
Improving Reward-Conditioned Policies for Multi-Armed Bandits using Normalized Weight Functions

Kai Xu¹ Farid Tajaddodianfar² Ben Allison²

Abstract

Recently proposed reward-conditioned policies (RCPs) offer an appealing alternative in reinforcement learning. Compared with policy gradient methods, policy learning in RCPs is simpler since it is based on supervised learning, and unlike value-based methods, it does not require optimization in the action space to take actions. However, for multi-armed bandit (MAB) problems, we find that RCPs are slower to converge and have inferior expected rewards at convergence, compared with classic methods such as the upper confidence bound and Thompson sampling. In this work, we show that the performance of RCPs can be enhanced by constructing policies through the marginalization of rewards using *normalized weight functions*, whose sum or integral equal 1, although the function values may be negative. We refer to this technique as *generalized marginalization*, whose advantage is that *negative weights* for policies conditioned on *low* rewards can make the resulting policies more distinct from them. Strategies to perform generalized marginalization in MAB with discrete action spaces are studied. Through simulations, we demonstrate that the proposed technique improves RCPs and makes them competitive with classic methods, showing superior performance on challenging MABs with large action spaces and sparse reward signals.

1. Introduction

Multi-armed bandit (MAB), or its contextual variant, is a standard formulation for many sequential decision making problems in statistics, engineering, psychology, e-commerce and online advertising (Li et al., 2010; Sutton & Barto, 2018). Methods for MAB and their reinforcement learning (RL) counterparts are usually value-based or action-based (Sutton & Barto, 2018). In value-based algorithms such as

the upper confidence bound (UCB) and Thompson sampling (TS), the value for each action is estimated. In order to take an action, it requires to solve an optimization problem in the action space to find the action with the best estimated value. Such optimization can be expansive or even intractable if the action space is combinatorially large or heterogeneous (Hill et al., 2017; Kumar et al., 2019), e.g. when finding the best wiring of electronic circuits, or optimizing the styles of multiple components in web design. For policy-based approaches, the most popular approach is gradient bandit, the counterpart of policy gradient in MAB (Sutton & Barto, 2018). For complex problems, the naive policy gradient algorithm is usually difficult and/or expensive to implement and apply (Kumar et al., 2019) because the REINFORCE estimator it uses has high variance. Therefore some variance reduction techniques with extra baseline models (Williams, 1992) are needed, or the doubly robust estimator with extra value estimators (Huang & Jiang, 2020) is required. This becomes even more challenging when policies are modeled by deep generative models because the large number of parameters often causes training difficulties.

Reward-conditioned policies (RCPs; Kumar et al., 2019) are a recently proposed alternative to value-based methods and policy gradient methods in RL. In RCPs, a reward-conditioned policy $\pi_\theta(a | r)$ is learned from pairs of reward-action data (r, a) via maximum likelihood estimation of θ , where a is the action, r is the reward and θ is the parameters of the policy model. Examples include regression that minimize some error metric (Kumar et al., 2019) or conditional generative modeling that minimize an evidence lower bound (ELBO; Ajay et al., 2023, this work). After learning, the policy to use at inference time can be constructed through conditioning. Intuitively, the way how such *inference policies* are constructed can have huge impacts on their performance in terms of convergence speed and expected rewards at convergence. Kumar et al. (2019) proposes to use what we refer as the *marginalized policy*, defined as

$$\pi_\theta^\dagger(a) = \int \pi_\theta(a | r)q(r)dr \text{ or } \sum_r \pi_\theta(a | r)q(r),$$

continuous rewards discrete rewards

where $q(r)$ is the *target value distribution* that models how

¹MIT-IBM Watson AI Lab (work done while at Amazon)

²Amazon. Correspondence to: Kai Xu <xuk@mit.edu>.

high reward distributes empirically.¹

In this paper, we apply RCPs to MABs and study how the marginalized policy performs in MAB with discrete actions, which to our best knowledge is not studied in the literature before. Importantly, we find that the marginalized policy has slower convergence and suboptimal performance than classic methods like the UCB and TS, in both standard and challenging MAB problems. We therefore propose to use *generalized marginalization* to construct inference policies as

$$\pi_{\theta, \phi}^{\ddagger}(a) = \int \pi_{\theta}(a | r) w_{\phi}(r) dr \text{ or } \sum_r \pi_{\theta}(a | r) w_{\phi}(r),$$

