

Joint Value Estimation and Bidding in Repeated First-Price Auctions

Yuxiao Wen, Yanjun Han, Zhengyuan Zhou*

February 25, 2025

Abstract

We study regret minimization in repeated first-price auctions (FPAs), where a bidder observes only the realized outcome after each auction—win or loss. This setup reflects practical scenarios in online display advertising where the actual value of an impression depends on the difference between two potential outcomes, such as clicks or conversion rates, when the auction is won versus lost. We analyze three outcome models: (1) adversarial outcomes without features, (2) linear potential outcomes with features, and (3) linear treatment effects in features. For each setting, we propose algorithms that jointly estimate private values and optimize bidding strategies, achieving near-optimal regret bounds. Notably, our framework enjoys a unique feature that the treatments are also actively chosen, and hence eliminates the need for the overlap condition commonly required in causal inference.

Keywords: First-price auctions; Contextual bandits; Linear bandits; Causal inference.

1 Introduction

Recent years have seen an industry-wide shift from second-price to first-price auctions (FPAs) in online advertising, beginning with platforms like OpenX, AppNexus, and Index Exchange [Slu17], and extending to Google AdX [Dav19] and AdSense [Won21], the world’s largest ad exchanges. Unlike second-price auctions, FPAs are non-truthful, introducing critical challenges for real-time algorithmic bidding. A key challenge is the need to learn the distribution of the highest other bids (HOBs). To address this, [BGM⁺23, HZF⁺20, HWZ24] introduced the framework of regret minimization in repeated FPAs, developing algorithms that achieve near-optimal regret under various feedback mechanisms. This framework has since been extended to accommodate practical considerations, such as latency [ZKH⁺21], additional side information [ZHZ⁺22], budget constraints [WYDK23], return on investment (ROI) constraints [AFZ24], to name a few. We refer to a recent survey [ABB⁺24] for an overview of these developments.

However, another important challenge in FPAs often overlooked by the existing literature is the estimation of the actual value of an impression (or advertising slot). In practice, this value is determined by the difference between two potential outcomes—commonly clicks or conversion rates—when the auction is won versus lost. As shown in Fig. 1, an advertiser can observe the outcome of winning the advertising slot when he/she wins the auction, and the outcome of doing

*Yuxiao Wen is with the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, email: yuxiaowen@nyu.edu. Yanjun Han is with the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences and the Center for Data Science, New York University, email: yanjunhan@nyu.edu. Zhengyuan Zhou is with the Stern School of Business, New York University, and Arena Technologies, email: zz26@stern.nyu.edu.




Figure 1: The learner repeatedly bids for advertisement slots and observes the (random) outcome sales after winning or losing the auctions.

nothing when losing the auction; the value of the advertising slot is the difference between these two potential outcomes. Consequently, as [WNC24] observes, the problem of value estimation can be framed as a specific instance of causal inference, where the target quantity is the treatment effect, and the treatment is determined by the bidding outcome. This introduces the following challenges:

- First, as in all causal inference problems, only one potential outcome is observable for each subject, making direct estimation of the treatment effect inherently difficult.
- Second, unique to bidding in FPAs, the treatment (winning or losing the auction) is determined by the bidding strategy, which, in turn, depends on the current estimate of the actual value. This interdependence complicates both the estimation and the bidding process.

To address the aforementioned challenges, practitioners often rely on randomized controlled experiments for value estimation or manually decouple value estimation and learning, treating them as independent processes. However, these approaches can be either prohibitively costly or introduce significant biases into the final bidding outcome. In this paper, we propose a framework for joint value estimation and bidding in FPAs, making the following contributions:

- **Problem formulation:** We formalize the problem of joint value estimation and bidding in repeated FPAs, representing the value as the difference between two potential outcomes, observed upon winning and losing, respectively. We further introduce three models for the potential outcomes.
- **Adversarial outcomes:** When the potential outcomes can be adversarially chosen, we devise an EXP3-type algorithm that achieves an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret, during a time horizon T , against an oracle who knows the distribution of the HOBs. Due to the absence of additional contextual information in this setting, a natural oracle here only bids a constant price over time.
- **Linear potential outcomes:** When some features are available and both potential outcomes are linear in the features, we develop an algorithm that achieves an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ regret against an oracle who makes optimal feature-dependent bids. Here d is the feature dimension, and the algorithm tries to learn both potential outcomes based on the linearity assumption.
- **Linear treatment effect:** Under a more realistic assumption where only the treatment effect is linear in the features, we still manage to establish an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ regret against an oracle who makes optimal feature-dependent bids. The algorithm consists of two parts: the estimation part applies the inverse propensity weighted (IPW) estimator to find an unbiased estimator of the treatment effect, which might suffer from a large variance without the overlap condition;

the decision-making part of the algorithm uses a careful bidding strategy to neutralize the effect of estimation variance in bidding, and consequently eliminates the need of randomized trials or overlap conditions.

1.1 Related Work

Bidding in FPAs. FPAs, also known as descending-price or Dutch auctions, have a long history. Early study of FPAs typically took a game-theoretic view dating back to the foundational work of [Vic61, Mye81], and there has been significant progress in understanding the computational complexity of Bayesian Nash equilibrium for online FPAs [WSZ20, FRGH⁺21, BFO23, CP23, FRGHK24]. A different line of study takes the perspective of online learning where a single bidder would like to learn the “environment”, mainly the behaviors of other bidders in the literature. Dating back to [KL03] in a different pricing context, this perspective has inspired a flurry of work [HZF⁺20, ZHZ⁺22, BGM⁺23, BFG23, WYDK23, HWZ24, AFZ24] which establishes sublinear regrets under various feedback structures and environments in FPAs; we refer to a recent survey [ABB⁺24] for an overview. However, this line of work assumes a known valuation and mainly focuses on learning HOBs or handling other constraints (budget, side information, etc), and the problem of joint value estimation and bidding is explicitly listed as an open direction in [HWZ24].

Unknown valuation. There is also a rich line of literature on learning unknown valuations in auctions. In second-price auctions, [WPR16] studies a regret minimization setting where the bidder observes the valuation only if he/she wins the auction; this setting is then generalized to other auction formats [FPS18] including FPAs [ACG21]. A recent work [CBCC⁺24] provides a systematic study of feedback mechanisms (termed as *transparency*) and unknown valuations in FPAs and provides tight regret bounds in various settings. However, all these studies do *not* view the valuation of a bidder as a treatment effect, while an empirical study [WNC24] stresses the importance of a causal inference modeling. Although [WNC24] does not directly study the regret minimization problem, they identify a unique challenge in FPAs that the goals of regret minimization and causal inference are not well-aligned (while in second-price auctions these tasks are aligned). This challenge precisely motivates the problem formulation of joint value estimation and bidding in the current work.

We provide a more detailed comparison with [CBCC⁺24] as it is closest to ours. First, as explained above, the unknown valuation is the potential outcome of winning in [CBCC⁺24]; by contrast, since the unknown valuation in our model is a treatment effect, we need to deal with the scenario where only the treatment effect, but not the potential outcomes, could be learned. Second, no contextual information is assumed in [CBCC⁺24], so that dependence between the valuation and HOB is allowed; as a comparison, we adopt a causal inference framework with available contexts, and make the standard unconfoundedness assumption that the potential outcomes are conditionally independent of the HOBs given the contexts. In fact, in our first model of adversarial outcomes without contexts, both the algorithm and analysis are inspired by [CBCC⁺24].

Causal inference. The causal inference formulation of value estimation in FPAs in [WNC24] assumes the unconfoundedness and overlap conditions; both conditions are standard in causal inference [IR15], and are essential for controlling the estimation error in policy learning [AW21, ZAW23]. There have also been some efforts in relaxing or removing the overlap condition, such as trimming [YD18, BKBW23], policy shifts [ZCJY24], and bypassing the uniform requirements [JRYW22]. For example, the policy learning result in [JRYW22] only involves the overlap condition for the selected

policy; by contrast, thanks to the special nature of the joint value estimation and bidding problem, we do not even require the overlap condition for the selected bid.

1.2 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the problem formulation and presents the main regret bounds under three different models. Sections 3 to 5 work on the three models of adversarial outcomes, linear potential outcomes, and linear treatment effect, respectively, and develop the corresponding bidding strategies under each scenario. Conclusions and some future directions are discussed in Section 6. The proofs of technical results, including the regret lower bounds, are deferred to the appendices.

1.3 Notation

For positive integers $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For an event E , we defined the indicator function $\mathbb{1}[E]$ to be 1 if the event occurs and 0 otherwise. The standard asymptotic notations $O(\cdot)$, $\Omega(\cdot)$, and $\Theta(\cdot)$ are used to suppress constant factors, and $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$, $\tilde{\Omega}(\cdot)$, and $\tilde{\Theta}(\cdot)$ to suppress poly-logarithmic factors. For a random variable X , $\mathbb{E}[X]$ and $\text{Var}(X)$ denote its mean and variance respectively. Throughout, we use the filtration \mathcal{F}_t to denote all available history up to the beginning of round t , and write $\mathbb{E}_t[X] = \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{F}_t]$ for simplicity. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a PSD matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, let $\|x\|_A = \sqrt{x^\top A x}$. For a cumulative distribution function G on $[0, 1]$, let its inverse be $G^{-1}(z) = \inf\{x \in [0, 1] : G(x) \geq z\}$.

2 Problem Formulation and Main Results

In this section, we formulate this learning problem in FPAs and the three models under different assumptions on the potential outcomes. Subsequently, we discuss the key challenges of these formulations in Section 2.2, and summarize our main results in Section 2.3.

2.1 Problem Formulation

In this work, we consider a single bidder that jointly estimates her private values and bids against a population of other bidders in repeated FPAs over a time horizon T . At the beginning of each time t , the bidder participates in an auction and observes some contextual information x_t (which could be empty). The bidder then makes a bid $b_t \in \mathcal{B} = [0, 1]$, and observes the highest other bid (HOB) M_t at the end of each auction. Here we assume that the HOB M_t is always revealed to the bidder, regardless of the outcome of the auction; this is known as the full-information feedback [HZF⁺20, CBCC⁺24], and is called the “minimum-bid-to-win” in the Google Ad Exchange. Depending on the comparison between b_t and M_t , the bidder receives an outcome value $v_{t,1} \in [0, 1]$ if she wins the auction and pays b_t , i.e. $b_t \geq M_t$, or an outcome value $v_{t,0} \in [0, 1]$ if she loses the auction, i.e. $b_t < M_t$. The final realized payoff for the learner is

$$\begin{aligned} r_t(b_t) &= \mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t](v_{t,1} - b_t) + \mathbb{1}[b_t < M_t]v_{t,0} \\ &= \mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t](v_{t,1} - v_{t,0} - b_t) + v_{t,0}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The main feature in the reward function (1) is that up to an unimportant additive constant $v_{t,0}$, optimizing the bid b_t amounts to predict the HOB M_t and estimate the *treatment effect* $v_{t,1} - v_{t,0}$. The standard nonconfoundedness assumption in causal inference [IR15] states that the estimation problems for M_t and $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})$ can be decoupled.

Assumption 2.1 (Unconfoundedness). It holds that $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0}) \perp\!\!\!\perp M_t \mid x_t$.

As in many causal inference problems, Assumption 2.1 of no unmeasured confounders is vital to avoid Simpson’s paradox and make estimators like inverse propensity weighting (IPW) work. Specializing to bidding in FPAs, even for $v_{t,0} = 0$ and $x_t = \emptyset$, dependence between $v_{t,1}$ and M_t could lead to a $\Omega(T)$ regret (see, e.g. [HWZ24, Theorem 8] and [CBCC⁺24, Theorem 8]). As for the joint distribution of $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0}, x_t)$ over time, we also adopt the following conditional independence assumption, which essentially states that the context sequence $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is chosen by an oblivious adversary (e.g. x_t cannot depend on b_{t-1} or M_{t-1}).

Assumption 2.2 (Conditional independence). Conditioned on the contexts $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$, the random vectors $\{(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0}, M_t)\}_{t=1}^T$ are conditionally independent over time.

Thanks to Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.2, and the full-information feedback on M_t , the estimation of M_t is done independently of either value estimation or bidding: regardless of the generation processes of $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0}, b_t)$, the bidder always observes the same trajectory $\{(x_t, M_t)\}_{t=1}^T$, which is also the only useful information for predicting future HOBs. By contrast, the problem of joint value estimation and bidding lies in the interdependence between $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})$ and b_t : the bidder chooses the bid b_t based on the current estimate of $v_{t,1} - v_{t,0}$, while the choice of b_t affects the bidder’s likelihood of observing the potential outcomes $v_{t,1}$ or $v_{t,0}$. Since the primary focus of this paper is on the problem of joint value estimation and bidding, in the sequel we will focus less on the modeling and estimation of M_t , and use the following black-box model instead.

Specifically, for the modeling of M_t , we let G_t be a generic time-varying cumulative distribution function (CDF) of M_t which possibly depends on the context x_t . Then $G_t(b) = \mathbb{P}(b \geq M_t)$ and the expected payoff for bidding b_t is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t)] &= G_t(b_t)(v_{t,1} - b_t) + (1 - G_t(b_t))v_{t,0} \\ &= G_t(b_t)(v_{t,1} - v_{t,0} - b_t) + v_{t,0}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Throughout this paper we will always make the following assumption on G_t .

Assumption 2.3 (Bounded density). The CDF G_t is L -Lipschitz, i.e. it admits a density g_t with $\|g_t\|_\infty \leq L$.

Also, for the estimation of G_t , we assume a general estimation oracle which outputs an estimator \widehat{G}_t of G_t , based on the available and relevant information $\{x_s, M_s\}_{s < t} \cup \{x_t\}$. Consequently, our regret bounds will depend on some closeness parameter between \widehat{G}_t and G_t which will be specified in the explicit regret bounds and validated through simple examples.

The main distinct feature of this work lies in the modeling of potential outcomes $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})$. First, recall that $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})$ has a crucial feedback structure: the bidder only observes $v_{t,1}$ if $b_t \geq M_t$, and only observes $v_{t,0}$ if $b_t < M_t$. If we refer all observations of $v_{t,1}$ as the “treatment group”, then the propensity score of a treatment is $\mathbb{P}(b_t \geq M_t) = G_t(b_t)$, a value depending on the bid b_t . This is precisely the main difficulty we encounter in the problem of joint value estimation and bidding. Second, for the distributional assumptions on $(v_{t,0}, v_{t,1})$ and possibly x_t , we consider three different models as follows.

2.1.1 Model 1: Adversarial Outcomes

In the first model, we have no context (i.e. $x_t = \emptyset$), and make no distributional assumptions on the potential outcomes $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})$. Specifically, we assume that both $\{(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})\}_{t=1}^T$ and the

CDFs $\{G_t\}_{t=1}^T$ (satisfying Assumption 2.3) are generated by an oblivious adversary. Thanks to the independence of $(v_{1,t}, v_{0,t})$ and M_t in Assumption 2.1, the expected payoff takes the form (2). In addition, since no context is available, a natural (context-dependent) oracle is to bid the optimal *fixed* price $b_* \in \mathcal{B}$ in hindsight, i.e. the regret of a policy $\pi = (b_1, \dots, b_T)$ in this model is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_{\text{adv}}(\pi) &= \sup_{\{(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0}, G_t)\}_{t=1}^T} \sup_{b_* \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbb{E}[r_t(b_*)] - \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t)]) \\ &= \sup_{\{(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0}, G_t)\}_{t=1}^T} \sup_{b_* \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{t=1}^T (G_t(b_*)(v_{1,t} - v_{0,t} - b_*) - \mathbb{E}[G_t(b_t)(v_{1,t} - v_{0,t} - b_t)]). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here the expectation in the second line of (3) is over the randomness in a possibly randomized bidding strategy b_t . The bidder’s objective is to find a policy π that minimizes $\text{Reg}_{\text{adv}}(\pi)$.

