
Online Bandit Learning with Offline Preference Data

Akhil Agnihotri

University of Southern California
akhil.agnihotri@usc.edu

Rahul Jain

Google Research and USC
rahulajain@google.com

Deepak Ramachandran

Google Research
ramachandrand@google.com

Zheng Wen

Google DeepMind
zhengwen@google.com

Abstract

Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF) is at the core of fine-tuning methods for generative AI models for language and images. Such feedback is often sought as rank or preference feedback from human raters, as opposed to eliciting scores since the latter tends to be very noisy. On the other hand, RL theory and algorithms predominantly assume that a reward feedback is available. In particular, approaches for online learning that can be helpful in adaptive data collection via active learning cannot incorporate offline preference data. In this paper, we adopt a finite-armed linear bandit model as a prototypical model of online learning. We consider an offline preference dataset to be available generated by an expert of unknown ‘competence’. We propose `warmPref-PS`, a posterior sampling algorithm for online learning that can be warm-started with an offline dataset with noisy preference feedback. We show that by modeling the ‘competence’ of the expert that generated it, we are able to use such a dataset most effectively. We support our claims with novel theoretical analysis of its Bayesian regret, as well as extensive empirical evaluation of an approximate algorithm which performs substantially better (almost 25 to 50% regret reduction in our studies) as compared to baselines.

1 Introduction

In the development of generative AI models for language and image generation, it has proven quite effective to first ‘pretrain’ with a very large offline dataset followed by reinforcement learning (RL)-based ‘fine-tuning’ with small amounts of high quality Human Feedback (HF) data (usually obtained offline) to improve alignment with human preferences. HF data is usually obtained as a ranking over choices or preference feedback, since absolute scores tend to be very subjective and noisy. Aggregating preference information from multiple raters is much easier than aggregating absolute rating scores, since different raters could be calibrated very differently in their assignment of absolute scores to the same item, while agreeing on their relative orderings. Nevertheless, absolute scores are generally more informative than relative ones, and designing mechanisms that find optimal tradeoffs between these different feedback modalities is critical to scaling RLHF.

In this paper, we approach this challenge by considering the setting where there is access to an offline dataset of preferences (potentially aggregated over many raters) and an online learning phase with an individual rater. In the case where the online ratings are absolute scores, we propose a simple Bayesian algorithm for online learning that incorporates learning from the offline preference dataset which has strong theoretical guarantees, and empirically strong performance as compared to certain baselines. When the online ratings are also in preference form, we propose another algorithm that demonstrates that strong empirical gains are still possible. The algorithms for both settings are immediately applicable to common RLHF data collection use cases where getting high-quality

feedback at scale from a diverse rating pool is a challenge. The first setting is also applicable to the case where a foundational model aligned to general human preferences from an initial offline dataset needs to be rapidly personalized to the idiosyncratic preferences of a particular user; here absolute rating scores are viable since they need not be cross-calibrated to a population, and moreover may be necessary to enable quick adaptation.

We adopt a finite-armed linear bandit model, with arms corresponding to different generated outputs, with indicated rater preferences available offline before starting the online phase when absolute reward scores from a user become available. To efficiently learn the optimal arm selection strategy, we propose `warmPref-PS`, a posterior sampling-based Bayesian algorithm that naturally incorporates offline preference data and minimizes Bayesian regret, which is known to lead to tight theoretical guarantees and superior empirical performance. Our approach builds on the classical and recent literature on contextual and stochastic bandits, warm-starting with offline data, and dueling bandits.

While posterior sampling algorithms have a natural structure (which is appealing), how to effectively incorporate offline preference data into such algorithms is far from obvious. We establish a sample complexity bound on the offline dataset set size for it to be ‘informative’ about the optimal action. We then provide an upper bound on the Bayesian regret for our algorithm, and as a special case show that as the dataset size goes to infinity, the algorithm has constant regret, i.e., it learns the optimal action after a finite number of samples. We then propose the `Bootstrapped warmPref-PS` algorithm which allows for computationally tractable approximation of the posterior update step in the `warmPref-PS` algorithm. We finally present extensive experimental results on the robust empirical performance of the `Bootstrapped warmPref-PS` algorithm including on misspecification of the form of the expert’s policy that generated the offline preference data, as well as other parameters.

Contributions of this paper. (i) We present the first online learning algorithm that naturally and effectively incorporates offline preference data into the online phase, even when it comes from a subpar expert. The key is that the algorithm is able to model and learn how ‘competent’ the expert is (with respect to the optimal policy). This is also the key insight in leveraging any offline dataset in the most effective manner possible. (ii) While our proposed algorithm is a natural extension of posterior sampling for the use of an offline preference dataset, it requires novel and significantly different theoretical analysis. We provide novel theoretical guarantees on the minimum size of the offline dataset needed for it to allow learning of the optimal action with high probability in terms of the expert’s competence. We also provide a novel upper bound on the algorithm’s Bayesian regret that reveals the dependence of learning efficiency and effectiveness on the offline dataset size, the expert’s competence and knowledge. (iii) We then propose a practical version of our `warmPref-PS` algorithm that is computationally tractable, and establish its superior empirical performance with regard to certain baselines by 25 to 50% through extensive experiments and ablation studies.

Related work. There is of course, substantial literature on online learning for bandit models in various settings - finite-armed or linear, stochastic or adversarial, non-contextual or contextual models, etc. [18]. There is even recent literature on utilizing offline data to improve learning regret during the online phase but these approaches either do not incorporate offline preference data [30, 9, 36, 5, 3], or solve the best arm identification problem which focuses on pure exploration [3]. Furthermore, the quality of the offline data is not accounted for, which usually results in only a marginal regret reduction even while warm-starting with offline data. Ranking, comparison or preference feedback is indeed considered in dueling bandit models [35, 11, 33, 34, 8, 31, 2, 1, 16] but it is akin to active learning from preferences [4, 15] without incorporating a *given, fixed* offline preference dataset. More recently, [19] gave sample complexity bounds on estimation error for policy evaluation with human preferences but it has no online learning phase, and doesn’t do cumulative regret minimization.

The importance of offline dataset quality in imitation learning was first investigated in [7]. Later, [13] introduced an algorithm which leveraged offline reward feedback to warm start the online phase. While the algorithm use offline reward feedback data, it cannot incorporate preference feedback as we do in this paper. The framework we adopt in this paper is partly inspired by this paper, and thus shares some common elements. We note that incorporation of preference feedback is a highly challenging problem. Our proposed algorithms (Algorithms 1 and 2) follow the posterior sampling approach, hence share some similarities but the sample complexity bound (in Theorem 4.2) is novel and the regret analysis techniques developed and used (presented in the Appendix) are entirely different than for the case when reward feedback is available.

2 Preliminaries

We model all unknown quantities as random variables defined on a common probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Now, consider a stochastic K -armed linear bandit problem with a set of actions, $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, \dots, a_K\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. The environment is characterized by a random vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with a prior distribution ν_0 . At each time step t , the agent chooses an action $A_t \in \mathcal{A}$ and receives a reward R_t :

$$R_t = \langle A_t, \theta \rangle + \eta_t$$

where $\eta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ are i.i.d. sampled at each time step. For RLHF applications, the rewards might correspond to absolute score feedback by an individual rater on outputs (i.e., actions) generated by a foundational model. The learning agent’s objective is to maximize $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[R_t]$, the expected total reward over any time horizon T , where the expectation is over the algorithm’s decisions and the randomness in the environment. In addition, we also have an initial *offline preference* dataset \mathcal{D}_0 , which is generated by human raters *with limited competence*. This offline dataset is a sequence of tuples of the form $\mathcal{D}_0 = \left((\bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, Y_n) \right)_{n \in [N]}$, where $[N] := [1, 2, \dots, N]$, $\bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \bar{A}_n^{(1)} \in \mathcal{A}$ are two actions, and $Y_n \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates the rater’s preference. In particular, $Y_n = 0$ if the rater prefers action $\bar{A}_n^{(0)}$ to $\bar{A}_n^{(1)}$, and $Y_n = 1$ otherwise. In addition to the dataset size N , we characterized the offline dataset by: (i) an action sampling distribution μ , where $\bar{A}_n^{(0)}$ and $\bar{A}_n^{(1)}$ are i.i.d. sampled from μ ; and (ii) we assume that given the two actions $\bar{A}^{(0)}$ and $\bar{A}^{(1)}$, the rater follows a *noisy* Bradley-Terry model [10] and chooses $Y = 0$ (i.e., ranks action $\bar{A}_n^{(0)}$ above $\bar{A}_n^{(1)}$) with probability

$$P(Y=0 \mid \bar{A}^{(0)}, \bar{A}^{(1)}; \vartheta) = \frac{\exp\left(\beta \langle \bar{A}^{(0)}, \vartheta \rangle\right)}{\exp\left(\beta \langle \bar{A}^{(0)}, \vartheta \rangle\right) + \exp\left(\beta \langle \bar{A}^{(1)}, \vartheta \rangle\right)} \quad (1)$$

where the parameter $\beta \geq 0$ is a measure of the *deliberateness* of the rater’s decision: $\beta = 0$ means the rater’s decisions are uniformly random, whereas as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, its decisions pick the maximum of the reward under the two actions. The parameter $\vartheta \sim N(\theta, \mathbf{I}_d/\lambda^2)$ (\mathbf{I}_d is a $d \times d$ identity matrix) is the rater’s estimate of the true reward model and the parameter λ is a measure of its *knowledgeability* of it, i.e., as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, $\vartheta \rightarrow \theta$. Alternatively, in the adaptation scenario where the online learning phase is used to align with the desires of a single user, the knowledgeability parameter can be seen as controlling the expected degree of alignment between the user and the general population from which preferences are aggregated. Denoting the online dataset collected by time t as $\mathcal{H}_t = \{(A_s, R_s)\}_{s=1}^t$, we have $\mathcal{D}_t = \mathcal{D}_0 \cup \mathcal{H}_t$, the entire dataset available at time t .

Notion of Regret. Given an offline preference dataset \mathcal{D}_0 and some arbitrary environment available θ for the online phase for T rounds, the Bayesian Regret is given by:

$$\mathcal{BR}_T(\pi) := \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\pi, \theta, \mathcal{D}_0} \left[\langle A^*, \theta \rangle - R_t \right], \quad (2)$$

where expectation is taken over $(\pi, \theta, \mathcal{D}_0)$, and $A^*(\theta) = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \langle a, \theta \rangle$ (the optimal action for environment θ), and π is a policy that maps past observations \mathcal{D}_t to a distribution over actions. Here, we assume that the prior distribution over the environment θ is a Gaussian distribution $\nu_0 = \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \Sigma_0)$. To distinguish from the “informed prior” learned from \mathcal{D}_0 , we call ν_0 as the uninformed prior. The goal then is to learn a policy π that minimizes the Bayesian regret given in equation (2).

3 Introducing the Preference-Warmed Posterior Sampling Algorithm

The online learning problem for Bayesian regret-minimization (in equation (2)) that we have introduced in the previous section has two novel elements: an offline dataset to begin with, and such a dataset having only (noisy) preference feedback generated by a human rater with limited capacity, instead of reward feedback. While the former has been addressed before (see [13]), the latter element is new. We adopt the posterior sampling (PS) approach to designing online bandit learning algorithms since they have a natural structure, and also because they usually offer superior empirical performance as compared to optimism-based algorithms [29].

