

A Tale of Two Metrics: Simultaneous Bounds on Competitiveness and Regret

Lachlan L. H. Andrew [*] landrew@swin.edu.au	Siddharth Barman [†] barman@caltech.edu	Katrina Ligett [‡] katrina@caltech.edu
Minghong Lin [†] mhl@caltech.edu	Adam Meyerson [‡] awmeyerson@gmail.com	Alan Roytman [§] alan.roytman@cs.tau.ac.il
Adam Wierman [†] adamw@caltech.edu		

Abstract

We consider algorithms for “smoothed online convex optimization” problems, a variant of the class of online convex optimization problems that is strongly related to metrical task systems. Prior literature on these problems has focused on two performance metrics: regret and the competitive ratio. There exist known algorithms with sublinear regret and known algorithms with constant competitive ratios; however, no known algorithm achieves both simultaneously. We show that this is due to a fundamental incompatibility between these two metrics – no algorithm (deterministic or randomized) can achieve sublinear regret and a constant competitive ratio, even in the case when the objective functions are linear. However, we also exhibit an algorithm that, for the important special case of one-dimensional decision spaces, provides sublinear regret while maintaining a competitive ratio that grows arbitrarily slowly.

1 Introduction

In an *online convex optimization* (OCO) problem, a learner interacts with an environment in a sequence of rounds. During each round t : (i) the learner must choose an action x^t from a convex decision space F ; (ii) the environment then reveals a convex cost function c^t , and (iii) the learner experiences cost $c^t(x^t)$. The goal is to design learning algorithms that minimize the cost experienced over a (long) horizon of T rounds.

In this paper, we study a generalization of online convex optimization that we term *smoothed online convex optimization* (SOCO). The only change in SOCO compared to OCO is that the cost experienced by the learner each round is now $c^t(x^t) + \|x^t - x^{t-1}\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is a seminorm.¹ That is, the learner experiences a “smoothing cost” or “switching cost” associated with changing the action, in addition to the “operating cost” $c(\cdot)$.

Many applications typically modeled using online convex optimization have, in reality, some cost associated with a change of action. For example, switching costs in the k -armed bandit setting have received considerable attention [2, 13]. Additionally, a strong motivation for studying

^{*}Swinburne University of Technology

[†]California Institute of Technology

[‡]Google, Inc.

[§]Tel-Aviv University

¹Recall that a seminorm satisfies the axioms of a norm except that $\|x\| = 0$ does not imply $x = 0$.

SOCO comes from the recent developments in dynamic capacity provisioning algorithms for data centers [18–20, 22, 24–26], where the goal is to dynamically control the number and placement of active servers (x^t) in order to minimize a combination of the delay and energy costs (captured by c^t) and the switching costs involved in cycling servers into power saving modes and migrating data ($\|x^t - x^{t-1}\|$). Further, SOCO has applications even in contexts where there are no costs associated with switching actions. For example, if there is concept drift in a penalized estimation problem, it is natural to make use of a regularizer (switching cost) term in order to control the speed of the drift of the estimator.

Two communities, two performance metrics. Though the precise formulation of SOCO does not appear to have been studied previously, there are two large bodies of literature on closely related problems: (i) the online convex optimization (OCO) literature within the machine learning community, e.g., [15, 27], and (ii) the metrical task system (MTS) literature within the algorithms community, e.g., [8, 23]. We discuss these literatures in detail in Section 3. While there are several differences between the formulations in the two communities, a notable difference is that they focus on different performance metrics.

In the OCO literature, the goal is typically to minimize the *regret*, which is the difference between the cost of the algorithm and the cost of the offline optimal static solution. In this context, a number of algorithms have been shown to provide sublinear regret (also called “no regret”). For example, online gradient descent can achieve $O(\sqrt{T})$ -regret [27]. Though such guarantees are proven only in the absence of switching costs, we show in Section 3.1 that the same regret bound also holds for SOCO.

In the MTS literature, the goal is typically to minimize the *competitive ratio*, which is the maximum ratio between the cost of the algorithm and the cost of the offline optimal (dynamic) solution. In this setting, most results tend to be “negative,” e.g., when c^t are arbitrary, for any metric space the competitive ratio of an MTS algorithm with states chosen from that space grows without bound as the number of states grows [6, 8]. However, these results still yield competitive ratios that do not increase with the number of tasks, i.e., with time. Throughout, we neglect dependence of the competitive ratio on the number of states, and describe the competitive ratio as “constant” if it does not grow with time. Note also that positive results have emerged when the cost function and decision space are convex [20].

Interestingly, the focus on different performance metrics in the OCO and MTS communities has led the communities to develop quite different styles of algorithms. The differences between the algorithms is highlighted by the fact that *all algorithms developed in the OCO community have poor competitive ratio and all algorithms developed in the MTS community have poor regret*.

However, it is natural to seek algorithms with both low regret and low competitive ratio. In learning theory, doing well for both corresponds to being able to learn both static and dynamic concepts well. In the design of a dynamic controller, low regret shows that the control is not more risky than static control, whereas low competitive ratio shows that the control is nearly as good as the best dynamic controller.

The first to connect the two metrics were [3], who treated the special case where the switching costs are a fixed constant, instead of a norm. In this context, they showed how to translate bounds on regret to bounds on the competitive ratio, and vice versa. A recent breakthrough was made by [9] who used a primal-dual approach to develop an algorithm that performs well for the “ α -unfair competitive ratio,” which is a hybrid of the competitive ratio and regret that provides comparison to the dynamic optimal when $\alpha = 1$ and to the static optimal when $\alpha = \infty$ (see Section 2). Their algorithm was not shown to perform well *simultaneously* for regret and the competitive ratio, but

the result highlights the feasibility of unified approaches for algorithm design across competitive ratio and regret.²

Summary of contributions. This paper explores the relationship between minimizing regret and minimizing the competitive ratio. To this end, we seek to answer the following question: “Can an algorithm simultaneously achieve both a constant competitive ratio and a sublinear regret?”

To answer this question, we show that *there is a fundamental incompatibility between regret and competitive ratio* — no algorithm can maintain both sublinear regret and a constant competitive ratio (Theorems 2, 3, and 4). This “incompatibility” does not stem from a pathological example: it holds even for the simple case when c^t is linear and x^t is scalar. Further, it holds for both deterministic and randomized algorithms and also when the α -unfair competitive ratio is considered.

Though providing both sublinear regret and a constant competitive ratio is impossible, we show that it is possible to “nearly” achieve this goal. We present an algorithm, “*Randomly Biased Greedy*” (RBG), which achieves a competitive ratio of $(1 + \gamma)$ while maintaining $O(\max\{T/\gamma, \gamma\})$ regret for $\gamma \geq 1$ on one-dimensional action spaces. If γ can be chosen as a function of T , then this algorithm can balance between regret and the competitive ratio. For example, it can achieve sublinear regret while having an arbitrarily slowly growing competitive ratio, or it can achieve $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret while maintaining an $O(\sqrt{T})$ competitive ratio. Note that, unlike the scheme of [9], this algorithm has a finite competitive ratio on continuous action spaces and provides a *simultaneous* guarantee on both regret and the competitive ratio.

2 Problem Formulation

An instance of smoothed online convex optimization (SOCO) consists of a convex decision/action space $F \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^+)^n$ and a sequence of cost functions $\{c^1, c^2, \dots\}$, where each $c^t : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. At each time t , a learner/algorithm chooses an action vector $x^t \in F$ and the environment chooses a cost function c^t . Define the α -penalized cost with lookahead i for the sequence $\dots, x^t, c^t, x^{t+1}, c^{t+1}, \dots$ to be

$$C_i^\alpha(A, T) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T c^t(x^{t+i}) + \alpha \|x^{t+i} - x^{t+i-1}\| \right],$$

where x^1, \dots, x^T are the decisions of algorithm A , the initial action is $x^i = 0$ without loss of generality, the expectation is over randomness in the algorithm, and $\|\cdot\|$ is a seminorm on \mathbb{R}^n . We usually suppress the parameter T .

In the OCO and MTS literatures the learners pay different special cases of this cost. In OCO the algorithm “plays first” giving a 0-step lookahead and switching costs are ignored, yielding C_0^0 . In MTS the environment plays first giving the algorithm 1-step lookahead ($i = 1$), and uses $\alpha = 1$, yielding C_1^1 . Note that we sometimes omit the superscript when $\alpha = 1$, and the subscript when $i = 0$.

One can relate the MTS and OCO costs by relating C_i^α to C_{i-1}^α , as done by [3] and [9]. The penalty due to not having lookahead is

$$c^t(x^t) - c^t(x^{t+1}) \leq \nabla c^t(x^t)(x^t - x^{t+1}) \leq \|\nabla c^t(x^t)\|_2 \cdot \|x^t - x^{t+1}\|_2, \quad (1)$$

²There is also work on achieving simultaneous guarantees with respect to the static and dynamic optima in other settings, e.g., decision making on lists and trees [5], and there have been applications of algorithmic approaches from machine learning to MTS [1, 4].

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the Euclidean norm. We adopt the assumption, common in the OCO literature, that $\|\nabla c^t(\cdot)\|_2$ are bounded on a given instance; which thus bounds the difference between the costs of MTS and OCO (with switching cost), C_1 and C_0 .

Performance metrics. The performance of a SOCO algorithm is typically evaluated by comparing its cost to that of an offline “optimal” solution, but the communities differ in their choice of benchmark, and whether to compare additively or multiplicatively.

The OCO literature typically compares against the optimal offline *static* action, i.e.,

$$OPT_s = \min_{x \in F} \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(x),$$

and evaluates the **regret**, defined as the (additive) difference between the algorithm’s cost and that of the optimal static action vector. Specifically, the regret $R_i(A)$ of Algorithm A with lookahead i on instances \mathfrak{C} , is less than $\rho(T)$ if for any sequence of cost functions $(c^1, \dots, c^T) \in \mathfrak{C}^T$,

$$C_i^0(A) - OPT_s \leq \rho(T). \quad (2)$$

Note that for any problem and any $i \geq 1$ there exists an algorithm A for which $R_i(A)$ is non-positive; however, an algorithm that is not designed specifically to minimize regret may have $R_i(A) > 0$.

