

---

# Variance-Aware Sparse Linear Bandits

---

**Yan Dai**  
Tsinghua University  
yan-dai20@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

**Ruosong Wang**  
Carnegie Mellon University  
ruosongw@andrew.cmu.edu

**Simon S. Du**  
University of Washington  
ssdu@cs.washington.edu

## Abstract

It is well-known that the worst-case minimax regret for sparse linear bandits is  $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{dT})$  where  $d$  is the ambient dimension and  $T$  is the number of time steps (ignoring the dependency on sparsity). On the other hand, in the benign setting where there is no noise and the action set is the unit sphere, one can use divide-and-conquer to achieve an  $\tilde{O}(1)$  regret, which is (nearly) independent of  $d$  and  $T$ . In this paper, we present the first variance-aware regret guarantee for sparse linear bandits:  $\tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{d\sum_{t=1}^T\sigma_t^2 + 1}\right)$ , where  $\sigma_t^2$  is the variance of the noise at the  $t$ -th time step. This bound naturally interpolates the regret bounds for the worst-case constant-variance regime ( $\sigma_t = \Omega(1)$ ) and the benign deterministic regimes ( $\sigma_t = 0$ ). To achieve this variance-aware regret guarantee, we develop a general framework that converts any variance-aware linear bandit algorithm to a variance-aware algorithm for sparse linear bandits in a “black-box” manner. Specifically, we take two recent algorithms as black boxes to illustrate that the claimed bounds indeed hold, where the first algorithm can handle unknown-variance cases and the second one is more efficient.

## 1 Introduction

This paper studies the sparse linear stochastic bandit problem, which is a special case of linear stochastic bandits. In linear bandits (Dani et al., 2008), the agent is facing a sequential decision-making problem lasting for  $T$  rounds. For the  $t$ -th round, the agent chooses an action  $x_t \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is an action set, and receives a noisy reward  $r_t = \langle \theta^*, x_t \rangle + \eta_t$  where  $\theta^* \in \mathcal{X}$  is the (hidden) parameter of the game and  $\eta_t$  is random zero-mean noise. The goal of the agent is to minimize her *regret*  $\mathcal{R}_T$ , that is, the difference between her cumulative reward  $\sum_{t=1}^T \langle \theta^*, x_t \rangle$  and  $\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle \theta^*, x \rangle$  (check Eq. (2) for a definition). Dani et al. (2008) proved that the minimax optimal regret for linear bandits is  $\tilde{\Theta}(d\sqrt{T})$  when the noises are independent Gaussian random variables with means 0 and variances 1 and both  $\theta^*$  and the action set  $\mathcal{X}$  is the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .<sup>1</sup>

In real-world applications such as recommendation systems, only a few features may be relevant despite a large candidate feature space. In other words, the high-dimensional linear regime may actually allow a low-dimensional structure. As a result, if we still use the linear bandit model, we will always suffer  $\Omega(d\sqrt{T})$  regret no matter how many features are useful. Motivated by this, the sparse lin-

---

<sup>1</sup>Throughout the paper, we will use the notations  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  and  $\tilde{\Theta}(\cdot)$  to hide  $\log T$ ,  $\log d$ ,  $\log s$  (where  $s$  is the sparsity parameter, which will be introduced later) and  $\log \log \frac{1}{\delta}$  factors (where  $\delta$  is the failure probability).

ear stochastic bandit problem was introduced (Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2012; Carpentier and Munos, 2012). This problem has an additional constraint that the hidden parameter,  $\theta^*$ , is sparse, i.e.,  $\|\theta^*\|_0 \leq s$  for some  $s \ll d$ . However, the agent has *no* prior knowledge about  $s$  and thus the interaction protocol is exactly the same as that of linear bandits. The minimax optimal regret for sparse linear bandits is  $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{sdT})$  (Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2012; Antos and Szepesvári, 2009).<sup>2</sup> This bound bypasses the  $\Omega(d\sqrt{T})$  lower bound for linear bandits as we always have  $s = \|\theta^*\|_0 \leq d$  and the agent does not have access to  $s$  either (though a few previous works assumed a known  $s$ ).

However, both the  $\tilde{\Theta}(d\sqrt{T})$  and the  $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{sdT})$  bounds are the *worst-case* regret bounds and sometimes are too pessimistic especially when  $d$  is large. On the other hand, many problems with delicate structures permit a regret bound much smaller than the worst-case bound. The structure this paper focuses on is the magnitude of the noise. Consider the following motivating example.

**Motivating Example (Deterministic Sparse Linear Bandits):** Consider the case where the action set is the unit ball  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{B}^d$ , and there is no noise, i.e., the feedback is  $r_t = \langle \theta^*, x_t \rangle$  for each time step  $t \in [T]$ . In this case, one can identify all non-zero entries of  $\theta^*$  coordinates in  $\mathcal{O}(s \log d)$  steps with high probability via a divide-and-conquer algorithm, and thus yield a *dimension-free* regret  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s)$  (see Appendix B for more details about this).<sup>3</sup> However, this divide-and-conquer algorithm is specific for deterministic sparse linear bandit problems and does not work for noisy models. Henceforth, we study the following natural question:

*Can we design an algorithm whose regret adapts to the noise level such that the regret interpolates the  $\sqrt{dT}$ -type bound in the worst case and the dimension-free bound in the deterministic case?*

Before introducing our results, we would like to mention that there are recent works that studied the noise-adaptivity in linear bandits (Zhou et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2021). They gave *variance-aware* regret bounds of the form  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\text{poly}(d)\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2} + \text{poly}(d)\right)$  where  $\sigma_t^2$  is the (conditional) variance of the noise  $\eta_t$ . This bound reduces to the standard  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{poly}(d)\sqrt{T})$  bound in the worst-case when  $\sigma_t = \Omega(1)$ , and to a constant-type regret  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\text{poly}(d))$  that is independent of  $T$ . However, compared with the linear bandits setting, the variance-aware bound for sparse linear bandits is more significant because it reduces to a *dimension-free* bound in the noiseless setting. Despite this, to our knowledge, no variance-aware regret bounds exist for sparse linear bandits.

## 1.1 Our Contributions

This paper gives the first set of variance-aware regret bounds for sparse linear bandits. We design a general framework to reduce variance-aware sparse linear bandits to variance-aware linear bandits with little overhead in regret. For the ease of presentation, we define the following notation to characterize the *variance-awareness* of a sparse linear bandit algorithm:

**Definition 1.** A *variance-aware sparse linear bandit algorithm*  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $(f(s, d), g(s, d))$ -variance-aware, if for any given failure probability  $\delta > 0$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  ensures

$$\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(f(s, d)\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2} \text{polylog} \frac{1}{\delta} + g(s, d)\text{polylog} \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$$

when  $\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}}$  is the regret of  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $T$  time steps,  $d$  is the ambient dimension and  $s$  is the maximum number of non-zero coordinates. Specifically, for linear bandits,  $f, g$  are functions only of  $d$ .

<sup>2</sup>Carpentier and Munos (2012) and Lattimore et al. (2015) obtained an  $\mathcal{O}(s\sqrt{T})$  regret bound under different models. The former one assumed a component-wise noise model, while the latter one assumed a  $\|\theta^*\|_1 \leq 1$  ground-truth as well as a  $\|x_t\|_\infty \leq 1$  action space. See Appendix A for more discussions on this.

<sup>3</sup>We also remark that some assumptions on the action is needed. For example, if every action can only query one coordinate (each action corresponds to one vector of the standard basis) then an  $\Omega(d)$  regret lower bound is unavoidable. Hence, in this paper, we only consider the benign case that action set is the unit ball.

Hence, an  $(f, g)$ -variance-aware algorithm will achieve  $\tilde{O}(f(s, d)\sqrt{T} \text{polylog } \frac{1}{\delta})$  worst-case regret and  $\tilde{O}(g(s, d) \text{polylog } \frac{1}{\delta})$  deterministic-case regret. Ideally, we would like  $g(s, d)$  being independent of  $d$ , making the bound *dimension-free* in deterministic cases, as the divide-and-conquer approach.

In this paper, we provide a general framework that can convert *any* linear bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$  to a corresponding sparse linear bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{G}$  in a black-box manner. Moreover, it is *variance-aware-preserving*, in the sense that, if  $\mathcal{F}$  enjoys the variance-aware property, so does  $\mathcal{G}$ . Generally speaking, if the plug-in linear bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $(f(d), g(d))$ -variance-aware, then our framework directly gives an  $(s(f(s) + \sqrt{d}), s(g(s) + 1))$ -variance-aware algorithm  $\mathcal{G}$  for sparse linear bandits.

Besides presenting our framework, we also illustrate its usefulness by plugging in two existing variance-aware linear bandit algorithms, where the first one is variance-aware (i.e., works in unknown-variance cases) but computationally inefficient. In contrast, the second one is efficient but requires the variance  $\sigma_t^2$  to be delivered together with feedback  $r_t$ . Their regret guarantees are stated as follows.

1. The first variance-aware linear bandit algorithm we plug in is VOFUL, which was proposed by Zhang et al. (2021) and improved by Kim et al. (2021). This algorithm is computationally inefficient but deals with *unknown variances* and yields better regret bound than the second algorithm. Using this VOFUL, our framework generates a  $(s^{2.5} + s\sqrt{d}, s^3)$ -variance-aware algorithm for sparse linear bandits. Compared to the  $\Omega(\sqrt{sdT})$  regret lower-bound for sparse linear bandits (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, §24.3), our worst-case regret bound is near-optimal up to a factor  $\sqrt{s}$ . Moreover, our bound is independent of  $d$  and  $T$  in the deterministic case, nearly matching the bound of divide-and-conquer algorithm dedicated to the deterministic setting up to  $\text{poly}(s)$  factors.
2. The second algorithm we plug in is Weighted OFUL (Zhou et al., 2021), which requires known variances but is computationally efficient. We obtain an  $(s^2 + s\sqrt{d}, s^{1.5}\sqrt{T})$ -variance-aware *efficient* algorithm. In the deterministic case, this algorithm can only achieve a  $\sqrt{T}$ -type regret bound (albeit still independent of  $d$ ). We note that this is not due to our framework but due to Weighted OFUL which itself cannot give constant regret bound in the deterministic setting.

Finally, we would like to remark that the state-of-the-art variance-aware linear bandit algorithm (Kim et al., 2021) does not match the regret lower bound by a gap of  $\sqrt{d}$ . If better variance-aware linear bandit algorithms are derived in the future, it will give a better bound for sparse ones as well.

## 1.2 Technical Overview

At a high level, our framework follows the “explore-then-commit” approach, which was also used by Carpentier and Munos (2012) for sparse linear bandits, where the agent first identifies the non-zero entries of  $\theta^*$  and then performs a linear bandit algorithm on them. However, it is unclear how to incorporate variances in their algorithm so that the deterministic-case regret is independent of  $T$ .

In our proposed framework, our idea is still to identify the non-zero coordinates and then perform linear bandit algorithms on them. However, we reduce the uncertainty gently and alternate between the “explore” and “commit” modes. More precisely, we decrease the “gap threshold”  $\Delta$  in a halving manner, during which we maintain a set  $S$  of coordinates that we believe in having a non-zero magnitude. Then, for each  $\Delta$ , we perform the following two steps, which *first* commits *then* explores:

1. In the first step, we get an estimate for the coordinates in  $S$  via a linear bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $S$ . Intuitively, as long as  $\mathcal{F}$  learns the structure of the linear bandit better, we will get a closer estimate of  $\{\theta_i^*\}_{i \in S}$ . This is formally characterized by the “regret-to-sample-complexity” conversion: Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  plays  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  and achieves regret  $\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ , then we automatically ensure

$$\langle \theta^* - \hat{\theta}, \theta^* \rangle \leq \frac{\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}}{n}, \text{ where } \hat{\theta} \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i. \quad (1)$$

Therefore, if we take  $\hat{\theta}$  as our estimate for those coordinates in  $S$ , we will get smaller and smaller estimation errors as long as  $\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  is sub-linear. Moreover, we can show that  $\hat{\theta}$  will not be away from  $\mathcal{X}$  by a lot (check Lemma 21 in the appendix for more details). Hence, we can directly use

$\hat{\theta}$  as our estimate to  $\{\theta_i^*\}_{i \in S}$  in this phase. More importantly, if we are granted access to  $\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ , we will also know how close we are and proceed to the next stage once it becomes satisfactory.

However, as  $\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  is actually unrevealed to the agent, our framework requires a *pessimistic* estimation such that  $\overline{\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}} \geq \mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  with high probability (which is chosen as the regret guarantee of  $\mathcal{F}$ ). Hence, terminating when  $\frac{1}{n}\overline{\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}} < \Delta^2$  can then ensure  $\langle \theta^* - \hat{\theta}, \theta^* \rangle < \Delta^2$  with high probability.

2. While keeping the regret incurred by the coordinates identified in  $S$  small by putting mass  $\hat{\theta}_i$  for each  $i \in S$ , we need to identify new coordinates with estimated magnitude  $|\hat{r}_i| > \Delta$  and add them to  $S$ . The estimation is done by random projection, an idea borrowed from compressed sensing literature (Blumensath and Davies, 2009; Carpentier and Munos, 2012). Note that putting mass  $\hat{\theta}_i$  for all  $i \in S$  will induce bias to our estimation as  $\sum_{i \in S} \hat{\theta}_i^2 \neq \sum_{i \in S} \hat{\theta}_i \theta_i^*$ . However, due to the previous stage, this bias will be bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta^2)$  and become dominated by  $\frac{\Delta}{4}$  as  $\Delta$  decreases. Henceforth, if we omit this bias, we will get closer and closer estimates due to standard concentration inequalities. Similar to the ‘commit’ stage, we will also need to bound our estimation error to decide when to proceed. Fortunately, due to Empirical Bernstein Inequalities (Maurer and Pontil, 2009; Zhang et al., 2021), we can always overestimate the estimation error with high probability.

Therefore, conditioning on good events, we can ensure all coordinates not in  $S$  have magnitudes no more than  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta)$  and all coordinates in  $S$  will together contribute regret bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta^2)$ . Hence, the regret in each step is (roughly) bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(s\Delta^2)$ . Then upper bounding the number of steps needed for each stage together with some observations (Eq. (5)) gives our framework itself is  $(s\sqrt{d}, s)$ -variance-aware, which is  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s\sqrt{dT})$  in the worst case and  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s)$  in the deterministic case.

Besides our framework, we also strengthened the VOFUL algorithm (Zhang et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2021) by enabling it to estimate its own regret up to an error of order  $\mathcal{O}(d \log \frac{1}{\delta})$  (where  $d$  is the dimension that it is executed on), which is critical for us to deploy it in unknown-variance situations where we need to determine when to stop executing the plug-in algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$ .

### 1.3 Related Work

**Linear Bandits.** This problem was first introduced by Dani et al. (2008), where an algorithm with regret  $\mathcal{O}(d\sqrt{T}(\log T)^{3/2})$  and a near-matching regret lower-bound  $\Omega(d\sqrt{T})$  were given. After that, an improved upper bound  $\mathcal{O}(d\sqrt{T} \log T)$  (Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011) together with an improved lower bound  $\Omega(d\sqrt{T} \log T)$  (Li et al., 2019) were derived. An extension of it, namely linear contextual bandits, where the action set allowed for each step can vary with time (Chu et al., 2011; Kannan et al., 2018; Li et al., 2019, 2021), is receiving more and more attention. The best-arm identification problem where the goal of the agent is to approximate  $\theta^*$  with as few samples as possible (Soare et al., 2014; Degenne et al., 2019; Jedra and Proutiere, 2020; Alieva et al., 2021) is also of great interest.

