

Fast Rates for Bandit PAC Multiclass Classification

Liad Erez* Alon Cohen*,† Tomer Koren*,† Yishay Mansour*,†

Shay Moran†,‡

June 19, 2024

Abstract

We study multiclass PAC learning with bandit feedback, where inputs are classified into one of K possible labels and feedback is limited to whether or not the predicted labels are correct. Our main contribution is in designing a novel learning algorithm for the agnostic (ε, δ) -PAC version of the problem, with sample complexity of $O((\text{poly}(K) + 1/\varepsilon^2) \log(|\mathcal{H}|/\delta))$ for any finite hypothesis class \mathcal{H} . In terms of the leading dependence on ε , this improves upon existing bounds for the problem, that are of the form $O(K/\varepsilon^2)$. We also provide an extension of this result to general classes and establish similar sample complexity bounds in which $\log |\mathcal{H}|$ is replaced by the Natarajan dimension. This matches the optimal rate in the full-information version of the problem and resolves an open question studied by Daniely, Sabato, Ben-David, and Shalev-Shwartz (2011) who demonstrated that the multiplicative price of bandit feedback in realizable PAC learning is $\Theta(K)$. We complement this by revealing a stark contrast with the agnostic case, where the price of bandit feedback is only $O(1)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Our algorithm utilizes a stochastic optimization technique to minimize a log-barrier potential based on Frank-Wolfe updates for computing a low-variance exploration distribution over the hypotheses, and is made computationally efficient provided access to an ERM oracle over \mathcal{H} .

1 Introduction

Multiclass classification is a fundamental learning problem in which a learner is tasked with classifying objects into one of K possible labels. In *bandit multiclass classification* (Kakade et al., 2008), upon making a prediction, the learner does not observe the true label, but only whether or not the prediction was correct. As a concrete example, consider a the task of classifying images, say, from the ImageNet dataset, with the number of labels K being several thousands. After the learner predicts a label for a particular image, both the image and the prediction are shown to a human rater who is asked if the prediction is correct or not, after which the answer is revealed to the learner. Thus, the learner faces a bandit multiclass classification instance as the true label is not revealed in case the prediction was deemed incorrect by the rater.

Much of previous work on the foundations of bandit multiclass classification focused on the *online* setting (Kakade et al., 2008; Daniely et al., 2011; Daniely and Helbertal, 2013; Long, 2020; Raman et al., 2023; Erez et al., 2024), where the goal of the learner is to minimize the *regret* compared to a given *hypothesis class* \mathcal{H} , namely, the learner’s total number of correct predictions

*Blavatnik School of Computer Science, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

†Google Research Tel Aviv, Israel.

‡Departments of Mathematics and Computer Science, Technion, Haifa, Israel.

throughout the learning process compared to that of the best fixed hypothesis from \mathcal{H} . A central line of work focused on studying the properties of \mathcal{H} that allow for sublinear regret in this context, and on characterizing the achievable regret rates in terms of K , $|\mathcal{H}|$ and the number of prediction rounds T . For instance, [Auer et al. \(2002\)](#) show that for any finite \mathcal{H} one can obtain a regret bound of $O(\sqrt{KT \log |\mathcal{H}|})$, by casting the classification problem as a (contextual) K -armed bandit problem. [Daniely and Helbertal \(2013\)](#) demonstrate that the dependence on $\log |\mathcal{H}|$ can be replaced by the Littlestone dimension of \mathcal{H} , which may potentially be smaller than $\log |\mathcal{H}|$ and, in particular, may be finite even when \mathcal{H} is infinite. Very recently, [Erez et al. \(2024\)](#) establish a characterization of the optimal regret rates for finite hypothesis classes and show that it is of the form $\Theta(\min\{\sqrt{KT \log |\mathcal{H}|}, |\mathcal{H}| + \sqrt{T}\})$, which is tight even when the labeled examples are drawn i.i.d. from a fixed distribution.

Here we focus on a different, yet closely related version of multiclass classification, viewed as a learning problem in a PAC framework ([Valiant, 1984](#)). In this setting, the labeled examples are drawn from a fixed unknown distribution, and the learner’s goal is to ultimately output a prediction rule which performs well, over this distribution, relative to the best hypothesis from the underlying class \mathcal{H} . This problem has mainly been studied in the analogous full-information setting, that is, when the learner has access to a training set of i.i.d. examples along with their true labels, where the number of samples required to learn an ε -optimal hypothesis was shown to be $O((1/\varepsilon^2) \log(|\mathcal{H}|/\delta))$ for finite classes ([Natarajan, 1989](#); [Ben-David et al., 1992](#); [Daniely et al., 2011](#); [Brukhim et al., 2022](#)). In the bandit case, however—namely where the learner may repeatedly predict labels of drawn examples and obtain feedback only on whether the prediction was correct or not—a comprehensive understanding of the achievable sample complexity rates is still missing.

On the surface, the PAC bandit multiclass problem might be deemed trivial: a straightforward approach of uniformly approximating the losses of all hypotheses in \mathcal{H} by drawing i.i.d. examples and predicting labels uniformly at random, already gives rise to $O((K/\varepsilon^2) \log |\mathcal{H}|)$ sample complexity which appears to be optimal due to the bandit feedback. Furthermore, the simple underlying algorithm can be implemented efficiently, provided that empirical risk minimization (ERM) can be carried out efficiently over the hypothesis class. However, this view regards multiclass classification as a generic K -armed (contextual) bandit problem and neglects a crucial aspect of the setting: each example has a single correct label, as opposed to a more general scenario where each label may be associated with its own loss, independently of other labels. And indeed, no non-trivial lower bounds can be found in the existing literature for this problem.¹

The following questions thus remain:

- (1) *What is the optimal sample complexity of the bandit multiclass setting? In particular, can one improve upon the prototypical K/ε^2 rate, representative of bandit problems?*
- (2) *Can this sample complexity be attained by an efficient (polynomial time) algorithm, whenever ERM can be computed efficiently over the underlying hypothesis class?*

In this work, we address the questions above and establish a nearly-tight characterization of the achievable sample complexity in the bandit multiclass problem, along with an efficient algorithm.

1.1 Summary of contributions

Our main contributions are summarized as follows.

¹We note that [Daniely and Helbertal \(2013\)](#) do provide a stochastic lower bound construction, but it pertains to multi-label multiclass rather to the standard single-label setting we consider here.

- (i) For a finite hypothesis class \mathcal{H} , we give an algorithm with sample complexity of $O((\text{poly}(K) + 1/\varepsilon^2) \log(|\mathcal{H}|/\delta))$ for producing an ε -optimal classifier with probability at least $1 - \delta$; see Theorem 1 in Section 3. Further, our algorithm is a proper learner and can be implemented efficiently provided a (weighted) ERM oracle for the class \mathcal{H} . In terms of the leading dependence on ε , this bound significantly improves over the previously mentioned $O(K/\varepsilon^2)$ bound, and matches the optimal rate in the full-information version of the problem.
- (ii) For more general, possibly infinite hypothesis classes \mathcal{H} with finite Natarajan dimension d , we establish a generalized sample complexity bound of $O((\text{poly}(K) + 1/\varepsilon^2)d \log(1/\delta))$; see Theorem 2 in Section 4. This improves over the previous $O(Kd/\varepsilon^2)$ bound due to Daniely, Sabato, Ben-David, and Shalev-Shwartz (2011), and matches the known rate in the full-information case (Natarajan, 1989) up to logarithmic factors for sufficiently small ε .

These results bear some interesting consequences. First, and perhaps most surprisingly, they imply that there is *no additional price for bandit feedback* in PAC multiclass classification, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$; namely, that the ratio between the optimal sample complexity rates in the bandit and the full-information settings is $\Theta(1)$, and not $\Theta(K)$ as one might expect. Indeed, the latter is often the multiplicative price of bandit information in a multitude of scenarios (see, e.g., Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020), and further, it is the tight price in the realizable case of bandit multiclass (Daniely et al., 2011). This phenomenon occurs already in the case of a finite hypothesis class, and extends naturally to general Natarajan classes.

