

The Query Complexity of Contracts*

Paul Dütting[†] Michal Feldman[‡] Yoav Gal-Tzur[§] Aviad Rubinfeld[¶]

Abstract

Algorithmic contract design is a new frontier in the intersection of economics and computation, with combinatorial contracts being a core problem in this domain. A central model within combinatorial contracts explores a setting where a principal delegates the execution of a task, which can either succeed or fail, to an agent. The agent can choose any subset among a given set of costly actions, where every subset is associated with a success probability. The principal incentivizes the agent through a contract that specifies the payment upon success of the task.

A natural setting of interest is one with submodular success probabilities. It is known that finding the optimal contract for the principal is NP-hard, but the hardness result is derived from the hardness of demand queries. A major open problem is whether the hardness arises solely from the hardness of demand queries, or if the complexity lies within the optimal contract problem itself. In other words: does the problem retain its hardness, even when provided access to a demand oracle? We resolve this question in the affirmative, showing that any algorithm that computes the optimal contract for submodular success probabilities requires an exponential number of demand queries, thus settling the query complexity problem.

1 Introduction

Contract design is one of the pillars of economic theory (cf., the 2016 Nobel Prize in Economics for Hart and Holmström [Roy16]), of which the hidden-action principal-agent model is a cornerstone. Recently, this area has seen growing attention from the theoretical computer science and algorithmic game theory community, with combinatorial contract design being a natural focal point.

A prime example of a combinatorial contract setting is the multi-action model of Dütting, Ezra, Feldman, and Kesselheim [DEFK22]. In this model, a principal delegates the execution of a project, which can either succeed or fail, to an agent. The agent may pick any subset of a known set of actions A , where each subset $S \subseteq A$ induces a success probability of the project, given by the success probability function $f : 2^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Each action $i \in A$, however, is also associated with a cost $c_i > 0$. The cost of a chosen set of actions S , which is incurred by the agent regardless of the project’s outcome, is the sum of costs of its elements, $\sum_{i \in S} c_i$. The principal cannot observe the actions taken by the agent, only the final outcome. In order to incentivize the agent to perform actions, the principal offers a *contract* — the payment that goes from the principal to the agent in case the project succeeds.

In this two-player game, the agent responds to the contract by picking a set of actions that maximizes his expected payment minus cost. The principal, in turn, picks the contract that maximizes her expected reward minus the payment, given the agent’s best response function. As is standard, we will normalize the principal’s reward on success to 1, so that expected reward and success probability coincide. In line with

*This project has been partially funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No. 866132), by an Amazon Research Award, by the NSF-BSF (grant number 2020788), and by a grant from TAU Center for AI and Data Science (TAD). Aviad Rubinfeld is supported by NSF CCF-2112824, and a David and Lucile Packard Fellowship.

[†]Google Research, Zurich, Switzerland. Email: duetting@google.com

[‡]Tel Aviv University, Israel. Email: mfeldman@tauex.tau.ac.il

[§]Tel Aviv University, Israel. Email: yoavgaltzur@mail.tau.ac.il

[¶]Stanford University, USA. Email: aviad@cs.stanford.edu

prior work, we will take the principal’s perspective and study the problem of finding an optimal contract, i.e., a contract that maximizes the principal’s expected utility.

An appealing trait of the combinatorial multi-action model is that it can succinctly capture structure through the combinatorial set function f . A particular natural class for set functions f is the class of submodular functions, as it corresponds to actions which exhibit diminishing returns. In this paper we study the complexity of the optimal contract problem, for settings where f is submodular.

Dütting, Ezra, Feldman and Kesselheim [DEFK22] have established that the optimal contract is NP-hard to compute when f is submodular. This hardness stems from the computational intractability of the agent’s best response problem, which turns out to be equivalent to the problem of answering a demand query in combinatorial auctions with submodular valuations. In this work we investigate whether the hardness arises solely from the hardness of demand queries, or if the complexity is inherent to the optimal contract problem itself, an open question raised by [DEFK22] and reiterated by Deo-Campo Vuong, Dughmi, Patel, and Prasad [DDPP24].

1.1 Our Contribution

Query Complexity with Demand Oracle. We show that any algorithm that computes the optimal contract for submodular success probabilities requires an exponential number of demand queries. This demonstrates that the hardness truly comes from the contract design question rather than the hardness of implementing a demand query with value queries.

Theorem (Theorem 1). When f is submodular, any algorithm that computes the optimal contract requires exponentially-many demand queries to f .

To prove Theorem 1 we proceed as follows. As our first main technical contribution, we show that it’s possible to construct an “equal-revenue instance” with submodular rewards and exponentially many optimal contracts. More specifically, we show that for each n there exists a submodular reward function f on ground set $A = [n]$ such that each set $S \subseteq A$ is the agent’s best response to a different contract $\alpha_S \in [0, 1]$, and all contracts α_S yield the same utility for the principal.

We utilize this construction to define a collection of $2^n - 1$ optimal contract problems, all of which share the same costs but each with a different reward function f_S . Each f_S is identical to the original f , except that the set of actions S gets an additive bonus of ε , namely, $f_S(S) = f(S) + \varepsilon$. Thus, each of the problem instances in this collection has a distinct optimal contract, α_S .

Then, as our second main technical contribution, we show that for any set of actions $S \subseteq A$, one can implement a demand oracle for f_S using poly-many value queries. We do so by introducing the notion of an ε -approximate demand set, which is the collection of sets that maximize the agent’s utility up to an additive factor of ε for a given price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$. We use a delicate counting argument to show that for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, and any p , this collection has no more than $O(n^2)$ different subsets of actions. This gadget is useful because it shows that if one can compute the approximate demand set (a purely computational problem, which does not depend on the actual reward function f_S), one can also answer a demand query with poly-many value queries.

We complete the proof by showing that an exponential number of value queries is required to compute an optimal contract. This final step uses the standard technique of hiding a special set, and exploits the fact that value queries reveal no information about the instance unless they hit the special set.

Query-Complexity Analogue of Strong NP-Hardness. Up until now, the representation size of our construction has not been a concern for us. However, as we show in Appendix B, our construction can be rounded to have a polynomial size, while preserving its essential properties. Our argument leverages the fact that the lower bound continues to hold when the equal-revenue property is met only approximately. As an implication, there cannot be a poly-time algorithm, not even weakly poly-time, for finding the optimal contract for submodular f with demand oracle access. Together with the weakly poly-time FPTAS of [DEFK22], this fully characterizes what can be achieved with demand oracle access for poly-size instances

of the optimal contract problem. It remains open whether the problem admits an FPTAS, whose running time does not depend on the representation size.

Separating Value and Demand Queries. Our query complexity lower bound for demand queries crucially relies on the fact that, for the family of instances considered in the lower bound construction, value queries are de facto as powerful as demand queries (up to a polynomial gap). We complement the above result by showing that this is not always the case, and that the gap between value and demand queries can be exponentially large.

Theorem (Theorem 3). There exists an instance of the optimal contract problem with submodular reward function for which the optimal contract can be found with $O(1)$ demand queries, but requires $\Omega(2^n/n)$ value queries.

To show this we devise a family of exponentially-many instances of the optimal contract problem, one for each subset $S \subseteq A$ with $|S| = n/2$ and one for $S = \emptyset$. These instances are such that for any $S \neq \emptyset$ the optimal contract is $\alpha^* = \frac{3}{4}$ and for $S = \emptyset$ the optimal contract is $\alpha^* = \frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}$. We show that given a reward function f_S , distinguishing between the case that $S = \emptyset$ and $S \neq \emptyset$ requires an exponential number of value queries, but only a constant number of demand queries.

1.2 Related Work

The combinatorial multi-action model of the principal-agent problem was introduced by Dütting, Ezra, Feldman, and Kesselheim [DEFK22], who showed that the optimal contract is tractable when the reward function f is gross-substitutes and NP-hard to compute when f is submodular. They also gave a weakly poly-time FPTAS for any f . Deo-Campo Vuong, Dughmi, Patel, and Prasad [DDPP24] and Dütting, Feldman, Gal-Tzur [DFG24] gave an algorithm to enumerate all the breakpoints in the agent’s piece-wise linear utility given access to a demand oracle, and used it to obtain an efficient algorithm for finding the optimal contract when f is supermodular. Ezra, Feldman, and Schlesinger [EFS24] show an inapproximability result for the optimal contract when f is submodular in the value query model, unless $P = NP$.

Dütting, Roughgarden, and Talgam-Cohen [DRT21] considered scenarios with large outcome space (of size 2^m), whose description size is $\text{poly}(n, m)$. They exhibit a dichotomy between settings with a constant number of actions, and settings with a general number of actions. An important concept they introduce is that of a δ -IC contract, in which the principal’s preferred action maximizes the agent’s utility up to an additive factor of δ . For settings with a constant number of actions they give an algorithm that finds a δ -IC contract with payoff at least that of the optimal IC contract in time $\text{poly}(m, 1/\delta)$. For the general case, they show that for any constant c , finding an IC contract that achieves a c -approximation to the optimal IC contract is NP-hard. This impossibility extends to δ -IC contracts, provided that δ is small enough.

