



**HAL**  
open science

# Finite-Time Analysis of Stratified Sampling for Monte Carlo

Alexandra Carpentier, Rémi Munos

► **To cite this version:**

Alexandra Carpentier, Rémi Munos. Finite-Time Analysis of Stratified Sampling for Monte Carlo. [Technical Report] 2011. inria-00636924v2

**HAL Id: inria-00636924**

**<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00636924v2>**

Submitted on 13 Jan 2012 (v2), last revised 27 Feb 2012 (v3)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

000  
001  
002  
003  
004  
005  
006  
007  
008  
009  
010  
011  
012  
013  
014  
015  
016  
017  
018  
019  
020  
021  
022  
023  
024  
025  
026  
027  
028  
029  
030  
031  
032  
033  
034  
035  
036  
037  
038  
039  
040  
041  
042  
043  
044  
045  
046  
047  
048  
049  
050  
051  
052  
053

---

# Finite Time Analysis of Stratified Sampling for Monte Carlo

---

Anonymous Author(s)  
Affiliation  
Address  
email

## Abstract

We consider the problem of stratified sampling for Monte-Carlo integration. We model this problem in a multi-armed bandit setting, where the arms represent the strata, and the goal is to estimate a weighted average of the mean values of the arms. We propose a strategy that samples the arms according to an upper bound on their standard deviations and compare its estimation quality to an ideal allocation that would know the standard deviations of the strata. We provide two regret analyses: a distribution-dependent bound  $\tilde{O}(n^{-3/2})$  that depends on a measure of the disparity of the strata, and a distribution-free bound  $\tilde{O}(n^{-4/3})$  that does not.

## 1 Introduction

Consider a polling institute that has to estimate as accurately as possible the average income of a country, given a finite budget for polls. The institute has call centers in every region in the country, and gives a part of the total sampling budget to each center so that they can call random people in the area and ask about their income. A naive method would allocate a budget proportionally to the number of people in each area. However some regions show a high variability in the income of their inhabitants whereas others are very homogeneous. Now if the polling institute knows the level of variability within each region, it could adjust the budget allocated to each region in a more clever way (allocating more polls to regions with high variability) in order to reduce the final estimation error.

This example is just one of many for which an efficient method of sampling a function with natural strata (i.e., the regions) is of great interest. Note that even in the case that there are no natural strata, it is always a good strategy to design arbitrary strata and allocate a budget to each stratum that is proportional to the size of the stratum, compared to a crude Monte-Carlo. There are many good surveys on the topic of stratified sampling for Monte-Carlo, such as (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2008)[Subsection 5.5] or (Glasserman, 2004).

The main problem for performing an efficient sampling is that the variances within the strata (in the previous example, the income variability per region) are unknown. One possibility is to estimate the variances *online* while sampling the strata. There is some interesting research along this direction, such as (Arouna, 2004) and more recently (Etoré and Jourdain, 2010, Kawai, 2010). The work of Etoré and Jourdain (2010) matches exactly our problem of designing an efficient adaptive sampling strategy. In this article they propose to sample according to an empirical estimate of the variance of the strata, whereas Kawai (2010) addresses a computational complexity problem which is slightly different from ours. The recent work of Etoré et al. (2011) describes a strategy that enables to sample *asymptotically* according to the (unknown) standard deviations of the strata and at the same time adapts the shape (and number) of the strata online. This is a very difficult problem, especially in

054 high dimension, that we will not address here, although we think this is a very interesting  
055 and promising direction for further researches.

056 These works provide asymptotic convergence of the variance of the estimate to the targeted  
057 stratified variance <sup>1</sup> divided by the sample size. They also prove that the number of pulls  
058 within each stratum converges asymptotically to the desired number of pulls i.e. the optimal  
059 allocation if the variances per stratum were known. Like Etoré and Jourdain (2010), we  
060 consider a stratified Monte-Carlo setting with fixed strata. Our contribution is to design a  
061 sampling strategy for which we can derive a finite-time analysis (where 'time' refers to the  
062 number of samples). This enables us to predict the quality of our estimate for any given  
063 budget  $n$ .

064 We model this problem using the setting of multi-armed bandits where our goal is to estimate  
065 a weighted average of the mean values of the arms. Although our goal is different from a usual  
066 bandit problem where the objective is to play the best arm as often as possible, this problem  
067 also exhibits an *exploration-exploitation trade-off*. The arms have to be pulled both in  
068 order to estimate the initially unknown variability of the arms (exploration) and to allocate  
069 correctly the budget according to our current knowledge of the variability (exploitation).

070 Our setting is close to the one described in (Antos et al., 2010) which aims at estimating  
071 *uniformly well* the mean values of all the arms. The authors present an algorithm, called  
072 GAFS-MAX, that allocates samples proportionally to the empirical variance of the arms,  
073 while imposing that each arm is pulled at least  $\sqrt{n}$  times to guarantee a sufficiently good  
074 estimation of the true variances.

075 Note though that in the Master Thesis (Grover, 2009), the author presents an algorithm  
076 named GAFS-WL which is similar to GAFS-MAX and has an analysis close to the one of  
077 GAFS-MAX. It deals with stratified sampling, i.e. it targets an allocation which is propor-  
078 tional to the standard deviation (and not to the variance) of the strata times their size<sup>2</sup>.  
079 There are however some open questions in this very good Master Thesis, notably on the  
080 asymptotic consistency of GAFS-WL and on the existence of a problem independent regret  
081 bound. We clarify this point in Section 4.

082 **[Jai change ici en parlant de GAFS-WL.]**

083 Our objective is similar, and we extend the analysis of this setting.

084 **Contributions:** In this paper, we introduce a new algorithm based on Upper-Confidence-  
085 Bounds (UCB) on the standard deviation. They are computed from the empirical standard  
086 deviation and a confidence interval derived from Bernstein's inequalities. We provide a  
087 finite-time analysis of its performance. The algorithm, called MC-UCB, samples the arms  
088 proportionally to an UCB<sup>3</sup> on the standard deviation times the size of the stratum. Our  
089 contributions are the following:

- 090 • We derive a *finite-time analysis* for the stratified sampling for Monte-Carlo setting  
091 by using an algorithm based on upper confidence bounds. By clarifying the notion  
092 of regret introduced in (Grover, 2009), we prove asymptotic consistency of our  
093 algorithm.
- 094 • We provide two regret analysis: (i) a distribution-dependent bound  $\tilde{O}(n^{-3/2})^4$  that  
095 depends on the disparity of the stratas (a measure of the problem complexity), and  
096 which corresponds to a stationary regime where the budget  $n$  is large compared to  
097 this complexity. (ii) A distribution-free bound  $\tilde{O}(n^{-4/3})$  that does not depend on  
098 the disparity of the stratas, and corresponds to a transitory regime where  $n$  is  
099 small compared to the complexity. The characterization of those two regimes and  
100

101 <sup>1</sup>The target is defined in [Subsection 5.5] of (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2008) and later in this  
102 paper, see Equation 4.

103 <sup>2</sup>This is explained in (Rubinstein and Kroese, 2008) and will be formulated precisely later.

104 <sup>3</sup>Note that we consider a sampling strategy based on UCBs on the standard deviations of the  
105 arms whereas the so-called *UCB algorithm* of Auer et al. (2002), in the usual multi-armed bandit  
106 setting, computes UCBs on the mean rewards of the arms.

107 <sup>4</sup>The notation  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  corresponds to  $O(\cdot)$  up to logarithmic factors.

the fact that the corresponding excess error rates differ enlightens the fact that a finite-time analysis is very relevant for this problem.

[Jai change ici en parlant de consistance asymptotique.]

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we formalize the problem and introduce the notations used throughout the paper. Section 3 introduces the MC-UCB algorithm and reports performance bounds. We then discuss in Section 4 about the parameters of the algorithm and its performances. In Section 5 we report numerical experiments that illustrate our method to the problem of pricing Asian options as introduced in (Glasserman et al., 1999). Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper and suggests future works.

## 2 Preliminaries

The allocation problem mentioned in the previous section is formalized as a  $K$ -armed bandit problem where each arm (stratum)  $k = 1, \dots, K$  is characterized by a distribution  $\nu_k$  with mean value  $\mu_k$  and variance  $\sigma_k^2$ . At each round  $t \geq 1$ , an allocation strategy (or algorithm)  $\mathcal{A}$  selects an arm  $k_t$  and receives a sample drawn from  $\nu_{k_t}$  independently of the past samples. Note that a strategy may be adaptive, i.e., the arm selected at round  $t$  may depend on past observed samples. Let  $\{w_k\}_{k=1, \dots, K}$  denote a known set of positive weights which sum to 1. For example in the setting of stratified sampling for Monte-Carlo, this would be the probability mass in each stratum. The goal is to define a strategy that estimates as precisely as possible  $\mu = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \mu_k$  using a total budget of  $n$  samples.

Let us write  $T_{k,t} = \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{I}\{k_s = k\}$  the number of times arm  $k$  has been pulled up to time  $t$ , and  $\hat{\mu}_{k,t} = \frac{1}{T_{k,t}} \sum_{s=1}^{T_{k,t}} X_{k,s}$  the empirical estimate of the mean  $\mu_k$  at time  $t$ , where  $X_{k,s}$  denotes the sample received when pulling arm  $k$  for the  $s$ -th time.

After  $n$  rounds, the algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  returns the empirical estimate  $\hat{\mu}_{k,n}$  of all the arms. Note that in the case of a deterministic strategy, the expected quadratic estimation error of the weighted mean  $\mu$  as estimated by the weighted average  $\hat{\mu}_n = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \hat{\mu}_{k,n}$  satisfies:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu)^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K w_k (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)\right)^2\right] = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E}_{\nu_k}\left[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2\right].$$

We thus use the following measure for the performance of any algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$L_n(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E}\left[(\mu_k - \hat{\mu}_{k,n})^2\right]. \quad (1)$$

We give some properties of this performance in Appendix E.

[Faut il expliquer et donner les deux propositions de l'Appendix?]

The goal is to define an allocation strategy that minimizes the global loss defined in Equation 1. If the variance of the arms were known in advance, one could design an optimal static<sup>5</sup> allocation strategy  $\mathcal{A}^*$  by pulling each arm  $k$  proportionally to the quantity  $w_k \sigma_k$ . Indeed, if arm  $k$  is pulled a deterministic number of times  $T_{k,n}^*$ , then <sup>6</sup>

$$L_n(\mathcal{A}^*) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \frac{\sigma_k^2}{T_{k,n}^*}. \quad (2)$$

By choosing  $T_{k,n}^*$  such as to minimize  $L_n$  under the constraint that  $\sum_{k=1}^K T_{k,n}^* = n$ , the optimal static allocation (up to rounding effects) of algorithm  $\mathcal{A}^*$  is to pull each arm  $k$ ,

$$T_{k,n}^* = \frac{w_k \sigma_k}{\sum_{i=1}^K w_i \sigma_i} n, \quad (3)$$

<sup>5</sup>Static means that the number of pulls allocated to each arm does not depend on the received samples.

<sup>6</sup>As it will be discussed later, this equality does not hold when the number of pulls is random, as it is the case of adaptive algorithms where the strategy depends on the observed samples.

times, and achieves a global performance

$$L_n(\mathcal{A}^*) = \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\Sigma_w = \sum_{i=1}^K w_i \sigma_i$ . In the following, we write  $\lambda_k = \frac{T_{k,n}^*}{n} = \frac{w_k \sigma_k}{\Sigma_w}$  the optimal allocation proportion for arm  $k$  and  $\lambda_{\min} = \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \lambda_k$ . Note that a small  $\lambda_{\min}$  means a large disparity of the  $w_k \sigma_k$  and, as explained later, provides for the algorithm we build in Section 3 a characterization of the hardness of a problem.

However, in the setting considered here, the  $\sigma_k$  are unknown, and thus the optimal allocation is out of reach. A possible allocation is the uniform strategy  $\mathcal{A}^u$ , i.e., such that  $T_k^u = \frac{w_k}{\sum_{i=1}^K w_i} n$ . Its performance is

$$L_n(\mathcal{A}^u) = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{w_k \sigma_k^2}{n} = \frac{\Sigma_{w,2}}{n},$$

where  $\Sigma_{w,2} = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \sigma_k^2$ . Note that by Cauchy-Schwartz's inequality, we have  $\Sigma_w^2 \leq \Sigma_{w,2}$  with equality if and only if the  $(\sigma_k)$  are all equal. Thus  $\mathcal{A}^*$  is always at least as good as  $\mathcal{A}^u$ . In addition, since  $\sum_i w_i = 1$ , we have  $\Sigma_w^2 - \Sigma_{w,2} = -\sum_k w_k (\sigma_k - \Sigma_w)^2$ . The difference between those two quantities is the weighted quadratic variation of the  $\sigma_k$  around their weighted mean  $\Sigma_w$ . In other words, it is the variance of the  $(\sigma_k)_{1 \leq k \leq K}$ . As a result the gain of  $\mathcal{A}^*$  compared to  $\mathcal{A}^u$  grow with the disparity of the  $\sigma_k$ .

We would like to do better than the uniform strategy by considering an adaptive strategy  $\mathcal{A}$  that would estimate the  $\sigma_k$  at the same time as it tries to implement an allocation strategy as close as possible to the optimal allocation algorithm  $\mathcal{A}^*$ . This introduces a natural trade-off between the exploration needed to improve the estimates of the variances and the exploitation of the current estimates to allocate the pulls nearly-optimally.

In order to assess how well  $\mathcal{A}$  solves this trade-off and manages to sample according to the true standard deviations *without knowing them in advance*, we compare its performance to that of the optimal allocation strategy  $\mathcal{A}^*$ . For this purpose we define the notion of *regret* of an adaptive algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  as the difference between the performance loss incurred by the algorithm and the optimal algorithm:

$$R_n(\mathcal{A}) = L_n(\mathcal{A}) - L_n(\mathcal{A}^*). \quad (5)$$

The *regret* indicates how much we loose in terms of expected quadratic estimation error by not knowing in advance the standard deviations  $(\sigma_k)$ . Note that since  $L_n(\mathcal{A}^*) = \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n}$ , a consistent strategy i.e., asymptotically equivalent to the optimal strategy, is obtained whenever its regret is neglectable compared to  $1/n$ .

## 3 Allocation based on Monte Carlo Upper Confidence Bound

### 3.1 The algorithm

In this section, we introduce our adaptive algorithm for the allocation problem, called *Monte Carlo Upper Confidence Bound* (MC-UCB). The algorithm computes a high-probability bound on the standard deviation of each arm and samples the arms proportionally to their bounds times the corresponding weights. The MC-UCB algorithm,  $\mathcal{A}_{MC-UCB}$ , is described in Figure 1. It requires three parameters as inputs:  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  which are related to the shape of the distributions (see Assumption 1), and  $\delta$  which defines the *confidence level* of the bound. In Subsection 4.3, we discuss a way to reduce the number of parameters from three to one. The amount of exploration of the algorithm can be adapted by properly tuning these parameters.

The algorithm starts by pulling each arm twice in rounds  $t = 1$  to  $2K$ . From round  $t = 2K+1$  on, it computes an upper confidence bound  $B_{k,t}$  on the standard deviation  $\sigma_k$ , for each arm  $k$ , and then pulls the one with largest  $B_{k,t}$ . The upper bounds on the standard deviations

216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269

**Input:**  $c_1, c_2, \delta$ . Let  $b = 2\sqrt{2\log(2/\delta)}\sqrt{c_1\log(c_2/\delta)} + \frac{\sqrt{2c_1\delta(1+\log(c_2/\delta))}n^{1/2}}{(1-\delta)}$ .