Algorithm 1 Preference-Warmed Posterior Sampling (warmPref-PS)

- 1: **Input:** Action set \mathcal{A} , uninformed prior ν_0 over environment θ , offline preference dataset \mathcal{D}_0 .
 - 2: Construct informed prior ν_1 from \mathcal{D}_0 using equation (3).
 - 3: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 4: Sample $\hat{\theta}_t \sim \nu_t$ to take action $A_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} a^T \hat{\theta}_t$ and receive reward R_t .
 - 5: Update dataset \mathcal{D}_t and posterior $\nu_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbb{P}(\cdot | \mathcal{D}_t)$ using equation (4).
 - 6: **end for**
-

Thus, we introduce warmPref-PS, a (Bayesian) posterior sampling algorithm warm-started with offline preference data. As we see below, most of the steps are common with any meta-PS algorithm: Before starting the online phase, it constructs a prior distribution over θ , the reward model informed by the offline noisy preference data. It samples from the posterior distribution over θ , pretends that the sampled parameter is the true one, and takes a decision. And then, it updates the posterior distribution by using the action taken and the reward received. It is summarized as Algorithm 1.

1. **Constructing an informed prior.** Using the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 , construct an informed prior ν_1 ,

$$\nu_1(\theta) := P(\theta | \mathcal{D}_0) \propto P(\mathcal{D}_0 | \theta) \cdot \nu_0(\theta) \propto \left[\prod_{n=1}^N P(Y_n | \bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, \theta) \cdot P(\bar{A}_n^{(0)} | \theta) \cdot P(\bar{A}_n^{(1)} | \theta) \right] \cdot \nu_0(\theta) \quad (3)$$

where ν_0 is the uninformed prior and the second step follows from equation (1) and that $\bar{A}_n^{(0)}$ and $\bar{A}_n^{(1)}$ are assumed independent. It is worth emphasizing here that the actions in the offline dataset carry information about the environment through the term $P(\bar{A}_n^{(\cdot)} | \theta)$, which incorporates information about the expert’s policy, and thus improves the informativeness of the prior distribution.

2. **Online decision making.** At time t , get sample $\hat{\theta}_t \sim \nu_t$, take action $A_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \langle a, \hat{\theta}_t \rangle$, observe reward R_t , and update the dataset as $\mathcal{D}_t = \mathcal{D}_{t-1} \cup \{(A_t, R_t)\}$.
3. **Updating knowledge of the environment.** At time t , the environment parameter θ will have distribution $\nu_t(\theta)$, and we update our posterior as,

$$\nu_{t+1}(\theta | \mathcal{D}_t) \propto P(\{(A_t, R_t)\} | \mathcal{D}_{t-1}, \theta) \cdot \nu_t(\theta | \mathcal{D}_{t-1}) = P(R_t | A_t, \theta) \cdot P(A_t | \mathcal{D}_{t-1}) \cdot \nu_t(\theta | \mathcal{D}_{t-1}), \quad (4)$$

where $P(R_t | A_t, \mathcal{D}_{t-1}, \theta) = P(R_t | A_t, \theta)$ and $P(A_t | \mathcal{D}_{t-1}, \theta) = P(A_t | \mathcal{D}_{t-1})$. The posterior of ϑ also changes, and hence, $\vartheta_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_{t+1}, \mathbf{I}/\lambda^2)$ with $\theta_{t+1} \sim \nu_{t+1}(\theta)$. We regard β to be a known parameter. We relax this in Section 6.

Remark 3.1. The presented algorithm is an adaptation of the meta-PS algorithm to our setting. A prior is usually assumed as given in Bayesian algorithms. In equation (3), we construct an informed prior using the offline preference dataset. This step can be intractable. Similarly, the posterior update step in (4) is also usually intractable, unless the distributions we are working with have a conjugacy property. In which case, we resort to various approximations. In Section 5, we present a practical version of this algorithm by introducing a loss function that approximates Steps 2 and 5 of the above algorithm. As we will show in Section 4, while the algorithm presented above is a natural extension of posterior sampling for the use of an offline preference dataset, it requires significantly different theoretical analysis with many novel elements.

Remark 3.2. Extension to the case of online preference feedback: In Appendix A.6, we present the warm Posterior Sampling with Online Feedback (warmTSOF) algorithm wherein the learning agent has the option to ask for preference feedback between two actions. However, the agent incurs a cost every time it asks for such feedback. This has applications in active learning [27, 21] and crowd-sourcing data from experts for large language models [23, 17]. We present some preliminary empirical results and defer the theoretical analysis to future work.

4 Analysis of warmPREF-PS

We now present an analysis of the warmPREF-PS algorithm in two steps. First, in Section 4.1, we present an “informativeness” analysis of the offline preference data \mathcal{D}_0 , which establishes a sample complexity result for \mathcal{D}_0 to be informative about the optimal action. Then, based on this result, we develop an upper bound on the Bayesian regret for warmPREF-PS in Section 4.2.

4.1 Informativeness of Offline Preference Data

We first introduce the notion of *informativeness* of the offline preference data, which characterizes how much information about the optimal action is provided by this offline preference dataset. Specifically, for purposes of analysis, we construct an ‘information’ set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ such that it contains the optimal action with high probability (see Appendix A.1, A.2, and A.3 for details). This is useful for the analysis during the online phase; intuitively, the warmPref-PS algorithm is expected to sample most actions from $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$.

Definition 4.1. Consider a random set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ measurable with respect to \mathcal{D}_0 . For any $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, we say $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ as $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative if $P(A^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$, i.e., it contains the optimal action with high probability.

This information set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ has to be measurable with respect to \mathcal{D}_0 (i.e., conditionally deterministic given \mathcal{D}_0). Since $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ is random, its cardinality $|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|$ is also random. Intuitively, the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 is useful in determining the optimal action A^* if there exists a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ measurable to \mathcal{D}_0 s.t. (i) $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ is $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative, and (ii) $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|]$ is small. In other words, one can construct a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ based on \mathcal{D}_0 s.t. $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ has a small expected cardinality and contains A^* with high probability. We first present a sample complexity result (i.e., how large the offline dataset size needs to be) on \mathcal{D}_0 such that the set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ constructed in the appendix is $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative. This justifies the existence of such $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$. We start by studying the special case of the set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ being a singleton to elucidate its dependence on various parameters, but our discussion in the next section will not require this assumption.

Theorem 4.2. Let the action set \mathcal{A} have size K with a sampling distribution μ such that $0 < \mu_{\min} \leq \mu_k \leq \mu_{\max} < 1, \forall k \in [K]$. Given some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and finite $\beta < \infty$, let $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose that the set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ constructed in Appendix A.3 is a singleton, then it is $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative if

$$N > N_0 := \frac{\ln K + (k_{\max} - 1) \ln \ln K}{\mu_{\min}^2 \epsilon}, \quad \text{where} \quad (5)$$

$$k_{\max} = \max_{i,j \in [K]} \frac{\ln \left(\left(\frac{2K^2}{\epsilon} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(x_{i,j})} - 1 \right) \right)}{\beta \langle a_i - a_j, \theta_0 \rangle}, \quad x_{i,j} = \frac{(a_i - a_j)^T \mu_0}{\sqrt{(a_i - a_j)^T \Sigma_0 (a_i - a_j)}}.$$

and, N is the size of the preference dataset and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard Normal CDF.

The proof can be found in Appendix A.3. The above theorem provides a bound on the size of the offline preference dataset \mathcal{D}_0 needed to find a singleton information set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ containing the optimal action. To understand the above result, note that in the special case of $K = 2$, we have the following.

Corollary 4.3. For an action set $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, a_1\}$, any $\beta \in (0, \infty)$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, with $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, if

$$N > N_0 := \frac{\ln \left(\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(x)} - 1 \right) \right)}{\beta \langle a_0 - a_1, \theta_0 \rangle}, \quad (6)$$

where $x := \frac{(a_0 - a_1)^T \mu_0}{\sqrt{(a_0 - a_1)^T \Sigma_0 (a_0 - a_1)}}$, then there exists a singleton $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ that is $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative.

See Appendix A.1 and A.1.4 for proof. The above corollary reveals how the offline dataset size N needed to infer the optimal action depends on the deliberateness parameter in the presence of noisy comparisons. We see that as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, we have $N_0 \rightarrow 0$, i.e., we only need a single comparison.

4.2 Regret Bound

We now first introduce an information theoretic result from the literature for Bayesian regret for a posterior sampling algorithm. The discussion below is for the general case where the information set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ is not necessarily a singleton.

Theorem 4.4. ([13]) For any $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, the Bayesian Regret of any PS algorithm can be upper bounded as:

$$\mathcal{BR}_T(\text{PS}) \leq \sqrt{T \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|] \ln(\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|])} + \epsilon \ln(K/\epsilon) + C_1 T \epsilon,$$

where C_1 is the bound on the expected reward range, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\max a^T \theta] - \mathbb{E}[\min a^T \theta] \leq C_1$.

To apply the above theorem, we can construct the set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ in the following way: it contains all actions that have been preferred to another action *at least* once in the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 and also includes any actions that do not appear in the dataset \mathcal{D}_0 . Thus, $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ can contain upto K actions. First, let $\Delta := \ln(T\beta)/\beta$, $\alpha_1^\Delta := K \min(1, \Delta)$, and $\alpha_2 := \lambda^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)}$. Then, denote

$$\tilde{f}_1 := \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(\beta(\min(1, \Delta) + \alpha_2 - \alpha_1^\Delta))} \right)^N + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N}, \quad f_1 := \tilde{f}_1 + \frac{1}{T}$$

and, $f_2 := \min \left((\alpha_1^\Delta)^2 + \frac{NK}{T\beta} (1 + \exp(-\beta\alpha_2 + \alpha_1^\Delta))^{-1} + \frac{2}{T}, K \right)$.

The constants (f_1, f_2) characterize the offline preference dataset in terms of its size N , and expert's competence parameters λ and β . Then, we have the following guarantee on the informativeness and size of the set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$.

Lemma 4.5. *If $0 < \mu_{\min} \leq \mu_{\max} < 1$, then the set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ constructed above is $(1 - f_1)$ -informative, and $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|] \leq f_2$.*

Proof sketch. We upper bound the probability of the optimal action A^* not being in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ (the ‘error probability’), and by defining an event $\mathcal{E}_{(n)} := \{\langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle \leq \Delta\}$, where (A^*, a_n) is the action tuple in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ for some $n \in [N]$ and $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we decompose this error probability based on the event $\mathcal{E}_{(n)}$ and the sub-optimality gap of actions (Δ) . To bound the expected cardinality of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$, we again decompose based on $\mathcal{E}_{(n)}$ and use a Poisson approximation to bound the probability. See Appendix A.4 for the complete proof. \square

Here, α_1^Δ and α_2 are representative of the nature of the problem, and take into the consideration the information loss due to finite deliberateness and knowledgeability of the rater respectively. Both $\alpha_1^\Delta, \alpha_2 \rightarrow 0$, as β and λ get large. The parameter f_1 captures the error probability of the optimal action not being in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$, and decays exponentially as the size of the dataset increases. Note that we need μ_{\min} and $\mu_{\max} \in (0, 1)$ to obtain a nonzero sampling probability over all the actions.

