
Dynamic Online Recommendation for Two-Sided Market with Bayesian Incentive Compatibility

Yuantong Li

Department of Statistics
University of California Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90025
yuantongli@ucla.edu

Guang Cheng

Department of Statistics
University of California Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90025
guangcheng@ucla.edu

Xiaowu Dai

Department of Statistics
University of California Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90025
dai@stat.ucla.edu

Abstract

Recommender systems play a crucial role in internet economies by connecting users with relevant products or services. However, designing effective recommender systems faces two key challenges: (1) the exploration-exploitation trade-off in balancing new product exploration against exploiting known preferences, and (2) dynamic incentive compatibility in accounting for users' self-interested behaviors and heterogeneous preferences. This paper formalizes these challenges into a Dynamic Bayesian Incentive-Compatible Recommendation Protocol (DBICRP). To address the DBICRP, we propose a two-stage algorithm (RCB) that integrates incentivized exploration with an efficient offline learning component for exploitation. In the first stage, our algorithm explores available products while maintaining dynamic incentive compatibility to determine sufficient sample sizes. The second stage employs inverse proportional gap sampling integrated with an arbitrary machine learning method to ensure sublinear regret. Theoretically, we prove that RCB achieves $O(\sqrt{KdT})$ regret and satisfies Bayesian incentive compatibility (BIC) under a Gaussian prior assumption. Empirically, we validate RCB's strong incentive gain, sublinear regret, and robustness through simulations and a real-world application on personalized warfarin dosing. Our work provides a principled approach for incentive-aware recommendation in online preference learning settings.

1 Introduction

In the current era of the internet economy, recommender systems have been widely adopted across various domains such as advertising, consumer goods, music, videos, news, job markets, and travel routes [51, 58, 26, 89, 93, 65, 67, 56, 12]. Modern recommendation markets typically involve three key stakeholders: products, users, and the platform (which acts as a *principal*). The platform collects and analyzes user data to enhance future distribution services and to respond effectively to user feedback. In these dynamic markets, the platform serves as the planner and fulfills a dual role: recommending the best available product (i.e., exploitation) and experimenting with lesser-known products to gather more information (i.e., exploration). This exploration is crucial because users often have imbalanced preferences, and many products may initially seem unappealing. However, exploration can be valuable as feedback provides critical insights into the products and helps determine whether they might be worthwhile for future users with similar interests. Unlike in service-

oriented scenarios, these are marketplaces where choices are ultimately made by users rather than imposed by the platform.

The key challenge arises from the fact that heterogeneous users may lack *incentives* to adhere to the platform’s recommendations due to varying interests. A myopic user is likely to choose products based solely on immediate benefits, demonstrating a bias toward exploitation over exploration. How can we effectively integrate a balance between exploration and exploitation while taking individualized incentive compatibility into account? In other words, recommender systems commonly face two significant obstacles: (1) *exploration-exploitation tradeoff*: How can we design recommender systems that maximize rewards but also consider that failing to sufficiently explore all available products initially may lead to suboptimal decisions? (2) *dynamic incentive compatibility*: How can we strategically address the tendency of heterogeneous users to behave myopically?

In this paper, we first formalize the aforementioned challenges into a *Dynamic Bayesian Incentive-Compatible Recommendation Protocol* (DBICRP). This protocol assumes that the platform can communicate directly with users—for example, by sending individualized messages and product recommendations, and then observing the user’s actions and the outcomes. The user’s actions are influenced not only by their personalized interests and a common public prior over all products but also by the individualized message sent by the platform. We then propose a two-stage algorithm to address the DBICRP. In the first stage, the platform explores all available products, taking into account dynamic incentive compatibility, and determines the minimal amount of information (sample size) that must be collected for the subsequent stage. The second stage employs an inverse proportional gap sampling bandit integrated with any efficient plug-in offline machine learning method. This approach aims to simultaneously ensure sublinear regret and maintain dynamic incentive compatibility.

The basic model of incentivized exploration has been examined in several studies, such as [52, 21, 64, 77], which model the recommendation policy within the framework of multi-armed bandit problems, incorporating incentive compatibility constraints. These constraints are induced by agents’ Bayesian priors. These models assume uniformity among agents, expecting them to share the same prior and necessitating a comprehensive understanding of that prior. Subsequently, approaches were developed by [45, 76], which propose personalized recommendation policies for customers with heterogeneous priors. These policies are constrained by BIC and utilize a Thompson sampling algorithm that accommodates adaptive priors.

Our main contributions can be delineated into three parts:

1. We formalize the dynamic online recommendation problem for a two-sided market under BIC constraints in Section 2. This formulation accommodates dynamic user preferences and incorporates incentive-compatible constraints.
2. We introduce a two-stage Bayesian incentive-compatible awareness bandit algorithm (RCB) for addressing DBICRP problem (see Algorithms 1 and 2). This algorithm adapts to any efficient offline machine learning algorithm as a component of the exploitation stage. RCB is also a decision length T -free algorithm, as long as T is greater than a constant. Moreover, we demonstrate that our algorithm achieves an $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{KdT})$ regret bound (Theorem 2), where K is the number of products and d is the feature dimension. It also maintains the BIC property (Theorem 1) assuming a Gaussian distribution for the prior.
3. Lastly, we validate the effectiveness of RCB through its performance in terms of incentive gain and sublinear regret, and its robustness across various environmental and hyperparameter settings in Section 5.1. Additionally, we apply our algorithm to real-world data (personalized warfarin dose allocation) and compare it with other methods to demonstrate its efficacy in Section 5.2.

In §2, we introduce the heterogeneous recommendation protocol featuring BIC and the associated challenges. §3 details the design of our algorithm. In §4, we demonstrate that RCB upholds the BIC constraint and incurs sublinear regret under the assumption of a Gaussian prior. §5 showcases the effectiveness and robustness of RCB through simulations and real-data studies. Further discussions on related works in incentivized exploration and its applications in medical trials are presented in Appendix §F. Appendices §G to §J provide detailed proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, along with additional experimental details.

Notations. We denote $[N] = [1, 2, \dots, N]$ where N is a positive integer. Define $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a d -dimensional random vector. The capital $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ represents a $d \times d$ real-valued matrix. Let I_d represent a $d \times d$ diagonal identity matrix. We use $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ to denote the asymptotic complexity. We denote T as the time horizon.

2 Recommendation Protocol

We first illustrate the basic *Dynamic Bayesian Incentive-Compatible Recommendation Protocol* (DBICRP). Assume a sequence of T (may be unknown) users arrive sequentially to the platform and each user p_t with her covariates x_t , where the observed sequence of covariates $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ are random vectors that are drawn i.i.d. from a distribution \mathcal{D}_X over a deterministic set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. In addition, the platform has access to a set of products (arms) \mathcal{A} , e.g., ads/music/video/medicine, where $|\mathcal{A}| = K$. Each arm has an unknown parameter $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. At time t , the platform recommends the arm following this protocol: (1) The platform sends the user with a recommendation arm I_t based on user's covariates x_t . (2) User myopically chooses an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$ and receives a stochastic reward $y_t(a_t) \in \mathcal{Y}$ where $\mathcal{Y} \in [0, 1]$, and leaves. The reward follows the model,

$$y_t(a_t) = \mu(x_t, a_t) + \eta_{t,a_t} \quad (1)$$

where we assume $\mu(x_t, a_t)$ follows the linear structure $\mu(x_t, a_t) = x_t^\top \beta_{a_t}$ ¹ and $\{\eta_{t,a_t}\}_{t \geq 1}$ are σ -subgaussian random variables if $\mathbb{E}[e^{t\eta}] \leq e^{\sigma^2 t^2/2}$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\{\eta_{t,a_t}\}_{t \geq 1}$ are independent of the sequence $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 1}$. Besides, with a slight abuse of notation, let y_t denote the vector potential reward in $[0, 1]^K$, $\mu(x_t)$ as the vector true conditional expectation reward in $[0, 1]^K$, and η_t as the vector noise in \mathbb{R}^d . Without loss of generality, we assume exist positive constant x_{\max} and b such that $\|x\|_2 \leq L, \forall x_t \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\|\beta_i\|_2 \leq b$ for all $i \in [K]$, which is a common assumption in literature [2, 13, 59] and usually assume $L = b = 1$. It's important to note that the reward function contains two stochastic sources: the covariate vector x_t and the noise η_t , which is general harder than the fixed design $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ in bandit [55]. Besides, we define the data domain $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. We write $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ to denote the distribution over set \mathcal{Z} .

The key difference between the above recommendation protocol with previous literature in sequential decision making [82, 55] is that the user p_t may not follow the recommendation arm I_t , that is, $I_t \neq a_t$. However, in DBICRP, the platform performs as a principal to recommend I_t and the decision a_t is made by the user based on prior knowledge over products. We assume the platform and all users share a prior belief over arms $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P}_{1,0} \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_{K,0}$ where $\beta_i \sim \mathcal{P}_{i,0}$ with the prior mean $\beta_{i,0} = \mathbb{E}[\beta_i]$ and covariance matrix $\text{var}(\beta_i) = \Sigma_{i,0}$. Additionally, given covariate x_t , denote $\mu_0(x_t, i) = \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i)]$ as the prior mean reward for arm i . It's important to note that this setting is different from the bandit setup where the unknown parameter β_i is fixed.

Ideally, we hope users follow the recommended arm I_t even it is not the greedy option for them given that the goal of each user is to maximize her expected reward conditional on her priors over products. Here we define the event that recommendations have been followed in the past before time t with prior knowledge \mathcal{P}_0 as $\Gamma_{t-1} = \{I_s = a_s : s \in [t-1]\} \cup \mathcal{P}_0$, which works as a public information. Then we can formally define the ϵ -*Dynamic Bayesian-Incentive Compatible* (DBIC) for users as follows.

Definition 1 (ϵ -DBIC). Given an *incentive budget* $\epsilon \geq 0$, a recommendation algorithm is ϵ -dynamic Bayesian incentive-compatible (ϵ -DBIC) if

$$\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j) | I_t = i, \Gamma_{t-1}] \geq -\epsilon, \quad \forall t \in [T], i \in [K]. \quad (2)$$

If $\epsilon = 0$, we call it dynamic Bayesian incentive-compatible (DBIC). For brevity, we use the term DBIC to denote both DBIC and ϵ -DBIC throughout the following paper, unless emphasized.

This definition implies that after receiving additional information, such as the recommended arm I_t and the historical information Γ_{t-1} , the user act greedily based on personal preferences. Specifically, the user selects the arm i that maximizes the posterior mean reward, which is either the recommended arm I_t or another arm whose posterior mean reward is within an ϵ budget of the maximum. From the perspective of the principal, it needs to *dynamically* determine which arm to be recommended based on the current covariate x_t and all historical feedback $\mathfrak{S}_{1:t-1}$ at time t , where $\mathfrak{S}_{1:t} = \{(x_t, y_t, a_t)\}_{1:t}$ denotes the sigma-algebra generated by the history up to round t .

¹The nonlinear structure is discussion in Appendix §K.

The objective for the platform is to design a sequential decision-making policy $\pi = \{\pi_t(\cdot)\}_{t \geq 1}$ that maximizes the expected reward for each user while adhering to the DBIC constraint, where $\pi_t(x_t | \mathcal{C}_{1:t-1}) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ denote the arm chosen at time t . Finally, let's define the regret with respect to DBIC constraint when following the policy π . The regret $\text{Reg}_{[T]}(\pi)$ is defined as follows:

$$\text{Reg}_{[T]}(\pi) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, \pi_t^*(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, \pi_t(x_t))] \quad (3)$$

where $\pi_t^*(x_t)$ is the posterior optimal arm given all information up to $t - 1$, covariate x_t , and prior knowledge \mathcal{P}_0 . The $\text{Reg}_{[T]}(\pi)$ is taken over the randomness in the realized rewards and the randomness inherent in the algorithm. Besides, define Bayesian regret $\mathfrak{R}_{[T]}(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}_0}[\text{Reg}_{[T]}(\pi)]$ and its expectation is taken over the prior. In summary, we identify the key challenge in the DBICRP:

Key challenge:

In DBICRP, users exhibit dynamic prior preferences over arms, requiring that recommended products be more valuable than those selected myopically but still within an ϵ margin of the maximum reward. Concurrently, the platform aims to maximize long-term expected rewards. Therefore, the principal challenge lies in designing an algorithm that can **simultaneously** balance the users' incentive with the platform's requirement for low regret.

3 Algorithms

In this section, we introduce the Recommendation Contextual Bandit (RCB) algorithm, which is structure into two stages, the *cold start* stage and the *exploitation* stage. The objective during the cold start stage is to develop an algorithm that not only maintains incentive compatibility but also fulfills the minimal sample size requirement necessary for the subsequent stage. In the second stage, the design of RCB focuses on constructing a sampling bandit framework that seamlessly integrates efficient offline learning methods. This integration aims to balance the efficiency of an ϵ -budget allocation, through a carefully designed of sequential spread parameter $\{\gamma_m\}_m$.

3.1 Cold Start Stage

During the cold start stage, we first need to determine two important quantities, *minimum sample size* N for each arm and *exploration probability* L for RCB. In addition, denote $N_i(t)$ as the current number of pulls of arm i at time t , and $B_t = \{i \mid N_i(t) = N, \forall i \in [K]\}$ as the set of arms that have been pulled N times. Additionally, S_i represents the set collecting historical rewards and covariates for arm i , and $S = \{S_k\}_{k \in [K]}$ encompasses the historical information for all arms.

The cold start stage's process comprises two steps: (1) identify the most popular arm based on the dynamic preference priors, and (2) recommend the remaining arms in a manner that economically allocates the incentive budget.