2.1.2 Model 2: Linear Potential Outcomes

In practical scenarios, the bidder has access to contextual information x_t based on which he/she can estimate the potential outcomes $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})$. A simple yet popular model is the linear model, where

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{t,0}] = \theta_{*,0}^\top x_t, \quad \mathbb{E}[v_{t,1}] = \theta_{*,1}^\top x_t$$

hold for some unknown parameters $\theta_{*,0}, \theta_{*,1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\theta_{*,0}\|_2, \|\theta_{*,1}\|_2 \leq 1$. Here we assume that the context $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an d -dimensional vector with $\|x_t\|_2 \leq 1$, and the context sequence $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is chosen by an oblivious adversary. Given the presence of contexts x_t , in this model we compete against a more powerful time-varying oracle and define the regret as

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{lpo}}(\pi) = \sup_{\{G_t, x_t\}_{t=1}^T, \theta_{*,0}, \theta_{*,1}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_*(x_t))] - \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t)], \quad (4)$$

where b_t is chosen by the learner’s policy π and $b_*(x_t)$ is the optimal bid of the oracle who has full knowledge of the true parameters $\theta_{*,0}, \theta_{*,1}$ and the CDFs G_t :

$$b_*(x_t) = \arg \max_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{E}[r_t(b)] = \arg \max_{b \in \mathcal{B}} G_t(b) (\theta_{*,1}^\top x_t - b) + (1 - G_t(b)) \theta_{*,0}^\top x_t. \quad (5)$$

The bidder’s objective is to find a policy π that minimizes $\text{Reg}_{\text{lpo}}(\pi)$, where “lpo” stands for “linear potential outcomes”.

2.1.3 Model 3: Linear Treatment Effect

Finally, we relax our assumption on the linear structures and only let

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{t,1} - v_{t,0}] = \theta_*^\top x_t$$

for an unknown parameter $\theta_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\theta_*\|_2 \leq 1$. This models a more practical scenario where the potential outcomes $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})$ could have more complicated structures than the treatment effect $v_{t,1} - v_{t,0}$. Again, we assume that $\|x_t\|_2 \leq 1$, and that $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is chosen by an oblivious adversary. Once again, we compete against a time-varying oracle and define the regret as

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{lte}}(\pi) = \sup_{\{G_t, x_t\}_{t=1}^T, \theta_*} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_*(x_t))] - \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t)], \quad (6)$$

where “lte” stands for “linear treatment effect”, and $b_*(x_t)$ is the optimal context-dependent bid defined in (5).

2.2 Key Challenges

As discussed in Section 1, the inherent difficulty comes from the causal inference of the treatment effect $v_{t,1} - v_{t,0}$ and the interdependence between the inference and the bidding process. Specifically, two main questions arise in the process of value estimation and bidding:

1. Could the bidder perform value estimation on the fly, or need randomized experiments which could be costly and incur a large regret?
2. Would the bidding process lead to a propensity score too close to 0 or 1, and if so, incur a large estimation error and a large regret in future bidding?

For the first question, fortunately, the answer is affirmative and the bidder could perform value estimation on the fly. Specifically, for Model 1, an EXP3-type algorithm could be applied to directly estimate the rewards for each bid and use them for decision making. In Model 2, we apply a classical arm elimination algorithm for linear contextual bandits, and the possibility of not relying on randomized experiments (i.e. *exploration-free* algorithms) has been observed in this line of literature [BBK21, HZZ+20]. One complication is a possible dependence structure between decision making and estimation error, and we employ a master algorithm in [Aue02] to decouple the dependence.

Bidding in Model 3 is more complicated, and is the scenario where the second question above arises. Since only the treatment effect is linear in the context and we do not have a model for the potential outcomes, a good estimator of $\mathbb{E}[v_{t,1} - v_{t,0}] = \theta_*^\top x_t$ is necessary for the estimation of θ_* . A popular estimator in the causal inference literature is the IPW estimator: assuming for the ease of exposition that the CDF G_t is perfectly known, then the IPW estimator

$$\hat{e}_t(b_t) = \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t]v_{t,1}}{G_t(b_t)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t < M_t]v_{t,0}}{1 - G_t(b_t)} \quad (7)$$

satisfies $\mathbb{E}_t[\hat{e}_t(b_t)] = \theta_*^\top x_t$. A key issue arises from the variance of this estimator, which is bounded by

$$\text{Var}_t(\hat{e}_t(b_t)) \leq 2 \max\{G_t(b_t)^{-1}, (1 - G_t(b_t))^{-1}\}.$$

The optimal bid b_t , however, is often likely to either win or lose the auction—i.e. either $G_t(b_t)$ or $1 - G_t(b_t)$ approaches 0. This leads to an unbounded variance in the estimator $\hat{e}_t(b_t)$ and thereby breaks the regret guarantee for linear contextual bandit algorithms in the literature. To address this issue, the common approach to reduce the estimation error is to impose the *overlap condition*, i.e. require that $G_t(b_t) \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$ for some $\eta > 0$ and therefore lead to non-greedy strategies for b_t . Nonetheless, we show that the overlap condition is not necessary by exploiting two equivalent forms of the reward function in (2), with leading coefficient $G_t(b_t)$ or $1 - G_t(b_t)$ on the decision b_t . Our final bidding algorithm then selects the better reward formulation in a data-driven manner, and manages to mitigate the effect of a possibly large variance in decision making.

2.3 Main Results

Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, we are in a position to present the regret guarantees in all three models. For the adversarial outcome model (Model 1), the estimation oracle \widehat{G}_t turns out to be unnecessary, and we have the following unconditional regret guarantee.

Theorem 2.4 (Upper bound for Model 1). *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3 and Model 1 in Section 2.1.1, there is an algorithm π_{adv} that achieves the expected regret*

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{adv}}(\pi_{\text{adv}}) = \widetilde{O}(\sqrt{T}).$$

Table 1: Minimax Regret Characterizations for the Three Models

	Adversarial Outcomes	Linear Potential Outcomes	Linear Treatment Effect
Upper Bound	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT} + \Delta)$	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\Delta_2 dT} + \Delta_1)$
Lower Bound	$\Omega(\sqrt{T})$	$\Omega(\sqrt{dT})$	$\Omega(\sqrt{dT})$

Note: The quantities $\Delta, \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ concern the performance of the estimation oracle, which we view as a black box.

The regret upper bounds under the other models will be conditional on the performance of the estimation oracle \hat{G}_t , for explicit estimation of potential outcomes or the treatment effect becomes necessary. Despite this conditional nature, we stress that the estimation of G_t is a totally independent problem based only on the trajectory $\{(x_t, M_t)\}_{t=1}^T$. For Model 2, we will make the following assumption on the estimation oracle:

Assumption 2.5 (Estimation oracle I). With probability at least $1 - T^{-1}$, there is a sequence $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=1}^T$ such that $\|\hat{G}_t - G_t\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_t$ for all $t \in [T]$.

Based on Assumption 2.5, we have the following regret guarantee for Model 2.

Theorem 2.6 (Upper bound for Model 2). *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, 2.5, and Model 2 in Section 2.1.2, there is an algorithm π_{lpo} that achieves the expected regret*

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{lpo}}(\pi_{\text{lpo}}) = \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{dT} + \Delta\right),$$

where $\Delta := \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_t$ is the sum of estimation errors.

Theorem 2.6 shows an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ regret whenever the estimation of the HOB distribution G_t does not suffer from a too large error. For example, when M_t is i.i.d., the famous Dvoretzky–Kiefer–Wolfowitz inequality [DKW56] states that $\varepsilon_t = \tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$ for the empirical CDF \hat{G}_t , and $\Delta = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ is smaller than the $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ regret.

For Model 3, we will assume a slightly stronger estimation oracle, motivated by the Bernstein’s concentration that a smaller estimation error is available for events with small probability.

Assumption 2.7 (Estimation oracle II). With probability at least $1 - T^{-1}$, there is a sequence $\{\delta_t\}_{t=1}^T$ such that

$$\left| \hat{G}_t(b) - G_t(b) \right| \leq \delta_t \sqrt{G_t(b)(1 - G_t(b))} + \delta_t^2, \quad \forall b \in \mathcal{B}, t \in [T].$$

Based on Assumption 2.7, we have the following regret guarantee for Model 3.

Theorem 2.8 (Upper bound for Model 3). *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, 2.7, and Model 3 in Section 2.1.3, there is an algorithm π_{lte} (with the knowledge of the confidence bounds $\{\delta_t\}_{t=1}^T$) that achieves the expected regret*

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{lte}}(\pi_{\text{lte}}) = \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{\Delta_2 dT} + \Delta_1\right),$$

where $\Delta_1 := \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t$, $\Delta_2 := 1 + \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t^2$ are essentially the ℓ_1 and ℓ_2^2 norms of $\{\delta_t\}_{t=1}^T$, respectively.

Again, when M_t is i.i.d., Bernstein’s concentration inequality shows that Assumption 2.7 holds with $\delta_t = \tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$, so that $\Delta_1 = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ and $\Delta_2 = \tilde{O}(1)$. Therefore, Theorem 2.8 still leads to an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ regret even if only the treatment effect possesses a linear structure. We also remark that Assumption 2.3 crucially does not assume a density lower bound; therefore, it could happen that the overlap condition is violated (i.e. $G_t(b_t)$ is close to 0 or 1), but the regret upper bound in Theorem 2.8 remains unaffected.

Finally, we show that all these $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ or $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ regret upper bounds are not improvable in general, by providing matching lower bounds.

Theorem 2.9 (Lower bounds). *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, even if G_t is perfectly known, the following lower bounds hold for the three models:*

1. *Model 1:* $\inf_{\pi} \text{Reg}_{\text{adv}}(\pi) = \Omega(\sqrt{T})$;
2. *Model 2:* $\inf_{\pi} \text{Reg}_{\text{ipo}}(\pi) = \Omega(\sqrt{dT})$ for $T \geq d^2$;
3. *Model 3:* $\inf_{\pi} \text{Reg}_{\text{ite}}(\pi) = \Omega(\sqrt{dT})$ for $T \geq d^2$.

The lower bounds in Theorem 2.9 are established by classical information-theoretic arguments, and for completeness we include the proofs in the appendix. Table 1 presents a summary of the above results.

3 Model 1: Adversarial Outcomes

We start with the problem in which no contextual information is provided to the learner. The model is formulated in Section 2.1.1, and the learner’s objective is to minimize the regret $\text{Reg}_{\text{adv}}(\pi)$. As a first step, we consider a finite bid set $\mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ that comes from some sort of discretization of the bid space. We construct EXP3-FPA-TE (Algorithm 1), an extension of the EXP3-FPA algorithm in [CBCC⁺24], that achieves $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ expected regret when competing against the best fixed bid within the finite subset \mathcal{B}' . Then EXP3-FPA-TE can be coupled with a simple discretization to achieve near-optimal regret on the continuous bid space \mathcal{B} .

Algorithm 1: EXP3-FPA-TE (EXP3 for first-price auctions with treatment effects)

1 **Input:** time horizon T , finite bid set $\mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, learning rate $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

2 **Initialize:** set $w_{t,b} = 1$ for each $b \in \mathcal{B}'$.

3 **for** $t = 1$ **to** T **do**

4 Set probability $p_t(b) = (1 - 2\eta) \frac{w_{t,b}}{\sum_{b' \in \mathcal{B}'} w_{t,b'}} + \eta \delta_{b_{\min}} + \eta \delta_{b_{\max}}$.

5 Draw bid $b_t \sim p_t$.

6 Make bid b_t , observe M_t , and build payoff estimator for every $b \in \mathcal{B}'$:

$$\hat{r}_t(b) = \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t]}{\sum_{b' \geq M_t} p_t(b')} \mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t](v_{1,t} - b) + \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t < M_t]}{\sum_{b' < M_t} p_t(b')} \mathbb{1}[b < M_t]v_{t,0}.$$

7 For every $b \in \mathcal{B}'$, update $w_{t+1,b} = w_{t,b} \exp(\eta \hat{r}_t(b))$.

Let δ_b denote the Dirac measure on the bid $b \in \mathcal{B}'$. EXP3-FPA-TE maintains an exponential weight for each bid in the finite subset. At each time, it draws a bid based on these weights and an η -exploration on the largest and the smallest bid. Then the algorithm builds an unbiased estimator for the payoff for every candidate bid $b \in \mathcal{B}'$ and updates the weights accordingly.

Theorem 3.1. When $\log |\mathcal{B}'| < (e - 1)T$, EXP3-FPA-TE with $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{\log |\mathcal{B}'|}{(4e-2)T}} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ achieves expected regret

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{b' \in \mathcal{B}'} \sum_{t=1}^T r_t(b') - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) r_t(b) \right] \leq \sqrt{(4e-2) \log |\mathcal{B}'| T}.$$

Proof. Note that $\eta \hat{r}_t(b) \leq 1$ for every $t \in [T]$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}'$, thanks to the η amount of exploration on b_{\min} and b_{\max} . Let $W_t = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} w_{t,b}$. Following the standard analysis for EXP3, for each $t \in [T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{W_{t+1}}{W_t} &= \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} \frac{w_{t,b}}{W_t} \exp(\eta \hat{r}_t(b)) \\ &\leq \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} \frac{w_{t,b}}{W_t} (1 + \eta \hat{r}_t(b) + (e-2)\eta^2 \hat{r}_t(b)^2) \\ &= 1 + \eta \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} \frac{w_{t,b}}{W_t} (\hat{r}_t(b) + (e-2)\eta \hat{r}_t(b)^2) \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{\eta}{1-2\eta} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) (\hat{r}_t(b) + (e-2)\eta \hat{r}_t(b)^2) \end{aligned}$$

Summing over the time horizon, we have

$$\log W_{T+1} - \log W_1 = \sum_{t=1}^T \log \frac{W_{t+1}}{W_t} \leq \frac{\eta}{1-2\eta} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) (\hat{r}_t(b) + (e-2)\eta \hat{r}_t(b)^2).$$

Fix any $b_* \in \mathcal{B}'$. Since $W_1 = |\mathcal{B}'|$ and $W_{T+1} = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} \exp(\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{r}_t(b)) \geq \exp(\eta \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{r}_t(b_*))$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{r}_t(b_*) - \frac{\log |\mathcal{B}'|}{\eta} \leq \frac{1}{1-2\eta} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) (\hat{r}_t(b) + (e-2)\eta \hat{r}_t(b)^2). \quad (8)$$

Note that the quadratic payoff term can be bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \hat{r}_t(b)^2 &\leq \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t]}{\left(\sum_{b' \geq M_t} p_t(b')\right)^2} \mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t] (v_{1,t} - b)^2 + \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t < M_t]}{\left(\sum_{b' < M_t} p_t(b')\right)^2} \mathbb{1}[b < M_t] v_{t,0}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t]}{\left(\sum_{b' \geq M_t} p_t(b')\right)^2} \mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t] + \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t < M_t]}{\left(\sum_{b' < M_t} p_t(b')\right)^2} \mathbb{1}[b < M_t]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_t]$ w.r.t. the filtration at time t . For every $t \in [T]$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}_t[\hat{r}_t(b)] = r_t(b)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) \hat{r}_t(b)^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}_t \left[2 \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t] \mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t]}{\left(\sum_{b' \geq M_t} p_t(b')\right)^2} + p_t(b) \frac{\mathbb{1}[b_t < M_t] \mathbb{1}[b < M_t]}{\left(\sum_{b' < M_t} p_t(b')\right)^2} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t \left[2 \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) \frac{\mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t]}{\sum_{b' \geq M_t} p_t(b')} + p_t(b) \frac{\mathbb{1}[b < M_t]}{\sum_{b' < M_t} p_t(b')} \right] \\ &= 4. \end{aligned}$$

Now taking expectation of (8) and rearranging give us, for any $b_* \in \mathcal{B}'$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(b_*) - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) r_t(b) \right] \leq \frac{\log |\mathcal{B}|}{\eta} + (4e - 2)\eta T.$$

□

To handle the continuous bid space \mathcal{B} , we consider a simple discretization $\mathcal{B}' = \{\frac{k}{T} : k \in [T]\}$. Thanks to the Lipschitzness of the CDF G_t in Assumption 2.3, we are able to approximate the optimal fixed bid in \mathcal{B} with the optimal bid in the discretization, which leads to the following result.

