

Contextual Thompson Sampling via Generation of Missing Data

Kelly W. Zhang¹ Tiffany (Tianhui) Cai² Hongseok Namkoong² Daniel Russo²

Imperial College London¹ Columbia University²

kelly.zhang@imperial.ac.uk {tc3100, hn2369, djr2174}@columbia.edu

Abstract

We introduce a framework for Thompson sampling contextual bandit algorithms, in which the algorithm’s ability to quantify uncertainty and make decisions depends on the quality of a generative model that is learned offline. Instead of viewing uncertainty in the environment as arising from unobservable latent parameters, our algorithm treats uncertainty as stemming from missing, but potentially observable, future outcomes. If these future outcomes were all observed, one could simply make decisions using an “oracle” policy fit on the complete dataset. Inspired by this conceptualization, at each decision-time, our algorithm uses a generative model to probabilistically impute missing future outcomes, fits a policy using the imputed complete dataset, and uses that policy to select the next action. We formally show that this algorithm is a generative formulation of Thompson Sampling and prove a state-of-the-art regret bound for it. Notably, our regret bound i) depends on the probabilistic generative model only through the quality of its offline prediction loss, and ii) applies to any method of fitting the “oracle” policy, which easily allows one to adapt Thompson sampling to decision-making settings with fairness and/or resource constraints.

1 Introduction

Recent advances in machine learning have transformed our ability to develop high quality predictive and generative models for complex data. This work introduces a framework for developing decision-making algorithms, specifically for contextual bandit problems, that can take advantage of these machine learning advances. By design, we assume the algorithm developer is able to effectively apply these machine learning techniques (e.g., minimize a loss via gradient descent) and employ these methods as subroutines in our decision-making algorithm. Moreover, our theory formally connects the quality of effective (self-)supervised learning via loss minimization to the quality of decision-making.

Classically, contextual Thompson sampling algorithms form a parametric model of the environment and consider the decision-maker’s uncertainty as arising from unknown latent parameters of that model [51]. In this classical perspective, the primitive operations that are assumed to be feasible (at least approximately) include i) the ability to specify an informative prior for the latent parameter using domain knowledge, ii) the ability to sample from the posterior distribution of the latent parameter, and iii) the ability to update the posterior distribution as more data is collected. Unfortunately, it is well known that all three of these primitive operations are non-trivial to perform with neural networks [20, 61].

Building on our previous work [8] which focuses on multi-armed bandits without contexts, we view missing, but potentially observable, future outcomes as the source of the decision-maker’s uncertainty. This perspective allows us to replace the primitive operations required in the classical view with new primitives that are more compatible with neural networks: i) the ability to effectively minimize an offline sequence prediction loss, ii) the ability to autoregressively generate from the optimized sequence model, and iii) the ability to fit a desired policy given access to a complete dataset (outcomes from all actions and decision-times).

In the missing data view of uncertainty, if we had a complete dataset, there is no uncertainty because we could simply use the entire dataset to fit a desired “oracle” policy to use to make decisions. Inspired by this idea, at each decision time our algorithm imputes all missing outcomes using a pretrained generative sequence model, fits a desired policy using the imputed complete dataset, and selects the best action according to the fitted policy. We show that this algorithm is a generative implementation of Thompson sampling [51]. Moreover, we demonstrate empirically that it is possible to learn an accurate generative model to impute missing outcomes using standard machine learning tools in *meta-bandit* settings, where one encounters many distinct, but related bandit tasks. We use data from previous bandit tasks to train a generative sequence model offline.

We prove a state-of-the-art regret bound for our generative Thompson sampling algorithm with three key properties, which each have significant practical implications. First, the generative model used to impute missing outcomes only affects our bound through the offline sequence prediction of the model. This means that our theory is applicable to any sequence model architecture, and that the quality of the sequence model can be easily optimized for and evaluated via offline training and validation. Second, our bound is unique in that it applies to any procedure for fitting a desired “oracle” policy. This allows one to easily adapt Thompson sampling to decision-making problems with constraints, including resource and fairness constraints. Finally, our proof approach makes important improvements to previous information theoretic analyses, which may be broadly applicable: i) we accommodate infinite policy classes directly without discretization, and ii) our bound quantifies the benefit of prior information available from a task, such as side information regarding actions.

2 Problem formulation

2.1 Meta contextual bandit problem

We consider a meta contextual bandit problem where bandit tasks τ are sampled from an unknown task distribution p^* :

$$\tau \sim p^*. \tag{1}$$

Each bandit task τ consists of prior information Z_τ , an action space \mathcal{A}_τ , a sequence of context vectors $X_{1:T} = \{X_1, \dots, X_T\}$, and a table of potential outcomes¹ $\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} = \{Y_1^{(a)}, \dots, Y_T^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau}$:

$$\tau = \{Z_\tau, X_{1:T}, \{Y_1^{(a)}, \dots, Y_T^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau}\}.$$

Informally, the agent’s objective is to select actions to maximize the total expected reward for each encountered task. At the start of a task, the agent observes prior information Z_τ . For each decision time $t \in [1: T]$, the agent observes the context X_t , selects an action $A_t \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$, observes the outcome $Y_t = Y_t^{(A_t)}$, and computes the reward $R(Y_t)$, for a fixed, known function R that takes values in $[0, 1]$. We use \mathcal{H}_t to denote the history, which includes the current context:

$$\mathcal{H}_t = \{Z_\tau, (X_1, A_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_{t-1}, A_{t-1}, Y_{t-1}), X_t\}.$$

The agent is able to learn both online *within a single task* meaning over the T total decision times, as well as meta-learn *across different tasks* (e.g., learning how task prior information Z_τ may inform the distribution of $\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau}$).

¹We omit subscripting X_t and $Y_t^{(a)}$ with τ to reduce clutter.



Figure 1: News recommendation meta contextual bandit problem. This

Offline data. We assume that the algorithm has access to training data from previous tasks, $\mathcal{D}^{\text{offline}} = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n\}$, sampled according to (1). These previous bandit tasks can be used by the algorithm to meta-learn across tasks, e.g., learn about the distribution p^* itself to improve decision-making quality. For simplicity, we present our algorithm assuming we have access to complete task datasets τ_i , where all outcomes from all actions, $\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau}$, are available. In Appendix B.2.1, we discuss how by bootstrapping we can learn from partial data from each task (e.g., where $Y_t^{(a)}$ is only observed if $A_t = a$ was selected).

Motivating example: News recommendation task. As depicted in 1, a motivating meta-contextual bandit problem is cold-start news recommendations. Each day, a new set of articles \mathcal{A}_τ are released, which the agent recommends to users who arrive throughout the day. In contrast to Li et al. [33], our algorithm meta-learns across news recommendation tasks and uses the article text to improve cold-start decisions. We use $Z_\tau = (Z_\tau^{(a)})_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau}$ to denote the task-specific prior information, i.e., the news article text. The context variables X_t consist of user-specific features and Y_t are recommendation outcomes observed following the t^{th} decision.

The modern challenge in this problem setting is that incorporating the news article text Z_τ can greatly improve the recommendation system’s decisions, but a foundation model is needed to read process this high dimensional text and inform the decision-making of the agent. This motivates us in this work to i) make very minimal structural assumptions on the relationship between prior information Z_τ , context features X_t , and outcomes Y_t , and ii) develop an algorithm that is amenable to incorporating foundation models.

2.2 Environment assumptions

The defining quality of our problem formulation is that *we do not make explicit assumptions about the distribution of outcomes Y conditional on contexts X and prior information Z* . It is common in the meta bandit literature to assume a known parametric model class that accurately captures the distribution $\{Y_t^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid (X_t, Z_\tau)$ [9, 10, 28, 62]; Typically, there is an unknown environment parameter that varies between tasks. We instead allow this distribution to be general. Our algorithm’s decision-making quality depends on how accurately the agent models this distribution, as well as the policy fitting procedure the algorithm designer chooses. Rather than relying on strong assumptions on the environment structure, we put the onus on the algorithm designer to i) learn a model that accurately captures the environment structure of the meta-bandit task at hand, and ii) choose a meaningful method for fitting a desired “oracle” policy, assuming access to a complete dataset. The motivation for this comes recognizing that such offline learning problems are routinely

solved in practice in settings that extend well beyond theory. We focus on our theory on formal reductions to offline learning and policy selection problems, assuming offline learning can be done at scale.

(1) Stationary contextual bandit. Assumption 1 below captures two critical properties of (stationary) contextual bandit environments: (i) that contexts $X_{1:T}$ are *exogenous* to (independent of) past outcomes and actions taken by the agent, and (ii) that the context outcome tuples $(X_t, Y_t^{(a)})$ are permutation invariant over time. These assumptions are standard properties of contextual bandit type environments considered in the literature [30].

Assumption 1 (Contextual bandit environment). *For any task $\tau \sim p^*$, the distribution of the next context X_t is independent of the previous outcomes, i.e.,*

$$X_t \perp \{Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid (X_{1:t-1}, Z_\tau).$$

Additionally, for any action $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$, the tuples $(X_t, Y_t^{(a)})$ are exchangeable over time, i.e., for any permutation σ over T elements, the following are equal in distribution:

$$(X_t, Y_t^{(a)})_{t \in [1:T]} \stackrel{D}{=} (X_{\sigma(t)}, Y_{\sigma(t)}^{(a)})_{t \in [1:T]}.$$

(2) Independence across actions. We also assume that the outcomes Y are independent across actions, conditional on Z and X . This is a simplifying assumption, which allows us to safely model actions independently, and ignore dependencies between outcomes across actions.