This traditional definition of regret omits switching costs and lookahead (i.e., $R_0(A)$). One can generalize regret to define $R'_i(A)$, by replacing $C_i^0(A)$ with $C_i^1(A)$ in Equation (2). Specifically, $R'_i(A)$ is less than $\rho(T)$ if for any sequence of cost functions $(c^1, \dots, c^T) \in \mathfrak{C}^T$,

$$C_i^1(A) - OPT_s \leq \rho(T).$$

Except where noted, we use the set \mathfrak{C}^1 of sequences of convex functions mapping $(\mathbb{R}^+)^n$ to \mathbb{R}^+ with (sub)gradient uniformly bounded over the sequence. Note that we do not require differentiability; throughout this paper, references to gradients can be read as references to subgradients.

The MTS literature typically compares against the optimal offline (dynamic) solution,

$$OPT_d = \min_{x \in F^T} \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(x^t) + \|x^t - x^{t-1}\|,$$

and evaluates the **competitive ratio**. The cost most commonly considered is C_1 . More generally, we say the competitive ratio with lookahead i , denoted by $CR_i(A)$, is $\rho(T)$ if for any sequence of cost functions $(c^1, \dots, c^T) \in \mathfrak{C}^T$,

$$C_i(A) \leq \rho(T)OPT_d + O(1). \quad (3)$$

Bridging competitiveness and regret. Many hybrid benchmarks have been proposed to bridge static and dynamic comparisons. For example, Adaptive-Regret [16] is the maximum regret over any interval, where the “static” optimum can differ for different intervals, and internal regret [7] compares the online policy against a simple perturbation of that policy. We adopt the static-dynamic hybrid proposed in the most closely related literature [3, 6, 9], the α -**unfair competitive ratio**, which we denote by $CR_i^\alpha(A)$ for lookahead i . For $\alpha \geq 1$, $CR_i^\alpha(A)$ is $\rho(T)$ if Equation (3) holds with OPT_d replaced by

$$OPT_d^\alpha = \min_{x \in F^T} \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(x^t) + \alpha \|x^t - x^{t-1}\|.$$

Specifically, the α -unfair competitive ratio with lookahead i , $CR_i^\alpha(A)$, is $\rho(T)$ if for any sequence of cost functions $(c^1, \dots, c^T) \in \mathfrak{C}^T$,

$$C_i(A) \leq \rho(T)OPT_d^\alpha + O(1).$$

For $\alpha = 1$, OPT_d^α is the dynamic optimum; as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, OPT_d^α approaches the static optimum.

To bridge the additive versus multiplicative comparisons used in the two literatures, we define the **competitive difference**. The α -unfair competitive difference with lookahead i on instances \mathfrak{C} , $CD_i^\alpha(A)$, is $\rho(T)$ if for any sequence of cost functions $(c^1, \dots, c^T) \in \mathfrak{C}^T$,

$$C_i(A) - OPT_d^\alpha \leq \rho(T).$$

This measure allows for a smooth transition between regret (when α is large enough) and an additive version of the competitive ratio when $\alpha = 1$.

3 Background

In the following, we briefly discuss related work on both online convex optimization and metrical task systems, to provide context for the results in the current paper.

3.1 Online Convex Optimization

The OCO problem has a rich history and a wide range of important applications. In computer science, OCO is perhaps most associated with the k -experts problem [17, 21], a discrete-action version of online optimization wherein at each round t the learning algorithm must choose a number between 1 and k , which can be viewed as following the advice of one of k “experts.” However, OCO also has a long history in other areas, such as portfolio management [10, 12].

The identifying features of the OCO formulation are that (i) the typical performance metric considered is regret, (ii) switching costs are not considered, and (iii) the learner must act before the environment reveals the cost function. In our notation, the cost function in the OCO literature is $C^0(A)$ and the performance metric is $R_0(A)$. Following [27] and [15], the typical assumptions are that the decision space F is non-empty, bounded and closed, and that the Euclidean norms of gradients $\|\nabla c^t(\cdot)\|_2$ are also bounded.

In this setting, a number of algorithms have been shown to achieve “no regret,” i.e., sublinear regret, $R_0(A) = o(T)$. An important example is *online gradient descent* (OGD), which is parameterized by learning rates η_t . OGD works as follows.

Algorithm 1 (Online Gradient Descent, OGD). *Select an arbitrary $x^1 \in F$. At time step $t \geq 1$, select $x^{t+1} = P(x^t - \eta_t \nabla c^t(x^t))$, where $P(y) = \arg \min_{x \in F} \|x - y\|_2$ is the projection under the Euclidean norm.*

With appropriate learning rates η_t , OGD achieves sublinear regret for OCO. In particular, the variant of [27] uses $\eta_t = \Theta(1/\sqrt{t})$ and obtains $O(\sqrt{T})$ -regret. Tighter bounds are possible in restricted settings. The work of [15] achieved $O(\log T)$ regret by choosing $\eta_t = 1/(\gamma t)$ for settings when the cost function additionally is twice differentiable and has minimal curvature, i.e., $\nabla^2 c^t(x) - \gamma I_n$ is positive semidefinite for all x and t , where I_n is the identity matrix of size n . In addition to algorithms based on gradient descent, more recent algorithms such as Online Newton Step and Follow the Approximate Leader [15] also attain $O(\log T)$ -regret bounds for a class of cost functions.

None of the work discussed above considers switching costs. To extend the literature discussed above from OCO to SOCO, we need to track the switching costs incurred by the algorithms. This leads to the following straightforward result, proven in Appendix A.

Proposition 1. *Consider an online gradient descent algorithm A on a finite dimensional space with learning rates such that $\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t = O(\rho_1(T))$. If $R_0(A) = O(\rho_2(T))$, then we have $R'_0(A) = O(\rho_1(T) + \rho_2(T))$.*

Interestingly, the choices of η_t used by the algorithms designed for OCO also turn out to be good choices to control the switching costs of the algorithms. The algorithms of [27] and [15], which use $\eta_t = 1/\sqrt{t}$ and $\eta_t = 1/(\gamma t)$, are still $O(\sqrt{T})$ -regret and $O(\log T)$ -regret respectively when switching costs are considered, since in these cases $\rho_1(T) = O(\rho_2(T))$. Note that a similar result can be obtained for Online Newton Step [15].

Importantly, though the regret of OGD algorithms is sublinear, it can easily be shown that the competitive ratio of these algorithms is unbounded.

3.2 Metrical Task Systems

Like OCO, MTS also has a rich history and a wide range of important applications. Historically, MTS is perhaps most associated with the k -server problem [11]. In this problem, there are k servers, each in some state, and a sequence of requests is incrementally revealed. To serve a request, the system must move one of the servers to the state necessary to serve the request, which incurs a cost that depends on the source and destination states.

The formulation of SOCO in Section 2 is actually, in many ways, a special case of the most general MTS formulation. In general, the MTS formulation differs in that (i) the cost functions c^t are not assumed to be convex, (ii) the decision space is typically assumed to be discrete and is not necessarily embedded in a vector space, and (iii) the switching cost is an arbitrary metric $d(x^t, x^{t-1})$ rather than a seminorm $\|x^t - x^{t-1}\|$. In this context, the cost function studied by MTS is typically C_1 and the performance metric of interest is the competitive ratio, specifically $CR_1(A)$, although the α -unfair competitive ratio CR_1^α also receives attention.

The weakening of the assumptions on the cost functions, and the fact that the competitive ratio uses the dynamic optimum as the benchmark, means that most of the results in the MTS setting are “negative” when compared with those for OCO. In particular, it has been proven that, given an arbitrary metric decision space of size n , any deterministic algorithm must be $\Omega(n)$ -competitive [8]. Further, any randomized algorithm must be $\Omega(\sqrt{\log n / \log \log n})$ -competitive [6].

These results motivate imposing additional structure on the cost functions to attain positive results. For example, it is commonly assumed that the metric is the uniform metric, in which $d(x, y)$ is equal for all $x \neq y$; this assumption was made by [3] in a study of the tradeoff between competitive ratio and regret. For comparison with OCO, an alternative natural restriction is to impose convexity assumptions on the cost function and the decision space, as done in this paper.

Upon restricting c^t to be convex, F to be convex, and $\|\cdot\|$ to be a semi-norm, the MTS formulation becomes quite similar to the SOCO formulation. This restricted class has been the focus of a number of recent papers, and some positive results have emerged. For example, [20] showed that when F is a one-dimensional normed space,³ a deterministic online algorithm called Lazy Capacity Provisioning (LCP) is 3-competitive.

Importantly, though the algorithms described above provide constant competitive ratios, in all cases it is easy to see that the regret of these algorithms is linear.

³We need only consider the absolute value norm, since for every seminorm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R} , $\|x\| = \|1\||x|$.

4 The Incompatibility of Regret and the Competitive Ratio

As noted in the introduction, there is considerable motivation to perform well for regret and competitive ratio simultaneously, see also [3, 6, 7, 9, 16]. None of the algorithms discussed so far achieves this goal. For example, Online Gradient Descent has sublinear regret but its competitive ratio is infinite. Similarly, Lazy Capacity Provisioning is 3-competitive but has linear regret.

This is no accident. We show below that the two goals are fundamentally incompatible: any algorithm that has sublinear regret for OCO necessarily has an infinite competitive ratio for MTS; and any algorithm that has a constant competitive ratio for MTS necessarily has at least linear regret for OCO. Further, our results give lower bounds on the simultaneous guarantees that are possible.

