

Online Resource Allocation: Bandits feedback and Advice on Time-varying Demands

Lixing Lyu¹ and Wang Chi Cheung²

¹Institute of Operations Research and Analytics, National University of Singapore, *lyulixing@u.nus.edu*

²Department of Industrial Systems Engineering and Management, National University of Singapore, *isecwc@nus.edu.sg*

June 13, 2023

Abstract

We consider a general online resource allocation model with bandit feedback and time-varying demands. While online resource allocation has been well studied in the literature, most existing works make the strong assumption that the demand arrival process is stationary. In practical applications, such as online advertisement and revenue management, however, this process may be exogenous and non-stationary, like the constantly changing internet traffic. Motivated by the recent Online Algorithms with Advice framework [Mitzenmacher and Vassilvitskii, *Commun. ACM* 2022], we explore how online advice can inform policy design. We establish an impossibility result that any algorithm perform poorly in terms of regret without any advice in our setting. In contrast, we design an robust online algorithm that leverages the online predictions on the total demand volumes. Empowered with online advice, our proposed algorithm is shown to have both theoretical performance and promising numerical results compared with other algorithms in literature. We also provide two explicit examples for the time-varying demand scenarios and derive corresponding theoretical performance guarantees. Finally, we adapt our model to a network revenue management problem, and numerically demonstrate that our algorithm can still performs competitively compared to existing baselines.

1 Introduction

Online resource allocation is a fundamental framework in Operations Research, encompassing models where a decision maker (DM) endowed with resource constraint serves sequentially coming customers, each of which consumes resources and generates a reward. At each time step, the DM takes an action, aiming to maximize cumulative reward subject to resource constraints. This area has been studied extensively over many decades, with several applications such as network revenue management (Talluri and Van Ryzin [1998], Liu and Van Ryzin [2008], Zhang and Adelman [2009]) and online advertising (Mehta et al. [2007, 2013]).

While there is a substantial body of literature in this area, most existing works rely on the assumption that the demand arrival process is stationary (Besbes and Zeevi [2012], Ferreira et al. [2018]). In practice, however, this assumption could be too strong. Consider the example of online advertising. The internet traffic volume is constantly changing, leading to a non-stationary model. While the problem model exhibits non-stationarity, the model is structured in the sense that the non-stationarity in internet traffic is often exogenous, while the attractiveness of an online advertisement can be considered stationary. How could we effectively harness this problem structure to design policies?

Motivated by the aforementioned considerations, we address an online resource allocation problem in which the outcome, represented an array of reward and resource consumptions, is scaled by a non-stationary quantity that signifies changing demand volumes. Specifically, the DM is endowed with a set of available actions and an array of resource budgets to be allocated in a fixed and finite horizon T . The outcome of each action at time $t \in [T]$ involves an adversarial and a stochastic component. The adversarial part, q_t , represents the non-stationary demand volume, and the stochastic term refers to the outcome per unit demand, which is sampled from an unknown distribution, characterizing the intrinsic quality of each action. The DM only receives information about the adversarial q_t and the latent outcome distribution via the bandit feedback after each allocation. The DM needs to choose an action at each time step with the objective of maximizing the total cumulative rewards and subject to the fixed resource budget constraint. Replenishment is not allowed during the planning horizon. Given the unknown distribution of outcome and bandit feedback setting, the DM faces a common *exploration-exploitation* tradeoff, and the limited resource increases the urgency of *exploration*. Moreover, the non-stationarity of demands brings about additional uncertainty in the outcome of each allocation decision each

round and the future total demand volume, further complicating the online optimization challenge.

The uncertainties arising from both latent outcome distribution and non-stationary time-varying demand pose significant challenges in designing robust online policies that perform well. Badanidiyuru et al. [2013] is the most relevant work to ours, except for the stationary demand, referred to as *Stochastic Bandits with Knapsacks* (Stochastic BwK) problem. This model is a special case of ours by setting $q_t = 1$ for all $t \in [T]$. Badanidiyuru et al. [2013], Agrawal and Devanur [2014] provide optimal online algorithms for stochastic BwK with regret sub-linear in T when the resource budget is in the same level of T . The regret of an algorithm is the difference between the optimum and the expected cumulative reward earned by the algorithm, and a sub-linear-in- T regret implies the convergence to optimality as T grows. An alternative setting, *adversarial BwK*, is introduced by Immorlica et al. [2019]. Each action's outcome distribution can change arbitrarily over time. Contrary to the stochastic BwK, it is impossible to achieve a regret sub-linear in T , even when the outcome distribution is changed only once during the horizon, as shown in [Liu et al., 2022]. Although our model is less adversarial compared to the adversarial BwK, as the outcome distribution changes due to non-stationary demand, our setting still presents significant challenges. Indeed, it is still impossible to achieve a sub-linear-in- T regret in our setting, if the DM does not receive any online advice, as shown in our forthcoming Section 3.

Motivated by the Online Algorithm with Advice framework [Mitzenmacher and Vasilvitskii, 2022b], we are interested in incorporating predictions on non-stationary demand to enhance the tractability of our problem. These predictions as a form of advice can be used to model consulting services, which is broadly used in applications in supply chain management, revenue management and risk management. For example, in the context of revenue management, consultants may provide forecast about market size trend, which can help firms or government organizations to optimize their pricing strategies. Interesting readers can refer to Ribeiro Soriano [2001], Mughan et al. [2004], Makovetskiy et al. [2021]. Intuitively, the performance of a policy that leverages the advice crucially depends on the accuracy of the advice. Our paper aims to develop an algorithm with theoretical performance guarantees, by robustly incorporating an online advice irrespective to its quality. To achieve this, we assume that the DM only has access to the advice, but not its accuracy of. In other words, our algorithm takes the advice as a black box, and performs well when the advice is informative. By leveraging the growing capabilities from machine learning methods, our algorithm can harness the increasing accuracy of predictions.

1.1 Main Contributions

Here we briefly summarize our contributions.

Model. We propose an online resource allocation model with bandit feedback and time-varying demand, incorporating a prediction oracle. Such an incorporation is novel compared to existing literature. We identify the value of total demand volume $Q = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t$ as a crucial (but latent) parameter that affects the online decision. The prediction oracle provides a prediction to this value at each time step. The oracle corresponds to how the DM (who can be a firm or the government) constantly acquires updated information about the total demand through some consulting service. In practice, various existing time series or machine learning tools can be used to construct such prediction oracle.

Impossibility Results. We establish two impossibility results in terms of regret for our proposed model: Firstly, without any advice, we prove that any online algorithm performs poorly, suffering a linear-in- T regret. This result highlights the challenging nature of the problem when no advice is available. Second, with the access of a prediction oracle, we establish the regret lower bound that depends on the accuracy of the prediction. When the predictions align perfectly with the groundtruth, the regret lower bound will reduce to that of the well-studied stochastic BwK problem. This result demonstrates that the quality of the prediction can significantly impact the achievable regret in our model, indicating the importance of accurate demand forecasting.

Algorithms and Analysis. We design a robust online algorithm, OA-UCB, that utilizes the predictions judiciously. OA-UCB is innovative in its incorporation of the prediction and demand volume into the estimation of opportunity costs of the resources, in relation to the predicted demand volumes. We derive a regret upper bound on OA-UCB that depends on the accuracy of the predictions, even though the algorithm does not have knowledge about the accuracy of each prediction. OA-UCB is shown to achieve near optimal regret bounds when the accuracy of the predictions improves across time. This highlights the effectiveness of OA-UCB in leveraging the predictions to make informed online decisions and achieve competitive regret performance.

Two Specific Examples. We propose two specific examples of the time-varying demand: Linearly increasing model and AR(1) model. For each example, we propose a prediction oracle and derive explicit regret upper bound, respectively. Both of these bounds are shown to be near optimal.

Numerical Validations. We propose two parts of numerical experiment to validate

the advancement of our proposed OA-UCB algorithm. First, we compare the performance of our OA-UCB with other existing algorithms in our setting, demonstrating that the OA-UCB can outperform others with the help of online advice. Moreover, we investigate the impact of different prediction oracles by comparing the performance of OA-UCB with various prediction methods. This analysis shows the benefit of receiving accurate predictions in our model. Second, we adapt our model to a network revenue management problem and develop a variant of our algorithm, dubbed as OA-UCB-DP. We perform numerical experiments to evaluate the performance of OA-UCB-DP in comparison to other dynamic pricing algorithms in the literature. In this experiment, our algorithm can still outperform others.

1.2 Literature Review

Our work relates to the following areas of literature:

Bandits with Knapsacks (BwK): The Bandits with Knapsacks (BwK) problem has been extensively studied. Badanidiyuru et al. [2013] first introduced the stochastic BwK problem, which bears applications in dynamic pricing (Besbes and Zeevi [2009, 2012]) and ad allocation (Mehta et al. [2007]). The BwK problem is generalized by Agrawal and Devanur [2014] to incorporate convex constraints and concave rewards. Several variants are studied, such as the settings of contextual bandits (Agrawal et al. [2016], Badanidiyuru et al. [2014]), combinatorial semi-bandits (Sankararaman and Slivkins [2018]).

Non-stationary BwK problems, where the outcome distribution of each arm is changing over time, are studied recently. Immorlica et al. [2019] achieves a $O(\log T)$ competitive ratio against the best fixed distribution benchmark in an adversarial setting. Rangi et al. [2018] consider both stochastic and adversarial BwK problems in the single resource case. Liu et al. [2022] design a sliding window learning algorithm with sub-linear-in- T regret, assuming the amount of non-stationarity is upper bounded and known. A sub-linear-in- T regret on non-stationary BwK is only possible in restrictive settings. For example, as shown in Immorlica et al. [2019], Liu et al. [2022] and our forthcoming Lemma 2, for any online algorithm, there exists a non-stationary BwK instance where the outcome distribution only changes once during the horizon, for which the algorithm incurs a linear-in- T regret.

Non-stationary Bandits: Non-stationary stochastic bandits with no resource constraints are studied in [Besbes et al., 2014, Cheung et al., 2019, Zhu and Zheng, 2020], who provide sub-linear-in- T regret bounds in less restrictive non-stationary settings than Liu et al.

[2022], while the amount of non-stationarity, quantified as the variational budget or the number of change points, has to be sub-linear in T . Our work goes in an orthogonal direction. Instead of studying settings with limited non-stationarity, we seek an improved regret bound when the decision maker is endowed with information additional (in the form of prediction oracle) to the online observations.

Online Resource Allocation with horizon uncertainty: Our work is also related to a recent stream of work on resource allocation with horizon uncertainty. Bai et al. [2022], Aouad and Ma [2022] consider a stochastic resource allocation setting under full model certainty. In their model, the total demand volume is a random variable, whose probability distribution is known to the decision maker, but the *realization* of the total demand volume is not known. Balseiro et al. [2022] consider an online resource allocation setting with model uncertainty on the horizon, which is closely related to our model uncertainty setting on the total demand volume Q . A crucial difference between the uncertainty settings in Balseiro et al. [2022] and ours is that, the former focuses on the case when the DM is provided with *static* advices, while our work complementarily consider the case of *dynamic* advices. More precisely, Balseiro et al. [2022] consider a model where $q_t \in \{0, 1\}$. They first consider a model when the DM knows $Q \in [Q_{lower}, Q_{upper}]$ but not the actual value of Q at the beginning, and then consider a case when the DM is additionally endowed with a static prediction \hat{Q} at the beginning. In both cases, the performance guarantees are quantified as *competitive ratios* that depends on the static advices. By contrast, our study quantifies the benefit of receiving dynamically updated advices \hat{Q}_t , and pinpoint conditions on $\{\hat{Q}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ that leads to a sublinear-in- T regret.

Online algorithm with machine learning advice: Our work is related to an active stream of research works on online algorithm design with machine learned advice (Piotr et al. [2019], Mitzenmacher and Vassilvitskii [2022a]). While traditional online algorithm research focuses on worst case performance guarantee in full model uncertainty setting, this stream of works focuses on enhancing the performance guarantee when the decision maker (DM) is provided with a machine learned advice at the start of the online dynamics. A variety of results are derived in different settings, such as online caching (Lykouris and Vassilvitskii [2021]), rent-or-buy (Purohit et al. [2018]), scheduling (Mitzenmacher [2019], Lattanzi et al. [2020]), online set cover problems (Bamas et al. [2020], Almanza et al. [2021]), online matching (Antoniadis et al. [2020]). Our research seeks to take a further step, by investigating the case when the DM receives progressively updated predictions across the horizon, instead of being given a fixed prediction at the beginning.

Online optimization with predictions: Lastly, our prediction model is also related to a line of works online optimization with predictions, which concerns improving the performance guarantee with the help of predictions. These predictions are provided to the DM at the beginning of each round sequentially. A variety of full feedback settings are studied in Rakhlin and Sridharan [2013a,b], Steinhardt and Liang [2014], Jadbabaie et al. [2015], and the contextual bandit setting is studied in Wei et al. [2020]. We remark that the abovementioned works do not involve resource constraints, and they are fundamental different from ours, as shown in the forthcoming Lemma 2.

1.3 Notation

For a positive integer d , we denote $[d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$; We denote $\Delta_d = \{\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i = 1\}$ as the probabilistic simplex with dimension d . We adopt the $O(\cdot)$, $o(\cdot)$, $\Omega(\cdot)$ notation in Cormen et al. [2009].

2 Model

Now we describe our model. Our model instance can be represented by the tuple

$$(\mathcal{A}, d, B, T, \{q_t\}_{t=1}^T, \{P_{a,t}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}, t \in [T]}).$$

We denote \mathcal{A} as the set of K actions. There are d types of resources, and the DM is endowed with $B_i \geq 0$ units of resource i for each $i \in [d]$. The planning horizon consists of T discrete time steps. Following the convention in [Badanidiyuru et al., 2013], we assume for all $i \in [d]$ that $B_i = B = bT$, where b is the normalized budget. At time t , there are q_t units of demands arriving at the DM's platform. For example, q_t can be the number of customers visiting an online shop at time step t , and a time step can be a fifteen minute interval. We assume $q_t \in [\underline{q}, \bar{q}]$, where $0 < \underline{q} < \bar{q}$, and is unknown to the DM. The sequence $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is an arbitrary element of $[\underline{q}, \bar{q}]^T$ fixed by the nature before the online dynamics. The arbitrariness represents the exogenous nature of the demands.

When the DM chooses action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ at time t , s/he receives a vector $(R_t; C_{t,1}, \dots, C_{t,d}) \in [0, 1]^{d+1}$ of random outcomes, sampled independently from latent distribution $P_{a,t}$. The quantity R_t is the reward earned per demand unit, and $C_{t,i}$ is the amount of type i resource consumed per demand unit. The latent distribution $P_{a,t}$ for arm a is varies over time, sharing a common support of $[0, 1]^{d+1}$ and mean. We denote $(r(a); c(a, 1), \dots, c(a, d)) = \mathbb{E}[P_{a,t}]$,

and $\mathbf{r} = (r(a))_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$, $\mathbf{c} = (c(a, i))_{a \in \mathcal{A}, i \in [d]}$. To ensure feasibility, we assume there is a *null action* $a_0 \in \mathcal{A}$, which yields no reward and no resource consumption whenever it is pulled. Equivalently, we allow the DM to do nothing (not take any action) in a time step. This is a common assumption in BwK literature. In the context of dynamic pricing, for example, the null action corresponds to a “no-sale” price (like pricing a hotel room stay at USD 999,999) to indicate a product’s unavailability. For technical convenience, we also introduce an additional *null resource* such that each action does not yield any consumption on this resource. We dub it as the $(d + 1)^{\text{th}}$ resource. Clearly, it satisfies $C_{t,d+1} = 0$ with certainty and $c(a, d + 1) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

At each time t , the DM is provided with a *prediction oracle* \mathcal{F}_t . The oracle is a function $\mathcal{F}_t : [q, \bar{q}]^{t-1} \rightarrow [qT, \bar{q}T]$ that provides an prediction $\hat{Q}_t = \mathcal{F}_t(q_1, \dots, q_{t-1})$ on $Q = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t$ with the past observations $\{q_s\}_{s=1}^{t-1}$. At time t , the DM knows $\mathcal{A}, B, T, d, \{q_s\}_{s=1}^{t-1}$, and has the access to \mathcal{F}_t in a sequential manner. In contrast, the DM does not know $\{P_{a,t}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}, t \in [T]}$, $\{q_s\}_{s=t'}^T$ and lower and upper bound q, \bar{q} .

Dynamics. At each time t , three events happen. Firstly, the DM receives a prediction $\hat{Q}_t = \mathcal{F}_t(q_1, \dots, q_{t-1})$ on Q . Secondly, based on \hat{Q}_t and the history observation, the DM chooses action $A_t \in \mathcal{A}$. Thirdly, the DM observes the feedback consisting of (i) demand volume q_t , (ii) reward earned $q_t R_t$, (iii) resources consumed $\{q_t C_{t,i}\}_{i \in [d]}$. Recall that $(R_t, C_{t,1}, \dots, C_{t,d}) \sim P_{A_t,t}$. Then, the DM proceeds to time $t + 1$. If some resource is depleted, *i.e.* $\exists j \in [d]$ such that $\sum_{s=1}^t q_s C_{s,j} > B_j$, then the null action a_0 is to be chosen in the remaining horizon $t + 1, \dots, T$. We denote the stopping time here as τ . The DM aims to maximize the total reward $\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t$, subject to the resource constraints and model uncertainty.

On q_t . Our feedback model on q_t is more informative than Lykouris et al. [2020], where none of q_1, \dots, q_T is observed during the horizon. In contrast, ours is less informative than Tracà et al. [2021], where q_1, \dots, q_T are all observed at time 1. Our assumption of observing q_t at the end of time t is mild in online retail settings. For example, the number of visitors to a website within a time interval can be extracted from the electronic records when the interval ends.

While the nature sets $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$ to be fixed but arbitrary, the sequence is set without knowing the DM’s online algorithm and prediction oracle $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t=1}^T$. Our model is milder than the *oblivious adversary* model, where the nature sets a latent quantity (in this case $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$) with the knowledge of the DM’s algorithm before the online dynamics. Our milder model allows the possibility of $\hat{Q}_t = \mathcal{F}_t(q_1, \dots, q_{t-1})$ being a sufficiently accurate (to be quantified in our main results) estimate to Q for each t , for example when $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is governed by a

latent time series model. In contrary, an oblivious adversary can set Q to be far away from the predictions $\hat{Q}_1, \dots, \hat{Q}_T$ in response to the information on \mathcal{F} .

On $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}$. Our prediction oracle is a general Black-Box model. We do not impose any structural or parameteric assumption on \mathcal{F} or $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$. It is instructive to understand \mathcal{F} as a side information provided to the DM by an external source, like some consulting service. In the dynamic pricing example, \hat{Q}_t could be a forecast on the customer base population provided by an external marketing research firm. A prime candidate of \mathcal{F} is the cornucopia of time series prediction models proposed in decades of research works on time series [Shumway and Stoffer, 2017, Hyndman and Athanasopoulos, 2021, Lim and Zohren, 2021]. These prediction models allow *one step prediction*, where for any t , the predictor \mathcal{P} inputs $\{q_s\}_{s=1}^{t-1}$ and outputs an estimate \hat{q}_t on q_t . The prediction \hat{Q}_t can be constructed by (1) iteratively applying \mathcal{P} on $\{q_s\}_{s=1}^{t-1} \cup \{\hat{q}\}_t^{t+\rho-1}$ to output $\hat{q}_{t+\rho}$ for $\rho \in \{0, \dots, T-t\}$, (2) summing over $q_1, \dots, q_{t-1}, \hat{q}_t, \dots, \hat{q}_T$ and return \hat{Q}_t . We provide two specific examples in Section 5.

