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Abstract

We present a Bayesian view of counterfactual risk minimization (CRM), also known as offline policy optimization from logged bandit feedback. Using PAC-Bayesian analysis, we derive a new generalization bound for the truncated IPS estimator. We apply the bound to a class of Bayesian policies, which motivates a novel, potentially data-dependent, regularization technique for CRM.

1 Introduction

In industrial applications of machine learning, model development is typically an iterative process, involving multiple trials of offline training and online experimentation. For example, a content streaming service might explore various recommendation strategies in a series of A/B tests. The data that is generated by this process—e.g., impression and interaction logs—can be used to augment training data and further refine a model. However, learning from logged interactions poses two fundamental challenges: (1) the feedback obtained from interaction is always incomplete, in that one only observes responses (usually referred to as rewards) for actions that were taken; (2) the distribution of observations is inherently biased by the policy that determines which action to take in each context.

This learning problem has been studied under various names by various authors [2, 4, 13, 14]. We adopt the moniker counterfactual risk minimization (CRM), introduced by Swaminathan and Joachims [14]. The goal of CRM is to learn a policy from data that was logged by a previous policy, such that the learned policy maximizes expected reward (alternatively, minimizes counterfactual risk) over draws of future contexts. Using an analysis based on Bennett’s inequality, Swaminathan and Joachims derived an upper bound on the counterfactual risk of a stochastic policy, which motivates learning with variance-based regularization. In a similar vein, Strehl et al. [13] derived a lower bound on the expected reward of a deterministic policy.

In this work, we study CRM from a Bayesian perspective, in which one’s uncertainty over actions becomes uncertainty over models. That is, instead of learning a single stochastic policy from which actions are sampled, one learns
a distribution over hypotheses, which induces a distribution over policies. This bridges the gap between CRM, which has until now been approached from the frequentist perspective, and Bayesian methods, which are often used to balance exploration and exploitation in contextual bandit problems.

Using a PAC-Bayesian analysis, we prove an upper bound on the counterfactual risk of a Bayesian policy. We then apply this bound to a class of Bayesian policies based on the mixed logit model. This analysis suggests a novel regularization strategy for CRM based on the $L_2$ distance from the logging policy’s parameters. This regularizer is effectively similar to variance regularization, but simpler to implement. We also consider the scenario in which the logging policy is unknown; in this case, we propose learning the logging policy, and provide a corresponding counterfactual risk bound based on data-dependent regularization.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote a space of contexts, and $\mathcal{A}$ denote a finite set of $k$ discrete actions. We are interested in finding a stochastic policy, $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta^k$, which maps $\mathcal{X}$ to the $k$-dimensional probability simplex, $\Delta^k$; in other words, $\pi$ defines a conditional probability distribution over actions given contexts, from which we can sample actions. For a given context, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we denote the conditional distribution on $\mathcal{A}$ by $\pi(x)$, and the probability mass of a particular action, $a \in \mathcal{A}$, by $\pi(a | x)$.

Each action is associated with a stochastic, contextual reward, given by an unknown function, $\rho : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, which we assume is bounded. When an action is played in response to a context, we only observe the reward for said action. This type of incomplete feedback is commonly referred to as bandit feedback. We assume a stationary distribution, $D$, over contexts and reward functions. Our goal will be to find a policy that maximizes the expected reward over draws of $(x, \rho) \sim D$ and $a \sim \pi(x)$; or, put differently, one that minimizes the counterfactual risk,

$$R(\pi) \triangleq 1 - \mathbb{E}_{(x, \rho) \sim D} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(x)} [\rho(x, a)].$$

We assume that we have access to a dataset of logged observations (i.e., examples), $S \triangleq (x_i, a_i, r_i, p_i)_{i=1}^n$, where $(x_i, \rho)$ were sampled from $D$; action $a_i$ was sampled with probability $p_i \triangleq \pi_0(a_i | x_i)$ from a stationary logging policy, $\pi_0$; and reward $r_i \triangleq \rho(x_i, a_i)$ was observed. The distribution of $S$, which we denote by $(D \times \pi_0)^n$, is biased by the logging policy, in that we only observe rewards for actions that were sampled from its distribution. Nonetheless, since

$$\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_0(x)} \left[ \frac{\pi(a | x) \rho(x, a)}{\pi_0(a | x)} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(x)} [\rho(x, a)],$$

we can obtain an unbiased estimate of $R(\pi)$ by scaling each reward by its inverse.
propensity score (IPS) \( p_i^{-1} \), which yields the IPS empirical risk,

\[
\hat{R}(\pi, S) \triangleq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\pi(a_i | x_i) r_i}{p_i}.
\]

Unfortunately, without additional assumptions on the supports of \( \pi \) and \( \pi_0 \), this estimator has unbounded variance. This issue can be mitigated by truncating (or clipping) \( p_i \) to the interval \([\tau, 1]\) (as proposed in [13]), which yields

\[
\hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S) \triangleq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\pi(a_i | x_i) r_i \max\{p_i, \tau\}}{\max\{p_i, \tau\}}.
\]

This estimator has finite variance, but at the cost of adding bias. However, since \( \max\{p_i, \tau\} \geq p_i \), we have that \( \hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S) \geq \hat{R}(\pi, S) \), which implies

\[
\mathbb{E}_{S \sim (D \times \pi_0)^n} \left[ \hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S) \right] \geq \mathbb{E}_{S \sim (D \times \pi_0)^n} \left[ \hat{R}(\pi, S) \right] = R(\pi).
\]

Thus, if \( \hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S) \) concentrates around its mean, then by minimizing \( \hat{R}_\tau(\cdot, S) \), we minimize a probabilistic upper bound on the counterfactual risk.

Remark 1. There are other estimators we can consider. For instance, we could instead truncate the ratio of the reward and the IPS, \( \min\{r_i/p_i, \tau^{-1}\} \). When \( r_i \) is small relative to \( p_i \), this form of truncation has roughly the same effect as the one above. However, when \( r_i \) and \( p_i \) are equally small relative to \( \tau \), their ratio is one and no truncation occurs; this means that a policy can incur minimal penalty by putting all of its mass on the given action, in spite of the fact that it has low reward. If an action has low reward, we want the policy to avoid it, regardless of how likely it was under the logging policy. This rationale is supported by the expression \( r_i / \max\{p_i, \tau\} \), which will always be small whenever \( r_i \) is small (assuming \( \tau \) is not too small). Alternatively, we could truncate the ratio of the policy and the logging policy, \( \min\{\pi(a_i | x_i)/p_i, \tau^{-1}\} \) (as proposed in [5, 14]). However, this form of truncation is incompatible with our subsequent analysis because the policy is inside the min operator. Avoiding truncation altogether, we could use the self-normalizing estimator [15], but this is also incompatible with our analysis, since the estimator does not decompose as a sum of i.i.d. random variables. Finally, we note that our theory does apply, with small modifications, to the doubly-robust estimator [4].