Corollary 3.2 (Theorem 2.4). *Let $\mathcal{B}' = \{\frac{k}{T} : k \in [T]\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. Let π be the resulting bidding strategy of Algorithm 1 running on this discretization with $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{\log(T)}{(4e-2)T}}$. Then under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, the policy π achieves expected regret*

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{adv}}(\pi) = O\left(\sqrt{T \log T}\right).$$

Proof. Let $b_* = \arg \max_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[r_t(b)]$ be the optimal fixed bid in the bid space. By Assumption 2.3, for any bid $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$|\mathbb{E}[r_t(b + \varepsilon)] - \mathbb{E}[r_t(b)]| = |G_t(b + \varepsilon)(v - b - \varepsilon) - G_t(b)(v - b)| \leq (2L + 1)\varepsilon$$

where $v = v_{t,1} - v_{t,0} \in [-1, 1]$. Then by Theorem 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_{\text{adv}}(\pi) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T r_t(b_*) - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) r_t(b) \right] \\ &\leq 2L + 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{b' \in \mathcal{B}'} \sum_{t=1}^T r_t(b') - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}'} p_t(b) r_t(b) \right] \\ &\leq 2L + 1 + \sqrt{(4e - 2)T \log T}. \end{aligned}$$

□

4 Model 2: Linear Potential Outcomes

In this section, we consider Model 2 proposed in Section 2.1.2 that incorporates the presence of contexts.

4.1 A Bid Elimination Algorithm

When both potential outcomes are linear in the context x_t , a natural strategy of estimating $\theta_{*,0}$ and $\theta_{*,1}$ is to run linear regression on the observed potential outcomes, respectively. To this end, we propose a master algorithm SUP-LIN-PO (Algorithm 3) and a base algorithm LIN-PO (Algorithm 2). The high-level idea is that, at each time t , SUP-LIN-PO eliminates suboptimal bids based on their confidence bounds provided by the base algorithm LIN-PO and selects a bid from the remaining candidates. We first present the base algorithm, and then explain the need for the master algorithm.

Algorithm 2: LIN-PO (Base algorithm for FPAs with linear potential outcomes)

- 1 **Input:** Time indices $\Phi_t \subseteq [t-1]$, bid space $B_t \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, estimated CDF \widehat{G}_t , time horizon T .
 - 2 Set $\beta \leftarrow \sqrt{\log(2T)}$ and $\lambda \leftarrow 1$.
 - 3 $A_{t,0} \leftarrow \lambda I + \sum_{s \in \Phi_t} \mathbb{1}[b_s < M_s] x_s x_s^\top$;
 - 4 $A_{t,1} \leftarrow \lambda I + \sum_{s \in \Phi_t} \mathbb{1}[b_s \geq M_s] x_s x_s^\top$;
 - 5 $z_{t,0} \leftarrow \sum_{s \in \Phi_t} \mathbb{1}[b_s < M_s] v_{s,0} x_s$;
 - 6 $z_{t,1} \leftarrow \sum_{s \in \Phi_t} \mathbb{1}[b_s \geq M_s] v_{s,1} x_s$;
 - 7 Compute estimators $\widehat{\theta}_{t,0} \leftarrow A_{t,0}^{-1} z_{t,0}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_{t,1} \leftarrow A_{t,1}^{-1} z_{t,1}$.
 - 8 **for** $b \in B_t$ **do**
 - 9 Compute the reward estimator $\widehat{r}_t \leftarrow \widehat{G}_t(b) (\widehat{\theta}_{t,1}^\top x_t - b) + (1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)) \widehat{\theta}_{t,0}^\top x_t$.
 - 10 Compute the width $w_t(b) \leftarrow (\beta + \lambda) \widehat{G}_t(b) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,1}^{-1}} + (\beta + \lambda) (1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,0}^{-1}}$.
-

4.1.1 Base algorithm

At time t , the base algorithm LIN-PO takes as input a subset of the bid space B_t and a selected subset $\Phi_t \subseteq [t-1]$ of previous time indices. Based on the available observations $(x_s, M_s, b_s, \mathbb{1}[b_s \geq M_s] v_{s,1}, \mathbb{1}[b_s < M_s] v_{s,0})_{s \in \Phi_t}$, the standard ridge regression is applied to estimate $\theta_{*,0}$ and $\theta_{*,1}$ (with a regularization parameter $\lambda = 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_{t,0} &= \arg \min_{\theta_0} \sum_{s \in \Phi_t} \mathbb{1}[b_s < M_s] (v_{s,0} - \theta_0^\top x_s)^2 + \lambda \|\theta_0\|_2^2, \\ \widehat{\theta}_{t,1} &= \arg \min_{\theta_1} \sum_{s \in \Phi_t} \mathbb{1}[b_s \geq M_s] (v_{s,1} - \theta_1^\top x_s)^2 + \lambda \|\theta_1\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The expressions of $(\widehat{\theta}_{t,0}, \widehat{\theta}_{t,1})$ are computed in Line 7 of Algorithm 2. After that, for each active bid $b \in B_t$, the base algorithm uses the plug-in approach to estimate the expected payoff function $\mathbb{E}[r_t(b)]$ in (2) by $\widehat{r}_t(b)$ in Line 9, as well as a width parameter $w_t(b)$ in Line 10. The rationale behind these quantities is summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $(v_{s,1}, v_{s,0})_{s \in \Phi_t}$ are conditionally independent given $(x_s, b_s, M_s)_{s \in \Phi_t}$, then with probability at least $1 - T^{-2}$, it holds that*

$$\left| \widehat{\theta}_{t,i}^\top x_t - \theta_{*,i}^\top x_t \right| \leq (\beta + \lambda) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,i}^{-1}}, \quad \text{for both } i = 0, 1.$$

Conditioned on the above events, we further have

$$\left| \widehat{r}_t(b) - [\widehat{G}_t(b) (\widehat{\theta}_{t,1}^\top x_t - b) + (1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)) \widehat{\theta}_{t,0}^\top x_t] \right| \leq w_t(b), \quad \text{for all } b \in \mathcal{B}.$$

4.1.2 Master algorithm

Note that the conditional independence assumption in Lemma 4.1 breaks down when $\Phi_t = [t-1]$ for all $t \in [T]$. To see this, note that the selection of the bid b_t depends on the realized outcomes

$$\{\mathbb{1}[b_s \geq M_s] v_{s,1}, \mathbb{1}[b_s < M_s] v_{s,0}\}_{s < t};$$

therefore, conditioned on such a future bid b_t , the past potential outcomes $(v_{s,0}, v_{s,1})_{s < t}$ may become dependent. To address this subtle dependence issue, we propose to use a master algorithm SUP-LIN-PO in Algorithm 3. The idea behind this master algorithm is taken from [Aue02], and has been

Algorithm 3: SUP-LIN-PO (Master algorithm for FPA with linear potential outcomes)

```

1 Input: Time horizon  $T$ , bid space  $\mathcal{B} = [0, 1]$ , estimation oracle  $\mathcal{O}$ .
2 Initialize: Set  $S \leftarrow \lceil \log_2 \sqrt{T} \rceil$ ,  $\Phi_1^{(s)} = \emptyset$  for  $s \in [S]$ .
3 for  $t = 1$  to  $T$  do
4   Observe the context vector  $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .
5   Estimate  $\widehat{G}_t$  from  $\widehat{G}_t \leftarrow \mathcal{O}(\{M_\tau, x_\tau\}_{\tau < t}; x_t)$ .
6   Initialize  $B_1 \leftarrow \mathcal{B}$ .
7   for  $s = 1$  to  $S$  do
8     Invoke Algorithm 2 with time indices  $\Phi_t^{(s)}$ , space  $B_s$ , and CDF  $\widehat{G}_t$  to compute
9      $\{\widehat{r}_t^{(s)}(b)\}_{b \in B_s}$  and widths  $\{w_t^{(s)}(b)\}_{b \in B_s}$ .
10    if  $\exists b \in B_s$  such that  $w_t^{(s)}(b) > 2^{-s}$  then
11      Choose any such bid  $b_t \leftarrow b$ .
12      Update:  $\Phi_{t+1}^{(s)} \leftarrow \Phi_t^{(s)} \cup \{t\}$  and  $\Phi_{t+1}^{(s')} \leftarrow \Phi_t^{(s')}$  for  $s' \neq s$ . Break the inner for loop.
13    else if  $w_t^{(s)}(b) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$  for all  $b \in B_s$  then
14      Choose  $b_t \leftarrow \max_{i \in B_s} \widehat{r}_t^{(s)}(i)$ .
15      Do not update:  $\Phi_{t+1}^{(s')} \leftarrow \Phi_t^{(s')}$  for all  $s' \in [S]$ . Break the inner for loop.
16    else
17      We have  $w_t^{(s)}(b) \leq 2^{-s}$  for all  $b \in B_s$ . Proceed to bid elimination:
18       $B_{s+1} \leftarrow \left\{ b \in B_s : \widehat{r}_t^{(s)}(b) + w_t^{(s)}(b) \geq \max_{b^* \in B_s} \left( \widehat{r}_t^{(s)}(b^*) + w_t^{(s)}(b^*) \right) - 2 \cdot 2^{-s} \right\}$ .
19    Bidder bids the chosen bid  $b_t$ .
20    Bidder observes  $\mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t]v_{t,1}$  and  $\mathbb{1}[b_t < M_t]v_{t,0}$ .

```

subsequently used to address similar dependence issues in [CLRS11, HWZ24]. The purpose of this master algorithm is to partition the time indices $[t]$ into multiple stages, eliminate the suboptimal bids in a hierarchical manner, and select the bid b_t only through the confidence width $w_t(b)$ in LIN-PO, instead of the point estimates $\widehat{r}_t(b)$. Crucially, the widths $w_t(b)$ are computed based on the contexts (x_t, b_t, M_t) on the current stage, but do not involve the potential outcomes $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})$ on this stage. By contrast, the point estimates $\widehat{r}_t(b)$ (which depend on the potential outcomes $(v_{s,1}, v_{s,0})_{s < t}$ on this stage) are only revealed when we decide to move to the next stage (Line 17). This information structure turns out to be the key idea to ensure the conditional independence in Lemma 4.1:

Lemma 4.2 (Corollary of Lemma 14 in [Aue02]). *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.2, for every $s \in [S]$ and $t \in [T]$, $(v_{\tau,1}, v_{\tau,0})_{\tau \in \Phi_t^{(s)}}$ are conditionally independent given $(x_\tau, b_\tau, M_\tau)_{\tau \in \Phi_t^{(s)}}$.*

Finally, we remark that while statistically Algorithm 3 leads to the target regret upper bound for the continuous bid space $\mathcal{B} = [0, 1]$, for computational considerations one can discretize \mathcal{B} to a fine enough resolution which does not affect the regret bound. In addition, Line 12 of Algorithm 3 ensures that we never reach $s = S + 1$ in the inner for loop.

4.2 Regret Upper Bound

The following theorem establishes the regret upper bound of Algorithm 3.

Theorem 4.3 (Upper bound of Algorithm 3). *Let π be the resulting bidding strategy of Algorithm 3 (combined with Algorithm 2). Then under Assumptions 2.1–2.3 and 2.5, the policy π achieves an expected regret*

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{Ipo}}(\pi) = O\left(\sqrt{dT} \log^2 T + \Delta \log^{3/2} T\right),$$

where $\Delta = \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_t$.

It is clear that Theorem 4.3 implies Theorem 2.6. The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.3. Since all events with probability $O(T^{-1})$ only contribute $O(S)$ regret in total, WLOG we assume that the guarantees in Assumption 2.5 and Lemma 4.1 hold almost surely. Adopting the notation¹

$$\hat{r}_t(b) = \hat{G}_t(b)(\theta_{*,1}^\top x_t - b) + (1 - \hat{G}_t(b))\theta_{*,0}^\top x_t, \quad (10)$$

we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *In Algorithm 3, for every $t \in [T]$ and $s \in [S]$, it holds that $\max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \hat{r}_t(b^*) - \hat{r}_t(b) \leq 8 \cdot 2^{-s}$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_s$.*

In other words, Lemma 4.4 states that the any bid that has survived into stage s is $O(2^{-s})$ -close to optimal under \hat{r}_t . Consequently, if we denote by $\Phi^{(s)} \subseteq [T]$ the set of time indices belonging to stage $s \in [S]$, and $\Phi^{(S+1)} \subseteq [T]$ the set of time indices where all widths are below $\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_{\text{Ipo}}(\pi) &= \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{E}[r_t(b^*)] - \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t)] \right) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(2\varepsilon_t + \max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \hat{r}_t(b^*) - \hat{r}_t(b_t) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2\Delta + 8 \left(\sum_{s=1}^S 2^{-s} |\Phi^{(s)}| + \frac{|\Phi^{(S+1)}|}{2^S} \right) \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} O(\Delta + \sqrt{T}) + 8 \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t). \end{aligned}$$

Here (a) uses $|\mathbb{E}[r_t(b)] - \hat{r}_t(b)| \leq \|G_t - \hat{G}_t\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_t$ by (2), (10), and Assumption 2.5, (b) follows from Lemma 4.4, and (c) uses $S = \lceil \log_2 \sqrt{T} \rceil$ and $w_t^{(s)}(b_t) \geq 2^{-s}$ whenever $t \in \Phi^{(s)}$. Then Theorem 4.3 is a direct consequence of the following upper bound, which is essentially the elliptical potential lemma applied to the sum $\sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t)$.

Lemma 4.5. *For every $s \in [S]$, it holds that $\sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t) = O(\Delta \sqrt{\log T} + \sqrt{dT} \log T)$.*

5 Model 3: Linear Treatment Effect

In this section, we relax the linear structure imposed on the potential outcomes to only impose it on the treatment effect and consider Model 3 as proposed in Section 2.1.3.

¹Warning: not to confuse $\hat{r}_t(b)$ with $\hat{r}_t^{(s)}(b)$ in Algorithm 3: $\hat{r}_t(b)$ is the reward w.r.t. $\hat{G}_t(b)$, while $\hat{r}_t^{(s)}(b)$ further plugs in the estimated parameters from stage s for $\theta_{*,0}$ and $\theta_{*,1}$.

5.1 An Adaptive Bid Elimination Algorithm

5.1.1 A truncated IPW estimator.

When the HOB distribution G_t is perfectly available, a natural estimator of the treatment effect $\mathbb{E}[v_{t,1} - v_{t,0}]$ is the IPW estimator in (7):

$$\widehat{e}_t(b) = \frac{\mathbf{1}[b \geq M_t]v_{t,1}}{G_t(b)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}[b < M_t]v_{t,0}}{1 - G_t(b)}.$$

However, since we only have access to an estimator \widehat{G}_t of G_t , we will apply a truncated IPW estimator defined as

$$\widetilde{e}_t(b) = \frac{\mathbf{1}[b \geq M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, \widehat{G}_t(b)\}}v_{t,1} - \frac{\mathbf{1}[b < M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, 1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)\}}v_{t,0}, \quad (11)$$

where δ_t is the concentration parameter in Assumption 2.7 which is assumed to be known. Unlike $\widehat{e}_t(b)$, the truncated estimator $\widetilde{e}_t(b)$ is biased. The following lemma summarizes the bias-variance properties of $\widetilde{e}_t(b)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $|\widehat{G}_t(b) - G_t(b)| \leq \delta_t \sqrt{G_t(b)(1 - G_t(b))} + \delta_t^2$. Then there exist absolute constants $c, c' > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{e}_t(b)] - \theta_*^\top x_t \right| &\leq c\delta_t\sigma_t(b), \\ \text{Var}(\widetilde{e}_t(b)) &\leq c'\sigma_t(b)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the quantity $\sigma_t(b)$ is defined as

$$\sigma_t(b) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\widehat{G}_t(b)(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b))}}. \quad (12)$$

In the sequel, we will use $\sigma_t(b)^2$ in (23) as the variance proxy for the truncated IPW estimator $\widetilde{e}_t(b)$. In particular, since $\widehat{G}_t(b)$ could be close to 0 or 1 (i.e. no overlap condition), the quantity $\sigma_t(b)$ can indeed become prohibitively large.