**Sparse Linear Bandits.** Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2011) and Carpentier and Munos (2012) concurrently considered the sparse linear bandit problem, where the former work assumed a noise model of  $r_t = \langle x_t, \theta^* \rangle + \eta_t$  such that  $\eta_t$  is  $R$ -sub-Gaussian and achieved  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(R\sqrt{sdT})$  regret, while the latter one considered the noise model of  $r_t = \langle x_t + \eta_t, \theta^* \rangle$  such that  $\|\eta_t\|_2 \leq \sigma$  and  $\|\theta^*\|_2 \leq \theta$ , achieving  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}((\sigma + \theta)^2 s\sqrt{T})$  regret. Lattimore et al. (2015) assumed an hypercube (i.e.,  $\mathcal{X} = [-1, 1]^d$ ) action set and a  $\|\theta^*\|_1 \leq 1$  ground-truth, yielding  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s\sqrt{T})$  regret. Antos and Szepesvári (2009) proved a  $\Omega(\sqrt{dT})$  lower-bound when  $s = 1$  with the unit ball as  $\mathcal{X}$ . Some recent works considered contextual settings (Bastani and Bayati, 2020; Ren and Zhou, 2020) or data-poor regimes where  $d \gg T$  (Hao et al., 2020, 2021a,b; Wang et al., 2020), which are both beyond the scope of this paper. Another work worth mentioning is the recent work by Dong et al. (2021), which studies bandits or MDPs with deterministic rewards. Their result implies an  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{15/16} s^{1/16})$  upper bound for deterministic sparse linear bandits, which is independent of  $d$ . They also remarked the ad-hoc divide-and-conquer algorithm for deterministic sparse linear bandits, which achieves  $\mathcal{O}(s \log d)$  regret.

**Variance-Aware Online Learning.** For tabular MDPs, the variance information is widely used in both discounted settings (Lattimore and Hutter, 2012) and episodic settings (Azar et al., 2017; Jin et al., 2018), where Zanette and Brunskill (2019) used variance information to derive problem-dependent regret bounds for tabular MDPs. For bandits, Audibert et al. (2009) made use of vari-

ance information in multi-armed bandits, giving an algorithm outperforming existing ones when the variances for suboptimal arms are relatively small. For bandits with high-dimensional structures, [Fauray et al. \(2020\)](#) studied variance adaptation for logistic bandits, [Zhou et al. \(2021\)](#) considered linear bandits and linear mixture MDPs where the variance information is revealed to the agent, giving an  $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2} + \sqrt{dT})$  guarantee for linear bandits, and [Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#) proposed another algorithm for linear bandits and linear mixture MDPs, which does not require any variance information, whose regret can be improved to be  $\tilde{O}(d^{1.5}\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2} + d^2)$  as shown by [Kim et al. \(2021\)](#). The recent work by [Hou et al. \(2022\)](#) considered variance-constrained best arm identification, where the feedback noise only depends on the action by the agent (whereas ours can depend on time, which is more general than theirs). Another recent work ([Zhao et al., 2022](#)) studied variance-aware regret bounds for bandits with general function approximation in the known variance case.

## 2 Problem Setup

**Notations.** We use  $[N]$  to denote the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . For a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we use  $\|x\|_p$  to denote the  $L_p$ -norm of  $x$ , namely  $\|x\|_p \triangleq (\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^p)^{1/p}$ . We use  $\mathbb{B}^d$  to denote the unit ball in  $d$ -dimensional space, i.e.,  $\mathbb{B}^d \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$ . We use  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  and  $\tilde{\Theta}(\cdot)$  to hide all logarithmic factors in terms of  $T, s, d$  and  $\log \frac{1}{\delta}$ . For an event  $\mathcal{E}$ , we use  $\mathbb{1}[\mathcal{E}]$  to denote its indicator.

We assume the action space and the ground-truth space are both the  $d$ -dimensional unit ball, denoted by  $\mathcal{X} \triangleq \mathbb{B}^d$ . Denote the ground-truth by  $\theta^* \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then there will be  $T \geq 1$  time steps for the agent to make decisions sequentially. At the beginning of time step  $t \in [T]$ , the agent has to choose an action  $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$ . At the end of step  $t$ , the agent will receive a *noisy* feedback  $r_t = \langle x_t, \theta^* \rangle + \eta_t$ ,  $\forall t \in [T]$ , where  $\eta_t$  is a zero-mean Gaussian random variable. Denote by  $\sigma_t^2 = \text{Var}(\eta_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1})$  the conditional variance of  $\eta_t$ . For a fair comparison with the non-variance-aware algorithms, we make the assumption that  $\sigma_t^2 \leq 1$ . We remark that the Gaussian noise assumption is only for the ease of presentation, as the results can be easily generalized to conditionally symmetric and sub-Gaussian noises, which are formally defined in Appendix C.1. Note that Gaussian random variables indeed satisfy these two conditions.

The agent also receives a (deterministic) reward of magnitude  $\langle x_t, \theta^* \rangle$ . The agent is allowed to make the decision  $x_t$  based on all historical actions  $x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}$ , all historical feedback  $r_1, \dots, r_{t-1}$ , and any amount of private randomness. The goal of the agent is to minimize the regret, defined as follows.

**Definition 2** (Regret). *The following random variable is the **regret** of an linear bandit algorithm.*

$$\mathcal{R}_T = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle x, \theta^* \rangle - \sum_{t=1}^T \langle x_t, \theta^* \rangle = \sum_{t=1}^T \langle \theta^* - x_t, \theta^* \rangle. \quad (2)$$

For the sparse linear bandit problem, we have an additional restriction that  $\|\theta^*\|_0 \leq s$ , i.e., there are at most  $s$  coordinates of  $\theta^*$  is non-zero. However, as mentioned in the introduction, the agent does *not* know anything about  $s$ . She only knows that she is facing a (probably sparse) linear environment.

## 3 Framework and Analysis

Our framework is presented in Algorithm 1. We first sketch the analysis of the framework itself in Section 3.1, and then give two applications using VOFUL2 ([Kim et al., 2021](#)) and Weighted VOFUL ([Zhou et al., 2021](#)) as  $\mathcal{F}$ , whose sketched analyses are presented in Sections 4 and 5, respectively.

### 3.1 Analysis of the Framework

**Notations.** For each  $\Delta$ , define  $\mathcal{T}_\Delta$  as the set of time steps associated with gap threshold  $\Delta$ . By the design of the algorithm, each  $\mathcal{T}_\Delta$  should be an interval. Moreover,  $\{\mathcal{T}_\Delta\}_\Delta$  forms a partition of  $[T]$ . Define  $\mathcal{T}_\Delta^a$  as the time steps in  $\mathcal{T}_\Delta$  such that  $\mathcal{F}$  is executed, and  $\mathcal{T}_\Delta^b$  as the remaining of them (i.e., those executing RANDOMPROJECTION when the gap threshold is  $\Delta$ ). Let  $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^a$  and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^b$  be the steps

---

**Algorithm 1** Reduction from Sparse Linear Bandits to Linear Bandits
 

---

- Input:** Number of dimensions  $d$ , linear bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$  and its regret estimator  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$
- 1: Initialize gap threshold  $\Delta \leftarrow \frac{1}{4}$ , estimated “good” dimensions  $S \leftarrow \emptyset$
  - 2: **while** current time step  $t < T$  **do**
  - 3:   Initialize a new linear bandit instance  $\mathcal{F}$  on coordinates  $S$ . ▷ Phase A begins.
  - 4:   Execute  $\mathcal{F}$  for  $n \geq 1$  steps and maintain the pessimistic estimation  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ , until  $\frac{1}{n}\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}} < \Delta^2$ .
  - 5:   Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  plays  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ , then set  $\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$  as the estimate for  $\{\theta_i^*\}_{i \in S}$ .
  - 6:   Let  $R \leftarrow \sqrt{1 - \sum_{i \in S} \hat{\theta}_i^2}$ ,  $K = d - |S|$ . ▷ Phase B begins.
  - 7:   **Continue** if  $\sum_{i \in S} \hat{\theta}_i^2 > 1 - \Delta^2$  ▷ There is no undiscovered coordinate with  $\theta_i^* > \frac{\Delta}{2}$ , w.h.p.
  - 8:   Perform  $n$  calls to RANDOMPROJECTION( $K, R, S, \hat{\theta}$ ) in Algorithm 2 until:

$$2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{k=1}^n (r_{k,i} - \bar{r}_i)^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}} < n \cdot \frac{\Delta}{4}, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq K. \quad (3)$$

- where  $r_k$  is the  $k$ -th return vector of the procedure RANDOMPROJECTION (Algorithm 2) and  $\bar{r} \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n r_k$  is defined as the empirical mean of  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ .
- 9:   **for**  $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$  **do**
  - 10:     Add the  $i$ -th element that is not in  $S$  to  $S$ , if  $|\bar{r}_i| > \Delta$  where  $\bar{r} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N r_n$ .
- 

**Algorithm 2** The RANDOMPROJECTION Subroutine
 

---

- 1: **function** RANDOMPROJECTION( $K, R, S, \hat{\theta}$ )
  - 2:   Generate  $K$  i.i.d. samples  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_K$ , each with equal probability being  $\pm R/\sqrt{K}$ .
  - 3:   Construct query  $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$  by  $x_{k,i} = \begin{cases} \hat{\theta}_i, & i \in S \\ y_j, & i \text{ is the } j\text{-th element that is not in } S \end{cases}$
  - 4:   Play  $x_k$ , get feedback  $r_k = \langle x_k, \theta^* \rangle + \eta_k$  (as well as  $\sigma_k^2$  in known-variance cases).
  - 5:   **return**  $r_n \triangleq K/R^2((r_n - \sum_{i \in S} \hat{\theta}_i^2) y)$ .
- 

that the agent decided not to proceed in  $\mathcal{T}_\Delta^a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_\Delta^b$ , respectively, which are formally defined as  $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^i = \{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^i \mid t \neq \max_{t' \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^i} t'\}$ ,  $i = a, b$ . Define the final value of  $\Delta$  as  $\Delta_f$ , define  $n_\Delta^a = |\mathcal{T}_\Delta^a|$  and  $n_\Delta^b = |\mathcal{T}_\Delta^b|$ , then we have  $\sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} (n_\Delta^a + n_\Delta^b) = T$ .

With these notations, we can decompose our regret  $\mathcal{R}_T$  into two parts,  $\mathcal{R}_T^a$  and  $\mathcal{R}_T^b$ , each defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a = \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \langle \theta^* - x_t, \theta^* \rangle, \quad \mathcal{R}_T^b = \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} \langle \theta^* - x_t, \theta^* \rangle,$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_T^a$  may depend on the choice of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_T^b$  only depends on the framework (Algorithm 1) itself. We then show that, as long as the regret estimation  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  is indeed an overestimation of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  with high probability, we can get a good upper bound of  $\mathcal{R}_T^b$ , which is formally stated as Theorem 3. The full proof of Theorem 3 is postponed to Appendix D and only sketched here.

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose that for any execution of  $\mathcal{F}$  that last for  $n$  steps,  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}} \geq \mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  holds with probability  $1 - \delta$ , i.e.,  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  is pessimistic. Then the total regret incurred by the second phase satisfies*

$$\mathcal{R}_T^b = \tilde{O} \left( s\sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \quad \text{with probability } 1 - \delta.$$

**Remark.** This theorem indicates that our framework *itself* will only induce an  $(s\sqrt{d}, s)$ -variance-awareness to the resulting algorithm. As noticed by Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2011), when  $\sigma_t \equiv 1$ ,  $\Omega(\sqrt{sdT})$  regret is unavoidable, which means that it is only sub-optimal by a factor no more than



$\sqrt{s}$ . Moreover, for deterministic cases, the  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s)$  regret also matches the aforementioned divide-and-conquer algorithm, which is specially designed and only works for deterministic cases.

*Proof Sketch of Theorem 3.* For each given gap threshold  $\Delta$ , we first define two ‘‘good events’’ that happens with high probability, namely  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\Delta$ . Informally,  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$  will be the event that  $\sum_{i \in S} \theta_i^* (\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i) < \Delta^2$  indeed holds and  $\mathcal{H}_\Delta$  will be the event that  $|\theta_i^*| \geq \Omega(\Delta)$  if and only if  $i \in S$ . Check Eq. (13) in the appendix for formal definitions of them. For  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$ , from Eq. (1), we know that it happens as long as  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}} \geq \mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ . We then argue that  $\Pr\{\mathcal{H}_\Delta \mid \mathcal{G}_\Delta, \mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}\} \geq 1 - s\delta$ .

After conditioning on  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$ , we have  $|\sum_{i \in S} (\hat{\theta}_i^2 - (\theta_i^*)^2)| \leq \mathcal{O}(\Delta^2)$  by direct calculation. Then consider the random projection process, where  $r_{n,i}$  can be viewed as an independent sample of

$$\frac{K}{R^2} (y_i)^2 \theta_i^* + \sum_{j \in S} \hat{\theta}_j (\theta_j^* - \hat{\theta}_j) + \sum_{j \notin S, j \neq i} \left( \frac{K}{R^2} y_i y_j \right) \theta_j^* + \left( \frac{K}{R^2} y_i \right) \eta_n, \quad (4)$$

where  $\frac{\sqrt{K}}{R} y_i$  is an independent Rademacher random variable. Therefore, the first term is exactly  $\theta_i^*$  (the magnitude we want to estimate), the second term is a small bias bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta^2)$  and the last two terms are zero-mean noises, which are bounded by  $\frac{\Delta}{4}$  with high probability from Eq. (3) together with the Empirical Bernstein Inequality (Theorem 13). Hence,  $\Pr\{\mathcal{H}_\Delta \mid \mathcal{G}_\Delta, \mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}\} \geq 1 - s\delta$ . So we can conclude that, all the good events hold simultaneously with probability  $1 - (s + T)\delta$ .

Let us focus on an arm  $i^*$  that is never identified into  $S$  throughout Algorithm 1. The existence can be guaranteed by the without-loss-of-generality assumption that  $s < d$ . By properties of sample variances, for each execution of  $\mathcal{F}$ , we have  $\sum_{n=1}^N (r_{n,i^*} - \bar{r}_{i^*})^2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^N (r_{n,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{n,i^*}])^2$  with high probability. Together with Eq. (3), we can conclude the following upper bound for  $n_\Delta^b$ :

$$(n_\Delta^b - 1) \frac{\Delta}{4} < 2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}}.$$

By  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$ , we will have  $\sum_{i \in S} (\theta_i^* - x_{t,i}) \theta_i^* = \sum_{i \in S} (\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i) \theta_i^* < \Delta^2$  for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b$ . Moreover, by  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$ , each arm  $i \notin S$  will (w.h.p.) roughly incur  $n_\Delta^b (\theta_i^*)^2 < \mathcal{O}(n_\Delta^b \Delta^2)$  regret, as the  $y_i$  used for each step is independent and zero-mean. As there are at most  $s$  non-zero coordinates, the total regret for  $\mathcal{T}_\Delta^b$  will be roughly bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(n_\Delta^b \cdot s \Delta^2)$  (there exists another term due to randomized  $y_i$ 's, which is omitted here; check Lemma 24 for more details). Hence, the total regret is bounded by

$$\mathcal{R}_T^b \lesssim \sum_{\Delta=2^0, 2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \mathcal{O}(s n_\Delta^b \Delta^2) = s \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sum_{\Delta=2^0, 2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \Delta \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(s).$$

To avoid undesired  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$  factors, we cannot directly apply Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to the sum of square-roots. Instead, again according to Eq. (3), we observe the following lower bound of  $n_\Delta^b$  which holds for all  $\Delta$ 's except for  $\Delta_f$ :

$$n_\Delta^b \geq \frac{4}{\Delta} \cdot 2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \bar{r}_{i^*})^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}} \geq \frac{8}{\Delta} \sqrt{2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}}, \quad (5)$$

where second last step is due to variance concentrations (Theorem 17 in the appendix). As  $\sum_\Delta n_\Delta^b \leq T$ , a calculation involving a ‘‘summation threshold’’ (Eq. (18) in the appendix) gives

$$\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \Delta \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \Delta^2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2} \right).$$

For a given  $\Delta$ , the expectation of  $(r_{n,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{n,i^*}])^2$  is bounded by  $(1 + \frac{K}{R^2} \sigma_n^2)$  (Eq. (22)), which is no more than  $(1 + \frac{4d}{\Delta^2} \sigma_n^2)$  as long as  $K \leq d$  and  $R \geq \frac{\Delta}{4}$  (Line 7 of Algorithm 1). So again by

the variance concentration properties (Theorem 17 in the appendix), we have

$$\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \Delta \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2} + \Delta_f \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\Delta_f}^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta} \Delta^2 n_{\Delta}^b} + \sqrt{d \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2} \right).$$

Further notice that the first term,  $\sqrt{\sum_{\Delta} \Delta^2 n_{\Delta}^b}$ , is just the square root of the left-handed-side divided by  $s$ , while the second term is what we desire. Therefore, by a ‘‘self-bounding property’’ mentioned by Efroni et al. (2020), we can conclude that  $\mathcal{R}_T^b = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s \sqrt{d \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2} \text{polylog } \frac{1}{\delta} + s \text{polylog } \frac{1}{\delta})$  with high probability. Adjusting the coefficients before  $\delta$  then gives our conclusion.  $\square$

Hence, it only remains to bound  $\mathcal{R}_T^a$ , which depends on the choice of the plug-in algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$ . In the following sections, we show two specific choices of  $\mathcal{F}$ , VOFUL2 (Kim et al., 2021) and Weighted OFUL (Zhou et al., 2021). The former algorithm does not require the information of  $\sigma_t$ ’s (i.e., works in unknown-variance cases), whereas being computationally inefficient. In contrast, the latter one is computationally efficient, but requires  $\sigma_t^2$  to be revealed together with the feedback  $r_t$  at time step  $t$ .