Second, the results reveal an unexpected gap between the attainable bounds in the online (i.e., regret minimization) and the PAC settings of the bandit multiclass problem. A recognized trademark of online learning is that online-to-batch conversions of regret bounds very often give sharp sample complexity rates in the i.i.d. PAC setting (see e.g., Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006; Bubeck et al., 2012; Hazan et al., 2016). In bandit multiclass classification, however, we exhibit a stark separation between the two settings, where for sufficiently large hypothesis classes an online-to-batch conversion of the optimal regret rate results with sample complexity $\tilde{\Theta}(K/\varepsilon^2)$ (Erez et al., 2024), whereas the rate we establish here is $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon^2 + \text{poly}(K))$.²

The core novelty in our algorithmic approach is a stochastic optimization technique for efficiently recovering a low-variance exploration distribution over the hypotheses in \mathcal{H} , with variance $O(1)$ rather than the $O(K)$ obtained by simple uniform exploration of labels. We show that through minimization of a stochastic objective akin to a log-barrier (convex) potential over the induced label probabilities, such a distribution can be computed in a sample-efficient way and in turn be used to uniformly estimate the losses of all hypotheses in \mathcal{H} via importance sampling. Moreover, we demonstrate how this stochastic optimization problem can be solved efficiently using a stochastic Frank-Wolfe method. More details about the algorithmic ideas and an overview of the analysis are given in Section 3.

1.2 Additional related work

Bandit multiclass classification. In agnostic online multiclass classification with bandit feedback, regret bounds of the form $O(\sqrt{KT \log |\mathcal{H}|})$ can be obtained by viewing the problem as an instance of contextual multi-armed bandits (Auer et al., 2002); this bound has been recently improved by Erez et al. (2024) to $\Theta(\min \{\sqrt{KT \log |\mathcal{H}|}, |\mathcal{H}| + \sqrt{T}\})$ for the classification setting. Daniely and Helbertal (2013) show how to replace the $\log |\mathcal{H}|$ dependence in the first bound by the

²A similar separation has been observed before, e.g., in the context of general online/stochastic convex optimization (Shamir, 2013).

Littlestone dimension of \mathcal{H} , and (Raman et al., 2023) show how K can be replaced with a refined quantity which encapsulates the effective number of labels. Additional refinements in the realizable setting include the *Bandit Littlestone dimension* which provides a characterization of the optimal mistake bound for deterministic learning algorithms (Daniely et al., 2011).

Contextual bandits. The PAC objective of the bandit multiclass classification problem can be seen as a special case of the problem of identifying an approximately optimal policy in contextual multi-armed bandits. In the more general contextual bandit framework, sample complexity lower bounds of $\tilde{\Omega}(K/\varepsilon^2)$ are known (Auer et al., 2002), with regret upper bounds of the form $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{KT})$ obtained in several previous works (Auer et al., 2002; Dudik et al., 2011; Agarwal et al., 2014). Reducing our problem to contextual bandits, however, ignores the special structure exhibited by the reward function in the classification setting, namely their sparsity (see Erez et al. (2024) for a more detailed comparison), and indeed we establish improved sample complexity rates in this special case. In a bit more detail, in the works of Dudik et al. (2011); Agarwal et al. (2014), one of the main technical ideas is to compute a distribution over policies which induces a reward estimator whose variance is bounded, uniformly over the policies, by $O(K)$ (it is actually nontrivial to show that such a distribution even exists). Our approach involves similar ideas in the sense that we also aim to compute such a low-variance exploration distribution over the hypotheses, but the crucial difference is that in the classification setting, the sparse nature of the rewards allows us to uniformly bound the variance by $O(1)$ rather than $O(K)$.

2 Problem Setup

Bandit multiclass classification. We consider a learning setting in which a learner is tasked with classifying objects from a set of examples \mathcal{X} with a single label from a set of K possible labels $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, K\}$. A stochastic multiclass classification instance is specified by a hypothesis class $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \{\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}\}$ and a joint distribution \mathcal{D} over example-label pairs over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. We focus on finite hypothesis classes and denote $N \triangleq |\mathcal{H}|$. In the bandit setup, the learner interacts with the environment in an iterative manner according to the following protocol, over $i = 1, 2, \dots$:

- (i) The environment generates a pair $(x_i, y_i) \sim \mathcal{D}$ and the example x_i is revealed to the learner;
- (ii) The learner predicts a label $\hat{y}_i \in \mathcal{Y}$;
- (iii) The learner observes whether or not the classification of x_i is correct, namely $\mathbb{1}\{\hat{y}_i = y_i\}$.³

Agnostic PAC model. In the PAC version of the problem, given parameters $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ the goal of the learner is to produce a hypothesis $\hat{h} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$,⁴ such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (over the randomness of the environment as well as any internal randomization of the algorithm):

$$L_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{h}) - L_{\mathcal{D}}(h^*) \leq \varepsilon,$$

where here $L_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \triangleq \Pr[h(x) \neq y]$ is the expected zero-one loss of h with respect to $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$, and $h^* \triangleq \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} L_{\mathcal{D}}(h)$ is the best hypothesis in \mathcal{H} . That is, the learner needs to identify a hypothesis which is ε -optimal in \mathcal{H} with respect to the expected zero-one loss, with probability at least $1 - \delta$. In this model, the learner’s performance is measured in terms of *sample complexity*,

³Note that in the bandit setting, the learner does *not* observe the true label y_i directly.

⁴In this model we allow for *improper* learners, that is, the output hypothesis may not be a member of \mathcal{H} ; we emphasize, however, that our main algorithm below is a *proper* learner, namely it returns a hypothesis $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{H}$.

which is the number of interaction rounds with the environment as a function of ε, δ required for satisfying the guarantee stated above.

Weighted ERM oracle. For our computational results, we will assume a weighted empirical risk minimization (ERM) oracle access to the hypothesis class \mathcal{H} . In more detail, we assume access to an oracle, denoted $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{H}}$, defined as follows: given a sequence of examples, labels and weights $(x_1, y_1, \alpha_1), \dots, (x_t, y_t, \alpha_t) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R}$ as input, the oracle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{H}}$ returns

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{s=1}^t \alpha_s \mathbb{1}\{h(x_s) \neq y_s\}. \quad (1)$$

We remark that this is a version of the argmin oracle often considered in the more general contextual bandit setting (e.g., [Dudik et al., 2011](#); [Agarwal et al., 2014](#)), specialized for the classification setting we focus on here. For our runtime results, we will assume that each call to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{H}}$ takes $O(1)$ time.

Additional notation. We denote by $\Delta_N \triangleq \{P \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \mid \sum_{i=1}^N P_i = 1\}$ the N -dimensional *simplex* which corresponds to the set of all probability distributions over \mathcal{H} . Given $P \in \Delta_N$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$ we use the notation $P(h)$ to denote the probability assigned to h by the probability vector P . Given an example-label pair $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ we define the binary vector $r_{x,y} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ by

$$r_{x,y}(h) \triangleq \mathbb{1}\{h(x) = y\} \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H},$$

that is, $r_{x,y}(h)$ is the zero-one reward of the hypothesis h on the pair (x, y) . Given $P \in \Delta_N$ and $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ we denote the probability of predicting the label y for x when sampling a hypothesis from P by

$$W_{x,y}(P) \triangleq \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} P(h) \mathbb{1}\{h(x) = y\} = P \cdot r_{x,y},$$

and for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ we let $W_{x,y}^{\gamma}(P) \triangleq (1 - \gamma)W_{x,y}(P) + \gamma/K$, which corresponds to mixing the distribution $W_{x,y}(P)$ with a uniform distribution over labels with weight factor γ .

3 Algorithm and Analysis

In this section we present and analyze our main contribution: an efficient bandit multiclass classification algorithm, detailed in [Algorithm 1](#), which will be shown to satisfy the following agnostic PAC guarantee.

Theorem 1. *If we set $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$, $M_1 = \Theta(K^8 \log(N/\delta))$, $M_2 = \Theta(\log(N/\delta)(K/\varepsilon + 1/\varepsilon^2))$ and use [Algorithm 2](#) to solve the optimization problem defined in [Eq. \(2\)](#) for $T = \Theta((K^4/\gamma^4)\sqrt{\log(N/\delta)})$ rounds with step sizes $\eta_t = 1/t$ and batch sizes $b_t = (\gamma/2K)^2 t^2$ for $t \in \{2^k - 1\}_{k \geq 1}$ and $b_t = t$ otherwise; then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ [Algorithm 1](#) outputs $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{H}$ with $L_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{h}) - L_{\mathcal{D}}(h^*) \leq \varepsilon$, using a total sample complexity of*

$$O\left(\left(K^9 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \log \frac{N}{\delta}\right).$$

Furthermore, [Algorithm 1](#) makes a total number of $O(K^4 \sqrt{\log(N/\delta)})$ calls to the weighted ERM oracle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{H}}$, and runs in total time polynomial in K , $1/\varepsilon$ and $\log(N/\delta)$.

