

Simultaneous Swap Regret Minimization via KL-Calibration

Haipeng Luo*
USC
haipengl@usc.edu

Spandan Senapati*
USC
ssenapat@usc.edu

Vatsal Sharan*
USC
vsharan@usc.edu

Abstract

Calibration is a fundamental concept that aims at ensuring the reliability of probabilistic predictions by aligning them with real-world outcomes. There is a surge of studies on new calibration measures that are easier to optimize compared to the classical ℓ_1 -Calibration while still having strong implications for downstream applications. One recent such example is the work by Fishelson et al. (2025) who show that it is possible to achieve $\tilde{O}(T^{1/3})$ pseudo ℓ_2 -Calibration error via minimizing pseudo swap regret of the squared loss, which in fact implies the same bound for all bounded proper losses with a smooth univariate form. In this work, we significantly generalize their result in the following ways: (a) in addition to smooth univariate forms, our algorithm also simultaneously achieves $\tilde{O}(T^{1/3})$ swap regret for any proper loss with a twice continuously differentiable univariate form (such as Tsallis entropy); (b) our bounds hold not only for pseudo swap regret that measures losses using the forecaster’s distributions on predictions, but also hold for the actual swap regret that measures losses using the forecaster’s actual realized predictions.

We achieve so by introducing a new stronger notion of calibration called (*pseudo*) *KL-Calibration*, which we show is equivalent to the (pseudo) swap regret with respect to log loss. We prove that there exists an algorithm that achieves $\tilde{O}(T^{1/3})$ KL-Calibration error and provide an explicit algorithm that achieves $\tilde{O}(T^{1/3})$ pseudo KL-Calibration error. Moreover, we show that the same algorithm achieves $\mathcal{O}(T^{1/3}(\log T)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \log(T/\delta))$ swap regret with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for any proper loss with a smooth univariate form, which implies $\tilde{O}(T^{1/3})$ ℓ_2 -Calibration error. A technical contribution of our work is a new randomized rounding procedure and a non-uniform discretization scheme to minimize the swap regret for log loss.

1 Introduction

We consider online *calibration* — a problem of making sequential probabilistic predictions over binary outcomes. Formally, at each time $t = 1, \dots, T$, a forecaster randomly predicts $p_t \in [0, 1]$ while simultaneously the adversary chooses $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$, and subsequently the forecaster observes the true label y_t . Letting n_p denote the number of rounds the forecaster predicts $p_t = p$, the forecaster’s predictions are perfectly calibrated if for all $p \in [0, 1]$, the empirical distribution of the label conditioned on the forecast being p , i.e., the quantity $\rho_p := \sum_{t:p_t=p} y_t / n_p$, matches p . The ℓ_q -Calibration error ($q \geq 1$) is then defined as

$$\text{Cal}_q := \sum_{p \in [0,1]} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = p] (p - \rho_p)^q. \quad (1)$$

A related concept used in Fishelson et al. (2025) that we call *pseudo calibration error* measures the error using the forecaster’s conditional distribution $\mathcal{P}_t \in \Delta_{[0,1]}$ at time t , instead of the actual prediction p_t . More specifically, the pseudo ℓ_q -Calibration error is defined as

$$\text{PCal}_q := \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{p \sim \mathcal{P}_t} [(p - \tilde{\rho}_p)^q], \quad (2)$$

*Author ordering is alphabetical

where $\tilde{\rho}_p := \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathcal{P}_t(p)}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p)}$. By not dealing with the random variable p_t , pseudo calibration is often easier to optimize.

Two of the most popular calibration measures are ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 -Calibration. It has been long known that $\text{Cal}_1 = \mathcal{O}(T^{2/3})$ is achievable, and there are some recent breakthroughs towards closing the gap between this upper bound and a standard lower bound $\text{Cal}_1 = \Omega(\sqrt{T})$ (see more discussion in related work). On the other hand, for ℓ_2 -Calibration, a smaller error of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{T})$ can be achieved (see e.g. the expository note by Roth (2022)). Somewhat surprisingly, a very recent work by Fishelson et al. (2025) showed that the bound can be further improved to $\text{PCal}_2 = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{1/3})$ by establishing equivalence to pseudo swap regret of the squared loss and proposing an algorithm based on the well-known Blum-Mansour reduction (Blum and Mansour, 2007) for minimizing pseudo swap regret.

More specifically, given a loss function $\ell : [0, 1] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the swap regret of the forecaster is defined as $\text{SReg}^\ell := \sup_{\sigma: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]} \text{SReg}_\sigma^\ell$, where $\text{SReg}_\sigma^\ell := \sum_{t=1}^T \ell(p_t, y_t) - \ell(\sigma(p_t), y_t)$ measures the difference between the forecaster's total loss and the loss of a strategy that always swaps the forecaster's prediction via a swap function σ . Similarly, pseudo swap regret (Fishelson et al., 2025; referred in their work as full swap regret) is defined using the conditional distribution of predictions \mathcal{P}_t instead of p_t itself: $\text{PSReg}^\ell := \sup_{\sigma: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]} \text{PSReg}_\sigma^\ell$, where $\text{PSReg}_\sigma^\ell := \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{p \sim \mathcal{P}_t} [\ell(p, y_t) - \ell(\sigma(p), y_t)]$. Fishelson et al. (2025) show that it is possible to achieve $\text{PSReg}^\ell = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{1/3})$ when ℓ is the squared loss, which, as we will show, further implies that the same bound holds for any bounded proper loss ℓ with a smooth univariate form (refer to Section 2 for concrete definitions of proper losses and their univariate form).

In this work, we significantly generalize their results by not only recovering their results for pseudo swap regret, but also proving the same $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{1/3})$ bound for new losses such as log loss and those induced by the Tsallis entropy. Moreover, we prove the same bound (either in expectation or with high probability) for the actual swap regret, which was missing in Fishelson et al. (2025). To achieve these goals, we introduce a natural notion of (pseudo) KL-Calibration, where the penalty incurred by the forecaster's prediction p deviating from the empirical distribution of y (conditioned on the forecast being p) is measured in terms of the KL-divergence. Specifically, the KL-Calibration and the pseudo KL-Calibration incurred by the forecaster are respectively defined as

$$\text{KLCal} := \sum_{p \in [0,1]} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = p] \text{KL}(\rho_p, p), \quad \text{PKLCal} := \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{p \sim \mathcal{P}_t} [\text{KL}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p)], \quad (3)$$

where $\text{KL}(q, p) = q \log \frac{q}{p} + (1-q) \log \frac{1-q}{1-p}$ is the KL-divergence for two Bernoulli distributions with mean q and p respectively. It follows from Pinsker's inequality that $\text{KL}(\rho_p, p) \geq (\rho_p - p)^2$, therefore, $\text{KLCal} \geq \text{Cal}_2$ and $\text{PKLCal} \geq \text{PCal}_2$, making (pseudo) KL-Calibration a stronger measure for studying upper bounds than than (pseudo) ℓ_2 -Calibration.

1.1 Contributions and Technical Overview

Let \mathcal{L} denote the class of bounded (in $[-1, 1]$) proper losses.

- In Section 3, we start by discussing the implications of (pseudo) KL-Calibration towards minimizing (pseudo) swap regret. In particular, in subsection 3.1, we show for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2$, where \mathcal{L}_2 is the class of bounded proper losses whose univariate form $\ell(p) := \mathbb{E}_{y \sim p} [\ell(p, y)]$ is twice continuously differentiable in $(0, 1)$, we have $\text{SReg}^\ell = \mathcal{O}(\text{KLCal})$, $\text{PSReg}^\ell = \mathcal{O}(\text{PKLCal})$. In subsection 3.2, we show that for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_G$, where \mathcal{L}_G is the class of bounded proper losses with a G -smooth univariate form, (pseudo) KL-Calibration implies that $\text{SReg}^\ell \leq G \cdot \text{Cal}_2 \leq G \cdot \text{KLCal}$, $\text{PSReg}^\ell \leq G \cdot \text{PCal}_2 \leq G \cdot \text{PKLCal}$. This gives us strong incentives to study PKLCal and KLCal.
- In Section 4, we prove that there exists an algorithm that achieves $\mathbb{E}[\text{KLCal}] = \mathcal{O}(T^{1/3} (\log T)^{5/3})$. To achieve so, we first realize that (pseudo) KL-Calibration is equivalent to the (pseudo) swap regret of the log loss $\ell(p, y) = -y \log p - (1-y) \log(1-p)$, i.e., $\text{KLCal} = \text{SReg}^\ell$, $\text{PKLCal} = \text{PSReg}^\ell$. Subsequently, we propose a non-constructive proof for minimizing SReg^ℓ ; our proof is based on swapping the forecaster and the adversary via von-Neumann's minimax theorem. Two particularly technical aspects of our proof are the

usage of a non uniform discretization, which is contrary to all previous works, and the use of Freedman’s inequality for martingale difference sequences.

We remark that our non-constructive proof is motivated from [Hu and Wu \(2024\)](#), who provide a similar proof to show the existence of an algorithm that simultaneously achieves $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T} \log T)$ swap regret for any bounded proper loss. However, compared to [Hu and Wu \(2024\)](#), we use a non uniform discretization, which requires a more involved analysis.¹ Moreover, due to the desired $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}})$ nature of our final bounds, we cannot merely use Azuma-Hoeffding that guarantees $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$ concentration. The aforementioned reasons combined make our analysis considerably non-trivial and different than [Hu and Wu \(2024\)](#).

Combined with the implications of Section 3, we show the existence of an algorithm that simultaneously achieves the following bounds on $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell]$: (a) $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}})$ for the log loss; (b) $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}})$ for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2$; (c) $\mathcal{O}(G \cdot T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}})$ for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_G$; and (d) $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{2}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{6}})$ for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathcal{L}_2 \cup \mathcal{L}_G\}$. Notably, our result is better than [Luo et al. \(2024\)](#) who studied the weaker notion of external regret, defined as $\text{REG}^\ell := \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \sum_{t=1}^T \ell(p_t, y_t) - \ell(p, y_t)$, and showed that the Follow-the-Leader (FTL) algorithm achieves $\text{REG}^\ell = \mathcal{O}(\log T)$ for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2 \cup \mathcal{L}_G$, however incurs $\text{REG}^\ell = \Omega(T)$ for a specific $\ell \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathcal{L}_2 \cup \mathcal{L}_G\}$.

- In Section 5, we propose an explicit algorithm that achieves $\text{PKLCal} = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}})$. Similar to [Fishelson et al. \(2025\)](#), we utilize the Blum-Mansour reduction for minimizing PSReg^ℓ for the log loss. However, our key novelty lies in the usage of a non uniform discretization and a new randomizing rounding procedure (Algorithm 4) for the log loss. Since the log loss is not Lipschitz, we show that the common rounding schemes studied in the literature fail to work for our considered discretization. A natural implication of our result is that, since $\text{PSReg}^\ell \leq G \cdot \text{PKLCal}$ for any $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_G$, we recover the result of [Fishelson et al. \(2025\)](#). However, since $\text{PSReg}^\ell = \mathcal{O}(\text{PKLCal})$ for any $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2$, we are able to deal with new losses, and even the log loss which is unbounded.
- Finally, in Section 6, we show that if we only consider the class of bounded proper losses with a smooth univariate form, our algorithm guarantees

$$\text{Cal}_2 = \mathcal{O}\left(T^{1/3}(\log T)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \log(T/\delta)\right), \quad \text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_G} = \mathcal{O}\left(G \cdot T^{1/3}(\log T)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \log(T/\delta)\right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. This marks the first appearance of a sub- \sqrt{T} bound for classical ℓ_2 -Calibration.