continuous rewards discrete rewards

where $w_{\phi}(r)$ is a *normalized weight function* with tunable parameter ϕ , designed to maximize the expected rewards (section 3). Importantly, $w_{\phi}(r)$ does not need to satisfy the non-negativity condition but only requires to be *normalized*, i.e. $\int w_{\phi}(r) dr = 1$ (or $\sum_r w_{\phi}(r) = 1$ for discrete rewards), which is necessary to ensure the normalization property of $\pi_{\theta, \phi}^{\ddagger}(a)$ as a valid distribution over a . The benefit here is that it allows constructing inference policies that are *dissimilar* to policies conditioned on *low* rewards by having *negative* $w_{\phi}(r)$ for small r . We study a principled strategy to design and learn w_{ϕ} in settings with discrete actions (section 3.1) as well as some effective heuristics (section 3.2). Through simulations in section 4, we demonstrate that the proposed technique can outperform the marginalized policy for RCPs in challenging MAB (section 4.1) and contextual MAB (section 4.2) settings, being competitive to classic methods. Finally, on MAB with large action spaces and sparse reward signals, we show that RCPs implemented by conditional variational autoencoders (CVAEs) with the proposed techniques can outperform classic methods (section 4.3).

2. Related Work

Multi-armed bandit algorithms The UCB and TS algorithms are principled methods for MAB with provable convergence bounds and are widely used in industries. Li et al. (2010) proposes to solve the contextual bandit problem using linear models in UCB. Hill et al. (2017) uses TS in which the optimization step is solved by hill-climbing to optimize web layout design, for which the action space is combinatorially large. UCB with neural networks are explored by many works with different ways to model the confidence level, via first-order approximation Zhou et al. (2020) or using a separate network to model the variance

¹In Algorithm 1 of Kumar et al. (2019), the marginalization is implicitly defined by ancestor sampling, i.e. first sampling r' from $q(r)$ and then sampling a from $\pi_{\theta}(a | r')$. Note that this marginalization formulation allows the use of a Dirac delta distribution that only has mass on some desirable reward for $q(r)$, which is the actual experiment setup of Kumar et al. (2019) where some optimistic reward is used (more discussion later).

(Zhu & Rigotti, 2021). Similarly, TS with neural networks are studied with different ways for approximate Bayesian inference, via Gaussian approximations (Zhang et al., 2020) or sample average uncertainty (Rawson & Freeman, 2021). Standard RL algorithms have also been adopted to solve bandit problems. Policy gradient has been used to solve bandit problems for contextual recommendation (Pan et al., 2019). Cheng et al. (2022) uses policy gradient together with a generative model for chip design optimization. Actor-critic algorithms Konda & Tsitsiklis (1999) have also been used for bandit problems (Yu et al., 2018; Lei et al., 2022).

Reward-conditioned policies Kumar et al. (2019) propose to learn a reward-conditioned policy as a regression task with concurrent work referring this approach as upside-down reinforcement learning (Srivastava et al., 2019; Schmidhuber, 2019). Ding et al. (2023) uses Bayesian reparameterization to improve generalization on high reward-to-go (RTG) inputs and to avoid out-of-distribution RTG queries during testing time. Similarly, goal-conditioned RL requires learning policies according to different goals (Liu et al., 2022; Li et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023). Reward-conditioned policies has also been studied under the name reinforcement learning via supervised learning (RvS; Emmons et al., 2022) or reward-conditioned supervised learning (RCSL; Brandfonbrener et al., 2023). These works find that RCPs enjoys better performance than other offline RL methods but require a stronger assumption than traditional dynamic programming based methods.

Conditional generation for optimization and decision-making Conditional generative models have been explored in many recent works to solve optimization and decision-making problems. Jiang et al. (2019) uses CVAEs for slate optimization problems by learning the joint distribution of components on the slate conditioned on user responses. Chen et al. (2021) propose to formulate decision-making as sequence modeling tasks where the state, action and reward at each step are consumed by a transformer to output the action, which can be also seen as an instantiation of reward-conditioned policies. Follow-up works generalize this idea to other models such as diffusion models (Ajay et al., 2023) or with more complex setups with online components (Zheng et al., 2022). For generation tasks, Kanungo et al. (2022) explores conditioning on positive click-through-rates to improve headline generation by finetuning pretrained language models for reward conditioning.

3. Generalized Marginalization for Reward-Conditioned Policies

In this section, we start by introducing the general formulation of generalized marginalization of reward-conditioned policies for MAB with discrete action spaces (section 3.1),

where we start with binary rewards and extend it to other reward types in section 3.1.1. We then discuss two simple and computationally cheap heuristic strategies for it (section 3.2). We finish by illustrating how the resulting inference policies differ from each other and giving intuitions of why they are expected to perform better (section 3.3).

