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Abstract

We explore whether quantum advantages can be found for the zeroth-order online convex optimization problem, which is also known as bandit convex optimization with multi-point feedback. In this setting, given access to zeroth-order oracles (that is, the loss function is accessed as a black box that returns the function value for any queried input), a player attempts to minimize a sequence of adversarially generated convex loss functions. This procedure can be described as a $T$ round iterative game between the player and the adversary. In this paper, we present quantum algorithms for the problem and show for the first time that potential quantum advantages are possible for problems of online convex optimization. Specifically, our contributions are as follows. (i) When the player is allowed to query zeroth-order oracles $O(1)$ times in each round as feedback, we give a quantum algorithm that achieves $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret without additional dependence of the dimension $n$, which outperforms the already known optimal classical algorithm only achieving $O(\sqrt{nT})$ regret. Note that the regret of our quantum algorithm has achieved the lower bound of classical first-order methods. (ii) We show that for strongly convex loss functions, the quantum algorithm can achieve $O(\log T)$ regret with $O(1)$ queries as well, which means that the quantum algorithm can achieve the same regret bound as the classical algorithms in the full information setting.

1 Introduction

Convex optimization is a basic foundation for artificial intelligence, particularly for machine learning. While many ingenious algorithms have been developed for convex optimization problems [3, 6], people still hunger for more efficient solutions in the era of big data. Since quantum computing exhibits advantages over classical computing...
people seek to employ quantum computing techniques to accelerate the optimization process. On the one hand, combinatorial optimization was shown to be acceleratable by using quantum techniques such as Grover’s algorithm or quantum walks [2, 9, 10, 13, 30, 41, 33, 20]. On the other hand, in the last few years, some significant quantum improvements were achieved for convex optimization in linear programming [25, 29, 38], second-order cone programming [28, 27, 26], quadratic programming [24], polynomial optimization [32], and semi-definite optimization [37, 4, 23, 39, 25]. Note that they are all special cases of convex optimization. In the last two years, quantum algorithms for general convex optimization were studied [40, 8], where the main technique used is the quantum gradient estimation algorithm [22, 12]. While many studies focus on improving offline convex optimization with quantum computing techniques as mentioned above, few work considers applying quantum computing methods to online convex optimization.

1.1 Online convex optimization

Online convex optimization (OCO) is an important framework in online learning, and particularly useful in sequential decision making problems, such as online routing, portfolio selection, and recommendation systems. Online convex optimization is best understood as a $T$ round iterative game between a player and an adversary. At every iteration $t$, the player generates a prediction $x_t$ from a fixed and known convex set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. The adversary observes $x_t$ and chooses a convex loss function $f_t : K \to \mathbb{R}$. After that, the player suffers the loss $f_t(x_t)$. Then, some information about the loss function $f_t$ is revealed to the player as feedback. The goal of the player is to minimize his regret, which is defined as

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(x_t) - \min_{x^* \in K} \sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(x^*).$$

An algorithm/strategy of the player is said to perform well if its regret is sublinear as a function of $T$, since this implies that on average the algorithm performs as well as the best fixed strategy in hindsight.

The variants of OCO mainly depend on the following four aspects:

1. The power of the adversary

   (a) Completely adaptive adversary: A completely adaptive adversary is allowed to choose loss functions $f_t$ after observing the player’s choice $x_t$.

   (b) Adaptive adversary: An adaptive adversary is limited to choosing the loss function $f_t$ of each round before observing the player’s choice $x_t$.

   (c) Oblivious adversary: An oblivious adversary is limited to choosing all the loss functions $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_T$ before the game starting.
2. Feedback

(a) Full information setting: After suffering the loss $f_t(x_t)$, $f_t$ is revealed to the player as feedback.

(b) First-order setting: After suffering the loss $f_t(x_t)$, a gradient oracle is revealed to the player as feedback, where the player can query the gradient of the loss function.

(c) Multi-query bandit setting: After suffering the loss $f_t(x_t)$, a zeroth-order oracle is revealed to the player (i.e., $f$ is supplied to the player as a black box), where the player can query the value of the loss function at more than 1 points as feedback.

(d) Single-query bandit setting: After suffering the loss $f_t(x_t)$, only the loss value $f_t(x_t)$ is revealed to the player. This can be seen as 1-query of a zeroth-order oracle.

3. The property of loss functions: $\beta$-smooth, $\alpha$-strongly, exp-concave et al.

4. The property of the feasible set.

1.2 Related work

For more information about online convex optimization, one can refer to Reference [16]. Also note that it is well-known that any algorithm for online convex optimization can be converted to an algorithm for stochastic convex optimization with similar guarantees [19, 31, 34, 35]. As shown in Table 1, below we review some work on online convex optimization that are closely related to the topic considered in this paper, which is organized according to the feedback fashion. We put the first-order setting and the full information setting together because most of the work in full information setting only use the gradient information.

First-order oracles/Full information. In 2003, Zinkevich defined the online convex optimization model and showed that the online gradient descent could achieve $O((D^2 + G^2)\sqrt{T})$ regret [42]. Note that the regret could be improved to $O(DG\sqrt{T})$ easily by choosing better parameters if the diameter $D$ and the Lipschitz constant $G$ were known to the player, and also it has been known that the lower bound of this setting is $\Omega(DG\sqrt{T})$ (Theorem 3.2 of [17]). For strongly convex loss functions, Hazan et.al. showed that $O(G^2 \log T)$ regret could be achieved by using online gradient descent [18]. In the same paper, for exp-concave loss functions, Hazan et.al. proposed an online Newton method which achieved $O(DGn \log T)$ regret [18].

Single-query bandit setting. In those work mentioned above, it is assumed that the player can get full information of loss functions as feedback, or has access to gradient oracles of loss functions. Contrarily, online convex optimization in the single-query bandit setting was proposed by Flaxman et.al. [11], where the only feedback was the value of the loss and the adversary was assumed to be oblivious. Note that in the
bandit setting, a regret bound for any strategy against the completely adaptive adversary is necessarily $\Omega(T)$. Thus, it needs to be assumed that the adversary is adaptive or oblivious, i.e. the adversary must choose the loss function before observing the player’s choice or before the game starting, respectively. The expected regret of Flaxman’s algorithm is $O(\sqrt{DGCnT})$, where $C$ is the width of the range of loss functions. In 2016, the upper bound was improved to $O((D^2 + n^2G^2)\sqrt{T})$ by Bubeck and Eldan [7], where both the diameter $D$ and the Lipschitz constant $G$ were assumed to be 1.

**Multi-query bandit setting.** Better regret can be achieved if the player can query the value of the loss function at more than 1 points in each round. In 2010, Agarwal et.al. [1] considered the multi-query bandit setting and proposed an algorithm with an expected regret bound of $O((D^2 + n^2G^2)\sqrt{T})$, where the player queries $O(1)$ points in each round. In 2017, the upper bound was improved to $O(D\sqrt{nT/k})$ by Shamir [35], where the player queries $k$ points in each round. It is worth mentioning that the regret lower bound of zeroth-order online convex optimization with $O(1)$ queries each round is still not known very well, and the best upper bound still has additional dependence of dimension.

