
On Pareto Optimality for the Multinomial Logistic Bandit

Jierui Zuo¹ Hanzhang Qin²

Abstract

We provide a new online learning algorithm for tackling the Multinomial Logit Bandit (MNL-Bandit) problem. Despite the challenges posed by the combinatorial nature of the MNL model, we develop a novel Upper Confidence Bound (UCB)-based method that achieves Pareto optimality by balancing regret minimization and estimation error of the assortment revenues and the MNL parameters. We develop theoretical guarantees characterizing the tradeoff between regret and estimation error for the MNL-Bandit problem through information-theoretic bounds, and propose a modified UCB algorithm that incorporates forced exploration to improve parameter estimation accuracy while maintaining low regret. Our analysis sheds critical insights into how to optimally balance the collected revenues and the treatment estimation in dynamic assortment optimization.

1. Introduction

The Multinomial Logit Bandit (MNL-Bandit) problem is a dynamic framework for assortment optimization, where the goal is to iteratively learn consumer preferences while maximizing cumulative revenues over a finite horizon. This problem, rooted in online decision-making, bridges the exploration-exploitation tradeoff by dynamically offering subsets of items (assortments) to consumers whose choices follow the multinomial logit (MNL) model. Among the parametric family of modeling customer choice, the MNL model is celebrated for its analytical tractability and practical relevance in modeling consumer substitution behavior, with applications spanning retail, online advertising, and recommendation systems.

In classical assortment optimization, consumer preference parameters are estimated a priori, and static assortments are

then deployed to maximize expected revenue. However, in fast-changing environments such as online retail, the ability to adaptively refine estimates of consumer preferences and optimize assortments is critical. The MNL-Bandit framework addresses this by combining sequential experimentation with real-time revenue maximization. Yet, the inherent exploration-exploitation dilemma makes it challenging to balance the dual objectives of learning accurate preference parameters and minimizing regret simultaneously.

Recent advancements in multi-armed bandit (MAB) literature emphasize the tradeoff between exploration for accurate inference and exploitation for low regret. While classical MAB algorithms such as Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) and Thompson Sampling excel in minimizing regret, they typically fail to adequately account for parameter estimation accuracy, especially in structured settings like the MNL model. This underscores the need for a unified approach that achieves Pareto optimality—a state where neither regret nor parameter estimation accuracy can be improved without compromising the other.

The concept of Pareto optimality is increasingly recognized as a critical design principle in bandit frameworks involving multiple objectives. Pareto optimal policies aim to operate on the Pareto frontier, where any improvement in one objective (e.g., lower regret) necessitates a tradeoff in the other (e.g., higher estimation error). This paradigm has been formalized in recent studies as a multi-objective optimization framework, providing theoretical and algorithmic insights into designing adaptive policies.

For the MNL-Bandit problem, the Pareto frontier is defined as the set of policies that optimally balance the regret of offering suboptimal assortments and the estimation error in learning the MNL parameters. Despite its relevance, achieving Pareto optimality in the MNL-Bandit setting remains a significant challenge due to the non-linear and combinatorial nature of the MNL model.

This paper introduces a novel Upper Confidence Bound (UCB)-based algorithm tailored to the MNL-Bandit problem, which provably achieves Pareto optimality. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We establish theoretical guarantees for policies operating on the Pareto frontier of the MNL-Bandit prob-

¹School of Economics and Management, Tsinghua University
²Department of Industrial Systems Engineering and Management, National University of Singapore. Correspondence to: Hanzhang Qin <hzqin@nus.edu.sg>.

lem. Specifically, we characterize the fundamental tradeoff between regret and estimation error through information-theoretic bounds by constructing hard instances.

- We propose a modified UCB algorithm that dynamically adjusts exploration and exploitation efforts to maintain Pareto optimality. The algorithm incorporates mechanisms for forced exploration to improve parameter estimation accuracy without incurring excessive regret.
- We prove that our algorithm achieves sublinear regret and estimation error rates that asymptotically approach the Pareto frontier. By combining them with the derived lower bounds, we show that our algorithm achieves the best possible rate.

By addressing the dual objectives of regret minimization and preference estimation, this work advances the state-of-the-art in adaptive assortment optimization. It provides a rigorous framework for practitioners to design decision-making policies that are both efficient and statistically robust in complex, dynamic environments.

2. Related Literature and Contributions

Our work is rooted in the MNL-Bandit literature, a field pioneered by Agrawal et al. (2016) and Agrawal et al. (2017). The MNL-Bandit problem can be regarded as a bandit problem with a specific combinatorial structure – the “arm” can be any subset of a finite number of items (i.e., an assortment) and the corresponding bandit feedback is then a single item selection among the offered set of items. The MNL-Bandit is widely applicable to online revenue management, advertisement allocations, recommender systems, etc. (Agrawal, 2019).

Many recent papers study variants of the original MNL-Bandit model. To name a few, Oh & Iyengar (2019; 2021); Choi et al. (2024); Zhang & Luo (2024) studied the MNL-Bandit model with contextual information; Chen et al. (2020); Foussoul et al. (2023) focused on the MNL-Bandit problem with non-stationarity; Aznag et al. (2021); Chen et al. (2024) considered the MNL-Bandit problem with knapsack constraints; (Perivier & Goyal, 2022) tackled the MNL-Bandit problem with dynamic pricing; Lee & Oh (2024); Zhang & Wang (2024) provided improved regret bounds for the MNL-Bandit.

Yet, our focus is different from most existing papers about MNL-Bandit that consider the regret of revenue maximization as the primary objective. Our work is instead motivated by Simchi-Levi & Wang (2023) who consider not only the revenue maximization objective but also the minimization of the estimation errors on the average treat-

ment effects (ATEs). Simchi-Levi & Wang (2023) studied the Pareto frontiers of the K -armed bandit problem with ATE defined as the difference of expected reward of the distinct arms (i.e., the “treatments”). Besides, several recent papers (Zhao, 2023; Xu et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2024; Qin & Russo, 2024; Cook et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024) have investigated this fundamental trade-off in bandit learning by additional considerations related to fairness, best arm identification, diminishing marginal effects, and optimal statistical accuracy. As far as we know, none of these papers has touched upon the bandit learning problem with a combinatorial nature.

Naturally, a seemingly straightforward solution for achieving Pareto optimality for MNL-Bandits would be to generalize the algorithm by Simchi-Levi & Wang (2023) as simply exploring the assortments as independent arms. Nevertheless, this idea will not work since the number of assortments (i.e., the number of arms) is exponential in the number of items, so applying the simple generalization will result in a large estimation error.

We would like to emphasize the practical importance of studying Pareto optimality for MNL-Bandits. For instance, in the context of online recommendation systems, this tradeoff between regret minimization and accurate estimation of user preferences is vital for delivering optimal user experiences. Platforms like Netflix or Amazon must adaptively recommend assortments of movies or products while learning consumer preferences. A policy operating on the Pareto frontier ensures that these platforms do not compromise long-term learning about user behavior for short-term gains in engagement or sales. By achieving Pareto optimality, the recommendation system balances exploration—offering diverse, less certain items to learn user preferences—and exploitation—recommending items with high predicted relevance to maximize immediate user satisfaction and revenue.

To address the challenge of balancing regret and ATE of learning user preferences simultaneously, we propose a new upper confidence bound (UCB) scheme by incorporating an additional active exploration of the MNL parameter space – we retain a small estimation error that only scales linearly in the number of items, proving the online algorithm maintains a low regret. In particular, our algorithm is proved to be Pareto optimal and achieves lower estimation error of ATE (differences between the expected revenue of assortments) that only scales by $N^2 \cdot \sqrt{N^{1-\alpha}}$ where N is the total number of items, compared to scaling by the total number of assortments which is exponential in the number of items. Moreover, we extend the definition of Pareto optimality to the context of cumulative regret and estimation error of both the expected revenue of assortments and the attraction parameters (key parameters in the MNL model).

Furthermore, we derive the sufficient and necessary conditions of Pareto optimality for the MNL-Bandit.

3. Model

In this section, we formally introduce the MNL model, the bandit framework and the Pareto optimality conditions.

3.1. The Basic MNL Model for Assortment Selection

At each time period t , the seller presents an assortment $S_t \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$, where $\{1, \dots, N\}$ denotes the total set of available items. Customers faced with this assortment S_t select either one item from the set S_t or the “no-purchase” option, denoted by 0. The customer’s choice $c_t \in S_t \cup \{0\}$ is observed by the seller, providing crucial feedback to refine future assortment decisions. The probability of a customer selecting item $i \in S_t$, when offered the assortment $S_t = S$, is modeled using the Multinomial Logit (MNL) framework. The probability is expressed as:

$$\mathbb{P}(c_t = i \mid S_t = S) \begin{cases} \frac{v_i}{v_0 + \sum_{j \in S} v_j}, & \text{if } i \in S \cup \{0\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $v_i > 0$ represents the attraction parameter of item i , and $v_0 = 1$ is the normalized attraction parameter for the no-purchase option. These attraction parameters quantify the relative appeal of each item and directly influence customer choice probabilities. The parameters v_i are not known a priori and must be learned through observations of customer choices over time. The expected revenue when assortment S is offered and the MNL parameters are denoted by \mathbf{v} is given by:

$$R(S, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i \in S} \frac{r_i v_i}{v_0 + \sum_{j \in S} v_j},$$

where $r_i > 0$ is the known revenue associated with item i , and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N)$ denotes the vector of attraction parameters.

3.2. MNL-Bandit for Online Assortment Optimization

Given the basic MNL model, our objective is to design a history-dependent policy π that selects assortments (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_T) over T decision periods to maximize the cumulative expected revenue:

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\sum_{t=1}^T R(S_t, \mathbf{v}) \right),$$

where $R(S, \mathbf{v})$ is the expected revenue from offering assortment S . Direct optimization of the cumulative revenue is not tractable due to the unknown attraction parameters \mathbf{v} . The parameters v_i must be learned iteratively

through consumer feedback, introducing the need to balance exploration (offering diverse assortments to learn \mathbf{v}) and exploitation (offering assortments that maximize revenue given the current knowledge of \mathbf{v}). A key performance metric in this context is regret, defined as the cumulative revenue loss compared to the optimal policy with perfect knowledge of \mathbf{v} :

$$\text{Reg}(T, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{t=1}^T R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{t=1}^T R(S_t, \mathbf{v}) \right],$$

where $S^* = \arg \max_{S \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}} R(S, \mathbf{v})$ represents the optimal assortment under perfect knowledge. The regret measures the performance gap between the ideal revenue and the revenue achieved by the policy π . A well-designed policy aims to minimize regret over finite time steps T , balancing learning and revenue maximization.

3.3. Pareto optimality for the MNL-Bandit

In MNL-Bandit, the trade-off between regret minimization and accurate estimation leads naturally to the concept of Pareto optimality, which provides a framework for identifying policies that achieve the best possible balance between these two conflicting objectives. The formal definition of Pareto optimality is given as follows:

Definition 3.1. (Pareto optimality) A policy $(\pi, \hat{\Delta})$, where π denotes the decision-making strategy and $\hat{\Delta}$ represents the estimation procedure, is considered Pareto optimal if no other admissible policy $(\pi', \hat{\Delta}')$ can strictly improve one objective without worsening the other. Formally, $(\pi, \hat{\Delta})$ is Pareto optimal if and only if there does not exist another policy $(\pi', \hat{\Delta}')$ such that:

$$\text{Reg}_{\pi'}(T, \mathbf{v}) \leq \text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}) \text{ and } \max e(\hat{\Delta}') \leq \max e(\hat{\Delta})$$

with at least one inequality being strict, where $\text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v})$ denotes the cumulative regret incurred by policy π within T time steps and $e(\hat{\Delta}) = \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\Delta} - \Delta|]$ represents the estimation error, where Δ in MNL-Bandit can be either $\Delta_R^{(i,j)} = R(S_{\tau_i}) - R(S_{\tau_j})$ for any $i \neq j \in [|S|]$ or $\Delta_v^{(i,j)} = v_i - v_j$ for any $i \neq j \in [N]$.

