Abstract

This paper studies active learning in the context of robust statistics. Specifically, we propose the Contaminated Best Arm Identification variant of the multi-armed bandit problem, in which every arm pull has probability $\varepsilon$ of generating a sample from an arbitrary contamination distribution instead of the true underlying distribution. The goal is to identify the best (or approximately best) true distribution with high probability, with a secondary goal of providing guarantees on the quality of that arm’s underlying distribution. It is simple to see that in this contamination model there are no consistent estimators for statistics (e.g. median) of the underlying distribution, and that even with infinite samples, statistics can be estimated only up to some unavoidable bias. We present tight, non-asymptotic sample complexity bounds for estimating the first two robust moments (median and median absolute deviation) with high probability. We then show how to use this algorithmically for our problem by adapting Best Arm Identification algorithms from the classical multi-armed bandit literature. We give matching upper and lower bounds (up to a small logarithmic factor) on these algorithms’ sample complexities. These results suggest an inherent robustness of classical Best Arm Identification algorithms.
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1 Introduction

Consider Pat, an aspiring machine learning researcher deciding between working in a statistics, mathematics, or computer science department. Pat’s sole criterion is salary, so Pat surveys current academics with the goal of finding the department with highest median income. However, some subset of the data will be inaccurate: some obscure their salaries for privacy reasons, some converted currency incorrectly, and some did not read the question and reported yearly instead of monthly salary, etc. How should Pat target his or her surveys, in an adaptive (online) fashion, to find the highest paying department with high probability in the presence of contaminated data?

In this paper, we study the Best Arm Identification (BAI) problem for multi-armed bandits where observed rewards are not completely trustworthy. The multi-armed bandit problem has received extensive study in the last three decades [Lai and Robbins, 1985, Bubeck and Cesa-Bianchi, 2012]. The problem setup is as follows: in each round \( t \in [T] := \{1, \ldots, T\} \), the learner selects an arm \( I_t \) out of \( k \geq 2 \) options and receives corresponding reward \( R_{I_t,t} \). We study the fixed confidence, or \((\alpha, \delta)-PAC\), BAI problem, in which the learner must identify an \( \alpha \)-suboptimal arm with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \), using as few samples as possible. Most BAI algorithms for the fixed-confidence setting assume i.i.d. rewards from distributions with relatively strict control on the tails, such as boundedness or more generally sub-Gaussianity [Jamieson et al., 2014]. However, for Pat, the data neither are i.i.d. nor are from a distribution with controllable tails. How can we model this data, and how can we optimally explore these arms?

To answer the first question, we turn to robust statistics, which has studied such questions for over fifty years. In a seminal paper [Huber, 1964], Huber introduced the contamination model, which we adapt to the multi-armed bandit model by proposing the Contaminated Best Arm Identification problem (CBAI). This is formally defined in Section 2 but is informally described as follows. There are \( k \geq 2 \) arms, each endowed with a fixed base distribution \( F_i \) and arbitrary contamination distributions \( G_{i,t} \) for \( t \geq 1 \). We place absolutely no assumptions on \( G_{i,t} \). When arm \( i \) is pulled in round \( t \), the learner receives a sample that with probability \( 1 - \varepsilon \) is drawn from the arm’s true distribution \( F_i \), and with the remaining probability \( \varepsilon \) is drawn from an arbitrary contamination distribution \( G_{i,t} \). A key point is that suboptimality of the arms is based on the quality of the underlying true distributions \( F_i \), not the contaminated distributions \( \tilde{F}_{i,t} \) of the observed samples. Note that existing BAI algorithms, fed with samples from \( \tilde{F}_{i,t} \), will not necessarily work.

This contamination model nicely fits Pat’s problem: samples are usually trustworthy, but sometimes they are completely off and cannot be modeled by a distribution with controlled tails. Additionally, the nature of contamination changes with the person, and hence \( G_{i,t} \) should be considered as time varying, which completely breaks the usual i.i.d. data assumption. Finally, Pat wants to determine the department with highest true median salary, not highest contaminated median salary. Contaminated bandits also naturally model many other situations, such as:

- measuring drug responses where samples can be corrupted or test results incorrectly recorded;
• testing new software features, where yet-unfixed bugs may distort responses but will be fixed before release;
• online advertisement, where a small portion of users respond much differently to novel ads; and
• conducting surveys with randomized responses, where a subject’s response is randomly negated in order to preserve privacy (e.g. surveys for sensitive issues [Warner, 1965]).

Importantly note that the CBAI problem is nontrivially harder than the BAI problem since with arbitrary contaminations, there are no consistent estimators for statistics (e.g. the mean or median) of \( F_i \). Under some mild technical assumptions on \( F_i \), the contamination can cause the median of \( \tilde{F}_{i,t} \) to be anywhere in an \( \Theta(\varepsilon) \)-neighborhood of the median of \( F_i \), and hence we can only determine the median of \( F_i \) up to some unavoidable estimation bias, \( U_i \), of order \( \varepsilon \) (see Section 2 for details). This leads us to generalize our study to the more abstract Partially Identifiable Best Arm Identification (PIBAI) problem (defined formally in Section 3), which includes CBAI as a special case.

This PIBAI problem can be seen as an active-learning version of the more general problem of estimation under partial identifiability, which has been studied for most of the last century in the econometrics literature [Marschak and Andrews, 1944, Manski, 2009]. A canonical example in this field is trying to learn the age distribution of a population by only asking in which decade each subject was born; clearly the median age can only be learned up to certain unidentifiability regions.

1.1 Our contributions

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper to consider the Best Arm Identification problem with arbitrary contaminations. Our contributions fall into three parts: (1) estimating statistics of an underlying distribution given access only to samples from the contamination model; (2) using these statistical guarantees to develop efficient algorithms for the CBAI problem (these algorithms are a special case of algorithms we develop for the more general PIBAI problem); and (3) lower bounds on CBAI showing that the aforementioned algorithms have optimal sample complexity (up to possibly a small logarithmic factor). Let us elaborate on these parts.

Section 2 investigates (1). At a high level, we first show that one cannot hope to exactly identify any statistic (e.g. median) of an arm’s underlying distribution, since some region of unidentifiability always remains: indeed, the adversary’s ability to inject arbitrary contaminations can render “similar” underlying distributions indistinguishable, even when given access to infinite samples. We then show that, although estimation of standard moments (mean, variance) is impossible, estimation of robust moments (median, median absolute deviation) is possible, and we give tight, non-asymptotic sample complexity guarantees for this under three adversarial models defined in Section 2. Namely, in each of these adversarial settings, we show that with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \), the empirical median of the contaminated samples lies in a region around the true median of width \( U_i + E_{n,\delta} \), where \( U_i \) is some unavoidable bias that depends on further quantiles of \( F_i \) as well as the power of the adversary, \( E_{n,\delta} \) is an confidence-interval term that decreases at the standard
rate, and \( n \) is the number of samples. Under mild technical assumptions, we also present similar non-asymptotic sample complexity guarantees for estimating the second median moment (often called Median Absolute Deviation (MAD)) of \( F_i \), in each of the adversarial contamination settings. This quantity is a robust measure of the spread of \( F_i \), and controls the width \( U_i \) of the median’s unidentifiability region.

Section 3 turns to algorithm design. We show that, surprisingly, existing BAI algorithms are readily adaptable to the general PIBAI problem, and thus also to the CBAI problem as special case. This result suggests that classical bandit algorithms possess an inherent robustness. Our resulting sample complexity guarantees for CBAI closely mirror the known sample complexity guarantees for BAI in the classical stochastic multi-armed bandit setup. The main difference is that BAI sample complexities depend on the “gaps” \( \Delta_i := p_{i^*} - p_i \) between the statistics of the optimal arm \( i^* \) and each suboptimal arm \( \Delta_i \); whereas in CBAI the analogous quantity is the effective gap \( \tilde{\Delta}_i := (p_{i^*} - U_{i^*}) - (p_i + U_i) = \Delta_i - (U_{i^*} + U_i) \), which accounts for the unavoidable estimation uncertainties in the most pessimistic way. We present two algorithms: robust versions of the MEDIAN ELIMINATION and SUCCESSIVE ELIMINATION algorithms of [Even-Dar et al., 2002], and provide upper bounds on their sample complexities in all three adversarial settings. We show that the former algorithm is \((\alpha, \delta)-PAC\), and the latter is \((0, \delta)-PAC\). We also show how to apply the results in Section 2 about MAD estimation to obtain guarantees on the quality of the distribution of the outputted arm. Finally, in Section 4 we provide matching lower bounds (up to a small logarithmic factor) on CBAI via a reduction to classical lower bounds for the stochastic multi-armed bandit problem. We argue that \( \tilde{\Delta}_i \) is the right analog of the traditional gap, since it appears in matching ways in both our upper and lower bounds.

1.2 Previous work

The Best Arm Identification problem in the fixed-confidence setting has a long history, see e.g. [Bechhofer et al., 1968, Lai and Robbins, 1985]. Recent interest in the learning theory community was sparked by the seminal paper of [Even-Dar et al., 2002], which proposed two algorithms we study: SUCCESSIVE ELIMINATION and MEDIAN ELIMINATION. Since then, there has been much work on the algorithmic side, see e.g. [Kalyanakrishnan et al., 2012, Gabillon et al., 2012, Karnin et al., 2013, Jamieson et al., 2014]. Concurrently, a parallel line of work has focused on improving lower bounds, starting with the 2-armed setting [Chernoff, 1972, Anthony and Bartlett, 2009], later extending to the multi-armed setting [Mannor and Tsitsiklis, 2004], and then more recently continuing with more finely tuned lower bounds that include properties of the arm distributions aside from the gaps, see e.g. [Chen and Lai, 2015, Kaufmann et al., 2016, Garivier and Kaufmann, 2016], and references therein.

In the cumulative regret setting, the online learning literature has considered both stochastic bandits with mild tail assumptions (e.g. only the existence of a \((1 + \varepsilon)\) moment) [Bubeck et al., 2013], and algorithms that obtain near-optimal regret guarantees if the environment is stochastic or adversarial [Bubeck and Cesa-Bianchi, 2012, Seldin and Slivkins, 2014]. The partial monitoring problem is also loosely similar to our problem of CBAI, in the sense that both problems feature partial identification: there, the learner only knows
the loss up to some subset \cite{Bartok2014}.

The existing literature closest to our work are the papers that study the BAI problem in settings more general than i.i.d. arms, for example stochastic but non-stationary distributions \cite{Allesiardo2017,AllesiardoF2017}, or arbitrary rewards where each arm converges to a limit (in a fixed budget setting only) in \cite{Jamieson2016,Li2016}. However, neither setting fits the contamination model or allows for arbitrary perturbations.

This paper also makes connections between several long bodies of work. The contamination model \cite{Huber1964} has a long history of more than fifty years in robust statistics, see e.g. \cite{Hampel1974,MaronnaY1976,RousseeuwL2005,Hampel2011} and references therein. Contamination models and malicious errors have also been studied in the computer science community, see e.g. the classical papers \cite{Valiant1985,KearnsL1993}, as well as the very recent burst of results including e.g. algorithms that handle estimation of means and variances \cite{Lai2016}, efficient estimation in high dimensions \cite{Diakonikolas2018}, PCA \cite{Cherapanamjeri2017}, and general learning \cite{Charikar2017} all in the presence of outliers or corrupted data. And finally, the partial identification literature from econometrics also has a rich history, see e.g. \cite{marschak1944,HorowitzM1995,Manski2009,Romano2010,Bontemps2012}.

1.3 Notation

Let \( F \) be a distribution. We denote its left and right quantiles, respectively, by \( Q_{L,F}(p) := \inf \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geq p \} \) and \( Q_{R,F}(p) := \inf \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) > p \} \). The left and right medians, respectively, of \( F \) are then defined as \( m_{1,L}(F) := Q_{L,F}(\frac{1}{2}) \) and \( m_{1,R}(F) := Q_{R,F}(\frac{1}{2}) \). We denote the set of medians of \( F \) by \( m_{1}(F) := [m_{1,L}(F), m_{1,R}(F)] \). When \( F \) has a unique median, we overload \( m_{1}(F) \) to be just this point rather than a singleton set containing it. When \( F \) has a unique median, we denote the median absolute deviation (MAD) of \( F \) by \( m_{2}(F) := m_{1}(|X - m_{1}(F)|) \) where \( X \sim F \). When \( m_{2}(F) \) is unique, we further define \( m_{4}(F) := m_{1}(|X - m_{1}(F)| - m_{2}(F)|) \). Note that \( m_{1}(F), m_{2}(F), \) and \( m_{4}(F) \) are robust analogues of centered first (mean), second (variance), and fourth (kurtosis) moments, respectively. For clarity, we use hats throughout whenever we discuss an empirical median \( \hat{m}_{1}() \) or empirical MAD \( \hat{m}_{2}() \). When \( F \) has a unique median, we denote by \( H_{F} \) the “folded distribution of \( F \)”, i.e., the distribution of \( |Y - m_{1}(F)| \) where \( Y \sim F \).

We denote the Dirac measure at a point \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) by \( \delta_{x} \), the Bernoulli distribution with parameter \( p \in [0,1] \) by \( \text{Ber}(p) \), and the uniform distribution over an interval \([a,b]\) by \( \text{Unif}(a,b) \). For \( \varepsilon \in [0,1] \) and distributions \( F \) and \( G \), we denote by \((1-\varepsilon)F + \varepsilon G\) the mixture model under which variables have law \((1-D)Y + DZ\), where \( D \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon) \), \( Y \sim F \), and \( Z \sim G \) are all independent.

We denote the interval \([a-b, a+b]\) by \([a\pm b]\), the set of non-negative real numbers by \( \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \), the set of positive integers by \( \mathbb{N} \), and the set \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \) by \( [n] \) for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). We denote the \( k \)-th order statistic of a (possibly random) real-valued sequence \( x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in \mathbb{R} \) by \( x_{(k)} \), and the median of this sequence by \( x_{(\text{med})} \): if \( n \) is odd, this is the middle value; and if \( n \) is even, it is the average of the middle two values. We abbreviate “with high probability” by “w.h.p.” and “cumulative distribution function” by “cdf”. 