Now using Lemma 4.5 in conjunction with the information theoretic upper bound in Theorem 4.4, we obtain the following main result about the Bayesian regret of the warmPref-PS algorithm:

Theorem 4.6. *The Bayesian regret of the warmPref-PS algorithm can be bounded as*

$$\mathcal{B}\mathcal{R}_T(\pi_{\text{warmPref-PS}}) \leq \underbrace{\sqrt{T f_2 (\ln(f_2) + f_1 \ln(K/f_1))}}_{\text{main term}} + 2\sqrt{2 \ln(K)} T \left(\tilde{f}_1 + \frac{1}{T} \right).$$

The proof can be found in Appendix A.4. Although the bound in Theorem 4.6 appears to be linear in T , in fact $\tilde{f}_1 < 1$, and as the dataset size $N \rightarrow \infty$, $\tilde{f}_1 \rightarrow 0$, implying that the second term behaves like a constant. Second, for the main term, as the deliberateness β increases, the information ratio (f_2) decreases exponentially and then the entropy part $(\ln(f_2) + f_1 \ln(K/f_1))$ decreases further until $f_2 = 1$. Finally, note that as the preference dataset parameters λ and β get large, the main term in the regret bound above converges to 0. Thus, the algorithm has constant regret in the case where the offline dataset is very large and is from a near-optimal expert.

5 A Practical Approximation of the warmPref-PS Algorithm

As mentioned before, the posterior update in equation (3) and equation (4) lacks the conjugacy property due to the $P(A_t | \mathcal{D}_{t-1})$ term, and is hence intractable. This makes the warmPref-PS algorithm impractical to implement. However, it inspires us to design a practical algorithm in the manner of well established Bayesian bootstrapping ideas [25] where a surrogate loss function is constructed with added noise, and is then optimized to obtain the Maximum A Posteriori (MAP) estimate. This provides a point estimate of the unknown parameters (θ, ϑ) , but due to the added noise can be viewed as a sample from an approximation to the posterior distribution over the unknown parameters.

A surrogate loss function. We start with the MAP estimate problem for (θ, ϑ) given the offline and online dataset \mathcal{D}_{t-1} at time $t - 1$. We show that this is equivalent to minimizing a particular surrogate loss function as described in the lemma below:

Lemma 5.1. *At time t , the MAP estimate of (θ, ϑ) can be constructed by solving the following equivalent optimization problem:*

$$\begin{aligned}
(\theta_{opt}, \vartheta_{opt}) &= \underset{\theta, \vartheta}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(\theta, \vartheta \mid \mathcal{D}_{t-1}) \equiv \underset{\theta, \vartheta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{L}_1(\theta, \vartheta) + \mathcal{L}_2(\theta, \vartheta) + \mathcal{L}_3(\theta, \vartheta), \\
\text{where, } \mathcal{L}_1(\theta, \vartheta) &:= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (R_s - \langle A_s, \theta \rangle)^2, \\
\mathcal{L}_2(\theta, \vartheta) &:= - \sum_{n=1}^N \beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(Y_n)}, \vartheta \rangle + \ln \left(e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \vartheta \rangle} + e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, \vartheta \rangle} \right), \quad \text{and} \\
\mathcal{L}_3(\theta, \vartheta) &:= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \|\theta - \vartheta\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \mu_0)^T \Sigma_0^{-1} (\theta - \mu_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

See Appendix A.5 for proof. A close look at equation (7) shows that \mathcal{L}_1 captures the likelihood of the online rewards, \mathcal{L}_2 captures the likelihood of preferences from the offline preference dataset \mathcal{D}_0 , and \mathcal{L}_3 handles the prior distribution of θ and ϑ . While there are other ways to construct such surrogate loss functions [14], we employ the above simple yet efficient Bayesian approach, which integrates well with this work. Note that we work directly with ϑ instead of λ for convenience. We could also regard β to be unknown but that leads to a non-convex loss function. So, we estimate that separately in Section 6 and then plug it in equation (7). Minimizing the above loss function however, only yields a point estimate of (θ, ϑ) that is deterministic given the dataset \mathcal{D}_{t-1} .

Perturbing the loss function. As mentioned above, the idea now is to *perturb* the loss function in (7) with some noise, so that the MAP point estimates we get from this perturbed surrogate loss function serve as *samples* from a distribution that approximates the true posterior [25, 20, 26, 12]. To that end, we propose a perturbation of the ‘online’ loss function $\mathcal{L}_1(\cdot)$ by additive Gaussian noise, of the ‘offline’ loss function $\mathcal{L}_2(\cdot)$ by multiplicative random weights, and of the ‘prior’ loss function $\mathcal{L}_3(\cdot)$ by random samples from the prior distribution as follows:

(i) *Online perturbation.* Let $\zeta_s \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, all i.i.d. Then, the perturbed $\mathcal{L}_1(\cdot)$ becomes

$$\mathcal{L}'_1(\theta, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (R_s + \zeta_s - \langle A_s, \theta \rangle)^2$$

(ii) *Offline perturbation.* Let $\omega_n \sim \operatorname{Bern}(0.5)$, all i.i.d. Then, the perturbed $\mathcal{L}_2(\cdot)$ becomes $\mathcal{L}'_2(\theta, \vartheta)$

$$= - \sum_{n=1}^N \omega_n \left[\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(Y_n)}, \vartheta \rangle + \ln \left(e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \vartheta \rangle} + e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, \vartheta \rangle} \right) \right]$$

(iii) *Prior perturbation.* Let $\theta' \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \Sigma_0)$ and $\vartheta' \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \mathbf{I}_d/\lambda^2)$, all i.i.d. Then, the perturbed $\mathcal{L}_3(\cdot)$ becomes $\mathcal{L}'_3(\theta, \vartheta)$

$$= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \|\theta - \vartheta + \vartheta'\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \mu_0 - \theta')^T \Sigma_0^{-1} (\theta - \mu_0 - \theta')$$

Then, at time t , we get the following MAP point estimate from the perturbed surrogate loss function, $(\hat{\theta}_t, \hat{\vartheta}_t)$

$$= \underset{\theta, \vartheta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{L}'(\theta, \vartheta) = \underset{\theta, \vartheta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{L}'_1(\theta, \vartheta) + \mathcal{L}'_2(\theta, \vartheta) + \mathcal{L}'_3(\theta, \vartheta), \tag{8}$$

which are well understood to have a distribution that approximates the actual posterior distribution. Note that the perturbed surrogate loss function is convex, and hence can be optimized easily. In addition, it can be extended easily to the setting where the offline dataset comes from *multiple* experts with different (λ_i, β_i) competence tuples. Specifically, for M experts, there will be M similar terms for $\mathcal{L}'_2(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{L}'_3(\cdot)$ respectively, while $\mathcal{L}'_1(\cdot)$ will remain unchanged. To conclude, the final practical algorithm which we refer to as *Bootstrapped warmPref-PS*, is summarized as Algorithm 2.

6 Empirical Results

We now present results on the empirical performance of the *Bootstrapped warmPref-PS* algorithm introduced in the previous section. We are particularly interested in the following questions: (i) How

Algorithm 2 Bootstrapped warmPref-PS

- 1: **Input:** Horizon T , offline preference dataset \mathcal{D}_0 , action set \mathcal{A} , knowledgeability λ , deliberateness β .
 - 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 3: Sample a set of perturbations $\mathcal{P}_t = \{(\zeta_s, \omega_n, \theta', \vartheta')\}$.
 - 4: Solve equation (8) using this set \mathcal{P}_t to find $(\hat{\theta}_t, \hat{\vartheta}_t)$.
 - 5: Take action $A_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \langle a, \hat{\theta}_t \rangle$, receive reward R_t , and update $\mathcal{D}_t \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{t-1} \cup \{(A_t, R_t)\}$.
 - 6: **end for**
-

much is the reduction in cumulative Bayesian regret due to warm start with an offline preference dataset? (ii) How much does the competence (in terms of λ and β) of the expert (rater) who generated the offline preference affect regret? (iii) What is the impact of action space structure on the performance of warmPref-PS in terms of correlation between actions? (iv) Is warmPref-PS robust to mis-specification of λ and β ?

Baselines. To evaluate the Bootstrapped warmPref-PS algorithm, we will consider the following baselines: (i) (vanilla) PS, which is a PS algorithm that does not use the offline dataset, and (ii) naive-PS, which is essentially the warmPref-PS in Algorithm 2 but assumes $\beta = 0$, i.e., models the expert as naive who uniformly randomly ranks among the action pairs. All plots show empirical regret.

Evaluation protocol. Unless specified otherwise, for all experiments, we have $K = 10$ arms, dimension $d = 4$, $\lambda = 100$, $\beta = 10$, dataset size $N = 20$, and horizon $T = 300$. We averaged over 5 runs (with random seeds). For easy interpretation, we let the action sampling distribution $\mu \sim \operatorname{Unif}(\cdot)$.




Figure 1: Performance of warmPref-PS with varying N , β , and λ . Shaded region around the mean line represents 1 standard deviation over 5 independent runs.




Figure 2: Sensitivity of warmPref-PS to flawed expert policy, misspecified and unknown competence.

Value of Offline Preferences. We first aim to understand the impact of the offline preference dataset \mathcal{D}_0 on the performance of warmPref-PS as three parameters, β , λ and N vary. Figure 1(a) shows that as λ increases (the expert has a better estimate of the reward model θ), the regret reduces and this reduction is substantial for the warmPref-PS algorithm than for the naive-PS algorithm (vanilla-PS is unaffected by λ as it does not use the offline dataset). Figure 1(b) shows that (for fixed λ and N) as β increases, the regret reduces substantially. Figure 1(c) now fixes β and λ , and shows that as dataset size N increases, even with a ‘mediocre’ expert ($\beta = 5$) the regret reduces substantially, and in fact by 25 to 50% even with a very small ($N = 5$) dataset size.

The conclusion from the empirical results is that even by using a small amount of offline data from a mediocre expert, the Bootstrapped warmPref-PS algorithm is able to achieve significant reduction in regret over the naive-PS which uses the offline dataset but does not use it as ‘carefully’.

Sensitivity to parameter specification errors. The (Bootstrapped) warmPref-PS algorithm in Section 5 requires a knowledge of expert’s parameters β and λ . In Figure 2, we study the sensitivity of the algorithm’s performance to errors in specification of these parameters (as well as of assuming a Bradley-Terry model for the rater).

(i) **Different Preference Generation Expert Policy.** Though the learning agent assumes equation (1) as the expert’s generative model, we consider that it actually uses a deterministic greedy policy. Actions $\bar{A}_n^{(0)}$ and $\bar{A}_n^{(1)}$ are sampled, and then choose $Y_n = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in \{0,1\}} \beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(i)}, \vartheta \rangle$, where $\vartheta \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, \mathbf{I}_d / \lambda^2)$. From Figure 2(a), we can see that while learning agent’s assumption of the parametric form of the expert policy is *flawed*, warmPref-PS still significantly outperforms the baselines.

(ii) **Misspecified Competence parameters.** First, we generate the offline data with the true $\lambda = 10$ but the algorithm uses a misspecified λ . Second, we generate the offline data with the true $\beta = 10$ but the algorithm uses a misspecified β . Figure 2(b) and 2(c) show that although the performance of informed PS decreases as the degree of flawness increases, our algorithm still outperforms the baselines.

(iii) **Unknown Competence.** As seen in Section 5, Bayesian bootstrapping requires an input for the competence level. In practice, this is not available but, can be estimated from the offline dataset. There are many ways of estimating β [6, 13], but the most common methods are: (i) Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) : optimize β over the negative log-likelihood of the \mathcal{D}_0 and, (ii) Entropy : calculate entropy of the empirical distribution of the actions occurring in \mathcal{D}_0 , call it $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ and use $\hat{\beta} = c / \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$, where $c > 0$ is a hyperparameter. We compare entropy-based method and MLE based method for warmPref-PS with two baselines: (1) use true β with warmPref-PS and, (2) vanilla PS. To isolate the effect of β , we let $\lambda = 10^4$. As shown in Figure 2(d), although the performance degrades due to estimation, warmPref-PS still outperforms the baselines.