Definition 3.2. (Pareto Frontier) The Pareto frontier is defined as the set of all Pareto optimal policies $(\pi, \hat{\Delta})$, representing the achievable trade-offs between regret minimization and estimation accuracy, which is denoted by \mathcal{P} is formally expressed as:

$$\mathcal{P} = \left\{ (\pi, \hat{\Delta}) \mid \nexists (\pi', \hat{\Delta}') \text{ s.t. } \text{Reg}_{\pi'}(T, \mathbf{v}) \leq \text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}), \right. \\ \left. \max_{i < j} e_{\Delta'}(i, j) \leq \max_{i < j} e_{\Delta}(i, j) \right\}.$$

Policies on the Pareto frontier achieve efficient trade-offs between regret and pairwise estimation error. Any policy not on the frontier is suboptimal, as another policy exists that strictly improves at least one objective without worsening the other. The problem of identifying Pareto optimal policies can be formulated as a multi-objective optimization problem:

$$\min_{(\pi, \hat{\Delta})} \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left(\text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}), \max e(\hat{\Delta}) \right),$$

where \mathcal{E}_0 denotes the set of admissible MNL-Bandit problem instances. This formulation captures the dual goals of minimizing cumulative regret and improving estimation accuracy under the worst-case scenario.

How to solve the multi-objective optimization problem to get the Pareto optimal policy is the primary goal of this work. However, finding only one Pareto optimal solution is always not enough. It is important to design experiments flexibly under different requirements for the trade-off between the objectives. This is indeed asking how to obtain the best Pareto optimal solutions given different levels of trade-off in the objectives, which is what we want to achieve by our algorithm.

4. Algorithm and Analysis

To address the challenges of balancing exploration and exploitation in the MNL-Bandit problem, we propose a novel algorithm based on the Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) framework. The algorithm is designed to dynamically select assortments over a sequence of time periods while ensuring accurate parameter estimation and minimizing cumulative regret. The algorithm flexibly accommodates the trade-offs between regret minimization and inference accuracy by leveraging epoch-based updates.

4.1. Details of the Algorithm

Here, we demonstrate the main ideas of the UCB for MNL-Bandit Experiment whose pseudocode is provided in Algorithm 1. We adopt the famous UCB algorithm for stochastic MAB, together with the idea to actively explore the less-offered items. Below we illustrate the ideas in details.

We divide the time horizon T into multiple epochs. During each epoch, we repeatedly offer a fixed assortment of items until a "no-purchase" outcome occurs. Specifically, in epoch ℓ , we offer the assortment S_ℓ , and the length of epoch $|\mathcal{E}_\ell|$ is a random variable that follows a geometric distribution, determined by the probability of no purchasing. The total number of epochs L is defined as the minimum number of epochs within T time steps, i.e.

$$L = \min \left\{ L \mid \sum_{\ell=1}^{L+1} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \geq T \right\}.$$

At the end of each epoch ℓ , we update our estimates for the parameters of the MNL model. These estimates are used to determine the assortment $S_{\ell+1}$ for the next epoch. For any time step $t \in \mathcal{E}_\ell$, the consumer's response to S_ℓ is denoted by c_t . If the consumer purchases item i , then $c_t = i$; if no purchase is made, $c_t = 0$. The number of times item i is purchased in epoch ℓ is defined as:

$$\hat{v}_{i,\ell} = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_\ell} \mathbb{I}(c_t = i),$$

where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is an indicator function that equals 1 if the condition holds and 0 otherwise.

For each item i , we track the set of epochs before ℓ where assortments containing i were offered. This set is denoted as $\mathcal{T}_i(\ell)$, and its size is $T_i(\ell) = |\mathcal{T}_i(\ell)|$. Using this data, we compute an unbiased estimator for the MNL parameter ν_i as:

$$\tilde{v}_{i,\ell} = \frac{1}{T_i(\ell)} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{T}_i(\ell)} \hat{v}_{i,\ell}.$$

To ensure sufficient confidence in the parameter estimates, we define an upper confidence bound (UCB) for item i at epoch ℓ as:

$$v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} = \tilde{v}_{i,\ell} + \sqrt{\tilde{v}_{i,\ell} \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}.$$

With high probability, the true parameter ν_i is below $v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}}$ for all i and ℓ . These confidence bounds play a role similar to that of hypothesis testing, ensuring that the parameter estimates are reliably large enough to identify the true values. Then based on our estimates in the previous ℓ epochs, we define the optimistic assortment in the next epoch as:

$$S_{\ell+1}^* := \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \max \{ R(S, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) : \hat{v}_i \leq v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} \},$$

where $R(S, \hat{\mathbf{v}})$ is as defined as previously. We can also show that the above optimization problem is equivalent to the following optimization problem:

$$S_{\ell+1}^* := \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{R}_{\ell+1}(S),$$

where $\tilde{R}_{\ell+1}(S)$ is defined as

$$\tilde{R}_{\ell+1}(S) := \frac{\sum_{i \in S} r_i v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}}}{1 + \sum_{j \in S} v_{j,\ell}^{\text{UCB}}}.$$

Then, in each epoch, the algorithm is designed to offer the supplement of optimistic assortment with a carefully designed probability $\alpha_\ell = \frac{1}{2\ell^\alpha}$ (otherwise offer the optimistic assortment with high probability $1 - \alpha_\ell$). This step is different from the UCB algorithm used for MNL-Bandit by

Agrawal et al. (2019) in that there is a probability $\alpha_l > 0$ to offer $(S_l^*)^c$ (instead of offering S_l^* with probability one). α is an important input parameter that balances exploration and exploitation and can take any value in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$. If $\alpha = 0$, then $\alpha_\ell = \frac{1}{2} = 1 - \alpha_\ell$, which means that both the optimistic assortment and its supplement will be offered to the customers with equal probability $\frac{1}{2}$ at each time step. Thus each item will also be offered with equal probability. One can expect a relatively large regret and strong statistical power. As α becomes larger, the probability of offering $(S_\ell^*)^c$ decreases faster as ℓ grows, putting more emphasis on regret minimization and less on statistical efficiency. If $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, α_ℓ decays faster as ℓ grows, which will not introduce much extra regret compared to the UCB algorithm developed by Agrawal et al. (2019). Later we will show as long as $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$, our algorithm guarantees Pareto optimality.

Also we define $\widehat{\text{SumV}}_\ell(i)$ for $i \in [N]$ and $\ell \leq L$ as:

$$\widehat{\text{SumV}}_\ell(i) = \widehat{\text{SumV}}_{\ell-1}(i) + \frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell),$$

where $\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}$ is an unbiased estimator of v_i as we defined previously. Note that $\widehat{\text{SumV}}_\ell(i)$ can provide an unbiased estimation of v_i after being divided by ℓ , i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\text{SumV}}_\ell(i)] = \ell \cdot v_i$. Thus we have $\widehat{v}_i = \frac{\widehat{\text{SumV}}_L(i)}{L}$ as the ultimate estimator of v_i . Finally, we use the estimates of attraction parameters to estimate the expected revenue of a certain assortment, i.e.

$$\widehat{R}(S_{\tau_i}) = \frac{\sum_{i \in S_{\tau_i}} r_i \widehat{v}_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_{\tau_i}} \widehat{v}_i},$$

for all $\tau \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$.

4.2. Analysis of the Algorithm

We make the following assumptions throughout the analysis.

Assumption 4.1 (MNL Parameters)

1. The MNL parameter corresponding to any item $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ satisfies $\nu_i \leq \nu_0 = 1$.
2. The family of assortments \mathcal{S} is such that $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $Q \subseteq S$ imply that $Q \in \mathcal{S}$.

The above assumptions about MNL parameters are widely assumed in the MNL-Bandit literature (see, e.g., Agrawal et al. 2019). The first assumption states that no-purchase choice is the most probable as is often the case in real-world settings, such as online retail and display-based advertising. The second assumption indicates that if we remove an item from a set that meets certain rules, the smaller set still meets those rules. This requirement holds for many practical constraints, including limits on the number of items (cardinality constraints) and, more generally, matroid constraints. It should be noted that we adopt the

Algorithm 1 UCB for MNL-Bandit Experiment

- 1: **Input:** Collection of assortments \mathcal{S} , total time steps T , and exploration parameter $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.
- 2: **Initialization:** $v_{i,0}^{UCB} = 1, \widehat{\text{SumV}}_0(i) = 0, \forall i \in [N]$;
- 3: $t = 1, \ell = 1$ keeps track of time steps and total epochs respectively and $\alpha_\ell = \frac{1}{2\ell^\alpha}$
- 4: **while** $t < T$ **do**
- 5: Compute $S_\ell^* := \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \widetilde{R}_\ell(S)$,

$$S_\ell = \begin{cases} S_\ell^*, & \text{w.p. } 1 - \alpha_\ell, \\ (S_\ell^*)^c, & \text{w.p. } \alpha_\ell, \end{cases}$$

where $(S_\ell^*)^c$ is the collection of items not in S_ℓ^* .

- 6: Offer S_ℓ and observe customer decision c_t .
- 7: $\mathcal{E}_\ell \leftarrow \mathcal{E}_\ell \cup \{t\}$ keeps track of time steps in epoch ℓ ;
- 8: **if** $c_t = 0$ **then**
- 9: compute $\widehat{v}_{i,\ell} = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_\ell} \mathbf{1}(c_t = i)$, the number of consumers who chose i in epoch ℓ ;
- 10: update $\mathcal{T}_i(\ell) = \{\tau \leq \ell \mid i \in S_\tau\}, T_i(\ell) = |\mathcal{T}_i(\ell)|$, the number of epochs until ℓ that offered item i ;
- 11: update $\bar{v}_{i,\ell} = (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i(\ell)} \widehat{v}_{i,\tau}) / T_i(\ell)$, the sample mean of estimates;
- 12: $\widehat{\text{SumV}}_\ell(i) = \widehat{\text{SumV}}_{\ell-1}(i) + \frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell)}{P(i \in S_\ell)}$;
- 13: update $v_{i,\ell}^{UCB} = \bar{v}_{i,\ell} + \sqrt{\frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}, \ell = \ell + 1$
- 14: **end if**
- 15: $t \leftarrow t + 1$
- 16: **end while**
- 17: **Return:** $\widehat{v}_i = \frac{\widehat{\text{SumV}}_L(i)}{L}, \widehat{R}(S_{\tau_i}) = \frac{\sum_{i \in S_{\tau_i}} r_i \widehat{v}_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_{\tau_i}} \widehat{v}_i}$.

first assumption mainly to simplify our core findings, and it does not play a central role in deriving the regret bounds.

