Multi-armed Bandits

Sham Kakade and Wen Sun

CS 6789: Foundations of Reinforcement Learning

The need for Exploration in RL:

The Combination Lock Example (i.e., the sparse reward problem)

(1) We have reward zero everywhere except at the goal (the right end);(2) Every black node, one of the two actions will lead the agent to the dead state (red)



The need for Exploration in RL:

The Combination Lock Example (i.e., the sparse reward problem)

(1) We have reward zero everywhere except at the goal (the right end);(2) Every black node, one of the two actions will lead the agent to the dead state (red)



What is the probability of a random policy generating a trajectory that hits the goal?

Exploration!

We need to perform systematic exploration, i.e., remember where we visited, and purposely try to visit unexplored regions..

What we will do today:

Study Exploration in a very simple MDP:

$$\mathcal{M} = \{s_0, \{a_1, \dots, a_K\}, H = 1, R\}$$

i.e., MDP with one state, one-step transition, and K actions This is also called Multi-armed Bandits

Plan for today:

1. Introduction of MAB

2. Attempt 1: Greedy Algorithm (a bad algorithm)

3. Attempt 2: Explore and Commit

4. Attempt 3: Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) Algorithm

Setting:



We have K many arms: a_1, \ldots, a_K

Setting:



We have K many arms: a_1, \ldots, a_K

Each arm has a unknown reward distribution, i.e., $\nu_i \in \Delta([0,1])$, w/ mean $\mu_i = \mathbb{E}_{r \sim \nu_i}[r]$

Setting:



We have K many arms: a_1, \ldots, a_K

Each arm has a unknown reward distribution, i.e., $\nu_i \in \Delta([0,1])$, w/ mean $\mu_i = \mathbb{E}_{r \sim \nu_i}[r]$

Example: a_i has a Bernoulli distribution ν_i w/ mean $\mu_i := p$:

Setting:



We have K many arms: a_1, \ldots, a_K

Each arm has a unknown reward distribution, i.e., $\nu_i \in \Delta([0,1]),$ w/ mean $\mu_i = \mathbb{E}_{r\sim \nu_i}[r]$

Example: a_i has a Bernoulli distribution ν_i w/ mean $\mu_i := p$:

Every time we pull arm a_i , we observe an i.i.d reward $r = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{w/ prob } p \\ 0 & \text{w/ prob } 1 - p \end{cases}$

Applications on online advertisement:



Arms correspond to Ads Each arm has **click-through-rate**

(CTR): probability of getting clicked (unknown)

Applications on online advertisement:



A learning system aims to maximize CTR in a long run:

Arms correspond to Ads Each arm has **click-through-rate** (CTR): probability of getting clicked (unknown)

Applications on online advertisement:



A learning system aims to maximize CTR in a long run:

1. Try an Ad (pull an arm)

Arms correspond to Ads Each arm has **click-through-rate** (CTR): probability of getting clicked (unknown)

Applications on online advertisement:



Arms correspond to Ads Each arm has **click-through-rate** (CTR): probability of getting clicked (unknown) A learning system aims to maximize CTR in a long run:

- 1. Try an Ad (pull an arm)
- 2. **Observe** if it is clicked (see a zero-one **reward**)

Applications on online advertisement:



Arms correspond to Ads Each arm has **click-through-rate** (CTR): probability of getting clicked (unknown) A learning system aims to maximize CTR in a long run:

- 1. Try an Ad (pull an arm)
- 2. **Observe** if it is clicked (see a zero-one **reward**)
- 3. **Update**: Decide what ad to recommend for next round

More formally, we have the following interactive learning process:

For $t = 0 \rightarrow T - 1$

More formally, we have the following interactive learning process:

For $t = 0 \rightarrow T - 1$

1. Learner pulls arm $I_t \in \{1, \dots, K\}$

More formally, we have the following interactive learning process:

For $t = 0 \rightarrow T - 1$ (# based on historical information) 1. Learner pulls arm $I_t \in \{1, ..., K\}$

More formally, we have the following interactive learning process:

For $t = 0 \rightarrow T - 1$ (# based on historical information) 1. Learner pulls arm $I_t \in \{1, ..., K\}$