Effect of action space dynamics. We also study how the correlation (ρ) between action pairs, and (ii) the dimensionality of the environment $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, affect cumulative regret. Table 1 in Appendix A.7 shows that the performance of all these methods degrades as environment dimensionality and correlation between action increases. However, warmPref-PS still outperforms the baselines.

7 Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed an online learning algorithm for bandits that can be warm-started with offline preference data. It enables use of offline preference feedback data (that is more robust than score feedback) and adaptive collection of online RLHF data to further improve human alignment of AI

models than is possible by either alone. A key insight is that the offline data need not even come from very good human raters: if their competence is properly modelled, it can be very effective in reducing regret (and hence learning efficiently). On the other hand, when the expert is highly competent (high β), very little online data is needed to find the optimal action (almost constant regret).

While further work is needed to make this approach practical for RLHF, the results presented here provide strong theoretical and empirical justification of its viability. Many extensions are possible: online learning when only preference feedback is available during the online phase (in the appendix, we provide preliminary empirical results for such an extension), extension to contextual bandits (e.g., a linear bandit model), and to a batch version, i.e., the algorithm takes a batch of decisions in choosing action pairs on which the human raters then provide feedback during the online phase. These developments, while important, are beyond the scope of this paper, and left as future work.

References

- [1] Akhil Agnihotri, Prathamesh Saraf, and Kriti Rajesh Bapnad. A convolutional neural network approach towards self-driving cars. In *2019 IEEE 16th India Council International Conference (INDICON)*, pages 1–4, 2019. doi: 10.1109/INDICON47234.2019.9030307.
- [2] Akhil Agnihotri, Rahul Jain, and Haipeng Luo. Average-constrained policy optimization. In *OPT 2023: Optimization for Machine Learning*, 2023.
- [3] Shubhada Agrawal, Sandeep Juneja, Karthikeyan Shanmugam, and Arun Sai Suggala. Optimal best-arm identification in bandits with access to offline data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09048*, 2023.
- [4] Nir Ailon. Active learning ranking from pairwise preferences with almost optimal query complexity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 24, 2011.
- [5] Siddhartha Banerjee, Sean R Sinclair, Milind Tambe, Lily Xu, and Christina Lee Yu. Artificial replay: a meta-algorithm for harnessing historical data in bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00025*, 2022.
- [6] Mark Beliaev, Andy Shih, Stefano Ermon, Dorsa Sadigh, and Ramtin Pedarsani. Imitation learning by estimating expertise of demonstrators. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1732–1748. PMLR, 2022.
- [7] Mark Beliaev, Andy Shih, Stefano Ermon, Dorsa Sadigh, and Ramtin Pedarsani. Imitation learning by estimating expertise of demonstrators. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1732–1748. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/beliaev22a.html>.
- [8] Viktor Bengs, Róbert Busa-Fekete, Adil El Mesaoudi-Paul, and Eyke Hüllermeier. Preference-based online learning with dueling bandits: A survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22 (7):1–108, 2021.
- [9] Djallel Bouneffouf, Srinivasan Parthasarathy, Horst Samulowitz, and Martin Wistub. Optimal exploitation of clustering and history information in multi-armed bandit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03979*, 2019.
- [10] Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E. Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952. ISSN 00063444. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2334029>.
- [11] Miroslav Dudík, Katja Hofmann, Robert E Schapire, Aleksandrs Slivkins, and Masrour Zoghi. Contextual dueling bandits. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 563–587. PMLR, 2015.
- [12] Vikranth Dwaracherla, Zheng Wen, Ian Osband, Xiuyuan Lu, Seyed Mohammad Asghari, and Benjamin Van Roy. Ensembles for uncertainty estimation: Benefits of prior functions and bootstrapping. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- [13] Botao Hao, Rahul Jain, Tor Lattimore, Benjamin Van Roy, and Zheng Wen. Leveraging demonstrations to improve online learning: Quality matters. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12527–12545. PMLR, 2023.
- [14] He He, Jason Eisner, and Hal Daume. Imitation learning by coaching. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25, 2012.
- [15] Neil Houlsby, Ferenc Huszár, Zoubin Ghahramani, and Máté Lengyel. Bayesian active learning for classification and preference learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1112.5745*, 2011.
- [16] Hanjiang Hu, Zuxin Liu, Sharad Chitlangia, Akhil Agnihotri, and Ding Zhao. Investigating the impact of multi-lidar placement on object detection for autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the*

- IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2550–2559, June 2022.
- [17] Tomasz Korbak, Kejian Shi, Angelica Chen, Rasika Vinayak Bhalerao, Christopher Buckley, Jason Phang, Samuel R Bowman, and Ethan Perez. Pretraining language models with human preferences. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17506–17533. PMLR, 2023.
- [18] Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [19] Zihao Li, Xiang Ji, Minshuo Chen, and Mengdi Wang. Policy evaluation for reinforcement learning from human feedback: A sample complexity analysis. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2737–2745. PMLR, 2024.
- [20] Xiuyuan Lu and Benjamin Van Roy. Ensemble sampling. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/49ad23d1ec9fa4bd8d77d02681df5cfa-Paper.pdf.
- [21] Katerina Margatina, Giorgos Vernikos, Loïc Barrault, and Nikolaos Aletras. Active learning by acquiring contrastive examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03764*, 2021.
- [22] Pascal Massart. The tight constant in the dvoretzky-kiefer-wolfowitz inequality. *The annals of Probability*, pages 1269–1283, 1990.
- [23] Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Cross-task generalization via natural language crowdsourcing instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08773*, 2021.
- [24] Donald J Newman. The double dixie cup problem. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 67(1): 58–61, 1960.
- [25] Ian Osband, Benjamin Van Roy, Daniel J Russo, Zheng Wen, et al. Deep exploration via randomized value functions. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 20(124):1–62, 2019.
- [26] Chao Qin, Zheng Wen, Xiuyuan Lu, and Benjamin Van Roy. An analysis of ensemble sampling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:21602–21614, 2022.
- [27] Pengzhen Ren, Yun Xiao, Xiaojun Chang, Po-Yao Huang, Zhihui Li, Brij B Gupta, Xiaojiang Chen, and Xin Wang. A survey of deep active learning. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 54(9): 1–40, 2021.
- [28] Daniel Russo. Simple bayesian algorithms for best arm identification. In *29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, pages 1417–1418. PMLR, 2016. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v49/russo16.html>.
- [29] Daniel J Russo, Benjamin Van Roy, Abbas Kazerouni, Ian Osband, Zheng Wen, et al. A tutorial on thompson sampling. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(1):1–96, 2018.
- [30] Pannagadatta Shivaswamy and Thorsten Joachims. Multi-armed bandit problems with history. In Neil D. Lawrence and Mark Girolami, editors, *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 22 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1046–1054, La Palma, Canary Islands, 21–23 Apr 2012. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v22/shivaswamy12.html>.
- [31] Balázs Szörényi, Róbert Busa-Fekete, Adil Paul, and Eyke Hüllermeier. Online rank elicitation for plackett-luce: A dueling bandits approach. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [32] Roman Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*, 2010.

- [33] Huasen Wu and Xin Liu. Double thompson sampling for dueling bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [34] Xinyi Yan, Chengxi Luo, Charles LA Clarke, Nick Craswell, Ellen M Voorhees, and Pablo Castells. Human preferences as dueling bandits. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 567–577, 2022.
- [35] Yisong Yue, Josef Broder, Robert Kleinberg, and Thorsten Joachims. The k-armed dueling bandits problem. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 78(5):1538–1556, 2012.
- [36] Chicheng Zhang, Alekh Agarwal, Hal Daumé Iii, John Langford, and Sahand Negahban. Warm-starting contextual bandits: Robustly combining supervised and bandit feedback. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7335–7344. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/zhang19b.html>.

A Appendix

This appendix is structured as follows.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Section A.1 | First building block of main result Theorem 4.2 . Deals with two actions and understanding comparison noises. Contains Lemma A.1 and proofs. |
| Section A.2 | Second building block. Deals with multiple actions but no comparison noises i.e. $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. Contains Lemma A.2 and proofs. |
| Section A.3 | Final building block. Combines the results from Lemmas A.1 and A.2 , and gives proof of Theorem 4.2 . |
| Section A.4 | Concerns regret analysis, and contains proofs of Lemma 4.5 given in Lemmas A.3 and A.4 . |
| Section A.5 | Contains details on Bayesian bootstrapping of <code>warmPref-PS</code> and proof of Lemma 5.1 . |
| Section A.6 | Gives proof of concept of <code>warmTSOF</code> algorithm and experimental results. |
| Section A.7 | Empirical results on the effect of the action space dynamics. |

A.1 Understanding Two Actions and Finite Deliberateness

In the building block towards Theorem 4.2, we consider the case with $K = 2$ and hence $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, a_1\}$, which means $\bar{A}_i^{(0)} = a_0$ and $\bar{A}_i^{(1)} = a_1$ for all $i \in [N]$. Here, we focus on understanding how the comparison noises, due to finite deliberateness, affect the results. In other words, we see how the effect of deliberateness results in more than one sample being required to determine the optimal action with high probability.

Essentially, given an offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 , we construct a *warm*-posterior of the likelihood that an action is optimal. Based on this posterior over the actions, we can construct an action subset $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0} \subset \mathcal{A}$ with $|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}| = 1$.

A.1.1 Constructing the Algorithm

In this part, we deal with the question that given an offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 , how to develop an algorithm to constructing an action subset $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{A}$ with $|\mathcal{U}| = 1$.

For this, we need to calculate the posterior distribution of an action being optimal given the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 . If $P(a_0 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0) > P(a_1 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0)$, then $\mathcal{U} = \{a_0\}$, else $\mathcal{U} = \{a_1\}$. Let $p_0 := \exp(\beta \langle a_0, \vartheta \rangle)$ and $p_1 := \exp(\beta \langle a_1, \vartheta \rangle)$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(a_0 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0) &= \frac{P(\mathcal{D}_0 | a_0 = A^*) \cdot P(a_0 = A^*)}{P(\mathcal{D}_0)} \\
&= \frac{\int P(\mathcal{D}_0 | a_0 = A^*; \vartheta) d\vartheta \cdot P(a_0 = A^*)}{\int \int P(\mathcal{D}_0 | \beta, \lambda) d\lambda d\beta} \\
&= \frac{\int \left(\frac{p_0}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N d\vartheta \cdot P(a_0 = A^*; \theta_0)}{\int \int P(\mathcal{D}_0 | \beta, \lambda) d\lambda d\beta} \quad (\theta_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \Sigma_0)) \\
&= \frac{\int \left(\frac{p_0}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N d\vartheta \cdot P(\langle a_0, \theta_0 \rangle \geq \langle a_1, \theta_0 \rangle)}{\int \int P(\mathcal{D}_0 | \beta, \lambda) d\lambda d\beta} \\
&= \frac{\int \left(\frac{p_0}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N d\vartheta}{\int \int P(\mathcal{D}_0 | \beta, \lambda) d\lambda d\beta} \cdot P(\langle a_0 - a_1, \theta_0 \rangle \geq 0) \\
&= \frac{\int \left(\frac{p_0}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N d\vartheta}{\int \int P(\mathcal{D}_0 | \beta, \lambda) d\lambda d\beta} \cdot \left(1 - \Phi \left(- \frac{(a_0 - a_1)^T \mu_0}{\sqrt{(a_0 - a_1)^T \Sigma_0 (a_0 - a_1)}} \right) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

, where Φ is the CDF of the standard normal distribution. Similar expression follows for $P(a_1 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0) = 1 - P(a_0 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0)$.