Another combinatorial setting is when the principal is faced with *multiple agents* and may hire any subset of those. Babaioff, Feldman, and Nisan [BFN06a] introduced the combinatorial agency model, in which each agent may or may not exert effort, and the principal chooses which subset of agent to incentivize. The outcome depends on the set of effort-making agents, the structure of which is also expressed by a set function. In following works, Babaioff, Feldman, and Nisan [BFN09], [BFN06b] study mixed strategies and free-riding in this model. In contrast with these works, which considered a success probability function encoded as a read-once network, the more recent work of Dütting, Ezra, Feldman, and Kesselheim [DEFK23] studied reward functions from the complement-free hierarchy: Subadditive, XOS and submodular. They achieve $O(1)$ -approximation to the optimal utility of the principal with poly-many demand and value oracle calls, when rewards are XOS. If the reward function is submodular, they show that poly-many value queries are sufficient for a constant-factor approximation. The same multi-agent model was also considered by Deo-Campo Vuong, Dughmi, Patel, and Prasad [DDPP24], who show hardness of approximation when the reward function is supermodular. Castiglioni, Marchesi, and Gatti [CMG23], considered a different multi-agent setting in which the principal can observe each agent’s individual outcome and make the contract contingent on this information.

Additional work on algorithmic contract theory beyond combinatorial contracts includes works that involve an online learning perspective, as in the case of Ho, Slivkins, and Vaughan [HSV14], Zhu, Bates, Yang, Wang, Jiao, and Jordan [ZBY+23], and Dütting, Guruganesh, Schneider, and Wang [DGSW23]. The recent works of Guruganesh, Schneider, and Wang [GSW21], Guruganesh, Schneider, Wang, and Zhu [GSWZ23], Castiglioni, Marchessi, and Gatti [CMG21, CMG22], Alon, Dütting, and Talgam-Cohen [ADT21], and Alon, Dütting, Li, and Talgam-Cohen [ADLT23], study the combination of moral hazard (hidden action) and screening (hidden types). Finally, Dütting, Feldman and Peretz [DFP23] study structural and algorithmic properties of ambiguous contracts.

2 Model and Preliminaries

The Optimal Contract Problem. A principal (she) delegates the execution of a task to an agent (he). The agent may perform any subset of a known set of actions $A = \{1, \dots, n\}$, where each action i incurs him a cost of $c_i > 0$. The cost of a set of actions $S \subseteq A$ is additive, i.e., $c(S) = \sum_{i \in S} c_i$ and $c(\emptyset) = 0$. We consider a binary outcome space, $\Omega = \{0, 1\}$, where outcome 1 corresponds to the success of the principal’s project and 0 to its failure. The success probability of the project, provided that a set of actions $S \subseteq A$ is performed by the agent, is given by the combinatorial set function $f : 2^A \rightarrow [0, 1]^1$. We assume without loss of generality that the principal gains a reward of 1 if the project succeeds and 0 if it fails. Thus, we also refer to f as the (expected) *reward* function.

The agent’s actions cannot be observed by the principal, only the outcome, so the principal may only incentivize the agent using an outcome-contingent payment scheme. That is, the *contract*, which describes the payment, is a function $t : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, specifying the payment in case of a success or failure. We impose the standard limited liability constraint, meaning that payments can only go from the principal to the agent. Given a contract, the agent responds with a set of actions $S \subseteq A$ that maximize his utility. We take the perspective of the principal and seek a contract t which maximizes her expected utility, given the agent’s best-response.

In this setting, it is without loss of generality that the optimal contract satisfies $t(0) = 0$ [DEFK22] and can thus be expressed using a single parameter $t(1) = \alpha \in [0, 1]$ (the payment will never exceed the reward of the principal). Hereafter we will refer to α as the contract.

We denote the utility functions of the agent and the principal from a contract $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and a chosen set of actions S by

$$u_a(\alpha, S) = \alpha f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i \quad \text{and} \quad u_p(\alpha, S) = (1 - \alpha)f(S),$$

respectively. We slightly abuse notation and denote the agent’s and principal utilities for contract α , while also accounting for the agent’s best-response, by

$$u_a(\alpha) = u_a(\alpha, S_\alpha) = \max_{S \subseteq A} \alpha f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i \quad \text{and} \quad u_p(\alpha) = u_p(\alpha, S_\alpha) = (1 - \alpha)f(S_\alpha),$$

respectively, where S_α denotes the agent’s best response for contract α .

As standard in the literature, we assume the agent is breaking ties in favor of the principal. So for any two sets $S, S' \subseteq A$ maximizing the agent’s utility for a given contract α , S_α is taken to be the set with the higher value of f .

Drawing from the literature on combinatorial auctions, we refer to the collection of sets which maximize the agent’s utility as the agent’s *demand* for a contract α . This is due to the equivalence between solving the agent’s utility maximization problem for contract α and finding the demand set from the ground set A with valuation function f and prices c_i/α ; that is, the demand set for a contract α is

$$\arg \max_{S \subseteq A} \left\{ \alpha f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i \right\} = \arg \max_{S \subseteq A} \left\{ f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} \frac{c_i}{\alpha} \right\}$$

¹For simplicity, we consider reward functions f such that the image of f is $[0, B]$ and $B > 1$. One can scale down f together with the costs $\{c_i\}_{i \in A}$ by B without affecting our results.

Structure of the Optimal Contract. For a fixed set of actions S , the agent’s utility, $u_a(\alpha, S) = \alpha f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i$, is an affine function of α . As the agent always picks the set S_α that maximizes his utility, the function $u_a(\alpha) = u_a(\alpha, S_\alpha) = \max_{S \subseteq A} u_a(\alpha, S)$ is piece-wise linear, monotonically non-decreasing and convex. The “breakpoints” of $u_a(\alpha)$ are those values of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ in which the agent’s best response changes, i.e. values of α such that $S_\alpha \neq S_{\alpha-\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. It is easy to see (and has been observed by [DEFK22]) that the optimal contract must reside at such a breakpoint, since any other contract that incentivizes the same set of actions must be costlier for the principal. These breakpoints are also referred to as *critical values*.

Observation 1 ([DEFK22]). *For every set of non-negative costs $\{c_i\}_{i \in A}$ and every reward function $f : 2^A \rightarrow [0, 1]$, there exist $k + 1 \leq 2^n$ critical values, $0 = \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_k \leq 1$, such that*

1. *For every contract $x \in [0, 1]$, $S_x = S_{\alpha_{j(x)}}$, where $j(x) = \arg \max_j \{\alpha_j \mid \alpha_j \leq x\}$.*
2. *For every $0 \leq j < j' \leq k$, $f(S_{\alpha_j}) < f(S_{\alpha_{j'}})$.*
3. *The optimal contract, $\alpha^* = \arg \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} u_p(\alpha)$, satisfies $\alpha^* \in \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\}$.*

Because any critical value α is, by definition, a contract for which the agent’s best response changes, the agent is indifferent between two sets of actions when facing a contract α . This implies the following observation.

Observation 2 ([DEFK22]). *Let α be a critical value, and let S_α be the agent’s best response at α . The critical value that immediately succeeds α is $\min\{\alpha', 1\}$, where $\alpha' = \min_{S \subseteq A, f(S) > f(S_\alpha)} \frac{\sum_{i \in S} c_i - \sum_{i \in S_\alpha} c_i}{f(S) - f(S_\alpha)}$.*

Combinatorial Set Functions and Oracles. For any combinatorial set function $f : 2^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $f(i \mid S)$ the *marginal value* of action $i \in A$ given the set $S \subseteq A$, i.e. $f(i \mid S) = f(S \cup \{i\}) - f(S)$. In this work we consider submodular set functions, which are characterized by decreasing marginal returns.

Definition 1. *$f : 2^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is submodular if for every two sets $S, T \subseteq A$ such that $S \subseteq T$ and every $i \in A$, $f(i \mid S) \geq f(i \mid T)$.*

Representing a combinatorial set function may require exponential size in the number of actions, n . Thus, we assume that the principal accesses f via queries to an oracle. We consider two types of queries:

- *Value queries:* The oracle accept a set of actions $S \subseteq A$ and returns $f(S)$.
- *Demand queries:* The oracle accepts a price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and returns the set of actions $S \subseteq A$, that maximizes $f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} p_i$. As before, we assume that ties are broken in favor of set with the higher reward.

Observe that querying a demand oracle with $p_i = c_i/\alpha$ returns the agent’s best response for a contract α .

3 Hardness in the Demand Query Model

In this section we give a hardness result for submodular rewards in the demand query model.

Theorem 1. *When f is submodular, any algorithm that computes the optimal contract requires exponentially-many demand queries to f .*

Before presenting the formal proof we give a sketch of the argument. The proof of the theorem is divided into three parts: In the first part, we construct a submodular function f with $2^n - 1$ critical values, such that they all yield the same utility for the principal.

In the second part, we define the notion of an ε -approximate demand set, which is the collection of sets that provide the maximal utility for the agent, given a vector of prices, up to an additive factor of ε . We




Figure 1: The utilities of the players for f and $\{c_i\}_{i \in A}$ as defined above, for the case of $n = 2$. Observe that each of the critical values yields the principal the same expected utility of 1.

show that for the defined f and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, the size of this set is bounded by $O(n^2)$, for any price vector.

In the third part, we consider a family of instances of the optimal contract problem, all share the same costs, but each with a slightly perturbed version of the reward function f and a distinct optimal contract. We use the notion of ε -approximate demand set to show that for each of those instances a demand query can be implemented using poly-many value queries. We complete the argument by showing that the principal must use exponentially-many value queries to find the optimal contract when the optimal contract problem is taken from the above collection.

In Section 3.1 we describe the construction and its basic properties. In Section 3.2 we define the notion of an approximate demand set and bound its size. Finally, in Section 3.3 we conclude the proof of Theorem 1 and show that it also applies to a submodular function f with poly-size representation (see Theorem 2).