6
2 Best Arm Identification for contaminated bandits

Let us first formally define the setup of the Contaminated Best Arm Identification problem (CBAI). Let \( k \geq 2 \) be the number of arms, \( \varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) be the contamination level, \( \{F_i\}_{i \in [k]} \) be the true but unknown distributions, and \( \{G_{i,t}\}_{i \in [k], t \in \mathbb{N}} \) be arbitrary contamination distributions. This induces contaminated distributions \( \tilde{F}_{i,t} \), samples from which have laws \((1 - D_{i,t})Y_{i,t} + D_{i,t}Z_{i,t}\), where \( D_{i,t} \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon) \), \( Y_{i,t} \sim F_i \), \( Z_{i,t} \sim G_{i,t} \). Note that if all of these random variables are independent, then each \( \tilde{F}_{i,t} \) is simply equal to the contaminated mixture model \((1 - \varepsilon)F_i + \varepsilon G_{i,t}\). However, we generalize by also considering the setting when the \( Y_{i,t}, D_{i,t}, Z_{i,t} \) are not all independent. This allows an adversary to further obfuscate samples by adapting the distributions of the \( D_{i,t} \) and \( Z_{i,t} \) depending on the realizations of the \( Y_{i,t} \) (i.e., couple these random variables); see below for details.

Now at each iteration \( t \), a CBAI algorithm chooses an arm \( I_t \in [k] \) to pull and receives a sample \( X_{I_t,t} \) distributed according to the corresponding contaminated distribution \( \tilde{F}_{I_t,t} \). After \( T \) iterations (a possibly random stopping time that the algorithm may choose), the algorithm outputs an arm \( \hat{I} \in [k] \). For \( \alpha \geq 0 \) and \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), the algorithm is said to be \((\alpha, \delta)\)-PAC if with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \), \( \hat{I} \) has median within \( \alpha + U \) of the optimal:

\[
P \left( m_1(F_{\hat{I}}) \geq \max_{i \in [k]} m_1(F_i) - (\alpha + U) \right) \geq 1 - \delta, \tag{1}
\]

where \( U \) is the unavoidable uncertainty term induced by lack of identifiability (see Section 3 for details). The goal is thus to find an algorithm achieving the PAC-guarantee in (1) with small sample complexity \( T \), either in expectation or with high probability.

**Power of the adversary.** As is typical in online learning problems, it is important to define the power of the adversary since this affects the complexity of the resulting problem. Interestingly, CBAI is still possible even when we grant the adversary significant power. (Although of course, the adversary’s power is reflected in the corresponding rates.) We consider three settings, presented in increasing order of adversarial power. The key differences between these different types of adversaries are twofold: (1) whether they can choose the contaminated distributions “presciently” based on all other realizations \( \{Y_{i,t}, D_{i,t}\}_{i \in [k], t \geq 1} \) both past and future; and (2) whether they can “maliciously” couple the distributions of each \( D_{i,t} \) with the corresponding \( Y_{i,t} \), subject only to the constraint that the marginals \( D_{i,t} \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon) \) and \( Y_{i,t} \sim F_i \) stay correct.

- **Oblivious adversary.** For all \( i \in [k] \), the triples \( \{(Y_{i,t}, D_{i,t}, Z_{i,t})\}_{t \geq 1} \) are independent, and for all \( t \geq 1 \), \( Y_{i,t} \sim F_i \), \( D_{i,t} \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon) \), and \( Y_{i,t} \) and \( D_{i,t} \) are independent.

- **Prescient adversary.** For all \( i \in [k] \), the pairs \( \{(Y_{i,t}, D_{i,t})\}_{t \geq 1} \) are independent, and for all \( t \geq 1 \), \( Y_{i,t} \sim F_i \), \( D_{i,t} \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon) \), \( Y_{i,t} \) and \( D_{i,t} \) are independent, and \( Z_{i,t} \) may depend on all \( \{Y_{i',t'}, D_{i',t'}, Z_{i',t'}\}_{i' \in [k], t' \geq 1} \).

- **Malicious adversary.** For all \( i \in [k] \), the pairs \( \{(Y_{i,t}, D_{i,t})\}_{t \geq 1} \) are independent, and for all \( t \geq 1 \), \( Y_{i,t} \sim F_i \), \( D_{i,t} \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon) \), and \( Z_{i,t} \) may depend on all \( \{Y_{i',t'}, D_{i',t'}, Z_{i',t'}\}_{i' \in [k], t' \geq 1} \).
Perhaps surprisingly, we will show that the complexity is the same for both oblivious and prescient adversaries. Indeed for these two settings, we will prove our upper bounds for the (more powerful) setting of prescient adversaries, and our lower bounds for the (less powerful) setting of oblivious adversaries. We also note that the rate for malicious adversaries is only worse by at most a “factor of 2”; see Section 3.2 for a precise statement.

2.1 Contamination can render different underlying distributions indistinguishable

For now, consider a single arm. In this subsection, we discuss the simple yet critical observation that a contaminating adversary can render different underlying distributions of that arm statistically indistinguishable. This implies statistical impossibility of identifying the arm’s underlying distribution (and in particular also of identifying statistics of the underlying distribution such as the median) up to some region of uncertainty, even given infinite samples.

Let us formalize this. For simplicity, consider for now the oblivious adversarial setting (rather than prescient or malicious), since this is simpler to analyze and is already powerful enough to elicit indistinguishability. Let $F$ denote the arm’s true underlying distribution. Then the question at hand is: What is the set of distributions $F'$ for which there exists adversarially chosen distributions $G$ and $G'$ such that $(1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon G = (1 - \varepsilon)F' + \varepsilon G'$? Now since for the purposes of CBAI we are primarily interested in how much an adversary can mask the median of $F$, let us for simplicity briefly restrict to $F'$ that are translations of $F$. In other words, we are asking for the range of how far an adversary can translate the underlying distribution $F$ (and thus its median) yet still ensure the statistical impossibility of distinguishing between $F$ and the translated version from contaminated samples.

First, note that this unidentifiable set includes more than just $F$, even in the simplified scenario when $F$ is known. This is illustrated by the following example. Let $F$ be the uniform distribution on the interval $[-1, 1]$, and let $G$ be the uniform distribution on $[-1 - c, -1] \cup [1, 1 + c]$, where $c = \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)^{-1}$. Then $\tilde{F} := (1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon G$ is the uniform distribution on $[-1 - c, 1 + c]$. However, for any $p \in [-c, c]$, $\tilde{F}$ is also equal to $(1 - \varepsilon)F(\cdot - p) + \varepsilon G_p$, where $G_p$ is the uniform distribution over $[-1 - c, 1 + c] \setminus [-1 + p, 1 + p]$. We conclude that $F$ is statistically indistinguishable from any of the translations $\{F(\cdot - p)\}_{p \in [-c, c]}$ in the contamination model, even given infinite samples. In particular, even in this simple setting, infinite samples only allow us to identify the median of $F$ at most up to the unidentifiability region $[-c, c]$.

The following simple but key fact quantifies exactly how large the unidentifiability region is for the median of an arbitrary distribution $F$, in terms of its quantiles and the contamination level $\varepsilon$.

**Lemma 1.** For any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, any distribution $F$, and any median $m_1 \in m_1(F)$,

$$\sup_{\text{distribution } G, \tilde{m}_1 \in m_1((1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon G)} |\tilde{m}_1 - m_1| = \max \left\{ Q_{R,F} \left( \frac{1}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \right) - m_1, m_1 - Q_{L,F} \left( \frac{1 - 2\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \right) \right\}$$

**Proof.** The fact that the left hand side is no smaller than the right hand side is straightforward: to shift the median to the right (resp. left), let $\{G_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of dis-
tributions which are Dirac measures at \( n \) (resp. \(-n\)). Now we show the reverse direction: the “\( \leq \)" inequality for any fixed distribution \( G \). For shorthand, denote the contaminated distribution by \( \tilde{F} := (1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon G \), and denote its left and right medians by \( \tilde{m}_{1, L} \) and \( \tilde{m}_{1, R} \), respectively. Since every median of \( \tilde{F} \) lies within \([\tilde{m}_{1, L}, \tilde{m}_{1, R}]\), it suffices to show \( \tilde{m}_{1, L} \geq Q_{L, F}(\frac{1 - 2\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)}) \) and \( \tilde{m}_{1, R} \leq Q_{R, F}(\frac{1 - 2\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)}) \). We bound \( \tilde{m}_{1, L} \) presently; bounding \( \tilde{m}_{1, R} \) follows by a similar argument or by simply applying the \( \tilde{m}_{1, L} \) bound to \( F(\cdot) \). By definition of \( \tilde{m}_{1, L} \), for all \( t > 0 \), \( \frac{1}{2} \leq \tilde{F}(\tilde{m}_{1, L} + t) = (1 - \varepsilon)F(\tilde{m}_{1, L} + t) + \varepsilon G(\tilde{m}_{1, L} + t) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)F(\tilde{m}_{1, L} + t) + \varepsilon \), where the last step is because \( G(\tilde{m}_{1, L} + t) \leq 1 \) since \( G \) is a distribution. Rearranging yields \( F(\tilde{m}_{1, L} + t) \geq \frac{1 - 2\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \). Thus \( \tilde{m}_{1, L} \geq Q_{L, F}(\frac{1 - 2\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)}) \). 

Therefore, a minimal requirement to have any hope of approaching CBAI is to require control over quantiles of the underlying arm distributions \( F_i \). In particular, we will prove rates for CBAI when all \( F_i \) are in some such controlled family of distributions. To this aim, we now define such a family of distributions, with what we again stress is the minimum possible requirement needed for median estimation.

**Definition 1.** For any \( \bar{t} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) and any non-decreasing function \( R : [0, \bar{t}] \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \), define \( \mathcal{H}_{\bar{t}, R} \) to be the family of all distributions \( F \) satisfying

\[
R(t) \geq \max \left\{ Q_{R, F} \left( \frac{1}{2} + t \right) - m_1, m_1 - Q_{L, F} \left( \frac{1}{2} - t \right) \right\}
\]

for any \( t \in [0, \bar{t}] \) and any median \( m_1 \in m_1(F) \).

Combining Lemma \[1\] and Definition \[1\] immediately yields the following tight bound on the maximal possible change in median from \( \varepsilon \)-contaminating a distribution from our class \( \mathcal{H}_{\bar{t}, R} \). We note that the class \( \mathcal{H}_{\bar{t}, R} \) can only handle contamination levels \( \varepsilon \leq \bar{\varepsilon}(\bar{t}) := \frac{2\bar{t}}{1 + 2\bar{t}} \), since this is equivalent to \( \bar{t} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \), which Lemma \[1\] proved is the largest possible deviation from the \( \frac{1}{2} \)-quantile.

**Corollary 2.** For any \( \bar{t} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \), any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \bar{\varepsilon}(\bar{t})) \), and any non-decreasing function \( R : [0, \bar{t}] \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \),

\[
\sup_{F \in \mathcal{H}_{\bar{t}, R}, \text{distribution } G, \tilde{m}_1 \in m_1((1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon G)} \left| \tilde{m}_1 - m_1(F) \right| = R \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \right).
\]

### 2.2 Finite-sample guarantees for median estimation from contaminated samples

Corollary \[2\] exactly specifies the size of the unidentifiability region of median estimation under unknown and arbitrary contamination. In this section, we provide non-asymptotic guarantees for median estimation, which we will later use as a primitive for our CBAI algorithms in Section \[3\].

First, we show guarantees for oblivious and prescient adversaries. It turns out that prescience of the adversary does not hurt us, and so the rates are the same for both
settings. In particular, we show that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the estimation error is bounded above by $R\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)}\right) + O\left(\frac{\log 1/\delta}{n}\right)$. Note that if $R$ is Lipschitz, then this is bounded above by the unavoidable uncertainty term $R\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)}\right)$ (see Corollary 2) plus an error term that decays quickly with $n^{-1/2}$ rate and sub-Gaussian tails. We remark that this latter confidence-interval term is of optimal order, since it is tight e.g. even for estimating the mean (and thus median) of a Gaussian random variable with known unit variance, from uncontaminated samples.

We also remark that the lower bound requirement on the sample complexity $n$ in the following lemma simply reflects that our class $\mathcal{H}_{i,R}$ only assumes control on the $[\frac{1}{2} \pm \bar{t}]$ quantiles; and so performance (unavoidably) smoothly degrades as the contamination level $\varepsilon$ is such that $\frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)}$ grows to this amount.

**Lemma 3.** Let $\bar{t} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon(\bar{t}))$, and $F \in \mathcal{H}_{i,R}$. Let $Y_i \sim F$ and $D_i \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon)$, for $i \in [n]$, all be drawn independently. Let $\{Z_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ be arbitrary random variables possibly depending on $\{Y_i, D_i\}_{i \in [n]}$, and define $X_i = (1 - D_i)Y_i + D_iZ_i$. Then for any confidence level $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and sample complexity $n \geq 2 \left(\bar{t} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)}\right)^{-2} \log \frac{2}{\delta}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_1(F)\right| \leq R\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)} + \sqrt{\frac{2\log(2/\delta)}{n}}\right)\right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$ 

**Proof.** For each $i \in [n]$, define the the indicator random variable

$$L_i := 1\left\{(D_i = 1) \text{ or } (D_i = 0 \text{ and } Y_i \geq Q_{R,F}\left(\frac{1}{2(1-\varepsilon)} + a\right))\right\},$$

where $a := \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}/(1-\varepsilon)/\sqrt{2n}}{2(1-\varepsilon)}$. By independence of $D_i$ and $Y_i$, $L_i$ has mean

$$\mathbb{E}[L_i] = \varepsilon + (1-\varepsilon)\left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{2(1-\varepsilon)} + a\right)\right) = \frac{1}{2} - (1-\varepsilon)a.$$ 

Moreover, the $\{L_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ are independent, and thus by Hoeffding’s inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{m}_1 \geq Q_{R,F}\left(\frac{1}{2(1-\varepsilon)} + a\right)\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} L_i \geq \frac{n}{2}\right) \leq \exp\left(-2n(1-\varepsilon)^2a^2\right) = \frac{\delta}{2}.$$ 

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$,

$$\hat{m}_1 - m_1 < Q_{R,F}\left(\frac{1}{2(1-\varepsilon)} + a\right) - Q_{R,F}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \leq R\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)} + a\right),$$ 

where the final inequality is due to (2), which we may invoke since $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)} + a \leq \frac{1}{2} + \bar{t}$ by our choice of $n$. An identical argument (or by symmetry to $-F$) yields the analogous result for the lower tail of $\hat{m}$, namely that $m_1 - \hat{m}_1 < R\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)} + a\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$. The lemma statement now follows by a union bound. □
Next, we show a finite-sample guarantee for median estimation against malicious adversaries. Note that we only obtain estimation accuracy of $R(\varepsilon)$ rather than the $R(\varepsilon)$ achieved above against oblivious and prescient adversaries. Lemma 4, which serves as a converse to Lemma 4, shows that this $R(\varepsilon)$ term is actually tight and unavoidable. Moreover, the $O(\sqrt{\log 1/\delta})$ error term in Lemma 4 below is tight for the same reason as it was in Lemma 3 see the discussion there. Finally, we remark on the upper bound limit on $\varepsilon$ and lower bound limit on the sample complexity $n$ in the following lemma: these are exactly the analogues of the corresponding bounds in Lemma 3 above, the only difference here being that malicious adversaries can force the contaminated distributions to have medians at roughly $F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2} \pm \varepsilon)$, resulting in our need for control of these further quantiles.

