

EEG106 Lecture 10 (Date: 20th Feb 2024)

Recall:

$P, Q \rightarrow 2$ prob measures on (Ω, \mathcal{F})

P absolutely continuous wrt Q

$$\{P(A) > 0 \Rightarrow Q(A) > 0\}$$

\exists measurable function $\frac{dP}{dQ}$ s.t.

$$\mathbb{E}_P[X] = \mathbb{E}_Q\left[X \frac{dP}{dQ}\right]$$

If $\Omega = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$

$$p_i = P(\{i\}), \quad q_i = Q(\{i\})$$

$$\text{Then } \frac{dP}{dQ}(i) = \frac{p_i}{q_i}$$

\rightarrow captures a likelihood ratio

We are doing all this in order to arrive at the KL Divergence

Def: For prob. measures P, Q on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , if P is abs. cont. wrt Q

$$KL(P, Q) = D(P, Q) = \int \log\left(\frac{dP}{dQ}\right) dP$$

Kullback
Liebler
Divergence

relative
entropy between
 P and Q

$$= \mathbb{E}_P\left[\log\left(\frac{dP}{dQ}\right)\right]$$

If P is not absolutely continuous wrt Q ,

$$KL(P, Q) = D(P, Q) = \infty$$

Note: The KL divergence is an asymmetric object, hence it is not a distance. It is astounding that it still captures the closeness of the two distributions

Note: It is entirely possible that $D(P, Q) = \infty$ when $D(Q, P)$ is finite

If $\Omega = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, then

$$D(P, Q) = \sum_{i \in \Omega} p_i \log \left(\frac{p_i}{q_i} \right)$$

Note: The KL divergence between two random variables X and Y is understood to be the KL divergence between their laws

Eg $X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$ and $Y \sim \text{Bernoulli}(q)$

$$D(X, Y) = p \log \left(\frac{p}{q} \right) + (1-p) \log \left(\frac{1-p}{1-q} \right)$$

Eg $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma^2)$

$Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \sigma^2)$

(variances are assumed to be the same)

$$\frac{dF_X}{dF_Y} = \exp \left(-\frac{(x-\mu_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{(x-\mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \dots \text{Special case}$$

$$KL(X, Y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_X(x) \left(\frac{dF_X(x)}{dF_Y} \right) dx = \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma^2}$$

EXERCISE

Thm If P, Q are 2 probability measures on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , then for $A \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$P(A) + Q(A^c) \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-\min(D(P, Q), D(Q, P))}$$

This is known as the Bretagnolle - Huber inequality

Note: This is true for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

The left and right hands are both symmetric wrt P & Q

*

It hence suffices to show

$$P(A) + Q(A^c) \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-D(P, Q)}$$

What this inequality is trying to tell us is the following

① If P is very close to Q , the event on the left is sure and hence $P(A) + Q(A^c)$ is a very likely event

② $P(A) + Q(A^c)$ can be small only if A is rare under P and A^c is rare under Q . Then by this P cannot be close to Q .

Proof: STEP 1

We will show that $P(A) + Q(A^c) \geq \sum_{i \in \Omega} \min(p_i, q_i)$

(We assume we are working in the discrete setting)

$$P(A) + Q(A^c) = \sum_{i \in A} p_i + \sum_{i \in A^c} q_i \geq \sum_{i \in \Omega} \min(p_i, q_i) \quad \square$$

STEP 2

$$\sum \min(p_i, q_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum \sqrt{p_i q_i} \right)^2$$

$$\text{RHS} = \left(\sum \sqrt{p_i q_i} \right)^2 = \left(\sum \sqrt{\max(p_i, q_i) \min(p_i, q_i)} \right)^2$$

$$\stackrel{\text{Cauchy-Schwarz}}{\leq} \left[\sum \max(p_i, q_i) \right] \left[\sum \min(p_i, q_i) \right]$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in \Omega} (p_i + q_i) \leq 2 \sum \min(p_i, q_i) \quad \square$$

STEP 3

$$\left(\sum \sqrt{p_i q_i} \right)^2 \geq e^{-D(P, Q)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} &= \left(\sum \sqrt{p_i q_i} \right)^2 = e^{2 \log \sum \sqrt{p_i q_i}} \\ &= e^{2 \log \sum p_i \sqrt{\frac{q_i}{p_i}}} \\ &\geq e^{2 \sum p_i \log \left(\sqrt{\frac{q_i}{p_i}} \right)} \end{aligned}$$

$$= e^{-\sum p_i \log \left(\frac{p_i}{q_i} \right)} = e^{-D(P, Q)}$$

Consider a policy π , acting on bandit instance $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_k)$, we define P_π , which captured the joint distribution of $(A_1, X_1, A_2, X_2, \dots, A_n, X_n)$

Lemma (Divergence Decomposition Lemma)

Let ν, ν' be 2 MAB instances. Let $P_\nu, P_{\nu'}$ denote the corresponding measures induced by a common policy π . Then

$$D(P_\nu, P_{\nu'}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{P_\nu} [T_i(n)] D(\nu_i, \nu'_i)$$

Expected times i^{th} arm is pulled under ν

→ Note that this is for arm i

ν_i is the distribution of the i^{th} arm in the instance ν_i .

We shall use the quantity $D(P_\nu, P_{\nu'})$ by treating it with the Bretagnole.

Huber inequality and choosing the event A strategically.

Note

There are no restrictions on the two instances ^{expect} such that the two supports are conveniently taken to be the same.

Proof

$$D(P_\nu, P_{\nu'}) = \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[\log \frac{dP_\nu}{dP_{\nu'}} \right]$$

$$\frac{dP_\nu}{dP_{\nu'}}(a_1, x_1, \dots, a_n, x_n) = \prod_{t=1}^n \pi_t(a_t | a_1, x_1, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_{t-1}) P_{a_t}(x_t)$$

\downarrow
 $P(\text{taking action based on history})$

\downarrow
 $P(\text{outcome given action})$

$$\prod_{t=1}^n \pi_t(a_t | a_1, x_1, \dots, a_{t-1}, x_{t-1}) P'_{a_t}(x_t)$$

$$= \prod_{t=1}^n \frac{P_{a_t}(x_t)}{P'_{a_t}(x_t)} \quad \dots \text{ since the policies are identical}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu \left[\log \frac{dP_\nu}{dP_{\nu'}} \right] = \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[\log \left(\frac{\prod_{t=1}^n P_{a_t}(x_t)}{\prod_{t=1}^n P'_{a_t}(x_t)} \right) \right]$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[\log \frac{P_{a_t}(x_t)}{P'_{a_t}(x_t)} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[\mathbb{E}_\nu \left[\log \frac{P_{a_t}(x_t)}{P'_{a_t}(x_t)} \mid A_t \right] \right]$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[D(\nu_{A_t}, \nu'_{A_t}) \right]$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[D(\nu_{A_t}, \nu'_{A_t}) \mathbb{1}_{\{A_t=i\}} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{t=1}^n \mathcal{D}(v_i, v_i') \mathbb{P}_v(A_t = i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}_v[T_i(n)] \mathcal{D}(v_i, v_i')
\end{aligned}$$

□

Syllabus: Everything till now

HW2: Stochastic Bandits and Preliminaries for IT Bounds (Submission post midsem)

It is open notes !! (Handwritten notes can be referred)