

Thompson Sampling for Combinatorial Network Optimization in Unknown Environments

Alihan Hüyük, Cem Tekin, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Influence maximization, item recommendation, adaptive routing and dynamic spectrum allocation all require choosing the right action from a large set of alternatives. Thanks to the advances in combinatorial optimization, these and many similar problems can be efficiently solved given that the stochasticity of the environment is perfectly known. In this paper, we take this one step further and focus on combinatorial optimization in unknown environments. All of these settings fit into the general combinatorial learning framework called combinatorial multi-armed bandit with probabilistically triggered arms. We consider a very powerful Bayesian algorithm, Combinatorial Thompson Sampling (CTS), and analyze its regret under the semi-bandit feedback model. Assuming that the learner does not know the expected base arm outcomes beforehand but has access to an exact oracle, we show that when the expected reward is Lipschitz continuous in the expected base arm outcomes CTS achieves $O(\sum_{i=1}^m \log T / (p_i \Delta_i))$ regret, where m denotes the number of base arms, p_i denotes the minimum non-zero triggering probability of base arm i , Δ_i denotes the minimum suboptimality gap of base arm i and T denotes the time horizon. In addition, we prove that when triggering probabilities are at least $p^* > 0$ for all base arms, CTS achieves $O(1/p^* \log(1/p^*))$ regret independent of the time horizon. We also numerically compare CTS with algorithms that use the principle of optimism in the face of uncertainty in several combinatorial networking problems, and show that CTS outperforms these algorithms by at least an order of magnitude in the majority of the cases.

Index Terms—Combinatorial network optimization, multi-armed bandits, Thompson sampling, regret bounds, online learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

How should an advertiser promote its products in a social network to reach to a large set of users with a limited budget [2], [3]? How should a search engine suggest a ranked list of items to its users to maximize the click-through rate [4]? How should a base station allocate its users to channels to maximize the system throughput [5]? How should a mobile crowdsourcing platform dynamically assign available tasks to its workers to maximize the performance [6]? How can we identify the most reliable paths from source to destination under probabilistic link failures [7]? All of these problems require optimizing decisions among a vast set of alternatives. When the probabilistic description of the environment is fully

specified, these problems—and many others—are solved using computationally efficient exact or approximation algorithms. In this paper, we focus on a much difficult and more realistic problem: How should we learn the optimal decisions in these complex problems via repeated interaction with the environment when the probabilistic description of the environment is unknown or only partially known?

It is natural to assume that the environment is unknown in many real-world applications. For instance, the advertiser may not know with what probability user i will influence its neighbor j in the social network or the search engine may not know with what probability user i will click the item shown on position j beforehand. Moreover, decisions are need to made sequentially over time. For instance, the recommender system should show a new list of items to each arriving user and the base station should reallocate network resources when the channel conditions change or the users leave/enter the system. Obviously, future decisions of the learner must be guided based on what it has observed thus far, i.e., the trajectory of actions, observations and rewards generated by the learner's past decisions. Importantly, both the cumulative reward of the learner and what it has learned so far also depend on this trajectory. Therefore, the learner needs to balance how much it earns (by exploiting the actions it believes to be the best) and how much it learns (by exploring actions it does not know much about) in order to maximize its long-term performance. In this paper, we solve the formidable task of combinatorial optimization in unknown environments by modeling it as a combinatorial multi-armed bandit (MAB).

MAB problems have a long history as they exhibit the prime example of the tradeoff between exploration and exploitation [5], [8]. In the classical MAB, at each round the learner selects an arm (action) which yields a random reward that comes from an unknown distribution. The goal of the learner is to maximize its expected cumulative reward over all rounds by learning to select arms that yield high rewards. The learner's performance is measured by its regret with respect to an oracle that always selects the arm with the highest expected reward. It is shown that when the arms' rewards are independent, any uniformly good policy will incur at least logarithmic in time regret [9].

Several classes of policies are proposed for the learner to minimize its regret. One example is Thompson sampling [10]–[12], which is a Bayesian method. In this method, the learner keeps a posterior distribution over the expected arm rewards, and at each round takes a sample from each arm's posterior, and then, plays the arm with the largest sample. Reward observed from the played arm is then used to update

A. Hüyük and C. Tekin are with the Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey, 06800. Email: alihan.huyuk@ug.bilkent.edu.tr, cemtekin@ee.bilkent.edu.tr.

This work was supported in part by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey under Grant 215E342.

A preliminary version of this work was presented in AISTATS 2019 [1].

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

its posterior. This sampling strategy allows the learner to frequently select the arms whose probabilities of being optimal are the highest based on their posteriors and to occasionally explore inferior arms to refine their posteriors. Policies in the other end of the spectrum use the principle of optimism under the face of uncertainty. Notable examples include policies based on upper confidence bound (UCB) indices [9], [13], [14], which are usually composed of sample mean reward of an arm plus an exploration bonus that accounts for the uncertainty in the arm's reward estimates. The strategy is to play the arm with the highest UCB index to tradeoff exploration and exploitation. Unlike Thompson sampling, performance of this type of policies heavily rely on the confidence sets used to compute the exploration bonus [12]. This together with the superior performance of Thompson sampling documented in numerous applications [15], [16] motivate us to consider a Thompson sampling based approach for our problem.

Our main focus in this paper, i.e., combinatorial MAB (CMAB) [5], [17]–[19], is an extension of MAB where the learner selects a *super arm* at each round, which is defined to be a subset of the *base arms*. Then, the learner observes and collects the reward associated with the selected super arm, and also observes the outcomes of the base arms that are in the selected super arm. This type of feedback is also called *semi-bandit* feedback. For instance, when allocating users to orthogonal channels, each user-channel pair represents a base arm, the super arm is the set of user-channel pairs in the selected allocation, outcomes of base arms are indicators of successful packet transmissions and the reward is the number of packets successfully transmitted, i.e., sum of the indicators. While CMAB is general enough to model the aforementioned resource allocation problem, it does not fully capture the probabilistic structure of influence maximization, item list recommendation and reliable packet routing applications discussed in the preceding paragraphs. Therefore, we consider a generalized version of CMAB, called CMAB with probabilistically triggered arms (CMAB-PTA) [20], where the selected super arm probabilistically triggers a set of base arms, and the expected reward obtained in a round is a function of the set of triggered base arms and their expected outcomes. For instance, in influence maximization, each edge of the graph represents a base arm, the super arm is the selected seed set of nodes, outcomes of base arms are indicators of influence propagation on the corresponding edge (see, e.g., the independent cascade model [21]) and the reward is the number of influenced nodes, i.e., the set of nodes reachable from the seed set of nodes after the outcomes of base arms are realized. Triggered base arms in this case correspond to the set of edges that originate from all influenced nodes (including the seed set).

The regret for CMAB-PTA is defined as the difference between the expected cumulative reward of an oracle that always selects the super arm with the highest expected reward and that of the learner. Our goal is to design an algorithm that achieves the smallest rate of growth of the regret over time, as this will ensure that the average reward of the learner will converge to the highest possible expected reward. To this end, we propose a Bayesian algorithm called combinatorial

Thompson sampling (CTS) and analyze its regret assuming that the learner does not know the expected base arm outcomes beforehand but has access to an exact optimization oracle. Essentially, this oracle outputs an estimated optimal super arm given estimates of expected base arm outcomes as inputs. When the expected reward is Lipschitz continuous in the expected base arm outcomes, we show that CTS achieves $O(\sum_{i=1}^m \log T / (p_i \Delta_i))$ regret, where m denotes the number of base arms, p_i denotes the minimum non-zero triggering probability of base arm i , Δ_i denotes the minimum suboptimality gap of base arm i and T denotes the time horizon. Our bound is optimal in the sense that the dependence of the regret on the terms that appear in the bound is shown to be unavoidable in general [22]. In addition, we prove that when triggering probabilities are at least $p^* > 0$ for all base arms, CTS achieves $O(1/p^* \log(1/p^*))$ regret independent of the time horizon. This setting is of particular interest since it can model random behavior of users in a recommender system. For instance, a user may rate an item even when it is not in the list of recommended items as a result of an exogenous event (by rating the item on a partner website or by explicitly navigating to the item to rate it). Moreover, it is also closely linked to related work on online learning with probabilistic graph feedback [23], [24] and MAB with side observations [25]. Specifically, the models in [24] and [25] become special cases of our work when the graph is fully-connected for the one-step case and connected for the cascade case in [24] and when the probability of having an observation from any arm is non-zero in [25].

We complement our theoretical findings via extensive simulations in the following combinatorial network optimization problems: cascading bandits [4], probabilistic maximum coverage bandits [20] and influence maximization bandits [20]. For cascading bandits, we show that CTS, which uses Beta posterior on base arms significantly outperforms all competitor algorithms that use either UCB indices [4] or Thompson sampling with Gaussian posterior [26]. The latter finding emphasizes the importance of working with the correct type of posterior. For probabilistic maximum coverage bandits, we show that CTS achieves an order of magnitude improvement over combinatorial UCB (CUCB) in [20] when both algorithms use an exact oracle. For influence maximization bandits, we show a similar result even when both algorithms use an approximation oracle instead of an exact oracle.

To sum up, the main contribution of this paper is to analyze Thompson sampling for a very general combinatorial online learning framework that is comprehensive enough to model many different sequential decision-making applications defined over networks and show its optimality both theoretically and experimentally.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Related work is given in Section II followed by problem formulation in Section III. Applications of CMAB-PTA are detailed in Section IV. Description of CTS and regret bounds are given in Section V. Proofs of the main results are explained in Sections VI and VII. Numerical results are presented in Section VIII, and concluding remarks are given in Section IX.