### 1.3 Problem setting and our contributions

In this paper, we present quantum algorithms for the online convex optimization problem (Subsection 1.1) in the multi-query bandit setting, exploring whether quantum advantages can be found. Here, an algorithm is allowed to query the zeroth-order oracle multiple times after committing the prediction for getting feedback in each round. A classical zeroth-order oracle $O_f$ to the loss function $f$, queried with a vector $x \in K$, outputs $O_f(x) = f(x)$. A quantum zeroth-order oracle $Q_f$ is a unitary transformation that maps a quantum state $|x\rangle |q\rangle$ to the state $|x\rangle |q + f(x)\rangle$, where $|x\rangle$, $|q\rangle$ and $|q + f(x)\rangle$ are basis states corresponding to the floating-point representations of $x$, $q$ and $q + f(x)$. Moreover, given the superposition input $\sum_{x,q} \alpha_{x,q} |x\rangle |q\rangle$, by linearity the quantum oracle will output the state $\sum_{x,q} \alpha_{x,q} |x\rangle |q + f(x)\rangle$.

Unlike the previous work of the bandit setting, we do not need to limit the power of the adversary, namely, the adversary in our setting is *completely adaptive*, who can choose $f_t$ after observing the player’s choice $x_t$. In addition, as usually in online
convex optimization, we also make the following assumptions: The loss functions are G-Lipschitz continuous, that is, $|f_t(x) - f_t(y)| \leq G \|y - x\|$, $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{K}$; the feasible set $\mathcal{K}$ is bounded and its diameter has an upper bound $D$, that is, $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{K}$, $\|x - y\|_\infty \leq D$. $\mathcal{K}, D, G$ are known to the player. 

Our main results are as follows.

**Result 1** (Theorem 1). *In online convex optimization problems with quantum zeroth-order oracles, there exists a quantum algorithm that can achieve the regret bound $O(DG\sqrt{T})$, by querying the oracle $O(1)$ times in each round.*

**Result 2** (Theorem 2). *In online convex optimization problems with quantum zeroth-order oracles and $\alpha$-strongly convex loss functions, there exists a quantum algorithm that can achieve the regret bound $O(G^2 \log T)$, by querying the oracle $O(1)$ times in each round.*

For completeness, we also give a simple classical algorithm which guarantees $O(DG\sqrt{T})$ regret by consuming $O(n)$ queries in each round (see Theorem 3).

Our results show quantum advantages are possible for online convex optimization, since from Table 1 and the above results one can see the following results.

- Quantum algorithms outperform classical ones in the zeroth-order OCO model, since to our best knowledge the optimal classical algorithm with $O(1)$ queries in each round can only achieve $O(DG\sqrt{nT})$ regret [35], where $n$ is the dimension of the feasible set, whereas our quantum algorithm has a better regret $O(DG\sqrt{T})$.

- The quantum zeroth-order oracle is as powerful as the classical first-order oracle, since our quantum algorithm with only $O(1)$ queries to the zeroth-order quantum oracle in each round has achieved the regret lower bound $O(DG\sqrt{T})$ of the classical algorithms with first-order oracles [17].

- Result 2 shows that for $\alpha$-strongly convex loss functions, the quantum algorithm with only $O(1)$ queries to the zeroth-order oracle in each round can achieve the same regret $O(G^2 \log T)$ as the classical algorithms in the first-order setting [18].

The framework of our proofs are depicted in Figure 1. The main idea is that we first give a quantum algorithm in Algorithm 1, and then we show that the algorithm can guarantee the results mentioned above by choosing appropriate parameters. In technical aspect, we improve the analysis of the quantum gradient estimation method in [8, 40], and show that $O(1)$ queries is enough in our problem, instead of $O(\log n)$ repetitions.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is for the online convex optimization with quantum zeroth-order oracles; Section 3 is for the online convex optimization with classical zeroth-order oracles. Proofs are placed at Appendix A except the proofs of our main theorems. Some extra definitions are listed at Appendix B for the reader benefit.
2 Online convex optimization with quantum zeroth-order oracles

This section aims to prove Result 1 and 2. We first give a quantum algorithm and state some technical lemmas in Subsection 2.1. Then in Section 2.2, for general convex loss functions, we show that by choosing appropriate parameters, sublinear regret can be guaranteed. Finally in Subsection 2.3, we show that for $\alpha$-strongly convex loss functions, $O(\log T)$ regret can be guaranteed by Algorithm 1 with different parameters, which gives Result 2. See Appendix B for the definition of $\alpha$-strongly convex functions.

2.1 Algorithm

For the OCO problem stated in Subsection 1.1 and the setting stated in Subsection 1.3, given the round number $T$ and $\delta = T(p + \rho)$, we present Algorithm 1 to produce a decision sequence $x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_T$ for the player, such that it achieves a regret being sublinear of $T$, with probability greater than $1 - \delta$. Here $p$ and $\rho$ are some intermediate parameters used to adjust the success probability. Initially, the algorithm chooses $x_1$ randomly from $\mathcal{K}$, and then sequentially produces $x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_T$ by online gradient descent. Steps 5-12 are the process of quantum gradient estimation whose circuit is depicted in Figure 2. The quantum circuit of $Q_F$ in Step 7 is constructed after the sampling of $z$ by using $Q_f$ twice; $\mathbbm{1}$ in Step 7 is the $n$-dimensional all 1’s vector; the last register and the operation of addition modulo 2 in Step 8 are used for implementing the common technique in quantum algorithm known as phase kickback; Step 9 is known as uncompute trick; the projection operation is defined as $\prod_K(y) \triangleq \arg\min_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \|x - y\|$; $B_\infty(x, r)$ is the ball in $L_\infty$ norm with radius $r$ and center $x$.

First we analyze the query complexity of Algorithm 1. In each round, it needs to call the oracle twice to construct $Q_F$, and twice to perform the uncompute step $Q_F^{-1}$, so totally 4 times for computing the gradient. Thus, $O(1)$ times for each round.

In order to prove the main results of this paper (i.e., Theorems 1 and 2), some technical lemmas (i.e., Lemmas 1, 2, and 3) are required, of which the proofs are presented in Appendix A. First, Lemma 1 shows that the evaluating error of the gradient
can be bounded. Note that we omit the subscript $t$ in the statement of the lemmas as they hold for each round.

**Lemma 1.** In each round of Algorithm 1, if $f$ is $\beta$-smooth in the domain of $B_\infty(x, r + r')$, then for any $r, r' > 0$ and $1 \geq \rho > 0$, we have

$$\Pr \left[ \|\nabla f(z) - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 > 8\pi n^3 (n/\rho + 1) \beta r'/\rho \right] < \rho.$$  \hfill (1)

The evaluating error of subgradient of $f_t$ at point $x_t$ in each round can also be bounded as follows.