1.2 Related Work

Simultaneous swap regret minimization Calibration can also be viewed from the lens of simultaneous regret minimization ([Kleinberg et al., 2023](#); [Roth and Shi, 2024](#); [Hu and Wu, 2024](#); [Luo et al., 2024](#)). It is known from [Kleinberg et al. \(2023\)](#) that ℓ_1 -Calibrated forecasts can simultaneously lead to sublinear swap regret for all $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$. However, as shown by [Qiao and Valiant \(2021\)](#); [Dagan et al. \(2024\)](#), for any forecasting algorithm there exists an adversary that ensures that $\text{Cal}_1 = \Omega(T^{0.54389})$, thereby sidestepping the goal of achieving the favorable \sqrt{T} style regret guarantee. Despite the limitations of calibration, [Hu and Wu \(2024\)](#) proposed an explicit algorithm that achieves $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \text{SReg}^\ell] = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T} \log T)$. Compared to [Hu and Wu \(2024\)](#), we show that a single algorithm in fact achieves $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{\frac{1}{3}})$ swap regret for important subclasses of \mathcal{L} and even the log loss, while simultaneously achieving $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{\frac{2}{3}})$ swap regret for any arbitrary $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$. Notably, the result of [Hu and Wu \(2024\)](#) does not apply to the log loss since it does not belong to \mathcal{L} . An analogue of simultaneous swap regret minimization has also been studied in the contextual setting ([Garg et al., 2024](#); referred to as swap omniprediction), where the forecaster competes with functions from a hypothesis class \mathcal{F} . For this, [Garg et al. \(2024\)](#) showed that it is impossible to achieve $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$ swap omniprediction for the class of convex and Lipschitz loss functions, even in the simplest setting where \mathcal{F} contains the constant 0, 1 functions.

¹We remark that the idea of using a non uniform discretization has already appeared in the literature ([Kotłowski et al., 2016](#)), albeit in a different context. In fact our discretization scheme in Section 5 coincides with [Kotłowski et al. \(2016\)](#), however, its combination with other techniques in our paper results in a significantly different approach.

Simultaneous external regret minimization Kleinberg et al. (2023) proposed U-Calibration, where the goal is to simultaneously minimize REG^ℓ for all $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and provided an algorithm that achieves U-Calibration error $\text{UCal} := \sup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \text{REG}^\ell = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$. In the multiclass setting with K classes, Luo et al. (2024) proved that the minimax error is $\Theta(\sqrt{KT})$. The concept of U-Calibration has also been extended to the contextual setting (referred to as online omniprediction (Garg et al., 2024)). Very recently, Okoroafor et al. (2025) have shown that it is possible to achieve $\text{REG}^\ell = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T \log |\mathcal{F}|})$ simultaneously for any Lipschitz loss function ℓ against a finite hypothesis class \mathcal{F} , thereby surpassing the limitations of swap omniprediction.

Weaker notions of calibration Understanding the limitations of online calibration, i.e., $\text{Cal}_1 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$ is impossible, has led to a recent line of work aimed at studying weaker notions of calibration which are still meaningful for downstream loss minimization tasks, e.g., continuous calibration (Foster and Hart, 2021), U-Calibration (Kleinberg et al., 2023), distance to calibration (Qiao and Zheng, 2024; Arunachaleswaran et al., 2025). Particularly, the last two works considered the problem of minimizing the distance to calibration (CalDist_1), defined as the ℓ_1 distance between the forecaster’s vector of predictions and that of the nearest perfectly calibrated predictor, and proposed a non-constructive, constructive proof respectively that there exists an algorithm that achieves $\text{CalDist}_1 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$. Since $\text{CalDist}_1 \leq \text{Cal}_1 \leq \sqrt{T} \cdot \overline{\text{Cal}}_2$, our Algorithm 1 in fact ensures that $\text{CalDist}_1 = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{2}{3}}(\log T)^{-\frac{1}{6}} \sqrt{\log(T/\delta)})$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, while simultaneously minimizing swap regret for several subclasses of \mathcal{L} .

2 Preliminaries and Background

Notation For a $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $[m]$ denotes the index set $\{1, \dots, m\}$. We reserve bold lower-case alphabets for vectors and bold upper-case alphabets for matrices. The notation $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$ refers to the indicator function, which evaluates to 1 if the condition is true, and 0 otherwise. We use e_i to represent the i -th standard basis vector (dimension inferred from context), which is 1 at the i -th coordinate and 0 everywhere else. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we use Δ_k to represent the $(k - 1)$ -dimensional simplex. Moreover, we use $\Delta_{[0,1]}$ to represent the set of all probability distributions over $[0, 1]$. We use $\mathbb{P}_t, \mathbb{E}_t$ to represent the conditional probability, expectation respectively, where the conditioning is over the randomness till time $t - 1$ (inclusive). Throughout the paper, $\text{KL}(p, q), \text{TV}(p, q), \chi^2(p, q)$ shall represent the KL divergence, total variation distance, chi-squared distance between two Bernoulli distributions with means p, q . For a set \mathcal{I} , we represent its complement by $\bar{\mathcal{I}} = \Omega \setminus \mathcal{I}$, where the sample set Ω shall be clear from the context. A twice differentiable function $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called α -smooth over $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}$ if $f''(x) \leq \alpha$ for all $x \in \mathcal{D}$. A function $f : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called α -exp-concave over a convex set \mathcal{W} if the function $\exp(-\alpha f(w))$ is concave over \mathcal{W} . We use the notation $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$ to hide lower order logarithmic terms.

Proper Losses A loss $\ell : [0, 1] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called proper if $\mathbb{E}_{y \sim p}[\ell(p, y)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{y \sim p}[\ell(p', y)]$ for all $p, p' \in [0, 1]$. Intuitively, a proper loss incentivizes the forecaster to report the true distribution of the label. Throughout the paper, we shall be primarily concerned about the family \mathcal{L} (or a subset) of bounded proper losses, i.e., $\mathcal{L} := \{\ell \text{ s.t. } \ell \text{ is proper and } \ell(p, y) \in [-1, 1] \text{ for all } p \in [0, 1], y \in \{0, 1\}\}$, even though our results hold for (and in fact achieved via) the unbounded log loss. For a proper loss ℓ , the univariate form of ℓ is defined as $\ell(p) := \mathbb{E}_{y \sim p}[\ell(p, y)]$. It turns out that a loss is proper only if its univariate form is concave. Moreover, one can construct a proper loss using a concave univariate form based on the following characterization lemma.

Lemma 1 (Theorem 2 in Gneiting and Raftery (2007)). *A loss $\ell : [0, 1] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is proper if and only if there exists a concave function f such that $\ell(p, y) = f(p) + \langle g_p, y - p \rangle$ for all $p \in [0, 1], y \in \{0, 1\}$, where g_p denotes a subgradient of f at p . Also, f is the univariate form of ℓ .*

Examples of proper losses include squared loss $\ell(p, y) = (p - y)^2$, log loss $\ell(p, y) = y \log \frac{1}{p} + (1 - y) \log \frac{1}{1-p}$, spherical loss $\ell(p, y) = -\frac{py + (1-p)(1-y)}{\sqrt{p^2 + (1-p)^2}}$, etc.

Bregman Divergence For a convex function ϕ , let $\text{BREG}_\phi(x, y) = \phi(x) - \phi(y) - \langle \partial\phi(y), x - y \rangle$ denote the Bregman divergence associated with ϕ . The following lemma is important to our results.

Lemma 2 (Lemma 3.8 in [Hu and Wu \(2024\)](#)). *Let $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ be a twice differentiable concave function. Then, we have $\text{BREG}_{-u}(\hat{p}, p) = \int_p^{\hat{p}} |u''(\mu)| \cdot (\hat{p} - \mu) d\mu$.*

Problem Setting As mentioned in Section 1, we consider calibration, where the interaction between the forecaster and the adversary is according to the following protocol: at each time $t = 1, \dots, T$, (a) the forecaster randomly predicts $p_t \in [0, 1]$ and simultaneously the adversary chooses $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$; (b) the forecaster observes y_t . Throughout the paper, we shall consider algorithms that make predictions p_t that fall in a finite discretization $\mathcal{Z} \subset [0, 1]$. According to (3), the KL-Calibration, Pseudo KL-Calibration incurred by the forecaster are $\text{KLCal} = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = p] \text{KL}(\rho_p, p)$, $\text{PKLCal} = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \text{KL}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p)$, where $\rho_p = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[p_t = p]}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = p]}$, $\tilde{\rho}_p = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathcal{P}_t(p)}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p)}$.² For simplicity, we assume that the adversary is oblivious, that is it selects y_1, \dots, y_T at time $t = 0$ with complete knowledge of the forecaster's algorithm³. Our goal is to minimize the (pseudo) KL-Calibration error, which as we show in Section 3, has powerful implications.

As mentioned, the swap regret of the forecaster with respect to a loss function ℓ against a swap function $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is $\text{SReg}_{\sigma}^{\ell} = \sum_{t=1}^T \ell(p_t, y_t) - \ell(\sigma(p_t), y_t)$. Swap regret is then defined as $\text{SReg}^{\ell} = \sup_{\sigma: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]} \text{SReg}_{\sigma}^{\ell}$. Similarly, the pseudo swap regret is $\text{PSReg}^{\ell} = \sup_{\sigma: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]} \text{PSReg}_{\sigma}^{\ell}$, where $\text{PSReg}_{\sigma}^{\ell} = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) (\ell(p, y_t) - \ell(\sigma(p), y_t))$. We further define *maximum (pseudo) swap regret* with respect to the class of bounded proper losses \mathcal{L} as

$$\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}} := \sup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \text{SReg}^{\ell}, \quad \text{PMsr}_{\mathcal{L}} := \sup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \text{PSReg}^{\ell}. \quad (4)$$

For a subset of losses $\mathcal{L}' \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, we define $\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}'}$ and $\text{PMsr}_{\mathcal{L}'}$ similar to (4), with the supremum over $\ell \in \mathcal{L}'$. The usage of ℓ for a bounded proper loss, or the log loss (which does not belong to \mathcal{L}) shall be clear from the context.

3 Implications of (Pseudo) KL-Calibration

In this section, we discuss the implications of (pseudo) KL-Calibration towards minimizing the maximum (pseudo) swap regret. In particular, we shall show that (pseudo) KL-Calibration upper bounds the following: (a) $(\text{P})\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ (subsection 3.1); (b) $(\text{P})\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_G}$ (subsection 3.2). This gives a strong incentive to study (pseudo) KL-Calibration.

The following proposition, which relates (pseudo) swap regret with Bregman Divergence is central to all subsequent results developed in this work.

Proposition 1. *For any proper loss ℓ and a swap function $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, let $\text{BREG}_{-\ell}$ be the Bregman divergence associated with the negative univariate form $-\ell$. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SReg}_{\sigma}^{\ell} &= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = p] \right) (\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\rho_p, p) - \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\rho_p, \sigma(p))), \\ \text{PSReg}_{\sigma}^{\ell} &= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \right) (\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p) - \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, \sigma(p))), \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_p = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = p] y_t}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = p]}$, $\tilde{\rho}_p = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) y_t}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p)}$. Furthermore,

$$\text{SReg}^{\ell} = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = p] \right) \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\rho_p, p), \quad \text{PSReg}^{\ell} = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \right) \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p).$$

The proof of Proposition 1, deferred to Appendix A, follows by an application of Lemma 1 and is similar to [Hu and Wu \(2024\)](#). Two particularly interesting applications of Proposition 1 are:

²For convenience, we set $\frac{0}{0} = 0$. This is because if $n_p = 0$, the forecast $p_t = p$ was never made and thus does not contribute to the calibration error.

³However, our results generalize directly to an adaptive adversary who decides y_t based on p_1, \dots, p_{t-1} .