#### 4 A Computationally Inefficient Algorithm for Unknown Variance Case

In this section, we use the VOFUL2 algorithm from Kim et al. (2021) as the plug-in algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$ , which has the following regret guarantee. Note that though the original paper assumed a bounded noise, their algorithm also works under our assumption (see Appendix E.2 for more discussions). Moreover, we also included the ‘‘self-bounding’’ version of it (i.e., the first inequality in Eq. (6) that upper bounds  $\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}}$  by sum of  $\eta_t^2$ ), which is critical to our analysis for unknown-variance cases.

**Proposition 4** (Kim et al. (2021, Variant of Theorem 2)). *VOFUL2 executed for  $n$  time steps on  $d$  dimensions guarantees, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , there exists a constant  $C = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$  such that*

$$\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} \leq C \left( d^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + d^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( d^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + d^2 \log \frac{4}{\delta} \right), \quad (6)$$

where  $\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \dots, \sigma_T^2$  are the (conditional) variance proxies of  $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_T$ , respectively.

Due to the unknown variances, it is not straightforward to construct the regret over-estimation  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  as we will see in Section 5. Our rescue is to use the ridge linear estimator defined as  $\hat{\beta} \triangleq \text{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} (\sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \beta \rangle)^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_2)$  for samples  $\{(x_k, r_k)\}_{k=1}^n$ , which enjoys the following property, whose formal version together with the proof is presented in Appendix C.3.

**Lemma 5** (Informal). *If  $r_k = \langle x_k, \beta^* \rangle + \eta_k, \forall k$ , such that  $\eta_k$  satisfies Assumptions 9 and 10, then*

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 - \sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \beta^* \rangle)^2 \right| \leq 2s \ln \frac{n}{\lambda s \delta^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \lambda, \quad \text{with probability } 1 - \delta.$$

Picking  $\lambda = 1$  then ensures that our empirical variance estimation  $\widehat{\text{Var}} \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2$  differs from the true sample variance  $\sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \beta^* \rangle)^2$  by no more than  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s \log \frac{1}{\delta})$ . Accordingly, from Proposition 4, we can conclude that the regret of  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $n$  time steps is bounded by

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}} \triangleq C \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{n}{s \delta^2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^{1.5} \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right). \quad (7)$$

Moreover, one can observe that the sample variance  $\sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k^2$  is again bounded by (a constant multiple of) the total variance proxy  $\sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2$  (which is formally stated as Theorem 16 in the appendix). Therefore, with Eq. (7) as our regret estimation  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ , we have the following regret guarantee.



**Theorem 6** (Regret of Algorithm 1 with VOFUL2). *Algorithm 1 with VOFUL2 as  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  defined in Eq. (7) ensures, with probability  $1 - \delta$ , the total regret is bounded by*

$$\mathcal{R}_T = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( (s^{2.5} + s\sqrt{d}) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + s^3 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

Due to space limitations, we defer the full proof to Appendix E.1 and only sketch it here.

*Proof Sketch of Theorem 6.* To bound  $\mathcal{R}_T^a$ , we consider the regret from the coordinates in  $S$  and not in  $S$  separately. For the former one, the total regret in a single phase with gap threshold  $\Delta$  is simply controlled due to Proposition 4, which is of order  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \eta_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + s^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}})$ . For the latter part, due to the good event  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$  defined in Theorem 3, each non-zero coordinate not in  $S$  will incur no more than  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta^2)$  regret for each step. As there are no more than  $s$  of them, the second part's regret is bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(sn_\Delta^a \Delta^2)$ . Hence it only remains to upper bound  $n_\Delta^a$ . By Line 4 of Algorithm 1, we will have the following upper bound of  $n_\Delta^a$ , just like the proof of Theorem 3:

$$n_\Delta^a \leq C \left( \frac{s^{1.5}}{\Delta^2} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^a} \eta_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{s^2}{\Delta^2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) + 1. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, combining two parts (those inside  $S$  and those outside  $S$ ) together will conclude

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a \leq \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \mathcal{O} \left( s^{2.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \eta_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + s^3 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + s\Delta^2} \right).$$

As in Theorem 3, further notice that the opposite direction of Eq. (8) also holds (up to constants) for all  $\Delta \neq \Delta_f$ . This will move the summation over  $\Delta$  into the square-root operation. Moreover, by the fact that  $\eta_t^2 = \mathcal{O}(\sigma_t^2 \log 1/\delta)$  (formally stated as Theorem 17 in the appendix), we will have

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s^{2.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + s^3 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

Combining this with Theorem 3 (which upper bounds  $\mathcal{R}_T^b$ ) then gives our conclusion.  $\square$

## 5 A Computationally Efficient Algorithm for Known Variance Case

In this section, we consider a computational efficient algorithm **Weighted OFUL** proposed by Zhou et al. (2021), which *itself* requires  $\sigma_t^2$  to be presented together with  $r_t$  at the end of time step  $t$ . Their algorithm has the following regret guarantee, which holds under our noise assumptions as well:

**Proposition 7** (Zhou et al. (2021), Corollary 4.3). *With probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , **Weighted OFUL** executed for  $T$  steps on  $d$  dimensions guarantees  $\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} \leq C(\sqrt{dT \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + d\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}})$ , where  $C = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$  and  $\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \dots, \sigma_T^2$  are the (conditional) variance proxies of  $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_T$ , respectively.*

Taking  $\mathcal{F}$  as **Weighted OFUL**, we will have the following regret guarantee for sparse linear bandits:

**Theorem 8** (Regret of Algorithm 1 with **Weighted OFUL**). *Algorithm 1 with **Weighted OFUL** as  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  defined as  $C(\sqrt{sn \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}})$  guarantees, with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\mathcal{R}_T = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( (s^2 + s\sqrt{d}) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} + s^{1.5} \sqrt{T} \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

The proof will be quite similar to that of Theorem 6, i.e., first upper bounding  $n_\Delta^a$  by Line 4 of Algorithm 1 and then using summation techniques to move the summation over  $\Delta$  into the square-root operation. The only difference is that we will need to bound  $\mathcal{O}(\sum_\Delta \Delta^{-2})$ , which seems to be as large as  $T$  if we follow the analysis of Theorem 6. However, as we included a factor  $\sqrt{sn \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$  in the new regret over-estimation  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ , we will have  $n_\Delta^a \geq \Delta^{-2} \sqrt{sn_\Delta^a \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$ , which means  $n_\Delta^a = \Omega(s\Delta^{-4})$ . From  $\sum_\Delta n_\Delta^a \leq T$ , we can consequently bound  $\sum_\Delta \Delta^{-2}$  as  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T/s})$ . The remaining part is just an analog of Theorem 6. Therefore, the proof is omitted here and deferred to Appendix F.

## 6 Conclusion

We considered the sparse linear bandit problem with heteroscedastic noises and provided a general framework to reduce *any* variance-aware linear bandit algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$  to an algorithm  $\mathcal{G}$  for sparse linear bandits that is also variance-aware. As an specific application, we first applied the computationally inefficient algorithm VOFUL from Zhang et al. (2021) and Kim et al. (2021). The result algorithm works for the unknown-variance case and gets  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}((s^{2.5} + s\sqrt{d})\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^3 \log \frac{1}{\delta})$  regret, which not only is worst-case optimal but also enjoys a constant regret in the best case when regarding the sparsity factor  $s \ll d$  as a constant. We also applied the efficient algorithm Weighted OFUL by Zhou et al. (2021) which, requires known variance, and got  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}((s^2 + s\sqrt{d})\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + (\sqrt{sT} + s) \log \frac{1}{\delta})$  regret, still independent of  $d$  in the deterministic case. However, there is still a gap in the worst-case regret in terms of  $s$ , as the lower-bound for sparse linear bandits is  $\Omega(\sigma\sqrt{sdT})$  instead of our  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sigma s\sqrt{dT})$ . Closing this gap is an interesting future work.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

We greatly acknowledge Csaba Szepesvári for sharing his manuscript (Antos and Szepesvári, 2009) with us, which shows the  $\Omega(\sqrt{dT})$  lower bound for sparse linear bandits when  $s = 1$  and the action sets are unit balls.

## References

- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Dávid Pál, and Csaba Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, David Pal, and Csaba Szepesvari. Online-to-confidence-set conversions and application to sparse stochastic bandits. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1–9. PMLR, 2012.
- Ayya Alieva, Ashok Cutkosky, and Abhimanyu Das. Robust pure exploration in linear bandits with limited budget. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 187–195. PMLR, 2021.
- András Antos and Csaba Szepesvári. Stochastic bandits with large action sets revisited. Personal communication, 2009.
- Jean-Yves Audibert, Rémi Munos, and Csaba Szepesvári. Exploration–exploitation tradeoff using variance estimates in multi-armed bandits. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(19):1876–1902, 2009.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Ian Osband, and Rémi Munos. Minimax regret bounds for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 263–272. PMLR, 2017.
- Hamsa Bastani and Mohsen Bayati. Online decision making with high-dimensional covariates. *Operations Research*, 68(1):276–294, 2020.
- Bernard Bercu and Abderrahmen Touati. Exponential inequalities for self-normalized martingales with applications. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 18(5):1848–1869, 2008.

- Thomas Blumensath and Mike E Davies. Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing. *Applied and computational harmonic analysis*, 27(3):265–274, 2009.
- Alexandra Carpentier and Rémi Munos. Bandit theory meets compressed sensing for high dimensional stochastic linear bandit. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 190–198. PMLR, 2012.
- Wei Chu, Lihong Li, Lev Reyzin, and Robert Schapire. Contextual bandits with linear payoff functions. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 208–214. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.
- Varsha Dani, Thomas P Hayes, and Sham M Kakade. Stochastic linear optimization under bandit feedback. In *21st Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 355–366. Omnipress, 2008.
- Victor H de la Pena. A general class of exponential inequalities for martingales and ratios. *Annals of Probability*, pages 537–564, 1999.
- Rémy Degenne, Wouter M Koolen, and Pierre Ménard. Non-asymptotic pure exploration by solving games. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Kefan Dong, Jiaqi Yang, and Tengyu Ma. Provable model-based nonlinear bandit and reinforcement learning: Shelve optimism, embrace virtual curvature. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- Yonathan Efroni, Shie Mannor, and Matteo Pirota. Exploration-exploitation in constrained mdps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02189*, 2020.
- Xiequan Fan, Ion Grama, and Quansheng Liu. Exponential inequalities for martingales with applications. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 20:1–22, 2015.
- Louis Faury, Marc Abeille, Clément Calauzènes, and Olivier Fercoq. Improved optimistic algorithms for logistic bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3052–3060. PMLR, 2020.
- David A Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *the Annals of Probability*, pages 100–118, 1975.
- Botao Hao, Tor Lattimore, and Mengdi Wang. High-dimensional sparse linear bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:10753–10763, 2020.
- Botao Hao, Tor Lattimore, and Wei Deng. Information directed sampling for sparse linear bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021a.
- Botao Hao, Tor Lattimore, Csaba Szepesvári, and Mengdi Wang. Online sparse reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 316–324. PMLR, 2021b.
- Jean Honorio and Tommi Jaakkola. Tight bounds for the expected risk of linear classifiers and pac-bayes finite-sample guarantees. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 384–392. PMLR, 2014.
- Yunlong Hou, Vincent YF Tan, and Zixin Zhong. Almost optimal variance-constrained best arm identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.10142*, 2022.
- Yassir Jedra and Alexandre Proutiere. Optimal best-arm identification in linear bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:10007–10017, 2020.
- Chi Jin, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Sebastien Bubeck, and Michael I Jordan. Is q-learning provably efficient? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Sampath Kannan, Jamie H Morgenstern, Aaron Roth, Bo Waggoner, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. A smoothed analysis of the greedy algorithm for the linear contextual bandit problem. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.

- Yeoneung Kim, Insoon Yang, and Kwang-Sung Jun. Improved regret analysis for variance-adaptive linear bandits and horizon-free linear mixture mdps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.03289*, 2021.
- Johannes Kirschner and Andreas Krause. Information directed sampling and bandits with heteroscedastic noise. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 358–384. PMLR, 2018.
- Tor Lattimore and Marcus Hutter. Pac bounds for discounted mdps. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 320–334. Springer, 2012.
- Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Tor Lattimore, Koby Crammer, and Csaba Szepesvári. Linear multi-resource allocation with semi-bandit feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- Yingkai Li, Yining Wang, and Yuan Zhou. Nearly minimax-optimal regret for linearly parameterized bandits. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2173–2174. PMLR, 2019.
- Yingkai Li, Yining Wang, Xi Chen, and Yuan Zhou. Tight regret bounds for infinite-armed linear contextual bandits. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 370–378. PMLR, 2021.
- Andreas Maurer and Massimiliano Pontil. Empirical bernstein bounds and sample-variance penalization. In *COLT 2009 - The 22nd Conference on Learning Theory*, 2009.
- Zhimei Ren and Zhengyuan Zhou. Dynamic batch learning in high-dimensional sparse linear contextual bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.11918*, 2020.
- Marta Soare, Alessandro Lazaric, and Rémi Munos. Best-arm identification in linear bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 27, 2014.
- Yining Wang, Yi Chen, Ethan X Fang, Zhaoran Wang, and Runze Li. Nearly dimension-independent sparse linear bandit over small action spaces via best subset selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.02003*, 2020.
- Andrea Zanette and Emma Brunskill. Tighter problem-dependent regret bounds in reinforcement learning without domain knowledge using value function bounds. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7304–7312. PMLR, 2019.
- Zihan Zhang, Jiaqi Yang, Xiangyang Ji, and Simon S Du. Improved variance-aware confidence sets for linear bandits and linear mixture mdp. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- Heyang Zhao, Dongruo Zhou, Jiafan He, and Quanquan Gu. Bandit learning with general function classes: Heteroscedastic noise and variance-dependent regret bounds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.13603*, 2022.
- Dongruo Zhou, Quanquan Gu, and Csaba Szepesvari. Nearly minimax optimal reinforcement learning for linear mixture markov decision processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4532–4576. PMLR, 2021.

