

# Minimax Optimality in Contextual Dynamic Pricing with General Valuation Models

Xueping Gong<sup>\*</sup> and Jiheng Zhang<sup>†</sup>

<sup>\*†</sup>Department of Industrial Engineering and Decision Analytics

<sup>\*†</sup>The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

## Abstract

Dynamic pricing, the practice of adjusting prices based on contextual factors, has gained significant attention due to its impact on revenue maximization. In this paper, we address the contextual dynamic pricing problem, which involves pricing decisions based on observable product features and customer characteristics. We propose a novel algorithm that achieves improved regret bounds while minimizing assumptions about the problem. Our algorithm discretizes the unknown noise distribution and combines the upper confidence bounds with a layered data partitioning technique to effectively regulate regret in each episode. These techniques effectively control the regret associated with pricing decisions, leading to the minimax optimality. Specifically, our algorithm achieves a regret upper bound of  $\tilde{O}(\rho_V^{\frac{1}{3}}(\delta)T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ , where  $\rho_V(\delta)$  represents the estimation error of the valuation function. Importantly, this bound matches the lower bound up to logarithmic terms, demonstrating the minimax optimality of our approach. Furthermore, our method extends beyond linear valuation models commonly used in dynamic pricing by considering general function spaces. We simplify the estimation process by reducing it to general offline regression oracles, making implementation more straightforward.

## 1 Introduction

The contextual dynamic pricing problem involves setting real-time prices for products or services based on contextual factors like product details and customer characteristics. It has received significant attention in the literature due to its practical applications and its impact on revenue maximization. For a comprehensive review of the literature on dynamic pricing, we refer readers to [8], and for specific applications, Saharan et al. [20] provide valuable insights.

Recent works have particularly focused on feature-based (or contextual) pricing models, which consider observable product features to determine both the market value of a product and the pricing strategy [9, 4, 5]. These models account for product heterogeneity and enable personalized pricing. However, designing low-regret policies in this setting presents several challenges. Firstly, the demand curve continuously shifts due to changes in covariates over time. Secondly, the shape of the demand curve is often unknown due to the lack of information on the market noise distribution, which may not follow a specific parametric form. Consequently, solving the dynamic pricing problem requires precise estimation of the demand function across a wide range of prices, diverging from non-contextual dynamic pricing and non-parametric bandit problems, where estimation around

a single maximum is sufficient. Thus, the contextual dynamic pricing problem presents unique challenges and potentially leads to higher regret compared to its non-contextual counterpart.

Despite extensive research on the contextual dynamic pricing problem, previous findings suffer from either strong assumptions that restrict their applicability or sub-optimal regret bounds. In our work, we aim to address both limitations by achieving improved regret bounds while minimizing assumptions about the problem.

To tackle the problem, we employ an explore-then-UCB approach and propose an epoch-based learning framework. Initially, we conduct a pure exploration phase to gather samples for learning the true valuation function. Subsequently, an UCB (Upper Confidence Bound) phase is executed to set a suitable price based on the evaluation estimator. During the UCB phase, we discretize the domain of the unknown distribution function into equal-length intervals to effectively handle the challenge posed by its inherent uncertainty. Notably, this discretization process leads to a linear bandit structure, enabling the development of upper confidence bounds that robustly account for estimation errors and biases arising from valuation estimation. To further leverage the distinctive structure of this linear bandit, we employ a layered data partitioning technique to effectively regulate regret in each episode. The adaptive nature of this technique eliminates the need for a Lipschitz constant, enhancing the flexibility and practicality of our approach. Lastly, we carefully select an appropriate number of discretization intervals to strike a balance between the regret arising from the discrete-part and continuous-part of the problem, ultimately achieving the minimax optimality of this challenging problem.

In this work, we propose Algorithm 1, a novel algorithm capable of handling a general valuation function space and nonparametric noise distribution. Our algorithm achieves a regret upper bound of  $\tilde{O}(\rho_V^{\frac{1}{3}}(\delta)T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ , where  $\rho_V(\delta)$  is related with the estimation error of the valuation function. Notably, our method relies solely on the widely adopted Lipschitz continuity assumption found in the literature [9, 13, 17, 6, 7], without assuming second-order smoothness around the optimal price or uniqueness of the optimal price, which are commonly assumed in contextual pricing literature. Importantly, our regret bound matches the lower bound up to logarithmic terms, as demonstrated in [24].

When applied to linear valuation models with  $d_0$ -dimensional covariates, our results yield  $\tilde{O}(d_0^{\frac{1}{3}}T^{\frac{2}{3}})$  regrets. This represents an improvement over the existing regret bound of Luo et al. [17], which reports  $\tilde{O}(d_0^2T^{\frac{2}{3}})$  with the second-order smoothness assumption, and  $\tilde{O}(d_0T^{\frac{3}{4}})$  without this assumption. Furthermore, compared to the results of Fan et al. [9], which reported a regret bound of  $\tilde{O}(d_0^{\frac{5}{7}}T^{\frac{5}{7}})$  under both conditions, our approach achieves a lower order in  $T$  while relaxing the assumptions. Notably, our method extends beyond linear models by considering general function spaces and reducing the estimation to general offline regression oracles, allowing for natural incorporation of sparsity, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, and other general function spaces.

We also explore scenarios where the distribution function  $F$  is known, the valuation can be observed, and a more powerful classification oracle exists. In the first case, our assumptions are comparable to [13], as we extend their linear valuation model to a general valuation model. In the second case, we demonstrate how the regret can be improved to  $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{3}{5}})$  with the additional second-order smoothness assumption. This upper bound matches the lower bound in [16] where only censored feedback can be observed. If only the censored feedback can be observed but powerful classification oracles in **Assumption 5.3** exist, we show that our method can still improve the

upper bounds  $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{2}{3}\vee(1-\alpha)})$  reported in [16, 17] to  $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{3}{5}\vee(1-\alpha)})$ .

## 1.1 Related work

**Dynamic pricing.** Dynamic pricing has been an active area of research, driven by advancements in data technology and the increasing availability of customer information. Initial research focused on non-contextual dynamic pricing without covariates [3, 4]. For example, Wang et al. [23] employed the UCB approach with local-bin approximations, achieving an  $\tilde{O}(T^{(m+1)/(2m+1)})$  regret for  $m$ -th smooth demand functions and establishing a matching lower bound. However, these approaches did not incorporate covariates into pricing policies, making our model fundamentally distinct.

In the domain of dynamic pricing with covariates, the linear customer valuation model has been widely adopted. Javanmard and Nazerzadeh [13] studied this model assuming known noise distribution, but their methods were limited when the noise distribution was unknown or not log-concave. In contrast, Golrezaei et al. [12] considered an ambiguity set for the noise distribution, achieving a regret of  $\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$  compared to a robust benchmark. However, their approach faced challenges with ambiguity sets encompassing infinite distributions. Our proposed model addresses the general case of an unknown noise distribution and establishes regret bounds by comparing against the true optimal policy. Chen et al. [5] explored nonparametric aspects of the unknown demand function, using adaptive binning of the covariate space to achieve a regret of  $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{d_0+2}{d_0+4}})$ . Notably, our method outperforms theirs when  $d_0 \geq 2$ . Under the Cox proportional hazards (PH) model, Choi et al. [7] introduced the CoxCP algorithm, which demonstrated a regret of  $\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$ . However, their approach relied on the separability of the unknown linear structure and noise distribution in the PH model, making it unsuitable for our pricing model where these components are entangled. Recent work by Xu and Wang [24] proposed an adaptive pricing policy with  $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{3}{4}})$  regret for adversarial contexts and bounded noise distributions. Our method improves the regret to  $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{2}{3}})$  under Lipschitz noise distribution, while maintaining computational efficiency compared to the exponential computations required by the EXP4-based policy in Xu and Wang [24].

Other related studies [17, 16, 9] share similarities with our work in terms of settings, but differ in their assumptions about the smoothness of the noise distribution. For example, Luo et al. [16] proposed an epoch-based algorithm with regret bounds of  $\tilde{O}(d_0^2 T^{\frac{2}{3}})$  and  $\tilde{O}(d_0 T^{\frac{3}{4}})$  under different smoothness assumptions. Fan et al. [9] considered  $m$ -th differentiable distributions and achieved a regret of  $\tilde{O}((d_0 T)^{\frac{2m+1}{4m-1}})$  using the Nadaraya-Watson kernel regression estimator. In comparison, our method achieves  $\tilde{O}(d_0^{\frac{1}{3}} T^{\frac{2}{3}})$  regrets when applied to linear valuation models, demonstrating minimax optimality while relying on minimal assumptions.

**Contextual bandit.** Our pricing policy shares connections with bandit algorithms [14, 11, 1, 22, 2], which aim to balance exploration and exploitation in decision-making. Specifically, our approach relates to the concept of misspecified linear bandits [2, 16] within the context of dynamic pricing. Unlike traditional bandit algorithms, dynamic pricing requires consideration of both estimation variance and the bias resulting from linear parameter perturbation. Notably, we have discovered an intriguing finding that by leveraging the unique structure of the dynamic pricing problem, we can achieve a more precise and improved regret bound compared to directly applying complex existing algorithms designed for misspecified linear bandits. This improvement is mainly attributed to the fact that the bias encountered in each round is consistent across all prices (actions).

While previous research has explored bandit algorithms and misspecified linear bandits, our work extends these concepts to the dynamic pricing domain, incorporating the specific characteristics and demands of pricing decisions. This underscores the importance of leveraging the distinctive structure and attributes of the pricing context in order to achieve superior performance.

**Notations.** Throughout the paper, we use the following notations. For any positive integer  $n$ , we denote the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  as  $[n]$ . The cardinality of a set  $A$  is denoted by  $|A|$ . We use  $\mathbf{I}_{\{E\}}$  to represent the indicator function of the event  $E$ . Specifically,  $\mathbf{I}_{\{E\}}$  takes the value 1 if  $E$  happens, and 0 otherwise. For norms, we utilize the notation  $\|\cdot\|_p$  where  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  to denote the  $\ell_p$  norm. Throughout the analysis, the notation  $\tilde{O}$  is employed to hide the dependence on absolute constants and logarithmic terms. It allows us to focus on the dominant behavior of the quantities involved.

