

Contextual Dynamic Pricing: Algorithms, Optimality, and Local Differential Privacy Constraints

Zifeng Zhao¹, Feiyu Jiang², Yi Yu^{3*}

Abstract

We study the contextual dynamic pricing problem where a firm sells products to T sequentially arriving consumers that behave according to an unknown demand model. The firm aims to maximize its revenue, i.e. minimize its regret over a clairvoyant that knows the model in advance. The demand model is a generalized linear model (GLM), allowing for a stochastic feature vector in \mathbb{R}^d that encodes product and consumer information. We first show that the optimal regret upper bound is of order \sqrt{dT} , up to a logarithmic factor, improving upon existing upper bounds in the literature by a \sqrt{d} factor. This sharper rate is materialised by two algorithms: a confidence bound-type (supCB) algorithm and an explore-then-commit (ETC) algorithm. A key insight of our theoretical result is an intrinsic connection between dynamic pricing and the contextual multi-armed bandit problem with many arms based on a careful discretization.

We further study contextual dynamic pricing under the local differential privacy (LDP) constraints. In particular, we propose a stochastic gradient descent based ETC algorithm that achieves an optimal regret upper bound of order $d\sqrt{T}/\epsilon$, up to a logarithmic factor, where $\epsilon > 0$ is the privacy parameter. The regret upper bounds with and without LDP constraints are accompanied by newly constructed minimax lower bounds, which further characterize the cost of privacy. Extensive numerical experiments and a real data application on online lending are conducted to illustrate the efficiency and practical value of the proposed algorithms in dynamic pricing.

Keywords: Online learning, Confidence bound, Explore-then-commit, Differential privacy, Minimax optimality.

*1. University of Notre Dame; 2. Fudan University; 3. University of Warwick

1 Introduction

With the technological advances and prevalence of online marketplaces, many firms can now dynamically make pricing decisions while having access to an abundance of contextual information such as consumer characteristics, product features and economic environment. On the other hand, in practice, the demand model is unknown in advance and firms need to dynamically learn how the contextual information impacts consumer demand. Thus, to maximize its revenue, the firm needs to implement dynamic pricing, which aims to optimally balance the trade-off between learning the unknown demand function and earning revenues by exploiting the estimated demand model. Due to its importance in revenue management, dynamic pricing has been extensively studied across the fields of statistics, machine learning, and operations research under various settings. We refer the readers to Section 1.2 for recent works and [den Boer \(2015\)](#) for a comprehensive review.

In this work, we consider the problem of contextual dynamic pricing, where the firm sells products to $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$ sequentially arriving consumers and the unknown demand follows a generalized linear model (GLM). In particular, at each time point $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, the seller is given a d -dimensional feature vector $z_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, which encodes the contextual information such as consumer and product characteristics, and needs to set a price p_t in a compact price interval $[l, u]$. Given (z_t, p_t) , the demand y_t follows a GLM with an unknown parameter $\theta = (\alpha, \beta)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(y_t | z_t, p_t; \theta) = m(\alpha^\top z_t - (\beta^\top z_t) \cdot p_t),$$

where $m(\cdot)$ is the inverse of the GLM link function. For example, we have $m(x) = x$ for linear regression and $m(x) = 1/(1 + \exp(-x))$ for logistic regression. Here, the $\alpha^\top z_t$ term models the intrinsic utility of the product and $\beta^\top z_t$ captures the price elasticity. The revenue of the firm is defined as $r_t = p_t \cdot y_t$. Due to its interpretability and flexibility, this GLM demand model and its linear counterpart (i.e. $m(x) \equiv x$) have been widely studied in the dynamic pricing literature under various scenarios (e.g. [Ban and Keskin, 2021](#); [Wang et al., 2021](#); [Bastani et al., 2022](#); [Chen et al., 2022c](#); [Lei et al., 2023](#)).

In the vanilla version of this problem, the firm aims to design a policy that utilizes the raw context $\{z_t\}$ and maximizes its expected revenue $\mathbb{E}(\sum_{t=1}^T r_t)$ over the T periods (i.e. minimizes its regret over

a clairvoyant that knows θ in advance). In this paper, we first propose two newly designed algorithms and show that the optimal upper bound of the regret under this setting is of order $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$, an improvement over the existing $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$ upper bound in the literature (e.g. [Ban and Keskin, 2021](#); [Wang et al., 2021](#)). In other words, the regret is *sublinear* in the dimensionality of the context vector.

To build intuition, consider the special (and simplified) case of a linear demand model with

$$y_t = \alpha^\top z_t - (\beta^\top z_t) \cdot p_t + \epsilon_t,$$

where $\{\epsilon_t\}$ is an i.i.d. mean zero error process. Denote $e(i)$ as the i th standard basis of \mathbb{R}^d for $i = 1, \dots, d$. We further set the context vector $z_t = e(\lceil td/T \rceil)$ for $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, assuming T is a multiple of d . Under this simplified setting, we are essentially dealing with d *independent* dynamic pricing problem. In particular, the i th sub-problem runs for time $t \in \{(i-1) \cdot T/d + 1, \dots, i \cdot T/d\}$ with a total of T/d periods and assumes a linear demand model with *no* context (i.e. context-free)

$$y_t = \alpha_i - \beta_i \cdot p_t + \epsilon_t,$$

where α_i and β_i denote the i th entry of α and β . The optimal regret upper bound of this context-free sub-problem, due to [Broder and Rusmevichientong \(2012\)](#), is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T/d})$. Summing up over all d sub-problems, intuitively, we can have a regret upper bound of order $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T/d}) = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$.

In recent years, there has been a growing concern over data privacy ([Lucas et al., 2021](#)), as consumers become increasingly aware of the data collected about them and its use in personalized pricing and recommendation. Based on *differential privacy* (e.g. [Dwork et al., 2006](#)), industry-led initiatives have emerged to address these concerns, such as the RAPPOR project ([Google, 2014](#)) and the integration of privacy safeguards into Siri ([Apple, 2019](#)). In this paper, we further study contextual dynamic pricing under the local differential privacy (LDP) constraint, a privacy notion developed by [Evfimievski et al. \(2003\)](#) and [Duchi et al. \(2018\)](#). Depending on a privacy parameter $\epsilon > 0$, LDP provides a strong notion of (decentralized) differential privacy in the sense that it ensures sensitive personal information remains protected even if the data security of the focal firm is compromised. Intuitively speaking, an ϵ -LDP algorithm masks the sensitive context z_t at any time t by ensuring that for any two possible outcomes of the raw data, the probability distributions of their privatized data

differ by no more than a multiplicative constant $\exp(\epsilon)$. Therefore, a smaller ϵ implies higher privacy. Leveraging stochastic gradient descent, we devise the first dynamic pricing policy in the literature that is provably ϵ -LDP and achieves an optimal regret upper bound of order $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T}/\epsilon)$ under the GLM demand model, therefore characterize the cost of privacy in parametric contextual dynamic pricing.

1.1 Our contributions

First, we thoroughly study the contextual dynamic pricing problem with a parametric GLM demand function and characterize its near-optimal regret upper bound. In particular, we propose two newly designed pricing policies in Section 2, a confidence bound-type (supCB) algorithm and an explore-then-commit (ETC) algorithm, and show that both achieve a regret of order $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$, with d and T being the dimension of feature vectors and total number of consumers. Thus, we improve the existing upper bound $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$ in the literature (e.g. Ban and Keskin, 2021; Wang et al., 2021) by a factor of \sqrt{d} , suggesting that the impact of dimension d to the regret can be controlled at a sublinear rate.

The supCB algorithm proposed in Section 2.2 is a more complex version of the widely used upper confidence bound (UCB) algorithm and is inspired by algorithms designed for the classical contextual multi-armed bandit (MAB) problem (e.g. Auer, 2002; Chu et al., 2011; Li et al., 2017). At a high-level, the key basis of supCB is a novel discovery of an intrinsic connection between contextual dynamic pricing and contextual MAB. In particular, by discretizing the *one-dimensional* continuous action space $[l, u]$ with K equally-spaced price points, we can *approximately* treat the contextual dynamic pricing problem as a contextual MAB with K arms. Importantly, we show that regret due to the approximation error of such discretization can be controlled at $O(T/K)$. It is well-known that the optimal regret upper bound for contextual MAB with K arms is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT \log K})$. Therefore, setting $K = O(\sqrt{T/d})$ will intuitively provide the desired $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ upper bound for contextual dynamic pricing. Furthermore, we remark that supCB achieves this optimal regret under assumptions weaker than the ones required in the existing dynamic pricing literature.

Under the mild condition that the optimal price is unique and in the interior of $[l, u]$, a commonly used assumption in the dynamic pricing literature, we show in Section 2.3 that a simple tuning-free

and computationally efficient ETC algorithm can also achieve the optimal regret upper bound and improve the regret of supCB by a logarithmic term. This is different than the contextual MAB literature where ETC is in general sub-optimal. At a high-level, the key insight is that due to the structure of the reward function (i.e. the expected revenue), the regret incurred due to estimation error (or more precisely, prediction error) in fact scales with the magnitude of $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|^2$ instead of $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|$. We refer to Proposition S.2.1 and its discussion for more details. We further examine the cause of the sub-optimality of the existing upper bound based on the popular MLE-Cycle algorithm (e.g. Broder and Rusmevichientong, 2012; Ban and Keskin, 2021) for contextual dynamic pricing, which is due to under-exploration, and suggest a simple fix to make it optimal.

Second, we further consider in Section 3 the important and timely setting where the consumer data is subject to local differential privacy (LDP) constraints. Building upon Duchi et al. (2018) and Chen et al. (2022a), we rigorously extend the notion of LDP to the setting of parametric contextual dynamic pricing. Based on stochastic gradient descent (SGD) in conjunction with the L_2 -ball mechanism in Duchi et al. (2018), we then design an efficient ETC-type algorithm that is provably ϵ -LDP and achieves a near-optimal regret of order $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T}/\epsilon)$. To our knowledge, this is the first LDP upper bound algorithm for contextual dynamic pricing under the GLM demand model and therefore provides the first characterization of the cost of LDP in the task of parametric dynamic pricing. As a byproduct, we study the SGD estimator under ϵ -LDP and carefully analyze the bias-variance trade-off due to an additional truncation step in the L_2 -ball mechanism for handling unbounded gradients.

Third, to demonstrate the optimality of the regret upper bounds with and without the LDP constraints, we further establish the accompanying minimax lower bounds in Section 4. The proofs of lower bounds are based on a novel construction of 2^d indistinguishable demand models and the results, i.e. the $\Omega(\sqrt{dT})$ lower bound under the non-private setting and the $\Omega(d\sqrt{T}/\epsilon)$ lower bound under the LDP setting, are first time seen in the literature. We note that compared to lower bound construction for statistical estimation under the LDP setting (e.g. Duchi et al., 2018; Acharya et al., 2024), where data is independent, our lower bound construction is much more involved as data is

adaptively collected due to the pricing policy. Extensive numerical results including both simulations and real data applications are conducted in Section 5 to support our theoretical findings and illustrate the efficiency of the proposed algorithms over existing ones in the contextual dynamic pricing literature.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 1.2, we provide a detailed literature review on related works. In Section 2, we formally introduce the problem setup and propose the supCB and ETC algorithms. In Section 3, we further consider contextual dynamic pricing under the additional LDP constraint. Minimax lower bounds are derived in Section 4. We conclude with extensive numerical analysis in Section 5 and a departing discussion in Section 6.

1.2 Literature review

Three streams of literature are closely related to our paper: dynamic pricing with demand learning, contextual multi-armed bandit, and differential privacy for online learning.

Dynamic pricing with demand learning. Due to the increasing popularity of online retailing, dynamic pricing with demand learning has been extensively studied across statistics, machine learning, and operations research. Early works in dynamic pricing mainly focus on the context-free setting, see e.g. Besbes and Zeevi (2009), Farias and Van Roy (2010) and Broder and Rusmevichientong (2012). In particular, Broder and Rusmevichientong (2012) show that there exist two regimes in context-free dynamic pricing, the well-separated case where demand curves do not overlap at any price and the general case where there exists an uninformative price. Broder and Rusmevichientong (2012) show that the optimal regret for the well-separated case is $O(\log(T))$ and for the general case is $O(\sqrt{T})$.

For parametric contextual dynamic pricing, Qiang and Bayati (2016) consider the well-separated case with a linear demand function and derive a regret upper bound of order $O(d \log T)$, which is further corroborated by Javanmard and Nazerzadeh (2019), where results with high-dimensional covariates are also available. For the general case, Ban and Keskin (2021) adapt the MLE-cycle algorithm proposed in Broder and Rusmevichientong (2012) and achieve a regret of order $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$ under the GLM demand function. Allowing for adversarial contexts, Wang et al. (2021) propose an UCB algorithm and derive the same $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$ rate for the regret under the GLM demand function.

Beyond parametric models, [Chen and Gallego \(2021\)](#) study contextual dynamic pricing under non-parametric demand models, while [Wang et al. \(2023\)](#), [Luo et al. \(2024\)](#) and [Fan et al. \(2024\)](#) study the semiparametric cases. In particular, [Fan et al. \(2024\)](#) show that under a linear valuation model and an infinitely differentiable market noise function, the optimal regret upper bound is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$, which in some sense complements our result under the parametric GLM model. Context dynamic pricing has also been studied from a wide range of aspects, such as consumer strategic behavior ([Liu et al., 2023](#)), non-stationarity ([Zhao et al., 2023](#)), fairness constraints ([Chen et al., 2023](#)), and differential privacy constraints (see later for more detailed discussion).

Contextual multi-armed bandit. Most contextual MAB literature focuses on the linear contextual bandit setting where the reward assumes a linear model with $r_{t,a} = x_{t,a}^\top \theta + \epsilon_t$, where $x_{t,a} \in \mathcal{X}$ is the context associated with arm a , and θ is the unknown parameter and ϵ_t is the error process. It is well-known that the optimal regret is of order $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$ when the arm space \mathcal{X} is a compact (but otherwise arbitrary) subset of \mathbb{R}^d and can be achieved via UCB ([Dani et al., 2008](#); [Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011](#)). In contrast, for the setting where the number of available arms K in each round is finite, the regret can be further lowered to $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT \log K})$ ([Auer, 2002](#); [Chu et al., 2011](#)). However, such a regret bound can only be achieved via a more involved confidence bound-type algorithm. This type of algorithm is first proposed by [Auer \(2002\)](#) under the name sup-LinRel and is extended to the generalized linear bandit in [Li et al. \(2017\)](#), which inspires the design of the proposed supCB algorithm in our paper. Note that contextual dynamic pricing can in some sense be viewed as a contextual MAB with infinite number of arms, as the price can take any value in $[l, u]$. However, the key insight of our work is that, despite being uncountable, this action space is of dimension *one* regardless of the contextual dimensionality d , and thus can be well-approximated by a contextual MAB with *reasonably many* arms via discretization and achieves an optimal regret of order $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$.

Differential privacy for online learning. The most prevalent privacy concept used in both academia and industry is the notion of differential privacy (DP) proposed by [Dwork et al. \(2006\)](#). In the DP literature, there are two widely used privacy schemes known as central differential pri-

vacancy (CDP, [Dwork et al., 2006](#)) and local differential privacy (LDP, [Evfimievski et al., 2003](#)).

CDP assumes the existence of a trusted central handler (e.g. the firm) that can securely store and process raw consumer information. This may raise concerns about data vulnerability, particularly the risk of attacks on the central server, leading to unauthorized access to sensitive customer information. In contrast, LDP offers a decentralized approach that prioritizes individual privacy. Instead of relying on a central authority to store and process data, LDP allows each customer to locally randomize their data before sharing it with the firm or any other party.

Due to the practical importance of privacy, there is a recent surge in designing online learning algorithms with DP guarantees for contextual MAB and contextual dynamic pricing. [Shariff and Sheffet \(2018\)](#) study linear contextual bandits under CDP, while [Zheng et al. \(2020\)](#) explore them under LDP. Based on a covariate-diversity assumption, [Han et al. \(2021\)](#) propose an exploration-free algorithm for generalized linear bandits under LDP. However, this assumption in general does not hold under dynamic pricing as the adaptively chosen price is part of the covariate.

[Chen et al. \(2022c\)](#) examine dynamic pricing under a GLM demand model with CDP constraints and [Chen et al. \(2022a\)](#) further study nonparametric dynamic pricing under both LDP and CDP constraints. Under the offline setting, where all historical data is accessible for learning, [Lei et al. \(2023\)](#) study contextual dynamic pricing for a linear demand model under LDP, focusing primarily on preserving the privacy of contexts. Leveraging the structure of the linear model, they propose a perturbed OLS estimator, which cannot be used for GLM. In this paper, we consider contextual dynamic pricing with a GLM demand function under the online setting and propose a stochastic gradient descent based algorithm that offers LDP guarantees for both consumer responses and contexts.

1.3 Notations

For a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote its Euclidean norm as $\|a\|$; for two square matrices A and B , we write $A \succeq B$ and $A \succ B$, if $A - B$ is semi-positive definite and positive definite, respectively. Denote \otimes as the Kronecker product. Let $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$, $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ be the L_2 -operator norm, the smallest and largest eigenvalues of a matrix. For $M \succ 0$ and any vector v of compatible dimension, let

$\|v\|_{M^{-1}} = \sqrt{v^\top M^{-1}v}$. For any positive integer K , denote $[K] = \{1, \dots, K\}$. For any vector v and set S , let $\Pi_S(v)$ be the L_2 -projection of v onto S . We let $O(\cdot)$, $o(\cdot)$, $\Theta(\cdot)$ and $\Omega(\cdot)$ denote Landau's Big-O, little-o, Big-Theta and Big-Omega, respectively. $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ disregards poly-logarithmic factors for $O(\cdot)$.

2 An improved upper bound on the regret

In this section, we provide an improved upper bound on the regret for contextual dynamic pricing. The detailed problem setup is introduced in Section 2.1, with two proposed algorithms, namely supCB and ETC, presented and analyzed in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, respectively.

2.1 Problem setup

We consider a firm, hereafter referred to as the *seller*, that sells a product to $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$ sequentially arriving consumers. In each time period $t \in [T]$, the seller observes contextual information featured as a vector $z_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, which may include consumer personal information and product characteristics. Upon observing z_t , the seller offers a price p_t from a compact price interval $[l, u] \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$ to the consumer and observes a demand $y_t \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that we do not require the knowledge of T .

Model setup: Denote the covariate as $x_t = (z_t^\top, -p_t \cdot z_t^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and denote the σ -field at time t as $\mathcal{F}_{t-1} = \sigma(x_t, x_{t-1}, \dots, x_1, y_{t-1}, \dots, y_1)$. We assume the demand y_t follows a generalized linear model (GLM) with the probability distribution

$$f(y_t = y | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}; \theta^*) = f(y_t = y | x_t; \theta^*) = f(y_t = y | z_t, p_t; \theta^*) = \exp \left\{ \frac{yx_t^\top \theta^* - \psi(x_t^\top \theta^*)}{a(\phi)} + h(y) \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\theta^* = (\alpha^{*\top}, \beta^{*\top})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ is the unknown model parameter, $\psi(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a known function, $a(\phi)$ is a fixed and known scale parameter and $h(\cdot)$ is a known normalizing function. This setting covers important GLMs, including Gaussian, logistic and Poisson regression models.

Note that, conditioning on x_t , following (1), it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}(y_t | x_t; \theta^*) = \mathbb{E}(y_t | z_t, p_t; \theta^*) = \psi'(x_t^\top \theta^*) = \psi'(z_t^\top \alpha^* - z_t^\top \beta^* p), \quad (2)$$

where the inverse function of $\psi'(\cdot)$ is commonly known as the link function of a GLM. In other words, the consumer demand depends on (i) the intrinsic utility $z_t^\top \alpha^*$ and (ii) the pricing effect $(z_t^\top \beta^*) \cdot p_t$, where $z_t^\top \beta^*$ captures the price elasticity. Define $\varepsilon_t := y_t - \psi'(x_t^\top \theta^*)$ as the error term. We can thus rewrite (1) as $y_t = \psi'(x_t^\top \theta^*) + \varepsilon_t$ and it holds that $\mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_t | x_t) = 0$. Throughout this paper, we impose

the following assumptions on the GLM in (1), the covariate process $\{z_t\}$ and the model parameter θ^* .

Assumption 2.1. (a) The feature vector $z_t \in \mathcal{Z} \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|z\| \leq 1\}$ is an i.i.d. random vector from an unknown distribution supported on \mathcal{Z} . (b) Letting $\Sigma_z = \mathbb{E}(z_t z_t^\top)$, we have that $\lambda_z := \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z) > 0$. (c) There exist absolute constants $u_a, u_b > 0$ such that $|z^\top \alpha^*| \leq u_a$ and $|z^\top \beta^*| \leq u_b$ for any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. (d) Define $\mathcal{X} := \{(z^\top, -pz^\top)^\top : z \in \mathcal{Z} \text{ and } p \in [l, u]\}$. There exists an absolute constant $\sigma > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\mathbb{E}\{\exp(\lambda \varepsilon_t) | x_t = x\} \leq \exp(\lambda^2 \sigma^2 / 2)$ for any $\lambda > 0$. (e) The function $\psi(\cdot)$ is triple continuously differentiable and its second order derivative $\psi''(a) > 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Assumption 2.1 is standard in the dynamic pricing literature, see, e.g. [Javanmard and Nazerzadeh \(2019\)](#); [Ban and Keskin \(2021\)](#); [Chen et al. \(2022b\)](#). Assumption 2.1(a), together with $p \in [l, u]$, implies that $\|x\| \leq u_x := \sqrt{1 + u^2}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Assumption 2.1(b) states that Σ_z is of full rank. Note that Assumption 2.1(a) implies that $\lambda_z \leq 1/d$. Assumption 2.1(c) assumes that the intrinsic utility $z^\top \alpha^*$ and the price sensitivity $z^\top \beta^*$ are upper bounded. Assumption 2.1(d) imposes sub-Gaussianity on the error term ε_t . Assumption 2.1(e) holds for all commonly used GLMs and ensures the log-likelihood function is convex. Note that unlike existing literature, we allow the parameter space $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ without imposing compactness conditions. We refer to discussions following [Theorem 2.1](#) for more details.

Based on [Assumption 2.1](#), we define several absolute constants that will be used later in the paper:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\psi 1} &= \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\psi'(x^\top \theta^*)| \vee 1, & M_{\psi 2} &= \sup_{\{x \in \mathcal{X}, \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq 1\}} |\psi''(x^\top \theta)| \vee 1, \\ M_{\psi 3} &= \sup_{\{x \in \mathcal{X}, \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq 1\}} |\psi'''(x^\top \theta)| \vee 1 & \text{and } \kappa &= \inf_{\{x \in \mathcal{X}, \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq 1\}} \psi''(x^\top \theta) \wedge 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Note that it is easy to see that $\kappa > 0$ and $M_{\psi 1}, M_{\psi 2}, M_{\psi 3} < \infty$ and $(\kappa, M_{\psi 1}, M_{\psi 2}, M_{\psi 3})$ are absolute constants that only depend on $\psi(\cdot)$, l, u and u_a, u_b in [Assumption 2.1](#).

Pricing policies and performance metric: In dynamic pricing, the key objective is to design an algorithm (i.e. pricing policy) that maximizes the seller's expected revenue. Based on (1), the expected revenue function at any given price p and context z_t can be written as

$$r(p, z_t, \theta^*) = \mathbb{E}(p \cdot y_t | z_t, p; \theta^*) = p \psi'(z_t^\top \alpha^* - z_t^\top \beta^* p). \quad (4)$$

Denote p_t^* as the optimal price that maximizes $r(p, z_t, \theta^*)$.

Denote by Π the family of all price processes $\{p_1, \dots, p_T\}$ satisfying the condition that p_t is \mathcal{F}_{t-1}° -measurable for all $t \in [T]$, where $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}^\circ = \sigma(y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}, p_1, \dots, p_{t-1}, z_1, \dots, z_t)$ is the natural filtration generated by the demand, price and context history up to time $t - 1$, together with the context z_t . In other words, we require the pricing policy to be non-anticipating. Given a pricing policy $\pi \in \Pi$, we evaluate its performance using the common notion of regret: the expected revenue loss compared with a clairvoyant that has the perfect knowledge of the model parameter θ^* (and thus sets the prices at $\{p_t^*\}_{t=1}^T$). In particular, with $r(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ defined in (4), let the regret be

$$R_T^\pi = \sum_{t=1}^T r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p_t^\pi, z_t, \theta^*). \quad (5)$$

We aim to design pricing policies that can minimize R_T^π in high probability and in expectation.

Non-asymptotic bounds for MLE: Given a sample $\{(y_t, x_t)\}_{t \in [\tau]}$, the log-likelihood of the GLM takes the form $L(\theta) = \sum_{t=1}^\tau \{y_t x_t^\top \theta - \psi(x_t^\top \theta)\}$. Denote $V_\tau = \sum_{t=1}^\tau x_t x_t^\top$ as the design matrix. Note that by Assumption 2.1(e), $L(\theta)$ is a strictly convex function in \mathbb{R}^{2d} and has a unique maximizer $\hat{\theta}_\tau$ (i.e. MLE) given that $V_\tau \succ 0$. Theorem 2.1 provides non-asymptotic performance guarantees for $\hat{\theta}_\tau$.

Theorem 2.1. Suppose Assumption 2.1(c)-(e) hold and $\{y_t\}_{t \in [\tau]}$ are *conditionally independent* given $\{x_t\}_{t \in [\tau]}$ such that $f(y_1, \dots, y_\tau | x_1, \dots, x_\tau) = \prod_{t=1}^\tau f(y_t | x_t; \theta^*)$, where $f(y_t | x_t; \theta^*)$ is the true GLM model in (1). We have that for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\varsigma \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds

- (i). $\|\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma$, provided that $\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau) \geq 3\sigma^2/(\kappa^2 \varsigma^2) \cdot \{d + \log(1/\delta)\}$;
- (ii). $(\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*)^\top V_\tau (\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*) \leq 12\sigma^2/\kappa^2 \cdot \{d + \log(1/\delta)\}$ and $\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(V_\tau) \|\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*\| \leq \sqrt{3}\sigma/\kappa \cdot \sqrt{d + \log(1/\delta)}$, provided that $\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau) \geq 3\sigma^2/\kappa^2 \cdot \{d + \log(1/\delta)\}$;
- (iii). $|x^\top (\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*)| \leq 3\sigma/\kappa \cdot \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \|x\|_{V_\tau^{-1}}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, if $\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau) \geq 512M_{\psi_3}^2 \sigma^2/\kappa^4 \cdot \{d^2 + \log(1/\delta)\}$.

Theorem 2.1 states that once the minimum eigenvalue of V_τ surpasses some mild thresholds that scale with d and $\log(1/\delta)$, the MLE $\hat{\theta}_\tau$ will be consistent as stated in (i) and have controllable prediction and estimation error as stated in (ii) and (iii). Theorem 2.1(i)-(ii) is derived in this work and serves as the theoretical foundation for the ETC algorithm, and Theorem 2.1(iii) is adapted from Li et al. (2017) and plays a key role in bounding the regret of supCB. Importantly, note that Theorem 2.1

does not require a compact parameter space Θ and instead allows $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, which is due to a nice geometric result for the log-likelihood function of GLM in [Chen et al. \(1999\)](#) (Lemma A).

