

TRANSFER LEARNING FOR CONTEXTUAL MULTI-ARMED BANDITS

BY CHANGXIAO CAI^{1,a}, T. TONY CAI^{2,c} AND HONGZHE LI^{1,b}¹*Department of Biostatistics, University of Pennsylvania, changxiao.cai@penntestmed.upenn.edu;
hongzhe@penntestmed.upenn.edu*²*Department of Statistics and Data Science, University of Pennsylvania, tcai@wharton.upenn.edu*

Motivated by a range of applications, we study in this paper the problem of transfer learning for nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits under the covariate shift model, where we have data collected on source bandits before the start of the target bandit learning. The minimax rate of convergence for the cumulative regret is established and a novel transfer learning algorithm that attains the minimax regret is proposed. The results quantify the contribution of the data from the source domains for learning in the target domain in the context of nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits.

In view of the general impossibility of adaptation to unknown smoothness, we develop a data-driven algorithm that achieves near-optimal statistical guarantees (up to a logarithmic factor) while automatically adapting to the unknown parameters over a large collection of parameter spaces under an additional self-similarity assumption. A simulation study is carried out to illustrate the benefits of utilizing the data from the auxiliary source domains for learning in the target domain.

1. Introduction. Inspired by the human intelligence of leveraging prior experiences to tackle novel problems, *transfer learning*, which aims to improve the performance in the target domain by transferring knowledge contained in different but related source domains, has become an active and promising area of research in machine learning. Transfer learning has achieved significant success in a wide range of practical applications such as computer vision (Quattoni, Collins and Darrell, 2008; Kulis, Saenko and Darrell, 2011; Li et al., 2013), genomic and genetic studies (Wang et al., 2019; Peng et al., 2021), and medical imaging (Raghu et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2022), to mention a few. We refer interested readers to Pan and Yang (2009); Weiss, Khoshgoftaar and Wang (2016) for detailed surveys on transfer learning. Motivated by the success of these applications, substantial progress has also been made recently on the theoretical quantification for transfer learning in both supervised and unsupervised settings. A partial list of examples includes classification (Cai and Wei, 2021; Kpotufe and Martinet, 2021; Maity, Sun and Banerjee, 2020; Reeve, Cannings and Samworth, 2021), high-dimensional linear regression (Li, Cai and Li, 2022a), graphical model (Li, Cai and Li, 2022b), and nonparametric regression (Cai and Pu, 2022a; Ma, Pathak and Wainwright, 2022; Pathak, Ma and Wainwright, 2022).

In this paper, we consider transfer learning for nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits. Since the seminal formulation in Robbins (1952), the multi-armed bandit (MAB) and its various extensions have been widely used in numerous fields related to sequential decision-making, including personalized medicine (Yu et al., 2021; Tewari and Murphy, 2017; Lu, Xu and Tewari, 2021), recommendation system (Li et al., 2010; Kallus and Udell, 2020) and dynamic pricing (Rothschild, 1974; Kleinberg and Leighton, 2003; Wang,

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62G08; secondary 62L12.

Keywords and phrases: Contextual bandit, transfer learning, covariate shift, minimax rate, regret bounds, adaptivity, self-similarity.

Chen and Simchi-Levi, 2021). In the classical nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandit problem, a decision-maker sequentially and repeatedly chooses an arm from a set of available arms each time, and then receives a random reward of the chosen arm. The goal is to develop an arm selection policy to maximize the expected cumulative rewards over a finite time horizon. Motivated by the fact that the decision-maker often has access to side information to assist arm selection, covariates are introduced to encode the features that affect the reward yielded by each arm at each step. The expected reward of each arm conditional on the context is assumed to follow a nonparametric form, which makes the formulation more flexible and robust in real-world applications.

However, in practice, it is sometimes hard to collect enough reward feedback in order to design an optimal selection strategy. For instance, Yahoo web services (Li et al., 2010) use a contextual multi-armed bandit framework to develop a personalized recommendation system of news articles that can tailor the content presentation to individual users. Every time a user visits the website, the recommendation system selects a news article to display, in the hope of attracting the user’s interest. And the objective is to maximize the total number of user clicks. In this case, articles, user clicks, and user features correspond to arms, rewards, and covariates, respectively. Given the limited availability of click data, it is common to resort to the historical activities of other users with similar demographic information and educational background. One can also explore the user’s preferences for related objects (e.g. novels and movies) to better predict their choices for news articles. In such a scenario, the task of transfer learning for contextual multi-armed bandits naturally arises.

We consider the following setting of transfer learning for contextual multi-armed bandits. Let Q and P be two probability distributions over $[0, 1]^d \times [0, 1]^K$ that generate a sequence of independent random vectors $(X_t, Y_t^{(1)}, \dots, Y_t^{(K)})_{t \geq 1}$ associated with K -armed contextual bandits. Here, $(X_t)_{t \geq 1}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random vectors in $\mathcal{X} := [0, 1]^d$ representing the covariates. And for each $1 \leq k \leq K$ and $t \geq 1$, $Y_t^{(k)}$ is a random variable in $[0, 1]$ indicating the reward yielded by arm k at time t , with conditional expectation given by $\mathbb{E}[Y_t^{(k)} | X_t] = f_k(X_t)$, where $f_k : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is referred to as reward function. The bandit game operates as follows: at each time step t , given side information X_t , the decision-maker pulls one of the K arms, denoted by π_t , and receives the random reward $Y_t^{(\pi_t)}$. Throughout the paper, Q refers to the target distribution about which we wish to make statistical inferences; P stands for the source distribution from which we have collected data to improve the decision-making under Q . We use Q -bandit (resp. P -bandit) to represent the bandit with distribution Q (resp. P). In addition, we use superscripts Q and P to refer to quantities associated with Q -bandit and P -bandit, respectively. Suppose that before the Q -bandit game starts, we have access to pre-collected samples $\{(X_i^P, \pi_i^P, Y_i^{(\pi_i^P)})\}_{1 \leq i \leq n_P}$, generated from a source bandit with the underlying distribution P . Our goal is to design a policy $\pi = \{\pi_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ that maximizes the expected cumulative rewards under the target distribution Q . The performance of the policy π can be measured by its cumulative regret over n_Q time steps, given by

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{E}[R_{n_Q}(\pi)] := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} \left(Y_t^{Q, (\pi_t^*)}(X_t^Q) - Y_t^{Q, (\pi)}(X_t^Q) \right) \right],$$

where π^* is the oracle policy with complete knowledge of the reward functions $\{f_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq K}$. One can expect that as long as the distributions P and Q are similar, the auxiliary data from the source P -bandit can improve the decision-making in the Q -bandit. Therefore, it is natural to quantify the improvement in terms of the cumulative regret, which can be viewed as the amount of information transferred from the source distribution P to the target distribution Q .

This paper focuses on transfer learning under the covariate shift model where the marginal distributions of the covariates P_X and Q_X differ (i.e. $P_X \neq Q_X$) but that the conditional

distributions of $Y^{(k)}$ given X are identical for P and Q (i.e. $P_{Y^{(k)}|X} = Q_{Y^{(k)}|X}$) for all $1 \leq k \leq K$. This framework is well motivated by many practical applications, typically arising from the scenario when the same study is conducted among different populations. We point out several examples as follows.

- **Personalized medicine.** A medical treatment can often be modeled as a sequential decision-making procedure involving treatment type and drug dosage, making the contextual multi-armed bandit a promising framework to design efficient strategies (Tewari and Murphy, 2017; Yu et al., 2021). While personalized healthcare based on an individual patient’s biomarkers and health records can substantially increase the success rate, it is often the case where clinical results are scarce due to cost or ethical concerns. In this scenario, a common solution is to leverage auxiliary data collected from other clinical studies, which can be modeled as the covariate shift setting due to the difference in patients’ profiles.
- **Online recommendation.** Contextual multi-armed bandits are also frequently used in online recommendation systems that seek to learn dynamically the preferences of an individual customer from a pool of candidates based on the demographics and purchase histories (Agrawal et al., 2019; Kallus and Udell, 2020). Since each user is only able to purchase a small set of products, the availability of transactional data is often limited in practice. Therefore it is natural to explore information from different but related customers in order to better predict the possibility of a certain customer purchasing a certain product. In such cases, one can view the difference among users as a covariate shift.
- **Anomaly detection.** The anomaly detection system often consists of a limited number of interactions with human experts for verification to maximize the true anomalies detected. Due to its trade-off between exploration (e.g. investigation of various anomalies to improve prediction) and exploitation (e.g. queries of the most suspicious one), anomaly detection has also been formulated by a contextual multi-armed bandit framework (Ding, Li and Liu, 2019; Soemers et al., 2018). In credit card fraud identification systems, if the account history of a single card holder is short, it would be advisable to utilize the information from similar types of transactions and customers to increase the detection accuracy for fraudulent transactions. Due to the structural difference, this leads to another example of the covariate shift in the contextual multi-armed bandits.

The key in the covariate shift model is the characterization of the similarity between the marginal distributions P_X and Q_X . Various assumptions on the similarity have been proposed in the literature. In the present paper, we adopt the notion of *transfer exponent*—introduced in Kpotufe and Martinet (2021) to study transfer learning for nonparametric classification—that measures the discrepancy between P_X and Q_X in terms of the ball mass ratio of the respective distributions. It is assumed that there exists a transfer exponent $\gamma \geq 0$ such that $P_X(B(x, r)) \gtrsim r^\gamma Q_X(B(x, r))$ holds for any ℓ_∞ -ball with center $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and radius $r \in (0, 1]$ (see Definition 1). Informally, the transfer exponent γ quantifies how locally singular P_X is with respect to Q_X . When γ is small, this condition ensures that the auxiliary data adequately covers important regions under the target distribution Q (i.e. with large Q_X mass), thereby allowing information transferred from the source domain. A recent work (Suk and Kpotufe, 2021) considers contextual multi-armed bandits in a setting where the distribution of covariates changes over time, and uses a similar framework to capture the distributional shift. The proposed algorithm provably achieves the near-optimal minimax regret, while automatically adapting to the unknown change point in time and the shift level. However, the results therein suffer some deficiencies. First, the proposed algorithm works only for Lipschitz reward functions (i.e. smoothness parameter $\beta = 1$, see Section 2 for the formal definition). Therefore, it falls short of accommodating the general settings where $\beta \neq 1$.

Moreover, this issue leads to a more challenging question—is it possible to design a data-driven procedure that adapts to the smoothness level, which is typically *a priori* unknown in practice?

Going beyond such smoothness concerns, we note that [Suk and Kpotufe \(2021\)](#) focuses on a setting where the decision-maker is allowed to freely explore the bandit game with the covariate shift. However, it is more common in practice that one does not have the privilege to interact with the source bandit, but instead is only given by a fixed pre-collected batch dataset. It is natural to expect that the latter might incur a larger regret because the arm selection policy in the source data might be uninformative (e.g. only one arm is pulled in the auxiliary data). To capture this, we propose an exploration coefficient κ (see Definition 2) that quantifies how extensively each arm is explored in the source bandit, where κ guarantees that each arm is pulled with probability at least κ/K across the covariate space in the auxiliary dataset. So when κ is not vanishingly small, each arm is pulled more or less sufficiently, and useful information regarding the reward functions can be provided from the source domain. A natural question in such a scenario is: what is the minimax regret under the transfer learning setting with pre-collected batch data? Finally, we note that there is a logarithmic gap between the upper and lower bounds in [Suk and Kpotufe \(2021\)](#) and it remains unknown if the minimax lower bound on the regret can be achieved.

In the present paper, we seek answers to the following questions: Given a pre-collected auxiliary dataset, what is the minimax rate of convergence of the regret for the nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits in the covariate shift setting? Can we design a rate-optimal policy to achieve the minimax regret? Moreover, is it possible to design a data-driven procedure that achieves near-optimal statistical guarantees, while at the same time automatically adapting to the unknown levels of the smoothness of the reward functions and the covariate shift of the source distribution? Encouragingly, the answers to these questions are affirmative.

1.1. Main Contribution. Our main contribution is twofold. We first establish the minimax rate of convergence of the cumulative regret for nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits for transfer learning under the covariate shift model. In addition to the standard assumptions that the reward functions are β -Hölder (see Assumption 1) and that the target distribution Q satisfies a margin assumption with parameter α (see Assumption 2), we assume that the source and target distributions P and Q satisfy transfer learning conditions with transfer exponent γ and exploration coefficient κ (see Definitions 1 and 2). Given n_P auxiliary samples collected from the source bandit, we show that the minimax rate of convergence of the regret over n_Q time steps in the target Q -bandit is of order $n_Q \left(n_Q + (\kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \right)^{-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{2\beta+d}}$. In the classical setting where one has no auxiliary data from the source domain, i.e. $n_P = 0$, the minimax regret is known to be of order $n_Q^{1-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{2\beta+d}}$. Therefore, the term $(\kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}}$ in the minimax regret captures the contribution from the source data to the target bandit, which depends on the amount of covariate shift between P_X and Q_X as well as the degree of arm exploration in the auxiliary data.

We also develop a novel transfer learning algorithm and prove that it achieves the minimax optimal regret. However, the constructed procedure depends on the knowledge of the smoothness and transfer learning parameters. Unfortunately, it has been widely recognized that adaptation to the unknown smoothness level is generally infeasible in nonparametric bandit problems ([Locatelli and Carpentier, 2018](#); [Gur, Momeni and Wager, 2022](#); [Cai and Pu, 2022b](#)). To this end, we choose to focus on the bandits with reward functions that satisfy the self-similarity condition—an assumption extensively used in the statistics literature ([Picard and Tribouley, 2000](#); [Giné and Nickl, 2010](#)). We develop a data-driven algorithm and show

that it simultaneously achieves the near-optimal minimax regret at the penalty of an additional logarithmic factor over a large class of parameter spaces. Moreover, we demonstrate that the self-similarity assumption does not decrease the complexity of the problem by establishing the minimax lower bound that stays the same as in the general case.

1.2. Related works.

Contextual multi-armed bandits. The contextual multi-armed bandit framework was first introduced in Woodroffe (1979). Among the parametric approaches, an important line of work assumes a linear reward function (Abe and Long, 1999; Auer, 2002; Bastani and Bayati, 2020; Goldenshluger and Zeevi, 2013). It is shown in Bastani, Bayati and Khosravi (2021) that the greedy strategy is rate-optimal with a regret logarithmic in the length of the time horizon under a margin condition. The nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits typically assume Hölder smooth rewards. Yang and Zhu (2002) developed a greedy policy and showed that the regret goes to zero as the time horizon tends to infinity. Rigollet and Zeevi (2010) studied the two-armed bandits and proposed an upper-bound-confidence (UCB) type policy that attains a near-optimal minimax regret. This result is refined in Perchet and Rigollet (2013) where a rate-optimal policy called ABSE was developed in the multi-armed setting. Additionally, Reeve, Mellor and Brown (2018) combined a UCB-type policy with the nearest neighbor method to develop a near-optimal algorithm that adapts to the low intrinsic dimension of contexts. It is worth noting that all the above-mentioned methods are designed for β -Hölder smooth reward with $\beta \in (0, 1]$. Hu, Kallus and Mao (2019) extends the theory to accommodate the smoother reward functions with $\beta > 1$.

