

Deviation-Based Learning: Training Recommender Systems Using Informed User Choice*

Junpei Komiyama[†] Shunya Noda[‡]

First Draft: September 22, 2021; Last Updated: August 22, 2022

Abstract

This paper proposes a new approach to training recommender systems called *deviation-based learning*. The recommender and rational users have different knowledge. The recommender learns user knowledge by observing what action users take upon receiving recommendations. Learning eventually stalls if the recommender always suggests a choice: Before the recommender completes learning, users start following the recommendations blindly, and their choices do not reflect their knowledge. The learning rate and social welfare improve substantially if the recommender abstains from recommending a particular choice when she predicts that multiple alternatives will produce a similar payoff.

Keywords: Recommender System, Social Learning, Information Design, Strategic Experimentation, Revealed Preference

JEL Codes: C44, D82, D83

*We are grateful to Alex Bloedel, Jin-Wook Chang, Vitor Farinha Luz, Kohei Kawaguchi, Yichuan Lou, Daisuke Nakajima, Foster Provost, Wing Suen, and the seminar participants at the Happy Hour Seminar (online), the 27th Decentralization Conference (online), Otaru University of Commerce, the Information-Based Induction Sciences Workshop (IBISML) 2021 (online), the CUHK-HKU-HKUST Theory Seminar (online), the 2nd UTMD Conference (online), the Marketplace Innovations Workshop (online), and the North American Meeting (Miami), Australasia Meeting (online), and Asian Meeting (Tokyo) of the Econometric Society. All remaining errors are our own.

[†]Leonard N. Stern School of Business, New York University, 44 West 4th Street, New York, NY 10012, United States. E-mail: junpei.komiyama@gmail.com.

[‡]Graduate School of Economics, University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Tokyo, 113-0033, Japan. E-mail: shunya.noda@gmail.com. Noda has been supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP22K13361.

1 Introduction

In every day of our life, our choices rely on recommendations made by others based on their knowledge and experience. The prosperity of online platforms and artificial intelligence has enabled us to develop data-based recommendations, and many systems have been implemented in practice. Successful examples include e-commerce (Amazon), movies (Netflix), music (Spotify), restaurants (Yelp), sightseeing spots (TripAdvisor), hotels (Booking.com), classes (RateMyProfessors), hospitals (RateMD), and route directions by car navigation apps (Google Maps). These “recommender systems”¹ are helping us to make better decisions.

The advantages of the data-based recommender systems can be classified into two groups. First, the system can leverage experiences of the most knowledgeable experts. Once the system learns experts’ behavior using data, the system can report what a user would do if he had expert knowledge. Accordingly, with the help of the recommender system, all users can optimize their payoffs even when they have no experience with the problem they are facing. Second, the system can utilize information that an individual cannot access easily or quickly. For example, restaurant-reservation systems present the list of all available reservation slots at that moment, and online travel agencies provide the prices and available rooms of hotels. These conditions change over time; thus, it would be very difficult for an individual user to keep up to the minute with the latest conditions on their own. Accordingly, even experts benefit from the information provided by recommender systems.

One of the largest challenges in developing a recommender system is to predict users’ payoffs associated with specific alternatives. Real-world recommenders always confront the problem of insufficient initial experimentation (known as the “cold start” problem). Utilization of feedback provided by users is necessary, but such data are often incomplete and insufficient. In particular, the system can rarely observe information about users’ payoffs, which is crucial in many learning methods (e.g., reinforcement learning and algorithms to solve the multi-armed bandit problem). As a proxy for payoffs, many recommender systems have adopted *rating-based learning*, which substitutes the ratings submitted by the users for the true payoffs of users. Nevertheless, a number of previous studies have reported that user-generated ratings often involve various types of biases and are not very informative signals of users’ true payoffs (e.g., [Salganik et al., 2006](#); [Muchnik et al., 2013](#); [Luca and Zervas, 2016](#)).

In this paper, we propose a new approach to training recommender systems called *deviation-based learning*. In our model, a recommender (she) faces many rational users (he) sequentially. Neither users’ payoffs nor ratings are available. Instead, we train a recommender system using

¹In a narrow sense, a “recommender system” is defined as an algorithm for predicting rating users would enter. For example, [Adomavicius and Tuzhilin \(2005\)](#) state “In its most common formulation, the recommendation problem is reduced to the problem of estimating ratings for the items that have not been seen by a user” (p. 734). Our system is not a “recommender system” in this narrow sense because we do not utilize ratings. This paper adopts a broader definition of “recommender system” to denote any mechanism recommending arms (items or actions) to help users make better decisions.

data about past recommendations and users’ actions taken after receiving recommendations. By focusing on the relationship between recommendation and action choice, the recommender can infer the user’s knowledge. For example, if the recommender has not yet been well-trained, expert users often deviate from her recommendations. On the flip side of the coin, upon observing expert users’ deviations, the recommender can recognize that she misestimated the underlying state. Conversely, if a user follows the recommendation while the recommender is not perfectly sure whether the user would follow it, then the recommender can improve her confidence in the accuracy of her recommendations. We refer to this approach as “deviation-based learning” because these two examples, both based on deviations, represent the most primitive ways of extracting users’ knowledge from choices given information.

We evaluate the tradeoff between choice efficiency and communication complexity in deviation-based learning. If the recommender could send a more informative message to users, then users can better understand the recommender’s information and make a better choice. However, because simpler communications are preferred in practice, the real-world recommender system often attempts to make the recommendation as simple as possible. By analyzing a stylized environment, we demonstrate that almost all gain is obtained by slightly enriching the communication from a simple straightforward recommendation, i.e., just to inform the estimated-to-be-better choice to users. A slightly richer communication not only better conveys the recommender’s information to users but also enhances the recommender’s learning by making users’ choices more informative. Our results suggest that, in a wide range of environments, an optimal recommender system employs communication that is slightly more complex than a straightforward recommendation.²

An illustrative example is app-based car navigation systems (e.g., Google Maps or, Waze). In recent years, such navigation apps have become extremely popular.³ Navigation apps have an immense information advantage over individual drivers because they use aggregated information to dynamically detect traffic jams and then recommend less-congested routes. Accordingly, such apps are useful even for expert drivers who can figure out the shortest route without the recommender’s help.

When a navigation app is launched, the app does not have complete information about road characteristics—local drivers have more comprehensive knowledge about their neighborhoods. For example, the app may miss information about hazard conditions associated with specific roads (e.g., high-crime-rate areas, rock-fall hazard zones, and accident blind spots). Such hazardous roads are often vacant because local drivers avoid them, leading a naïve recommender to consider such a route desirable and recommend it. Drivers unfamiliar with this hazard information might then follow the recommendation, exposing them to danger. To avoid this tragedy, the app must learn

²We do not model the communication cost explicitly because its shape, structure, and magnitude critically depend on the applications. Instead, we characterize the tradeoff by evaluating the benefits of enriching communication.

³According to [Khoury \(2019\)](#), Google Maps became the second app (after YouTube) to reach five billion downloads.

road characteristics to understand *why* the road is vacant.

The classical rating-based approach is unsuitable for detecting hazards in the car navigation problem because (i) detailed ratings and reviews are often unavailable, and (ii) the app should not wait until it observes low payoffs because that would mean incidents or accidents indeed occur, causing problems for some users. Moreover, this problem cannot be solved completely by inputting hazard information manually because it is difficult to list all relevant hazard conditions in advance.⁴

Our deviation-based learning approach solves this dilemma by extracting local drivers’ (i.e., experts’) knowledge. For example, when a hazardous route is recommended, a local driver ignores the recommendation and chooses a different route. Given that the app has an information advantage (i.e., insight into road congestion), such a decision would not be made unless the app has misunderstood something about the static map (with which the local driver is very familiar). Thus, upon observing a deviation, the app can update its knowledge about the static map. Conversely, if the app recommends a route that involves a potentially hazardous road but observes that the local driver followed the suggested route, then the app can conclude that the road is not so dangerous. In this manner, the app can better understand the static map and improve its recommendations. Furthermore, the deviation-based learning approach can detect hazardous roads *before* additional incidents occur because the recommender can observe that local drivers avoid hazardous roads from the outset.

We analyze how the recommender can efficiently perform deviation-based learning. Formally, we analyze a stylized model in which each user has two arms (actions), as in seminal papers on information design theory (e.g., [Kremer et al. 2014](#) and [Che and Hörner 2017](#)). A user’s payoff from an arm is normalized to zero, and his payoff from another arm is given by $x\theta + z$. The *context* x specifies the user’s problem (in the navigation problem, a context includes elements such as the origin, destination, and means of transportation). We assume each user is an expert who knows the parameter θ and can correctly interpret his context x to predict the first term of his payoff, $x\theta$ (i.e., he knows the static map and can find the shortest safe route). The recommender has additional information about the value of z (e.g., congestion), which is not observed by the user. We assume that local drivers are more knowledgeable than the recommender about the static map; the recommender does not at first know the parameter θ and must learn it over time. For each user, the recommender sends a recommendation (message) based on a precommitted information structure. Upon observing the recommendation, the user forms a belief about the unobservable payoff component z and selects either one of the two actions.

We demonstrate that the size of the message space is crucial for efficiency, showing that by making the message space *slightly* larger than the action space, we obtain a *very large* welfare gain. A large message space enables the recommender to send a signal that indicates the recommender is “on the fence” which means that the payoffs associated with the two distinct actions are likely

⁴Nevertheless, navigation apps attempt to avoid this problem by manually inputting hazard information in practice. For example, in Israel and Brazil, Waze provides the option of alerting about high-risk routes: <https://support.google.com/waze/answer/7077122?hl=en> (seen on July 22, 2021).

similar. The availability of such messaging reveals users’ information more efficiently and improves the learning rate exponentially without sacrificing the utilization of current knowledge.

First, we consider a binary message space, which is the same size as the action space. We first analyze the *straightforward policy*, which simply informs the user which arm is estimated to be better. Our first main theorem shows that learning is very slow under the straightforward policy, and therefore, users suffer from substantial welfare loss. Here, recall that the recommended arm is chosen based on the recommender’s current knowledge. Given the recommender has an information advantage, provided the recommender knows the state *moderately* well, users are prone to following the recommendation blindly despite its flaws. Because the recommender knows that no deviation will occur, she learns nothing from users’ subsequent behaviors. Formally, we prove that the expected number of users required to improve the recommendations increases exponentially as the quality of the recommender’s knowledge improves. This effect slows learning severely, which has a large welfare cost: While the per-round welfare loss in this situation is moderately small (because most users want to follow the recommendation blindly), the loss accumulates to a large amount in the long run.

We demonstrate that an ideal solution to the problem above is to use a ternary message space. We focus on the *ternary policy*, a simple policy that recommends a particular arm only if the recommender is confident in her prediction. Otherwise, the recommender explains that she is “on the fence,” which means that, based on the recommender’s current information, the two actions are predicted to produce similar payoffs. When the recommender is confident about her prediction (which is almost always the case after the quality of her knowledge has become high), the user also confidently follows the recommendation, which maximizes the true payoff with high probability. Furthermore, when the recommender admits that she is on the fence, the user’s choice is very useful in updating the recommender’s belief: The user’s choice reveals whether the recommender overestimates or underestimates the state, and this information shrinks the recommender’s confidence interval geometrically. With the ternary message space, the total welfare loss is bounded by a constant (independent of the number of users). We confirm this theoretical result by conducting numerical simulation and demonstrate that the ternary policy reduces the welfare loss by 99% compared to the straightforward policy under a certain simulation setting. Note also that the performance difference becomes arbitrarily large when we consider a longer time horizon. Accordingly, the recommender can improve the learning rate and social welfare drastically by increasing the size of the message space just by one.

To confirm the superiority of the ternary policy, we also develop and analyze two further binary policies, the *myopic policy* and the *exploration-versus-exploitation (EvE) policy*. The myopic policy maximizes the current user’s expected payoff with respect to the recommender’s current knowledge. While the myopic policy sometimes achieves a strictly better payoff than the straightforward policy, it is asymptotically equivalent to the straightforward policy and the order of welfare loss is also the same. The EvE policy sacrifices early users’ payoffs but rapidly learns the state at first and exploits

the knowledge gained to achieve better welfare for late users. Among the three binary policies, the EvE policy performs the best. The myopic policy and the EvE policy feature several drawbacks and are difficult to implement. The ternary policy is easier to use, despite requiring one more message to be sent. Moreover, we demonstrate that the ternary policy substantially outperforms all three binary policies in terms of social welfare.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature. Section 3 describes the model. Section 4 studies the straightforward policy. Section 5 studies the ternary policy. Section 6 considers the myopic policy and the EvE policy. Section 7 presents the simulation results. Section 8 concludes the research.

2 Related Literature

Information Design The literature on strategic experimentation (e.g., Bolton and Harris, 1999; Kremer et al., 2014; Che and Hörner, 2017) has considered an environment where a social planner can improve (utilitarian) social welfare by inducing early users’ effort for exploration, while myopic users have no incentive to explore the state. The previous studies have demonstrated that effort for exploration can be induced by controlling users’ information. In our recommender’s problem, the recommender also wants to explore information to improve the payoffs of late users. However, to achieve this, we sacrifice no user’s payoff: By increasing the message space slightly, we can improve all users’ payoffs substantially. Rather, this paper points out that there is a tradeoff between choice efficiency and communication complexity.

Furthermore, this paper elucidates how the recommender learns experts’ knowledge via users’ actions. This contrasts with previous studies on strategic experimentation and information design (e.g., Kamenica and Gentzkow, 2011; Bergemann and Morris, 2016a,b), which have explored ways of incentivizing agents to obey recommendations. Indeed, when either (i) the recommender (sender) has complete information about the underlying parameter (as in information design models) or (ii) payoffs (or signals about them) are observable (as in strategic experimentation models), a version of the “revelation principle” (originally introduced by Myerson, 1982) holds. In these cases, without loss of generality, we can focus on incentive-compatible straightforward policies (which always recommend actions from which no user has an incentive to deviate). By contrast, we demonstrate that when the recommender learns about underlying parameters by observing how users act after receiving the recommendation, only recommending a choice is often inefficient.

Recommender System Although the recommender systems have mostly focused on predicting ratings, the vulnerability of rating-based learning has been widely recognized. Salganik et al. (2006) and Muchnik et al. (2013) show that prior ratings bias the evaluations of subsequent reviewers. Marlin and Zemel (2009) show that ratings often involve nonrandom missing data because users choose which item to rate. Mayzlin et al. (2014) and Luca and Zervas (2016) report that

firms attempt to manipulate their online reputations strategically. While the literature has proposed several approaches to addressing these issues (for example, [Sinha et al. \(2016\)](#) propose a way to correct bias by formulating recommendations as a control problem), the solutions proposed thus far remain somewhat heuristic. That is, their authors have not identified the fundamental source of the biases in rating systems using a model featuring rational agents.⁵ By contrast, our deviation-based approach is fundamentally free from these biases because our approach does not assume the availability of ratings.

