

Group Distributionally Robust Optimization with Flexible Sample Queries

Haomin Bai

BAIHM@LAMDA.NJU.EDU.CN

Dingzhi Yu

YUDZ@LAMDA.NJU.EDU.CN

National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, China

School of Artificial Intelligence, Nanjing University, China

Shuai Li

SHUAILI8@SJTU.EDU.CN

John Hopcroft Center, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

Haipeng Luo

HAIPENGL@USC.EDU

Thomas Lord Department of Computer Science, University of Southern California, USA

Lijun Zhang

ZHANGLJ@LAMDA.NJU.EDU.CN

National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, China

School of Artificial Intelligence, Nanjing University, China

Abstract

Group distributionally robust optimization (GDRO) aims to develop models that perform well across m distributions simultaneously. Existing GDRO algorithms can only process a fixed number of samples per iteration, either 1 or m , and therefore can not support scenarios where the sample size varies dynamically. To address this limitation, we investigate GDRO with flexible sample queries and cast it as a two-player game: one player solves an online convex optimization problem, while the other tackles a prediction with limited advice (PLA) problem. Within such a game, we propose a novel PLA algorithm, constructing appropriate loss estimators for cases where the sample size is either 1 or not, and updating the decision using follow-the-regularized-leader. Then, we establish the first high-probability regret bound for non-oblivious PLA. Building upon the above approach, we develop a GDRO algorithm that allows an arbitrary and varying sample size per round, achieving a high-probability optimization error bound of $O\left(\frac{1}{t}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \log m}\right)$, where r_t denotes the sample size at round t . This result demonstrates that the optimization error decreases as the number of samples increases and implies a consistent sample complexity of $O(m \log(m)/\epsilon^2)$ for any fixed sample size $r \in [m]$, aligning with existing bounds for cases of $r = 1$ or m . We validate our approach on synthetic binary and real-world multi-class datasets.

1. Introduction

Traditional machine learning typically trains models by minimizing the empirical risk over a set of random samples drawn from an unknown distribution (Vapnik, 2000; Golden, 2020). However, when the test distribution deviates from the distribution of samples, models often suffer from significant performance degradation (Sugiyama et al., 2007; Gama et al., 2014; Kuang et al., 2018). A promising solution is distributionally robust optimization (DRO), which minimizes the worst-case risk over an uncertainty set (Delage and Ye, 2010; Duchi and Namkoong, 2021; Rahimian and Mehrotra, 2022).

In this paper, we focus on a special case of DRO, known as group DRO (GDRO) (Sagawa et al., 2020), where the uncertainty set is defined as a finite collection of distributions. GDRO can be




Figure 1: Illustration of GDRO with fixed sample sizes (1, left; m , middle) and flexible sample queries (right). Squares with different colors represent distinct distributions, with those that are ticked indicating the selected distributions queried for samples, and the others representing the unselected distributions.

mathematically formulated as a minimax stochastic optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \max_{i \in [m]} \{R_i(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i} [\ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z})]\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i \in [m]}$ represents a set of m distributions, $\mathbf{z}$ denotes a random sample, $\mathbf{w}$ corresponds to the model, $\mathcal{W}$ represents the hypothesis class, and $\ell(\cdot; \cdot)$ is the loss function that measures the model’s performance. By assuming all risk functions $R_i(\mathbf{w})$ are convex, (1) can be cast as a stochastic convex-linear optimization (SCLO) problem (Nemirovski et al., 2009)

$$\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \left\{ \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i R_i(\mathbf{w}) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta_m = \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^m | \mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{0}_m, \sum_{i=1}^m q_i = 1\}$ denotes the $(m-1)$ -dimensional simplex.

There are two major methodologies for solving the SCLO problem (2). One applies stochastic mirror descent (SMD) with either m (Nemirovski et al., 2009) or 1 (Sagawa et al., 2020; Carmon and Hausler, 2022) sample per round. The other interprets it as a two-player zero-sum game, querying 1 sample per round (Soma et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023). It is evident that existing GDRO algorithms are limited to processing a fixed number of samples per round, either 1 or m . However, such rigid and constrained sample sizes are often unrealistic in practical scenarios. On the one hand, querying m samples per round could be infeasible due to limited resources. For example, in medical diagnosis (Ktena et al., 2024), limited and time-varying resources often restrict access to only a subset of groups per iteration. Similarly, in agnostic federated learning (Mohri et al., 2019), fluctuating network bandwidth (Zhang et al., 2020) limits the number of clients that can be queried each round. On the other hand, if we can query multiple samples per round, processing them one by one leads to slow convergence. To capture the flexibility of sampling, we consider a setting where an arbitrary and varying number of samples $r_t \in [m]$ is allowed to query in the t -th round. Processing multiple samples concurrently enables algorithms to adapt to resource constraints while accelerating convergence. The distinctions among the three sampling schemes described above are depicted in Fig. 1.

For algorithm design, we also formulate GDRO with flexible sample queries as a two-player game. Similar to Zhang et al. (2023), the w -player aims to solve a “non-oblivious online convex

optimization (OCO) with stochastic gradients” problem. However, the q -player differs as it solves a “non-oblivious prediction with limited advice (PLA)” problem, enabling support for flexible sample queries. For the w -player, although the problem formulation remains the same as that in previous work, we use the follow-the-regularized-leader (FTRL) (Orabona, 2023) to ensure that our GDRO algorithm exhibits the *anytime* ability, i.e., the execution of algorithm does not require prior knowledge of the total number of iterations and can return a solution at any round (Cutkosky, 2019; Zhang et al., 2024a,b).

For the q -player, existing PLA approaches are not applicable to our non-oblivious setting with varying sample sizes, as they either focus on stochastic settings (Saad and Blanchard, 2021), oblivious settings (Seldin et al., 2014), pseudo-regret (Kale, 2014), or fixed sample sizes (Yun et al., 2018). To tackle the PLA problem in our setting, we first re-analyze Prediction with Limited Advice (PrLiA), an oblivious PLA algorithm (Seldin et al., 2014), and verify its feasibility for rounds with $r_t \geq 2$ in the non-oblivious setting. We then propose a hybrid algorithm that operates two sub-algorithms: PrLiA in rounds where $r_t \geq 2$ and **Exp3** with Implicit eXploration (Exp3-IX) (Neu, 2015), an effective algorithm for non-oblivious multi-armed bandits (MAB), in rounds where $r_t = 1$. Then, we establish the first high-probability regret bound of $O\left(\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \log m}\right)$ for non-oblivious PLA. We further demonstrate that Exp3-IX and PrLiA can be unified into a single process. This leads to a more elegant and efficient algorithm by eliminating the need to maintain two separate sub-algorithms, while achieving the same order of regret bound as the hybrid approach.

By integrating the algorithms for the w -player and the q -player into the two-player game, we develop a GDRO method capable of handling an arbitrary and varying number of samples per round. Furthermore, we establish a high-probability optimization error of $O\left(\frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \log m}\right)$, where r_t denotes the number of samples at round t . Our contributions are summarized as follows:

1. We propose a GDRO algorithm that can handle an arbitrary and varying number of samples per round and establish a high-probability optimization error bound of $O\left(\frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \log m}\right)$. It implies a sample complexity of $O(m \log(m)/\epsilon^2)$ for any fixed sample size $r \in [m]$, matching existing results (Nemirovski et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2023).
2. We achieve an optimization error bound of $O(\sqrt{m \log(m)/(rt)})$ for any fixed sample size $r \in [m]$, improving the existing bound of $O(\log(t) \sqrt{m \log(m)/(rt)})$ established by anytime algorithms (Zhang et al., 2024b) for the cases $r = 1$ or $r = m$.
3. As a by-product, we propose two novel non-oblivious PLA algorithms and establish the first high-probability regret bound of $O\left(\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \log m}\right)$, on the same order as the expected regret bound against an oblivious adversary established by Seldin et al. (2014).

2. Related Work

In this section, we briefly review recent advancements in GDRO and PLA.

2.1. Group Distributionally Robust Optimization

The objective of GDRO is to minimize the worst-case risk across multiple distributions. Nemirovski et al. (2009) consider minimax stochastic optimization problem (2) and propose merging the updates for $\mathbf{w}_t$ and $\mathbf{q}_t$ into one SMD process, achieving a high-probability sample complexity of $O(m \log(m)/\epsilon^2)$ with m samples per round. Sagawa et al. (2020) reduce the number of samples

per round from m to 1 using SMD and establish a loose sample complexity of $O(m^2 \log(m)/\epsilon^2)$. Subsequently, [Carmon and Hausler \(2022\)](#) improve the sample complexity to $O(m \log(m)/\epsilon^2)$ using SMD with gradient clipping, albeit providing only an expected bound. [Soma et al. \(2022\)](#) propose a two-player game framework for GDRO, but do not realize the non-oblivious nature of the problem. Then, [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#) utilize the techniques from non-oblivious online learning and achieve a sample complexity of $O(m \log(m)/\epsilon^2)$ with high probability by querying 1 sample per round. [Nguyen et al. \(2024\)](#) propose a novel notion of sparsity to reduce the dependence on m in the sample complexity. Most aforementioned algorithms require a predetermined number of iterations. To eliminate this need, [Zhang et al. \(2024b\)](#) propose anytime algorithms, achieving optimization error bounds of $O(\log(t) \sqrt{m \log(m)/(rt)})$ for $r = 1$ or m .

Recently, [Agarwal and Zhang \(2022\)](#) introduce minimax regret optimization (MRO) by replacing the vanilla risk in DRO with excess risk and study the problem with a finite number of distributions. MRO can be regarded as a specific case of the formulation by [Ślowski and Bottou \(2022\)](#), designed to prevent any single distribution from dominating the maximum. [Zhang et al. \(2024a\)](#) propose efficient algorithms for MRO. [Yu et al. \(2024\)](#) develop efficient algorithms for the empirical GDRO and MRO.

Despite these advancements, existing GDRO algorithms are limited to processing 1 ([Sagawa et al., 2020](#); [Carmon and Hausler, 2022](#); [Zhang et al., 2023](#)) or m ([Nemirovski et al., 2009](#)) samples per round, while methods for arbitrary and time-varying sample sizes remain unexplored.

2.2. Prediction with Limited Advice

PLA ([Seldin et al., 2014](#)) can be regarded as an intermediate case between MAB, where the player observes the advice of 1 expert per round, and prediction with expert advice, where the player is allowed to observe the advice of all m experts. In PLA, the player is allowed to observe the advice of $r_t \in [m]$ experts at round t , and the incurred loss is evaluated based on a subset of the selected experts. [Seldin et al. \(2014\)](#) study PLA with time-varying sample sizes r_t and propose PrLiA by extending the Exp3 algorithm ([Auer et al., 2002](#); [Bubeck and Cesa-Bianchi, 2012](#)), a classical method for MAB. [Kale \(2014\)](#) considers a scenario where probability distributions over all experts can be queried to determine which expert to select. [Amin et al. \(2015\)](#) focus on a general case with non-uniform expert costs. [Yun et al. \(2018\)](#) explore PLA in the non-oblivious setting and employ a two-layered structure algorithm. [Thune and Seldin \(2018\)](#) achieve a loss-range-based regret with two samples per round. [Saad and Blanchard \(2021\)](#) focus on minimizing excess generalization error in stochastic settings. [Saad and Blanchard \(2023\)](#) conduct a study on scenarios where the player utilizes a convex combination of multiple experts for prediction.

Unfortunately, these existing PLA algorithms cannot address our concern about the regret against a non-oblivious adversary with varying sample sizes, as they either focus on stochastic settings ([Saad and Blanchard, 2021](#)), oblivious setting ([Seldin et al., 2014](#); [Saad and Blanchard, 2023](#)), pseudo-regret ([Kale, 2014](#); [Amin et al., 2015](#)) and fixed sample sizes ([Thune and Seldin, 2018](#); [Yun et al., 2018](#)).

3. GDRO with Flexible Sample Queries

In this section, we first introduce the preliminaries and formulate two-player game. Then, we provide a technical motivation and detail the strategies for both the q -player and the w -player. Finally, we present the overall procedure and derive our main theoretical results.

3.1. Preliminaries

We consider a setup where the domain $\mathcal{W}$ is equipped with a function $\nu_w(\cdot)$, which is 1-strongly convex with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_w$. Similarly, the domain Δ_m is equipped with the negative entropy function $\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i \ln q_i$, which is 1-strongly convex with respect to the ℓ_1 -norm $\|\cdot\|_1$. Then, we make some standard assumptions (Nemirovski et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2023).

Assumption 1 $\mathcal{W}$ is convex and its diameter measured by a function $\nu_w(\cdot)$ is bounded by D , i.e.,

$$\max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) \leq D^2. \quad (3)$$

It is easy to verify that Δ_m is convex, and its diameter measured by $\nu_q(\cdot)$ is upper bounded by $\sqrt{\ln m}$.

Assumption 2 For all $i \in [m]$, we assume

$$\|\nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z})\|_{w,*} \leq G \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}, \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i, \quad (4)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{w,*}$ denotes the dual norm of $\|\cdot\|_w$.

Assumption 3 For all $i \in [m]$, we assume

$$0 \leq \ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}) \leq 1 \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}, \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i. \quad (5)$$

Assumption 4 For all $i \in [m]$, the risk function $R_i(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i}[\ell(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z})]$ is convex.

Any approximate solution $(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}})$ to (2) is evaluated by the error

$$\epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}) = \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}),$$

which controls the optimality of $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$ to the original problem (1) (Zhang et al., 2023). Following previous studies, we also formulate the problem (2) with flexible sample queries as a two-player game, where the solution of (2) corresponds to the equilibrium of the game (Roux et al., 2021). As pointed by Zhang et al. (2023), both players have to solve *non-oblivious* online learning problems, i.e., the objective functions encountered by each player may depend on their past decisions. Meanwhile, we consider a stochastic setting where both players can only access unbiased stochastic gradients using queried random samples, rather than exact gradients.

In this game, two players make decision $(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ in each round t . The w -player aims to minimize a sequence of convex functions $\{\phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_j)\}_{j \in [t]}$ with $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$, and the q -player needs to maximize a series of linear functions $\{\phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q})\}_{j \in [t]}$, subject to $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$. The optimization error can be bounded by the regrets of the w -player and the q -player, which are respectively defined as

$$\text{Regret}_{w,t} = \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_j)$$

and

$$\text{Regret}_{q,t} = \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j).$$

From the analysis by [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#), the number of samples only affects $\text{Regret}_{q,t}$. To explicitly reveal the impact of sample sizes, we define a new regret measure for the q -player in terms of stochastic losses as

$$\text{Regret}'_{q,t} = \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \min_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,i}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\hat{s}_{t,i} = 1 - \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}) \stackrel{(5)}{\in} [0, 1], \quad \forall i \in [m], \quad (7)$$

denote the stochastic losses with $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$ representing a random sample drawn from distribution $\mathcal{P}_i$ at round t . We note that $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_t$ is introduced for analytical purposes, and only the queried subset of losses $\hat{s}_{t,i}$ is observed in the t -th iteration. The difference between $\text{Regret}_{q,t}$ and $\text{Regret}'_{q,t}$ can be bounded using concentration inequalities ([Haghtalab et al., 2022](#); [Zhang et al., 2023](#)). In this way, we decouple the stochastic and adversarial nature faced by the q -player and can treat the PLA algorithm as a black-box.

