

---

# Recommender system as an exploration coordinator: a bounded $O(1)$ regret algorithm for large platforms

---

**Hyunwook Kang**

Dept. of Electrical & Computer Engineering  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77840  
hwkang@tamu.edu

**P. R. Kumar**

Dept. of Electrical & Computer Engineering  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77840  
prk@tamu.edu

## Abstract

On typical modern platforms, users are only able to try a small fraction of the available items. This makes it difficult to model the exploration behavior of platform users as typical online learners who explore all the items. Towards addressing this issue, we propose to interpret a recommender system as a bandit exploration coordinator that provides counterfactual information updates. In particular, we introduce a novel algorithm called Counterfactual UCB (CFUCB) which is guaranteed user exploration coordination with bounded regret under the presence of linear representations. Our results show that sharing information is a Subgame Perfect Nash Equilibrium for agents in terms of regret, leading to each agent achieving bounded regret. This approach has potential applications in personalized recommender systems and adaptive experimentation.

## 1 Introduction

In personalized recommender platforms, users (hereafter called agents) repeatedly explore the available choices (hereafter called arms). The platform then obtains increasing information with time about the rewards each agent gets from its choices. Moreover, the platform learns from the experiences of not just one agent but from the experiences of *all agents*. Could it put that totality of information to good use in helping each agent's exploration, allowing each agent exempt from exploration of most of the arms? It has been recently known that bounded ( $O(1)$ ) regret, the necessary outcome towards this goal, can be achieved in linear contextual bandits under some rank conditions of context set when contexts are sampled i.i.d. from a fixed context set ([9]). However, the linear algebraic theory and proof methods used to substantiate these results cannot provide interpretation in the context of a recommender system in which each agent decides which arm to pull next with the help of recommendations.

In this paper, we propose a different theory, different proof technique and detailed conditions for bounded regret than [9] that allows us to interpret recommender system as a bandit exploration coordinator. Here, the bandit exploration coordinator exempts each agent from the exploration of non-optimal arms using counterfactual information updates, leading to bounded, i.e.,  $O(1)$  regret when the number of agents is relatively large compared to the number of arms.

The intuitive explanation of recommender systems as bandit exploration coordinator is as follows. In adaptive medical prescription, the number of agents (patients) is much larger than the number of arms (possible treatments). We assume that linear representations of each agent's medical record is available thanks to recent advances in representation learning [6, 19]. Due to the linear dependencies among their feature vectors, the physician (recommender) can make a counterfactual inference on the effect of an arm to an agent from other agent's previous outcomes of other agents on that arm. Then the actual treatment recommendation of a physician can be interpreted as giving counterfactual

confidence interval information of each arm to each agent. We show that after some time agents become fully relieved from further exploration, leading to bounded regret for all agents.

While a mediator (e.g., a physician, YouTube) may coordinate agents' exploration (e.g., by recommendations), agents are usually selfish and strategic, so they might not follow the suggested policy or might not report properly (e.g., refusing to provide the physician their previous medical history, or turn on the privacy mode while using YouTube). We show that all agents truthfully reporting their private information initially, conforming to the policy provided, and truthfully reporting their subsequent arm-pulling experiences to the mediator, constitutes a Subgame Perfect Nash Equilibrium (SPNE) for the agents with asymptotically indifferent preference. This means that the first-best outcome of bounded regret is achieved under this equilibrium.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose the arrival model and the reward model and explore the condition under which bounded regret is shown to be achieved. Section 3 then explores how our problem relates to other existing problems. The main algorithm is proposed in Section 4 and analyzed in Section 5. We then investigate the proposed algorithm's robustness with respect to incentive constraints in Section 6 and noise in Section 7. Finally, we empirically demonstrate the bounded regret result using a simulation experiment in Section 8.

## 2 The problem setting

**Agent arrivals** Let  $A$  denote the set of agents. Each agent repeatedly arrives according to a renewal process where the inter-arrival times are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). Two cases are considered: When all inter-arrival times are (i) i.i.d. subgaussian with a density on the real line, or (ii) i.i.d. exponential. Denote the time of the  $n$ -th arrival of agent  $j$  by  $S_n^{(j)}$ , and the associated inter-arrival time by  $Y_n^{(j)} := S_n^{(j)} - S_{n-1}^{(j)}$ . We denote the associated counting process of agent  $j$ 's arrivals by  $N^{(j)}(t)$ . That is,  $\{S_n^{(j)} \leq t\} = \{N^{(j)}(t) \geq n\}$ .

**Feature Vectors of Agents and Arms** Denote the set arms by  $M$ . Each of the agents and each of the arms is associated with a feature vector of dimension  $d$ . Denote the feature vector of agent  $j$  by  $\alpha^{(j)}$ , and the feature vector of arm  $m$  by  $\beta_m$ . For the feature vectors associated with the agents, we further assume that any  $d$ -sized subset of  $A$  is linearly independent (note that this is justified by the fact that fullness of rank is generic). Under the cooperative setting, we assume, as of now, that each agent's feature vector is common knowledge. Later we will show that sharing this constitutes a SPNE with respect to the order of the regret for each agent.

**Rewards and objective** An agent gets to pull an arm every time that it arrives. Therefore  $N^{(j)}(t)$  is also the total number of pulls over all arms by agent  $j$  until time  $t$ . We further denote by  $N_m^{(j)}(t)$  the number of agent  $j$ 's pulls of arm  $m$  until time  $t$ . Agent  $j$  receives a random reward with mean  $\mu_m^{(j)} := \alpha^{(j)}\beta_m$  when it pulls arm  $m$ . The  $k$ th reward of agent  $j$  from arm  $m$  is  $X_{m,k}^{(j)} := \alpha^{(j)}\beta_m + \epsilon_m^{(j)}(k)$  where  $\epsilon_m^{(j)}(k)$  follows a sub-Gaussian distribution with  $E[\epsilon_m^{(j)}(k)] = 0$  and proxy variance  $\sigma^2$  ([15]). This rewards setup is a generalized version of typical linear contextual bandit formulation called *disjoint* linear contextual bandits.

For each agent  $j \in A$ , define  $m_j^* \in M$  as an arbitrarily chosen arm that satisfies  $\mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)} \geq \mu_m^{(j)} \quad \forall m \in M$ . We define  $\Delta_m^{(j)} := \mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)} - \mu_m^{(j)}$  and  $A_n := \{j \in A : m_j^* = n\}$ . Note that  $\{A_n\}_{n \in M}$  partitions  $A$ . Denote the arm pulled by agent  $j$  at its  $n$ -th arrival by  $m_j(n)$ . Then the finite time regret of agent  $j$  until time  $T$  is  $Regret^{(j)}(T) := \sum_{n=1}^{N^{(j)}(T)} \Delta_{m_j(n)}^{(j)} = \sum_{n=1}^{N^{(j)}(T)} (\mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)} - \mu_{m_j(n)}^{(j)})$ .

**Agent set size constraint** In the following sections, we will show that  $E[Regret^{(j)}(T)]$  is upper bounded by a constant under the following condition that intuitively holds when  $|A|$  is large enough:

$$|A_m| \geq d + 1, \quad \forall m \in M. \quad (1)$$

How large should the number of agents be in order to make this condition as probable as desired? Theorem 1 answers this question which is a previously unaddressed version of the Double Dixie cup problem [14]:

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that the optimal arms associated with agents  $\{m_j^* : j \in A\}$  are independently and uniformly distributed over  $A$ . If*

$$|A| \geq |M|d + \max\{\eta|M|d, \frac{2(1+\eta)}{\eta} \left( |M| \ln |M| + |M| \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + d \right)\}, \quad (2)$$

then

$$P(|A_m| \geq d + 1 \forall m \in M) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

The parameter  $\eta$  is a parameter to be tuned. The proof of Theorem 1 is provided in Appendix A. It shows that at least a multiple of  $(|M| \ln |M| + |M|d)$  number of agents is required, and an additional multiple of  $|M| \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}$  agents is needed if we want  $(1 - \epsilon)$  probability assurance.

If this condition does not hold, then there will be some agents who suffer  $O(\log T)$  expected regret instead of enjoying bounded expected regret. For the rest of the paper, we will assume that the condition (1) holds.

### 3 Related works and comparison to our work

In this paper, we assume that the platform (or a recommender) a priori knows the feature vector of each agent that constitutes the reward when an inner product is taken between it and the feature vector of the arm (which is unknown). Such feature vector of each agent is called a linear representation of the agent. Recent results [6, 19] in representation learning provides justifications of such linear representations assumption.

The reward model we discussed in Section 2 is a simplified version the reward model of disjoint linear contextual bandit model [[13, 10]]. In disjoint linear contextual bandit model, each agent has one separate feature vector for each arm; in our simplified model, each agent has only one feature vector that are shared for all arms. Because those feature vectors are all known vectors, our reward model does not loss any generality compared to the that of disjoint linear contextual bandit model. That is, our proposed algorithm is applicable to non-simplified models also. In comparison to typical (non-disjoint) linear contextual bandit models, which have only one shared unknown feature vector, disjoint linear contextual bandit model is a generalization of typical model; while disjoint model has a separate unknown feature vector for each arm, a typical model has only one unknown feature vector that is shared across all arms.