**Lemma 4.** Let $\bar{i} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{i})$, and $F \in \mathcal{H}_{t,R}$. Let $(Y_i, D_i)$, for $i \in [n]$, be drawn independently with marginals $Y_i \sim F$ and $D_i \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon)$. Let $\{Z_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ be arbitrary random variables possibly depending on $\{Y_i, D_i\}_{i \in [n]}$, and define $X_i = (1 - D_i)Y_i + D_iZ_i$. Then for any confidence level $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and sample complexity $n \geq 2(\bar{i} - \varepsilon)^{-2}\log\frac{2}{\delta}$,

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_1(F)| \leq R \left(\varepsilon + \sqrt{\frac{2\log(3/\delta)}{n}}\right)\right) \geq 1 - \delta.
$$

**Lemma 5.** Let $\bar{i} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \bar{i})$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $n \geq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{-2}\log\frac{1}{\delta}$, and $R : [0, \bar{i}] \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be any strictly increasing function. Then there exists a distribution $F \in \mathcal{H}_{t,R}$ and a joint distribution on $(D, Y, Z)$ with marginals $D \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon)$ and $Y \sim F$, such that

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_1(F)| \geq R \left(\varepsilon - \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{2n}}\right)\right) \geq 1 - \delta,
$$

where each $\{(D_i, Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$ is drawn independently from the joint distribution, and $X_i := (1 - D_i)Y_i + D_iZ_i$.

Informally, the proof of Lemma 4 proceeds by: (i) applying Lemma 3 to show that $\hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ is deterministically bounded within the order statistics $Y_{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \pm \sum_{i=1}^{n} D_i)}$; (ii) showing that w.h.p., at most $\sum_{i=1}^{n} D_i \approx \varepsilon n$ samples are contaminated; and then (iii) showing that w.h.p., the order statistics of $Y_{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \pm \varepsilon n)}$ are within the desired error range from $m_1(F)$. To accomplish step (i), we will use the following simple Lemma 4 its proof is straightforward by induction on $s$ and thus is omitted. Step (ii) will be accomplished simply by Hoeffding’s inequality, and step (iii) by using the same techniques as in the proof of Lemma 3 above. Since each of these steps is tight up to a small amount of slack, the proof of Lemma 5 proceeds essentially by just showing that each of these steps occurs also in the opposite direction w.h.p., modulo a small amount of slack.

**Lemma 6.** Let $x_i := d_iy_i + (1 - d_i)z_i$, where $y_1 \leq \cdots \leq y_n$ and $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ are arbitrary real-valued sequences, and $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ is an arbitrary binary-valued sequence satisfying $s := \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i < \frac{n}{2}$. Then:

$$
y(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - s) \leq x_{(\text{med})} \leq y(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + s).
$$
**Proof of Lemma 4.** Define for shorthand \( a := \sqrt{\frac{\log(3/\delta)}{2n}}. \) By Hoeffding’s inequality, the event \( E := \{ \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \leq (\varepsilon + a)n \} \) occurs with probability at least \( P(E) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{3}. \) Note that \( \varepsilon + a \leq \frac{t}{2} \) by our choice of \( n, \) and thus by Lemma 6, whenever \( E \) occurs,

\[
Y(\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor - (\varepsilon + a)n) \leq \hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \leq Y(\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor + (\varepsilon + a)n).
\]

Now define for each \( i \in [n] \) the indicator random variable \( L_i := 1(Y_i > Q_{R,F}(\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon + 2a)). \) Then \( E[L_i] \leq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon - 2a, \) so by Hoeffding’s inequality,

\[
P\left( Y(\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor + (\varepsilon + a)n) > Q_{R,F}(\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon + 2a) \right) \leq P\left( \sum_{i=1}^n L_i \geq (\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon - a)n \right) \leq \exp(-2na^2) = \frac{\delta}{3}.
\]

An identical argument (or simply by symmetry on \( F(\cdot) \)) also yields that \( Y(\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor - (\varepsilon + a)n) < Q_{L,F}(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon - 2a) \) with probability at most \( \frac{\delta}{3}. \) We conclude by a union bound that with probability at least \( 1 - \delta, \)

\[
Q_{L,F}(\frac{1}{2} - (\varepsilon + 2a)) \leq \hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \leq Q_{R,F}(\frac{1}{2} + (\varepsilon + 2a)).
\]

Whenever this occurs, we have by virtue of (2) that \( |\hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_1(F)| \leq R(\varepsilon + 2a), \) since both \( \frac{1}{2} \pm (\varepsilon + 2a) \in [\frac{1}{2} \pm \varepsilon] \) by our choice of \( n. \) \( \square \)

**Proof of Lemma 5.** Consider any distribution \( F \) with unique median 0 satisfying \( R(t) = Q_{R,F}(\frac{1}{2} + t) = -Q_{L,F}(\frac{1}{2} - t) \) for each \( t \in \mathbb{I}. \) Note that such an \( F \) can be produced constructively by starting with a Dirac measure \( \delta_0 \) at zero, and then pushing mass as far as possible to each tail while still satisfying (3). Next, consider the joint distribution on \( (D,Y,Z) \) where \( Y \sim F, \) the conditional distribution of \( D \) given \( Y \) is \( \text{Ber}(2\varepsilon \cdot 1(Y \leq 0)), \) and \( Z \sim \delta_{Q_{R,F}(\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon)}. \) The marginal of \( D \) is easily seen to be correct, since

\[
P(D = 1) = P(D = 1|Y \leq 0) \cdot P(Y \leq 0) + P(D = 1|Y > 0) \cdot P(Y > 0) = 2\varepsilon \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \varepsilon.
\]

Now for shorthand let \( a := \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{2n}}, \) and note that \( a < \varepsilon \) by our choice of \( n. \) For each \( i \in [n] \) define the indicator r.v.

\[
L_i := 1\left( (Y_i > R(\varepsilon - a)) \text{ or } (Y_i \leq 0 \text{ and } D_i = 1) \right).
\]

Each of these has mean

\[
E[L_i] \leq 1 - \left( \frac{1}{2} + (\varepsilon - a) \right) + \frac{1}{2}(2\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2} + a.
\]

Therefore, by Hoeffding’s inequality, we conclude that

\[
P\left( |\hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_1(F)| < R(\varepsilon - a) \right) \leq P\left( \hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) < m_1(F) + R(\varepsilon - a) \right) \\
\leq P\left( \sum_{i=1}^n L_i \geq \frac{n}{2} \right) \leq \exp\left( -2a^2n \right) = \delta.
\]

\( \square \)
2.2.1 Median estimation for cdfs that are not too flat around the median

Now we introduce a more specific class of cdfs $F$ that increase at least linearly on an interval around the median. This ensures that $F$ is not “too flat” in this interval, which we stress is a very standard and in fact essential assumption for median estimation.

**Definition 2.** For $\bar{t} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $B > 0$, let $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$ be the family of distributions $F$ satisfying

$$|F(x_1) - F(x_2)| \geq \frac{1}{Bm_2(F)}|x_1 - x_2|$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in I_{F,\bar{t}} := [Q_{L,F}(\frac{1}{2} - \bar{t}), Q_{R,F}(\frac{1}{2} + \bar{t})]$.

We make a few remarks about the definition. 1) Requiring the right-hand side of (3) to scale inversely in the median absolute deviation (MAD) $m_2(F)$ ensures closure of $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$ under scaling; see below. We also mention that $m_2(F)$ is a robust measure of the spread of $F$ (it is the “median moment” analogue of variance), and controls the width of the median’s unidentifiability region. 2) If $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$, then $F \in \mathcal{H}_{\bar{t},R}$ for $R(t) := Bm_2(F)t$. 3) It is not clear a priori that $m_2(F)$ is even well-defined for $F$, since it is not clear $m_1(F)$ is unique; however (3) ensures that $m_1(F)$ is unique for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$ (proven in Lemma 24). 4) Distributions in $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$ are not required to have densities, nor even be continuous. 5) The family $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$ has many natural and expected properties, such as closure under scaling and translation. These properties are gathered and proved in Lemma 24 which is deferred to Appendix A for brevity of the main text.

**Examples of distributions in $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$.** Most common distributions belong to $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$ for some values of the parameters $\bar{t}$ and $B$. Moreover, by Lemma 24 if a distribution is in $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$, then all scaled and translated versions are as well. A short list includes: i) the Normal distribution for $B \geq \frac{q_3/4}{\phi(q_{1/2+\bar{t}})}$, where $\phi$ is the standard Gaussian density and $q_\alpha$ is the corresponding $\alpha$-quantile, ii) any uniform distribution on an interval with $\bar{t} \in (0, 1/2)$ and $B = 4$, iii) any fixed continuous distribution $F$ with positive density $f = F'$ and $B$ large enough (namely, $B \geq \left( m_2(F) \min_{x \in I_{F,\bar{t}}} f(x) \right)^{-1}$).

**Median estimation results for $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$.** We now specialize the median estimation results presented above for the most general possible setting of $\mathcal{H}_{\bar{t},R}$, to the setting of $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$. This will be helpful since we will actually use these median estimation results to prove MAD estimation results in Section 2.3.

First, note that by Lemma 24 whenever $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$, then also $F \in \mathcal{H}_{\bar{t},R}$ for $R : [0, \bar{t}] \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined by $R(t) := tBm_2(F)$. Therefore, Corollary 2 immediately yields the following tight bound on the maximal possible change in median from $\varepsilon$-contaminating a distribution in $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B}$. Since this maximal change is tight (example given in Remark 8), we denote it in the sequel by

$$U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2} := Bm_2 \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)}.$$
Corollary 7. For any \( \tilde{t} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \), any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\tilde{t})) \), and any \( F \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{t}, B} \),
\[
\sup_{\text{distribution } G, \ \tilde{m}_1 \in m_1((1-\varepsilon)F+\varepsilon G)} |\tilde{m}_1 - m_1(F)| \leq U_{\varepsilon, B, m_2(F)}.
\]

Remark 8 (Tightness of Corollary 7). For any \( a > 0 \), let \( F \) be the uniform distribution over \([0, a]\). Then \( m_1(F) = \frac{a}{2} \) and \( m_2(F) = \frac{a}{4} \), and thus \( F \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{t}, B} \) for any \( \tilde{t} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) and \( B = 4 \). Now for any \( \varepsilon \in (0, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\tilde{t})) \subseteq (0, \frac{1}{2}) \), let \( G \) be the uniform distribution over \([a, \frac{a}{4}]\). Then \( \tilde{F} := (1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon G \) is the uniform distribution over \([0, \frac{a}{4}]\), and has median \( m_1(F) = \frac{a}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)}a = m_1(F) + U_{\varepsilon, B, m_2(F)} \). An identical argument on \( F(\cdot) \) and \( G(\cdot) \) yields an example where the median decreases by \(-U_{\varepsilon, B, m_2(F)}\), so the bound in Corollary 7 is tight.

Now we turn to median estimation bounds. Since \( R(t) = tBm_2(F) \) is clearly Lipschitz, the discussion preceding Lemmas 3 and 4 about the optimality of the following error bounds applies. That is, the error decomposes into the sum of the unavoidable uncertainty term \( U_{\varepsilon, B, m_2(F)} \) plus a confidence-interval term decaying at the rate of \( n^{-1/2} \) with sub-Gaussian tails, both of which are optimal. For brevity, we omit the proofs of the following corollaries since they follow immediately from Lemmas 3, 4, and 24.

Corollary 9. Consider the same setup as in Lemma 3 except with the added restriction that \( F \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{t}, B} \). Then for any confidence level \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), error level \( E > 0 \), and sample complexity \( n \geq 2 \max \left( \frac{B^2m_2^2(F)}{E^2}, \left( \tilde{t} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)} \right)^{-2} \right) \log \frac{2}{\delta} \), we have
\[
P \left( |\tilde{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_1(F)| \leq U_{\varepsilon, B, m_2(F)} + E \right) \geq 1 - \delta.
\]

Corollary 10. Consider the same setup as in Lemma 4 except with the added restriction that \( F \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{t}, B} \). Then for any confidence level \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), error level \( E > 0 \), and sample complexity \( n \geq 2 \max \left( \frac{B^2m_2^2(F)}{E^2}, (\tilde{t} - \varepsilon)^{-2} \right) \log \frac{2}{\delta} \),
\[
P \left( |\tilde{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_1(F)| \leq U_{\varepsilon, B, m_2(F)}^{(MALICIOUS)} + E \right) \geq 1 - \delta.
\]

In Corollary 10 above, we have defined \( U_{\varepsilon, B, m_2}^{(MALICIOUS)} := Bm_2 \varepsilon \), which is a tight bound on the uncertainty in median estimation that a malicious adversary can induce (see Lemma 5).

2.3 Finite-sample guarantees for MAD estimation from contaminated samples

Our algorithms for CBAI in Section 3 will use as primitives the finite-sample guarantees on median estimation proved above in Section 2.2. However, in many applications, it is desirable not only to return a (nearly) optimal arm, but also to provide guarantees on how good that arm is. The purpose of this section is to accomplish the latter objective.
Specifically, in addition to determining a (near) optimal arm $\hat{I}$, we would like to also obtain guarantees of the form: “with probability at least 80\%, a new random variable $Y \sim F_{\hat{I}}$ is at least 10”, say. Such a guarantee could be accomplished directly using the machinery developed in the previous subsection: by estimating the 0.2 quantile in addition to the median (i.e. 0.5 quantile). However, this approach has two problems. First, if we would like to obtain such a guarantee for multiple probability levels (e.g. 55\%, 60\%, \ldots) we would have to perform a separate estimation for each of the corresponding quantiles. Second, and more importantly, estimation of a quantile $q$ from contaminated samples requires control of quantiles in a $\frac{\epsilon}{2(1-\epsilon)}$ neighborhood of $q$ (this follows by an identical argument as in Lemma 1), which can severely restrict the range of quantiles that are even possible to estimate.

