

When Online Algorithms Influence the Environment: A Dynamical Systems Analysis of the Unintended Consequences

Prabhat Lankireddy¹, Jayakrishnan Nair², D Manjunath²

¹Center for Machine Intelligence and Data Science, IIT Bombay, Mumbai, India

²Department of Electrical Engineering, IIT Bombay, Mumbai, India
{prabhat.lr, jayakrishnan.nair, dmanju}@iitb.ac.in

Abstract

We analyze the effect that online algorithms have on the environment that they are learning. As a motivation, consider recommendation systems that use online algorithms to learn optimal product recommendations based on user and product attributes. It is well known that the sequence of recommendations affects user preferences. However, typical learning algorithms treat the user attributes as static and disregard the impact of their recommendations on user preferences. Our interest is to analyze the effect of this mismatch between the model assumption of a static environment, and the reality of an evolving environment affected by the recommendations. To perform this analysis, we first introduce a model for a generic coupled evolution of the parameters that are being learned, and the environment that is affected by it. We then frame a linear bandit recommendation system (RS) into this generic model where the users are characterized by a state variable that evolves based on the sequence of recommendations. The learning algorithm of the RS does not explicitly account for this evolution and assumes that the users are static. A dynamical system model that captures the coupled evolution of the population state and the learning algorithm is described, and its equilibrium behavior is analyzed. We show that when the recommendation algorithm is able to learn the population preferences in the presence of this mismatch, the algorithm induces similarity in the preferences of the user population. In particular, we present results on how different properties of the recommendation algorithm, namely the user attribute space and the exploration-exploitation tradeoff, effect the population preferences when they are learned by the algorithm. We demonstrate these results using model simulations.

1 Introduction

Online learning algorithms learn an environment through a sequence of actions and feedbacks from the environment to these actions. Most online learning algorithms make the key assumption that the characteristics that describe the environment, and the statistics of its response to the actions do not change as the learning progresses, i.e., the environment is static. Specifically, there is an implicit assumption that the environment does not respond to the actions of the learner. We argue that that is a strong assumption for these algorithms. Our interest in this paper is to analyze the consequence of this mismatch. Specifically, we consider the case of a learning algorithm updating its parameters assuming a

stationary environment while the environment is evolving in response to the actions of the learning process, i.e., unbeknownst to it, the learner is influencing the environment that it is learning. Thus, we have an unintended consequence on the environment. This is perhaps best illustrated by a ‘YouTube session’ where a user starts off seeking videos on specific topics but the recommendations distract from the original intent and take the user through an entirely different sequence of videos. And all this while, the recommendation system would be updating the interest profile of the user in response to the new clicks. Thus the learning algorithm (recommendation system) and the environment (user preferences) are evolving together. In this paper, we will analyze this coupled evolution of the state of the learner and the state of the environment.

Learning in non-stationary environments has received attention in recent literature, especially in multi-armed bandits where reward distributions of the arms are assumed non-stationary. In these models, the objective is typically to develop a learning algorithm that performs optimally in some sense, in the presence of an environment that changes. For example, in (Besbes, Gur, and Zeevi 2014), the expected reward from any arm can change at any point and any number of times but the changes are independent of the algorithm and the reward sequence. In rotting and recharging bandits, respectively (Levine, Crammer, and Mannor 2017) and (Kleinberg and Immorlica 2018), the arms have memory of when they were last recommended and the reward distribution depends on the delay since the last use of the arm. A generalization of rotting and recharging bandits is considered in (Fiez, Sekar, and Ratliff 2018) where the mean rewards from the arms vary according to a Markov chain.

The change of user preferences in response to recommendations has been well documented (Flaxman, Goel, and Rao 2016), (Mansoury et al. 2020). This has inspired some work to explicitly model this interaction and exploit it to improve the learning, e.g., (Shah, Blanchet, and Johari 2018) and more recently (Agarwal and Brown 2024). These works focus on optimally learning user preferences as they change, which is clearly different from our goal.

There is some literature that studies the effect of algorithms on the environment, albeit in a non online learning setting. The performative prediction literature (Perdomo et al. 2020) studies learning the environment when the ob-

jective of the learner affects the environment, i.e., the environment ‘performs’ as a reaction to what learner does; see (Hardt, Jagadeesan, and Mendl-Dünner 2022), (Hardt and Mendl-Dünner 2023) for more recent work on performance prediction. In this work, learning the environment is studied in a supervised learning setting. The work on data feedback loops (Taori and Hashimoto 2023) induced by data generated by learning algorithms is also similar in nature.

Feedback loops in collaborative filtering based recommendation systems is studied (Sinha, Gleich, and Ramani 2016) and (Schmit and Riquelme 2018) also discuss the problem from a recommendation systems perspective. While these works are similar in nature, the model that we use in our work is significantly different. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first analysis of mismatch between the learner and the environment.

Organization and Summary of Results

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We first introduce a generic model of interaction between an online learning algorithm and its environment in which the environment changes in response to the learners actions. We provide a result that allows us to understand the asymptotic behavior of the model by analyzing a dynamical system, when suitable assumptions are made on the model. Then, we consider the particular case of the contextual linear bandits problem in the setting where the environment is influenced by the algorithm. This is followed by a discussion on the equilibrium points of the dynamical system of aforementioned linear bandits setting and various results obtained from the simulation of the same. The proofs for all the theorems are provided in the appendix.

In the rest of the paper the term ‘learner’ will refer to the online learning algorithm that assumes that the environment is stationary. Also, we will use the terms ‘learner’, ‘algorithm’ and ‘learning algorithm’ interchangeably.

2 A Model of a Generic Online Learning System

We consider a discrete time interaction sequence between an environment E and a learner L that is trying to learn E ; time is indexed by t . The learner believes that the environment is characterized by a state $\varphi^* \in \mathcal{E}_\varphi$, where \mathcal{E}_φ is the set of all possible states that the learner knows. The learning of E by L is achieved by finding φ^* that minimizes objective function $\mathcal{L}^\mathcal{O}$, i.e.,

$$\varphi^* = \min_{\varphi} \mathcal{L}^\mathcal{O}(\varphi).$$

However, the environment is characterized by $\psi_t \in \mathcal{E}_\psi$ at time t , where \mathcal{E}_ψ is the set of all possible states of the environment. \mathcal{E}_φ and \mathcal{E}_ψ are subsets of real-numbered coordinate spaces and are not necessarily identical.

To learn E , L responds to a signal from E at time t with an action. This action elicits a reward from E even as E changes state to $\psi_t \in \mathcal{E}_\psi$ that depends on the action by L . The sequence of past signals, actions, and rewards are used to determine the action at time t ; this history is captured by L in its state variable $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_\varphi$. In the following, we make




Figure 1: Schematic of the general model of interaction between the learner L and the environment E . The numbers in the picture correspond to the step numbers in the generic model description in Section 2.

the sequence of events of this interaction between L and E explicit and also introduce the notation.

1. At time t , the learner receives a random signal U_t from the environment. The distribution of U_t is a function of the state of the environment ψ_t .
2. The learner responds with an action $A_t = Q(U_t, \varphi_t)$, where Q is a random variable that describes the output of the learning algorithm.
3. The environment responds to the action of the learner by returning a reward $R_t = r(U_t, A_t, \psi_t) + \eta_t$, where r is the reward function and η_t is noise with $\mathbb{E}[\eta_t | U_t, A_t, \psi_t] = 0$. The tuple (U_t, A_t) can be interpreted as the *context* that influences the reward at time t .
4. The learner updates its state from φ_t as

$$\varphi_{t+1} = \varphi_t + \alpha_t \Phi(U_t, A_t, R_t, \varphi_t). \quad (1)$$

where Φ describes the updating function that the learner uses and α_t is a scalar constant, also called the learning parameter. Typically, this update corresponds to the minimization of a loss function or a surrogate objective function \mathcal{L} , which is different from $\mathcal{L}^\mathcal{O}$, and can be written as

$$\varphi_{t+1} = \arg \min_{\varphi} \mathcal{L}(\varphi, A_{1:t}, R_{1:t}) \quad (2)$$

where $A_{1:t}$ and $R_{1:t}$ are sequences of actions and rewards until time t . Such a practice of iteratively optimizing a surrogate function is common in online learning algorithms, when optimizing over the desired objective function is not feasible (Lange, Hunter, and Yang 2000).