5.1.2 Base algorithm

Next we present the base algorithm LIN-TE in Algorithm 4 based on $\widetilde{e}_t(b)$. Again, we will apply linear regression of $\widetilde{e}_t(b_t)$ against x_t to estimate θ_* , but Lemma 5.1 shows that the ordinary least squares will suffer from heteroskedasticity. To address this problem, we use the following weighted least squares estimator:

$$\widehat{\theta}_t = \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \left(\frac{\widetilde{e}_\tau(b_\tau) - \theta^\top x_\tau}{\sigma_\tau(b_\tau)} \right)^2 + \lambda \|\theta\|_2^2, \quad (13)$$

with $\widetilde{e}_\tau(b_\tau)$ and $\sigma_\tau(b_\tau)$ given in (11) and (23), respectively. The estimation performance of $\widehat{\theta}_t$ is summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose $(v_{\tau,1}, v_{\tau,0})_{\tau \in \Phi_t}$ are conditionally independent given $(x_\tau, b_\tau, M_\tau)_{\tau \in \Phi_t}$, then with probability at least $1 - T^{-2}$, it holds that*

$$\left| \widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - \theta_*^\top x_t \right| \leq \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}},$$

where γ is defined in Line 7 of Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4: LIN-TE (Base algorithm for linear treatment effects)

- 1 **Input:** Time indices $\Phi_t \subseteq [t-1]$, bid space $B_t \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, estimated CDF \widehat{G}_t , time horizon T .
 - 2 $\lambda \leftarrow 1$;
 - 3 $\sigma_\tau \leftarrow \sigma_\tau(b_\tau)$ in (23) for $\tau \in \Phi_t$;
 - 4 $A_t \leftarrow \lambda I + \sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \sigma_\tau^{-2} x_\tau x_\tau^\top$;
 - 5 $z_t \leftarrow \sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \sigma_\tau^{-2} x_\tau \tilde{e}_\tau$ where $\tilde{e}_\tau = \tilde{e}_\tau(b_\tau)$ is defined in (11);
 - 6 Compute estimator $\hat{\theta}_t \leftarrow A_t^{-1} z_t$.
 - 7 Set $\gamma \leftarrow \lambda + c_1 \log(2T) + c_2 \sqrt{\sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \delta_\tau^2}$, with δ_τ given in Assumption 2.7 and absolute constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ defined in Lemma A.6.
 - 8 **for** $b \in B_t$ **do**
 - 9 Compute width $w_t(b) \leftarrow c_3 L \gamma \left(\widehat{G}_t(b)(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)) \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} + \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 \right)$ with absolute constant $c_3 > 0$ defined in Lemma A.7.
 - 10 Compute $u_{t,0}(b) \leftarrow \widehat{G}_t(b) \left(\hat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - b + \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right)$.
 - 11 Compute $u_{t,1}(b) \leftarrow \widehat{G}_t(b) \left(\hat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - b - \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right) - \left(\hat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right)$.
 - 12 Compute maximizers $b_{*,i} \leftarrow \arg \max_{b \in B_t} u_{t,i}(b)$ for both $i = 0, 1$.
-

As for the quantities $u_{t,0}(b)$ and $u_{t,1}(b)$ in Lines 10 and 11, note that the high-probability event in Lemma 5.2 yields that for every $b \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$u_{t,0}(b) \geq \widehat{r}_t(b) - \mathbb{E}[v_{t,0}] =: \widehat{r}_{t,0}(b), \quad (14)$$

$$u_{t,1}(b) \geq \widehat{r}_t(b) - \mathbb{E}[v_{t,1}] =: \widehat{r}_{t,1}(b), \quad (15)$$

where we recall in (10) that

$$\widehat{r}_t(b) = \widehat{G}_t(b)(\theta_*^\top x_t - b) + \mathbb{E}[v_{t,0}] = \widehat{G}_t(b)(\theta_*^\top x_t - b) - \theta_*^\top x_t + \mathbb{E}[v_{t,1}]. \quad (16)$$

In other words, both quantities $u_{t,0}(b)$ and $u_{t,1}(b)$ are upper confidence bounds of $\widehat{r}_t(b)$, up to additive constants independent of b . Consequently, the maximizers $b_{*,0} \geq b_{*,1}$ are the bids chosen by two different UCB policies, and their roles will be discussed in the master algorithm.

5.1.3 Master algorithm

Similar to Algorithm 3, the master algorithm in Algorithm 5 partitions $[t]$ into multiple stages to ensure the conditional independence condition in Lemma 5.2. However, the main distinct feature of Algorithm 5 lies in the selection from two different criteria $u_{t,0}$ and $u_{t,1}$. The reason behind this selection is that, the rewards

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{r}_{t,0}(b) &= \widehat{G}_t(b)(\theta_*^\top x_t - b), \\ \widehat{r}_{t,1}(b) &= \widehat{G}_t(b)(\theta_*^\top x_t - b) - \theta_*^\top x_t = -(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b))\theta_*^\top x_t - b\widehat{G}_t(b) \end{aligned}$$

in (14) and (15) are sensitive to the estimation error of $\theta_*^\top x_t$ in different ways: in $\widehat{r}_{t,0}(b)$ the leading coefficient is $\widehat{G}_t(b)$, while in $\widehat{r}_{t,1}(b)$ the leading coefficient has magnitude $1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)$. Therefore, a possibly large estimation error of $\theta_*^\top x_t$ when $\widehat{G}_t(b)$ is close to 0 (resp. 1) does not transform into a large estimation error in $\widehat{r}_{t,0}(b)$ (resp. $\widehat{r}_{t,1}(b)$); this is essentially a ‘‘variance reduction’’ step. The key then is to choose the better reward ($\widehat{r}_{t,0}(b)$ or $\widehat{r}_{t,1}(b)$) for decision making, depending on whether $\widehat{G}_t(b)$ is close to 0 or 1 for approximately optimal bids b .

Algorithm 5: SUP-LIN-TE (Master algorithm for FPA with linear treatment effects)

1 Input: Time horizon T , bid space $\mathcal{B} = [0, 1]$, estimation oracle \mathcal{O} .
2 Initialize: set $S = \lceil \log_2 \sqrt{T} \rceil$, $\Phi_1^{(s)} = \emptyset$ for $s \in [S]$.
3 for $t = 1$ **to** T **do**
4 Observe the context vector $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
5 Estimate the CDF and confidence level with $(\hat{G}_t, \delta_t) \leftarrow \mathcal{O}(\{M_\tau, x_\tau\}_{\tau < t}; x_t)$.
6 Initialize $B_1 \leftarrow \mathcal{B}$.
7 **for** $s = 1$ **to** S **do**
8 Invoke Algorithm 4 with time indices $\Phi_t^{(s)}$, space B_s , and CDF \hat{G}_t to compute UCBs $\{u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b)\}_{b \in B_s}$ and maximizers $b_{*,i}^{(s)}$ for $i = 0, 1$, and widths $\{w_t^{(s)}(b)\}_{b \in B_s}$.
9 Select the criterion $i \leftarrow \mathbb{1} \left[\hat{G}_t(b_{*,1}^{(s)}) > \frac{1}{40L} \right] \in \{0, 1\}$.
10 **if** $\exists b \in B_s$ such that $w_t^{(s)}(b) > 2^{-s}$ **then**
11 Choose this $b_t \leftarrow b$.
12 Update: $\Phi_{t+1}^{(s)} \leftarrow \Phi_t^{(s)} \cup \{t\}$ and $\Phi_{t+1}^{(s')} \leftarrow \Phi_t^{(s')}$ for $s' \neq s$. Break the inner for loop.
13 **else if** $w_t^{(s)}(b) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$ for all $b \in B_s$ **then**
14 Choose $b_t \leftarrow \max_{b \in B_s} u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b)$.
15 Do not update: $\Phi_{t+1}^{(s')} \leftarrow \Phi_t^{(s')}$ for all $s' \in [S]$. Break the inner for loop.
16 **else**
17 We have $w_t^{(s)}(b) \leq 2^{-s}$ for all $b \in B_s$.
18 Eliminate bids: $B_{s+1} \leftarrow \left\{ b \in B_s : u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b) \geq u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b_{*,i}^{(s)}) - 2 \cdot 2^{-s} \right\} \cap [b_{*,1}^{(s)}, b_{*,0}^{(s)}]$.
19 Set $\gamma_t \leftarrow 1 + c_1 \log(2T) + c_2 \sqrt{\sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t^{(s)}} \delta_\tau^2}$ where $s \in [S]$ is the stage b_t is selected.
20 Let $z \leftarrow \min\{\gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{d}{T}} + 4\delta_t, \frac{1}{2}\}$, and bidder bids the truncated bid

$$b_t \leftarrow \min \left\{ \max \left\{ b_t, \hat{G}_t^{-1}(z) \right\}, \hat{G}_t^{-1}(1 - z) \right\}.$$

21 Bidder observes $\mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t]v_{t,1}$ and $\mathbb{1}[b_t < M_t]v_{t,0}$.

To this end, we compute the maximizer $b_{*,1}$ of the map $b \mapsto u_{t,1}(b)$, and check if $\hat{G}_t(b_{*,1})$ is close to 0 or 1. A small $\hat{G}_t(b_{*,1})$ suggests a small CDF and thus the choice of $\hat{r}_{t,0}$, and a large $\hat{G}_t(b_{*,1})$ suggests a big CDF and the other option $\hat{r}_{t,1}$. This is the criterion $i \in \{0, 1\}$ in Line 9 of Algorithm 5. The following result shows that the selected reward $\hat{r}_{t,i}(b)$ enjoys a small width $w_t(b)$ that scales with $\hat{G}_t(b)(1 - \hat{G}_t(b)) = \sigma_t(b)^{-2}$ for all candidate bids.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose the event in Lemma 5.2 holds. Let $\hat{r}_{t,0}$ and $\hat{r}_{t,1}$ be defined as in (14) and (15). For any $s \in [S]$ and for the criterion $i \in \{0, 1\}$ selected in Algorithm 5, it holds that*

$$u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b) - 2w_t^{(s)}(b) \leq \hat{r}_{t,i}(b) \leq u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b), \quad \forall b \in [b_{*,1}, b_{*,0}]$$

where $b_{*,i}^{(s)} = \arg \max_{b \in B_s} u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b)$ for $i = 0, 1$ as defined in Algorithm 4.

Therefore, the width of the selected UCB scales inversely with the variance $\sigma_t(b_t)$ of the truncated IPW estimator, thereby neutralizing the effect of the variance in the final regret. Consequently, this adaptive UCB selection eliminates the need for an overlap condition in our framework.

5.2 Regret Upper Bound

The regret upper bound of Algorithm 5 is established in the following result, which implies Theorem 2.8.

Theorem 5.4 (Upper bound of Algorithm 5). *Let π be the resulting bidding strategy of Algorithm 5 (combined with Algorithm 4). Then under Assumptions 2.1–2.3 and 2.7, the policy π achieves an expected regret*

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{ite}}(\pi) = O\left(\sqrt{dT\Delta_2} \log^3 T + \Delta_1\right)$$

where $\Delta_2 = \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t^2$ and $\Delta_1 = \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t$, with δ_t given in Assumption 2.7.

Again, we present the proof of Theorem 5.4 in the remainder of this section. WLOG we assume Assumption 2.7 and the high-probability event in Lemma 5.2 holds almost surely. We also assume that $\delta_t < 0.1$ for all $t \in [T]$, since there are at most $10\Delta_1$ times when this assumption is violated, contributing $O(\Delta_1)$ regret. Recall the notation in (16), and we have the following lemma that proves the bids in stage s are only $O(2^{-s})$ -suboptimal under \hat{r}_t .

Lemma 5.5. *In Algorithm 5, for every $t \in [T]$ and $s \in [S]$, it holds that $\max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \hat{r}_t(b^*) - \hat{r}_t(b) \leq 8 \cdot 2^{-s}$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_s$.*

Let b_t° denote the selected bid before the truncation in Line 22 in Algorithm 5 and b_t denote the final bid after. Since Assumption 2.7 implies $\|G_t - \hat{G}_t\|_\infty \leq 2\delta_t$, by Lemma C.4, the truncation step does not hurt the reward too much:

$$\hat{r}_t(b_t^\circ) - \hat{r}_t(b_t) \leq \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{d}{T}} + 8\delta_t. \quad (17)$$

Then let again $\Phi^{(s)}$ denote the set of time indices for stage s and $\Phi^{(S+1)}$ where all widths are less than $\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$. Denote $b_t^* = \max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{E}[r_t(b^*)]$ and $\hat{b}_t^* = \max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{E}[\hat{r}_t(b^*)]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_{\text{ite}}(\pi) &= \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t^*)] - \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t)] \\ &= \sum_{t \in [T]} \underbrace{(\mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t^*)] - \hat{r}_t(b_t^*))}_{(a)} + \underbrace{(\hat{r}_t(b_t^*) - \hat{r}_t(\hat{b}_t^*))}_{(b)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{(\hat{r}_t(\hat{b}_t^*) - \hat{r}_t(b_t^\circ))}_{(c)} + \underbrace{(\hat{r}_t(b_t^\circ) - \hat{r}_t(b_t))}_{(d)} + \underbrace{(\hat{r}_t(b_t) - \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t)])}_{(e)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2.7, we can bound both (a) $\leq 2 \sum_{t \in [T]} \delta_t = 2\Delta_1$ and (e) $\leq 2\Delta_1$. By definition of \hat{b}_t^* ,

(b) ≤ 0 . By (17), (d) $\leq (1 + c_1 \log(2T) + c_2 \sqrt{\Delta_2}) \sqrt{dT} + 8\Delta_1$. It remains to bound (c) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t \in [T]} \hat{r}_t(\hat{b}_t^*) - \hat{r}_t(b_t^\circ) &= \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(S+1)}} \hat{r}_t(\hat{b}_t^*) - \hat{r}_t(b_t^\circ) + \sum_{s \in [S]} \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} \hat{r}_t(\hat{b}_t^*) - \hat{r}_t(b_t^\circ) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{|\Phi^{(S+1)}|}{\sqrt{T}} + 8 \sum_{s \in [S]} 2^{-s} |\Phi^{(s)}| \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} O(\sqrt{T}) + \sum_{s \in [S]} \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t^\circ) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} O(\sqrt{T}) + \sum_{s \in [S]} \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t)
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is from Lemma 5.5, (b) uses $w_t^{(s)}(b_t^\circ) \geq 2^{-s}$ when $t \in \Phi^{(s)}$, and (c) uses $\hat{G}_t(b_t)(1 - \hat{G}_t(b_t)) \geq \hat{G}_t(b_t^\circ)(1 - \hat{G}_t(b_t^\circ))$ to conclude that $w_t^{(s)}(b_t) \geq w_t^{(s)}(b_t^\circ)$ by the definition of $w_t^{(s)}$. Then applying the following elliptical potential lemma leads to the upper bound in Theorem 5.4.

Lemma 5.6. *For any $s \in [S]$, suppose $\delta_t < 0.1$ for $t \in \Phi^{(s)}$ and we have*

$$\sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t) = O(\sqrt{dT\Delta_2} \log^2 T + d\Delta_2 \log T + d \log^3 T).$$

6 Conclusion and Future Directions

In this paper, we formulate the problem of joint value estimation and bidding for a single bidder in repeated first-price auctions into a special instance of causal inference. In particular, we model the bidder's valuation as the difference between two potential outcomes, with a special feedback structure where exactly one potential outcome can be observed upon winning or losing. Under standard assumptions of causal inference excluding the overlap condition, we provide three models for the valuation and devise bidding algorithms that achieve $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ or $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ regrets, up to the HOB estimation error, under these models.

We also point out some open directions. First, instead of the black-box modeling for the HOB estimation, one can study explicit models for M_t and prove unconditional regret guarantees as well. For example, consider the linear model $M_t = \varphi_*^\top x_t + \eta_t$ studied in [BFG23], where $\varphi_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an unknown parameter and η_t is an i.i.d. additive noise. We assume $\|\varphi_*\|_2 \leq 1$ and the following assumption on the unknown distribution of η_t .

Assumption 6.1. There exist constants $\sigma, a_0, a_1, a_2 > 0$, such that the following holds for the CDF Q of η_t :

- η_t is zero-mean and σ^2 -sub-Gaussian;
- If $Q(v) \in [0, a_0] \cup [1 - a_0, 1]$, then $Q'(v) \leq a_1 \sqrt{Q(v)(1 - Q(v))}$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}$;
- The second derivative is bounded, i.e. $|Q''(v)| \leq a_2$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}$.