In discussing this “incompatibility,” there are a number of subtleties as a result of the differences in formulation between the OCO literature, where regret is the focus, and the MTS literature, where competitive ratio is the focus. In particular, there are four key differences which are important to highlight: (i) OCO uses lookahead $i = 0$ while MTS uses $i = 1$; (ii) OCO does not consider switching costs ($\alpha = 0$) while MTS does ($\alpha = 1$); (iii) regret uses an additive comparison while the competitive ratio uses a multiplicative comparison; and (iv) regret compares to the static optimal while competitive ratio compares to the dynamic optimal. Note that the first two are intrinsic to the costs, while the latter are intrinsic to the performance metric. The following teases apart which of these differences create incompatibility and which do not. In particular, we prove that (i) and (iv) each create incompatibilities.

Our first result in this section states that there is an incompatibility between regret in the OCO setting and the competitive ratio in the MTS setting, i.e., between the two most commonly studied measures $R_0(A)$ and $CR_1(A)$. Naturally, the incompatibility remains if switching costs are added to regret, i.e., $R'_0(A)$ is considered. Further, the incompatibility remains when the competitive difference is considered, and so both the comparison with the static optimal and the dynamic optimal are additive. In fact, the incompatibility remains even when the α -unfair competitive ratio/difference is considered. Perhaps most surprisingly, the incompatibility remains when there is lookahead, i.e., when C_i and C_{i+1} are considered.

Theorem 2. *Consider an arbitrary seminorm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^n , constants $\gamma > 0$, $\alpha \geq 1$, and $i \in \mathbb{N}$. There is a \mathfrak{C} containing a single sequence of cost functions such that, for all deterministic and randomized algorithms A , either $R_i(A) = \Omega(T)$ or, for large enough T , both $CR_{i+1}^\alpha(A) \geq \gamma$ and $CD_{i+1}^\alpha(A) \geq \gamma T$.*

The incompatibility arises even in “simple” instances; the proof of Theorem 2 uses linear cost functions and a one-dimensional decision space, and the construction of the cost functions does not depend on T or A .

The cost functions used by regret and the competitive ratio in Theorem 2 are “off by one,” motivated by the different settings in OCO and MTS. However, the following shows that parallel results also hold when the cost functions are not “off by one,” i.e., for $R_0(A)$ versus $CR_0^\alpha(A)$ and $R'_1(A)$ versus $CR_1^\alpha(A)$.

Theorem 3. *Consider an arbitrary seminorm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^n , constants $\gamma > 0$ and $\alpha \geq 1$, and a deterministic or randomized online algorithm A . There is a \mathfrak{C} containing two cost functions such that either $R_0(A) = \Omega(T)$ or, for large enough T , both $CR_0^\alpha(A) \geq \gamma$ and $CD_0^\alpha(A) \geq \gamma T$.*

Theorem 4. *Consider an arbitrary norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^n . There is a \mathfrak{C} containing two cost functions such that, for any constants $\gamma > 0$ and $\alpha \geq 1$ and any deterministic or randomized online algorithm A , either $R'_1(A) = \Omega(T)$ or, for large enough T , $CR_1^\alpha(A) \geq \gamma$.*

The impact of these results can be stark. It is impossible for an algorithm to learn static concepts with sublinear regret in the OCO setting, while having a constant competitive ratio for learning dynamic concepts in the MTS setting. More strikingly, in control theory, any dynamic controller that has a constant competitive ratio must have at least linear regret, and so there are cases where it does much worse than the best static controller. Thus, one cannot simultaneously guarantee the dynamic policy is always as good as the best static policy and is nearly as good as the optimal dynamic policy.

Theorem 4 is perhaps the most interesting of these results. Theorem 2 is due to seeking to minimize different cost functions (c^t and c^{t+1}), while Theorem 3 is due to the hardness of attaining a small CR_0^α , i.e., of mimicking the dynamic optimum without 1-step lookahead. In contrast, for Theorem 4, algorithms exist with strong performance guarantees for each measure individually, and the measures are aligned in time. However, Theorem 4 must consider the (nonstandard) notion of regret that includes switching costs (R'), since otherwise the problem is trivial.

4.1 Proofs

We now prove the results above. We use one-dimensional examples; however, these examples can easily be embedded into higher dimensions if desired. We show proofs only for competitive ratio; the proofs for competitive difference are similar.

Let $\bar{\alpha} = \max(1, \|\alpha\|)$. Given $a > 0$ and $b \geq 0$, define two possible cost functions on $F = [0, 1/\bar{\alpha}]$: $f_1^\alpha(x) = b + ax\bar{\alpha}$ and $f_2^\alpha(x) = b + a(1 - x\bar{\alpha})$. These functions are similar to those used by [14] to study online gradient descent to learn a concept of bounded total variation. To simplify notation, let $D(t) = 1/2 - \mathbb{E}[x^t] \bar{\alpha}$, and note that $D(t) \in [-1/2, 1/2]$.

4.1.1 Proof of Theorem 2

To prove Theorem 2, we prove the stronger claim that $CR_{i+1}^\alpha(A) + R_i(A)/T \geq \gamma$.

Consider a system with costs $c^t = f_1^\alpha$ if t is odd and f_2^α if t is even. Then $C_i(A) \geq (a/2 + b)T + a \sum_{t=1}^T (-1)^t D(t+i)$. The static optimum is not worse than the scheme that sets $x^t = 1/(2\bar{\alpha})$ for all t , which has total cost no more than $(a/2 + b)T + \|1/2\|$. The α -unfair dynamic optimum for C_{i+1} is not worse than the scheme that sets $x^t = 0$ if t is odd and $x^t = 1/\bar{\alpha}$ if t is even, which has total α -unfair cost at most $(b+1)T$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} R_i(A) &\geq a \sum_{t=1}^T (-1)^t D(t+i) - \|1/2\|, \\ CR_{i+1}^\alpha(A) &\geq \frac{(a/2 + b)T + a \sum_{t=1}^T (-1)^t D(t+i+1)}{(b+1)T}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since $D(t) \in [-1/2, 1/2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (b+1)T(CR_{i+1}^\alpha(A) + R_i(A)/T) &+ (b+1)\|1/2\| - (a/2 + b)T \\ &\geq a \sum_{t=1}^T (-1)^t (D(t+i+1) + (b+1)D(t+i)) \\ &= ab \sum_{t=1}^T (-1)^t D(t+i) - a(D(i+1) + (-1)^T D(T+i+1)) \\ &\geq -abT/2 - a. \end{aligned}$$

To establish the claim, it is then sufficient that $(a/2 + b)T - (b + 1)\|1/2\| - abT/2 - a \geq \gamma T(b + 1)$. For $b = 1/2$ and $a = 30\gamma + 2 + \|6\|$, this holds for $T \geq 5$.

4.1.2 Proof of Theorem 3

To prove Theorem 3, we again prove the stronger claim $CR_0^\alpha(A) + R_0(A)/T \geq \gamma$.

Consider the cost function sequence with $c^t(\cdot) = f_2^0$ for $\mathbb{E}[x^t] \leq 1/2$ and $c^t(\cdot) = f_1^0$ otherwise, on decision space $[0, 1]$, where x^t is the (random) choice of the algorithm at round t . Here the expectation is taken over the marginal distribution of x^t conditioned on c_1, \dots, c_{t-1} , averaging out the dependence on the realizations of x_1, \dots, x_{t-1} . Notice that this sequence can be constructed by an oblivious adversary before the execution of the algorithm.

The following lemma is proven in Appendix B.

Lemma 5. *Given any algorithm, the sequence of cost functions chosen by the above oblivious adversary gives the following:*

$$R_0(A), R'_0(A) \geq a \sum_{t=1}^T |1/2 - \mathbb{E}[x^t]| - \|1/2\|, \quad (4)$$

$$CR_0^\alpha(A) \geq \frac{(a/2 + b)T + a \sum_{t=1}^T |1/2 - \mathbb{E}[x^t]|}{(b + \|\alpha\|)T}. \quad (5)$$

From Equation (4) and Equation (5) in Lemma 5, we have $CR_0^\alpha(A) + R_0(A)/T \geq \frac{(a/2 + b)T}{(b + \|\alpha\|)T} - \frac{\|1/2\|}{T}$. For $a > 2\gamma(b + \|\alpha\|)$, the right hand side is bigger than γ for sufficiently large T , which establishes the claim.

4.1.3 Proof of Theorem 4

Let $a = \|1\|/2$ and $b = 0$. Let $M = 4\alpha\gamma\|1\|/a = 8\alpha\gamma$. For $T \gg M$, divide $[1, T]$ into segments of length $3M$. For the last $2M$ of each segment, set $c^t = f_1^\alpha$. This ensures that the static optimal solution is $x = 0$. Moreover, if c^t is either f_1^α or f_2^α for all t in the first M time steps, then the optimal dynamic solution is also $x^t = 0$ for the last $2M$ time steps.

Consider a solution for which each segment has non-negative regret. Then to obtain sublinear regret, for any positive threshold ϵ , at least $T/(3M) - o(T)$ of these segments must have regret below $\epsilon\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|$. We then show that these segments must have high competitive ratio. To make this more formal, consider (without loss of generality) the single segment $[1, 3M]$.

Let \tilde{c} be such that $\tilde{c}^t = f_2^\alpha$ for all $t \in [1, M]$ and $\tilde{c}^t = f_1^\alpha$ for $t > M$. Then the optimal dynamic solution on $[1, 3M]$ is $x_d^t = \mathbf{1}_{t \leq M}/\bar{\alpha}$, which has total cost $2\alpha\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|$ consisting entirely of switching costs.

The following lemma is proven in Appendix C.