Adaptivity. It has been shown in various bandit settings that adaptation to the unknown smoothness is generally impossible in the sense that no policy can achieve the minimax regrets simultaneously over different classes of reward functions (Locatelli and Carpentier, 2018; Gur, Momeni and Wager, 2022; Cai and Pu, 2022b). We note that this phenomenon is closely related to the impossibility of construction of adaptive confidence bands in nonparametric function estimation (Low, 1997; Cai and Low, 2004; Cai, 2012). Fortunately, adaptive statistical inference can be accomplished under shape constraints such as monotonicity and convexity (Hengartner and Stark, 1995; Dumbgen, 1998; Genovese and Wasserman, 2005; Cai, Low and Xia, 2013). Self-similarity—first introduced by Picard and Tribouley (2000) for adaptive nonparametric confidence intervals—is another widely used condition to allow adaptivity, which finds applications in density estimation (Giné and Nickl, 2010), sparse regression (Nickl and Van De Geer, 2013) and ℓ_p -confidence sets (Nickl and Szabó, 2016). It was first introduced in the nonparametric contextual bandit setting by Qian and Yang (2016), where a UCB-type policy based on Lepski’s method (Lepski, Mammen and Spokoiny, 1997) was proposed and shown to achieve the minimax regret up to a logarithmic factor. The drawback, however, is that the cost of adaptation tends to infinity as the covariate dimension grows. Gur, Momeni and Wager (2022) improved upon this result by reducing the adaptation cost to a logarithmic factor independent of the dimension.

Transfer learning. Transfer learning has been studied using information measures such as KL-divergence and total variation to quantify the similarity between the target and source distributions (Ben-David et al., 2006; Blitzer et al., 2007; Mansour, Mohri and Rostamizadeh, 2009), based on which generalization bounds are then established. Despite its generality, such results are often not tight under specific statistical models. Recent work imposes more structured assumptions on the similarity between the target and source distributions such as covariate shift and posterior drift (Cai and Wei, 2021; Cai and Pu, 2022a; Hanneke and Kpotufe, 2019; Kpotufe and Martinet, 2021; Maity, Sun and Banerjee, 2020; Reeve, Cannings and Samworth, 2021), thereby leading to more refined theoretical guarantees.

1.3. *Organization*. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formulates the problem and introduces definitions and assumptions. We then establish the minimax optimal rate of the regret and develop a rate-optimal algorithm in Section 3. In Section 4, we propose a data-driven adaptive procedure that achieves the minimax regret up to logarithmic factors. Section 5 presents the numerical performance of the proposed algorithms. We conclude with a discussion of future directions in Section 6. Section 7 contains the proof of Theorem 1, and the proofs of the other theorems and technical lemmas are deferred to the supplementary material (Cai, Li and Cai, 2022).

1.4. *Notation*. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$. We denote by $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ the ℓ_2 norm and the ℓ_∞ norm, respectively. The notation $B_\infty(x, r) := \{y : \|y - x\|_\infty \leq r\}$ refers to the ℓ_∞ ball with center x and radius r , and we define the shorthand $B(x, r) := B_\infty(x, r)$. Denote by $[K] := \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. We use $\mathbb{1}\{\cdot\}$ to represent the indicator function, and we define $\log^+(x) := \log(x) \vee 1$. Let $\text{supp}(\cdot)$ denote the support of a probability distribution. For any distributions P, Q , the notation $\text{KL}(P\|Q)$ stands for the KL-divergence. For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, denote by $\lfloor a \rfloor$ (resp. $\lceil a \rceil$) the largest (resp. smallest) integer that is strictly smaller (resp. larger) than a . The notation \mathbb{N} stands for the set of non-negative integers. Throughout the paper, we denote by C or c some constants independent of n_P and n_Q which may vary from line to line.

For any two functions $f(n), g(n) > 0$, the notation $f(n) \lesssim g(n)$ (resp. $f(n) \gtrsim g(n)$) means that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $f(n) \leq Cg(n)$ (resp. $f(n) \geq Cg(n)$). The notation $f(n) \asymp g(n)$ means that $C_0f(n) \leq g(n) \leq C_1f(n)$ holds for some constants $C_0, C_1 > 0$. In addition, $f(n) = o(g(n))$ means that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n)/g(n) = 0$, $f(n) \ll g(n)$ means that $f(n) \leq c_0g(n)$ for some small constant $c_0 > 0$ and $f(n) \gg g(n)$ means that $f(n) \geq c_1g(n)$ for some large constant $c_1 > 0$.

2. Problem formulation.

2.1. *Transfer learning for nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits*. Let Q be a probability distribution over $\mathcal{X} \times [0, 1]^K$ that generates a sequence of independent random vectors $(X^Q, Y^{Q,(1)}, \dots, Y^{Q,(K)})$. At each time point t , based on the covariate $X_t^Q \in \mathcal{X}$ drawn from the marginal distribution Q_X , one selects an arm $k \in [K]$ and receive a random reward $Y_t^{Q,(k)} \in [0, 1]$ according to the conditional distribution $Q_{Y^{(k)}|X=X_t^Q}$. We assume that for any $k \in [K]$ and $t \geq 1$, the random reward $Y_t^{Q,(k)}$ is a random variable with conditional expectation given by

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_t^{Q,(k)} | X_t^Q] = f_k^Q(X_t^Q),$$

where $f_k^Q : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is an unknown function called reward function. A policy π is a collection of functions $\{\pi_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ from \mathcal{X} to $[K]$ that prescribe the arm to pull at each time t .

In the context of transfer learning, we assume that one is given a batch dataset $\mathcal{D}^P := \{(X_i^P, \pi_i^P, Y_i^{P,(\pi_i^P)})\}_{i=1}^{n_P}$ collected from a contextual K -armed bandit over n_P rounds, of which the underlying probability distribution P generates a sequence of independent random vectors $(X^P, Y^{P,(1)}, \dots, Y^{P,(K)}) \in \mathcal{X} \times [0, 1]^K$. Here, $X_i^P \in \mathcal{X}$ is the covariate observed at time i , policy $\pi_i^P : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [K]$ denotes the selected arm at time i , and $Y_i^{P,(\pi_i^P)}$ represents the corresponding observed random reward. Similar to the Q -bandit, we assume that for any $k \in [K]$ and $i \geq 1$, the random reward $Y_i^{P,(k)}$ of the P -bandit obeys

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i^{P,(k)} | X_i^P] = f_k^P(X_i^P),$$

for an unknown function $f_k^P : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Throughout the paper, we denote $n := n_Q \vee n_P$.

As mentioned in the introduction, this paper focuses on the covariate shift model. To be specific, it is assumed that the marginal distributions of the covariate in the P -bandit and Q -bandit are different (i.e. $P_X \neq Q_X$) while the distributions of the rewards conditional on the covariate value are identical (i.e. $P_{Y^{(k)}|X} = Q_{Y^{(k)}|X}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq K$). In particular, the latter implies that the reward functions are also identical in the two bandits, and we denote $f_k(x) := f_k^P(x) \equiv f_k^Q(x)$ for all $k \in [K]$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Recall that π^* is the oracle policy with access to the complete knowledge of the reward functions $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^K$. It is straightforward to see that given the covariate value X , the oracle policy π^* selects any arm with the largest expected reward with ties broken arbitrarily, namely

$$\pi^*(X) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in [K]} f_k(X).$$

Therefore, given a policy $\pi = \{\pi_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, the regret of π in the Q -bandit defined in (1) has the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R_{n_Q}(\pi)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} \left(f_{\pi^*(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) - f_{\pi_t(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) \right) \right] \\ (2) \quad &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} \left(\max_{k \in [K]} f_k(X_t^Q) - f_{\pi_t(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the remainder of the paper, we may drop the subscript n_Q whenever there is no confusion.

Finally, we emphasize that the policy π_t at time t depends on both the observations prior to time t of the Q -data (i.e. $\{(X_i^Q, \pi_i^Q, Y_i^{Q, (\pi_i^Q)})\}_{i=1}^{t-1}$) and the entire P -data (i.e. $\{(X_i^P, \pi_i^P, Y_i^{P, (\pi_i^P)})\}_{i=1}^{n_P}$).

2.2. Assumptions. We note that one cannot hope to distinguish the optimal arm of a bandit with arbitrary covariate and reward distributions. In order to guarantee provably small cumulative regrets, we impose the following model assumptions, which have become standard in the nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandit literature (Rigollet and Zeevi, 2010; Perchet and Rigollet, 2013).

We begin by imposing a Hölder smoothness assumption on the reward functions $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^K$ as follows.

ASSUMPTION 1 (Smoothness). *The reward functions $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^K$ are (β, C_β) -Hölder continuous for some constants $0 < \beta \leq 1, C_\beta > 0$, i.e. for any $k \in [K]$,*

$$|f_k(x) - f_k(x')| \leq C_\beta \|x - x'\|_\infty^\beta, \quad \forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}.$$

REMARK 1. Given the primary focus of this work is to illustrate the feasibility of reducing the cumulative regret by utilizing the auxiliary data, we restrict ourselves to the case $0 < \beta \leq 1$ for simplicity of presentation. We note that the results in this work can be extended to accommodate the $\beta > 1$ case. The discussion on the generalization is deferred to Section 6.

Next, it is natural to expect that the gap between the reward functions is a pivotal measure of the complexity of a bandit problem. To this end, let $f_{(1)}$ (resp. $f_{(2)}$) denote the pointwise maximum (resp. the second pointwise maximum) of the reward functions $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^K$, namely

$$f_{(1)}(x) := \max_{k \in [K]} f_k(x)$$

and

$$f_{(2)}(x) := \begin{cases} \max_{k \in [K]} \{f_k(x) : f_k(x) < f_{(1)}(x)\}, & \text{if } \min_{k \in [K]} f_k(x) \neq \max_{k \in [K]} f_k(x), \\ f_{(1)}(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Equipped with these notations, we introduce the following margin assumption—widely used in classification (Mammen and Tsybakov, 1999; Tsybakov, 2004; Audibert and Tsybakov, 2007) and contextual bandits (Goldenshluger and Zeevi, 2009; Perchet and Rigollet, 2013)—to quantify the interplay between the reward gap and the covariate distribution in the target bandit Q .

ASSUMPTION 2 (Margin). *There exist constants $\alpha \geq 0, C_\alpha > 0$ such that the reward functions $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^K$ and the marginal distribution Q_X satisfy*

$$Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X) - f_{(2)}(X) \leq \delta) \leq C_\alpha \delta^\alpha, \quad \forall 0 < \delta \leq 1.$$

Roughly speaking, the margin condition encodes the behavior of the distribution of the contexts near the decision boundary. If the margin parameter α is large, with low probability, the reward gap between the optimal arm and others is small but nonzero. This implies that the reward functions of different arms are well-separated on a set of large probability, thereby decreasing the difficulty to distinguish the arms.

REMARK 2. As discussed in Perchet and Rigollet (2013, Proposition 3.1), when $\alpha\beta > d$, there exists an arm that dominates others over the entire covariate space, and a contextual multi-armed bandit problem degenerates to a static multi-armed bandit problem that falls outside of the interest of this work. Therefore, we shall assume $\alpha\beta \leq d$ in the remainder of the paper.

In addition, we impose some regularity conditions on the marginal distribution Q_X . It essentially ensures that the support of Q_X is regular and that the density is bounded away from zero and infinity on the support.

ASSUMPTION 3 (Bounded density). *There exist constants $\bar{q} > \underline{q} > 0$ such that $\bar{q}r^d \leq Q_X(B(x, r)) \leq \underline{q}r^d$ for any $x \in \text{supp}(Q_X)$ and $r \in (0, 1]$.*

With these conditions regarding the target bandit Q in place, let us turn to the assumptions that enable reliable transfer learning. As discussed in Section 1, we focus on the covariate shift setting under the transfer exponent notion. It was originally introduced in Kpotufe and Martinet (2021) and many variants have appeared in the transfer learning literature (Hanneke and Kpotufe, 2019; Cai and Wei, 2021; Suk and Kpotufe, 2021).

DEFINITION 1 (Transfer exponent). *Define the transfer exponent $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0, \infty\}$ of P_X with respect to Q_X to be the smallest constant such that*

$$(3) \quad P_X(B(x, r)) \geq c_\gamma r^\gamma Q_X(B(x, r)), \quad \forall x \in \text{supp}(Q_X), r \in (0, 1],$$

for some constant $0 < c_\gamma \leq 1$.

Note that for an arbitrary probability distribution pair P and Q , condition (3) always holds with $\gamma = \infty$. Also, since the radius r is always upper bounded by 1 in $[0, 1]^d$, the probability mass $P_X(B(x, r))$ increases as γ goes to 0. Intuitively speaking, this implies that the auxiliary data cover a larger subset of the covariate regime of interest, and hence more information can be transferred from the source distribution P to the target distribution Q .

In addition, the covariate-arm pairs $\{(X_i^P, \pi_i^P(X_i^P))\}_{i=1}^{n_P}$ in the pre-collected auxiliary data are assumed to be generated i.i.d. according to $P_X \mu(\cdot | X)$ where $\{\mu(\cdot | x)\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ is a collection of probability distributions over the set of arms $[K]$. We make a note that this i.i.d. assumption prevails in the studies of bandits and reinforcement learning literature where one seeks to exploit offline data (Rashidinejad et al., 2021), and is well motivated by the data randomization procedure in experience replay (Mnih et al., 2015). To quantify the degree of exploration over the arm set in the source dataset, we introduce the definition of the exploration coefficient as follows.

DEFINITION 2 (exploration coefficient). *Define the exploration coefficient $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ of a collection of probability distributions $\{\mu(\cdot | x)\}$ over the arm set $[K]$ with respect to Q_X as*

$$(4) \quad \kappa := \inf_{k \in [K], x \in \text{supp}(Q_X)} K \mu(k | x).$$

Note that κ/K is the lowest probability that an arm is pulled over the support of Q_X in the P -data. Intuitively, when the exploration coefficient κ is not vanishingly small, each arm in the regions of interest is well tested by the auxiliary policy. This provides the decision-maker with more certainties about the reward functions of arms, and hence facilitates the decision-making in the target bandit.

Finally, we assume the number of arms K is constant throughout this paper.

Denote by $\Pi(K, \beta, C_\beta, \alpha, C_\alpha, \underline{q}, \bar{q}, \gamma, c_\gamma, \kappa)$ the class of nonparametric contextual K -armed bandits that satisfy Assumptions 1-3 and Definitions 1-2. Here and throughout the paper, we may use the shorthands $\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa)$ and Π if there is no confusion.

3. Minimax Rate of Convergence. In this section, we establish the minimax rate of convergence for the regret on the Q -bandit for transfer learning under the covariate shift model, and develop an rate-optimal procedure Algorithm 1 to achieve the minimax regret.

3.1. Algorithm. The key of solving nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandit problems is to accurately estimate the values of the reward functions $\{f_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq K}$ at each observed point X_t^Q . Inspired by the success of Rigollet and Zeevi (2010); Perchet and Rigollet (2013) in the classical setting, the high-level idea of Algorithm 1 is straightforward—it dynamically partitions the covariate space \mathcal{X} into a set of hypercubes (bins), and uses bin-wise constant local estimators for the reward functions in each bin. One can then reduce the original contextual bandit problem into a collection of static bandits without covariates, and apply an elimination policy within each bin individually. To be more specific, Algorithm 1 yields a sequence of nested partitions $\{\mathcal{L}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ of the covariate space \mathcal{X} over time. Given a bin B with $Q_X(B) > 0$ in the partition, if we restrict our focus to samples located in B , it is not hard to see that the corresponding observed rewards $(Y_s^{Q, (k)}(B))_{s \geq 1}$ of arm k are i.i.d. random variables with expectation equal to the conditional mean reward of arm k over bin B , namely $\bar{f}_k^Q(B) := \frac{1}{Q_X(B)} \int_B f_k(x) dQ_X(x)$. As a consequence, given the covariate X_t at time t , we first find the bin B from the current partition \mathcal{L}_t that contains X_t^Q , and then call Procedure 1—a transfer learning procedure tailored to a static multi-armed bandit that yields a sequence of policy $\{\tilde{\pi}_s(B)\}_{s \geq 1}$ for bin B —to obtain π_t .

