# **Online Learning with Sublinear Best-Action Queries**

### **NeurIPS 2024, Vancouver (Canada)**

**Matteo Russo Sapienza University Rome**

Andrea Celli Bocconi University

Federico Fusco Sapienza University Rome

Stefano Leonardi Sapienza University Rome

Riccardo Colini-Baldeschi Meta

Daniel Haimovich Meta

Dima Karamshuk Meta

Niek Tax Meta

#### **How to continuously moderate posted content**





#### **How to continuously moderate posted content**





#### **How to continuously moderate posted content**

- 
- Either by an automatic decision that can make mistakes





### **How to continuously moderate posted content**

- 
- Either by an automatic decision that can make mistakes





### **How to continuously moderate posted content**





- Posts come one after the other and platform has to flag content as harmful or not • Either by an automatic decision that can make mistakes
- 
- Or by asking for an (expert) human review which we assume to be perfect

### **How to continuously moderate posted content**

- 
- Either by an automatic decision that can make mistakes
- Or by asking for an (expert) human review which we assume to be perfect





### **Learning Protocol Online Learning with Best-Action Queries**

• **Setting**: *n* possible actions and *k* best-action queries available

### **Learning Protocol Online Learning with Best-Action Queries**

# **Learning Protocol**

- **Setting**: *n* possible actions and *k* best-action queries available
- For time  $t = 1, ..., T$ :
	- 1. A (hidden) loss  $\ell_i(i)$  arrives for each action  $i \in [n]$
	- 2. The learner
		- A. Either takes action  $i_t$  at time t
		-
	- 3. The learner incurs a (hidden) loss  $\mathcal{C}_t(i_t)$  or
	- 4. A feedback z<sub>t</sub> is revealed

B. Or is told the identity of the best action  $i_t^*$  at time *t*, and takes it *t*) or  $\ell_t$  (*i*<sup>\*</sup>)

# **Online Learning with Best-Action Queries**

# **Learning Protocol**

- **Setting**: *n* possible actions and *k* best-action queries available
- For time  $t = 1, ..., T$ :
	- 1. A (hidden) loss  $\ell_i(i)$  arrives for each action  $i \in [n]$
	- 2. The learner
		- A. Either takes action  $i_t$  at time t
		- B. Or is told the identity of the best action  $i_t^*$  at time *t*, and takes it
	- 3. The learner incurs a (hidden) loss  $\mathcal{C}_t(i_t)$  or *t*) or  $\ell_t$  (*i*<sup>\*</sup>)
	- 4. A feedback z<sub>t</sub> is revealed

# **Online Learning with Best-Action Queries**

# **Learning Protocol**

- **Setting**: *n* possible actions and *k* best-action queries available
- For time  $t = 1, ..., T$ :
	- 1. A (hidden) loss  $\ell_i(i)$  arrives for each action  $i \in [n]$
	- 2. The learner
		- A. Either takes action  $i_t$  at time t
		-
	- 3. The learner incurs a (hidden) loss  $\mathcal{C}_t(i_t)$  or
	- 4. A feedback z<sub>t</sub> is revealed

B. Or is told the identity of the best action  $i_t^*$  at time *t*, and takes it

*t*) or  $\ell_t$  (*i*<sup>\*</sup>)

# **Online Learning with Best-Action Queries**

### **The Model Adversary, Queries & Feedback, Regret**

• We assume losses to be generated by an **oblivious adversary**

**Adversary, Queries & Feedback, Regret**

**Adversary, Queries & Feedback, Regret**

- We assume losses to be generated by an **oblivious adversary**
- At time step *t*, before feedback is received, a **best-action query** reveals the *identity* of the best action at that time step, i.e.,  $i_t^* := \arg \min_{i \in [n]} \ell_i(i)$ *i*∈[*n*]

**Adversary, Queries & Feedback, Regret**

- We assume losses to be generated by an **oblivious adversary**
- At time step *t*, before feedback is received, a **best-action query** reveals the *identity* of the best action at that time step, i.e.,  $i_t^* := \arg \min_{i \in [n]} \ell_i(i)$ *i*∈[*n*]



