Value-Based Bandit Algorithms

Chen-Yu Wei

Roadmap


Generalization
Exploration
Credit
Assignment


Learning Method
Model-Based
Policy-Based
Value-Based
Environment
Bandit
MDP

Contextual Bandits and Non-Contextual Bandits

Context
(Input)

Contextual Bandit

a_1 ?
$\boldsymbol{a_2}$ $\mathbf{0.5}$
a_3 ?

Policy: $\pi(a|\text{context})$

Non-Contextual Bandit

a_1 ?
$\boldsymbol{a_2}$ $\mathbf{0.5}$
a_3 ?

Policy: $\pi(a)$

Multi-Armed Bandits

Non-Contextual Bandits with Discrete Actions

Multi-Armed Bandits

A slot machine

One-armed bandit

A row of slot machines

Multi-armed bandit

Multi-Armed Bandits

Given: arm set $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \ldots, A\}$

For time $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$:

Learner chooses an arm $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$

Learner observes $r_t = R(a_t) + w_t$

Arm = Action

Assumption: $R(a)$ is the (hidden) ground-truth reward function

w_t is (zero-mean) noise

Goal: maximize the total reward $\sum_{t=1}^{T} R(a_t)$

Regret = $\max_a TR(a) - \sum_{t=1}^{T} R(a_t)$

Multi-Armed Bandits (MAB)

- Key challenge in MAB: **Exploration**
- The other challenges of RL are not presented in MAB:
  - Generalization (there is no input in MAB)
  - Credit assignments (there is no delayed feedback)

- We will discuss about two categories of exploration strategies
  - Based on mean estimation
  - Based on mean and uncertainty estimation

Multi-Armed Bandits

Based on mean estimation

The Exploration and Exploitation Trade-off in MAB

- To perform as well as the best policy (i.e., best arm), the learner has to pull the best arm most of the time

  ⇒ need to **exploit**

- To identify the best arm, the learner has to try every arm sufficiently many times

  ⇒ need to **explore**

A Simple Strategy: Explore-then-Commit

Explore-then-commit (Parameter: T_0)

In the first T_0 rounds, sample each arm T_0/A times. **(Explore)**

Compute the **empirical mean** $\hat{R}(a)$ for each arm a

In the remaining $T - T_0$ rounds, draw $\hat{a} = \text{argmax}_a \hat{R}(a)$ **(Exploit)**

What is the *right* amount of exploration (T_0)?

Another Simple Strategy: ϵ-Greedy

Mixing exploration and exploitation in time

ϵ-Greedy (Parameter: ϵ)

Take action

$$a_t = \begin{cases} \text{uniform}(\mathcal{A}) & \text{with prob. } \epsilon \quad \textbf{(Explore)} \\ \text{argmax}_a \, \hat{R}_t(a) & \text{with prob. } 1-\epsilon \quad \textbf{(Exploit)} \end{cases}$$

where $\hat{R}_t(a) = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}\{a_s=a\} \, r_s}{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}\{a_s=a\}}$ is the empirical mean of arm a using samples up to time $t-1$.

What is the *right* amount of exploration (ϵ)?

Comparison

- ϵ-Greedy is more **robust to non-stationarity** than Explore-then-Commit
- ϵ-Greedy has a better performance in the early phase of the learning process

Quantifying the Estimation Error

In Explore-then-Commit, we obtain $N = T_0/A$ i.i.d. samples of each arm.

Key Question:

$$\left| \hat{R}(a) - R(a) \right| \leq ? \quad f(N)$$

should decrease with N

Empirical mean of N independent samples

True mean

Quantifying the Estimation Error



Quantifying the Error: Concentration Inequality

Theorem. Hoeffding's Inequality

Let $X_1, \ldots, X_N \in [-1,1]$ be independent random variables with mean μ.

Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i - \mu \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{N}} \quad .$$

Quantifying the Estimation Error

In Explore-then-Commit, we obtain $N = T_0/A$ independent samples of each arm.