Assumption 2 (Independence across actions). *Conditional on $Z_\tau, X_{1:T}$, outcomes $Y_{1:T}^{(a)}$ are independent across actions $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$.*

(3) Known context distribution. The final assumption we make is that the agent knows the distribution of contexts $X_{1:T}$. In practice, this is often not a strong assumption because contexts X from previous tasks (which do not need to be associated with any outcomes Y) can be used to approximate this context distribution. In many applications, the foremost cost in data collection is that of acquiring “labels” associated with the unlabeled covariates X [56] and it is common to easily acquire large quantities of unlabeled covariate data [67]. We do not focus on learning the context distribution in this work since existing unsupervised methods could be directly used here for covariate modeling [26]. Moreover, learning the distribution of passively observed stationary contexts (which are unaffected by the actions taken by the agent by Assumption 1) is less compelling from the perspective of designing active learning algorithms.

Assumption 3 (Context distribution is known). *The conditional distribution of contexts, $X_{1:T} \mid Z_\tau$, is known.*

2.3 Definition of regret

Policy fitting. We assume that the algorithm designer specifies a procedure for fitting a desired “oracle” policy given access to a complete bandit task dataset τ . This policy fitting procedure outputs policies in a function class Π^* where each $\pi^* \in \Pi^*$ defines a mapping from contexts X_t to an action $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$ that does not vary over time. For notational simplicity, the policies in Π^* are assumed to be non-stochastic. Note that we *do not* require that this policy class is necessarily “correct”. For a particular task τ , we use $\pi^*(\cdot; \tau)$ to denote a “best-fitting” policy $\pi^* \in \Pi^*$, where

the fitting criterion is defined by the algorithm designer. For a simple example, one could fit using a least squares criterion:

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\pi \in \Pi^*} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ R(Y_t^{\pi(X_t)}) - \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} R(Y_t^{(a)}) \right\}^2.$$

One should think of $\pi^*(\cdot; \tau)$ the policy one *would* implement if abundant task data, τ , was available. This could involve fitting a model, adding prompt tokens to condition a language model, or maximizing hindsight performance. This policy fitting could also incorporate various desirable constraints on the policy, including resource or fairness constraints. We aim to attain performance competitive with this policy through efficient interactive learning, despite starting without any of the outcomes Y from the task data.

Regret. We consider a best-in-class style regret objective, which is common in the contextual bandit literature [1, 16, 17, 29]. The objective of the agent \mathbb{A} is to make decisions to minimize the per-period regret against $\pi^*(X_t; \tau)$:

$$\Delta(\mathbb{A}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ R(Y_t^{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)}) - R(Y_t^{(A_t)}) \right\} \right]. \quad (2)$$

The expectation above averages over tasks $\tau \sim p^*$ and any randomness in the algorithm used to select actions $A_{1:T}$. This can be interpreted as the long-run per-period regret if the algorithm was deployed across many tasks.

Note that increasing the complexity of the policy class Π^* (in a VC dimension sense) can increase the average reward under the best-fitting policy, $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T R(Y_t^{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)}) \right]$. However, this increased complexity also means that large sample sizes are required to learn $\pi^*(\cdot; \tau)$ accurately and will worsen our regret bound (see Section 5).

3 Key conceptual idea: Missing data view of uncertainty quantification

In this work, we view missing data as the source of the decision-maker’s uncertainty. This contrasts the classical approach of considering unknown model parameters as the source of uncertainty. As we will explore in the following sections, the missing data viewpoint is very amenable to modern deep learning methods, which can be used to train models that are able to impute missing data probabilistically in a calibrated fashion.

3.1 Posterior sampling via imputing missing data

To convey the missing data viewpoint, we first consider an idealized setting in which we have access to the meta task distribution p^* (we discuss how to approximate p^* in Section 4). Using p^* we can form an exact posterior sample for task outcomes $\tau = \{Z_\tau, X_{1:T}, \{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}\}$ given the history \mathcal{H}_t :

$$\hat{\tau}_t \sim p^*(\tau \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{H}_t). \quad (3)$$

Above we probabilistically generate values in τ that have not yet been observed in the history \mathcal{H}_t ; This consists of future contexts, future outcomes, and outcomes from previous timesteps for actions that were not selected.




Figure 2: At each decision time, the agent imputes missing outcomes and uses the imputed dataset to fit a policy to select actions.

With this exact posterior sample of the task outcomes $\hat{\tau}_t$, we can use it to form posterior samples of any statistic computed using $\hat{\tau}_t$. In particular, we are interested in sampling from the posterior distribution of the fitted policy $\pi^*(\cdot; \tau)$, which can be computed by finding the fitted policy for the sampled task dataset $\hat{\tau}_t$, i.e., $\pi^*(\cdot; \hat{\tau}_t)$. Obtaining posterior samples of a best-fitting policy is a common subroutine used in Bayesian decision-making algorithms [27, 50, 52]. Thus, the posterior sampling via generation easily integrates with these existing contextual bandit algorithms.

In this work, we focus on Thompson sampling [49, 60], i.e., probability matching, which selects actions according to the posterior probability that they are optimal. Thompson sampling can be implemented with a single posterior sample per decision time. Specifically, at decision time t , after sampling $\hat{\tau}_t$ as in (3), Thompson sampling fits the policy $\pi^*(\cdot; \hat{\tau}_t)$, and selects the action $A_t \leftarrow \pi^*(X_t; \hat{\tau}_t)$. See Figure 2 for a depiction. Under this generative version of Thompson sampling, the policies in Π^* that are optimal under some likely generation of $\hat{\tau}_t$ have a chance of being selected. Once no plausible sample of missing outcome $\hat{\tau}_t$ could result in an action being optimal, it is essentially written off. See Algorithm 1 for pseudocode for Thompson sampling via generation.

Algorithm 1 Thompson sampling via generation

Require: Imputation model p , actions \mathcal{A}_T , task input Z_T .

- 1: **for** $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ **do**
 - 2: Observe context X_t and append it to \mathcal{H}_t
 - 3: Generate / sample $\hat{\tau}_t \sim p(\tau \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{H}_t)$
 - 4: Fit the policy $\pi^*(\cdot; \hat{\tau}_t)$
 - 5: Select the action $A_t \leftarrow \pi^*(X_t; \hat{\tau}_t)$
 - 6: Observe outcome $Y_t \leftarrow Y_t^{(A_t)}$ from action A_t .
 - 7: Update history $\mathcal{H}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{H}_t \cup \{(X_t, A_t, Y_t)\}$
 - 8: **end for**
-

3.2 Regret: Thompson sampling via generation with p^*

This section presents a regret bound for Algorithm 1 with the perfect imputation model, p^* from (1). Our work develops a novel analysis of contextual Thompson sampling, which is applicable to infinite policy classes Π^* with finite VC dimension. Our VC dimension bound resembles those from adversarial bandits, but for the first time, we show we can derive this using an information theoretic analysis.

Notation. For any random variables X, Y (for Y discrete), we denote the conditional entropy of Y given X using $H(Y | X)$; Note $H(Y | X)$ is a constant, i.e., $H(Y | X) = \mathbb{E}[\sum_y \mathbb{P}(Y = y | X) \log \mathbb{P}(Y = y | X) dy]$. Additionally, we use the following notation to define the best fitting policy evaluated at contexts $X_{1:T}$:

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) := \{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)\}_{t=1}^T. \quad (4)$$

Regret bound. Proposition 1 states our regret bound for Algorithm 1 when the imputation model is p^* from (1).

Proposition 1 (Regret for Thompson sampling via generation with p^*). *Let Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. Under Thompson sampling via generation (Algorithm 1) with the imputation model p^* , denoted $\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p^*)$,*

$$\Delta(\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p^*)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}| \cdot H(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) | Z_\tau, X_{1:T})}{2T}}.$$

Proposition 1 follows as a direct corollary of our more general result (Theorem 1 in Section 5). What is notable in the regret bound from this result is that i) it quantifies the benefit of incorporating prior information Z , and ii) it automatically applies to infinite policy classes since it only depends on the entropy of the fitted policy evaluated at a finite number of contexts, $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) := \{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)\}_{t=1}^T$.

Relation to other information theoretic regret bounds. Our regret bound notably improves on prior work, which develop Bayesian regret bounds for contextual Thompson sampling. First, our bound can be applied broadly, while approaches like Neu et al. [42] depends on the entropy of a latent environment parameter, which is only applicable to parametric contextual bandits. Second, the entropy term in our bound $H(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) | Z_\tau, X_{1:T})$ is often notably smaller than those from other contextual Thompson sampling Bayesian regret bounds. Specifically, Min and Russo [38] consider a contextual bandit setting where at decision-time t the algorithm selects a policy to use to choose A_t , prior to observing the context X_t . Their regret depends on the entropy of the optimal policy function, which when translated to our setting is much larger than our entropy term: $H(\{\pi^*(X_t)\}_{t=1}^T | X_{1:T}, Z_\tau) < H(\pi^* | Z_\tau)$; Intuitively, this is saying that the entropy of a policy evaluated at a finite number of contexts is less than the entropy of the entire policy function. Finally, while many information-theoretic analyses for Thompson sampling that generalize beyond multi-armed bandits require arguments that discretize the latent parameter space [14, 21, 38, 42] and utilize cover-number type arguments, our proof approach notably does not require any discretization.

Upper bounding the condition entropy using VC dimension. We can construct a coarse upper bound for the entropy $H(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) | Z_\tau, X_{1:T})$ using the VC-dimension of the policy class Π^* . This bound is coarse because the VC-dimension is a worst case quantity that has to with the number of possible assignments of actions to contexts. In contrast, entropy reflects that based on the task distribution (learned from past tasks) and the information Z (e.g. article texts), many assignments may be extremely unlikely to be optimal. We formalize VC dimension upper bound in Lemma 1 below, which holds by the Sauer-Shelah lemma [54, 57].