Regret. To measure the performance of an online algorithm, we define the regret of it as

$$\text{Regret}_T = \text{OPT} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t, \quad (1)$$

where OPT denotes the expected cumulative reward of the offline optimal dynamic policy given all latent distribution $\{P_{a,t}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}, t \in [T]}$ and demand sequence $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$. More specifically, our model can be in fact phrased as a Markov decision process (MDP) problem with T time steps, where a state is represented by the vector of remaining inventory on each resource, and a state transition corresponds to consumption of resources. The offline optimal dynamic policy is defined as the optimal policy (the policy that accrues the highest expected total reward) in the MDP, and in particular a DM who has full model certainty on all parameters would be able to compute such a policy. The scalar quantity $\text{OPT} > 0$ is the expected total reward under the offline optimal dynamic policy. Thus, we are comparing our online algorithm, which suffers from model uncertainty, with the optimal algorithm with full information.

For analytical tractability in our regret upper bound, we consider an alternative bench-

mark

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} = \max_{\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_K} & \left(\sum_{t=1}^T q_t \right) \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{u} \\ \text{s.t.} & \left(\sum_{t=1}^T q_t \right) \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{u} \leq B \mathbf{1}_d, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The benchmark (2) is justified by the following Lemma, which is proved in Appendix A:

Lemma 1. $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \geq \text{OPT}$.

Based on this lemma, any regret upper bound derived using OPT_{LP} as a benchmark will also serve as a regret upper bound for the original benchmark OPT .

3 Impossibility Results: Regret Lower Bounds

In this section, we provide impossibility results of our model in the form of regret lower bounds. Firstly, we show that a linear-in- T regret is inevitable in the absence of the prediction oracle \mathcal{F} .

Lemma 2. *Consider a fixed but arbitrary online algorithm that knows*

$$\{P_{a,t}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}, t \in [T]}, \quad \{(q_s, q_s R_s, q_s C_{s,1}, \dots, q_s C_{s,d})\}_{s=1}^{t-1}, \quad q_t,$$

but does not have any access to a prediction oracle when the action A_t is to be chosen at each time t . There exists an instance such that the online algorithm suffers $\text{Regret}_T = \Omega(T)$.

Lemma 2 is proved in Appendix B.1. Lemma 2 shows that even when all model information on time steps $1, \dots, t$ are revealed when A_t is to be chosen, the DM still suffers $\text{Regret}_T = \Omega(T)$. Thus, Our model is fundamentally different from non-stationary bandits without resource constraints such as Besbes et al. [2015], and online optimization with predictions problems, such as Rakhlin and Sridharan [2013a]. In these settings, we can achieve $\text{Regret}_T = 0$ if all model information on time steps $1, \dots, t$ are available at the time point of choosing A_t or the action at time t . Indeed, given all model information at time t , the DM achieves the optimum by choosing an arm or an action that maximizes the reward function of time t for every $t \in [T]$.

In view of Lemma 2, we seek to understand if the DM can avoid $\text{Regret}_T = \Omega(T)$ when providing with an accurate prediction on Q . Certainly, if the DM only receives an uninformative prediction, such as a worst case prediction $\hat{Q}_t = 0$, at each time step, $\text{Regret}_T = \Omega(T)$

still cannot be avoided. In contrast, if the DM received an *accurate* prediction at a time step, we demonstrate our first step for deriving a better regret bound, in the form of a more benign regret lower bound compared to Lemma 2. We formalize the notion of being *accurate* by the following two concepts.

For $T_0 \in [T - 1]$ and $\epsilon_{T_0+1} \geq 0$, an instance $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is said to be $(T_0 + 1, \epsilon_{T_0+1})$ -well estimated by oracle \mathcal{F} , if the prediction $\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} = \mathcal{F}_{T_0+1}(q_1, \dots, q_{T_0})$ returned by the oracle at time $T_0 + 1$ satisfies $|Q - \hat{Q}_{T_0+1}| \in [\epsilon_{T_0+1}, 2\epsilon_{T_0+1}]$. This notion measures the power of prediction oracle \mathcal{F} . We say that ϵ_{T_0+1} is $(T_0 + 1, \{q_t\}_{t=1}^{T_0})$ -well response by oracle \mathcal{F} if ϵ_{T_0+1} satisfies $\epsilon_{T_0+1} \leq \min\{\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s - \underline{q}(T - T_0), \bar{q}(T - T_0) - (\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t), \hat{Q}_{T_0+1}/2\}$, where $\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} = \mathcal{F}_{T_0+1}(q_1, \dots, q_{T_0})$. This concept imposes requirements on the quality of prediction by introducing a non-trivial upper bound on ϵ_{T_0+1} for the "well-estimate" notion. This can help us eliminate trivial and uninformative predictions such as $\hat{Q}_t = 0$ or $\bar{q}T$.

Theorem 1. Consider our model setting, and consider a fixed but arbitrary online algorithm and prediction oracle $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t=1}^T$. For any $T_0 \in [T - 1]$ and any $\epsilon_{T_0+1} > 0$ that is $(T_0 + 1, \{q_t\}_{t=1}^{T_0})$ -well response, there exists a $(T_0 + 1, \epsilon_{T_0+1})$ -well estimated instance $I = \{q_t\}_{t=1}^{T_0} \cup \{q_t\}_{t=T_0+1}^T$ such that

$$\text{Regret}_T = \Omega \left(\max \left\{ \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t \epsilon_{T_0+1}, \Lambda \right\} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $Q = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t$, and

$$\Lambda = \min \left\{ \text{OPT}, \text{OPT} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \text{OPT}} \right\}.$$

Theorem 1 is proved in Appendix B.2. In (3), the regret lower bound Λ is due to the uncertainty on $\{P_{a,t}\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}, t \in [T]}$, and Λ is derived directly from Badanidiyuru et al. [2013]. The regret lower bound $\frac{1}{Q} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t \epsilon_{T_0+1}$ is due to the oracle's prediction error on \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} . Theorem 1 demonstrates a more benign regret lower bound than $\Omega(T)$, under the condition that the prediction on Q is sufficiently accurate (as formalized as $(T_0 + 1, \epsilon_{T_0+1})$ -well estimated).

More specifically, let us consider the following *accurate prediction condition* at time T_0 by oracle \mathcal{F} : ϵ_{T_0+1} is $(T_0 + 1, \{q_t\}_{t=1}^{T_0})$ -well response by oracle \mathcal{F} and

$$\frac{\epsilon_{T_0+1}}{Q} = O(T_0^{-\alpha}) \quad \text{for some } \alpha > 0. \quad (4)$$

The condition implies that, for the prediction \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} made using T_0 data points q_1, \dots, q_{T_0} ,

it holds that $|1 - (\hat{Q}_{T_0+1}/Q)| = O(T_0^{-\alpha})$. For example, when $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$ are i.i.d. generated, the accurate prediction condition holds with $\alpha = 1/2$.

Corollary 1. *Consider the setting of Theorem 1. Suppose the accurate prediction condition (4) holds at T_0 , then the refined regret lower bound $\text{Regret}_T = \Omega(\max\{\underline{q}T_0^{1-\alpha}, \Lambda\})$ holds.*

Altogether, under the accurate prediction condition, the corollary presents a strictly smaller regret lower bound than that in Lemma 2, which has no prediction oracle available. In complement, we design and analyze an online algorithm in the next section that leverages the benefits of predictions, and in particular nearly matches the regret lower bound in Corollary 1 under the accurate prediction condition. Thus, a $o(T)$ -regret is possible in a non-stationary environment given accurate predictions as prescribed above, even though the amount of non-stationarity in the underlying model is not bounded in general.

4 Algorithm and Analysis

We propose the Online-Advice-UCB (OA-UCB) algorithm, displayed in Algorithm 1, for solving our model. The algorithm design involves constructing confidence bounds to address the model uncertainty on r, c , as discussed in Section 4.1. In Section 4.2, we provide detail description on OA-UCB, which utilizes Online Convex Optimization (OCO) tools to balance the trade-off among rewards and resources. Crucially, at each time t , we incorporate the prediction \hat{Q}_t to scale the opportunity costs of the resources. Furthermore, both q_t and \hat{Q}_t are judiciously integrated into the OCO tools to factor the demand volumes into the consideration of the abovemention trade-off. In Section 4.3, we provide a regret upper bound to OA-UCB, and demonstrate its near-optimality when the accurate prediction condition (4) holds and when capacity is large. In Section 4.4 we provide a sketch proof of the regret upper bound, where the complete proof is in Appendix C.

4.1 Confidence Bounds

We consider the following confidence radius function:

$$\text{rad}(v, N, \delta) = \sqrt{\frac{2v \log(\frac{1}{\delta})}{N}} + \frac{4 \log(\frac{1}{\delta})}{N}. \quad (5)$$

The function (5) satisfies the following property:

Lemma 3 (Babaioff et al. [2015], Agrawal and Devanur [2014]). *Let random variables $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be independently distributed with support in $[0, 1]$. Denote $\hat{V} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N V_i$, then with probability $\geq 1 - 3\delta$, we have*

$$\left| \hat{V} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{V}] \right| \leq \text{rad}(\hat{V}, N, \delta) \leq 3\text{rad}(\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}], N, \delta).$$

We prove Lemma 3 in Appendix D.1 by following the line of argument in Babaioff et al. [2015] for the purpose of extracting the values of the coefficients in (5), which are implicit in Babaioff et al. [2015], Agrawal and Devanur [2014]. Based on the observation $\{R_s, \{C_{s,i}\}_{i \in [d]}\}_{s \in [t-1]}$, we compute the sample means

$$\hat{R}_t(a) = \frac{1}{N_{t-1}^+(a)} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} R_s \mathbf{1}_{\{A_s=a\}}, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A},$$

$$\hat{C}_t(a, i) = \frac{1}{N_{t-1}^+(a)} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} C_{s,i} \mathbf{1}_{\{A_s=a\}}, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, i \in [d],$$

where $N_{t-1}^+(a) = \max\{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{A_s=a\}}, 1\}$. In line with the principle of Optimism in Face of Uncertainty, we construct upper confidence bounds (UCBs) for the rewards and lower confidence bounds (LCBs) for resource consumption amounts. For each $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we set

$$\text{UCB}_{r,t}(a) = \min \left\{ \hat{R}_t(a) + \text{rad}(\hat{R}_t(a), N_{t-1}^+(a), \delta), 1 \right\}. \quad (6)$$

For each $a \in \mathcal{A}, i \in [d+1]$, we set

$$\text{LCB}_{c,t}(a, i) = \begin{cases} \max \left\{ \hat{C}_t(a, i) - \text{rad}(\hat{C}_t(a, i), N_{t-1}^+(a), \delta), 0 \right\} & i \in [d] \\ 0 & i = d+1. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The design of the UCBs and LCBs are justified by Lemma 3 and the model assumption that $r(a), c(a, i) \in [0, 1]$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}, i \in [d+1]$:

Lemma 4. *With probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$, we have*

$$\text{UCB}_{r,t}(a) \geq r(a), \quad \text{LCB}_{c,t}(a, i) \leq c(a, i)$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}, i \in [d+1]$.

Lemma 4 is proved in Appendix D.2.

4.2 Details on OA-UCB

OA-UCB is presented in Algorithm 1. At each time step t , the algorithm first computes a composite reward term (Line 4-5)

$$\text{UCB}_{r,t}(a) - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(a), \quad (8)$$

where $\text{UCB}_{r,t}(a)$, \hat{Q}_t and $\mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(a)$ are the surrogates for the latent $r(a)$, Q , $\mathbf{c}(a)$ respectively. The term $\frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(a)$ can be interpreted as the opportunity cost of the resources. The scalarization $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t \in \Delta_{d+1}$ weighs the relative importance of the resources. The factor \hat{Q}_t/B reflects that the opportunity cost increases with \hat{Q}_t , since with a higher total demand volume, the DM is more likely to exhaust some of the resources during the horizon, and similar reasoning holds for B . Altogether, (8) balances the trade-off between the reward of an action and the opportunity cost of that action's resource consumption. We choose an action that maximizes (8) at time t (Line 5).

After receiving the feedback, We update the scalarization $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t$ (Line 10-11) via the AdaHedge (Orabona [2019], Orabona and Pál [2015, 2018]). AdaHedge is a powerful OCO tool that can adapt to the characteristics of the sequence of functions without relying on future information. We apply this tool on the sequence of functions $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^T$, where

$$f_t(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{q_t \hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right)^\top \mathbf{x}, \quad (9)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_i)_{i \in [d+1]} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ satisfies $\beta_i = 1$ for $i \in [d]$ and $\beta_{d+1} = 0$. The expression of f_t serves to incorporate not only the prediction \hat{Q}_t in order to account for the estimated opportunity cost, as seen in equation (8), but also the actual demand q_t to accurately capture the amount of resources consumed. In fact, the choice of f_t is largely driven by our analysis. Let us provide further intuitions: To account for the opportunity cost for each resource, we need to consider the information of the total demand Q and total budget B . The inner part, $\left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right)$, can be understood as the remaining resource after choosing A_t , assuming that the total resource is scaled down from B to $\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t}$. Next, the ratio $\frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B}$ reflects the estimated amount of demand volume that 1 unit of a resource can serve, where this estimation is rooted in the fact that we replace the latent Q with the prediction \hat{Q}_t . Thus, the product of the two terms represents the estimated demand volume that the remaining resource can serve. For a resource i , higher consumption from time 1 to t results in a lower value of demand that this resource can serve in the remaining period, thereby increasing

its opportunity cost and improving the willingness of the DM to choose actions with lower consumption on this resource in the future. Lastly, the effect of each round is scaled by q_t to accurately reflect the demand volume at time t . Collectively, these considerations result in the expression for f_t .

Algorithm 1 Online-advice-UCB (OA-UCB)

- 1: **Initialize** $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \frac{1}{d+1} \mathbf{1} = \left(\frac{1}{d+1}, \dots, \frac{1}{d+1}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $\eta_1 = 0$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $\kappa = \sqrt{\ln(d+1)}$, $\mathbf{B} = (B_i)_{i \in [d]} = (B, \dots, B)$, **Reward** = 0.
- 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
- 3: Receive $\hat{Q}_t = \mathcal{F}_t(q_1, \dots, q_{t-1})$.
- 4: Compute $\text{UCB}_{r,t}(a)$, $\text{LCB}_{c,t}(a, i)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $i \in [d]$ by (6), (7), $\mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(a) = (\text{LCB}_{c,t}(a, i))_{i \in [d]}$.
- 5: Select

$$A_t \in \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \text{UCB}_{r,t}(a) - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(a) \right\}.$$

- 6: Observe q_t , receive reward $q_t R_t$, and consume $q_t C_{t,i}$ for each resource $i \in [d]$.
- 7: **if** $\exists j \in [d]$ such that $\sum_{s=1}^t q_s C_{s,j} > B$ **then**
- 8: Break, and pull the null action a_0 all the way.
- 9: Update

$$\text{Reward} = \text{Reward} + q_t R_t, \quad B_i = B_i - q_t C_{t,i}, \quad i \in [d]$$

- 10: Set

$$\mathbf{g}_t = \frac{q_t \hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right), \quad (10)$$

$$\rho_t = \begin{cases} \mathbf{g}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \min_{j=1, \dots, d+1} g_{1,j} & t = 1 \\ \eta_t \ln \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \mu_{t,j} \exp \left(\frac{-g_{t,j}}{\eta_t} \right) \right) + \mathbf{g}_t^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- 11: Update

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \mathbf{g}_t, \quad \eta_{t+1} = \eta_t + \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \rho_t, \quad \mu_{t+1,j} = \frac{\exp \left(\frac{\theta_{t+1,j}}{\eta_{t+1}} \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \exp \left(\frac{\theta_{t+1,i}}{\eta_{t+1}} \right)}, \quad j \in [d+1]. \quad (11)$$

4.3 Performance Guarantees of OA-UCB

The following theorem provides a high-probability regret upper bound for Algorithm 1:

Theorem 2. Consider the OA-UCB algorithm, that is provided with predictions that satisfy $|\hat{Q}_t - Q| \leq \epsilon_t$ for all $t \in [T]$. With probability $\geq 1 - 3KT\delta\delta$,

$$\text{OPT}_{LP} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t \leq O \left(\left(\text{OPT}_{LP} \sqrt{\frac{qK}{B}} + \sqrt{qK \text{OPT}_{LP}} \right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \quad (12)$$

$$+ \left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)}. \quad (13)$$

Theorem 2 is proved in the Appendix, and we provide a sketch proof in Section 4.4. The Theorem holds in the special case when we set $\epsilon_t = |\hat{Q}_t - Q|$, and ϵ_t represents an upper bound on the prediction error of \hat{Q}_t on Q , for example by certain theoretical guarantees. The term (12) represents the regret due to the learning on $r(a), c(a, i)$. The first term in (13) represents the regret due to the prediction error of the prediction oracle, and the second term in (13) represents the regret due to the application of OCO.

We provide more intuition on how the one-step advice \hat{Q}_t can improve the algorithm performance. The expression of OPT_{LP} demonstrates the critical role that the total demand value Q plays in an optimal policy. In the ideal case when the DM knows Q, r and c , s/he could in fact obtain a $O(\bar{q}\sqrt{T})$ regret by solving the linear program (LP) OPT_{LP} and following a static randomized rule based on the LP's optimal solution. However, in our setting, all of Q, r and c are not known. We follow the traditional techniques in learning r, c while optimizing in the online process. Our crucial contribution lies in our novel way of utilizing the predictions $\{\hat{Q}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ to achieve a regret that depends on these predictions's errors $\{\epsilon_t\}_{t=1}^T$, despite not having knowledge on these errors, meaning that the DM does not know how reliable each prediction is when making online decisions. It is important to note that while we use the LP to build intuition, it does not lead to a successful algorithm, and we rely on a OCO procedure that incorporates $\{\hat{Q}_t\}_{t=1}^T, \{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$ in a novel manner.

Comparison between regret lower and upper bounds. The regret term (12) matches the lower bound term Λ in Theorem 1 within a logarithmic factor. Next, we compare the regret upper bound term $(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t$ and the lower bound term $\frac{1}{Q} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t \epsilon_{T_0+1}$ in Theorem 1. We first assure that the lower and upper bound results are consistent, in the sense that our regret upper bound is indeed in $\Omega(\frac{1}{Q} \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t \epsilon_{T_0+1})$ on the lower bounding instances constructed for the proof of Theorem 1. In those instances, T_0 is set in a way that the resource is not fully exhausted at time T_0 under any policy, thus the stopping time τ of OA-UCB satisfies $\tau > T_0$ with certainty. More details are provided in Appendix B.3.