- For the squared loss $\ell(p, y) = (p - y)^2$, the univariate form is $\ell(p) = p - p^2$, and $\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\rho_p, p) = (\rho_p - p)^2$. Therefore, $\text{SReg}^\ell = \text{Cal}_2$, $\text{PSReg}^\ell = \text{PCal}_2$.
- For the log loss $\ell(p, y) = y \log \frac{1}{p} + (1 - y) \log \frac{1}{1-p}$, the univariate form is $\ell(p) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim p}[\ell(p, y)] = -p \log p - (1 - p) \log(1 - p)$. Moreover, as can be verified by direct computation, the associated Bregman divergence $\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\hat{p}, p)$ is exactly equal to $\text{KL}(\hat{p}, p)$. Therefore, we have $\text{SReg}^\ell = \text{KLCal}$, $\text{PSReg}^\ell = \text{PKLCal}$. This equivalence between (pseudo) KL-Calibration and (pseudo) swap regret of the log loss shall be our starting tool towards the developments in Sections 4, 5, where we bound KLCal , PKLCal respectively.

Note that since $\text{PSReg}^\ell \leq \mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell]$ trivially holds by definition, PCal_2 and PKLCal are indeed weaker notions compared to Cal_2 and KLCal respectively.

3.1 (Pseudo) KL-Calibration implies maximum (pseudo) swap regret against \mathcal{L}_2

In this subsection, we show that $\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \mathcal{O}(\text{KLCal})$, $\text{PMsr}_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \mathcal{O}(\text{PKLCal})$, where

$$\mathcal{L}_2 := \{\ell \in \mathcal{L} \text{ s.t. the univariate form } \ell(p) \text{ is twice continuously differentiable in } (0, 1)\}.$$

Note that according to Lemma 1, for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, the univariate form must be concave, Lipschitz, and bounded, for the induced loss $\ell(p, y)$ to be proper and bounded. In addition to these implicit constraints, we require the condition that the second derivative $\ell''(p)$ is continuous in $(0, 1)$. We state several examples of losses that belong to \mathcal{L}_2 . First, the squared loss clearly belongs to \mathcal{L}_2 , since its univariate form is $\ell(p) = p - p^2$. Second, consider a generalization of the squared loss via Tsallis entropy, which corresponds to a loss with the univariate form $\ell(p) = -c \cdot p^\alpha$, where we choose $\alpha > 1$ and the proportionality constant $c > 0$ is to ensure that the induced loss $\ell(p, y)$ is in $[-1, 1]$ (refer Lemma 1). We have, $\ell(p, y) = c(\alpha - 1)p^\alpha - \alpha c p^{\alpha-1}y$, which is in \mathcal{L}_2 . Third, the spherical loss has the univariate form $\ell(p) = -\sqrt{p^2 + (1 - p)^2}$ and is also contained in \mathcal{L}_2 .

The following lemma, derived by Luo et al. (2024), provides a growth rate on the second derivative of any $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2$ and is a key ingredient for our proof of the desired implication.

Lemma 3 (Lemma 2 in Luo et al. (2024)). *For a function f that is concave, Lipschitz, and bounded over $[0, 1]$ and twice continuously differentiable over $(0, 1)$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $|f''(p)| \leq c \cdot \max\left(\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{1-p}\right)$ for all $p \in (0, 1)$.*

Using this to bound $|u''(p)|$ in the statement of Lemma 2, we immediately obtain the following proposition whose proof can be found in Appendix A.

Proposition 2. *Let $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2$. Then, we have $\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\hat{p}, p) = \mathcal{O}(\text{KL}(\hat{p}, p))$ and thus*

$$\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \mathcal{O}(\text{KLCal}), \quad \text{PMsr}_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \mathcal{O}(\text{PKLCal}).$$

We remark that Proposition 2 holds more generally for any subclass of proper losses where each loss satisfies the growth rate in Lemma 3. To keep the exposition simple, we only state our results for \mathcal{L}_2 .

3.2 (Pseudo) KL-Calibration implies (pseudo) maximum swap regret against \mathcal{L}_G

We now consider another class \mathcal{L}_G , containing proper losses whose univariate form is G -smooth, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_G := \{\ell \in \mathcal{L} \text{ s.t. } |\ell''(p)| \leq G \text{ for all } p \in [0, 1]\}$. Losses that belong to \mathcal{L}_G include squared loss, spherical loss, Tsallis entropy for $\alpha \geq 2$, etc. Notably, the latter does not lie in \mathcal{L}_G for $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. Using Lemma 2 again, along with the fact $\text{PCal}_2 \leq \text{PKLCal}$, $\text{Cal}_2 \leq \text{KLCal}$ due to Pinsker's inequality, we immediately obtain the following.

Proposition 3. *Let $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_G$. Then, we have $\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\hat{p}, p) \leq G(\hat{p} - p)^2$, and thus*

$$\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_G} \leq G \cdot \text{Cal}_2 \leq G \cdot \text{KLCal}, \quad \text{PMsr}_{\mathcal{L}_G} \leq G \cdot \text{PCal}_2 \leq G \cdot \text{PKLCal}.$$

The proof of Proposition 3 is deferred to Appendix A. As already mentioned, Fishelson et al. (2025) proposed an algorithm that achieves $\text{PCal}_2 = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{\frac{1}{3}})$, which implies that the same algorithm in fact ensures $\text{PMsr}_{\mathcal{L}_G} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(G \cdot T^{\frac{1}{3}})$. However, the implications of KLCal , PKLCal allow us get simultaneous guarantees for a broader subclass of proper losses, particularly, $\mathcal{L}_2 \cup \mathcal{L}_G$.

4 Achieving KL-Calibration

In this section, we prove that there exists an algorithm that achieves $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}})$ for ℓ being the log loss, therefore the same algorithm achieves $\mathbb{E}[\text{KLCal}] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}})$. Our proof is non-constructive, since it is based on swapping the adversary and the algorithm via the minimax theorem (Theorem 4 in Appendix B), and deriving a forecasting algorithm in the dual game.

Theorem 1. *There exists an algorithm that achieves $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}})$ for the log loss, where the expectation is taken over the internal randomness of the algorithm.*

The proof of Theorem 1 is quite technical and is deferred to Appendix B. We discuss the key novelty of our proof here. Two particularly technical aspects of our proof are the usage of a non uniform discretization, which is contrary to all previous works, and the use of Freedman's inequality for martingale difference sequences (Lemma 8). In particular, we employ the following discretization scheme: $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_{K-1}\} \subset [0, 1]$, where $z_i = \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi i}{2K}\right)$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ is a constant to be specified later. For convenience, we set $z_0 = 0, z_K = 1$, however, z_0, z_K are not included in the discretization. For our analysis, we require a discretization scheme that satisfies the following constraints: (a) $z_i - z_{i-1} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K}\right)$ for all $i \in [K]$; (b) $\frac{\max^2(z_i - z_{i-1}, z_{i+1} - z_i)}{z_i(1-z_i)} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$ for all $i \in [K-1]$; (c) $\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{z_i(1-z_i)} = \mathcal{O}(K^2)$; and (d) $\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i(1-z_i)}} = \mathcal{O}(K)$. The uniform discretization $\mathcal{Z} = \{\frac{1}{K}, \dots, \frac{K-1}{K}\}$ satisfies (a), (c), (d) above, however, doesn't satisfy (b). As we show in Lemma 6 (Appendix B), our considered non uniform discretization achieves all these required bounds by having a finer granularity close to the boundary of $[0, 1]$, thereby making it suitable for our purpose. The following steps provide a brief sketch of our proof, which is proved for an adaptive adversary and therefore also holds for the weaker oblivious adversary.

Step I We only consider discretized forecasters that make predictions that lie inside \mathcal{Z} . Since the strategy space of such forecasters is finite, and that of the adversary is trivially finite, Theorem 4 applies and we can swap the adversary and the algorithm, thereby resulting in the dual game. In this dual game, at every time t , the adversary first reveals the conditional distribution of y_t , based on which the forecaster predicts p_t . We consider a forecaster F which at time t does the following: (a) it computes $\tilde{p}_t = \mathbb{E}_t[y_t]$; (b) predicts $p_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\tilde{p}_t - z|$. For such a forecaster, we obtain a high probability bound on SReg^ℓ , and subsequently bound $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell]$.

Step II Applying Lemma 8, we show that for each i (with $n_i = n_{z_i}$)

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = z_i](\tilde{p}_t - y_t) \right| \leq 2\sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \cdot \max \left(\sqrt{n_i \left(z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K} \right)}, \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta KT$. Using this, we bound $|z_i - \rho_i|$, where ρ_i is a shorthand for ρ_{z_i} . Notably, the bound above dictates separate consideration of $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $i \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}$ (depending on which term realizes the maximum), where $\mathcal{I} := \left\{ i \in [K-1]; n_i < \frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K}} \right\}$.

Step III Next, we write SReg^ℓ as the sum of two terms $\text{SReg}^\ell = \text{Term I} + \text{Term II}$, where $\text{Term I} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} n_i \text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i)$, $\text{Term II} = \sum_{i \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}} n_i \text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i)$, and bound Term I, II individually. Since $\text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i) \leq \chi^2(\rho_i, z_i) = \frac{(\rho_i - z_i)^2}{z_i(1-z_i)}$, we utilize the bound on $|\rho_i - z_i|$ obtained in the previous step and show that $\text{Term II} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$. Importantly, the use of Freedman's inequality provides a variance term that mitigates the potentially small denominator of $\frac{(\rho_i - z_i)^2}{z_i(1-z_i)}$. Similarly, we show that $\text{Term I} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K(\log K)^{\frac{3}{2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$. Combining, we obtain $\text{SReg}^\ell = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K(\log K)^{\frac{3}{2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \delta KT$. Subsequently, we bound $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell]$ by setting $\delta = 1/T, K = T^{\frac{1}{3}}/(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}}$.

Equipped with Theorem 1, we prove the following stronger corollary whose proof can be found in Appendix B.

Corollary 1. *There exists an algorithm that achieves the following bounds simultaneously:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\text{KLCal}] &= \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}}), & \mathbb{E}[\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_G}] &= \mathcal{O}(G \cdot T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}}), \\ \mathbb{E}[\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_2}] &= \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}}), & \mathbb{E}[\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathcal{L}_G \cup \mathcal{L}_2\}}] &= \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{2}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{6}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the expectation is taken over the internal randomness of the algorithm.

5 Achieving Pseudo KL-Calibration

In this section, we propose an explicit algorithm that achieves $\text{PSReg}^\ell = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}})$ for the log loss, therefore the same algorithm achieves $\text{PKLCal} = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}})$. Our algorithm is based on the well-known Blum-Mansour (BM) reduction (Blum and Mansour, 2007) and extends the idea from Fishelson et al. (2025). First, we employ a similar but slightly different non uniform discretization scheme that adds two extra end points z_0 and z_K to the one used in the previous section (for technical reasons):

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{K-1}, z_K\}, \text{ where } z_0 = \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{4K}, z_i = \sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{2K} \text{ for } i \in [K-1], z_K = \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{4K},$$

and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ is a constant to be specified later. The same scheme was used before by Rooij and Erven (2009); Kotłowski et al. (2016) for different problems. Since the conditional distribution \mathcal{P}_t has support over \mathcal{Z} , taking supremum over all swap functions $\sigma : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ in Proposition 1, we obtain

$$\sup_{\sigma: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}} \text{PSReg}_\sigma^\ell = \text{PSReg}^\ell - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \inf_{\sigma: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}} \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\rho_p, \sigma(p)) \geq \text{PSReg}^\ell - \frac{(2 - \sqrt{2})\pi^2 T}{K^2},$$

where the inequality follows by choosing $\sigma(p) = \text{argmin}_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\rho_p, z)$. For this choice of σ , from (Kotłowski et al., 2016, page 13), we have $\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\rho_p, \sigma(p)) \leq (2 - \sqrt{2}) \frac{\pi^2}{K^2}$. Therefore,

$$\text{PSReg}^\ell \leq \sup_{\sigma: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}} \text{PSReg}_\sigma^\ell + (2 - \sqrt{2}) \pi^2 \frac{T}{K^2}, \quad (5)$$

and it suffices to bound $\sup_{\sigma: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}} \text{PSReg}_\sigma^\ell$, which we do via the BM reduction. Towards this end, we first recall the BM reduction. The reduction maintains $K+1$ external regret algorithms $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_K$. At each time t , let $\mathbf{q}_{t,i} \in \Delta_{K+1}$ represent the probability distribution over \mathcal{Z} output by \mathcal{A}_i . Let $\mathbf{Q}_t = [\mathbf{q}_{t,0}, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{t,K}]$ be the matrix obtained by stacking the vectors $\mathbf{q}_{t,0}, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{t,K}$ as columns. We compute the stationary distribution of \mathbf{Q}_t , i.e., a distribution $\mathbf{p}_t \in \Delta_{K+1}$ over \mathcal{Z} that satisfies $\mathbf{Q}_t \mathbf{p}_t = \mathbf{p}_t$. With \mathbf{p}_t being our final distribution of predictions (that is, $\mathcal{P}_t(z_i) = p_{t,i}$), we draw a prediction from it and observe y_t . After that, we feed the scaled loss function $p_{t,i} \ell(\cdot, y_t)$ to \mathcal{A}_i . Let $\tilde{\ell}_{t,i} = p_{t,i} \ell_t \in \mathbb{R}^{K+1}$ be a scaled loss vector, where $\ell_t(j) = \ell(z_j, y_t)$. It then follows from (Blum and Mansour, 2007, Theorem 5) that

$$\sup_{\sigma: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}} \text{PSReg}_\sigma^\ell \leq \sum_{i=0}^K \text{REG}_i, \text{ where } \text{REG}_i := \sup_{j \in [K+1]} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle \mathbf{q}_{t,i} - \mathbf{e}_j, \tilde{\ell}_{t,i} \rangle, \quad (6)$$

i.e., the pseudo swap regret is bounded by the sum of the external regrets of the $K+1$ algorithms. We summarize the discussion so far in Algorithm 1.