(1) The Most Popular Arm's Sample Collection (MPASC). If no arm has collected N samples, meaning B_t is empty, the platform recommends arm i to agent p_t , where arm i has the highest prior mean reward with respect to agent p_t . Subsequently, agent p_t provides feedback $y_{t,i}$ according to Eq. (1). Afterwards, the platform updates the number of pulls $N_i(t)$ and the data S_i respectively: $N_i(t) = N_i(t - 1) + 1, S_i = S_i \cup (x_t, y_{t,i})$. Once an arm has been pulled N times, it is removed from further consideration and added to B_t . The principle initially verifies whether any arm has accumulated N samples. This step determines which arm is prior optimal, indicating the most popular among heterogeneous users.

(2) Rest Arm Sample's Collection (RASC). The platform initially samples a Bernoulli random variable $q_t \sim \text{Ber}(1/L)$ to determine the recommendation strategy for the current user. With a probability of $1/L$, the platform recommends exploring promoted (sample-poor) products, while with an exploitation probability of $1 - 1/L$, it suggests exploiting organic (sample-efficient) products. The optimal value of L is determined based on prior information and the incentive budget ϵ , as specified in Theorem 1 in §4.

a) Promoted Recommendation. If $q_t = 1$, the platform recommends agent p_t to explore with a promoted arm which is the highest prior mean reward arm within the set of $[K]/B_t$, representing that arms have not been pulled N times,

$$\tilde{a}_t = \underset{i \in [K]/B_t}{\text{argmax}} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i)]. \quad (4)$$

Algorithm 1: Cold Start Stage

Input : $K, N, L, B, S, \{N_i(t)\}_{i \in [K]}, t = 1$.

- 1 **STEP 1 - THE MOST POPULAR ARM SAMPLE COLLECTION (MPASC)**
 - 2 **while** *there is no arm been pulled N times* **do**
 - 3 Agent p_t is recommended with arm $i = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in [K]} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, j)]$ and receives reward $y_{t,i}$.
 - 4 The platform updates pulls and rewards: $N_i(t) \leftarrow N_i(t-1) + 1, S_i \leftarrow S_i \cup (x_t, y_{t,i})$.
 - 5 If $N_i(t) = N$, add i to B_t . $t \leftarrow t + 1$. **STEP 1** stopped.
 - 6 Update $t \leftarrow t + 1$.
 - 7 **STEP 2 - REST ARM SAMPLE COLLECTION (RASC)**
 - 8 **while** *there exists an arm i such that the number of pulled $N_i(t)$ has not reached N* **do**
 - 9 Samples $q_t \sim \operatorname{Ber}(1/L)$.
 - 10 **if** $q_t = 1$ **then**
 - 11 p_t is recommended to explore with the arm \tilde{a}_t based on Eq.(4) and receives y_{t,\tilde{a}_t} .
 - 12 Updates $N_{\tilde{a}_t}(t) \leftarrow N_{\tilde{a}_t}(t-1) + 1$ and dataset $S_{\tilde{a}_t} \leftarrow S_{\tilde{a}_t} \cup (x_t, y_{t,\tilde{a}_t})$.
 - 13 If $N_{\tilde{a}_t}(t) = N$, add \tilde{a}_t to B_t .
 - 14 **else**
 - 15 p_t is recommended to exploit with the arm a_t^* based on Eq.(5) and receives y_{t,a_t^*} .
 - 16 Update $t \leftarrow t + 1$.
-

Algorithm 2: Exploitation Stage

Input : S , epochs m_0, m_1 , function class \mathcal{F} , learning algorithm $\text{Off}_{\mathcal{F}}$, confidence level δ .

- 1 **for** *epoch* $m \in [m_0, m_1]$ **do**
 - 2 Set $\gamma_m = 4\sqrt{K/\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F},\delta}(|\mathcal{T}_{m-1}|)}$.
 - 3 Feed $m - 1$ epoch's data $W_{\mathcal{T}_{m-1}}$ into the OffPos and get $\{\hat{\beta}_{m,i}\}_{i \in [K]}$.
 - 4 **for** $t \in \mathcal{T}_m$ **do**
 - 5 Agent p_t arrives with covariate x_t . Compute estimate $\hat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, i) = x_t^\top \hat{\beta}_{m,i}, \forall i \in [K]$.
 - 6 Obtain the optimal arm $b_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, i)$.
 - 7 Sample $a_t \sim p_m(i)$ according to Eq.(6) and observe reward $y_t(a_t)$.
-

Then agent p_t receives reward y_{t,\tilde{a}_t} and the platform updates the number of pulls and samples of pair of the covariate and reward respectively: $N_{\tilde{a}_t}(t) \leftarrow N_{\tilde{a}_t}(t-1) + 1, S_{\tilde{a}_t} \leftarrow S_{\tilde{a}_t} \cup (x_t, y_{t,\tilde{a}_t})$. When arm \tilde{a}_t has been pulled N times, arm \tilde{a}_t is added to set B_t .

b) Organic Recommendation. If $q_t = 0$, the platform recommends the agent p_t to exploit with the organic arm a_t^* , which is the highest expected mean reward arm conditional on S_{B_t} .

$$a_t^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) | S_{B_t}]. \quad (5)$$

That is, arms in B_t 's expected rewards are evaluated through posterior mean rewards and arms not in B_t 's expected rewards are evaluated through prior mean rewards. Then the agent p_t receives reward y_{t,a_t^*} , but in this case, the principal will not update $N_{a_t^*}(t)$ and $S_{a_t^*}$.

3.2 Exploitation Stage

Given the data S (defined in §3.1) collected during the cold start stage, where each arm accumulates N samples, the platform's objective in the exploitation stage is to recommend arms with higher posterior means while satisfying the DBIC constraint. Thus, the key challenge of the bandit algorithm's design lies in balancing exploitation efficiency with the allocation of the incentive budget ϵ . The general principle of the bandit algorithm involves first strategically dividing the decision points into a series of epochs of increasing length. At the beginning of each epoch, samples collected in the previous epoch are used to update the *spread parameter* γ_m to control the balance of exploration and exploitation at epoch m , thereby informing the decisions for the current epoch. Here we first denote the m th epoch's rounds as $\mathcal{T}_m = \{t \in [2^{m-1}, 2^m), m \geq m_0\}$ and $m(t)$ representing the epoch where the current t belongs to. The cold start stage's epoch is demoted as $m_0 = \lceil 2 + \log_2 N \rceil$ and the final stage is denoted as m_1 . The principal collected data at the m th epoch denoted as $W_{\mathcal{T}_m} = \{x_t, a_t, y_t(a_t)\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}_m}$.

At epoch $m \in [m_0, m_1]$, the platform then obtains the posterior mean estimator $\hat{\beta}_i = \mathbb{E}_{\beta_i \sim p(\beta_i | W_{\mathcal{T}_{m-1}})}[\beta_i]$, where $p(\beta_i | W_{\mathcal{T}_{m-1}})$ represents the posterior distribution based on data from $W_{\mathcal{T}_{m-1}}$. Subsequently, the platform computes the *predictive estimate reward* $\hat{\mu}_t(x_t, i) = x_t^\top \hat{\beta}_i$ for all arms. We denote $b_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_t(x_t, i)$ as the *best predictive arm*. The platform then randomly selects arm a_t according to the distribution $p_t(i)$, for $t \in \mathcal{T}_m$:

$$p_m(i) = \begin{cases} 1 - \sum_{i \neq b_t} p_t(i), & \text{if } i = b_t. \\ 1/[K + \gamma_m(\hat{\mu}_t(x_t, b_t) - \hat{\mu}_t(x_t, i))], & \text{if } i \neq b_t. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where the spread parameter $\gamma_m = 4\sqrt{K/\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F},\delta}(|\mathcal{T}_{m-1}|)}$ regulates the balance between exploration and exploitation, and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F},\delta}(|\mathcal{T}_{m-1}|)$ denotes the mean squared prediction error (MSPE) at epoch $m-1$. A smaller γ_m results in a more dispersed p_t , enhancing exploration. Conversely, a larger γ_m leads to a more concentrated p_t , focusing recommendations on the best predictive arm b_t . As the epoch progresses, γ_m increases and is inversely proportional to the square root of the MSPE. The MSPE is typically derived via cross-validation using an efficient offline statistical learning method. Below, we present the formal definition of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F},\delta}(n)$ with n i.i.d. training samples.

Definition 2. Let p be an arbitrary action selection kernel. Given a sample size of n data of the format (x_i, a_i, y_i, a_i) , which are i.i.d. according to $(x_i, y_i) \sim \mathcal{D}$, $a_i \sim p(\cdot | x_i)$, the offline learning algorithm $\text{Off}_{\mathcal{F}}$ based on the data and a general function class \mathcal{F} returns a predictor $\hat{\mu}_t(x, a) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{P}_X, a \sim p(\cdot | x)} [\hat{\mu}_t(x, a) - \mu(x_t, a_t)]^2 \leq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F},\delta}(n)$.

4 Theory

In this section, we first provide necessary assumptions in §4.1 to get the N, L , and the analytical regret upper bound. Then we demonstrate that RCB simultaneously satisfies the DBIC constraints in the whole decision process in §4.2 when sample size N and probability L are well designed. In §4.3, we show RCB achieves a $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{KdT})$ regret.

4.1 Regularity Conditions

In order to satisfy the DBIC constraint, we list two assumptions over the prior distribution.

Assumption 1 (Prior-Posterior Distribution Assumption). Denote $G_t(i) = \min_{j \in B_t, i \in [K] \setminus B_t} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j) | S_{B_t}]$ as the *minimum prior-posterior gap* when we have N samples of arm $j \in B_t$ and zero sample of arm i in the cold start stage. There exists *time-independent prior constants* $n_{\mathcal{P}}, \tau_{\mathcal{P}}, \rho_{\mathcal{P}} > 0$ such that $\forall n \geq n_{\mathcal{P}_0}, i \in [K]$, then $\Pr(G_t(i) \geq \tau_{\mathcal{P}_0}) \geq \rho_{\mathcal{P}_0}$.

Any given arm i can be a posteriori best arm by margin $\tau_{\mathcal{P}_0}$ with probability at least $\rho_{\mathcal{P}_0}$ after seeing sufficiently many samples from B_t . The platform provides a fighting chance for those arms from $[K] \setminus B_t$ with a low prior mean, which means after seeing sufficiently many samples of arm $j \in B_t$ there is a positive probability that arm $i \in [K] \setminus B_t$ (zero sample collected) is better. What's more, we assume the gap between arms are at least greater than $\tau_{\mathcal{P}_*}$ with at least probability $\rho_{\mathcal{P}_*}$ after we have $n_{\mathcal{P}_*}$ data.

Assumption 2 (Posterior Distribution Assumption). Denote $G_t(b_t) = \min_{j \neq b_t} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, b_t) - \mu(x_t, j) | S]$ as the *minimum posterior gap* when we have N samples of each arms in the exploitation stage. There exist *a uniform time-independent posterior constants* $n_{\mathcal{P}_*}, \tau_{\mathcal{P}_*}, \rho_{\mathcal{P}_*} > 0$ such that $\forall n \geq n_{\mathcal{P}_*}, i \in [K]$, then $\Pr(G_t(b_t) \geq \tau_{\mathcal{P}_*}) \geq \rho_{\mathcal{P}_*}$.

The we provide the regularity conditions over covariates \mathcal{P}_X as follows.

Assumption 3 (Minimum Eigenvalue of Σ). Define the *minimum eigenvalue of the covariance matrix of X* as $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma) = \lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{P}_X}[xx^\top])$. There exists such a $\phi_0 > 0$ satisfying that $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma) \geq \phi_0$.

Assumption 4 (Prior Covariance Matrix Minimum Eigenvalue Assumption). For each arm i , the *minimum eigenvalue of prior covariance matrix $\Sigma_{i,0}$* satisfying: (1) $\Sigma_{i,0} \succeq \lambda_{i,0} \mathbf{I}_d$. (2) $\{\lambda_{i,t}\}_{t \geq 0}$ is increasing with order $\mathcal{O}(t)$.

This assumption assumes that with more interaction and feedback occurred in the platform, users have a dynamic prior belief and this prior becomes weaker and weaker since users tend to trust the

platform’s recommendation rather than have strong belief for specific arms. And these minimum eigenvalues of the covariance matrix become larger which means that users are more open to those products rather than with strong opinion towards specific products. We also explore when this assumption is violated in Appendix §J.

4.2 Dynamic Bayesian Incentive Compatible Constraint

Next we provide the requirements for the minimum sample size $N(\epsilon)$ and the exploration probability L to efficiently allocate the budget ϵ and effectively recommend the optimal arms to users.

Theorem 1. *With Assumptions 1 - 3, and the prior follows the normal distribution, if the parameters N, L are larger than some prior-dependent constant and the platform follows the RCB algorithm, then it preserves the ϵ -DBIC property with probability at least $\rho_{\mathcal{P}_0}\rho_{\mathcal{P}_*}$. More precisely, it suffices to take*

$$N(\epsilon) \geq \frac{(\sigma^2 d + 1)K^3}{\phi_0(\tau_{\mathcal{P}_*} + \epsilon)^2} \text{ and } L \geq 1 + \frac{1 - \epsilon}{\tau_{\mathcal{P}_0}\rho_{\mathcal{P}_0} + \epsilon}. \quad (7)$$

And the exploitation stage starts at $m_0(\epsilon) \geq \lceil 2 + \log_2 N(\epsilon) \rceil$.