Note that Assumption 6.1 does not require the log-concavity assumed in [BFG23], and is satisfied for Gaussian η_t (by the well-known Mills ratio results [Gor41, Eq (9)]). The following result shows that Assumption 2.7 still holds under the above assumption:

Lemma 6.2. *Let Assumptions 2.1–2.3 and Assumption 6.1 hold. There exists a CDF estimator \hat{G}_t that satisfies Assumption 2.7 with the HOB error bounds $\Delta_1 = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ and $\Delta_2 = \tilde{O}(d)$.*

Since the quantity Δ in Assumption 2.5 satisfies $\Delta \leq 2\Delta_1$, our algorithms achieve regret $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{dT})$ under Model 2 and $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$ under Model 3. It is an interesting question to see the tightness of the $\tilde{O}(d\sqrt{T})$ regret under Model 3, and generalize the above results to other models of the HOBs M_t .

Second, it is interesting to see if the unconfoundedness assumption is really necessary for joint value estimation and bidding, motivated by the possibility and impossibility results in [CBCC+24] where $(v_{t,1}, v_{t,0})$ and M_t are dependent in a context-free environment. Finally, it would be interesting to generalize this framework to other transparency models in [CBCC+24], where the estimation of HOBs would no longer be independent of the bidding process and we essentially arrive at a challenging “joint value estimation, HOB estimation, and bidding” problem.

References

- [ABB⁺24] Gagan Aggarwal, Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Santiago R Balseiro, Kshipra Bhawalkar, Yuan Deng, Zhe Feng, Gagan Goel, Christopher Liaw, Haihao Lu, Mohammad Mahdian, et al. Auto-bidding and auctions in online advertising: A survey. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 22(1):159–183, 2024.
- [ACG21] Juliette Achddou, Olivier Cappé, and Aurélien Garivier. Fast rate learning in stochastic first price bidding. In *Asian Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1754–1769. PMLR, 2021.
- [AFZ24] Gagan Aggarwal, Giannis Fikioris, and Mingfei Zhao. No-regret algorithms in non-truthful auctions with budget and roi constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09832*, 2024.
- [AS16] Noga Alon and Joel H Spencer. *The probabilistic method*. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- [Aue02] Peter Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):397–422, 2002.
- [AW21] Susan Athey and Stefan Wager. Policy learning with observational data. *Econometrica*, 89(1):133–161, 2021.
- [Azu67] Kazuoki Azuma. Weighted sums of certain dependent random variables. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series*, 19(3):357–367, 1967.
- [BBK21] Hamsa Bastani, Mohsen Bayati, and Khashayar Khosravi. Mostly exploration-free algorithms for contextual bandits. *Management Science*, 67(3):1329–1349, 2021.
- [BFG23] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Zhe Feng, and Guru Guruganesh. Learning to bid in contextual first price auctions. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, pages 3489–3497, 2023.
- [BFO23] Martin Bichler, Max Fichtl, and Matthias Oberlechner. Computing bayes–nash equilibrium strategies in auction games via simultaneous online dual averaging. *Operations Research*, 2023.
- [BGM⁺23] Santiago Balseiro, Negin Golrezaei, Mohammad Mahdian, Vahab Mirrokni, and Jon Schneider. Contextual bandits with cross-learning. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(3):1607–1629, 2023.
- [BH78] Jean Bretagnolle and Catherine Huber. Estimation des densités: risque minimax. *Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg*, 12:342–363, 1978.
- [BKBW23] Zach Branson, Edward H Kennedy, Sivaraman Balakrishnan, and Larry Wasserman. Causal effect estimation after propensity score trimming with continuous treatments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00706*, 2023.
- [BLB03] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Olivier Bousquet. Concentration inequalities. In *Summer school on machine learning*, pages 208–240. Springer, 2003.

- [CBCC⁺24] Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, Tommaso Cesari, Roberto Colomboni, Federico Fusco, and Stefano Leonardi. The role of transparency in repeated first-price auctions with unknown valuations. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 225–236, 2024.
- [CLRS11] Wei Chu, Lihong Li, Lev Reyzin, and Robert Schapire. Contextual bandits with linear payoff functions. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 208–214. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.
- [CP23] Xi Chen and Binghui Peng. Complexity of equilibria in first-price auctions under general tie-breaking rules. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 698–709, 2023.
- [Dav19] Jessica Davies. What to know about google’s implementation of first-price ad auctions. <https://digiday.com/media/buyers-welcome-auction-standardization-as-google-finally-goes-all-in-on-first-price/>, 2019. Published: September 6, 2019.
- [DKW56] Aryeh Dvoretzky, Jack Kiefer, and Jacob Wolfowitz. Asymptotic minimax character of the sample distribution function and of the classical multinomial estimator. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 642–669, 1956.
- [FPS18] Zhe Feng, Chara Podimata, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Learning to bid without knowing your value. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 505–522, 2018.
- [FRGH⁺21] Aris Filos-Ratsikas, Yiannis Giannakopoulos, Alexandros Hollender, Philip Lazos, and Diogo Poças. On the complexity of equilibrium computation in first-price auctions. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 454–476, 2021.
- [FRGHK24] Aris Filos-Ratsikas, Yiannis Giannakopoulos, Alexandros Hollender, and Charalampos Kokkalis. On the computation of equilibria in discrete first-price auctions. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 379–399, 2024.
- [Gor41] Robert D Gordon. Values of mills’ ratio of area to bounding ordinate and of the normal probability integral for large values of the argument. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 12(3):364–366, 1941.
- [HWZ24] Yanjun Han, Tsachy Weissman, and Zhengyuan Zhou. Optimal no-regret learning in repeated first-price auctions. *Operations Research*, 2024.
- [HZF⁺20] Yanjun Han, Zhengyuan Zhou, Aaron Flores, Erik Ordentlich, and Tsachy Weissman. Learning to bid optimally and efficiently in adversarial first-price auctions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.04568*, 2020.
- [HZZ⁺20] Yanjun Han, Zhengqing Zhou, Zhengyuan Zhou, Jose Blanchet, Peter W Glynn, and Yinyu Ye. Sequential batch learning in finite-action linear contextual bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.06321*, 2020.
- [IR15] Guido W Imbens and Donald B Rubin. *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge university press, 2015.

- [JRYW22] Ying Jin, Zhimei Ren, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. Policy learning" without"overlap: Pessimism and generalized empirical bernstein's inequality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09900*, 2022.
- [KL03] Robert Kleinberg and Tom Leighton. The value of knowing a demand curve: Bounds on regret for online posted-price auctions. In *44th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2003. Proceedings.*, pages 594–605. IEEE, 2003.
- [MSS15] Adam W Marcus, Daniel A Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. Interlacing families ii: Mixed characteristic polynomials and the Kadison—Singer problem. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 327–350, 2015.
- [Mye81] Roger B Myerson. Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of operations research*, 6(1):58–73, 1981.
- [Slu17] Sarah Sluis. Big changes coming to auctions, as exchanges roll the dice on first-price. <https://www.adexchanger.com/platforms/big-changes-coming-auctions-exchanges-roll-dice-first-price/>, 2017. Published: September 5, 2017.
- [Vic61] William Vickrey. Counterspeculation, auctions, and competitive sealed tenders. *The Journal of finance*, 16(1):8–37, 1961.
- [WNC24] Caio Waisman, Harikesh S Nair, and Carlos Carrion. Online causal inference for advertising in real-time bidding auctions. *Marketing Science*, 2024.
- [Won21] Matt Wong. Moving adsense to a first-price auction. <https://blog.google/products/adsense/our-move-to-a-first-price-auction/>, 2021. Published: Oct 7, 2021.
- [WPR16] Jonathan Weed, Vianney Perchet, and Philippe Rigollet. Online learning in repeated auctions. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1562–1583. PMLR, 2016.
- [WSZ20] Zihe Wang, Weiran Shen, and Song Zuo. Bayesian nash equilibrium in first-price auction with discrete value distributions. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pages 1458–1466, 2020.
- [WYDK23] Qian Wang, Zongjun Yang, Xiaotie Deng, and Yuqing Kong. Learning to bid in repeated first-price auctions with budgets. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 36494–36513. PMLR, 2023.
- [YD18] Shu Yang and Peng Ding. Asymptotic inference of causal effects with observational studies trimmed by the estimated propensity scores. *Biometrika*, 105(2):487–493, 2018.
- [ZAW23] Zhengyuan Zhou, Susan Athey, and Stefan Wager. Offline multi-action policy learning: Generalization and optimization. *Operations Research*, 71(1):148–183, 2023.
- [ZCJY24] Pan Zhao, Antoine Chambaz, Julie Josse, and Shu Yang. Positivity-free policy learning with observational data. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1918–1926. PMLR, 2024.
- [ZHZ⁺22] Wei Zhang, Yanjun Han, Zhengyuan Zhou, Aaron Flores, and Tsachy Weissman. Leveraging the hints: Adaptive bidding in repeated first-price auctions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:21329–21341, 2022.

- [ZKH⁺21] Wei Zhang, Brendan Kitts, Yanjun Han, Zhengyuan Zhou, Tingyu Mao, Hao He, Shengjun Pan, Aaron Flores, San Gultekin, and Tsachy Weissman. Meow: A space-efficient nonparametric bid shading algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 3928–3936, 2021.

A Proofs of Main Lemmas

A.1 Proof of Lemma 4.1

Lemma A.1 (Restatement of Lemma 4.1). *Let $\beta = \sqrt{\log(2T)}$ and $\lambda = 1$. Suppose $(v_{s,1}, v_{s,0})_{s \in \Phi_t}$ are conditionally independent given $(x_s, b_s, M_s)_{s \in \Phi_t}$, then with probability at least $1 - T^{-2}$, it holds that*

$$\left| \hat{\theta}_{t,i}^\top x_t - \theta_{*,i}^\top x_t \right| \leq (\beta + \lambda) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,i}^{-1}}, \quad \text{for both } i = 0, 1.$$

Conditioned on the above events, in LIN-PO we further have

$$\left| \hat{r}_t(b) - [\hat{G}_t(b)(\theta_{*,1}^\top x_t - b) + (1 - \hat{G}_t(b))\theta_{*,0}^\top x_t] \right| \leq w_t(b), \quad \text{for all } b \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Proof. We will show the claimed inequality for $i = 1$, and the case $i = 0$ follows the same argument. Denote $D_{t,1} = [\mathbf{1}[b_\tau \geq M_\tau] x_\tau]_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times |\Phi_t|}$ and $V_{t,1} = [\mathbf{1}[b_\tau \geq M_\tau] v_{t,1}]_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times |\Phi_t|}$. Recall that in LIN-PO we define

$$A_{t,1} = I + D_{t,1} D_{t,1}^\top, \quad z_{t,1} = D_{t,1} V_{t,1}^\top.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{t,1}^\top x_t - \theta_{*,1}^\top x_t &= x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1} z_{t,1} - x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1} (I + D_{t,1} D_{t,1}^\top) \theta_{*,1} \\ &= x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1} D_{t,1} (V_{t,1}^\top - D_{t,1}^\top \theta_{*,1}) + x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1} \theta_{*,1}. \end{aligned}$$

Given $\|\theta_{*,1}\|_2 \leq 1$, it follows that

$$\left| \hat{\theta}_{t,1}^\top x_t - \theta_{*,1}^\top x_t \right| \leq \left| x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1} D_{t,1} (V_{t,1}^\top - D_{t,1}^\top \theta_{*,1}) \right| + \|x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1}\|_2. \quad (18)$$

Since $(v_{s,1}, v_{s,0})_{s \in \Phi_t}$ are conditionally independent, we have $\mathbb{E}[V_{t,1}^\top | (x_s, b_s, M_s)_{s \in \Phi_t}] = D_{t,1}^\top \theta_{*,1}$. Thus by Azuma's inequality [Azu67, AS16],

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\left| x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1} D_{t,1} (V_{t,1}^\top - D_{t,1}^\top \theta_{*,1}) \right| \geq \beta \|x_t\|_{A_{t,1}^{-1}} \right) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\beta^2 \|x_t\|_{A_{t,1}^{-1}}^2}{\|x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1} D_{t,1}\|_2^2} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-2\beta^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2T^2} \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from $A_{t,1} = I + D_{t,1} D_{t,1}^\top \succeq D_{t,1} D_{t,1}^\top$. Similarly, we can bound the second term in (18) as $\|x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1}\|_2 = \sqrt{x_t^\top A_{t,1}^{-1} I A_{t,1}^{-1} x_t} \leq \|x_t\|_{A_{t,1}^{-1}}$. Plugging them back in (18) yields

$$\left| \hat{\theta}_{t,1}^\top x_t - \theta_{*,1}^\top x_t \right| \leq (\beta + 1) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,1}^{-1}}.$$

Then applying union bound over $i = 0, 1$ concludes the proof. \square

A.2 Proof of Lemma 4.4

Lemma A.2 (Restatement of Lemma 4.4). *In Algorithm 3, for every $t \in [T]$ and $s \in [S]$, it holds that $\max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \hat{r}_t(b^*) - \hat{r}_t(b) \leq 8 \cdot 2^{-s}$ for all $b \in B_s$.*

Proof. Denote the optimal bid under \hat{r}_t by $b_t^* = \arg \max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \hat{r}_t(b^*)$. We prove this result via an induction argument on $s \in [S]$ with the following induction hypothesis: for each $s \in [S]$, the optimal bid remains uneliminated, i.e. $b_t^* \in B_s$, and $\hat{r}_t(b_t^*) - \hat{r}_t(b) \leq 8 \cdot 2^{-s}$ for all $b \in B_s$. For $s = 1$ it clearly holds.

Suppose the hypothesis holds for $s - 1$. The elimination step (Line 16) in Algorithm 3 implies that for any $b \in B_s$, we have $w_t^{(s-1)}(b) \leq 2^{-(s-1)}$, $w_t^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) \leq 2^{-(s-1)}$, and $\hat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b) + w_t^{(s-1)}(b) \geq \hat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) + w_t^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) - 2^{-s+2}$. Since $b_t^* \in B_{s-1}$ by the induction hypothesis, by Lemma 4.1,

$$\hat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) + w_t^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) \geq \hat{r}_t(b_t^*) \geq \hat{r}_t(b) \geq \hat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b) - w_t^{(s-1)}(b) \geq \hat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b) - 2^{-(s-1)}$$

for all $b \in B_{s-1}$. Therefore, $b_t^* \in B_s$ by the elimination criterion. Then for any $b \in B_s$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r}_t(b) &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \hat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b) - w_t^{(s-1)}(b) \\ &\geq \hat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b) + w_t^{(s-1)}(b) - 2 \cdot 2^{-(s-1)} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \max_{b' \in B_{s-1}} \hat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b') + w_t^{(s-1)}(b') - 4 \cdot 2^{-(s-1)} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \hat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) + w_t^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) - 4 \cdot 2^{-(s-1)} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \hat{r}_t(b_t^*) - 4 \cdot 2^{-(s-1)} \end{aligned}$$

where (a) uses Lemma 4.1, (b) is by the elimination criterion in Algorithm 5, and (c) follows from $b_t^* \in B_{s-1}$. This concludes the induction and hence the proof. \square

A.3 Proof of Lemma 4.5

Before we proceed to the proof, we present a lemma that bounds the sum of the matrix norms:

Lemma A.3. *For any given vectors $\{z_\tau\}_{\tau=1}^{t-1}$ in \mathbb{R}^d with $\|z_\tau\|_2 \leq 1$, let the Gram matrix be $A_s = cI + \sum_{\tau < s} z_\tau z_\tau^\top$ for some $c > 0$ and for every $1 \leq s \leq t$. It holds that*

$$\sum_{\tau < t} \|z_\tau\|_{A_\tau^{-1}}^2 \leq 2d \log \left(c + \frac{t-1}{d} \right) + 2 \log(c).$$

In particular, by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\sum_{\tau < t} \|z_\tau\|_{A_\tau^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{2d(t-1) \log \left(1 + \frac{t-1}{d} \right)}.$$