In case of context arrivals modeled as i.i.d. sampling from a finite context set, [9] provided a context set rank condition with which typical LinUCB algorithm may achieve bounded regret. As the confidence ellipsoid computation of LinUCB algorithm requires centralized inverse computations, it is hard to identify recommender systems interpretation of those results. In addition to providing a condition that can be applied to disjoint linear contextual bandit problem, our paper’s condition and algorithm provides an interpretation of a recommender system as bandit exploration coordinator.

The decentralized version of the proposed algorithm (see Section 4) that conveys the concept of each agent uploading local information to a mediator that coordinates information is also related to Federated Learning [10]. A notable result proved in [10] is that a tight minimax regret performance of  $O(\sqrt{T \log T})$  is achieved in spite of keeping information private. Our paper is motivated by a different consideration: How can agents obtain a *bounded regret of  $O(1)$* ? We show that this is achieved by the fact that sharing information constitutes a Subgame Perfect Nash Equilibrium (SPNE). This is an equilibrium where at every stage of the game no agent can strictly benefit by lying or not conforming [7, 16]. We establish that everyone reporting their private context to the mediator at time 0, following the CFUCB policy and reporting the rewards truthfully afterward does constitute a Subgame Perfect Nash equilibrium (SPNE) since  $O(1)$  regret cannot be improved. There are some previous works on incentive constraints in coordinating exploration: [17] shows that identification of a social planner’s best arm does not require extra payment when you must incentivize individually rational agents ([12]) instead of forcing them. In comparison, our paper shows that the context information enables an individual agent’s best arm to be chosen after a finite time. [11] considers incentive-compatible coordination of agents’ exploration with a setting opposite to ours: the context is private, but the mean reward associated with each arm is known.

## 4 The Counterfactual UCB Algorithm

We now introduce the Counterfactual-UCB (CFUCB) algorithm 1 that achieves bounded regret.

The high-level idea of this algorithm is as follows. In a typical UCB-based algorithm (e.g., [3] for the multi-armed bandit problem, an agent forms a confidence interval based solely on its own experience, which we call the *self-experienced confidence interval*. In our problem, an agent can also construct a confidence interval for each arm based on the experience of *other* agents in addition to itself. We call this the *counterfactual confidence interval*.

The main idea that enables the bounded expected regret result is somewhat related to the idea of a technique called imputation, which has recently been popularized in the causal inference community ([1, 18, 2, 5, 20]): Suppose that arm  $m$  is not the optimal arm for agent  $j$ , but it is optimal for a set of other agents, say  $A_m$ . If the total number of agents is large enough, we can express the feature vector of agent  $j$  by a linear combination of feature vectors of agents in  $A_m$ . Then this linear combination relationship can be used to simulate a counterfactual estimate of agent  $j$ 's experience on arm  $m$  using the experiences of  $A_m$  on arm  $m$ . If we can further impute the uncertainty of that estimate, the agent  $j$  may be fully exempt from the burden of further exploring arm  $m$  after a finite time.

**Self-experienced Confidence interval.** Denote by  $\bar{X}_m^{(j)}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N_m^{(j)}(t)} X_{m,k}^{(j)}}{N_m^{(j)}(t)}$  the empirical mean reward of agent  $j$  on arm  $m$ . Then the width  $w_m^{(j)}(t)$  of the lone wolf confidence interval is chosen as  $w_m^{(j)}(t) := \sqrt{\frac{\log N_m^{(j)}(t)}{N_m^{(j)}(t)}}$ . Defining  $\bar{X}_m^{(j)}(t) + w_m^{(j)}(t)$  as  $ucb_m^{(j)}(t)$ , and  $\bar{X}_m^{(j)}(t) - w_m^{(j)}(t)$  as  $lcb_m^{(j)}(t)$ , the lone wolf confidence interval is  $CI_m^{(j)}(t) := (lcb_m^{(j)}(t), ucb_m^{(j)}(t))$ .

**Counterfactual Confidence interval.** Define  $A_m(d, t) := \{j \in A : |\{i \in A : N_m^{(i)}(t) > N_m^{(j)}(t)\}| < d\}$ . This set includes the top  $d$  agents for arm  $m$  with all ties at the bottom being included. Taking into account Theorem 1, suppose that  $|A| \geq d+1$ . Note that this implies  $|A_m(d+1, t)| \geq d+1$ . Now arbitrarily choose a  $d$ -size subset  $E_m^{(j)}(t)$  of  $A_m(d+1, t) \setminus j$ . Since the feature vectors of the  $d$ -size subset of  $A$  are linearly independent,  $\alpha^{(j)} = \sum_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} a_i^{(j)} \alpha^{(i)}$  for some coefficients  $\{a_i^{(j)}\}$ , and consequently  $\mu_m^{(j)} = \sum_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} a_i^{(j)} \mu_m^{(i)}$ . Define  $\hat{X}_m^{(j)}(t) := \sum_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} a_i^{(j)} \bar{X}_m^{(i)}(t)$  and call it the *counterfactual mean reward of agent  $j$  for arm  $m$* . The width  $\hat{w}_m^{(j)}(t)$  of the corresponding counterfactual confidence interval is chosen as  $\hat{w}_m^{(j)}(t) := \sqrt{\frac{\log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{N_m^{(\min)}(d, t, j)/c_{m,t}^2}}$ , where  $c_{m,t} := \sum_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} |a_i^{(j)}|$ , and  $N_m^{(\min)}(d, t, j) := \min_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} N_m^{(i)}(t)$ . If we define  $\hat{X}_m^{(j)}(t) + \hat{w}_m^{(j)}(t)$  as  $\widehat{ucb}_m^{(j)}(t)$ , and  $\hat{X}_m^{(j)}(t) - \hat{w}_m^{(j)}(t)$  as  $\widehat{lcb}_m^{(j)}(t)$ , then the *counterfactual confidence interval* is defined as  $\widehat{CI}_m^{(j)}(t) := (\widehat{lcb}_m^{(j)}(t), \widehat{ucb}_m^{(j)}(t))$ .

The corresponding *Self-experienced upper confidence bound* and *counterfactual upper confidence bound* are

$$ucb_m^{(j)}(t) := \bar{X}_m^{(j)}(t) + w_m^{(j)}(t), \quad \widehat{ucb}_m^{(j)}(t) := \hat{X}_m^{(j)}(t) + \hat{w}_m^{(j)}(t). \quad (3)$$

**The Counterfactual UCB (CFUCB) algorithm** We introduce a notion of *epochs*. Define  $S := \cup_{i \in A} \{S_n^{(i)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , the set of all arrival times of all agents. The elements of  $S$  can be ordered as a monotone increasing sequence  $\{s_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , with  $s_k$  denoting the time of the  $k$ th arrival, irrespective of agent identity. From now on, denote by  $s_k$  the time of the  $k$ th arrival epoch, or simply the  $k$ th epoch. Define a sequence of agent indices  $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $a_k = i \in A$  if  $s_k = S_n^{(i)}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . That is,  $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  indicates the identity of the agent that arrives at each epoch. Ties between agents arriving at the same time can be broken arbitrarily, while the probability of simultaneous arrivals at subsequent times is zero due to the existence of a density for inter-arrival times. Given  $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , denote the index of the arm pulled by agent  $a_k$  at epoch  $k$  by  $m_k$ , and the corresponding accrued reward by  $r_k$ , where  $m_k \in M$  and  $r_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$  ( $r_k = \alpha^{(a_k)} \beta_{m_k} + \epsilon_k$ , where  $\epsilon_k$  is noise at epoch  $k$ ). Recall that  $X_m^{(j)}(n)$  denotes the  $n$ -th reward of agent  $j$  from arm  $m$ .  $N_m^{(j)}(t)$  denotes agent  $j$ 's number of pulls of arm  $m$  until time  $t$ .

Algorithm 1 describes the pseudocode of the CFUCB Algorithm. The only difference between CFUCB and UCB is that arm  $j$  at time  $t$  chooses the arm with largest  $\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(j)}(t)$ , not  $ucb_m^{(j)}(t)$ .

---

**Algorithm 1:** CFUCB Algorithm

---

**Input:**  $\{\alpha^{(j)}\}_{j \in A}$  where  $\alpha^{(j)}$  denotes the feature vector of agent  $j$

- 1 **for**  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  **do**
- 2     Observe  $s_k$  and  $a_k$
- 3     **for**  $m = 1, 2, \dots, |M|$  **do**
- 4         Compute  $ucb_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)$  (Self-experienced upper confidence bound) according to Eq (3)
- 5         Compute  $\widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)$  (counterfactual upper confidence bound) according to Eq (3)
- 6          $\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k) = \min(ucb_m^{(a_k)}(s_k), \widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k))$
- 7         Set  $m_k = \arg \min_{m \in M} \{\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}$
- 8         Let agent  $a_k$  pull the arm  $m_k$  and obtain  $r_k$
- 9         Store  $X_{m_k}^{(a_k)}(N_{m_k}^{(a_k)}(s_k)) = r_k$  for the future use in later loop's line 4 and line 5

---

Algorithms 2 and 3 jointly describe the pseudocode of the decentralized version CFUCB Algorithm, which provides recommender system's interpretation as bandit exploration coordination system.

According to Equation (3), the mediator calculates the counterfactual UCBs  $\{\widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}_{m \in M}$  assuming that all previous reports  $\{(m_l, r_l)\}_{l=1}^{k-1}$  were truthful, and lets agent  $a_k$  know the counterfactual UCBs. After receiving  $\{\widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}_{m \in M}$  from the mediator, the agent calculates  $\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)$  for all  $m \in M$  according to  $\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k) = \min(ucb_m^{(a_k)}(s_k), \widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k))$ . (Note that agent  $a_k$  can calculate  $\{ucb_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}_{m \in M}$  by only using it's own pulling history, which is private information.)