Algorithm 1 Bandit PAC Multiclass Classification via Log Barrier Stochastic Optimization

Parameters: $M_1, M_2, \gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

Phase 1:

Initialize $S \leftarrow \emptyset$.

while $|S| < M_1$ **do**

Environment generates $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$, algorithm receives x .

Predict \hat{y} uniformly at random from \mathcal{Y} and receive feedback $\mathbb{1}\{\hat{y} = y\}$.

Update $S \leftarrow S \cup \{(x, y)\}$ if $y = \hat{y}$, otherwise S is unchanged.

end while

Solve the stochastic optimization problem defined in Eq. (2) up to an additive error of $\mu = \gamma^2/2K^2$ using the dataset S . Let $\hat{P} \in \Delta_N$ be its output.

Phase 2:

for $i = 1, \dots, M_2$ **do**

Environment generates $(x_i, y_i) \sim \mathcal{D}$, algorithm receives x_i .

With prob. γ , pick $\hat{y}_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ uniformly at random; otherwise sample $h_i \sim \hat{P}$ and set $\hat{y}_i = h_i(x_i)$.

Predict \hat{y}_i and receive feedback $\mathbb{1}\{\hat{y}_i = y_i\}$.

end for

Return:

$$\hat{h} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\{(x_i, \hat{y}_i, \alpha_i)\}_{i=1}^{M_2}\right),$$

where $\alpha_i = \mathbb{1}\{y_i = \hat{y}_i\}/W_{\hat{P}}^{\gamma}(x_i, \hat{y}_i)$.

Algorithm 1 operates in two phases. In the first phase, we construct a dataset S of $M_1 = \text{poly}(K) \log(N/\delta)$ i.i.d. samples from \mathcal{D} by predicting labels uniformly at random and taking into S the samples for which the correct label is predicted (and is thus known). We then feed these samples to a stochastic optimization scheme which finds an approximate solution to the following stochastic optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \Phi(P) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\phi(P; x, y)], \quad \text{where} \quad \phi(P; x, y) \triangleq -\log(W_{x,y}^{\gamma}(P)) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & P \in \Delta_N. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The approximate solution, $\hat{P} \in \Delta_N$ will be shown to satisfy certain low-variance properties, which will allow us to repeatedly sample from \hat{P} for $M_2 = O((K/\varepsilon + 1/\varepsilon^2) \log(N/\delta))$ rounds and estimate the loss of hypotheses in \mathcal{H} such that we are guaranteed to find an approximately optimal policy with high probability. We again emphasize that our algorithm is a proper learner in the sense that the returned hypothesis \hat{h} is a member of the underlying class \mathcal{H} .

3.1 Overview of algorithmic ideas

We next outline the details and intuition leading to Algorithm 1.

Low-variance exploration distribution. The main goal of the first phase of Algorithm 1 is to compute an exploration distribution $\hat{P} \in \Delta_N$ with the property that with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, the following holds:

$$\forall h \in \mathcal{H} : \quad \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^{\gamma}(\hat{P})} \right] \leq C, \tag{3}$$

where γ is some predefined parameter and C is an absolute constant, which crucially does not depend on K . The intuition behind this property is that the quantity of the left-hand side of Eq. (3) constitutes an upper bound on the variance of the random variable

$$\frac{J_{x,y}(h)\mathbb{1}\{y = \hat{y}\}}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(\hat{P})},$$

which is an unbiased estimator of the expected reward of the hypothesis h , that is, of $\mathbb{1}\{h(x) = y\}$ if the label \hat{y} is chosen according to an hypothesis drawn from \hat{P} and (x, y) is drawn from \mathcal{D} . Thus, we think of Eq. (3) as a property which guarantees that the exploration distribution \hat{P} can be used to estimate rewards, *uniformly* for all hypotheses in \mathcal{H} , with low (constant) variance. This is reminiscent of a technique of Dudik et al. (2011); Agarwal et al. (2014), who consider the more general stochastic contextual bandit problem, and rely on computing a distribution over policies which induces a reward estimator whose variance is bounded by $O(K)$. The low-variance estimator allows us to make use of variance-sensitive concentration bounds, namely Bernstein’s inequality, in order to accurately approximate the optimal policy using a small number of samples (this is done in the second phase of the algorithm, described below).

Controlling variance via stochastic optimization. In some more detail, our approach for computing such a low-variance exploration distribution \hat{P} is via approximately solving the stochastic convex optimization problem defined in Eq. (2). The reason for the choice of Φ as a convex potential to be minimized is the fact that its gradient is, up to a constant factor, given by

$$\forall h \in \mathcal{H} : \quad (\nabla\Phi(P))_h \approx \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P)} \right], \quad (4)$$

so that finding a low-variance exploration distribution amounts to computing $\hat{P} \in \Delta_N$ for which $\nabla\Phi(\hat{P})$ is bounded in L_∞ norm. Indeed, we show that the optimal solution to the optimization problem given in Eq. (2) satisfies such a property. This, together with the properties of Φ as a self-concordant function allows finding such \hat{P} by approximately minimizing Φ over the simplex: the self-concordance of Φ acts as a “restricted strong convexity” property, which roughly implies that approximate minimizers of Φ must also have small (low norm) gradients.

Efficient optimization via Stochastic Frank-Wolfe. In order to compute an approximate minimizer of the convex potential Φ defined in Eq. (2), we employ a stochastic optimization procedure, formally described in Algorithm 2, which is based on a stochastic version of the Frank-Wolfe (FW) algorithm (Frank et al., 1956) with SPIDER gradient estimates (Fang et al., 2018). The reason for choosing a FW based approach, is that it allows for efficient optimization of Φ in N -dimensional space, with runtime essentially independent of N , by exploiting the weighted ERM oracle at our disposal. Furthermore, the FW algorithm, when performed over the simplex, generates iterates P_1, P_2, \dots such that P_t is supported on at most t coordinates (provided that P_1 is initialized at an arbitrary vertex of the simplex), allowing us to maintain a succinct representation of the FW iterates—again, essentially independently of the ambient dimension N . Additionally, we remark that while existing analyses (e.g. Yurtsever et al. (2019b)) of the stochastic FW algorithm rely on smoothness of the objective with respect to the L_2 -norm, our objective of interest, namely Φ , is not smooth in this classical sense, however it is smooth with respect to the L_1 norm. Therefore, we crucially rely on a different analysis of the FW algorithm with SPIDER gradient estimates, presented in Appendix C, which accommodates smoothness with respect to the L_1 norm.

Final exploration phase. The second phase of Algorithm 1 is more straightforward, where we repeatedly predict labels using i.i.d. samples from a distribution which mixes the distribution over labels induced by \hat{P} (the exploration distribution computed in phase 1) with a uniform distribution over \mathcal{Y} . Using Bernstein’s inequality and the uniform low-variance property of \hat{P} , we show that $M_2 = O((K/\varepsilon + 1/\varepsilon^2) \log(N/\delta))$ samples suffice in order to ultimately output an hypothesis $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{H}$ being ε -optimal with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$. With this in hand, the desired PAC guarantee follows by a union bound over the failure probabilities of the two phases of the algorithm.

3.2 Stochastic Optimization via SPIDER Frank-Wolfe

Next, we present the stochastic FW procedure used in our algorithm as subprocedure; see Algorithm 2. It is essentially the SPIDER FW algorithm of Yurtsever et al. (2019b), specialized for solving the stochastic optimization problem defined in Eq. (2). We remark that the algorithm makes calls to a linear optimization oracle over the simplex denoted by LOO, that given an input $g \in \mathbb{R}^N$ computes $\text{LOO}(g) = \text{argmin}_{Q \in \Delta_N} Q \cdot g$. As we will show later, each of the calls Algorithm 2 makes to LOO can be implemented by a call to the weighted ERM oracle. We also remark that, as discussed before, existing analyses of the stochastic FW procedure with SPIDER gradient estimates relies on L_2 smoothness of the objective (Yurtsever et al., 2019b), and here we provide an analysis with respect to L_1 smoothness being crucial in our case. We defer further details about SPIDER FW and its analysis to Appendix C.