Learning from Observed Behaviors In the literature of economic theory, inferring a rational agent’s preferences given their observed choices is rather a classic question (*revealed preference theory*, pioneered by [Samuelson, 1938](#)).⁶ Furthermore, recent studies on machine learning and operations research, including inverse reinforcement learning ([Ng and Russell, 2000](#)) and contextual inverse optimization ([Ahuja and Orlin, 2001](#); [Besbes et al., 2021](#)) have also proposed learning methods that recover a decision maker’s objective function from his behavior.⁷ These methods can usefully extract experts’ knowledge to make better predictions about users’ payoffs.

Our contribution to this literature can be summarized as follows. First, we elucidate the effect of the recommender’s information advantage. In many real-world problems (e.g., navigation), the recommender is not informationally dominated by expert users; thus, decisions made by experts who are not informed of the recommender’s information are typically suboptimal. This paper proposes a method to efficiently extract experts’ knowledge and combine it with the recommender’s own information. Second, we articulate the role of users’ beliefs about the accuracy of the recommender’s predictions. When the recommendation is accurate, users tend to follow recommendations blindly, and therefore, learning stalls under a naïve policy. Third, we demonstrate that the recommender can improve her learning rate significantly by intervening in the data generation process through information design. In our environment, learning under the ternary policy is exponentially faster than learning under the binary (straightforward) policy. The difference in social welfare achieved is also large.

The marketing science literature has proposed adaptive conjoint analysis as a method of posing questions to estimate users’ preference parameters in an adaptive manner. Several studies, such as [Toubia et al. \(2007\)](#) and [Sauré and Vielma \(2019\)](#), have considered adaptive *choice-based* conjoint analysis, which regards choice sets as questions and actual choices as answers to those questions. This strand of the literature has also developed efficient methods for intervening in the data generation process to extract users’ knowledge. However, in the recommender problem, the recommender

⁵See the survey of the biases in rating systems by [Chen et al. \(2020\)](#).

⁶More recently, [Cheung and Masatlioglu \(2021\)](#) has developed a revealed-preference framework under the presence of recommendations and proposed a method for identifying how recommendations influence decisions.

⁷Classical learning methods, such as reinforcement learning (see [Sutton and Barto 2018](#), a standard textbook on this subject) and algorithms that solve multi-armed bandit problems ([Thompson, 1933](#); [Lai and Robbins, 1985](#)), assume that the learner can directly observe realized payoffs.

is not allowed to select users' choice sets to elicit their preferences.

3 Model

3.1 Environment

We consider a sequential game that involves a long-lived *recommender* and T short-lived *users*. Initially, the state of the world $\theta \sim \text{Unif}[-1, 1]$ is drawn. We assume that all users are experts and more knowledgeable than the recommender about the state θ initially.⁸ Formally, we assume that while users know the realization of θ , the recommender knows only the distribution of θ . Accordingly, the recommender learns about θ via the data obtained.

Users arrive sequentially. At the beginning of round $t \in [T] := \{1, \dots, T\}$, user t arrives with the shared *context* $x_t \sim \mathcal{N}$, where \mathcal{N} is the standard (i.e., with a zero mean and unit variance) normal distribution.⁹ The context x_t is public information and observed by both user t and the recommender. The context specifies the user's decision problem. The recommender additionally observes her private information $z_t \sim \mathcal{N}$, the realization of which is not disclosed to user t . Each user has binary actions available: arm -1 and arm 1 .¹⁰ Without loss of generality, the user's payoff from choosing arm -1 is normalized to zero: $r_t(-1) = 0$.¹¹ The payoff from choosing arm 1 is given by

$$r_t(1) = x_t\theta + z_t.$$

We refer to $x_t\theta$ as the *static payoff* and z_t as the *dynamic payoff*. These names come from the navigation problem presented as an illustrative example, in which users are assumed to be familiar with the static road map but do not observe dynamic congestion information before they select the route. All the variables, θ , $(x_t)_{t \in [T]}$, $(z_t)_{t \in [T]}$ are drawn independently of each other.

⁸As long as the recommender can identify the set of expert users, she can exclude nonexpert users from the model. In the navigation app example, it should not be difficult for the app to identify the set of local residents who drive cars frequently. Once the recommender trains the system using the data of the experts' decisions, then she can use it to make recommendations to nonexpert users.

⁹We assume that the state θ and context x_t are one-dimensional because this assumption enables us to write the recommender's estimate as a tractable closed-form formula ($\mathbb{E}_t[\theta] = m_t := (u_t + l_t)/2$), where (u_t, l_t) is defined in page 10). If θ and x_t are multi-dimensional, then $\mathbb{E}_t[\theta]$ is a centroid of a convex polytope defined by $t - 1$ faces, which does not have a tractable formula and is generally #P-hard to compute (Rademacher, 2007), while a reasonable approximation is achieved by a random sampling method (Bertsimas and Vempala, 2004). We consider the high-level conclusion of this paper does not crucially depend on the dimensionality of the state and contexts.

¹⁰Alternatively, we can assume that each user has many actions but all except two are obviously undesirable in each round.

¹¹We are not assuming that arm -1 is a safe arm, but normalizing the payoff of one of the two arms. To illustrate this, let us start from the following formulation: $r_t(1) = x_t\theta^{(1)} + z_t^{(1)}$ and $r_t(-1) = x_t\theta^{(-1)} + z_t^{(-1)}$. The user chooses arm 1 if and only if $r_t(1) > r_t(-1)$, i.e., $x_t(\theta^{(1)} - \theta^{(-1)}) + (z_t^{(1)} - z_t^{(-1)})$. By redefining $r_t(-1) \equiv 0$, $\theta = \theta^{(1)} - \theta^{(-1)}$ and $z_t = z_t^{(1)} - z_t^{(-1)}$, the model is reduced to a normalized one, without changing the users' decision problem.

In round t , the recommender first selects a *recommendation* $a_t \in A$, where A is the *message space*. For example, if the recommender simply reports the estimated-to-be-better arm, then the message space is equal to the action space: $A = \{-1, 1\}$. Observing the recommendation a_t , user t forms a posterior belief about the realization of z_t and chooses an action $b_t \in B = \{-1, 1\}$. User t receives a payoff of $r_t(b_t)$ and leaves the market. The recommender cannot observe users' payoffs.

Technically, by sending a signal, the recommender informs the realization of the dynamic payoff z_t , which users cannot observe directly. In round t , the recommender initially commits to an *signal function* $\mu_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow A$ that maps a dynamic payoff z_t to a message a_t . Subsequently, the recommender observes the realization of z_t and mechanically submits a message (recommendation) $a_t = \mu_t(z_t)$. When the recommender chooses the round- t information structure, she can observe the sequences of all contexts $(x_s)_{s=1}^t$, all past dynamic payoffs $(z_s)_{s=1}^{t-1}$, all past messages, $(a_s)_{s=1}^{t-1}$, and all past actions that users took, $(b_s)_{s=1}^{t-1}$. A *policy* is a rule to map the information that the recommender observes $((z_s, a_s, b_s)_{s=1}^{t-1} \text{ and } (x_s)_{s=1}^t)$ to a signal function.

Receiving a message $a_t = \mu_t(z_t)$, user t forms a posterior belief about z_t , and choose an arm that has a better conditional expected payoff. As in the information design literature (e.g., [Kamenica and Gentzkow, 2011](#)), we assume that the user knows the information structure: User t observes the signal function μ_t .¹² Upon observing a_t , user t forms his posterior belief about the dynamic payoff z_t . User t computes the conditional expected payoff of arm 1, $\mathbb{E}_{z_t}[x_t\theta + z_t|\mu_t, a_t]$, based on his posterior belief. Then, user t selects an arm $b_t \in B := \{-1, 1\}$, which is expected to provide a larger payoff: $b_t = 1$ if $\mathbb{E}_{z_t}[x_t\theta + z_t|\mu_t, a_t] > 0$ and $b_t = -1$ otherwise.

3.2 Regret

Utilitarian *social welfare* is defined as the sum of all users' payoffs: $\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(b_t)$. However, its absolute value is meaningless because we normalize $r_t(-1) \equiv 0$.¹³ Instead, we quantify welfare loss in comparison to the first-best scenario, which is invariant to the normalization. We define per-round regret, reg , and (cumulative) regret, Reg , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reg}(t) &:= r_t(b_t^*) - r_t(b_t); \\ \text{Reg}(T) &:= \sum_{t=1}^T \text{reg}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $b_t^* := \arg \max_{b \in \{-1, 1\}} r_t(b)$ is the superior arm with respect to true payoffs. Per-round regret, $\text{reg}(t)$, represents the loss of the current (round- t) user due to a suboptimal choice. While user t could enjoy $r_t(b_t^*)$ if he were to observe z_t , his actual payoff is $r_t(b_t)$. Therefore, his loss compared with the (unattainable) first-best case is given by $\text{reg}(t)$. Since $\text{Reg}(T)$ is a summation

¹²The other information is redundant for the user's decision problem, given that user t observes the signal function μ_t .

¹³See also footnote 11.

of $\text{reg}(t)$, $\text{Reg}(T)$ is the difference between the total payoffs from best arms $\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(b_t^*)$ (which is unattainable) and the actual total payoffs $\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(b_t)$. The first-best benchmark, $\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(b_t^*)$, is independent of the policy and users' choices. Thus, the maximization of the total payoffs is equivalent to the minimization of the regret.

If the recommender already knows (or has accurately learned) the state θ , then the recommender would always inform user t of the superior arm, and the user would always obey the recommendation. Therefore, $b_t = b_t^*$ and $\text{reg}(t) = 0$ would be achieved. Conversely, if the recommender's belief about the state θ is inaccurate, then users cannot always select the superior arm. Therefore, regret also measures the progress of the recommender's learning of θ .

In this paper, we characterize the relationship between the size of the message space $|A|$ and the order of regret $\text{Reg}(T)$. When the message space is a singleton (i.e., $|A| = 1$), the recommender can deliver no information about the dynamic payoff component z_t . Consequently, users suffer from constant welfare loss in each round; therefore, the regret grows linearly in T , that is, $\text{Reg}(T) = \Theta(T)$. By contrast, if the message space is a continuum (i.e., $A = \mathbb{R}$), the recommender can inform each user t of the "raw data" about the dynamic payoff z_t , i.e., she can send $a_t = z_t$ as a message. In this case, users can recover true payoffs $r_t(1)$ and select the superior arms for every round. There is no need for the recommender to learn, and the regret of exactly zero is achieved, that is, $\text{Reg}(T) = 0$ for all T . Nevertheless, an infinite message space incurs a large communication cost, making it considerably inconvenient. Practically, it is infeasible for real-world recommender systems to disclose all current congestion information. The above argument indicates that there is a tradeoff between regret and communication complexity (i.e., the size of the message space $|A|$), which remains to be evaluated. The following sections characterize the regret incurred by small finite message spaces, namely, the cases of binary and ternary message spaces ($|A| = 2, 3$).

4 Binary Straightforward Policy

4.1 Policy

First, we consider the case of the binary message space, i.e., $A = \{-1, 1\} = B$. We say that a policy is *binary* if it employs a binary message space. We begin with a *straightforward policy* that simply discloses an arm that the recommender estimates to be superior.

The recommender's estimation proceeds as follows. After observing user t 's choice b_t , the recommender updates the posterior distribution about θ , characterized by (l_t, u_t) , according to Bayes' rule. The recommender's belief at the beginning of round 1 is the same as the prior belief: $\text{Unif}[-1, 1]$. Due to the property of uniform distributions, the posterior distribution of θ always belongs to the class of uniform distributions. The posterior distribution at the beginning of round t is specified by $\text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]$, where l_t and u_t are the lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the confidence interval at the beginning of round t . Note that the *confidence interval* $[l_t, u_t]$ shrinks

over time:

$$-1 =: l_1 \leq l_2 \leq \dots \leq l_{T-1} \leq l_T \leq \theta \leq u_T \leq u_{T-1} \leq \dots \leq u_2 \leq u_1 := 1,$$

and thus the *width of the confidence interval* $w_t := u_t - l_t$ is monotonically decreasing. In round t , the recommender believes that θ is drawn from the posterior distribution, $\text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]$, and therefore, the estimated payoff from arm 1 is

$$\hat{r}_t(1) := \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\theta}_t \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]} [x_t \tilde{\theta}_t] + z_t = x_t m_t + z_t,$$

where $m_t := (l_t + u_t)/2 = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\theta}_t \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]} [\tilde{\theta}_t]$.

The straightforward policy recommends arm 1 if and only if the recommender believes that the expected payoff from arm 1 is larger than that from arm -1 , i.e., $\hat{r}_t(1) = x_t m_t + z_t > 0 = \hat{r}_t(-1)$.¹⁴ That is, the signal function μ_t is given by

$$\mu_t(z_t; m_t, x_t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_t m_t + z_t > 0; \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Although the straightforward policy is simple, natural, intuitive, and easy to understand, it is not an optimal binary policy. Indeed, Section 6 introduces two binary policies that are substantially more complex and perform better than the straightforward policy. Nevertheless, we discuss the straightforward policy as the main benchmark because its simple and natural structure is desirable in terms of communication complexity. For further discussion, see Section 6.

4.2 Learning

From now, we consider users' action choices under the straightforward policy. User t 's conditional expected payoff from choosing arm 1 is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[r_t(1) | \mu_t, a_t] = x_t \theta + Z_t,$$

where $Z_t := \mathbb{E}[z_t | \mu_t, a_t]$.

The prior distribution of z_t is the standard normal distribution, \mathcal{N} . In addition, $a_t = 1$ implies $z_t > -x_t m_t$, whereas $a_t = -1$ implies $z_t < -x_t m_t$. Accordingly, the posterior distribution of z_t is always a truncated standard normal distribution. Let $\mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(\alpha, \beta)$ be the truncated standard normal distribution with support (α, β) . Then, the posterior distribution of z_t after $a_t = 1$ and $a_t = -1$ are $\mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-x_t m_t, \infty)$ and $\mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-\infty, -x_t m_t)$, respectively. These distributions are illustrated as Figure 1.

¹⁴We ignore equalities of continuous variables that are of measure zero, such as $\hat{r}_t(1) = 0$.




Figure 1: The shape of the posterior distribution of z_t conditional on $a_t = -1$ (left) and $a_t = 1$ (right) being sent under the straightforward policy, when $x_t m_t > 0$.

To summarize, we have

$$Z_t := \mathbb{E}[z_t | \mu_t, a_t] = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-\infty, -x_t m_t)}[z] & \text{if } a_t = -1; \\ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-x_t m_t, \infty)}[z] & \text{if } a_t = 1. \end{cases}$$

The arm that user t will choose is as follows:

$$b_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_t \theta + Z_t > 0; \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Upon observing the user's decision b_t , the recommender updates her confidence interval, $[l_t, u_t]$. When the user chooses $b_t = 1$, the recommender can recognize that $x_t \theta + Z_t > 0$. If $x_t > 0$, then this is equivalent to $\theta > -Z_t/x_t$; and if $x_t < 0$, then this is equivalent to $\theta < -Z_t/x_t$. Using this information, the recommender may be able to shrink the support of the posterior distribution of θ . We can analyze the case of $b_t = -1$ in a similar manner. The belief update rule is as follows:

$$l_{t+1} = \begin{cases} l_t & \text{if } b_t \cdot \text{sgn}(x_t) < 0; \\ \max\{l_t, -Z_t/x_t\} & \text{if } b_t \cdot \text{sgn}(x_t) > 0, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$u_{t+1} = \begin{cases} \min\{u_t, -Z_t/x_t\} & \text{if } b_t \cdot \text{sgn}(x_t) < 0; \\ u_t & \text{if } b_t \cdot \text{sgn}(x_t) > 0, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where sgn is the following signum function:¹⁵

$$\text{sgn}(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x > 0; \\ -1 & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

¹⁵Because $x_t = 0$ occurs with probability zero, we ignore such a realization.