Next, we model the problem faced by the w -player as “non-oblivious OCO with stochastic gradients” and that of q -player as “non-oblivious PLA”. Both players are equipped with algorithms $\mathcal{A}_w$ and $\mathcal{A}_q$, respectively. In each round, the two players use algorithms to make decisions $(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ based on history information. Once the decisions are submitted, new samples can be queried according to r_t provided by the environment. Then, average solutions $(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t)$ are computed and output at each iteration, defined as

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbf{w}_j, \text{ and } \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbf{q}_j. \quad (8)$$

We decompose the optimization error $\epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t)$ as follows.

Lemma 1 *Under Assumptions 1-4, suppose that*

1. *The w -player is equipped with a non-oblivious OCO algorithm $\mathcal{A}_w$, and for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the regret $\text{Regret}_{w,t}$ is upper bounded by $U_w(t, \delta)$.*
2. *The q -player is equipped with a non-oblivious PLA algorithm $\mathcal{A}_q$, and for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the regret $\text{Regret}'_{q,t}$ is upper bounded by $U_q(t, \delta)$.*

Then, for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \leq \frac{1}{t} U_w \left(t, \frac{\delta}{4} \right) + \frac{1}{t} U_q \left(t, \frac{\delta}{4} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{t}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{4m}{\delta} \right). \quad (9)$$

By Lemma 1, it suffices to design effective online algorithms for each player, with the combination of their regret bounds deriving the overall optimization error.

3.2. Technical Motivation

Our method adopts FTRL with averaged outputs (8), in contrast to prior GDRO approaches ([Nemirovski et al., 2009](#); [Zhang et al., 2023](#)) that employ SMD with step-size-weighted outputs:

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}'_t = \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{\eta_{w,j} \mathbf{w}_j}{\sum_{k=1}^t \eta_{w,k}}, \text{ and } \bar{\mathbf{q}}'_t = \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{\eta_{q,j} \mathbf{q}_j}{\sum_{k=1}^t \eta_{q,k}}, \quad (10)$$

where $\eta_{w,t}$ and $\eta_{q,t}$ denote step sizes. This choice is technically motivated, as detailed below.

For the q -player, using SMD with the output $\bar{\mathbf{q}}'_t$ results in intractable analysis and does not yield meaningful results in our setting, as it requires bounding terms such as $(\sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j)^{-1} (\sum_{j=1}^t \eta_j^2)$, where each step size η_t depends on the irregular and time-varying sequence $\{r_j\}_{j=1}^t$. Under Assumption 1, SMD lacks theoretical guarantees when used with the averaged output (8) (Nemirovski et al., 2009). In contrast, FTRL provides such guarantees (Orabona, 2023), and its combination with the averaged output (8) yields meaningful and tractable solutions. Therefore, we adopt FTRL to update $\mathbf{q}_t$ and output $\bar{\mathbf{q}}_t$. For the w -player, since Lemma 1 requires consistency in output formats, we also apply FTRL to update $\mathbf{w}_t$ and output $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t$. In addition, FTRL avoids the $O(\log t)$ factor induced by the accumulation of $\{1/j\}_{j=1}^t$ in SMD with outputs (10).

In summary, FTRL with output (8) not only enables anytime operation and theoretical tractability but also yields an $O(\log t)$ improvement in optimization error bound over existing results (Zhang et al., 2024b).

3.3. Strategy for the q Player

We consider an environment oracle $\mathcal{E}$ that reveals the number of samples r_t available for querying at the start of each round t . The case where $r_t = 1$ has been addressed by non-oblivious MAB algorithms, such as Exp3-IX (Neu, 2015). Therefore, we can directly adopt Exp3-IX for this scenario. When $r_t \geq 2$, we employ PrLiA (Seldin et al., 2014). Unfortunately, the original analysis of PrLiA establish only expected regret bounds for oblivious setting. To make it applicable in the non-oblivious setting, we re-analyze PrLiA and derive a high-probability regret bound when $r_t \geq 2$. A natural strategy is to execute two sub-algorithms: Exp3-IX for rounds where $r_t = 1$ and PrLiA for rounds where $r_t \geq 2$, thereby forming a *hybrid strategy* for the q player. Specifically, we maintain two separate estimated cumulative losses: $\mathbf{L}_t^s$ for single-sample rounds ($r_t = 1$), and $\mathbf{L}_t^m$ for multiple-sample rounds ($r_t \geq 2$). These estimators are used and updated independently to compute $\mathbf{q}_t$. We present the full algorithm and its theoretical analysis in Appendix A. Below, we propose an improved *unified strategy* that integrates these two sub-algorithms into a single process.

Since both Exp3-IX and PrLiA are based on FTRL, we unify the two cumulative loss estimates, $\mathbf{L}_t^s$ and $\mathbf{L}_t^m$, into a single aggregate $\mathbf{L}_t$ for updating $\mathbf{q}_t$. The update rule for $\mathbf{q}_t$ is given by

$$\mathbf{q}_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \{ \langle \eta_{q,t} \mathbf{L}_{t-1}, \mathbf{q} \rangle + \nu_q(\mathbf{q}) \}, \quad (11)$$

where $\eta_{q,t}$ is the step size. Note that when the regularizer is defined as $\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i \ln q_i$, (11) has a closed-form solution. Specifically, for all $i \in [m]$, the solution is given by

$$q_{t,i} = \frac{\exp(-\eta_{q,t} L_{t-1,i})}{\sum_{k=1}^m \exp(-\eta_{q,t} L_{t-1,k})}. \quad (12)$$

The step size is then set as

$$\eta_{q,t} = \sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{m \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{1}{r_j}}}. \quad (13)$$

After obtaining $\mathbf{q}_t$, we proceed to query new samples through the following process. We begin by selecting an distribution index $c_t \in [m]$ according to the probability vector $\mathbf{q}_t$. For rounds where $r_t \geq 2$, we additionally select $r_t - 1$ distribution indices uniformly at random and without

Algorithm 1 Unified Strategy for PLA

Input: an environment oracle $\mathcal{E}$

```

1: Initialize  $\mathbf{L}_0 = \mathbf{0}_m$ 
2: for  $t = 1, 2 \dots$  do
3:   Receive  $r_t$  from  $\mathcal{E}$ 
4:   Update  $\mathbf{q}_t$  according to (12)
5:   if  $r_t = 1$  then
6:     Select  $c_t \in [m]$  according to  $\mathbf{q}_t$  and set  $\mathcal{I}_t = \emptyset$ 
7:   else
8:     Select  $c_t \in [m]$  according to  $\mathbf{q}_t$  and generate  $\mathcal{I}_t = \text{DepRound}(\frac{r_t-1}{m-1} \mathbf{1}_{m-1})$  from  $\{[m] \setminus c_t\}$ 
9:   end if
10:  Send  $C_t = c_t \cup \mathcal{I}_t$  and  $c_t$  to  $\mathcal{E}$ 
11:  Receive losses  $\hat{s}_{t,i}$  for all  $i \in C_t$  from  $\mathcal{E}$ 
12:  Construct  $\tilde{s}_t$  in (14), and update  $\mathbf{L}_t$  according to (16)
13: end for
    
```

replacement from the remaining $m - 1$ elements. These additional indices form the set $\mathcal{I}_t \subseteq \{[m] \setminus c_t\}$ and the complete set of selected distributions indices is denoted as $C_t = c_t \cup \mathcal{I}_t$. Subsequently, samples $\mathbf{z}_t^{(i)}$ are queried by $\mathcal{E}$ for all $i \in C_t$. The uniform sampling can be implemented using the DepRound algorithm (Gandhi et al., 2006), with further details provided in Appendix B.

Next, we transmit the set C_t to $\mathcal{E}$ to query losses $\hat{s}_{t,i}$ for all $i \in C_t$ and send the index c_t to $\mathcal{E}$ for the update of the w -player, which will be introduced in Section 3.4. Depending on the value of r_t , we employ different loss estimators: (i) the biased Implicit-eXploration (IX) loss estimator (Kocák et al., 2014) when $r_t = 1$; (ii) an unbiased loss estimator when $r_t \geq 2$ (Seldin et al., 2014). Formally, the loss estimator is constructed as follows: for all $i \in [m]$,

$$\tilde{s}_{t,i} = \begin{cases} \frac{\hat{s}_{t,i}}{q_{t,i} + \gamma_t} \mathbb{I}[i \in C_t], & r_t = 1 \\ \frac{\hat{s}_{t,i}}{q_{t,i} + (1 - q_{t,i}) \frac{r_t-1}{m-1}} \mathbb{I}[i \in C_t], & r_t \geq 2 \end{cases}, \quad (14)$$

where $\hat{s}_{t,i}$ is defined in (7), $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$ denotes the indicator function and γ_t is the IX coefficient set as

$$\gamma_t = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{q,t}. \quad (15)$$

Finally, the estimated cumulative loss at round t is updated as

$$\mathbf{L}_t = \mathbf{L}_{t-1} + \tilde{s}_t, \quad (16)$$

with the initialization $\mathbf{L}_0 = \mathbf{0}_m$. The unified strategy for the q -player is outlined in Algorithm 1.

We re-analyze PrLiA over multiple-sample rounds in the non-oblivious setting and establish a high-probability regret bound. By integrating the theoretical guarantees of Exp3-IX with our new analysis for PrLiA, we establish the regret bound of Algorithm 1. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first high-probability regret guarantee against a non-oblivious adversary in PLA.

Lemma 2 Let $\eta_{q,t}$ and γ_t be defined in (13) and (15) for Algorithm 1. Under Assumption 3, we have for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Regret}'_{q,t} \leq & \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(5\sqrt{2 \ln m} + 3\sqrt{2 \ln \frac{5}{\delta}} \right) + m \sqrt{\ln m} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{5}{\delta}} \\ & + \left(m + 1 + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \right) \ln \frac{5}{\delta} + \frac{2m}{3} \ln m. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Remark 1 In the non-oblivious setting, we achieve a regret bound of $O\left(\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \log m}\right)$ in high-probability for $\text{Regret}'_{q,t}$ in (17), which matches the order of the expected regret bound established by Seldin et al. (2014) in the oblivious setting.

3.4. Strategy for the w Player

Unlike prior GDRO algorithms that update $\mathbf{w}_t$ using SMD (Nemirovski et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2023), we instead adopt FTRL, motivated by the analysis in Section 3.2. At the beginning, the cumulative loss is initialized to $\mathbf{F}_0 = \mathbf{0}_d$ where d denotes the dimension of the vector in $\mathcal{W}$. The update rule for $\mathbf{w}_t$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{w}_t = \underset{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \left\langle \eta_{w,t} \mathbf{F}_{t-1}, \mathbf{w} \right\rangle + \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) \right\}, \quad (18)$$

where $\eta_{w,t} > 0$ is the step size. If we set $\nu_w(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2$, then (18) has a closed-form solution

$$\mathbf{w}_t = \Pi_{\mathcal{W}} [-\eta_{w,t} \mathbf{F}_{t-1}],$$

where $\Pi_{\mathcal{W}}[\cdot]$ denotes the Euclidean projection onto the nearest point in $\mathcal{W}$. To construct unbiased gradients for updating $\mathbf{w}_t$, we reuse samples queried by the q -player without additional querying. Specially, the w -player sends $\mathbf{w}_t$ to the environment oracle $\mathcal{E}$ and then receive a stochastic gradient

$$\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t) = \nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(c_t)}), \quad (19)$$

where the random sample $\mathbf{z}_t^{(c_t)}$ queried from the distribution $\mathcal{P}_{c_t}$ is also used in Algorithm 1. Under Assumption 3, $\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ is a bounded, unbiased estimator of $\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$, i.e., for all t ,

$$\|\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)\|_{w,*} \stackrel{(4)}{\leq} G, \quad \mathbb{E}_{t-1} [\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)] = \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t), \quad (20)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation conditioned on the randomness up to round $t - 1$, given a sample size of r_t . Then, we update $\mathbf{F}_t$ as

$$\mathbf{F}_t = \mathbf{F}_{t-1} + \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t). \quad (21)$$

The procedure for the w -player is summarized in Algorithm 2. We then establish the regret bound for Algorithm 2 in Lemma 3. In the analysis, we tackle the non-obliviousness by applying the “ghost iterate” technique proposed by Nemirovski et al. (2009).

Algorithm 2 FTRL Strategy for OCO

Input: an environment oracle $\mathcal{E}$

- 1: Initialize $\mathbf{F}_0 = \mathbf{0}_d$
 - 2: **for** $t = 1, 2 \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Update $\mathbf{w}_t$ according to (18) and send $\mathbf{w}_t$ to $\mathcal{E}$
 - 4: Receive loss $\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{q}_t)$ in (19) from $\mathcal{E}$
 - 5: Update $\mathbf{F}_t$ according to (21)
 - 6: **end for**
-

Algorithm 3 An Anytime Stochastic Approach for GDRO with Flexible Sample Queries

Input: an OCO algorithm $\mathcal{A}_w$ and a PLA algorithm $\mathcal{A}_q$

- 1: Run algorithms $\mathcal{A}_w$ and $\mathcal{A}_q$ simultaneously
 - 2: **for** $t = 1, 2 \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Receive r_t from environment and send r_t to $\mathcal{A}_q$
 - 4: Receive C_t, c_t and $\mathbf{q}_t$ from $\mathcal{A}_q$
 - 5: Receive $\mathbf{w}_t$ from $\mathcal{A}_w$
 - 6: Observe and send losses $\hat{s}_{t,i}$ for all $i \in C_t$ to $\mathcal{A}_q$
 - 7: Observe and send loss $\nabla \ell(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathbf{z}_t^{(c_t)})$ to $\mathcal{A}_w$
 - 8: Calculate the averages $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t$ and $\bar{\mathbf{q}}_t$ in (8)
 - 9: **end for**
-

Lemma 3 Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 4, and setting $\eta_{w,t} = \frac{\sqrt{2}D}{\sqrt{5}G} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$ for Algorithm 2, we have for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\text{Regret}_{w,t} \leq DG\sqrt{t} \left(2\sqrt{10} + 8\sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right). \quad (22)$$

Remark 2 We obtain a high-probability regret bound (22), which is of the same order as the non-anytime bound established by Zhang et al. (2023, Theorem 5). Moreover, due to different definitions of regret, our result is not directly comparable to that of the algorithm presented by Zhang et al. (2024b, Theorem 6).

3.5. An Anytime Stochastic Approach for GDRO with Flexible Sample Queries

We present the procedure for GDRO with flexible sample queries in Algorithm 3. By integrating Algorithms 1 and 2 into 3, and combining Lemmas 1, 2 with 3, we derive the following theorem.

Theorem 1 Let Algorithm 3 employ Algorithm 1 as $\mathcal{A}_q$ and Algorithm 2 as $\mathcal{A}_w$, with step sizes specified by Lemma 2 for Algorithm 1 and Lemma 3 for Algorithm 2. Under Assumptions 1–4, we

have for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \\ & \leq \frac{DG}{\sqrt{t}} \left(2\sqrt{10} + 8\sqrt{\ln \frac{4}{\delta}} \right) + \frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(5\sqrt{2 \ln m} + 3\sqrt{2 \ln \frac{20}{\delta}} \right) + \frac{m}{t} \sqrt{\ln m \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{20}{\delta}}} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{t} \left(m + 1 + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \right) \ln \frac{20}{\delta} + \frac{2m}{3t} \ln m + \sqrt{\frac{2}{t}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{4m}{\delta} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Remark 3 From (23), we have $\epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) = O\left(\frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \log m}\right)$, indicating that increasing sample sizes reduces optimization error. For the case where the number of samples is fixed, i.e., $r_j = r$ for all $j \in [t]$, the optimization error bound $\epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) = O(\sqrt{m \log(m)/(rt)})$ is achieved with high probability, implying the sample complexity of $O(m \log(m)/\epsilon^2)$ for all $r \in [m]$. This matches prior results for $r = 1$ (Zhang et al., 2023) and $r = m$ (Nemirovski et al., 2009), and nearly attains the lower bound of $\Omega(m/\epsilon^2)$ by Soma et al. (2022, Theorem 5). In contrast to comparable methods, our approach does not require prior knowledge of the total number of iterations.