This procedure can be intuitively thought of as agent  $a_k$  updating its prior on each arm  $m \in M$  following the mediator's recommendation. Recalling the medical experimentation example introduced earlier, a patient who *explores under optimism in face of uncertainty* is what exactly the UCB policy

models. A physician who works as CFUCB’s mediator will not only recommend a particular drug but also dis-recommend other drugs. This reduces the patient’s optimism for the less self-explored drugs.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Decentralized CFUCB - Each agent  $j$ ’s algorithm

---

**Input:**  $\alpha^{(j)}$  (agent  $j$ ’s feature vector)

```

1 for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  do
2   if  $a_k = j$  then
3     Receive  $\{\widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}_{m \in M}$  from the Mediator
4     for  $m = 1, 2, \dots, |M|$  do
5       Compute  $ucb_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)$  (Self-experienced upper confidence bound) according to Eq (3)
6        $\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k) = \min(ucb_m^{(a_k)}(s_k), \widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k))$ 
7     Pull arm  $m_k := \arg \min_{m \in M} \{\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}$  and observe  $r_k$ 
8     Generate  $(\widehat{m}_k, \widehat{r}_k)$  according to its reporting strategy
9     Report  $(\widehat{m}_k, \widehat{r}_k)$  to the mediator
10    Store  $X_{m_k}^{(a_k)}(N_{m_k}^{(a_k)}(s_k)) = r_k$  for the future use in later loop’s line 5
11  else
12    Pass

```

---



---

**Algorithm 3:** Decentralized CFUCB - Mediator algorithm

---

```

1 At  $k = 0$ , receive  $\{\alpha^{(j)}\}_{j \in A}$  from agents where  $\alpha^{(j)}$  denotes agent  $j$ ’s report on its feature vector at epoch 0
2 for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  do
3   Observe  $s_k$  and  $a_k$ 
4   for  $m = 1, 2, \dots, |M|$  do
5     Compute  $\widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)$  (counterfactual upper confidence bound) according to Eq (3)
6   Let agent  $a_k$  know  $\{\widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}_{m \in M}$ 
7   Receive agent  $a_k$ ’s report  $(\widehat{m}_k, \widehat{r}_k)$ 
8   Store  $X_{\widehat{m}_k}^{(a_k)}(N_{\widehat{m}_k}^{(a_k)}(s_k)) = \widehat{r}_k$  for the future use in later loop’s line 5

```

---

## 5 The analysis of CFUCB

We first start by describing how the confidence intervals are chosen. We follow the spirit of [3] - that is, we bound the violation probability by the inverse square of the total number of pulls at time  $t$ . Lemmas 2 and 3 describe this confidence interval choice. The proofs are deferred to Appendix A.

**Lemma 2** ([3]). For  $\epsilon \geq \sqrt{\frac{\log N^{(j)}(t)}{N_m^{(j)}(t)}}$ ,  $P(|\bar{X}_m^{(j)}(t) - \mu_m^{(j)}| > \epsilon) \leq N^{(j)}(t)^{-2}$ .

**Lemma 3.** Denote  $c_{m,t} := \sum_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} |a_i^{(j)}|$  and  $N_m^{(\min)}(d, t, j) := \min_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} N_m^{(i)}(t)$ . Then, for  $\epsilon \geq \sqrt{\frac{\log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{N_m^{(\min)}(d, t, j)/c_{m,t}^2}}$ ,  $P(|\widehat{X}_m^{(j)}(t) - \mu_m^{(j)}| > \epsilon) \leq N^{(j)}(t)^{-2}$ .

Now we are ready to derive the condition for the agent  $j$  to pull a non-optimal arm  $m$  in Lemma 4. Lemma 4 is the key result in that it provides the intuition about why bounded regret is achieved.

Note that as a consequence of Lemmas 2 and 3, at time  $t$ , for every arm  $n$  and every agent  $i$ , the Self-experienced confidence interval  $CI_n^{(i)}(t)$  and the counterfactual confidence interval  $\widehat{CI}_n^{(i)}(t)$  both include the true mean  $\mu_n^{(i)}$ , with high probability.

**Lemma 4.** If  $CI_n^{(i)}(t)$  and  $\widehat{CI}_n^{(i)}(t)$  both include the true mean  $\mu_n^{(i)}$  for all  $i \in A$  and  $n \in M$ , then an agent  $j$  who arrives at time  $t$  pulls a non-optimal arm  $m$ , i.e., one with  $\Delta_m^{(j)} > 0$ , only if

$$\min_{i \in A_m} \{N^{(i)}(t) - (\sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)^2}}) \log N^{(i)}(t)\} \leq \frac{4c_{m,t}^2 \log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{\Delta_m^{(j)^2}}. \quad (4)$$

One may note that the LHS of (4) will increase far faster than the RHS of (4) unless some agent  $i \in A_m$  arrives far slower than agent  $j$ . Soon, therefore, the inequality will cease to hold for all non-optimal arms, and only the optimal arm will be pulled afterwards.

Lemma 4 is based on the following Lemma 5.

**Lemma 5.** Under the same conditions as in Lemma 4, agent  $j$  pulls arm  $m$  only if  $\min \left( 2\sqrt{\frac{\log N^{(j)}(t)}{N_m^{(j)}(t)}}, 2\sqrt{\frac{\log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{N_m^{(\min)}(d,t,j)/c_{m,t}^2}} \right) \geq \Delta_m^{(j)}$ . That is, both  $N_m^{(j)}(t) \leq \frac{4 \log N^{(j)}(t)}{\Delta_m^{(j)^2}}$  and  $N_m^{(\min)}(d,t,j) \leq \frac{4c_{m,t}^2 \log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{\Delta_m^{(j)^2}}$  must hold for agent  $j$  to pull arm  $m$ .

*Proof of Lemma 5.* Denote the optimal arm for agent  $j$  as arm  $m_j^*$ . According to Algorithm 1,  $\{\text{Agent } j \text{ pulls arm } m\} \subseteq \{\widetilde{\text{ucb}}_m^{(j)}(t) \geq \widetilde{\text{ucb}}_{m_j^*}^{(j)}(t)\}$ . Note that  $\widetilde{\text{lcb}}_m^{(j)}(t) \leq \mu_m^{(j)} \leq \widetilde{\text{ucb}}_m^{(j)}(t)$  and  $\widetilde{\text{lcb}}_{m_j^*}^{(j)}(t) \leq \mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)} \leq \widetilde{\text{ucb}}_{m_j^*}^{(j)}(t)$  holds according to the assumptions of Lemma 4. Therefore, under the assumption of Lemma 4,  $\{\text{Agent } j \text{ pulls arm } m\} \subseteq \{\widetilde{\text{lcb}}_m^{(j)}(t) \leq \mu_m^{(j)}, \mu_m^{(j)} \leq \mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)}, \mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)} \leq \widetilde{\text{ucb}}_{m_j^*}^{(j)}(t), \widetilde{\text{ucb}}_{m_j^*}^{(j)}(t) \leq \widetilde{\text{ucb}}_m^{(j)}(t)\} = \{\widetilde{\text{lcb}}_m^{(j)}(t) \leq \mu_m^{(j)} \leq \mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)} \leq \widetilde{\text{ucb}}_m^{(j)}(t)\} = \{\mu_m^{(j)}, \mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)} \in CI_m^{(j)}(t) \cap \widehat{CI}_m^{(j)}(t)\}$ . Note that  $\{\mu_m^{(j)}, \mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)} \in CI_m^{(j)}(t) \cap \widehat{CI}_m^{(j)}(t)\} \subseteq \{\min(2w_m^{(j)}(t), 2\widehat{w}_m^{(j)}(t)) \geq \Delta_m^{(j)}\}$ . Therefore, under the assumptions of Lemma 4, agent  $j$  pulls arm  $m$  only if  $\min(2w_m^{(j)}(t), 2\widehat{w}_m^{(j)}(t)) \geq \Delta_m^{(j)}$  holds. Combining this with Lemma 2 and 3 yields the result.  $\square$

As can be seen in the proof of Lemma 5, by using Algorithm 1 it is assured that the arm  $m$  is pulled by agent  $j$  only if both  $\mu_m^{(j)}$  and  $\mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)}$  are included in the intersection of Self-experienced confidence interval  $CI_m^{(j)}(t)$  and the counterfactual confidence interval  $\widehat{CI}_m^{(j)}(t)$ . If any of them shrinks and cannot include both  $\mu_m^{(j)}$  and  $\mu_{m_j^*}^{(j)}$  anymore, agent  $j$  won't pull the arm  $m$  anymore.