With probability **0.99**,

$$\left| \hat{R}(a) - R(a) \right| \leq ? \quad f(N) \approx c_{0.99} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}}$$

Empirical mean of N independent samples

True mean

Calculating the Regret for Explore-then-Commit (1/4)

In the first T_0 rounds, sample each arm T_0/A times. **(Explore)**

Compute the **empirical mean** $\hat{R}(a)$ for each arm a

In the remaining $T - T_0$ rounds, draw $\hat{a} = \text{argmax}_a \hat{R}(a)$ **(Exploit)**

$$\textbf{Regret} \quad = TR(a^\star) - \sum_{t=1}^{T} R(a_t) \quad = \sum_{t=1}^{T} (R(a^\star) - R(a_t))$$

Assume $R(a) \in [0,1]$ for simplicity.

Calculating the Regret for Explore-then-Commit (2/4)

In the first T_0 rounds, sample each arm T_0/A times. **(Explore)**

Compute the **empirical mean** $\hat{R}(a)$ for each arm a

In the remaining $T - T_0$ rounds, draw $\hat{a} = \text{argmax}_a \hat{R}(a)$ **(Exploit)**

Exploration Phase a_t is chosen evenly across arms

$$R(a^\star) - R(a_t) \leq 1$$

Calculating the Regret for Explore-then-Commit (3/4)

In the first T_0 rounds, sample each arm T_0/A times. **(Explore)**

Compute the **empirical mean** $\hat{R}(a)$ for each arm a

In the remaining $T - T_0$ rounds, draw $\hat{a} = \text{argmax}_a \hat{R}(a)$ **(Exploit)**

Exploitation Phase $a_t = \text{argmax}_a \hat{R}(a)$

For all arm a, $\left| \hat{R}(a) - R(a) \right| \leq c \sqrt{\frac{1}{\#\text{ samples of arm } a}} = c\sqrt{\frac{A}{T_0}}$

$R(a^\star) - R(a_t)$

Calculating the Regret for Explore-then-Commit (4/4)

In the first T_0 rounds, sample each arm T_0/A times. **(Explore)**

Compute the **empirical mean** $\hat{R}(a)$ for each arm a

In the remaining $T - T_0$ rounds, draw $\hat{a} = \text{argmax}_a \hat{R}(a)$ **(Exploit)**

$$\textbf{Regret} = \sum_{t=1}^{T} (R(a^\star) - R(a_t))$$

$$\leq \underbrace{T_0 \times 1}_{\text{Exploration Phase}} + \underbrace{(T - T_0) \times 2c\sqrt{\frac{A}{T_0}}}_{\text{Exploitation Phase}}$$

(regret increases with T_0)

(regret decreases with T_0)

How much to spend on exploration?

The T_0 that minimizes the regret satisfies roughly $\frac{T_0}{T} \approx \left(\frac{A}{T}\right)^{1/3}$

⇒ The percentage of exploration should decrease with time.

In ϵ-greedy, we usually decrease the exploration rate ϵ with time. For example:



$\epsilon_t \approx t^{-1/3}$



$\epsilon_t \approx 0.05 + (1 - 0.05)e^{-0.01t}$

Can We Do Better?

In explore-then-commit and ϵ-greedy, the probability to choose arms do not depend on the estimated mean (except for the empirically best arm).

… Maybe, the probability of choosing arms can be adaptive to the estimated mean?

Solution: Refine the amount of exploration for each arm **based on the current mean estimation**.

(Has to do this carefully to avoid **under-exploration**)

Refined Exploration

Boltzmann Exploration

In each round, sample a_t according to

$$\pi_t(a) \propto \exp\left(\lambda_t \hat{R}_t(a)\right)$$

where $\hat{R}_t(a)$ is the empirical mean of arm a using samples up to time $t-1$.

λ_t controls the degree of exploration.

Should λ_t be increasing or decreasing over time?

Summary: MAB Based on Mean Estimation

For $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$,

Design a distribution $\pi_t(\cdot)$ based on the current mean estimation $\hat{R}_t(\cdot)$

EG $\pi_t(a) = (1 - \epsilon_t)\mathbb{I}\left\{a = \underset{a'}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, \hat{R}_t(a')\right\} + \frac{\epsilon_t}{A}$

BE $\pi_t(a) \propto \exp\left(\lambda_t \hat{R}_t(a)\right)$

Sample an arm $a_t \sim \pi_t$ and receive the corresponding reward r_t.

