

# Optimization-Driven Adaptive Experimentation

Ethan Che<sup>1</sup>   Daniel Jiang<sup>2,3</sup>   Hongseok Namkoong<sup>1</sup>   Jimmy Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Columbia University, <sup>2</sup>Meta, <sup>3</sup>University of Pittsburgh

{eche25, namkoong}@gsb.columbia.edu, drjiang@meta.com, jw4209@columbia.edu

## Abstract

Real-world experiments involve batched & delayed feedback, non-stationarity, multiple objectives & constraints, and (often some) personalization. Tailoring adaptive methods to address these challenges on a per-problem basis is infeasible, and a static design remains the de facto standard. Focusing on short-horizon ( $\leq 10$ ) adaptive experiments, we move away from bespoke algorithms and present a *mathematical programming* formulation that can flexibly incorporate a wide range of objectives, constraints, and statistical procedures. We formulate a dynamic program based on central limit approximations, which enables the use of scalable optimization methods based on auto-differentiation and GPU parallelization. To evaluate our framework, we implement a simple heuristic planning method (“solver”) and benchmark it across hundreds of problem instances involving non-stationarity, personalization, and multiple objectives & constraints. Unlike bespoke methods (e.g., Thompson sampling variants), our mathematical programming framework provides consistent gains over static randomized control trials and exhibits robust performance across problem instances.

## 1 Introduction

Experimentation forms the foundation of scientific decision-making, from natural and social sciences to industry. Yet even for online platforms with hundreds of millions of users, achieving sufficient statistical power is costly [44, 45, 46, 12, 22]. Adaptive experimentation can significantly improve efficiency by focusing resources on promising treatments, and expand the set of scientific hypotheses that can be tested beyond the typical handful of treatment options. However, significant practical challenges remain in applying standard adaptive algorithms:

- **Batching, delayed feedback, and short horizons:** Standard algorithms are designed to be updated after every observation, but experiments are typically conducted with a few large batches and infrequent updates to the sampling policy due to infrastructure constraints and delayed feedback [10, 58, 39]. This results in problem formulations with limited adaptivity, or, in other words, formulations with finite and short horizons.
- **Nonstationarity:** Real-world experiments operate in non-stationary environments. In a week-long experiment comparing multiple layouts for the landing page of a fashion retailer, behavior of customers who visit the page on the weekend is different from those that visit on Monday.
- **General objectives and metric constraints:** Across a range of outcomes/metrics/rewards, there is a wide range of objectives and constraints that practitioners may consider such as within- vs. post-experiment performance.
- **Cost/budget constraints:** Practitioners running a field experiment wish to find the best treatment while satisfying budget constraints and ethical constraints involving the social welfare of participants during the experiment. Other constraints may include requiring sufficient sample coverage for post-experiment inference [58, 79], requiring fairness [21], and ensuring safety [7].

**Long-horizon bandit algorithms (Section 2).** To address these challenges, the standard algorithm development paradigm takes a problem-specific approach; researchers craft tailored methods that deliver strong theoretical guarantees for problems with frequent opportunities to reallocate measurement effort (“long horizon”) [40, 61, 41, 4, 62, 33, 49, 29, 73, 23, 63, 25]. However, it is infeasible for practitioners to develop a new algorithm for each new setting they encounter in practice. Deploying algorithms to settings that are slightly different than what they were designed for can lead to highly suboptimal performance that is even worse than that of static uniformly randomized allocations (see Figure 1). Additionally, maintaining a portfolio of problem-specific methods for each possible instance leads to fragmented infrastructures that are cumbersome to manage.

To understand why the literature takes this approach, consider the adaptive experiment sequential decision making problem


$$\min_{\pi_t(\mathcal{H}_t) \geq 0} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^T \text{Objective}_t(\pi_t; \mathcal{H}_t) \right] \mid \sum_{t=0}^T \text{Cost}_t(\pi_t, \mathcal{H}_t) \leq B, \quad 1^\top \pi_t(\mathcal{H}_t) \leq 1 \quad \forall t \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $T$  is the number of updates to the sampling allocation (horizon),  $\mathcal{H}_t$  denotes historical data (outcomes, contexts, treatment assignments) up to the  $t$ -th batch,  $\pi_t$  denotes the policy the modeler needs to learn, and  $B$  is the budget constraint of the experiment. In this paper, we focus on short-horizon ( $T \leq 10$ ) problems to model batched real-world experiments where reallocation of measurement effort is costly.

The dynamic program (1) is intractable since the dimension of the states  $\mathcal{H}_t$  is commensurate with the total number of observations. Even though they are usually designed for good performance as  $T$  grows large, bandit algorithms [49] are commonly applied as an approximate solution method. They optimize a surrogate such as an upper confidence bound (UCB) derived from concentration inequalities or a model drawn from a posterior distribution (e.g., Top-Two Thompson sampling). While these proxies do not directly measure the regret objective of interest, they nonetheless serve as useful approximations that guide sampling decisions to reduce regret as the horizon  $T$  increases. However, these proxy-based approaches are difficult to adapt to the aforementioned challenges that arise in real-world experiments, and it is unclear whether their performance guarantees will be maintained after suitable modifications.

As a result, most experiments in practice are non-adaptive [69, 3]. In this paper, we focus on short-horizon batched adaptive experiments ( $T \leq 10$ ) and do not consider large-horizon behavior. Our goal is to uniformly improve upon non-adaptive designs across multiple problem instances.

**Mathematical programming via tractable reformulation (Section 3).** We present a scalable and flexible *mathematical programming* view for *batched* adaptive experiments. It is instructive to use deterministic optimization as a fable. There, a practitioner writes down a problem instance consisting of decision variables, an objective, and constraints in a standardized interface (e.g., CVX [32]) that gets passed to a general solver (e.g., Gurobi [34], MOSEK [8]). We argue *short-horizon* adaptive experimentation problems can be viewed in an analogous way. Practitioners should be able to express their objectives, constraints, and structure of the assignment policy through a *standardized and flexible language* that includes simple objectives like best arm identification, or complex ones like best top- $k$  selection while minimizing cumulative regret. Under this mathematical programming view, an effective adaptive method must perform well across a wide set of problem instances, rather than focus only on a specific set of problems.



**Figure 1. (Real-world non-stationarity)** Benchmark results on 241 non-stationary settings based on 78 real experiments run at ASOS, a fashion retailer with over 26 million active customers as of 2024 [52]. Treatment effects vary significantly over days. We simulate 750 batched experiments across instances, resulting in 180,750 evaluations across different batch sizes and different policies. Plots shown for batch size  $n_t = 100$  and  $T = 10$ . Contextual policies model non-stationarity effects, but still pick a single arm at the end of the experiment; we compare BLDP with variants of Thompson sampling, including Contextual Top-Two Thompson sampling (TTTS) [63] tailored for non-stationary settings. **Right:** Adaptive algorithms often do worse than uniform, overfitting on initial, temporary performance. RHO (stars) is the only adaptive policy with greater average reward and choose the best arm more often compared to uniform sampling, outperforming bandit algorithms even under model misspecification (non-contextual), across a wide range of learning rates. **Left:** Quantile of simple regret across 241 settings (normalized by that of uniform allocation). RHO outperforms uniform on more instances (60.5%) compared to other adaptive policies (51.8% for Top-Two Thompson Sampling). TS-based policies tend to be more fragile on difficult instances; when it underperforms Uniform it does so 10.7% on average (compared to 6.9% for RHO).

Toward this vision, we simplify the dynamic program (1) to a tractable optimization problem that we can heuristically solve using modern computational tools (auto-differentiation and GPU parallelization). Our main observation is that a *batched* view of the experimentation process allows us to model the uncertainty around sufficient statistics necessary to make allocation decisions, instead of attempting to model unit-level outcomes whose distributions are commonly unknown and leads to intractable dynamic programs with combinatorial action spaces [11]. We consider any outcomes whose conditional means can be learned via a loss minimization problem over a parametric model class  $\theta \in \Theta$ . (In a vanilla multi-armed setting, the true parameter  $\theta^*$  corresponds to average rewards.) Instead of an entire batch of data, we compress the information into a sufficient statistic, the empirical risk minimizer  $\hat{\theta}_t$ , which is calculated over each batch.

Letting  $n_t$  be the batch size at reallocation epoch  $t$ , the central limit approximation implies

$$\hat{\theta}_t \sim N(\theta^*, n_t^{-1} F(\pi_t)) \text{ for some known function } F(\cdot) \text{ of sampling allocation } \pi_t. \quad (2)$$

Here, we view  $\hat{\theta}_t$  as a noisy observation of the true parameter  $\theta^*$ , or equivalently, that the *data*  $\hat{\theta}_t$  has approximately Gaussian likelihoods given the parameter  $\theta^*$ . We model the experimenter’s evolving beliefs on the true parameter  $\theta^*$  as  $\hat{\theta}_t$ ’s are observed. In particular, a Gaussian prior on  $\theta^*$  with prior mean  $\beta_0$  and variance  $\Sigma_0$  and the approximate likelihood (2) gives conjugate posteriors

$$(\beta_0, \Sigma_0) \xrightarrow{\hat{\theta}_1} (\beta_1, \Sigma_1) \xrightarrow{\hat{\theta}_2} \dots \xrightarrow{\hat{\theta}_T} (\beta_T, \Sigma_T).$$

By modeling posterior beliefs  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  as states, we arrive at the *batch limit dynamic program*

(BLDP) with known dynamics


$$\min_{\pi_t(\beta_t, \Sigma_t) \geq 0} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^T \text{Objective}_t(\pi_t; \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \right] \mid \sum_{t=0}^T \text{Cost}(\pi_t) \leq B, \quad 1^\top \pi_t(\beta_t, \Sigma_t) \leq 1 \quad \forall t \right\}. \quad (3)$$

To concretely illustrate the benefits of the tractable mathematical programming reformulation BLDP (3), consider an experiment ubiquitous in practice involving both minimizing *within experiment* (cumulative) regret and post experiment (simple) regret while satisfying a budget constraint. For example, experimenters running a field experiment in the social sciences strive to maximize the welfare of participants (cumulative regret) due to ethical considerations while satisfying cost constraints and exploring enough to determine the efficacy of each treatment (simple regret). An online platform wishes to conduct an experiment while limiting negative user experience (cumulative regret) and ensuring experiment constraints are satisfied. To our knowledge, no tailored algorithm for this setting even for long horizons, even though separate algorithms have been proposed to satisfy budget constraints [78] and optimize the trade-off between simple and cumulative regret [65, 64, 13]. [76] proposes a method to learn treatment effects while treating those in need and satisfying budget constraints, but can only handle single stage designs. In contrast, this setup is easy to model in the BLDP as we detail in Section 3.2; see Section 5 for an empirical demonstration. Figure 2 shows that our formulation is able to efficiently tradeoff between these objectives in a principled manner, while adaptations of existing methods are difficult to tune and satisfy objectives and constraints in a principled or exact manner.

Central limit approximations are universal in statistical inference, and we use it to model the sufficient statistics  $\theta_t$  as a Gaussian distribution (“likelihood”). We do not require the experimenter to be Bayesian *when analyzing the data*, but combine frequentist CLT approximations (2) with Bayesian principles to *optimize adaptive designs*. In our framework, Gaussianity is a *result* of the CLT rather than a blanket assumption, and justifying the CLT approximation (2) requires significant effort. The standard CLT only holds conditional on the history, and proving joint convergence over  $t = 1, \dots, T$  requires careful control of the *rate* at which convergence occurs. Our main theoretical contribution (Section 6) proves this under weak conditions, by combining M-estimation theory and Stein’s method.

**Optimizing short-horizon adaptive experiments (Section 4).** Since the BLDP (3) has simple closed-form dynamics (posterior updates), we can simulate trajectories (“roll-outs”) under various treatment allocations and *plan* future sampling allocations for short horizons ( $T \leq 10$ ). As an initial step toward approximate solution methods for BLDP, we introduce a simple method based on the *model-predictive control* (MPC) design principle: *residual horizon optimization* (RHO). Whenever new observations are obtained, the policy simulates trajectories from the BLDP to solve for an optimal *static* sequence of treatment allocations to use for the rest of experiment. By re-solving this sequence after every batch, the policy remains adaptive while working flexibly with batched feedback. RHO’s main advantage is that regardless of the complexity of objectives, constraints, and predictable non-stationarity patterns, it is guaranteed to have a lower Bayesian regret than static designs. While static designs appear to be a weak benchmark initially, we empirically find bandit algorithms struggle to consistently outperform a standard A/B test when facing aforementioned practical challenges.

Since dynamics are differentiable with respect to sampling allocations, our proposed algorithm can optimize lookahead policies (with short horizons) over any set of objectives and constraints that



**Figure 2. Satisfying budget constraints while optimizing simple plus cumulative regret.**

Pareto frontier of the tradeoff between simple and cumulative regret while maintaining a fixed budget of 100 units across the experiment. Each arm is associated with a fixed cost. RHO can exactly satisfy the budget constraint in expectation via projected gradient descent. Additionally, RHO trades off between simple and cumulative regret in a principled manner by setting weights equal to the number of individuals under each objective. We are not aware of any existing adaptive algorithm designed for this setting, so we combine Budgeted TS [78] designed for budget constraints and Top-Two TS [65] which can tradeoff between simple and cumulative regret [64]. In contrast to RHO, it is difficult to tune Budgeted Top-Two TS in an exact and principled way to satisfy the objective and constraints. This method involves a scaling parameter  $b \in [0, \infty)$  to satisfy the budget constraint and a scaling parameter  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  to trade off between simple and cumulative regret. These parameters are difficult to tune as adjusting one parameter directly affects the other. Keeping the budget parameter  $b$  constant while varying  $\alpha$  to tradeoff between simple and cumulative regret yields average budget costs from 82.2 to 105.2 units, potentially violating the constraint. In contrast, keeping RHO’s budget costs fixed yields average budget costs varying from 94.1 to 99.5 units.

can be expressed as a function of posterior beliefs (e.g., top- $k$ -sum, simple, and cumulative regret) through stochastic gradient descent methods. The use of pathwise stochastic gradients obtained through auto-differentiation provides a effective and simple method compared to REINFORCE-style policy gradient methods. Our formulation is not only applicable for personalized treatments or policy learning, but also improving upon the efficiency and robustness of standard bandit experiments. Given the vast literature on adaptive methods, we provide a necessarily abridged review in Sections 3 and 7.

**Rigorous empirical benchmarking (Section 5).** In our mathematical programming framework, adaptive designs are learned based on scalable optimization algorithms regardless of the problem instance. To assess the potential of our mathematical programming framework, we empirically validate our simple solution approach RHO over diverse problem instances. In particular, we benchmark adaptive designs against static uniform allocations (“A/B tests”, the de facto standard), along with state-of-the-art adaptive methods like Thompson sampling [6] and its extensions that

account for (predictable) non-stationarity [63] and various constraints and objectives [78, 65, 64]. Despite the preliminary and limited nature of RHO, it consistently outperforms these state-of-the-art methods over a wide variety of settings involving non-stationarity, personalization, multiple objectives, and constraints. In Figure 1, we provide a preview of our empirical work, where we find that RHO exhibits a unique robustness to non-stationarity. Figure 2 shows that RHO can trade off between the cumulative and simple regret objectives while exactly maintaining a fixed budget in expectation via projected gradient descent. This shows that incorporating multiple, possibly competing objectives and constraints into our mathematical programming framework is straightforward. We are not aware of existing methods designed for this setting despite its ubiquity. Other methods such as Budgeted Thompson Sampling [78] and Top-Two Thompson Sampling [65] can theoretically tradeoff between these objectives individually, but there is no principled approach to setting the values of these parameters. Furthermore, Figure 4 displays RHO’s ability to efficiently trade off between a combined cumulative and simple regret objective in a personalized ranking environment, showing our framework’s applications in diverse areas.

## 2 Batched Adaptive Experimentation

We begin by formalizing short-horizon adaptive experiments as a sequential decision-making problem and highlight the challenges of solving this problem directly. Given the widespread practice of conducting experiments in a few, large batches, we consider a *batched adaptive experiment* composed of  $T$  sequential epochs (or “batches”) and  $K$  treatment arms. Each epoch  $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$  comprises of  $n_t$  sampling units, where each unit  $i = 1, \dots, n_t$  has a *context*  $X_{t,i} \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$  drawn i.i.d. from a potentially time-varying batch context distribution  $\mu_t$ .

In this work, we restrict attention to *predictable* non-stationarity and assume that the context distributions  $\mu_t$  are known to the modeler. While this may seem like a strong requirement, this is often naturally satisfied when modeling temporal non-stationarity (e.g., day-of-the-week or novelty effects). Temporal non-stationarity can be modeled by having the context be the epoch  $x = t$ : in this case future context arrival distributions are  $\mu_s(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x = s\}$  and are deterministic. In more complicated settings, e.g., if the context are highly user-specific features, we can instead use historical samples from the context distributions  $\mu_s$  as an approximation.

The experimenter is interested in a stochastic *outcome*  $R_{t,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ , along with the effect of each treatment arm  $a \in [K]$  on the outcome. In many applications, the experimenter is interested in multiple outcome metrics, in which case  $R_{t,i} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for  $m > 1$ . While the framework we introduce can seamlessly handle this case, we focus on a single outcome metric for clarity of presentation. We denote  $\mathcal{D}_t = \{(X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{t,i})\}_{i=1}^{n_t}$  to be the data collected in batch  $t$ .

The experimenter allocates treatments to sampling units to optimize the learning objective subject to constraints, both of which may depend on outcomes. Defining  $\mathcal{S}_K := \{(x_1, \dots, x_K) \mid x_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^K x_i \leq 1 \forall i \in [K]\}$  be the “filled” simplex, the decision variables are *sampling allocations*  $p_t(\cdot \mid x) \in \mathcal{S}_K$ , which are conditional probabilities over treatment arms  $a \in [K]$ . This includes non-contextual sampling allocations which allocate a fixed fraction of the sampling units to each treatment arm. Adaptivity means allocations may depend on the *history*  $\mathcal{H}_t := \bigcup_{s=0}^{t-1} \mathcal{D}_s$  of sampled contexts, arm allocations, and rewards observed before epoch  $t$ .