In order to present the policy $\pi = \{\pi_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ generated by Algorithm 1, we need several notations. First, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \geq 1$, let $B_t(x) \in \mathcal{L}_t$ denote the bin in the partition \mathcal{L}_t at time t such that $x \in B_t(x)$. (If there are multiple bins, we choose $B_t(x)$ to be the one whose center is closest to the origin). Next, for any bin B and $t \geq 1$, denote by $N_t(B)$ the number of times when the covariate fell in B anterior to time t , i.e. $N_t(B) := \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t} \mathbb{1}\{X_s^Q \in B\}$.

$B\}$. With these definitions in place, the policy $\pi = \{\pi_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ yielded by Algorithm 1 can be presented by $\pi_t = \tilde{\pi}_{N_t(B_t(X_t^Q))}(B_t(X_t^Q))$ for any $t \geq 1$.

Before delving into the details of Algorithm 1, we pause to introduce additional notations. For any non-negative integer $l \geq 0$, we define a collection of bins $\mathcal{B}_l := \{B_k\}_{k \in [2^l]^d}$ where

$$(5) \quad B_k := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : (k_i - 1)2^{-l} \leq x_i \leq k_i 2^{-l}, k_i \in [2^l], i \in [d]\}, \quad \forall k = (k_1, \dots, k_d).$$

Denote by $|B|$ the length of bin B , i.e. $|B| = 2^{-l}$ for any $B \in \mathcal{B}_l$. As Algorithm 1 maintains an adaptive partition of the covariate space \mathcal{X} over time, it is convenient to describe the partition by a partition tree. To this end, denote by \mathcal{T}_l the complete tree with root node \mathcal{X} and maximum depth $l \geq 0$, where there are 2^{id} nodes in each depth i and each node B represents a bin in set \mathcal{B}_i . The set of children of any bin $B \in \mathcal{B}_i$ with $0 \leq i < l$ is defined as $\text{child}(B) := \{B' \in \mathcal{B}_{i+1} : B' \subset B\}$. As we shall see momentarily, at each time t , the partition \mathcal{L}_t induced by Algorithm 1 can be presented by a set of leaf nodes of some subtree \mathcal{T} of \mathcal{T}_{l^*} for some integer $l^* > 0$ to be specified later. Throughout the paper, the term bin and node are used interchangeably.

Next, given any subset \mathcal{D} of the auxiliary dataset \mathcal{D}^P , for any bin B and arm k , let $n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})$ denote the number of samples in \mathcal{D} such that the covariate falls in B and arm k is pulled, i.e.

$$(6) \quad n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D}) := \sum_{(X, \pi, Y) \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{1}\{X \in B, \pi = k\}.$$

We denote by $\bar{Y}_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})$ the empirical mean of the reward of arm k over bin B in \mathcal{D} :

$$(7) \quad \bar{Y}_k^P(B; \mathcal{D}) := \frac{1}{n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})} \sum_{(X, \pi, Y) \in \mathcal{D}} Y \mathbb{1}\{X \in B, \pi = k\},$$

where we adopt the convention that $0/0 = 0$. In addition, for any non-negative integer $\tau \geq 0$, let us define

$$(8) \quad U_k(\tau, B; \mathcal{D}) := \begin{cases} 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})} \log^+(n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta} \vee \kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}) \vee 2C_\beta |B|^\beta}, & \text{if } \tau = 0, \\ 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\tau + n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})} \log^+(\frac{n_Q |B|^d}{\tau}) \vee 2C_\beta |B|^\beta}, & \text{if } \tau > 0, \end{cases}$$

for any bin B and arm k , where we recall the notation $\log^+(x) := \log(x) \vee 1$ and use the convention $1/0 = \infty$. The confidence bound U essentially quantifies the uncertainty of the reward estimator used in Algorithm 1.

With these notations in place, we present the transfer learning algorithm for nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits in Algorithm 1.

Now let us discuss the details of Algorithm 1 accompanied by some intuition. As briefly discussed above, Algorithm 1 aims to segment the covariate space based on the local margins of the reward functions. We use smaller bins where the gaps between the reward functions of different arms are small, whereas partitioning the region in a more crude way where arms are easy to distinguish. Given the partition, we then view each bin B as an index of a sequence of local static bandit problems and run Procedure 1 on B with bin-specific parameters.

In order to achieve such adaptive partition, in each bin B we assign each arm k an individual non-negative upper bound on the number of pulls, denoted by $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$. Recall the definition of $U_k(\tau, B; \mathcal{D})$ (see (8)), we define

$$(9) \quad \tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D}) := \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{N}} \{\tau : U_k(\tau, B; \mathcal{D}) \leq 2C_\beta |B|^\beta\}$$

Algorithm 1 Transfer learning algorithm for contextual bandit

-
- 1: **Input:** set of arms \mathcal{I} , horizon length n_Q , smoothness parameters β, C_β , transfer parameters γ, c_γ , exploration coefficient κ , P -data \mathcal{D}^P .
 - 2: Initialize $\mathcal{L}_1 \leftarrow \{\mathcal{X}\}$, $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{X}) \leftarrow \mathcal{I}$, $N(\mathcal{X}) \leftarrow 0$. For each $k \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$, set $\tau_k(\mathcal{X}) \leftarrow 0$ and $\tau_k^*(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D}^P)$ as in (9). Set l^* as in (10).
 - 3: Initialize a policy $\tilde{\pi}(\mathcal{X})$ by Procedure 1 ($\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{X}), U, \mathcal{D}^P$).
 - 4: **for** $t = 1, \dots, n_Q$ **do**
 - 5: Draw a sample X_t^Q according to $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$.
 - 6: Set $B \leftarrow B_t(X_t^Q)$, i.e. find $B \in \mathcal{L}_t$ such that $X_t^Q \in B$.
 - 7: **while** $|\mathcal{I}(B)| > 1$, $|B| > 2^{-l^*}$ and $\tau_k(B) \geq \tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D}^P)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}(B)$ **do**
 - 8: **if** $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D}^P) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}(B)$ **then**
 - 9: Set $\underline{Y}^*(B; \mathcal{D}^P) \leftarrow \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}(B)} \{\bar{Y}_k^P(B; \mathcal{D}^P) - U_k(0, B; \mathcal{D}^P)\}$.
 - 10: Update the active arm set: $\mathcal{I}(B) \leftarrow \{k \in \mathcal{I}(B) : \bar{Y}_k^P(B; \mathcal{D}^P) + U_k(0, B; \mathcal{D}^P) \geq \underline{Y}^*(B; \mathcal{D}^P)\}$.
 - 11: **for** $B' \in \text{child}(B)$ **do**
 - 12: Set $\mathcal{I}(B') \leftarrow \mathcal{I}(B)$, $N(B') \leftarrow 0$. For each $k \in \mathcal{I}_{B'}$, set $\tau_k(B') \leftarrow 0$ and $\tau_k^*(B'; \mathcal{D}^P)$ as in (9).
 - 13: Initialize a policy $\tilde{\pi}(B')$ by Procedure 1 ($B', \mathcal{I}(B'), U, \mathcal{D}^P$).
 - 14: Update the partition tree: $\mathcal{L}_t \leftarrow (\mathcal{L}_t \setminus B) \cup \text{child}(B)$.
 - 15: Set $B \leftarrow B_t(X_t^Q)$, i.e. find $B \in \mathcal{L}_t$ such that $X_t^Q \in B$.
 - 16: Set $N_B \leftarrow N_B + 1$.
 - 17: Set $\pi_t \leftarrow \tilde{\pi}_{N_B}(B)$, $\mathcal{I}(B) \leftarrow \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{N_B}(B)$ and $(\tau_k(B))_{k \in \mathcal{I}(B)} \leftarrow (\tilde{\tau}_{N_B, k}(B))_{k \in \mathcal{I}(B)}$ according to policy $\tilde{\pi}(B)$.
 - 18: **Output:** policy $\{\pi_t\}_{t \geq 1}$.
-

for any bin B and arm k . Note that the confidence bound $U_k(\tau, B; \mathcal{D})$ (cf. (8)) is composed of two terms. The first term represents the standard deviation of the reward estimator due to the finite samples, while the second term stands for the bias term as we try to approximate the reward function by its conditional expectation over bin B . Roughly speaking, the value of $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$ is chosen to ensure that after arm k has been pulled $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$ times in bin B , the standard deviation and bias of the corresponding estimator is balanced. In particular, suppose that the conditional average reward of arm k over bin B is small. Then Procedure 1 run on bin B can identify and eliminate it by the end of $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$ rounds with high probability. Combined with the smoothness assumption, this procedure guarantees that the eliminated arms are uniformly suboptimal over bin B and that none of the remaining arms dominates the others. Therefore, if multiple arms remain active in B after each arm k has been pulled $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$ times, one knows that the reward functions of the remaining arms are close to each other locally, and hence needs to estimate them more carefully. Consequently, we split the node B in the partition tree and replace B with its children $\text{child}(B)$ in the partition \mathcal{L} . Moreover, the set of the active arms in B is passed to each child $B' \in \text{child}(B)$. We repeat this partition process until the depth of the partition tree reaches a prescribed maximum depth l^* , given by

$$(10) \quad l^* := \left\lceil \frac{\log_2(n_Q)}{d + 2\beta} \vee \frac{\log_2(c^* \kappa n_P)}{d + 2\beta + \gamma} \right\rceil.$$

for some constant c^* that depends on C_β, c_γ, q and K ; with the exact value given in Section 7. When the partition tree terminates partitioning, it essentially means that the local gap between different reward functions is sufficiently small and one cannot hope to further distinguish the optimal arm given the time length horizon. Therefore, one just selects the arm with the largest empirical mean reward. We note that there exists a bias-variance trade-off in the choice of the maximum depth of the partition tree. Given the smoothness assumption, spanning a deeper

Procedure 1 Elimination procedure for a static bandit with auxiliary data

- 1: **Input:** bin B , set of arms \mathcal{I} , confidence bound function U , auxiliary data \mathcal{D} .
 - 2: For each $k \in \mathcal{I}$, compute $n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})$, $\bar{Y}_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})$, $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$ as in (6), (7), (9), respectively.
 - 3: Initialize $t \leftarrow 0$. Set $\tau_{0,k} \leftarrow 0$, $n_k^P \leftarrow n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})$, $\bar{Y}_k \leftarrow \bar{Y}_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})$ and $\tau_k^* \leftarrow \tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$ for each $k \in \mathcal{I}$.
Initialize $\underline{Y}^* \leftarrow \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \{\bar{Y}_k - U_k(0, B; \mathcal{D})\}$.
 - 4: **loop**
 - 5: **if** $\tau_{t,k} \geq \tau_k^*$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$ **then**
 - 6: Set $t \leftarrow t + 1$. Choose $\tilde{\pi}_t \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \bar{Y}_k$ (with ties broken arbitrarily), pull arm $\tilde{\pi}_t$ and receive the reward $Y^{Q,(\tilde{\pi}_t)}$.
 - 7: Set $(\tau_{t,k})_k \leftarrow (\tau_{t-1,k})_k$, $\tau_{t,\tilde{\pi}_t} \leftarrow \tau_{t-1,\tilde{\pi}_t} + 1$ and $\mathcal{I}_t \leftarrow \mathcal{I}$.
 - 8: Update $\bar{Y}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \leftarrow \frac{1}{n_{\tilde{\pi}_t}^P + \tau_{t,\tilde{\pi}_t}} (Y^{Q,(\tilde{\pi}_t)} + (n_{\tilde{\pi}_t}^P + \tau_{t,\tilde{\pi}_t} - 1)\bar{Y}_{\tilde{\pi}_t})$.
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: **for** $k \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
 - 11: **if** $\tau_{t,k} < \tau_k^*$ **then**
 - 12: **if** $\bar{Y}_k + U_k(\tau_{t,k}, B; \mathcal{D}) \geq \underline{Y}^*$ **then**
 - 13: Set $t \leftarrow t + 1$. Choose $\tilde{\pi}_t \leftarrow k$, pull arm $\tilde{\pi}_t$ and receive the reward $Y^{Q,(\tilde{\pi}_t)}$.
 - 14: Set $(\tau_{t,k})_k \leftarrow (\tau_{t-1,k})_k$, $\tau_{t,\tilde{\pi}_t} \leftarrow \tau_{t-1,\tilde{\pi}_t} + 1$ and $\mathcal{I}_t \leftarrow \mathcal{I}$.
 - 15: Update $\bar{Y}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \leftarrow \frac{1}{n_{\tilde{\pi}_t}^P + \tau_{t,\tilde{\pi}_t}} (Y^{Q,(\tilde{\pi}_t)} + (n_{\tilde{\pi}_t}^P + \tau_{t,\tilde{\pi}_t} - 1)\bar{Y}_{\tilde{\pi}_t})$.
 - 16: Update $\underline{Y}^* \leftarrow \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \{\bar{Y}_k - U_k(\tau_{t,k}, B; \mathcal{D})\}$.
 - 17: **else**
 - 18: Eliminate arm k from the active arm set $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \mathcal{I} \setminus \{k\}$.
 - 19: **Output:** policy $\{\tilde{\pi}_t(B)\}_{t \geq 1}$, arm pull counts $\{(\tau_{t,k}(B))_{k \in \mathcal{I}_t}\}_{t \geq 1}$, set of active arms $\{\mathcal{I}_t(B)\}_{t \geq 1}$.
-

partition tree can reduce the estimation bias in the leaf nodes due to the small side-lengths. However, the average sample size per bin decreases as we grow the partition tree, and the resulting large variances hinder the identification of the optimal arm. The chosen depth l^* balances such trade-off and thus leads to the minimax optimal rate of convergence for the regret.

Next, let us move on to take a closer look at Procedure 1. Since it is designed for each individual bin, in addition to a bin index B , a set of arms \mathcal{I} and a confidence bound function U , Procedure 1 also requires the information regarding the samples from the source data that fall in the bin of interest. In particular, Procedure 1 needs the auxiliary sample size n_k^P , auxiliary empirical mean of reward \bar{Y}_k^P , and upper bound on play rounds τ_k^* for each arm $k \in \mathcal{I}$.

Before any arm reaches its round limit, Procedure 1 runs in a similar way as a standard elimination algorithm (see e.g. Auer and Ortner (2010); Perchet and Rigollet (2013)). It operates in rounds and maintains a set of active arms that are potentially optimal. In each round, it pulls each arm in the active arm set once. Given the access to the auxiliary data, it takes the empirical mean of the observed rewards from both the Q -bandit and the P -bandit, and then seeks to eliminate arms from the active set by comparing their upper and lower confidence bounds of the empirical averages of rewards. As a side remark, we note that a careful choice of the confidence bound function U is pivotal in attaining the minimax optimal rate of convergence.

Once arm k has been pulled for τ_k^* times, Procedure 1 stops selecting it temporarily. In fact, τ_k^* can be viewed as the maximum round of the exploration phase for arm k . The rationale is simple: given the additional information from the auxiliary data, one should be able to gain more certainty about whether arm k is optimal compared to the standard case. Consequently, we can reduce the cumulative regret by exiting the exploration stage earlier. After every arm in the active arm set reaches its round limit, Procedure 1 proceeds into the

second phase, where we only pull the arm with the largest empirical average reward. In this case, a previously suspended arm may be pulled again if it turns out to be the only active arm or if it has the largest empirical mean award.

To sum up, there are three critical steps in Algorithm 1 to integrate the source data. First, we combine the target and the source data to estimate the reward function of each arm, and the increased sample size would improve the estimation accuracy. In addition, note that the upper bound on the play rounds $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$ in (9) incorporates the information from the auxiliary data \mathcal{D} . It is easy to see that $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$ is a decreasing function of the auxiliary sample size $n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})$. Therefore, if an inferior arm k is pulled sufficiently many times in the P -bandit so that one is certain about its suboptimality, then we don't need to test it anymore in the Q -bandit. This leads to a shorter exploration phase and thus reduces the regret. Finally, as clear in (10), the additional source data leads to a deeper partition tree. Closely related to the second point, the auxiliary data allows us to build a deeper partition tree. We can then discretize the covariate space more finely, thus facilitating the identification of suboptimal arms and incurring a smaller regret.