Algorithm 2 Stochastic Frank-Wolfe with SPIDER gradient estimates

Parameters: Dataset $S \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, step sizes $\{\eta_t\}_t$, batch sizes $\{b_t\}_t$.

Initialize $P_1 \in \Delta_N$ and initial gradient estimate $g_1 = 0$.

Let $\tau_k = 2^k - 1$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$

for $t = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

 Draw b_t fresh samples $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_{b_t}, y_{b_t})$ from S ;

if $t \in \{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ **then**

 Set

$$g_t = \frac{1}{b_t} \sum_{i=1}^{b_t} \nabla \phi(P_t; x_i, y_i);$$

else

 Set

$$g_t = g_{t-1} + \frac{1}{b_t} \sum_{i=1}^{b_t} (\nabla \phi(P_t; x_i, y_i) - \nabla \phi(P_{t-1}; x_i, y_i));$$

end if

 Compute $Q_t = \text{LOO}(g_t)$;

 Update $P_{t+1} = (1 - \eta_t)P_t + \eta_t Q_t$;

end for

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1

We now turn to formally prove Theorem 1. For clarity of notation, we henceforth use $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ instead of $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\cdot]$ to denote an expectation of a random variable with respect to \mathcal{D} . We begin this section by analyzing the first phase of Algorithm 1. The following lemma, which is proven in Appendix A,

characterizes the optimal solution to the stochastic optimization problem defined in Eq. (2), and shows that the gradient of Φ at that optimum is bounded by a constant in L_∞ norm.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and let $P_\star \in \operatorname{argmin}_{P \in \Delta_N} \Phi(P)$, where $\Phi : \Delta_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ was defined in Eq. (2). Then for any $P \in \Delta_N$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)} \right] \leq 1. \quad (5)$$

In particular, letting P be the delta distribution on some $h \in \mathcal{H}$:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)} \right] \leq 2.$$

The next key lemma, whose proof is also in Appendix A ensures that a sufficiently approximate minimizer of Φ is also a point in which the gradient Φ is bounded in L_∞ -norm, establishing the property given in Eq. (3).

Lemma 2. *Suppose $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and assume that for all $P_\star \in \Delta_N$ the following holds for \hat{P} which was computed in phase 1 of Algorithm 1:*

$$\Phi(\hat{P}) - \Phi(P_\star) \leq \mu.$$

Then,

$$\|\nabla \Phi(\hat{P})\|_\infty \leq 2 + \sqrt{\frac{2\mu K^2}{\gamma^2}}.$$

In particular, setting $\mu = \gamma^2/2K^2$ gives $\|\nabla \Phi(\hat{P})\|_\infty \leq 3$.

The fact that the property given in Eq. (3) can be guaranteed with high probability using as few as $M_1 = \Theta(\text{poly}(K) \log(N/\delta))$ samples relies on the following lemma, also proven in Appendix A, which follows from the analysis of the stochastic Frank-Wolfe procedure (see Appendix C for the detailed analysis).

Lemma 3. *Suppose $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$. If $M_1 = 58000(K^8/\gamma^8) \log(16N/\delta)$ and $T = 240(K^4/\gamma^4) \sqrt{\log(16N/\delta)}$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, for all $P_\star \in \Delta_N$ it holds that*

$$\Phi(\hat{P}) - \Phi(P_\star) \leq \frac{\gamma^2}{2K^2}.$$

We are now in position to prove Theorem 1 by analyzing the second phase of Algorithm 1. We make use of the guarantee of the first phase given in Lemma 2 with respect to the exploration distribution \hat{P} , which allows us to use Bernstein's concentration inequality in order to compute an ε -optimal hypothesis in high probability using only $\approx K/\varepsilon + 1/\varepsilon^2$ samples.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first show that we can in fact use Algorithm 2 as specified in the theorem's statement. That is, we prove that the calls to the linear optimization oracle, denoted by LOO in Algorithm 2 can be implemented using the weighted ERM oracle $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{H}$. Indeed, we first note that for any $g \in \mathbb{R}^N$ it holds that

$$\text{LOO}(g) = \operatorname{argmin}_{P \in \Delta_N} \{P \cdot g\} = \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \{g_h\},$$

so it suffices to show that this can be represented in the form given in Eq. (1) for the SPIDER gradient estimates used in Algorithm 2, which we denote by g_t . It is straightforward to see each g_t is a linear combination of terms of the form $\nabla\phi(P, x, y)$ where P is either P_t or P_{t-1} . Thus, we show that for $g = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla\phi(P_t, x_i, y_i)$, $\text{LOO}(g)$ can be computed by a call to the weighted ERM oracle. Indeed,

$$\text{LOO}(g) = \underset{h \in \mathcal{H}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ -(1-\gamma) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{1}\{h(x_i) = y_i\}}{W_{x_i, y_i}^\gamma(P_t)} \right\} = \underset{h \in \mathcal{H}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{1}\{h(x_i) \neq y_i\},$$

where $\alpha_i = (1-\gamma)/nW_{x_i, y_i}^\gamma(P_t)$. Now, assume that after phase 1, Algorithm 1 computed $\hat{P} \in \Delta_N$ with

$$\max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{r_{x, y}(h)}{W_{x, y}^\gamma(\hat{P})} \right] \leq 3.$$

Fix some $h \in \mathcal{H}$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, M_2\}$ define $X_i(h) = \frac{r_{x_i, y_i}(h) \mathbb{1}\{y_i = \hat{y}_i\}}{W_{x_i, y_i}^\gamma(\hat{P})}$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[X_i(h)] = \Pr[h(x) = y]$ and that $X_1(h), \dots, X_{M_2}(h)$ are i.i.d. Additionally, by the guarantee of phase 1:

$$\operatorname{Var}[X_i(h)] \leq \mathbb{E}[X_i(h)^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{r_{x_i, y_i}(h) \mathbb{1}\{y_i = \hat{y}_i\}}{(W_{x_i, y_i}^\gamma(\hat{P}))^2} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{r_{x, y}(h)}{W_{x, y}^\gamma(\hat{P})} \right] \leq 3.$$

Define $\bar{X}(h) = \frac{1}{M_2} \sum_{i=1}^{M_2} X_i(h)$, and note that by the form of the weighted ERM oracle, $\hat{h} = \operatorname{argmax}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \bar{X}(h)$. Therefore, by an application of Bernstein's inequality (see e.g. [Lattimore and Szepesvári \(2020\)](#), page 86) and a union bound, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$ for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$:

$$|\bar{X}(h) - \Pr[h(x) = y]| \leq \sqrt{\frac{6 \log(2N/\delta)}{M_2}} + \frac{2K \log(2N/\delta)}{\gamma M_2}.$$

Hence for \hat{h} , with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{h}) - L_{\mathcal{D}}(h^*) &= \Pr[\hat{h}(x) \neq y] - \Pr[h^*(x) \neq y] \\ &= \Pr[h^*(x) = y] - \Pr[\hat{h}(x) = y] \\ &\leq \Pr[h_*(x) = y] - \bar{X}(h^*) + \bar{X}(\hat{h}) - \Pr[\hat{h}(x) = y] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{36 \log(2N/\delta)}{M_2}} + \frac{4K \log(2N/\delta)}{\gamma M_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $M_2 \geq \max\{144 \log(2N/\delta)/\varepsilon^2, 8K \log(2N/\delta)/(\gamma\varepsilon)\}$ gives $L_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{h}) - L_{\mathcal{D}}(h^*) \leq \varepsilon$. Thus, using Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, we are only left with proving that with high probability, collecting M_1 samples for S takes at most $O(K^9 \log(N/\delta))$ steps. This essentially follows from the fact that a binomial random variables is smaller than half of its expected value with very small probability. Formally, we use lemma F.4 of [Dann et al. \(2017\)](#) to deduce that if $X \sim \text{Bin}(4KM_1, 1/K)$ then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ it holds that $X \geq 2M_1 - \log(1/\delta) \geq M_1$, which means that $4KM_1$ trials suffice to guarantee that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the dataset S will contain at least M_1 samples. Thus, the proof of Theorem 1 is complete once we make the observation that $2K/\varepsilon \leq K^2 + 1/\varepsilon^2$ (using the AM-GM inequality) so that the K/ε term is of lower order and can be dropped from the final bound. \square

4 Extension to Natarajan Classes

In this section we extend our result for finite classes given in Theorem 1 to general, possibly infinite hypothesis classes \mathcal{H} with finite *Natarajan dimension*. The Natarajan dimension is an extension of the VC dimension to the multiclass setting, defined as follows:

Definition 1 (Natarajan dimension; Natarajan, 1989). *The Natarajan dimension of a hypothesis class $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is the largest integer d for which there exist d points $x_1, \dots, x_d \in \mathcal{X}$ and d pairs of distinct labels $\{y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}\}, \dots, \{y_{d,1}, y_{d,2}\} \in \binom{[\mathcal{Y}]}{2}$ such that all 2^d sequences of the form $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_d, y_d)$, with $y_i \in \{y_{i1}, y_{i2}\}$, are realizable by \mathcal{H} .*

Note that in the binary case, when $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$, the Natarajan dimension reduces to the VC dimension. Our main result in this case effectively replaces the $\log|\mathcal{H}|$ term, relevant when \mathcal{H} is finite, with the Natarajan dimension d_N of \mathcal{H} .