Lemma 6. *For any $\delta \in (0, 1/\bar{\alpha})$ and integer $\tau > 0$, there exists an $\epsilon(\delta, \tau) > 0$ such that, if $c^t = f_2^\alpha$ for all $1 \leq t \leq \tau$ and $x^t > \delta$ for any $1 \leq t \leq \tau$, then there exists an $m \leq \tau$ such that $C_1(x, m) - C_1(OPT_s, m) > \epsilon(\delta, \tau)\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|$.*

Let $\delta = 1/[5\bar{\alpha}] \in (0, 1)$. For any decisions such that $x^t < \delta$ for all $t \in [1, M]$, the operating cost of x under \tilde{c} is at least $3\alpha\gamma\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|$. Let the adversary choose a c on this segment such that $c^t = f_2^\alpha$ until (a) the first time $t_0 < M$ that the algorithm's solution x satisfies $C_1(x, t_0) - C_1(OPT_s, t_0) > \epsilon(\delta, M)\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|$, or (b) $t = M$. After this, it chooses $c^t = f_1^\alpha$.

In case (a), $C_1(x, 3M) - C_1(OPT_s, 3M) > \epsilon(\delta, M)\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|$ by Lemma 6, since OPT_s incurs no cost after t_0 . Moreover $C_1(x, 3M) \geq C_1(OPT_d, 3M)$.

In case (b), $C_1(x, 3M)/C_1(OPT_d, 3M) \geq 3\alpha\gamma\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|/(2\alpha\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|) = 3\gamma/2$.

To complete the argument, consider all segments. Let $g(T)$ be the number of segments for which case (a) occurs. The regret then satisfies

$$R'_1(A) \geq \epsilon(\delta, M)\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|g(T).$$

Similarly, the ratio of the total cost to that of the optimum is at least

$$\frac{C_1(x, T)}{C_1(OPT_d, T)} \geq \frac{[T/(3M) - g(T)]3\alpha\gamma\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|}{[T/(3M)]2\alpha\|1/\bar{\alpha}\|} = \frac{3}{2}\gamma \left(1 - \frac{3Mg(T)}{T}\right).$$

If $g(T) = \Omega(T)$, then $R'_1(A) = \Omega(T)$. Conversely, if $g(T) = o(T)$, then for sufficiently large T , $3Mg(T)/T < 1/3$ and so $CR'_1(A) > \gamma$.

5 Balancing Regret and the Competitive Ratio

Given the above incompatibility, it is necessary to reevaluate the goals for algorithm design. In particular, it is natural now to seek tradeoffs such as being able to obtain ϵT regret for arbitrarily small ϵ while remaining $O(1)$ -competitive, or being $\log \log T$ -competitive while retaining sublinear regret.

To this end, in the following we present a novel algorithm, Randomly Biased Greedy (RBG), which can achieve simultaneous bounds on regret R'_0 and competitive ratio CR_1 , when the decision space F is one-dimensional. The one-dimensional setting is the natural starting point for seeking such a tradeoff given that the proofs of the incompatibility results all focus on one-dimensional examples and that the one-dimensional case has recently been of practical significance, e.g. [20]. The algorithm takes a norm N as its input:

Algorithm 2 (Randomly Biased Greedy, RBG(N)).

Given a norm N , define $w^0(x) = N(x)$ for all x and $w^t(x) = \min_y \{w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y) + N(x - y)\}$. Generate a random number r uniformly in $(-1, 1)$. For each time step t , go to the state x^t which minimizes $Y^t(x^t) = w^{t-1}(x^t) + rN(x^t)$.

RBG is motivated by [11], and makes very limited use of randomness – it parameterizes its “bias” using a single random $r \in (-1, 1)$. It then chooses actions to greedily minimize its “work function” $w^t(x)$.

As stated, RBG performs well for the α -unfair competitive ratio, but performs poorly for the regret. Theorem 7 shows that $\text{RBG}(\|\cdot\|)$ is 2-competitive,⁴ and hence has at best linear regret. However, the key idea behind balancing regret and competitive ratio is to run RBG with a “larger” norm to encourage its actions to change less. This can make the coefficient of regret arbitrarily small, at the expense of a larger (but still constant) competitive ratio.

Theorem 7. *For a SOCO problem in a one-dimensional normed space $\|\cdot\|$, running $\text{RBG}(N)$ with a one-dimensional norm having $N(1) = \theta\|1\|$ as input (where $\theta \geq 1$) attains an α -unfair competitive ratio CR_1^α of $(1 + \theta)/\min\{\theta, \alpha\}$ and a regret R'_0 of $O(\max\{T/\theta, \theta\})$.*

⁴Note that this improves the best known competitive ratio for this setting from 3 (achieved by Lazy Capacity Provisioning) to 2.

Note that Theorem 7 holds for the usual metrics of MTS and OCO, which are the “most incompatible” case since the cost functions are mismatched (cf. Theorem 2). Thus, the conclusion of Theorem 7 still holds when R_0 or R_1 is considered in place of R'_0 .

The best CR_1^α , $1 + 1/\alpha$, achieved by RBG is obtained with $N(\cdot) = \alpha \|\cdot\|$. However, choosing $N(\cdot) = \|\cdot\|/\epsilon$ for arbitrarily small ϵ gives ϵT -regret at the cost of a larger CR_1^α . Similarly, if T is known in advance, choosing $N(1) = \theta(T)$ for some increasing function achieves an $O(\theta(T))$ α -unfair competitive ratio and $O(\max\{T/\theta(T), \theta(T)\})$ regret; taking $\theta(T) = O(\sqrt{T})$ gives $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret, which is optimal for arbitrary convex costs [27]. If T is not known in advance, $N(1)$ can increase in t , and bounds similar to those in Theorem 7 still hold.

Proof of Theorem 7

To prove Theorem 7, we derive a more general tool for designing algorithms that simultaneously balance regret and the α -unfair competitive ratio. In particular, for any algorithm A , let the operating cost be $OC(A) = \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(x^{t+1})$ and the switching cost be $SC(A) = \sum_{t=1}^T \|x^{t+1} - x^t\|$, so that $C_1(A) = OC(A) + SC(A)$. Define OPT_N to be the dynamic optimal solution under the norm $N(1) = \theta\|1\|$ ($\theta \geq 1$) with $\alpha = 1$. The following lemma is proven in Appendix D.

Lemma 8. *Consider a one-dimensional SOCO problem with norm $\|\cdot\|$ and an online algorithm A which, when run with norm N , satisfies $OC(A(N)) \leq OPT_N + O(1)$ along with $SC(A(N)) \leq \beta OPT_N + O(1)$ with $\beta = O(1)$. Fix a norm N such that $N(1) = \theta\|1\|$ with $\theta \geq 1$. Then $A(N)$ has α -unfair competitive ratio $CR_1^\alpha(A(N)) = (1+\beta) \max\{\frac{\theta}{\alpha}, 1\}$ and regret $R'_0(A(N)) = O(\max\{\beta T, (1+\beta)\theta\})$ for the original SOCO problem with norm $\|\cdot\|$.*

Theorem 7 then follows from the following lemmas, proven in Appendices E and F.

Lemma 9. *Given a SOCO problem with norm $\|\cdot\|$, $\mathbb{E}[OC(RBG(N))] \leq OPT_N$.*

Lemma 10. *Given a one-dimensional SOCO problem with norm $\|\cdot\|$, $\mathbb{E}[SC(RBG(N))] \leq OPT_N/\theta$ with probability 1.*

6 Concluding Remarks

This paper studies the relationship between regret and competitive ratio when applied to the class of SOCO problems. It shows that these metrics, from the learning and algorithms communities respectively, are fundamentally incompatible, in the sense that algorithms with sublinear regret must have infinite competitive ratio, and those with constant competitive ratio have at least linear regret. Thus, the choice of performance measure significantly affects the style of algorithm design. It also introduces a generic approach for balancing these competing metrics, exemplified by a specific algorithm, RBG.

There are a number of interesting directions that this work motivates. In particular, the SOCO formulation is still under-explored, and many variations of the formulation discussed here are still not understood. For example, is it possible to tradeoff between regret and the competitive ratio in bandit versions of SOCO? More generally, the message from this paper is that regret and the competitive ratio are incompatible within the formulation of SOCO. It is quite interesting to try to understand how generally this holds. For example, does the “incompatibility result” proven here extend to settings where the cost functions are random instead of adversarial, e.g., variations of SOCO such as k -armed bandit problems with switching costs?

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by NSF grants CNS 0846025 and DoE grant DE-EE0002890, along with the Australian Research Council (ARC) grants FT0991594 and DP130101378. Katrina Ligett gratefully acknowledges the generous support of the Charles Lee Powell Foundation. Alan Roytman was partially supported by NSF grants IIS-1065276, CCF-1016540, CNS-1118126, and CNS-1136174.

References

- [1] Jacob Abernethy, Peter L. Bartlett, Niv Buchbinder, and Isabelle Stanton. A regularization approach to metrical task systems. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, 2010.
- [2] Manjari Asawa and Demosthenis Teneketzis. Multi-armed bandits with switching penalties. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 41(3):328–348, 1996.
- [3] Avrim Blum and Carl Burch. On-line learning and the metrical task system problem. *Machine Learning*, 39(1):35–58, 2000.
- [4] Avrim Blum, Carl Burch, and Adam Kalai. Finely-competitive paging. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 1999.
- [5] Avrim Blum, Suchi Chawla, and Adam Kalai. Static optimality and dynamic search-optimality in lists and trees. In *Proceedings of the 13th annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2002.
- [6] Avrim Blum, Howard Karloff, Yuval Rabani, and Michael Saks. A decomposition theorem and bounds for randomized server problems. In *Proceedings of the 33rd annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 1992.
- [7] Avrim Blum and Yishay Mansour. From external to internal regret. *Learning Theory*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3559:621–636, 2005.
- [8] Allan Borodin, Nathan Linial, and Michael E. Saks. An optimal on-line algorithm for metrical task system. *Journal of the ACM*, 39(4):745–763, 1992.
- [9] Niv Buchbinder, Shahar Chen, Joseph Naor, and Ohad Shamir. Unified algorithms for online learning and competitive analysis. In *Proceedings of the 25th annual Conference on Learning Theory*, 2012.
- [10] Giuseppe Carlo Calafiore. Multi-period portfolio optimization with linear control policies. *Automatica*, 44(10):2463–2473, 2008.
- [11] Aaron Coté, Adam Meyerson, and Laura Poplawski. Randomized k-server on hierarchical binary trees. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2008.
- [12] Thomas M. Cover. Universal portfolios. *Mathematical Finance*, 1(1):1–29, 1991.
- [13] Sudipto Guha and Kamesh Munagala. Multi-armed bandits with metric switching costs. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2009.