2.2 A supCB algorithm

As discussed in the introduction, a key element of supCB is to approximate the contextual dynamic pricing problem via contextual MAB based on discretization. In particular, we approximate the price interval $[l, u]$, which is a one-dimensional continuous action space, by a set of K equispaced discrete price points $\mathcal{P}_K = \{p^{(a)}\}_{a \in [K]}$, where $p^{(a)} = l + (a - 1)(u - l)/(K - 1)$ for $a \in [K]$. We thus have a generalized linear bandit (GLB) with K arms, where $x_{t,a} = (z_t^\top, -p^{(a)} \cdot z_t^\top)^\top$ is the context associated with arm $a \in [K]$ at time t . We name it *revenue-GLB* as unlike standard GLB (e.g. [Filippi et al., 2010](#); [Li et al., 2017](#)), where the reward is defined as the conditional mean $\mathbb{E}(y_t|x_{t,a}) = \psi'(x_{t,a}^\top \theta^*)$, our reward here is the more complicated revenue function $r(p^{(a)}, z_t, \theta^*) = p^{(a)} \cdot \psi'(x_{t,a}^\top \theta^*)$. The optimal arm at time t is therefore the arm associated with $p_t^o = \arg \max_{p \in \mathcal{P}_K} r(p, z_t, \theta^*)$.

Denote π as a policy for the revenue-GLB based on \mathcal{P}_K . By simple algebra, its regret for the *original* contextual dynamic pricing problem as defined in (5) can be rewritten as

$$R_T^\pi = \sum_{t=1}^T r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p_t^\pi, z_t, \theta^*) = \underbrace{\sum_{t=1}^T r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p_t^o, z_t, \theta^*)}_{\text{regret due to approximation error}} + \underbrace{\sum_{t=1}^T r(p_t^o, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p_t^\pi, z_t, \theta^*)}_{\text{regret due to revenue-GLB}}.$$

Importantly, Lemma S.2.2 in the supplement shows that the class of revenue functions $\{r(p, z, \theta^*) : z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ is uniformly L_r -Lipschitz continuous with $L_r := M_{\psi_1} + uu_b M_{\psi_2}$, which indicates that the approximation error is of order $O(T/K)$ and thus can be easily controlled.

Therefore, the key to an optimal regret R_T^π is an algorithm that can efficiently bound the regret of the revenue-GLB. To this end, we propose supCB in Algorithm 2, with a CB-GLM subroutine in Algorithm 1. Similar to the standard upper confidence bound (UCB) algorithm in the bandit literature ([Lai and Robbins, 1985](#)), the essential idea of supCB is to balance exploration and exploitation via confidence bounds. However, to achieve the optimal $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT} \log K)$ regret, supCB is substantially more involved than the standard UCB in its algorithm design.

We first discuss the CB-GLM subroutine. In particular, based on an observed sample $\{y_t, x_t\}_{t \in \Psi}$,

CB-GLM first estimates θ^* via the MLE $\hat{\theta}$ and constructs the design matrix $V = \sum_{t \in \Psi} x_t x_t^\top$. It then provides an estimation $r_a = p^{(a)} \cdot \psi'(x_a^\top \hat{\theta})$ and confidence bound $w_a = \alpha \|x_a\|_{V^{-1}}$ for the expected revenue $r(p^{(a)}, z, \theta^*) = p^{(a)} \cdot \psi'(x_a^\top \theta^*)$ of arm $x_a = (z^\top, -p^{(a)} z^\top)^\top$ at a new context z . Note that given Theorem 2.1(iii), by the smoothness of $\psi'(\cdot)$ and boundedness of $p^{(a)}$, we have that w_a can serve as a valid high probability confidence bound for $|r_a - r(p^{(a)}, z, \theta^*)|$ with an appropriately chosen α .

Algorithm 1 The CB-GLM subroutine

Input: A new context vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, price candidate set $A \subset [K]$, and data index set $\Psi \subset [T]$, confidence level parameter $\alpha > 0$.

- a. Let $\hat{\theta}$ be the MLE of $L(\theta) = \sum_{i \in \Psi} y_i x_i^\top \theta - \psi(x_i^\top \theta)$.
 - b. Set $V = \sum_{i \in \Psi} x_i x_i^\top$.
 - c. For all $a \in A$, set $x_a = (z^\top, -p^{(a)} z^\top)^\top$ and set $r_a = p^{(a)} \cdot \psi'(x_a^\top \hat{\theta})$ and $w_a = \alpha \|x_a\|_{V^{-1}}$.
 - d. Return $\{r_a, w_a\}_{a \in A}$.
-

However, Theorem 2.1 requires the crucial assumption that $\{y_t\}_{t \in \Psi}$ are *conditionally independent* given $\{x_t\}_{t \in \Psi}$. Such an assumption in general does not hold when the sample $\{y_t, x_t\}_{t \in \Psi}$ is adaptively generated based on standard bandit algorithms such as UCB, as the outcome of y_t will influence the future arm choice $x_{t'}$ for $t' > t$. This issue is solved via a *decomposition* technique developed in Auer (2002), which is used in linear contextual bandits (e.g. Auer, 2002; Chu et al., 2011) and generalized linear bandits (e.g. Li et al., 2017) to create conditionally independent samples.

In supCB (Algorithm 2), we adapt this technique to the revenue-GLB. In particular, at each round t , supCB decomposes its decision process into $S = \lfloor \log_2 T \rfloor$ stages. At stage $s \in [S]$, in step I, we first call CB-GLM (based on samples in $\mathcal{F}_s \cup \Psi_s$) to compute the estimated revenue $r_{t,a}^{(s)}$ and confidence bound $w_{t,a}^{(s)}$ for all remaining candidate arms. In step II, if $w_{t,a}^{(s)} > 2^{-s}$ for some a (i.e. uncertainty is high), supCB will choose arm a for exploration, collect the result in Ψ_s and move to round $t + 1$. Otherwise, step III checks whether all $w_{t,a}^{(s)} \leq 1/\sqrt{T}$ and if satisfied, we simply pick the arm with highest $r_{t,a}^{(s)}$ and move to round $t + 1$ as no exploration is needed. If not, the arms are filtered in step IV to ensure the price points passed to the next stage $s + 1$ are close enough to the optimal one. Since all $w_{t,a}^{(s)} \leq 2^{-s}$ and $w_{t,a}^{(s)}$ is a high probability bound on $|r_{t,a}^{(s)} - r(p^{(a)}, z_t, \theta^*)|$, we know that an arm a cannot be optimal if $r_{t,a}^{(s)} < \max_{j \in A_s} r_{t,j}^{(s)} - 2 \cdot 2^{-s}$. Note that this screening process is guaranteed to

terminate in at most S stages since $1/\sqrt{T} > 2^{-S}$ by design.

Denote $\Psi_s(t)$ as the sample collected in stage s before round t and denote $\Psi_s^o(t) = \Psi_s(t) \cup \mathcal{F}_s$. The key property of supCB is that due to the decomposition design, whether an arm $x_{t,a}$ is selected in stage s depends on historical data $\cup_{s' < s} \{y_i, x_i\}_{i \in \Psi_{s'}^o(t)}$ in previous stages and $w_{t,a}^{(s)}$, which by definition, only depends on historical *covariates* $\{x_i\}_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)}$ in stage s . Intuitively, this provides the desired conditional independence of $\{y_i\}_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)}$ given $\{x_i\}_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)}$ and we refer to Lemma S.2.3 for the formal proof.

Note that supCB starts with a pure exploration phase during which p_t is drawn uniformly from \mathcal{P}_K . Denote μ_p and σ_p^2 as the mean and variance of the uniform distribution on \mathcal{P}_K and denote $\Sigma_p = [1, -\mu_p; -\mu_p, \mu_p^2 + \sigma_p^2] \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$. For all K , it holds that $\mu_p = (u + l)/2$, $\sigma_p^2 \geq (u - l)^2/12$ and that Σ_p is a positive definite matrix with

$$\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_p) \geq L_p := (u - l)^2 / [4(u^2 + l^2 + ul + 3)]. \quad (6)$$

Write $\Sigma_x = \Sigma_p \otimes \Sigma_z$, which is the covariance matrix of the feature $x_t = (z_t^\top, -z_t^\top p_t)^\top$ during the pure exploration phase. By the property of Kronecker product and Assumption 2.1(b), it holds that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) = \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_p) \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z) \geq L_p \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z) = L_p \lambda_z. \quad (7)$$

The pure exploration phase creates an i.i.d. sample of size τ (collected into \mathcal{F}_s) for each stage $s \in [S]$, which together with (7) ensures that the minimum eigenvalue of the design matrix based on $\Psi_s^o(t) = \Psi_s(t) \cup \mathcal{F}_s$ surpasses the threshold required in Theorem 2.1(iii). Theorem 2.2 establishes both a high-probability and an expectation bound on the regret of supCB when T is known. The standard doubling trick (Auer et al., 1995) is used later to extend supCB to the case of unknown T .

Theorem 2.2. Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds. For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, set $K = \sqrt{T/d}/\log(T)$, $\tau = \sqrt{dT}$ and $\alpha = 3\sigma u M_{\psi_2}/\kappa \cdot \sqrt{\log(3TKS/\delta)}$. Provided that

$$T \geq \left[B_{S1} \cdot \frac{d^2 + (\log T)^2}{d\lambda_z^4} \right] \vee \left[B_{S2} \cdot \frac{d^4 + (\log(3TKS/\delta))^2}{d\lambda_z^2} \right], \quad (8)$$

we have that, with probability at least $1 - \delta - 2\log(T)/T$, the regret of supCB is upper bounded by

$$R_T \leq B_{S3} \cdot \sqrt{dT \log(T) \log(T/\delta) \log(T/d)},$$

where $B_{S1}, B_{S2}, B_{S3} > 0$ are absolute constants that only depend on quantities in Assumption 2.1. In

Algorithm 2 The supCB algorithm for dynamic pricing

Input: Total rounds T , price interval $[l, u]$, discretization rate K , exploration length τ , confidence level parameter α .

Initialization: Discretize the price interval $[l, u]$ into K equispaced points as in $\mathcal{P}_K = \{p^{(a)}\}_{a \in [K]}$. Set the number of stages $S = \lfloor \log_2 T \rfloor$ and set $\Psi_0 = \Psi_1 = \dots = \Psi_S = \emptyset$.

for $s \in [S]$ **do**
 Set the exploration set as $\mathcal{F}_s = \{(s-1)\tau + 1, (s-1)\tau + 2, \dots, s\tau\}$.
 for $t \in \mathcal{F}_s$ **do**
 Randomly choose $p_t \in \mathcal{P}_K$, record y_t and $x_t = (z_t^\top, -p_t z_t^\top)^\top$.
 end for
end for

for $t = S\tau + 1, S\tau + 2, \dots, T$ **do**
 Initialize $A_1 = [K]$, $s = 1$ and $a_t = \text{NULL}$.
 while $a_t = \text{NULL}$ **do**
 I. Run CB-GLM with α and $\Psi_s \cup \mathcal{F}_s$ to obtain $\{r_{t,a}^{(s)}, w_{t,a}^{(s)}\}_{a \in A_s}$.
 II. If $w_{t,a}^{(s)} > 2^{-s}$ for some $a \in A_s$,
 set $a_t = \arg \max_{a \in A_s} w_{t,a}^{(s)}$, update $\Psi_s = \Psi_s \cup \{t\}$.
 III. Else if $w_{t,a}^{(s)} \leq 1/\sqrt{T}$ for all $a \in A_s$,
 set $a_t = \arg \max_{a \in A_s} r_{t,a}^{(s)}$ and update $\Psi_0 = \Psi_0 \cup \{t\}$.
 IV. Else if $w_{t,a}^{(s)} \leq 2^{-s}$ for all $a \in A_s$,
 update $A_{s+1} = \{a \in A_s \mid r_{t,a}^{(s)} \geq \max_{j \in A_s} r_{t,j}^{(s)} - 2 \cdot 2^{-s}\}$ and update $s \leftarrow s + 1$.
 end while
 Set $p_t = p^{(a_t)}$, record y_t and $x_t = (z_t^\top, -p_t z_t^\top)^\top$.
end for

particular, setting $\delta = 1/\sqrt{T}$, we have that $\mathbb{E}(R_T) \lesssim \log^{3/2}(T)\sqrt{dT}$.

The details of B_{S1}, B_{S2}, B_{S3} can be found in the proof of Theorem 2.2 in the supplement. Theorem 2.2 states that when the sample size T is sufficiently large, supCB can achieve a regret of order $O(\sqrt{dT} \log^{3/2}(T))$. To our knowledge, this improves the best available regret in the contextual dynamic pricing literature (e.g. Ban and Keskin, 2021; Wang et al., 2021) by a factor of \sqrt{d} .

As discussed in the introduction, there are two types of contextual MAB problems. For the first type, its arm space \mathcal{X} is a d -dimensional (uncountable) compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d and the optimal regret $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$ can be achieved via standard UCB (Dani et al., 2008; Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011). The second type has a finite K number of arms in each round t , where the optimal regret is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT \log K})$ (Auer, 2002; Chu et al., 2011). The key insight of Theorem 2.2 and supCB is that the contextual dynamic pricing problem can be essentially viewed as a contextual MAB of the second

type. The intuition is that, despite being uncountable, the action space $[l, u]$ of dynamic pricing is of dimension *one* regardless of the context dimension d . Moreover, thanks to the uniform Lipschitz continuity of the revenue function, we can discretize the action space $[l, u]$ into K arms and achieve a controllable approximation error as long as K is of polynomial order in T (i.e. $O(\sqrt{T})$, independent of d).

Unknown T . When T is unknown, we run supCB with the doubling trick (e.g. [Auer et al., 1995](#)). In particular, we partition $[1, \infty)$ into non-overlapping episodes $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, where for the k th episode, we set its length as $E_k = 2^k$ and run Algorithm 2 with $T = E_k$. The algorithm is then restarted at the beginning of the next episode. To conserve space, we refer to Theorem S.2.1 for its theoretical guarantee. See also Algorithm 4 later for a detailed implementation of ETC with the doubling trick.

2.3 An explore-then-commit (ETC) algorithm

The supCB algorithm achieves the optimal regret under a minimal set of assumptions. On the other hand, due to the complex design, its computational efficiency may not be ideal and the confidence level α involves unknown constants in Theorem 2.2. This motivates us to further propose an explore-then-commit (ETC) algorithm in Algorithm 3, which is tuning-free and computationally efficient.

Algorithm 3 The ETC algorithm for dynamic pricing

Input: Total rounds T , price interval $[l, u]$, exploration length τ .

- a. (Exploration): For $t \in [\tau]$, uniformly choose $p_t \in [l, u]$, record y_t and $x_t = (z_t^\top, -p_t z_t^\top)^\top$ into the price experiment set Ψ .
 - b. (Estimation): Obtain MLE $\hat{\theta}$ based on observations in Ψ .
 - c. (Exploitation): For $t = \tau + 1, \dots, T$, offer the greedy price at $\hat{p}_t^* = p^*(\hat{\theta}, z_t)$ based on $\hat{\theta}$.
-

ETC employs a simple two-stage structure: in the exploration stage, it conducts τ rounds of price experiments where prices are randomly drawn from $[l, u]$; it then obtains an MLE $\hat{\theta}$ based on the sample collected and switches to the exploitation stage, where it uses $\hat{\theta}$ to set prices for the rest $T - \tau$ rounds. We remark that ETC is a standard algorithm in the bandit literature (e.g. [Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020](#)) and is recently used in semi-parametric dynamic pricing in [Fan et al. \(2024\)](#).

Importantly, note that ETC only requires a single computation of MLE, while supCB requires the computation of at least $O(T)$ many MLE, with the worst case scenario being $O(T \log_2 T)$. In

Section 5, we conduct extensive numerical experiments to showcase the computational efficiency of ETC compared to supCB. We proceed by introducing an additional Assumption 2.2.

Assumption 2.2. There exists an absolute constant $\varsigma_o > 0$ such that for any $\theta \in \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma_o\}$ and any context vector $z \in \bar{\mathcal{Z}}$, with $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ being the closure of \mathcal{Z} , it holds that the optimal price $p^* = \arg \max_{p \in [l, u]} r(p, z, \theta)$ is unique and is an interior point of the price range $[l, u]$.

We remark that Assumption 2.2 is a mild assumption commonly used in the dynamic pricing literature under various settings (e.g. Broder and Rusmevichientong, 2012; Javanmard and Nazerzadeh, 2019; Ban and Keskin, 2021; Chen and Gallego, 2021; Lei et al., 2023; Fan et al., 2024). In particular, it requires that the optimal price p^* is unique for all context vector and all θ within an arbitrarily small neighborhood of θ^* . To understand Assumption 2.2, consider a linear demand model. We have that the optimal price is unique over \mathbb{R} and is $p^* = z^\top \alpha / (2z^\top \beta)$ for any z and $\theta = (\alpha, \beta)$. Therefore, given that the true price elasticity $z^\top \beta^*$ is lower bounded by an absolute constant c_b such that $z^\top \beta^* \geq c_b > 0$ for all $z \in \bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ (i.e. all consumers are sensitive to prices), one can always find a sufficiently large interval $[l, u]$ and sufficiently small ς_o such that Assumption 2.2 holds. By simple algebra, the same holds under a logistic demand model. In the following, without loss of generality, we assume $\varsigma_o \in (0, 1]$.

An important implication of Assumption 2.2 is that the optimal price p^* is a Lipschitz continuous function of θ over $\|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma_o$ uniformly for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, as stated in Proposition S.2.1 of the supplement. In other words, when the parameter estimation error $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|$ is sufficiently small, its impact on the estimation error of the optimal price is Lipschitz. Such a Lipschitz continuity property is explicitly assumed in the literature (e.g. Broder and Rusmevichientong, 2012; Ban and Keskin, 2021), while we give a formal proof under mild conditions. As will be discussed later, this Lipschitz continuity property of the optimal price function plays a key role in the theoretical guarantees for ETC.

Theorem 2.3. Suppose Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. For any $\delta \in (0, 1/3)$, set $\tau = \sqrt{Td \log(1/\delta)}$. For any T satisfying

$$T \geq B_{E1} \cdot \frac{d^2 + (\log(1/\delta))^2}{d\lambda_z^8}, \quad (9)$$

we have that, with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$, the regret of ETC is upper bounded by

$$R_T \leq B_{E2} \cdot \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)},$$

where $B_{E1}, B_{E2} > 0$ are absolute constants that only depend on quantities in Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2. In particular, setting $\delta = 1/T$, we have that $\mathbb{E}(R_T) \lesssim \sqrt{dT \log(T)}$.

The details of B_{E1}, B_{E2} can be found in the proof of Theorem 2.3 in the supplement. Remarkably, despite its simplicity, ETC also achieves the optimal regret $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ for sufficiently large T and in fact improves upon the regret of supCB by a logarithmic factor $\log T$. The key intuition lies in a second-order structure of the revenue function due to Assumption 2.2 and Proposition S.2.1. In particular, for the regret incurred in the exploitation stage, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T |r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(\hat{p}_t^*, z_t, \theta^*)| &= \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2} r(p_t^+, z_t, \theta^*) (p_t^* - \hat{p}_t^*)^2 \right| \\ &\leq C_r \cdot C_\varphi^2 \cdot \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T \{ \|z_t^\top (\alpha^* - \hat{\alpha})\|^2 + \|z_t^\top (\beta^* - \hat{\beta})\|^2 \}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the equality follows from a Taylor expansion and the fact that $p_t^* \in (l, u)$ is the maximizer of the revenue function with p_t^+ between p_t^* and \hat{p}_t^* , and the inequality follows from the fact that $|\partial^2 r(p, z_t, \theta^*) / \partial p^2| < C_r$ for an absolute constant C_r (Lemma S.2.2) and Proposition S.2.1. In the proof of Theorem 2.3, we show that the last term in (10) is related to the *squared* prediction error of $\hat{\theta}$, which can be well controlled using results in Theorem 2.1(ii) and matrix concentration inequality.

Intuitively, this indicates that the regret in (10) is of order $\tilde{O}(dT/\tau)$ when the exploration set is of length τ , which is the key for the optimality of ETC. Without Assumption 2.2, the arguments in (10) will not hold and we can only control the regret at the order of $\tilde{O}(dT/\sqrt{\tau})$ using the Lipschitz property of the revenue function, which leads to a sub-optimal regret and makes supCB necessary.

Note that the regret bound in Theorem 2.3 does not depend on the minimum eigenvalue λ_z of the context vector, as our technical arguments show that the regret can be controlled by the prediction error of the MLE $\hat{\theta}$. Under the additional assumption $\lambda_z \asymp \bar{\lambda}_z := \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z)$, we further show in Proposition S.2.2 of the supplement, using an estimation error based argument, that ETC can achieve the same optimal regret as in Theorem 2.3 but with a relaxed requirement on T than the one in (9).

Unknown T. When T is unknown, we couple ETC with the doubling trick (Auer et al., 1995).

We summarize the algorithm, named ETC-Doubling, in Algorithm 4. For a given dimension d , denote T_d^* as the minimum T such that condition (9) holds with $\delta = 1/T$.

Algorithm 4 The ETC-Doubling algorithm for dynamic pricing

Input: Price interval $[l, u]$, $\Psi = \emptyset$.

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

a. (New episode): Set the episode length as $E_k = 2^k$.

b. (Exploration): For the first $\tau_k = \min \left\{ \sqrt{dE_k \log(E_k)}, E_k \right\}$ rounds, randomly choose $p_t \in [l, u]$, and record y_t and $x_t = (z_t^\top, -p_t z_t^\top)^\top$ into the price experiment set Ψ .

c. (Estimation): Obtain MLE $\hat{\theta}$ based on observations in Ψ .

d. (Exploitation): For the rest $E_k - \tau_k$ rounds, offer the greedy price at $p^*(\hat{\theta}, z_t)$ based on $\hat{\theta}$.

end for

Theorem 2.4. Suppose Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. For any T satisfying $T \geq T_d^{*2}/d$, with probability at least $1 - 6/\sqrt{dT}$, the regret of ETC-Doubling is upper bounded by $R_T \leq B_{E3} \cdot \sqrt{dT \log(T)}$, where $B_{E3} > 0$ is an absolute constant that only depends on quantities in Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2.

Remark 2.1 (Comparison with MLE-Cycle). An important algorithm in the dynamic pricing literature that works under an unknown T is the MLE-Cycle algorithm (e.g. Broder and Rusmevichientong, 2012; Ban and Keskin, 2021), which achieves a regret of order $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$. The key idea of MLE-Cycle is to divide the horizon $[1, \infty)$ into cycles. In particular, the c th cycle is of length $c + k$, where k is a constant. Within each cycle, the first k rounds are used for price experiments and the next c rounds are used for price exploitation. In Section S.2.4 of the supplement, we show the sub-optimality of MLE-Cycle is due to that k is constant, i.e., it under-explores. Moreover, we show that via a simple modification that boosts exploration, MLE-Cycle can achieve the optimal regret of order $O(\sqrt{dT \log T})$. On the other hand, due to its design, MLE-Cycle requires the computation of $O(\sqrt{T})$ number of MLE while ETC-Doubling only requires $O(\log_2 T)$. In Section 5, we show via extensive numerical experiments that ETC-Doubling achieves better statistical and computational efficiency in finite sample.

3 Contextual dynamic pricing under LDP constraints

As discussed in the introduction, there is a growing trend for implementing privacy preserving practice in business operations where personal information is used. This motivates us to further study

contextual dynamic pricing within the framework of local differential privacy (LDP).

We first introduce the notion of LDP for contextual dynamic pricing and then propose the ETC-LDP algorithm in Section 3.1 and establish its regret upper bound in Section 3.2. For $t \in [T]$, let $s_t = (z_t, y_t, p_t)$ be the raw data observed at time t . We follow the formulation of LDP in dynamic pricing put forward by the seminal work of Chen et al. (2022a), where the privacy-preserving policy assumes a two-part structure such that

$$p_t \sim A_t(\cdot | z_t, w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}) = A_t(z_t, w_{<t}), \quad (11)$$

$$w_t \sim Q_t(\cdot | s_t, w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}) = Q_t(s_t, w_{<t}), \quad (12)$$

with A_t being the pricing strategy and Q_t being the privacy mechanism. Here, w_t denotes the privatized statistic based on raw data s_t and we denote the past privatized statistics as $w_{<t} = (w_1, \dots, w_{t-1})$.

The pricing strategy $A_t(z_t, w_{<t})$ utilizes the true context z_t of the t th customer and the privatized information $w_{<t}$ from previous time periods. Note that while the raw context z_t is utilized for pricing purposes, it is never retained or stored by the seller. In particular, the personalized price p_t is computed based on z_t *locally* on the customer's device and the only data passed to the seller is the privatized w_t . The privatization mechanism $Q_t(s_t, w_{<t})$ is used to transform the raw data of the t th customer, s_t , into a privatized statistic w_t . Note that Q_t only utilizes the privatized statistics $w_{<t}$ and thus maintains privacy for previously encountered consumers. We remark that the seller does not store raw customer data s_t . Instead, only the privatized statistic w_t is retained for future pricing.

Following Duchi et al. (2018) and Chen et al. (2022a), we give the formal definition of local differential privacy (LDP) in the context of dynamic pricing.

Definition 3.1 (LDP for dynamic pricing). For any $\epsilon \geq 0$, a pricing policy $\pi = \{Q_t, A_t\}_{t=1}^T$ satisfies ϵ -LDP if for any $t \in [T]$, $w_{<t}$, and s_t, s'_t , it holds that for any measurable set W ,

$$Q_t(W | s_t, w_{<t}) \leq e^\epsilon Q_t(W | s'_t, w_{<t}).$$

We remark that our theoretical results hold for any $\epsilon \in (0, b]$, where b is an absolute constant. For simplicity, we assume in the following that $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ in all of our theoretical results regarding LDP.

3.1 The ETC-LDP algorithm

Algorithm 5 presents the proposed ETC-LDP algorithm for privacy-preserving contextual dynamic pricing, with a L_2 -ball mechanism (Duchi et al., 2018) subroutine in Algorithm 6. The high-level structure of ETC-LDP is the same as the ETC algorithm in Section 2.3 for non-private dynamic pricing. In particular, it partitions the entire horizon into an exploration phase and an exploitation phase. The exploration phase is used for *private* parameter estimation while in the exploitation phase, the seller uses a greedy approach to set optimal prices based on the estimated model parameter.

Unlike ETC where the seller can simply conduct a single maximum likelihood estimation *after* collecting all raw data $\{s_t\}_{t \in [\tau]}$ in the exploration phase, an alternative estimator is needed for ETC-LDP to meet the LDP constraint. In particular, leveraging the *sequential* nature of the LDP notion and dynamic pricing, we employ a stochastic gradient descent (SGD) based privacy-preserving estimation procedure integrated into the exploration phase of ETC-LDP (i.e. step A1-A3 in Algorithm 5).

Algorithm 5 The ETC-LDP algorithm for privacy-preserving dynamic pricing

Input: Total rounds T , price interval $[l, u]$, parameter space Θ , privacy parameter ϵ , exploration length τ , learning rate of SGD ζ_l , gradient truncation parameter C_g

[A. Exploration]

Randomly sample an initial estimator $\hat{\theta}_0$ from Θ .

for $t \in [\tau]$ **do**

A1 (Experiment): uniformly choose p_t from $[l, u]$, observe raw data $s_t = (z_t, y_t, p_t)$.

A2 (Privatization): compute the truncated gradient

$$g_t^{[C]} = g_t^{[C]}(\hat{\theta}_{t-1}; s_t) = \Pi_{\mathbb{B}_{C_g}}[g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1}; s_t)], \text{ with } g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1}; s_t) = [y_t - \psi'(x_t^\top \hat{\theta}_{t-1})]x_t. \quad (13)$$

run the L_2 -ball subroutine on $g_t^{[C]}$ with parameter C_g and ϵ , and obtain $w_t = W(g_t^{[C]})$.