To deal with these two problems, we instead resort to estimating the “second median moment”, called the \textit{median absolute deviation} (MAD), of the arm’s underlying distribution $F$. Similar to variance (which may not exist for $F$ and anyways we stress is not estimatable from contaminated samples), the MAD describes the scale of $F$’s tails away from the median, which we already know how to estimate. Now, the MAD is of course not fully identifiable from contaminated samples, just like the median (see discussion in Section 2.1). However, we can estimate the MAD up to a reasonable region of uncertainty provided some additional mild assumptions restricting the class $F_{\bar{\ell},B}$.

**Definition 3.** For any $\bar{\ell} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $B > 0$, $\bar{m}_2 > 0$, and $\kappa \geq 2$, let $F_{\bar{\ell},B,\bar{m}_2,\kappa}$ be the family of distributions $F$ satisfying

(i) $[3]$ holds for all $x_1, x_2 \in I_{F,\bar{\ell}} \cup [m_1(F) \pm 2m_2(F)]$.

(ii) $m_2(F) \leq \bar{m}_2$.

(iii) $m_2(F) \leq \kappa m_4(F)$.

Let us make a few more remarks on this definition. 1) Our CBAI algorithms will work when the arms’ distributions are in the general class of $F_{\bar{\ell},B}$ since this is enough for median estimation; however, when we restrict to $F_{\bar{\ell},B,\bar{m}_2,\kappa}$, we can also estimate the MAD and thus additionally prove guarantees on the returned arm as described above. 2) It is not clear a priori that $m_2(F)$ and $m_4(F)$ are even well-defined for $F$, since it is not clear that $m_1(F)$ and $m_2(F)$ are unique; however $F \in F_{\bar{\ell},B,\bar{m}_2,\kappa} \subseteq F_{\bar{\ell},B}$ ensures that $m_1(F)$ is unique, and the possible interval extension in (i) ensures that $m_2(F)$ is also unique for $F \in F_{\bar{\ell},B,\bar{m}_2,\kappa}$ (proven in Lemma 24). 3) Property (iii) requires bounds on the higher robust moments, namely the fourth median moment. Informally, higher robust moments are necessary to control the error of estimation of lower robust moments, analogous to how bounds on variance (resp. kurtosis) are typically necessary for estimation of a distribution’s mean (resp. variance). 4) Note that distributions in $F_{\bar{\ell},B,\bar{m}_2,\kappa}$ are not required to have densities, nor even be continuous. 5) As we will show in Lemma 13 below, the inequality $m_4(F) \leq 2m_2(F)$ holds for any distribution with well-defined $m_4(F)$ and $m_2(F)$; this is why we impose the parameter $\kappa$ to be at least 2. 6) The family $F_{\bar{\ell},B,\bar{m}_2,\kappa}$ has many natural and expected properties, such as closure under scaling and translation. These properties are gathered and proved in Lemma 24 which is deferred to Appendix A for brevity of the main text.
MAD estimation results for $\hat{F}_{\ell,B,\hat{m}_2,\kappa}$. We are finally ready to present finite-sample guarantees on the speed of convergence of the empirical MAD $\hat{m}_2$ from contaminated samples, to the underlying distribution’s MAD $m_2$. We first present results for the oblivious and prescient adversarial settings. As before, the estimation error decomposes into the sum of two terms: a bias term reflecting the uncertainty the adversary can inject given her contamination level; and a confidence-interval term that shrinks with optimal $n^{-1/2}$ rate and sub-Gaussian tails.

Lemma 11. Let $\ell \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min(\varepsilon(\ell), \frac{1}{\ell}))$, and $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\ell,B,\hat{m}_2,\kappa}$. Let $Y_i \sim F$ and $D_i \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon)$, for $i \in [n]$, all be drawn independently. Let $\{Z_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ be arbitrary random variables possibly depending on $\{Y_i, D_i\}_{i \in [n]}$, and define $X_i = (1 - D_i)Y_i + D_iZ_i$. Then for any confidence level $\delta > 0$, error level $E > 0$, and sample complexity $n \geq 2 \max\left(\frac{16\kappa^2 B^2 \rho_2^2}{E^2}, \left(\min(\ell, \frac{1}{B}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)}\right)^{-2}\right) \log \frac{4}{\delta}$,

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{m}_2(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_2(F)| \leq (1 + 2\kappa)U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F)} + E\right) \geq 1 - \delta,
$$

where $\hat{m}_2(X_1, \ldots, X_n) := \hat{m}_1(|X_1 - \hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n)|, \ldots, |X_n - \hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n)|)$.

Informally, we prove Lemma 11 by decomposing the MAD estimation error into two terms, each of which resembles the error between a true median (of a distribution related to $F$) and an empirical median of contaminated samples, and then applying the median estimation guarantees proved above. Before proving Lemma 11 however, we first present two lemmas which be helpful in the proof.

Lemma 12. For any sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
|m_1(|x_1 + c|, \ldots, |x_n + c|) - m_1(|x_1|, \ldots, |x_n|)| \leq |c|.
$$

Proof. For any fixed vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the function $c \mapsto m_1(|x_1 + c|, \ldots, |x_n + c|)$ is 1-Lipschitz since it is the composition of 1-$L_\infty$ Lipschitz functions: adding $c\mathbb{I}$, taking entrywise absolute values, and taking an order statistic. \qed

Lemma 13. For any distribution $F$ with well-defined $m_2(F)$ and $m_4(F)$,

$$
m_4(F) \leq 2m_2(F).
$$

Proof. Let $Y \sim F$. Then, by an application of Lemma 12

$$
m_4(F) = m_1\left(|Y - m_1(F)| - m_2(F)|\right) \leq m_1\left(|Y - m_1(F)|\right) + m_2(F) = 2m_2(F).
$$

\qed

We are now ready to prove Lemma 11.
Proof of Lemma 11. For shorthand, denote \( \hat{m}_1 := \hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \), and let \( H \) denote the induced folded distribution of \( |Y - m_1(F)| \) where \( Y \sim F \). By the fact \( m_2(F) = m_1(H) \), Lemma 12 and the triangle inequality, the MAD estimation error is bounded above by:

\[
\left| \hat{m}_2(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_2(F) \right| = \left| \hat{m}_1(|X_1 - \hat{m}_1|, \ldots, |X_n - \hat{m}_1|) - m_1(H) \right| \leq \left| \hat{m}_1(|X_1 - m_1(F)|, \ldots, |X_n - m_1(F)|) - m_1(H) \right| + |\hat{m}_1 - m_1(F)|. \tag{4}
\]

By Corollary 9 and our choice of \( n \), the second error term in (4) is bounded above by \( U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F)} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \) with probability at least \( 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \). Now for the first error term in (4) we may apply Corollary 9 using the distribution \( H \) in lieu of \( F \) and using the contaminations \( \hat{Z}_i := |Z_i - m_1(F)| \) in lieu of \( Z_i \). Thus, by combining item 8 in Lemma 24 with Corollary 9, this first error term is bounded above by \( U_{\varepsilon,\kappa,B,m_2(H)} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \) with probability at least \( 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \) whenever we have at least \( 2 \max \left( 4B^2\kappa^2m_2^2(H)E^{-2}, (\min(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4})^{-2} \right) \) \log \frac{4}{\delta} \) samples, which is satisfied because of our choice of \( n \) and the inequality

\[
m_2(H) = m_4(F) \leq 2m_2(F) \tag{5}
\]

from Lemma 13. Therefore we conclude by a union bound that, with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \), the MAD estimation error is at most \( U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F)} + U_{\varepsilon,\kappa,B,m_2(H)} + E \). By another application of (5), this is bounded above by \( (1 + 2\kappa)U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F)} + E \), as desired. \( \square \)

Similar to median estimation above, it is possible to estimate the MAD even in the malicious adversarial setting. The proof is omitted since it is identical to the proof of Lemma 11 above, only replacing the uses of Corollary 9 with uses of Corollary 10.

Lemma 14. Let \( \bar{t} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \varepsilon \in (0, \min(\bar{t}, \frac{1}{e})) \), and \( F \in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{t},B,m_2,\kappa} \). Let \( \{Y_i, D_i\} \), for \( i \in [n] \), be drawn independently with marginals \( Y_i \sim F \) and \( D_i \sim \text{Ber}(\varepsilon) \). Let \( \{Z_i\}_{i \in [n]} \) be arbitrary random variables possibly depending on \( \{Y_i, D_i\}_{i \in [n]} \), and define \( X_i = (1 - D_i)Y_i + D_iZ_i \). Then for any confidence level \( \delta > 0 \), error level \( E > 0 \), and sample complexity \( n \geq 2 \max \left( \frac{16\kappa^2B^2m_2^2}{E^2}, (\min(\bar{t}, \frac{1}{e}) - \varepsilon)^{-2} \right) \log \frac{6}{\delta} \),

\[
\mathbb{P} \left( |\hat{m}_2(X_1, \ldots, X_n) - m_2(F)| \leq (1 + 2\kappa)U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F)}^{\text{(MALICIOUS)}} + E \right) \geq 1 - \delta,
\]

where \( \hat{m}_2(X_1, \ldots, X_n) := \hat{m}_1(|X_1 - \hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n)|, \ldots, |X_n - \hat{m}_1(X_1, \ldots, X_n)|) \).

3 Algorithms

Our algorithms for CBAI actually work for a more general problem: best arm identification in partially identified settings. Specifically, consider any setting where the statistic (e.g. median, mean, etc.) which measures the goodness of an arm, can be estimated only up to some unavoidable error term due to lack of identifiability. The main result
of this section is informally that BAI algorithms for the classical stochastic multi-armed bandit setting can be adapted with little modification to such partially identified settings. Perhaps surprisingly, this suggests a certain innate robustness of many existing classical BAI algorithms.

Because of this generality, we present our algorithms for this slightly more abstract problem of best arm identification under partial identifiability, which we define formally in Section 3.1. In Section 3.2, we detail how to adapt classical BAI algorithms for this setting; and in Section 3.3 we apply these guarantees to our CBAI problem.

3.1 Best Arm Identification under partial identifiability

Let us formally define the setup of the Partially Identifiable Best-Arm-Identification problem (PIBAI). Let \( k \geq 2 \) be the number of arms. For each arm \( i \in [k] \), consider a family of distributions \( D_i = \{ D_i(p_i, G) \} \) where \( p_i \) is a parameter of interest associated to each arm and \( G \) is a nuisance parameter in some abstract space \( \mathcal{G} \). We let \( i^* := \arg \max_{i \in [k]} p_i \) be the best arm. We assume the existence of non-negative unavoidable biases \( \{ U_i \}_{i \in [k]} \) satisfying:

(i) Even from infinitely many independent samples \( X_t, t = 1, 2, \ldots \) with \( X_t \sim D_i(p_i, G_t) \) for some unknown, possibly varying \( G_t \in \mathcal{G} \) \( (t \geq 1) \), it is impossible to estimate \( p_i \) more precisely than the region \([p_i \pm U_i]\).

(ii) There exists some estimator that, for any \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), uses \( n_{\alpha,\delta} = O(\alpha^{-2} \log \frac{1}{\delta}) \) i.i.d. samples\(^1\) from \( D_i \) to output an estimate \( \hat{p}_i \) satisfying

\[
\mathbb{P}( \hat{p}_i \in [p_i \pm (U_i + \alpha)]) \geq 1 - \delta.
\]  

The PIBAI problem is then precisely the standard fixed-confidence stochastic bandit game using these distributions: in each iteration \( t \), the algorithm chooses an arm \( I_t \in [k] \), and receives a sample from \( D_{I_t}(p_{I_t}, G_{I_t}) \) for some unknown \( G_{I_t} \in \mathcal{G} \).

By the partial identifiability property (i), it is clear that even given infinite samples, it is impossible to distinguish between the optimal arm \( i^* \) and any suboptimal arm \( i \neq i^* \) satisfying \( p_i + U_i \geq p_{i^*} - U_{i^*} \). (This is made formal in the lower bound section; see Section 4.1 for details.) Therefore we restrict henceforth to the statistically possible setting in which the effective gaps \( \tilde{\Delta}_i = (p_{i^*} - U_{i^*}) - (p_i + U_i) \) are strictly positive for each suboptimal arm \( i \neq i^* \).

Now for any \( \alpha \geq 0 \), arm \( i \) is said to be \( \alpha \)-suboptimal if \( \tilde{\Delta}_i \leq \alpha \). Moreover, for any \( \alpha \geq 0 \) and \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), a PIBAI algorithm is said to be \((\alpha, \delta)\)-PAC if it outputs an arm \( \hat{I} \) that is \( \alpha \)-suboptimal with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \). That is,

\[
\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Delta}_I \leq \alpha) \geq 1 - \delta,
\]
while $|S| > 1$ do
    Sample each arm $i \in S$ for $n_{\alpha/2,\delta/4}$ times, and generate estimates $\hat{p}_i$
    $S \leftarrow \{i \in S : \hat{p}_i \geq m_1(\{\hat{p}_j\}_{j \in S}) \}$
    $\delta \leftarrow \frac{\delta}{2}$
end

Output the only arm left in $S$

Algorithm 1: Adaptation of median elimination algorithm for PIBAI.

where the above probability is taken over the possible randomness of the samples, estimator from (ii), and PIBAI algorithm.

3.2 Algorithms under partial identifiability

Naïve algorithm. A simple, first attempt at an $(\alpha, \delta)$-PAC PIBAI algorithm is the following: pull each of the $k$ arms $n_{\alpha/2,\delta/k}$ times to create estimates $\hat{p}_i$, and simply output the arm $\hat{I} := \max_{i \in [k]} \hat{p}_i$ with the highest estimate. By (6) and a union bound, we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, all estimates $\hat{p}_i \in [p_i \pm (U_i + \alpha)]$. Whenever this occurs,

$$\tilde{\Delta}_\hat{I} = (p_i^* - U_i^*) - (\hat{p}_i + U_i) \leq (\hat{p}_i + \alpha) - (\hat{p}_i - \alpha) \leq \alpha,$$

implying that $\hat{I}$ is $\alpha$-suboptimal, and that the (deterministic) sample complexity of the naïve algorithm is $O\left(\frac{k}{\alpha^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$.