**Lemma 2.** (Lemma 12 of [40]) In each round of Algorithm 1, let $z \in B_\infty(x, r)$ and $f : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function with Lipschitz parameter $G$, then for any $y \in \mathcal{K}$, the gradient of each round, $\tilde{\nabla} f(x)$, satisfies

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T(y - x) - \|\nabla f(z) - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 \|y - x\|_\infty - 2G\sqrt{nr}.$$  \hfill (2)

Then, Lemma 3 shows that non $\beta$-smooth loss functions are still $\beta$-smooth in a small region with high probability by bounding the trace of their Hessian matrices \cite{8, 21}.

**Lemma 3.** (Lemma 2.5 and 2.6 of the old version of [8]) Let $f : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function with Lipschitz parameter $G$. Then for any $r, r' > 0$ and $1 \geq \rho > 0$, we have

$$\Pr_{z \in B_\infty(x, r)} \left[ \exists y \in B_\infty(z, r'), \Tr\{\nabla^2 f(y)\} \geq \frac{nG}{\rho r^2} \right] \leq p.$$  \hfill (3)
Algorithm 1 Quantum algorithm for OCO

Input: Step sizes \( \{ \eta_t \} \), parameters \( \{ r_t \}, \{ r'_t \} \)

Output: \( x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_T \)

1. Choose the initial point \( x_1 \in K \) randomly.
   
   for \( t = 1 \) to \( T \) do
     
     3. Play \( x_t \), get the oracle of loss function \( Q_f \) from the adversary.
     
     4. Sample \( z \in B_\infty(x_t, r_t) \).
     
     5. Let \( \beta = \frac{D_{Gr}}{pr} \). Prepare the initial state: \( n \) \( b \)-qubit registers \( |0^{\otimes b}, 0^{\otimes b}, \ldots, 0^{\otimes b} \rangle \) where \( b = \log_2 \frac{G_p}{4\pi n^2 \beta r_t} \). Prepare 1 \( c \)-qubit register \( |0^{\otimes c} \rangle \) where \( c = \log_2 \frac{4G}{nG_{Gr}^2} - 1 \). And prepare \( |y_0 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{a \in \{0,1,\ldots,2^n-1\}} e^{\frac{2\pi ia}{2^n}} |a \rangle \).
     
     6. Perform Hadamard transform to the first \( F \) registers.
     
     7. Perform the inverse evaluating oracle \( Q_f^{-1} \) to the first \( n + 1 \) registers, where \( F(u) = \frac{\sqrt{G_{Gr}}}{2G} [f(z + \frac{r_t}{2^n} (u - \frac{2^b}{2^n} I)) - f(z)] \), and the result is stored in the \( (n+1) \)th register.
     
     8. Perform the addition modulo \( 2^c \) operation to the last two registers.
     
     9. Perform the inverse query oracle \( Q_f^{-1} \) to the first \( n + 1 \) registers.
     
    10. Perform quantum inverse Fourier transformations to the first \( n \) registers separately.
     
    11. Measure the first \( n \) registers in computation bases respectively to get \( m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n \).
     
    12. Compute the gradient \( \nabla f_t(x_t) = \frac{2G}{n} (m_1 - \frac{2^b}{2}, m_2 - \frac{2^b}{2}, \ldots, m_n - \frac{2^b}{2})^T \).
     
    13. Update \( x_{t+1} = \prod_{K} x_t - \eta_t \nabla f_t(x_t) \)
     
end for

2.2 Analysis for general convex loss functions

In this subsection we show how to choose appropriate parameters such that Algorithm 1 guarantees \( O(DG\sqrt{T}) \) regret for all \( T \geq 1 \), which gives Theorem 1 (Result 1). Before that, the following lemma is required, with proof given in Appendix A.

Lemma 4. Let \( f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be a convex function with Lipschitz parameter \( G \), where \( K \) is a convex set with diameter \( D \), then for any \( y \in K \), with probability greater than \( 1 - (\rho + p) \), the gradient of each round, \( \nabla f(x) \), satisfies

\[
\nabla f(y) \geq \nabla f(x) + (\nabla f(x))^T (y - x) - \frac{8\pi n^4 (n + p) D Gr'}{\rho^2 pr} - 2G\sqrt{n}r. \tag{4}
\]

Now we present one main result of this paper below.

Theorem 1. Algorithm 1 with parameters \( \eta_t = \frac{D}{\sqrt{T}}, r_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}, r'_t = \frac{\rho^2 p}{8\pi \sqrt{n}(n + p)} \)

\( \text{can achieve the regret bound } O(DG\sqrt{T}) \), with probability greater than \( 1 - T(\rho + p) \), and its query complexity is \( O(1) \) in each round.

Proof. Inequality (4) is required to hold for all \( T \) rounds. By the union bound, the probability that Algorithm 1 fails to satisfy Inequality (4) at least one round is less than
T(\rho + p), which means the probability that Algorithm 1 succeeds for all T round is greater than \(1 - T(\rho + p)\). Let \(x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in K} \sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(x)\). Then by Lemma 4, for the fixed \(y = x^*\), with probability \(1 \geq 1 - T(\rho + p)\) we have

\[
f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*) \leq \nabla f_t(x_t)^T (x_t - x^*) + \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGr_t'}{\rho^2 pr_t} + 2G\sqrt{nr_t}, \text{ for all } t = [T].
\]  

(5)

By the update rule for \(x_{t+1}\) and the Pythagorean theorem, we get

\[
\|x_{t+1} - x^*\|^2 = \| \prod_{k} (x_t - \eta_t \nabla f_t(x_t)) - x^* \|^2 \\
\leq \| x_t - \eta_t \nabla f_t(x_t) - x^* \|^2 \\
= \| x_t - x^* \|^2 + \eta_t^2 \| \nabla f_t(x_t) \|^2 - 2\eta_t \nabla f_t(x_t)^T (x_t - x^*).
\]  

(6)

Hence

\[
\nabla f_t(x_t)^T (x_t - x^*) \leq \frac{\| x_t - x^* \|^2 - \| x_{t+1} - x^* \|^2}{2\eta_t} + \frac{\eta_t \| \nabla f_t(x_t) \|^2}{2}.
\]  

(7)

Substituting Inequality (7) into Inequality (5) and summing Inequality (5) from \(t = 1\) to \(T\), we have

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} (f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \nabla f_t(x_t)^T (x_t - x^*) + \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGr_t'}{\rho^2 pr_t} + 2G\sqrt{nr_t} \\
\leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( \frac{\| x_t - x^* \|^2 - \| x_{t+1} - x^* \|^2}{2\eta_t} + \frac{\eta_t \| \nabla f_t(x_t) \|^2}{2} \right) \\
+ \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGr_t'}{\rho^2 pr_t} + 2G\sqrt{nr_t}).
\]  