Proof. We decompose the Gram matrix as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\det(A_t) &= \det\left(A_{t-1} + z_{t-1}z_{t-1}^\top\right) \\
&= \det\left(A_{t-1}^{1/2}\left(I + A_{t-1}^{-1/2}z_{t-1}z_{t-1}^\top A_{t-1}^{-1/2}\right)A_{t-1}^{1/2}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \det(A_{t-1}) \det\left(I + A_{t-1}^{-1/2}z_{t-1}z_{t-1}^\top A_{t-1}^{-1/2}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \det(A_{t-1})\left(1 + \|z_{t-1}\|_{A_{t-1}^{-1}}^2\right) \\
&= \det(A_1) \prod_{\tau < t} \left(1 + \|z_\tau\|_{A_\tau^{-1}}^2\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where (a) uses $\det(AB) = \det(A)\det(B)$ and (b) uses that $I + vv^\top$ only has eigenvalues 1 and $1 + \|v\|_2^2$. Since $\det(A_1) = \det(cI) = c$, by AM-GM inequality,

$$\det(A_t) \leq \left(\frac{\text{tr}(A_t)}{d}\right)^d = \left(\frac{cd + \sum_{\tau < t} \text{tr}(z_\tau z_\tau^\top)}{d}\right)^d \leq \left(c + \frac{t-1}{d}\right)^d. \tag{20}$$

Note that for all $\tau < t$, we have $\|z_\tau\|_{A_\tau^{-1}}^2 \leq \|z_\tau\|_2^2 \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(A_\tau) \leq 1$, and hence $\|z_\tau\|_{A_\tau^{-1}}^2 \leq 2 \log\left(1 + \|z_\tau\|_{A_\tau^{-1}}^2\right)$. Combining (19) and (20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\tau < t} \|z_\tau\|_{A_\tau^{-1}}^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{\tau < t} \log\left(1 + \|z_\tau\|_{A_\tau^{-1}}^2\right) \\
&= 2 \log \prod_{\tau < t} \left(1 + \|z_\tau\|_{A_\tau^{-1}}^2\right) \\
&= 2 \log \frac{\det(A_t)}{\det(A_1)} \\
&\leq 2d \log\left(c + \frac{t-1}{d}\right) + 2 \log(c).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.4 (Restatement of Lemma 4.5). *For every $s \in [S]$, it holds that $\sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t) = O(\Delta \sqrt{\log T} + \sqrt{dT} \log T)$.*

Proof. For any $t \in [T]$, since $A_{t,i} \succeq I$, it holds that $\|x_t\|_{A_{t,i}^{-1}} \leq \|x_t\|_2 \leq 1$ for both $i = 0, 1$. By Assumption 2.5, we have $|G_t(b) - \widehat{G}_t(b)| \leq \varepsilon_t$ for any $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Then fix any $s \in [S]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} \widehat{G}_t(b_t) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,1}^{-1}} &\leq \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} G_t(b_t) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,1}^{-1}} + \varepsilon_t \\
&= \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} \varepsilon_t + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} \|\mathbb{1}[b_t \geq M_t] x_t\|_{A_{t,1}^{-1}} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Delta + 2\sqrt{d|\Phi^{(s)}| \log |\Phi^{(s)}|} \\
&\leq \Delta + 2\sqrt{dT \log T}
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where (a) uses Lemma A.3. Similarly,

$$\sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} \left(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b_t)\right) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,0}^{-1}} \leq \Delta + 2\sqrt{dT \log T}. \quad (22)$$

Combining (21) and (22) yields the desired bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t) &= \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} (2\sqrt{\log(2T)} + 1) \left(\widehat{G}_t(b_t) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,1}^{-1}} + \left(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b_t)\right) \|x_t\|_{A_{t,0}^{-1}} \right) \\ &= O(\Delta \sqrt{\log T} + \sqrt{dT \log T}). \end{aligned}$$

□

A.4 Proof of Lemma 5.1

Lemma A.5 (Restatement of Lemma 5.1). *Suppose $|\widehat{G}_t(b) - G_t(b)| \leq \delta_t \sqrt{G_t(b)(1 - G_t(b))} + \delta_t^2$. Then there exist absolute constants $c, c' > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{e}_t(b)] - \theta_*^\top x_t \right| &\leq c \delta_t \sigma_t(b), \\ \text{Var}(\tilde{e}_t(b)) &\leq c' \sigma_t(b)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{e}_t(b)$ is defined in (11) and the quantity $\sigma_t(b)$ is defined as

$$\sigma_t(b) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\widehat{G}_t(b)(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b))}}. \quad (23)$$

Proof. (Bias) Denote the bias by $\xi_t(b) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{e}_t(b)] - \theta_*^\top x_t$. We decompose the bias as follows: By taking expectation w.r.t. M_t , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{M_t}[\tilde{e}_t(b)] - (v_{t,1} - v_{t,0}) = \left(\frac{G_t(b)}{\max\{\delta_t^2, \widehat{G}_t(b)\}} - 1 \right) v_{t,1} - \left(\frac{1 - G_t(b)}{\max\{\delta_t^2, 1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)\}} - 1 \right) v_{t,0}.$$

By Assumption 2.7 and $v_{t,1} \in [0, 1]$, the absolute value of the first term is bounded by

$$\xi_{t,1}(b) \equiv \left| \frac{G_t(b)}{\max\{\delta_t^2, \widehat{G}_t(b)\}} - 1 \right|.$$

Similarly, the second term is

$$\xi_{t,0}(b) \equiv \left| \frac{1 - G_t(b)}{\max\{\delta_t^2, 1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)\}} - 1 \right|$$

Finally, by Jensen's inequality and triangle inequality, for any b ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{e}_t(b)] - \theta_*^\top x_t \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{v_{t,1}, v_{t,0}}[\mathbb{E}_{M_t}[\tilde{e}_t(b)] - (v_{t,1} - v_{t,0})] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{v_{t,1}, v_{t,0}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{M_t}[\tilde{e}_t(b)] - (v_{t,1} - v_{t,0}) \right| \\ &\leq \xi_{t,1}(b) + \xi_{t,0}(b). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we will bound $\xi_t(b)^2$ to obtain the first inequality in the claim. Note that $\xi_t(b)^2 \leq 4 \max\{\xi_{t,1}(b)^2, \xi_{t,0}(b)^2\}$ by the decomposition above. We deal with each case separately. First consider $\xi_{t,1}(b)^2$: when $\widehat{G}_t(b) \geq 6\delta_t^2$, by Assumption 2.7 and some algebra, we have $G_t(b) \geq 3\delta_t^2$, and thereby straightforward computation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_t(b)^{-2}\xi_{t,1}(b)^2 &\leq \widehat{G}_t(b) \frac{(G_t(b) - \widehat{G}_t(b))^2}{\widehat{G}_t(b)^2} \\
&= \frac{(G_t(b) - \widehat{G}_t(b))^2}{\widehat{G}_t(b)} \\
&\leq \frac{(\delta_t\sqrt{G_t(b)} + \delta_t^2)^2}{\widehat{G}_t(b)} \\
&\leq 2\delta_t^2 \frac{G_t(b)}{\widehat{G}_t(b)} + 2\frac{\delta_t^4}{8\delta_t^2} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2\delta_t^2 \frac{G_t(b)}{G_t(b) - \delta_t\sqrt{G_t(b)} - \delta_t^2} + \frac{\delta_t^2}{4} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 40\delta_t^2 + \frac{\delta_t^2}{4} \leq 41\delta_t^2
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is by Assumption 2.7 and (b) uses $\delta_t\sqrt{G_t(b)} + \delta_t^2 \leq \frac{19}{20}G_t(b)$ when $G_t(b) \geq 3\delta_t^2$. On the other hand, when $\widehat{G}_t(b) < 6\delta_t^2$, again by Assumption 2.7 we have $G_t(b) < 11\delta_t^2$, and

$$\sigma_t(b)^{-2}\xi_{t,1}(b)^2 \leq \widehat{G}_t(b)(11 - 1)^2 < 600\delta_t^2.$$

A symmetric argument applies to $\sigma_t(b)^{-2}\xi_{t,0}(b)^2$. Together we obtain the inequality

$$|\xi_t(b)| = |\mathbb{E}[\tilde{e}_t(b)] - \theta_*^\top x_t| \leq 10\sqrt{6}\sigma_t(b)\delta_t.$$

(Variance) We will bound the variance of $\tilde{e}_t(b)$ by its second moment. Toward this end, we look at the first term in the estimator:

$$\left(\frac{\mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, \widehat{G}_t(b)\}} v_{t,1} \right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{\mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, \widehat{G}_t(b)\}} \right)^2 \leq \widehat{G}_t(b)^{-1} \frac{\mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, \widehat{G}_t(b)\}}.$$

Similarly,

$$\left(\frac{\mathbb{1}[b < M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, 1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)\}} v_{t,0} \right)^2 \leq (1 - \widehat{G}_t(b))^{-1} \frac{\mathbb{1}[b < M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, 1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)\}}.$$

Then we have the second moment

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(\tilde{e}_t(b)) &\leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{e}_t(b)^2] \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, \widehat{G}_t(b)\}}v_{t,1}\right)^2\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\mathbb{1}[b < M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, 1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)\}}v_{t,0}\right)^2\right] \\
&\leq 2\widehat{G}_t(b)^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}[b \geq M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, \widehat{G}_t(b)\}}\right] + 2(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b))^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}[b < M_t]}{\max\{\delta_t^2, 1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)\}}\right] \\
&= 2\widehat{G}_t(b)^{-1}\frac{G_t(b)}{\max\{\delta_t^2, \widehat{G}_t(b)\}} + 2(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b))^{-1}\frac{1 - G_t(b)}{\max\{\delta_t^2, 1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)\}} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 8\widehat{G}_t(b)^{-1} + 8(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b))^{-1} \\
&\leq 16\max\left\{\widehat{G}_t(b)^{-1}, (1 - \widehat{G}_t(b))^{-1}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) bounds each fraction by 4 due to Assumption 2.7 and some algebra. \square

A.5 Proof of Lemma 5.2

Lemma A.6 (Restatement of Lemma 5.2). *Suppose $(v_{\tau,1}, v_{\tau,0})_{\tau \in \Phi_t}$ are conditionally independent given $(x_\tau, b_\tau, M_\tau)_{\tau \in \Phi_t}$, then with probability at least $1 - T^{-2}$, it holds that*

$$\left|\widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - \theta_*^\top x_t\right| \leq \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}},$$

where γ is defined in Line 7 of Algorithm 4.

Proof. Let the bias of the IPW estimator in (11) at time τ be $\xi_\tau = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{e}_\tau(b_\tau)] - \theta_*^\top x_\tau$. Denote $D_t = [\sigma_\tau^{-1}x_\tau]_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times |\Phi_t|}$ the weighted contexts, $V_t = [\sigma_\tau^{-1}\tilde{e}_\tau(b_\tau)]_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Phi_t| \times 1}$ the weighted estimators, and $\Xi_t = [\sigma_\tau^{-1}\xi_\tau]_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Phi_t| \times 1}$ the weighted biases, where $\sigma_\tau^{-1} = \sqrt{\widehat{G}_t(b_\tau)(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b_\tau))}$ as defined in Lemma 5.1. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - \theta_*^\top x_t &= x_t^\top A_t^{-1}b_t - x_t^\top A_t^{-1}(I + D_t D_t^\top)\theta_* \\
&= x_t^\top A_t^{-1}D_t(V_t - \Xi_t - D_t^\top \theta_*) + x_t^\top A_t^{-1}D_t \Xi_t + x_t^\top A_t^{-1}\theta_*.
\end{aligned}$$

Given $\|\theta_*\|_2 \leq 1$, it follows that

$$\left|\widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - \theta_*^\top x_t\right| \leq \left|x_t^\top A_t^{-1}D_t(V_t - \Xi_t - D_t^\top \theta_*)\right| + \left|x_t^\top A_t^{-1}D_t \Xi_t\right| + \|x_t^\top A_t^{-1}\|_2. \quad (24)$$

Since $A_t \succeq I$, the last term is upper bounded by

$$\|x_t^\top A_t^{-1}\|_2 = \sqrt{x_t^\top A_t^{-1} I A_t^{-1} x_t} \leq \sqrt{x_t^\top A_t^{-1} x_t} = \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}.$$

For the first term in (24), we can write

$$x_t^\top A_t^{-1}D_t(V_t - \Xi_t - D_t^\top \theta_*) = \sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t} x_t^\top A_t^{-1} \sigma_\tau^{-2} x_\tau \tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau = \tilde{e}_\tau(b_\tau) - \theta_*^\top x_\tau - \xi_\tau$ satisfies the followings:

- $\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau$ are conditionally independent given $(x_\tau, b_\tau, M_\tau)_{\tau \in \Phi_t}$;
- $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau] = 0$;
- $|\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau| \leq |\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau(b_\tau)| \leq 2 \max\left\{\widehat{G}_t(b_\tau)^{-1}, \left(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b_\tau)\right)^{-1}\right\}$;
- $\text{Var}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau) = \text{Var}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau(b_\tau)) \leq c' \sigma_\tau^{-2}$ by Lemma 5.1.

Since $\max\left\{\widehat{G}_t(b_\tau)^{-1}, \left(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b_\tau)\right)^{-1}\right\} \leq 2\widehat{G}_t(b_\tau)^{-1}\left(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b_\tau)\right)^{-1}$, it follows that for every $\tau \in \Phi_t$,

- $\text{Var}(x_t^\top A_t^{-1} \sigma_\tau^{-2} x_\tau \tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau) \leq |x_t^\top A_t^{-1} \sigma_\tau^{-1} x_\tau|^2 \sigma_\tau^{-2} \text{Var}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau) \leq c' |x_t^\top A_t^{-1} \sigma_\tau^{-1} x_\tau|^2$;
- $|x_t^\top A_t^{-1} \sigma_\tau^{-2} x_\tau \tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau| \leq 4 |x_t^\top A_t^{-1} x_\tau| \leq 4 \|x_t^\top A_t^{-1}\|_2 \leq 4 \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}$.

Then by Bernstein's inequality (Lemma C.5), with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{T^{-2}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t} x_t^\top A_t^{-1} \sigma_\tau^{-2} x_\tau \tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau \right| &\leq \sqrt{2c' \log(2T^2) \sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t} |x_t^\top A_t^{-1} \sigma_\tau^{-1} x_\tau|^2} + \frac{8}{3} \log(2T^2) \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \\ &= \sqrt{2c' \log(2T^2) \|x_t^\top A_t^{-1} D_t\|_2^2} + \frac{8}{3} \log(2T^2) \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sqrt{2c' \log(2T^2) \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2} + \frac{8}{3} \log(2T^2) \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \\ &\leq c_1 \log(2T) \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \end{aligned}$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is an absolute constant and (a) follows from $\|x_t^\top A_t^{-1} D_t\|_2^2 = x_t^\top A_t^{-1} D_t D_t^\top A_t^{-1} x_t \leq x_t^\top A_t^{-1} x_t = \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}$ by $A_t = I + D_t D_t^\top$. Finally, to bound the middle term in (24), we write

$$\begin{aligned} |x_t^\top A_t^{-1} D_t \Xi_t| &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \|D_t \Xi_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \\ &= \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \sqrt{\Xi_t^\top D_t^\top A_t^{-1} D_t \Xi_t} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \|\Xi_t\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

where (b) applies Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (c) is due to $D_t^\top (I + D_t D_t^\top) D_t \preceq I$ by Woodbury matrix identity. To obtain the desired claim, we can further upper bound the following by Lemma 5.1:

$$\|\Xi_t\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \sigma_\tau^{-2} \xi_\tau^2} \leq c \sqrt{\sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t} \delta_\tau^2}.$$

□

A.6 Proof of Lemma 5.3

Lemma A.7 (Restatement of Lemma 5.3). *Suppose the event in Lemma 5.2 holds. Let $\widehat{r}_{t,0}$ and $\widehat{r}_{t,1}$ be defined as in (14) and (15). For any $s \in [S]$ and for the criterion $i \in \{0, 1\}$ selected in stage s in Algorithm 5, it holds that*

$$u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b) - 2w_t^{(s)}(b) \leq \widehat{r}_{t,i}(b) \leq u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b), \quad \forall b \in [b_{*,1}, b_{*,0}]$$

where $b_{*,i}^{(s)} = \arg \max_{b \in B_s} u_{t,i}^{(s)}(b)$ for $i = 0, 1$ as defined in Algorithm 4.