Lemma 1 (VC dimension bound on entropy). *For any binary¹ action policy class Π^* ,*

$$H(\pi^*(X_{1:T}) \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T}) \leq H(\pi^*(X_{1:T}) \mid X_{1:T}) = O(\text{VCdim}(\Pi^*) \log T).$$

Using our coarser upper bound on the entropy, our regret bound (Proposition 1) resembles adversarial regret bounds that depend on VC dimension, showing for the first time how such a result can be established through information theoretic arguments [6]. Additionally, our rate also resembles standard Bayesian regret bounds for linear contextual bandits [50]; When Π^* is defined by a linear model of dimension d , then $\text{VCdim}(\Pi^*) = d + 1$, so $H(\pi^*(X_{1:T}) \mid X_{1:T}) = O(d \log T)$.

4 Thompson sampling via generation under an imperfect imputation model

In the previous section, we introduced a generative version of Thompson sampling for contextual bandits under the assumption we have access to a perfect imputation model p^* . In this section, we discuss how to practically approximate such an algorithm. First, we pretrain an autoregressive sequence model to predict successive outcomes (Y 's) on historical data $\mathcal{D}^{\text{offline}}$. Then, at decision time, recommendation decisions are made by imputing the missing outcomes in τ with by generating outcomes (\hat{Y} 's) autoregressively from the pretrained sequence model. The offline pretraining allows the algorithm to “meta-learn” a good model for imputing missing outcomes using data from previous tasks.




Figure 3: Offline meta-learning and online decision-making across multiple tasks. Figure is slight modification of one from Cai et al. [8].

Step 1: Offline learning to predict masked outcomes. We train an autoregressive sequence model p_θ , parameterized by $\theta \in \Theta$, to predict missing outcomes, conditioned on the task prior information Z , and limited previously observed context and outcome tuples (X, Y) . This enables us to generate hypothetical completions of the potential outcome table τ later in the online decision-making phase. Formally, this model specifies a probability $p_\theta(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z, X_{1:T}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)})$ of observing outcome $Y_t^{(a)}$ from the next interaction conditioned on the current context X_t , prior information Z , and the previous contexts and outcomes $(X_{1:t-1}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)})$. These one-step conditional probabilities generate a probability distribution over missing task τ outcomes.

¹Note, VC-dimension is defined for binary functions.

Specifically, we use historical data $\mathcal{D}^{\text{offline}}$ to minimize the following loss function, which can be optimized using stochastic gradient descent (Algorithm 2):

$$-\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}^{\text{offline}}|} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{offline}}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \sum_{t=1}^T \log p_\theta(Y_t^{(a)} | Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}) \quad (5)$$

The offline learning procedure can be used with any sequence model class. The quality of the decision-making algorithm depends on the quality of the learned sequence model p_θ ; Our regret bounds (Section 5) formalize this.

Algorithm 2 Offline training of a sequence model

Require: Training data $\mathcal{D}^{\text{offline}}$, model class $\{p_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$

- 1: **while** not converged **do**
 - 2: Sample a mini-batch of tasks $\mathcal{D}^{\text{mini-batch}} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\text{offline}}$
 - 3: Compute loss in (5) using tasks $\tau \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{mini-batch}}$
 (optionally permute the order of $(X_t, Y_t^{(a)})$ tuples)
 - 4: Backpropagate and take gradient step to update p_θ
 - 5: **end while**
-

Optionally, when training to minimize the loss (5), we can permute the order of the tuples $(X_t, Y_t^{(a)})$ over time, since they are exchangeable under Assumption 1. Learning an approximately exchangeable sequence model mirrors recent work on neural processes [19, 25, 31, 43] and prior-data fitted networks [41], connecting also to a long tradition in Bayesian statistics and information theory [5, 13].

Step 2: Online decision-making using the learned sequence model. After a sequence model p_θ is trained offline, it is deployed and used for online decision-making. No additional training of p_θ is needed. Instead the sequence model learns “in-context” by conditioning [7]. We implement generative Thompson sampling (Algorithm 1) by using p_θ to autoregressively generate (impute) missing outcomes in τ for each candidate action $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$, forming τ_t . In the generation procedure, we sample both missing outcomes Y and future contexts X (which is known by Assumption 3). Recall that generative Thompson sampling uses both the observed and generated outcomes, τ_t , to fit a policy and selects the best action according to that policy. Good decision-making relies on the model p_θ matching the meta-bandit task distribution p^* closely (see Section 5).




Figure 4: Posterior sampling via autoregressive generation (Algorithm 3).

Algorithm 3 Posterior sampling via autoregressive generation

Require: Sequence model p_θ , actions \mathcal{A}_τ , history \mathcal{H}_t

- 1: For each $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$, construct $\mathcal{M}^{(a)}$ the set of timesteps $i \in [1: T]$ for which $Y_i^{(a)}$ has not been observed in \mathcal{H}_t
 - 2: For each $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$, construct ordering \prec_a placing observed outcomes before unobserved ones
 - 3: $\hat{X}_{1:t+1} \leftarrow X_{1:t+1}$ (observed contexts from \mathcal{H}_t)
 - 4: Sample future contexts $\hat{X}_{t+1}, \dots, \hat{X}_T$ (Assump. 3)
 - 5: **for** $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$ **do**
 - 6: **for** $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ in order of \prec_a **do**
 - 7: **if** $i \notin \mathcal{M}^{(a)}$ **then**
 - 8: $\hat{Y}_i^{(a)} \leftarrow Y_i^{(a)}$
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: Sample $\hat{Y}_i^{(a)} \sim p_\theta(\cdot \mid Z, \{\hat{X}_j, \hat{Y}_j^{(a)}\}_{j \prec_a i}, \hat{X}_i)$
 - 11: **end if**
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: **Return:** $\hat{\tau}_t \leftarrow \{Z_\tau, \hat{X}_{1:T}, \{\hat{Y}_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau}\}$
-

We formally describe the posterior sampling via autoregressive generation procedure to form samples $\hat{\tau}_t$ in Algorithm 3; This subroutine can be used in line 3 of Algorithm 1 to implement generative Thompson sampling. In Algorithm 3, we use $\mathcal{M}_a \subset \{1, \dots, T\}$ to denote the timesteps t for which $Y_t^{(a)}$ has not been observed. To clarify the order of generating outcomes in $\hat{\tau}_t$, we permute observed outcomes to always precede missing ones; this matches the ordering used for generation in Figure 4. Specifically, we use \prec_a to denote this ordering for an action $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$; We use $i \prec_a j$ whenever either (a) $i < j$ or (b) $i \notin \mathcal{M}_a$, but $j \in \mathcal{M}_a$.

5 Regret of generative Thompson sampling with an imperfect imputation model

In this section, we present a generalization of the regret bound for the Thompson sampling via generation algorithm from Section 3.2. Our generalization is notable because the sequence model only affects the regret bound through its offline prediction loss, which means any sequence model class can be used—even sequence models that are not exactly exchangeable. Moreover, our result shows that the lower offline prediction loss of the sequence model p_θ translates into a better regret guarantee. Our result effectively *reduces a difficult online decision-making problem to one of training an accurate sequence prediction model*.

Specifically, our regret bound will depend on the following population-level version of the training loss from (5) (the expectation below averages over the task distribution p^*):

$$\ell(p_\theta) = -\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \sum_{t=1}^T \log p_\theta(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}) \right]. \quad (6)$$

Theorem 1 (Regret bound for generative Thompson sampling with an imperfect imputation model). *Let Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. Under generative Thompson sampling (Algorithm 1)*

using p_θ , $\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p_\theta)$,

$$\Delta(\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p_\theta)) \leq \underbrace{\sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot H(\pi^*(X_{1:T}) \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T})}{2T}}}_{\text{Regret bound for Thompson sampling}} + \underbrace{\sqrt{2\{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}}}_{\text{Penalty for sub-optimal prediction}}. \quad (7)$$

Comparing the results of Theorem 1 and Proposition 1, we can interpret the “cost” of using an imperfect imputation model p_θ in generative sequence modeling instead of p^* as $\sqrt{2\{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}}$. In other words, the regret is penalized depending on how well p_θ approximates p^* . This penalty term, which does not vanish as T grows, is unavoidable in bandits; see Appendix A.1 for further discussion. Also, we do not attempt to mathematically characterize when making the gap $\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)$ small via offline learning is possible, since it would involve stringent and unrealistic conditions derived from loose generalization bounds for neural networks. Model performance “scaling-laws” with the quantity of training data has been studied with great interest empirically [22].

Novelty and proof approach. Note that Proposition 1 itself (a direct corollary of Theorem 1) is novel due to the conditional entropy term we introduce, which quantifies the benefit of using prior information Z and can be bounded using VC dimension (Section 3.2). What is particularly novel about Theorem 1 is that we are able to carry out our analysis even in cases where the imputation model p_θ is misspecified and does not correspond to any proper way of performing Bayesian inference.

In our previous work [8], we prove a regret bound with a similar prediction loss penalty for model misspecification for a generative Thompson sampling algorithm for a multi-armed, non-contextual bandit algorithm. Although they also use an information theoretic analysis, in their simpler setting without contexts, they do not need to introduce the concept of a general “oracle” policy fitting procedure and as a result do not provide an information theoretic analysis that extends to infinite policy classes as we do. Moreover, we were not able to directly build on the proof approach used in Cai et al. [8] because they critically rely on the fact that under p^* , unobserved outcomes Y are exchangeable given the history; However, for contextual bandits, unobserved outcomes Y are not exchangeable conditional on observing their associated contexts X .