(8)

Upper bounds can be obtained for the right side of the above inequality. First, by denoting \(\frac{1}{\eta_0} := 0\), we have

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{\| x_t - x^* \|^2 - \| x_{t+1} - x^* \|^2}{\eta_t} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} (\| x_t - x^* \|^2 - \frac{1}{\eta_t} - \frac{1}{\eta_{t-1}}) \\
\leq \frac{D^2}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{1}{\eta_t} - \frac{1}{\eta_{t-1}} \\
= \frac{D^2}{2\eta_T}.
\]  

(9)
Second, there is
\[ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \eta_t \| \tilde{\nabla} f_t(x_t) \|^2 = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \eta_t \| \tilde{\nabla} f_t(x_t) + g - g \|^2 \]
\[ \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \eta_t (\| \tilde{\nabla} f_t(x_t) - g \| + \| g \|)^2 \]
\[ \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \eta_t (\| \tilde{\nabla} f_t(x_t) - g \|_1 + G)^2 \]
\[ \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \eta_t \left( \frac{8\pi n^4(n+\rho)G^2}{\rho^2 c} + G \right)^2. \] (10)

Setting \( \eta_t = \frac{D}{G \sqrt{t}} \) (where \( \frac{1}{\eta_0} := 0 \)), \( r_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t n}} \), \( r'_t = \frac{\rho^2}{8\pi \sqrt{t n^2(n+\rho)}} \), we have
\[ \sum_{t=1}^{T} (f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*)) \leq \frac{DG\sqrt{T}}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{DG (G + G)^2}{2G \sqrt{t}} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{DG}{2 \sqrt{t}} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{2G}{\sqrt{t}} \]
\[ \leq \frac{DG\sqrt{T}}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{2DG}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{DG\sqrt{T}}{2} + 2G \sqrt{T} \]
\[ \leq \frac{DG\sqrt{T}}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{2DG}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{DG\sqrt{T}}{2} + 2G \sqrt{T} \]
\[ \leq \frac{DG\sqrt{T}}{2} + 2DG \sqrt{T} + \frac{DG\sqrt{T}}{2} + 2G \sqrt{T} \]
\[ = O(DG \sqrt{T}). \] (11)

Thus, the theorem follows. \( \square \)

The space complexity can be analyzed as follows. Plugging \( \{r_t\}, \{r'_t\} \) into \( b, c \), we have \( b = \log_2 \frac{G \rho}{4\pi n^2 G r'_t} = \log_2 \frac{2n(n+\rho)}{\rho} = O(\log(Tn/\delta)) \), \( c = \log_2 \frac{4G}{\log(\rho/\delta)} = 1 = \log_2 \frac{16\pi n}{\rho} - 1 = O(\log(Tn/\delta)) \). Thus, \( O(n \log(Tn/\delta)) \) qubits are needed in this case.

### 2.3 Analysis for \( \alpha \)-strongly convex loss functions

In this subsection, we show that for \( \alpha \)-strongly convex loss functions, \( O(G^2 \log T) \) regret can be guaranteed by choosing different parameters in Algorithm 1, which gives Theorem 2 (Result 2). Before that, the following lemma is required, with proof given in Appendix A.

**Lemma 5.** In each round of Algorithm 1, let \( f : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{R} \) be \( \alpha \)-strongly convex with Lipschitz parameter \( G \), where \( \mathcal{K} \) is a convex set, then for any \( y \in \mathcal{K} \), with probability
greater than $1 - (\rho + p)$, the gradient of each round, $\nabla f(x)$, satisfies
\[
f(y) \geq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^T(y - x) - \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGTr}{\rho^2 pr} - (2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha nD)r + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|y - x\|^2.
\]
(12)

Now we present another main result of this paper.

**Theorem 2.** For $\alpha$-strongly convex loss functions, Algorithm 1 with parameters $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\alpha t}, r_t = \frac{G^2}{(2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha nD)}, r'_t = \frac{G^2 \rho^2 p}{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)(2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha nD)}$, can achieve the regret bound $O(G^2 \log T)$, with probability greater than $1 - T(\rho + p)$, and its query complexity is $O(1)$ in each round.

**Proof.** Inequality (12) is required to hold for all $T$ rounds. By the union bound, the probability that Algorithm 1 fails to satisfy Inequality (12) at least one round is less than $T(\rho + p)$, which means the probability that Algorithm 1 succeeds for all $T$ round is greater than $1 - T(\rho + p)$. Let $x^* \in \arg\min_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(x)$. By Lemma 5, for the fixed $y = x^*$, with probability $1 - T(\rho + p)$ we have
\[
f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*) \leq \nabla f_t(x_t)^T(x_t - x^*) + \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGTr}{\rho^2 pr} + (2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha D)r_t
\]
\[-\frac{\alpha}{2}\|x_t - x^*\|^2.
\]
(13)

By the update rule for $x_{t+1}$ and the Pythagorean theorem, there is
\[
\|x_{t+1} - x^*\|^2 = \prod_{\mathcal{K}}(x_t - \eta_t \nabla f_t(x_t) - x^*)^2
\]
\[
\leq \|x_t - \eta_t \nabla f_t(x_t) - x^*\|^2
\]
\[
= \|x_t - x^*\|^2 + \eta_t^2 \|\nabla f_t(x_t)\|^2 - 2\eta_t \nabla f_t(x_t)^T(x_t - x^*).
\]
(14)

Hence
\[
\nabla f_t(x_t)^T(x_t - x^*) \leq \frac{\|x_t - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{t+1} - x^*\|^2}{2\eta_t} + \frac{\eta_t \|\nabla f_t(x_t)\|^2}{2}.
\]
(15)

Substituting Inequality (15) into Inequality (13) and summing Inequality (13) from $t = 1$ to $T$, we have
\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} (f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \nabla f_t(x_t)^T(x_t - x^*) + \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGTr}{\rho^2 pr} + (2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha nD)r_t - \frac{\alpha}{2}\|x_t - x^*\|^2
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{\|x_t - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{t+1} - x^*\|^2}{2\eta_t} + \frac{\eta_t \|\nabla f_t(x_t)\|^2}{2} + \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGTr}{\rho^2 pr} + (2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha D)r_t - \frac{\alpha}{2}\|x_t - x^*\|^2.
\]
(16)
In the right side of the above inequality, for the first term and the last term, by denoting \( \eta_0 := 0 \), we have

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( \frac{\|x_t - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{t+1} - x^*\|^2}{2\eta_t} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x_t - x^*\|^2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( \frac{\|x_t - x^*\|^2}{\eta_t} - \frac{1}{\eta_{t-1}} - \alpha \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{D^2}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( \frac{1}{\eta_t} - \frac{1}{\eta_{t-1}} - \alpha \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{D^2}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\eta_T} - \alpha T \right).
\] (17)