3.1 Equal-Revenue Instance with Exponentially Many Critical Values

We associate every subset of actions $S \subseteq A = \{1, \dots, n\}$ with an index $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$, which is the decimal value of the n -bit characteristic vector of S . We order the sets by those indexes $S_0 = \emptyset, S_1 = \{1\}, S_2 = \{2\}, S_3 = \{1, 2\}, S_4 = \{3\}, S_5 = \{1, 3\}, \dots, S_{2^n-1} = \{1, \dots, n\}$. We set the cost for each action $i \in A$, to be $c_i = 2^{i-1}$. Note that the cost of the set S_t is exactly its index, t .

$$c(S_t) = \sum_{i \in S_t} 2^{i-1} = \sum_{i=1}^n I[i \in S_t] \cdot 2^{i-1} = t$$

We define a set of $2^n - 1$ values of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, using the following recurrence relation

$$\alpha_0 = 0; \quad \alpha_{t+1} = \alpha_t + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{4\alpha_t^2 - 8\alpha_t + 5} - 1 \right) \quad t \in \{0, \dots, 2^n - 2\} \quad (1)$$

and define the reward for a set S_t to be $f_t := f(S_t) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha_t}$ for $t \geq 0$, see illustration in Figure 1.

Below, we establish the basic properties of our construction. Most importantly we show that f is monotone and submodular (Proposition 2), and that each of the $2^n - 1$ values of α_t defined above is a distinct critical value, that gives the principal the same utility (Proposition 1).

Our first lemma shows that the α_t values defined through Equation (1) are distinct, form an increasing sequence, and are bounded in $[0, 1)$.

Lemma 1. For every $t \in \{0, \dots, 2^n - 2\}$, $0 \leq \alpha_t < \alpha_{t+1} < 1$

Proof. One can easily show that $\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{4\alpha_t^2 - 8\alpha_t + 5} - 1 \right)$ is always positive for $\alpha_t \in [0, 1)$ and zero at $\alpha_t = 1$, which implies that the α_t is monotonically increasing in t .

The fact that $\alpha_{t+1} < 1$ can be derived from the recurrence relation together with the fact that $\alpha_t < 1$. Assume $\alpha_{t+1} > 1$, it implies that

$$1 < \alpha_t + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{4\alpha_t^2 - 8\alpha_t + 5} - 1 \right).$$

Using simple algebraic manipulations we get $\alpha_t > 1$, a contradiction. \square

Our second lemma establishes a key property of the set of rewards, namely that the discrete derivative $f_{t+1} - f_t$ is negative. The proof of this lemma is deferred to Appendix A.

Lemma 2. $f_{t+1} - f_t$ is a decreasing function of t , for any $t \geq 0$.

Next we show that all α_t values are critical, and yield the same principal utility of 1.

Proposition 1. The set of critical values is $0 = \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_{2^n-1} < 1$ and for any $t \in \{0, \dots, 2^n - 2\}$, S_t is the agent's best response for contract $\alpha \in [\alpha_t, \alpha_{t+1})$. Additionally, each of the critical values yields the same utility for the principal.

Proof. Observe that for $\alpha_0 = 0$, $S_0 = \emptyset$ is the agent's best response, as any other set has positive costs.

Assume that S_t is the agent's best response at α_t , for some $t \geq 0$. By Observation 1, the agent's best response can only change to a set with a higher reward, i.e., S_{t+k} for some $k > 1$. By Observation 2, the next critical value satisfies

$$\alpha = \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, 2^n - t - 1\}} \frac{c_{t+k} - c_t}{f_{t+k} - f_t} = \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, 2^n - t - 1\}} \frac{k}{f_{t+k} - f_t} = \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, 2^n - t - 1\}} \frac{k}{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} f_{t+i+1} - f_{t+i}},$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of $\{c_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ and the second from telescoping sum. By Lemma 2, it holds that for any k , $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} f_{t+i+1} - f_{t+i} \leq k \cdot (f_{t+1} - f_t)$. Thus,

$$\alpha \geq \min_{k \in \{1, \dots, 2^n - t - 1\}} \frac{k}{k(f_{t+1} - f_t)} = \frac{1}{f_{t+1} - f_t},$$

and the next critical value will be $\frac{1}{f_{t+1} - f_t} = \frac{c_{t+1} - c_t}{f_{t+1} - f_t}$ with the agent best response being S_{t+1} .

Finally, observe that for any $t \geq 0$

$$\frac{1}{f_{t+1} - f_t} = \frac{\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t}{(1 - \alpha_{t+1})(1 - \alpha_t)} = \alpha_{t+1},$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of f_t . The second equality can be shown by plugging the definition from Equation (1).

The fact that for $t \geq 0$, every contract α_t yields the same utility for the principal follows immediately from the definition of f_t :

$$u_p(\alpha_t) = (1 - \alpha_t)f_t = 1.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

We conclude by showing that the reward function we described is monotone and submodular.

Proposition 2. *The reward function f as defined above is monotonically non-decreasing and submodular.*

Proof. The monotonicity of f follows immediately from Lemma 1, as $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_{2^n-1}$ and $f_t = \frac{1}{1-\alpha_t}$.

To show submodularity, we prove a slightly stronger claim: for any two sets $S_t, S_{t'} \subseteq A$ such that $t' > t$ and any action $i \notin S_t$, it holds that $f(i | S_t) \geq f(i | S_{t'})$. Observe that this property implies submodularity: Fix $S_t \subseteq S_{t'}$. If $i \in S_t$, then $i \in S_{t'}$ and $f(i | S_t) = f(i | S_{t'}) = 0$. Otherwise, $i \notin S_t$, and since $S_t \subseteq S_{t'}$ implies $t < t'$, we get $f(i | S_t) \geq f(i | S_{t'})$.

To see why the stronger claim holds, observe that if $i \in S_{t'}$, then by the monotonicity of f , $f(i | S_t) \geq 0 = f(i | S_{t'})$. Otherwise, $i \notin S_{t'}$, and we have $f(i | S_{t'}) = f_{t'+2^{i-1}} - f_{t'}$. In addition, since by assumption $i \notin S_t$, it also holds that $f(i | S_t) = f_{t+2^{i-1}} - f_t$. For $k = t, t'$, we have by telescoping sum that

$$f_{k+2^{i-1}} - f_k = \sum_{j=1}^{2^{i-1}} (f_{k+j} - f_{k+j-1}).$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that for every $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^{i-1}\}$, it holds that $f_{t+j} - f_{t+j-1} \geq f_{t'+j} - f_{t'+j-1}$. As $t' > t$, this follows immediately from Lemma 2. \square

3.2 Poly-Size Approximate Demand Set

In this section we define the notion of ε -approximate demand set, and show that for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ the size of this collection is bounded when applied to the reward function f defined above.

Definition 2. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, the ε -approximate demand set for a fixed reward function f is the collection of sets of actions that maximize the agent's utility, up to an additive factor of ε :*

$$\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon = \left\{ S \subseteq A \mid \max_{T \subseteq A} f(T) - \sum_{i \in T} p_i - \left(f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} p_i \right) \leq \varepsilon \right\}$$

Proposition 3. *Let f be as defined in Section 3.1. There exists a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, the size of the approximate demand set for f , $\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$, is $O(n^2)$.*

To prove Proposition 3 we partition the approximate demand set, $\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$, according to each set's "minimal ambiguous action" (see Definition 4). We then show that an action can be the minimal ambiguous action for at most $O(n)$ sets, which implies the claim.

Definition 3 (Ambiguity Interval). *For any action $i \in A$ and price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we define the ambiguity interval with respect to i and p as $[l_{i,p}, r_{i,p}] \subseteq [0, 2^n - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}$, where*

- $r_{i,p} = \max_{t \in [2^n-1]} \{S_t \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon \mid i \in S_t\}$, and
- $l_{i,p} = \max\{r_{i,p} - 2^i, 0\}$.

If action i does not belong to any set in $\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$, we define $r_{i,p} = l_{i,p} = 0$. For brevity, we omit the subscript p when clear from the context.

Definition 4 (Minimal Ambiguous Action). *For any price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, the minimal ambiguous action of an approximately optimal set, $S_t \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ is $i(S_t) = \min\{i \in A \mid t \in [l_{i,p}, r_{i,p}]\}$, with $i(S_t) = n + 1$ if t does not belong to any such interval.*

In the following lemma we establish a key property of the ambiguity intervals (as defined in Definition 3), which holds for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$: Namely, for sets $S_t \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ such that $t < l_{i,p}$ it must hold that $i \in S_t$, while if sets $t > r_{i,p}$, it must hold that $i \notin S_t$. For $t \in [l_{i,p}, r_{i,p}]$ there is ambiguity as to whether i is in S_t or not (hence the name). See Figure 2 for an illustration.




Figure 2: Illustration of ambiguity intervals (top), and minimal ambiguous actions for a fixed price vector p (bottom). The minimal ambiguous action of a set S_t for $t \in [l_3, l_1) \cup (r_1, r_3]$, is $i(S_t) = 3$. By Lemma 3 for $S_{t'}$ such that $t' \in (r_1, r_3]$ as in the figure, $S_{t'}$ does not contain action 1 and contains action 2.

Lemma 3. For small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, for any $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, any action $i \in A$ and any $S_t \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$, if $t > r_{i,p}$, then $i \notin S_t$. If $t < l_{i,p}$, then $i \in S_t$.

Proof. The first claim is immediate from the definition of $r_{i,p}$. To prove the second claim we show that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that for any price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and any two sets $S_t, S_{t'} \subseteq A$ such that $i \in S_{t'} \setminus S_t$ and $t < t' - 2^i$, it holds that S_t and $S_{t'}$ cannot simultaneously be approximately optimal (i.e., $\{S_t, S_{t'}\} \not\subseteq \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$). Since by definition $S_{r_{i,p}} \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$, replacing t' with $r_{i,p}$, proves the claim for any $t < l_{i,p} = r_{i,p} - 2^i$.

