

# Quantum bandit with amplitude amplification exploration in an adversarial environment

Byungjin Cho, Yu Xiao, Pan Hui *Fellow, IEEE*, and Daoyi Dong *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—The rapid proliferation of learning systems in an arbitrarily changing environment mandates the need for managing tensions between exploration and exploitation. This work proposes a quantum-inspired bandit learning approach for the learning-and-adapting-based offloading problem where a client observes and learns the costs of each task offloaded to the candidate resource providers, e.g., fog nodes. In this approach, a new action update strategy and novel probabilistic action selection are adopted, provoked by the amplitude amplification and collapse postulate in quantum computation theory, respectively. We devise a locally linear mapping between a quantum-mechanical phase in a quantum domain, e.g., Grover-type search algorithm, and a distilled probability-magnitude in a value-based decision-making domain, e.g., adversarial multi-armed bandit algorithm. The proposed algorithm is generalized, via the devised mapping, for better learning weight adjustments on favourable/unfavourable actions and its effectiveness is verified via simulation.

**Index Terms**—Quantum amplitude amplification, multi-armed bandit

## I. INTRODUCTION

Fog computing domains, such as vehicular networks and crowd-sourcing, have been rapidly proliferated [1]. Enabling such emerging applications to work in a pervasive uncertain environment mandates the need for intelligent decision-making (DM) to choose an ideally suited computing server guaranteeing the quality of service, e.g., offloaded to nodes geared with sufficiently powerful computing capability [2]. To solve the suitable provider identification problem, sequential DM has been leveraged for its ability to learn in a trial/error fashion without explicit knowledge of the environment, while facing the exploration/exploitation (ExR/ExT) dilemma [3]. The exploration strategy is known as a crucial ingredient for learning-based DM: under-ExR makes the decision stick at a sub-optimal strategy, while over-ExR may incur an ExR cost.

Various exploration strategies have been introduced to address the balancing issue, which can be categorized into three main methods of selecting an action, e.g., a service provider: i) An upper-confidence bound (UCB)-type strategy, referred to as interval-estimation method [4], selects an action that has the highest estimated action-value plus the UCB exploration term, making it possible to play an action that was not explored sufficiently; ii) A greedy-type strategy, referred to as the semi-uniform (SU) method [5], consists of choosing a random action with  $\epsilon$ -frequency or choosing the action with the highest estimated mean otherwise. For the latter, the estimation is based on the rewards observed so far; iii) A softmax-type strategy, referred to as the probability-matching (PM) method [6], chooses actions according to a Gibbs-type probability

distribution reflecting how likely the actions would be optimal, with a free parameter corresponding to inverse temperature  $\beta$ . With careful tuning, such a UCB-type rule is asymptotically optimal for specific cost distributions but may occur after a long period of time particularly in an adversarial environment. *Using SU and PM methods requires tuning the ExR parameter,  $\epsilon$  or  $\beta$ , vital in a varying environment but non-trivial to set in a systematic way due to lack of generality in how to adjust the factors on favourable/unfavourable actions.*

As a promising direction to overcome the difficulties of controlling the ExR factors, adopting quantum mechanism in the field of learning algorithms has been considered. Existing works in [7], [8] show that quantum learning algorithms can achieve a better ExR/ExT trade-off compared with classical learning, and learning efficiency improvement. Such enhancement arises from the use of quantum subroutines such as quantum amplitude amplification (QAA) and quantum measurement (QM). QM envisions natural ExR based on the collapse postulate of quantum mechanics, which can be used for the importance-weighted Gibbs sampling without specific exploration parameter settings. QAA, a core in Grover's algorithm [9], updates the probability amplitudes of actions with a certain degree of importance, performed by multiple iterations. Each of the iterations can be generalized to adjust weights on favorable actions.

Existing works for probability amplitude updating are in general supported by two different methods [8], [10]–[12]. One is to make use of a fixed phase with multiple Grover iterations, which however suffers from a discrete operator causing an amplitude jumping issue [8]. The other is to consider a varied phase with a single iteration. However, this suffers from some limitations such as i) unbounded mapping [11] causing non-linearity, ii) empirical mapping [10] causing complexity, iii) no one-to-one mapping [12] causing inflexibility. To deal with the issues above, this work aims at devising a novel action updating strategy via a continuous linear mapping in QAA<sup>1</sup>. We aim at alleviating the effects of arbitrary phase variations on the amplitudes via a locally linear mapping, with the following contributions.