We allow  $p_t(\cdot \mid x)$  to sum to less than one instead of lying on the  $K$ -simplex, in order to satisfy potential budget constraints. Notably, we allow the zero-vector as an action, i.e.  $p_t(\cdot \mid x) = \mathbf{0}$  allowing the experimenter to abstain from assigning a treatment to take a zero-cost action to



maintain feasibility during the experiment.

Experiments are often evaluated based on the quality of downstream deployment decisions after the experiment is run. To model this, we can also consider a *post-experiment deployment decision* of a treatment arm or even a policy allocating treatments over a population distribution  $X \sim \mu$ . We characterize this as the *post-experimental phase*, in which the experimenter uses the data collected during the experiment to make a final treatment allocation.

**Definition 1.** *The final epoch  $t = T$  is the **post-experimental phase** after the batched adaptive experiment performed during epochs  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ . During this phase, based on the history  $\mathcal{H}_T$ , the experimenter selects a final arm allocation decision over treatment arms  $p_T(\cdot | x) \in \Delta_K$  for units from a **population distribution**  $\mu$ .*

The final allocation  $p_T$  naturally depends on sampling allocations made during the experiment. Due to non-stationarity, the sampling units that arrive during the experiment may be drawn from distributions  $\mu_t$  that are very different from the population distribution  $\mu$ . Therefore, if the adaptive design does not account for non-stationarity, it may overfit to data that is not representative of the treatment effects for the population distribution.

## 2.1 Reward Models

Given an observed context  $X_{t,i} = x$  and assigned action  $A_{t,i} = a$ , the stochastic rewards  $R_{t,i}$  follow the conditional distribution

$$R_{t,i} | X_{t,i} = x, A_{t,i} = a \sim \nu_t(\cdot | x, a),$$

with mean  $r(x, a) := \mathbb{E}[R_{t,i} | X_{t,i} = x, A_{t,i} = a]$ . Crucially, we do not assume  $\nu_t(\cdot | x, a)$  is known to the experimenter. We assume that the primary object of interest, the conditional mean reward  $r(x, a)$ , is given by a general parametric model

$$r(x, a) = f(x, a; \theta^*) \quad \text{for some } \theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4)$$

Common examples include linear and linear-logistic contextual models, given respectively by

$$r(x, a) = \phi(x, a)^\top \theta^* \quad \text{and} \quad r(x, a) = \sigma(\phi(x, a)^\top \theta^*), \quad (5)$$

where  $\phi(x, a) : \mathcal{X} \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is a known feature mapping and  $\sigma(x) = 1/(1 + e^{-x})$  is the sigmoid.

The set of reward models we consider can model a range of application scenarios. Contexts can range from user-specific features to day-of-the-week or geographic fixed effects.

**Example 1** (Additive treatment effects with confounders). Let  $\theta^* = (\theta_1^*, \dots, \theta_K^*, \bar{\theta}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{K+p}$  consist of an unknown linear parameter  $\bar{\theta}^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , along with an additive treatment effect  $\theta_a^* \in \mathbb{R}$  associated with each arm  $a \in [K]$ . Under the model  $r(x, a) = \phi(x, a)^\top \theta^* = x^\top \bar{\theta}^* + \theta_a^*$ , there exists a single arm that maximizes expected reward for all contexts  $x$ .  $\diamond$

**Example 2** (Mixed contextual treatment effects). Let  $\theta^* = (\bar{\theta}_1^*, \dots, \bar{\theta}_K^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{Kp}$  consist of action embeddings  $\bar{\theta}_a^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . Under the model  $r(x, a) = \phi(x, a)^\top \theta^* = x^\top \bar{\theta}_a^*$ , the optimal action varies across  $x$ , this setup can model personalization (when  $x$  represents user-specific features), or predictable non-stationarity (when  $x$  represents the day-of-the-week).  $\diamond$

We assume the experimenter's statistical procedure for estimating  $\theta^*$  is specified through a *loss function*  $\ell$ , mirroring common practice as well as the theoretical framework of M-estimation. This

includes estimation procedures such as least-squares, maximum likelihood, quantile regression, as well as robust (Huber) losses. In order to connect this loss function to the underlying parameter of interest, we assume that the true parameter  $\theta^*$  minimizes the expected loss under a suitable population distribution, along with standard regularity assumptions.

**Assumption A** (True parameter specified by loss minimization). *Let  $\ell(\theta | x, a, r)$  be a convex, twice continuously differentiable loss in  $\theta$  for all  $(x, a, r)$ . Under a population distribution over contexts  $X_i \sim \mu$ , a reference action distribution  $A_i \sim p(\cdot | X_i)$ , and under the reward distribution  $R_i \sim \nu_t(\cdot | X_i, A_i)$ ,  $\theta^*$  is the unique minimizer of the population loss  $L(\theta)$ :*

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\{ L(\theta) := \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta | X_i, A_i, R_i)] \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore,  $L(\theta)$  has a positive definite Hessian on a neighborhood of  $\theta^*$ .

For the linear and the linear-logistic models, the corresponding loss functions are as follows,

$$\ell(\theta | X_i, A_i, R_i) = |R_i - \phi(X_i, A_i)^\top \theta|^2, \quad \ell(\theta | X_i, A_i, R_i) = \log \left( 1 + e^{-R_i \phi(X_i, A_i)^\top \theta} \right).$$

In order to estimate  $\theta^*$  from a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  consisting of  $n$  i.i.d. tuples of contexts, arms, and rewards  $\{(X_i, A_i, R_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ , the experimenter solves the empirical risk minimization problem  $\hat{\theta}_n = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \{L_n(\theta | \mathcal{D}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta | X_i, A_i, R_i)\}$ .

## 2.2 Challenges of Optimization for Adaptive Experimentation

For short horizon adaptive experiments (1), a natural approach is to frame the problem as a Markov decision process (MDP) and use approximate dynamic programming to optimize the experimenter’s objective (e.g. cumulative or simple regret). In the absence of assumptions on the reward distribution  $R_{t,i} \sim \nu(\cdot | x, a)$ , states are the history of observed data  $\mathcal{H}_t$ , which is intractable as the dimension of the history is proportional to the total number of sampling units seen so far  $\sum_{s=0}^t n_s$ . This is huge in typical experiments (e.g.,  $n_s \geq 10^5$  in typical A/B tests) and the curse of dimensionality prevents the use of standard dynamic programming techniques. It is unclear how to properly distill the history  $\mathcal{H}_t$  into something more manageable without additional assumptions on the distribution  $\nu(\cdot | x, a)$  of rewards  $R_{t,i}$ . The state transition  $\mathcal{H}_{t+1} = \mathcal{H}_t \cup \mathcal{D}_t$  relies on newly observed rewards, but the reward-generating distribution  $R_{t,i} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \nu(\cdot | x, a)$  is unknown.

It may be possible to design approaches for overcoming these issues, such as (online) reinforcement learning or constructing a Bayesian posterior over  $\nu$ , but again, since the state is  $\mathcal{H}_t$ , such approaches will be impractical. The intractability of solving this dynamic program has been widely recognized in the bandit literature and has served as motivation for specialized algorithms that are guaranteed to perform well only in large horizon problems. As a result, they may not be able to manage exploration-exploitation trade-offs for short horizons, let alone trade-offs among multiple objectives and constraints.

## 3 Batch Limit Dynamic Program

We now derive a tractable approximation with *known dynamics* that only relies on  $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ -dimensional states where  $d$  is the dimension of the parameter  $\theta^*$  (Assumption A). We leverage the fact that



typical experiments feature large enough batch sizes [10, 58, 39] to admit a central limit approximation, a universal practice in statistical inference. In particular, we use a normal approximation for relevant sufficient statistics at the batch level.

Our work directly extends the framework of Che and Namkoong [18] in simple multi-armed settings to allow nonstationarities, multiple objectives, constraints, and personalized policies. Our mathematical programming view is enabled by our main theoretical results which derive sequential local asymptotic normality for M-estimation problems. Our analysis carefully leverages Stein’s method to address the sequential, adaptive nature of the problem and provides the most general formulation of classical local asymptotic normality and normal experiments to date [71]. Overall, the BLDP provides a substantially more general framework than their Gaussian sequential experiment over finite arm rewards and this generalization allows experimenters to update a flexible and tractable Bayesian model over the solution to a general loss minimization problem. Methodologically, we extend the MPC principle to formulate a general planning algorithm—which we still term RHO for conceptual ease—that can handle any objectives and constraints. Empirically, we demonstrate the performance of RHO in Section 5 across an extensive array of problem instances motivated by practice, compared to the simple simulation examples in Che and Namkoong [18].

### 3.1 Large-Batch Statistical Approximations

We derive our tractable dynamic programming formulation informally in this section, deferring a rigorous treatment to Section 6. Our main theoretical insight is that the following approximations are valid in the large batch limit where normal approximations become valid.

Given data  $\mathcal{D}_t$  collected in batch  $t$  with sampling allocation  $p_t(\cdot | x)$ , the experimenter can obtain an estimate  $\hat{\theta}_t$  of  $\theta^*$  by minimizing the empirical risk

$$\hat{\theta}_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\{ L_{n_t}(\theta | \mathcal{D}_t) := \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \ell(\theta | X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{t,i}) \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Our key observation is that according to standard intuition from M-estimation, under large batch sizes (i.e.  $n_t \rightarrow \infty$ ) the distribution of  $\hat{\theta}_t$  is asymptotically Gaussian, i.e.,

$$\hat{\theta}_t \text{ approximately follows } N(\theta^*, n_t^{-1} H_t^{-1} I_t H_t^{-1}), \quad (8)$$

where the Hessian  $H_t$  and the gradient covariance matrix  $I_t$  are defined as follows

$$H_t := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_a p_t(a | x) \nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell(\theta^* | X_{t,i}, a, R_{t,i}) \right], \quad (9a)$$

$$I_t := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_a p_t(a | x) \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta^* | X_{t,i}, a, R_{t,i}) \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta^* | X_{t,i}, a, R_{t,i})^{\top} \right]. \quad (9b)$$

For example, for the squared loss  $\ell(\theta | x, a, r) = |r - \phi(x, a)^{\top} \theta|^2$ , the central limit approximation (8) recovers the standard asymptotics for the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator:

$$\hat{\theta}_t \text{ approximately follows } N \left( \theta^*, n_t^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_a p_t(a | x) \phi(X_{t,i}, a) \phi(X_{t,i}, a)^{\top} \right] \right).$$

Our main theoretical result proves that the sequence  $(\hat{\theta}_0, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{T-1})$  converges jointly in distribution to a *sequential Gaussian experiment*, where the each observation is Gaussian conditional on past data. Let  $G_t | G_0, \dots, G_{t-1} \sim N(\theta^*, n_t^{-1} H_t^{-1} I_t H_t^{-1})$  be the limit Gaussian observation from population level quantities at time  $t$ . The main analytical challenge in Section 6 comes from the fact

that each  $\hat{\theta}_t$  depends on the realizations of previous estimates  $\hat{\theta}_0, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{t-1}$ , as the sampling policy uses previous measurements to determine the sampling allocations. This requires us to derive a novel theoretical framework that carefully quantifies how the dependency impacts the rate at which the central limit approximation becomes valid. Our joint convergence result holds under minimal assumptions around the underlying sampling policy  $\{\pi_t\}_{t=0}^{T-1}$ , even allowing for  $\{\pi_t\}_{t=0}^{T-1}$  to sample arms with zero probability as well as allowing for  $H_t$  to be non-invertible.

### 3.2 A Bayesian MDP Formulation

So far, we have argued that the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_t$  of (7) provides information about  $\theta^*$  contaminated by Gaussian noise with a known distribution. Alternatively, we can think of this approximation as a data-generating model where given  $\theta^*$ , the observation  $\hat{\theta}_t$  follows a Gaussian distribution. We adopt Bayesian principles to reason through the modeler’s uncertainty on  $\theta^*$  and guide adaptive designs, but do not assume the experimenter is Bayesian—meaning they can use standard frequentist tools for final statistical inference based on the data collected from the adaptive experiment.

Given a Gaussian likelihood  $\mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_t | \theta^*)$ , one can efficiently perform Bayesian inference of  $\theta^*$  under a Gaussian prior  $\theta^* \sim N(\beta_0, \Sigma_0)$ . By conjugacy, the posterior will also be Gaussian.

**Fact 1.** *Under a Gaussian prior  $\theta^* \sim N(\beta_0, \Sigma_0)$ , the posterior distribution of  $\theta^*$  after observing a Gaussian random variable  $G \sim N(\theta, n_t^{-1}H^{-1}IH^{-1})$  is  $\theta^* | G \sim N(\beta, \Sigma)$ , where*

$$\Sigma^{-1} := \Sigma_0^{-1} + n_t H I^{-1} H \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \Sigma (\Sigma_0^{-1} \beta_0 + n_t H I^{-1} H G). \quad (10)$$

Instead of keeping track of the entire history  $\mathcal{H}_t$  of all observations collected during the experiment, the experimenter can simply keep track of the posterior distribution of  $\theta^*$  parameterized by  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$ . This posterior is updated after every batch  $t$ , using the asymptotic characterization of  $\hat{\theta}_t$ .

The dynamics of the sequence of posterior states  $\{(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)\}_{t=0}^T$  are controlled by the sampling allocations  $p_t$  chosen by the experimenter, and they follow a simple closed-form expression.

**Lemma 1.** *Under a Gaussian prior  $\theta^* \sim N(\beta_0, \Sigma_0)$ , given observations  $\{G_t\}_{t=1}^T$  where  $G_t | G_{1:t-1} \sim N(\theta^*, n_t^{-1}H_t^{-1}I_tH_t^{-1})$ , the joint distribution of posterior states  $\{(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)\}_{t=0}^T$  is characterized by the following recursive equations:*

$$\Sigma_{t+1}^{-1} := \Sigma_t^{-1} + n_t H_t I_t^{-1} H_t \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{t+1} := \beta_t + (\Sigma_t - \Sigma_{t+1})^{1/2} Z_t, \quad (11)$$

where  $H_t$  and  $I_t$  are defined in (9a) and (9b) respectively and  $Z_0, \dots, Z_{T-1} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, I_d)$ .

Lemma 1 makes use of the reparameterization trick for Gaussian random variables; we defer derivation details to Section C.1.

With the transition dynamics given in Lemma 1, we can formulate an MDP. Given sampling allocations  $p_{0:T} = (p_0, p_1, \dots, p_T)$ , where we recall that each  $p_t$  maps contexts in  $\mathcal{X}$  to an allocation in  $\Delta_K$ , we evaluate the  $p_{0:T}$  by the loss  $J_T(p_{0:T})$ , which is a sum of per-period objective functions  $c_t : (p_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  that depend on the sampling allocation and the current posterior  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  at each epoch  $t$ . We also assume known per-period  $b$ -dimensional cost functions  $g_t : (p_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^b$ , along with a cumulative budget  $B \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^b$ . The remaining budget at time  $t$  is computed by the simple transition equation

$$B_{t+1} = B_t - g_t(p_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t), \quad (12)$$

with  $B_0 = B$ . Since  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  characterizes the posterior at epoch  $t$ , it is sufficient to consider policies  $\pi = \{\pi_t\}_{t=0}^T$  that map the posterior state and the remaining budget to a sampling allocation

$\pi_t : (\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t) \mapsto p_t(\cdot | x)$ . We assume that for any  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$  and any state  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t)$ , there exists an action  $p_t(\cdot | x)$  that satisfies the remaining budget, i.e.,  $g_t(p_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \leq B_t$ .<sup>1</sup> This means that a feasible policy exists.

Given the prior  $\theta^* \sim N(\beta_0, \Sigma_0)$ , we consider the objective of finding a policy  $\pi$  that minimizes the *Bayesian policy loss*:

$$\min_{\pi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_0[J_T(\pi)] := \mathbb{E}_{\theta^* \sim N(\beta_0, \Sigma_0)} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^T c_t(\pi_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \right] \mid \sum_{t=0}^T g_t(\pi_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \leq B \right\},$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \beta_t, \Sigma_t]$  denotes expectation under the posterior distribution of  $\theta^*$  at epoch  $t$ . We can observe how  $J_T(\pi)$  generalizes more familiar notions of regret, such as Bayesian cumulative regret or Bayesian simple regret, depending on the specification of  $c_t$ .

Note the following approximation is used to formulate and optimize the planning problem, but the resulting sampling allocations are to be used in the *original* batched experiment.

**Definition 2.** The *batch limit dynamic program* (BLDP) is an MDP where the state is given by  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t)$  and actions are the sampling allocations  $p_t(\cdot | x)$ . The state transition of  $(\beta_{t+1}, \Sigma_{t+1}, B_{t+1})$  for epoch  $t + 1$ , starting from the state  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t)$  and under a sampling allocation  $p_t(\cdot | x)$  is given by (11) and (12). The goal is to minimize Bayesian loss over policies  $\pi_t : (\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t) \mapsto p_t(\cdot | x)$  that are feasible (i.e., satisfy the budget constraint):

$$\min_{\pi} \left\{ V_0^\pi(\beta_0, \Sigma_0, B_0) := \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \sum_{t=0}^T c_t(\pi_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \right] \mid \sum_{t=0}^T g_t(\pi_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \leq B \right\}. \quad (13)$$

Given a feasible policy  $\pi$ , the value function is  $V_t^\pi(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t) = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{s=t}^T c_s(\pi_s, \beta_s, \Sigma_s) \right]$ .

By virtue of restricting attention to policies that only depend on the batch posterior states (11), the BLDP avoids the issues that make the dynamic program (1) intractable to solve.