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{H} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a hypothesis class of finite Natarajan dimension d_N . Then there exists a bandit multiclass classification algorithm which outputs a hypothesis \hat{h} with $L_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{h}) - \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} L_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \leq \varepsilon$ with a sample complexity of $\tilde{O}((K^9 + 1/\varepsilon^2)d_N \log(1/\delta))$.*

As discussed, this result improves the classical result of Daniely et al. (2011), who provided an upper bound on the sample complexity of PAC learning with bandit feedback, given by $\tilde{O}(Kd_N/\varepsilon^2)$, and left obtaining tighter bounds as an open question. In particular, for small target excess loss ($\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$), our bound eliminates the linear dependence on the number of labels K , thereby matching the $\tilde{\Theta}(d_N/\varepsilon^2)$ bound from the full information setting (Natarajan, 1989).

Theorem 2 follows directly from the following technical result, which is proven in Appendix B, when put together with Theorem 1.

Proposition 1. *Assume that the sample complexity of PAC learning with bandit feedback a finite class of size N over a label-space of size K is at most $m(N, K, \varepsilon, \delta)$, where ε, δ are the error and confidence parameters. Then, the sample complexity of learning an infinite class \mathcal{H} is at most*

$$s + m(S, K, \varepsilon/2, \delta/2),$$

where

$$s := O\left(\frac{d_N \ln(K) \ln(1/\varepsilon) + \ln(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

$$S := \sum_{i=0}^{d_N} \binom{s}{i} \binom{K}{2}^i \leq \left(\frac{e s}{d_N}\right)^{d_N} K^{2d_N},$$

and d_N is the Natarajan dimension of \mathcal{H} .

The proposition is proven by using the first s examples to construct a finite discretization of size S of the class \mathcal{H} , which is $(\varepsilon/2)$ -dense in \mathcal{H} in the sense that every $h \in \mathcal{H}$ is $(\varepsilon/2)$ -close to some h' in the discretization. Then, we apply our algorithm for finite classes on this finite discretization. Most of the proof is dedicated to establishing that the discretization is dense and to upper bounding its size. A similar result for discretizing binary classes, with the VC dimension replacing the Natarajan dimension, is well known. In the VC case, the proof is based on considering the class of all symmetric differences of hypotheses from \mathcal{H} and analyzing the VC dimension of that class using standard techniques. In our proof, we follow a similar argument, but the analysis of the VC dimension of the symmetric difference class, which remains binary even in the multiclass setting, is more nuanced.

Proof of Theorem 2. By Theorem 1, we have an upper bound on the sample complexity for PAC learning with bandit feedback over finite classes of size N of

$$m(N, K, \varepsilon, \delta) = O((K^9 + 1/\varepsilon^2) \log(N/\delta)).$$

Thus, the proof follows immediately from Proposition 1 together with the fact that:

$$\log\left(\frac{S}{\delta}\right) \leq d_N \log\left(\frac{es}{d_N}\right) + 2d_N \log K + \log \frac{1}{\delta},$$

where s and S are defined in the statement of Proposition 1 (note that $\log(s)$ only contributes logarithmic terms to the overall bound). \square

Acknowledgments

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreements No. 101078075; 882396). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. This project has also received funding from the Israel Science Foundation (ISF, grant numbers 2549/19; 2250/22), the Yandex Initiative for Machine Learning at Tel Aviv University, the Tel Aviv University Center for AI and Data Science (TAD), the Len Blavatnik and the Blavatnik Family foundation, and from the Adelis Foundation.

Shay Moran is a Robert J. Shillman Fellow; supported by ISF grant 1225/20, by BSF grant 2018385, by an Azrieli Faculty Fellowship, by Israel PBC-VATAT, by the Technion Center for Machine Learning and Intelligent Systems (MLIS), and by the European Union (ERC, GENERALIZATION, 101039692). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

References

- A. Agarwal, D. Hsu, S. Kale, J. Langford, L. Li, and R. Schapire. Taming the monster: A fast and simple algorithm for contextual bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1638–1646. PMLR, 2014.
- N. Alon, R. Bassily, and S. M. and. Limits of private learning with access to public data. In H. M. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. B. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 10342–10352, 2019. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/9a6a1aaafe73c572b7374828b03a1881-Abstract.htm>
- H. Asi, V. Feldman, T. Koren, and K. Talwar. Private stochastic convex optimization: Optimal rates in l1 geometry. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 393–403. PMLR, 2021.
- P. Auer, N. Cesa-Bianchi, Y. Freund, and R. E. Schapire. The nonstochastic multiarmed bandit problem. *SIAM journal on computing*, 32(1):48–77, 2002.

- S. Ben-David, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and P. M. Long. Characterizations of learnability for classes of $\{0, \dots, n\}$ -valued functions. In *Proceedings of the fifth annual workshop on Computational learning theory*, pages 333–340, 1992.
- N. Brukhim, D. Carmon, I. Dinur, S. Moran, and A. Yehudayoff. A characterization of multiclass learnability. In *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 943–955. IEEE, 2022.
- S. Bubeck, N. Cesa-Bianchi, et al. Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 5(1):1–122, 2012.
- N. Cesa-Bianchi and G. Lugosi. *Prediction, learning, and games*. Cambridge university press, 2006.
- A. Daniely and T. Helbertal. The price of bandit information in multiclass online classification. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 93–104. PMLR, 2013.
- A. Daniely, S. Sabato, S. Ben-David, and S. Shalev-Shwartz. Multiclass learnability and the erm principle. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 207–232. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.
- C. Dann, T. Lattimore, and E. Brunskill. Unifying pac and regret: Uniform pac bounds for episodic reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- M. Dudik, D. Hsu, S. Kale, N. Karampatziakis, J. Langford, L. Reyzin, and T. Zhang. Efficient optimal learning for contextual bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1106.2369*, 2011.
- L. Erez, A. Cohen, T. Koren, Y. Mansour, and S. Moran. The real price of bandit information in multiclass classification, 2024.
- C. Fang, C. J. Li, Z. Lin, and T. Zhang. Spider: Near-optimal non-convex optimization via stochastic path-integrated differential estimator. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- M. Frank, P. Wolfe, et al. An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 3(1-2):95–110, 1956.
- D. Haussler and P. M. Long. A generalization of sauer’s lemma. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 71(2): 219–240, 1995.
- E. Hazan et al. Introduction to online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, 2(3-4):157–325, 2016.
- S. M. Kakade, S. Shalev-Shwartz, and A. Tewari. Efficient bandit algorithms for online multiclass prediction. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 440–447, 2008.
- T. Lattimore and C. Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- P. M. Long. New bounds on the price of bandit feedback for mistake-bounded online multiclass learning. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 808:159–163, 2020. doi: 10.1016/J.TCS.2019.11.017.
- B. K. Natarajan. On learning sets and functions. *Machine Learning*, 4(1):67–97, 1989.