## 2 Basic Setting

In the context of contextual dynamic pricing, a potential customer arrives at the platform during each round  $t \in [T]$ , and the seller observes a covariate  $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$  representing the product features and customer characteristics. Upon observing  $x_t$ , the customer's valuation of the product, denoted as  $v_t = v^*(x_t) + \epsilon_t$ , is determined by a linear function of  $v^*(x_t)$  and a market noise term  $\epsilon_t$ . The value function  $v^*$  belongs to the function space  $\mathcal{V}$ , and the noise terms  $\{\epsilon_t\}_{t \in [T]}$  are independently and identically drawn from an unknown zero-mean distribution  $F$ .

If the customer's valuation  $v_t$  exceeds the seller's set price  $p_t$ , a sale occurs, resulting in the seller collecting a revenue of  $p_t$ . However, if  $v_t$  is lower than  $p_t$ , the customer leaves without making a purchase, and the seller does not receive any revenue. We denote the occurrence of a sale as  $y_t = \mathbf{I}_{\{v_t \geq p_t\}}$ , which can be modeled as a Bernoulli random variable with a parameter of  $1 - F(p_t - v^*(x_t))$ . Consequently, the reward from the sale is given by  $r_t = p_t y_t$ . The triplet  $(x_t, p_t, y_t)$  captures the information pertaining to the pricing procedure at time  $t$ .

Given the customer choice model and the covariate  $x$ , the expected reward of setting a price  $p$  can be expressed as  $p(1 - F(p - v^*(x)))$ . The optimal price  $p^*(x)$  is defined as the price that maximizes  $p(1 - F(p - v^*(x)))$ . In the dynamic pricing process, the seller dynamically sets prices and observes binary feedbacks to collect instant revenues while gathering information to estimate  $v^*$  and  $F$ . Apparently, learning  $v^*$  and  $F$  gives the seller much more information to estimate the market value of a new product given its feature covariates. On the other hand, the seller also wants to always give optimized price so as to maximize the expected revenue. It is necessary to have a good policy that strikes a balance between exploration (collecting additional information for better future revenues) and exploitation (utilizing current knowledge for immediate revenues based on the learned model).

The regret at time  $t$  is defined as the loss in reward resulting from setting the price  $p_t$  compared to the optimal price  $p^*(x_t)$ . The cumulative regret over the horizon of  $T$  periods, denoted as  $Reg(T)$ , is given by the expression:

$$Reg(T) = \sum_{t=1}^T p^*(x_t)(1 - F(p^*(x_t) - v^*(x_t))) - p_t(1 - F(p_t - v^*(x_t))).$$

To evaluate the performance, we consider the expected cumulative regret  $\mathbb{E}[Reg(T)]$ , which takes

into account the randomness of the covariates and the potential randomness of the pricing policy. The goal of our contextual dynamic pricing is to decide the price  $p_t$  for covariate  $x_t$  at time  $t$ , by utilizing all historical data  $\{(x_s, p_s, y_s), s \in [t - 1]\}$ , in order to minimize the expected cumulative regret.

**Assumption 2.1 (Bounded Valuation)** *For each round  $t$ , the customers' valuations  $v^*(x_t) \in [0, B]$  for a known constant  $B$ .*

In **Assumption 2.1**, a known upper bound is considered for the customers' valuations, which is a reasonable assumption for real-life products. It is worth noting that this assumption also implies the existence of a known upper bound  $B$  for the optimal prices. Moving forward, we introduce the Lipschitz condition in **Assumption 2.2**, which is widely discussed in the literature [17, 16, 5]. **Assumption 2.2** is satisfied by  $F$  with bounded derivative as considered in [5, 9, 13], but fits for a broader class of  $F$ .

**Assumption 2.2 (Lipschitz Continuity)** *The noise distribution  $F$  is Lipschitz continuous with a positive constant  $L$ , i.e.,  $|F(x) - F(y)| \leq L|x - y|, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

### 3 Algorithm Design

In this section, we present a distribution-free pricing policy designed to address the contextual dynamic pricing problem in the presence of unknown  $v^*$  and unknown  $F$ . To tackle this challenge, we propose an episode-based learning framework, outlined in Algorithm 1, consisting of three phases: a pure exploration phase, an estimation phase, and a UCB phase. Given the lack of prior knowledge regarding the horizon length  $T$ , we employ the doubling trick to partition the horizon into episodes. This technique eliminates the requirement of knowing  $T$  and allows us to dynamically adapt our pricing strategy. Furthermore, our algorithmic construction ensures that the size of candidate prices remains bounded within each episode. The boundedness property is essential for controlling regret and achieving minimax optimality, ensuring that our pricing policy performs well under uncertainty. The episode-based learning framework allows us to adaptively refine our pricing strategy as additional data is gathered and improved estimations of  $v^*$  and  $F$  are obtained. By partitioning the horizon into episodes, our approach enables iterative improvement of the pricing policy, leading to near-optimal performance.

**Estimation.** To overcome the challenge of not directly observing the valuation  $v_t$  in the dynamic pricing problem, we leverage a key property. During each episode, we employ a uniform random policy  $p_t \sim \text{Unif}(0, B)$  to generate data for estimating the true value  $v^*$ . This approach results in a linear regression structure that incorporates the signal of  $v^*$ . Specifically, we have the following relationship:

$$\mathbb{E}[By_t|x_t] = B\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{I}_{\{p_t \leq v^*(x_t) + \epsilon_t\}}|x_t, \epsilon_t]|x_t] = B\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{v^*(x_t) + \epsilon_t}{B} \middle| x_t\right] = v^*(x_t)$$

This property allows us to decouple the estimation of  $v^*$  from the unknown distribution  $F$ , providing a means to estimate  $v^*$  independently. To achieve the minimax optimality, we set the exploration phase length  $T_k^e = \lceil \ell_k^{\frac{2}{3}} \ln^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta) \rceil$ . This choice ensures minimax optimality in terms of  $T$  and  $|\mathcal{V}|$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** Distribution-Free Dynamic Pricing Algorithm

---

**Input:** price upper bound  $B$ , function space  $\mathcal{V}$ , confidence parameter  $\delta$

- 1: Let  $k^* = \lceil 3 \log_2 \ln(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta) \rceil$   
   *// warm up*
- 2: **for** round  $t = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{k^*-1}$  **do**
- 3:     Observe context  $x_t$
- 4:     Set a price  $p_t$  uniformly from  $(0, B)$
- 5:     Observe the feedback  $y_t$
- 6: **for** episode  $k = k^*, k^* + 1, \dots$  **do**
- 7:     Set the length of the  $k$ -th episode as  $\ell_k = 2^{k-1}$
- 8:     Set the length of the exploration phase at  $k$ -th episode as  $T_k^e = \lceil \ell_k^{\frac{2}{3}} \ln^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta) \rceil$   
      *// exploration phase*
- 9:     **for** round  $t = 2^{k-1} + 1, \dots, 2^{k-1} + T_k^e$  **do**
- 10:         Observe context  $x_t$
- 11:         Set a price  $p_t$  uniformly from  $(0, B)$
- 12:         Observe the feedback  $y_t$
- // estimation phase*
- 13:         Find the estimator

$$\hat{v}_k = \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{t=2^{k-1}+1}^{2^{k-1}+T_k^e} (v(x_t) - By_t)^2$$

by the **Offline Least Square Oracle**

- // UCB phase*
  - 14:         Set the length  $T_k = \ell_k - T_k^e$
  - 15:         Set the discretization number  $d_k = \lceil T_k^{\frac{1}{3}} \rceil$
  - 16:         **for**  $t = 2^{k-1} + T_k^e + 1, \dots, 2^k$  **do**
  - 17:             Apply the **UCB-LDP** on the coming sequential contexts  $x_t$  with the estimator  $\hat{v}_k$ , the discretization number  $d_k$ , the length  $T_k$  and the bound  $B$
- 

To ensure that the exploration phase length does not exceed  $\ell_k$ , we uniformly set prices for the rounds before the episode  $k^* = \lceil 3 \log_2 \ln(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta) \rceil$ .

Initially, we focus on the case where the function space is finite, i.e.,  $|\mathcal{V}| < \infty$ . The expected estimation error for this case is presented in Lemma 3.1. However, it is worth noting that our results can be extended to infinite function spaces using standard learning tools such as metric entropy. By applying these techniques, our proposed approach can handle more general scenarios. In Section 5, we further extend our results to general offline regression oracles and classification oracles, broadening the applicability of our findings. By addressing these broader problem domains, we demonstrate the versatility and relevance of our proposed methodology in a wider range of applications.

**Remark 3.1** *In Algorithm 1, we estimate the valuation function  $v^*$  using only the samples collected in the current episode  $k$ . However, we can also leverage all the previously data obtained from the exploration phases. Despite this possibility, incorporating the previous data does not change the final regret order, as the sample size is of order  $\mathcal{O}(\ell_k^{\frac{2}{3}} \ln^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta))$ . To maintain clarity, we choose*

to feed the data to the offline oracle only in episode  $k$  to obtain  $\hat{v}_k$ . This approach ensures that the estimation process remains focused on the current episode, enhancing the readability of our algorithm.