Proof. Fix any $s \in [S]$. For the ease of notation, we suppress the superscript (s) for $A_t^{(s)}$, $b_{*,i}^{(s)}$, $w_t^{(s)}$, $u_{t,1}^{(s)}$, and $u_{t,0}^{(s)}$ in the remaining proof. Denote $\gamma_t = 1 + c \log(2T) + c' \sqrt{\sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t^{(s)}} \delta_\tau^2}$ as defined in Algorithm 4. By Lemma C.1, when $2\gamma_t \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{20L}$, we have $\widehat{G}_t(b_{*,0}) - \widehat{G}_t(b_{*,1}) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{20L}$.

If $\widehat{G}_t(b_{*,1}) > \frac{1}{40L}$, then $\widehat{G}_t(b) \geq \frac{1}{40L}$ and $1 \leq 40L\widehat{G}_t(b)$ for all $b \in [b_{*,1}, b_{*,0}]$ by monotonicity of \widehat{G}_t . Recall that $\widehat{r}_{t,1}(b) = (1 - \widehat{G}_t(b))(b - \theta_*^\top x_t) - b$ in (15). By Lemma 5.2,

$$\widehat{r}_{t,1}(b) \leq u_{t,1}(b) = \widehat{G}_t(b) \left(\widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - b - \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right) - \left(\widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{t,1}(b) - \widehat{r}_{t,1}(b)| &= \left| \widehat{G}_t(b) \left(\widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - b - \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right) - \left(\widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right) - \widehat{r}_{t,1}(b) \right| \\ &= (1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)) \left| \theta_*^\top x_t - \widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t + \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right| \\ &\leq 2(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)) \gamma_t \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \\ &\leq 80L \gamma_t \widehat{G}_t(b) (1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)) \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \\ &\leq w_t(b). \end{aligned}$$

If $\widehat{G}_t(b_{*,1}) \leq \frac{1}{40L}$, since $\widehat{G}_t(b_{*,0}) - \widehat{G}_t(b_{*,1}) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{20L}$, we have $\widehat{G}_t(b_{*,0}) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{40L}$ when $2\gamma_t \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{20L}$. Then for all $b \in [b_{*,1}, b_{*,0}]$,

$$1 \leq 40L(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)) + 40L\gamma_t \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}.$$

Again, by definition in (14) and Lemma 5.2,

$$\widehat{G}_t(b) \left(\theta_*^\top x_t - b \right) = \widehat{r}_{t,0}(b) \leq u_{t,0}(b) = \widehat{G}_t(b) \left(\widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - b + \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right).$$

For all $b \in [b_{*,1}, b_{*,0}]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{t,0}(b) - \widehat{r}_{t,0}(b)| &\leq 2\widehat{G}_t(b) \gamma_t \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \\ &\leq 80L \left((1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)) + \gamma_t \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right) \widehat{G}_t(b) \gamma_t \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \\ &\leq w_t(b). \end{aligned}$$

□

A.7 Proof of Lemma 5.5

Lemma A.8 (Restatement of Lemma 5.5). *In Algorithm 5, for every $t \in [T]$ and $s \in [S]$, it holds that $\max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \widehat{r}_t(b^*) - \widehat{r}_t(b) \leq 8 \cdot 2^{-s}$ for all $b \in B_s$.*

Proof. This proof shares the same idea as the proof for Lemma 4.4. Denote the optimal bid under \widehat{r}_t by $b_t^* = \arg \max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \widehat{r}_t(b^*)$. We prove this result via an induction argument on $s \in [S]$ with the following induction hypothesis: for each $s \in [S]$, the optimal bid remains uneliminated, i.e. $b_t^* \in B_s$, and $\widehat{r}_t(b_t^*) - \widehat{r}_t(b) \leq 8 \cdot 2^{-s}$ for all $b \in B_s$. For $s = 1$ it clearly holds.

Suppose the hypothesis holds for $s - 1$. The elimination step (Line 16) in Algorithm 3 implies that for any $b \in B_s$, we have $w_t^{(s-1)}(b) \leq 2^{-(s-1)}$, $w_t^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) \leq 2^{-(s-1)}$, and by Lemma 5.3

$u_{t,i}^{(s-1)}(b) \geq u_{t,i}^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) - 2^{-s+2}$ for the criterion $i \in \{0, 1\}$ selected in stage $s - 1$. Since $b_t^* \in B_{s-1}$ by the induction hypothesis, by Lemma 5.3,

$$u_{t,i}^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) \geq \widehat{r}_t(b_t^*) \geq \widehat{r}_t(b) \geq u_{t,i}^{(s-1)}(b) - 2w_t^{(s-1)}(b) \geq \widehat{r}_t^{(s-1)}(b) - 2^{-(s-1)}$$

for all $b \in B_{s-1}$. Therefore, together with Lemma C.3, $b_t^* \in B_s$ in the elimination step. Then for any $b \in B_s$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{r}_t(b_t^*) - \widehat{r}_t(b) &= \widehat{r}_{t,i}(b_t^*) - \widehat{r}_{t,i}(b) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} u_{t,i}^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) - u_{t,i}^{(s-1)}(b) + 2w_t^{(s-1)}(b) \\ &\leq u_{t,i}^{(s-1)}(b_t^*) - \max_{b \in B_{s-1}} u_{t,i}^{(s-1)}(b) + 2 \cdot 2^{-(s-1)} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} -4 \cdot 2^{-(s-1)} \end{aligned}$$

where (a) uses Lemma 4.1 and (b) is by the elimination criterion in Algorithm 5. This concludes the induction and hence the proof. \square

A.8 Proof of Lemma 5.6

Then we are ready for the proof of Lemma 5.6.

Lemma A.9 (Restatement of Lemma 5.6). *For any $s \in [S]$, suppose $\delta_t < 0.1$ for $t \in \Phi^{(s)}$ and we have*

$$\sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t) = O(\sqrt{dT\Delta_2} \log^2 T + d\Delta_2 \log T + d \log^3 T).$$

Proof. Fix any $s \in [S]$. Write $A_t = A_t^{(s)}$ and $\gamma = 1 + c_1 \log(2T) + c_2 \sqrt{\sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} \delta_t^2}$ for simplicity. For each time t , recall in Algorithm 4 we write $\gamma_t = 1 + c_1 \log(2T) + c_2 \sqrt{\sum_{\tau \in \Phi_t^{(s)}} \delta_\tau^2}$. Summing over the widths in this stage gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} w_t^{(s)}(b_t) &= \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} c_3 L \gamma_t \widehat{G}_t(b) \left(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b)\right) \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} + c_3 L \gamma_t^2 \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{t \in \Phi^{(s)}} c_3 L \gamma_t \|\sigma_t^{-1} x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} + 2c_3 L \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{T}{d}} \|\sigma_t^{-1} x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 + 20c_3 L \gamma_t^2 \|\sigma_t^{-1} x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sqrt{2} c_3 L \gamma \sqrt{d |\Phi^{(s)}| \log |\Phi^{(s)}|} + 4c_3 L \gamma \sqrt{dT} \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi^{(s)}|}{d}\right) + 40c_3 L \gamma^2 d \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi^{(s)}|}{d}\right) \\ &\leq cL\gamma \sqrt{dT} \log T + cL\gamma^2 d \log T \end{aligned}$$

for an absolute constant $c > 0$. Note that Assumption 2.7 implies $\|\widehat{G}_t - G_t\|_\infty \leq 2\delta_t$. Thus by the truncation step in Line 22 of Algorithm 5 and Lemma C.4, it holds that

$$\min \left\{ \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{d}{T}}, \frac{1}{2} \right\} \leq \widehat{G}_t(b_t) \leq \min \left\{ 1 - \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{d}{T}}, \frac{1}{2} + 4\delta_t \right\}$$

Recall $\sigma_t^{-2} = \widehat{G}_t(b_t)(1 - \widehat{G}_t(b_t)) \leq 2 \min\{\widehat{G}_t(b_t), 1 - \widehat{G}_t(b_t)\}$. Then (a) uses

$$\|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 \leq 2 \min \left\{ \gamma_t^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{T}{d}}, 10 \right\} \|\sigma_t^{-1} x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 \leq \left(2\gamma_t^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{T}{d}} + 20 \right) \|\sigma_t^{-1} x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2$$

since $\delta_t < 0.1$; and (b) uses Lemma A.3 and that $\gamma_t \leq \gamma$. \square

A.9 Proof of Lemma 6.2

The proof of Lemma 6.2 is a direct consequence of Lemma A.3 given the following explicit expression of $\{\delta_t\}$:

Lemma A.10. *Under the conditions of Lemma 6.2, there is an estimator \widehat{G}_t for G_t that satisfies Assumption 2.7 with*

$$\delta_t = O\left(\log^{3/2}(T)\sqrt{\frac{d}{t}} + \log(T)\|x_t\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}\right).$$

Here $\Sigma_t = 18I + \sum_{s < t} x_s x_s^\top$ is the regularized Gram matrix at time t .

Proof. Given the Lipschitzness in Assumption 2.3, we consider the discretized bid space $\widehat{\mathcal{B}} = \{\frac{i}{T} : i \in \{0\} \cup [T]\}$. At each time t , we estimate the parameter φ_* via linear regression with a careful data splitting scheme: Denote $\Sigma_t = 18I + \sum_{s < t} x_s x_s^\top$. By Lemma C.7, there is a subset $S_t \subseteq [t-1]$ such that $|S_t| \leq \frac{t-1}{2}$ and $18I + \sum_{s \in S_t} x_s x_s^\top \succeq \frac{\Sigma_t}{9}$. Define $A_t = 18I + \sum_{s \in S_t} x_s x_s^\top$ and $z_t = \sum_{s \in S_t} M_s x_s$, and set the estimator $\widehat{\varphi}_t = A_t^{-1} z_t$. By Lemma 4.1, with probability at least $1 - T^{-2}/2$, we have a confidence bound that

$$\left| \widehat{\varphi}_t^\top x - \varphi_*^\top x \right| \leq \beta \|x\|_{A_t^{-1}} \quad (25)$$

for $\beta = O(\sigma\sqrt{\log T})$ and all $x \in \{x_t - x_s : s \in [t-1]\}$, where σ is the sub-Gaussian parameter in Assumption 6.1. Construct the empirical CDF as follows: let $X_s(b) = \mathbf{1}[M_s - \widehat{\varphi}_t^\top x_s + \widehat{\varphi}_t^\top x_t \leq b]$ and $\widehat{G}_t(b) = \frac{1}{|S_t^c|} \sum_{s \in S_t^c} X_s(b)$ using the remaining data $S_t^c = [t-1] \setminus S_t$. Note

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_s(b)] &= \mathbb{P}\left(M_s - \widehat{\varphi}_t^\top x_s + \widehat{\varphi}_t^\top x_t \leq b\right) \\ &= Q\left(b - \varphi_*^\top x_s + \widehat{\varphi}_t^\top x_s - \widehat{\varphi}_t^\top x_t\right) \\ &= Q\left(b - \varphi_*^\top x_t\right) + Q\left(b - \varphi_*^\top x_t + \varepsilon_s\right) - Q\left(b - \varphi_*^\top x_t\right) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $Q(\cdot)$ denotes the CDF of the noise and $\varepsilon_s = (\widehat{\varphi}_t - \varphi_*)^\top (x_s - x_t)$. By (25), the error term ε_s satisfies

$$|\varepsilon_s| \leq \beta \|x_s - x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}. \quad (27)$$

Note $Q(b - \varphi_*^\top x_t) = \mathbb{P}(M_t \leq b) = G_t(b)$, so the bias of this indicator variable is in the difference of the last two terms in (26).

Write the target value as $v = \varphi_*^\top x_t - b$ for simplicity. Since $\mathbb{E}[X_s(b)] = Q(v + \varepsilon_s)$, its variance is $\text{Var}(X_s(b)) = Q(v + \varepsilon_s)(1 - Q(v + \varepsilon_s))$. Now we apply Bernstein's inequality (cf. Lemma C.5) to $\widehat{G}_t(b)$ and a union bound to obtain, with probability at least $1 - T^{-2}/2$, for all $b \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}$,

$$\left| \widehat{G}_t(b) - \frac{1}{|S_t^c|} \sum_{s \in S_t^c} Q(v + \varepsilon_s) \right| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2\log(2T)}}{|S_t^c|} \sqrt{\sum_{s \in S_t^c} Q(v + \varepsilon_s)(1 - Q(v + \varepsilon_s))} + \frac{8\log(2T)}{3|S_t^c|}.$$

For each $s < t$, we can decompose

$$\begin{aligned} Q(v + \varepsilon_s)(1 - Q(v + \varepsilon_s)) &= Q(v)(1 - Q(v)) + Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v + \varepsilon_s)^2 - Q(v) + Q(v)^2 \\ &= Q(v)(1 - Q(v)) + (Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v))(1 - Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)) \\ &\leq Q(v)(1 - Q(v)) + |Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)|. \end{aligned}$$

Together with the bias term in (26) and that $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ for $a, b > 0$, we obtain an error bound for our CDF estimator:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{G}_t(b) - G_t(b) \right| &\leq 2\sqrt{\frac{2\log(2T)Q(v)(1-Q(v))}{|S_t^c|}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2\log(2T)}}{|S_t^c|} \sqrt{\sum_{s \in S_t^c} |Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)|} \\ &\quad + \frac{8\log(2T)}{3|S_t^c|} + \frac{1}{|S_t^c|} \sum_{s \in S_t^c} |Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)|. \end{aligned}$$

If $\sum_{s \in S_t^c} |Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)| \leq 1$, since $|S_t^c| \geq \frac{t-1}{2}$, it becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{G}_t(b) - G_t(b) \right| &\leq 2\sqrt{\frac{2\log(2T)Q(v)(1-Q(v))}{|S_t^c|}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2\log(2T)}}{|S_t^c|} + \frac{11\log(2T)}{3|S_t^c|} \\ &\leq 4\sqrt{\frac{2\log(2T)Q(v)(1-Q(v))}{t}} + \frac{8\sqrt{2\log(2T)}}{t} + \frac{15\log(2T)}{t} \end{aligned}$$

and we are done. When $\sum_{s \in S_t^c} |Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)| > 1$, the bound can be simplified to

$$\left| \widehat{G}_t(b) - G_t(b) \right| \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{2\log(2T)Q(v)(1-Q(v))}{|S_t^c|}} + \frac{4\sqrt{\log(2T)}}{|S_t^c|} \sum_{s \in S_t^c} |Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)| + \frac{3\log(2T)}{|S_t^c|}. \quad (28)$$

The key lies in upper bounding the second term. Note we have

$$|Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)| \leq Q'(v)|\varepsilon_s| + \|Q''\|_\infty \varepsilon_s^2.$$

Let $a_0, a_1, a_2 > 0$ be the constants in Assumption 6.1. When $Q(v) \in (a_0, 1 - a_0)$, we bound the second term as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s \in S_t^c} |Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)| &\leq L\beta \sum_{s \in S_t^c} \|x_s - x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} + a_2\beta^2 \sum_{s \in S_t^c} \|x_s - x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 \\ &\leq a_0^{-1}L\beta\sqrt{Q(v)(1-Q(v))} \sum_{s \in S_t^c} \left(\|x_s\|_{A_t^{-1}} + \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} \right) + 2a_2\beta^2 \sum_{s \in S_t^c} \left(\|x_s\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 + \|x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} a_0^{-1}L\beta\sqrt{Q(v)(1-Q(v))} \left(\sqrt{2d|S_t^c|\log(T)} + 3|S_t^c|\|x_t\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}} \right) \\ &\quad + 2a_2\beta^2 \left(2d\log(T) + 9|S_t^c|\|x_t\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2 \right) + c\beta^2 \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

for a constant $c > 0$, where (a) uses Lemma A.3 and the properties of S_t . On the other hand, when $Q(v) \in [0, a_0] \cup [1 - a_0, a]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s \in S_t^c} |Q(v + \varepsilon_s) - Q(v)| &\leq a_1\beta\sqrt{Q(v)(1-Q(v))} \sum_{s \in S_t^c} \|x_s - x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}} + a_2\beta^2 \sum_{s \in S_t^c} \|x_s - x_t\|_{A_t^{-1}}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} a_1\beta\sqrt{Q(v)(1-Q(v))} \left(\sqrt{2d|S_t^c|\log(T)} + 3|S_t^c|\|x_t\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}} \right) \\ &\quad + 2a_2\beta^2 \left(2d\log(T) + 9|S_t^c|\|x_t\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2 \right) + c\beta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Plugging (29) and (30) into (28) and substituting in $|S_t^c| \geq \frac{t-1}{2} \geq \frac{t}{4}$, the CDF estimation error is bounded as desired: for every $b \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}$, with probability at least $1 - T^{-2}/2$,

$$\left| \widehat{G}_t(b) - G_t(b) \right| \leq \delta_t \sqrt{Q(v)(1-Q(v))} + \delta_t^2$$

where $\delta_t = O\left(\log^{3/2}(T)\sqrt{d/t} + \log(T)\|x_t\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}\right)$, and we recall that $Q(v) = G_t(b)$.