4.3 Failure

We present our first main theorem, which evaluates the order of total regret under the straightforward policy.

Theorem 1 (Regret Bound of Straightforward Policy). For the straightforward policy, there exists a $\tilde{\Theta}(1)$ (polylogarithmic) function¹⁶ $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] \geq T/f(T).$$

Theorem 1 shows that the total regret is $\tilde{\Omega}(T)$, which implies that users suffer from a large per-round regret even in the long run.

All the formal proofs are presented in Appendix B. The intuition of Theorem 1 is as follows. While each user precisely knows his static payoff $x_t\theta$, he has access to the dynamic payoff z_t only via recommendation. To help the user make the best decision, the recommender must identify which arm is better as a whole. The recommender must therefore learn about the state θ in order to figure out the value of $r_t(1) = x_t\theta + z_t$ via the users' feedback b_t . As the recommender becomes more knowledgeable about θ , users' feedback becomes less informative: Rational users rarely deviate from (moderately) accurate recommendations because the recommender's information advantage (in terms of information about the dynamic payoff term) tends to dominate the estimation error. Consequently, when recommendations are accurate, deviations are rarely observed, and the recommender has few opportunities to improve her estimations.

In the following, we provide two lemmas that characterize the problem and then discuss how we derive Theorem 1 from these lemmas.

Lemma 2 (Lower Bound on Regret per Round). Under the straightforward policy, there exists a universal constant $C_{\text{reg}} > 0$ such that the following inequality holds:¹⁷

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t)] \geq C_{\text{reg}}|\theta - m_t|^2.$$

Since the recommender does not know θ , she substitutes m_t for θ to determine her recommendation. The probability that the recommender fails to recommend the superior arm is proportional to $|\theta - m_t|$, and the welfare cost from such an event is also proportional to $|\theta - m_t|$. Accordingly, the per-round expected regret is at the rate of $\Omega(|\theta - m_t|^2)$. Note that, from the perspective of the recommender, the posterior distribution of θ is $\text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]$, and therefore, the conditional expectation of $|\theta - m_t|^2$ is $\Theta(w_t^2)$.

¹⁶ \tilde{O} , $\tilde{\Omega}$, and $\tilde{\Theta}$ are Landau notations that ignore polylogarithmic factors (e.g., $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{T}) = (\log T)^c \Theta(\sqrt{T})$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$). We often treat these factors as if they were constant because polylogarithmic factors grow very slowly ($o(N^\epsilon)$ for any exponent $\epsilon > 0$).

¹⁷A universal constant is a value that does not depend on any model parameters.

Lemma 3 (Upper Bound on Probability of Update). Under the straightforward policy, there exists a universal constant $C_{\text{update}} > 0$ such that, for all $w_t \leq C_{\text{update}}$,

$$\mathbb{P}[(l_{t+1}, u_{t+1}) \neq (l_t, u_t)] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{C_{\text{update}}}{w_t}\right).$$

User t compares two factors when making his decision: (i) the recommender’s estimation error of the static payoff term $|x_t(\theta - m_t)|$ and (ii) the recommender’s information advantage about the dynamic payoff term z_t . When the former term is small, the user blindly obeys the recommendation, and the user’s decision does not provide additional information. Because $w_t > |\theta - m_t|$, the former factor is bounded by $|x_t w_t|$. For a user’s decision to be informative, $|x_t|$ must be $\Omega(1/w_t)$ (in which case $|x_t(\theta - m_t)|$ exceeds a threshold value). Because x_t follows a normal distribution, the probability of such a context decreases exponentially in $1/w_t$.¹⁸

Lemma 3 states that the recommender’s learning stalls when w_t is moderately small. In particular, if $w_t = 2C_{\text{update}}/(\log T) = \Theta(1/(\log T))$, then the probability of her belief update is $1/T^2$. This implies that no update occurs in the next T rounds with a probability of at least $1 - 1/T$.

We use these lemmas to obtain the total regret bound presented in Theorem 1. First, Lemma 3 implies that the update of θ is likely to stall when it reaches $w_t = |\theta - m_t| = \Theta(1/(\log T))$. Given $|\theta - m_t| = \Theta(1/(\log T))$, Lemma 2 implies that the per-round (expected) regret is $\Theta(1/(\log T)^2)$. Consequently, the order of total regret is $\Omega(T/(\log T)^2) = \tilde{\Omega}(T)$, implying that users suffer from large per-round regrets even in the long run. Thus, we obtain the regret bound presented as Theorem 1.

5 Ternary Policy

5.1 Policy

In Section 4, we demonstrate that the straightforward policy suffers from an approximately linear regret. This section shows that the regret rate improves substantially if we introduce a ternary message space, $A = \{-1, 0, 1\} = B \cup \{0\}$, and incorporate the additional message, “0”, into the straightforward policy in a simple manner. The ternary message space allows the recommender to inform users that she is “on the fence.” When the recommender is confident in her recommendation, she sends either $a_t = -1$ or $a_t = 1$. If the recommender predicts that the user should be approximately indifferent to the choice between the two arms, then she sends $a_t = 0$ instead.

Specifically, we introduce a sequence of parameters $(\epsilon_t)_{t=1}^T$, where $\epsilon_t > 0$ for all $t \in [T]$. This specifies whether the recommender is confident in her prediction. If $\hat{r}_t(1) > \epsilon_t$, then the recommender is confident about the superiority of arm 1, and therefore recommends arm 1: $a_t = 1$.

¹⁸A similar result holds whenever x_t follows a sub-Gaussian distribution, where the probability of observing x_t decays at an exponential rate with respect to $|x_t|$. Conversely, when the distribution of x_t is heavy-tailed, the conclusion of Lemma 3 may not hold.




Figure 2: The shape of the posterior distribution of z_t conditional on $a_t = -1$ (left), $a_t = 0$, and $a_t = 1$ (right) being sent under the ternary policy, when $x_t m_t > 0$.

Conversely, if $\hat{r}_t(1) < -\epsilon_t$, then the recommender is confident about the superiority of arm -1 , and therefore recommends arm -1 : $a_t = -1$. In the third case, i.e., $-\epsilon_t < \hat{r}_t(1) < \epsilon_t$, the recommender states honestly that she is on the fence; she sends the message $a_t = 0$, implying that she predicts similar payoffs for arms 1 and -1 . This policy is summarized as follows:

$$\mu_t(z_t; m_t, x_t, \epsilon_t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_t m_t + z_t > \epsilon_t; \\ 0 & \text{if } \epsilon_t > x_t m_t + z_t > -\epsilon_t; \\ -1 & \text{if } x_t m_t + z_t < -\epsilon_t. \end{cases}$$

Because this paper does not discuss any other policy that employs the ternary message space, we refer to this as the *ternary policy*.

User t 's posterior belief about z_t is given by (i) $z_t \sim \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-\infty, -x_t m_t - \epsilon_t)$ given $a_t = -1$; (ii) $z_t \sim \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-x_t m_t - \epsilon_t, -x_t m_t + \epsilon_t)$ given $a_t = 0$; and (iii) $z_t \sim \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-x_t m_t + \epsilon_t, \infty)$ given $a_t = 1$. Accordingly, the conditional expectation of z_t with respect to the posterior distribution is formulated as follows (and illustrated in Figure 2).

$$Z_t := \mathbb{E}[z_t | \mu_t, a_t] = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-\infty, -x_t m_t - \epsilon_t)}[z] & \text{if } a_t = -1; \\ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-x_t m_t - \epsilon_t, -x_t m_t + \epsilon_t)}[z] & \text{if } a_t = 0; \\ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-x_t m_t + \epsilon_t, \infty)}[z] & \text{if } a_t = 1. \end{cases}$$

Given the new specifications of a_t and Z_t , the user's decision rule for choosing b_t (given in Eq. (1)) and the belief update rule for deciding (l_{t+1}, u_{t+1}) (given in Eq. (2) and (3)) do not change.

5.2 Success of Ternary Policy

The following theorem characterizes the total regret achieved by the ternary policy.

Theorem 4 (Regret Bound of Ternary Policy). Let $\epsilon_t = C_\epsilon w_t$ where $C_\epsilon > 0$ is an arbitrary constant. Then, under the ternary policy, there exists a constant $C_{\text{ter}} > 0$ that depends only on C_ϵ

and with which the regret is bounded as:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] \leq C_{\text{ter}}.$$

Under the ternary policy, the expected regret is $O(1)$, which is the best possible regret order and is often celebrated in theoretical computer science. This result contrasts with Theorem 1, which indicates that the straightforward policy suffers from $\tilde{\Omega}(T)$ regret. Theorem 4 implies that a slight expansion of the message space drastically improves the regret rate.

The ternary message space benefits users in two ways. First, it increases the current user's payoff by enabling more informative signaling about z_t . Because a more informed conditional expectation of z_t closely approximates the realization, a larger message space enables users to make better decision.¹⁹ However, the first effect alone does not improve the order of regret.

The second effect is critical, positioning it as the basis of the proof of Theorem 4. Under the ternary policy, the learning rate improves drastically. This is because users' actions after they receive $a_t = 0$ are very informative for the recommender's belief update. This is because the "on-the-fence" message $a_t = 0$ is sent when the recommender is "unconfident" about the better arm, and a user's action tells the answer to the recommender. This effect allows us to prove that the recommender's confidence interval shrinks geometrically, leading the per-round regret to diminish exponentially. The following key lemma illustrates this fact.

Lemma 5 (Geometric Update). Let $\epsilon_t = C_\epsilon w_t$ for $C_\epsilon > 0$. Then, under the ternary policy, there exists a constant $C_w > 0$ that depends only on C_ϵ and with which the following inequality holds:

$$\mathbb{P} \left[w_{t+1} \leq \frac{5}{6} w_t \mid a_t = 0 \right] \geq C_w.$$

The intuition for the geometric gain after $a_t = 0$ is as follows. When $\epsilon_t \approx 0$, upon observing $a_t = 0$, user t can accurately figure out the realization of the dynamic payoff term: $z_t \approx -x_t m_t$. Given this, the user chooses $b_t = 1$ if $x_t \theta + z_t \approx x_t(\theta - m_t) > 0$ and $b_t = -1$ otherwise; in other words, by observing b_t , the recommender can identify whether or not $\theta > m_t$. Since m_t is the median of the confidence interval $[l_t, u_t]$, this observation (approximately) halves the width of the confidence interval.

While a smaller ϵ_t results in a larger update after $a_t = 0$ is sent, we cannot set $\epsilon_t = 0$ because in that case the probability of sending $a_t = 0$ becomes zero. The policy parameter ϵ_t must be chosen

¹⁹Since the ternary policy does not dominate the straightforward policy in terms of the Blackwell informativeness criterion (Blackwell, 1953), the ternary policy may provide a smaller expected payoff for current users. This happens if ϵ_t is too large. Meanwhile, Section 7 demonstrates that for $C_\epsilon = 1/4$, all users receive larger expected payoffs under the ternary policy. Alternatively, we can consider a slightly different ternary policy that dominates the straightforward policy. For example, by defining $\mu_t(z_t) = 1$ if $x_t m_t + z_t > 0$, $\mu_t(z_t) = 0$ if $x_t m_t + z_t \in (-\epsilon_t, 0)$, and $\mu_t(z_t) = -1$ if $x_t m_t + z_t < -\epsilon_t$, the alternative ternary policy informationally dominates the straightforward policy and, therefore, provides the current user with a larger expected payoff than that offered by the straightforward policy, regardless of the choice of ϵ_t .

to balance this trade-off. Lemma 5 shows that $\epsilon_t = C_\epsilon w_t$ (for any $C_\epsilon > 0$) is an appropriate choice in the sense that it achieves a constant per-round probability of geometric updates. Accordingly, the ternary policy shrinks the confidence interval exponentially in the total number of rounds in which $a_t = 0$ is sent.

We introduce two more lemmas to illustrate the proof sketch of Theorem 4. The second lemma, Lemma 6, computes the probability that $a_t = 0$ is sent.

Lemma 6 (Probability of $a_t = 0$). Under the ternary policy, there exist universal constants $C_{\text{OtF}}^L, C_{\text{OtF}}^U > 0$ such that the following equality holds:²⁰

$$C_{\text{OtF}}^L \epsilon_t \leq \mathbb{P}[a_t = 0] \leq C_{\text{OtF}}^U \epsilon_t,$$

Lemma 6 states that the probability that $a_t = 0$ is recommended is linear in ϵ_t . This result immediately follows from the fact that (i) z_t follows a standard normal distribution, and (ii) $a_t = 0$ is sent when $z_t \in (-x_t m_t - \epsilon_t, -x_t m_t + \epsilon_t)$.

The third lemma, Lemma 7, bounds the per-round regret, $\text{reg}(t)$, using a quadratic function of the policy parameter, ϵ_t , and the width of the confidence interval, w_t .

Lemma 7 (Upper Bound on Regret per Round). Under the ternary policy with $\epsilon_t = C_\epsilon w_t$, there exists a constant $C_{\text{regt}} > 0$ that only depends on C_ϵ such that the following inequality holds:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t)] \leq C_{\text{regt}} w_t^2.$$

When an arm is recommended (i.e., when $a_t \neq 0$), then we can apply essentially the same analysis as the straightforward policy to derive the per-round expected regret of $O(w_t^2)$. The message $a_t = 0$ is sent with probability $\Theta(\epsilon_t)$ (by Lemma 6). Since $a_t = 0$ is sent only when the utility is (approximately) indifferent between two arms, the per-round regret is bounded by $\epsilon_t + w_t$ in this case. Hence, the per-round expected regret for this case is $O(\max\{\epsilon_t, w_t\}^2)$. When we choose $\epsilon_t = C_\epsilon w_t$, then the per-round regret becomes quadratic in w_t .

The proof outline of Theorem 4 is as follows. By Lemma 6, the probability of $a_t = 0$ is $\Theta(\epsilon_t) = \Theta(w_t)$. Together with Lemma 5, it follows that, in round t , with probability $\Theta(w_t)$, the width of confidence interval w_t shrinks geometrically to $w_{t+1} = (5/6)w_t$ or smaller. This leads an exponential reduction of the confidence interval to the total number of users to which the recommender has sent $a_t = 0$. Finally, when $\epsilon_t = \Theta(w_t)$, Lemma 7 ensures that the per-round regret is $O(w_t^2)$. Let us refer to an interval between two geometric intervals as an *epoch*. Since a geometric update occurs with probability $\Theta(w_t)$, the expected number of rounds contained in one epoch is $\Theta(1/w_t)$. The regret incurred per round is $\Theta(w_t^2)$; thus, the total regret incurred in one epoch is $\Theta(w_t^2 \times 1/w_t) = \Theta(w_t)$. Accordingly, the expected regret associated with each epoch is bounded by a geometric sequence whose common ratio is $5/6 < 1$. The total regret is the sum of

²⁰“OtF” stands for “on the fence.”

the regret from all the epochs. Accordingly, the total regret is bounded by the sum of a geometric series, which converges to a constant.