Next, we highlight that the regret upper and lower bounds are nearly matching (modulo multiplicative factors of $\log(1/\delta)$ as well as the additive $O\left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)}\right)$ term), under the high capacity condition $B = \Theta(Q)$ and the accurate prediction condition (4) for each $T_0 \in [T]$. The first condition is similar to the large capacity assumption in the literature Besbes and Zeevi [2009, 2012], Liu et al. [2022], while the second condition is a

natural condition that signifies a non-trivial estimation by the prediction oracle, as discussed in Section 3. On one hand, by setting $T_0 = \Theta(T)$ for the highest possible lower bound in Corollary 1, we yield the regret lower bound $\Omega(\max\{\underline{q}T_0^{1-\alpha}, \Lambda\}) = \Omega(\max\{\underline{q}T^{1-\alpha}, \Lambda\})$. On the other hand, the second term in (13) is upper bounded as

$$\left(\frac{1}{\underline{Q}} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t = O\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\epsilon_t}{\underline{Q}}\right) = O\left(\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t t^{-\alpha}\right) = O(\bar{q}T^{1-\alpha}).$$

Altogether, our claim on the nearly matching bounds is established.

4.4 Proof Sketch of Theorem 2

We provide an overview on the proof of Theorem 2, which is fully proved in Appendix C. We first provide bounds on the regret induced by the estimation errors of the UCBs and LCBs. Now, with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$, the inequalities

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t \right| \leq O\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t} + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right)\right)\right), \quad (14)$$

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t C_{t,i} \right| \leq O\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \left(\sqrt{\bar{q}KB} + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right)\right)\right), \quad \forall i \in [d]. \quad (15)$$

hold. Inequalities (14, 15) are proved in Appendix D.3. Next, by the optimality of A_t in Line 5 in Algorithm 1, the inequality

$$\text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \geq \text{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \text{LCB}_{c,t} \mathbf{u}^*, \quad (16)$$

holds, which is also proved in Appendix D.3. (16) is equivalent to the following

$$\text{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* - \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) + \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \text{LCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^*\right) \leq \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t)\right). \quad (17)$$

Follow the line of arguments in Orabona [2019], Orabona and Pál [2015, 2018], the following performance guarantee for our OCO tool holds with $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^T$ defined in (9), that for all $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Delta_{d+1}$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\boldsymbol{\mu}_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq O\left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{T \ln(d+1)}\right) \quad (18)$$

Inequality (18) is completed proved in Appendix E. Multiply q_t on both side of (17), and sum over t from 1 to $\tau - 1$. By applying the OCO performance guarantee in (18), we argue that, for all $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Delta_{d+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right)^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} + O \left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If $\tau \leq T$, then there exists $j_0 \in [d]$ such that $\sum_{t=1}^{\tau} q_t C_{t,j_0} > B$. Take $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \frac{\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}}{Q} \mathbf{e}_{j_0} + \left(1 - \frac{\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}}{Q}\right) \mathbf{e}_{d+1} \in \Delta_{d+1}$ (This is because $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} = Q \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \leq Q$). Analysis yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) & \leq O \left(\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

If $\tau > T$, it is the case that $\tau - 1 = T$, and no resource is exhausted at the end of the horizon.

Take $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{e}_{d+1}$. Similar analysis to the previous case shows that

$$\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) \leq O \left(\frac{1}{Q} \sum_{t=1}^T q_t \epsilon_t + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{T \ln(d+1)} \right). \quad (20)$$

Combine (14), (19), (20) and the fact that $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \geq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t$, the theorem holds.

5 Two Specific Demand Models

This section presents two specific demand models: the linearly increasing model and the AR(1) model. We provide asymptotically accurate prediction oracles for each of them. By using these advice, we derive explicit expressions of the upper bound for the prediction error, i.e., ϵ_t in Theorem 2, as well as the corresponding regret upper bound. Our analysis shows that the regret for both models are near optimal except for a $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\tau-1})$ term.

5.1 Linearly Increasing Model

The linearly increasing model is a commonly used demand model in many operational applications, such as inventory management and revenue management. It assumes that

the demand for a product increases linearly over time. This model is appropriate when there is a "expanding market", that is, the demand for a product has an increasing trend due to promotions or other external factors. We consider the following linearly increasing model for $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$:

$$q_t = \alpha + \beta t + \xi_t, \quad (21)$$

where $\{\xi_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is a sequence of independent random variables, each of which is bounded and zero-mean, supported in $[-M, M]$, and α, β are unknown parameters satisfying $\alpha > M > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. This model can be applied to some expanding markets. We apply the Least Square method and provide the following prediction oracle:

$$\hat{Q}_t = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_s + \sum_{s=t}^T (\hat{\alpha}_t + \hat{\beta}_t s), \quad (22)$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_t, \hat{\beta}_t$ are calculated via Least Square method as following:

$$\hat{\alpha}_t = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_s - \hat{\beta}_t \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s}{t-1}, \quad \hat{\beta}_t = \frac{(t-1) \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s q_s - (\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s) (\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_s)}{(t-1) \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s^2 - (\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s)^2}.$$

The following lemma provides a theoretical guarantee on the accuracy of the prediction oracle:

Lemma 5. Consider the linearly increasing demand model (21) with prediction oracle \hat{Q}_t as (22) on $Q = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t$, then with probability $\geq 1 - T\delta$,

$$\left| Q - \hat{Q}_t \right| \leq O \left(MT^2 \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} (t-1)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \right) := \epsilon_t.$$

Lemma 5 is proved in Appendix F. Combining with the regret upper bound for general prediction upper bound ϵ_t (Theorem 2), the high-probability regret upper bound under the linearly increasing model (21) is provided as follow:

Theorem 3. Consider the model under the linearly increasing demand model (21), and the DM is provided with predictions \hat{Q}_t as (22) for all $t \in [T]$. Take $\bar{q} = \alpha + \beta T + M$. Assume $b = \Theta(\bar{q})$, then with probability $\geq 1 - T\delta$, the OA-UCB algorithm satisfies

$$\left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t = O \left(M \left(1 + \frac{\bar{q}}{b} \right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \right) = \tilde{O}(M\sqrt{\tau-1})$$

Thus, with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta - T\delta$, the OA-UCB algorithm induces regret

$$OPT_{LP} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t \leq \tilde{O} \left(OPT_{LP} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K OPT_{LP}} + (M + \bar{q})\sqrt{\tau - 1} \right).$$

Theorem 3 is proved in Appendix F. Clearly in this case, the regret lower and upper bound are nearly matched except for a $\tilde{O}((M + \bar{q})\sqrt{\tau - 1})$ term, which shows the near-optimality of our algorithm.

5.2 AR(1) Model

The Autoregressive Moving Average (ARMA) model is a widely used time series model in literature to forecast demand in various applications such as inventory management, production planning, and supply chain management Aviv [2003]. The ARMA model assumes that the demand in a time period is a function of the demand in previous time periods and a random error term. The ARMA model captures both the autoregressive and moving average effects of a time series. The autoregressive effect refers to the relationship between the current demand and past demand values, while the moving average effect refers to the relationship between the current demand and past error terms. The ARMA model can be expressed as $ARMA(p, q)$, where p and q are the orders of the autoregressive and moving average parts, respectively. In this section, we focus on a special case of ARMA model, $AR(1)$, where $p = 1$ and $q = 0$. The $AR(1)$ model for $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is defined as

$$q_t = \alpha + \beta q_{t-1} + \xi_t. \quad (23)$$

where $\{\xi_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is a sequence of independent random variables, each of which follows a zero-mean σ^2 -subgaussian distribution, and α, β, σ are unknown parameters satisfying $\alpha > 0$, $|\beta| \in [-M, M]$, where $M < 1$. Denote $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta)$. Motivated by Bacchiocchi et al. [2022], we construct the parameter estimation $\hat{\gamma}_t$ for γ by solving the following ridge regression problem:

$$\hat{\gamma}_t = \left(\hat{\alpha}_t, \hat{\beta}_t \right) = \arg \min_{\gamma' = (\alpha', \beta') \in \mathbb{R}^2} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (q_s - \alpha' - \beta' q_{s-1})^2 + \lambda \|\gamma'\|_2^2 \right\} = \mathbf{V}_t^{-1} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_t,$$

where

$$\mathbf{V}_t = \lambda I_2 + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{z}_{s-1} \mathbf{z}_{s-1}^\top, \quad \zeta_t = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{z}_{s-1} q_s, \quad \mathbf{z}_s = (1, q_s), \quad q_0 = 0.$$

Now we provide the following prediction oracle of Q :

$$\hat{Q}_t = \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_s + \frac{\hat{\beta}_t - \hat{\beta}_t^{T-t+1}}{1 - \hat{\beta}_t} q_{t-1} + \hat{\phi}_t \left(T - t + 1 - \hat{\beta}_t + \hat{\beta}_t^{T-t+2} \right), \quad (24)$$

where $\hat{\phi}_t = \frac{\hat{\alpha}_t}{1 - \hat{\beta}_t}$. The following lemma provides the theoretical guarantee for the accuracy of the prediction oracle:

Lemma 6. Consider the AR(1) model (23) with prediction oracle \hat{Q}_t as (24) on $Q = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t$. Assume the parameters $\alpha, \beta, \sigma, \delta, q_1$ satisfies the following condition:

$$\min \left\{ q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1 - \beta} \right\} > \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 - \beta^2} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)}, \quad (25)$$

then with probability $\geq 1 - 3T\delta$, $\underline{q} \leq q_t \leq \bar{q}$ for all t , and

$$\left| \hat{Q}_t - Q \right| \leq O \left(\frac{T - t + 1}{\sqrt{t - 1}} \cdot \frac{\alpha A}{\underline{q}(1 - M)^2} + \sqrt{T - t + 1} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{1 - \beta} \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \right) := \epsilon_t,$$

where

$$\bar{q} = \max \left\{ q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1 - \beta} \right\} + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 - \beta^2} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)}, \quad \underline{q} = \min \left\{ q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1 - \beta} \right\} - \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 - \beta^2} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)},$$

and

$$A = O \left(\sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} + \sqrt{\log(T)} \right).$$

Lemma 6 is proved in Appendix F. The assumption (25) is to assure the positivity of q_t with high probability. Combine Theorem 2, the high-probability regret upper bound under the AR(1) model is provided as follow:

Theorem 4. Consider the model under AR(1) demand model (23), that is provided with predictions \hat{Q}_t as (24) for all $t \in [T]$. Assume the parameters $\alpha, \beta, \sigma, \delta, q_1$ satisfies the following condition:

$$\min \left\{ q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1 - \beta} \right\} > \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 - \beta^2} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)},$$

then with probability $\geq 1 - 3T\delta$, $\underline{q} \leq q_t \leq \bar{q}$ for all t , and OA-UCB satisfies

$$\left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t = O(\Gamma \sqrt{\tau-1}),$$

where

$$\Gamma = \left(\frac{1}{\underline{q}} + \frac{1}{b}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2} \left(\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \sqrt{\log(T)}\right) + \frac{\sigma}{1-\beta} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right),$$

and

$$\bar{q} = \max\left\{q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta}\right\} + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\beta^2} \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}, \quad \underline{q} = \min\left\{q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta}\right\} - \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\beta^2} \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}.$$

Thus, with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta - 3T\delta$, the OA-UCB algorithm induces regret

$$OPT_{LP} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t \leq \tilde{O}\left(OPT_{LP} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K OPT_{LP}} + (\Gamma + \bar{q}) \sqrt{\tau-1}\right).$$

Theorem 4 is proved in Appendix. Clearly in this case, the regret lower and upper bound are nearly matched except for a $\tilde{O}((\Gamma + \bar{q})\sqrt{\tau-1})$ term, which shows the near-optimality of our algorithm.

6 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we provide numerical results, and compare our algorithm with several existing benchmarks in literature. In the first part, the experiments are in the context of general BwK problem with only 1 resource, i.e. $d = 1$. In the second part, we illustrate an application of our algorithm in a network revenue management problem with unknown demand distribution, similar as Agrawal and Devanur [2019].

Demand sequence and Prediction oracle: We apply AR(1) demand model to generate the demand sequence $\{q_t\}$ as introduced in the previous section. To achieve time-efficiency, we consider an alternative "power-of-two" policy for updating the prediction $\{\hat{Q}_t\}$: We only recompute \hat{Q}_t as (24) when $t = 2^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, as shown in Algorithm 2. The estimation error of Algorithm 2 in terms of additive gap is plotted in Figure 1.

Algorithm 2 Estimation Generation Policy

Input: Time step t , history observation $\{q_s\}_{s=1}^{t-1}$, previous estimation \hat{Q}_{t-1} .

- 1: **if** $t = 2^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ **then**
 - 2: Compute \hat{Q}_t as (24).
 - 3: **else**
 - 4: Set $\hat{Q}_t = \hat{Q}_{t-1}$.
 - 5: **return** \hat{Q}_t .
-




Figure 1: Estimation error

6.1 Bandits with Knapsack Problem with 1 resource

Benchmarks: Our model can be viewed as a kind of “Non-stationary BwK” problem, if we view our “action” as “arm”. Hence, we would like to compare our algorithm with other existing online algorithms design for BwK:

1. PDB: The PrimalDualBwK algorithm in Badanidiyuru et al. [2013] (Algorithm 2), which is designed to solve stochastic BwK problems and has been shown to achieve optimality.
2. AD-UCB: The UCB algorithm presented in Agrawal and Devanur [2014] (Algorithm 2), which is designed to solve stochastic BwK problems and has been shown to achieve optimality.
3. SW-UCB: The Sliding-Window UCB in Liu et al. [2022], designed to solve a non-stationary BwK problems, where the amount of non-stationarity is limited by a variational budget. In implementing SW-UCB, we set the sliding window size according to the suggestion in Liu et al. [2022], and we input the required non-stationarity measures by computing them from the ground truth $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$.
4. EXP3++: The EXP3++.BwK in Rangi et al. [2018], working in both stochastic and

adversarial BwK setting in 1 resource case.

In the experiment, we simulate our algorithm and benchmarks on a family of instances, with $K = 4$, $d = 1$, $\alpha = 12$, $\beta = 0.5$, $\sigma = 2$, $\mathbf{r} = (1, 0.8, 0.5, 0.3)$, $\mathbf{c} = (0.95, 0.7, 0.4, 0.2)$, and varies b and T . Each arms's per-unit-demand outcome $(R_t, \{C_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^d)$ follows the standard Gaussian distribution truncated in $[0, 1]^{d+1}$, which has mean denoted as (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}) . We perform two groups of the experiment: In the first group, we fix time horizon $T = 10000$ and varies inventory level $b = 10, 15, 20$; In the second group, we fix inventory level $b = 15$ and varies horizon length T from 5000 to 20000. Then, for each fixed (b, T) , we simulate each algorithm 100 times with demand volume sequence $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$, and compute the regret and competitive ratio (CR) based on the sample average and standard error, where the competitive ratio is computed as the ratio of the total cumulative reward $\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t r_t$ obtained by the algorithm to the offline benchmark OPT_{LP} .

Table 1 compares the regret/competitive ratio of each algorithm on different inventory level, where the average \pm standard error is reported and the best performed algorithm in each setting has been bold; Figure 2a and 2b plot the regret/competitive ratio of each algorithm on different horizon lengths, respectively. The superiority in numerical performance for OA-UCB does not mean that our algorithm is strictly superior to the baselines. Indeed, our algorithm OA-UCB receives online advice, while the benchmarks do not. The numerical results instead indicate the benefit of predicting the underlying non-stationary demand sequence, and showcase how a suitably designed algorithm such as OA-UCB could reap the benefit of predictions. In addition, we remark that the sliding window UCB algorithm proposed by Liu et al. [2022] is designed to handle arbitrarily changing mean outcome distributions, subject to constraints on the amount of temporal variations. On the one hand, the sliding window UCB algorithm has been shown to outperform the stationary BwK benchmarks in piece-wise stationary models where the mean outcome distributions change abruptly [Liu et al., 2022]. On the other hand, in our non-stationary scaling setting, the per-demand-unit mean outcomes $r(a), c(a, 1), \dots, c(a, d)$ are time stationary for each arm a . Hence, historical data are useful for estimating these mean outcomes, which explain why the stationary benchmark could appear to out-perform sliding window UCB.

In order to better explain the benefit of receiving a "good" prediction further, we conduct two additional groups of experiment. Table 2 and Table 3 compare the regret and competitive ratio achieved by our algorithm OA-UCB under different choices of prediction oracles, as shown in the first row in Tables 2, 3. The ALG 2 is the prediction we provide in

	OA-UCB	PDB	AD-UCB	SW-UCB	EXP3++
$b = 10$					
Regret	4807 ± 313	42874 ± 382	20298 ± 151	51992 ± 206	8161 ± 327
CR	0.961 ± 0.003	0.654 ± 0.003	0.836 ± 0.003	0.581 ± 0.002	0.934 ± 0.003
$b = 15$					
Regret	7034 ± 375	92944 ± 431	18725 ± 183	101916 ± 196	29368 ± 526
CR	0.960 ± 0.002	0.466 ± 0.002	0.892 ± 0.001	0.414 ± 0.001	0.831 ± 0.003
$b = 20$					
Regret	9314 ± 182	136547 ± 502	10658 ± 215	145539 ± 165	72962 ± 460
CR	0.957 ± 0.001	0.372 ± 0.002	0.951 ± 0.001	0.331 ± 0.001	0.665 ± 0.002

Table 1: Regret/Competitive Ratio Comparison among algorithms varying inventory level b under BwK setting.




Figure 2: Regret/Competitive Ratio Comparison among algorithms varying time horizon T

Algorithm 2, which we have shown that the accuracy is "Good", in the sense that $|\hat{Q}_t - Q|$ tends to 0 as t increases. " xT " is the static prediction oracle which returns $\hat{Q}_t = Q + xT$ for all $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$. We vary x over the values in $\{5, 10, 15, 20\}$ in Table 2, and over the values in $\{-5, -10, -15, -20\}$ in Table 3. In " xT " where $\hat{Q}_t = Q + xT$ for all t , we have $\epsilon_t = |x|T$ for all t . The instance and experiment setting are the same as Table 1.

Table 2 compares the ALG 2 and 4 "aggressive" prediction oracles, i.e. $x > 0$ and $\hat{Q}_t > Q$, showing that when $|x|$ becomes larger, i.e. the prediction becomes worse, the performance of OA-UCB becomes worse, especially in the small inventory case of $b = 10$. However, note that the ALG 2 may not be the best in small inventory case. This is because in such cases, the algorithm stops too early to allow the ALG 2 to produce a good prediction. Indeed, Figure 1 shows that in early stage, the proposed ALG 2 might not have produced a good prediction yet. On the contrary, Table 3 compares the ALG 2 with 4 "conservative" prediction oracles, i.e. $x < 0$ and $\hat{Q}_t < Q$, demonstrating the same conclusion as Table 2 on

how the performance of OA-UCB worsens when $|x|$ grows. We believe both Table 2 and Table 3 verify the value of prediction: A better prediction oracle can help OA-UCB improve its performance.

	ALG 2	" $+5T$ "	" $+10T$ "	" $+15T$ "	" $+20T$ "
$b = 10$					
Regret	4917 ± 337	1985 ± 383	14769 ± 396	24847 ± 355	32860 ± 382
CR	0.960 ± 0.003	0.984 ± 0.003	0.881 ± 0.003	0.800 ± 0.003	0.735 ± 0.003
$b = 15$					
Regret	6969 ± 377	9897 ± 365	28085 ± 393	41924 ± 350	53055 ± 422
CR	0.960 ± 0.002	0.943 ± 0.002	0.839 ± 0.002	0.759 ± 0.002	0.695 ± 0.002
$b = 20$					
Regret	9330 ± 239	17327 ± 372	37584 ± 351	54635 ± 383	69521 ± 383
CR	0.957 ± 0.001	0.920 ± 0.002	0.827 ± 0.002	0.749 ± 0.002	0.685 ± 0.002

Table 2: Comparison of Regret/Competitive Ratios achieved by OA-UCB with 4 static "aggressive" prediction oracles with $x \in \{5, 10, 15, 20\}$.