5. Finally, the environment reacts to the action A_t of the learner by changing its state to ψ_{t+1} as follows.

$$\psi_{t+1} = \psi_t + \beta_t \Psi(U_t, A_t, R_t, \psi_t). \quad (3)$$

Here Ψ is the updating function of the environment and β_t is a scalar constant that we call the adaptation parameter.

In Figure 1 we give a compact representation of the above steps at time t . There are two important features of the preceding description that are significantly different from the usual assumptions in the literature on multi-armed bandits and other similar online algorithms. In step 5 above, the environment reacts to the action of the learner and changes its state. Thus the environment is not static and the learning algorithm will influence the state evolution of the environment through the choice of its action sequence. This model is similar in nature to that of (Jiang et al. 2019), and there are similarities to reinforcement learning models as well. The key differences are twofold: we allow \mathcal{E}_φ and \mathcal{E}_ψ , the state space of L and E respectively, to be different, i.e., the learner does not know the actual description of E , and we use the notion of model mismatch between the learner and the environment. We formally define mismatch using the following.

Definition 1. *The environment is **stationary** if the adaptability parameter β_t satisfies*

$$\beta_t = 0 \quad \forall t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Else, the environment is **non-stationary**.

Definition 2. *The environment is **learnable** if there exists a surjection from \mathcal{E}_φ to \mathcal{E}_ψ i.e., if there exists a function f such that for any environment state $\psi \in \mathcal{E}_\psi$, there exists at least one learner state $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_\varphi$ that satisfies*

$$\psi = f(\varphi).$$

Else, the environment is **non-learnable**.

L can learn E if E is both stationary and learnable. However, when E does not satisfy either of the above conditions, L is not guaranteed to learn E . We show this using the following two examples. Consider an environment where $\mathcal{E}_\psi = \mathcal{E}_\varphi$ but $\beta_t \neq 0$ for all t . An adversary, at some time t' , can change the state of the environment immediately after L learns E with high confidence. Consider another example where $\beta_t = 0$ for all t but $\mathcal{E}_\psi = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{E}_\varphi = \mathbb{R}^e$ for some $d > e$. In such a case, minimizing any objective function will not help L learn E , as the state of E lies in a higher dimensional space as compared to the state of L . We use both of the above ideas in formally defining *mismatch* below.

Definition 3. *A **mismatch** between the learning algorithm and the environment is said to exist if the environment is either non-stationary or non-learnable or both.*

Our objective in this paper is to analyze the unintended consequences on the environment when the learner uses a mismatched model for the environment, i.e., when $\mathcal{E}_\varphi \neq \mathcal{E}_\psi$, and also assumes that it is static, i.e., $\beta_t = 0$ for all t . It is also of interest to understand if the learner is able to learn the environment despite the mismatch, and what happens to the environment in that case. The following definition formalizes this idea.

Definition 4. *The learner is said to **asymptotically track** the environment if*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_t = \min_{\varphi} \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{O}}(\varphi) = \varphi_*$$

for some $\varphi_* \in \mathcal{E}_\varphi$.

If the learner asymptotically tracks the environment when there is a mismatch, it appears as if the mismatch never existed from the learner's perspective. Moreover, the environment is affected by its interaction with the learner. By analyzing the long-term behavior of the model, we can understand what happens to the environment when the learner asymptotically tracks the environment.

We characterize the long-term consequences of the mismatch by analyzing the asymptotic behavior of the states of the learner and of the environment. We make the following assumptions on the model.

Assumption A1. $\|\varphi_t\| < \infty$ and $\|\psi_t\| < \infty$ for all $t = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ w.p. 1.

Assumption A2. $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_t = \infty$, $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_t^2 < \infty$, $\alpha_t = \beta_t$ for all $t \geq 0$.

Assumption A3. $\mathbb{E}[\Phi|\varphi, \psi]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\Psi|\varphi, \psi]$ are Lipschitz continuous in both φ and ψ .

Assumption A1 is a technical assumption and is reasonable to make in practice, while assumptions A2 and A3 can be restrictive. A2 requires that the learner and the environment evolve in the same timescale, while A3 does not allow the analysis of algorithms with a discontinuous probability distribution, such as the ϵ -greedy algorithm. While these assumptions are necessary for mathematical analysis, the qualitative results surrounding the analysis still hold under small relaxations of these assumptions i.e., models with $\alpha_t \approx \beta_t$ and algorithms with continuous approximations of discrete probability distributions.

These assumptions let us use stochastic approximation theory to obtain the desired system of Ordinary Differential Equations (o.d.e.), which gives us the following result.

We do so by obtaining a system of o.d.e.s that asymptotically tracks the model, using stochastic approximation theory (Borkar 2009), and analyze the asymptotic behavior of the o.d.e. system.

Theorem 1. *Under the assumptions A1, A2, and A3, the sequences $\{\varphi_t\}$ and $\{\psi_t\}$ converge to a connected internally chain transitive invariant set of the o.d.e.s*

$$\dot{\varphi}(\tau) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi|\varphi, \psi] \text{ and } \dot{\psi}(\tau) = \mathbb{E}[\Psi|\varphi, \psi] \quad (4)$$

respectively a.s.

This result tells us that we can characterize the long term behavior of the states of L and E , given by φ_t and ψ_t respectively, by analyzing the long term behavior of continuous time iterates of the o.d.e. in Eq. (4), given by $\varphi(\tau)$ and $\psi(\tau)$ respectively. This helps us study the long term behavior of the complex stochastic model using dynamical system theory, which has been well studied. We will now use this model of interaction between a learner and its environment to study the special case of the interaction between a recommendation platform and its users.

3 Unintended Consequences in a Linear Bandits Recommendation System

We consider a setting where a multi-type population of users receives suggestions from a recommendation system RS

that uses a linear bandit model to learn the preferences of the population even as it makes the suggestions to the users that arrive sequentially. The interaction between RS and the user population corresponds to that between, respectively, a learner and its environment. We develop this model in the framework described in the previous section.

Model Description

There are N users in the population and are given recommendations from a pool of K products. RS associates each user $n \in [N]$ with a user attribute $v_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and each product $k \in [K]$ with a product attribute $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^q$, where p and q are positive integers, and these attributes are used to make predictions. The set of all user attributes span \mathbb{R}^p which tells us that $N \geq p$, and similarly the set of all product attributes span \mathbb{R}^q which gives us $K \geq q$. At each time t , a user $U_t \in [N]$ arrives at RS and receives a recommendation $A_t \in [K]$. We define $C_t \in \mathbb{R}^{pq}$ as the *context* at time t , which is given by

$$C_t = v_{U_t} \otimes w_{A_t}$$

The goal of RS is to learn the population. RS believes that the population is characterized by a parameter $\theta_* \in \mathbb{R}^{pq}$, which does not change with time, and that the reward is a linear function of θ_* and the context C_t . RS believes that θ_* minimizes a least squares objective given by

$$\theta_* = \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E} \left[(R_t - C_t^T \theta)^2 \right].$$

To learn the population, RS maintains a state $\theta_t \in \mathbb{R}^{pq}$ that is updated at every time t . Contrary to the learner's assumption, the state of the population is given by $Y_t = [Y_{1,t}^T, Y_{2,t}^T, \dots, Y_{N,t}^T]^T$, where $Y_{n,t} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is called the state of the user n at time t . Moreover, the state of the population changes with time, and that change at time t depends on the context C_t at that time. The following describes this interaction in the framework of the generic model described in the previous section.

1. At time t , a user U_t arrives at RS where the probability of arrival of user n at time t is $\mathbb{P}(U_t = n) = \lambda_n$. This is the signal received by the learner RS.
2. RS responds to the user by giving a recommendation A_t . The recommendation is made by the recommendation algorithm Q , which is described by

$$\mathbb{P}(Q(U_t, \theta_t) = k) = \frac{\exp(a \cdot C_{U_t, k}^T \theta_t)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(a \cdot C_{U_t, j}^T \theta_t)} \quad (5)$$

where $C_{n,k}$ is the context formed by user n and product k , which is given by

$$C_{n,k} = v_n \otimes w_k. \quad (6)$$

Note that \otimes represents the Kronecker product, so $C_{n,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{pq}$ for all $n \in [N]$ and $k \in [K]$. The parameter a in the recommendation algorithm Q controls the exploration-exploitation tradeoff — decreasing the value of a increases the exploration. One can think of Q as an ϵ -greedy algorithm with a smooth probability distribution.