4.2.1. REGRET UPPER BOUND

In Agrawal et al. (2019), the regret is proved to satisfy $\text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}) \leq C_1 \sqrt{NT \log NT} + C_2 N \log^2 NT$, where C_1 and C_2 are absolute constants independent of problem parameters. In MNL-Bandit, accurate estimation of the attraction parameters requires observing a sufficiently diverse set of choices. By enforcing the selection of suboptimal assortments, we introduce additional regret, but this helps improve the long-term statistical power of the estimation. Therefore, the inclusion of this extra regret is a necessary design choice to balance regret minimization with the accurate estimation of MNL parameters.

In our algorithm, for epoch ℓ , we set a carefully controlled probability $\alpha_\ell = \frac{1}{2\ell^\alpha}$ for the supplement set of the optimistic assortment, i.e. $P(S_\ell = (S_\ell^*)^c) = \alpha_\ell$, which introduces extra regret to the regret term in Agrawal et al. (2019). Define $\Delta R_\ell := \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_\ell| \cdot [R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})] \mid S_\ell]$ as the regret in epoch ℓ . Since we have shown the length of an epoch $|\mathcal{E}_\ell|$ conditioned on S_ℓ is a geometric random variable with success probability being the probability of no purchase in S_ℓ , i.e. $1/(1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i)$, then we can derive an upper bound of ΔR_ℓ which is $\Delta R_\ell = (1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i) [R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})] \leq N + 1$. Thus we introduce $(N + 1) \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^L P(S_\ell = (S_\ell^*)^c) \leq CN \cdot T^{1-\alpha}$ more in the cumulative regret. So we have $\text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}) \leq C_1 \sqrt{NT \log NT} + C_2 N \log^2 NT + C_3 NT^{1-\alpha}$. We provide the detailed proof of the following theorem in Appendix B.1.

Theorem 4.1. *For any instance $\mathbf{v} = (v_0, \dots, v_N)$ of the MNL-Bandit problem with N items, $r_i \in [0, 1]$, and given the problem assumption, let Algorithm 1 run with $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ the regret at any time T is $O(\sqrt{NT \log NT} + N \log^2 NT + NT^{1-\alpha})$.*

4.2.2. INFERENCE FOR ATTRACTION PARAMETERS

Now we focus on estimating the attraction parameters. Since we have shown that $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\text{SumV}}_\ell(i)] = \ell \cdot v_i$, we can define a set of martingales as $M_\ell^i = \widehat{\text{SumV}}_\ell(i) - \ell \cdot v_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. For any $\ell \in L$, the martingale difference of M_ℓ^i is $|M_\ell^i - M_{\ell-1}^i| = \left| \frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell) - v_i \right|$ so that the variance of M_ℓ^i can be written as

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell) - v_i \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{H}_{\ell-1} \right],$$

and bounded by $\sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \cdot \mathbb{E}[(\widehat{v}_{i,\ell})^2 \mid i \in S_\ell, \mathcal{H}_{\ell-1}]$. And we know $\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}$ is a geometric random variable with parameter $\frac{1}{1+v_i}$ and $P(i \in S_\ell) \geq \alpha^\ell$. So we further bound the variance of M_ℓ^i by $\frac{6(L+1)^{\alpha+1}}{\alpha+1}$. By Bernstein's inequality, we can derive the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *If Algorithm 1 runs with $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, with probability $1 - \delta$, for any $i \in [N]$*

$$|\widehat{v}_i - v_i| \leq 12 \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{(L+1)^{1-\alpha}}}.$$

Taking $\delta = \frac{1}{L^2}$, then we can derive that $\mathbb{E}[|\widehat{v}_i - v_i|] = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{(L+1)^{1-\alpha}}}\right)$. Since $\sum_{\ell=1}^L |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \geq T$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_\ell|] = 1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i$, we can easily derive $\frac{T}{L+1} \leq N + 1$ which

further implies that

$$|\widehat{v}_i - v_i| \leq 12\sqrt{2} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \cdot \sqrt{\left(\frac{N}{T}\right)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

So $\mathbb{E}[|\widehat{v}_i - v_i|] = O\left(\sqrt{T^{\alpha-1}}\right)$. And according to triangle inequality we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\Delta}_v^{(i,j)} - \Delta_v^{(i,j)}| &= |(\widehat{v}_i - \widehat{v}_j) - (v_i - v_j)| \\ &= |(\widehat{v}_i - v_i) - (\widehat{v}_j - v_j)| \leq |\widehat{v}_i - v_i| + |\widehat{v}_j - v_j| \end{aligned}$$

So we can easily derive the following corollary:

Corollary 4.3. *If Algorithm 1 runs with $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, the estimation error of parameter differences, i.e. $\Delta_v^{(i,j)} = v_i - v_j$ for all $i, j \in [N], i \neq j$ is*

$$|\widehat{\Delta}_v^{(i,j)} - \Delta_v^{(i,j)}| = O\left(\sqrt{T^{\alpha-1}}\right).$$

4.2.3. INFERENCE FOR EXPECTED REVENUE

Since we have obtained the unbiased estimators for attraction parameters, a direct and useful idea is to use the estimates of v_i to estimate the expected revenue, i.e. $R(S_\tau) = \frac{\sum_{i \in S_\tau} r_i \widehat{v}_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_\tau} \widehat{v}_i}$. Then we can derive that $|\widehat{R}(S_\tau) - R(S_\tau)|$ can be bounded by $(2N^2 + N)|\widehat{v}_i - v_i|$. And combined with Theorem 3.2, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.4. *If Algorithm 1 runs with $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, with probability $1 - \delta$, for any $\tau \in [S]$*

$$|\widehat{R}(S_\tau) - R(S_\tau)| \leq 12\sqrt{2} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \cdot (2N^2 + N) \sqrt{\left(\frac{N}{T}\right)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

Thus we have: $\mathbb{E}[|\widehat{R}(S_\tau) - R(S_\tau)|] = O\left(\sqrt{T^{\alpha-1}}\right)$. And similarly as above, by triangle inequality we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\Delta}_R^{(i,j)} - \Delta_R^{(i,j)}| &= |(\widehat{R}(S_{\tau_i}) - \widehat{R}(S_{\tau_j})) - (R(S_{\tau_i}) - R(S_{\tau_j}))| \\ &= |(\widehat{R}(S_{\tau_i}) - R(S_{\tau_i})) - (\widehat{R}(S_{\tau_j}) - R(S_{\tau_j}))| \\ &\leq |(\widehat{R}(S_{\tau_i}) - R(S_{\tau_i}))| + |(\widehat{R}(S_{\tau_j}) - R(S_{\tau_j}))| \end{aligned}$$

Combined with Theorem 4.4, we can derive that

$$|\widehat{\Delta}_R^{(i,j)} - \Delta_R^{(i,j)}| \leq 72 \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \cdot N^2 \sqrt{\left(\frac{N}{T}\right)^{1-\alpha}}. \quad (1)$$

Thus we get the following corollary:

Corollary 4.5. *If Algorithm 1 runs with $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, the estimation error of parameter differences, i.e. $\Delta_R^{(i,j)} = R(S_{\tau_i}) - R(S_{\tau_j})$ for all $i, j \in [S], i \neq j$ is*

$$|\widehat{\Delta}_R^{(i,j)} - \Delta_R^{(i,j)}| = O\left(\sqrt{T^{\alpha-1}}\right).$$

As shown on the RHS of (1), given a fixed total time steps T and confidence level δ , the estimation error of the difference between the expected revenue of assortment S_{τ_i} and S_{τ_j} , for any $i \neq j \in [|\mathcal{S}|]$, scales as $N^2 \cdot \sqrt{N^{1-\alpha}}$ in the number of items N . This indicates the effectiveness of our algorithm in addressing the complexities arising from the combinatorial nature of the MNL model.

4.2.4. ON PARETO OPTIMALITY

Now we present the conditions of Pareto optimality and verify that our algorithm is indeed Pareto optimal. Note that when it comes to comparing regrets with errors, we will only focus on the order of T ignoring the universal constant and the logarithm terms, since T is usually relatively large.

(1) Regret and Estimation Error of Δ_R : In classic multi-armed bandit with K arms, as proposed in Chonghuan's paper, an admissible pair $(\pi^*, \hat{\Delta}^*)$ is Pareto optimal if and only if

$$\max_{\nu \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[\left(\max_{i < j \leq K} e_\nu(T, \hat{\Delta}^*(i, j)) \right) \sqrt{R_\nu(T, \pi^*)} \right] = \tilde{O}(1),$$

where ν is a stochastic bandit instance, $e_\nu(T, \hat{\Delta}^*(i, j))$ is the estimation error of ATE between arm i and arm j , i.e. $e_\nu(T, \hat{\Delta}^*(i, j)) = \mathbb{E}_\pi [|\Delta(i, j) - \hat{\Delta}^*(i, j)|]$ where $\Delta(i, j)$ is the difference between expected reward of arm i and j , i.e. $\Delta(i, j) = \mu_i - \mu_j$. And $R_\nu(T, \pi^*)$ is the cumulative regret within T under policy π^* .

All the same, by ignoring the MNL structure, we can directly see each assortment S_τ as an arm with its only reward distribution of mean $R(S_\tau)$ and then it follows the classic MAB games. Then we have the following theorem whose strict proof is provided in Appendix A.

Theorem 4.6. *In MNL-Bandit, an admissible pair $(\pi, \hat{\Delta}_R)$ is Pareto optimal if and only if it satisfies*

$$\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[\left(\max_{i < j \leq |\mathcal{S}|} e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_R^{(i, j)}) \right) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)} \right] = \tilde{O}(1).$$

where φ is a MNL-Bandit instance, $e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_R^{(i, j)})$ is the estimation error of ATE between S_{τ_i} and S_{τ_j} , i.e. $e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_R^{(i, j)}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi [|\hat{\Delta}_R^{(i, j)} - \Delta_R^{(i, j)}|]$ and $Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)$ is the cumulative regret within T time steps under policy π .

For Algorithm 1, by Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.4, we have $Reg_\varphi(T, \pi) = \tilde{O}(T^{(1-\alpha) \vee \frac{1}{2}})$ and $e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_R^{(i, j)}) = O(\sqrt{T^{\alpha-1}})$. Thus we can derive that $\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[\left(\max_{i < j \leq |\mathcal{S}|} e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_R^{(i, j)}) \right) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)} \right] = \tilde{O}(1)$ holds for Algorithm 1 when $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ which implies that our algorithm is Pareto optimal in terms of regret and estimation error of Δ_R .

(2) Regret and Estimation Error of Δ_v : Then we move on to analyze the Pareto optimality between regret and Δ_v . Let us start with MNL-Bandit with only 2 items, which can later be extended to the general case $N \geq 2$. In the following theorem, we establish an minimax lower bound for $e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)}$.

Theorem 4.7. *When $N = 2$, for any admissible pair $(\pi, \hat{\Delta}_v)$, there always exists a hard instance $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0$ such that $e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)}$ is no less than a constant order, i.e.,*

$$\inf_{(\pi, \hat{\Delta}_v)} \max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)} \right] = \Omega(1).$$

In the above theorem, we have shown that no solution can perform better than a constant order in terms of $e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)}$ in the worst case. The following theorem states that one policy is Pareto optimal if it can achieve the constant order on $e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)}$ in terms of the dependence on T .