It remains to derive the i -th external regret algorithm \mathcal{A}_i that minimizes REG_i in (6). Note that \mathcal{A}_i is required to predict a distribution $\mathbf{q}_{t,i}$ over \mathcal{Z} and is subsequently fed a scaled loss function $p_{t,i} \ell(\cdot, y_t)$ at each time t . We propose to employ the Exponentially Weighted Online Optimization (EWO) algorithm along with a novel randomized rounding scheme for \mathcal{A}_i (Algorithm 2).

EWO was studied by Hazan et al. (2007) for minimizing the regret $\sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(w_t) - f_t(w)$, when \mathcal{W} is a convex set, and the loss functions f_t 's are exp-concave. Since the log loss is 1-exp-concave in p over $[0, 1]$ ((Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006, page 46), EWO_i (an instance of EWO for \mathcal{A}_i) with functions $\{f_{t,i}\}_{t=1}^T$ defined as $f_{t,i}(w) = p_{t,i} \ell(w, y_t)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$, where $\mathcal{W} = [0, 1]$ is a natural choice.

Next, we derive a bound on the regret of EWO_i . Towards this end, we realize that the scaled log loss $f_{t,i}(w) = p_{t,i} \ell(w, y_t)$ is 1-exp-concave since $\exp(-f_{t,i}(w)) = w^{y_t p_{t,i}} (1-w)^{(1-y_t)p_{t,i}}$ is concave when $p_{t,i} \in [0, 1]$. Appealing to (Hazan et al., 2007, Theorem 7), we then obtain the following lemma.

Algorithm 1 BM for log loss

Initialize: \mathcal{A}_i for $i \in \{0, \dots, K\}$ and set $\mathbf{q}_1 = \left[\frac{1}{K+1}, \dots, \frac{1}{K+1} \right]$;

- 1: **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$
 - 2: Set $\mathbf{Q}_t = [\mathbf{q}_{t,0}, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{t,K}]$;
 - 3: Compute the stationary distribution of \mathbf{Q}_t , i.e., $\mathbf{p}_t \in \Delta_{K+1}$ that satisfies $\mathbf{Q}_t \mathbf{p}_t = \mathbf{p}_t$;
 - 4: Output conditional distribution \mathcal{P}_t , where $\mathcal{P}_t(z_i) = p_t(i)$ and observe y_t ;
 - 5: **for** $i = 0, \dots, K$
 - 6: Feed the scaled loss function $f_{t,i}(w) = p_{t,i} \ell(w, y_t)$ to \mathcal{A}_i (Algorithm 2) and obtain $\mathbf{q}_{t+1,i}$;
-

Algorithm 2 The i -th external regret algorithm (\mathcal{A}_i)

- 1: **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$
 - 2: Set $w_{t,i} \in [0, 1]$ as the output of EWOO_i (Algorithm 3) at time t ;
 - 3: Predict $\mathbf{q}_{t,i} = \text{RROUND}^{\log}(w_{t,i})$ (Algorithm 4);
 - 4: Receive the scaled loss function $f_{t,i}(w) = p_{t,i} \ell(w, y_t)$.
-

Lemma 4. *The regret of Algorithm 3 satisfies $\sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{t,i}(w_{t,i}) - f_{t,i}(w) \leq \log(T+1)$.*

Note that at each time t , EWOO_i outputs $w_{t,i} \in [0, 1]$, however, \mathcal{A}_i is required to predict a distribution $\mathbf{q}_{t,i} \in \Delta_{K+1}$ over \mathcal{Z} . Thus, we need to perform a rounding operation that projects the output $w_{t,i}$ of EWOO_i to a distribution over \mathcal{Z} . In Remark 1 in Appendix C, we show that the following two known rounding schemes: (a) rounding $w_{t,i}$ to the nearest $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and setting $\mathbf{q}_{t,i}$ as the corresponding one-hot vector; (b) the rounding procedure proposed by Fishelson et al. (2025), cannot be applied to our setting since they incur a $\Omega(1)$ change in the expected loss $\langle \mathbf{q}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{\ell}_t \rangle - \ell(w_{t,i}, y_t)$, which is not sufficient to achieve the desired regret guarantee. To mitigate the shortcomings of these rounding procedures, we propose a different randomized rounding scheme for the log loss (Algorithm 4) that achieves a $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$ change in the expected loss, as per Lemma 5.

Lemma 5. *Let $p \in [0, 1]$ and $p^-, p^+ \in \mathcal{Z}$ be neighbouring points in \mathcal{Z} such that $p^- \leq p < p^+$. Let q be the random variable that takes value p^- with probability $\propto \frac{p^+ - p}{p^+(1-p^+)}$ and p^+ with probability $\propto \frac{p - p^-}{p^-(1-p^-)}$. Then, for all $y \in \{0, 1\}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\ell(q, y)] - \ell(p, y) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$.*

The high-level idea of the proof is as follows: since the log loss is convex in p (for any $y \in \{0, 1\}$), we have $\ell(q, y) - \ell(p, y) \leq \ell'(q, y) \cdot (q - p) = \frac{(q-y)(q-p)}{q(1-q)}$, which is $\frac{p}{q} - 1$ if $y = 1$, and $\frac{1-p}{1-q} - 1$ if $y = 0$. By direct computation of $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{q}\right]$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{1-q}\right]$, we show that $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{p}{q}\right] - 1 = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1-p}{1-q}\right] - 1 \leq (p^+ - p^-)^2 \cdot \max\left(\frac{1}{p^-(1-p^-)}, \frac{1}{p^+(1-p^+)}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$, where the last step follows from a technical result due to Lemmas 6 (Appendix B) and 7 (Appendix C).

Combining everything, we derive the regret guarantee REG_i of \mathcal{A}_i (Algorithm 2). It follows from Lemma 5 that at any time t , the distribution $\mathbf{q}_{t,i}$ obtained by rounding the prediction $w_{t,i}$ of EWOO_i as per Algorithm 4 satisfies $\langle \mathbf{q}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{\ell}_t \rangle = \ell(w_{t,i}, y_t) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$. Multiplying with $p_{t,i}$ and summing over all t , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle \mathbf{q}_{t,i} - \mathbf{e}_j, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\ell}}_{t,i} \rangle &= \sum_{t=1}^T p_{t,i} \ell(w_{t,i}, y_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T p_{t,i} \ell(z_j, y_t) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^T p_{t,i}}{K^2}\right), \\ &\leq \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{t,i}(w_{t,i}) - f_{t,i}(w) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^T p_{t,i}}{K^2}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\log T + \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T p_{t,i}}{K^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 4. Therefore, the regret REG_i of \mathcal{A}_i satisfies

$$\text{REG}_i = \mathcal{O}\left(\log T + \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{t=1}^T p_{t,i}\right).$$

Algorithm 3 Exponentially Weighted Online Optimization (EWOO_i) with scaled losses

- 1: **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$
 - 2: Set weights $\mu_{t,i}(w) = \exp\left(-\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} f_{\tau,i}(w)\right)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$;
 - 3: Output $w_{t,i} = \frac{\int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} w \mu_{t,i}(w) dw}{\int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mu_{t,i}(w) dw}$.
-

Algorithm 4 Randomized rounding for log loss (RROUND^{log})

Input: $p \in [0, 1]$, **Output:** Probability distribution $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{K+1}$;

Scheme: Let $i \in \{0, \dots, K-1\}$ be such that $p \in [z_i, z_{i+1})$. Output $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_{K+1}$, where

$$q_i = \frac{1}{D} \cdot \frac{z_{i+1} - p}{z_{i+1}(1 - z_{i+1})}, \quad q_{i+1} = \frac{1}{D} \cdot \frac{p - z_i}{z_i(1 - z_i)}, \quad \text{and } q_j = 0, \quad \forall j \notin \{i, i+1\}$$

with $D = \frac{p - z_i}{z_i(1 - z_i)} + \frac{z_{i+1} - p}{z_{i+1}(1 - z_{i+1})}$ being the normalizing constant.

Summing over all i , we obtain

$$\sup_{\sigma: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}} \text{PSReg}_{\sigma}^{\ell} \leq \sum_{i=0}^K \text{REG}_i = \mathcal{O}\left(K \log T + \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{i=0}^K \sum_{t=1}^T p_{t,i}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(K \log T + \frac{T}{K^2}\right).$$

Finally, it follows from (5) that $\text{PSReg}^{\ell} = \mathcal{O}\left(K \log T + \frac{T}{K^2}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}}\right)$ on choosing $K = (T/\log T)^{\frac{1}{3}}$. Therefore, we have the main result of this section.

Theorem 2. *Choosing $K = (T/\log T)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, Algorithm 1 achieves $\text{PKLCal} = \mathcal{O}\left(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}}\right)$.*

In a similar spirit as Corollary 1, we can show Algorithm 1 achieves the following regret bounds simultaneously. The proof can be found in Appendix C and for most part follows similar to Corollary 1, except that we prove and utilize the bounds (a) $\text{PCal}_1 \leq \sqrt{T \cdot \text{PCal}_2}$; (b) for any $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, $\text{PSReg}^{\ell} \leq 4\text{PCal}_1$.

Corollary 2. *Algorithm 1 achieves the following bounds simultaneously:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PKLCal} &= \mathcal{O}\left(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}}\right), & \text{PMSr}_{\mathcal{L}_G} &= \mathcal{O}\left(G \cdot T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}}\right), \\ \text{PMSr}_{\mathcal{L}_2} &= \mathcal{O}\left(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}}\right), & \text{PMSr}_{\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\mathcal{L}_G \cup \mathcal{L}_2\}} &= \mathcal{O}\left(T^{\frac{2}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

6 High probability bound for maximum swap regret against \mathcal{L}_G

While we do not have a concrete algorithm for KLCal , in this section, we show that if we only consider \mathcal{L}_G , then our Algorithm 1 or the algorithm of Fishelson et al. (2025) already achieves a $\mathcal{O}\left(G \cdot T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \log \frac{T}{\delta}\right)$ high probability bound for $\text{MSr}_{\mathcal{L}_G}$. To obtain so, we first prove a generic high probability bound that relates Cal_2 with PCal_2 . Subsequently, we instantiate our bound with an explicit algorithm for minimizing PCal_2 and use the result of Proposition 3. Our high probability bound in Theorem 3 is independent of the choice of the discretization \mathcal{Z} .