This theorem demonstrates that RCB maintains ϵ -DBIC throughout the entire recommendation process given the lower bound of N and L . We provide that the minimum sample size is cubic with respect to the number of arms, linear in relation to the covariate dimension d , inversely quadratic to the sum of ϵ and the minimal optimal posterior gap $\tau_{\mathcal{P}_*}$, and inversely linear to the minimum eigenvalue of the covariance matrix of our features ϕ_0 . This critically shows the tradeoff that a relatively larger budget ϵ significantly reduces the minimal sample size needed. Additionally, the determination of the spread parameter γ_m is based on the pivot of the functionality of ϵ in $N(\epsilon)$. In RCB, given $N(\epsilon)$ in the cold start stage, γ_m for each epoch is entirely determined by the offline learning method and is independent of ϵ due to the increasing length of the epochs.

4.3 Regret Upper Bound

In the following theorem, we show the regret upper bound of RCB.

Theorem 2. *Given $N(\epsilon)$ and L from Theorem 1, and Assumption 4, for any $T \geq \tau_{m_0-1} + 1$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the regret upper bound of RCB is $\tau_{m_0-1}(\epsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{Kd(T - \tau_{m_0-1}(\epsilon))})$.*

The total regret is partitioned into two components: the cold start stage’s regret τ_{m_0-1} and the exploitation stage $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{KdT})$, where the latter depends only on the square root of the number of arms K , the covariate dimension d , and the decision horizon T . This square root dependency on T , d , and K underscores the efficiency of the approach, as detailed in [55]. Moreover, the effect of the ϵ budget is predominantly observed in the regret of the cold start stage, especially when T is small.

5 Experiments

In this section, we apply RCB to synthetic data (§5.1) and real data (§5.2) to demonstrate its effectiveness by illustrating how RCB ensures sublinear regret, maintains DBIC, and exhibits robustness across various hyperparameters. Our code is made available to ensure reproducibility of the results.

5.1 Simulation Studies

The goal of this section is to demonstrate that RCB algorithm can satisfy the ϵ -DBIC property and secure the sublinear regret. For all settings, the following parameters need to be specified (a) *environment parameters*: time horizon T , number of arms K , feature dimension d , and noise level σ ; (b) *ϵ -DBIC parameters*: budget ϵ , prior-posterior minimum gap constants $\tau_{\mathcal{P}_0}$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{P}_0}$; (c) *prior belief parameters*: prior \mathcal{P}_0 , where we assume the prior follows the normal distribution.

Setting 1 (Environment Effects): We consider RCB’s robustness in terms of different $K = [2, 5, 10]$, $d = [3, 5, 10]$. For rest parameters, we set $T = 10^5$, $\sigma = 0.05$, $\epsilon = 0.05$, $\tau_{\mathcal{P}_0} = 0.01$, and $\rho_{\mathcal{P}_0} = 0.95$. The prior are set to be $\beta_{i,0} = \mathbf{0}_d$ and $\Sigma_{i,0} = 1/5\mathbf{I}_d$.

Setting 2 (Ad-hoc Design): This scenario demonstrates the results when the platform adopts an ad-hoc approach to $N(\epsilon)$ without following the guidelines of Theorem 1. Here, N is set to $\{10, 100, 1000\}$. All other parameters remain consistent with those specified in Setting 1.

Analysis of Setting 1 (Upper part of Figure 1): Different columns in the figure represent various dimensions d , with the first three columns illustrating the ϵ -DBIC gain and the last three columns




Figure 1: Incentive gain (left) and cumulative regret (right) of Setting 1 (upper) and Setting 2 (lower).

detailing the regrets observed. Our findings indicate that RCB satisfies the ϵ -DBIC property, as evidenced by the gain consistently exceeding -0.05 (dashed line), or budget not been used up. During the exploitation stage, there is an observable upward trend in the instantaneous ϵ -DBIC gain, suggesting that the recommendation system increasingly gains trust from customers (larger ϵ gain). The right segment of the figure explores the relationship between regret, d , and K . It was observed that the regret for $K = 10$ significantly exceeds that for $K = 3$ and $K = 5$. This discrepancy arises because, to maintain the ϵ -DBIC property, the duration of the cold start stage increases cubically with K , representing a substantial cost during this initial phase. In contrast, the impact of d on cost is relatively minimal, as articulated in Theorem 1.

Analysis of Setting 2 (Lower part of Figure 1): This setting mirrors Setting 1 in terms of overall configuration. However, in this scenario, the platform does not adhere to the sample size requirements needed to satisfy the ϵ -DBIC property, opting instead for an arbitrary fixed cold start length of $N(\epsilon) = \{10, 100, 1000\}$. The simulation results for $N(\epsilon) = \{100, 1000\}$ are detailed in Appendix §J. When compared with the regret observed in Setting 1, which is at the level of 10^5 , the regret in Setting 2 is considerably lower, at approximately 10^3 . However, in terms of ϵ -DBIC gain, Setting 1 consistently shows positive gains, fully complying with the ϵ -DBIC property, whereas Setting 2 experiences periods of negative gains, particularly when the number of arms is high ($K = 10$). This negative trend is more pronounced as d increases, making it increasingly challenging to estimate an appropriate cold start length, as further discussed in Appendix §J. Notably, even with $N(\epsilon) = 1000$, the ϵ -DBIC gain remains negative for most instances when $d = 5$ or 10 .

5.2 Real Data

We utilize a publicly available dataset from the Pharmacogenomics Knowledge Base (PharmGKB) that includes medical records of 5,700 patients treated with warfarin across various global research groups [25]. In the U.S., inappropriate warfarin dosing leads to about 43,000 emergency department visits annually. Traditional fixed-dose strategies can result in severe adverse effects due to initial dosing inaccuracies. Our study aims to optimize initial dosages by leveraging patient-specific factors from the cleaned data of 5,528 patients. Detailed data information and cleaning procedures are provided in Appendix J.2.

Arms Construction: We follow the arm construction as it in [13] and formulate the problem as a K -armed bandit with covariates ($K = 3$). We bucket the optimal dosages using the “clinically relevant” dosage differences: (1) Low: under 3mg/day (33% of cases), (2) Medium: 3-7mg/day (54% of cases), and (3) High: over 7mg/day (13% of cases). In particular, patients who require a low (high) dose would be at risk for excessive (inadequate) anti-coagulation under the physician’s medium starting dose.

Reward Construction: For each patient, the reward is set to 1 if the dosing algorithm selects the arm corresponding to the patient’s true optimal dose; otherwise, the reward is 0. This straightforward reward function allows the regret to directly quantify the number of incorrect dosing decisions. Additionally, it is important to note that while we employ a binary reward for simplicity, we model the reward as a linear function. Despite this, the RCB algorithm demonstrates robust performance in this setting, indicating its potential utility for scenarios involving discrete outcomes.

Table 1: Fraction of patients

True Dosage		RCB Algo Assigned Dosage			Physician Algo Assigned Dosage			% of Patients
		Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	
Low	Low	50%	48%	2%	0%	100%	0%	27%
	Medium	14%	84%	2%	0%	100%	0%	60%
	High	2%	93%	5%	0%	100%	0%	13%




Figure 2: Fraction of Incorrect Decision

Ground Truth: We estimate the true arm parameters β_i using the linear regression with the entire dataset for specific group. Besides, we scale the optimal warfarin dosing into $[0, 1]$ with minimum dosing as 0, and maximum dosing as 1. The true mean warfarin dosage is obtained from the inner production of β_i (based on the optimal arm) multiplies the covariate of this patient. Besides, for the counterfactual arm, the true mean dosage are set to be 0.

RCB Setup: The total number of trials is set at $T = 5528$, with reward noise $\hat{\sigma} = 0.054$ estimated from the true optimal dosing of warfarin after scaling. To create an online decision-making scenario, we simulate the process across 10 random permutations of patient arrivals, averaging the results over these permutations. The exploration budget ϵ is varied among $[0.025, 0.035, 0.045]$. The minimum gap $\tau_{\mathcal{P}_0}$ is set at 0.005. The prior variance is defined as $\Sigma = [0.4, 0.6, 0.8]\mathbf{I}_d$, and the prior means are $\beta_{2,0} = 0.05 \times \mathbf{I}_d$, $\beta_{1,0} = \beta_{3,0} = \mathbf{0}_d$. Further details on hyperparameters are available in §J.2.

Evaluation Criteria: We apply four criteria to evaluate the warfarin dose decision. (1) *Regret*: The regret is optimal mean dose minus 0. (2) *ϵ -DBIC Gain*. (3) *Fraction of Incorrect Decision*: the fraction of incorrect decision. (4) *Weighted Risk Score*: the correct decision deserves 1 point and incorrect decision loss 1 point and multiple the true dosage sample proportion.

Result Analysis: In Table 1, we exhibits the RCB algorithm’s true dosage correction ratio and physician assigned dosage correction ratio (always choose medium) and the weighted risk score.

Fraction of Incorrect Decision: In Figure 2, we present the fraction of incorrect decisions, a newly metric, made by the RCB, which is particularly relevant in the medical trial field where the optimal continuous dosage often remains unknown and difficult to ascertain. Our findings indicate varying levels of incorrect decisions based on the size of ϵ and different prior variances. At $\epsilon = 0.025$, three prior variances show a similar fraction of incorrect decisions, with all variations approximately at a 0.35 decision error rate, which is considered state of the art when compared to the lasso bandit described in [13], which utilizes prior knowledge of non-zero feature counts. At $\epsilon = 0.035$, only $\Sigma = 0.4\mathbf{I}$ achieves the lowest fraction of incorrect decisions, approximately 0.37. When ϵ is increased to 0.045, the fraction of incorrect decisions for all three beliefs exceeds 0.4. These observations suggest that with strong prior knowledge of the optimal dosage, a smaller ϵ improves correction rates. This highlights that RCB may require an extended cold start phase to reach optimal performance and build sufficient confidence in its recommendations.

Weighted Risk Score: In Table 1, we present the dosages assigned by RCB, the true dosages, the dosages assigned by a typical physician algorithm, and the true percentage of patients for each dosage level. Notably, 60% of patients require a medium dosage level, while 27% should receive a low dosage level, and 13% a high dosage level. We use blue percentages to indicate the correction rate of dosages assigned by RCB within each true dosage level, and red percentages to denote extremely incorrect decisions across these levels. The physician algorithm, which consistently prescribes a medium level dosage, achieves a 100% correctness rate at the low dosage level. Conversely, RCB attains correction rates of 50%, 84%, and 5% for the low, medium, and high dosage levels, respectively, with an *extremely* incorrect rate of 2% for the low and high levels. With respect to the

weighted risk score, we find that at $\epsilon = 0.025$, the three prior beliefs achieve scores of 0.291, 0.289, and 0.274, respectively, indicating higher scores are better. When $\epsilon = 0.035$ and $\Sigma = 0.4\mathbf{I}$, the score is 0.265. The physician policy, evaluated under the metric of the weighted risk score, calculates as $-1 \times 0.27 + 1 \times 0.60 - 1 \times 0.13 = 0.20$, significantly lower than the scores provided by RCB (0.291).

References

- [1] Y. Abbasi-Yadkori, A. Antos, and C. Szepesvári. Forced-exploration based algorithms for playing in stochastic linear bandits. In *COLT Workshop on On-line Learning with Limited Feedback*, volume 92, page 236, 2009.
- [2] Y. Abbasi-Yadkori, D. Pál, and C. Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- [3] N. Abe and P. M. Long. Associative reinforcement learning using linear probabilistic concepts. In *ICML*, pages 3–11. Citeseer, 1999.
- [4] A. Agarwal, M. Dudík, S. Kale, J. Langford, and R. Schapire. Contextual bandit learning with predictable rewards. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 19–26. PMLR, 2012.
- [5] J. Arango, T. Chuck, S. S. Ellenberg, B. Foltz, C. Gorman, H. Hinrichs, S. McHale, K. Merchant, J. Seltzer, S. Shapley, et al. Good clinical practice training: identifying key elements and strategies for increasing training efficiency. *Therapeutic innovation & regulatory science*, 50(4):480–486, 2016.
- [6] S. Athey and I. Segal. An efficient dynamic mechanism. *Econometrica*, 81(6):2463–2485, 2013.
- [7] P. Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):397–422, 2002.
- [8] P. Auer, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and P. Fischer. Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine learning*, 47:235–256, 2002.
- [9] M. Babaioff, Y. Sharma, and A. Slivkins. Characterizing truthful multi-armed bandit mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 79–88, 2009.
- [10] M. Babaioff, S. Dughmi, R. Kleinberg, and A. Slivkins. Dynamic pricing with limited supply, 2015.
- [11] A. Badanidiyuru, R. Kleinberg, and A. Slivkins. Bandits with knapsacks. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 65(3):1–55, 2018.
- [12] K. Bao, J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, W. Wang, F. Feng, and X. He. Tallrec: An effective and efficient tuning framework to align large language model with recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 1007–1014, 2023.
- [13] H. Bastani and M. Bayati. Online decision making with high-dimensional covariates. *Operations Research*, 68(1):276–294, 2020.
- [14] R. Bellman. A problem in the sequential design of experiments. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics (1933-1960)*, 16(3/4):221–229, 1956.
- [15] D. Bergemann and S. Morris. Information design, bayesian persuasion, and bayes correlated equilibrium. *American Economic Review*, 106(5):586–591, 2016.
- [16] D. Bergemann and J. Välimäki. The dynamic pivot mechanism. *Econometrica*, 78(2):771–789, 2010.
- [17] O. Besbes and A. Zeevi. Dynamic pricing without knowing the demand function: Risk bounds and near-optimal algorithms. *Operations research*, 57(6):1407–1420, 2009.
- [18] P. Bolton and C. Harris. Strategic experimentation. *Econometrica*, 67(2):349–374, 1999.

