrook, and Daniel D Sleator. Randomized competitive algorithms for the list update problem. *Algorithmica*, 11(1):15–32, 1994.
- [Sei99] Steve Seiden. Unfair problems and randomized algorithms for metrical task systems. *Information and Computation*, 148(2):219–240, 1999.