**Initialize:** Pull each arm twice.

**for**  $t = 2K + 1, \dots, n$  **do**

Compute  $B_{k,t} = \frac{w_k}{T_{k,t-1}} \left( \hat{\sigma}_{k,t-1} + b\sqrt{\frac{1}{T_{k,t-1}}} \right)$  for each arm  $1 \leq k \leq K$

Pull an arm  $k_t \in \arg \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} B_{k,t}$

**end for**

**Output:**  $\hat{\mu}_{k,t}$  for each arm  $1 \leq k \leq K$

Figure 1: The pseudo-code of the MC-UCB algorithm. The empirical standard deviations  $\hat{\sigma}_{k,t-1}$  are computed using Equation 6.

are built by using Theorem 10 in (Maurer and Pontil, 2009)<sup>7</sup> and based on the empirical standard deviation  $\hat{\sigma}_{k,t-1}$  :

$$\hat{\sigma}_{k,t-1}^2 = \frac{1}{T_{k,t-1} - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{T_{k,t-1}} (X_{k,i} - \hat{\mu}_{k,t-1})^2, \quad (6)$$

where  $X_{k,i}$  is the  $i$ -th sample received when pulling arm  $k$ , and  $T_{k,t-1}$  is the number of pulls allocated to arm  $k$  up to time  $t - 1$ . After  $n$  rounds, MC-UCB returns the empirical mean  $\hat{\mu}_{k,n}$  for each arm  $1 \leq k \leq K$ .

### 3.2 Regret analysis of MC-UCB

Before stating the main results of this section, we state the assumption that the distributions are sub-Gaussian, which includes e.g., Gaussian or bounded distributions. See (Buldygin and Kozachenko, 1980) for more precisions.

**Assumption 1** *There exist  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that for all  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{X \sim \nu_k} (|X - \mu_k| \geq \epsilon) \leq c_2 \exp(-\epsilon^2/c_1). \quad (7)$$

We provide two analyses, a *distribution-dependent* and a *distribution-free*, of MC-UCB, which are respectively interesting in two *regimes*, i.e., stationary and transitory *regimes*, of the algorithm. We will comment on this later in Section 4.

**A *distribution-dependent* result:** We now report the first bound on the regret of MC-UCB algorithm. The proof is reported in Appendix B (in the supplementary material) and relies on upper- and lower-bounds on  $T_{k,t} - T_{k,t}^*$ , i.e., the difference in the number of pulls of each arm compared to the optimal allocation (see Lemma 3).

**Theorem 1** *Under Assumption 1 and if we choose  $c_2$  such that  $c_2 \geq 2Kn^{-5/2}$ , the regret of MC-UCB run with parameter  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$  with  $n \geq 4K$  is bounded as*

$$R_n(\mathcal{A}_{MC-UCB}) \leq \frac{\log(n)}{n^{3/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} \left( 112\Sigma_w \sqrt{c_1(c_2 + 2)} + 6c_1(c_2 + 2)K \right) + \frac{19}{\lambda_{\min}^3 n^2} \left( K\Sigma_w^2 + 720c_1(c_2 + 1) \log(n)^2 \right). \quad (8)$$

Note that this result crucially depends on the smallest proportion  $\lambda_{\min}$  which is a measure of the disparity of product of the standard deviations and the weights. For this reason we refer to it as “distribution-dependent” result.

**A *distribution-free* result:** Now we report our second regret bound that does not depend on  $\lambda_{\min}$  but whose rate is poorer. The proof is given in Appendix C of the supplementary material and relies on other upper- and lower-bounds on  $T_{k,t} - T_{k,t}^*$  detailed in Lemma 4.

<sup>7</sup>We could also have used the variant reported in (Audibert et al., 2009).



**Theorem 2** Under Assumption 1 and if we choose  $c_2$  such that  $c_2 \geq 2Kn^{-5/2}$ , the regret of MC-UCB run with parameter  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$  with  $n \geq 4K$  is bounded as

$$R_n(\mathcal{A}_{MC-UCB}) \leq \frac{200\sqrt{c_1}(c_2 + 2)\Sigma_w K}{n^{4/3}} \log(n) + \frac{365}{n^{3/2}} \left(129c_1(c_2 + 2)^2 K^2 \log(n)^2 + K\Sigma_w^2\right). \quad (9)$$

This bound does not depend on  $1/\lambda_{\min}$ , not even in the  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  neglectable term, as detailed in Appendix C<sup>8</sup>. This is obtained at the price of the slightly worse rate  $\tilde{O}(n^{-4/3})$ .

## 4 Discussion on the results

### 4.1 Asymptotic optimality

As explained in Section 2, our objective is to design a sampling strategy capable of estimating the mean value  $\mu$  as accurately as possible given the strata. In order to assess our performance, we compare our strategy to the optimal static strategy  $\mathcal{A}^*$  that requires the knowledge of the standard deviations in each stratum. Theorems 1 and 2 imply that the regret of MC-UCB is asymptotically neglectable compared to the optimal loss  $L_n(\mathcal{A}^*) = \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n}$ . Thus, our algorithm is asymptotically optimal (like the algorithms of Kawai (2010), Etoré and Jourdain (2010)): the estimate  $\hat{\mu}_n = \sum_k w_k \hat{\mu}_{k,n}$  is asymptotically equal to  $\mu$  and the variance of  $\hat{\mu}_n$  is asymptotically equal to the variance of the optimal allocation  $\Sigma_w^2/n$ . This comes from the fact that for algorithm MC-UCB,  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu)^2 \leq L_n + \tilde{O}(n^{-3/2})$ , where  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  is  $O(\cdot)$  up to  $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$  and  $\log(n)$  factors. This is explained in Appendix E.2. Note that the asymptotic optimality of GAFS-WL is not provided in Grover (2009), although we believe it to hold also.

[Jai change ici en rajoutant que on est pas sur que GAFS-WL soit optimal asymptotiquement et en expliquant pourquoi nous on lest.]

Note also that whenever there is some disparity among the arms, i.e., when  $\Sigma_w^2 - \Sigma_{2,w} < 0$ , the MC-UCB is asymptotically strictly better than the uniform strategy.

### 4.2 Distribution-free versus distribution-dependent

Theorem 1 provides a regret bound of order  $\tilde{O}(\lambda_{\min}^{-5/2} n^{-3/2})$ , whereas Theorem 2 provides a bound in  $\tilde{O}(n^{-4/3})$  independently of  $\lambda_{\min}$ . Hence, for a given problem i.e., a given  $\lambda_{\min}$ , the distribution-free result of Theorem 2 is more informative than the distribution-dependent result of Theorem 1 in the *transitory regime*, that is to say when  $n$  is small compared to  $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$ . The distribution-dependent result of Theorem 1 is better in the *stationary regime* i.e., for  $n$  large. This distinction reminds us of the difference between distribution-dependent and distribution-free bounds for the UCB algorithm in usual multi-armed bandits<sup>9</sup>.

Although we do not have a lower bound on the regret yet, we believe that the rate  $n^{-3/2}$  cannot be improved for general distributions. As explained in the proof in Appendix B, this rate is a direct consequence of the high probability bounds on the estimates of the standard deviations of the arms which are in  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ , and those bounds are tight. A natural question is whether there exists an algorithm with a regret of order  $\tilde{O}(n^{-3/2})$  without any dependence in  $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$ . Although we do not have an answer to this question, we can say that our algorithm MC-UCB does not satisfy this property. In Appendix D.1 of the supplementary material, we give a simple example where  $\lambda_{\min} = 0$  and for which the rate of MC-UCB cannot be better than  $\tilde{O}(n^{-4/3})$ . This shows that our analysis of MC-UCB is tight.

<sup>8</sup>Note that the bound is not entirely distribution free since  $\Sigma_w$  appears. But it can be proved using Assumption 1 that  $\Sigma_w^2 \leq c_1 c_2$ .

<sup>9</sup>The distribution dependent bound is in  $O(K \log n / \Delta)$ , where  $\Delta$  is the difference between the mean value of the two best arms, and the distribution-free bound is in  $O(\sqrt{nK \log n})$  as explained in (Auer et al., 2002, Audibert and Bubeck, 2009).

The problem dependent lower bound is similar to the one provided for GAFS-WL in (Grover, 2009). We however expect that GAFS-WL has for some problems a sub-optimal behavior: it is possible to find cases where  $R_n(\mathcal{A}_{GAFS-WL}) \geq O(1/n)$ , see Appendix D.2 for more details. Note however that when there is an arm with 0 standard deviation, GAFS-WL is likely to perform better than MC-UCB, as it will only sample this arm  $O(\sqrt{n})$  times while MC-UCB samples it  $\tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$  times.

[Jai change ici en parlant dune lower bound problem dep pour GAFS-WL et en disant pquoi il est mieux que nous quand on a des bras a 0.]

### 4.3 The parameters of the algorithm

Our algorithm takes three parameters as input, namely  $c_1$ ,  $c_2$  and  $\delta$ , but we only use a combination of them in the algorithm, with the introduction of  $b = 2\sqrt{2\log(2/\delta)}\sqrt{c_1\log(c_2/\delta)} + \frac{\sqrt{2c_1\delta(1+\log(c_2/\delta))n^{1/2}}}{(1-\delta)}$ . For practical use of the method, it is enough to tune the algorithm with a single parameter  $b$ . By the choice of the value assigned to  $\delta$  in the two theorems,  $b \approx c\log(n)$ , where  $c$  can be interpreted as a high probability bound on the range of the samples. We thus simply require a rough estimate of the magnitude of the samples. Note that in the case of bounded distributions,  $b$  can be chosen as  $b = 4\sqrt{\frac{5}{2}}c\sqrt{\log(n)}$  where  $c$  is a true bound on the variables. This result is easy to deduce by simplifying Lemma 1 in Appendix A for the case of bounded variables.

## 5 Numerical experiment: Pricing of an Asian option

We consider the pricing problem of an Asian option introduced in (Glasserman et al., 1999) and later considered in (Kawai, 2010, Etoré and Jourdain, 2010). This uses a Black-Schole model with strike  $C$  and maturity  $T$ . Let  $(W(t))_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  be a Brownian motion that is discretized at  $d$  equidistant times  $\{i/d\}_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ , which defines the vector  $W \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with components  $W_i = W(i/d)$ . The discounted payoff of the Asian option is defined as a function of  $W$ , by:

$$F(W) = \exp(-rT) \max \left[ \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d S_0 \exp \left[ \left( r - \frac{1}{2}s_0^2 \right) \frac{iT}{d} + s_0 \sqrt{T} W_i \right] - C, 0 \right], \quad (10)$$

where  $S_0$ ,  $r$ , and  $s_0$  are constants, and the price is defined by the expectation  $p = \mathbb{E}_W F(W)$ .

We want to estimate the price  $p$  by Monte-Carlo simulations (by sampling on  $W = (W_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ ). In order to reduce the variance of the estimated price, we can stratify the space of  $W$ . Glasserman et al. (1999) suggest to stratify according to a one dimensional projection of  $W$ , i.e., by choosing a projection vector  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and define the strata as the set of  $W$  such that  $u \cdot W$  lies in intervals of  $\mathbb{R}$ . They further argue that the best direction for stratification is to choose  $u = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ , i.e., to stratify according to the last component  $W_d$  of  $W$ . Thus we sample  $W_d$  and then conditionally sample  $W_1, \dots, W_{d-1}$  according to a Brownian Bridge as explained in (Kawai, 2010). Note that this choice of stratification is also intuitive since  $W_d$  has the biggest exponent in the payoff (10), and thus the highest volatility. Kawai (2010) and Etoré and Jourdain (2010) also use the same direction of stratification.

Like in (Kawai, 2010) we consider 5 strata of equal weight. Since  $W_d$  follows a  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , the strata correspond to the 20-percentile of a normal distribution. The left plot of Figure 2 represents the cumulative distribution function of  $W_d$  and shows the strata in terms of percentiles of  $W_d$ . The right plot represents, in dot line, the curve  $\mathbb{E}[F(W)|W_d = x]$  versus  $\mathbb{P}(W_d < x)$  parameterized by  $x$ , and the box plot represents the expectation and standard deviations of  $F(W)$  conditioned on each stratum. We observe that this stratification produces an important heterogeneity of the standard deviations per stratum, which indicates that a stratified sampling would be profitable compared to a crude Monte-Carlo sampling.

We choose the same numerical values as Kawai (2010):  $S_0 = 100$ ,  $r = 0.05$ ,  $s_0 = 0.30$ ,  $T = 1$  and  $d = 16$ . Note that the strike  $C$  of the option has a direct impact on the variability of



378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431




Figure 2: Left: Cdf of  $W_d$  and the definition of the strata. Right: expectation and standard deviation of  $F(W)$  conditioned on each stratum for a strike  $C = 90$ .

the strata. Indeed, the larger  $C$ , the more probable  $F(W) = 0$  for strata with small  $W_d$ , and thus, the smaller  $\lambda_{\min}$ .

Our two main competitors are the SSAA algorithm of Etoré and Jourdain (2010) and GAFS-WL of Grover (2009). We did not compare to (Kawai, 2010) which aims at minimizing the computational time and not the loss considered here<sup>10</sup>. SSAA works in  $K_r$  rounds of length  $N_k$  where, at each round, it allocates proportionally to the empirical standard deviations computed in the previous rounds. Etoré and Jourdain (2010) report the asymptotic consistency of the algorithm whenever  $\frac{k}{N_k}$  goes to 0 when  $k$  goes to infinity. Since their goal is not to obtain a finite-time performance, they do not mention how to calibrate the length and number of rounds in practice. We choose the same parameters as in their numerical experiments (Section 3.2.2 of (Etoré and Jourdain, 2010)) using 3 rounds. In this setting where we know the budget  $n$  at the beginning of the algorithm, GAFS-WL pulls each arm  $a\sqrt{n}$  times and then pulls at time  $t + 1$  the arm  $k_{t+1}$  that maximizes  $\frac{w_k \hat{\sigma}_{k,t}}{T_{k,t}}$ . We set  $a = 1$ .

As mentioned in Subsection 4.3, an advantage of our algorithm is that it requires a single parameter to tune. We chose  $b = 1000 \log(n)$  where 1000 is a high-probability range of the variables (see right plot of Figure 2). Table 5 reports the performance of MC-UCB, GAFS-WL, SSAA, and the uniform strategy, for different values of strike  $C$  i.e., for different values of  $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$  and  $\Sigma_{w,2}/\Sigma_w^2 = \frac{\sum_k w_k \sigma_k^2}{(\sum_k w_k \sigma_k)^2}$ . The total budget is  $n = 10^5$ . The results are averaged on 50000 trials. We notice that MC-UCB outperforms SSAA and the uniform strategy and GAFS-WL strategy. Note however that, in the case of GAFS-WL strategy, the small gain could come from the fact that there are more parameters in MC-UCB, and that we were thus able to adjust them (even if we kept the same parameters for the three values of  $C$ ).

