

Exercise 2: Adversarial sparse losses

The aim of this exercise is to study what happens when both a non-negativity and a sparsity assumptions are made on the vectors of losses picked by the opponent.

More formally, we consider the setting of linear losses, with N components, where at most s components are positive while the other components are null. The parameter $s \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ is fixed throughout the game but is unknown to the statistician. The online protocol is the following.

Protocol: For all rounds $t = 1, 2, \dots$,

- The statistician picks a convex combination $(p_{j,t})_{1 \leq j \leq N}$ while the environment simultaneously picks a loss vector $(\ell_{j,t})_{1 \leq j \leq N} \in [0, +\infty)^N$, with at most s non-null components;
- The choices are publicly revealed.

The statistician aims to control the regret

$$R_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N p_{j,t} \ell_{j,t} - \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_{i,t}.$$

The question is:

What is the optimal order of magnitude of the regret under the non-negativity and sparsity assumptions?

Lower bound on the regret (only requires Lecture #1)

Consider the joint distribution over $\{0, 1\}^N$ defined as the law of a random vector $\mathbf{L} = (L_1, \dots, L_N)$ drawn in two steps. First, we pick s components uniformly at random among $\{1, \dots, N\}$; we call them K_1, \dots, K_s . Then, the components not picked ($k \neq K_j$ for all j) are associated with zero losses, $L_k = 0$. The losses L_k for picked components K_1, \dots, K_s are drawn according to a Bernoulli distribution with parameter $1/2$. The loss vector $\mathbf{L} \in [0, 1]^N$ thus generated is indeed s -sparse and non-negative.

We fix an algorithm for the statistician, consider an i.i.d. sequence $\mathbf{L}_1, \mathbf{L}_2, \dots$ of random vectors thus generated, and study the corresponding regret

$$R_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^N p_{j,t} L_{j,t} - \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sum_{t=1}^T L_{i,t}.$$

1. Show that the expectation of the regret can be written as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{R_T}{\sqrt{T}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T X_t^{(i)} \right]$$

where the $(X_t^{(1)}, \dots, X_t^{(N)})$ are i.i.d. centered random vectors taking values in $[-1, 1]^N$, with covariance matrix denoted by Γ .

please give a closed-form definition of the $X_t^{(i)}$ based on the $L_{i,t}$, and also compute Γ .

2. Explain why

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T X_t^{(i)} \right] \longrightarrow \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} Z_i \right]$$

where (Z_1, \dots, Z_N) follows the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Gamma)$, i.e., the centered normal distribution with covariance matrix Γ .

3. Consider the Gaussian random vector (W_1, \dots, W_N) with i.i.d. components W_i with distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \text{Var}(Z_1))$. Show that Slepian's lemma (stated at the bottom of next page) is applicable and that it entails

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} Z_i \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} W_i \right]$$

4. Conclude to an asymptotic lower bound of the order of $\sqrt{(Ts \ln N)/N}$; state it carefully and rigorously.

Upper bound on the regret (requires Lecture #2)

5. Recall first how, under the non-negativity assumption, i.e., assuming that the losses $\ell_{j,t}$ all lie in $[0, M]$, we could prove the bound

$$R_T \leq 13M \ln N + 2 \sqrt{M \min_{j=1, \dots, N} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_{j,t} \ln N},$$

referred to as an “improvement for small cumulative losses.”

More precisely, recall the algorithm at hand and the sketch of its performance bound above. (Answer in a about 10–15 lines only.)

6. Deduce a $13M \ln N + 2M \sqrt{(Ts \ln N)/N}$ bound on the regret of this algorithm under the sparsity assumption.
Does the algorithm need to know s to ensure this bound? Explain and comment.

Slepian’s lemma (1962): Let (Z_1, \dots, Z_N) and (W_1, \dots, W_N) be two centered Gaussian random vectors in \mathbb{R}^N . If

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}^2, \quad \mathbb{E}[Z_i^2] = \mathbb{E}[W_i^2]$$

and

$$\forall (i, j) \in \{1, \dots, N\}^2, \quad i \neq j \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{E}[Z_i Z_j] \leq \mathbb{E}[W_i W_j],$$

then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} Z_i > t \right\} \geq \mathbb{P}\left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} W_i > t \right\}.$$