

Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Bandits with Parsimonious Hints

Amirmahdi Mirfakhar¹, Xuchuang Wang¹, Jinhang Zuo², Yair Zick¹, Mohammad Hajiesmaili¹

¹University of Massachusetts Amherst, ²City University of Hong Kong
smirfakhar@umass.edu, xuchuangw@gmail.com, jinhang.zuo@cityu.edu.hk, yzick@umass.edu, hajiesmaili@cs.umass.edu

Abstract

We study a hinted heterogeneous multi-agent multi-armed bandits problem (HMA2B), where agents can query low-cost observations (hints) in addition to pulling arms. In this framework, each of the M agents has a unique reward distribution over K arms, and in T rounds, they can observe the reward of the arm they pull only if no other agent pulls that arm. The goal is to maximize the total utility by querying the minimal necessary hints without pulling arms, achieving time-independent regret. We study HMA2B in both centralized and decentralized setups. Our main centralized algorithm, GP-HCLA, which is an extension of HCLA, uses a central decision-maker for arm-pulling and hint queries, achieving $O(M^4K)$ regret with $O(MK \log T)$ adaptive hints. In decentralized setups, we propose two algorithms, HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC, that allow agents to choose actions independently through collision-based communication and query hints uniformly until stopping, yielding $O(M^3K^2)$ regret with $O(M^3K \log T)$ hints, where the former requires knowledge of the minimum gap and the latter does not. Finally, we establish lower bounds to prove the optimality of our results and verify them through numerical simulations.

1 Introduction

The multi-agent multi-armed bandit (MA2B) problem (Liu and Zhao 2010; Anandkumar et al. 2011) is a sequential decision making task consisting of $K \in \mathbb{N}^+$ arms and $M \in \mathbb{N}^+$ agents. In each of the total $T \in \mathbb{N}^+$ decision rounds, each agent selects one arm to pull and observes its reward if no other agent pulls the same arm (called no *collision*). This model has applications in wireless communication (Jouini et al. 2009, 2010), caching (Xu, Tao, and Shen 2020; Xu and Tao 2020), and edge computing (Wu et al. 2021). Among various models in MA2B, the heterogeneous multi-agent multi-armed bandit (Bistriz and Leshem 2018; Shi et al. 2021) is a more realistic variant for these applications where agents have different reward distributions over the arms, e.g., in a wireless communication scenario where agents have different channel qualities due to different geographical locations. In this heterogeneous MA2B model, the optimal action of all agents is a bipartite matching (between agents and arms) that maximizes the total reward, called the *optimal matching*. An

algorithm’s performance is evaluated by *regret*, the difference between the accumulative reward of keeping to choose the optimal matching in all decision rounds and the total reward of the bandit algorithm. A smaller expected regret implies a better algorithm.

Recently, learning-augmented approaches are emerging, e.g., Lykouris and Vassilvitskii (2021); Bamas, Maggiori, and Svensson (2020); Bhaskara et al. (2023). This stream of research studies how to assist an algorithm with *hints* (a.k.a., predictions) queried from existing ML models, e.g., large language model (Achiam et al. 2023), deep convolutional neural network (Krizhevsky, Sutskever, and Hinton 2017), and deep reinforcement learning (François-Lavet et al. 2018).

In this paper, we study the utilization of hint information in heterogeneous multi-agent multi-armed bandits. In addition to receiving feedback from pulling arms, agents can sequentially query hints about the potential rewards of other arms, assisting in their decision-making process. We call the model *Hinted Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Multi-Armed Bandits* (HMA2B). Specifically, we consider a simple and accurate hint mechanism where agents can query the reward of an arm without pulling it, with no regret incurred from the queried hint. Despite assuming accurate hints, this model poses challenges, such as balancing hint queries and arm-pullings while accounting for agent heterogeneity and potential future collisions. In addition to minimizing regret, we aim to reduce *hint complexity*, the total number of queried hints, as querying hints, such as via the GPT-4 API (Achiam et al. 2023), can be costly. Efficiently leveraging hints is crucial in scenarios where hint costs are significantly lower than the costs of taking actions. For instance, in labor markets, structured, low-cost interviews provide hints to improve applicant-role matching, reducing the risk of human resource misallocation. Similarly, in radio channel assignments, test signals serve as hints to allocate high-bandwidth channels effectively, preventing delays and disruptions in critical applications like disaster recovery, where drones depend on reliable communication channels.

We study two scenarios of HMA2B: *centralized* and *decentralized* setups. In the centralized setup, an omniscient decision-maker determines which arm each agent should pull or query hints from, similar to decision-making in hiring processes where the employer has access to the applicants’ information to decide which of them to interview and which

Algorithm	D/C	Regret	Queried Hints	Communication
HCLA (Algorithm 1)	C	$O(MK^{2M})$	$O(MK^M \log T)$	N/A
G-HCLA (Algorithm 5)	C	$O(M^4K)$	$O(M^2K \log T)$	N/A
GP-HCLA (Algorithm 2)	C	$O(M^4K)$	$O(MK \log T)$	N/A
HD-ETC (Algorithm 3) [†]	D	$O(M^3K^2)$	$O(M^3K \log(MT))$	$O(\log T)$
EBHD-ETC (Algorithm 4)	D	$O(M^3K^2)$	$O(M^3K \log(MT))$	$O(\log T)$

Table 1: Regret, Queried Hints, and Communication Bounds for Centralized and Decentralized Algorithms (‘C’ and ‘D’ stand for centralized and decentralized algorithms respectively, [†] indicates that HD-ETC relies on the knowledge of minimum gap)

to hire. In the decentralized setup, agents independently decide their actions through collision-based communications, e.g., in radio channel allocation to stations.

Designing an algorithm that achieves time-independent regret with a linear number of hints in T is straightforward. However, reducing the queried hints to a sub-linear number in T is challenging. To tackle this, we first analyze the fundamental limits of hint complexity in the centralized setup and propose GP-HCLA, a fine-tuned algorithm based on the advanced `k1-UCB` algorithm (Cappé et al. 2013), which achieves asymptotically optimal hint complexity (Appendix H). In decentralized setups, the essence of communication lies in the absence of a central decision maker, requiring collision-based signaling (Wang et al. 2020), where making or avoiding collisions encode ‘1’ or ‘0’ information bit. This method introduces inaccuracies from sending decimal statistics in binary and additional regret due to delayed exploration while balancing communication to determine the optimal matching. To address these challenges, we propose HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC, which achieve relatively similar bounds on hint complexity and regret. These algorithms use a round-robin hint querying strategy combined with an *Explore-then-Commit* (Garivier, Ménard, and Stoltz 2019) approach until a stopping condition is met. Finally, we discuss the optimality of the results in both centralized and decentralized setups in Appendix H.

1.1 Contributions

For the centralized setup (Section 3), we propose two algorithms: HCLA and GP-HCLA. Both use empirical means to select a matching to pull and `k1-UCB` indices (Cappé et al. 2013) to identify another matching, querying a hint if the latter has a higher value. Additionally, we analyze an intermediate algorithm, G-HCLA (Appendix A), which operates similarly to HCLA but differs from GP-HCLA in how it selects the matching to hint after deciding to query. As summarized in Table 1, both GP-HCLA and G-HCLA—extensions of HCLA—achieve time-independent regret with an asymptotically optimal number of hints. We further prove that the upper bound on the hint complexity for GP-HCLA is tight, with both GP-HCLA and G-HCLA matching the established lower bounds. In the decentralized setup (Section 4), we introduce two algorithms: HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC. Both divide the time horizon into three phases: *exploration*, *communication*, and *exploitation*, with a key difference in how they transition

to the exploitation phase. In the exploitation phase, no further communication, exploration, or hint querying occurs, and the two algorithms handle this transition differently. In HD-ETC, agents know the minimum gap—the smallest utility difference between the optimal and other matchings—and the time horizon T , allowing them to switch to exploitation at a fixed time step T_0 . Conversely, EBHD-ETC does not require this knowledge, using an edge elimination strategy to determine the transition point, which makes it a random variable. This results in slightly higher hint queries and regret compared to HD-ETC. We provide regret bounds for both algorithms that align with the lower bounds, accounting for uncertainties due to delayed communication.

1.2 Related Works

Heterogeneous MMAB (HMMAB) HMMAB is one of the standard models in multi-player multi-armed bandits with collision literature; to name a few, Rosenski, Shamir, and Szlak (2016); Boursier and Perchet (2019); Mehrabian et al. (2020); Bistritz and Leshem (2018); Shi et al. (2021). Among them, Bistritz and Leshem (2018) was the first to study the HMMAB, where they proposed a decentralized algorithm with $O(\log^2 T)$ regret. Later on, the regret bound of this model was improved to $O(M^3K \log T)$ by Mehrabian et al. (2020) and further to $O(M^2K \log T)$ by Shi et al. (2021) that is the state-of-the-art result. We are the first to introduce the hint mechanism to HMMAB.

Bandits with Hints Learning algorithms with hints (or predictions) are part of the emerging literature on learning-augmented methods, as seen in works like (Lykouris and Vassilvitskii 2021; Purohit, Svitkina, and Kumar 2018; Mitzenmacher and Vassilvitskii 2022), etc. The hint mechanism was initially explored in the basic stochastic multi-armed bandits model by Yun et al. (2018). Later, Lindståhl, Proutiere, and Johnsson (2020) examined a more realistic hint mechanism, which includes failure noise, for the same model. Additionally, Bhaskara et al. (2023) investigated the impact of hints in adversarial bandits. We are the first to study the hint mechanism in a multi-agent scenario.

2 Hinted Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Multi-Armed Bandits

Basic model A Hinted Heterogeneous Multi-agent Multi-Armed Bandit (HMA2B) model consists of a set of K arms

\mathcal{K} and a set of M agents \mathcal{M} , such that $M < K$. Agents have heterogeneous rewards for arms. That is, for each agent $m \in \mathcal{M}$, each arm $k \in \mathcal{K}$ is associated with a Bernoulli reward random variable $X_{m,k}$ with mean $\mu_{m,k} := \mathbb{E}[X_{m,k}]$. The heterogeneous reward means are represented by a matrix $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in [0, 1]^{M \times K}$, where each of its rows is denoted by $\boldsymbol{\mu}_m = (\mu_{m,k})_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \in [0, 1]^K$.

Reward feedback Suppose that $T \in \mathbb{N}^+$ denotes the total number of decision rounds. At each time step $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$, every agent m chooses an arm $k_m(t)$ to pull. The arms requested by the agents construct a bipartite graph characterized by M nodes (agents) on one side and K nodes (arms) on the other comprising M edges, ensuring that each node on the agent side is connected to exactly one arm. Let us define \mathcal{G} as the set of all such graphs. Denote $G(t) := (m, k_m(t))_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ as the bipartite graph representing the arm pulling graph of the agents at time step t . We consider the *collision* setting (Boursier and Perchet 2019; Shi et al. 2021): that is, if there exist other agents pulling the arm $k_m(t)$ at time step t , then agent m gets a reward of zero; otherwise, agent m gets a reward $X_{m, k_m(t)}(t)$ sampled from the reward distribution of arm $k_m(t)$, or formally, $r_m(t) := X_{m, k_m(t)}(t) \mathbb{1}\{\forall m' \neq m : k_{m'}(t) \neq k_m(t)\}$. This induces the optimal action to be a matching.

Given a matching $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and a reward mean matrix $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in [0, 1]^{M \times K}$, we define the expected utility as

$$\begin{aligned} U(G; \boldsymbol{\mu}) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} r_m \right] \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mu_{m, k_m^G} \mathbb{1}\{\forall m' \neq m : k_{m'}^G \neq k_m^G\}, \end{aligned}$$

where k_m^G denotes the matched arm of agent m under matching G . We denote the matching with the highest utility as the optimal matching $G^* := \max_{G \in \mathcal{G}} U(G; \boldsymbol{\mu})$. We assume that G^* is *unique*, i.e., there does not exist any $G \neq G^*$ in \mathcal{G} such that $U(G; \boldsymbol{\mu}) = U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu})$.

Hint mechanism At each time slot t , besides the pulled arm $k_m(t)$, agent m can query another arm $k_m^{\text{hint}}(t)$ and observe the arm's reward realization $X_{m, k_m^{\text{hint}}(t)}(t)$ without regret cost. The hint graph then is denoted by $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ and $k_m^{\text{hint}}(t)$ is the arm agent m queried a hint for in it. These hint observations do not impact the accumulative reward and regret, and the agent can decide whether to query for a hint, denoted by the indicator function $\ell_m^\pi(t) := \mathbb{1}\{\text{agent } m \text{ query a hint at } t \text{ under policy } \pi\}$. We denote $L^\pi(T) := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_m^\pi(t) \right]$ as the total number of times of agents querying hints, and we want to design a learning policy π minimizes the $L^\pi(T)$ while maintaining low regret.

Regret. We aim to find a policy π that maximizes the cumulative reward of all agents by determining $G(t)$ at each round in the T rounds. To evaluate the performance of π , we define the *regret* of a policy as the difference between the total reward of all agents under the optimal matching

G^* in all decision rounds and the total reward of all agents following the policy π , as follows,

$$R^\pi(T) := \sum_{t=1}^T U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \mathbb{E} [U(G(t); \boldsymbol{\mu})], \quad (1)$$

where the expectation is taken over the randomness of the policy π . Last, we define the important parameter, the minimum gap, which is crucial and appears in our regret analysis. The *minimum gap* here represents the minimum difference between the utility of any matching G and G^* , i.e., $\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} := \min_{G \neq G^* \in \mathcal{G}} U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - U(G; \boldsymbol{\mu})$.