However, this sample complexity is undesirable for two important reasons. First, the extra factor of $k$ in the logarithm (introduced from the crude union bound above) is unnecessary; and its removal results in matching the lower bound proved in Section 4.1. Second, the sample complexity is not adaptive to the difficulty of the actual instance: an arm is sampled $n_{\alpha/2,\delta/k}$ times even if it is far from $\alpha$-suboptimal (i.e. $\tilde{\Delta}_i \gg \alpha$) and could potentially be eliminated much more quickly. Both of these problems were remedied in the classical multi-armed bandit literature; we now show how to analogously accomplish this for PIBAI using the same algorithmic tricks, only slightly modified.

Removing the log $k$ by modifying [Even-Dar et al., 2006]’s Median Elimination Algorithm for PIBAI. Pseudocode is given in Algorithm 1. The primary change from their original algorithm is simply that for PIBAI, there is no need to have geometrically decaying estimation error in the rounds. That is, the original Median Elimination Algorithm for BAI requires taking roughly $n_{(3/4)r^2, 2^{-r}\delta}$ samples on the round $r$, whereas we need only take roughly $n_{\alpha,2^{-r}\delta}$ samples.

**Theorem 15.** For any $\alpha > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, Algorithm 1 is an $(\alpha, \delta)$-PAC PIBAI algorithm with sample complexity $O\left(\frac{k}{\alpha^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$.

The proof is deferred to Appendix 3 since it follows closely the analysis of the original algorithm [Even-Dar et al., 2006, Theorem 10]. Here, we describe only the main difference
\begin{algorithm}
\begin{algorithmic}
\State $S \leftarrow [k]$, $r \leftarrow 1$
\While {$|S| > 1$}
\State Sample each arm $i \in S$ once and produce $\hat{p}_{i,r}$ from all $r$ past samples of it
\State $S \leftarrow \{i \in S : \hat{p}_{i,r} \leq \max_{j \in S} \hat{p}_{j,r} - 2\alpha_{r,6\delta/(r^{2}kr^{2})}\}$
\State $r \leftarrow r + 1$
\EndWhile
\State Output the only arm left in $S$
\end{algorithmic}
\caption{Adaptation of successive elimination algorithm for PIBAI. Here, $\alpha_{r,\delta} := \sqrt{c \log \frac{1}{\delta}}$, where $c$ is a universal constant satisfying $n_{\alpha,\delta} \leq c \alpha^{-2} \log \frac{1}{\delta}$.}
\end{algorithm}

in the proof: in order to guarantee that Algorithm 1 returns an $\alpha$-suboptimal arm for PIBAI, we must ensure that all arms that are more than $\alpha$-suboptimal are eliminated before the optimal arm is eliminated (if it ever is). This is in contrast to the original for BAI in classical the multi-armed bandit setup: there, it is not problematic if the best (or even currently best) arm is eliminated at round $r$, so long as the best arm in consecutive rounds $r$ and $r+1$ changes at most by a small amount. At its essence, this is due to the following “additive property of suboptimality” for BAI:

“If arm $i$ has $\Delta_i$ suboptimality gap w.r.t. the optimal arm $i^*$, and if arm $j$ has $\Delta_j^{(i)}$ suboptimality gap w.r.t. arm $i$, then arm $j$ has suboptimality gap $\Delta_j = \Delta_i + \Delta_j^{(i)}$ w.r.t. the optimal arm $i^*$”

The critical point is that the same argument does not work for PIBAI, since errors propagate from adding the uncertainties $U_i$ in the suboptimality gaps: $(p_i^* - U_i^*) - (p_i + U_i) \neq [(p_i^* - U_i^*) - (p_j + U_j)] + [(p_i - U_i) - (p_j + U_j)]$. We stress that this nuance is not merely a technicality, but actually fundamental to correctness proofs for PIBAI.

Obtaining instance-adaptive sample complexity by modifying [Even-Dar et al., 2006]’s Successive Elimination Algorithm for PIBAI. Pseudocode is given in Algorithm 2. The algorithm and analysis are practically identical to the original in [Even-Dar et al., 2006]. As such, proof details are deferred to Appendix B.2. The main difference is just that in the proof of correctness, we show the event $\{|\hat{p}_{i,r} - p_i| \leq U_i + n_{\alpha,\delta}(6\delta^2)/(6kr), \forall r \in [R], \forall i \in S_r\}$ occurs with probability at least $1 - \delta$. This ensures that in each round $r$, each estimate $\hat{p}_{i,r}$ is accurate enough to use for the elimination step.

Note that Algorithm 2 returns the optimal arm w.h.p. (without knowing the smallest effective gap), unlike Algorithm 1 above which only returns a near-optimal arm w.h.p.

Theorem 16. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, Algorithm 1 outputs the optimal arm after using at most $O\left(\sum_{i \neq i^*} \frac{1}{\Delta_i^2} \log \left(\frac{k}{\delta\Delta_i}\right)\right)$ samples.

\footnote{In particular, at most $2^{-r}\alpha$, since this implies that the final arm $\hat{j}$ is at most $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{-r}\alpha = \alpha$-suboptimal.}
Moreover, as noted in Remark 9 of [Even-Dar et al., 2006], Algorithm 2 is easily modified (simply terminate early) to be an \((\alpha, \delta)\)-PAC algorithm with sample complexity

\[
O \left( \frac{N_\alpha}{\alpha^2} \log \left( \frac{N_\alpha}{\delta} \right) \right) + \sum_{i \in [k] : \Delta_i > \alpha} \frac{1}{\Delta_i^2} \log \left( \frac{k}{\delta \Delta_i^2} \right),
\]

where \(N_\alpha\) is the number of \(\alpha\)-suboptimal arms, i.e. arms with \(\Delta_i \leq \alpha\).

**Remark 17.** In the multi-armed bandit literature, the sample complexity of the Successive Elimination algorithm (tight up to a logarithmic factor) was improved upon by [Karnin et al., 2013]’s Exponential-Gap Elimination (EGE) algorithm (tight up to a doubly logarithmic factor). A natural idea is to analogously improve upon the PIBAI guarantee in Theorem 16 by adapting the EGE algorithm. However, this does not work. The reason for this inadaptability of the EGE – in contrast to the easy adaptability of the above-described algorithms – is that EGE relies heavily upon the “additive property of suboptimality” for MAB, which does not hold for PIBAI (see discussion following Theorem 16 for details).

### 3.3 Algorithms for CBAI

In this subsection, we show how to use the PIBAI algorithms described in Section 3.2 above for CBAI. Recall the notation of Section 2 for CBAI: consider the bandit problem with \(k \geq 2\) arms, where at each time \(t \geq 1\), pulling an arm \(i \in [k]\) produces a random variable \(X_{i,t} = (1 - D_{i,t})Y_{i,t} + D_{i,t}Z_{i,t}\), where \(Y_{i,t}\), \(D_{i,t}\), and \(Z_{i,t}\) are as defined in Section 2 depending on the different adversarial settings. Assume that each \(F_i\) is in the class \(\mathcal{F}_{t,B}\), for some known set of parameters \(B\) and \(\bar{t}\). We would like to identify the arm \(i^*\) with the best median \(m_1(F_i)\). The effective gap of each suboptimal arm \(i \neq i^*\) is given by \(\bar{\Delta}_i := (m_1(F_{i^*}) - U_{i^*}) - (m_1(F_i) + U_i)\), where \(U_i\) is the unavoidable uncertainty term for median estimation. That is, \(U_{i} = U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F_i)}\) for oblivious and prescient adversaries by Corollary 9 and \(U_{i} = U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F_i)}^{(MALICIOUS)}\) for malicious adversaries by Corollary 10. We will prove algorithmic upper bounds for all these adversarial settings simultaneously by proving the upper bounds in terms of the effective gaps, since these are defined in terms of the uncertainties \(U_i\) which are defined by the adversarial strength.

#### 3.3.1 PAC guarantees

Similarly to the literature on first moment estimation (see e.g. [Bubeck et al., 2013]), we assume throughout this subsection that all arm distributions \(F_i\) have a second robust moment uniformly bounded by \(\bar{m}_2\).

First, we discuss how to apply Algorithm 1. For \((\alpha, \delta)\)-PAC guarantees, we can directly apply Algorithm 1 without modification, where at each round, \(\hat{p}_i\) is the empirical median of the payoffs of arm \(i\) and \(n_{\alpha,\delta} = 2 \max \left( \frac{B^2 \bar{m}_2^2}{\alpha}, \left( \frac{\bar{t}}{\bar{t} - \varepsilon} \right)^{-2} \right) \log \frac{2}{\delta} \) against oblivious and prescient adversaries, see Corollary 9 (resp. \(n_{\alpha,\delta} = 2 \max \left( \frac{B^2 \bar{m}_2^2}{\alpha}, \left( \bar{t} - \varepsilon \right)^{-2} \right) \log \frac{2}{\delta} \) against malicious adversaries, see Corollary 10. Note that the constant term in the sample
$S \leftarrow [k], r \leftarrow 1$
Sample each arm $n_0(\delta)$ times.

while $|S| > 1$ do

Sample each arm $i \in S$ for $(2N + 1)$ times and produce $\hat{p}_{i,r}$ from all past samples

$S \leftarrow \{i \in S : \hat{p}_{i,r} \leq \max_{j \in S} \hat{p}_{j,r} - 2\alpha_{r,\delta}/(\pi^2 kr^2)\}$

$r \leftarrow r + 1$

end

Output the only arm left in $S$

Algorithm 3: Adaptation of successive elimination algorithm (see Algorithm 2) for CBAI. Here, $\alpha_{r,\delta} := \sqrt{2Bm^2 \log \frac{4}{r^3}}$.

Complexity introduces an extra term that is negligible in the overall sample complexity of the Median Elimination Algorithm, and we have the following theorem.

Theorem 18. Let $F_i \in F_{i,B}$ with $m_2(F) \leq \bar{m}_2$ for each arm $i \in [n]$, and let the adversary be oblivious, prescient, or malicious. For any $\alpha > 0$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$, Algorithm 3 is an $(\alpha, \delta)$-PAC CBAI algorithm with sample complexity $O\left(\frac{k}{\alpha^2} \log \frac{4}{\delta}\right)$.

Next, we discuss how to apply Algorithm 2. In the traditional Successive Elimination Algorithm for BAI, concentration inequalities are needed even for small sample sizes, since during the first round, each arm is pulled only once. However, our guarantees from Section 2 are only valid when the sample size is greater than a threshold that only depends on the confidence $\delta$, not on the precision $\alpha$. Hence, we need to modify Algorithm 2 and the pseudocode is given in Algorithm 3, where we denote by $N = \left(\bar{t} - \frac{\epsilon}{2(1-\epsilon)}\right)^{-2}$ (resp. $N = (\bar{t} - \epsilon)^{-2}$) and $n_0(\delta) = 2N \log \frac{2}{\delta}$ (resp. $n_0(\delta) = 2N \log \frac{3}{\delta}$) in the oblivious and prescient (resp. malicious) adversarial settings.

Theorem 19. Let $F_i \in F_{i,B}$ with $m_2(F) \leq \bar{m}_2$ for each arm $i \in [n]$, and let the adversary be either oblivious, prescient, or malicious. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$. Set $N = \left(\bar{t} - \frac{\epsilon}{2(1-\epsilon)}\right)^{-2}$ for the oblivious and prescient cases, and $N = (\bar{t} - \epsilon)^{-2}$ for the malicious case. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, Algorithm 3 outputs the optimal arm after using at most $O\left(kN \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \sum_{i \neq i^*} \frac{1}{\Delta_i} \log \left(\frac{k}{\delta \Delta_i}\right)\right)$ samples.

3.3.2 Guarantees for the selected arm

As discussed in Section 2.3, it is typically desirable in applications to not only to output the best arm, but also to provide guarantees on how good this arm is. We have just discussed how to accomplish the former w.h.p.; we now show how these described CBAI algorithms also achieve the latter to a certain precision “for free”, i.e. with no extra samples. We describe this below for our adapted Successive Elimination Algorithm 3, a nearly identical (yet technically hairier) argument yields a similar guarantee for our adapted Median Elimination Algorithm.
The following simple lemma will be helpful to prove the desired types of guarantees.

In words, it shows that the lower tail of any distribution \( F \in \mathcal{F}_{\hat{I},B,\hat{m}_2,\kappa} \) is controlled by its median and MAD.

**Lemma 20.** Let \( F \in \mathcal{F}_{\hat{I},B,\hat{m}_2,\kappa} \) and \( Y \sim F \). Then simultaneously for all \( t \in [0, \bar{t}] \),

\[
\mathbb{P} \left( Y \geq m_1(F) - tBm_2(F) \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} + t.
\]

**Proof.** By item (6) of Lemma 24 we have that for all \( t \in [0, \bar{t}] \),

\[
t = \frac{1}{2} - (\frac{1}{2} - t) \geq \frac{1}{Bm_2(F)}(F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) - F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2} - t)).
\]

Rearranging yields that \( F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2} - t) \geq m_1(F) - Bm_2(F)t \), and thus completes the proof. \( \square \)

We now show how to use this to prove guarantees for the arm that Algorithm 1 outputs. We remark that as above, the following guarantees hold for all adversarial settings, since the adversarial strength is already encapsulated in the definition of the unavoidable uncertainty terms \( U_i \) and effective gaps \( \hat{\Delta}_i \).