3. The reward received by the algorithm is given by

$$R_t = w_{A_t}^T Y_{U_t, t} + \eta_t \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\eta_t | Y_{U_t, t}, A_t] = 0$. This reward structure allows the following interpretation of a user state: each component of the user state is the user's affinity towards the corresponding component of a product attribute.

4. The platform state is the least squares estimator $\theta_{t+1} = \min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_t(\theta)$ which optimizes the least squares loss at time t given by

$$\mathcal{L}_t(\theta) = \zeta \|\theta\|^2 + \sum_{s=1}^t (R_s - C_{U_s, A_s}^T \theta)^2 \quad (8)$$

where $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a regularization parameter. θ_{t+1} can be expressed in terms of two auxiliary state variables (B_t, S_t) where $B_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t C_s R_s$ and $S_t = \frac{1}{t} \left(\zeta I_{pq} + \sum_{s=1}^t C_s C_s^T \right)$. The evolution of the platform state can be described by the evolution of these auxiliary states i.e.

$$B_{t+1} = B_t + \frac{1}{t+1} (C_{U_t, A_t} R_t - B_t) \quad (9)$$

$$S_{t+1} = S_t + \frac{1}{t+1} (C_{U_t, A_t} C_{U_t, A_t}^T - S_t) \quad (10)$$

where the initial states are given by $B_0 = 0$ and $S_0 = \zeta I$. Note that S_t is a symmetric, positive definite matrix for all $t \geq 0$. From the above equations, the learnability parameter α_t is observed to be $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{t+1}$.

5. The evolution of the state of the population is described by

$$Y_{n, t+1} = Y_{n, t} + \frac{1}{t+1} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\} (w_{A_t} - Y_{n, t}). \quad (11)$$

The state of the user at time t is updated such that the user's affinity towards the recommended product increases. The states of all users other than U_t do not change at time t . While we consider Eq. 11 for the evolution of the population, one can also consider other models. The initial state of the environment $\psi_0 = (Y_{1,0}, \dots, Y_{N,0})$ is initialized arbitrarily. Note that the adaptability parameter β_t is taken to be $\beta_t = \frac{1}{t+1}$ from the above equation, which is identical to the learnability parameter α_t .

Now that the system is fully described, we can better understand the mismatch between the algorithm's supposed setting and the real setting. The environment, which is the user population, is non-stationary and possibly non-learnable. The former is due to the evolution of the user state given by Eq. (11). The latter is due to the possibility that the state space of the population \mathbb{R}^{Nq} is larger than that of RS, which is \mathbb{R}^{pq} , when the number of users N satisfies $N > p$. If the environment is stationary i.e. $Y_{n, t+1} = Y_{n, t}$ for all $n \in [N]$, $t \geq 0$, and learnable, i.e. $N = p$, then the model described above turns into a standard linear bandit problem.

The failure of these assumptions of stationarity and learnability characterizes the mismatch between the assumed setting and reality. If there is no mismatch, then the algorithm guarantees that there exists a $\theta_* \in \mathbb{R}^{pq}$ such that a.s.

$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \theta_t = \theta_*$. Nevertheless, it's possible that the algorithm fully minimizes its loss i.e.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_t(\theta_t) = 0 \quad (12)$$

despite the presence of a mismatch. Using the terminology defined in Section 2, we say that RS is said to *asymptotically track* the population preferences when Eq. (12) holds. It is of interest to understand the consequences of the mismatch on the environment state, and to identify conditions under which RS asymptotically tracks the population preferences despite the mismatch. To understand such long term behavior of the model, we find the o.d.e. that has the same asymptotic behavior as that of the states of RS and the population.

Asymptotic o.d.e. for the model

We first introduce some notation for ease of composition. Let $V = [v_1 \ v_2 \ \dots \ v_N]$ be a $p \times N$ matrix containing all user attributes, $W = [w_1 \ w_2 \ \dots \ w_K]$ be a $q \times K$ matrix containing all product attributes, $Y_t = [Y_{1,t}^T \ Y_{2,t}^T \ \dots \ Y_{N,t}^T]^T$ be a $Nq \times 1$ vector, and $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N)$ be a $N \times N$ diagonal matrix containing the users' arrival probabilities. The following result describes the asymptotic o.d.e. that has the same limiting behavior as that of the learner and environment states.

Theorem 2. *The sequence $\{B_t, S_t, Y_t\}$ converges a.s. to a connected internally chain transitive invariant set of the o.d.e. of $x(\tau) = (b(\tau), s(\tau), y(\tau))$ given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{b}(\tau) &= (V \otimes W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(p(\tau)) (I_N \otimes W)^T y(\tau) - b(\tau) \\ \dot{s}(\tau) &= (V \otimes W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(p(\tau)) (V \otimes W)^T - s(\tau) \\ \dot{y}(\tau) &= \Lambda_q ((I_N \otimes W)^T p(\tau) - y(\tau)) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and the initial values are given by

$$b(0) = B_0 \quad s(0) = S_0 \quad y(0) = [Y_{1,0}, Y_{2,0}, \dots, Y_{N,0}]$$

where $b(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{pq}$, $s(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{pq \times pq}$, $\theta(\tau) := s^{-1}(\tau)b(\tau)$, $y(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nq}$, $p(\tau) := [p_{11}(\tau) \ p_{12}(\tau) \ \dots \ p_{NK}(\tau)]^T$, $p_{nk}(\tau) := \mathbb{P}(Q(n, \theta(\tau)) = k)$, $\Lambda_K := \Lambda \otimes I_K$, and $\Lambda_q := \Lambda \otimes I_q$.

Figure 2 shows the theorem at work for a model simulation with $N = p = 2$, in which the states of two users $Y_{1,t}$ and $Y_{2,t}$ vary with time. The sequence of user states $\{Y_{n,t}\}$ is obtained from a simulation of the stochastic model, and the sequence $\{y_n(\tau)\}$ is obtained from a simulation of the o.d.e. system from Theorem 2. In this example, the states $\{Y_{n,t}\}$ and the o.d.e. iterates $\{y_n(\tau)\}$ seem to asymptotically converge to a unique point in \mathbb{R}^2 as seen in Figure 2.

Next, we use the o.d.e. to discuss the long-term consequence that RS has on the environment.

4 Long Term Consequence on the Population

The following result ensures the existence of an equilibrium point to the previously obtained o.d.e.

Lemma 1. *There exists at least one equilibrium point $(\bar{b}, \bar{s}, \bar{y})$ to the o.d.e. given by Eq. (13) and the equilibrium*




Figure 2: Plot of user states $\{Y_{n,t}\}$ and o.d.e. iterates $\{y_n(\tau)\}$ against time. Each user state $Y_{n,t} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ from the stochastic model is represented by two solid lines, one corresponding to each component, and each o.d.e. iterate $y_n(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is represented by two dotted lines. The states $\{Y_{n,t}\}$ were sampled after every 1000 time steps.

point satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{b} &= (V \otimes W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p}) (I_N \otimes W)^T \bar{y} \\ \bar{s} &= (V \otimes W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p}) (V \otimes W)^T \\ \bar{y} &= (I_N \otimes W) \bar{p} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $\bar{p} = [\mathbb{P}(Q(1, \bar{\theta}) = 1) \ \dots \ \mathbb{P}(Q(N, \bar{\theta}) = K)]^T$ is a $NK \times 1$ vector and $\bar{\theta} := \bar{s}^{-1} \bar{b}$.

While an equilibrium is guaranteed to exist, it is difficult to comment on the stability of these equilibria in general. However, when certain conditions are imposed on the learner, the system gives rise to locally stable equilibria that are achieved when RS asymptotically tracks the population preferences. These equilibria also cause degeneracy in the user states as we will see later. We focus our attention towards these equilibria in this section. The following result provides a sufficient condition for an equilibrium to be locally stable.


Theorem 3. *An equilibrium point $(\bar{b}, \bar{s}, \bar{y})$ of the o.d.e. (13) is locally stable if it satisfies*

$$\bar{y} = (V \otimes I_q)^T \bar{\theta} \quad (15)$$

where $\bar{\theta} = \bar{s}^{-1} \bar{b}$.

One can observe that such locally stable equilibrium points are global minimizers of the learner's objective function given by Eq. (8). In other words, if RS asymptotically tracks the population's preferences, then both RS and the population will have reached a locally stable equilibrium. To the learner, reaching this equilibrium appears as if the learner's state has converged to the unknown environment parameter. Moreover, the preferences of the population stop evolving as well. We now look at conditions needed to satisfy Eq. (15) that are external to the learner.