Theorem 3. *For any algorithm \mathcal{A}_{Cal} , with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the randomness in \mathcal{A}_{Cal} 's predictions p_1, \dots, p_T , we have*

$$\text{Cal}_2 \leq 6\text{PCal}_2 + 96 |\mathcal{Z}| \log \frac{4|\mathcal{Z}|}{\delta}.$$

We defer the proof of Theorem 3 to Appendix D. Instantiating \mathcal{A}_{Cal} in Theorem 3, we obtain the following corollary whose proof can also be found in Appendix D.

Corollary 3. *On choosing $K = (T/\log T)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, Algorithm 1 ensures that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over its internal randomness*

$$\text{Cal}_2 = \mathcal{O}\left(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \log \frac{T}{\delta}\right), \quad \text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_G} = \mathcal{O}\left(G \cdot T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \log \frac{T}{\delta}\right).$$

Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_2] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}})$, $\mathbb{E}[\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_G}] = \mathcal{O}(G \cdot T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}})$.

Instantiating \mathcal{A}_{Cal} with the algorithm of Fishelson et al. (2025), we also obtain the exact same guarantee as Corollary 3. Compared to Algorithm 1, the algorithm of Fishelson et al. (2025) is more efficient since it uses scaled online gradient descent for the i -th external regret algorithm, which is more efficient than EWO_i . On the contrary, it does not possess the generality of Algorithm 1 towards minimizing the maximum swap regret for \mathcal{L}_2 .

7 Conclusion and Future Directions

In this paper, we introduced a new stronger notion of calibration called (pseudo) KL-Calibration which not only allows us to recover results for classical (pseudo) ℓ_2 -Calibration, but also obtain simultaneous (pseudo) swap regret guarantees for several important subclasses of proper losses. We also derived the first high probability and in-expectation bounds for Cal_2 . Several interesting questions remain, including (1) obtaining an explicit high probability swap regret guarantee for the log loss, similar to Section 6; (2) improving the $T^{\frac{2}{3}}$ dependence (e.g., to \sqrt{T} as in Hu and Wu (2024)) for a bounded proper loss in Corollaries 1, 2; and (3) studying KL-Calibration in the offline setting.

Acknowledgement We thank Fishelson, Kleinberg, Okoroafor, Paes Leme, Schneider, and Teng for sharing a draft of their paper (Fishelson et al., 2025) with us. HL is supported by NSF award IIS-1943607. SS is supported by NSF CAREER Award CCF-2239265. VS is supported by NSF CAREER Award CCF-2239265 and an Amazon Research Award. This work was done in part while VS was visiting the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing.

References

- Arunachaleswaran, E. R., Collina, N., Roth, A., and Shi, M. (2025). An elementary predictor obtaining distance to calibration. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1366–1370. SIAM. 4
- Beygelzimer, A., Langford, J., Li, L., Reyzin, L., and Schapire, R. (2011). Contextual bandit algorithms with supervised learning guarantees. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 19–26. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings. 21
- Blum, A. and Mansour, Y. (2007). From external to internal regret. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(6). 2, 8
- Cesa-Bianchi, N. and Lugosi, G. (2006). *Prediction, learning, and games*. Cambridge university press. 8
- Dagan, Y., Daskalakis, C., Fishelson, M., Golowich, N., Kleinberg, R., and Okoroafor, P. (2024). Improved bounds for calibration via stronger sign preservation games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13668*. 3
- Fishelson, M., Kleinberg, R., Okoroafor, P., Leme, R. P., Schneider, J., and Teng, Y. (2025). Full swap regret and discretized calibration. In *36th International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19
- Foster, D. P. and Hart, S. (2021). Forecast hedging and calibration. *Journal of Political Economy*, 129(12):3447–3490. 4

- Garg, S., Jung, C., Reingold, O., and Roth, A. (2024). Oracle efficient online multicalibration and omniprediction. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2725–2792. SIAM. 3, 4
- Gneiting, T. and Raftery, A. E. (2007). Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 102(477):359–378. 4
- Hazan, E., Agarwal, A., and Kale, S. (2007). Logarithmic regret algorithms for online convex optimization. *Machine Learning*, 69(2):169–192. 8
- Hu, L. and Wu, Y. (2024). Predict to Minimize Swap Regret for All Payoff-Bounded Tasks . In *2024 IEEE 65th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 244–263, Los Alamitos, CA, USA. IEEE Computer Society. 3, 5, 11
- Kleinberg, B., Leme, R. P., Schneider, J., and Teng, Y. (2023). U-calibration: Forecasting for an unknown agent. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 5143–5145. PMLR. 3, 4, 19, 20
- Kotłowski, W., Koolen, W. M., and Malek, A. (2016). Online isotonic regression. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1165–1189. PMLR. 3, 8
- Luo, H., Senapati, S., and Sharan, V. (2024). Optimal multiclass u-calibration error and beyond. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 3, 4, 6
- Okoroafor, P., Kleinberg, R., and Kim, M. P. (2025). Near-optimal algorithms for omniprediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17205*. 4
- Qiao, M. and Valiant, G. (2021). Stronger calibration lower bounds via sidestepping. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 456–466. 3
- Qiao, M. and Zheng, L. (2024). On the distance from calibration in sequential prediction. In Agrawal, S. and Roth, A., editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Seventh Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 247 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4307–4357. PMLR. 4
- Rooij, S. and Erven, T. (2009). Learning the switching rate by discretising bernoulli sources online. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 432–439. PMLR. 8
- Roth, A. (2022). Uncertain: Modern topics in uncertainty estimation. *Unpublished Lecture Notes*. 2
- Roth, A. and Shi, M. (2024). Forecasting for swap regret for all downstream agents. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 466–488. 3

A Deferred proofs in Section 3

A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. For simplicity, we only prove the result for PSReg_σ^ℓ since the result for SReg_σ^ℓ follows by simply replacing $\mathcal{P}_t(p)$ with $\mathbb{I}[p_t = p]$. We have the following chain of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{PSReg}_\sigma^\ell &= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) (\ell(p, y_t) - \ell(\sigma(p), y_t)) \\
&= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) (\ell(p) + \langle \partial \ell(p), y_t - p \rangle - \ell(\sigma(p)) - \langle \partial \ell(\sigma(p)), y_t - \sigma(p) \rangle) \\
&= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \right) (\ell(p) + \langle \partial \ell(p), \tilde{\rho}_p - p \rangle - \ell(\sigma(p)) - \langle \partial \ell(\sigma(p)), \tilde{\rho}_p - \sigma(p) \rangle) \\
&= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \right) (\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p) - \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, \sigma(p))),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 1, while the final equality follows by adding and subtracting $\ell(\tilde{\rho}_p)$. Taking supremum over $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we obtain

$$\sup_{\sigma: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]} \text{PSReg}_\sigma^\ell = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \right) \left(\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p) - \inf_{\sigma: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]} \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, \sigma(p)) \right).$$

Next, we realize that $\text{BREG}_\phi(x, y) \geq 0$ since ϕ is convex, and the choice of $\sigma(p) = \tilde{\rho}_p$ leads to $\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, \sigma(p)) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\text{PSReg}^\ell = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \right) \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p)$$

which completes the proof. \square

A.2 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. For simplicity, we only consider the case when $p \leq \hat{p}$, since the other case follows exactly similarly. Applying the result of Lemma 2, we obtain

$$\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\hat{p}, p) = \int_p^{\hat{p}} |\ell''(\mu)| (\hat{p} - \mu) d\mu \leq c \cdot \int_p^{\hat{p}} \left(\frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{1}{1-\mu} \right) \cdot (\hat{p} - \mu) d\mu,$$

where the inequality follows from Lemma 3. By direct computation, the integral above evaluates to

$$\hat{p} \cdot \int_p^{\hat{p}} \frac{d\mu}{\mu} + (1 - \hat{p}) \cdot \int_p^{\hat{p}} \frac{d\mu}{\mu - 1} = \hat{p} \cdot \log \frac{\hat{p}}{p} + (1 - \hat{p}) \cdot \log \frac{1 - \hat{p}}{1 - p} = \text{KL}(\hat{p}, p).$$

Therefore, we have $\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\hat{p}, p) \leq c \cdot \text{KL}(\hat{p}, p)$, which completes the proof of the first part of the Proposition. The second part follows by combining the result of Proposition 1 with the result obtained above, and taking a supremum over $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_2$. This completes the proof. \square

A.3 Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. For simplicity, we only consider the case when $p \leq \hat{p}$, since the other case follows exactly similarly. Applying the result of Lemma 2, we obtain

$$\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\hat{p}, p) \leq G \int_p^{\hat{p}} (\hat{p} - \mu) d\mu = G \left(\hat{p}(\hat{p} - p) - \frac{\hat{p}^2 - p^2}{2} \right) = \frac{G}{2} (\hat{p} - p)^2.$$

The case when $\hat{p} \leq p$ follows similarly. Applying the result of Proposition 1, taking a supremum over $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_G$, and bounding $\text{Cal}_2, \text{PCal}_2$ in terms of $\text{KLCal}, \text{PKLCal}$ completes the proof. \square

B Deferred proofs in Section 4

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 4 (Von-Neumann's Minimax Theorem). *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times c}$ for $r, c \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,*

$$\min_{p \in \Delta_r} \max_{q \in \Delta_c} p^\top M q = \max_{q \in \Delta_c} \min_{p \in \Delta_r} p^\top M q.$$

Proof of Theorem 1. We prove a stronger statement that the result holds against any adaptive adversary. In the forecasting setup, let $\mathcal{H}_{t-1} = \{p_1, \dots, p_{t-1}\} \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}\}$ denote the history till time t (exclusive). With complete knowledge about the forecaster's algorithm, an adaptive adversary chooses y_t depending on

\mathcal{H}_{t-1} . As mentioned in Section 4, we shall consider forecasters that make predictions which belong to the discretization

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_{K-1}\}, \text{ where } z_i = \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi i}{2K}\right),$$

and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ is a constant to be specified later. For convinience, we set $z_0 = 0, z_K = 1$, however, z_0, z_K are not included in the discretization. In Lemma 6, we prove some important facts regarding \mathcal{Z} which shall be useful for the subsequent analysis. For a deterministic forecaster, p_t is obtained via a mapping $F_{t-1} : \mathcal{H}_{t-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$. Similarly, for a deterministic adversary, y_t is obtained via a mapping $A_{t-1} : \mathcal{H}_{t-1} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Therefore, a deterministic forecaster can be represented by the sequence of mappings $F = (F_1, \dots, F_T)$, and a deterministic adversary can be represented by the sequence $A = (A_1, \dots, A_T)$. Given F, A , we let $\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)$ denote the swap regret achieved by executing F, A .

Let $\{F\}, \{A\}$ be all possible enumerations of F, A respectively, and $\Delta(\{F\}), \Delta(\{A\})$ denote the set of all distributions over $\{F\}, \{A\}$. Then, $\mathfrak{F} \in \Delta(\{F\}), \mathfrak{A} \in \Delta(\{A\})$ are distributions over $\{F\}, \{A\}$ and represent a randomized forecaster, adversary respectively. Note that $|\{F\}|, |\{A\}| < \infty$, since the domain and range of each map F_t, A_t is finite. Therefore, by Theorem 4, we have

$$\min_{\mathfrak{F} \in \Delta(\{F\})} \max_{\mathfrak{A} \in \Delta(\{A\})} \mathbb{E}_{F \sim \mathfrak{F}, A \sim \mathfrak{A}}[\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)] = \max_{\mathfrak{A} \in \Delta(\{A\})} \min_{\mathfrak{F} \in \Delta(\{F\})} \mathbb{E}_{F \sim \mathfrak{F}, A \sim \mathfrak{A}}[\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)]. \quad (7)$$

For a $v \in \mathbb{R}$, to upper bound the quantity on the right hand side of (7) by v , it is sufficient to prove that for any randomized adversary there exists a forecaster F that guarantees that $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)] \leq v$. Moreover, swapping the adversary and forecaster allows the forecaster to witness the distribution of y_t before deciding p_t . Towards this end, we consider a forecaster F which at time t does the following: (a) it computes $\tilde{p}_t = \mathbb{E}_t[y_t]$; (b) predicts $p_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\tilde{p}_t - z|$.