### 2.1 Counterfactual Risk Minimization

Our work is heavily influenced by Swaminathan and Joachims [14], who coined the term \textit{counterfactual risk minimization} (CRM) to refer to the problem of learning a policy from logged bandit feedback by minimizing an upper bound on the counterfactual risk. Their bound is a function of the truncated IPS estimator [10], the sample variance of said estimator, \( \text{Var}[\hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S)] \), and a measure

\footnote{Though Swaminathan and Joachims used a different form of truncation, their results nonetheless hold for our estimator.}
of the complexity, $C$, of the class of policies being considered, $\Pi \subseteq \{\pi : X \rightarrow \Delta^k\}$. Ignoring constants, their bound is of the form

$$R(\pi) \leq \hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S) + O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}[\hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S)]C(\Pi)}}{n} + \frac{C(\Pi)}{n}\right).$$

When $\text{Var}[\hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S)]$ is sufficiently small, the bound’s dominating term is $O(n^{-1})$, which is the so-called “fast” learning rate. This motivates a variance-regularized learning objective,

$$\arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S) + \lambda \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}[\hat{R}_\tau(\pi, S)]}{n}},$$

for a regularization parameter, $\lambda > 0$. Swaminathan and Joachims propose a majorization-minimization algorithm to solve this optimization.

### 3 PAC-Bayesian Analysis

In this work, we view CRM from a Bayesian perspective. We consider stochastic policies whose action distributions are induced by distributions over hypotheses. Instead of sampling directly from a distribution on the action space, we sample from a distribution on a hypothesis space, $H \subseteq \{h : X \rightarrow A\}$, in which each element is a deterministic mapping from contexts to actions. As such, for a distribution, $Q$, on $H$, the probability of an action, $a \in A$, given a context, $x \in X$, is the marginal probability that a random hypothesis, $h \sim Q$, maps $a$ to $x$; that is,

$$\pi_Q(a \mid x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{h \sim Q}\left[I\{h(x) = a\}\right].$$

(3)

Usually, the hypothesis space consists of functions of a certain parametric form, so the distribution is actually over the parameter values. We analyze one such class in Section 4.

We will analyze Bayesian policies using the PAC-Bayesian framework (also known as simply PAC-Bayes). The PAC-Bayesian learning paradigm proceeds as follows:

1. We fix a hypothesis space, $H$, and a prior distribution, $P$, on $H$.
2. We receive some data, $S$, drawn according to a fixed distribution.
3. Using $S$, we learn a posterior distribution, $Q$, on $H$.

In our PAC-Bayesian formulation of CRM, the learned posterior becomes our stochastic policy (Equation 3). Given a context, $x \in X$, we sample an action by sampling $h \sim Q$ (independent of $x$) and returning $h(x)$. (In PAC-Bayesian terminology, this procedure is often referred to as the Gibbs classifier.)

---

2This view of stochastic policies was also used by Seldin et al. to analyze contextual bandits in the PAC-Bayes framework.
Remark 2. Instead of sampling actions via a posterior over hypotheses, we could equivalently sample policies from a posterior over policies, \( \{ \pi : \mathcal{X} \to \Delta^k \} \), then sample actions from said policies. The Bayesian policy would then be the expected policy, \( \bar{\pi}_{Q}(a | x) \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim Q} [\pi(a | x)] \). That said, it is more traditional in PAC-Bayes—and perhaps more flexible—to think in terms of the Gibbs classifier, which directly maps contexts to actions.

It is important to note that the choice of prior cannot depend on the training data; however, the prior can generate the data. Indeed, we can generate \( S \) by sampling \( (x_i, \rho) \sim D \), \( h \sim P \) and logging \( (x_i, h(x_i), \rho(h(x_i) | x_i)) \), for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Thus, in the PAC-Bayesian formulation of CRM, the prior can be the logging policy. We elaborate on this idea in Section 4.

3.1 PAC-Bayesian Counterfactual Risk Bounds

The heart of our analysis is an application of the PAC-Bayesian theorem—a generalization bound for Bayesian learning—to upper-bound the counterfactual risk. The particular PAC-Bayesian bound we use is by McAllester [8].

Lemma 1. Let \( D \) denote a fixed distribution on an instance space, \( \mathcal{Z} \). Let \( L : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{Z} \to [0, 1] \) denote a loss function. For a distribution, \( Q \), on the hypothesis space, \( \mathcal{H} \), and a dataset, \( S \equiv (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \), let \( R(Q) \equiv \mathbb{E}_{h \sim Q} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim D} [L(h, z)] \) and \( \hat{R}(Q, S) \equiv \mathbb{E}_{h \sim Q} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} L(h, z_i) \right] \) denote the risk and empirical risk, respectively. For any \( n \geq 1 \), \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), and fixed prior, \( P \), on \( \mathcal{H} \), with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \) over draws of \( S \sim D^n \), the following holds simultaneously for all posteriors, \( Q \), on \( \mathcal{H} \):

\[
R(Q) \leq \hat{R}(Q, S) + \sqrt{\frac{2 \hat{R}(Q, S) \left( D_{\text{KL}}(Q||P) + \ln \frac{n}{\delta} \right)}{n - 1}} + \frac{2 \left( D_{\text{KL}}(Q||P) + \ln \frac{n}{\delta} \right)}{n - 1}.
\]

The hallmark of a PAC-Bayesian bound is the KL divergence from the fixed prior to a learned posterior. This quantity can be interpreted as a complexity measure, similar to the VC dimension, covering number or Rademacher complexity [9]. The divergence penalizes posteriors that stray from the prior, effectively penalizing overfitting.

One attractive property of this particular bound is that, if the empirical risk is sufficiently small, then the generalization error, \( R(Q) - \hat{R}(Q, S) \), can be of order \( O(n^{-1}) \). Thus, the bound captures both realizable and non-realizable learning problems.

We use Lemma 1 to prove the following counterfactual risk bound.

Theorem 1. Let \( \mathcal{H} \subseteq \{ h : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{A} \} \) denote a hypothesis space mapping contexts to actions. For any \( n \geq 1 \), \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), \( \tau \in (0, 1) \) and fixed prior, \( P \), on \( \mathcal{H} \), with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \) over draws of \( S \sim (D \times \pi_0)^n \), the following holds
simultaneously for all posteriors, $Q$, on $\mathcal{H}$:
\[
R(\pi_Q) \leq \hat{R}_\tau(\pi_Q, S) + \sqrt{\frac{2(\frac{1}{\tau} - 1 + \hat{R}_\tau(\pi_Q, S))}{\tau(n-1)}} \left( D_{KL}(Q \| P) + \ln \frac{2}{\rho} \right) \\
+ \frac{2(\hat{R}_\tau(\pi_Q, S) + \ln \frac{2}{\rho})}{\tau(n-1)}.
\]