II. RELATED WORK

CMAB has been studied under various assumptions on the relation between super arms, base arms and rewards [17]. Here, we mainly discuss the related works that assume semi-bandit feedback as we do in our work. A version of CMAB in which the expected reward of a super arm is a linear combination of the expected outcomes of the base arms in that super arm is studied in [5]. For this problem, it is shown in [18] that a combinatorial version of UCB1 in [14] achieves $O(Km \log T/\Delta)$ gap-dependent and $O(\sqrt{KmT} \log T)$ gap-free (worst-case) regrets, where m is the number of base arms, K is the maximum number of base arms in a super arm, and Δ is the gap between the expected reward of the optimal super arm and the second best super arm.

Later on, this setting is generalized to allow the expected reward of each super arm to be a more general function of the expected outcomes of the base arms that obeys certain monotonicity and bounded smoothness conditions [19]. The main challenge in the general case is that the optimization problem itself is NP-hard, but an approximately optimal solution can usually be computed efficiently for many special cases [27]. Therefore, it is assumed that the learner has access to an approximation oracle, which can output a super arm that has expected reward that is at least α fraction of the optimal reward with probability at least β when given the expected outcomes of the base arms. Thus, the regret is measured with respect to the $\alpha\beta$ fraction of the optimal reward, and it is proven that a combinatorial variant of UCB1, called CUCB, achieves $O(\sum_{i=1}^m \log T/\Delta_i)$ regret, when the bounded smoothness function is $f(x) = \gamma x$ for some $\gamma > 0$, where Δ_i is the minimum gap between the expected reward of the optimal super arm and the expected reward of any suboptimal super arm that contains base arm i .

Recently, it is shown in [28] that Thompson sampling can achieve $O(\sum_{i=1}^m \log T/\Delta_i)$ regret for the general CMAB under a Lipschitz continuity assumption on the expected reward, given that the learner has access to an exact computation oracle, which outputs an optimal super arm when given the set of expected base arm outcomes. Moreover, it is also shown that in general the learner cannot guarantee sublinear regret when it only has access to an approximation oracle. Since the setting studied in this paper is a special case of ours, for our theoretical analysis we also assume that the learner uses an exact computation oracle. Nevertheless, we show in Section VIII that in practice CTS works well even when used with an approximation oracle. Another related work on CMAB [29] considers a new smoothness condition termed the Gini-weighted smoothness on the expected reward. For some problem types, this leads to regret bounds with better dependency on the sizes of super arms as compared to the common linear dependency of existing algorithms.

Different from CMAB, papers on CMAB-PTA assume that the expected reward is a function of expected outcomes of the triggered base arms, which is a random superset of base arms in the selected super arm. For this problem, it is shown in [20] that logarithmic regret is achievable when the expected reward function has the l_∞ bounded smoothness

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF THE RELATED WORK WITH A COMPARISON TO OUR WORK.

Publ.	Algorithm	Oracle	PTAs	Regret Bound
[19]	CUCB	Approx.	No	$O(\sum_i \log T/\Delta_i)$
[20]	CUCB	Approx.	Yes	$O(\sum_i \log T/(p_i \Delta_i))$
[22]	CUCB	Approx.	Yes	$O(\sum_i \log T/\Delta_i)^*$
[28]	CTS	Exact	No	$O(\sum_i \log T/\Delta_i)$
[30]	CUCB & CTS	Approx.	Yes [†]	$O((1/p^*)^4)$
Ours	CTS	Exact	Yes	$O(\sum_i \log T/(p_i \Delta_i))$
			Yes [†]	$O(1/p^* \log(1/p^*))$

*Under the triggering probability modulated bounded smoothness assumption.

[†]The case when the arm triggering probabilities are all positive.

property. However, this bound depends on $1/p^*$, where p^* is the minimum non-zero triggering probability. Later, it is shown in [22] that under a more strict smoothness assumption on the expected reward function, called triggering probability modulated bounded smoothness, it is possible to achieve regret that does not depend on $1/p^*$. It is also shown in this work that the dependence on $1/p^*$ is unavoidable for the general case. In another work [30], CMAB-PTA is considered for the case when the arm triggering probabilities are all positive, and it is shown that both CUCB and CTS achieve bounded regret. However, their $O((1/p^*)^4)$ bound has a much worse dependence on p^* than our $O(1/p^* \log(1/p^*))$ bound.

Apart from the works mentioned above, numerous other works also tackle related online learning problems. For instance, [31] considers matroid bandits, which is a special case of CMAB where the super arms are given as independent sets of a matroid with base arms being the elements of the ground set, and the expected reward of a super arm is the sum of the expected outcomes of the base arms in the super arm. Another example is cascading bandits [4], which is a special case of CMAB-PTA, where each super arm corresponds to a ranked list of items and base arms are triggered according to a user click model. A plethora of papers exist on UCB based policies for variants of these two models (see e.g., [32] for a variant of matroid bandits and [33] and [34] for variants of cascading bandits.) Apart from these, [26] considers Thompson sampling with Gaussian posterior for cascading bandits and proves that the worst-case regret is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{KmT})$. We show in Section VIII that CTS significantly outperforms their algorithm for cascading bandits. We think that this is the case in practice because Beta posterior is more suitable in modeling click probabilities compared to Gaussian posterior.

Several other works focus on contextual CMAB [34]–[36], CMAB with adversarial rewards [37], [38] and CMAB with knapsacks [39]. Most recently there has been a surge of interest in analyzing CMAB under the full-bandit feedback setting, where the learner only observes the reward of the selected super arm but not the outcomes of the base arms [40], [41]. For instance, [41] uses a sampling method based on Hadamard matrices to estimate base arm rewards from full-bandit feedback. On the other hand, [42] considers a more general feedback model where the learner observes a linear combination of base arm’s rewards.

Table I compares our work with the most closely related

papers in terms of the assumptions and the regret bounds. Finally, we would like to note that Thompson sampling is also analyzed for a parametric CMAB model given a prior with finite support in [43], and a contextual CMAB model with a Bayesian regret metric in [44]. Unlike these works, we adopt the models in [20] and [28], work in a setting where there is an unknown but fixed parameter (expected outcome) vector, and analyze the expected regret.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

CMAB-PTA is a decision making problem where the learner interacts with its environment through m base arms, indexed by the set $[m] := \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ sequentially over rounds indexed by $t \in [T]$. In this paper, we consider the model introduced in [20] and borrow the notation from [28]. In this model, the following events take place in order in each round t :

- The learner selects a subset of base arms, denoted by $S(t)$, which is called a super arm.
- $S(t)$ causes some other base arms to probabilistically trigger based on a stochastic triggering process, which results in a set of triggered base arms $S'(t)$ that contains $S(t)$.
- The learner obtains a reward that depends on $S'(t)$ and observes the outcomes of the base arms in $S'(t)$.

Next, we describe in detail the base arm outcomes, the super arms, the triggering process, the reward, the observation (feedback) model and the regret.

A. Base Arm Outcomes

In each round t , the environment draws a random outcome vector $\mathbf{X}(t) := (X_1(t), X_2(t), \dots, X_m(t))$ from a fixed probability distribution D on $[0, 1]^m$ independent of the previous rounds, where $X_i(t)$ represents the outcome of base arm i . D is unknown by the learner, but it belongs to a class of distributions \mathcal{D} which is known by the learner. We define the mean outcome (parameter) vector as $\boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_m)$, where $\mu_i := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim D}[X_i(t)]$, and use $\boldsymbol{\mu}_S$ to denote the projection of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ on S for $S \subseteq [m]$.

Since CTS computes a posterior over $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, the following assumption is made to have an efficient and simple update of the posterior distribution.

Assumption 1. *The outcomes of all base arms are mutually independent, i.e., $D = D_1 \times D_2 \times \dots \times D_m$.*

Note that this independence assumption holds in many applications, including the influence maximization problem with independent cascade influence propagation model [21].

B. Super Arms and the Triggering Process

The learner is allowed to select $S(t)$ from a subset of $2^{[m]}$ denoted by \mathcal{I} , which corresponds to the set of feasible super arms. Once $S(t)$ is selected, all base arms $i \in S(t)$ are immediately triggered. These arms can trigger other base arms that are not in $S(t)$, and those arms can further trigger other base arms, and so on. At the end, a random superset $S'(t)$ of $S(t)$

is formed that consists of all triggered base arms as a result of selecting $S(t)$. We have $S'(t) \sim D^{\text{trig}}(S(t), \mathbf{X}(t))$, where D^{trig} is the probabilistic triggering function that describes the triggering process. For instance, in the influence maximization problem, D^{trig} may correspond to the independent cascade influence propagation model defined over a given influence graph [21]. The triggering process can also be described by a set of triggering probabilities. For each $i \in [m]$ and $S \in \mathcal{I}$, $p_i^{D', S}$ denotes the probability that base arm i is triggered when super arm S is selected given that the arm outcome distribution is $D' \in \mathcal{D}$. For simplicity, we let $p_i^S = p_i^{D, S}$, where D is the true arm outcome distribution. Let $\tilde{S} := \{i \in [m] : p_i^S > 0\}$ be the set of all base arms that could potentially be triggered by super arm S , which is called the *triggering set* of S . We have that $S(t) \subseteq S'(t) \subseteq \tilde{S}(t) \subseteq [m]$. We define $p_i := \min_{S \in \mathcal{I}: i \in \tilde{S}} p_i^S$ as the minimum nonzero triggering probability of base arm i , and $p^* := \min_{i \in [m]} p_i$ as the minimum nonzero triggering probability.