- We assume losses to be generated by an **oblivious adversary**
- At time step *t*, before feedback is received, a **best-action query** reveals the *identity* of the best action at that time step, i.e.,  $i_t^* := \arg \min_{i \in [n]} \ell_i(i)$ *i*∈[*n*]
- We study two types of feedback regimes
	- 1. **Full feedback:** All losses revealed at all time steps, i.e.,  $z_t = (\mathcal{C}_t(i))_{i \in [n]}$
	- 2. **Label-efficient feedback:** All losses revealed *only after* a querying time step

**Adversary, Queries & Feedback, Regret**



**Adversary, Queries & Feedback, Regret**

- We assume losses to be generated by an **oblivious adversary**
- At time step *t*, before feedback is received, a **best-action query** reveals the *identity* of the best action at that time step, i.e.,  $i_t^* := \arg \min_{i \in [n]} \ell_i(i)$ *i*∈[*n*]
- We study two types of feedback regimes
	- 1. **Full feedback:** All losses revealed at all time steps, i.e.,  $z_t = (\mathcal{C}_t(i))_{i \in [n]}$
	- 2. **Label-efficient feedback:** All losses revealed *only after* a querying time step
- We want to understand how the **regret** grows:

$$
R_T := \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_t(i_t)] - \min_{i \in [n]} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathcal{E}_t(i)
$$



### **Our Results** Upper and Lower Bounds



**Sublinear Query** 

$$
k \in \Omega\left(\sqrt{T}\right)
$$

$$
R_T \in \Theta\left(\frac{T}{k}\right)
$$

### **Our Results Upper and Lower Bounds**



**Sublinear Query** 

$$
\begin{aligned}\n\end{aligned}\n\left.\begin{array}{c}\n\end{array}\right|\n\left.\begin{array}{c}\nk \in \Omega\left(\sqrt{T}\right) \\
R_T \in \Theta\left(\frac{T}{k}\right)\n\end{array}\n\right.\n\left.\begin{array}{c}\n\end{array}\right)\n\left.\begin{array}{c}\nk \in \Omega\left(T^{2/3}\right) \\
R_T \in \Theta\left(\frac{T^2}{k^2}\right)\n\end{array}\n\right.
$$

## **Our Results**

### **Upper and Lower Bounds**

**Sublinear Query** 

 $k \in \Omega\left(\sqrt{T}\right)$  $R_T \in \Theta$  ( *T k* )  $\left| k \in \Omega \left( T^{2/3} \right) \right|$  $\frac{T^2}{k^2}$ 



#### **Upper Bound**

- **Full feedback:** *Hedge* on *true* losses equipped with uniform random queries across the time horizon *k*(+ refined analysis)
- **• Label-efficient feedback:** *Hedge* on *estimated* losses equipped with uniform probability querying until query budget exhaustion (+ refined analysis)





# **Our Results**

### **Upper and Lower Bounds**

**Sublinear Query** 



$$
k \in \Omega\left(\sqrt{T}\right)
$$

$$
R_T \in \Theta\left(\frac{T}{k}\right)
$$

 $\overline{k^2}$ 

• **Full and label-efficient feedback:** Two actions where queries cannot help more than  $T/k$  and  $T^2/k^2$ 

#### **Upper Bound**





- **Full feedback:** *Hedge* on *true* losses equipped with uniform random queries across the time horizon *k* (+ refined analysis)
- **• Label-efficient feedback:** *Hedge* on *estimated* losses equipped with uniform probability querying until query budget exhaustion (+ refined analysis)

#### **Lower Bound**

# **Our Results**

### **Upper and Lower Bounds**

**Sublinear Query** 

 $\left| k \in \Omega \left( T^{2/3} \right) \right|$ *T*2



$$
k \in \Omega\left(\sqrt{T}\right)
$$

$$
R_T \in \Theta\left(\frac{T}{k}\right)
$$

• **Full and label-efficient feedback:** Two actions where queries cannot help more than  $T/k$  and  $T^2/k^2$ 

#### **Upper Bound**

- **Full feedback:** *Hedge* on *true* losses equipped with uniform random queries across the time horizon *k* (+ refined analysis)
- **• Label-efficient feedback:** *Hedge* on *estimated* losses equipped with uniform probability querying until query budget exhaustion (+ refined analysis)

#### **Lower Bound**

#### **Future**

- What about **bandit feedback, feedback graphs, partial monitoring feedback**?
- What if queries are **not perfect**?







# **Thank you!**