Remark 4 In the cases of fixed sample size $r = 1$ and $r = m$, our result (23) yields optimization error bounds of $O(\sqrt{m \log(m)/t})$ and $O(\sqrt{\log(m)/t})$, respectively. These results improve upon the $O(\log(t)\sqrt{m \log(m)/t})$ and $O(\log(t)\sqrt{\log(m)/t})$ bounds achieved by SMD-based anytime algorithms in Zhang et al. (2024b, Theorems 2 and 8), achieving a reduction by a factor of $O(\log t)$. The enhancement is attributed to leveraging FTRL with uniformly averaged outputs (8).

Theorem 1 provides a high-probability guarantee for each fixed $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$. We strengthen this result to a time-uniform bound that holds simultaneously for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Unlike the approach in Zhang et al. (2024a), which takes the union bound over all t with different confidence levels, our method directly leverages time-uniform concentration inequalities, leading to a tighter guarantee.

Theorem 2 Let Algorithm 3 employ Algorithm 1 as $\mathcal{A}_q$ and Algorithm 2 as $\mathcal{A}_w$, with step sizes specified by Lemma 2 for Algorithm 1 and Lemma 3 for Algorithm 2. Under Assumptions 1–4, and further assuming that the sequence $\{r_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ is oblivious, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) & \leq \frac{DG}{\sqrt{t}} \left(2\sqrt{10} + 10\sqrt{\ln \frac{16}{\delta} + 2 \ln \ln(2t)} \right) + 4\sqrt{\frac{1}{t} \left(\ln \frac{16m}{\delta} + 2 \ln \ln(2t) \right)} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(8\sqrt{\ln m} + 2\sqrt{\ln \frac{20C_{2,t}}{\delta}} \right) + \frac{m}{t} \sqrt{2 \ln m \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \left(\frac{20C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right)}} \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{t} \sqrt{2 \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{20C_{3,t}}{\delta}} + \frac{m}{t} \ln \frac{20C_{2,t}}{\delta} + \frac{1}{t} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \right) \ln \frac{80(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \\ & \quad + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{t} \ln \left(\frac{20C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right) + \frac{2m \ln m}{t} + \frac{2m}{t} \ln \frac{20C_{3,t}}{\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{1,t} = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{2}{m} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{1}{r_j}} \right) \right)^2$, $C_{2,t} = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{4}{m^2} \left(\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} + |S_t| \right) \right) \right)^2$, $C_{3,t} = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{2}{mr_j} \right) \right)^2$ with $\ln^+ x = \max\{\ln x, 0\}$, $S_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j = 1], j \in [t]\}$ and $M_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j \geq 2], j \in [t]\}$.

Remark 5 This time-uniform guarantee is $O \left(\frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \max\{\sqrt{\log m}, \log \log(t)/\sqrt{\log m}\} \right)$, which adds a minor cost compared to the fixed-time bound in (23), increasing the factor from $O(\sqrt{\log m})$ to $O(\max\{\sqrt{\log m}, \log \log(t)/\sqrt{\log m}\})$. By leveraging time-uniform concentration inequalities, we reduce the time-uniform cost from $O(\sqrt{\log t})$ (Zhang et al., 2024a) to $O(\sqrt{\log \log t})$.

4. Experiments

In our experiments, we evaluate both dynamic-resource ($r_t \in [m-1]$) and fixed-resource scenarios ($r \in [m]$) on a synthetic binary dataset ($m = 20$) and a real-world multi-class diabetes dataset ($m = 12$) (Strack et al., 2014). All the experiments are repeated 5 times and implemented with Python on a server running Ubuntu 20.04, equipped with dual Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8358P CPUs (2.60 GHz).

4.1. Datasets and Experimental Settings

We construct the synthetic dataset following prior works (Namkoong and Duchi, 2016; Soma et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023, 2024a,b). Specifically, we consider $m = 20$ distributions, each associated with a ground-truth classifier $\mathbf{w}_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^{500}$. The set $\{\mathbf{w}_i^*\}_{i \in [m]}$ is constructed following the approach outlined in the synthetic dataset by Zhang et al. (2024b). For each distribution, we randomly generate samples $(\mathbf{x}, y)$, where $\mathbf{x}$ is drawn from the standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and y is generated as $y = \text{sign}(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{w}_i^*)$ with probability 0.9, or $y = -\text{sign}(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{w}_i^*)$ with probability 0.1.

For the real-world dataset, we employ the diabetes dataset (Strack et al., 2014) to perform a multi-class classification task. The goal is to predict a patient’s hospital readmission status, categorized as readmitted within 30 days, readmitted after 30 days, or not readmitted, based on treatment-related features. The original dataset contains 101,766 instances and 47 attributes. After preprocessing by removing three features with predominantly missing values, three highly sparse features unsuitable for one-hot encoding, and two irrelevant features, we obtain a refined dataset of 99,493 instances with no missing values and 114 expanded feature dimensions. We partition the dataset into $m = 12$ groups based on the combination of three sensitive attributes: race {Caucasian, African American, Other}, age $\{\leq 60, > 60\}$, and gender {Male, Female}. Each distribution $\mathcal{P}_i$ corresponds to the empirical distribution of the samples in the i -th group.

We use the following algorithm notations in the experiments: HYB refers to Algorithm 3, where Algorithm 4 and Algorithm 2 are used as $\mathcal{A}_q$ and $\mathcal{A}_w$, respectively; UNI also uses Algorithm 3, but with Algorithm 1 as $\mathcal{A}_q$ and Algorithm 2 as $\mathcal{A}_w$; SMD(m) denotes Algorithm 1 from Zhang et al. (2023), which consumes m samples per round; and Online(1) refers to Algorithm 2 from Zhang et al. (2023), using 1 sample per round. We additionally construct a benchmark, Online(1)', which performs r_t updates in each iteration, with each update following Online(1) and using 1 sample.

Our learning objective is to train a linear model for classification, with the loss function $\ell(\cdot; \cdot)$ defined as the logistic loss. During training, samples for the synthetic dataset are generated and arrive on the fly, while for the real-world dataset, we conduct uniform sampling with replacement




Figure 2: GDRO under varying sample sizes: max risk versus the number of iterations




Figure 3: GDRO under varying sample sizes: max risk versus the running time

within each group. During evaluation, for all datasets, the expected loss is approximated by the empirical average loss computed over a large number of samples drawn from each distribution.

4.2. Dynamic-resource Scenario

We set the number of samples that can be queried in each round to vary over time and be strictly less than m , i.e., uniformly sampling $r_t \in [1, m - 1]$ in each round. In this setting, SMD(m) is inapplicable, while Online(1), Online(1)', HYB and UNI can be employed. Figs. 2 and 3 present the maximum risk versus the number of iterations and the running time, respectively. In both figures, the risk curves of HYB and UNI are closely aligned, indicating similar empirical performance. Fig. 2 shows that the risks of HYB and UNI decrease more rapidly than that of Online(1) and are comparable to that of Online(1)'. This observation supports our theoretical results that HYB and UNI achieve a faster convergence rate of $O\left(\frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \log m}\right)$, compared to the rate of $O(\sqrt{m \log(m)/T})$ attained by Online(1). The fast risk reduction of Online(1)' benefits from performing r_t updates within each iteration. Fig. 3 shows that HYB and UNI attain lower risks within the same running time compared to both Online(1) and Online(1)', highlighting the advantage in processing multi-




Figure 4: HYB under different fixed sample sizes: max risk versus the number of iterations




Figure 5: HYB under different fixed sample sizes: max risk versus the number of samples

ple samples simultaneously. Despite identical per-update costs, Online(1)' converges slower than Online(1) due to the lack of a theoretically justified algorithm design and step-size schedule.

4.3. Fixed-resource Scenario

We consider a scenario with a fixed number of samples $r \in \{1, 5, 10, 15, 20\}$ for the synthetic dataset and $r \in \{1, 4, 7, 10, 12\}$ for the diabetes dataset. We denote HYB and UNI with r samples as HYB(r) and UNI(r), respectively. The corresponding results are presented in Figs. 4, 5 and Figs. 6, 7. For HYB and UNI with different fixed samples, Figs. 4 and 6 demonstrate that processing more samples per round leads to faster risk reduction, aligning with the theoretical bound of $O(\sqrt{m \log(m)/rt})$ for fixed r . Unlike Online(1) and SMD(m) using fixed step sizes, HYB(r) and UNI(r) adopt diminishing step sizes. This results in larger initial steps and therefore faster risk reduction in the early stages for HYB(r) and UNI(r). Fig. 5 shows that the final risks of SMD(m) and Online(1) closely match those of HYB across different sample sizes, which is also observed for UNI in Fig. 7. This observation aligns with the shared sample complexity of $O(\sqrt{m \log(m)/T})$.




Figure 6: UNI under different fixed sample sizes: max risk versus the number of iterations




Figure 7: UNI under different fixed sample sizes: max risk versus the number of samples

5. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we investigate GDRO in a general setting where an arbitrary and potentially varying number of samples can be queried in each round. We propose two novel PLA algorithms and establish the first high-probability regret bound in the non-oblivious setting. Based on our PLA methods, we develop a GDRO algorithm that enables flexible sample querying. Our theoretical results demonstrate that increasing the number of samples accelerates convergence, generalize existing results, and imply consistent sample complexity for any fixed sample size per round.

Future work could extend support for arbitrary and varying sample queries to other optimization algorithms, such as the MRO algorithm (Zhang et al., 2024a), and to practical applications with dynamic sampling, including recommendation systems (Wang et al., 2025) and large language models (Xie et al., 2023; Qiu et al., 2024; Ramesh et al., 2024).

References

Alekh Agarwal and Tong Zhang. Minimax regret optimization for robust machine learning under distribution shift. In *Proceedings of 35th Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2704–2729, 2022.

- Kareem Amin, Satyen Kale, Gerald Tesauro, and Deepak Turaga. Budgeted prediction with expert advice. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 29(1), 2015.
- Peter Auer, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, and Robert E. Schapire. The nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 32(1):48–77, 2002.
- Sébastien Bubeck and Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi. Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 5(1):1–122, 2012.
- Yair Carmon and Danielle Hausler. Distributionally robust optimization via ball oracle acceleration. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35*, pages 35866–35879, 2022.
- N. Cesa-Bianchi and G. Lugosi. *Prediction, Learning, and Games*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Ashok Cutkosky. Anytime online-to-batch, optimism and acceleration. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1446–1454, 2019.
- Erick Delage and Yinyu Ye. Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations research*, 58(3):595–612, 2010.
- John C. Duchi and Hongseok Namkoong. Learning models with uniform performance via distributionally robust optimization. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(3):1378–1406, 2021.
- Rick Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*, volume 49. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- David A. Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *The Annals of Probability*, 3(1):100–118, 1975.
- Joao Gama, Indre Zliobaite, Albert Bifet, Mykol Pechenizkiy, and Abdelhamid Bouchachia. A survey on concept drift adaptation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 46(4):1–37, 2014.
- Rajiv Gandhi, Samir Khuller, Srinivasan Parthasarathy, and Aravind Srinivasan. Dependent rounding and its applications to approximation algorithms. *Journal of the ACM*, 53(3):324–360, 2006.
- Richard Golden. *Statistical machine learning: A unified framework*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2020.
- Nika Haghtalab, Michael I. Jordan, and Eric Zhao. On-demand sampling: Learning optimally from multiple distributions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35*, pages 406–419, 2022.
- Satyen Kale. Multiarmed bandits with limited expert advice. In *Proceedings of The 27th Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 107–122, 2014.
- Tomás Kocák, Gergely Neu, Michal Valko, and Rémi Munos. Efficient learning by implicit exploration in bandit problems with side observations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27*, pages 613–621, 2014.
- Ira Ktena, Olivia Wiles, Isabela Albuquerque, Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Ryutaro Tanno, Abhijit Guha Roy, Shekoofeh Azizi, Danielle Belgrave, Pushmeet Kohli, Taylan Cemgil, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Sven Gowal. Generative models improve fairness of medical classifiers under distribution shifts. *Nature Medicine*, 30(4):1166–1173, 2024.

- Kun Kuang, Peng Cui, Susan Athey, Ruoxuan Xiong, and Bo Li. Stable prediction across unknown environments. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1617–1626, 2018.
- Harin Lee and Min hwan Oh. Minimax optimal reinforcement learning with quasi-optimism. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- Harin Lee, Taehyun Hwang, and Min hwan Oh. Lasso bandit with compatibility condition on optimal arm. *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2406.00823, 2025.
- Mehryar Mohri, Gary Sivek, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Agnostic federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4615–4625, 2019.
- Hongseok Namkoong and John C Duchi. Stochastic gradient methods for distributionally robust optimization with f-divergences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 2208–2216, 2016.
- A. Nemirovski, A. Juditsky, G. Lan, and A. Shapiro. Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(4):1574–1609, 2009.
- Gergely Neu. Explore no more: Improved high-probability regret bounds for non-stochastic bandits. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, pages 3168–3176, 2015.
- Quan Nguyen, Nishant A. Mehta, and Cristóbal Guzmán. Beyond minimax rates in group distributionally robust optimization via a novel notion of sparsity. *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2410.00690, 2024.
- Francesco Orabona. A modern introduction to online learning. *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1912.13213, 2023.
- Zi-Hao Qiu, Siqi Guo, Mao Xu, Tuo Zhao, Lijun Zhang, and Tianbao Yang. To cool or not to cool? temperature network meets large foundation models via DRO. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 41604–41643, 2024.
- Hamed Rahimian and Sanjay Mehrotra. Frameworks and results in distributionally robust optimization. *Open Journal of Mathematical Optimization*, 3:1–85, 2022.
- Shyam Sundhar Ramesh, Yifan Hu, Iason Chaimalas, Viraj Mehta, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Haitham Bou Ammar, and Ilija Bogunovic. Group robust preference optimization in reward-free rlhf. *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2405.20304, 2024.
- Christophe Roux, Elias Wirth, Sebastian Pokutta, and Thomas Kerdreux. Efficient online-bandit strategies for minimax learning problems. *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2105.13939, 2021.
- El Mehdi Saad and Gilles Blanchard. Fast rates for prediction with limited expert advice. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34*, pages 23582–23591, 2021.
- El Mehdi Saad and Gilles Blanchard. Constant regret for sequence prediction with limited advice. In *Proceedings of The 34th International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 1343–1386, 2023.

- Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Tatsunori B. Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. Distributionally robust neural networks for group shifts: On the importance of regularization for worst-case generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Yevgeny Seldin, Peter Bartlett, Koby Crammer, and Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori. Prediction with limited advice and multiarmed bandits with paid observations. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 280–287, 2014.
- Agnieszka Słowik and Léon Bottou. On distributionally robust optimization and data rebalancing. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1283–1297, 2022.
- Tasuku Soma, Khashayar Gatmiry, and Stefanie Jegelka. Optimal algorithms for group distributionally robust optimization and beyond. *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2212.13669, 2022.
- Beata Strack, Jonathan P. DeShazo, Chris Gennings, Juan L. Olmo, Sebastian Ventura, Krzysztof J. Cios, and John N. Clore. Impact of hba1c measurement on hospital readmission rates: Analysis of 70,000 clinical database patient records. *BioMed Research International*, 2014(1):781670, 2014.
- Masashi Sugiyama, Matthias Krauledat, and Klaus-Robert Müller. Covariate shift adaptation by importance weighted cross validation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(35):985–1005, 2007.
- Tobias Sommer Thune and Yevgeny Seldin. Adaptation to easy data in prediction with limited advice. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pages 2909–2918, 2018.
- Taishi Uchiya, Atsuyoshi Nakamura, and Mineichi Kudo. Algorithms for adversarial bandit problems with multiple plays. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 375–389, 2010.
- Vladimir N. Vapnik. *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*. Springer, second edition, 2000.
- Nuri Mert Vural, Hakan Gokcesu, Kaan Gokcesu, and Suleyman S. Kozat Kozat. Minimax optimal algorithms for adversarial bandit problem with multiple plays. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(16):4383–4398, 2019.
- Yibo Wang, Yingchun Jian, Wenhao Yang, Shiyin Lu, Lei Shen, Bing Wang, Xiaoyi Zeng, and Lijun Zhang. Towards unbiased information extraction and adaptation in cross-domain recommendation. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 39(12):12757–12765, 2025.
- Sang Michael Xie, Hieu Pham, Xuanyi Dong, Nan Du, Hanxiao Liu, Yifeng Lu, Percy S Liang, Quoc V Le, Tengyu Ma, and Adams Wei Yu. Doremi: Optimizing data mixtures speeds up language model pretraining. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36*, pages 69798–69818, 2023.
- Dingzhi Yu, Yunuo Cai, Wei Jiang, and Lijun Zhang. Efficient algorithms for empirical group distributionally robust optimization and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 57384–57414, 2024.

Donggyu Yun, Alexandre Proutiere, Sumyeong Ahn, Jinwoo Shin, and Yung Yi. Multi-armed bandit with additional observations. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems*, 2(1):1–22, 2018.

Lijun Zhang, Peng Zhao, Zhenhua Zhuang, Tianbao Yang, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Stochastic approximation approaches to group distributionally robust optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36*, pages 52490–52522, 2023.

Lijun Zhang, Haomin Bai, Wei-Wei Tu, Ping Yang, and Yao Hu. Efficient stochastic approximation of minimax excess risk optimization. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 58599–58630, 2024a.

Lijun Zhang, Haomin Bai, Peng Zhao, Tianbao Yang, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Stochastic approximation approaches to group distributionally robust optimization and beyond. *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2302.09267, 2024b.

Xiongtao Zhang, Xiaomin Zhu, Ji Wang, Hui Yan, Huangke Chen, and Weidong Bao. Federated learning with adaptive communication compression under dynamic bandwidth and unreliable networks. *Information Sciences*, 540:242–262, 2020.

Appendix A. Hybrid Strategy for PLA

In this section, we present the hybrid strategy for the q -player, along with its theoretical guarantees. Note that the unified strategy in Algorithm 1 is built upon this hybrid method. Compared to Algorithm 1, the hybrid strategy is more intuitive and easier to analysis, as it separately executes two sub-algorithms. In the hybrid strategy, we run Exp3-IX during single-sample rounds ($r_t = 1$) and PrLiA during multiple-sample rounds ($r_t \geq 2$). We maintain two separate cumulative loss estimators $\mathbf{L}_t^s$ and $\mathbf{L}_t^m$ to update $\mathbf{q}_t$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{q}_t = \begin{cases} \underset{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \langle \eta_{q,t}^s \mathbf{L}_{t-1}^s, \mathbf{q} \rangle + \nu_q(\mathbf{q}) \}, & r_t = 1 \\ \underset{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \langle \eta_{q,t}^m \mathbf{L}_{t-1}^m, \mathbf{q} \rangle + \nu_q(\mathbf{q}) \}, & r_t \geq 2 \end{cases}, \quad (24)$$

where $\eta_{q,t}^s$ and $\eta_{q,t}^m$ denote the step sizes for single-sample and multiple-sample rounds, respectively. Similar to (11), the close-form solution to (24) for all $i \in [m]$ is given as

$$q_{t,i} = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(-\eta_{q,t}^s L_{t-1,i}^s)}{\sum_{k=1}^m \exp(-\eta_{q,t}^s L_{t-1,k}^s)}, & r_t = 1 \\ \frac{\exp(-\eta_{q,t}^m L_{t-1,i}^m)}{\sum_{k=1}^m \exp(-\eta_{q,t}^m L_{t-1,k}^m)}, & r_t \geq 2 \end{cases}. \quad (25)$$

The step sizes are then set as

$$\eta_{q,t}^s = 2\gamma_t = \sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{m \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbb{I}[r_j = 1]}}, \quad \eta_{q,t}^m = \sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{m \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{1}{r_j} \mathbb{I}[r_j \geq 2]}}. \quad (26)$$

Algorithm 4 Hybrid Strategy for PLA

Input: an environment oracle $\mathcal{E}$

- 1: Initialize $\mathbf{L}_0^s = \mathbf{L}_0^m = \mathbf{0}_m$
 - 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Receive r_t from $\mathcal{E}$
 - 4: Update $\mathbf{q}_t$ according to (25)
 - 5: **if** $r_t = 1$ **then**
 - 6: Select $c_t \in [m]$ according to $\mathbf{q}_t$ and set $\mathcal{I}_t = \emptyset$
 - 7: **else**
 - 8: Select $c_t \in [m]$ according to $\mathbf{q}_t$ and generate $\mathcal{I}_t = \text{DepRound}(\frac{r_t-1}{m-1} \mathbf{1}_{m-1})$ from $\{[m] \setminus c_t\}$
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: Send $C_t = c_t \cup \mathcal{I}_t$ and c_t to $\mathcal{E}$
 - 11: Receive losses $\hat{s}_{t,i}$ for all $i \in C_t$ from $\mathcal{E}$
 - 12: Construct $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t$ in (14), and update $\mathbf{L}_t^s$ and $\mathbf{L}_t^m$ according to (27)
 - 13: **end for**
-

We follow the same sampling process and loss estimation $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t$ as in Algorithm 1. Based on the value of r_t , we update either $\mathbf{L}_t^s$ or $\mathbf{L}_t^m$ as

$$\mathbf{L}_t^s = \mathbf{L}_{t-1}^s + \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t \cdot \mathbb{I}[r_t = 1], \quad \mathbf{L}_t^m = \mathbf{L}_{t-1}^m + \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t \cdot \mathbb{I}[r_t \geq 2]. \quad (27)$$

with the initialization as $\mathbf{L}_0^s = \mathbf{L}_0^m = \mathbf{0}_m$. The procedure for the hybrid strategy is outlined in Algorithm 4. We present the theoretical guarantee for Algorithm 4 as follows.

Lemma 4 *Let $\eta_{q,t}^s$ and $\eta_{q,t}^m$ be defined in (26) for Algorithm 4. Under Assumption 3, we have for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Regret}'_{q,t} &\leq 4 \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{6}{\delta}} + \sqrt{\ln m} \right) + \left(\sqrt{\frac{m|S_t|}{\ln m}} + 1 \right) \ln \frac{8}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{|S_t|}{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right) \\ &\quad + m \sqrt{\ln m} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{6}{\delta}} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} \ln \frac{6}{\delta} + m \ln \frac{6m}{\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where $S_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j = 1], j \in [t]\}$ and $M_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j \geq 2], j \in [t]\}$.

Remark 6 Both Algorithm 1 (unified) and Algorithm 4 (hybrid) achieve the same order of regret bound. Consequently, when integrated into Algorithm 3, the hybrid strategy achieves the same order of optimization error as the unified strategy, as established in Theorem 2.

By integrating Algorithms 2 and 4 into Algorithm 3, and combining Lemmas 1, 4, and 3, we obtain the following bound on the optimization error.

Theorem 3 Let Algorithm 3 employ Algorithm 4 as $\mathcal{A}_q$ and Algorithm 2 as $\mathcal{A}_w$, with step sizes specified by Lemma 4 for Algorithm 4 and Lemma 3 for Algorithm 2. Under Assumptions 1–4, we have for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \\
 & \leq \frac{DG}{\sqrt{t}} \left(2\sqrt{10} + 8\sqrt{\ln \frac{4}{\delta}} \right) + \frac{4}{t} \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{24}{\delta}} + \sqrt{\ln m} \right) + \frac{1}{t} \left(\sqrt{\frac{m|S_t|}{\ln m}} + 1 \right) \ln \frac{32}{\delta} \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\frac{|S_t|}{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{16}{\delta} \right) + \frac{m}{t} \sqrt{\ln m \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{24}{\delta}} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3t} \ln \frac{24}{\delta} + \frac{m}{t} \ln \frac{24m}{\delta} \\
 & \quad + \sqrt{\frac{2}{t}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{4m}{\delta} \right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $S_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j = 1], j \in [t]\}$ and $M_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j \geq 2], j \in [t]\}$.

Remark 7 Following the proof of time-uniform guarantee in Lemma 2, one can similarly derive a time-uniform version of Theorem 3. The resulting bound retains the same order, namely, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with high probability, $\text{Regret}'_{q,t} = O\left(\frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \max\{\sqrt{\log m}, \log \log(t)/\sqrt{\log m}\}\right)$.

Appendix B. Supporting Algorithm: DepRound

The DepRound algorithm has been extensively employed in combinatorial semi-bandit algorithms (Uchiya et al., 2010; Vural et al., 2019; Roux et al., 2021). DepRound takes as input a vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ and $\|\mathbf{p}\|_1 = k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and outputs a set $\mathcal{I}$ such that $\Pr[i \in \mathcal{I}] = p_i$ and $|\mathcal{I}| = k$, with a computational complexity $O(m)$ for both time and space. The DepRound procedure is outlined in Algorithm 5.

Algorithm 5 DepRound

Input: vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ that satisfies $\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{1}$ and $\|\mathbf{p}\|_1 = k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$

- 1: **while** $\exists i \in [m]$ s.t. $p_i \in (0, 1)$ **do**
- 2: Choose any $i, j \in [m]$ with $i \neq j$ and $p_i \in (0, 1), p_j \in (0, 1)$
- 3: Set $\alpha = \min\{1 - p_i, p_j\}$ and $\beta = \min\{p_i, 1 - p_j\}$
- 4: Update

$$(p_i, p_j) = \begin{cases} (p_i + \alpha, p_j - \alpha) & \text{with probability } \frac{\beta}{\alpha + \beta} \\ (p_i - \beta, p_j + \beta) & \text{with probability } \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta} \end{cases}$$

- 5: **end while**
 - 6: **return** $\mathcal{I} = \{i \in [m] \mid p_i = 1\}$
-

Appendix C. Analysis

C.1. Supporting Lemmas

We give some supporting lemmas as follows.

Lemma 5 (*Seldin et al., 2014, Lemma 7*) For any probability distribution $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$ and any $r \in [m]$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{q_i(m-1)}{q_i(m-r) + r - 1} \leq \frac{m}{r}. \quad (30)$$

Lemma 6 (*Seldin et al., 2014, Lemma 8*) For any sequence of non-negative numbers $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_t$, such that $a_1 > 0$, and any power $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{a_j}{(\sum_{s=1}^t a_s)^\gamma} \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(\sum_{j=1}^t a_j \right)^{1-\gamma}. \quad (31)$$

We present two classical concentration inequalities: Azuma's inequality and Bernstein's inequality as follows.

Lemma 7 (*Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006, Lemma A.7*) Let $V_1, V_2, \dots$ be a martingale difference sequence with respect to some sequence $X_1, X_2, \dots$ such that $V_i \in [A_i, A_i + c_i]$ for some random variable A_i , measurable with respect to $X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}$ and a positive constant c_i . If $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n V_i$, then for any $t > 0$,

$$\Pr[S_n > t] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2} \right).$$

Lemma 8 (*Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006, Lemma A.8*) Let $\{X_j\}_{j \in [t]}$ be a bounded martingale difference sequence satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[X_j] = 0, \quad |X_j| \leq K, \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq V, \quad \forall j \in [t],$$

where K and V are all finite positive values. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^t X_j \leq \sqrt{2V \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{2}{3} K \ln \frac{1}{\delta}.$$

Note that both Lemmas 7 and 8 hold only for a fixed time horizon t . In the following, we present two time-uniform versions to establish time-uniform guarantee.

Lemma 9 (*Lee et al., 2025, Lemma 27*) Let $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a real-valued martingale difference sequence adapted to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$. Assume that $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ is conditionally σ -sub-Gaussian, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[e^{sX_t} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq e^{\frac{s^2 \sigma^2}{2}}$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, the following inequality holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$:

$$\sum_{t=1}^n X_t \leq 2^{\frac{3}{4}} \sigma \sqrt{n \ln \frac{7(\ln 2n)^2}{2\delta}}.$$

A time-uniform version of Bernstein's inequality is presented in Lee and hwan Oh (2025, Lemma 37), but it relies on a uniform upper bound on the conditional variance. Instead, we adopt Theorem 3 from the author's blog ¹ which provides a bound that depends on the cumulative conditional variance. For completeness, we provide its proof in Appendix C.9.

1. <https://harinboy.github.io/posts/FreedmansInequality/>

Lemma 10 *Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a martingale difference sequence with respect to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$. Suppose $X_n \leq 1$ holds almost surely for all n . Let $T_n = \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$. Then, the following inequality holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \leq 2 \ln \frac{2(1 + \ln^+ T_n)^2}{\delta} + 2 \sqrt{T_n \ln \frac{2(1 + \ln^+ T_n)^2}{\delta}},$$

where $\ln^+ x = \max\{\ln x, 0\}$.

Using similar techniques, we can establish an extension of Lemma 9, which characterizes different modules of conditional Gaussian random variables. Evidently, the dependence on $\sqrt{\Sigma_n^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^n \sigma_t^2}$ can be much tighter than the $\sigma\sqrt{n}$ dependence in Lemma 9. The proof of Lemma 11 can be found in Appendix C.10.

Lemma 11 (Heterogeneous version of Lemma 9) *Let $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a real-valued martingale difference sequence adapted to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$. Assume that X_t is conditionally σ_t -sub-Gaussian, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[e^{sX_t} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq e^{\frac{s^2 \sigma_t^2}{2}}$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, the following inequality holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$:*

$$\sum_{t=1}^n X_t \leq \sqrt{(\Sigma_n^2 + 3 \max\{\Sigma_n^2, 1\}) \ln \frac{\pi^2 (1 + \ln^+ \Sigma_n^2)^2}{6\delta}}.$$

where $\Sigma_n^2 = \sum_{t=1}^n \sigma_t^2$ and $\ln^+ x = \max\{\ln x, 0\}$.

C.2. Proof of Theorem 1

By substituting the results of Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 into Lemma 1, we complete the proof.

C.3. Proof of Theorem 2

The analysis proceeds by decomposing the time-uniform optimization error and then bounding regrets for both the w player and the q player.