**Proof.** To apply Lemma 1 we need to define an appropriate loss for CRM. It should be expressed as a function of a hypothesis and a single example\(^4\), and bounded in $[0, 1]$. Accordingly, we define
\[
L_\tau(h, x, a, r, p) \triangleq 1 - \frac{\tau \mathbbm{1}\{h(x) = a\} r}{\max\{p, \tau\}},
\]
which satisfies these criteria. Using this loss function, we let
\[
R_\tau(Q) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{h \sim Q, (x, \rho) \sim \mathcal{D} \sim \pi_0(x)} \left[ L_\tau(h, x, a, r, p) \right],
\]
and
\[
\hat{R}_\tau(Q, S) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{h \sim Q} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} L_\tau(h, x_i, a_i, r_i, p_i) \right].
\]
Importantly, $\hat{R}_\tau(Q, S)$ is an unbiased estimate of $R_\tau(Q)$,
\[
\mathbb{E}_{S \sim (\mathcal{D} \times \pi_0)^n} [\hat{R}_\tau(Q, S)] = R_\tau(Q),
\]
and a draw of $h \sim Q$ does not depend on context, so $R_\tau(Q)$ and $\hat{R}_\tau(Q, S)$ can be expressed as expectations over $h \sim Q$.\(^5\) Further, via linearity of expectation,
\[
R_\tau(Q) = 1 - \tau \mathbb{E}_{(x, \rho) \sim \mathcal{D} \sim \pi_0(x)} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{E}_{h \sim Q} \mathbbm{1}\{h(x) = a\}}{\pi_0(a \mid x), \tau} \right] \rho(x, a) \\
= 1 - \tau \mathbb{E}_{(x, \rho) \sim \mathcal{D} \sim \pi_0(x)} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{E}_{h \sim Q} \mathbbm{1}\{h(x) = a\}}{\max\{\pi_0(a \mid x), \tau\}} \right] \rho(x, a) \\
\geq 1 - \tau \mathbb{E}_{(x, \rho) \sim \mathcal{D} \sim \pi_0(x)} [\rho(x, a)] \\
= 1 - \tau + \tau R(\pi_Q),
\]
and
\[
\hat{R}_\tau(Q, S) = 1 - \frac{\tau}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{h \sim Q} \mathbbm{1}\{h(x_i) = a_i\} r_i \max\{p_i, \tau\} \\
= 1 - \frac{\tau}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \pi_Q(a_i \mid x_i) r_i \max\{p_i, \tau\} \\
= 1 - \tau + \tau \hat{R}_\tau(\pi_Q, S).
\]
\(^4\)This criterion ensures that the (empirical) risk decomposes as a sum of i.i.d. random variables, which is our motivation for using the truncated IPS estimator over the self-normalizing estimator \(^5\); the latter does not decompose.

\(^5\)This is why we truncate as $1/\max\{p_i, \tau\}$ instead of $\min\{\pi(a_i \mid x_i)/p_i, \tau^{-1}\}$. 

Thus,
\[
R_\tau(Q) - \hat{R}_\tau(Q) \geq \tau (R(\pi_Q) - \hat{R}_\tau(\pi_Q, S)),
\]
which means that Lemma 1 can be used to upper-bound \(R(\pi_Q) - \hat{R}_\tau(\pi_Q, S)\).

It is important to note that the truncated IPS empirical risk, \(\hat{R}_\tau\), can be negative, achieving its minimum at \(1 - \tau^\gamma\). This means that when \(\hat{R}_\tau\) is minimized, the middle \(O(n^{-1/2})\) term disappears and the \(O(n^{-1})\) term dominates the bound, yielding the “fast” learning rate. That said, our bound may not be as tight as Swaminathan and Joachims (Equation 2), since the sample variance can sometimes be smaller than the average. To achieve a similar rate, we could perhaps use Seldin et al.’s PAC-Bayesian Bernstein bound [12].

Theorem 1 assumes that the truncation parameter, \(\tau\), is fixed a priori. However, using a covering technique, we can derive a counterfactual risk bound that holds for all \(\tau\) simultaneously—meaning, \(\tau\) can be data-dependent, such as the 10th percentile of the logged propensities.

Theorem 2.
Let \(H \subseteq \{h : X \rightarrow A\}\) denote a hypothesis space mapping contexts to actions. For any \(n \geq 1, \delta \in (0, 1)\) and fixed prior, \(P\), on \(H\), with probability at least \(1 - \delta\) over draws of \(S \sim (D \times \pi_0)^n\), the following holds simultaneously for all posteriors, \(Q\), on \(H\), and all \(\tau \in (0, 1)\):
\[
R(\pi_Q) \leq \hat{R}_\tau(\pi_Q, S) + \frac{4(\frac{1}{\tau} + \frac{D}{2\tau}) D_{KL}(Q||P) + \ln \frac{n}{\delta}}{\tau(n-1)} + \frac{4}{\tau(n-1)}(D_{KL}(Q||P) + \ln \frac{2\eta}{\delta}).
\]

We defer the proof to Appendix A.1.

Theorems 1 and 2 hold for any fixed prior, but they have an intriguing interpretation when the prior is defined as the logging policy. In this case, one can minimize an upper bound on the counterfactual risk by minimizing the empirical risk while keeping the learned policy close to the logging policy. We explore this idea, and its relationship to variance regularization, in the next section.

4 Mixed Logit Models
We will apply our PAC-Bayesian analysis to the following class of stochastic policies. We first define a hypothesis class,
\[
H \triangleq \{h_{w, \gamma} : w \in \mathbb{R}^d, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^k\},
\]
of functions of the form
\[
h_{w, \gamma}(x) \triangleq \arg\max_{a \in A} w \cdot \phi(x, a) + \gamma_a.
\]
where $\phi(x, a) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ outputs features of the context and action, whose norm we assume is uniformly bounded by $B$. If each $\gamma_a$ is sampled from a standard Gumbel distribution, Gumbel(0, 1) (location 0, scale 1), then $h_{w, \gamma}(x)$ produces a sample from a softmax model,

$$
\pi_w(a | x) \triangleq \frac{\exp(w \cdot \phi(x, a))}{\sum_{a' \in A} \exp(w \cdot \phi(x, a'))} = E_{\gamma \sim \text{Gumbel}(0,1)^k} [I \{h_{w, \gamma}(x) = a\}]. \quad (7)
$$

Further, if $w$ is normally distributed, then $h_{w, \gamma}(x)$ has a logistic-normal distribution [1].

We define the posterior, $Q$, as a Gaussian over softmax parameters, $w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I)$, for some learned $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma^2 \in (0, \infty)$, with standard Gumbel perturbations, $\gamma \sim \text{Gumbel}(0,1)^k$. As such, we have that

$$
\pi_Q(a | x) = E_{(w, \gamma) \sim Q}[I \{h_{w, \gamma}(x) = a\}] = E_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)}[\pi_w(a | x)]. \quad (8)
$$

This model is alternately referred to as a mixed logit or random parameter logit.