	ALG 2	" $-5T$ "	" $-10T$ "	" $-15T$ "	" $-20T$ "
$b = 10$					
Regret	4898 ± 339	9537 ± 324	17238 ± 178	20317 ± 167	20339 ± 167
CR	0.960 ± 0.003	0.923 ± 0.003	0.861 ± 0.001	0.836 ± 0.001	0.836 ± 0.001
$b = 15$					
Regret	6930 ± 395	16454 ± 202	18735 ± 192	18773 ± 193	18700 ± 194
CR	0.960 ± 0.002	0.905 ± 0.001	0.892 ± 0.001	0.892 ± 0.001	0.893 ± 0.001
$b = 20$					
Regret	9305 ± 206	10752 ± 211	10709 ± 225	10640 ± 224	10749 ± 241
CR	0.957 ± 0.001	0.951 ± 0.001	0.951 ± 0.001	0.951 ± 0.001	0.951 ± 0.001

Table 3: Comparison of Regret/Competitive Ratios achieved by OA-UCB with 4 static "conservative" prediction oracles with $x \in \{-5, -10, -15, -20\}$.

6.2 A Dynamic Pricing Example: Network Revenue Management Model

We consider a network revenue management model that is similar to the models in Agrawal and Devanur [2019], Ferreira et al. [2018], Besbes and Zeevi [2012]. In this model, a firm needs to determine the prices of J products produced by d resources within a finite time horizon of length T . A resource consumption matrix A is provided to the firm, where the (j, i) th entry represents the amount of resource i needed to produce one unit of product j . The inventory level of each resource is $B_i = B = bT$, which cannot be replenished during the horizon. The firm is given a set \mathcal{A} of K price vectors, where the j th component of a vector specifies the price for the j th product. At each time t , the firm needs to choose one out of these K price vectors. After a price \mathbf{p}_t is chosen, the demand for each product j ,

$D_{t,j}$, is generated independently as $\sum_{\ell=1}^{q_t} X_{\ell,j}$. Here q_t can be viewed as the "market size" at time t , or more specifically, q_t is the number of customers entering the system at this timestamp. Each $X_{\ell,j}$ is an independent Bernoulli random variable, referring to the binary choice of buying/not buying product j for the ℓ^{th} customer. The mean of $X_{\ell,j}$ is $\lambda(\mathbf{p}_t)_j$, where $\lambda(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^J \rightarrow [0, 1]^J$ is an unknown vector value function, representing the individual choice model. The revenue at time t is the sum of prices of products sold, i.e., $\sum_{j=1}^J p_{t,j} D_{t,j}$, and the resource consumption for resource i at time t is the sum of the amount of resources consumed to produce these products, that is, $\sum_{j=1}^J A_{j,i} D_{t,j}$. If some resource is depleted, then the selling horizon is ended, and the stopping time is denoted as τ . The objective for the firm is to maximize the total revenue while satisfying the resource constraints, i.e. $\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} \sum_{j=1}^J p_{t,j} D_{t,j}$.

This problem can be formulated using our model: Each available price vector refers to one action. The $R_t, C_{t,i}, r(\mathbf{p}_t), c(\mathbf{p}_t, i)$ can be formulated as following (Suppose at time t \mathbf{p}_t is chosen)

$$R_t = \frac{1}{q_t} \sum_{j=1}^J p_j D_{t,j}, \quad C_{t,i} = \frac{1}{q_t} \sum_{j=1}^J A_{j,i} D_{t,j},$$

$$r(\mathbf{p}_t) = \mathbb{E}[R_t] = \mathbf{p}_t^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{p}_t), \quad c(\mathbf{p}_t, i) = \mathbb{E}[C_{t,i}] = (A \cdot \boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{p}_t))_i.$$

At each time t , after receiving prediction \hat{Q}_t , the firm chooses price $\mathbf{p}_t \in \mathcal{A}$, observing the feedback of (i) demand volume q_t , (ii) reward $q_t R_t = \sum_{j=1}^J p_{t,j} D_{t,j}$ and (iii) resources i consumed $q_t C_{t,i} = \sum_{j=1}^J A_{j,i} D_{t,j}$. If some resource is depleted, i.e. $\exists i_0 \in [d]$ such that $\sum_{s=1}^t q_s C_{s,j} = \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{j=1}^J A_{j,i_0} D_{s,j} > B_{i_0}$, then a null price vector $\mathbf{p}_\infty = (\infty, \dots, \infty)$ (Clearly in this case the demand will be 0 with certainty) is to be chosen in the remaining horizon $t+1, \dots, T$. The firm aims to maximize the total reward $\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t = \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} \sum_{j=1}^J p_{t,j} D_{t,j}$, subject to the resource constraints and model uncertainty.

Now we describe how we adapt our OA-UCB to this application. The $(R_t; C_{t,1}, \dots, C_{t,d})$ can be viewed as the random outcomes sampled independently from some unknown distribution $P_{\mathbf{p}_t, t}$. The latent distribution $P_{\mathbf{p}, t}$ for price vector \mathbf{p} varies over time and shares a common support and mean. However, the support may not be $[0, 1]^{d+1}$ anymore, depending on the resource consumption matrix A and price vector set \mathcal{A} . Nonetheless, the random variables following $P_{\mathbf{p}, t}$ are still bounded and non-negative, which implies their sub-gaussianity and makes the confidence bound technique applicable. Additionally, note that the model uncertainty arises from the underlying demand function $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{p})$ for all available \mathbf{p} , rather than the direct latent reward and resource consumption distribution. Therefore,

instead of constructing UCB/LCB separately for r and c , we directly construct UCB/LCB for the unknown demand function per unit of customer, i.e. using $\left\{ \frac{D_{s,j}}{q_s} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_s = \mathbf{p}) \right\}_{s=1}^{t-1}$ to estimate $\lambda(\mathbf{p})_j$ for price \mathbf{p} and product j , as shown in Algorithm 3. Here, the value $\frac{D_{t,j}}{q_t}$ for all j is a sequence of random variables with the same mean $\lambda(\mathbf{p})_j$ and support $[0, 1]$ throughout the horizon, satisfying the condition for using our confidence radius.

Benchmarks: We compare the performance of our OA-UCB-DP with the following four dynamic pricing algorithms:

1. AD-UCB-DP: The AD-UCB algorithm applied to dynamic pricing setting presented in Agrawal and Devanur [2019] (Algorithm 6).
2. TS-fixed: The algorithm presented in Ferreira et al. [2018] (Algorithm 1), which applies Thompson Sampling technique to estimate the latent demand and uses the estimation to get the pricing strategy by solving an LP in each time step.
3. TS-update: The algorithm presented in Ferreira et al. [2018] (Algorithm 2), which is same as TS-fixed except the adaptive inventory level in its LP.
4. BZ12: The algorithm proposed in Besbes and Zeevi [2012] (Algorithm 1), which first explores all prices and then exploits the best pricing strategy by solving a linear program once. In implementating this algorithm, we divide the exploration and exploitation phases at period $\tau = T^{2/3}$, as suggested in their paper.

6.2.1 Single Product, Single Resource Example

We first consider a special case. The firm only sells a single product ($J = 1$) in a finite time horizon. Without loss of generality, we assume that the product is itself the resource ($d = 1$) which has limited inventory. There are $K = 6$ possible prices: $\mathcal{A} = \{\$10, \$11, \$13, \$15, \$17, \$19\}$, and the mean demand function is given by $\lambda(\$10) = 1, \lambda(\$11) = 0.9, \lambda(\$13) = 0.7, \lambda(\$15) = 0.5, \lambda(\$17) = 0.3, \lambda(\$19) = 0.1$. The α, β, σ is the same as before. We fix $T = 10000$ and vary $b = 10, 15, 20$. For each fixed b , we run each algorithm 100 times and report sample average and standard error of regret and competitive ratio. The result is shown in Table 4. The result clearly demonstrates the benefit of our framework in such single-product, single-resource problem.

Algorithm 3 OA-UCB for Dynamic Pricing (OA-UCB-DP)

- 1: **Initialize** $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \frac{1}{d+1} \mathbf{1} = \left(\frac{1}{d+1}, \dots, \frac{1}{d+1}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $\eta_1 = 0$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $\kappa = \sqrt{\ln(d+1)}$,
 $\mathbf{B} = (B_i)_{i \in [d]} = (B, \dots, B)$, **Reward** = 0.
- 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
- 3: Receive $\hat{Q}_t = \mathcal{F}_t(q_1, \dots, q_{t-1})$.
- 4: Compute $\text{UCB}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p})$, $\text{LCB}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p})$ for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}$ as following:

$$\hat{D}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{N_{t-1}(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \frac{D_{s,j} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{p}_s = \mathbf{p})}{q_s},$$

$$\text{UCB}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p}) = \hat{D}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p}) + \text{rad}(\hat{D}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p}), N_{t-1}(\mathbf{p}), \delta),$$

$$\text{LCB}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p}) = \hat{D}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p}) - \text{rad}(\hat{D}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p}), N_{t-1}(\mathbf{p}), \delta).$$

- 5: Denote $\mathbf{UCB}_t(\mathbf{p}) = (\text{UCB}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p}))_{j \in [J]}$, $\mathbf{LCB}_t(\mathbf{p}) = (\text{LCB}_{t,j}(\mathbf{p}))_{j \in [J]}$. Select

$$\mathbf{p}_t \in \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \mathbf{UCB}_t(\mathbf{p})^\top \mathbf{p} - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \cdot A \cdot \mathbf{LCB}_t(\mathbf{p}) \right\}.$$

- 6: Observe market size q_t and demand $\{D_{t,j}\}_{j \in [J]}$.
- 7: **if** $\exists i \in [d]$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^J A_{j,i} D_{t,j} > B_i$, **then**
- 8: Break, and select the null price \mathbf{p}_∞ all the way.
- 9: Update

$$\text{Reward} = \text{Reward} + \sum_{j=1}^J p_{t,j} D_{t,j}, \quad B_i = B_i - \sum_{j=1}^J A_{j,i} D_{t,j}, \quad i \in [d].$$

- 10: Set

$$\mathbf{g}_t = \frac{q_t \hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - (A \cdot \mathbf{LCB}_t(\mathbf{p}))_i \right),$$

$$\rho_t = \begin{cases} \mathbf{g}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \min_{j=1, \dots, d+1} g_{1,j} & t = 1 \\ \eta_t \ln \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \mu_{t,j} \exp \left(\frac{-g_{t,j}}{\eta_t} \right) \right) + \mathbf{g}_t^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- 11: Update

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \mathbf{g}_t,$$

$$\eta_{t+1} = \eta_t + \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \rho_t,$$

$$\mu_{t+1,j} = \frac{\exp \left(\frac{\theta_{t+1,j}}{\eta_{t+1}} \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \exp \left(\frac{\theta_{t+1,i}}{\eta_{t+1}} \right)}, \quad j \in [d+1].$$

	OA-UCB-DP	AD-UCB-DP	TS-fixed	TS-update	BZ12
$b = 10$					
Regret	394034 ± 2820	429123 ± 1627	551735 ± 1903	523617 ± 206	528413 ± 34319
CR	0.747 ± 0.002	0.725 ± 0.001	0.646 ± 0.001	0.664 ± 0.002	0.661 ± 0.022
$b = 15$					
Regret	331294 ± 2710	355020 ± 2128	530342 ± 1957	512541 ± 1976	511933 ± 36609
CR	0.837 ± 0.001	0.826 ± 0.001	0.740 ± 0.001	0.748 ± 0.001	0.749 ± 0.018
$b = 20$					
Regret	73263 ± 1969	73276 ± 1931	299816 ± 1788	292063 ± 2213	266875 ± 65152
CR	0.968 ± 0.001	0.968 ± 0.001	0.870 ± 0.001	0.873 ± 0.001	0.665 ± 0.028

Table 4: Regret/Competitive Ratio Comparison among algorithms varying inventory level b under Single Product, Single Resource Dynamic Pricing setting.

6.2.2 Multi-Product, Multi-Resource Example

Now we consider a more general setting with multi-product and multi-resource. Similar as in Besbes and Zeevi [2012], Ferreira et al. [2018], Agrawal and Devanur [2019], there are two products and three resources ($d = 3, J = 2$). There are $K = 6$ possible prices:

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(\$5, \$10), (\$6, \$11), (\$6, \$13), (\$7, \$15), (\$8, \$17), (\$9, \$19)\},$$

where $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{A}$ means that the price for the first product is p_1 and the second product is p_2 . The matrix A equals to

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We consider three individual choice model:

- Linear model: $\lambda(\mathbf{p}) = (1 - 0.1p_1, 1 - 0.05p_2)$.
- Exponential model: $\lambda(\mathbf{p}) = (\exp(-0.2p_1), \exp(-0.1p_2))$.
- Logit model: $\lambda(\mathbf{p}) = \left(\frac{4 \exp(-0.4p_1)}{1 + \exp(-0.4p_1) + \exp(-0.2p_2)}, \frac{4 \exp(-0.2p_2)}{1 + \exp(-0.4p_1) + \exp(-0.2p_2)} \right)$.

The α, β, σ is the same as before. We fix $T = 10000$, and vary $b = 20, 30$. The result is shown in Table 5,6. The result clearly demonstrates that our algorithm can outperform other benchmarks in this setting in most cases.

	OA-UCB-DP	AD-UCB-DP	TS-fixed	TS-update	BZ12
Linear					
Regret	304652 ± 1985	358159 ± 2365	414709 ± 7525	388136 ± 9057	395570 ± 27243
CR	0.702 ± 0.002	0.650 ± 0.002	0.595 ± 0.007	0.621 ± 0.009	0.614 ± 0.027
Expo					
Regret	280236 ± 2453	349069 ± 4790	449530 ± 19703	434440 ± 17479	417928 ± 59593
CR	0.740 ± 0.002	0.676 ± 0.004	0.583 ± 0.018	0.597 ± 0.016	0.613 ± 0.055
Logit					
Regret	251288 ± 1877	303256 ± 1577	333680 ± 600	315206 ± 897	326623 ± 463
CR	0.732 ± 0.002	0.676 ± 0.002	0.643 ± 0.001	0.664 ± 0.001	0.651 ± 0.0005

Table 5: Regret/Competitive Ratio Comparison among algorithms when $b = 20$ under Multi-Product, Multi-Resource setting

	OA-UCB-DP	AD-UCB-DP	TS-fixed	TS-update	BZ12
Linear					
Regret	321384 ± 3440	379419 ± 3546	452417 ± 11519	435005 ± 6713	429984 ± 39892
CR	0.764 ± 0.002	0.722 ± 0.003	0.668 ± 0.008	0.681 ± 0.005	0.685 ± 0.029
Expo					
Regret	175335 ± 6221	174260 ± 6196	314341 ± 26772	302451 ± 29435	265473 ± 82943
CR	0.860 ± 0.005	0.860 ± 0.005	0.748 ± 0.021	0.758 ± 0.024	0.787 ± 0.066
Logit					
Regret	218885 ± 2464	260040 ± 1707	293944 ± 601	281591 ± 724	286263 ± 8657
CR	0.817 ± 0.002	0.783 ± 0.001	0.755 ± 0.001	0.765 ± 0.001	0.761 ± 0.007

Table 6: Regret/Competitive Ratio Comparison among algorithms when $b = 30$ under Multi-Product, Multi-Resource setting

7 Conclusion

We study an online resource allocation problem with bandit feedback and time varying demands, focusing on the benefits of online advice in policy design and algorithm performance. Our main contributions are twofold. Firstly, we propose impossibility results that (i) any policy without any advice performs poorly in terms of regret, and (ii) a regret lower bound that depends on the accuracy of advice. With informative advice, a strictly smaller regret lower bound is possible. Second, we design a robust online algorithm that incorporates the online advice in the form of prediction on total demand volume Q , which shows outstanding performance when the advice is informative (prediction is correct). Our approach is novel comparing to existing models in online learning/optimization with advice (such as Lykouris and Vassilvitskii [2021]), in that ours returns a (possibly refined) prediction on Q in each time step. Our results demonstrate the significance of online advice and the potential for improved performance in resource allocation problems.

There are many interesting future directions, such as investigating the models Bamas

et al. [2020], Lykouris and Vassilvitskii [2021], Purohit et al. [2018], Mitzenmacher [2019] in the presense of sequential prediction oracles similar to ours. It is also interesting to invenstigate other forms of predictions, such as predictions with distributional information Bertsimas et al. [2019], Diakonikolas et al. [2021]. Customizing prediction oracles for our model is also an interesting direction to pursuse Anand et al. [2020].

References

- Shipra Agrawal and Nikhil R Devanur. Bandits with concave rewards and convex knapsacks. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM conference on Economics and computation*, pages 989–1006, 2014.
- Shipra Agrawal and Nikhil R Devanur. Bandits with global convex constraints and objective. *Operations Research*, 67(5):1486–1502, 2019.
- Shipra Agrawal, Nikhil R Devanur, and Lihong Li. An efficient algorithm for contextual bandits with knapsacks, and an extension to concave objectives. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4–18. PMLR, 2016.
- Matteo Almanza, Flavio Chierichetti, Silvio Lattanzi, Alessandro Panconesi, and Giuseppe Re. Online facility location with multiple advice. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:4661–4673, 2021.
- Keerti Anand, Rong Ge, and Debmalya Panigrahi. Customizing ML predictions for online algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 303–313. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020.
- Antonios Antoniadis, Themis Gouleakis, Pieter Klier, and Pavel Kolev. Secretary and on-line matching problems with machine learned advice. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:7933–7944, 2020.
- Ali Aouad and Will Ma. A nonparametric framework for online stochastic matching with correlated arrivals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.02229*, 2022.
- Jean-Yves Audibert, Rémi Munos, and Csaba Szepesvári. Exploration–exploitation tradeoff using variance estimates in multi-armed bandits. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(19): 1876–1902, 2009.

- Yossi Aviv. A time-series framework for supply-chain inventory management. *Operations Research*, 51(2):210–227, 2003.
- Moshe Babaioff, Shaddin Dughmi, Robert Kleinberg, and Aleksandrs Slivkins. Dynamic pricing with limited supply, 2015.
- Francesco Bacchiocchi, Gianmarco Genalti, Davide Maran, Marco Mussi, Marcello Restelli, Nicola Gatti, and Alberto Maria Metelli. Autoregressive bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.06251*, 2022.
- Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Robert Kleinberg, and Aleksandrs Slivkins. Bandits with knapsacks. In *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 207–216. IEEE, 2013.
- Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, John Langford, and Aleksandrs Slivkins. Resourceful contextual bandits. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1109–1134. PMLR, 2014.
- Yicheng Bai, Omar El Housni, Billy Jin, Paat Rusmevichientong, Huseyin Topaloglu, and David Williamson. Fluid approximations for revenue management under high-variance demand. *SSRN*, 2022. URL <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4136445>.
- Santiago Balseiro, Christian Kroer, and Rachitesh Kumar. Online resource allocation under horizon uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.13606*, 2022.
- Étienne Bamas, Andreas Maggiori, and Ola Svensson. The primal-dual method for learning augmented algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:20083–20094, 2020.
- Dimitris Bertsimas, Melvyn Sim, and Meilin Zhang. Adaptive distributionally robust optimization. *Management Science*, 65(2):604–618, 2019.
- Omar Besbes and Assaf Zeevi. Dynamic pricing without knowing the demand function: Risk bounds and near-optimal algorithms. *Operations Research*, 57(6):1407–1420, 2009.
- Omar Besbes and Assaf Zeevi. Blind network revenue management. *Operations research*, 60(6):1537–1550, 2012.
- Omar Besbes, Yonatan Gur, and Assaf Zeevi. Stochastic multi-armed-bandit problem with non-stationary rewards. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.