Theorem 4.8. *When $N = 2$, an admissible pair $(\pi, \hat{\Delta}_v)$ is Pareto optimal if it satisfies*

$$\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)} \right] = \tilde{O}(1).$$

Then we extend our results from $N = 2$ to the general case. According to Corollary 3.3, we can have $\max_{i < j \leq N} e(T, \Delta_v(i, j)) = O(\sqrt{T^{\alpha-1}})$. Then combined with Theorem 3.1, we can naturally derive that $\left(\max_{i < j \leq N} e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v(i, j)) \right) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)} = \tilde{O}(1)$ for all MNL-Bandit instance φ . By such an observation, we can generalize Theorem 3.8 and get the sufficient condition for the general case: $\max_{\varphi} \left(\max_{i < j \leq N} e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v(i, j)) \right) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)} = \tilde{O}(1)$. Therefore, Algorithm 1 is Pareto optimal for all $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then combined the sufficient condition with the definition of Pareto optimality, we can proof the following theorem by contradiction:

Theorem 4.9. *In MNL-Bandit with N items, any Pareto optimal $(\pi, \hat{\Delta}_v)$ has*

$$\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left(\max_{i < j \leq N} e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v(i, j)) \right) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)} = \tilde{O}(1)$$

Then we can conclude the following corollary:

Corollary 4.10. *In MNL-Bandit, an admissible pair $(\pi, \hat{\Delta}_R)$ is Pareto optimal if and only if it satisfies*

$$\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left(\max_{i < j \leq N} e_\varphi(T, \hat{\Delta}_v(i, j)) \right) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)} = \tilde{O}(1).$$

Therefore, we conclude that the sufficient and necessary condition of Pareto optimality is $\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left(\max_{i < j} e_{\varphi}(T, \widehat{\Delta}(i, j)) \right) \sqrt{\text{Reg}_{\varphi}(T, \pi)} = \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$, where $\widehat{\Delta}$ can be either $\widehat{\Delta}_R$ or $\widehat{\Delta}_v$. As an immediate corollary, our algorithm is Pareto optimal in both cases.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate Pareto optimality for the MNL-Bandit model. We define Pareto optimality as the trade-off between regret of the revenue minimization and the average estimation errors on assortment revenues or MNL parameters. We present sufficient and necessary conditions of Pareto optimality and develop a novel algorithm that achieves Pareto optimality for the MNL-Bandit. Future directions will include extending our result to more general dynamic assortment problems or studying Pareto optimality with other forms of bandit feedback or other regret/ATE metrics.

Impact Statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

- Agrawal, S. Recent advances in multiarmed bandits for sequential decision making. *Operations Research & Management Science in the Age of Analytics*, pp. 167–188, 2019.
- Agrawal, S., Avadhanula, V., Goyal, V., and Zeevi, A. A near-optimal exploration-exploitation approach for assortment selection. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pp. 599–600, 2016.
- Agrawal, S., Avadhanula, V., Goyal, V., and Zeevi, A. Thompson sampling for the mnl-bandit. In *Conference on learning theory*, pp. 76–78. PMLR, 2017.
- Agrawal, S., Avadhanula, V., Goyal, V., and Zeevi, A. Mnl-bandit: A dynamic learning approach to assortment selection. *Operations Research*, 67(5):1453–1485, 2019.
- Aznag, A., Goyal, V., and Perivier, N. Mnl-bandit with knapsacks: a near-optimal algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01135*, 2021.
- Chen, X., Wang, Y., and Zhou, Y. Dynamic assortment optimization with changing contextual information. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(216):1–44, 2020.
- Chen, X., Liu, M., Wang, Y., and Zhou, Y. A re-solving heuristic for dynamic assortment optimization with knapsack constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05564*, 2024.
- Choi, H.-j., Udwani, R., and Oh, M.-h. Cascading contextual assortment bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Cook, T., Mishler, A., and Ramdas, A. Semiparametric efficient inference in adaptive experiments. In *Causal Learning and Reasoning*, pp. 1033–1064. PMLR, 2024.
- Foussoul, A., Goyal, V., and Gupta, V. Mnl-bandit in non-stationary environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02504*, 2023.
- Lee, J. and Oh, M.-h. Nearly minimax optimal regret for multinomial logistic bandit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09831*, 2024.
- Li, J., Simchi-Levi, D., and Zhao, Y. Optimal adaptive experimental design for estimating treatment effect. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05552*, 2024.
- Oh, M.-h. and Iyengar, G. Thompson sampling for multinomial logit contextual bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Oh, M.-h. and Iyengar, G. Multinomial logit contextual bandits: Provable optimality and practicality. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pp. 9205–9213, 2021.
- Perivier, N. and Goyal, V. Dynamic pricing and assortment under a contextual mnl demand. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3461–3474, 2022.
- Qin, C. and Russo, D. Optimizing adaptive experiments: A unified approach to regret minimization and best-arm identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10592*, 2024.
- Simchi-Levi, D. and Wang, C. Multi-armed bandit experimental design: Online decision-making and adaptive inference. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 3086–3097. PMLR, 2023.
- Wei, W., Ma, X., and Wang, J. Fair adaptive experiments. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Xu, J., Wu, Y., Wang, Y., Wang, C., and Zheng, Z. A/b test and online experiment under diminishing marginal effects: Regret minimization and statistical inference. *Available at SSRN 4640583*, 2024.
- Zhang, M. and Luo, H. Contextual multinomial logit bandits with general value functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08126*, 2024.

Zhang, Z. and Wang, Z. Online experimental design with estimation-regret trade-off under network interference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03727*, 2024.

Zhao, J. Adaptive neyman allocation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08808*, 2023.

A. Sufficient Conditions for Pareto Optimality

A.1. Pareto optimality between regret and ATE estimation

First, let us consider the Pareto optimality in classic multi-armed bandit with K arms introduced in (Simchi-Levi & Wang, 2023) which proposes the necessary and sufficient condition for Pareto optimality in MAB with general K arms. Specifically, an admissible pair $(\pi^*, \hat{\Delta}^*)$ is Pareto optimal if and only if

$$\max_{\nu \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[\left(\max_{i < j \leq K} e_\nu(T, \Delta^*(i, j)) \right) \sqrt{R_\nu(T, \pi^*)} \right] = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1).$$

In the MNL-Bandit setting, we can see each assortment as an arm, thus we have $|\mathcal{S}|$ arms and each arm has its own reward distribution. Specifically, assortment \mathbf{S}_τ has a reward distribution with mean $\mu_\tau = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathbf{S}_\tau} r_i v_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in \mathbf{S}_\tau} v_i}$. Therefore, it follows that there also exists Pareto optimality in the context of MNL-Bandit and the necessary and sufficient condition is

$$\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[\left(\max_{i < j \leq |\mathcal{S}|} e_\varphi(T, \Delta_R^{(i, j)}) \right) \sqrt{Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)} \right] = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1).$$

where $e_\varphi(T, \Delta_R^{(i, j)})$ is the estimation error of ATE between \mathbf{S}_i and \mathbf{S}_j , i.e. $e_\varphi(T, \Delta_R^{(i, j)}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\left| \hat{\Delta}_R^{(i, j)} - \Delta_R^{(i, j)} \right| \right]$ and $Reg_\varphi(T, \pi)$ is the cumulative regret within T time steps under policy π .

A.2. Pareto optimality between regret and parameter differences inference (when $N = 2$)

Lemma A.1. *When $N=2$, for any given online decision-making policy π , the error of any estimator of parameter difference can be lower bounded as follows, for any function $f : n \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{8}]$ and any $u \in \mathcal{E}$.*

$$\inf_{\hat{\Delta}_v} \max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \mathbb{P}_\varphi \left(|\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_\varphi| \geq f(t) \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \sqrt{\frac{16f(t)^2 Reg_u(T, \pi)}{|\Delta_u|}} \right].$$

Proof. First, we define distribution D as if $X \sim D(a, b)$ then $X = 0$ with probability $\frac{a}{a+b}$ and $X = r$ with probability $\frac{b}{a+b}$. Then we construct MNL model instance $v = (v_1, v_2)$ and two MNL-bandit instance $\varphi_1 = (D(v_0, v_1), D(v_0, v_2))$ and $\varphi_2 = (D(v_0, v_1), D(v_0, v_2 - 2f(t)))$. Without loss of generality we can assume $v_1 \geq v_2$ and $v_2 - 2f(t) \geq \frac{1}{8}$. Then we have $\Delta_{\varphi_1} = v_1 - v_2$ and $\Delta_{\varphi_2} = v_1 - v_2 + 2f(t)$.

We define the minimum distance test $\psi(\hat{\Delta}_v)$ that is associated to $\hat{\Delta}_v$ by

$$\psi(\hat{\Delta}_v) = \arg \min_{i=1,2} |\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_{\varphi_i}|.$$

If $\psi(\hat{\Delta}_v) = 1$, we know that $|\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_{\varphi_1}| \leq |\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_{\varphi_2}|$. By the triangle inequality, we can have, if $\psi(\hat{\Delta}_v) = 1$,

$$|\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_{\varphi_2}| \geq |\Delta_{\varphi_1} - \Delta_{\varphi_2}| - |\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_{\varphi_1}| \geq |\Delta_{\varphi_1} - \Delta_{\varphi_2}| - |\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_{\varphi_2}|,$$

which yields that

$$|\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_{\varphi_2}| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\Delta_{\varphi_1} - \Delta_{\varphi_2}| = f(t).$$

Symmetrically, if $\psi(\hat{\Delta}_v) = 2$, we can have

$$|\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_{\varphi_1}| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\Delta_{\varphi_1} - \Delta_{\varphi_2}| = f(t).$$

Therefore, we can use this to show

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\hat{\Delta}_v} \max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \mathbb{P}_\varphi \left(|\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_\varphi| \geq f(t) \right) &\geq \inf_{\hat{\Delta}_v} \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \mathbb{P}_{\varphi_i} \left(|\hat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_{\varphi_i}| \geq f(t) \right) \\ &\geq \inf_{\hat{\Delta}_v} \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \mathbb{P}_{\varphi_i} \left(\psi(\hat{\Delta}_v) \neq i \right) \\ &\geq \inf_{\psi} \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \mathbb{P}_{\varphi_i} (\psi \neq i). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the last infimum is taken over all tests ψ based on \mathcal{H}_t that take values in $\{1, 2\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \inf_{\widehat{\Delta}_v} \max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \mathbb{P}_\varphi \left(|\widehat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_\varphi| \geq f(t) \right) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\psi} (\mathbb{P}_{\varphi_1}(\psi = 2) + \mathbb{P}_{\varphi_2}(\psi = 1)) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} [1 - \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{\varphi_1}, \mathbb{P}_{\varphi_2})] \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_{\varphi_1}, \mathbb{P}_{\varphi_2})} \right] \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \sqrt{\frac{16f(t)^2}{\Delta_{\varphi_1}} \text{Reg}_{\varphi_1}(T, \pi)} \right]. \tag{3}
 \end{aligned}$$

where the equality holds due to Neyman-Pearson lemma and the second inequality holds due to Pinsker's inequality, and the third inequality holds due to the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_{\varphi_1}, \mathbb{P}_{\varphi_2}) &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\varphi_1} [\text{KL}(P_{1,A_t}, P_{2,A_t})] \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbb{E}_{\varphi_1} [T_i(T)] \text{KL}(P_{1,i}, P_{2,i}) \\
 &= \text{KL}(D(v_0, v_2), D(v_0, v_2 - 2f(t))) (\mathbb{E}_{\varphi_1} [T_2(T)]) \\
 &\leq \frac{32(f(t))^2}{\Delta_{\varphi_1}} \text{Reg}_{\varphi_1}(T, \pi). \tag{4}
 \end{aligned}$$

where we use

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{KL}(D(v_0, v_2), D(v_0, v_2 - 2f(t))) &= \frac{1}{1+v_2} \cdot \log \frac{\frac{1}{1+v_2}}{\frac{1}{1+v_2-2f(t)}} + \frac{v_2}{1+v_2} \cdot \log \frac{\frac{v_2}{1+v_2}}{\frac{v_2-2f(t)}{1+v_2-2f(t)}} \\
 &= \frac{1}{1+v_2} \cdot \log \frac{1+v_2-2f(t)}{1+v_2} + \frac{v_2}{1+v_2} \cdot \log \left(\frac{1+v_2-2f(t)}{1+v_2} \cdot \frac{v_2}{v_2-2f(t)} \right) \\
 &= \log \frac{1+v_2-2f(t)}{1+v_2} + \frac{v_2}{1+v_2} \cdot \log \frac{v_2}{v_2-2f(t)} \\
 &= \log \left(1 - \frac{2f(t)}{1+v_2} \right) + \frac{v_2}{1+v_2} \cdot \log \left(1 + \frac{2f(t)}{v_2-2f(t)} \right) \\
 &\leq \frac{-2f(t)}{1+v_2} + \frac{v_2}{1+v_2} \cdot \frac{2f(t)}{v_2-2f(t)} \\
 &= \frac{4f^2(t)}{(1+v_2)(v_2-2f(t))} \\
 &\leq \frac{4f^2(t)}{v_2-2f(t)} \leq 32f^2(t). \tag{5}
 \end{aligned}$$

and the last inequality holds because the history \mathcal{H}_t is generated by π and $\Delta_{\varphi_1} \mathbb{E}_{\varphi_1} [T_2(T)]$ is just the expected regret of φ_1 , which is just the definition of regret. Thus we finish our proof. \square