# Supplementary Materials

<b>A</b>	<b>More on Related Works</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Divide-and-Conquer Algorithm for Deterministic Settings</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Concentration Inequalities</b>	<b>14</b>
	C.1 Conditions on the Noises . . . . .	14
	C.2 Empirical Bernstein Inequality . . . . .	15
	C.3 Ridge Linear Regression . . . . .	17
<b>D</b>	<b>Omitted Proof in Section 3.1 (Analysis of Framework)</b>	<b>18</b>
	D.1 Proof of Main Theorem . . . . .	18
	D.2 Regret-to-Sample-Complexity Conversion . . . . .	22
	D.3 Random Projection . . . . .	22
	D.4 Single-Phase Regret . . . . .	23
<b>E</b>	<b>Omitted Proof in Section 4 (Analysis of VOFUL2)</b>	<b>24</b>
	E.1 Proof of Main Theorem . . . . .	24
	E.2 Regret Over-Estimation . . . . .	27
<b>F</b>	<b>Omitted Proof in Section 5 (Analysis of Weighted OFUL)</b>	<b>30</b>
	F.1 Proof of Main Theorem . . . . .	30
	F.2 Regret Over-estimation . . . . .	32
<b>G</b>	<b>Auxilliary Lemmas</b>	<b>36</b>

## A More on Related Works

In this section, we briefly compare to several related works on sparse linear bandits in terms of regret guarantees, noise assumptions and query models.

- The regret of [Abbasi-Yadkori et al. \(2012\)](#) is  $\tilde{O}(Rs\sqrt{dT})$  when assuming conditionally  $R$ -sub-Gaussian noises (i.e.,  $\eta_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim \text{subG}(R^2)$ ), which will be formally defined in [Assumption 10](#)). At the same time, they allow an arbitrary varying action set  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_T \subseteq \mathbb{B}^d$  (though they in fact allows arbitrary decision sets  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , their regret bound scales with  $\max_{x \in D_t} \|x\|_2$ , so we assume  $D_t \subseteq \mathbb{B}^d$  without loss of generality). This model is stronger than ours, as we only allow  $D_1 = D_2 = \dots = D_T = \mathbb{B}^d$  (as explained in [Footnote 3](#) in the main text). When the noises are Gaussian with variance 1 and the ground-truth  $\theta^*$  is one-hot (i.e.,  $s = 1$ ), their regret bound reduces to  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ , which matches the  $\Omega(\sqrt{dT})$  bound in [Antos and Szepesvári \(2009\)](#) when the actions sets are allowed to be the entire unit ball (which means the agent will be more powerful than that of [Abbasi-Yadkori et al. \(2012\)](#)).
- The regret of [Carpentier and Munos \(2012\)](#) is  $\tilde{O}((\|\theta\|_2 + \|\sigma\|_2)s\sqrt{T})$ , assuming a unit-ball action set, a  $\|\theta^*\|_2 \leq \|\theta\|_2$  ground-truth and  $\|\eta_t\|_2 \leq \|\sigma\|_2$  noises, where  $\eta_t$  will be defined later. This bound seems to violate the  $\Omega(\sqrt{dT})$  lower bound when  $s = 1$ . However, this is due to a different noise model: They assumed the noise is component-wise, i.e.,  $r_t = \langle \theta^* + \eta_t, x_t \rangle$  where  $\eta_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . In contrast, our model assumed a  $\langle \theta^*, x_t \rangle + \eta_t$  noise model where  $\eta_t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, the  $\max_t \|\eta_t\|_2$  dependency can be of order  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$  to ensure a similar noise model as ours.

- The regret of [Lattimore et al. \(2015, Appendix G\)](#) is also of order  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s\sqrt{T})$ , assuming a  $[-1, 1]$ -bounded noises, a hypercube  $\mathcal{X} = [-1, 1]^d$  action set and a  $\|\theta^*\|_1 \leq 1$  ground-truth. We will then explain why this does not violate the  $\Omega(\sqrt{sdT})$  regret lower bound as well. Consider an extreme query  $(1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathcal{X}$ , which is valid in their query model (in fact, their algorithm is a random projection procedure with some carefully designed regularity conditions, so this type of queries appears all the time). However, in our query model where the action set is the unit ball  $\mathbb{B}^d$ , we have to scale it by  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$ . As the noise will never be scaled, this will amplify the noises by  $\sqrt{d}$ , so we will need  $\text{poly}(d)$  more times of queries to get the same confidence set, making the regret bound have a polynomial dependency on  $d$ . Moreover, their ground-truth  $\theta^*$  needs to satisfy  $\|\theta^*\|_1 \leq 1$ . However, an  $s$ -sparse ground-truth  $\theta^*$  with 2-norm 1 can have 1-norm as much as  $\sqrt{s}$ . Therefore, another  $\sqrt{s}$  should also be multiplied for a fair comparison with our algorithm.

In conclusion, the second and the third work assumed different noise or query models to amplify the signal-to-noise ratio and thus avoiding a polynomial dependency on  $d$ , compared to [Abbasi-Yadkori et al. \(2012\)](#) as well as our work. However, we have to point out again that [Abbasi-Yadkori et al. \(2011\)](#) allows a drifting action set, whereas ours only allow a unit-ball action set, just like [Carpentier and Munos \(2012\)](#). The reason is discussed in Footnote 3 in the main text.

## B Divide-and-Conquer Algorithm for Deterministic Settings

In this section, we discuss how to solve the deterministic sparse linear bandit problem in  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s)$  steps using a divide-and-conquer algorithm, as we briefly mentioned in the main text.

We mainly adopt the idea mentioned by [Dong et al. \(2021, Footnote 6\)](#). For each divide-and-conquer subroutine working on several coordinates  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \in [d]$ , we query half of them (e.g.,  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{k/2}$  when assuming  $2 \mid k$ ) with  $\sqrt{2/k}$  mass on each coordinate. This will reveal whether there is a non-zero coordinate among them due to deterministic feedback. If the feedback is non-zero, we can conclude that there exists a non-zero coordinate in this half. Hence, we dive into this half and conquer this sub-problem (i.e., divide-and-conquer). Otherwise, we simply discard this half and consider the other half.

However, this vanilla algorithm fails to consider the possibility that two coordinates cancel each other (e.g., two coordinates with magnitude  $\pm\sqrt{1/2}$  will make the feedback equal to zero). Fortunately, this problem can be resolved via randomly putting magnitude  $\pm\sqrt{2/k}$  on each coordinate, which is similar to the idea illustrated in Algorithm 2. As the environment is deterministic, each step will give the correct feedback with probability 1. Therefore, a constant number of trials is enough.

At last, we analyze the number of interactions needed for this approach. As it is guaranteed that each divide-and-conquer subroutine will be working on a set of coordinates where at least one of them is non-zero, we can bound the number of interactions as  $\mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{\theta_i^* \neq 0} \# \text{subroutines containing } i\right)$ . As for each time we will divide the coordinates into half, there can be at most  $\log_2 d$  subroutines containing  $i$  for each individual  $i$ . Therefore, the number of interactions will be  $\mathcal{O}(s \log d)$ .

After that, we will be sure to find out all coordinates with non-zero magnitudes. Asking each of them once then reveals their actual magnitude. Therefore, we can recover  $\theta^*$  in  $\mathcal{O}(s \log d + s) = \mathcal{O}(s \log d)$  rounds and will not suffer any regret after that. So the regret of this algorithm will indeed be  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s)$ , which is independent of  $d$  and  $T$ .

## C Concentration Inequalities

### C.1 Conditions on the Noises

As stated in the main text, we will generalize the Gaussian noise models to conditionally symmetric sub-Gaussian noises. That is,  $\eta_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  is a symmetric and a sub-Gaussian random variable with variance proxy  $\sigma_t^2$ , which are formally defined as follows.



**Assumption 9** (Conditionally Symmetric Noise). *We assume  $\eta_t$  to be conditionally symmetric with respect to filtration  $\mathcal{F}$ , i.e.,  $\eta_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  has a symmetric density function about its mean (which should be 0 as the noises are always zero-mean).*

**Assumption 10** (Conditionally Sub-Gaussian Noise). *We assume the noises  $\eta_t$  to be conditionally sub-Gaussian with variance proxy  $\sigma_t^2$ , i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda(\eta_t - \mathbb{E}[\eta_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}])) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2\sigma_t^2\right), \quad \forall \lambda > 0.$$

It is easy to see that a Gaussian random variable with variance  $\sigma^2$  is indeed symmetric and is sub-Gaussian with variance proxy  $\sigma^2$ . Hence, compared to the independent Gaussian noise assumption, our assumption is a strict generalization as it not only allows a broader class of distributions, but also allows the noises to be history-dependent.

## C.2 Empirical Bernstein Inequality

### C.2.1 Sample Mean Upper Bound

As long as the noises are conditionally symmetric, we have the following generalization of de la Peña's Inequality.

**Theorem 11** (de la Pena (1999, Theorem 6.1); Bercu and Touati (2008, Theorem 4.2)). *Suppose that  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is a martingale difference sequence adapted to filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  that is conditionally symmetric, i.e.,  $\xi_i \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$  has a symmetric density function with 0. Then we have*

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2}}\right| \geq x\right\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{4}\right).$$

**Corollary 12.** *For a stochastic process  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[X_i \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \mu_i$  and  $(X_i - \mu_i) \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$  is symmetric, with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have*

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu_i)\right| \leq 2\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu_i)^2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta}}.$$

*Proof.* This immediately follows by picking  $x = 2\sqrt{\ln \frac{2}{\delta}}$ . □

Therefore, we are able to present our Empirical Bernstein Inequality for conditional symmetric stochastic processes with common mean, as follows:

**Theorem 13** (Empirical Bernstein Inequality for Conditionally Symmetric Stochastic Processes with Common Mean). *For a stochastic process  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[X_i \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \mu$  and  $(X_i - \mu) \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$  is symmetric, we have the following inequality as long as  $n \geq 8$ :*

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)\right| \leq 2\sqrt{2\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}}\right\} \geq 1 - \delta, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 1),$$

where  $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  is the sample mean.

*Proof.* By direct calculation, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 - 2n\bar{X}^2 + n\bar{X}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 - n\bar{X}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 - n(\bar{X} - \mu)^2.$$

Applying Corollary 12 to  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  gives

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)\right| \geq 2\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}}\right\} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (9)$$

Therefore, with probability  $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 + \frac{4}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}. \quad (10)$$

So for  $n \geq 8$ , with probability  $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2.$$

Hence, by the union bound, with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu) \right| \leq 2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}},$$

as claimed.  $\square$

### C.2.2 Sample Variance Upper Bound

We first state the following Freedman's inequality for sub-Gaussian martingales.

**Theorem 14** (Freedman's Inequality for Sub-Gaussian Martingales, [Fan et al. \(2015, Theorem 2.6\)](#)). *Suppose that  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is a martingale difference sequence adapted to filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = 0$ . Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda \xi_i) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \leq \exp(f(\lambda) V_i)$  for some deterministic function  $f(\lambda)$  and some stochastic process  $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n$  adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  (i.e.,  $V_i$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ -measurable) for all  $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ , then, for all  $x, v > 0$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , we have*

$$\Pr \left\{ \exists 1 \leq k \leq n : \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i \geq x \wedge \sum_{i=1}^k V_i \leq v^2 \right\} \leq \exp(-\lambda x + f(\lambda) v^2).$$

To derive a bound related to  $\sum (X_i - \bar{X})^2$  and  $\sum \sigma_i^2$ , we will need to characterize the concentration of the square of a sub-Gaussian random variable, which is a "sub-exponential" random variable:

**Theorem 15** ([Honorio and Jaakkola \(2014, Appendix B\)](#)). *For a sub-Gaussian random variable  $X$  with variance proxy  $\sigma^2$  and mean  $\mu$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} [\exp(\lambda(X^2 - \mathbb{E}[X^2]))] \leq \exp(16\lambda^2 \sigma^4), \quad \forall |\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}.$$

**Theorem 16** (Variance Concentration for Sub-Gaussian Stochastic Processes). *For a stochastic process  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[X_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \mu_i$  and  $X_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \sim \text{subG}(\sigma_i^2)$ ,*

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n ((X_i - \mu_i)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X_i - \mu_i)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]) \right| > 4\sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \right\} \leq \delta, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 1).$$

*Proof.* Apply [Theorem 14](#) to the martingale difference sequence  $\{(X_i - \mu_i)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X_i - \mu_i)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]\}$  with  $V_i = \sigma_i^4$ ,  $f(\lambda) = 16\lambda^2$  for  $\lambda < \frac{1}{4\sigma_{\max}^2}$  and  $f(\lambda) = \infty$  otherwise, where  $\sigma_{\max}$  is defined as  $\max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n\}$ . Then for all  $x, v > 0$  and  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{\sigma_{\max}^2})$ , we have

$$\Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n ((X_i - \mu_i)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X_i - \mu_i)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]) > x \wedge \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^4} \leq v \right\} \leq \exp(-\lambda x + 16\lambda^2 v^2).$$

Picking  $v^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^4 \sqrt{\ln \frac{2}{\delta}}$  and  $x = 4\sqrt{2}v \ln \frac{2}{\delta}$  gives

$$\Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n ((X_i - \mu_i)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X_i - \mu_i)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]) > 4\sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^4 \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \right\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{32v^2}\right)$$

$$= \exp\left(-\frac{32v^2 \ln^2 \frac{2}{\delta}}{32v^2}\right) = \frac{\delta}{2},$$

where  $\lambda$  is set to  $\frac{x}{32v^2} = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}v} < \frac{1}{\sigma_{\max}^2}$  (as  $v^2 > \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^4 \geq \sigma_{\max}^4$ ). A union bound by applying Theorem 14 to the martingale difference sequence  $\{\mathbb{E}[(X_i - \mu_i)^2] - (X_i - \mu_i)^2\}$  with the same parameters and noticing the fact that  $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^4} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2$  then gives our conclusion.  $\square$

**Theorem 17** (Variance Concentration for Conditionally Symmetric Sub-Gaussian Stochastic Processes with Common Mean). *Let  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a stochastic process adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[X_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \mu$ ,  $X_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \sim \text{subG}(\sigma_i^2)$  and  $(X_i - \mu) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$  is symmetric, then,  $\forall \delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have the following three inequalities:*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 \\ \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 \\ \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2 &\leq 8 \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  is the sample mean.