The handing of the second term is the same as Equation (10). Setting \( \eta_t = \frac{1}{\alpha t} \) (where \( \eta_0 := 0 \), \( r_t = \frac{G^2}{4\pi n(n+\alpha nD)}, r'_t = \frac{G^2p^2}{8\pi n^2(n+\alpha nD)} \), we have

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} (f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*)) \leq \frac{D^2}{2} (\alpha T - \alpha T) + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{(G + G)^2}{2\alpha t} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{G^2}{2t} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{G^2}{t}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{2G^2}{\alpha} \log T + \frac{G^2 \log T}{2} + G^2 \log T
\]

\[
= O(G^2 \log T).
\] (18)

Hence, the theorem follows.

\[\square\]

3 Online convex optimization with classical zeroth-order oracles

In this section, we first give a classical OCO algorithm using classical zeroth-order oracles, which is stated in Algorithm 2. Then after some technical lemmas, we analyze its performance and show how we choose the appropriate parameters to ensure that it performs well in Theorem 3.

Here we give the classical OCO algorithm. For the OCO problem stated in Subsection 1.1 and the setting stated in Subsection 1.3, given the round number \( T \) and \( \delta \), we present Algorithm 2 to produce a decision sequence \( x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_T \) for the player, such that it achieves a regret being sublinear of \( T \), with probability greater than \( 1 - \delta \). Initially, the algorithm chooses \( x_1 \) randomly from \( K \), and then sequentially produces \( x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_T \) by online gradient descent. Steps 5-8 are the process of the finite difference method. Step 6 is the process of evaluating the partial derivative. The projection operation in Step 8 is defined as \( \prod_{K} y = \arg \min_{x \in K} \|x - y\|; B_\infty(x, r) \) is the ball in \( L_\infty \) norm with radius \( r \) and center \( x \).
Algorithm 2 Classical algorithm for OCO

Input: Step sizes \{\eta_t\}, parameters \{r_t\}, \{r'_t\}
Output: \(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_T\)

1: Choose the initial point \(x_1 \in K\) randomly.
2: for \(t = 1\) to \(T\) do
3: play \(x_t\), get the oracle of loss function \(O_{f_t}\).
4: Sample \(z \in B_\infty(x_t, r_t)\).
5: for \(j = 1\) to \(n\) do
6: \(\nabla (r'_t f_t(z)) = O_{f_t}(z + r'_te_j) - O_{f_t}(z - r'_te_j) / 2r'_t\);
7: end for
8: \(\tilde{\nabla}_t f_t(x_t) = \left(\nabla (r'_1 f_t(z)), \nabla (r'_2 f_t(z)), \ldots, \nabla (r'_n f_t(z))\right)\).
9: update \(x_{t+1} = \prod_{K}(x_t - \eta_t \tilde{\nabla}_t f_t(x_t))\).
10: end for

First we analyze the query complexity of Algorithm 2. In each round, it needs to call the oracle twice to compute each partial derivative, so totally \(2n\) times for computing the gradient. Thus, \(O(n)\) times for each round. Next, we show that Algorithm 2 guarantees \(O(DG\sqrt{T})\) regret for all \(T \geq 1\) under the setting of our paper.

The evaluating error of gradient of \(f_t\) at point \(z\) in each round can be bounded as shown in Lemma 6, of which the proof can be found in Lemma 10 and Lemma 11 of [40]. Note that we omit the subscript \(t\) in the statement of the lemmas as they hold for each round.

**Lemma 6.** (Lemma 10 and 11 of [40]) In each round of Algorithm 2, let \(f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) be convex with Lipschitz parameter \(G\). If \(r \geq r' > 0\), then we have

\[
\mathbb{E}_{z \in B_{\infty}(x, r)} \|\nabla f(z) - \tilde{\nabla}_t f_t(x)\|_1 \leq \frac{nGr'}{2r}.
\]  

The evaluating error of subgradient of \(f_t\) at point \(x_t\) in each round can also be bounded as follows, with proof given in Appendix A.

**Lemma 7.** Let \(f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) be convex with Lipschitz parameter \(G\), where \(K\) is a convex set with diameter \(D\). If \(r \geq r' > 0\), then for any \(y \in K\), with probability greater than \(1 - \rho\), the gradient of each round, \(\tilde{\nabla}_t f_t(x)\), satisfies

\[
f(y) \geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla}_t f_t(x)^T(y - x) - \frac{nGr'D}{2\rho r} - 2G\sqrt{n\rho}.
\]  

Now we give the regret bound of Algorithm 2, with proof given in Appendix A.

**Theorem 3.** Algorithm 2 with parameters \(\eta_t = \frac{D}{G\sqrt{T}}, r_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{tn}}, r'_t = \frac{\delta}{T\sqrt{tn^3}}\) can achieve the regret bound \(O(DG\sqrt{T})\), with probability greater than \(1 - \delta\), and its query complexity is \(O(n)\) in each round.
4 Conclusion

In this paper, we considered the multi-points bandit feedback setting for online convex optimization against the completely adaptive adversary. We provided a quantum algorithm and proved that it can achieve $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret where only $O(1)$ queries were needed in each round. We further showed that the algorithm can achieve $O(\log T)$ regret for $\alpha$-strongly convex loss functions by choosing different parameters. These results showed that the quantum zeroth-order oracle is as powerful as the classical first-order oracle because the quantum case achieves the regret lower bound of the classical one, in the same query complexity. Furthermore, our results showed that the quantum computing outperforms classical computing in this setting because, with $O(1)$ queries in each round, the state-of-art classical algorithm against weaker adversary only achieved $O(\sqrt{nT})$ regret.

This work leaves some open questions for future investigation: Can quantum algorithms achieve better regret bound if quantum first-order oracles are available? Is there any quantum algorithm which can achieve $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret with only 1 query in each round? Furthermore, the regret lower bound of classical $O(1)$ queries methods is still needed to be proved to show the quantum advantage rigorously. It is also interesting to discuss some special cases of online convex optimization such as projection-free setting and constraint setting.
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### A Proof of Lemmas and Theorems

At this appendix, we give the proof of lemmas and theorems mentioned in the text.