*Proof of Lemma 4.* Fix agent  $j$  and arm  $m$ . Note that for any arm  $i \in A$ ,  $N_m^{(i)}(t) = N^{(i)}(t) - \sum_{n \in M \setminus m} N_n^{(i)}(t)$ . Let  $t^n$  be the last time prior to  $t$  at which a non-optimal arm  $n$  is played by agent  $i$ . Then  $N_n^{(i)}(t) = N_n^{(i)}(t^n) \leq \frac{4 \log N^{(i)}(t^n)}{\Delta_n^{(i)^2}} \leq \frac{4 \log N^{(i)}(t)}{\Delta_n^{(i)^2}}$  holds by Lemma 5. Therefore, for agent  $i \in A_m$ , for arm  $m$ ,  $N_m^{(i)}(t) \geq N^{(i)}(t) - (\sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)^2}}) \log N^{(i)}(t)$ . By the assumption (1),  $|A_m| \geq d + 1$ , and  $N_m^{(\min)}(d,t,j) \geq N_m^{(i)}(t)$  for some  $i \in A_m$ . Therefore,  $N_m^{(\min)}(d,t,j) \geq N_m^{(i)}(t) \geq N^{(i)}(t) - (\sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)^2}}) \log N^{(i)}(t)$  for some  $i \in A_m$ . That is,  $N_m^{(\min)}(d,t,j) \geq \min_{i \in A_m} \{N^{(i)}(t) - (\sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)^2}}) \log N^{(i)}(t)\}$ . Substituting this into  $N_m^{(\min)}(d,t,j) \leq \frac{4c_{m,t}^2 \log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{\Delta_m^{(j)^2}}$  from Lemma 5, it can be seen that arm  $m$  is pulled by agent  $j$  only when  $\min_{i \in A_m} \{N^{(i)}(t) - (\sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)^2}}) \log N^{(i)}(t)\} \leq \frac{4c_{m,t}^2 \log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{\Delta_m^{(j)^2}}$ .  $\square$

Lemma 6 draws a connection between the expected regret and the probability of agent  $j$  arriving at time  $t$  pulling a non-optimal arm  $m$ . The proof of the following Lemma 6 is deferred to Appendix A.

**Lemma 6.** Denote the event  $\{\text{Agent } j \text{ arrives at time } t \text{ and pulls a non-optimal arm } m\}$  by  $G_m^{(j)}(t)$ , and the event  $\{\mu_n^{(i)} \in CI_n^{(i)}(t) \cap \widehat{CI}_n^{(i)}(t) \forall i \in A_m, n \in M\}$  as  $V(t)$ . Suppose

that there is a function  $g_m^{(j)}(t)$  such that  $P(G_m^{(j)}(t)|V(t)) \leq g_m^{(j)}(t)$ . Then  $E[\text{Regret}^{(j)}(T)] \leq \sum_{m \in M \setminus m^*} \Delta_m \left( \frac{\pi^2}{6} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{+\infty} g_m^{(j)}(t) dF_n^{(j)}(t) \right)$  holds, where  $F_n^{(j)}(t) := P(S_n^{(j)} \leq t)$ .

Showing  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{+\infty} g_m^{(j)}(t) dF_n^{(j)}(t) < \infty$  will yield the result on bounded expected regret. The strategy of the proof is to show that  $\int_0^{+\infty} g_m^{(j)}(t) dF_n^{(j)}(t) = O(\frac{1}{n^2})$  holds for the two arrival process models: 1) agents arrive according to sub-Gaussian inter-arrival times (Section 5.1) and 2) agents arrive according to exponential inter-arrival times (Section 5.2). Before discussing how (4) of Lemma 4 can be used, in Lemma 7 we make an observation on the functional form of (4).

**Lemma 7.** For  $A, B, C > 0$ ,  $Ay - B \ln y < C \ln(\frac{x}{d})$  is satisfied only if  $y < -\frac{B}{A} \mathcal{W}_{-1} \left( -\frac{A}{B} (\frac{x}{d})^{-\frac{C}{B}} \right)$ , where  $\mathcal{W}_{-1}$  denotes the lower branch of the Lambert  $W$ -function ([4]).

*Proof of Lemma 7.* For  $A, B, C > 0$ ,  $\frac{A}{C}y - \frac{B}{C} \ln y < \ln(\frac{x}{d}) \iff y^{-\frac{B}{C}} e^{\frac{A}{C}y} < (\frac{x}{d}) \iff ye^{-\frac{A}{B}y} > (\frac{x}{d})^{-\frac{C}{B}} \iff -\frac{A}{B}ye^{-\frac{A}{B}y} < -\frac{A}{B}(\frac{x}{d})^{-\frac{C}{B}} \iff -\frac{B}{A} \mathcal{W}_0 \left( -\frac{A}{B} (\frac{x}{d})^{-\frac{C}{B}} \right) < y < -\frac{B}{A} \mathcal{W}_{-1} \left( -\frac{A}{B} (\frac{x}{d})^{-\frac{C}{B}} \right)$  where  $\mathcal{W}_0$  denotes the principal branch of the Lambert  $W$ -function. Therefore,  $Ay - B \ln y < C \ln(\frac{x}{d})$  holds only if  $y < -\frac{B}{A} \mathcal{W}_{-1} \left( -\frac{A}{B} (\frac{x}{d})^{-\frac{C}{B}} \right)$ .  $\square$

In the present case,  $y = N^{(i)}(t)$ ,  $x = N^{(j)}(t)$ ,  $A = 1$ ,  $B = \sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)^2}}$  and  $C = \frac{4c_{m,t}^2}{\Delta_m^{(j)^2}}$ . Define  $q_{ij}$  as  $q_{ij}(x) = -\frac{B}{A} \mathcal{W}_{-1} \left( -\frac{A}{B} (\frac{x}{d})^{-\frac{C}{B}} \right)$  where we use the above parameter values. One can easily check that  $\frac{B}{A} \mathcal{W}_{-1} \left( -\frac{A}{B} x^{-\frac{C}{B}} \right)$  is a function growing faster than  $\log x$  and slower than  $x$ .

## 5.1 Bounded expected regret result for the agents with sub-Gaussian inter-arrival times

**Lemma 8.** Suppose that each agent  $i \in A$  arrives independently with i.i.d. 1-subgaussian inter-arrival times with mean  $\theta_i$ , plays according to CFUCB. Then  $P(G_m^{(j)}(t)|V(t)) \leq g_m^{(j)}(t)$  holds, where  $g_m^{(j)}(t) = |A| \left( \exp(-2 \frac{(t - q_{ij}(\lceil \frac{t}{\theta_j - \epsilon_j} \rceil) \theta_{\max})^2}{q_{ij}(\lceil \frac{t}{\theta_j - \epsilon_j} \rceil)}) + \exp(-2 \frac{\epsilon_j^2}{\theta_j - \epsilon_j} t) \right)$ , with  $\theta_{\max} =: \max_{i \in A} \theta_i$  and  $\epsilon^j$  is a parameter to be tuned later.

The proof of Lemma 8 is a bit technical is deferred to Appendix A.

**Theorem 9.** Suppose that each agent  $i \in A$  arrives independently with i.i.d. 1-subgaussian inter-arrival times with mean  $\theta_i$ . Then with  $g_m^{(j)}$  defined as in Lemma 8,  $E[\text{Regret}(T)] \leq \sum_{m \in M} \Delta_m \left( \frac{\pi^2 |A| |M|}{6} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{+\infty} g_m^{(j)}(t) dF_n^{(j)}(t) \right) < \infty$  for all  $T$  under CFUCB.

*Proof.* From  $\int_0^{+\infty} g_m^{(j)}(t) dF_n^{(j)}(t) = 2|A| \left( 2 \exp(-2n\epsilon^2) + \exp(-2 \frac{(n(\theta^j - \epsilon) - q_{ij}(n) \theta_{\min})^2}{q_{ij}(n)}) \right) = O(\frac{1}{n^2})$  where  $\theta_{\min} = \min_{i \in A} \theta_i$ , the result follows. See Appendix A for the details.  $\square$

## 5.2 Bounded expected regret result for the agents with exponential inter-arrival times

**Lemma 10.** Suppose that each agent  $i$  of  $A$  arrives independently with i.i.d. exponentially distributed inter-arrival times with Mean  $\frac{1}{\lambda_i}$ . Every time an agent arrives, it plays according to CFUCB. Then  $P(G_m^{(j)}(t)|V(t)) \leq g_m^{(j)}(t)$  holds, where  $g_m^{(j)}(t) = |A| \left( \exp(-\frac{(\lambda_{\min} t - q_{ij}((\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)t)^2)}{2\lambda_{\min} t}) + \exp(-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j} t) \right)$  and  $\lambda_{\min} = \min_{i \in A} \lambda_i$  and  $\epsilon_j$  is a parameter to be tuned later.

The proof of Lemma 10 is a bit technical and so we defer it to Appendix A.

**Theorem 11.** Suppose that each agent  $i \in A$  arrives independently with i.i.d. exponentially distributed inter-arrival times with  $\lambda_i$ , and employs the CFUCB Policy. Then with  $g_m^{(j)}$  defined as in Lemma 10,  $E[\text{Regret}(T)] \leq \sum_{m \in M} \Delta_m \left( \frac{\pi^2 |A| |M|}{6} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{+\infty} g_m^{(j)}(t) dF_n^{(j)}(t) \right) < \infty$  for all  $T$ .



*Proof.* The result follows from  $\int_0^{+\infty} g_m^{(j)}(t) dF_n^{(j)}(t) \leq 3|A| \exp(-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}) + |A| \exp(-\frac{(\lambda_{\min} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j} - q_{ij}(n-1))^2}{2\lambda_{\min} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}}) = O(\frac{1}{n^2})$  where  $\lambda_{\min} = \min_{i \in A} \lambda_i$ . See the Appendix A for the details.  $\square$

## 6 Non-cooperative agents and Truthtelling

Now we turn to the non-cooperative case. Users of most real-world platforms are generally selfish and not necessarily cooperative. So far in the cooperative setup, there were the following two implicit truthfulness assumptions on each agent's behavior which will not be true in the non-cooperative case:

- T1. Each agent truthfully shares its feature vector (to the mediator) at the very beginning.
- T2. Each agent follows the CFUCB policy and truthfully shares every arm-pulling result (to the mediator) as it happens.