Main goal and motivating examples Our goal is to design learning policies that use hints—one per agent at a time—to reduce the large regret bounds established in previous works (Shi et al. 2021; Mehrabian et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2020; Boursier and Perchet 2019) to a preferably time-independent regret, while minimizing the number of hints queried. We assume that hints are sampled from the same distributions as the rewards from pulling arms. Our algorithms query these hints strategically, only when exploring a sub-optimal matching is necessary before committing to the optimal one. This approach minimizes the costs of direct exploration and improves performance by separating the exploration of sub-optimal matchings from the exploitation of the optimal one.

In practical scenarios, hints are typically much cheaper than direct actions. For instance, in labor markets, a low-cost interview process can provide valuable insights into candidate suitability without the high costs of hiring mistakes. Similarly, in communication networks, using test signals to estimate bandwidth needs can prevent wasting high-quality channels on low-demand stations. These examples demonstrate how the hint-based approach in HMA2B can improve decision-making across various applications.

3 Algorithms for Centralized Hinted Heterogeneous Multi-Armed Bandits

In the *Centralized Hinted Heterogeneous Multi-Armed Bandit* (C_HMA2B) setup, we consider an *omniscient* decision maker who selects both the matching and the hint graph at each round. The agents then follow the decision maker's instructions to pull arms and query hints. We propose two learning policies for this setup: the *Hinted Centralized Learning Algorithm* (HCLA) and the *Generalized Projection-based Hinted Centralized Learning Algorithm* (GP-HCLA).

Under both policies, the decision maker treats each matching $G \in \mathcal{G}$ as a super arm for hint inquiries. However, the handling of observations differs between the two: in HCLA, observations are maintained for each matching, while in GP-HCLA, they are treated at the edge level. This distinction allows us to reduce the potentially exponential regret relative to the size of \mathcal{G} to a polynomial regret upper bound in the number of edges, MK .

We first introduce the statistics maintained by agents in HCLA and GP-HCLA, aiding the central decision maker in deciding when and how to query hints. Next, we describe HCLA as a baseline for designing GP-HCLA, our main algorithm. We also present an intermediate algorithm, G-HCLA,




Figure 1: Set of covering matchings \mathcal{R} for $M = 3$ and $K = 4$: R_1, R_2, R_3 and R_4 are depicted in (a), (b), (c) and (d).

as a direct extension of HCLA. Finally, we detail GP-HCLA, which requests hints more efficiently than G-HCLA. G-HCLA is further discussed in Appendix A.

3.1 Preliminaries

Beyond the generic empirical means matrix $\hat{\mu}$, the decision maker employs kl-UCB indices \mathbf{d} (Cappé et al. 2013) as upper confidence bounds for $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ in the C_HMA2B setup to determine when to query a hint. These indices are defined as:

$$\hat{\mu}_G(t) := \frac{\sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1}\{G(t') = G\} U(G(t'); \mathbf{r}(t'))}{N_G^\pi(t)}, \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) := \frac{\sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1}\{(m,k) \in G(t')\} r_m(t')}{N_{m,k}^\pi(t)}, \quad (3)$$

$$d_G(t) := \sup \{q \geq 0 : N_G^\pi(t) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_G(t), q) \leq f(t)\}, \quad (4)$$

$$d_{m,k}(t) := \sup \{q \geq 0 : N_{m,k}^\pi(t) \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t), q) \leq f(t)\}, \quad (5)$$

for any matching $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and edge $(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$, respectively, where kl is the Kullback-Leibler divergence, and $f(t) = \log t + 4 \log \log t$. Here, $N_G^\pi(t)$ and $N_{m,k}^\pi(t)$ represent the number of times matching G or edge (m,k) has been pulled or hinted.

Before detailing the algorithm, we define a fixed set $\mathcal{R} := \{R_1, \dots, R_K\}$ of K pairwise edge-disjoint matchings that cover all edges $(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$, referred to as *covering matchings*. For uniquely labeled agents and arms in $[M]$ and $[K]$, $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$ is the matching where agent m is paired with arm $(m+i-1) \bmod K$, as shown in Figure 1 for $M=3$ and $K=4$. By pulling or hinting each covering matching in \mathcal{R} at least once, agents can observe all $G \in \mathcal{G}$ at least once. This set serves as a *hint pool*, from which all hint graphs G^{hint} will be selected.

3.2 Warm-up: The HCLA Algorithm

As noted earlier, the HCLA algorithm treats each $G \in \mathcal{G}$ as a super arm and maintains separate statistics: empirical mean $\hat{\mu}_G(t)$, kl-UCB index $d_G(t)$, and counters $N_G^{\text{HCLA}}(t)$. At each time step t , the central decision maker selects a matching $G(t)$ with the maximum empirical mean $\hat{\mu}_G(t)$ and another matching $G'(t)$ with the maximum $d_G(t)$ (Lines 3–4). If $d_{G'(t)}(t) > \hat{\mu}_{G(t)}(t)$, the decision maker chooses $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ as either $G'(t)$ or a uniformly at random chosen matching $G_2^{\text{hint}}(t)$, each with probability $1/2$. It then queries a hint from

Algorithm 1: Hinted Centralized Learning Algorithm (HCLA)

Input: agent set \mathcal{M} , arm set \mathcal{K} , number of agents M , matching set \mathcal{G} , time horizon T

- 1: **Initialization:** $t \leftarrow 0$, $\hat{\mu}_G(t) \leftarrow 0$, $d_G(t) \leftarrow 0$, $N_G(t) = 0$ for each matching $G \in \mathcal{G}$
- 2: **for** $t \in [T]$ **do**
- 3: $G(t) \leftarrow \arg \max_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \hat{\mu}_G(t)$
- 4: $G'(t) \leftarrow \arg \max_{G \in \mathcal{G}} d_G(t)$
- 5: **if** $d_{G'(t)}(t) > \hat{\mu}_{G(t)}(t)$ **then**
- 6: $G_1^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow G'(t)$
- 7: $G_2^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow$ pick a matching out of \mathcal{G} uniformly at random
- 8: $G^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow \begin{cases} G_1^{\text{hint}}(t), & \text{w.p. } \frac{1}{2} \\ G_2^{\text{hint}}(t), & \text{w.p. } \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$
- 9: Each agent m asks for a hint from $k_m^{G^{\text{hint}}(t)}$
- 10: Update $\hat{\mu}_{G^{\text{hint}}(t)}(t+1)$ according to the observation of $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$
- 11: Each agent m pulls $k_m^{G(t)}$
- 12: Update $\hat{\mu}_{G(t)}(t+1)$ and according to the reward observation of $G(t)$
- 13: Update $d_G(t+1)$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$

$G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ and updates $\hat{\mu}_{G^{\text{hint}}(t)}(t+1)$ based on the hint observation (Lines 5–10). Finally, the decision maker pulls $G(t)$, updates $\hat{\mu}_{G(t)}(t+1)$ with the reward observation, and recalculates $d_G(t+1)$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$ (Lines 11–10). The detailed pseudocode of the HCLA algorithm is provided in Algorithm 1.

Next, we present the upper bounds for the time-independent regret and the number of queried hints $L^{\text{HCLA}}(T)$ for the HCLA algorithm in Theorem 1. The detailed proof is presented in Appendix B.1.

Theorem 1. For $0 < \delta < \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{2}$ and policy $\pi = \text{HCLA}$, the policy π has

1. time-independent regret $R^\pi(T) \in O(MK^{2M})$,
2. hint complexity $L^\pi(T) \in O\left(\frac{MK^M \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}\right)$,

where $\Delta^{\text{kl}} = \text{kl}(U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} + \delta, U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \delta)$.

The regret of HCLA is time-independent, but the exponential constants in its regret and hint upper bounds are unsatisfactory. To address this, we propose a new algorithm called GP-HCLA, which provides a more refined analysis while maintaining the same hint inquiry and arm-pulling approach but using observations differently.

3.3 The GP-HCLA Algorithm

We present GP-HCLA in Algorithm 2. The GP-HCLA algorithm follows steps similar to HCLA to identify $G(t)$ and $G'(t)$. However, unlike HCLA, the central decision maker maintains statistics $\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t)$ and $d_{m,k}(t)$ for each edge $(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$. It then defines $d_G(t) := \sum_{(m,k) \in G} d_{m,k}(t)$, with a slight abuse of notation, enabling the use of the Hungarian algorithm (Kuhn 1955), which finds the matching with maximum additive utility in a

Algorithm 2: Generalized Projection-based Hinted Centralized Learning Algorithm (GP-HCLA)

Input: agent set \mathcal{M} , arm set \mathcal{K} , time horizon T ,

- 1: **Initialization:** $t \leftarrow 0$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_m(t) \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{d}_m(t) \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$, $N_m^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(t) \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$ for each agent $m \in \mathcal{M}$
- 2: **for** $t \in T$ **do**
- 3: $G(t) \leftarrow \text{Hungarian}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t))$
- 4: $G'(t) \leftarrow \text{Hungarian}(\mathbf{d}(t))$
- 5: **if** $U(G'(t); \mathbf{d}(t)) > U(G(t); \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t))$ **then**
- 6: $(m, k) \leftarrow \arg \min_{(m', k') \in G'(t)} N_{m', k'}^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(t)$
- 7: $G_1^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow \{R \in \mathcal{R} : (m, k) \in R\}$
- 8: $G_2^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow$ pick a matching out of \mathcal{R} uniformly at random
- 9: $G^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow \begin{cases} G_1^{\text{hint}}(t), & \text{w.p. } \frac{1}{2} \\ G_2^{\text{hint}}(t), & \text{w.p. } \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$
- 10: Each agent m asks for a hint from $k_m^{G^{\text{hint}}(t)}$
- 11: Each agent m pulls $k_m^{G(t)}$
- 12: Update $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_m(t+1)$, $N_m^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(t+1)$, and $\mathbf{d}_m(t+1)$ for each agent m according to new observations

weighted bipartite graph. Accordingly, GP-HCLA utilizes Hungarian to compute $G(t)$ and $G'(t)$, where the weights of the edges (m, k) are $\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t)$ and $d_{m,k}(t)$, respectively (Lines 3–4). The decision maker employs a distinctly different approach from HCLA for selecting $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ and updating the statistics after each observation, whether from pulling an arm or querying a hint. As in HCLA, the algorithm queries for a hint if $U(G'(t); \mathbf{d}(t)) > U(G(t); \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t))$ (Line 5). However, instead of querying a hint directly from $G'(t)$, GP-HCLA projects $G'(t)$ onto a matching in \mathcal{R} , a set of pairwise edge-disjoint covering matchings. By projection, we mean mapping $G'(t) \in \mathcal{G}$ to a matching in \mathcal{R} , which contains K covering matchings and is exponentially smaller. During this step, the algorithm selects the matching $G_1^{\text{hint}}(t)$ from \mathcal{R} that contains the edge $(m, k) \in G'(t)$ with the fewest $N_{m,k}^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(t)$, and a second matching $G_2^{\text{hint}}(t)$, chosen uniformly at random from \mathcal{R} . The hint graph $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ is then set to either $G_1^{\text{hint}}(t)$ or $G_2^{\text{hint}}(t)$, each with probability $1/2$ (Lines 6–10).

In Theorem 2, we provide the bound for the regret and the asymptotically optimal bound for the number of hints. The detailed proof is presented in Appendix B.2.

Theorem 2. For $0 < \delta < \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{2}$ and policy $\pi = \text{GP-HCLA}$, the policy π has

1. time-independent regret $R^\pi(T) \in O(M^4 K)$ regret,
2. hint complexity $L^\pi(T) \in O\left(\frac{MK \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}\right)$,

where $\Delta^{\text{kl}} = \text{kl}(U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} + \delta, U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \delta)$.

Theorem 2 highlights the impact of maintaining edge-level statistics in GP-HCLA, reducing the exponential time-independent regret bound to a polynomial. It also shows that projection in hint inquiries minimizes hints, achieving asymptotic optimality (matching the lower bound given by Theorem 7 in the Appendix). We study G-HCLA, an extension of HCLA, which updates statistics like GP-HCLA but

skips projection, using $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ as in HCLA. Theorem 6 (Appendix) shows G-HCLA can have up to M -times higher hint complexity than GP-HCLA, highlighting the importance of projection. Experiments (Appendix H, Figure 3b) confirm GP-HCLA outperforms G-HCLA on small problem instances. The exact tightness of this gap remains open due to the complexity of the kl-UCB index.

4 Algorithms for Decentralized Hinted Heterogeneous Multi-Armed Bandits

We study the *Decentralized Hinted Heterogeneous Multi-Armed Bandits* (D_HMA2Bs), where no central decision maker coordinates agents to avoid collisions while learning the optimal matching G^* . Theorem 3 demonstrates that sub-linear regret is unattainable in a decentralized setup without agents sharing statistics, making communication essential in D_HMA2Bs. To enable communication, agents intentionally collide to exchange statistics like $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ s, while non-colliding agents continue pulling their assigned arms k_m^G from the matching $G \in \mathcal{G}$ without interference (Shi et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2020). Communication order is determined by unique agent ranks, as discussed below.