**Lemma 3.1** *The estimator  $\hat{v}_k$  satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x))^2] \leq \frac{18B \log(|\mathcal{V}| \log_2(T_k^e)/\delta)}{T_k^e}$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

*Proof.* Consider the data collected at the episode  $k$ . Then for any round  $t$  satisfying  $\ell_k < t \leq \ell_k + T_k^e$  and any  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , we denote the random variable

$$Z_t = (v(x_t) - By_t)^2 - (v^*(x_t) - By_t)^2.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_t] &= \mathbb{E}[(v(x_t) - By_t)^2 - (By_t - v^*(x_t))^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(v(x_t) - v^*(x_t))(v(x_t) + v^*(x_t) - 2By_t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(v(x_t) - v^*(x_t))\mathbb{E}_{y_t}[(v(x_t) + v^*(x_t) - 2By_t)|x_t]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(v(x_t) - v^*(x_t))^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Z_t) &\leq \mathbb{E}[Z_t^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(v(x_t) - v^*(x_t))^2(v(x_t) + v^*(x_t) - 2By_t)^2] \\ &\leq 4B\mathbb{E}[(v(x_t) - v^*(x_t))^2] \\ &= 16B^2\mathbb{E}[Z_t]. \end{aligned}$$

From Freedman's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=\ell_k+1}^{\ell_k+T_k^e} \mathbb{E}[Z_t] - \sum_{t=\ell_k+1}^{\ell_k+T_k^e} Z_t \\ &\leq 4\sqrt{\sum_{t=\ell_k+1}^{\ell_k+T_k^e} \text{Var}(Z_t) \ln(1/\delta) + 2B \ln(1/\delta)} \\ &\leq 16B\sqrt{\sum_{t=\ell_k+1}^{\ell_k+T_k^e} \mathbb{E}[Z_t] \ln(1/\delta) + 2B \ln(1/\delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta \log_2(T_k^e)$ . The last inequality is due to the boundedness of  $y_t$ . Solving

$\sum_{t=\ell_k+1}^{\ell_k+T_k^e} \mathbb{E}[Z_t]$  from the above inequality yields

$$\sum_{t=\ell_k+1}^{\ell_k+T_k^e} \mathbb{E}[Z_t] \leq 18B \ln(1/\delta) + \sum_{t=\ell_k+1}^{\ell_k+T_k^e} Z_t.$$

By a union bound, with probability at least  $1 - |\mathcal{V}| \log_2(T_k^e) \delta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(v(x_t) - v^*(x_t))^2] \leq \frac{18B \ln(1/\delta)}{T_k^e} + \frac{1}{T_k^e} \sum_{t=\ell_k+1}^{\ell_k+T_k^e} Z_t.$$

Then from the algorithmic construction, we know  $\sum_{t=\ell_k+1}^{\ell_k+T_k^e} Z_t \leq 0$  for  $\hat{v}_k$ . We immediately obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[(v(x_t) - v^*(x_t))^2] \leq \frac{18B \ln(1/\delta)}{T_k^e}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - |\mathcal{V}| \log_2(T_k^e) \delta$ . □

**Discretization for F-Learning.** During the UCB phase in episode  $k$ , we utilize the regression estimator  $\hat{v}_k$  to drive a UCB procedure that strikes a balance between  $F$ -learning and revenue maximization. To explore potential optimal prices  $p \in (0, B)$  efficiently, we focus our attention on the  $F$ -values within the range of  $p - \hat{v}_k(x)$ . Specifically, we restrict our  $F$ -learning to the interval  $[-\|\hat{v}_k\|_\infty, B + \|\hat{v}_k\|_\infty]$  by discretizing it into  $d_k$  sub-intervals and concentrating our learning on the  $d_k$  midpoints  $\{m_j\}_{j \in [d_k]}$ . This approach, in contrast to [5, 9] where the entire cumulative distribution function  $F$  is estimated, simplifies the estimation task by focusing on a limited number of  $F$  values. This discretization approach allows for a mutually reinforcing process between the discretized price selection and the accumulation of knowledge in  $F$  at these specific points, creating a closed loop of improvement.

After discretization, Luo et al. [17] formulate the inner UCB as a perturbed linear bandit problem, with  $\xi^* = (1 - F(m_1), 1 - F(m_2), \dots, 1 - F(m_{d_k}))$  as the parameter for this perturbed linear bandit. The action takes the form  $(0, 0, \dots, p_t, \dots, 0)$ , with a single non-zero element  $p_t = m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t)$  at the  $j$ -th position. Although the  $\xi^*$  parameter is perturbed in each round, its magnitude can be controlled due to **Assumption 2.2** and the estimation error of  $\hat{v}_k$ . While Luo et al. [17] employ the elliptical potential lemma from [1] to address this problem, the formulation fails to fully exploit the special structure of the dynamic pricing problem and can be optimized further to achieve a suboptimal regret order.

A crucial observation is that the number of actions in a given episode is bounded by  $d_k$ . Existing literature, such as [15, 2], has demonstrated that in linear contextual bandit problems, the elliptical potential lemma is unnecessary. They have shown that the regret bound can be reduced to  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d_k T_k \log^3(K T_k)})$  when dealing with time-varying action sets with bounded size  $K$ .

However, the methods proposed in [15, 2] cannot be directly applied to our current setting. One key challenge arises from the normalized parameters. If we were to normalize  $\xi^*$ , an additional  $\sqrt{d_k}$  term would still arise. However, we can take advantage of the fact that the action vector has only one non-zero component and satisfies  $|(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_j))| \leq B$ . This observation allows us

---

**Algorithm 2** Upper Confidence Bound with Layered Data Partitioning (UCB-LDP)
 

---

**Input:** the estimator  $\hat{v}$ , the discretization number  $d$ , the length  $T$  and the bound  $B$

- 1: Cut the  $F$ -learning interval  $[-\|\hat{v}\|_\infty, B + \|\hat{v}\|_\infty]$  into  $d$  same-length sub-intervals with their midpoints denoted as  $m_1, \dots, m_d$
  - 2: Set  $S = \lceil \ln T \rceil$ ,  $\Psi_t^s = \emptyset$  for  $s \in [S]$
  - 3: **for** round  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
  - 4:   Observe the context  $x_t$
  - 5:   Let  $s = 1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{j \in [d_k] | m_j + \hat{v}(x_t) \in (0, B)\}$
  - 6:   **repeat**
  - 7:     Compute  $\mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j = \{\tau \in \Psi_t^s | m_j + \hat{v}(x_\tau) = p_\tau\}$  for all  $j \in [d]$
  - 8:     For all  $j \in [d]$ , compute the average of  $1 - F(m_j)$  as  $w_{t,s}^j = \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 y_\tau}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2}$
  - 9:     For all  $j \in [d]$ , compute the radius of  $1 - F(m_j)$  as  $r_{t,s}^j = \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\log(Td/\delta)}{2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2}}, 1 \right\}$
  - 10:    **if**  $r_{t,s}^j \leq 1/\sqrt{T}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{A}_s$  **then**
  - 11:     Choose the index  $j_t = \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{A}_s} (m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))(w_{t,s}^j + r_{t,s}^j)$
  - 12:     Update the round collection  $\Psi_{t+1}^\sigma = \Psi_t^\sigma$  for all  $\sigma \in [S]$
  - 13:     // step (a)
  - 14:     **else if**  $(m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))r_{t,s}^j \leq B2^{-s}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{A}_s$  **then**
  - 15:       Let  $\mathcal{A}_{s+1} = \{j \in \mathcal{A}_s | (m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))(w_{t,s}^j + r_{t,s}^j) \geq \max_{j' \in \mathcal{A}_s} (m_{j'} + \hat{v}(x_t))(w_{t,s}^{j'} + r_{t,s}^{j'}) - B2^{1-s}\}$
  - 16:       Let  $s \leftarrow s + 1$
  - 17:     // step (b)
  - 18:     **else**
  - 19:       Choose  $j_t$  such that  $(m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))r_{t,s}^j > B2^{-s}$
  - 20:       Update  $\Psi_{t+1}^s = \Psi_t^s \cup \{t\}$
  - 21:    **until** An index  $j_t$  is found
  - 22:    Set the price  $p_t = m_{j_t} + \hat{v}(x_t)$
-

to focus on the UCB for each component individually, rather than considering the entire parameter vector. By doing so, we can exploit the  $\ell_\infty$  estimation error for linear parameters, which excludes the extra  $\sqrt{d_k}$  term compared to the  $\ell_2$  norm. Therefore, we can apply the Azuma's inequality rather than the elliptical potential lemma to obtain concentration bounds. To obtain statistical dependence, we apply the layered data partitioning technique in our algorithmic construction.

The second challenge we face is related to the perturbation of  $\xi^*$ . This perturbation introduces misspecification errors in the reformulated linear bandit, resulting in a complex construction of the UCB. When considering the price  $p_t$  and covariate  $x_t$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[y_t]$  is equal to  $1 - F(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) - v^*(x_t))$ , which is only approximately equal to  $\xi_j^*$  rather than an exact equality. It is evident, as indicated in **Assumption 2.2**, that estimation errors of  $\hat{v}_k$  can propagate into misspecification errors. This assumption implies that the perturbation is proportional to the estimation error. If the estimator  $\hat{v}_k$  is accurate, then  $\xi^*$  remains unperturbed, and the problem reduces to a classic linear bandit. However, a poorer estimator implies a larger perturbation, increasing the difficulty in solving the perturbed linear bandit problem and potentially leading to a larger regret as shown in Theorem 4.1.

**Layered Data Partitioning.** In each time period  $t$ , we begin by constructing the candidate action set  $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{j \in [d_k] \mid m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \in (0, B)\}$ . Instead of utilizing all the data collected prior to time  $t$  for an ordinary least squares estimator for  $\xi^*$ , we divide the preceding time periods into disjoint layers indexed by  $s \in [S]$ , such that  $\cup_{s \in [S]} \Psi_t^s = [t - 1]$ . At time  $t$ , we sequentially visit the layers  $s \in [S]$  and, within each layer, calculate the upper confidence bound for each  $\xi_j^*$  using data collected exclusively during the periods in  $\Psi_t^s$ . From OLS estimator for  $\xi^*$ , we know that the estimator for  $\xi_j^*$  is

$$w_{t,s}^j = \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 y_\tau}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2},$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j$  contains the rounds that select the index corresponding to  $1 - F(m_j)$ . To determine the radius for  $\xi_j^*$ , we design the following expression:  $r_{t,s}^j = \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\log(T_k d_k / \delta)}{2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2}}, 1 \right\}$ . If  $\mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j$  is empty, indicating no corresponding rounds were selected, the UCB for that index is set to infinity.