- [19] S. Bubeck, N. Cesa-Bianchi, et al. Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 5(1):1–122, 2012.
- [20] Y.-K. Che and J. Horner. Optimal design for social learning. 2015.
- [21] Y.-K. Che and J. Hörner. Recommender systems as mechanisms for social learning. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133(2):871–925, 2018.
- [22] H. Chen, W. Lu, and R. Song. Statistical inference for online decision making via stochastic gradient descent. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(534):708–719, 2021.
- [23] H. Chen, W. Lu, and R. Song. Statistical inference for online decision making: In a contextual bandit setting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(533):240–255, 2021.
- [24] S.-C. Chow and M. Chang. Adaptive design methods in clinical trials—a review. *Orphanet journal of rare diseases*, 3(1):1–13, 2008.
- [25] I. W. P. Consortium. Estimation of the warfarin dose with clinical and pharmacogenetic data. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 360(8):753–764, 2009.
- [26] P. Covington, J. Adams, and E. Sargin. Deep neural networks for youtube recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on recommender systems*, pages 191–198, 2016.
- [27] N. R. Devanur and S. M. Kakade. The price of truthfulness for pay-per-click auctions. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 99–106, 2009.
- [28] J. Ely, A. Frankel, and E. Kamenica. Suspense and surprise. *Journal of Political Economy*, 123(1):215–260, 2015.
- [29] D. Foster and A. Rakhlin. Beyond ucb: Optimal and efficient contextual bandits with regression oracles. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3199–3210. PMLR, 2020.
- [30] P. Frazier, D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and R. Kleinberg. Incentivizing exploration. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM conference on Economics and computation*, pages 5–22, 2014.
- [31] B. Freidlin and R. Simon. Adaptive signature design: an adaptive clinical trial design for generating and prospectively testing a gene expression signature for sensitive patients. *Clinical cancer research*, 11(21):7872–7878, 2005.
- [32] B. Freidlin, E. L. Korn, R. Gray, and A. Martin. Multi-arm clinical trials of new agents: some design considerations. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 14(14):4368–4371, 2008.
- [33] B. Freidlin, W. Jiang, and R. Simon. The cross-validated adaptive signature design. *Clinical cancer research*, 16(2):691–698, 2010.
- [34] A. Ghosh and P. Hummel. Learning and incentives in user-generated content: Multi-armed bandits with endogenous arms. In *Proceedings of the 4th conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 233–246, 2013.
- [35] J. C. Gittins. Bandit processes and dynamic allocation indices. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 41(2):148–164, 1979.
- [36] J. Han and X. Dai. Robust multi-item auction design using statistical learning: Overcoming uncertainty in bidders’ types distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00941*, 2023.
- [37] Q. Han, W. W. Sun, and Y. Zhang. Online statistical inference for matrix contextual bandit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.11385*, 2022.
- [38] B. Hao and T. Lattimore. Regret bounds for information-directed reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:28575–28587, 2022.
- [39] B. Hao, T. Lattimore, and C. Qin. Contextual information-directed sampling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8446–8464. PMLR, 2022.

- [40] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, J. H. Friedman, and J. H. Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, volume 2. Springer, 2009.
- [41] M. Hellmich. Monitoring clinical trials with multiple arms. *Biometrics*, 57(3):892–898, 2001.
- [42] C.-J. Ho, A. Slivkins, and J. W. Vaughan. Adaptive contract design for crowdsourcing markets: Bandit algorithms for repeated principal-agent problems. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM conference on Economics and computation*, pages 359–376, 2014.
- [43] J. Hörner and A. Skrzypacz. Selling information. *Journal of Political Economy*, 124(6):1515–1562, 2016.
- [44] C. Hu and J. J. Dignam. Biomarker-driven oncology clinical trials: key design elements, types, features, and practical considerations. *JCO Precision Oncology*, 1:1–12, 2019.
- [45] X. Hu, D. Ngo, A. Slivkins, and S. Z. Wu. Incentivizing combinatorial bandit exploration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:37173–37183, 2022.
- [46] W. Jiang, B. Freidlin, and R. Simon. Biomarker-adaptive threshold design: a procedure for evaluating treatment with possible biomarker-defined subset effect. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 99(13):1036–1043, 2007.
- [47] S. M. Kakade, I. Lobel, and H. Nazerzadeh. Optimal dynamic mechanism design and the virtual-pivot mechanism. *Operations Research*, 61(4):837–854, 2013.
- [48] E. Kamenica and M. Gentzkow. Bayesian persuasion. *American Economic Review*, 101(6):2590–2615, 2011.
- [49] G. Keller, S. Rady, and M. Cripps. Strategic experimentation with exponential bandits. *Econometrica*, 73(1):39–68, 2005.
- [50] R. Kleinberg and T. Leighton. The value of knowing a demand curve: Bounds on regret for online posted-price auctions. In *44th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2003. Proceedings.*, pages 594–605. IEEE, 2003.
- [51] Y. Koren, R. Bell, and C. Volinsky. Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems. *Computer*, 42(8):30–37, 2009.
- [52] I. Kremer, Y. Mansour, and M. Perry. Implementing the “wisdom of the crowd”. *Journal of Political Economy*, 122(5):988–1012, 2014.
- [53] B. Kveton, C. Szepesvári, S. Vaswani, Z. Wen, T. Lattimore, and M. Ghavamzadeh. Garbage in, reward out: Bootstrapping exploration in multi-armed bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3601–3610. PMLR, 2019.
- [54] T. L. Lai and H. Robbins. Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in applied mathematics*, 6(1):4–22, 1985.
- [55] T. Lattimore and C. Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [56] P. Lewis, E. Perez, A. Piktus, F. Petroni, V. Karpukhin, N. Goyal, H. Küttler, M. Lewis, W.-t. Yih, T. Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- [57] J. Li, Y. Li, and X. Dai. Jiayi li, yuantong li and xiaowu dai’s contribution to the discussion of ‘estimating means of bounded random variables by betting’ by waudby-smith and ramdas. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 86(1):41–43, 2024.
- [58] L. Li, W. Chu, J. Langford, and R. E. Schapire. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*, pages 661–670, 2010.
- [59] Y. Li, C.-H. Wang, and G. Cheng. Online forgetting process for linear regression models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 217–225. PMLR, 2021.

- [60] Y. Li, C.-h. Wang, G. Cheng, and W. W. Sun. Rate-optimal contextual online matching bandit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.03699*, 2022.
- [61] Y. Li, G. Cheng, and X. Dai. Double matching under complementary preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.10230*, 2023.
- [62] O.-A. Maillard. *Mathematics of statistical sequential decision making*. PhD thesis, Université de Lille, Sciences et Technologies, 2019.
- [63] M. L. Maitland and R. L. Schilsky. Clinical trials in the era of personalized oncology. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians*, 61(6):365–381, 2011.
- [64] Y. Mansour, A. Slivkins, and V. Syrgkanis. Bayesian incentive-compatible bandit exploration. *Operations Research*, 68(4):1132–1161, 2020.
- [65] J. McInerney, B. Lacker, S. Hansen, K. Higley, H. Bouchard, A. Gruson, and R. Mehrotra. Explore, exploit, and explain: personalizing explainable recommendations with bandits. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM conference on recommender systems*, pages 31–39, 2018.
- [66] J. Mourtada and L. Rosasco. An elementary analysis of ridge regression with random design. *Comptes Rendus. Mathématique*, 360(G9):1055–1063, 2022.
- [67] M. Naumov, D. Mudigere, H.-J. M. Shi, J. Huang, N. Sundaraman, J. Park, X. Wang, U. Gupta, C.-J. Wu, A. G. Azzolini, et al. Deep learning recommendation model for personalization and recommendation systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00091*, 2019.
- [68] M. Ostrovsky and M. Schwarz. Reserve prices in internet advertising auctions: A field experiment. *Journal of Political Economy*, 131(12):3352–3376, 2023.
- [69] Y. Papanastasiou, K. Bimpikis, and N. Savva. Crowdsourcing exploration. *Management Science*, 64(4):1727–1746, 2018.
- [70] P. Ramprasad, Y. Li, Z. Yang, Z. Wang, W. W. Sun, and G. Cheng. Online bootstrap inference for policy evaluation in reinforcement learning. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(544):2901–2914, 2023.
- [71] L. Rayo and I. Segal. Optimal information disclosure. *Journal of political Economy*, 118(5): 949–987, 2010.
- [72] A. J. Redig and P. A. Jänne. Basket trials and the evolution of clinical trial design in an era of genomic medicine. *J Clin Oncol*, 33(9):975–977, 2015.
- [73] H. Robbins. Some aspects of the sequential design of experiments. 1952.
- [74] D. Russo and B. Van Roy. Learning to optimize via posterior sampling. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(4):1221–1243, 2014.
- [75] D. J. Russo, B. Van Roy, A. Kazerouni, I. Osband, Z. Wen, et al. A tutorial on thompson sampling. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(1):1–96, 2018.
- [76] M. Sellke. Incentivizing exploration with linear contexts and combinatorial actions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 30570–30583. PMLR, 2023.
- [77] M. Sellke and A. Slivkins. The price of incentivizing exploration: A characterization via thompson sampling and sample complexity. *Operations Research*, 71(5):1706–1732, 2023.
- [78] C. Shi, S. Zhang, W. Lu, and R. Song. Statistical inference of the value function for reinforcement learning in infinite-horizon settings. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(3):765–793, 2022.
- [79] D. Simchi-Levi and Y. Xu. Bypassing the monster: A faster and simpler optimal algorithm for contextual bandits under realizability. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(3):1904–1931, 2022.

- [80] A. Singla and A. Krause. Truthful incentives in crowdsourcing tasks using regret minimization mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1167–1178, 2013.
- [81] A. Slivkins et al. Introduction to multi-armed bandits. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 12(1-2):1–286, 2019.
- [82] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [83] I. Taneva. Information design. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 11(4):151–185, 2019.
- [84] W. R. Thompson. On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples. *Biometrika*, 25(3-4):285–294, 1933.
- [85] G. Vaidyanathan. Redefining clinical trials: the age of personalized medicine. *Cell*, 148(6):1079–1080, 2012.
- [86] S. S. Villar, J. Bowden, and J. Wason. Multi-armed bandit models for the optimal design of clinical trials: benefits and challenges. *Statistical science: a review journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics*, 30(2):199, 2015.
- [87] C.-H. Wang, Y. Yu, B. Hao, and G. Cheng. Residual bootstrap exploration for bandit algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08436*, 2020.
- [88] C.-H. Wang, Z. Wang, W. W. Sun, and G. Cheng. Online regularization toward always-valid high-dimensional dynamic pricing. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–13, 2023.
- [89] R. Wang, B. Fu, G. Fu, and M. Wang. Deep & cross network for ad click predictions. In *Proceedings of the ADKDD'17*, pages 1–7. 2017.
- [90] I. Waudby-Smith, L. Wu, A. Ramdas, N. Karampatziakis, and P. Mineiro. Anytime-valid off-policy inference for contextual bandits. *ACM/JMS Journal of Data Science*, 2022.
- [91] J. Woodcock and L. M. LaVange. Master protocols to study multiple therapies, multiple diseases, or both. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 377(1):62–70, 2017.
- [92] S. Wu, C.-H. Wang, Y. Li, and G. Cheng. Residual bootstrap exploration for stochastic linear bandit. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2117–2127. PMLR, 2022.
- [93] G. Zheng, F. Zhang, Z. Zheng, Y. Xiang, N. J. Yuan, X. Xie, and Z. Li. Drn: A deep reinforcement learning framework for news recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 world wide web conference*, pages 167–176, 2018.

Appendix

Table of Contents

F Additional Related Works	15
F.1 Incentivized exploration	15
F.2 Application in medical trails	15
F.3 Bandit algorithms	16
F.4 Information design	16
G DBIC Property	16
G.1 Proof of Theorem 1 - Cold Start Stage	16
G.2 Proof of Theorem 1 - Exploitation Stage	18
H Prediction Error of Ridge Regression with Random Design	20
I Proof of No Regret Learning	21
I.1 Key Lemmas	22
I.2 Proof of Theorem 2	28
J Additional Experiments Results	28
J.1 Additional Simulation Settings and Results Analysis	28
J.2 Additional Real Data Analysis	30
K Nonlinear Reward Discussion	32

F Additional Related Works

We review related work from multiple kinds of literature, including incentive exploration and its application in adaptive clinical trials, bandit algorithms, and information design.

F.1 Incentivized exploration

There is a growing literature about a three-way interplay of exploration, exploitation, and incentives, comprising a variety of scenarios. The study of mechanisms to incentivized exploration has been initiated by [52] of the setting of one planner and multiple self-interested agents. They mainly focus on deriving the Bayesian-optimal policy for the case of only two actions and deterministic rewards and only obtain a preliminary result for stochastic rewards. [69] consider a similar two-actions model with time-discounted. If expected rewards are known for one arm, they provide a BIC algorithm that achieves the “first-best” utility. For the general case, they design an optimal BIC algorithm that is computationally inefficient and propose a tractable heuristic based on the same techniques. Similarly, [20] proposes a model with a continuous information flow and a continuum of consumers arriving to a recommendation system and derive a BIC policy restricted to two arms and binary rewards. [30] considers a different setting with monetary transfers, where the platform not only recommends an action to each agent, but also offers a payment for taking this action where in this setting, incentives are created via the offered payments rather than via information asymmetry.

Exploration-exploitation problems with multiple self-interested agents have also been studied in several other scenarios: multiple agents engaging in exploration and benefiting from exploration performed by others, without a planner to coordinate them (e.g., [18, 49]), dynamic pricing with model uncertainty (e.g., [50, 17, 11]), dynamic auctions (e.g., [16, 6, 47, 68, 36]), pay-per-click ad auctions with unknown click probabilities (e.g., [27, 9, 10]), as well as human computation (e.g., [34, 80, 42]).