Theorem 3 (Necessity of Communication). *No decentralized learning algorithm can achieve sub-linear instance-independent regret in HMA2Bs without communication.*

Building on Theorem 3, we propose a cooperative learning framework for the *Hinted Decentralized Explore-then-Commit* (HD-ETC) and *Elimination-Based Hinted Decentralized Explore-then-Commit* (EBHD-ETC) algorithms. These divide time into *Initialization*, *Exploration*, and *Communication* phases, where agents request hints in a round-robin manner until meeting a *stopping condition*, after which they transition to the *Exploitation* phase with no further hints or communication.

4.1 Decentralized Learning Framework

We first outline the common framework for the HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC algorithms. Both divide the T decision-making rounds into alternating exploration and communication phases. A counter ρ tracks exploration epochs, and $N_{m,k}^\rho$ records the number of times agent m has pulled or hinted at arm k by the start of epoch ρ . The decentralized learning framework for HMA2B consists of four phases:

Initialization phase: Assigning unique ranks among the agents. The detailed rank assignment procedure and analysis follows Wang et al. (2020) (detailed in Appendix D).

Exploration phase: Agents use the gathered statistics to identify the best matching G^ρ at the start of each epoch ρ using Hungarian algorithm. They then commit to their corresponding arm $k_m^{G^\rho}$ for K rounds until the epoch ends. At the end of epoch ρ , agents signal the communication phase by creating collisions on arms pulled by other agents.

Communication phase: Before each exploration epoch ρ , agents transmit their statistics $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ to others, denoted as $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho$. This communication is realized via the intentional collision signals, where a collision represents a '1' and its absence a '0' information bits (Boursier and Perchet 2019), with agents

relying on their unique ranks to identify senders and receivers. Since $\hat{\mu}^\rho$ often contains decimal values, agents transmit a quantized version, $\tilde{\mu}^\rho$, optimized for binary communication at the cost of minor information loss. To further reduce communication length and minimize information loss, agents employ the *Differential* communication (Shi et al. 2021), sending only the differences $\tilde{\delta}^\rho = \tilde{\mu}^\rho - \tilde{\mu}^{\rho-1}$ at the start of epoch ρ . This method reduces communication-induced regret through $t_{\text{com}}^\rho \in O(M^2K)$ communication rounds. It enables agents to synchronize actions and exchange critical information efficiently via the Send2All($\tilde{\delta}^\rho$) routine, detailed in Appendix E.

Exploitation phase: Agents stop communicating, exploring, and querying for hints after a specific time T_0^π , which depends on the policy π being used. After that, they agree on a matching G^{t*} and commit to it for the rest of the time.

Unlike Shi et al. (2021) employing exponentially increasing exploration epoch lengths summing to $O(\log T)$ epochs, our approach simplifies this by assigning each epoch the same length K , resulting in potentially $O\left(\frac{T}{K}\right)$ epochs. However, with stop conditions, our algorithms reduce the number of epochs and transition to the **exploitation phase** while maintaining $O(\log T)$ exploration epochs.

Hint inquiry mechanism HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC employ a round-robin approach for querying hints, setting $G^{\text{hint}}(t) = R_{(t\%K)+1}$, and follow an Explore-then-Commit exploration style. By evenly distributing hint queries over K rounds, this method reduces communication costs and prevents time-dependent regret. In comparison, the decentralized HCLA queries hints on demand, requiring constant communication and potentially incurring linear regret.

Regret decomposition We decompose the regret as follows to analyze its components separately:

$$R^\pi(T) = R^{\pi_{\text{rank}}}(T) + R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) + R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T),$$

where $R^{\pi_{\text{rank}}}(T)$, $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T)$, and $R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T)$ represent the regret due to ‘rank assignment,’ ‘exploration,’ and ‘communication,’ respectively, under policy π .

Under this framework, we introduce the HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC algorithms in the following sections.

4.2 Warm-Up: The HD-ETC algorithm

The HD-ETC algorithm builds on the learning framework in Section 4.1, extending the Explore-then-Commit (ETC) method in bandits literature. To follow this method, agents uniformly query hints for covering matchings $R \in \mathcal{R}$, Lines 9–11, until time step $T_0^{\text{HD-ETC}}$, determined by the assumed knowledge of $\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}$.

At $T_0^{\text{HD-ETC}}$ where ρ is the index of the last exploration epoch, agents run Hungarian($\tilde{\mu}^\rho$) to identify the matching G^{t*} , which they commit to for all $t > T_0^{\text{HD-ETC}}$, i.e., $G(t) = G^{t*}$ (Lines 18–20). Theorem 4 establishes that with a properly chosen $T_0^{\text{HD-ETC}}$, which depends on $\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}$, the algorithm achieves time-independent exploration regret while ensuring asymptotically optimal hint and communication usage. Detailed proofs are provided in Appendix F.1.

Algorithm 3: Hinted Decentralized Explore then Commit (HD-ETC) : agent m

Input: agent m , agent set \mathcal{M} , arm set \mathcal{K} , number of agents M , time horizon T , time threshold for hint inquiry $T_0^{\text{HD-ETC}}$

- 1: **Initialization:** $t \leftarrow 0$, $\rho \leftarrow 0$, $\hat{\mu}_m(t) \leftarrow 0$, $N_m^{\text{HD-ETC}}(t) \leftarrow 0$, $\tilde{\mu}_{m'}^\rho \leftarrow 0$ for each $m' \in \mathcal{M}$
- 2: **while** $t < T_0^{\text{HD-ETC}}$ **do**
- 3: **for** each epoch ρ **do**
- 4: $G^\rho \leftarrow \text{Hungarian}(\tilde{\mu}^\rho)$
- 5: $t_0 \leftarrow t$
- 6: \triangleright Exploration Phase
- 7: **for** $t \leq t_0 + K$ **do**
- 8: Pull the arm $k_m^{G^\rho}$
- 9: Update $\hat{\mu}_{m,k_m^{G^\rho}}(t+1)$ and $N_{m,k_m^{G^\rho}}^{\text{HD-ETC}}(t+1)$
- 10: \triangleright Hint Inquiry
- 11: $G^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow R_{(t\%K)+1}$
- 12: Ask for a hint from $k_m^{G^{\text{hint}}(t)}$
- 13: Update $\hat{\mu}_{m,k_m^{G^{\text{hint}}(t)}}(t+1)$ and $N_{m,k_m^{G^{\text{hint}}(t)}}^{\text{HD-ETC}}(t+1)$
- 14: $t \leftarrow t + 1$
- 15: \triangleright Communication Phase
- 16: **for** $k \in [K]$ **do**
- 17: $\tilde{\delta}_{m,k}^{\rho+1} \leftarrow \tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^{\rho+1} - \tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho$
- 18: Send2All($\tilde{\delta}_{m,k}^{\rho+1}$)
- 19: $t \leftarrow t + t_{\text{com}}^{\rho+1}$
- 20: $\rho \leftarrow \rho + 1$
- 21: \triangleright Exploitation Phase
- 22: $G^{t*} \leftarrow \text{Hungarian}(\tilde{\mu}^\rho)$
- 23: **while** $t \leq T$ **do**
- 24: Pull the arm $k_m^{G^{t*}}$

Theorem 4. Assuming knowing the minimum gap $\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}$, for the policy $\pi = \text{HD-ETC}$ and $T_0^\pi = \frac{9M^2K \log(2MT)}{(\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}})^2}$, the policy π has

1. exploration regret $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) \in O(M^3K^2)$.
2. hint complexity $L^\pi(T) \in O(MT_0^\pi)$
3. communication regret $R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T) \in O(M^2T_0^\pi)$.

Although HD-ETC performs well, it assumes agents know $\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}$, an unrealistic requirement in many settings. To overcome this, we propose EBHD-ETC, an elimination-based algorithm that achieves similar bounds without relying on the minimum gap. The simplicity of the Explore-then-Commit structure in HD-ETC necessitates knowledge of $\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}$ to determine the stopping time $T_0^{\text{HD-ETC}}$. Removing this assumption requires a more advanced algorithm design. In the next section, we introduce an elimination-based approach within the decentralized learning framework that operates without this gap assumption.

4.3 The EBHD-ETC algorithm

In EBHD-ETC, agents transition into the exploitation phase differently compared to HD-ETC. Accordingly, each agent maintains a set of active edges \mathcal{C}^ρ , which includes edges likely to be in G^ρ for the upcoming epoch ρ , initially

Acknowledgments

The work of Mohammad Hajiesmaili is supported by NSF CNS-2325956, CAREER-2045641, CPS-2136199, CNS-2102963, and CNS-2106299. The work of Jinhang Zuo was supported by CityU 9610706. Xuchuang Wang is the corresponding author.

References

- Achiam, J.; Adler, S.; Agarwal, S.; Ahmad, L.; Akkaya, I.; Aleman, F. L.; Almeida, D.; Altenschmidt, J.; Altman, S.; Anadkat, S.; et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Anandkumar, A.; Michael, N.; Tang, A. K.; and Swami, A. 2011. Distributed algorithms for learning and cognitive medium access with logarithmic regret. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 29(4): 731–745.
- Bamas, E.; Maggiori, A.; and Svensson, O. 2020. The primal-dual method for learning augmented algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 20083–20094.
- Bhaskara, A.; Cutkosky, A.; Kumar, R.; and Purohit, M. 2023. Bandit online linear optimization with hints and queries. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2313–2336. PMLR.
- Bistriz, I.; and Leshem, A. 2018. Distributed multi-player bandits—a game of thrones approach. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31.
- Boursier, E.; and Perchet, V. 2019. SIC-MMAB: Synchronisation involves communication in multiplayer multi-armed bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Cappé, O.; Garivier, A.; Maillard, O.-A.; Munos, R.; and Stoltz, G. 2013. Kullback-Leibler upper confidence bounds for optimal sequential allocation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1516–1541.
- Combes, R.; Magureanu, S.; Proutiere, A.; and Laroche, C. 2015. Learning to rank: Regret lower bounds and efficient algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems (ACM SIGMETRICS)*, 231–244.
- François-Lavet, V.; Henderson, P.; Islam, R.; Bellemare, M. G.; Pineau, J.; et al. 2018. An introduction to deep reinforcement learning. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(3-4): 219–354.
- Garivier, A.; Ménard, P.; and Stoltz, G. 2019. Explore first, exploit next: The true shape of regret in bandit problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(2): 377–399.
- Jouini, W.; Ernst, D.; Moy, C.; and Palicot, J. 2009. Multi-armed bandit based policies for cognitive radio’s decision making issues. In *2009 3rd International Conference on Signals, Circuits and Systems (SCS)*, 1–6. IEEE.
- Jouini, W.; Ernst, D.; Moy, C.; and Palicot, J. 2010. Upper confidence bound based decision making strategies and dynamic spectrum access. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Communications*, 1–5. IEEE.
- Krizhevsky, A.; Sutskever, I.; and Hinton, G. E. 2017. ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 60(6): 84–90.
- Kuhn, H. W. 1955. The Hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2): 83–97.
- Lai, T. L.; and Robbins, H. 1985. Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in applied mathematics*, 6(1): 4–22.
- Lindstahl, S.; Proutiere, A.; and Johnsson, A. 2020. Predictive bandits. In *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 1170–1176. IEEE.
- Liu, K.; and Zhao, Q. 2010. Distributed learning in multi-armed bandit with multiple players. *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, 58(11): 5667–5681.
- Lykouris, T.; and Vassilvitskii, S. 2021. Competitive caching with machine learned advice. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 68(4): 1–25.
- Mehrabian, A.; Boursier, E.; Kaufmann, E.; and Perchet, V. 2020. A practical algorithm for multiplayer bandits when arm means vary among players. In *Proceedings of the 23th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 1211–1221. PMLR.
- Mitzenmacher, M.; and Vassilvitskii, S. 2022. Algorithms with predictions. *Communications of the ACM*, 65(7): 33–35.
- Purohit, M.; Svitkina, Z.; and Kumar, R. 2018. Improving online algorithms via ML predictions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31.
- Rosenski, J.; Shamir, O.; and Szlak, L. 2016. Multi-player bandits—a musical chairs approach. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 155–163. PMLR.
- Shi, C.; Xiong, W.; Shen, C.; and Yang, J. 2021. Heterogeneous multi-player multi-armed bandits: Closing the gap and generalization. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 22392–22404.
- Wang, P.-A.; Proutiere, A.; Ariu, K.; Jedra, Y.; and Russo, A. 2020. Optimal algorithms for multiplayer multi-armed bandits. In *Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 4120–4129.
- Wu, B.; Chen, T.; Ni, W.; and Wang, X. 2021. Multi-agent multi-armed bandit learning for online management of edge-assisted computing. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 69(12): 8188–8199.
- Xu, X.; and Tao, M. 2020. Decentralized multi-agent multi-armed bandit learning with calibration for multi-cell caching. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 69(4): 2457–2472.
- Xu, X.; Tao, M.; and Shen, C. 2020. Collaborative multi-agent multi-armed bandit learning for small-cell caching. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 19(4): 2570–2585.
- Yun, D.; Proutiere, A.; Ahn, S.; Shin, J.; and Yi, Y. 2018. Multi-armed bandit with additional observations. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems*, 2(1): 1–22.

A The G-HCLA Algorithm

Here we analyse hint complexity of algorithm G-HCLA that is a variation of HCLA. In this algorithm a matching $G'(t)$ satisfying $U(G'(t); d(t)) > U(G(t); \hat{\mu}(t))$ would be served as $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ with probability $1/2$.