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$ and $n \in [T]$, let $n_i(n) := \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{I}[p_t = z_i]$. For convinience, we refer to $n_i(T)$ as n_i . Fix a $i \in [K-1]$, and define the sequence $X_{1,i}, \dots, X_{T,i}$ as follows:

$$X_{j,i} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j > n_i, \\ y_{t_j} - \tilde{p}_{t_j} & \text{if } j \leq n_i. \end{cases}$$

Here t_j denotes the j -th time instant when the prediction made is $p_t = z_i$. Observe that the sequence $X_{1,i}, \dots, X_{T,i}$ is a martingale difference sequence with $|X_{j,i}| \leq 1$ for all $j \in [T]$. In the subsequent steps we obtain a high probability bound on prefix sums of this sequence.

Fix $n \in [T], \mu \in [0, 1], \delta \in [0, 1]$. Applying Lemma 8, we obtain that the following inequality holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n X_{j,i} \right| \leq \mu \mathcal{V}_i(n) + \frac{1}{\mu} \log \frac{2}{\delta},$$

where $\mathcal{V}_i(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{\min(n, n_i)} \tilde{p}_{t_j} (1 - \tilde{p}_{t_j})$. To uniformly bound $\mathcal{V}_i(n)$ in terms of n , we consider the 2 cases $n \leq n_i$ and $n > n_i$. When $n \leq n_i$, $\mathcal{V}_i(n)$ can be bounded in terms of n as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_i(n) &= n z_i (1 - z_i) + \sum_{j=1}^n (\tilde{p}_{t_j} (1 - \tilde{p}_{t_j}) - z_i (1 - z_i)) \\ &= n z_i (1 - z_i) + \sum_{j=1}^n (\tilde{p}_{t_j} - z_i) \cdot (1 - \tilde{p}_{t_j} - z_i) \\ &\leq n z_i (1 - z_i) + \sum_{j=1}^n |\tilde{p}_{t_j} - z_i| \\ &\leq n \left(z_i (1 - z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 6. When $n > n_i$, we note that $\mathcal{V}_i(n) = \mathcal{V}_i(n_i) \leq n(z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K})$, since $n > n_i$. Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n X_{j,i} \right| \leq \mu n \left(z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K} \right) + \frac{1}{\mu} \log \frac{2}{\delta}.$$

Minimizing the bound above with respect to $\mu \in [0, 1]$, we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n X_{j,i} \right| \leq \begin{cases} 2\sqrt{n(z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K}) \log \frac{2}{\delta}} & \text{if } n \geq \frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K}}, \\ n(z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K}) + \log \frac{2}{\delta} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that when $n < \frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K}}$, we can simply bound $n(z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K}) + \log \frac{2}{\delta} < 2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}$. The bounds obtained for both cases can be combined into the following single bound:

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n X_{j,i} \right| \leq 2\sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \cdot \max \left(\sqrt{n(z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K})}, \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \right),$$

which holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Taking a union bound, we obtain that $\left| \sum_{j=1}^n X_{j,i} \right| \leq 2\sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \cdot \max \left(\sqrt{n(z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K})}, \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \right)$ holds simultaneously for all $i \in [K-1]$, $n \in [T]$ with probability at least $1 - (K-1)T\delta \geq 1 - KT\delta$. In particular, setting $n = n_i$, we obtain that

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} X_{j,i} \right| \leq 2\sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \cdot \max \left(\sqrt{n_i(z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K})}, \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \right) \quad (8)$$

holds for all $i \in [K-1]$ with probability at least $1 - K\delta T$. Equipped with this bound, in the following steps we obtain a high probability bound on $\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)$. This shall be used to bound $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)]$ eventually.

We begin by bounding the quantity $|z_i - \rho_i|$, which shall be used to obtain the high probability bound on $\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)$. We proceed as

$$\begin{aligned} |z_i - \rho_i| &= \frac{1}{n_i} \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = z_i](z_i - y_t) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n_i} \left(\left| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = z_i](z_i - \tilde{p}_t) \right| + \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = z_i](\tilde{p}_t - y_t) \right| \right) \\ &\leq \max(d_i, d_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{n_i} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} X_{j,i} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where for each $i \in [K]$, we define $d_i := z_i - z_{i-1}$. The first inequality above follows from the Triangle inequality; the second inequality is because, if $p_t = z_i$, we must have $\tilde{p}_t \in [z_0, \frac{z_1+z_2}{2}]$ if $i = 1$, $\tilde{p}_t \in [\frac{z_{i-1}+z_i}{2}, \frac{z_i+z_{i+1}}{2}]$ if $2 \leq i \leq K-2$, and $\tilde{p}_t \in [\frac{z_{K-2}+z_{K-1}}{2}, 1]$ if $i = K-1$, therefore, $|\tilde{p}_t - p_t| \leq \max(d_i, d_{i+1})$. For each $i \in [K-1]$, let $t_i := \frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{z_i(1-z_i) + \frac{\pi}{2K}}$. Next, we write $\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)$ as

$$\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A) = \underbrace{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} n_i \text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i)}_{\text{Term I}} + \underbrace{\sum_{i \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}} n_i \text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i)}_{\text{Term II}},$$

where $\mathcal{I} := \{i \in [K-1]; n_i < t_i\}$, and bound Term I, II individually. We begin by bounding Term II in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Term II} &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} n_i \chi^2(\rho_i, z_i) \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} n_i \left(\frac{(\rho_i - z_i)^2}{z_i} + \frac{(\rho_i - z_i)^2}{1 - z_i} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{n_i (\rho_i - z_i)^2}{z_i (1 - z_i)} \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{2n_i}{z_i (1 - z_i)} \left((\max(d_i, d_{i+1}))^2 + \left(\frac{1}{n_i} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} X_{j,i} \right| \right)^2 \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} 2n_i \cdot \frac{(\max(d_i, d_{i+1}))^2}{z_i (1 - z_i)} + 8 \log \frac{2}{\delta} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\frac{\pi}{2K} \cdot \frac{1}{z_i (1 - z_i)} + 1 \right) \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{T}{K^2} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(K \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows since $\text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i) \leq \chi^2(\rho_i, z_i)$; the second inequality follows from the bound on $|z_i - \rho_i|$ established above, and since $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$; the third inequality follows from (8); the final equality follows from Lemma 6, particularly, we use the bounds $\frac{(\max(d_i, d_{i+1}))^2}{z_i (1 - z_i)} = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{K^2})$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{z_i (1 - z_i)} = \mathcal{O}(K^2)$. To bound Term I, we first note from the proof of Proposition 2 that

$$n_i \text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i) = \sup_{\sigma: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[p_t = z_i] (\ell(p_t, y_t) - \ell(\sigma(p_t), y_t)) \leq n_i \log \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K}},$$

where the last inequality is because for the rounds where $p_t = z_i$, we have

$$\ell(p_t, y_t) \leq \max \left(\log \frac{1}{z_i}, \log \frac{1}{1 - z_i} \right) \leq \max \left(\log \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K}}, \log \frac{1}{1 - \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{2K}} \right) = \mathcal{O}(\log K). \quad (9)$$

Moreover, repeating the exact same steps done to bound Term II above, we can also bound $n_i \text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
n_i \text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i) &\leq \frac{2n_i}{z_i (1 - z_i)} \left((\max(d_i, d_{i+1}))^2 + \left(\frac{1}{n_i} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} X_{j,i} \right| \right)^2 \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n_i}{K^2} \right) + 8 \left(\log \frac{2}{\delta} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{n_i z_i (1 - z_i)} \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n_i}{K^2} + \left(\log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{n_i z_i (1 - z_i)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Lemma 6 and (8). Taking minimum of the two bounds obtained above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
n_i \text{KL}(\rho_i, z_i) &= \mathcal{O} \left(\min \left(n_i \log K, \frac{n_i}{K^2} + \left(\log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{n_i z_i (1 - z_i)} \right) \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n_i}{K^2} + \min \left(n_i \log K, \left(\log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{n_i z_i (1 - z_i)} \right) \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{n_i}{K^2} + \sqrt{\log K} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i (1 - z_i)}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows since for a fixed $a > 0$, $\min(x, \frac{a}{x}) \leq \sqrt{a}$ holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Summing over $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we obtain the following bound on Term I:

$$\text{Term I} = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} n_i + \sqrt{\log K} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i(1-z_i)}} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K(\log K)^{\frac{3}{2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right),$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 6, particularly, $\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i(1-z_i)}} = \mathcal{O}(K \log K)$. Summarizing, we have shown that

$$\text{Term I} = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K(\log K)^{\frac{3}{2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right), \quad \text{Term II} = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)$$

hold simultaneously with probability at least $1 - KT\delta$. Therefore,

$$\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K(\log K)^{\frac{3}{2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \quad (10)$$

with probability at least $1 - KT\delta$. To bound $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)]$, we let \mathcal{E} be the event in (10). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)] &= \mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)|\mathcal{E}] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) + \mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)|\bar{\mathcal{E}}] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K(\log K)^{\frac{3}{2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta} + (K \log K)T^2\delta \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K(\log K)^{\frac{3}{2}} \log T + K \log K \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows by using the high probability bound on $\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)$ obtained in (10), and bounding $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell(F, A)|\bar{\mathcal{E}}] = \mathcal{O}(T \log K)$, which follows from (9); the third equality follows by choosing $\delta = \frac{1}{T^2}$; the final equality follows by choosing $K = \frac{T^{\frac{1}{3}}}{(\log T)^{\frac{5}{3}}}$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6. Fix a $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\{z_i\}_{i=0}^K$ be a sequence where $z_0 = 1, z_i = \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi i}{2K}\right)$ for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$, and $z_K = 1$. For each $i = 1, \dots, K$, define $d_i := z_i - z_{i-1}$. Then, the following holds: (a) $d_i \leq \frac{\pi}{2K}$ for all $i \in [K]$; (b) $\frac{\max^2(d_i, d_{i+1})}{z_i(1-z_i)} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$; (c) $\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{z_i(1-z_i)} = \mathcal{O}(K^2)$; and (d) $\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i(1-z_i)}} = \mathcal{O}(K \log K)$.

Proof. By direct computation, we have

$$z_i - z_{i-1} = \sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{2K} - \sin^2 \frac{\pi(i-1)}{2K} = \frac{\cos \frac{\pi(i-1)}{K} - \cos \frac{\pi i}{K}}{2} = \sin \frac{\pi}{2K} \sin \left(\frac{\pi}{K} \left(i - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right), \quad (11)$$

where the second equality follows from the identity $\sin^2 \theta = \frac{1 - \cos 2\theta}{2}$, while the last equality follows from the identity $\cos \alpha - \cos \beta = 2 \sin \frac{\alpha + \beta}{2} \sin \frac{\beta - \alpha}{2}$. Since $\sin \theta \leq \theta$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, and bounding $\sin \theta \leq 1$, we obtain $z_i - z_{i-1} \leq \frac{\pi}{2K}$, which completes the proof for the first part of the lemma.

