

Various feedback on the course:

By Ludovic Schweitzer:

a convex function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (or even $[0,1]$) does not necessarily achieve its infimum,

hence we safely and rightfully considered p_1^* as an approximate arginf in the last proof of Lecture 1

Ex: $f(x) = x^2 + \frac{1}{q} \mathbb{1}_{x=0}$, infimum equal to 0, never achieved
(take $f(x) = x^2 + \frac{1}{q} \mathbb{1}_{x=0}$ for an exp-concave example)

By Hassan Sliker:

in the last proof, it is easy to directly optimize over $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ the obtained bound:

$$B(\varepsilon) = T \ln(1-\varepsilon) + (N-1) \ln \varepsilon$$

$$B'(\varepsilon) = \frac{-T}{1-\varepsilon} + \frac{N-1}{\varepsilon}$$

$$B''(\varepsilon) < 0$$

thus the ε^* s.t. $B'(\varepsilon^*) = 0$ is the global minimum of B

$$\text{We have } B'(\varepsilon^*) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{\varepsilon^*}{N-1} = \frac{1}{T} - \frac{\varepsilon^*}{T} \Leftrightarrow \varepsilon^* = \frac{1/T}{1/T + 1/(N-1)} = \frac{N-1}{T+N-1}$$

We thus get the sharper final bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\eta} \left(T \ln \left(\frac{T+N-1}{T} \right) + (N-1) \ln \left(\frac{T}{T+N-1} \right) \right) = \frac{T+N-1}{\eta} H \left(\frac{N-1}{T+N-1} \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{\eta} \left((N-1) \ln \left(1 + \frac{N-1}{T} \right) + (N-1) \ln \left(\frac{T}{T+N-1} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$\leq \frac{(N-1)^2}{T}$

where $H(x) = -x \ln x - (1-x) \ln(1-x)$ is the binary entropy

* However * both bounds are $\sim \frac{N-1}{\eta} \ln T$ as $T \rightarrow +\infty$.

Exercise #1 / Various considerations around the notion of regret.

1) ($N=2$ is enough)

Time	$t=1$	$t=2$	$t=3$	$t=4$	$t=5$	$t=6$	etc.
l_{1t}	1	0	1	0	1	0	
$\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} l_{1s}$		1	1	2	2	3	
l_{2t}	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	0	1	0	1	
$\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} l_{2s}$		$\frac{1}{2}$	$1+\frac{1}{2}$	$1+\frac{1}{2}$	$2+\frac{1}{2}$	$2+\frac{1}{2}$	
Leader over $s=1, \dots, t-1$		2	1	2	1	2	
p_{1t}	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	0	1	0	
p_{2t}	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	0	1	0	1	
$\sum_{j=1}^2 p_{jt} l_{jt}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	1	1	1	1	1	
$\sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{j=1}^2 p_{js} l_{js}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$1+\frac{3}{4}$	$2+\frac{3}{4}$	$3+\frac{3}{4}$	$4+\frac{3}{4}$	$5+\frac{3}{4}$	

Follow the leader is a strategy that fails miserably. $\rightarrow$ EV of it is a smoothed alternative.

We have
$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^2 p_{jt} l_{jt} = T \cdot 1 + \frac{3}{4}$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^T l_{1t} = \begin{cases} T/2 & \text{if } T \text{ even} \\ \frac{T-1}{2} & \text{if } T \text{ odd} \end{cases} \quad (\text{lower integer part})$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^T l_{2t} = \begin{cases} (T-1)/2 + 1/2 & \text{if } T \text{ odd} \\ T/2 - 1 + 1/2 & \text{if } T \text{ even} \end{cases}$$

$$\min \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T l_{1t}, \sum_{t=1}^T l_{2t} \right\} \leq \frac{T}{2}$$

$$R_T \geq T \cdot 1 + \frac{3}{4} - T/2 = T/2 - 1/4 \neq o(T)$$

2) It suffices to consider only the sequences in $\{0,1\}^{NT}$:

For any given strategy, we denote for $t \geq 2$:

$$k_t^* \in \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in \{1..N\}} p_{kt} \quad \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{in particular,} \\ p_{k_t^* t} \geq 1/N \end{array} \right.$$

Note that k_t^* depends only on ℓ_{js} , $j \in \{1..N\}$, $s \in \{1..t-1\}$

The sequence
$$\begin{cases} \ell_{k_t^*, t} = 1 \\ \ell_{jt} = 0 \quad j \neq k_t^* \end{cases}$$

is such that :

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_j p_{jt} \ell_{jt} \geq \sum_{t=1}^T \underbrace{p_{k_t^* t}}_{\geq 1/N} \ell_{k_t^* t} \geq \frac{T}{N}$$

while

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \min_j \ell_{jt} = 0.$$

Thus, no strategy can be such that

$$\sup_{\substack{(\ell_{1t}.. \ell_{Nt}) \in \{0,1\}^N \\ t=1..T}} \left\{ \sum_{t,j} p_{jt} \ell_{jt} - \sum_t \min_k \ell_{kt} \right\} = o(T)$$