Wen et al. [64] also consider a non-contextual, multi-armed Thompson sampling algorithm that incorporates a generative outcome model. Our algorithm is not a generalization of theirs, since they require specifying a prior over latent environment parameters. Their regret bound allows for the generative model to be misspecified and requires a history-dependent KL divergence term to be small, which is different from our prediction loss penalty. Despite these differences, we carefully integrate bounding techniques from Wen et al. [64] in proving our contextual bandit regret bounds. What is surprising is that their information theoretic bounding techniques developed for multi-armed, non-contextual bandits are relevant for contextual bandits with infinite policy classes, which has been of independent interest in the literature, even for correctly specified model settings [38, 42].

6 Related work

Decision-making with sequence models. Many recent methods use sequence models in decision-making involve imitation learning, i.e., from demonstrations learn to mimic an expert’s actions [12, 23, 24]. Lee et al. [32] discuss how these approaches can be used even without access to expert demonstrations, as long as one is able to fit an approximate “oracle” policy from offline bandit

environments. Our work differs significantly from Lee et al. [32] and other imitation learning based works because our sequence models are used to sample future *outcomes*, instead of predicting optimal actions. Several recent works also use sequence models to generate future rewards for decision-making [18, 36, 39, 41, 43]. Mukherjee et al. [39] find that their approach which trains sequence models to predict future rewards performs better than decision pre-trained transformers trained to predict the optimal action [32]. Future work is needed to develop a more complete understanding of the trade-offs between decision-making algorithms that use sequence models to approximate future rewards versus predict optimal next actions.

Our work differs from most previous works that use sequence models that predict future rewards for decision-making. Specifically, most previous works do not use autoregressive generation to quantify uncertainty [18, 39, 41, 43]; Instead they employ strategies that only model uncertainty in the single next timestep’s reward under each action, e.g., by using softmax sampling [39]. We find empirically that alternative (non-autoregressive) ways of sampling from the sequence model can lead to inferior decision-making performance (Figure 5).

(Approximate) Thompson sampling with neural networks. Implementing Thompson sampling with neural network models has been a longstanding challenge. Riquelme et al. [48] investigated a variety of Bayesian uncertainty quantification techniques for neural networks to use with Thompson sampling; They find that linear Thompson sampling with context features embedded with a neural network stood out over many more complex methods. Since then, others have investigated other methods including Thompson sampling when directly modeling uncertainty in neural network weights [63, 66]. Perhaps the foremost approach currently in the literature is implementing Thompson sampling using deep ensembles and related approaches designed to reduce computational overhead [15, 34, 35, 37, 44, 45, 45, 47]. Our generative Thompson sampling algorithm is critically different from ensembling because a) through offline meta-training we are able to learn informed priors from complex task-specific information Z (like text) with benefits that are explicitly reflected in our bound, and b) our approach allows the sequence model to learn *in-context* avoiding retraining online using gradient updates on subsampled data, which is sensitive to learning rates.

7 Experiments

Problem settings. We consider two meta-bandit settings. In both, $T = 500$, $|\mathcal{A}| = 10$, outcomes Y are binary, and $R(y) = y$. Our SYNTHETIC setting uses a Bayesian logistic regression data generating process with a 2-dimensional task vector Z and 5-dimensional contexts X . Our SEMI-SYNTHETIC setting is designed to mimic a cold-start news recommendation setting and uses the MICROSOFT NEWS DATASET [65]; Here Z consists of the article headlines, contexts X are 5-dimensional user features, and Y represents whether or not the user clicked on a recommended article. See Appendix B.1 for more details.

Bandit algorithms. The sequence model used in generative Thompson sampling (TS-Gen) is a simple multi-layer perceptron-based sequence model which takes as input the prior information Z , a summary statistic for the history, and the current context X , and outputs a distribution over Y . In the SEMI-SYNTHETIC setting, we additionally embed the article text Z using DistilBERT [53] before feeding it into our sequence model. For the policy class Π^* , we choose a simple logistic policy class for our SYNTHETIC setting and a XGBoost-like, tree based policy class for our SEMI-SYNTHETIC setting. We compute regret against the best fitting policy in each class for the respective setting. We further examine the choice of policy class in App. B.5.




Figure 5: Cumulative regret for synthetic (left) and semisynthetic (right) settings, averaged over 500 bandit tasks each. TS-Gen performs well compared to other algorithms, including others that use the same sequence model p_θ (Greedy, Epsilon-Greedy, Softmax). Regret is against the best fitting policy in Π^* (logistic for synthetic, and tree-based for semisynthetic). Error bars (barely visible) denote ± 1 s.e.

We compare to several baselines. Three baselines use the same sequence model p_θ as TS-Gen, but use alternative, non-autoregressive ways to select the next action: 1) GREEDY deterministically selects the actions predicted by p_θ to have the greatest next reward. 2) EPSILON-GREEDY acts the same as GREEDY with probability 0.9 and with probability 0.1 selects an action uniformly at random. 3) SOFTMAX uses softmax/Boltzmann exploration [11], which is akin to the PreDeTor- τ algorithm from Mukherjee et al. [40]. Finally, we also compare to linear Thompson sampling (TS-Linear) with an uninformative prior [3] and LinUCB [33].

Results. As shown in Figure 5, TS-Gen significantly outperforms other approaches in both settings. Our advantage over LinUCB and TS-Linear attributable to our meta-learning procedure and better use of prior information Z . Moreover, TS-Gen’s superior performance compared to other algorithms that use the same p_θ sequence model to make decisions supports the benefit of autoregressive generative approach to uncertainty quantification and decision-making. Also, we find, as suggested by Theorem 1, the lower the offline prediction loss of a sequence model, the lower the regret of TS-Gen with that sequence model (Appendix B.4).

8 Discussion

We introduce a generative Thompson sampling algorithm for contextual bandits that is compatible with any generative model with low offline prediction loss and any policy fitting procedure. We prove a regret bound for our algorithm that allows for misspecification of the generative model, and also provides insights into information theoretic analyses for contextual bandits, which may be of independent interest.

Directions for future investigation include i) developing methods to guide how one might choose an appropriate policy class [17], ii) quantifying how much offline data is needed to train a high quality generative sequence model (which includes settings where the offline data is collected by a behavior policy), iii) investigating the impact of approximating the context distribution when it is unknown, iv) exploring if the generative approach to modelling uncertainty can be extended to more difficult decision-making settings, like Markov decision processes.

References

- [1] Alekh Agarwal, Haipeng Luo, Behnam Neyshabur, and Robert E Schapire. Corraling a band of bandit algorithms. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 12–38. PMLR, 2017.
- [2] Shipra Agrawal and Navin Goyal. Analysis of thompson sampling for the multi-armed bandit problem. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 39–1. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2012.
- [3] Shipra Agrawal and Navin Goyal. Thompson sampling for contextual bandits with linear payoffs. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 127–135. PMLR, 2013.
- [4] Nikolay Babakov, David Dale, Ilya Gusev, Irina Krotova, and Alexander Panchenko. Don’t lose the message while paraphrasing: A study on content preserving style transfer. In *Natural Language Processing and Information Systems*, pages 47–61, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland. ISBN 978-3-031-35320-8.
- [5] Andrew Barron, Jorma Rissanen, and Bin Yu. The minimum description length principle in coding and modeling. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 1998.
- [6] Alina Beygelzimer, John Langford, Lihong Li, Lev Reyzin, and Robert Schapire. Contextual bandit algorithms with supervised learning guarantees. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 19–26, 2011.
- [7] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2020.
- [8] Tiffany (Tianhui) Cai, Hongseok Namkoong, Daniel Russo, and Kelly W Zhang. Active exploration via autoregressive generation of missing data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19466*, 2024.
- [9] Leonardo Cella, Alessandro Lazaric, and Massimiliano Pontil. Meta-learning with stochastic linear bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020.
- [10] Leonardo Cella, Karim Lounici, and Massimiliano Pontil. Meta representation learning with contextual linear bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15100*, 2022.
- [11] Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, Claudio Gentile, Gábor Lugosi, and Gergely Neu. Boltzmann exploration done right. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [12] Lili Chen, Kevin Lu, Aravind Rajeswaran, Kimin Lee, Aditya Grover, Misha Laskin, Pieter Abbeel, Aravind Srinivas, and Igor Mordatch. Decision transformer: Reinforcement learning via sequence modeling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [13] A Philip Dawid. Present position and potential developments: Some personal views statistical theory the prequential approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (General)*, 147(2):278–290, 1984.
- [14] Shi Dong and Benjamin Van Roy. An information-theoretic analysis for thompson sampling with many actions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [15] Vikranth Dwaracherla, Xiuyuan Lu, Morteza Ibrahimi, Ian Osband, Zheng Wen, and Benjamin Van Roy. Hypermodels for exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07464*, 2020.