Finally, we note that Algorithm 1 takes the horizon length n_Q as input that may be unknown in practice. Fortunately, this issue can be circumvented by the well-known doubling trick (see Auer et al. (1995)).

3.2. Minimax rate of convergence. We proceed to discuss the theoretical guarantees of Algorithm 1. To begin with, Theorem 1 gives an upper bound on the regret of the Q -bandit. The proof is postponed to Section 7.

THEOREM 1 (Upper bound). *Assume that $\alpha\beta \leq d$. Then the expected regret of the policy π given by Algorithm 1 satisfies*

$$(11) \quad \sup_{\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa)} \mathbb{E}[R_{n_Q}(\pi)] \leq C n_Q \left(n_Q + (\kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \right)^{-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{2\beta+d}}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant not depending on n_Q or n_P .

In addition, Theorem 2 below shows that the regret of Algorithm 1 matches the minimax lower bound, thereby justifying Algorithm 1 is rate-optimal. The proof can be found in the supplementary material (Cai, Li and Cai, 2022).

THEOREM 2 (Lower bound). *Assume that $\alpha\beta \leq d$. Then one has*

$$(12) \quad \inf_{\pi} \sup_{\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa)} \mathbb{E}[R_{n_Q}(\pi)] \geq c_1 n_Q \left(n_Q + (\kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \right)^{-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{2\beta+d}}$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is a constant not depending on n_Q or n_P .

We now discuss several important implications.

- Theorems 1 and 2 together establish the minimax rate of convergence for the regret for transfer learning under the covariate shift model when $K \asymp 1$:

$$(13) \quad \inf_{\pi} \sup_{\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa)} \mathbb{E}[R_{n_Q}(\pi)] \asymp n_Q \left(n_Q + (\kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \right)^{-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{2\beta+d}}.$$

- In the classical setting where one has no access to the P -data, the minimax regret is established in Perchet and Rigollet (2013), given by

$$(14) \quad \inf_{\pi} \sup_{\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha)} \mathbb{E}[R_{n_Q}(\pi)] \asymp n_Q^{1-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{2\beta+d}}.$$

We can see that (14) is a special case of (13) by setting $n_P = 0$.

- Compared with the regret (14) in the standard setting, we can see that incorporating the source data leads to a faster convergence rate of the regret (13) for transfer learning. The reduced regret quantifies the information allowed to be transferred from the source data to the target bandit, with a precise characterization of the dependence on the smoothness parameter β , dimension d , transfer exponent γ and exploration coefficient κ .
- Due to the difference between the source and target distributions, it is natural to expect that the value of the source data is different from that of the target data. This intuition is illustrated in (13) where we can view $(\kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}}$ as the effective sample size provided by the source data. Moreover, since the parameters $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ and $\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma} \leq 1$ for $\gamma \geq 0$, the minimax regret (13) further implies that the samples from the source data are always inferior in the context of nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits unless $P = Q$.
- We proceed to examine the roles of the parameters defined for transfer learning. As discussed intuitively in Section 2, the difficulty of transfer learning grows with the value of the transfer exponent γ . This point is justified theoretically in (13), showing that a small value of γ will create a faster convergence rate of the regret.
- Turning to the exploration coefficient κ , the dependence of the minimax rate (13) on κ also reveals that in order to achieve reliable transfer learning, the arms pulled in the source data should not concentrate on a small set of arms. When $\kappa = 0$, the effective auxiliary sample size is zero. To see this, let us consider a three-armed bandit problem where the policy in the source domain only selects arm 3. In such a case, even if the auxiliary sample size n_P goes to infinity which informs us of the true value of the reward function $f_3(x)$ of arm 3, we are still faced with a two-armed bandit problem with the minimax rate of convergence of the regret given by $n_Q^{1-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{d+2\beta}}$. This means that one cannot hope to substantially reduce the regret if the auxiliary dataset is not highly-exploratory.
- Finally, we note that the minimax lower bound (12) in Theorem 2 is identical to that in Kpotufe and Martinet (2021) established for the classification setting. This means even if we can observe the rewards generated from all the arms at each round, it is impossible to design a policy to improve the regret bound (12) as a function of n_P and n_Q . Intuitively, this implies that although we are faced with the challenge of sequential decision-making, the hardness of nonparametric estimation controls the complexity of the problem of transfer learning for nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits.

4. Adaptivity. The main drawback of Algorithm 1 is its dependence on the knowledge of the smoothness parameter β and transfer parameters γ, κ , which is often unknown in practical applications. Therefore, it is natural to ask if one can develop a data-driven algorithm that achieves the minimax optimal rate of convergence while adapting to a large class of the parameter spaces $\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa)$. However, it has been widely recognized in the bandit literature that one cannot hope to develop a smoothness-adaptive algorithm that achieves the optimal rate simultaneously over different multi-armed bandit problems (Locatelli and Carpentier, 2018; Gur, Momeni and Wager, 2022; Cai and Pu, 2022b). Additional structural assumptions on the reward functions are needed to enable smoothness adaptivity.

In view of the general impossibility of adaptation, we focus on a setting where the reward functions satisfy the self-similarity condition, which has been used for adaptive confidence intervals in nonparametric regression literature (Picard and Tribouley, 2000; Giné and Nickl, 2010) and adaptive multi-armed bandits (Gur, Momeni and Wager, 2022; Cai and Pu, 2022b). In the remainder of this section, we first introduce the self-similarity condition in Section 4.1, and then present a data-driven algorithm with theoretical guarantees in Section 4.2. As a remark, we believe it is also possible to develop adaptive strategies for the bandits with shape-constrained reward functions (e.g. concavity), and defer the discussion to Section 6.

4.1. *The self-similarity condition.* Denote by $\text{poly}(p)$ the set of polynomials of degree at most p for any integer $p \geq 0$. For any function $f(x)$ on \mathcal{X} , bin $B \subset \mathcal{X}$, integer $p \geq 0$, bandwidth $h \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and probability distribution μ over \mathcal{X} , let $\Gamma_h^p f(x; B, \mu)$ be the $L_2(\mu)$ -projection of the function $f(x)$ onto the class of polynomial functions of degree at most p over the bin B , i.e. for any $x \in B$,

$$(15) \quad \Gamma_h^p f(x; B, \mu) := \min_{g \in \text{poly}(p)} \int_B |f(u) - g(u)|^2 \mathbb{1}\{\|x - u\|_\infty \leq h\} \mu(u | B) \, du.$$

Recalling that \mathcal{B}_l denotes the partition of \mathcal{X} that consists of bins with side-length 2^{-l} , we introduce the self-similarity condition as follows:

DEFINITION 3 (Self-similarity). *Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous function in $\mathcal{H}(\beta, C_\beta)$ with $0 < \beta \leq 1$. For some constants $l_0 \geq 0$ and $b > 0$, we say f is self-similar under distribution μ with parameters l_0 and b if for any integer $l \geq l_0$,*

$$\max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_l} \sup_{x \in B} |\Gamma_{2^{-l}}^0 f(x; B, \mu) - f(x)| \geq b 2^{-\beta l}.$$

In a nutshell, the self-similarity condition imposes a global lower bound on the approximation error of a function by piecewise polynomial functions. Therefore, it may be viewed as a complement to the Hölder smoothness condition which implies an upper bound on the difference. We note that the difficulty of smoothness adaptation lies in the fact that a function can be extremely irregular on small scales, which is precluded by the self-similarity condition. Interested readers are referred to [Bull \(2012\)](#); [Nickl and Szabó \(2016\)](#) for more discussions on the self-similarity conditions. We present an example of self-similar functions below.

EXAMPLE 1. *Fix some constants $a, c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then function $f(x) = ax^\beta + c$ is self-similar under the uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$ with parameters $l_0 = 0$ and $b = \frac{a}{\beta+1}$.*

To verify this, let us fix an arbitrary $l \geq 0$ and denote $B_0 = [0, 2^{-l}]$. It is straightforward to compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_l} \sup_{x \in B} |\Gamma_{2^{-l}}^0 f(x; B, \text{Unif}[0, 1]) - f(x)| \\ & \geq |\Gamma_{2^{-l}}^0 f(0; B_0, \text{Unif}[0, 1]) - f(0)| = \left| \int_{B_0} f(x) 2^l \, dx - c \right| \\ & = a \int_0^{2^{-l}} x^\beta 2^l \, dx \geq a \int_0^{2^{-l}} x^\beta 2^l \, dx = \frac{a}{\beta+1} 2^{-\beta l}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, this shows that $f(x) = ax^\beta + c$ is self-similar by [Definition 3](#).

We now introduce the self-similarity assumption regarding the reward functions $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^K$ as follows.

ASSUMPTION 4 (Self-similarity). *Assume that there exists a reward function $f \in \{f_k\}_{k=1}^K$ such that f is self-similar under both the marginal distributions Q_X and P_X with some parameters $l_0 \geq 0$ and $b > 0$.*

We denote by $\Pi(K, \beta, C_\beta, \alpha, C_\alpha, \underline{q}, \bar{q}, \gamma, c_0, \kappa, l_0, b)$ the class of K -armed contextual bandits that satisfy the [Assumptions 1-4](#) and [Definitions 1-2](#). The shorthand $\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa, l_0, b)$ and Π are used whenever it is clear from the context.

Algorithm 2 Adaptive transfer learning algorithm for contextual bandit

- 1: **Input:** set of arms \mathcal{I} , horizon length n_Q , lower and upper bounds on smoothness parameter $\underline{\beta}$ and $\bar{\beta}$, upper bound on \bar{C}_β , upper bound on transfer exponent $\bar{\gamma}$, P -data \mathcal{D}^P .
 - 2: Run Procedure 2 ($n_Q, \underline{\beta}, \bar{\beta}, \bar{\gamma}, \mathcal{D}^P$) to obtain the smoothness estimate $\hat{\beta}$ and time steps s_Q, s_P .
 - 3: Denote $\mathcal{D}_2^P \leftarrow \{(X_i^P, \pi_i^P, Y^P, (\pi_i^P))\}_{s_P < i \leq n_P}$ the partial auxiliary data.
 - 4: Set $\mathcal{L}_1 \leftarrow \{\mathcal{X}\}$, $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{X}) \leftarrow \mathcal{I}$, $N(\mathcal{X}) \leftarrow 0$. For each $k \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{X})$, set $\tau_k(\mathcal{X}) \leftarrow 0$, and $\hat{\tau}_k^*(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D}_2^P)$ as in (18).
 - 5: Initialize a policy $\tilde{\pi}(\mathcal{X})$ by Procedure 1 ($\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{X}), \hat{U}, \mathcal{D}_2^P$).
 - 6: **for** $t = s_Q + 1, \dots, n_Q$ **do**
 - 7: Draw a sample X_t^Q according to Q_X .
 - 8: Set $B \leftarrow B_t(X_t^Q)$, i.e. $B \in \mathcal{L}_t$ such that $X_t^Q \in B$.
 - 9: **while** $|\mathcal{I}(B)| > 1$ and $\tau_k(B) \geq \hat{\tau}_k^*(B; \mathcal{D}_2^P)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}(B)$ **do**
 - 10: **if** $\hat{\tau}_k^*(B; \mathcal{D}_2^P) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}(B)$ **then**
 - 11: Set $\underline{Y}^*(B; \mathcal{D}_2^P) \leftarrow \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}(B)} \{\bar{Y}_k^P(B; \mathcal{D}_2^P) - \hat{U}(0, B; \mathcal{D}_2^P)\}$.
 - 12: Update the active arm set: $\mathcal{I}(B) \leftarrow \{k \in \mathcal{I}(B) : \bar{Y}_k^P(B; \mathcal{D}_2^P) + \hat{U}_k(0, B; \mathcal{D}_2^P) \geq \underline{Y}^*(B; \mathcal{D}_2^P)\}$.
 - 13: **for** $B' \in \text{child}(B)$ **do**
 - 14: Set $\mathcal{I}(B') \leftarrow \mathcal{I}(B)$, $N(B') \leftarrow 0$. For each $k \in \mathcal{I}(B')$, set $\tau_k(B') \leftarrow 0$ and $\hat{\tau}_k^*(B'; \mathcal{D}_2^P)$ as in (18).
 - 15: Initialize a policy $\tilde{\pi}(B')$ by Procedure 1 ($B', \mathcal{I}(B'), \hat{U}, \mathcal{D}_2^P$).
 - 16: Update the partition tree: $\mathcal{L}_t \leftarrow (\mathcal{L}_t \setminus B) \cup \text{child}(B)$.
 - 17: Set $B \leftarrow B_t(X_t^Q)$, i.e. $B \in \mathcal{L}_t$ such that $X_t^Q \in B$.
 - 18: Set $N_B \leftarrow N_B + 1$.
 - 19: Set $\pi_t \leftarrow \tilde{\pi}_{N_B}(B)$, $\mathcal{I}(B) \leftarrow \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{N_B}(B)$ and $(\tau_k(B))_{k \in \mathcal{I}(B)} \leftarrow (\tilde{\tau}_{N_B, k}(B))_{k \in \mathcal{I}(B)}$ according to policy $\tilde{\pi}(B)$.
 - 20: **Output:** policy $\pi_a = \{\pi_t\}_{t \geq 1}$.
-

4.2. *Adaptive algorithm.* In this section, we present a two-stage adaptive transfer learning algorithm for the contextual multi-armed bandits with self-similar reward functions. In short, the adaptive algorithm begins by computing a reasonably good estimate $\hat{\beta}$ for the Hölder smoothness parameter β (see Procedure 2), and then uses $\hat{\beta}$ as an input to a variant of Algorithm 1 that is guaranteed to achieve nearly optimal statistical guarantees given an accurate estimate of the smoothness parameter. The details are summarized in Algorithm 2.