3.1. Generalized marginalization with discrete action spaces

We start our discussion with RCPs for contextual MAB with binary rewards. Assume that we have obtained some reward-conditioned policy $\pi_\theta(a | c, r)$ where a is the action, c is the context and r is the reward. Policy inference by generalized marginalization with a general normalized weight functions

$$w_\phi(r) = \begin{cases} w_0 & r = 0 \\ w_1 & r = 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{subject to} \quad w_0 + w_1 = 1$$

gives inference policies $\pi_{\theta, \phi}^\dagger(a | c)$ with the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\theta, \phi}^\dagger(a | c) &= \sum_{r'=0,1} \pi_\theta(a | c, r=r') w_\phi(r=r') \\ &= \pi_\theta(a | c, r=0) w_0 + \pi_\theta(a | c, r=1) w_1 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the weight parameter ϕ is a 2-dimensional vector $[w_0, w_1]$. Also note that ϕ has a different parameterization that always satisfies the normalization constraint: $\phi = [1 - \lambda, \lambda]$, which we will use later. Our goal is to optimize ϕ such that the expected reward is maximized

$$\phi^* = \arg \max_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{p_C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta, \phi}^\dagger(a|c)} [\bar{R}(a | c)] \quad (2)$$

where p_C is the context distribution, $\bar{R}(a | c)$ is the unknown value function of action a under context c . As w_0, w_1 do not necessarily have to be positive, it is now possible to have $w_0 < 0$ and $w_1 > 0$ to construct policies that is dissimilar to $\pi_\theta(a | c, r=0)$, which intuitively could obtain a larger expected reward; we will also refer to $\pi_\theta(a | c, r=0)$ as the *negative policy*, and similarly $\pi_\theta(a | c, r=1)$ as the *positive policy*, in the rest of the paper. Note that, although the formulation ensures that the inference policy satisfies the normalization property as a valid probability distribution, the non-negativity still needs to be ensured, i.e.

$$\pi_{\theta, \phi}^\dagger(a | c) \geq 0 \quad \forall a. \quad (3)$$

We will show how it constrains the range of λ (the only variable in w_ϕ) for discrete action spaces next.

Substituting (1) into (2) with the parameterization $w_0 = 1 - \lambda, w_1 = \lambda$, we have the optimization task

$$\begin{aligned} &\arg \max_{\lambda} R(\lambda) \quad \text{where} \\ R(\lambda) &:= \mathbb{E}_{p_C} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta, \phi}^\dagger(a|c, r=0)} [(1 - \lambda) \bar{R}(a | c)] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta, \phi}^\dagger(a|c, r=1)} [\lambda \bar{R}(a | c)] \}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Given N off-policy data points, $\{(c^i, a^i, r^i, q^i)\}_{i=1}^N$, where r^i is the observed reward and $q^i := q(a^i | c^i)$ is the action probability of the data collection policy, $R(\lambda)$ can be estimated using Monte Carlo with importance sampling as

$$\begin{aligned} R(\lambda) &\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{\pi_\theta(a | c, r=0)}{q^i} (1 - \lambda) r^i + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{\pi_\theta(a | c, r=1)}{q^i} \lambda r^i \right\} \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{N} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{\pi_\theta(a | c, r=1)}{q^i} r^i \right] - \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{\pi_\theta(a | c, r=0)}{q^i} r^i \right] \right\} + \text{constant} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

which is linear to λ . In other words, depending on the sign of the difference term (the coefficient of λ), one either needs to use the maximum or minimal of λ under the constraint specified by (3), which can be solved efficiently as below. For discrete action space with K actions a_1, \dots, a_K and for a given context c , (3) reduces to a set of constraints on λ as:

$$(1 - \lambda) \pi_0^i + \lambda \pi_1^i \geq 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, K,$$

where we denote $\pi_0^i = \pi_\theta(a_i | c, r=0)$ and $\pi_1^i = \pi_\theta(a_i | c, r=1)$ to simplify the notation. This gives lower and upper bounds for λ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \max(\Lambda_l) &\leq \lambda \leq \min(\Lambda_u) \quad \text{where} \\ \Lambda_u &:= \left\{ -\frac{\pi_0^i}{\pi_1^i - \pi_0^i} \mid \pi_1^i - \pi_0^i > 0 \right\} \quad \text{and} \\ \Lambda_l &:= \left\{ -\frac{\pi_0^i}{\pi_1^i - \pi_0^i} \mid \pi_1^i - \pi_0^i < 0 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Therefore, solving (4) is reduced to two steps: (i) computing the upper and the lower bounds according to (6) and (ii) computing (5) at two bounds and picking λ that yields the larger $R(\lambda)$ estimate. We refer an inference policy resulting from this optimization procedure of our generalized marginalization strategy as the *optimized policy*.