A3 (SGD): update estimation via $\hat{\theta}_t = \Pi_{\Theta}[\hat{\theta}_{t-1} + \eta_t w_t]$ with step size $\eta_t = (\zeta_l t)^{-1}$.

end for

[B. Exploitation]

for $t = \tau + 1, \dots, T$ **do**

offer the greedy price at $p_t = p^*(\hat{\theta}_\tau, z_t)$ based on $\hat{\theta}_\tau$.

end for

We now give a detailed explanation of step A1-A3. Step A1 creates a new data point $s_t = (z_t, p_t, y_t)$ based on price experiments. Define the log-likelihood function and its gradient based on $\{s_t\}$ as

$$l(\theta; s_t) = y_t x_t^\top \theta - \psi(x_t^\top \theta) \quad \text{and} \quad g(\theta; s_t) = [y_t - \psi'(x_t^\top \theta)]x_t,$$

Algorithm 6 The L_2 -ball mechanism (Duchi et al., 2018). L_2 -ball (g, C_g, ϵ)

Input: Raw data $g \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, upper bound C_g such that $\|g\| \leq C_g$, privacy parameter ϵ .

1. Generate $\tilde{X} = (2b - 1)g$ where b is a Bernoulli random variable with success probability $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\|g\|}{2C_g}$.
2. Generate random vector $W(g)$ via

$$W(g) \sim \begin{cases} \text{Unif} \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^d : w^\top \tilde{X} > 0, \|w\| = C_g r_{\epsilon,d} \right\} & \text{with probability } e^\epsilon / (1 + e^\epsilon), \\ \text{Unif} \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^d : w^\top \tilde{X} \leq 0, \|w\| = C_g r_{\epsilon,d} \right\} & \text{with probability } 1 / (1 + e^\epsilon), \end{cases}$$

where $r_{\epsilon,d} = \sqrt{\pi} \frac{e^\epsilon + 1}{e^\epsilon - 1} \frac{d\Gamma(d + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(d + 1)}$ and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function.

Output: $w = W(g)$.

respectively. The update direction of the standard SGD will be $g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1}; s_t)$ given the current estimator $\hat{\theta}_{t-1}$. However, to preserve privacy, we need to privatize $g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1}; s_t)$, which is done in Step A2 via the L_2 -ball mechanism (Duchi et al., 2018). In particular, Step A2 first computes a truncated gradient $g_t^{[C]}$ in (13) by projecting $g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1}; s_t)$ to the ball \mathbb{B}_{C_g} in \mathbb{R}^{2d} , as the L_2 -ball mechanism requires a bounded input. It then runs the L_2 -ball subroutine and obtains the privatized gradient w_t . Step A3 updates the estimator via $\hat{\theta}_t = \Pi_\Theta[\hat{\theta}_{t-1} + \eta_t w_t]$ with a step size $\eta_t = 1/(\zeta t)$ that decays with $1/t$.

After exploration, we obtain the SGD based privacy-preserving estimator $\hat{\theta}_\tau$, which is then used in the exploitation phase. In Proposition S.3.1 of the supplement, we show ETC-LDP is indeed ϵ -LDP.

3.2 Regret upper bound of ETC-LDP

We start with a mild assumption on the parameter space and the eigenvalue of the context vector z_t .

Assumption 3.1. (a) The parameter space Θ is compact and satisfies that $\theta^* \in \Theta \subseteq \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq c_\theta\}$, for some absolute constant $c_\theta > 0$. (b) There exist absolute constants $c_{\lambda 1}, c_{\lambda 2} > 0$ such that $c_{\lambda 1}/d \leq \lambda_z \leq \bar{\lambda}_z \leq c_{\lambda 2}/d$, where recall $\lambda_z = \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)$ and $\bar{\lambda}_z = \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z)$.

Assumptions 2.1(c) and 3.1(a) together ensure that $\{x^\top \theta : x \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and } \theta \in \Theta\}$ is bounded. Define

$$M_{\psi 1}^* = \sup_{(x,\theta) \in \mathcal{X} \otimes \Theta} |\psi'(x^\top \theta)| \vee 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa^* = \inf_{(x,\theta) \in \mathcal{X} \otimes \Theta} \psi''(x^\top \theta) \wedge 1. \quad (14)$$

By simple algebra and (7), we have that the population log-likelihood function $l(\theta) := \mathbb{E}[l(\theta; s_t)]$ in the exploration phase of ETC-LDP is ϕ_z -strongly concave over Θ with $\phi_z := L_p \kappa^* \lambda_z$. This serves as the foundation for the theoretical analysis of the SGD estimator $\hat{\theta}_\tau$. Note that if we assume $\|\theta^*\| \leq c$

for some absolute constant c , Assumption 3.1(a) then holds by setting $\Theta = \{\theta : \|\theta\| \leq c\}$ and $c_\theta = 2c$.

Assumption 3.1(b) imposes the mild condition that $\lambda_z \asymp \bar{\lambda}_z \asymp 1/d$. This essentially requires z_t to have a balanced covariance matrix, which is a standard assumption in the statistical regression literature. Note that the $1/d$ factor is due to the fact that $\|z_t\| \leq 1$ as in Assumption 2.1(a). Theorem 3.1 gives the high probability estimation error bound for the private SGD estimator $\hat{\theta}_\tau$ in the exploration phase of ETC-LDP, which serves as the basis for bounding its regret.

Theorem 3.1. Suppose Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1(a) hold. For any $\tau \geq 4$, set $C_g = 2\sqrt{1+u^2}(M_{\psi_1}^* + \sigma\sqrt{\log \tau})$ and $\zeta_l = c_l \cdot \phi_z$ with some $c_l \in (0, 1]$, where recall $\phi_z = L_p \kappa^* \lambda_z$. We have that, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < (e \vee \log \tau)^{-1}$, with probability at least $1 - \delta \log \tau$, it holds that

$$\|\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*\|^2 \leq B_{L1} \cdot \frac{1}{c_l^2} \cdot \frac{d \log(1/\delta) \log(\tau)}{\lambda_z^2 \epsilon^2 \tau},$$

where $B_{L1} > 0$ is an absolute constant that only depends on quantities in Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1(a).

We remark that our private SGD estimator for the GLM model is adapted from a similar procedure in Duchi et al. (2018) without the truncation mechanism. Assuming the boundedness of the gradient, Duchi et al. (2018) provide an asymptotic estimation error bound (in our notation) such that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*\|^2 \lesssim \frac{d}{\lambda_z^2 \epsilon^2 \tau},$$

and show its asymptotic minimax optimality. In contrast, we provide a non-asymptotic high probability bound for the private SGD estimator via substantially different technical arguments adapted from the standard SGD literature (Rakhlin et al., 2011). Moreover, as we allow an unbounded gradient, our result requires a careful analysis of the additional bias-variance trade-off due to truncation. Note that our results matches the one in Duchi et al. (2018), up to logarithmic terms, where $\log(1/\delta)$ is due to the high probability nature of our bound and $\log \tau$ is due to the bias from truncation.

For the natural case where the minimum eigenvalue $\lambda_z \asymp d^{-1}$, the MLE in Theorem 2.1(ii) and the private SGD in Theorem 3.1 achieve high-probability upper bounds, up to logarithmic factors,

$$\|\hat{\theta}_\tau^{\text{MLE}} - \theta^*\|^2 \lesssim \frac{d^2}{\tau} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\theta}_\tau^{\text{SGD}} - \theta^*\|^2 \lesssim \frac{d^3}{\epsilon^2 \tau}.$$

This suggests that the LDP constraint shrinks the effective sample size from τ to $\tau\epsilon^2/d$, a phenomenon repeatedly observed in the LDP literature (e.g. Duchi et al., 2018; Li et al., 2023).

Remark 3.1 (Learning rate ζ_l). A key tuning parameter of the private SGD estimator is the learning rate ζ_l , which regulates the step size $\eta_t = 1/(\zeta_l t)$. In line with the standard SGD literature (e.g. [Rakhlin et al., 2011](#)), we require $\zeta_l = c_l \cdot \phi_z$ for some $c_l \in (0, 1]$ to achieve the optimal error bound. The term $\phi_z = L_p \kappa^* \lambda_z$ is the strong-concavity parameter of the population log-likelihood function and in general is unknown. However, if the order of λ_z is known, e.g. $\lambda_z \asymp 1/d$ as in Assumption 3.1(b), one can set $c_l = 1/\log \log \tau$ and replace ϕ_z by its order $1/d$ in ζ_l . It is easy to see that this ζ_l will be valid for all sufficiently large τ and the estimation error of SGD will only be inflated by a poly-logarithmic factor. Therefore, for simplicity, we set $\zeta_l = \phi_z$ in the regret analysis of ETC-LDP in Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.2. Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1 hold. For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < (e \vee \log T)^{-1}$, set the learning rate $\zeta_l = \phi_z$, the exploration length $\tau = d\sqrt{\log(T)\log(1/\delta)T}/\epsilon$ and the truncation parameter $C_g = 2\sqrt{1+u^2}(M_{\psi_1}^* + \sigma\sqrt{\log \tau})$. For any T satisfying

$$T \geq B_{L2} \cdot \lambda_z^{-4} [\epsilon^{-2} \log T \log(1/\delta) \vee d], \quad (15)$$

we have that, with probability at least $1 - \delta \log(T)$, the regret of ETC-LDP is upper bounded by

$$R_T \leq B_{L3} \cdot \frac{d\sqrt{\log(T)\log(1/\delta)T}}{\epsilon},$$

where $B_{L2}, B_{L3} > 0$ are absolute constants that only depends on quantities in Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1. In particular, setting $\delta = 1/T$, we have that $\mathbb{E}(R_T) \lesssim \epsilon^{-1} d\sqrt{T} \log(T)$.

Theorem 3.2 suggests that ETC-LDP achieves the regret of order $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T}/\epsilon)$. Compared to ETC, which achieves a regret of order $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$, we see that the LDP constraint inflates the regret by \sqrt{d}/ϵ , matching the phenomenon for the private SGD estimator when compared with MLE.

In Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we require a diverging C_g to control the bias due to truncation of the gradient. For GLMs where y_t is bounded, C_g can be made tighter as a constant. For example, we can set $C_g = \sqrt{1+u^2}$ for the logistic regression. This would improve the estimation error (and hence regret) by a poly-logarithmic factor. Same as supCB and ETC, we can further extend ETC-LDP to the case where T is unknown with the doubling trick. We omit the details to conserve space.

4 Minimax lower bounds on the regret

In this section, we provide minimax lower bounds for both non-private and private contextual dynamic pricing, which verify the optimality of our upper bound methods supCB, ETC and ETC-LDP.

Theorem 4.1 (Non-private lower bound). Let \mathcal{P} be the collection of distributions satisfying the GLM model in (1) and Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, and Π be the set of all non-anticipating policies. There exists an absolute constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ such that $\inf_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}^{\pi} R_T \geq \tilde{c} \sqrt{dT}$, for all $T \geq 4d^2 \log(T)$.

Theorem 4.1 shows that both supCB and ETC achieve the minimax optimal regret, up to logarithmic factors. The sub-linear dependence on the dimensionality d is the first time seen in the contextual dynamic pricing literature and extends the $\Omega(\sqrt{T})$ lower bound for contextual-free dynamic pricing in Broder and Rusmevichientong (2012). Unlike Broder and Rusmevichientong (2012), which connects the regret with the error of a hypothesis testing problem between two highly indistinguishable demand models and applies Le Cam’s lemma, our technical arguments are substantially different and more involved. In particular, to capture the effect of the dimension d , we construct 2^d number of demand models that can be grouped into pairs, where each pair is highly indistinguishable along one dimension of the context vector. We connect the regret with the error of a multiple-classification problem and establish the lower bound based on Assouad’s method. We remark that due to adaptivity of the data (i.e. $\{y_t, z_t, p_t\}$ generated by the pricing policy is not i.i.d.), our arguments are more involved than standard applications of Assouad’s method in lower bounds for statistical estimation problems.

Theorem 4.2 (Private lower bound). Let \mathcal{P} be the collection of distributions satisfying the GLM model in (1), Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1, and $\Pi(\epsilon)$ be the set of all non-anticipating ϵ -LDP policies as defined in Definition 3.1. There exists an absolute constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ such that $\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\epsilon)} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}^{\pi} R_T \geq \tilde{c} d \sqrt{T} / \epsilon$, for all $T \geq \tilde{c} \cdot d^4 \epsilon^{-2} \log(T)$, where $\tilde{c} > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Theorem 4.2 shows that ETC-LDP achieves the minimax optimal regret, up to logarithmic factors. Compared with Theorem 4.1, the regret lower bound under LDP inflates by a factor of \sqrt{d}/ϵ , matching the phenomenon seen in the upper bounds. The proof of Theorem 4.2 shares some similarity with that of Theorem 4.1, with the Assouad’s method replaced by a private version tailored for LDP. While this

strategy has been used in the LDP literature for establishing lower bounds for private estimation with independent data (e.g. [Duchi et al., 2018](#); [Acharya et al., 2024](#)), our setting is much more involved and thus requires more delicate analysis. In particular, in our lower bound setting, we allow the data (especially price) to be adaptively generated by *any* pricing policy π , making the data inherently dependent. To tackle this difficulty, we exploit the two-part structure of the LDP pricing policy as in [\(11\)](#) and [\(12\)](#), and devise a novel conditioning argument to track the intrinsic dependence of the data. This allows us to generalize the information contraction bound in [Acharya et al. \(2024\)](#) to the adaptive setting and can be of independent interest to other works in dynamic pricing under LDP.

5 Numerical analysis

In this section, we conduct extensive numerical experiments on both synthetic and real-world data, to investigate the performance of the proposed algorithms and further validate our theoretical findings.

Section [5.1](#) discusses the general simulation settings. Section [5.2.1](#) examines supCB and ETC with a known T . Section [5.2.2](#) compares ETC-Doubling with MLE-Cycle with an unknown T . Section [5.2.3](#) examines ETC-LDP under privacy. Section [5.3](#) presents a real data application on auto loan pricing.

5.1 General simulation settings

Data generating process in Section [5.2](#). We consider a logistic regression setting, where given (z_t, p_t) , the consumer demand y_t is a Bernoulli random variable such that

$$\mathbb{E}(y_t|z_t, p_t) = \psi' \left(z_t^\top \alpha^* - (z_t^\top \beta^*) p_t \right), \quad (16)$$

where $\psi'(\cdot)$ is the logistic function. The feature vector $z_t = (z_{t,1}, \dots, z_{t,d})$ are i.i.d. random vectors across time. We consider two simulation scenarios.

(S1). We set $\alpha^* = 1.6 \cdot \mathbf{1}_d / \sqrt{d}$ and $\beta^* = \mathbf{1}_d / \sqrt{d}$. For each feature vector z_t , we set $\{z_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^d$ as i.i.d. $\text{uniform}(1/\sqrt{d}, 2/\sqrt{d})$ random variables. **(S2).** We set $\alpha^* = \mathbf{1}_d$ and $\beta^* = \mathbf{1}_d$. For each feature vector z_t , it is uniformly drawn from $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_d\}$, which consists of the d standard orthonormal basis in \mathbb{R}^d . For (S1), the optimal price is always between $[0.91, 2.68]$ for all d , while for (S2), the optimal price is always 1.57. Therefore, we set the price range $[l, u]$ to be $[0, 3]$ for all algorithms in Section [5.2](#).

Implementation details. For a known horizon T , the algorithms are implemented as follows.

- For ETC, following Theorem 2.3, we set the length of price experiments as $\tau = \lceil \sqrt{dT \log T} \rceil$.
- For supCB, following Theorem 2.2, we set the number of stages as $S = \lfloor \log_2 T \rfloor$, the length of price experiments as $\tau = \lceil \sqrt{dT} \rceil$ and the discretization rate as $K = \lceil \sqrt{T/d} / \log T \rceil$. We set $\alpha = \log \log T \cdot \sqrt{\log(3T^{1.5}KS)}$. Here, a $\log \log T$ factor is included in α as in practice $(\sigma, M_{\psi_2}, \kappa)$ is unknown. It is easy to see this at most inflates the regret of supCB by $\log \log T$.
- For ETC-LDP, following Theorem 3.2, we set the length of price experiments as $\tau = \lceil 2d\sqrt{T} \log T / \epsilon \rceil$ and the learning rate of SGD as $\zeta_l = L_p/d$. For the L_2 -ball mechanism, it is easy to derive that $C_g = \max \|z_t\|_2 \cdot \sqrt{1 + u^2}$ under the logistic regression model in (16).

For the case where T is unknown, all algorithms are implemented with the standard doubling trick.

5.2 Experiments on Synthetic Data

5.2.1 ETC and supCB with a known horizon

In this section, we examine the statistical and computational efficiency of ETC and supCB when the horizon T is known. We set the horizon $T \in \{(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)^2 \times 10000\}$ and set the dimension $d \in \{(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)^2\} = \{1, 4, 9, 16, 25\}$. Given (T, d) , for each algorithm, we conduct 500 independent experiments and record the realized regrets $\{R_{T,d}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$.

Reported metrics: We report the sample mean regret $\bar{R}_{T,d} = \sum_{i=1}^{500} R_{T,d}^{(i)} / 500$. Denote $S_{T,d}$ as the sample standard deviation of $\{R_{T,d}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$, we further construct $I_{T,d} = [\bar{R}_{T,d} - 3S_{T,d}/\sqrt{500}, \bar{R}_{T,d} + 3S_{T,d}/\sqrt{500}]$, which is the 99% confidence interval of the expected regret $\mathbb{E}(R_{T,d})$ based on normal approximation. Based on $\{\log \bar{R}_{T,d}\}$ across all (d, T) , we further fit a linear regression

$$\log \bar{R}_{T,d} = \beta_0 + \beta_d \log d + \beta_T \log T + \text{offset}, \quad (17)$$

and examine the coefficients (β_d, β_T) . Here, the offset term is used to remove the impact of the poly-logarithmic factor that appears in the expected regret $\mathbb{E}(R_{T,d})$.

Figure 1 reports the performance of ETC under (S1). Specifically, Figure 1(left) reports the mean regret $\bar{R}_{T,d}$ (and the confidence interval $I_{T,d}$) of ETC at different (T, d) under (S1). As can be seen, given a fixed dimension d , the regret scales sublinearly w.r.t. T , and given a fixed horizon T , the regret increases with the dimension d . Figure 1(middle) plots $\log \bar{R}_{T,d}$ vs. $\log T$ for each fixed d , and further

plots the estimated regression lines based on (17) with an offset term of $0.5 \log \log T$. In particular, the regression coefficients are estimated as $\beta_d = 0.48$ and $\beta_T = 0.49$, which provides numerical evidence for Theorem 2.3. For illustration, Figure 1(right) further gives the boxplot of $\{R_{T,d}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$ for each $T \in \{(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)^2 \times 10000\}$ with a fixed $d = 9$.




Figure 1: ETC under (S1). [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) under different (d, T) . [Middle]: Mean regret (in log scale) with fitted regression lines. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets at different T ($d = 9$).

Similarly, Figure 2 reports the performance of supCB under (S1). The estimated linear regression based on (17) with an offset term of $1.5 \log \log T$ gives $(\beta_d, \beta_T) = (0.50, 0.49)$, which provides numerical evidence for Theorem 2.2. However, though its regret scales sublinearly with (d, T) , supCB records an expected regret that is overall 3 to 4 times higher than ETC. To conserve space, the performance of ETC and supCB under (S2) is reported in Figure S.1 and Figure S.2 in the supplement, where similar phenomenon is observed. Therefore, in terms of statistical efficiency, ETC is preferred over supCB.




Figure 2: supCB under (S1). [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) under different (d, T) . [Middle]: Mean regret (in log scale) with fitted regression lines. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets at different T ($d = 9$).

Figure S.3 in the supplement reports the mean computation time of ETC and supCB at different

(T, d) computed over 500 experiments under (S1). Overall, ETC is faster than supCB by around 10~100 times (with an average of 54 times), where the improvement is larger under larger dimension d . Therefore, to summarize, in practice, we recommend to use ETC as the default algorithm for dynamic pricing, as it is simple and achieves better statistical and computational efficiency.

5.2.2 ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle with unknown T

In this section, we examine the performance of ETC-Doubling when T is unknown and further compare with the *modified* MLE-Cycle algorithm discussed in Section S.2.4 of the supplement.

We set $T = 7^2 \times 10000$ and $d \in \{1, 4, 9, 16, 25\}$. Note that T is unknown to the pricing algorithm and it only means that we stop at T . Given (T, d) , for each algorithm, we conduct 500 independent experiments and record the realized sample paths of regrets $\{R_{t,d}^{(i)}, t \in [1, T]\}_{i=1}^{500}$. For each $t \in [1, T]$, we compute the sample mean regret $\bar{R}_{t,d} = \sum_{i=1}^{500} R_{t,d}^{(i)}/500$ and the confidence interval $I_{t,d} = [\bar{R}_{t,d} - 3S_{t,d}/\sqrt{500}, \bar{R}_{t,d} + 3S_{t,d}/\sqrt{500}]$, where $S_{t,d}$ denotes the sample standard deviation of $\{R_{t,d}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$.

Here, for the q th episode in ETC-Doubling, which is of length $T_q = 2^q$, we set the number of price experiments as $\tau_q = \min\{T_q, \sqrt{dT_q \log T_q} \cdot (\sqrt{2} - 1)\}$. The $\sqrt{2} - 1$ factor is introduced such that the total price experiments conducted in ETD-Doubling is approximately $\sqrt{dT \log T}$, which matches the number of price experiments conducted by ETC when T is known. For a fair comparison, we also design the exploration scheme of MLE-Cycle such that it conducts approximately $\sqrt{dT \log T}$ price experiments. We refer to Section S.2.4 of the supplement for more details.

Figure 3(left) plots the mean regret path $\{\bar{R}_{t,d}, t \in [1, T]\}$ and the pointwise confidence bound $\{I_{t,d}, t \in [1, T]\}$ of ETC-Doubling across $d \in \{1, 4, 9, 16, 25\}$ under (S1). The episodic nature of ETC-Doubling can be clearly seen, as the regret accumulates sharply during the price experiment stage of each episode and then switches to a mild increase during exploitation. Compare Figure 3(left) to Figure 1(left), we can see that ETC-Doubling incurs larger regret without the knowledge of the horizon T , which is indeed intuitive. Based on $\{\log \bar{R}_{t,d}\}$ across all d and $t \in [1, T]$, the estimated linear regression in (17) with an offset term of $0.5 \log \log T$ gives $(\beta_d, \beta_T) = (0.45, 0.48)$.

Figure 3(middle) reports the performance of MLE-Cycle, which gives a smooth regret path due

to its design. The estimated linear regression with an offset term of $0.5 \log \log T$ gives $(\beta_d, \beta_T) = (0.44, 0.49)$. Figure 3(right) gives the boxplot of the final regret $\{R_{T,d}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$ incurred by ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle. Overall, the two achieve similar performance with ETC-Doubling having a smaller regret, especially for large d . The result under (S2) is reported in Figure S.4 of the supplement, where similar findings are observed. Moreover, in Figures S.5-S.6 of the supplement, we provide the regret path of the *original* MLE-Cycle algorithm under (S1) and (S2), which under-explores and thus gives substantially higher regret compared to the *modified* MLE-Cycle considered in this section.




Figure 3: Performance of ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle under (S1) with unknown T [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of ETC-Doubling. [Middle]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of MLE-Cycle. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets (based on 500 experiments) at $T = 490000$.

Table 1 reports the sample mean $\bar{R}_{T,d}$ and standard deviation $S_{T,d}$ of the final regret for ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle. It matches the pattern seen in Figure 3(right), where ETC-Doubling improves upon MLE-Cycle for around 6-9%. Table 1 further reports the sample mean and standard deviation of computation time for ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle, where it is seen that ETC-Doubling is more efficient than MLE-Cycle, especially when the dimension d is large.

Table 1: Mean and sample SD (in parentheses) of regrets and computational time (over 500 experiments) by ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle under (S1) with unknown horizon $T = 490000$.

	ETC-Doubling					MLE-Cycle				
d	1	4	9	16	25	1	4	9	16	25
Regret	1048.8 (478.9)	1982.4 (436.4)	2897.6 (411.0)	3790.2 (399.9)	4679.2 (381.5)	1148.8 (451.6)	2076.2 (471.9)	3060.3 (436.1)	4038.7 (444.2)	5004.4 (425.8)
Time	58.2 (0.6)	59.1 (1.0)	61.9 (0.5)	66.5 (1.6)	85.5 (5.5)	59.3 (2.5)	84.3 (2.6)	144.9 (6.9)	282.3 (21.5)	545.9 (71.7)

5.2.3 ETC-LDP with known T

In this section, we examine ETC-LDP under differential privacy when the horizon T is known. We set $T \in \{(1, 3, 5, 7, 9) \times 10^5\}$ and set $d \in \{1, 2, 4, 6\}$. We focus on simulation settings with small dimension d , as estimation and thus pricing are intrinsically much more challenging under the local differential privacy setting. Following the LDP literature (e.g. [Duchi et al., 2018](#)), we set $\epsilon \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, which are the most commonly used LDP parameters in the industry (e.g. [Han et al., 2021](#)).

Recall under LDP, by Assumption 3.1(a), the parameter space Θ is required to be compact. Here, we set $\Theta = \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq \sqrt{d}\}$, i.e., we allow Θ to grow with the dimension d in the numerical experiments, which is more realistic. For each (T, d, ϵ) , we conduct 500 independent experiments and record the realized regrets $\{R_{T,d,\epsilon}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$ of ETC-LDP. We then compute the sample mean regret $\bar{R}_{T,d,\epsilon}$ and the confidence interval $I_{T,d,\epsilon}$ based on $\{R_{T,d,\epsilon}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$ as described in Section 5.2.1.

Figure 4(left) reports the mean regret $\bar{R}_{T,d,\epsilon}$ (and confidence interval $I_{T,d,\epsilon}$) of ETC-LDP with $\epsilon = 1$ at different (T, d) under (S1). As can be seen, given a fixed d , the regret scales sublinearly w.r.t. T , and given a fixed horizon T , the regret grows with the dimension d . Based on $\{\log \bar{R}_{t,d,\epsilon}\}$ across all (T, d) with $\epsilon = 1$, the estimated linear regression in (17) with an offset term of $\log \log T$ gives $(\beta_d, \beta_T) = (0.72, 0.54)$. Compared to ETC in Section 5.2.1, it is clear that to accommodate differential privacy, ETC-LDP incurs a substantially higher regret (and larger variance). In particular, a careful comparison between Figure 1(left) and Figure 4(left) shows that the mean regret of ETC-LDP is around 7-8 times higher than the mean regret of ETC for comparable (T, d) under (S1). This is as expected and indeed intuitive as the private SGD estimator is much less efficient than MLE. Such a phenomenon is later observed in the real data analysis as well.

Figure 4(middle) reports the performance of ETC-LDP with $\epsilon = 4$ and the estimated linear regression gives $(\beta_d, \beta_T) = (0.75, 0.56)$. For illustration, Figure 4(right) further gives the boxplot of $\{R_{T,d,\epsilon}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$ for each $T \in \{(1, 3, 5, 7, 9) \times 10^5\}$ and $\epsilon \in \{1, 4\}$ with a fixed $d = 6$. Clearly, as the privacy constraint eases, ETC-LDP achieves lower mean regret with smaller variance. To conserve space, the performance of ETC-LDP under (S2) with $\epsilon \in \{1, 4\}$ is reported in Figure S.7 of the supplement,

where similar phenomenon as the one in Figure 4 is observed.




Figure 4: Performance of ETC-LDP under (S1). [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) under different (d, T) and $\epsilon = 1$. [Middle]: Mean regret (with C.I.) under different (d, T) and $\epsilon = 4$. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets (based on 500 experiments) at different T (with $d = 6$) with $\epsilon \in \{1, 4\}$.