Lemma 12 *Under Assumptions 1-4, suppose that*

1. *The w -player is equipped with a non-oblivious OCO algorithm $\mathcal{A}_w$, and with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, the regret $\text{Regret}_{w,t}$ is upper bounded by $U_w(t, \delta)$.*
2. *The q -player is equipped with a non-oblivious OCO algorithm $\mathcal{A}_q$, and with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, the regret $\text{Regret}'_{q,t}$ is upper bounded by $U_q(t, \delta)$.*

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \leq \frac{1}{t} U_w\left(t, \frac{\delta}{4}\right) + \frac{1}{t} U_q\left(t, \frac{\delta}{4}\right) + 4 \sqrt{\frac{1}{t} \left(\ln \frac{16m}{\delta} + 2 \ln \ln(2t) \right)}.$$

Lemma 13 Let $\eta_{q,t}$ and γ_t be defined in (13) and (15) for Algorithm 1. Under Assumption 3 and further assuming $\{r_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ is an oblivious sequence, we obtain with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Regret}'_{q,t} \leq & \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(8\sqrt{\ln m} + 2\sqrt{\ln \frac{5C_{2,t}}{\delta}} \right) + m \sqrt{2 \ln m \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j}} \ln \left(\frac{5C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right)} \\ & + 2 \sqrt{2 \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{5C_{3,t}}{\delta}} + m \ln \frac{5C_{2,t}}{\delta} + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \right) \ln \frac{20(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \\ & + m^2 \sqrt{\ln m} \ln \left(\frac{5C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right) + 2m \ln m + 2m \ln \frac{5C_{3,t}}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{1,t} = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{2}{m} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{1}{r_j}} \right) \right)^2$, $C_{2,t} = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{4}{m^2} \left(\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} + |S_t| \right) \right) \right)^2$, $C_{3,t} = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{2}{mr_j} \right) \right)^2$ with $\ln^+ x = \max\{\ln x, 0\}$, $S_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j = 1], j \in [t]\}$ and $M_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j \geq 2], j \in [t]\}$.

Lemma 14 Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 4, and setting $\eta_{w,t} = \frac{\sqrt{2}D}{\sqrt{5}G} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$ for Algorithm 2, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\text{Regret}_{w,t} \leq DG\sqrt{t} \left(2\sqrt{10} + 10\sqrt{\ln \frac{4}{\delta}} + 2 \ln \ln(2t) \right).$$

By substituting the results of Lemma 13 and Lemma 14 into Lemma 12, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \\ \leq & \frac{DG}{\sqrt{t}} \left(2\sqrt{10} + 10\sqrt{\ln \frac{16}{\delta}} + 2 \ln \ln(2t) \right) + 4\sqrt{\frac{1}{t} \left(\ln \frac{16m}{\delta} + 2 \ln \ln(2t) \right)} \\ & + \frac{1}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(8\sqrt{\ln m} + 2\sqrt{\ln \frac{20C_{2,t}}{\delta}} \right) + \frac{m}{t} \sqrt{2 \ln m \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j}} \ln \left(\frac{20C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right)} \\ & + \frac{2}{t} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j}} \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{20C_{3,t}}{\delta}} + \frac{m}{t} \ln \frac{20C_{2,t}}{\delta} + \frac{1}{t} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \right) \ln \frac{80(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \\ & + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{t} \ln \left(\frac{20C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right) + \frac{2m \ln m}{t} + \frac{2m}{t} \ln \frac{20C_{3,t}}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{1,t}, C_{2,t}, C_{3,t} = O((\log t)^2)$.

C.4. Proof of Theorem 3

By substituting the results of Lemma 4 and Lemma 3 into Lemma 1, we complete the proof.

C.5. Proof of Lemma 1

By Jensen's inequality and the outputs $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbf{w}_j$ and $\bar{\mathbf{q}}_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbf{q}_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) &= \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi(\mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{t} \left(\max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_j) \right) \\
 &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{t} \left(\max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) \right)}_{\text{Regret}_{q,t}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{t} \left(\sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_j) \right)}_{\text{Regret}_{w,t}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

For the first term $\text{Regret}_{q,t}$, by the definition of $\phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q})$ in (2) and the property of linear optimization over the simplex Δ_m , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Regret}_{q,t} &= \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}) - \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) \\
 &= \max_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \sum_{i=1}^m q_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^t R_i(\mathbf{w}_j) \right) - \sum_{j=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} R_i(\mathbf{w}_j) \\
 &= \sum_{j=1}^t R_{k^*}(\mathbf{w}_j) - \sum_{j=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} R_i(\mathbf{w}_j) = \sum_{j=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} s_{j,i} - \sum_{j=1}^t s_{j,k^*} \\
 &= \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \mathbf{s}_j \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,k^*} + \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,k^*} - \sum_{j=1}^t s_{j,k^*} \\
 &\leq \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \mathbf{s}_j \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle}_{\text{term}(\mathbf{e}_1)} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \min_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,i}}_{\text{Regret}'_{q,t}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,k^*} - \sum_{j=1}^t s_{j,k^*}}_{\text{term}(\mathbf{e}_2)},
 \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $k^* = \arg\max_{k \in [m]} \sum_{j=1}^t R_k(\mathbf{w}_j)$, $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is defined in (7) and the vector $\mathbf{s}_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is defined as

$$s_{j,i} = \mathbb{E}[\hat{s}_{j,i}] = 1 - R_i(\mathbf{w}_j) = 1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{P}_i}[\ell(\mathbf{w}_j; \mathbf{z})] \stackrel{(5)}{\in} [0, 1], \quad \forall i \in [m]. \tag{34}$$

For $\text{term}(\mathbf{e}_1)$, we utilize the Hoeffding-Azuma inequality (Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006) in Lemma 7 to establish a high probability bound. Denoting $V_j = \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \mathbf{s}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle$, by (34) and (7), we know $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[V_j] = 0$ and $|V_j| \leq 1$ for all $j \in [t]$. By Lemma 7, we have for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\text{term}(\mathbf{e}_1) = \sum_{j=1}^t V_j \leq \sqrt{2t \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{t}{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right). \tag{35}$$

Similarly, for $\text{term}(\mathbf{e}_2)$, we can verify that for all $i \in [m]$, $V'_{j,i} = \hat{s}_{j,i} - s_{j,i}$ is a martingale difference sequence bounded by 1, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[V'_{j,i}] = 0$ and $|V'_{j,i}| \leq 1$ for all $j \in [t]$. Thus, by Lemma 7 and taking the union bound over $i \in [m]$, we have for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\text{term}(\mathbf{e}_2) = \sum_{j=1}^t V'_{j,k^*} \leq \sqrt{2t \ln \frac{m}{\delta}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{t}{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{m}{\delta}\right). \quad (36)$$

By substituting (35) and (36) into (33), and subsequently combining the result with (32), we obtain the high-probability bound stated in (9).

C.6. Proof of Lemma 2

By defining $\nu_{q,t}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\eta_{q,t}} (\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \nu_q(\mathbf{q}))$, the update rule in (11) can be reformulated as the standard FTRL update rule

$$\mathbf{q}_t = \underset{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \langle \mathbf{L}_{t-1}, \mathbf{q} \rangle + \nu_{q,t}(\mathbf{q}) \}.$$

Since $\eta_{q,t}$ is a non-increasing sequence, by the results from Orabona (2023, Remark 7.4., Lemma 7.14 and §7.5), we can derive for each $i \in [m]$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^t (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \tilde{s}_{j,i}) \leq \frac{\ln m}{\eta_{q,t}} + \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} (\tilde{s}_{j,i})^2. \quad (37)$$

This bound can also be derived by an intermediate step in the analysis of Exp3 (Bubeck and Cesa-Bianchi, 2012, Theorem 3.1), which is applied as Lemma 5 in Seldin et al. (2014).

Let $k^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,i}$, and $S_t = \{j | r_j = 1, j \in [t]\}$ and $M_t = \{j | r_j \geq 2, j \in [t]\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Regret}'_{q,t} &\stackrel{(6)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \min_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,i} = \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,k^*} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^t (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \tilde{s}_{j,k^*}) + \sum_{j=1}^t (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle) + \sum_{j=1}^t (\tilde{s}_{j,k^*} - \hat{s}_{j,k^*}) \\ &\stackrel{(37)}{\leq} \frac{\ln m}{\eta_{q,t}} + \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} (\tilde{s}_{j,i})^2 + \sum_{j=1}^t (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle) + \sum_{j=1}^t (\tilde{s}_{j,k^*} - \hat{s}_{j,k^*}). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Then, we analyze the bias introduced by $\tilde{s}_{j,i}$ when $j \in S_t$. For $r_j = 1$, the selected distribution set $C_j = c_j$. Using Neu (2015, (5)), for $j \in S_t$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{I}[i = c_j] \frac{\hat{s}_{j,i} (q_{j,i} + \gamma_j)}{q_{j,i} + \gamma_j} - \gamma_j \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{I}[i = c_j] \frac{\hat{s}_{j,i}}{q_{j,i} + \gamma_j} = \hat{s}_{j,c_j} - \gamma_j \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{j,i}. \quad (39)$$

By combining (39) with (38), and noting that $S_t \cup M_t = [t]$ and $q_{j,i} \tilde{s}_{j,i} \leq 1$ for all $j \in S_t, i \in [m]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Regret}'_{q,t} &\leq \frac{\ln m}{\eta_{q,t}} + \sum_{j \in S_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{j,i} + \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} (\tilde{s}_{j,i})^2 \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j \in S_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle) + \sum_{j \in M_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle) + \sum_{j=1}^t (\tilde{s}_{t,k^*} - \hat{s}_{t,k^*}) \\
 &\stackrel{(39)}{\leq} \frac{\ln m}{\eta_{q,t}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j \in S_t} \left(\frac{\eta_{q,j}}{2} + \gamma_j \right) \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{j,i}}_{\text{term(a)}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} (\tilde{s}_{j,i})^2}_{\text{term(b)}} \\
 &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{j \in S_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,c_j}) + \sum_{j \in M_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)}_{\text{term(c)}} \\
 &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{j \in S_t} (\tilde{s}_{j,k^*} - \hat{s}_{j,k^*})}_{\text{term(d)}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j \in M_t} (\tilde{s}_{j,k^*} - \hat{s}_{j,k^*})}_{\text{term(e)}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

For term(a), we invoke Lemma 2 in [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#) and extend it to any subset of $[t]$ as follows.

Lemma 15 *Let $\hat{\xi}_{j,i} \in [0, 1]$ for all $j \in [t]$ and $i \in [m]$, and $\tilde{\xi}_{j,i}$ be its IX-estimator defined as $\tilde{\xi}_{j,i} = \frac{\hat{\xi}_{j,i}}{p_{j,i} + \gamma_j} \mathbb{I}[i_j = i]$, where the index i_j is sampled from $[m]$ according to the distribution $\mathbf{p}_j \in \Delta_m$. Let $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^t$ be a non-increasing positive sequence and $\alpha_{j,i}$ be non-negative $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$ -measurable random variables satisfying $\alpha_{j,i} \leq 2\gamma_j$ for all $j \in [t]$ and $i \in [m]$. Let S be a subset of $[t]$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\sum_{j \in S} \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} (\tilde{\xi}_{j,i} - \hat{\xi}_{j,i}) \leq \ln \frac{1}{\delta}. \tag{41}$$

Note that for all $j \in S_t$, our construction of $\tilde{s}_{j,i}$ satisfies the requirements of Lemma 15. Therefore, by setting $S = S_t$, $\alpha_{j,i} = \eta_{q,j}$ for all $j \in [t]$ and $i \in [m]$, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{j \in S_t} \left(\frac{\eta_{q,j}}{2} + \gamma_j \right) \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{j,i} \stackrel{(13)}{=} \sum_{j \in S_t} \eta_{q,j} \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{j,i} \stackrel{(41)}{\leq} \sum_{j \in S_t} \eta_{q,j} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{s}_{t,i} + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \\
 &\stackrel{(7)}{\leq} \sum_{j \in S_t} \eta_{q,j} m + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \stackrel{(13)}{=} \sum_{j \in S_t} \sqrt{\frac{m \ln m}{\sum_{s=1}^j \frac{1}{r_s}}} + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \leq \sum_{j \in S_t} \sqrt{\frac{m \ln m}{|[j] \cap S_t|}} + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \\
 &\leq 2\sqrt{|S_t| m \ln m} + \ln \frac{1}{\delta},
 \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact $\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \leq \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} dx = 2\sqrt{x}|_0^t = 2\sqrt{t}$.

For term(b), we denote $Q_j = \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} (\tilde{s}_{j,i})^2$ for $j \in [t]$ and present the following lemma.

Lemma 16 We define a real-valued sequence $\{Q_j\}_{j=1}^t$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For each $j \in [t]$, the sequence is defined as $Q_j = \frac{\eta_j}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} (\tilde{s}_{j,i})^2$, where η_j is a non-increasing step size and $\mathbf{q}_j \in \Delta_m$. The term $\tilde{s}_{j,i} = \frac{\hat{s}_{j,i}}{q_{j,i} + (1-q_{j,i}) \frac{r_j-1}{m-1}} \mathbb{I}[i \in C_j]$, where the set C_j is selected from $[m]$ such that $\Pr[i \in C_j] = q_{j,i} + (1-q_{j,i}) \frac{r_j-1}{m-1}$, where $r_j \geq 2$ and $|\hat{s}_{j,i}| \leq 1$ for all $j \in [t], i \in [m]$. Then, for any subset $S \subseteq [t]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{j \in S} Q_j \leq m \sqrt{\frac{m\eta_1}{2} \sum_{j \in S} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{m^2 \eta_1}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in S} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j}. \quad (43)$$

By setting $S = M_t$ in Lemma 16 and noting $\max_{i \in M_t} \{\eta_i\} \leq \sqrt{\ln m}$, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in M_t} Q_j &\stackrel{(43)}{\leq} m \sqrt{\frac{m\sqrt{\ln m}}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{r_j} \\ &\leq m \sqrt{\ln m} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln m}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where the last inequality is obtained by setting $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ in Lemma 6 as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{r_j} &\stackrel{(13)}{=} \frac{\sqrt{m \ln m}}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\frac{1}{r_j}}{\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^t \frac{1}{r_s}}} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{m \ln m}}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\frac{1}{r_j}}{\sqrt{\sum_{s \in \{[t] \cap M_t\}} \frac{1}{r_s}}} \stackrel{(31)}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln m}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

For term(c), we define $V_j = \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,c_j}$ when $j \in S_t$ and $V_j = \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle$ when $j \in M_t$. Then we know $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[V_j] = 0$. By Lemma 5, (34), (7) and $r_j \geq 2$ when $j \in M_t$, we know $|V_j| \leq \frac{m}{r_j} \leq \frac{m}{2}$ for all $j \in [t]$. Moreover, for $j \in S_t$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V_j^2] = \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,c_j})^2] \leq 1,$$

and for $j \in M_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V_j^2] &= \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] = \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] - (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] \stackrel{(30)}{\leq} \frac{m}{r_j} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle] \leq \frac{m}{r_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Lemma 8, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^t V_j \leq \sqrt{2 \left(\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} + |S_t| \right) \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{m}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \leq \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{m}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}. \quad (46)$$