We can define the prior in any way that seems reasonable—without access to training data, of course. In the absence of any prior knowledge, a logical choice of prior is the standard (zero mean, unit variance) multivariate normal distribution, with standard Gumbel perturbations. This prior corresponds to a Bayesian policy that takes uniformly random actions, and motivates standard $L_2$ regularization of $\mu$. However, we know that the data was generated by the logging policy, and this knowledge motivates a different kind of prior (hence, regularizer). If the logging policy performs better than a uniform action distribution (which we can verify empirically, using the logs), then it makes sense to define the prior in terms of the logging policy.

Let us assume that the logging policy is known (we relax this assumption in Section 5), and has a softmax form (Equation 7), with parameters $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We define the prior, $P$, as an isotropic Gaussian centered at the logging policy’s parameters, $w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2 I)$, for some predetermined $\sigma_0^2 \in (0, \infty)$, with standard Gumbel perturbations, $\gamma \sim \text{Gumbel}(0,1)^k$. This prior encodes a belief that the logging policy, while not perfect, is a good starting point. Using the logging policy to define the prior does not violate the PAC-Bayes paradigm, since the logging policy is fixed before generating the training data. The Bayesian policy induced by this prior may not correspond to the actual logging policy, since the logging policy may have a different covariance structure than the prior; regardless, we can define the prior any way we want, and certain choices for $\sigma_0^2$ have nice analytic properties, which we discuss later.

**Remark 3.** We used isotropic covariances for the prior and posterior in order to simplify our analysis and presentation. That said, it is possible to use more complex covariance structures.

### 4.1 Bounding the KL Divergence

The KL divergence for the above prior and posterior constructions motivates an interesting regularizer for counterfactual risk minimization. We first derive an
upper bound on the KL divergence as a function of the model parameters.

Lemma 2. For distributions $P \triangleq N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2 I) \times \text{Gumbel}(0, 1)^k$ and $Q \triangleq N(\mu, \sigma^2 I) \times \text{Gumbel}(0, 1)^k$, with $\mu_0, \mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $0 < \sigma^2 \leq \sigma_0^2 < \infty$,

$$D_{\text{KL}}(Q\|P) \leq \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2}{2\sigma_0^2} + \frac{d}{2} \ln \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma^2}.$$ 

Proof. We can ignore the Gumbel distributions, since they are identical. Using the definition of the KL divergence for multivariate Gaussians, and properties of diagonal matrices (since both covariances are diagonal), we have that

$$D_{\text{KL}}(Q\|P) = \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2}{2\sigma_0^2} + \frac{d}{2} \left( \ln \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma^2} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} - 1 \right).$$

We conclude by noting that $\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} - 1 \leq 0$ for $\sigma^2 \leq \sigma_0^2$.

One implication of Lemma 2, captured by the term $\frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2}{2\sigma_0^2}$, is that, to generalize, the learned policy’s parameters should stay close to the logging policy’s parameters. This intuition concurs with Swaminathan and Joachims’s variance regularization [14], which implicitly penalizes diverging from the logging policy; hence, one way to reduce the variance is to not stray too far from the logging policy. Implementing this guideline in practice requires a simple modification to the usual $L_2$ regularization: instead of $\lambda \|\mu\|^2$ (where $\lambda > 0$ controls the amount of regularization), use $\lambda \|\mu - \mu_0\|^2$. Of course, this assumes that the logging policy’s parameters, $\mu_0$, are known; we address the scenario in which the logging policy is unknown in Section 5.

Another implication of Lemma 2 is that the variance parameters of the prior and posterior—$\sigma_0^2$ and $\sigma^2$, respectively—affect the KL divergence, which can be thought of as the variance of the risk estimator. As we show in Section 4.2, $\sigma^2$ also affects the bias of the risk estimator. Thus, selecting these parameters controls the bias-variance trade-off. We discuss this trade-off in Section 4.3.

4.2 Approximating the Action Probabilities

In practice, computing the posterior action probabilities (Equation 8) of a mixed logit model is difficult, since there is no analytical expression for the mean of the logistic-normal distribution [1]. It is therefore difficult to log action probabilities, or to compute the empirical risk (Equation 1), which is a function of the learned and logged action probabilities. Since it is easy to sample from a mixed logit, we can use Monte Carlo methods to estimate the probabilities. Alternatively, we can bound the action probabilities by a function of the mean softmax parameters, $\mu$.

Interestingly, a similar bound holds for the KL divergence between action distributions, $D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_\mu(x)\|\pi_{\mu_0}(x)) \leq O(\|\mu - \mu_0\|)$, which follows from Fenchel duality and Cauchy-Schwarz.
Lemma 3. If \( \sup_{x \in X, a \in A} \|\phi(x, a)\| \leq B \), then

\[
\pi_\mu(a \mid x) \exp \left( -\frac{\sigma^2 B^2}{2} \right) \leq \pi_Q(a \mid x) \leq \pi_\mu(a \mid x) \exp(2\sigma^2 B^2).
\]

We defer the proof to Appendix A.2.

By Lemma 3, the action probabilities induced by the mean parameters provide lower and upper bounds on the action probabilities of the mixed logit model. The bounds tighten as the variance, \( \sigma^2 \), becomes smaller. For instance, if \( \sigma^2 = O(n^{-1}) \), then \( \pi_Q(a \mid x) \to \pi_\mu(a \mid x) \) as \( n \to \infty \). During learning, we can use the lower bound of the learned action probabilities to upper-bound the empirical risk. Likewise, when the learned posterior is deployed, we can log the upper bound of the action probabilities, so that future training with the logged data has an upper bound on the IPS empirical risk.

4.3 Bayesian Counterfactual Risk Minimization for Mixed Logit Models

We now state a counterfactual risk bound for the Bayesian policy, \( \pi_Q \), in terms of the non-Bayesian policy, \( \pi_\mu \), given by the mean parameters, \( \mu \). This bound motivates a new regularized learning objective for Bayesian CRM.

In light of Lemma 3, we overload our previous notation to define a new estimator,

\[
\hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \exp\left( -\frac{\sigma^2 B^2}{2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\pi_\mu(a_i \mid x_i) r_i}{\max\{p_i, \tau\}}.
\]

This estimator is biased, but the bias decreases with \( \sigma^2 \). Importantly, \( \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) \) is easy to compute, since it avoids the logistic-normal integral.

The following bound is based on Theorem 1 for fixed \( \tau \), though one can easily derive an analogous bound for data-dependent \( \tau \) using Theorem 2.

**Theorem 3.** Let \( \mathcal{H} \) denote the space of hypotheses defined in Equations 5 and 6 and let \( \pi_Q \) denote the mixed logit policy defined in Equation 8. For any \( n \geq 1 \), \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), \( \tau \in (0, 1) \), \( \mu_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( \sigma_0^2 \in (0, \infty) \), with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \) over draws of \( S \sim (D \times \pi_0)^n \), the following holds simultaneously for all \( \mu \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2) \):

\[
R(\pi_Q) \leq \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) + \sqrt{\frac{(1 - 1 + \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S))(\Gamma(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) + 2\ln \frac{2}{\delta})}{\tau (n - 1)}} + \frac{1}{\tau} \left( \Gamma(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) + 2\ln \frac{2}{\delta} \right),
\]

where \( \Gamma(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) \triangleq \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2}{\sigma_0^2} + d \ln \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma^2}. \)

\(^6\)This statement assumes that the action space is not too large to compute the normalizing constant of the action distribution.
Proof. Using Lemma 3, it is easy to show that \( \hat{R}_\tau(\pi_Q, S) \leq \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) \). The rest of the proof follows from using Lemma 2 to upper-bound the KL divergence in Theorem 1.