C. Reward

At the end of round t , the learner receives a reward that depends on the set of triggered arms $S'(t)$ and the outcome vector $\mathbf{X}(t)$, which is denoted by $R(S'(t), \mathbf{X}(t))$. For simplicity of notation, we also use $R(t) = R(S'(t), \mathbf{X}(t))$ to denote the reward in round t . Note that whether a base arm is in the selected super arm or is triggered afterwards is not relevant in terms of the reward. We assume that the expected reward depends on the mean outcome vector in a specific way by making the following mild assumptions about the expected reward function. We note that these assumptions are standard in the CMAB literature [20], [28] and hold for the networking applications given in Section IV. The first assumption states that the expected reward is only a function of $S(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

Assumption 2. *The expected reward of super arm $S \in \mathcal{I}$ only depends on S and the mean outcome vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, i.e., there exists a function r such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R(t)] &= \mathbb{E}_{S'(t) \sim D^{\text{trig}}(S(t), \mathbf{X}(t)), \mathbf{X}(t) \sim D}[R(S'(t), \mathbf{X}(t))] \\ &= r(S(t), \boldsymbol{\mu}) . \end{aligned}$$

In order to learn the best action, we require the estimate of the expected reward vector to converge to the true expected reward vector as the number of observations increases. This can be done when the expected reward varies smoothly with the mean outcome vector. Below, we state a form of continuity for the expected reward.

Assumption 3. *(Lipschitz continuity) There exists a constant $B > 0$, such that for every super arm S and every pair of mean outcome vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}'$, we have*

$$|r(S, \boldsymbol{\mu}) - r(S, \boldsymbol{\mu}')| \leq B \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_S - \boldsymbol{\mu}'_S\|_1$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the l_1 norm.

D. Observation Model

We consider the semi-bandit feedback model, where at the end of round t , the learner observes the individual outcomes of

the triggered arms, denoted by $Q(S'(t), \mathbf{X}(t)) := \{(i, X_i(t)) : i \in S'(t)\}$. Again, for simplicity of notation, we also use $Q(t) = Q(S'(t), \mathbf{X}(t))$ to denote the observation at the end of round t . Based on this, the only information available to the learner when choosing the super arm to select in round $t + 1$ is its observation history, given as $\mathcal{F}_t := \{(S(\tau), Q(\tau)) : \tau \in [t]\}$.

In short, the tuple $([m], \mathcal{I}, D, D^{\text{trig}}, R)$ constitutes a CMAB-PTA problem instance. Among the elements of this tuple only D is unknown to the learner.

E. Regret

In order to evaluate the performance of the learner, we define the set of optimal super arms given an m -dimensional parameter vector θ as $\text{OPT}(\theta) := \text{argmax}_{S \in \mathcal{I}} r(S, \theta)$. We use $\text{OPT} := \text{OPT}(\mu)$ to denote the set of optimal super arms given the true mean outcome vector μ . Based on this, we let S^* to represent a specific super arm in $\text{argmin}_{S \in \text{OPT}} |\tilde{S}|$, which is the set of super arms that have triggering sets with minimum cardinality among all optimal super arms. We also let $k^* := |S^*|$ and $\tilde{k}^* := |\tilde{S}^*|$.

Next, we define the suboptimality gap due to selecting super arm $S \in \mathcal{I}$ as $\Delta_S := r(S^*, \mu) - r(S, \mu)$, the maximum suboptimality gap as $\Delta_{\max} := \max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} \Delta_S$, and the minimum suboptimality gap of base arm i as $\Delta_i := \min_{S \in \mathcal{I} - \text{OPT}: i \in \tilde{S}} \Delta_S$.¹ The goal of the learner is to minimize the (expected) regret over the time horizon T , given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}(T) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T (r(S^*, \mu) - r(S(t), \mu)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \Delta_{S(t)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

IV. NETWORKING APPLICATIONS

Here, we introduce three networking applications of CMAB-PTA: cascading bandits, probabilistic maximum coverage bandits and influence maximization bandits. Numerical experiments given in Section VIII explore specific cases of all these problems that are generated either synthetically or from real-world data.

A. Cascading Bandits

1) *Disjunctive Form for Search Engine Optimization:* In the disjunctive form of the cascading bandit problem [4], a search engine outputs a list of K web pages for each of its R users among a set of L web pages. Then, the users examine their respective lists, and click on the first page that they find attractive. If all pages fail to attract them, they do not click on any page. The goal of the search engine is to maximize the number of clicks.

This problem can be modeled as an instance of CMAB-PTA as follows. The base arms are page-user pairs (i, j) , where $i \in [L]$ and $j \in [R]$. User j finds page i attractive independent of other users and other pages with probability $p_{i,j}$. The super

arms are R lists of K -tuples, where each K -tuple represents the list of pages shown to a user. Given a super arm S , let $S(k, j)$ denote the k th page that is selected for user j . Then, the triggering probabilities can be written as

$$p_{(i,j)}^S = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = S(1, j) \\ \prod_{k'=1}^{k-1} (1 - p_{S(k',j),j}) & \text{if } \exists k \neq 1 : i = S(k, j) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

that is we observe feedback for a top selection immediately, and observe feedback for the other selections only if all previous selections fail to attract the user. The expected reward of playing super arm S can be written as

$$r(S, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{j=1}^R \left(1 - \prod_{k=1}^K (1 - p_{S(k,j),j}) \right)$$

for which Assumption 3 holds when $B = 1$.

2) Conjunctive Form for Network Routing Reliability:

One can also consider the conjunctive analogue of the problem, where the goal of the search engine is to—somewhat peculiarly—maximize the number of users with lists that do not contain any unattractive page, and when examining their lists, users provide feedback by reporting the first unattractive page. Formally,

$$p_{(i,j)}^S = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = S(1, j) \\ \prod_{k'=1}^{k-1} p_{S(k',j),j} & \text{if } \exists k \neq 1 : i = S(k, j) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$r(S, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{j=1}^R \prod_{k=1}^K p_{S(k,j),j}.$$

This conjunctive form fits particularly well to the network reliability problem [7], where we are interested in finding the most reliable routing path in a communication network. We consider routing paths as super arms, \mathcal{I} being the set of all possible routing paths. Each routing path $S \in \mathcal{I}$ consists of a variable number of ordered links that correspond to the base arms. We denote the index of k th link in routing path S as $S(k)$ and the length of the path as $|S|$. Each link $i \in [m]$ in a routing path can fail independently from all other links with probability $1 - p_i$. Then, the probabilistic reliability of a routing path is defined as the probability of successful operation with no link in the path failing.

Since we can only observe whether a link has failed or not up to the first link that has failed, the triggering probability of link i when routing path S is selected can be written as

$$p_i^S = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = S(1) \\ \prod_{k'=1}^{k-1} p_{S(k')} & \text{if } \exists k \neq 1 : i = S(k) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the probabilistic reliability of routing path S —in other words, the expected reward—becomes

$$r(S, \mathbf{p}) = \prod_{k=1}^{|S|} p_{S(k)}.$$

¹If there is no such super arm S , let $\Delta_i = \infty$.

B. Probabilistic Maximum Coverage Bandits

Consider a special case of the probabilistic maximum coverage problem, where an online shopping site advertises K items that are selected from a catalog of L items to its R users. Each user inspects all of the items that are advertised and likes one of the attractive items. The users do not like any item if none of the items attract them. The goal of the shopping site is to maximize the number of likes. Analogous to cascading bandits, in this problem, base arms are item-user pairs (i, j) , where $i \in [L]$ and $j \in [R]$. User j finds item i attractive independent of other users and other items with probability $p_{i,j}$. The super arms are the set of all pairs (i, j) such that item i is the element of a size- K subset of $[L]$.

This can also model the problem of allocating orthogonal channels to secondary users in a cognitive radio network [5]. Consider L as the number of orthogonal channels, R as the number of secondary users ($L > R$), and $p_{i,j}$ as the expected throughput that user j can obtain using channel i . We would like to maximize the expected sum throughput by allocating each user j a unique channel $c_j \in [L]$ so that $c_j = c_{j'}$ if and only if $j = j'$ for all $j, j' \in [R]$. Given one such allocation, the corresponding super arm would be the set $S = \{(c_j, j)\}_{j=1}^R$ and the expected reward of it can be written as $r(S, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in S} p_{i,j}$.

In its classical form, this problem does not have any PTAs. In order to provide an example case with strictly positive triggering probabilities, we introduce the *word-of-mouth effect* as follows. Regardless of the shopping site's decisions, we assume that users inspect, i.e., they explicitly search or navigate to, unadvertised items independently with probability p^* .² This can happen if users hear about the items outside of the shopping site (e.g., from their friends or from another venue). Then, the triggering probabilities can be written as

$$p_{(i,j)}^S = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (i, j) \in S \\ p^* & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the expected reward of super arm S can be written as

$$r(S, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{j=1}^R \left(1 - \prod_{i=1}^L (1 - p_{(i,j)}^S p_{i,j}) \right)$$

for which Assumption 3 holds when $B = 1$.

C. Influence Maximization Bandits

In the influence maximization problem with the independent cascade model [21], the learner is given a directed graph denoted by $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of nodes and E is the set of edges. The learner selects and triggers a set of nodes $S \subseteq V$ such that $|S| = K$, where K is one of the problem parameters. This is the first iteration of a diffusion process. In each subsequent iteration, a node i that was triggered in the previous iteration might trigger another node j that is not triggered yet if j is adjacent to one of its outgoing edges. This happens with probability $p_{i,j}$ independently from the states of all other nodes. The diffusion process ends when no new

²For simplicity we assume that p^* is the same for all items while it can be different in practice.

node triggers in an iteration. The goal of the learner is to maximize—through the initial decision of nodes—the number of triggered nodes at the end of the diffusion process.

The problem can be modeled as a CMAB problem with PTAs, where base arms are edges $(i, j) \in E$ and super arms are the set of all edges (i, j) such that $i \in S$.³ Assumption 3 holds as proven in Lemma 6 of [20].