Algorithm 5: Generalized Centralized Learning Algorithm (G-HCLA)

Input: agent set \mathcal{M} , arm set \mathcal{K} , time horizon T ,

- 1: **Initialization:** $t \leftarrow 0$, $\hat{\mu}_m(t) \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$, $d_m(t) \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$, $N_m^{\text{G-HCLA}}(t) \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$ for each agent $m \in \mathcal{M}$
 - 2: **for** $t \in T$ **do**
 - 3: $G(t) \leftarrow \text{Hungarian}(\hat{\mu}(t))$
 - 4: $G'(t) \leftarrow \text{Hungarian}(d(t))$
 - 5: **if** $U(G'(t), d(t)) > U(G(t), \hat{\mu}(t))$ **then**
 - 6: $G_1^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow G'(t)$
 - 7: $G_2^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow$ pick a matching out of \mathcal{R} uniformly at random
 - 8: $G^{\text{hint}}(t) \leftarrow \begin{cases} G_1^{\text{hint}}(t), & \text{w.p. } \frac{1}{2} \\ G_2^{\text{hint}}(t), & \text{w.p. } \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$
 - 9: Each agent m asks for a hint from $k_m^{G^{\text{hint}}(t)}$
 - 10: Update $d_G(t+1)$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$
 - 11: Each agent m pulls k_m^G
 - 12: Update $\hat{\mu}_m(t+1)$, $N_m^{\text{G-HCLA}}(t+1)$, and $d_m(t+1)$ for each agent m according to new observations
-

Theorem 6. For $0 < \delta < \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{2}$ and policy $\pi = \text{G-HCLA}$, the policy π has

1. time-independent regret $R^\pi(T) \in O(M^4 K)$,
2. hint complexity $L^\pi(T) \in O\left(\frac{M^2 K \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}\right)$,

where $\Delta^{\text{kl}} = \text{kl}(U(G^*; \mu) - \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} + \delta, U(G^*; \mu) - \delta)$.

By this Theorem, we prove that G-HCLA asks for at most $O\left(\frac{M^2 K \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}\right)$ hints in the worst case which is M times larger than that of GP-HCLA.

B Analysis of HCLA, GP-HCLA, and G-HCLA

Our proofs use an *event-based* analysis inspired by Wang et al. (2020), which was originally developed for homogeneous multi-armed bandits. We have adapted this method for the heterogeneous setting, addressing its unique challenges. We will now explain the Event-Based Regret Analysis and how it applies to regret and hint complexity analysis of HCLA, GP-HCLA, and G-HCLA. The regret analysis for the decentralized algorithms HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC follows the same approach, but their detailed analysis is deferred to Appendix F.3. This method mainly focuses on bounding the number of times specific events that affect regret occur, as defined below.

Definition 1. We define the following sets of time steps at which specific events occur as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{A} &:= \{t \geq 1 : G(t) \neq G^*\} \\
 \mathcal{B} &:= \{t \geq 1 : |U(G(t); \hat{\mu}(t)) - U(G(t); \mu)| \geq \delta\} \\
 \mathcal{C} &:= \{t \geq 1 : U(G^*; d(t)) < U(G^*; \mu)\} \\
 \mathcal{D} &:= \{t \geq 1 : t \in \mathcal{A} \setminus (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}), |U(G^*; \hat{\mu}(t)) - U(G^*; \mu)| \geq \delta\} \\
 \mathcal{E} &:= \{t \geq 1 : U(G'(t), d(t)) > U(G^*, \hat{\mu}(t))\}
 \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, \mathcal{A} contains the time steps at which a sub-optimal matching is pulled, incurring regret. We also need to bound the size of the set \mathcal{B} , which includes the time steps where the chosen matching is not well-estimated, potentially leading to the selection of a sub-optimal $G(t)$. The sets \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} help us bound the exploration needed to identify G^* through hints when a sub-optimal matching is selected. Finally, \mathcal{E} bounds the number of required hints when G^* is detected, to explore potential matchings that might not have been chosen as $G(t)$ due to potentially inaccurate estimations.

We can observe that for a policy $\pi \in \{\text{HCLA}, \text{G-HCLA}, \text{GP-HCLA}\}$,

$$R^\pi(T) \leq M \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}|],$$

so we focus on bounding $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}|]$, which represents the expected number of time steps during which the central decision maker selects a sub-optimal matching under each policy.

Next, we prove that Lemma 1, originally established in Wang et al. (2020) for homogeneous multi-agent multi-armed bandits, also holds for the HMA2Bs. This is done by substituting each arm with a matching (i.e., a super arm) in their proof, without loss of generality.

Lemma 1 (Wang et al. (2020)). *For the HMA2Bs, the following chain of inequalities is satisfied:*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}|]. \quad (7)$$

In analyzing the algorithms HCLA, GP-HCLA, and G-HCLA, we focus on bounding each term on the RHS of inequality (7) separately to assess the regret. The final step in the proofs is to bound the expected size of $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|]$, which determines the asymptotic hint complexity $L^\pi(T)$, where $\pi \in \{\text{HCLA}, \text{GP-HCLA}, \text{G-HCLA}\}$.

First, we analyze the warm-up algorithm HCLA by proving Theorem 1 utilizing matching-level analysis, which is so straightforward compared to the proofs for GP-HCLA and G-HCLA that depend on multiple edge-level lemmas that we prove later. We then present the proof of Lemmas 4, 5, and 6, which bound $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|]$, $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}|]$, and $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}|]$ respectively, to analyze the regret of GP-HCLA and G-HCLA using edge-level analysis. Unlike HCLA, this method takes into account how observations from one matching influence the estimations of other matchings that share an edge or a subset of edges. Moreover, GP-HCLA and G-HCLA differ in the worst case upperbound for $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}|]$. By Lemma 7, we bound the size of \mathcal{E} for GP-HCLA and move that of G-HCLA to the proof of Theorem 6.

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1. *For $0 < \delta < \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{2}$ and policy $\pi = \text{HCLA}$, the policy π has*

1. *time-independent regret $R^\pi(T) \in O(MK^{2M})$,*
2. *hint complexity $L^\pi(T) \in O\left(\frac{MK^M \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}\right)$,*

where $\Delta^{\text{kl}} = \text{kl}(U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} + \delta, U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \delta)$.

Proof. We bound the size of the sets of time steps defined in Definition 1 as follows:

By Lemma 3, we can prove that $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|] \leq 4 + 2\delta^{-2}$. Bounding $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}|]$ is also a straightforward application of Lemma 2 by replacing $(m, k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$ with $G \in \mathcal{G}$ to have $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}|] \leq 15$. We can also prove that at every time step $t \in \mathcal{D}$, $U(G^*; \mathbf{d}(t)) > U(G(t); \boldsymbol{\mu}(t))$, thus decision maker hints at that time under HCLA algorithm. It the hints the G^* with probability at least $1/2K^M$, which implies $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}|] \leq K^M(K^M + \delta^{-2})$ by applying Lemma 3. Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\text{HCLA}}(T) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} M (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}|]), \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 4M + 2M\delta^{-2} + 15M + MK^{2M} + MK^M\delta^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) is directly adopted from Wang et al. (2020) in which the authors showed that $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$.

We next prove an upper bound on the $L^{\text{HCLA}}(T)$ by bounding the number of time steps the condition in Line 5 of the HCLA occurs. For a fixed matching $G' \in \mathcal{G}$, we define $\mathcal{E}_{G'}$ as

$$\mathcal{E}_{G'} := \{t \in \mathcal{E} : G'(t) = G', \mathbf{d}(t) > \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t)\}.$$

Now, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} L^{\text{HCLA}}(T) &\leq M \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{G'}|], \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{2MK^M (\log T + 4 \log \log T)}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}} + MK^M (4 + 2\delta^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

The inequality (a) is obtained by applying Lemma 3 to the established argument in (Wang et al. 2020), noting that under HCLA, the probability of requesting a hint for $G^{\text{hint}}(t) = G'$ is at least $1/2$ at those hint inquiry time steps. For further details, readers can refer to the Proof of Lemma 7, where the same argument is validated using edge-level analysis. We skip the detailed proof here as a warm-up for our main algorithm GP-HCLA.

Finally, we conclude that $R^{\text{HCLA}}(T) \in O(MK^{2M})$ and $L^{\text{HCLA}}(T) \in O\left(\frac{MK^M \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}\right)$.

□

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Theorem 2. For $0 < \delta < \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{2}$ and policy $\pi = \text{GP-HCLA}$, the policy π has

1. time-independent regret $R^\pi(T) \in O(M^4 K)$ regret,
2. hint complexity $L^\pi(T) \in O\left(\frac{MK \log T}{\Delta_{\text{kl}}}\right)$,

where $\Delta^{\text{kl}} = \text{kl}(U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} + \delta, U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \delta)$.

Proof. Using Lemma 1 we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(T) &\leq M (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}|]), \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 15M^2 + 4M^2K + 16M^2k^2 + 6M^4K\delta^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) holds by aggregation over the results of Lemmas 4, 5, and 6. Therefore, the total regret of GP-HCLA is included to be in $O(M^4 K)$.

Now that we bounded $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}|]$, we bound the hints that GP-HCLA queries for after detecting the G^* . By directly applying the result of Lemma 7, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} L^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(T) &\leq M \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{G'}|], \\ &\leq 4MK^3 + 2M^3K\delta^{-2} + \frac{2MK \log T}{\Delta_{\text{kl}}}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $L^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(T) \in O\left(\frac{MK \log T}{\Delta_{\text{kl}}}\right)$ that wraps the proof up. \square

B.3 Detailed Lemmas Required to Analyze G-HCLA and GP-HCLA

Concentration bounds

Here we introduce lemmas play very central role in our event-based analysis.

Lemma 2 (Combes et al. (2015), Lemma 6). For any $(m, k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$, we have

$$\sum_{t \geq 1} \Pr[d_{m,k}(t) \leq \mu_{m,k}] \leq 15.$$

Lemma 3 (Wang et al. (2020), Lemma 9). Let $(m, k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$, and $c > 0$. Let H be a random set of rounds such that for all t , $\{t \in H\} \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$. Assume that there exists $(C_{m,k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, a sequence of independent binary random variables such that for any $t \geq 1$, $C_{m,k}(t)$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable and $\Pr[C_{m,k}(t) = 1] \geq c$. In addition, assume that for any $t \in H$, agent m pulls the arm k if $C_{m,k}(t) = 1$. Then,

$$\sum_{t \geq 1} \Pr[\{t \in H, |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \varepsilon\}] \leq 2c^{-1} (2c^{-1} + \varepsilon^{-2}).$$

Event-Based Analysis Lemmas

Here, we prove the lemmas necessary to analyze the regret and hint complexity of GP-HCLA using the event-based analysis described above.

Lemma 4. For policy $\pi = \{G\text{-HCLA}, \text{GP-HCLA}\}$, the expected size of set \mathcal{B} is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|] \leq 4MK + \frac{2M^3K}{\delta^2}.$$

Proof. To bound $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|]$, we start by defining a new set of time steps as follows:

$$\mathcal{B}_{m,k} := \left\{ t \geq 1 : |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}(t)| \geq \frac{\delta}{M} \right\}.$$

We now show that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|] \leq \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}_{m,k}|].$$

First, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{B}|] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \geq 1} \mathbb{1} \{ |U(G(t); \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t)) - U(G(t); \boldsymbol{\mu})| \geq \delta \} \right], \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \geq 1} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{(m,k) \in G(t)} |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \delta \right\} \right], \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \geq 1} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \exists (m,k) \in G(t) : |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M} \right\} \right], \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \geq 1} \sum_{(m,k) \in G(t)} \mathbb{1} \left\{ |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M} \right\} \right], \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \geq 1} \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M} \right\} \right], \\
&\leq \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \geq 1} \mathbb{1} \left\{ |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M} \right\} \right], \\
&\leq \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{B}_{m,k}|].
\end{aligned}$$

In the above steps, inequality (a) holds due to the triangle inequality, which implies that $|U(G(t); \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t)) - U(G(t); \boldsymbol{\mu})| \leq \sum_{(m,k)} |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}(t)|$. Inequality (b) is derived by applying the union bound.

Therefore, by Lemma 3, we can conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{B}|] &\leq \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{B}_{m,k}|], \\
&\leq 4MK + \frac{2M^3K}{\delta^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5. For policy $\pi = \{G\text{-HCLA}, GP\text{-HCLA}\}$, the expected size of set \mathcal{C} is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{C}|] \leq 15M.$$

Proof. To bound $\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{C}|]$, we apply the union bound on all edges contained in G^* . Accordingly, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{C}|] &\leq \sum_{(m,k) \in G^*} \mathbb{E} [|\{t \geq 1 : d_{m,k}(t) < \mu_{m,k}\}|] \\
&\leq 15M,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the results of Lemma 2.

□

Lemma 6. For policy $\pi = \{G\text{-HCLA}, GP\text{-HCLA}\}$, the expected size of set \mathcal{D} is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{D}|] \leq 16MK^2 + \frac{4M^3K}{\delta^2}.$$

Proof. First we can observe that at each time step $t \in \mathcal{D}$ the hint inquiry condition is satisfied for the optimal matching, i.e.,

$$U(G^*; \mathbf{d}(t)) \geq U(G(t); \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t)),$$

which means that a hint is queried by GP-HCLA at all those time steps.