Lemma 2. *If $N = p$, then $\bar{y} = (V \otimes I_q)^T \bar{\theta}$. If $N > p$, then $\bar{y} = (V \otimes I_q)^T \bar{\theta} + y^\perp$ where $y^\perp \in \text{null}((V \otimes$*



(a) Simulation with initial parameters.

(b) Initial parameters except $a = 4.0$.

(c) Initial parameters except $v_3 = [2, 3, 1.1]^T$

Figure 3: Simplex plots of user states generated from simulations as described in Section 5. Each point on the plot is a probability simplex corresponding to a user.

$W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p})(I_N \otimes W)^T$ is a vector in a $(N - p)q$ dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^{Nq} .

This lemma gives some insight into how the number of users in the model affect the equilibria. When the number of users N is equal to the dimension of the user attributes p , the lemma guarantees that all the equilibrium points are locally stable. This is because the environment is learnable (as per definition 2) when $N = p$. This is noteworthy because the algorithm appears to learn the environment when $N = p$ even though the stationarity assumption on the environment is violated. The parameter p is controlled by the learner, and the learner can choose to increase p to ensure that Eq. (15) is always met. The following theorem discusses what happens to the user states when $N = p$.

Theorem 4. Let $\mathcal{Y}_a \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ be the set of all possible equilibrium states that the state of any user n can take for a given parameter a when $N = p$. Let $\{a_n\}$ be any increasing sequence of positive reals that tends to ∞ and let $\{y_{a_n}\}$ be a sequence of states indexed by $\{n\}$ such that $y_{a_n} \in \mathcal{Y}_{a_n}$. Let \tilde{W} be the subset of all available product attributes that lie on the boundary of $\text{conv}(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_K)$. If $N = p$, then

1. If $a < \frac{2}{\|W\|_2^2}$, then $|\mathcal{Y}_a| = 1$.
2. All convergent subsequences of all possible sequences $\{y_{a_n}\}$ converge to \tilde{W} .

This result has implications on what happens to the user states when RS asymptotically tracks the population preferences (in the $N = p$ case). If the exploration-exploitation parameter a is too small i.e., when RS explores more, then all the user states form a consensus. When RS exploits more, then the user states tend to polarize towards a subset of the product attributes.

One might be more interested in the $N > p$ case, since most algorithms operate under that setting. This is because the learner might be interested in learning the preferences of a very large number of users, while minimizing computational cost associated with increasing p . This computational cost arises because the learner's state is a pq -dimensional vector. The following theorem discusses the user states at equilibrium in the $N > p$ setting.

Theorem 5. If $N > p$ and $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N\}$ lie in a $p - 1$ dimensional hyperplane, then there exists at least one locally stable equilibrium, and that equilibrium satisfies $\bar{y}_1 = \bar{y}_2 = \dots = \bar{y}_N$.

This result states the conditions that RS must satisfy in order to asymptotically track the population in the $N > p$ case. Moreover, a consequence of this result is that all the user preferences end up being identical when RS asymptotically tracks the population preferences. While local stability of such equilibria has been proved, simulations suggest that these equilibria are asymptotically stable. The following section discusses these simulations.

5 Numerical Experiments

We demonstrate the long term effect of the parameters that are controlled by RS over the population using simulations. We do this by simulating a model using a set of simple, non-trivial parameters, and then study what happens when a specific parameter is varied. The following describes the initial simulation setup.

Initial Simulation Parameters

There are 3 users in the population and there are 3 products available for recommendation to RS i.e., $N = 3$ and $K = 3$ respectively. Each user arrives at RS with equal probability i.e., $\lambda_n = 1/3$ for all $n \in [N]$. The dimension of the user attribute space p is taken to be $p = 3$ and the dimension of product attribute space satisfies $q = 2$. RS assumes that users have attributes, given by $v_1 = [1, 2, 3]^T$, $v_2 = [2, 3, 1]^T$, $v_3 = [3, 1, 2]^T$, and the product attributes are given by $w_1 = [\cos(1^\circ), \sin(1^\circ)]^T$, $w_2 = [\cos(45^\circ), \sin(45^\circ)]^T$, $w_3 = [\cos(89^\circ), \sin(89^\circ)]^T$. The initial states of the users are given by $y_1(0) = [2, 0]^T$, $y_2(0) = [0, 2]^T$, $y_3(0) = [2, 2]^T$. The regularization parameter in Eq. (8) is set to $\zeta = 0.001$, and the exploration-exploitation parameter of the recommendation algorithm is set to $a = 8$. Each simulation is run for $\tau = 1000$ time steps, where τ is time in the o.d.e. timescale.

Simplex Plot

Figure 3a plots the initial simulation data onto a *simplex plot*. Each point on the simplex plot is the probability simplex $p(x) = [p_1(x), p_2(x), p_3(x)]$ where $p_k(x) = \frac{\exp(aw_k^T x)}{\sum_{j=1}^3 \exp(aw_j^T x)}$. Each black point represents the probability simplex of a product $k \in 1, 2, 3$, given by $p(w_k)$. The probability simplices of users $p(y_1(\tau)), p(y_2(\tau)), p(y_3(\tau))$ are shown in blue, orange and green respectively. The initial states are depicted using \circ in the plot, and the final states are shown using \times . The dotted lines in the center of the plot divide the plot into three regions, where each region corresponds to the *dominant* region of a product i.e., all simplices in that region assign a higher probability to that product as compared to other products.

Analyzing the effect of RS parameters


From Figure 3a, we see that the most preferred product remains the same for each of the user for all time. However, the degree to which the user prefers a certain product has changed; preferences of users 1 and 3 are closer to the preferences of user 2 at time $\tau = 1000$ as compared to that at $\tau = 0$.

Next, we study the effect of the exploration-exploitation parameter a by changing its value from 8 to 4. Figure 3b shows the simplex plot for this simulation. Observe that all the users end up preferring the same product at $\tau = 1000$. Moreover, their states also end up being identical. We observe that too much exploration causes the population to reach a consensus, whereas too much exploitation induces polarization in the population.


Figure 3c illustrates the effect of the user attributes v_1, v_2, v_3 on the final state. These user attributes can be viewed as the information RS has about the users. So, if the attributes of two users are similar, then they are more likely to be given similar recommendations. We see this effect in Figure 3c, in which all the initial simulation parameters are used except that the attribute of user 3 is set to $v_3 = [2, 3, 1.1]$, which is a point very close to $v_2 = [2, 3, 1]$ in \mathbb{R}^3 . The figure shows that users 2 and 3 end up preferring the same product in the long-term, and their states become identical. We now simulate models with large number of users and products i.e. $N > p$ and $K > q$.

Large N and K

We simulate a model with $N = 100$, $K = 10$, and $p = q = 5$. User attributes are sampled uniformly from the set $[0, 1]^p$. The product attributes are uniformly sampled from the set $[0, 1]^q$ and then normalized to have unit L_2 norm. Figure 4a illustrates how product preferences change over time in such a simulation. Each line corresponds to a product, and it represents the number of users who prefer that product over all the others. Figure 4a shows that users' preferences tend to deviate significantly in the long-term from what they initially were. Moreover, we also observe polarization i.e., most users' preferences tend to become similar, and favor a certain product in the long-term. Motivated by Theorem 5, we run a simulation in which all the user attributes lie in a $(p-1)$ -dimensional hyperplane. To do so, we



(a) User attributes do not lie in $(p-1)$ -dimensional hyperplane.



(b) User attributes lie in $(p-1)$ -dimensional hyperplane.

Figure 4: Plot of the frequency of users that prefer a certain product against time for $N = 100, K = 10, p = q = 5$. Each of the K lines in the plot corresponds to a particular product.

create the user attributes as specified before and then modify the attributes such that the last element of all the attributes is 1. Figure 4b shows how the users' preferences towards each of the products vary with time. It is interesting to see that all the 100 users end up preferring the same recommendation in the long-term, which is the locally stable equilibrium stated by Theorem 5.

6 Discussion

In conclusion, we reiterate that the focus of this work is to understand the long term consequences of the interaction of the algorithm-dependent actions of a learning algorithm and the environment. Towards this, we first developed a general framework for modeling and analysis of such interactions. We then applied this to a linear bandits based recommendation system and demonstrated several consequences that depend on the system parameters and the initial values.