1. **Obviating the need for a sophisticated unit-level Bayesian model.** Instead of the full data  $\mathcal{D}_t = \{(X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{t,i})\}_{i=1}^{n_t}$  observed in batch  $t$ , BLDP only considers sufficient statistics  $\hat{\theta}_t$ , as introduced in (7), modeled through posterior states. Compressing the states this way removes the need to posit a Bayesian model for individual rewards common in the Bayesian MDP literature [30], which requires knowledge of the data-generating distribution of rewards  $R_{t,i} \sim \nu(\cdot | x, a)$ . In particular, the central limit approximation (8) provides a formal justification for using Gaussian likelihoods, meaning that Gaussianity is now a result of the CLT, not an unverifiable assumption made by the modeler.
2. **Dimensionality reduction of the state space.** The states of the BLDP are  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t)$ , which has dimension  $d + d^2 + b$ . This is orders of magnitude smaller than the size of the history  $|\mathcal{H}_t|$  for typical experiments.
3. **Closed-form state transitions.** Although the reward distribution is unknown, by making use of the asymptotic normality of the M-estimator  $\hat{\theta}_t$ , state transitions in the BLDP can be written in a certain closed form that involves i.i.d. Gaussian random variables. It is easy to simulate rollouts for even very long horizons.

<sup>1</sup>This condition is not difficult to satisfy in our framework. Since we allow for the zero-vector as an action, i.e.,  $p_t(\cdot | x) = \mathbf{0}$ , one way is to ensure that  $g_t$  assigns zero cost to the  $p_t(\cdot | x) = \mathbf{0}$ . This way, the experimenter can always take zero cost actions and maintain feasibility at any point in the experiment.

4. **Differentiable state transitions.** The effect of the sampling allocation on the posterior state  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  is mediated through  $H_t$  and  $I_t$  which are both *linear* in  $p_t$ , smoothing the partial feedback. This means that state transitions are differentiable along any sample path, and one can compute a sample-path gradient  $\nabla_{p_t} c_s(p_s, \beta_s, \Sigma_s)$  for any  $s > t$  with modern auto-differentiation frameworks (e.g., PyTorch [59] or TensorFlow [1]) to directly optimize over sampling allocations.

### 3.3 Objectives and Constraints

We now discuss multiple objectives and constraints that can be tractably optimized under BLDP. Unlike bandit algorithms focusing on particular functional forms, our optimization-driven framework can handle flexible functions of posterior states as objectives and constraints.

**Example 3** (Cumulative regret). To define *cumulative regret*, we consider sampling allocations made *during* the experiment (i.e.  $p_t$  for  $t < T$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BayesRegret}_T(p_{0:T}) &= \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(p_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} n_t \mathbb{E}_t \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu_t} \left[ \max_a r(x, a) - \sum_a p_t(a|x) r(x, a) \right] \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined  $c_t(p_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) = n_t \mathbb{E}_t \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu_t} [\max_a r(x, a) - \sum_a p_t(a|x) r(x, a)]$ . Recall that  $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \beta_t, \Sigma_t]$ , so that the expectation is taken over the conditional distribution of  $r(x, a)$  given  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$ . Note that the regret of each period is weighted by the size of the batch  $n_t$ .  $\diamond$

On the other hand, the *simple (post-experiment) regret* models a common goal in typical A/B tests where a treatment arm is deployed to all users at the end of the experiment. In such a setting, the experimenter is concerned with the post-experiment performance of the final deployment decision  $p_T$ , which typically affects far more users than those that participated in the experiment.

**Example 4** (Simple regret). We define the *simple regret* as the sub-optimality of the final (non-contextual) arm allocation  $p_T \in \Delta_K$  compared to the arm with the highest average reward:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BayesSimpleRegret}_T(p_{0:T}) &= \mathbb{E}_0 [c_T(p_T, \beta_T, \Sigma_T)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ n_T \left( \max_a \mathbb{E}_T \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} [r(x, a)] - \sum_a p_T(a) \mathbb{E}_T \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} [r(x, a)] \right) \right], \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_t(p_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) = 0$  for  $t < T$  and

$$c_T(p_T, \beta_T, \Sigma_T) = n_T \left( \max_a \mathbb{E}_T \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} [r(x, a)] - \sum_a p_T(a) \mathbb{E}_T \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} [r(x, a)] \right).$$

Again, the  $\mathbb{E}_T$  signifies that we take expectation over the conditional distribution of  $r(x, a)$  under  $(\beta_T, \Sigma_T)$ . Importantly, for simple regret,  $p_T$  does not depend on the context  $x$ .  $\diamond$

Rather than identifying a single best arm to be deployed for all contexts, an extension to settings requiring personalization gives rise to the *policy regret* where we compare the final policy for assigning treatment arms against the optimal policy that knows  $\theta^*$ .

**Example 5** (Policy regret). In defining *policy regret*, we compare the final policy for assigning treatment arms against the optimal policy that knows  $\theta^*$ :

$$\text{BayesPolicyRegret}_T(p_{0:T}) = \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ n_T \left( \mathbb{E}_T \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} \left[ \max_a r(x, a) - \sum_a p_T(a | x) r(x, a) \right] \right) \right],$$

with  $c_t$  and  $c_T$  appropriately defined as in previous examples. This is closely related to the cumulative regret of Example 3, except that policy regret is defined in the *post-experiment phase* (see Definition 1).  $\diamond$

Our framework can handle more exotic objectives. For example, in recommendation systems, experimenters may want to select *multiple* arms, for which a top- $k$ -sum objective might be useful.

**Example 6** (Top- $k$ -sum regret). The goal here is to measure the regret between the sum of the  $k$  highest mean rewards and a set of  $k$  arms chosen by the experimenter at the end of experiment.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BayesTop-}k\text{-Sum}_T(p_{0:t}) \\ = \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \mathbb{E}_T \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} \left[ \text{top-}k\text{-sum}[(r(x, a))_{a \in \mathcal{A}}] - \sum_{A_k} p_T(A_k | x) \sum_{a \in A_k} r(x, a) \right] \right], \end{aligned}$$

where for any vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^K$ ,  $\text{top-}k\text{-sum}(v) = \max\{v^\top q : 1^\top q = k, q \geq 0\}$  takes the sum of the top  $k$  elements and  $p_T$  is modified to assign probability to  $k$ -subsets of actions  $A_k$  (rather than actions themselves). For  $k = 1$ , this is identical to Bayesian simple regret.  $\diamond$

**Example 7** (Arm-cost budget constraints). When each treatment arm has an associated cost (e.g., an e-commerce platform experiments with different levels of promotions), we may want to specify an overall budget for the experiment. This can be achieved by setting  $g_t(p_t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t) = q^\top p_t$ , where  $q$  is a vector of arm costs.  $\diamond$

**Example 8** (Sample coverage guarantees). In some cases, we may want to guarantee that all arms are sampled with some minimum probability, i.e.,  $p_t(a | x) \geq 0.1$ . This can be accomplished in our framework by establishing  $T \cdot K$  constraints via appropriate definitions of  $g_t$  and  $B$ .  $\diamond$

## 4 Optimization Algorithm (RHO)

For small horizon adaptive experiments ( $T \leq 10$ ), the **Batched Limit Dynamic Program** gives a tractable dynamic program that can guide experimentation in batched settings. With this in hand, one can apply methods from approximate dynamic programming and reinforcement learning to develop adaptive designs to optimize performance in this model. While the BLDP is far more tractable than the original DP formulation described in Section 2.2, it still has some of the inherent difficulties of solving dynamic programs, especially since it is a continuous state and action dynamic program. But fully solving the dynamic program may not be necessary. Che and Namkoong [19] notes even a simple algorithm based on model-predictive control (MPC) can achieve large improvements compared to standard adaptive policies—including sophisticated RL algorithms. By crystallizing the algorithm design principle behind this method, we extend this simple yet robust heuristic to the substantially more general formulation BLDP.

---

**Algorithm 1** Residual Horizon Optimization

---

- 1: Input: Prior  $(\beta_0, \Sigma_0)$ , objectives  $c_s$ , constraints  $(g_t, B)$ , batch context distributions  $\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{T-1}$
- 2: Initialize  $(\beta_0, \Sigma_0), B_0 = B$ .
- 3: **for** each epoch  $t \in 0, \dots, T-1$  **do**
- 4:   Solve the problem (e.g., using SGD) with sample-paths  $(\beta_s, \Sigma_s)$  drawn from the BLDP.

$$p_{t:T}^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{p_t, \dots, p_T} \left\{ V_t^{p_{t:T}}(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t) := \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{s=t}^T c_s(p_s | \beta_s, \Sigma_s) \right] \mid \sum_{s=t}^T g_s(p_s, \beta_s, \Sigma_s) \leq B_t \right\} \quad (15)$$


- 5:   Sample arms  $A_{t,i} \sim p_t^*(\cdot | X_{t,i})$ . Observe rewards  $R_{t,i}$ .
  - 6:   Update state  $(\beta_{t+1}, \Sigma_{t+1})$  according to the transitions (10).
  - 7:   Update constraint  $B_{t+1} = B_t - g_t(p_t^*, \beta_t, \Sigma_t)$ .
  - 8: **end for**
  - 9: Output: Final posterior state  $(\beta_T, \Sigma_T)$  and final allocation  $p_T^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{p_T} c_s(p_T | \beta_T, \Sigma_T)$ .
- 

The key capability we leverage from the BLDP is the ability to plan over short time horizons  $T$ . Instead of solving for an optimal dynamic policy, RHO instead plans a sequence of static sampling allocations  $\rho_s$  to be used for future epochs. It does so by solving an open-loop *planning problem*, following the MPC design principle:

**MPC design principle:** At every epoch  $t$ , given the current state  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t)$ , solve for the optimal *static* sampling allocations  $(\rho_t, \dots, \rho_{T-1})$ .

At any epoch, this leads to an optimization problem over static (constant) sampling allocations that only depend on the previous data through the current posterior state (Algorithm 1). The current sampling allocation gets deployed and additional data is observed; by updating the posterior beliefs using the Gaussian approximation of the estimators  $\hat{\theta}_t$  computed in each batch (11), we can flexibly re-solve the optimization problem whenever new data is obtained. Despite its simplicity, we demonstrate in the following that the MPC design principle can reap the benefits of adaptivity. In particular, this method can be seen as a natural dynamic extension of a static A/B test.

The planning problem (15) over static sampling allocations is computationally efficient to solve, compared to its counterparts involving dynamic allocations that depend on future observations. In fact, we can leverage the differentiability of the state transitions of the asymptotic model (11), and solve this optimization problem (15) directly with stochastic gradient descent methods, rather than any dynamic programming. As we illustrate in Figure 3, we are nevertheless still solving a non-convex stochastic program and do not expect formal guarantees. Given the AI community’s success in heuristically solving such problems in the past decade, we believe standard software tools in ML (e.g., PyTorch and Weights & Biases) can provide good adaptive designs in practice. We validate this claim empirically on a wealth of



**Figure 3.** BLDP provides a differentiable MDP that can be minimized via stochastic gradient descent. For a 3-armed experiment with horizon  $T = 10$ , we plot simple regret (red) over static sampling allocations  $\pi(\mathcal{H}) := p = (p_1, p_2, 1 - p_1 - p_2)$  optimized using the Adam optimizer.



examples in the next section.

**Robustness Guarantee** A key advantages of RHO over other alternatives is that it flexibly handles custom objectives, constraints, and non-stationarity, while guaranteeing performance in all of these myriad settings. This is concretely realized by the following theorem, which shows that it always achieves a lower Bayesian regret compared to a static A/B test across all time horizons  $T$ —even across these custom objectives, constraints, and non-stationarity arrivals.

**Theorem 1** (Policy Improvement). *Suppose that for any  $t$ ,  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$ , and  $B$ , there exists a static sequence  $p_t, \dots, p_T$  such that  $\sum_{s=t}^T g_s(p_s) \leq B$  is feasible. Consider any static sequence  $p = (p_0, \dots, p_T)$  of feasible sampling allocation policies. Let  $V_t^{p_0:T}$  be the corresponding value function under the Bayesian model and  $V_t^{\text{RHO}}(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  be the value function of RHO. For all  $t, \beta_t, \Sigma_t$  and budget  $B_t$ ,*

$$V_t^{\text{RHO}}(\beta_t, \Sigma_t) \leq \min_{p_0:T} \left\{ V_t^{p_0:T}(\beta_t, \Sigma_t) \mid \sum_{s=t}^T g_s(p_s) \leq B_t \right\}.$$

The proof is in Appendix C.4.

Given that a static A/B test is often the de-facto choice of sampling allocation, this result guarantees that RHO will achieve the baseline level of performance, even in settings where standard heuristics such as Thompson Sampling cannot be applied without modification. In contrast, to apply standard heuristics to new settings requires ad-hoc changes to the policy without any guarantees that the modified sampling principle will work appropriately.

This guarantee is even more crucial under non-stationarity. In non-stationary settings adaptive algorithms can often perform much worse than static designs as we concretely demonstrate in the next section, as adaptive policies can overfit towards early but temporary performance. As long as the non-stationarity is *predictable*, that is the batch context distributions  $\mu_s$  are known ahead of time, RHO is guaranteed to do at least as well as the best static design. While this may seem like a strong requirement, this is naturally satisfied when modeling temporal non-stationarity (e.g. day-of-the-week effects or novelty effects). Temporal non-stationarity can be modeled by having the context be the epoch  $x = t$ ; in this case future context arrival distributions are  $\mu_s = 1\{x = s\}$  and are deterministic. In more complicated settings, e.g. if the context are highly user-specific features, we can instead use samples from the context distributions  $\mu_s$ , e.g., collected through a historical dataset.

Beyond guaranteeing performance against static designs, RHO can match performance and even outperform other adaptive policies on standard instances by planning with the Bayesian model. In doing so, it calibrates exploration to the time horizon and the signal-to-noise ratio. It uses more information about the experimental setting to achieve this, such as the horizon length  $T$ , which is often known in advance. RHO also requires the ability to estimate the hessian  $H_t$  and gradient covariance  $I_t$ . This is straightforward for standard statistical settings, such as least-squares or logistic regression. Using this additional information, it does sensible things. Early in the experiment, when the remaining sample size is large, it explores widely. Towards the end of the experiment, it focuses on a few, promising treatment arms. Ultimately though, we validate the algorithmic design through evaluation in realistic experimental environments.

We emphasize that RHO is a simple heuristic and that the goal of this paper is not to propose the most optimal or theoretically grounded algorithm. As an example of its limitations, RHO converges to a greedy policy when optimizing only for cumulative regret. While greedy policies perform well in short horizon settings, they can perform poorly in longer experiments. Our approach serves as

an initial proof-of-concept for our mathematical programming framework, and its strong empirical performance provides promising validation for our current framework. We hope to spur further work on scalable solution methods and algorithm designs.

## 5 Numerical Experiments

Using the simple heuristic RHO, we illustrate the potential of our mathematical programming framework across multiple problem instances. We examine two important challenges that are highly relevant to real-world experimentation applications: *non-stationarity* and *personalization*. Both can pose difficulties for standard adaptive experimentation algorithms. For the former, we make use of the ASOS Digital Experiments Dataset, introduced in [52], which contains 78 real experiments run at ASOS, a global fashion retailer with over 26 million active customers (as of 2024). For the latter, we create a synthetic environment for personalized content ranking for online platforms, inspired by the content recommendation systems of Instagram and Facebook [55, 47].

For both environments, we compare the performance of RHO against three baseline methods: Uniform allocation, Thompson sampling [6, 67], and Top-two Thompson sampling [65]. We select these baseline methods for their widespread adoption, state-of-the-art performance [16], and importantly, the ability to naturally handle the batched setting.<sup>2</sup> All of the baseline methods maintain a Gaussian belief. We provide more details about the baselines below.

- **Uniform.** A non-adaptive policy that uniformly allocates samples across all arms.
- **Thompson sampling (TS).** The main idea behind Thompson sampling is to sample from the posterior distribution of the optimal action [66]. To implement this, at time  $t$ , TS first samples a parameter  $\hat{\beta}_t$  from a prior belief  $\hat{\beta}_t \sim N(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$ . Given a reward model<sup>3</sup>  $f(x, a; \theta)$  and context  $X_{t,i}$ , TS then makes an allocation decision by choosing  $A_{t,i} = \operatorname{argmax}_a f(X_{t,i}, a; \hat{\beta}_t)$ . See [6, 67] for additional details. As mentioned above, although TS is typically presented in the fully-sequential setting, we can naturally adapt TS to our batch setting by simply repeating the sampling procedure for each unit in the batch.
- **Top-two Thompson sampling (TTTS).** Top-two Thompson sampling, introduced in [65], first identifies  $A_{t,i}$  via the same procedure as TS. With probability  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , TTTS discards  $A_{t,i}$  and repeatedly samples parameters  $\hat{\beta}_t \sim N(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  until the optimal action  $\operatorname{argmax}_a f(X_{t,i}, a; \hat{\beta}_t) \neq A_{t,i}$ . This encourages the algorithm to explore outside of the best arm and is specifically designed to minimize simple regret.

### 5.1 Non-stationarity via the ASOS Digital Experiments Dataset

Our first empirical study focuses on the issue of non-stationarity and makes use of the 78 real experiments included in the ASOS Digital Experiments Dataset, introduced in [52]. Each experiment contains one treatment and one control variant and includes up to four different metrics (i.e., outcomes of interest), which results in 241 unique benchmark settings. Associated with each metric is

<sup>2</sup>Many bandit algorithms, such as UCB, do not easily extend to the batched setting. For example, in a non-personalized setting, UCB would assign the same action to all individuals. Traditional Bayesian optimization approaches [27] face a similar difficulty.

<sup>3</sup>Recall our notation from (4) that  $r(x, a) = f(x, a; \theta^*)$ .

sequence of sample means and variances, recorded at either 12-hour or daily intervals. The length of the experiments range from 2 to 132 recorded intervals.

We construct a simulation environment using the ASOS dataset as follows. To model non-stationarity, we view the context  $X_{t,i}$  to be time; i.e., we have that  $X_{t,i} \equiv t$ . We take the conditional mean rewards to be the sample means provided in the dataset, while individual rewards are assumed to be sampled from a Gaussian distribution parameterized by the sample means and sample variances from the dataset. Since each experiment in the dataset contains only two arms (treatment and control), we also generated *synthetic arms* to mimic multi-armed experimentation problems that arise in practice. The means of the synthetic arms are set to be the sample mean of the control arm shifted by a  $N(0, 1)$  noise term multiplied by the gap between the sample means of treatment and control arms. The variances of the synthetic arms are set to be identical to the sample variance of the treatment arm. In doing so, we generate arms with similar average rewards to the treatment arm and display similar non-stationarity in the means across epochs.