Theorem A.2. *When $N = 2$, for any admissible pair $(\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v)$, there always exists a hard instance $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0$ such that $e_\varphi(T, \widehat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{\text{Reg}_\varphi(T, \pi)}$ is no less than a constant order, i.e.,*

$$\inf_{(\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v)} \max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[e_\varphi(T, \widehat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{\text{Reg}_\varphi(T, \pi)} \right] = \Omega(1).$$

Proof. Based on Lemma A.1, given policy π , and $\widehat{\Delta}_n$, if $f(T) \leq \sqrt{\frac{|\Delta_u|}{64\text{Reg}_u(T, \pi)}}$ for some $u \in \mathcal{E}_0$,

$$\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \mathbb{E} \left[|\widehat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_\varphi| \right] \geq f(T) \max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \mathbb{P}_\varphi \left(|\widehat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_\varphi|_2 \geq f(T) \right) \geq \frac{f(T)}{2} \left[1 - \sqrt{\frac{16f(T)^2}{\Delta_u} \text{Reg}_u(T, \pi)} \right] \geq \frac{f(T)}{4},$$

where the second inequality holds due to Lemma 1. We use $\varphi_{\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v}$ to denote $\arg \max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \mathbb{E} \left[|\widehat{\Delta}_v - \Delta_\varphi| \right]$ given policy π and $\widehat{\Delta}_v$, and thus $e_{\varphi_{\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v}}(T, \widehat{\Delta}_v) \geq \frac{f(T)}{4}$. After taking $f(T) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Delta_{\varphi_{\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v}}|}{64\text{Reg}_{\varphi_{\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v}}(T, \pi)}}$, we retrieve for any given policy π and $\widehat{\Delta}_v$,

$$\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[e_\varphi(T, \widehat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{\text{Reg}_\varphi(T, \pi)} \right] \geq e_{\varphi_{\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v}}(T, \widehat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{\text{Reg}_{\varphi_{\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v}}(T, \pi)} \geq \frac{f(T)}{4} \sqrt{\text{Reg}_{\varphi_{\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v}}(T, \pi)} = \Theta(1),$$

where the last equation holds because we plug in $f(T)$ and $\Delta_\varphi = \Theta(1)$ for $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0$. Since the above inequalities hold for any policy π and $\widehat{\Delta}_v$, we finish the proof. \square

Theorem A.3. *When $N = 2$, an admissible pair $(\pi, \widehat{\Delta}_v)$ is Pareto optimal if it satisfies*

$$\max_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left[e_\varphi(T, \widehat{\Delta}_v) \sqrt{\text{Reg}_\varphi(T, \pi)} \right] = \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}(1).$$

Proof. We conduct proof by contradiction. Assume that $(\pi_0, \widehat{\Delta}_0)$ satisfies the above equality, but is not Pareto optimal. This means that there exists a $(\pi_1, \widehat{\Delta}_1)$ that Pareto dominates $(\pi_0, \widehat{\Delta}_0)$. The lower bound in Theorem A.2 guarantees that there must be a point at the front of $(\pi_1, \widehat{\Delta}_1)$, denoted by

$$(e_{\varphi_1}(T, \widehat{\Delta}_1), \text{Reg}_{\varphi_1}(T, \pi_1))$$

satisfying

$$e_{\varphi_1}(T, \widehat{\Delta}_1) \sqrt{\text{Reg}_{\varphi_1}(T, \pi_1)} = \Omega(1).$$

By the definition of Pareto dominance, there exists

$$(e_{\varphi_2}(T, \widehat{\Delta}_0), \text{Reg}_{\varphi_2}(T, \pi_0)) \in \mathcal{F}(\pi_0, \widehat{\Delta}_0)$$

such that

$$e_{\varphi_2}(T, \widehat{\Delta}_0) \sqrt{\text{Reg}_{\varphi_2}(T, \pi_0)} > e_{\varphi_1}(T, \widehat{\Delta}_1) \sqrt{\text{Reg}_{\varphi_1}(T, \pi_1)} = \Omega(1).$$

Note that, as we have mentioned, the strict inequality in the above inequality is in the term of the dependence of n . It means that

$$(e_{\varphi_2}(T, \widehat{\Delta}_0), \text{Reg}_{\varphi_2}(T, \pi_0)) = \Omega(n^p)$$

for some strictly positive $p > 0$, which contradicts with our assumption. \square

B. Analysis of Algorithm 1

B.1. Regret Analysis

Lemma B.1. *(Agrawal et al., 2019) The moment generating function of the estimate conditioned on $\mathcal{S}_\ell, \widehat{v}_i$, is given by:*

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \left(e^{\theta \widehat{v}_{i, \ell}} \right) = \frac{1}{1 - v_i(e^\theta - 1)}, \quad \text{for all } \theta \leq \ln \frac{1 + v_i}{v_i}, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Proof. we have that the probability of a no-purchase event when assortment S_ℓ is offered is given by

$$p_0(S_\ell) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j \in S_\ell} v_j}.$$

Let n_ℓ be the total number of offerings in epoch ℓ before a no-purchase occurred (i.e., $n_\ell = |\mathcal{E}_\ell| - 1$). Therefore, n_ℓ is a geometric random variable with probability of success $p_0(S_\ell)$. And given any fixed value of n_ℓ , $\phi_{i,\ell}$ is a binomial random variable with n_ℓ trials and a probability of success given by

$$q_i(S_\ell) = \frac{v_i}{\sum_{j \in S_\ell} v_j}.$$

In the calculations below, for brevity, we use p_0 and q_i to denote $p_0(S_\ell)$ and $q_i(S_\ell)$, respectively. Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi [e^{\theta \phi_{i,\ell}}] = \mathbb{E}_{n_\ell} [\mathbb{E}_\pi [e^{\theta \phi_{i,\ell}} \mid n_\ell]]. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Because the moment-generating function for a binomial random variable with parameters n, p is $(pe^\theta + 1 - p)^n$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi [e^{\theta \phi_{i,\ell}} \mid n_\ell] = \mathbb{E}_{n_\ell} \left\{ (q_i e^\theta + 1 - q_i)^{n_\ell} \right\}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

For any α , such that $\alpha(1 - p) < 1$, if n is a geometric random variable with parameter p , then we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\alpha^n] = \frac{p}{1 - \alpha(1 - p)}.$$

Because n_ℓ is a geometric random variable with parameter p_0 , and by the definition of q_i and p_0 , we have $q_i(1 - p_0) = v_i p_0$, it follows that for any $\theta < \log 1 + v_i/v_i$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{n_\ell} \left\{ (q_i e^\theta + 1 - q_i)^{n_\ell} \right\} = \frac{p_0}{1 - (q_i e^\theta + 1 - q_i)(1 - p_0)} = \frac{1}{1 - v_i(e^\theta - 1)}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

□

Then we can derive the following corollary from Lemma B.1.

Corollary B.2 (Unbiased Estimates). *We have the following results:*

(1) *The estimates $\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}$, $\ell \leq L$, are i.i.d. geometrical random variables with parameter $\frac{1}{1+v_i}$. Thus:*

$$\Pr(\widehat{v}_{i,\ell} = m) = \frac{1}{1 + v_i} \left(\frac{v_i}{1 + v_i} \right)^m, \quad \forall m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

(2) *$\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}$ and $\bar{v}_{i,\ell}$ are both unbiased estimates of V_i for all i, t .*

Lemma B.3. (Agrawal et al., 2019) *If $v_i \leq v_0$ for all i , then for every epoch ℓ , according to our algorithm:*

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & \Pr \left(|\bar{v}_{i,\ell} - v_i| > \sqrt{\frac{48 \bar{v}_{i,\ell} \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} \right) \leq \frac{6}{N\ell}, \\ (2) \quad & \Pr \left(|\widehat{v}_{i,\ell} - v_i| > \sqrt{\frac{24 v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} \right) \leq \frac{4}{N\ell}, \\ (3) \quad & \Pr \left(\bar{v}_{i,\ell} \geq \frac{3}{2} v_i + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \leq \frac{3}{N\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem B.4. (Agrawal et al., 2019) For every $\ell = 1, \dots, L$:

(1) $v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} \geq v_i$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{6}{N\ell}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$.

(2) There exists constant C_1, C_2 such that:

$$v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_i \leq C_1 \sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{7}{N\ell}$.

Proof. By the design of Algorithm 1, we have

$$v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} = \bar{v}_{i,\ell} + \sqrt{\frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Therefore, from Lemma B.3, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi(v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} < v_i) \leq \frac{6}{N\ell'}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

The first inequality in Theorem B.4 follows from (B.5). From the triangle inequality and (B.4), we have

$$|v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_i| \leq |v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - \bar{v}_{i,\ell}| + |\bar{v}_{i,\ell} - v_i|.$$

Thus,

$$|v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_i| \leq \sqrt{\frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} + |\bar{v}_{i,\ell} - v_i|. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

From Lemma B.3, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(|\bar{v}_{i,\ell} - v_i| > \frac{3\sigma_i^2}{T_i(\ell)} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \leq \frac{3}{N\ell'},$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(\sqrt{\frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} > \sqrt{\frac{72\sigma_i^2 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{(48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1))}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \leq \frac{3}{N\ell'}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Using the fact that $\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b} < \sqrt{a+b}$, for any positive numbers a, b , we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(\sqrt{\frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} > \sqrt{\frac{72\sigma_i^2 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{96 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \leq \frac{3}{N\ell'}.$$

From Lemma B.3, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(|\bar{v}_{i,\ell} - v_i| > \sqrt{\frac{24\sigma_i^2 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} \right) \leq \frac{4}{N\ell'}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

From (B.6), and applying the union bound on (B.7) and (B.8), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(|v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_i| > \sqrt{\frac{(72 + 24)\sigma_i^2 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{144 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \leq \frac{7}{N\ell'}.$$

Theorem B.4 follows from the above inequality and (B.5). □

Lemma B.5. (Agrawal et al., 2019) Assume $0 \leq w_i \leq v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Suppose S is the optimal assortment when the MNL parameters are given by \mathbf{w} . Then:

$$R(S, \mathbf{v}^{\text{UCB}}) \geq R(S, \mathbf{w}).$$

Proof. We prove the result by first showing that for any $j \in S$, we have $R(S, \mathbf{w}^j) \geq R(S, \mathbf{w})$, where \mathbf{w}^j is vector \mathbf{w} with the j^{th} component increased to v_j^{UCB} (i.e., $w_i^j = w_i$ for all $i \neq j$ and $w_j^j = v_j^{\text{UCB}}$). We can use this result iteratively to argue that increasing each parameter of MNL to the highest possible value increases the value of $R(S, \mathbf{w})$ to complete the proof.