2. Learner observes an i.i.d reward $r_t \sim \nu_{I_t}$ of arm I_t

More formally, we have the following interactive learning process:

For $t = 0 \rightarrow T - 1$ (# based on historical information) 1. Learner pulls arm $I_t \in \{1, ..., K\}$

2. Learner observes an i.i.d reward $r_t \sim \nu_{I_t}$ of arm I_t

Note: each iteration, we do not observe rewards of arms that we did not try

More formally, we have the following learning objective:

$$\mathsf{Regret}_{T} = T\mu^{\star} - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mu_{I_{t}} \qquad \mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_{i}$$

More formally, we have the following learning objective:

$$\operatorname{Regret}_{T} = T\mu^{\star} - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mu_{I_{t}}$$
Total expected reward if we pulled best arm over T rounds

More formally, we have the following learning objective:

$$\operatorname{Regret}_{T} = T\mu^{\star} - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mu_{I_{t}}$$
Total expected reward if we pulled best arm over T rounds
$$\mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_{i}$$
Total expected reward of the arms we pulled over T rounds

More formally, we have the following learning objective:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_{i} \\ \mu_{I_{t}} \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \\ Total expected reward if we \\ pulled best arm over T rounds \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{l} \mu_{T-1} \\ Total expected reward of the \\ arms we pulled over T rounds \end{array} \\ \end{array}$$

Goal: no-regret, i.e., $\operatorname{Regret}_T/T \to 0$, as $T \to \infty$

Why the problem is hard?

Exploration and Exploitation Tradeoff:

Why the problem is hard?

Exploration and Exploitation Tradeoff:

Every round, we need to ask ourselves:

Should we pull arms that are less frequently tried in the past (i.e., **explore**), Or should we commit to the current best arm (i.e., **exploit**)?

Plan for today:



2. Attempt 1: Greedy Algorithm (a bad algorithm)

3. Attempt 2: Explore and Exploit

4. Attempt 3: Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) Algorithm

Alg: try each arm once, and then commit to the one that has the **highest observed** reward

Alg: try each arm once, and then commit to the one that has the **highest observed** reward

Q: what could be wrong?

Alg: try each arm once, and then commit to the one that has the **highest observed** reward

Q: what could be wrong?

A bad arm (i.e., low μ_i) may generate a high reward by chance! (recall we have $r \sim \nu$, i.i.d)

More concretely, let's say we have two arms a_1, a_2 : Reward dist for a_1 : w/ prob 60%, r = 1; else r = 0Reward dist for a_2 : w/ prob 40%, r = 1; else r = 0

More concretely, let's say we have two arms a_1, a_2 : Reward dist for a_1 : w/ prob 60%, r = 1; else r = 0Reward dist for a_2 : w/ prob 40%, r = 1; else r = 0

Clearly a_1 is a better arm!

More concretely, let's say we have two arms a_1, a_2 : Reward dist for a_1 : w/ prob 60%, r = 1; else r = 0Reward dist for a_2 : w/ prob 40%, r = 1; else r = 0

Clearly a_1 is a better arm!

But try a_1, a_2 once, with probability 16%, we will observe reward pair (0,1)

More concretely, let's say we have two arms a_1, a_2 : Reward dist for a_1 : w/ prob 60%, r = 1; else r = 0Reward dist for a_2 : w/ prob 40%, r = 1; else r = 0

Clearly a_1 is a better arm!

But try a_1, a_2 once, with probability 16%, we will observe reward pair (0,1)

The greedy alg will pick a_2 -loosing expected reward 0.2 every time in the future

Plan for today:





3. Attempt 2: Explore and Commit

4. Attempt 3: Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) Algorithm

What lessons we learned from the Greedy Alg:

Due to randomness in the reward distribution, trying each arm once is not enough, i.e., observed single reward may be far away from the mean
What lessons we learned from the Greedy Alg:

Due to randomness in the reward distribution, trying each arm once is not enough, i.e., observed single reward may be far away from the mean

Q: what's the fix here?

What lessons we learned from the Greedy Alg:

Due to randomness in the reward distribution, trying each arm once is not enough, i.e., observed single reward may be far away from the mean

Q: what's the fix here?