6 Other Binary Policies

As aforementioned, although the straightforward policy is simple, natural, and practical, it is not an optimal binary policy. An optimal binary policy may perform better, and its performance could be comparable with the ternary policy. Nevertheless, the construction of the optimal policy, which requires a T -step look ahead, is computationally intractable for large T . We instead present two other binary policies, the myopic policy, and the EvE (exploration versus exploitation) policy, to demonstrate how the performance of the straightforward policy could be improved while maintaining the binary message space. We also discuss the shortcomings of such policies.

The two binary policies considered in this section can be characterized by a threshold parameter, ρ_t . Specifically, the policy decides the message according to the following criterion.

$$\mu_t(z_t; \rho_t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } z_t > \rho_t; \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that the straightforward policy also belongs to this policy class, where the threshold parameter is fixed to $\rho_t^{\text{st}} := -x_t m_t$ for all t .

6.1 Myopic Policy

6.1.1 Definition

We first analyze whether and how the recommender can improve the current user's payoff by fully exploiting the recommender's current information. For simplicity, we focus on the case of $x_t > 0$. The analysis for the case of $x_t < 0$ is similar, while we need to flip some inequalities appearing in the calculation process. Let $V(\rho_t; x_t, l_t, u_t)$ be the current user's expected payoff, where the expectation is taken with respect to the recommender's current information, (x_t, l_t, u_t) :

$$\begin{aligned} V(\rho_t; x_t, u_t, l_t) &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\theta} \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t], z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1}\{b_t = 1\} (x_t \tilde{\theta} + z_t) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{u_t - l_t} \left[\int_{\min\left\{\max\left\{-\frac{\mathbb{E}[z'_t | z'_t < \rho_t]}{x_t}, l_t\right\}, u_t\right\}}^{u_t} \int_{-\infty}^{\rho_t} (x_t \theta + z_t) \phi(z_t) dz_t d\theta \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\min\left\{\max\left\{-\frac{\mathbb{E}[z'_t | z'_t > \rho_t]}{x_t}, l_t\right\}, u_t\right\}}^{u_t} \int_{\rho_t}^{\infty} (x_t \theta + z_t) \phi(z_t) dz_t d\theta \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

According to the recommender's (Bayesian) posterior belief, the state θ is distributed according to $\text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]$. If the state θ is so large that the user's expected payoff from arm 1 is larger than zero, then the user chooses arm 1 and receives a payoff of $x_t \theta + z_t$. Otherwise, the user chooses arm -1

and receives a zero payoff, which does not appear in the formula (4). When $a_t = 1$ is recommended, the user knows that $z_t > \rho_t$, and the user chooses arm 1 if and only if

$$x_t \theta + \mathbb{E}[z'_t | z'_t > \rho_t] > 0,$$

or equivalently,

$$\theta > -\frac{\mathbb{E}[z'_t | z'_t > \rho_t]}{x_t}.$$

Similarly, when $a_t = -1$ is recommended, the user chooses arm 1 if and only if

$$\theta > -\frac{\mathbb{E}[z'_t | z'_t < \rho_t]}{x_t}.$$

The minimum and maximum appearing in the interval of integration is for letting the threshold within the belief support, $[l_t, u_t]$. The formula (4) is obtained by specifying the region of θ under which $b_t = 1$ will be taken. The *myopic policy* maximizes V , i.e., $\rho_t^{\text{myopic}} := \arg \max_{\rho_t} V(\rho_t; x_t, l_t, u_t)$.

6.1.2 Characterization and Regret Rate

Using direct calculation, we can derive the functional form of V .

$$V(\rho_t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{u_t - l_t} \left[x_t u_t^2 + \frac{1}{x_t} \frac{(\phi^*)^2}{\Phi^*(1 - \Phi^*)} \right] & \text{if } x_t l_t < -\frac{\phi^*}{1 - \Phi^*} < \frac{\phi^*}{\Phi^*} < x_t u_t, & \text{(Case 1)} \\ x_t m_t (1 - \Phi^*) + \phi^* & & \\ + \frac{1}{2(u_t - l_t)} \left[x_t u_t^2 \Phi^* + \frac{(\phi^*)^2}{\Phi^* x_t} - 2\phi^* u_t \right] & \text{if } -\frac{\phi^*}{1 - \Phi^*} < x_t l_t < \frac{\phi^*}{\Phi^*} < x_t u_t, & \text{(Case 2)} \\ x_t m_t (1 - \Phi^*) + \phi^* & & \\ + \frac{1}{2(u_t - l_t)} \left[x_t l_t^2 (1 - \Phi^*) + \frac{(\phi^*)^2}{(1 - \Phi^*) x_t} + 2\phi^* l_t \right] & \text{if } x_t l_t < -\frac{\phi^*}{1 - \Phi^*} < x_t u_t < \frac{\phi^*}{\Phi^*}, & \text{(Case 3)} \\ x_t m_t (1 - \Phi^*) + \phi^* & & \\ x_t m_t & \text{if } -\frac{\phi^*}{1 - \Phi^*} < x_t l_t < x_t u_t < \frac{\phi^*}{\Phi^*}, & \text{(Case 4)} \\ 0 & \text{if } \frac{\phi^*}{\Phi^*} < x_t l_t, & \text{(Case 5)} \\ 0 & \text{if } x_t u_t < -\frac{\phi^*}{1 - \Phi^*}, & \text{(Case 6)} \end{cases}$$

where $\phi^* = \phi(\rho_t)$ and $\Phi^* = \Phi(\rho_t)$. Note that the above formula is derived by assuming $x_t > 0$, and we have a slightly different formula if $x_t < 0$. We can obtain the optimizer, ρ_t^{myopic} , by numerically maximizing the V function.

Depending on the integration intervals that appear in (4), the V function takes different forms. The intervals of integration are determined by comparing the following four terms: (i) $x_t l_t$, (ii) $x_t u_t$, (iii) $-\mathbb{E}[z'_t | z'_t > \rho_t] = -\phi^*/(1 - \Phi^*)$, and (iv) $-\mathbb{E}[z'_t | z'_t < \rho_t] = \phi^*/\Phi^*$. Term (ii) is always larger




Figure 3: The relationship between the threshold parameter ρ_t and the current user's expected payoff $V(\rho_t)$. We fix (x_t, u_t) to $(3.0, 0.5)$, and plot lines for $l_t \in \{-0.8, -0.4, 0.2, 0, 0.2, 0.4\}$. Threshold ρ belonging to different cases are drawn in different colors and styles. The markers $*$, \circ , and \square shows the optimal value, the value at $\rho_t = 0$, and the value at $\rho_t = -x_t m_t$, respectively.

than term (i), and term (iv) is always larger than term (iii). Accordingly, there are $4!/(2! \times 2!) = 6$ cases in total.

In Cases 5 and 6, the user always (i.e., for any values of $\theta \in [l_t, u_t]$) chooses arms 1 and -1 respectively, regardless of the recommendation a_t . In these cases, the recommendation is totally useless for the user's decision-making, and therefore, such a choice of the threshold parameter ρ_t is always suboptimal.

In Cases 1 and 2, the user may deviate and choose $b_t = -1$ when $a_t = 1$ is recommended. In Cases 1 and 3, the user may deviate and choose $b_t = 1$ when $a_t = -1$ is recommended. In Case 4, the user always follows the recommendation. Depending on (x_t, l_t, u_t) , an optimal threshold ρ_t could exist in each of the four cases.

If the optimal solution belongs to either Case 2 or 3, then it cannot be represented in a tractable closed-form formula. By contrast, when the optimal ρ_t belongs to Case 1 or 4, then it takes a simple form. When the optimal solution belongs to Case 1, then $\rho_t = 0$ must be the case, and when the optimal solution belongs to Case 4, then $\rho_t = -x_t m_t$ must be the case. These facts can be easily verified by checking the first-order condition for optimality.

Figure 3 shows the structure of the myopic policy. We fix (x_t, u_t) at $(3.0, 0.5)$, and plot V

varying l_t . When the confidence interval is wide ($l_t = -0.8$ and -0.4), the optimal solution belongs to Case 1, and it is optimal to choose $\rho_t = 0$. In contrast, when the confidence interval is narrow ($l_t = 0.2$ and 0.4), the optimal solution belongs to Case 4, and it is optimal to choose $\rho_t = -x_t m_t$. For the intermediate case ($l_t = -0.2$ and 0), the myopically optimal policy is also intermediate: The optimal ρ_t belongs to Case 2, and ρ_t^{myopic} is also in between $\rho_t = 0$ and $\rho_t = -x_t m_t$.

6.1.3 Connection to the Straightforward Policy

When the optimal solution belongs to Case 4, the myopic policy matches the straightforward policy. Figure 3 suggests that this is likely to occur if the confidence interval is small. The following theorem formally demonstrates that when the confidence interval $[l_t, u_t]$ is sufficiently small, these two policies are identical unless $|x_t|$ is very large.

Theorem 8 (Equivalence under Narrow Confidence Intervals). For all $\delta > 0$, for all (l_t, u_t) such that $u_t - l_t =: w_t < \delta^2/4\sqrt{\pi \log(1/\delta)}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\rho_t^{\text{myopic}} = -x_t m_t \mid l_t, u_t \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

The intuition of Theorem 8 can be described as follows. When w_t is small and $|x_t|$ is not very large, the recommender’s estimation about $r_t(1) = x_t \theta + z_t$ is accurate, and therefore, the recommender can correctly figure out the better arm with a large probability. In such a case, the recommender should communicate which arm is estimated to be better, and the user should follow the recommendation. Therefore, the myopic policy matches the straightforward policy.

Theorem 8 is important for our argument for two reasons. First, Theorem 8 characterizes the asymptotic efficiency of the straightforward policy. That is, while the straightforward policy may differ from the myopic policy at first, the two policies align in the long run, indicating that the straightforward policy asymptotically maximizes the current user’s payoff. In this sense, the straightforward policy is asymptotically optimal in terms of exploitation. Second, given that the myopic policy and the straightforward policy are asymptotically identical, their regret rates are also identical. Accordingly, the myopic policy also fails to learn the state θ precisely even in the long run and incurs $\tilde{\Theta}(T)$ regret.

6.1.4 Drawbacks

This section’s analyses have demonstrated that the straightforward policy is sometimes suboptimal for the current user. In particular, when the recommender is not confident about θ , the recommender should simply communicate the sign of z_t , rather than communicating the estimated better arm. When the recommender has moderate confidence, the optimal threshold falls between the two. By changing the structure of the recommendation depending on the width of the confidence interval, the recommender can improve current users’ payoffs.

Nevertheless, the myopic policy is difficult to implement. Unlike the straightforward policy, the interpretation of the message a_t changes over time. For example, in the car navigation context, when the confidence interval is wide, a_t communicates the sign of z_t , which is interpreted as “which road is more vacant”; meanwhile, when the confidence interval is narrow, a_t communicates the sign of $x_t m_t + z_t$, which is interpreted as “which road the recommender estimates to be better.” Furthermore, the message’s interpretation shifts continuously in the intermediate case. Therefore, while we have considered binary policies because a binary message space to evaluate the regret achieved by minimal communication, the myopic policy requires complex communication. We contend that the ternary policy should be easier for users than the myopic policy in practice.

Moreover, Section 7 shows that the myopic policy and the straightforward policy perform very similarly. More importantly, the ternary policy greatly outperforms these two.

6.2 Exploration versus Exploitation (EvE) Policy

6.2.1 Definition

Parallel to the multi-armed bandit problem, the recommender faces the tradeoff between the acquisition of new information (called “exploration”) and optimization of her decision based on current information (called “exploitation”). The straightforward policy and myopic policy only consider the current user’s payoff, and therefore, tend towards exploitation.

In this section, we study the EvE policy. This policy initially explores the information on state θ , ignoring the current user’s expected payoff. That is, when the width of the confidence interval, w_t , is larger than a threshold, $1/\sqrt{T}$, the recommender attempts to maximize the recommender’s own information gain. Subsequently, the recommender starts to exploit the acquired information, i.e., adopts the straightforward policy.²¹ Since the per-round regret from the straightforward policy is $\Theta(w_t^2) = \Theta(1/T)$, the total regret from the exploitation phase is bounded by a constant. Accordingly, the total regret rate is characterized by the learning speed in the exploration phase. Such policies often outperform myopic policies in multi-armed bandit problems, where decision makers need to consider the tradeoff between exploration and exploitation.

The formal construction of the exploration phase is as follows. We design a policy such that user t ’s action b_t discloses whether $\theta > m_t$ or not. To this end, we define the threshold function $c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows. The value of $c(0)$ is defined arbitrarily.²² For $y > 0$, $c(y)$ is defined as a unique scalar that satisfies

$$(\mathbb{E}[z_t | z_t < c(y)] =) - \frac{\phi(c(y))}{\Phi(c(y))} = -y. \quad (5)$$

²¹Since the confidence interval is already narrow, the straightforward policy is approximately optimal in terms of exploitation (Theorem 8).

²²We need to define $c(0)$ because $m_t = 0$ in the first round. Once the confidence interval is updated, $x_t m_t = 0$ subsequently occurs with probability zero, meaning the definition of $c(0)$ does not impact the long-run performance of the EvE policy.




Figure 4: The shape of the threshold function c . $\lim_{y \uparrow 0} c(y) = -\infty$, $\lim_{y \downarrow 0} c(y) = +\infty$, and the value of $c(0)$ is defined arbitrarily.

Such $c(y)$ exists because as $c(y)$ moves from $-\infty$ to ∞ , the left hand side of (5) moves from $-\infty$ to 0. Furthermore, the solution is unique because the left hand side of (5) is increasing in $c(y)$. For $y < 0$, $c(y)$ is defined as a unique scalar that satisfies

$$(\mathbb{E}[z_t | z_t > c(y)]) = \frac{\phi(c(y))}{1 - \Phi(c(y))} = -y.$$

The existence and uniqueness of $c(y)$ for $y < 0$ can be shown in the same manner. The shape of the threshold function c appears in Figure 4.

We define the EvE policy as follows:

$$\rho_t^{\text{EvE}} := \begin{cases} c(x_t m_t) & \text{if } w_t > \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \quad (\text{Exploration Phase}), \\ -x_t m_t & \text{otherwise.} \quad (\text{Exploitation Phase}). \end{cases}$$

6.2.2 Regret Rate

For instruction, we focus on the case of $x_t m_t > 0$. Suppose that the recommender employs $\rho_t = c(x_t m_t)$. If $z_t < c(x_t m_t)$ is the case, message $a_t = -1$ is sent, and then user t 's expected payoff from arm 1 is $r_t(1) = x_t \theta + \mathbb{E}[z'_t | z'_t < c(x_t m_t)] = x_t(\theta - m_t)$. Since x_t is known, by observing the user's choice, the recommender can identify whether $\theta > m_t$ or not. By observing the user's choice b_t , the recommender can halve the confidence interval: From $[l_t, u_t]$ to either $[l_t, m_t]$ or $[m_t, u_t]$. Furthermore, $z_t < c(x_t m_t)$ occurs with a constant probability for each round. Accordingly, under the threshold policy with $\rho_t = c(x_t m_t)$, the confidence interval shrinks geometrically. Therefore, it takes only $O(\log T)$ rounds to reach $w_t < 1/\sqrt{T}$.