V. THE LEARNING ALGORITHM AND MAIN RESULTS

A. Combinatorial Thompson Sampling

CTS is a Bayesian algorithm that selects super arms by sampling from posterior distributions of base arms. Its pseudocode is given in Algorithm 1. We assume that the learner has access to an exact computation oracle, which takes as input an m -dimensional parameter vector θ and the problem structure $([m], \mathcal{I}, D^{\text{trig}}, R)$, and outputs a super arm, denoted by $\text{Oracle}(\theta)$ such that $\text{Oracle}(\theta) \in \text{OPT}(\theta)$. CTS keeps a Beta posterior over the mean outcome of each base arm. At the beginning of round t , for each base arm i it draws a sample $\theta_i(t)$ from its posterior distribution. Then, it forms the parameter vector in round t as $\theta(t) := (\theta_1(t), \dots, \theta_m(t))$, gives it to the exact computational oracle, and selects the super arm $S(t) = \text{Oracle}(\theta(t))$. At the end of the round, CTS updates the posterior distributions of the triggered base arms using the observation $Q(t)$.

Algorithm 1 Combinatorial Thompson Sampling (CTS).

- 1: For each base arm i , let $a_i = 1, b_i = 1$
 - 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: For each base arm i , draw a sample $\theta_i(t)$ from Beta distribution $\beta(a_i, b_i)$; let $\theta(t) := (\theta_1(t), \dots, \theta_m(t))$
 - 4: Select super arm $S(t) = \text{Oracle}(\theta(t))$, get the observation $Q(t)$
 - 5: **for all** $(i, X_i) \in Q(t)$ **do**
 - 6: $Y_i \leftarrow 1$ with probability X_i , 0 with probability $1 - X_i$
 - 7: $a_i \leftarrow a_i + Y_i$
 - 8: $b_i \leftarrow b_i + (1 - Y_i)$
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: **end for**
-

B. Regret of CTS for the General Case

Theorem 1. Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, for all D , the regret of CTS by round T is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}(T) \leq & \sum_{i=1}^m \max_{S \in \mathcal{I} - \text{OPT}; i \in \tilde{S}} \frac{16B^2 |\tilde{S}| \log T}{(1 - \rho) p_i (\Delta_S - 2B(\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2)\varepsilon)} \\ & + \left(3 + \frac{\tilde{K}^2}{(1 - \rho) p^* \varepsilon^2} + \frac{2\mathbb{I}\{p^* < 1\}}{\rho^2 p^*} \right) m \Delta_{\max} \\ & + \alpha \frac{8\tilde{k}^*}{p^* \varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} + 1 \right)^{\tilde{k}^*} \log \frac{\tilde{k}^*}{\varepsilon^2} \Delta_{\max} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\rho \in (0, 1)$, and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/\sqrt{e}]$ such that $\forall S \in \mathcal{I} - \text{OPT}, \Delta_S > 2B(\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2)\varepsilon$, where B is the Lipschitz

³This is equivalent to defining the super arm as S itself.

constant in Assumption 3, $\alpha > 0$ is a problem independent constant that is also independent of T , and $\tilde{K} := \max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} |\tilde{S}|$ is the maximum triggering set size among all super arms.

We compare the result in Theorem 1 with [20], which shows that the regret of CUCB is $O(\sum_{i \in [m]} \log T / (p_i \Delta_i))$ given an l_∞ bounded smoothness condition on the expected reward function, when the bounded smoothness function is $f(x) = \gamma x$. When ε is sufficiently small, the regret bound in Theorem 1 is asymptotically equivalent to the regret bound for CUCB (in terms of the dependence on T , p_i and Δ_i , $i \in [m]$).

For the case with $p^* = 1$ (no probabilistic triggering), the regret bound in Theorem 1 matches with the regret bound in Theorem 1 in [28] (in terms of the dependence on T and Δ_i , $i \in [m]$). As a final remark, we note that Theorem 3 in [22] shows that the $1/p_i$ term in the regret bound that multiplies the $\log T$ term is unavoidable in general.

C. Regret of CTS for Strictly Positive Triggering Probabilities

We improve the regret bound in Theorem 1 when all triggering probabilities are strictly positive.

Theorem 2. *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, for all D such that $\forall i \in [m], S \in \mathcal{I}$, $p_i^{D,S} \geq p^* > 0$, the regret of CTS by round T is bounded as*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}(T) \leq & \max \left\{ 16mB \sqrt{\frac{e}{(1-\rho)p^*}}, \right. \\ & \max_{S \in \mathcal{I}-OPT} \left\{ \frac{128mB^2 |\tilde{S}|}{(1-\rho)p^*(\Delta_S - 2B(\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2)\varepsilon)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \log \frac{4B|\tilde{S}|}{(1-\rho)p^*(\Delta_S - 2B(\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2)\varepsilon)} \right\} \left. \right\} \\ & + \left(5 + \frac{\tilde{K}^2}{(1-\rho)p^*\varepsilon^2} + \frac{2\mathbb{I}\{p^* < 1\}}{\rho^2 p^*} \right) m\Delta_{\max} \\ & + \alpha \frac{8\tilde{k}^*}{p^*\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} + 1 \right)^{\tilde{k}^*} \log \frac{\tilde{k}^*}{\varepsilon^2} \Delta_{\max} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\rho \in (0, 1)$, and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/\sqrt{e}]$ such that $\forall S \in \mathcal{I} - OPT$, $\Delta_S > 2B(\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2)\varepsilon$, where B is the Lipschitz constant in Assumption 3, $\alpha > 0$ is a problem independent constant that is also independent of T , and $\tilde{K} := \max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} |\tilde{S}|$ is the maximum triggering set size among all super arms.

Note that having all triggering probabilities strictly positive makes the exploration aspect of the MAB problem trivial. No matter which actions the learner takes, all base arms provide occasional feedback. As a result of this, the upper bound for the expected regret becomes independent of the time horizon T . We compare the result of Theorem 2 with [30], which shows a similar bound for CTS in the exact same setting. While the bound in [30] is on order $O((1/p^*)^4)$ with respect to p^* , the bound in Theorem 2 is on order $O(1/p^* \log(1/p^*))$.

As a final remark, we observe that our bound in Theorem 2 does not match the lower bound on order $O(\log(1/p^*))$ proven for a special case of our setting given in Theorem 1 of [25], where the reward only depends on the selected arm. This is due to the fact that the setting in [25] satisfies the the triggering

probability modulated bounded smoothness condition given in [22] in addition to our Assumption 3. Considering how this condition was necessary to get rid of the $1/p^*$ term in the previous upper bound given in [20], it might be the case that an upper bound on order $O(\log(1/p^*))$ instead of order $O(1/p^* \log(1/p^*))$ is possible under the triggering probability modulated bounded smoothness condition, which is more restrictive than Assumption 3 (one necessitates the other).

VI. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Before delving into the details, we give a high-level sketch of the proof. First, we identify four events that can be contributing factors when a suboptimal decision is made:

- at least one base arm has an estimated expected outcome that deviates too much from its true expected outcome,
- at least one base arm is triggered much less than the total number of rounds it could have been triggered,
- at least one base arm has a posterior sample that deviates too much from its estimated expected outcome,
- the (posterior) sample vector and the expected outcome vector are too close to each other when projected onto the triggering set of the super arm that is played.

The fact that the last event leads to suboptimal decisions might be counterintuitive since we would expect making better decisions when the samples are close to the expected outcomes. However, in Lemma 2, we show that making a suboptimal decision despite having a sample vector that is close to the expected outcome vector when projected onto the triggering set of the super arm that is played can only mean the same vectors are distant from each other when projected onto some subset of the triggering set of the optimal super arm.

Next, we show that all four of these events can only occur a finite number of times independent of the time horizon when a suboptimal decision is made (for the first two events in Section VI-D1, for the third event in Section VI-D2, and for the last event in Section VI-D4). Then, in Section VI-D3, we shift our focus to the rounds when none of those events occur, which implies that, for a suboptimal decision to be made, there must be an under-explored base arm. More specifically, for at least one base arm, the number rounds that it could have been triggered must be smaller than a threshold that is logarithmic with respect to the time horizon. This, in turn, leads to a logarithmic upper bound on the expected regret.

We would also like to emphasize that our regret analysis is significantly different from the analysis in [28] (without probabilistic triggering) in the following aspects: First of all, our bad events $\mathcal{E}_{Z,1}(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{Z,2}(\theta)$ given in Section VI-A are defined in terms of subsets Z of \tilde{S}^* rather than S^* . Secondly, we need to relate the number of times base arm i is in the triggering set of the selected super arm ($M_i(t)$) with the number of times it is triggered ($N_i(t)$), which requires us to define events $\mathcal{B}_{i,2}(t)$ for $i \in [m]$ as given in (4), and use them in the regret decomposition. This introduces new challenges in bounding (10), where we make use of a variable called *trial threshold* ($L_i(S(t))$) given in (2) to show that (10)

cannot happen when $M_i(t) > L_i(S(t))$, $\forall i \in \tilde{S}(t)$. We also need to take probabilistic triggering into account when proving Lemmas 1 and 3. For instance, in Lemma 3, we define a new way to count the number of times $\mathcal{E}_{Z,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \wedge \mathcal{E}_{Z,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ happens for all $Z \subseteq \tilde{S}^*$ such that $Z \neq \emptyset$.

