

APPENDIX

A TECHNICAL LEMMAS

A.1 FOLLOW-THE-REGULARIZED-LEADER TYPE RESULTS

Lemma 5. Let $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of functions and $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{K}$. Suppose there exists a sequence of lower barrier functions $\{h_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ such that $h_t(x_t) = f_t(x_t)$ and $h_t \leq f_t$. Then, the following inequality holds:

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - f_t(x) \leq \max_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{t=1}^T h_t(x_t) - h_t(x).$$

Proof. The proof follows from the inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - f_t(x) &= \sum_{t=1}^T h_t(x_t) - f_t(x) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T h_t(x_t) - h_t(x), \end{aligned}$$

and taking the maximum over \mathcal{K} . \square

Lemma 6. Let $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of convex functions defined on a closed convex set \mathcal{K} , and let $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of points in \mathcal{K} such that the subgradient of f_t at x_t is denoted as g_t . Let $\{r_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of non-negative convex functions. Then the update $x_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_x g_{1:t}^T x + r_{0:t}(x)$ incurs regret at most

$$\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - f_t(x) \leq r_{0:T}(x) + \sum_{t=1}^T g_t^T(x_t - x_{t+1}).$$

Proof. The regret with respect to a fixed point x can be decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - f_t(x) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T g_t^T(x_t - x) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T g_t^T(x_t - x_{t+1}) + g_t^T(x_{t+1} - x). \end{aligned}$$

The proof then follows from the inequality

$$\sum_{t=1}^T g_t^T x_{t+1} \leq r_{0:T}(x) + \sum_{t=1}^T g_t^T x,$$

which can be shown in a straightforward manner by induction. \square

A.2 SMOOTHING AND UNBIASED GRADIENT ESTIMATES

Lemma 1. Let $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an SPSD matrix, and define $\hat{f}(x) = \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n} [f(x + Av)]$. Then, for $g_t = n f(x + Au) A^{-1} u$, the following holds: $\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{S}^n} [g_t] = \nabla \hat{f}(x)$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{S}^n} [g_t] &= \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{S}^n} [n f(x + Au) A^{-1} u] \\ &= A^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{S}^n} [n f(x + Au) u] \\ &= A^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n} [\nabla_x f(x + Av) A] \\ &\quad \text{(by the divergence theorem)} \\ &= \nabla_x \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n} [f(x + Av)] \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 4. Let A be an SPSD matrix, and let $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be A -strongly convex. Then \hat{f} is also A -strongly convex.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{f}(x) - \hat{f}(y) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n} [f(x + Av) - f(y + Av)] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n} \left[\nabla f(y + Av)^T (x - y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|_A^2 \right] \\ &= \nabla \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n} [f(y + Av)]^T (x - y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|_A^2 \\ &= \nabla \hat{f}(y)^T (x - y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|_A^2 \end{aligned}$$

\square

A.3 AN INEQUALITY CONCERNING NORMALIZED SUMS

Lemma 7. Let $\alpha_t \geq 0$, $\gamma > 0$, $\beta > 1$, and $\eta_t = \beta^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} (\alpha_{1:t})^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}}$. Then

$$\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^\gamma \alpha_t \right) + \frac{\beta}{\eta_T} \leq (2 + \gamma) \beta^{\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}} (\alpha_{1:T})^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}}$$

Proof. By our choice of η_t , it follows that $\frac{\beta}{\eta_T} \leq \beta^{\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}} (\alpha_{1:T})^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}}$. We now proceed by induction for the remaining expression. For $T = 1$, the inequality holds by

direct inspection. If the statement is true for $T - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^\gamma \alpha_t &= \left(\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \eta_t^\gamma \alpha_t \right) + \eta_T^\gamma \alpha_T \\ &\leq (1 + \gamma) \beta^{\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}} (\alpha_{1:T-1})^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} + \eta_T^\gamma \alpha_T \\ &= (1 + \gamma) \beta^{\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}} (\alpha_{1:T} - \alpha_T)^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} + \frac{\beta^{\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}} \alpha_T}{\alpha_{1:T}^{\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}}} \\ &\leq (1 + \gamma) \beta^{\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}} \alpha_{1:T}^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} \end{aligned}$$

since the second to last expression is optimized for $\alpha_T = 0$. \square

A.4 FACTS ABOUT RANDOM SAMPLING

Lemma 8. *Let $x \sim \mathcal{D}$ be a random vector and A be a symmetric matrix. Then, the following identity holds:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [x^T A x] = \text{trace}(A \text{cov}(x)) + \mathbb{E}[x]^T A \mathbb{E}[x],$$

where $\text{cov}(x) = \mathbb{E}[x x^T] - \mathbb{E}[x] \mathbb{E}[x]^T$ is the covariance matrix associated to x .