We construct our simulation with 10 experimentation epochs consisting of 10 arms and three batch sizes: 10,000, 100,000, and 250,000 observations per epoch. We assume that the experimenter starts with a prior  $N(\beta_0, \Sigma_0)$  where the structure of  $\beta_0$  and  $\Sigma_0$  depend on the assumed model. The objective is to minimize Bayesian simple regret (Example 4). In this nonstationary setting, we set the population distribution  $\mu$  to be uniform over  $[T]$ , resulting in

$$\text{BayesSimpleRegret}_T(p_{0:T}) = \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \max_a \sum_{t=1}^T r(t, a) \right] - \sum_a p_T(a) \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \sum_{t=1}^T r(t, a) \right] \right],$$

**Reward models.** Based on the temporal variation within the ASOS dataset and the simple regret objective, we first introduce two models that form the basis of each experimentation policy.

- *Non-contextual.* Here, the parameter vector is given by  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , where we learn one parameter per arm. We then set  $\phi(t, a)$  so that

$$f(t, a; \theta) = \phi(t, a)^\top \theta = \theta_a,$$

with arm effects being constant across time.

- *Contextual (interactive effects).* The parameter vector is given by

$$\theta = (\underbrace{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K}_{\text{arm constants}}, \underbrace{\theta_{1,1}, \dots, \theta_{1,K}}_{\text{time 1}}, \dots, \underbrace{\theta_{T,1}, \dots, \theta_{T,K}}_{\text{time T}}),$$

and the feature map  $\phi(t, a)$  is set so that rewards are modeled as

$$f(t, a; \theta) = \phi(t, a)^\top \theta = \theta_a + \theta_{t,a}.$$

In contrast to the non-contextual model, arm effects can now vary across time, better resembling the true data generating model.

**Implementation details.** We implement Uniform, TS, TTTS, and RHO under both reward model specifications above. Note that TS and TTTS under the interactive effects model is exactly Deconfounded TS [63], an extension of TS designed specifically to handle non-stationary environments. To initialize the prior for all policies, each policy starts out with a uniform prior  $N(0, \lambda I)$  where  $\lambda$  scales inversely proportional to the batch size  $b_t n$ . The nature of these time dependent models implies that the minimum eigenvalue of the sample covariance matrices  $\lambda_{\min}(\Phi_t^\top \Phi_t) = 0$  at

each batch. Since the Bayesian posterior updates in (28) require invertibility of  $\Sigma_t$ , we choose to scale  $\lambda$  with the batch size to maintain invertibility and stable condition numbers as the experiment progresses. Empirically, we find that this scaling is necessary to maintain stable performance across all policies.

The values in the ASOS dataset are reported in a cumulative fashion, but it is ambiguous why the data were reported in this way. We interpret the data by making the assumption that users are observed once at each time step (e.g. daily active user metric) rather than cumulatively (e.g. total clicks over a time period). We preprocess the data by subtracting off the values of the previous time step.

### 5.1.1 Results and Discussion for the ASOS Dataset

We run 750 experiment simulations for each of the 241 settings in the ASOS dataset, resulting in 180,750 evaluations of each policy and batch size. Surprisingly, most of adaptive experimentation algorithms benchmarked on the different settings within the ASOS dataset offer little to no gains over uniform allocation.

**Performance comparison between TS-based policies versus RHO.** While TS-based policies offer strong theoretical guarantees in ideal settings, Figure 1 shows that under a batch size of 100,000, all TS-based policies actually perform worse than uniform in both average reward obtained and identifying the best arm. In contrast, RHO offers strong performance. In fact, for *every hyperparameter setting* (i.e., the choice of learning rate, RHO’s only hyperparameter), RHO outperforms TS-based policies even when choosing between the best of TTTS and the greedier TS in each individual setting. This type of robustness against hyperparameters is highly desirable in practice. We observe the same trends across batch sizes of 10,000 and 250,000, where RHO is the only policy to outperform Uniform. All policies have lower raw regret values as batch sizes increase, showing that while all policies perform better with more information, RHO is particularly robust to various amounts of statistical power.

Sometimes, an experimenter may have validation data to tune RHO’s learning rate in individual settings. We simulate this possibility and find that choosing from a sweep over five different learning rates in each setting yields substantial performance gains. Overall, we find that RHO is robust to different learning rate choices, but can also offer significant gains when tuned properly.

**Failure of existing adaptive experimentation policies.** To understand why existing adaptive experimentation policies like TS or TTTS fail to offer significant gains over uniform allocation, we note that the settings within the ASOS dataset are often incredibly challenging with severe non-stationarity and a low signal-to-noise ratio. As previously mentioned, Figure ?? shows an example of a setting with non-stationary means. Under non-stationary behavior, adaptive algorithms may fail to explore, allocating samples to arms that show initial promise but eventually underperform the experiment progresses. In addition, the average gap between arms in the ASOS dataset is 0.0093 while the average measurement variance is 33.76, ranging from 0.0007 to over 2870. As these data are from real experiments, we believe that our results serve not just to advocate for the validity of RHO as a method, but also sheds light on the robustness (or lack thereof) of standard adaptive experimentation algorithms in challenging, non-ideal, but realistic conditions.

**Understanding the performance of RHO.** We observe that the main performance gains of

Policy	Simple Regret < Uniform		Simple Regret > Uniform
	% Settings	% Avg Regret of Uniform	% Avg Regret of Uniform
Non-contextual TTTS [65]	39.1	92.1	124.8
Contextual TTTS [63]	51.8	89.7	110.7
Contextual RHO	60.5	90.4	106.9

**Table 1.** While TS and TTTS policies can achieve lower average regret on settings where they do better than Uniform, RHO is much more stable in situations where it underperforms Uniform. RHO achieves lower regret than Uniform in 445/732 settings (60.5%), more than Non-contextual TTTS (39.1%) and Deconfounded (Contextual) TTTS (51.8%).

Policy	Batch Size		
	10,000	100,000	250,000
Non-contextual TS	0.0006	-1.01	-0.004
Non-contextual TTTS	0.003	-1.02	-0.003
Non-contextual RHO	0.099	0.003	0.004

**Table 2.** Difference in raw regret values of methods under misspecified (non-contextual) models compared to Uniform with a correctly specified model. Non-contextual RHO is able to consistently outperform Uniform under model misspecification, while TS-based policies struggle.

RHO come from its consistency and robustness in challenging scenarios where adaptive algorithms underperform Uniform. In Table 1, we examine the two events of underperforming and outperforming Uniform separately. We find that while RHO obtains slightly higher regret compared to TS when both are *conditioned on* outperforming Uniform, overall RHO performs better than Uniform in many more settings (60.5% vs 51.8% and 39.1%). TS policies also have heavier regret tails, doing much worse in challenging situations compared to RHO. Similar behavior is detailed in Appendix A is found in settings with 10,000 and 250,000 batch sizes.

**Model misspecification.** Even when the model is misspecified, RHO can do better than other similarly misspecified models. When comparing policies under the non-contextual model (which cannot explain the variations due to interdependent arm and day effects), Table 2 shows that RHO still outperforms Uniform while TS and TTTS can suffer large drops in performance.

## 5.2 Personalized Value Models for Ranking and Recommendations

We further benchmark and explore the performance of RHO in a synthetic personalization setting. Classical works in personalization with contextual bandits focus on settings that involve sequentially choosing individual pieces of content to recommend to users [51, 15, 6], with the goal of minimizing cumulative regret as content is recommended. Let  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be the features corresponding to user  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . The basic linear model used in [51] involves a separate parameter  $\theta_a \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for each piece of content (arm)  $a$  such that  $r(x_i, a_i) = x_i^\top \theta_a^*$ . Content is sequentially recommended to various users based on beliefs about the parameter  $\theta_a^*$ . Note that there is a separate parameter  $\theta_a^*$  to be learned for each action (piece of content).

However, as platforms like Instagram and Facebook scale significantly in size and recommend



**Figure 4. (Personalized Value Models)** Pareto frontier of the tradeoff between simple and cumulative regret with 5 epochs of experimentation in a synthetic personalized ranking simulation. Lighter colors corresponding to TTTS indicate parameter values closer to 0, while darker values correspond to values closer to 1. Note that a value of 1 is exactly TS. Similarly, lighter values for RHO correspond to higher weights on simple regret while darker values correspond to higher weights on cumulative regret. RHO is able to efficiently trade off between the two objectives, with many points strictly dominating all values associated with TTTS. As more weight is put on the simple regret term, the simple regret incurred decreases monotonically. RHO trades off in a principled and interpretable way simply by setting the weights equal to the number of individuals under each objective. On the other hand, there is no principled way of selecting the parameter values for TTTS, and most do not outperform Uniform in terms of simple regret.

content to billions of users, sequentially recommending and estimating the value of individual pieces of content may be infeasible. In addition, learning separate coefficients  $\theta_a$  for each piece of content like the traditional contextual bandit setting is impractical. Therefore, these platforms use a *user value model*, a linear function that scalarizes a set of machine learning signals into a single value for each piece of content [55, 47]. Define user features  $x$  and content features  $z$ . The experimenter has a known feature map  $\phi(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  that generates  $d$  ranking signals. Given weights  $w_x$  for a user  $x$ , the “value” (or “score”) assigned to content  $z$  would be modeled as  $w_x^\top \phi(x, z)$ . For each piece of content  $z$  in the universe of content  $\mathcal{Z}$ , this value can be calculated and content can be ranked based on this model. Instead of choosing each individual piece of content to recommend to users, each experimentation epoch involves choosing ranking weights  $w_x$  to deploy for each user  $x$  such that each user sees  $b$  pieces of content ranked by  $w_x$ .

**Ranking simulation setup.** There are  $T$  epochs of experimentation with  $n_t$  users at each epoch  $t$ . Each user has features  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and there is a selection of  $|\mathcal{Z}|$  pieces of content that can be recommended to each user. At each epoch  $t$ , the experimenter can recommend  $b$  pieces of content to each user. User features  $x$  and content features  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are simulated from Gaussian distributions:

$$x \sim N(\mu_{\text{user}}, \Sigma_{\text{user}}), \quad z \sim N(\mu_{\text{content}}, \Sigma_{\text{content}}).$$

We let  $\phi(x, z) := x \odot z$ , where  $\odot$  denotes the element-wise product. Given a true parameter  $\theta^*$ , we



let the expected reward of recommending content  $z$  to user  $x$  be

$$r_{\mathcal{Z}}(x, z) = f_{\mathcal{Z}}(x, z; \theta^*) = (x \odot z)^\top \theta^* = \langle x, z \rangle_{\theta^*}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\langle x, z \rangle_{\theta^*}$  represents a  $\theta^*$ -weighted inner product between  $x$  and  $z$  and the subscript  $\mathcal{Z}$  indicates that this is the *user-content* reward function (later, we will define the primary reward function, which depends on  $x$  and  $w$ ). The individual rewards are distributed according to  $N(\langle x, z \rangle_{\theta^*}, s^2)$  for some fixed measurement variance  $s^2$ .

The action space consists of  $K$  predefined rankers  $\{w^{(1)}, \dots, w^{(K)}\}$ , with  $w^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , that the experimenter must choose between. For each user  $x$ , the experimenter may choose a personalized ranker. Choosing ranker  $w$  for user  $x$  chooses a set of items  $\mathcal{Z}(x, w)$  to be recommended, defined to be the top  $b$  items when sorted by  $\langle x, z \rangle_w$ . Let  $r(x, w)$  be the total reward over the user-content rewards for the top  $b$  items

$$r(x, w) = f(x, w; \theta^*) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}(x, w)} f_{\mathcal{Z}}(x, z; \theta^*) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{Z}(x, w) := \text{top-}b_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \langle x, z \rangle_w. \quad (17)$$


**Objectives.** For the ranking experiment, we consider a range of objectives, where the experimenter is interested in balancing cumulative regret and simple regret (or maximizing the cumulative and final rewards). The tension between these two objectives is a recurring dilemma that experimentation practitioners often face. One way to view this trade-off is to consider the direct impact on users: during the experiment phase the experimenter may have to experiment on  $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} n_t$  users, while the final policy will be deployed on  $n_T$  users. The experimenter will ideally minimize the cumulative regret incurred within the experiment (i.e., not recommending low quality content) while finding a good policy to deploy after the experiment. If  $n_T \gg \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} n_t$ , then the experimenter should focus primarily on minimizing simple regret, while if  $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} n_t \gg n_T$ , then the experimenter should minimize cumulative regret.

**Implementation details.** Given a context  $X_{t,i}$ , TS chooses an action by sampling  $\hat{\beta}_t \sim N(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  and then selecting  $A_{t,i} = \arg\max_w f(X_{t,i}, w; \hat{\beta}_t)$ . RHO directly optimizes the simple and cumulative regret objective, where the tradeoff between these two terms is automatically optimized based on the number of individuals assigned to each objective  $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} n_t$  and  $n_T$ .

### 5.2.1 Results and Discussion for Personalized Value Models

In this section, we present several experiments based on the personalized recommendations setting. We examine each algorithm’s ability to (1) balance simple and cumulative regret and (2) optimize simple regret only. Lastly, we also present a more traditional, single-item recommendation system formulation (i.e., without ranking or value models) that is closer to the idealized contextual bandit setting under which TS-based policies are designed.

**Balancing simple and cumulative regret.** We first benchmark the algorithms’ ability to efficiently trade off between simple and cumulative regret. We fix the within-experiment phase at  $T = 5$  waves of  $n_t = 100$  users for  $t < T$ . There are  $K = 10$  different rankers to choose from that recommend  $b = 4$  items out of 10 for each user. To trade off between the two objectives, we vary the parameter of TTTS from 0.1 to 1 in increments of 0.1 as it controls the level of exploration. A parameter of 1.0 exactly corresponds to standard TS, which behaves more greedily [65]. To vary



**Figure 5.** Plot of simple and cumulative regret performance of various policies and RHO when it optimizes only for simple regret. **(Left)** RHO is the only policy that consistently outperforms Uniform. **(Right)** Plotting the cumulative regret performance shows that both TS and TTTS incur lower cumulative regret than RHO, potentially showing that they are too greedy, giving a possible explanation as to why they fail compared to RHO and Uniform.


the level of exploration of RHO, we vary  $n_T$ , which corresponds to the number of users the final policy will be deployed upon.

Figure 4 shows how RHO is able to efficiently trade off between simple and cumulative regret. As more weight is put on the simple regret term by increasing  $n_T$ , the simple regret achieved monotonically decreases. As noted in the caption of Figure 4, RHO efficiently trades off between simple and cumulative regret and often *strictly dominates* the performance of all variants of TTTS along both axes. It is noteworthy that RHO handles this tradeoff in a principled and interpretable way simply by setting the weights equal to the number of individuals under each objective. On the other hand, there is no principled way of selecting the parameter values for TTTS, and most do not outperform Uniform in terms of simple regret.

We can also consider the *weighted objective* directly, with the weight on cumulative and simple regret terms to be exactly  $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} n_t$  and  $n_T$ . Under this alternative setup, RHO achieves the best objective value in 9 out of the 13 combinations of  $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} n_t$  and  $n_T$  tested in Figure 4.

It is worth noting that when only optimizing for cumulative regret, RHO exactly recovers a greedy policy. The strong performance of greedy policies over TS-based policies over short time horizons has been observed in [67], further supporting RHO’s ability to plan when there are limited opportunities for adaptivity.

**Simple regret minimization with varying reallocation epochs.** Figure 5a measures simple regret performance of various policies while varying the number of reallocation epochs within the experiment. RHO is able to consistently outperform Uniform, however, TS and TTTS do not. To understand why this is this case, 5b plots the cumulative regret performance of the various policies. It is noteworthy that both TS and TTTS incur lower cumulative regret compared to both RHO and



**Figure 6. (Left)** TS and TTTS outperform Uniform in simple regret minimization across various experiment lengths, unlike in the ranking example. This indicates that TS may be better suited to this setting. RHO RHO still outperforms TS policies by a large margin. **(Right)** Lighter values linked to TS indicate parameters closer to 0, while darker values indicate parameters closer to 1. Lighter values for RHO mean higher weight on simple regret, while darker values are higher weights on cumulative regret. RHO is again able to efficiently trade off between simple and cumulative regret while TS policies have relatively homogeneous performance.

Uniform, potentially giving an explanation as to why TS and TTTS fail to outperform Uniform in terms of simple regret. This also shows that RHO automatically calibrates its level of exploration such that when only optimizing for simple regret, it explores potentially bad options instead of sampling just the best arm.

**A tradition single-item formulation.** Many works have shown that TS has strong empirical and theoretical performance in a more traditional personalization setting [15, 6]. Instead of choosing a ranking policy based on a value model, the traditional setting typically involves item-by-item, fully-sequential content recommendation (i.e., no batches of users or ranking and presenting multiple items per user). This involves learning separate coefficients  $\theta_z$  for each action, or content to be recommended [51]. Similarly to the ranking setting, we have  $x \sim N(\mu_{\text{user}}, \sigma_{\text{user}}^2 I)$  and rewards for user  $x$  and content  $z$  are distributed as  $N(x^\top \theta_z, s^2)$ .

Each epoch involves a batch of 100 samples. Figure 6a shows that unlike in the ranking example (Figure 5a), TS policies outperform Uniform by a wide margin in simple regret minimization. In contrast, RHO showcases strong performance in both settings, exhibiting its ability to adapt and optimize for specific conditions. Figure 6b showcases how RHO is able to efficiently optimize both simple and cumulative regret when various weights are placed on each objective. Values for TS are rather homogeneous and many objective values of RHO strictly dominate those of TS.