Theorem 3 provides an upper bound on the counterfactual risk that can be computed with training data. Moreover, the bound is differentiable and smooth, meaning it can be optimized using gradient-based methods. We simplify the bound and obtain the following Bayesian CRM objective.

Proposition 1. The following optimization minimizes an upper bound on Equation 9:

\[
\arg\min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma^2_0]} \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) + \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2}{\sigma_0^2 \tau(n-1)} - \frac{d \ln \sigma^2}{\tau(n-1)}. \tag{11}
\]

Equation 11 is unfortunately non-convex. However, using standard convexity tricks, we can upper-bound \( \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) \) and obtain an objective that is differentiable, smooth and convex.

Proposition 2. The following convex optimization minimizes an upper bound on Equation 9:

\[
\arg\min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \ln \pi_\mu(a_i | x_i) + \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2}{\sigma_0^2 \tau(n-1)}, \tag{12}
\]

with \( \sigma^2 \triangleq \min \left\{ \frac{2d}{B^2 \tau(n-1)} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\max\{p_i, \tau\}} \right)^{-1}, \sigma_0^2 \right\} \).

We defer the proofs of Propositions 1 and 2 to Appendix A.3.

Conveniently, Equation 12 is equivalent to a weighted softmax regression with a modified \( L_2 \) regularizer. This optimization can be solved using standard methods, with guaranteed convergence to a global optimum. Moreover, by decoupling the optimizations of \( \mu \) and \( \sigma^2 \) in the upper bound (refer to the proof for details), we can solve for the optimal \( \sigma^2 \) in closed form.

In practice, one usually tunes the amount of regularization to optimize the empirical risk on a held-out validation dataset. By Propositions 1 and 2 this is equivalent to tuning the variance of the prior, \( \sigma_0^2 \). Though \( \mu_0 \) could in theory be any fixed vector, the case when it is the parameters of the logging policy corresponds to an interesting regularizer. This regularizer instructs the learning algorithm to keep the learned policy close to the logging policy, which effectively reduces the variance of the estimator.

Remark 4. Using Theorem 3 we can examine how the parameters \( \sigma^2_0 \) and \( \sigma^2 \) affect the bias-variance trade-off. Recall from Lemma 3 that higher values of \( \sigma^2 \) increase the bias of the estimator, \( \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) \). To reduce this bias, we want \( \sigma^2 \) to be small; e.g., \( \sigma^2 = \Theta(n^{-1}) \) results in negligible bias. However, if we also have \( \sigma_0^2 = \Theta(1) \), then \( \Gamma(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) \) —which can be interpreted as the variance
of the estimator—has a term, \(d \ln \frac{\sigma_n^2}{\sigma_0^2} = O(d \ln n)\), that depends linearly on the number of features, \(d\). When \(d\) is large, this term can dominate the risk bound. The dependence on \(d\) is eliminated when \(\sigma_0^2 = \sigma_j^2\); but if \(\sigma_0^2 = \Theta(n^{-1})\), then \(\Gamma(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) = O(\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2 n)\), which makes the risk bound vacuous.

5 When the Logging Policy Is Unknown

In Section 4, we assumed that the logging policy was known and used it to construct a prior. However, there may be settings in which the logging policy is unknown. We can nonetheless construct a prior that approximates the logging policy by learning from its logged actions.

At first, this idea may sound counterintuitive. After all, the prior is supposed to be fixed before drawing the training data. However, the expected value of a function of the data is constant with respect to any realization of the data. Thus, the expected estimator of the logging policy is independent of the training data, and can therefore serve as a valid prior. Further, if the estimator concentrates around its mean, then we can probabilistically bound the distance between the prior and the learned logging policy, which yields a data-dependent regularizer.

Overloading our previous notation, let \(L: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{X} \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+\) denote a loss function that measures the fit of softmax parameters \(w \sim \mathbb{R}^d\), given context \(x \in \mathcal{X}\) and action \(a \in A\). We will assume that \(L\) is both convex and \(\beta\)-Lipschitz with respect to \(w\). For a dataset of logged contexts and actions, \(S \in (\mathcal{X} \times A)^n\), let

\[
F(w, S) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} L(w, x_i, a_i) + \lambda \|w\|^2
\]

(13)
de note the regularized empirical risk. Let

\[
\hat{\mu}_0(S) \triangleq \arg\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} F(w, S)
\]

(14)
de note the minimizer of the regularized empirical risk, or RERM, and let

\[
\bar{\mu}_0 \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{S \sim (\mathcal{D} \times \pi_0)^n}[\hat{\mu}_0(S)]
\]

denote the expected RERM. Since \(\bar{\mu}_0\) is a constant, it is independent of any realization of the training data. We can therefore construct a Gaussian prior around \(\bar{\mu}_0\), which corresponds to a regularizer proportional to \(\|\mu - \bar{\mu}_0\|^2\).

Due to the strong convexity of \(F\), the RERM exhibits uniform algorithmic stability; meaning, it is robust to perturbations of the training data. Because of this property, the random variable \(\hat{\mu}_0(S)\) concentrates around its mean, \(\bar{\mu}_0\). We therefore have that, with high probability, the distance from \(\hat{\mu}_0(S)\) to \(\bar{\mu}_0\) is small. Thus, by the triangle inequality, \(\|\mu - \bar{\mu}_0\|\) is approximately \(\|\mu - \hat{\mu}_0(S)\|\), with high probability.

\[\text{This assumption is satisfied by the negative log-likelihood.}\]
We use this reasoning to prove the following. Our analysis (deferred to Appendix A.4) is similar to Lever et al.’s analysis of distribution-dependent PAC-Bayesian priors [6], and uses a concentration bound from Liu et al. [7].

**Theorem 4.** Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the space of hypotheses defined in Equations 5 and 6, and let $\pi_0$ denote the mixed logit policy defined in Equation 8. Let $\hat{\mu}_0(\mathcal{S})$ denote the RERM defined by Equation 14, for a convex, $\beta$-Lipschitz loss function. For any $n \geq 1$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $\sigma_0^2 \in (0, \infty)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over draws of $\mathcal{S} \sim (\mathbb{D} \times \pi_0)^n$, the following holds simultaneously for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]$:

\[
R(\pi_0) \leq \hat{R}\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, \mathcal{S}) + \sqrt{\frac{(\frac{1}{t} - 1 + \hat{R}\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, \mathcal{S})) (\hat{\Gamma}(\hat{\mu}_0(\mathcal{S}), \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) + 2 \ln \frac{2n}{\tau}}{\tau(n - 1)} + \frac{\hat{\Gamma}(\hat{\mu}_0(\mathcal{S}), \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) + 2 \ln \frac{2n}{\tau}}{\tau(n - 1)},} 
\]

(15)

where $\hat{\Gamma}(\hat{\mu}_0(\mathcal{S}), \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) \equiv \left( \frac{\|\mu - \hat{\mu}_0(\mathcal{S})\|^d \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln \frac{2n}{\tau}}{n}}}{\sigma_0^2} + d \ln \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma^2} \right)^2$.