How incentive issue can be addressed in decentralized CFUCB algorithm (see Appendix B is as follows. When agent  $j$  arrives, the mediator assumes that all the agents have been conforming to  $T1$  and  $T2$  (e.g., all patients disclosing their previous medical records to the physician and reporting their progress accurately afterwards). The mediator computes  $\{\widehat{ucb}_m^{(j)}(t)\}_{m \in M}$  (agent  $j$ 's counterfactual UCBs for all arms  $m \in M$ ) and lets agent  $j$  know. (Intuitively, this is a form of negative recommendation that reduces confidence bound). As we saw from equation (3) of Algorithm 1, agent  $j$  can compute  $\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(j)}(t) = \min(ucb_m^{(j)}(t), \widehat{ucb}_m^{(j)}(t))$  for all arms  $m \in M$ . (Intuitively, a patient updates her expectation of a relatively self-unexplored drug's side effects due to the physician's recommendation).

The question we address is the following: Fix an agent  $i$ , and suppose that all other agents in  $A \setminus i$  don't violate the truthfulness assumptions. Would there be any incentive for the agent  $i$  to choose a behavior that violates  $T1$  and  $T2$  at any time? This is a dynamic game, and the question relates to whether truthtelling constitutes a Subgame Perfect Nash Equilibrium [8].

The answer, in plain English, is as follows. Suppose that an agent  $i$  only cares about the asymptotic order of the regret. That is, the agent  $i$  is indifferent between an  $f(T)$  regret and an  $g(T)$  regret if  $f(T) = \Theta(g(T))$ . Then we say that the agent  $i$  has an *asymptotically indifferent preference*, (defined formally in Appendix B). If all the agents of  $A$  have asymptotically indifferent preferences, it is trivial that no agent can strictly improve herself by violating  $T1$  and  $T2$  since she already has  $O(1)$  regret. Hence one has the following result.

**Theorem 12.** *If all agents have asymptotically indifferent preferences, then the strategy where every agent conforms to  $T1$  and  $T2$  is a Subgame Perfect Nash Equilibrium.*

The formal formulation of this game and result are provided in the Appendix B.

## 7 Robustness to noise

The results in Section 4 implicitly assume that all measurements and reportings of rewards are perfectly accurate. That is, there is no measurement/communication noise. The following Theorem 13 shows that the algorithm 4 is robust to sub-Gaussian noise, and still achieves bounded regret.

**Theorem 13.** *Let  $X_m^{(j)}(k) = X_m^{(j)}(k) + e_m^{(j)}(k)$  be the noisy observation of  $X_m^{(j)}(k)$ . If the noise  $e_m^{(j)}(k)$  is i.i.d. and follows a sub-Gaussian distribution, then each agent still has only bounded regret under the same conditions as Theorem 9.*

The proof is deferred to Appendix A.

## 8 Simulation experiments

We conduct a simulation experiment to empirically demonstrate that the CFUCB algorithm indeed achieves  $O(1)$  expected regret for the linear contextual bandit problem introduced in Section 2.




Figure 1: The regret of the CFUCB algorithm compared to that of the UCB algorithm, for the problem with 200 agents and 20 arms of feature vector dimension 5.

In this experiment, there are 200 agents repeatedly arriving to explore 20 arms. Each agent independently arrives according to its own renewal process with positively truncated *i.i.d.* Normally distributed inter-arrival times. Both agent and arm feature vectors are randomly and uniformly generated as vectors on the surface of the 0-centered unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^5$  (also known as unit 4-sphere). The inner product of the agent’s pulled arm’s feature vectors, plus noise that is *i.i.d.*  $N(0, 0.1)$ , is the reward resulting from an arm pull. As a baseline for comparing the CFUCB algorithm’s performance, we consider the same system, with the same arrival sequences, but with the agents following the vanilla UCB algorithm [3]. As can be seen in Figure 1, the regret graph of CFUCB levels off, indicating that the regret does not increase further after a finite number of arrivals, showing that a regret of  $O(1)$  is indeed achieved. In contrast, the average regret of the UCB algorithm is  $O(\log T)$ . Figure 1 averages the result of ten experiments in which arrivals and feature vectors are newly generated each time. For the codes, refer to Supplementary materials or Appendix C.

## 9 Concluding remarks

In many applications, multiple agents are simultaneously exploring choices. This paper proposes a new contextual bandit framework for which a policy that we call Counterfactual-UCB (CFUCB) guarantees that the expected regret of the totality of all agents is  $O(1)$ , i.e., it is bounded. The key idea enabling this result is to take advantage of the exploitation results of other agents to give every agent relief from its own exploration requirements on its bad arms.

## References

- [1] A. Abadie and G. W. Imbens. Bias-corrected matching estimators for average treatment effects. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 29(1):1–11, 2011.
- [2] S. Athey and G. W. Imbens. Machine learning methods for estimating heterogeneous causal effects. *stat*, 1050(5):1–26, 2015.
- [3] P. Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):397–422, 2002.

- [4] R. M. Corless, G. H. Gonnet, D. E. Hare, D. J. Jeffrey, and D. E. Knuth. On the lambertw function. *Advances in Computational mathematics*, 5(1):329–359, 1996.
- [5] S. Cunningham. Causal inference. In *Causal Inference*. Yale University Press, 2021.
- [6] S. S. Du, W. Hu, S. M. Kakade, J. D. Lee, and Q. Lei. Few-shot learning via learning the representation, provably. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09434*, 2020.
- [7] D. Fudenberg and D. Levine. Subgame-perfect equilibria of finite-and infinite-horizon games. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 31(2):251–268, 1983.
- [8] D. Fudenberg and J. Tirole. *Game theory*. MIT press, 1991.
- [9] B. Hao, T. Lattimore, and C. Szepesvari. Adaptive exploration in linear contextual bandit. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3536–3545. PMLR, 2020.
- [10] R. Huang, W. Wu, J. Yang, and C. Shen. Federated linear contextual bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:27057–27068, 2021.
- [11] N. Immorlica, J. Mao, A. Slivkins, and Z. S. Wu. Bayesian exploration with heterogeneous agents. In *The World Wide Web Conference*, pages 751–761, 2019.
- [12] M. O. Jackson. Mechanism theory, page 2. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2542983, 2014. Lecture note.
- [13] L. Li, W. Chu, J. Langford, and R. E. Schapire. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*, pages 661–670, 2010.
- [14] D. J. Newman. The double dixie cup problem. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 67(1):58–61, 1960.
- [15] O. Rivasplata. Subgaussian random variables: An expository note. *Internet publication, PDF*, 5, 2012.
- [16] R. Selten. Spieltheoretische behandlung eines oligopolmodells mit nachfragertragheit: Teil i: Bestimmung des dynamischen preisgleichgewichts. *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft/Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, pages 301–324, 1965.
- [17] C. Shi, H. Xu, W. Xiong, and C. Shen. (almost) free incentivized exploration from decentralized learning agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:560–571, 2021.
- [18] E. A. Stuart. Matching methods for causal inference: A review and a look forward. *Statistical science: a review journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics*, 25(1):1, 2010.
- [19] N. Tripuraneni, M. Jordan, and C. Jin. On the theory of transfer learning: The importance of task diversity. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:7852–7862, 2020.
- [20] L. Ye, Y. Lin, H. Xie, and J. Lui. Combining offline causal inference and online bandit learning for data driven decision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.05699*, 2020.

## A Proofs of Lemmas and Theorems

*Proof of Theorem 1.* For simplicity, we denote  $|A| = a$  and  $|M| = b$ . Let  $I_m$  be the indicator random variable for the event  $\{|A_m| < d + 1\}$ , and  $I := \sum_{m \in M} I_m$ . What we want is to upper bound  $P(I > 0)$  by  $\epsilon$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
P(I > 0) &= P(I \geq 1) \\
&\leq E[I] \quad (\text{because of Markov's inequality}) \\
&= bE[I_1] \\
&= bP(I_1 = 1) \\
&= b \sum_{k=0}^d \binom{a}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{b}\right)^{a-k} \left(\frac{1}{b}\right)^k \\
&\leq b \sum_{k=0}^d \binom{a}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{b}\right)^{a-d} \left(\frac{1}{b}\right)^k \\
&\leq b \sum_{k=0}^d \frac{a^k}{k!} \exp\left(-\frac{a-d}{b}\right) \left(\frac{1}{b}\right)^k \quad (\text{because } \binom{a}{k} \leq \frac{a^k}{k!}, \text{ and } 1+x \leq e^x) \\
&= \exp\left(\frac{d}{b}\right) \sum_{k=0}^d \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^k \exp\left(-\frac{a}{b}\right) \\
&= b \exp\left(\frac{d}{b}\right) P(Z \leq d), \text{ where } Z \sim \text{Poi}\left(\frac{a}{b}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} b \exp\left(\frac{d}{b}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{b}{a} \frac{(a-bd)^2}{b^2}\right) \tag{5} \\
&= b \exp\left(\frac{1}{b} \left(d - \frac{(a-bd)^2}{2a}\right)\right) \\
&= \exp\left(\ln b - \frac{1}{b} \left(\frac{(a-bd)^2}{2a} - d\right)\right). \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

Above, the inequality (a) of (5) holds because  $Z \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ ,  $\Pr[Z \leq \lambda - x] \leq e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\lambda}}$  for  $0 \leq x \leq \lambda$ , where in our case  $\frac{a}{b} \geq d$  as assumed,  $\lambda = \frac{a}{b}$ ,  $\lambda - x = d$  and  $x = \frac{a}{b} - d = \frac{a-bd}{b}$ .

Let us further assume that  $a \geq (1 + \eta)bd$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned}
a &\geq (1 + \eta)bd \\
(\Leftrightarrow) \quad (1 + \eta)(a - bd) &\geq (1 + \eta)a - a = \eta a \\
(\Leftrightarrow) \quad a &\leq (a - bd) \frac{(1 + \eta)}{\eta}. \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(I > 0) &\leq \epsilon \\
(\Leftrightarrow) \quad \exp\left(\ln b - \frac{1}{b} \left(\frac{(a-bd)^2}{2a} - d\right)\right) &\leq \epsilon \quad (\text{because of (6)}) \\
(\Leftrightarrow) \quad \exp\left(-\frac{\left(\frac{(a-bd)^2}{2a} - d\right) - b \ln b}{b}\right) &\leq \epsilon \\
(\Leftrightarrow) \quad \frac{(a-bd)^2}{2a} &\geq b \ln b + b \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + d \\
(\Leftrightarrow) \quad a - bd &\geq \frac{2(1 + \eta)}{\eta} \left(b \ln b + b \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + d\right) \quad (\text{because of (7)}) \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 2.* This follows from Hoeffding's inequality,  $P(|\bar{X}_m^{(j)}(t) - \mu_m^{(j)}| > \epsilon) \leq \exp(-2N_m^{(j)}(t)\epsilon^2)$ . Since we want to upper bound  $P(|\bar{X}_m^{(j)}(t) - \mu_m^{(j)}| > \epsilon) \leq \text{by } N^{(j)}(t)^{-2}$ , the value of  $\epsilon$  that renders  $\exp(-2N_m^{(j)}(t)\epsilon^2) \leq N^{(j)}(t)^{-2}$  will suffice. This yields  $\epsilon \geq \sqrt{\frac{\log N^{(j)}(t)}{N_m^{(j)}(t)}}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(|\hat{X}_m^{(j)}(t) - \mu_m^{(j)}| > \epsilon) \\
&= 1 - P(|\hat{X}_m^{(j)}(t) - \mu_m^{(j)}| \leq \epsilon) \\
&\leq 1 - \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} P(|a_i^{(j)}| |\bar{X}_m^{(i)}(t) - \mu_m^{(i)}| \leq |a_i^{(j)}| \frac{\epsilon}{c_{m,t}}) \\
&= 1 - \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} (1 - P(|\bar{X}_m^{(i)}(t) - \mu_m^{(i)}| > \frac{\epsilon}{c_{m,t}})) \\
&\leq 1 - \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} ((1 - \exp(-\frac{2N_m^{(i)}(t)\epsilon^2}{c_{m,t}^2}))) \\
&\leq 1 - \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(t)} (1 - \exp(-\frac{2N_m^{(\min)}(d, t, j)\epsilon^2}{c_{m,t}^2})) \\
&= 1 - (1 - \exp(-\frac{2N_m^{(\min)}(d, t, j)\epsilon^2}{c_{m,t}^2}))^d \\
&\leq d \exp(-\frac{2N_m^{(\min)}(d, t, j)\epsilon^2}{c_{m,t}^2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\epsilon \geq \sqrt{\frac{\log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{N_m^{(\min)}(d, t, j)/c_{m,t}^2}}$  implies  $P(|\hat{X}_m^{(j)}(t) - \mu_m^{(j)}| > \epsilon) \leq N^{(j)}(t)^{-2}$ .  $\square$

***Proof of Lemma 6.***

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[\text{Regret}^{(j)}(T)] = \sum_{m \in M \setminus m_j^*} \Delta_m E[\# \text{ of agent } j\text{'s non-optimal arm } m \text{ pulls before } T] \\
&= \sum_{m \in M \setminus m_j^*} \Delta_m \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[1_{G_m^{(j)}(S_n^{(j)})} 1_{S_n^{(j)} \leq T}] \\
&= \sum_{m \in M \setminus m_j^*} \Delta_m \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[E[1_{G_m^{(j)}(S_n^{(j)})} 1_{S_n^{(j)} \leq T} | S_n^{(j)}]] \\
&= \sum_{m \in M \setminus m_j^*} \Delta_m (\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[E[1_{G_m^{(j)}(S_n^{(j)})} 1_{S_n^{(j)} \leq T} | V(S_n^{(j)})^c, S_n^{(j)}] P(V(S_n^{(j)})^c | S_n^{(j)}) + \\
&E[1_{G_m^{(j)}(S_n^{(j)})} 1_{S_n^{(j)} \leq T} | V(S_n^{(j)}), S_n^{(j)}] P(V(S_n^{(j)}) | S_n^{(j)})]) \\
&\leq \sum_{m \in M \setminus m_j^*} \Delta_m \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[P(V(S_n^{(j)})^c | S_n^{(j)})] + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[E[1_{G_m^{(j)}(S_n^{(j)})} 1_{S_n^{(j)} \leq T} | V(S_n^{(j)}), S_n^{(j)}]] \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{m \in M \setminus m_j^*} \Delta_m \left( \frac{\pi^2 |A| |M|}{6} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[E[1_{G_m^{(j)}(S_n^{(j)})} | V(S_n^{(j)}), S_n^{(j)}]] \right) \\
&= \sum_{m \in M \setminus m_j^*} \Delta_m \left( \frac{\pi^2 |A| |M|}{6} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[P(G_m^{(j)}(S_n^{(j)}) | V(S_n^{(j)}), S_n^{(j)})] \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{m \in M \setminus m_j^*} \Delta_m \left( \frac{\pi^2 |A| |M|}{6} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{+\infty} g_m^{(j)}(t) dF_n^{(j)}(t) \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 8.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(G_m^{(j)}(t)|V(t)) \\
&= P(\{\text{Agent } j \text{ pulls arm } m \text{ when it arrives at time } t\}|V(t)) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} P(\min_{i \in A_m} \{N^{(i)}(t) - (\sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)2}}) \log N^{(i)}(t)\} < \frac{4c_{m,t}^2 \log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{\Delta_m^{(j)2}}) \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{i \in A_m} P(N^{(i)}(t) - (\sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)2}}) \log N^{(i)}(t) < \frac{4c_{m,t}^2 \log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{\Delta_m^{(j)2}}) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in A_m} P(N^{(i)}(t) < q_{ij}(N^{(j)}(t))) \text{ (because of Lemma 7)} \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i \in A_m} \int P(N^{(i)}(t) < q_{ij}(n)) dF_{N^{(j)}(t)}(n) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in A} \int P(N^{(i)}(t) < q_{ij}(n)) dF_{N^{(j)}(t)}(n) \\
&= \sum_{i \in A} \int P(S_{\lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil}^{(i)} > t) dF_{N^{(j)}(t)}(n) \\
&= \sum_{i \in A} \left( \int_{[0, \frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}]} P(S_{\lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil}^{(i)} > t) dF_{N^{(j)}(t)}(n) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}, \infty)} P(S_{\lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil}^{(i)} > t) dF_{N^{(j)}(t)}(n) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in A} \left( P(S_{\lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil}^{(i)} > t) \times 1 + 1 \times \exp(-2 \frac{\epsilon^{j2}}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j} t) \right) \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i \in A} \left( \exp(-2 \frac{(t - \lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil) \theta_i^2}{\lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil}) + \exp(-2 \frac{\epsilon^{j2}}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j} t) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \exp(-2 \frac{(t - \lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil) \theta_i^2}{\lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil}) \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq |A| \left( \exp(-2 \frac{(t - \lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil) \theta_{\max}^2}{\lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil}) + \exp(-2 \frac{\epsilon^{j2}}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j} t) \right). \tag{13}$$

Above,

- The inequality (b) of (9) follows from Lemma 4.
- $\theta_{\max} := \max_{i \in A} \theta_i$ .
- The inequality (c) of (11) holds because we apply left tail Hoeffding inequality, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(S_n^{(j)} \leq n(\theta^j - \epsilon^j)\right) &= P\left(N^{(j)}(n(\theta^j - \epsilon^j)) \geq n\right) \leq e^{-2n\epsilon^{j2}} \\
&\Leftrightarrow P\left(N^{(j)}(t) \geq \frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}\right) \leq e^{-2 \frac{\epsilon^{j2}}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j} t}
\end{aligned}$$

and  $\lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil$  is an increasing function of  $n$ .

- The inequality (d) of (12) results from applying another version of right tail Hoeffding inequality,  $P\{S_n \geq n\theta + a\} \leq e^{-2a^2/n}$ ,

$$P(S_{\lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil}^{(i)} > t) = P(S_{\lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil}^{(i)} - \lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil \theta_i > t - \lceil q_{ij}(\frac{t}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil \theta_i).$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 9.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int g_m^{(j)} F_{S_n^{(j)}} \\
&= \int_{[0, n(\theta^j - \epsilon)]} g_m^{(j)} F_{S_n^{(j)}} + \int_{[n(\theta^j - \epsilon), \infty)} g_m^{(j)} F_{S_n^{(j)}} \\
&\leq g_m^{(j)}(0^+) \times e^{-2n\epsilon^2} + g_m^{(j)}(n(\theta^j - \epsilon)) \times 1 \\
&= 2|A|e^{-2n\epsilon^2} + g_m^{(j)}(n(\theta^j - \epsilon)) \\
&= 2|A|(\exp(-2n\epsilon^2) + \exp(-2 \frac{(n(\theta^j - \epsilon) - \lceil q_{ij}(\frac{n(\theta^j - \epsilon)}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil \theta_{\max})^2}{\lceil q_{ij}(\frac{n(\theta^j - \epsilon)}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j}) \rceil} \\
&\quad + \exp(-2 \frac{\epsilon^j^2}{\theta^j - \epsilon^j} n(\theta^j - \epsilon))) \\
&= 2|A| \left( 2 \exp(-2n\epsilon^2) + \exp(-2 \frac{(n(\theta^j - \epsilon) - \lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil \theta_{\max})^2}{\lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil}) \right) \\
&\quad \text{(for simplicity, we fix } \epsilon^j = \epsilon) \\
&= O(\frac{1}{n^2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Above,

(14) holds because  $P(S_n^{(j)} \leq n(\theta^j - \epsilon)) \leq e^{-2n\epsilon^2}$  and since  $g_m^{(j)}$  is a decreasing function,

(15) holds because

$$(n(\theta^j - \epsilon) - \lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil \theta_{\max})^2 \geq \lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil^2 \text{ for all } n \geq N \text{ for some } N \tag{16}$$

$$\Rightarrow (n(\theta^j - \epsilon) - \lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil \theta_{\max})^2 \geq \log(n) \lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil \text{ for all } n \geq N \tag{17}$$

$$\Rightarrow \exp(-2 \frac{(n(\theta^j - \epsilon) - \lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil \theta_{\max})^2}{\lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil}) = O(\frac{1}{n^2}),$$

where

- (16) follows from  $\lceil q_{ij}(n) \rceil = o(n)$ ,
- and (17) follows from  $\log(n) = o(q_{ij}(n))$ ,

□

*Proof of Lemma 10.* Again, as in Lemma 8,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(G_m^{(j)}(t)|V(t)) \\
&= P(\{\text{Agent } j \text{ pulls arm } m \text{ when it arrives at time } t\}|V(t)) \\
&\leq P(\min_{i \in A_m} \{N^{(i)}(t) - (\sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)2}}) \log N^{(i)}(t)\} < \frac{4c_{m,t}^2 \log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{\Delta_m^{(j)2}}) \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{i \in A_m} P(N^{(i)}(t) - (\sum_{n \neq m} \frac{4}{\Delta_n^{(i)2}}) \log N^{(i)}(t) < \frac{4c_{m,t}^2 \log(N^{(j)}(t)/d)}{\Delta_m^{(j)2}}) \\
&= \sum_{i \in A_m} P(N^{(i)}(t) < q_{ij}(N^{(j)}(t))) \quad (\text{because of Lemma 7}) \quad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i \in A_m} \int P(N^{(i)}(t) < q_{ij}(n)) dF_{N^{(j)}(t)}(n) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in A} \int P(N^{(i)}(t) < q_{ij}(n)) dF_{N^{(j)}(t)}(n) \\
&= \sum_{i \in A} \left( \int_{[0, (\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)t]} P(N^{(i)}(t) < q_{ij}(n)) dF_{N^{(j)}(t)}(n) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{((\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)t, \infty)} P(N^{(i)}(t) < q_{ij}(n)) dF_{N^{(j)}(t)}(n) \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in A} \left( P(N^{(i)}(t) < q_{ij}((\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)t)) \times 1 + 1 \times e^{-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j}t} \right) \quad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in A} \left( \exp\left(-\frac{(\lambda_i t - q_{ij}((\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)t))^2}{2\lambda_i t}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j}t\right) \right) \quad (21)$$

$$\leq |A| \left( \exp\left(-\frac{(\lambda_{\min} t - q_{ij}((\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)t))^2}{2\lambda_{\min} t}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j}t\right) \right). \quad (22)$$

Above,

- (18) follows from Lemma 4.
- $\lambda_{\min} = \min_{i \in A} \lambda_i$ .
- (20) holds because  $P(N^{(j)}(t) \geq (\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)t) \leq e^{-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j}t}$  from the Poisson concentration right tail bound  $P(X \geq \lambda + x) \leq e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\lambda}}$  and  $q_{ij}(n)$  is an increasing function of  $n$ .
- (21) holds because  $P(X \leq \lambda - x) \leq e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\lambda}}$  from the Poisson concentration left tail bound.

□



*Proof of Theorem 11.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int g_m^{(j)} F_{S_n^{(j)}} \\
&= \int_{[0, \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j})} g_m^{(j)} F_{S_n^{(j)}} + \int_{[\frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}, \infty)} g_m^{(j)} F_{S_n^{(j)}} \\
&\leq g_m^{(j)}(0^+) \times \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}\right) + g_m^{(j)}\left(\frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}\right) \times 1 \\
&= 2|A| \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}\right) + g_m^{(j)}\left(\frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}\right) \\
&= 3|A| \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}\right) + |A| \exp\left(-\frac{(\lambda_{\min} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j} - q_{ij}(n-1))^2}{2\lambda_{\min} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}}\right) \\
&= O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Above,

- $\lambda_{\min} = \min_{i \in A} \lambda_i$ .
- (23) holds because  $P(S_n^{(j)} < \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}) \leq P(S_{\lceil(\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)T\rceil}^{(j)} \leq T) = P(N^{(j)}(T) \geq \lceil(\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)T\rceil) = P(N^{(j)}(T) \geq (\lambda_j + \epsilon_j)T) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j} T\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon_j^2}{2\lambda_j} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}\right)$ , and  $g_m^{(j)}(t)$  is a decreasing function of  $t$ .
- Concerning (24), we want to find  $N$  such that  $\frac{(\lambda_{\min} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j} - q_{ij}(n-1))^2}{2\lambda_{\min} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}} \geq 2 \ln(n)$  for all  $n \geq N$ , i.e.,  $(\frac{\lambda_{\min}}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}(n-1) - q_{ij}(n-1))^2 \geq 4 \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j} (n-1) \ln(n)$  for all  $n \geq N$ . We can show this by instead showing  $\frac{\lambda_{\min}}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j} ((n-1) - q_{ij}(n-1))^2 \geq 4n \ln(n)$ , or  $\frac{((n-1) - q_{ij}(n-1))^2}{n \ln(n)} \geq 4 \frac{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}{\lambda_{\min}}$  for all  $n \geq N$ . Note that for some  $\beta > 1$ ,  $\beta(n-1) > n$  holds for all  $n \geq N_1$  for some  $N_1$ . Therefore showing  $\frac{(n - q_{ij}(n))^2}{\beta n \ln(\beta n)} \geq 4 \frac{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}{\lambda_{\min}}$  for all  $n \geq N'$  is sufficient. Now note that  $\frac{d}{dn} \left( \frac{(n + \mathcal{W}_{-1}(-\frac{1}{n}))^2}{\beta n \log(\beta n)} \right) = ((\mathcal{W}_{-1}(-\frac{1}{n}) + n) (\mathcal{W}_{-1}(-\frac{1}{n}))^2 (-\log(n\beta) + 1)) + \mathcal{W}_{-1}(-\frac{1}{n}) ((n-3) \log(n\beta) - n - 1) + n(\log(n\beta) - 1)) / (n^2 \beta (\mathcal{W}_{-1}(-\frac{1}{n}) + 1) \log^2(n\beta)) > 0$  for  $n > 5$ . This means that  $\frac{(n - q_{ij}(n))^2}{\beta n \ln(\beta n)}$  is monotone strictly increasing, and therefore there exists some  $N'$  such that  $\frac{(n - q_{ij}(n))^2}{\beta n \ln(\beta n)} \geq 4 \frac{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}{\lambda_{\min}}$  for all  $n \geq N'$ . We can therefore conclude that  $\exp\left(-\frac{(\lambda_{\min} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j} - q_{ij}(n-1))^2}{2\lambda_{\min} \frac{n-1}{\lambda_j + \epsilon_j}}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)$ .

□

*Proof of Theorem 13.* We start by almost repeating the proof of Theorem 3. Suppose that given  $E_m^{(j)}(T)$ ,  $\alpha_m^{(j)} = \sum_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} a_i^{(j)} \alpha_m^{(i)}$  and thus  $\mu_m^{(j)} = \sum_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} a_i^{(j)} \mu_m^{(i)}$ . Then  $\widehat{X}_m^{(j)}(T)$  we construct is  $\sum_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} a_i \overline{X}_m^{(i)}(T)$ .

As in the proof of Theorem 3, we first upper bound  $P(|\widehat{X}_m^{(j)}(T) - \mu_m^{(j)}| > \epsilon)$ . As before, denote  $\sum_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} |a_i^{(j)}| := c_{m,T}$ . For simplicity, assume that  $e_m^{(j)}(k)$  follows a 1-sub-Gaussian distribution. Then  $P(|\widehat{X}_m^{(j)}(T) - \mu_m^{(j)}| > \epsilon) = 1 - P(|\widehat{X}_m^{(j)}(T) - \mu_m^{(j)}| \leq \epsilon) \leq 1 - \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} P(|a_i| |\overline{X}_m^{(i)}(T) - \mu_m^{(i)}| \leq |a_i| \frac{\epsilon}{c_{m,T}}) = 1 - \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} P(|\overline{X}_m^{(i)}(T) - \mu_m^{(i)}| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{c_{m,T}}) \leq$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\epsilon}{c_{m,T}}) \leq 1 - \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} P(|\overline{X}'_m{}^{(i)}(T) - \overline{X}_m{}^{(i)}(T)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2c_{m,T}}, |\overline{X}_m{}^{(i)}(T) - \mu_m^{(i)}| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2c_{m,T}}) \\
& = 1 - \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} (P(|\overline{X}'_m{}^{(i)}(T) - \overline{X}_m{}^{(i)}(T)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2c_{m,T}}) P(|\overline{X}_m{}^{(i)}(T) - \mu_m^{(i)}| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2c_{m,T}})) \\
& \leq 1 - \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} ((1 - \exp(\frac{-N_m^{(i)}(T)\epsilon^2}{2c_{m,T}^2}))^2). \text{ Now we want to bound the last term by } N^{(j)}(T)^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

As before, define  $N_m^{(\min)}(d, T) := \min_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} N_m^{(i)}(T)$ . Now  $\prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} (1 - \exp(\frac{-N_m^{(i)}(T)\epsilon^2}{2c_{m,T}^2}))^2 \geq \prod_{i \in E_m^{(j)}(T)} (1 - \exp(\frac{-N_m^{(\min)}(d, T)\epsilon^2}{2c_{m,T}^2}))^2$   
 $= (1 - \exp(\frac{-N_m^{(\min)}(d, T)\epsilon^2}{2c_{m,T}^2}))^{2d} \geq 1 - 2d \exp(\frac{-N_m^{(\min)}(d, T)\epsilon^2}{2c_{m,T}^2})$ . Therefore showing  $n^{(j)}(T) \geq 2d \exp(\frac{-n_m^{(\min)}(d, T)\epsilon^2}{2c_{m,T}^2})$  is enough. Hence,  $\epsilon \geq \sqrt{\frac{\log(N^{(j)}(T)/(2d))}{N_m^{(\min)}(d, T)/(2c_{m,T}^2)}}$  works as the counterfactual CI's width. Now recall that the counterfactual CI's width computed in Lemma 3 was  $\sqrt{\frac{\log(N^{(j)}(T)/(d))}{N_m^{(\min)}(d, T)/(c_{m,T}^2)}}$ . Therefore all the subsequent results are inherited except that we substitute  $d$  by  $2d$  and substitute  $c_{m,T}^2$  by  $2c_{m,T}^2$ . □

## B Decentralized algorithm and incentive analysis

### B.1 Decentralized CFUCB algorithm within the sequential game framework

We now describe Algorithm 2 and 3, the decentralized version of the Algorithm 1, within the framework of the following game  $G = (A, M, \{\lambda^{(i)}\}_{i \in A}, \{\alpha^{(i)}\}_{i \in A}, \{\beta_m\}_{m \in M}, \Gamma)$ . It is defined as an  $|A|$ -player infinite horizon sequential game where

- $A$  denotes the index set of agents and  $M$  denote the index set of arms.
- $\{\lambda^{(i)}\}_{i \in A}$  determines the arrival processes  $\{\{S_n^{(i)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+}\}_{i \in A}$ .
- $\alpha^{(i)}$  denotes the feature vector of agent  $i$ , and  $\beta_m$  denotes the feature vector of arm  $m$ .
- $\Gamma$  denotes the counterfactual UCB sharing mechanism (we describe below).

$G$  is a sequential game [8] where each *epoch* (see Section 4 for its definition) is a stage of the game. At the beginning of the game, which we call epoch 0, each agent  $i$  is asked to submit its feature vector  $\alpha^{(i)}$ . (Of course it can lie). The  $k$ th epoch means the  $k$ th arrival of any agent (See Section 4 for the details). At each epoch  $k$ ,

- 1) An agent we denote by  $a_k \in A$  arrives. The mediator observes  $a_k$ .
- 2) According to Equation (3), the mediator calculates the counterfactual UCBs  $\{\widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}_{m \in M}$  assuming that all previous reports  $\{(m_l, r_l)\}_{l=1}^{k-1}$  were truthful, and lets agent  $a_k$  know the counterfactual UCBs.

**Remark.**  $\Gamma$  of game  $G$ , the counterfactual-UCB sharing mechanism, is formally defined as a function that maps the previous history of reports the mediator has at  $k$ ,  $\{a_l, (\widehat{m}_l, \widehat{r}_l)\}_{l=1}^{k-1}$ , into  $\{\widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}_{m \in M}$ .

- 3) After receiving  $\{\widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}_{m \in M}$  from the mediator, the agent calculates  $\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)$  for all  $m \in M$  according to  $\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k) = \min(ucb_m^{(a_k)}(s_k), \widehat{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k))$ . (Note that agent  $a_k$  can calculate  $\{ucb_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}_{m \in M}$  by only using its own pulling history, which is private information.)

- 4) Agent  $a_k$  then pulls arm  $m_k := \arg \min_{m \in M} \{\widetilde{ucb}_m^{(a_k)}(s_k)\}$  and observes a reward that we denote by  $r_k$ .

- 5) According to its reporting strategy, agent generates its report  $(\widehat{m}_k, \widehat{r}_k)$  from the truth  $(m_k, r_k)$  and sends it to the mediator.

- 6) The mediator receives  $(\widehat{m}_k, \widehat{r}_k)$  and stores it.

This whole procedure can be intuitively thought of as agent  $a_k$  updating its prior on each arm  $m \in M$  following the mediator’s recommendation. Recalling the medical experimentation example introduced earlier, a patient who *explores under optimism in face of uncertainty* is what exactly the UCB policy models. A physician who works as CFUCB’s mediator will not only recommend a particular drug but also dis-recommend other drugs. This reduces the patient’s optimism for the less self-explored drugs.

Now there is one remaining question: will each agent report truthfully? This question is answered in the following Section B.2.

## B.2 Truthtelling and Conformance is a Subgame Perfect Nash Equilibrium

We denote by  $\sigma_{ucb, True}^{(i)}$  the *Truthful CFUCB strategy* of agent  $i$  of never violating the two assumptions (T1,T2) at any of its arrivals. We define  $\sigma_{ucb, True} = \times_{i \in A} \sigma_{ucb, True}^{(i)}$  as the *strategy profile* corresponding to each agent  $i \in A$  following the *Truthful CFUCB strategy*.

The strategy profile where every  $i \in A$  chooses  $\sigma_{ucb, True}^{(i)}$  is defined as  $\sigma_{ucb, True}$ . When no agent ever violates the two assumptions, the outcome of  $\sigma_{ucb, True}$  and Algorithm 1 are the same. Corollary 1, which is an immediate result of Theorem 9 and 11, formally states this observation.

**Corollary 1.** *Consider the cases when agents arrive independently with either 1) all agents having i.i.d. subgaussian inter-arrival times, or 2) all agents having i.i.d. exponential inter-arrival times. In both cases, under the strategy profile  $\sigma_{ucb, True}$ , every agent’s expected regret is bounded.*

Now we formally define the notion of “asymptotically indifferent agents”. Given the game  $G$  and some strategy profile  $\sigma$ , after playing the game up to time  $T$ , denote the regret of agent  $i$  up to time  $T$  by  $Regret_{\sigma}^{(i)}(T)$ . Suppose that for each  $i \in A$ , we are able to achieve  $E[Regret_{\sigma}^{(i)}(T)] = O(f_{\sigma}^{(i)}(T))$  for some function  $f_{\sigma}^{(i)}$ . Denoting the set of all possible strategy profiles  $\Sigma$ , we say that an agent  $i$  has an *asymptotically indifferent preference* if its preference can be described by a complete and transitive preference relation  $\succeq_i$  on  $\Sigma$  such that  $\sigma \succeq_i \sigma'$  if and only if  $f_{\sigma}^{(i)}(T) = O(f_{\sigma'}^{(i)}(T))$ . We say that  $\sigma$  is strictly preferred to  $\sigma'$  by agent  $i$  if  $\sigma \succeq_i \sigma'$  but not  $\sigma' \succeq_i \sigma$ .

**Corollary 2.** *Suppose that all the agents in  $A$  have asymptotically indifferent preferences. Then  $\sigma_{ucb, True}$  constitutes a Subgame Perfect Nash Equilibrium for the game  $G = (A, M, \{\lambda^{(i)}\}_{i \in A}, \{\alpha^{(i)}\}_{i \in A}, \{\beta_m\}_{m \in M}, \Gamma)$ .*

*Proof of Corollary 2.* This result is immediate from Corollary 1, in that (i) no other strategy profile can be strictly preferred to  $\sigma_{ucb, True}$  by any agent with asymptotically indifferent preference; (ii)  $\sigma_{ucb, True}$  already achieves bounded regret, i.e.,  $O(1)$ , for all the agents, and (iii) thus cannot be improved in terms of asymptotically indifferent preference.  $\square$

## C Codes

All codes are attached in the Supplementary material zip file (named Appendix + Codes) with the folder name “Codes”.