Yes, let's (1) try each arm multiple times, (2) compute the empirical mean of each arm, (3) commit to the one that has the highest empirical mean

Algorithm hyper parameter N < T/K (we assume T >> K)

For $k = 1 \rightarrow K$: (# Exploration phase)

Algorithm hyper parameter N < T/K (we assume T >> K)

For $k = 1 \rightarrow K$: (# Exploration phase)

Pull arm-*k* N times, observe $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \nu_k$

Algorithm hyper parameter N < T/K (we assume T >> K)

For $k = 1 \rightarrow K$: (# Exploration phase)

Pull arm-*k* N times, observe $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \nu_k$ Calculate arm k's empirical mean: $\hat{\mu}_k = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i/N$

Algorithm hyper parameter N < T/K (we assume T >> K)

For $k = 1 \rightarrow K$: (# Exploration phase)

Pull arm-*k* N times, observe
$$\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \nu_k$$

Calculate arm k's empirical mean: $\hat{\mu}_k = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i/N$

For $t = NK \rightarrow T - 1$: (# Exploitation phase)

Algorithm hyper parameter N < T/K (we assume T >> K)

For $k = 1 \rightarrow K$: (# Exploration phase)

Pull arm-*k* N times, observe
$$\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \nu_k$$

Calculate arm k's empirical mean: $\hat{\mu}_k = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i/N$

For $t = NK \rightarrow T - 1$: (# Exploitation phase)

Pull the best empirical arm, i.e.,
$$I_t = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$$

Algorithm hyper parameter N < T/K (we assume T >> K)

For $k = 1 \rightarrow K$: (# Exploration phase)

Pull arm-*k* N times, observe
$$\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \nu_k$$

Calculate arm k's empirical mean: $\hat{\mu}_k = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i/N$

For $t = NK \rightarrow T - 1$: (# Exploitation phase)

Pull the best empirical arm, i.e.,
$$I_t = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$$

Q: how to

∕∖?

set /

1. Hoeffding inequality (optional, no need to remember or understand it)

1. Hoeffding inequality (optional, no need to remember or understand it)

Given a distribution $\mu \in \Delta([0,1])$, and N i.i.d samples $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \mu$, w/ probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have: $\left|\sum_{i=1}^N r_i/N - \mu\right| \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{N}}\right)$

1. Hoeffding inequality (optional, no need to remember or understand it)

Given a distribution $\mu \in \Delta([0,1])$, and N i.i.d samples $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \mu$, w/ probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have: $\left|\sum_{i=1}^N r_i/N - \mu\right| \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{N}}\right)$

i.e., this gives us a confidence interval:

1. Hoeffding inequality (optional, no need to remember or understand it)

Given a distribution $\mu \in \Delta([0,1])$, and N i.i.d samples $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \mu, \text{ w/ probability at least } 1 - \delta, \text{ we have:} \\ \left| \sum_{i=1}^N r_i / N - \mu \right| \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln(1/\delta)}{N}}\right) \qquad \hat{\mu} + \sqrt{\ln(1/\delta)/N} \\ \bullet$ i.e., this gives us a confidence interval:

Combine Hoeffding and Union Bound, we have:

Combine Hoeffding and Union Bound, we have: After the Exploration phase, with probability at least 1- δ , for all

arm
$$k \in [K]$$
, we have:
 $\left| \hat{\mu}_{k} - \mu_{k} \right| \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln(K/\delta)}{N}}\right)$



 μ_1

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

1. What's the worst possible regret in the exploration phase:

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

1. What's the worst possible regret in the exploration phase:

$$\operatorname{Regret}_{explore} \leq N(K-1) \leq NK$$

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

1. What's the worst possible regret in the exploration phase:

$$\operatorname{Regret}_{explore} \leq N(K-1) \leq NK$$

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

1. What's the worst possible regret in the exploration phase:

$$\operatorname{Regret}_{explore} \leq N(K-1) \leq NK$$

$$\mathsf{Regret}_{exploit} \leq (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right)$$

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

1. What's the worst possible regret in the exploration phase:

$$\operatorname{Regret}_{explore} \leq N(K-1) \leq NK$$

2. What's the regret in the exploitation phase:

$$\mathsf{Regret}_{exploit} \leq (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right)$$