**Lemma 1.** In each round of Algorithm 1, if $f$ is $\beta$-smooth in the domain of $B_\infty(x, r + r')$, then for any $r, r' > 0$ and $1 \geq \rho > 0$, we have

$$
\Pr\left[ \| \nabla f(z) - \tilde{\nabla} f(x) \|_1 > 8\pi n^3(n/\rho + 1)\beta r'/\rho \right] < \rho. \tag{1}
$$

**Proof.** The states after Step 5 will be:

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{a \in \{0,1,\ldots,2^n-1\}} e^{\frac{2\pi i ax}{2^n}} |0^\otimes b, 0^\otimes b, \ldots, 0^\otimes b\rangle |0^\otimes c\rangle |a\rangle. \tag{21}
$$

After Step 6:

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{m+c}}} \sum_{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n \in \{0,1,\ldots,2^b-1\}} \sum_{a \in \{0,1,\ldots,2^n-1\}} e^{\frac{2\pi i ax}{2^n}} |u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n\rangle |0^\otimes c\rangle |a\rangle. \tag{22}
$$
After Step 7:
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{bn+c}}} \sum_{u_1, u_2, ..., u_n \in \{0, 1, ..., 2^b-1\}} \sum_{a \in \{0, 1, ..., 2^c-1\}} e^{\frac{2\pi i a}{2^n}} |u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n \rangle |F(u)\rangle |a\rangle.
\] (23)

After Step 8:
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{bn+c}}} \sum_{u_1, u_2, ..., u_n \in \{0, 1, ..., 2^b-1\}} \sum_{a \in \{0, 1, ..., 2^c-1\}} e^{2\pi i F(u)} e^{\frac{2\pi i a}{2^n}} |u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n \rangle |F(u)\rangle |a\rangle.
\] (24)

After Step 9:
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{bn+c}}} \sum_{u_1, u_2, ..., u_n \in \{0, 1, ..., 2^b-1\}} \sum_{a \in \{0, 1, ..., 2^c-1\}} e^{2\pi i F(u)} e^{\frac{2\pi i a}{2^n}} |u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n \rangle |0^c \rangle |a\rangle.
\] (25)

We omit the last two registers on the rest of the proof because they have already done their job and will keep unchanged, which leaves:
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{bn}}} \sum_{u_1, u_2, ..., u_n \in \{0, 1, ..., 2^b-1\}} e^{2\pi i F(u)} |u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n \rangle.
\] (26)

And then we simply relabel the state by changing \( u \rightarrow v = u - \frac{2^b}{2} \):
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{bn}}} \sum_{v_1, v_2, ..., v_n \in \{-2^{b-1}, -2^{b-1}+1, \ldots, 2^{b-1}\}} e^{2\pi i F(v)} |v\rangle.
\] (27)

We denote Formula (27) as \( |\phi\rangle \). Let \( g = \nabla f(z) \), and consider the idealized state
\[
|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{bn}}} \sum_{v_1, v_2, ..., v_n \in \{-2^{b-1}, -2^{b-1}+1, \ldots, 2^{b-1}\}} e^{\frac{2\pi i u \cdot v}{2^n}} |v\rangle.
\] (28)

After Step 10, from the analysis of phase estimation [5]:
\[
\Pr\left[ \left| \frac{N g_i}{2G} - m_i \right| > e \right] < \frac{1}{2(e - 1)}, \forall i \in [n].
\] (29)

Let \( e = n/\rho + 1 \), where \( 1 \geq \rho > 0 \). We have
\[
\Pr\left[ \left| \frac{N g_i}{2G} - m_i \right| > n/\rho + 1 \right] < \frac{\rho}{2n}, \forall i \in [n].
\] (30)

Note that the difference in the probabilities of measurement on \( |\phi\rangle \) and \( |\psi\rangle \) can be bounded by the trace distance between the two density matrices:
\[
\| |\phi\rangle \langle \phi| - |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \|_1 = 2\sqrt{1 - |\langle \phi|\psi\rangle|^2} \leq 2\| |\phi\rangle - |\psi\rangle \|.
\] (31)
Since $f$ is $\beta$-smooth, we have

\[
F(v) \leq \frac{2b}{2G\tau'}\left[f(z + r'v) - f(z)\right] + \frac{1}{2^{\epsilon+1}} \\
\leq \frac{2b}{2G\tau'}\left[r'g \cdot v + \beta(r'v)^2\right] + \frac{1}{2^{\epsilon+1}} \\
\leq \frac{g \cdot v}{2G} + \frac{2b\beta r' n}{4G} + \frac{1}{2^{\epsilon+1}}. \tag{32}
\]

Then,

\[
\|\phi - \psi\|^2 = \frac{1}{2b\tau} \sum_v |e^{2\pi i F(v)} - e^{2\pi i g \cdot v}|^2 \\
\leq \frac{1}{2b\tau} \sum_v |2\pi i F(v) - \frac{2\pi i g \cdot v}{2G}|^2 \\
\leq \frac{1}{2b\tau} \sum_v 4\pi^2 \left(\frac{2b\beta r' n}{4G} + \frac{1}{2^{\epsilon+1}}\right)^2. \tag{33}
\]

Set $b = \log_2 \frac{G\rho}{\pi n^2 \beta r'}$, $c = \log_2 \frac{4G}{\pi n^2 \beta r'} - 1$. We have

\[
\|\phi - \psi\|^2 \leq \frac{\rho^2}{16n^2}, \tag{34}
\]

which implies $\|\phi\phi - \psi\psi\|_1 \leq \frac{\rho}{2n}$. Therefore, by the union bound,

\[
\Pr \left[ 2b g_i - m_i > \frac{n}{\rho} + 1 \right] < \frac{\rho}{n}, \forall i \in [n]. \tag{35}
\]

Furthermore, there is

\[
\Pr \left[ g_i - \bar{\nabla}_i f(x) \right] > \frac{2G(n/\rho + 1)}{2b} \right] < \frac{\rho}{n}, \forall i \in [n], \tag{36}
\]

as $b = \log_2 \frac{G\rho}{\pi n^2 \beta r'}$, we have

\[
\Pr \left[ g_i - \bar{\nabla}_i f(x) \right] > 8\pi n^2 (n/\rho + 1)\beta r'/\rho \right] < \frac{\rho}{n}, \forall i \in [n]. \tag{37}
\]

By the union bound, we have

\[
\Pr \left[ \|g - \bar{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 > 8\pi n^3 (n/\rho + 1)\beta r'/\rho \right] < \rho, \tag{38}
\]

which gives the lemma.

**Lemma 2.** (Lemma 12 of [40]) In each round of Algorithm 1, let $z \in B_\infty(x, r)$ and $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function with Lipschitz parameter $G$, then for any $y \in K$, the gradient of each round, $\bar{\nabla} f(x)$, satisfies

\[
f(y) \geq f(x) + \bar{\nabla} f(x)^T (y - x) - \|\nabla f(z) - \bar{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 \|y - x\|_\infty - 2G\sqrt{n}r. \tag{2}
\]
Proof. Let \( g = \nabla f(z) \). For any \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \), by convexity and simple equivalent transformation, we have

\[
f(y) \geq f(z) + \langle g, y - z \rangle \]

\[
= f(z) + \langle g, y - z \rangle + (\tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T (y - x) - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T (y - x)) + (f(x) - f(x))
\]

\[
= f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T (y - x) + (g - \tilde{\nabla} f(x))^T (y - x) + (f(z) - f(x)) + g^T (x - z)
\]

\[
\geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T (y - x) - \|g - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 \|y - x\|_\infty - G \|z - x\|_2 + \|g\|_2 \|x - z\|_2
\]

\[
\geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T (y - x) - \|g - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 \|y - x\|_\infty - 2G \sqrt{n} r. \tag{39}
\]