F.2 Application in medical trails

Patients’ incentives are a significant barrier to conducting medical trials, especially large-scale ones for common conditions with affordable treatments. While recruiting patients and offering treatments

is feasible, motivating enough participants to join remains difficult. BIC exploration represents a theoretical effort to overcome this challenge.

Medical trials initially motivated the study of multi-arm bandits (MABs) and exploration-exploitation tradeoffs [84, 35, 86], focusing on designs that consider patient well-being, unlike traditional randomized clinical trials. Bandit-like designs are part of adaptive medical trials [14, 24, 86], which may also feature adaptations like early stopping, re-estimating sample size, and dosage adjustments. Later developments in “message-restricted” algorithms, which do not reveal information to patients, also suit this domain. However, disclosing some information about the medical trial is necessary to meet the “informed consent” standards set by various guidelines and regulations [5]. In addition, medical trials, particularly those involving multiple treatments, underscore the relevance of BIC bandit exploration with multiple actions. Traditional trials typically compare a new treatment against a placebo or standard treatment, but the designs incorporating multiple treatments are gaining practical importance and have been explored in biostatistics literature [41, 32]. It’s important to note that even the expected reward for placebos or standard treatments can be uncertain, as it might vary with the patient population.

BIC bandit exploration with contextual consideration is increasingly applied in adaptive trial designs, leveraging patients’ “background information” to tailor treatments. This contextual data can encompass age, fitness levels, race or ethnicity, medical history, and genetic markers, which are particularly relevant as genetic sequencing becomes more accessible. Personalized medicine, especially treatments dependent on genetic markers in oncology [63, 85, 44]), has been a significant trend over the past decade. Context-dependent medical trials, which are more complex due to the need to consider individual patient contexts, have led to novel and cost-effective trial designs. These designs explicitly use contextual information to determine the best treatment approach for each patient [72, 91], with recent advancements in biostatistics [31, 46, 33, 44] further enhancing these contextual models.

F.3 Bandit algorithms

There are various strategies and algorithms to solve the sequential decision making problem [19, 81, 62, 55], such as the ϵ -greedy algorithm [8, 22, 23, 37, 78], explore-then-commit algorithm [73, 1, 60], upper confidence bound (UCB) algorithms [54, 7, 59, 88], Thompson sampling [84, 74, 75, 61], bootstrap sampling algorithm [53, 87, 92, 70], information directed sampling methods [74, 39, 38], inversely proportional to the gap sampling method [3, 29, 79], and betting methods [90, 57]. These algorithms employ different trade-offs between exploration and exploitation to achieve optimal or near-optimal rewards over time.

F.4 Information design

The original Bayesian persuasion framework as introduced by [48], focusing on a single round where the planner’s signal is informed by the “history” of previous interactions. In exploring strategic information disclosure, [71] investigate how planners can encourage better decision-making among agents by controlling information flows. The temporal aspect of information release is addressed by [28, 43], who study the optimization of suspense and the commercial strategy of selling information over time, respectively. These contributions highlight different facets of information design. Additionally, [15, 83] offer extensive insights into the theoretical foundations of designing information structures, which underpin the broader context of our study in information design.

G DBIC Property

G.1 Proof of Theorem 1 - Cold Start Stage

Proof. To guarantee the DBIC property for the cold start of RCB, it suffices to have a lower bound on parameter L to avoid too many samples wasted in the cold start stage.

The cold start stage can be split into K phases and each phase last LN round in expectation based on the algorithm design except the most popular arm. Although the first phase (most popular arm) last unknown rounds, it usually lasts a pretty short period. So in the following analysis, we ignore the DBIC property in the initial sample collection stage (MPASC stage).

Due to the design of cold start stage, agents are unaware which phase they belong to, they are only aware they have $1/L$ probability to be chosen in the cold start stage. We first argue that for each agent

p_t in phase $l \in [2, K]$ (except the MPASC), she has no incentive not to follow the recommended arm.

(1). If agent p_t is recommended with the arm $j \neq \tilde{a}_t$, then she knows since this arm j is the organic arm a_t^* and is not the promoted arm; so by the definition of the organic arm, it is DBIC for the agent to follow it.

(2). If agent p_t is recommended with the arm \tilde{a}_t and does not want to deviate to some other arms $j \neq \tilde{a}_t$. That is to say, we need to prove that when the platform recommend arm i , the agent p_t has no incentive to deviate the current recommendation arm i to other arm j in expected reward. From the user's perspective, the platform needs to demonstrate this,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j) | I_t = i] \Pr(I_t = i) \geq 0. \quad (\text{G.1})$$

Denote the time dependent posterior gap $G_{tij} := \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j) | S_{B_t}]$ where arm i is the recommended arm by RCB and $j \neq i$, and the corresponding minimal posterior gap $G_t(i) = \min_{j \neq i} G_{tij}$. The G_{tij} represents the posterior gap between arm i and arm j at time t . The $G_t(i)$ represents the minimal gap given the current accumulative samples which is composed of two cases: (1) $G_t(i) > 0$, that means arm i is the posterior best arm. (2) $G_t(i) \leq 0$, that means arm i is not the posterior best arm.

To satisfy the ϵ -DBIC property, we need the Eq. (G.1) satisfied. By the law of iterated expectations $E[X] = E[E[X|Y]]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j) | I_t = i] \Pr(I_t = i) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j) | S_{B_t}] | I_t = i] \Pr(I_t = i) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | I_t = i] \Pr(I_t = i) > -\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.2})$$

Define two events $Q_{t,1} = \{q_t = 1\}$ and $Q_{t,0} = \{q_t = 0\}$, representing agent p_t is recommended with the promoted arm or organic arm respectively. Thus, there are two disjoint events under which agent p_t is recommended arm i , either $E_{t1} = \{G_t(i) > 0\}$ or $E_{t2} = \{G_t(i) \leq 0\} = \{G_t(i) \leq 0 \text{ and } p_t \in Q_{t,1}\}$. For notation simplicity, we denote $E_1 = E_{t1}$ and $E_2 = E_{t2}$. The reason $\{G_t(i) \leq 0\} = \{G_t(i) \leq 0 \text{ and } p_t \in Q_{t,1}\}$ is because $G_t(i) \leq 0$ happens only when $p_t \in Q_{t,1}$. So the above equation is equivalent to prove

$$\mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | I_{p_t} = i] \Pr(I_t = i) = \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | E_1] \Pr(E_1) + \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | E_2] \Pr(E_2) > 0. \quad (\text{G.3})$$

We observe that $\Pr(E_2) = \Pr(p_t \in Q_{t,1} | G_t(i) \leq 0) \Pr(G_t(i) \leq 0) = \Pr(G_t(i) \leq 0) / L_t$, where $q_t \sim \text{Ber}(1/L_t)$ and is time dependent and independent of other random variables. Since the event $p_t \in Q$ is independent of G_{tij} and agent p_t in $Q_{t,1}$ is randomly selected according to the Bernoulli distribution with expectation $1/L_t$. Therefore, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j) | I_t = i] \Pr(I_t = i) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | E_1] \Pr(E_1) + \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | E_2] \Pr(E_2) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) > 0] \Pr(G_t(i) > 0) + \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) \leq 0 \text{ and } p_t \in Q_{t,1}] \frac{1}{L_t} \Pr(G_t(i) \leq 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) > 0] \Pr(G_t(i) > 0) + \frac{1}{L_t} \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) \leq 0] \Pr(G_t(i) \leq 0), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.4})$$

where the second equation holds by the independent property. By the fact that $\mathbb{E}[G_{tij}] = \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) \leq 0] \Pr(G_t(i) \leq 0) + \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) > 0] \Pr(G_t(i) > 0)$, so the above equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) > 0] \Pr(G_t(i) > 0) + \frac{1}{L_t} \left(\mathbb{E}[G_{tij}] - \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) > 0] \Pr(G_t(i) > 0) \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{L_t}\right) \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) > 0] \Pr(G_t(i) > 0) + \frac{1}{L_t} \mathbb{E}[G_{tij}]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.5})$$

We know $\mathbb{E}[G_{tij}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j) | S_{B_t}]] = \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j)] = x_t^\top \beta_{i,0} - x_t^\top \beta_{j,0} = \mu_0(t, i) - \mu_0(t, j)$. Thus, the above equation will be

$$= \left(1 - \frac{1}{L_t}\right) \mathbb{E}[G_{tij} | G_t(i) > 0] \Pr(G_t(i) > 0) + \frac{1}{L_t} (\mu_0(t, i) - \mu_0(t, j)). \quad (\text{G.6})$$

To make the process be ϵ -DBIC, we need $\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j)|I_t = i]\Pr(I_t = i) > -\epsilon$. Since we know $G_{tij} > G_t(i)$ by definition, so we have $\mathbb{E}[G_{tij}|G_t(i) > 0] > \mathbb{E}[G_t(i)|G_t(i) > 0]$. To combine them all, we get

$$\geq (1 - \frac{1}{L_t})\mathbb{E}[G_t(i)|G_t(i) > 0]\Pr(G_t(i) > 0) + \frac{1}{L_t}(\mu_0(t, i) - \mu_0(t, j)) \geq -\epsilon. \quad (\text{G.7})$$

Thus, $\forall i, j \in [K]$, it suffices to pick L_t at time t such that:

$$\begin{aligned} L_t &\geq 1 - \frac{\mu_0(t, i) - \mu_0(t, j) + \epsilon}{\mathbb{E}[G_t(i)|G_t(i) > 0]\Pr(G_t(i) > 0) + \epsilon} \\ &= 1 + \frac{\mu_0(t, j) - \mu_0(t, i) - \epsilon}{\mathbb{E}[G_t(i)|G_t(i) > 0]\Pr(G_t(i) > 0) + \epsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.8})$$

Thus we need,

$$L_t \geq 1 + \frac{\bar{\Delta}_t^0 - \epsilon}{\tau_{\mathcal{P}_{0,t}}\rho_{\mathcal{P}_{0,t}} + \epsilon}, \quad (\text{G.9})$$

where $\bar{\Delta}_t^0 = \max_{i \neq j} [\mu_0(t, j) - \mu_0(t, i)]$, and $\mathbb{E}[G_t(i)|G_t(i) > 0]\Pr(G_t(i) > 0) \geq \tau_{\mathcal{P}_{0,t}}\rho_{\mathcal{P}_{0,t}}$.

By the design of the cold start stage, we know that arm i is the platform recommended arm and arm j is the arm agent p_t potentially wants to deviate to. Therefore, based on the prior knowledge, $\mu_0(t, j) \geq \mu_0(t, i)$. Since this L_t is time dependent, to get a time uniform L to let all agents have the ϵ -DBIC property, we need

$$\max_t L_t = 1 + \frac{\bar{\Delta}^0 - \epsilon}{\tau_{\mathcal{P}_0}\rho_{\mathcal{P}_0} + \epsilon}, \quad (\text{G.10})$$

where $\bar{\Delta}^0 = \max_t \bar{\Delta}_t^0$ and we know $\bar{\Delta}^0 \leq 1$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{P}_0} = \min_t \tau_{\mathcal{P}_{0,t}}$, $\rho_{\mathcal{P}_0} = \min_t \rho_{\mathcal{P}_{0,t}}$. So we have L needs to be at least

$$L \geq 1 + \frac{1 - \epsilon}{\tau_{\mathcal{P}_0}\rho_{\mathcal{P}_0} + \epsilon}. \quad (\text{G.11})$$

By selecting the time uniform L , we have the ϵ -DBIC property. □

G.2 Proof of Theorem 1 - Exploitation Stage

Proof. To satisfy the DBIC property, which is any agent p_t who is recommended arm i ($I_t = i$) does not want to switch to some other arm j in expectation. Besides, we assert that when the platform satisfies the DBIC property at the cold start stage and the DBIC property also holds when we have a minimum requirement of N , then in the following epochs, the RCB algorithm will automatically satisfy the DBIC in the exploitation stage. More formally, we need that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j)|I_t = i]\Pr(I_t = i) \geq -\epsilon/K, \forall t \in \text{exploitation stage}. \quad (\text{G.12})$$

Similarly to the construction of L in the previous analysis, we denote the time dependent posterior gap $G_{tij} := \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j)|S_*]$ where arm i is the recommended arm by RCB and $j \neq i$, where S_* is the dataset collected in the cold start stage. The corresponding minimal posterior gap $G_t(i) = \min_{j \neq i} G_{tij}$. The G_{tij} represents the posterior gap between arm i and arm j at time t . The $G_t(i)$ represents the minimal gap given the current accumulative samples which is composed of two cases: (1) If $G_t(i) > 0$, that means arm i is the best arm in terms of the posterior. (2) If $G_t(i) \leq 0$, that means arm i is not the posterior best arm. Recall the definition of $G_t(i)$, it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G_t(i)|I_t = i] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \max_{j \in [K]/i} \mu(x_t, j)|S_*]|I_t = i\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i)|S_*] - \max_{j \in [K]/i} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, j)|S_*]|I_t = i\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.13})$$

Let S_* be the data set collected by the algorithm by the beginning of exploitation stage. The reward gap can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) | S_*] - \max_{j \in [K]/i} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, j) | S_*] | I_t = i \right] \Pr(I_t = i) \\
&= \underbrace{\Pr(i = b_t) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) | S_*] - \max_{j \in [K]/i} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, j) | S_*] | i = b_t \right]}_{\text{Part I Reward Gap}} \\
&+ \underbrace{\Pr(i \neq b_t) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) | S_*] - \max_{j \in [K]/i} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, j) | S_*] | i \neq b_t \right]}_{\text{Part II Reward Gap}}, \tag{G.14}
\end{aligned}$$

where b_t is the highest posterior mean arm $b_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in [K]} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, j) | S_*]$.