In the first phase, our goal is to estimate the Hölder smoothness parameter β under the self-similarity condition. The procedure is built upon the key observation that the local polynomial regression estimator of any function f is sufficiently close to its polynomial projection Γf with high probability. Hence, if one uses the local polynomial regression method to estimate the reward function, the self-similarity condition ensures that the estimation bias will not decay too fast. Combined with the Hölder smooth condition, these two assumptions together yield a tight bound on the estimation bias which depends on the smoothness parameter β . Despite having no access to the estimation bias, one can adapt Lepski's method (Lepskii, 1991, 1992, 1993; Lepski, Mammen and Spokoiny, 1997) suitably to obtain a reliable estimate by comparing the difference between estimators with different bin side-lengths. To this end, Procedure 2 first constructs two partitions of the covariate space by using bins of different sizes. It then draws independent samples to build two separate local polynomial regression estimators for the reward function of each arm in each bin. Clearly, the estimation bias is larger in the bin with a larger side-length. As long as we collect enough samples so that the estimation bias dominates the standard deviation, the maximal difference between the two regression estimates is approximately of the same order as the larger estimation bias. This allows us to infer the smoothness of the reward functions. Specifically, with high probability

Procedure 2 Smoothness estimation procedure

-
- 1: **Input:** horizon length n_Q , lower and upper bounds on Hölder smoothness $\underline{\beta}$ and $\bar{\beta}$, upper bound on $\bar{\gamma}$, P -data \mathcal{D}^P .
 - 2: **if** $n_P > n_Q$ **then**
 - 3: Set $l_1 \leftarrow \lceil \frac{\beta \log_2(n)}{(d+2\bar{\beta}+\bar{\gamma})^2} \rceil$, $l_2 \leftarrow \lceil l_1 + \underline{\beta}^{-1} \log_2(\log(n)) \rceil$, $l_3 \leftarrow \lceil (\bar{\beta}/\underline{\beta})l_1 + \underline{\beta}^{-1} \log_2(\log(n)) \rceil$, $T \leftarrow n \frac{\beta}{d+2\bar{\beta}+\bar{\gamma}} (\log(n))^{(d+\bar{\beta}+\bar{\gamma})/\beta}$.
 - 4: Set $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \{(X_i^P, Y_i^P, (\pi_i^P))\}_{1 \leq i \leq T}$, $s_P \leftarrow T$ and $s_Q \leftarrow 0$.
 - 5: **else**
 - 6: Set $l_1 \leftarrow \lceil \frac{\beta \log_2(n)}{(d+2\bar{\beta})^2} \rceil$, $l_2 \leftarrow \lceil l_1 + \underline{\beta}^{-1} \log_2(\log(n)) \rceil$, $l_3 \leftarrow \lceil (\bar{\beta}/\underline{\beta})l_1 + \underline{\beta}^{-1} \log_2(\log(n)) \rceil$, $T \leftarrow n \frac{\beta}{d+2\bar{\beta}} (\log(n))^{(d+\bar{\beta})/\beta}$.
 - 7: For $t \in [T]$, draw a sample X_t^Q , pull an arm π_t^Q uniformly at random from $[K]$, and get the reward $Y_t^Q, (\pi_t^Q)$. Set $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \{(X_t^Q, Y_t^Q, (\pi_t^Q))\}_{1 \leq t \leq T}$, $s_P \leftarrow 0$ and $s_Q \leftarrow T$.
 - 8: Define a grid

$$\mathcal{M} := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : x_i = k_i 2^{-l_3}, k_i = 0, \dots, 2^{l_3}, i = 1, \dots, d\}.$$

- 9: **for** $i \in \{1, 2\}$ **do**
- 10: For each $x \in \mathcal{M}$, let $B \in \mathcal{B}_{l_i}$ be the bin such that $x \in B$. For each $k \in [K]$, let $\mathcal{D}_k = \{(X_t, Y_t)\}_t$ be the set of samples in \mathcal{D} such that $X_t \in B$ and $\pi_t = k$. Construct the estimator

$$(16) \quad \hat{f}_k(x; 2^{-l_i}) := \frac{\sum_{(X_t, Y_t) \in \mathcal{D}_k} Y_t \mathbb{1}\{\|X_t - x\|_\infty \leq 2^{-l_i}\}}{\sum_{(X_t, Y_t) \in \mathcal{D}_k} \mathbb{1}\{\|X_t - x\|_\infty \leq 2^{-l_i}\}}$$

if $\sum_{(X_t, Y_t) \in \mathcal{D}_k} \mathbb{1}\{\|X_t - x\|_\infty \leq 2^{-l_i}\} > 0$, and $\hat{f}_k(x; 2^{-l_i}) := 0$ otherwise.

- 11: Compute $\mathbf{b} \leftarrow \sup_{k \in [K]} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}} |\hat{f}_k(x; 2^{-l_1}) - \hat{f}_k(x; 2^{-l_2})|$ and $\hat{\beta} \leftarrow -l_1^{-1} \log \mathbf{b} - \log_2(\log(n))/\log_2(n)$.
 - 12: **Output:** the smoothness estimator $(\underline{\beta} \vee \hat{\beta}) \wedge \bar{\beta}$, termination time step s_Q and s_P .
-

we can obtain a smoothness estimate $\hat{\beta}$ with precision $\beta - O(\log_2(\log(n))/\log_2(n)) \leq \hat{\beta} \leq \beta$, which suffices to attain a near-optimal rate of regret. The detailed smoothness estimation procedure is summarized in Procedure 2. It is worth noting that based on the relationship between n_P and n_Q , the independent samples are collected from either the target bandit or the auxiliary dataset. This stage only takes a small portion of the time horizon length n_Q /the auxiliary sample size n_P , and hence the regret incurred is negligible compared to the minimax regret.

With the smoothness estimate $\hat{\beta}$ in hand, the second stage of Algorithm 2 takes it as an input and operates similarly as in Algorithm 1. As partial auxiliary data may have been used for the smoothness estimation process, Algorithm 2 only uses the dataset $\mathcal{D}_2^P \subset \mathcal{D}^P$ to facilitate distinguishing the optimal arm in the target bandit. Note that the confidence bound U (cf. 8) used in Algorithm 1 requires the knowledge of unknown parameters γ and κ . To construct an adaptive procedure, we use the following confidence bound \hat{U} in Algorithm 2. Given a subset \mathcal{D} of the source data \mathcal{D}^P , for any non-negative integer $\tau \geq 0$, we define

$$(17) \quad \hat{U}_k(\tau, B; \mathcal{D}) := 2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\tau + n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D})} \log(n) \vee 2\bar{C}_\beta |B|^{\hat{\beta}}}$$

for any bin B and arm k . And the associated upper bound on the play rounds $\hat{\tau}_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$ is defined as

$$(18) \quad \hat{\tau}_k^*(B; \mathcal{D}) := \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{N}} \{\tau : \hat{U}_k(\tau, B; \mathcal{D}) \leq 2\bar{C}_\beta |B|^{\hat{\beta}}\}.$$

In addition, note that the oracle choice of the maximum depth l^* of the partition tree in Algorithm 1 depends on the unknown transfer exponent γ and exploration κ . As discussed, the value of l^* is chosen based on the expectation of the sample size in each bin to make sure that the regression standard deviation and bias are balanced. As it turns out, the sample size is highly concentrated around its expectation in the bins with the depth of interest. By our choice of $\widehat{\gamma}_k^*(B; \mathcal{D})$, Algorithm 2 automatically adapts to the unknown parameters γ, κ to achieve a balanced bias-variance trade-off for estimating the reward functions in each active bin, and thus leading to a near-optimal rate of regret. Finally, we make a note that while Algorithm 2 requires the knowledge of $\bar{\gamma}$, it is only used in the smoothness estimation stage (i.e. Procedure 2). As discussed, our smoothness estimation procedure seeks to use T independent samples to evaluate the estimation bias of the local regression estimator under the self-similarity condition. To guarantee a good statistical performance of the local estimator in a bin with side-length h , one needs to collect sufficient samples to balance the standard deviation (of order $(1/\sqrt{Th^{d+\gamma}})$ with the estimation bias (of order h^β). On the other hand, we also need to make sure the regret incurred in the smoothness estimation process is small relative to the minimax regret. Therefore, this requires the knowledge of an upper bound on γ . As it turns out, once obtaining a reliable smoothness parameter estimate $\widehat{\beta}$, the remainder of the adaptive algorithm no longer needs the information.

We now present the theoretical guarantees of Algorithm 2. The proof is postponed to the supplementary material (Cai, Li and Cai, 2022).

THEOREM 3 (Upper bound). *Let $0 < \underline{\beta} < \bar{\beta} \leq 1$ and $\bar{\gamma} \geq 0$. Suppose that $\kappa \asymp 1$ and $\alpha\beta \leq d$. Then the policy π_a given by Algorithm 2 satisfies that for all $\beta \in [\underline{\beta}, \bar{\beta}]$ and $\gamma \in [0, \bar{\gamma}]$,*

$$(19) \quad \sup_{\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa, l_0, b)} \mathbb{E}[R_{n_Q}(\pi_a)] \leq C_1 n_Q \left(n_Q + (\kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \right)^{-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{2\beta+d}} \log^{C_2}(n_P + n_Q),$$

for some constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ independent of n_Q and n_P .

All in all, Theorem 3 demonstrates that Algorithm 2 achieves the near-optimal minimax regret simultaneously for all $\beta \in [\underline{\beta}, \bar{\beta}]$ and $\gamma \in [0, \bar{\gamma}]$ when $K, \kappa \asymp 1$. In comparison with Theorem 1, the regret upper bound (19) contains an additional logarithmic factor, which can be viewed as the cost paid for adaptation. The condition $\kappa \asymp 1$ basically assumes that the sample size corresponding to each arm in the source data is roughly of the same order, in which case one can achieve the most effective transfer learning.

Moreover, Theorem 4 below shows that the self-similarity assumption does not reduce the minimax complexity of the problem. The proof is deferred to the supplementary material (Cai, Li and Cai, 2022).

THEOREM 4 (Lower bound). *Assume that $\alpha\beta \leq d$. Then for any constant $\beta \in (0, 1]$ and $l_0 \geq 0$, there exists a constant $b > 0$ that only depends on $\beta, C_\beta, \underline{q}, \bar{q}$ and d such that*

$$(20) \quad \inf_{\pi} \sup_{\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa, l_0, b)} \mathbb{E}[R_{n_Q}(\pi)] \geq c_1 n_Q \left(n_Q + (\kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \right)^{-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{2\beta+d}}.$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$ independent of n_Q and n_P .

Recognizing that the self-similar function space $\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa, l_0, b)$ is a subset of the general space $\Pi(K, \beta, \alpha, \gamma, \kappa)$, Theorem 4 and 2 together demonstrates that the minimax regret under the self-similar condition is the same as that in the general case, and hence the self-similar condition does not reduce the complexity of the problem.

5. Numerical experiments. In this section, we perform a series of numerical experiments to demonstrate the performance of the proposed transfer learning procedures Algorithms 1 and 2. All results displayed are averaged over 50 independent Monte Carlo trials.

Set $d = 2$ and $K = 2$. We generate the data under the covariate shift model where the marginal distributions P_X, Q_X are different whereas the reward distributions are the same under P and Q .

For the marginal distributions, we set $Q_X \sim \text{Unif}([0, 1]^2)$ to be a uniform distribution over $[0, 1]^2$. And P_X is chosen such that the density $p_X(x)$ obeys $p_X(x) = c \|x - (1/2, 1/2)\|_\infty^\gamma$ for some absolute constant $c > 0$.

As for the reward distributions, we assume that conditional on the covariate X , the observed reward $Y^{(k)} \sim \mathcal{N}(f_k(X), \sigma^2)$ is a Gaussian random variable with mean $f_k(X)$ and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.05$. We make a note that while the current paper focuses on the bounded rewards for simplicity of presentation, the theoretical guarantees can be easily generalized to the sub-Gaussian reward case. As for the reward functions, let us define a function $\varphi_\beta(x) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $\varphi_\beta(x) = (1 - x)^\beta \mathbb{1}\{x \leq 1\}$. Based on the function $\varphi_\beta(x)$, we then choose the reward functions on $[0, 1]^2$ as

$$f_1(x) = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(x) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^4 \omega_i \varphi_\beta(4\|x - c_i\|_\infty),$$

where the sign $\omega_i = \pm 1$ is drawn i.i.d. with probability $1/2$, and the centers $\{c_i\}_i = \{(1/2 \pm 1/4, 1/2 \pm 1/4)\}$.

In addition, arm selections in the auxiliary data are generated i.i.d. according to probability distributions $\mu(\cdot | x) \equiv \mu(\cdot)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where each arm k is pulled with probability $\mu(k)$. One can verify that the construction of distributions P and Q satisfies the assumptions introduced in Section 2. As for the parameters for the adaptive Algorithm 2, we set $\underline{\beta} = 0.5, \bar{\beta} = 1, \bar{\gamma} = 2$.

For the sake of comparison, we also plot the numerical performance of the ABSE algorithm (Perchet and Rigollet, 2013) in addition to our proposed transfer learning methods. The ABSE algorithm is shown to attain the minimax regret in the standard setup where one has no access to additional auxiliary data. Therefore, it can be viewed as a benchmark to illustrate the improvement gained from transfer learning.

Minimax optimal algorithm. We start with the numerical performance of the oracle algorithm Algorithm 1 with complete knowledge of parameters β and γ , which provably achieves the minimax rate of convergence in the transfer learning setting. Figure 1 (a), (b) and (c) plot the means and standard deviations of the regret vs. horizon length n_Q for $n_P = n_Q/2$, $n_P = 3n_Q$ and $n_P = 3 \times 10^5$, respectively. As can be seen, Algorithm 1 outperforms the ABSE algorithm, thereby demonstrating the advantage of incorporating the auxiliary data.

We proceed to investigate the roles of the parameters that control transfer learning from the source domain. Let us first consider the dependence of the regret on the number of the auxiliary samples n_P . Figure 2 (a) displays the mean and standard deviation of the regret vs. the auxiliary sample size n_P . As one can see, there is a clear gap between the regret of our procedure and the ABSE algorithm. Naturally, one expects the improvement to increase as we collect more auxiliary data, which is reflected in the plot. Next, we move on to study how the degree of covariate shift affects the effectiveness of transfer learning. Figure 2 (b) depicts the mean and standard deviation of the regret vs. the transfer exponent γ . It can be seen from the plot that the regret grows as γ increases (which means that P_X and Q_X are more distinct). Hence, it confirms our theoretical guarantees regarding the impact of the transfer exponent. Moreover, let us examine the influence of the exploration coefficient κ . Figure 2 (c) plots the mean and standard deviation of the regret vs. the probability that the




FIG 1. (a) Regret vs. horizon length n_Q with $n_P = n_Q/2$; (b) Regret vs. horizon length n_Q with $n_P = 3n_Q$; (c) Regret vs. horizon length n_Q with $n_P = 3 \times 10^5$. Here, $d = 2, K = 2, \beta = 0.8, \gamma = 1$ and $\kappa = 1$.




FIG 2. (a) Regret vs. auxiliary sample size n_P with $\gamma = 1, \kappa = 1$; (b) Regret vs. transfer exponent γ with $n_P = 2 \times 10^5, \kappa = 1$; (c) Regret vs. auxiliary policy probability $\mu(1)$ with $n_P = 2 \times 10^5, \gamma = 1$. Here, $d = 2, \beta = 0.8$ and $n_Q = 1 \times 10^5$.

auxiliary policy selects arm 1 in the source data. As predicted by our theories, we can see the regret curve exhibits a U shape with roughly mirror-symmetry. In particular, it attains its minimum when $\mu(1) = 1/2$, which corresponds to the case where the exploration coefficient $\kappa = 1$.

Adaptive algorithm. Finally, let us compare the numerical performance of the proposed adaptive algorithm (Algorithm 2) with the minimax optimal algorithm (Algorithm 1) and the ABSE algorithm. Assuming that Algorithm 1 and the ABSE algorithm have knowledge of the parameters β and γ , Figure 3 (a) and (b) illustrate the means and standard deviations of the regret vs. the source data sample size n_P for $\beta = 0.6$ and $\beta = 0.8$, respectively. Encouragingly, Figure 3 demonstrates that the regrets of Algorithm 2 are reasonably close to those of Algorithm 1 for different values of β , thereby confirming the practical applicability of our adaptive procedure.

6. Discussion. In this paper, we have studied transfer learning for nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandit under the covariate shift model. We establish the minimax rate of convergence for the regret that captures the amount of information transferred from the source domains to the target domain. A novel transfer learning algorithm is proposed to attain the minimax regret. Moreover, we also develop a data-driven algorithm that achieves within a logarithmic factor of the minimax regret while adapting to the unknown parameters over a large collection of parameter spaces under an additional self-similarity assumption.

There are several possible extensions worth pursuing. While the current paper focuses on the “rough” reward functions with the smoothness parameter $\beta \in (0, 1]$, it is possible to generalize the algorithmic ideas to the case $\beta > 1$. Given a partition of the covariate space,




FIG 3. (a) Regret vs. horizon length n_Q with $\beta = 0.6$; (b) Regret vs. auxiliary sample size n_P with $\beta = 0.8$. Here, $d = 2, K = 2, \gamma = 1, \kappa = 1$ and $n_Q = 1 \times 10^5$.

instead of running static MAB procedures within each bin separately, we need to utilize observations from nearby bins to extrapolate the reward functions across context regions, as was introduced in [Hu, Kallus and Mao \(2019\)](#). Since the resulting policy is rather involved, we leave it to future investigation due to the space limit.