- This work proposes a quantum exploration-based decision-making algorithm, where a novel probabilistic action selection is adopted for enhancing an adversarial multi-armed bandit (MAB) learning strategy [5], provoked by the amplitude amplification and collapse phenomenon in quantum computation theory.
- This work extends non-classical learning algorithms using a fixed phase with flexible iterations [8] to their counter-

Byungjin Cho and Yu Xiao are with Aalto University, Finland. Pan Hui are with Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, and also with University of Helsinki, Finland. Daoyi Dong is with University of New South Wales, Australia.

<sup>1</sup>While it is expected to implement computation on practical quantum computers, the proposed algorithm employs some ideas from quantum theory that can be directly conducted on traditional computers.




Fig. 1. System model

parts, flexible phases with an iteration, in a resembling way to existing works [10]–[12]. Our work differs from previous works in the ways the phases are tuned, overcoming the hardness of justifying to set a free parameter.

- This work generalizes the MAB algorithm through increasing the probability amplitude of a dominant action as well as decreasing the ones of the others. This is realized by adjusting importance weights via the devised one-to-one mapping between a quantum-mechanical phase and a learning-based decision probability, which otherwise conventionally requires an extra normalization [11].

## II. SYSTEM MODEL AND LEARNING STRATEGY

This section demonstrates the system model and learning-based decision-making, applicable to offloading services.

### A. System model

A service client (SC) generates tasks, while a set of service providers (SPs)  $k \in \mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, K\}$  execute the requested tasks with their own available resources. An SC can send a task, e.g., offloading a computational task [3],  $t$  to any SP  $k$  within its accessible communication range. Here  $k \in \mathcal{K}^t \subseteq \mathcal{K}$  where  $\mathcal{K}^t$  is a candidate SP set. The available SPs are discovered and selected by an SC based on their topological states, e.g., their locations. Each SC forms a candidate SP set from the accessible SPs. Each task,  $t$ , is considered as a basic unit for offloading, i.e., offloaded to and processed by an SP within one time period. The demand for resources from each SC may vary depending on the nature of performed applications, e.g., which can be expressed as the multiplication of the input size  $q^t$  (bits/task) and the computational complexity (cycles/bit). This work considers that the service capability of an SP  $k$  depends on its resource availability (cycles/sec), e.g., determined by the computing resource allocation policy, and it is assumed to remain static for each task  $t$ . The wireless medium of an SP  $k$  is shared by the SCs that choose to offload to the SP. The achievable up/down-link transmission rates between an SC and an SP are determined by the physical characteristics of the wireless medium. The cost for offloading a task includes the cost for uploading the input to an SP  $k$ , and the execution cost at the SP, downloading the result to the SC, expressed as  $D_k^t$ . Assuming that the feedback size is small enough that the down-link cost can be ignored [3].

This work defines the unit service cost reflecting the service capability of each candidate SP  $k$ , e.g., the cost of processing one bit of input data for task  $t$  on SP  $k$ , as  $l_k^t = D_k^t/q^t$ . One aim of this work is to minimize the average unit service cost by optimizing the SP selection, done by each SC, for each task in each round,  $k_t$ . We design a learning-based algorithm minimizing the expectation of the unit service cost,

formulated as  $\mathcal{P} : \min_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^T l_{k_t}^t \right]$  where  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  is the expectation,  $l_{k_t}^t$  is a sequence of unit cost for the  $t$ -th task in the task set  $\mathcal{T}$ , and  $T = |\mathcal{T}|$  is the number of tasks. The significance of a learning algorithm depends on the adopted benchmark policy which the algorithm is measured against. The learning regret measuring how much the SC regrets choosing its pulled action-sequence over the one with the optimal policy, is expressed as  $\bar{L}_{k'}^T - \bar{L}_{k^*}^T$  where  $\bar{L}_{k'}^T = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^T l_{k'}^t \right]$  and  $\bar{L}_{k^*}^T = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^T l_{k^*}^t \right]$  correspond to the expected cumulative costs incurred by an algorithm and the optimal solution  $k^* = \arg \min_k \sum_{t=1}^T l_k^t/T$ , respectively.