Part I Reward Gap: The platform selects the highest posterior mean reward arm $b_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in [K]} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, j) | S_*] = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in [K]} \hat{\mu}_m(x_t, j)$ according to the Algorithm 2's design with probability $\Pr(I_t = b_t) = 1 - \sum_{i \neq b_t} \frac{1}{K + \gamma_m u_i}$, where $u_i = \hat{\mu}_m(x_t, b_t) - \hat{\mu}_m(x_t, i)$. Denote $G_t(b_t)$ as the minimal optimal posterior gap $\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, b_t) | S_*] - \max_{j \in [K]/b_t} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, j) | S_*]$, which is the gap between the highest posterior mean utility and second highest posterior mean utility. By the sampling design of RCB and $\gamma_m > 0, \forall m \geq m_0$, we get that $p(b_t) \geq 1/K$, where $p(b_t)$ is the probability of selecting the highest posterior mean arm.

$$\text{Part I Reward Gap} \geq \frac{1}{K} G_t(b_t). \tag{G.15}$$

Part II Reward Gap: According to the sampling structure, it has the probability that the platform recommended arm is not b_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Part II Reward Gap} &= \Pr(i \neq b_t) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) | S_*] - \max_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, j) | S_*] | i \neq b_t \right] \\
&= \sum_{i \neq b_t} p_t(i) \left[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) | S_*] - \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, b_t) | S_*] \right] \\
&= - \sum_{i \neq b_t} p_t(i) \left[\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, b_t) | S_*] - \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) | S_*] \right] \\
&= -r_t
\end{aligned} \tag{G.16}$$

where $r_t = \sum_{i \neq b_t} p_t(i) (\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, b_t) | S_*] - \mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) | S_*])$. Therefore, to achieve DBIC property, we can lower bound the following term,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mu(x_t, i) - \mu(x_t, j) | I_t = i] \Pr(I_t = i) \geq \frac{G_t(b_t)}{K} - r_t \geq \frac{G_t(b_t)}{K} - \frac{K}{\gamma_m} \tag{G.17}$$

The $G_t(b_t)/K$ is each step's expected gain and r_t is each step's expected loss, and by Lemma 7, we have $r_t \leq K/\gamma_m$ used in the last inequality. In order to satisfy the ϵ -DBIC property, we need

$$\frac{G_t(b_t)}{K} - \frac{K}{\gamma_m} > -\frac{\epsilon}{K} \tag{G.18}$$

which is equivalent to need

$$\gamma_m(\epsilon) \geq \frac{K^2}{G_t(b_t) + \epsilon}. \tag{G.19}$$

That is, in order to satisfy the ϵ -DBIC property, we need the spread parameter at each epoch $m (\geq m_0)$ is at least greater than $\gamma_m(\epsilon)$. Here $\tau_m = 2^m$ is the time step where epoch m stops. $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F}, \delta}(m-1)$ represents the prediction error in the functional class \mathcal{F} when using training data collected in epoch $m-1$ that is in the time interval $(\tau_{m-2}, \tau_{m-1}]$. Based on the offline learning's result from

Definition 2 given the epoch m , we have $\gamma_{m_0} = c\sqrt{K/\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F},\delta}(\tau_{m_0-1} - \tau_{m_0-2})}$. So we can derive the requirement of the minimum prediction error at epoch m_0 . We need

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{m_0} &\geq \gamma_m(\epsilon) \\
c\sqrt{\frac{K}{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F},\frac{\delta}{2K^2}}(\tau_{m_0-1} - \tau_{m_0-2})}} &\geq \frac{K^2}{G_t(b_t) + \epsilon} \\
\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F},\frac{\delta}{2K^2}}(\tau_{m_0-1} - \tau_{m_0-2}) &\leq \frac{c^2(G_t(b_t) + \epsilon)^2}{K^3} \\
\frac{c_3\sigma^2 d}{\phi_0 n} &\leq \frac{c^2(G_t(b_t) + \epsilon)^2}{K^3} \\
n &\geq \frac{(\sigma^2 d + 1)K^3}{\phi_0(G_t(b_t) + \epsilon)^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{G.20}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F},\frac{\delta}{2K^2}}(\tau_{m_0-1} - \tau_{m_0-2})$ is the prediction error with training sample size with $n = \tau_{m-1} - \tau_{m-2}$, which bounds the squared L_2 distance between $\hat{\mu}$ and μ on the test data sampled following the same data generation process as the training data. For the forth inequality, based on Corollary 1, we need the minimum sample size as $N(\epsilon) = \frac{(\sigma^2 d + 1)K^3}{\phi_0(G_t(b_t) + \epsilon)^2}$. We have $\tau_m = 2^m$, $\tau_{m-1} - \tau_{m-2} = 2^{m-1} - 2^{m-2} = 2^{m-2}$. By the minimum sample size requirement for the cold start stage's $N(\epsilon)$ for each arm, we know in exploitation stage, the starting epoch m_0 should be

$$\begin{aligned}
N &\leq \tau_{m-1} - \tau_{m-2}, \\
\log_2 N &\leq m - 2, \\
m &\geq m_0 = \lceil 2 + \log_2 \frac{(\sigma^2 d + 1)K^3}{\phi_0(\tau_{\mathcal{P}_*} + \epsilon)^2} \rceil.
\end{aligned} \tag{G.21}$$

where $\tau_{\mathcal{P}_*}$ is the minimum posterior mean gap based on Assumption 1. \square

H Prediction Error of Ridge Regression with Random Design

From [66], we have the following lemmas of the prediction error of ridge regression with random design.

Lemma 1. *Assume the noise has gaussian distribution, then the excess risk bound is*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{\beta} - \beta \right\|_{\Sigma}^2 \right] \leq \left(1 + \frac{R^2}{\lambda n} \right)^2 \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{ L(\beta) + \lambda \|\beta\|^2 - L(\beta^*) \} + \left(1 + \frac{R^2}{\lambda n} \right) \frac{\sigma^2 \text{Tr}[(\Sigma + \lambda)^{-1} \Sigma]}{n} \tag{H.1}$$

where $\|X\|_2 \leq R$ and risk $L(\beta) = \mathbb{E}[(Y - \langle \beta, X \rangle)^2]$.

Lemma 2. *For every $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$\inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{ L(\beta) + \lambda \|\beta\|^2 - L(\beta^*) \} = \lambda \left\| (\Sigma + \lambda)^{-1/2} \Sigma^{1/2} \beta^* \right\|^2 \leq \lambda \|\beta^*\|^2. \tag{H.2}$$

Corollary 1. *The prediction error can be upper bounded bounded by*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{\beta}^T X_t - \beta^T X_t)^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{\beta} - \beta \right\|_{\Sigma}^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\|X_t\|_{\Sigma^{-1}}^2 \right] \leq \frac{R^2}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{\beta} - \beta \right\|_{\Sigma}^2 \right] \leq \frac{c_3 \sigma^2 d}{\phi_0 n}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{\beta} - \beta \right\|_{\Sigma}^2 \right] &\leq \left(1 + \frac{R^2}{\lambda n} \right)^2 \lambda \|\beta^*\|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{R^2}{\lambda n} \right) \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n} \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_1} \right)^2 \frac{c_1}{n} + \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_1} \right) \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n}
\end{aligned} \tag{H.3}$$

Assume that $\|\beta\|_2 \leq 1$, $R \leq 1$ and $\lambda = \frac{c_1}{n}$. So when $n \geq N = \frac{1}{c_1^2(c_2-1)^2}$ and denote $c_2 = (1 + \frac{1}{c_1})^2$. So when $n \geq N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_{\Sigma}^2 \right] &\leq \frac{c_1 c_2}{n} + \frac{c_2 \sigma^2 d}{n} \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 c_2 + c_2 \sigma^2 d}{n} \\ &\leq c_3 \frac{\sigma^2 d}{n} \end{aligned} \tag{H.4}$$

where we define $c_3 \sigma^2 d = c_1 c_2 + c_2 \sigma^2 d$ for $c_3 > 0$. Since we know $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma) \geq \phi_0$, so the prediction error can be upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\widehat{\beta}^\top X_t - \beta^\top X_t)^2 \right] \leq \frac{c_3 \sigma^2 d}{\phi_0 n} \tag{H.5}$$

□

I Proof of No Regret Learning

We first denote $\Psi := \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{X}}$ as the universal policy space, which contains all possible policies. Here we assume that $|\mathcal{X}| < \infty$ but allows $|\mathcal{X}|$ to be arbitrarily large. Focusing on such a setting enables us to highlight important ideas and key insights without the need to invoke measure theoretic arguments, which are necessary for infinite/uncountable \mathcal{X} . At epoch $m(t)$, $m = m(t)$ if t is clear, and $p_t(\cdot) = p_m(\cdot|x_t)$. We next analyze the following virtual process at round t in epoch $m(t)$. Here we use a novel virtual probability distribution $Q_m(\cdot)$ to analyze the $p_t(\cdot)$'s effect over the regret. There are three steps:

1. Algorithm samples $\pi_t \sim Q_m(\cdot)$, where $\pi_t : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a deterministic policy, and $Q_m(\cdot) : \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \text{Probability Measure}$ (a probability distribution over all policies in $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{X}}$).
2. At time t , $x_t \sim \mathcal{P}_X$.
3. Algorithm selects $a_t = \pi_t(x_t)$.

Note that at round t , $Q_m(\cdot)$ is a stationary distribution which has already been determined at the beginning of epoch m . How to construct this $Q_m(\cdot)$? For any policy $p_m(\cdot|x)$, we can construct a unique product probability measure $Q_m(\cdot)$ on Ψ such that $Q_m(\pi) = \prod_{x \in \mathcal{P}_X} p_m(\pi(x)|x)$ for all $\pi \in \Psi$. This product measure $Q_m(\cdot)$ ensures that for every

$$p_m(a|x) = \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} \mathbb{I}\{\pi(x) = a\} Q_m(\pi(x)). \tag{I.1}$$

That is, for any arbitrary context $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the algorithm's recommended action generated by $p_m(\cdot|x)$ is probabilistically equivalent to the action generated by $Q_m(\cdot)$ through this virtual process. Since $Q_m(\cdot)$ is a dense distribution over all deterministic policies in the universal policy space, we refer to $Q_m(\cdot)$ as the "equivalent randomized policy" induced by $p_m(\cdot|x)$. Since $p_m(\cdot|x)$ is completely determined by γ_m and $\widehat{\mu}_m$, we know that $Q_m(\cdot)$ is also completely determined by γ_m and $\widehat{\mu}_m$. We emphasize that the exploitation stage does not actually compute $Q_m(\cdot)$, but implicit maintains $Q_m(\cdot)$ through spread parameter γ_m and estimated posterior mean $\widehat{\mu}_m$, so called virtual process. That is important, as even when \mathcal{X} is known to the learner, computing the product measure $Q_m(\cdot)$ requires $\Omega(|\mathcal{X}|)$ computational cost which is intractable for large \mathcal{X} .

To get the regret upper bound, we need following notations. For any action selection kernel p and any policy π , let's define the following terms:

1. **Reward** $R_t(\pi)$: defines the expected reward in the measure of μ if it follows the policy π to select the action $\pi(x_t)$ with respect to distribution \mathcal{P}_X : $R_t(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} [\mu(x_t, \pi(x_t))]$
2. **Reward** \widehat{R}_t : defines the expected reward in the measure of empirical $\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}$ if follows the policy π to select the action $\pi(x_t)$ with respect to distribution \mathcal{P}_X : $\widehat{R}_t(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} [\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi(x_t))]$.
3. **Regret** $\text{Reg}(\pi)$: defines the expected regret in the measure of μ if it follows the policy π to select the action $\pi(x_t)$ with respect to distribution \mathcal{P}_X : $\text{Reg}(\pi) = R_t(\pi_\mu) - R_t(\pi)$.

4. **Regret $\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi)$** : defines the expected regret in the measure of empirical $\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}$ if it follow the policy π to select the action $\pi(x_t)$ with respect to distribution \mathcal{P}_X : $\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) = \widehat{R}_t(\pi_{\widehat{\rho}_{m(t)}}) - \widehat{R}_t(\pi)$.

where $\pi_{\widehat{\rho}_{m(t)}}$ is the policy selects the action $b_t = \arg\max_{i \in [K]} \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, i)$ according to Eq. (6).