**Theorem 21.** Let \( F_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\hat{I},B,\hat{m}_2,\kappa} \), and let the adversary be either oblivious, prescient, or malicious. Consider using Algorithm 1 for CBAI exactly as in Theorem 18. Let \( \hat{I} \) denote the arm it outputs, let \( Y \) be the random variable whose conditional distribution on \( \hat{I} \) is \( F_i \), and let \( \hat{m}_1 \) and \( \hat{m}_2 \) denote the empirical median and MAD, respectively, from the samples it has seen from \( F_i \). Then simultaneously for all \( t \in [0, \bar{t}] \),

\[
\mathbb{P} \left( Y \geq [\hat{m}_1 - tB\hat{m}_2] - \left( 1 + Bt \right) \frac{4\kappa \alpha}{\sqrt{\log_2 k}} + (1 + (1 + 2\kappa)Bt)U_{\varepsilon,B,\hat{m}_2} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} + t - \delta.
\]

**Proof.** By definition of Algorithm 1 \( \hat{I} \) has stayed in \( S \) for the entirety of the algorithm. Therefore, by the discussion preceding Theorem 18, \( \hat{I} \) has been sampled at least \( n_\alpha,\delta \log_2 k = 2 \max \left( \frac{B^2\hat{m}_2^2}{\alpha^2}, \left( \bar{t} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)} \right)^{-2} \right) \log \frac{3}{\alpha} \log_2 k \) times against oblivious and prescient adversaries (resp. \( n_\alpha,\delta \log_2 k = 2 \max \left( \frac{B^2\hat{m}_2^2}{\alpha^2}, \left( \bar{t} - \varepsilon \right)^{-2} \right) \log \frac{3}{\alpha} \log_2 k \) against malicious adversaries). Therefore by Corollary 9 and Lemma 11 we have that with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \), both

\[
m_1(F_i) \geq \hat{m}_1 - U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F)} + E
\]

\[
m_2(F_i) \leq \hat{m}_2 + (1 + 2\kappa)U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F)} + E
\]

where \( E := \frac{4\kappa \alpha}{\sqrt{\log_2 k}} \). Whenever this occurs, we have that \( m_1(F) - tBm_2(F) \geq [\hat{m}_1 - tB\hat{m}_2] - [(1 + Bt)E + (1 + (1 + 2\kappa)Bt)U_1] \). We conclude by Lemma 20 noting that \( U_1 \leq U_{\varepsilon,B,\hat{m}_2} \), and using a union bound. \( \square \)

Note that if \( \varepsilon \) and \( \alpha \) are small, the bound inside the probability term in Theorem 21 is less conservative than the crude bound \( \hat{m}_1 - tB\hat{m}_2 \).
4 Lower bounds

This section provides lower bounds for the CBAI problem that match, up to small logarithmic factors, the algorithmic upper bounds proved in Section 3.2 for each of the adversarial settings. The main insight is a reduction from hard instances for the BAI problem to instances of our CBAI problem. In this way, we leverage the sophisticated lower bounds already developed in the classical multi-armed bandit literature.

4.1 Statement of lower bounds

Let \( i^* := \arg\max_{i \in [k]} m_1(F_i) \) denote the optimal arm. As in Section 3, define for each suboptimal arm \( i \neq i^* \) the effective gap \( \tilde{\Delta}_i := (m_1(F_i^*) - U_i^*) - (m_1(F_i) + U_i) \), where \( U_i \) is the unavoidable uncertainty term for median estimation. That is, \( U_i = U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F_i)} \) for oblivious and prescient adversaries by Corollary 9; and \( U_i = U_{\varepsilon,B,m_2(F_i)}^{(\text{prescient})} \) for malicious adversaries by Corollary 10. We will prove lower bounds for all these adversarial settings simultaneously by proving the lower bounds in terms of the effective gaps, since these are defined in terms of the uncertainties \( U_i \), which already encapsulate the adversarial strength.

As mentioned for PIBAI in Section 3.1, CBAI is impossible when there exists suboptimal arms with non-positive effective gaps. Indeed, if \( i \neq i^* \) satisfies \( \tilde{\Delta}_i \leq 0 \), then there exist distributions \( G_i \) and \( G_i^* \) such that the resulting contaminated distributions \( \tilde{F}_i := (1 - \varepsilon)F_i + \varepsilon G_i \) and \( \tilde{F}_i^* := (1 - \varepsilon)F_i^* + \varepsilon G_i^* \) have equal medians. Moreover since the distributions \( F \) are arbitrary (CBAI makes no parametric assumption), it is thus statistically impossible to distinguish which between arm \( i \) or \( i^* \) has higher true median. Thus any CBAI algorithm, even with infinite samples, cannot succeed with probability more than \( \frac{1}{2} \).

Therefore we henceforth restrict to the setting where all effective gaps \( \tilde{\Delta}_i \) are strictly positive. The results in this section lower bound the sample complexity of any CBAI algorithm in terms of these effective gaps. To match the algorithmic upper bounds for best-median identification in Section 3, we will show our lower bounds for the function class \( \mathcal{F}_{l,B} \).

**Theorem 22.** Consider CBAI against an oblivious, prescient, or malicious adversary. There exists positive constants \( \delta' \) and \( B \) such that, for any number of arms \( k \geq 2 \), confidence level \( \delta \in (0, \delta') \), suboptimality level \( \alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{6}) \), contamination level \( \varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{15}) \), regularity level \( \bar{t} \in (0, \frac{1}{10}) \), and \( (\alpha, \delta) \)-PAC CBAI algorithm, there exists a CBAI instance with \( F_1, \ldots, F_k \in \mathcal{F}_{l,B} \), for which the algorithm uses at least the following number of samples in expectation:

\[
\mathbb{E}[T] \geq \Omega \left( \sum_{i \in [k]\setminus \{i^*\}} \frac{1}{\max(\tilde{\Delta}_i, \alpha)^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right),
\]

where \( i^* = \arg\max_{i \in [k]} m_1(F_i) \) is the optimal arm.

Taking the limit as \( \alpha \to 0 \) in Theorem 22 immediately yields the following lower bound on \( (0, \delta) \)-PAC algorithms.
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Corollary 23. Consider the same setup as in Theorem 22. Any $(0, \delta)$-PAC CBAI algorithm uses at least the following number of samples in expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}[T] \geq \Omega \left( \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{i^*\}} \frac{1}{\Delta_i^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right).$$

4.2 Proof sketch

We give here proofs sketches for Theorem 22 and Corollary 23. For brevity, full details are deferred to Appendix C.

The key idea in the proof is to “lift” hard BAI instances to hard CBAI problem instances. Specifically, let $\{P_i\}_{i \in [k]}$ be distributions for arms in a BAI problem, let $\{U_i\}_{i \in [k]}$ be the corresponding unavoidable uncertainties for median estimation of $P_i$ in CBAI, and let $i^*$ denote the best arm. We say $\{P_i\}_{i \in [k]}$ admits an $(\varepsilon, F_{t,B})$-CBAI-lifting to $\{F_i\}_{i \in [k]}$ if (i) $F_i \in F_{t,B}$ for each $i$, (ii) there exists some adversarial distributions $\{G_i\}_{i \in [k]}$ such that each $P_i = (1 - \varepsilon)F_i + \varepsilon G_i$; and (iii) the effective gaps $\bar{\Delta}_i$ for the $\{F_i\}_{i \in [k]}$ are equal to the gaps $\Delta_i$ in the original BAI problem. Intuitively, such a lifting can be thought of as choosing $F_i^*$ to be as large as possible and the other $F_i$ as small as possible while still being consistent with $P_i$, i.e. staying in the uncertainty region corresponding to the $U_i$.

Armed with this informal definition, we now outline the central idea behind the reduction. Let $\{P_i\}_{i \in [k]}$ be a “hard” BAI instance with best arm $i^*$, and assume it admits an $(\varepsilon, F_{t,B})$-CBAI-lifting to $\{F_i\}_{i \in [k]}$. Consider running a CBAI algorithm $A$ on the samples obtained from $\{P_i\}$; we claim that if $A$ is $(\alpha, \delta)$-PAC, then it must output an $\alpha$-suboptimal arm for the original BAI problem. Indeed, by (ii), the samples from the BAI instance have the same law as the samples that would be obtained from the CBAI problem with $\{F_i\}$, and by (iii), the effective gaps in the CBAI problem are equal to the gaps in the original problem. Therefore, $A$ must have sample complexity for this problem that is no smaller than the sample complexity of the best BAI algorithm.

Let us make a few remarks about this proof. First, note that the $\{F_i\}$ in the lifting need only exist, as we do not explicitly use these distributions but instead simply run $A$ on samples from the original bandit instance. Thus ensuring the existence of such a lifting is the main obstacle.

This raises a technical yet important nuance: most BAI lower bounds are constructed from Bernoulli or Gaussian distributions, which are not quite compatible with the reduction described above. The problem with Bernoulli arms is that they do not have liftings to $F_{t,B}$: any resulting $F_i$ would not satisfy and thus cannot be in $F_{t,B}$. This is not a problem for Gaussian arms; however, they run into a different problem: it is not clear how to lift Gaussian arms up or down far enough to change the median by exactly the maximum uncertainty amount $U_i$. We overcome this nuance by considering arms with smoothed Bernoulli distribution $\text{SBer}(p)$, which we define to be the uniform mixture between a Bernoulli distribution with parameter $p$ and a uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$. Fortunately, this distribution enjoys the desired $(\varepsilon, F_{t,B})$-CBAI-lifting: unlike the Bernoulli distribution, it is smooth enough to have liftings in $F_{t,B}$; and unlike the Gaussian distribution, the median of the appropriate lifting of $\text{SBer}(p)$ is exactly $U_i$ away
from the median of SBer\(p\). Both of these facts are simple calculations; see Appendix C for details.

The only ingredient remaining in the proof is to prove that there are hard instances for BAI with SBer-distributed arms. Intuitively, this can be argued as follows. Let \(\vec{p} \in [0,1]^k\) be such that \(\{\text{Ber}(p_i)\}_{i \in [k]}\) is a hard instance for BAI (e.g., the one from [Mannor and Tsitsiklis, 2004]); we argue that \(\{\text{SBer}(p_i)\}_{i \in [k]}\) is also hard. First, note that the sub-optimality gaps do not change, and thus the lower bound we are trying to prove is the same. Second, any arm pull that generates a sample from the uniform distribution is not helpful: that is, SBer\(p_i\) can be thought of as just a noisy version of Ber\(p_i\). Thus any algorithm obtains less information from pulling SBer\(p_i\) than from pulling Ber\(p_i\), and so the optimal sample complexity can only increase. We make this informal intuition rigorous in Appendix C by adapting [Mannor and Tsitsiklis, 2004]'s elegant change-of-measure lower-bound argument, which was originally designed for Bernoulli arms.
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A Properties of $F_{\tilde{t},B}$ and $F_{\tilde{t},B,\tilde{m}_2,\kappa}$

The following lemma lists some simple properties of $F_{\tilde{t},B}$ and $F_{\tilde{t},B,\tilde{m}_2,\kappa}$, which we use often throughout the paper.

Lemma 24. If $F \in F_{\tilde{t},B}$, then:

1. The distribution $F(a \cdot +b)$ is also in $F_{B,\tilde{t}}$ for any $a \neq 0$.

2. $F$ is monotonically increasing in $I_{F,\tilde{t}}$.

3. $Q_{L,F}(t) = Q_{R,F}(t)$, for all $t \in F(I_{F,\tilde{t}}) = [\frac{1}{2} \pm \tilde{t}]$. 
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Moreover if also $F$ is well-defined, and also we write $F^{-1}$ for $Q_{L,F} = Q_{R,F}$.

5. The left and right quantiles of $F$ are equal in the interval $F(I_{\tilde{F}}; i) = \left[ \frac{1}{2} - \tilde{t}, \frac{1}{2} + \tilde{t} \right]$.

6. For any $u_1, u_2 \in F(I_{F}; i)$, $\frac{1}{Bm_2(F)} |F^{-1}(u_1) - F^{-1}(u_2)|$. 

Moreover if also $F \in \mathcal{F}_{t,B,m_2,\kappa}$, then

7. The distribution $F(a \cdot + b)$ is in $\mathcal{F}_{B, t, a m_2, \kappa}$ for any $a \neq 0$.

8. The folded distribution\(^3\) $H_F$ of $F$ satisfies $H_F \in \mathcal{F}_{t H, B H}$, where $B H := \kappa B$ and $t_H := \min(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{B})$.

9. $m_2(F)$ is unique and thus $m_4(F)$ is well-defined.

Proof. When proved in order, all of these statements follow easily from the definition of the function class and the earlier statements. The only part requiring effort is item 8, which we prove presently. Let $H$ be the folded distribution of $H$; that is the induced distribution of $|Y - m|$ where $Y \sim F$. Define also $B H := \kappa B$ and $t_H := \min(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{B})$. Fix any $r_1, r_2 \in I_{H, t_H}$ where without loss of generality $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq 0$. Then

$$H(r_1) - H(r_2) = \mathbb{P}(|Y - m_1(F)| \leq r_1) - \mathbb{P}(|Y - m_1(F)| \leq r_2)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(Y \leq m_1(F) + r_1) - \mathbb{P}(Y \leq m_1(F) + r_2)$$

$$+ \mathbb{P}(Y < m_1(F) - r_2) - \mathbb{P}(Y < m_1(F) - r_1)$$

$$\geq F(m_1(F) + r_1) - F(m_1(F) + r_2)$$

$$\geq \frac{|r_1 - r_2|}{B m_2(F)}$$

$$\geq \frac{|r_1 - r_2|}{\kappa B m_4(F)}$$

$$= \frac{|r_1 - r_2|}{B_H m_2(H)}.$$ 

The only step requiring justification is the inequality in (7); this is evident by (3) if $r_1, r_2 \in [m_1(F) \pm 2m_2(F)]$, but this condition must be checked. Once we show this condition is met, however, we are immediately done.

Therefore, it is now sufficient to prove $r_1, r_2 \in [m_1(F) \pm 2m_2(F)]$. Since $r_1, r_2 \geq 0$, it suffices to show that the largest value in $I_{H, t_H}$, namely $Q_{R, H}(\frac{1}{2} + t_H)$, is at most $2m_2(F)$. And to show this, it suffices to show $\frac{1}{2} + t_H < H(2m_2(F))$. We show this last inequality

\(^3\)Recall that $H_F$ is the distribution of $|Y - m|$, where $Y \sim F$. 
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presently: by an similar argument as in the first few lines of the above display,

\[
H(2m_2(F)) - \frac{1}{2} = H(2m_2(F)) - H(m_2(F))
\]
\[
= [\mathbb{P}(Y \leq m_1(F) + 2m_2(F)) - \mathbb{P}(Y \leq m_1(F) + m_2(F))] \\
+ \mathbb{P}(Y \in [m_1(F) - 2m_2(F), m_1(F) - m_2(F)])
\]
\[
> F(m_1(F) + 2m_2(F)) - F(m_1(F) + m_2(F))
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{B}
\]
\[
\geq \bar{t}_H,
\]

where (8) is because \( F \) is monotonically increasing in \([m_1(F) - 2m_2(F), m_1(F) + 2m_2(F)]\) by property (i) in the definition of \( F_{\bar{t},B,m_2,\kappa} \), and (9) is due to (3). This completes the proof. \( \Box \)

**B Deferred proofs for algorithms**

Throughout this section, we let \( c \) be a constant such that \( n_{\alpha,\delta} \leq c\alpha^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \) for all \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( \delta \in (0, 1) \). Such a constant clearly exists by definition of PIBAI; see (6).

**B.1 Adaptation of the median elimination algorithm**

The proof of Theorem [15] follows closely the analysis of the original Median Elimination Algorithm (see [Even-Dar et al., 2006, Theorem 10]). See the discussion in Section 3.1 for the main difference between the two proofs.