If there exists $j \in S$ such that $r_j < R(S)$, then removing the product j from assortment S yields a higher expected revenue, contradicting the optimality of S . Therefore, we have

$$r_j \geq R(S), \quad \forall j \in S.$$

Multiplying by $(v_j^{\text{UCB}} - w_j)(\sum_{i \in S \setminus j} w_i + 1)$ on both sides of the above inequality and rearranging terms, we can show that

$$R(S, \mathbf{w}^j) \geq R(S, \mathbf{w}).$$

□

Theorem B.6. (Agrawal et al., 2019) Suppose $S^* \in \mathcal{S}$ is the assortment with the highest expected revenue, and our algorithm offers $S_\ell = \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{R}_\ell(S)$ in epoch ℓ . Then, for epoch ℓ , we have:

$$\tilde{R}_\ell(S_\ell) \geq \tilde{R}_\ell(S^*) \geq R(S^*, \mathbf{v})$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{6}{\ell}$.

Proof. Let \hat{S}, \mathbf{w}^* be maximizer of the optimization problem

$$\max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \max_{0 \leq \mathbf{w} \leq \mathbf{v}_t^{\text{UCB}}} R(S, \mathbf{w}).$$

Assume $v_{i,t}^{\text{UCB}} \geq v_i$ for all i . Then from Lemma B.5 it follows that

$$\hat{R}_\ell(S_\ell) = \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} R(S, \mathbf{v}_t^{\text{UCB}}) \geq \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \max_{0 \leq \mathbf{w} \leq \mathbf{v}_t^{\text{UCB}}} R(S, \mathbf{w}) \geq R(S, \mathbf{v}). \tag{B.9}$$

From Lemma B.4, for each ℓ and $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi(v_{i,t}^{\text{UCB}} < v_i) \leq \frac{6}{N\ell'}.$$

Hence, from the union bound, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^N \{v_{i,t}^{\text{UCB}} < v_i\} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{6}{\ell'}. \tag{B.10}$$

Lemma B.6 follows from (B.9) and (B.10). □

Lemma B.7. (Agrawal et al., 2019) If $r_i \in [0, 1]$ and $0 \leq v_i \leq v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}}$ for all $i \in S_\ell$, then:

$$\tilde{R}_\ell(S_\ell) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v}) \leq \frac{\sum_{i \in S_\ell} (v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_i)}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i}.$$

Proof. Because $1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} \geq 1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_\ell(S_\ell) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v}) &\leq \frac{\sum_{i \in S_\ell} r_i v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}}}{1 + \sum_{j \in S_\ell} v_{j,\ell}^{\text{UCB}}} - \frac{\sum_{i \in S_\ell} r_i v_i}{1 + \sum_{j \in S_\ell} v_j} \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \frac{(v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_i)}{1 + \sum_{j \in S_\ell} v_{j,\ell}^{\text{UCB}}} \leq \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \frac{(v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_i)}{1 + \sum_{j \in S_\ell} v_j}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem B.8. (Agrawal et al., 2019) If $r_i \in [0, 1]$, there exist constants C_1 and C_2 such that for every $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, we have:

$$\left(1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i\right) \left(\tilde{R}_\ell(S_\ell) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})\right) \leq \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \left(C_1 \sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right),$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{13}{\ell}$.

Proof. From Lemma B.7, we have

$$\left(1 + \sum_{j \in S_\ell} v_j\right) \left(\hat{R}_\ell(S_\ell) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})\right) \leq \sum_{j \in S_\ell} (v_{j,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_j). \quad (\text{B.11})$$

From Lemma B.3, we have that, for each $i = 1, \dots, N$ and ℓ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_i > C_1 \sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \leq \frac{7}{N\ell}.$$

Therefore, from the union bound, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^N \left\{ v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} - v_i < C_1 \sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right\} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{7}{\ell}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Theorem B.8 follows from (B.11) and (B.12). □

Theorem B.9. For any instance $\mathbf{v} = (v_0, \dots, v_N)$ of the MNL-Bandit problem with N items, $r_i \in [0, 1]$, and given the problem assumptions, let Algorithm 1 run with $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ the regret at any time T is $O(\sqrt{NT \log NT} + N \log^2 NT + NT^{1-\alpha})$.

Proof. Now, we can put the lemmas together to analyze the regret:

$$\text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^L |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \cdot [R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})] \right\}.$$

The probability of a no-purchase conditioned on S_ℓ is given by:

$$P_0(S_\ell) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i}.$$

So,

$$\mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{E}_\ell| \mid S_\ell) = 1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i = 1 + V(S_\ell), \quad \text{where we define } V(S) := \sum_{i \in S} v_i.$$

Thus, by the formula of full probability, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}) &= \mathbb{E}_\pi \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}_\ell| \cdot [R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})] \mid S_\ell] \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^L (1 + V(S_\ell)) [R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Then define ΔR_ℓ as:

$$\Delta R_\ell = (1 + V(S_\ell)) [R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})], \quad \text{for each } \ell = 1, \dots, L.$$

Define bad event:

$$A_\ell = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \left\{ v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} < v_i \text{ or } v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB}} > v_i + C_1 \sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right\}.$$

Then according to Theorem B.4 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} P(A_\ell) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\Pr(v_i^{\text{UCB}} < v_i) + \Pr\left(v_i^{\text{UCB}} > v_i + C_1 \sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}\right) \right] \\ &\leq N \cdot \left(\frac{6}{N\ell} + \frac{7}{N\ell} \right) = \frac{13}{\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Define event B_ℓ as:

$$B_\ell = \left\{ S_\ell = \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{R}_\ell(S) \right\}, \quad \text{then we can easily have } \Pr(B_\ell^c) = \frac{1}{2 \cdot \ell^\alpha}.$$

Because both A_ℓ and B_ℓ^c are 'low-probability' events, we can break down the regret in one epoch as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi(\Delta R_\ell) &= \mathbb{E}_\pi(\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbf{1}(A_\ell)) + \mathbb{E}_\pi(\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbf{1}(A_\ell^c)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi(\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbf{1}(A_\ell)) + \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbf{1}(A_\ell^c) \cdot \mathbf{1}(B_\ell^c)] + \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbf{1}(A_\ell^c) \cdot \mathbf{1}(B_\ell)]. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Using the fact that $R(S^*, \mathbf{v})$ and $R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})$ are both bounded by 1 and $V(S_\ell) \leq N$, we have $\Delta R_\ell \leq N + 1$. Substituting the preceding inequality in the above equation, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi(\Delta R_\ell) \leq (N + 1) [P(A_\ell) + \Pr(B_\ell^c)] + \mathbb{E}_\pi(\Delta R_\ell \mid A_\ell^c, B_\ell) \cdot \Pr(B_\ell).$$

By Theorem B.6, when event A_ℓ^c and B_ℓ happens at the same time, we have $\tilde{R}_\ell(S_\ell) \geq \tilde{R}_\ell(S^*) \geq R(S^*, \mathbf{v})$, which implies that

$$\Delta R_\ell = (1 + V(S_\ell)) [R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})] \leq (1 + V(S_\ell)) [\tilde{R}_\ell(S_\ell) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})].$$

By Theorem B.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi(\Delta R_\ell \mid A_\ell^c, B_\ell) &\leq \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[(1 + V(S_\ell)) \left[\tilde{R}_\ell(S_\ell) - R(S_\ell, v) \right] \mid A_\ell^c, B_\ell \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{i \in S_\ell} \left(C_1 \sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi(\Delta R_\ell) \leq (N + 1) [P(A_\ell) + \Pr(B_\ell^c)] + C \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right].$$

where $C = \max(C_1, C_2)$. And it follows that

$$\text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}) \leq \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^L \left((N + 1) [P(A_\ell) + \Pr(B_\ell^c)] + C \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \left(\sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \right) \right].$$

Therefore, from the probability we have derived above:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}) &\leq C \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^L \left((N + 1) \left(\frac{1}{\ell} + \frac{1}{\ell^\alpha} \right) + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \left(\sqrt{\frac{v_i \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} CN \left(\log T + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\ell^\alpha} \right) + CN \log^2 \sqrt{NT} + C \mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{v_i T_i \log \sqrt{NT}} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} CN \left(\log T + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\ell^\alpha} \right) + CN \log^2 NT + C \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{v_i \log(NT) \mathbb{E}_\pi(T_i)} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} CN \left[\log T + \left(1 + \frac{T^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\alpha \neq 1)} + \log T \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\alpha=1)} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + CN \log^2 NT + C \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{v_i \log(NT) \mathbb{E}_\pi(T_i)}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Inequality (a) follows from the observation that $L \leq T$, $T_i \leq T$,

$$\sum_{T_i(\ell)=1}^{T_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_i(\ell)}} \leq \sqrt{T_i}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{T_i(\ell)=1}^{T_i} \frac{1}{T_i(\ell)} \leq \log T_i.$$

Inequality (b) follows from Jensen's inequality.

Whereas inequality (c) follows from

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\ell^\alpha} \leq 1 + \int_1^L \frac{1}{x^\alpha} dx$$

For any realization of $L, \mathcal{E}_\ell, T_i, S_\ell$, we have the following relation:

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L n_\ell \leq T.$$

Hence, we have $\mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L n_\ell \right) \leq T$. Let \mathcal{F} denote the filtration corresponding to the offered assortments S_1, \dots, S_L ;

then by the law of total expectation, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L n_\ell \right) &= \mathbb{E}_\pi (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}}(n_\ell)) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L 1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi \left(L + \sum_{i=1}^n v_i T_i \right) = \mathbb{E}_\pi(L) + \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \mathbb{E}_\pi(T_i).\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

Therefore, it follows that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N v_i \mathbb{E}_\pi(T_i) \leq T.$$

To get the worst-case upper bound, we maximize the bound subject to the above condition. Thus we have

$$\text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}) \leq CN \left[\log T + \left(1 + \frac{T^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\alpha \neq 1)} + \log T \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\alpha=1)} \right) \right] + CN \log^2 NT + C\sqrt{NT \log NT}.$$

Since we set $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Reg}_\pi(T, \mathbf{v}) &= O \left(\sqrt{NT \log NT} + N \log^2 NT + NT^{1-\alpha} \right) \\ &= \tilde{O} \left(T^{(1-\alpha)\vee \frac{1}{2}} \right).\end{aligned}$$

□

B.2. Inference Error of Attraction Parameter

Now, let's focus on the estimation error of attraction parameters, i.e.

$$e_\varphi(T, v_i) = \mathbb{E}_\pi [|\hat{v}_i - v_i|],$$

where φ is a MNL-Bandit instance and $i, j \in [N]$.