Besides, for any probability kernel p_m and any policy $\pi(\cdot)$, let $V(p_m, \pi)$ denote the expected inverse probability

$$V(p_m, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\frac{1}{p_m(\pi(x_t)|x_t)} \right] \quad (I.2)$$

and define $\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)$ as the maximum expected inverse probability over the exploitation stage,

$$\mathcal{V}_t(\pi) = \max_{m_0 \leq m \leq m(t)-1} V(p_m, \pi) \quad (I.3)$$

I.1 Key Lemmas

Lemma 3 (Azuma-Hoeffding Inequality). *Let $\{D_k, \mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a martingale difference sequence for which there are constants $\{(a_k, b_k)\}_{k=1}^n$, such that $D_k \in [a_k, b_k]$ almost surely for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then, for all $t \geq 0$, $\Pr[|\sum_{k=1}^n D_k| \geq t] \leq 2 \exp[-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n (b_k - a_k)^2}]$.*

Lemma 4. $\forall t \in [\tau_{m-1} + 1, \tau_m]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta/2m^2$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_t, a_t} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t) - \mu(x_t, a_t) \right)^2 | \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right] \leq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F}, \delta/(2m^2)}(\tau_{m-1} - \tau_{m-2}) = \frac{16K}{\gamma_m^2} \quad (I.4)$$

where $\tau_m = 2^m$. Therefore, the following event Λ_2 holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$:

$$\Lambda_2 := \left\{ \forall t \geq \tau_{m_0}, \mathbb{E}_{x_t, a_t} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t) - \mu(x_t, a_t) \right)^2 | \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right] \leq \frac{16K}{\gamma_m^2} \right\}. \quad (I.5)$$

Proof. Note that Algorithm 2 always collects $(x_t, a_t; y_t(a_t))$ -type data used for OffPos algorithm to conduct offline training, where $(x_t, y_t) \sim \mathcal{D}$ and $a_t \sim p_{m(t)-1}(\cdot|x_t)$ based on epoch $m(t) - 1$ collected data. Based on the prediction error of the OffPos algorithm provided in 2, we have $\forall t \in [\tau_{m-1} + 1, \tau_m]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x_t, a_t} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t) - \mu(x_t, a_t) \right)^2 | \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{P}_X, a_t \sim p_{m(t)-1}(\cdot|x_t)} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t) - \mu(x_t, a_t) \right)^2 | p_{m(t)-1} \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F}, \delta/(2m^2)}(\tau_{m-1} + 1 - \tau_{m-2} - 1) = \frac{16K}{\gamma_m^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (I.6)$$

where last the inequality simply follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 from [4]. \square

As we mentioned in previous, a starting point of our proof of regret upper bound is to translate the action selection kernel $p_m(\cdot|\cdot)$ into an equivalent distribution over policies $Q_m(\cdot)$. The following lemma provides a justification of such translation by showing the existence of an equivalent $Q_m(\cdot)$ for every $p_m(\cdot|\cdot)$. Here we refer Lemma 3 from [79] in the following Lemma.

Lemma 5. *Fix any epoch $m \geq m_0$. The action selection scheme $p_m(\cdot|\cdot)$ is a valid probability kernel $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A}) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ over epoch m . There exists a probability measure Q_m on Ψ such that*

$$\forall a_t \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x_t \in \mathcal{X}, p_m(a_t|x_t) = \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} \mathbb{I}\{\pi(x_t) = a_t\} Q_m(\pi) \quad (I.7)$$

The following Lemma demonstrates $y_t(\pi_\mu) - y_t(a_t) - \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \text{Reg}(\pi)$ is a martingale difference sequence with respect to \mathfrak{E}_t .

Lemma 6. *Fix any epoch $m \geq m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, for any round t in epoch m , we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_t, y_t, a_t} \left[y_t(\pi_\mu) - y_t(a_t) | \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right] = \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \text{Reg}(\pi) \quad (I.8)$$

Proof. By the definition of $\mathbb{E}[y_t(a_t)]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x_t, y_t, a_t} \left[y_t(\pi_\mu(x_t)) - y_t(a_t) \mid \mathfrak{S}_{t-1} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t, a_t} \left[\mu(x_t, \pi_\mu(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, a_t) \mid \mathfrak{S}_{t-1} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{P}_X, a_t \sim p_{m(t)}(\cdot | x)} \left[\mu(x_t, \pi_\mu(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, a_t) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\sum_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}} p_{m(t)}(a_t | x_t) \left(\mu(x_t, \pi_\mu(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, a_t) \right) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{I.9}$$

By Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\sum_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}} p_{m(t)}(a_t | x) \left(\mu(x_t, \pi_\mu(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, a_t) \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\sum_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} \mathbb{I}\{\pi(x_t) = a_t\} Q_m(\pi) \left(\mu(x_t, \pi_\mu(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, a_t) \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \left(\mu(x_t, \pi_\mu(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, \pi(x_t)) \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\mu(x_t, \pi_\mu(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, \pi(x_t)) \right] \\
&= \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \text{Reg}(\pi)
\end{aligned} \tag{I.10}$$

where the last equality is from the definition of the expected regret in the measure μ . \square

Lemma 7. Fix any epoch $m \geq m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and any round t in epoch m , we have:

$$\sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) < \frac{K}{\gamma_m}. \tag{I.11}$$

Proof. For any t in epoch m , based on the definition of $\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} [\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi(x_t))]$ where $b_t = \pi \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t) = \text{argmax}_{i \in [K]} \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, i)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) \\
&= \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi(x_t)) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi(x_t)) \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\sum_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \mathbb{I}\{\pi(x_t) = a_t\} \left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t) \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\sum_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}} p_{m(t)}(a_t | x_t) \left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t) \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\sum_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{K + \gamma_m (\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t))} \left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t) \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\sum_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}/\{b_t\}} \frac{1}{\gamma_m} \frac{\gamma_m (\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t))}{K + \gamma_m (\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t))} \right] \\
&< \frac{K-1}{\gamma_m}.
\end{aligned} \tag{I.12}$$

where the last inequality holds by the $\frac{\gamma_m (\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t))}{K + \gamma_m (\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, a_t))} < 1$. \square

The next lemma establishes the relationship between the predicted implicit regret and the true implicit regret of any policy at round t . This lemma ensures that the predicted implicit regret of good policies are becoming more and more accurate, while the predicted implicit regret of bad policies do not need to have such property.

Lemma 8. *Suppose the event Λ_2 in Lemma 4 holds, let $C_0 = 204$. For all policies π and epoch $m \geq m_0$, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Reg}(\pi) &\leq 2\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) + \frac{C_0 K}{\gamma_m} \\
\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) &\leq 2\text{Reg}(\pi) + \frac{C_0 K}{\gamma_m}
\end{aligned} \tag{I.13}$$

That is, for any policy, Lemma 8 bounds the prediction error of the implicit regret estimate.

Proof. We prove it via induction on epoch m . We first consider the base case when $m = 1$ and $1 \leq t \leq \tau_1$. In this case, since $\gamma_1 = 1$, we know that $\forall \pi \in \Psi, \text{Reg}(\pi) \leq \sqrt{K} \leq C_0 K / \gamma_1$, $\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) = 0 \leq C_0 K / \gamma_1$. Note that we use condition $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{P}_X} [\sup_{a, a' \in \mathcal{A}} (\mu(x, a) - \mu(x, a'))] \leq \sqrt{K}$, which is very weak - in the special case of multi-armed bandits, it means "the gap between mean rewards of two actions is no greater than \sqrt{K} ". Thus the claim holds in the base case.

For the induction step, fix some epoch $m > 1$. We assume that for all epochs $m' \leq m$, all rounds t' in epoch m' , and all $\pi \in \Psi$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Reg}(\pi) &\leq 2\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{t'}(\pi) + C_0 \frac{K}{\gamma_{m'}}, \\
\widehat{\text{Reg}}_{t'}(\pi) &\leq 2\text{Reg}(\pi) + C_0 \frac{K}{\gamma_{m'}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{I.14}$$

Step 1. For all rounds t in epoch m and all $\pi \in \Psi$, we first show that

$$\text{Reg}(\pi) \leq 2\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) + C_0 \frac{K}{\gamma_m}.$$

Based on the definition of $\text{Reg}(\pi)$ and $\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Reg}(\pi) - \widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) &= (R_t(\pi_\mu) - R_t(\pi)) - (\widehat{R}_t(\pi_{\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}}) - \widehat{R}_t(\pi)) \\
&\leq (R_t(\pi_\mu) - R_t(\pi)) - (\widehat{R}_t(\pi_\mu) - \widehat{R}_t(\pi)) \\
&\leq |\widehat{R}_t(\pi) - R_t(\pi)| + |R_t(\pi_\mu) - \widehat{R}_t(\pi_\mu)| \\
&\leq \frac{4\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)}\sqrt{K}}{\gamma_m} + \frac{4\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_t(\pi_\mu)}\sqrt{K}}{\gamma_m} \\
&\leq \frac{\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)}{5\gamma_m} + \frac{\mathcal{V}_t(\pi_\mu)}{5\gamma_m} + \frac{40K}{\gamma_m}
\end{aligned} \tag{I.15}$$

where the third inequality holds by Lemma 9, and the last inequality holds by the AM-GM inequality. Based on the definition of $\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)$, $\mathcal{V}_t(\pi_\mu)$ and the upper bound of the expected inverse probability from Lemma 10, there exist epochs at least one $i, j \leq m$ and $t \leq \tau_m$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}_t(\pi) &= V_t(p_i, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\frac{1}{p_i(\pi(x_t)|x_t)} \right] \leq K + \gamma_i \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\tau_i}(\pi) \\
\mathcal{V}_t(\pi_\mu) &= V_t(p_j, \pi_\mu) = \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\frac{1}{p_j(\pi_\mu(x_t)|x_t)} \right] \leq K + \gamma_j \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\tau_j}(\pi_\mu)
\end{aligned}$$

Combing above two inequalities with Eq.(I.15) of induction and $\gamma_i, \gamma_j \leq \gamma_m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)}{5\gamma_m} &\leq \frac{K + \gamma_i \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\tau_i}(\pi)}{5\gamma_m} \leq \frac{K + \gamma_i(2\text{Reg}(\pi) + C_0 \frac{K}{\gamma_i})}{5\gamma_m} \leq \frac{(1 + C_0)K}{5\gamma_m} + \frac{2}{5}\text{Reg}(\pi) \\
\frac{\mathcal{V}_t(\pi_\mu)}{5\gamma_m} &\leq \frac{K + \gamma_j \widehat{\text{Reg}}_{\tau_j}(\pi_\mu)}{5\gamma_m} \leq \frac{K + \gamma_j(2\text{Reg}(\pi_\mu) + C_0 \frac{K}{\gamma_j})}{5\gamma_m} = \frac{(1 + C_0)K}{5\gamma_m}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality by $\text{Reg}(\pi_\mu) = 0$. Combining all above, we have

$$\text{Reg}(\pi) - \widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) \leq \frac{2}{5}\text{Reg}(\pi) + \frac{2(1 + C_0)K}{5\gamma_m} + \frac{40K}{\gamma_m}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\text{Reg}(\pi) \leq \frac{5}{3}\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) + \frac{2C_0K}{3\gamma_m} + \frac{68K}{\gamma_m} \leq 2\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) + \frac{C_0K}{\gamma_m},$$

by $C_0 \leq 204$.

Step 2. We then show for all rounds t in epoch m and all $\pi \in \Psi$,

$$\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) \leq 2\text{Reg}(\pi) + \frac{C_0K}{\gamma_m}. \tag{I.16}$$

Similar to step 2, we can get the similar result. Thus we complete the inductive step, and the claim proves to be true for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

This following lemma is a key step to provide the relationship of $\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi)$ and $\text{Reg}(\pi)$ in Lemma 8.

Lemma 9. For any round $t \geq \tau_{m_0} + 1$, for any policy $\pi \in \Psi$, we have

$$|\widehat{R}_t(\pi) - R_t(\pi)| \leq \frac{4\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)}\sqrt{K}}{\gamma_{m(t)}} \tag{I.17}$$

Proof. Fix any policy $\pi \in \Psi$, and any round $t > \tau_{m_0-1}$. By the definition of $\widehat{R}_t(\pi)$ and $R_t(\pi)$, we have

$$\widehat{R}_t(\pi) - R_t(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, \pi(x_t)) \right] \tag{I.18}$$

Given a context x_t , define $\Delta_{x_t} = \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi(x_t)) - \mu(x_t, \pi(x_t))$, then we have the equality $\mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}}[\Delta_x] = \widehat{R}_t(\pi) - R_t(\pi)$. For all $s = \tau_{m_0-1} + 1, \dots, \tau_{m(t)-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{a_s|x_s} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_s, a_s) - \mu(x_s, a_s) \right)^2 \middle| \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right] \\
&= \sum_{a_s \in \mathcal{A}} p_{m(s)}(a_s|x_s) \left[\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_s, a_s) - \mu(x_s, a_s) \right]^2 \\
&\geq p_{m(s)}(\pi(x_s)|x_s) \left[\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_s, \pi(x_s)) - \mu(x_s, \pi(x_s)) \right]^2 \\
&= p_{m(s)}(\pi(x_s)|x_s) \Delta_{x_s}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{I.19}$$

where the first inequality holds by the kernel and squared terms both positive and ignoring other actions $a_s \neq \pi(x_s)$. Then we can take a sum of regret difference over the epoch m and multiply it by the maximum expected inverse probability $\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)$, defined in Eq.(I.3). For the start of the epoch $m(t)$, we define $s_0 = \tau_{m(t)-1} + 1$ and assume $m(t) > m_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{V}_t(\pi) \sum_{s=s_0}^{\tau_{m(t)-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x_s, a_s} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_s, a_s) - \mu(x_s, a_s) \right)^2 \middle| \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right] \\
&\geq \sum_{s=s_0}^{\tau_{m(t)-1}} V(p_{m(s)}, \pi) \mathbb{E}_{x_s, a_s} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_s, a_s) - \mu(x_s, a_s) \right)^2 \middle| \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right] \\
&= \sum_{s=s_0}^{\tau_{m(t)-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x_s} \left[\frac{1}{p_{m(s)}(\pi(x_s)|x_s)} \right] \mathbb{E}_{x_s} \mathbb{E}_{a_s|x_s} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_s, a_s) - \mu(x_s, a_s) \right)^2 \middle| \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right] \\
&\geq \sum_{s=s_0}^{\tau_{m(t)-1}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{x_s} \left[\sqrt{\frac{1}{p_{m(s)}(\pi(x_s)|x_s)}} \mathbb{E}_{a_s|x_s} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_s, a_s) - \mu(x_s, a_s) \right)^2 \middle| \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right] \right] \right)^2
\end{aligned} \tag{I.20}$$

where the first inequality from the definition of $\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)$ and the second follows the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. By the above inequality from Eq.(I.19), we have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
& \geq \sum_{s=s_0}^{\tau_{m(t)-1} - 1} \left(\mathbb{E}_{x_s} \left[\sqrt{\frac{1}{p_{m(s)}(\pi(x_s)|x_s)}} p_{m(s)}(\pi(x_s)|x_s) \Delta_{x_s}^2 \right] \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{s=s_0}^{\tau_{m(t)-1} - 1} \left(\mathbb{E}_{x_s} [|\Delta_{x_s}|] \right)^2 \\
&\geq \sum_{s=s_0}^{\tau_{m(t)-1} - 1} |\widehat{R}_t(\pi) - R_t(\pi)|^2 \\
&= (\tau_{m(t)} - s_0) |\widehat{R}_t(\pi) - R_t(\pi)|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{I.21}$$

and the last inequality follows from the convexity of the l_1 norm and last equality holds by the definition of $\widehat{R}_t(\pi)$ and $R_t(\pi)$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\widehat{R}_t(\pi) - R_t(\pi)| &\leq \sqrt{\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{s=s_0}^{\tau_{m(t)-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x_s, a_s} \left[\left(\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_s, a_s) - \mu(x_s, a_s) \right)^2 \middle| \mathfrak{E}_{t-1} \right]}{\tau_{m(t)} - \tau_{m(t)-1}}} \\
&\leq \frac{4\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_t(\pi)}\sqrt{K}}{\gamma_{m(t)}}
\end{aligned} \tag{I.22}$$

where the last inequality holds by the definition of the exploitation rate of $\gamma_{m(t)}$. \square

The following Lemma is a key step to control the expected inverse probability $V(p_{m(t)}, \pi)$.