A. Preliminaries for the Proof

The complement of set S is denoted by $\neg S$ or S^c . The indicator function is given as $\mathbb{I}\{\cdot\}$. $M_i(t) := \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}\{i \in \tilde{S}(\tau)\}$ denotes the number of times base arm i is in the triggering set of the selected super arm, i.e., it is tried to be triggered, $N_i(t) := \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}\{i \in S'(\tau)\}$ denotes the number of times base arm i is triggered, and $\hat{\mu}_i(t) := \frac{1}{N_i(t)} \sum_{\tau: \tau < t, i \in S'(\tau)} Y_i(\tau)$ denotes the empirical mean outcome of base arm i until round t , where $Y_i(t)$ is the Bernoulli random variable with mean $X_i(t)$ that is used for updating the posterior distribution that corresponds to base arm i in CTS. We define

$$\ell(S) := \frac{2 \log T}{\left(\frac{\Delta_S}{2B|\tilde{S}|} - \frac{\tilde{k}^* + 2}{|\tilde{S}|} \varepsilon \right)^2}$$

as the *sampling threshold* of super arm S ,

$$L_i(S) := \frac{\ell(S)}{(1-\rho)p_i} \quad (2)$$

as the *trial threshold* of base arm i with respect to super arm S , and $L_i^{\max} := \max_{S \in \mathcal{I}\text{-OPT}: i \in \tilde{S}} L_i(S)$.

Consider an m -dimensional parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Similar to [28], given $Z \subseteq \tilde{S}^*$, we say that the *first bad event* for Z , denoted by $\mathcal{E}_{Z,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, holds when all $\boldsymbol{\theta}' = (\boldsymbol{\theta}'_Z, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{Z^c})$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}'_Z - \boldsymbol{\mu}_Z\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ satisfies the following properties:

- $Z \subseteq \text{Oracle}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')$,
- Either $\text{Oracle}(\boldsymbol{\theta}') \in \text{OPT}$ or $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}'_{\text{Oracle}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\text{Oracle}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')}\|_1 > \frac{\Delta_{\text{Oracle}(\boldsymbol{\theta}')}}{B} - (\tilde{k}^* + 1)\varepsilon$.

Given the same parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the *second bad event* for Z is defined as $\mathcal{E}_{Z,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_Z - \boldsymbol{\mu}_Z\|_\infty > \varepsilon$.

In addition, similar to the regret analysis in [28], we will make use of the following events when bounding the regret:

$$\mathcal{A}(t) := \{S(t) \notin \text{OPT}\} \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{i,1}(t) := \left\{ |\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \mu_i| > \frac{\varepsilon}{|\tilde{S}(t)|} \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{i,2}(t) := \{N_i(t) \leq (1-\rho)p_i M_i(t)\} \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(t) := \left\{ \exists i \in \tilde{S}(t) : \mathcal{B}_{i,1}(t) \vee \mathcal{B}_{i,2}(t) \right\} \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{C}(t) := \left\{ \exists i \in \tilde{S}(t) : |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| > \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{N_i(t)}} \right\} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{D}(t) := \left\{ \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\tilde{S}(t)}\|_1 > \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{B} - (\tilde{k}^* + 1)\varepsilon \right\} \quad (7)$$

B. Regret Decomposition

Using the definitions of the events given in (3)-(7), the regret can be upper bounded as follows:

$$\text{Reg}(T) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}]$$

$$\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \quad (8)$$

$$+ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \quad (9)$$

$$+ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\neg \mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg \mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \quad (10)$$

$$+ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\neg \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}]. \quad (11)$$

The regret bound in Theorem 1 is obtained by bounding each term in the above decomposition. All events except the one specified in (10) can only happen a small (finite) number of times. Every time (10) happens, there must be base arms in the triggering set of the selected super arm which are ‘‘tried’’ to be triggered less than the trial threshold. These ‘‘under-explored’’ base arms are the main contributors of the regret, and their contribution depends on how many times they are ‘‘tried.’’ Moreover, every time these base arms are tried, their contribution to the future regret decreases. Thus, by summing up these contributions we obtain a logarithmic bound for (10). In the proof, we will make use of the facts and lemmas that are introduced in the following section.

C. Facts and Lemmas

Fact 1. (Lemma 4 in [28]) *When CTS is run, the following holds for all base arms $i \in [m]$:*

$$\Pr \left[\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t) > \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{N_i(t)}} \right] \leq \frac{1}{T}$$

$$\Pr \left[\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \theta_i(t) > \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{N_i(t)}} \right] \leq \frac{1}{T}$$

We will make use of the following technical lemmas. Their proofs can be found in the supplemental document of the conference version of the paper [1].

Lemma 1. *When CTS is run, we have for all $i \in [m]$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{t : 1 \leq t \leq T, i \in \tilde{S}(t), |\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \mu_i| > \varepsilon \vee \mathcal{B}_{i,2}(t)\}]$$

$$\leq 1 + \frac{1}{(1-\rho)p^*\varepsilon^2} + \frac{2\mathbb{I}\{p^* < 1\}}{\rho^2 p^*}$$

Lemma 2. *Suppose that $\neg \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)$ happens. Then, there exists $Z \subseteq \tilde{S}^*$ such that $Z \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{E}_{Z,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))$ holds.*

Lemma 3. *When CTS is run, for all $Z \subseteq \tilde{S}^*$ such that $Z \neq \emptyset$, we have*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{Z,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)), \mathcal{E}_{Z,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))\}]$$

$$\leq 13\alpha'_2 \cdot \frac{|Z|}{p^*} \cdot \left(\frac{2^{2|Z|+3} \log \frac{|Z|}{\varepsilon^2}}{\varepsilon^{2|Z|+2}} \right)$$

where α'_2 is a problem independent constant.

D. Main Part of the Proof

1) *Bounding (8)*: Using Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \\ & \leq \Delta_{\max} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left\{ t : 1 \leq t \leq T, i \in \tilde{S}(t), \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \left. |\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \mu_i| > \frac{\varepsilon}{\tilde{K}} \vee \mathcal{B}_{i,2}(t) \right\} \right\| \right] \\ & \leq \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{K}^2}{(1-\rho)p^*\varepsilon^2} + \frac{2\mathbb{I}\{p^* < 1\}}{\rho^2 p^*} \right) m \Delta_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

2) *Bounding (9)*: By Fact 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \\ & \leq \Delta_{\max} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T \Pr \left[|\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| > \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{N_i(t)}} \right] \\ & \leq 2m \Delta_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

3) *Bounding (10)*: For this, we first show that event $\neg\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)$ cannot happen when $M_i(t) > L_i(S(t))$, $\forall i \in \tilde{S}(t)$. To see this, assume that both $\neg\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)$ and $M_i(t) > L_i(S(t))$, $\forall i \in \tilde{S}(t)$ hold. Then, we must have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t)\|_1 &= \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{N_i(t)}} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i M_i(t)}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i L_i(S(t))}} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{\ell(S(t))}} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \left(\frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B|\tilde{S}(t)|} - \frac{\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2}{|\tilde{S}(t)|} \varepsilon \right) \\ &= |\tilde{S}(t)| \left(\frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B|\tilde{S}(t)|} - \frac{\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2}{|\tilde{S}(t)|} \varepsilon \right) \\ &= \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2)\varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where (12) holds when $\neg\mathcal{C}(t)$ happens, (13) holds when $\neg\mathcal{B}(t)$ happens, and (14) holds by the definition of $L_i(S(t))$.

We also know that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\tilde{S}(t)}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$, when $\neg\mathcal{B}(t)$ happens. Then, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\tilde{S}(t)}\|_1 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t)\|_1 + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\tilde{S}(t)}\|_1 \leq \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon < \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon$, which implies that $\neg\mathcal{D}(t)$ happens. Thus, we conclude that when $\neg\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)$ happens, then there exists some $i \in \tilde{S}(t)$ such that $M_i(t) \leq L_i(S(t))$. Let $S_1(t)$ be the

base arms i in $\tilde{S}(t)$ such that $M_i(t) > L_i(S(t))$, and $S_2(t)$ be the other base arms in $\tilde{S}(t)$. By the result above, $S_2(t) \neq \emptyset$. Next, we show that

$$\Delta_{S(t)} \leq 2B \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i M_i(t)}}.$$

This holds since,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon &< \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \mu_i| \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} (|\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| + |\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \mu_i|) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in S_1(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| + \varepsilon \\ &\leq |S_1(t)| \left(\frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B|\tilde{S}(t)|} - \frac{\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2}{|\tilde{S}(t)|} \varepsilon \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{N_i(t)}} \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i M_i(t)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $i \in [m]$. For $w > 0$, let η_w^i be the round for which $i \in S_2(\eta_w^i)$ and $|\{t \leq \eta_w^i : i \in S_2(t)\}| = w$, and $w^i(T) := |\{t \leq T : i \in S_2(t)\}|$. We have $i \in S_2(\eta_w^i) \subseteq \tilde{S}(\eta_w^i)$ for all $w > 0$, which implies that $M_i(\eta_w^i) \geq w$. Moreover, by the definition of $S_2(t)$, we know that $M_i(t) \leq L_i(S(t)) \leq L_i^{\max}$ for $i \in S_2(t)$, $t \leq T$. These two facts together imply that $w^i(T) \leq L_i^{\max}$ with probability 1.

Consider the round τ_1^i for which $i \in \tilde{S}(t)$ for the first time, i.e., $\tau_1^i := \min\{t : i \in \tilde{S}(t)\}$. We know that $M_i(\tau_1^i) = 0 \leq L_i(S)$ for all S , hence $i \in S_2(\tau_1^i)$. Since $\forall t < \tau_1^i$, $i \notin \tilde{S}(t)$, and $i \notin \tilde{S}(t)$ implies $i \notin S_2(t)$, we conclude that $\tau_1^i = \eta_1^i$. We also observe that $\neg\mathcal{B}(t)$ cannot happen for $t \leq \tau_1^i = \eta_1^i$, since $N_i(t) > (1-\rho)p_i M_i(t) = 0$ cannot be true when $N_i(t) \leq M_i(t) = 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\neg\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \mathbb{I}\{\neg\mathcal{B}(t)\} 2B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i M_i(t)}} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{i \in S_2(t), \neg\mathcal{B}(t)\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times 2B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i M_i(t)}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=\eta_i^i+1}^T \mathbb{I}\{i \in S_2(t)\} 2B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i M_i(t)}} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{w=1}^{\lfloor L_i^{\max} \rfloor} \sum_{t=\eta_w^i+1}^{\eta_{w+1}^i} \mathbb{I}\{i \in S_2(t)\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times 2B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i M_i(t)}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{w=1}^{\lfloor L_i^{\max} \rfloor} 2B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i M_i(\eta_{w+1}^i)}} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{w=1}^{\lfloor L_i^{\max} \rfloor} 2B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i w}} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m 4B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i} L_i^{\max}} \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

where (15) holds since $\sum_{n=1}^N \sqrt{1/n} \leq 2\sqrt{N}$.

