

1 We would like to thank the reviewers for their positive and constructive comments. As mentioned in the paper, the
2 setting of dying experts can be motivated by problems such as fairness in machine learning. Also, interesting follow-up
3 works may include studying the problem in the bandits setting. Below we respond to each of your comments.

4 **Reviewer 1**

5 **Comment:** With more space the authors might present more discussion of past/related work

6 **Response:** Thanks, we will expand our discussion of related work, in particular including references [2]–[4] below.

7 **Reviewer 2**

8 **Comment:** It would be interesting to know if the approach of [1] works here and gives similar results.

9 **Response:** The notion of regret in the “Prediction with specialist experts’ advice” section of [1] (this is the relevant
10 section) is *per-action* regret, and so we believe that the results are not directly applicable to our setting (we adopt the
11 notion of *ranking* regret). In per-action regret, the performance of the algorithm is compared to an expert only over
12 those rounds in which that expert was alive. In particular, per-action regret is the difference between the cumulative loss
13 of the algorithm and an expert where the summation is taken over the rounds that expert is available. This makes the
14 notion incomparable to the ranking regret where *all* the rounds are included, and in many settings per-action regret is
15 smaller than ranking regret (see the commentary in [5]). In addition, we would like to mention that there at least can be
16 no direct application of the results of [1] to obtain our results. To see this, let us take Corollary 4 of [1] (which holds for
17 η -mixable losses) and fix $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{\ln K}{T}}$ to recover a bound comparable to ours. This yields $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T \ln K})$ which as we
18 mentioned, holds for per-action regret. If a similar bound held for ranking regret, this would contradict the lower bound
19 that we established.

20 **Reviewer 3**

21 **Comment:** Why do we need to specify the “first” alive expert, rather than the alive expert with the optimal performance?

22 **Response:** Thanks for this great question! We are unsure of the right interpretation and so offer three potential
23 interpretations and responses for each. (1) We interpret “the alive expert with the optimal performance” as the best
24 expert that is alive in all the rounds. In this case, the notion of regret becomes much weaker than the one that we use
25 (the ranking regret). (2) We interpret the “optimal performance” as comparing to the best expert in each round (i.e. any
26 expert whose instantaneous loss in that round is the minimum achieved by all the experts in that round). In this case, it is
27 known that achieving sub-linear regret is hopeless. (3) We interpret the “the alive expert with the optimal performance”
28 in each round as the alive expert that is the leader in that round, i.e., the awake expert that has the least cumulative
29 loss from round 1 through to the end of the current round. Looking at the problem this way, one can come up with a
30 two-expert construction (even in the simple case where no one dies) where: the leader alternates between two experts
31 and, in a given round, the leader will always be the expert that obtains the minimum loss in that round; thus, this notion
32 of regret becomes equivalent to the second interpretation and the problem becomes hopeless.

33 **Comment:** Meanwhile, a contrary setting – growing expert – should be mentioned in the related work.

34 **Response:** Thanks for the comment. We are aware of this work (also a similar one, [3]) and we will mention them in
35 the related work.

36 **Comment:** I would like to mention paper of [4] gives the non-asymptotic lower bound for expert advice problem,
37 though the form is not as neat as Thm 4.1.

38 **Response:** Thanks for pointing out this previous work on the lower bound. We were not aware of this result of Orabona
39 and Pál; while it seems more complicated to prove, we appreciate the fact that their result gives explicit constants. We
40 will be sure to cite this paper.

41 [1] Chernov and Vovk, “Prediction with expert evaluators’ advice”. ALT, 2009.

42 [2] Mourtada, Jaouad, and Odalric-Ambrym Maillard. “Efficient tracking of a growing number of experts.” ALT, 2017.

43 [3] Gofér, Eyal, et al. “Regret minimization for branching experts.” COLT, 2013.

44 [4] Orabona, Francesco, and Dávid Pál. “Optimal non-asymptotic lower bound on the minimax regret of learning with
45 expert advice.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.02176* (2015).

46 [5] Kale, Satyen, Chansoo Lee, and Dávid Pál. “Hardness of online sleeping combinatorial optimization problems.”
47 NIPS, 2016.