5.3 Real data analysis

In this section, we explore practical utility of the proposed algorithms on a real-world auto loan dataset provided by the Center for Pricing and Revenue Management at Columbia University.

The dataset records all auto loan applications received by a major online lender in the U.S. from July 2002 to November 2004 with a total of 208,085 applications. For each application, we observe information about the loan (e.g., term and amount), the prospective consumer (e.g., FICO score), and the economic environment (e.g., prime rate). We also observe the monthly payment required for the approved loan, which can be viewed as the pricing decision by the company, and whether the offer was accepted – a binary purchasing decision by a consumer.

We follow the feature selection result in Luo et al. (2021) and Bastani et al. (2022) and use the loan amount approved, term, prime rate, the competitor’s rate and FICO score as covariates. Thus, $d = 5$. We refer to Table S.1 in the supplement for detailed description of the covariates. We further standardize each covariate by its sample mean. The price p of a loan is computed as the net present value of future payment minus the loan amount, i.e., $p = \text{Monthly Payment} \times \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Term}} (1 + \text{Rate})^{-i} - \text{Loan Amount}$. We set Rate as 0.12%, an average of the monthly London interbank offered rate for the studied time period. For convenience, we use one thousand dollars as the basic unit for loan prices.

Note that it is impossible to obtain consumers’ real online responses to any pricing strategy unless

it was used in the system when the data were collected. Therefore, following the literature, we first estimate the demand model based on the entire observations and use it as the ground truth to generate consumer responses. In particular, denote the t th consumer decision as y_t , the covariates as $z_t \in \mathbb{R}^5$, and loan price as p_t , we fit the logistic regression model in (16) to $\{y_t, z_t, p_t\}_{t=1}^{208085}$. To conserve space, the estimated $\theta^* = (\alpha^*, \beta^*)$ is reported in Table S.2 of the supplement.

Figure 5(left and middle) gives the histograms of covariates norm $\{\|z_t\|_2\}_{t=1}^{208085}$ and price sensitivity $\{z_t^\top \beta^*\}_{t=1}^{208085}$ computed via the fitted ground truth model. The 99% quantile of covariates norm (which is 3.05) and 1% quantile of price sensitivity (which is 0.13) are further marked via red vertical lines. To impose an upper bound of covariates norm and a lower bound of price sensitivity, we remove covariates z_t whose norm is larger than 3.05 or whose price sensitivity is smaller than 0.13. We denote the remaining $\{z_t\}$ as \mathcal{Z} , which consists of 204782 covariates. Figure 5(right) further gives the histogram of the optimal prices (in thousands) of all covariates in \mathcal{Z} based on the ground truth model, where the maximum is 9.994 and the minimum is 0.632 (in thousands).




Figure 5: Histograms of covariate norm, price sensitivity and optimal price.

We run all algorithms (i.e. ETC-Doubling, MLE-Cycle, ETC-LDP) based on the ground truth model for $T = 208085$, where the covariate z_t is i.i.d. random vector sampled from \mathcal{Z} and y_t follows the ground truth model given (z_t, p_t) . For each algorithm, we conduct 500 experiments and record regret $\{R_T^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$. Note that the horizon T is set as unknown for all algorithms. For ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle, the implementation follows that in Section 5.2.2. The only difference is that we set the price range $[l, u]$ to be $[0, 10]$ based on Figure 5(c). For ETC-LDP, the implementation follows that in

Section 5.2.3, while to handle the unknown horizon T , we use doubling trick. To conserve space, we refer to Section S.1.2 of the supplement for more implementation details of ETC-LDP.

Figure 6(left) gives the mean regret path $\{\bar{R}_t, t \in [1, T]\}$ and the pointwise confidence bound $\{I_t, t \in [1, T]\}$ of ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle, where similar phenomenon as that in Figure 3 is seen. In particular, the two methods provide similar performance with ETC-Doubling having a better regret (around 6%) than MLE-Cycle, where the final mean regrets of the two algorithms are 2336.43 and 2478.64, respectively. Based on $\{\log \bar{R}_t\}$ across $t \in [1, T]$, the estimated linear regression in (17) with an offset term of $0.5 \log \log T$ gives $\beta_T = 0.49$ for ETC-Doubling and $\beta_T = 0.48$ for MLE-Cycle.

Figure 6(middle) gives the mean regret path $\{\bar{R}_t, t \in [1, T]\}$ and the pointwise confidence bound of ETC-LDP for $\epsilon \in \{1, 2, 4\}$. The final mean regrets are 15591.76, 10057.41 and 7021.67, for $\epsilon = 1, 2, 4$, respectively. Not surprisingly, a more stringent privacy constraint gives a higher regret. The estimated linear regression in (17) with an offset term of $\log \log T$ gives $\beta_T = 0.57, 0.53, 0.57$ for $\epsilon = 1, 2, 4$, respectively. For illustration, Figure 6(right) further gives the boxplot of $\{R_T^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{500}$ for all algorithms. Note that compared to ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle, ETC-LDP incurs substantially higher regret. With $\epsilon = 1$, ETC-LDP incurs around 6 times higher regret than ETC-Doubling. By simple algebra, this translates to 13.26 million dollars loss in revenue for $T = 208085$ customers, which highlights the trade-off between privacy preservation and profitability of the firm.




Figure 6: Performance of different algorithms for real data [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle. [Middle]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of ETC-LDP with $\epsilon \in \{1, 2, 4\}$. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets of all algorithms (based on 500 experiments) at $T = 208085$.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we studied the contextual dynamic pricing problem with a GLM demand model and a stochastic contextual vector of dimension d . For the non-private version, we propose two algorithms, supCB and ETC, that can achieve the optimal regret of order $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$, up to logarithmic factors. Importantly, this improves upon the state-of-the-art in the literature by a factor of \sqrt{d} . In addition, we consider the timely problem of dynamic pricing under LDP and propose a private SGD based ETC-LDP algorithm, which achieves a regret of order $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T}/\epsilon)$, highlighting the cost of privacy. We further illustrate the efficiency and utility of the proposed methods via extensive numerical experiments.

For future research, one direction is to allow temporal dependence among the context vector process $\{z_t\}$, which seems doable by leveraging concentration inequalities for weakly dependent data. Another direction of interest is to further consider scenarios where there are slowly-varying or abrupt changes in the context distribution or the regression coefficients of the demand model.

References

- Abbasi-Yadkori, Y., Pál, D., and Szepesvári, C. (2011). Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24.
- Acharya, J., Canonne, C. L., Sun, Z., and Tyagi, H. (2024). Unified lower bounds for interactive high-dimensional estimation under information constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Apple (2019). Improving siri’s privacy protections. <https://apple.co/3GwnLvj>.
- Auer, P. (2002). Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):397–422.
- Auer, P., Cesa-Bianchi, N., Freund, Y., and Schapire, R. E. (1995). Gambling in a rigged casino: The adversarial multi-armed bandit problem. In *Proceedings of IEEE 36th annual foundations of computer science*, pages 322–331. IEEE.
- Ban, G.-Y. and Keskin, N. B. (2021). Personalized dynamic pricing with machine learning: High-dimensional features and heterogeneous elasticity. *Management Science*, 67(9):5549–5568.
- Bastani, H., Simchi-Levi, D., and Zhu, R. (2022). Meta dynamic pricing: Transfer learning across experiments. *Management Science*, 68(3):1865–1881.
- Besbes, O. and Zeevi, A. (2009). Dynamic pricing without knowing the demand function: Risk bounds and near-optimal algorithms. *Operations Research*, 57(6):1407–1420.

- Broder, J. and Rusmevichientong, P. (2012). Dynamic pricing under a general parametric choice model. *Operations Research*, 60(4):965–980.
- Chen, K., Hu, I., and Ying, Z. (1999). Strong consistency of maximum quasi-likelihood estimators in generalized linear models with fixed and adaptive designs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 27(4):1155–1163.
- Chen, N. and Gallego, G. (2021). Nonparametric pricing analytics with customer covariates. *Operations Research*, 69(3):974–984.
- Chen, X., Miao, S., and Wang, Y. (2022a). Differential privacy in personalized pricing with nonparametric demand models. *Operations Research*.
- Chen, X., Owen, Z., Pixton, C., and Simchi-Levi, D. (2022b). A statistical learning approach to personalization in revenue management. *Management Science*, 68(3):1923–1937.
- Chen, X., Simchi-Levi, D., and Wang, Y. (2022c). Privacy-preserving dynamic personalized pricing with demand learning. *Management Science*, 68(7):4878–4898.
- Chen, X., Simchi-Levi, D., and Wang, Y. (2023). Utility fairness in contextual dynamic pricing with demand learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16528*.
- Chu, W., Li, L., Reyzin, L., and Schapire, R. (2011). Contextual bandits with linear payoff functions. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 208–214. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings.
- Dani, V., Hayes, T. P., and Kakade, S. M. (2008). Stochastic linear optimization under bandit feedback. In *COLT*, volume 2, page 3.
- den Boer, A. V. (2015). Dynamic pricing and learning: historical origins, current research, and new directions. *Surveys in operations research and management science*, 20(1):1–18.
- Duchi, J. C., Jordan, M. I., and Wainwright, M. J. (2018). Minimax optimal procedures for locally private estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):182–201.
- Dwork, C., McSherry, F., Nissim, K., and Smith, A. (2006). Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006. Proceedings 3*, pages 265–284. Springer.
- Evfimievski, A., Gehrke, J., and Srikant, R. (2003). Limiting privacy breaches in privacy preserving data mining. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, pages 211–222.
- Fan, J., Guo, Y., and Yu, M. (2024). Policy optimization using semiparametric models for dynamic pricing. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(545):552–564.
- Farias, V. F. and Van Roy, B. (2010). Dynamic pricing with a prior on market response. *Operations Research*, 58(1):16–29.

- Filippi, S., Cappe, O., Garivier, A., and Szepesvári, C. (2010). Parametric bandits: The generalized linear case. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 23.
- Google (2014). Learning statistics with privacy, aided by the flip of a coin. <https://bit.ly/2RehPPz>.
- Han, Y., Liang, Z., Wang, Y., and Zhang, J. (2021). Generalized linear bandits with local differential privacy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:26511–26522.
- Javanmard, A. and Nazerzadeh, H. (2019). Dynamic pricing in high-dimensions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(1):315–363.
- Lai, T. L. and Robbins, H. (1985). Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in applied mathematics*, 6(1):4–22.
- Lattimore, T. and Szepesvári, C. (2020). *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lei, Y., Miao, S., and Momot, R. (2023). Privacy-preserving personalized revenue management. *Management Science*.
- Li, L., Lu, Y., and Zhou, D. (2017). Provably optimal algorithms for generalized linear contextual bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2071–2080. PMLR.
- Li, M., Berrett, T. B., and Yu, Y. (2023). On robustness and local differential privacy. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(2):717–737.
- Liu, P., Yang, Z., Wang, Z., and Sun, W. W. (2023). Contextual dynamic pricing with strategic buyers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04055*.
- Lucas, O., Sokalski, M., and Fisher, R. (2021). Corporate data responsibility: Bridging the consumer trust gap. *KPMG Advisory*.
- Luo, Y., Sun, W. W., and Liu, Y. (2021). Distribution-free contextual dynamic pricing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07340*.
- Luo, Y., Sun, W. W., and Liu, Y. (2024). Distribution-free contextual dynamic pricing. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 49(1):599–618.
- Qiang, S. and Bayati, M. (2016). Dynamic pricing with demand covariates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.07463*.
- Rakhlin, A., Shamir, O., and Sridharan, K. (2011). Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.5647*.
- Shariff, R. and Sheffet, O. (2018). Differentially private contextual linear bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31.
- Wang, C.-H., Wang, Z., Sun, W. W., and Cheng, G. (2023). Online regularization toward always-valid high-dimensional dynamic pricing. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–13.

- Wang, H., Talluri, K., and Li, X. (2021). On dynamic pricing with covariates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.13254*.
- Zhao, Z., Jiang, F., Yu, Y., and Chen, X. (2023). High-dimensional dynamic pricing under non-stationarity: Learning and earning with change-point detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07570*.
- Zheng, K., Cai, T., Huang, W., Li, Z., and Wang, L. (2020). Locally differentially private (contextual) bandits learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:12300–12310.

Supplementary Material – Contextual Dynamic Pricing: Algorithms, Optimality, and Local Differential Privacy Constraints

Zifeng Zhao¹, Feiyu Jiang², Yi Yu^{3*}

The supplementary material is organized as follows. Section S.1 provides additional results for simulation and real data application. Section S.2 provides technical details for theoretical guarantees of the supCB and ETC algorithms in Section 2 of the main text. Section S.3 provides technical details for theoretical guarantees of the ETC-LDP algorithm in Section 3 of the main text. Section S.4 provides technical details for the minimax lower bound results in Section 4 of the main text.

S.1 Additional numerical results

S.1.1 Synthetic data




Figure S.1: Performance of ETC under (S2) [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) under different (d, T) . [Middle]: Mean regret (in log scale) with fitted linear regression lines $((\beta_d, \beta_T) = (0.51, 0.45))$. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets (based on 500 experiments) at different T (with $d = 9$).

*1. University of Notre Dame; 2. Fudan University; 3. University of Warwick




Figure S.2: Performance of supCB under (S2) [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) under different (d, T) . [Middle]: Mean regret (in log scale) with fitted linear regression lines $((\beta_d, \beta_T) = (0.47, 0.51))$. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets (based on 500 experiments) at different T (with $d = 9$).




Figure S.3: Average computation time (with C.I.) of ETC and supCB under (S1).




Figure S.4: Performance of ETC-Doubling and MLE-Cycle under (S2) with unknown T [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of ETC-Doubling. [Middle]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of MLE-Cycle. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets (based on 500 experiments) at $T = 490000$.




Figure S.5: Performance of (modified) MLE-Cycle and the original MLE-Cycle under (S1) [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of (modified) MLE-Cycle. [Middle]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of the original MLE-Cycle. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets (based on 500 experiments) at $T = 490000$.




Figure S.6: Performance of (modified) MLE-Cycle and the original MLE-Cycle under (S2) [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of (modified) MLE-Cycle. [Middle]: Mean regret (with C.I.) of the original MLE-Cycle. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets (based on 500 experiments) at $T = 490000$.




Figure S.7: Performance of ETC-LDP under (S2). [Left]: Mean regret (with C.I.) under different (d, T) and $\epsilon = 1$. The fitted linear regression gives $(\beta_d, \beta_T) = (0.95, 0.56)$. [Middle]: Mean regret (with C.I.) under different (d, T) and $\epsilon = 4$. The fitted linear regression gives $(\beta_d, \beta_T) = (1.02, 0.58)$. [Right]: Boxplot of regrets (based on 500 experiments) at different T (with $d = 6$) with $\epsilon = (1, 4)$.

S.1.2 Additional real data analysis

Table S.1: Summary of the auto loan dataset used in Section 5.3

Variable	Type	Description
apply	Binary	Indicator for eventual contract (dependent variable)
Price	Continuous	Price of the loan
Primary_FICO	Continuous	FICO score
Competition_rate	Continuous	Competitor's rate
Amount_Approved	Continuous	Loan amount approved
onemonth	Continuous	Prime rate
Term	Continuous	Approved term in months

Table S.2: Estimated logistic regression on the entire auto loan dataset.

	FICO	Competitor Rate	Amount	Prime Rate	Term
α	-1.434	0.288	-2.348	0.807	2.845
β	1.956	-1.542	-0.432	0.672	0.147

For ETC-LDP, the implementation follows that in Section 5.2.3, while to handle the unknown horizon T , we use doubling trick. In particular, for the q th episode, which is of length $T_q = 2^q$, we set the number of price experiments as $\tau_q = \min \{T_q, d\sqrt{2T_q} \log T_q/\epsilon\}$, where recall ϵ is the privacy parameter. To be more realistic, we set $\Theta = \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^o\| \leq \sqrt{d}\}$, where for each experiment, θ^o is uniformly sampled from the unit ball centered at θ^* . In other words, θ^o is a perturbed version of θ^* . Since ETC-LDP requires more price experiments, we set the price range $[l, u]$ to be $[0, 3]$ for price experiments and keep the price range to be $[0, 10]$ for price exploitation, which improves its performance.

S.2 Technical details in Section 2

The results collected in the Appendix rely on notations defined in (3) of the main text. For convenience, we copy them here:

$$M_{\psi_1} = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\psi'(x^\top \theta^*)| \vee 1, \quad M_{\psi_2} = \sup_{\{x \in \mathcal{X}, \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq 1\}} |\psi''(x^\top \theta)| \vee 1,$$

$$M_{\psi_3} = \sup_{\{x \in \mathcal{X}, \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq 1\}} |\psi'''(x^\top \theta)| \vee 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa = \inf_{\{x \in \mathcal{X}, \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq 1\}} \psi''(x^\top \theta) \wedge 1.$$

S.2.1 Key technical results

Lemma S.2.1 establishes a high-probability upper bound on the behavior of the sample design matrix of the GLM. Lemma S.2.1 serves as the basis for later theoretical results.

Lemma S.2.1. For $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_+$, define $V_\tau = \sum_{t=1}^\tau x_t x_t^\top$, where $\{x_t\}_{t \in [\tau]}$ are i.i.d. from an unknown distribution with $\|x_1\| \leq u_x$, with $u_x > 0$. Denote $\Sigma_x = \mathbb{E}(x_1 x_1^\top)$. There exist absolute constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have that

(i) $\|V_\tau/\tau - \Sigma_x\|_{\text{op}} \leq \max(\varsigma, \varsigma^2)$, where

$$\varsigma = [\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)]^{-1} u_x^4 \{c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}\} / \sqrt{\tau}; \quad (\text{S.1})$$

and

(ii) $\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau) \geq B$ for any $B > 0$ provided that

$$\tau \geq u_x^4 \left\{ \frac{c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)} \right\}^2 + \frac{2B}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)}. \quad (\text{S.2})$$

Proof of Lemma S.2.1. For $t \in [\tau]$, let $a_t = \Sigma_x^{-1/2} x_t$. We therefore have that a_t is isometric, i.e. $\mathbb{E}(a_t a_t^\top) = I$ and $\|a_t\| \leq \{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)\}^{-1/2} u_x$. Denote $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\tau]^\top$ and $A = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_\tau]^\top$, satisfying that $X = A \Sigma_x^{1/2}$. The sub-Gaussian parameters of x_t and a_t are upper bounded by u_x and $\{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)\}^{-1/2} u_x$ respectively.

As for (i), by Lemma 1 in [Li et al. \(2017\)](#), there exist absolute constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $m > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp\{-2(m/c_2)^2\}$, we have that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\tau} A^\top A - I \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \max(\varsigma_A, \varsigma_A^2), \quad (\text{S.3})$$

where $\varsigma_A = \{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)\}^{-1} u_x^2 (c_1 \sqrt{d} + m) / \sqrt{\tau}$.

Since $V_\tau = X^\top X$ and $X = A \Sigma_x^{1/2}$, we further have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{\tau} V_\tau - \Sigma_x \right\|_{\text{op}} &= \left\| \frac{1}{\tau} X^\top X - \Sigma_x \right\|_{\text{op}} = \left\| \Sigma_x^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{\tau} A^\top A - I \right) \Sigma_x^{1/2} \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_x) \max(\varsigma_A, \varsigma_A^2) \leq u_x^2 \max(\varsigma_A, \varsigma_A^2). \end{aligned}$$

Set $m = c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}$ where $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. By the above result, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\tau} V_\tau - \Sigma_x \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \max(\varsigma, \varsigma^2),$$

where $\varsigma = \{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)\}^{-1} u_x^4 (c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}) / \sqrt{\tau}$. This finishes the proof of (i).

As for (ii), first note that $\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau) = \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x^{1/2} A^\top A \Sigma_x^{1/2}) \geq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) \lambda_{\min}(A^\top A)$. It follows from

(S.3) that, for any $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\lambda_{\min}(A^\top A) \geq \tau - \tau \max(\varsigma_{A'}, \varsigma_{A'}^2),$$

where $\varsigma_{A'} = \{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)\}^{-1} u_x^2 (c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}) / \sqrt{\tau}$. Note that under (S.2), $\varsigma_{A'} < 1$. We then have that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau) \geq \tau \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) - \sqrt{\tau} u_x^2 (c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}).$$

By simple algebra with the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality, (ii) is proved. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For notational convenience, in the proof, we omit the index τ when no confusion arises. Denoting $L(\theta) = \sum_{t=1}^\tau \{y_t x_t^\top \theta - \psi(x_t^\top \theta)\}$, let $L'(\theta) = \sum_{t=1}^\tau \{y_t - \psi'(x_t^\top \theta)\} x_t$ and $L''(\theta) = -\sum_{t=1}^\tau \psi''(x_t^\top \theta) x_t x_t^\top$ be the first and second order derivatives of $L(\theta)$. By the definitions of θ^* and $\hat{\theta}$, recalling that $\varepsilon_t = y_t - \psi'(x_t^\top \theta^*)$, we have that $L'(\theta^*) = \sum_{t=1}^\tau \varepsilon_t x_t$ and $L'(\hat{\theta}) = 0$. Define $G(\theta) = L'(\theta^*) - L'(\theta)$. We have that $G(\theta^*) = 0$ and $G(\hat{\theta}) = \sum_{t=1}^\tau \varepsilon_t x_t$.

Consistency: For any $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, by the mean value theorem, we have that

$$G(\theta_1) - G(\theta_2) = G'(\bar{\theta})(\theta_1 - \theta_2) = \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^\tau \psi''(x_t^\top \bar{\theta}) x_t x_t^\top \right\} (\theta_1 - \theta_2),$$

for some $\bar{\theta}$ between θ_1 and θ_2 . By the property of GLM detailed in Assumption 2.1(e), we have that $\psi''(a) > 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. In addition, since V_τ is positive definite, we have that $(\theta_1 - \theta_2)^\top (G(\theta_1) - G(\theta_2)) > 0$ for any $\theta_1 \neq \theta_2$. In other words, $G(\theta)$ is an injection from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^d . Define $H(\theta) = V_\tau^{-1/2} G(\theta)$, clearly $H(\theta)$ is also an injection from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^d . Moreover, we have $H(\theta^*) = 0$.

Denote the ς -neighborhood of θ^* as $\mathbb{B}_\varsigma := \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma\}$, where $\varsigma \in (0, 1)$. Define $\kappa_\varsigma := \inf_{\{x \in \mathcal{X}, \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma\}} \psi''(x^\top \theta)$. By definition, we have that $\kappa_\varsigma \geq \kappa_1 \geq \kappa$. Therefore, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{B}_\varsigma$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|H(\theta)\|^2 &= G(\theta)^\top V_\tau^{-1} G(\theta) = \{G(\theta) - G(\theta^*)\}^\top V_\tau^{-1} \{G(\theta) - G(\theta^*)\} \\ &\geq \kappa_\varsigma^2 (\theta - \theta^*)^\top V_\tau (\theta - \theta^*) \geq \kappa^2 \lambda_{\min}(V_\tau) \|\theta - \theta^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, denote $\partial \mathbb{B}_\varsigma := \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^*\| = \varsigma\}$, we have that $\inf_{\theta \in \partial \mathbb{B}_\varsigma} \|H(\theta)\| \geq \kappa \varsigma \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau)}$.

Importantly, by Lemma A in [Chen et al. \(1999\)](#), this implies that

$$\left\{ \theta : \|H(\theta)\| \leq \kappa\varsigma \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau)} \right\} \subset \mathbb{B}_\varsigma.$$

Therefore, we have that $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{B}_\varsigma$ if we can show that $\|H(\hat{\theta})\| < \kappa\varsigma \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau)}$. Note that $\|H(\hat{\theta})\|^2 = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top X(X^\top X)^{-1}X^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)^\top$ and $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^\top$. Denote $\Sigma = X(X^\top X)^{-1}X^\top$. We have $\text{tr}(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) = d$ and $\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} = 1$. By Theorem 2.1 in [Hsu et al. \(2012\)](#) and Assumption 2.1(d), we have that for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \Sigma \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} > \sigma^2 \{d + 2\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)} + 2 \log(1/\delta)\} \right] \leq \delta. \quad (\text{S.4})$$

In addition, by the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality, we have that $d + 2\sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)} + 2 \log(1/\delta) \leq 2d + 3 \log(1/\delta) \leq 3\{d + \log(1/\delta)\}$. Together, it implies that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the event $\mathcal{E}_H := \{\|H(\hat{\theta})\| \leq \sqrt{3}\sigma \sqrt{d + \log(1/\delta)}\}$ holds.

Recall that we have $\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau) \geq 3\sigma^2/(\kappa^2\varsigma^2)\{d + \log(1/\delta)\}$. Combined with the above result, it implies that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have $\|H(\hat{\theta})\| < \kappa\varsigma \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(V_\tau)}$, and hence $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 < \varsigma$.

Prediction error: By the definition of $\hat{\theta}$, we have that $L(\hat{\theta}) \geq L(\theta^*)$. By Taylor’s expansion,

$$L(\hat{\theta}) = L(\theta^*) + L'(\theta^*)^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top L''(\theta^+) (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*),$$

for some θ^+ between $\hat{\theta}$ and θ^* . By the above result, we know that with probability $1 - \delta$, we have $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\| \leq 1$. Together, this implies that

$$(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top V_\tau (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) \leq 2/\kappa |L'(\theta^*)^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)| \leq 2/\kappa \cdot \|L'(\theta^*)^\top V_\tau^{-1/2}\| \cdot \|(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top V_\tau^{1/2}\|,$$

where the second inequality follows from the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality. This further gives that

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top V_\tau (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) &\leq \frac{4}{\kappa^2} \cdot L'(\theta^*)^\top V_\tau^{-1} L'(\theta^*) = \frac{4}{\kappa^2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top X(X^\top X)^{-1}X^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\ &= \frac{4}{\kappa^2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \Sigma \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{12\sigma^2}{\kappa^2} \{d + \log(1/\delta)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)^\top$ and the last inequality follows from (S.4). This completes the proof.

Estimation error: By the definition of $\hat{\theta}$, we have that

$$0 = L'(\hat{\theta}) = L'(\theta^*) + L''(\theta^+) (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)$$

for some θ^+ between $\hat{\theta}$ and θ^* . Recall that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma$.

Combined with the above result, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\| &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \|V_\tau^{-1} L'(\theta^*)\| = \frac{1}{\kappa} \|V_\tau^{-1} X^\top \varepsilon\| \leq \frac{1}{\kappa \lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(V_\tau)} \|V_\tau^{-1/2} X^\top \varepsilon\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa \lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(V_\tau)} \|H(\widehat{\theta})\| \leq \frac{1}{\kappa \lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(V_\tau)} \sqrt{3} \sigma \sqrt{d + \log(1/\delta)}\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (S.4).

The last result in Theorem 2.1 is a direct adaptation of Theorem 1 in Li et al. (2017) and we thus omit the proof. \square

S.2.2 Technical details in Section 2.2

Lemma S.2.2. Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds. For all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, the true revenue function $r(p, z, \theta^*)$ defined in (4) is L_r -Lipschitz in $p \in [l, u]$, with $L_r = M_{\psi_1} + uu_b M_{\psi_2}$. For all $p \in [l, u]$ and $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, it holds that $r(p, z, \theta^*) \leq u M_{\psi_1}$ and $|\partial^2 r(p, z, \theta^*) / \partial p^2| \leq C_r = 2M_{\psi_2} u_b + uu_b^2 M_{\psi_3}$.

Proof of Lemma S.2.2. Denote $p \neq \tilde{p}$ and $p, \tilde{p} \in [l, u]$, and denote $x = (z, -pz)$ and $\tilde{x} = (z, -\tilde{p}z)$.