Applying the framework to other online learning settings is an obvious next step. One can also relax the assumptions made by the linear bandit model. An immediate extension is to allow the RS and the users to have different views of the product attributes. Two-timescale stochastic approximation theory can be applied to analyze the case when the evolution of the learner and the environment happen at different timescales. Using constant α_t and β_t is also a natural next question.

References

- Agarwal, A.; and Brown, W. 2024. Online Recommendations for Agents with Discounted Adaptive Preferences. arXiv:2302.06014.
- Besbes, O.; Gur, Y.; and Zeevi, A. 2014. Stochastic multi-armed-bandit problem with non-stationary rewards. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27.
- Borkar, V. S. 2009. *Stochastic approximation: a dynamical systems viewpoint*, volume 48. Springer.
- Fiez, T.; Sekar, S.; and Ratliff, L. J. 2018. Multi-armed bandits for correlated markovian environments with smoothed reward feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.04008*.
- Flaxman, S.; Goel, S.; and Rao, J. M. 2016. Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. *Public opinion quarterly*, 80(S1): 298–320.
- Hardt, M.; Jagadeesan, M.; and Mendler-Dünner, C. 2022. Performative power. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 22969–22981.
- Hardt, M.; and Mendler-Dünner, C. 2023. Performative prediction: Past and future. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16608*.
- Jiang, R.; Chiappa, S.; Lattimore, T.; György, A.; and Kohli, P. 2019. Degenerate feedback loops in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, 383–390.
- Kleinberg, R.; and Immorlica, N. 2018. Recharging bandits. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 309–319. IEEE.
- Lange, K.; Hunter, D. R.; and Yang, I. 2000. Optimization transfer using surrogate objective functions. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, 9(1): 1–20.
- Levine, N.; Crammer, K.; and Mannor, S. 2017. Rotting bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Mansoury, M.; Abdollahpouri, H.; Pechenizkiy, M.; Mobasher, B.; and Burke, R. 2020. Feedback loop and bias amplification in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*, 2145–2148.
- Perdomo, J.; Zrnic, T.; Mendler-Dünner, C.; and Hardt, M. 2020. Performative prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 7599–7609. PMLR.
- Schmit, S.; and Riquelme, C. 2018. Human interaction with recommendation systems. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 862–870. PMLR.
- Shah, V.; Blanchet, J.; and Johari, R. 2018. Bandit learning with positive externalities. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31.
- Sinha, A.; Gleich, D. F.; and Ramani, K. 2016. Deconvolving feedback loops in recommender systems. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- Taori, R.; and Hashimoto, T. 2023. Data feedback loops: Model-driven amplification of dataset biases. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 33883–33920. PMLR.

A Proof of Theorem 1

From Eq. (3), we get

$$\psi_{t+1} = \psi_t + \alpha_t(\mathbb{E}[\Psi(A_t, R_t, \psi_t)|\varphi_t, \psi_t] + M_{t+1})$$

where $M_{t+1} := \Psi(A_t, R_t, \psi_t) - \mathbb{E}[\Psi(A_t, R_t, \psi_t)|\varphi_t, \psi_t]$ is a martingale difference sequence that satisfies $\mathbb{E}[M_t|\varphi_t, \psi_t] = 0$. Similarly, Eq. (1) can be expressed as

$$\varphi_{t+1} = \varphi_t + \alpha_t(\mathbb{E}[\Phi(A_t, R_t, \psi_t)|\varphi_t, \psi_t] + M'_{t+1})$$

where $M'_{t+1} := \Phi(A_t, R_t, \psi_t) - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(A_t, R_t, \psi_t)|\varphi_t, \psi_t]$. We now use the following theorem from (Borkar 2009) to proceed.

Theorem 6. Consider the stochastic approximation scheme

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + \alpha_t(h(x_t) + M_{t+1})$$

for $t \geq 0$, where h is Lipschitz continuous, the stepsizes α_t satisfy $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_t = \infty$ and $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_t^2 < \infty$, M_{t+1} is a martingale difference sequence satisfying $\mathbb{E}[M_{t+1}|x_t] = 0$ a.s., and the iterates x_t are bounded for all time i.e. $\sup_t \|x_t\| < \infty$ almost surely. The sequence $\{x_t\}$ converges to a connected internally chain transitive invariant set of the o.d.e.

$$x(\tau) = h(x(\tau))$$

where $\tau \geq 0$.

The result follows by applying the above theorem for φ_t and ψ_t using assumptions A1, A2 and A3, and choosing τ such that $\tau = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha_s$ at time t .

B Proof of Theorem 2

The platform state is given by $\varphi_t = (B_t, S_t)$ and the environment's state is given by $\psi_t = (Y_{1,t}, Y_{2,t}, \dots, Y_{N,t})$. The evolution of the platform state $\varphi_t = (B_t, S_t)$ can be described by the function $\Phi = (\Phi_B, \Phi_S)$, where

$$\Phi_B(\varphi_t, \psi_t) = C_{U_t, A_t} R_t - B_t$$

$$\Phi_S(\varphi_t, \psi_t) = C_{U_t, A_t} C_{U_t, A_t}^T - S_t$$

and the evolution of the environment's state ψ_t can be described by the function $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_N)$, where for any $n \in [N]$ we have

$$\Psi_n(\varphi_t, \psi_t) = \mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\}(w_{A_t} - Y_{n,t}).$$

If assumptions A1, A2 and A3 hold, then Theorem 1 tells us that Eq. (4) asymptotically tracks the system. We now show that all A1, A2 and A3 hold.

To show A1 holds, we must first obtain expressions for $\mathbb{E}[\Phi|\varphi_t, \psi_t]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\Psi|\varphi_t, \psi_t]$. Before that, we obtain expressions for C_{U_t, A_t} and R_t . From Eq (6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{U_t, A_t} \\ &= (V \otimes W) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{Q(1, \theta_t) = 1\} \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{Q(1, \theta_t) = 2\} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = N\} \mathbb{I}\{Q(N, \theta_t) = K\} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (V \otimes W) P'_t \end{aligned}$$

where $P'_t := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\}\mathbb{I}\{Q(1, \theta_t) = 1\} \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\}\mathbb{I}\{Q(1, \theta_t) = 2\} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = N\}\mathbb{I}\{Q(N, \theta_t) = K\} \end{bmatrix}$. For R_t ,

we obtain the following from Eq. (7).

$$\begin{aligned}
R_t &= w_{A_t}^T Y_{U_t, t} + \eta_t \\
&= \sum_{n \in [N]} \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = k\} w_k^T Y_{n, t} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = k\} w_k \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = N\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = k\} w_k \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} Y_{1, t} \\ \vdots \\ Y_{N, t} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} W \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 1\} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = K\} \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots \\ W \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = N\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 1\} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = N\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = K\} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}^T Y_t \\
&= \left((I_N \otimes W) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 1\} \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 2\} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = N\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = K\} \end{bmatrix} \right)^T Y_t \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 1\} \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 2\} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = N\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = K\} \end{bmatrix}^T (I_N \otimes W^T) Y_t \\
&= P_t'^T (I_N \otimes W^T) Y_t
\end{aligned}$$

Using the above expressions for C_{U_t, A_t} and R_t , we can find an expression for $\mathbb{E}[\Phi_B | \varphi_t, \psi_t]$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\Phi_B | \varphi_t, \psi_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\Phi_B | B_t, S_t, Y_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[C_{U_t, A_t} R_t - B_t | B_t, S_t, Y_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[(V \otimes W) P_t' P_t'^T (I_N \otimes W^T) Y_t - B_t | B_t, S_t, Y_t \right] \\
&= (V \otimes W) \mathbb{E} \left[P_t' P_t'^T | B_t, S_t \right] (I_N \otimes W^T) Y_t - B_t
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\mathbb{E}[P_t' P_t'^T | B_t, S_t]$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[P_t' P_t'^T | B_t, S_t \right] \\
&= \sum_{n, k} \lambda_n \mathbb{P}(Q(n, \theta_t) = k) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 1\} \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 2\} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = N\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = K\} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 1\} \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = 1\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = 2\} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{I}\{U_t = N\} \mathbb{I}\{A_t = K\} \end{bmatrix}^T \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \mathbb{P}(Q(1, \theta_t) = 1) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \lambda_N \mathbb{P}(Q(N, \theta_t) = K) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= (\Lambda \otimes I_K) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{P}(Q(1, \theta_t) = 1) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \mathbb{P}(Q(N, \theta_t) = K) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \Lambda_K \text{diag}(P_t)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda_K = \Lambda \otimes I_K$ and

$$P_t = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{P}(Q(1, \theta_t) = 1) \\ \mathbb{P}(Q(1, \theta_t) = 2) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{P}(Q(N, \theta_t) = K) \end{bmatrix}.$$

So, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi_B | B_t, S_t, Y_t] = (V \otimes W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(P_t) (I_N \otimes W^T) Y_t - B_t.$$

This function is Lipschitz continuous in B_t and S_t because the softmax function is Lipschitz continuous, and the function is Lipschitz continuous in Y_t because of the linear relationship. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\Phi_S | \varphi_t, \psi_t] &= \mathbb{E}[\Phi_S | B_t, S_t, Y_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[C_{U_t, A_t} C_{U_t, A_t}^T - S_t | B_t, S_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[(V \otimes W) P_t' P_t'^T (V \otimes W)^T - S_t | B_t, S_t \right] \\
&= (V \otimes W) \mathbb{E} \left[P_t' P_t'^T | B_t, S_t \right] (V \otimes W)^T - S_t \\
\mathbb{E}[\Phi_S | \varphi_t, \psi_t] &= (V \otimes W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(P_t) (V \otimes W)^T - S_t.
\end{aligned}$$

One can see that this function is also Lipschitz continuous in B_t and S_t for the same reason as above.

We now move on to $\mathbb{E}[\Psi | \varphi_t, \psi_t]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\Psi_n|\varphi_t, \psi_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\}(w_{A_t} - Y_{n,t})|B_t, S_t, Y_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\}\left(W\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}(Q(n, \theta_t) = 1) \\ \mathbb{I}(Q(n, \theta_t) = 2) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{I}(Q(n, \theta_t) = K) \end{bmatrix} - Y_{n,t}\right)|B_t, S_t, Y_t\right] \\
&= \lambda_n\left(W\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{P}(Q(n, \theta_t) = 1) \\ \mathbb{P}(Q(n, \theta_t) = 2) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{P}(Q(n, \theta_t) = K) \end{bmatrix} - Y_{n,t}\right) \\
&= \lambda_n(WP_{n,t} - Y_{n,t})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } P_{n,t} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{P}(Q(n, \theta_t) = 1) \\ \mathbb{P}(Q(n, \theta_t) = 2) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{P}(Q(n, \theta_t) = K) \end{bmatrix}. \text{ We can obtain}$$

$\mathbb{E}[\Psi|\varphi_t, \psi_t]$ from the above.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\Psi|\varphi_t, \psi_t] &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\Psi_1|\varphi_t, \psi_t] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{E}[\Psi_N|\varphi_t, \psi_t] \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1(WP_{1,t} - Y_{1,t}) \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_N(WP_{N,t} - Y_{N,t}) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= (\Lambda \otimes I_q)(I_N \otimes W)P_t - (\Lambda \otimes I_q)Y_t \\
&= \Lambda_q((I_N \otimes W)P_t - Y_t)
\end{aligned}$$

This function is Lipschitz continuous in B_t, S_t, Y_t as a result of the Lipschitz continuity of the softmax function. This concludes the proof for A1.

The assumption A2 holds for the choice of $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{t+1}$. To see that A3 holds, observe the expressions for B_t, S_t, Y_t . For Y_t , one can show that for any $n \in [N]$

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{n,t+1} &= Y_{n,t} + \frac{1}{t+1}\mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\}(w_{A_t} - Y_{n,t}) \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{1}{t+1}\mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\}\right)Y_{n,t} + \frac{1}{t+1}\mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\}w_{A_t} \\
&\leq \sup_{k \in [K]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{t+1}\mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\}\right)Y_{n,t} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{t+1}\mathbb{I}\{U_t = n\}w_k \\
&\leq \sup_{k \in [K]} \{w_k, Y_{n,t}\} \\
&\leq \sup_{k \in [K]} \{w_k, Y_{n,0}\}
\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is taken element-wise, and the last step is obtained by recursion. As long as the initial states $Y_{n,0}$ are bounded for all $n \in [N]$, the states $Y_{n,t}$ are bounded for all

time $t \geq 0$. From this, we observe that the reward R_t is also bounded a.s. when $\mathbb{P}(\eta_t = \infty) = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
R_t &= w_{A_t}^T Y_{U_t, t} + \eta_t \\
&\leq \sup_{n,k} \{w_k^T Y_{n,t}\} + \eta_t \leq 0 \quad w.p.1
\end{aligned}$$

For B_t , one can show that

$$B_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t C_{U_t, A_t} R_t \preceq \sup_{n,k,t} C_{n,k} R_t$$

which is bounded because the reward is bounded a.s., and similarly

$$S_t = \frac{1}{t} \left(\zeta I + \sum_{s=1}^t C_{U_t, A_t} C_{U_t, A_t}^T \right) \preceq \zeta I + \sup_{n,k,t} \{C_{n,k} C_{n,k}^T\}$$

which is bounded because ζ and $C_{n,k}$ for all $n \in [N]$ and $k \in [K]$ are bounded. This proves that A3 holds.

Since A1, A2 and A3 hold, the expressions for $\mathbb{E}[\Phi_B|\varphi_t, \psi_t], \mathbb{E}[\Phi_S|\varphi_t, \psi_t], \mathbb{E}[\Psi|\varphi_t, \psi_t]$ in conjunction with Theorem 1 completes the proof.

C Proof of Lemma 1

From Eq. (14), we can substitute \bar{y} out to get the following

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{b} &= (V \otimes W)\Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p})(I_N \otimes W)^T (I_N \otimes W)\bar{p} \\
\bar{s} &= (V \otimes W)\Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p})(V \otimes W)^T
\end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We can break down the expression for \bar{b} as a sum of multiple expressions as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{b} &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_n \mathbb{P}_{nk}(\bar{b}, \bar{s}) C_{n,k} w_k^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^K \mathbb{P}_{nj}(\bar{b}, \bar{s}) w_j \right) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^K \lambda_n \mathbb{P}_{nk}(\bar{b}, \bar{s}) \mathbb{P}_{nj}(\bar{b}, \bar{s}) C_{n,k} w_k^T w_j \\
&\in \text{conv} \left(\bigcup_{n \in [N]} \bigcup_{k \in [K]} \bigcup_{j \in [K]} C_{n,k} w_k^T w_j \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{nk}(b, s) := \frac{\exp a C_{nk}^T s^{-1} b}{\sum_{j \in [K]} \exp a C_{nj}^T s^{-1} b}$ is defined for all vectors $b \in \mathbb{R}^{pq}$ and all symmetric positive definite matrices $s \in \mathbb{R}^{pq \times pq}$. We define

$$\Omega_b := \text{conv} \left(\bigcup_{n \in [N]} \bigcup_{k \in [K]} \bigcup_{j \in [K]} C_{n,k} w_k^T w_j \right).$$

Similarly, we now break down the expression of \bar{s} .

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{s} &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_n \mathbb{P}_{nk}(\bar{b}, \bar{s}) C_{n,k} C_{n,k}^T \\
&\in \text{conv} \left(\bigcup_{n \in [N]} \bigcup_{k \in [K]} C_{n,k} C_{n,k}^T \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\Omega_s := \text{conv} \left(\bigcup_{n \in [N]} \bigcup_{k \in [K]} C_{nk} C_{nk}^T \right)$. Using these sets, we define three functions $g_b : \Omega_b \times \Omega_s \rightarrow \Omega_b$, $g_s : \Omega_b \times \Omega_s \rightarrow \Omega_s$ and $g : \Omega_b \times \Omega_s \rightarrow \Omega_b \times \Omega_s$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} g_b(b, s) &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^K \lambda_n \mathbb{P}_{nk}(b, s) \mathbb{P}_{nj}(b, s) C_{n,k} w_k^T w_j \\ g_s(b, s) &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_n \mathbb{P}_{nk}(b, s) C_{nk} C_{nk}^T \\ g(b, s) &= (g_b(b, s), g_s(b, s)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Omega_b \times \Omega_s$ is a convex set, we use the Brouwer's fixed point theorem to say that there exists at least one solution to the fixed point equation $(b, s) = g(b, s)$. This solution corresponds to an equilibrium of the system of equations given by Eq. (16), and \bar{p} can be computed from the solution (\bar{b}, \bar{s}) . Using that \bar{p} , one can compute \bar{y} using $\bar{y} = (I_N \otimes W) \bar{p}$.