Let's now bound Regret_{exploit}

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

$$\operatorname{\mathsf{Regret}}_{exploit} \leq (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right)$$

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

$$\mathsf{Regret}_{exploit} \le (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right)$$

$$\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \leq \left[\hat{\mu}_{I^{\star}} + \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right] - \left[\hat{\mu}_{\hat{I}} - \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right]$$

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

$$\mathsf{Regret}_{exploit} \leq (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right)$$

$$\begin{split} \mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} &\leq \left[\hat{\mu}_{I^{\star}} + \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right] - \left[\hat{\mu}_{\hat{I}} - \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right] \\ &= \hat{\mu}_{I^{\star}} - \hat{\mu}_{\hat{I}} + 2\sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N} \end{split}$$

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

$$\mathsf{Regret}_{exploit} \le (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right)$$

$$\begin{split} \mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} &\leq \left[\hat{\mu}_{I^{\star}} + \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right] - \left[\hat{\mu}_{\hat{I}} - \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right] \\ &= \hat{\mu}_{I^{\star}} - \hat{\mu}_{\hat{I}} + 2\sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N} \end{split}$$

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

$$\mathsf{Regret}_{exploit} \le (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right)$$

$$\begin{split} \mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} &\leq \left[\hat{\mu}_{I^{\star}} + \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right] - \left[\hat{\mu}_{\hat{I}} - \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right] \\ &= \hat{\mu}_{I^{\star}} - \hat{\mu}_{\hat{I}} + 2\sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N} \\ \text{Q: why?} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N} \end{split}$$

Denote empirical best arm $\hat{I} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_i$, and THE best arm $I^* = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$

What's the regret in the exploitation phase:

$$\mathsf{Regret}_{exploit} \le (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right)$$

$$\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \leq \left[\hat{\mu}_{I^{\star}} + \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right] - \left[\hat{\mu}_{\hat{I}} - \sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}\right]$$

$$= \hat{\mu}_{I^{\star}} - \hat{\mu}_{\hat{I}} + 2\sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}$$

Q: why? $\leq 2\sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)/N}$

$$\mathsf{Regret}_{exploit} \le (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right) \le 2T \sqrt{\frac{\ln(K/\delta)}{N}}$$

Finally, combine two regret together:

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{\mathsf{Regret}}_{explore} \leq N(K-1) \leq NK \\ & \operatorname{\mathsf{Regret}}_{exploit} \leq (T-NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\widehat{I}} \right) \leq T \sqrt{\frac{\ln(K/\delta)}{N}} \\ & \operatorname{\mathsf{Regret}}_{T} = \operatorname{\mathsf{Regret}}_{explore} + \operatorname{\mathsf{Regret}}_{exploit} \leq NK + 2T \sqrt{\frac{\ln(K/\delta)}{N}} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, combine two regret together:

$$\operatorname{Regret}_{explore} \leq N(K-1) \leq NK$$
$$\operatorname{Regret}_{exploit} \leq (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right) \leq T \sqrt{\frac{\ln(K/\delta)}{N}}$$
$$\operatorname{Regret}_{T} = \operatorname{Regret}_{explore} + \operatorname{Regret}_{exploit} \leq NK + 2T \sqrt{\frac{\ln(K/\delta)}{N}}$$

Minimize the upper bound via optimizing N:

Finally, combine two regret together: $\mathsf{Regret}_{explore} \le N(K-1) \le NK$ 12 $\mathsf{Regret}_{exploit} \le (T - NK) \left(\mu_{I^{\star}} - \mu_{\hat{I}} \right) \le T \sqrt{\frac{\ln(K/\delta)}{N}}$ $\operatorname{Regret}_{T} = \operatorname{Regret}_{explore} + \operatorname{Regret}_{exploit} \leq NK + 2T\sqrt{\frac{\ln(K/\delta)}{N}}$ Minimize the upper bound via optimizing N:

$$\frac{\text{Pognef}_{T}}{T} \rightarrow 0$$

$$T$$

$$T$$

$$T$$

$$T$$

$$T$$

$$T$$

$$T$$

$$T$$

$$T$$

Set
$$N = \left(\frac{T\sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)}}{2K}\right)^{2/3}$$
, we have:

$$\operatorname{\mathsf{Regret}}_{T} \le O\left(T^{2/3}K^{1/3} \cdot \ln^{1/3}(K/\delta)\right)$$