4) *Bounding (11)*: From Lemma 2, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\neg \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \\
&\leq \Delta_{\max} \sum_{Z \subseteq \tilde{S}^*, Z \neq \emptyset} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{Z,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)), \mathcal{E}_{Z,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))\}] \right)
\end{aligned}$$

since $\neg \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)$ implies $\mathcal{E}_{Z,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))$ for some $Z \subseteq \tilde{S}^*$, and $\mathcal{E}_{Z,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)) \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{Z,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))$ implies either $\neg \mathcal{A}(t)$ or $\mathcal{D}(t)$.

From Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{Z \subseteq \tilde{S}^*, Z \neq \emptyset} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{Z,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t)), \mathcal{E}_{Z,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}(t))\}] \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{Z \subseteq \tilde{S}^*, Z \neq \emptyset} 13\alpha'_2 \cdot \frac{|Z|}{p^*} \cdot \left(\frac{2^{2|Z|+3} \log \frac{|Z|}{\varepsilon^2}}{\varepsilon^{2|Z|+2}} \right) \\
&\leq 13\alpha'_2 \frac{8\tilde{k}^*}{p^*\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{\tilde{k}^*}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{Z \subseteq \tilde{S}^*, Z \neq \emptyset} \frac{2^{2|Z|}}{\varepsilon^{2|Z|}} \\
&\leq 13\alpha'_2 \frac{8\tilde{k}^*}{p^*\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} + 1 \right)^{\tilde{k}^*} \log \frac{\tilde{k}^*}{\varepsilon^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

5) *Summing the Bounds*: The regret bound for CTS is computed by summing the bounds derived for terms (8)-(11) in the regret decomposition, which are given in the sections above:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Reg}(T) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m 4B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i} L_i^{\max}} \\
&\quad + \left(3 + \frac{\tilde{K}^2}{(1-\rho)p^*\varepsilon^2} + \frac{2\mathbb{I}\{p^* < 1\}}{\rho^2 p^*} \right) m \Delta_{\max} \\
&\quad + 13\alpha'_2 \frac{8\tilde{k}^*}{p^*\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} + 1 \right)^{\tilde{k}^*} \log \frac{\tilde{k}^*}{\varepsilon^2} \Delta_{\max} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \max_{S \in \mathcal{I} - \text{OPT}: i \in \tilde{S}} \frac{16B^2 |\tilde{S}| \log T}{(1-\rho)p_i (\Delta_S - 2B(\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2)\varepsilon)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ \left(3 + \frac{\tilde{K}^2}{(1-\rho)p^*\varepsilon^2} + \frac{2\mathbb{I}\{p^* < 1\}}{\rho^2 p^*} \right) m \Delta_{\max} \\
&+ \alpha \frac{8\tilde{k}^*}{p^*\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} + 1 \right)^{\tilde{k}^*} \log \frac{\tilde{k}^*}{\varepsilon^2} \Delta_{\max}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha := 13\alpha'_2$.

VII. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

While the proof of Theorem 2 is similar to the proof of Theorem 1, there are subtle differences that necessitates using a quite different proof technique. Different from Theorem 1, we need to update the definitions of the sampling and trial thresholds so that they depend on the most recent round index t rather than the time horizon T .

In Section VII-B2, similar to Section VI-D3 in the proof of Theorem 1, we observe that, for at least one base arm, $M_{(\cdot)}(t)$ must be smaller than the trial threshold for a suboptimal decision to be made. When the trial threshold—which is now logarithmic with respect to t —is independent of the time horizon, $M_{(\cdot)}(t)$ —which is equal to t for all base arms when all triggering probabilities are positive—surpasses it in a round that is also independent of the time horizon. In other words, we show in Section VII-B2 that suboptimal decisions can only be made up to a time-horizon-independent round, which was not the case in Section VI-D3. The rest of the proof of Theorem 1 remains largely unchanged except for some small tweaks to accommodate this crucial update.

A. Preliminaries for the Proof

We update the definition of the sampling threshold as

$$\ell(S, t) := \frac{4 \log t}{\left(\frac{\Delta_S}{2B|\tilde{S}|} - \frac{\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2}{|\tilde{S}|} \varepsilon \right)^2}$$

and the definition of event $\mathcal{C}(t)$ as

$$\mathcal{C}(t) := \left\{ \exists i \in \tilde{S}(t) : |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| > \sqrt{\frac{4 \log t}{N_i(t)}} \right\}.$$

We also define

$$L := \max \left\{ e, \max_{S \in \mathcal{I} - \text{OPT}} \frac{4}{(1-\rho)p^* \left(\frac{\Delta_S}{2B|\tilde{S}|} - \frac{\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2}{|\tilde{S}|} \varepsilon \right)^2} \right\}$$

so that $L_i(S, t) \leq L \log t$ for all base arms $i \in [m]$, all super arms $S \in \mathcal{I} - \text{OPT}$, and all rounds $t \in [T]$ (t in $L_i(S, t)$ represents dependence of the trial threshold on time due to $\ell(S, t)$). Finally, note that having non-zero triggering probabilities implies that $M_i(t) = t$ for all base arms $i \in [m]$.

B. Main Part of the Proof

We use the same regret decomposition as Theorem 1 given in (11) with the updated definition for $\mathcal{C}(t)$. We only bound terms (9) and (10) since those are the only ones effected from the updated definitions.

1) *Bounding (9)*: Using Fact 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \\ & \leq \Delta_{\max} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T \Pr \left[|\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| > \sqrt{\frac{4 \log t}{N_i(t)}} \right] \\ & \leq \Delta_{\max} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{t^2} \leq 4m\Delta_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

2) *Bounding (10)*: Similar to Theorem 1, we first show that event $\neg\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)$ cannot occur when $t > L_i(S(t), t)$, $\forall i \in \tilde{S}(t)$. To see this, assume that both $\neg\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)$ and $t > L_i(S(t), t)$, $\forall i \in \tilde{S}(t)$ hold. Then, we must have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \hat{\mu}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t)\|_1 &= \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \sqrt{\frac{4 \log t}{N_i(t)}} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \sqrt{\frac{4 \log t}{(1-\rho)p_i t}} \quad (17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \sqrt{\frac{4 \log t}{(1-\rho)p_i L_i(S(t), t)}} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \sqrt{\frac{4 \log t}{\ell(S(t), t)}} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} \left(\frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B|\tilde{S}(t)|} - \frac{\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2}{|\tilde{S}(t)|} \varepsilon \right) \\ &= |\tilde{S}(t)| \left(\frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B|\tilde{S}(t)|} - \frac{\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2}{|\tilde{S}(t)|} \varepsilon \right) \\ &= \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2)\varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where (16) holds when $\neg\mathcal{C}(t)$ occurs, (17) holds when $\neg\mathcal{B}(t)$ occurs, and (18) holds by the definition of $L_i(S(t), t)$. We also know that $\|\hat{\mu}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \mu_{\tilde{S}(t)}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$, when $\neg\mathcal{B}(t)$ happens. Then, $\|\theta_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \mu_{\tilde{S}(t)}\|_1 \leq \|\theta_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \hat{\mu}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t)\|_1 + \|\hat{\mu}_{\tilde{S}(t)}(t) - \mu_{\tilde{S}(t)}\|_1 \leq \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon < \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon$, which implies that $\neg\mathcal{D}(t)$ happens.

Thus, we conclude that when $\neg\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)$ occurs, then there exists some $i \in \tilde{S}(t)$ such that $t \leq L_i(S(t), t)$. Let $S_1(t)$ be the base arms i in $\tilde{S}(t)$ such that $t > L_i(S(t), t)$, and $S_2(t)$ be the other base arms in $\tilde{S}(t)$. By the result above, $S_2(t) \neq \emptyset$.

We also conclude that, for some $i \in \tilde{S}(t)$, $t \leq L_i(S(t), t) \leq L \log t$. This inequality can only hold when $t \leq t^+$, where t^+ is the greatest root of $t = L \log t$. The equation can be written in the alternative form $\exp(t/L) = t$, whose roots are given by $t = -LW(-1/L)$, where $W(\cdot)$ is the Lambert W function [45]. Indeed for $-1/e \leq x < 0$, there are two real values for $W(x)$. As our solution, we take the lowest value (this branch is

usually denoted as $W_{-1}(x)$) since it corresponds to the greatest root of $t = L \log t$. Thus, we set $t^+ = -LW_{-1}(-1/L)$. Then, by using the lower bound for $W_{-1}(x)$ given in [46], we obtain $t^+ \leq L(\log L + \sqrt{2 \log L - 2}) \leq 2L \log L$.