Lemma 10. Fix any epoch $m \geq m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$V(p_{m(t)}, \pi) \leq K + \gamma_m \widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) \quad (\text{I.23})$$

Proof. For any policy $\pi \in \Psi$, given any context $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{p_{m(t)}(\pi(x_t)|x_t)} \begin{cases} = K + \gamma_m (\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi(x_t))), & \text{if } \pi(x_t) \neq b_t; \\ \leq \frac{1}{1/K} = K = K + \gamma_m (\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi(x_t))), & \text{if } \pi(x_t) = b_t. \end{cases} \quad (\text{I.24})$$

Based on the definition of the expected inverse probability in Eq.(I.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} V(p_{m(t)}, \pi) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\frac{1}{p_{m(t)}(\pi(x_t)|x_t)} \right] \\ &\leq K + \gamma_m \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} \left[\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, b_t) - \widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}(x_t, \pi(x_t)) \right] \\ &= K + \gamma_m \widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I.25})$$

where the inequality follows by the condition if $\pi(x_t) = b_t$ and the last equation is followed by the definition of the expected regret in the measure of empirical $\widehat{\mu}_{m(t)}$. \square

The following lemma provides the key step to provide the regret upper bound.

Lemma 11. For any $T \in \mathbb{N}$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the expected regret of RCB after T rounds is at most $\tau_{m_0-1} + 206K \sum_{t=\tau_{m_0-1}+1}^T 1/\gamma_{m(t)} + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log(2/\delta)}$.

Proof. For each round $t \geq \tau_{m_0-1} + 1$, define $M_t := y_t(\pi_\mu) - y_t(a_t) - \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \text{Reg}(\pi)$ and M_t is a martingale difference sequence since $\mathbb{E}_{x_t, y_t, a_t} [M_t | \mathfrak{S}_{t-1}] = 0$ provided by Lemma 6. So we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_t, y_t, a_t} \left[y_t(\pi_\mu) - y_t(a_t) | \mathfrak{S}_{t-1} \right] = \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \text{Reg}(\pi), \quad (\text{I.26})$$

Since $|M_t| \leq 2$ by $y_t \in [0, 1]$, by the Azuma-Hoeffding's inequality from Lemma 3,

$$\sum_{t=\tau_{m_0-1}+1}^T M_t \leq \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \quad (\text{I.27})$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$. By Lemma 4, we can upper bound the regret the with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=\tau_{m_0-1}+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[y_t(\pi_\mu) - y_t(a_t) | \mathfrak{S}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=\tau_{m_0-1}+1}^T \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) \text{Reg}(\pi) + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \\ &\leq \sum_{t=\tau_{m_0-1}+1}^T \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} Q_m(\pi) (2\widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) + \frac{C_0 K}{\gamma_m}) + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \\ &= \sum_{t=\tau_{m_0-1}+1}^T \sum_{\pi \in \Psi} [2Q_m(\pi) \widehat{\text{Reg}}_t(\pi) + Q_m(\pi) \frac{C_0 K}{\gamma_m}] + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \\ &\leq \sum_{t=\tau_{m_0-1}+1}^T \left[\frac{2K}{\gamma_m} + \frac{C_0 K}{\gamma_m} \right] + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \\ &\leq 206 \sum_{t=\tau_{m_0-1}+1}^T \frac{K}{\gamma_{m(t)}} + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I.28})$$

where the second inequality holds by Lemma 8 to control the implicit expected regret in π and the third inequality holds by Lemma 7 controlling the empirical regret. \square

I.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. By Lemma 11, with probability $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{D}_X} (y_t(\pi_\mu) - y_t(a_t)) \\
& \leq \tau_{m_0-1} + \sum_{t=\tau_{m_0-1}+1}^T \frac{206K}{\gamma_m(t)} + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \\
& \leq \tau_{m_0-1} + 52 \sum_{m=m_0}^{m_1} \sqrt{K \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{F}}(\tau_{m-2}, \tau_{m-1})} (\tau_m - \tau_{m-1}) + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{I.29}$$

With the assumption that the prior distribution \mathcal{P}_0 is normal and the variance is increasing in order $\mathcal{O}(t)$, by $\tau_m = 2^m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& = \tau_{m_0-1} + 52\sigma\sqrt{Kd} \sum_{m=m_0}^{m_1} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{m-2}}}\right) 2^{m-1} + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \\
& = \tau_{m_0-1} + 52\sigma\sqrt{Kd} \sum_{m=m_0}^{m_1} \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^m}) + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \\
& \leq \tau_{m_0-1} + 52\sigma\sqrt{Kd} \int_{m_0}^{\log_2(T)} 2^{\frac{x}{2}} dx + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \\
& \leq \tau_{m_0-1} + \frac{104}{\ln 2} \sigma\sqrt{KdT} + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \\
& < \tau_{m_0-1} + 151\sigma\sqrt{KdT} + \sqrt{8(T - \tau_{m_0-1}) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}
\end{aligned} \tag{I.30}$$

□

J Additional Experiments Results

J.1 Additional Simulation Settings and Results Analysis

Setting 3 (ϵ effects): We consider the RCB algorithm's effect over different budget parameters with $\epsilon = [0.01, 0.03, 0.05]$ and prior variances $\Sigma_{i,0} = 1/\lambda \mathbf{I}_d = [1/3, 1/5, 1/10] \mathbf{I}_d$. For rest parameters, $T = 5 \times 10^4$, $K = 5$, $d = 5$, $\sigma = 0.05$, and $\beta_{i,0} = \mathbf{0}_d, \forall i \in [K]$.

Setting 4 (Prior Decay and Prior-Posterior Gap Assumption Mis-specification Effects): We also test the robustness of RCB algorithm when the Assumption 4 is mis-specified. Here we assume $\Sigma_{i,0} = [0.02, 0.04, 0.1] \mathbf{I}$ and the prior decay rate are *linear decay*, *square root decay*, and *log decay*. We set the environment parameters to be $T = 5^4$, $K = 5$, $d = 5$. We set $\epsilon = 0.05$ and the prior mean $\beta_{1,0} = [1, 1, 1, 1, 1]^T$ and $\beta_{i,0} = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0]^T$.

Setting 3 - ϵ Effects Analysis: In Figure 3, three columns represent different ϵ 's effects over the ϵ -DBIC gain and regret.

For the top of the figure, we found that RCB can satisfy the ϵ -DBIC property under different ϵ and λ 's scenario. What's more, all the instantaneous gains have the uplift trend (increasing gain), which shows similar pattern to the setting 1.

The bottom shows the relationship between the regret, ϵ , and the prior variance $\Sigma_{i,0} = 1/\lambda \mathbf{I}_d$. We found that the regret of $\Sigma_{i,0} = 1/10 \mathbf{I}_d$ is much larger than the regret of $\Sigma_{i,0} = 1/3 \mathbf{I}_d$ and $\Sigma_{i,0} = 1/5 \mathbf{I}_d$. The reason is that in order to satisfy ϵ -DBIC property, the length of the cold start stage is linearly inverse proportion to the order of minimum eigenvalue ϕ_0 , which is demonstrated in Theorem 1. In other words, when the prior variance is small, it means that the customers have strong opinions over arms and the platform needs a long length of the cold start stage to make the RCB algorithm to satisfy the ϵ -DBIC property. In addition, the regret will decrease when ϵ increases. That is, when the platform wants to avoid long length of the cold start stage, it can sacrifice the ϵ to avoid a large regret, which is a trade-off between the guarantee of ϵ -DBIC property and the regret.




Figure 3: Gain (top) and Regret (bottom) of Setting 2.




Figure 4: Gain (top) and Regret (bottom) of Setting 2.

Setting 4 - Misspecified Effects Analysis: In Figure 4, the three columns represent different prior margin $\tau_{\mathcal{P}_0}$'s effects over the regret and decay rate mis-specified over the ϵ -DBIC gain. For top figure, we found RCB can still protect the ϵ -DBIC under different Σ scenario. Besides, we found that all the instantaneous ϵ -DBIC gains still have the uplift trend, which shows similar pattern to the setting 1 and setting 2. And the linear decay rate has the largest ϵ -DBIC gain and as $\Sigma_{i,0}$ increases, the platform gains more.

The second row shows the relationship between the regret and margin, and the decay rate misspecified. We found that in any decay rate that the RCB algorithm employs, the regret of are really similar. The reason is that for any element of $\beta_{i,0}$ is small within $[0, 1]$ and the prior variance is moderate, three decay rates has similar effect. And we found that when variance increases, regret decrease. It indicates that when prior variance is large, the regret difference among three different decay rates is shrinkage. In other words, when costumers do not have strong opinions over arms (variance is large), different decay rates have similar regret effects.




Figure 5: Gain (top) and Regret (bottom) of Setting 2 with $N = 10^2$.

J.2 Additional Real Data Analysis

Data Description: This data contains the true patient-specific optimal warfarin doses (which are initially unknown but are eventually found through the physician-guided dose adjustment process over the course of a few weeks) for 5528 patients with more than 70 features. It also includes patient-level covariates such as clinical factors, demographic variables, and genetic information that have been found to be predictive of the optimal warfarin dosage [25]. We follow the similar data construction method in [13]. These covariates include:

- Demographics: gender, race, ethnicity, age, height (cm), weight (kg).
- Diagnosis: reason for treatment (e.g. deep vein thrombosis, pulmonary embolism, etc.).
- Pre-existing diagnoses: indicators for diabetes, congestive heart failure or cardiomyopathy, valve replacement, smoker status.
- Medications: indicators for potentially interacting drugs (aspirin, Tylenol, and Zocor).
- Genetics: presence of genotype variants of CYP2C9 and VKORC1.




Figure 6: Gain (top) and Regret (bottom) of Setting 2 with $N = 10^3$.

The details can be found in Appendix 1 of [25]. All these covariates were hand-selected by professionals as being relevant to the task of warfarin dosing based on medical literature; there are no extraneously added variables. Since the detailed feature construction is not available in [13], we construct features follow the description in [13]. For *diagnosis variables*, we categorize the reason for treatment with 0/1 (1 represents patients have reason for treatment, 0 represents patients have no reason or unknown reason for treatment). For *medications variables*, we only include three medications: aspirin, Tylenol, Zocor, and all other medications are set to be 0. For *genetics variables*, we considered genotype variants of CYP2C9 and VKORC1 and the rest are set to be 0. The previous feature construction aims to avoid to high dimensional feature space. All categorical variables are transformed into dummy variables and all missing values are set to 0. After the data construction, we have 70 features and 5528 patients. In [13], they have 93 features, which is similar to our constructions.

Model Hyperparameter Setup: The prior mean’s setup follow the fixed-dose strategy and detailed explanation is provided in the following. We assume the prior variance increases linearly over time after the *cold start*. This allows physicians decrease the confidence of their prior dose strategy and trust the RCB algorithm over time. In addition, the length of the *cold start* is determined by Theorem 1.

Addition Result Analysis.

Regret: In the first row, we show the regret of RCB with different confidence strengths (prior variance). When Σ is small that means physicians have stronger opinion over the medium dosage, and the reverse is that the physicians have weaker opinion over the medium dosage. With different prior, we found that when $\Sigma = 0.4\mathbf{I}$, it has the largest regret since we need more samples in the cold start stage to let physicians trust RCB, which means that we need a large N . Interestingly, we found that when ϵ increases (left to right), the regret difference between different prior variance shrinks because when we can tolerate with a higher ratio of non- ϵ -DBIC compatible patients, the prior’s effect decreases and the overall regret decreases because of a shorter cold start stage.

$\epsilon - \text{DBIC Gain}$: In the second row, we show ϵ -DBIC gain of the RCB with different confidence strengths. Different prior variance has similar effect on the DBIC gain and all variants’ gain are




Figure 7: Regret and incentive compatibility of warfarin dosing.

above $-\epsilon$, which satisfies the property since the gain after the cold start stage is only determined by the posterior difference within the arm RCB selected.

K Nonlinear Reward Discussion

If the true model has a non-linear structure, we can approximate the nonlinear functions of the covariates by using basis expansion methods in from statistical learning [40].