The regret upper bound of our adaptive policy mismatches the minimax optimal rate by a logarithmic term. It is unclear whether this logarithmic factor is unavoidable for not knowing the smoothness or it arises from the proof artifact. As discussed, it has been widely recognized in the literature of nonparametric function estimation that sharp adaption is often achievable under global integrated squared error, and that one must pay a logarithmic penalty for adaption under pointwise squared error. On the other hand, for the construction of confidence interval, it is typically impossible to adapt to the unknown smoothness without additional structural assumptions and it is possible to be fully adaptive under self-similarity or shape constraints. In particular, it is shown in [\(Cai, Low and Xia, 2013\)](#) that adaptive confidence intervals can be constructed for regression functions under shape constraints such concavity that are near optimal for every individual function. It is interesting to further investigate the cost of adaptation in the bandit problems, especially in the context of transfer learning. One problem of particular interest is developing adaptive transfer learning procedures for nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits with concave reward functions.

Finally, it is also interesting to study transfer learning for nonparametric contextual multi-armed bandits under other models. For instance, one avenue for future study is the posterior drift model where the marginal distributions of the target and source bandits are identical whereas the conditional reward distributions differ. In this case, it is also of interest to characterize the similarity between the reward distributions, establish the minimax rate of convergence which quantifies the information that can be transferred, and develop data-driven adaptive algorithms.

7. Proof of Theorem 1. Inspired by the analytical framework developed in [Perchet and Rigollet \(2013\)](#), let us first introduce several notations. For any bin $B \in \mathcal{T}$, recalling that $\text{child}(B')$ denotes the set of children of a bin B' , we define the parent of B by

$$(21) \quad \mathfrak{p}(B) := \begin{cases} \{B' \in \mathcal{T} : B \in \text{child}(B')\}, & \text{if } B \neq \mathcal{X}, \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } B = \mathcal{X}. \end{cases}$$

Denote $\mathfrak{p}^1(B) := \mathfrak{p}(B)$ and $\mathfrak{p}^k(B) := \mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{p}^{k-1}(B))$. Then the set of ancestors of bin B is defined by

$$(22) \quad \text{anc}(B) := \{B' \in \mathcal{T} : B' = \mathfrak{p}^k(B) \text{ for some } k \geq 1\}.$$

In addition, since we use the whole auxiliary dataset \mathcal{D}^P in Algorithm 1, we drop the notation \mathcal{D}^P in $n_k^P(B; \mathcal{D}^P)$, $\bar{Y}_k^P(B; \mathcal{D}^P)$ and $\tau_k^*(B; \mathcal{D}^P)$ throughout the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 7.

With the notations in hand, we begin the proof of Theorem 1. For any bin B , let us denote

$$(23) \quad R_l(B) := \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} (f_{\pi^*(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) - f_{\pi_t(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q)) \mathbb{1}\{X_t^Q \in B\} \mathbb{1}\{B \in \mathcal{L}_t\},$$

$$(24) \quad R_b(B) := \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} (f_{\pi^*(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) - f_{\pi_t(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q)) \mathbb{1}\{X_t^Q \in B\} \mathbb{1}\{B \in \cup_{1 \leq s \leq t} \mathcal{L}_s\},$$

where we recall \mathcal{L}_t is the partition of \mathcal{X} at time t . For any bin B , one can express $R_b(B)$ as

$$(25) \quad R_b(B) = R_l(B) + \sum_{B' \in \text{child}(B)} R_b(B').$$

We shall focus on the arms where the reward of the arms have a gap of order $|B|^\beta$. To make this precisely, for each bin B , let us define two sets of arms:

$$\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B := \{k \in [K] : \sup_{x \in B} \{f_{(1)}(x) - f_k(x)\} \leq c_0 |B|^\beta\},$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{I}}_B := \{k \in [K] : \sup_{x \in B} \{f_{(1)}(x) - f_k(x)\} \leq 8c_0 |B|^\beta\},$$

where we define $c_0 := 2C_\beta$. In addition, let $\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B$ denote the set of active arms on bin B at the end of rounds before B is replaced by its children in the partition. Now we define the ‘‘good’’ event

$$\mathcal{E}_B := \{\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B \subset \mathcal{I}_B \subset \bar{\mathcal{I}}_B\}.$$

By (25), we can decompose

$$\begin{aligned} R_b(B) &= R_b(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c\} + R_b(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B\} \\ &= R_b(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c\} + \left(R_l(B) + \sum_{B' \in \text{child}(B)} R_b(B') \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B\} \\ &= R_b(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c\} + R_l(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B\} + \sum_{B' \in \text{child}(B)} R_b(B') \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B\} \\ &= R_b(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c\} + R_l(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{B' \in \text{child}(B)} \left(R_b(B') \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_{B'}^c\} + R_l(B') \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_{B'}\} + \sum_{B'' \in \text{child}(B')} R_b(B'') \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_{B'}\} \right) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B\} \\ &= R_b(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c\} + \sum_{B' \in \text{child}(B)} R_b(B') \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B \cap \mathcal{E}_{B'}^c\} \\ &\quad + R_l(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B\} + \sum_{B' \in \text{child}(B)} R_l(B') \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B \cap \mathcal{E}_{B'}\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{B' \in \text{child}(B)} \sum_{B'' \in \text{child}(B')} R_b(B'') \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B \cap \mathcal{E}_{B'}\} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by deduction, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
R = R_b(\mathcal{X}) &= \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} \underbrace{\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} R_b(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\}}_{=: R_{b,i}} + \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} \underbrace{\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} R_l(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B \cap \mathcal{G}_B\}}_{=: R_{l,i}} \\
(26) \quad &+ \underbrace{\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{l^*}} R_l(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{G}_B\}}_{=: R_{l^*}}.
\end{aligned}$$

where we define $\mathcal{G}_B := \bigcap_{B' \in \text{anc}(B)} \mathcal{E}_{B'}$. In what follows, we shall upper bound the regret on the non-leaf and leaf nodes of \mathcal{X} separately. Lemmas 1 and 2 below provide upper bounds of the regret incurred on the non-leaf nodes.

LEMMA 1. *For any $0 \leq i < l^*$, one has*

$$(27) \quad \mathbb{E}[R_{b,i}] \lesssim K 2^{(d+2\beta-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}).$$

Moreover, let $c_2 := 2C_\beta^{-2} \vee 1$ and $c_3 := c_\gamma q$. For any $0 \leq i < l_1 := \lceil \frac{1}{d+\gamma} \log_2 \left(\frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{16K \log(n)} \right) \rceil$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
(28) \quad \mathbb{E}[R_{b,i}] &\lesssim K 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \left(2^{2\beta i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i} \vee \kappa n_P 2^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)i}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \right) \\
&\vee K 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 2. *For any $0 \leq i < l^*$, we have*

$$(29) \quad \mathbb{E}[R_{l,i}] \lesssim K 2^{(d+2\beta-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}).$$

Furthermore, the following holds for any $0 \leq i < l_1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
(30) \quad \mathbb{E}[R_{l,i}] &\lesssim K 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \left(2^{2\beta i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i} \vee \kappa n_P 2^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)i}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \right) \\
&\vee K 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, Lemma 3 below controls the regret accumulated on the leaf nodes of depth l^* .

LEMMA 3. *The regret incurred on the leaf nodes of depth l^* obeys*

$$(31) \quad \mathbb{E}[R_{l^*}] \lesssim n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*}.$$

With Lemmas 1-3 in hand, we can readily upper bound the regret. Plugging (28), (30) and (31) into (26) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(32) \quad \mathbb{E}[R] &= \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} \mathbb{E}[R_{b,i}] + \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} \mathbb{E}[R_{l,i}] + \mathbb{E}[R_{l^*}] \\
&\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i < l_1 \wedge l^*} K 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \left\{ \left(2^{2\beta i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i} \vee \kappa n_P 2^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)i}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \vee \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right) \right\} \\
&+ \sum_{l_1 \wedge l^* \leq i < l^*} K 2^{(d+2\beta-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}) + n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*}.
\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, we can also combine (26), (27), (29) and (31) to obtain the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R] &= \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} \mathbb{E}[R_{b,i}] + \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} \mathbb{E}[R_{l,i}] + \mathbb{E}[R_{l^*}] \\ (33) \quad &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} K 2^{(d+2\beta-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}) + n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*}. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we shall bound the regret differently according to the relationship between n_P and n_Q .

- We first consider the case where $n_Q < (c^* \kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}}$. By (10), we have $l^* = \lceil \frac{1}{d+2\beta+\gamma} \log_2(c^* \kappa n_P) \rceil$. As $\beta > 0$, one has $l^* \leq l_1$ for sufficiently large n_P . Consequently, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R] &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} K 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \left\{ \left(2^{2\beta i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}) \vee \kappa n_P 2^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)i}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \vee \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right) \right\} + n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall $c_2 := 2C_\beta^{-2} \vee 1$ and $c_3 := c_\gamma \underline{q}$. We set $c^* := \sup\{x \in \mathbb{R}_+ : x \log^+(1/x) < c_3/(2c_2 K)\}$. By the condition $n_Q < (c^* \kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}}$, one can verify that for any $0 \leq i < l^*$,

$$2^{2\beta i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}) \vee \kappa n_P 2^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)i} - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \leq 0.$$

As a result, the regret bound can be simplified as

$$\mathbb{E}[R] \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} K 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right) + n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*}.$$

Plugging the value of l^* into the above inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R] &\lesssim n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*} + \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} K 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*} + 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))l^*} \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)l^*} \wedge 2^{2\beta l^*} \right) \\ &= \left(n_Q + \frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(d+2\beta+\gamma)l^*} \wedge 2^{(d+2\beta)l^*} \right) 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*} \\ &= \left(n_Q + \frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} c^* \kappa n_P \wedge (c^* \kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \right) (c^* \kappa n_P)^{-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} n_Q (\kappa n_P)^{-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{d+2\beta+\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, (i) is due to the condition $d \geq \alpha\beta$ and $K \asymp 1$; (ii) follows from the condition that $n_Q < (c^* \kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}}$.

- We move on to the scenario where $n_Q \geq (c^* \kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}}$. By (10), one has $l^* = \lceil \frac{1}{d+2\beta} \log_2(n_Q) \rceil$. In this case, we shall invoke (33) to get

$$\mathbb{E}[R] \lesssim n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*} + \sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} K 2^{(d+2\beta-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}).$$

By the condition $\alpha\beta \leq d$, straightforward calculation gives

$$\sum_{0 \leq i < l^*} 2^{(d+2\beta-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}) \lesssim 2^{(d+2\beta-\beta(1+\alpha))l^*} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)l^*}) \lesssim n_Q^{1-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{d+2\beta}}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[R] \lesssim n_Q^{1 - \frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{d+2\beta}}.$$

- Combining the two cases above, we arrive at the advertised bound

$$\mathbb{E}[R] \lesssim n_Q \left(n_Q + (\kappa n_P)^{\frac{d+2\beta}{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \right)^{-\frac{\beta(1+\alpha)}{d+2\beta}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.

7.1. Proof of Lemma 1. Fix an arbitrary bin $B \in \mathcal{B}_i$ such that $0 \leq i < l^*$ and $B \cap \text{supp}(Q_X) \neq \emptyset$. Recall that Procedure 1 in Algorithm 1 operated on the bin B is restricted to observations of which the covariates fall in the bin B . For arm $k \in [K]$, denote by $(Y_\tau^{Q,(k)}(B))_{\tau \geq 1}$ the corresponding random rewards observed by successive pulls of arm k . The average reward over τ pulls that incorporates the P -data is denoted by

$$(34) \quad \bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) := \frac{1}{\tau + n_k^P(B)} \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau} Y_s^{Q,(k)}(B) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_k^P(B)} Y_i^{P,(k)}(B) \right).$$

On the event \mathcal{G}_B , we know that $\mathcal{I}_{p(B)} \subset \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{p(B)}$. By definition of $\bar{\mathcal{I}}$, for any arm $k \in \mathcal{I}_{p(B)}$, one has

$$\sup_{x \in p(B)} \{f_{(1)}(x) - f_k(x)\} \leq 8c_0 |p(B)|^\beta = 2^{3+\beta} c_0 |B|^\beta =: c_1 |B|^\beta,$$

which implies that one can upper bound

$$(35) \quad \sup_{x \in B} \{f_{(1)}(x) - f_k(x)\} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{G}_B\} \leq c_1 |B|^\beta \mathbb{1}\{0 < f_{(1)}(x) - f_{(2)}(x) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta\}.$$

Therefore, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[R_b(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\}] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f_{\pi^*(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) - f_{\pi_t(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) \right) \mathbb{1}\{X_t^Q \in B\} \mathbb{1}\{B \in \cup_{1 \leq s \leq t} \mathcal{L}_s\} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} \mathbb{E} \left[c_1 |B|^\beta \mathbb{1}\{0 < f_{(1)}(X_t^Q) - f_{(2)}(X_t^Q) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta\} \mathbb{1}\{X_t^Q \in B\} \mathbb{1}\{B \in \cup_{1 \leq s \leq t} \mathcal{L}_s\} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} \right] \\ &\leq n_Q c_1 |B|^\beta Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X) - f_{(2)}(X) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta, X \in B) \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all $B \in \mathcal{B}_i$ yields

$$(36) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R_{b,i}] &= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} \mathbb{E}[R_b(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\}] \\ &\leq c_1 n_Q 2^{-\beta i} \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X) - f_{(2)}(X) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta, X \in B). \end{aligned}$$

By the margin condition Assumption 2, we can upper bound

$$(37) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X) - f_{(2)}(X) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta, X \in B) &= Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X) - f_{(2)}(X) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta) \\ &\leq C_\alpha (c_1 |B|^\beta)^\alpha \\ &= C_\alpha c_1^\alpha 2^{-\beta \alpha i} \end{aligned}$$

Combining (36) and (37) shows that

$$(38) \quad \mathbb{E}[R_{b,i}] \lesssim n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)i} \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\}.$$

In addition, we claim that for any $0 \leq i < l^*$,

$$(39) \quad \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} \lesssim \frac{K}{n_Q} 2^{(d+2\beta)i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}),$$

and for any $0 \leq i < l_1$,

$$(40) \quad \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} \lesssim \frac{K}{n_Q} 2^{di} \left\{ \left(2^{2\beta i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i} \vee \kappa n_P 2^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)i}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \right) \vee \frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \right\};$$

with the proof is postponed to the end of the section. Combining (38), (39) and (40) leads to the advertised bounds (27) and (28).

Therefore, the remainder of the proof boils down to establishing (39) and (40). By definition of \mathcal{E}_B , we can express

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} = \mathbb{P}\{\{\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B \not\subset \mathcal{I}_B\} \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} + \mathbb{P}\{\{\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B \subset \mathcal{I}_B\} \cap \{\mathcal{I}_B \not\subset \bar{\mathcal{I}}_B\} \cap \mathcal{G}_B\}.$$

In what follows, we shall control the terms on the right-hand side separately.