- [14] Yonatan Gur, Omar Besbes, and Assaf Zeevi. Non-stationary online stochastic approximation. In *INFORMS general meeting*, 2012.
- [15] Elad Hazan, Amit Agarwal, and Satyen Kale. Logarithmic regret algorithms for online convex optimization. *Machine Learning*, 69(2-3):169–192, 2007.
- [16] Elad Hazan and C. Seshadhri. Efficient learning algorithms for changing environments. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2009.
- [17] Mark Herbster and Manfred K. Warmuth. Tracking the best expert. *Machine Learning*, 32(2):151–178, 1998.
- [18] Dara Kusic and Nagarajan Kandasamy. Risk-aware limited lookahead control for dynamic resource provisioning in enterprise computing systems. *Cluster Computing*, 10(4):395–408, 2007.
- [19] Minghong Lin, Zhenhua Liu, Adam Wierman, and Lachlan L. H. Andrew. Online algorithms for geographical load balancing. In *Proceedings of the International Green Computing Conference*, 2012.
- [20] Minghong Lin, Adam Wierman, Lachlan L. H. Andrew, and Eno Thereska. Dynamic right-sizing for power-proportional data centers. In *Proceedings of the 30th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications*, 2011.
- [21] Nick Littlestone and Manfred K. Warmuth. The weighted majority algorithm. *Information and Computation*, 108(2):212–261, 1994.
- [22] Tan Lu, Minghua Chen, and Lachlan L. H. Andrew. Simple and effective dynamic provisioning for power-proportional data centers. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 24(6):1161–1171, 2012.
- [23] Mark Manasse, Lyle McGeoch, and Daniel Sleator. Competitive algorithms for on-line problems. In *Proceedings of the 20th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 1988.
- [24] Rahul Urgaonkar, Bhuvan Urgaonkar, Michael J. Neely, and Anand Sivasubramaniam. Optimal power cost management using stored energy in data centers. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMETRICS International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems*, 2011.
- [25] Jian Yang, Ke Zeng, Han Hu, and Hongsheng Xi. Dynamic cluster reconfiguration for energy conservation in computation intensive service. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 61(10):1401–1416, 2012.
- [26] Qi Zhang, Mohamed Faten Zhani, Shuo Zhang, Quanyan Zhu, Raouf Boutaba, and Joseph L. Hellerstein. Dynamic energy-aware capacity provisioning for cloud computing environments. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM International Conference on Autonomic Computing*, 2012.
- [27] Martin Zinkevich. Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent. In *Proceedings of the 20th annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2003.

A Proof of Proposition 1

Recall that, by assumption, $\|\nabla c^t(\cdot)\|_2$ is bounded. So, let us define D such that $\|\nabla c^t(\cdot)\|_2 \leq D$. Next, due to the fact that all norms are equivalent in a finite dimensional space, there exist $m, M > 0$ such that for every x , $m\|x\|_a \leq \|x\|_b \leq M\|x\|_a$. Combining these facts, we can bound the switching cost incurred by an OGD algorithm as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \|x^t - x^{t-1}\| &\leq M \sum_{t=1}^T \|x^t - x^{t-1}\|_2 \\ &\leq M \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t \|\nabla c^t(\cdot)\|_2 \\ &\leq MD \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality comes from the fact that projection to a convex set under the Euclidean norm is nonexpansive, i.e., $\|P(x) - P(y)\|_2 \leq \|x - y\|_2$. Thus, the switching cost causes an additional regret of $\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t = O(\rho_1(T))$ for the algorithm, completing the proof.

B Proof of Lemma 5

Recall that the oblivious adversary chooses $c^t(\cdot) = f_2^0$ for $\mathbb{E}[x^t] \leq 1/2$ and $c^t(\cdot) = f_1^0$ otherwise, where x^t is the (random) choice of the algorithm at round t . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} C_0(A) &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \begin{cases} a(1 - x^t) + b & \text{if } \mathbb{E}[x^t] \leq 1/2 \\ ax^t + b & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[bT + a \sum_{t=1}^T (1/2 + (1/2 - x^t) \text{sgn}(1/2 - \mathbb{E}[x^t])) \right] \\ &= bT + a \sum_{t=1}^T (1/2 + (1/2 - \mathbb{E}[x^t]) \text{sgn}(1/2 - \mathbb{E}[x^t])) \\ &= (a/2 + b)T + a \sum_{t=1}^T |1/2 - \mathbb{E}[x^t]|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{sgn}(x) = 1$ if $x > 0$ and -1 otherwise. The static optimum is not worse than the scheme that sets $x^t = 1/2$ for all t , which has total cost $(a/2 + b)T + \|1/2\|$. This establishes Equation (4).

The dynamic scheme which chooses $x^{t+1} = 0$ if $c^t = f_1^0$ and $x^{t+1} = 1$ if $c^t = f_2^0$ has total α -unfair cost not more than $(b + \|\alpha\|)T$. This establishes Equation (5).

C Proof of Lemma 6

Proof. We only consider the case that $\bar{\alpha} = 1$; other cases are analogous. We prove the contrapositive (that if $C_1(x; m) - C_1(OPT_s, m) \leq \epsilon\|1\|$ for all m , then $x^t \leq \delta$ for all $t \in [1, \tau]$). We consider the case that x^t are non-decreasing; if not, the switching and operating cost can both be reduced by setting $(x^t)' = \max_{t' \leq t} x^{t'}$.

Note that OPT_s sets $x^t = 0$ for all t , which implies $C_1(OPT_s, m) = am$, and that

$$C_1(x; m) = x^m \|1\| - a \sum_{i=1}^m x^i + am.$$

Thus, we want to show that if $x^m \|1\| - a \sum_{i=1}^m x^i \leq \epsilon$ for all $m \leq \tau$, then $x^t < \delta$ for all $t \in [1, \tau]$.

Define $f_i(\cdot)$ inductively by $f_1(y) = 1/(1-y)$, and

$$f_i(y) = \frac{1}{1-y} \left(1 + y \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} f_j(y) \right).$$

If $y < 1$, then $\{f_i(y)\}$ are increasing in i . Notice that $\{f_i\}$ satisfy

$$f_m(y)(1-y) - y \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} f_i(y) = 1.$$

Expanding the first term gives that for any $\hat{\epsilon}$,

$$\hat{\epsilon} f_m(a/\|1\|) - \frac{a}{\|1\|} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{\epsilon} f_i(a/\|1\|) = \hat{\epsilon}.$$

If for some $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$,

$$x^m - \frac{a}{\|1\|} \sum_{j=1}^m x^j \leq \hat{\epsilon} \tag{6}$$

for all $m \leq \tau$, then by induction $x^i \leq \hat{\epsilon} f_i(a/\|1\|) \leq \hat{\epsilon} f_\tau(a/\|1\|)$ for all $i \leq \tau$, where the last inequality uses the fact that $a < \|1\|$ and hence $\{f_i(a/\|1\|)\}$ are increasing in i .

Observe that the left hand side of Equation (6) is $(C_1(x; m) - C_1(OPT_s, m))/\|1\|$. Define $\epsilon = \hat{\epsilon} = \delta/(2f_\tau(a/\|1\|))$. Assuming we have $(C_1(x; m) - C_1(OPT_s, m)) \leq \epsilon \|1\|$ for all m , then Equation (6) holds for all m , and thus $x^t \leq \hat{\epsilon} f_\tau(a/\|1\|) = \delta/2 < \delta$ for all $t \in [1, \tau]$. \square

D Proof of Lemma 8

We first prove the α -unfair competitive ratio result. Let $\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \dots, \hat{x}^T$ denote the actions chosen by algorithm ALG when running on a normed space with $N = \|\cdot\|_{ALG}$ as input. Let $\hat{y}^1, \hat{y}^2, \dots, \hat{y}^T$ be the actions chosen by the optimal dynamic offline algorithm, which pays α times more for switching costs, on a normed space with $\|\cdot\|$ (i.e., OPT_d^α). Similarly, let $\hat{z}^1, \hat{z}^2, \dots, \hat{z}^T$ be the actions chosen by the optimal solution on a normed space with $\|\cdot\|_{ALG}$, namely $OPT_{\|\cdot\|_{ALG}}$ (without an unfairness cost). Recall that we have $C_1(ALG) = \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}) + \|\hat{x}^{t+1} - \hat{x}^t\|$, $OPT_d^\alpha = \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(\hat{y}^t) + \alpha \|\hat{y}^t - \hat{y}^{t-1}\|$, and $OPT_{\|\cdot\|_{ALG}} = \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(\hat{z}^t) + \|\hat{z}^t - \hat{z}^{t-1}\|_{ALG}$. By the assumptions in our lemma, we know that $C_1(ALG) \leq (1 + \beta) OPT_{\|\cdot\|_{ALG}} + O(1)$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} OPT_d^\alpha &= \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(\hat{y}^t) + \alpha \|\hat{y}^t - \hat{y}^{t-1}\| \\ &\geq \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(\hat{y}^t) + \frac{\alpha}{\theta} \|\hat{y}^t - \hat{y}^{t-1}\|_{ALG} \geq \frac{OPT_{\|\cdot\|_{ALG}}}{\max\{1, \frac{\theta}{\alpha}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds since $\|\cdot\|_{ALG} = \theta\|\cdot\|$ with $\theta \geq 1$. Therefore, $C_1(ALG) \leq (1 + \beta) \max\{1, \frac{\theta}{\alpha}\} OPT_d^\alpha$.