- Omar Besbes, Yonatan Gur, and Assaf Zeevi. Non-stationary stochastic optimization. *Operations research*, 63(5):1227–1244, 2015.
- Wang Chi Cheung, David Simchi-Levi, and Ruihao Zhu. Learning to optimize under non-stationarity. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1079–1087. PMLR, 2019.
- Fan Chung and Linyuan Lu. Concentration inequalities and martingale inequalities: a survey. *Internet mathematics*, 3(1):79–127, 2006.
- Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, 3rd Edition*. MIT Press, 2009. ISBN 978-0-262-03384-8.
- Steven De Rooij, Tim Van Erven, Peter D Grünwald, and Wouter M Koolen. Follow the leader if you can, hedge if you must. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1281–1316, 2014.
- Ilias Diakonikolas, Vasilis Kontonis, Christos Tzamos, Ali Vakilian, and Nikos Zarifis. Learning online algorithms with distributional advice. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2687–2696. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.
- Devdatt P Dubhashi and Alessandro Panconesi. *Concentration of measure for the analysis of randomized algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Kris Johnson Ferreira, David Simchi-Levi, and He Wang. Online network revenue management using thompson sampling. *Operations research*, 66(6):1586–1602, 2018.
- David A Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *the Annals of Probability*, pages 100–118, 1975.
- R.J. Hyndman and G. Athanasopoulos. *Forecasting: principles and practice*. OTexts, 2021. URL <https://otexts.com/fpp3/>.
- Nicole Immorlica, Karthik Abinav Sankararaman, Robert Schapire, and Aleksandrs Slivkins. Adversarial bandits with knapsacks. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 202–219. IEEE, 2019.
- Ali Jadbabaie, Alexander Rakhlin, Shahin Shahrampour, and Karthik Sridharan. Online optimization: Competing with dynamic comparators. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 398–406. PMLR, 2015.

- Hamed Karimi, Julie Nutini, and Mark Schmidt. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the polyak-łojasiewicz condition. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2016, Riva del Garda, Italy, September 19-23, 2016, Proceedings, Part I* 16, pages 795–811. Springer, 2016.
- Silvio Lattanzi, Thomas Lavastida, Benjamin Moseley, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Online scheduling via learned weights. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1859–1877. SIAM, 2020.
- Bryan Lim and Stefan Zohren. Time-series forecasting with deep learning: a survey. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 379(2194), 2021.
- Qian Liu and Garrett Van Ryzin. On the choice-based linear programming model for network revenue management. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 10(2):288–310, 2008.
- Shang Liu, Jiashuo Jiang, and Xiaocheng Li. Non-stationary bandits with knapsacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12427*, 2022.
- Thodoris Lykouris and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Competitive caching with machine learned advice. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 68(4):1–25, 2021.
- Thodoris Lykouris, Vahab Mirrokni, and Renato Paes Leme. Bandits with adversarial scaling. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6511–6521, 2020.
- Vladimir V Makovetskiy, Valery M Koshelev, Larisa E Kresova, Maria A Sukharnikova, and Andzhelika V Sharapova. Consulting service as a tool to support decision-making by rural producers. In *The Challenge of Sustainability in Agricultural Systems: Volume 2*, pages 417–424. Springer, 2021.
- Aranyak Mehta, Amin Saberi, Umesh Vazirani, and Vijay Vazirani. Adwords and generalized online matching. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 54(5):22–es, 2007.
- Aranyak Mehta et al. Online matching and ad allocation. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 8(4):265–368, 2013.

- Michael Mitzenmacher. Scheduling with predictions and the price of misprediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.00732*, 2019.
- Michael Mitzenmacher and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Algorithms with predictions. *Commun. ACM*, 65(7):33–35, jun 2022a.
- Michael Mitzenmacher and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Algorithms with predictions. *Communications of the ACM*, 65(7):33–35, 2022b.
- Terry Mughan, Lester Lloyd-Reason, and Carsten Zimmerman. Management consulting and international business support for smes: need and obstacles. *Education+ Training*, 46(8/9):424–432, 2004.
- Francesco Orabona. A modern introduction to online learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.13213*, 2019.
- Francesco Orabona and Dávid Pál. Scale-free algorithms for online linear optimization. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory: 26th International Conference, ALT 2015, Banff, AB, Canada, October 4–6, 2015, Proceedings*, pages 287–301. Springer, 2015.
- Francesco Orabona and Dávid Pál. Scale-free online learning. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 716:50–69, 2018.
- Indyk Piotr, Singer Yaron, Vakilian Ali, and Vassilvitskii Sergei. Summer workshop on learning-based algorithms. 2019. URL <http://www.mit.edu/~vakilian/ttic-workshop.html>.
- Manish Purohit, Zoya Svitkina, and Ravi Kumar. Improving online algorithms via ml predictions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31, 2018.
- Alexander Rakhlin and Karthik Sridharan. Online learning with predictable sequences. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 993–1019. PMLR, 2013a.
- Sasha Rakhlin and Karthik Sridharan. Optimization, learning, and games with predictable sequences. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 26, 2013b.
- Anshuka Rangi, Massimo Franceschetti, and Long Tran-Thanh. Unifying the stochastic and the adversarial bandits with knapsack. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.12253*, 2018.
- Domingo Ribeiro Soriano. Quality in the consulting service—evaluation and impact: a survey in spanish firms. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 11(1):40–48, 2001.

- Karthik Abinav Sankararaman and Aleksandrs Slivkins. Combinatorial semi-bandits with knapsacks. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1760–1770. PMLR, 2018.
- R.H. Shumway and D.S. Stoffer. *Time Series Analysis and Its Applications: With R Examples*. Springer texts in statistics. Springer, 2017. URL <https://github.com/nickpoison/tsa4/blob/master/textRcode.md>.
- Jacob Steinhardt and Percy Liang. Adaptivity and optimism: An improved exponentiated gradient algorithm. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1593–1601. PMLR, 2014.
- Kalyan Talluri and Garrett Van Ryzin. An analysis of bid-price controls for network revenue management. *Management science*, 44(11-part-1):1577–1593, 1998.
- Stefano Tracà, Cynthia Rudin, and Weiyu Yan. Regulating greed over time in multi-armed bandits. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22:3–1, 2021.
- Chen-Yu Wei, Haipeng Luo, and Alekh Agarwal. Taking a hint: How to leverage loss predictors in contextual bandits? In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3583–3634. PMLR, 2020.
- Dan Zhang and Daniel Adelman. An approximate dynamic programming approach to network revenue management with customer choice. *Transportation Science*, 43(3):381–394, 2009.
- Feng Zhu and Zeyu Zheng. When demands evolve larger and noisier: Learning and earning in a growing environment. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11629–11638. PMLR, 2020.

A Proof for Section 2

A.1 Proof for Lemma 1

Let's first consider

$$\text{OPT}'_{\text{LP}} = \max_{\mathbf{x}_t \in \Delta_K, \forall t \in [T]} \sum_{t=1}^T q_t \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{x}_t \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T q_t \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}_t \leq B \mathbf{1}_d, \quad (26)$$

It is evident that $\text{OPT}'_{\text{LP}} \geq \text{OPT}$, since for a fixed policy π that achieves OPT , the solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \{\bar{x}_{t,a}\}_{t \in [T], a \in \mathcal{A}}$ defined as

$$\bar{x}_{t,a} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}(\text{action } a \text{ is chosen at } t \text{ under } \pi)]$$

is feasible to OPT' , and the objective value of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ in OPT'_{LP} is equal to the expected revenue earned in the online process.

Next, we claim that $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} = \text{OPT}'_{\text{LP}}$. Indeed, for each feasible solution $(\mathbf{x}_t)_{t \in [T]}$ to OPT'_{LP} , the solution

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T q_t \mathbf{x}_t}{\sum_{t=1}^T q_t},$$

is feasible to LP_{OPT} and has the same objective value as $(\mathbf{x}_t)_{t \in [T]}$. Altogether, the Lemma is proved.

B Proofs for Section 3, and Consistency Remarks

In this section, we provide proofs to the lower bound results. In both proofs, we consider an arbitrary but fixed deterministic online algorithm, that is, conditioned on the realization of the history in $1, \dots, t-1$ and q_t, \hat{Q}_t , the chosen action A_t is deterministic. This is without loss of generality, since the case of random online algorithm can be similarly handled by replace the chosen action A_t with a probability distribution over the actions, but we focus on deterministic case to ease the exposition. Lastly, in Section B.3 we demonstrate that our regret upper and lower bounds are consistent on the lower bounding instances we constructed in Section B.2.

B.1 Proof for Lemma 2

Our lower bound example involve two instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$ with deterministic rewards and deterministic consumption amounts. Both instances involve two non-dummy actions 1, 2 in addition to the null action a_0 , and there is $d = 1$ resource type. Instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$ differ in their respective sequences of demand volumes $\{q_t^{(1)}\}_{t=1}^T, \{q_t^{(2)}\}_{t=1}^T$, but for other parameters are the same in the two instances.

In both $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$, action 1 is associated with (deterministic) reward $r(1) = 1$ and (deterministic) consumption amount $c(1, 1) = 1$, while action 2 is associated with (deterministic) reward $r(2) = 3/4$ and (deterministic) consumption amount $c(2, 1) = 1/2$. Both instances share the same horizon T , a positive even integer, and the same capacity $B = T/2$. The sequences of demand volumes $\{q_t^{(1)}\}_{t=1}^T, \{q_t^{(2)}\}_{t=1}^T$ of instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$ are respectively defined as

$$q_t^{(1)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in \{1, \dots, T/2\}, \\ 1/16 & \text{if } t \in \{T/2 + 1, \dots, T\}, \end{cases}$$

$$q_t^{(2)} = 1, \quad \text{for all } t \in \{1, \dots, T\}.$$

Then the optimal reward for $I^{(1)}$ is at least $\frac{T}{2}$ (always select the action 1 until the resource is fully consumed), and the optimal reward for $I^{(2)}$ is $\frac{3T}{4}$ (always select action 2 until the resource is fully consumed).

Consider the first $T/2$ rounds, and consider an arbitrary online algorithm that knows $\{P_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$, the sequence $\{(q_s, q_s R_s, q_s C_{s,1}, \dots, q_s C_{s,d})\}_{s=1}^{t-1}$ and the time t demand q_t when the action A_t is to be chosen at each time t . Under this setting, the DM receives the same set of observations in the first $T/2$ time steps in each of instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$. Consequently, the sequence of action pulls in the first $T/2$ time steps are the same. Now, we denote $N_a = \sum_{t=1}^{T/2} \mathbf{1}(A_t = a)$ for $a \in \{1, 2\}$. By the previous remark, N_a is the number of times action a is pulled during time steps $1, \dots, T/2$ in each of the two instances. Observe that $N_1 + N_2 \leq \frac{T}{2}$, which implies $N_1 \leq \frac{T}{4}$ or $N_2 \leq \frac{T}{4}$. We denote $\text{Reward}_T(I^{(i)})$, $\text{Regret}_T(I^{(i)})$ as the expected reward and the expected regret of the policy in instance $I^{(i)}$. In what follows, we demonstrate that

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \text{Regret}_T(I^{(i)}) \geq \frac{T}{32}, \quad (27)$$

which proves the Lemma.

Case 1: $N_1 \leq \frac{T}{4}$. We consider the algorithm on $I^{(1)}$, which earns

$$\text{Reward}_T(I^{(1)}) \leq \frac{T}{4} \cdot 1 + \frac{T}{4} \cdot \frac{3}{4} + \frac{T}{2} \frac{1}{16} = \frac{15}{32}T.$$

Hence,

$$\text{Regret}_T(I^{(1)}) \geq \frac{T}{2} - \text{Reward}_T(I^{(1)}) \geq \frac{1}{32}T.$$

Case 2: $N_2 \leq \frac{T}{4}$. We consider the algorithm on $I^{(2)}$, which earns

$$\text{Reward}_T(I^{(2)}) = \left(\frac{T}{2} - N_2\right) \cdot 1 + N_2 \cdot \frac{3}{4} + \left(\frac{T}{2} - \left(\frac{T}{2} - N_2\right) \cdot 1 - N_2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}\right) \cdot \frac{3}{4} = \frac{T}{2} + \frac{N_2}{4} \leq \frac{9}{16}T.$$

Hence,

$$\text{Regret}_T(I^{(2)}) \geq \frac{3}{4}T - \text{Reward}_T(I^{(2)}) \geq \frac{3}{16}T.$$

Altogether, the inequality (27) is shown.

B.2 Proof for Theorem 1

By the Theorem's assumption that $\epsilon_{T_0+1} > 0$ is $(T_0 + 1, \{q_t\}_{t=1}^{T_0})$ -well response by $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}$, we know that

$$0 < \epsilon_{T_0+1} \leq \min \left\{ \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t - \underline{q}(T - T_0), \bar{q}(T - T_0) - \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t, \frac{\hat{Q}_{T_0+1}}{2} \right\}, \quad (28)$$

where $\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} = \mathcal{F}_{T_0+1}(q_1, \dots, q_{T_0})$. In what follows, we first construct two deterministic instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$ which only differ in their respective sequences of demand volumes $\{q_t^{(1)}\}_{t=T_0+1}^T, \{q_t^{(2)}\}_{t=T_0+1}^T$, but the two instances are the same on other parameters, and that $q_t^{(1)} = q_t^{(2)} = q_t$ for $t \in \{1, \dots, T_0\}$. Both $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$ only involve one resource constraint. We establish the Theorem by showing three claims:

1. Both $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$ are $(T_0 + 1, \epsilon_{T_0+1})$ -well-estimated by \mathcal{F} , and the underlying online algorithm and prediction oracle (which are assumed to be fixed but arbitrary in the Theorem statement) suffer

$$\text{Regret}_T(I^{(i)}) \geq \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{6Q^{(i)}} \text{ for some } i \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (29)$$

In (29), we define $\text{Regret}_T(I^{(i)})$ as the regret of the algorithm on instance $I^{(i)}$, and $Q^{(i)} = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t^{(i)}$.

2. Among the set of instances $\{J_c^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$ (see **Instances** $\{J_c^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$), the online algorithm suffers

$$\text{Regret}_T(J_c^{(i)}) \geq \frac{1}{128} \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\frac{K\bar{q}}{B}} \right\} \text{opt}(J_c^{(i)}) \text{ for some } i \in [K], \quad (30)$$

where $\text{opt}(I)$ denote the optimum of instance I , even when the DM has complete knowledge on q_1, \dots, q_T , and \hat{Q}_t is equal to the ground truth Q in each of the instances in $\{J_c^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$.

3. Among the set of instances $\{J_r^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$ (see **Instances** $\{J_r^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$), the online algorithm suffers

$$\text{Regret}_T(J_r^{(i)}) \geq \frac{1}{20} \sqrt{\bar{q}K} \text{opt}(J_r^{(i)}) \text{ for some } i \in [K], \quad (31)$$

even when the DM has complete knowledge on q_1, \dots, q_T , and \hat{Q}_t is equal to the ground truth Q in each of the instances in $\{J_r^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$.

Once we establish inequalities (29, 30, 31), the Theorem is shown. We remark that (30, 31) are direct consequences of Badanidiyuru et al. [2013]. We first extract the instances $\{J_c^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$, $\{J_r^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$ that are constructed in Badanidiyuru et al. [2013], then we construct the instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$. After that, we prove (29), which establish the Theorem.

Instances $\{J_c^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$. These instances are single resource instances, with deterministic rewards but stochastic consumption. According to Badanidiyuru et al. [2013], we first set parameters

$$\eta = \frac{1}{32} \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\frac{K}{B}} \right\}, \quad T = \frac{16B}{\eta(1/2 - \eta)},$$

and set $q_t = \bar{q}$ for all $t \in [T]$. The instances $J_c^{(1)}, \dots, J_c^{(K)}$ share the same $B, T, \{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$, and the instances share the same (deterministic) reward function:

$$R(a) = r(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \in [K] \setminus \{a_0\} \\ 0 & \text{if } a = a_0 \end{cases}.$$

In contrast, instances $J_c^{(1)}, \dots, J_c^{(K)}$ differ in the resource consumption model. We denote $C^{(i)}(a)$ as the random consumption of action a in instance $J_c^{(i)}$. The probability distribution

of $C^{(i)}(a)$ for each $a, i \in [K]$ is defined as follow:

$$C^{(i)}(a) \sim \begin{cases} \text{Bern}(1/2) & \text{if } a \in [K] \setminus \{a_0, i\} \\ \text{Bern}(1/2 - \eta) & \text{if } a = i \\ \text{Bern}(0) & \text{if } a = a_0 \end{cases},$$

where $\text{Bern}(p)$ denotes the Bernoulli distribution with mean d . The regret lower bound (30) is a direct consequence of Lemma 6.10 in Badanidiyuru et al. [2013], by incorporating the scaling factor \bar{q} into the rewards earned by the DM and the optimal reward.

Instances $\{J_r^{(i)}\}_{i \in [K]}$. These instances are single resource instances, with random rewards but deterministic consumption. These instances share the same $B, T > K$ (set arbitrarily), the same demand volume sequence, which is $q_t = \bar{q}$ for all $t \in [T]$, and the same resource consumption model, in that $c(a) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. These instances only differ in the reward distributions. We denote $R^{(i)}(a)$ as the random reward of action a in instance $J_r^{(i)}$. The probability distribution of $R^{(i)}(a)$ for each $a, i \in [K]$ is defined as follow:

$$R^{(i)}(a) \sim \begin{cases} \text{Bern}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{K}{T}}\right) & \text{if } a \in [K] \setminus \{a_0, i\} \\ \text{Bern}(1/2) & \text{if } a = i \\ \text{Bern}(0) & \text{if } a = a_0 \end{cases}.$$

The regret lower bound (31) is a direct consequence of Claim 6.2a in Badanidiyuru et al. [2013], by incorporating the scaling factor \bar{q} into the rewards earned by the DM and the optimal reward.

Construct $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$. We first describe $\{q_t^{(1)}\}_{t=1}^T, \{q_t^{(2)}\}_{t=1}^T$. As previously mentioned, for $t \in \{1, \dots, T_0\}$, we have $q_t^{(1)} = q_t^{(2)} = q_t$. To define $q_t^{(1)}, q_t^{(2)}$ for $t \in \{T_0 + 1, \dots, T\}$, first recall that $|\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - Q| \geq \epsilon_{T_0+1}$, where ϵ_{T_0+1} satisfies (28). By (28), we know that

$$\underline{q}(T - T_0) \leq \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t - \epsilon_{T_0+1} < \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t + \epsilon_{T_0+1} \leq \bar{q}(T - T_0)$$

We set $q_{T_0+1}^{(1)} = \dots = q_T^{(1)} \in [\underline{q}, \bar{q}]$ and $q_{T_0+1}^{(2)} = \dots = q_T^{(2)} \in [\underline{q}, \bar{q}]$ such that based on current instance $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^{T_0}$ we have ever received, we construct the following two subsequent instances

$I^{(1)} = \{q_t^{(1)}\}_{t=T_0+1}^T$, $I^{(2)} = \{q_t^{(2)}\}_{t=T_0+1}^T$, such that

$$Q^{(1)} = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t^{(1)} = \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1}, \quad Q^{(2)} = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t^{(2)} = \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} + \epsilon_{T_0+1},$$

which is valid by the stated inequalities.