It is straightforward to show that Propositions 1 and 2 hold for Theorem 4 with $\mu_0 \equiv \hat{\mu}_0(\mathcal{S})$. Thus, Theorem 4 motivates the following two-step learning procedure for Bayesian CRM:

1. Using logged data, $\mathcal{S}$, but ignoring the rewards and propensities, train a softmax model (Equation 7) by minimizing the regularized empirical risk (Equation 13), which outputs parameters $\hat{\mu}_0(\mathcal{S})$.

2. Using $\mathcal{S}$ again, including the rewards and propensities, train a mixed logit model (Equation 8) by minimizing a Bayesian CRM objective (Equation 11 or 12) with $\mu_0 \equiv \hat{\mu}_0(\mathcal{S})$.

**Remark 5.** Throughout, we have assumed that the log data includes the action probabilities (propensities), which enables IPS weighting. Given that we can learn to approximate the logging policy, it seems natural to use the learned propensities in the absence of the true propensities. In practice, this may work, though we cannot provide any formal guarantees for this approximation without further assumptions on the true logging policy and analysis of the RERM estimator. We leave this as a task for future work.

6 Conclusion

We have presented a PAC-Bayesian analysis of counterfactual risk minimization, for learning Bayesian policies from logged bandit feedback. Like Swaminathan and Joachims’s risk bound (Equation 2), ours achieves a “fast” learning rate under certain conditions—though theirs suggests variance regularization, while ours suggests regularizing by the posterior’s divergence from the prior. We applied our risk
bound to a class of mixed logit policies, which led to these key insights: (1) to minimize the counterfactual risk, the learned policy should minimize the IPS empirical risk while staying as close as possible to the logging policy, which can be implemented as $L_2$ regularization; (2) when the logging policy is unknown, one can learn the logging policy from logged data, thus motivating a two-step learning procedure for data-dependent regularization. Though our contributions are theoretical, they suggest practical, actionable advice for practitioners, which we will evaluate empirically in future work.

A  Deferred Proofs

This appendix contains all deferred proofs.

A.1  Proof of Theorem 2

We construct an infinite sequence of $\tau$ values, $(\tau_i \triangleq 2^{-i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$, and $\delta$ values, $(\delta_i \triangleq \delta_{\tau_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$. For any $\tau_i$, Equation 4 holds with probability at least $1 - \delta_i$. Thus, with probability at least $1 - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta_i = 1 - \delta$, Equation 4 holds for all $\tau_i$ simultaneously.

For a given $\tau$—which may depend on the data—we select $i^* \triangleq \lceil \ln \frac{\tau}{\ln 2} - 1 \rceil$. (Since $\tau \in (0, 1)$, the ceiling function ensures that $i^* \geq 1$.) Then, we have that $\tau/2 \leq \tau_{i^*} \leq \tau$; and, since $\max\{p, \tau_{i^*}\} \leq \max\{p, \tau\}$, we have that $\hat{R}_{\tau_{i^*}}(\pi, S) \leq \hat{R}_{\tau}(\pi, S)$. Further, $\delta_{i^*} \geq \delta_{\tau}/2$. Thus, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$R(\pi) \leq \hat{R}_{\tau_{i^*}}(\pi, S) + \sqrt{\frac{2(1 + \hat{R}_{\tau_{i^*}}(\pi, S))}{\tau_{i^*} (n-1)} \left( D_{KL}(Q \| P) + \ln \frac{n}{\delta_{i^*}} \right)} + \frac{2 \left( D_{KL}(Q \| P) + \ln \frac{n}{\delta_{i^*}} \right)}{\tau_{i^*} (n-1)}$$

$$\leq \hat{R}_{\tau}(\pi, S) + \sqrt{\frac{4(1 + \hat{R}_{\tau}(\pi, S))}{\tau (n-1)} \left( D_{KL}(Q \| P) + \ln \frac{2n}{\delta_{\tau}} \right)} + \frac{4 \left( D_{KL}(Q \| P) + \ln \frac{2n}{\delta_{\tau}} \right)}{\tau (n-1)},$$

which completes the proof.

A.2  Proof of Lemma 3

We begin with the lower bound. First, let

$$\Phi(w) \triangleq \sum_{a' \in A} \exp(w \cdot \phi(x, a'))$$
denote a normalizing constant, sometimes referred to as the partition function. Using \( \Phi \) in the definition of \( \pi \), and applying Jensen’s inequality, we have that
\[
\pi_Q(a \mid x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I)}[\pi_w(a \mid x)]}{\mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I)}[\exp(w \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(w))]} \\
\geq \exp \left( \mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I)}[w \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(w)]\right).
\] (16)

We then express the random parameters, \( w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I) \), as the sum of the mean parameters, \( \mu \), and a zero-mean Gaussian vector, \( g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I) \), which yields
\[
\mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I)}[w \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(w)] = \mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)}[\mu \cdot \phi(x, a)]
\]
\[
= \mu \cdot \phi(x, a) - \mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)}[\ln \Phi(\mu + g)]
\]
\[
= \mu \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(\mu) - \mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)}[\ln \left( \frac{\Phi(\mu + g)}{\Phi(\mu)} \right)].
\] (17)

The second line follows from the fact that the expected dot product of any vector with a zero-mean Gaussian vector is zero. Applying Jensen’s inequality again to the last term, we have
\[
- \mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)}[\ln \left( \frac{\Phi(\mu + g)}{\Phi(\mu)} \right)] \geq - \ln \mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)}[\Phi(\mu + g)] - \mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)}[\Phi(\mu)].
\] (18)

Observe that
\[
\frac{\Phi(\mu + g)}{\Phi(\mu)} = \sum_{a' \in A} \frac{\exp(\mu \cdot \phi(x, a'))}{\Phi(\mu)} \exp(g \cdot \phi(x, a')) = \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_{\mu}(x)}[\exp(g \cdot \phi(x, a'))].
\]

Thus, via linearity of expectation,
\[
\mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)}[\ln \left( \frac{\Phi(\mu + g)}{\Phi(\mu)} \right)] = \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_{\mu}(x)}[\exp(g \cdot \phi(x, a'))].
\] (19)