### B. Online learning decision-making in bandit setting

Consider a framework of online learning where an SC selects one SP,  $k \in \mathcal{K}^t$  based on an unknown cost function. There exists a trade-off between exploiting the experiential best SP for instantaneous costs and exploring the other SPs for potential benefits. The trade-off is formulated as a MAB problem specified by  $\mathcal{K}^t$  and  $l_k^t, t \in \mathcal{T}$ .

1) *Estimation process*: An SC selects an arm for a task and receives the cost from the selected arm, not from the others. The cost from an arm  $k \neq k'$  could not be observed due to incomplete feedback in the bandit problem. One may use an unbiased estimate,  $\hat{l}_k^t = \frac{l_k^t \cdot \mathbb{1}_{k=k'}}{p_k^t}$ , but it could cause large fluctuation in the cost due to inverse-proportion to  $p_k^t$ . Instead, this work considers Exp3 algorithm endowed with implicit exploration (IX)-style cost estimates [3], which controls the variance at the price of extra bias. After each action, the cost estimate is calculated as  $\hat{l}_k^t = \frac{l_k^t \cdot \mathbb{1}_{k=k'}}{p_k^t + \gamma_t}$ , a biased estimator due to  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{l}_k^t] = \sum_k p_k^t \hat{l}_k^t \leq l_k^t$ , where  $\gamma_t \in (0, 1]$  is the implicit learning rate. While actions with large costs are set to be negligible probabilities by the classical recipe [13], such an implicit price allows them to have low but non-negligible ones and to be chosen occasionally. Thus, the estimator could guarantee performance with high probability.

2) *Selection process*: In an adversarial MAB, randomized policy is used such that an SC draws an arm according to a probability distribution,  $k' \sim p^t = [p_k^t]_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ . One may employ weighted-average randomized strategy with potentials to achieve a cumulative cost as small as that of the best action [13]. An arm  $k$  is assigned with the selected probability for task  $t$ ,  $p_k^t$  proportional to weighted accumulated cost caused by that arm in the past,  $p_k^t = \frac{\mathcal{W}_k^t}{\sum_k \mathcal{W}_k^t}$  where  $\mathcal{W}_k^t$  is a weight of each arm  $k$  maintained by the SC. A score-based learning process is considered as follows: service capability of an SP can be represented by a score, cumulative per-bit cost up to  $t-1$ ,  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_k^{t-1} = \sum_{t'=1}^{t-1} \eta_{t'} \hat{l}_k^{t'}$ , where  $\hat{l}_k^{t'}$  is the cost estimate from the arm  $k$  for task  $t'$  and  $\eta_{t'} \in (0, 1]$  is the learning rate. Considering exponential potential with the score,  $\mathcal{W}_k^t = e^{-\hat{\mathcal{L}}_k^{t-1}}$ , the importance-weighted mechanism assigns exponentially higher probability to strategy with lower cumulative scores up to  $t-1$  due to  $\frac{\partial p_k^t}{\partial L_k} = \frac{-Z e^{-L_k}}{(Z + e^{-L_k})^2} < 0$  where  $L_k = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_k^{t-1}$  and  $Z = \sum_{z \neq k} e^{-L_z}$ . The scores reinforce the success of each strategy measured by the estimated TO cost, so an SC would rely on the strategy with the lowest one.

### III. QUANTUM AMPLIFICATION EXPLORATION STRATEGY

We develop a quantum learning-based TO algorithm, enabling an SC to learn the TO costs of candidate SPs and to choose an SP in aid of quantum subroutines.

#### A. Quantum amplitude amplification

An action in a learning system is represented with a quantum state, inspired by the advantages of quantum computation. The state specified by probability amplitude is updated by a QAA process. And the action selection is carried out by observing the state according to collapse postulate of QM.

1) *Collapsing action selection*: A quantum state at  $t$ , comprised of  $n$  qubits, is shown as  $|\Psi^t\rangle = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^t} g_a^t |a\rangle$  where  $\mathcal{A}^t$  is the set of  $2^n$  eigenactions, each of which with  $n$  length of a binary string, and  $g_a^t$  is the complex coefficient, the probability amplitude<sup>2</sup> of eigenaction  $|a\rangle$  subject to  $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^t} |g_a^t|^2 = 1$ . The index  $t$  is omitted below for ease of description. The quantum representation establishes a bridge between the eigenactions  $\mathcal{A}$  and the arms  $\mathcal{K}$ , shown by  $|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\Psi_n\rangle = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} g_a |a\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} g_k |k\rangle$  where  $\otimes$  means tensor product and  $|\Psi_v\rangle$  represents the  $v$ -th ( $v \in [1, n]$ ) qubit in the superposition state of  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$ . The actions can be represented by  $\log_2 K$  qubits, denoted by  $|1\rangle, \dots, |K\rangle$ . An SP selected by an SC before any QM is implemented on a superposition state  $|\Psi\rangle$  which would collapse to one of its eigenactions with probability  $p_k = |g_k|^2$ ,  $|\Psi\rangle \rightarrow |k\rangle$  when an agent measures the quantum state. Such quantum collapse phenomenon can be considered as creating information on action selection strategy, e.g.,  $k' \sim p$  where  $p = [p_1, \dots, p_K]$ .