While the experiment in Figure 6 involves noise sampled from a Gaussian distribution, we further benchmark the algorithms' performance under non-standard noise distributions. We choose the Gumbel distribution which involves high skewness, and the Student's  $t$  distribution, which involves heavy tails. Table 3 keeps the number of epochs constant at 10 and shows the performance of

Policy	$s^2 = 0.2, \sigma_{\text{user}}^2 = 0.1$	$s^2 = 0.2, \sigma_{\text{user}}^2 = 5$	$s^2 = 1, \sigma_{\text{user}}^2 = 0.1$	$s^2 = 1, \sigma_{\text{user}}^2 = 5$
(Gumbel) TS	67.0	82.8	94.22	91.7
Top-Two TS	69.1	93.8	93.8	94.0
RHO	<b>61.8</b>	<b>80.3</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>86.1</b>
(Student's t) TS	77.1	102	90.6	91.6
Top-Two TS	76.1	97.8	90.8	88.9
RHO	<b>60.5</b>	<b>83.0</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>83.3</b>

**Table 3.** There are a total of 10 epochs. Performance of policies under non-standard noise distributions, the Gumbel and Student's  $t$ . We also vary the measurement variance level and context distribution. In all settings, RHO outperforms TS policies, and performs particularly well under the student's  $t$  distribution.

policies under these distributions as well as various measurement variance and context distribution levels. We find that under all circumstances, RHO is able to outperform. These results suggest that RHO can be robust to other noise distributions.

### 5.3 Budget Constraints


We further benchmark RHO's ability to handle budget constraints, a large practical concern. Our basic simulation setup follows that of the single item formulation for ranking and recommendations in section 5.2, but we repeat the setup here for clarity. There are  $T$  epochs of experimentation with  $n_t$  individuals at each epoch  $t$ . Each individual has features  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  where  $x \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$  and there are  $K$  arms. Playing arm  $a_i$  on individual  $x_i$  yields a linear reward of  $R(x_i, a_i) = x_i^\top \theta_{a_i} + \varepsilon_i$ , where  $\varepsilon \sim N(0, s^2)$ . Furthermore, each arm is associated with a fixed cost  $c_t(a)$  which may vary across epochs. At each time  $t$ , the costs of each arm are sampled from a Half Normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 1.

**Objectives.** We consider a range of objectives, where the experimenter is interested in balancing cumulative and/or simple regret while maintaining costs at each epoch  $t$  under a fixed budget  $B_t$ . While section 5.2 only looks at the tradeoff between simple and cumulative regret, this setting with a fixed budget is relevant as real-world experiments are often constrained by their costs.

**Algorithmic Details.** To satisfy the budget constraint  $B_t$ , we easily incorporate projected gradient descent into RHO. Since RHO involves stochastic gradient descent, we first take a gradient step on the regret objective. Then we use gradient steps to minimize

$$g_t(p_t) = \sum_{a \in [K]} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} p_t(x_i, a) \right) c(a),$$

until  $g_t(p_t) \leq B_t$ . We compare RHO to Budgeted Thompson Sampling [78] which works as follows. Given a context  $x_i$ , Budgeted TS chooses an action by sampling  $\hat{\beta}_t \sim N(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  and then selecting  $a_i = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in [K]} \frac{x_i^\top \hat{\beta}_t}{c_t(a)}$ . To weight the costs to be more or less important, we introduce a scaling factor  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that Budgeted TS plays  $a_i = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in [K]} \frac{x_i^\top \hat{\beta}_t}{\exp(b * c_t(a))}$ . Setting  $b = 0$  yields a denominator of 1 and no influence by the costs. To tradeoff between simple and cumulative regret, we use a Top-Two TS [65] variant of Budgeted TS.



**Figure 7.** Pareto frontier between simple regret incurred and the average budget cost used by the algorithm throughout the experiment. RHO strictly dominates that of Budgeted TS. Additionally, satisfying budget constraints with RHO is easy since it uses projected gradient descent to exactly satisfy the constraint in expectation. In contrast, while Budgeted TS can trade off between these objectives, there is no principled method of setting the cost scaling parameter  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and is difficult to tune.

### 5.3.1 Results and Discussion for Budget Constraints

We first run an experiment involving trading off between simple and cumulative regret in section 5.2 while imposing an exact budget constraint. Figure 2 showcases RHO’s ability to efficiently tradeoff between these two objectives while exactly satisfying the budget constraint via projected gradient descent. In contrast, Budgeted Top-Two TS involves two conflicting parameters that are difficult to tune. In Figure 7, we look at the pareto frontier between the budget costs and simple regret incurred. We find that RHO strictly dominates Budgeted TS.

## 6 Asymptotics for Batch Adaptive Experiments

The theoretical foundation for the BLDP presented in Section 3 is the asymptotic normality (8) of the estimators  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  obtained by empirical risk minimization (7) over a batch. We now prove this result rigorously. The key technical challenge is to show not only that this applies for the estimator computed in a single batch, but also for the entire sequence of estimators, which justifies the dynamic programming formulation. While we focus on the case where the Hessian  $H_t$  (9a) is invertible in Section 3, the main results we prove in this section allow the empirical and population Hessians to be singular. This enables us to apply our asymptotic results to a much wider range of adaptive policies, feature mappings, and non-stationary context arrivals. Our result applies to general loss minimization problems and significantly generalizes the validity of sequential normal approximations compared to Che and Namkoong [18] who focus on non-contextual and stationary settings.

The main difficulty is in showing convergence of sampling statistics under sampling probabilities that are themselves stochastic, as they are influenced by previous measurements. Standard asymptotic normality results for adaptively sampled data show results for the special case where  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  is the OLS estimator [35, 54, 53, 79]. This typically requires a uniform lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue of the design matrix. Even when the sampling policy  $\pi_t > \delta$  is bounded from below for some  $\delta > 0$  — a standard assumption for inference under adaptive sampling which we do not make — the design matrix could still be non-invertible due to non-stationary context arrivals.

**Example 9.** (Monday/Tuesday). Consider a batched experiment with  $T = 2$  epochs (corresponding to days of the week) and  $K = 1$  arm. The context is simply the day-of-the-week, i.e.  $x = t$ . We consider a simple reward model with coefficient vector  $\theta = (\theta_0^{\text{day}}, \theta_1^{\text{day}}, \theta^{\text{arm}}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  where rewards are composed of a time fixed effect and an arm fixed effect and the loss function is least squares:

$$r(t, a) = \phi(x, a)^\top \theta = \theta_t^{\text{day}} + \theta^{\text{arm}}$$

At  $t = 0$ , suppose 100 sampling units arrive. They will all share the same context  $x = t = 0$  and are all assigned to treatment  $a = 0$ . The sample covariance matrix  $\sum_{i=1}^{100} \phi(0, 0)\phi(0, 0)^\top$  will then yield

$$\lambda_{\min} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{100} \phi(0, 0)\phi(0, 0)^\top \right) = \lambda_{\min} \left( \begin{bmatrix} 100 & 0 & 100 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 100 & 0 & 100 \end{bmatrix} \right) = 0$$

This is because the context  $t = 1$  is never observed in epoch  $t = 0$ .  $\diamond$  To handle these cases, our proof method instead shows convergence of batched rewards scaled by the Hessian. This approach obviates the need for minimum eigenvalues of population/empirical Hessians and the sampling allocations to be bounded away from zero.

## 6.1 Diffusion scaling

Recall that  $\mathcal{D}_t := \{(X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{n,t,i})\}_{i=1}^{n_t}$  denotes the data collected in batch  $t$ , and let  $\mathcal{D}_{t,i} = (X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{n,t,i})$  denote the tuple of observations for sampling unit  $i$ . We let  $\ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_{t,i}) = \ell(\theta|X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{n,t,i})$  be the statistical loss for unit  $i$  and  $L_{n_t}(\theta|\mathcal{D}_t)$  denote the empirical risk minimization objective under the batch dataset  $\mathcal{D}_t$ . We let  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  be a minimizer of the empirical loss:

$$\hat{\theta}_{n,t} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\{ L_{n_t}(\theta|\mathcal{D}_t) = \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \ell(\theta|X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{n,t,i}) \right\} \quad (18)$$

We emphasize that this loss function depends on the sampling allocation selected in batch  $t$ , and review the data-generating process for batch  $t$ :

$$X_{t,i} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mu_t, \quad A_{t,i} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} p_t(\cdot|X_{t,i}), \quad R_{n,t,i} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \nu(\cdot|X_{t,i}, A_{t,i})$$

where  $\mu_t$  can be different for different  $t$ 's and  $\nu$  is unknown. Since we allow  $p_t(\cdot|X_{t,i})$  to sum to less than one and even be the zero action  $p_t(\cdot|X_{t,i}) = \mathbf{0}$ , if no actions are taken and no observations are received, then we set  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t} = 0$ . In this section, we let  $\mathbb{E}_t$  denote expectation with respect to the above data-generating distribution.

We can define several key quantities related to the curvature of the loss function. Recalling the population Hessian and gradient covariance at time  $t$  (9), their empirical counterparts are

$$\hat{H}_{n,t} := \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell(\hat{\theta}_{n,t}|\mathcal{D}_{t,i}) \quad (19a)$$



$$\hat{I}_{n,t} := \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} | \mathcal{D}_{t,i}) \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} | \mathcal{D}_{t,i})^{\top}. \quad (19b)$$

To illustrate, under a linear reward model with the least-squares loss function,  $r(x, a) = \phi(x, a)^{\top} \theta^*$ , and residual variance  $\text{Var}(R|X, A) = 1$ , these quantities correspond with the population and empirical design matrices, where we define  $\Phi_{n,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t \times d}$  to be the matrix of feature vectors

$$H_t = I_t = \mathbb{E}_t[\phi(X_{t,i}, A_{t,i})\phi(X_{t,i}, A_{t,i})^{\top}], \quad \hat{H}_{n,t} = \hat{I}_{n,t} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \phi(X_{t,i}, A_{t,i})\phi(X_{t,i}, A_{t,i})^{\top}.$$

To formalize our use of normal approximations, we consider a scaling parameter  $n$  so as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , batch sizes grow large while the true parameter becomes harder to identify

$$r_n(x, a) = f(x, a; \theta_n^*) = f(x, a; \theta^* / \sqrt{n}), \quad n_t = n, \quad (20)$$

so that the signal-to-noise ratio remains fixed as batch size grows. For simplicity, we assume that the batch size remains constant across epochs such that  $n_t = n$ , but our theory trivially extends to varying batch sizes. Intuitively, scaling the parameter  $\theta^*$  also scales the gap between average rewards of each arm, making it harder to identify the best arm. For example, if  $\theta^*$  represents the mean of a distribution, then scaling  $\theta^*$  by  $1/\sqrt{n}$  scales the gap between average rewards by the same factor. In the case of linear and logistic regression, scaling  $\theta^*$  reduces the effect size of the covariate on the linear response and log-odds respectively. This is a classical scaling used to analyze the statistical power of binary hypothesis tests and heavy traffic behavior of queueing systems [75]; more recently, it been used to analyze adaptive experiments in the sequential limit  $T \rightarrow \infty$  [42, 74, 24, 2, 9] or the large batch limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$  [36]. Our work extends the classical *Gaussian experiment* [71, 50] to sequential M-estimators.

In the general case where  $H_t$  is allowed to be non-invertible, the statistical estimator we analyze is not  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  but rather  $\hat{H}_{n,t}\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$ . This is because when  $H_t^{-1}$  does not exist, asymptotic normality does not necessarily hold for the minimizer  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  and even the minimizer may not be unique. However,  $\hat{H}_{n,t}\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  satisfies a well-defined central limit theorem and the limiting random variable gives rise to a well-defined generalization of the Bayesian posterior update. Precisely, the sufficient statistic we consider is

$$\hat{\Psi}_t := \sqrt{n} \hat{H}_{n,t} \hat{\theta}_{n,t}. \quad (21)$$

The  $\sqrt{n}$  scaling is needed for  $\hat{\Psi}_t$  to be  $O(1)$  because the target parameter  $\theta_n^*$  is  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ .

## 6.2 Sequential Gaussian Experiment for M-estimators

We show that conditional on previous observations  $\hat{\theta}_0, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{t-1}$ , which affect the arm assignments  $A_{t,i}$  through the policy  $\pi_t(\cdot | x, \hat{\Psi}_{0:t-1})$ ,  $\hat{\Psi}_t$  converges in distribution to a Gaussian random variable. We refer to this as the *Batched Limit Sequential Experiment*.

**Definition 3.** *The Batched Limit Sequential Experiment is characterized by observations  $G_0, \dots, G_{T-1}$  with conditional distributions*

$$G_t | G_0, \dots, G_{t-1} \sim N(H_t \theta^*, I_t)$$

If  $H_t$  is non-invertible, this only provides a partial observation of  $\theta^*$  as it is well-known that unbiased estimators do not exist in this case. Nevertheless, one can still perform Bayesian updating with this partial signal.

In order to rigorously show convergence, we require mild regularity assumption on the policy.

**Assumption B.** We consider policies  $\pi = \{\pi_t\}_{t=1}^T$  where

1. Sufficient Statistic:  $\pi$  depends on the data only through the sufficient statistics,

$$\pi_t(\cdot|x, \mathcal{H}_t) = \pi_t(\cdot|x, \hat{\Psi}_{0:t-1}) \quad \text{for all } t = 0, \dots, T-1$$

where  $\hat{\Psi}_{0:t} = (\hat{\Psi}_1, \dots, \hat{\Psi}_t)$

2. Continuity: The policy  $\pi_t(a|x, \hat{\Psi}_{0:t-1})$  is continuous in inputs  $\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}$  for all  $a, t$ .

We also allow the  $\pi_t$  to depend on the Hessian and the gradient covariance matrices as well. These are mild assumptions, and for standard settings such as linear-contextual bandits, this class of policies includes Linear Thompson Sampling [5].

We do not assume the Hessian of the population loss  $\mathbb{E}_t[\ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_i^t)]$  is strictly positive definite, which could be the case if  $\pi_t$  does not sample certain treatment arms or if there is severe non-stationarity in the context distribution. As a result, we relax standard assumptions regarding strong convexity of the population loss. Instead, we require strong convexity only for the parameters in the range of the population Hessian, which is a much weaker assumption that is consistent with the fact that the minimum eigenvalue  $\lambda_{\min}(H_t) = 0$  can equal zero.

Let  $P_t$  be the orthogonal projection matrix for the range space of the population Hessian  $H_t$ . We require the following mild assumptions, which are generally satisfied by all standard convex loss functions (e.g. mean squared error, logistic loss).

**Assumption C.** 1. Strong Convexity: The population loss  $\ell(\theta|\cdot)$  is twice differentiable with respect to  $\theta$  and there exists  $\mu > 0$  such that for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_{t,i})] - \mathbb{E}_t[\ell(\theta_n^*|\mathcal{D}_{t,i})] \geq \mu \|P_t(\theta - \theta_n^*)\|_2^2 \quad (22)$$

2. Lipschitz Condition: there exists  $c_1 > 0, c_2 > 0$  such that for any  $\mathcal{D}_{t,i} = (X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{n,t,i})$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,

$$\|\ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_{t,i}) - \ell(\theta_n^*|\mathcal{D}_{t,i})\|_2 \leq c_1 \|P_t(\theta - \theta_n^*)\|_2 \quad (23)$$

$$\|\nabla_\theta^2 \ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_{t,i}) - \nabla_\theta^2 \ell(\theta_n^*|\mathcal{D}_{t,i})\|_2 \leq c_2 \|P_t(\theta - \theta_n^*)\|_2 \quad (24)$$

3. Boundedness Condition: there exists  $c_3, c_4 > 0$  such that

$$\|\nabla \ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_{t,i})\|_2 \leq c_3, \quad \nabla^2 \ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_{t,i}) \preceq c_4 I \text{ for all } X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{n,t,i}, \theta \in \Theta \quad (25)$$

Furthermore,  $\|\theta^*\|_2 < \infty$ .

4. Optimality Condition: At each epoch  $t$ , the empirical risk minimizer  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t} \in \arg\min_{\theta \in \Theta} L_{n_t}(\theta|\mathcal{D}_t)$  (18) is attained in the interior of the constraint set  $\Theta$ .

It is worth mentioning what is not assumed. First, we do not require sampling probabilities to be bounded away from zero, i.e.  $\pi_t(a|x, \hat{\Psi}_{0:t-1}) > 0$ . Second, unlike standard results for inference of bandit algorithms and M-estimation in general [79, 70, 71, 72, 50], we do not require that the Hessian is invertible, i.e., we allow both the empirical and population versions to have a zero eigenvalue. For linear least-squares with  $r(x, a) = \phi(x, a)^\top \theta^*$ , this corresponds to a singular design matrix,

$$\lambda_{\min} \left( \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \phi(X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}) \phi(X_{t,i}, A_{t,i})^\top \right) = 0, \quad \lambda_{\min} \left( \mathbb{E}_t[\phi \phi^\top] \right) = 0.$$

Rather than being a purely technical matter, this is critical for being able to show the validity of the contextual Gaussian sequential experiment under non-stationary context arrivals, as we will discuss later.

Finally, we require the following assumption on the Hessian of the loss function.

**Assumption D.** For each  $t$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} | \mathcal{D}_i^t) - \nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell(\theta^* | \mathcal{D}_i^t) \right) \right\|_2 \right] \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

This assumption is automatically satisfied by a range of common models such as linear models, as their Hessians are solely dependent on the data and independent of the parameter. When performing traditional M-estimation [71, 50], consistency of the empirical risk minimizer yields consistent estimates of the Hessian and Fisher information, which is only needed for valid inference purposes. This assumption is needed in our formulation as we prove convergence of the statistic  $\hat{\Psi}_{n,t}$  which involves the empirical Hessian, instead of just  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$ .

We now present our main asymptotic result, which shows that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the contextual Gaussian sequential experiment is a valid approximation for the batch statistics even under adaptive sampling policies. We prove this in Section B.1.

**Theorem 2.** Let Assumptions B, C, D hold. Under a fixed policy  $\{\pi_t\}_{t=0}^{T-1}$ , the Gaussian sequential experiment in Definition 3 provides a valid asymptotic approximation for  $\hat{\Psi}_t := \sqrt{n} \hat{H}_{n,t} \hat{\theta}_{n,t}$

$$(\hat{\Psi}_0, \dots, \hat{\Psi}_{T-1}) \overset{d}{\rightsquigarrow} (G_0, \dots, G_{T-1}) \quad \text{as batch size } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (26)$$

Note that if  $p_t(\cdot | X_{t,i})$  is close to the zero action, then the Hessian and Fisher information (19) will approach 0. If  $p_t(\cdot | X_{t,i}) = \mathbf{0}$ , then  $G_t$  and  $\hat{\Psi}_t$  will be equal to 0.