For the second part, we note that

$$\frac{\max^2(d_i, d_{i+1})}{z_i(1-z_i)} = \frac{\max^2(d_i, d_{i+1})}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{2K} \cos^2 \frac{\pi i}{2K}} = 4 \cdot \frac{\max^2(d_i, d_{i+1})}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{K}},$$

where the second equality follows from the identity $\sin 2\theta = 2 \sin \theta \cos \theta$. It follows from (11) that

$$\max(d_i, d_{i+1}) = \sin \frac{\pi}{2K} \cdot \max \left(\sin \left(\frac{\pi}{K} \left(i - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right), \sin \left(\frac{\pi}{K} \left(i + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \right).$$

For simplicity, we assume that K is odd, although a similar treatment can be done for even K . Let $1 \leq i \leq \frac{K-1}{2}$. Then, $\max(d_i, d_{i+1}) = \sin \frac{\pi}{2K} \sin \left(\frac{\pi}{K} \left(i + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)$. Observe that

$$\frac{\sin \left(\frac{\pi}{K} \left(i + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)}{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K}} = \frac{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K} \cos \frac{\pi}{2K} + \cos \frac{\pi i}{K} \sin \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K}} = \cos \frac{\pi}{2K} + \cot \frac{\pi i}{K} \sin \frac{\pi}{2K} \leq 1 + \frac{\sin \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin \frac{\pi}{K}},$$

where the first equality follows from the identity $\sin(\alpha + \beta) = \sin \alpha \cos \beta + \cos \alpha \sin \beta$, while the inequality follows by noting that $\cot \frac{\pi i}{K} \leq \cot \frac{\pi}{K}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \frac{K-1}{2}$. Finally, since $\frac{\sin \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin \frac{\pi}{K}} = \frac{1}{2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2K}} = \mathcal{O}(1)$, we obtain $\frac{\max^2(d_i, d_{i+1})}{z_i(1-z_i)} = \mathcal{O}(\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K}) = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{K^2})$. Next, we consider the case when $\frac{K+1}{2} \leq i \leq K-1$. Then, $\max(d_i, d_{i+1}) = \sin \frac{\pi}{2K} \sin \left(\frac{\pi}{K} \left(i - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)$. Repeating a similar analysis as before, we obtain

$$\frac{\sin \left(\frac{\pi}{K} \left(i - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)}{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K}} = \frac{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K} \cos \frac{\pi}{2K} - \cos \frac{\pi i}{K} \sin \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K}} = \cos \frac{\pi}{2K} - \cot \frac{\pi i}{K} \sin \frac{\pi}{2K} \leq 1 + \frac{\sin \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin \frac{\pi}{K}},$$

which is $\mathcal{O}(1)$ as claimed earlier. Therefore, $\frac{\max^2(d_i, d_{i+1})}{z_i(1-z_i)} = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{K^2})$. Combining both the cases completes the proof of (b) above.

For (c), similar to (b), we assume for simplicity that K is odd. Then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{z_i(1-z_i)} = 4 \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{K}} = 8 \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{K-1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{K}},$$

and the summation $\sum_{i=1}^{\frac{K-1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{K}}$ can be bounded in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{K-1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{K}} &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{K}} + \int_1^{\frac{K-1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi \nu}{K}} d\nu \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{K}} + \int_1^{\frac{K}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi \nu}{K}} d\nu \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{K}} + \frac{K}{\pi} \int_{\frac{\pi}{K}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \nu} d\nu \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{K}} + \frac{K}{\pi} \cot \frac{\pi}{K} \right) = \mathcal{O}(K^2). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof for (c). Repeating the exact same steps as (c) proves (d). We include the full proof for completeness. Observe that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i(1-z_i)}} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K}} = 4 \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{K-1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K}},$$

and the summation $\sum_{i=1}^{\frac{K-1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K}}$ can be bounded in the following manner:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\frac{K-1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi i}{K}} \leq \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi}{K}} + \int_1^{\frac{K-1}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi \nu}{K}} d\nu \leq \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi}{K}} + \int_1^{\frac{K}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi \nu}{K}} d\nu = \frac{1}{\sin \frac{\pi}{K}} + \frac{K}{\pi} \int_{\frac{\pi}{K}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{1}{\sin \nu} d\nu.$$

The integral above evaluates to $\log \left(\csc \frac{\pi}{K} + \cot \frac{\pi}{K} \right)$. Therefore, we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i(1-z_i)}} \leq 4 \left(\csc \frac{\pi}{K} + \frac{K}{\pi} \log \left(\csc \frac{\pi}{K} + \cot \frac{\pi}{K} \right) \right) = \mathcal{O}(K \log K).$$

This completes the proof. \square

B.2 Proof of Corollary 1

Proof. Let \mathcal{A} be the algorithm guaranteed by Theorem 1. By Pinsker's inequality, we get that \mathcal{A} guarantees $\mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_2] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{6}})$. Moreover, since $\text{Cal}_1 \leq \sqrt{T \cdot \text{Cal}_2}$ (Kleinberg et al., 2023, Lemma 13), by Jensen's inequality we have $\mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_1] \leq \sqrt{T \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_2]} = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{6}})$. Next, (Kleinberg et al., 2023, Theorem 12) states that for any proper loss ℓ , we have $\text{SReg}^\ell \leq 4\text{Cal}_1$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[\text{SReg}^\ell] \leq 4\mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_1] = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{2}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{6}})$. Combining this with the result of Proposition 2, 3 completes the proof. \square

C Deferred proofs and discussion in Section 5

C.1 Expected loss of common rounding schemes

We recall the discussion in Section 5: at each time t , EWOO_i outputs $w_{t,i} \in [0, 1]$, however, \mathcal{A}_i is required to predict a distribution $\mathbf{q}_{t,i} \in \Delta_{K+1}$ over \mathcal{Z} . Thus, we need to perform a rounding operation that projects the output $w_{t,i}$ of EWOO_i to a distribution over \mathcal{Z} . In the remark below, we show that the following two known rounding schemes: (a) rounding $w_{t,i}$ to the nearest $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and setting $\mathbf{q}_{t,i}$ as the corresponding one-hot vector; (b) the rounding procedure proposed by Fishelson et al. (2025), cannot be applied to our setting since they incur a $\Omega(1)$ change in the expected loss $\langle \mathbf{q}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{\ell}_t \rangle - \ell(w_{t,i}, y_t)$, which is not sufficient to achieve the desired regret guarantee.

Remark 1. Let $y_t = 1$ and $w_{t,i} = \frac{z_0 + z_1}{2}$. The rounding procedure in (a) above ensures that $\mathbf{q}_{t,i} = \mathbf{e}_0$ with probability one. Therefore, $\langle \mathbf{q}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{\ell}_t \rangle - \ell(w_{t,i}, y_t) = \ell(z_0, 1) - \ell\left(\frac{z_0 + z_1}{2}, 1\right) = \log \frac{z_0 + z_1}{2z_0}$. Observe that $\frac{z_1}{z_0} = \frac{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{4K}} = 4 \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{4K} = 2 + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2K}$. Therefore, $\langle \mathbf{q}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{\ell}_t \rangle - \ell(w_{t,i}, y_t) = \log\left(\frac{3}{2} + \cos \frac{\pi}{2K}\right) = \Omega(1)$. For the chosen example, the rounding procedure in (b) sets $q_{t,i}(0) = q_{t,i}(1) = \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, $\langle \mathbf{q}_{t,i}, \boldsymbol{\ell}_t \rangle - \ell(w_{t,i}, y_t) = \frac{\ell(z_0, 1) + \ell(z_1, 1)}{2} - \ell\left(\frac{z_0 + z_1}{2}, 1\right) = \log \frac{z_0 + z_1}{2\sqrt{z_0 z_1}} = \log \frac{1 + 4 \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{4K}}{4 \cos \frac{\pi}{4K}} = \Omega(1)$.

C.2 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. Since the log loss $\ell(p, y)$ is convex in p (for any $y \in \{0, 1\}$), we have

$$\ell(q, y) - \ell(p, y) \leq \ell'(q, y) \cdot (q - p) = \frac{(q - y)(q - p)}{q(1 - q)} = \begin{cases} \frac{p}{q} - 1 & \text{if } y = 1, \\ \frac{1-p}{1-q} - 1 & \text{if } y = 0. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Let $y = 1$. Taking expectation on both sides of (12), we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\ell(q, y)] - \ell(p, y) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{p}{q}\right] - 1$. To simplify the expressions involved in the computation of $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{q}\right]$, we define the normalizing factor $D := \frac{p^+ - p}{p^+(1 - p^+)} + \frac{p - p^-}{p^-(1 - p^-)}$. By direct computation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{q}\right] = \frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{p^+ - p}{p^- p^+ (1 - p^+)} + \frac{p - p^-}{p^- p^+ (1 - p^-)} \right) = \frac{1}{D} \cdot \frac{(p^+ - p^-)(1 - p)}{p^- p^+ (1 - p^-)(1 - p^+)}.$$

Similarly, by direct computation, we obtain

$$D = \frac{p^+ - p}{p^+(1 - p^+)} + \frac{p - p^-}{p^-(1 - p^-)} = \frac{(p^+ - p^-)(p + p^- p^+ - p(p^- + p^+))}{p^- p^+ (1 - p^-)(1 - p^+)}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{p}{q}\right] - 1 = \frac{p(1 - p)}{p + p^- p^+ - p(p^- + p^+)} - 1 = \frac{(p^+ - p)(p - p^-)}{p + p^- p^+ - p(p^- + p^+)} \leq \frac{(p^+ - p^-)^2}{p + p^- p^+ - p(p^- + p^+)}.$$

Next, we let $y = 0$. Taking expectation on both sides of (12), we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\ell(q, y)] - \ell(p, y) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1-p}{1-q}\right] - 1$, thus, we require to bound $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{1-q}\right]$. Direct computation yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{1-q}\right] = \frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{p^+ - p}{p^+(1 - p^+)(1 - p^+)} + \frac{p - p^-}{p^-(1 - p^-)(1 - p^+)} \right) = \frac{1}{D} \cdot \frac{p(p^+ - p^-)}{p^- p^+ (1 - p^-)(1 - p^+)}.$$

Substituting the expression for D obtained above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1-p}{1-q}\right] - 1 &= \frac{p(1-p)}{p+p^-p^+ - p(p^-+p^+)} - 1 = \frac{(p^+ - p)(p - p^-)}{p+p^-p^+ - p(p^-+p^+)} \\ &\leq \frac{(p^+ - p^-)^2}{p+p^-p^+ - p(p^-+p^+)}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $f(p) = p+p^-p^+ - p(p^-+p^+)$. Since $f(p)$ is linear in p , for any $p \in [p^-, p^+]$, we have $\min(f(p^-), f(p^+)) \leq f(p) \leq \max(f(p^-), f(p^+))$. Since $f(p^-) = p^-(1-p^-)$, $f(p^+) = p^+(1-p^+)$, we obtain

$$\min(p^-(1-p^-), p^+(1-p^+)) \leq p+p^-p^+ - p(p^-+p^+) \leq \max(p^-(1-p^-), p^+(1-p^+))$$

for all $p \in [p^-, p^+]$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_q[\ell(q, y)] - \ell(p, y) \leq (p^+ - p^-)^2 \cdot \max\left(\frac{1}{p^-(1-p^-)}, \frac{1}{p^+(1-p^+)}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right),$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 7. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 7. Fix a $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\{z_i\}_{i=0}^K$ be a sequence where $z_0 = \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{4K}$, $z_i = \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi i}{2K}\right)$ for $i \in [K-1]$, and $z_K = \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{4K}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, K$, define $d_i := z_i - z_{i-1}$. Then, the following holds true for all $i \in [K]$: (a) $\frac{d_i^2}{z_i(1-z_i)} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$, and (b) $\frac{d_i^2}{z_{i-1}(1-z_{i-1})} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 6 that (a), (b) hold for all $2 \leq i \leq K-1$. For $i = 1$, since $d_1 \leq z_1 = \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K}$, we have

$$\frac{d_1^2}{z_1(1-z_1)} \leq \frac{\sin^4 \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K} \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{2K}} = \tan^2 \frac{\pi}{2K},$$

which is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$ for a large K . Similarly, for $i = K$, $d_i = \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{4K} - \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{2K} = \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K} - \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{4K} \leq \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{d_K^2}{z_K(1-z_K)} \leq \frac{\sin^4 \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{4K} \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{4K}} = 4 \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K} \leq \frac{\pi^2}{K^2},$$

where the equality follows from the identity $\sin 2\theta = 2 \sin \theta \cos \theta$. This completes the proof for (a). For (b), when $i = 1$, we have

$$\frac{d_1^2}{z_0(1-z_0)} \leq \frac{\sin^4 \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{4K} \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{4K}} = 4 \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K} \leq \frac{\pi^2}{K^2}.$$