2) *Amplifying probability amplitude*: Before the collapse, the probability amplitudes of eigenactions can be reshaped via a QAA subroutine, e.g., Grover iterations, each of which gradually modifies the collapsing probabilities. The evolution of a system is described by a unitary transformation performed on the superposition states of its possible eigenactions to amend the probability amplitudes updated after  $n$ -Grover iterations on  $|\Psi_0\rangle$ , a state before amplification, viewed as

$$|\Psi\rangle = G^m \cdot |\Psi_0\rangle \quad (1)$$

where  $|\Psi_0\rangle = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} g_k |k\rangle$  and  $G$  is a Grover iteration which has two substeps, an oracle query and a diffusion operation, built in a form of the unitary as follows,

$$G = -U_{(\phi_2, \Psi_0)} \cdot U_{(\phi_1, m)} \quad (2)$$

where  $U_{(\phi_1, m)}$  is an operation based on an oracle query, shifting the phase of the target action<sup>3</sup>  $|m\rangle$  with  $\phi_1$ , and  $U_{(\phi_2, \Psi_0)}$  is a diffusion operation, rearranging the phases of all actions with  $\phi_2$ . The two unitary operators, employed for the targeted action  $|m\rangle$  before amplification,  $|\Psi_0\rangle = g_m |m\rangle + g_{\check{m}} |\check{m}\rangle$  where  $|\check{m}\rangle$  is the vector orthogonal to  $|m\rangle$ , are expressed as  $U_{(\phi_1, m)} = I - (1 - e^{j\phi_1})|m\rangle\langle m|$  and  $U_{(\phi_2, \Psi_0)} = I - (1 - e^{j\phi_2})|\Psi_0\rangle\langle\Psi_0|$  where  $I$  is the identity matrix,  $\langle m|$  and  $\langle\Psi_0|$  are Hermitian transposes of  $|m\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_0\rangle$ . While two operators have no effect on  $\check{m}$  except normalization, they amend the target action's amplitude.

<sup>2</sup>Amplitudes are quantum probabilities representing the chance that a quantum state will be observed when being collapsed.

<sup>3</sup>Classically,  $m = \arg \max_k p_k$ , while non-classically done by [15].

#### B. Quantum amplitude amplification based exploration

The effect of the Grover iterations on  $|\Psi_0\rangle$ , due to its probability updating nature, can be used as a quantum learning strategy. A natural question is how to amplify/attenuate the amplitudes appropriately, yielding a better exploration strategy.

1) *Controlling probability amplitude*: Note that the parameters,  $\phi_1$ ,  $\phi_2$ , and  $n$  in (1) and (2) determine how the probability amplitudes are updated. The transformation can be executed with proper values of the parameters corresponding to importance weights for the eigenactions. Different amplitude updating approaches have been considered in [8], [10]–[12]. Generally, one is to fix  $n = 1$  with varied values of  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  as learning-related factors, and another is to use a feasible value of  $n$  with fixed values of  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ . Since the latter suffers from intermittent update in the amplitudes, the former is adopted in this work, i.e.,  $n = 1$  with varied  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ .

**Lemma 1.** (*Impact of  $G$* ) *The updated coefficients in amplification/attenuation, defined as the ratio between the amplitudes of targeted/untargeted actions, after being acted by an operator  $G$  and before that, can be expressed as  $\varrho$  and  $\varsigma$  where*

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho &= |(1 - e^{j\phi_1} - e^{j\phi_2}) - (1 - e^{j\phi_1})(1 - e^{j\phi_2})p_m|^2 \\ \varsigma &= |-e^{j\phi_2} - (1 - e^{j\phi_1})(1 - e^{j\phi_2})p_m|^2. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* After applying one operator  $G$  on  $|\Psi_0\rangle$ , the amplitude vector in the next iteration becomes  $|\Psi\rangle = G|\Psi_0\rangle$  shown as  $G|\Psi_0\rangle = (P - e^{j\phi_1})g_m|m\rangle + (P - 1)g_{\check{m}}|\check{m}\rangle$  where  $P = (1 - e^{j\phi_2})[1 - (1 - e^{j\phi_1})p_m]$ . The updated probabilities of the selected and unselected actions,  $|m\rangle$  and  $|\check{m}\rangle$ , can be obtained by  $\varrho \cdot p_m$  and  $\varsigma \cdot p_{\check{m}}$  where the ratios of the amplitudes between after and before  $G$  are shown as  $\sqrt{\varrho} = P - e^{j\phi_1} = 1 - e^{j\phi_1} - e^{j\phi_2} - (1 - e^{j\phi_1})(1 - e^{j\phi_2})p_m$  and  $\sqrt{\varsigma} = P - 1 = -e^{j\phi_2} - (1 - e^{j\phi_1})(1 - e^{j\phi_2})p_m$  for  $|m\rangle$  and  $|\check{m}\rangle$  [12].  $\square$

2) *Mapping phase/probability amplitudes*: Note that the overall effect of  $G$  on  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  is a two-substep phase rotation amplitude enabling to update probability amplitude, i.e., by selecting feasible  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ , it is possible to manipulate the values of  $\varrho$  and  $\varsigma$ . While existing works in [10]–[12] focused on updating the probability amplitude of a target action only, e.g., amplifying/attenuating the amplitude for a good/bad action, they have limited capability of generalizability and complexity: requiring i) a free parameter selection indicating an amplified/attenuated degree but varying for different situations and ii) a re-normalization updating probability amplitudes of untargeted actions, both of which are due to lack of one-to-one mapping between quantum probability and phase rotation amplitudes. This work proposes a pipeline to support the mapping operation by designing a local monotone function.

**Lemma 2.** (*Impact of  $\phi$* ) *Setting  $\phi = \phi_1 = \phi_2$  allows for updating the values of  $\varrho$  and  $\varsigma$  simultaneously but oppositely.*

*Proof.* Note that two functions,  $(1 - \varrho)$  and  $(1 - \varsigma)$  have opposite signs due to the facts that i)  $0 < p_m < 1$ , ii)  $1 - \varrho = (p_m - 1)\kappa$  and iii)  $1 - \varsigma = p_m\kappa$  where  $\kappa = 4(2p_m - 1)\sin^2(\phi_1/2)(\cos\phi_2 - 1) + 2\sin\phi_1\sin\phi_2$ . It is straightforward to conclude that  $\varrho$  and  $\varsigma$  are designed to be larger or smaller than 1, respectively but conversely, irrespective of  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ .

Based on the phase matching condition [14],  $\phi = \phi_1 = \phi_2$ , their second derivatives w.r.t  $\phi$  also have signs opposite each other due to  $\frac{\partial^2(1-\varrho)}{\partial\phi^2} = (p_m - 1)\kappa'$  and  $\frac{\partial^2(1-\varsigma)}{\partial\phi^2} = p_m\kappa'$  where  $\kappa' = (4 - 8p_m)\cos\phi + 8p_m\cos 2\phi$ . Such a converse relation between  $\varrho$  and  $\varsigma$  allows to focus on updating one of them.  $\square$

An action is rewarded/punished with higher/lower unit effort. To determine an updating degree, e.g., establishing how much it would be amplified/attenuated, the differences in learning scores between the optimal arm and sub-optimal ones can be considered,  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{W}/\|\mathcal{W}\|_\infty = [e^{-(L_k - \min(L))}]_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  where  $L = [L_1, \dots, L_K]$  and  $L_k = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_k^{t-1}$ , representing the relative disparity between targeted and untarget actions. Due to the fact that the values are lower than or equal to 1 for all actions, we map the average obtained relative disparity  $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$  to the ratio  $\varsigma$  via an appropriate adjustment of  $\phi$ . To diminish the probabilities of untarget actions proportional to  $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ , one may find a range where probability amplitudes vary monotonically.

Next, we show how to establish  $\phi$  for the amplitude amplification, by identifying locally monotonic function of  $\varsigma$  on  $\phi$  and specifying an one-to-one mapping between  $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$  to  $\varsigma$ .