*Proof.* The first two inequalities follow from Eqs. (9) and (10). The last one follows from Theorem 16 together with the fact that  $\mathbb{E}[(X_i - \mu_i)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \leq \sigma_i^2$  by the definition of a sub-Gaussian random variable.  $\square$

### C.3 Ridge Linear Regression

**Lemma 18** (Formal Verison of Lemma 5). *Suppose that we are given  $n$  samples  $y_i = \langle x_i, \beta^* \rangle + \epsilon_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , where  $\beta^* \in \mathbb{B}^d$  and  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are stochastic processes adapted to the filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  such that  $\epsilon_i$  is conditionally  $\bar{\sigma}$ -Gaussian, i.e.,  $\epsilon_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \sim \text{subG}(\bar{\sigma}^2)$ . Define the following quantity as the estimate for  $\beta^*$ :*

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i^\top \beta)^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_2 \right).$$

Then with probability  $1 - \delta$ , the following inequality holds:

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i^\top \beta^*)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i^\top \hat{\beta})^2 \right| \leq 2d\bar{\sigma}^2 \ln \frac{n}{\lambda d \delta^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \lambda.$$

*Proof.* Denote  $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)^\top$ ,  $X = (X_1^\top, X_2^\top, \dots, X_n^\top)$  and  $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n)^\top$ . Denote  $\operatorname{Var}^* = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i^\top \beta^*)^2$  and  $\widehat{\operatorname{Var}} = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i^\top \hat{\beta})^2$ . We have the following representation of  $\hat{\beta}$ , which is by direct calculation (check, e.g., (Kirschner and Krause, 2018))

$$\hat{\beta} = (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} X^\top y. \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, by Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2011, Proof of Theorem 2), we have

$$\hat{\beta} - \beta^* = (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} X^\top \epsilon - \lambda (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \beta^*. \quad (12)$$

Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}^* - \widehat{\operatorname{Var}} &= (y - X\beta^*)^\top (y - X\beta^*) - (y - X\hat{\beta})^\top (y - X\hat{\beta}) \\ &= (\beta^*)^\top X^\top X \beta^* - (\beta^*)^\top X^\top y - y^\top X \beta^* - \hat{\beta}^\top X^\top X \hat{\beta} + \hat{\beta}^\top X^\top y + y^\top X \hat{\beta} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \widehat{\beta}^\top (X^\top y - X^\top X \widehat{\beta}) - (\beta^*)^\top X^\top (y - X\beta^*) + y^\top X(\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*).$$

By Eq. (11), we have  $X^\top y = (X^\top X + \lambda I)\widehat{\beta}$ . So the first term is just  $\lambda \widehat{\beta}^\top \widehat{\beta}$ . As  $y = X\beta^* + \epsilon$ , the second term is just  $-(\beta^*)^\top X^\top \epsilon$ . By Eq. (12), the last term becomes

$$y^\top X(X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} X^\top \epsilon - \lambda y^\top X(X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \beta^*.$$

For the sake of simplicity, we define  $\langle a, b \rangle_M = a^\top (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} b$  (note that  $\langle a, b \rangle_M = \langle b, a \rangle_M$  as  $X^\top X + \lambda I$  is symmetric) and denote the induced norm by  $\|\cdot\|_M$ . Therefore, we have

$$\text{Var}^* - \widehat{\text{Var}} = \lambda \widehat{\beta}^\top \widehat{\beta} - (\beta^*)^\top X^\top \epsilon + \langle X^\top y, X^\top \epsilon \rangle_M - \lambda \langle X^\top y, \beta^* \rangle_M.$$

Again by Eq. (11), we have  $\langle X^\top y, X^\top \epsilon \rangle_M = \widehat{\beta}^\top X^\top \epsilon$ . Therefore, the second and third term together give

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\beta^*)^\top X^\top \epsilon + \langle X^\top y, X^\top \epsilon \rangle_M = (\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*)^\top X^\top \epsilon \\ & = ((X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} X^\top \epsilon - \lambda (X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1} \beta^*)^\top X^\top \epsilon \\ & = \|X^\top \epsilon\|_M^2 - \lambda \langle \beta^*, X^\top \epsilon \rangle = \|X^\top \epsilon\|_M^2 - \lambda (\beta^*)^\top (\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*) + \lambda^2 \langle \beta^*, \beta^* \rangle_M, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is yielded from using Eq. (12) reversely. Then note that  $\langle X^\top y, \beta^* \rangle = \widehat{\beta}^\top \beta^*$ , so taking expectation on both sides gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \text{Var}^* - \widehat{\text{Var}} \right| &= \lambda \widehat{\beta}^\top \widehat{\beta} + \|X^\top \epsilon\|_M^2 - \lambda (\beta^*)^\top (\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*) + \lambda^2 \langle \beta^*, \beta^* \rangle_M - \lambda \widehat{\beta}^\top \beta^* \\ &= \|X^\top \epsilon\|_M^2 + \lambda \|\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2^2 + \lambda^2 \|\beta^*\|_M^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\|\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2^2 \leq \|X^\top \epsilon\|_M^2 \|(X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1/2}\|^2 + \|\beta^*\|_M^2 \|(X^\top X + \lambda I)^{-1/2}\|^2,$$

where the matrix norms can further be bounded by  $1/\lambda_{\min}(X^\top X + \lambda I) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . Similarly, we can conclude that  $\|\beta^*\|_M^2 \leq 1/\lambda_{\min}(X^\top X + \lambda I) \|\beta^*\|_2^2 \leq 1/\lambda$ . Consequently, we have

$$\left| \text{Var}^* - \widehat{\text{Var}} \right| = 2\|X^\top \epsilon\|_M^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \lambda.$$

As proved by Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2011, Theorem 1), with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\|X^\top \epsilon\|_M^2 \leq 2\bar{\sigma}^2 \ln \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{\sqrt{\det(X^\top X + \lambda I)}}{\sqrt{\det(\lambda I)}} \right) = \bar{\sigma}^2 \ln \left( \frac{1}{\delta^2} \frac{(\lambda + n/s)^s}{\lambda} \right) \leq d\bar{\sigma}^2 \ln \left( \frac{1}{\delta^2} \left( 1 + \frac{n}{\lambda d} \right) \right),$$

where  $\bar{\sigma}^2$  is the (maximum) variance proxy and the second last step is due to the Determinant-Trace Inequality (Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011, Lemma 10). Hence, with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\left| \text{Var}^* - \widehat{\text{Var}} \right| \leq 2d\bar{\sigma}^2 \ln \frac{n}{\lambda d \delta^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \lambda,$$

as claimed.  $\square$

## D Omitted Proof in Section 3.1 (Analysis of Framework)

### D.1 Proof of Main Theorem

In this section, we prove Theorem 3, which is restated as follows for the ease of reading:

**Theorem 19** (Restatement of Theorem 3). *Suppose that for any execution of  $\mathcal{F}$  that last for  $n$  steps,  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}} \geq \mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  holds with probability  $1 - \delta$ , i.e.,  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  is pessimistic. Then the total regret incurred by the second phase satisfies*

$$\mathcal{R}_T^b = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s\sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \quad \text{with probability } 1 - \delta.$$

*Proof.* As mentioned in the main body, we define the following good events for each  $\Delta = 2^{-2}, 2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f$  where  $\Delta_f$  is the final value of  $\Delta$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_\Delta &: \sum_{i \in S} \theta_i^* (\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i) < \Delta^2 \text{ after } \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a, \\ \mathcal{H}_\Delta &: (|\theta_i^*| > 3\Delta \rightarrow i \in S) \wedge \left( i \in S \rightarrow |\theta_i^*| > \frac{1}{2}\Delta \right) \text{ after } \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

It is by definition to see that  $\mathcal{H}_{\frac{\Delta}{2}}$  indeed holds, as all  $|\theta_i^*| < \frac{3}{2}$  and  $S$  is initially empty. We can then use induction to prove that all good events hold with high probability.

Here, we list several technical lemmas that we informally referred to in the main body, whose proofs are left to subsequent sections. The first one is about the regret-to-sample-complexity conversion.

**Lemma 20** (Regret-to-sample-complexity Conversion). *If for any execution of  $\mathcal{F}$  that lasts for  $n$  steps, we have  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}} \geq \mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  with probability  $1 - \delta$ , then we have  $\Pr\{\mathcal{G}_\Delta\} \geq 1 - n_\Delta^a \delta$ .*

The second term bounds the ‘bias’ term, i.e., the second term of Eq. (4) for random projection.

**Lemma 21** (Bias Term of the Random Projection). *Conditioning on  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$ , we have  $|\sum_{i \in S} (\hat{\theta}_i^2 - (\theta_i^*)^2)| < 3\Delta^2$ , which further gives  $|\sum_{i \in S} \hat{\theta}_i (\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i)| < 4\Delta^2$ .*

Furthermore, we can bound the estimation error of the random projection process.

**Lemma 22** (Concentration of the Random Projection). *For any given  $i \in [K]$ , we will have*

$$\Pr \left\{ |\hat{r}_i - \theta_i^*| > 3\Delta^2 + \frac{\Delta}{4} \middle| \mathcal{G}_\Delta, \mathcal{H}_{2\Delta} \right\} \leq \delta.$$

As long as the estimation errors are small, we can ensure, with high probability that the good event for  $\Delta$ , namely  $\mathcal{H}_\Delta$  will also hold.

**Lemma 23** (Identification of Non-zero Coordinates). *Events  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$  can infer  $\mathcal{H}_\Delta$  with probability  $1 - d\delta$ .*

Therefore, by combining all lemmas above, we can ensure that all good events, namely  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta \wedge \mathcal{G}_\Delta \mid \Delta = 2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f$ , hold simultaneously with probability  $1 - (d+T)\delta$ .

At last, we bound the total regret incurred in Phase B for  $\Delta$ .

**Lemma 24** (Single-Phase Regret Bound). *Conditioning on  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$ , we have*

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} \langle \theta^* - x_t, \theta^* \rangle \leq 36sn_\Delta^b \Delta^2 + 6s\Delta \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}} \sqrt{2n_\Delta^b \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}, \quad \text{with probability } 1 - s\delta.$$

Then we follow the analysis sketched in the main body. We assume, without loss of generality, that  $s < d$ . Then conditioning on all good events (which happens with probability  $1 - (d+T)\delta$  according to the lemmas), there must exist some coordinate  $i^*$  that is never included into  $S$  as  $\mathcal{H}_\Delta$  holds for all  $\Delta$ .

Therefore, by property of the sample variances (Theorem 17), for such  $i^*$  and for each phase, with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have  $\sum_{n=1}^N (r_{n,i^*} - \bar{r}_{i^*})^2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^N (r_{n,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{n,i^*}])^2$ . Together with Eq. (3),

$$2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{t \in \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}} > (n_\Delta^b - 1) \frac{\Delta}{4}. \quad (14)$$

By using Lemma 24, the total regret from Phase B is bounded by

$$\mathcal{R}_T^b \leq \sum_{\Delta=2^0, 2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \left( 36sn_\Delta^b \Delta^2 + 6s\Delta \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}} \sqrt{2n_\Delta^b \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right)$$

By writing  $n_\Delta^b$  as  $(n_\Delta^b - 1) + 1$ , for any given  $\Delta$ , the total regret of Phase b is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_T^b &\leq \sum_{\Delta} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} \langle \theta^* - x_t, \theta^* \rangle \\
&\leq \sum_{\Delta} 36s\Delta^2 \cdot \left( \frac{4}{\Delta} 2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta} + 1} \right) + \\
&\quad \sum_{\Delta} 6s\Delta \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}} \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \sqrt{4\Delta \cdot 2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta} + 1}} \\
&\leq \underbrace{\sum_{\Delta} \left( 288\sqrt{2}s \sqrt{\Delta^2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta} + 36s\Delta^2} \right)}_{\text{Part (a)}} + \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{\Delta} \underbrace{\left( 24s\sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \Delta \sqrt{4 \Delta^2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta} + 12s\Delta \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}}} \right)}_{\text{Part (b)}}. \tag{16}$$

As mentioned in the main text, we make use of the following lower bound of  $n_\Delta^b$  which again follows from Eq. (3) and holds for all  $\Delta$ 's except  $\Delta_f$ :

$$n_\Delta^b \geq \frac{4}{\Delta} \cdot 2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \bar{r}_{i^*})^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}} \geq \frac{8}{\Delta} \sqrt{2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}},$$

where the last step is due to Theorem 17. For simplicity, define  $S_\Delta = \Delta^2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} (r_{n,i} - \mathbb{E}[r_{n,i}])^2$  and therefore  $n_\Delta^b \geq \frac{C}{\Delta^2} \sqrt{S_\Delta}$  where  $C = 8\sqrt{2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}}$ , a constant if we regard  $\delta$  as a constant. Therefore,

$$\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \frac{C}{\Delta^2} \sqrt{S_\Delta} \leq \sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} n_\Delta^b \leq T \tag{17}$$

and our goal is to upper bound  $\sum_{\Delta} \sqrt{S_\Delta}$ . Define a threshold  $X = T / (C\sqrt{\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} S_\Delta})$  and denote  $\Delta_X = 2^{-\lceil \log_4 X \rceil}$  so that  $\Delta_X^2 \leq \frac{1}{X}$ . We will have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \sqrt{S_\Delta} &= \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_X} \sqrt{S_\Delta} + \sum_{\Delta=\Delta_X/2, \dots, 2\Delta_f} \sqrt{S_\Delta} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sqrt{\log_4 X} \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_X} S_\Delta} + \sum_{\Delta_X > \Delta > \Delta_f} \frac{\Delta_X^2}{\Delta^2} \sqrt{S_\Delta} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sqrt{\log_4 X} \sqrt{\sum_{\frac{1}{4} \geq \Delta \geq \Delta_X} S_\Delta} + \frac{1}{X} \sum_{\Delta_X > \Delta > \Delta_f} \frac{\sqrt{S_\Delta}}{\Delta^2} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sqrt{\log_4 X} \sqrt{\sum_{\frac{1}{4} \geq \Delta \geq \Delta_X} S_\Delta} + \frac{1}{X} \frac{T}{C} = (\sqrt{\log_4 X} + 1) \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} S_\Delta}, \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$



where (a) applied Cauchy-Schwartz to the first summation, (b) applied the fact that  $\Delta_X^2 \leq \frac{1}{X}$  and (c) used Eq. (17). So Part (a) of the regret, namely Eq. (15), can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\Delta} \left( 288\sqrt{2}s \sqrt{\Delta^2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\Delta}^b} (r_{t,i} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta} + 36s\Delta^2} \right) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 288\sqrt{2}s \sum_{\Delta} \sqrt{S_{\Delta} \ln \frac{4}{\delta}} + 72s \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 288\sqrt{2}s \sqrt{\ln \frac{4}{\delta}} \left( \sqrt{\log_4(4T) \sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} S_{\Delta}} + \sqrt{S_{\Delta_f}} \right) + 72s \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 576s \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \Delta^2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\Delta}^b} (r_{t,i^*} - \mathbb{E}[r_{t,i^*}])^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \log_4(4T) + 72s} \\
& \stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 576s \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} 8 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\Delta}^b} (\Delta^2 + d\sigma_t^2) \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \log_4(4T) + 72s} \tag{19} \\
& \leq 1152\sqrt{2}s\sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \log_4(4T)} + 1152\sqrt{2}s \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta} n_{\Delta}^b \Delta^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \log_4(4T) + 72s}.
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) used the fact that  $\sum \Delta^2 \leq 2$  as  $\Delta = 2^{-i}$ , (b) used Eq. (18), (c) again used Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (d) used Theorem 17(3), the variance concentration result, Eq. (22), the magnitude of the variance, and the facts that  $R \geq \Delta$ ,  $K \leq d$ . Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\mathcal{O}(s) \cdot \sum_{\Delta} n_{\Delta}^b \Delta^2 \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s\sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{4}{\delta}} + s \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s \sqrt{n_{\Delta}^b \Delta^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

Notice that the left-handed-side and the right-handed-side has a common term (the RHS one is inside the square-root sign). Hence, by the self-bounding property Lemma 40, we can conclude that (note that we divided  $s$  on both sides)

$$\sum_{\Delta} n_{\Delta}^b \Delta^2 \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{4}{\delta}} + 1 \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right), \tag{20}$$

which means that Part (a) (Eq. (15)), or equivalently  $\mathcal{O}(s \sum_{\Delta} n_{\Delta}^b \Delta^2)$ , is bounded by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s\sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{4}{\delta}} + s \log \frac{4}{\delta} \right).$$

Now consider Part (b) of the regret, namely Eq. (16). The second term in each summand will sum up to  $\mathcal{O}(s\sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}})$ . For the first term, using the notation  $S_{\Delta}$ , we want to bound

$$24s \left( \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^{3/4} \sum_{\Delta} \Delta \sqrt[4]{S_{\Delta}} \leq 24s \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{\Delta} \Delta \sqrt[4]{\sum_{\Delta} S_{\Delta}} \leq 48s \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \sqrt[4]{\sum_{\Delta} S_{\Delta}}.$$

Conditioning on the same events as in Eq. (19), we will have

$$\sum_{\Delta} S_{\Delta} \leq \mathcal{O} \left( \sum_{\Delta} n_{\Delta}^b \Delta^2 + \sum_{t=1}^T d\sigma_t^2 \right) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sum_{t=1}^T d\sigma_t^2 + \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T d\sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sum_{t=1}^T d\sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right),$$

where the second step comes from Eq. (20). Therefore,

$$24s \left( \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^{3/4} \sum_{\Delta} \Delta \sqrt[4]{S_{\Delta}} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s \sqrt{\sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \left( \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^{3/4}} \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s \sqrt[4]{d \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right),$$

which gives (by combining the bound of Eq. (15) and Eq. (16) together):

$$\mathcal{R}_T^b \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s \sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{4}{\delta}} + s \sqrt[4]{d \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \log \frac{4}{\delta} \right).$$