- We start with the first term. On the event $\{\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B \not\subset \mathcal{I}_B\}$, we know that an arm $k_0 \in \underline{\mathcal{I}}_B$ is eliminated before $\tau_{k_0}^*(B)$ rounds in bin B . By the elimination criterion in Algorithm 1, we know that there exists some $j_0 \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{p}(B)}$ and $\tau \geq 0$ such that $\bar{Y}_\tau^{(j_0)}(B) - U_{j_0}(\tau, B) > \bar{Y}_\tau^{(k_0)}(B) + U_{k_0}(\tau, B)$. Since arm $k_0 \in \underline{\mathcal{I}}_B$, one knows from the definition of $\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}_{j_0}^Q(B) - \bar{f}_{k_0}^Q(B) &\leq \bar{f}_{(1)}^Q(B) - \bar{f}_{k_0}^Q(B) \leq c_0 |B|^\beta \leq \frac{1}{2} U_{k_0}(\tau, B) + \frac{1}{2} U_{j_0}(\tau, B) \\ \bar{f}_{j_0}^P(B) - \bar{f}_{k_0}^P(B) &\leq \bar{f}_{(1)}^P(B) - \bar{f}_{k_0}^P(B) \leq c_0 |B|^\beta \leq \frac{1}{2} U_{k_0}(\tau, B) + \frac{1}{2} U_{j_0}(\tau, B) \end{aligned}$$

where the last step holds due to the definition $U_k^*(\tau, B)$ in (8). It follows from the triangle inequality that there exists some $k \in \{k_0, j_0\}$ such that $|\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| > \frac{1}{2} U_k(\tau, B)$ for some $0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B)$. Therefore, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\{\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B \not\subset \mathcal{I}_B\} \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\exists k \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{p}(B)}, 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : |\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2\} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}\{\exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : |\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

- We proceed to control the second term. By definition, there exists an arm $j_0 \in \mathcal{I}_B$ and a point $x_0 \in B$ such that $f_{(1)}(x_0) - f_{j_0}(x_0) > 8c_0 |B|^\beta$ on the event $\{\mathcal{I}_B \not\subset \bar{\mathcal{I}}_B\}$. Let $k_0 \in [K]$ be an optimal arm at x_0 , i.e. $f_{k_0}(x_0) = f_{(1)}(x_0)$. It is not hard to see that $k_0 \in \underline{\mathcal{I}}_B$. Indeed, the smoothness assumption yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B} |f_{k_0}(x) - f_{k_0}(x_0)| &\leq C_\beta \sup_{x \in B} \|x - x_0\|_\infty^\beta \leq \frac{1}{2} c_0 |B|^\beta, \\ \sup_{x \in B} |f_{(1)}(x) - f_{(1)}(x_0)| &\leq C_\beta \sup_{x \in B} \|x - x_0\|_\infty^\beta \leq \frac{1}{2} c_0 |B|^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, applying the triangle inequality shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B} |f_{(1)}(x) - f_{k_0}(x)| &\leq \sup_{x \in B} |f_{(1)}(x) - f_{(1)}(x_0)| + |f_{(1)}(x_0) - f_{k_0}(x_0)| \\ &\quad + \sup_{x \in B} |f_{k_0}(x_0) - f_{k_0}(x)| \\ &\leq c_0 |B|^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from the definition of $\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B$ that $k_0 \in \underline{\mathcal{I}}_B$. Therefore, on the $\{\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B \subset \mathcal{I}_B\} \cap \{\mathcal{I}_B \not\subset \bar{\mathcal{I}}_B\}$, arms j_0 and k_0 are still active before bin B gets split, and it follows from the elimination procedure in Algorithm 1 that

$$(41) \quad \left| \bar{Y}_{B, \tau_{B, k_0}^*}^{(k_0)} - \bar{Y}_{B, \tau_{j_0}^*}^{(j_0)} \right| \leq U_{k_0}(\tau_{k_0}^*(B), B) + U_{j_0}(\tau_{j_0}^*(B), B).$$

In addition, by the smoothness condition, it is easy to see that for any $k \in [K]$ and $x \in B$, the average reward satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{f}_k^Q(B) - f_k(x)| &= \left| \frac{1}{Q(B)} \int_B (f_k(y) - f_k(x)) dQ_X(y) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{Q(B)} \int_B |f_k(y) - f_k(x)| dQ_X(y) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{Q(B)} \int_B \frac{1}{2} c_0 |B|^\beta dQ_X(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} c_0 |B|^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we can lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}_{k_0}^Q(B) &\geq f_{k_0}(x_0) - \frac{1}{2} c_0 |B|^\beta = f_{(1)}(x_0) - \frac{1}{2} c_0 |B|^\beta \\ &> f_{j_0}(x_0) + \frac{15}{2} c_0 |B|^\beta > \bar{f}_{j_0}^Q(B) + 7c_0 |B|^\beta \\ (42) \quad &\geq \bar{f}_{j_0}^Q(B) + \frac{3}{2} U_{j_0}(\tau_{j_0}^*(B), B) + \frac{3}{2} U_{k_0}(\tau_{k_0}^*(B), B), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step holds due to (9). Clearly, the above inequality holds for $\bar{f}_{k_0}^P(B) - \bar{f}_{j_0}^P(B)$. Combined with (41), this implies that the following holds for either $k = k_0$ or $k = j_0$:

$$\left| \bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)] \right| > \frac{1}{2} U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B).$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\{\{\underline{\mathcal{I}}_B \subset \mathcal{I}_B\} \cap \{\mathcal{I}_B \not\subset \bar{\mathcal{I}}_B\} \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\exists k \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{p}(B)} : |\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)]| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2\} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}\{|\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)]| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

- Combining these two terms, we find that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_B^c \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} \leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}\{\exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : |\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2\}$$

$$(43) \quad + \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}\left\{ \left| \bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)] \right| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2 \right\}.$$

It then suffices to control the two terms on the right-hand side, which is established in Lemma 4 below, with the proof deferred to Section 7.2.

LEMMA 4. *Instate the assumptions of Theorem 1. For any fixed $k \in [K]$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}_i$ with $0 \leq i < l^*$, one has*

$$(44) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left\{ \exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : \left| \bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)] \right| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2 \right\} \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{n_Q} 2^{(d+2\beta)i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}), \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $0 \leq i < l_1$, one further has

$$(45) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left\{ \exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : \left| \bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)] \right| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2 \right\} \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{n_Q} 2^{di} \left(2^{2\beta i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i} \vee \kappa n_P 2^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)i}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \right) \\ & \vee \frac{1}{n_Q} 2^{di} \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, the inequalities above also holds for $\mathbb{P}\left\{ \left| \bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)] \right| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2 \right\}$.

Therefore, applying Lemma 4 to (43) completes the proof for (40) and (39).

7.2. *Proof of Lemma 4.* Fix an arbitrary arm $k \in [K]$ and bin $B \in \mathcal{B}_i$ such that $0 \leq i < l^*$ and $B \cap \text{supp}(Q_X) \neq \emptyset$.

- Let us start with $\mathbb{P}\left\{ \exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : \left| \bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)] \right| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2 \right\}$. Conditional on $\{X_t^P\}_{1 \leq t \leq n_P}$, one can invoke Lemma ?? in the supplementary material (Cai, Li and Cai, 2022) to find

$$(46) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left\{ \exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : \left| \bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)] \right| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2 \mid \{X_t^P\}_{t=1}^{n_P} \right\} \\ & \lesssim \frac{\tau_k^*(B)}{n_Q |B|^d} + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}}. \end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of $\tau_k^*(B)$ in (9), it is straightforward to find that

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau_k^*(B) & \leq (c_2 |B|^{-2\beta} \log^+(n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta} \vee \kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}) - n_k^P(B)) \\ & \vee \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge |B|^{-2\beta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where $c_2 := 2C_\beta^{-2} \vee 1$. In particular, in light of the fact that $n_k^P(B) \geq 0$, we always have the following simple upper bound:

$$(48) \quad \tau_k^*(B) \leq c_2 |B|^{-2\beta} \log^+(n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}).$$

Recall $l_1 = \lceil \frac{1}{d+\gamma} \log_2(\frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{16K \log(K n_Q)}) \rceil$ with $c_3 = q c_\gamma$. If $0 \leq i \leq l_1$, we shall lower bound $n_k^P(B)$ more carefully. To this end, let us define event

$$(49) \quad \mathcal{G} := \left\{ n_k^P(B) \geq \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2K} |B|^{d+\gamma} \right\}.$$

On the event \mathcal{G} , one has

$$(50) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau_k^*(B) &\leq \left(c_2 |B|^{-2\beta} \log^+ (n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta} \vee \kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2K} |B|^{d+\gamma} \right) \\ &\vee \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge |B|^{-2\beta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, note that $n_k^P(B)$ is a sum of independent zero-mean Bernoulli random variables. By Assumption 3 and Definitions 1-2, one can lower bound the expectation of $n_k^P(B)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[n_k^P(B)] &\geq P_X(B) \frac{\kappa n_P}{K} \geq c_\gamma |B|^\gamma Q_X(B) \frac{\kappa n_P}{K} \geq \frac{c_\gamma \underline{q} \kappa n_P}{K} |B|^{d+\gamma} \\ &= \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{K} |B|^{(d+\gamma)i} = \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the choice of l_1 that $\mathbb{E}[n_k^P(B)] > 16 \log(n)$. As a consequence, we can invoke the Chernoff bound and the union bound to find

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}^c\} &= \mathbb{P}\left\{n_k^P(B) < \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2K} |B|^{d+\gamma}\right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{n_k^P(B) < \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[n_k^P(B)]\right\} \\ &\leq \exp(-\mathbb{E}[n_k^P(B)]/8) \\ &\leq n^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

With these bounds in place, we can readily control $\mathbb{P}\{\exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : |\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2\}$. In light of (46), we can upper bound

$$(52) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\{\exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : |\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2\} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\tau_k^*(B)}{n_Q |B|^d} + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q} |B|^{-(d+2\beta)} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{n_Q} |B|^{-(d+2\beta)} \log^+(n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}) + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q} |B|^{-(d+2\beta)} \\ &\asymp \frac{1}{n_Q} 2^{(d+2\beta)i} \log^+(n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_Q} 2^{(d+2\beta)i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}). \end{aligned}$$

where (i) utilizes the upper bound of $\tau_k^*(B)$ in (48).

Moreover, if $0 \leq i < l_1$, we can further bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\{\exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : |\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\{\exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : |\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2 \mid \mathcal{G}\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\{\exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : |\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2 \mid \mathcal{G}^c\} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}^c\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\exists 0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_k^*(B) : |\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_\tau^{(k)}(B)]| \geq U_k(\tau, B)/2 \mid \mathcal{G}\} + \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}^c\} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \frac{\tau_k^*(B)}{n_Q |B|^d} + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}} + \frac{1}{n^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{n_Q |B|^d} \left\{ \left(|B|^{-2\beta} \log^+ (n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta} \vee \kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} |B|^{d+\gamma} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \vee \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge |B|^{-2\beta} \right) \right\} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q} |B|^{-(d+2\beta)} + \frac{1}{n^2} \\
& \asymp \frac{2^{di}}{n_Q} \left(2^{2\beta i} \log^+ (n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i} \vee \kappa n_P 2^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)i}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \right) \\
(53) \quad & \vee \frac{2^{di}}{n_Q} \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, (i) follows from (46), (51) and the fact that event \mathcal{G} belongs to the σ -algebra generated by $\{X_t^P\}_{1 \leq t \leq n_P}$, (ii) is true by the upper bound of $\tau_k^*(B)$ in (50).

Putting (53) and (52) together completes the proof of the first claim.

- Next, let us proceed to consider $\mathbb{P}\{|\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)]| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2\}$, for which we can apply a similar argument as above. Conditional on $\{X_t^P\}_{1 \leq t \leq n_P}$, since $\{Y_i^{Q,(k)}(B)\}_i$ and $\{Y_i^{P,(k)}(B)\}_i$ are bounded martingale differences in $[0, 1]$, one can apply the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\{|\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)]| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2 \mid \{X_t^P\}_{t=1}^{n_P}\} \\
(54) \quad & \lesssim \frac{\tau_k^*(B)}{n_Q |B|^d} + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\{|\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)]| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2\} \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \frac{\tau_k^*(B)}{n_Q |B|^d} + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q} |B|^{-(d+2\beta)} \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{n_Q} |B|^{-(d+2\beta)} \log^+ (n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}) + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q} |B|^{-(d+2\beta)} \\
& \asymp \frac{1}{n_Q} 2^{(d+2\beta)i} \log^+ (n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}) \\
(55) \quad & \asymp \frac{1}{n_Q} 2^{(d+2\beta)i} \log^+ (n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}).
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from (54), and (ii) is due to the upper bound of $\tau_k^*(B)$ in (48).

Furthermore, if $0 \leq i < l_1$, recalling the definition of event \mathcal{G} in (49), one can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\{|\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)]| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2\} \\
& = \mathbb{P}\{|\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)]| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2 \mid \mathcal{G}\} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}\} \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P}\{|\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)]| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2 \mid \mathcal{G}^c\} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}^c\} \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\{|\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}_{\tau_k^*(B)}^{(k)}(B)]| > U_k(\tau_k^*(B), B)/2 \mid \mathcal{G}\} + \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}^c\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \frac{\tau_k^*(B)}{n_Q |B|^d} + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}} + n_P^{-2} \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{n_Q |B|^d} \left\{ \left(|B|^{-2\beta} \log^+ (n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta} \vee \kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} |B|^{d+\gamma} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \vee \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge |B|^{-2\beta} \right) \right\} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge \frac{1}{n_Q} |B|^{-(d+2\beta)} + \frac{1}{n^2} \\
& \asymp \frac{2^{di}}{n_Q} \left(2^{2\beta i} \log^+ (n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i} \vee \kappa n_P 2^{-(d+2\beta+\gamma)i}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \right) \\
(56) \quad & \vee \frac{2^{di}}{n_Q} \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, (i) arises from (54) and (51); (ii) uses the upper bound of $\tau_k^*(B)$ in (50).

Combining (56) and (55) finishes the proof of the second claim.

7.3. Proof of Lemma 2. Recall the definition of $R_l(B)$ in (23). For any bin $B \in \mathcal{B}_i$ such that $0 \leq i < l^*$ and $B \cap \text{supp}(Q_X) \neq \emptyset$, one can upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[R_l(B) \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B \cap \mathcal{G}_B\}] \\
& = \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f_{\pi^*(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) - f_{\pi_t(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) \right) \mathbf{1}\{X_t^Q \in B, B \in \mathcal{L}_t\} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} \right] \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} \mathbb{E} \left[c_1 |B|^\beta \mathbf{1}\{0 < f_{(1)}(X_t^Q) - f_{(2)}(X_t^Q) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta\} \mathbf{1}\{X_t^Q \in B, B \in \mathcal{L}_t\} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B \cap \mathcal{G}_B\} \right] \\
(57) \quad & \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} c_1 |B|^\beta Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X) - f_{(2)}(X) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta | X \in B) \sum_{1 \leq k \leq K} \mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B)].
\end{aligned}$$

Here, (i) follows from (35), (ii) holds due to the round limits in non-leaf bins in Algorithm 1. Note that we can upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i, B \cap \text{supp}(Q_X) \neq \emptyset} Q_X(0 < f_{(1)} - f_{(2)} \leq c_1 |B|^\beta | X \in B) \\
& = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i, B \cap \text{supp}(Q_X) \neq \emptyset} \frac{1}{Q_X(B)} Q_X(0 < f_{(1)} - f_{(2)} \leq c_1 |B|^\beta, X \in B) \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{q |B|^d} Q_X(0 < f_{(1)} - f_{(2)} \leq c_1 |B|^\beta) \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{q |B|^d} C_\alpha (c_1 |B|^\beta)^\alpha \\
(58) \quad & \lesssim |B|^{\beta\alpha-d}
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from Assumption 3 and (ii) arises from Assumption 2. Clearly, regret is only incurred in a bin B such that $B \cap \text{supp}(Q_X) \neq \emptyset$. As a result, summing over bins in \mathcal{B}_i ,

we combine (57) and (58) to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[R_{l,i}] &= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i} \mathbb{E}[R_l(B) \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}_B \cap \mathcal{G}_B\}] \\
&\leq c_1 K |B|^\beta \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i, k \in [K]} \mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B)] \\
&\quad \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i, B \cap \text{supp}(Q_X) \neq \emptyset} Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X) - f_{(2)}(X) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta | X \in B) \\
(59) \quad &\lesssim K 2^{(d-\beta(1+\alpha))i} \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i, k \in [K]} \mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B)].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it remains to upper bound $\max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i, k \in [K]} \mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B)]$. Towards this, fix an arbitrary $B \in \mathcal{B}_i$ and $k \in [K]$. In view of (48), one can bound directly

$$(60) \quad \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_i, k \in [K]} \mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B)] \lesssim 2^{2\beta i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}).$$

for any $0 \leq i < l^*$.