By definition, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}r(p, z, \theta^*) - r(\tilde{p}, z, \theta^*) &= p\psi'(x^\top \theta^*) - \tilde{p}\psi'(\tilde{x}^\top \theta^*) \\ &= (p - \tilde{p})\psi'(x^\top \theta^*) - \tilde{p}\{\psi'(\tilde{x}^\top \theta^*) - \psi'(x^\top \theta^*)\} \\ &= (p - \tilde{p})\psi'(x^\top \theta^*) - \tilde{p}\psi''(\dot{x}^\top \theta^*)(\tilde{x}^\top \theta^* - x^\top \theta^*) \\ &= (p - \tilde{p})\psi'(x^\top \theta^*) + \tilde{p}\psi''(\dot{x}^\top \theta^*)z^\top \beta^*(\tilde{p} - p),\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from the mean value theorem with $\dot{x}^\top \theta^*$ between $x^\top \theta^*$ and $\tilde{x}^\top \theta^*$.

Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}|r(p, z, \theta^*) - r(\tilde{p}, z, \theta^*)| &\leq |(p - \tilde{p})\psi'(x^\top \theta^*)| + |\tilde{p}\psi''(\dot{x}^\top \theta^*)z^\top \beta^*(\tilde{p} - p)| \\ &\leq (M_{\psi_1} + uu_b M_{\psi_2})|p - \tilde{p}|,\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Assumption 2.1 and the definition of M_{ψ_1} and M_{ψ_2} . The other results can be proved similarly. \square

Lemma S.2.3 is adapted from Lemma 4 in Li et al. (2017) and Lemma 14 in Auer (2002) with a formal proof. Denote $\Psi_s^o(t) = \Psi_s(t) \cup \mathcal{F}_s$, where \mathcal{F}_s is the s th pure price experiment set and $\Psi_s(t)$ is

the index set that collects all time periods in $[S\tau + 1, t - 1]$ such that supCB stopped in stage s .

Lemma S.2.3. In Algorithm 2, for all $s \in [S]$ and $t \in [S\tau + 1, T]$, given the features $\{x_i, i \in \Psi_s^o(t)\}$, the demands $\{y_i, i \in \Psi_s^o(t)\}$ are conditionally independent GLM random variables with parameter θ^* .

Proof of Lemma S.2.3. Note that we need to show

$$\mathbb{P}(\{y_i\}, i \in \Psi_s^o(t) | \{x_i\}, i \in \Psi_s^o(t)) = \prod_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)} \mathbb{P}(y_i | x_i). \quad (\text{S.5})$$

For notational simplicity, denote $X_{\leq t}^s = \{x_i : i \in \Psi_s^o(t)\}$ and $Y_{\leq t}^s = \{y_i : i \in \Psi_s^o(t)\}$. For $s \geq 2$, define $\Phi_{< s}^o(t) = \bigcup_{\sigma < s} \{Y_{\leq t}^\sigma, X_{\leq t}^\sigma\}$ as the results observed at stages $[s - 1]$ up to time t (not including t). Furthermore, for time points $t_1 < t_2$, define $\Phi_{< s}^o(t_1, t_2) = \Phi_{< s}^o(t_2) \setminus \Phi_{< s}^o(t_1)$ as the results observed at stages $[s - 1]$ between time t_1 to $t_2 - 1$, inclusive.

In the following, we show that for all $t \in [S\tau + 1, T]$ and $s \in [S]$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{\leq t}^s | X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t)) = \prod_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)} \mathbb{P}(y_i | x_i). \quad (\text{S.6})$$

Note that by the property of conditional probability, (S.6) directly implies (S.5). We proceed by mathematical induction. First, note that for $t = S\tau + 1$, (S.6) clearly holds as $\Psi_s^o(S\tau + 1) = \mathcal{F}_s$, which consists of only price experiments.

Now, suppose (S.6) holds for t . Denote t^+ as the first time point such that $\Psi_s^o(t^+) \setminus \Psi_s^o(t) \neq \emptyset$. Note that clearly $t^+ > t$ and in fact we have $\Psi_s^o(t^+) \setminus \Psi_s^o(t) = t^+ - 1$. In other words, (y_{t^*}, x_{t^*}) is observed in stage s , where for notational simplicity, we define $t^* = t^+ - 1$. To finish the proof, we only need to show that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{\leq t^+}^s | X_{\leq t^+}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t^+)) = \prod_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t^+)} \mathbb{P}(y_i | x_i).$$

In particular, by the property of conditional probability, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\{Y_{\leq t^+}^s, X_{\leq t^+}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t^+)\} = \mathbb{P}\{y_{t^*}, Y_{\leq t}^s, x_{t^*}, X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t), \Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)\} \\ & = \mathbb{P}\{y_{t^*} | Y_{\leq t}^s, x_{t^*}, X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t), \Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)\} \mathbb{P}\{x_{t^*} | Y_{\leq t}^s, X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t), \Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)\} \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{P}\{\Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+) | Y_{\leq t}^s, X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t)\} \mathbb{P}\{Y_{\leq t}^s | X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t)\} \mathbb{P}\{X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now analyze the above terms one by one.

- First, by (1), we have that $\mathbb{P}(y_{t^*}|Y_{\leq t}^s, x_{t^*}, X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t), \Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)) = \mathbb{P}(y_{t^*}|x_{t^*})$.
- Second, importantly, by design, t^* can only be added to stage s in **Step II** of Algorithm 2. For this to happen, it only depends on the results in the previous stages $\Phi_{< s}^o(t^+)$ and $w_{t^*, a}^{(s)}$, and moreover, $w_{t^*, a}^{(s)}$ only depends on $X_{\leq t}^s$ but not $Y_{\leq t}^s$. Therefore, the possible values of x_{t^*} that leads to t^* being added in stage s is entirely determined by $X_{\leq t}^s$ and $\Phi_{< s}^o(t^+)$, and is not affected by the value of $Y_{\leq t}^s$. In other words, we have the conditional independence result

$$\mathbb{P}\{x_{t^*}|Y_{\leq t}^s, X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t), \Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)\} = \mathbb{P}\{x_{t^*}|X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t), \Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)\} = \mathbb{P}\{x_{t^*}|X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t^+)\}.$$

- Third, by the design of Algorithm 2, the observations $\Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)$ at stages $[s-1]$ does not depends on $Y_{\leq t}^s, X_{\leq t}^s$ and therefore, we have $\mathbb{P}\{\Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)|Y_{\leq t}^s, X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t)\} = \mathbb{P}\{\Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)|\Phi_{< s}^o(t)\}$.

Moreover, by the induction assumption, we have that $\mathbb{P}(Y_{\leq t}^s|X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t)) = \prod_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)} \mathbb{P}(y_i|x_i)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\{Y_{\leq t^+}^s, X_{\leq t^+}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t^+)\} \\ &= \left[\mathbb{P}(y_{t^*}|x_{t^*}) \prod_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)} \mathbb{P}(y_i|x_i) \right] \left[\mathbb{P}\{x_{t^*}|X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t^+)\} \mathbb{P}\{\Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)|\Phi_{< s}^o(t)\} \mathbb{P}\{X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t)\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, to finish the proof, we only need to show that

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_{\leq t^+}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t^+)\} = \mathbb{P}\{x_{t^*}|X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t^+)\} \mathbb{P}\{\Phi_{< s}^o(t, t^+)|\Phi_{< s}^o(t)\} \mathbb{P}\{X_{\leq t}^s, \Phi_{< s}^o(t)\},$$

which can be shown based on the exact same arguments as above and thus is omitted. \square

Lemma S.2.4 establishes a high probability confidence bound for the true revenue function.

Lemma S.2.4. For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, set the supCB algorithm with $\tau = \sqrt{dT}$ and $\alpha = 3\sigma u M_{\psi 2} / \kappa \cdot \sqrt{\log(3TKS/\delta)}$. Suppose T satisfies that

$$T \geq \left\{ \frac{4u_x^8}{L_p^4 \lambda_z^4} \left(c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(T)} \right)^4 / d \right\} \vee \left\{ \frac{2048M_{\psi 3}^4 \sigma^4}{\kappa^8 L_p^2 \lambda_z^2} (d^2 + \log(3TKS/\delta))^2 / d \right\}, \quad (\text{S.7})$$

The following event \mathcal{E}_X holds with probability at least $1 - \delta - S/T$, where we define

$$\mathcal{E}_X := \left\{ \left| r_{t,a}^{(s)} - r(p^{(a)}, z_t, \theta^*) \right| \leq w_{t,a}^{(s)}, \text{ for all } t \in [S\tau + 1, T], s \in [S], a \in [K] \right\}. \quad (\text{S.8})$$

Proof of Lemma S.2.4. Set $B = \tau \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)/4$ and $\delta = 1/T$, by simple algebra, we have (S.2) in Lemma S.2.1 always holds for any τ such that

$$\tau \geq 2u_x^4 \left\{ \frac{c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(T)}}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)} \right\}^2. \quad (\text{S.9})$$

In Algorithm 2, we set $\tau = \sqrt{dT}$. Therefore, under condition (S.7), by simple algebra and the fact that $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) \geq L_p \lambda_z$, with L_p defined in (6), we have that τ satisfies (S.9) and furthermore

$$B = \tau \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)/4 \geq \frac{512M_{\psi 3}^2 \sigma^2}{\kappa^4} \left\{ d^2 + \log \left(\frac{3TKS}{\delta} \right) \right\}.$$

Denote $V_{s,\tau} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_s} x_i x_i^\top$. Therefore, by Lemma S.2.1, under condition (S.7), for any $s \in [S]$, we have with probability at least $1 - 1/T$, it holds that

$$\lambda_{\min}(V_{s,\tau}) \geq B \geq \frac{512M_{\psi 3}^2 \sigma^2}{\kappa^4} \left\{ d^2 + \log \left(\frac{3TKS}{\delta} \right) \right\}.$$

Recall that for any $t \in [S\tau + 1, T]$, $\Psi_s^o(t)$ is the union of \mathcal{F}_s and all periods before t that are in Ψ_s . Denote $V_{s,t} = \sum_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)} x_i x_i^\top$ and denote $\hat{\theta}_t^s$ as the MLE based on $\{y_i, x_i\}_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)}$. By design, the index set $\Psi_s^o(t)$ has \mathcal{F}_s as a subset and thus $\lambda_{\min}(V_{s,t}) \geq \lambda_{\min}(V_{s,\tau})$ for all $t \in [S\tau + 1, T]$ and $s \in [S]$. Moreover, by Lemma S.2.3, on each $\Psi_s^o(t)$, $s \in [S]$, the reward $\{y_i\}_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)}$ are conditionally independent given $\{x_i\}_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)}$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.1, for any fixed $t \in [S\tau + 1, T]$ and $s \in [S]$ and $a \in [K]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta/(TKS)$, we have that $\|\hat{\theta}_t^s - \theta^*\| \leq 1$ and

$$|x_{t,a}^\top (\hat{\theta}_t^s - \theta^*)| \leq \frac{3\sigma}{\kappa} \sqrt{\log(3TKS/\delta)} \|x_{t,a}\|_{V_{s,t}^{-1}}. \quad (\text{S.10})$$

By union bound, we know that (S.10) holds for all $t \in [S\tau + 1, T]$ and $s \in [S]$ and $a \in [K]$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. In the following, assume this good event holds.

In addition, by the smoothness of the revenue function, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| r_{t,a}^{(s)} - r(p^{(a)}, z_t, \theta^*) \right| &= \left| r_{t,a}^{(s)} - p^{(a)} \cdot \psi'(x_{t,a}^\top \theta^*) \right| = \left| p^{(a)} \cdot \psi'(x_{t,a}^\top \hat{\theta}_t^s) - p^{(a)} \cdot \psi'(x_{t,a}^\top \theta^*) \right| \\ &\leq p^{(a)} M_{\psi 2} |x_{t,a}^\top (\hat{\theta}_t^s - \theta^*)| \leq u M_{\psi 2} |x_{t,a}^\top (\hat{\theta}_t^s - \theta^*)|, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Assumption 2.1, the mean value theorem and the fact that $\|\hat{\theta}_t^s - \theta^*\| \leq 1$, and the second inequality follows from that $p^{(a)} \leq u$ for all $a \in [K]$.

Recall by definition, $w_{t,a}^{(s)} = \alpha \|x_{t,a}\|_{V_{s,t}^{-1}}$. Since $\alpha = 3\sigma u M_{\psi 2} / \kappa \cdot \sqrt{\log(3TKS/\delta)}$, we have \mathcal{E}_X holds with probability at least $1 - \delta - S/T$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma S.2.5 establishes an upper bound on the regret for each round $t \in [T]$ given that the high probability confidence bound (S.8) in Lemma S.2.4 covers the true revenue function.

Lemma S.2.5. Suppose that event \mathcal{E}_X defined in (S.8) holds, and that in round t , the action a_t is chosen at stage s_t . Denote a_t^* as the action of the optimal price given z_t . Then $a_t^* \in A_s$ for all $s \leq s_t$. Furthermore, we have that

$$r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*) \leq \begin{cases} (4 \vee L_r u) 2^{-(s_t-1)} & \text{if } a_t \text{ is chosen in step II,} \\ 2/\sqrt{T} & \text{if } a_t \text{ is chosen in step III.} \end{cases}$$

Proof of Lemma S.2.5. We prove by induction. For $s = 1$, we have $A_1 = [K]$ and thus $a_t^* \in A_1$. Suppose $a_t^* \in A_s$ for some $1 \leq s < s_t$. Since the supCB algorithm does not stop at s , by **Step IV** in Algorithm 2, we have that $w_{t,a}^{(s)} \leq 2^{-s}$ for all $a \in A_s$. Given that \mathcal{E}_X holds, we have

$$r_{t,a_t^*}^{(s)} \geq r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - w_{t,a_t^*}^{(s)} \geq r(p^{(a)}, z_t, \theta^*) - w_{t,a_t^*}^{(s)} \geq r_{t,a}^{(s)} - w_{t,a}^{(s)} - w_{t,a_t^*}^{(s)} \geq r_{t,a}^{(s)} - 2^{1-s},$$

for all $a \in A_s$, where the first and third inequalities follow from the definition of \mathcal{E}_X , and the second inequality holds by the definition of a_t^* . Therefore, by the definition of A_{s+1} , we have that $a_t^* \in A_{s+1}$. This finishes the proof of the first part.

Now suppose a_t is chosen at **Step II** of Algorithm 2. If $s_t = 1$, by Lemma S.2.2, we have that $|r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*)| \leq L_r u$. Suppose $s_t > 1$, then based on $s = s_t - 1$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*) &\geq r_{t,a_t}^{(s_t-1)} - w_{t,a_t}^{(s_t-1)} \\ &\geq r_{t,a_t^*}^{(s_t-1)} - 2^{1-(s_t-1)} - w_{t,a_t}^{(s_t-1)} \geq r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - 2^{1-(s_t-1)} - w_{t,a_t}^{(s_t-1)} - w_{t,a_t^*}^{(s_t-1)} \\ &\geq r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - 2^{2-(s_t-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of the event \mathcal{E}_X defined in (S.8), the second inequality follows from the fact that both a_t and a_t^* are in A_{s_t-1} , and the last from the design of the supCB algorithm and the fact that the algorithm does not stop at the $s_t - 1$. Therefore, we have that $r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*) \leq (4 \vee L_r u) 2^{-(s_t-1)}$ given that a_t is chosen at **Step II**.

Now suppose a_t is chosen at **Step III**, we have that

$$r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*) \geq r_{t,a_t}^{s_t} - 1/\sqrt{T} \geq r_{t,a_t^*}^{s_t} - 1/\sqrt{T} \geq r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - 2/\sqrt{T}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2. First, the sample size condition on T in (8) in Theorem 2.2 can be explicitly written as

$$T \geq \left\{ \frac{4u_x^8}{L_p^4 \lambda_z^4} \left(c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(T)} \right)^4 / d \right\} \vee \left[\frac{2048M_{\psi_3}^4 \sigma^4}{\kappa^8 L_p^2 \lambda_z^2} \{d^2 + \log(3TKS/\delta)\}^2 / d \right], \quad (\text{S.11})$$

where we denote $u_x = \sqrt{1+u^2}$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are absolute constants from the concentration inequalities used in Lemma S.2.1.

By Lemma S.2.4, the good event \mathcal{E}_X defined in (S.8) holds with probability at least $1 - \delta - 2\log(T)/T$, with $S = \lfloor \log_2(T) \rfloor$. Recall we set the number of arms $K = \sqrt{T/d}/\log(T)$.

Recall $\Psi_s(T)$ collects all rounds in $[S\tau + 1, \tau + 2, \dots, T]$ such that a_t is chosen in **Step II** at the stage s . Denote $\Psi_s^o(T) = \mathcal{F}_s \cup \Psi_s(T)$. Define $V_{s,t} = \sum_{i \in \Psi_s^o(t)} x_{i,a_i} x_{i,a_i}^\top$. By the proof of Lemma S.2.4, for all T that satisfies (S.11), with probability at least $1 - 1/T$, we have $\lambda_{\min}(V_{s,t}) \geq \lambda_{\min}(V_\tau) \geq B$, where $B = \tau \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)/4 \geq 1$. Therefore, by Lemma 2 in Li et al. (2017), with probability at least $1 - 2\log(T)/T$, we have that

$$\sum_{t \in \Psi_s(T)} w_{t,a_t}^{(s)} = \sum_{t \in \Psi_s(T)} \alpha \|x_{t,a_t}\|_{V_{s,t}^{-1}} \leq \alpha \sqrt{2d \log(T/d) |\Psi_s(T)|}, \quad (\text{S.12})$$

for all $s \in [S]$. On the other hand, by **Step II** of Algorithm 2, we have that

$$\sum_{t \in \Psi_s(T)} w_{t,a_t}^{(s)} \geq 2^{-s} |\Psi_s(T)|. \quad (\text{S.13})$$

Combining (S.12) and (S.13), we have that

$$|\Psi_s(T)| \leq 2^s \alpha \sqrt{2d \log(T/d) |\Psi_s(T)|}. \quad (\text{S.14})$$

Denote $\Psi_0(T)$ as the collection of rounds where a_t is chosen in **Step III**. Since $S = \lfloor \log_2 T \rfloor$, we have that $2^{-S} = 1/T < 1/\sqrt{T}$. Therefore, each $t \in [S\tau + 1, T]$ must be in one of $\Psi_s(T)$. It holds that $\{S\tau + 1, \tau + 2, \dots, T\} = \Psi_0(T) \cup \{\cup_{s=1}^S \Psi_s(T)\}$. Recall that $\tau = \sqrt{dT}$. Together, with probability at least $1 - \delta - 2\log(T)/T$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} R_T &= \sum_{t=1}^T \{r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*)\} \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \{r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*)\} + \sum_{t=1}^T \{r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*)\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq TL_r(u-l)/K + \sum_{t=1}^{S\tau} \{r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*)\} + \sum_{t=S\tau+1}^T \{r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*)\} \\
&\leq uL_r\sqrt{dT}\log(T) + S\tau uL_r + \sum_{t=S\tau+1}^T \{r(p^{(a_t^*)}, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p^{(a_t)}, z_t, \theta^*)\} \\
&\leq \{\log(T) + S\}uL_r\sqrt{dT} + 2|\Psi_0(T)|/\sqrt{T} + \sum_{s=1}^S |\Psi_s(T)|(4 \vee L_ru)2^{-(s-1)} \\
&\leq 3uL_r\sqrt{dT}\log T + 2\sqrt{T} + 2\alpha(4 \vee L_ru) \sum_{s=1}^S \sqrt{2d\log(T/d)|\Psi_s(T)|} \\
&\leq 3uL_r\sqrt{dT}\log T + 2\sqrt{T} + 2\alpha(4 \vee L_ru)\sqrt{2STd\log(T/d)} \\
&\leq 24\sigma uM_{\psi_2}/\kappa \cdot (4 \vee L_ru)\sqrt{dT\log(T)\log(T/\delta)\log(T/d)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the Lipschitz condition of the revenue function as demonstrated in Lemma S.2.2 and that we partition $[l, u]$ into $K = \sqrt{T/d}/\log T$ equally spaced price points, the second inequality follows from the Lipschitz condition of the revenue function, the third inequality follows from Lemma S.2.5, the fourth inequality follows from (S.14), and the fifth inequality follows from the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality.

Therefore, set $\delta = 1/\sqrt{T}$, we further have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(R_T) &\leq 2/\sqrt{T} \cdot TL_ru + 24\sqrt{1.5}\sigma uM_{\psi_2}/\kappa \cdot (4 \vee L_ru) \cdot \sqrt{dT} \cdot \{\log(T)\}^{3/2} \\
&\leq 30\sigma uM_{\psi_2}/\kappa \cdot (4 \vee L_ru) \cdot \sqrt{dT} \cdot \{\log(T)\}^{3/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem S.2.1 provides theoretical guarantees for the regret of supCB combined with the standard doubling trick described at the end of Section 2.2. For a given dimension d , denote T_d^* as the minimum T such that condition (8) holds with $\delta = 1/T$.

Theorem S.2.1. Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds. For any T satisfying $T \geq T_d^{*2}/d$, we have that with probability at least $1 - 6\log(T)/\sqrt{dT}$, the regret of supCB with the doubling trick described at the end of Section 2.2 is upper bounded by

$$R_T \leq B_{S4} \cdot \sqrt{dT}\{\log(T)\}^{3/2},$$

where $B_{S_4} > 0$ is an absolute constant that only depend on quantities in Assumption 2.1.

Proof of Theorem S.2.1. It is easy to see that the total rounds up to the k th episode is $2^{k+1} - 2$. For any T , there exists a $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $2^{k+1} - 2 \leq T < 2^{k+2} - 2$. Denote $\bar{T} = 2^{k+2} - 2$. Clearly, $R_T \leq R_{\bar{T}}$. Therefore, in the following, we focus on the analysis of $R_{\bar{T}}$, which is the total regret till the $(k + 1)$ th episode. Define

$$j = \min_i \left\{ i \in \mathbb{N}_+ : 2^i \geq \sqrt{dT} \right\}. \quad (\text{S.15})$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $j \geq 2$ and $k \geq 3$. To establish the high probability bound, we decompose the regret $R_{\bar{T}}$ into $R^{(1)}$, which accounts for regret from episode $i \in [j - 1]$, and $R^{(2)}$, which accounts for regret from episode $i \in [k + 1] \setminus [j]$. Denote $E_i = 2^i$ as the length of the i th episode. First, by Lemma S.2.2, we have

$$R^{(1)} \leq L_r u \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} E_i = L_r u \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} 2^i \leq L_r u 2^j \leq 2L_r u \sqrt{dT},$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of j in (S.15).

Second, by assumption, we know that $E_j \geq \sqrt{dT} \geq T_d^*$. In other words, Theorem 2.2 applies to all episodes $j, j + 1, \dots, k + 1$. Note that $\sum_{i=j}^{k+1} \sqrt{2^i} \leq 2.5\sqrt{2^{k+2}}$. For $R^{(2)}$, by a union bound argument and Theorem 2.2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(2)} &\leq 24\sigma u M_{\psi_2} / \kappa \cdot (4 \vee L_r u) \sum_{i=j}^{k+1} \sqrt{dE_i} \cdot \sqrt{2} \{\log(E_i)\}^{3/2} \\ &\leq 24\sigma u M_{\psi_2} / \kappa \cdot (4 \vee L_r u) \cdot 2.5\sqrt{2} \sqrt{d2^{k+2}} \{\log(T)\}^{3/2} \\ &\leq 120\sigma u M_{\psi_2} / \kappa \cdot (4 \vee L_r u) \cdot \sqrt{dT} \{\log(T)\}^{3/2}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least

$$1 - \sum_{i=j}^{k+1} \{1/E_i + 2 \log(E_i)/E_i\} \geq 1 - 3 \log(T) \sum_{i=j}^{k+1} 1/E_i \geq 1 - 3 \log(T) / 2^{j-1} \geq 1 - 6 \log(T) / \sqrt{dT},$$

where the second inequality holds by definition of j in (S.15). \square

S.2.3 Technical details in Section 2.3

Proposition S.2.1. Define $R_{\varsigma_o} = \{(\alpha^\top z, \beta^\top z) : z \in \bar{\mathcal{Z}}, \|(\alpha^\top, \beta^\top)^\top - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma_o\}$. Under Assumptions 2.1(a), (c), (e) and 2.2, there exists a bivariate Lipschitz continuous function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot)$ over R_{ς_o} with a

Lipschitz constant $C_\varphi > 0$ such that

$$p^* = \arg \max_{p \in [l, u]} \left\{ p \psi'(\alpha^\top z - \beta^\top z p) \right\} = \varphi(\alpha^\top z, \beta^\top z),$$

for all $z \in \bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ and $\theta \in \{(\alpha^\top, \beta^\top) : \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma_o\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Moreover, C_φ is an absolute constant that only depends on quantities in Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2,

Proof of Proposition S.2.1. By definition,

$$p^* = \arg \max_{p \in [l, u]} p \cdot \psi'(\alpha^\top z - \beta^\top z p).$$

Thus, p^* depends on θ and z via $\alpha^\top z$ and $\beta^\top z$.

By Assumption 2.2, for all $z \in \bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ and $\theta = (\alpha, \beta)$ where $\|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma_o$, the optimal price p^* is unique. Therefore, for all $(\alpha^\top z, \beta^\top z) \in R_{\varsigma_o}$, we have that p^* is in fact a function of $\alpha^\top z$ and $\beta^\top z$ and can be written as $p^* = \varphi(\alpha^\top z, \beta^\top z)$. Note it is clear that R_{ς_o} is a compact set in \mathbb{R}^2 and furthermore $R_{\varsigma_o} \subseteq \{(w, v) : |w| \leq u_a + \varsigma_o, |v| \leq u_b + \varsigma_o\}$ by Assumption 2.1(a) and (c).

We next prove that $\varphi(w, v)$ is continuous over R_{ς_o} by Berge's Maximum Theorem (Berge, 1957). To apply Berge's Maximum Theorem, we first define $\Gamma(w, v) = [l, u]$ for any w, v . Note that $\Gamma(w, v)$ is a set-valued function and is continuous at any (w, v) . By the definition of $\varphi(w, v)$, we have that

$$\varphi(w, v) = \arg \max_{p \in [l, u]} p \cdot \psi'(w - vp) = \arg \max_{p \in \Gamma(w, v)} p \cdot \psi'(w - vp).$$

By Assumption 2.1(e), $p \cdot \psi'(w - vp)$ is a continuous function of (p, w, v) . Together with the fact that $\Gamma(w, v)$ is continuous at any (w, v) , by Berge's Maximum Theorem, we have that $\varphi(w, v)$ (as a set-valued function) is upper hemicontinuous at any (w, v) . Moreover, by the above discussion, we know that $\varphi(w, v)$ is indeed a function over R_{ς_o} . Thus, by the definition of upper hemicontinuity, we have that $\varphi(w, v)$ is continuous over R_{ς_o} .