Next, we define a new set of time steps as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}_{m,k} := \{t \geq 1 : t \in \mathcal{A} \setminus (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}), |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}(t)| \geq \frac{\delta}{M}\}.$$

We can then write:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}|] &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{(m,k) \in G^*} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}_{m,k}|], \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 16MK^2 + \frac{4M^3K}{\delta^2},\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (a) is derived using the same method as in the proof of Lemma 4 for bounding $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}|]$. To achieve inequality (b), we utilize the fact that an edge $(m, k) \in G^*$ is independently hinted with a probability of at least $1/2k$ at each time step in \mathcal{D} . Consequently, the number of time steps in \mathcal{D} where $|\hat{\mu}_{m,k} - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M}$ holds for (m, k) is bounded by Lemma 3. We then apply the union bound to all the edges in G^* to derive inequality (b). \square

Lemma 7. *Let us define $\mathcal{E}_{G'}$ as be the set of time steps in \mathcal{E} at which GP-HCLA's hint inquiry condition is triggered by a matching G' :*

$$\mathcal{E}_{G'} := \{t \in \mathcal{E} \mid G'(t) = G', U(G', \mathbf{d}(t)) > U(G^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t))\}.$$

Then, for $0 < \delta < \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{2}$, the expected size of this set satisfies the following bound:

$$\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{G'}|] \leq 4K^3 + 2M^2K\delta^{-2} + \frac{2K \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}},$$

where $\Delta^{\text{kl}} = \text{kl}(U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} + \delta, U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \delta)$.

Proof. We start the proof defining new sets of time steps as:

$$\mathcal{E}_{1,G'} := \{t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'} : |U(G'; \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t)) - U(G'; \boldsymbol{\mu}(t))| \geq \delta\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{2,G'} := \left\{ t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'} : \sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1}\{t' \in \mathcal{E}_{G'}\} < t_0 \right\}.$$

where $t_0 = \frac{\log T + 4 \log \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}$.

Similar to the argument Wang et al. (2020) made, we can prove that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{G'}|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{1,G'}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|].$$

Accordingly we bound each $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{1,G'}|]$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|]$ separately and then apply union bound over it. However, applying the union bound on the set of all matchings \mathcal{G} to bound $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{G'}|]$ would result in an exponential constant, i.e., K^M , for the number of hints policy GP-HCLA queries a hint for. To mitigate this, GP-HCLA utilizes the idea of projecting $G' \in \mathcal{G}$ to a matching in the sset of covering matchings \mathcal{R} to specify $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$, thereby reducing the possible set of hints from the exponentially-sized \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{R} that has K matchings in it. We can observe that every time a matching $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ is hinted at by GP-HCLA, the counter for all involved edges increases by one, i.e., $\forall (m, k) \in G^{\text{hint}}(t), N_{m,k}^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(t+1) = N_{m,k}^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(t) + 1$. Additionally, under this projection-based hint inquiry approach, the number of rounds each arbitrary edge $(m, k) \in G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ is hinted at is equal to that of the other edges in $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$.

Accordingly, we bound $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{1,G'}|]$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{E}_{1,G'}|] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'}} \mathbb{1} \{ |U(G'(t); \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t)) - U(G'(t); \boldsymbol{\mu}(t))| \geq \delta \} \right], \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \exists (m, k) \in G' : |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M} \right\} \right], \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{t \in \cup_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathcal{E}_{G'}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ G^{\text{hint}}(t) = R, \exists (m, k) \in G'(t), R : |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M} \right\} \right], \\
&\leq \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \cup_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathcal{E}_{G'}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \exists (m, k) \in G'(t), R : |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M} \right\} \right], \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} K(4K^2 + 2M^2\delta^{-2}), \\
&= 4K^3 + 2M^2K\delta^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We do not need to take the union bound over all edges $(m, k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$ because G^{hint} is selected from the covering matchings \mathcal{R} , ensuring that all involved edges are observed by the corresponding agents. Therefore, applying the union bound over the K pairwise edge-independent members of \mathcal{R} effectively accounts for all edges, leading to equality (a). Inequality (b) follows by applying Lemma 3, considering that at each time step $t \in \mathcal{E}_{1,G'}$, the probability of hinting a matching that includes the edge $(m, k) \in G'(t)$, where $|\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M}$, is at least $1/2K$.

Now we bound $\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|]$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1} \{ t' \in \mathcal{E}_{G'} \} < t_0 \right\} \right], \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \exists (m, k) \in G' : \sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1} \{ (m, k) \in G'(t') \} < t_0 \right\} \right], \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \min_{(m,k) \in G'} \sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1} \{ (m, k) \in G'(t') \} < t_0 \right\} \right], \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{t \in \cup_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathcal{E}_{G'}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \min_{(m,k) \in G'} \sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1} \{ G^{\text{hint}}(t') = R, (m, k) \in G'(t'), R \} < t_0 \right\} \right], \\
&\leq \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \cup_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathcal{E}_{G'}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \min_{(m,k) \in G'} \sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1} \{ (m, k) \in G'(t'), R \} < t_0 \right\} \right], \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{2K \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Equality (a) holds because the number of times each matching G' is hinted at is always less than or equal to the number of times $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ covers each edge $(m, k) \in G'$, including the edge with the minimum number of hint occurrences. Inequality (b) holds because the probability of increasing the counter for any edge, specifically the edge with the fewest hint occurrences, is at least $1/2$. This implies that the expected number of trials to increase this counter is at most 2. By applying the union bound over all members of \mathcal{R} , we obtain an upper bound on the total number of required hints.

Finally we can imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{E}_{G'}|] &\leq \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{E}_{1,G'}|] + \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|], \\
&\leq 4K^3 + 2M^2K\delta^{-2} + \frac{2K \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

B.4 Proof of Theorem 6

The main difference between GP-HCLA and G-HCLA is the determining G^{hint} as the same event is triggered. Thus, the regret analysis for both algorithms is the same, while the number of hints is M times larger for G-HCLA according to the following theorem.

Theorem 6. For $0 < \delta < \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{2}$ and policy $\pi = \text{G-HCLA}$, the policy π has

1. time-independent regret $R^\pi(T) \in O(M^4 K)$,
2. hint complexity $L^\pi(T) \in O\left(\frac{M^2 K \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}\right)$,

where $\Delta^{\text{kl}} = \text{kl}(U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} + \delta, U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \delta)$.

Proof. We skip the analysis of $R^\pi(T)$ cause it follows the exact upper bound proven for GP-HCLA in Theorem 2. Now, to bound the hint complexity, we use the same set of time steps $\mathcal{E}_{G'}$ previously defined in the proof of Theorem 2 and define new sets of time steps $\mathcal{E}_{1,G'}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{1,G'} &:= \{t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'} : |U(G'; \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t)) - U(G'; \boldsymbol{\mu}(t))| \geq \delta\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{2,G'} &:= \{t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'} : \sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1}_{\{t' \in \mathcal{E}_{G'}\}} < t_0\}, \\ \mathcal{E}'_{1,G'} &:= \left\{t \in \mathcal{E}_{G'} : \exists(m, k) \in G', |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M}\right\}, \\ \mathcal{X}_{1,m,k} &:= \left\{t \geq 1 : (m, k) \in G'(t), |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M}\right\}, \\ \mathcal{X}_{2,m,k} &:= \left\{t \geq 1 : \sum_{t'=1}^t \mathbb{1}_{\{(m, k) \in G'(t)\}} < t_0\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

As argued in the proof of Theorem 2, we know that $\mathcal{E}_{G'} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{1,G'} \cup \mathcal{E}_{2,G'}$. Then, we can conclude that $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{1,G'}|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}'_{1,G'}|]$, and also

$$\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|] \leq \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{X}_{2,m,k}|].$$

Therefore, we finish the proof by writing:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{G'}|] &\leq \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{1,G'}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|], \\ &\leq \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}'_{1,G'}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|], \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} |\mathcal{E}'_{1,G'}|\right] + \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|], \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{1}\left\{G'(t) = G', \exists(m, k) \in G' : |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M}\right\}\right] + \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|], \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} |\mathcal{X}_{1,m,k}|\right] + \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|], \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{X}_{1,m,k}|] + \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_{2,G'}|], \\ &\leq \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{X}_{1,m,k}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{X}_{2,m,k}|], \\ &\leq 4MK + \frac{2M^3 K}{\delta^2} + \frac{2MK \log T}{\Delta^{\text{kl}}}.\end{aligned}$$

while inequalities (a) and (d) hold because of the linearity of expectation. Inequality (b) is derived from the nature of the algorithm, which only chooses one $G' \in \mathcal{G}$ to be hinted at each round. Another important observation is that when the $G^{\text{hint}}(t)$ is hinted at, there might be more than one edge (m, k) satisfying $|\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M}$, which directly implies (c). \square

C Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem 3 (Necessity of Communication). *No decentralized learning algorithm can achieve sub-linear instance-independent regret in HMA2Bs without communication.*

Proof. The proof demonstrates that not knowing the magnitudes of other agents' statistics causes more conflicts in the future because it is impossible for agents to distinguish between different possible reward models using their private information.

Consider two instances, A and B , with $M = 2$ and $K = 2$, where the sets of agents and arms are $\mathcal{M} = \{m_1, m_2\}$ and $\mathcal{K} = \{k_1, k_2\}$, respectively. We assume that the instances are:

$$\begin{aligned} A : \boldsymbol{\mu}_{m_1} &= \left\langle \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon, \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \right\rangle & \boldsymbol{\mu}_{m_2} &= \langle 2\epsilon, \epsilon \rangle \\ B : \boldsymbol{\mu}_{m_1} &= \left\langle \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon, \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \right\rangle & \boldsymbol{\mu}_{m_2} &= \langle 4\epsilon, \epsilon \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Any fixed policies π_{m_1} and π_{m_2} chosen by the agents that achieve sub-linear regret on instance A will fail on instance B . The reason is that in instance A , the optimal solution for agent m_1 is to pull arm k_1 . This means that every time a conflict occurs on arm k_1 , policy π_{m_1} chooses to keep requesting to pull arm k_1 while policy π_{m_2} leads agent m_2 to stop requesting k_1 and try to pull k_2 instead.

However, if the underlying instance is B , agent m_1 's policy, π_{m_1} , still requests arm k_1 when a conflict on k_1 occurs. The reason is that without knowing the magnitude of agent m_2 's utility, instances A and B are indistinguishable from k_1 's perspective. Therefore, agent m_1 continues pulling arm k_1 in instance B and m_2 's policy π_{m_2} switches to request arm k_2 for the same reason. Meanwhile, the optimal matching under instance B is for m_1 to pull k_2 and for m_2 to pull k_1 , which leads policies π_{m_1} and π_{m_2} to a linear regret. \square

D Rank Assignment.

The rank assignment algorithm from Wang et al. (2020) involves two steps: Orthogonalization, where players are assigned unique external ranks through blocks of length $K + 1$, and Rank Assignment, where external ranks are converted to internal ranks using a modified Round-Robin scheme. More details can be found in Wang et al. (2020).

Lemma 8 (Shi et al. (2021); Wang et al. (2020), Lemma 1,2). *The expected duration of the rank assignment procedure is less than $\frac{K^2 M}{K-M} + 2K$ time steps. Once the procedure is completed, all players correctly learn the number of players M , each assigned with a unique index between 1 and M .*

E Communication Protocol

The implicit collision-based communication method introduced by (Boursier and Perchet 2019) involves the *sender* signaling and transmitting statistics by pulling the *receiver's communication arm* in a predetermined, time-dependent sequence governed by the unique ranks agents have been assigned through rank assignment phase. Specifically, during the communication phase preceding the exploration phase ρ , the communication arm of agent m is $k_m^{G^{\rho-1}}$. The sender m then either pulls the receiver m' 's communication arm (creating a collision; bit 1) or refrains from pulling it (no collision; bit 0).

To minimize regret during communication, agents should be aware of the trade-off between keeping the communication brief, and the information loss that occurs when sending quantized format of the accurate decimal estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ using a bit-by-bit integral method. The quantized format of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is denoted as $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. The statistic $\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho$ represents the shared information about the edge (m, k) among all agents after communication, used for decision-making in the upcoming exploration epoch ρ . To optimize communication duration while minimizing information loss, the *Differential* communication protocol by Shi et al. (2021) is employed. In this protocol, agents transmit $\tilde{\delta}_{m,k}^\rho := \tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho - \tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^{\rho-1}$ using $\left\lceil 1 + \frac{\log \rho}{2} \right\rceil$ bits. The receivers then update their statistics with $\hat{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho = \tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^{\rho-1} + \tilde{\delta}_{m,k}^\rho$. It has been shown that

$$\hat{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho \leq \tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho,$$

and

$$\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho - \hat{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho}}, \quad (8)$$

which are essential for the analysis. Additionally, transmitting $\tilde{\delta}_{m,k}^\rho$ requires $O(1)$ bits, and the communication duration per phase is $O(M^2K)$ since each statistic $\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho$ must be shared with M agents.

Unlike the leader-follower framework used in Shi et al. (2021) and Boursier and Perchet (2019), where one agent (typically the one with rank 1) acts as a leader by gathering statistics from others and announcing the arm-pulling graph after running the Hungarian algorithm, this work assumes a peer-to-peer connection model. This approach allows for further analysis in situations where the shared statistics among agents may differ. Each agent independently runs the Hungarian algorithm using its own gathered statistics, which introduces additional complexity to the online decision-making problem. If agents reach different conclusions after running Hungarian, it could lead to potential collisions and reward loss.