Consider some $\varepsilon > 0$ and fix $p, S_t, S_{t'}$ and i as above. Since $S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}$ is the agent's best response for contract $\alpha_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}}$, it holds that

$$\alpha_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}} f(i | S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}) \leq c_i = 2^{i-1}$$

and thus

$$f(i | S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}) \leq \frac{2^{i-1}}{\alpha_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}}}$$

So if $p_i > \frac{2^{i-1}}{\alpha_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}}} + \varepsilon$ we get that $S_{t'} \notin \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ and the claim holds.

Similarly,

$$\alpha_{S_t \cup \{i\}} f(i | S_t) \geq c_i = 2^{i-1}$$

and if $p_i < \frac{2^{i-1}}{\alpha_{S_t \cup \{i\}}} - \varepsilon$ we have that $S_t \notin \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ and the claim holds.

Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{2^{i-1}}{\alpha_{S_t \cup \{i\}}} - \varepsilon \geq \frac{2^{i-1}}{\alpha_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}}} + \varepsilon.$$

First, observe that by assumption $t' - 2^{i-1} > t + 2^{i-1}$, so the index of the set $S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}$ is greater than the index of the set $S_t \cup \{i\}$. Then, by Lemma 1 it holds that $\alpha_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}} > \alpha_{S_t \cup \{i\}}$. For small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ it holds that

$$\alpha_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}} - \alpha_{S_t \cup \{i\}} > \frac{2\varepsilon \alpha_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}} \alpha_{S_t \cup \{i\}}}{2^{i-1}},$$

and the claim follows. Note that the constraints on ε are independent of the value of p . \square




Figure 3: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 4. Let S_t and $S_{t'}$ have the same minimal ambiguous action i^* and $t' > t$. If both t and t' are on the same side of the ambiguity interval of $i < i^*$, then S_t and $S_{t'}$ agree on action i . Otherwise, as in the figure, it must be that $i \in S_t$ and $i \notin S_{t'}$.

Next, for any $i^* \in [n + 1]$, we establish an upper bound on the number of sets $S_t \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ for which i^* is the minimal ambiguous action (see Definition 4), i.e., $i(S_t) = i^*$.

Lemma 4. *For any $i^* \in \{1, \dots, n, n + 1\}$, there can be at most $4i^*$ sets $S_t \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ such that $i(S_t) = i^*$.*

Proof. Fix price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough as above. Let $t < t'$ be two indexes such that $S_t, S_{t'} \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ and $i(S_t) = i(S_{t'}) = i^*$.

We give a counting argument for why there cannot be more than $4i^*$ sets of the above form. First, we show that as we increase the index from t to t' , the set $S_{t'}$ does not introduce any new actions i such that $i < i^*$. Then, we turn to consider the characteristic vectors of S_t and show that for any suffix (the $i^* + 1$ least significant bits), there may only exist a single prefix (the $n - i^* - 1$ most significant bits), such that $t \in [l_{i^*}, r_{i^*}]$.

Fix $i < i^*$. Since $i(S_t) = i^*$ it must be that $t \notin [l_i, r_i]$. In particular, if $t < r_i$, then $t < l_i$. Thus, together with Lemma 3 we have that $i \in S_t$ if and only if $t < r_i$, and similarly for t' . This implies that if $i \in S_{t'}$, then $i \in S_t$, because in this case $t < t' < r_i$ (see illustration in Figure 3). Equivalently, $(S_{t'} \cap [i^* - 1]) \subseteq (S_t \cap [i^* - 1])$.

Since this holds for any $t < t'$ as above, we get that there can be at most i^* different sets of the form $S_t \cap [i^* - 1]$ such that $S_t \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ and $i(S_t) = i^*$. Consequently, there are at most $4i^*$ different sets of the form $S_t \cap [i^* + 1]$ for S_t as above.

Fix a set $X \subseteq [i^* + 1]$, there can be one set S_t such that $S_t \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$, $i(S_t) = i^*$ and $X = S_t \cap [i^* + 1]$. To see that, aiming for contradiction, assume there are two different sets S_t and $S_{t'}$ which satisfy the above. Because S_t and $S_{t'}$ only disagree on actions greater than $i^* + 1$, the difference $|t - t'|$ is at least $2^{i^*+2-1} = 2^{i^*+1}$, so they cannot both satisfy $t, t' \in [l_{i^*}, r_{i^*}]$, as $r_{i^*} - l_{i^*} = 2^{i^*}$. This contradicts the fact that $i(S_t) = i(S_{t'}) = i^*$, and the claim immediately follows. \square

Proposition 3 is an immediate corollary of Lemma 4.

Proof of Proposition 3. From Lemma 4,

$$|\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon| = \sum_{i^* \in \{1, \dots, n, n+1\}} |\{S \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon \mid i(S) = i^*\}| \leq \frac{4(n+1)(n+2)}{2} = O(n^2),$$

which shows the claim. \square

3.3 A Challenging Family of Optimal Contract Instances

We define a family of reward functions that are in proximity to the reward function f defined in Section 3.1: for each $S \subseteq A$, excluding $S = \emptyset$, and every $\varepsilon > 0$, let f_S be the reward function which is identical to f everywhere except that $f_S(S) = f(S) + \varepsilon$. It can be easily observed, that there exists a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $S \subseteq A$, f_S satisfies Proposition 1 (up to the fact that all but two contracts yield the same utility) and Proposition 2². Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be one that also satisfies Proposition 3 when we replace f with f_S for every $S \subseteq A$. We denote this family of reward functions by \mathcal{F} :

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f_S \mid f_S(T) = f(T) \ \forall T \neq S, \quad f_S(S) = f(S) + \varepsilon\}_{S \subseteq A, S \neq \emptyset}$$

²This holds for $0 < \varepsilon < (f_{2^n-2} - f_{2^n-3}) - (f_{2^n-1} - f_{2^n-2})$.

The collection \mathcal{F} induces a family of optimal-contract problems, where in each problem, the principal needs to find the optimal contract for costs $\{c_i = 2^{i-1}\}_{i \in A}$ as before, and a submodular reward that satisfies $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$.

As any optimal contract instance with $f_S \in \mathcal{F}$ has $2^n - 1$ distinct critical values, for any set $T \subseteq A$ there exists a critical value α_T such that T is the agent's best response in the optimal contract problem instance with the reward function f_S . Thus, adding the ε bonus to $f_S(S)$ makes α_S the unique optimal contract.

Observation 3. *For any $S \neq \emptyset$, α_S is the unique optimal contract for the optimal-contract problem with reward function f_S .*

We begin by showing that when faced with an instance from the above collection, the principal must make exponentially-many value queries in expectation in order to find the optimal contract.

Proposition 4. *Any algorithm that is only given access to a value oracle for f^* , must perform an exponential number of value queries (in expectation) to find the optimal contract.*

Proof. By Yao's principle, it is enough to show that when we draw $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$ uniformly at random, any deterministic algorithm requires an exponential number of value queries in expectation over the choice of f^* .

First, observe that every value query $f^*(S)$ can lead to two different answers. If $f^* = f_S$, then $f^*(S) = f(S) + \varepsilon$, otherwise $f^*(S) = f(S)$. Thus, without loss of generality, every deterministic algorithm makes a *fixed* series of value queries and stops whenever the answer is $f^*(S) = f(S) + \varepsilon$. If it stops beforehand, and makes less than $2^n - 2$ value queries, there exist two sets S, S' which the algorithm did not query and are both consistent with the oracle answers given. Thus, the algorithm cannot distinguish between the case in which α_S is optimal and the case in which $\alpha_{S'}$ is. It follows that any deterministic algorithm that makes k value queries only stops for k different choices of f^* .

Fix a deterministic algorithm for the optimal contract. Since f^* is drawn uniformly at random, with probability $1/2$, the first 2^{n-1} queries, $S_1, \dots, S_{2^{n-1}}$, satisfy $f^*(S_i) = f(S_i)$, and the algorithm does not stop. Thus, the expected number of queries of any deterministic algorithm is at least $\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{n-1} = 2^{n-2}$. \square

The second part of the argument is that we can solve a demand query for any $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$ using poly-many value queries. The argument relies on the fact that $|\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon| = O(n^2)$.

Proposition 5. *One can implement a demand oracle for $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$ using poly-many calls to a value oracle for f^* (and exponentially many computational steps).*

Proof. Fix $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$. First, observe that for any price vector p , if S_p should be returned by the demand oracle, then $f^*(S_p) - p(S_p) \geq f^*(S) - p(S)$ for any $S \subseteq A$. As $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$, for any $S \subseteq A$:

$$f(S_p) + \varepsilon - p(S_p) \geq f^*(S_p) - p(S_p) \geq f^*(S) - p(S) \geq f(S) - p(S)$$

and as such $S_p \in \mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$. So every set in the demand with respect to p must also belong to $\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$, the approximate demand with respect to p and ε .

Because the approximate demand $\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ does not depend on the identity of f^* , it can be computed without any value queries – but perhaps using a super-polynomial number of computational steps. Thus, to solve the demand query we can pick the best set in the collection $\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon$ using $|\mathcal{D}_p^\varepsilon|$ value queries, which by Proposition 3 is $O(n^2)$. \square

The following corollary is a direct consequence, which in turn implies Theorem 1.

Corollary 1. *Any algorithm that is only given access to a demand oracle for f^* , must perform an exponential number of queries (in expectation) to find the optimal contract in the worst case.*

Proof. Assume towards contradiction that there exists such an algorithm, then by Proposition 5 we can solve the problem with poly-many value queries, contradicting Proposition 4. \square

Polynomial Representation. In Appendix B we strengthen the results of this section, by showing that f can be replaced with a reward function whose representation size is polynomial in n . This implies that there cannot be a poly-time algorithm, not even weakly poly-time, for finding the optimal contract for submodular rewards with demand oracle access.