We now further show that $\varphi(w, v)$ is a continuously differentiable function over R_{ς_o} based on an application of the implicit function theorem. For any fixed $(w_o, v_o) \in R_{\varsigma_o}$, by Assumption 2.2, there is a unique optimal price $p^* \in (l, u)$. Note that by Assumption 2.1(e), the revenue function $r(p; w_o, v_o) = p \cdot \psi'(w_o - v_o p)$ is twice continuously differentiable. Define $f(p; w_o, v_o) = \psi'(w_o - v_o p) - p \psi'(w_o - v_o p) v_o$, which is the derivative of $r(p; w_o, v_o)$. Since p^* is the unique maximizer of $r(p; w_o, v_o)$, we therefore have

that $f(p^*; w_o, v_o) = 0$ and $f'(p^*; w_o, v_o) < 0$. Therefore, viewing $f(p; w, v) = \psi'(w - vp) - p\psi'(w - vp)v$ as a trivariate function of (w, v, p) , by the implicit function theorem, we have that there exists a continuously differentiable function $g(w, v)$ (that may depend on (w_o, v_o)) such that for all points (w, v) in a small neighborhood of (w_o, v_o) , we have that $f(g(w, v), w, v) = 0$. By definition, this $g(w, v)$ is the optimal price p^* at (w, v) . On the other hand, by our above result, we know that $p^* = \varphi(w, v)$. Therefore, we have that $\varphi(w, v) = g(w, v)$ for all (w, v) in R_{ζ_o} and thus $\varphi(w, v)$ is continuously differentiable over R_{ζ_o} , which completes the proof. \square

Proposition S.2.2. Suppose Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. For any $\delta \in (0, 1/3)$, set $\tau = \sqrt{Td \log(1/\delta)}$.

For any T satisfying

$$T \geq B_{E4} \cdot \frac{d^2 + (\log(1/\delta))^2}{d\lambda_z^4}, \quad (\text{S.16})$$

we have that, with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$, the regret of ETC is upper bounded by

$$R_T \leq B_{E5} \cdot \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)} \cdot \bar{\lambda}_z / \lambda_z,$$

where $B_{E4}, B_{E5} > 0$ are absolute constants that only depend on quantities in Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2. In particular, setting $\delta = 1/T$, we have that $\mathbb{E}(R_T) \lesssim \sqrt{dT \log(T)} \cdot \bar{\lambda}_z / \lambda_z$.

The details of B_{E4}, B_{E5} can be found in the proof of Proposition S.2.2. Recall that we denote $\bar{\lambda}_z = \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z)$. Proposition S.2.2 implies that if the largest and smallest eigenvalues of Σ_z are of the same order, then without increasing regret, the sample size condition of T for ETC in (9) of Theorem 2.3 can be relaxed to (S.16), similar to the one required by supCB as in Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.3 and Proposition S.2.2. We prove Theorem 2.3 and Proposition S.2.2 together here. First, the sample size condition on T in (9) in Theorem 2.3 can be explicitly written as

$$T \geq \left(\frac{u_x^{16}}{L_p^8 \lambda_z^8} \vee \frac{4u_x^8}{L_p^4 \lambda_z^4} \vee \frac{144\sigma^4}{L_p^2 \lambda_z^2 \kappa^4 \zeta_o^4} \right) \left(c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right)^4 / d. \quad (\text{S.17})$$

Furthermore, the sample size condition on T in (S.16) in Proposition S.2.2 can be explicitly written

as

$$T \geq \left(\frac{4u_x^8}{L_p^4 \lambda_z^4} \vee \frac{144\sigma^4}{L_p^2 \lambda_z^2 \kappa^4 \zeta_o^4} \right) \left(c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right)^4 / d. \quad (\text{S.18})$$

Recall that we denote $u_x = \sqrt{1+u^2}$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are absolute constants from the concentration inequalities used in Lemma S.2.1.

We now give the proof in three steps.

(I). Bounds for estimation error and design matrix: Denote Ψ as the index set consisting of price experiments. By design, $\tau = |\Psi|$. Denote $V = \sum_{t \in \Psi} x_t x_t^\top$ and denote $\hat{\theta}$ as the MLE based on Ψ . By Assumption 2.1(b) and its follow-up discussion, we have that $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) \geq L_p \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)$.

Set $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = \delta$ and define

$$B_0 := \frac{3\sigma^2}{\kappa^2 \zeta_o^2} (d + \log(1/\delta_2)) \text{ and } B_1 := \frac{\tau \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)}{4}.$$

By simple algebra and Lemma S.2.1(ii), for any τ such that

$$\tau > 2u_x^4 \left(\frac{c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta_1)}}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)} \right)^2, \quad (\text{S.19})$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta_1$, we have that $\lambda_{\min}(V) \geq B_1$. In the ETC algorithm, we set $\tau = \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)}$. Therefore, under condition (S.18), by simple algebra, we have $\tau = \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)}$ satisfies (S.19) and furthermore $B_1 \geq B_0$.

Therefore, by Theorem 2.1 and a union bound argument, with probability at least $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2$, the event \mathcal{A} holds, where

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\| \leq \zeta_o \text{ and } (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top V (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) \leq \frac{12\sigma^2}{\kappa^2} \{d + \log(1/\delta_2)\} \\ &\text{and } \|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{3}\sigma}{\kappa \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)}} \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta_2)}{\tau}} \end{aligned} \right\}.$$

(II). High probability events: Denote Φ as the index set consisting of price explorations. By design, we have that $|\Phi| = T - \tau$. Denote $U = \sum_{i \in \Phi} z_i z_i^\top$. Set $\delta_3 = \delta$. By Lemma S.2.1(i), we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta_3$ the events \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} hold, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \left\{ \|V/\tau - \Sigma_x\|_{\text{op}} \leq \max(\varsigma_1, \varsigma_1^2) \right\}, \text{ with } \varsigma_1 = [\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)]^{-1} u_x^4 \{c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta_3)}\} / \sqrt{\tau}, \\ \mathcal{C} &= \left\{ \|U/(T - \tau) - \Sigma_z\|_{\text{op}} \leq \max(\varsigma_2, \varsigma_2^2) \right\}, \text{ with } \varsigma_2 = [\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)]^{-1} \{c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta_3)}\} / \sqrt{T - \tau}. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we assume that the good events \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} hold, which is of probability at least $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2 - \delta_3$. For $t \in \Phi$, denote the estimated optimal price based on $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$ as $\hat{p}_t = \arg \max_{p \in [l, u]} p \cdot \psi'(\hat{\alpha}^\top z_t - \hat{\beta}^\top z_t p)$. By Proposition S.2.1, we have that there exists a continuous function $\varphi(u, v)$ such that

$$\hat{p}_t = \varphi(\hat{\alpha}^\top z_t, \hat{\beta}^\top z_t)$$

for all $z_t \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma_o$. Moreover, $\varphi(v_1, v_2)$ is C_φ -Lipschitz continuous in u, v where C_φ is an absolute constant that only depends on ψ and the price range $[l, u]$. Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t \in \Phi} \{r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(\hat{p}_t, z_t, \theta^*)\} \\ &= \sum_{t \in \Phi} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2} r(\tilde{p}_t, z_t, \theta^*) \right| (p_t^* - \hat{p}_t)^2 \\ &\leq C_r C_\varphi^2 \sum_{t \in \Phi} [(\hat{\alpha}^\top z_t - \alpha^{*\top} z_t)^2 + (\hat{\beta}^\top z_t - \beta^{*\top} z_t)^2] \\ &= C_r C_\varphi^2 [(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*)^\top U (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^\top U (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)], \end{aligned} \tag{S.20}$$

where the first equality follows from a Taylor expansion with \tilde{p}_t between p_t^* and \hat{p}_t and the inequality follows from the fact that the second order derivative of $r(p, z_t, \theta^*)$ is upper bounded by $C_r := 2M_{\psi_2} u_b + u u_b^2 M_{\psi_3}$ for $p \in [l, u]$ due to the boundedness of $z_t^\top \alpha^*$ and $z_t^\top \beta^*$ and the differentiability of ψ in in Assumption 2.1. We now analyze the last term in more details. In particular, denote $N = T - \tau$, we consider two scenarios.

(III). Regret bounds: UNDER CONDITION (S.18) ON (d, T) : We have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*)^\top U (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^\top U (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \\ &= N(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*)^\top \Sigma_z (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*) + N(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^\top \Sigma_z (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \\ & \quad + (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*)^\top (U - N\Sigma_z) (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^\top (U - N\Sigma_z) (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \\ &\leq N\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z) \|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|^2 + N\|U/N - \Sigma_z\|_{\text{op}} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \left\{ N\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z) + \sqrt{N}[\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)]^{-1}(c_1\sqrt{d} + c_2\sqrt{\log(1/\delta_3)}) \right\} \frac{12\sigma^2}{\kappa^2\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)} \frac{d + \log(1/\delta_2)}{\tau} \\ &\leq \frac{T}{\tau} \frac{12\sigma^2\{d + \log(1/\delta_2)\}}{L_p\kappa^2} \left[\frac{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z)}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)} + \frac{c_1\sqrt{d} + c_2\sqrt{\log(1/\delta_3)}}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)^2\sqrt{T}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{12\sigma^2}{L_p\kappa^2} \left\{ \sqrt{dT/\log(1/\delta)} + \sqrt{T/d\log(1/\delta)} \right\} \left[\frac{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z)}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)} + \frac{c_1\sqrt{d} + c_2\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)^2\sqrt{T}} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{24\sigma^2}{L_p\kappa^2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z)}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)} \sqrt{dT\log(1/\delta)}, \tag{S.21}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact that events \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{C} hold and the last inequality follows from the fact that $\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z)/\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z) \geq 1$ and that under condition (S.18), we have $(c_1\sqrt{d} + c_2\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)})/(\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)^2\sqrt{T}) < 1$.

UNDER CONDITION (S.17) ON (d, T) : We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*)^\top U(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^\top U(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \\
&= N(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*)^\top \Sigma_z(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*) + N(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^\top \Sigma_z(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \\
&\quad + (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*)^\top (U - N\Sigma_z)(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^\top (U - N\Sigma_z)(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \\
&= N(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top (I_2 \otimes \Sigma_z)(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) + (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top (I_2 \otimes (U - N\Sigma_z))(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\
&\leq \frac{N}{L_p} (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top (\Sigma_p \otimes \Sigma_z)(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) + \|U - N\Sigma_z\|_{\text{op}} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|^2 \\
&= \frac{N}{L_p\tau} \cdot (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top V(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) + \frac{1}{L_p} \cdot (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top (N\Sigma_x - NV/\tau)(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) + \|U - N\Sigma_z\|_{\text{op}} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{N}{L_p\tau} \cdot (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top V(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) + \frac{N}{L_p} \|V/\tau - \Sigma_x\|_{\text{op}} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|^2 + N \|U/N - \Sigma_z\|_{\text{op}} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{T}{L_p\tau} \frac{12\sigma^2}{\kappa^2} (d + \log(1/\delta_2)) + \frac{T}{L_p\tau} \max(\varsigma_1, \varsigma_1^2) \cdot \frac{12\sigma^2(d + \log(1/\delta_2))}{\kappa^2\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)} + \frac{T}{\tau} \cdot \frac{12\sigma^2(d + \log(1/\delta_2))}{L_p\kappa^2} \\
&= \frac{T}{\tau} \cdot \frac{12\sigma^2(d + \log(1/\delta))}{L_p\kappa^2} \left\{ 2 + \frac{\max(\varsigma_1, \varsigma_1^2)}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)} \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{T}{\tau} \cdot \frac{36\sigma^2(d + \log(1/\delta))}{L_p\kappa^2} \leq \frac{36\sigma^2}{L_p\kappa^2} \sqrt{dT\log(1/\delta)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from fact that the minimum eigenvalue of Σ_p is lower bounded by L_p , the third inequality follows from the fact that the events \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} hold and the proof of (S.21), the fourth inequality follows from the fact that under condition (S.17), we have $\varsigma_1/\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) < 1$.

By Lemma S.2.2, we have that $r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) \leq uM_{\psi 1}$. Therefore, with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$, under condition (S.18) we have that

$$R_T = \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p_t, z_t, \theta^*) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(\hat{p}_t, z_t, \theta^*)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)} uM_{\psi_1} + C_r C_\varphi^2 \cdot \frac{24\sigma^2}{L_p \kappa^2} \cdot \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z)}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)} \cdot \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)} \\
&\leq \left(uM_{\psi_1} + \frac{24\sigma^2 C_r C_\varphi^2}{L_p \kappa^2} \right) \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_z)}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_z)} \cdot \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)},
\end{aligned}$$

and under condition (S.17) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
R_T &= \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p_t, z_t, \theta^*) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(\hat{p}_t, z_t, \theta^*) \\
&\leq \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)} uM_{\psi_1} + C_r C_\varphi^2 \frac{36\sigma^2}{L_p \kappa^2} \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)} \leq \left(uM_{\psi_1} + \frac{36\sigma^2 C_r C_\varphi^2}{L_p \kappa^2} \right) \sqrt{dT \log(1/\delta)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The expectation bound follows directly with $\delta = 1/T$ and thus completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. The proof is similar to that of Theorem S.2.1.

It is easy to see that the total rounds up to the k th episode is $2^{k+1} - 2$. For any T , there exists a $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $2^{k+1} - 2 \leq T < 2^{k+2} - 2$. Denote $\bar{T} = 2^{k+2} - 2$. Clearly, $R_T \leq R_{\bar{T}}$. Therefore, in the following, we focus on the analysis of $R_{\bar{T}}$, which is the total regret till the $k+1$ th episode. Define

$$j = \min_i \left\{ i \in \mathbb{N}_+ : 2^i \geq \sqrt{d\bar{T}} \right\}.$$

To establish the high probability bound, we decompose the regret $R_{\bar{T}}$ into $R^{(1)}$, which accounts for regret from episode $i = 1, \dots, j-1$, and $R^{(2)}$, which accounts for regret from episode $i = j, j+1, \dots, k+1$. Denote $E_i = 2^i$ as the length of the i th episode. First, by Lemma S.2.2, we have that $r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) \leq uM_{\psi_1}$, hence

$$R^{(1)} \leq uM_{\psi_1} \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} E_i = uM_{\psi_1} \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} 2^i \leq uM_{\psi_1} 2^j \leq 2uM_{\psi_1} \sqrt{d\bar{T}}.$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of j .

Second, by assumption, we know that $E_j \geq \sqrt{d\bar{T}} \geq T_d^*$. In other words, Theorem 2.3 applies to all episodes $j, j+1, \dots, k+1$. Note that $\sum_{i=j}^{k+1} \sqrt{2^i} \leq 2.5\sqrt{2^{k+2}}$. For $R^{(2)}$, by union bound and Theorem 2.3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
R^{(2)} &\leq \left[uM_{\psi_1} + 36\sigma^2 C_r C_\varphi^2 / (L_p \kappa^2) \right] \sum_{i=j}^{k+1} \sqrt{E_i d \log E_i} \\
&\leq \left[uM_{\psi_1} + 36\sigma^2 C_r C_\varphi^2 / (L_p \kappa^2) \right] 2.5 \sqrt{2^{k+2} d \log T} \\
&\leq \left[4uM_{\psi_1} + 144\sigma^2 C_r C_\varphi^2 / (L_p \kappa^2) \right] \sqrt{T d \log T}
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least

$$1 - \sum_{i=j}^{k+1} 3/E_i \geq 1 - 3/2^{j-1} \geq 1 - 6/\sqrt{dT},$$

where the second inequality holds by definition of j . □

S.2.4 The MLE-cycle algorithm and a simple modification

The MLE-Cycle algorithm is first proposed in [Broder and Rusmevichientong \(2012\)](#) for dynamic pricing under an unknown demand model with no covariates (i.e. context-free) and is shown to provide a regret of order $O(\sqrt{T})$. We summarize MLE-Cycle in [Algorithm S.1](#). A (slight) variant of MLE-Cycle is further introduced in [Ban and Keskin \(2021\)](#) for contextual dynamic pricing with a d -dimensional covariate and is shown to provide a regret of order $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$.

The key idea of the MLE-Cycle algorithm is to divide the horizon $[1, \infty)$ into cycles of increasing lengths. In particular, the c th cycle is of length $c + k$, where k is a constant. Within each cycle, the first k rounds are allocated for price experiments and the next c rounds are used for price exploitation. By simple algebra, it is easy to see that for all sufficiently large T , the number of price experiments conducted till the T th round is of order $O(k\sqrt{T})$.

In the above mentioned literature, k is set as an absolute constant (typically 2) and MLE-Cycle gives a regret of order $O(d\sqrt{T})$, which is sub-optimal. The intuitive reason is that since k is a constant that does not increase with the dimension d , the number of exploration is of order $O(\sqrt{T})$ instead of the desired $O(\sqrt{dT \log T})$. In other words, the (original) MLE-Cycle algorithm under-explores. Therefore, a simple fix is to make k increase with the dimension d . In particular, in the modified MLE-Cycle algorithm, we set the length of price experiments for the c th cycle as

$$k = \sqrt{d \log(2c)}.$$

By simple algebra, for all sufficiently large T , the number of price experiments conducted by the modified MLE-Cycle till the T th round is of order $O(\sqrt{dT \log T})$. Using similar arguments as the ones in our proof of [Theorem 2.3](#), we can show that, under similar conditions as the ones used in [Theorem 2.4](#), the modified MLE-Cycle can achieve the near-optimal regret of order $O(\sqrt{dT \log T})$.

Algorithm S.1 The MLE-Cycle algorithm for dynamic pricing

Input: Price interval $[l, u]$, exploration length k and $\Psi = \emptyset$.

for cycles $c = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

a. (Exploration): For the first k rounds, randomly choose $p_t \in [l, u]$, and record y_t and $x_t = (z_t^\top, -p_t z_t^\top)^\top$ into the price experiment set Ψ .

c. (Estimation): Obtain MLE $\hat{\theta}$ based on observations in Ψ .

d. (Exploitation): For the next c rounds, offer the greedy price at $p^*(\hat{\theta}, z_t)$ based on $\hat{\theta}$.

end for

S.3 Technical details in Section 3

S.3.1 LDP guarantees

Lemma S.3.1 is directly from Section I.2 in [Duchi et al. \(2018\)](#) and we omit its proof. It ensures the LDP guarantees of Algorithm 6.

Lemma S.3.1. Let $W(g)$ be the output of L_2 -ball(g, C_g, ϵ). Then, $W(g)$ is an ϵ -LDP view of g , and $\mathbb{E}[W(g)|g] = g$ and $\|W(g)\| = C_g r_{\epsilon, d}$.

Proposition S.3.1. The LDP-ETC policy is ϵ -LDP.

Proof of Proposition S.3.1. Note that by design of ETC-LDP, for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\|g_t^{[C]}(\theta; s_t)\| \leq C_g$.

Define the truncation mechanism of g_t as the mapping of $T : g_t \mapsto g_t^{[C]}$, and the L_2 -ball mechanism as $W : g_t^{[C]} \mapsto w_t$, then our mechanism is a composition of truncation and L_2 -ball, i.e. $W \circ T : g_t \mapsto w_t$.

By definition, for all $w_{<t}$, g_t and g'_t , we have for any measurable set S ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W(T(g_t)) \in S | w_{<t}) &= \mathbb{P}(W(g_t^{[C]}) \in S | w_{<t}) \\ &\leq \exp(\epsilon) \mathbb{P}(W(g_t'^{[C]}) \in S | w_{<t}) = \exp(\epsilon) \mathbb{P}(W(T(g'_t)) \in S | w_{<t}), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds by Lemma S.3.1 and the definition of LDP. This implies that $W \circ T$ is an ϵ -LDP mechanism. We note that no privacy issue is involved for $t > \tau$. \square

S.3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

This section collects the proof of Theorem 3.1 and auxiliary lemmas. Recall that

$$l(\theta; s_t) = y_t x_t^\top \theta - \psi(x_t^\top \theta) \quad \text{and} \quad g(\theta; s_t) = [y_t - \psi'(x_t^\top \theta)] x_t,$$

are the stochastic likelihood function and the stochastic gradient function, respectively, with their population counterparts being

$$l(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[y_t x_t^\top \theta - \psi(x_t^\top \theta)] \quad \text{and} \quad g(\theta) = \mathbb{E}\{[y_t - \psi'(x_t^\top \theta)]x_t\}. \quad (\text{S.22})$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By Taylor expansion, for any $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$, and some $\tilde{\theta}$ in between, we have

$$l(\theta_1) - l(\theta_2) = g(\theta_2)^\top (\theta_1 - \theta_2) - \frac{1}{2} (\theta_1 - \theta_2)^\top \mathbb{E}[\psi''(x_t^\top \tilde{\theta}) x_t^\top x_t] (\theta_1 - \theta_2).$$

Therefore, under Assumption 3.1, we have that the negative likelihood function $-\ell(\theta)$ is $\kappa^* \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)$ -strongly convex i.e.

$$l(\theta_2) - l(\theta_1) + g(\theta_2)^\top (\theta_1 - \theta_2) \geq \frac{\kappa^* \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)}{2} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2. \quad (\text{S.23})$$

Note that $l(\theta^*) \geq l(\theta)$ for any $\theta \in \Theta$, and $g(\theta^*) = 0$, by setting $\theta_2 = \theta^*$ and $\theta_1 = \theta$, we thus have

$$l(\theta^*) - l(\theta) \geq \frac{\kappa^* \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)}{2} \|\theta^* - \theta\|^2. \quad (\text{S.24})$$

Recall that $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) \geq L_p \lambda_z$ by (7), given that $\zeta_t \leq \kappa^* \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)$, for all $1 \leq t \leq \tau$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\theta}_t - \theta^*\|^2 \\ &= \|\Pi_\Theta[\hat{\theta}_{t-1} + \eta_t w_t] - \theta^*\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|\hat{\theta}_{t-1} + \eta_t w_t - \theta^*\|^2 \\ &= \|\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*\|^2 + 2\eta_t w_t^\top (\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*) + \eta_t^2 \|w_t\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \|\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*\|^2 + 2\eta_t g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1})^\top (\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*) + 2\eta_t [w_t - g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1})]^\top (\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*) + \eta_t^2 C_g^2 r_{\epsilon,d}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} (1 - 2\eta_t \zeta_t) \|\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*\|^2 + 2\eta_t [w_t - g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1})]^\top (\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*) + \eta_t^2 C_g^2 r_{\epsilon,d}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.25})$$

where (a) holds by noting $\theta^* \in \Theta$, (b) holds since $\|w_t\| = C_g r_{\epsilon,d}$ due to Lemma S.3.1, and (c) holds by (S.23), (S.24) and the fact that $\zeta_t \leq \kappa^* \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)$, such that

$$g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1})^\top (\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*) \leq -\frac{\zeta_t}{2} \|\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*\|^2 + l(\hat{\theta}_{t-1}) - l(\theta^*) \leq -\zeta_t \|\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*\|^2.$$

Hence, we have

$$\|\hat{\theta}_t - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{2}{t}\right) \|\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*\|^2 + \frac{2}{\zeta_t t} [w_t - g(\hat{\theta}_{t-1})]^\top (\hat{\theta}_{t-1} - \theta^*) + \frac{C_g^2 r_{\epsilon,d}^2}{\zeta_t^2 t^2}.$$

Therefore, by iteration, with the convention $\prod_{j=t+1}^t = 1$, we have that for $t \geq 2$,

$$\|\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{\zeta_l} \sum_{i=2}^t \frac{1}{i} \prod_{j=i+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{2}{j}\right) [w_i - g(\widehat{\theta}_{i-1})]^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*) + \frac{C_g^2 r_{\epsilon,d}^2}{\zeta_l^2} \sum_{i=2}^t \frac{1}{i^2} \prod_{j=i+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{2}{j}\right).$$

Using the fact that $\prod_{j=i+1}^t (1 - 2/j) = i(i-1)/[t(t-1)]$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=2}^t \frac{1}{i} \prod_{j=i+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{2}{j}\right) [w_i - g(\widehat{\theta}_{i-1})]^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*) &= \frac{1}{t(t-1)} \sum_{i=2}^t (i-1) [w_i - g(\widehat{\theta}_{i-1})]^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*), \\ \sum_{i=2}^t \frac{1}{i^2} \prod_{j=i+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{2}{j}\right) &\leq \frac{1}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have for all $2 \leq t \leq \tau$,

$$\|\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{\zeta_l(t-1)t} \sum_{i=2}^t (i-1) [w_i - g(\widehat{\theta}_{i-1})]^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*) + \frac{C_g^2 r_{\epsilon,d}^2}{\zeta_l^2 t}. \quad (\text{S.26})$$

Define $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(w_t, s_t, w_{t-1}, s_{t-1}, \dots)$, and $\widetilde{g}_i^{[C]} = \mathbb{E}[g_i^{[C]} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$. To handle the bias due to the truncation, in the following analysis, we decompose $w_i - g(\widehat{\theta}_{i-1})$ into a bias term, $l_i^b = \widetilde{g}_i^{[C]} - g(\widehat{\theta}_{i-1})$, and a variance term, $l_i^v = w_i - \widetilde{g}_i^{[C]}$. Based on (S.26), we thus have that for $t \leq \tau$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta^*\|^2 &\leq \frac{2}{\zeta_l(t-1)t} \sum_{i=2}^t (i-1) [l_i^b]^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*) + \frac{2}{\zeta_l(t-1)t} \sum_{i=2}^t (i-1) [l_i^v]^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*) + \frac{C_g^2 r_{\epsilon,d}^2}{\zeta_l^2 t} \\ &:= R_{t1} + R_{t2} + \frac{C_g^2 r_{\epsilon,d}^2}{\zeta_l^2 t}. \end{aligned}$$

[Bound for R_{t1}]: Note that $g(\widehat{\theta}_{i-1}) = \mathbb{E}[g(\widehat{\theta}_{i-1}; s_i) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$ since $\{s_t\}_{t=1}^\tau$ is i.i.d., we have $l_i^b = \mathbb{E}[g_i^{[C]} - g_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$. By Jensen's inequality and triangle inequality,

$$\|l_i^b\| = \|\mathbb{E}[g_i^{[C]} - g_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]\| \leq \mathbb{E}[\|g_i^{[C]} - g_i\| | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \leq \mathbb{E}[(\|g_i\| - C_g) \mathbb{I}(\|g_i\| > C_g) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}].$$

Recall that $g_i = [y_i - \psi'(x_i^\top \widehat{\theta}_{i-1})] x_i$. Hence, using $\|x_i\| \leq \sqrt{1+u^2}$, $|y_i| \leq M_{\psi_1}^* + |\varepsilon_i|$ and $|\psi'(x_i^\top \widehat{\theta}_i)| \leq M_{\psi_1}^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|l_i^b\| &\leq \sqrt{1+u^2} \mathbb{E} \left[(|y_i - \psi'(x_i^\top \widehat{\theta}_i)| - 2M_{\psi_1}^* - 2\sigma \log^{1/2} \tau) \mathbb{I}(\|g_i\| > C_g) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \right] \\ &= \sqrt{1+u^2} \mathbb{E} \left[(|\varepsilon_i + \psi'(x_i^\top \theta^*) - \psi'(x_i^\top \widehat{\theta}_i)| - 2M_{\psi_1}^* - 2\sigma \log^{1/2} \tau) \mathbb{I}(\|g_i\| > C_g) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{1+u^2} \mathbb{E} \left[(|\varepsilon_i| - 2\sigma \log^{1/2} \tau) \mathbb{I}(\|g_i\| > C_g) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{1+u^2} \mathbb{E} \left[(|\varepsilon_i| - 2\sigma \log^{1/2} \tau) \mathbb{I}(|\varepsilon_i| > 2\sigma \log^{1/2} \tau) \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{1+u^2} \left[\sqrt{(\mathbb{E}\varepsilon_i^2) \mathbb{P}(|\varepsilon_i| > 2\sigma \log^{1/2} \tau)} - 2\sigma \log^{1/2} \tau \mathbb{P}(|\varepsilon_i| > 2\sigma \log^{1/2} \tau) \right] \\ &\leq 4\sigma \sqrt{1+u^2} [\tau^{-1} - \tau^{-2} \log^{1/2} \tau] \leq 2\sqrt{1+u^2} \sigma \tau^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.27})$$

where the third inequality holds since $\{\|g_i\| > C_g\} \subset \{|\varepsilon_i| > 2\sigma \log^{1/2} \tau\}$ and the independence between ε_i and \mathcal{F}_{i-1} , and the fourth holds by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the last by Assumption 2.1(d) and Chernoff bound with $\tau \geq 4$.