For any $b \in \mathcal{B}$ in the continuous bid space, let its discretized neighbors be $h_1 = h_2 - T^{-1} \leq b \leq h_2$ for $h_1, h_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}$. Thanks to the Lipschitzness of Q , for both $h = h_1, h_2$, it holds that $G_t(h)(1-G_t(h)) \leq G_t(b)(1-G_t(b)) + \frac{L}{T}$. Hence by monotonicity of \widehat{G}_t and the triangular inequality, with probability at least $1 - T^{-2}/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{G}_t(b) - G_t(b) \right| &\leq \max_{h \in \{h_1, h_2\}} \left| \widehat{G}_t(h) - G_t(h) \right| + \frac{L}{T} \\ &\leq \delta_t \left(\sqrt{G_t(b)(1-G_t(b))} + \sqrt{\frac{L}{T}} \right) + \delta_t^2 + \frac{L}{T} \\ &= O(\delta_t) \sqrt{G_t(b)(1-G_t(b))} + O(\delta_t^2). \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The proof is completed by taking a union bound over (25), (31), and all time indices $t \in [T]$. \square

B Proof of lower bounds

In this section we prove the regret lower bounds in Theorem 2.9. We begin with the analysis of Model 1.

Theorem B.1. *Consider a special instance with i.i.d. $v_{t,1} \sim \text{Bern}(\mu)$ for an unknown $\mu \in [0, 1]$, $v_{t,0} \equiv 0$, and i.i.d. M_t following a known distribution*

$$M_t \sim \frac{1}{2} \text{Unif} \left(\left[0, \frac{1}{100}\right] \right) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Unif} \left(\left[\frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{200}, \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{200}\right] \right).$$

Then for some absolute constant $c > 0$, it holds that

$$\inf_{\pi} \sup_{\mu \in [0,1]} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\max_{b_* \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_*)] - \mathbb{E}[r_t(b_t)] \right) \geq c\sqrt{T}.$$

Proof. We use Le Cam's two-point lower bound. Set $\mu_1 = \frac{1}{4} - \Delta$ and $\mu_2 = \frac{1}{4} + \Delta$, with $\Delta := \frac{1}{4\sqrt{T}}$. Let $\mathbb{E}[r_i(b)] = G(b)(\mu_i - b)$ be the expected payoff under the choice μ_i , for $i = 1, 2$. By straightforward computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_1(b)] &= \mathbb{E}[r_1(b_1^*)] = \frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{200} - \frac{\Delta}{2}, \\ \max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_2(b)] &= \mathbb{E}[r_2(b_2^*)] = \frac{1}{8} + \Delta - \frac{1}{200}, \\ \max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_1(b)] + \mathbb{E}[r_2(b)] &= \mathbb{E}[r_1(b_2^*)] + \mathbb{E}[r_2(b_2^*)] = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{100}, \end{aligned}$$

where $b_1^* := \frac{1}{200}$, and $b_2^* = \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{100}$. Consequently, for any $b_t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_1(b) - r_1(b_t)] + \max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_2(b) - r_2(b_t)] \\
& \geq \max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_1(b)] + \max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_2(b)] - \max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_1(b)] + \mathbb{E}[r_2(b)] \\
& \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

This shows that no single bid can perform well under both of the environments μ_1 and μ_2 . For any fixed policy π , the environment μ_i gives rise to a distribution $\mathbb{P}_i^{\otimes T}$ over the time horizon T for $i = 1, 2$. Denote the environment-specific regret by

$$\text{Reg}_i(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_i^{\otimes T}} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_i(b) - r_i(b_t)] \right]$$

for $i = 1, 2$, where b_t is the bid chosen by policy π . Let $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ denote the total variation distance. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Reg}_1(\pi) + \text{Reg}_2(\pi) &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{P}_1^{\otimes t} \left(\max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_1(b) - r_1(b_t)] \right) + \mathbb{P}_2^{\otimes t} \left(\max_{b \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}[r_2(b) - r_2(b_t)] \right) \\
&\stackrel{(32)}{\geq} \frac{\Delta}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \int \min\{d\mathbb{P}_1^{\otimes t}, d\mathbb{P}_2^{\otimes t}\} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{\Delta}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (1 - \|\mathbb{P}_1^{\otimes t} - \mathbb{P}_2^{\otimes t}\|_{\text{TV}}) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{\Delta T}{2} \left(1 - \|\mathbb{P}_1^{\otimes T} - \mathbb{P}_2^{\otimes T}\|_{\text{TV}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) uses $\int \min\{dP, dQ\} = 1 - \|P - Q\|_{\text{TV}}$ and (b) follows from the data processing inequality for the total variation distance. By Lemma C.6 and the fact that

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Bern}(p)^{\otimes T} \|\text{Bern}(q)^{\otimes T}) = T D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Bern}(p) \|\text{Bern}(q)) \leq \frac{T(p-q)^2}{q(1-q)},$$

we arrive at

$$\text{Reg}_1(\pi) + \text{Reg}_2(\pi) \geq \frac{\Delta T}{4} \exp(-O(T\Delta^2)).$$

Finally, plugging in the choice of $\Delta = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{T}}$ leads to

$$\max_{i=1,2} \text{Reg}_i(\pi) \geq \frac{\text{Reg}_1(\pi) + \text{Reg}_2(\pi)}{2} = \Omega(\sqrt{T}),$$

establishing the theorem. \square

Note that Theorem B.1 completes the proof of Theorem 2.9 for Model 1, with $L = O(1)$ in Assumption 2.3. We proceed to show that the special lower bound instance in Theorem B.1 can also be embedded in other lower bounds of Theorem 2.9. Under Model 2 and $d \geq 2$, let

$$\theta_{1,*} = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \text{Unif} \left(\left\{ -2\Delta, 2\Delta \right\}^{d-1} \right) \right), \quad \theta_{0,*} = 0,$$

with $\Delta = \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{d-1}{T}}$. Since $T \geq d^2$, it holds that $\|\theta_{1,*}\|_2 \leq 1$ almost surely. Divide the time horizon T into $d-1$ sub-horizons T_i for $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ with equal length $\frac{T}{d-1}$, and let

$$x_t = \left(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \dots, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 0, \dots, 0 \right)$$

during the sub-horizon T_i , where the second $\frac{1}{2}$ appears in the $(i+1)$ -th entry. As for M_t , we again use the i.i.d. distribution in Theorem B.1. Consequently, the regret $\text{Reg}_{\text{lpo}}(\pi)$ can be decomposed as the sum of regrets from $d-1$ independent sub-problems, each of time duration $\frac{T}{d-1}$. By Theorem B.1, we have

$$\inf_{\pi} \text{Reg}_{\text{lpo}}(\pi) = (d-1) \cdot \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{T}{d-1}}\right) = \Omega(\sqrt{dT}),$$

as claimed. For the case of $d=1$, we simply use a different construction $\theta_{1,*} \sim \text{Unif}(\{\frac{1}{4}-\Delta, \frac{1}{4}+\Delta\})$ and $x_t \equiv 1$, so that Theorem B.1 again gives a regret lower bound $\Omega(\sqrt{T})$. Finally, since $\text{Reg}_{\text{lte}}(\pi) \geq \text{Reg}_{\text{lpo}}(\pi)$, the lower bound for Model 3 also follows.

C Auxiliary lemmas

Lemma C.1. *Let G be a CDF on $[0, 1]$ with density upper bounded by L , and \widehat{G} be another CDF with $\|G - \widehat{G}\|_{\infty} \leq 0.1$. Denote $\widehat{b}_*(v) = \arg \max_{b \in [0, 1]} \widehat{G}(b)(v-b)$ with tie broken by taking the maximum. For any $v_1 \leq v_2$, if $v_2 - v_1 \leq \frac{1}{20L}$, then*

$$\widehat{G}(\widehat{b}_*(v_2)) - \widehat{G}(\widehat{b}_*(v_1)) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{20L}.$$

Proof. For simplicity, write $b_1 = \widehat{b}_*(v_1)$ and $b_2 = \widehat{b}_*(v_2)$. By Lemma C.2, we have $\widehat{G}(b_1) \leq \widehat{G}(b_2)$. For the sake of contradiction, assume $\widehat{G}(b_2) - \widehat{G}(b_1) > 1 - \frac{1}{20L}$, which implies $\widehat{G}(b_1) \leq \frac{1}{20L}$ and $\widehat{G}(b_2) > 1 - \frac{1}{20L}$.

Define $b_+ = \sup\{b \in [0, 1] : \widehat{G}(b) \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$. We have $\widehat{G}(b_2) > 1 - \frac{1}{20L} \geq \widehat{G}(b_+ - \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{20L}$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Then $b_2 - b_+ \geq \frac{1}{5L}$, since otherwise by Lipschitzness of G ,

$$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{20L} < \widehat{G}(b_2) - \widehat{G}(b_+ - \varepsilon) \leq 0.2 + L(b_2 - b_+ + \varepsilon) < \frac{2}{5} + L\varepsilon$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$, which is a contradiction². Since $\widehat{G}(b_+) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we have the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{20L} &\geq \widehat{G}(b_1)(v_1 - b_1) \\
&\geq \widehat{G}(b_+)(v_1 - b_+) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}(v_1 - b_+) \\
&> \frac{1}{2}\left(v_1 - b_2 + \frac{1}{5L}\right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\left(v_2 - \frac{1}{20L} - b_2 + \frac{1}{5L}\right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{5L} - \frac{1}{20L}\right) \\
&= \frac{3}{40L}
\end{aligned}$$

which yields a contradiction. Hence the proof is complete. \square

Lemma C.2. *Let $G : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be any CDF and let $v_1, v_0 \in [0, 1]$ satisfy $v_1 \geq v_0$. Denote $b_*(v) = \arg \max_{b \in [0, 1]} G(b)(v - b)$ with tie broken by taking the maximum (or minimum). Then b_* is increasing in v .*

Proof. Let $b_1 = b_*(v_1)$ and $b_0 = b_*(v_0)$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose $b_0 > b_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
G(b_1)(v_1 - b_1) &= G(b_1)(v_0 - b_1) + G(b_1)(v_1 - v_0) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} G(b_0)(v_0 - b_0) + G(b_0)(v_1 - v_0) \\
&= G(b_0)(v_1 - b_0).
\end{aligned}$$

If tie is broken by taking the maximum, then we have $b_1 = b_*(v_1) \geq b_0 > b_1$, a contradiction. If tie is broken by minimum, inequality (a) becomes strict because $b_*(v_0) = b_0 > b_1$ and hence $G(b_1)(v_0 - b_1) < G(b_0)(v_0 - b_0)$; then we end up with a contradiction again. \square

Lemma C.3. *In Algorithm 5, at any time t and any stage s , it holds that*

$$b_{*,1}^{(s)} \leq \arg \max_{b^* \in \mathcal{B}} \widehat{r}_t(b^*) \leq b_{*,0}^{(s)}$$

for the UCB maximizers $b_{*,0}^{(s)}$ and $b_{*,1}^{(s)}$ as defined in Algorithm 4.

Proof. Recall the definition of the optimal bid that

$$\widehat{b}_*(x_t) = \arg \max_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \widehat{r}_t(b) = \arg \max_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \widehat{G}_t(b) \left(\theta_*^\top x_t - b \right).$$

At each stage s , let $\widehat{\theta}_t$ be the estimated parameter in Algorithm 4. By Lemma 5.2, we have $\left| \widehat{\theta}_t^\top x_t - \theta_*^\top x_t \right| \leq \gamma \|x_t\|_{A_t^{(s)} - 1}$, where γ is defined in Line 7 of Algorithm 4. Then since the mapping $v \mapsto \arg \max_{b \in \mathcal{B}} G(b)(v - b)$ is monotone by Lemma C.2, the claim follows from the definitions of $b_{*,0}^{(s)}$ and $b_{*,1}^{(s)}$ in Algorithm 4 and that $\widehat{r}_t(b^*) = \widehat{G}_t(b^*)(\theta_*^\top x_t - b^*)$. \square

²Since G is a CDF, it holds that $L \geq 1$.

Lemma C.4. Let G be a continuous CDF on $[0, 1]$, $v \in [0, 1]$, and $t \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Let \widehat{G} be another CDF satisfying $\|G - \widehat{G}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$. For $b \in [0, 1]$, let

$$b' = \min\{\max\{b, \widehat{G}^{-1}(t)\}, \widehat{G}^{-1}(1-t)\}.$$

Then $t \leq \widehat{G}(b') \leq 1 - t + 2\varepsilon$ and

$$\widehat{G}(b)(v-b) - \widehat{G}(b')(v-b') \leq t + 2\varepsilon.$$

Proof. If $\widehat{G}^{-1}(t) < b < \widehat{G}^{-1}(1-t)$, clearly the difference is zero. If $b \leq \widehat{G}^{-1}(t)$, then by continuity of G and the bounded error, we have $t \leq \widehat{G}(b') \leq t + 2\varepsilon$ and hence

$$\widehat{G}(b)(v-b) - \widehat{G}(b')(v-b') = v(\widehat{G}(b) - \widehat{G}(b')) + b'\widehat{G}(b') - b\widehat{G}(b) \leq b'\widehat{G}(b') \leq t + 2\varepsilon.$$

Finally, if $b \geq \widehat{G}^{-1}(1-t)$, then similarly we have $1-t \leq \widehat{G}(b') \leq 1-t+2\varepsilon$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{G}(b)(v-b) - \widehat{G}(b')(v-b') &= v(\widehat{G}(b) - \widehat{G}(b')) - (b\widehat{G}(b) - b'\widehat{G}(b')) \\ &\leq \widehat{G}(b) - \widehat{G}(b') \leq 1 - \widehat{G}(b') \leq t. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma C.5 (Bernstein's inequality in [BLB03]). Consider independent random variables $X_1, \dots, X_n \in [a, b]$. We have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i]\right| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(\sigma^2 + \varepsilon(b-a)/3)}\right)$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$, where $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_i)$.

In particular, it implies the following confidence bound: for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i] \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2/n \log(2/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{2(b-a) \log(2/\delta)}{3n}.$$

Lemma C.6 (Bretagnolle–Huber inequality [BH78]). Let P, Q be two probability measures on the same probability space. Then

$$1 - \|P - Q\|_{\text{TV}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-D_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q))$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ denotes the total variation distance, and D_{KL} denotes the KL divergence.

Lemma C.7. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be vectors with $\|x_i\|_2 \leq 1$ for all $i \in [n]$, and $\Sigma := 18I + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_i^\top$. Then there exists $S \subseteq [n]$ with $|S| \leq \frac{n}{2}$ such that

$$18I + \sum_{i \in S} x_i x_i^\top \succeq \frac{\Sigma}{9}.$$

Proof. The proof uses a deep result in the Kadison–Singer problem. Let $y_i := \Sigma^{-1/2}x_i$ for every $i \in [n]$, so that $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i y_i^\top \preceq I$. In addition,

$$\|y_i\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{18} \|x_i\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{18}.$$

By [MSS15, Corollary 1.5] (with $r = 2, \delta = \frac{1}{18}$), there exists a partition $\{S_1, S_2\}$ of $[n]$ such that for $j \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\sum_{i \in S_j} y_i y_i^\top \preceq \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} + \sqrt{\delta} \right)^2 I = \frac{8}{9} I \implies \sum_{i \in S_j} x_i x_i^\top \preceq \frac{8}{9} \Sigma.$$

WLOG assume that $|S_1| \geq \frac{n}{2}$, then the choice of $S = S_2$ satisfies $|S| \leq \frac{n}{2}$, and

$$18I + \sum_{i \in S} x_i x_i^\top = \Sigma - \sum_{i \in S_1} x_i x_i^\top \succeq \frac{\Sigma}{9}.$$

This proves the lemma. □