Next, we define the parameters $\{r(a)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$, $\{c(a, 1)\}_{a, B}$. (recall $d = 1$) Similar to the proof for Lemma 2, we only consider deterministic instances, so it is sufficient to define the mean rewards and consumption amounts. To facilitate our discussion, we specify $\mathcal{A} = [K] = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, with $K \geq 3$ and action K being the null action. The parameters $\{r(a)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$, $\{c(a, 1)\}_{a, B}$ shared between instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$ are defined as follows:

$$r(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a = 1, \\ (1+c)/2 & \text{if } a = 2, \\ 0 & \text{if } a \in \{3, \dots, K\}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$c(a, 1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a = 1, \\ c & \text{if } a = 2, \\ 0 & \text{if } a \in \{3, \dots, K\}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$c = \frac{\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} + \epsilon_{T_0+1}}.$$

Finally, we set

$$B = \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1}.$$

Inequality (28) ensures that $c, B > 0$.

Proving (29). To evaluate the regrets in the two instances, we start with the optimal rewards. The optimal reward in $I^{(1)}$ is $\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1}$, which is achieved by pulling action 1 until the resource is exhasuted. The optimal reward for $I^{(2)}$ is \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} , which is achieved by pulling action 2 until the resource is exhasuted.

Consider the execution of the fixed but arbitrary online algorithm during time steps $1, \dots, T_0$ in each of the instances. The prediction oracle returns the same prediction \hat{Q}_t for $t \in \{1, \dots, T_0\}$ in both instances, since both instances share the same r, c, B, T and $q_t^{(1)} = q_t^{(2)}$ for $t \in \{1, \dots, T_0\}$. Consequently, the fixed but arbitrary online algorithm has the same

sequence of action pulls A_1, \dots, A_{T_0} during time steps $1, \dots, T_0$ in both instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$. Now, for each action $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we define $N_i = \{t \in \{1, \dots, T_0\} : A_t = i\}$, which has the same realization in instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$. Since $N_1 \cup N_2 \subseteq [T_0]$, at least one of the cases $\sum_{t \in N_1} q_t \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s$ or $\sum_{t \in N_2} q_t \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s$ holds.

We denote $\text{Reward}_T(I^{(i)})$ as the expected reward of the online algorithm in instance $I^{(i)}$.

We proceed with the following case consideration:

Case 1: $\sum_{t \in N_1} q_t \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s$. We consider the online algorithm's execution on $I^{(1)}$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reward}_T(I^{(1)}) &\leq \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s}{2} \cdot 1 + \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2}(1+c) + \left(\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1} - \sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \right) \cdot 1 \\ &= \left(\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \right) \left(-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4}c \right) + \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\text{Regret}_T(I^{(1)}) \geq \left(\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \right) \cdot \frac{1}{4}(1-c) = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{2(\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} + \epsilon_{T_0+1})} \geq \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{6(\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1})} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{6Q^{(1)}},$$

where the last inequality is by the inequality $\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} \geq 2\epsilon_{T_0+1}$, which is implied by the well response assumption of ϵ_{T_0+1} . For the last equality, recall that $\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1} = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t^{(1)}$.

Case 2: $\sum_{t \in N_2} q_t \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s$. We consider the online algorithm's execution on $I^{(2)}$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reward}_T(I^{(2)}) &\leq \left(\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s - \sum_{t \in N_2} q_t \right) \cdot 1 + \sum_{t \in N_2} q_t \cdot \frac{1}{2}(1+c) \\ &\quad + \left(B - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s - \sum_{t \in N_2} q_t \right) - \sum_{t \in N_2} q_t \cdot c \right) \cdot \frac{\frac{1}{2}(1+c)}{c} \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \left(1 - \frac{1+c}{2c} \right) + \left(\sum_{s \in N_2} q_s \right) \left[-1 + \frac{1+c}{2} + \frac{1+c}{2c} - \frac{1+c}{2} \right] + B \cdot \frac{1+c}{2c} \\ &= -\frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1}} + \left(\sum_{s \in N_2} q_s \right) \cdot \frac{\epsilon_{T_0+1}}{\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1}} + \hat{Q}_{T_0} \\ &\leq -\frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{2(\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1})} + \hat{Q}_{T_0+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\text{Regret}_T(I^{(2)}) \geq \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{2(\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1})} \geq \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{2(\hat{Q}_{T_0+1} + \epsilon_{T_0+1})} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T_0} q_s \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{2Q^{(2)}}.$$

Altogether, the Theorem is proved.

B.3 Consistency Between Regret Upper and Lower Bounds

Recall that in the proof of Theorem 1, we constructed two instances $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$ such that (see (29):

$$\text{Regret}_T(I^{(i)}) \geq \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{6Q^{(i)}} \text{ for some } i \in \{1, 2\}, \quad (32)$$

where $\text{Regret}_T(I^{(i)})$ is the regret of an arbitrary but fixed online algorithm on $I^{(i)}$, with its prediction oracle satisfying that

$$|Q^{(i)} - \hat{Q}_t| \leq \epsilon_{T_0+1} \text{ for each } i \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (33)$$

In the lower bound analysis on $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}$, we establish the regret lower bound (32) solely hinging on the model uncertainty on $Q^{(1)}, Q^{(2)}$, and the bound (32) still holds when the DM knows $\{P_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$.

In particular, we can set the online algorithm to be OA-UCB, with an oracle that satisfies the property (33) above. Now, also recall in our construction that $q_t^{(1)} = q_t^{(2)} = q_t$ for all $t \in [T_0]$, thus the predictions \hat{Q}_t for $t \in [T_0]$ are the same in the two instances, whereas $Q^{(1)} = \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1}$ but $Q^{(2)} = \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} + \epsilon_{T_0+1}$, while we still have $Q^{(2)} \leq 3Q^{(1)}$, so that $Q^{(1)} = \Theta(Q^{(2)})$. Therefore, (32) is equivalent to

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \{\text{Regret}_T(I^{(i)})\} \geq \Omega \left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{Q^{(1)}} \right). \quad (34)$$

To demonstrate the consistency, it suffices to show

$$\max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{Q^{(1)}} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t^{(i)} \right\} = \Omega \left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t \epsilon_{T_0+1}}{Q^{(1)}} \right). \quad (35)$$

where $\epsilon_t^{(i)} = |\hat{Q}_t - Q^{(i)}|$ is the prediction error on instance $I^{(i)}$ at time t . Indeed, to be consistent, we should have Theorem 2 holds true for both instances, while (34) still holds

true. We establish (35) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t^{(i)} \right\} &\geq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\epsilon_t^{(1)} + \epsilon_t^{(2)}}{2} \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{|\hat{Q}_t - \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} + \epsilon_{T_0+1}| + |\hat{Q}_t - \hat{Q}_{T_0+1} - \epsilon_{T_0+1}|}{2} \\
&\geq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{2\epsilon_{T_0+1}}{2} \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t \epsilon_{T_0+1}. \tag{37}$$

Step (36) is by the triangle inequality, and step (37) is by the fact that for any algorithm that fully exhausts the resource, its stopping time $\tau > T_0$ (In the case when OA-UCB does not fully consume all the resource at the end of time T , by definition we have $\tau = T + 1 > T_0$). By construction, the common budget B in both instances is strictly larger than $\sum_{t=1}^{T_0} q_t$, thus the resource is always not exhasuted at T_0 , since at time $t \in [T_0]$ the DM consumes at most q_t units of resource. Altogether, (35) is shown and consistency is verified.

C Proof for Theorem 2

Denote $\mathbf{UCB}_{r,t} = (\mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}(a))_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$, $\mathbf{LCB}_{c,t} = (\mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(a, i))_{a \in \mathcal{A}, i \in [d]}$. We first claim that, at a time step $t \leq \tau - 1$,

$$\mathbf{e}_{A_t} \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_K} \mathbf{UCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{u} - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{u}. \tag{38}$$

In fact, the following linear optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{u} - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{u} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{u} \in \Delta_K
\end{aligned}$$

has an extreme point solution such that $\mathbf{u}^* = \mathbf{e}_a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$. According to the definition of A_t , we know that $\mathbf{u}^* = \mathbf{e}_{A_t}$. Then the claim holds. Suppose \mathbf{u}^* is an optimal solution of (2), then we have $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} = \mathbf{Qr}^\top \mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{Qc}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \leq B1$ and $\mathbf{u}^* \in \Delta_K$. By the optimality of (38), we have

$$\mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) = \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{e}_{A_t} - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{e}_{A_t} \geq \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* - \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^*,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) + \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \right) \leq \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right). \quad (39)$$

Multiply q_t on both side of (39), and sum over t from 1 to $\tau - 1$. By Lemma 20, for any $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \Delta_{d+1}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right)^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} + O \left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Recall by Lemma 4 that with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$, we have

$$\mathbf{LCB}_{c,t} \leq \mathbf{c}.$$

Hence, with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \right) \geq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \right) \quad (41a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \frac{B}{Q} \boldsymbol{\beta} \right) \\ & + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{Q} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \right) \end{aligned} \quad (41b)$$

$$\geq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^\top \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \frac{B}{Q} \boldsymbol{\beta} \right) \quad (41c)$$

$$\geq - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left| \frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right|, \quad (41d)$$

where (41a) comes from Lemma 4, (41b) comes from rearranging the sum, and (41c) comes from the fact the definition of \mathbf{u}^* . We first consider the case $\tau \leq T$, which implies that there exists $j_0 \in [d]$ such that

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\tau} q_t C_{t,j_0} > B \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t C_{t,j_0} > B - \bar{q}. \quad (42)$$

Take $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \lambda \mathbf{e}_{j_0} + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{e}_{d+1}$, where $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ is a constant that we tune later. In this case, with probability $\geq 1 - 3KT\delta$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \geq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \mathbf{r}_t^\top \mathbf{u}^* = \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \frac{Q_{\tau-1}}{Q}, \quad (43)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right)^\top (\lambda \mathbf{e}_{j_0} + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{e}_{d+1}) &= \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0) \right) \\ &= \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right) \\ &\quad + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{Q} - C_{t,j_0} \right) \\ &\quad + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} (C_{t,j_0} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Then we deal with each term respectively:

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{Q} - C_{t,j_0} \right) = \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{Q}{B} \left(\frac{B}{Q} - C_{t,j_0} \right) + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t - Q}{B} \left(\frac{B}{Q} - C_{t,j_0} \right) \quad (45a)$$

$$\leq Q_{\tau-1} - \frac{Q}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t C_{t,j_0} + \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t \left| \frac{B}{Q} - C_{t,j_0} \right| \quad (45b)$$

$$< Q_{\tau-1} - Q + \frac{Q}{B} \bar{q} + \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t \frac{B}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t C_{t,j_0} \quad (45c)$$

$$\leq Q_{\tau-1} - Q + \frac{Q}{B} \bar{q} + \left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t, \quad (45d)$$

where (45a) comes from rearranging the sum, (45c) comes from the (42), and (45d) comes from the fact that C_{t,j_0} is supported in $[0, 1]$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} (C_{t,j_0} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) &= \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{Q}{B} (C_{t,j_0} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t - Q}{B} (C_{t,j_0} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) \\ &\leq \frac{Q}{B} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t (C_{t,j_0} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) \right| + \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where the inequality comes from the fact that $|\hat{Q}_t - Q| \leq \epsilon_t$, $0 \leq \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0), C_{t,j_0} \leq 1$.
Combine (44), (45) and (46), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \beta - \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right)^\top (\lambda \mathbf{e}_{j_0} + (1-\lambda) \mathbf{e}_{d+1}) \\
& \leq \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right) + \lambda \left(Q_{\tau-1} - Q + \frac{Q}{B} \bar{q} + \left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t \right) \\
& + \lambda \left(\frac{Q}{B} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t (C_{t,j_0} - \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) \right| + \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t \right) \tag{47} \\
& \leq \lambda \left(Q_{\tau-1} - Q + \frac{Q}{B} \bar{q} + \frac{Q}{B} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t (C_{t,j_0} - \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) \right| \right) + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right) \\
& + O \left(\left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t \right),
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, combine (40), (41), (43), (47), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \frac{Q_{\tau-1}}{Q} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left| \frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right| \\
& \leq \lambda \left(Q_{\tau-1} - Q + \frac{Q}{B} \bar{q} + \frac{Q}{B} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t (C_{t,j_0} - \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) \right| \right) + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right) \\
& + O \left(\left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) & \leq \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \left(1 - \frac{Q_{\tau-1}}{Q} \right) + \lambda \left(Q_{\tau-1} - Q + \frac{Q}{B} \bar{q} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{Q}{B} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t (C_{t,j_0} - \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) \right| \right) + 2 \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left| \frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right| \\
& \quad + O \left(\left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t \right) + O \left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\lambda = \frac{\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}}{Q} \leq 1$ (This is because $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} = Q \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \leq Q$), then we can further derive

with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) &\leq \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \left(1 - \frac{Q_{\tau-1}}{Q}\right) + \frac{\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}}{Q} \left(Q_{\tau-1} - Q + \frac{Q}{B} \bar{q}\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{Q}{B} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t (C_{t,j_0} - \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) \right| \right) + 2 \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left| \frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right| \\
&\quad + O\left(\left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t\right) + O\left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)}\right) \\
&= \frac{\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}}{B} \bar{q} + \frac{\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}}{B} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t (C_{t,j_0} - \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, j_0)) \right| + 2 \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left| \frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right| \\
&\quad + O\left(\left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t\right) + O\left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)}\right) \\
&\leq O\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t\right) \\
&\quad + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)},
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where the second inequality comes from Lemma 16 and the following

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\tau} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left| \frac{B}{Q} - \frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \right| = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} q_t \left| \hat{Q}_t - Q \right| \leq \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} q_t \epsilon_t.$$

The above concludes our arguments for the case $\tau \leq T$. In complement, we then consider the case $\tau > T$, which means that $\tau = T + 1$, and no resource is fully exhausted during the horizon. With probability $\geq 1 - 3KT\delta$, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T q_t \mathbf{UCB}_{r,t}^\top \mathbf{u}^* \geq \sum_{t=1}^T q_t \mathbf{r}_t^\top \mathbf{u}^* = \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}. \tag{49}$$

Take $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{e}_{d+1}$ and combine (40), (41), (49), with probability $\geq 1 - 3KT\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \frac{\hat{Q}_t}{B} \left| \frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} - \frac{B}{Q} \right| + O\left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{T \ln(d+1)}\right) \\
&\leq O\left(\frac{1}{Q} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{T \ln(d+1)}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Combine (50) and (48), for any stopping time τ , with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) &\leq O\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 15, we can further derive it to the high probability bound, that with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t &\leq O\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \left(\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t} + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right)\right)\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)}\right) \\ &\leq O\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \left(\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b}\right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality comes from the fact that $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \geq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t$. Now we finish the proof of Theorem 2.

D Proofs for Confidence Radii

This section contains proofs for the confidence radius results, which largely follow the literature, but we provide complete proofs since we are in a non-stationary setting. Section D.1 provides the proof for Lemma 3, which allows us to extract the implicit constants in existing proofs in Babaiouff et al. [2015], Agrawal and Devanur [2014]. Section D.2 provides the proof for Lemma 4. Finally, section D.3, we prove inequalities (14, 15).

D.1 Proof for Lemma 3, due to Babaiouff et al. [2015], Agrawal and Devanur [2014]

In this subsection, we prove Lemma 3 by following the line of arguments in Babaiouff et al. [2015]. We emphasize that a version of the Lemma has been proved in Babaiouff et al. [2015]. We derive the Lemma for the purpose of extracting the values of the constant coefficients. We first extract some relevant concentration inequalities in the following two Lemmas.

Lemma 7 (Theorem 8 in Chung and Lu [2006]). Suppose $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent random variables satisfying $U_i \leq M$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$ almost surely. Let $U = \sum_{i=1}^n U_i$, $\|U\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[U_i^2]$. With probability $\geq 1 - e^{-x}$, we have

$$U - \mathbb{E}[U] \leq \sqrt{2\|U\|^2 x} + \frac{2x}{3} \max\{M, 0\}.$$

Lemma 8 (Theorem 6 in Chung and Lu [2006]). Suppose U_i are independent random variables satisfying $U_i - \mathbb{E}[U_i] \leq M$, $M > 0$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $U = \sum_{i=1}^n U_i$, $\text{Var}(U) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(U_i)$, then with probability $\geq 1 - e^{-x}$, we have

$$U - \mathbb{E}[U] \leq \sqrt{2\text{Var}(U)x} + \frac{2Mx}{3}.$$

Using Lemma 8, we first derive the following Lemma that bounds the empirical mean:

Lemma 9. Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be independent random variables supported in $[0, 1]$. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $\text{Var}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_i)$. For any fixed $x > 0$, With probability $\geq 1 - 2e^{-x}$, we have

$$|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \leq \sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)x} + \frac{2x}{3}.$$

Proof of Lemma 9. Apply Lemma 8 with $U_i = X_i$, $U_i = -X_i$, respectively, and $M = 1$, then with probability $\geq 1 - 2e^{-x}$, we have

$$|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \leq \sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)x} + \frac{2x}{3}.$$

□

Next, we bound the difference between the ground truth variance and its empirical counterpart using Lemma 7:

Lemma 10. Suppose X_i are independent random variables supported in $[0, 1]$. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, $\text{Var}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_i)$, $V_n = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^2$ then with probability $\geq 1 - 3e^{-x}$, we have

$$\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)} \leq \sqrt{V_n} + 2\sqrt{x}.$$

Proof of Lemma 10. The proof follows the line of argument in Audibert et al. [2009]. First, we apply Lemma 7 with $U_i = -(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^2$ and $M = 0$. With probability $\geq 1 - e^{-x}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(X) &\leq V_n + \sqrt{2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^4] \right) x} \\ &\leq V_n + \sqrt{2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i])^2] \right) x} \\ &= V_n + \sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)x}.\end{aligned}\tag{51}$$

Since $X_i \in [0, 1]$ almost surely for all $i \in [n]$, we have

$$\text{Var}(X_i) = \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] - \mathbb{E}[X_i]^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[X_i] - \mathbb{E}[X_i]^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Now, observe that

$$\text{Var}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{4} = \frac{n}{4} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sqrt{\text{Var}(X)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}.$$

If $2\sqrt{x} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}$, then the Lemma evidently holds. Otherwise, we assume $2\sqrt{x} \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}$, which is equivalent to $x \leq \frac{n}{16}$. Combining Lemma 9 and (51), with probability $\geq 1 - 3e^{-x}$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(X) &\leq V_n + \sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)x} + \frac{(X - \mathbb{E}[X])^2}{n} \\ &\leq V_n + \sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)x} + \frac{1}{n} \left(2\text{Var}(X)x + \frac{4}{3}x\sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)x} + \frac{4x^2}{9} \right) \\ &\leq V_n + \sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)x} + \frac{1}{n} \left(2\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)x} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{4} + \frac{4}{3}\sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)x} \cdot \frac{n}{16} + \frac{4x}{9} \cdot \frac{n}{16} \right) \\ &= \sqrt{\text{Var}(X)x} \left(\frac{13}{12}\sqrt{2} + \frac{1}{4} \right) + \left(V_n + \frac{x}{36} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we can derive an upper bound for $\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}$:

$$\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{x}}{2} \left(\frac{13}{12}\sqrt{2} + \frac{1}{4} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{x \left(\frac{13}{12}\sqrt{2} + \frac{1}{4} \right)^2 + 4 \left(V_n + \frac{x}{36} \right)} \leq \sqrt{V_n} + 2\sqrt{x},$$

which proves the Lemma. \square

Lemma 11. Suppose X_i are independent random variables supported in $[0, 1]$. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$,

then with probability $\geq 1 - 3e^{-x}$, we have

$$|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \leq \sqrt{2Xx} + 4x.$$

Proof of Lemma 11. Apply Lemma 9 and Lemma 10, we directly derive that with probability $\geq 1 - 3e^{-x}$

$$|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \leq \sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)x} + \frac{2x}{3} \leq \sqrt{2V_n x} + \left(2\sqrt{2} + \frac{2}{3}\right)x < \sqrt{2V_n x} + 4x \leq \sqrt{2Xx} + 4x,$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact that for random variable whose support is $[0, 1]$, then its variance is always smaller than its mean. \square

Lemma 12 (Theorem 1.1 in Dubhashi and Panconesi [2009]). *Suppose X_i are independent random variables supported in $[0, 1]$. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, then for any $R > 2e\mathbb{E}[X]$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(X > R) \leq 2^{-R}.$$

Now we turn back to the proof of Lemma 3. Denote $\delta = e^{-x}$. Apply Lemma 11 then with probability $\geq 1 - 3\delta$, we have,

$$N \left| \hat{V} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{V}] \right| \leq \sqrt{2N\hat{V} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + 4 \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right),$$

which is equivalent to ,

$$\left| \hat{V} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{V}] \right| \leq \text{rad}(\hat{V}, N, \delta). \quad (52)$$

Besides,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\text{rad}(\hat{V}, N, \delta) > 3\text{rad}(\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}], N, \delta)\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{V} > 9\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}] + 32 \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right) \\ &\leq 2^{-9\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}] - 32 \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} \\ &\leq \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Therefore, combining (52) and (53), the lemma holds.