The following theorem demonstrates that the EvE policy achieves $O(\log T)$ expected regret.

Theorem 9 (Regret Bound of EvE). Under the EvE policy, there exists a universal constant $C_{\text{EvE}} > 0$ such that the regret is bounded as:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] \leq C_{\text{EvE}} \log T.$$

The EvE policy spends the first $O(\log T)$ rounds for learning and subsequently adopts the straightforward policy. It incurs $O(\log T)$ regret for the exploration phase, and the regret from the exploitation phase is bounded by a constant. The EvE policy outperforms the straightforward policy in terms of the regret rate.

Remark 1. The construction of the exploration phase of the EvE policy resembles the optimal information design in a Bayesian persuasion model (Kamenica and Gentzkow, 2011). Kamenica and Gentzkow (2011) consider a sender-receiver model, where the sender submits information about the state, and the receiver takes an action to maximize his payoff that depends on the state and action. Kamenica and Gentzkow (2011) show that the sender can maximize her own payoff by obscuring the state information conveyed to the receiver, and in some cases, the optimal information design makes the receiver indifferent between multiple actions. In the exploration phase of the EvE policy, the recommender (sender) also attempts to make the user (receiver) indifferent between the two arms with respect to the recommender’s best knowledge (i.e., believing $\theta = m_t$), by setting $\rho_t = c(x_t m_t)$. However, its purpose differs, with the recommender in our model is attempting to extract more information from the user rather than induce a recommender-preferred action.

6.2.3 Drawbacks

Although the EvE policy achieves a sublinear regret rate without expanding the message space, several drawbacks limit its practical desirability.

First, the EvE policy sacrifices the utility of early users. This feature produces an unfair welfare distribution across users. Furthermore, although this paper does not model the outside option, when users find that the recommender is not really helping them but trying to take advantage of their knowledge, they may quit using the recommender system. If this is the case, the recommender fails to extract users’ knowledge in the exploration phase.

Second, the EvE policy needs detailed information about the environment. To compute the threshold function c , the recommender needs detailed knowledge about the distribution of z_t . Furthermore, to optimize the length of the exploration phase, the recommender should know the total number of users, T . The EvE policy cannot be used if the recommender has no such detailed knowledge. By contrast, the straightforward policy and ternary policy can be implemented even in the absence of such information.

Third, although the EvE policy outperforms other binary policies, allowing a ternary message space makes achieving an even better regret rate easy. Recall that the simple ternary policy considered in Section 5 has a regret rate of $O(1)$, even though its construction does not fully account




Figure 5: The evolution of cumulative regret $\text{Reg}(t)$ under the straightforward policy, myopic policy, EvE policy, and ternary policy. Panel (b) is an enlarged view of Panel (a).

for the tradeoff between exploration and exploitation. Given that the ternary policy does not suffer from the disadvantages associated with the EvE policy, we have no reason to implement such a policy. In Section 7, we further demonstrate that the ternary policy substantially outperforms the EvE policy.

7 Simulations

This section provides the simulation results. For each path, we draw θ from $\text{Unif}[-1, 1]$ and x_t, z_t from i.i.d. standard normal distribution for each of the $T = 10,000$ rounds. For the ternary policy, we choose $C_\epsilon = 1/4$ as the algorithm parameter.²³

7.1 Regret Growth

We plot the cumulative regret, $\text{Reg}(t)$, in Figure 5. For all graphs in this section, the lines are averages over 5000 trials, and the shaded areas cover between 25 and 75 percentiles. The whiskers drawn at the final round ($T = 10,000$) represent the two-sigma confidence intervals of the average values.

As Theorem 1 has proven, under the straightforward policy, the cumulative regret grows almost linearly, and users suffer from a large regret in the long run. The myopic policy behaves similarly to (but very slightly worse than) the straightforward policy. By contrast, the EvE policy initially explores the value of θ by sacrificing early users and produces approximately no regret subsequently. Consequently, in the last period ($T = 10,000$), the EvE policy performs substantially better than the other two binary policies: The EvE policy incurs regret of 3.23 on average, whereas the straightforward policy and myopic policy incur 11.82 and 12.37. Furthermore, if the problem continued

²³The simulation code is available at <https://github.com/jkomiyama/deviationbasedlearning>.

beyond round 10,000, we could expect the performance difference to become larger and larger.

Despite the ternary policy’s simple construction, it performs remarkably better than these three binary policies. Similar to the EvE policy, regret grows rapidly in the beginning. However, regret growth terminates much earlier than under the EvE policy, and subsequently, cumulative regret does not grow. Because its regret is proven to be bounded by a constant (Theorem 4), it is guaranteed that regret would not grow even when T is extremely large. At $T = 10,000$, the ternary policy only incurs regret of 0.127, which is roughly 1/100 of the regret incurred by the straightforward policy.

Interestingly, the performance difference between the ternary and EvE policies is large, despite the EvE policy learning the state at an exponential rate. This is because the EvE policy does not optimally select the “timing to learn.” The EvE policy sacrifices payoffs of all users arriving during the exploration phase, completely ignoring their situations. That is, each user is not informed of the better arm even when one arm appears much better than the other for him (i.e., $|x_t m_t + z_t| \gg 0$). Such users suffer from large per-round regret, meaning regret grows very rapidly during the exploration phase. By contrast, the ternary policy attempts to extract information from the user only when the current user is estimated to be indifferent between two arms (i.e., $|x_t m_t + z_t| \approx 0$), making the per-round regret much smaller. While the ternary policy learns more slowly than the EvE policy, this feature does not deteriorate the regret. If the two arms exhibit different performances for the current user, the recommender need not collect the information at that moment. That is, although the recommender’s knowledge is not yet precise, the recommender can confidently recommend the better arm for such an “easy case.” The ternary policy attempts to acquire information when (and only when) the information is necessary for identifying the better arm. Because the EvE policy ignores this aspect, it is inefficient.

7.2 Exploration

This section analyzes each policy’s performance in terms of exploration and exploitation of information. First, we depict exploration by showing the learning rate. We measure it by the per-round percentage shrink of the confidence interval, defined as $(w_t - w_{t+1})/w_t$. If the shrink is large, then the policy learns the state θ rapidly, and the narrowed confidence interval benefits all subsequent users.

Figure 6 shows the per-round expected percentage shrink, defined by

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_t, z_t \sim \mathcal{N}, \theta \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]} \left[\frac{w_t - w_{t+1}}{w_t} \right] \times 100.$$

The expectation is replaced with an empirical average of 10,000 trials. u_t is fixed at 0.5, and we vary the width of the confidence interval, $w_t := u_t - l_t$, between 0.0 and 1.5. We plot the performances of the straightforward policy, the myopic policy, the exploration phase of the EvE policy, and the ternary policy.




Figure 6: The per-round expected percentage shrink, $\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]} [(w_t - w_{t+1})/w_t]$ under the straightforward policy, the myopic policy, the exploration phase of the EvE policy, and the ternary policy. The performances of the straightforward policy and myopic policy are nearly identical. u_t is fixed at 0.5, and we vary the width of the confidence interval, $w_t := u_t - l_t$, between 0.0 and 1.5.

As Theorem 8 indicates, the straightforward policy and the myopic policy often generate the same threshold ρ_t , rendering their performances almost identical. As anticipated from Theorem 1, these two policies perform the worst. While the straightforward policy can acquire some information when w_t is large, the expected shrink diminishes rapidly as w_t becomes small (Lemma 3 implies that its rate is exponential to $-1/w_t$). When $w_t = 0.75$, the straightforward policy can shrink the confidence interval only by 0.4%, and when $w_t = 0.3$, the shrink becomes zero, i.e., literally no information was gained in the 10,000 trials. (Even for large w_t , the EvE policy and the ternary policy substantially outperform the straightforward policy.)

By contrast, the ternary policy effectively shrinks the confidence interval for any w_t . When $w_t = 0.75$, the ternary policy shrinks the confidence interval by 7.6%, and even when $w_t = 0.075$, the percentage shrink is 0.7%. Therefore, as predicted by theory, the expected percentage shrink is linear in w_t . That is, with probability $\Theta(w_t)$, the ternary policy sends $a_t = 0$ (Lemma 6), and then, the confidence interval shrinks at a constant percentage (Lemma 5).

The EvE policy’s exploration phase is specialized for exploration, and therefore, its expected percentage shrink is much larger than the other policies, and it shrinks the confidence interval by 25% for any value of w_t . The constant information gain is achieved because the policy sends a message ($a_t = -1$ if $x_t m_t > 0$ and $a_t = 1$ if $x_t m_t < 0$) for exploration with a constant probability, and the confidence interval halves every time such a message is sent.

Remark 2. In Appendix A, we analyze how the confidence intervals are updated. Under the straightforward policy, most information gain happens when users deviate from recommendations, while such updates are less frequent. By contrast, under the ternary policy, virtually all information




Figure 7: The per-round expected regret $\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]}[\text{reg}(t)]$ under the straightforward policy, the myopic policy the exploration phase of the EvE policy, and the ternary policy. u_t is fixed at 0.5, and we vary the width of the confidence interval, $w_t := u_t - l_t$, between 0.0 and 1.5. Panel (b) is an enlarged view of Panel (a).

gains happen when $a_t = 0$ is sent.

7.3 Exploitation

Next, we compare each policy’s ability to exploit the recommender’s current knowledge about θ . This ability is measured simply using the per-round regret $\text{reg}(t)$, which represents the size of the current user’s payoff. Figure 7 shows the per-round expected regret,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_t, z_t \sim \mathcal{N}, \theta \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]} [\text{reg}(t)],$$

of the straightforward policy, the exploration phase of the EvE policy, and the ternary policy. As in Section 7.2, we fix $l_t = -0.5$ and vary the value of u_t between -0.5 and 0.5 . The vertical axis represents $w_t = u_t - l_t$.

Panel (a) shows that the exploration phase of the EvE policy incurs a substantial per-round regret. Because it is not designed to reduce the current user’s regret, even when the confidence interval is small, the per-round regret does not diminish. Accordingly, this policy incurs a large regret even if it is only used for a short period of time.

Because the other three policies incur much smaller regret, we show an enlarged view of Panel (a) as Panel (b). The difference between the straightforward policy and the myopic policy is very small, while the myopic policy performs slightly better when the confidence interval is wide.

Panel (b) demonstrates that, under this simulation setting (c.f., $C_\epsilon = 1/4$), the per-round regret of the ternary policy is about 1/2 to 2/3 of the per-round regret of the myopic policy. Considering that the (cumulative) regret of the ternary policy is 1/100 of the regret of the myopic policy, the improvement in myopic payoffs is relatively small. This fact articulates that welfare gain from

increasing the message space is gained mostly from the improvement in learning rate.

Nevertheless, from a fairness perspective, the improvement in myopic payoffs is very important. The myopic policy maximizes the current user’s payoff for every round among all binary policies. Panel (b) demonstrates that, for an appropriate choice of the algorithm parameter, the ternary policy provides even better payoffs for any w_t . In this sense, the ternary policy sacrifices no user, in contrast to the EvE policy.

8 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we propose deviation-based learning, a novel approach to training recommender systems. In contrast to traditional rating-based learning, we do not assume observability of payoffs (or noisy signals of them). Instead, our approach extracts users’ expert knowledge from the data about choices given recommendations. The deviation-based learning is effective when (i) payoffs are unobservable, (ii) many users are knowledgeable experts, and (iii) the recommender can easily identify the set of experts.

Our analysis reveals that the size of the message space is crucial for the efficiency of deviation-based learning. Using a stylized model with two arms, we demonstrated that a binary message space and straightforward policy result in a large welfare loss. After the recommender is trained to some extent, users start to follow her recommendations blindly, and users’ decisions are uninformative in terms of advancing the recommender’s learning. This effect significantly slows down learning, and the total regret grows almost linearly with the number of users. While we can improve the regret rate by developing more sophisticated binary policies (such as the myopic policy and the EvE policy), a much simpler and more effective solution is to increase the size of the message space. Employing a ternary message space allows the recommender to communicate that she predicts that two arms will produce similar payoffs. User’s choices after receiving such a message are extremely useful for the recommender’s learning. Thus, making such messages available accelerates learning drastically. Under the ternary policy, total regret is bounded by a constant, and in round 10,000, the ternary policy only incurs 1/100 of the regret incurred by the straightforward policy.

While it is not explicitly modeled in this paper, the optimal policy choice should also depend on the magnitude of the communication cost. If the communication cost is extremely large, the recommender would abandon communication and choose $|A| = 1$, and if it is zero, the recommender would choose $|A| = \infty$ to achieve the first-best choices from the beginning. However, our analysis suggests that, for a wide range of “moderately large” communication costs, the ternary policy should be an (approximately) optimal choice, because it is extremely more efficient than the binary policies, while the communication cost is (nearly) minimal.

Our analysis of the binary policy suggests one further useful caveat: The recommender should not use the rate at which users follow recommendations as a key performance indicator. When the recommender has an information advantage, a user may follow a recommendation blindly even

when the recommendation does not fully incorporate his own information and preference. This means that using this performance indicator may inadvertently engender a large welfare loss.

Although we believe that the insight obtained from our stylized model will be useful in general environments (given that the intuitions of our theorems do not rely on the assumptions made for the sake of simplicity), more comprehensive and exhaustive analyses are necessary for practical applications. In practice, observable contexts (x_t) are often multi-dimensional. Furthermore, users' payoffs are rarely linear in the parameter (θ), and their functional forms may be unknown ex ante, requiring that the recommender adopt a nonparametric approach. Future studies could investigate deviation-based learning in more complex environments.

References

- ADOMAVICIUS, G. AND A. TUZHILIN (2005): “Toward the Next Generation of Recommender Systems: a Survey of the State-of-the-Art and Possible Extensions,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 17, 734–749.
- AHUJA, R. K. AND J. B. ORLIN (2001): “Inverse Optimization,” *Operations Research*, 49, 771–783.
- BERGEMANN, D. AND S. MORRIS (2016a): “Bayes Correlated Equilibrium and the Comparison of Information Structures in Games,” *Theoretical Economics*, 11, 487–522.
- (2016b): “Information Design, Bayesian Persuasion, and Bayes Correlated Equilibrium,” *American Economic Review*, 106, 586–91.
- BERTSIMAS, D. AND S. S. VEMPALA (2004): “Solving Convex Programs by Random Walks,” *Journal of the ACM*, 51, 540–556.
- BESBES, O., Y. FONSECA, AND I. LOBEL (2021): “Contextual Inverse Optimization: Offline and Online Learning,” *CoRR*, abs/2106.14015.
- BLACKWELL, D. (1953): “Equivalent Comparisons of Experiments,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 265–272.
- BOLTON, P. AND C. HARRIS (1999): “Strategic Experimentation,” *Econometrica*, 67, 349–374.
- CHE, Y.-K. AND J. HÖRNER (2017): “Recommender Systems as Mechanisms for Social Learning,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133, 871–925.
- CHEN, J., H. DONG, X. WANG, F. FENG, M. WANG, AND X. HE (2020): “Bias and Debias in Recommender System: A Survey and Future Directions,” *CoRR*, abs/2010.03240.
- CHEUNG, P. AND Y. MASATLIOGLU (2021): “Decision Making with Recommendation,” Working Paper.

