



Abstract

①

We study standard online learning algorithms when the feedback is **delayed by an adversary**. We obtain:

- ▶ $O(\sqrt{D})$ regret bounds for online-gradient-descent, and
- ▶ $O(\sqrt{D})$ regret bounds for follow-the-perturbed-leader,

where D is the sum of delays. These bounds collapse to optimal $O(\sqrt{T})$ in the undelayed settings and the algorithms are essentially unmodified.

Delayed Feedback Model

④

- ▶ $d_t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ denotes a non-negative **delay**. Feedback from round t is delivered at the end of round $t + d_t - 1$ and can be used in round $t + d_t$.
- ▶ $\mathcal{F}_t = \{u \in [T] : u + d_u - 1 = t\}$ denotes the set of rounds whose feedback appears at the end of round t .
- ▶ $D = \sum_{t=1}^T d_t$ denotes the sum of all delays. In the standard setting with no delays, $D = T$.

Online Learning

②

Each round $t = 1, \dots, T$, we pick $x_t \in K$ and adversary picks cost function f_t . We incur the **loss** $f_t(x_t)$. The **regret** of our strategy is the difference between our total loss and the total loss of the best fixed point in hindsight:

$$R(T) = \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - \arg \min_{x \in K} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x).$$

The goal is to minimize the regret $R(T)$.

online-gradient-descent

⑤

Convex setting:

Convex domain K , convex loss functions $\{f_t : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$

Undelayed algorithm and regret bound:

[Zinkevich, 2003]

$$x_{t+1} = \pi_K \left(x_t - \Theta \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \right) f'(x_t) \right),$$

where π_K projects to nearest point in K .

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) \leq \arg \min_{x \in K} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x) + O(\sqrt{T}).$$

Delayed algorithm:

$$x_{t+1} = \pi_K \left(x_t - \Theta \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{D}} \right) \sum_{s \in \mathcal{F}_t} f'(x_s) \right)$$

(!) Same as undelayed algorithm when $\mathcal{F}_t = \{t\}$

Delayed regret bound:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) \leq \arg \min_{x \in K} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x) + O(\sqrt{D})$$

(!) Matches undelayed regret bound when $D = T$

follow-the-perturbed-leader

⑥

Discrete setting:

Discrete domain K , cost vectors $\{c_t \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$

Undelayed algorithm and regret bound:

[Kalai and Vempala, 2005]

$$x_{t+1} = \arg \min_{x \in K} c_0 \cdot x + \sum_{s=1}^t c_s \cdot x,$$

where $c_0 \sim [0, \Theta(\sqrt{T})]^n$ uniformly at random.

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{t=1}^T c_t \cdot x_t \leq \arg \min_{x \in K} \sum_{t=1}^T c_t \cdot x + O(\sqrt{T})$$

Delayed algorithm:

$$x_{t+1} = \arg \min_{x \in K} c_0 \cdot x + \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{r \in \mathcal{F}_s} c_r \cdot x$$

where $c_0 \sim [0, \Theta(\sqrt{D})]^n$ uniformly at random.

(!) Same as undelayed algorithm when $\mathcal{F}_t = \{t\}$

Delayed regret bound:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T c_t \cdot x_t \leq \arg \min_{x \in K} \sum_{t=1}^T c_t \cdot x + O(\sqrt{D})$$

(!) Matches undelayed regret bound when $D = T$

Motivation

③

Standard models assume that the adversary gives us the loss function f_t *before* we select the next point x_{t+1} . What if the feedback is delayed? For example:

- ▶ Online advertising algorithms serve many ads simultaneously.
- ▶ Online algorithms planning resource allocation in the cloud cannot wait for one batch job to end before launching the next.
- ▶ Online learning algorithms managing financial portfolios are subject to information and transaction delays from the market.
- ▶ Distributed and parallelized optimization algorithms suffer communication delays between asynchronous processors.

Extensions

⑦

- ▶ $O(\sqrt{D})$ regret bound for online-mirror-descent, a generalization of online-gradient-descent and randomized expert selection by exponential weights.
- ▶ $O(\sqrt{D})$ regret bound for follow-the-lazy-leader, a variation of follow-the-perturbed-leader for switching costs.

Selected References

⑧

- A. Kalai and S. Vempala. Efficient algorithms for online decision problems. **J. Comput. Sys. Sci.**, 71:291–307, 2005. Extended abstract in Proc. 16th Ann. Conf. Comp. Learning Theory (COLT), 2003.
- M. Zinkevich. Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent. In **Proc. 20th Int. Conf. Mach. Learning (ICML)**, pages 928–936, 2003.