3.1.1. BEYOND BINARY REWARDS

We now discuss ways to extend our proposed method beyond binary rewards. For discrete rewards with finite values, instead of 0 and 1, it is straightforward to set the conditioning rewards for the negative and positive policy to the minimal and maximal values in the discrete space, respectively. For continuous rewards, we propose to set the conditioning rewards to the q_0 -percent and q_1 -percent quantiles, e.g. $q_0 = 10, q_1 = 90$, from observed rewards, where q_0, q_1 are hyperparameters to set for low and high percentiles; Kumar et al. (2019) uses the same idea to select the optimistic reward. For discrete rewards with unbounded values, a similar

strategy can be used with the quantile values cast to their closest discrete values in the domain.²

3.2. Heuristic strategies for generalized marginalization

Computing (5) for each context c can still be computationally expansive for large action spaces, therefore we further propose two heuristics that share the same intuition as the solution developed in section 3.1.

Optimistic policy An intuitive strategy to approach (2) would be to set $w_0 = 0, w_1 = 1$, which satisfies all constraints by design. This is essentially using the positive policy (i.e. the reward-conditioned policy conditioned on the positive reward) and is similar to what Kumar et al. (2019) do in their experiments, despite that their settings is real-valued rewards where they use empirically large rewards observed in the data as the reward condition. As the negative policy is not used at all, we do not expect it to work well, which is later confirmed in our simulation.

SubMax policy With our original intuition being to make policies dissimilar to the negative policy $\pi_\theta(a \mid c, r = 0)$, here we present another simple heuristics to maximize (2) for discrete actions. Denoting $\mathbf{p}_0 := \pi_\theta(a \mid c, r = 0)$, $\mathbf{p}_1 := \pi_\theta(a \mid c, r = 1)$, we define the *SubMax policy* as

$$\pi_{\theta, \phi}^\dagger(a \mid c) = \text{normalize}(\max(\mathbf{p}_1 - \mathbf{p}_0, 0)), \quad (7)$$

where \max is applied to the vector in an element-wise manner and normalize is the operator that normalizes a vector to have a sum of 1. The name SubMax refers to the operations we take in (7): the subtraction of the two probability vectors followed by the element-wise maximization against 0. This SubMax strategy can in fact lead to policies that are outside the space defined by (1), but such construction follows the same motivations which is to be dissimilar to the negative policy. To see this, note that (7) could lead to an inference policy with 0 probabilities for multiple actions while (4) would only lead to a policy with 0 probability for a single action, unless more than one actions attain equality in (3) for the same λ . The illustration in section 3.3 visually shows this. Unexpectedly, we find the SubMax policy to be generally competitive or even superior than other methods in our simulation.

3.3. Illustration of inference policies

We now visualize the inference policies from different strategies in a simple, non-contextual MAB. We consider a prob-

²Note that these ways to deal with general discrete rewards by transforming into a form of low and high rewards are designed such that the efficient solution developed in section 3.1 can be used. Other ways under the idea of generalized marginalization that require solving a more complex optimization problem are mentioned in section 5.

lem with 10 Bernoulli arms with probabilities sampled from Beta(1, 9) and collect 1000 observations using a random policy (i.e. uniformly randomly picking 10 arms). The probabilities in the reward condition policy, $\pi_\theta(a \mid r = 0)$ and $\pi_\theta(a \mid r = 1)$, can be estimated by simply counting the action frequencies for with $r = 0$ and $r = 1$, respectively. We then apply different strategies to construct inference policies using generalized marginalization: optimized policy, optimistic policy and SubMax policy. Figure 1 shows the ground truth value (i.e. expected reward) for each action in the environment, the two reward-conditioned policies and the resulting inference policies from three strategies. As it can be seen, all policies except the 0-reward policy or negative policy (0.077) achieves better than random expected reward (0.0816). Importantly, the optimistic policy, equivalently the 1-conditioned policy, which does not use the negative policy, is the worst (0.131) among the rest. Optimized policy (0.136) perform better than the optimistic one as expected, since it directly maximizes the expected reward (4). Unexpectedly, the SubMax policy (0.157) works the best, despite of its simplicity. Qualitatively, we can see that both optimized policy and SubMax policy have the ability to “zero out” certain actions that have bad performance (estimated value) so far. However, due to the set of constraints in (6) that the optimized policy has to satisfy, in general it can only “zero out” one action, unless more than one actions attain equality in (3) for the same λ , while the SubMax operation can potentially “zero out” more through the max operator. This is shown in figure 1d where only action 6 has a probability of 0 while in figure 1f, action 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8 all have 0 probabilities.

4. Simulations

In this section, we perform a set of MAB simulations with diverse settings. Section 4.1 focuses on simple non-contextual MAB with sparse rewards, large action space and delayed reward, respectively, where we also compare the proposed method with classic MAB algorithms. Section 4.2 further studies the method in contextual MAB and compare it against TS. Finally, we design a contextual MAB problem with large combinatorial action spaces in section 4.3 to study how the proposed method works for design problems where multiple discrete design choices need to be made jointly.