- A. Raman, V. Raman, U. Subedi, and A. Tewari. Multiclass online learnability under bandit feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04620*, 2023.
- O. Shamir. On the complexity of bandit and derivative-free stochastic convex optimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3–24. PMLR, 2013.
- L. G. Valiant. A theory of the learnable. *Communications of the ACM*, 27(11):1134–1142, 1984.
- V. Vapnik and A. Chervonenkis. On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities. In *Proc. USSR Acad. Sci.*, 1968.
- M. J. Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- A. Yurtsever, S. Sra, and V. Cevher. Conditional gradient methods via stochastic path-integrated differential estimator. In K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7282–7291. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019a.
- A. Yurtsever, S. Sra, and V. Cevher. Conditional gradient methods via stochastic path-integrated differential estimator. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7282–7291. PMLR, 2019b.

A Proofs for Section 3

Proof of Lemma 1. First note that the gradient of $\Phi(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\nabla\Phi(P) = \mathbb{E}\left[-\frac{(1-\gamma)r_{x,y}}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P)}\right].$$

Thus, using a first-order optimality condition for P_\star , the following holds that for any $P \in \Delta_N$,

$$\nabla\Phi(P_\star) \cdot (P - P_\star) \geq 0,$$

which amounts to

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(1-\gamma)(P - P_\star) \cdot r_{x,y}}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P)}\right] \leq 0,$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P) - W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)}\right] \leq 0,$$

which rearranges to the first inequality to be proven. Letting P be the delta distribution on some $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we have proven that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(1-\gamma)\frac{r_{x,y}}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)}\right] \leq 1,$$

and the second inequality follows since $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Assume that \hat{P} minimizes Φ up to an additive error of μ , that is, the assumption given in the statement of the lemma. Now, note that for every $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, using the explicit form of $\phi(\cdot; x, y)$ and its gradient, it holds that:

$$\phi(\hat{P}; x, y) - \phi(P_\star; x, y) - \nabla\phi(P_\star; x, y) \cdot (\hat{P} - P_\star) = \omega(R_{x,y}),$$

where $\omega(z) = -\log z + z - 1$ and $R_{x,y} = W_{x,y}^\gamma(\hat{P})/W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)$. Using the lower bound $\omega(z) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min\{(1-z)^2, (1-\frac{1}{z})^2\}$ (see Lemma 4 in Appendix A; this is where the self-concordance of ϕ comes in) we obtain that for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\hat{P}; x, y) - \phi(P_\star; x, y) - \nabla\phi(P_\star; x, y) \cdot (\hat{P} - P_\star) &\geq \frac{\gamma^2}{2K^2} \left(\frac{1}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(\hat{P})} - \frac{1}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)} \right)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\gamma^2}{2K^2} \left(\frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(\hat{P})} - \frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation of the inequality over $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$ while using a first-order optimality condition for P_\star with respect to Φ and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[(\cdot)^2] \geq \mathbb{E}^2[\cdot]$, we obtain

$$\mu \geq \Phi(\hat{P}) - \Phi(P_\star) \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{2K^2} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(\hat{P})}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)}\right] \right)^2,$$

and rearranging we obtain that for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(\hat{P})}\right] \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mu K^2}{\gamma^2}} + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P_\star)}\right],$$

so using Lemma 1 and the form of $\nabla\Phi$ we obtain the desired bound. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. In order to invoke Theorem 3 on $\Phi(\cdot)$, we prove that $\phi(\cdot; x, y)$ satisfies the required Lipschitz and smoothness properties with $G = K/\gamma$ and $\beta = K^2/\gamma^2$. Indeed, the gradient of ϕ is given by

$$\nabla\phi(P, x, y) = -(1 - \gamma)\frac{r_{x,y}}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P)},$$

and since $W_{x,y}^\gamma(P) \geq \gamma/K$ and $\|r_{x,y}\|_\infty \leq 1$ we obtain the required Lipschitz property, that is, $\|\nabla\phi(P, x, y)\|_\infty \leq G$. For L_1 smoothness, it suffices to show that for any $P, Q \in \Delta_N$ and any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ it holds that

$$\|\nabla\phi(P, x, y) - \nabla\phi(Q, x, y)\|_\infty \leq \beta\|P - Q\|_1.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla\phi(P, x, y) - \nabla\phi(Q, x, y)\|_\infty &= (1 - \gamma) \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left| \frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P)} - \frac{r_{x,y}(h)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(Q)} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{W_{x,y}^\gamma(Q) - W_{x,y}^\gamma(P)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P)W_{x,y}^\gamma(Q)} \right| \\ &= (1 - \gamma) \left| \frac{r_{x,y} \cdot (Q - P)}{W_{x,y}^\gamma(P)W_{x,y}^\gamma(Q)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{K^2}{\gamma^2} \|P - Q\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used Hölder's inequality. Now, using Theorem 3, our choice of T and M_1 for which the batch sizes b_t defined in Theorem 3 satisfy $\sum_{t=1}^T b_t \leq M_1$, the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 4. Let $\omega(z) = -\log z + z - 1$. It holds that:

$$\omega(z) \geq \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}(1 - z)^2, \frac{z}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{z}\right)^2\right\}.$$

The first lower bound is relevant for $z \leq 1$ and the second for $z \geq 1$.

Proof. Note that $\omega'(z) = 1 - 1/z$ and $\omega(1) = 0$, hence $\omega(z) = \int_1^z (1 - 1/x)dx$. When $0 < z \leq 1$ we can bound $1 - 1/x \leq 1 - x$ for any $z \leq x \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$\omega(z) = \int_1^z (1/x - 1)dx \geq \int_1^z (x - 1)dx = \frac{1}{2}(1 - z)^2.$$

When $z \geq 1$, we can use the elementary inequality, for any $z \geq x \geq 1$:

$$1 - \frac{1}{x} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{x^2}\right) = \frac{d}{dx} \left\{ \frac{x}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{x}\right)^2 \right\}$$

to bound

$$\omega(z) = \int_1^z (1 - 1/x)dx \geq \int_1^z \left(\frac{1}{2}(1 - 1/x^2)\right)dx = \frac{z}{2}(1 - 1/z)^2.$$

\square

B Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. Consider the following learning rule: first sample s examples x_1, \dots, x_s from the population (guess their label arbitrarily). Now for each pattern $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^s$ which is realizable by some function $h \in \mathcal{H}$, pick a representative $h \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $h(x_i) = y_i$ for all $i \leq s$. Define \mathcal{H}_{fin} to be the set of all such representatives. The Sauer-Shelah-Perles Lemma for the Natarajan dimension (Haussler and Long, 1995) implies that

$$|\mathcal{H}_{\text{fin}}| \leq S.$$

Now, apply the assumed algorithm on the finite class \mathcal{H}_{fin} with error and confidence parameters $\varepsilon/2, \delta/2$. Let \hat{h} denote the hypothesis outputted by the algorithm. Thus, with probability at least $\delta/2$ the excess loss (or regret) of \hat{h} with respect to \mathcal{H}_{fin} is at most $\varepsilon/2$. A union bound combined with the following lemma imply that with probability at least δ , the excess loss of \hat{h} with respect to \mathcal{H} is at most ε .

Lemma 5. *With probability at least $1 - \delta/2$ over the sampling of x_1, \dots, x_s , the finite class \mathcal{H}_{fin} is an $(\varepsilon/2)$ -cover for \mathcal{H} . That is, for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$ there exists $h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{fin}}$ such that the probability that $h'(x) \neq h(x)$ for a random point x drawn from the population is at most $\varepsilon/2$.*

Indeed, by a union bound, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, both (i) the excess loss of \hat{h} is at most $\varepsilon/2$, and (ii) \mathcal{H}_{fin} is an $(\varepsilon/2)$ -cover for \mathcal{H} . Hence, the excess loss of \hat{h} with respect to the best hypothesis in \mathcal{H} is at most $\varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon$, as required. \square

Lemma 5 follows from a standard uniform convergence argument. In the case of binary labels $K = 2$, this lemma is known and has been used e.g. in Alon et al. (2019). The general case is derived below using a similar argument like in Alon et al. (2019).

Proof of Lemma 5. We need to show that with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$ over $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_s, y_s) \sim \mathcal{D}$, for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists $h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{fin}}$ such that $\Pr_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[h(x) \neq h'(x)] \leq \varepsilon/2$. For convenience, we use the notation $d(h, h') := \Pr_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[h(x) \neq h'(x)]$.

Let $T = (x_1, \dots, x_s)$ be the sequence of points in the random sample, and for a hypothesis h let $h(T) = (h(x_1), \dots, h(x_s))$. By construction, for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists $h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{fin}}$ such that $h'(T) = h(T)$. We will show that $d(h, h') \leq \varepsilon/2$.