[Resultats pour GAFS-WL+Comparaison]

[Resultats pour GAFS-WL+Comparaison]

In the left plot of Figure 3, we plot the rescaled regret  $R_n n^{3/2}$ , averaged over 50000 trials, as a function of  $n$ , where  $n$  ranges from 50 to 5000. The value of the strike is  $C = 120$ . Again, we notice that MC-UCB performs better than Uniform and SSAA because it adapts faster to the distributions of the strata. But it performs very similarly to GAFS-WL. In addition, it seems that the regret of Uniform and SSAA grows faster than the rate  $n^{3/2}$ , whereas MC-UCB, as well as GAFS-WL, grow with this rate. The right plot focuses on the MC-UCB algorithm and rescales the  $y$ -axis to observe the variations of its rescaled regret

<sup>10</sup>In that article, the computational costs for each stratum vary, i.e. it is faster to sample in some strata than in others, and the aim of the article is to minimize the global computational cost while achieving a given performance.

432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485

$C$	$\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}}$	$\Sigma_{w,2}/\Sigma_w^2$	Uniform	SSAA	GAFS-WL	MC-UCB
60	6.18	1.06	$2.52 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.87 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$8.25 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$7.29 \cdot 10^{-4}$
90	15.29	1.24	$3.32 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$6.14 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$8.58 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$8.07 \cdot 10^{-4}$
120	744.25	3.07	$3.56 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$6.22 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$9.89 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$9.28 \cdot 10^{-4}$

Table 1: Characteristics of the distributions ( $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$  and  $\Sigma_{w,2}/\Sigma_w^2$ ) and regret of the Uniform, SSAA, and MC-UCB strategies, for different values of the strike  $C$ .

more accurately. The curve grows first and then stabilizes. This could correspond to the two regimes discussed previously.




Figure 3: Left: Rescaled regret ( $R_n n^{3/2}$ ) of the Uniform, SSAA, and MC-UCB strategies. Right: zoom on the rescaled regret for MC-UCB that illustrates the two regimes.

## 6 Conclusions

We provide a finite-time analysis for stratified sampling for Monte-Carlo in the case of fixed strata. An immediate consequence is the asymptotic convergence of the variance of our estimate to the optimal variance that requires the knowledge of the standard deviations per stratum. We reported two bounds: (i) a distribution dependent bound  $\tilde{O}(n^{-3/2} \lambda_{\min}^{-5/2})$  which is of interest when  $n$  is large compared to a measure of disparity  $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$  of the standard deviations (*stationary regime*), and (ii) a distribution free bound in  $\tilde{O}(n^{-4/3})$  which is of interest when  $n$  is small compared to  $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$  (*transitory regime*).

Possible directions for future work include: (i) making the MC-UCB algorithm anytime (i.e. not requiring the knowledge of  $n$ ), (ii) investigating whether there exists an algorithm with  $\tilde{O}(n^{-3/2})$  regret without dependency on  $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$ , and (iii) deriving distribution-dependent and distribution-free lower-bounds for this problem.

486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539

## References

- András Antos, Varun Grover, and Csaba Szepesvári. Active learning in heteroscedastic noise. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411:2712–2728, June 2010.
- B. Arouna. Adaptative monte carlo method, a variance reduction technique. *Monte Carlo Methods and Applications*, 10(1):1–24, 2004.
- J.Y. Audibert and S. Bubeck. Minimax policies for adversarial and stochastic bandits. In *22nd annual conference on learning theory*, 2009.
- J.Y. Audibert, R. Munos, and Cs. Szepesvári. Exploration-exploitation tradeoff using variance estimates in multi-armed bandits. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(19):1876–1902, 2009.
- P. Auer, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and P. Fischer. Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine learning*, 47(2):235–256, 2002.
- VV Buldygin and Y.V. Kozachenko. Sub-gaussian random variables. *Ukrainian Mathematical Journal*, 32(6):483–489, 1980.
- Pierre Etoré and Benjamin Jourdain. Adaptive optimal allocation in stratified sampling methods. *Methodol. Comput. Appl. Probab.*, 12(3):335–360, September 2010.
- Pierre Etoré, Gersende Fort, Benjamin Jourdain, and Éric Moulines. On adaptive stratification. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 2011. to appear.
- P. Glasserman. *Monte Carlo methods in financial engineering*. Springer Verlag, 2004. ISBN 0387004513.
- P. Glasserman, P. Heidelberger, and P. Shahabuddin. Asymptotically optimal importance sampling and stratification for pricing path-dependent options. *Mathematical Finance*, 9(2):117–152, 1999.
- V. Grover. Active learning and its application to heteroscedastic problems. *Department of Computing Science, Univ. of Alberta, MSc thesis*, 2009.
- R. Kawai. Asymptotically optimal allocation of stratified sampling with adaptive variance reduction by strata. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation (TOMACS)*, 20(2):1–17, 2010. ISSN 1049-3301.
- A. Maurer and M. Pontil. Empirical bernstein bounds and sample-variance penalization. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 115–124, 2009.
- S.I. Resnick. *A probability path*. Birkhäuser, 1999.
- R.Y. Rubinstein and D.P. Kroese. *Simulation and the Monte Carlo method*. Wiley-interscience, 2008. ISBN 0470177942.

540 Supplementary material for the paper :  
 541 Finite Time Analysis of Stratified Sampling for  
 542 Monte Carlo  
 543  
 544  
 545  
 546  
 547  
 548

549 **A Main tools**

550  
 551 **A.1 The main tool: a high probability bound on the standard deviations**

552 **Upper bound on the standard deviation:** The upper confidence bounds  $B_{k,t}$  used  
 553 in the MC-UCB algorithm is motivated by Theorem 10 in (Maurer and Pontil, 2009) (a  
 554 variant of this result is also reported in (Audibert et al., 2009)). We extend this result to  
 555 sub-Gaussian random variables.  
 556

557 **Lemma 1** *Let Assumption 1 hold and  $n \geq 2$ . Define the following event*  
 558

$$559 \xi = \xi_{K,n}(\delta) = \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq K, 2 \leq t \leq n} \left\{ \left| \sqrt{\frac{1}{t-1} \sum_{i=1}^t \left( X_{k,i} - \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t X_{k,j} \right)^2} - \sigma_k \right| \leq 2a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{t}} \right\}, \quad (11)$$

564 where  $a = \sqrt{2c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)} + \frac{\sqrt{c_1 \delta (1+c_2 + \log(c_2/\delta))}}{(1-\delta)\sqrt{2 \log(2/\delta)}} n^{1/2}$ . Then  $\Pr(\xi) \geq 1 - 2nK\delta$ .  
 565  
 566

567 Note that the first term in the absolute value in Equation 11 is the empirical standard  
 568 deviation of arm  $k$  computed as in Equation 6 for  $t$  samples. The event  $\xi$  plays an important  
 569 role in the proofs of this section and a number of statements will be proved on this event.  
 570

571 *Proof:*

572 **Step 1. Truncating sub-Gaussian variables.** We want to characterize the mean and  
 573 variance of the variables  $X_{k,t}$  given that  $|X_{k,t} - \mu_k| \leq \sqrt{c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)}$ . For any positive  
 574 random variable  $Y$  and any  $b \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(Y \mathbb{I}\{Y > b\}) = \int_b^\infty \mathbb{P}(Y > \epsilon) d\epsilon + b\mathbb{P}(Y > b)$ . If we take  
 575  $b = c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)$  and use Assumption 1, we obtain:  
 576  
 577

$$578 \mathbb{E}\left[|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 > b\}\right] = \int_b^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 > \epsilon) d\epsilon + b\mathbb{P}(|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 > b)$$

$$579 \leq \int_b^{+\infty} c_2 \exp(-\epsilon/c_1) d\epsilon + bc_2 \exp(-b/c_1)$$

$$580 \leq c_1 \delta + c_1 \log(c_2/\delta) \delta$$

$$581 \leq c_1 \delta (1 + \log(c_2/\delta)).$$

582  
 583 We have  $\mathbb{E}\left[|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 > b\}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b\}\right] = \sigma_k^2$ ,  
 584 which, combined with the previous equation, implies that  
 585

$$586 \left| \mathbb{E}\left[|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mid |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b\right] - \sigma_k^2 \right| = \frac{\left| \mathbb{E}\left[\left((X_{k,t} - \mu_k)^2 - \sigma_k^2\right) \mathbb{I}\{|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 > b\}\right] \right|}{\mathbb{P}\left(|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b\right)}$$

$$587 \leq \frac{c_1 \delta (1 + \log(c_2/\delta)) + \delta \sigma_k^2}{1 - \delta}. \quad (12)$$

Note also that Cauchy-Schwartz inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( X_{k,t} - \mu_k \right) \mathbb{I} \{ |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 > b \} \right] \right| &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( X_{k,t} - \mu_k \right)^2 \mathbb{I} \{ |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 > b \} \right]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{c_1 \delta (1 + \log(c_2/\delta))}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, notice that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ X_{k,t} \mathbb{I} \{ |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 > b \} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ X_{k,t} \mathbb{I} \{ |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b \} \right] = \mu_k$ , which, combined with the previous result and using  $n \geq K \geq 2$ , implies that

$$|\tilde{\mu}_k - \mu_k| = \frac{\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( X_{k,t} - \mu_k \right) \mathbb{I} \{ |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 > b \} \right] \right|}{\mathbb{P} \left( |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b \right)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{c_1 \delta (1 + \log(c_2/\delta))}}{1 - \delta}, \quad (13)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{\mu}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[ X_{k,t} \mid |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ X_{k,t} \mathbb{I} \{ |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b \} \right]}{\mathbb{P} \left( |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b \right)}.$$

We note  $\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{V} \left[ X_{k,t} \mid |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mid |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b \right] - (\mu_k - \tilde{\mu}_k)^2$ . From Equations 12 and 13, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\sigma}_k^2 - \sigma_k^2| &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mid |X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \leq b \right] - \sigma_k^2 \right| + |\tilde{\mu}_k - \mu_k|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 \delta (1 + \log(c_2/\delta)) + \delta \sigma_k^2}{1 - \delta} + \frac{c_1 \delta (1 + \log(c_2/\delta))}{(1 - \delta)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{2c_1 \delta (1 + \log(c_2/\delta)) + \delta \sigma_k^2}{(1 - \delta)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce, because  $\sigma_k^2 \leq c_1 c_2$

$$|\tilde{\sigma}_k - \sigma_k| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2c_1 \delta (1 + c_2 + \log(c_2/\delta))}}{1 - \delta}. \quad (14)$$

## Step 2. Application of large deviation inequalities.

Let  $\xi_1 = \xi_{1,K,n}(\delta)$  be the event:

$$\xi_1 = \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq t \leq n} \left\{ |X_{k,t} - \mu_k| \leq \sqrt{c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)} \right\}.$$

Under Assumption 1, using a union bound, we have that the probability of this event is at least  $1 - nK\delta$ .

We now recall Theorem 10 of (Maurer and Pontil, 2009):

**Theorem 1 (Maurer and Pontil (2009))** *Let  $(X_1, \dots, X_t)$  be  $t \geq 2$  i.i.d. random variables of variance  $\sigma^2$  and mean  $\mu$  and such that  $\forall i \leq t, X_i \in [a, a + c]$ . Then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ :*

$$\left| \sqrt{\frac{1}{t-1} \sum_{i=1}^t \left( X_i - \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t X_j \right)^2} - \sigma \right| \leq 2c \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{t-1}}.$$

On  $\xi_1$ , the  $\{X_{k,i}\}_{i, 1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq i \leq t}$  are  $t$  i.i.d. bounded random variables with standard deviation  $\tilde{\sigma}_k$ .

Let  $\xi_2 = \xi_{2,K,n}(\delta)$  be the event:

$$\xi_2 = \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq t \leq n} \left\{ \left| \sqrt{\frac{1}{t-1} \sum_{i=1}^t \left( X_{k,i} - \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t X_{k,j} \right)^2} - \tilde{\sigma}_k \right| \leq 2\sqrt{c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{t-1}} \right\}.$$

Using Theorem 10 of (Maurer and Pontil, 2009) and a union bound, we deduce that  $\Pr(\xi_1 \cap \xi_2) \geq 1 - 2nK\delta$ .

Now, from Equation 14, we have on  $\xi_1 \cap \xi_2$ , for all  $1 \leq k \leq K$ ,  $2 \leq t \leq n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sqrt{\frac{1}{t-1} \sum_{i=1}^t \left( X_{k,i} - \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t X_{k,j} \right)^2} - \sigma_k \right| &\leq 2\sqrt{c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{t-1}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{2c_1\delta(1+c_2+\log(c_2/\delta))}}{1-\delta} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{t}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{2c_1\delta(1+c_2+\log(c_2/\delta))}}{1-\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce Lemma 1 (since  $\xi_1 \cap \xi_2 \subseteq \xi$  and  $2 \leq t \leq n$ ).  $\square$

We deduce the following corollary when the number of samples  $T_{k,t}$  are random.

**Corollary 1** For any  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and  $t = 2K, \dots, n$ , let  $\{X_{k,i}\}_i$  be  $n$  i.i.d. random variables drawn from  $\nu_k$ , satisfying Assumption 1. Let  $T_{k,t}$  be any random variable taking values in  $\{2, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $\hat{\sigma}_{k,t}^2$  be the empirical variance computed from Equation 6. Then, on the event  $\xi$ , we have:

$$|\hat{\sigma}_{k,t} - \sigma_k| \leq 2a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{k,t}}}. \quad (15)$$

## A.2 Other important properties

**A stopping time problem:** We now draw a connection between the adaptive sampling and stopping time problems. We report the following proposition which is a type of Wald's Theorem for variance (see e.g. Resnick (1999)).

**Proposition 1** Let  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$  be a filtration and  $X_t$  a  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted sequence of i.i.d. random variables with variance  $\sigma^2$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{F}_t$  and the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{X_i : i \geq t+1\}$  are independent and  $T$  is a stopping time w.r.t.  $\mathcal{F}_t$  with a finite expected value. If  $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] < \infty$  then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^T X_i - T \mu \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}[T] \sigma^2. \quad (16)$$

**Bound on the regret outside of  $\xi$ .** The next lemma provides a bound for the loss whenever the event  $\xi$  does not hold.

**Lemma 2** Let Assumption 1 holds. Then for every arm  $k$ :

$$\mathbb{E} [ |\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi^C \} ] \leq 2c_1 n^2 K \delta (1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta)).$$

*Proof:* Since the arms have sub-Gaussian distribution, for any  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_{k,t} - \mu_k| \geq \epsilon) \leq c_2 \exp(-\epsilon/c_1),$$

and thus by setting  $\epsilon = c_1 \log(c_2/2nK\delta)$ <sup>11</sup>, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \geq c_1 \log(c_2/2nK\delta)) \leq 2nK\delta.$$

<sup>11</sup>Note that we need to choose  $c_2$  such that  $c_2 \geq 2nK\delta = 2Kn^{-5/2}$  if  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$ .