We implement algorithms studied in this section as a Julia package called `MultiArmedBandits.jl` for reproducibility; codes can be found in the supplementary material.

4.1. RCPs and classic methods on challenging non-contextual MABs

For simulation of non-contextual MABs, similarly to section 3.3, we randomly initialize K Bernoulli arms with




Figure 1: Illustration of different strategies to construct inference policies. Figure 1a shows the true value per action and the rest of the figures show different inference-time policies where the red line indicates the ground truth best arm. Numbers in braces are the expected reward (larger the better) under each policy and the number next to the environment corresponds to a random policy. Note that the 1-conditioned policy, or positive policy, is equivalent to the optimistic policy.

a predefined beta distribution $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$. To mimic real-world reward delay, we implement a delay buffer that only returns the simulated data after N_b observations. We focus on studying how varying K , (α, β) and N_b affects the convergence of each algorithm, as indicated by the accumulated regret over time. The sweeping settings we use are (1) $K = 10, 100, 500$, (2) $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 1), (1, 9), (1, 99)$ and (3) $N_b = 100, 500, 1000$, which results in 27 total configurations. For each configuration, we randomly initialize an environment and run each algorithm for 5000 observations; we repeat such simulation for 100 times and plot the mean along with its 95% quantiles in ribbons.

For comparison, we consider the following list of MAB algorithms: (1) random: a policy with uniformly random selection, (2) ϵ -greedy: a greedy policy with a chance of ϵ for picking the arm with the best estimated value and otherwise uniformly randomly selecting the arm, (3) UCB1: upper confidence bound, (4) TS: Thompson sampling with independent beta-Bernoulli arms, (5) RCPs with optimistic policies, (6) RCP: RCPs with the optimized policy and (7) the SubMax policy. As the choice of ϵ in (2) and the choice of prior in (4) highly affect their performance, we further sweep these hyperparameters.

Here, due to space limitation, we focus on discussing the results of varying one parameter while keeping the other two fixed; the results for all 27 configurations is in appendix A³.

³Our appendix is provided as a separate file, `appendix.pdf`, in the supplementary material due to over-sized PDF.

Large action space We first look at the results of varying K while keeping $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 9)$, $N_b = 100$, which is shown in figure 2. We see that the performance of classic methods degrade when K increase, except TS with the prior equal to the ground truth beta used for initializing the environment. Overall, RCPs with the SubMax strategy yields the best policy across the 3 settings. For the rest two strategies, the optimized strategy is consistently better than the optimistic one.

Sparse reward We then look the results of varying (α, β) while keeping $K = 100$, $N_b = 100$ in figure 3. Here RCPs with the SubMax strategy still remains competitive across different methods. For each prior, TS with the prior being the same one used to initialize the environment is also better than others and for $\text{Beta}(1, 99)$, ϵ -greedy strategy show a faster convergence within 5000 observations.

Delayed reward Finally, we check the results of varying N_b while keeping $K = 100$, $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 9)$, which is shown in figure 4. Again RCPs with the SubMax strategy still remains competitive across different methods. It is only outperformed by TS with the largest reward delay. However, based on the trend (the slope of the accumulated regret curve), RCPs with the SubMax policy is likely to outperform TS beyond the 5000 observations.

Overall, RCPs with the SubMax strategy is the most competitive method across all configurations and often converge faster than classic methods especially when the MAB settings are difficult. Within RCPs, the SubMax




Figure 2: Accumulated regret with varying K and $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 9)$ and $N_b = 500$.




Figure 3: Accumulated regret with varying (α, β) while keeping $K = 100$ and $N_b = 100$.

strategy outperforms the optimized strategy which again outperforms the optimistic strategy.

4.2. RCPs and TS on contextual MABs

To perform simulations with contextual MABs, we follow the setup in Zhou et al. (2020). For each environment, we randomly initialize a neural network to represent ground truth value distribution: it takes in a pair of action and context and returns the parameter of a Bernoulli distribution. During simulation the context is sampled from a hypersphere uniformly. We use $K = 4$ actions and contexts with 20 dimensions, which is the same as Zhou et al. (2020). Additionally, we use a delay buffer of size $N_b = 1000$ and also add a constant shift s to the output of the value function in the logit space in order to control the sparsity of the reward (a negative shift would lead to a Bernoulli with small chances of positive rewards). We vary $s = 0, -2.0, -4.0$ and for each configuration, we randomly initialize an environment and run the algorithm for 10000 observations; we repeat such simulation for 50 times and plot the mean of accumulated regret with its 95% quantiles in ribbons.

