Batched Multi-armed Bandits Problem

Yanjun Han (Stanford EE)

Joint work with:

Zijun Gao Zhimei Ren Zhengqing Zhou Stanford Stats Stanford Stats Stanford Math

NeurIPS 2019, Vancouver, Canada

Background: Multi-armed Bandits (MAB)

- sequential decision making
- time horizon T
- action space: K arms
- random reward for each action
- target: maximize the cumulative rewards



Background: Multi-armed Bandits (MAB)

- sequential decision making
- time horizon T
- action space: K arms
- random reward for each action
- target: maximize the cumulative rewards





Space Domain: Bandit Feedback

Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



Space Domain: Bandit Feedback



- limited rounds of actively querying data
- split the time horizon into M batches
- rewards revealed simultaneously at the end of each batch

- limited rounds of actively querying data
- split the time horizon into M batches
- rewards revealed simultaneously at the end of each batch



Clinical trial



Crowdsourcing



Reinforcement learning

- limited rounds of actively querying data
- split the time horizon into M batches
- rewards revealed simultaneously at the end of each batch



Clinical trial



Crowdsourcing



Reinforcement learning

$$\overrightarrow{M=1}$$
 $\overrightarrow{M=7}$

- limited rounds of actively querying data
- split the time horizon into M batches
- rewards revealed simultaneously at the end of each batch



- limited rounds of actively querying data
- split the time horizon into M batches
- rewards revealed simultaneously at the end of each batch



Time Domain: Limited Rounds of Adaptivity

Time Domain: Limited Rounds of Adaptivity



Time Domain: Limited Rounds of Adaptivity



Time Domain: Limited Rounds of Adaptivity



Time Domain: Limited Rounds of Adaptivity



• time horizon T, number of arms K

- time horizon T, number of arms K
- stochastic MAB: pulling arm i gives reward $r_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, 1)$

• time horizon T, number of arms K

- stochastic MAB: pulling arm *i* gives reward $r_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, 1)$
- best arm $\mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [\mathcal{K}]} \mu^{(i)}$, suboptimality gap $\Delta_i = \mu^{\star} \mu^{(i)}$

- time horizon T, number of arms K
- stochastic MAB: pulling arm *i* gives reward $r_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, 1)$
- best arm $\mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [\mathcal{K}]} \mu^{(i)}$, suboptimality gap $\Delta_i = \mu^{\star} \mu^{(i)}$
- policy π : π_t determined by the observed rewards before current batch

- time horizon T, number of arms K
- stochastic MAB: pulling arm *i* gives reward $r_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, 1)$
- best arm $\mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [\mathcal{K}]} \mu^{(i)}$, suboptimality gap $\Delta_i = \mu^{\star} \mu^{(i)}$
- policy π : π_t determined by the observed rewards before current batch

Regret $R(\pi) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\mu^* - \mu^{(\pi_t)} \right).$

• time horizon T, number of arms K

- stochastic MAB: pulling arm *i* gives reward $r_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, 1)$
- best arm $\mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [\mathcal{K}]} \mu^{(i)}$, suboptimality gap $\Delta_i = \mu^{\star} \mu^{(i)}$
- policy π : π_t determined by the observed rewards before current batch

Regret $R(\pi) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\mu^* - \mu^{(\pi_t)} \right).$

Batch constraint represented by a grid $t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_M = T$

- time horizon T, number of arms K
- stochastic MAB: pulling arm *i* gives reward $r_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, 1)$
- best arm $\mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [\mathcal{K}]} \mu^{(i)}$, suboptimality gap $\Delta_i = \mu^{\star} \mu^{(i)}$
- policy π : π_t determined by the observed rewards before current batch

Regret $R(\pi) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\mu^* - \mu^{(\pi_t)} \right).$

Batch constraint represented by a grid $t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_M = T$

• static grid: $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \cdots, t_M\}$ fixed in advance

- time horizon T, number of arms K
- stochastic MAB: pulling arm *i* gives reward $r_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, 1)$
- best arm $\mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [\mathcal{K}]} \mu^{(i)}$, suboptimality gap $\Delta_i = \mu^{\star} \mu^{(i)}$
- policy π : π_t determined by the observed rewards before current batch

Regret $R(\pi) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\mu^* - \mu^{(\pi_t)} \right).$

Batch constraint represented by a grid $t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_M = T$

- static grid: $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \cdots, t_M\}$ fixed in advance
- adaptive grid: the next grid point determined by historic data