### 6.3 Asymptotic Validity of BLDP

Upon observing a Gaussian random variable with  $N(H_t \theta^*, n_t^{-1} I_t)$ , the posterior update for  $\theta^*$  is given by the following.

**Definition 4.** Let  $\theta^* \sim N(\beta_0, \Sigma_0)$ . Given observations  $\{G_t\}_{t=1}^T$  where  $G_t | G_{1:t-1} \sim N(H_t \theta^*, n_t^{-1} I_t)$ , the joint distribution of posterior states  $\{(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)\}_{t=0}^T$  are characterized by the recursive relation

$$\text{Posterior variance:} \quad \Sigma_{t+1}^{-1} := \Sigma_t^{-1} + H_t I_t^\dagger H_t \quad (27a)$$

$$\text{Posterior mean:} \quad \beta_{t+1} := \beta_t + (\Sigma_t - \Sigma_{t+1})^{1/2} Z_t \quad (27b)$$

where  $H_t$  and  $I_t$  are defined in (9a) and (9b) respectively, and  $Z_0, \dots, Z_{T-1} \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, I_d)$  are standard normal variables.

Unlike the MDP (11) in Section 3, the above MDP does not have  $n$  in the update for  $\Sigma$  as this is under the rescaled rewards  $r_n$ . By rescaling removing the  $\sqrt{n}$  factor in  $\Phi_{n,t}$ , we can recover the same scaling as in (11). Under this scaling, we let  $R_{n,t} = \{R_{n,t,i}\}_{i=1}^{n_t}$  be the vector of rewards collected from epoch  $t$ . Note that  $R_{n,t}$  depends on  $n$  through the number of observations  $n_t$  and also the scaling of the average rewards  $r_n$  as  $\mathbb{E}[R_{n,t,i} | X_{t,i} = x, A_{t,i} = a] = r_n(x, a)$ . As the batch size grows large, the population-level quantities become relevant.

Naturally, the dynamics (27) cannot be used exactly since the population covariance is unknown and the measurement  $\hat{\Psi}_t$  is used instead of  $G_t$ . So instead, we can plug-in the empirical counterparts to the asymptotic quantities, leading to an approximate Bayesian model  $(\beta_{n,t}, \Sigma_{n,t})$ , which is compatible with the data obtained from the batched experiment.

**Definition 5.** The **approximate Bayesian model** is defined by the following update rule for posterior parameters  $(\beta_{n,t}, \Sigma_{n,t})$ , upon observing aggregated rewards  $\hat{\Psi}_t$  and contexts  $\Phi_{n,t}$ :

$$\text{Posterior variance: } \Sigma_{n,t+1}^{-1} := \Sigma_{n,t}^{-1} + \left( \hat{H}_{n,t} \hat{\Gamma}_{n,t}^{\dagger} \hat{H}_{n,t} \right) \quad (28a)$$

$$\text{Posterior mean: } \beta_{n,t+1} := \Sigma_{n,t+1} \left( \Sigma_{n,t}^{-1} \beta_t + \hat{H}_{n,t} \hat{\Gamma}_{n,t}^{\dagger} \hat{\Psi}_t \right) \quad (28b)$$

Using the main asymptotic result in Theorem 2, we can show that trajectories of the approximate Bayesian model converge in distribution to trajectories of the asymptotic model as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

**Corollary 1.** Let  $\pi_t(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  be a policy that is continuous a.s. under  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  drawn from (27). Let Assumptions B, C, D hold. Consider any fixed  $\theta$  and prior  $(\beta_{n,0}, \Sigma_{n,0}) = (\beta_0, \Sigma_0)$ . The posterior states of (28) converge in distribution to the states (27) as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(\beta_{n,1}, \Sigma_{n,1}, \dots, \beta_{n,t}, \Sigma_{n,t}) \xrightarrow{d} (\beta_1, \Sigma_1, \dots, \beta_t, \Sigma_t).$$

This in turn implies convergence of the performance metrics and the value functions. Ultimately, this justifies the use of the asymptotic model as a guide for evaluating and optimizing performance metrics.

**Corollary 2.** If the objective functions  $c_s(\pi_s, \beta_s, \Sigma_s)$  are all continuous in all arguments a.s. under  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  drawn from (27), then  $c_s(\pi_s, \beta_{n,s}, \Sigma_{n,s}) \xrightarrow{d} c_s(\pi_s, \beta_s, \Sigma_s)$  for all  $s \leq T$ . If in addition,  $c_s = O(\|\beta\|_2 + \|\Sigma\|_2)$  then we also have convergence of the value functions for all  $t = 0, \dots, T-1$

$$\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{s=t}^T c_s(\pi_s | \beta_{n,s}, \Sigma_{n,s}) \right] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{s=t}^T c_s(\pi_s | \beta_s, \Sigma_s) \right]$$

The exact form of the approximate posterior updates in (28) is useful for showing theoretical convergence, but also has implications for posterior updates in batched settings.

**Implications on practical performance: Scaling the design matrix or prior.** While the covariance update (28) scales the design matrix by the batch size in order to obtain a sensible limit, we find that this is also practically relevant. By scaling down the covariance matrix, or alternatively scaling up the prior by  $n_t$ , we manage to avoid numerical difficulties that emerge when updating with large batches, especially if the design matrix is singular or low-rank. This numerical difficulties emerge when trying to invert  $\Sigma_{t+1}^{-1}$ , which is going to have an extremely small minimum eigenvalue if the low-rank design matrix dominates the prior.

## 7 Discussion

Normal approximations have been informally proposed in the simulation optimization literature [43, Section 3.1], and normality is a common *assumption* in simulation optimization [37, 20], Bayesian optimization [28, 31, 48, 77, 38], and bandits [49]. Our main theoretical contribution establishes the validity of sequential Gaussian approximations for general M-estimators in the large batch limit. Our formalization is connected to Gaussian approximations for bandit algorithms [54, 79, 35], and provides a general guarantee that can model a wide range of M-estimators under nonstationary

settings and small policy weights. In particular, Hirano and Porter [36] derives sequential Gaussian approximations for non-contextual settings, and study inferential questions such as power calculations.

Managing the exploration-exploitation trade-off computationally is a classical idea in reinforcement learning [30], with applications in ranking and selection [60] and Bayesian experimental design [14, 68, 26] where the goal is to optimize information gain. For pure-exploration problems, Bhat et al. [11] use covariate balancing to sequentially assign treatments as subjects arrive stochastically, and derive a state state collapse behavior in specific distributional settings. Our work focuses on small-horizon adaptive experiments similar to Che and Namkoong [19], but we significantly expand the scope of computational methods (e.g., RHO) to handle practical problem instances involving batched & delayed feedback, non-stationarity, multiple objectives & constraints, and personalization.

As we emphasize throughout, our main goal is to improve upon the static randomized control trial in a consistent and robust manner across problem instances. There is much work to be done to materialize our mathematical programming perspective. The simple SGD-based algorithm RHO we study cannot easily handle stochastic constraints and has to resort to Lagrangian dual relaxations. We also do not expect it to perform well for large horizons  $T$ , or problems that require substantial adaptivity. We hope this work spurs future methodological innovations in solution approaches and corresponding empirical foundations over which solvers can be benchmarked against a wide range of instances. The mathematical programming community has long adopted this two-pronged approach, and we expect a similar approach will be fruitful in adaptive experimentation.

## References

- [1] M. Abadi, P. Barham, J. Chen, Z. Chen, A. Davis, J. Dean, M. Devin, S. Ghemawat, G. Irving, M. Isard, M. Kudlur, J. Levenberg, R. Monga, S. Moore, D. G. Murray, B. Steiner, P. Tucker, V. Vasudevan, P. Warden, M. Wicke, Y. Yu, and X. Zheng. Tensorflow: A system for large-scale machine learning. In *12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 16)*, pages 265–283, 2016. URL <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/osdi16/osdi16-abadi.pdf>.
- [2] K. Adusumilli. Risk and optimal policies in bandit experiments. *arXiv:2112.06363 [econ.EM]*, 2021.
- [3] A. Agarwal, S. Bird, M. Cozowicz, L. Hoang, J. Langford, S. Lee, J. Li, D. Melamed, G. Oshri, O. Ribas, et al. Making contextual decisions with low technical debt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.03966*, 2016.
- [4] A. Agarwal, S. Agarwal, S. Assadi, and S. Khanna. Learning with limited rounds of adaptivity: Coin tossing, multi-armed bandits, and ranking from pairwise comparisons. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pages 39–75. PMLR, 2017.
- [5] S. Agrawal and N. Goyal. Thompson sampling for contextual bandits with linear payoffs. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 127–135, 2013.
- [6] S. Agrawal and N. Goyal. Thompson sampling for contextual bandits with linear payoffs. In

- S. Dasgupta and D. McAllester, editors, *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 28 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 127–135, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 17–19 Jun 2013. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v28/agrawal13.html>.
- [7] S. Amani, M. Alizadeh, and C. Thrampoulidis. Linear stochastic bandits under safety constraints. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 19*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2019/file/09a8a8976abdcdfdee15128b4cc02f33a-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/09a8a8976abdcdfdee15128b4cc02f33a-Paper.pdf).
  - [8] M. ApS. *The MOSEK optimization toolbox for MATLAB manual. Version 9.0.*, 2019. URL <http://docs.mosek.com/9.0/toolbox/index.html>.
  - [9] V. F. Araman and R. Caldentey. Diffusion approximations for a class of sequential experimentation problems. *Management Science*, 68(8):5958–5979, 2022.
  - [10] E. Bakshy, L. Dworkin, B. Karrer, K. Kashin, B. Letham, A. Murthy, and S. Singh. Ae: A domain-agnostic platform for adaptive experimentation. In *Neural Information Processing Systems Workshop on Systems for Machine Learning*, pages 1–8, 2018.
  - [11] N. Bhat, V. F. Farias, C. C. Moallemi, and D. Sinha. Near-optimal a-b testing. *Management Science*, 66(10):4359–4919, 2020.
  - [12] K. S. Button, J. Ioannidis, C. Mokrysz, B. A. Nosek, J. Flint, E. S. Robinson, and M. R. Munafò. Power failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 14(5):365–376, 2013.
  - [13] A. S. Caria, G. Gordon, M. Kasy, S. Quinn, S. Shami, and A. Teytelboym. An adaptive targeted field experiment: Job search assistance for refugees in jordan. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.1257/rct.3870-2.2>. Preprint.
  - [14] K. Chaloner and I. Verdinelli. Bayesian experimental design: A review. *Statistical Science*, 10(3):273–304, 1995.
  - [15] O. Chapelle and L. Li. An empirical evaluation of thompson sampling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24*, pages 2249–2257, 2011.
  - [16] O. Chapelle and L. Li. An empirical evaluation of thompson sampling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24 (NeurIPS 2011)*, pages 2249–2257. NeurIPS, 2011.
  - [17] S. Chatterjee and E. Meckes. Multivariate normal approximation using exchangeable pairs. *arXiv:0701464 [math.PR]*, 2008.
  - [18] E. Che and H. Namkoong. Adaptive experimentation at scale: A computational framework for flexible batches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11582*, 2023.
  - [19] E. Che and H. Namkoong. Adaptive experimentation at scale: A computational framework for flexible batches. *arXiv:2303.11582 [cs.LG]*, 2023.
  - [20] C.-H. Chen, S. E. Chick, L. H. Lee, and N. A. Pujowidianto. Ranking and selection: efficient



- simulation budget allocation. *Handbook of Simulation Optimization*, pages 45–80, 2015.
- [21] Y. Chen, A. Cuellar, H. Luo, J. Modi, H. Nemlekar, and S. Nikolaidis. Fair contextual multi-armed bandits: Theory and experiments. In J. Peters and D. Sontag, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, volume 124 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 181–190. PMLR, 03–06 Aug 2020.
  - [22] E. Czibor, D. Jimenez-Gomez, and J. A. List. The dozen things experimental economists should do (more of). *Southern Economic Journal*, 86(2):371–432, 2019.
  - [23] H. Esfandiari, A. Karbasi, A. Mehrabian, and V. Mirrokni. Regret bounds for batched bandits. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 7340–7348, 2021.
  - [24] L. Fan and P. W. Glynn. Diffusion approximations for thompson sampling. *arXiv:2105.09232 [cs.LG]*, 2021.
  - [25] T. Fiez, H. Nassif, Y.-C. Chen, S. Gamez, and L. Jain. Best of three worlds: Adaptive experimentation for digital marketing in practice. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2402.10870>, 2024.
  - [26] A. Foster, D. R. Ivanova, I. Malik, and T. Rainforth. Deep adaptive design: Amortizing sequential bayesian experimental design. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
  - [27] P. I. Frazier. A tutorial on bayesian optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.02811*, 2018.
  - [28] P. I. Frazier, W. B. Powell, and S. Dayanik. A knowledge-gradient policy for sequential information collection. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 47(5):2410–2439, 2008. doi: 10.1137/070693424.
  - [29] Z. Gao, Y. Han, Z. Ren, and Z. Zhou. Batched multi-armed bandits problem. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 19*, 2019.
  - [30] M. Ghavamzadeh, S. Mannor, J. Pineau, and A. Tamar. Bayesian reinforcement learning: A survey. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(5-6):359–483, 2015.
  - [31] J. Gonzalez, M. Osborne, and N. Lawrence. Glasses: Relieving the myopia of bayesian optimisation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2016.
  - [32] M. Grant and S. Boyd. CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 1.21. <http://cvxr.com/cvx/>, 2011.
  - [33] A. Grover, T. Markov, P. Attia, N. Jin, N. Perkins, B. Cheong, M. Chen, Z. Yang, S. Harris, W. Chueh, and S. Ermon. Best arm identification in multi-armed bandits with delayed feedback. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 833–842. PMLR, 2018.
  - [34] I. Gurobi Optimization. Gurobi optimizer reference manual, 2015. URL <http://www.gurobi.com>.
  - [35] V. Hadad, D. A. Hirshberg, R. Zhan, S. Wager, and S. Athey. Confidence intervals for policy

- evaluation in adaptive experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(15): e2014602118, 2021.
- [36] K. Hirano and J. R. Porter. Asymptotic representations for sequential decisions, adaptive experiments, and batched bandits. *arXiv:2302.03117 [econ.EM]*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.03117>.
  - [37] L. J. Hong, B. L. Nelson, and J. Xu. Discrete optimization via simulation. In *Handbook of Simulation Optimization*, pages 9–44. Springer, 2015.
  - [38] S. Jiang, D. Jiang, M. Balandat, B. Karrer, J. Gardner, and R. Garnett. Efficient nonmyopic bayesian optimization via one-shot multi-step trees. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, 2020.
  - [39] S. Jöbgrönsson, H. Schaak, O. Musshoff, and T. Friede. Improving the statistical power of economic experiments using adaptive designs. *Experimental Economics*, 2022.
  - [40] P. Joulani, A. Gyorgy, and C. Szepesvári. Online learning under delayed feedback. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1453–1461. PMLR, 2013.
  - [41] K.-S. Jun, K. Jamieson, R. Nowak, and X. Zhu. Top arm identification in multi-armed bandits with batch arm pulls. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 139–148. PMLR, 2016.
  - [42] A. Kalvit and A. Zeevi. A closer look at the worst-case behavior of multi-armed bandit algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34*, 2021.
  - [43] S.-H. Kim and B. L. Nelson. Recent advances in ranking and selection. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Winter Simulation Conference*, 2007.
  - [44] R. Kohavi, R. Longbotham, D. Sommerfield, and R. M. Henne. Controlled experiments on the web: survey and practical guide. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 18(1):140–181, 2009.
  - [45] R. Kohavi, A. Deng, B. Frasca, R. Longbotham, T. Walker, and Y. Xu. Trustworthy online controlled experiments: Five puzzling outcomes explained. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 786–794, 2012.
  - [46] R. Kohavi, A. Deng, B. Frasca, T. Walker, Y. Xu, and N. Pohlmann. Online controlled experiments at large scale. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1168–1176, 2013.
  - [47] A. Lada, M. Wang, and T. Yan. How machine learning powers facebook’s news feed ranking algorithm. <https://engineering.fb.com/2021/01/26/ml-applications/news-feed-ranking/>, 2021.
  - [48] R. R. Lam, K. E. Willcox, and D. H. Wolpert. Bayesian optimization with a finite budget: an approximate dynamic programming approach. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 16*, 2016.

- [49] T. Lattimore and C. Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge, 2019.
- [50] L. Le Cam and G. L. Yang. *Asymptotics in Statistics: Some Basic Concepts*. Springer, 2000.
- [51] L. Li, W. Chu, J. Langford, and R. E. Schapire. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web (WWW 2010)*, pages 661–670. ACM, 2010.
- [52] C. Liu, Â. Cardoso, P. Couturier, and E. J. McCoy. Datasets for online controlled experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.10198*, 2021.
- [53] A. R. Luedtke and M. J. v. d. Laan. Parametric-rate inference for one-sided differentiable parameters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(522):780–788, 2018.
- [54] A. R. Luedtke and M. J. van der Laan. Super-learning of an optimal dynamic treatment rule. *International Journal of Biostatistics*, 12(1):305–332, 2016.
- [55] A. Mahapatra. How instagram suggests new content. <https://engineering.fb.com/2020/12/10/web/how-instagram-suggests-new-content/>, 2020.
- [56] E. Meckes. On stein’s method for multivariate normal approximation. *High dimensional probability V: the Luminy volume*, 5:153–178, 2009.
- [57] M. W. Meckes. Gaussian marginals of convex bodies with symmetries. *Beitrage zur Algebra und Geometrie*, 50(1):101–118, 2009.
- [58] M. Offer-Westort, A. Coppock, and D. P. Green. Adaptive experimental design: Prospects and applications in political science. *SSRN 3364402*, 2020. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3364402>.
- [59] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga, A. Desmaison, A. Kopf, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, M. Raison, A. Tejani, S. Chilamkurthy, B. Steiner, L. Fang, J. Bai, and S. Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, 2019.
- [60] Y. Peng, E. K. Chong, C.-H. Chen, and M. C. Fu. Ranking and selection as stochastic control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(8):2359–2373, 2018.
- [61] V. Perchet, P. Rigollet, S. Chassang, and E. Snowberg. Batched bandit problems. *Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):660–681, 2016.
- [62] C. Pike-Burke, S. Agrawal, C. Szepesvari, and S. Grunewalder. Bandits with delayed, aggregated anonymous feedback. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4105–4113. PMLR, 2018.
- [63] C. Qin and D. Russo. Adaptive experimentation in the presence of exogenous nonstationary variation. *arXiv:2202.09036 [cs.LG]*, 2023.
- [64] C. Qin and D. Russo. Optimizing adaptive experiments: A unified approach to regret minimization and best-arm identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10592*, July 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.10592>.