Define the event

$$E = \{\exists h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H} : d(h_1, h_2) > \varepsilon/2 \text{ and } h_1(T) = h_2(T)\}.$$

We prove that

$$\Pr[E] \leq 2 \left(\frac{2es}{d_N} \right)^{2d_N} K^{4d_N} e^{-\varepsilon s/4}. \quad (6)$$

Before we do so, we first show that this suffices to prove the lemma: indeed, if $d(h, h') > \varepsilon/2$ for some $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{fin}}$ such that $h'(T) = h(T)$, then the event E occurs because $\mathcal{H}_{\text{fin}} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. Now, via standard manipulation, this bound is at most $\delta/2$ for some

$$s = O\left(\frac{d_N \ln(K) \ln(1/\varepsilon) + \ln(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

which yields the desired bound and completes the proof.

It remains to prove (6). To do so, we use a standard VC-based uniform convergence bound on the class $\mathcal{H}_\Delta = \{\Delta_{h_1, h_2} : h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}\}$, where

$$\Delta_{h_1, h_2}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & h_1(x) \neq h_2(x), \\ 0 & h_1(x) = h_2(x). \end{cases}$$

Let \mathcal{G}_Δ denote the growth function of \mathcal{H}_Δ ; that is, for any number m ,

$$\mathcal{G}_\Delta(m) = \max_{\{V:|V|=m\}} |\mathcal{H}_\Delta|_V|,$$

where $\mathcal{H}_\Delta|_V$ is the set of all restrictions (or projections) on V of functions from \mathcal{H}_Δ . Note that

$$\mathcal{G}_\Delta(m) \leq \left(\frac{2e s}{d_N}\right)^{2d_N} K^{4d_N}.$$

This follows from the fact that for any set V of size m , we have $|\mathcal{H}_\Delta|_V| \leq |\mathcal{H}|_V|^2$, since every binary vector in $\mathcal{H}_\Delta|_V$ is determined by a pair of functions in $\mathcal{H}|_V$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{G}_\Delta(m) \leq \max_{|V|=m} |\mathcal{H}|_V|^2 \leq \left(\frac{2e s}{d_N}\right)^{2d_N} K^{4d_N},$$

where the last inequality follows from the extended Sauer's Lemma for Natarajan classes applied on \mathcal{H} (Haussler and Long, 1995).

Now, by invoking a uniform convergence argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[E] &= \Pr[\exists h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H} : d(h_1, h_2) > \varepsilon/2 \text{ and } h_1(T) = h_2(T)] \\ &= \Pr[\exists b \in \mathcal{H}_\Delta : d(b, b_0) \geq \varepsilon/2 \text{ and } b(T) = b_0(T)] \quad (\text{Here } b_0 \text{ is the all-zero vector}) \\ &\leq 2\mathcal{G}_\Delta(2s) e^{-\varepsilon, s/4} \quad (\text{double-sample symmetrization argument}) \\ &\leq 2 \left(\frac{2e s}{d_N}\right)^{2d_N} K^{4d_N} e^{-\varepsilon s/4}. \end{aligned}$$

The bound in the third line is non-trivial; it is known as the double-sample argument which was used by Vapnik and Chervonenkis in their seminal paper (Vapnik and Chervonenkis, 1968). The same argument is used in virtually all VC-based uniform convergence bounds. This proves inequality (6) and completes the proof of the lemma. \square

C Stochastic (SPIDER) Frank-Wolfe in L1 Norm

In this section we present and analyze the stochastic Frank-Wolfe (FW) method used as a sub-procedure in our main algorithm. Crucially, we require a specific variant of stochastic FW due to Yurtsever et al. (2019a), called SPIDER-FW, that employs mini-batching and variance-reduced for stochastic gradient estimation.

SPIDER FW has been shown to obtain the optimal $1/\varepsilon^2$ rate of convergence in a general stochastic setting that involves a convex and smooth objective (Yurtsever et al., 2019a). However, the existing analysis pertain to the Euclidean case, whereas we crucially require an L_1 - L_∞ analysis. We provide such analysis here with a specialized argument for variance-reduction with respect to the L_1 norm. (We note that similar arguments have appeared in Asi et al. (2021) in the context of differentially-private optimization.)

Setup. The setup for this section is the following. We consider a stochastic optimization problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && F(w) = \mathbb{E}[f(w, z)] \\ & \text{s.t.} && w \in W, \end{aligned}$$

where W is a convex domain in \mathbb{R}^d and the expectation is over z drawn from an underlying distribution \mathcal{D} . In the context of this section, we think of \mathcal{D} as being unknown but assume that i.i.d. samples $z_1, z_2, \dots \sim \mathcal{D}$ are readily available.

We further make the following assumptions:

- We assume that f convex, β -smooth and G -Lipschitz (in its first argument) with respect to the L_1 norm over W , that is,

$$f(u, z) \leq f(v, z) + \nabla f(v, z) \cdot (u - v) + \frac{\beta}{2} \|u - v\|_1^2 \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}, \forall u, v \in W,$$

and further, that $\|\nabla f(v, z)\|_\infty \leq G$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $v \in W$;

- We assume that the feasible domain W has L_1 diameter $\leq D$, that is, $\|u - v\|_1 \leq D$ for all $u, v \in W$. the algorithmic access to the set W is through a linear optimization oracle (LOO), that given any vector $g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ computes

$$\text{LOO}(g) = \underset{w \in W}{\text{argmin}} g \cdot w.$$

C.1 Stochastic FW with SPIDER gradient estimates

The SPIDER FW algorithm is presented in Algorithm 3. The algorithm makes Frank-Wolfe type updates using ‘‘SPIDER’’ gradient estimates g_t , that are computed from the raw stochastic gradients. The SPIDER estimates work in mini-batches, but employ low-variance bias correction in order to update the estimates without resetting them entirely from round to round, thus saving in the mini-batch sizes.

The main result of this section is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *Algorithm 3 with step sizes $\eta_t = 1/t$ and batch sizes b_t defined as*

$$b_t = \begin{cases} (G/\beta D)^2 t^2 & \text{if } t \in \{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 1}; \\ t & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

guarantees that, for all $t \geq 2$ and any $\delta > 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}[F(w_t) - F(w^*)] \leq \frac{25\beta D^2}{t} \sqrt{\log d}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr\left(F(w_t) - F(w^*) \leq \frac{25\beta D^2}{t} \sqrt{\log \frac{dt}{\delta}}\right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Consequently, for convergence to within $\epsilon > 0$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the algorithm requires $O((\beta D^2/\epsilon)\sqrt{\log(d/\delta)})$ calls to LOO and $O(((G^2 D^2 + \beta^2 D^4)/\epsilon^2) \log(d/\delta))$ stochastic gradient computations.

Algorithm 3 Stochastic Frank-Wolfe with SPIDER gradient estimates

Parameters: step sizes $\{\eta_t\}_t$, batch sizes $\{b_t\}_t$.
Initialize $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ and initial gradient estimate $g_1 = 0$.
Let $\tau_k = 2^k - 1$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$
for $t = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 Draw fresh b_t samples z_1, \dots, z_{b_t} from \mathcal{D} ;
 if $t \in \{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ **then**
 Set

$$g_t = \frac{1}{b_t} \sum_{i=1}^{b_t} \nabla f(w_t, z_i);$$

 else
 Set

$$g_t = g_{t-1} + \frac{1}{b_t} \sum_{i=1}^{b_t} (\nabla f(w_t, z_i) - \nabla f(w_{t-1}, z_i));$$

 end if
 Compute $v_t = \text{LOO}(g_t)$;
 Update $w_{t+1} = (1 - \eta_t)w_t + \eta_t v_t$;
end for

C.2 Analysis

To analyze Algorithm 3, we first record a generic convergence guarantee for stochastic FW template with gradient estimates. The template operates as follows; starting from an arbitrary initialization $w_1 \in W$, for $t = 1, \dots, T$:

- (i) get gradient estimator g_t at w_t ;
- (ii) use LOO to compute $v_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in W} g_t \cdot w$;
- (iii) update $w_{t+1} = (1 - \eta_t)w_t + \eta_t v_t$.