A.1.2 Limiting Behaviour of the Algorithm for Optimal Expert

Here, we see that under our specified algorithm, for any offline data size $N \geq 1$, as $\beta, \lambda \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{A^*\}$ almost surely. It is easy to see this. As $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\vartheta \rightarrow \theta_0$. Then,

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty, \vartheta \rightarrow \theta_0} \left(\frac{p_0}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty, \vartheta \rightarrow \theta_0} \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta \langle a_0 - a_1, \vartheta \rangle}} \right)^N.$$

Now observe that if $\beta, \lambda \rightarrow \infty$, if $a_1 = A^*$, then $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \langle a_0 - a_1, \vartheta \rangle \leq 0 \Rightarrow \lim_{\beta, \lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{p_0}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow P(a_0 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0) \rightarrow 0$. Same holds for when $\beta, \lambda \rightarrow \infty$ and if a_0 is optimal. Which means the specified decision rule above converges with $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{A^*\}$ almost surely.

A.1.3 Limiting Behaviour of the Algorithm for Large Datasets

Here, we show that under our specified algorithm, for any finite $\beta > 0$, as $\lambda, N \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{A^*\}$ almost surely.

For this, we just calculate the ratio $\lim_{\lambda, N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P(a_0 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0)}{P(a_1 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0)}$ and check whether it tends to zero or infinity. Let $x := \frac{(a_0 - a_1)^T \mu_0}{\sqrt{(a_0 - a_1)^T \Sigma_0 (a_0 - a_1)}}$. So then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda, N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P(a_0 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0)}{P(a_1 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0)} &= \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \theta_0, N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left(\frac{p_0}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N \cdot (1 - \Phi(-x))}{\left(\frac{p_1}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N \cdot (1 - \Phi(x))} \\ &= \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \theta_0, N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{p_0}{p_1} \right)^N \cdot \frac{\Phi(x)}{1 - \Phi(x)} \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [\exp(\beta \langle a_0 - a_1, \theta_0 \rangle)]^N \cdot \frac{\Phi(x)}{1 - \Phi(x)} \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can apply the same argument of, if $a_0 = A^*$, then $\langle a_0 - a_1, \theta_0 \rangle \geq 0$ to see that the above expression tends to positive infinity for any finite $\beta > 0$. Hence, we can construct $\mathcal{U} = \{A^*\}$ almost surely.

A.1.4 Sample Complexity for Finite Deliberateness

In this part, we consider for any finite $\beta > 0$, as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, and any given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, under our specified algorithm, how large does N need to be to ensure $P(\mathcal{U} = \{A^*\}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$?

Lemma A.1. *For an action set $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, a_1\}$ and any finite $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, with $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ and for some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the size of the offline dataset to ensure $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0} = \{A^*\}$ and hence $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative is:*

$$N \geq \frac{\ln \left(\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(x)} - 1 \right) \right)}{\beta \langle a_0 - a_1, \theta_0 \rangle}, \quad (10)$$

where $x := \frac{(a_0 - a_1)^T \mu_0}{\sqrt{(a_0 - a_1)^T \Sigma_0 (a_0 - a_1)}}$, and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard Normal CDF.

Proof. Assume $A^* = a_0$. Then, we want $P(a_0 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0) > 1 - \epsilon$ and $P(a_1 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0) < \epsilon$. Letting Let $x := \frac{(a_0 - a_1)^T \mu_0}{\sqrt{(a_0 - a_1)^T \Sigma_0 (a_0 - a_1)}}$ same as before and taking the ratio of these as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ for a finite $\beta, N > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P(a_0 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0)}{P(a_1 = A^* | \mathcal{D}_0)} &= \lim_{\vartheta \rightarrow \theta_0} \frac{\left(\frac{p_0}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N \cdot (1 - \Phi(-x))}{\left(\frac{p_1}{p_0 + p_1} \right)^N \cdot (1 - \Phi(x))} > \frac{1 - \epsilon}{\epsilon} \\ &= [\exp(\beta \langle a_0 - a_1, \theta_0 \rangle)]^N \cdot \frac{\Phi(x)}{1 - \Phi(x)} > \frac{1}{\epsilon} - 1 \quad (11) \\ &\Rightarrow N > \frac{\ln \left(\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(x)} - 1 \right) \right)}{\beta \langle a_0 - a_1, \theta_0 \rangle}. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, similar argument holds for if $A^* = a_1$. □

A.2 Understanding Multiple Actions and Infinite Deliberateness

In this building block towards Theorem 4.2, we focus on the case with $\lambda = \beta = \infty$. In other words, there are no comparison noises. Moreover, as before, the two actions $\bar{A}_n^{(0)}$ and $\bar{A}_n^{(1)}$ are i.i.d. sampled from a distribution μ over \mathcal{A} . With this, we understand how this sampling distribution μ affects the results.

For a finite dataset \mathcal{D}_0 of size N , let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0} \subset \mathcal{A}$ be the set consisting of all unique actions occurring in \mathcal{D}_0 . Then, the informative set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ can be constructed with two types of actions : (i) actions not appearing in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ (ii) actions occurring in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ that have not ‘lost’ the comparison with any another action. We begin by constructing an algorithm for this analysis.

A.2.1 Developing the Algorithm

For a finite dataset \mathcal{D}_0 of size N , let $\mathcal{U}_N \subset \mathcal{A}$ be the set consisting of all unique actions occurring in \mathcal{D}_0 . Then, \mathcal{U} can be constructed with two types of actions : (i) actions not appearing in \mathcal{U}_N (ii) actions occurring in \mathcal{U}_N that have not ‘lost’ the comparison with any another action. For this, let \mathcal{C}_i be the set of comparisons from \mathcal{D}_0 involving action a_i i.e. $\mathcal{C}_i = \{(\bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, Y_n) ; \bar{A}_n^{(0)} = a_i \text{ or } \bar{A}_n^{(1)} = a_i, n \in [N]\}$. Hence, construct $\mathcal{U} = (\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N) \cup \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}$, where $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N} := \{a_i \in \mathcal{U}_N ; Y_j = a_i \forall (\bar{A}_j^{(0)}, \bar{A}_j^{(1)}, Y_j) \in \mathcal{C}_i\}$.

Note here that the conditions mentioned above are tight conditions, which can be analyzed in the case of uniform action sampling distribution ($\mu = \text{Uniform}(\cdot)$). However, in the case of an arbitrary distribution such analysis is intractable. In this case, we then only consider the sufficient condition to obtain complete ordering of actions. The sufficient condition to determine the optimal action with high probability is to sample each pair of actions at least once i.e. sample each of $\binom{K}{2}$ pairs once.

A.2.2 Finding the Optimal Action Given a Large Dataset

Here, we show that the construction procedure as described above in Part A.2.1 yields in finding the optimal action given a large dataset. More formally, we show that if the action sampling distribution μ is not degenerate i.e. $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P(a \in \mathcal{U}_N) > 0 \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$, then as $N \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{A^*\}$ almost surely.

To see this, if μ is not degenerate, then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P(a \in \mathcal{U}_N) > 0 \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N) = \emptyset$. In addition, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, for all possible pairs of actions (a_i, a_j) with $a_i \neq a_j \in \mathcal{A}$, we will have $\bar{A}_n^{(0)} = a_i$ and $\bar{A}_n^{(1)} = a_j$ for some $(\bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, Y_n) \in \mathcal{D}_0$. Due to the construction of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}$, we will also have $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N} = \{A^*\}$ almost surely. This implies $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U} = \{A^*\}$.

Now that we know that the construction procedure of \mathcal{U}_N is principled, we wish to generalize the result for finite size of the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 .

A.2.3 General Sample Complexity Analysis

In this section, we present results for the following question : In general, how large N need be to ensure that $P(|\mathcal{U}| = \iota(K))$, or even $P(|\mathcal{U}| = 1)$ with high probability? We aim to derive this result for an arbitrary action sampling distribution μ , however we begin by analyzing the case of uniform distribution i.e. $\mu \sim \text{Uniform}(\cdot)$.

General analysis of probability of picking all n items in N trials.

Here, we describe the general theoretical framework to bound the probabilities of picking *all* of n given items in N independent trials. We first begin with a uniform distribution over each of these n items and later generalize to an arbitrary distribution μ . Note that we derive a general result for n items, which in our case corresponds to actions ($n = K$) or action pairs ($n = \binom{K}{2}$).

- **Uniform distribution.** We have n items which are equally likely to be selected, so we can invoke the Stirling numbers of the second kind (or Stirling partition number) to get a bound on this probability. Stirling numbers of the second kind give the number of ways to partition a set of u objects into v non-empty subsets and is denoted by $S(u, v)$. For notation, we have n items to be selected, N as the number of trials.

Now, let S_i be all the outcomes in which an item i is *not* selected. For each i , $|S_i| = (n-1)^N$ and there are $\binom{n}{1}$ choices for i . For each $j \neq i$, $|S_j \cap S_i| = (n-2)^N$ and there are $\binom{n}{2}$ choices for (i, j) . Continuing in this manner to count the number of outcomes missing at least 1 number, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^n S_i \right| &= \sum_{i=1}^n |S_i| - \sum_{j < i} |S_j \cap S_i| + \sum_{k < j < i} |S_k \cap S_j \cap S_i| - \dots \\ &= \binom{n}{1} (n-1)^N - \binom{n}{2} (n-2)^N + \binom{n}{3} (n-3)^N - \dots \end{aligned}$$

Since there are a total of n^N total outcomes, we get the number of desired outcomes in which *all* possible numbers are rolled, denoted by $\#_{\text{desired}}$ as

$$\#_{\text{desired}} = n^N - \binom{n}{1} (n-1)^N + \binom{n}{2} (n-2)^N - \binom{n}{3} (n-3)^N + \dots$$

Thus, the probability $p_{n,N}$ of picking all n items in N trials is $\frac{\#_{\text{desired}}}{n^N}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{n,N} &= 1 - \binom{n}{1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^N + \binom{n}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^N - \binom{n}{3} \left(1 - \frac{3}{n}\right)^N + \dots \\ \Rightarrow p_{n,N} &= \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right)^N \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

- **Arbitrary Distribution.** Assume now that the actions are sampled from an action sampling distribution μ . Since we are forming action pairs for comparison, denote with $\hat{\mu}_k$, the probability of sampling action pair $k := (i, j) \in \left[\binom{K}{2}\right]$ and with $\sum_k \hat{\mu}_k = 1$, with (i, j) representing the action pair (a_i, a_j) . Furthermore, this means that assume that $\mu_{\min}^2 \leq \hat{\mu}_k \leq \mu_{\max}^2 \forall k$ for some arbitrary $0 < \mu_{\min} \leq \mu_{\max} < 1$.