- [65] D. Russo. Simple bayesian algorithms for best-arm identification. *Operations Research*, 68(6):1625–1647, 2020.
- [66] D. Russo and B. Van Roy. An information-theoretic analysis of thompson sampling. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):2442–2471, 2016.
- [67] D. J. Russo, B. Van Roy, A. Kazerouni, I. Osband, and Z. Wen. A tutorial on thompson sampling. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(1):1–96, 2018.
- [68] E. G. Ryan, C. C. Drovandi, J. M. McGree, and A. N. Pettitt. A review of modern computational algorithms for bayesian optimal design. *International Statistics Review*, 84(1):128–154, 2016.
- [69] D. Sculley, G. Holt, D. Golovin, E. Davydov, T. Phillips, D. Ebner, V. Chaudhary, M. Young, J.-F. Crespo, and D. Dennison. Hidden technical debt in machine learning systems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, pages 2503–2511, 2015.
- [70] Q.-M. Shao and Z.-S. Zhang. Berry–esseen bounds for multivariate nonlinear statistics with applications to m-estimators and stochastic gradient descent algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04923*, Apr 2021. Version 2.
- [71] A. W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [72] A. W. van der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*. Springer, New York, 1996.
- [73] C. Vernade, A. Carpentier, T. Lattimore, G. Zappella, B. Ermiš, and M. Brueckner. Linear bandits with stochastic delayed feedback. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9712–9721. PMLR, 2020.
- [74] S. Wager and K. Xu. Diffusion asymptotics for sequential experiments. *arXiv:2101.09855 [math.ST]*, 2021.
- [75] W. Whitt. *Stochastic Process Limits: An Introduction to Stochastic Process Limits and Their Application to Queues*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2002.
- [76] B. Wilder and P. Welle. Learning treatment effects while treating those in need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07596*, July 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.07596>.
- [77] J. Wu and P. I. Frazier. Practical two-step look-ahead bayesian optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 19*, 2019.
- [78] Y. Xia, H. Li, T. Qin, N. Yu, and T.-Y. Liu. Thompson sampling for budgeted multi-armed bandits. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, Beijing, China, 2015. IJCAI.
- [79] K. Zhang, L. Janson, and S. Murphy. Inference for batched bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, 33:9818–9829, 2020.

## A Further Experimental Results

Policy $b_t = 250,000$	Simple Regret < Uniform		Simple Regret > Uniform
	% Settings	% Avg Regret of Uniform	% Avg Regret of Uniform
Non-contextual TTTS [65]	41.1	82.8	119.8
Contextual TTTS [63]	55.1	83.9	107.2
Contextual RHO	57.1	86.39	105.8

---

Policy $b_t = 10,000$	Simple Regret < Uniform		Simple Regret > Uniform
	% Settings	% Avg Regret of Uniform	% Avg Regret of Uniform
Non-contextual TTTS [65]	48.5	93.5	119.8
Contextual TTTS [63]	50.6	94.2	103.3
Contextual RHO	65.1	93.7	103.2

## B Derivations of Gaussian sequential experiment

### B.1 Proof of Theorem 2

Recall the Gaussian sequential experiment given in Definition 3: for all  $0 < t \leq T - 1$

$$G_0 \sim N(H_0\theta^*, I_0), \quad G_t | G_{t-1}, \dots, G_0 \sim N(H_t\theta^*, I_t)$$

where the population Hessian and Fisher Information at time  $t$  respectively are:

$$H_t := \mathbb{E}_t[\nabla^2 \ell(0 | \mathcal{D}_i^t)], \quad I_t := \mathbb{E}_t[\nabla \ell(0 | \mathcal{D}_i^t) \nabla \ell(0 | \mathcal{D}_i^t)^\top].$$

Note that the Hessian and Fisher Information are evaluated at zero since  $\theta_n^* \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

To recapitulate,  $\mathcal{D}_i^t := (X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}, R_{n,t,i})$ ,  $\theta^*$  is the true parameter,  $\theta_n^* = \theta^* / \sqrt{n}$  is the scaled parameter where the  $\sqrt{n}$  scaling maintains the difficulty of the experiment as the batch size grows. We also assume that  $n_t = n$  for simplicity, but it is trivial to extend our result to differing batch sizes. Furthermore,

$$X_{t,i} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mu_t, \quad A_{t,i} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} p_t(\cdot | X_{t,i}), \quad R_{n,t,i} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \nu(\cdot | X_{t,i}, A_{t,i}).$$

Note that due to the dependence of  $H_t$ , and  $I_t$  on  $p_t$  and  $p_t(\cdot | x) = \pi_t(\cdot | x, \mathcal{H}_t)$  on previous observations,  $G_t$  depends on the outcomes of  $G_{t-1}, \dots, G_0$ . Define

$$\hat{H}_{n,t} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 \ell(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} | \mathcal{D}_i^t), \quad H_{n,t} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^t).$$

We use a shorthand  $\hat{\Psi}_{n,t}$  to denote the estimator

$$\hat{\Psi}_{n,t} := \sqrt{n} \hat{H}_{n,t} \hat{\theta}_{n,t}$$

Since  $p_t(\cdot | X_{t,i}) \in \mathcal{S}_K := \{(x_1, \dots, x_K) \mid x_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^K x_i \leq 1 \forall i \in [K]\}$ , meaning  $p_t$  can sum to less than one, we assume that if no action is sampled, then  $\mathcal{D}_{t,i}$  is excluded from the loss minimization objective. Furthermore, if no actions are sampled for all  $X_{t,i}$ , then we set  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t} = 0$ .

As  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} L_n(\theta | \mathcal{D}_t)$  (18) and  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  is in the interior of the constraint set  $\Theta$  by assumption 4, it follows that  $\nabla_{\theta} L_n(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} | \mathcal{D}_t) = 0$ . Therefore, we can take a Taylor Expansion of the gradient of the empirical loss around  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$ :

$$0 = \nabla_{\theta} L_n(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} | \mathcal{D}_t) = \nabla_{\theta} L_n(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_t) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 \nabla^2 \ell(\theta_s | \mathcal{D}_{t,i}) (\hat{\theta}_{n,t} - \theta_n^*) ds \quad (29)$$

where  $\theta_s = \theta_n^* + s(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} - \theta_n^*)$ . We first focus our attention on the quantity  $\sqrt{n}H_{n,t}\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  instead of  $\hat{\Psi}_{n,t} := \sqrt{n}\hat{H}_{n,t}\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$ , as the former is more amenable to analysis since  $H_{n,t} \rightarrow H_t$  directly by the Law of Large Numbers. It follows that  $\sqrt{n}H_{n,t}\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  can be written as

$$\sqrt{n}H_{n,t}\hat{\theta}_{n,t} = H_t\theta^* + (H_{n,t} - H_t)\theta^* - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^t) \quad (30)$$

$$- \sqrt{n} \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 \ell(\theta_s | \mathcal{D}_{t,i}) - H_{n,t} \right) (\hat{\theta}_{n,t} - \theta_n^*) ds. \quad (31)$$

**Induction** We use an inductive argument to prove the weak convergence (26) for a policy  $\pi$  and reward process  $R_{n,t}$  satisfying Assumptions B, C, and D.

For  $t = 0$ ,  $p_0, \mu_0$  are fixed, implying that  $\mathcal{D}_i^0$  are identically and independently distributed (i.i.d). Thus,  $\nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^0)$  and  $\nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^0)$  are i.i.d. Since  $\nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^0)$  is uniformly bounded by Assumption 3,  $H_{n,0} \xrightarrow{a.s.} H_0$  by the Strong Law of Large Numbers. To bound the last term in the expansion (29), we rely on the following proposition, which we prove in Section B.2.

**Proposition 3.** *Under condition (22) there exists a constant  $m_1 > 0$  that depends on  $\mu, c_1$ , and  $d$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_t(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} - \theta_n^*)\|_2^p] \leq m_1 n^{-p/2} \quad (32)$$

By Assumption 2 and Proposition 3, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\sqrt{n} \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 \ell(\theta_s | \mathcal{D}_i^0) - H_{n,0} \right) (\hat{\theta}_{n,0} - \theta_n^*) ds] \leq c_2 \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E}[\|P_0(\hat{\theta}_{n,0} - \theta_n^*)\|_2^2] \leq c_2 m_1^2 n^{-1/2}$$

Therefore, we can apply the Lindeberg CLT to obtain

$$\sqrt{n}H_{n,0}\hat{\theta}_{n,0} \xrightarrow{d} N(H_0\theta^*, I_0).$$

By Assumption D and the Continuous Mapping Theorem,

$$\hat{\Psi}_{n,0} \xrightarrow{d} N(H_0\theta^*, I_0).$$

Next, suppose

$$(\hat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \hat{\Psi}_{n,t}) \xrightarrow{d} (G_0, \dots, G_t). \quad (33)$$

To show weak convergence to  $G_{t+1}$ , it is sufficient to show

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\hat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \hat{\Psi}_{n,t+1})] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[f(G_0, \dots, G_{t+1})] \text{ for any bounded Lipschitz function } f. \quad (34)$$

Fixing a bounded Lipschitz  $f$ , assume without loss of generality that

$$\sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{(t+1) \times d}} |f(x) - f(y)| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad f \in \operatorname{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{(t+1) \times d}).$$



We first set up some basic notation. For any  $\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t} \in \mathbb{R}^{(t+1) \times d}$ , define the conditional expectation operator on a random variable  $W$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}}[W] := \mathbb{E} \left[ W \middle| \left\{ \widehat{\Psi}_{n,s} \right\}_{s=0}^t = \widehat{\Psi}_{0:t} \right].$$

Then, conditional on realizations of previous estimators up to time  $t$ , we define a shorthand for the conditional expectation of  $f$  and its limiting counterpart. Suppressing the dependence on  $f$ , let  $\widehat{g}_n, g_n, g : \mathbb{R}^{t \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{g}_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) &:= \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ f \left( \widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t}, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t+1} \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t+1} \right) \right] \\ g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) &:= \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ f \left( \widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t}, \sqrt{n} H_{n,t+1} \widehat{\theta}_{n,t+1} \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}, \sqrt{n} H_{n,t+1} \widehat{\theta}_{n,t+1} \right) \right] \\ g(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) &:= \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ f \left( \widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t}, I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) Z + H_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) \theta^* \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}, I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) Z + H_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) \theta^* \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where  $Z \sim N(0, I)$  and the conditional Hessian and Fisher information is determined by the allocation  $\pi_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})$ , which depends on previous observations. Conditional on the history  $\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}$ ,  $\widehat{\Psi}_{n,t}$  depends on  $\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}$  only through the sampling probabilities  $\pi_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})$ .

To show the weak convergence (34), decompose the difference between  $\mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t+1})]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[f(G_0, \dots, G_{t+1})]$  in terms of  $\widehat{g}_n, g_n$  and  $g$

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t+1})] - \mathbb{E}[f(G_0, \dots, G_{t+1})]| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}[\widehat{g}_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - \mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] + \mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - \mathbb{E}[g(G_0, \dots, G_t)]| \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}[\widehat{g}_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - \mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})]| + |\mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - \mathbb{E}[g(G_0, \dots, G_t)]|. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

First, for any bounded lipschitz function  $f$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t+1} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}, \sqrt{n} H_{n,t+1} \widehat{\theta}_{n,t+1} \right) \right] \right| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t+1} - \sqrt{n} H_{n,t+1} \widehat{\theta}_{n,t+1} \right\|_2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sqrt{n} (\widehat{H}_{n,t+1} - H_{n,t+1}) \right\| \left\| \widehat{\theta}_{n,t+1} \right\|_2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption D, we have

$$|\mathbb{E}[\widehat{g}_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - \mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})]| \rightarrow 0. \quad (37)$$

We can further decompose as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - \mathbb{E}[g(G_0, \dots, G_t)]| &\leq |\mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - \mathbb{E}[g(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})]| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}[g(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - \mathbb{E}[g(G_0, \dots, G_t)]|. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

By Assumption B2 and dominated convergence,  $g$  is continuous almost surely under  $(G_0, \dots, G_t)$ . From the inductive hypothesis (33), the continuous mapping theorem implies

$$\mathbb{E}[g(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[g(G_1, \dots, G_t)]. \quad (39)$$

**Uniform convergence of  $g_n \rightarrow g$**  It remains to show the convergence

$$\mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[g(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})].$$

While one would expect pointwise convergence of  $g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})$  to  $g(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})$  by the CLT, proving the above requires controlling the convergence across random realizations of the sampling probabilities  $\pi_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})$ . This is complicated by the fact that we allow the sampling probabilities to be zero. To this end, we use the Stein's method for multivariate distributions to provide rates of convergence for the CLT that are uniform across realizations  $\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}$ . We use the bounded Lipschitz distance  $d_{\text{BL}}$  to metrize weak convergence.

$$d_{\text{BL}}(\mu, \nu) := \sup \left\{ |\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mu} \bar{f}(R) - \mathbb{E}_{R \sim \nu} \bar{f}(R)| : \bar{f} \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^K), \sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^K} |\bar{f}(x) - \bar{f}(y)| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Define

$$b_{n,t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) = H_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})\theta^* - \sqrt{n}H_{n,t+1}\hat{\theta}_{n,t+1} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1}).$$

To bound  $|\mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - g(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})|$ , decompose

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})] - g(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}}[f(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}, \sqrt{n}H_{n,t+1}\hat{\theta}_{n,t+1}) - f(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}, I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})Z + H_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})\theta^*)]| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}}[d_{\text{BL}}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1}), I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})Z + b_{n,t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}))] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}}[d_{\text{BL}}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1}), I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})Z)] + \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}}[d_{\text{BL}}(I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})Z, I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})Z + b_{n,t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}))] \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

We now proceed to bound both terms in the inequality (40). The first term measures the difference between a centered  $\sqrt{n}H_{n,t+1}\hat{\theta}_{n,t+1}$  and its Gaussian limit, and can be bounded by noting that

$$\text{Cov}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1}) \right) = I_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}).$$

The second term accounts purely for the bias incurred compared to its true limit. To ease notation, we often omit the dependence on  $\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}$ .

**Bounding the first term in inequality (40)** Before we proceed, it is helpful to define the following quantities, which describe smoothness of the derivatives of any function  $f \in \mathcal{C}^3$

$$M_1(f) = \sup_x \|\nabla f\|_2 \quad M_2(f) = \sup_x \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{op}} \quad M_3(f) = \sup_x \|\nabla^3 f\|_{\text{op}}$$

The following bound, which we prove in Section B.1.1, quantifies the rate of convergence for the CLT using the multivariate Stein's method Meckes [56].

**Proposition 4.** *For any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^3$ ,*

$$|\mathbb{E}f(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1})) - \mathbb{E}f(I_{t+1}^{1/2}Z)| \leq C_1 n^{-1/2} M_2(f) + C_2 n^{-1/2} M_3(f)$$

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  depend polynomially on  $d, c_3$ .

It remains to show convergence of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1})$  to  $I_{t+1}^{1/2} Z$  for Lipschitz test functions, which is required to control the bounded Lipschitz distance. We use standard Gaussian smoothing arguments found in Meckes [57]: by convolving the test function with a Gaussian density, one obtains a smoother function for which the result of Proposition 4 is applicable. At the same time, the amount of smoothing is controlled to ensure the bias with the original test function is small.

**Lemma 2** (Meckes [57, Corollary 3.5]). *For any 1-Lipschitz function  $f$ , consider the Gaussian convolution  $(f * \phi_\delta)(x) := \mathbb{E}[f(x + \delta Z)]$ , where  $Z \sim N(0, I_d)$ .*

$$M_2(f * \phi_\delta) \leq M_1(f) \sup_{\theta: \|\theta\|_2=1} \left\| \nabla \phi_\delta^\top \theta \right\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{\delta}$$

$$M_3(f * \phi_\delta) \leq M_1(f) \sup_{\theta: \|\theta\|_2=1} \left\| \theta^\top \nabla^2 \phi_\delta \theta \right\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\delta^2}$$

Moreover, for any random vector  $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(f * \phi_\delta)(X) - f(X)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\delta \|Z\|_2] \leq \delta \sqrt{d}$$

Thus, for any 1-Lipschitz function  $f$ , we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}f(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1})) - \mathbb{E}f(I_{t+1}^{1/2} Z)| &\leq |\mathbb{E}f(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1})) - \mathbb{E}(f * \phi_\delta)(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1}))| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}(f * \phi_\delta)(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1})) - \mathbb{E}(f * \phi_\delta)(I_{t+1}^{1/2} Z)| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}(f * \phi_\delta)(I_{t+1}^{1/2} Z) - \mathbb{E}f(I_{t+1}^{1/2} Z)| \\ &\leq 2\delta \sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{\delta} C_1 n^{-1/2} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\delta^2} C_2 n^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Optimizing over  $\delta$ , we obtain

$$d_{\text{BL}}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1}), I_{t+1}^{1/2} Z) \leq C_{t+1} n^{-1/6}$$

for some constant  $C_{t+1}$  that depends only on  $d$  and  $c_3$  but not on  $n$  or  $\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}$ .

**Bounding the second term in inequality (40)** Finally, it remains to show uniform convergence of the second term in the bound (40).