The UCB property described in Lemma 3.2 is highly intuitive. The first term captures the variance resulting from the randomness of  $y_t$  given  $x_t$  and  $p_t$ , while the second term represents the bias stemming from the estimation of  $\hat{v}_k$ . As the UCB phase progresses, the variance gradually diminishes, and the bias caused by estimation errors tends to approach zero with each subsequent episode. With an increasing number of samples of  $x_t$  and  $y_t$ , our constructed  $w_{t,s}^j$  becomes increasingly accurate and converges to  $\xi_j^*$ . It is important to note that our constructed UCB does not involve the bias term. This allows us to eliminate the need for knowledge of the Lipschitz constant. The reason behind this is that we compare the UCB values on both sides, and the bias term is the same for all indices. Therefore, we can deduct the bias term at both sides in Step (a) of the algorithm and the Lipschitz term is implicitly absorbed in the adaptive term  $B2^{1-s}$ . This advantage of our algorithm eliminates the need for explicit knowledge of the Lipschitz constant.

**Lemma 3.2** *Consider the episode  $k$ , any round  $t$  in the episode  $k$  and any layer  $s$  in the round  $t$ .*

Then for each  $j \in [d_k]$ , we have

$$|\xi_j^* - w_{t,s}^j| \leq r_{t,s}^j + \frac{L \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2},$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta/(d_k T_k)$ .

*Proof.* Due to statistical independence of samples indexed in  $\Psi_t^s$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[y_\tau | x_\tau] = 1 - F(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau))$  for  $\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j$ . Then we apply the Azuma's inequality to  $\frac{p_\tau^2 y_\tau}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2}$ . We can obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| w_{t,s}^j - \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 \mathbb{E}[y_\tau | x_\tau]}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right| \geq \frac{\sqrt{\ln(T_k d_k / \delta) \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^4}}{2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{d_k T_k}$$

Thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^4 \leq \left( \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 \right)^2.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left( \left| w_{t,s}^j - \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 \mathbb{E}[y_\tau | x_\tau]}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right| \geq r_{t,s}^j \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \left| w_{t,s}^j - \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 \mathbb{E}[y_\tau | x_\tau]}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right| \geq \frac{\sqrt{\ln(T_k d_k / \delta) \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^4}}{2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\delta}{d_k T_k}. \end{aligned}$$

From **Assumption 2.2**, we can obtain

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 (\xi_j^* - \mathbb{E}[y_\tau | x_\tau])}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right| \leq \frac{L \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2},$$

so by the triangular inequality, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left( \left| w_{t,s}^j - \xi_j^* \right| \geq r_{t,s}^j + \frac{L \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \left| w_{t,s}^j - \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 \mathbb{E}[y_t | x_t]}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right| + \left| \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 (\xi_j^* - \mathbb{E}[y_t | x_t])}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right| \geq r_{t,s}^j + \frac{L \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \left| w_{t,s}^j - \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 \mathbb{E}[y_t | x_t]}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2} \right| \geq r_{t,s}^j \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\delta}{d_k T_k}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The algorithm commences with  $s = 1$ , corresponding to the widest confidence bands, and incrementally increases  $s$ , while simultaneously eliminating sub-optimal prices using OLS estimates from  $\Psi_t^s$ . This procedure is meticulously designed to ensure that the “stopping layer”  $s'$  determined at time  $t$  solely depends on  $\{\Psi_t^s\}_{s \leq s'}$ , effectively decoupling the statistical correlation in OLS estimates. The validity of this property has been formally stated and proven in [15, 2].

Based on Lemma 3.2, we construct a high-probability event

$$\Gamma_k = \left\{ |\xi_j^* - w_{t,s}^j| \leq r_{t,s}^j + \frac{L \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2}, \forall t, \forall s, \forall j \right\}.$$

Then by the union bound, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{\Gamma}_k) \leq \frac{\delta}{d_k T_k} \times T_k \times d_k \times S = \delta S.$$

For brevity, we denote  $\eta_{t,s}^j = \frac{L \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2}$ . Since  $x_t$  is i.i.d. sampled from a fixed distribution, we know that  $\mathbb{E}_x[\eta_{t,s}^j] = L \mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|]$ .

Recall that the index of the discrete best price is  $j_t^* = \arg \max_{j \in [d_k]} (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) - v^*(x_t)))$ . We define the discrete best price at the layer  $s$  as

$$j_{t,s}^* = \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{A}_s} (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) - v^*(x_t))).$$

For simplicity, we introduce the revenue function

$$rev_t(p) = p(1 - F(p - v^*(x_t))).$$

In [2], their algorithm ensures  $j_{t,s}^* = j_t^*$ , as the optimal action will not be eliminated when their constructed high-probability event holds. In contrast, due to the misspecification error being proportional to  $BL \mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|]$  when transitioning to a new layer, the revenue between prices

indexed by  $j_{t,s}^*$  and  $j_t^*$  is naturally proportional to  $s-1$ . Combining the above discussion, we proceed to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3** *Given the event  $\Gamma_k$ , then for each round  $t$  in the episode  $k$  and each layer  $s$  in the round  $t$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_t}[\text{rev}_t(m_{j_t^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) - \text{rev}_t(m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))] \leq 4BL\mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|](s-1).$$

*Proof.* We prove this lemma by induction on  $s$ . For  $s=1$ , the lemma holds naturally as  $\mathcal{A}_1 = [d_k]$  and thus  $j_t^* = j_{t,s}^*$ . Assume that the bound holds in the layer  $s$ . It is sufficient to show that  $\mathbb{E}_{x_t}[\text{rev}_t(m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) - \text{rev}_t(m_{j_{t,s+1}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))] \leq 2BL\mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|]$ . If  $j_{t,s}^* = j_{t,s+1}^*$ , the desired bound holds. Hence we assume that  $j_{t,s+1}^* \notin \mathcal{A}_{t,s+1}$ . Let  $\hat{j}_{t,s} := \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{A}_s} (w_{t,s}^j + r_{t,s}^j)$  be the index with the highest UCB in  $\mathcal{A}_s$ . From Step (a) we know  $\hat{j}_{t,s} \in \mathcal{A}_{s+1}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{rev}_t(m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) - \text{rev}_t(m_{j_{t,s+1}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) \\ & \leq \text{rev}_t(m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) - \text{rev}_t(m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) \\ & \leq (m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_{j_{t,s}^*})) - (m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}})) + 2BL|\hat{v}_k(x_t) - v^*(x_t)|. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition to  $\Gamma_k$ , we know that

$$\begin{aligned} & (m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_{j_{t,s}^*})) - (m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}})) \\ & \leq (m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(w_{t,s}^{j_{t,s}^*} + r_{t,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}) - (m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(w_{t,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + r_{t,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}) \\ & \quad + \frac{BL \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}} p_\tau^2} + \frac{BL \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}} p_\tau^2} \\ & = (m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(w_{t,s}^{j_{t,s}^*} + r_{t,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}) - (m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(w_{t,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + r_{t,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}) + 2r_{t,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}(m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) \\ & \quad + \frac{BL \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}} p_\tau^2} + \frac{BL \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}} p_\tau^2} \end{aligned}$$

From algorithmic construction (step (b)), we know  $(m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))r_{t,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}} \leq B2^{-s}$ . Since  $\hat{j}_{t,s} \notin \mathcal{A}_s$ , the step (a) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & (m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(w_{t,s}^{j_{t,s}^*} + r_{t,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}) - (m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(w_{t,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + r_{t,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}) \\ & > B2^{1-s} \\ & \geq 2(m_{\hat{j}_{t,s}} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))r_{t,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combing all inequalities above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{rev}_t(m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) - \text{rev}_t(m_{j_{t,s+1}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) \\ & \leq 2BL|\hat{v}_k(x_t) - v^*(x_t)| + \frac{BL \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}} p_\tau^2} + \frac{BL \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{\hat{j}_{t,s}}} p_\tau^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation with respect to all referred  $x_\tau$  yields the desired inequality.  $\square$

Now, we can effectively control the regret within layer  $s$  using  $j_{t,s}^*$  as the benchmark. The upper bound in Lemma 3.4 can be divided into two components: the variance and the bias. As we increase the value of  $s$ , the variance decreases exponentially, while the bias only increases linearly. Therefore, having a larger value of  $s$  is advantageous for online learning.

**Lemma 3.4** *Given the event  $\Gamma_k$ , then for each round  $t$  in the episode  $k$  and each layer  $s$  in the round  $t$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_{j_{t,s}^*})) - (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_j))] \\ & \leq 4B \cdot 2^{-s} + 2BL\mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|](s-1), \forall j \in \mathcal{A}_s. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Step (a) shows that

$$(m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))(w_{t,s}^j + r_{t,s}^j) \geq (m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}(x_t))(w_{t,s-1}^{j_{t,s}^*} + r_{t,s-1}^{j_{t,s}^*}) - B2^{2-s}.$$

Step (b) implies that  $(m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))r_{t,s-1}^j \leq B2^{1-s}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{A}_{s-1}$ . Combing two inequalities we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & (m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}(x_t))(w_{t,s-1}^{j_{t,s}^*} + r_{t,s-1}^{j_{t,s}^*}) - (m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))(w_{t,s-1}^j - r_{t,s-1}^j) \\ & \leq 2(m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))r_{t,s-1}^j + B2^{2-s} \\ & \leq 4B2^{1-s}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from the definition of  $\Gamma_k$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 4B2^{1-s} \\ & \geq (m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}(x_t))(w_{t,s-1}^{j_{t,s}^*} + r_{t,s-1}^{j_{t,s}^*}) - (m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))(w_{t,s-1}^j - r_{t,s-1}^j) \\ & \geq (m_{j_{t,s}^*} + \hat{v}(x_t))(1 - F(m_{j_{t,s}^*})) - (m_j + \hat{v}(x_t))(1 - F(m_j)) \\ & \quad - \frac{BL \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_{t,s}^*}} p_\tau^2} - \frac{BL \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2 |\hat{v}_k(x_\tau) - v^*(x_\tau)|}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^j} p_\tau^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation over all referred  $x_\tau$  yields the desired inequality.  $\square$

Based on Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, it is straightforward to derive the upper bound of the

discrete-part regrets for prices in the layer  $s$ .