- [16] Dylan J Foster, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Haipeng Luo. Model selection for contextual bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [17] Dylan J Foster, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Haipeng Luo. Open problem: Model selection for contextual bandits. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3842–3846. PMLR, 2020.
- [18] Marta Garnelo, Dan Rosenbaum, Christopher Maddison, Tiago Ramalho, David Saxton, Murray Shanahan, Yee Whye Teh, Danilo Rezende, and SM Ali Eslami. Conditional neural processes. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1704–1713. PMLR, 2018.
- [19] Marta Garnelo, Jonathan Schwarz, Dan Rosenbaum, Fabio Viola, Danilo J Rezende, SM Eslami, and Yee Whye Teh. Neural processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01622*, 2018.
- [20] Ethan Goan and Clinton Fookes. Bayesian neural networks: An introduction and survey. *Case Studies in Applied Bayesian Data Science: CIRM Jean-Morlet Chair, Fall 2018*, 2020.
- [21] Amaury Gouverneur, Borja Rodríguez Gálvez, Tobias Oechtering, and Mikael Skoglund. An information-theoretic analysis of thompson sampling for logistic bandits. In *NeurIPS Workshop on Bayesian Decision-making and Uncertainty*, 2024.
- [22] Tom Henighan, Jared Kaplan, Mor Katz, Mark Chen, Christopher Hesse, Jacob Jackson, Heewoo Jun, Tom B Brown, Prafulla Dhariwal, Scott Gray, et al. Scaling laws for autoregressive generative modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14701*, 2020.
- [23] Ahmed Hussein, Mohamed Medhat Gaber, Eyad Elyan, and Chrisina Jayne. Imitation learning: A survey of learning methods. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 50(2):1–35, 2017.
- [24] Michael Janner, Qiyang Li, and Sergey Levine. Offline reinforcement learning as one big sequence modeling problem. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:1273–1286, 2021.
- [25] Saurav Jha, Dong Gong, Xuesong Wang, Richard E Turner, and Lina Yao. The neural process family: Survey, applications and perspectives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00517*, 2022.
- [26] E Niclas Jonsson and Mats O Karlsson. Automated covariate model building within nonmem. *Pharmaceutical research*, 15:1463–1468, 1998.
- [27] Emilie Kaufmann, Olivier Cappé, and Aurélien Garivier. On bayesian upper confidence bounds for bandit problems. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 592–600. PMLR, 2012.
- [28] Branislav Kveton, Mikhail Konobeev, Manzil Zaheer, Chih-wei Hsu, Martin Mladenov, Craig Boutilier, and Csaba Szepesvari. Meta-thompson sampling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5884–5893. PMLR, 2021.
- [29] John Langford and Tong Zhang. The epoch-greedy algorithm for contextual multi-armed bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 20(1):96–1, 2007.
- [30] Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge, 2019.
- [31] Hyungi Lee, Eunggu Yun, Giung Nam, Edwin Fong, and Juho Lee. Martingale posterior neural processes, 2023.

- [32] Jonathan Lee, Annie Xie, Aldo Pacchiano, Yash Chandak, Chelsea Finn, Ofir Nachum, and Emma Brunskill. In-context decision-making from supervised pretraining. In *ICML Workshop on New Frontiers in Learning, Control, and Dynamical Systems*, 2023.
- [33] Lihong Li, Wei Chu, John Langford, and Robert E Schapire. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*, pages 661–670, 2010.
- [34] Yingru Li, Jiawei Xu, Baoxiang Wang, and Zhi-Quan Luo. Scalable exploration via ensemble++. Preprint. An early version "Adaptive Foundation Models for Online Decisions: HyperAgent with Fast Incremental Uncertainty Estimation" presented at ICML 2024 Workshops: (1) "Aligning Reinforcement Learning Experimentalists and Theorists"; (2) "Automated Reinforcement Learning: Exploring Meta-Learning, AutoML, and LLMs".
- [35] Yingru Li, Jiawei Xu, Lei Han, and Zhi-Quan Luo. Q-Star Meets Scalable Posterior Sampling: Bridging Theory and Practice via HyperAgent. In *The 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2024.
- [36] Che-Yu Liu and Lihong Li. On the prior sensitivity of thompson sampling. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 321–336. Springer, 2016.
- [37] Xiuyuan Lu and Benjamin Van Roy. Ensemble sampling. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [38] Seungki Min and Daniel Russo. An information-theoretic analysis of nonstationary bandit learning. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2023.
- [39] Subhojyoti Mukherjee, Josiah P Hanna, Qiaomin Xie, and Robert Nowak. Pretraining decision transformers with reward prediction for in-context multi-task structured bandit learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05064*, 2024.
- [40] Subhojyoti Mukherjee, Josiah P. Hanna, Qiaomin Xie, and Robert Nowak. Pretraining decision transformers with reward prediction for in-context multi-task structured bandit learning, 2024.
- [41] Samuel Müller, Noah Hollmann, Sebastian Pineda Arango, Josif Grabocka, and Frank Hutter. Transformers can do bayesian inference. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022x.
- [42] Gergely Neu, Iuliia Olkhovskaia, Matteo Papini, and Ludovic Schwartz. Lifting the information ratio: An information-theoretic analysis of thompson sampling for contextual bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:9486–9498, 2022.
- [43] Tung Nguyen and Aditya Grover. Transformer neural processes: Uncertainty-aware meta learning via sequence modeling. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022.
- [44] Ian Osband and Benjamin Van Roy. Bootstrapped thompson sampling and deep exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.00300*, 2015.
- [45] Ian Osband, Zheng Wen, Seyed Mohammad Asghari, Vikranth Dwaracherla, Morteza Ibrahimi, Xiuyuan Lu, and Benjamin Van Roy. Approximate thompson sampling via epistemic neural networks. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. PMLR, 2023.

- [46] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- [47] Chao Qin, Zheng Wen, Xiuyuan Lu, and Benjamin Van Roy. An analysis of ensemble sampling. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [48] Carlos Riquelme, George Tucker, and Jasper Snoek. Deep bayesian bandits showdown: An empirical comparison of bayesian deep networks for thompson sampling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [49] Daniel Russo and Benjamin Van Roy. An information-theoretic analysis of thompson sampling. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(68):1–30, 2016.
- [50] Daniel Russo and Benjamin Van Roy. Learning to optimize via information-directed sampling. *Operations Research*, 66(1):230–252, 2018.
- [51] Daniel Russo, Benjamin Van Roy, Abbas Kazerouni, Ian Osband, and Zheng Wen. A tutorial on thompson sampling, 2020.
- [52] Ilya O Ryzhov, Warren B Powell, and Peter I Frazier. The knowledge gradient algorithm for a general class of online learning problems. *Operations Research*, 60(1):180–195, 2012.
- [53] Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*, 2019.
- [54] Norbert Sauer. On the density of families of sets. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 13(1):145–147, 1972.
- [55] Bhadrish Savani. distilbert-base-uncased-sentiment-sst2, 2022. URL <https://huggingface.co/bhadrish-savani/distilbert-base-uncased-sentiment-sst2>.
- [56] Burr Settles. Active learning literature survey. 2009.
- [57] Saharon Shelah. A combinatorial problem; stability and order for models and theories in infinitary languages. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 41(1):247–261, 1972.
- [58] Max Simchowitz, Christopher Tosh, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Daniel J Hsu, Thodoris Lykouris, Miro Dudik, and Robert E Schapire. Bayesian decision-making under misspecified priors with applications to meta-learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [59] Richard S Sutton. Reinforcement learning: An introduction. *A Bradford Book*, 2018.
- [60] William R Thompson. On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples. *Biometrika*, 25(3-4):285–294, 1933.
- [61] Dustin Tran, Jasper Snoek, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Practical uncertainty estimation and out-of-distribution robustness in deep learning. *NeurIPS Tutorial, Google Brain*, 2020.
- [62] Runzhe Wan, Lin Ge, and Rui Song. Metadata-based multi-task bandits with bayesian hierarchical models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:29655–29668, 2021.

- [63] Zhendong Wang and Mingyuan Zhou. Thompson sampling via local uncertainty. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 10115–10125, 2020.
- [64] Zheng Wen, Ian Osband, Chao Qin, Xiuyuan Lu, Morteza Ibrahimi, Vikranth Dwaracherla, Mohammad Asghari, and Benjamin Van Roy. From predictions to decisions: The importance of joint predictive distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.09224*, 2021.
- [65] Fangzhao Wu, Ying Qiao, Jiun-Hung Chen, Chuhan Wu, Tao Qi, Jianxun Lian, Danyang Liu, Xing Xie, Jianfeng Gao, Winnie Wu, et al. Mind: A large-scale dataset for news recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3597–3606, 2020.
- [66] Weitong Zhang, Dongruo Zhou, Lihong Li, and Quanquan Gu. Neural thompson sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00827*, 2020.
- [67] Zhi-Hua Zhou and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Semi-supervised learning. *Machine Learning*, 2021.

A Theory

A.1 Relationship to Thompson sampling with misspecified priors and lower bounds.

In our per-period regret bound from Theorem 1, the “penalty” for using a suboptimal sequence model p_θ does not vanish as T grows. Since frequentist regret for Thompson sampling do not incorporate such non-vanishing terms, one might interpret this as indicating our result is not tight. This interpretation is significantly mistaken. Standard frequentist regret bounds for Thompson sampling *critically* assume diffuse, non-informative priors [2, 3], which ensure that each arm is explored sufficiently. It turns out that Thompson Sampling can be highly sensitive to misspecification in the prior, especially if under the prior the probability of the optimal action being the best is too low, so the algorithm has a high probability of under exploring the best action. Specifically, previous work has shown that the per period regret may be non-vanishing for a worst case environment and choice of prior [36, 58]. Additionally, Cai et al. [8] show that for a multi-arm (non-contextual) bandit version of the generative Thompson sampling algorithm that the penalty for using an imperfect sequence model depends on $\sqrt{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)}$ in a way that is in general unavoidable.

A.2 Notation

We first introduce some notation we use throughout this Appendix.

- Recall that by definition

$$\Delta(\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p_\theta)) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p_\theta)} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T R(Y_t^{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)}) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T R(Y_t^{(A_t)}) \right].$$

Throughout proof, we will omit the $\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p_\theta)$ subscript on the expectation, i.e., we use $\mathbb{E}[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p_\theta)}[\cdot]$.