For this problem, let T_i denote the random number of trials needed to sample item i for the first time. The total number of trials needed can be then denoted by the random variable $T = \max(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. Note that T_i is a geometric random variable with parameter $\hat{\mu}_i$, but now these variables are no more independent. Since the minimum of T_i and T_j is the number of trials needed to obtain either item i or item j , it follows that for $j \neq i$, $\min(T_i, T_j)$ is a geometric random variable with parameter $\hat{\mu}_i + \hat{\mu}_j$ and the same holds true for the minimum of any finite number of these random variables. Hence, we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T] &= \mathbb{E}[\max T_i] \\ &= \sum_i \mathbb{E}[T_i] - \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{E}[\min(T_i, T_j)] + \sum_{i < j < k} \mathbb{E}[\min(T_i, T_j, T_k)] - \dots + (-1)^{n+1} \mathbb{E}[\min(T_1, \dots, T_n)] \\ &= \sum_i \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}_i} - \sum_{i < j} \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}_i + \hat{\mu}_j} + \sum_{i < j < k} \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}_i + \hat{\mu}_j + \hat{\mu}_k} - \dots + (-1)^{n+1} \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}_1 + \dots + \hat{\mu}_n} \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\int_0^\infty e^{-tx} dx = \frac{1}{t}$. We also know the identity

$$1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - e^{-t_i x}) = \sum_i e^{-t_i x} - \sum_{i < j} e^{-(t_i + t_j)x} + \dots + (-1)^{n+1} e^{-(t_1 + \dots + t_n)x} \quad (13)$$

Using the above identity, and integrating it, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[T] = \int_0^\infty \left(1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - e^{-\hat{\mu}_i x})\right) dx \quad (14)$$

Lemma A.2. Let the action set be $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, \dots, a_K\}$, with a sampling distribution μ such that $0 < \mu_{\min} \leq \mu_k \leq \mu_{\max} < 1 \forall k \in [K]$. For the case of $\beta, \lambda \rightarrow \infty$, with some given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the minimum size of the offline dataset to ensure $\mathcal{U}_{D_0} = \{A^*\}$ and hence is $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative is given by

$$\text{Uniform } \mu : N \geq \frac{K^2 \ln K}{\epsilon} \quad ; \quad \text{Arbitrary } \mu : N \gtrsim \frac{\ln K}{\mu_{\min}^2 \epsilon} \quad (15)$$

Proof. We first begin by proving the case of uniform action sampling distribution, and then extend the results to an arbitrary distribution.

Uniform Distribution.

If $|\mathcal{U}| = 1$, then $|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N| = 1 \wedge |\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 0$ OR $|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N| = 0 \wedge |\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 1$.

Case 1. $|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N| = 1$ and $|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 0$.

For the former, we simply do not want to select the optimal action while making action pairs, and hence the probability is:

$$P(|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N| = 1) \geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{K}\right)^N$$

For the latter, we use Equation (12) with $n = \binom{K-1}{2}$ to get

$$P(|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 0) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{\binom{K-1}{2}} (-1)^i \binom{\binom{K-1}{2}}{i} \left(1 - \frac{i}{\binom{K-1}{2}}\right)^N.$$

Case 2. $|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N| = 0$ and $|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 1$.

In this case, if all pairs are sampled at least once, the event $\{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 1\}$ is a sufficient condition for event $\{|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N| = 0\}$ to occur. Hence, we use Equation (12) with $n = \binom{K}{2}$ to get the probability as:

$$P(|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 1) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{\binom{K}{2}} (-1)^i \binom{\binom{K}{2}}{i} \left(1 - \frac{i}{\binom{K}{2}}\right)^N.$$

Putting it all together, we need

$$1 - \epsilon \leq P(|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N| = 1) \cdot P(|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 0) + P(|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 1)$$

However, the above form is intractable to solve for a closed form solution. Hence, we use the Stirling number approximation for factorials (i.e. $\ln(n!) \approx n \ln(n) - n$) and approximation of the Stirling number of second kind i.e. $S(u, v) \leq n \ln(n) - n \ln(\ln(n)) + n \ln(k)$, where $S(u, v) = \sum_{i=0}^v \frac{(-1)^{v-i} i^u}{(v-i)!}$. In addition, we also Stirling's approximation to the binomial as $\binom{a}{b} \approx \frac{a^b}{b!}$ for $a \gg b$. Using these, the expression simplifies to $N \geq \frac{K^2 \ln K}{\epsilon}$.

Arbitrary Distribution.

Similar to the case of uniform distribution, we still need

$$1 - \epsilon \leq P(|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{U}_N| = 1) \cdot P(|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 0) + P(|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 1)$$

However, a closed form solution for the above does not exist for the case of multiple actions. Instead, we aim to derive the result based on the sufficient condition for obtaining the optimal action : if all pairs of actions are sampled at least once, we know the optimal action. For this, we just need $P(|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{U}_N}| = 1) \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

Recalling from the analysis given above in Section A.2.3, T_i denotes the random number of trials needed to sample item i for the first time. The total number of trials needed can be then denoted by the random variable $T = \max(T_1, \dots, T_n)$.

Now, since T is a random variable denoting the total number of trials needed to obtain all n items at least once, it can also be viewed as the *stopping time* for when the agent has collected all items. Hence,

we are interested in the probability $P(T \leq N)$ i.e. the probability that this stopping time T is less than the dataset size N . This is because the event $\{T \leq N\}$ is the event that by time (or dataset size) N , the agent has sampled all n items.

We then also have $P(T \leq N) = 1 - P(T > N)$. Since N is non-negative, we can bound the $P(T > N)$ using a concentration inequality as below using Equation (14).

$$P(T > N) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[T]}{N} = \frac{1}{N} \int_0^\infty \left(1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - e^{-\hat{\mu}_i x})\right) dx$$

$$\Rightarrow P(T \leq N) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{N} \int_0^\infty \left(1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - e^{-\hat{\mu}_i x})\right) dx \quad (16)$$

$$\geq 1 - \frac{1}{N} \int_0^\infty \left(\sum_i e^{-\hat{\mu}_i x} - \sum_{i < j} e^{-(\hat{\mu}_i + \hat{\mu}_j)x} + \dots + (-1)^{n+1} e^{-(\hat{\mu}_1 + \dots + \hat{\mu}_n)x}\right) dx$$

(using Identity (13))

$$\geq 1 - \frac{1}{N\mu_{\min}^2} \left(\binom{n}{1} \frac{1}{1} - \binom{n}{2} \frac{1}{2} + \dots + (-1)^{n+1} \frac{\binom{n}{n}}{n}\right) \quad (17)$$

$$\geq 1 - \frac{H_n}{N\mu_{\min}^2} \quad (18)$$

, where H_n is the Harmonic sum of the first n natural numbers. Now, we wish that $P(T \leq N) \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Using the bound above, we find that we need

$$N \geq \frac{H_n}{\mu_{\min}^2 \epsilon} \gtrsim \frac{\ln K}{\mu_{\min}^2 \epsilon}.$$

□

A.3 Understanding Multiple Actions and Finite Deliberateness

We can break the expected number of samples needed to find an optimal action into parts and then use a generalized version of the Coupon Collection problem, solution of which is known [24]. The first deals with using Equation (10) to find the minimum samples needed to determine the more likely optimal action between two actions (one pair) with high probability of $(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2n})$, where n is total number of items. Here, n would be the number of pairs i.e. $n = \binom{K}{2}$. The second part deals with finding the bound on total number of samples needed to determine the more likely optimal action for every such pair.

Finding the better action in the i^{th} item (pair). The expected number of samples needed to find the better action can be calculated using Equation (10). Call this number k_i . So,

$$k_i \geq \frac{\ln \left(\left(\frac{2\binom{K}{2}}{\epsilon} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(x_i)} - 1 \right) \right)}{\beta \langle a_i^{(0)} - a_i^{(1)}, \theta_0 \rangle},$$

where $x_i := \frac{(a_i^{(0)} - a_i^{(1)})^T \mu_0}{\sqrt{(a_i^{(0)} - a_i^{(1)})^T \Sigma_0 (a_i^{(0)} - a_i^{(1)})}}$, $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the CDF of the standard Normal distribution, and

$(a_i^{(0)}, a_i^{(1)})$ are the actions of the i^{th} pair.

Theorem 4.2. *Let the action set \mathcal{A} have size K with a sampling distribution μ such that $0 < \mu_{\min} \leq \mu_k \leq \mu_{\max} < 1, \forall k \in [K]$. Given some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and finite $\beta < \infty$, let $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose that the set*

$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ constructed in Appendix A.3 is a singleton, then it is $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative if

$$N > N_0 := \frac{\ln K + (k_{\max} - 1) \ln \ln K}{\mu_{\min}^2 \epsilon}, \quad \text{where} \quad (5)$$

$$k_{\max} = \max_{i,j \in [K]} \frac{\ln \left(\left(\frac{2K^2}{\epsilon} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(x_{i,j})} - 1 \right) \right)}{\beta \langle a_i - a_j, \theta_0 \rangle}, \quad x_{i,j} = \frac{(a_i - a_j)^T \mu_0}{\sqrt{(a_i - a_j)^T \Sigma_0 (a_i - a_j)}}.$$

and, N is the size of the preference dataset and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard Normal CDF.

Proof. Our sample complexity analysis to achieve no Bayesian regret can be broken down into three main building blocks:

- Appendix A.1 and Lemma A.1 : there are only two actions ($|\mathcal{A}| = 2$) but we have finite deliberateness ($\beta < \infty$).
- Appendix A.2 and Lemma A.2: there are many actions ($|\mathcal{A}| = K$) but we have very high deliberateness ($\beta \rightarrow \infty$).
- Appendix A.3 : there are many actions ($|\mathcal{A}| = K$) and finite deliberateness, where we combine the results from the first two cases. In this case, we can break the expected number of samples needed to find an optimal action into two parts. The first deals with using Lemma A.1 to find the minimum samples needed to determine the more likely optimal action between two actions (one pair) with high probability of $(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2n})$, where n is total number of items. Here, n would be the number of pairs i.e. $n = \binom{K}{2}$. The second part deals with finding the bound on total number of samples needed to determine the more likely optimal action for *every* such pair.

With this in mind, we prove the result below.

[24] gave a generalization of the coupon collector's problem when m copies of each coupon need to be collected with total coupons being n . Let T_m be the first time m copies of *each* coupon are collected. We then know that $\mathbb{E}[T_m] = n \ln n + (m - 1)n \ln(\ln n)$.

Using similar analysis as before for a general action pair sampling distribution μ with $\mu_{\min} \leq \mu_i \leq \mu_{\max}$ for some $\mu_{\min}, \mu_{\max} \in [0, 1]$ for all items (pairs) $i \in [n]$, we can derive the general sampling result. Adapting it to our setting, we need k_i samples for i^{th} pair, and we have $n = \binom{K}{2}$ pairs. Letting $T_{k_{\max}}$ denote the total number of samples needed to obtain k_{\max} number of samples for each item (pair),

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{k_{\max}}] \leq \frac{1}{\mu_{\min}^2} [2 \ln(n) + (k_{\max} - 1) \ln(\ln(n))] \quad ; \quad n = \binom{K}{2}, \quad k_{\max} = \max_{i \in [n]} k_i$$

Denoting $T_{k_{\max}}$ as the random stopping time when at least k_{\max} occurrences of all n items have been collected, we need $P(T_{k_{\max}} > N) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, where N is the size of the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 . Hence, using Markov inequality, we can bound it as:

$$N \geq \frac{\ln K + (k_{\max} - 1) \ln \ln K}{\mu_{\min}^2 \epsilon} \quad \text{where,} \quad (19)$$

$$k_{\max} = \max_{i,j \in [K]} \frac{\ln \left(\left(\frac{2K^2}{\epsilon} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(x_{i,j})} - 1 \right) \right)}{\beta \langle a_i - a_j, \theta_0 \rangle}, \quad x_{i,j} = \frac{(a_i - a_j)^T \mu_0}{\sqrt{(a_i - a_j)^T \Sigma_0 (a_i - a_j)}}$$

□

A.4 Regret Analysis Continued

In this appendix section, we provide the building block proofs that allow us to construct a prior-dependent Bayesian regret bound on the warmPref-PS algorithm. The heart of these proofs lies in constructing a $(1 - \epsilon)$ -informative set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ from the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 .

Lemma A.3. $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ is $(1 - f_1)$ -informative.

Proof. We construct $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ as a set of actions that have been preferred to *at least* once in the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 and of actions that do not appear in the \mathcal{D}_0 . Thus, $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ contains at most K actions.

Now, we consider the formulation below. Recall that $\bar{A}_n^{(0)}$ and $\bar{A}_n^{(1)}$ are i.i.d. sampled from the action set and each datapoint in the dataset \mathcal{D}_0^i , conditioned on ϑ, β , is independent of \mathcal{D}_0^j for $i \neq j$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(A^* \notin \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) &\leq P(A^* \text{ has lost all comparisons in } \mathcal{D}_0) + P(A^* \text{ is not present in } \mathcal{D}_0) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{n=1}^N \frac{\exp(\beta \langle a_n, \vartheta \rangle)}{\exp(\beta \langle a_n, \vartheta \rangle) + \exp(\beta \langle A^*, \vartheta \rangle)} + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{n=1}^N \left(1 - \frac{\exp(\beta \langle A^*, \vartheta \rangle)}{\exp(\beta \langle a_n, \vartheta \rangle) + \exp(\beta \langle A^*, \vartheta \rangle)} \right) \right] + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N} \quad (20) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{n=1}^N \left(1 - \underbrace{\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\beta \langle A^* - a_n, \vartheta \rangle)}}_{\clubsuit} \right) \right] + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N}
\end{aligned}$$

, where A^* is a function of θ and thus a random variable as well. Looking closely at the term \clubsuit above, it can be written as $P(Y_n = A^* | \vartheta)$. We now analyze this term.

$$\begin{aligned}
P(Y_n = A^* | \vartheta) &= \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\beta \langle A^* - a_n, \vartheta \rangle)} \\
&= \left(1 + \exp(\beta \langle A^* - a_n, \theta - \vartheta \rangle - \beta \langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle) \right)^{-1} \\
&\geq \left(1 + \exp(\beta \|A^* - a_n\|_1 \|\theta - \vartheta\|_\infty - \beta \langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle) \right)^{-1} \quad (\text{H\"older's inequality}) \\
&\geq \left(1 + \exp(\beta \|\vartheta - \theta\|_\infty - \beta \langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle) \right)^{-1} \quad (\|A^* - a_n\|_1 \leq 1 \quad \forall a_n \in \mathcal{A})
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\vartheta - \theta \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_d/\lambda^2)$, using the Dvoretzky–Kiefer–Wolfowitz inequality bound [22, 32] implies

$$P(\|\vartheta - \theta\|_\infty \geq t) \leq 2d^{1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{t^2 \lambda^2}{2}\right).$$

Set $t = \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)}/\lambda$ and define an event $\mathcal{E}_1 := \{\|\vartheta - \theta\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)}/\lambda\}$ such that $P(\mathcal{E}_1^c) \leq 1/T$. We decompose Equation (20) using Union Bound as:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(A^* \notin \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{n=1}^N (1 - P(Y_n = A^* | \theta, \vartheta)) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_1} \right] + P(\mathcal{E}_1^c) + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{n=1}^N \left(1 - \left(1 + \exp\left(\frac{\beta \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)}}{\lambda} \right) \underbrace{\exp(-\beta \langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle)}_{\blacktriangle} \right)^{-1} \right) \right] + \frac{1}{T} + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N}. \quad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we define another event $\mathcal{E}_{(n)} := \{\langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle \leq \Delta\}$. Based on $\mathcal{E}_{(n)}$ we analyze the \blacktriangle term as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp(-\beta \langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle) &= \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\beta \langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_{(n)}}] + \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\beta \langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_{(n)}^c}] \\
&\leq \exp(0) P(\mathcal{E}_{(n)}) + \exp(-\beta \Delta) P(\mathcal{E}_{(n)}^c) \\
&\leq P(\mathcal{E}_{(n)}) + (1 - P(\mathcal{E}_{(n)})) \exp(-\beta \Delta)
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this back in Equation (21) we get,

$$P(A^* \notin \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{n=1}^N \left(1 - \left(1 + \exp\left(\frac{\beta \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)}}{\lambda} \right) (\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_{(n)}} + (1 - \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_{(n)}}) \exp(-\beta \Delta)) \right)^{-1} \right) \right] + \frac{1}{T} + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N} \quad (22)$$

Note that the random variable $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_{(n)}}$ depends on the action sampling distribution μ . Denote the probability of sampling this action a_n by μ_n , and as before we have μ supported by $[\mu_{\min}, \mu_{\max}]$. We first analyze this for any arbitrary $n \in [N]$ and study the the distribution of $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_{(n)}}$ conditioned on A^* . Without loss of generality, we first condition on $A^* = \hat{a}$ for some $\hat{a} \in \mathcal{A}$. For that, let $\rho(\cdot)$ be the univariate Gaussian distribution and $\theta_a = \langle a, \theta \rangle$ for any action a .

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_{(n)}} = 1 | A^* = \hat{a}) &= P(\mathbb{I}(\langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle \leq \Delta) = 1 | A^* = \hat{a}) \\
&= \frac{1}{P(A^* = \hat{a})} P(\mathbb{I}(\langle A^* - a_n, \theta \rangle \leq \Delta) = 1, A^* = \hat{a}) \\
&= \frac{1}{P(A^* = \hat{a})} P\left(\mathbb{I}(\theta_{a_n} \geq \theta_{\hat{a}} - \Delta) = 1, \bigcap_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \{\theta_{\hat{a}} \geq \theta_a\}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{P(A^* = \hat{a})} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{\theta_{\hat{a}} - \Delta}^{\infty} d\rho(\theta) \right] d\rho(\theta_{\hat{a}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{P(A^* = \hat{a})} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{\theta_{\hat{a}} - \Delta}^{\theta_{\hat{a}}} d\rho(\theta) \right] d\rho(\theta_{\hat{a}}) \quad (\text{since } \theta_a \leq \theta_{A^*} \ \forall a)
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Noticing that the term inside the integral can be represented as a distribution, we first find a normalizing constant to represent the probabilities. So, define

$$\Phi(\theta_{\hat{a}}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\theta_{\hat{a}}} (2\pi)^{-1/2} \exp(-x^2/2) dx \quad ; \quad g(\theta_{\hat{a}}) = \frac{1}{\Phi(\theta_{\hat{a}})} \int_{\theta_{\hat{a}} - \Delta}^{\theta_{\hat{a}}} d\rho(\theta) .$$

For fixed $\theta_{\hat{a}}$, let $X_{\theta_{\hat{a}}} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1, g(\theta_{\hat{a}}))$. With Eq. (23) and letting $d\mu(\theta_{\hat{a}}) = \frac{\Phi(\theta_{\hat{a}})}{P(A^* = \hat{a})} d\rho(\theta_{\hat{a}})$ we have,

$$P(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}_{(n)}} = 1 | A^* = \hat{a}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(X_{\theta_{\hat{a}}} = 1) \frac{\Phi(\theta_{\hat{a}})}{P(A^* = \hat{a})} d\rho(\theta_{\hat{a}}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(X_{\theta_{\hat{a}}} = 1) d\mu(\theta_{\hat{a}}) . \tag{24}$$

Plugging this back in Equation (22) and upper bounding the probabilities we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(A^* \notin \mathcal{U}_{D_0}) &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(X_{\theta_a} = 0) d\mu(\theta_a) P(A^* = a) \left(1 - \left(1 + \exp\left(\beta \left(\lambda^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)} - \Delta\right)\right)\right)^{-1}\right)^N \cdot \mu_{\max}^N \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{T} + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N} \\
&\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(X_{\theta_a} = 0) \left(1 - \left(1 + \exp\left(\beta \left(\lambda^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)} - \Delta\right)\right)\right)^{-1}\right)^N \cdot \mu_{\max}^N d\mu(\theta_a) P(A^* = a) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{T} + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N} \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{a} \in \mathcal{A}} \left[\left(1 - \left(1 + \exp\left(\beta \left(\lambda^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)} - (1 - X_{\theta_{\hat{a}}})\Delta\right)\right)\right)^{-1}\right)^N \right] \cdot \mu_{\max}^N d\mu(\theta_{\hat{a}}) + \frac{1}{T} + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where μ_{\max} is used to obtain the exponent N by accounting for the sampling distribution μ , and last step follows from the uniformity of each action being optimal. Finally, we need to find the supremum of $g(\theta_{\hat{a}})$ and hence Equation (25). Recall that,

$$g(\theta_{\hat{a}}) = \frac{1}{\Phi(\theta_{\hat{a}})} \int_{\theta_{\hat{a}} - \Delta}^{\theta_{\hat{a}}} d\rho(\theta) = \frac{\int_{\theta_{\hat{a}} - \Delta}^{\theta_{\hat{a}}} d\rho(\theta)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\theta_{\hat{a}}} d\rho(\theta)} = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\theta_{\hat{a}}} d\rho(\theta) - \int_{-\infty}^{\theta_{\hat{a}} - \Delta} d\rho(\theta)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\theta_{\hat{a}}} d\rho(\theta)} = 1 - h_{\Delta}(\hat{a})$$

, where $h_{\Delta}(\hat{a}) := \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\theta_{\hat{a}} - \Delta} d\rho(\theta)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\theta_{\hat{a}}} d\rho(\theta)}$. Setting $\nabla_{\hat{a}} h_{\Delta}(\hat{a}) = 0$ and analyzing $\nabla_{\hat{a}}^2 h_{\Delta}(\hat{a}) > 0$, we find that

$$g(\theta_{\hat{a}}) \leq 1 - \Delta \exp\left(-\frac{(2\theta_{\hat{a}} - \Delta)\Delta}{2}\right) \leq \min(1, \Delta) . \tag{26}$$

Finally we, decompose Equation (25) based on the event $\mathcal{E}_2 := \{X_{\theta_{\hat{a}}} = 0\}$, and upper bound the probability to simplify. Setting $\Delta = \ln(T\beta)/\beta$, we conclude with the following bound:

$$P(A^* \notin \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) \leq \left(1 - \left(1 + \exp \left(\beta \left(\lambda^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)} - (K-1) \min(1, \ln(T\beta)/\beta) \right) \right) \right)^{-1} \right)^N + \frac{1}{T} + (1 - \mu_{\min})^{2N} \quad (27)$$

□

Lemma A.4. $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|] \leq f_2$.