**Proposition 1.** (Finding of  $\phi$ ) *The ratios  $\varrho$  and  $\varsigma$  can be controlled via a phase  $\phi = -\arccos(W_{(1-\varsigma_{min})\bar{\mathcal{D}}+\varsigma_{min}})$  where  $W_x = 1 - \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{x}}{2p_m}\right)$  and  $\varsigma_{min} = \max[(1 - 4p_m)^2, 0]$ .*

*Proof.* Note that a ratio of  $\varsigma$  is monotonically increasing within a specified range. The ratio  $\varsigma$  has local maximum/minimum points at  $\phi = \left\{0, \pi, \arccos\left(1 - \frac{1}{2p_m}\right)\right\}$ , each of which satisfying  $\frac{\partial\varsigma}{\partial\phi} = 0$ . And it increases in  $\phi$ ,  $\frac{\partial\varsigma}{\partial\phi} > 0$ , when case i)  $\sin\phi < 0$  and  $\cos\phi > 1 - \frac{1}{2p_m}$ , or case ii)  $\sin\phi > 0$  and  $\cos\phi < 1 - \frac{1}{2p_m}$  is satisfied, fulfilled with  $-\text{Re}[\arccos(W_0)] < \phi < -\text{Re}[\arccos(W_1)]$  for case i), or  $\text{Re}[\arccos(W_0)] < \phi < \text{Re}[\arccos(W_{-1})]$  for case ii), respectively, where  $W_x = 1 - \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{x}}{2p_m}\right)$ . While for case i) a phase value of  $\phi$  may have different maximum values of  $\varsigma$  for different  $p_m$  in its increasing range, for case ii), a ratio value of  $\varsigma$  monotonically increases in  $\phi$  ranged from

$$\phi_{min} \leq \phi < 0 \quad (3)$$

where  $\phi_{min} = -\min[\arccos(W_0), \pi]$ , for  $\varsigma_{min} \leq \varsigma < 1$  where  $\varsigma_{min} = \max[(1 - 4p_m)^2, 0]$ , and reaches the maximum equal to 1 only at  $\phi = 0$  irrespective of  $p_m$ , which allows us to focus on case i), see Fig.2(a). Note that a ratio value of  $\varsigma = 1 - p_m\kappa$  in Lemma 2 increases w.r.t a phase value of  $\phi = -\arccos(W_\varsigma)$  satisfying Eq. (3). The feasible  $\phi$  is set to be proportional to the average obtained relative disparity  $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$  which could be one-to-one mapped to the range of  $\varsigma$  given  $p_m$ . Thus, the ratios,  $\varrho$  and  $\varsigma$ , can be controlled via  $\phi = -\arccos(W_{(1-\varsigma_{min})\bar{\mathcal{D}}+\varsigma_{min}})$ , simultaneously.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** (Profiles of  $\phi$  and  $\varsigma$ ) *Note that  $\varsigma$  decreases in  $p_m$  due to  $\frac{\partial\varsigma}{\partial p_m} < 0$  in Prop. 1, and thus attenuated probabilities are achieved, see Fig. 2(a). For a high  $p_m$ , the impact of  $\phi$  on  $\varsigma$  becomes large, and thus  $\phi$  can be tuned within a small variation range for the updating. Contrarily, for a relatively small  $p_m$ , a much larger degree of freedom on  $\phi$  adjustment*

---

### Algorithm 1 Quantum amplification exploration strategy

---

```

1: Input:  $\eta_t > 0, \gamma_t > 0, \mathcal{K} = \emptyset, \mathcal{K}^t = \mathcal{K}, \forall t, \mathcal{W} \leftarrow \vec{1} \in \mathcal{R}^K$ 
2: for  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  do
3:   Set  $p \leftarrow \mathcal{W}/\|\mathcal{W}\|_1$ 
4:   Set  $|\Psi_0\rangle \leftarrow$  preparing  $\sum_k g_k|k\rangle$  where  $|g_k|^2 = p_k$ 
5:   Set  $|\Psi\rangle \leftarrow$  updating  $(\varrho, \varsigma)$  with  $\phi$  set by Prop. 1
6:   Set  $k' \leftarrow$  measuring  $|\Psi\rangle$  and play the strategy  $k'$ 
7:   Get the feedback and suffer the cost  $l_{k'}$ 
8:   Update the weights  $\mathcal{W}$  with  $\eta_t, \gamma_t$  by Prop. 2
9: end for
10: Output: sequences  $\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} l_{k'}^t > 0$ 