To conclude on Explore then Commit:

[Theorem] Fix
$$\delta \in (0,1)$$
, set $N = \left(\frac{T\sqrt{\ln(K/\delta)}}{2K}\right)^{2/3}$, with

probability at least $1-\delta,$ Explore and Commit has the following regret:

$$\operatorname{Regret}_{T} \leq O\left(T^{2/3}K^{1/3} \cdot \ln^{1/3}(K/\delta)\right)$$

Q: can we do better, particularly, can we get \sqrt{T} regret bound?

Plan for today:



2. Attempt 1: Greedy Algorithm (a bad algorithm: constant regret)



4. Attempt 3: Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) Algorithm

Statistics that we maintain during learning:

We maintain the following statistics during the learning process:

At the beginning of iteration t, for all $i \in [K]$, # of times we have tried arm i,

Statistics that we maintain during learning:

We maintain the following statistics during the learning process:

At the beginning of iteration t, for all $i \in [K]$, # of times we have tried arm i,

i.e.,
$$N_t(i) = \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{1}\{I_{\tau} = i\}$$

Statistics that we maintain during learning:

We maintain the following statistics during the learning process:

At the beginning of iteration t, for all $i \in [K]$, # of times we have tried arm i,

i.e.,
$$N_t(i) = \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{1}\{I_{\tau} = i\}$$

and its empirical mean $\hat{\mu}_t(i)$ so far;
Statistics that we maintain during learning:

We maintain the following statistics during the learning process:

At the beginning of iteration t, for all $i \in [K]$, # of times we have tried arm i,

i.e.,
$$N_t(i) = \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{1}\{I_\tau = i\}$$

and its empirical mean $\hat{\mu}_t(i)$ so far; i.e., $\hat{\mu}_t(i) = \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{1}\{I_{\tau} = i\}r_{\tau}/N_t(i)$

Recall the Tool for Building Confidence Interval:

Recall the Tool for Building Confidence Interval:

Thus, we can show that for all iteration *t*, we have the for all $k \in [K]$, w/ prob $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{split} |\hat{\mu}_{k}(i) - \mu_{k}| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\ln(KT/\delta)}{N_{t}(k)}} \\ & \nabla \\ & \text{How many times we have} \\ & \text{trued } k \end{split}$$

Recall the Tool for Building Confidence Interval:

Thus, we can show that for all iteration t, we have the for all $k \in [K]$, w/ prob $1 - \delta$,

$$|\hat{\mu}_k(i) - \mu_k| \le \sqrt{\frac{\ln(KT/\delta)}{N_t(k)}}$$

Proving this result actually requires reasoning **Martinalges**, as samples are not i.i.d, i.e., whether or not you pull arm k in this round depends on previous random outcomes (See Ch 6 for more details)

UCB: Optimism in the face of Uncertainty

Given the confidence interval, we pick arm that has the **highest Upper-Conf-Bound:**

UCB: Optimism in the face of Uncertainty

Given the confidence interval, we pick arm that has the **highest Upper-Conf-Bound**:



UCB: Optimism in the face of Uncertainty

Given the confidence interval, we pick arm that has the **highest Upper-Conf-Bound**:



Put things together: UCB Algorithm:

For
$$t = 0 \rightarrow T - 1$$
:

$$I_t = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \left(\hat{\mu}_t(i) + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(KT/\delta)}{N_t(i)}} \right)$$

Put things together: UCB Algorithm:

For
$$t = 0 \rightarrow T - 1$$
:

$$I_t = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \left(\hat{\mu}_t(i) + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(KT/\delta)}{N_t(i)}} \right)$$

(# Upper-conf-bound of arm *i*)

Put things together: UCB Algorithm:

For
$$t = 0 \rightarrow T - 1$$
:

$$I_t = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \left(\hat{\mu}_t(i) + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(KT/\delta)}{N_t(i)}} \right)$$

(# Upper-conf-bound of arm i)





UCB Regret:

[Theorem (informal)] With high probability, UCB has the following regret:

$$\operatorname{Regret}_{T} = \widetilde{O}\left(\sqrt{KT}\right)$$

Intuitive Explanation of UCB $\hat{\mu}_t(2) + \sqrt{\ln(KT/\delta)/N_t(2)}$ $\hat{\mu}_t(3) + \sqrt{\ln(KT/\delta)/N_t(3)}$ $\hat{\mu}_t(1) + \sqrt{\ln(KT/\delta)/N_t(1)}$ $\hat{\mu}_t(2)$ μ_3 $\hat{\mu}_t(1)$ $\hat{\mu}_t(3)$ μ_1 $\hat{\mu}_t(1) - \sqrt{\ln(KT/\delta)/N_t(1)}$ $\hat{\mu}_t(2) - \sqrt{\ln(KT/\delta)/N_t(2)}$ $\hat{\mu}_t(3) - \sqrt{\ln(KT/\delta)/N_t(3)}$

Case 1: it has large conf-interval, which means that it has not been tried many times yet (high uncertainty)





Case 2: it has low uncertainty, then it is simply a good arm, i.e., it's true mean is high!



Explore and Exploration Tradeoff

Case 1: I_t has large conf-interval, which means that it has not been tried many times yet (high uncertainty) Thus, we do exploration in this case!

Explore and Exploration Tradeoff

Case 1: I_t has large conf-interval, which means that it has not been tried many times yet (high uncertainty) Thus, we do exploration in this case!

Case 2: I_t has small conf-interval, then it is simply a good arm, i.e., it's true mean is pretty high! Thus, we do exploitation in this case!

Regret-at-t =
$$\mu^{\star} - \mu_I$$

Regret-at-t =
$$\mu^{\star} - \mu_{I_t}$$

 $\leq \hat{\mu}_t(I_t) + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(TK/\delta)}{N_t(I_t)}} - \mu_{I_t}$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Regret-at-t} = \mu^{\star} - \mu_{I_{t}} & \text{UCB}(I_{t}) \geqslant \text{UCB}(I^{\star}) \geqslant \mu^{\star} \\ \text{Q: why?} & \leq \widehat{\mu_{t}(I_{t})} + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(TK/\delta)}{N_{t}(I_{t})}} - \mu_{I_{t}} \\ & \text{UCB of } I_{t} \end{array}$$

Regret-at-t =
$$\mu^* - \mu_{I_t}$$

Q: why?
 $\leq \hat{\mu}_t(I_t) + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(TK/\delta)}{N_t(I_t)}} - \mu_{I_t}$
 $\leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\ln(TK/\delta)}{N_t(I_t)}} \int_{C} \frac{\hat{\mu}_t(I_t) - \mu_{I_t}}{\hat{\mu}_t(I_t)} = \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\mu}_t(I_t)}{N_t(I_t)}}$

Denote the optimal arm $I^{\star} = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$; recall $I_t = \arg \max_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_t(i) + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(KT/\delta)}{N_t(i)}}$

Regret-at-t =
$$\mu^{\star} - \mu_{I_t}$$

Q: why?
 $\leq \hat{\mu}_t(I_t) + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(TK/\delta)}{N_t(I_t)}} - \mu_{I_t}$
 $\leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\ln(TK/\delta)}{N_t(I_t)}} \int_{-\gamma}^{-\gamma} (arge)^{-\gamma}$

Case 1: $N_t(I_t)$ is small (i.e., uncertainty about I_t is large);

We pay regret, BUT we **explore** here, as we just tried I_t at iter t!

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Regret-at-t} &= \mu^{\star} - \mu_{I_{t}} \\ &\leq \widehat{\mu}_{t}(I_{t}) + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(TK/\delta)}{N_{t}(I_{t})}} - \mu_{I_{t}} \end{aligned} \begin{aligned} \text{Case 2: } N_{t}(I_{t}) \text{ is large, i.e., conf-interval of} \\ &I_{t} \text{ is small,} \end{aligned} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\ln(TK/\delta)}{N_{t}(I_{t})}} \int \Rightarrow \text{ small} \end{aligned} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let's add all per-iter regret together:





Summary

1. Setting of Multi-armed Bandit: MDP with one state, and K actions, H = 1

2. Need to carefully balance exploration and exploitation

3. The Principle of Optimism in the face of Uncertainty