For **term(d)**, by setting $\alpha_{j,i} = 2\gamma_j$ for all $j \in [t], i \in [m]$ in Lemma 15 and taking the union bound, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $i \in [m]$,

$$\sum_{j \in S_t} (\tilde{s}_{j,i} - \hat{s}_{j,i}) \leq \frac{1}{2\gamma_t} \ln \frac{m}{\delta} \stackrel{(13)}{=} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \ln \frac{m}{\delta} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \ln m} + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}. \quad (47)$$

For **term(e)**, we define for all $i \in [m]$, $X_{j,i} = \tilde{s}_{j,i} - \hat{s}_{j,i}$ for $j \in M_t$ and $X_{j,i} = 0$ for $j \in S_t$. It holds that $\mathbb{E}[X_{j,i}] = 0$, $|X_{j,i}| \leq m$ for all $j \in [t], i \in [m]$. When $j \in M_t$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[X_{j,i}^2] = \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[\tilde{s}_{j,i}^2] - \hat{s}_{j,i}^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[\tilde{s}_{j,i}^2] = \frac{1}{q_{j,i} + (1 - q_{j,i}) \frac{r_j - 1}{m - 1}} \leq \frac{m}{r_j - 1} \leq \frac{2m}{r_j}.$$

Then by Lemma 8 and taking the union bound, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $i \in [m]$,

$$\sum_{j \in M_t} (\tilde{s}_{j,i} - \hat{s}_{j,i}) \leq 2 \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{m}{\delta}} + \frac{2m}{3} \ln \frac{m}{\delta} \leq 2 \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(\sqrt{\ln m} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) + \frac{2m}{3} \ln \frac{m}{\delta}. \quad (48)$$

Combining (42)-(48) with (40) and taking the union bound, we have for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Regret}'_{q,t} &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(2\sqrt{\ln m} + \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{5}{\delta}} \right) + 2\sqrt{|S_t| m \ln m} + \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(3\sqrt{\ln m} + 2\sqrt{\ln \frac{5}{\delta}} \right) \\ &\quad + m \sqrt{\ln m} \sqrt{\sum_{t \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{5}{\delta}} + \left(m + 1 + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \right) \ln \frac{5}{\delta} + \frac{2m}{3} \ln m \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(5\sqrt{2 \ln m} + 3\sqrt{2 \ln \frac{5}{\delta}} \right) + m \sqrt{\ln m} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{5}{\delta}} \\ &\quad + \left(m + 1 + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \right) \ln \frac{5}{\delta} + \frac{2m}{3} \ln m. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to

$$\sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{1}{r_j}} + \sqrt{|S_t|} \leq \sqrt{2 \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{1}{r_j} + 2 \sum_{t \in S_t} 1} = \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{1}{r_j}}. \quad (49)$$

C.7. Proof of Lemma 3

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^t [\phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_j)] &\leq \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w} \rangle \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w} \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

We bound the first term as follows. By defining $\nu_{w,t}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{\eta_{w,t}} (\nu_w(\mathbf{w}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w}))$, we rewrite (18) as

$$\mathbf{w}_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left\{ \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{q}_i), \mathbf{w} \right\rangle + \nu_{w,t}(\mathbf{w}) \right\}.$$

From the standard analysis of FTRL, by Corollary 7.9 in Orabona (2023) and noting ν_w is 1-strongly convex with respect to certain norm $\|\cdot\|_w$, for $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w} \rangle &\leq \frac{\nu_w(\mathbf{w}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})}{\eta_{w,t}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_{w,j} \|\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\|_{w,*}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(3),(20)}{\leq} \frac{D^2}{\eta_{w,t}} + \frac{G^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_{w,j}. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Taking maximum over the two side in (50) over $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^t [\phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_j)] \right\} &= \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_j) \\ &\stackrel{(51)}{\leq} \frac{D^2}{\eta_{w,t}} + \frac{G^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_{w,j} + \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left\{ \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^t \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w} \rangle}_{=F_t(\mathbf{w})} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

To bound $\max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} F_t(\mathbf{w})$ in (52), we cannot directly apply martingale techniques because $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{w}})] \neq 0$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} F_t(\mathbf{w})$ (Zhang et al., 2023). To address this challenge, we employ the ‘ghost iterate’ technique (Nemirovski et al., 2009, proof of Lemma 3.1), which decouples the dependency between $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ and $F_t(\mathbf{w})$. It is important to note that the referenced work applies the ‘ghost iterate’ to SMD, whereas our analysis requires constructing an FTRL-based variant. Specifically, we introduce a virtual sequence of variables that performs FTRL as

$$\mathbf{v}_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left\{ \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{q}_i) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{q}_i), \mathbf{w} \right\rangle + \nu_{w,t}(\mathbf{w}) \right\}, \quad (53)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{w}_1$. By repeating the derivation of (51), we obtain for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{w} \rangle \\
 & \leq \frac{\nu_w(\mathbf{w}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w})}{\eta_{w,t}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_{w,j} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\|_{w,*}^2 \\
 & \leq \frac{D^2}{\eta_{w,t}} + 2G^2 \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_{w,j},
 \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

where the last inequality is due to (3) and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\|_{w,*} \leq \|\phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\|_{w,*} + \|\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\|_{w,*} \\
 & \leq \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\|\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\|_{w,*}] + \|\mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\|_{w,*} \stackrel{(20)}{\leq} 2G.
 \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} F_t(\mathbf{w}) &= \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{w} \rangle \right\} \\
 & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{v}_j \rangle \\
 & \stackrel{(54)}{\leq} \frac{D^2}{\eta_{w,t}} + 2G^2 \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_{w,j} + \sum_{j=1}^t V_j,
 \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where $V_j = \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{v}_j \rangle$. From the updating rule of $\mathbf{v}_t$ in (53), we know that $\mathbf{v}_j$ is independent from $\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)$, and thus $V_1, \dots, V_t$ is a martingale difference sequence.

To establish a high probability bound for a each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |V_j| &= |\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j), \mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{v}_t \rangle| \\
 &\leq \|\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \mathbf{g}_w(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j)\|_{w,*} \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|_w \\
 &\stackrel{(55)}{\leq} 2G \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|_w \leq 2G (\|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_1\|_w + \|\mathbf{v}_t - \mathbf{w}_1\|_w) \\
 &\leq 2G \left(\sqrt{2B_w(\mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{w}_1)} + \sqrt{2B_w(\mathbf{v}_t, \mathbf{w}_1)} \right) \leq 4\sqrt{2}DG,
 \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

where the last step is by defining

$$B_w(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \nu_w(\mathbf{u}) - [\nu_w(\mathbf{v}) + \langle \nabla \nu_w(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \rangle], \quad \forall \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{W},$$

and the inequality (Nemirovski et al., 2009, (2.42))

$$\max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} B_w(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_1) \leq \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \nu_w(\mathbf{w}) \stackrel{(3)}{\leq} D^2.$$

By applying Lemma 7, we obtain for each $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^t V_j \leq 8DG \sqrt{t \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}. \quad (58)$$

Combining (52), (56) and (58), it follows that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_j) &\leq \frac{2D^2}{\eta_{w,t}} + \frac{5G^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_{w,j} + 8DG \sqrt{t \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \\ &= DG \sqrt{t} \left(2\sqrt{10} + 8\sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we set $\eta_{w,j} = \frac{\sqrt{2D}}{\sqrt{5G}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}$ and use the fact that

$$\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \leq \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} dx = 2\sqrt{x} \Big|_0^t = 2\sqrt{t}.$$

C.8. Proof of Lemma 4

We note that Algorithm 4 is hybrid, with the two estimated cumulative losses and step sizes calculated independently. The update rule for $\mathbf{q}_t$ is determined by r_t . Specifically, when $r_t = 1$, the update uses $\{\eta_{q,t}^s, \mathbf{L}_{t-1}^s\}$, whereas for $r_j \geq 2$, the update employs $\{\eta_{q,t}^m, \mathbf{L}_{t-1}^m\}$. As a result, the proof involves partitioning $\text{Regret}'_{q,t}$ into two components and independently leveraging the guarantees of two sub-algorithms.

Based on the conditions under which the two sub-algorithms operate, we divide the round indices $[t]$ into two sets: (i) for Exp3-IX, $S_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j = 1], j \in [t]\}$; (ii) for PrLiA, $M_t = \{j | \mathbb{I}[r_j \geq 2], j \in [t]\}$. Let $k^* \in \arg\min_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,i}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Regret}'_{q,t} &\stackrel{(6)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \min_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,i} = \sum_{j=1}^t \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{s}_{j,k^*} \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{j \in S_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,k^*})}_{E_s} + \underbrace{\sum_{j \in M_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,k^*})}_{E_m}, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where the last equality is due to $S_t \cup M_t = [t]$. Next, we will analyze E_s and E_m separately.

C.8.1. E_s : ERROR BOUND FOR THE SINGLE-SAMPLE CASE SUB-ALGORITHM

When $r_t = 1$, we actually employ Exp3-IX (Neu, 2015), so we can use the result in Neu (2015) with a concentration term. We have

$$E_s = \sum_{j \in S_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,c_j}) + \sum_{j \in S_t} (\hat{s}_{j,c_j} - \hat{s}_{j,k^*}). \quad (60)$$

For the first term, we define $V_j = \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,c_j}$ for $j \in S_t$ and $V_j = 0$ for $j \in M_t$. Since c_j is sampled according to $\mathbf{q}_j$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[V_j] = 0$ for all $j \in [t]$. Thus, $\{V_j\}_{j=1}^t$ a martingale

difference sequence. Moreover, by (7), we know $|V_j| \leq 1$ for all $j \in S_t$ and $|V_j| = 0$ for all $j \in M_t$. By applying Lemma 7, the following bound holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{j \in S_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,c_j}) = \sum_{j=1}^t V_j \leq \sqrt{2|S_t| \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{|S_t|}{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right). \quad (61)$$

For the second term, we note that the estimated cumulative loss $\mathbf{L}_t^s$ is updated only when $r_t = 1$, and the update of $\mathbf{q}_t$ is the same as Exp3-IX (Neu, 2015, (4)). Consequently, we utilize the result of Theorem 1 from Neu (2015). By setting $\eta_{q,t}^s = 2\gamma_t = \sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{m \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbb{I}[r_j=1]}}$ and taking the union bound over $i \in [m]$, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{j \in S_t} (\hat{s}_{j,c_j} - \hat{s}_{j,i}) \leq 4\sqrt{m|S_t| \ln m} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{m|S_t|}{\ln m}} + 1\right) \ln \frac{2}{\delta}, \quad \forall i \in [m]. \quad (62)$$

Combining (61) and (62) with (60) and taking the union bound, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$E_s \leq \sqrt{\frac{|S_t|}{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{2}{\delta}\right) + 4\sqrt{m|S_t| \ln m} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{m|S_t|}{\ln m}} + 1\right) \ln \frac{4}{\delta}. \quad (63)$$

C.8.2. E_m : ERROR BOUND FOR THE MULTIPLE-SAMPLE CASE SUB-ALGORITHM

We first decompose E_m as follows

$$\begin{aligned} E_m &= \sum_{j \in M_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,k^*}) \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{j \in M_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)}_{\text{term(f)}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j \in M_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \tilde{s}_{j,k^*})}_{\text{term(g)}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j \in M_t} (\tilde{s}_{j,k^*} - \hat{s}_{j,k^*})}_{\text{term(h)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

and proceed to bound the three terms separately.

For term(f), we define $V_j = \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle$ for $j \in M_t$ and $V_j = 0$ for $j \in S_t$. Then we know $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[V_j] = 0$ for all $j \in [t]$. For $j \in M_t$, by Lemma 5, we know $|V_j| \leq \frac{m}{r_j} \leq \frac{m}{2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V_j^2] &= \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] = \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] - \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] \\ &\stackrel{(30)}{\leq} \frac{m}{r_j} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle] = \frac{m}{r_j} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle] \stackrel{(7)}{\leq} \frac{m}{r_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Lemma 8, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{j \in M_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle) = \sum_{j=1}^t V_j \leq \sqrt{2 \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{m}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}. \quad (65)$$

For term(g), by defining $\nu_{q,j}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\eta_{q,j}^m} (\nu_q(\mathbf{q}) - \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \nu_q(\mathbf{q}))$, we can rewrite the update rule in (24) when $r_j \geq 2$ as the standard FTRL update rule

$$\mathbf{q}_j = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m} \{ \langle \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^m, \mathbf{q} \rangle + \nu_{q,j}(\mathbf{q}) \}.$$

Given that $\eta_{q,j}^m$ is a non-increasing sequence, and leveraging the similar analysis of (37), we can derive for each $i \in [m]$,

$$\sum_{j \in M_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \tilde{s}_{j,i}) \leq \frac{\ln m}{\eta_{q,t}^m} + \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}^m}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} (\tilde{s}_{j,i})^2. \quad (66)$$

By setting $S = M_t$ in Lemma 16 and noting that $\eta_{q,j}^m \leq \sqrt{\ln m}$ for $j \in M_t$ by (26), we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}^m}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{j,i} (\tilde{s}_{j,i})^2 \leq m \sqrt{\frac{m \sqrt{\ln m}}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}^m}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}^m}{r_j}}.$$

Thus, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $i \in [m]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in M_t} (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \tilde{s}_{j,i}) &\leq \frac{\ln m}{\eta_{q,t}^m} + m \sqrt{\frac{m \sqrt{\ln m}}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}^m}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}^m}{r_j}} \\ &\leq 2 \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln m} + m \sqrt{\ln m \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where the last inequality is obtained by applying Lemma 6 with $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ as follows

$$\frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}^m}{r_j} \stackrel{(26),(31)}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln m}.$$

For term(h) , by following the analysis of (48), we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $i \in [m]$,

$$\sum_{j \in M_t} (\tilde{s}_{j,i} - \hat{s}_{j,i}) \leq 2 \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(\sqrt{\ln m} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) + \frac{2m}{3} \ln \frac{m}{\delta}. \quad (68)$$

Combining (65), (67) and (68) with (64) and taking the union bound, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_m &\leq 4 \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}} + \sqrt{\ln m} \right) + m \sqrt{\ln m \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{3}{\delta}}} \\ &\quad + \frac{m}{3} \ln \frac{3}{\delta} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} \ln \frac{3}{\delta} + \frac{2m}{3} \ln \frac{3m}{\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Finally, by taking the union bound, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Regret}'_{q,t} &\stackrel{(59)}{=} E_s + E_m \\
 &\stackrel{(63),(69)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{|S_t|}{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{4}{\delta}\right) + 4\sqrt{m|S_t| \ln m} + \left(\sqrt{\frac{m|S_t|}{\ln m}} + 1\right) \ln \frac{8}{\delta} \\
 &\quad + 4\sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{6}{\delta}} + \sqrt{\ln m}\right) + m\sqrt{\ln m} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{6}{\delta}} \\
 &\quad + \frac{m}{3} \ln \frac{6}{\delta} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} \ln \frac{6}{\delta} + \frac{2m}{3} \ln \frac{6m}{\delta} \\
 &\stackrel{(49)}{\leq} 4\sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{6}{\delta}} + \sqrt{\ln m}\right) + \left(\sqrt{\frac{m|S_t|}{\ln m}} + 1\right) \ln \frac{8}{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{|S_t|}{2}} \left(1 + \ln \frac{4}{\delta}\right) \\
 &\quad + m\sqrt{\ln m} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{6}{\delta}} + \frac{m^2 \sqrt{\ln m}}{3} \ln \frac{6}{\delta} + m \ln \frac{6m}{\delta} \\
 &= O\left(\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \log m}\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

C.9. Proof of Lemma 10

The proof in this section is a direct reproduction of an online blog post², which is included here for completeness. We begin by presenting a concentration inequality (Freedman, 1975; Lee and hwan Oh, 2025).