• time horizon T, number of arms K

- stochastic MAB: pulling arm *i* gives reward $r_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, 1)$
- best arm $\mu^{\star} = \max_{i \in [K]} \mu^{(i)}$, suboptimality gap $\Delta_i = \mu^{\star} \mu^{(i)}$
- policy π : π_t determined by the observed rewards before current batch

Regret $R(\pi) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\mu^* - \mu^{(\pi_t)} \right).$

Batch constraint represented by a grid $t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_M = T$

• static grid: $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \cdots, t_M\}$ fixed in advance

- adaptive grid: the next grid point determined by historic data
- task: design policy + grid

Two Types of Regrets

Tight analysis of stochastic MAB [Vog'60, LR'85, AB'09]:

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\pi^1)] \leq C \cdot \sqrt{K T} \ \mathbb{E}[R(\pi^2)] \leq C \cdot \sum_{i
eq \star} rac{1 ee \log(T \Delta_i^2)}{\Delta_i}$$

Two Types of Regrets

Tight analysis of stochastic MAB [Vog'60, LR'85, AB'09]:

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\pi^1)] \leq C \cdot \sqrt{KT} \ \mathbb{E}[R(\pi^2)] \leq C \cdot \sum_{i
eq \star} rac{1 ee \log(T\Delta_i^2)}{\Delta_i}$$

Minimax Regret

$$R_{\min\operatorname{-max}}(K, M, T) = \inf_{\pi, T} \sup_{\|\Delta\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{K}} \mathbb{E}[R(\pi)]$$

Two Types of Regrets

Tight analysis of stochastic MAB [Vog'60, LR'85, AB'09]:

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\pi^1)] \leq C \cdot \sqrt{KT} \ \mathbb{E}[R(\pi^2)] \leq C \cdot \sum_{i
eq \star} rac{1 ee \log(T\Delta_i^2)}{\Delta_i}$$

Minimax Regret

$$R_{\min\operatorname{-max}}(K, M, T) = \inf_{\pi, T} \sup_{\|\Delta\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{K}} \mathbb{E}[R(\pi)]$$

Problem-dependent Regret

$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, M, \mathbf{T}) = \inf_{\pi, \mathcal{T}} \sup_{\Delta > 0} \Delta \cdot \sup_{\Delta_i \in \{0\} \cup [\Delta, \sqrt{K}]} \mathbb{E}[R(\pi)]$$
Full online case:

$$R_{\min-\max}(K, T, T) = \Theta(\sqrt{KT})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, T, T) = \Theta(K \log(T))$$

Full online case:

$$R_{\min-\max}(K, T, T) = \Theta(\sqrt{KT})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, T, T) = \Theta(K \log(T))$$

Required number of batches [ACBF'02, CBDS'13]:

$$R_{\min-\max}(K, \log T, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{KT}) \quad (UCB2)$$
$$R_{\min-\max}(K, \log \log T, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{KT}) \quad (\text{switching cost})$$

Full online case:

$$R_{\min-\max}(K, T, T) = \Theta(\sqrt{KT})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, T, T) = \Theta(K \log(T))$$

Required number of batches [ACBF'02, CBDS'13]:

$$R_{\min-\max}(K, \log T, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{KT}) \quad (UCB2)$$
$$R_{\min-\max}(K, \log \log T, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{KT}) \quad (\text{switching cost})$$

Two-armed case with static grid [PRCS'16]:

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(2, M, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(T^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(2, M, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(T^{\frac{1}{M}})$$

Full online case:

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(K, T, T) = \Theta(\sqrt{KT})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, T, T) = \Theta(K \log(T))$$

Required number of batches [ACBF'02, CBDS'13]:

$$R_{\min-\max}(K, \log T, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{KT}) \quad (UCB2)$$
$$R_{\min-\max}(K, \log \log T, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{KT}) \quad (\text{switching cost})$$

Two-armed case with static grid [PRCS'16]:

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(2, M, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(T^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(2, M, T) = \widetilde{\Theta}(T^{\frac{1}{M}})$$

Lower bounds typically very challenging [JJNZ'16, AAAK'17, DRY'18, ...].