The right-hand inner expectation is simply the moment-generating function of a multivariate Gaussian. Combining its closed-form expression,
\[
\mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)}[\exp(g \cdot \phi(x, a'))] = \exp \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \| \phi(x, a') \|^2 \right),
\]
with Equation (19) we have
\[
- \ln \mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)}[\ln \left( \frac{\Phi(\mu + g)}{\Phi(\mu)} \right)] = - \ln \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_{\mu}(x)} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \| \phi(x, a') \|^2 \right) \right]
\]
\[
\geq - \ln \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_{\mu}(x)} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{\sigma^2 B^2}{2} \right) \right]
\]
\[
= - \frac{\sigma^2 B^2}{2}.
\] (20)
The inequality follows from the assumption that $\|\phi(x, a')\| \leq B$. Finally, combining Equations 16 to 18 and 20, we have

$$\pi_Q(a \mid x) \geq \exp \left( \mathbb{E}_{w \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2 I)} \left[ w \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(w) \right] \right)$$

$$= \exp \left( \mu \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(\mu) - \mathbb{E}_{g \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I)} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{\Phi(\mu + g)}{\Phi(\mu)} \right) \right] \right)$$

$$\geq \exp \left( \mu \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(\mu) - \mathbb{E}_{g \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I)} \left[ \frac{\Phi(\mu + g)}{\Phi(\mu)} \right] \right)$$

$$\geq \exp \left( \mu \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(\mu) - \frac{\sigma^2 B^2}{2} \right)$$

$$= \pi_\mu(a \mid x) \exp \left( - \frac{\sigma^2 B^2}{2} \right).$$

To prove the upper bound, first observe that

$$\pi_w(a \mid x) = \exp \left( \mu \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(\mu) + g \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(g) \right)$$

$$= \pi_\mu(a \mid x) \exp \left( g \cdot \phi(x, a) - \ln \Phi(g) \right)$$

$$= \pi_\mu(a \mid x) \exp \left( g \cdot \phi(x, a) - \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_\mu(x)} \left[ \exp(g \cdot \phi(x, a')) \right] \right)$$

$$\leq \pi_\mu(a \mid x) \exp \left( g \cdot \phi(x, a) - \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_\mu(x)} \left[ g \cdot \phi(x, a') \right] \right)$$

$$\leq \pi_\mu(a \mid x) \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_\mu(x)} \left[ \exp \left( g \cdot \left( \phi(x, a) - \phi(x, a') \right) \right) \right].$$

The inequalities follow from Jensen’s inequality. We then have that

$$\pi_Q(a \mid x) = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2 I)} \left[ \pi_w(a \mid x) \right]$$

$$\leq \pi_\mu(a \mid x) \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_\mu(x)} \mathbb{E}_{g \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I)} \left[ \exp \left( g \cdot \left( \phi(x, a) - \phi(x, a') \right) \right) \right].$$

The right-hand inner expectation is the moment-generating function of a multivariate Gaussian:

$$\mathbb{E}_{g \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I)} \left[ \exp \left( g \cdot \left( \phi(x, a) - \phi(x, a') \right) \right) \right] = \exp \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|\phi(x, a) - \phi(x, a')\|^2 \right)$$

$$\leq \exp \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|\phi(x, a)\|^2 + \|\phi(x, a')\|^2 \right)$$

$$\leq \exp \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2} (B + B)^2 \right)$$

$$= \exp(2\sigma^2 B^2).$$
The first inequality follows from the triangle inequality. Therefore,
\[ \pi_Q(a \mid x) \leq \pi_\mu(a \mid x) E_{a' \sim \pi_\mu(x)} [\exp(2\sigma^2 B^2)] = \pi_\mu(a \mid x) \exp(2\sigma^2 B^2), \]
which completes the proof.

### A.3 Proofs of Propositions 1 and 2

We start by proving Proposition 1. To simplify Equation 9, we let
\[ \alpha \triangleq \frac{1}{\tau} - 1 + \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta \triangleq \frac{\Gamma(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2)}{\tau (n - 1)}. \]
Noting that \( \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) \leq \alpha \) (since \( \tau^{-1} - 1 \geq 0 \)), we can upper-bound Equation 9 as
\[ R(\pi_Q) \leq \alpha + \sqrt{\alpha \beta} + \beta. \]
(21)

The middle term is the geometric mean of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), which is upper-bounded by the arithmetic mean:
\[ \alpha + \sqrt{\alpha \beta} + \beta \leq \alpha + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{2} = \frac{3(\alpha + \beta)}{2}. \]
(22)

We therefore obtain an upper bound on Equation 9 that omits the middle term, which can be tricky to optimize due to the interaction between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). If we optimize this upper bound,
\[ \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{3(\alpha + \beta)}{2} = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \alpha + \beta \]
\[ = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \frac{1}{\tau} - 1 + \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) + \frac{\Gamma(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) + 2 \ln \frac{\tau}{\beta}}{\tau (n - 1)} \]
\[ = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) + \frac{\Gamma(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2)}{\tau (n - 1)} \]
\[ = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) + \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} \|\mu - \mu_0\|^2 + d \ln \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma^2} \]
\[ = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) + \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} \|\mu - \mu_0\|^2 - d \ln \sigma^2 \]
\[ = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) + \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} \|\mu - \mu_0\|^2 - d \ln \sigma, \]
we obtain Equation 11.

To prove Proposition 2 we upper-bound \( \hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) \) by using
\[ 1 - u v = 1 - u \exp(\ln v) \leq 1 - u(1 + \ln v), \]
for $u, v \geq 0$. Setting

$$u_i \triangleq \frac{r_i}{\max\{p_i, \tau\}} \quad \text{and} \quad v_i \triangleq \frac{\pi\mu(a_i \mid x_i)}{\exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2 B^2}{2}\right)},$$

we have that

$$\hat{R}_\tau(\mu, \sigma^2, S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1 - \frac{r_i}{\max\{p_i, \tau\}} \frac{\pi\mu(a_i \mid x_i)}{\exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2 B^2}{2}\right)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1 - u_i v_i \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1 - u_i (1 + \ln v_i).$$

Let

$$\gamma \triangleq \frac{1}{\tau} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} -u_i (1 + \ln v_i),$$

and observe that $\alpha \leq \gamma$. Thus, by Equations 21 and 22,

$$R(\pi_Q) \leq \frac{3(\alpha + \beta)}{2} \leq \frac{3(\gamma + \beta)}{2}.$$ 

Optimizing this upper bound yields the following equivalence:

$$\arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \frac{3(\gamma + \beta)}{2} = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \gamma + \beta$$

$$= \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \frac{1}{\tau} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} -u_i (1 + \ln v_i) + \frac{\Gamma(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) + 2 \ln \frac{2}{\sigma}}{\tau (n - 1)} - \frac{d \ln \sigma^2}{\tau (n - 1)}$$

$$= \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} -u_i (1 + \ln v_i) + \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2}{\sigma_0^2 \tau (n - 1)} - \frac{d \ln \sigma^2}{\tau (n - 1)}$$

$$= \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} -r_i \frac{1 + \ln \pi\mu(a_i \mid x_i) - \frac{\sigma^2 B^2}{2}}{\max\{p_i, \tau\}} + \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|^2}{\sigma_0^2 \tau (n - 1)} - \frac{d \ln \sigma^2}{\tau (n - 1)}$$