We consider comparing two RCP variants studied in the paper against two classic MAB algorithms, ϵ -greedy and TS; we do not study RCPs with the optimized strategy here because it is computationally expensive to compute (5) per context, which is needed for contextual MABs. In RCPs, the policies are modeled by CVAEs (Kingma et al., 2014)



with multiplicative injection layers (Kumar et al., 2019).⁴ For TS, we use neural networks to fit the value function and use Monte Carlo dropout to approximate model uncertainty, i.e. to sample a random value we run a forward pass of the network with dropout enabled. Finally, we sweep ϵ for ϵ -greedy as it affects its performance.

The accumulated regret plots for this simulation setup are given in Figure 5. As we can see, while classic methods perform better in a dense reward setting, their performance degrade a lot when the rewards become sparse. RCPs, on the other side, are more robust to the sparsity in reward, rendering RCPs with SubMax being the best in the highest sparsity setup (figure 5c). One explanation for the success of RCPs with the SubMax policy is that, the 0-conditioned policy, which is used to construct the inference policy, benefits from the increasing number of negative rewards during training.

4.3. RCPs on MAB with combinatorial action spaces

Finally, we study how RCPs with different policies perform in MAB with large combinatorial action spaces. In particular, we define the action to be the combination of 5 options

⁴Using a CVAE is not necessarily for this experiment as the output is a univariate Categorical. The intention here is to make the implementation consistent with that in section 4.3 where the policy requires a deep generative model to capture correlations in the action space. We detail the use of CVAEs in the next section.


 Figure 4: Accumulated regret with varying N_b while keeping $K = 100$ and $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 9)$.

 Figure 5: Accumulated regret with varying constant shift s in the ground truth value function. The numbers next to each s in the subtitles are the average of the expected reward over all randomized environment.

$a = [a_1, \dots, a_5]$ chosen from a set of 2, 4, 6, 16, 32 possible choices, resulting an action space with cardinality of $2 \times 4 \times 6 \times 16 \times 32 = 32768$ in total. The rest of environment setup is same as that of section 4.2 where the one-hot choices are concatenated as the action to be consumed by the ground truth value function. We randomly initialize an environment and run the algorithm for 10000 observations; we repeat such simulation for 20 times and plot the mean of the accumulated *reward* along with 95% quantiles. Note that we plot the reward instead of regret because it is expensive to calculate the optimal action/value required by regret due to the large action space.

Reward conditioned policies via CVAEs We implement the reward-conditioned policies $\pi_\theta(a | c, r)$ using CVAEs (Kingma et al., 2014) with the multiplicative injection layers (van den Oord et al., 2016; de Vries et al., 2017; Perez et al., 2017; Kumar et al., 2019) for reward conditioning.⁵ The CVAE consists an inference network $q_\theta(z | a, c, r)$ and a generative network $p_\theta(a | c, r, z)$. The inference network $q_\theta(z | a, c, r) := \mathcal{N}(z; \mu_\theta(a, c, r), \sigma_\theta(a, c, r))$ is

⁵A naive alternative to the multiplicative injection layers is to concatenate r together with a and c . However, we find that in this way r can be ignored in later layers in the neural network, making the learned reward-conditioned policy insensitive to r . Similarly findings have been also reported by Kumar et al. (2019).




Figure 6: CVAE with multiplicative injection layers for r . \oplus denotes concatenation. During training, action a , condition c and reward r are fed to the inference network to get parameters of the variational posterior, μ, σ ; z is then sampled from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$ and, together with c and r , go into the generative network to produce the action distribution. At inference time, z is sampled from the prior p_0 instead.

a parametric normal where μ_θ and σ_θ share a few multiplicative injection layers except the last layer that outputs the mean and standard deviation respectively. The generative network $p_\theta(a | c, r, z) := \text{Cat}(a_1; h_\theta^1(c, r, z)) \times \dots \times \text{Cat}(a_5; h_\theta^5(c, r, z))$ is a product of categorical distributions where $h_\theta^1, \dots, h_\theta^5$ share the layers with multiplicative injection except the last layer that outputs the probability vector (with softmax activation) for each action variable a_i . A schematics of the CVAE is shown in figure 6. The




Figure 7: Accumulated reward for simulations w/ $\mathbb{E}[\bar{R}] = 0.0483$.