We now prove the regret bound. Let d_{\max} denote the diameter of the decision space (i.e., the length of the interval). Recall that $C_0(ALG) = \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(\hat{x}^t) + \|\hat{x}^t - \hat{x}^{t-1}\|$ and $OPT_s = \min_x \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(x)$. Then we know that $C_0(ALG) \leq C_1(ALG) + D \sum_{t=1}^T \|x^{t+1} - x^t\| + \|d_{\max}\|$ for some constant D by Equation (1). Based on our assumptions, we have $\sum_{t=1}^T c^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}) \leq OPT_{\|\cdot\|_{ALG}} + O(1)$ and $\sum_{t=1}^T \|\hat{x}^{t+1} - \hat{x}^t\| \leq \beta OPT_{\|\cdot\|_{ALG}} + O(1)$. For convenience, we let $E = D + 1 = O(1)$. Then $C_0(ALG)$ is at most:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T c^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}) + E\|\hat{x}^{t+1} - \hat{x}^t\| + \|d_{\max}\| + O(1) &\leq (1 + E\beta)OPT_{\|\cdot\|_{ALG}} + \|d_{\max}\| + O(1) \\ &\leq (1 + E\beta)(OPT_s + \|d_{\max}\|_{ALG}) + \|d_{\max}\| + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get that the regret $C_0(ALG) - OPT_s$ is at most

$$E\beta OPT_s + \|d_{\max}\|(1 + E(1 + \beta)\theta) + O(1) = O(\beta OPT_s + (1 + \beta)\theta) = O(\max\{\beta OPT_s, (1 + \beta)\theta\}).$$

In the OCO setting, the cost functions $c^t(x)$ are bounded from below by 0 and are typically bounded from above by a value independent of T (e.g., [17, 21]), so that $OPT_s = O(T)$. This immediately gives the result that the regret is at most $O(\max\{\beta T, (1 + \beta)\theta\})$.

E Proof of Lemma 9

In this section, we argue that the expected operating cost of RBG (when evaluated under $\|\cdot\|$) with input norm $N(\cdot) = \theta\|\cdot\|$, $\theta \geq 1$, is at most the cost of the optimal dynamic offline algorithm under norm N (i.e., OPT_N). Let M denote our decision space. Before proving this result, let us introduce a useful lemma. Let $\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \dots, \hat{x}^{T+1}$ denote the actions chosen by RBG (similarly, let $x_{OPT}^1, \dots, x_{OPT}^{T+1}$ denote the actions chosen by OPT_N).

Lemma 11. $w^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}) = w^{t-1}(\hat{x}^{t+1}) + c^t(\hat{x}^{t+1})$.

Proof. We know that for any state $x \in M$, we have $w^t(x) = \min_{y \in M} \{w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y) + \theta\|x - y\|\}$. Suppose instead $w^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}) = w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y) + \theta\|\hat{x}^{t+1} - y\|$ for some $y \neq \hat{x}^{t+1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{t+1}(\hat{x}^{t+1}) &= w^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}) + \theta r \|\hat{x}^{t+1}\| \\ &= w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y) + \theta\|\hat{x}^{t+1} - y\| + \theta r \|\hat{x}^{t+1}\| \\ &> w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y) + \theta r \|y\| \\ &= Y^{t+1}(y), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts $\hat{x}^{t+1} = \arg \min_{y \in M} Y^{t+1}(y)$. Therefore $w^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}) = w^{t-1}(\hat{x}^{t+1}) + c^t(\hat{x}^{t+1})$. \square

Now let us prove the expected operating cost of RBG is at most the total cost of the optimal solution, OPT_N :

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{t+1}(\hat{x}^{t+1}) - Y^t(\hat{x}^t) &\geq Y^{t+1}(\hat{x}^{t+1}) - Y^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}) \\ &= (w^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}) + \theta r \|\hat{x}^{t+1}\|) - (w^{t-1}(\hat{x}^{t+1}) + \theta r \|\hat{x}^{t+1}\|) \\ &= c^t(\hat{x}^{t+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 9 is proven by summing up the above inequality for $t = 1, \dots, T$, since $Y^{T+1}(\hat{x}^{T+1}) \leq Y^{T+1}(x_{OPT}^{T+1})$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y^{T+1}(x_{OPT}^{T+1})] = OPT_N$ by $\mathbb{E}[r] = 0$.

Note that this approach also holds when the decision space $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for $n > 1$.

F Proof of Lemma 10

To prove Lemma 10, we make a detour and consider a version of the problem with a discrete state space. We first show that on such spaces the lemma holds for a discretization of RBG, which we name DRBG. Next, we show that as the discretization becomes finer, the solution (and hence switching cost) of DRBG approaches that of RBG. The lemma is then proven by showing that the optimal cost of the discrete approximation approaches the optimal cost of the continuous problem.

To begin, define a discrete variant of SOCO where the number of states is finite as follows. Actions can be chosen from m states, denoted by the set $M = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, and the distances $\delta = x_{i+1} - x_i$ are the same for all i . Without loss of generality we define $x_1 = 0$. Consider the following algorithm.

Algorithm 3 (Discrete RBG, DRBG(N)).

Given a norm N and discrete states $M = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, define $w^0(x) = N(x)$ and $w^t(x) = \min_{y \in M} \{w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y) + N(x - y)\}$ for all $x \in M$. Generate a random number $r \in (-1, 1)$. For each time step t , go to the state x^t which minimizes $Y^t(x^t) = w^{t-1}(x^t) + rN(x^t)$.

Note that DRBG looks nearly identical to RBG except that the states are discrete. DRBG is introduced only for the proof and need never be implemented; thus we do not need to worry about the computational issues when the number of states m becomes large.

F.1 Bounding the Switching Cost of DRBG

We now argue that the expected switching cost of DRBG (evaluated under the norm $\|\cdot\|$ and run with input norm $N(\cdot) = \theta\|\cdot\|$) is at most the total cost of the optimal solution in the discrete system (under norm N). We first prove a couple of useful lemmas regarding the work function. The first lemma states that if the optimal way to get to some state x at time t is to come to state y in the previous time step, incur the operating cost at state y , and travel from state y to state x , then in fact the optimal way to get to state y at time t is to come to y at the previous time step and incur the operating cost at state y .

Lemma 12. *If $\exists x, y : w^t(x) = w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y) + \theta\|x - y\|$, then $w^t(y) = w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y)$.*

Proof. Suppose towards a contradiction that $w^t(y) < w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y)$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} w^t(y) + \theta\|x - y\| &< w^{t-1}(y) + c^t(y) + \theta\|x - y\| \\ &= w^t(x) \leq w^t(y) + \theta\|x - y\| \end{aligned}$$

(since one way to get to state x at time t is to get to state y at time t and travel from y to x). This is a contradiction, which proves the lemma. \square

The second lemma we show regarding the work function is as follows.

Lemma 13. *Suppose there is some state x for which $w^t(x) = w^{t-1}(x) + c^t(x)$. If $c^t(z) \geq c^t(x)$ for all $z \geq x$, then we have $w^t(z) \geq w^{t-1}(z) + c^t(x)$ for all $z \geq x$ (similarly, if $c^t(z) \leq c^t(x)$ for all $z \leq x$, then we have $w^t(z) \geq w^{t-1}(z) + c^t(x)$ for all $z \leq x$).*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that the entries in the cost vector satisfy $c^t(z) \geq c^t(x)$ for all $z \geq x$. Let z be any state such that $z > x$, and assume towards a contradiction that

$w^t(z) < w^{t-1}(z) + c^t(x)$. The optimal way to get to z at time step t , $w^t(z)$, must go through some point j in the previous time step and incur the operating cost at j . If $j \geq x$, then we know

$$\begin{aligned} w^{t-1}(j) + c^t(x) + \theta\|z - j\| &\leq w^{t-1}(j) + c^t(j) + \theta\|z - j\| = w^t(z) \\ &< w^{t-1}(z) + c^t(x) \leq w^{t-1}(j) + \theta\|z - j\| + c^t(x), \end{aligned}$$

which cannot happen. On the other hand, by Lemma 12, if $j < x$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} w^t(x) + \theta\|z - x\| &\leq w^t(j) + \theta\|1\|\|x - j\| + \theta\|1\|\|z - x\| \\ &= w^t(j) + \theta\|z - j\| = w^{t-1}(j) + c^t(j) + \theta\|z - j\| \\ &= w^t(z) < w^{t-1}(z) + c^t(x) \leq w^{t-1}(x) + \theta\|z - x\| + c^t(x), \end{aligned}$$

which cannot happen either. □

We now argue that, assuming the cost vectors are of a particular form, the algorithm can only move from one state to another state (which are independent of the randomness r). More specifically, at any particular time step, if the algorithm does ever move, it always moves from a unique state x and it always moves to a unique state y (x and y are independent of the randomness r and hence remain the same for all values of r that cause the algorithm to move).

Lemma 14. *Fix any time step t , and assume the entries in the cost vector c^t are either 0 or ϵ in each coordinate (for a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$), and are either non-increasing or non-decreasing. There exist states x, y such that, for any r , we have the following guarantee. At time t , we only have the following two possibilities for this value of r :*

1. *The algorithm does not move.*
2. *The algorithm moves from state x to state y .*

Proof. Fix a time step t , and assume without loss of generality the cost vector $c^t = (0, \dots, 0, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon)$ (the case when the entries are non-increasing is symmetric). Let $A = \{j : Y^{t+1}(j) = Y^t(j)\}$ and let $B = \{j : Y^{t+1}(j) = Y^t(j) + \epsilon\}$. That is, A is the set of states j such that the values $Y^t(j)$ do not increase (and in particular, the work function values $w^{t-1}(j)$ also do not increase), and B is the set of states j such that the values $Y^t(j)$ do increase. Note that sets A and B define a partition of the set of all states and are independent of r , since only an increase in the work function value at a state j can cause an increase in $Y^t(j)$ (note that the work function value is independent of r). Moreover, by Lemma 13, we know that sets A and B have the form $A = \{1, \dots, i\}, B = \{i + 1, \dots, m\}$ for some i . If set B is empty, then the algorithm never moves at time step t since at least one state's work function value must increase for the algorithm to move (this is true for all r). Moreover, if set A is empty, then the algorithm also cannot move at time step t since at least one state's work function value must not increase (this is true for all r). Hence, we assume that both sets A and B are non-empty, and moreover we assume this for all values of r .