Refine the mean estimation $\hat{R}_{t+1}(\cdot)$ with the new sample (a_t, r_t).

Summary: MAB Based on Mean Estimation



$$\hat{R}_t(a) = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}\{a_s = a\} r_s}{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}\{a_s = a\}}$$



$$\pi_t(a) = (1-\epsilon)\mathbb{I}\left\{a = \underset{a'}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, \hat{R}_t(a')\right\} + \frac{\epsilon}{A}$$

$$\pi_t(a) \propto \exp\left(\lambda \hat{R}_t(a)\right)$$

Summary: MAB Based on Mean Estimation

- Both methods are based on the same **mean estimation**
  - ϵ-Greedy, Boltzmann exploration

- The key difference is in the **decision rule**, i.e., the mapping from estimated means $\hat{R}_t$ to a distribution π_t.
  - The shape of the mapping makes differences

- There is a scalar hyperparameter that allows for a tradeoff between exploration and exploitation (ϵ_t in EG, λ_t in BE)

Some Experiments

$T = 10000$ rounds

$A = 2$ arms

Reward mean $R = [0.5, 0.5 - \Delta]$

Bernoulli distribution

Time-dependent parameters

30 random seeds

[code]

Observations:

- Most algorithms have its worst regret at some intermediate Δ value
- Smaller exploration leads to larger variation in performance



Small Δ is easy: don't need to distinguish the two arms
Large Δ is also easy: easy to distinguish the two arms

Contextual Bandits

Based on reward function estimation

Contextual Bandits Generalizes MAB and SL



No input, bandit feedback

- Generalization
- **Exploration**
- Credit assignment



Takes input, full-information feedback

- **Generalization**
- Exploration
- Credit assignment



Takes input, bandit feedback

- **Generalization**
- **Exploration**
- Credit assignment

Multi-Armed Bandits vs. Contextual Bandits



all-user recommendation



personalized recommendation

E.g. the user's history, location, social network activity, …

Contextual Bandits

For time $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$:

Environment generates a context $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$

Learner chooses an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$

Learner observes $r_t = R(x_t, a_t) + w_t$

Discussion

- Contextual bandits is a minimal simultaneous generalization of supervised learning (SL) and multi-armed bandits (MAB)
- SL is extensively discussed in machine learning courses
- We just learned some simple MAB algorithms
  - Two strategies based on mean estimation

- **Question:** Can you design a contextual bandits algorithm based on the techniques for SL and MAB?

Two ways to leverage SL techniques in CB

x: context, a: action, r: reward



Learn a mapping from
(context, action) to reward

Value-based approach
(discussed next)



Learn a mapping from
context to action (or action distribution)

Policy-based approach
(slightly later in the course)

Recall: MAB Based on Mean Estimation



$$\hat{R}_t(a) = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}\{a_s = a\} r_s}{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{I}\{a_s = a\}}$$



$$\pi_t(a) = (1 - \epsilon_t)\mathbb{I}\left\{a = \operatorname{argmax}_{a'} \hat{R}_t(a')\right\} + \frac{\epsilon_t}{A}$$

$$\pi_t(a) \propto \exp\left(\lambda_t \hat{R}_t(a)\right)$$

CB Based on Reward Function Estimation (Regression)



Train a $\hat{R}$ such that $r_i \approx \hat{R}(x_i, a_i)$

$$\pi_t(a|x) = (1-\epsilon_t)\mathbb{I}\left\{a = \underset{a'}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, \hat{R}_t(x,a')\right\} + \frac{\epsilon_t}{A}$$

$$\pi_t(a|x) \propto \exp\left(\lambda_t \hat{R}_t(x,a)\right)$$

The Regression Procedure

Context x_t ⟶



$\hat{R}_\theta(x_t, 1)$

$\hat{R}_\theta(x_t, 2)$

$\vdots$

$\hat{R}_\theta(x_t, A)$

Training loss: $L(\theta) = \left(\hat{R}_\theta(x_t, a_t) - r_t\right)^2$

CB Based on Reward Function Estimation

Instantiate a regression procedure $\hat{R}_1$

For $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$,

Receive context x_t

Design a distribution $\pi_t(\cdot|x_t)$ based on the estimated reward $\hat{R}_t(x_t, \cdot)$