CVAE is trained by maximizing the standard ELBO with a standard normal $p_0(z) = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ as the prior. We also down-weight the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence term by a weight $\beta = 0.5$, i.e. annealing, to mitigate component collapse during training (Sønderby et al., 2016). When new observations are returned by the delay buffer, we retrain the CVAE from scratch for a fixed number of total steps with all the data observed so far. After training, the reward conditioned policy can be approximated by Monte Carlo estimation using N_z samples of z from the prior p_0 as

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\theta(a | c, r) &= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_0} [p_\theta(a | c, r, z)] \\ &\approx \frac{1}{N_z} \sum_{i=1}^{N_z} p_\theta(a | c, r, z^i), \end{aligned}$$

where $z^i \sim p_0(z)$; in practice, we find that only 3–5 samples are enough for stable and consistent policies.

The accumulated reward plot is given in figure 7, where we also provide the expected reward under a uniformly random policy, $\mathbb{E}[\bar{R}] = 0.0483$, to give a sense of the high reward sparsity. As it can be seen, RCPs with both strategies can be successfully applied to this MAB setting with an action space of cardinality 32768, yielding better than chance performance. Between the two strategies, the SubMax strategy still consistently works better than the optimistic strategy. This indicates its potential effectiveness in design tasks where multiple discrete design choices need to be made jointly.

5. Discussions, Limitations and Future Work

Relationships to existing methods Many other methods have the notion of measuring the contrast between data with positive and negative rewards. In gradient bandits, the gradient has a similar contrastive form (Sutton & Barto, 2018). Kumar et al. (2019) studies how the advantages, defined as the differences between estimated state-action value and estimated state value, can be used for conditioning. It can be seen as contrastive against a base reward estimated by an extra reward model. More recently, direct policy opti-

mization (Rafailov et al., 2023) also involves a difference term using positive and negative samples in its loss/gradient computation.

Decoupled learning and inference policies An important take-away from our study is that by taking use of the fact that the policies at learning time and inference time can be different in RCPs, there is room to further optimize the inference-time policies. More research could be done in this direction of decoupled policies in learning and inference to derive better MAB and RL algorithms.

Theoretical analysis Although the effectiveness of our proposed strategies to construct policies in RCPs have been empirically validated through simulation, the theoretical foundation is still missing. In particular, it would be interesting to derive the convergence bound for each strategy and compare the rates against each other and further understand the effectiveness of the SubMax strategy.

Extending to real-valued actions Our presentation has mostly focused on developing strategies for discrete actions. Real-valued actions are challenging because it is hard to construct a valid and tractable policy through generalized marginalization. For optimized policies, the constraints in (6) would be infinitely many. For SubMax policies, it is generally hard to sample from the resulting policy due to its unknown normalization constant, which would require computationally expensive sampling methods like Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms.

General ways to handle beyond binary rewards Section 3.1.1 presents ways to handle general discrete rewards and real-valued rewards, but they rely on the simplification of using only two specific reward conditions (low and high rewards), similar to the binary case. However, a general extension, e.g. to real-valued rewards, is non-trivial as in (2) it would require optimizing/learning a continuous weight function with the constraint of having a resulting integral of 1.

Continual learning of deep generative models In section 4.3, we retrain the CVAE from scratch for each round, mostly for its simplicity to avoid catastrophic forgetting. However, this wastes computation and methods like variational continual learning (Kingma et al., 2014) can be potentially used to avoid training from scratch, which is more practical if the model is large. In general, how to continually train neural network based policies with new data without re-initializing the networks is an important research question.

6. Conclusions

We have presented a novel approach to improve the convergence of RCPs using generalized marginalization and studied several concrete strategies in MAB with discrete action spaces. Practically, we have identified a simple-to-implement strategy, the SubMax policy, effective in a diverse set of simulation settings. We hope our approach can make RCPs more competitive in various MAB settings and enable easy development of policies implemented by deep generative models to solve bandit problems.

References

- Ajay, A., Du, Y., Gupta, A., Tenenbaum, J. B., Jaakkola, T. S., and Agrawal, P. Is Conditional Generative Modeling all you need for Decision Making? In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, February 2023.
- Brandfonbrener, D., Bietti, A., Buckman, J., Laroche, R., and Bruna, J. When does return-conditioned supervised learning work for offline reinforcement learning?, January 2023.
- Chen, L., Lu, K., Rajeswaran, A., Lee, K., Grover, A., Laskin, M., Abbeel, P., Srinivas, A., and Mordatch, I. Decision Transformer: Reinforcement Learning via Sequence Modeling, June 2021.
- Cheng, R., Lyu, X., Li, Y., Ye, J., Hao, J., and Yan, J. The policy-gradient placement and generative routing neural networks for chip design. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26350–26362, 2022.
- de Vries, H., Strub, F., Mary, J., Larochelle, H., Pietquin, O., and Courville, A. Modulating early visual processing by language, December 2017.
- Ding, W., Che, T., Zhao, D., and Pavone, M. Bayesian reparameterization of reward-conditioned reinforcement learning with energy-based models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11340*, 2023.
- Emmons, S., Eysenbach, B., Kostrikov, I., and Levine, S. RvS: What is Essential for Offline RL via Supervised Learning?, May 2022.
- Hill, D. N., Nassif, H., Liu, Y., Iyer, A., and Vishwanathan, S. An efficient bandit algorithm for realtime multivariate optimization. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 1813–1821, 2017.
- Huang, J. and Jiang, N. From Importance Sampling to Doubly Robust Policy Gradient, June 2020.
- Jiang, R., Gowal, S., Mann, T. A., and Rezende, D. J. Beyond Greedy Ranking: Slate Optimization via List-CVAE, February 2019.
- Kanungo, Y. S., Das, G., A, P., and Negi, S. COBART: Controlled, Optimized, Bidirectional and Auto-Regressive Transformer for Ad Headline Generation. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '22*, pp. 3127–3136, New York, NY, USA, August 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-9385-0. doi: 10.1145/3534678.3539069.