Next, we show that

$$\Delta_{S(t)} \leq 4B \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log L}{(1-\rho)p_i t}}.$$

This holds since,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon &< \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \mu_i| \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \tilde{S}(t)} (|\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| + |\hat{\mu}_i(t) - \mu_i|) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in S_1(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| + \varepsilon \\ &\leq |S_1(t)| \left(\frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B|\tilde{S}(t)|} - \frac{\tilde{k}^{*2} + 2}{|\tilde{S}(t)|} \varepsilon \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} |\theta_i(t) - \hat{\mu}_i(t)| \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \sqrt{\frac{4 \log t}{N_i(t)}} \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \sqrt{\frac{4 \log t}{(1-\rho)p_i t}} \\ &\leq \frac{\Delta_{S(t)}}{2B} - (\tilde{k}^{*2} + 1)\varepsilon + \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \sqrt{\frac{8 \log L}{(1-\rho)p_i t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\neg\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \\ & \stackrel{[2L \log L]}{=} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor 2L \log L \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{\neg\mathcal{B}(t) \wedge \neg\mathcal{C}(t) \wedge \mathcal{D}(t) \wedge \mathcal{A}(t)\} \times \Delta_{S(t)}] \\ & \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor 2L \log L \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[4B \sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log L}{(1-\rho)p_i t}} \right] \\ & \leq 4B \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor 2L \log L \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in S_2(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log L}{(1-\rho)p_i t}} \right] \\ & \leq 4mB \sqrt{\frac{2 \log L}{(1-\rho)p^*}} \cdot \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor 2L \log L \rfloor} \sqrt{\frac{1}{t}} \\ & \leq 16mB \log L \cdot \sqrt{\frac{L}{(1-\rho)p^*}}. \end{aligned}$$

VIII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we compare CTS with other state-of-the-art CMAB algorithms in three different applications: cascading bandits, probabilistic maximum coverage bandits, and




Fig. 1. Regrets of CTS and CUCB for the disjunctive cascading bandit problem.

influence maximization bandits introduced in Section IV. We compare the performance of CTS with CUCB in [20] in all settings. For the first two problems, we assume that all algorithms have access to an exact computation oracle that computes the estimated optimal super arm in each round. On the other hand, for the third problem, we assume that all algorithms use an approximation oracle. For cascading bandits only, we also compare CTS with algorithms specifically designed for this setting: CascadeKL-UCB in [4] and TS-Cascade in [26]. The former uses the principle of optimism under the face of uncertainty to compute Kullback-Leibler divergence based UCBs while the latter uses Thompson sampling with Gaussian posterior over the base arms.

A. Cascading Bandits

We consider the disjunctive case with $L = 100$, $R = 20$ and $K = 5$, and generate $p_{i,j}$ s by sampling uniformly at random from $[0, 1]$. We run both CTS and CUCB for 1600 rounds, and report their regrets averaged over 1000 runs in Fig. 1, where error bars represent the standard deviation of the regret (multiplied by 10 for visibility). In this setting CTS significantly outperforms CUCB by achieving a final regret that is no more than 5% of the final regret of CUCB. Relatively bad performance of CUCB can be explained by excessive number of explorations due to the UCBs that stay high for a large number of rounds.

In addition, we also consider the same class of problems $B_{LB}(L, K, p, \Delta)$ as in [4], where $R = 1$ and the probability that the user finds page j attractive is given as

$$p_{1,j} = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } j \leq K \\ p - \Delta & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Similar to [4], we set $p = 0.2$ and vary other parameters, namely L , K , and Δ . We run both CTS and CUCB for 100000 rounds in all problem instances, and report their regrets averaged over 20 runs in Table II.

In addition to CUCB, we compare CTS against CascadeUCB1 and CascadeKL-UCB given in [4], and TS-Cascade given in [26] as well. Note that regrets of CUCB and

CascadeUCB1 matches very closely as two algorithms are essentially the same when CUCB is applied to cascading bandits except for some minor differences in the initialization stage and how UCBs larger than 1 are handled. We observe that CTS outperforms all other algorithms in all problem instances by achieving a regret that is at most 44% of the regret of all other algorithms. For CTS, we also see that the regret increases as the number of pages (L) increases, it decreases as the number of recommended items (K) increases, and it increases as Δ decreases, which are very similar to the major observations that are made in [4].

B. Probabilistic Maximum Coverage Bandits

Our experimental setup for this case is based on MovieLens dataset [47] as in [30].⁴ The dataset contains 20 million movie ratings that are assigned between January 1995 and March 2015. Out of this, we only use the ones that are assigned between March 2014 and March 2015. In the experiments, the recommender chooses $K = 3$ movies out of $L = 30$ movies, which include 10 of the highest rated movies, 10 of the lowest rated movies and 10 randomly selected movies from the dataset. These 30 movies are rated by $R = 57369$ users.

In total, there are 20 genres in the dataset. Each movie belongs to at least one genre. We take genre information into account to define attraction probabilities. For this, we create a 20-dimensional vector \mathbf{g}_i for each movie $i \in [L]$, where $g_{ik} = 1$ if the movie belongs to genre k and 0 otherwise. Using these vectors, we calculate a genre preference vector \mathbf{u}_j for each user $j \in [R]$ as

$$\mathbf{u}_j = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}_j} \mathbf{g}_i}{|\mathcal{L}_j|} + \epsilon_j$$

where \mathcal{L}_j is the set of movies that user j rated and ϵ_j is a random vector such that $\epsilon_{jk} = |\chi_{jk}|$ for $\chi_{jk} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.05)$. The noise ϵ_j is introduced to model exploratory behavior of the user. Finally, defining $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_i = \mathbf{g}_i / \|\mathbf{g}_i\|$ and $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j = \mathbf{u}_j / \|\mathbf{u}_j\|$ as the normalized versions of the vectors we have defined, the attraction probabilities are calculated as

$$p_{i,j} = 0.2 \times \frac{\langle \hat{\mathbf{g}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j \rangle r_i}{\max_{i \in [L]} r_i}$$

where r_i is the average rating of movie i .

We run both CTS and CUCB for 1000 rounds, and report their regrets averaged over 10 runs in Fig. 2, where error bars represent standard deviation of the regret. We consider two cases with $p^* = 0.01$ and $p^* = 0.05$. For both cases, CTS significantly outperforms CUCB by achieving a final regret that is no more than 9% of the final regret of CUCB.

C. Influence Maximization Bandits

We consider a directed version of the Facebook network dataset [48] that consists of 15k edges and 3120 nodes. Since, the dataset does not contain influence probabilities, we artificially generate them by setting $p_{i,j} = 1/|\mathcal{V}_i|$ where \mathcal{V}_i

⁴While the probabilistic maximum coverage problem is NP-hard, here we focus on a small-scale problem and use an exact computation oracle.

TABLE II
REGRETS OF CTS AND CUCB WITH THEIR STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR VARIOUS PROBLEM INSTANCES.

L	K	Δ	CTS	CUCB	CascadeUCB1	CascadeKL-UCB	TS-Cascade
16	2	0.15	155.4 ± 14.1	1284.1 ± 52.4	1300.6 ± 46.8	360.6 ± 23.4	381.1 ± 16.8
16	4	0.15	103.2 ± 9.0	998.9 ± 33.2	993.6 ± 32.8	267.3 ± 20.6	281.0 ± 11.8
16	8	0.15	52.1 ± 9.8	549.5 ± 16.8	546.4 ± 11.7	150.3 ± 15.6	137.9 ± 8.8
32	2	0.15	321.4 ± 18.9	2718.8 ± 61.2	2676.4 ± 59.4	749.2 ± 34.2	752.9 ± 49.9
32	4	0.15	252.2 ± 17.0	2227.0 ± 55.4	2232.1 ± 46.6	617.4 ± 39.9	612.3 ± 15.2
32	8	0.15	155.4 ± 25.7	1531.0 ± 21.9	1525.4 ± 30.0	420.6 ± 27.5	385.0 ± 16.3
16	2	0.075	276.9 ± 50.7	2057.6 ± 79.6	2065.4 ± 87.4	709.0 ± 60.4	688.3 ± 78.5
16	4	0.075	205.4 ± 25.7	1496.5 ± 65.2	1512.4 ± 87.0	546.3 ± 53.5	557.9 ± 45.0
16	8	0.075	113.1 ± 40.4	719.4 ± 53.7	717.5 ± 44.2	266.1 ± 32.4	273.8 ± 30.7




Fig. 2. Regrets of CTS and CUCB for the probabilistic maximum coverage bandit problem.

represents the set of outgoing neighbors of node i . We assume that in each round the learner selects a seed set of $K = 30$ nodes and this set forms the selected super arm. Moreover, we assume that the influence propagates—starting from the seed set—according to the independent cascade model [21], which is one of the most widely used influence propagation models. We adopt the edge-level feedback model in which the learner both observes the set of influenced nodes and the influence outcomes of the outgoing edges of these nodes.

Since the problem itself is NP-hard, an exact computation oracle is computationally infeasible for the given graph size. Nevertheless, many computationally efficient approximation algorithms exist for the influence maximization problem (see e.g., CELF in [49] and TIM and TIM+ in [50]). Due to its computational efficiency and good performance in practice, we set the learner to use TIM+ as the approximation oracle. When given as input an influence graph with n nodes and m edges, the influence probabilities on these edges and parameters ϵ and l , TIM+ is guaranteed to return a $(1 - 1/e - \epsilon)$ -approximate solution with probability at least $1 - 3n^{-l}$ and with time complexity $O((K + l)(n + m) \log n/\epsilon^2)$.

We run both CTS and CUCB for 5000 rounds and report their regrets averaged over 10 runs in Fig. 3. Here, error bars represent standard deviation of the regret multiplied by 0.5 for visibility. Note that in these simulations, we consider the realized regret of the learner’s actions instead of the expected regret as we do in the other experiments. This is once again




Fig. 3. Regrets of CTS and CUCB for the influence maximization bandit problem.

due to the complexity of the problem and the difficulty in calculating expected regret. Hence, having negative regret as a result of a lucky diffusion process is entirely possible in some rounds. Again, it is observed that CTS significantly outperforms CUCB by achieving a final regret that is no more than 16% of the final regret of CUCB. Relatively bad performance of CUCB is due to the fact that the considered time horizon is not long enough for CUCB to efficiently explore all base arms. It is observed that the UCBs of many base arms remain above 1 even at the end of 5000 rounds. As an algorithm that is based on the principle of optimism in the face of uncertainty, CUCB’s performance completely depends on the confidence sets it uses to calculate the UCB indices, and this example shows that these confidence sets are not tight enough to guarantee fast convergence.