D.2 Proof for Lemma 4

By Lemma 3, with probability $\geq 1 - 3KT\delta$, we have

$$|r(a) - \hat{R}_t(a)| \leq \text{rad}(\hat{R}_t(a), N_{t-1}^+(a), \delta).$$

Hence with probability $\geq 1 - 3KT\delta$,

$$\begin{cases} r(a) \leq \hat{R}_t(a) + \text{rad}(\hat{R}_t(a), N_{t-1}^+(a), \delta) \\ r(a) \leq 1 \end{cases} \Rightarrow r(a) \leq \min \left\{ \hat{R}_t(a) + \text{rad}(\hat{R}_t(a), N_{t-1}^+(a), \delta), 1 \right\} = \text{UCB}_{r,t}(a).$$

Similarly, with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$,

$$\text{LCB}_{c,t}(a) \preceq c(a).$$

D.3 Proof for Inequalities (14, 15)

We first provide the two lemmas:

Lemma 13 (Theorem 1.6 in Freedman [1975]). *Suppose $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a martingale difference sequence supported in $[0, 1]$ with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Let $U = \sum_{i=1}^n U_i$, and $V = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(U_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1})$. Then for any $a > 0, b > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(|U| \geq a, V \leq b) \leq 2e^{-\frac{a^2}{2(a+b)}}.$$

Lemma 14. *Suppose $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are random variables supported in $[0, 1]$, where X_i is \mathcal{F}_i -measurable and $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a filtration. Let $M_i = \mathbb{E}[X_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $M = \sum_{i=1}^n M_i$. Then with probability $\geq 1 - 2n\delta$, we have*

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - M_i) \right| \leq O \left(\sqrt{M \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} + \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right).$$

Proof of Lemma 14. The proof follows the line of Theorem 4.10 in Babaioff et al. [2015]. Let $U_i = X_i - M_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Clearly, $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a martingale difference sequence

with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Since

$$\text{Var}(U_i|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}) = \text{Var}(X_i|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}) = \mathbb{E}[X_i^2|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - \mathbb{E}[X_i|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}]^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[X_i|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = M_i \text{ almost surely,}$$

we have $V = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(U_i|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n M_i = M$ almost surely. Apply Lemma 13 with $a = \sqrt{2b \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + 2 \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ for any $b \geq 1$, it follows that with probability $\leq 2\delta$,

$$|U| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n U_i \right| \geq O\left(\sqrt{b \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right) \quad \& \quad V \leq b,$$

Take the union bound over all integer b from 1 to n , noting that $V \leq M$ and $b-1 \leq M \leq b$ for some $b \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ almost surely, with probability $\geq 1 - 2n\delta$ we have

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - M_i) \right| \leq O\left(\sqrt{M \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

Altogether, the lemma holds. □

Now, we paraphrase inequalities (14, 15) as Lemmas 15, 16, and provide their proofs.

Lemma 15. *With probability $\geq 1 - 3KT\delta$, we have*

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t \right| \leq O\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t} + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right)\right)\right).$$

Lemma 16. *With probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$, we have*

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t C_{t,i} \right| \leq O\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \left(\sqrt{\bar{q}KB} + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right)\right)\right), \quad \forall i \in [d].$$

Proof of Lemma 15. First with probability $\geq 1 - 2T\delta$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t r(A_t) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t \right| = \bar{q} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{q_t}{\bar{q}} (r(A_t) - R_t) \right| \tag{54a}$$

$$\leq O\left(\sqrt{\bar{q} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t r(A_t)} + \bar{q} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right) \tag{54b}$$

$$\leq O \left(\sqrt{\bar{q} \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t)} + \bar{q} \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right), \quad (54c)$$

where (54c) comes from Lemma 4. Inequality (54b) comes from Lemma 14, where we apply $X_t = \frac{q_t R_t}{\bar{q}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{t-1} = \sigma(\{A_s, q_s, R_s, \{C_{s,i}\}_{i=1}^d, \hat{Q}_s\}_{s=1}^{t-1} \cup \{q_t\})$. Then with probability $\geq 1 - 3KT\delta$, we also have

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t r(A_t) \right| \leq 6 \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{rad}(r(A_t), N_{t-1}^+(A_t), \delta) \quad (55a)$$

$$\leq 6 \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}: N_{\tau-1}(a) > 0} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\tau-1}(a)} q_n(a) \text{rad}(r(a), n, \delta) \quad (55b)$$

$$= 6\bar{q} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}: N_{\tau-1}(a) > 0} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\tau-1}(a)} \frac{q_n(a)}{\bar{q}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2r(a) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)}{n}} + \frac{4}{n} \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \quad (55c)$$

$$\leq 6\bar{q} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}: N_{\tau-1}(a) > 0} \left(2\sqrt{2r(a) \frac{Q_{\tau-1}(a)}{\bar{q}} \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} + 4(1 + \log(N_{\tau-1}(a))) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \quad (55d)$$

$$\leq 12 \left(\sqrt{2\bar{q}K \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} r(a) Q_{\tau-1}(a)} + 2\bar{q}K \log \left(\frac{T}{K} \right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) + 2\bar{q}K \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \quad (55e)$$

$$= 12 \left(\sqrt{2\bar{q}K \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t r(A_t)} + 2\bar{q}K \log \left(\frac{T}{K} \right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) + 2\bar{q}K \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \quad (55f)$$

$$\leq 12 \left(\sqrt{2\bar{q}K \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t)} + 2\bar{q}K \log \left(\frac{T}{K} \right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) + 2\bar{q}K \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right), \quad (55g)$$

where

- (55a) comes from the following, with probability $\geq 1 - 3KT\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) - r(A_t)| &\leq \left| \hat{R}_{t-1}(A_t) - r(A_t) \right| + \text{rad}(\hat{R}_{t-1}(A_t), N_{t-1}^+(A_t), \delta) \\ &\leq 2\text{rad}(\hat{R}_{t-1}(A_t), N_{t-1}(A_t), \delta) \\ &\leq 6\text{rad}(r(A_t), N_{t-1}(A_t), \delta). \end{aligned}$$

- (55b) comes from rearranging the sum. $q_n(a)$ means the n -th adversarial term that the algorithm selects a .
- (55c) comes from the definition of $\text{rad}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$.
- (55d) comes from the following

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{\sqrt{i}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2w_i}{2\sqrt{i}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{2w_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^i w_j} + \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} w_j}} = \sum_{i=1}^n 2 \left(\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^i w_j} - \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} w_j} \right) = 2\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i},$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i} \leq (1 + \log(n)).$$

where $w_i \in (0, 1]$.

- In (55d) and (55e) $Q_t(a) = \sum_{s \in [t], A_s = a} q_s$.
- (55e) comes from Jansen inequality.

Combine (54) and (55), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t r_t + O \left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\left(\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t)} - O \left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} \right) \right)^2 \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t r_t + O \left(\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right),$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{r,t}(A_t)} &\leq O\left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right) \\
&+ \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t r_t + O\left(\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t r_t + O\left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Combine (54) and (55), (56), we finish the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 16. The proof is quite similar to Lemma 15, so we omit the descriptive details. Similarly, with probability $\geq 1 - 2Td\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t c(A_t, i) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t C_{t,i} \right| &= \bar{q} \left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{q_t}{\bar{q}} (c(A_t) - C_{t,i}) \right| \\
&\leq O\left(\sqrt{\bar{q} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t c(A_t, i) + \bar{q} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right) \\
&\leq O\left(\sqrt{\bar{q} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i) + \bar{q} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

where

$$\text{UCB}_{c,t}(a, i) = \min \left\{ \hat{C}_t(a, i) + \text{rad}(\hat{C}_t(a, i), N_{t-1}^+(a), \delta), 1 \right\}.$$

Then with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t c(A_t, i) \right| &\leq 6 \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{rad}(c(A_t, i), N_{t-1}^+(A_t), \delta) \\
&\leq 6 \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}: N_{\tau-1}(a) > 0} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\tau-1}(a)} q_n(a) \text{rad}(c(a, i), n, \delta) \\
&= 6\bar{q} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}: N_{\tau-1}(a) > 0} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\tau-1}(a)} \frac{q_n(a)}{\bar{q}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2c(a, i) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}{n}} + \frac{4}{n} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right) \\
&\leq 6\bar{q} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}: N_{\tau-1}(a) > 0} \left(2\sqrt{2c(a, i) \frac{Q_{\tau-1}(a)}{\bar{q}}} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 4(1 + \log(N_{\tau-1}(a))) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right) \\
&\leq 12 \left(\sqrt{2\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c(a, i) Q_{\tau-1}(a)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + 2\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right) \\
&\leq 12 \left(\sqrt{2\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + 2\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right). \tag{58}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t c(A_t, i) \right| &\leq 6 \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{rad}(c(A_t, i), N_{t-1}^+(A_t), \delta) \\
&\leq O \left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right). \tag{59}
\end{aligned}$$

Combine (57) and (59), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t C_{t,i} + O \left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\left(\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i)} - O\left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right) \right)^2 \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t C_{t,i} + O\left(\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right),$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \text{UCB}_{c,t}(A_t, i)} &\leq O\left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right) \\ &+ \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t C_{t,i} + O\left(\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t C_{t,i}} + O\left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{B} + O\left(\sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{T}{K}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where the last inequality comes from the definition of the stopping time τ . Combine (57) and (58), (60), we finish the proof. \square

E Proof for OCO Performance Guarantee

This section contains the proof for the performance guarantee of the OCO tool AdaHedge we apply in the Algorithm 1, which largely follows the line in Orabona [2019], De Rooij et al. [2014], Orabona and Pál [2015, 2018]. Here we still provide the proof for completeness. We first provide several lemmas, then we show the Inequality (18) holds.

Lemma 17 (Karimi et al. [2016]). *For a continuously differentiable and μ -strongly convex function f with respect to norm $\|\cdot\|$, suppose $\mathbf{x}^* \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x})$, then for all $\mathbf{x} \in \text{dom} f$, the following Polyak-Lojasiewicz Inequality holds:*

$$f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|_*^2}{2\mu}$$

Proof. The μ -strong convexity of f implies $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$, we have

$$f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla f(\mathbf{x})^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^2.$$

Take minimization respect to \mathbf{y} on both sides, we obtain

$$f(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2\mu} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|_*^2$$

Rearranging it then we have the Polyak-Lojasiewicz Inequality holds. \square

Lemma 18 (A generalized version of Lemma 7 in Orabona and Pál [2018]). *Let $\{a_t\}$ be any sequence of non-negative real numbers. Suppose $\{\delta_t\}$ is a sequence of non-negative real numbers satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \delta_0 = 0 \\ \delta_t \leq \delta_{t-1} + \min \left\{ ba_t, c \frac{a_t^2}{\delta_{t-1}} \right\} \quad t \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

then for any $T > 0$,

$$\delta_T \leq \sqrt{(b^2 + 2c) \sum_{t=1}^T a_t^2}$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\delta_T^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T (\delta_t^2 - \delta_{t-1}^2) = \sum_{t=1}^T ((\delta_t - \delta_{t-1})^2 + 2(\delta_t - \delta_{t-1})\delta_{t-1}).$$

From the definition of δ_t , we have

$$(\delta_t - \delta_{t-1})^2 \leq b^2 a_t^2 \quad \text{and} \quad 2(\delta_t - \delta_{t-1})\delta_{t-1} \leq 2c a_t^2$$

sum over t from 1 to T , then we finish the proof. \square

Lemma 19. *Suppose $f_t(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{g}_t^\top \mathbf{x}$ is a sequence of linear functions, $\mathbf{g}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d$, then Algorithm 4 applied on $\{f_t\}$ with $\kappa = \sqrt{\ln d}$ guarantees the following for all $T \geq 1$, $\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_d$:*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{u}) \leq 2\sqrt{(4 + \ln d) \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty^2}.$$

Algorithm 4 AdaHedge

- 1: Initialize $\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{1}{d}\mathbf{1} = (\frac{1}{d}, \dots, \frac{1}{d}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\eta_1 = 0$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\kappa > 0$.
- 2: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
- 3: Play \mathbf{x}_t and observe cost $f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) = \mathbf{g}_t^\top \mathbf{x}_t$.
- 4: Set

$$\rho_t = \begin{cases} \mathbf{g}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_1 - \min_{j=1, \dots, d} g_{t,j} & t = 1 \\ \eta_t \ln \left(\sum_{j=1}^d x_{t,j} \exp \left(\frac{-g_{t,j}}{\eta_t} \right) \right) + \mathbf{g}_t^\top \mathbf{x}_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- 5: Update

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} &= \boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \mathbf{g}_t, \\ \eta_{t+1} &= \eta_t + \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \rho_t, \\ x_{t+1,j} &= \frac{\exp \left(\frac{\theta_{t+1,j}}{\eta_{t+1}} \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^d \exp \left(\frac{\theta_{t+1,i}}{\eta_{t+1}} \right)}, \quad j \in [d]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Observe that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{g}_i$, $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \rho_i$, and for $t > 1$

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \left(\frac{\exp \left(\frac{\theta_{t,j}}{\eta_t} \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^d \exp \left(\frac{\theta_{t,i}}{\eta_t} \right)} \right)_{j \in [d]} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \eta_t \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} f_i(\mathbf{x})$$

where $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \ln x_i + \ln d$. Denote $\psi_t(\mathbf{x}) = \eta_t \psi(\mathbf{x})$ for $t > 1$ and $\psi_1(\mathbf{x}) = \psi(\mathbf{x})$, $F_t(\mathbf{x}) = \psi_t(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} f_i(\mathbf{x})$. Then we can view the update rule as

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \psi_t(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} F_t(\mathbf{x}), \quad t \in [T]$$

We claim that for any $\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_d$, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{u}) \leq \psi_{T+1}(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{t=1}^T (F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - F_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t)) \quad (61)$$

In fact, it is equivalent to verify that

$$-\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{u}) \leq \psi_T(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{t=1}^T (F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - F_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}))$$

which can be shown as following:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{u}) &= \psi_{T+1}(\mathbf{u}) - F_{T+1}(\mathbf{u}) \\
&= \psi_{T+1}(\mathbf{u}) - F_1(\mathbf{x}_1) + F_1(\mathbf{x}_1) - F_{T+1}(\mathbf{x}_{T+1}) + F_{T+1}(\mathbf{x}_{T+1}) - F_{T+1}(\mathbf{u}) \\
&= \psi_{T+1}(\mathbf{u}) - F_1(\mathbf{x}_1) + \sum_{t=1}^T (F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - F_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1})) + F_{T+1}(\mathbf{x}_{T+1}) - F_{T+1}(\mathbf{u}) \\
&\leq \psi_{T+1}(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{t=1}^T (F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - F_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}))
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality uses the definition of $F_{T+1}(\cdot)$, and the inequality comes from the fact that $F_1(\mathbf{x}_1) = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \psi(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ and $F_{T+1}(\mathbf{x}_{T+1}) = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} F_{T+1}(\mathbf{x}) \leq F_{T+1}(\mathbf{u})$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_d$. Then the claim holds. Now we upper bound the term $F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - F_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - F_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) &= F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \psi_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&= F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \eta_{t+1} \psi(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&\leq F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \eta_t \psi(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&\leq F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \left\{ \eta_t \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\mathbf{x}) \right\} + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&= \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \left\{ \eta_t \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} f_i(\mathbf{x}) \right\} - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \left\{ \eta_t \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\mathbf{x}) \right\} + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&= \begin{cases} \mathbf{g}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_1 - \min_{j=1, \dots, d} g_{t,j} & t = 1 \\ \eta_t \ln \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^d \exp\left(\frac{\theta_{t+1,j}}{\eta_t}\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^d \exp\left(\frac{\theta_{t,j}}{\eta_t}\right)} \right) + \mathbf{g}_t^\top \mathbf{x}_t & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \mathbf{g}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_1 - \min_{j=1, \dots, d} g_{t,j} & t = 1 \\ \eta_t \ln \left(\sum_{j=1}^d x_{t,j} \exp\left(\frac{-g_{t,j}}{\eta_t}\right) \right) + \mathbf{g}_t^\top \mathbf{x}_t & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&= \rho_t
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where the first inequality comes from the claim that $\rho_t \geq 0$ ($\rho_1 \geq 0$ is obvious, for $t > 1$, use the concavity of $\ln(\cdot)$), and thus $\eta_{t+1} \geq \eta_t$. Combine (61), (62), we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{u}) \leq \psi_{T+1}(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_T = \eta_{T+1} (\psi(\mathbf{u}) + \kappa^2)$$

Now we only need to upper bound η_{T+1} . Since $\eta_{t+1} = \eta_t + \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \rho_t = \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \sum_{i=1}^t \rho_i$, we bound ρ_t first. For one hand, denote $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \{ \eta_t \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\mathbf{x}) \} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \{ F_t(\mathbf{x}) + f_t(\mathbf{x}) \}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_t &= F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \left\{ \eta_t \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\mathbf{x}) \right\} + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&= F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \eta_t \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) + \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&\leq F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) - \eta_t \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) + \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&= -f_t(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&\leq 2\|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

where the last inequality comes from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. For another hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_t &= F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_d} \left\{ \eta_t \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\mathbf{x}) \right\} + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&= F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \eta_t \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) + \sum_{i=1}^t f_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\
&= F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) + f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - (F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) + f_t(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \\
&\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty^2}{2\eta_t}
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where the last inequality uses Lemma 17 with $F_t + f_t$, which is η_t -strongly convex and the fact that $\nabla(F_t + f_t)(\mathbf{x}_t) = \nabla F_t(\mathbf{x}_t) + \nabla f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) = \mathbf{0} + \mathbf{g}_t = \mathbf{g}_t$. Combine (63),(64), we have

$$\rho_t \leq \min \left\{ 2\|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty, \frac{\|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty^2}{2\eta_t} \right\},$$

and thus η_t satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \eta_1 = 0 \\ \eta_t \leq \eta_{t-1} + \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \min \left\{ 2\|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty, \frac{\|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty^2}{2\eta_t} \right\} \quad t \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

Apply Lemma 18, we have

$$\eta_{T+1} \leq \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \sqrt{(4 + \kappa^2) \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty^2}$$

Finally,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{u}) \leq \eta_{T+1} (\psi(\mathbf{u}) + \kappa^2) \leq \frac{\psi(\mathbf{u}) + \kappa^2}{\kappa^2} \sqrt{(4 + \kappa^2) \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty^2} = 2 \sqrt{(4 + \ln d) \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{g}_t\|_\infty^2}.$$

The lemma is proved. \square

Now we paraphrase inequality (18) as the Lemma 20, and provide the proof.