We thus know that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\Omega/\mathbb{P}(\Omega)=2nK\delta} \mathbb{E}[|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{\Omega\}] \\ & \leq \int_{c_1 \log(c_2/2nK\delta)}^{\infty} c_2 \exp(-\epsilon/c_1) d\epsilon + c_1 \log(c_2/2nK\delta) \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \\ & = 2c_1 nK\delta(1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta)). \end{aligned}$$

Since the event  $\xi^C$  has a probability at most  $2nK\delta$ , for any  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi^C\}] \leq \max_{\Omega/\mathbb{P}(\Omega)=2nK\delta} \mathbb{E}[|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{\Omega\}] \leq 2c_1 nK\delta(1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta)).$$

The claim follows from the fact that  $\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi^C\}] \leq \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi^C\}] \leq 2c_1 n^2 K\delta(1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta))$ .  $\square$

### A.3 Technical inequalities

**Upper and lower bound on  $a$ :** If  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$ , with  $n \geq 4K \geq 8$

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \sqrt{2c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)} + \frac{\sqrt{c_1 \delta(1 + c_2 + \log(c_2/\delta))}}{(1 - \delta)\sqrt{2 \log(2/\delta)}} n^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{7c_1(c_2 + 1) \log(n)} + \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sqrt{c_1(2 + c_2)} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2c_1(c_2 + 2) \log(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

[On multiplie juste par  $\sqrt{2}$  et on vire le terme en  $\hat{\mu}$  par rapport a avant.]

We also have by just keeping the first term and choosing  $c_2$  such that  $c_2 \geq e\delta = en^{-7/2}$

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \sqrt{2c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)} + \frac{\sqrt{c_1 \delta(1 + c_2 + \log(c_2/\delta))}}{(1 - \delta)\sqrt{2 \log(2/\delta)}} n^{1/2} \\ &\geq \sqrt{2c_1} \geq \sqrt{c_1}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lower bound on  $c(\delta)$  when  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$ :** Since the arms have sub-Gaussian distribution, for any  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2 \geq \epsilon) \leq c_2 \exp(-\epsilon/c_1),$$

We then have

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_{k,t} - \mu_k|^2] \leq \int_0^{\infty} c_2 \exp(-\epsilon/c_1) d\epsilon = c_2 c_1$$

We then have  $\Sigma_w \leq \sqrt{c_2 c_1}$ .

If  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$ , we obtain by using the lower bound on  $a$  that

$$\begin{aligned} c(\delta = n^{-7/2}) &= \left( \frac{2a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\Sigma_w + 4a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}} \frac{1}{K} \right)^{2/3} \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{2K} - \frac{1}{2K} \frac{\Sigma_w}{\Sigma_w + 4a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}} \right)^{2/3} \\ &\geq \left( \frac{1}{2K} - \frac{1}{2K} \frac{\Sigma_w}{\Sigma_w + 4\sqrt{c_1 \log(n)}} \right)^{2/3} \\ &\geq \left( \frac{1}{2K} \right)^{2/3} \left( \frac{\sqrt{c_1}}{\Sigma_w + \sqrt{c_1}} \right)^{2/3} \geq \left( \frac{1}{2K} \right)^{2/3} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_2} + 1} \right)^{2/3}, \end{aligned}$$

756 by using  $\Sigma_w \leq \sqrt{c_2 c_1}$  for the last step.  
757

758 **Upper bound on  $\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi^C\}]$  when  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$ :** We get from Lemma 2 when  
759  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$  and when choosing  $c_2$  such that  $c_2 \geq 2enK\delta = 2Ken^{-5/2}$   
760

$$\begin{aligned} 761 \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi^C\}] &\leq 2c_1 n^2 K \delta (1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta)) \\ 762 &\leq 2c_1 K \left(1 + \frac{5}{2}(c_2 + 1) \log(n)\right) n^{-3/2} \\ 763 &\leq 6c_1 K (c_2 + 1) \log(n) n^{-3/2}. \end{aligned}$$

## 764 B Proof of Theorem 1

765 In this section, we first provide the proof for the following Lemma and then use the result  
766 to prove Theorem 1.  
767

768 **Lemma 3** *Let Assumption 1 hold. Let  $0 < \delta \leq 1$  be arbitrary and and  $n \geq 4K$ . The  
769 difference between the allocation  $T_{p,n}$  implemented by the MC-UCB algorithm described in  
770 Figure 1 and the optimal allocation rule  $T_{p,n}^*$  has the following upper and lower bounds, on  
771  $\xi$  (and thus with probability at least  $1 - 2nK\delta$ ), for any arm  $1 \leq p \leq K$ :*  
772

$$773 -12a\lambda_p \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\Sigma_w \lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} \sqrt{n} - 4K\lambda_p \leq T_{p,n} - T_{p,n}^* \leq 12a \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\Sigma_w \lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} \sqrt{n} + 4K. \quad (17)$$

774 where  $a = \sqrt{2c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)} + \frac{\sqrt{c_1 \delta (1+c_2+\log(c_2/\delta))}}{(1-\delta)\sqrt{2\log(2/\delta)}} n^{1/2}$ .  
775

776 In Equation 17, the difference  $T_{p,n} - T_{p,n}^*$  is bounded with  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ . This is directly linked  
777 to the parametric rate of convergence of the estimation of  $\sigma_k$ , which is of order  $1/\sqrt{n}$ . Note  
778 that Equation 17 also shows the inverse dependency on the smallest proportion  $\lambda_{\min}$ .  
779

780 *Proof:* [Lemma 3] The proof consists of the following three main steps.  
781

782 **Step 1. Properties of the algorithm.** Recall the definition of the upper bound used in  
783 MC-UCB when  $t > 2K$ :  
784

$$785 B_{q,t+1} = \frac{w_q}{T_{q,t}} \left( \hat{\sigma}_{q,t} + 2a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,t}}} \right), \quad 1 \leq q \leq K.$$

786 From Corollary 1, we obtain the following upper and lower bounds for  $B_{q,t+1}$  on  $\xi$ :  
787

$$788 \frac{w_q \sigma_q}{T_{q,t}} \leq B_{q,t+1} \leq \frac{w_q}{T_{q,t}} \left( \sigma_q + 4a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,t}}} \right). \quad (18)$$

789 Let  $t+1 > 2K$  be the time at which a given arm  $k$  is pulled for the last time, i.e.,  $T_{k,t} =$   
790  $T_{k,n} - 1$  and  $T_{k,(t+1)} = T_{k,n}$ . Note that as  $n \geq 4K$ , there is at least one arm  $k$  such that this  
791 happens, i.e. such that it is pulled after the initialization phase. Since  $\mathcal{A}_{MC-UCB}$  chooses  
792 to pull arm  $k$  at time  $t+1$ , we have for any arm  $p$   
793

$$794 B_{p,t+1} \leq B_{k,t+1}. \quad (19)$$

795 From Equation 18 and the fact that  $T_{k,t} = T_{k,n} - 1$ , we obtain  
796

$$797 B_{k,t+1} \leq \frac{w_k}{T_{k,t}} \left( \sigma_k + 4a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{k,t}}} \right) = \frac{w_k}{T_{k,n} - 1} \left( \sigma_k + 4a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{k,n} - 1}} \right). \quad (20)$$

Using the lower bound in Equation 18 and the fact that  $T_{p,t} \leq T_{p,n}$ , we may lower bound  $B_{p,t+1}$  as

$$B_{p,t+1} \geq \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,t}} \geq \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}}. \quad (21)$$

Combining Equations 19, 20, and 21, we obtain

$$\frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}} \leq \frac{w_k}{T_{k,n} - 1} \left( \sigma_k + 4a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{k,n} - 1}} \right). \quad (22)$$

Note that at this point there is no dependency on  $t$ , and thus, the probability that Equation 22 holds for any  $p$  and for any  $k$  such that arm  $k$  is pulled after the initialization phase, i.e., such that  $T_{k,n} > 2$ , is at least  $1 - 2nK\delta$  (probability of event  $\xi$ ).

**Step 2. Lower bound on  $T_{p,n}$ .** If an arm  $p$  is under-pulled compared to its optimal allocation *without taking into account the initialization phase*, i.e.,  $T_{p,n} - 2 < \lambda_p(n - 2K)$ , then from the constraint  $\sum_k (T_{k,n} - 2) = n - 2K$  and the definition of the optimal allocation, we deduce that there exists at least another arm  $k$  that is over-pulled compared to its optimal allocation *without taking into account the initialization phase*, i.e.,  $T_{k,n} - 2 > \lambda_k(n - 2K)$ . Note that for this arm,  $T_{k,n} - 2 > \lambda_k(n - 2K) \geq 0$ , so we know that this specific arm is pulled at least once *after* the initialization phase and that it satisfies Equation 22. Using the definition of the optimal allocation  $T_{k,n}^* = nw_k \sigma_k / \Sigma_w$ , and the fact that  $T_{k,n} \geq \lambda_k(n - 2K) + 2$ , Equation 22 may be written as for any arm  $p$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}} &\leq \frac{w_k}{T_{k,n}^*} \frac{n}{(n - 2K)} \left( \sigma_k + 4a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{\lambda_k(n - 2K) + 1}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\Sigma_w}{n} + \frac{4K \Sigma_w}{n^2} + 8\sqrt{2}a \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{n^{3/2} \lambda_k^{3/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

because  $n \geq 4K$ . The previous Equation, combined with the fact that  $\lambda_k \geq \lambda_{\min}$ , may be written as

$$\frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}} \leq \frac{\Sigma_w}{n} + 12a \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{n^{3/2} \lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} + \frac{4K \Sigma_w}{n^2}. \quad (23)$$

By rearranging Equation 23, we obtain the lower bound on  $T_{p,n}$ :

$$T_{p,n} \geq \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{\frac{\Sigma_w}{n} + 12a \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{n^{3/2} \lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} + \frac{4K \Sigma_w}{n^2}} \geq T_{p,n}^* - 12a \lambda_p \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\Sigma_w \lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} \sqrt{n} - 4K \lambda_p, \quad (24)$$

where in the second inequality we use  $1/(1+x) \geq 1-x$  (for  $x > -1$ ). Note that the lower bound holds on  $\xi$  for any arm  $p$ .

**Step 3. Upper bound on  $T_{p,n}$ .** Using Equation 24 and the fact that  $\sum_k T_{k,n} = n$ , we obtain

$$T_{p,n} = n - \sum_{k \neq p} T_{k,n} \leq \left( n - \sum_{k \neq p} T_{k,n}^* \right) + \sum_{k \neq p} \left( 12a \lambda_p \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\Sigma_w \lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} \sqrt{n} + 4K \lambda_p \right).$$

And we deduce because  $\sum_{k \neq p} \lambda_k \leq 1$

$$T_{p,n} \leq T_{p,n}^* + 12a \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\Sigma_w \lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} \sqrt{n} + 4K. \quad (25)$$

The lemma follows by combining the lower and upper bounds in Equations 24 and 25.  $\square$

864

865

866

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

867

868

869

**Theorem 1** Under Assumption 1 and if  $c_2$  is chosen such that  $c_2 \geq 2Kn^{-5/2}$ , the regret of MC-UCB run with parameter  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$  with  $n \geq 4K$  is bounded as

870

871

872

873

874

$$R_n(\mathcal{A}_{MC-UCB}) \leq \frac{\log(n)}{n^{3/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} \left( 112\Sigma_w \sqrt{c_1(c_2+2)} + 6c_1(c_2+2)K \right) + \frac{19}{\lambda_{\min}^3 n^2} \left( K\Sigma_w^2 + 720c_1(c_2+1)\log(n)^2 \right).$$

875

*Proof:* [Theorem 1] The proof consists of the following two steps.

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

**Step 1.  $T_{k,n}$  is a stopping time.** Consider an arm  $k$ . At each time step  $t+1$ , the MC-UCB algorithm decides which arm to pull according to the current values of the upper-bounds  $\{B_{k,t+1}\}_k$ . Thus for any arm  $k$ ,  $T_{k,(t+1)}$  depends only on the values  $\{T_{k,t}\}_k$  and  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{k,t}\}_k$ . So by induction,  $T_{k,(t+1)}$  depends on the sequence  $\{X_{k,1}, \dots, X_{k,T_{k,t}}\}$ , and on the samples of the other arms (which are independent of the samples of arm  $k$ ). We deduce that  $T_{k,n}$  is a stopping time adapted to the process  $(X_{k,t})_{t \leq n}$ .

884

885

**Step 2. Regret bound.** By definition, the loss of the algorithm writes

886

887

888

889

$$L_n = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \right] = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi\} \right] + \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi^C\} \right].$$

890

Using the definition of  $\hat{\mu}_{k,n}$  and Proposition 1 we bound the first term as

891

892

893

894

$$\sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi\} \right] \leq \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \frac{\sigma_k^2 \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}]}{\underline{T}_{k,n}}, \quad (26)$$

895

where  $\underline{T}_{k,n}$  is the lower bound on  $T_{k,n}$  on the event  $\xi$ .

896

897

Note that as  $\sum_k T_{k,n} = n$ , we also have  $\sum_k \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}] = n$ .

898

899

Using Equation 26 and Equation 23 for  $w_k \sigma_k / \underline{T}_{k,n}$  (which is equivalent to using a lower bound on  $T_{k,n}$  on the event  $\xi$ ), we obtain

900

901

902

903

904

$$\sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \frac{\sigma_k^2 \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}]}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{\Sigma_w}{n} + 12a \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{n^{3/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} + \frac{4K\Sigma_w}{n^2} \right)^2 \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}]. \quad (27)$$

905

Equation 27 may be bounded using the fact that  $\sum_k \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}] = n$  as

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \frac{\sigma_k^2 \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}]}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} &\leq \left( \frac{\Sigma_w}{n} + 12a \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{n^{3/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} + \frac{4K\Sigma_w}{n^2} \right)^2 n \\ &\leq \left( \left( \frac{\Sigma_w}{n} \right)^2 + 24a\Sigma_w \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{n^{5/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} + \frac{8K\Sigma_w^2}{n^3} + 288a^2 \frac{\log(2/\delta)}{n^3\lambda_{\min}^3} + \frac{8K^2\Sigma_w^2}{n^4} \right) n \\ &= \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + 24a\Sigma_w \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{n^{3/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} + \frac{8K\Sigma_w^2}{n^2} + 288a^2 \frac{\log(2/\delta)}{n^2\lambda_{\min}^3} + \frac{8K^2\Sigma_w^2}{n^3} \\ &\leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + 24a\Sigma_w \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{n^{3/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} + \frac{16}{\lambda_{\min}^3 n^2} \left( K\Sigma_w^2 + 18a^2 \log(2/\delta) \right). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2, we have  $\mathbb{E}\left[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi^C\}\right] \leq 2c_1 n^2 K \delta (1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta))$ . Thus using the previous equation, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} L_n &\leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + 24a\Sigma_w \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{n^{3/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} + \frac{16}{\lambda_{\min}^3 n^2} \left(K\Sigma_w^2 + 18a^2 \log(2/\delta)\right) + 2c_1 n^2 K \delta (1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta)) \\ &\leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + 54a\Sigma_w \frac{\sqrt{\log(n)}}{n^{3/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} + \frac{16}{\lambda_{\min}^3 n^2} \left(K\Sigma_w^2 + 90a^2 \log(n)\right) + 6c_1 K (c_2 + 1) \log(n) n^{-3/2} \\ &\leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + \frac{\log(n)}{n^{3/2}\lambda_{\min}^{3/2}} \left(112\Sigma_w \sqrt{c_1(c_2 + 2)} + 6c_1(c_2 + 2)K\right) + \frac{19}{\lambda_{\min}^3 n^2} \left(K\Sigma_w^2 + 720c_1(c_2 + 1) \log(n)^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

where we use  $a \leq 2\sqrt{2c_1(c_2 + 2)\log(n)}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi^C\}] \leq 6c_1 K (c_2 + 1) \log(n) n^{-3/2}$ . Those bounds are made explicit in A.3.

The Theorem follows by expressing the regret.  $\square$

## C Proof of Theorem 2

Again, we first state and prove the following Lemma and then use this result to prove Theorem 2.