Lemma 3. (Lemma 2.5 and 2.6 of the old version of [8]) Let \( f : K \to \mathbb{R} \) be a convex function with Lipschitz parameter \( G \). Then for any \( r, r' > 0 \) and \( 1 \geq p > 0 \), we have

\[
\Pr_{z \in B_\infty(x, r)} \left( \exists y \in B_\infty(z, r'), \text{Tr}(\nabla^2 f(y)) \geq \frac{nG}{pr} \right) \leq p. \tag{3}
\]

Proof. This lemma comes from Lemma 2.5 and 2.6 of the old version of [8]. They improved their proof in the published version, but the old version is enough for us. We rewrite it here for reader benefit. First, we use the mollification of \( f \), an infinitely differentiable convex function with the same Lipschitz parameter as \( f \), to approximate \( f \) with the approximated error much less than the truncation error, by choosing appropriate width of mollifier. Then from Inequality (2.21) of [8], we have

\[
E_{z \in B_\infty(x, r)} \text{Tr}(\nabla^2 f(z)) \leq \frac{nG}{r}. \tag{40}
\]

By Markov’s inequality, we have

\[
\Pr_{z \in B_\infty(x, r)} \text{Tr}(\nabla^2 f(z)) \geq \frac{nG}{pr} \leq p. \tag{41}
\]

We denote the set \( \{ y | \text{Tr}(\nabla^2 f(y)) \leq \frac{nG}{pr} \} \) as \( Y \), and denote the measure of \( Y \) as \( \mathcal{M}(Y) \).

Consider \( z \in B_\infty(x, r) \), the probability that \( z \in Y \subseteq B_\infty(x, r) \) is \( \mathcal{M}(Y)/(2r)^n \). Define \( B_\infty(Y, r') := \{ z | \exists y \in B_\infty(z, r'), y \in Y \} \), from the union bound, we have

\[
\mathcal{M}(B_\infty(Y, r')) \leq \mathcal{M}(Y) + \mathcal{M}(Y) \mathcal{M}(B_\infty(x, r'))
\]

\[
= (1 + (2r')^n) \mathcal{M}(Y). \tag{42}
\]
Then,
\[
\Pr_{z \in B_\infty(x, r')} \left[ \exists y \in B_\infty(z, r'), \Tr(\nabla^2 f(y)) \geq \frac{nG}{pr} \right] = \frac{M(B_\infty(x, r'))}{(2r)^n} \\
\leq (1 + (2r')^n) \frac{M(Y)}{(2r)^n} \\
= (1 + (2r')^n) \Pr_{z \in B_\infty(x, r)} \left[ z \in Y \right] \\
= (1 + (2r')^n) \Pr_{z \in B_\infty(x, r)} \left[ \Tr(\nabla^2 f(z)) \geq \frac{nG}{pr} \right] \\
\leq (1 + (2r')^n)p.
\] (43)

Since \( r' \ll 1 \) (see Theorem 1 and 2), we omit that term approximately, which gives the lemma.

\[\square\]

**Lemma 4.** Let \( f : K \to \mathbb{R} \) is convex with Lipschitz parameter \( G \), where \( K \) is a convex set with diameter \( D \), then for any \( y \in K \), with probability greater than \( 1 - (\rho + p) \), the gradient of each round, \( \tilde{\nabla} f(x) \), satisfies

\[
f(y) \geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T (y - x) - \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGr'}{\rho^2 pr} - 2G\sqrt{n}r. \tag{4}
\]

**Proof.** By lemma 1, we have

\[
\| g - \tilde{\nabla} f(x) \|_1 \leq 8\pi n^3(n/\rho + 1)\beta r'/\rho, \tag{44}
\]

succeeded with probability greater than \( 1 - \rho \).

By lemma 3, for any \( z \in B_\infty(x, r) \), the probability of \( \forall y \in B_\infty(z, r') \), \( \nabla^2 f(y) < \frac{aG}{pr} I \) is greater than \( 1 - p \). Thus, by the condition of \( \beta \)-smooth convex (see Appendix B), we set \( \beta = \frac{aG}{pr} \). By the union bound, the probability of both success is greater than \( 1 - (\rho + p) \). Combining with Lemma 2, we have

\[
f(y) \geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T (y - x) - \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGr'}{\rho^2 pr} - 2G\sqrt{n}r, \tag{45}
\]

succeeded with probability greater than \( 1 - (\rho + p) \). \[\square\]

**Lemma 5.** In each round of Algorithm 1, let \( f : K \to \mathbb{R} \) be \( \alpha \)-strongly convex with Lipschitz parameter \( G \), where \( K \) is a convex set, then for any \( y \in K \), with probability greater than \( 1 - (\rho + p) \), the gradient of each round, \( \tilde{\nabla} f(x) \), satisfies

\[
f(y) \geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T (y - x) - \frac{8\pi n^4(n + \rho)DGr'}{\rho^2 pr} - (2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha nD)r + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - x\|^2. \tag{12}
\]
Proof. Let $g = \nabla f(z)$. For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $z \in B_{\infty}(x, r)$, by strong convexity,
\[ f(y) \geq f(z) + \langle g, y - z \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - z\|^2. \quad (46) \]
For the last term in the right side, we have
\[
\frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - z\|^2 = \frac{\alpha}{2} \|(y - x) - (z - x)\|^2 \\
\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|(y - x) - z\|^2 \\
\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|(y - x)^2 + \|z - x\|^2 - 2\|y - x\|\|z - x\| \)
\[
\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|(y - x)^2 - 2\sqrt{n} \|y - x\|\|z - x\| \)
\[
\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|(y - x)^2 - 2\sqrt{n}Dr \)
\[
= \frac{\alpha}{2} \|(y - x)^2 - 2nDr \). \quad (47)
For other terms, by the same technique as Lemma 2, we have
\[
f(y) \geq f(z) + \langle g, y - z \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - z\|^2 \\
\geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T(y - x) - \|g - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 \|y - x\|_\infty - 2G\sqrt{n}r + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - z\|^2 \\
\geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T(y - x) - \|g - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 \|y - x\|_\infty - 2G\sqrt{n}r \\
+ \frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - x\|^2 - 2nDr \)
\[
\geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T(y - x) - \|g - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 D - (2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha n)r + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - x\|^2. \quad (48)
By lemma 1, we have
\[
\|g - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 \leq 8\pi n^3(n/\rho + 1)\beta r'/\rho, \quad (49)
\]
succeeded with probability greater than $1 - \rho$. By lemma 3, we have $\beta = \frac{nG}{\rho}$, succeeded
with probability greater than $1 - p$. Then by the union bound, the probability of both
success is greater than $1 - (\rho + p)$. which we have,
\[
f(y) \geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T(y - x) - \|g - \tilde{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 D - (2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha n)r + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - x\|^2 \\
\geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T(y - x) - \frac{8\pi n^3(n/\rho + 1)DGr'}{\rho^2pr} - (2G\sqrt{n} + \alpha n)r + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|y - x\|^2, \quad (50)
\]
succeeded with probability greater than $1 - (\rho + p)$, which gives the lemma. \hfill \Box