Lemma 20. Suppose $f_t(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{q_t \hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right)^\top \mathbf{x}$, then the OCO update in Algorithm 1 applied on $\{f_t\}$ guarantees the following for all $\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_d$:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{u}) \leq O \left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{\ln(d+1)T} \right).$$

Proof. Directly apply Lemma 19, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(\mathbf{u}) &\leq 2 \sqrt{(4 + \ln(d+1)) \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \frac{q_t \hat{Q}_t}{B} \left(\frac{B}{\hat{Q}_t} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{LCB}_{c,t}(A_t) \right) \right\|_\infty^2} \\ &\leq O \left(\left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{\ln(d+1)T} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the triangle inequality of norm. Then the lemma holds. \square

F Proofs for Regret Upper Bound for Linearly increasing and AR(1) demand models

This section provides the proof for the regret upper bound for our algorithm under linearly increasing and AR(1) demand model.

F.1 Proof for Lemma 5

Clearly $\bar{q} = \alpha + \beta T + M = \Theta(\beta T)$. Observe that for $t > 1$,

$$\hat{\beta}_t = \frac{(t-1) \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s q_s - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s \right) \left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_s \right)}{(t-1) \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s^2 - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s \right)^2} = \beta + \frac{12}{t(t-1)(t-2)} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \xi_s \left(s - \frac{t}{2} \right),$$

and similarly,

$$\hat{\alpha}_t = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_s - \hat{\beta}_t \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} s}{t-1} = \alpha + \frac{2}{(t-1)(t-2)} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \xi_s (2t-3s-1).$$

By the definition of \hat{Q}_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{Q}_t - Q| &= \left| \sum_{s=t}^T (\hat{\alpha}_t + \hat{\beta}_t s - \alpha - \beta s - \xi_s) \right| \\ &\leq (T-t+1) |\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha| + \frac{1}{2}(T-t+1)(T+t) |\hat{\beta}_t - \beta| + \left| \sum_{s=t}^T \xi_s \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(|\hat{Q}_t - Q| > \epsilon_t \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha| > \frac{\lambda_1}{T-t+1} \epsilon_t \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(|\hat{\beta}_t - \beta| > \frac{2\lambda_2}{(T-t+1)(T+t)} \epsilon_t \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{s=t}^T \xi_s \right| > \lambda_3 \epsilon_t \right), \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

where $\lambda_1 = \frac{(t-1)\sqrt{T-t+1}}{A}$, $\lambda_2 = \frac{(T+t)\sqrt{T-t+1}}{A}$, $\lambda_3 = \frac{(t-1)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{A}$, and A is the value that makes $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1$. Now we apply Hoeffding's inequality for each term for $t \geq 4$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha| > \frac{\lambda_1}{T-t+1} \epsilon_t \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \xi_s (2t-3s-1) \right| > \frac{(t-1)(t-2)}{2(T-t+1)} \lambda_1 \epsilon_t \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{(t-1)(t-2)}{(T-t+1)^2 (t-\frac{1}{2})} \cdot \frac{\lambda_1^2 \epsilon_t^2}{8M^2} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{(t-1)^3}{T-t+1} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_t^2}{16A^2 M^2} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(|\hat{\beta}_t - \beta| > \frac{2\lambda_2}{(T-t+1)(T+t)} \epsilon_t \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \xi_s \left(s - \frac{t}{2} \right) \right| > \frac{t(t-1)(t-2)}{6(T-t+1)(T+t)} \lambda_2 \epsilon_t \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t(t-1)(t-2)}{(T-t+1)^2 (T+t)^2} \cdot \frac{\lambda_2^2 \epsilon_t^2}{6M^2} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{(t-1)^3}{T-t+1} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_t^2}{16A^2 M^2} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{s=t}^T \xi_s \right| > \lambda_3 \epsilon_t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\lambda_3^2 \epsilon_t^2}{2M^2 (T-t+1)} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{(t-1)^3}{T-t+1} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_t^2}{16A^2 M^2} \right). \tag{68}$$

Combine (65), (66), (67), (68), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\hat{Q}_t - Q\right| > \epsilon_t\right) \leq 6 \exp\left(-\frac{(t-1)^3}{T-t+1} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_t^2}{16A^2M^2}\right).$$

Thus, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$,

$$\left|\hat{Q}_t - Q\right| \leq O\left(AM\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\frac{(T-t+1)}{(t-1)^3}}\right) = O\left(MT^2\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}(t-1)^{-\frac{3}{2}}\right) := \epsilon_t.$$

Take the union bound for all t then we finish the proof.

F.2 Proof for Theorem 3

Based on the expression of ϵ_t derived in Lemma 5, with probability $\geq 1 - T\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t &\leq 3\bar{q}T + \sum_{t=4}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t \\ &\leq 3\bar{q}T + \sum_{t=4}^{\tau-1} (\alpha + \beta t + M)\epsilon_t \\ &= O\left(MT^2\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right) \cdot O\left(\sum_{t=4}^{\tau-1} \beta t \cdot (t-1)^{-\frac{3}{2}}\right) \\ &= O\left(\bar{q}MT\sqrt{(\tau-1)\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $Q = \sum_{t=1}^T q_t = \Theta(\bar{q}T)$, $B = bT$, we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t = O\left(M\left(1 + \frac{\bar{q}}{b}\right)\sqrt{(\tau-1)\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right).$$

Hence, combine Theorem 2, with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta - T\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t &\leq O \left(\left(\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}} \right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B} \right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)} \right) \\
&= O \left(\left(\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}} \right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + M \left(1 + \frac{\bar{q}}{b} \right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} + \left(\bar{q} + \frac{\bar{q}^2}{b} \right) \sqrt{(\tau-1) \ln(d+1)} \right) \\
&= \tilde{O} \left(\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}} + (M + \bar{q}) \sqrt{\tau-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now the theorem is proved.

E.3 Proof for Lemma 6

We prove this lemma by showing the following 2 claims:

1. With probability $\geq 1 - T\delta$, $\underline{q} \leq q_t \leq \bar{q}$, for all t , where

$$\bar{q} = \max \left\{ q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta} \right\} + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\beta^2} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)}, \quad \underline{q} = \min \left\{ q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta} \right\} - \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\beta^2} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)}.$$

Proof: We recursively explore the expression of q_t :

$$\begin{aligned}
q_t &= \alpha + \beta q_{t-1} + \xi_t \\
&= \alpha + \beta (\alpha + \beta q_{t-2} + \xi_{t-1}) + \xi_t \\
&= \alpha(1 + \beta) + \beta^2 q_{t-2} + \beta \xi_{t-1} + \xi_t \\
&\vdots \\
&= \alpha (1 + \beta + \dots + \beta^{t-2}) + \beta^{t-1} q_1 + \beta^{t-2} \xi_2 + \dots + \beta \xi_{t-1} + \xi_t \\
&= \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta} (1 - \beta^{t-1}) + \beta^{t-1} q_1 + \beta^{t-2} \xi_2 + \dots + \beta \xi_{t-1} + \xi_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\xi_t\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables with zero-mean σ^2 -subgaussian distribution, we can derive that

$$\sum_{s=2}^t \beta^{t-s} \xi_s \text{ follows a zero-mean } A' \sigma^2 \text{-subgaussian distribution,}$$

where

$$A' = \sum_{s=2}^t (\beta^{t-s})^2 = \frac{1 - \beta^{2(t-1)}}{1 - \beta^2}.$$

Hence with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} q_t &\in \left[\frac{\alpha}{1-\beta} (1 - \beta^{t-1}) + \beta^{t-1} q_1 - \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2(1 - \beta^{2(t-1)})}{1 - \beta^2} \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta} (1 - \beta^{t-1}) + \beta^{t-1} q_1 + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2(1 - \beta^{2(t-1)})}{1 - \beta^2} \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \right] \\ &\subseteq \left[\min\left\{q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta}\right\} - \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\beta^2} \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}, \max\left\{q_1, \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta}\right\} + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{1-\beta^2} \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)} \right] \\ &= [\underline{q}, \bar{q}] \end{aligned}$$

Take the union bound for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, then with probability $\geq 1 - T\delta$, $\underline{q} \leq q_t \leq \bar{q}$.

2. Suppose $q_t \geq \underline{q}$ holds for all t , then with probability $\geq 1 - 2T\delta$,

$$\left| \hat{Q}_t - Q \right| \leq O \left(\frac{T-t+1}{\sqrt{t-1}} \cdot \frac{\alpha A}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2} + \sqrt{T-t+1} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{1-\beta} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} \right) = \epsilon_t,$$

where \underline{q}, \bar{q} are defined as above and

$$A = O \left(\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \sqrt{\log(T)} \right).$$

Proof: Apply Lemma 2 in Bacchiocchi et al. [2022] with $k = 1$ and $n = 1$, then with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\gamma}_t - \gamma\|_{\mathbf{V}_t} &\leq \Delta_t = \sqrt{\lambda} \|\gamma\|_2 + \sigma \sqrt{2 \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \log\left(\frac{\det(\mathbf{V}_t)}{\lambda^2}\right)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\lambda} \|\gamma\|_2 + \sigma \sqrt{2 \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + 2 \log\left(\frac{2\lambda + \bar{q}^2(t-1)}{\lambda^2}\right)} \\ &= O \left(\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \sqrt{\log(T)} \right) := A. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of \mathbf{V}_t , i.e.

$$\mathbf{V}_t = \lambda I_2 + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{z}_{s-1} \mathbf{z}_{s-1}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda + t - 1 & \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_{s-1} \\ \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_{s-1} & \lambda + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_{s-1}^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

when $t > 2$ and $\lambda = 1$, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$,

$$(\lambda + t - 1) |\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha|^2 \leq \|\hat{\gamma}_t - \gamma\|_{\mathbf{V}_t}^2 \leq \Delta_t^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad |\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha| \leq \frac{\Delta_t}{\sqrt{\lambda + t - 1}} = O\left(\frac{\Delta_t}{\sqrt{t-1}}\right).$$

Similarly, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, we have

$$\left(\lambda + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_{s-1}^2\right) |\hat{\beta}_t - \beta|^2 \leq \|\hat{\gamma}_t - \gamma\|_{\mathbf{V}_t}^2 \leq \Delta_t^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad |\hat{\beta}_t - \beta| \leq \frac{\Delta_t}{\sqrt{\lambda + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_s^2}} = O\left(\frac{\Delta_t}{\underline{q}\sqrt{t-1}}\right).$$

Denote $\phi = \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta}$, then we obtain: with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$,

$$|\hat{\phi}_t - \phi| = \left| \frac{\hat{\alpha}_t}{1 - \hat{\beta}_t} - \frac{\alpha}{1 - \beta} \right| \leq \frac{1}{(1 - M)^2} |\hat{\alpha}_t(1 - \beta) - \alpha(1 - \hat{\beta}_t)| = O\left(\frac{\alpha\Delta_t}{\underline{q}(1 - M)^2\sqrt{t-1}}\right).$$

Now we recursively explore the expression of Q :

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \sum_{t=1}^T q_t \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} q_t + \alpha + \beta q_{T-1} + \xi_T \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{T-2} q_t + \phi(1 - \beta) + (\beta + 1)q_{T-1} + \xi_T \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} q_s + \frac{\beta - \beta^{T-t+1}}{1 - \beta} q_{t-1} + \phi(T - t + 1 - \beta + \beta^{T-t+2}) + \sum_{s=t}^T \frac{1 - \beta^{T-s+1}}{1 - \beta} \xi_s. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of \hat{Q}_t (24), we can analyze the prediction error ϵ_t as following: with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{Q}_t - Q| &\leq \bar{q} \left| \frac{\hat{\beta}_t - \hat{\beta}_t^{T-t+1}}{1 - \hat{\beta}_t} - \frac{\beta - \beta^{T-t+1}}{1 - \beta} \right| + (T - t + 1) |\hat{\phi}_t - \phi| \\ &\quad + \left| \hat{\phi}_t (\hat{\beta}_t - \hat{\beta}_t^{T-t+2}) - \phi (\beta - \beta^{T-t+2}) \right| + \left| \sum_{s=t}^T \frac{1 - \beta^{T-s+1}}{1 - \beta} \xi_s \right| \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{\bar{q}}{1 - M}\right) + O\left(\frac{\alpha\Delta_t(T - t + 1)}{\underline{q}(1 - M)^2\sqrt{t-1}}\right) \\ &\quad + \left| \hat{\phi}_t (\hat{\beta}_t - \hat{\beta}_t^{T-t+2}) - \phi (\beta - \beta^{T-t+2}) \right| + \left| \sum_{s=t}^T \frac{1 - \beta^{T-s+1}}{1 - \beta} \xi_s \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Now we study the last two terms respectively. First, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \hat{\phi}_t \left(\hat{\beta}_t - \hat{\beta}_t^{T-t+2} \right) - \phi \left(\beta - \beta^{T-t+2} \right) \right| &\leq \left| \left(\hat{\phi}_t - \phi \right) \left(\hat{\beta}_t - \hat{\beta}_t^{T-t+2} \right) \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \phi \left(\hat{\beta}_t - \hat{\beta}_t^{T-t+2} - \beta + \beta^{T-t+2} \right) \right| \\
&\leq 2 \left| \hat{\phi}_t - \phi \right| + 4 |\phi| \\
&= O \left(\frac{\alpha \Delta_t}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2 \sqrt{t-1}} + \phi \right). \tag{70}
\end{aligned}$$

Second, since $\{\xi_t\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables with zero-mean σ^2 -subgaussian distribution, we can derive that

$$\sum_{s=t}^T \frac{1 - \beta^{T-s+1}}{1 - \beta} \xi_s \quad \text{follows a zero-mean } A' \sigma^2\text{-subgaussian distribution,}$$

where

$$A' = \sum_{s=t}^T \left(\frac{1 - \beta^{T-s+1}}{1 - \beta} \right)^2 = \frac{T-t+1}{(1-\beta)^2} - 2 \frac{\beta - \beta^{T-t+2}}{(1-\beta)^3} + \frac{\beta^2 - \beta^{2(T-t+2)}}{(1-\beta)^2(1-\beta^2)} = O \left(\frac{T-t+1}{(1-\beta)^2} \right).$$

Hence with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$,

$$\left| \sum_{s=t}^T \frac{1 - \beta^{T-s+1}}{1 - \beta} \xi_s \right| \leq O \left(\frac{\sqrt{T-t+1}}{1-\beta} \sigma \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \right). \tag{71}$$

Combine (69), (70), (71) and take union bound on event

$$\left\{ \left| \sum_{s=t}^T \frac{1 - \beta^{T-s+1}}{1 - \beta} \xi_s \right| > \Omega \left(\frac{\sqrt{T-t+1}}{1-\beta} \sigma \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \right) \right\}$$

and $\{\|\hat{\gamma}_t - \gamma\|_{\mathbf{V}_t} > \Delta_t\}$, we obtain the explicit expression of ϵ_t : with probability $\geq 1 - 2\delta$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \hat{Q}_t - Q \right| &\leq O \left(\frac{\alpha \Delta_t (T-t+1)}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2 \sqrt{t-1}} \right) + O \left(\frac{\sqrt{T-t+1}}{1-\beta} \sigma \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \right) \\
&= O \left(\frac{T-t+1}{\sqrt{t-1}} \cdot \frac{\alpha A}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2} + \sqrt{T-t+1} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{1-\beta} \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \right) := \epsilon_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Take the union bound for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, the claim is proved.

Altogether, the lemma is proved.

F.4 Proof for Theorem 4

Based on the expression of ϵ_t derived in Lemma 6, with probability $\geq 1 - 3T\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t &= 2O(\bar{q}T) + \bar{q} \sum_{t=3}^{\tau-1} \epsilon_t \\
&\leq O\left(2\bar{q}T + \sum_{t=3}^{\tau-1} \left(\frac{T-t+1}{\sqrt{t-1}} \cdot \frac{\alpha A}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2} + \sqrt{T-t+1} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{1-\beta} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right)\right) \\
&\leq O\left(2\bar{q}T + (T-\tau+1)\sqrt{\tau-1} \cdot \frac{\alpha A}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2} + (\tau-1)\sqrt{T} \cdot \frac{\sigma}{1-\beta} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right) \\
&= O(\Gamma' T \sqrt{\tau-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where

•

$$\Gamma' = \frac{\alpha A}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2} + \frac{\sigma}{1-\beta} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} = \frac{\alpha}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2} \left(\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \sqrt{\log(T)}\right) + \frac{\sigma}{1-\beta} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}.$$

• The second inequality comes from the following two facts:

$$\sum_{t=3}^{\tau-1} \frac{T-t+1}{\sqrt{t-1}} \leq \int_2^{\tau-1} \frac{T-t+1}{\sqrt{t-1}} dt = \Theta\left(T\sqrt{\tau-1} - (\tau-1)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) = \Theta\left((T-\tau+1)\sqrt{\tau-1}\right),$$

and

$$\sum_{t=3}^{\tau-1} \sqrt{T-t+1} \leq \int_2^{t-1} \sqrt{T-t+1} dt = \Theta\left(T^{\frac{3}{2}} - (T-\tau+1)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) = \Theta\left((\tau-1)\sqrt{T}\right).$$

Since $Q \geq \underline{q}T$, $B = bt$, ultimately we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{Q} + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t \epsilon_t = O(\Gamma \sqrt{\tau-1}),$$

where

$$\Gamma = \left(\frac{1}{\underline{q}} + \frac{1}{b}\right) \Gamma' = \left(\frac{1}{\underline{q}} + \frac{1}{b}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha}{\underline{q}(1-M)^2} \left(\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} + \sqrt{\log(T)}\right) + \frac{\sigma}{1-\beta} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}\right).$$

Same as the proof for Theorem 3, we can obtain that with probability $\geq 1 - 3KTd\delta - 3T\delta$,

$$\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} q_t R_t \leq \tilde{O} \left(\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \sqrt{\frac{\bar{q}K}{B}} + \sqrt{\bar{q}K \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}} + (\Gamma + \bar{q}) \sqrt{\tau - 1} \right).$$