However, we assume that after all agents share their quantized statistics through the Send2All routine (Routine 6), they will have similar information and thus reach similar outcomes with Hungarian. Under both HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC, all agents simultaneously enter the communication phase by invoking the Send2All routine. This routine determines which agent will act as the receiver and execute the Receive subroutine (Routine 8), and which agent will act as the sender and execute the Send subroutine (Routine 7) at each time step during the communication phase. In the Send2All routine, each agent maintains a counter s , which tracks the rank of the last sender, incrementing it by one after they send or receive statistics from other agents. An agent sends its statistics using the Send subroutine only if s matches its rank; otherwise, it remains open to receive statistics being sent by the agent with rank s .

Routine 6: Send2all: agent m

Input: quantized statistic $\tilde{\delta}_{m,k}^{\rho+1}$

- 1: **Initialization:** $s \leftarrow 1$,
- 2: **while** $s \leq M$ **do** ▷ number of the agents M is known to the agents
- 3: **for** $m' \in [M]$ **do**
- 4: **if** $s = M$ and $m' \neq m$ **then**
- 5: Send($\tilde{\delta}_{m,k}^{\rho+1}, m'$)
- 6: **else if** $s \neq M$ and $m' \neq m$ **then**
- 7: Receive(bit_string($\tilde{\delta}_{m',k}^{\rho+1}$), m')
- 8: $s \leftarrow s + 1$

Sub-Routine 7: Send: agent m

Input: quantized statistic $\tilde{\delta}_{m,k}^{\rho+1}$, receiver m'

- 1: **Initialization:** $b \leftarrow \text{bit_string}(\tilde{\delta}_{m,k}^{\rho+1})$
- 2: $l \leftarrow |b|$
- 3: **for** $i = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, l\}$ **do**
- 4: **if** $b[i] = 1$ **then**
- 5: pull the arm $k_{m'}^{G^\rho}$ ▷ epoch ρ and matching G^ρ are known to the agents
- 6: **else**
- 7: pull the arm $k_m^{G^\rho}$

Sub-Routine 8: Receive: agent m

Input: bit string b' with length l' , sender m'

- 1: $\tilde{\delta}_{m',k}^{\rho+1} \leftarrow 0$ ▷ epoch ρ and arm index k are known to the agents
- 2: **for** $i = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, l'\}$ **do**
- 3: $\tilde{\delta}_{m',k}^{\rho+1} \leftarrow 2\tilde{\delta}_{m',k}^{\rho+1}$
- 4: **if** collision **then**
- 5: $\tilde{\delta}_{m',k}^{\rho+1} \leftarrow \tilde{\delta}_{m',k}^{\rho+1} + 1$

F Analysis of HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC

According to Lemma 8, the regret caused by the rank assignment phase, which follows the same routine in both algorithms, has a time-independent upper bound as $R^{\pi_{\text{rank}}}(T) \leq M \left(\frac{K^2 M}{K-M} + 2K \right)$.

Furthermore, Shi et al. (2021) demonstrated that the *Differential* protocol requires $O(1)$ bits for each peer-to-peer communication to transmit at each epoch. This protocol induces $O(M^2 K)$ regret at each communication phase, where $M^2 K$ is the total number of statistics shared among agents at each communication phase. However, unlike the rank assignment phase, which is common among all algorithms, different policies may have different criteria entering the exploitation phase, leading to varying number of communication phases and hint complexity. Therefore, we aim to analyze $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) + R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T)$ while maintaining a time-independent upper bound for $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T)$ with the minimum possible number of hints $L^\pi(T)$.

F.1 Proof of Theorem 4

Theorem 4. *Assuming knowing the minimum gap $\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}$, for the policy $\pi = \text{HD-ETC}$ and $T_0^\pi = \frac{9M^2 K \log(2MT)}{(\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}})^2}$, the policy π has*

1. *exploration regret $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) \in O(M^3 K^2)$.*
2. *hint complexity $L^\pi(T) \in O(MT_0^\pi)$*
3. *communication regret $R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T) \in O(M^2 T_0^\pi)$.*

Proof. First, we argue that $L^\pi(T) \in O(MT_0^\pi)$ because agents request M hints at each time step during the first T_0^π rounds. We then bound $R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T)$. Under HD-ETC, agents communicate every k rounds up to time step T_0^π that implies $R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T) \in O(M^2 T_0^\pi)$.

The HD-ETC algorithm has $\frac{T_0^\pi}{K}$ decision-making rounds up to the time step T_0^π , followed by one additional round for the period from T_0^π to T . Thus, we can break down the exploration regret of $\pi = \text{HD-ETC}$ as follows:

$$R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) = R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi) + R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi : T).$$

We then apply the results of Lemma 9 to bound $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi)$ as:

$$R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi) \leq 19M^2 K + 4M^2 K^2 + (4M^3 K + 8M^4 K + 8M^4 K^2) \delta^{-2}.$$

To further bound $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi : T)$, we write:

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi : T) &\leq 0T \Pr(G^{I^*} = G^*) + MT \Pr(G^{I^*} \neq G^*), \\ &\leq MT \Pr(G^{I^*} \neq G^*), \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} M, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality (a) holds by Lemma 13, which bounds the probability of $G^{I^*} \neq G^*$.

Therefore, we can write:

$$R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) \leq M + 19M^2 K + 4M^2 K^2 + (4M^3 K + 8M^4 K + 8M^4 K^2) \delta^{-2}.$$

which results in a time-independent exploration regret. □

F.2 Proof of Theorem 5

Theorem 5. *The policy $\pi = \text{EBHD-ETC}$ has*

1. *exploration regret $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) \in O(M^3 K^2)$.*
2. *hint complexity $L^\pi(T) \in O\left(\frac{M^3 K \log(T\sqrt{2M})}{(\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}})^2}\right)$*
3. *communication regret $R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T) \in O\left(\frac{M^4 K \log(T\sqrt{2M})}{(\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}})^2}\right)$.*

Proof. For $\pi = \text{EBHD-ETC}$ we denote the index of the last exploration epoch during which agents query for hints for K consecutive rounds, by ρ' . Finding an upper bound for ρ' , we can then argue that $L^\pi(T) = MK\rho'$ and $R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T) \in O(M^2 K\rho')$.

Under EBHD-ETC, agents maintain a set of active edges \mathcal{C}^ρ , which includes the edges that could potentially be part of G^* . Consequently, agents decide to stop hinting at the beginning of epoch $\rho' + 1$ when $|\mathcal{C}^{\rho'+1}| = M$, such that ρ' and T_0^π become random variables, as opposed to the fixed $T_0^{\text{HD-ETC}}$ in HD-ETC. We then, break down the exploration regret of $\pi = \text{HD-ETC}$ as follows:

$$R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) = R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi) + R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi : T),$$

where $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi)$ follows the same bound as we proved in Lemma 9. So, finding an upper bound for $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi : T)$, would induce an upper bound on the hint and communication complexity.

Accordingly, we define the event \mathcal{H}_T as

$$\mathcal{H}_T := \mathbb{1} \left\{ \forall \rho \leq \frac{T}{K}, \forall G \in \mathcal{G} : |U(G; \tilde{\mu}^\rho) - U(G; \mu)| \leq 2M\epsilon^\rho \right\}.$$

In Lemma 14, we prove that $\Pr(\mathcal{H}_T \neq 1) \leq \frac{1}{T}$. Next, we focus on bounding the probability of $G'^* = G^*$ to find an upper bound for $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi : T)$. In Lemma 15, we prove that the edges in the set of active edges form a perfect matching when $|\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}| = M$ the graph formed by the edges in $\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}$ is exactly G^* , which is the same outcome as Hungarian finds with probability at least $1 - \frac{M}{T}$. By Lemma 16, we can prove that given $\mathcal{H}_T = 1$, the index of the final epoch $\rho' \leq \frac{64M^2 \log(T\sqrt{2M})}{(\Delta_{\text{match}}^{\text{min}})^2}$ and $G'^* = G^*$. Thus, we write:

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T_0^\pi : T) &\leq MT \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 0) + \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 1) (0T \Pr(G'^* = G^* | \mathcal{H}_T = 1) + MT \Pr(G'^* \neq G^* | \mathcal{H}_T = 1)) \\ &\leq MT \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 0) + MT \Pr(G'^* \neq G^* | \mathcal{H}_T = 1), \\ &\leq M + M^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can conclude that

$$R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) \leq M + M^2 + 19M^2K + 4M^2K^2 + (4M^3K + 8M^4K + 8M^4K^2) \delta^{-2}.$$

We wrap up the proof by applying the result of Lemma 16 to bound $L^\pi(T) \in O\left(\frac{M^3K \log(T\sqrt{2M})}{(\Delta_{\text{match}}^{\text{min}})^2}\right)$ and $R^{\pi_{\text{com}}}(T) \in O\left(\frac{M^4K \log(T\sqrt{2M})}{(\Delta_{\text{match}}^{\text{min}})^2}\right)$. □

F.3 Decentralized Event-Based Analysis

Here we present the event-based analysis for decentralized algorithms like what we did in Section B.

Lemma 9. For policy $\pi \in \{\text{HD-ETC}, \text{EBHD-ETC}\}$, $R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T)$ is bounded by

$$R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) \leq 19M^2K + 4M^2K^2 + (4M^3K + 8M^4K + 8M^4K^2) \delta^{-2}.$$

Proof. Here, we use the same event-based analysis as in Section B to bound the newly defined sets of time steps like defined in Definition 1 as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}' &:= \{t \geq 1 : G(t) \neq G^*\}, \\ \mathcal{B}' &:= \{t \geq 1 : |U(G(t); \tilde{\mu}(t)) - U(G(t); \mu)| \geq \delta\}, \\ \mathcal{C}' &:= \{t \geq 1 : U(G^*; \tilde{\mathbf{d}}(t)) < U(G^*; \mu)\}, \\ \mathcal{D}' &:= \{t \geq 1 : t \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus (\mathcal{B}' \cup \mathcal{C}'), |U(G^*; \tilde{\mu}(t)) - U(G^*; \mu)| \geq \delta\}. \end{aligned}$$

These sets are analogous to those in Definition 1, but they are defined on $\tilde{\mu}$ instead of $\hat{\mu}$. For any policy $\pi \in \{\text{HD-ETC}, \text{EBHD-ETC}\}$, we have:

$$R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) \leq M \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}'|].$$

Thus, the focus is on finding an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}'|]$, which represents the number of time steps during which the central decision-maker selects a sub-optimal matching under each policy. Applying Lemma 1, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}'|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{A}' \cup \mathcal{B}'|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}'|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}'|].$$

Each of these can be bounded separately.

Thus, we can express the regret as:

$$R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) \leq M (\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}'|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}'|]),$$

which, by applying Lemmas 10, 11, and 12 to bound $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'|]$, $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}'|]$, and $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}'|]$ respectively, leads to:

$$R^{\pi_{\text{exp}}}(T) \leq 19M^2K + 4M^2K^2 + (4M^3K + 8M^4K + 8M^4K^2) \delta^{-2}.$$

□

F4 Detailed Lemmas Required to Decentralized Event-Based Analysis

Here, we prove the lemmas necessary to analyze the regret and hint complexity of HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC using the event-based analysis.

Lemma 10. For policy $\pi \in \{HD-ETC, EBHD-ETC\}$, the expected size of set \mathcal{B}' is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'|] \leq 4MK^2 + (4M^2K + 8M^3K^2)\delta^{-2}$$

Proof. Then we bound $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'|]$ by new sets of time steps defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}'_{m,k} &:= \left\{ t \geq 1 : (m, k) \in G(t), |\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{M} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B}'_{1,m,k} &:= \left\{ t \geq 1 : (m, k) \in G(t), |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{2M} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B}'_{2,m,k} &:= \left\{ t \geq 1 : (m, k) \in G(t), \tilde{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \hat{\mu}_{m,k} \geq \frac{\delta}{2M} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can write

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'|] \leq \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'_{m,k}|] \leq \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'_{1,m,k}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'_{2,m,k}|].$$

while the second inequality holds by triangle inequality. We then bound each $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'_{1,m,k}|]$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'_{2,m,k}|]$ separately. We now write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'_{1,m,k}|] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_t \mathbb{1}\left\{(m, k) \in G(t), |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{2M}\right\}\right], \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{\rho} \sum_{t \in \rho} \mathbb{1}\left\{(m, k) \in G^{\rho}, |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{2M}\right\}\right], \\ &= K \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{\rho} \mathbb{1}\left\{(m, k) \in G^{\rho}, |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}| \geq \frac{\delta}{2M}\right\}\right], \\ &\leq 4K + 8M^2K\delta^{-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the last inequality holds by Lemma 3.

By setting $\frac{\delta}{2M} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho}}$, we can conclude the for $\rho \geq 4M^2\delta^{-2}$ it always holds that $\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^{\rho} - \hat{\mu}_{m,k}^{\rho} \leq \frac{\delta}{2M}$. Now, based on the fact that the algorithm asks for a hint at each time step before t' and every epoch hints for all edges, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(m,k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'_{2,m,k}|] &\leq \sum_{\rho} \sum_{t \in \rho} \mathbb{1}\left\{\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \hat{\mu}_{m,k} \geq \frac{\delta}{2M}\right\}, \\ &\leq 4M^2K\delta^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'|] \leq 4MK^2 + (4M^2K + 8M^3K^2)\delta^{-2}.$$

□

Lemma 11. For policy $\pi \in \{HD-ETC, EBHD-ETC\}$, the expected size of set \mathcal{C}' is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}'|] \leq 15MK.$$

Proof. First, we argue that

$$\Pr(U(G^*; \tilde{\mathbf{d}}(t)) < U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu})) \leq \Pr(U(G^*; \mathbf{d}(t)) < U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu})),$$

where the inequality holds because $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(t) > \boldsymbol{\mu}(t)$ and by Lemma 19.