Theorem 2. *When f is submodular any algorithm that computes the optimal contract requires an exponential number of demand queries in the instance representation size.*

4 Separation Between Value and Demand Queries

In this section we show an instance of the optimal contract problem with submodular reward function in which demand queries are more powerful than value queries.

Theorem 3. *For large enough values of n , there exists an instance of the optimal contract problem with submodular reward function for which the optimal contract can be found with $O(1)$ demand queries, but requires $\Omega(2^n/n)$ value queries.*

We devise a family of instances of the optimal contract problem, one for each subset $S \subseteq A$ with $|S| = n/2$ and one more for $S = \emptyset$. In the instances associated with $S \neq \emptyset$ the reward function f_S is defined such that the unique optimal contract is $\alpha^* = 3/4$. For $S = \emptyset$, the unique optimal contract is $\frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}$. Thus, the principal must distinguish between two cases: when S is the empty set and when it is not. We show that this task is easy when the principal has access to a demand oracle, but with a value oracle it requires an exponential number of queries in expectation.

In Section 4.1 we define the family of instances and prove its basic properties. In Section 4.2 we establish the desired bounds on the query complexity for value and demand oracles.

4.1 A Family of Instances with Only Two Critical Values

Consider a setting with an even number of actions n , and identical costs, $c_i = \frac{3}{4}$ for every $i \in A$. We define a family of submodular reward functions, that includes a function f_S for every $S \subseteq A$ with $|S| = \frac{n}{2}$. We define each such f_S as follows:

$$f_S(T) = \begin{cases} |T| & |T| < \frac{n}{2} \\ \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2} & |T| = \frac{n}{2} \wedge T \neq S \\ \frac{n}{2} - \varepsilon & T = S \\ \frac{n}{2} & |T| > \frac{n}{2}, \end{cases}$$

for some $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{8n})$. We also define a function f_\emptyset , which is similar to the above, except there is no “special set” S :

$$f_\emptyset(T) = \begin{cases} |T| & |T| < \frac{n}{2} \\ \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2} & |T| = \frac{n}{2} \\ \frac{n}{2} & |T| > \frac{n}{2} \end{cases}$$

We denote the collection of reward functions with $\mathcal{F} = \{f_S \mid |S| = \frac{n}{2} \vee S = \emptyset\}$.

Claim 1. *Each $f_S \in \mathcal{F}$ is submodular.*

Proof. Fix a reward function $f_S \in \mathcal{F}$, two sets $T \subsetneq T'$, and an action $i \in A$. Observe that the marginal rewards are always bounded by 0 from below and by 1 from above. If $i \in T'$, then $f_S(i \mid T') = 0$ and we have $f_S(i \mid T') = 0 \leq f_S(i \mid T)$. Otherwise, $i \notin T'$, and we divide into cases:

- If $|T'| > n/2$, then $f_S(i \mid T') = 0 \leq f_S(i \mid T)$.

- If $|T'| < n/2$, then $|T| < n/2 - 1$ and $f_S(i | T) = 1 \geq f_S(i | T')$.
- If $|T'| = n/2$:
 - If $S = \emptyset$, then $f_S(i | T') = 1/2 \leq f_S(i | T)$.
 - If $S \neq \emptyset$ and $T' \neq S$, then $f_S(i | T') = \frac{1}{2}$. Because $|T| < \frac{n}{2}$, then $T \neq S$, and we have $f_S(i | T) \geq \frac{1}{2}$.
 - If $S \neq \emptyset$ and $T' = S$, then $f_S(i | T') = \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} \leq f_S(i | T)$.

This completes the proof. \square

Claim 2. Consider the optimal contract problem where each action $i \in A$ has cost $c_i = \frac{3}{4}$ and the reward function is some $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$.

1. If $f^* = f_\emptyset$, then the optimal contract is $\alpha^* = \frac{3}{4}$.
2. If $f^* = f_S$ and $S \neq \emptyset$, then the optimal contract is $\alpha^* = \frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}$.

Proof. Observe that for any S (including $S = \emptyset$), and for any $T \subseteq A$, it holds that $f_S(T) \leq |T|$. So for any contract $\alpha < \frac{3}{4}$, the agent will not pick any actions, as every $T \neq \emptyset$ yields negative utility $u_a(\alpha, T) = \alpha f_S(T) - \sum_{i \in T} c_i < \frac{3}{4}|T| - \frac{3}{4}|T| = 0$. Thus, the optimal contract cannot belong to the interval $(0, \frac{3}{4})$.

Assume $f^* = f_\emptyset$. For contract $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$, any set $T \subseteq A$ of size $|T| < \frac{n}{2}$ yields utility 0 for the agent, and any set of size $|T| \geq \frac{n}{2}$ yields a negative utility. As the agent breaks ties in favor of the principal, its best response to $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$ is to pick a set T of size $\frac{n}{2} - 1$.

From Observation 2, the next higher critical value, $\alpha' \geq \alpha$, must incentivize a set of actions T' such that $|T'| \geq \frac{n}{2}$, and must be of the form

$$\alpha' = \min_{T' \subseteq A, |T'| \geq \frac{n}{2}} \frac{\sum_{i \in T'} c_i - \sum_{i \in T} c_i}{f_\emptyset(T') - f_\emptyset(T)} = \min_{T' \subseteq A, |T'| \geq \frac{n}{2}} \frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{|T'| - n/2 + 1}{f_\emptyset(T') - n/2 + 1} \geq \frac{3}{2}.$$

One can easily verify that equality is achieved when $|T'| = \frac{n}{2}$ or $|T'| = \frac{n}{2} + 1$, as all other sets T' require a higher contract in order to be incentivized. This implies that all critical values other than $\frac{3}{4}$ are greater than 1 and yield a negative utility for the principal. We conclude that $\alpha^* = \frac{3}{4}$ is the unique critical value and the optimal contract in this case.

Now fix $S \neq \emptyset$ and let $f^* = f_S$. The same reasoning as in the previous case applies for $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$, which is a critical value with the agent's best response being T with $|T| = \frac{n}{2} - 1$. The next higher critical value, $\alpha' \geq \alpha$, satisfies

$$\alpha' = \min_{T' \subseteq A, |T'| \geq \frac{n}{2}} \frac{\sum_{i \in T'} c_i - \sum_{i \in T} c_i}{f_S(T') - f_S(T)} = \min_{T' \subseteq A, |T'| \geq \frac{n}{2}} \frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{|T'| - n/2 + 1}{f_S(T') - n/2 + 1} \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon},$$

where equality is achieved when $T' = S$. A similar computation to the above shows that all critical values following $\alpha' = \frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}$, are greater than 1 and yield a negative utility for the principal. We have thus established that for $S \neq \emptyset$ there are only two critical values. It remains to show that $\alpha = \frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}$ yields greater utility for the principal.

Observe that the principal's utility from $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$ is $u_p(\frac{3}{4}) = \frac{1}{4}(\frac{n}{2} - 1)$. For $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{8n}$, we get that the utility of the principal from contract $\alpha' = \frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}$ is greater:

$$\begin{aligned} u_p\left(\frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}\right) &= \left(1 - \frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}\right) f_S(S) = \left(1 - \frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}\right) \left(\frac{n}{2} - \varepsilon\right) \\ &> \left(1 - \frac{3}{4(1-\frac{1}{8n})}\right) \left(\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{8n}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{6n}{8n-1}\right) \frac{4n^2-1}{8n} \\ &\geq \frac{2n-1}{8n} \cdot \frac{4n^2-1}{8n} = \frac{n}{8} - \frac{1}{16} - \frac{1}{32n} + \frac{1}{64n^2} \\ &\geq \frac{n}{8} - \frac{1}{4} = u_p\left(\frac{3}{4}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality follows from the fact that $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{8n}$ and the other two inequalities hold for large enough values of n . \square

Claim 2 implies that any algorithm that finds the optimal contract must distinguish between two cases: (a) the case $f^* = f_\emptyset$, where the optimal contract is $\alpha^* = \frac{3}{4}$ and (b) the case where $f^* \neq f_\emptyset$ and the optimal contract is $\alpha^* = \frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}$. Below we will show that this is not possible with poly-many value queries.

4.2 Bounding the Query Complexity

We first prove the lower bound on the number of value queries needed to find the optimal contract when f^* is taken from \mathcal{F} , as defined above.

Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 3. By Yao's principle it is enough to show that when we draw $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$ uniformly at random, any deterministic algorithm requires an exponential number of value queries in expectation.

First, observe that for any set of actions $T \subseteq A$ with $|T| \neq \frac{n}{2}$, $f_S(T) = f_{S'}(T)$ for any $f_S, f_{S'} \in \mathcal{F}$. For any T with $|T| = \frac{n}{2}$, $f^*(T)$ can return one of two different values: If $f^* = f_T$, then $f^*(T) = f_T(T) = \frac{n}{2} - \varepsilon$. Otherwise, $f^*(T) = \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$.

Claim 2 implies that the algorithm must identify the case in which $f^* = f_\emptyset$ in order to find the optimal contract. Therefore we can assume without loss of generality that any deterministic algorithm makes a *fixed* series of value queries $f^*(T)$ with sets of size $|T| = \frac{n}{2}$ and stops whenever $f^*(T) = \frac{n}{2} - \varepsilon$. If it stops beforehand, and makes less than $\binom{n}{n/2}$ queries, then there exists a set T which was not queried and both f_T and f_\emptyset are consistent with the oracle answers up to this point. Thus, the algorithm cannot distinguish between the two cases.