Lemma 17 (Lee and hwan Oh, 2025, Proposition 4.) *Let $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a martingale difference sequence with respect to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$. Suppose $X_t \leq 1$ holds almost surely for all $t \geq 1$. Let $V_t := \mathbb{E}[X_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$ for $t \geq 1$ and take $\lambda > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1]$ arbitrarily. Then, the following inequality holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$\sum_{t=1}^n X_t \leq \frac{e^\lambda - 1 - \lambda}{\lambda} \sum_{t=1}^n V_t + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{1}{\delta}. \quad (70)$$

Suppose $0 < \lambda < 3$. Then, by Taylor expansion, it holds that

$$g(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^i}{(i+2)!} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^i}{2 \cdot 3^i} \leq \frac{1}{2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{3})}$$

where the first inequality holds by $n! = 2 \cdot 3 \cdots n \geq 2 \cdot 3 \cdots 3 = 2 \cdot 3^{n-2}$ for $n \geq 2$ and the last inequality holds since $0 < \lambda < 3$. Then, it holds that $\frac{e^\lambda - 1 - \lambda}{\lambda} \leq \frac{1}{2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{3})}$. Plugging in this bound to (70), we obtain that for fixed $0 < \lambda < 3$ and $T_n = \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{t=1}^n X_t \geq \frac{\lambda T_n}{2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{3})} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \leq \delta \quad (71)$$

2. <https://harinboy.github.io/posts/FreedmansInequality/>.

Taking the union bound over the following values of $\lambda = \lambda_k$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots$, we have, with probabilities $\delta_k = \frac{\delta}{2(1+k)^2}$,

$$\lambda_k = \frac{3\sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_k}}}{\sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_k}} + 3e^{\frac{k}{2}}}.$$

Plugging in this value to λ , we have

$$\frac{\lambda_k T_n}{2\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_k}{3}\right)} + \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \log \frac{1}{\delta_k} = \frac{T_n \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_k}}}{2e^{\frac{k}{2}}} + e^{\frac{k}{2}} \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_k}} + \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{1}{\delta_k}.$$

By inequality (71) and taking the union bound, the probability of $\sum_{t=1}^n X_t$ exceeding this value for any k , or equivalently exceeding the minimum of these values over k , is less than δ , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \geq \min_{k=0,1,\dots} \left(\frac{T_n}{2e^{\frac{k}{2}}} + e^{\frac{k}{2}}\right) \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_k}} + \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{1}{\delta_k}\right) \leq \delta.$$

The proof is completed by showing that the minimum is smaller than the desired value by choosing appropriate $k = k_n$ for all n . We separately deal with the cases $T_n \geq 1$ and $0 \leq T_n < 1$.

Case 1 ($T_n \geq 1$):

Choose $k_n = \lfloor \log T_n \rfloor$. Then, it holds that

$$\sqrt{T_n/e} \leq e^{\frac{k_n}{2}} \leq \sqrt{T_n}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{T_n}{2e^{\frac{k_n}{2}}} + e^{\frac{k_n}{2}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{eT_n}}{2} + \sqrt{T_n} \leq 2\sqrt{T_n}.$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{k=0,1,\dots} \left(\frac{T_n}{2e^{\frac{k}{2}}} + e^{\frac{k}{2}}\right) \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_k}} + \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{1}{\delta_k} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{T_n}{2e^{\frac{k_n}{2}}} + e^{\frac{k_n}{2}}\right) \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_{k_n}}} + \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{1}{\delta_{k_n}} \leq 2\sqrt{T_n \log \frac{1}{\delta_{k_n}}} + \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{1}{\delta_{k_n}} \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{T_n \log \frac{2(1+\log^+ T_n)^2}{\delta}} + 2 \log \frac{2(1+\log^+ T_n)^2}{\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses that $\frac{1}{\delta_{k_n}} = \frac{2(1+k_n)^2}{\delta} \leq \frac{2(1+\log^+ T_n)^2}{\delta}$ and $\frac{1}{3} \leq 2$.

Case 2 ($0 \leq T_n < 1$):

In this case, we choose $k_n = 0$. Since $T_n \leq 1$, $T_n \leq \sqrt{T_n}$ holds. Using that $\log \frac{1}{\delta_0} \geq \log 2$, it holds that $\sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_0}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log 2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta_0}$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{T_n}{2e^0} + e^0\right) \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_0}} + \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{1}{\delta_0} & \leq \sqrt{\frac{T_n}{2} \log \frac{1}{\delta_0}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log 2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta_0} + \frac{1}{3} \log \frac{1}{\delta_0} \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{T_n \log \frac{1}{\delta_0}} + 2 \log \frac{1}{\delta_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in this case, $\frac{1}{\delta_0} = \frac{2}{\delta} = \frac{2(1+\log^+ T_n)^2}{\delta}$. The proof is complete.

C.10. Proof of Lemma 11

Define $M_n(s) = \exp(s \sum_{t=1}^n X_t - s^2 \Sigma_n^2/2)$. By the definition of conditional Gaussian random variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[M_t] &= \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[M_{t-1} \exp(sX_t - s^2 \sigma_t^2/2)] \\ &= M_{t-1} \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[\exp(sX_t - s^2 \sigma_t^2/2)] \leq M_{t-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, M_n is a supermartingale. By Ville's maximal inequality (Durrett, 2019), it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : M_n(s) \geq \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \leq \delta.$$

The above inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{t=1}^n X_t \geq \frac{s \Sigma_n^2}{2} + \frac{1}{s} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \leq \delta. \quad (72)$$

We note that s in the above relation can not rely on n . Taking the union bound for the following values of $s = s_j$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots$, with probabilities $\delta_j = 6\delta/\pi^2(j+1)^2$:

$$s_j = \sqrt{e^{-j} \cdot \log \frac{\pi^2(j+1)^2}{6\delta}}$$

and plugging in these values into (72), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{t=1}^n X_t \geq \min_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\frac{\Sigma_n^2}{2\sqrt{e^j}} + \sqrt{e^j} \right) \sqrt{\log \frac{\pi^2(j+1)^2}{6\delta}}\right) \leq \delta$$

The proof is completed by showing that the minimum is smaller than the desired value by choosing appropriate $j = j_n$ for all n . We separately deal with the cases $\Sigma_n^2 \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \Sigma_n^2 < 1$.

Case 1 ($\Sigma_n^2 \geq 1$):

Choose $j_n = \lfloor \log \Sigma_n^2 \rfloor$. Then, it holds that

$$\sqrt{\Sigma_n^2/e} \leq \sqrt{e^{j_n}} \leq \sqrt{\Sigma_n^2}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\Sigma_n^2}{2e^{\frac{j_n}{2}}} + e^{\frac{j_n}{2}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{e \Sigma_n^2}}{2} + \sqrt{\Sigma_n^2} \leq 2\sqrt{\Sigma_n^2}.$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\frac{\Sigma_n^2}{2e^{\frac{j}{2}}} + e^{\frac{j}{2}} \right) \sqrt{\log \frac{\pi^2(j+1)^2}{6\delta}} &\leq \left(\frac{\Sigma_n^2}{2e^{\frac{j_n}{2}}} + e^{\frac{j_n}{2}} \right) \sqrt{\log \frac{\pi^2(j_n+1)^2}{6\delta}} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\Sigma_n^2 \log \frac{\pi^2(1+\log^+ \Sigma_n^2)^2}{6\delta}} = \sqrt{(\Sigma_n^2 + 3 \max\{\Sigma_n^2, 1\}) \log \frac{\pi^2(1+\log^+ \Sigma_n^2)^2}{6\delta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses that $\frac{1}{\delta_{j_n}} = \frac{\pi^2(1+j_n)^2}{6\delta} \leq \frac{\pi^2(1+\log^+ \Sigma_n^2)^2}{6\delta}$.

Case 2 ($0 \leq \Sigma_n^2 < 1$):

In this case, we choose $j_n = 0$. Since $\Sigma_n^2 \leq 1$, $\Sigma_n^2 \leq \sqrt{\Sigma_n^2}$ holds. Therefore, it holds that

$$\left(\frac{\Sigma_n^2}{2e^0} + e^0\right) \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_0}} = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma_n^2}{2} \log \frac{1}{\delta_0}} + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_0}} \leq \left(\sqrt{\Sigma_n^2} + 3 \max\{\Sigma_n^2, 1\}\right) \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta_0}}.$$

Note that in this case, $\frac{1}{\delta_0} = \frac{\pi^2}{6\delta} = \frac{\pi^2(1+\log^+ \Sigma_n^2)^2}{6\delta}$. The proof is complete.

C.11. Proof of Lemma 12

We adopt the notation introduced in Appendix C.5 and continue from (33). We utilize Lemma 9 to get the time-uniform bound for $\text{term}(e_1)$ and $\text{term}(e_2)$. According to Hoeffding's inequality (Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006, Lemma A.1.) and the conditions $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[V_t] = 0$ and $|V_t| \leq 1$, as well as $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[V'_{t,i}] = 0$ and $|V'_{t,i}| \leq 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $i \in [m]$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[e^{sV_t}] \leq \exp(s^2/2)$ and $\mathbb{E}[e^{sV'_{t,i}}] \leq \exp(s^2/2)$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and for all $i \in [m]$. Therefore, the sequences $\{V_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ and $\{V'_{t,i}\}_{t=1}^\infty$ for all $i \in [m]$ are 1-sub-Gaussian.

By Lemma 9, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\text{term}(e_1) = \sum_{j=1}^t V_j \leq 2^{\frac{3}{4}} \sqrt{t \ln \frac{7(\ln 2t)^2}{2\delta}} \leq 2 \sqrt{t \left(\ln \frac{4}{\delta} + 2 \ln \ln(2t) \right)}. \quad (73)$$

By Lemma 9 and taking the union bound over $i \in [m]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\text{term}(e_2) = \sum_{j=1}^t V'_{j,k^*} \leq 2^{\frac{3}{4}} \sqrt{t \ln \frac{7m(\ln 2t)^2}{2\delta}} \leq 2 \sqrt{t \left(\ln \frac{4m}{\delta} + 2 \ln \ln(2t) \right)}. \quad (74)$$

Substituting (73) and (74) into (33), and combining (32), we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\epsilon_\phi(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{q}}_t) \leq \frac{1}{t} U_w \left(t, \frac{\delta}{4} \right) + \frac{1}{t} U_q \left(t, \frac{\delta}{4} \right) + 4 \sqrt{\frac{1}{t} \left(\ln \frac{16m}{\delta} + 2 \ln \ln(2t) \right)}.$$

C.12. Proof of Lemma 13

We adopt the notation introduced in Appendix C.6 and continue from (40). For $\text{term}(\mathbf{a})$, we extend Lemma 15 to the time-uniform version as follows.

Lemma 18 *Let $\hat{\xi}_{j,i} \in [0, 1]$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $i \in [m]$, and $\tilde{\xi}_{j,i}$ be its IX-estimator defined as $\tilde{\xi}_{j,i} = \frac{\hat{\xi}_{j,i}}{p_{j,i} + \gamma_j} \mathbb{I}[i_j = i]$, where the index i_j is sampled from $[m]$ according to the distribution $\mathbf{p}_j \in \Delta_m$. Let $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a non-increasing positive sequence and $\alpha_{j,i}$ be non-negative $\mathcal{F}_{j-1}$ -measurable random variables satisfying $\alpha_{j,i} \leq 2\gamma_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $i \in [m]$. Let $\{r_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a fixed sequence and $S_t = \{j | r_j = 1, j \in [t]\}$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all t , we have*

$$\sum_{j \in S_t} \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} (\tilde{\xi}_{j,i} - \hat{\xi}_{j,i}) \leq \ln \frac{4(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta}. \quad (75)$$

Similar to (42) and by Lemma 18, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j \in S_t} \left(\frac{\eta_{q,j}}{2} + \gamma_j \right) \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{j,i} &\stackrel{(13)}{=} \sum_{j \in S_t} \eta_{q,j} \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{s}_{j,i} \stackrel{(75)}{\leq} \sum_{j \in S_t} \eta_{q,j} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{s}_{t,i} + \ln \frac{4(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \\
 &\stackrel{(34)}{\leq} \sum_{j \in S_t} \eta_{q,j} m + \ln \frac{4(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \stackrel{(13)}{=} \sum_{j \in S_t} \sqrt{\frac{m \ln m}{\sum_{s=1}^j \frac{1}{r_s}}} + \ln \frac{4(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \\
 &\leq \sum_{j \in S_t} \sqrt{\frac{m \ln m}{|[t] \cap S_t|}} + \ln \frac{4(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \leq 2\sqrt{|S_t| m \ln m} + \ln \frac{4(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

For term(b), we extend Lemma 16 to the time-uniform version as follows.

Lemma 19 *We define a real-valued sequence $\{Q_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ with $Q_t = \frac{\eta_t}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{t,i} (\tilde{s}_{t,i})^2$, where η_t is a non-increasing step size and $\mathbf{q}_t \in \Delta_m$. The term $\tilde{s}_{t,i} = \frac{\hat{s}_{t,i}}{q_{t,i} + (1-q_{t,i}) \frac{r_t-1}{m-1}} \mathbb{I}[i \in C_t]$, where the set C_t is selected from $[m]$ such that $\Pr[i \in C_t] = q_{t,i} + (1-q_{t,i}) \frac{r_t-1}{m-1}$, where $r_t \geq 2$ and $|\hat{s}_{t,i}| \leq 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+, i \in [m]$. Let $\{r_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a fixed sequence and $M_t = \{j | r_j \geq 2, j \in [t]\}$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,*

$$\sum_{j \in M_t} Q_j \leq \eta_1 m^2 \ln \left(\frac{C_t}{\delta} \right) + m \sqrt{\eta_1 m \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j} \ln \left(\frac{C_t}{\delta} \right)} + \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j},$$

$$\text{where } C_t = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{1}{\eta_1 m} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j} \right) \right)^2.$$

We denote $Q_t = \frac{\eta_{q,t}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m q_{t,i} (\tilde{s}_{t,i})^2$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$. By Lemma 19 and $\sqrt{\frac{\ln m}{m}} \leq \eta_1 \leq \sqrt{\ln m}$, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j \in M_t} Q_t &\leq m \sqrt{\sqrt{\ln m} m \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{r_j} \ln \left(\frac{C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right)} + m^2 \sqrt{\ln m} \ln \left(\frac{C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right) + \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_{q,j}}{r_j} \\
 &\leq m \sqrt{2 \ln m \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \left(\frac{C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right)}} + m^2 \sqrt{\ln m} \ln \left(\frac{C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right) + \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln m},
 \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by (45) and $C_{1,t} = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{2}{m} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{1}{r_j}} \right) \right)^2$.