- FELLER, W. (1968): *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications.*, vol. 1 of *Third edition*, New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- KAMENICA, E. AND M. GENTZKOW (2011): “Bayesian Persuasion,” *American Economic Review*, 101, 2590–2615.
- KHOURY, R. E. (2019): “Google Maps Hits 5 Billion Downloads on the Play Store, Does It after YouTube but Before the Google App,” *Android Police*, <https://www.androidpolice.com/2019/03/09/google-maps-hits-5-billion-downloads-on-the-play-store-does-it-after-youtube-but-before-the-google-app/>.
- KREMER, I., Y. MANSOUR, AND M. PERRY (2014): “Implementing the ‘Wisdom of the Crowd’,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 122, 988–1012.
- LAI, T. AND H. ROBBINS (1985): “Asymptotically Efficient Adaptive Allocation Rules,” *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 6, 4–22.
- LUCA, M. AND G. ZERVAS (2016): “Fake It till You Make It: Reputation, Competition, and Yelp Review Fraud,” *Management Science*, 62, 3412–3427.
- MARLIN, B. M. AND R. S. ZEMEL (2009): “Collaborative Prediction and Ranking with Non-random Missing Data,” in *Proceedings of the Third ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, 5–12.
- MAYZLIN, D., Y. DOVER, AND J. CHEVALIER (2014): “Promotional Reviews: An Empirical Investigation of Online Review Manipulation,” *American Economic Review*, 104, 2421–55.
- MUCHNIK, L., S. ARAL, AND S. J. TAYLOR (2013): “Social Influence Bias: A Randomized Experiment,” *Science*, 341, 647–651.
- MYERSON, R. B. (1982): “Optimal Coordination Mechanisms in Generalized Principal–Agent Problems,” *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 10, 67–81.
- NG, A. Y. AND S. J. RUSSELL (2000): “Algorithms for Inverse Reinforcement Learning,” in *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, 663–670.
- RADEMACHER, L. A. (2007): “Approximating the Centroid is Hard,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, 302–305.
- SALGANIK, M. J., P. S. DODDS, AND D. J. WATTS (2006): “Experimental Study of Inequality and Unpredictability in an Artificial Cultural Market,” *Science*, 311, 854–856.
- SAMUELSON, P. A. (1938): “A Note on the Pure Theory of Consumer’s Behaviour,” *Economica*, 5, 61–71.

- SAURÉ, D. AND J. P. VIELMA (2019): “Ellipsoidal Methods for Adaptive Choice-Based Conjoint Analysis,” *Operations Research*, 67, 315–338.
- SINHA, A., D. F. GLEICH, AND K. RAMANI (2016): “Deconvolving Feedback Loops in Recommender Systems,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Curran Associates, Inc., vol. 29.
- SUTTON, R. S. AND A. G. BARTO (2018): *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*, The MIT Press, second ed.
- THOMPSON, W. R. (1933): “On the Likelihood that One Unknown Probability Exceeds Another in View of the Evidence of Two Samples,” *Biometrika*, 25, 285–294.
- TOUBIA, O., J. HAUSER, AND R. GARCIA (2007): “Probabilistic Polyhedral Methods for Adaptive Choice-Based Conjoint Analysis: Theory and Application,” *Marketing Science*, 26, 596–610.




Figure 8: The growth of the number of updates. For Panel (b), we observe $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{Obey}}(T)| = |\mathcal{T}_{\text{Deviate}}(T)| \approx 0$; thus, the total number of updates until round t is approximately equal to $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{OtF}}(t)|$.

Appendix

A Source of Learning

This section investigates how the width of the confidence interval, w_t , is updated. First, we focus on when and how frequently updates occur. We count the occurrence of belief updates, i.e., the number of rounds such that $w_{t+1} < w_t$. Among all rounds in which updates occur, (i) the set of rounds in which the user followed the recommendation is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Obey}}$ (obedience), (ii) the set of rounds in which the user deviated from the recommendation is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Deviate}}$ (deviation), and (iii) the set of rounds in which the recommender did not recommend a particular action is denoted by \mathcal{T}_{OtF} (on the fence). Formally, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_{\text{Obey}}(t) &:= \{s \in [t] : w_{s+1} < w_s \text{ and } a_s = b_s\}; \\ \mathcal{T}_{\text{Deviate}}(t) &:= \{s \in [t] : w_{s+1} < w_s, a_s \neq 0 \text{ and } a_s \neq b_s\}; \\ \mathcal{T}_{\text{OtF}}(t) &:= \{s \in [t] : w_{s+1} < w_s \text{ and } a_s = 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{OtF}}| = 0$ for the case of the straightforward policy since $a_t = 0$ is never sent.

Figure 8 plots the number of updates, $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{Obey}}(t)|$, $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{Deviate}}(t)|$, $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{OtF}}(t)|$, and their total, $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{Obey}}(t)| + |\mathcal{T}_{\text{Deviate}}(t)| + |\mathcal{T}_{\text{OtF}}(t)|$. Panel (a) displays the results of the straightforward policy. The updates by obedience occur more often than the updates by deviation. Panel (b) shows the results of the ternary policy. Since the recommender recommends an arm only if she is confident about it, users follow the recommendation blindly whenever an arm is recommended; therefore, an update occurs only if the recommender confesses that she is on the fence. The opportunities for her learning are mostly concentrated at the beginning, but updates occur occasionally even in the later stages. On




Figure 9: The breakdown of accuracy gains. For Panel (b), almost all the accuracy gains are from $a_t = 0$; thus, $ACC(t) \approx ACC_{OtF}(t)$.

average, updates occur more frequently than in the case of the straightforward policy.

Next, we evaluate the total amount of information acquired from each recommendation. We measure the *accuracy* of the estimation in round t by

$$ACC(t) := -\log(w_{t+1}/2).$$

The value w_{t+1} is the width of the confidence interval after the round- t update. Note that $w_1 = u_1 - l_1 = 1 - (-1) = 2$, and therefore, $ACC(0)$ is normalized to zero.

We define the *accuracy gain* from each recommendation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} ACC_{obey}(t) &:= -\sum_{s \in \mathcal{T}_{Obey}} \log(w_{s+1}/w_s); \\ ACC_{deviate}(t) &:= -\sum_{s \in \mathcal{T}_{Deviate}} \log(w_{s+1}/w_s); \\ ACC_{OtF}(t) &:= -\sum_{s \in \mathcal{T}_{OtF}} \log(w_{s+1}/w_s). \end{aligned}$$

Note that it is always the case that $ACC(t) = ACC_{obey}(t) + ACC_{deviate}(t) + ACC_{OtF}(t)$.

Figure 9 shows the accuracy gain from each recommendation under the straightforward policy and ternary policy. As illustrated in Panel (a), under the ternary policy, learning from obedience occurs more frequently than learning from deviations. Nevertheless, Panel (a) shows that the recommender acquires more information from deviations than obedience. This is because once a deviation occurs, it is much more informative than obedience.

The following theorem elucidates the informativeness of deviations under the straightforward policy.

Theorem 10 (Informativeness). Under the straightforward policy, if $a_t \neq b_t$, then

$$w_{t+1} < \frac{1}{2}w_t. \quad (6)$$

Conversely, if $a_t = b_t$, then

$$w_{t+1} > \frac{1}{2}w_t. \quad (7)$$

When a user deviates from the recommendation (i.e., when $a_t \neq b_t$), the width of the recommender's confidence interval will be at least halved. Since the recommender has an information advantage about z_t , a deviation occurs only if the recommender significantly misestimates the static payoff component. Accordingly, upon observing a deviation, the recommender can update her belief about θ by a large amount. In contrast, when a user obeys the recommendation (i.e., when $a_t = b_t$), the decrease of w_t is bounded. Note that, when users are obedient, it is frequently the case that no update occurs and so $w_{t+1} = w_t$. This is the case if the recommender's error $|x_t(\theta - m_t)|$ is small, and therefore, the user follows the recommendation blindly, given any $\theta \in [l_t, u_t]$.

Panel (b) of Figure 9 reveals that, under the ternary recommendation, almost all the accuracy gains are obtained when the recommender signals are on the fence. For any stage, the learning rate is higher than that under the straightforward policy, and the difference is quantitatively large. In round 10,000, the average accuracy under the ternary policy becomes larger than that under the straightforward policy by (roughly) six points, which implies that w_T under the ternary policy is $e^6 \approx 403$ times smaller than w_T under the straightforward policy.

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $C_1 = (1/2)C_{\text{update}}$ and

$$\mathcal{Z}(t) := \left\{ w_t \leq \frac{C_1}{\log T}, |\theta - m_t| \geq \frac{C_1}{2 \log T} \right\}.$$

In the following, we first show the following inequality.

Claim 1.a.

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{Z}(3)] \geq \frac{C_2}{\text{polylog}(T)}$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$.

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ u_2 \leq \theta + \frac{C_1}{6 \log T} \right\},$$




Figure 10: Illustration of $(l_t, u_t)_{t=1,2,3}$ in the instance of Theorem 1. Here, $w_3 = O(1/\log T)$ holds, which implies that (l_t, u_t) has very small chance of being updated again.

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ \theta - \frac{5C_1}{6\log T} \leq l_3 \leq \theta - \frac{2C_1}{3\log T} \right\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(3)$.

In order to evaluate the probability that $\mathcal{Z}(3)$ occurs, in the following, we evaluate the probability that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} occur, assuming $\theta > 2C_1/(\log T)$ (which occurs with probability $\Theta(1)$ for sufficiently large T).

Claim 1.b. $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}] = \Theta(1/(\log T))$.

Proof. Recall that $(l_1, u_1, m_1) = (-1, 1, 0)$. Let $\sigma_1 = \int_0^\infty 2\phi(x)dx$, which is equal to $-Z_1$ given $b_1 = -1$. Under $a_1 = -1$, $Z_1 = -\sigma_1$. Let

$$\mathcal{A}' := \{z_1 < 0\} \cap \left\{ \frac{\sigma_1}{\theta + \frac{C_1}{6\log T}} \leq x_1 \leq \frac{\sigma_1}{\theta} \right\}.$$

In the following, we show that \mathcal{A}' implies \mathcal{A} and $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}'] = \Omega(1/\log T)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}' &= \mathcal{A}' \cap \{a_1 = -1\} \quad (\text{by } x_1 m_1 + z_1 = z_1 < 0) \\ &= \mathcal{A}' \cap \{a_1 = -1, b_1 = -1\} \quad (\text{by } x_1 \theta + Z_1 = x_1 \theta - \sigma_1 < 0) \\ &= \mathcal{A}' \cap \left\{ a_1 = -1, b_1 = -1, u_2 \leq \theta + \frac{C_1}{6\log T} \right\} \quad (\text{by Eq. (3)}) \\ &\subseteq \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}] \geq \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}'] \quad (\text{by Eq. (8)})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{P}[z_1 < 0] \times \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\sigma_1}{\theta + \frac{C_1}{6\log T}} \leq x_1 \leq \frac{\sigma_1}{\theta}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\sigma_1}{\theta + \frac{C_1}{6\log T}} \leq x_1 \leq \frac{\sigma_1}{\theta}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\frac{\sigma_1}{\theta + \frac{C_1}{6\log T}}}^{\frac{\sigma_1}{\theta}} \phi(x) dx \\
&\geq \frac{\sigma_1}{2\theta^2} \frac{C_1}{6\log T} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma_1^2}{2\theta^2}\right) \quad (\text{for } \theta \geq C_1/(6\log T)) \\
&= \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\log T}\right) \quad (\text{since } \sigma_1, C_1, \theta = \Theta(1)).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Claim 1.c. The probability $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A}] = \Theta(1/(\log T))$.

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{B}' = \{x_2 > 0\} \cap \{x_2 m_2 + z_2 < 0\} \cap \left\{ \frac{-Z_2}{\theta - \frac{2C_1}{3\log T}} \leq x_2 \leq \frac{-Z_2}{\theta - \frac{5C_1}{6\log T}} \right\}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}' &= \mathcal{B}' \cap \{a_2 = -1\} \quad (\text{by } x_2 m_2 + z_2 < 0) \\
&= \mathcal{B}' \cap \{a_2 = -1, b_2 = 1\} \quad (\text{by } x_2 \theta + Z_2 > 2C_1/(3\log T) > 0) \\
&= \mathcal{B}' \cap \left\{ a_2 = -1, b_2 = 1, \theta - \frac{2C_1}{3\log T} \leq l_3 \leq \theta - \frac{5C_1}{6\log T} \right\} \quad (\text{by Eq. (2)}) \\
&\subseteq \mathcal{B}.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by using the fact that $-Z_2 \in (0, \sigma_1) = \Theta(1)$ and $\sigma_1 = \Theta(1)$, we have the following under $\{l_2 < 0, x_2 m_2 < 0\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A}] &\geq \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}'|\mathcal{A}] \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{-Z_2}{\theta - \frac{2C_1}{3\log T}} \leq x_2 \leq \frac{-Z_2}{\theta - \frac{5C_1}{6\log T}}, x_2 m_2 + z_2 < 0\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{-Z_2}{\theta - \frac{2C_1}{3\log T}} \leq x_2 \leq \frac{-Z_2}{\theta - \frac{5C_1}{6\log T}}\right] \times \frac{1}{2} \\
&\quad (\text{by } x_2 m_2 \leq 0) \\
&\geq \frac{C_1}{6\log T} \frac{-Z_2}{2\theta^2} \phi\left(\frac{-2Z_2}{\theta}\right) \times \frac{1}{2} \\
&\quad (\text{for } \theta \geq 2 \times \frac{5C_1}{6\log T})
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\log T}\right). \quad (\text{since } Z_2, C_1, \theta = \Theta(1))$$

□

Combining these claims, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{Z}(3)] \geq \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}] = \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}] \times \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A}] = \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\log T} \times \frac{1}{\log T}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{1}{(\log T)^2}\right), \quad (9)$$

as desired. □

Note that, by Lemma 3, $\mathcal{Z}(3)$ implies $\mathcal{Z}(4) \cap \mathcal{Z}(5) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{Z}(T)$ with probability at least $1 - 1/T$. It follows that $\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)]$ is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=3}^T \text{reg}(t) \middle| \mathcal{Z}(3)\right] \Omega\left(\frac{1}{(\log T)^2}\right) \quad (\text{by Eq. (9)}) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{T}\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=3}^T \text{reg}(t) \middle| \bigcap_{t=3}^T \mathcal{Z}(t)\right] \Omega\left(\frac{1}{(\log T)^2}\right) \\ &\quad (\text{by Lemma 3 and construction of } \mathcal{Z}(3)) \\ &= \Theta(1) \times \Omega\left(\frac{T}{(\log T)^2}\right) \times \Omega\left(\frac{1}{(\log T)^2}\right) \\ &\quad (\text{by Lemma 2, } \mathcal{Z}(t) \text{ implies } \mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t)] = \Omega(w_t^2) = \Omega(1/(\log T)^2)) \\ &= \Omega\left(\frac{T}{\text{polylog}(T)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

B.2 Lemma 11

We prove a lemma that is useful to prove Lemmas 2 and 3.

