

BEST-ARM IDENTIFICATION IN UNIMODAL BANDITS

RICCARDO POIANI¹, MARC JOURDAN², RÉMY DEGENNE³, EMILIE KAUFMANN³

¹ Bocconi University, Milan, Italy, ² EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland, ³ Univ. Lille, Inria, CNRS, Centrale Lille, UMR 9189-CRISTAL

UNIMODAL BANDITS

⚙️ Problem Setting

- **Input:** Arms $(\nu_i)_{i \in [K]}$ of distributions with means μ_i
- **Unimodality:** $\exists \star \in [K]$ such that $\mu_i \leq \mu_{i+1}$ for all $i < \star$ and $\mu_i > \mu_{i+1}$ for all $i \geq \star$
- **Goal:** Identify $\star \in \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [K]} \mu_i$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$ while minimizing the *sample complexity*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\tau_{\delta}] = \sum_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[N_i(\tau_{\delta})]$$

DEPENDENCY IN THE NUMBER OF ARMS

➤ (Another) Lower Bound

Thm. Let $\Delta > 0$, and $\nu^{(i)} = \mathcal{N}(\mu^{(i)}, I_K)$ where $\mu_i^{(i)} = \Delta$ and $\mu_j^{(i)} = 0$ if $j \neq i$. For $\delta \leq 0.25$, we have:

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{(i)}}[\tau_{\delta}] \geq \frac{K}{64\Delta^2}.$$

➔ $\exists \nu^{(i)}$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{(i)}}[\tau_{\delta}] \geq \frac{K}{64\Delta^2}$

👎 In the **worst-case**, there is a linear dependency in K

UNIMODAL TAS

➤ How to apply Track and Stop? [2]

- We can compute ω^* only for unimodal μ 's
- **Project** $\hat{\mu}(t) \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}(t)$ to be unimodal!

👍 Projection error to 0 ➔ Optimality

👍 Projection takes $\mathcal{O}(K)$

👎 Forced Exploration **do not exploit sparsity!**

EXPERIMENTS SUMMARY

- All our algorithms outperform asymptotic optimal algorithms for generic structures [1, 4, 5]
- U-TaS suffers a lot when K is large and μ is not flat

REFERENCES

- [1] Rémy Degenne, Wouter M Koolen, and Pierre Ménard. Non-asymptotic pure exploration by solving games. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [2] Aurélien Garivier and Emilie Kaufmann. Optimal best arm identification with fixed confidence. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 998–1027. PMLR, 2016.
- [3] Marc Jourdan and Rémy Degenne. Non-asymptotic analysis of a ucb-based top two algorithm. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:68980–69020, 2023.
- [4] Pierre Ménard. Gradient ascent for active exploration in bandit problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.08165*, 2019.
- [5] Po-An Wang, Ruo-Chun Tzeng, and Alexandre Proutiere. Fast pure exploration via frank-wolfe. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:5810–5821, 2021.

DEPENDENCY IN THE RISK PARAMETER δ

➤ (Instance-Dependent) Sample Complexity Lower Bound

Thm. For any δ -correct strategy, and any unimodal bandit μ it holds that $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[c_{\tau_{\delta}}] \geq T^*(\mu) \log\left(\frac{1}{2.4\delta}\right)$ where

$$T^*(\mu)^{-1} := \sup_{\omega \in \tilde{\Delta}_K(\mu)} \min_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\star)} g_i(\omega, \mu), \quad g_i(\omega, \mu) = \inf_{x \in (\mu_i, \mu_{\star})} \omega_{\star} d(\mu_{\star}, x) + \omega_i d(\mu_i, x)$$

$$\tilde{\Delta}_K(\mu) = \{\omega \in \Delta_K \mid \forall i \notin \mathcal{N}(\star) \cup \star, \omega_i = 0\}$$

and $\mathcal{N}(\star)$ are the neighbors of arm \star .

➤ Remarks

- Sparsity pattern of the oracle-weights! No dependency in $T^*(\mu)^{-1}$ on K .
- Lower bound is exactly BAI lower bound but on arms in $\mathcal{N}(\star) \cup \star$, i.e., [2]
- We have fast algorithms for computing $\omega^*(\mu)$ (e.g., bisection methods)

STOPPING RULES

➤ Full-sum Stopping Rule

$$\inf_{\lambda \in \text{Alt}(\hat{\mu}(t))} \sum_{i \in [K]} N_i(t) d(\hat{\mu}_i(t), \lambda_i) \geq c_K(t-1, \delta), \quad c_K(t, \delta) \approx \log \frac{1}{\delta} + K \log t$$

- The l.h.s. can be very large, although only 3 arms matter
- Cannot use the empirical threshold $\tilde{c}(t, \delta) = \log\left(\frac{1 + \log t}{\delta}\right)$ commonly used in experiments
- Gaussian bandits with variance σ^2 . Arm means 0 but one with mean Δ . After init, l.h.s. $\approx K D_{\sigma}$

➤ Local GLR Stopping Rule

$$\nu_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in [K]} \min_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} W_t(i, j), \quad W_t(i, j) = \inf_{\lambda_j > \lambda_i} \sum_{k \in \{i, j\}} N_k(t) d(\hat{\mu}_k(t), \lambda_k)$$

$$\min_{j \in \mathcal{N}(\nu_t)} W_t(\nu_t, j) \geq c(t-1, \delta), \quad c(t-1, \delta) \approx \log\left(\frac{K}{\delta}\right) + \log(t)$$

- We exploit **local** information to stop
- No linear dependency in K , but logarithmic (due to union bound)

OPTIMISTIC TRACK AND STOP

➤ How to apply Optimistic Track and Stop? [1]

✗ Confidence Intervals

$$\Theta_t := \{\theta \mid \forall i \in [K] : N_i(t) d(\hat{\mu}_i(t), \theta_i) \leq f(t)\}, \quad f(t) \approx \log(t)$$

✓ **Structured Confidence Intervals** $\tilde{\Theta}_t = \Theta_t \cap \mathcal{S}$ where \mathcal{S} are unimodal bandits

</> Compute

$$\mu^+(t), \omega(t) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{\lambda \in \tilde{\Theta}_t} \max_{\omega \in \tilde{\Delta}_K(\lambda)} \min_{i \in \mathcal{N}(i^*(\lambda))} g_i(\omega, \lambda)$$

👍 Can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(K)$ using K calls to $T^*(\cdot)^{-1}$

👍 There exists a time on the good event where O-TaS pulls only arms within $\star \cup \mathcal{N}(\star)$

👎 Asymptotically optimal but finite time bound does not match dependency in K

UNIMODAL TOP-TWO SAMPLING

➤ How to apply Top-Two Approaches? [3]

✓ (Structured) Leader

$$B_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [K]} \max_{\lambda \in \tilde{\Theta}_t} \lambda_i$$

✓ (Unimodal) Challenger

$$C_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{j \in \mathcal{N}(B_t)} W_t(B_t, j)$$

</> Arms are pulled according to fixed-design

👍 Computing the leader takes $\mathcal{O}(K)$ and no calls to $T^*(\cdot)^{-1}$

👍 There exists a time on the good event after which the leader is always \star

👎 Asymptotically β -optimal with fixed design, finite time bound is $\tilde{O}(K)$