Now, fix a value for r , and consider the values $Y^t(j)$ for all states j (the shape of Y^t may be somewhat arbitrary). It is useful to understand how various values of r affect the shape of Y^t . As we increase the value for r , the value of $Y^t(j)$ certainly increases for all states, but states j which are farther to the right have the property that $Y^t(j)$ increases at a faster rate (and hence, states which are farther to the left have a slower rate of increase). Moreover, as we decrease the value for r , the value of $Y^t(j)$ decreases for all states j , but states j which are farther to the right have the property that $Y^t(j)$ decreases at a faster rate (similarly, states farther to the left have a slower rate of decrease). These properties hold due to the fact that the dependence on r for $Y^t(j)$ appears in

the term $r \cdot N(j)$, and hence as we change r , larger values of j have a larger impact on the value of $Y^t(j)$ (since $N(j)$ is larger for such states j).

With these observations in mind, we again take r to be any fixed value, and we also define $a_r = \arg \min_{j \in A} Y^t(j)$, $b_r = \arg \min_{j \in B} Y^t(j)$ (recall that we assume A and B are non-empty for all values of r). Note that a_r and b_r may depend on the particular value of r , and moreover we always have $a_r < b_r$ for all values of r (since states in set B are farther to the right). In particular, the algorithm can only move from a state in B to a state in A . In addition, the global minimum value of Y^t is precisely $\min\{Y^t(a_r), Y^t(b_r)\}$. It is useful to note that, as we increase r , a_r and b_r may decrease (i.e., the minimum state in A may move left and the minimum state in B may move left), while decreasing r can cause a_r and b_r to increase.

Suppose that for every r we have $Y^t(a_r) \neq Y^t(b_r)$. This implies that either $Y^t(a_r) < Y^t(b_r)$ for all r or $Y^t(a_r) > Y^t(b_r)$ for all r . In other words, it is impossible for there to exist r_1, r_2 such that $Y^t(a_{r_1}) < Y^t(b_{r_1})$ while $Y^t(a_{r_2}) > Y^t(b_{r_2})$. If such a scenario existed, it would imply that there exists some value r' such that $Y^t(a_{r'}) = Y^t(b_{r'})$ (i.e., a crossover point) due to continuity. Hence, in the case that $Y^t(a_r) \neq Y^t(b_r)$ for all r , we must have that either $Y^t(a_r) < Y^t(b_r)$ for every r , or we must have $Y^t(a_r) > Y^t(b_r)$ for every r . In either case, it is impossible for the algorithm to move (i.e., for all values of r , the algorithm does not move). To see why, consider the case when $Y^t(a_r) < Y^t(b_r)$ for every r . This means that the state which achieves the global minimum of Y^t (i.e., $\min\{Y^t(a_r), Y^t(b_r)\}$) lies in A for every value of r , and since the algorithm never moves from a state in A after receiving the cost vector c^t , the first case is done. A similar argument can be made in the second case where for all values of r we have $Y^t(a_r) > Y^t(b_r)$. In particular, although the global minimum lies in the set B for every r , in the second case we know that for every r we have $Y^t(b_r) < Y^t(a_r) \leq Y^t(j)$ for every $j \in A$ (we can assume ϵ is small enough that the new global minimum after c^t arrives still remains in B).

Hence, we assume there exists an r such that $Y^t(a_r) = Y^t(b_r)$. We define the state y to be a_r , and the state x to be b_r . Note that x and y are unique. If there are ties for the minimum Y^t value at the crossover point in set B , we take x to be the rightmost such point since states to the left in B cannot be the minimum for smaller values of r (ties in set A can be dealt with similarly when defining y). Although a_r and b_r depend on r , we can claim uniqueness due to the fact that $b_r > a_r$ and hence $Y^t(b_r)$ increases at a faster rate than $Y^t(a_r)$ as we increase r and $Y^t(b_r)$ decreases at a faster rate than $Y^t(a_r)$ as we decrease r . Hence, let r^* denote the unique value at which $Y^t(a_{r^*})$ and $Y^t(b_{r^*})$ meet. Now that x and y are defined, let us see why the lemma holds.

Observe that the only values of r for which the algorithm can move are precisely those when the algorithm is currently at the minimum state in set B , namely b_r , and the values $Y^t(a_r) > Y^t(b_r)$ are really close together (in particular, increasing $Y^t(b_r)$ by ϵ causes $Y^{t+1}(a_r) \leq Y^{t+1}(b_r)$ for a carefully chosen, sufficiently small ϵ). Consider the value r^* , so that $Y^t(x)$ is the minimum value in set B and $Y^t(y)$ is the minimum value in set A . Observe that for all larger values $r' \geq r^*$, the algorithm does not move since the global minimum is in set A for such values r' .

Now, consider a slightly smaller value $\tilde{r} < r^*$, which is sufficiently close to r^* so that $Y^t(y)$ is still the minimum value in set A and $Y^t(x)$ is still the minimum value in set B , namely $y = a_{\tilde{r}}$ and $x = b_{\tilde{r}}$ (if \tilde{r} is chosen too small, it is possible that x and y do not satisfy these properties). Choose ϵ to be sufficiently small so that, $Y^{t+1}(a_{\tilde{r}}) = Y^t(b_{\tilde{r}}) + \epsilon$. Now, for all values $r' < \tilde{r}$, the algorithm cannot possibly move from any state, since the gap between $Y^t(a_{r'})$ and $Y^t(b_{r'})$ is larger than the gap between $Y^t(a_{\tilde{r}})$ and $Y^t(b_{\tilde{r}})$, and ϵ is sufficiently small that the global minimum remains in B after the cost vector arrives. Now, consider values r' such that $r^* > r' \geq \tilde{r}$. It is not possible for another state $j \in B$ to become the minimum state in B for this range, by definition of how we chose \tilde{r} and by definition of x (similar reasoning shows that no other state $j \in A$ can be the minimum state in A for this range). Hence, every time the algorithm moves, it goes from state x to state y .

In particular, x remains the minimum state in set B and y remains the minimum state in set A for this range, and the algorithm moves from state x to state y for all r' in this range. \square

We now prove the main lemma. Let $SC^t = \sum_{i=1}^t \|x^i - x^{i-1}\|$ denote the total switching cost incurred by DRBG up until time t , and define the potential function $\phi^t = \frac{1}{2\theta}(w^t(x_1) + w^t(x_m)) - \frac{\|x_m - x_1\|}{2}$. Then we can show the following lemma.

Lemma 15. *For every time step t , $\mathbb{E}[SC^t] \leq \phi^t$.*

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction on t . At time $t = 0$, clearly it is true since the left hand side $\mathbb{E}[SC^0] = 0$, while the right hand side $\phi^0 = \frac{1}{2\theta}(w^0(x_1) + w^0(x_m)) - \frac{\|x_m - x_1\|}{2} = \frac{1}{2\theta}(0 + \theta\|x_m - x_1\|) - \frac{\|x_m - x_1\|}{2} = 0$. We now argue that at each time step, the increase in the left hand side is at most the increase in the right hand side.

Since the operating cost is convex, it is non-increasing until some point x_{min} and then non-decreasing over the set M . We can imagine our cost vector arriving in ϵ -sized increments as follows. We imagine sorting the cost values so that $c^t(i_1) \leq c^t(i_2) \leq \dots \leq c^t(i_m)$, and then view time step t as a series of smaller time steps where we apply a cost of ϵ to all states for the first $c^t(i_1)/\epsilon$ time steps, followed by applying a cost of ϵ to all states except state i_1 for the next $(c^t(i_2) - c^t(i_1))/\epsilon$ time steps (if each such cost vector's entries strictly decrease at some point and then strictly increase at some point, we split the vector into two vectors which add up to the original, one of which is non-increasing and the other of which is non-decreasing), etc., where ϵ has a very small value. If adding these ϵ -sized cost vectors would cause us to exceed the original cost $c^t(i_k)$ for some k , then we just use the residual $\epsilon' < \epsilon$ in the last round in which state i_k has non-zero cost. Eventually, these ϵ -sized cost vectors add up precisely to the original cost vector c^t . Under these new cost vectors, the algorithm's switching cost does not get better (and the optimal solution does not get worse). If the left hand side does not increase at all from time step $t - 1$ to t , then the lemma holds (since the right hand side can only increase).

Our expected switching cost is the probability that the algorithm moves multiplied by the distance moved. Suppose the algorithm is currently in state x . Observe that, by Lemma 14, there is only one state the algorithm could be moving from (state x) and only one state y the algorithm could be moving to, both of which do not depend on the randomness r (we can choose ϵ to be sufficiently small in order to guarantee this). Moreover, we would never move to a state where the work function increases by ϵ . First we consider the case $x \geq x_{min}$.