Proof. The identity follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [x^T A x] &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [\text{trace}(A x x^T)] \\ &= \text{trace}(A \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [x x^T]) \\ &= \text{trace}(A (\text{cov}(x) + \mathbb{E}[x] \mathbb{E}[x]^T)) \\ &= A \text{cov}(x) + \mathbb{E}[x]^T A \mathbb{E}[x], \end{aligned}$$

using the linearity of expectation and that of the trace operator. \square

Lemma 9. *Let $u \sim \mathcal{S}^n$. Then $\text{cov}(u) = \frac{1}{n} I$ and $\mathbb{E}[u] = 0$.*

Proof. By symmetry, $(u_1, \dots, u_i, \dots, u_n)$ and $(u_1, \dots, -u_i, \dots, u_n)$ admit the same distribution. This implies that for all i , $\mathbb{E}[u_i] = \mathbb{E}[-u_i] = 0$ and also that the two random vectors admit the same covariance matrix. The latter means that $\mathbb{E}[u_i u_j] = \mathbb{E}[-u_i u_j] = 0$ for $i \neq j$.

Finally, the fact that u is distributed over the unit sphere implies that $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[u_i^2] = 1$. By spherical symmetry, the elements of the vector are exchangeable, so that $\mathbb{E}[u_i^2] = \mathbb{E}[u_j^2]$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, which shows that $\mathbb{E}[u_i^2] = \frac{1}{n}$. \square

B AdaBCO-Lipschitz REGRET BOUND

We present here the proof of Theorem 3, the regret bound for Algorithm 3.

Theorem 3 (AdaBCO using dynamic Lipschitz bounds). *Let \mathcal{K} be a convex set and \mathcal{R} a ν -self-concordant barrier over \mathcal{K} . Assume that $|f| \leq C$. Then Algorithm 2 provides the regret bound:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[f_t(y_t) - f_t(x)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[5(\nu \log(T))^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(L_t n C^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(B_t) \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We will first prove the intermediate inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[f_t(y_t) - f_t(x)] \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[L_t \delta_t \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(B_t) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta_t}{\delta_t^2} (n f_t(x_t + B_t u))^2 \right) + \frac{1}{\eta_T} \nu \log(T) \right] \end{aligned}$$

As in the smooth scenario, we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}_T(w)] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[f_t(y_t) - f_t(w)] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[f_t(y_t) - f_t(x_t)] + \mathbb{E}[f_t(x_t) - \hat{f}_t(x_t)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_t(w) - f_t(w)] + \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_t(x_t) - \hat{f}_t(w)]. \end{aligned}$$

By appealing to Theorem 1, it suffices to bound the first three terms using the L_t -Lipschitz property.

For the first term, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[f_t(y_t) - f_t(x_t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{S}^n} [f_t(x_t + \delta_t B_t u) - f_t(x_t) | x_t]] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{S}^n} [L_t \delta_t \|B_t u\|_2 | x_t]] \\ &\quad \text{(by } L_t\text{-Lipschitz)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[L_t \delta_t \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{S}^n} [u^T B_t^2 u | x_t]}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[L_t \delta_t \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(B_t^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &\quad \text{(by Lemmas 8 and 9).} \end{aligned}$$

The second term can be bounded using Jensen's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[f_t(x_t) - \hat{f}_t(x_t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f_t(x_t) - \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n} [f_t(x_t + Av)]] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f_t(x_t) - f_t(\mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n} [x_t + Av])] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The third term can be bounded in a way similar to the first term:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\widehat{f}_t(w) - f_t(w)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n}[f_t(w + \delta_t B_t v)] - f_t(w)] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mathcal{B}^n}[L_t \|\delta_t B_t v\|_2]] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[L_t \delta_t \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(B_t^2)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the estimates yields the intermediate inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[f_t(y_t) - f_t(x)] \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[L_t \delta_t \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(B_t)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta_t}{\delta_t^2} (n f_t(x_t + B_t u))^2\right) + \frac{1}{\eta_T} \nu \log(T)\right] \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[L_t \delta_t \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(B_t)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta_t}{\delta_t^2} n^2 C^2\right) + \frac{1}{\eta_T} \nu \log(T)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

and by our choice of δ_t , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[f_t(y_t) - f_t(x)] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^T 2 \left(2\eta_t n C^2 L_t \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(B_t)\right)^{1/3}\right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\eta_T} \nu \log(T)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, our choice of η_t , Lemma 7, and the fact that $\eta_t \leq \eta_{t-1}$ yield:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[f_t(y_t) - f_t(x)] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[5(\nu \log(T))^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(L_t n C^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(B_t)\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

□