**Lemma 4** *Let Assumption 1 hold. For any  $0 < \delta \leq 1$  and for  $n \geq 4K$ , the algorithm MC-UCB satisfies on  $\xi$ , and thus with probability at least  $1 - 2nK\delta$ , for any arm  $p$ ,*

$$T_{p,n} \geq T_{p,n}^* - \left(24aK^{2/3} \frac{1}{\Sigma_w} \lambda_q \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} n^{2/3} + 12K\lambda_q\right), \quad (28)$$

and

$$T_{p,n} \leq T_{p,n}^* + \left(24aK^{2/3} \frac{1}{\Sigma_w} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} n^{2/3} + 12K\Sigma_w\right), \quad (29)$$

where  $c(\delta) = \left(\frac{2a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\Sigma_w + 4a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}} \frac{1}{K}\right)^{2/3}$  and  $a = \sqrt{2c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)} + \frac{\sqrt{c_1 \delta(1+c_2+\log(c_2/\delta))}}{(1-\delta)\sqrt{2\log(2/\delta)}} n^{1/2}$ .

Unlike the bounds proved in Lemma 3, the difference between  $T_{p,n}$  and  $T_{p,n}^*$  is bounded by  $\tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$  without any inverse dependency on  $\lambda_{\min}$ .

*Proof:*

**Step 1. Lower bound of order  $\tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$ .** Let  $k$  be the index of an arm such that  $T_{k,n} \geq \frac{n}{K}$  (this implies  $T_{k,n} \geq 3$  as  $n \geq 4K$ , and arm  $k$  is thus pulled after the initialization) and let  $t + 1 \leq n$  be the last time at which it was pulled<sup>12</sup>, i.e.,  $T_{k,t} = T_{k,n} - 1$  and  $T_{k,t+1} = T_{k,n}$ . From Equation 15 and the fact that  $T_{k,n} \geq \frac{n}{K}$ , we obtain on  $\xi$

$$B_{k,t} \leq \frac{w_k}{T_{k,t}} \left(\sigma_k + 4a\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{k,t}}}\right) \leq \frac{K\left(\Sigma_w + 4a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}\right)}{n}, \quad (30)$$

where the second inequality follows from the facts that  $T_{k,t} \geq 1$ ,  $w_k \sigma_k \leq \Sigma_w$ , and  $w_k \leq \sum_k w_k = 1$ . Since at time  $t + 1$  the arm  $k$  has been pulled, then for any arm  $q$ , we have

$$B_{q,t} \leq B_{k,t}. \quad (31)$$

<sup>12</sup>Note that such an arm always exists for any possible allocation strategy given the constraint  $n = \sum_q T_{q,n}$ .

From the definition of  $B_{q,t}$ , and also using the fact that  $T_{q,t} \leq T_{q,n}$ , we deduce on  $\xi$  that

$$B_{q,t} \geq 2aw_q \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{T_{q,t}^{3/2}} \geq 2aw_q \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{T_{q,n}^{3/2}}. \quad (32)$$

Combining Equations 30–32, we obtain on  $\xi$

$$2aw_q \frac{\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{T_{q,n}^{3/2}} \leq \frac{K(\Sigma_w + 4a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)})}{n}.$$

Finally, this implies on  $\xi$  that for any  $q$ ,

$$T_{q,n} \geq \left( \frac{2aw_q \sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\Sigma_w + 4a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}} \frac{n}{K} \right)^{2/3}. \quad (33)$$

In order to simplify the notation, in the following we define

$$c(\delta) = \left( \frac{2a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\Sigma_w + 4a\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}} \frac{1}{K} \right)^{2/3},$$

thus the lower bound on  $T_{q,n}$  on  $\xi$  writes  $T_{q,n} \geq w_q^{2/3} c(\delta) n^{2/3}$ .

**Step 2. Properties of the algorithm.** We follow a similar analysis to Step 1 of the proof of Lemma 3. We first recall the definition of  $B_{q,t+1}$  used in the MC-UCB algorithm

$$B_{q,t+1} = \frac{w_q}{T_{q,t}} \left( \hat{\sigma}_{q,t} + 2a\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,t}}} \right).$$

Using Corollary 1 it follows that, on  $\xi$

$$\frac{w_q \sigma_q}{T_{q,t}} \leq B_{q,t+1} \leq \frac{w_q}{T_{q,t}} \left( \sigma_q + 4a\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,t}}} \right). \quad (34)$$

Let  $t+1 \geq 2K+1$  be the time at which an arm  $q$  is pulled for the last time, that is  $T_{q,t} = T_{q,n} - 1$ . Note that there is at least one arm such that this happens as  $n \geq 4K$ . Since at  $t+1$  arm  $q$  is chosen, then for any other arm  $p$ , we have

$$B_{p,t+1} \leq B_{q,t+1}. \quad (35)$$

From Equation 34 and  $T_{q,t} = T_{q,n} - 1$ , we obtain on  $\xi$

$$B_{q,t+1} \leq \frac{w_q}{T_{q,t}} \left( \sigma_q + 4a\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,t}}} \right) = \frac{w_q}{T_{q,n} - 1} \left( \sigma_q + 4a\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,n} - 1}} \right). \quad (36)$$

Furthermore, since  $T_{p,t} \leq T_{p,n}$ , then on  $\xi$

$$B_{p,t+1} \geq \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,t}} \geq \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}}. \quad (37)$$

Combining Equations 35–37, we obtain on  $\xi$

$$\frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}} (T_{q,n} - 1) \leq w_q \left( \sigma_q + 4a\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,n} - 1}} \right).$$

Summing over all  $q$  such that the previous Equation is verified, i.e. such that  $T_{q,n} \geq 3$ , on both sides, we obtain on  $\xi$

$$\frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}} \sum_{q|T_{q,n} \geq 3} (T_{q,n} - 1) \leq \sum_{q|T_{q,n} \geq 3} w_q \left( \sigma_q + 4a\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,n} - 1}} \right).$$



1026 This implies  
1027

$$1028 \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}} (n - 3K) \leq \sum_{q=1}^K w_q \left( \sigma_q + 4a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,n} - 1}} \right). \quad (38)$$

1032 **Step 3. Lower bound.** Plugging Equation 33 in Equation 38,  
1033

$$1034 \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}} (n - 3K) \leq \sum_q w_q \left( \sigma_q + 4a \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{T_{q,n} - 1}} \right)$$

$$1035 \leq \sum_q w_q \left( \sigma_q + 4a \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2/\delta)}{w_q^{2/3} c(\delta) n^{2/3}}} \right)$$

$$1036 \leq \Sigma_w + \sum_q 4a w_q^{2/3} \sqrt{2 \frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta) n^{2/3}}} \leq \Sigma_w + 6a K^{2/3} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta) n^{2/3}}},$$

1040 on  $\xi$ , since  $\sum_q w_q^{2/3} \leq K^{2/3}$  by Jensen inequality and because  $T_{q,n} - 1 \geq \frac{T_{q,n}}{2}$  (as  $T_{q,n} \geq 2$ ).  
1041 Finally as  $n \geq 4K$ , we obtain on  $\xi$  the following bound  
1042

$$1043 \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{T_{p,n}} \leq \frac{\Sigma_w}{n} + 24a K^{2/3} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} n^{-4/3} + \frac{12K \Sigma_w}{n^2}. \quad (39)$$

1044 We now invert the bound and obtain on  $\xi$  the final lower-bound on  $T_{p,n}$  as follows:  
1045

$$1046 T_{p,n} \geq \frac{w_p \sigma_p}{\frac{\Sigma_w}{n} + 24a K^{2/3} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} n^{-4/3} + \frac{12K \Sigma_w}{n^2}} \geq T_{p,n}^* - 24a K^{2/3} \frac{1}{\Sigma_w} \lambda_p \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} n^{2/3} - 12K \lambda_p.$$

1048 Note that the above lower bound holds with high probability for any arm  $p$ .  
1049

1050 **Step 4. Upper bound.** An upper bound on  $T_{p,n}$  on  $\xi$  follows by using  $T_{p,n} = n - \sum_{q \neq p} T_{q,n}$   
1051 and the previous lower bound, that is  
1052

$$1053 T_{p,n} \leq n - \sum_{q \neq p} T_{q,n}^* + \sum_{q \neq p} \left( 12K \lambda_q + 24a K^{2/3} \frac{1}{\Sigma_w} \lambda_q \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} n^{2/3} \right)$$

$$1054 \leq T_{p,n}^* + \left( 24a K^{2/3} \frac{1}{\Sigma_w} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} n^{2/3} + 12K \right),$$

1055  $\square$

1056 because  $\sum_{q \neq p} \lambda_q \leq 1$ .  
1057

1058 We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.  
1059

1060 **Theorem 2** Under Assumption 1 and by ensuring that  $c_2 \geq 2Kn^{-5/2}$ , the regret of MC-  
1061 UCB run with parameter  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$  with  $n \geq 4K$  is bounded as  
1062

$$1063 R_n(\mathcal{A}_{MC-UCB}) \leq \frac{200 \sqrt{c_1} (c_2 + 2) \Sigma_w K}{n^{4/3}} \log(n) + \frac{365}{n^{3/2}} \left( 129c_1 (c_2 + 2)^2 K^2 \log(n)^2 + K \Sigma_w^2 \right).$$

1064 *Proof:* [Theorem 2]  
1065

1066 We decompose the loss on  $\xi$  and its complement:  
1067

$$1068 L_n = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \right] = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi\} \right] + \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I}\{\xi^C\} \right].$$

1080 Using the definition of  $\hat{\mu}_{k,n}$  and Proposition 1 we bound the first term as  
 1081

$$1082 \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \right] \leq \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \frac{\sigma_k^2 \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}]}{\underline{T}_{k,n}}, \quad (40)$$

1083 where  $\underline{T}_{k,n}$  is the lower bound on  $T_{k,n}$  on  $\xi$ .  
 1084

1085 Note also that as  $\sum_k T_{k,n} = n$ , we also have  $\sum_k \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}] = n$ . Using Equation 40 and  
 1086 Equation 39 which provides an upper bound on  $\xi$  on  $\frac{w_k \sigma_k}{T_{k,n}}$  (and thus a lower bound on  $\xi$  on  
 1087  $T_{k,n}$ ), we deduce  
 1088

$$1089 \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \right] \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{\Sigma_w}{n} + 24aK^{2/3} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} n^{-4/3} + \frac{12K\Sigma_w}{n^2} \right)^2 \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}].$$

1092 (41)

1093 Using the fact that  $\sum_k \mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}] = n$ , Equation 41 may be rewritten as  
 1094

$$1095 \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \right] \leq \left( \frac{\Sigma_w}{n} + 24aK^{2/3} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} n^{-4/3} + \frac{12K\Sigma_w}{n^2} \right)^2 n$$

$$1099 \leq \left( \left( \frac{\Sigma_w}{n} \right)^2 + \frac{48\Sigma_w a K^{2/3}}{n^{7/3}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} \right.$$

$$1100 \left. + \frac{12K\Sigma_w^2}{n^3} + \frac{1152a^2 K^{4/3} \log(2/\delta)}{n^{8/3} c(\delta)} + \frac{288K^2 \Sigma_w^2}{n^4} \right) n$$

$$1104 = \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + \frac{48\Sigma_w a K^{2/3}}{n^{4/3}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} +$$

$$1105 \frac{12K\Sigma_w^2}{n^2} + \frac{1152a^2 K^{4/3} \log(2/\delta)}{n^{5/3} c(\delta)} + \frac{288K^2 \Sigma_w^2}{n^3}$$

$$1109 \leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + \frac{48\Sigma_w a K^{2/3}}{n^{4/3}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} + \frac{300}{n^2} \left( 4a^2 K^{4/3} \frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)} + K\Sigma_w^2 \right).$$

1112 From Lemma 2, we have  $\mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi^C \} \right] \leq 2c_1 n^2 K \delta (1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta))$ . Thus using  
 1113 the last equation and the fact that  $\delta = n^{-7/2}$ , the loss is bounded as  
 1114

$$1115 L_n \leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + \frac{48\Sigma_w a K^{2/3}}{n^{4/3}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)}} + \frac{300}{n^2} \left( 4a^2 K^{4/3} \frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c(\delta)} + K\Sigma_w^2 \right) + 2c_1 n^2 K \delta (1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta))$$

$$1119 \leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + \frac{96\Sigma_w a K}{n^{4/3}} \sqrt{\log(n)} (\sqrt{c_2} + 1)^{1/3} + \frac{300}{n^2} \left( 16a^2 K^2 \log(n) (\sqrt{c_2} + 1)^{2/3} + K\Sigma_w^2 \right)$$

$$1122 + 6c_1 K (c_2 + 1) \log(n) n^{-3/2}$$

$$1123 \leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + \frac{200\sqrt{c_1(c_2+2)}\Sigma_w K}{n^{4/3}} \log(n) (\sqrt{c_2} + 1)^{1/3}$$

$$1124 + \frac{365}{n^{3/2}} \left( 16a^2 K^2 \log(n) (\sqrt{c_2} + 1)^{2/3} + K\Sigma_w^2 + c_1(c_2+2)K \log(n) \right)$$

$$1125 \leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n} + \frac{200\sqrt{c_1(c_2+2)}\Sigma_w K}{n^{4/3}} \log(n) + \frac{365}{n^{3/2}} \left( 129c_1(c_2+2)^2 K^2 \log(n)^2 + K\Sigma_w^2 \right).$$

1126 where we use  $a \leq 2\sqrt{2c_1(c_2+2)\log(n)}$ ,  $c(\delta) = \left(\frac{1}{2K}\right)^{2/3} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{c_2+1}}\right)^{2/3}$  and  $\mathbb{E} [ |\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k|^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi^C \} ] \leq 6c_1 K (c_2 + 1) \log(n) n^{-3/2}$ . Those bound are made explicit in A.3.  
 1127  
 1128  
 1129

□

1134 **D Comments on problem independent bounds for MC-UCB and**  
 1135 **GAFS-WL**  
 1136

1137 **D.1 Note on the problem independent bound for MC-UCB**  
 1138

1139 An interesting question is whether it is possible to obtain a regret bound of order  $n^{-3/2}$   
 1140 without the dependency on  $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$ . We provide a simple example that demonstrates that  
 1141 MC-UCB does not possess this property.