- Additionally, throughout this proof we use \mathbb{E}_t to denote expectations conditional on \mathcal{H}_t and $X_{1:T}$, i.e., we use

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T}]. \quad (8)$$

Note that this means $\mathbb{E}_1[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}_1, X_{1:T}] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid Z, X_{1:T}]$.

- We use $H(Y)$ to denote the entropy of a discrete random variable Y , i.e., $H(Y) = \sum_y \mathbb{P}(Y = y) \log \mathbb{P}(Y = y) dy$. We also use $H_t(Y) = H(Y \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T})$ to denote the entropy of Y conditional on \mathcal{H}_t and $X_{1:T}$; Note that is standard in information theory, $H_t(Y)$ is *not* a random variable, rather, it marginalizes over \mathcal{H}_t and $X_{1:T}$:

$$H_t(Y) := H(Y \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_y \mathbb{P}(Y = y \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T}) \log \mathbb{P}(Y = y \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T}) dy \right];$$

Above, the outer expectation marginalizes over the history \mathcal{H}_t and $X_{1:T}$.

- We also use $I(Z; Y)$ to denote the mutual information between some random variables Z and Y , i.e., $I(Z; Y) = \int_z \int_y \mathbb{P}(Z = z, Y = y) \log \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z=z, Y=y)}{\mathbb{P}(Z=z)\mathbb{P}(Y=y)} dz dy$. We further use $I_t(Z; Y)$ to denote the mutual information between Z and Y conditional on \mathcal{H}_t and $X_{1:T}$ (where again

we marginalize over \mathcal{H}_t and $X_{1:T}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} I_t(Z; Y) &:= I(Z; Y \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_z \int_y \mathbb{P}(Z = z, Y = y \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T}) \log \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z = z, Y = y \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T})}{\mathbb{P}(Z = z \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T}) \mathbb{P}(Y = y \mid \mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T})} dx dy \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Above, the outer expectation marginalizes over the history \mathcal{H}_t and $X_{1:T}$.

A.3 VC Dimension

Lemma 1 (VC dimension bound on entropy). *For any binary¹ action policy class Π^* ,*

$$H(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T}) \leq H(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) \mid X_{1:T}) = O(\text{VCdim}(\Pi^*) \log T).$$

Proof. The first inequality $H(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T}) \leq H(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) \mid X_{1:T})$ holds by the chain rule for entropy.

The second big O equality result holds by the Sauer-Shelah lemma [54, 57]. Specifically, by the Sauer-Shelah lemma if a function class has VC dimension k , then that function class can produce most $\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{T}{i} = O(T^k)$ different labelings of any T points. Thus, since a coarse upper bound on the entropy of a random variable is the log of the number of unique values that variable can take, we get that $H(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) \mid X_{1:T}) \leq \log \sum_{i=0}^{\text{VCdim}(\Pi^*)} \binom{T}{i} = O(\text{VCdim}(\Pi^*) \log T)$. \square

A.4 Lemma 2: To minimize loss p_θ needs to approximate p^* .

The next lemma is a standard result connecting the excess expected loss of a sequence model p_θ to its KL divergence from the true sequence model p^* . Recall, the expected loss of a sequence model p_θ is denoted $\ell(p_\theta)$, defined in (6). To (nearly) minimize loss, p_θ the learner needs to closely approximate the true sequence model p^* .

Lemma 2 (Decomposing loss under p_θ). *Under Assumptions 1 and 3, for the loss ℓ as defined in (6),*

$$\ell(p_\theta) = \ell(p^*) + |\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}} \left(p^*(Y_{1:T}^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T}) \parallel p_\theta(Y_{1:T}^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T}) \right) \right].$$

Proof. By the definition of the expected loss in (6),

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*) &= \mathbb{E} \left[- \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \sum_{t=1}^T \log p_\theta(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}) \right] - \left[- \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \sum_{t=1}^T \log p^*(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} -|\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ \log p_\theta(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}) - \log p^*(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}) \right\} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} |\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}} \left(p^*(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}) \parallel p_\theta(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

¹Note, VC-dimension is defined for binary functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underbrace{=}_{(c)} |\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(p^* \left(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)} \right) \parallel p_\theta \left(Y_t^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)} \right) \right) \right] \\
& + |\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(p^* \left(X_t \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t-1}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)} \right) \parallel p_\theta \left(X_t \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:t-1}, Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)} \right) \right) \right]}_{=0} \\
& \underbrace{=}_{(d)} |\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(p^* \left(Y_{1:T}^{(a)}, X_{1:T} \mid Z_\tau \right) \parallel p_\theta \left(Y_{1:T}^{(a)}, X_{1:T} \mid Z_\tau \right) \right) \right] \\
& \underbrace{=}_{(e)} |\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(p^* \left(Y_{1:T}^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T} \right) \parallel p_\theta \left(Y_{1:T}^{(a)} \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T} \right) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Above, equality (a) uses Assumption 2 (Independence across actions). Equality (b) uses the definition of KL divergence. Equality (c) uses Assumption 1 (Contextual bandit environment) and Assumption 3 (Context distribution is known). Equality (d) uses the chain rule for KL divergence. Equality (e) holds by the chain rule for KL divergence and since $\mathbb{E} [\text{D}_{\text{KL}} (p^* (X_{1:T} \mid Z_\tau) \parallel p_\theta (X_{1:T} \mid Z_\tau))] = 0$ by Assumption 3 (Context distribution is known). \square

A.5 Lemma 3: Action selection under perfect vs. imperfect imputation models.

Lemma 3 (KL Divergence in next action distribution). *Under Assumption 3, for any t ,*

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{D}_{\text{KL}} (\mathbb{P}_t (\pi^* (X_t; \tau) = \cdot) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t (A_t = \cdot))] \leq |\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot \{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}.$$

Proof. Note the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [\text{D}_{\text{KL}} (\mathbb{P}_t (\pi^* (X_t; \tau) = \cdot) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t (A_t = \cdot))] \\
& \underbrace{\leq}_{(a)} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{p^*} \left(\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid X_{1:T}, \mathcal{H}_t \right) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{p_\theta} \left(\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid X_{1:T}, \mathcal{H}_t \right) \right) \right] \\
& \underbrace{\leq}_{(b)} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{p^*} \left(\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid X_{1:T}, Z_\tau \right) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{p_\theta} \left(\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid X_{1:T}, Z_\tau \right) \right) \right] \\
& \underbrace{\leq}_{(c)} |\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{p^*} \left(Y_{1:T}^{(a)} \mid X_{1:T}, Z_\tau \right) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{p_\theta} \left(Y_{1:T}^{(a)} \mid X_{1:T}, Z_\tau \right) \right) \right] \underbrace{\leq}_{(d)} \{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Above,

- Inequality (a) holds because $\pi^*(X_t; \tau)$ and A_t are both derived by applying the same function to the outcomes $\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau}$.
- Inequality (b) holds because by the chain rule for KL divergence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{p^*} \left(\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid X_{1:T}, Z_\tau \right) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{p_\theta} \left(\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid X_{1:T}, Z_\tau \right) \right) \\
& = \text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{p^*} \left(\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid X_{1:T}, \mathcal{H}_t \right) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{p_\theta} \left(\{Y_{1:T}^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mid X_{1:T}, \mathcal{H}_t \right) \right) \\
& + \text{D}_{\text{KL}} (\mathbb{P}_{p^*} (\mathcal{H}_t \mid X_{1:T}, Z_\tau) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{p_\theta} (\mathcal{H}_t \mid X_{1:T}, Z_\tau)),
\end{aligned}$$

and the KL divergence is non-negative.

- Inequality (c) holds by Assumption 2 (Independence across actions).
- Inequality (d) holds by Lemma 2 (Decomposing loss under p_θ).

\square

A.6 Lemma 4: Mutual information equivalency.

Lemma 4 (Mutual information equivalency).

$$\begin{aligned} I_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau); (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t)) \\ = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a, A \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a) \mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = A) \cdot \text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(a)} \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = A) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(a)}) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} I_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau); (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t)) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} I_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau); Y_t^{(A_t)} \mid A_t) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a) I_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau); Y_t^{(a)} \mid A_t = a) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a) I_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau); Y_t^{(a)}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = A) \text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(a)} \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = A) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(a)}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Above, equality (a) holds since $\pi^*(X_t; \tau)$ and A_t are independent conditional on $\mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T}$. Equality (b) holds by the definition of conditional mutual information. Equality (c) holds because $Y_t^{(a)}$ and $\pi^*(X_t; \tau)$ are independent of A_t conditional on $\mathcal{H}_t, X_{1:T}$. Equality (d) holds by the KL divergence form of mutual information. \square

A.7 Lemma 5: Bounding sum of mutual information terms.

Lemma 5 (Bounding sum of mutual information terms).

$$\sum_{t=1}^T I_t \left(\pi^*(X_{1:T}); (A_t, Y_t^{(A_t)}) \right) \leq H(\pi^*(X_{1:T}) \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T}).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T I_t \left(\pi^*(X_{1:T}); (A_t, Y_t^{(A_t)}) \right) &\stackrel{(i)}{=} I_1(\pi^*(X_{1:T}); (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t)_{t=1}^T) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} H_1(\pi^*(X_{1:T})) - H_1(\pi^*(X_{1:T}) \mid (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t)_{t=1}^T) \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} H_1(\pi^*(X_{1:T})) \stackrel{(iv)}{=} H(\pi^*(X_{1:T}) \mid Z_\tau, X_{1:T}). \end{aligned}$$

Above, equality (i) holds by the chain rule for mutual information. Equality (ii) holds by the entropy formulation of mutual information. Equality (iii) holds since the entropy is always non-negative. Equality (iv) holds by the definition of H_1 , which is the entropy conditional on $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{Z_\tau\}$ and $X_{1:T}$. \square

A.8 Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1 (TS-Gen regret bound). *We use ℓ as defined in (6). Under Assumptions 1, 2, and 3, the regret of the TS-Gen algorithm is bounded as follows:*

$$\Delta(\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p\theta)) \leq \underbrace{\sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot H(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) \mid Z, X_{1:T})}{2T}}}_{\text{Regret bound for Thompson sampling}} + \underbrace{\sqrt{2\{\ell(p\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}}}_{\text{Penalty for sub-optimal prediction}}.$$

Recall from (4) that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) := \{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)\}_{t=1}^T$.