**Lemma 3.5** *Given the event  $\Gamma_k$ , for every round  $t$  in the episode  $k$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_t}[rev_t(m_{j_t^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) - rev_t(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))] \leq 4B \cdot 2^{-s} + 4BL\mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|](3s - 2).$$

for all  $j \in \mathcal{A}_s$ .

*Proof.* It follows from **Assumption 2.2** and Lemma 3.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{x_t}[rev_t(m_{j_t^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) - rev_t(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))] \\ & \leq 4BL\mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|](s - 1) + \mathbb{E}_{x_t}[(m_{j_t^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_{j_t^*})) - rev_t(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{x_t}[(m_{j_t^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_{j_t^*})) - (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_j))] + 2BL\mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|](2s - 1) \\ & \leq 4B \cdot 2^{-s} + 2BL\mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|](3s - 2). \end{aligned}$$

□

## 4 Regret Analysis

In this section, we analyze the regret of our proposed Algorithm 1. We begin with analyzing a single episode in Algorithm 1 and then extend it to the entire horizon.

### 4.1 Upper bounds

From the initial pure exploration phase, we obtain an estimator  $\hat{v}_k$ . As this estimator guides the UCB procedure, it is important to understand how the estimation error affects the regret in the UCB phase. A lower error rate in the estimation is expected to result in less regret. However, achieving a lower error rate requires a longer exploration phase, which leads to more regret. Therefore, in addition to the “inner” balance between revenue maximization and  $F$ -learning in the UCB phase, there exists an “outer” balance between the regret in the exploration phase and the regret in the UCB phase, both related to learning  $v^*$ .

For the round  $t$  at the episode  $k$ , define  $j_t^* := \arg \max_{j \in [d_k]} (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) - v^*(x_t)))$ . By defining the discrete best prices as  $\tilde{p}_t^* = m_{j_t^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)$ , the time  $t$  regret can be decomposed as

$$\underbrace{\tilde{p}_t^*(1 - F(\tilde{p}_t^* - v^*(x_t))) - p_t(1 - F(p_t - v^*(x_t)))}_{\mathcal{R}_t^1} + \underbrace{p_t^*(1 - F(p_t^* - v^*(x_t))) - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 - F(\tilde{p}_t^* - v^*(x_t)))}_{\mathcal{R}_t^2}.$$

We refer  $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{R}_t^1$  and  $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{R}_t^2$  as the discrete-part and continuous-part regrets. We first analyze the regret for the inner UCB algorithm. To bound the discrete-part regret of the inner UCB algorithm, we prove the following theorem.

**Lemma 4.1** *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.2, the expected regret of the discrete-part satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{R}_t^1\right] \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \log_2 T \rceil} \left( 8B\sqrt{d_k T_k \log(T_k d_k / \delta) \ln T_k} + 12BL \ln^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}| \log T / \delta) \ell_k^{\frac{2}{3}} \log \ell_k \right).$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

*Proof.* We consider the episode  $k$ . Let  $\Psi_0$  be the set of rounds for which an alternative is chosen when  $r_{t,s}^j \leq 1/\sqrt{T_k}$ . Since  $2^{-S} \leq 1/\sqrt{T_k}$ , we have  $\Psi_0 \cup \cup_{s \in [S]} \Psi_{T_k+1}^s = [T_k]$ .

Recall  $j_t^* := \arg \max_{j \in [d_k]} (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))(1 - F(m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) - v^*(x_t)))$  and we define the discrete empirical best price as  $\tilde{p}_t^* = m_{j_t^*} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)$ . We first bound the regret  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=2^{k-1}+T_k^e+1}^{2^k} \mathcal{R}_t^1]$  at the episode  $k$  as following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=2^{k-1}+T_k^e+1}^{2^k} \mathcal{R}_t^1\right] &= \sum_{t=2^{k-1}+T_k^e+1}^{2^k} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{p}_t^*(1 - F(\tilde{p}_t^* - v^*(x_t))) - p_t(1 - F(p_t - v^*(x_t)))] \\ &= \sum_{t=2^{k-1}+T_k^e+1}^{2^k} \mathbb{E}[\text{rev}_t(\tilde{p}_t^*) - \text{rev}_t(p_t)] \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{t \in \Psi_{T_k+1}^s} \mathbb{E}[\text{rev}_t(\tilde{p}_t^*) - \text{rev}_t(p_t)] \\ &\leq \sum_{s=1}^S 4B \cdot 2^{-s} |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| + 4BL \mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|] (3s - 2) |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 3.5.

From Lemma B.2, we have

$$|\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \leq 2^s \sqrt{2d_k |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \log(T_k d_k / \delta)}.$$

Putting it back yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{s=1}^S 4B \cdot 2^{-s} |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| + 4BL \mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|] (3s - 2) |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \\ &\leq \sum_{s=1}^S 4B \sqrt{2d_k |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \log(T_k d_k / \delta)} + 4BL \mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|] \sum_{s=1}^S (3s - 2) |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \\ &\leq 4B \sqrt{2d_k \log(T_k d_k / \delta) S \sum_{s=1}^S |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s|} + 4BL \mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|] \cdot 3T_k \log T_k \\ &\leq 8B \sqrt{d_k T_k \log(T_k d_k / \delta) \ln T_k} + 12BL \mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|] T_k \log T_k. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality is the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Notice that  $T_k \leq \ell_k$  and

$$\mathbb{E}_x[|\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x)|] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_x[(\hat{v}_k(x) - v^*(x))^2]} \leq \ln^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}| \log T/\delta) \ell_k^{-\frac{1}{3}}.$$

due to Lemma 3.1. We obtain the desired result by summing over all episodes.  $\square$

In Lemma 4.1, the first term saves an additional  $\sqrt{d_k}$  compared to the regret bounds presented in [16]. This term captures the impact of uncertainty in estimating the values of points on  $F$  and its influence on the regret bounds. It signifies the importance of accurately estimating the underlying distribution and how uncertainty in these estimates affects the regret. The second term in Lemma 4.1 arises from the transformation of baselines in the linear bandit problems. It highlights the connection between the estimation error of  $\hat{v}_k$  and the resulting regret bounds. The presence of this component illustrates how inaccuracies in estimating the baselines can influence the regret in the UCB phase. Essentially, it indicates that a higher level of estimation accuracy leads to a lower regret in the UCB phase.

We then delve into the analysis of the continuous-part of regret, denoted as  $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{R}_t^2$ . A denser discretization, achieved by increasing the number of price points, leads to a reduction in continuous-part regret. This is because a finer grid of prices brings the discrete best price closer to the overall best price. Due to algorithmic construction, the continuous-part regret can be bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\ell_k}{d_k})$ . However, it is important to note that a larger value of  $d_k$  results in higher discrete-part regret, as indicated by Lemma 4.1. This is due to the increased number of candidate prices and the resulting complexity in the search process. Therefore, it is necessary to find an appropriate value of  $d_k$  that optimally balances the discrete-part and continuous-part regrets. One approach to achieving this balance is to scale  $d_k$  with  $T_k^{\frac{1}{3}}$ , which allows for effective regulation of the trade-off between the discrete-part and continuous-part regret.

**Lemma 4.2** *Under Assumption 2.1, the expected regret of the continuous-part satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{R}_t^2] \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \log_2 T \rceil} \frac{4BT_k}{d_k}.$$

*Proof.* We consider the continuous-part regret at each round  $t$  in the episode  $k$ . It admits the form

$$p_t^*(1 - F(p_t^* - v^*(x_t))) - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 - F(\tilde{p}_t^* - v^*(x_t))),$$

where  $p_t^*$  is the overall best price and  $\tilde{p}_t^*$  is the discrete best price among the candidate set.

Denote  $\dot{p}_t = \max\{0, \max_{j \in [d_k], m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq p_t^*} (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t))\}$ . Then we discuss case by case.

1.  $\{j \in [d_k], m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq p_t^*\} = \emptyset$ . Then we have  $\dot{p}_t = 0$  and

$$p_t^* \leq m_1 + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq -\|\hat{v}_k\|_\infty + \frac{B + 2\|\hat{v}_k\|_\infty}{2d_k} + \|\hat{v}_k\|_\infty \leq \frac{B + 2\|\hat{v}_k\|_\infty}{2d_k} \leq \frac{3B}{2d_k}.$$

Therefore, we have  $0 \leq p_t^* - \dot{p}_t \leq \frac{3B}{2d_k}$ .

2.  $\{j \in [d_k], m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq p_t^*\} \neq \emptyset$  and  $\max_{j \in [d_k], m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq p_t^*} (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) < m_{d_k} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)$ . Then

we have  $\max_{j \in [d_k], m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq p_t^*} (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) \leq \dot{p}_t \leq \max_{j \in [d_k], m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq p_t^*} (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) + \frac{3B}{2d_k}$ . Namely, we have  $0 \leq p_t^* - \dot{p}_t \leq \frac{3B}{2d_k}$ .

3.  $\{j \in [d_k], m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq p_t^*\} \neq \emptyset$  and  $\max_{j \in [d_k], m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq p_t^*} (m_j + \hat{v}_k(x_t)) = m_{d_k} + \hat{v}_k(x_t)$ . Since  $m_{d_k} + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \geq B + \hat{v}_k(x_t) - \frac{3B}{2d_k} - \|\hat{v}_k\|_\infty \geq B - \frac{3B}{2d_k}$ , then we have  $B - \frac{3B}{2d_k} \leq m_{d_k} + \hat{v}_k(x_t) \leq p_t^* \leq B$ . Therefore we have  $p_t^* - \dot{p}_t \leq \frac{3B}{2d_k}$ .