3) In the proof, instead of applying Hoeffding's lemma

$$\ln \mathbb{E}[e^{\eta X}] \leq \eta \mathbb{E}X + \frac{\eta^2}{8} (M-m)^2$$

we apply Jensen's inequality:

$$\ln \mathbb{E}[e^{\eta X}] \geq \eta \mathbb{E}X$$

(valid $\forall \eta \in \mathbb{R}$ and all variables X
s.t. X is integrable)

$$\text{Then } \sum_j p_j \ell_j = -\frac{1}{\eta} \underbrace{\left(-\eta \sum_j p_j \ell_j \right)}_{\leq \ln \sum_j p_j e^{-\eta \ell_j}} \geq -\frac{1}{\eta} \ln \sum_j p_j e^{-\eta \ell_j}$$

Now, with the same telescoping argument:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N p_{jt} \ell_{jt} &\geq -\frac{1}{\eta} \ln \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N e^{-\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_{jt}}}{N} \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{\eta} \ln \max_{j=1 \dots N} e^{-\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_{jt}} \\ &= \min_{j=1 \dots N} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_{jt} \end{aligned}$$

upper bound in the log by the average

$$\text{That, } \forall \eta > 0, \quad R_T = \sum_{t,j} p_{jt} \ell_{jt} - \min_k \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_{kt} \geq 0$$

Exercise #3 / Convex loss functions and comparison to the best convex vector

Strategy at hand: $\eta > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
 p_t &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} p \, e^{-\eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \ell_s(p)} d\mu(p) / \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \ell_s(p)} d\mu(p) \\
 &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} p \, d\mu_t(p) \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{d\mu_t}{d\mu}(p) = \frac{e^{-\eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \ell_s(p)}}{\int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \ell_s(q)} d\mu(q)}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 1) \quad \ell_t(p_t) &= \ell_t\left(\int p \, d\mu_t(p)\right) \stackrel{\text{Jensen}}{\leq} \int \ell_t(p) \, d\mu_t(p) \\
 &\stackrel{\text{Hoeffding, as for EWA}}{\leq} -\frac{1}{\eta} \ln \int e^{-\eta \ell_t(p)} d\mu_t(p) + \frac{(M-m)^2}{8} \eta \\
 &\quad \underbrace{\ln \frac{\int e^{-\eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \ell_s(p)} d\mu(p)}{\int e^{-\eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \ell_s(p)} d\mu(p)}}_{=0}
 \end{aligned}$$

Summing over $t=1, \dots, T$, a telescoping sum appears:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p_t) \leq -\frac{1}{\eta} \ln \frac{\int e^{-\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p)} d\mu(p)}{1} + \frac{(M-m)^2}{8} \eta T$$

can be bounded using the same techniques as for

exp. concave losses, but the proof needs to be slightly adapted:

$$\delta > 0 \text{ and } p_\delta^* \text{ s.t. } \inf_{p \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p) \leq \delta + \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p_\delta^*)$$

$$\varepsilon > 0 \text{ and } \Delta_{\delta, \varepsilon}^* = \{ (1-\varepsilon) p_\delta^* + \varepsilon r, \quad r \in \mathcal{X} \}$$

$$\text{We still have } \mu(\Delta_{\delta, \varepsilon}^*) = \varepsilon^{N-1}$$

But for $p = (1-\varepsilon)p_s^* + \varepsilon r$ we can only resort to convexity:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_t(p) &\leq (1-\varepsilon)\ell_t(p_s^*) + \varepsilon\ell_t(r) \\ &\leq \ell_t(p_s^*) + \varepsilon(\underbrace{\ell_t(r) - \ell_t(p_s^*)}_{\leq M-m}) \end{aligned}$$

since ℓ takes values in $[m, M]$ by assumption

$$e^{-\eta\ell_t(p)} \geq e^{-\eta\ell_t(p_s^*)} e^{-\eta\varepsilon(M-m)}$$

Putting all things together:

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p)} d\mu(p) \geq \underbrace{\int_{\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}^*}}_{\text{integral only over } \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}^*} e^{-\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p_s^*)} \times e^{-\eta\varepsilon(M-m)T} \times \varepsilon^{N-1}$$

Substituting above and taking $\inf_{\varepsilon}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p_t) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p_s^*) + \inf_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \left\{ \varepsilon(M-m)T - \frac{N-1}{\eta} \ln \varepsilon \right\} \\ &\leq \delta + \inf_p \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p) + \frac{(M-m)^2}{8} \eta T \end{aligned}$$

We let $\delta \downarrow 0$ to conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p_t) - \inf_{p \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t(p) &\leq \frac{(M-m)^2}{8} \eta T + \inf_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \left(\varepsilon(M-m)T - \frac{N-1}{\eta} \ln \varepsilon \right) \end{aligned}$$

2) Optimize first over ε :

$$\begin{aligned} g(\varepsilon) &= \varepsilon(M-m)T - \frac{N-1}{\eta} \ln \varepsilon \\ g'(\varepsilon) &= (M-m)T - \frac{N-1}{\eta \varepsilon} \\ g''(\varepsilon) &= \frac{N-1}{\eta \varepsilon^2} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

g strictly convex,
a unique minimizer
on $(0, +\infty)$ at ε s.t. $g'(\varepsilon) = 0 \iff \varepsilon = \frac{N-1}{\eta(M-m)T}$

⚠ but question is whether this ε is in $(0,1)$!