Proof. Note that by the law of iterated expectations,

$$\Delta(\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T R(Y_t^{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)}) - R(Y_t^{(A_t)}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)}) - R(Y_t^{(A_t)}) \right] \right].$$

Consider the following for any $t \in [1: T]$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)}) - R(Y_t^{(A_t)}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a) \cdot \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a \right] + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a) \cdot \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \mid A_t = a \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a) \cdot \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a \right] + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a) \cdot \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a) \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a)} \left(\mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a \right] - \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \right] \right) \\ &+ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \left(\sqrt{\mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a)} - \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a)} \right) \\ &\quad \left(\sqrt{\mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a \right] + \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \right] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sqrt{|\mathcal{A}_\tau| \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a) \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a) \left(\mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a \right] - \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \right] \right)^2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} |\mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a) - \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a)| \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \sqrt{|\mathcal{A}_\tau| \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = A) \left(\mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = A \right] - \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{(a)}) \right] \right)^2} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{2 \cdot \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = \cdot) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = \cdot))} \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau|}{2} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = a) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = A) \cdot \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(a)} \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = A) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(a)}))} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{2 \cdot \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = \cdot) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = \cdot))} \end{aligned}$$

Above, equality (i) holds since conditional on \mathcal{H}_t , the action A_t and the outcome $Y_t^{(a)}$ are independent. Inequality (ii) uses Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in the first term and uses that R takes values in $[0, 1]$ in the second term. Inequality (iii) uses an elementary equality of summation in the

first term, and Pinsker's inequality in the second term. Inequality (iv) uses Fact 9 of Russo and Van Roy [49] (which uses Pinsker's inequality).

Using the above result, averaging over t and taking an expectation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_t \left[R(Y_t^{\pi^*(X_t; \tau)}) - R(Y_t^{(A_t)}) \right] \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau|}{2} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = A) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a) \cdot \text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(a)} \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(A)}) \right)} \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sqrt{2 \cdot \text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = \cdot) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = \cdot) \right)} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau|}{2} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = A) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a) \cdot \text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(a)} \mid \pi^*(X_t; \tau) = a) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(Y_t^{(A)}) \right) \right]} \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T 2 \cdot \text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = \cdot) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = \cdot) \right) \right]} \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau|}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T I_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau); (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t))} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T 2 \cdot \text{D}_{\text{KL}} \left(\mathbb{P}_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau) = \cdot) \parallel \mathbb{P}_t(A_t = \cdot) \right) \right]} \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau|}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T I_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau); (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t))} + \sqrt{2\{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}} \\
&\stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau|}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T I_t(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}); (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t))} + \sqrt{2\{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}} \\
&\stackrel{(v)}{=} \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau|}{2T} I_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}); (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t)_{t=1}^T)} + \sqrt{2\{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}} \\
&\stackrel{(vi)}{=} \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau|}{2T} \{H_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T})) - H_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}) \mid (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t)_{t=1}^T)\}} + \sqrt{2\{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}} \\
&\stackrel{(vii)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}_\tau| \cdot H_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*(X_{1:T}))}{2T}} + \sqrt{2\{\ell(p_\theta) - \ell(p^*)\}}
\end{aligned}$$

Above,

- Inequality (i) uses Jensen's inequality twice.
- Equality (ii) uses Lemma 4 (Mutual information equivalency).
- Inequality (iii) uses Lemma 3 (KL Divergence in next action distribution).
- For inequality (iv), note that for any random variables X_1, X_2, Y (where X_1, X_2 are discrete),

by properties of mutual information and entropy,

$$\begin{aligned} I((X_1, X_2); Y) &= H(X_1, X_2) - H(X_1, X_2 | Y) \\ &= H(X_1) - H(X_1 | Y) + H(X_2 | X_1) - H(X_2 | Y, X_1) \\ &= I(X_1; Y) + I(X_2; Y | X_1) \end{aligned}$$

The above implies that $I((X_1, X_2); Y) \geq I(X_1; Y)$ since $I(X_2; Y | X_1) \geq 0$. Thus, since $\pi^*(X_t; \tau) \in \pi^*(X_{1:T})$ we have that

$$I_t(\pi^*(X_{1:T}); (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t)) \geq I_t(\pi^*(X_t; \tau); (Y_t^{(A_t)}, A_t)).$$

- Equality (v) uses the chain rule for mutual information.
- Equality (vi) holds by the relationship between mutual information and entropy.
- Inequality (vii) holds since entropy is always nonnegative.

□

A.9 Proof of Proposition 1

Proposition 1 (Regret for Thompson sampling via generation with a perfect imputation model). *Under Assumptions 1 and 3, Thompson sampling via generation (Algorithm 1) with the imputation model p^* has regret that is bounded as follows:*

$$\Delta(\mathbb{A}_{\text{TS-Gen}}(p^*)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}| \cdot H(\pi^*(X_{1:T}) | Z_\tau, X_{1:T})}{2T}}.$$

Proof. This proposition holds as a direct corollary of Theorem 1. □

B Experiment details

B.1 Data generating process

Synthetic setting We evaluate our method on a synthetic contextual bandit setting. The task features Z for a given bandit task consist of one feature per action, i.e. $Z = \{Z^{(a)}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau}$, where only $Z^{(a)}$ affects the reward for action a . For simplicity, $R(y) = y$. For task τ , action a , and timestep t , with action features $Z_\tau^{(a)}$, context features X_t , and unknown coefficients $U^{(a)} := (U_{\text{const}}^{(a)}, U_Z^{(a)}, U_X^{(a)}, U_{\text{cross}}^{(a)})$, let $\sigma(w) := (1 + \exp(-w))^{-1}$, and define

$$W_t^{(a)} = U_{\text{const}}^{(a)} + U_Z^{(a)} Z^{(a)} + U_X^{(a)} X_t + X_t^\top U_{\text{cross}}^{(a)} Z^{(a)}$$

where $Y_t^{(a)} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\sigma(W_t^{(a)}))$ i.i.d. (10)

All of the random variables above are generated i.i.d. for each task τ . All of the random variables indexed by action a above are also generated i.i.d. across actions $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$.

We generate each $Z^{(a)} \sim N(0_2, I_2)$ and $X_t \sim N(0_5, I_5)$ as multivariate Gaussians. The unobserved coefficients are also drawn as multivariate Gaussians: $U_{\text{const}}^{(a)} \sim N(0, 1)$, $U_Z^{(a)} \sim N(1_2, I_2 \cdot 0.25^2)$, $U_X^{(a)} \sim N(1_5, I_5 \cdot 0.25^2)$. The last coefficient $U_{\text{cross}}^{(a)}$ is drawn as a random diagonal matrix, where the diagonal entries are each drawn independently as i.i.d. $N(1, 0.25^2)$.

Unless otherwise specified, the training dataset consists of 10k independently drawn actions, and the validation set also consists of 10k independently drawn actions. For bandit evaluation, sets of 10 actions are drawn independently for each bandit environment.

Semi-synthetic setting We extend our synthetic experiment setting to a semi-synthetic news recommendation setting in which we use text headlines $Z^{(a)}$ for arm a , so that the sequence model requires feature learning. We define

$$W_t^{(a)} = U_{\text{const}}^{(a)} + U_Z^{(a)} \phi_Z(Z^{(a)}) + U_X^{(a)} \phi_X(X_t) + \phi_X(X_t)^\top U_{\text{cross}}^{(a)} \phi_Z(Z^{(a)})$$

where $Y_t^{(a)} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\sigma(W_t^{(a)}))$ i.i.d. (11)

This is similar to the synthetic setting in Equation (10), except that the data-generating process uses $\phi_X(X_t)$ and $\phi_Z(Z^{(a)})$ instead of $X_t, Z^{(a)}$, respectively, where ϕ_X and ϕ_Z are nonlinear. This increases the difficulty of the learning task for the sequence model. The rest of the data generation is the same, aside from $Z^{(a)}$ being text headlines and using $\phi_X(X_t)$ and $\phi_Z(Z^{(a)})$, is the same.

More specifically, the headlines $Z^{(a)}$ are sampled randomly (without replacement) from the MIND large dataset [65] (training split only). The headlines are split into training, validation, and bandit evaluation sets, where headlines are disjoint between these three datasets. The training and validation sets are used to train and perform model selection for sequence models, and the bandit evaluation set is solely for evaluating regret. We generate one draw of one action (i.e. $W_t^{(a)}$) for each headline. Unless otherwise specified, the training set has 20k headlines, validation has 10k, and the bandit set is everything left over, which is about 74k headlines.

Additionally, $\phi_Z(Z^{(a)})$ is a two-dimensional vector, where the first dimension is the probability output of a pre-trained binary [55] evaluated on $Z^{(a)}$, and the second dimension is the probability output of a binary pre-trained formality classifier on $Z^{(a)}$ [4] with outputs normalized to have mean 0 and variance 1. Both models were obtained from huggingface.com. Next, $\phi_X(X_t)$ is as follows: as $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^5$ as defined in the synthetic setting, $\phi_X(X)_{t,1:4} = X_{t,1:4} \cdot \text{sign}(X_{t,5})$, i.e. ϕ_X multiplies the first four dimensions of X_t by the sign of the fifth dimension.