```

---

*is configured, a natural way to avoid local maxima with a relatively small  $p_m$ . Setting  $\phi$  tunes  $\varrho$  and  $\varsigma$ , simultaneously.*

#### C. Proposed algorithm

The workflow of the proposed algorithm (Algorithm 1) can be divided into three parts: i) interaction, ii) estimation, and iii) selection. While the first part is about a typical interaction as an external learning process, the last two parts correspond to a classical and quantum-inspired operation as an internal learning process. An iterative method is used to link the conventional outer and inner processes such that the classical information is conveyed from a time step  $t$  to the next one  $t+1$  via interaction between an agent and the adversary, including: strategy playing, feedback getting, and cost suffering (Line 7). The internal learning process is characterized by the score updating rule (Line 8), and the local selection rule defined by what action is output given the score (selection). The algorithm is designed in a modular way so that its quantum-inspired part can be treated as a separate building block (Lines 4-6) where the quantum enhancement is exhibited, whose source lies in the use of quantum subroutines to perform each internal selection process. The probability distributions  $p^t \in \mathcal{R}^K$  are passed to the quantum subroutines where, instead of sampling one action in a classical manner, in a quantum setting, one sample can be obtained by preparing the state  $|\Psi_0\rangle = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}^t} g_k^t|k\rangle$  where  $|g_k^t| = \sqrt{p_k^t}$ , updating it with the proposed amplification, see Prop. 1, and measuring the updated  $|\Psi\rangle$ , e.g., collapsing action selection.

**Proposition 2.** *The quantum strategy with  $\phi \neq 0$  can achieve better regret than the one with  $\phi=0$ , when  $\eta_t > \frac{1}{t}$  and  $\gamma_t > \frac{1}{2t}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that a dominant arm's index is  $m$ ,  $L_m \leq L_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}$ , one non-dominant arm selection  $k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus m$  for  $t$  yields  $p_k^t > p_{k|\phi \neq 0}^t$ , while a dominant one yields  $p_m^t < p_{m|\phi \neq 0}^t$ . Further proof is omitted, being analogous to the proof of [3, Props. 2 and 6].  $\square$

**Remark 2.** *Note that the collapse of a quantum state is not real selection, but just a fundamental phenomenon when the state is measured, resulting in i) a good ExR/ExT balance and ii) a natural action selection without setting parameters unlike conventional approaches. The agent can explore its strategies in superposition in a way which guarantees a provable regret improvement in its learning time over its classical analogue.*

## IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

This section evaluates experimental results for the considered task offloading problem via the proposed quantum




Fig. 2. (a) Profiles of  $\phi$  and  $\zeta$  w.r.t  $p_m$ . One example of  $\zeta \cdot p_m$  where  $p_m^t = p_m$ , (b)  $\phi$  and  $\varrho$  w.r.t  $p_m$  for different  $K$  and (c)  $\Delta$  for  $K = 5$ .

enhanced strategy solution. For comparison, a few conventional methods including Exp3, Exp3IX,  $\epsilon$ -greedy strategies are performed as benchmarks. For the simulation, we follow the detailed setting as in [3].

Fig. 2 shows the feasible solution behavior (space) of  $\phi$  selected for the proposed quantum-enhanced strategy (Prop. 1), and its performance result in terms of the learning regret. Fig. 2(b) shows the solution behavior of  $\phi$ . i) The probability of a dominant action increases alongside the learning progress. A larger gap of probabilities between the dominant action and overall dominated actions,  $p_m^t$  and  $\frac{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus m} p_k^t}{N-1}$  guides us to set a lower  $\phi$ , see Prop. 1. ii) As  $N$  increases, the selected action  $m$  with a given  $p_m^t$  has higher dominance than the others,  $p_m^t \gg \frac{1-p_m^t}{N-1}$ , and thus the chosen  $\phi$  becomes lower, resulting in larger variability of  $\phi$ . iii) Meanwhile, the minimum limit of  $\phi$  increases starting from  $p_m^t$  equal to  $\frac{1}{4}$  by Eq. (3) and the probability gap proportionally relative to the reduced range of  $\phi$  yields the larger  $\phi$ . Choosing an appropriate value of  $\phi \neq 0$  allows for simultaneously amplifying the amplitude of a dominant action while attenuating the ones of the others, thereby leading to better performance (Prop. 2).