Thus, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}'|] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}|] \\ &\leq 15M,\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{C} is defined in Definition 1, and the last inequality is derived from Lemma 5. However, we may use a looser bound of $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}'|] \leq 15MK$. This is because each $t \in \mathcal{C}'$ may occur at the beginning of an epoch where decision-making takes place. If the event at t coincides with the start of an epoch ρ , it could result in K rounds of regret, as agents commit to G^ρ for the entire epoch. \square

Lemma 12. For policy $\pi \in \{HD-ETC, EBHD-ETC\}$, the expected size of set \mathcal{D}' is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}'|] \leq 4MK + 8M^3K\delta^{-2}.$$

Proof. We bound $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}'|]$ very similar to what we did for the set \mathcal{B}' . However, there is no need to account for the communication error here cause we addressed it while bounding $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{B}'|]$ for all the edges. Thus, by Lemma 3, we can conclude $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}'|] \leq 4MK + 8M^3K\delta^{-2}$. \square

F.5 Detailed Lemmas Required to Proof of Theorem 4

Lemma 13. For policy $\pi = HD-ETC$ and $T_0^\pi = \frac{9M^2K \log(2MT)}{(\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}})^2}$, the probability of $G'^* = G^*$ is at least $1 - \frac{1}{T^2}$.

Proof. Starting with defining $\epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{com}}(t) = \tilde{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t)$ and $\epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{exp}}(t) = |\hat{\mu}_{m,k}(t) - \mu_{m,k}|$ we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(G'^* \neq G^*) &= \Pr(U(G'^*; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(T_0^\pi)) > U(G^*; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(T_0^\pi))), \\ &= \Pr\left(\sum_{(m',k') \in G'^*} \tilde{\mu}_{m',k'}(T_0^\pi) > \sum_{(m,k) \in G^*} \tilde{\mu}_{m,k}(T_0^\pi)\right), \\ &\leq \Pr\left(\sum_{(m',k') \in G'^*} \hat{\mu}_{m',k'}(T_0^\pi) + \epsilon_{m',k'}^{\text{com}}(T_0^\pi) > \sum_{(m,k) \in G^*} \hat{\mu}_{m,k}(T_0^\pi)\right), \\ &\leq \Pr\left(\sum_{(m',k') \in G'^*} \mu_{m',k'} + \epsilon_{m',k'}^{\text{exp}}(T_0^\pi) + \epsilon_{m',k'}^{\text{com}}(T_0^\pi) > \sum_{(m,k) \in G^*} \mu_{m,k} - \epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{exp}}(T_0^\pi)\right), \\ &\leq \Pr\left(\sum_{(m',k') \in G'^*} \epsilon_{m',k'}^{\text{exp}}(T_0^\pi) + \epsilon_{m',k'}^{\text{com}}(T_0^\pi) + \sum_{(m,k) \in G^*} \epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{exp}}(T_0^\pi) > \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}\right), \\ &\leq \sum_{(m',k') \in G'^*} \Pr\left(\epsilon_{m',k'}^{\text{exp}}(T_0^\pi) > \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{3M}\right) + \Pr\left(\epsilon_{m',k'}^{\text{com}}(T_0^\pi) > \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{3M}\right) + \sum_{(m,k) \in G^*} \Pr\left(\epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{exp}}(T_0^\pi) > \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{3M}\right), \\ &\leq \sum_{(m,k) \in G'^* \cup G^*} \Pr\left(\epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{exp}}(T_0^\pi) > \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{3M}\right) + \sum_{(m,k) \in G'^*} \Pr\left(\epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{com}}(T_0^\pi) > \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{3M}\right), \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2Me^{-\frac{2T_0^\pi \delta^2}{9KM^2}} + \sum_{(m,k) \in G'^*} \Pr\left(\epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{com}}(T_0^\pi) > \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{3M}\right), \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2Me^{-\frac{2T_0^\pi \delta^2}{9KM^2}}, \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{1}{T^2},\end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds by applying Hoeffding's inequality, under the assumption that all edges have been hinted at least $\frac{T_0^\pi}{K}$ times by time step T_0^π , and (b) holds because inequality (8) implies that after at least $\frac{T_0^\pi}{K}$ observations for an edge (m, k) , the condition $\epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{exp}}(T_0^\pi) > \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{3M}$ occurs with zero probability, resulting in $\sum_{(m,k) \in G'^*} \Pr\left(\epsilon_{m,k}^{\text{com}}(T_0^\pi) > \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{3M}\right) = 0$. Finally, we replace T_0^π with its actual value to achieve (c). \square

F.6 Detailed Lemmas Required to Proof of Theorem 5

Lemma 14. Under policy $\pi = \text{EBHD-ETC}$, we have $\Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 1) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{T}$.

Proof. For a fixed $\rho < \frac{T}{K}$, and any fixed edge $(m, k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$, we can observe that $N_{m,k}^\rho \geq \rho$ because EBHD-ETC hints for that edge during each exploration epoch exactly once. Now for (m, k) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left(\left|\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho - \mu_{m,k}\right| > 2\epsilon^\rho\right) &\leq \Pr\left(\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho - \hat{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho > \epsilon^\rho\right) + \Pr\left(\left|\hat{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho - \mu_{m,k}\right| > \epsilon^\rho\right), \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Pr\left(\left|\hat{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho - \mu_{m,k}\right| > \epsilon^\rho\right), \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2e^{\log\left(\frac{\eta^2}{4}\right)}, \\ &\leq \frac{\eta^2}{2}, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where (a) follows from the communication error bound (8), which implies $\Pr\left(\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho - \hat{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho > \epsilon^\rho\right) = 0$, and (b) is derived using Hoeffding's inequality assuming $N_{m,k}^\rho \geq \rho$.

Since EBHD-ETC hints for all edges until the end of epoch ρ , inequality (10) holds for all $(m, k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$. Therefore, by summing the error bound over all M edges included in any matching $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and then taking the union bound over all the edges, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\exists G \in \mathcal{G} : |U(G, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) - U(G, \boldsymbol{\mu})| > 2M\epsilon^\rho) &\leq \Pr\left(\exists(m, k) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K} : \left|\tilde{\mu}_{m,k}^\rho - \mu_{m,k}\right| > 2\epsilon^\rho\right), \\ &\leq \frac{MK\eta^2}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we take union bound on all $\rho \leq \frac{T}{K}$ and write:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T \neq 1) &\leq \Pr\left(\exists \rho \leq \frac{T}{K} : \exists G \in \mathcal{G} : |U(G; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) - U(G; \boldsymbol{\mu})| > 2M\epsilon^\rho\right), \\ &\leq \frac{TM\eta^2}{2}, \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{T}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds by setting $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{2}{MT^2}}$. □

Lemma 15. For any $\rho' \leq \frac{T}{K}$, under the policy $\pi = \text{EBHD-ETC}$, if $|\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}| = M$, the edges in $\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}$ form a matching that, with probability at least $1 - \frac{M}{T}$, corresponds to G^* .

Proof. The algorithm EBHD-ETC stops hinting and communicating at the beginning of epoch ρ' if $|\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}| = M$. Suppose the edges $(m, k) \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho'}$ do not form a matching. Consequently, there must exist an agent m' such that $\nexists k \in \mathcal{K}$ where $(m', k) \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho'}$, which is impossible. This is because, according to how EBHD-ETC updates \mathcal{C}^ρ at each epoch, any edge $(m, k) \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho'}$ is included in a matching $G_{(m,k)}^{\rho'}$ such that $U(G^{\rho'}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\rho'}) - U(G_{(m,k)}^{\rho'}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\rho'}) < 4M\epsilon^{\rho'}$, where m' is connected to $k_{m'}^{G_{(m,k)}^{\rho'}}$, implying that $(m', k_{m'}^{G_{(m,k)}^{\rho'}})$ should be in $\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}$.

We now show that if agents stop hinting and communicating when $|\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}| = M$, the matching formed by the edges in $\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}$ is G^* with a probability of at least $1 - \frac{M}{T}$. To support this claim, we bound the probability of an edge (m, k) being eliminated by EBHD-ETC at any epoch ρ . Assume that $(m, k) \in G^*$ is eliminated from \mathcal{C}^ρ , i.e., $U(G^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) - U(G_{(m,k)}^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) > 4M\epsilon^\rho$. We first define the following events $A_{m,k}$ and $B_{m,k}$ for an edge $(m, k) \in G^*$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{m,k} &:= \left\{ \exists \rho \leq \rho' : U(G^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) - U(G_{(m,k)}^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) > 4M\epsilon^\rho \right\}, \\ B_{m,k} &:= \left\{ \exists \rho \leq \rho' : U(G^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) - U(G^*; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) > 4M\epsilon^\rho \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We can then write:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(A_{m,k}) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Pr(B_{m,k}), \\ &\leq \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T \neq 1) + \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 1) \Pr(B_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{H}_T = 1), \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T \neq 1), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds because G^* is a matching containing (m, k) while $G_{(m,k)}^\rho$ is one of such matchings with the highest utility, i.e., $U(G_{(m,k)}^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) \geq U(G^*; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho)$. Inequality (b) follows from the observation that, given $\mathcal{H}_T = 1$, the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} U(G^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) - 2M\epsilon^\rho &\leq U(G^\rho; \boldsymbol{\mu}), \\ U(G^*; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) + 2M\epsilon^\rho &\geq U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies:

$$U(G^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) - U(G^*; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) \leq 4M\epsilon^\rho - \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}},$$

making $\Pr(B_{m,k} \mid \mathcal{H}_T = 1) = 0$. We demonstrated that any edge $(m, k) \in G^*$ is eliminated from the set of active edges with a probability of at most $\frac{1}{T}$. By applying the union bound to all M edges of the matching G^* , we can show that the final M edges appearing in $\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}$ form G^* with a probability of at least $1 - \frac{M}{T}$. \square

Lemma 16. *Assuming a unique optimal matching $G^* \in \mathcal{G}$, under the policy $\pi = \text{EBHD-ETC}$, the algorithm stops querying for hints by epoch $\rho' \leq \frac{64M^2 \log(T\sqrt{2M})}{(\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}})^2}$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{T}$.*

Proof. We first define the event A_T as

$$A_T := \mathbb{1} \left\{ \exists \rho' \leq \frac{T}{K} : |\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}| = M \right\},$$

which represents whether EBHD-ETC stops hinting and enters the exploitation phase at the beginning of some epoch ρ' .

Now we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(A_T \neq 1) &= \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 1) \Pr(A_T \neq 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_T = 1) + \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 0) \Pr(A_T \neq 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_T = 0), \\ &\leq \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 1) \Pr(A_T \neq 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_T = 1) + \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 0). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

From Lemma 14, we know that $\Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 0) \leq \frac{1}{T}$. Thus, we prove that, given $\mathcal{H}_T = 1$, there exists an epoch $\rho' \leq \frac{T}{K}$ such that $|\mathcal{C}^{\rho'}| = M$, that makes $\Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 1) \Pr(A_T \neq 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_T = 1) = 0$.

Accordingly, given $\mathcal{H}_T = 1$, we bound the index of the last epoch ρ where an edge $(m', k') \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{K}$ such that $(m', k') \notin G^*$ can be in \mathcal{C}^ρ . As a consequence of Lemma 15, we know that all the edges $(m, k) \in G^*$ will remain in \mathcal{C} till time step T when $\mathcal{H}_T = 1$. We also know that $U(G^*; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) \leq U(G^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho)$. Thus, if $4M\epsilon^\rho < \frac{\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}}}{2}$ we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} U(G^*; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) - U(G_{(m',k')}^\rho; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\rho) &\geq U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - U(G_{(m',k')}^\rho; \boldsymbol{\mu}) - 4M\epsilon^\rho, \\ &\geq \Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} - 4M\epsilon^\rho, \\ &\geq 4M\epsilon^\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, all the edges $(m', k') \notin G^*$ can not remain in \mathcal{C}^ρ for $\rho \geq \frac{64M^2 \log(T\sqrt{2M})}{(\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}})^2}$ given $\mathcal{H}_T = 1$.

Therefore, re-write inequality (11) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(A_T \neq 1) &\leq \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 1) \Pr(A_T \neq 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_T = 1) + \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 0), \\ &\leq \Pr(\mathcal{H}_T = 0), \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

G Extended Experiments

Here, we present additional simulation plots that provide further insights, complementing the main plots shown in Figure 2.

One key aspect not fully illustrated in Figure 2 is the distinct difference in hint complexity between G -HCLA and GP -HCLA. As demonstrated in Theorem 6, the hint complexity of G -HCLA is up to M times greater than that of GP -HCLA in the worst-case scenario. Although constructing a worst-case instance for small graphs is challenging, Figure 3 offers a direct comparison of the performance of GP -HCLA and G -HCLA for an instance with $M = 2$, $K = 2$, and $\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} = 0.45$, averaged over 50 trials with $T = 10^5$.




Figure 3: Figure 3b demonstrates that GP -HCLA outperforms G -HCLA in terms of $L^\pi(T)$.

In the following plots in Figure 4, we present the results of simulations conducted on a larger graph with $M = 4$, $K = 7$, and $\Delta_{\min}^{\text{match}} = 0.20$, averaged over 50 trials with $T = 10^5$. These plots illustrate how the slight increase in the size of the instance, compared to the instance in Figure 2, amplifies the performance gap between HCLA and the other algorithms.