- Kingma, D. P., Rezende, D. J., Mohamed, S., and Welling, M. Semi-Supervised Learning with Deep Generative Models, October 2014.
- Konda, V. and Tsitsiklis, J. Actor-Critic Algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12. MIT Press, 1999.
- Kumar, A., Peng, X. B., and Levine, S. Reward-conditioned policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.13465*, 2019.
- Lei, H., Lu, Y., Tewari, A., and Murphy, S. A. An Actor-Critic Contextual Bandit Algorithm for Personalized Mobile Health Interventions, April 2022.
- Li, L., Chu, W., Langford, J., and Schapire, R. E. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*, pp. 661–670, 2010.
- Li, Y., Gao, T., Yang, J., Xu, H., and Wu, Y. Phasic self-imitative reduction for sparse-reward goal-conditioned reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 12765–12781. PMLR, 2022.
- Liu, M., Zhu, M., and Zhang, W. Goal-conditioned reinforcement learning: Problems and solutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08299*, 2022.
- Pan, F., Cai, Q., Tang, P., Zhuang, F., and He, Q. Policy gradients for contextual recommendations. In *The World Wide Web Conference*, pp. 1421–1431, 2019.
- Perez, E., Strub, F., de Vries, H., Dumoulin, V., and Courville, A. FiLM: Visual Reasoning with a General Conditioning Layer, December 2017.
- Rafailov, R., Sharma, A., Mitchell, E., Ermon, S., Manning, C. D., and Finn, C. Direct Preference Optimization: Your Language Model is Secretly a Reward Model, May 2023.
- Rawson, M. and Freeman, J. Deep Upper Confidence Bound Algorithm for Contextual Bandit Ranking of Information Selection, October 2021.
- Schmidhuber, J. Reinforcement Learning Upside Down: Don’t Predict Rewards – Just Map Them to Actions. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.02875v2>, December 2019.
- Sønderby, C. K., Raiko, T., Maaløe, L., Sønderby, S. R. K., and Winther, O. Ladder Variational Autoencoders. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- Srivastava, R. K., Shyam, P., Mutz, F., Jaśkowski, W., and Schmidhuber, J. Training Agents using Upside-Down Reinforcement Learning. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.02877v2>, December 2019.
- Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning Series. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, second edition edition, 2018. ISBN 978-0-262-03924-6.
- van den Oord, A., Kalchbrenner, N., Vinyals, O., Espeholt, L., Graves, A., and Kavukcuoglu, K. Conditional Image Generation with PixelCNN Decoders, June 2016.
- Wang, T., Torralba, A., Isola, P., and Zhang, A. Optimal goal-reaching reinforcement learning via quasimetric learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01203*, 2023.
- Williams, R. J. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8:229–256, 1992.
- Yu, S., Xu, J., Lan, Y., Guo, J., and Cheng, X. Reducing Variance in Gradient Bandit Algorithm using Antithetic Variates Method. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR ’18*, pp. 885–888, New York, NY, USA, June 2018. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-5657-2. doi: 10.1145/3209978.3210068.
- Zhang, W., Zhou, D., Li, L., and Gu, Q. Neural thompson sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00827*, 2020.
- Zheng, Q., Zhang, A., and Grover, A. Online Decision Transformer, July 2022.
- Zhou, D., Li, L., and Gu, Q. Neural contextual bandits with ucb-based exploration. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 11492–11502. PMLR, 2020.
- Zhu, R. and Rigotti, M. Deep Bandits Show-Off: Simple and Efficient Exploration with Deep Networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pp. 17592–17603. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.

A. Results for all 27 configurations in section 4.1




Figure 8: Accumulated regret with varying K , (α, β) and N_b (full results for section 4.1).