Let us define some notation. Let \( R \) denote the number of total rounds in Algorithm [11]; note that clearly \( R \) is deterministic and \( R = O(\log_2 k) \). For each round \( r \in [R] \), denote by \( S_r \) the set of all arms that are still in \( S \) when entering round \( r \); and for each \( i \in [S_r] \), denote by \( \hat{p}_{i,r} \) the algorithm’s estimate of \( p_i \) in round \( r \). Finally, for each round \( r \in [R] \), denote by \( \delta_r = 2^{-r}\delta \) the value of \( \delta \) in the beginning of the round.

*Proof of Theorem [15]* We show \((\alpha, \delta)\)-PAC correctness first, and then prove the sample complexity bound afterwards.

*Proof of \((\alpha, \delta)\)-PAC correctness.* Without loss of generality, assume that the best arm is \( i^* = 1 \). For each round \( r \in [R] \), define the event \( E_r \): “At round \( r \) of Algorithm [11] arm 1 is eliminated and at least one arm \( i \) with \( \bar{\Delta}_i > \alpha \) is kept for the next round”. Note that if Algorithm [11] fails (i.e. does not output an \( \alpha \)-suboptimal arm), then \( E_r \) must occur for some round \( r \in [R] \). In other words, if the algorithm fails, then there exists some round \( r \geq 1 \) for which \( 1 \in S_r, 1 \notin S_{r+1} \) and \(|N_r| \geq |S_r|/2\), where \( N_r := \{i \in S_r : \bar{\Delta}_i > \alpha, \hat{p}_{i,r} > \hat{p}_{1,r}\} \).
Then, the failure probability $\delta_F$ of Algorithm [1] is bounded from above by

$$
\delta_F \leq P \left( \exists r \geq 1, 1 \in S_r \text{ and } |N_r| \geq \frac{|S_r|}{2} \right)
$$

$$
\leq \sum_{r=1}^{R} P \left( 1 \in S_r \text{ and } |N_r| \geq \frac{|S_r|}{2} \right)
$$

$$
= \sum_{r=1}^{R} E \left[ P \left( |N_r| \geq \frac{|S_r|}{2} \mid S_r \right) 1_{1 \in S_r} \right].
$$

(10)

Now, let $r \in [R]$ and assume $1 \in S_r$ (so that $\hat{p}_{1,r}$ is well defined). By Markov’s inequality,

$$
P \left( |N_r| \geq \frac{|S_r|}{2} \mid S_r \right) \leq \frac{2}{|S_r|} \mathbb{E} \left[ |N_r| \mid S_r \right] = \frac{2}{|S_r|} \sum_{i \in S_r} \mathbb{P}(\hat{p}_{i,r} > \hat{p}_{1,r}).
$$

So consider any $i \in S_r$ such that $\tilde{\Delta}_i > \alpha$. By (6), the definition of $n_{\delta_r/4, \alpha/2}$, and a union bound, we have that both $|\hat{p}_{i,r} - p_i| \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}$ and $|\hat{p}_{1,r} - p_1| \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}$ simultaneously occur with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta_r}{2}$. Whenever this occurs, $\hat{p}_{i,r} - \hat{p}_{1,r} \leq (p_i + \frac{\alpha}{2}) - (p_1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}) < 0$. Thus $\mathbb{P}(\hat{p}_{i,r} > \hat{p}_{1,r}) \leq \frac{\delta_r}{2}$ for any such $i$. Combining this with the above two displays yields

$$
\delta_F \leq \sum_{r=1}^{R} \delta_r \leq \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \delta_r = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{-r} \delta = \delta,
$$

Proof of sample complexity. The total number of arm pulls in Algorithm [1] is equal to $\sum_{r=1}^{R} |S_r| n_{\delta_r/4, \alpha/2}$. Now since $|S_{r+1}| \leq |S_r|/2$ for each round $r$, the sample complexity is bounded above by

$$
k \sum_{r=1}^{R} 2^{-r} n_{\delta_r/4, \alpha/2} \leq \frac{4ck}{\alpha^2} \sum_{r=1}^{R} 2^{-r} \log \left( \frac{4}{\delta_r} \right) = \frac{4ck}{\alpha^2} \sum_{r=1}^{R} 2^{-r} \log \left( \frac{2^{r+2}}{\delta} \right) = O \left( \frac{k}{\alpha^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).
$$

B.2 Adaptation of the successive elimination algorithm

Let us first define some notation. As in the previous subsection, let $R$ denote the number of total rounds in Algorithm [2] before termination; and for each round $r \in [R]$, let $S_r$ denote the set of all arms still in $S$ when entering round $r$. Denote for succinctness also $\delta_r := \frac{6\delta}{\pi^2 kr^2}$.

Proof of Theorem [1b]. Without loss of generality, assume that the best arm is $i^* = 1$. Consider the event $E := \{ |\hat{p}_{i,r} - p_i| \leq U_i + \alpha_r \delta_r, \forall r \geq 1, \forall i \in S_r \}$. The following inequality is a consequence of a union bound, where we consider virtual estimates $\hat{p}_{i,r}$ for $r \leq R, i \notin S_r$ or $r > R, i \in [k]$ that could be obtained if we continued to pull the eliminated arms indefinitely:

$$
P \left( E^C \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} P \left( |\hat{p}_{i,r} - p_i| > U_i + \alpha_r \delta_r \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \delta_r \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{6\delta}{\pi^2 kr^2} = \delta,
$$
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where above we have used (6) and the famous Basel identity.

We conclude from the above that $E$ occurs with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Henceforth let us be in the event that $E$ occurs. A simple induction argument shows that $1 \in S_r$ for each round $r \in [R]$, yielding that Algorithm 2 outputs the optimal arm. Indeed, at each round $r$ for which $1 \in S_r$, $E$ guarantees that for all $j \in S_r$,

$$\hat{p}_{1,r} \geq p_1 - U_1 - \alpha_{r,\delta_r} = \hat{\Delta}_j + p_j + U_j - \alpha_{r,\delta_r} > p_j + U_j - \alpha_{r,\delta_r} \geq \hat{p}_{j,r} - 2\alpha_{r,\delta_r},$$

and so by definition of Algorithm 2 the optimal arm 1 is not eliminated at round $r$.

Now, still assuming that $E$ occurs, let us bound the sample complexity $T$. For each $i \in [k]$, denote by $T_i$ the number of times that arm $i$ is pulled. Then clearly $T = \sum_{i=1}^k T_i$. Moreover, since arm 1 is never eliminated (proved above), $T \leq 2 \sum_{i=2}^k T_i$. For each $i \geq 2$, arm $i$ is eliminated no later than the first round $r$ in which $\hat{p}_{i,r} < \hat{p}_{1,r} - 2\alpha_{r,\delta_r}$ which, by $E$, is satisfied as soon as $p_i + U_i + \alpha_{r,\delta_r} < p_1 - U_1 - 3\alpha_{r,\delta_r}$, i.e., $\hat{\Delta}_i > 4\alpha_{r,\delta_r}$. We conclude that arm $i$ is eliminated in the first round $r$ where

$$\hat{\Delta}_i > 4\alpha_{r,\delta_r} = 4\sqrt{\frac{c \log(\frac{\pi 2kr^2}{\delta_2})}{r}}.$$

Now this is granted when $r \leq C \frac{1}{\hat{\Delta}_i} \log \left(\frac{k}{\delta_2}\right)$ for some universal constant $C > 0$. Hence,

$$T \leq \sum_{j=2}^k T_j = O \left( \sum_{j=2}^k \frac{1}{\hat{\Delta}_j} \log \left(\frac{k}{\delta \hat{\Delta}_j}\right) \right).$$

Proof of Theorem 19. The proof is very similar to that of Theorem 16. We only note that at each round $r \geq 0$, if any arm is still in $S_r$, it has been pulled at least $n_r$ times, where

$$n_r \geq n_0(\delta_1) + (2N + 1)r \geq n_0(\delta_r) + r \geq n_0(\delta_r) + \frac{2B^2 \bar{m}^2}{\alpha_{r,\delta_r}^2} \log \frac{s}{\delta_r},$$

where we set $s = 2$ in the oblivious and prescient cases, $s = 3$ in the malicious case. Hence, the $(0, \delta)$-PAC guarantee follows easily from the same reasoning as that of Theorem 16 and the sample complexity is only affected by the preliminary draws before the first round of the algorithm.

\[\square\]

C Deferred proofs for lower bounds

In this section, we make the proof sketch in Section 4.1 formal. The proof is broken into two parts. First, we exhibit hard instances for BAI in which the arms all have smoothed
Bernoulli distributions. Second, we reduce this instance into a lower bound instance for CBAI.

Throughout, we adopt the standard assumption in the multi-armed bandit literature (see e.g. [Mannor and Tsitsiklis, 2004]) and only consider algorithms where the stopping time $T$ is almost surely finite.

### C.1 BAI lower bound using smoothed Bernoulli arms

We will follow closely the change-of-measure argument from [Mannor and Tsitsiklis, 2004] which provided the first gap-dependent lower bound for the BAI problem. Their paper exhibited hard instances for BAI using Bernoulli-distributed arms. However, our CBAI reduction will not work with Bernoulli distributions (see proof sketch in Section 4.2), and so here we exhibit hard instances for BAI using instead a distribution that will work for our CBAI reduction, namely the smoothed Bernoulli distribution.

**Lemma 25.** There exists a positive constant $\delta'$ such that for every $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, every $\delta \in (0, \delta')$, every $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]^k$, and every $(\alpha, \delta)$-PAC BAI algorithm, there exists an instance of BAI with SBer distributions forcing the algorithm to use at the least following number of samples in expectation:

$$E[T] \geq \Omega\left( \sum_{i \in [k] \backslash \{i^*\}} \frac{1}{\max(\Delta_i, \alpha)^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right),$$

where $i^* := \arg \max_{i \in [k]} p_i$, and $\Delta_i := p_{i^*} - p_i$ denotes for each $i \in [k] \backslash \{i^*\}$.

**Proof.** We follow closely the proof of Theorem 5 in [Mannor and Tsitsiklis, 2004] and only describe the main differences. Fix any $p \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$; as their paper says, this will only affect the constant in our final lower bound, which is anyways absorbed by our $\Omega(\cdot)$.

We are now ready to begin. The technique is to reduce to a hypothesis-testing lower bound; our hypothesis are just slightly different since we will consider arms with SBer distributions instead of Ber distributions, albeit with the same parameters. Formally, let $p_1 = \max_{i \in [k]} p_i$, without loss of generality, and define the hypotheses as in [Mannor and Tsitsiklis, 2004] by

$$H_0 : q_i = p_i, \forall i \in [k],$$

and for $\ell \in [k]$:

$$H_\ell : q_\ell = p_1 + \alpha, q_i = p_i, \forall i \neq \ell.$$

If we are in hypothesis $H_\ell$, then we will consider the BAI instance with arm distributions $\{\text{SBer}(q_i)\}_{i \in [k]}$. (As opposed to the arm distributions $\{\text{Ber}(q_i)\}_{i \in [k]}$ as in the original paper.) We will henceforth use $E_{\cdot}[-]$ and $P_{\cdot}(\cdot)$ to denote the expectation and probability, respectively, with respect to the randomness of algorithm and arms under the measure induced by hypothesis $H_\ell$.

Assume for sake of contradiction that there exists some arm $\ell \in [k]$ satisfying $E_0[T_\ell] \leq t^*_\ell$, where $t^*_\ell$ is defined as in their paper, and the random variable $T_\ell$ denote the number of
times that arm $\ell$ is pulled. Now a slight deviation from their proof: we define $Z_{\ell}^1, \ldots, Z_{\ell}^T$ to be the sequence of samples obtained from the pulls of arm $\ell$; we partition this into the sequences $X_{\ell}^1, \ldots, X_{T_{\ell,x}}^\ell$ and $U_{\ell}^1, \ldots, U_{T_{\ell,u}}^\ell$ of samples that were generated, respectively, from the Bernoulli and uniform sub-distributions in $\text{SBer}(\cdot)$. Define also $K_{\ell}^t := \sum_{s=1}^t X_s^\ell$ for any $t \leq T_{\ell,x}$. Here $T_{\ell,x}$ and $T_{\ell,u}$, respectively, are the number of samples that were generated from each of these sub-distributions; thus in particular $T_{\ell,x} + T_{\ell,u} = T_{\ell}$, and so obviously

$$T_{\ell,x} \leq T_{\ell}.$$  

(11)

This seemingly trivial inequality will shortly help us formalize the notion that injecting uniform samples can only lessen the amount of information the algorithm receives about the different arms’ biases.

The next thing that changes is the most substantial change: the proof of their Lemma 6. The statement of their lemma remains the same for us; the only difference is the likelihood ratio calculation for the change-of-measure argument. Formally, let the random variable $W$ be the history and define the likelihood functions $L_\ell(w) = \mathbb{P}_{\ell}(W = w)$. Denoting by $\hat{I}$ the algorithm’s final decision of best arm, we wish to show that conditional upon the event

$$S_{\ell} := \{T_{\ell,x} \leq 4t_{\ell}^*\} \cap \{\hat{I} \neq \ell\} \cap \{\max_{1 \leq t \leq 4t_{\ell}^*} |K_{\ell}^t - p_{\ell,t}| < \sqrt{t_{\ell}^* \log(1/\theta)}\},$$

then $\mathbb{P}_\ell(I \neq \ell) > \delta$. By the elegant change-of-measure argument in the end of the proof of their Theorem 5, it suffices to show the following two anti-concentration type inequalities: (i) the following uniform lower bound of the likelihood ratios:

$$\frac{L_\ell(W)}{L_0(W)} I_{S_{\ell}} \geq 8\delta \cdot I_{S_{\ell}},$$

(12)

and (ii) that

$$\mathbb{P}_0(S_{\ell}) > 1/8.$$  

(13)

We first prove (13) since this follows nearly identically as in their paper. We use a union bound over the three events in the definition of $S_{\ell}$. The second and third events occur under $H_0$ with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{7}{8}$, respectively, by identical arguments as in their paper. To lower bound the probability of the first event, we first use the “information inequality” in (11) and then their simple Markov’s inequality argument to obtain that $\mathbb{P}_0(T_{\ell,x} \leq 4t_{\ell}^*) \geq \mathbb{P}_0(T_{\ell} \leq 4t_{\ell}^*) \geq \frac{3}{4}$. Therefore by a union bound, (13) is proven. So it suffices to now just prove (12); we do this presently.