Lemma 6. *Set $\eta_t = 1/t$ for all t and suppose that the gradient estimates satisfy, for some $c > 0$,*⁵

$$\forall t \geq 1 : \quad \mathbb{E} \|g_t - \nabla F(w_t)\|_\infty \leq c\eta_t.$$

Then the FW iterations guarantees for all $t \geq 2$ and $w^ \in W$ that:*

$$\mathbb{E}[F(w_t) - F(w^*)] \leq \frac{\beta D^2 + 2cD}{t}.$$

Similarly, if the estimates satisfy

$$\forall t \geq 1 : \quad \Pr(\|g_t - \nabla F(w_t)\|_\infty > c_\delta \eta_t) \leq \delta.$$

for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $c_\delta > 0$, then for any $t \geq 2$ and $w^ \in W$, with probability at least $1 - t\delta$,*

$$F(w_t) - F(w^*) \leq \frac{\beta D^2 + 2c_\delta D}{t}.$$

⁵The claim of this particular theorem holds in fact for any pair of dual norms, but for consistency, is stated and proved here only for the L_1 - L_∞ case.

Proof. First, using β -smoothness (with respect to $\|\cdot\|_1$) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} F(w_{t+1}) &\leq F(w_t) + \nabla F(w_t) \cdot (w_{t+1} - w_t) + \frac{1}{2}\beta\|w_{t+1} - w_t\|_1^2 \\ &\leq F(w_t) + \eta_t \nabla F(w_t) \cdot (v_t - w_t) + \frac{1}{2}\eta_t^2 \beta D^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, due to the minimality of v_t , notice that for any $w^* \in W$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla F(w_t) \cdot (v_t - w_t) &= g_t \cdot (v_t - w_t) + (\nabla F(w_t) - g_t) \cdot (v_t - w_t) \\ &\leq g_t \cdot (w^* - w_t) + (\nabla F(w_t) - g_t) \cdot (v_t - w_t) \\ &= \nabla F(w_t) \cdot (w^* - w_t) + (\nabla F(w_t) - g_t) \cdot (v_t - w^*) \\ &\leq F(w^*) - F(w_t) + D\|\nabla F(w_t) - g_t\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from convexity and the diameter bound. Plugging into the inequality and rearranging, we obtain

$$F(w_{t+1}) - F(w^*) \leq (1 - \eta_t)(F(w_t) - F(w^*)) + \eta_t D\|\nabla F(w_t) - g_t\|_\infty + \frac{1}{2}\eta_t^2 \beta D^2.$$

Taking the expectation of both sides and using our assumption on the gradient estimates, we obtain the following progress inequality, that holds for all $t \geq 1$:

$$\mathbb{E}[F(w_{t+1}) - F(w^*)] \leq (1 - \eta_t)\mathbb{E}[F(w_t) - F(w^*)] + \frac{1}{2}\eta_t^2(\beta D^2 + 2cD).$$

We are now ready to prove the main claim by induction on $t \geq 2$. First, plugging $t = 1$ and $\eta_1 = 1$ into the progress inequality we have that $\mathbb{E}[F(w_2) - F(w^*)] \leq \frac{1}{2}(\beta D^2 + 2cD)$, that is, the claim holds for $t = 2$. For the induction step, let us assume that $\mathbb{E}[F(w_t) - F(w^*)] \leq (\beta D^2 + 2cD)/t$ for some $t \geq 2$. Then by the progress inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F(w_{t+1}) - F(w^*)] &\leq (1 - \eta_t)\mathbb{E}[F(w_t) - F(w^*)] + \frac{1}{2}\eta_t^2(\beta D^2 + 2cD) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{t}\right) \frac{\beta D^2 + 2cD}{t} + \frac{\beta D^2 + 2cD}{2t^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta D^2 + 2cD}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof in expectation. The second claim regarding convergence with high probability follows from the same arguments together with a union bound. \square

The next lemma analyzes the variance-reduced (SPIDER) gradient estimates used in Algorithm 3.

Lemma 7. *If we set the batch sizes as defined in Eq. (7), then for all t and $\delta > 0$:*

$$\mathbb{E}\|g_t - \nabla F(w_t)\|_\infty \leq \frac{12\beta D}{t} \sqrt{\log d}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr\left(\|g_t - \nabla F(w_t)\|_\infty > \frac{12\beta D}{t} \sqrt{\log \frac{d}{\delta}}\right) \leq \delta. \quad (8)$$

Proof. The proof relies on standard properties of sub-Gaussian random variables, all of which can be found in, e.g., (Wainwright, 2019). Let $Z_{t,j} = (g_t - \nabla F(w_t))_j$ be the j 'th coordinate of the error at step t . Note that $Z_{t,j}$ is zero-mean. We will show that $Z_{t,j}$ is also sub-Gaussian with parameter $\sigma_t = 6\beta D/t$. The claim will then follow since $\|g_t - \nabla F(w_t)\|_\infty$ is a maximum of $2d$ zero-mean sub-Gaussians with parameter σ_t , which implies Eq. (8).

First, consider t of the form $t = \tau_k$ and any coordinate $j \in [d]$. The claim follows in this case from variance reduction by mini-batching: condition on randomness before step t ; since all gradients are bounded in L_∞ norm by G , we have by Hoeffding's Lemma that $(\nabla f(w_t, z_i) - \nabla F(w_t))_j$ are independent zero-mean G -sub-Gaussian RVs (for $i = 1, \dots, b_t$), thus their mean $Z_{t,j} = (g_t - \nabla F(w_t))_j$ is zero-mean sub-Gaussian with parameter $\sigma_t = G/\sqrt{b_t} = \beta D/t$.

Next, consider any other round such that $\tau_k < t < \tau_{k+1}$ and any coordinate $j \in [d]$. In this case, the claim will follow from accumulation of variance starting from the reset step τ_k . Note that due to smoothness,

$$\begin{aligned} & |((\nabla f(w_t, z_i) - \nabla F(w_t))_j - (\nabla f(w_{t-1}, z_i) - \nabla F(w_{t-1}))_j)| \\ & \leq |(\nabla f(w_t, z_i) - \nabla f(w_{t-1}, z_i))_j| + |(\nabla F(w_t) - \nabla F(w_{t-1}))_j| \\ & \leq \|\nabla f(w_t, z_i) - \nabla f(w_{t-1}, z_i)\|_\infty + \|\nabla F(w_t) - \nabla F(w_{t-1})\|_\infty \\ & \leq 2\beta\|w_t - w_{t-1}\|_1 \\ & \leq 2\beta D\eta_{t-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, as before, the random variable $Z_{t,j} - Z_{t-1,j} = (g_t - \nabla F(w_t))_j - (g_{t-1} - \nabla F(w_{t-1}))_j$ is a zero-mean sub-Gaussian with parameter $2\beta D\eta_{t-1}/\sqrt{b_t}$, conditioned on randomness before step t . By the martingale-summation property of sub-Gaussian RVs, we then obtain that $Z_{t,j}$ is zero-mean sub-Gaussian with parameter σ_t , where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_t^2 &= \frac{G^2}{b_{\tau_k}} + \sum_{s=\tau_k+1}^t \frac{4\beta^2 D^2 \eta_{s-1}^2}{b_s} \\ &= \frac{\beta^2 D^2}{\tau_k^2} + 4\beta^2 D^2 \sum_{s=\tau_k+1}^t \frac{1}{s(s-1)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta^2 D^2}{\tau_k^2} + 8\beta^2 D^2 \sum_{s=\tau_k+1}^t \left(\frac{1}{(s-1)^2} - \frac{1}{s^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta^2 D^2}{\tau_k^2} + \frac{8\beta^2 D^2}{\tau_k^2} \\ &\leq \frac{36\beta^2 D^2}{t^2} \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality uses $\tau_k \geq t/2$. Therefore, we deduce that $\sigma_t \leq 6\beta D/t$. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. The theorem follows directly from Lemmas 6 and 7 and plugging in the specified parameters. The number of steps for convergence to within a given $\epsilon > 0$ is therefore $t = O((\beta D^2/\epsilon)\sqrt{\log(d/\delta)})$, which is also the number of LOO calls. For the total sample complexity, observe that the contribution of rounds $t \notin \{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded by $\sum_{s=1}^t s = O(t^2)$, while the contribution of rounds $t \in \{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is at most $O((G/\beta D)^2 t^2)$. \square