D Proof of Theorem 3

Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta, y) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\Lambda_q^{1/2}(\bar{y} - (V \otimes I_q)^T \theta)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \|(I_N \otimes W) \bar{p} - y\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

To show that the equilibrium point is locally stable, we will show that $\frac{dL(\theta, y)}{d\tau} < 0$ for small perturbations around the equilibrium point. We have

$$\frac{dL(\theta, y)}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial L(\theta, y)}{\partial \theta} \dot{\theta}(\tau) + \frac{\partial L(\theta, y)}{\partial y} \dot{y}(\tau)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta, y)}{\partial \theta} = -(\Lambda_q(\bar{y} - (V \otimes I_q)^T \theta))^T (V \otimes I_q)^T$$

and

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta, y)}{\partial y} = -((I_N \otimes W) \bar{p} - y(\tau))^T.$$

We wish to evaluate $\frac{dL(\theta, y)}{d\tau}$ at points close to the equilibrium point. We define $\delta_\theta(\tau) = \theta(\tau) - \bar{\theta}$, $\delta_y(\tau) = y(\tau) - \bar{y}$, $\delta_p(\tau) = p(\tau) - \bar{p}$ and express the above using the new terms as follows

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta, y)}{\partial \theta} = \delta_\theta(\tau)^T (V \otimes I_q) \Lambda_q (V \otimes I_q)^T$$

and

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta, y)}{\partial y_n} = \delta_y(\tau)^T.$$

We have the following expressions for $\dot{\theta}(\tau)$ and $\dot{y}(\tau)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}(\tau) &= s(\tau)^{-1} (V \otimes W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(p(\tau)) ((I_N \otimes W)^T \delta_y(\tau) \\ &\quad - (V \otimes W)^T \delta_\theta(\tau)) \\ \dot{y}(\tau) &= \Lambda_q ((I_N \otimes W) \delta_p(\tau) - \delta_y(\tau)) \end{aligned}$$

If all the deviations $\delta_\theta(\tau), \delta_y(\tau), \delta_p(\tau)$ are small, then $s(\tau) \approx \bar{s}$ and $p(\tau) \approx \bar{p}$, using which the expression for $\dot{\theta}(\tau)$ can be simplified as

$$\dot{\theta}(\tau) = \bar{s}^{-1} (V \otimes W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p}) (I_N \otimes W)^T \delta_y(\tau) - \delta_\theta(\tau)$$

For ease of exposition, we define $A := (V \otimes I_q)^T \bar{s}^{-1} (V \otimes W) \Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p}) (I_N \otimes W)^T$. Observe that A is idempotent i.e., $A^2 = A$. Putting all of this together, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dL(\theta, y)}{d\tau} &= \delta_\theta(\tau)^T (V \otimes I_q) \Lambda_q A \delta_y(\tau) \\ &\quad - \delta_\theta(\tau)^T (V \otimes I_q) \Lambda_q (V \otimes I_q)^T \delta_\theta(\tau) \\ &\quad + \delta_y(\tau)^T \Lambda_q (I_N \otimes W) \delta_p(\tau) \\ &\quad - \delta_y(\tau)^T \Lambda_q \delta_y(\tau) \end{aligned}$$

We can simplify this further by expression $\delta_p(\tau)$ as a function of $\delta_\theta(\tau)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_p(\tau) &= a \text{diag}(\text{diag}(\bar{p}_1) - \bar{p}_1 \bar{p}_1^T, \dots, \\ &\quad \text{diag}(\bar{p}_N) - \bar{p}_N \bar{p}_N^T) (V \otimes W)^T \delta_\theta(\tau) \end{aligned}$$

By taking the derivative of the equilibrium condition $\bar{y} = (I_N \otimes W) \bar{p}$ with respect to \bar{y} , one gets the following expression

$$aW(\text{diag}(\bar{p}_n) - \bar{p}_n \bar{p}_n^T) W^T = I_q$$

for all $n \in [N]$. Using both the expressions above, one can express $\delta_p(\tau)$ as

$$(I_N \otimes W) \delta_p(\tau) = (V \otimes I_q)^T \delta_\theta(\tau).$$

Using this in the expression for time derivative of L , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dL(\theta, y)}{d\tau} &= -\|(V \otimes I_q)^T \delta_\theta(\tau)\|_{\Lambda_q}^2 - \|\delta_y(\tau)\|_{\Lambda_q}^2 \\ &\quad + \langle (V \otimes I_q)^T \delta_\theta(\tau), \delta_y(\tau) \rangle_{\Lambda_q} \\ &\quad + \langle (V \otimes I_q)^T \delta_\theta(\tau), A \delta_y(\tau) \rangle_{\Lambda_q}. \end{aligned}$$

To simplify this, we make use of properties of A . Observe that A satisfies the following

$$A(V \otimes I_q)^T = (V \otimes I_q)^T$$

where $(V \otimes I_q)^T$ is a $Nq \times pq$ matrix of rank pq . Also observe that A has rank pq . This indicates that \mathbb{R}^{Nq} can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{R}^{Nq} = \text{range}((V \otimes I_q)^T) \oplus \text{null}(A).$$

This allows us to decompose any $\delta_y(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nq}$ using elements from $\text{range}((V \otimes I_q)^T)$ and $\text{null}(A)$ as

$$\delta_y(\tau) = (V \otimes I_q)^T y^\parallel + y^\perp$$

where $y^\parallel \in \mathbb{R}^{pq}$ and $y^\perp \in \text{null}(A)$. Moreover, note that $\|\delta_y(\tau)\| \geq \|(V \otimes I_q)^T y^\parallel\|$ because $(V \otimes I_q)^T y^\parallel$ and y^\perp are orthogonal. Using this, we express $\frac{dL(\theta, y)}{d\tau}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dL(\theta, y)}{d\tau} &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \left(\|(V \otimes I_q)^T \delta_\theta(\tau)\|_{\Lambda_q}^2 + \|\delta_y(\tau)\|_{\Lambda_q}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \langle (V \otimes I_q)^T \delta_\theta(\tau), \delta_y(\tau) \rangle_{\Lambda_q} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left(\|(V \otimes I_q)^T \delta_\theta(\tau)\|_{\Lambda_q}^2 + \|(V \otimes I_q)^T y^\parallel\|_{\Lambda_q}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \langle (V \otimes I_q)^T \delta_\theta(\tau), (V \otimes I_q)^T y^\parallel \rangle_{\Lambda_q}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Cauchy Schwarz inequality and the identity $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2ab$, we can show that

$$\frac{dL(\theta, y)}{d\tau} \leq 0$$

which completes the proof.

E Proof of Lemma 2

At equilibrium, $\bar{\theta} = \bar{s}^{-1}\bar{b}$ gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{s}\bar{\theta} &= \bar{b} \\ 0 &= \bar{b} - \bar{s}\bar{\theta} \\ 0 &= (V \otimes W)\Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p})((I_N \otimes W)^T \bar{y} - (V \otimes W)\bar{\theta}) \\ 0 &= (V \otimes W)\Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p})(I_N \otimes W)^T (\bar{y} - (V \otimes I_q)^T \bar{\theta}) \\ 0 &= (V \otimes I_q)\tilde{W}(\bar{y} - (V \otimes I_q)^T \bar{\theta}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{W} := (I_N \otimes W)\Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p})(I_N \otimes W)^T$ is a $Nq \times Nq$ matrix. The last step uses the relation $V \otimes W = (V \otimes I_q)(I_N \otimes W)$. Observe that $\text{rank}(\tilde{W}) = \min\{\text{rank}(I_N \otimes W), \text{rank}(\Lambda_K \text{diag}(\bar{p}))\} = \min\{Nq, NK\} = Nq$, which tells us that \tilde{W} is a full rank matrix. Observe that $(\bar{y} - (V \otimes I_q)^T \bar{\theta}) \in \text{null}((V \otimes I_q)\tilde{W})$. This gives us

$$\bar{y} = (V \otimes I_q)^T + y^\perp$$

where $y^\perp \in \text{null}((V \otimes I_q)\tilde{W})$. When $N = p$, we have $y^\perp = 0$ because both $(V \otimes I_q)$ is a full rank matrix. When $N > p$, the dimension of $\text{null}((V \otimes I_q)\tilde{W})$ is $(N - p)q$ because rank of $V \otimes I_q$ is always pq .