Lemma 11 (Gap between Z_t and $-x_t m_t$: Binary Case). There exist universal constants $C_l, C_u > 0$ such that the following inequalities hold.

1. If $\text{sgn}(x_t m_t) a_t < 0$, then

$$C_l \min\{1, 1/|x_t|\} < a_t(Z_t + x_t m_t) < C_u. \quad (10)$$

2. If $\text{sgn}(x_t m_t) a_t > 0$, then

$$C_l < a_t(Z_t + x_t m_t). \quad (11)$$




Figure 11: Illustration of Lemma 11 when $x_t m_t > 0$. The lemma bounds $G := a_t(Z_t + x_t m_t)$. The left figure corresponds to Eq. (10), whereas the right figure corresponds to Eq. (11).

The term $\min\{1, 1/|x|\}$ in Eq. (10) is derived from the fact that $e^{-x^2/2}$ decays faster for a large $|x|$. It is analogous to the equation

$$\frac{1}{(x+1)^2 - x^2} = \frac{1}{2x+1} \geq \frac{1}{3} \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{x}\right\}$$

for $x > 0$.

Proof of Lemma 11. For ease of discussion, we assume $x_t m_t \geq 0$ (which aligns with Figure 1). The case of $x_t m_t < 0$ can be dealt with the same discussion.

Let $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2}$ be the pdf of the standard normal distribution and $\text{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt$ be the error function. Let $a_t = -1$ and $C_2 = \min\{1, 1/|x_t m_t|\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_t + x_t m_t &= \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{-x_t m_t} (z + x_t m_t) \phi(z) dz}{\int_{-\infty}^{-x_t m_t} \phi(z) dz} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\phi(-x_t m_t)} \int_{-\infty}^{-x_t m_t} (z + x_t m_t) \phi(z) dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\phi(-x_t m_t)} \int_{-x_t m_t - 2C_2}^{-x_t m_t - C_2} (z + x_t m_t) \phi(z) dz \\ &\leq \frac{-C_2}{\phi(-x_t m_t)} \int_{-x_t m_t - 2C_2}^{-x_t m_t - C_2} \phi(z) dz \\ &\leq \frac{-C_2}{\phi(-x_t m_t)} \min_{z \in [-x_t m_t - 2C_2, -x_t m_t - C_2]} \phi(z) \\ &\leq -C_2 \min_{z \in [-x_t m_t - 2C_2, -x_t m_t - C_2]} e^{-(3/2)} = -C_2 e^{-(3/2)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\text{by } e^{-(x+a)^2/2}/e^{-x^2/2} = e^{-xa-a^2/2} \text{ and } |x_t m_t| C_2 \leq 1) \\
& = -e^{-(3/2)} \min\{1, 1/|x_t m_t|\} \leq -e^{-(3/2)} \min\{1, 1/|x_t|\},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the first inequality²⁴ of Eq. (10).

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_t + x_t m_t &= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}_{-\infty, -x_t m_t}^{\text{tr}}}[z] + x_t m_t \\
&= \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{-x_t m_t} (z + x_t m_t) \phi(z) dz}{\int_{-\infty}^{-x_t m_t} \phi(z) dz} \\
&\geq \frac{\int_{-\infty}^0 z \phi(z) dz}{\int_{-\infty}^0 \phi(z) dz} \\
&\quad (\text{by } \phi(x+c)/\phi(x) \leq \phi(c) \text{ for any } x, c \leq 0) \\
&= -\frac{\int_0^{\infty} z \phi(z) dz}{\int_0^{\infty} \phi(z) dz} \\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}},
\end{aligned}$$

which is a constant and implies the second inequality²⁵ of Eq. (10).

If $a_t = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_t + x_t m_t &= \mathbb{E}_{z \in \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(-x_t m_t, \infty)}[z] + x_t m_t \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{z \in \mathcal{N}^{\text{tr}}(0, \infty)}[z] \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies Eq. (11). □

B.3 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof of Lemma 2. Without loss of generality, we assume $m_t \geq 0$. (Otherwise, by using the symmetry of the model, we may flip the sign of variables as $(l_t, u_t, \theta) = (-u_t, -l_t, -\theta)$ and apply the same analysis to obtain the same result.) For the ease of discussion, we assume $m_t - \theta > 0$. (In the case of $m_t - \theta < 0$, we can follow essentially the same discussion as the case of $m_t - \theta > 0$.)

For $t \in [T]$ and $l > 0$, let

$$\mathcal{C}(t, l) := \{-x_t m_t < z_t < -x_t \theta - l\} \cap \{x_t(m_t - \theta) < C_1\}.$$

²⁴Note that $a_t = -1$ and the inequality here is flipped.

²⁵Again, $a_t = -1$ and the inequality here is flipped.




Figure 12: Recommendation a_t is determined by the sign of $x_tm_t + z_t$, whereas the true superior arm is determined by $x_t\theta + z_t$. When $z_t \in [-x_tm_t, -x_t\theta]$, the recommender fails to recommend the superior arm.

Claim 3.a. $\mathcal{C}(t, l) \subseteq \{\text{reg}(t) \geq l\}$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{-x_tm_t < z_t < -x_t\theta - l\} \cap \{x_t(m_t - \theta) < C_1\} \\
&= \{0 < x_tm_t + z_t\} \cap \{x_t\theta + z_t < -l\} \cap \{x_t(m_t - \theta) < C_1\} \\
&\subseteq \{0 < x_tm_t + z_t\} \cap \{x_t\theta + z_t < -l\} \cap \{x_t\theta + Z_t > 0\} \quad (\text{by Eq. (11)}) \\
&= \{x_t\theta + z_t < -l\} \cap \{b_t^* = -1\} \cap \{a_t = 1\} \cap \{b_t = 1\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from $b_t \neq b_t^*$ and $x_t\theta + z_t < -l$ that $\text{reg}(t) > l$. □

Claim 3.b. $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{C}(t, l)] \geq \Theta(m_t - \theta - l)$.

Proof. By using the fact that C_1 is a universal constant and $1 \geq m_t > \theta \geq -1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[x_t(m_t - \theta) < C_1] &\geq \mathbb{P}[2x_t < C_1, x_t > 0] \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}[C_1/2 < 2x_t < C_1, x_t > 0] \\
&\geq \int_{C_1/4}^{C_1/2} \phi(x) dx \\
&= \Theta(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $C_1/4 \leq x_t \leq C_1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[-x_t m_t < z_t < -x_t \theta - l] &= \int_{-x_t m_t}^{-x_t \theta - l} \phi(z) dz \\ &= x_t(m_t - \theta - l) \min_{z \in \{-x_t m_t, -x_t \theta - l\}} \phi(z) \\ &= \Theta(m_t - \theta - l).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{C}(t, l)] \geq \Theta(1) \times \Theta(m_t - \theta - l) = \Theta(m_t - \theta - l)$. \square

Combining Claims 3.a and 3.b, the regret is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t)] &\geq \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[\text{reg}(t) \geq l] dl \\ &\geq \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{C}(t, l)] dl \quad (\text{by Claim 3.a}) \\ &\geq \int_0^{m_t - \theta} \Theta(m_t - \theta - l) dl \quad (\text{by Claim 3.b}) \\ &= \Omega((m_t - \theta)^2).\end{aligned}$$

\square

B.4 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof of Lemma 3. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}_1(t) &= \{b_t \text{sgn}(x_t) < 0\} \cap \{b_t > -Z_t/x_t\}, \\ \mathcal{U}_2(t) &= \{b_t \text{sgn}(x_t) > 0\} \cap \{a_t < -Z_t/x_t\}, \\ \mathcal{U}(t) &= \mathcal{U}_1(t) \cup \mathcal{U}_2(t).\end{aligned}$$

By the update rule (Eq. (2) and (3)), event $\mathcal{U}(t)$ is equivalent to $(l_{t+1}, u_{t+1}) \neq (l_t, u_t)$.

Eq. (10) and (11) in Lemma 11 imply

$$|Z_t - x_t m_t| \geq C_1 \min\{1, 1/|x_t|\}. \quad (12)$$

Accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}(t) &= \mathcal{U}_1(t) \cup \mathcal{U}_2(t) \\ &\subseteq \{b_t > -Z_t/x_t\} \cup \{a_t < -Z_t/x_t\} \\ &\subseteq \{w_t/2 > C_1 \min\{1/|x_t|, 1/|x_t|^2\}\} \\ &\quad (\text{by } u_t - m_t = m_t - l_t = w_t/2 \text{ and Eq. (12)}).\end{aligned}$$

For a sufficiently small w_t ,²⁶

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{U}(t)] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[w_t > \frac{2C_1}{x_t^2}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left[x_t^2 > \frac{2C_1}{w_t}\right] \\
&= 2\Phi^c\left(\sqrt{\frac{2C_1}{w_t}}\right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{2C_1}{w_t}\right) \times 2\Phi^c(0) \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{2C_1}{w_t}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

B.5 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof of Theorem 4. Let

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \left\{w_{t+1} \leq \frac{5}{6}w_t\right\}.$$

Lemmas 5 and 6 imply that there exists a universal constant $C_{\text{shrink}} > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}(t)] \geq C_{\text{shrink}}w_t. \quad (13)$$

Lemma 7 states that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t)] \leq C_{\text{regt}}w_t^2. \quad (14)$$

For $s = 1, 2, \dots$, let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_s(t) &= \left\{\left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^s \leq w_t \leq \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{s-1}\right\}, \\
\text{Reg}_s(T) &= \sum_{t=1}^T \text{reg}(t) \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{P}(t)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let t_s be the first round in which $\mathcal{P}_s(t)$ holds. Then, for each round $t = t_s + 1, t_s + 2, \dots$, we have the following:

1. Eq. (13) implies that, with probability at least $C_{\text{shrink}}(5/6)^{s-1}$, $\mathcal{E}(t)$ occurs. Furthermore, once $\mathcal{E}(t)$ occurs, $\mathcal{P}_s(t')$ never occurs again for round $t' > t$.
2. Eq. (14) implies that the expected regret per round is at most $C_{\text{regt}}(5/6)^{2(s-1)}$.

²⁶ $w_t \leq 2C_1$ is enough to assure $\{w_t/2 > C_1/|x_t|\} \subseteq \{w_t/2 > C_1/|x_t|^2\}$ because $\{w_t \leq 2C_1, w_t/2 > C_1/|x_t|\}$ implies $|x_t| > 1$.

Accordingly, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}_s(T)] &\leq C_{\text{regt}} \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{2(s-1)} \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \left[1 - C_{\text{shrink}} \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{s-1}\right]^u \\ &= \frac{C_{\text{regt}}}{C_{\text{shrink}}} \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{s-1}.\end{aligned}$$

The regret is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] &= \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}_s(T)] \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\text{regt}}}{C_{\text{shrink}}} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{s-1} \\ &= \frac{6C_{\text{regt}}}{C_{\text{shrink}}},\end{aligned}$$

which is a constant. □

B.6 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof of Lemma 5. Let

$$\mathcal{X}(t) := \{x_t \geq 3C_\epsilon\}.$$

Claim 6.a. $\mathcal{X}(t)$ and $a_t = 0$ implies $w_{t+1} \leq (5/6)w_t$.

Proof. Eq. (2) and (3) imply that $l_{t+1} = \max\{l_t, -Z_t/x_t\}$ or $u_{t+1} = \min\{u_t, -Z_t/x_t\}$ always holds. By using this, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\{\mathcal{X}(t), a_t = 0\} \\ &:= \{x_t \geq 3C_\epsilon, a_t = 0\} \\ &= \{x_t \geq 3C_\epsilon, |x_t m_t + Z_t| \leq \epsilon_t\} \\ &\subseteq \{|m_t + Z_t/x_t| \leq \epsilon_t/(3C_\epsilon)\} \\ &= \{|m_t + Z_t/x_t| \leq \epsilon_t/(3C_\epsilon)\} \cap \{l_{t+1} = \max\{l_t, -Z_t/x_t\} \cup u_{t+1} = \min\{u_t, -Z_t/x_t\}\} \\ &\quad (\text{by Eq. (2) and (3)}) \\ &\subseteq \{l_{t+1} \geq m_t - \epsilon_t/(3C_\epsilon) \cup u_{t+1} \leq m_t + \epsilon_t/(3C_\epsilon)\} \\ &= \{l_{t+1} \geq m_t - (1/3)w_t \cup u_{t+1} \leq m_t + (1/3)w_t\}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by $w_t/2 = u_t - m_t = m_t - l_t$, we have

$$\{l_{t+1} \geq m_t - (1/3)w_t \cup u_{t+1} \leq m_t + (1/3)w_t\} \subseteq \{w_{t+1} \leq (5/6)w_t\}.$$

□

Claim 6.b. $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{X}(t), a_t = 0] = \Theta(1)$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{X}(t), a_t = 0] &= \int_{3C_\epsilon}^{\infty} \int_{-x_t m_t - \epsilon_t}^{-x_t m_t + \epsilon_t} \phi(z) \phi(x) dz dx \\
&\geq \epsilon_t \int_{3C_\epsilon}^{\infty} \phi(-x_t - \epsilon_t) \phi(x) dx \\
&\geq \epsilon_t \int_{3C_\epsilon}^{\infty} \phi(-x_t - 1) \phi(x) dx \\
&\geq \frac{\epsilon_t}{2\pi} \int_{3C_\epsilon}^{\infty} e^{-(x+1)^2} dx =: C_{w,2} \epsilon_t.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Combining Claims 6.a and 6.b, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P} \left[w_{t+1} \leq \frac{5}{6} w_t \mid a_t = 0 \right] \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P} \left[w_{t+1} \leq \frac{5}{6} w_t, a_t = 0 \right]}{\mathbb{P}[a_t = 0]} \\
&\geq \frac{\mathbb{P} \left[w_{t+1} \leq \frac{5}{6} w_t, a_t = 0 \right]}{C_{\text{OtF}}^U \epsilon_t} \quad (\text{by Lemma 6}) \\
&\geq \frac{\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{X}(t), a_t = 0]}{C_{\text{OtF}}^U \epsilon_t} \quad (\text{by Claim 6.a}) \\
&\geq \frac{C_{w,2}}{C_{\text{OtF}}^U \epsilon_t} \quad (\text{by Claim 6.b}) \\
&=: C_w.
\end{aligned}$$

□

B.7 Proof of Lemma 6

Proof of Lemma 6. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[a_t = 0] &= \mathbb{P}[|x_t m_t + z_t| \leq \epsilon_t] \\
&= \mathbb{P} \left[\int_{-\epsilon_t/(1+m_t^2)}^{\epsilon_t/(1+m_t^2)} \phi(x) dx \right] \quad (\text{by } x_t m_t + z_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1 + m_t^2) \text{ given } m_t) \\
&= \Theta(\epsilon_t) \quad (\text{by } 1 \leq (1 + m_t^2) \leq 2 \text{ and } \phi(x) \leq 1),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

B.8 Proof of Lemma 7

We first introduce the following lemmas.