For term(c), we define $V_t = \langle \mathbf{q}_t, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_t \rangle - \hat{s}_{t,c_t}$ when $r_t = 1$ and $V_t = \langle \mathbf{q}_t, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_t \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_t, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t \rangle$ when $r_t \geq 2$. Then we know $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[V_t] = 0$ for all $j \in [t]$. By Lemma 5 and (7), we know $|V_t| \leq \frac{m}{2}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Let $X_t = \frac{2V_t}{m}$, we have $|X_t| \leq 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Moreover, for $r_t = 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^2] = \frac{4}{m^2} \mathbb{E} \left[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \hat{s}_{j,c_j})^2 \right] \leq \frac{4}{m^2},$$

and for $r_t \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X_t^2] &= \frac{4}{m^2} \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] = \frac{4}{m^2} \left(\mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] - (\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{m^2} \mathbb{E}[(\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle)^2] \stackrel{(30)}{\leq} \frac{4}{mr_t} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{q}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \rangle] \leq \frac{4}{mr_t}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, by Lemma 10, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^t V_j &= \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t X_j \leq m \ln \frac{C_{2,t}}{\delta} + m \sqrt{\left(\frac{4}{m^2} \left(\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} + |S_t| \right) \right) \ln \frac{C_{2,t}}{\delta}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{4 \sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{C_{2,t}}{\delta}} + m \ln \frac{C_{2,t}}{\delta}.\end{aligned}\tag{78}$$

where $C_{2,t} = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{4}{m^2} \left(\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} + |S_t| \right) \right) \right)^2$.

For term(d), by setting $\alpha_{j,i} = 2\gamma_j$ for all $j \in [t], i \in [m]$ in Lemma 18 and taking the union bound, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $i \in [m]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j \in S_t} (\tilde{s}_{j,i} - \hat{s}_{j,i}) &\leq \frac{1}{2\gamma_t} \ln \frac{4m(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \stackrel{(13),(15)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \left(\ln m + \ln \frac{4(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \right) \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \ln m} + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \ln \frac{4(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta}.\end{aligned}\tag{79}$$

For term(e), we define for all $i \in [m]$, $X_{j,i} = \frac{\tilde{s}_{j,i} - \hat{s}_{j,i}}{m}$ for $r_t \geq 2$ and $X_{j,i} = 0$ for $r_t = 1$. It holds that $\mathbb{E}[X_{j,i}] = 0$, $|X_{j,i}| \leq 1$ for all $i \in [m]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$. When $r_t \geq 2$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[X_{t,i}^2] = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[\tilde{s}_{t,i}^2] - \hat{s}_{t,i}^2}{m^2} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[\tilde{s}_{t,i}^2]}{m^2} = \frac{1}{m^2 \left(q_{t,i} + (1 - q_{t,i}) \frac{r_t - 1}{m - 1} \right)} \leq \frac{1}{m(r_t - 1)} \leq \frac{2}{mr_t}.$$

Then by Lemma 10 and taking the union bound, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $i \in [m]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j \in M_t} (\tilde{s}_{j,i} - \hat{s}_{j,i}) &= m \sum_{j=1}^t X_{j,i} \leq 2 \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{2m}{r_t} \ln \frac{mC_{3,t}}{\delta}} + 2m \ln \frac{mC_{3,t}}{\delta} \\ &\leq 2 \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{2m}{r_j}} \left(\sqrt{\ln m} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{C_{3,t}}{\delta}} \right) + 2m \ln m + 2m \ln \frac{C_{3,t}}{\delta}\end{aligned}\tag{80}$$

where $C_{3,t} = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{2}{mr_j} \right) \right)^2$.

Combining (76)-(80) with (40) and taking the union bound, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Regret}'_{q,t} &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(2\sqrt{\ln m} + 2\sqrt{\ln \frac{5C_{2,t}}{\delta}} \right) + 2\sqrt{|S_t| m \ln m} + 4\sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln m} \\
 &\quad + m \sqrt{2 \ln m \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \left(\frac{5C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right)}} + 2\sqrt{2 \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{5C_{3,t}}{\delta}} \\
 &\quad + m \ln \frac{5C_{2,t}}{\delta} + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \right) \ln \frac{20(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \\
 &\quad + m^2 \sqrt{\ln m} \ln \left(\frac{5C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right) + 2m \ln m + 2m \ln \frac{5C_{3,t}}{\delta} \\
 &\stackrel{(49)}{\leq} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}} \left(8\sqrt{\ln m} + 2\sqrt{\ln \frac{5C_{2,t}}{\delta}} \right) + m \sqrt{2 \ln m \sqrt{\sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \left(\frac{5C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right)}} \\
 &\quad + 2\sqrt{2 \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{m}{r_j} \ln \frac{5C_{3,t}}{\delta}} + m \ln \frac{5C_{2,t}}{\delta} + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j}}{\ln m}} \right) \ln \frac{20(\ln 2t)^2}{\delta} \\
 &\quad + m^2 \sqrt{\ln m} \ln \left(\frac{5C_{1,t}}{\delta} \right) + 2m \ln m + 2m \ln \frac{5C_{3,t}}{\delta} \\
 &= O \left(\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^t \frac{m}{r_j} \max\{\log m, \log \log t\}} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

C.13. Proof of Lemma 14

We adopt the notation introduced in Appendix C.7 and continue from (56). To establish a high probability bound for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we use Lemma 9 which provides a time-uniform bound. By Hoeffding's inequality, $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[V_t] = 0$ and (57), we know $\mathbb{E}[e^{sV_t}] \leq \exp(16D^2G^2s^2)$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and for all $i \in [m]$. Thus, the sequences $\{V_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ is $4\sqrt{2}DG$ -sub-Gaussian. By Lemma 9, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^t V_j \leq 2^{\frac{3}{4}} 4\sqrt{2}DG \sqrt{t \ln \frac{7(\ln 2t)^2}{2\delta}} \leq 10DG \sqrt{t \left(\ln \frac{4}{\delta} + 2 \ln \ln(2t) \right)}. \quad (81)$$

Combining (52), (56) and (81), we obtain that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{q}_j) - \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{j=1}^t \phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{q}_j) \leq DG\sqrt{t} \left(2\sqrt{10} + 10\sqrt{\ln \frac{4}{\delta} + 2 \ln \ln(2t)} \right).$$

C.14. Proof of Lemma 15

The proof follows the argument of Lemma 1 of Neu (2015). For all $i \in [m]$ and $j \in [t]$, the IX-estimator $\hat{\xi}_{j,i}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\xi}_{j,i} &= \frac{\hat{\xi}_{j,i}}{p_{j,i} + \gamma_j} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_j = i] \leq \frac{\hat{\xi}_{j,i}}{p_{j,i} + \gamma_j \hat{\xi}_{j,i}} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_j = i] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\gamma_j} \frac{2\gamma_j \cdot \hat{\xi}_{j,i}/p_{j,i}}{1 + \gamma_j \cdot \hat{\xi}_{j,i}/p_{j,i}} \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_j = i] \leq \frac{1}{\beta_j} \log(1 + \beta_j \bar{\xi}_{j,i}),\end{aligned}\tag{82}$$

where the first inequality is obtained by $\hat{\xi}_{j,i} \in [0, 1]$ for all $i \in [m]$ and $j \in [t]$, the last step is due to the inequality $\frac{z}{1+z/2} \leq \log(1+z)$ for $z \geq 0$ and the notations $\beta_j = 2\gamma_j$ and $\bar{\xi}_{j,i} = (\hat{\xi}_{j,i}/p_{j,i}) \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_j = i]$ are introduced for simplicity.

We define the notations $\tilde{\lambda}_j = \mathbb{I}[j \in S] \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} \tilde{\xi}_{j,i}$ and $\lambda_j = \mathbb{I}[j \in S] \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} \hat{\xi}_{j,i}$. Then, we conclude that $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[\exp(\tilde{\lambda}_j)] \leq \exp(\lambda_j)$ for all $j \in [t]$. This is true for $j \in \{[t] \setminus S\}$ clearly. For $j \in S$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[\exp(\tilde{\lambda}_j)] &= \mathbb{E}_{j-1}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} \tilde{\xi}_{j,i}\right)\right] \stackrel{(82)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{j-1}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\alpha_{j,i}}{\beta_j} \log(1 + \beta_j \bar{\xi}_{j,i})\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{j-1}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \log(1 + \alpha_{j,i} \bar{\xi}_{j,i})\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}_{j-1}\left[\prod_{i=1}^m (1 + \alpha_{j,i} \bar{\xi}_{j,i})\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{j-1}\left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} \bar{\xi}_{j,i}\right] = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} \hat{\xi}_{j,i} \leq \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{j,i} \hat{\xi}_{j,i}\right) = \exp(\lambda_j),\end{aligned}\tag{83}$$

where the second inequality is by the inequality $\frac{\alpha_{j,i}}{\beta_j} \leq 1$, $x \log(1+y) \leq \log(1+xy)$ that holds for all $y \geq -1$ and $x \in [0, 1]$. The last line follows from the fact that $\bar{\xi}_{j,i} \cdot \bar{\xi}_{j,k} = 0$ holds whenever $i \neq k$, $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[\bar{\xi}_{j,i}] = \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[(\hat{\xi}_{j,i}/p_{j,i}) \cdot \mathbb{I}[i_j = i]] = \hat{\xi}_{j,i}$ and the inequality $1 + z \leq e^z$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then, from (83) we conclude that the process $Z_t = \exp(\sum_{j=1}^t (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j))$ is a supermartingale. Indeed, $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[Z_t] = \mathbb{E}_{t-1}[\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)) \cdot \exp(\tilde{\lambda}_t - \lambda_t)] \leq Z_{t-1}$. Thus, we have $\mathbb{E}[Z_t] \leq \mathbb{E}[Z_{t-1}] \leq \dots \leq \mathbb{E}[Z_0] = 1$. By Markov's inequality,

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{j=1}^t (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j) > \epsilon\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{j=1}^t (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)\right)\right] \cdot \exp(-\epsilon) \leq \exp(-\epsilon)$$

holds for any $\epsilon > 0$. By setting $\exp(-\epsilon) = \delta$ and noting that $\sum_{j=1}^t (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j) = \sum_{j \in S} (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)$, we complete the proof.

C.15. Proof of Lemma 16

We define $H_j = Q_j$ for $j \in S$ and $H_j = 0$ for $j \in \{[t] \setminus S\}$. First, we note that $\tilde{s}_{j,i} \leq m$ for all $j \in S, i \in [m]$. It follows that $0 \leq Q_j \leq \frac{\max_{i \in S} \{\eta_i\}}{2} m^2 \leq \frac{\eta_1}{2} m^2$, and that $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}[Q_j] \leq \frac{m}{2} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j}$ for all

$j \in S$, based on (11) in [Seldin et al. \(2014\)](#). Next, we bound the term $\sum_{j=1}^t (H_j - \mathbb{E}[H_j])$ using Lemma 8. For $j \in S$, it holds that $|H_j - \mathbb{E}[H_j]| \leq \frac{\eta_1}{2} m^2$, and the variance is bounded as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(H_j - \mathbb{E}[H_j])^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[(H_j)^2 \right] - \mathbb{E}[H_j]^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \left[(H_j)^2 \right] \leq \frac{m^3 \eta_1}{4} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j}.$$

Applying Lemma 8, we conclude that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in S} (Q_j - \mathbb{E}[Q_j]) &= \sum_{j=1}^t (H_j - \mathbb{E}[H_j]) \\ &\leq m \sqrt{\frac{m \eta_1}{2} \sum_{j \in S} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{m^2 \eta_1}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}. \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Consequently, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in S} Q_j &= \sum_{j \in S} (Q_j - \mathbb{E}[Q_j]) + \sum_{j \in S} \mathbb{E}[Q_j] \\ &\stackrel{(84)}{\leq} m \sqrt{\frac{m \eta_1}{2} \sum_{j \in S} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}} + \frac{m^2 \eta_1}{3} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in S} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j}. \end{aligned}$$

C.16. Proof of Lemma 18

For a fixed but unknown sequence $\{r_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$, we can construct S_t for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Following the notations and results in Section C.14, we know the process $Z_t = \exp(\sum_{j=1}^t (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j))$ is a supermartingale. To obtain a time-uniform bound, we follow [Lee et al. \(2025\)](#) by partitioning $\mathbb{N}^+$ into intervals $I_j = \{t_j, t_j + 1, \dots, t_{j+1} - 1\}$ where $t_j = 2^j$ for $j \geq 0$. Applying Ville's inequality over each I_j , we have for any $\delta \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\exists n \in I_j : Z_n \geq \frac{\pi^2 (j+1)^2}{6\delta} \right) \leq \frac{6\delta}{\pi^2 (j+1)^2}.$$

Equivalently, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\exists n \in I_j : \sum_{j=1}^n (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j) \geq \ln \frac{\pi^2 (j+1)^2}{6\delta} \right) \leq \frac{6\delta}{\pi^2 (j+1)^2}.$$

By $\frac{\pi^2 (j+1)^2}{6} = \frac{\pi^2 (\log_2 2t_j)^2}{6} = \frac{\pi^2}{6(\ln 2)^2} (\ln 2t_j)^2 \leq 4(\ln 2n)^2$, we get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\exists n \in I_j : \sum_{j=1}^n (\tilde{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j) \geq \ln \frac{4(\ln 2n)^2}{\delta} \right) \leq \frac{6\delta}{\pi^2 (j+1)^2}. \tag{85}$$

Finally, by taking the union bound over $j \geq 0$ and using the fact $\sum_{j=0}^\infty \frac{1}{(j+1)^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6}$, we complete the proof.

C.17. Proof of Lemma 19

We define $H_t = Q_t \cdot \mathbb{I}[r_t \geq 2]$ and $M_t = \{j | r_j \geq 2, j \in [t]\}$. First, we note that $\tilde{s}_{t,i} \leq m$ for all $i \in [m]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$ with $r_t \geq 2$. It follows that $0 \leq Q_t \leq \frac{\eta_1}{2} m^2$, and that $\mathbb{E}_{t-1}[Q_t] \leq \frac{m}{2} \frac{\eta_t}{r_t}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$ with $r_t \geq 2$ by [Seldin et al. \(2014, \(11\)\)](#). Let $X_t = \frac{2(H_t - \mathbb{E}[H_t])}{\eta_1 m^2}$. It holds that $X_t \leq 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and its variance when $r_t \geq 2$ is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_t^2] &= \frac{4}{\eta_1^2 m^4} \mathbb{E}[(H_j - \mathbb{E}[H_j])^2] = \frac{4}{\eta_1^2 m^4} (\mathbb{E}[(H_j)^2] - \mathbb{E}[H_j]^2) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\eta_1^2 m^4} \mathbb{E}[(H_j)^2] \leq \frac{1}{\eta_1 m} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 10, we conclude that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in M_t} (Q_j - \mathbb{E}[Q_j]) &= \sum_{j=1}^t (H_j - \mathbb{E}[H_j]) = \frac{\eta_1 m^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^t X_t \\ &\leq \eta_1 m^2 \ln\left(\frac{C_t}{\delta}\right) + m \sqrt{\eta_1 m \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j} \ln\left(\frac{C_t}{\delta}\right)}. \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

where $C_t = 2 \left(1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{1}{\eta_1 m} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j}\right)\right)^2$.

Consequently, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in M_t} Q_j &= \sum_{j \in M_t} (Q_j - \mathbb{E}[Q_j]) + \sum_{j \in M_t} \mathbb{E}[Q_j] \\ &\stackrel{(86)}{\leq} \eta_1 m^2 \ln\left(\frac{C_t}{\delta}\right) + m \sqrt{\eta_1 m \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j} \ln\left(\frac{C_t}{\delta}\right)} + \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j \in M_t} \frac{\eta_j}{r_j}. \end{aligned}$$