Lemma 7. Let $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be convex with Lipschitz parameter $G$, where $K$ is a convex
set with diameter $D$. If $r \geq r' > 0$, then for any $y \in K$, with probability greater than
$1 - \rho$, the gradient of each round, $\tilde{\nabla} f(x)$, satisfies
\[
f(y) \geq f(x) + \tilde{\nabla} f(x)^T(y - x) - \frac{nGr'D}{2pr} - 2G\sqrt{n}r. \quad (20)\]
Proof. By Lemma 6 and Markov’s inequality, we have

\[ \Pr[\|\nabla f(z) - \bar{\nabla} f(x)\|_1 \leq \frac{nG\lambda'}{2r\rho}] \geq 1 - \rho. \]  

(51)

Combining with Lemma 2, we have

\[ f(y) \geq f(x) + \bar{\nabla} f(x)^T(y - x) - \frac{nG\lambda' D}{2r\rho} - 2G\sqrt{n}\rho. \]  

(52)

succeeded with probability greater than 1 - \rho.

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 3.** Algorithm 2 with parameters \( \eta_t = \frac{D}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}, r_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}n}, r'_t = \frac{\delta}{r\sqrt{n}^3} \) can achieve the regret bound \( O(DG\sqrt{T}) \), with probability greater than 1 - \delta, and its query complexity is \( O(n) \) in each round.

Proof. Inequality (20) is required to hold for all T rounds, then by the union bound, the probability that Algorithm 2 fails to satisfy Inequality (20) at least one round is less than \( T\rho \), which means the probability that Algorithm 2 succeeds for all T round is greater than 1 - \( T\rho \). Let \( x^* = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(x) \). By Lemma 7, setting \( \rho = \frac{T\rho}{3} \), for the fixed \( y = x^* \), with probability greater than 1 - \delta, we have

\[ f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*) \leq \bar{\nabla} f_t(x_t)^T(x_t - x^*) + \frac{TnGr^2D}{2\delta r_t} + 2G\sqrt{n}\rho. \]  

(53)

By the update rule for \( x_{t+1} \) and the Pythagorean theorem, we get

\[ \|x_{t+1} - x^*\|^2 = \|\prod_{\mathcal{K}}(x_t - \eta_t \bar{\nabla} f_t(x_t)) - x^*\|^2 \]
\[ \leq \|x_t - \eta_t \bar{\nabla} f_t(x_t) - x^*\|^2 \]
\[ = \|x_t - x^*\|^2 + \eta_t^2 \|\bar{\nabla} f_t(x_t)\|^2 - 2\eta_t \bar{\nabla} f_t(x_t)^T(x_t - x^*). \]  

(54)

Hence

\[ \bar{\nabla} f_t(x_t)^T(x_t - x^*) \leq \frac{\|x_t - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{t+1} - x^*\|^2}{2\eta_t} + \frac{\eta_t \|\bar{\nabla} f_t(x_t)\|^2}{2}. \]  

(55)

Substituting Inequation (55) into Inequation (53) and summing Inequation (53) from \( t = 1 \) to \( T \), we have

\[ \sum_{t=1}^{T} (f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( \bar{\nabla} f_t(x_t)^T(x_t - x^*) + \frac{TnGr^2D}{2\delta r_t} + 2G\sqrt{n}\rho \right) \]
\[ \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{\|x_t - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{t+1} - x^*\|^2}{2\eta_t} + \frac{\eta_t \|\bar{\nabla} f_t(x_t)\|^2}{2} + \frac{TnGr^2D}{2\delta r_t} + 2G\sqrt{n}\rho. \]  

(56)
Upper bounds can be obtained for the right side of the above inequality. The handling of the first term and the second term are the same as Inequation (9) (10). Setting $\eta_t = \frac{T}{G\sqrt{T}}$ (where $\eta_0 := 0$), $r_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$, $r'_t = \frac{\delta}{T\sqrt{t}}$, we have

$$
\sum_{t=1}^{T} (f_t(x_t) - f_t(x^*)) \leq \frac{1}{2}DG\sqrt{T} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{DG}{2\sqrt{T}} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{DG}{\sqrt{T}} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} 2G
$$

$$
\leq \frac{1}{2}DG\sqrt{T} + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{DG}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{DG\sqrt{T}}{2} + 2G\sqrt{T}
$$

$$
\leq \frac{1}{2}DG\sqrt{T} + T\sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{DG}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{DG\sqrt{T}}{2} + 2G\sqrt{T}
$$

$$
= O(DG\sqrt{T}). \quad (57)
$$

Hence, the theorem follows. \hfill \Box

### B Some Definitions

At this appendix, we list some additional definitions for the reader benefit.

**Definition 1** (Convex set). A set $K$ is convex if for any $x, y \in K$,

$$
\forall \theta \in [0, 1], \theta x + (1 - \theta)y \in K. \quad (58)
$$

**Definition 2** (Convex functions). A function $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex if for any $x, y \in K$

$$
\forall \theta \in [0, 1], f((1 - \theta)x + \theta y) \leq (1 - \theta)f(x) + \theta y. \quad (59)
$$

**Definition 3** ($\beta$-smooth convexity). A function $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $\beta$-smooth if for any $x, y \in K$,

$$
f(y) \leq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^T(y - x) + \frac{\beta}{2}\|y - x\|^2. \quad (60)
$$

**Definition 4** ($\alpha$-strong convexity). A function $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $\alpha$-strongly convex if for any $x, y \in K$,

$$
f(y) \geq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^T(y - x) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|y - x\|^2. \quad (61)
$$

If the function is twice differentiable, the above conditions for $\beta$-smooth convexity and $\alpha$-strong convexity are equivalent to the following condition on the Hessian of $f$, denoted $\nabla^2 f(x)$:

$$
\alpha I \preceq \nabla^2 f(x) \preceq \beta I, \quad (62)
$$

where $A \preceq B$ if the matrix $B - A$ is positive semidefinite.

**Definition 5** (Norm ball). The ball of radius $r > 0$ in $L_p$ norm centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined to be $B_p(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n ||x - y||_p \leq r\}$. 
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Definition 6 (Subgradient). The subgradient for a function $f : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ at $x \in \mathcal{K}$ is defined to be any member of the set of vectors $\{\nabla f(x)\}$ that satisfies

$$\forall y \in \mathcal{K}, f(y) \geq f(x) + \nabla f(x)^T(y - x).$$

(63)