Theorem 1 (Upper Bound)

There exist policies π^1,π^2 such that

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\pi^{1})] \leq \mathsf{polylog}(K, T) \cdot \sqrt{KT^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-K}}}}$$
$$\mathbb{E}[R(\pi^{2})] \leq \mathsf{polylog}(K, T) \cdot \frac{KT^{\frac{1}{M}}}{\min_{i \neq \star} \Delta_{i}}$$

Theorem 1 (Upper Bound)

There exist policies π^1, π^2 such that

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\pi^{1})] \leq \mathsf{polylog}(K, T) \cdot \sqrt{KT^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}}}$$
$$\mathbb{E}[R(\pi^{2})] \leq \mathsf{polylog}(K, T) \cdot \frac{KT^{\frac{1}{M}}}{\min_{i \neq \star} \Delta_{i}}$$

M = log log T batches sufficient for centralized minimax regret
M = log T batches sufficient for centralized problem-dependent regret

Input: K, M, T, time grid T**Output:** policy π

Input: K, M, T, time grid T**Output:** policy π initialize the set of active arms $A \leftarrow [K]$;

Input: K, M, T, time grid T**Output:** policy π initialize the set of active arms $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow [K]$; **for** m = 1 to M **do**

pull all active arms for same number of times in *m*-th batch;

Input: K, M, T, time grid T

Output: policy π

initialize the set of active arms $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow [K]$;

for m = 1 to M do

pull all active arms for same number of times in *m*-th batch; estimate the mean reward for each active arm;

Input: K, M, T, time grid T**Output:** policy π initialize the set of active arms $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow [K]$; **for** m = 1 to M **do** pull all active arms for same number of times in *m*-th batch; estimate the mean reward for each active arm; eliminate all probably suboptimal arms from \mathcal{A} . **end for**

Minimax Grid

 $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{minimax}} = \{t_1, \cdots, t_M\}$ with

$$t_1 = a, \qquad t_m = \lfloor a \sqrt{t_{m-1}} \rfloor,$$

where a is chosen such that $t_M = T$.

Minimax Grid

 $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{minimax}} = \{t_1, \cdots, t_M\}$ with

$$t_1 = a, \qquad t_m = \lfloor a \sqrt{t_{m-1}} \rfloor,$$

where *a* is chosen such that $t_M = T$.

Geometric Grid

 $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{geometric}} = \{t'_1, \cdots, t'_M\}$ with

$$t_1' = b, \qquad t_m' = \lfloor bt_{m-1}' \rfloor,$$

where b is chosen such that $t'_M = T$.

Minimax Grid

 $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{minimax}} = \{t_1, \cdots, t_M\}$ with

$$t_1 = a, \qquad t_m = \lfloor a \sqrt{t_{m-1}} \rfloor,$$

where *a* is chosen such that $t_M = T$.

Geometric Grid

 $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{geometric}} = \{t'_1, \cdots, t'_M\}$ with

$$t'_1 = b, \qquad t'_m = \lfloor bt'_{m-1} \rfloor,$$

where b is chosen such that $t'_M = T$.

$$t_1 = T^{4/7}$$
 $t_2 = T^{6/7}$

Minimax Grid

 $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{minimax}} = \{t_1, \cdots, t_M\}$ with

$$t_1 = a, \qquad t_m = \lfloor a \sqrt{t_{m-1}} \rfloor,$$

where *a* is chosen such that $t_M = T$.

Geometric Grid

 $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{geometric}} = \{t'_1, \cdots, t'_M\}$ with

$$t'_1 = b, \qquad t'_m = \lfloor bt'_{m-1} \rfloor,$$

where b is chosen such that $t'_M = T$.

$$t_1 = T^{4/7}$$
 $t_2 = T^{6/7}$
 $t'_1 = T^{1/3}$ $t'_2 = T^{2/3}$ T

Main Result II: Static Lower Bound

Theorem 2 (Static Lower Bound)

Under any static grid,

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(\sqrt{KT}^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(KT^{\frac{1}{M}})$$

Main Result II: Static Lower Bound

Theorem 2 (Static Lower Bound)

Under any static grid,

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(\sqrt{KT}^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(KT^{\frac{1}{M}})$$

• match the upper bounds within logarithmic factors

Main Result II: Static Lower Bound

Theorem 2 (Static Lower Bound)

Under any static grid,

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(\sqrt{KT}^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(KT^{\frac{1}{M}})$$

- match the upper bounds within logarithmic factors
- proof uses a max-min approach: find multiple fixed reward distributions under which no policy performs uniformly well

Fundamental idea of hypothesis testing: construct several reward distributions such that

Fundamental idea of hypothesis testing: construct several reward distributions such that

• Large separation: if a policy performs well under one distribution, it will perform badly under others

Fundamental idea of hypothesis testing: construct several reward distributions such that