Similarly, when $i = K$, we have

$$\frac{d_K^2}{z_{K-1}(1-z_{K-1})} \leq \frac{\sin^4 \frac{\pi}{2K}}{\sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2K} \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{2K}} = \tan^2 \frac{\pi}{2K},$$

which is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{K^2}\right)$ for a large K . This completes the proof. \square

C.3 Proof of Corollary 2

Proof. Since $\text{KLCal} \geq \text{PCal}_2$, Algorithm 1 ensures that $\text{PCal}_2 = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}})$. Next, we show that the PCal_1 satisfies (a) $\text{PCal}_1 \leq \sqrt{T} \cdot \text{PCal}_2$; (b) for any proper loss ℓ , we have $\text{PSReg}^\ell \leq 4\text{PCal}_1$. The proof is exactly similar to the corresponding variants of (a), (b) above for Cal as shown by Kleinberg et al. (2023). For (a), applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we obtain

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) |p - \tilde{\rho}_p| \leq \left(\sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) (p - \tilde{\rho}_p)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{T \cdot \text{PCal}_2}.$$

Towards showing (b), we first rewrite $\text{PSReg}^\ell = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_t(p) \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p)$, which holds for any proper loss ℓ as per Proposition 2. Next, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p) &= \ell(p) - \ell(\tilde{\rho}_p) + \partial\ell(p)(\tilde{\rho}_p - p) \leq \partial\ell(\tilde{\rho}_p)(p - \tilde{\rho}_p) + \partial\ell(p)(\tilde{\rho}_p - p) \\ &\leq 4|p - \tilde{\rho}_p|, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows since $\ell(p)$ is concave; the second inequality follows by noting that $\ell(p, 1) - \ell(p, 0) = \partial\ell(p)$ as per Lemma 1, and since $\ell(p, y) \in [-1, 1]$, we have $|\partial\ell(p)| \leq 2$ for all $p \in [0, 1]$. Substituting the bound on $\text{BREG}_{-\ell}(\tilde{\rho}_p, p)$ obtained above into PSReg^ℓ , we obtain $\text{PSReg}^\ell \leq 4\text{PCal}_1$ as desired. Since Algorithm 1 ensures $\text{PCal}_1 = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{1}{3}})$, we obtain $\text{PSReg}^\ell = \mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{1}{3}})$. Combining the above results with Propositions 2, 3 finishes the proof. \square

D Deferred proofs in Section 6

D.1 Proof of Theorem 3

Our proof of Theorem 3 crucially relies on the following version of Freedman's inequality from [Beygelzimer et al. \(2011\)](#). Refer therein for a proof.

Lemma 8. *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a martingale difference sequence adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n$, where $|X_i| \leq B$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, and B is a fixed constant. Define $\mathcal{V} := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$. Then, for any fixed $\mu \in [0, \frac{1}{B}]$, $\delta \in [0, 1]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right| \leq \mu \mathcal{V} + \frac{\log \frac{2}{\delta}}{\mu}.$$

Proof of Theorem 3. Before discussing the proof, we introduce some notation. Let \mathcal{Z} be enumerated as $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_0, \dots, z_K\}$, where $K = |\mathcal{Z}| - 1$. Observe that at time t , \mathcal{A}_{Cal} can be equivalently described by the following procedure: (a) it samples i_t from the set $\{0, \dots, K\}$ with $\mathbb{P}_t(i_t = i) = \mathcal{P}_t(z_i)$, which we write as $\mathcal{P}_{t,i}$ for convenience; (b) forecasts $p_t = z_{i_t}$. Clearly, $\mathbb{I}[p_t = z_i] = \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]$. For simplicity, we denote $\rho_{z_i} = \rho_i$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{z_i} = \tilde{\rho}_i$. Under this notation, $\rho_i, \tilde{\rho}_i$ can be expressed as

$$\rho_i = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}, \quad \tilde{\rho}_i = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathcal{P}_{t,i}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}}.$$

We begin by bounding $|\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i|$ using Lemma 8. Fix a $i \in \{0, \dots, K\}$ and define the martingale difference sequences $X_t := y_t(\mathcal{P}_{t,i} - \mathbb{I}[i_t = i])$ and $Y_t := \mathcal{P}_{t,i} - \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]$. Observe that $|X_t| \leq 1, |Y_t| \leq 1$ for all t . Fix a $\mu_i \in [0, 1]$. Applying Lemma 8 to the sequences X, Y and taking a union bound (over X, Y), we obtain that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^T y_t(\mathcal{P}_{t,i} - \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]) \right| \leq \mu_i \mathcal{V}_X + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i}, \quad \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} - \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] \right| \leq \mu_i \mathcal{V}_Y + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i}, \quad (13)$$

where $\mathcal{V}_X, \mathcal{V}_Y$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_X &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[X_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \sum_{t=1}^T y_t \cdot \mathcal{P}_{t,i}(1 - \mathcal{P}_{t,i}) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{V}_Y &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[Y_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}(1 - \mathcal{P}_{t,i}) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}. \end{aligned}$$

The upper tail $\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i$ can then be bounded in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i &= \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]} - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathcal{P}_{t,i}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]} + \frac{\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i} - \sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]\right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}\right)} \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} - \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]\right) + \frac{\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]\right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}\right)} \cdot \left(\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i}\right) + \frac{\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} \\
&\leq 2\mu_i + \frac{2 \log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first and second inequalities follow from (13), while the last inequality follows by bounding $y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] \leq \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]$. The lower tail can be bounded in an exact same manner as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_i - \rho_i &= \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathcal{P}_{t,i}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] + \mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}\right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]\right)} \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] - \mathcal{P}_{t,i}\right) + \frac{\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]}{\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]\right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}\right)} \cdot \left(\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i}\right) + \frac{\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} \\
&\leq 2\mu_i + \frac{2 \log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining both the bounds, we have shown that for a fixed $\mu_i \in [0, 1]$, $|\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i| \leq 2\mu_i + \frac{2 \log \frac{4}{\delta}}{\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}}$ holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Taking a union bound over all i , with probability $1 - \delta$, we have (simultaneously for all i)

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^T y_t (\mathcal{P}_{t,i} - \mathbb{I}[i_t = i]) \right| \leq \mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}}{\mu_i},$$

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} - \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] \right| \leq \mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \frac{\log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}}{\mu_i}, \tag{14}$$

$$|\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i| \leq 2\mu_i + \frac{2 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}}{\mu_i \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}}. \tag{15}$$

Consider the function $g(\mu) := \mu + \frac{a}{\mu}$, where $a \geq 0$ is a fixed constant. Clearly, $\min_{\mu \in [0,1]} g(\mu) = 2\sqrt{a}$ when $a \leq 1$, and $1 + a$ otherwise. Minimizing the bound in (15) with respect to μ_i , we obtain

$$|\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i| \leq 4 \sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}}}, \text{ when } \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}.$$

However, when $\log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} > \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}$, we obtain that $|\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i| \leq 2 + \frac{2 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}}$. In particular, when $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}$ is tiny, which is possible if \mathcal{A}_{Cal} does not allocate enough probability mass to the index i , the bound obtained is large making it much worse than the trivial bound $|\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i| \leq 1$ which follows since $\rho_i, \tilde{\rho}_i \in [0, 1]$ by definition. Based on this reasoning, we define the set

$$\mathcal{I} := \left\{ i \in \{0, \dots, K\} \text{ s.t. } \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} \right\}, \quad (16)$$

and bound $(\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2$ as

$$(\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 \leq \begin{cases} \frac{16 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Similarly, $\left| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} - \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] \right|$ can be bounded by substituting the optimal μ_i obtained above in (14); we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} - \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] \right| \leq \begin{cases} 2 \sqrt{\log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i}} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}, \\ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Equipped with (17), (18), we proceed to bound Cal_2 in the following manner:

$$\text{Cal}_2 = \sum_{i=0}^K \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] (z_i - \rho_i)^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^K \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] \left((z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + (\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 \right),$$

where the inequality is because $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. To further bound the term above, we split the summation into two terms $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_1 &:= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] \left((z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + (\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 \right), \\ \mathcal{T}_2 &:= \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{I}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[i_t = i] \left((z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + (\rho_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and bound \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 individually. We bound \mathcal{T}_1 as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_1 &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + 2 \sqrt{\log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} \sum_{\tau=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{\tau,i}} \right) \left((z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + \frac{16 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}}{\sum_{\tau=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{\tau,i}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} (z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + 16 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} |\mathcal{I}| + \\ &\quad 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sqrt{\log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} \sum_{\tau=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{\tau,i}} \left((z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + \frac{16 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}}{\sum_{\tau=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{\tau,i}} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} (z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + 16 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} |\mathcal{I}| + 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{\tau=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{\tau,i} \left((z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + \frac{16 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}}{\sum_{\tau=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{\tau,i}} \right) \\ &= 3 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} (z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + 48 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} |\mathcal{I}|, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows by substituting the bounds from (17), (18), while the final inequality follows since by the definition of \mathcal{I} in (16), we have $\sqrt{\log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} \sum_{\tau=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{\tau,i}} \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{\tau,i}$. Next, we bound \mathcal{T}_2 as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_2 &\leq \sum_{i \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}} \left(2 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} \right) \left((z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + 1 \right) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} (z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + 2 \sum_{i \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} + 2 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} |\bar{\mathcal{I}}| \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} (z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + 4 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} |\bar{\mathcal{I}}|, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows by substituting the bounds from (17), (18); the second inequality follows by bounding $(z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 \leq 1$; the final inequality follows from the definition of \mathcal{I} (16). Collecting the bounds on \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_1 + \mathcal{T}_2 &\leq 3 \sum_{i=0}^K \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{P}_{t,i} (z_i - \tilde{\rho}_i)^2 + 48 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} |\mathcal{I}| + 4 \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} |\bar{\mathcal{I}}| \\ &\leq 3\text{PCal}_2 + 48(K+1) \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of PCal_2 and since $|\mathcal{I}| + |\bar{\mathcal{I}}| = K + 1$. Since $\text{Cal}_2 \leq 2(\mathcal{T}_1 + \mathcal{T}_2)$, we have shown that

$$\text{Cal}_2 \leq 6\text{PCal}_2 + 96(K+1) \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta} \quad (19)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. This completes the proof. \square

D.2 Proof of Corollary 3

Proof. Since Algorithm 1 ensures that $\text{PCal}_2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K \log T\right)$ (refer Section 5), we obtain

$$\text{Cal}_2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K \log T + K \log \frac{K}{\delta}\right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$, which is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{1}{3}}}{(\log T)^{\frac{1}{3}}} \log \frac{T}{\delta}\right)$ on substituting K . The high probability bound on $\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_G}$ follows since $\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_G} \leq G \cdot \text{Cal}_2$. To bound $\mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_2]$, we let \mathcal{E} denote the event that $\text{Cal}_2 \leq \Delta$, where $\Delta := 6\text{PCal}_2 + 96(K+1) \log \frac{4(K+1)}{\delta}$. We then have,

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_2] = \mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_2 | \mathcal{E}] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) + \mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_2 | \bar{\mathcal{E}}] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{T}{K^2} + K \log T + K \log \frac{K}{\delta} + \delta \cdot T\right)$$

which is $\mathcal{O}(T^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log T)^{\frac{2}{3}})$ on substituting $\delta = \frac{1}{T}$ and K . Note that the second equality above follows since $\mathbb{E}[\text{Cal}_2 | \mathcal{E}] \leq \Delta$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \leq 1$, $\text{Cal}_2 \leq T$ and $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}) < \delta$. Finally, bounding $\text{Msr}_{\mathcal{L}_G} \leq G \cdot \text{Cal}_2$ finishes the proof. \square