1142 Consider a problem with  $K = 2$  arms with  $\sigma_1 = 1$  and  $\sigma_2 = 0$  and  $w_1 = w_2 = 0.5$ . The  
 1143 optimal allocation strategy for this problem is  $T_{1,n}^* = n - 1$ ,  $T_{2,n}^* = 1$  (we need only one  
 1144 sample of the second arm to estimate its mean). Since  $\lambda_{\min} = 0$  the bound in Theorem 1  
 1145 is meaningless (although MC-UCB is still able to minimize the regret as demonstrated by  
 1146 Theorem 2). Indeed, the definition of the upper-confidence bound on the standard deviation  
 1147 forces the algorithm to pull each arm at least  $\tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$  times, including those arms with zero  
 1148 variance. Hence in this example, arm 2 will be pulled  $\tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$  times, which results in under-  
 1149 pulling arm 1 by the same amount, and thus, in worsening its estimation. It can be shown  
 1150 that the resulting regret is  $\tilde{O}(n^{-4/3})$ , which still decreases to zero faster than  $1/n$  but with  
 1151 a poorer rate. A sketch of the proof of this argument is as follows. Using the definition of  
 1152  $B_{k,t}$  and Equation 20 (see Appendix B), since  $\hat{\sigma}_2 = 0$ , we have that at any time  $t + 1 > 2$   
 1153

$$1154 \quad B_{1,t+1} \leq \frac{1}{2T_{1,t}} (1 + b) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{2,t+1} = \frac{1}{2T_{2,t}} \left( b \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_{2,t}}} \right). \quad (42)$$

1154 Let  $t + 1 \leq n$  be the last time that arm 1 was pulled, i.e.,  $T_{1,t} = T_{1,n} - 1$  and  $B_{1,t+1} \geq B_{2,t+1}$ .  
 1155 From Equation 42, we have  
 1156

$$1157 \quad B_{2,t+1} = \frac{b}{2T_{2,t}^{3/2}} \leq B_{1,t+1} \leq \frac{1}{2T_{1,n} - 1} (1 + b). \quad (43)$$

1158 Now consider the two possible cases: **1)**  $T_{1,n} \leq n/2$ , in which case obviously  $T_{2,n} \geq n/2$   
 1159 and **2)**  $T_{1,n} > n/2$ , in this case Equation 43 implies that  $T_{2,n} \geq T_{2,t} = \tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$ . Thus  
 1160 in both cases, we may write  $T_{2,n} = \tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$ , which indicates that arm 2 (resp. arm 1) is  
 1161 over-sampled (resp. under-sampled) by a number of pulls of order  $\tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$ . By following  
 1162 the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2, we deduce that the regret in this case is  
 1163 of order  $\tilde{O}(n^{-4/3})$ . Note that this poorer rate is the result of over-sampling the arm with  
 1164 the smaller variance (and as a consequence under-sampling at least one arm with a larger  
 1165 variance).  
 1166

1167 Thus in the case of an arm with 0 standard deviation, the regret of MC-UCB is at least  
 1168  $\tilde{O}(n^{-4/3})$ .  
 1169

1170 **D.2 Note for a problem independent bound for GAFS-WL**  
 1171

1172 Let  $n \geq 4$  be the budget. We face a two-arms bandit problem with  $w_1 = w_2 = \frac{1}{2}$  and such  
 1173 that (i) the distribution of the first arm is a Bernoulli of parameter  $p = \frac{1}{n^{1/2+\epsilon}}$  with  $\epsilon$  such  
 1174 that  $1/6 > \epsilon > 0$  and that (ii) the distribution of the second arm is such that  $\sigma_2 = 1$  and  
 1175 bounded by  $c$ .  
 1176

1177 Note that  
 1178

$$1179 \quad \frac{1}{2n^{1/4+\epsilon/2}} \leq \sigma_1 \leq \frac{1}{n^{1/4+\epsilon/2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_2 = 1,$$

1180 because  $\sigma_1 = \sqrt{p(1-p)}$  and that thus  
 1181

$$1182 \quad L_n^* \leq \frac{(1 + n^{-1/4-\epsilon/2})^2}{4n} \leq \frac{1 + 3n^{-1/4-\epsilon/2}}{4n} \leq \frac{1}{4n} + \frac{1}{n^{5/4+\epsilon/2}}.$$

1188 We run algorithm GAFS-WL on that problem. Note that algorithm GAFS-WL pull each  
 1189 arm  $\lfloor a\sqrt{n} \rfloor$  times and then pull the arms according to  $\frac{w_k \hat{\sigma}_{k,t}}{T_{k,t}}$ .  
 1190

1191 We call  $\{X_{p,u}\}_{p=1,2;u=1,\dots,n}$  the samples of the arms.

1192 Note that:  
 1193

$$\begin{aligned}
 1194 & \mathbb{P}\left(X_{1,1} = 0, \dots, X_{1,\lfloor a\sqrt{n} \rfloor} = 0\right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^{1/2+\epsilon}}\right)^{a\sqrt{n}} \\
 1195 & \geq \left(1 - \frac{an^{-\epsilon}}{a\sqrt{n}}\right)^{a\sqrt{n}} \\
 1196 & \geq (1 - an^{-\epsilon}) \exp(-an^{-\epsilon}) \geq (1 - an^{-\epsilon})^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

1202 Note on the other hand, that  $\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\sigma}_{2,a\sqrt{n}} - 1| \geq \frac{2\sqrt{\log(2/\delta)}}{\sqrt{an^{1/4}}}) \leq \delta$ . This means that with  
 1203 probability at least  $1 - 2\exp(-a\sqrt{n}/4)$ , we have  $\hat{\sigma}_{2,a\sqrt{n}} > 0$ .  
 1204

1205 The probability that  $\hat{\sigma}_{1,a\sqrt{n}} = 0$  goes to 1 when  $n$  goes to  $+\infty$ . The probability that  
 1206  $\hat{\sigma}_{2,a\sqrt{n}} > 0$  goes to 1 when  $n$  goes to  $+\infty$ . This means that the probability that GAFS-WL  
 1207 stops pulling arm 1 after  $a\sqrt{n}$  pulls goes to 1 when  $n$  goes to  $+\infty$ , and arm 1 is under-pulled  
 1208 if  $\epsilon < 1/2$  (it should be pulled  $n^{3/4-\epsilon/2}$ ).  
 1209

1210 Note that on the event such that  $(X_{1,1} = 0, \dots, X_{1,\lfloor a\sqrt{n} \rfloor} = 0)$ , we know that  $\hat{\mu}_{1,a\sqrt{n}} = 0$ .

1211 Note also that we know that as arm 2 is gaussian, we have  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}_{2,n} - \mu_2)^2 \leq \frac{1}{4n}$ . The  
 1212 performance of GAFS-WL then verifies  
 1213

$$\begin{aligned}
 1214 & L_n(\mathcal{A}_{GAFS-WL}) \geq \frac{1}{4n} + \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{1,a\sqrt{n}} = 0)\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{2,a\sqrt{n}} > 0) \left(n^{-1/2-\epsilon}\right)^2 \\
 1215 & \geq \frac{1}{4n} + (1 - 2\exp(-a\sqrt{n}/4))(1 - an^{-\epsilon})^2 \left(n^{-1-2\epsilon}\right) \\
 1216 & \geq \frac{1}{4n} + \left(1 - \frac{8}{a\sqrt{n}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{2a}{n^\epsilon}\right) \frac{1}{n^{1+2\epsilon}} \\
 1217 & \geq \frac{1}{4n} + \frac{1}{n^{1+2\epsilon}} - \frac{8}{an^{3/2+2\epsilon}} - \frac{2a}{n^{1+3\epsilon}} \\
 1218 & \geq \frac{1}{4n} + \frac{1}{n^{1+2\epsilon}} - \frac{10 \max(a, 1/a)}{n^{1+3\epsilon}},
 \end{aligned}$$

1226 where the last line is obtained using the fact that  $\epsilon < 1/6$ .

1227 The loss thus verifies  
 1228

$$\begin{aligned}
 1229 & R_n(\mathcal{A}_{GAFS-WL}) \geq \frac{1}{n^{1+2\epsilon}} - \frac{10 \max(a, 1/a)}{n^{1+3\epsilon}} - \frac{1}{n^{5/4+\epsilon/2}} \\
 1230 & \geq \frac{1}{n^{1+2\epsilon}} - \frac{11 \max(a, 1/a)}{n^{1+3\epsilon}},
 \end{aligned}$$

1231 again because  $\epsilon < 1/6$ . This implies that for  $n$  such that  $n \geq \left(\frac{11 \max(a, 1/a)}{2}\right)^{1/\epsilon}$ , we have  
 1232

$$1233 R_n(\mathcal{A}_{GAFS-WL}) \geq \frac{1}{2n^{1+2\epsilon}},$$

1234 with  $\epsilon$  arbitrarily close to 0.  
 1235

## E Some properties of the regret

### E.1 A property of the regret in the special case of symmetric distributions

**Proposition 2** *f the distribution  $\nu_k$  of the arms are symmetric around  $\mu_k$  respectively, then for the algorithm MC-UCB*

$$L_n(\mathcal{A}_{MC-UCB}) = \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu)^2],$$

where the expectation of the right hand term is on the samples when running MC-UCB.

*Proof:*

**Step 1: Expression of  $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)|T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2]$ .** At each time step  $t+1 > 2K$ , the MC-UCB algorithm decides which arm to pull according to the current values of the upper-bounds  $\{B_{p,t+1}\}_p$ . Thus for any arm  $k$ ,  $T_{k,(t+1)}$  depends only of the values  $\{T_{p,t}\}_p$  and  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t}\}_p$ . So by induction,  $T_{k,n}$  depends of the samples of the arms only trough the  $K$  sequences  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n}$ .

Let us consider another arm  $q \neq k$ . The samples of arm  $k$  and arm  $q$  depend of each other only trough  $(T_{k,t})_{t \leq n}$  and  $(T_{q,t})_{t \leq n}$ , and thus by induction only trough the sequence  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n}$ . The samples are thus independent conditionally to the  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n}$ .

This leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)|T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{u=1}^{T_1} X_{k,u} - \mu_k\right)\left(\frac{1}{T_2} \sum_{u=1}^{T_2} X_{q,u} - \mu_q\right) \middle| T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{u=1}^{T_1} X_{k,u} - \mu_k\right)\left(\frac{1}{T_2} \sum_{u=1}^{T_2} X_{q,u} - \mu_q\right) \middle| \{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n}\right] \right. \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n} | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2) | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{u=1}^{T_1} X_{k,u} - \mu_k\right) \middle| \{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n}\right] \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n} | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2) | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\right] \right. \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{T_2} \sum_{u=1}^{T_2} X_{q,u} - \mu_q\right) \middle| \{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n}\right] \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n} | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2) | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\right] \right], \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where the  $X_{p,u}$  are the  $u$ -th samples pulled from arm  $p$ .

**Step 2: The distribution of  $\sum_{u=1}^T X_{k,u} - \mu_k$  conditioned on  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n}$  is symmetric.** Consider an arm  $k$ , and a time  $T$ . As the distributions  $\nu_k$  is symmetric,  $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{u=1}^T X_{k,u} - \mu_k$  conditioned on  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{k,t'}\}_{t' \leq n}$  is symmetric.

As  $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{u=1}^T X_{k,u} - \mu_k$  depends on  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p \neq k, t' \leq n}$  only trough  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{k,t'}\}_{t' \leq n}$ , the  $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{u=1}^T X_{k,u} - \mu_k$  conditioned on  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{k,t'}\}_{t' \leq n}$  is independent of  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p \neq k, t' \leq n}$ . The distribution of  $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{u=1}^T X_{k,u} - \mu_k$  conditioned on  $\{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n}$  is thus symmetric around 0, as  $\nu_k$  is symmetric around  $\mu_k$ .

This leads to

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{u=1}^T X_{k,u} - \mu_k\right) \middle| \{\hat{\sigma}_{p,t'}\}_{p,t' \leq n}\right] = 0. \tag{45}$$

1296 **Step 4: The cross products**  $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)]$  **are null.** We combine Equations  
 1297 44 and 45 to get  
 1298

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2] \\ & = \mathbb{E}[0 | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2] \mathbb{E}[0 | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

1303 Now note that  
 1304

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)] \\ & = \sum_{T_1=2}^n \sum_{T_2=2}^n \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) | T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2] \mathbb{P}(T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

1311 where we use the previous Equation at the end.  
 1312

1313 Finally, we conclude the proof with  
 1314

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu)^2] & = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K w_k (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)\right)^2\right] \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^2 \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2] + 2 \sum_{k \neq q} w_k w_q \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)] \\ & = L_n(\mathcal{A}_{MC-UCB}). \end{aligned}$$

□

## 1325 E.2 A distribution dependent bound in the general case

1327 **Proposition 3** For algorithm MC-UCB when run with the parameters as in Theorem 1  
 1328 and 2, we have  
 1329

$$1330 \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu)^2] \leq L_n + \tilde{O}(n^{-3/2}),$$

1332 where  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  is a  $O(\cdot)$  up to  $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}$  and  $\log(n)$  factors.  
 1333

1334 *Proof:*

### 1336 Step 0: A useful Lemma.

1337 **Lemma 5** Let  $(X, Y)$  be a couple of random variables such that  $\mathbb{E}(XY) = 0$ . Let  
 1338  $(\Omega_u)_{u=1, \dots, p}$  be a partition of the space of random events. Let  $(a_u)_{u=1, \dots, p}$  be a positive  
 1339 decreasing sequence of random numbers. We have  
 1340

$$1341 |\mathbb{E}(XY \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I}\{(X, Y) \in \Omega_u\})| \leq (a_1 - a_p) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(X^2)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(Y^2)}.$$

1345 *Proof:*

1346 First note that as the sequence of  $a_u$  is positive decreasing, the following equation holds  
 1347

$$1348 XY \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I}\{(X, Y) \in \Omega_u\} \leq XY a_1 \mathbb{I}\{XY \geq 0\} + XY a_p \mathbb{I}\{XY < 0\}.$$



1350 This implies

1351

1352

1353

1354

1355

1356

1357

1358

1359

1360

1361

1362

1363

1364

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[XY \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I}\{(X, Y) \in \Omega_u\}\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[XY a_1 \mathbb{I}\{XY \geq 0\} + XY a_p \mathbb{I}\{XY < 0\}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[(a_1 - a_p)XY \mathbb{I}\{XY \geq 0\} + a_p XY (\mathbb{I}\{XY < 0\} + \mathbb{I}\{XY \geq 0\})\right] \\
&\leq (a_1 - a_p) \mathbb{E}\left[XY \mathbb{I}\{XY \geq 0\}\right] \\
&\leq (a_1 - a_p) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[X^2 \mathbb{I}\{XY \geq 0\}\right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[Y^2 \mathbb{I}\{XY \geq 0\}\right]} \\
&\leq (a_1 - a_p) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[X^2\right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[Y^2\right]},
\end{aligned}$$

1365 by Cauchy-Schwartz.

1366

1367

1368

1369

1370

1371

$$XY \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I}\{(X, Y) \in \Omega_u\} \geq XY a_1 \mathbb{I}\{XY \leq 0\} + XY a_p \mathbb{I}\{XY > 0\},$$

1372 we show in the same way that

1373

1374

1375

1376

1377

$$\mathbb{E}\left[XY \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I}\{(X, Y) \in \Omega_u\}\right] \geq -(a_1 - a_p) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[X^2\right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[Y^2\right]}.$$

1378

1379

1380

1381

1382

1383

1384

1385

1386

1387

1388

1389

1390

1391

1392

1393

1394

1395

1396

1397

1398

1399

1400

1401

1402

1403

Those two inequalities lead to the desired result.