Observe that $\mu$ and $\sigma^2$ never interact multiplicatively in the objective function. We can therefore solve each sub-optimization separately.
Starting with $\mu$, we simply isolate the relevant terms and obtain Equation 12. For $\sigma^2$, we must solve

$$\arg \min_{\sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{r_i B^2 \sigma^2}{2 \max\{p_i, \tau\}} - \frac{d \ln \sigma^2}{\tau (n-1)}.$$ 

Note that this objective is convex in $\sigma^2$. If we ignore the constraint that $\sigma^2 \in (0, \sigma_0^2]$ and let $\sigma^2$ be any real number, then the problem has an analytic solution:

$$\arg \min_{\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{r_i B^2 \sigma^2}{2 \max\{p_i, \tau\}} - \frac{d \ln \sigma^2}{\tau (n-1)} = 2 \frac{d B^2 \tau}{B^2 \tau (n-1)} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{r_i}{\max\{p_i, \tau\}} \right).$$ 

This can be verified by setting the derivative equal to 0 and solving for $\sigma^2$. Suppose the solution to the unconstrained problem lies outside of the feasible region for the constrained problem, $(0, \sigma_0^2]$. It is easily verified that the unconstrained solution is strictly positive; thus, it must be greater than $\sigma_0^2$. Since the objective function is convex, we must then have that the solution to the constrained problem lies at the upper boundary, $\sigma_0^2$, which is the closest point to the unconstrained solution. Thus, the minimizer of the constrained problem is either the unconstrained solution or $\sigma_0^2$; whichever one is smaller.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

To prove Theorem 4, we start by borrowing a result from Liu et al. [7], which we simplify and specialize for our use case.

**Lemma 4** ([7, Lemma 1]). Suppose there exists a constant, $\alpha > 0$, such that for any two datasets, $S, S' \in (X \times A)^n$, that differ at a single example (i.e., their Hamming distance, $D_h(S, S')$, is 1), the following holds:

$$\sup_{S, S' \in (X \times A)^n: D_h(S, S') = 1} \|\hat{\mu}_0(S) - \hat{\mu}_0(S')\| \leq \alpha. \quad (23)$$

Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\Pr_{S \sim (D \times \pi_0)^n} \left\{ \|\hat{\mu}_0(S) - \bar{\mu}_0\| \geq \alpha \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta}} \right\} \leq \delta.$$

To apply Lemma 4 we must identify a value of $\alpha$ that satisfies Equation 23.

**Lemma 5.** If the loss function, $L$, is convex and $\beta$-Lipschitz with respect to its first argument, then the RERM, $\hat{\mu}_0(S)$, satisfies Equation 23 for $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{m}.$

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, assume that the index of the example at which $S$ and $S'$ differ is $i$. It easily verified that the regularizer, $\lambda \|w\|^2$, is $(2\lambda)$-strongly convex; and since $L$ is assumed to be convex, the regularized empirical risk, $F$
strongly convex functions, and the symmetry of distances, we have that

\[ \| \hat{\mu}(S) - \hat{\mu}(S') \|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \| \hat{\mu}(S) - \hat{\mu}(S') \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| \hat{\mu}(S') - \hat{\mu}(S) \|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda} (F(\hat{\mu}(S), S') - F(\hat{\mu}(S'), S')) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} (F(\hat{\mu}(S), S) - F(\hat{\mu}(S), S)) = \frac{1}{2\lambda} (F(\hat{\mu}(S), S) - F(\hat{\mu}(S), S')) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} (F(\hat{\mu}(S), S') - F(\hat{\mu}(S), S)) = \frac{1}{2\lambda} (L(\hat{\mu}(S), x_i, a_i) - L(\hat{\mu}(S'), x_i, a_i)) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} (L(\hat{\mu}(S), x_i', a_i') - L(\hat{\mu}(S), x_i, a_i)) = \frac{1}{2\lambda} (L(\hat{\mu}(S'), x_i, a_i) - L(\hat{\mu}(S), x_i, a_i)) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} (L(\hat{\mu}(S), x_i', a_i') - L(\hat{\mu}(S'), x_i', a_i')) \leq \frac{\beta}{2\lambda n} (\| \hat{\mu}(S) - \hat{\mu}(S') \| + \| \hat{\mu}(S) - \hat{\mu}(S') \|) = \frac{\beta}{\lambda n} \| \hat{\mu}(S) - \hat{\mu}(S') \|. \]

Dividing each side by \( \| \hat{\mu}(S) - \hat{\mu}(S') \| \) completes the proof. \( \square \)

Now, we can apply Lemma 4 to show that \( \hat{\mu}(S) \) concentrates around \( \hat{\mu} \).

**Lemma 6.** If the loss function, \( L \), is convex and \( \beta \)-Lipschitz with respect to its first argument, then for any \( \delta \in (0, 1) \),

\[ \Pr_{S \sim (\mathcal{D} \times \pi_0)^n} \left\{ \| \hat{\mu}(S) - \hat{\mu}_0 \| \geq \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}} \right\} \leq \delta. \]

**Proof.** Follows immediately from Lemmas 4 and 5 with \( \alpha = \frac{\beta}{\lambda n} \). \( \square \)

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4. We start by applying Theorem 3 with \( \mu_0 \) replaced by \( \hat{\mu}_0 \), and \( \delta \) replaced by \( \delta/2 \). With probability at least \( 1 - \delta/2 \),

\[ R(\pi_Q) \leq \hat{R}_r(\mu, \sigma^2, S) + \sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{\tau} - 1 + \hat{R}_r(\mu, \sigma^2, S) \right) \left( \Gamma(\hat{\mu}_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) + 2 \ln \frac{2n}{\delta} \right) / \tau (n - 1)} + \frac{\left( \Gamma(\hat{\mu}_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) + 2 \ln \frac{2n}{\delta} \right)}{\tau (n - 1)}. \]
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Then, using the triangle inequality and Lemma 6, we have that

\[ \| \mu - \bar{\mu}_0 \| \leq \| \mu - \hat{\mu}_0(S) \| + \| \hat{\mu}_0(S) - \bar{\mu}_0 \| \]

\[ \leq \| \mu - \hat{\mu}_0(S) \| + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}}{n}}, \]

with probability at least \( 1 - \delta/2 \). Substituting this into Equation 10 yields

\[
\Gamma(\bar{\mu}_0, \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2) = \frac{\| \mu - \hat{\mu}_0 \|^2}{\sigma_0^2} + d \ln \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma^2}
\]

\[ \leq \left( \frac{\| \mu - \hat{\mu}_0(S) \| + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}}{n}}}{\sigma_0^2} \right)^2 + d \ln \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma^2}
\]

\[ = \hat{\Gamma}(\hat{\mu}_0(S), \sigma_0^2, \mu, \sigma^2), \]

with probability at least \( 1 - \delta/2 \). Thus, Equation 15 holds with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \).
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