

Two-stage LinUCB

The pseudo-regret at time $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{R}_n &:= \mathbb{E}_{\eta_{1:n}} \sum_{t=1}^n X_t^* - X_t \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n \langle \Theta_*, A_t^* - A_t \rangle_R\end{aligned}$$

$\downarrow \psi(s_t, A_t)$
rounder

In a 2-stage system, the router will not be able to select A_t^* when not nominated

$$\hat{R}_n = \sum_{t=1}^n \underbrace{\langle \Theta_*, A_t^* - \tilde{A}_t^* \rangle_R}_{\text{nominator loss}} + \underbrace{\langle \Theta_*, \tilde{A}_t^* - A_t \rangle_R}_{\text{router loss}}$$

\nwarrow best nomin. action

- If all nominators and the router have access to the true representations ($a \leftarrow \psi(s, \tilde{a}) = \psi_j(s, \tilde{a}) \forall (s, \tilde{a})$ and $\forall j$) then $\hat{R}_n \leq O(\sqrt{nd^2 \log n})$ w.h.p

→ by assumption, nominators do not have an access to the same repres. ($\psi_j \neq \psi$) since they filter 10^7 to 10^3 items (latency)

- Standard techniques (Ch. 19 & 20) can be used to show that the rounder loss always

$$\sum_{t=1}^m \langle \Theta_*, \tilde{A}_t^* - A_t \rangle_R \leq O(\sqrt{md^2 \log m}) \quad \text{w. h. p.}$$

\Rightarrow failure cases only when the nominators do not function properly

- It is relatively easy to construct pathological cases where

$$\sum_{t=1}^m \langle \Theta_*, A_t^* - \tilde{A}_t^* \rangle_R \geq \Omega(m) \quad \text{a. s.}$$

e.g., by making the embeddings ψ_j pathological ($\psi_j : (s, c) \mapsto c$, a constant vector will result in unif. random nominations)

\Rightarrow need to make "sensible assumptions" about how well-behaved ψ_j is

(see the example below)

- 2-stage LinUCB can fail even if ψ_i are well-behaved:

→ Since ranker never fails (see above) and is typically better trained than the nominators (Ma et al., 2020), we ! assume $\Theta_t = \{\Theta^*\}$, $\forall t$, i.e., ranker always picks the best nom. action.

→ Take $m=2$ and $A_{t1}^{\forall t} = \{a_1\}$, $A_{t2}^{\forall t} = \{a_2, a_3\}$
 and $\langle \Theta^*, a_2 \rangle_R < \langle \Theta^*, a_1 \rangle_R < \langle \Theta^*, a_3 \rangle_R$
 → a_1 always nominated, 2nd nominator picks between a_2, a_3 , but ranker never selects a_2

→ Assume $\exists \Theta_{*2}$ s.t.

$$\langle \Theta_{*2}, a_i^2 \rangle_2^{\forall i} = \langle \Theta^*, a_i \rangle_R$$

\swarrow ψ -encoded a_i
2 R

where a_i^2 is ψ_2 -encoded a_i , i.e., the ψ_2 representation is "well-specified" (in a way a best case scenario → can learn to not make mistakes eventually)

→ Assume ellipsoidal confidence sets as usual

$$\Theta_{t2} := \left\{ \theta : \|\theta - \hat{\theta}_{(t-1)2}\|_{V_{(t-1)2}^{-1}(\lambda)}^2 \leq \beta_{t2} \right\}$$

↑ increasing sequence

$$V_{(t-1)2}(\lambda) = \lambda I + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} A_s^2 (A_s^2)^T$$

$$\hat{\theta}_{(t-1)2} = V_{(t-1)2}^{-1}(\lambda) \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} A_s^2 X_s \quad \leftarrow \text{reward}$$

→ Since router uses the true θ_* $\forall t$

$$V_{t2}(\lambda) = \lambda I + \mu_{t1} a_1^2 a_1^{2T} + \cancel{0 \cdot a_2^2 a_2^{2T}} + \mu_{t3} a_3^2 a_3^{2T}$$

⇒ there'll be $v_2 \propto (I - v_3 v_3^T)(I - v_1 v_1^T) a_2$ w/ v_1, v_3 an orthog. basis for $\text{span}(a_1, a_3)$ and v_2 is a unit vector perp. to it, and because $\lambda > 0$

$$\hat{\theta}_{t2} \in \text{span}(a_1^2, a_3^2) \quad \forall t$$

$$\text{so } \hat{\theta}_{t2} \rightarrow \hat{\theta}_{\infty 2} \in \text{span}(v_1, v_3)$$

⇒ since $A_{t2} \in \arg\max_{i \in [2]} \langle \hat{\theta}_{(t-1)2}, a_i^2 \rangle_2 + \sqrt{\beta_{t2}} \|a_i^2\|_{V_{(t-1)2}^{-1}(\lambda)}$
 $\langle \hat{\theta}_{(t-1)2}, a_2^2 \rangle_2$ might be off even as $t \rightarrow \infty$,
and $\sqrt{\beta_{t2}} \|a_2^2\|_{V_{(t-1)2}^{-1}(\lambda)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\beta_{t2} \rightarrow \infty$

and $\|a_2\|_{V^{-1}(\lambda)}^2 = (a_2'' + a_2^+)^T V_{(t-1)2}^{-1}(\lambda) (a_2'' + a_2^+)$
 where $a_2'' = v_2 v_2^T a_2$ and $a_2^+ = (\mathbb{I} - v_2 v_2^T) a_2$

$$\rightarrow (a_2^+)^T V_{(t-1)2}^{-1}(\lambda) a_2^+ = \bar{\lambda}^{-1} \|a_2^+\|_2^2 > 0$$

! assuming $a_2 \notin \text{span}(a_1, a_3)$

! \Rightarrow Numerator 2 will eventually end up spamming a_2 instead of the better a_3 , leading to $\Omega(n)$ regret

\hookrightarrow although see the note on the next page
 (probably more often the case as contexts change)
 • If $a_2 \in \text{span}(a_1, a_3)$, then everything will depend on the size of $\langle a_1, a_2 \rangle$ and $\langle a_3, a_2 \rangle$ as the "eigen value" in the direction a_2 will be

$$\geq [\lambda \mathbb{I} + n_{t1} \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle^2 + n_{t3} \langle a_3, a_2 \rangle^2]^{-1}$$

\Rightarrow convergence will be slower
 but probably only affects constants in most (all?) cases

- Further motivation for $\Theta_t^2 = \{0_*\}$:
Past data often thrown out due to dataset shift \rightarrow router deployed for longer so would have seen it, but nominators have a quicker turn-around (+ deal w/ a larger constantly changing set of items) so might not be as well trained

- $a_2 \notin \text{span}(a_1, a_3)$ may happen when items are clustered and some cluster that is never selected by the router (e.g. a "spam" category) is distinguished by a component that is perpendicular to the span of the items that the router actually recommends