Further notice that, if  $d \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \geq 1$ , then the square-root is larger than the 4th-root. When  $d \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \leq 1$ , then either root is bounded by  $s$ . Hence, in either case, the 4th-root will be hidden by other factors. Henceforth, we indeed have the following conclusion with probability  $1 - (s + 3T)\delta$ :

$$\mathcal{R}_T^b \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s \sqrt{d \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right).$$

By setting the actual  $\delta$  as  $(s + 3T)\delta$ , we will still have the same regret bound as  $\mathcal{O}(\log \frac{c}{\delta}) = \mathcal{O}(\log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log c) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\log \frac{1}{\delta})$  as all logarithmic factors will be hidden by  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ .  $\square$

## D.2 Regret-to-Sample-Complexity Conversion

*Proof of Lemma 20.* By a union bound, the probability that  $\overline{\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}}$  is a pessimistic estimation for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots, n_{\Delta}^b$  is bounded by  $1 - n_{\Delta}^b \delta$ . Conditioning on this, by definition, we will have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{n_{\Delta}^b} \langle \theta_i^*, \theta_i^* - x_n \rangle \leq \mathcal{R}_{n_{\Delta}^b}^{\mathcal{F}} \leq \overline{\mathcal{R}_{n_{\Delta}^b}^{\mathcal{F}}},$$

which means our stopping criterion (Line 4) will ensure

$$\sum_{n=1}^{n_{\Delta}^b} \langle \theta_i^*, \theta_i^* - \hat{\theta} \rangle \leq \frac{\overline{\mathcal{R}_{n_{\Delta}^b}^{\mathcal{F}}}}{n_{\Delta}^b} < \Delta^2$$

and thus  $\mathcal{G}_{\Delta}$  is ensured.  $\square$

## D.3 Random Projection

*Proof of Lemma 21.* By  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$ , we have  $|\theta_i^*| > \Delta, \forall i \in S$ , which gives  $|\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i| < \Delta$  by  $\mathcal{G}_{\Delta}$ . So we can bound  $|\sum_{i \in S} (\hat{\theta}_i^2 - (\theta_i^*)^2)|$  by  $2|\sum_{i \in S} \theta_i^* (\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i)| + |\sum_{i \in S} (\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i)^2| < 2\Delta^2 + \Delta^2 = 3\Delta^2$ . The second claim is then straightforward as  $\hat{\theta}_i (\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i) = -\theta_i^* (\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i) - ((\hat{\theta}_i^2 - (\theta_i^*)^2))$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 22.* In the random projection procedure, let  $Z_i^{(n)}$  be the random variable defined as

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i^{(n)} &= \frac{K}{R^2} y_i^{(n)} \left( \langle x_n, \theta^* \rangle + \eta_n - \sum_{j \in S} \hat{\theta}_j^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{K}{R^2} \left( y_i^{(n)} \right)^2 \theta_i^* + \sum_{j \in S} \hat{\theta}_j (\theta_j^* - \hat{\theta}_j) + \sum_{j \notin S, j \neq i} \left( \frac{K}{R^2} y_i^{(n)} y_j^{(n)} \right) \theta_j^* + \left( \frac{K}{R^2} y_i^{(n)} \right) \eta_n. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Then  $\bar{r}_i$  is just the sample mean estimator of  $\{Z_i^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^N$ .

Firstly, observe that  $y_i^2$  is always  $\frac{R^2}{K}$ , so the first term is just  $\theta_i^*$ , which is exactly the magnitude we want to estimate. Moreover, by Lemma 21, the second term is a small (deterministic) bias added to  $\theta_i^*$  and is bounded by  $3\Delta^2$ . For the third term, as each  $y_j$  is independent,  $\frac{K}{R^2}y_i y_j$  is an i.i.d. Rademacher random variable, denoted by  $z_j^{(n)}$ . Hence, the last two terms sums to

$$\sum_{j \notin S, j \neq i} z_j^{(n)} \theta_j^* + \left( \frac{K}{R^2} y_i^{(n)} \right) \eta_n.$$

By definition,  $\mathbb{E}[z_j] = \mathbb{E}[\eta_n] = 0$ , henceforth they can be viewed as noises with variance at most

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{j \notin S, j \neq i} z_j^{(n)} \theta_j^* + \frac{K}{R^2} y_i^{(n)} \eta_n \right)^2 \right] \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j \notin S} \left( z_j^{(n)} \theta_j^* \right)^2 + \left( \frac{K}{R^2} y_i^{(n)} \right)^2 \eta_n^2 \right] \leq 1 + \frac{K}{R^2} \sigma_n^2, \quad (22)$$

where (a) is due to the pairwise independence between  $z_j^{(n)}$  and  $y_i^{(n)}$ .

As the first two terms of Eq. (21) does not depend on the randomness by the algorithm (which is  $y^{(n)}$ ) and the environment (which is  $\eta_n$ ), Eq. (22) is just the variance of the noises to  $\hat{r}_i$ . Henceforth, Empirical Bernstein Inequality (Theorem 13, which is a analog of Theorem 4 from Zhang et al. (2021) for conditionally symmetric sub-Gaussian random variables) and Eq. (22) together ensures:

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \left( \sum_{j \notin S, j \neq i} z_j^{(n)} \theta_j^* + \left( \frac{K}{R^2} y_i^{(n)} \right) \eta_n \right) \right| \geq 2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{n=1}^N (r_{n,i} - \hat{r}_i)^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}} \right\} \leq \delta.$$

In other words, our choice of  $N$  in Eq. (3) will ensure the average noise is bounded by  $\frac{\Delta}{2}$ . By Lemma 21, we conclude that  $\Pr\{\hat{r}_i - \theta_i^* > 3\Delta^2 + \frac{\Delta}{4} \mid \mathcal{G}_\Delta, \mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}\} \leq \delta$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 23.* If we skipped due to  $\sum_{i \in S} \hat{\theta}_i^2 > 1 - \Delta^2$ , which is Line 7 of Algorithm 1, then by Lemma 21, we will have

$$\sum_{i \in S} (\theta_i^*)^2 > 1 - 5\Delta^2 \quad \text{conditioning on } \mathcal{G}_\Delta \wedge \mathcal{H}_{2\Delta},$$

and thus all remaining coordinates are smaller than  $3\Delta$ . Moreover, by  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$ , all discovered coordinates are with magnitude at least  $\frac{2\Delta}{2} > \frac{\Delta}{2}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{H}_\Delta$  automatically hold in this case.

Otherwise, suppose that the conclusion of Lemma 22 holds for all  $i \in [K]$  (which happens with probability  $1 - K\delta$  conditioning on  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$ ). As we only pick those coordinates with  $\hat{r}_i > \Delta$ , all coordinates with magnitude at last  $\Delta + \frac{\Delta}{4} + 3\Delta^2 < 3\Delta$  will be picked as  $\Delta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ , so the first condition of  $\mathcal{H}_\Delta$  indeed holds. Moreover, all picked coordinates will have magnitude at least  $\Delta - (\frac{\Delta}{4} + 3\Delta^2)$ . But when  $\Delta = \frac{1}{4}$ , there will be no coordinates in  $S$  as it is initially empty. And after that, we will have  $\Delta^2 \leq \frac{\Delta}{8}$ . Hence, all coordinates with magnitude  $\frac{\Delta}{2}$  will be sure to be identified, which means the second condition of  $\mathcal{H}_\Delta$  also holds.

In conclusion, we will have  $\Pr\{\mathcal{H}_\Delta \mid \mathcal{G}_\Delta, \mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}\} \geq 1 - K\delta$  by combining two cases together.  $\square$

#### D.4 Single-Phase Regret

*Proof of Lemma 24.* Conditioning on  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta$ , as we are playing  $x_{t,i} = \hat{\theta}_i$  for all  $i \in S$  and  $t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b$ , we will have

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} \sum_{i \in S} (\theta_i^* - x_{t,i}) \theta_i^* = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} \sum_{i \in S} (\theta_i^* - \hat{\theta}_i) \theta_i^* < n_\Delta^b \cdot \Delta^2.$$

Now consider a single coordinate not in  $S$ . For each  $t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b$ , we will equiprobably play  $\pm \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}}$  for this coordinate. Hence, the total regret will become

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} \left( \theta_i^* \pm \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}} \right) \theta_i^* = n_\Delta^b \cdot (\theta_i^*)^2 + \theta_i^* \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} \left( \pm \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}} \right).$$

By  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$ , the first term is bounded by  $36n_\Delta^b \Delta^2$ . By Chernoff bound, the absolute value of the summation in the second term will be bounded by  $\frac{R}{\sqrt{K}} \sqrt{2n_\Delta^b \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$  with probability  $1 - \delta$ . As there are at most  $s$  non-zero coordinates by sparsity, from a union bound, we can conclude that

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^b} \langle \theta^* - x_t, \theta^* \rangle \leq 36sn_\Delta^b \Delta^2 + 6s\Delta \frac{R}{\sqrt{K}} \sqrt{2n_\Delta^b \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$$

with probability  $1 - s\delta$ .  $\square$

## E Omitted Proof in Section 4 (Analysis of VOFUL2)

### E.1 Proof of Main Theorem

In this section, we prove Theorem 6, which is restated as Theorem 25. We first assume that Proposition 4 is indeed correct, whose discussion is left to Appendix E.2.

**Theorem 25** (Regret of Algorithm 1 with VOFUL2 in Unknown-Variance Case). *Consider Algorithm 1 with  $\mathcal{F}$  as VOFUL2 (Kim et al., 2021) and  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  as*

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}} = C \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{n}{s\delta^2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^{1.5} \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right), \quad (23)$$

where  $C = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$  is the constant hidden in the  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$  notation of Proposition 4,  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  are the actions made by the agent,  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$  are the corresponding (noisy) feedback, and  $\hat{\beta}$  is defined as

$$\hat{\beta} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^s} \left( \sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \beta \rangle)^2 + \|\beta\|_2 \right).$$

The algorithm ensures the following regret bound with probability  $1 - \delta$ :

$$\mathcal{R}_T = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( (s^{2.5} + s\sqrt{d}) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^3 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right).$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 4, the total regret incurred by algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}} \leq C \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right),$$

where  $C = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$  is a constant (with some logarithmic factors) and  $\eta_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \sim \text{subG}(\sigma_k^2)$  is the noise for the  $k$ -th time step executing  $\mathcal{F}$ . We now consider our regret estimator  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ . We show that, with high probability, it is indeed a pessimistic estimation.

**Lemma 26.** *For any given  $\Delta$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}} \geq \mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ .*

Therefore, for Phase B, we can make use of Theorem 19 (which only requires  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  to be an overestimate of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  with high probability). Hence, we can conclude that

$$\mathcal{R}_T^b \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s\sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right).$$

So we only need to bound the regret for Phase A, namely  $\mathcal{R}_T^a$ . As mentioned in the main text, we will consider the regret contributed from inside and outside  $S$  separately. Formally, we will write  $\mathcal{R}_T^a$  as

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a = \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \left( \sum_{i \in S} \theta_i^* (\theta_i^* - x_{t,i}) + \sum_{i \notin S} (\theta_i^*)^2 \right),$$

where the equality is due to the fact that we will not put any mass on those  $i \notin S$  during Phase A. As already conditioned on in the proof of Theorem 19, we assume the ‘good events’  $\mathcal{G}_\Delta, \mathcal{H}_\Delta$  hold for all  $\Delta$  (which are defined in Eq. (13)). Therefore, by  $\mathcal{H}_{2\Delta}$ , for a given  $\Delta$ ,  $\sum_{i \notin S} (\theta_i^*)^2 \leq 36s\Delta^2$ . Moreover, by Lemma 26, we will have

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a \leq \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \overline{\mathcal{R}_{n_\Delta^a}^{\mathcal{F}}} + 36s \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} n_\Delta^a \Delta^2.$$

By the terminating criterion  $\frac{1}{n} \overline{\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}} < \Delta^2$  (Line 4 of Algorithm 1), for all  $\Delta$ , we will have  $n_\Delta^a - 1 \leq \frac{C}{\Delta^2} \overline{\mathcal{R}_{n_\Delta^a}^{\mathcal{F}}}$ , which means

$$n_\Delta^a \leq \frac{C}{\Delta^2} \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^a} (r_t - \langle x_t, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{n_\Delta^a}{s\delta^2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^{1.5} \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + 1.$$

Therefore, plugging back into the expression of  $\mathcal{R}_T^a$  gives (the term related with  $\overline{\mathcal{R}_{n_\Delta^a}^{\mathcal{F}}}$  is dominated by the second term, as intuitively explained in the main text):

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a \leq \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s^{2.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^a} (r_t - \langle x_t, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^3 \left( \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + s\Delta^2 \right).$$

The last term is simply bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(s)$  after summing up over  $\Delta$ . Let us focus on the first term, where we need to upper bound the magnitude of  $\overline{\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}}$ . Applying Lemma 18 in the other direction (compared to the proof of Lemma 26) will give, with probability  $1 - \delta$ , the following also holds:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k^2 + 2s \ln \frac{n}{s\delta^2} + 2.$$

Therefore, we can write the regret (conditioning on this good event holds for all  $\Delta$ , which is with probability at least  $1 - T\delta$ ) as

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a \leq \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s^{2.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^a} \eta_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^3 \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + s\Delta^2 \right). \quad (24)$$

Again by the technique we used for Appendix D, we will need the following lower bound for all  $n_\Delta^a$  except for the last one, which follows from the fact that  $\overline{\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}} \geq \mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  (Lemma 26):

$$n_\Delta^a \geq \frac{Cs^{1.5}}{\Delta^2} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^a} \eta_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}.$$

By the summation technique that we used in Appendix D, more precisely, by the derivation of Eq. (18), we will have the following derivation:

$$\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} Cs^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^a} \eta_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \leq \sqrt{\log_4 X} \sqrt{\sum_{\frac{1}{4} \geq \Delta \geq \Delta_x} \sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^a} C^2 s^3 \eta_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{1}{X}} \sum_{\Delta_x > \Delta > \Delta_f} \frac{Cs^{1.5}}{\Delta^2} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\Delta^a} \eta_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$$

where  $X$  is defined as

$$X = T / \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} C^2 s^3 \eta_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$$

and  $\Delta_X = 2^{-\lceil \log_4 X \rceil}$ , which means  $\Delta_X^2 \leq \frac{1}{X}$ . Hence, we will have (the second summation will be bounded by  $\frac{T}{X}$  as  $\sum_{\Delta} n_\Delta^a \leq T$ )

$$\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} C s^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} C^2 s^3 \eta_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

In other words, the first term of Eq. (24) will be bounded by

$$s^{2.5} \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \eta_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s^{2.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

So we are done with the first and the last term of Eq. (24). Now consider the second term, which is equivalent to bounding  $\sum_{\Delta} 1$ . Use the following property guaranteed by (again) Line 4 of Algorithm 1:

$$\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \Delta^{-2} C s^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \leq \sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} n_\Delta \leq T,$$

which means  $\sum_{\Delta} 1 \leq \log_4(T/s^2) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ . Combining them together gives

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s^{2.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^3 \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right),$$

At last, due to Theorem 16, with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (r_i - \langle x_i, \beta^* \rangle)^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k^2 \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\eta_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] + 4\sqrt{2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \leq 8 \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta},$$

where (a) is due to Theorem 16 and (b) is due to  $\mathbb{E}[\eta_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \sigma_k^2$ . Hence,

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s^{2.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^3 \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right).$$

Combining this with the regret for  $\mathcal{R}_T^b$  (Theorem 19) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_T &\leq \mathcal{O} \left( (s^{2.5} + s\sqrt{d}) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^3 \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + s \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left( (s^{2.5} + s\sqrt{d}) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^3 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.  $\square$



---

**Algorithm 3** VOFUL2 Algorithm (Kim et al., 2021)

---

- 1: **for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
- 2:     Compute the action for the  $t$ -th round as

$$x_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{\theta \in \bigcap_{s=1}^{t-1} \Theta_s} \langle x, \theta \rangle, \quad (25)$$

- where  $\Theta_s$  is defined in Eq. (27).
- 3:     Observe reward  $r_t = \langle x_t, \theta^* \rangle + \eta_t$ .
- 

## E.2 Regret Over-Estimation

In this section, we first discuss why Proposition 4 holds under our noise assumptions, which is different from theirs (which assumed  $[-1, 1]$ -bounded noises). After that, we argue that our pessimistic estimation  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  is indeed an over-estimation of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ . We state the VOFUL2 algorithm in Algorithm 3 and also restate Proposition 4 as Proposition 27 for the ease of presentation.