- Large separation: if a policy performs well under one distribution, it will perform badly under others
- Indistinguishability: these reward distributions are information theoretically hard to distinguish given observed rewards

Fundamental idea of hypothesis testing: construct several reward distributions such that

- Large separation: if a policy performs well under one distribution, it will perform badly under others
- Indistinguishability: these reward distributions are information theoretically hard to distinguish given observed rewards

Indistinguishability Lemma

Let Q_1, \dots, Q_n be probability measures on some common probability space. Then for any tree T = ([n], E) and test Ψ ,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q_i(\Psi \neq i) \geq \sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{2n} \exp(-D_{\mathrm{KL}}(Q_i || Q_j)).$$

Theorem 3 (Adaptive Lower Bound)

Under any adaptive grid,

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(M^{-2} \cdot \sqrt{KT^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}}})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(M^{-2} \cdot KT^{\frac{1}{M}})$$

Theorem 3 (Adaptive Lower Bound)

Under any adaptive grid,

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(M^{-2} \cdot \sqrt{KT^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}}})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(M^{-2} \cdot KT^{\frac{1}{M}})$$

• still match the upper bounds within logarithmic factors

Theorem 3 (Adaptive Lower Bound)

Under any adaptive grid,

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(M^{-2} \cdot \sqrt{KT^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}}})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(M^{-2} \cdot KT^{\frac{1}{M}})$$

- still match the upper bounds within logarithmic factors
- max-min approach breaks down even for static but randomized grid

Theorem 3 (Adaptive Lower Bound)

Under any adaptive grid,

$$R_{\text{min-max}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(M^{-2} \cdot \sqrt{KT^{\frac{1}{2-2^{1-M}}}})$$
$$R_{\text{pro-dep}}(K, M, T) = \Omega(M^{-2} \cdot KT^{\frac{1}{M}})$$

- still match the upper bounds within logarithmic factors
- max-min approach breaks down even for static but randomized grid
- use a min-max approach instead: construct corresponding reward distributions after a policy is given

Min-max: More Details

Construct reward distributions P_1, P_2, \cdots, P_M and events A_1, \cdots, A_M .

Min-max: More Details

Construct reward distributions P_1, P_2, \cdots, P_M and events A_1, \cdots, A_M .

Lemma 1 (Adaptive Hypotheses)

For any policy, if $P_m(A_m)$ is not too small for some *m*, then the policy incurs a large regret in the worst case.

Min-max: More Details

Construct reward distributions P_1, P_2, \cdots, P_M and events A_1, \cdots, A_M .

Lemma 1 (Adaptive Hypotheses)

For any policy, if $P_m(A_m)$ is not too small for some *m*, then the policy incurs a large regret in the worst case.

Lemma 2 (Covering of Events)

For any policy it holds that

$$\sum_{m=1}^M P_m(A_m) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Take-home message:

• impact and optimal use of partial information in time domain

- impact and optimal use of partial information in time domain
- upper bound: BaSE policy with optimal grid design

- impact and optimal use of partial information in time domain
- upper bound: BaSE policy with optimal grid design
- lower bound: a min-max approach for adaptive grids

- impact and optimal use of partial information in time domain
- upper bound: BaSE policy with optimal grid design
- lower bound: a min-max approach for adaptive grids Future directions:

- impact and optimal use of partial information in time domain
- upper bound: BaSE policy with optimal grid design
- lower bound: a min-max approach for adaptive grids Future directions:
 - remove the M^{-2} factor in the adaptive lower bound

Take-home message:

- impact and optimal use of partial information in time domain
- upper bound: BaSE policy with optimal grid design
- lower bound: a min-max approach for adaptive grids

Future directions:

- $\bullet\,$ remove the M^{-2} factor in the adaptive lower bound
- generalize to adversarial and contextual bandits
Concluding Remarks

Take-home message:

- impact and optimal use of partial information in time domain
- upper bound: BaSE policy with optimal grid design
- lower bound: a min-max approach for adaptive grids

Future directions:

- remove the M^{-2} factor in the adaptive lower bound
- generalize to adversarial and contextual bandits
- general tools for limited rounds of adaptivity

Concluding Remarks

Take-home message:

- impact and optimal use of partial information in time domain
- upper bound: BaSE policy with optimal grid design
- lower bound: a min-max approach for adaptive grids

Future directions:

- remove the M^{-2} factor in the adaptive lower bound
- generalize to adversarial and contextual bandits
- general tools for limited rounds of adaptivity

Thank you!