Moreover, if $0 \leq i < l_1$, let us recall event \mathcal{G} defined in (49). We can combine (47), (50) and (51) to find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B)] &= \mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B) | \mathcal{G}] \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}\} + \mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B) | \mathcal{G}^c] \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}^c\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B) | \mathcal{G}] + \mathbb{E}[\tau_k^*(B) | \mathcal{G}^c] \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}^c\} \\
&\lesssim \left(c_2 |B|^{-2\beta} \log^+(n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta} \vee \kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2K} |B|^{d+\gamma} \right) \\
&\quad \vee \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge |B|^{-2\beta} \right) + |B|^{-2\beta} \log^+(n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta}) \frac{1}{n^2} \\
&\asymp \left(|B|^{-2\beta} \log^+(n_Q |B|^{d+2\beta} \vee \kappa n_P |B|^{d+2\beta+\gamma}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} |B|^{d+\gamma} \right) \\
&\quad \vee \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} |B|^{-(2\beta+\gamma)} \wedge |B|^{-2\beta} \right) \\
(61) \quad &= \left(2^{2\beta i} \log^+(n_Q 2^{-(d+2\beta)i}) - \frac{c_3 \kappa n_P}{2c_2 K} 2^{-(d+\gamma)i} \right) \vee \left(\frac{n_Q}{\kappa n_P} 2^{(2\beta+\gamma)i} \wedge 2^{2\beta i} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the upper bounds (61) and (60) back into (59) completes the proof.

7.4. Proof of Lemma 3. For any bin $B \in \mathcal{B}_{l^*}$, it is straightforward to bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[R_{l^*}(B) \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{G}_B\}] &= \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f_{\pi^*(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) - f_{\pi_t(X_t^Q)}(X_t^Q) \right) \mathbf{1}\{X_t^Q \in B, B \in \mathcal{L}_t\} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{G}_B\} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} \mathbb{E} \left[c_1 |B|^\beta \mathbf{1}\{0 < f_{(1)}(X_t^Q) - f_{(2)}(X_t^Q) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta\} \mathbf{1}\{X_t^Q \in B\} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} c_1 |B|^\beta Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X_t^Q) - f_{(2)}(X_t^Q) \leq c_1 |B|^\beta, X_t^Q \in B) \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} c_1 2^{-\beta l^*} Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X_t^Q) - f_{(2)}(X_t^Q) \leq c_1 2^{-\beta l^*}, X_t^Q \in B)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality arises from (35). As a consequence, we can sum over all bins $B \in \mathcal{B}_{l^*}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R_{l^*}] &= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{l^*}} \mathbb{E}[R_l(B) \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{G}_B\}] \leq \sum_{t=1}^{n_Q} c_1 2^{-\beta l^*} Q_X(0 < f_{(1)}(X_t^Q) - f_{(2)}(X_t^Q) \leq c_1 2^{-\beta l^*}) \\ &\leq n_Q C_\alpha (c_1 2^{-\beta l^*})^{1+\alpha} \lesssim n_Q 2^{-\beta(1+\alpha)l^*}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the margin condition (Assumption 2) in the last line. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplement to “Transfer Learning for Contextual Multi-armed Bandits”: Numerical Experiments and Proofs

In this supplementary material, we provide proofs of Theorems 2-4 and auxiliary lemmas.

REFERENCES

- ABE, N. and LONG, P. M. (1999). Associative reinforcement learning using linear probabilistic concepts. In *ICML* 3–11. Citeseer.
- AGRAWAL, S., AVADHANULA, V., GOYAL, V. and ZEEVI, A. (2019). MNL-bandit: A dynamic learning approach to assortment selection. *Operations Research* **67** 1453–1485.
- AUDIBERT, J.-Y. and TSYBAKOV, A. B. (2007). Fast learning rates for plug-in classifiers. *The Annals of Statistics* **35** 608–633.
- AUER, P. (2002). Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **3** 397–422.
- AUER, P. and ORTNER, R. (2010). UCB revisited: Improved regret bounds for the stochastic multi-armed bandit problem. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica* **61** 55–65.
- AUER, P., CESA-BIANCHI, N., FREUND, Y. and SCHAPIRE, R. E. (1995). Gambling in a rigged casino: The adversarial multi-armed bandit problem. In *Proceedings of IEEE 36th annual foundations of computer science* 322–331. IEEE.
- BASTANI, H. and BAYATI, M. (2020). Online decision making with high-dimensional covariates. *Operations Research* **68** 276–294.
- BASTANI, H., BAYATI, M. and KHOSRAVI, K. (2021). Mostly exploration-free algorithms for contextual bandits. *Management Science* **67** 1329–1349.
- BEN-DAVID, S., BLITZER, J., CRAMMER, K. and PEREIRA, F. (2006). Analysis of representations for domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **19**.
- BLITZER, J., CRAMMER, K., KULESZA, A., PEREIRA, F. and WORTMAN, J. (2007). Learning bounds for domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **20**.
- BULL, A. D. (2012). Honest adaptive confidence bands and self-similar functions. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **6** 1490–1516.
- CAI, T. T. (2012). Minimax and adaptive inference in nonparametric function estimation. *Statistical Science* **27** 31–50.
- CAI, C., LI, H. and CAI, T. T. (2022). Supplement to “Transfer Learning for Contextual Multi-armed Bandits”.
- CAI, T. T. and LOW, M. G. (2004). An adaptation theory for nonparametric confidence intervals. *The Annals of Statistics* **32** 1805–1840.
- CAI, T. T., LOW, M. G. and XIA, Y. (2013). Adaptive confidence intervals for regression functions under shape constraints. *The Annals of Statistics* **41** 722–750.
- CAI, T. T. and PU, H. (2022a). Transfer learning for nonparametric regression: Non-asymptotic minimax analysis and adaptive procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:??*
- CAI, T. T. and PU, H. (2022b). Stochastic continuum-armed bandits with additive models: Minimax regrets and adaptive algorithm. *The Annals of Statistics* **50** 2179–2204.
- CAI, T. T. and WEI, H. (2021). Transfer learning for nonparametric classification: Minimax rate and adaptive classifier. *The Annals of Statistics* **49** 100–128.
- DING, K., LI, J. and LIU, H. (2019). Interactive anomaly detection on attributed networks. In *Proceedings of the twelfth ACM international conference on web search and data mining* 357–365.

- DUMBGEN, L. (1998). New goodness-of-fit tests and their application to nonparametric confidence sets. *Annals of statistics* 288–314.
- GENOVESE, C. R. and WASSERMAN, L. (2005). Confidence sets for nonparametric wavelet regression. *The Annals of statistics* **33** 698–729.
- GINÉ, E. and NICKL, R. (2010). Confidence bands in density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* **38** 1122–1170.
- GOLDENSHLUGER, A. and ZEEVI, A. (2009). Woodroofe’s one-armed bandit problem revisited. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **19** 1603–1633.
- GOLDENSHLUGER, A. and ZEEVI, A. (2013). A linear response bandit problem. *Stochastic Systems* **3** 230–261.
- GUR, Y., MOMENI, A. and WAGER, S. (2022). Smoothness-adaptive contextual bandits. *Operations Research*.
- HANNEKE, S. and KPOTUFE, S. (2019). On the value of target data in transfer learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **32**.
- HENGARTNER, N. W. and STARK, P. B. (1995). Finite-sample confidence envelopes for shape-restricted densities. *The Annals of Statistics* 525–550.
- HU, Y., KALLUS, N. and MAO, X. (2019). Smooth Contextual Bandits: Bridging the Parametric and Non-differentiable Regret Regimes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02553*.
- KALLUS, N. and UDELL, M. (2020). Dynamic assortment personalization in high dimensions. *Operations Research* **68** 1020–1037.
- KLEINBERG, R. and LEIGHTON, T. (2003). The value of knowing a demand curve: Bounds on regret for online posted-price auctions. In *44th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2003. Proceedings*. 594–605. IEEE.
- KPOTUFE, S. and MARTINET, G. (2021). Marginal singularity and the benefits of labels in covariate-shift. *The Annals of Statistics* **49** 3299–3323.
- KULIS, B., SAENKO, K. and DARRELL, T. (2011). What you saw is not what you get: Domain adaptation using asymmetric kernel transforms. In *CVPR 2011* 1785–1792. IEEE.
- LEPSKI, O. V., MAMMEN, E. and SPOKOINY, V. G. (1997). Optimal spatial adaptation to inhomogeneous smoothness: an approach based on kernel estimates with variable bandwidth selectors. *The Annals of Statistics* 929–947.
- LEPSKII, O. (1991). On a problem of adaptive estimation in Gaussian white noise. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **35** 454–466.
- LEPSKII, O. (1992). Asymptotically minimax adaptive estimation. i: Upper bounds. optimally adaptive estimates. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **36** 682–697.
- LEPSKII, O. (1993). Asymptotically minimax adaptive estimation. II. Schemes without optimal adaptation: Adaptive estimators. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **37** 433–448.
- LI, S., CAI, T. T. and LI, H. (2022a). Transfer learning for high-dimensional linear regression: Prediction, estimation and minimax optimality. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **84** 149–173.
- LI, S., CAI, T. T. and LI, H. (2022b). Transfer learning in large-scale gaussian graphical models with false discovery rate control. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1–13.
- LI, L., CHU, W., LANGFORD, J. and SCHAPIRE, R. E. (2010). A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web* 661–670.
- LI, W., DUAN, L., XU, D. and TSANG, I. W. (2013). Learning with augmented features for supervised and semi-supervised heterogeneous domain adaptation. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* **36** 1134–1148.
- LOCATELLI, A. and CARPENTIER, A. (2018). Adaptivity to smoothness in X-armed bandits. In *Conference on Learning Theory* 1463–1492. PMLR.
- LOW, M. G. (1997). On nonparametric confidence intervals. *The Annals of Statistics* **25** 2547–2554.
- LU, Y., XU, Z. and TEWARI, A. (2021). Bandit algorithms for precision medicine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04782*.
- MA, C., PATHAK, R. and WAINWRIGHT, M. J. (2022). Optimally tackling covariate shift in RKHS-based nonparametric regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.02986*.
- MAITY, S., SUN, Y. and BANERJEE, M. (2020). Minimax optimal approaches to the label shift problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10443*.
- MAMMEN, E. and TSYBAKOV, A. B. (1999). Smooth discrimination analysis. *The Annals of Statistics* **27** 1808–1829.
- MANSOUR, Y., MOHRI, M. and ROSTAMIZADEH, A. (2009). Domain adaptation: Learning bounds and algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0902.3430*.
- MNIH, V., KAVUKCUOGLU, K., SILVER, D., RUSU, A. A., VENESS, J., BELLEMARE, M. G., GRAVES, A., RIEDMILLER, M., FIDJELAND, A. K., OSTROVSKI, G. et al. (2015). Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature* **518** 529–533.

- NICKL, R. and SZABÓ, B. (2016). A sharp adaptive confidence ball for self-similar functions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **126** 3913–3934.
- NICKL, R. and VAN DE GEER, S. (2013). Confidence sets in sparse regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **41** 2852–2876.
- PAN, S. J. and YANG, Q. (2009). A survey on transfer learning. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering* **22** 1345–1359.
- PATHAK, R., MA, C. and WAINWRIGHT, M. (2022). A new similarity measure for covariate shift with applications to nonparametric regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 17517–17530. PMLR.
- PENG, M., LI, Y., WAMSLEY, B., WEI, Y. and ROEDER, K. (2021). Integration and transfer learning of single-cell transcriptomes via cFIT. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** e2024383118.
- PERCHET, V. and RIGOLLET, P. (2013). The multi-armed bandit problem with covariates. *The Annals of Statistics* **41** 693–721.
- PICARD, D. and TRIBOULEY, K. (2000). Adaptive confidence interval for pointwise curve estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* **28** 298–335.
- QIAN, W. and YANG, Y. (2016). Randomized allocation with arm elimination in a bandit problem with covariates. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **10** 242–270.
- QUATTONI, A., COLLINS, M. and DARRELL, T. (2008). Transfer learning for image classification with sparse prototype representations. In *2008 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* 1–8. IEEE.
- RAGHU, M., ZHANG, C., KLEINBER, J. and BENGIO, S. (2019). Transfusion: understanding transfer learning for medical imaging. *33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019)*.
- RASHIDINEJAD, P., ZHU, B., MA, C., JIAO, J. and RUSSELL, S. (2021). Bridging offline reinforcement learning and imitation learning: A tale of pessimism. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34** 11702–11716.
- REEVE, H. W., CANNINGS, T. I. and SAMWORTH, R. J. (2021). Adaptive transfer learning. *The Annals of Statistics* **49** 3618–3649.
- REEVE, H., MELLOR, J. and BROWN, G. (2018). The k -nearest neighbour UCB algorithm for multi-armed bandits with covariates. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory* 725–752. PMLR.
- RIGOLLET, P. and ZEEVI, A. (2010). Nonparametric bandits with covariates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1003.1630*.
- ROBBINS, H. (1952). Some aspects of the sequential design of experiments. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* **58** 527–535.
- ROTHSCHILD, M. (1974). A two-armed bandit theory of market pricing. *Journal of Economic Theory* **9** 185–202.
- SOEMERS, D., BRYNS, T., DRIESSENS, K., WINANDS, M. and NOWÉ, A. (2018). Adapting to concept drift in credit card transaction data streams using contextual bandits and decision trees. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* **32**.
- SUK, J. and KPOTUFE, S. (2021). Self-Tuning Bandits over Unknown Covariate-Shifts. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory* 1114–1156. PMLR.
- TEWARI, A. and MURPHY, S. A. (2017). From ads to interventions: Contextual bandits in mobile health. In *Mobile Health* 495–517. Springer.
- TSYBAKOV, A. B. (2004). Optimal aggregation of classifiers in statistical learning. *The Annals of Statistics* **32** 135–166.
- WANG, Y., CHEN, B. and SIMCHI-LEVI, D. (2021). Multimodal dynamic pricing. *Management Science* **67** 6136–6152.
- WANG, J., AGARWAL, D., HUANG, M., HU, G., ZHOU, Z., YE, C. and ZHANG, N. R. (2019). Data denoising with transfer learning in single-cell transcriptomics. *Nature methods* **16** 875–878.
- WEISS, K., KHOSHGOFTAAR, T. M. and WANG, D. (2016). A survey of transfer learning. *Journal of Big data* **3** 1–40.
- WOODROOFE, M. (1979). A one-armed bandit problem with a concomitant variable. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **74** 799–806.
- YANG, Y. and ZHU, D. (2002). Randomized allocation with nonparametric estimation for a multi-armed bandit problem with covariates. *The Annals of Statistics* **30** 100–121.
- YU, C., LIU, J., NEMATI, S. and YIN, G. (2021). Reinforcement learning in healthcare: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* **55** 1–36.
- YU, X., WANG, J., HONG, Q.-Q., TEKU, R., WANG, S.-H. and ZHANG, Y.-D. (2022). Transfer learning for medical images analyses: A survey. *Neurocomputing* **489** 230–254.