**Proposition 27.** *Under Assumptions 9 and 10, VOFUL2 on  $d$  dimensions guarantees, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} = \tilde{O} \left( d^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + d^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) = \tilde{O} \left( d^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + d^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right), \quad (26)$$

where  $\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \dots, \sigma_T^2$  are the (conditional) variance proxies of  $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_T$ , respectively.

*Proof.* We will follow the proof of Kim et al. (2021) and highlight the different steps. We first argue that an analog to their Empirical Bernstein Inequality (Zhang et al., 2021, Theorem 4) still holds under Assumptions 9 and 10, due to our Empirical Bernstein Inequality Theorem 13, as follows.

**Lemma 28** (Analog of Theorem 4 from Zhang et al. (2021)). *Let  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  be a filtration,  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a sequence of real-valued random variables such that  $X_i$  is  $\mathcal{F}_i$ -measurable and  $\mathbb{E}[X_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = 0$  and  $X_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$  is symmetric. Then for all  $n \geq 8$  and any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right| \leq 8 \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 \ln \frac{4}{\delta}} \right\} \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Then due to Theorem 17, the following analog of Lemma 17 from Zhang et al. (2021) also holds:

**Lemma 29** (Analog of Lemma 17 from Zhang et al. (2021)). *Let  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  be a filtration,  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a sequence of real-valued random variables such that  $X_i$  is  $\mathcal{F}_i$ -measurable and  $\mathbb{E}[X_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = 0$  and  $X_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$  is symmetric and  $\sigma_i^2$ -sub-Gaussian, then for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 \geq 8 \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \right\} \leq \delta.$$

Then consider their Elliptical Potential Counting Lemma (Kim et al., 2021, Lemma 5), which holds as long as  $\|x_t\|_2 \leq 1$ . In our setting, we indeed have this property as  $x_t \in \mathbb{B}^d$  (only the noises can be unbounded, instead of actions). Hence, this lemma still holds.

**Lemma 30** (Kim et al. (2021, Lemma 5)). *Let  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be such that  $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$  for all  $s \in [k]$ . Let  $V_k = \lambda I + \sum_{i=1}^k x_i x_i^\top$ . Let  $J = \{i \in [k] \mid \|x_i\|_{V_{i-1}}^2 \geq q\}$ , then*

$$|J| \leq \frac{2d}{\ln(1+q)} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2/e}{\ln(1+q)} \frac{1}{\lambda} \right).$$

Then consider the confidence set construction:

$$\Theta_t = \bigcap_{\ell=1}^L \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{B}^d \left| \left| \sum_{s=1}^t \overline{(x_s^\top \mu)}_\ell \epsilon_s(\theta) \right| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^t \overline{(x_s^\top \mu)}_\ell^2 \epsilon_s^2(\theta) \iota}, \forall \mu \in \mathbb{B}^d \right\}, \quad (27)$$

where  $\epsilon_s(\theta) = r_s - x_s^\top \theta$ ,  $\epsilon_s^2(\theta) = (\epsilon_s(\theta))^2$ ,  $\iota = 128 \ln((12K2^L)^{d+2}/\delta) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ ,  $L = \max\{1, \lfloor \log_2(1 + \frac{T}{d}) \rfloor\}$  and  $\overline{(x)}_\ell = \min\{|x|, 2^{-\ell}\} \frac{x}{|x|}$ . Then we have  $\theta^* \in \Theta_t$  for all  $t \in [T]$  with high probability:

**Lemma 31** (Kim et al. (2021, Lemma 1)). *The good event  $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{\forall t \in [T], \theta^* \in \Theta_t\}$  happens with probability  $1 - \delta$ .*

The proof directly follows from the union bound over an  $\epsilon$ -net of  $\mathbb{B}^d$  argument used by Kim et al. (2021), except for a new Empirical Bernstein Inequality (Lemma 28). One may refer to their original proof for more details.

Similar to Kim et al. (2021), we define  $\theta_t$  be the maximizer of Eq. (25) in the  $t$ -th time step and define  $\mu_t = \theta_t - \theta^*$ . We also consider the following good event

$$\mathcal{E}_2 : \forall t \in [T], \sum_{s=1}^t \epsilon_s^2(\theta^*) \leq 8 \sum_{s=1}^t \sigma_s^2 \ln \frac{8T}{\delta},$$

which happens with probability  $1 - \delta$  due to Lemma 29. Define

$$W_{\ell, t-1}(\mu) = 2^{-\ell} \lambda I + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \left( 1 \wedge \frac{2^{-\ell}}{|x_s^\top \mu|} \right) x_s x_s^\top.$$

Abbreviate  $W_{\ell, t-1}(\mu_t)$  as  $W_{\ell, t-1}$ , then we have the following lemma, which is slightly different from the original one, whose proof will be presented later.

**Lemma 32** (Analog of Lemma 4 from Kim et al. (2021)). *Conditioning on  $\mathcal{E}_1$  and setting  $\lambda = 1$ , we have*

1.  $\|\mu_t\|_{W_{\ell, t-1}}^2 \leq C_1 2^{-\ell} (\sqrt{A_{t-1} \iota} + \iota)$  for some absolute constant  $C_1$ , where  $A_t \triangleq \sum_{s=1}^t \eta_s^2$ .
2. For all  $s \leq t$ , we have  $\|\mu_t\|_{W_{\ell, s-1}}^2 \leq C_1 2^{-\ell} (\sqrt{A_{s-1} \iota} + \iota)$ .
3. There exists absolute constant  $C_2$  such that  $x_t \mu_t \leq C_2 \|x_t^\top\|_{W_{\ell, t-1}}^2 (\sqrt{A_{t-1} \iota} + \iota)$ .

Therefore, as we have the same  $\mathcal{E}_1$ , Lemma 5 and a similar Lemma 4 (which uses  $\eta_s$  instead of  $\sigma_s$ ), we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} &\leq C \left( \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{T-1} \eta_s^2 \iota + \iota} \right) d \ln^2 \left( 1 + C \left( \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{T-1} \eta_s^2 \iota + \iota} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{T}{d} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( d^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + d^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right), \end{aligned}$$

as in Kim et al. (2021, Theorem 2) (recall that  $\iota = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d})$ ). Conditioning on  $\mathcal{E}_2$ , we then further have

$$\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( d^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + d^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right),$$

as claimed.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 32.* By definition and abbreviating  $\overline{(\cdot)}_\ell$  as  $\overline{(\cdot)}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mu_t\|_{W_{\ell, t-1-2^{-\ell}\lambda I}}^2 &= \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \overline{(x_s^\top \mu_t)} (x_s^\top \mu_t) = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \overline{(x_s^\top \mu_s)} (x_s \theta_t - r_t + r_t - x_s \theta^*) \\
&= \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \overline{(x_s^\top \mu_t)} (-\epsilon_s(\theta_t) + \epsilon_s(\theta^*)) \\
&\stackrel{(\mathcal{E}_1)}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (x_s^\top \mu_t)^2 \epsilon_s^2(\theta_t) \ell} + \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \overline{(x_s^\top \mu_t)}^2 \epsilon_s^2(\theta^*) \ell} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \overline{(x_s^\top \mu_t)}^2 2(x_s^\top \mu_t)^2 \ell} + 2\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \overline{(x_s^\top \mu_t)}^2 2\epsilon_s^2(\theta^*) \ell} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sqrt{2^{-\ell} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \overline{(x_s^\top \mu_t)}^2 2(x_s^\top \mu_t)^2 \ell} + 2^{-\ell} 16 \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \eta_s^2 \ell} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{2 \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \overline{(x_s^\top \mu_t)} (x_s^\top \mu_t) \ell} + 2^{-\ell} 16 \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \eta_s^2 \ell} \\
&= \sqrt{2^{-\ell} 8 \|\mu_t\|_{V_{t-1-\lambda I}}^2 \ell} + 2^{-\ell} 16 \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \eta_s^2 \ell},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) used  $\epsilon_s^2(\theta_t) = (r_s - x_s \theta_t)^2 = (x_s^\top(\theta^* - \theta_t) + \epsilon_s^2(\theta^*)) \leq 2(x_s^\top \mu_t)^2 + 2\epsilon_s^2$  and (b) used  $\epsilon_s^2(\theta^*) = \eta_s^2$ . By the self-bounding property Lemma 40, we have

$$\|\mu_t\|_{V_{t-1-\lambda I}}^2 \leq 16 \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sigma_s^2} + 8\ell,$$

which means  $\|\mu_t\|_{V_{t-1}}^2 \leq 4\lambda + 16 \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sigma_s^2} + 8\ell$ . Setting  $\lambda = 1$  gives the first conclusion. Based on this, the second and third conclusion directly follow according to Kim et al. (2021).  $\square$

## E.2.1 Extension to Unknown Variance Cases

Based on Proposition 4, we then show that, our regret estimation  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  Eq. (23) is indeed pessimistic (i.e., Lemma 26).

*Proof of Lemma 26.* From Lemma 18 with  $\lambda = 1$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we will have (recall the assumption that  $\sigma_t^2 \leq 1$  for all  $t \in [T]$ )

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \beta^* \rangle)^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 + 2s^2 \ln \frac{n}{s\delta^2} + 2.$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}} &\leq C \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \\
&\leq C \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{\left( \sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 + 2s \ln \frac{n}{s\delta^2} + 2 \right) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n (r_k - \langle x_k, \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{n}{s\delta^2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^{1.5} \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right) = \overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}.$$

In other words, our  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  is an over-estimation of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  with probability  $1 - \delta$ .  $\square$

## F Omitted Proof in Section 5 (Analysis of Weighted OFUL)

### F.1 Proof of Main Theorem

Similar to the VOFUL2 algorithm, we still assume Proposition 7 indeed holds and defer the discussions to the next section. We restate the regret guarantee of Weighted OFUL (Zhou et al., 2021), namely Theorem 8, for the ease of reading, as follows:

**Theorem 33** (Regret of Algorithm 1 with Weighted OFUL in Known-Variance Case). *Consider Algorithm 1 with  $\mathcal{F}$  as Weighted OFUL (Zhou et al., 2021) and  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}}$  as*

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_n^{\mathcal{F}} \triangleq C \left( \sqrt{sn \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

The algorithm ensures the following regret bound with probability  $1 - \delta$ :

$$\mathcal{R}_T = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( (s^2 + s\sqrt{d}) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^{1.5} \sqrt{T} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right).$$

*Proof.* Firstly, from Proposition 7, the condition of applying Theorem 19 holds. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_T^b \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s\sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right).$$

For  $\mathcal{R}_T^a$ , similar to Appendix F, we decompose it into two parts: those from  $S$  and from outside of  $S$ . The former case is bounded by Proposition 7, as

$$\text{Regret from } S \text{ with gap threshold } \Delta \leq C \left( \sqrt{sn_{\Delta}^a \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\Delta}^a} \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

For those outside  $S$ , we will bound it as  $\mathcal{O}(sn_{\Delta}^a \Delta^2)$ , where we only need to bound  $n_{\Delta}^a$ . From Line 4 of Algorithm 1, we have

$$n_{\Delta}^a - 1 \leq \frac{C}{\Delta^2} \left( \sqrt{s(n_{\Delta}^a - 1) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\Delta}^a} \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

By the ‘‘self-bounding’’ property that  $x \leq a + b\sqrt{x}$  implies  $x \leq \mathcal{O}(a + b^2)$  (Lemma 40), we have

$$n_{\Delta}^a - 1 \leq \frac{1}{\Delta^4} s \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{s}{\Delta^2} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\Delta}^a} \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}.$$

Therefore, we can conclude that (the regret from  $S$  is dominated)

$$\mathcal{R}_T^a \leq \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots} \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{s^2}{\Delta^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta} + s^2 \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\Delta}^a} \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s\Delta^2 \right),$$

where the last term is simply bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(s)$ . Again from Line 4 of Algorithm 1, we will have the following property for all  $\Delta \neq \Delta_f$ :

$$n_\Delta^a > \frac{C}{\Delta^2} \left( \sqrt{sn_\Delta^a \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right). \quad (28)$$

We first bound the second term, which basically follow the summation technique (Eq. (18)) that we used in Appendices D and E.1:

$$\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} C s \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \leq \sqrt{\log_4 X} \sqrt{\sum_{\frac{1}{4} \geq \Delta \geq \Delta_X} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} C^2 s^2 \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{1}{X} \sum_{\Delta_X > \Delta > \Delta_f} \frac{C s}{\Delta^2} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$$

where  $X$  is defined as

$$X = T / \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} C^2 s^2 \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}$$

and  $\Delta_X = 2^{-\lceil \log_4 X \rceil}$ , which means  $\Delta_X^2 \leq \frac{1}{X}$ . Hence, we will have (the second summation will be bounded by  $\frac{T}{X}$  as  $\sum_{\Delta} n_\Delta^a \leq T$ )

$$\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} C s \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} \sigma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sqrt{\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^a} C^2 s^2 \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

Hence, for the second term, we have

$$\mathcal{O} \left( s^2 \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \log T} \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s^2 \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

At last, we consider the first term. From the same lower bound of  $n_\Delta^a$  (Eq. (28)), we will have

$$n_\Delta^a > \frac{C}{\Delta^2} \sqrt{sn_\Delta^a \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \implies n_\Delta^a > \frac{C^2}{\Delta^4} s \ln \frac{1}{\delta}.$$

By the fact that  $\sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} n_\Delta^a \leq T$ , we will have

$$T \geq C^2 s \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{\Delta \neq \Delta_f} \Delta^{-4} = \mathcal{O}(1) C^2 s \ln \frac{1}{\delta} (2\Delta_f)^{-4}.$$

Henceforth,

$$\mathcal{O} \left( s^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \sum_{\Delta=2^{-2}, \dots, \Delta_f} \Delta^{-2} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left( s^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \Delta_f^{-2} \right) \leq \mathcal{O} \left( s^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{T}{s \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{T \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right).$$

Combining all above together gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_T &= \mathcal{R}_T^a + \mathcal{R}_T^b \leq \mathcal{O} \left( s^{1.5} \sqrt{T \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^2 \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( s \sqrt{d} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( (s^2 + s \sqrt{d}) \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + s^{1.5} \sqrt{T \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.  $\square$

---

**Algorithm 4** Weighted OFUL Algorithm (Zhou et al., 2021)
 

---

- 1: Initialize  $A_0 \leftarrow \lambda I$ ,  $c_0 \leftarrow 0$ ,  $\hat{\theta}_0 \leftarrow A_0^{-1}c_0$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_0 = 0$  and  $\Theta_0 \leftarrow \{\theta \mid \|\theta - \hat{\theta}_0\|_{A_0} \leq \hat{\beta}_0 + \sqrt{\lambda}B\}$ .
- 2: **for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
- 3:   Compute the action for the  $t$ -th round as

$$x_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{\theta \in \Theta_{t-1}} \langle x, \theta \rangle. \quad (29)$$

- 4:   Observe reward  $r_t = \langle x_t, \theta^* \rangle + \eta_t$  and variance information  $\sigma_t^2$ , set  $\bar{\sigma}_t = \max\{1/\sqrt{d}, \sigma_t\}$ , set confidence radius  $\hat{\beta}_t$  as

$$\hat{\beta}_t = 8\sqrt{d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{t}{d\lambda\bar{\sigma}_{\min,t}^2} \right) \ln \frac{4t^2}{\delta}}, \quad (30)$$

where  $\bar{\sigma}_{\min,t} \triangleq \min_{s=1}^t \bar{\sigma}_s$ .