First, define $\text{SumV}_\ell(i) := \ell \cdot v_i$. Then we propose an IPW estimator of $\text{SumV}_\ell(i)$:

$$\text{Sum}\widehat{V}_\ell(i) = \text{Sum}\widehat{V}_{\ell-1}(i) + \frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell) = \begin{cases} \text{Sum}\widehat{V}_{\ell-1}(i), & \text{if } i \notin S_\ell, \\ \text{Sum}\widehat{V}_{\ell-1}(i) + \frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\text{Sum}\widehat{V}_0(i) = 0$ for all $i \in [N]$ and $\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}$ is the estimation of v_i in epoch ℓ that we have defined above. Then we can compute:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\pi [\text{Sum}\widehat{V}_\ell(i)] &= \mathbb{E}_\pi [\text{Sum}\widehat{V}_{\ell-1}(i)] + \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \right] \cdot P(i \in S_\ell) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi [\text{Sum}\widehat{V}_{\ell-1}(i)] + \mathbb{E}_\pi [\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi [\text{Sum}\widehat{V}_{\ell-1}(i)] + v_i.\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

So we can easily derive

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi [\text{Sum}\widehat{V}_\ell(i)] = \ell \cdot v_i.$$

which means that $\frac{\text{Sum}\widehat{V}_\ell(i)}{\ell}$ is an unbiased estimator of v_i .

Define:

$$M_\ell^i = \text{Sum}\widehat{V}_\ell(i) - \ell \cdot v_i$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} [M_{\ell+1}^i | \mathcal{H}_\ell] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Sum} \widehat{V}_{\ell+1}(i) - (\ell + 1) \cdot v_i \mid \mathcal{H}_\ell \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Sum} \widehat{V}_\ell(i) - \ell \cdot v_i + \frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell) - v_i \mid \mathcal{H}_\ell \right] \\
 &= M_\ell^i + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell) \mid \mathcal{H}_\ell \right] - v_i = M_\ell^i.
 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

So, M_ℓ^i is a martingale. And $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{M_\ell^i}{\ell} \right] = \mathbb{E} [\widehat{v}_i - v_i]$ is the estimation error of v_i .

$$\begin{aligned}
 |M_\ell^i - M_{\ell-1}^i| &= \left| \left(\text{Sum} \widehat{V}_\ell(i) - \ell \cdot v_i \right) - \left(\text{Sum} \widehat{V}_{\ell-1}(i) - (\ell - 1) \cdot v_i \right) \right| \\
 &= \left| \frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell) - v_i \right|.
 \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Then the variance of M_L^i can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Var} [M_L^i] &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell) - v_i \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{H}_{\ell-1} \right] \\
 &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell) \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{H}_{\ell-1} \right] - L \cdot v_i^2 \\
 &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\widehat{v}_{i,\ell})^2}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \mid i \in S_\ell, \mathcal{H}_{\ell-1} \right] - L \cdot v_i^2 \\
 &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\widehat{v}_{i,\ell})^2}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \mid i \in S_\ell, \mathcal{H}_{\ell-1} \right] \\
 &\stackrel{(e)}{\leq} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{3}{P(i \in S_\ell)} \stackrel{(f)}{\leq} 6 \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^L \ell^\alpha \stackrel{(g)}{\leq} 6 \cdot \frac{(L+1)^{\alpha+1} - 1}{\alpha + 1}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where inequality (e) follows that $\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}$ is a geometric random variable with parameter $p_i := \frac{1}{1+v_i}$ which implies:

$$\mathbb{E} [(\widehat{v}_{i,\ell})^2] = \mathbb{E} [\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}]^2 + \text{Var} [\widehat{v}_{i,\ell}] = v_i^2 + \frac{1-p_i}{p_i^2} = v_i + 2v_i^2 \leq 3$$

inequality (f) follows that:

$$P(i \in S_\ell) \geq \min\{\alpha_\ell, 1 - \alpha_\ell\} = \alpha_\ell = \frac{1}{2 \cdot \ell^\alpha}$$

and inequality (g) follows that:

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L \ell^\alpha \leq \int_1^{L+1} x^\alpha dx = \frac{(L+1)^{\alpha+1} - 1}{\alpha + 1}$$

Then to apply Bernstein's Inequality, we further note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Var} [M_L^i] &\leq 6 \cdot \frac{(L+1)^{\alpha+1} - 1}{\alpha + 1} \\
 &\leq 6 \cdot \frac{(L+1)^{\alpha+1} - 1}{\alpha + 1} \vee \left[\frac{9(L+1)^{\alpha+1}}{e-2} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right) \right] \\
 &\leq \frac{9(L+1)^{\alpha+1}}{e-2} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Therefore, by Bernstein's Inequality, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$|M_L^i| \leq 6\ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)\sqrt{(L+1)^{\alpha+1}}$$

both sides divided by L we have:

$$\frac{|M_L^i|}{L} \leq 6\ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \cdot \frac{L+1}{L} \sqrt{\frac{1}{(L+1)^{1-\alpha}}} \leq 12\ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{(L+1)^{1-\alpha}}}$$

taking $\delta = \frac{1}{L^2}$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[|\hat{v}_i - v_i|] = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{(L+1)^{1-\alpha}}}\right)$$

According to the algorithm, L is defined as the total number of epochs within time T , i.e. L is the minimum number for which $\sum_{\ell=1}^{L+1} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \geq T$, so $\mathbb{E}_\pi\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{L+1} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \mid L\right) = (L+1) \cdot \mathbb{E}_\pi(|\mathcal{E}_\ell|) \geq T$, which follows that $\frac{T}{L+1} \leq \mathbb{E}_\pi(|\mathcal{E}_\ell|) = 1 + \sum_{i \in S_\ell} v_i \leq 1 + N$. So

$$e_\varphi(T, v_i) = \mathbb{E}[|\hat{v}_i - v_i|] = O\left(\sqrt{T^{\alpha-1}}\right).$$

B.3. Inference Error of Expected Revenue

Here we use the estimates of attraction parameters to estimate the expected revenue. And the estimation error is defined as:

$$e_\varphi(T, R(S_\tau)) = \mathbb{E}\left[|\hat{R}(S_\tau) - R(S_\tau)|\right]$$

where φ is a MNL-Bandit instance and $\tau \in [|\mathcal{S}|]$.

$$\hat{R}(S_\tau) - R(S_\tau) = \frac{\sum_{i \in S_\tau} r_i \hat{v}_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_\tau} \hat{v}_i} - \frac{\sum_{i \in S_\tau} r_i v_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_\tau} v_i}$$

Define:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_\tau &= \sum_{i \in S_\tau} r_i \hat{v}_i, & A_\tau &= \sum_{i \in S_\tau} r_i v_i \\ \hat{B}_\tau &= 1 + \sum_{i \in S_\tau} \hat{v}_i, & B_\tau &= 1 + \sum_{i \in S_\tau} v_i \end{aligned}$$

then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}(S_\tau) - R(S_\tau) &= \left| \frac{\hat{A}_\tau}{\hat{B}_\tau} - \frac{A_\tau}{B_\tau} \right| = \left| \frac{B_\tau \hat{A}_\tau - \hat{B}_\tau A_\tau}{\hat{B}_\tau B_\tau} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{|B_\tau \hat{A}_\tau - B_\tau A_\tau| + |B_\tau A_\tau - \hat{B}_\tau A_\tau|}{|\hat{B}_\tau B_\tau|} \\ &= \frac{|B_\tau| \cdot |\hat{A}_\tau - A_\tau| + |A_\tau| \cdot |\hat{B}_\tau - B_\tau|}{|\hat{B}_\tau B_\tau|} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{A}_\tau - A_\tau| &= \left| \sum_{i \in S_\tau} r_i (\hat{v}_i - v_i) \right| \leq \sum_{i \in S_\tau} |\hat{v}_i - v_i|, \\ |\hat{B}_\tau - B_\tau| &= \left| \sum_{i \in S_\tau} (\hat{v}_i - v_i) \right| \leq \sum_{i \in S_\tau} |\hat{v}_i - v_i|, \\ |A_\tau| &= \left| \sum_{i \in S_\tau} r_i v_i \right| \leq N, \quad |B_\tau| = \left| 1 + \sum_{i \in S_\tau} v_i \right| \leq N + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 2 UCB for MNL-Bandit Experiment with General Parameters

- 1: **Input:** Collection of assortments \mathcal{S} , total time steps T , and exploration parameter $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.
 - 2: **Initialization:** $v_{i,0}^{UCB2} = 1, \widehat{\text{SumV}}_0(i) = 0, \forall i \in [N]$;
 - 3: $t = 1, \ell = 1$ keeps track of time steps and total epochs respectively and $\alpha_\ell = \frac{1}{2\ell^\alpha}$
 - 4: **while** $t < T$ **do**
 - 5: Compute $S_\ell^* := \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \widetilde{R}_\ell(S)$,
- $$S_\ell = \begin{cases} S_\ell^*, & \text{w.p. } 1 - \alpha_\ell, \\ (S_\ell^*)^c, & \text{w.p. } \alpha_\ell, \end{cases}$$
- where $(S_\ell^*)^c$ is the collection of items not in S_ℓ^* .
- 6: **if** $T_i(\ell) < 48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)$ for some $i \in S_\ell$ **then**
 - 7: Define $\widehat{S} = \{i \mid T_i(\ell) < 48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)\}$.
 - 8: Choose $S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $S_\ell \subset \widehat{S}$.
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: Offer S_ℓ and observe customer decision c_t .
 - 11: $\mathcal{E}_\ell \leftarrow \mathcal{E}_\ell \cup \{t\}$ keeps track of time steps in epoch ℓ ;
 - 12: **if** $c_t = 0$ **then**
 - 13: compute $\widehat{v}_{i,\ell} = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{E}_\ell} \mathbf{1}(c_t = i)$, the number of consumers who chose i in epoch ℓ ;
 - 14: update $\mathcal{T}_i(\ell) = \{\tau \leq \ell \mid i \in S_\tau\}, T_i(\ell) = |\mathcal{T}_i(\ell)|$, the number of epochs until ℓ that offered item i ;
 - 15: update $\bar{v}_{i,\ell} = (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_i(\ell)} \widehat{v}_{i,\tau}) / T_i(\ell)$, the sample mean of estimates;
 - 16: $\widehat{\text{SumV}}_\ell(i) = \widehat{\text{SumV}}_{\ell-1}(i) + \frac{\widehat{v}_{i,\ell} \cdot \mathbf{1}(i \in S_\ell)}{P(i \in S_\ell)}$;
 - 17: update $v_{i,\ell}^{UCB2} = \bar{v}_{i,\ell} + \max\{\sqrt{\bar{v}_{i,\ell}}, \bar{v}_{i,\ell}\} \sqrt{\frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}}, \ell = \ell + 1$
 - 18: **end if**
 - 19: $t \leftarrow t + 1$
 - 20: **end while**
 - 21: **Return:** $\widehat{v}_i = \frac{\widehat{\text{SumV}}_L(i)}{L}, \widehat{R}(S_{\tau_i}) = \frac{\sum_{i \in S_{\tau_i}} r_i \widehat{v}_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_{\tau_i}} \widehat{v}_i}$.
-

$$|\widehat{B}_\tau B_\tau| = |(1 + \sum_{i \in S_\tau} \widehat{v}_i)(1 + \sum_{i \in S_\tau} v_i)| \geq 1,$$

then we have:

$$|\widehat{R}(S_\tau) - R(S_\tau)| \leq (2N + 1) \sum_{i \in S_\tau} |\widehat{v}_i - v_i| \leq N(2N + 1) |\widehat{v}_i - v_i|$$

Since we have already proved $\mathbb{E}[|\widehat{v}_i - v_i|] = O(\sqrt{T^{\alpha-1}})$, thus

$$\mathbb{E}[|\widehat{R}(S_\tau) - R(S_\tau)|] \leq (2N^2 + N) \mathbb{E}[|\widehat{v}_i - v_i|] = O(\sqrt{T^{\alpha-1}})$$

C. Relaxing the No-Purchasing Assumption

In this section, we release the assumption $v_i \leq v_0, \forall i \in [N]$. We provide an algorithm based on Algorithm 1 for this setting to achieve Pareto optimality and give rigorous proof of the regret upper bound. We first prove the initial exploratory phase is bounded.