□

**Step 1: Expressing the cross-products**  $\mathbb{E}\left[(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)\right]$ . Let  $k$  and  $q$  with  $k \neq q$  be two arms. Let us call  $X_{p,u}$  the  $u$ -th sample from arm  $p$ . We have if  $n \geq 2K$

1386

1387

1388

1389

1390

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \\
&= \sum_{T_1=2}^n \sum_{T_2=2}^n \left[ \left( \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{u=1}^{T_1} X_{k,u} - \mu_k \right) \right] \left[ \left( \frac{1}{T_2} \sum_{u=1}^{T_2} X_{q,u} - \mu_q \right) \right] \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\}.
\end{aligned}$$

1391

1392

1393

1394

1395

1396

1397

1398

1399

1400

1401

1402

1403

**Step 2: Some additional properties of  $\xi$ .** *Number of pulls:* We remind that, on  $\xi$  we have for all  $p$ ,

$$T_{p,n} \geq \underline{T}_{p,n} = \max\left(T_{p,n}^* - \min(A\lambda_p n^{2/3}, Bn^{1/2}), En^{2/3}\right),$$

1397 and

1398

1399

1400

1401

1402

1403

$$T_{p,n} \leq \bar{T}_{p,n} = T_{p,n}^* + \min(Cn^{2/3}, Dn^{1/2}),$$

where  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$  and  $D$  are as in Theorem 1 and 2 and  $E$  is as in the proof of Theorem 2. Note that  $B$  and  $D$  depend of  $\lambda_{\min}$ .

*Cross-products:*

1404 We have also

1405

1406

1407

1408

1409

1410

1411

1412

1413

1414

1415

1416

1417

1418

1419

1420

1421

1422

1423

1424

1425

1426

1427

1428

1429

1430

1431

1432

1433

1434

1435

1436

1437

1438

1439

1440

1441

1442

1443

1444

1445

1446

1447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}[(X_{q,v} - \mu_q)(X_{k,u} - \mu_k)\mathbb{I}\{\xi^c\}]| \\ & \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(X_{q,v} - \mu_q)^2\mathbb{I}\{\xi^c\}]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(X_{k,u} - \mu_k)^2\mathbb{I}\{\xi^c\}]} \\ & \leq 2c_1 n K \delta (1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta)) \leq \frac{5c_1(c_2 + 2)K \log(n)}{n^{3/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

as in Appendix A. And thus, as  $\mathbb{E}[(X_{q,v} - \mu_q)(X_{k,u} - \mu_k)\mathbb{I}\{\xi\}] + \mathbb{E}[(X_{q,v} - \mu_q)(X_{k,u} - \mu_k)\mathbb{I}\{\xi^c\}] = 0$  because of  $X_{q,v}$  is independent of  $X_{k,u}$ , we have

$$|\mathbb{E}[(X_{q,v} - \mu_q)(X_{k,u} - \mu_k)\mathbb{I}\{\xi\}]| \leq \frac{5c_1(c_2 + 2)K \log(n)}{n^{3/2}},$$

Let us note  $r = \frac{5c_1(c_2+2)K \log(n)}{n^{3/2}}$ .

The same way as before, for any  $(T_1, T_2)$ ,

$$|\mathbb{E}[(\frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{u=1}^{T_1} X_{k,u} - \mu_k)(\frac{1}{T_2} \sum_{v=1}^{T_2} X_{q,v} - \mu_q)\mathbb{I}\{\xi\}]| \leq r,$$

and

$$|\mathbb{E}[(X_{k,u} - \mu_k)(\frac{1}{T_2} \sum_{v=1}^{T_2} X_{q,v} - \mu_q)\mathbb{I}\{\xi\}]| \leq r.$$

*Cross-products on specific events:*

Let us pose  $t' \geq 1$ . Let us fix  $v$  such that  $v \geq T_2$ . Note that by the structure of the algorithm,  $X_{q,v}$  is independent of all the samples of all arms on the event  $\{T_{q,n} = T_2\}$ .

Thus,  $\mathbb{E}\left[(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{u=1}^T X_{k,u} - \mu_k)(X_{q,v} - \mu_q)\mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\}\right] = 0$  for any  $T_1$ , any  $T$  and any  $k \neq q$ . We conclude that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{u=1}^T X_{k,u} - \mu_k\right)(X_{q,v} - \mu_q)\mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\}\mathbb{I}\{\xi\}\right] \right| \leq r, \quad (46)$$

as Equation  $\left| \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{u=1}^T X_{k,u} - \mu_k\right)(X_{q,v} - \mu_q)\mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\}\mathbb{I}\{\xi^c\}\right] \right| \leq r$  holds.

In the same way, we obtain when  $v \geq T_2$ , we have for any  $u$ , any  $k \neq q$

$$\left| \mathbb{E}\left[(X_{k,u} - \mu_k)(X_{q,v} - \mu_q)\mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\}\mathbb{I}\{\xi\}\right] \right| \leq r \quad (47)$$

**Step 3: Expressing**  $(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)\mathbb{I}\{\xi\}$ . Now note that on  $\xi$ , for any arm  $p$ ,  $\underline{T}_{p,n} \leq T_{p,n} \leq \bar{T}_{p,n}$ .

Let us consider the following sub-term of the previous equation:

1458

1459

1460

$$(\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)(\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)\mathbb{I}\{\xi\}$$

1461

1462

1463

$$= \sum_{T_1=\underline{T}_{k,n}}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{T_2=\underline{T}_{q,n}}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \left( \frac{1}{T_1} \sum_{u=1}^{T_1} X_{k,u} - \mu_k \right) \left( \frac{1}{T_2} \sum_{u=1}^{T_2} X_{q,u} - \mu_q \right) \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\} \mathbb{I}\{\xi\}$$

1464

1465

1466

1467

$$= \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} \sum_{u=1}^{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} (X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \right)$$

1468

1469

1470

$$\times \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} \sum_{v=1}^{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \right) \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I}\{\xi\}$$

1471

1472

1473

$$= \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} \sum_{u=1}^{\underline{T}_{k,n}} X_{k,u} - \mu_k \right) + \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} \sum_{u=\underline{T}_{k,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} (X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \right]$$

1474

1475

1476

1477

$$\times \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} \sum_{v=1}^{\underline{T}_{q,n}} X_{q,v} - \mu_q \right) + \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \right]$$

1478

1479

1480

1481

$$\times \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I}\{\xi\}$$

1482

1483

1484

1485

$$= \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} (m_k - \mu_k) + \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} \sum_{u=\underline{T}_{k,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} (X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \right]$$

1486

1487

1488

1489

1490

1491

$$\times \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (m_q - \mu_q) + \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \right]$$

1492

1493

1494

1495

1496

$$\times \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I}\{\xi\}$$

1497

1498

1499

$$= \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} (m_k - \mu_k) \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (m_q - \mu_q) \right]$$

1500

1501

1502

1503

1504

1505

1506

1507

1508

1509

1510

1511

$$\times \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I}\{\xi\} \quad (48)$$

$$+ \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} (m_k - \mu_k) \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \right) \right]$$

1495

1496

1497

1498

1499

$$\times \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I}\{\xi\} \quad (49)$$

$$+ \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (m_q - \mu_q) \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} \sum_{u=\underline{T}_{k,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} (X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \right) \right]$$

1500

1501

1502

1503

1504

1505

1506

1507

1508

1509

1510

1511

$$\times \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I}\{\xi\} \quad (50)$$

$$+ \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \right) \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} \sum_{u=\underline{T}_{k,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} (X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \right) \right]$$

1505

1506

1507

1508

1509

1510

1511

$$\times \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I}\{\xi\}. \quad (51)$$

where  $m_p = \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{p,n}} \sum_{u=1}^{\underline{T}_{p,n}} X_{p,u}$ .

**Step 4.1: Bounding the first term (Equation 48).** Let us pose  $c = \mathbb{E}\left[(m_k - \mu_k)(m_q - \mu_q)\mathbb{I}\{\xi\}\right]$ .

We want to bound (Equation 48)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ (m_q - \mu_q)(m_k - \mu_k) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right]$$

By Lemma 6 where the partition of  $\xi$  is  $\left\{ \xi \cap \{T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\} \right\}_{T_1 = \underline{T}_{k,n}, \dots, \bar{T}_{k,n}, T_2 = \underline{T}_{q,n}, \dots, \bar{T}_{q,n}}$ , and where the decreasing sequence goes from 1 to  $\frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\bar{T}_{q,n}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_q - \mu_q)(m_k - \mu_k) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right] \\ & \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_q - \mu_q)(m_k - \mu_k) - c \right] \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right| + r \\ & \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (m_q - \mu_q)^2 \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right]} \left[ 1 - \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \right] + r \\ & \leq \frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \frac{\sigma_q}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{q,n}}} \left[ 1 - \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \right] + r, \end{aligned}$$

where  $r$  comes from Step 2 and from the fact that

$$\left| \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right| \leq 1.$$

Note that, by Step 2:

$$\begin{aligned} & w_k w_q \left[ \frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \frac{\sigma_q}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{q,n}}} \left[ 1 - \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \right] + r \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{q,n}}} \left[ \bar{T}_{k,n} \bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n} \underline{T}_{q,n} \right] + r \\ & = r + \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{q,n}}} \\ & \quad \times \left[ (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}) \underline{T}_{k,n} + (\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}) \underline{T}_{q,n} + (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n})(\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}) \right] + r \\ & \leq \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n^2} \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min} n - B\sqrt{n}} \left[ 3(B + D)n\sqrt{n} \right] + r \\ & \leq \tilde{O}(n^{-3/2}), \end{aligned}$$

because  $r = O(n^{-3/2})$ .

**Step 4.2: Bounding the second and third term (Equations 49 and 50).** We want to bound Equation 49

1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \right) \right] \right. \right. \\
& \times \mathbb{I} \{ T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \left. \right] \\
& = \left| \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k) (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \right] \mathbb{I} \{ v \leq \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \right. \right. \\
& \times \mathbb{I} \{ T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \left. \right] \left. \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

1583 Let us fix  $v$ .

1584 At first, note that because of Equation 46

1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k) (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \right] \mathbb{I} \{ v \leq \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \right. \right. \\
& \times \mathbb{I} \{ T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \left. \right] \\
& \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k) (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \right] \mathbb{I} \{ v \leq \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \right. \right. \\
& \times \mathbb{I} \{ T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \left. \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k) (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \right] \mathbb{I} \{ v > \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \right. \\
& \times \mathbb{I} \{ T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \left. \right] + r \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}) \\
& \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k) (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \right] \right. \right. \\
& \times \mathbb{I} \{ T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \left. \right] + r \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}).
\end{aligned}$$

1614 Let us pose  $c = \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k) (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \right]$ .

1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619

By Lemma 6 where the partition of  $\xi$  is  $\left\{ \xi \cap \{ T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2 \} \right\}_{T_1=\underline{T}_{k,n}, \dots, \bar{T}_{k,n}, T_2=\underline{T}_{q,n}, \dots, \bar{T}_{q,n}}$ , and where the decreasing sequence goes from  $\frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}}$  to  $\frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}}$ , we have

1620

1621

1622

1623

1624

1625

1626

1627

1628

1629

1630

1631

1632

1633

1634

1635

1636

1637

1638

1639

1640

1641

1642

1643

1644

1645

1646

1647

1648

1649

1650

1651

1652

1653

1654

1655

1656

1657

1658

1659

1660

1661

1662

1663

1664

1665

1666

1667

1668

1669

1670

1671

1672

1673

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k)(X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \right] \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right] \right| \\
& \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ [(m_k - \mu_k)(X_{q,v} - \mu_q) - c] \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \mathbb{I} \{ \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t' \} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right] \right| + \frac{r}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{q,v} - \mu_q)^2 \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (m_k - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right]} \left[ \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} - \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \right] + \frac{r}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \\
& \leq \frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \sigma_q \left[ \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} - \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \right] + \frac{r}{\underline{T}_{q,n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

And then by summing over all  $v$ , we bound the second term by  $(\frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \sigma_q \left[ \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} - \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \right] + \frac{2r}{\underline{T}_{q,n}})(\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n})$ .

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& w_k w_q \left( \frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \sigma_q \left[ \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} - \frac{\underline{T}_{k,n}}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \right] + \frac{2r}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \right) (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}) \\
& \leq 2r \frac{(A+C)n^{2/3}}{En^{2/3}} + \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}) \\
& \quad \times \left[ (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}) \underline{T}_{k,n} + (\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}) \underline{T}_{q,n} + (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n})(\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}) \right] \\
& \leq 2r \frac{(A+C)}{E} + \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n^2} \left( \frac{1}{n\lambda_{\min} - B\sqrt{n}} \right)^{3/2} (B+D)\sqrt{n} \left[ 3n(B+D)\sqrt{n} \right] \\
& \leq \tilde{O}(n^{-3/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

We bound the third term (Equation 50) in the same way by  $(\frac{\sigma_q}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{q,n}}} \sigma_k \left[ \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} - \frac{\underline{T}_{q,n}}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \right] + \frac{2r}{\underline{T}_{k,n}})(\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n})$ , and we can then also bound  $w_k w_q$  times the third term by  $\tilde{O}(n^{-3/2})$ .

**Step 4.3: Bounding the last term (Equation 51).** We want to bound Equation 51

1661

1662

1663

1664

1665

1666

1667

1668

1669

1670

1671

1672

1673

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} (X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \right) \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \sum_{u=\underline{T}_{k,n}+1}^{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} (X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \right) \right] \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right] \right| \\
& = \left| \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \sum_{u=\underline{T}_{k,n}+1}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{q,v} - \mu_q)(X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n} + t'} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n} + t} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \mathbb{I} \{v \leq \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{u \leq \underline{T}_{k,n} + t\} \right] \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

1674

Let us fix  $v$  and  $u$ .

1675

As in Step 4.2 and using 47, we obtain

1676

1677

1678

1679

1680

1681

1682

1683

1684

1685

1686

1687

1688

1689

1690

1691

1692

1693

1694

1695

1696

1697

1698

1699

1700

1701

1702

1703

1704

1705

1706

1707

1708

1709

1710

1711

1712

1713

1714

1715

1716

1717

1718

1719

1720

1721

1722

1723

1724

1725

1726

1727

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \sum_{u=\underline{T}_{k,n}+1}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{q,v} - \mu_q)(X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \times \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \mathbb{I} \{v \leq \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{u \leq \underline{T}_{k,n} + t\} \right] \right| \\
& \leq \left| \sum_{v=\underline{T}_{q,n}+1}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \sum_{u=\underline{T}_{k,n}+1}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{q,v} - \mu_q)(X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \times \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right] \right| + r \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n})(\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us pose  $c = \mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{k,u} - \mu_k)(X_{q,v} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right]$ .

1692

1693

1694

1695

1696

1697

1698

1699

1700

1701

1702

1703

1704

1705

1706

1707

1708

1709

1710

1711

1712

1713

1714

1715

1716

1717

1718

1719

1720

1721

1722

1723

1724

1725

1726

1727

By Lemma 6 where the partition of  $\xi$  is  $\left\{ \xi \cap \{T_{k,n} = T_1, T_{q,n} = T_2\} \right\}_{T_1=\underline{T}_{k,n}, \dots, \bar{T}_{k,n}, T_2=\underline{T}_{q,n}, \dots, \bar{T}_{q,n}}$ , and where the decreasing sequence goes from  $\frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}}$  to  $\frac{1}{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{k,n}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{q,v} - \mu_q)(X_{k,u} - \mu_k) \sum_{t=0}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}-\underline{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=0}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}-\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}+t'} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}+t} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \times \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} = \underline{T}_{k,n} + t, T_{q,n} = \underline{T}_{q,n} + t'\} \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right] \right| \\
& \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{q,v} - \mu_q)^2 \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{k,u} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I} \{\xi\} \right]} \left[ \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} - \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \right] + \frac{r}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \\
& \leq \frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \frac{\sigma_q}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{q,n}}} \left[ \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} - \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \right] + \frac{r}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

And then by summing over all  $v$  and  $u$ , we bound the last term by  $\left( \frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \frac{\sigma_q}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{q,n}}} \left[ \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} - \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \right] + \frac{2r}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \right) (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n})(\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n})$ .