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Assumption 3.1 (a), and (S.27), we have

$$R_{t_1} \leq \frac{2}{\zeta_l(t-1)t} \sum_{i=2}^t (i-1) \|\iota_i^b\| \|\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*\| \leq \frac{2c_\theta \sigma \sqrt{1+u^2}}{\zeta_l \tau}. \quad (\text{S.28})$$

[Bound for R_{t_2}]: Note that

$$\mathbb{E}(w_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(W(g_i^{[C]} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}, s_t) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1})] = \mathbb{E}(g_i^{[C]} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}),$$

where the first equality holds by the tower property of conditional expectation, and the second by the fact that the L_2 -ball mechanism ensures $\mathbb{E}(W(g_i^{[C]} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}, s_t) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) = g_i^{[C]}$, due to Lemma S.3.1.

This further implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\{[w_i - \widetilde{g}_i^{[C]}]^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}\} = [\mathbb{E}(w_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) - \widetilde{g}_i^{[C]}]^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*) = 0. \quad (\text{S.29})$$

Hence, $\{(\iota_i^v)^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*)\}$ forms a sequence of martingale differences.

By triangle inequality and Lemma S.3.1, $\|\iota_i^v\| \leq \|w_i\| + \|\widetilde{g}_i^{[C]}\| \leq C_g(r_{\epsilon,d} + 1) \leq 2C_g r_{\epsilon,d}$, thus

$$\sum_{i=2}^t \text{Var} \left\{ (i-1) (\iota_i^v)^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \right\} \leq 4C_g^2 r_{\epsilon,d}^2 \sum_{i=2}^t (i-1)^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*\|^2.$$

In addition, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have for $i \leq t$,

$$|(i-1) (\iota_i^v)^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*)| \leq 2(i-1) C_g r_{\epsilon,d} c_\theta \leq 2(t-1) C_g c_\theta r_{\epsilon,d}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma S.3.2 with $V_t = 4C_g^2 r_{\epsilon,d}^2 \sum_{i=2}^t (i-1)^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*\|^2$, $b = 2(t-1) C_g c_\theta r_{\epsilon,d}$, we have that with probability larger than $1 - \delta \log \tau$, for all $2 \leq t \leq \tau$, and $\tau \geq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=2}^t (i-1) (\iota_i^v)^\top (\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*) \\ & \leq 4C_g r_{\epsilon,d} \max \left\{ 2 \sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^t (i-1)^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*\|^2}, c_\theta (t-1) \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right\} \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.30})$$

[Finish the proof]: Combining (S.26), (S.28) and (S.30), thus with probability larger than $1 - \delta \log \tau$,

for all $2 \leq t \leq \tau$, we have

$$\|\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \frac{8C_g r_{\epsilon,d}}{\zeta_l(t-1)t} \max \left\{ 2 \sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^t (i-1)^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*\|^2}, c_\theta (t-1) \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right\} \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{2c_\theta\sigma\sqrt{1+u^2}}{\zeta_l\tau} + \frac{C_g^2r_{\epsilon,d}^2}{\zeta_l^2t} \\
& \leq \frac{16C_g r_{\epsilon,d}\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\zeta_l(t-1)t} \sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^t (i-1)^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*\|^2} \\
& \quad + \frac{8C_g r_{\epsilon,d}c_\theta\log(1/\delta)\zeta_l + 2c_\theta\sigma\sqrt{1+u^2}\zeta_l + C_g^2r_{\epsilon,d}^2}{\zeta_l^2t} \\
& := \frac{\varrho_2}{(t-1)t} \sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^t (i-1)^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_{i-1} - \theta^*\|^2} + \frac{\varrho_3}{t},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varrho_2 = \zeta_l^{-1}16C_g r_{\epsilon,d}\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}$, and $\varrho_3 = \zeta_l^{-2}8C_g r_{\epsilon,d}c_\theta\log(1/\delta)\zeta_l + 2c_\theta\sigma\sqrt{1+u^2}\zeta_l + C_g^2r_{\epsilon,d}^2$.

We now show that for some ϱ_1 ,

$$\|\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta^*\|^2 \leq \varrho_1/(t+1).$$

By induction, it suffices to find a such that

$$\frac{\varrho_1}{t+1} \geq \frac{\varrho_2}{(t-1)t} \sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^t (i-1)^2 \frac{\varrho_1}{i}} + \frac{\varrho_3}{t}.$$

By elementary but tedious algebra, it is sufficient to let $\varrho_1 \geq 9\varrho_2^2/4 + 3\varrho_3$, which gives

$$\varrho_1 = \frac{576C_g^2r_{\epsilon,d}^2\log(1/\delta) + 3\left\{8C_g r_{\epsilon,d}c_\theta\log(1/\delta)\zeta_l + 2c_\theta\sigma\sqrt{1+u^2}\zeta_l + C_g^2r_{\epsilon,d}^2\right\}}{\zeta_l^2}.$$

Note that $r_{\epsilon,d} \asymp \sqrt{d}\epsilon^{-1}$, we thus have

$$\varrho_1 \lesssim \frac{dC_g^2\log(1/\delta)}{\zeta_l^2\epsilon^2} \vee \frac{\sqrt{d}C_g\log(1/\delta)}{\zeta_l\epsilon} \lesssim \frac{dC_g^2\log(1/\delta)}{\zeta_l^2\epsilon^2},$$

where we hide the constant dependent on c_θ , u and σ . \square

The following lemma gives a uniform concentration inequality for martingale difference sequences, which is useful for bounding the variance component of the SGD estimator in Theorem 3.1.

Lemma S.3.2 (Lemma 3 in [Rakhlin et al. \(2011\)](#)). Suppose X_1, \dots, X_τ is a martingale difference sequence with natural filtration $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_t)$. Suppose $|X_t| \leq b$, and let $V_s = \sum_{t=1}^s \text{Var}(X_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})$, then for any $0 < \delta < e^{-1}$, and $\tau \geq 4$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{t=1}^s X_t > 2\max\left\{2\sqrt{V_s}, b\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}\right\}\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}, \text{ for some } s \leq \tau\right) \leq \log(\tau)\delta.$$

S.3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.2

This subsection collects the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. First, the sample size condition on T in (15) in Theorem 3.2 can be explicitly written as

$$T \geq 2\lambda_z^{-4} [B_{L1}^2 \varsigma_o^{-4} \epsilon^{-2} \log T \log(1/\delta) \vee d], \quad (\text{S.31})$$

where $B_{L1} > 0$ is the absolute constant in Theorem 3.1.

We now give the proof. We partition the horizon T into two parts, denoted by Ψ with $|\Psi| = \tau$, and Φ with $|\Phi| = T - \tau$, corresponding to the sets of exploration and exploitation, respectively.

Let $U = \sum_{t \in \Phi} z_t z_t^\top$, then by Lemma S.2.1(i), we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$ such that event \mathcal{C} holds, where

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \|U/(T - \tau) - \Sigma_z\|_{op} \leq \max(\varsigma_2, \varsigma_2^2) \right\}, \text{ with } \varsigma_2 = \lambda_z^{-1} (c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}) / \sqrt{T - \tau}.$$

By similar arguments used in establishing (S.21) in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\hat{\alpha}_\tau - \alpha^*)^\top U (\hat{\alpha}_\tau - \alpha^*) + (\hat{\beta}_\tau - \beta^*)^\top U (\hat{\beta}_\tau - \beta^*) \\ & \leq (T - \tau) \bar{\lambda}_z \|\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*\|^2 + (T - \tau) \|U/(T - \tau) - \Sigma_z\|_{op} \|\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*\|^2 \\ & \leq \left((T - \tau) \bar{\lambda}_z + \sqrt{(T - \tau)} \lambda_z^{-1} (c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}) \right) \|\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*\|^2. \\ & \leq \frac{T B_{L1} d \log \tau \log(1/\delta)}{\tau \epsilon^2 \lambda_z} \left[\frac{\bar{\lambda}_z}{\lambda_z} + \frac{c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}{\lambda_z^2 \sqrt{T}} \right] \\ & \leq 2 \frac{T B_{L1} d \log T \log(1/\delta) \bar{\lambda}_z}{\tau \epsilon^2 \lambda_z^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality holds by noting Theorem 3.1 with $c_l = 1$, and the last inequality holds by the fact that $(c_1 \sqrt{d} + c_2 \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}) / (\lambda_z^2 \sqrt{T}) \leq 1 \leq \bar{\lambda}_z / \lambda_z$ under (S.31).

Note that under (S.31) and the setting of τ , we have that $\tau \geq B_{L1} d \log T \log(1/\delta) / (\lambda_z \epsilon \varsigma_o)^2$. Hence by Theorem 3.1, $\|\hat{\theta}_\tau - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma_o$. Then, by Lemma S.2.2, and equation (S.20) in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} R_T &= \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(p_t, z_t, \theta^*) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T r(p_t^*, z_t, \theta^*) - r(\hat{p}_t, z_t, \theta^*) \\ &\leq \tau u M_{\psi_1} + 2C_r C_\varphi^2 B_{L1} \frac{T d \log T \log(1/\delta) \bar{\lambda}_z}{\tau \epsilon^2 \lambda_z^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.32})$$

The high probability bound thus follows by letting $\tau = d \sqrt{\log T \log(1/\delta) T} / \epsilon$ and noting $c_{\lambda_1} / d \leq \lambda_z \leq \bar{\lambda}_z \leq c_{\lambda_2} / d$ under Assumption 3.1.

If $\delta = T^{-1}$, R_T is upper bounded by (S.32) with probability at least $1 - \log T/T$. Otherwise, R_T is always upper bounded by $uM_{\psi_1}T$. Hence the expectation bound follows. \square

S.4 Technical details in Section 4

S.4.1 Lower bound construction

At a high level, we construct a set of 2^d revenue functions, indexed by the hyper parameter $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_d)^\top \in \{0, 1\}^d$ such that distinguishing $v_i = 0$ from $v_i = 1$ for each coordinate can only depend on the information from the i th covariate. This implies that learning the parameters associated with the i th covariate can only make use of the data sample of effective sample size of $O(T/d)$. In addition, by carefully crafting the model parameters, the revenue functions in the set are difficult to distinguish. Therefore, it is very costly to differentiate these functions, which will inevitably incur large regret.

Lower bounded construction Let $z_t = (\mathbb{I}(M_t = 1), \dots, \mathbb{I}(M_t = d))^\top \in \{0, 1\}^d$, where M_t is a multinomial distribution on $\{1, \dots, d\}$ with equal marginal probability. Consider the following demand model indexed by the hyper parameter $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_d)^\top \in \{0, 1\}^d$, such that

$$y_t = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[y_t | z_t, p_t] + \varepsilon_t, \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[y_t | z_t, p_t] := \lambda_{\mathbf{v}}(z_t, p_t) = 2 - p_t + \Delta \sum_{i=1}^d v_i (1 - p_t) \mathbb{I}(M_t = i), \quad (\text{S.33})$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is a sequence of independent $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variables, and $\Delta \in [0, 1/2]$ is a small quantity to be defined later.

Therefore, the instant revenue function (conditional on z_t, p_t) is

$$r(p_t, z_t, \theta^*) = p_t \lambda_{\mathbf{v}}(z_t, p_t).$$

This further implies that conditional on $\{M_t = i\}$ where $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we have that the optimal price takes the form

$$p^*(z_t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v_i = 0; \\ \frac{2+\Delta}{2+2\Delta}, & \text{if } v_i = 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.34})$$

For $M_t = i$, the instant regret associated with the policy π is given by

$$\text{regret}_t^\pi = \begin{cases} (p_t^\pi - 1)^2, & \text{if } v_i = 0; \\ (1 + \Delta)(p_t^\pi - \frac{2+\Delta}{2+2\Delta})^2 & \text{if } v_i = 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.35})$$

Define $S_p = \{p_t : |p_t - 1| \leq \Delta/6\}$. For $\Delta \leq 1/2$, it is clear that combined with (S.35), we have for $M_t = i$, it holds that

$$\text{regret}_t^\pi \geq \frac{\Delta^2}{36}, \quad \text{if } \begin{cases} p_t^\pi \in S_p^c \text{ and } v_i = 0; \\ p_t^\pi \in S_p \text{ and } v_i = 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S.36})$$

The property in (S.36) plays an important role in the subsequent analysis.

Proposition S.4.1 states that our lower bound instances constructed later in the proof of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 satisfy the corresponding assumptions in the upper bound results.

Proposition S.4.1. The lower bound construction in Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 satisfies Assumption 2.1 and 2.2. If $T \geq c\epsilon^{-2}d^4$ for some constant $c > 0$, then the parameter space in Theorem 4.2 satisfies Assumption 3.1.

Proof. For Assumption 2.1: Clearly, we have $\|z_t\| = 1$ and $\Sigma_z = d^{-1}I_d$, hence (a) and (b) are satisfied. Since $\alpha^* = 2 + \Delta\mathbf{v}$, $\beta^* = 1 + \Delta\mathbf{v}$, and $\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq 1$, we have $|z_t^\top \beta^*| \leq |z_t^\top \alpha^*| \leq 2 + \Delta \leq 3$. This implies that (c) is satisfied. The verification for (d) and (e) is trivial for linear model with Gaussian error.

For Assumption 2.2: We next show that it holds for $\varsigma_o = 1/16$ and $[l, u] = [1/3, 3/2]$. Due to the linearity of the demand function, we have that for any θ , $r(p, z_t, \theta)$ is uniquely maximized at $p_t^*(z_t, \theta) = z_t^\top \alpha / z_t^\top \beta$. It suffices to show that for $\|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq \varsigma_o$, we have $p_t^*(z_t, \theta) \in [1/3, 3/2]$. Without loss of generality, we can assume $M_t = i$, and hence $p_t^*(z_t, \theta) = \alpha_i / \beta_i$. We thus have

$$|p_t^*(z_t, \theta) - p_t^*(z_t, \theta^*)| \leq \beta_i^{-1} |\alpha_i^* - \alpha_i| + [(\beta_i^*)^{-1} - \beta_i^{-1}] \alpha_i^* \leq (\beta_i^* - \varsigma_o)^{-1} \varsigma_o + \alpha_i^* (\beta_i^* - \varsigma_o)^{-2} \varsigma_o,$$

where the last inequality holds by $|\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*|, |\beta_i - \beta_i^*| \leq \varsigma_o$. Using $\alpha_i^* \leq 3$, and $\beta_i^* \geq 1$, we have $|p_t^*(z_t, \theta) - p_t^*(z_t, \theta^*)| \leq \varsigma_o / (1 - \varsigma_o) + 3\varsigma_o / (1 - \varsigma_o)^2 = (4\varsigma_o - 3\varsigma_o^2) / (1 - \varsigma_o)^2 \leq 61/225 < 1/2$. Clearly, in view of (S.34), for $\Delta \leq 1/2$, we have $p_t^*(z_t, \theta^*) \in [5/6, 1] \subset [1/3, 3/2]$. This further implies that $p_t^*(z_t, \theta) \in [1/3, 3/2]$.

For Assumption 3.1: Note that in the proof of Theorem 4.2, we let $\Delta^2 = \sqrt{14}d / [672\epsilon\sqrt{T}]$. Hence, for any pairs of $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \in \{0, 1\}^d$, if $T \geq c\epsilon^{-2}d^4$, we have $\|\theta_{\mathbf{v}_1} - \theta_{\mathbf{v}_2}\|^2 \leq 2d\Delta^2 = \sqrt{14}/336\epsilon^{-1}d^2T^{-1/2} \leq \sqrt{14/c}/336$. Hence, letting $c_\theta^2 = \sqrt{14/c}/336$ is sufficient for (a). Part (b) is trivial. \square

S.4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We first provide a high probability concentration bounds on $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}(M_t = i)$, which implies the effective sample size for each coordinate of z_t is larger than $T/(2d)$. In particular, by Hoeffding's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i\} \geq T/d - \sqrt{T \log T}\right) \geq 1 - T^{-2}. \quad (\text{S.37})$$

We define \mathcal{A}_i as the above high probability event, i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i\} \geq T/d - \sqrt{T \log T} \right\}, \quad (\text{S.38})$$

such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq 1 - T^{-2}$. The subsequent analysis is conducted on the event $\mathcal{A} = \cap_{i=1}^d \mathcal{A}_i$, which, by union bound, holds with probability larger than $1 - dT^{-2}$.

Next, we lower bound the regret by the classification error, which is typically known as the Asouad's method. We construct a classifier using data $s_t = \{z_t, p_t, y_t\}$ such that $\psi : (s_1, \dots, s_T) \rightarrow \{\hat{v}_i\}_{i=1}^d \in \{0, 1\}^d$. In particular, given a policy π , let

$$\gamma_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i, p_t^\pi \in S_p\}, \quad \zeta_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i, p_t^\pi \in S_p^c\}. \quad (\text{S.39})$$

The classifier is given as

$$\hat{v}_i := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \gamma_i \leq \zeta_i; \\ 0, & \text{if } \gamma_i > \zeta_i. \end{cases}$$

We then show that large classification error will lead to large regret.

Lemma S.4.1. For any non-anticipating policy π , with probability at least $1 - dT^{-2}$, we have that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t^\pi \geq \frac{1}{144} T \Delta^2 d^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i).$$

Proof. Suppose $v_i = 0$ and $\hat{v}_i = 1$. This means $\gamma_i \leq \zeta_i$, and hence

$$2\zeta_i \geq \gamma_i + \zeta_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i\}.$$

Therefore, given that $\sqrt{T/\log T} \geq 2d$, on \mathcal{A}_i we have

$$\zeta_i \geq T/(4d). \quad (\text{S.40})$$

Similarly, if $v_i = 1$ and $\hat{v}_i = 0$, we have

$$\gamma_i \geq T/(4d). \quad (\text{S.41})$$

Hence, if $\hat{v}_i \neq v_i$, we have either γ_i or ζ_i is at least $T/(4d)$.

Recall we assume $\mathcal{A} = \cap_{i=1}^d \mathcal{A}_i$ holds, which holds with probability larger than $1 - dT^{-2}$. Thus, we have that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t^\pi &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\text{regret}_t^\pi \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(M_t = i) \right] \\
&\geq \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\text{regret}_t^\pi \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(M_t = i, \hat{v}_i \neq v_i) \right] \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \text{regret}_t^\pi \mathbb{I}(M_t = i, v_i = 0, \hat{v}_i = 1) + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \text{regret}_t^\pi \mathbb{I}(M_t = i, v_i = 1, \hat{v}_i = 0) \\
&\geq \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \text{regret}_t^\pi \mathbb{I}(M_t = i, p_t^\pi \in S_p^c, v_i = 0, \hat{v}_i = 1) \\
&\quad + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \text{regret}_t^\pi \mathbb{I}(M_t = i, p_t^\pi \in S_p, v_i = 1, \hat{v}_i = 0) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\Delta^2}{36} [\mathbb{I}(M_t = i, p_t^\pi \in S_p^c, v_i = 0, \hat{v}_i = 1) + \mathbb{I}(M_t = i, p_t^\pi \in S_p, v_i = 1, \hat{v}_i = 0)] \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \frac{\Delta^2}{36} \frac{T}{4d} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i),
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds by noting $1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(M_t = i)$, and (b) by (S.36), and (c) by (S.40) and (S.41). \square

Lemma S.4.2. For any non-anticipating policy π and classifier ψ , we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi, \psi} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i) \right] \geq \frac{d}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\Delta^2}{4d} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi [p_t - 1]^2} \right),$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{v}}$ denotes the mixture among all possible \mathbf{v} , i.e. $P_{\bar{\mathbf{v}}}^\pi := \sum_{\mathbf{v}} P_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi / 2^d$.

Proof. Define the symmetric Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between probability measure P and Q as $D_{KL}^{sy}(P, Q) = D_{KL}(P|Q) + D_{KL}(Q|P)$. Define

$$P_{+i}^\pi := \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}: v_i=1} P_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi, \quad P_{-i}^\pi := \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}: v_i=0} P_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi,$$

with $P_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi$ being the joint distribution of $\{s_1, \dots, s_T\}$ under model \mathbf{v} and policy π . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi, \psi} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i) \right] &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d (1 - \|P_{+i}^\pi - P_{-i}^\pi\|_{TV}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} D_{KL}^{sy}(P_{+i}^\pi, P_{-i}^\pi)} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{d}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4d} \sum_{i=1}^d D_{KL}^{sy}(P_{+i}^\pi, P_{-i}^\pi)} \right), \tag{S.42}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds by Assouad's Lemma, the second by Pinsker's inequality, and the last by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

We now explicitly compute $\sum_{i=1}^d D_{KL}^{sy}(P_{+i}^\pi, P_{-i}^\pi) = \sum_{i=1}^d D_{KL}(P_{+i}^\pi | P_{-i}^\pi) + D_{KL}(P_{-i}^\pi | P_{+i}^\pi)$. We first analyze the term $D_{KL}(P_{+i}^\pi | P_{-i}^\pi)$ in details. In particular, using the chain-rule of KL divergence, we have that

$$D_{KL}(P_{+i}^\pi | P_{-i}^\pi) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{+i}^\pi \{ D_{KL}(P_{+i,t}^\pi(\cdot | s_{<t}) | P_{-i,t}^\pi(\cdot | s_{<t})) \}.$$

Furthermore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{KL}(P_{+i,t}^\pi(\cdot | s_{<t}) | P_{-i,t}^\pi(\cdot | s_{<t})) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{+i}^\pi \left(\log \frac{f_{+i}^\pi(y_t, p_t, z_t | s_{<t})}{f_{-i}^\pi(y_t, p_t, z_t | s_{<t})} \Big| s_{<t} \right) = \mathbb{E}_{+i}^\pi \left(\log \frac{f_{+i}^\pi(y_t | p_t, z_t)}{f_{-i}^\pi(y_t | p_t, z_t)} \Big| s_{<t} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{+i}^\pi \{ (y_t - \lambda_{-i}(z_t, p_t))^2 - (y_t - \lambda_{+i}(z_t, p_t))^2 | s_{<t} \} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{+i}^\pi \{ (\lambda_{+i}(z_t, p_t) - \lambda_{-i}(z_t, p_t))^2 | s_{<t} \} = \frac{\Delta^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{+i}^\pi \{ (p_t - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(M_t = i) | s_{<t} \}, \end{aligned} \tag{S.43}$$

where the last equality follows by noting that $\lambda_{+i}(z_t, p_t) \neq \lambda_{-i}(z_t, p_t)$ if and only if $M_t = i$. Therefore, we have that

$$D_{KL}(P_{+i}^\pi | P_{-i}^\pi) = \frac{\Delta^2}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{+i}^\pi \{ (p_t - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(M_t = i) \}.$$

Similarly, we have that

$$D_{KL}(P_{-i}^\pi | P_{+i}^\pi) = \frac{\Delta^2}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{-i}^\pi \{ (p_t - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(M_t = i) \}.$$

Putting everything together, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^d D_{KL}^{sy}(P_{+i}^\pi, P_{-i}^\pi) = \sum_{i=1}^d D_{KL}(P_{+i}^\pi | P_{-i}^\pi) + D_{KL}(P_{-i}^\pi | P_{+i}^\pi) \\ &= \frac{\Delta^2}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{+i}^\pi \{ (p_t - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(M_t = i) \} + \mathbb{E}_{-i}^\pi \{ (p_t - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(M_t = i) \} \\ &= \frac{\Delta^2}{2^d} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{\mathbf{v}: v_i=1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \{ (p_t - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(M_t = i) \} + \sum_{\mathbf{v}: v_i=0} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \{ (p_t - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(M_t = i) \} \\ &= \frac{\Delta^2}{2^d} \sum_{\mathbf{v}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \{ (p_t - 1)^2 \} = \Delta^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \{ (p_t - 1)^2 \}, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Lemma S.4.3. For any time t , denote p_t^* as the optimal price and p_t^π as the policy price. For any t

and p_t^π , we have that

$$(p_t^\pi - p_t^*)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(p_t^\pi - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(|p_t^\pi - 1| \geq \sqrt{3}\Delta).$$

Proof of Lemma S.4.3. By design, we know that p_t^* can be 1 or $(2 + \Delta)/(2 + 2\Delta)$. The lemma holds if $p_t^* = 1$. Therefore, we only need to consider the case where $p_t^* = (2 + \Delta)/(2 + 2\Delta)$. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (p_t^\pi - p_t^*)^2 &= \left(p_t^\pi - \frac{2 + \Delta}{2 + 2\Delta}\right)^2 = \left(p_t^\pi - 1 + \frac{\Delta}{2 + 2\Delta}\right)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{3}{4}(p_t^\pi - 1)^2 - \frac{3\Delta^2}{(2 + 2\Delta)^2} \geq \frac{3}{4}(p_t^\pi - 1)^2 - \frac{3}{4}\Delta^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(p_t^\pi - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(|p_t^\pi - 1| \geq \sqrt{3}\Delta), \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Recall that $\mathcal{A} = \cap_{i=1}^d \mathcal{A}_i$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \geq 1 - dT^{-2}$. By Lemma S.4.1, we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t &\geq \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{A}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{144} T \Delta^2 d^{-1} \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi, \psi} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i, \mathcal{A}) \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{144} T \Delta^2 d^{-1} \left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi, \psi} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i) \right] - d^2 T^{-2} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by noting that $\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i, \mathcal{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i) - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i, \mathcal{A}^c)$, and that $\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i, \mathcal{A}^c) \leq d\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{A}^c)$.

By Lemma S.4.2, we further have that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t \geq \frac{T\Delta^2}{144} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\Delta^2}{4d} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi [p_t - 1]^2} \right) - dT^{-2} \right\}. \quad (\text{S.44})$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t &\geq \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T (p_t - p_t^*)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T (p_t - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(|p_t - 1| \geq \sqrt{3}\Delta) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T (p_t - 1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(|p_t - 1| \geq \sqrt{3}\Delta) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi [p_t - 1]^2 - \frac{3}{2} \Delta^2 T, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.45})$$

where the first inequality follows from (S.35) and the second inequality follows from Lemma S.4.3.

Now, set $\Delta^2 = c\sqrt{d/T}$, where $c = 1/3$. Denote $\eta = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_v^\pi [p_t - 1]^2$. Suppose $\eta \geq 6\Delta^2 T$, by (S.45), we have that

$$\sup_v \mathbb{E}_v^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t \geq 3/2 \Delta^2 T = 3c/2 \sqrt{dT}.$$

Suppose $\eta < 6\Delta^2 T$, by (S.44), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_v \mathbb{E}_v^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t &\geq \frac{T\Delta^2}{144} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\Delta^2}{4d} 6\Delta^2 T} \right) - dT^{-2} \right\} \\ &= \frac{c\sqrt{dT}}{144} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{3c^2/2} \right) - dT^{-2} \right\} \geq c\sqrt{dT}/576, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from that $c = 1/3$. This finishes the proof. \square

S.4.3 Proof of Theorem 4.2

The following lemma is a privatized version of Lemma S.4.1, which lower bounds the regret by a classification error. In particular, it shows that the regret of any ϵ -LDP policy π can be lower bounded by the classification error of an associated 2ϵ -LDP classifier.

Lemma S.4.4. Suppose $\sqrt{T} \geq 34d\epsilon^{-1}\sqrt{\log T}$. For any non-anticipating ϵ -LDP policy π , there exists a 2ϵ -LDP classifier $\psi : (w_1, \dots, w_T) \rightarrow \hat{v} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, such that with probability at least $1 - 5dT^{-2}$, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t^\pi \geq \frac{1}{144} T \Delta^2 d^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i).$$

Proof. For clarity, we structure the proof into three components.