Lemma 12 (Gap between Z_t and $-x_t m_t$: Ternary Case). There exist universal constants $C_1 > 0$ such that the following inequalities hold.

1. If $\text{sgn}(x_t m_t) a_t < 0$, then

$$C_1 \min\{1, 1/|x_t|\} < a_t(Z_t + x_t m_t). \quad (15)$$

2. If $\text{sgn}(x_t m_t) a_t > 0$, then

$$C_1 < a_t(Z_t + x_t m_t). \quad (16)$$

Lemma 12 is a version of Lemma 11 for the ternary recommendation. We omit the proof of Lemma 12 because it follows the same steps as Lemma 11.

Lemma 13 (Expected Regret from Choosing the Inferior Arm). The following inequality holds:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t) \mathbf{1}\{b_t^* \neq b_t, a_t \neq 0\}] = O(w_t^2).$$

Proof of Lemma 13. We have

$$\{b_t^* \neq b_t, a_t \neq 0\} \subseteq \{b_t^* \neq a_t, a_t \neq 0\} \cup \{a_t \neq b_t, a_t \neq 0\},$$

and we bound each of the terms on the right-hand side.

Claim 8.a. $\mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t) \mathbf{1}\{b_t^* \neq a_t, a_t \neq 0\}] = O(w_t^2)$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \{b_t^* \neq a_t, a_t \neq 0\} &\subseteq \{b_t^* \neq a_t\} \\ &= \{\text{sgn}(x_t \theta + z_t) \neq \text{sgn}(x_t m_t + z_t)\} \\ &= \{z_t \in [\min\{-x_t \theta, -x_t m_t\}, \max\{-x_t \theta, -x_t m_t\}]\}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus, conditioning on x_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}[z_t \in [\min\{-x_t \theta, -x_t m_t\}, \max\{-x_t \theta, -x_t m_t\}] | x_t] \\ &\leq \int_{\min\{-x_t \theta, -x_t m_t\}}^{\max\{-x_t \theta, -x_t m_t\}} \phi(z) dz \\ &\leq \int_{\min\{-x_t \theta, -x_t m_t\}}^{\max\{-x_t \theta, -x_t m_t\}} dz = |x_t(\theta - m_t)|, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where we have used the fact that $\phi(z) \leq 1$. The event $b_t^* \neq a_t$ implies $\text{reg}(t) \leq x_t w_t$, and marginalizing Eq. (17) over x_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t) \mathbf{1}\{b_t^* \neq a_t, a_t \neq 0\}] &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) |x^2 w_t (\theta - m_t)| dx \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) x^2 w_t^2 dx \\ &= w_t^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) x^2 dx \\ &= O(w_t^2), \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Claim 8.b. $\mathbb{P}[a_t \neq b_t, a_t \neq 0] = O(w_t^2)$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} &\{a_t \neq b_t, a_t \neq 0\} \\ &= \{\text{sgn}(x_t m_t + z_t) \neq \text{sgn}(x_t \theta + Z_t), a_t \neq 0\} \\ &\subseteq \{x_t m_t + z_t > 0, x_t \theta + Z_t < 0\} \cup \{x_t m_t + z_t < 0, x_t \theta + Z_t > 0\} \\ &\subseteq \{x_t \theta - x_t m_t + C_1 \min\{1, 1/|x_t|\} < 0\} \cup \{x_t \theta - x_t m_t - C_1 \min\{1, 1/|x_t|\} > 0\} \\ &\quad (\text{by Eq. (15) and Eq. (16)}) \\ &= \{|x_t \theta - x_t m_t| \geq C_1 \min\{1, 1/|x_t|\}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[a_t \neq b_t, a_t \neq 0] &\leq \mathbb{P}[|x_t \theta - x_t m_t| \geq C_1 \min\{1, 1/|x_t|\}] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left[|x_t|^2 \geq \frac{C_1}{|\theta - m_t|}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[|x_t|^2 \geq \frac{C_1}{w_t}\right] \\ &= 2\Phi^c\left(\sqrt{\frac{C_1}{w_t}}\right) \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{w_t}{2C_1}} \\ &= O(w_t^2). \quad (\text{An exponential decays faster than any polynomial}) \end{aligned}$$

□

(Proof of Lemma 13, continued.) Combining Claims 8.a and 8.b, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t) \mathbf{1}\{b_t^* \neq b_t, a_t \neq 0\}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t) \mathbf{1}\{b_t^* \neq a_t, a_t \neq 0\}] + \mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t) \mathbf{1}\{a_t \neq b_t, a_t \neq 0\}]$$

$$= O(w_t^2).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 7.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\text{reg}(t)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{a_t = 0\}\text{reg}(t)] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{b_t \neq b_t^*, a_t \neq 0\}\text{reg}(t)] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{a_t = 0\}|x_t\theta + z_t|] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{b_t \neq b_t^*, a_t \neq 0\}\text{reg}(t)] \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}[a_t = 0](\epsilon_t + w_t) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{b_t \neq b_t^*, a_t \neq 0\}\text{reg}(t)] \\
&\quad (\text{by } a_t = 0 \text{ implies } |x_t m_t + z_t| \leq \epsilon_t \text{ and } |x_t\theta + z_t| - |x_t m_t + z_t| \leq |x_t w_t|) \\
&\leq O((\epsilon_t + w_t)^2) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{b_t \neq b_t^*, a_t \neq 0\}\text{reg}(t)] \quad (\text{by Lemma 6}) \\
&\leq O((\epsilon_t + w_t)^2) + O(w_t^2) \quad (\text{by Lemma 13}) \\
&= O((\max\{\epsilon_t, w_t\})^2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

B.9 Proof of Theorem 8

Proof of Theorem 8. For $c \geq 1$, it follows from (Feller, 1968) that

$$\mathbb{P}[|x_t| \geq c] \leq e^{-\frac{c^2}{2}},$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|x_t| \geq \sqrt{2\log(1/\delta)}\right] \leq \delta.$$

Therefore, if $w_t \leq \delta^2/(4\sqrt{\pi\log(1/\delta)})$, then with probability $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-x_t^2} \geq |x_t|w_t \tag{18}$$

for all $\theta \in [-1, 1]$.

Consider an arbitrary threshold policy $\rho_t \neq \rho_t^{\text{st}}$. When the user always follows the recommendation (i.e., ρ_t belongs to Case 4), from the perspective of the recommender, the user's expected payoff is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\theta} \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t], z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1}\{a_t = 1\} \left(x_t \tilde{\theta} + z_t \right) \right] = x_t m_t (1 - \Phi(\rho_t)) + \phi(\rho_t),$$

and this formula takes maximum at $\rho_t^{\text{st}} := -x_t m_t$. Accordingly, whenever the straightforward policy is suboptimal, (i.e., there exists ρ_t such that $V(\rho_t) > V(\rho_t^{\text{st}})$), then there exists $\theta^d \in [l_t, u_t]$ such that the user deviates from the recommendation at θ^d given ρ_t . Note that the only possible strategies for the user for a fixed (x_t, θ) is (i) to follow the recommendation (i.e., $b_t = a_t$), (ii) to deviate to -1 (i.e., $b_t = -1$ regardless of a_t), or (iii) to deviate to 1 (i.e., $b_t = 1$ regardless of a_t).

We examine the latter two cases of deviations.

Case A ($b_t = -1$ while $a_t = 1$): In this case, at θ^d , the user chooses arm -1 even when $a_t = 1$. Since the user takes $b_t = -1$ deterministically, his expected payoff (computed before receiving a_t) is fixed to 0. Accordingly, the user adopts this strategy at θ^d if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1} \{z_t \geq \rho_t\} (x_t \theta^d + z_t) \right] &< 0, \\ \left(\mathbb{E}_{z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[x_t \theta^d + z_t \right] \right) x_t \theta^d &< 0.\end{aligned}$$

Using $|\theta - \theta^d| \leq w_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} [\mathbf{1} \{z_t \geq \rho_t\} (x_t \theta + z_t)] &\leq |x_t| w_t \\ x_t \theta &\leq |x_t| w_t,\end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta \in [l_t, u_t]$. Accordingly, this user's expected payoff under ρ_t is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\theta} \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t], z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1} \{b_t = 1\} (x_t \tilde{\theta} + z_t) \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\theta} \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t]} \left[\max \left\{ 0, \mathbb{E}_{z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1} \{z_t \geq \rho_t\} (x_t \tilde{\theta} + z_t) \right] \right\}, x_t \tilde{\theta} \right] \\ \leq |x_t| w_t.\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, the user's expected payoff from the straightforward policy given x_t is bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\theta} \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t], z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1} \{z_t \geq -x_t m_t\} (x_t \tilde{\theta} + z_t) \right] \\ = \int_{-x_t m_t}^{\infty} (x_t m_t + z_t) \phi(z_t) dz_t \\ = \int_0^{\infty} z' \phi(z' - x_t m_t) dz' \\ = \int_0^{\infty} z' \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(z' - x_t m_t)^2/2} dz' \\ \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(x_t m_t)^2} \int_0^{\infty} z' e^{-(z')^2} dz' \quad (\text{by } x^2 + y^2 \geq (x + y)^2/2) \\ = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(x_t m_t)^2} \\ \geq |x_t| w_t \quad (\text{by Eq. (18)}),\end{aligned}$$

implying that ρ_t is suboptimal.

Case B ($b_t = 1$ while $a_t = -1$): Most of the argument is parallel to Case A. In this case, the user chooses arm 1 regardless of $a_t \in \{-1, 1\}$ at θ^d . Such a choice is optimal for the user if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}_{z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1} \left\{ z_t \geq \rho_t^{\text{myopic}} \right\} (x_t \theta^d + z_t) \right] < x_t \theta^d$$

$$0 < x_t \theta^d.$$

Using $|\theta - \theta^d| \leq w_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1} \left\{ z_t \geq \rho_t^{\text{myopic}} \right\} (x_t \theta + z_t) \right] &\leq x_t \theta + |x_t| w_t \\ 0 &\leq x_t \theta + |x_t| w_t, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta \in [l_t, u_t]$, which implies that the expected payoff is at most

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\theta} \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t], z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1} \{b_t = 1\} (x_t \tilde{\theta} + z_t) \right] \leq x_t \theta + |x_t| w_t.$$

Meanwhile, the expected payoff when the user follows the straightforward recommendation is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\theta} \sim \text{Unif}[l_t, u_t], z_t \sim \mathcal{N}} \left[\mathbf{1} \{z_t \geq -x_t m_t\} (x \tilde{\theta} + z_t) \right] \\ &= x_t m_t - \int_{-\infty}^{-x_t m_t} (x_t m_t + z_t) \phi(z_t) dz_t \\ &= x_t m_t + \int_0^{\infty} z' \phi(-x_t m_t - z') dz' \\ &\geq x_t m_t + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(x_t m_t)^2} \\ &\geq x_t m_t + |x_t| w_t, \quad (\text{by Eq. (18)}) \end{aligned}$$

implying that ρ_t is suboptimal.

In summary, (i) $x_t \leq \sqrt{2 \log(1/\delta)}$ occurs with probability at least $1 - \delta$, and (ii) when it occurs, if $w_t \leq \delta^2 / (4\sqrt{\pi \log(1/\delta)})$, then $\rho_t^{\text{st}} = -x_t m_t$ is optimal. \square

B.10 Proof of Theorem 9

We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 14 (Geometric Update by EvE). Under the exploration phase of the EvE policy, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[w_{t+1} < \frac{1}{2} w_t \mid l_t, u_t \right] > C_{\text{EvEupdate}}.$$

for all l_t, u_t .

Proof of Lemma 14. We prove the case of $m_t > 0$. The proof for the other case is similar. When $z_t < c(x_t m_t)$, the recommender sends $a_t = -1$, and user t 's expected payoff from arm 1 is $x_t(\theta - m_t)$. Accordingly, for any case, the confidence interval is halved.

We evaluate the probability that $z_t < c(x_t m_t)$ occurs. Since $c(x_t m_t)$ is defined to satisfy $\mathbb{E}[z'_t | z'_t < c(x_t m_t)] = -x_t m_t$, we have $c(x_t m_t) > -x_t m_t$. Since $x_t \sim \mathcal{N}$, with probability $\Phi(1) - \Phi(0)$,

$x_t \in (0, 1)$. For such x_t , $-x_t m_t \in (-m_t, 0)$, and therefore, $-x_t m_t < -m_t \leq -1$. Accordingly, for any $z_t < -1$, we have $z_t < c(x_t m_t)$. Accordingly, with probability at least $(\Phi(1) - \Phi(0))\Phi(-1) = \Theta(1)$, $w_{t+1} < w_t/2$ occurs. \square

Proof of Theorem 9. By Lemma 14, the confidence interval shrinks geometrically with a constant probability, and it takes $O(\log T)$ rounds in expectation to have $w_t < 1/\sqrt{T}$ to terminate the exploration phase. During the exploration phase, the per-round regret is $O(1)$ in expectation, and therefore, $O(\log T)$ regret is incurred. During the exploitation phase, the per-round regret is $O(w_t^2) = O(1/T)$ (implied by Lemma 2), and therefore, the total regret is $O(1/T \times T) = O(1)$. Accordingly, $O(\log T)$ regret is incurred in total. \square

B.11 Proof of Theorem 10

Proof of Theorem 10. For ease of discussion, we assume $x_t > 0$. The case of $x_t < 0$ can be proved in a similar manner.

Case 1. $a_t = b_t = 1$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{t+1} &= u_{t+1} - l_{t+1} \\
&= u_t - \max\{l_t, (-Z_t/x_t)\} \quad (\text{by Eq. (2) and (3)}) \\
&> u_t - m_t \quad (\text{by } m_t > l_t \text{ and } a_t = 1 \text{ if and only if } m_t > -z_t/x_t) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}w_t.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Case 2. $a_t = b_t = -1$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{t+1} &= u_{t+1} - l_{t+1} \\
&= \min\{u_t, (-Z_t/x_t)\} - l_t \quad (\text{by Eq. (2) and (3)}) \\
&< m_t - l_t \quad (\text{by } m_t < u_t \text{ and } a_t = -1 \text{ if and only if } m_t < -z_t/x_t) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}w_t.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Eq. (6) follows from Eq. (19) and (20).

Case 3. $a_t = -1, b_t = 1$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{t+1} &= u_{t+1} - l_{t+1} \\
&\leq u_t - (-Z_t/x_t) \quad (\text{by Eq. (2) and (3)})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&< u_t - m_t \quad (\text{by } a_t = -1) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}w_t.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Case 4. $a_t = 1, b_t = -1$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{t+1} &= u_{t+1} - l_{t+1} \\
&\leq (-Z_t/x_t) - l_t \quad (\text{by Eq. (2) and (3)}) \\
&< m_t - l_t \quad (\text{by } a_t = 1) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}w_t.
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Eq. (7) follows from Eq. (21) and (22).

□