EG $\pi_t(a|x_t) = (1 - \epsilon_t)\mathbb{I}\left\{a = \underset{a'}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, \hat{R}_t(x_t, a')\right\} + \frac{\epsilon_t}{A}$

BE $\pi_t(a|x_t) \propto \exp\left(\lambda_t \hat{R}_t(x_t, a)\right)$

Sample an action $a_t \sim \pi_t(\cdot\,|x_t)$ and receive the corresponding reward r_t.

Refine the reward estimator $\hat{R}_{t+1}(\cdot, \cdot)$ with the new sample (x_t, a_t, r_t).

Summary

- Contextual bandits (CB) simultaneously generalizes supervised learning (SL) and multi-armed bandits (MAB). It captures the challenges of **generalization** and **exploration** in online RL.

- Any MAB algorithm based on "**mean estimation**" can be converted to a CB algorithm with "**reward function estimation**" by leveraging a regression.
  - This gives a general framework for value-based CB

Multi-Armed Bandits

Based on mean estimation and uncertainty quantification

Recall: MAB Based on Mean Estimation



MAB Based on Mean Estimation and Uncertainty Quantification



$U_t(a)$: quantifies the uncertainty of $\hat{R}_t(a)$

$$\left|\hat{R}_t(a) - R(a)\right| \leq c\sqrt{\frac{1}{N_t(a)}} \triangleq U_t(a)$$

Useful Idea: “Optimism in the Face of Uncertainty”

In words:

Act according to the **best plausible world**.



Image source: UC Berkeley CS188

Another Idea: "Optimism in the Face of Uncertainty"

In words:

Act according to the **best plausible world**.

At time t, suppose that arm a has been drawn for $N_t(a)$ times, with empirical mean $\hat{R}_t(a)$.

What can we say about the true mean $R(a)$?

$$\left| R(a) - \hat{R}_t(a) \right| \leq c\sqrt{\frac{1}{N_t(a)}} \quad \text{w.p.} \geq 0.99$$

What's the most optimistic mean estimation for arm a?

$$\hat{R}_t(a) + c\sqrt{\frac{1}{N_t(a)}}$$

Upper Confidence Bound (UCB)

UCB (Parameter: c)

In round t, draw

Exploration Bonus
= Amount of Uncertainty

$$a_t = \mathrm{argmax}_a \quad \hat{R}_t(a) + c\sqrt{\frac{2\log t}{N_t(a)}}$$

where $\hat{R}_t(a)$ is the empirical mean of arm a using samples up to time $t-1$.

$N_t(a)$ is the number of samples of arm a up to time $t-1$.

cf. Mean-estimation-based algorithms samples $a_t \sim \pi_t(\cdot) =$ an increasing function of $\hat{R}_t(\cdot)$

In those algorithms, Hoeffding's inequality is used in the **regret analysis**, but not in the **algorithm**.

Visualizing UCB

True mean: [0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.7] animation code

Summary: Algorithms We Learned So Far

	Approach
Explore-then-Exploit ϵ-Greedy Boltzmann Exploration Inverse Gap Weighting	Mean estimation + decision rule
Upper Confidence Bound	Mean estimation + uncertainty quantification + decision rule

Summary

Summary

Value-based bandit algorithms

- Multi-armed bandits (non-contextual bandits)
  - Based on mean estimation
  - Based on mean estimation and uncertainty quantification
- Contextual bandits
  - Based on reward function estimation

CB Based on Reward Function Estimation

(Special Case: MAB Based on Mean Estimation)



Train a $\hat{R}$ such that $r_i \approx \hat{R}(x_i, a_i)$

MAB Based on Mean and Uncertainty Estimation



UCB: $\underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}}\ \hat{R}(a) + U_t(a)$

TS: $\underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}}\ \hat{R}(a) + U_t(a) n_t(a)$

noise

Uncertainty quantification for CB is less trivial – discussed in the future (special topics).