From above discussion, we conclude that  $0 \leq p_t^* - \dot{p}_t \leq \frac{3B}{2d_k}$ . Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & p_t^*(1 - F(p_t^* - v^*(x_t))) - \dot{p}_t^*(1 - F(\dot{p}_t^* - v^*(x_t))) \\ & \leq p_t^*(1 - F(\dot{p}_t - v^*(x_t))) - \dot{p}_t^*(1 - F(\dot{p}_t^* - v^*(x_t))) \\ & \leq (p_t^* - \dot{p}_t)(1 - F(\dot{p}_t - v^*(x_t))) \\ & \leq \frac{3B}{2d_k}. \end{aligned}$$

We first sum over all rounds in the episode  $k$  and then sum over all episodes. We can obtain the desired results.  $\square$

Combining all previous lemmas, we are capable of proving the following theorem, showcasing the  $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{2}{3}})$  regret upper bound.

**Theorem 4.1** *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.2, the expected regret satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] = \mathcal{O}(BT^{\frac{2}{3}} \log^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta) \log^{\frac{3}{2}} T)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

*Proof.* Since the price  $p_t$  is bounded by  $B$ , then the regret caused by the exploration phase is

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \log_2 T \rceil} BT_k^e \leq B \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \log_2 T \rceil} \ell_k^{\frac{2}{3}} \ln^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta) \leq BT^{\frac{2}{3}} \ln^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta) \log T.$$

The warm-up phase cause at most  $B2^{k^*} \leq B \ln^3 |\mathcal{V}|$  regret.

We then combine the results in Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 and obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \log_2 T \rceil} \left( \sqrt{d_k T_k \log(d_k \ell_k / \delta) \ln T_k} + BL \ln^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}| \log T / \delta) \ell_k^{\frac{2}{3}} \log \ell_k + \frac{3BT_k}{2d_k} \right)$$

Since  $d_k = \lceil T_k^{1/3} \rceil$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] \leq 3T^{\frac{2}{3}} \sqrt{\log(T^{\frac{4}{3}}/\delta)}(1 + \log T) + B(L+1)T^{\frac{2}{3}} \log^{\frac{1}{3}}(|\mathcal{V}| \log T / \delta) \log T + B \ln^3 |\mathcal{V}|.$$

$\square$

**Lower bound.** Xu and Wang [24] demonstrated that under the Lipschitz continuity condition, any policy will result in a regret of at least  $\Omega(T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ . This finding establishes the minimax optimality

of our algorithm, up to logarithmic terms. However, there remains a gap of order  $|\mathcal{V}|$  in terms of exploration, which is an area for future research. The Lipschitz continuity assumption is crucial as it enables us to control the misspecification error in the regret analysis.

Without the Lipschitz condition, Xu and Wang [24] proposed an algorithm with a regret bound of  $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{3}{4}})$ . In their work, they discretize the linear parameter space and distribution space to form the policy space, reducing the original problem into an EXP4 agent. Although they discretize the distribution in a similar way to us, they still consider finding a good distribution within the given set, resulting in a policy space of size  $\mathcal{O}(2^{d_k})$ . In contrast, for setting a suitable price, we only need to evaluate at  $d_k$  points. This observation effectively reduces the search space from  $\mathcal{O}(2^{d_k})$  to  $\mathcal{O}(d_k)$ , leading to exponential decrease in both regret and time complexity.

However, it is currently unknown whether their bound is tight in the absence of the Lipschitz continuity assumption. Further investigation is required to explore the tightness of the regret bound without the Lipschitz assumption.

## 5 Discussion

In this section, we explore several extensions and improvements to the existing framework, aiming to enhance our understanding of the theoretical results and their applications.

**General offline regression oracle.** To simplify the discussion on the estimation process, we consider a natural approach of reducing it to the general offline regression oracle. This approach involves an offline regression oracle associated with  $\mathcal{V}$ . The offline regression oracle is a procedure that generates a predictor based on the input data.

**Assumption 5.1** *The general offline regression oracle takes  $n$  samples of the form  $(x_i, y_i)$ , independently and identically drawn according to a fixed distribution such that  $\mathbb{E}[By_i|x_i] = v^*(x_i)$  for  $v^* \in \mathcal{V}$ . It returns a predictor  $\hat{v} \in \mathcal{V}$  which satisfies that for any  $\delta > 0$*

$$\mathbb{E}_x[(\hat{v}(x) - v^*(x))^2] \leq \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)}{n}.$$

*holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .*

This assumption describes the estimation accuracy in statistical learning tasks. The quantity  $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)$  in **Assumption 5.1** reflects the properties of the function space  $\mathcal{V}$  and decreases as  $\delta$  decreases. Moreover, the function  $\frac{\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)}{n}$  serves as an upper bound on the squared  $L^2$  distance between the true value  $v^*$  and the estimated value  $\hat{v}$  in expectation. Under realizability assumption (i.e.,  $v^* \in \mathcal{V}$ ), this squared distance corresponds to the estimation error of  $\hat{v}$ . Characterizing sharp bounds on the estimation error and developing efficient algorithms to achieve such bounds are fundamental tasks in the field of statistical learning.

The choice of function class  $\mathcal{V}$  is flexible and can encompass various parametric or nonparametric models, including Lipschitz function classes, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, and neural networks. To achieve optimal regret in the contextual dynamic pricing problem, it is crucial to have a computationally-efficient and statistically-optimal offline regression oracle tailored to the chosen function class  $\mathcal{V}$ .

Furthermore, we can extend the results under a general estimation assumption through a simple corollary. By replacing the quantity  $\ln(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta)$  with  $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)$  in the algorithmic steps and proofs, we obtain an extended bound on the expected regret. For completeness, we present new Algorithm 4 in Appendix. Specifically, under the assumptions of boundedness, Lipschitz continuity, and the availability of an offline regression oracle (**Assumption 2.1**, **Assumption 2.2**, and **Assumption 5.1**), the expected regret satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] = \mathcal{O}(BT^{\frac{2}{3}}\rho_{\mathcal{V}}^{\frac{1}{3}}(\delta)\log^{\frac{3}{2}}T)$  with a probability of at least  $1 - \delta$ .

**Corollary 5.1** *Under Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.2 and Assumption 5.1, the expected regret of Algorithm 4 satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] = \mathcal{O}(BT^{\frac{2}{3}}\rho_{\mathcal{V}}^{\frac{1}{3}}(\delta)\log^{\frac{3}{2}}T)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

To demonstrate the versatility of the corollary, we can consider specific cases of function spaces and examine their corresponding bounds on  $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)$ .

- **Finite function space:** From Lemma 3.1 we know that the bound  $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta) = \mathcal{O}(\log(|\mathcal{V}|/\delta))$  for finite function spaces  $\mathcal{V}$ . This result is particularly noteworthy as it matches the lower bound of  $\Omega\left(\frac{\log(|\mathcal{V}|)}{n}\right)$  provided by minimax theory in empirical estimation [10]. The tightness of the method is thus established and we have presented this special case in Theorem 4.1.
- **Linear function space:** Linear valuation models have been widely employed in various dynamic pricing works [9, 17, 24]. Classical analysis techniques applied to linear regression yield guarantees of  $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta) = \mathcal{O}(d_0 \log(\delta^{-1}))$  for linear parameters. The tightness of this upper bound has been demonstrated through empirical minimax theorem [10]. Furthermore, linear regression techniques can be extended to incorporate sparsity [13] or utilize reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces [21, 18]. In the context of sparsity, under certain regularity conditions, we have  $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta) = \mathcal{O}(s_0 \log(\delta^{-1}))$ , where  $s_0$  is the sparsity parameter.

**Linear valuation model.** To demonstrate the versatility of our approach, we provide examples within the widely investigated linear valuation model, which has been extensively studied in dynamic pricing literature [17, 24, 9, 13, 12]. These examples highlight the adaptability of our method across various settings, resulting in improved regret orders compared to existing works.

In the linear valuation model, the function space  $\mathcal{V} = \{\theta^\top x : \|\theta\|_2 \leq 1\}$  satisfies **Assumption 5.1** with an estimation error bound  $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta) = \mathcal{O}(d_0 \log(1/\delta))$  under certain regularity conditions. Recall that we use  $d_0$  to denote the dimension of covariates. By imposing a Lipschitz condition, we conclude that Algorithm 1 achieves a regret order of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d_0^{\frac{1}{3}}T^{\frac{2}{3}})$  in the linear valuation model. Importantly, this regret order represents a significant improvement over the previously reported order of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d_0T^{\frac{3}{4}})$  in [17] and [24]. Furthermore, when combined with the lower bound results in [24], our method achieves minimax optimality, effectively bridging the gap in the previous literature.

Additionally, our approach naturally extends to the case of high-dimensional covariates with sparsity  $s_0$ . Under mild conditions, Oh et al. [19] utilizes Lasso regression to obtain an estimator

with  $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta) = \mathcal{O}(s_0 \log(d_0/\delta))$ , while Javanmard and Nazerzadeh [13] employs the regularized maximum likelihood method, resulting in a similar estimator error. Leveraging sparsity, we are able to improve the upper bound on regret to  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(s_0^{\frac{1}{3}} T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ .

Interestingly, Luo et al. [16] leverage **Assumption 5.2** of the revenue functions to achieve regret of  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d_0 T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ . This assumption assumes second-order smoothness of the expected revenue functions around the optimal prices and has also been imposed in [17, 6, 16]. In fact, as reported by [16], dynamic pricing problems satisfying both **Assumption 2.2** and **Assumption 5.2** have a regret lower bound of at least  $\Omega(T^{\frac{3}{5}})$ . This indicates that the assumption of second-order smoothness is non-trivial, as it indeed reduces the difficulty of dynamic pricing problems.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that the assumption of bounded second derivatives of  $F$  also satisfies **Assumption 5.2**. In contrast, for revenue functions with bounded second derivatives in Fan et al. [9], their method incurs a regret upper bound of  $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{5}{7}})$ , which is worse than the performance achieved by our method. This difference in performance can be attributed to the approach used in Fan et al. [9], which requires estimating  $F'$  to determine the price at each round. This estimation introduces additional error compared to our method, where we only need to estimate the values of specific points on  $F$ .