- 5:   Calculate  $A_t \leftarrow A_{t-1} + x_t x_t^\top / \bar{\sigma}_t^2$ ,  $c_t \leftarrow c_{t-1} + r_t x_t / \bar{\sigma}_t^2$ ,  $\hat{\theta}_t \leftarrow A_t^{-1}c_t$  and  $\Theta_t \leftarrow \{\theta \mid \|\theta - \hat{\theta}_t\|_{A_t} \leq \hat{\beta}_t + \sqrt{\lambda}B\}$ .
- 

## F.2 Regret Over-estimation

We argue that Proposition 7 still holds under our noise model, i.e., Assumptions 9 and 10. We present their algorithm in Algorithm 4.

**Proposition 34.** *Under Assumptions 9 and 10, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , Weighted OFUL executed for  $T$  steps on  $d$  dimensions guarantees*

$$\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} \leq C \left( \sqrt{dT \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + d \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right)$$

where  $C = \tilde{O}(1)$  and  $\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \dots, \sigma_T^2$  are the (conditional) variance proxies of  $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_T$ , respectively.

*Proof Sketch.* We mainly follow the original proof by Zhou et al. (2021) and highlight the differences. We first highlight their Bernstein Inequality for vector-valued martingales also holds under our assumptions, as:

**Lemma 35** (Analog of Theorem 4.1 from Zhou et al. (2021)). *Let  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  be a filtration,  $\{x_i, \eta_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a stochastic process such that  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is  $\mathcal{F}_i$ -measurable and  $\eta_i \in \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_i$ -measurable. Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[\eta_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = 0$  and  $\eta_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim \text{subG}(\sigma^2)$  is symmetric. Moreover, assume that  $\|x_t\|_2 \leq L$ . Let  $r_t = \langle \theta^*, x_t \rangle + \eta_t$  for all  $t \in [n]$ . Set  $Z_t = \lambda I + \sum_{s=1}^t x_s x_s^\top$ ,  $b_t = \sum_{s=1}^t r_s x_s$  and  $\theta_t = Z_t^{-1}b_t$ . Then,  $\forall \delta \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\Pr \left\{ \left\| \sum_{s=1}^t x_s \eta_s \right\|_{Z_t^{-1}} \leq \beta_t, \|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_{Z_t} \leq \beta_t + \sqrt{\lambda} \|\theta^*\|_2, \forall t \in [n] \right\} \geq 1 - \delta,$$

where  $\beta_t = 8\sigma \sqrt{d \ln(1 + \frac{tL^2}{d\lambda}) \ln \frac{8t^2}{\delta}}$ .

The proof, which will be presented later, mainly follows from the idea of their proof of Theorem 4.1, except that we are using a variant of Freedman's inequalities for sub-Gaussian martingale difference sequences (Theorem 14). Check the proof below for more details about this.

With this theorem, we can consequently conclude that the confidence construction is indeed valid by applying Lemma 35 to the sequence  $\{\eta_t / \bar{\sigma}_t\}_{t \in [T]}$ , which gives

$$\|\hat{\theta}_t - \theta^*\|_{A_t} \leq \hat{\beta}_t + \sqrt{\lambda} \|\theta^*\|_2 \leq \hat{\beta}_t + \sqrt{\lambda}, \quad \forall t \in [T], \quad \text{with probability } 1 - \delta,$$

where  $\widehat{\beta}_t = 8\sqrt{d \ln(1 + \frac{t}{d\lambda\bar{\sigma}_{\min,t}^2}) \ln \frac{4t^2}{\delta}}$ , as defined in Eq. (30). Therefore, we can conclude their (B.19) from exactly the same argument, namely

$$\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} \leq 2 \sum_{t=1}^T \min \left\{ 1, \bar{\sigma}_t (\widehat{\beta}_{t-1} + \sqrt{\lambda}) \|x_t / \bar{\sigma}_t\|_{A_{t-1}^{-1}} \right\}.$$

Similar to their proof, define  $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{t \in [T] \mid \|x_t / \bar{\sigma}_t\|_{A_{t-1}^{-1}} \geq 1\}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_2 = [T] \setminus \mathcal{I}_1$ , then we have (where  $\bar{\sigma}_{\min}$  is the abbreviation of  $\bar{\sigma}_{\min,T} = \min_{s=1}^T \bar{\sigma}_s$ )

$$|\mathcal{I}_1| = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_1} \min \{1, \|x_t / \bar{\sigma}_t\|_{A_{t-1}^{-1}}^2\} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \min \{1, \|x_t / \bar{\sigma}_t\|_{A_{t-1}^{-1}}^2\} \leq 2d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{T}{d\lambda\bar{\sigma}_{\min}^2} \right),$$

where the last step uses Lemma 37 and the fact that  $\|x_t / \bar{\sigma}_t\|_2 \leq \bar{\sigma}_{\min}^{-1}$ . Therefore, we are having the same Eq. (B.21) as theirs, which gives

$$\mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} \leq 2\sqrt{2d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{T}{d\lambda\bar{\sigma}_{\min}^2} \right)} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T (\widehat{\beta}_{t-1} + \sqrt{\lambda})^2 \bar{\sigma}_t^2} + 4d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{T}{d\lambda\bar{\sigma}_{\min}^2} \right).$$

By the choice of  $\bar{\sigma}_t = \max\{1/\sqrt{d}, \sigma_t\}$  and  $\lambda = 1$ , we have

$$\ln \left( 1 + \frac{T}{d\lambda\bar{\sigma}_{\min}^2} \right) \leq \ln \left( 1 + \frac{T}{d} \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1),$$

and that

$$\widehat{\beta}_t + \sqrt{\lambda} = \mathcal{O} \left( \sqrt{d \log T \log \frac{T}{\delta}} + 1 \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sqrt{d \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right),$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_T^{\mathcal{F}} &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( d \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \bar{\sigma}_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( d \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{1}{d} + \sigma_t^2 \right) \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left( \sqrt{dT \log \frac{1}{\delta}} + d \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed, while the second step uses  $\bar{\sigma}_t^2 = \min\{\frac{1}{d}, \sigma_t^2\} \leq \frac{1}{d} + \sigma_t^2$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 35.* Their original proof mainly use the following two auxilliary results: The first one is the well-known Freedman inequality (Freedman, 1975), which is originally for bounded martingale difference sequences, while the second one is Lemma 11 from Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2011). For the former one, from its variant for sub-Gaussian random variables (Theorem 14), we have:

**Corollary 36.** *Suppose that  $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is a martingale difference sequence adapted to filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = 0$ . Suppose that  $\xi_i \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \sim \text{subG}(\sigma_i^2)$  for some sequence  $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , then, for all  $x, v > 0$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , we have*

$$\Pr \left\{ \exists 1 \leq k \leq n : \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i \geq x \wedge \sum_{i=1}^k V_i \leq v^2 \right\} \leq \exp \left( -\frac{x^2}{2v^2} \right).$$

Moreover, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \leq 2\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta}}.$$

*Proof.* The first conclusion is done by applying Theorem 14 optimally with  $f(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2$ ,  $V_i = \sigma_i^2$  and  $\lambda = \frac{x}{v^2}$ . The second conclusion is consequently proved by taking  $v^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2$  and  $x = 2v\sqrt{\ln \frac{2}{\delta}}$ .  $\square$

Then for their second auxilliary lemma (Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011, Lemma 11), one can see that the original lemma indeed holds for conditionally sub-Gaussian random variables. Therefore, we still have the following lemma:

**Lemma 37** (Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2011, Lemma 11)). *Let  $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and define  $V_t = \lambda I + \sum_{s=1}^t x_s x_s^\top$  for some  $\lambda > 0$ . Then, if we have  $\|x_t\|_2 \leq L$  for all  $t \in [T]$ , then*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \min \left\{ 1, \|x_t\|_{V_{t-1}^{-1}}^2 \right\} \leq 2 \log \frac{\det(V_t)}{\det(\lambda I)} \leq 2d \ln \frac{d\lambda + TL^2}{d\lambda}.$$

Recall the definition that  $Z_t = \lambda I + \sum_{s=1}^t x_s x_s^\top$ . Further define  $d_t = \sum_{s=1}^t x_i \eta_i$ ,  $w_t = \|x_t\|_{Z_{t-1}^{-1}}$  and let  $\mathcal{E}_t$  be the event that  $\|d_s\|_{Z_{s-1}^{-1}} \leq \beta_s$  for all  $s \leq t$ . They proved the following lemma, which still hold in our case:

**Lemma 38** (Analog of Lemma B.3 from Zhou et al. (2021)). *With probability  $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$ , with the definitions of  $x_t$  and  $\eta_t$  in Lemma 35, the following inequality holds for all  $t \geq 1$ :*

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \frac{2\eta_s x_s^\top Z_{s-1}^{-1} d_{s-1}}{1 + w_s^2} \mathbb{1}[\mathcal{E}_{s-1}] \leq \frac{3}{4} \beta_t^2.$$

*Proof.* We only need to verify whether we can apply our Freedman's inequality to  $\ell_s \triangleq \frac{2\eta_s x_s^\top Z_{s-1}^{-1} d_{s-1}}{1 + w_s^2} \mathbb{1}[\mathcal{E}_{s-1}]$ . It is obvious that  $\mathbb{E}[\ell_s | \mathcal{F}_{s-1}] = 0$ . Moreover, from the following inequality (which is their Eq. (B.3))

$$|\ell_s| \leq \frac{2\|x_s\|_{Z_{s-1}^{-1}}}{1 + w_s^2} \|d_{s-1}\|_{Z_{s-1}^{-1}} \mathbb{1}[\mathcal{E}_{s-1}] \leq \frac{2w_i}{1 + w_i^2} \beta_{s-1} \leq \min\{1, 2w_i\} \beta_{i-1},$$

and the fact that  $\eta_s | \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \sim \text{subG}(\sigma^2)$ , we have  $\ell_s | \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \sim \text{subG}((\sigma \beta_{s-1} \min\{1, 2w_s\})^2)$ . Denote the sub-Gaussian parameter as  $\tilde{\sigma}_s$  for simplicity. We have

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \tilde{\sigma}_s^2 \leq \sigma^2 \beta_t^2 \sum_{s=1}^t (\min\{1, 2w_s\})^2 \leq 4\sigma^2 \beta_t^2 \sum_{s=1}^t \min\{1, w_s^2\} \leq 8\sigma^2 \beta_t^2 d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{tL^2}{d\lambda} \right),$$

where the first inequality is due to the non-decreasing property of  $\{\beta_s\}$  and the last one is due to Lemma 37. Therefore, from our Freedman's inequality (Corollary 36), we can conclude that with probability  $1 - \delta/(4t^2)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=1}^t \ell_s &\leq 2\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^t 8\sigma^2 \beta_t^2 d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{tL^2}{d\lambda} \right) \ln \frac{8t^2}{\delta}} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_t^2}{2} + 16\sigma^2 d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{tL^2}{d\lambda} \right) \ln \frac{8t^2}{\delta} = \frac{3}{4} \beta_t^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking a union bound over  $t$  and make use of the fact that  $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} t^{-2} < 2$  completes the proof.  $\square$

We also have the following lemma:

**Lemma 39** (Analog of Lemma B.4 from Zhou et al. (2021)). *Under the same conditions as the previous lemma, with probability  $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$ , we will have the following for all  $\geq 1$  simultaneously:*

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \frac{\eta_s^2 w_s^2}{1 + w_s^2} \leq \frac{1}{4} \beta_t^2.$$



*Proof.* We still need to apply our Freedman's inequality (Corollary 36) to

$$\ell_s = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\eta_s^2 w_s^2}{1 + w_s^2} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \right] - \frac{\eta_s^2 w_s^2}{1 + w_s^2}.$$

As  $\eta_s \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \sim \text{subG}(\sigma^2)$ ,  $\eta_s^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-1}$  is a sub-exponential random variable (Theorem 15) such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp(\lambda(\eta_s^2 - \mathbb{E}[\eta_s^2])) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \right] \leq \exp(16\lambda^2 \sigma^4), \quad \forall |\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2},$$

which consequently means

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp(\lambda \ell_s) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \right] \leq \exp \left( 16\lambda^2 \sigma^4 (\min\{1, w_s^2\})^2 \right), \quad \forall |\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}.$$

where the second step used the fact that  $\frac{w_s^2}{1+w_s^2} \leq \min\{1, w_s^2\}$  as we used in the proof of Lemma 38. Again by Lemma 37, we can conclude that

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \sigma^4 (\min\{1, w_s^2\})^2 \leq 2\sigma^2 d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{tL^2}{d\lambda} \right).$$

Then, as we did in the proof of Theorem 16, we will apply Theorem 14 to the martingale difference sequence  $\{\ell_s\}_{s=1}^t$  with  $V_s = \sigma^4 (\min\{1, w_s^2\})^2$ ,  $f(\lambda) = 16\lambda^2$  for  $\lambda < \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$  and  $f(\lambda) = \infty$  otherwise. Then for all  $x, v > 0$  and  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{\sigma^2})$ , we have

$$\Pr \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^t \ell_s > x \wedge \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^4 (\min\{1, w_s^2\})^2} \leq v \right\} \leq \exp(-\lambda x + 16\lambda^2 v^2).$$

Picking  $v^2 = \sum_{s=1}^t \sigma_i^4 (\min\{1, w_s^2\})^2$  and  $x = 4\sqrt{2}v\sqrt{\ln \frac{2}{\delta}}$  gives

$$\Pr \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^t \ell_s > 4\sqrt{2 \sum_{s=1}^t \sigma_i^4 (\min\{1, w_s^2\})^2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta}} \right\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{32v^2}\right) = \frac{\delta}{2},$$

where  $\lambda$  is set to  $\frac{x}{32v^2} < \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$ . Hence, with probability  $1 - \frac{\delta}{4t^2}$ , we indeed have

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \ell_s \leq 4\sqrt{2 \sum_{s=1}^t \sigma_i^4 (\min\{1, w_s^2\})^2 \ln \frac{2}{\delta}} \leq 8\sqrt{2\sigma^2 d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{tL^2}{d\lambda} \right) \ln \frac{8t^2}{\delta}}.$$

Moreover, due to Lemma 37, we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\eta_s^2 w_s^2}{1 + w_s^2} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \right] \leq \sigma^2 \sum_{s=1}^t \frac{w_s^2}{1 + w_s^2} \leq 2\sigma^2 d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{tL^2}{d\lambda} \right),$$

which means, as  $\frac{\eta_s^2 w_s^2}{1+w_s^2} \leq \ell_s + \mathbb{E}[\frac{\eta_s^2 w_s^2}{1+w_s^2}]$ ,

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \frac{\eta_s^2 w_s^2}{1 + w_s^2} \leq 2\sigma^2 d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{tL^2}{d\lambda} \right) + 8\sqrt{2\sigma^2 d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{tL^2}{d\lambda} \right) \ln \frac{8t^2}{\delta}} \leq \frac{1}{4}\beta_t^2.$$

Taking a union bound over all  $t$  and again making use of the fact that  $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} t^{-2} < 2$  gives our conclusion.  $\square$

Therefore, as long as their Lemmas B.3 and B.4 still hold, we can conclude exactly the same conclusion from their derivation. One may refer to their proof for the details.  $\square$

## G Auxilliary Lemmas

**Lemma 40** (Self Bounding Inequality, [Efroni et al. \(2020, Lemma 38\)](#)). *Let  $0 \leq x \leq a + b\sqrt{x}$  where  $a, b, x \geq 0$ , then we have*

$$x \leq 4a + 2b^2.$$

*Proof.* As  $x - b\sqrt{x} - a \leq 0$ , we have

$$\sqrt{x} \leq \frac{b}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}b^2 + 4a} \leq \frac{b}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{b^2}{4}} + \sqrt{4a} = b + 2\sqrt{a}$$

from the fact that  $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ . As  $\sqrt{x} \geq 0$ , we have

$$x \leq (b + 2\sqrt{a})^2 \leq 2b^2 + 4a$$

due to the relation that  $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ . □