

## Contextual Combinatorial Cascading Bandit Experiment

### 1 Preliminary

#### 1.1 Synthetic dataset

Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_2 = 1\}$  be the unit ball of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $E = \{1, \dots, L\}$  be the set of all base arms. We randomly choose  $\theta_*$  with  $\|\theta_*\|_2 = 1$  and randomly assign a  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{S}$  to  $i$  for any  $i \in E$ . At each time  $t$ , we choose  $b_{t,i} \in \mathcal{S}$  randomly for any base arm  $i$ . Also we fix a constant  $h$  to balance weights of  $\mu_i$  and disturbance  $b_{t,i}$ . Let  $x_{t,i} = \frac{\mu_i + h b_{t,i}}{\|\mu_i + h b_{t,i}\|_2}$  be the context of base arm  $i$  at time  $t$ . And the weight for base arm  $i$  at time  $t$  is  $w_t(i) = \theta_*^\top x_{t,i} + \epsilon_{t,i}$  where  $\epsilon_{t,i} \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma_i)$  for fixed  $\sigma_i$ .

#### 1.2 MovieLens

Let  $L$  be the number of all movies and let  $M$  be the number of all users. The MovieLens dataset is a big matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times L}$  where  $A(i, j) \in \{0, 1\}$  denotes whether user  $i$  has watched movie  $j$  or not. We split  $A$  to be  $H + F$  by putting entry-1 of  $A$  to  $H$  and  $F$  with probability  $\sim \text{Ber}(p)$  for some fixed  $p$ . We can regard  $H$  as know information about history 'What users have watched' and regard  $F$  as future criterion. We use  $H$  to derive feature vectors of both users and movies by SVD decomposition  $H = U S V^\top$  where  $U = (u_1; \dots; u_M)$  and  $V = (v_1; \dots; v_L)$ . At every time  $t$ , use  $x_{t,i} = u_i v_j^\top$  as the context information of base arm  $i$  and randomly choose a user  $I_t$ . And use  $w_t(j) = F(I_t, j)$  as the weight of base arm  $j$ .

Notice that for this case, fixed number of base arms, it might have problem if we use  $(u_{I_t}, v_j)$  as context information. Since to find the best arm, it is equivalent to find the best one with highest weights sum, so is equivalent to the best one with highest  $\theta_v^\top x$ .

The measurement for MovieLens is accuracy because we don't know the true  $\theta_*$ .

#### 1.3 Routing

Let  $G = (V, E = \{e_1, \dots, e_L\})$  be the topology representation of an ISP network,  $G$  is then symmetric by its definition. When a package is sent from the source node, it's returned back to the source after trying to bypass an edge with high latency. The routing is failed if so, and the source will receive the routing history till the failing edge. The agent is then motivated to assign an routing path, which can be recognized as an simple path in  $G$  from the source node to the destination node, so as to avoid edges with high latency. Assume we have some sort of tell about the dynamics of the network condition between the hosts, where the information is encoded in a  $d$ -dimensional vector, the network routing problem is to find the routing path least likely to involve an edge with high latency. Denote  $x_{i,t}$  be the vector associated with edge  $e_i$ , at time  $t$ , assume the corresponding latency is drawn from an exponential distribution with mean  $1 - \theta_*^\top x_{t,i}$  independently, and define the latency is high iff it's greater than a constant tolerance value. We formulate the network routing as an contextual combinatorial cascading problem.

Let  $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_L\}$  be the set of arms, and  $x_{i,t}$  be the context associated with arm  $e_i$  at time  $t$ . In order to send a package from  $u_t$  to  $v_t$ , the agent have to choose an superarm from

$$S = \{A = (e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_n}) : e_{k_j} \in E, e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_n} \text{ is a simple path of } G \text{ from } u_t \text{ to } v_t\}$$

To find the preferred superarm, the agent assigns an weight  $\hat{\theta}^\top x_{i,t}$  to  $e_i$ , and runs shortest path algorithm on  $G$ . After the agent choose the shortest path as the superarm, the reward and the first ever edge with high latency, if any, is feedbacked.

## 2 Disjunctive case

### 2.1 Need to involve Contextual information

We experiment both on synthetic data and MovieLens. We compare our method with  $\gamma_k = 1$  to the algorithm in Cascading Bandits(ICML'2015) with  $L =, K =,$

### 2.2 Need to involve position discount parameter $\gamma$

We experiment both on synthetic data and MovieLens. We compare our method with  $\gamma_k = \gamma^{k-1}$  to the algorithm in Cascading Bandits(ICML'2015) with  $L =, K =, \gamma_k = 1.$

### 2.3 Cascading Information

We experiment both on synthetic data and MovieLens. We compare our method with  $\gamma_k = \gamma^{k-1}$  to the algorithm in Qin Lijing(2014) with  $L =, K =, \gamma_k = 1.$

## 3 Conjunctive case

### 3.1 Need to involve Contextual information

We experiment on synthetic data. We compare our method with  $\gamma_k = 1$  to the algorithm in Cascading Bandits(ICML'2015) with  $L =, K =,$

### 3.2 Need to involve position discount parameter $\gamma$

We experiment on synthetic data. We compare our method with  $\gamma_k = \gamma^{k-1}$  to the algorithm in Cascading Bandits(ICML'2015) with  $L =, K =, \gamma_k = 1.$

### 3.3 Cascading Information

We experiment on synthetic data. We compare our method with  $\gamma_k = \gamma^{k-1}$  to the algorithm in Qin Lijing(2014) with  $L =, K =, \gamma_k = 1.$

## 4 Results

An example output, with  $T = 10000$ , is listed below.

<b>Algorithm</b>	<b>Cumulative Reward <math>\sum_{t=1}^T r_i</math></b>
Li	4342.73
Qin	4323.26
Monkey	1765.41
Kveton	1787.81
Perfect Play	N/A

Table 1: **Cumulative reward w.r.t different baselines, under Movielens setting.**