**Assumption 5.2 (Second-order Smoothness)** *Define the general expected revenue functions associated with the noise distribution  $F$  as  $rev_q(p) = p(1 - F(p - q))$ . There exists a positive constant  $C$  such that for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $q = v^*(x)$ , we have  $rev_q(p^*(x)) - rev_q(p) \leq C(p^*(x) - p)^2$ .*

**Knowledge of  $F$ .** In the case where the distribution  $F$  is fully known to sellers, Javanmard and Nazerzadeh [13] investigate this scenario and propose an algorithm with a regret of  $\mathcal{O}(d_0 \log T)$  under smoothness conditions for  $F$ . They demonstrate that if the positive-definiteness of the covariance matrix does not hold, an alternative method with a regret of  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T \log d_0})$  can be employed. The knowledge of  $F$  plays a crucial role in significantly reducing regret. Building upon the algorithm proposed in [13] and leveraging the assumption of an offline oracle (**Assumption 5.1**), we modify the algorithm in [13] and present our own method in Algorithm 3. The regret analysis of our method is provided in the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.2** *Under **Assumption 2.1**, **Assumption A.1**, **Assumption A.2** and **Assumption 5.1**, the expected regret of Algorithm 3 satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[Reg(T)] = \mathcal{O}(\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta) \log T).$$

*with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .*

*Proof.* Given the estimator  $\hat{v}_k$  using data collected in the previous episode,  $p_t$  is only determined by  $x_t$ . Therefore, we know that the data collected in one episode is i.i.d. due to the i.i.d. nature of covariates. Thanks to **Assumption A.1**, we apply the Taylor's expansion at  $p_t^*$  to  $rev_t(p_t)$ :

$$rev_t(p_t^*) - rev_t(p_t) \leq C(p_t^* - p_t)^2,$$

where  $C = \max_p |rev_t''(p)|$ . Using first order conditions, for the optimal posted price  $p_t^*$ , we obtain

$$p_t^* = \frac{1 - F(p_t^* - v^*(x_t))}{F'(p_t^* - v^*(x_t))}.$$

Since  $1 - F$  is log-concave, the hazard function  $v \rightarrow \frac{F'(v)}{1-F(v)}$  is increasing, which implies  $\phi(v) = v - \frac{1-F(v)}{F'(v)}$  is strictly increasing. Note that

$$\phi(p_t^* - v^*(x_t)) = p_t^* - v^*(x_t) - \frac{1 - F(p_t^* - v^*(x_t))}{F'(p_t^* - v^*(x_t))} = -v^*(x_t)$$

Define  $g(v) = v + \phi^{-1}(-v)$  and we know that

$$g(v^*(x_t)) = v^*(x_t) + \phi^{-1}(-v^*(x_t)) = p_t^*.$$

Similarly, since  $p_t$  maximizes  $p(1 - F(p - \hat{v}_k(x_t)))$ , we know that  $g(\hat{v}_k(x_t)) = p_t$ . From lemma 15 in [13], we know  $g$  is 1-Lipschitz and thus we have

$$|g(v^*(x_t)) - g(\hat{v}_k(x_t))| \leq |v^*(x_t) - \hat{v}_k(x_t)|.$$

Therefore, we have

$$rev_t(p_t^*) - rev_t(p_t) \leq C(p_t^* - p_t)^2 \leq C|v^*(x_t) - \hat{v}_k(x_t)|^2.$$

Due to **Assumption 5.1**, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[rev_t(p_t^*) - rev_t(p_t)] \leq \frac{C\rho_V(\delta)}{2^{k-1}}.$$

Summing over all rounds in all episodes yields

$$\mathbb{E}[Reg(T)] \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \log T \rceil} \sum_{t=2^{k-1}}^{2^k} \mathbb{E}[rev_t(p_t^*) - rev_t(p_t)] \leq 3C\rho_V(\delta) \log T.$$

□

**Knowledge of  $v_t$ .** In many realistic applications, the seller can directly observe the valuation  $v_t$  of customers after pricing, for example, through bidding. Having access to such information simplifies the algorithm design and eliminates the need for an exploration phase. Hence, we consider the setting where the valuation of customers can be observed after setting the price  $p_t$  and observe the feedback  $y_t$  at the round  $t$ . By removing the exploration phase, we can straightforwardly modify Algorithm 1 by incorporating the tuple  $(x_t, v_t)$  instead of  $(x_t, y_t)$  into the offline oracles. Remarkably, the regret of the new algorithm remains  $\mathcal{O}(BT^{\frac{2}{3}}\rho_V^{\frac{1}{3}}(\delta)\log^{\frac{3}{2}}T)$ . However, with the knowledge of  $v_t$ , we can improve upon the regret bound under **Assumption 5.2**. Intuitively, this modification adjusts the continuous-part regret to  $\mathcal{O}(\frac{T_k}{d_k^2})$  in the episode  $k$ .

**Corollary 5.3** *Under Assumption 2.1, Assumption 5.2 and Assumption 5.1, the expected*

regret of Algorithm 5 satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{3}{5}} \log T + \sqrt{\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)T}).$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

This bound matches the lower bound  $\Omega(T^{\frac{3}{5}})$  reported in [17, 16]. However, since the model in [17, 16] only allows obtaining censored demand data, it is not clear whether the seller can achieve lower regrets when it can observe customers' valuations. In the next discussion, we will demonstrate how to remove the requirement of valuation knowledge by relying on classification oracles.

**Classification oracle.** To estimate the unknown value function  $v^*$ , we introduce a method that utilizes all the data  $(x_t, p_t, y_t)$  from the previous  $(k - 1)$ -th episode. This allows us to obtain an estimate  $\hat{v}_k$  that can be used for pricing in the  $k$ -th episode. Since  $y_t$  is binary and determined by  $x_t$  and  $p_t$  through  $\mathbb{P}(y_t = 1) = 1 - F(p_t - v^*(x_t))$ , we can establish the following relationships:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(y_t = 1) > \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) + v^*(x_t) - p_t > 0; \\ \mathbb{P}(y_t = 1) = \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) + v^*(x_t) - p_t = 0; \\ \mathbb{P}(y_t = 1) < \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) + v^*(x_t) - p_t < 0. \end{cases}$$

This allows us to transform the estimation procedure into a classification problem. By applying a classification oracle, we can obtain a predictor  $\hat{v} \in \mathcal{V}$  that approximates  $v^*$ . The classification oracle provides a decision boundary based on the unknown function  $v^*$ .

**Assumption 5.3** *Given  $n$  samples of the form  $(x_i, p_i, y_i)$ , the classification oracle returns a predictor  $\hat{v} \in \mathcal{V}$ . For any  $\delta > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_x[(\hat{v}(x) - v^*(x))^2] \leq \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)}{n^\alpha}$$

for some positive  $\alpha$ .

In the work of Luo et al. [17], a linear classification method is applied to the adaptive data from the previous episode to obtain a linear parameter estimator. They demonstrate that in the linear valuation model, **Assumption 5.3** is satisfied with  $\alpha \geq 1$ . However, for a general function space, it remains unknown whether we can design a suitable classification oracle that meets the required conditions. Typically, classification oracles are criticized due to the lack of theoretical guarantees for estimation accuracy.

Under Lipschitz condition only, the upper bound for the contextual dynamic problem remains  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)^{\frac{1}{3}}T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ . However, by incorporating the additional assumption of second-order smoothness (**Assumption 5.2**), we can enhance the performance of the previous work [17]. Based on **Assumption 5.3** and **Assumption 5.2**, we can derive the following corollary:

**Corollary 5.4** *Under Assumption 2.1, Assumption 5.2 and Assumption 5.3, the expected regret of modified Algorithm 4 satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Reg}(T)] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{3}{5}} \log T + \sqrt{\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)T^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}).$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

It is worth noting that to achieve minimax optimality, it only requires  $\alpha \geq \frac{4}{5}$ , which is slightly less than 1. If we specify  $\mathcal{V}$  to be a linear function space and employ logistic regression to estimate the unknown parameters, we can improve upon the results in [17] and match the lower bound  $\Omega(T^{\frac{3}{5}})$  reported in [16].

## 6 Conclusion

In conclusion, we propose a novel algorithm for contextual dynamic pricing that achieves improved regret bounds while minimizing assumptions. Our algorithm combines an explore-then-UCB approach with layered data partitioning, achieving a regret upper bound of  $\tilde{O}(\rho_{\mathcal{V}}^{\frac{1}{3}}(\delta)T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ . It extends beyond linear valuation models, simplifies estimation through offline regression oracles, and demonstrates improved performance compared to existing approaches. Our algorithm provides a comprehensive solution to the contextual dynamic pricing problem with minimax optimality and practical applicability.

Future research directions for the contextual dynamic pricing problem can focus on the following aspects. Firstly, investigating the regret lower bound without assuming Lipschitz continuity of the noise distribution  $F$  would provide a deeper understanding of the problem’s difficulty. Although Xu and Wang [24] demonstrated a regret upper bound of  $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{3}{4}})$ , it is conjectured that the lower bound remains  $\Omega(T^{\frac{3}{4}})$  when the Lipschitz continuity assumption is relaxed.

Secondly, exploring the leading term in the regret bound in terms of function spaces is an important direction for future research. It is still unknown whether our achieved regret bound of  $\tilde{O}(d_0^{\frac{1}{3}}T^{\frac{2}{3}})$  is optimal with respect to the covariate dimension  $d_0$ . Further investigation in this area would provide insights into the relationship between regret and function space complexity.

Lastly, improving regret upper bounds for smoother distributions represents a promising future direction. By incorporating additional second-order smoothness conditions, it is possible to enhance the regret upper bound to  $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{3}{5}})$ . Exploring this avenue further would contribute to a deeper understanding of the impact of distribution smoothness on regret performance.