Fix a deterministic algorithm for the optimal contract. Since f^* is drawn uniformly at random, it is the case that with probability $1/2$ the first $\frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{n/2}$ queries all return $\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$ and the algorithm does not stop. Thus, the algorithm's expected number of queries is at least $\frac{1}{4}\binom{n}{n/2} = \Omega\left(\frac{2^n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ \square

We now turn to prove the second part of Theorem 3, namely the upper bound on the number of demand queries required, which concludes this section.

Proof of the upper bound in Theorem 3. As mentioned, calling a demand oracle for f^* with prices $p_i = c_i/\alpha$ returns $\arg \max_{T \subseteq A} f^*(T) - \sum_{i \in T} \frac{c_i}{\alpha} = \arg \max_{T \subseteq A} \alpha f^*(T) - \sum_{i \in T} c_i$, which is the agent's best response to contract α . Following Claim 2, it is enough to use two demand queries, with prices $p_i = \frac{c_i}{3/4} = 1$ and $p'_i = \frac{c_i}{3/4(1-\varepsilon)} = 1 - \varepsilon$, to get two best responses, T and T' . The principal then picks contract $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$ if it yields greater utility, that is $(1 - \frac{3}{4}) f^*(T) > (1 - \frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}) f^*(T')$, and contract $\frac{3}{4(1-\varepsilon)}$ otherwise.³ \square

References

- [ADLT23] Tal Alon, Paul Dütting, Yingkai Li, and Inbal Talgam-Cohen. Bayesian analysis of linear contracts. In *EC 2023*, page 66, 2023.
- [ADT21] Tal Alon, Paul Dütting, and Inbal Talgam-Cohen. Contracts with private cost per unit-of-effort. In *EC 2021*, pages 52–69, 2021.
- [BFN06a] Moshe Babaioff, Michal Feldman, and Noam Nisan. Combinatorial agency. In *EC 2006*, pages 18–28, 2006.
- [BFN06b] Moshe Babaioff, Michal Feldman, and Noam Nisan. Mixed strategies in combinatorial agency. In *WINE 2006*, pages 353–364, 2006.

³One can compute $f^*(T)$ using demand queries by setting all prices $p_i = 0$ for $i \in T$ and $p_i = \infty$ for $i \notin T$.

- [BFN09] Moshe Babaioff, Michal Feldman, and Noam Nisan. Free-riding and free-labor in combinatorial agency. In *SAGT 2009*, pages 109–121, 2009.
- [CMG21] Matteo Castiglioni, Alberto Marchesi, and Nicola Gatti. Bayesian agency: Linear versus tractable contracts. In *EC 2021*, pages 285–286, 2021.
- [CMG22] Matteo Castiglioni, Alberto Marchesi, and Nicola Gatti. Designing menus of contracts efficiently: the power of randomization. In *EC 2022*, pages 705–735, 2022.
- [CMG23] Matteo Castiglioni, Alberto Marchesi, and Nicola Gatti. Multi-agent contract design: How to commission multiple agents with individual outcomes. In *EC 2023*, pages 412–448, 2023.
- [DDPP24] Ramiro Deo-Campo Vuong, Shaddin Dughmi, Neel Patel, and Aditya Prasad. On supermodular contracts and dense subgraphs. In *SODA 2024*, pages 109–132, 2024.
- [DEFK22] Paul Dütting, Tomer Ezra, Michal Feldman, and Thomas Kesselheim. Combinatorial contracts. In *FOCS 2021*, pages 815–826, 2022.
- [DEFK23] Paul Dütting, Tomer Ezra, Michal Feldman, and Thomas Kesselheim. Multi-agent contracts. In *STOC 2023*, pages 1311–1324, 2023.
- [DFG24] Paul Dütting, Michal Feldman, and Yoav Gal Tzur. Combinatorial contracts beyond gross substitutes. In *SODA 2024*, pages 92–108, 2024.
- [DFP23] Paul Dütting, Michal Feldman, and Daniel Peretz. Ambiguous contracts. In *EC 2023*, 2023.
- [DGSW23] Paul Dütting, Guru Guruganesh, Jon Schneider, and Joshua Wang. Optimal no-regret learning for one-side lipschitz functions. In *ICML 2023*, 2023. Forthcoming.
- [DRT21] Paul Dütting, Tim Roughgarden, and Inbal Talgam-Cohen. The complexity of contracts. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(1):211–254, 2021.
- [EFS24] Tomer Ezra, Michal Feldman, and Maya Schlesinger. On the (in)approximability of combinatorial contracts. *ITCS 2024*, 2024.
- [GSW21] Guru Guruganesh, Jon Schneider, and Joshua R Wang. Contracts under moral hazard and adverse selection. In *EC 2021*, pages 563–582, 2021.
- [GSWZ23] Guru Guruganesh, Jon Schneider, Joshua R. Wang, and Junyao Zhao. The power of menus in contract design. In *EC 2023*, pages 818–848, 2023.
- [HSV14] Chien-Ju Ho, Aleksandrs Slivkins, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. Adaptive contract design for crowdsourcing markets: Bandit algorithms for repeated principal-agent problems. In *EC 2014*, pages 359–376, 2014.
- [Roy16] Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. Scientific background on the 2016 nobel prize in economic. 2016.
- [ZBY⁺23] Banghua Zhu, Stephen Bates, Zhuoran Yang, Yixin Wang, Jiantao Jiao, and Michael I. Jordan. The sample complexity of online contract design. In *EC 2023*, page 1188, 2023.

A Proof of Lemma 2

Proof of Lemma 2. For $t = 0$ we have $f_1 - f_0 = f_1 \approx 1.618$ and for $t = 1$, $f_2 - f_1 \approx 1.1338$. For $t > 1$, let $z_t = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{4\alpha_t^2 - 8\alpha_t + 5} - 1 \right)$, so that $\alpha_{t+1} = \alpha_t + z_t$. Rearranging we get

$$f_{t+1} - f_t = \frac{z_t}{(1 - \alpha_t - z_t)(1 - \alpha_t)}$$

Substituting α_t with x , and z_t with $z(x)$, we'll show that $g(x) = \frac{z(x)}{(1-x-z(x))(1-x)}$ is monotonically decreasing for $x \in [0, 1)$. The claim follows from continuity. It is enough to show that the numerator of $\frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x}$, which we denote by $\hat{g}(x)$, is negative for $x \in [0, 1)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}(x) &= z'(x)(1-x-z(x))(1-x) - z(x)[(-1-z'(x))(1-x) - (1-x-z(x))] \\ &= z'(x)(1-x)^2 - z'(x)z(x)(1-x) + z(x)(1+z'(x))(1-x) + z(x)(1-x) - z^2(x) \\ &= z'(x)(1-x)^2 + z(x)(1-x)[-z'(x) + 1 + z'(x) + 1] - z^2(x) \\ &= z'(x)(1-x)^2 + 2z(x)(1-x) - z^2(x) \end{aligned}$$

Replacing z with the relevant expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}(x) &= \frac{-2(1-x)^3}{\sqrt{4x^2-8x+5}} + (\sqrt{4x^2-8x+5}-1)(1-x) - \frac{1}{4}(4x^2-8x+6-2\sqrt{4x^2-8x+5}) \\ &= \frac{-2(1-x)^3}{\sqrt{4x^2-8x+5}} + \sqrt{4x^2-8x+5} \left(\frac{3}{2} - x \right) - (1-x) - \left(x^2 - 2x + \frac{3}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{-2(1-x)^3}{\sqrt{4x^2-8x+5}} + \sqrt{4x^2-8x+5} \left(\frac{3}{2} - x \right) - x^2 + 3x - \frac{5}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Since in the range $x \in [0, 1)$ it holds that $\sqrt{4x^2-8x+5} > 0$, $\hat{g}(x) < 0$ follows if $h(x) < 0$, where $h(x) := \sqrt{4x^2-8x+5} \cdot \hat{g}(x)$.

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= -2(1-x)^3 + (4x^2-8x+5) \left(\frac{3}{2} - x \right) - \left(x^2 - 3x + \frac{5}{2} \right) \sqrt{4x^2-8x+5} \\ &= -2x^3 + 8x^2 - 11x + \frac{11}{2} - \left(x^2 - 3x + \frac{5}{2} \right) \sqrt{4x^2-8x+5} \end{aligned}$$

$h(x) < 0$ if and only if the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} -2x^3 + 8x^2 - 11x + \frac{11}{2} &< \left(x^2 - 3x + \frac{5}{2} \right) \sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} \\ \left(-2x^3 + 8x^2 - 11x + \frac{11}{2} \right)^2 &< \left(x^2 - 3x + \frac{5}{2} \right)^2 (4x^2 - 8x + 5) \\ 4x^6 - 32x^5 + 108x^4 - 198x^3 + 209x^2 - 121x + 30.25 &< \left(x^4 - 6x^3 + 14x^2 - 15x + \frac{25}{4} \right) (4x^2 - 8x + 5) \\ 108x^4 - 198x^3 + 209x^2 - 121x + 30.25 &< 109x^4 - 202x^3 + 215x^2 - 125x + 31.25 \\ 0 &< x^4 - 3x^3 + 6x^2 - 4x + 1 \end{aligned}$$

One can easily verify that this is true for any $x \geq 0$. □

B Polynomial Representation

In this section we round our equal-revenue reward function so it can be represented with $\text{poly}(n)$ bits. We show that this new reward function, \tilde{f} , can be extended to a family of optimal-contract problems to show hardness in the demand query model, as in Section 3.