[A HIGH PROBABILITY EVENT \mathcal{A}^ϵ]: For each $i = 1, \dots, d$, we construct i.i.d. Laplace random variables $\{\eta_{ti}\}_{t=1}^T$ such that $\eta_{ti} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Lap}(2/\epsilon)$. Let $\{\eta'_{ti}\}_{t=1}^T$ be an independent copy of $\{\eta_{ti}\}_{t=1}^T$. Then, by concentration inequality for Laplace random variables, e.g. Corollary 2.9 in Chan et al. (2011), for $\sqrt{T} > \sqrt{2\log T}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max \left\{ \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{ti} \right|, \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \eta'_{ti} \right| \right\} \leq 8\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{T \log T} \right) \geq 1 - 4T^{-2}. \quad (\text{S.46})$$

Furthermore, recall by Hoeffding's inequality in (S.37), we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i\} \geq T/d - \sqrt{T \log T} \right) \geq 1 - T^{-2}.$$

We define \mathcal{A}_i^ϵ as the intersection of the above high probability events, i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}_i^\epsilon = \left\{ \max \left\{ \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{ti} \right|, \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \eta'_{ti} \right| \right\} \leq 8\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{T \log T} \right\} \cap \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i\} \geq T/d - \sqrt{T \log T} \right\}. \quad (\text{S.47})$$

Therefore, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_i^\epsilon) \geq 1 - 5T^{-2}$. The following analysis is conducted on the event $\mathcal{A}^\epsilon = \bigcap_{i=1}^d \mathcal{A}_i^\epsilon$, which, by union bound, holds with probability larger than $1 - 5dT^{-2}$.

[DESIGN A 2ϵ -LDP CLASSIFIER]: Note that we cannot directly use the classifier defined in the non-private setting as it utilizes non-privatized personal information in (S.39). Instead, we adopt the construction in Lemma 3 of Chen et al. (2022) and augment the ϵ -LDP policy π to construct a 2ϵ -LDP policy π' . In particular, we have to additionally privatize the information used for classification, which necessitates elevating the regret analysis from an ϵ -LDP policy to a 2ϵ -LDP policy. The resulting lower bound is thus inflated by a multiplicative constant.

Recall that w_t is the intermediate quantities produced by policy π , such that the distribution of w_t is measurable conditional on s_t and w_1, \dots, w_{t-1} . We construct augmented intermediate quantity $w'_t = (w_t, \{\gamma_{ti}\}_{i=1}^d, \{\zeta_{ti}\}_{i=1}^d)$ such that for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{ti} &= \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i, p_t^\pi \in S_p\} + \eta_{ti}, & \eta_{ti} &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Lap}(2/\epsilon), \\ \zeta_{ti} &= \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i, p_t^\pi \in S_p^c\} + \eta'_{ti}, & \eta'_{ti} &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Lap}(2/\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Note that w'_t satisfies 2ϵ -LDP thanks to the Laplace mechanism and simple composition of two ϵ -LDP procedures, see, e.g. Dwork et al. (2014). This indicates that π' is a 2ϵ -LDP policy. Furthermore, note that by construction, the policy π' has the exact same regret as π .

Define $\hat{\gamma}_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_{ti}$ and $\hat{\zeta}_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_{ti}$. It is clear that, $\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{ti}$ and $\hat{\zeta}_i - \zeta_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \eta'_{ti}$, where recall γ_i, ζ_i are defined in (S.39). Therefore, under \mathcal{A}_i^ϵ , we have

$$\max \left\{ |\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i|, |\hat{\zeta}_i - \zeta_i| \right\} \leq 8\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{T \log T}. \quad (\text{S.48})$$

We then construct the classifier $\psi : (w'_1, \dots, w'_T) \rightarrow \{\hat{v}_i\}_{i=1}^d \in \{0, 1\}^d$ such that

$$\hat{v}_i := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \hat{\gamma}_i \leq \hat{\zeta}_i; \\ 0, & \text{if } \hat{\gamma}_i > \hat{\zeta}_i. \end{cases}$$

Note that by construction, ψ is a 2ϵ -LDP classifier.

[REGRET LOWER BOUND BY CLASSIFICATION ERROR]: We now analyze the consequence of mis-

classification. Suppose $v_i = 0$ and $\hat{v}_i = 1$. This means $\hat{\gamma}_i \leq \hat{\zeta}_i$, and hence

$$2\zeta_i + (\hat{\zeta}_i - \zeta_i) + (\gamma_i - \hat{\gamma}_i) = 2\hat{\zeta}_i + \gamma_i - \hat{\gamma}_i + \zeta_i - \hat{\zeta}_i \geq \gamma_i + \zeta_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i\}.$$

This and (S.48) further imply that

$$\zeta_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i, p_t \in S_p^c\} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i\} \right) - 8\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{T \log T}. \quad (\text{S.49})$$

Recall on \mathcal{A}_i^ϵ , we have $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i\} \geq T/d - \sqrt{T \log T}$. Hence, for $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, and $\sqrt{T} \geq 34d\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{\log T}$, by (S.49), we have

$$\zeta_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i, p_t \in S_p^c\} \geq T/(4d). \quad (\text{S.50})$$

Similarly, if $v_i = 1$ and $\hat{v}_i = 0$, we have

$$\gamma_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{M_t = i, p_t \in S_p\} \geq T/(4d). \quad (\text{S.51})$$

Hence, if $\hat{v}_i \neq v_i$, we have either γ_i or ζ_i is at least $T/(4d)$.

By similar arguments as the proof of Lemma S.4.1 (after equation (S.41)), we have that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t^\pi \geq \frac{\Delta^2}{36} \frac{T}{4d} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i).$$

□

Similar to Lemma S.4.2, we need to lower bound the classification error under LDP by the total variation distance between distributions due to Assouad's Lemma. However, it turns out that the proof technique in Lemma S.4.2 using KL divergence to bound total variation distance will yield a less sharp result in terms of the dimension d . Instead, we establish the sharp bound using the Hellinger distance. In fact, for two arbitrary distributions P_1 and P_2 , we have

$$\|P_1 - P_2\|_{TV}^2 \leq 2H^2(P_1, P_2) \leq \text{KL}(P_1, P_2),$$

where $H^2(P_1, P_2) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} [\sqrt{P_1(dx)} - \sqrt{P_2(dx)}]^2$ is the Hellinger distance between P_1 and P_2 on the support \mathcal{X} . The above inequality implies that using the Hellinger distance allows for more delicate analysis than the KL divergence.

We first list notations. Define

$$M_{+i}^\pi := \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}: v_i=1} M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi, \quad M_{-i}^\pi := \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}: v_i=0} M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi,$$

with $M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}$ being the distribution of $\{w_1, \dots, w_T\}$ under model \mathbf{v} and policy π (in fact, the 2ϵ -LDP policy π' to be precise). More specifically, we have

$$M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}(w_1, \dots, w_T) = \prod_{t=1}^T M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}(w_t | w_{<t}),$$

where the marginal (conditional) distribution is

$$M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}(\cdot | w_{<t}) = \int_{s_t \in \mathcal{S}} Q_t(\cdot | s_t, w_{<t}) dP_{\mathbf{v},t}^{\pi}(s_t | w_{<t}).$$

where \mathcal{S} is the support of s_t , and $P_{\mathbf{v},t}^{\pi}(s_t | w_{<t})$ is the joint distribution of s_t given past privatized information $w_{<t}$ under policy π and model parameter \mathbf{v} . Let the density function of $M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}(\cdot | w_{<t})$ be

$$m_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}(\cdot | w_{<t}) = \int_{s_t \in \mathcal{S}} q_t(\cdot | s_t, w_{<t}) dP_{\mathbf{v},t}^{\pi}(s_t | w_{<t}). \quad (\text{S.52})$$

For any $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_d)^{\top} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, we define $\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i} = (v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, 1-v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_d)^{\top}$ by changing the i th element in \mathbf{v} . For a set $A \subset [T]$, we let

$$M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}, A}^{\pi}(w_1, \dots, w_T) = \prod_{t=1}^T [M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}(w_t | w_{<t}) \mathbb{I}(t \notin A) + M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^{\pi}(w_t | w_{<t}) \mathbb{I}(t \in A)],$$

as the joint distribution function by substituting the t -th conditional distribution of $M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}(w_t | w_{<t})$ by $M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^{\pi}(w_t | w_{<t})$ for $t \in A$. Define its density function as $m_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}, A}^{\pi}$, and write $M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}, \{t\}}^{\pi} = M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}, t}^{\pi}$. It is also clear that $M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}, \emptyset}^{\pi} = M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}$.

Now, we present some fundamental properties of the Hellinger distance.

Lemma S.4.5. Let two mixture distributions F, G be

$$F = aF_0 + (1-a)F_1, \quad G = aG_0 + (1-a)G_1,$$

where $a \in (0, 1)$, and F_0, F_1, G_0, G_1 are distribution functions with common support \mathcal{X} . Then,

$$H^2(F, G) \leq aH^2(F_0, G_0) + (1-a)H^2(F_1, G_1).$$

Proof. Let f_0, f_1, g_0, g_1 be associated probability density/mass functions for F_0, F_1, G_0, G_1 . Similarly we define f and g for F and G , respectively. Note $H^2(F, G) = 1 - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{f(x)g(x)} dx$, and that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial a^2} H^2(F, G) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{(f_1(x)g_0(x) - f_0(x)g_1(x))^2}{4(f(x)g(x))^{3/2}} dx \geq 0.$$

This implies that $H^2(F, G)$ is convex in a . The result follows. \square

Lemma S.4.6. For any fixed \mathbf{v} , and $i \in [d]$, we have that

$$H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi, M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi) \leq 7 \sum_{t=1}^T H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi, M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}, t}^\pi).$$

Proof. This is Lemma 4 in Jayram (2009). □

Lemma S.4.7. For any fixed \mathbf{v} ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi, M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}, t}^\pi) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, < t}^\pi \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(\cdot | w_{< t}), M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(\cdot | w_{< t})) \right\}.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi, M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}, t}^\pi) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{W}^{\otimes T}} [\sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_1, \dots, w_T)} - \sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}, t}^\pi(w_1, \dots, w_T)}]^2 \prod_{j=1}^T dw_j \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{W}^{\otimes T}} [\prod_{j \neq t} m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_j | w_{< j})] [\sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_t | w_{< t})} - \sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(w_t | w_{< t})}]^2 \prod_{j=1}^T dw_j \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{W}^{\otimes T}} [\prod_{j < t} m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_j | w_{< j})] [\sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_t | w_{< t})} - \sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(w_t | w_{< t})}]^2 [\prod_{j > t} m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_j | w_{< j})] \prod_{j=1}^T dw_j \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{W}^{\otimes t}} [\prod_{j < t} m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_j | w_{< j})] \sum_{i=1}^d [\sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_t | w_{< t})} - \sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(w_t | w_{< t})}]^2 \prod_{j=1}^t dw_j \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, < t}^\pi \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{W}} [\sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_t | w_{< t})} - \sqrt{m_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(w_t | w_{< t})}]^2 dw_t \right\} \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, < t}^\pi \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{W}} \sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(\cdot | w_{< t}), M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(\cdot | w_{< t})) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third-to-last inequality holds since for any fixed $w_{\leq t}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{W}^{\otimes T-t}} [\prod_{j > t} m_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(w_j | w_{< j})] \prod_{j=t+1}^T dw_j = 1.$$

□

Lemma S.4.8 is the privatized version of Lemma S.4.2. Note that due to the LDP constraint, compared to Lemma S.4.2, we have an additional $[\exp(2\epsilon) - 1]^2/d$ factor in the R.H.S. of the inequality in Lemma S.4.8, which is the key for getting the additional \sqrt{d}/ϵ factor in the regret lower bound under LDP in Theorem 4.2.

Lemma S.4.8. For any ϵ -LDP policy π and the associated 2ϵ -LDP classifier ψ as in Lemma S.4.4, suppose $[(1-u)^2 \vee (1-l)^2]\Delta^2 \leq 1$, we have that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi, \psi} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i) \right] \geq \frac{d}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{21\Delta^2[\exp(2\epsilon) - 1]^2}{d^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbf{v}}}^{\pi} [(1-p_t)^2]} \right),$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{v}}$ denotes the mixture among all possible \mathbf{v} , i.e. $P_{\bar{\mathbf{v}}}^{\pi} := \sum_{\mathbf{v}} P_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi} / 2^d$.

Proof of Lemma S.4.8. By the standard Assouad's Lemma, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi, \psi} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i) \right] \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d (1 - \|M_{+i}^{\pi} - M_{-i}^{\pi}\|_{TV}). \quad (\text{S.53})$$

[Step I] Bound TV distance by sequential Hellinger distance.

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the property of TV distance and Hellinger distance, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \|M_{+i}^{\pi} - M_{-i}^{\pi}\|_{TV} \right)^2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \|M_{+i}^{\pi} - M_{-i}^{\pi}\|_{TV}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{+i}^{\pi}, M_{-i}^{\pi}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2 \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v}: v_i=0} H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}, M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^{\pi}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{d-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^d} \sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}, M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^{\pi}) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{14}{2^d} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^d} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}, M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i, t}}^{\pi}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{14}{2^d} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^d} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, < t}^{\pi} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}(\cdot|w_{< t}), M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^{\pi}(\cdot|w_{< t})) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.54})$$

where the (a) holds by sequentially applying Lemma S.4.5, (b) by Lemma S.4.6, and (c) by Lemma S.4.7.

[Step II] Bound the summands on the RHS of (S.54) by instant regret.

In Step II, we work under any given $w_{< t} \in \mathcal{W}^{\otimes t-1}$, and any fixed model \mathbf{v} .

Recall (S.52), we have that

$$m_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi}(w|w_{< t}) = \int_{s_t \in \mathcal{S}} q_t(w|s_t, w_{< t}) dP_{\mathbf{v}, t}^{\pi}(s_t|w_{< t}) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, t}^{\pi}[q(w|s_t, w_{< t})|w_{< t}],$$

where the expectation is taken over s_t w.r.t. $P_{\mathbf{v}, t}^{\pi}(s_t|w_{< t})$ given $w_{< t}$.

Hence, for any $i \in [d]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t}), M_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t})) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \left(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i,t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]} \right)^2 dw \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i,t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i,t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]}} \right)^2 dw \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \frac{\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i,t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}] \right)^2}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]} dw.
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t}) = \frac{dP_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i,t}^\pi(s_t|w_{<t})}{dP_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi(s_t|w_{<t})} - 1.$$

The following lemma lists the basic properties of $\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t})$.

Lemma S.4.9. Given $w_{<t}$, and a fixed \mathbf{v} , we have

- (1) $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t})|w_{<t}] = 0$.
- (2) $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}^2(s_t|w_{<t})|w_{<t}] \leq 3\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[\mathbb{I}(M_t = i)\Delta^2(1 - p_t)^2|w_{<t}]$.
- (3) For any $i \neq j \in [d]$, $\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t})\varphi_{\mathbf{v},j}(s_t|w_{<t}) = 0$.

Proof. Recall that $p_t \sim A_t^\pi(z_t, w_{<t})$, we have that

$$\frac{dP_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i,t}^\pi(s_t|w_{<t})}{ds_t} = f_Z(z_t)a_t^\pi(p_t|w_{<t}, z_t)f_{\mathbf{v},Y}(y_t|p_t, z_t, w_{<t}),$$

where we use the independence of z_t and $w_{<t}$. Recall (S.33), for any \mathbf{v} , $y_t = \lambda_{\mathbf{v}}(z_t, p_t) + \varepsilon_t$ where $\varepsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ is independence of z_t and p_t . Under $P_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i,t}^\pi(s_t|w_{<t})$, we thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t}) &= \exp\{-[y_t - \lambda_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i}(z_t, p_t)]^2/2 + [y_t - \lambda_{\mathbf{v}}(z_t, p_t)]^2/2\} - 1 \\
&= \exp\{[\lambda_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i}(p_t, z_t) - \lambda_{\mathbf{v}}(p_t, z_t)][2\varepsilon_t + \lambda_{\mathbf{v}}(p_t, z_t) - \lambda_{\mathbf{v}^\oplus i}(p_t, z_t)]/2\} - 1 \\
&= \exp(-\mathbb{I}(M_t = i)\Delta^2(1 - p_t)^2/2) \exp((-1)^{v_i}\mathbb{I}(M_t = i)\varepsilon_t\Delta(1 - p_t)) - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall z_t is deterministic on M_t , by design of (S.33), $\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t}) = 0$ if $M_t \neq i$. Therefore, claim (3) follows easily.

As for the claim (1) and (2), by law of iterated expectation, and moment generating function of ε_t we have that,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t})|w_{<t}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi\{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t})|p_t, z_t, w_{<t}]|w_{<t}\} = 0. \quad (\text{S.55})$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}^2(s_t|w_{<t})|w_{<t}] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[\exp(\mathbb{I}(M_t = i)\Delta^2(1 - p_t)^2)|w_{<t}] - 1 \\ &\leq 3\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[\mathbb{I}(M_t = i)\Delta^2(1 - p_t)^2|w_{<t}], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.56})$$

where the inequality holds since $\exp(x) - 1 \leq 3x$ for $0 < x \leq 1$. \square

Now we continue the proof in Step II. By Radon–Nikodym theorem, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}] = \int_{s_t \in \mathcal{S}} q_t(w|s_t, w_{<t})[\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t}) + 1] dP_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi(s_t|w_{<t}).$$

Hence, given $w_{<t}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t}), M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t})) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \frac{(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t})|w_{<t}])^2}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]} dw \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi\{(q(w|s_t, w_{<t}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}])\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t})|w_{<t}\})^2}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]} dw \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.57})$$

where the equality holds by Lemma S.4.9(1).

Note z_t is a deterministic function of M_t , without loss of generality, we can write $s_t = (M_t, p_t, y_t)$. The following analysis works under a fixed \mathbf{v} , w and $w_{<t}$. To simplify the notation, we let $s_{t,i} = (\mathbb{I}(M_t = i), p_t, y_t)$, $o(s) = q(w|s, w_{<t}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]$, and $\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s|w_{<t}) = \varphi_i(s)$. The expectation \mathbb{E}^π is taken w.r.t. $P_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi$ for s_t conditional on $w_{<t}$.

Therefore, for the numerator in (S.57), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^d (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi\{(q(w|s_t, w_{<t}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}])\varphi_{\mathbf{v},i}(s_t|w_{<t})|w_{<t}\})^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d (\mathbb{E}^\pi\{o(s_t)\varphi_i(s_t)\})^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^d (\mathbb{E}^\pi[\mathbb{E}^\pi\{o(s_t)\varphi_i(s_t)|M_t\}])^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}^\pi \{ o(s_t) \varphi_i(s_t) | M_t = j \} \right)^2 \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}^\pi \{ o(s_{t,j}) \varphi_i(s_{t,j}) | M_t = j \} \right)^2 \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{d^2} (\mathbb{E}^\pi \{ o(s_{t,i}) \varphi_i(s_{t,i}) | M_t = i \})^2 \\
& \stackrel{(d)}{=} \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\mathbb{E}^\pi \left\{ o(s_{t,i}) \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \varphi_j(s_{t,i}) \right] \middle| M_t = i \right\} \right)^2 \\
& \stackrel{(e)}{=} \frac{1}{d} \mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\mathbb{E}^\pi \left\{ o(s_t) \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \varphi_j(s_t) \right] \middle| M_t \right\} \right)^2 \\
& \stackrel{(f)}{\leq} \frac{1}{d} \mathbb{E}^\pi \left\{ o(s_t) \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \varphi_j(s_t) \right] \right\}^2 \\
& \stackrel{(g)}{\leq} \frac{1}{d} \text{Var}^\pi [o(s_t)] \mathbb{E}^\pi \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \varphi_j(s_t) \right]^2 \\
& \stackrel{(h)}{=} \frac{1}{d} \text{Var}^\pi [o(s_t)] \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}^\pi [\varphi_j(s_t)]^2 \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{3}{d} \text{Var}^\pi [o(s_t)] \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}^\pi [(1-p_t)^2 \Delta^2 \mathbb{I}(M_t = j)] \\
& = \frac{3}{d} \text{Var}^\pi [o(s_t)] \mathbb{E}^\pi [(1-p_t)^2 \Delta^2].
\end{aligned}$$

In above analysis, (a) holds by law of iterated expectation, (b) holds by noting $\mathbb{P}(M_t = j) = 1/d$ for $j \in [d]$, (c) and (d) both hold by noting that $\varphi_i(s_{t,j}) = 0$ if $i \neq j$, (e) holds by noting $\mathbb{P}(M_t = i) = 1/d$, (f) holds by the Jensen's inequality for conditional expectation and law of iterated expectation, i.e. $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}^2\{X|\mathcal{F}\}) \leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[X^2|\mathcal{F}]) \leq \mathbb{E}[X^2]$, (g) holds by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (h) holds by the orthogonality property in Lemma S.4.9(3), (i) holds by Lemma S.4.9(2), and the last equality holds by noting $\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(M_t = j) = 1$.

Plugging the above inequality into (S.57), we thus obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t}), M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t})) \\
& \leq \frac{3}{2d} \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi [(1-p_t)^2 \Delta^2 | w_{<t}] \frac{\text{Var}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi [q(w|s_t, w_{<t}) | w_{<t}]}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi [q(w|s_t, w_{<t}) | w_{<t}]} dw.
\end{aligned} \tag{S.58}$$

[Step III] Bound the variance in (S.58) using LDP constraints.

Since $q(\cdot|s_t, w_{<t})$ is the density function of the privacy channel given s_t and $w_{<t}$, we must have that for any $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and $s_{t1}, s_{t2} \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$q(w|s_{t1}, w_{<t}) - q(w|s_{t2}, w_{<t}) \leq [\exp(2\epsilon) - 1]q(w|s_{t2}, w_{<t}).$$

Therefore, for any policy π' and model \mathbf{v} , taking expectation w.r.t. $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi$ first for s_{t2} , we have

$$q(w|s_{t1}, w_{<t}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}] \leq [\exp(2\epsilon) - 1]\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}].$$

Taking square and then taking expectation w.r.t. $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi$ for s_{t1} , we have that

$$\text{Var}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}] \leq [\exp(2\epsilon) - 1]^2 \{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}]\}^2.$$

Therefore, plugging the above inequality into (S.58), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t}), M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t})) \\ & \leq \frac{3[\exp(2\epsilon) - 1]^2 \Delta^2}{2d} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[(1 - p_t)^2 | w_{<t}] \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}] dw \\ & = \frac{3[\exp(2\epsilon) - 1]^2 \Delta^2}{2d} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[(1 - p_t)^2 | w_{<t}], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.59})$$

since $\int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[q(w|s_t, w_{<t})|w_{<t}] dw = 1$.

[Step IV] Finish the proof.

Putting (S.54) and (S.59) together, we thus obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \|M_{+i}^\pi - M_{-i}^\pi\|_{TV} \right)^2 & \leq \frac{14}{2^d} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^d} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},<t}^\pi \left[\sum_{i=1}^d H^2(M_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t}), M_{\mathbf{v}^{\oplus i}}^\pi(\cdot|w_{<t})) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{21\Delta^2[\exp(2\epsilon) - 1]^2}{d} \frac{1}{2^d} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^d} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},<t}^\pi [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v},t}^\pi[(1 - p_t)^2 | w_{<t}]]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.60})$$

The result follows by (S.53). \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. The proof is built on the results in Lemma S.4.4 and Lemma S.4.8. Recall that $\mathcal{A}^\epsilon = \bigcap_{i=1}^d \mathcal{A}_i^\epsilon$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^\epsilon) \geq 1 - 5dT^{-2}$. By Lemma S.4.4, we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^\pi \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t & \geq \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi, \psi} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{A}^\epsilon) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{144} T \Delta^2 d^{-1} \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi, \psi} \left[\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i, \mathcal{A}^\epsilon) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{144} T \Delta^2 d^{-1} \sup_{\mathbf{v}} [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi, \psi} [\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i)] - 5d^2 T^{-2}],$$

where the last inequality holds by noting that $\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i, \mathcal{A}^\epsilon) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i) - \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i, (\mathcal{A}^\epsilon)^c)$, and that $\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}(\hat{v}_i \neq v_i, (\mathcal{A}^\epsilon)^c) \leq d\mathbb{I}((\mathcal{A}^\epsilon)^c)$.

Using Lemma S.4.8, we further have that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t \geq \frac{T \Delta^2}{144} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{21 \Delta^2 [\exp(2\epsilon) - 1]^2}{d^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi} [(1 - p_t)^2]} \right) - 5d T^{-2} \right\}. \quad (\text{S.61})$$

On the other hand, by (S.45), we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi} [p_t - 1]^2 - \frac{3}{2} \Delta^2 T. \quad (\text{S.62})$$

Set $\Delta^2 = c\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{d^2/T}$ with $c = \sqrt{14}/672$ and denote $\eta = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi} [p_t - 1]^2$. Suppose $\eta > 6\Delta^2 T$, we have by (S.62) that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t \geq (3c)/2\epsilon^{-1} d\sqrt{T} = \frac{\sqrt{14}}{448} \epsilon^{-1} d\sqrt{T}.$$

Suppose otherwise, i.e. $\eta \leq 6\Delta^2 T$, then by (S.61), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{v}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\pi} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{regret}_t &\geq \frac{T \Delta^2}{144} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{126(e^{2\epsilon} - 1)^2 \Delta^4 T}{d^2}} \right) - 5d T^{-2} \right\} \\ &= \frac{c\epsilon^{-1} d\sqrt{T}}{144} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{126c\epsilon^{-1} (e^{2\epsilon} - 1)} \right) - 5d T^{-2} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{c\epsilon^{-1} d\sqrt{T}}{144} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{8} \right\} = \frac{\sqrt{14}\epsilon^{-1} d\sqrt{T}}{774144}. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by noting $\epsilon^{-1}(e^{2\epsilon} - 1) \leq 8$ for $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $dT^{-2} < 1/40$.

Here note we require $T \geq [(1 - u)^2 \vee (1 - l)^2] d^2 \epsilon^{-2} / (48 \times 672)$ to ensure that the condition in Lemma S.4.8. \square

References

- Auer, P. (2002). Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):397–422.
- Ban, G.-Y. and Keskin, N. B. (2021). Personalized dynamic pricing with machine learning: High-dimensional features and heterogeneous elasticity. *Management Science*, 67(9):5549–5568.

- Berge, C. (1957). Two theorems in graph theory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 43(9):842–844.
- Broder, J. and Rusmevichientong, P. (2012). Dynamic pricing under a general parametric choice model. *Operations Research*, 60(4):965–980.
- Chan, T.-H. H., Shi, E., and Song, D. (2011). Private and continual release of statistics. *ACM Transactions on Information and System Security (TISSEC)*, 14(3):1–24.
- Chen, K., Hu, I., and Ying, Z. (1999). Strong consistency of maximum quasi-likelihood estimators in generalized linear models with fixed and adaptive designs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 27(4):1155–1163.
- Chen, X., Miao, S., and Wang, Y. (2022). Differential privacy in personalized pricing with nonparametric demand models. *Operations Research*.
- Duchi, J. C., Jordan, M. I., and Wainwright, M. J. (2018). Minimax optimal procedures for locally private estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):182–201.
- Dwork, C., Roth, A., et al. (2014). The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends[®] in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4):211–407.
- Hsu, D., Kakade, S. M., and Zhang, T. (2012). A tail inequality for quadratic forms of subgaussian random vectors. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 17:1.
- Jayram, T. S. (2009). Hellinger strikes back: A note on the multi-party information complexity of and. In Dinur, I., Jansen, K., Naor, J., and Rolim, J., editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 562–573, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Li, L., Lu, Y., and Zhou, D. (2017). Provably optimal algorithms for generalized linear contextual bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2071–2080. PMLR.
- Rakhlin, A., Shamir, O., and Sridharan, K. (2011). Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.5647*.