IX. CONCLUSION

We analyzed the regret of CTS for CMAB-PTA and proved order optimal gap-dependent regret bounds when the expected reward function is Lipschitz continuous without assuming monotonicity. Our bounds include the $1/p^*$ term that is unavoidable in general. Future work includes deriving regret bounds under more strict assumptions on the expected reward function such as the triggering probability modulated bounded smoothness condition given in [22] to get rid of the $1/p^*$ term. Another important research direction is to derive a worst-case bound on the regret of CTS for CMAB-PTA.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Huyuk and C. Tekin, "Analysis of Thompson sampling for combinatorial multi-armed bandit with probabilistically triggered arms," in *Proc. 22nd Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. and Statist.*, 2019, pp. 1322–1330.
- [2] T. N. Dinh, H. Zhang, D. T. Nguyen, and M. T. Thai, "Cost-effective viral marketing for time-critical campaigns in large-scale social networks," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 2001–2011, 2014.
- [3] G. Tong, W. Wu, S. Tang, and D.-Z. Du, "Adaptive influence maximization in dynamic social networks," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 112–125, 2017.
- [4] B. Kveton, C. Szepesvari, Z. Wen, and A. Ashkan, "Cascading bandits: Learning to rank in the cascade model," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, 2015, pp. 767–776.
- [5] Y. Gai, B. Krishnamachari, and R. Jain, "Combinatorial network optimization with unknown variables: Multi-armed bandits with linear rewards and individual observations," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 1466–1478, 2012.
- [6] S. K. née Müller, C. Tekin, M. van der Schaar, and A. Klein, "Context-aware hierarchical online learning for performance maximization in mobile crowdsourcing," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 1334–1347, 2018.
- [7] H.-W. Lee, E. Modiano, and K. Lee, "Diverse routing in networks with probabilistic failures," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 1895–1907, 2010.
- [8] H. Robbins, "Some aspects of the sequential design of experiments," *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 55, pp. 527–535, 1952.
- [9] T. L. Lai and H. Robbins, "Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules," *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, vol. 6, pp. 4–22, 1985.
- [10] W. R. Thompson, "On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples," *Biometrika*, vol. 25, no. 3/4, pp. 285–294, 1933.
- [11] S. Agrawal and N. Goyal, "Analysis of Thompson sampling for the multi-armed bandit problem," in *Proc. 25th Annu. Conf. Learn. Theory*, 2012, pp. 39.1–39.26.
- [12] D. Russo and B. Van Roy, "Learning to optimize via posterior sampling," *Math. Oper. Res.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1221–1243, 2014.
- [13] R. Agrawal, "Sample mean based index policies with $O(\log n)$ regret for the multi-armed bandit problem," *Adv. Appl. Probability*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 1054–1078, 1995.
- [14] P. Auer, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and P. Fischer, "Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem," *Mach. Learn.*, vol. 47, pp. 235–256, 2002.
- [15] O. Chapelle and L. Li, "An empirical evaluation of Thompson sampling," in *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2011, pp. 2249–2257.
- [16] S. L. Scott, "A modern Bayesian look at the multi-armed bandit," *Appl. Stochastic Models Bus. Indust.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 639–658, 2010.
- [17] N. Cesa-Bianchi and G. Lugosi, "Combinatorial bandits," *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, vol. 78, no. 5, pp. 1404–1422, 2012.
- [18] B. Kveton, Z. Wen, A. Ashkan, and C. Szepesvari, "Tight regret bounds for stochastic combinatorial semi-bandits," in *Proc. 18th Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. and Statist.*, 2015, pp. 535–543.
- [19] W. Chen, Y. Wang, and Y. Yuan, "Combinatorial multi-armed bandit: General framework and applications," in *Proc. 30th Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, 2013, pp. 151–159.
- [20] W. Chen, Y. Wang, Y. Yuan, and Q. Wang, "Combinatorial multi-armed bandit and its extension to probabilistically triggered arms," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1746–1778, 2016.
- [21] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and E. Tardos, "Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network," in *Proc. 9th ACM SIGKDD Int. Conf. Knowl. Discovery and Data Mining*, 2003, pp. 137–146.
- [22] Q. Wang and W. Chen, "Improving regret bounds for combinatorial semi-bandits with probabilistically triggered arms and its applications," in *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2017, pp. 1161–1171.
- [23] F. Liu, S. Baccapatnam, and N. Shroff, "Information directed sampling for stochastic bandits with graph feedback," in *Proc. 32nd AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, 2018.
- [24] S. Li, W. Chen, Z. Wen, and K.-S. Leung, "Stochastic online learning with probabilistic graph feedback," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.01083*, 2019.
- [25] R. Degenne, E. Garcelon, and V. Perchet, "Bandits with side observations: Bounded vs. logarithmic regret," in *Proc. 34th Conf. Uncertainty Artif. Intell.*, 2018, pp. 467–476.
- [26] W. C. Cheung, V. Tan, and Z. Zhong, "A Thompson sampling algorithm for cascading bandits," in *Proc. 22nd Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Statist.*, 2019, pp. 438–447.
- [27] G. L. Nemhauser, L. A. Wolsey, and M. L. Fisher, "An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—I," *Math. Program.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 265–294, 1978.
- [28] S. Wang and W. Chen, "Thompson sampling for combinatorial semi-bandits," in *Proc. 35th Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, 2018, pp. 5114–5122.
- [29] N. Merlis and S. Mannor, "Batch-size independent regret bounds for the combinatorial multi-armed bandit problem," in *Proc. 32nd Annu. Conf. Learn. Theory*, 2019, pp. 2465–2489.
- [30] A. O. Saritac and C. Tekin, "Combinatorial multi-armed bandit with probabilistically triggered arms: A case with bounded regret," 2017, *arXiv:1707.07443*.
- [31] B. Kveton, Z. Wen, A. Ashkan, H. Eydgahi, and B. Eriksson, "Matroid bandits: Fast combinatorial optimization with learning," in *Proc. 30th Conf. Uncertainty Artif. Intell.*, 2014, pp. 420–429.
- [32] M. S. Talebi and A. Proutiere, "An optimal algorithm for stochastic matroid bandit optimization," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Auton. Agents Multi-Agent Syst.*, 2016, pp. 548–556.
- [33] B. Kveton, Z. Wen, A. Ashkan, and C. Szepesvari, "Combinatorial cascading bandits," in *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2015, pp. 1450–1458.
- [34] S. Li, B. Wang, S. Zhang, and W. Chen, "Contextual combinatorial cascading bandits," in *Proc. 33rd Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, vol. 16, 2016, pp. 1245–1253.
- [35] L. Qin, S. Chen, and X. Zhu, "Contextual combinatorial bandit and its application on diversified online recommendation," in *Proc. SIAM Int. Conf. Data Mining*, 2014, pp. 461–469.
- [36] A. O. Saritac, A. Karakurt, and C. Tekin, "Online contextual influence maximization with costly observations," *IEEE Trans. Signal Inf. Process. Netw.*, 2018.
- [37] J.-Y. Audibert, S. Bubeck, and G. Lugosi, "Regret in online combinatorial optimization," *Math. Oper. Res.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 31–45, 2013.
- [38] R. Combes, M. S. T. M. Shahi, A. Proutiere *et al.*, "Combinatorial bandits revisited," in *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2015, pp. 2116–2124.
- [39] K. A. Sankararaman and A. Slivkins, "Combinatorial semi-bandits with knapsacks," in *Proc. 21st Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. and Statist.*, 2018, pp. 1760–1770.
- [40] M. Agarwal and V. Aggarwal, "Regret bounds for stochastic combinatorial multi-armed bandits with linear space complexity," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.11925*, 2018.
- [41] I. Rejwan and Y. Mansour, "Combinatorial bandits with full-bandit feedback: Sample complexity and regret minimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12624*, 2019.
- [42] T. Lin, B. Abrahao, R. Kleinberg, J. Lui, and W. Chen, "Combinatorial partial monitoring game with linear feedback and its applications," in *Proc. 31st Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, 2014, pp. 901–909.
- [43] A. Gopalan, S. Mannor, and Y. Mansour, "Thompson sampling for complex online problems," in *Proc. 31st Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, 2014, pp. 100–108.
- [44] Z. Wen, B. Kveton, and A. Ashkan, "Efficient learning in large-scale combinatorial semi-bandits," in *Proc. 32nd Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, 2015, pp. 1113–1122.
- [45] R. M. Corless, G. H. Gonnet, D. E. Hare, D. J. Jeffrey, and D. E. Knuth, "On the Lambert W function," *Adv. Comput. Math.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 329–359, 1996.
- [46] I. Chatzigeorgiou, "Bounds on the Lambert function and their application to the outage analysis of user cooperation," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 17, no. 8, pp. 1505–1508, 2013.
- [47] F. M. Harper and J. A. Konstan, "The MovieLens datasets: History and context," *ACM Trans. Interact. Intell. Syst.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 19:1–19:19, 2015.
- [48] J. Leskovec and J. J. McAuley, "Learning to discover social circles in ego networks," in *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2012, pp. 539–547.
- [49] J. Leskovec, A. Krause, C. Guestrin, C. Faloutsos, J. VanBriesen, and N. Glance, "Cost-effective outbreak detection in networks," in *Proc. 13th ACM SIGKDD Int. Conf. Knowl. Discovery Data Mining*, 2007, pp. 420–429.
- [50] Y. Tang, X. Xiao, and Y. Shi, "Influence maximization: Near-optimal time complexity meets practical efficiency," in *Proc. ACM SIGMOD Int. Conf. Manage. Data*, 2014, pp. 75–86.