The only reason we would move from state x is if $w^t(x)$ increases from the previous time step, so that we have $w^t(x) = w^{t-1}(x) + \epsilon$. By Lemma 13, we know $w^t(z) = w^{t-1}(z) + \epsilon$ for all $z \geq x$. Hence, we can conclude a couple of facts. The state y we move to cannot be such that $y \geq x$. Moreover, we also know that $w^t(x_m) = w^{t-1}(x_m) + \epsilon$ (since $x_m \geq x$). Notice that for us to move from state x to state y , the random value r must fall within a very specific range. In particular, we must have $Y^t(x) \leq Y^t(y)$ and $Y^{t+1}(y) \leq Y^{t+1}(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & (w^{t-1}(x) + \theta r \|1\|x \leq w^{t-1}(y) + \theta r \|1\|y) \\ & \wedge (w^t(y) + \theta r \|1\|y \leq w^t(x) + \theta r \|1\|x) \\ \implies & w^{t-1}(y) - w^{t-1}(x) - \epsilon \leq w^t(y) - w^t(x) \\ & \leq \theta r \|x - y\| \leq w^{t-1}(y) - w^{t-1}(x). \end{aligned}$$

This means r must fall within an interval of length at most $\epsilon/\theta\|x - y\|$. Since r is chosen from an interval of length 2, this happens with probability at most $\epsilon/(2\theta\|x - y\|)$. Hence, the increase in our expected switching cost is at most $\|x - y\| \cdot \epsilon/(2\theta\|x - y\|) = \epsilon/2\theta$. On the other hand, the

increase in the right hand side is $\phi^t - \phi^{t-1} = \frac{1}{2\theta}(w^t(x_1) - w^{t-1}(x_1) + w^t(x_m) - w^{t-1}(x_m)) \geq \epsilon/2\theta$ (since $w^t(x_m) = w^{t-1}(x_m) + \epsilon$). The case when $x < x_{min}$ is symmetric. This finishes the inductive claim. \square

Now we prove the expected switching cost of DRBG is at most the total cost of the optimal solution for the discrete problem.

By Lemma 15, for all times t we have $\mathbb{E}[SC^t] \leq \phi^t$. Denote by OPT^t the optimal solution at time t (so that $OPT^t = \min_x w^t(x)$ and $OPT^T = OPT_N$). Let $x^* = \arg \min_x w^t(x)$ be the final state which realizes OPT^t at time t . We have, for all times t :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[SC^t] &\leq \phi^t = \frac{1}{2\theta}(w^t(x_1) + w^t(x_m)) - \frac{\|x_m - x_1\|}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\theta}(w^t(x^*) + \theta\|x^* - x_1\| + w^t(x^*) + \theta\|x_m - x^*\|) - \frac{\|x_m - x_1\|}{2} = \frac{1}{\theta}OPT^t. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the equation holds at time T , which gives the bound.

F.2 Convergence of DRBG to RBG

In this section, we are going to show that if we keep splitting the state spacing δ , then the output of DRBG, which is denoted by x_D^t , converges to the output of RBG, which is denoted by x_C^t .

Lemma 16. *Consider a SOCO with $F = [x_L, x_H]$. Consider a sequence of discrete systems such that the state spacing $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and for each system, $[x_1, x_m] = F$. Let x_i denote the output of DRBG in the i^{th} discrete system, and \hat{x} denote the output of RBG in the continuous system. Then the sequence $\{x_i\}$ converges to \hat{x} with probability 1 as i increases, i.e., for all t , $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |x_i^t - \hat{x}^t| = 0$ with probability 1.*

Proof. To prove the lemma, we just need to show that x_i converges pointwise to \hat{x} with probability 1. For a given δ , let Y_D^t denote the function Y^t used by DRBG in the discrete system (with feasible set $M = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \subset F$) and Y_C^t denote the function Y^t used by RBG in the continuous system (with feasible set F). The output of DRBG and RBG at time t are denoted by x_D^t and x_C^t respectively. The subsequence on which $|x_C^t - x_D^t| \leq 2\delta$ clearly has x_D^t converge to x_C^t . Now consider the subsequence on which this does not hold. For each such system, we can find an $\bar{x}_C^t \in \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ satisfying $|\bar{x}_C^t - x_C^t| < \delta$ (and thus $|\bar{x}_C^t - x_D^t| \geq \delta$) such that $Y_C^t(\bar{x}_C^t) \leq Y_C^t(x_D^t)$, by the convexity⁵ of Y_C^t . Moreover, $Y_D^t(x_D^t) \leq Y_D^t(\bar{x}_C^t)$ and $Y_C^t(x_D^t) \leq Y_D^t(x_D^t)$. So far, we have only rounded the t^{th} component. Now let us consider a scheme that rounds to the set M all components $\tau < t$ of a solution to the continuous problem.

For an arbitrary trajectory $x = (x^t)_{t=1}^T$, define a sequence $x_R(x)$ with $x_R^\tau \in \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ as follows. Let $l = \max\{k : x_k \leq x^\tau\}$. Set x_R^τ to x_l if $c^\tau(x_l) \leq c^\tau(x_{l+1})$ or $l = m$, and x_{l+1} otherwise. This rounding increases the switching cost by at most $2\theta\|\delta\|$ for each timeslot. If $l = m$ then the operating cost is unchanged. Next, we bound the increase in operating cost when $l < m$.

For each timeslot τ , depending on the shape of c^τ on (x_l, x_{l+1}) , we may have two cases: (i) c^τ is monotone; (ii) c^τ is non-monotone. In case (i), the rounding does not make the operating cost increase for this timeslot. Note that if $x_C^\tau \in \{x_L, x_H\}$ then for all sufficiently small δ , case (ii) cannot occur, since the location of the minimum of c^τ is independent of δ . We now consider case (ii) with $x_C^\tau \in (x_L, x_H)$. Note that there must be a finite left and right derivative of c^τ at all points in (x_L, x_H) for c^τ to be finite on F . Hence, these derivatives must be bounded on any compact

⁵The minimum of a convex function over a convex set is convex. Thus, by definition, w^t is a convex function by induction, and hence Y_C^t is convex as well.

subset of (x_L, x_H) . Since $x_C^\tau \in (x_L, x_H)$, there exists a set $[x'_L, x'_H] \subset (x_L, x_H)$ independent of δ such that, for sufficiently small δ , we have $[x_l, x_{l+1}] \subset [x'_L, x'_H]$. Hence, there exists an H^τ such that, for sufficiently small δ , the gradient of c^τ is bounded by H^τ on $[x_l, x_{l+1}]$. Thus, for sufficiently small δ , the rounding makes the operating cost increase by at most $H^\tau \delta$ in timeslot τ .

Define $H = \max_\tau \{H^\tau\}$. If we apply this scheme to the trajectory which achieves $Y_C^t(\bar{x}_C^t)$, we get a decision sequence in the discrete system with $\text{cost} + r\theta\|\bar{x}_C^t\|$ not more than $Y_C^t(\bar{x}_C^t) + (H\delta + 2\theta\|\delta\|)t$ (by the foregoing bound on the increase in costs) and not less than $Y_D^t(\bar{x}_C^t)$ (because the solution of $Y_D^t(\bar{x}_C^t)$ minimizes $\text{cost} + r\theta\|\bar{x}_C^t\|$). Specifically, we have $Y_D^t(\bar{x}_C^t) \leq Y_C^t(\bar{x}_C^t) + (H\delta + 2\theta\|\delta\|)t$. Therefore,

$$Y_C^t(\bar{x}_C^t) \leq Y_C^t(x_i^t) = Y_C^t(x_D^t) \leq Y_D^t(x_D^t) \leq Y_D^t(\bar{x}_C^t) \leq Y_C^t(\bar{x}_C^t) + (H\delta + 2\theta\|\delta\|)t.$$

Notice that the gradient bound H is independent of δ , and so $(H\delta + 2\theta\|\delta\|)t \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, $|Y_C^t(x_i^t) - Y_C^t(\bar{x}_C^t)|$ converges to 0 as i increases.

Independent of the random choice r , the domain of $w_C^t(\cdot)$ can be divided into countably many non-singleton intervals on which $w_C^t(\cdot)$ is affine, joined by intervals on which it is strictly convex. Then $Y_C^t(\cdot)$ has a unique minimum unless $-r$ is equal to the slope of one of the former intervals, since $Y_C^t(\cdot)$ is convex. Hence, it has a unique minimum with probability one with respect to the choice of r .

Hence, with probability one, x_C^t is the unique minimum of Y_C^t . To see that $Y_C^t(\cdot)$ is continuous at any point a , apply the squeeze principle to the inequality $w_C^t(a) \leq w_C^t(x) + \theta\|x - a\| \leq w_C^t(a) + 2\theta\|x - a\|$, and note that $Y_C^t(\cdot)$ is $w_C^t(\cdot)$ plus a continuous function. The convergence of $|\bar{x}_C^t - x_C^t|$ then implies $|Y_C^t(\bar{x}_C^t) - Y_C^t(x_C^t)| \rightarrow 0$ and thus $|Y_C^t(x_i^t) - Y_C^t(x_C^t)| \rightarrow 0$, or equivalently $Y_C^t(x_i^t) \rightarrow Y_C^t(x_C^t)$. Note that the restriction of Y_C^t to $[x_L, x_C^t]$ has a well-defined inverse Y^{-1} , which is continuous at $Y_C^t(x_C^t)$. Hence, for the subsequence of x_i^t such that $x_i^t \leq x_C^t$, we have $x_i^t = Y^{-1}(Y_C^t(x_i^t)) \rightarrow Y^{-1}(Y_C^t(x_C^t)) = x_C^t$. Similarly, the subsequence such that $x_i^t \geq x_C^t$ also converges to x_C^t . \square

F.3 Convergence of OPT in Discrete Systems

To show that the competitive ratio holds for RBG, we also need to show that the optimal costs converge to those of the continuous system.

Lemma 17. *Consider a SOCO problem with $F = [x_L, x_H]$. Consider a sequence of discrete systems such that the state spacing $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and for each system, $[x_1, x_m] = F$. Let OPT_D^i denote the optimal cost in the i^{th} discrete system, and OPT_C denote the optimal cost in the continuous system (both under the norm N). Then the sequence $\{OPT_D^i\}$ converges to OPT_C as i increases, i.e., $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |OPT_D^i - OPT_C| = 0$.*

Proof. We can apply the same rounding scheme in the proof of Lemma 16 to the solution vector of OPT_C to get a discrete output with total cost bounded by $OPT_C + (H\delta + 2\theta\|\delta\|)T$, thus

$$OPT_D^i \leq OPT_C + (H\delta + 2\theta\|\delta\|)T.$$

Notice that the gradient bound H is independent of δ and so $(H\delta + 2\theta\|\delta\|)T \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, OPT_D^i converges to OPT_C as i increases. \square