Recall our definition of the family of reward functions \mathcal{F} in Section 3.3: Each reward function $f_S \in \mathcal{F}$ was defined to be identical to the original f , except for a small fixed bonus $\varepsilon > 0$ for the set S , namely

$$f_S(T) = \begin{cases} f(T) & T \neq S \\ f(T) + \varepsilon & T = S \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

The purpose of the bonus was to guarantee that when the reward function is f_S , there are $2^n - 1$ critical values, but only one of these critical values, α_S , is optimal. Our argument also relied on the fact that ε is small enough to ensure that a demand oracle for f_S can be simulated with poly-many value queries, and that the monotonicity and submodularity of f are maintained.

Thus, to prove Theorem 2 it is enough to show that there exists a rounded reward function \tilde{f} and $\varepsilon > 0$, whose representation is polynomial in n , such that the following properties hold for any optimal contract instance defined with respect to the costs $c_i = 2^{i-1}$ and a reward function \tilde{f}_S :

1. \tilde{f}_S is monotone and submodular.
2. A demand oracle for \tilde{f}_S can be simulated with poly-many value queries.
3. There are $2^n - 1$ critical values $0 = \gamma_0 < \dots < \gamma_{2^n-1} < 1$, each yielding an expected utility of at most $1 + 2^{-\theta(n^2)}$ to the principal, except for one which yields $1 + 2^{-\theta(n)}$.

In Appendix B.1 we show that in the original construction any two critical values are significantly spaced from each other, and in Appendix B.2 we prove that rounding our construction with precision $2^{-\theta(n^2)}$ is sufficient to maintain the above properties.

B.1 Bounds for the Original Construction

The goal of this section is to lower bound the distance between any two critical values (and between the last critical value and 1) of the original construction. This bound, which is of order $2^{-\theta(n)}$ is large enough to guarantee that a rounded instance of precision $2^{-\theta(n^2)}$ maintains all the essential properties.

Lemma 5. *For any $t \in \{1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$,*

$$(1 - \alpha_t)^3 < \alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t < (1 - \alpha_t)^{3/2}.$$

Proof. Fix t . Recall that $\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{4\alpha_t^2 - 8\alpha_t + 5} - 1)$. First, observe that the inequality holds for $\alpha_1 = \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2} \approx 0.618$, as $(1 - \alpha_1)^3 \approx 0.0055$, $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 \approx 0.129$ and $(1 - \alpha_1)^{3/2} \approx 0.236$.

To prove the inequality on the right, observe that for any $x \in [\alpha_1, 1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} - 1)}{(1-x)^{3/2}} \right)' &= \frac{1}{2(1-x)^3} \cdot \left(\frac{8(x-1)(1-x)^{3/2}}{2\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5}} + \frac{3}{2}(1-x)^{1/2} \cdot (\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} - 1) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(1-x)^{5/2}} \cdot \left(\frac{-4(1-x)^2}{\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5}} + \frac{3}{2} \cdot (\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} - 1) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The above is negative if and only if

$$\frac{3}{2}(\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} - 1) < \frac{4(1-x)^2}{\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5}}$$

One can verify that this is equivalent to

$$2x^2 - 4x + \frac{7}{2} - \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} < 0.$$

and that this inequality holds for any $x \in [\alpha_1, 1)$ and in particular for any α_t with $t \geq 1$. For the left inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} - 1)}{(1-x)^3} \right)' &= \frac{1}{2(1-x)^6} \cdot \left(\frac{8(x-1)(1-x)^3}{2\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5}} + 3(1-x)^2 \cdot (\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} - 1) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(1-x)^4} \cdot \left(\frac{-4(1-x)^2}{\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5}} + 3(\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} - 1) \right) \end{aligned}$$

which is positive if and only if

$$3(\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} - 1) > \frac{4(1-x)^2}{\sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5}}$$

Equivalently,

$$8x^2 - 12x + 11 - \sqrt{4x^2 - 8x + 5} > 0,$$

which holds for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. □

Lemma 6. For any $t \in [2^n - 1]$, $1 - \alpha_t \geq 2^{-6n}$.

Proof. Observe that $1 - \alpha_t$ is a monotonically decreasing series. Aiming for contradiction, assume there exists t such that $1 - \alpha_t < 2^{-6n}$, and in particular $\alpha_{2^n-1} > 1 - 2^{-6n}$. Let t^* be such that $1 - \alpha_{t^*} < 2^{-4n}$ and $1 - \alpha_{t^*-1} \geq 2^{-4n}$. Using telescoping sum and the upper bound from Lemma 5 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{t^*} - \alpha_1 &= \sum_{t=1}^{t^*-1} \alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t = \sum_{t=1}^{t^*-1} \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{4\alpha_t^2 - 8\alpha_t + 5} - 1 \right) \\ &\leq \int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_{t^*-1}} \frac{1}{2} (\sqrt{4x - 8x + 5} - 1) dx \\ &< \int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_{t^*-1}} (1-x)^{3/2} dx \\ &= \frac{-2}{5} \left[(1-x)^{5/2} \right]_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_{t^*-1}} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{5} \left[(1-\alpha_1) - (1-\alpha_{t^*-1})^{5/2} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{5} \left[(1-\alpha_1) - (2^{-4n})^{5/2} \right] = \frac{2}{5} \left[(1-\alpha_1) - (2^{-10n}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of t^* . We get

$$\alpha_{t^*} \leq \frac{2}{5} + \frac{3}{5}\alpha_1 - \frac{2}{5} \cdot 2^{-10n} \approx 0.7708 - \frac{2}{5} \cdot 2^{-10n} \quad (3)$$

Lemma 1 implies that $\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t$ is a decreasing function of t , so for any $t > t^*$,

$$\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t \leq \alpha_{t^*+1} - \alpha_{t^*} < (1 - \alpha_{t^*})^{3/2} < 2^{-6n},$$

where the second to last inequality is due to Lemma 5. Thus, α_{2^n-1} satisfies:

$$\alpha_{2^n-1} = \alpha_{t^*} + \sum_{t=t^*+1}^{2^n-2} \alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t \leq \alpha_{t^*} + 2^n \cdot 2^{-6n} = \alpha_{t^*} + 2^{-5n}$$

According to our assumption, $\alpha_{2^n} > 1 - 2^{-6n}$ and so

$$\alpha_{t^*} \geq 1 - 2^{-6n} - 2^{-5n} \quad (4)$$

Combining equations 3 and 4 we get

$$2^{-6n} + 2^{-5n} - \frac{2}{5}2^{-10n} \geq 0.2292,$$

a contradiction for any $n > 1$. □

Corollary 2. *For any t , $\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t \geq 2^{-18n}$*

Proof. By Lemmas 5 and 6 we have

$$\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t \geq (1 - \alpha_t)^3 \geq 2^{-18n},$$

as claimed. □

B.2 Poly-Size Construction

We define a rounded version of our original critical values $\tilde{\alpha}_t = \lfloor \alpha_t \rfloor$, where $\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{k \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)} \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}, x \geq k \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}\}$, and a new reward function:

$$\tilde{f}(S_t) = \tilde{f}_t = \frac{1}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}_t} \quad (5)$$

We show that \tilde{f} possesses the three required properties defined at the beginning of Appendix B. We establish Property 1 in Corollary 3, Property 2 in Proposition 7, and Property 3 in Proposition 6.

We begin by bounding the distance between the rounded instance and the original one, proving that the series of differences $\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t$ is equal to $f_{t+1} - f_t$ up to an additive factor of $2^{-\theta(n^2)}$.

Lemma 7. *For any $t \in [2^n]$,*

$$\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t = (f_{t+1} - f_t) \pm 2^{-\theta(n^2)}.$$

Proof. Denote $\alpha_t - \tilde{\alpha}_t = \alpha_t - \lfloor \alpha_t \rfloor = e_t$. Note that $0 \leq e_t < 2^{-\theta(n^2)}$. With this definition at hand, we can rewrite $\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t &= \frac{1}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}_{t+1}} - \frac{1}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}_t} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{\alpha}_{t+1} - \tilde{\alpha}_t}{(1 - \tilde{\alpha}_t)(1 - \tilde{\alpha}_{t+1})} \\ &= \frac{\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t + e_t - e_{t+1}}{(1 - \alpha_t + e_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1} + e_{t+1})} \\ &= \frac{\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t + e_t - e_{t+1}}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + e_t(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + e_{t+1}(1 - \alpha_t) + e_{t+1}e_t}. \end{aligned}$$

We upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t &\leq \frac{\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t + 2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1})} \\ &= f_{t+1} - f_t + \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1})} \\ &\leq f_{t+1} - f_t + \frac{2^{-\kappa n}}{2^{-6n} \cdot 2^{-6n}} \\ &= f_{t+1} - f_t + 2^{-\theta(n^2)} \end{aligned}$$

and lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t &= \frac{\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t + e_t - e_{t+1}}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + e_t(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + e_{t+1}(1 - \alpha_t) + e_{t+1}e_t} \\
&> \frac{\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t - 2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + 3 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \\
&= \frac{\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + 3 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} - \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + 3 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \\
&= \frac{\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1})} \cdot \frac{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1})}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + 3 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} - \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + 3 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \\
&= (f_{t+1} - f_t) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{3 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + 3 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \right) - \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{(1 - \alpha_t)(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) + 3 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \\
&\geq (f_{t+1} - f_t) - \frac{3 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}(f_{t+1} - f_t) + 2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{2^{-12n}} \\
&\geq (f_{t+1} - f_t) - \frac{6 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)} + 2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{2^{-12n}} \\
&\geq (f_{t+1} - f_t) - 2^{-\theta(n^2)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from Lemma 2 and the fact that $f_1 - f_0 \approx 1.618 < 2$. \square

As in the original instance, the discrete derivative $\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t$ is negative, as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 8. $\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t$ is a decreasing function of t , for any t .