## References

- [1] Y. Abbasi-Yadkori, D. Pál, and C. Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- [2] P. Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):397–422, 2002.
- [3] O. Besbes and A. Zeevi. On the (surprising) sufficiency of linear models for dynamic pricing with demand learning. *Management Science*, 61(4):723–739, 2015.
- [4] N. Cesa-Bianchi, T. Cesari, and V. Perchet. Dynamic pricing with finitely many unknown valuations. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 247–273. PMLR, 2019.
- [5] E. Chen, X. Chen, L. Gao, and J. Li. Dynamic contextual pricing with doubly non-parametric random utility models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06866*, 2024.
- [6] N. Chen and G. Gallego. Nonparametric pricing analytics with customer covariates. *Operations Research*, 69(3):974–984, 2021.
- [7] Y.-G. Choi, G.-S. Kim, C. Yunseo, W. Cho, M. C. Paik, and M.-h. Oh. Semi-parametric contextual pricing algorithm using cox proportional hazards model. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5771–5786. PMLR, 2023.
- [8] A. V. Den Boer. Dynamic pricing and learning: historical origins, current research, and new directions. *Surveys in operations research and management science*, 20(1):1–18, 2015.
- [9] J. Fan, Y. Guo, and M. Yu. Policy optimization using semiparametric models for dynamic pricing. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(545):552–564, 2024.
- [10] K. Fan. Minimax theorems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 39(1):42, 1953.
- [11] D. Foster and A. Rakhlin. Beyond ucb: Optimal and efficient contextual bandits with regression oracles. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3199–3210. PMLR, 2020.
- [12] N. Golrezaei, A. Javanmard, and V. Mirrokni. Dynamic incentive-aware learning: Robust pricing in contextual auctions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [13] A. Javanmard and H. Nazerzadeh. Dynamic pricing in high-dimensions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(9):1–49, 2019.
- [14] T. Lattimore and C. Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [15] Y. Li, Y. Wang, and Y. Zhou. Nearly minimax-optimal regret for linearly parameterized bandits. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2173–2174. PMLR, 2019.
- [16] Y. Luo, W. W. Sun, and Y. Liu. Contextual dynamic pricing with unknown noise: Explore-then-ucb strategy and improved regrets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:37445–37457, 2022.

- [17] Y. Luo, W. W. Sun, and Y. Liu. Distribution-free contextual dynamic pricing. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 49(1):599–618, 2024.
- [18] S. Mendelson and J. Neeman. Regularization in kernel learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(1):526–565, 2010.
- [19] M.-h. Oh, G. Iyengar, and A. Zeevi. Sparsity-agnostic lasso bandit. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8271–8280. PMLR, 2021.
- [20] S. Saharan, S. Bawa, and N. Kumar. Dynamic pricing techniques for intelligent transportation system in smart cities: A systematic review. *Computer Communications*, 150:603–625, 2020.
- [21] I. Steinwart, D. R. Hush, C. Scovel, et al. Optimal rates for regularized least squares regression. In *COLT*, pages 79–93, 2009.
- [22] K. Takemura, S. Ito, D. Hatano, H. Sumita, T. Fukunaga, N. Kakimura, and K.-i. Kawarabayashi. A parameter-free algorithm for misspecified linear contextual bandits. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3367–3375. PMLR, 2021.
- [23] Y. Wang, B. Chen, and D. Simchi-Levi. Multimodal dynamic pricing. *Management Science*, 67(10):6136–6152, 2021.
- [24] J. Xu and Y.-X. Wang. Towards agnostic feature-based dynamic pricing: Linear policies vs linear valuation with unknown noise. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 9643–9662. PMLR, 2022.

## A Algorithms

---

### Algorithm 3 Distribution-Dependent Dynamic Pricing Algorithm

---

**Input:** price upper bound  $B$ , distribution  $F$ , confidence parameter  $\delta$

- 1: **for** episode  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  **do**
  - 2: Find the estimator  $\hat{v}_k$  by the **Offline Regression Oracle** with the dataset  $\{(x_t, y_t)\}_{t=2^{k-2}+1}^{2^{k-1}}$   
(For  $k = 1$ , set  $\hat{v}_k = 0$ )
  - 3: **for** round  $t = 2^{k-1} + 1, \dots, 2^k$  **do**
  - 4: Observe context  $x_t$
  - 5: Set a price  $p_t = \arg \max_p p(1 - F(p - \hat{v}_k(x_t)))$
  - 6: Observe the feedback  $y_t$
- 

**Assumption A.1 (Differentiability)** *The noise distribution  $F$  is twice continuously differentiable.*

**Assumption A.2 (Concavity)** *The function  $F$  and  $1 - F$  is log-concave.*

---

### Algorithm 4 Distribution-Free Dynamic Pricing Algorithm with General Offline Regression Oracle

---

**Input:** price upper bound  $B$ , estimation parameter  $\rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta)$

- 1: Let  $k^* = \lceil 3 \log_2 \rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta) \rceil$   
// warm up
  - 2: **for** round  $t = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{k^*-1}$  **do**
  - 3: Observe context  $x_t$
  - 4: Set a price  $p_t$  uniformly from  $(0, B)$
  - 5: Observe the feedback  $y_t$
  - 6: **for** episode  $k = k^*, k^* + 1, \dots$  **do**
  - 7: Set the length of the  $k$ -th episode as  $\ell_k = 2^{k-1}$
  - 8: Set the length of the exploration phase at  $k$ -th episode as  $T_k^e = \lceil \ell_k^{\frac{2}{3}} \rho_{\mathcal{V}}(\delta) \rceil$   
// exploration phase
  - 9: **for** round  $t = 2^{k-1} + 1, \dots, 2^{k-1} + T_k^e$  **do**
  - 10: Observe context  $x_t$
  - 11: Set a price  $p_t$  uniformly from  $(0, B)$
  - 12: Observe the feedback  $y_t$   
// estimation phase
  - 13: Find the estimator  $\hat{v}_k$  by the **General Offline Regression Oracle**  
// UCB phase
  - 14: Set the length  $T_k = \ell_k - T_k^e$
  - 15: Set the discretization number  $d_k = \lceil T_k^{\frac{1}{3}} \rceil$
  - 16: **for**  $t = 2^{k-1} + T_k^e + 1, \dots, 2^k$  **do**
  - 17: Apply the **UCB-LDP** on the coming sequential contexts  $x_t$  with the estimator  $\hat{v}_k$ , the discretization number  $d_k$ , the length  $T_k$  and the bound  $B$
-

---

**Algorithm 5** Distribution-Free Dynamic Pricing Algorithm with General Offline Regression Oracle and Observable Valuation

---

**Input:** price upper bound  $B$ , estimation parameter  $\rho_V(\delta)$

- 1: **for** episode  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  **do**
  - 2:     Feed the collected data in the previous episode to the **General Offline Regression Oracle** and obtain an estimator  $\hat{v}_k$
  - 3:     Set the length  $T_k = 2^{k-1}$
  - 4:     Set the discretization number  $d_k = \lceil T_k^{\frac{1}{5}} \rceil$
  - 5:     **for**  $t = 2^{k-1} + 1, \dots, 2^k$  **do**
  - 6:         Apply the **UCB-LDP** on the coming sequential contexts  $x_t$  with the estimator  $\hat{v}_k$ , the discretization number  $d_k$ , the length  $T_k$  and the bound  $B$
- 

## B Proofs

**Lemma B.1** *Assuming  $|\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \geq 2$ , we have*

$$\sum_{t \in \Psi_{T_k+1}^s} p_t r_{t,s}^{j_t} \leq B \sqrt{2d_k |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \log(T_k d_k / \delta)}.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\sum_{t \in \Psi_{T_k+1}^s} p_t r_{t,s}^{j_t} = \sqrt{\log(T_k d_k / \delta)} \sum_{t \in \Psi_{T_k+1}^s} \frac{p_t}{\sqrt{2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_t}} p_\tau^2}}.$$

It suffices to bound the term  $\sum_{t \in \Psi_{T_k+1}^s} \frac{p_t}{\sqrt{2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_t}} p_\tau^2}}$ . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t \in \Psi_{T_k+1}^s} \frac{p_t}{\sqrt{2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1,s}^{j_t}} p_\tau^2}} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_{T_k}^j} \frac{p_t}{\sqrt{2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{t-1}^j} p_\tau^2}} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sqrt{2 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_{T_k}^j} p_t^2} \\ & \leq \sqrt{2d_k \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_{T_k}^j} p_t^2} \\ & \leq B \sqrt{2d_k |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s|}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\sum_{t \in \Psi_{T_k+1}^s} p_t r_{t,s}^{j_t} \leq B \sqrt{2d_k |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \log(T_k d_k / \delta)}.$$

□

**Lemma B.2** *For all  $s$ , we have*

$$|\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \leq 2^s \sqrt{2d_k |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \log(T_k d_k / \delta)}.$$

*Proof.* From Step (b), we know that

$$\sum_{t \in \Psi_{T_k+1}^s} p_t r_{t,s}^{j_t} \geq B 2^{-s} |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s|.$$

By Lemma B.1, we obtain

$$\sum_{t \in \Psi_{T_k+1}^s} p_t r_{t,s}^{j_t} \leq B \sqrt{2d_k |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \log(T_k d_k / \delta)}.$$

Therefore, combining above inequalities, we have

$$|\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \leq 2^s \sqrt{2d_k |\Psi_{T_k+1}^s| \log(T_k d_k / \delta)}.$$

□

## C Related Material

**Lemma C.1 (Azuma's Inequality)** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be random variables with  $|X_\tau| \leq a_\tau$  for some  $a_\tau > 0, \tau \in [n]$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \sum_{\tau=1}^n X_\tau - \sum_{\tau=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_\tau | X_1, \dots, X_{\tau-1}] \right| \geq 2 \sqrt{\ln(2/\delta) \sum_{\tau=1}^n a_\tau^2} \right) \leq \delta.$$