Figure 4: Figures 4b and 4a illustrate the inefficiency of HCLA when subjected to a slight increase in the size of the instance.

H Optimality of the Results

H.1 A Lower Bound on the Necessary Number of Hints

An important concern in designing efficient learning policies for HMA2B, is the number of queried hints $L^\pi(T)$. In Theorem 7, we prove that all uniformly fast convergent learning policies, defined in Definition 2, require $\Omega(\log T)$ hints to achieve time-independent regret. Accordingly, we call a policy π , *asymptotically hint optimal* if $L^\pi(T) \in O(\log T)$.

Definition 2. A policy π is called *uniformly fast convergent* if for all $0 < \alpha < 1$ and all sub-optimal matchings $G \neq G^*$,

$$\mathbb{E}[N_G^\pi(T)] = o(T^\alpha),$$

holds.

Theorem 7. Any uniformly fast convergent policy π with time-independent regret should query for $L^\pi(T) \in \Omega(\log T)$ hints.

Proof. Recall that in classic multi-armed bandits Garivier, Ménard, and Stoltz (2019); Lai and Robbins (1985), for any uniformly fast convergent policy π , we have

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[N_G^\pi(T)]}{\log T} \geq \frac{1}{\text{kl}(U(G; \boldsymbol{\mu}), U(G^*; \boldsymbol{\mu}))}, \forall G \neq G^*,$$

If the number of hints is $o(\log T)$, then there must be at least $\Omega(\log T)$ non-hint observations on some suboptimal arms. Consequently, for any uniformly fast convergent policy, the regret is also $\Omega(\log T)$, which is time-dependent. \square

This theorem indicates that the upper bounds we have achieved for $L^\pi(T)$ are asymptotically optimal for $\pi \in \text{HCLA}, \text{GP-HCLA}, \text{G-HCLA}, \text{HD-ETC}, \text{EBHD-ETC}$. Additionally, we can observe that the upper bound $O(MK \log T)$ obtained for $L^{\text{GP-HCLA}}(T)$ is also tight. This is because there are MK edges, and there always exist instances where each edge must be explored or hinted at least $O(\log T)$ times.

H.2 Bounds on the Necessary Regret

When estimations are accurate for all agent pairs (m_1, m_2) with potential matches (k_1, k_2) , the Hungarian Algorithm finds the optimal matching with zero regret. This leads to an upper bound of $O(M^3 K^2)$, as there are $O(M^2 K^2)$ exploration rounds, each incurring a maximum regret of M . Our bound is tighter, particularly as K increases, due to the assumption $M \leq K$.

For the lower bound, in the homogeneous setting, agents rank arms globally to identify the top M arms, requiring sufficient exploration to distinguish them from the remaining $K - M$ arms. This results in an $O(M^2 K)$ bound, which also serves as a lower bound in our case. However, there remains a gap of M^2 between our centralized bound and this lower bound, which remains an open question.

In the decentralized case, our upper bound remains $O(M^3 K^2)$, aligning with the centralized case. However, proving a matching lower bound is an open direction for future work.

H.3 A Lower Bound on the Necessary Number of Communications

Minimizing communication phases is a crucial challenge in designing algorithms for decentralized setups. Even in offline scenarios without uncertainty, bounding the required communication remains difficult. While time-independent regret might seem achievable with time-independent communication phases in homogeneous multi-agent multi-armed bandits, we conjecture that achieving time-independent regret in HMA2Bs requires $O(\log T)$ communication epochs, similar to $L^\pi(T)$.

Conjecture 1. *Any uniformly fast-converging policy π with time-independent regret must communicate $\Omega(\log T)$ times, i.e., $R^{\pi_{\text{com}}} \in \Omega(\log T)$.*

The intuition behind the proof of Conjecture 1 involves dividing the time horizon into exploration intervals separated by communication phases. Policies like HD-ETC and EBHD-ETC achieve time-independent regret by uniformly querying hints until $T_0^\pi \in O(\log T)$. If the length of any exploration interval before T_0^π depends on t , there exist instances where any learning policy π incurs time-dependent regret. Conversely, if all exploration intervals before T_0^π have time-independent lengths, their number must be $O(\log T)$, as they span the first T_0^π steps. This number coincides with the required communication phases. Assessing the probability of time-dependent regret when interval lengths depend on T remains an open and non-trivial question for future work.

I Structure of the Optimal Matching

We argue that any optimal matching on a weighted bipartite graph implies a hierarchical structure on agents, referred to as the **Multi-Level Agent Structure (MLAS)**, based on the position of their optimal match in their sorted weight list. This hierarchical structure is central to designing efficient decentralized learning algorithms using the described hint inquiry mechanisms and the associated regret analysis.

Definition 3. *In a given perfect matching G over \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{K} and a sorted list μ_m^s for each agent $m \in \mathcal{M}$, we say G follows MLAS if all the following existence conditions hold simultaneously:*

$$\begin{aligned} \exists m_1 \in \mathcal{M} : \quad & p_{m_1}(S) \in \{1\}, \\ \exists m_2 \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{m_1\} : \quad & p_{m_2}(S) \in \{1, 2\}, \\ & \vdots \\ \exists m_M \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{M-1}\} : \quad & p_{m_M}(S) \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $p_m(S)$ denotes the index of k_m^G in μ_m^s .

Intuitively, Definition 3 indicates that if MLAS holds for S , then there is an agent who is matched with his most preferred arm under μ^s , another agent who is matched with his most or second most preferred arm, and so forth. Lemma 17 demonstrates that an optimal matching G^* adheres to MLAS when considering the μ_m^s , which are the sorted versions of the underlying vectors μ_m . It is important to note that sorting the underlying μ_m s does not alter G^* ; thus, applying Hungarian to μ_m^s s will also produce G^* as the optimal matching.

Lemma 17. *Lets denote the sorted lists of the underlying edge weights by μ_m^s . Then, the optimal matching G^* over μ_m^s s follows MLAS structure.*

Proof of Lemma 17. We first prove that there exists an agent m_1 who satisfies the topmost existence condition by having $p_{m_1}(G^*) = 1$, meaning that $k_{m_1}^{G^*}$ is the most preferred arm by agent m_1 . We then remove $k_{m_1}^{G^*}$ from the sorted lists $\mu_{m' \neq m_1}^s$ and use induction to show the existence of another agent m_2 who satisfies the second condition. We repeat this process to prove the conditions for the remaining agents.

To start, we prove that given an optimal matching G^* , there exists an agent m_1 such that $p_{m_1}(G^*) = 1$. We achieve this by constructing a directed preference graph PG_{G^*} where the nodes represent matched pairs $(m, k_m^{G^*})$. An edge is directed from node $(m, k_m^{G^*})$ to $(m', k_{m'}^{G^*})$ if $\mu_{m, k_{m'}^{G^*}} > \mu_{m, k_m^{G^*}}$.

We argue that PG_{G^*} must be an acyclic graph; otherwise, it would contradict the optimality of G^* . Suppose PG_{G^*} contains a cycle of length i , as depicted in Figure 5. We label the nodes as $(m_1, k_1^*), (m_2, k_2^*), (m_3, k_3^*), \dots, (m_i, k_i^*)$.




Figure 5: An i -cycle contained in PG_{G^*}

We can then construct a new matching by reassigning each agent m_j to the arm indicated by the node it points to, i.e., $k_{(j \% i) + 1}^*$, thus creating a new matching G' with a higher total weight. We then show that if no agent is matched with their most preferred arm, there must be a cycle in PG_{G^*} , which contradicts the optimality of G^* as established.

If no agent is matched with their most preferred arm, consider an arbitrary agent m . We observe that the node (m, k) has at least one outgoing edge. Suppose the node (m', k') is the any of them (m, k) is pointing to. We also know that (m', k') must have at least one outgoing edge that does not point back to (m, k) ; otherwise, PG_{G^*} would contain a 2-cycle, contradicting the optimality of G^* . Therefore, (m', k') must point to another node, (m'', k'') . To avoid forming a cycle, this chain of nodes would need to grow infinitely, which contradicts the assumption that \mathcal{M} is finite. Thus, there must be at least one agent, denoted m_1 , who is matched with their most preferred arm under G^* .

To complete the proof, we then remove m_1 from \mathcal{M} and $k_{m_1}^{G^*}$ from \mathcal{K} . We apply the same argument to show that there exists an agent m_2 who is matched with their most preferred arm after removing $k_{m_1}^{G^*}$, which could have been preferred to $k_{m_2}^{G^*}$ by m_2 . This implies that m_2 's match under G^* is either their most or second most preferred arm. We continue this argument for the remaining agents by induction, thereby completing the proof. \square

J Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma 18. For a given $0 < p \leq q \leq 1$ as mean of Bernoulli distribution and $n \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the following inequality holds

$$\text{kl}\left(\frac{p}{n}, \frac{q}{n}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \text{kl}(p, q).$$

Proof. We first replace both sides of the inequality with the definition of kl and write it as:

$$\frac{p}{n} \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{p}{n}\right) \log\left(\frac{1 - \frac{p}{n}}{1 - \frac{q}{n}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \left(p \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) + (1 - p) \log\left(\frac{1 - p}{1 - q}\right) \right), \quad (12)$$

For (12) to hold, it suffices to prove:

$$\left(1 - \frac{p}{n}\right) \log\left(\frac{1 - \frac{p}{n}}{1 - \frac{q}{n}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} (1 - p) \log\left(\frac{1 - p}{1 - q}\right),$$

which is equivalent to:

$$\left(\frac{1 - \frac{p}{n}}{1 - \frac{q}{n}}\right)^{n-p} \leq \left(\frac{1 - p}{1 - q}\right)^{1-p}. \quad (13)$$

Now we can observe that $n = 1$ makes both sides of inequality (13) equal. Assuming that $n \geq 1$, we prove that $\left(\frac{1 - \frac{p}{n}}{1 - \frac{q}{n}}\right)^{n-p}$ is a decreasing function in n . Then we finish the proof by showing that the derivative of $\left(\frac{1 - \frac{p}{n}}{1 - \frac{q}{n}}\right)^{n-p}$ with respect to n is always negative.

After renaming $v = n - p$ and $u = \frac{n-p}{n-q}$, we can write:

$$\frac{du^v}{dn} = u^v \left(\frac{dv}{dn} \log u + \frac{v \frac{du}{dn}}{u} \right),$$

To wrap up the proof, we need to show that this derivative is always negative, which implies u^v is decreasing in n . For this argument to be correct, the following inequalities should hold:

$$\begin{aligned} u^v \left(\frac{dv}{dn} \log u + \frac{v \frac{du}{dn}}{u} \right) \leq 0 &\implies \frac{dv}{dn} \log u + \frac{v \frac{du}{dn}}{u} \leq 0, \\ &\implies \log \left(\frac{n-p}{n-q} \right) \leq \frac{q-p}{n-q}, \\ &\implies \left(1 + \frac{q-p}{n-q} \right) \leq e^{\frac{q-p}{n-q}}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

By the inequality $\forall x > 0, (1+x)^{\frac{1}{x}} \leq e$, inequality (14) is always correct. Thus, we proved that $\left(\frac{1-\frac{p}{n}}{1-\frac{q}{n}} \right)^{n-p}$ is decreasing in n , which completes our proof. \square

Lemma 19. For a given $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{M}, k_1, k_2 \in \mathcal{K}$, and $n, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\hat{\mu}_{m_1, k_1}(t) \leq \hat{\mu}_{m_2, k_2}(t)$ and $n_1 \leq n_2$, We define $d_{m, k}^n(t)$ as

$$d_{m, k}^n(t) := \sup \{ q \geq 0 : n \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{m, k}(t), q) \leq \log t + 4 \log \log t \},$$

the following inequalities hold

1. $d_{m, k}^{n_1}(t) > d_{m, k}^{n_2}(t)$,
2. $d_{m_1, k_1}^n(t) \leq d_{m_2, k_2}^n(t)$.

Proof. For the first part, according to the definition, $d_{m, k}^n$ is decreasing in n . This is because increasing n requires q to be closer to $\hat{\mu}_{m, k}(t)$, as $\text{kl}(p', q')$ increases with q' . Therefore, since $n_1 \leq n_2$, we conclude that $d_{m, k}^{n_1}(t) > d_{m, k}^{n_2}(t)$.

For the second part we basically use the fact that $d_{m, k}^n(t) \geq \hat{\mu}_{m, k}(t)$. Assuming $q^* = d_{m_2, k_2}^n(t)$, then we know that

$$n \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{m_2, k_2}(t), q^*) = \log t + \log \log t, \quad (15)$$

We then we can prove that $d_{m_1, k_1}^n \leq q^*$. Accordingly we put q^* in definition of d_{m_1, k_1}^n and write

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_{m_1, k_1}(t) \leq \hat{\mu}_{m_2, k_2}(t) &\implies q^* - \hat{\mu}_{m_2, k_2}(t) \leq q^* - \hat{\mu}_{m_1, k_1}(t), \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\implies} \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{m_2, k_2}(t), q^*) \leq \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{m_1, k_1}(t), q^*), \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\implies} n \text{kl}(\hat{\mu}_{m_1, k_1}(t), q^*) \geq \log t + \log \log t, \\ &\implies d_{m_1, k_1}^n(t) \leq q^*, \\ &\implies d_{m_1, k_1}^n(t) \leq d_{m_2, k_2}^n(t). \end{aligned}$$

while (a) is implied by the fact that $\text{kl}(p', q')$ increases as $|q' - p'|$ grows and (b) is implied by equation 15. \square