F Proof for Theorem 4

From Lemma 2, then Eq. 19 holds when $N = p$, which can be rewritten as

$$0 = \bar{y}_n - \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \frac{\exp(aw_k^T \bar{y}_n)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(aw_j^T \bar{y}_n)}.$$

. The above can be expressed as the derivative of a function $f : \text{conv}(\mathcal{W}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ evaluated at \bar{y}_n , given by

$$f(y) = \frac{\|y\|^2}{2} - \frac{1}{a} \log \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \exp(aw_k^T y) \right). \quad (17)$$

The second term is the *LogSumExp* function, which behaves like a smooth max operator. As $a \rightarrow \infty$, this term gets closer to the max operator, which gives us

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} f(y) = \frac{\|y\|^2}{2} - \max_{k \in [K]} w_k^T y$$

Taking the derivative of the above and evaluating it at \bar{y}_n gives us

$$\bar{y}_n = \max_{k \in [K]} w_k \implies \bar{y}_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{W}}$$

which finishes the second part of the proof.

The derivative of f can also be expressed as

$$f'(y) = y - Wg(y)$$

where the function $g : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ is given by

$$g(y) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\exp(aw_1^T y)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(aw_j^T y)} \\ \frac{\exp(aw_2^T y)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(aw_j^T y)} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\exp(aw_K^T y)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(aw_j^T y)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{P}_1(y, a) \\ \mathbb{P}_2(y, a) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{P}_K(y, a) \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_i(y, a) := \frac{\exp(aw_i^T y)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(aw_j^T y)}$ for all $i \in [K]$. Taking the second derivative of the function in Eq. 17 gives us

$$f''(y) = I_q - Wg'(y).$$

The second derivative of f gives us information about the curvature of f . If $f''(y)$ is positive definite for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^q$, then f is convex and there exists a unique critical point for f . The rest of the proof is focused on finding out what values of a can cause $f''(y)$ to be positive definite. If $f''(y)$ is positive definite, then

$$v^T f''(y)v > 0 \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^q$$

which gives us

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< v^T (I_q - Wg'(y))v \\ \iff \|v\|^2 &> v^T Wg'(y)v \\ \iff \|v\|^2 &> \|v\|^T \|W\| \|g'(y)\| \|v\| \\ \iff 1 &> \|W\| \|g'(y)\| \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the spectral norm. So, f is convex if

$$\|g'(y)\| < \frac{1}{\|W\|}. \quad (18)$$

To proceed, we need to find what $g'(y)$ is. Note that g can be expressed as $g = g_1 \circ g_2$ where $g_2 : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ is a linear function given by

$$g_2(x) = aWx$$

and $g_1 : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ is the softmax function given by

$$g_1(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\exp(x_1)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(x_j)} \\ \frac{\exp(x_2)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(x_j)} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\exp(x_K)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(x_j)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The derivatives of these functions g_2 and g_1 are given by

$$g_2'(x) = aW$$

and

$$g_1'(x) = \text{diag}(g_1(x)) - g_1(x)g_1(x)^T$$

respectively, where diag creates a diagonal matrix for which the diagonal elements come from its input. Using the above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} g'(y) &= g_1'(g_2(y))g_2'(y) \\ &= (\text{diag}(g(y)) - g(y)g(y)^T)(aW). \end{aligned}$$

Using this in Eq. (18) gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\|W\|} > \|a(\text{diag}(g(y)) - g(y)g(y)^T)W\| \\
\iff & \frac{1}{\|W\|} > a\|(\text{diag}(g(y)) - g(y)g(y)^T)\| \|W\| \\
\iff & \frac{1}{\|W\|^2} > a\|\text{diag}(g(y)) - g(y)g(y)^T\| \\
\iff & \frac{1}{\|W\|^2} > aG(y, a).
\end{aligned}$$

where $G(y, a) \geq \|\text{diag}(g(y)) - g(y)g(y)^T\|$ is an upper bound. We obtain an expression for $G(y, a)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\text{diag}(g(y)) - g(y)g(y)^T\| \\
& \leq \|\text{diag}(g(y)) - g(y)g(y)^T\|_1 \\
& = \max_{i \in [K]} \sum_j |\delta_{ij} \mathbb{P}_i(y, a) - \mathbb{P}_i(y, a) \mathbb{P}_j(y, a)| \\
& = \max_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{P}_i(y, a)(1 - \mathbb{P}_i(y, a)) + \sum_j \mathbb{P}_i(y, a) \mathbb{P}_j(y, a) \\
& = \max_{i \in [K]} 2\mathbb{P}_i(y, a)(1 - \mathbb{P}_i(y, a)) \\
& = G(y, a)
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality comes from the inequality $\|A\| \leq \sqrt{\|A\|_\infty \|A\|_1} = \|A\|_1$ when A is a symmetric matrix. Observe that $\max_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{P}_i(y, a)(1 - \mathbb{P}_i(y, a)) \leq \frac{1}{4}$. This gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\|W\|^2} > aG(y, a) \\
\iff & \frac{1}{\|W\|^2} > 2a \max_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{P}_i(y, a)(1 - \mathbb{P}_i(y, a)) \\
\iff & \frac{1}{\|W\|^2} > 2a \left(\frac{1}{4}\right) \\
\iff & \frac{2}{\|W\|^2} > a
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the first part of the result. Note that one can obtain a tighter bound on a by finding a tighter bound on $G(y, a)$.

G Proof for Theorem 5

From Eq. (14) and Eq. (15), we get

$$\bar{y}_n = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \frac{\exp(aw_k^T \bar{y}_n)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(aw_j^T \bar{y}_n)} \quad \forall n \in [N] \quad (19)$$

Let \mathbb{W} denote the convex hull of all the product attributes $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_K\}$. Consider the function $f : \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}$ that satisfies

$$f(y) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \frac{\exp(aw_k^T y)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(aw_j^T y)}$$

From Brouwer's fixed point theorem, there exists at least one solution to the equation $y = f(y)$, which guarantees

that there exists at least one solution to Eq. (19). Let y^* be a solution to $y = f(y)$. We now proceed to show that if $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N\}$ lie in a $p - 1$ dimensional hyperplane, then there exists an equilibrium point $(\bar{\theta}, \bar{y})$ to the o.d.e. such that $\bar{y} = (V \otimes I_q)^T \bar{\theta}$ and $\bar{y}_n = y^*$ for all $n \in [N]$. We use the following definition in the proof.

Definition 5. Let $N > p$. A collection of vectors $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N\}$ in \mathbb{R}^p lies on a $p - 1$ dimensional hyperplane if for any arbitrary ordering of elements $\{v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_N}\}$, there exist scalars $\{\alpha_{11}, \alpha_{12}, \dots, \alpha_{1p}\}$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_{lj} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{i_l} = \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_{lj} v_{i_j} \quad (20)$$

for all $l \in \{p + 1, p + 2, \dots, N\}$.

In short, if all user attributes lie in a $p - 1$ dimensional hyperplane, then any user attribute can be expressed as an affine combination of any other p attributes. Define $\bar{\Theta} := \text{vec}^{-1}(\bar{\theta})$ which is a $q \times p$ matrix obtained by rearranging the elements of $\bar{\theta}$. Then $\bar{y} = (V^T \otimes I_q) \bar{\theta}$ is equivalent to

$$\bar{y}_n = \bar{\Theta} v_n \quad \forall n \in [N]$$

The linear relation between \bar{y}_n and v_n implies that all the user states $\{\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2, \dots, \bar{y}_N\}$ lie on a $p - 1$ dimensional hyperplane, which means that there exist constants $\{\alpha_{11}, \alpha_{12}, \dots, \alpha_{1p}, \alpha_{21}, \dots, \alpha_{(N-p)p}\}$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_{lj} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{y}_{p+l} = \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_{lj} \bar{y}_j$$

for all $l = 1, 2, \dots, N - p$. From the equilibrium expression for \bar{y} , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
W \bar{p}_{p+l} &= \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_{lj} W \bar{p}_j \\
W \left(\bar{p}_{p+l} - \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_{lj} \bar{p}_j \right) &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

for all $l = 1, 2, \dots, N - p$. The above expression holds true when $\bar{p}_1 = \bar{p}_2 = \dots = \bar{p}_N$.