B.2 Offline training

B.2.1 Resampling historical data

It is uncommon in to have access to all potential outcomes for all actions in realistic scenarios. Instead, it is more common to have access to the outcome corresponding to the action that was taken. Under the assumption that the contexts X_t are exchangeable, and that the actions chosen historically were chosen at random, then for each action a , we can consider the contexts X_t for timesteps t for which this action was taken, and the corresponding outcomes $Y_t^{(a)}$. We assume that we have 1000 such timesteps per action. During training, in every epoch, we sample without replacement from this set of $(X_t, Y_t^{(a)})$'s to form a sequence of length 500; the sequence model p_θ is then trained on such sequences of data.

B.2.2 Sequence model architecture




Figure 6: Diagram of model architecture for p_θ , for semisynthetic settings. In synthetic settings, the model architecture is the same, except that it does not include the DistilBERT [53] encoder to process text, or the X MLP encoder.

Synthetic setting In the synthetic setting, the model architecture is as follows: the output of p_θ is a final MLP head on top of a vector that is the concatenation of $Z^{(a)}$, X_t , and the summary statistics of the history for action a . The final MLP head has 3 layers, each with width 100.

For simplicity, in the synthetic setting, we use sequence p_θ models that summarize recent history with summary statistics as follows. The summary statistics are $(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \epsilon I)^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Y}$, where \mathbf{X} denotes a matrix where each row is a past observation of \mathbf{X} , and \mathbf{Y} is a vector where each element the corresponding past observation of Y . The hyperparameter ϵ is a value that is tuned during training, and we set it to $\epsilon = 1$.

Semisynthetic setting In the semisynthetic setting, p_θ is implemented to take as input the part of the task feature for one action a , $Z^{(a)}$, along with history for that action, and context X_t , to predict the next reward given X_t and for action a . As displayed in Figure 6, the model architecture is as follows. We concatenate a DistilBert [53] embedding of headline $Z^{(a)}$ with X_t , and also summary statistics of the history that take in $Y_{1:t-1}^{(a)}$, as well as an MLP embedding of $X_{1:t-1}$ (2 layers, width 100); the sufficient statistics described above are repeated 100 times. Then, this concatenated vector is fed into the final MLP head (3 layers, width 100). Finally, the output of the MLP is fed through a sigmoid function to obtain a prediction for the probability

that the next outcome is 1 (rather than 0). The other difference from the synthetic setting is that the summary statistics feed the history of X_t 's into a 2-layer, width 100 MLP before calculating summary statistics.

B.2.3 Additional sequence model training details

Synthetic setting We train (and validate) on sequences of length 500, sampled with replacement from historical sequences of length 1000, for 100 epochs. The training set has a pool of 10,000 actions (except for Figure 7), and the validation set also has pool of 10,000 actions. Tasks are sampled/constructed by independently selecting 10 actions from the pool. We optimize weights with the AdamW optimizer. We try learning rates $\{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}$ and choose the learning rate with the lowest validation loss, which is 0.01. We set weight decay to 0.01. The batch size is 500.

Semi-synthetic setting We train (and validate) on sequences of length 500, sampled with replacement from historical sequences of length 1000, for 40 epochs. The training set has a pool of 20,000 actions. The validation set has a pool of 10,000 actions. Tasks are sampled/constructed by independently selecting 10 actions from the pool. Again, we optimize weights with the AdamW optimizer. We try learning rates $\{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}$ and choose the learning rate and also the training epoch with the lowest validation loss; the learning rate chosen is 0.01. We set weight decay to 0.01. The batch size is 500. We do not fine-tune the DistilBERT encoder and leave those weights as-is.

B.3 Online learning

B.3.1 TS-Gen details

Here we describe additional details used to draw potential outcomes tables $\hat{\tau}$ by using a sequence model p_θ .

First, the $\{X_t\}_{1:T}$ on which we evaluate the bandit algorithm are assumed to be known at the beginning of bandit evaluations, but not known before that (i.e. the sequence model is not trained on the exact data used to evaluate the bandit algorithm). When the potential outcomes table $\hat{\tau}$ is generated, this $\{X_t\}_{1:T}$ is fixed. Variations of this algorithm can be made where the $\{X_t\}_{1:T}$ seen in the bandit setting are *not* known ahead of time, but we use this setting for simplicity.

Here we describe additional details used to fit $\pi^* \in \Pi$ on $\hat{\tau}$. For all model classes used, there is no train/test split. The policy π^* is fit directly on $\hat{\tau}$. This is the case for both TS-Gen, and for “oracles”. For logistic methods, we use the default logistic regression implementation from `scikit-learn` [46]. For tree-based methods, we use gradient-boosted forests with maximum depth set to 2, also from `scikit-learn` [46].

B.3.2 Baseline bandit methods

The first three (Greedy, Epsilon-Greedy, and Softmax) are alternative ways to make decisions using an existing pre-trained sequence model p_θ . The others (Linear Thompson Sampling, LinUCB) are contextual bandit methods that do not use p_θ .

Greedy We use a trained sequence model p_θ as in TS-Gen. In the online step, at time t , instead of using p_θ to generate the entire potential outcomes table $\hat{\tau}$, fit a policy π^* , and then evaluate this policy at the current context X_t , we just evaluate p_θ on the current task (action) features $Z^{(a)}$, history \mathcal{H}_t , and current context X_t . In our setting, this gives the probability that the corresponding

outcome (and also reward, as $R(y) = y$) $Y_t^{(a)}$ is 1. We choose the arm with the largest such probability.

Epsilon-Greedy The version of epsilon-greedy that we present here differs from the classical version of epsilon-greedy [59]. In our version, we choose according to the greedy algorithm (as described above, using the trained sequence model to obtain predicted rewards) with probability $1 - \epsilon$, and choose a uniformly random action with probability ϵ . We use $\epsilon = 0.1$ in the experiments.

Softmax This method is similar to PreDeToR- τ in Mukherjee et al. [39]. PreDeToR- τ also uses a trained sequence model to predict rewards, and chooses actions with probability according to softmax of the rewards for each arm, multiplied by a constant τ . In other words, if $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \hat{r}_1, \dots, \hat{r}_{\mathcal{A}_\tau}$ are the predicted rewards from a pre-trained model for actions $1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_\tau$, then we choose an action with probability $\text{softmax}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}/\tau)$. We set $\tau = 0.05$ as in Mukherjee et al. [39].

Linear Thompson Sampling For each arm $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$, outcomes are modeled as a linear function of X ,

$$Y = X\beta + \epsilon,$$

where β is modeled as a multivariate Gaussian prior with mean 0 and identity variance, and ϵ is modeled as a Gaussian prior with mean 0 and variance 1/4 (since the maximum variance of a Bernoulli is 1/4). After t timesteps, we use the history \mathcal{H}_t to calculate the posterior distributions for β and ϵ , for each arm a . Then, we do Thompson sampling: for each arm a , we sample once from the posteriors of β and ϵ , and calculate what Y should be, given the current context X_t . We choose the arm with the largest such value. Note that unlike TS-Gen, linear Thompson sampling does not learn a rich and flexible prior based on task features Z_τ .

LinUCB We implement LinUCB-disjoint in [33], on contexts X_t . We set $\alpha = 0.1$ as it performs well in comparison to a small set of other values tried ($\{0.1, 1, 2\}$). In this particular setting, the task features are different for each action, there are few actions in each environment, and the arms are generated independently, so it is appropriate to exclude task features from the on-line modeling for LinUCB. Note that unlike TS-Gen, LinUCB does not learn a rich and flexible prior based on task features Z_τ .

B.4 Sequence loss vs. regret under TS-Gen (Figure 7)

We examine the relationship between sequence model loss $\ell(p_\theta)$ and regret of TS-Gen using p_θ . Our Theorem 1 suggests that the lower the loss of a sequence model p_θ the lower the regret of TS-Gen using that sequence model p_θ . We examine this by varying the amount of training tasks used to learn p_θ and thus obtain sequence models with different losses. We also compute the cumulative regret for TS-Gen using each respective sequence models. Indeed, in Figure 7, models trained on more data tend to have lower sequence loss, which tend to have lower regret.

B.5 Policy class for TS-Gen (Figure 8)

The choice of policy class affects both TS-Gen (for a fixed sequence model p_θ), as well as the “oracle”; See Figure 8. In the semisynthetic setting, TS-Gen has moderately greater reward using a tree-based policy than a logistic policy. In contrast, the “oracle” using a tree-based policy is much better than the “oracle” using a logistic policy.




Figure 7: **Sequence loss vs. bandit regret:** We demonstrate the relationship between sequence loss and regret for TS-Gen by pre-training our sequence models offline on varying dataset sizes in the semisynthetic setting. As training dataset sizes are smaller, sequence loss (left) is higher (worse), and bandit regret (right) is higher (worse). “Training rows” refers to the number of actions used in the pool of actions to select from to form tasks (Appendix B.2.3). **(Left):** Prediction loss by timestep. We plot an empirical estimate of the per-timestep (non-cumulative) loss from (6) by evaluating our sequence models on an held-out validation set. Error bars represent ± 1 s.e. **(Right):** Cumulative regret for TS-Gen using the corresponding sequence models, with logistic policy class, and relative to the logistic “oracle”. Error bars represent ± 1 s.e. averaged over 500 re-drawn bandit environments.




Figure 8: Varying policy classes in the semisynthetic setting. The same experimental results are plotted on the left and the right. The plot on the right calculates regret relative to the logistic “oracle”, while the left calculates regret relative to the tree-based “oracle”. Error bars are ± 1 s.e. across 500 bandit environments.