Proof. It is enough to show that for any t , $f_{t+1} - f_t - (f_t - f_{t-1}) < -2^{-\theta(n)}$, as this implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t - (\tilde{f}_t - \tilde{f}_{t-1}) &\leq f_{t+1} - f_t + 2^{-\theta(n^2)} - (f_t - f_{t-1} - 2^{-\theta(n^2)}) \\
&= f_{t+1} - f_t - (f_t - f_{t-1}) + 2^{-\theta(n^2)} \\
&= -2^{-\theta(n)} + 2^{-\theta(n^2)} \\
&< 0
\end{aligned}$$

Recall from Proposition 1, that $\alpha_{t+1} = \frac{1}{f_{t+1} - f_t}$. Thus,

$$f_{t+1} - f_t - (f_t - f_{t-1}) = \frac{1}{\alpha_{t+1}} - \frac{1}{\alpha_t} = \frac{\alpha_t - \alpha_{t+1}}{\alpha_t \cdot \alpha_{t+1}} < \frac{-2^{-18}}{\alpha_0^2} = -2^{-\theta(n)},$$

where the inequality follows from Corollary 2 and the monotonicity of α_t . \square

As an immediate corollary from the negative discrete derivative of \tilde{f} , together with the bounds in Lemma 5, we show that choosing $\varepsilon = 2^{-\theta(n)}$ is enough to guarantee Property 1.

Corollary 3. There exists an $\varepsilon = 2^{-\theta(n)}$ such that for every $S \subseteq A$, \tilde{f}_S is monotone and submodular.

Proof. The monotonicity of \tilde{f} follows directly from Corollary 2 and the rounding scheme in Equation (5) which has precision $2^{-\theta(n^2)}$. To guarantee the monotonicity of \tilde{f}_S it is enough to pick $\varepsilon < \tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t$, for any $t \in [2^n - 2]$.

To maintain the decreasing second derivative (which implies submodularity, as in the original f), it is enough to satisfy $2\varepsilon < \tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t - (\tilde{f}_{t+2} - \tilde{f}_{t+1})$, for any $t \in [2^n - 3]$.

One can easily show that $\varepsilon = 2^{-\theta(n)}$ satisfies both sets of constraints by using the proximity between the discrete derivatives of \tilde{f} and f (Lemma 7) and the bounds on the original construction (Lemma 5), similarly to Lemma 8. \square

Next we show that when \tilde{f} is the reward function (and the additive cost is $c_i = 2^{i-1}$ for any $i \in [n]$), there are $2^n - 1$ distinct critical values (different from $\tilde{\alpha}_t$), each of which yields the same utility to the principal, up to an additive factor of $2^{-\theta(n^2)}$.

Lemma 9. *Consider the optimal contract problem defined with respect to \tilde{f} . There exists a series of critical values $0 = \beta_0 < \beta_1 < \dots < \beta_{2^n-1} < 1$ such that for any $t \in \{0, \dots, 2^n - 2\}$, S_t is the agent's best response for contract $\alpha \in [\beta_t, \beta_{t+1})$. Additionally, each β_t yields an expected utility of $1 \pm 2^{-\theta(n^2)}$ to the principal.*

Proof. As in Proposition 1, for any $t \geq 0$, the critical value for which S_{t+1} is the agent's best response is $\beta_{t+1} = \frac{1}{\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t}$. From Lemma 7,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t} &= \frac{1}{f_{t+1} - f_t \pm 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{f_{t+1} - f_t} \left(\frac{f_{t+1} - f_t}{f_{t+1} - f_t \pm 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \right) \\ &= \alpha_{t+1} \left(1 \mp \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{f_{t+1} - f_t \pm 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Proposition 1. Also, from Proposition 1 and Lemma 6, we have

$$f_{t+1} - f_t = \frac{1}{\alpha_{t+1}} \geq \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-6n}}$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t} \in \alpha_{t+1} \mp \frac{\alpha_{t+1} \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{1 - 2^{-6n} \pm 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \subseteq \alpha_{t+1} \mp \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{1 - 2^{-6n}}$$

By Corollary 2,

$$\beta_{t+1} - \beta_t \geq \alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_t - 2^{-\theta(n^2)} \geq 2^{-18n} - 2^{-\theta(n^2)} > 0$$

and from Lemma 6,

$$\beta_{2^n-1} \leq 1 - 2^{-6n} + 2^{-\theta(n^2)} < 1.$$

To see that each β_t yields approximately the same revenue for the principal, we replace β_t in principal's expected revenue according to the first equation in the proof:

$$\tilde{f}_t(1 - \beta_t) = \frac{1}{1 - \tilde{\alpha}_t}(1 - \beta_t) \in \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_t + e_t} \left(1 - \alpha_t \mp \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{1 - 2^{-6n}} \right)$$

This term is upper bounded as follows:

$$\tilde{f}_t(1 - \beta_t) \leq 1 + \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{1 - 2^{-6n}} \leq 1 + 2^{-\theta(n^2)},$$

and lower bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_t(1 - \beta_t) &\geq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_t + 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} \left(1 - \alpha_t - \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{1 - 2^{-6n}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1 - \alpha_t}{1 - \alpha_t + 2^{-\theta(n^2)}} - \frac{2^{-\theta(n^2)}}{(1 - \alpha_t + 2^{-\theta(n^2)})(1 - 2^{-6n})} \\ &\geq 1 - 2^{-\theta(n^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

The following proposition establishes Property 3. It shows that picking $\varepsilon = 2^{-\theta(n)}$ is sufficient to guarantee that (i) there are $2^n - 1$ different critical values in the instance defined with respect to \tilde{f}_S , for any $S \subseteq [n]$ (see Equation (2)), and (ii) one of these critical values yields significantly more utility to the principal than the others.

Proposition 6. *There exists an $\varepsilon = 2^{-\theta(n)}$ such that there for every $S_t \subseteq A$, the instance defined with respect to \tilde{f}_{S_t} has $2^n - 1$ critical values, each of them yields revenue of at most $1 + 2^{-\theta(n^2)}$ to the principal except for the optimal contract, γ_t , which yields $1 + 2^{-\theta(n)}$.*

Proof. Observe that when moving from the optimal contract instance defined with respect to \tilde{f} to the one defined with respect to \tilde{f}_{S_t} , the only critical values that may change are those defined with respect to $\tilde{f}(S_t)$, namely $\beta_t = \frac{1}{\tilde{f}_t - \tilde{f}_{t-1}}$ and $\beta_{t+1} = \frac{1}{\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t}$, which turn to $\gamma_t = \frac{1}{\tilde{f}_t + \varepsilon - \tilde{f}_{t-1}}$ and $\gamma_{t+1} = \frac{1}{\tilde{f}_{t+1} - \tilde{f}_t - \varepsilon}$, respectively.

Thus, in order to maintain the number of critical values to be as in Lemma 9, we need to make sure that $\beta_{t-1} < \gamma_t < \gamma_{t+1} < \beta_{t+2}$. One can easily verify that for any t , these constraints only bound ε to be at most $2^{-\theta(n)}$, by bounding the discrete derivative, similarly to Lemma 8.

The fact that all critical values except γ_t and γ_{t+1} yield at most $1 + 2^{-\theta(n^2)}$ utility to the principal is immediate from Lemma 9, which also implies this for γ_{t+1} , as $\tilde{f}_{t+1}(1 - \gamma_{t+1}) \leq \tilde{f}_{t+1}(1 - \beta_{t+1})$.

It is left to show that γ_t yields revenue of at least $1 + 2^{-\theta(n)}$. Using simple algebraic manipulations we can rewrite the principal's utility

$$(\tilde{f}_t + \varepsilon)(1 - \gamma_t) = \tilde{f}_t(1 - \beta_t) + \frac{\varepsilon}{\tilde{f}_t + \varepsilon - \tilde{f}_{t-1}}(1 - \varepsilon + \tilde{f}_t\beta_t) \geq 1 - 2^{-\theta(n^2)} + O(\varepsilon) = 1 + 2^{-\theta(n)},$$

where the inequality follows from Lemma 9. □

We conclude by showing that $\varepsilon = 2^{-\theta(n)}$ is sufficient for the rounded instance to satisfy Property 2.

Proposition 7. *There exists an $\varepsilon = 2^{-\theta(n)}$ such that for every $S \subseteq A$, a demand oracle for \tilde{f}_S can be implemented with poly-many value queries.*

Proof. It is enough to show that \tilde{f} satisfies Lemma 3. The claim follows from the same argument used for the original f (see Proposition 5). To see that Lemma 3 holds for \tilde{f} as well, replace f with \tilde{f} and β_t with α_t in the proof. The same argument holds, only that we need to verify that ε can be chosen to have a polynomial representation in n . The constraint imposed on ε in this lemma is

$$\varepsilon < \frac{2^{i-2}(\beta_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}} - \beta_{S_t \cup \{i\}})}{\beta_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}} \cdot \beta_{S_t \cup \{i\}}}$$

for any $i \in [n]$ any index $t \in [2^n - 1]$ and any $t' > t + 2^i$.

From Lemma 5, we have for any t

$$\beta_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}} - \beta_{S_t \cup \{i\}} \geq \alpha_{S_{t'} \setminus \{i\}} - \alpha_{S_t \cup \{i\}} - 2 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)} \geq 2^{-18n} - 2 \cdot 2^{-\theta(n^2)}$$

Thus, picking $\varepsilon = 2^{-\theta(n)}$ is enough to satisfy the above constraint for the rounded instance. □