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ d_{\text{BL}} \left( I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) Z, I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) Z + b_{n,t+1}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) \right) \right] \right].$$

Since the stochastic terms have identical distributions, by a simple coupling argument, for any bounded Lipschitz function  $f$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) Z \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) Z + b_{n,t+1}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) \right) \right] \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) Z - I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) Z - b_{n,t+1}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) \right\|_2 \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| b_{n,t+1}(\hat{\Psi}_{0:t}) \right\|_2 \right] \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| H_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})\theta^* - \sqrt{n}H_{n,t+1}\hat{\theta}_{n,t+1} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\theta} \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1}) \right\|_2 \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| (H_{t+1} - H_{n,t+1})\theta^* + \sqrt{n} \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 \ell(\theta_s | \mathcal{D}_{t,i}) - H_{n,t} \right) (\hat{\theta}_{n,t} - \theta_n^*) ds \right\|_2 \right] \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| (H_{t+1} - H_{n,t+1}) \right\|_2 \left\| \theta^* \right\|_2 + \left\| \sqrt{n} \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 \ell(\theta_s | \mathcal{D}_{t,i}) - H_{n,t} \right) (\hat{\theta}_{n,t} - \theta_n^*) ds \right\|_2 \right] \right] \quad (41)
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2 and Proposition 3, we can bound the second term in (41) as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{n} \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla^2 \ell(\theta_s | \mathcal{D}_i^0) - H_{n,t+1} \right) (\hat{\theta}_{n,t+1} - \theta_n^*) ds \right] \leq c_2 \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} [\|P_{t+1}(\hat{\theta}_{n,t+1} - \theta_n^*)\|_2^2] \leq c_2 m_1^2 n^{-1/2}. \quad (42)$$

Next, we bound the expected spectral norm  $\mathbb{E} [\|H_{n,t+1} - H_{t+1}\|_2]$ . Conditional on  $\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}$ ,  $H_{n,t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) - H_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varphi_{n,t+1,i}}{n}$  is a sum of iid, mean-zero, random matrices where

$$\varphi_{n,t+1,i} = \left( \nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} [\nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell(\theta_n^* | \mathcal{D}_i^{t+1})] \right)$$

By Assumption 3,  $\|\frac{\varphi_{n,t+1,i}}{n}\| \leq 2c_4/n$ . Moreover,

$$\lambda_{\max} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{\varphi_{n,t+1,i}}{n} \right)^2 \right) = \frac{1}{n} \lambda_{\max} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \varphi_{n,t+1,i}^2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \lambda_{\max} (\mathbb{E} \varphi_{n,t+1,i}^2) \leq c_4^2/n$$

By the matrix Bernstein inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| H_{t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) - H_{n,t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) \right\|_2 \right] \right] \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_4^2 \log d}{n}} + \frac{2c_4 \log d}{n} \quad (43)$$

Using results from (42), (43) and by collecting constants we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}} \left[ d_{\text{BL}} \left( I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})Z, I_{t+1}^{1/2}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t})Z + b_{n,t+1}(\widehat{\Psi}_{0:t}) \right) \right] \right] \leq D_{t+1} n^{-1/2},$$

where  $D_{t+1} > 0$  is a constant that depends on  $\|\theta^*\|_2, c_2, c_4$ , and  $m_1$ .

**Conclusion** Altogether, we have shown

$$|\mathbb{E}[g_n(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t}) - g(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t})]| \leq C_{t+1} n^{-1/6} + D_{t+1} n^{-1/2}$$

for constants  $C_{t+1}, D_{t+1}$  that depend polynomially on  $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4$  as well as on  $d$ . Alongside (37) and (39), this shows that  $\mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \widehat{\Psi}_{n,t+1})] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[f(G_0, \dots, G_{t+1})]$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for any bounded Lipschitz function  $f$ , which implies the desired weak convergence.

### B.1.1 Proof of Proposition 4

In order to quantify the rate of the CLT, we use the following result by Meckes [56] which provides a characterization of Stein's method for random vectors with arbitrary covariance matrices.

**Lemma 3** (Meckes [56, Theorem 3]). *Let  $(W, W')$  be an exchangeable pair of random vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Suppose that there exists  $\lambda > 0$ , a positive semi-definite matrix  $\Sigma$ , a random matrix  $E$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[W' - W|W] &= -\lambda W \\ \mathbb{E}[(W' - W)(W' - W)^\top | W] &= 2\lambda\Sigma + \mathbb{E}[E|W]\end{aligned}$$

Then for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^3$ ,

$$|\mathbb{E}f(W) - \mathbb{E}f(\Sigma^{1/2}Z)| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \left[ \frac{\sqrt{d}}{4} M_2(f) \mathbb{E} \|E\|_{H.S.} + \frac{1}{9} M_3(f) \mathbb{E} \|W' - W\|^3 \right]$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{H.S.}$  is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm.

The rest of the proof is similar to that of Chatterjee and Meckes [17, Theorem 7], with slight modifications due to the fact that we have a non-identity covariance. For simplicity, define  $W = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla \ell_{\theta_n^*}(\mathcal{D}_i^{t+1})$  and  $X_j := \frac{\nabla \ell_{\theta_n^*}(\mathcal{D}_j^{t+1})}{\sqrt{n}}$ . For any index  $j$ , we construct an independent copy  $Y_j$  of  $X_j$ . We construct an exchangeable pair  $(W, W')$  by selecting an random index  $I \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  chosen uniformly and independently from  $W$  and letting

$$W' = W - \frac{X_I}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{Y_I}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

We can observe then that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[W' - W|W] &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[Y_I - X_I|W] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[Y_j - X_j|W] \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} W\end{aligned}$$

by independence of  $Y_j$  and  $W$ . This pair satisfies the first condition of Theorem 3 with  $\lambda = 1/n$ .

It also satisfies the second condition of Theorem 3 with:

$$E_{a,a'} = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n (X_{j,a} X_{j,a'} - (I_{t+1})_{a,a'})$$

by independence of  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$ .

Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} E_{a,a'}^2 &= \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} (\mathbb{E}[X_{j,a} X_{j,a'} - (I_{t+1})_{a,a'} | W])^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} [(X_{j,a} X_{j,a'} - (I_{t+1})_{a,a'})^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^3} \mathbb{E} [(X_{1,a} X_{1,a'})^2 - (I_{t+1})_{a,a'}^2]\end{aligned}$$

This gives us a bound on the Hilbert-Schmidt norm:

$$\mathbb{E} \|E\|_{H.S.} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{a,a'} \mathbb{E} E_{a,a'}^2} \leq \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sqrt{\sum_{a,a'} \mathbb{E} (X_{1,a} X_{1,a'})^2 - (I_{t+1})_{a,a'}^2} \leq \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|X_1\|_2^4}$$

We can further bound  $\mathbb{E} \|X_1\|_2^4$  by a constant  $C_1$  that is polynomial in  $c_3$ .

Finally, we can bound  $\mathbb{E} \|W' - W\|_2^3$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{E} \|W' - W\|_2^3 = \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \mathbb{E} \|Y_I - X_I\|_2^3 \leq \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} 8 \mathbb{E} \|X_1\|_2^3$$

where the final inequality uses independence of  $Y_j$  and  $X_j$  as well as Holder's inequality. We can bound  $\mathbb{E} \|X_1\|_2^3$  by another constant  $C_2$  that is polynomial in  $c_3$ . Plugging these bounds into the statement of Theorem 3, we obtain the stated result.

## B.2 Proof of Proposition 3

Our proof follows that of [70, Lemma 5.2] with modifications because we only assume strong convexity with respect to the set of parameters projected into the range space of  $P_t$ . Given a sampling decision  $p_t$ , for each  $n$ , let

$$A_{j,n} = \{\theta : 2^{j-1} < \sqrt{n} \|P_t(\theta - \theta_n^*)\|_2 \leq 2^j\}, \quad j \geq 1.$$

First, by strong convexity in the projected parameter space (1), we have

$$\inf_{\theta \in A_{j,n}} \mathbb{E}_t[\ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_i^t)] - \mathbb{E}_t[\ell(\theta_n^*|\mathcal{D}_i^t)] \geq \mu \inf_{\theta \in A_{j,n}} \|P_t(\theta - \theta_n^*)\|_2^2 \geq \mu n^{-1} 4^j.$$

Define

$$M(p_t, \theta, \delta) = \sup_{\theta: \|P_t(\theta - \theta_n^*)\|_2 \leq \delta} \sqrt{n} \left| \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_i^t) - \mathbb{E}_t[\ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_i^t)] \right) - \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta_n^*|\mathcal{D}_i^t) - \mathbb{E}_t[\ell(\theta_n^*|\mathcal{D}_i^t)] \right) \right|,$$

and let  $\delta_j = 2^j n^{-1/2}$ . Since  $\hat{\theta}_{n,t}$  minimizes the empirical loss  $L_n(\theta|\mathcal{D}_t) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_i^t)$  (18) by Assumption (4), then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t[\sqrt{n} \|P_t(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} - \theta_n^*)\|_2]^p &\leq \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{jp} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} \in A_{j,n}) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{jp} \mathbb{P} \left( \inf_{\theta \in A_{j,n}} L_n(\theta|\mathcal{D}_t) - L_n(\theta_n^*|\mathcal{D}_t) \leq 0 \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{jp} \mathbb{P} \left( \inf_{\theta \in A_{j,n}} \mathbb{E}_t[\ell(\theta|\mathcal{D}_i^t)] - \mathbb{E}_t[\ell(\theta_n^*|\mathcal{D}_i^t)] - \inf_{\theta \in A_{j,n}} L_n(\theta|\mathcal{D}_t) + L_n(\theta_n^*|\mathcal{D}_t) \geq \mu n^{-1} 4^j \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{jp} \mathbb{P} \left( M(p_t, \theta, \delta_j) \geq \mu n^{-1/2} 4^j \right). \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

By [70, Lemma A.2], we can bound

$$M(p_t, \theta, \delta) \leq C c_1 \sqrt{d} \delta, \tag{45}$$

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant. Then, by substituting  $\delta_j$  and an application of both Markov's Inequality and (45), we can bound the series (44)

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{jp} \mathbb{P} \left( M(p_t, \theta, \delta_j) \geq \mu n^{-1/2} 4^j \right) \leq \mu^{-p} n^{p/2} \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{-jp} \mathbb{E}[M(p_t, \theta, \delta_j)^p].$$



$$\leq m_1,$$

where  $m_1 > 0$  is a constant that depends polynomially on  $C, c_1, d$ , and  $\mu$ . Therefore, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\|P_t(\hat{\theta}_{n,t} - \theta_n^*)\|_2]^p \leq m_1 n^{-p/2}.$$

## C Derivations for Bayesian adaptive experiment

### C.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Let  $\Gamma_t := n_t H_t I_t^{-1} H_t$ . Then, We can simplify the Bayesian posterior update for the mean as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Sigma_{t+1}(\Sigma_t^{-1}\beta_t + \Gamma_t\beta_t - \Gamma_t\beta_t + \Gamma_t\hat{\beta}_t) \\ &= \beta_t + \Sigma_{t+1}\Gamma_t(\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_t) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the posterior predictive distribution of  $\hat{\beta}_t \sim N(\beta^*, \Gamma_t^{-1})$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_t &= \beta^* + s\Gamma_t^{-1/2}Z_1 \\ &= (\beta_t + \Sigma_t^{1/2}Z_2) + s\Gamma_t^{-1/2}Z_1 \end{aligned}$$

where  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  are independent  $N(0, I_d)$  random vectors. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}\left(\Gamma_t(\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_t)\right) &= \text{Var}\left(\Gamma_t(\Sigma_t^{1/2}Z_2 + s\Gamma_t^{-1/2}Z_1)\right) \\ &= (\Gamma_t\Sigma_t\Gamma_t) + \Gamma_t(n_t^{-1}\Gamma_t^{-1})\Gamma_t \\ &= (\Gamma_t\Sigma_t\Gamma_t) + \Gamma_t \end{aligned}$$

To compute  $\text{Var}\left(\Sigma_{t+1}\Gamma_t(\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_t)\right)$ , we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}\left(\Sigma_{t+1}\Gamma_t(\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_t)\right) &= \Sigma_{t+1}((\Gamma_t\Sigma_t\Gamma_t) + \Gamma_t)\Sigma_{t+1} \\ &= \Sigma_{t+1}(\Gamma_t\Sigma_t + I)\Gamma_t\Sigma_{t+1} \end{aligned}$$

We use the identity  $(A + B)^{-1} = A^{-1} - (A + AB^{-1}A)^{-1}$ , taking  $A = \Gamma_t$  and  $B = \Sigma_t^{-1}$  and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{t+1} &= \Gamma_t^{-1} - [(\Gamma_t\Sigma_t\Gamma_t) + \Gamma_t]^{-1} \\ &= A^{-1} - [(AB^{-1} + I)A]^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

Further simplifying, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Sigma_{t+1}((\Gamma_t\Sigma_t\Gamma_t) + \Gamma_t)\Sigma_{t+1} \\ &= \left(A^{-1} - [(AB^{-1} + I)A]^{-1}\right)((AB^{-1} + I)A)\left(A^{-1} - [(AB^{-1} + I)A]^{-1}\right) \\ &= \left(A^{-1} - [(AB^{-1} + I)A]^{-1}\right)((AB^{-1} + I) - I) \\ &= \left(A^{-1} - [(AB^{-1} + I)A]^{-1}\right)AB^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \Sigma_{t+1} \Gamma_t \Sigma_t$$

Finally, we can observe that  $\Sigma_{t+1} \Gamma_t \Sigma_t$  is equal to  $\Sigma_t - \Sigma_{t+1}$ . Since,  $\Sigma_{t+1} \Gamma_t (\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_t)$  is a mean-zero Gaussian random vector, it can be expressed as  $\text{Var} \left( \Sigma_{t+1} \Gamma_t (\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_t) \right)^{1/2} Z$ . So altogether the posterior update can be expressed as

$$(\Sigma_t - \Sigma_{t+1})^{1/2} Z_t$$

## C.2 Proof of Corollary 1

Note that the posterior state (28) transitions are continuous functions of previous states  $(\beta_{n,t}, \Sigma_{n,t})$ ,  $\hat{\Psi}_{n,t}$ ,  $\hat{H}_{n,t}$  and  $\hat{I}_{n,t}$ . Therefore, they are continuous functions of  $\hat{\Psi}_{n,0}, \dots, \hat{\Psi}_{n,T-1}$  and  $\hat{H}_{n,0}, \hat{I}_{n,0}, \dots, \hat{H}_{n,t}, \hat{I}_{n,t}$ . As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the above quantities converge in distribution to  $G_0, \dots, G_{T-1}$  and  $H_0 I_0^\dagger H_0, \dots, H_{T-1} I_{T-1}^\dagger H_{T-1}$ . The continuous mapping theorem implies that

$$(\beta_{n,0}, \Sigma_{n,0}, \dots, \beta_{n,T-1}, \Sigma_{n,T-1}) \xrightarrow{d} (\beta_0, \Sigma_0, \dots, \beta_{T-1}, \Sigma_{T-1})$$

## C.3 Proof of Corollary 2

Since  $c_s$  are continuous functions of  $(\beta_{n,t}, \Sigma_{n,t})$ , by the continuous mapping theorem  $c_s(\pi_s, \beta_{n,s}, \Sigma_{n,s}) \xrightarrow{d} c_s(\pi_s, \beta_s, \Sigma_s)$ . Note that almost surely, we have that  $\|\Sigma_{n,s}\|_2 \leq \|\Sigma_0\|_2$  and  $\|\beta_{n,s}\| \leq \|\beta_0\|_2 + \sum_{t=1}^T \|\hat{\Psi}_{n,t}\|_2$ . Note that by definition of  $\Psi_{n,t}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\Psi}_{n,t}\|_2^2] \leq c_4 \theta^* < \infty$  has a uniformly bounded second moment across  $n$ . Thus,  $\beta_{n,t}$  and  $\Sigma_{n,t}$  and  $c$  are uniformly integrable and by dominated convergence theorem, the expectation of  $c_s$  converge.

## C.4 Proof of Theorem 1

First observe that when at  $T$  and  $T-1$ , the static policy and RHO coincide so  $V_t^{\text{RHO}}(\beta_t, \Sigma_t) = \max_p V_t^p(\beta_t, \Sigma_t)$  for any budget  $B_t$ . Next, as an induction hypothesis, suppose for all  $(\beta_{t+1}, \Sigma_{t+1}, B_{t+1})$ ,

$$V_{t+1}^{\text{RHO}}(\beta_{t+1}, \Sigma_{t+1}, B_{t+1}) \leq \min_{p_{t+1:T}} \left\{ V_{t+1}^{p_{t+1:T}}(\beta_{t+1}, \Sigma_{t+1}) \mid \sum_{s=t+1}^T g_s(p_s) \leq B_{t+1} \right\}.$$

For the purpose of clarity, we will explicitly denote  $B_t$  as part of the state. Then for any  $(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^{\text{RHO}}(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t) &= c_t(\rho_t^* | \beta_t, \Sigma_t) + \mathbb{E}_t[V_{t+1}^{\text{RHO}}(\beta_{t+1}, \Sigma_{t+1}, B_t - g_t(\rho_t^*))] \\ &\leq c_t(\rho_t^* | \beta_t, \Sigma_t) + \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \min_{p_{t+1:T}} \left\{ V_{t+1}^{p_{t+1:T}}(\beta_{t+1}, \Sigma_{t+1}, B_t - g_t(\rho_t^*)) \mid \sum_{s=t+1}^T g_s(p_s) \leq B_t - g_t(\rho_t^*) \right\} \right] \\ &\leq c_t(\rho_t^* | \beta_t, \Sigma_t) \\ &\quad + \min_{p_{t:T}} \mathbb{E}_t \left\{ [V_{t+1}^{p_{t+1:T}}(\beta_{t+1}, \Sigma_{t+1}, B_t - g_t(\rho_t^*))] \mid \sum_{s=t+1}^T g_s(p_s) \leq B_t - g_t(\rho_t^*) \right\} \\ &= \min_{p_{t:T}} \left\{ c_t(p_t | \beta_t, \Sigma_t) + \mathbb{E}_t[V_{t+1}^{p_{t+1:T}}(\beta_{t+1}, \Sigma_{t+1}, B_t - g_t(\rho_t^*))] \mid \sum_{s=t}^T g_s(p_s) \leq B_t \right\} \\ &= \max_{p_{t:T}} \left\{ V_t^{p_{t:T}}(\beta_t, \Sigma_t, B_t) \mid \sum_{s=t}^T g_s(p_s) \leq B_t \right\} \end{aligned}$$

using the definition for the policy  $\rho_t^*$ .