Fig. 2(c) shows that the proposed quantum algorithm outperforms the conventional counterparts in terms of the learning regret. Those counterparts include choose arms based on i) upper confidence bound such as UCB1, ii) current knowledge with a probability  $1-\epsilon$  such as  $\epsilon$ -Greedy when  $\epsilon = 0.1$ , and iii) probability matching such as Exp3, Exp3P, and Exp3IX when  $\beta = 1$ . The proposed algorithm learns much faster and ensures a better balancing between exploration and exploitation, since QAA process allows to adapt to the TO environment represented by difference in importance scores, without exploring the sub-optimal actions, and thus reducing the regret by 50% and 40% from those of Exp3IX and quantum bandit with a sole ratio tune case ( $\varrho = 1$ ) requiring re-normalization [12].

Provided that the related quantum apparatuses, the proposed algorithm has potential of powerful computation, which will lead to a more effective approach for the existing problems of learning in complex unknown environment. Although the quantum-inspired bandit algorithm is provoked by quantum mechanics and is designed for quantum computers in the future, one can observe that it is already effective on the traditional computer as well in the following two main aspects: i) collapse action selection strategy by quantum measurement postulate acts an intuitive means to balance between ExR and ExT, which does not depend on the empirical exploration parameter setting, and ii) probability magnitude updating strategy by controlling quantum-mechanical phase acts a simple

way to boost/suppress the strategies based on the learning score simultaneously in line with the quantum superposition principle, which does not use additional normalization process.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we proposed a quantum bandit learning algorithm to reduce the service cost under an adversarial environment. The proposed QAA approach allows for the new action update strategy and novel probabilistic action selection, provoked by the amplitude amplification and collapse postulate in quantum computation theory, respectively, together with a devised mapping between a quantum-mechanical phase in a quantum domain, and a distilled probability-magnitude in a value-based decision-making domain. This method can better deal with the trade-off between convergence speed and learning quality than traditional exploration approaches. Numerical results compared the regret performance with conventional counterparts, and validated its effectiveness.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Mao *et al.*, "A survey on mobile edge computing: The communication perspective," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 2322–2358, Fourth quarter 2017.
- [2] C. Mouradian *et al.*, "A comprehensive survey on fog computing: State-of-the-art and research challenges," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 416–464, First quarter 2018.
- [3] B. Cho *et al.*, "Learning-based decentralized offloading decision making in an adversarial environment," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 70, no. 11, pp. 11308–11323, 2021.
- [4] L. P. Kaelbling, "Learning in Embedded Systems," *MIT Press*, 1993.
- [5] P. Auer *et al.*, "The nonstochastic multiarmed bandit problem," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp.48–77, 2002.
- [6] N. Cesa-Bianchi *et al.*, "Boltzmann exploration done right." In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 6284–6293, 2017.
- [7] V. Dunjko *et al.*, "Machine learning & artificial intelligence in the quantum domain: a review of recent progress," *Reports on Progress in Physics*, no. 81, vol. 7, p.074001, 2018.
- [8] D. Dong *et al.*, "Quantum reinforcement learning," *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man. Cybern. B*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 1207–1220, 2008.
- [9] L. K. Grover, Synthesis of quantum superpositions by quantum computation. *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 85, pp.1334–1337, 2000.
- [10] P. Fakhari *et al.*, "Quantum inspired reinforcement learning in changing environment," *New Math. and Natural Comput.*, vol. 9, no. 03, pp. 273–294, 2013.
- [11] J. Li *et al.*, "Quantum reinforcement learning during human decision-making," *Nature Human Behaviour*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 294–307, 2020.
- [12] Y. Li *et al.*, "Intelligent trajectory planning in UAV-mounted wireless networks: Quantum inspired reinforcement learning perspective," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 10, no. 9, pp.1994–1998, 2021.
- [13] N. Cesa-Bianchi *et al.*, *Prediction, learning, and games*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [14] G. Long, *et al.*, "Phase matching condition for quantum search with a generalized initial state," *Physics Letters A*, vol. 294, no. 3–4, pp.143–152, 2002.
- [15] C. Durr, *et al.*, A quantum algorithm for finding the minimum. arXiv preprint quant-ph/9607014, 1996.