Let the random variable $I_t$ denote the arm that the algorithm pulls at iteration $t$. Consider any realization of history $w = ((i_1, w_1), \ldots, (i_T, w_T))$ where $i_t$ denotes the arm pulled at iteration $t$ and $w_t$ denotes the corresponding sample. We will denote the history up to time $t$ by $w_{1:t} := ((i_1, w_1), \ldots, (i_t, w_t))$. Then since an algorithm is defined as a random mapping from history to arms, and since also the sample $w_t$ is conditionally
independent of all history, we obtain by the chain rule of probability,

\[
L_\ell(W) = \left[ \prod_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{P}_{\text{ALG}}(I_t = i_t \mid W_{1:t-1} = w_{1:t-1}) \right] \left[ \prod_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{P}(W_t = w_t \mid I_t = i_t, W_{1:t-1} = w_{1:t-1}) \right] = \left[ \prod_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{P}_{\text{ALG}}(I_t = i_t \mid W_{1:t-1} = w_{1:t-1}) \right] \left[ \prod_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{P}(W_t = w_t \mid I_t = i_t) \right].
\]

Now every arm besides \( \ell \) has the same distribution in \( H_0 \) and \( H_\ell \). Thus we conclude

\[
\frac{L_\ell(W = w)}{L_0(W = w)} = \frac{\prod_{t=1}^{T_\ell} \mu_{p_1 + \alpha}(Z_{t}^\ell)}{\prod_{t=1}^{T_0} \mu_{p_1}(Z_t^0)} = \frac{\prod_{t=1}^{T_\ell} \mu_{p_1 + \alpha}(Z_{t}^\ell)}{\prod_{t=1}^{T_0} \mu_{p_1}(Z_t^0)} = \frac{\prod_{t=1}^{T_\ell} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2}(p_1 + \alpha) \mathbb{1}_{Z_{t}^\ell = 1} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - (p_1 + \alpha)) \mathbb{1}_{Z_{t}^\ell = 0} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{Z_{t}^\ell \in (0,1)} \right\rfloor \right)}{\prod_{t=1}^{T_0} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} p_1 \mathbb{1}_{Z_t^0 = 1} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - p_1) \mathbb{1}_{Z_t^0 = 0} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{Z_t^0 \in (0,1)} \right\rfloor \right)} = \frac{\sum_{S \subseteq [T_\ell]} \prod_{t \in S} a_{p_1 + \alpha}(X_t^\ell) \prod_{t \notin S} b(Y_t^\ell)}{\sum_{S \subseteq [T_\ell]} \prod_{t \in S} a_{p_1}(X_t^\ell) \prod_{t \notin S} b(Y_t^\ell)},
\]

where in the last step we have denoted \( a_q(X_t^\ell) := \frac{1}{2}(p_1 + \alpha) \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\ell = 1} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - (p_1 + \alpha)) \mathbb{1}_{X_t^\ell = 0} \) for both \( q \in \{p_1 + \alpha, p_1\} \), and also denoted \( b(Y_t^\ell) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{Y_t^\ell \in (0,1)} \).

Now define the events \( H_0^\text{Ber} \) and \( H_\ell^\text{Ber} \) to be exactly those in \[\text{Mannor and Tsitsiklis, 2004}\]. That is, they are the same as our hypotheses except that samples are generated from \( \text{Ber}(p) \) instead of \( \text{SBer}(p) \). Let also \( L_0^\text{Ber}(\cdot) \) and \( L_\ell^\text{Ber}(\cdot) \) denote the analogous likelihood functions defined. In pages 632-634 of \[\text{Mannor and Tsitsiklis, 2004}\], it is proved that, conditional on the event \( S_\ell \), the following inequality holds for any \( w \) of length at most \( T_\ell \)

\[
\frac{L_\ell^\text{Ber}(w)}{L_0^\text{Ber}(w)} \geq 8\delta.
\]
Now expand the left hand side of the above display exactly identically as we did for the likelihood ratio $\frac{L_\ell(w)}{L_0(w)}$ above. This yields that for each $S \subseteq [T]$

$$\prod_{t \in S} a_{p_1 + \alpha(X_1^t)} \geq 8 \delta.$$  

(15)

Now recall that the following simple fact: if $\frac{d_i}{e_i} \geq c$ for all $i$, then $\sum_i d_i \geq \sum_i e_i \geq c$. Therefore we conclude by combining (14) and (15), that the inequality (12) is true. This completes the proof.

\[\square\]

C.2 Proving the lower bound for CBAI

In this subsection, we show how to prove the lower bounds for CBAI using the technique sketched in Subsection 4.1. In particular, we will show how to prove Theorem 22 by “CBAI-lifting” the MAB instances we proved were hard in Lemma 25. The proof of Corollary 23 then follows immediately by letting $\alpha \rightarrow 0$; or said differently, by realizing that an algorithm that returns the best arm with probability at least $1 - \delta$, is by definition a $(0, \delta)$-PAC algorithm.

\textbf{Proof of Theorem 22.} Let $\delta'$ be the constant from Lemma 25. Assume for sake of contradiction that there exists some $k \geq 2$, $\delta \in (0, \delta')$, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{15})$, $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{10})$, and $(\alpha, \delta)$-PAC CBAI algorithm $A$ such that for any CBAI instance with $F_1, \ldots, F_k \in \mathcal{F}_{i,B}$, the algorithm uses $\Omega\left(\sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{i^*\}} \frac{1}{\max(\Delta_i, \alpha)^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ samples in expectation, where $i^* := \arg\max_{i \in [k]} m_1(F_i)$ and $\{\tilde{\Delta}_i\}_{i \in [k] \setminus \{i^*\}}$ are the effective gaps w.r.t. the arm distributions $\{F_i\}_{i \in [k]}$.

Now Lemma 25 asserts the existence of a BAI instance where all arms have $\tilde{F}_i := \text{SBer}(p_i)$ distributions where $p_i \in \left[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2} + \alpha\right] \subseteq \left[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\right]$ and for which any $(\alpha, \delta)$-PAC MAB algorithm must use at least $\Omega\left(\sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{i^*\}} \frac{1}{\max(\Delta_i, \alpha)^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ samples in expectation, where $i^* := \arg\max_{i \in [k]} p_i$ and $\{\Delta_i\}_{i \in [k] \setminus \{i^*\}}$ are the gaps w.r.t. the arm distributions $\{\text{Ber}(p_i)\}_{i \in [k]}$. Without loss of generality, let us assume $1 = \arg\max_{i \in [k]} p_i$, i.e. that arm 1 is the best. At this point we separate into the different adversarial settings, since the lower bounds and thus also the liftings differ.
Lifting for oblivious and prescient adversaries. Define the following distributions:

\[
F_1 := \frac{1 - 2\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \text{Ber}(r) + \frac{1}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \text{Unif}([0, 1])
\]
\[
F_i := \frac{1 - 2\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \text{Ber}(q) + \frac{1}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \text{Unif}([0, 1]), \quad \forall i \in \{2, \ldots, k\}
\]

where \( r := \frac{p_1 - 2\varepsilon}{1 - 2\varepsilon} \) and \( q := \frac{p_i - 2\varepsilon}{1 - 2\varepsilon} \). It is not hard to see that:

\[
\tilde{F}_1 := \text{SBer}(p_1) = (1 - \varepsilon)F_1 + \varepsilon\delta_0
\]
\[
\tilde{F}_i := \text{SBer}(p_i) = (1 - \varepsilon)F_i + \varepsilon\delta_1, \quad \forall i \in \{2, \ldots, k\}
\]

In other words, samples generated from \( \text{SBer}(p_i) \) are equal in distribution to samples generated from the above contaminated mixture model of \((1 - \varepsilon)F_i\) and \(\varepsilon\) times a Dirac measure.

Next, a simple calculation shows that \( m_1(\tilde{F}_1) = p_1, m_1(F_1) = p_1 + \varepsilon, m_2(F_1) = \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{2}\). And similarly for any \( i \in \{2, \ldots, k\}, \) we have \( m_1(\tilde{F}_i) = p_i, m_1(F_i) = p_i - \varepsilon, m_2(F_i) = \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{2}\). Moreover, for all \( i \in [k], \) we have that \( F_i \in \mathcal{F}_{B, \bar{t}} \) for \( B = 4 \) and any \( \bar{t} < \frac{1}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \min(p_i + \varepsilon, 1 - (p_i + \varepsilon)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{15}{14} \min(\frac{1}{3}, 1 - (\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{15})) = \frac{1}{7}. \) Therefore we conclude that for each \( i \in [k], \) the change in median between the distribution \( F_i \) and the contaminated distribution \( \tilde{F}_i \) is equal to

\[
|m_1(\tilde{F}_i) - m_1(F_i)| = \varepsilon = Bm_2(F_i) \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} = U_{\varepsilon, B, m_2(F_i)}.
\]

Therefore we conclude that running the aforementioned \((\alpha, \delta)-\text{approximate CBAI}\) algorithm \( \mathcal{A} \) on the samples obtained from the above BAI instance will result in \( \mathcal{A} \) outputting arm \( \hat{I} \) satisfying \( m_1(F_i) \geq m_1(F_1) - (2U_{\varepsilon, B, \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{2}} + \alpha), \) with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \). Whenever this occurs, we have by the above calculations that \( p_i \geq p_1 - \alpha. \) Therefore \( \mathcal{A} \) returned an \( \alpha \) approximate arm with probability at least \( 1 - \delta, \) for this hard BAI instance. Comparing the sample complexity of \( \mathcal{A} \) in (16) with the lower bound in (17), we conclude the desired contradiction.

Lifting for malicious adversaries. The idea is similar to what we did above for the oblivious and prescient cases. The difference is that malicious adversaries can shift quantiles further (see Corollary 10) and as such we must exhibit a lifting that exactly matches this larger shift. Formally, define the following underlying distributions over the CBAI arms:

\[
F_1 := \frac{1}{2} \text{Ber}(p_1 + 2\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Unif}([0, 1])
\]
\[
F_i := \frac{1}{2} \text{Ber}(p_i - 2\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Unif}([0, 1]), \quad \forall i \in \{2, \ldots, k\}
\]

We now present the malicious CBAI adversarial strategy. For the optimal arm 1, define the joint distribution \( J_1 \) over \((Y_1, Z_1, D_1)\) where \( Y_1 \sim F_1, \) \( Z_1 \sim \delta_0, \) and the conditional distribution of \( D_1 \) given \( Y_1 \) is \( \text{Ber}(\varepsilon^{-1}(\frac{p_1}{2} + \varepsilon)^{-1} \cdot 1(Y_1 = 1)) \). Similarly, for each suboptimal arm \( i \in \{2, \ldots, k\}, \) define the joint distribution \( J_i \) over \((Y_i, Z_i, D_i)\) where \( Y_i \sim F_i, \) \( Z_i \sim \delta_1, \) and the conditional distribution of \( D_i \) given \( Y_i \) is \( \text{Ber}(\varepsilon^{-1}(\frac{p_i}{2} - \varepsilon)^{-1} \cdot 1(Y_i = 0)) \). It is
simple to see that for each arm \( i \in [k] \), the marginals are correct under each \( J_i \). Indeed, a simple conditioning calculation yields:

\[
P(D_1 = 1) = P(D_1 = 1|Y_1 = 1)P(Y_1 = 1) + P(D_1 = 1|Y_1 \neq 1)P(Y_1 \neq 1)
\]

\[
= \epsilon(\frac{p_1}{2} + \epsilon)^{-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2}(p_1 + 2\epsilon) + 0
\]

\[
= \epsilon.
\]

An identical argument shows that the marginal distribution of \( D_i \) is equal to \( \text{Ber}(\epsilon) \) also for each suboptimal arm \( i \in \{2, \ldots, k\} \). Now for each arm \( i \in [k] \), denote by \( C_i \) the corresponding contaminated distributions induced by \((1-D_i)Y_i + D_iZ_i\) where \((Y_i, Z_i, D_i) \sim J_i \). It is not hard to see that:

\[
\tilde{F}_i := \text{SBer}(p_i) = C_i
\]

\[
\forall i \in \{2, \ldots, k\}
\]

In other words, samples generated from \( \text{SBer}(p_i) \) are equal in distribution to the samples generated by the malicious CBAI adversary’s distribution \( C_i \).

Next, a simple calculation shows that for the optimal arm, \((F_1)^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) = p_1 + 2\epsilon \) and \((\tilde{F}_1)^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) = (F_1)^{-1}(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon) = p_1 \). Note further that \( F_1 \) has cdf satisfying \( F_1(s) = \frac{1}{2}(1-p_1-2\epsilon) + \frac{1}{2}s \) for all \( s \in [0, 1] \), and \( F_1(1) = 1 \). Thus for any \( x_1, x_2 \in [Q_{L,F_1}(\frac{1}{2} - \tilde{t}), Q_{R,F_1}(\frac{1}{2} + \tilde{t})] \), we have that \( |F(x_1) - F(x_2)| = \frac{1}{2}|x_1 - x_2| \) since \([\frac{1}{2} - \tilde{t}], \frac{1}{2} + \tilde{t}] \subseteq [0.4, 0.6] \) is contained within the interval \([\frac{1}{2}(p_1 + 2\epsilon), 1 - \frac{1}{2}(p_1 + 2\epsilon)] \supseteq \left[\frac{1}{2}(\frac{2}{3} + 2\cdot\frac{1}{3}), 1 - \frac{1}{2}(\frac{2}{3} + 2\cdot\frac{1}{3})\right] = [0.4, 0.6] \). By definition, this implies that \( F_1 \in F_{L,B_1} \) where \( B_1 m_2(F_1) = 2 \). (Note also that \( B_1 \) is a finite constant since \( p_1 \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}) \subseteq (0, 1) \) implies \( m_2(F_1) > 0 \).) A completely identical calculation similarly shows that each suboptimal arm \( i \in \{2, \ldots, k\} \) satisfies \((F_i)^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) = p_i - 2\epsilon \), \((\tilde{F}_i)^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) = (F_i)^{-1}(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon) = p_i \), and \( F_i \in F_{L,B_i} \) where \( B_i m_2(F_i) = 2 \). Therefore we conclude that for each \( i \in [k] \), the difference in medians between the distributions \( F_i \) and \( \tilde{F}_i \) is equal to

\[
|m_1(F_i) - m_1(\tilde{F}_i)| = 2\epsilon = B_i m_2(F_i)\epsilon = U^{(\text{MALICIOUS})}_{\epsilon,B_i,m_2(F_i)},
\]

which is exactly equal to the largest possible uncertainty. Therefore we conclude by an identical contradiction argument as in the oblivious/prescient adversary proof above. \( \square \)