1715

1716

1717

1718

1719

1720

1721

1722

1723

1724

1725

1726

1727

Here, also, the same way as before,

1716

1717

1718

1719

1720

1721

1722

1723

1724

1725

1726

1727

$$\begin{aligned}
& w_k w_q \left( \frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \frac{\sigma_q}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{q,n}}} \left[ \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} - \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \right] + \frac{2r}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \right) (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n})(\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}) \\
& \leq 2r \left( \frac{A+C}{E} \right)^2 + \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{k,n}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\underline{T}_{q,n}}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n})(\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}) \\
& \times \left[ (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n}) \underline{T}_{k,n} + (\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}) \underline{T}_{q,n} + (\bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{q,n})(\bar{T}_{k,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n}) \right] \\
& \leq 2r \left( \frac{A+C}{E} \right)^2 + \frac{\Sigma_w^2}{n^2} \left( \frac{1}{n \lambda_{\min} - B \sqrt{n}} \right)^3 (B+D)n(3n(B+D)\sqrt{n}) \\
& \leq \tilde{O}(n^{-3/2}).
\end{aligned}$$



1728 **Step 5: Bounding the cross-products and finishing the proof.** By using step 4 and  
 1729 step 3, we get  
 1730

$$1731$$

$$1732 w_k w_q \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \right]$$

$$1733 \leq \tilde{O}(n^{-3/2}).$$

$$1734$$

$$1735$$

1736 And

$$1737$$

$$1738 w_k w_q \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{ \xi^c \} \right]$$

$$1739$$

$$1740 \leq \tilde{O}(n^{-3/2}) + \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi^c \} \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi^c \} \right]}$$

$$1741$$

$$1742 \leq \tilde{O}(n^{-3/2}) + O(n^{-3/2}),$$

$$1743$$

$$1744$$

1745 by using for the last inequality the result in Appendix A.

1746 To conclude the proof, it is sufficient to use

$$1747$$

$$1748 \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu)^2] = L_n + 2 \sum_{k \neq q} w_k w_q \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \right].$$

$$1749$$

1750  $\square$

### 1751 E.3 A distribution independent bound in the general case

1752 **Proposition 4** For algorithm MC-UCB when run with the parameters as in Theorem 1  
 1753 and 2, we have

$$1754 \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu)^2] \leq L_n + O(n^{-7/6}).$$

1755 *Proof:*

#### 1756 Step 0: A useful Lemma.

1757 **Lemma 6** Let  $X$  be a random variables such that  $\mathbb{E}(X) = 0$ . Let  $(\Omega_u)_{u=1, \dots, p}$  be a partition  
 1758 of the space of random events. Let  $(a_u)_{u=1, \dots, p}$  be a positive decreasing sequence of random  
 1759 numbers. We have

$$1760$$

$$1761 \left| \mathbb{E} \left( X \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I} \{ X \in \Omega_u \} \right) \right| \leq (a_1 - a_p) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(X^2)}.$$

$$1762$$

1763 *Proof:*

1764 First note that as the sequence of  $a_u$  is positive decreasing, the following equation holds

$$1765$$

$$1766 X \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I} \{ X \in \Omega_u \} \leq X a_1 \mathbb{I} \{ X \geq 0 \} + X a_p \mathbb{I} \{ X < 0 \}.$$

$$1767$$

1768 This implies

1782

1783

1784

1785

1786

1787

1788

1789

1790

1791

1792

1793

1794

1795

by Cauchy-Schwartz.

1796

1797

1798

1799

1800

1801

1802

1803

1804

1805

1806

1807

1808

1809

1810

1811

1812

1813

1814

1815

1816

1817

1818

1819

1820

1821

1822

1823

1824

1825

1826

1827

1828

1829

1830

1831

1832

1833

1834

1835

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[X \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I}\{X \in \Omega_u\}\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[X a_1 \mathbb{I}\{X \geq 0\} + X a_p \mathbb{I}\{X < 0\}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[(a_1 - a_p) X \mathbb{I}\{X \geq 0\} + a_p X (\mathbb{I}\{X < 0\} + \mathbb{I}\{X \geq 0\})\right] \\
&\leq (a_1 - a_p) \mathbb{E}\left[X \mathbb{I}\{X \geq 0\}\right] \\
&\leq (a_1 - a_p) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[X^2 \mathbb{I}\{X \geq 0\}\right]} \\
&\leq (a_1 - a_p) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[X^2\right]},
\end{aligned}$$

by Cauchy-Schwartz.

By remarking that

$$X \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I}\{X \in \Omega_u\} \geq X a_1 \mathbb{I}\{X \leq 0\} + X a_p \mathbb{I}\{X > 0\},$$

we show in the same way that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[X \sum_{u=1}^p a_u \mathbb{I}\{X \in \Omega_u\}\right] \geq -(a_1 - a_p) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[X^2\right]}.$$

Those two inequalities lead to the desired result.

□

**Step 1:**  $\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_{k,n}} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k)\right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_{q,n}} (X_{q,t} - \mu_q)\right)\right] = 0$ . Let us denote by  $t_{k,t}$  the moment where the algorithm pulls arm  $k$  the  $t$ -th time.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_{k,n}} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k)\right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_{q,n}} (X_{q,t} - \mu_q)\right)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^n (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} \geq t\}\right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^n (X_{q,t} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I}\{T_{q,n} \geq t\}\right)\right] \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{t'=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[(X_{k,t} - \mu_k) (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I}\{T_{q,n} \geq t'\} \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} \geq t\}\right] \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{t'=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[(X_{k,t} - \mu_k) (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I}\{T_{q,n} \geq t'\} \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} \geq t\} \mathbb{I}\{t_{k,t} < t_{q,t'}\}\right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{t'=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[(X_{k,t} - \mu_k) (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I}\{T_{q,n} \geq t'\} \mathbb{I}\{T_{k,n} \geq t\} \mathbb{I}\{t_{k,t} > t_{q,t'}\}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Let us call  $\mathcal{F}_{t_1, \dots, t_K} = \sigma(X_{1,1}, \dots, X_{1,t_1}, \dots, X_{K,1}, \dots, X_{K,t_K})$  the multidimensional filtration generated, for all  $k$ , by the  $t_k$  first instance of the  $k$ -th arm. Note that the algorithm MC-UCB disposes at time  $t$  of the informations from a certain  $\mathcal{F}_{t_1, \dots, t_K}$  where  $\sum_k t_k = t$  and picks an arm (i.e. a dimension of the filtration) according *only* to information in  $\mathcal{F}_{t_1, \dots, t_K}$ .

1836 If the algorithm picks arm  $k$ , the information at the disposal of MC-UCB is, after pulling  
 1837 arm  $k$ , in  $\mathcal{F}_{t_1, \dots, t_k+1, \dots, t_K}$ .

1838 Now let us consider consider two arms  $k$  and  $q$ . Note that the collection of events  $\tau =$   
 1839  $\sigma(X_{q,t'}) \cap \{T_{q,n} \geq t'\} \cap \{T_{k,n} \geq t\} \cap \{t_{k,t} > t_{q,t'}\}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_{n, \dots, t-1, \dots, n}$ <sup>13</sup>: indeed, no information  
 1840 of  $X_{k,u}$  with  $u$  greater than  $t-1$  is needed in addition  $\mathcal{F}_{n, \dots, t-1, \dots, n}$  to know if we are in an  
 1841 event of  $\tau$  and in which one. This means that  $X_{k,t}$  is independent of all events in  $\tau$ . Finally,  
 1842 we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1843 & \mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{k,t} - \mu_k)(X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{T_{q,n} \geq t'\} \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} \geq t\} \mathbb{I} \{t_{k,t} > t_{q,t'}\} \right] \\ 1844 & = \mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{T_{q,n} \geq t'\} \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} \geq t\} \mathbb{I} \{t_{k,t} > t_{q,t'}\} \mathbb{E} [(X_{k,t} - \mu_k) | \mathcal{F}_{n, \dots, t-1, \dots, n}] \right] \\ 1845 & = \mathbb{E} \left[ (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{T_{q,n} \geq t'\} \mathbb{I} \{T_{k,n} \geq t\} \mathbb{I} \{t_{k,t} > t_{q,t'}\} 0 \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

1851 By summing and doing the same reasoning for arm  $q$ , we obtain that

$$1852 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_{k,n}} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \right) \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_{q,n}} (X_{q,t} - \mu_q) \right) \right] = 0. \quad (52)$$

1853 Note that we have by doing a similar reasoning, that

$$1854 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=\max(T_k, \underline{T}_k)}^{\min(T_{k,n}, \bar{T}_k)} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \right) \left( \sum_{t'=\max(T_q, \underline{T}_q)}^{\min(T_{q,n}, \bar{T}_q)} (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \right) \right] = 0, \quad (53)$$

1855 where  $\underline{T}_k, \underline{T}_q, \bar{T}_k$  and  $\bar{T}_q$  are any constants.

1856 **Step 2: Definition of an event  $\tau$  of high probability.** We remind that, on  $\xi$  we have  
 1857 for all  $p$ ,

$$1858 T_{p,n} \geq \underline{T}_{p,n} = \max \left( T_{p,n}^* - A\lambda_p n^{2/3}, En^{2/3} \right),$$

1859 and

$$1860 T_{p,n} \leq \bar{T}_{p,n} = T_{p,n}^* + Cn^{2/3},$$

1861 where  $A$  and  $C$  are as in Theorem 1 and 2 and  $E$  is as in the proof of Theorem 2.

1862 The probability of  $\xi$  is more than  $1 - 2nK\delta$ .

1863 Now let us define the event  $\tau$  such that for all  $p$ ,

$$1864 T_{p,n} \geq \underline{T}_{p,n} = \max \left( T_{p,n}^* - A\lambda_p n^{2/3}, En^{2/3} \right),$$

1865 and

$$1866 T_{p,n} \leq \bar{T}_{p,n} = T_{p,n}^* + Cn^{2/3}.$$

1867 Note that  $\xi \subset \tau$ .

1868 We have, because of  $\xi \subset \tau$ ,

1869 <sup>13</sup>Here there are  $n$  at all positions except at the  $k$ - where there is a  $t$ .

1890

1891

1892

1893

1894

1895

1896

1897

1898

as in Appendix A.

1899

Finally, because  $T_{k,n}$  and  $T_{q,n}$  are smaller than  $n$ , we have

1900

1901

1902

1903

1904

1905

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_{k,n}} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \right) \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_{q,n}} (X_{q,t} - \mu_q) \right) \mathbb{I} \{ \tau^c \} \right] \right| \leq 2c_1 n^3 K \delta (1 + \log(c_2/2nK\delta)),$$

1906

**Step 3: Bounding the cross-products.** Using step 1 and 2 together, we get

1907

1908

1909

1910

1911

1912

1913

1914

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_{k,n}} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \right) \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_{q,n}} (X_{q,t} - \mu_q) \right) \mathbb{I} \{ \tau \} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=\max(T_{k,n}, \underline{T}_{k,n})}^{\min(T_{k,n}, \bar{T}_{k,n})} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \right) \left( \sum_{t'=\max(T_{q,n}, \underline{T}_{q,n})}^{\min(T_{q,n}, \bar{T}_{q,n})} (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \right) \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

1915

1916

1917

Let us call  $Z = \left( \sum_{t=\max(T_{k,n}, \underline{T}_{k,n})}^{\min(T_{k,n}, \bar{T}_{k,n})} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \right) \left( \sum_{t'=\max(T_{q,n}, \underline{T}_{q,n})}^{\min(T_{q,n}, \bar{T}_{q,n})} (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \right)$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}[Z] = 0$ . We thus have

1918

1919

1920

1921

1922

1923

1924

1925

1926

1927

1928

1929

1930

1931

1932

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{ \tau \} \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{T_{k,n}} \sum_{t=\max(T_{k,n}, \underline{T}_{k,n})}^{\min(T_{k,n}, \bar{T}_{k,n})} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \right) \left( \frac{1}{T_{q,n}} \sum_{t'=\max(T_{q,n}, \underline{T}_{q,n})}^{\min(T_{q,n}, \bar{T}_{q,n})} (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \right) \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T_{k,n}} \frac{1}{T_{q,n}} Z \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{t=\underline{T}_{k,n}}^{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \sum_{t'=\underline{T}_{q,n}}^{\bar{T}_{q,n}} Z \frac{1}{t} \frac{1}{t'} \mathbb{I} \{ T_{k,n} = t, T_{q,n} = t' \} \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n} \underline{T}_{q,n}} - \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{k,n} \bar{T}_{q,n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

1933

Note now that

1934

1935

1936

1937

1938

1939

1940

1941

1942

1943

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z^2] &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=\max(T_{k,n}, \underline{T}_{k,n})}^{\min(T_{k,n}, \bar{T}_{k,n})} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \right) \left( \sum_{t'=\max(T_{q,n}, \underline{T}_{q,n})}^{\min(T_{q,n}, \bar{T}_{q,n})} (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \right) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=\max(T_{k,n}, \underline{T}_{k,n})}^{\min(T_{k,n}, \bar{T}_{k,n})} (X_{k,t} - \mu_k) \right)^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t'=\max(T_{q,n}, \underline{T}_{q,n})}^{\min(T_{q,n}, \bar{T}_{q,n})} (X_{q,t'} - \mu_q) \right)^2 \right]} \\ &\leq \sigma_k \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}]} \sigma_q \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[T_{q,n}]}. \end{aligned}$$

1944  
1945  
1946  
1947  
1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997

Finally, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
w_k w_q \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{ \tau \} \right] \right| &\leq w_k \sigma_k \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}]} w_q \sigma_q \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[T_{q,n}]} \left( \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\underline{T}_{q,n}} - \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{k,n}} \frac{1}{\bar{T}_{q,n}} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\Sigma^2}{n^2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}] \mathbb{E}[T_{q,n}]}}{\bar{T}_{k,n} \bar{T}_{q,n}} (\bar{T}_{k,n} \bar{T}_{q,n} - \underline{T}_{k,n} \underline{T}_{q,n}) \\
&\leq \frac{\Sigma^2}{n^2} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}] \mathbb{E}[T_{q,n}]}}{\bar{T}_{k,n} \bar{T}_{q,n}} (A + C) \max(\bar{T}_{k,n}, \bar{T}_{q,n}) n^{2/3} \\
&\leq \frac{\Sigma^2}{n^{4/3}} (A + C) \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[T_{k,n}] \mathbb{E}[T_{q,n}]}}{\min(\bar{T}_{k,n}, \bar{T}_{q,n})} \\
&\leq \frac{\Sigma^2}{n^{7/6}} \frac{A + C}{E \sqrt{E}}.
\end{aligned}$$

**Step 4: Finishing the proof.** Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
w_k w_q \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{ \xi \} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \mathbb{I} \{ \xi^c \} \right] \\
&\leq \tilde{O}(n^{-3/2}) + \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k)^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi^c \} \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q)^2 \mathbb{I} \{ \xi^c \} \right]} \\
&\leq O(n^{-7/6}) + O(n^{-3/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

by using for the last inequality the result in Appendix A and Step 3.

To conclude the proof, it is sufficient to use

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu)^2] = L_n + 2 \sum_{k \neq q} w_k w_q \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}_{k,n} - \mu_k) (\hat{\mu}_{q,n} - \mu_q) \right].$$

□