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ is a set of actions that have been preferred to at least once in the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 and of actions that do not appear in the \mathcal{D}_0 . We first see that $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|] = \sum_{k=1}^K k \cdot P(|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}| = k)$. Define an event $\mathcal{E}_a = \{\langle A^* - a, \theta \rangle \leq \Delta\}$ and analyze as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{I}(a \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) \right] = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{I}(a \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_a) + \mathbb{I}(a \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_a^c) \right] \\ &\leq K \min(1, \Delta^2/2) + \frac{1}{T} + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{I}(a \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_a^c) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the second step follows from the event \mathcal{E}_a and analysis done before : break down the indicator variable conditioning on arbitrary $A^* = \hat{a} \in \mathcal{A}$, and use Poisson approximation to bound the probability. Now, analyze term in expectation above.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{I}(a \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_a^c) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P(Y_n = a, \langle A^* - a, \theta - \vartheta \rangle + \langle A^* - a, \vartheta \rangle \geq \Delta \mid \theta, \vartheta) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_a^c) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P(Y_n = a, \langle A^* - a, \vartheta \rangle \geq \Delta - \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)}/\lambda \mid \vartheta) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}_a^c) \right] \\ &\leq N \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a, b \in \mathcal{A}; \langle A^* - a, \vartheta \rangle \geq \Delta - \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)}/\lambda} (1 + \exp(\beta \langle b - a, \vartheta \rangle))^{-1} \right] \\ &\leq N \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}; \langle A^* - a, \vartheta \rangle \geq \Delta - \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)}/\lambda} (1 + \exp(-\beta \langle A^* - a, \vartheta \rangle))^{-1} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{N(K-1)}{T\beta} \left(1 + \exp \left(-\beta \left(\lambda^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)} + (K-1) \min(1, \Delta) \right) \right) \right)^{-1} \\ &\leq \frac{NK}{T\beta} \left(1 + \exp \left(-\beta \left(\lambda^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)} + (K-1) \min(1, \Delta) \right) \right) \right)^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Putting all of this together, we obtain the bound below.

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|] \leq K \min(1, \Delta^2/2) + \frac{NK}{T\beta} \left(1 + \exp \left(-\beta \left(\lambda^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)} + (K-1) \min(1, \Delta) \right) \right) \right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{T}. \quad (30)$$

Of course, $|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|$ cannot exceed K , so we have with the choice of $\Delta = \ln(T\beta)/\beta$,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|] \leq \min \left(K \min \left(1, \frac{\ln^2(T\beta)}{2\beta^2} \right) + \frac{NK}{T\beta} \left(1 + \exp \left(-\beta \lambda^{-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(2d^{1/2}T)} + (K-1) \min(1, \ln(T\beta)/\beta) \right) \right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{T}, K \right). \quad (31)$$

□

Lemma A.5. If $0 < \mu_{\min} \leq \mu_{\max} < 1$, then the set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ constructed above is $(1 - f_1)$ -informative, and $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{D}_0}|] \leq f_2$.

Proof. Combining Lemma A.3 and Lemma A.4 we have the desired result. □

A.5 Constructing Surrogate Loss Function

This section contains proofs of construction of the surrogate loss function as described in Section 5.

Lemma A.6. *At time t , the MAP estimate of (θ, ϑ) can be constructed by solving the following equivalent optimization problem:*

$$\begin{aligned}
(\theta_{opt}, \vartheta_{opt}) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta, \vartheta} P(\theta, \vartheta | \mathcal{D}_{t-1}) \equiv \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta, \vartheta} \mathcal{L}_1(\theta, \vartheta) + \mathcal{L}_2(\theta, \vartheta) + \mathcal{L}_3(\theta, \vartheta), \\
\text{where, } \mathcal{L}_1(\theta, \vartheta) &:= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (R_s - \langle A_s, \theta \rangle)^2, \\
\mathcal{L}_2(\theta, \vartheta) &:= - \sum_{n=1}^N \beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(Y_n)}, \vartheta \rangle + \ln \left(e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \vartheta \rangle} + e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, \vartheta \rangle} \right), \quad \text{and} \\
\mathcal{L}_3(\theta, \vartheta) &:= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \|\theta - \vartheta\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \mu_0)^T \Sigma_0^{-1} (\theta - \mu_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Proof. We first analyze the posterior distribution of ϑ, θ given the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 , optimize it by treating these random variables as parameters.

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{argmax}_{\theta, \vartheta} P(\theta, \vartheta | \mathcal{D}_{t-1}) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta, \vartheta} P(\mathcal{D}_{t-1} | \theta, \vartheta) \cdot P(\theta, \vartheta) \\
&= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta, \vartheta} \ln P(\mathcal{D}_{t-1} | \theta, \vartheta) + \ln P(\theta, \vartheta) \\
&= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta, \vartheta} \underbrace{\ln P(\mathcal{H}_{t-1} | \mathcal{D}_0, \theta, \vartheta)}_{\mathcal{L}_1} + \underbrace{\ln P(\mathcal{D}_0 | \theta, \vartheta)}_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \underbrace{\ln P(\theta, \vartheta)}_{\mathcal{L}_3}
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_1 &= \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \underbrace{\ln P(A_s | \mathcal{D}_{s-1}, \theta, \vartheta)}_{\text{indep. of } \theta, \vartheta \Rightarrow \text{constant}} + \ln P(R_s | A_s, \theta, \vartheta) \\
&= \text{constant} - \frac{t-1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{2\pi}{\sigma^2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (R_s - \langle A_s, \theta \rangle)^2. \\
\mathcal{L}_2 &= \sum_{n=1}^N \ln \left(\left(\bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, Y_n \right) | \theta, \vartheta \right) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^N \ln \left(Y_n | \bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, \theta, \vartheta \right) + \underbrace{\ln P \left(\bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \bar{A}_n^{(1)} | \theta, \vartheta \right)}_{\text{indep. of } \theta, \vartheta ; \text{ depends on } \mu \Rightarrow \text{constant}} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^N \beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(Y_n)}, \vartheta \rangle - \ln \left(e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \vartheta \rangle} + e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, \vartheta \rangle} \right) + \text{constant} \\
\mathcal{L}_3 &= \ln P(\vartheta | \theta) + \ln P(\theta) \\
&= \frac{d}{2} \ln \left(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda^2} \right) - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \|\theta - \vartheta\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2} \ln (|2\pi \Sigma_0|) - \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \mu_0)^T \Sigma_0^{-1} (\theta - \mu_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Hence, final surrogate loss function is

Algorithm 3 warm Thompson Sampling with Preference Feedback (warmTSOF)

- 1: **Input:** Horizon T , offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 , set of arms \mathcal{A} , knowledgeability λ , deliberateness β , feedback cost c .
 - 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 3: Sample a set of perturbations $\mathcal{P}_t = \{\zeta_s, \omega_n, \theta', \vartheta'\}$.
 - 4: Solve Equation (8) using this set \mathcal{P}_t to find $(\hat{\theta}_t, \hat{\vartheta}_t)$.
 - 5: Let A_t^1, A_t^2 be s.t. $\langle A_t^1, \hat{\theta}_t \rangle \geq \langle A_t^2, \hat{\theta}_t \rangle \geq \langle A, \hat{\theta}_t \rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{A_t^1, A_t^2\}$.
 - 6: Compute $\epsilon_t = \text{get_epsilon}(c, \mathcal{D}_t, t, \lambda, \beta)$.
 - 7: **if** $|\langle A_t^1, \hat{\theta}_t \rangle - \langle A_t^2, \hat{\theta}_t \rangle| < \epsilon_t$ **then**
 - 8: Ask for feedback on (A_t^1, A_t^2) and receive $Y_t \in \{0, 1\}$.
 - 9: Update $\mathcal{D}_t \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_t \cup \{A_t^1, A_t^2, Y_t\}$.
 - 10: Update posterior using Equation (8) to get new $(\tilde{\theta}_t, \tilde{\vartheta}_t)$.
 - 11: Set $A_t = \text{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \langle a, \tilde{\theta}_t \rangle$ and $c_t = c$.
 - 12: **else**
 - 13: Set $A_t = A_t^1$ and $c_t = 0$.
 - 14: **end if**
 - 15: Take action A_t to receive reward $R_t - c_t$.
 - 16: Set $\mathcal{D}_{t+1} = \mathcal{D}_t \cup \{A_t, R_t\}$.
 - 17: **end for**
-

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \vartheta) &= \mathcal{L}_1(\theta, \vartheta) + \mathcal{L}_2(\theta, \vartheta) + \mathcal{L}_3(\theta, \vartheta), \quad \text{where} \\ \mathcal{L}_1(\theta, \vartheta) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (R_s - \langle A_s, \theta \rangle)^2 \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\theta, \vartheta) &= - \sum_{n=1}^N \beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(Y_n)}, \vartheta \rangle + \ln \left(e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(0)}, \vartheta \rangle} + e^{\beta \langle \bar{A}_n^{(1)}, \vartheta \rangle} \right) \\ \mathcal{L}_3(\theta, \vartheta) &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \|\theta - \vartheta\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\theta - \mu_0)^T \Sigma_0^{-1} (\theta - \mu_0). \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Finally the problem in Equation (32) becomes equivalent as follows:

$$(\theta_{opt}, \vartheta_{opt}) = \underset{\theta, \vartheta}{\text{argmax}} P(\theta, \vartheta | \mathcal{D}_t) \equiv \underset{\theta, \vartheta}{\text{argmin}} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \vartheta) \tag{35}$$

□

A.6 warmPref-PS with Online Feedback (warmTSOF)

Here, we present an extension to warmPref-PS, where the agent has the option to ask for feedback during the online phase.

Problem Formulation. Consider, now in addition to Algorithm 2 (warmTS), the agent at any time, has the option to ask for *online* preference feedback between two actions. For simplicity, we assume the rater for this feedback is the same rater who generated the offline dataset \mathcal{D}_0 .

Let the cost incurred for this feedback on actions A_t^1 and A_t^2 be $c_t = c \in \mathbb{R}$ if agent asks for feedback, else $c_t = 0$. So, this feedback takes the form $\{A_t^1, A_t^2, Y_t\}$, and $Y_t \in \{0, 1\}$ and the reward the agent receives then becomes $R_t - c_t$.

The agent should incorporate the expected current rewards for all actions, cost of feedback, and expert competency into the decision making process. The core idea is to only initiate feedback retrieval process if top-two expected rewards of all actions are ‘close’. This idea finds its beginnings in the Top-Two Thompson Sampling procedure [28]. See warmTSOF (Algorithm 3) for exact details. The `get_epsilon`(\cdot) function will be decided through analysis.

Performance. See Figure 3 for performance comparison. Experiments are run with size of offline dataset $N = 20$, deliberateness $\beta = 10$, and knowledgeability $\lambda = 10$. In addition, we let number of




Figure 3: Performance of warmTSOF with varying cost of feedback c .

arms $k = 10$, dimension of environment $d = 4$, and horizon $T = 300$, all averaged over 100 runs (random seeds). For baselines, we consider the traditional and warm Thompson Sampling (TS and warmTS).

A.7 Effect of Action Space Dynamics.

We next study how the dynamics of the action space affect cumulative regret. Specifically, how (i) the relationship between action pairs measured by their correlation (ρ), and (ii) the dimensionality of the environment vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, affect cumulative regret. Table 1 shows that the performance of all these posterior sampling methods degrades as dimensionality of the environment and correlation between action increases. However, warmPref-PS still outperforms the baselines and enjoys a lesser performance degradation than PS and naive-PS as d and ρ increase.

| | PS | naive-PS | warmPref-PS |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|
| $d = 2, \rho = 0.1$ | 58.21 ± 0.45 | 39.23 ± 2.64 | 32.65 ± 1.78 |
| $d = 2, \rho = 0.8$ | 61.36 ± 1.23 | 40.31 ± 3.12 | 33.98 ± 3.07 |
| $d = 5, \rho = 0.1$ | 60.42 ± 0.82 | 40.22 ± 2.89 | 34.12 ± 3.05 |
| $d = 5, \rho = 0.8$ | 64.21 ± 1.57 | 41.55 ± 3.74 | 34.77 ± 2.94 |

Table 1: Effect of dimensionality and correlation within the action space on cumulative regret.