Lemma C.1. *Let L be the total number of epochs in our Algorithm, and let \mathcal{E}_ℓ denote the set of time steps in the exploratory epochs:*

$$E_L = \{\ell \mid \exists i \in S_\ell \text{ such that } T_i(\ell) < 48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)\},$$

where $T_i(\ell)$ is the number of epochs item i has been offered before epoch ℓ . If \mathcal{S}_{E_L} denote the time steps corresponding to

epoch ℓ and $v_i \leq Bv_0$ for all i for some $B \geq 1$, then we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\sum_{\ell \in E_L} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \right) < 49NB \log NT,$$

where the expectation is over all possible outcomes of the algorithm.

Proof. Consider $\ell \in E_L$, $|\mathcal{E}_\ell|$ is a geometric random variable with parameter $\frac{v_0}{V(S_\ell) + v_0}$.

Since $v_i \leq Bv_0$ for all i , we can assume W.L.O.G that $v_0 = 1$, and thus $|\mathcal{E}_\ell|$ is a geometric random variable with parameter $p \geq \frac{v_0}{B|S_\ell| + v_0} = \frac{1}{B|S_\ell| + 1}$.

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}_\ell (|\mathcal{E}_\ell| \mid S_\ell) \leq B|S_\ell| + 1 \tag{1}$$

According to our algorithm setting, after every item has been offered in at least $48 \log NT$ epochs, we do not have any exploratory epochs. Therefore:

$$\sum_{\ell \in E_L} |S_\ell| \leq 48N \log NT \tag{2}$$

Combining (1) and (2), we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\sum_{\ell \in E_L} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \right) \leq 48BN \log NT + 48N \log NT.$$

□

Then we prove $v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB2}}$ as an upper bound converging to v_i has the following results:

Lemma C.2. For every epoch ℓ , if $T_i(\ell) \geq 48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)$ for all $i \in S_\ell$, then:

1. $v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB2}} \geq v_i$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{6}{N\ell}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$.
2. There exist constants C_1 and C_2 such that:

$$v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB2}} - v_i \leq C_1 \max \{ \sqrt{v_i}, v_i \} \sqrt{\frac{\log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{7}{N\ell}$.

Lemma C.3. If in epoch ℓ , $T_i(\ell) \geq 48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)$ for all $i \in S_\ell$, then we have the following concentration bounds:

- (1) $\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(|\bar{v}_{i,\ell} - v_i| \geq \max \{ \sqrt{\bar{v}_{i,\ell}}, \bar{v}_{i,\ell} \} \sqrt{\frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \leq \frac{6}{N\ell}$.
- (2) $\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(|\bar{v}_{i,\ell} - v_i| \geq \max \{ \sqrt{v_i}, v_i \} \sqrt{\frac{24 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \leq \frac{4}{N\ell}$.
- (3) $\mathbb{P}_\pi \left(\bar{v}_{i,\ell} > \frac{3}{2}v_i + \frac{48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \leq \frac{3}{N\ell}$.

Lemma C.4. Suppose $S^* \in \mathcal{S}$ is the assortment with the highest expected revenue, and the algorithm offers $S_\ell = S^*(\ell)$ in epoch ℓ . Furthermore, if $T_i(\ell) \geq 48 \log(\sqrt{N\ell} + 1)$ for all $i \in S_\ell$, then we have:

$$\tilde{R}_\ell(S_\ell) \geq \tilde{R}_\ell(S^*) > R(S^*, \nu)$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{6}{N\ell}$.

Lemma C.5. For every epoch ℓ , if $r_i \in [0, 1]$ and $T_i(\ell) \geq 48 \log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)$ for all $i \in S_\ell$, then there exist constants C_1 and C_2 such that for every ℓ , we have:

$$\left(1 + \sum_{j \in S_\ell} v_j\right) \left(\tilde{R}_\ell(S_\ell) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})\right) \leq \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \max\{\sqrt{v_i}, v_i\} \sqrt{\frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{13}{N\ell}$.

Theorem C.6. For any instance $\mathbf{v} = (v_0, \dots, v_N)$ of the MNL-Bandit problem with N items, $r_i \in [0, 1]$, and given the adjusted assumption, let Algorithm 2 run with $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. The regret at any time T is $O(CNB \cdot \log^2(NT) + \sqrt{BNT} \log NT + NB \cdot T^{1-\alpha})$.

Proof. Putting it all together to prove the regret of Algorithm 2:

$$\text{Reg}_T(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell \in E_L} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \cdot (R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})) \right] + \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell \notin E_L} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| (R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})) \right]$$

then we define

$$\text{Reg}_1(T, \mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell \in E_L} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \cdot (R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})) \right]$$

$$\text{Reg}_2(T, \mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell \notin E_L} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| (R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})) \right]$$

For any S , $R(S, \mathbf{v}) \leq R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) \leq 1$, so it follows that:

$$\text{Reg}_1(T, \mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell \in E_L} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \right] \leq 48BN \log NT + 48N \log NT.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_2(T, \mathbf{v}) &= \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell \notin E_L} |\mathcal{E}_\ell| \cdot (R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell \notin E_L} (1 + V(S_\ell)) \cdot (R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of brevity, we define:

$$\Delta R_\ell = (1 + V(S_\ell)) \cdot (R(S^*, \mathbf{v}) - R(S_\ell, \mathbf{v})),$$

then:

$$\text{Reg}_2(T, \mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{\ell \notin E_L} \Delta R_\ell \right].$$

Let T_i denote the total number of epochs that offered an assortment containing item i . For all $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, define event B_ℓ as (bad event):

$$B_\ell = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \left\{ v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB2}} < v_i \text{ or } v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB2}} > v_i + C_1 \max\{\sqrt{v_i}, v_i\} \sqrt{\frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right\}.$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(B_\ell) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \Pr(v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB2}} < v_i) + \Pr\left(v_{i,\ell}^{\text{UCB2}} > v_i + C_1 \max\{\sqrt{v_i}, v_i\} \sqrt{\frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}\right) \\ &\leq N \cdot \left(\frac{6}{N\ell} + \frac{7}{N\ell}\right) = \frac{13}{\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

Then define A_ℓ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ as:

$$A_\ell = \{S_\ell = S^*(\ell)\},$$

then:

$$\Pr(A_\ell) = 1 - \alpha_\ell.$$

Then we can break down the regret (in one epoch) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell] &= \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}) + \Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}^c)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell | B_{\ell-1}] \cdot \Pr(B_{\ell-1}) + \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}^c)] \\ &\leq B(N+1) \cdot \Pr(B_{\ell-1}) + \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}^c)] \\ &\leq B(N+1) \cdot \Pr(B_{\ell-1}) + \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}^c) \cdot \mathbb{I}(A_\ell)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}^c) \cdot \mathbb{I}(A_\ell^c)] \\ &\leq B(N+1) \cdot \Pr(B_{\ell-1}) + B(N+1) \cdot \Pr(A_\ell^c) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}^c) \cdot \mathbb{I}(A_\ell)] \\ &\stackrel{(g)}{\leq} B(N+1) \cdot \Pr(B_{\ell-1}) + B(N+1) \cdot \Pr(A_\ell^c) \\ &\quad + C \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\max\{v_i, \sqrt{v_i}\} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where (g) follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi[\Delta R_\ell \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}^c) \cdot \mathbb{I}(A_\ell)] &= \mathbb{E}_\pi[(1 + V(S_\ell)) \cdot (R(S^*, \nu) - R(S_\ell, \nu)) \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}^c) \cdot \mathbb{I}(A_\ell)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\pi[(1 + V(S_\ell)) \cdot (\tilde{R}(S_\ell) - R(S_\ell, \nu)) \cdot \mathbb{I}(B_{\ell-1}^c) \cdot \mathbb{I}(A_\ell)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\sum_{i \in S_\ell} C_1 \max\{v_i, \sqrt{v_i}\} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + C_2 \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\max\{v_i, \sqrt{v_i}\} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}\ell + 1)}{T_i(\ell)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant and $C \geq \max\{C_1, C_2\}$. Define $\varphi = \{i : v_i \geq 1\}$, $\mathcal{D} = \{i : v_i < 1\}$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_2(T, \nu) &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E}_\pi \left\{ B(N+1) [\Pr(B_{\ell-1}) + \Pr(A_\ell^c)] + C \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \max\{v_i, \sqrt{v_i}\} \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(\sqrt{N}T)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{\log(\sqrt{N}T)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \right\} \\ &\leq CB(N+1) \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left(\frac{1}{\ell} + \frac{1}{\ell^\alpha} \right) + C \mathbb{E}_\pi \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in S_\ell} \max\{v_i, \sqrt{v_i}\} \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(NT)}{T_i(\ell)}} + \frac{\log(NT)}{T_i(\ell)} \right) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(h)}{\leq} CBN \log NT + CB(N+1) \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\ell^\alpha} + CN \log^2 NT \\ &\quad + C \cdot \mathbb{E}_\pi \left(\sum_{i \in \varphi} v_i \sqrt{T_i \log NT} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \sqrt{v_i T_i \log NT} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} CBN \log NT + CB(N+1) \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\ell^\alpha} + CN \log^2 NT \\
 &\quad + C \cdot \sum_{i \in \varphi} v_i \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\pi(T_i) \log NT} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \sqrt{v_i \mathbb{E}_\pi(T_i) \log NT}.
 \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (h) follows that $L, T_i \leq T$, $\sum_{T_i(\ell)=1}^{T_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_i(\ell)}} \leq \sqrt{T_i}$ and $\sum_{T_i(\ell)=1}^{T_i} \frac{1}{T_i(\ell)} \leq \log T_i$ and inequality (i) follows Jensen's Inequality.

And we have $\sum_i v_i \mathbb{E}_\pi(T_i) \leq T$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Reg}_\pi(T, \nu) &= \text{Reg}_1(T, \nu) + \text{Reg}_2(T, \nu) \\
 &\leq 48BN \log NT + 48N \log NT + CNB \log NT + CN \log^2 NT \\
 &\quad + CNB \left(\frac{T^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{I}(\alpha \neq 1) + \log T \cdot \mathbb{I}(\alpha = 1) \right) \\
 &\quad + C \cdot \sum_{i \in \varphi} v_i \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\pi(T_i) \log NT} + C \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \sqrt{v_i \mathbb{E}_\pi(T_i) \log NT} \\
 &\stackrel{(j)}{\leq} CNB \log NT + CN \log^2 NT + CNB \cdot T^{1-\alpha} + C \sqrt{BNT \log NT}
 \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (j) follows that the maximizing objective is concave so that we can use the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions to derive the worst-case bound. \square

As shown above, when $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, the regret of Algorithm 2 is

$$\text{Reg}_\pi(T, \nu) = \tilde{O}(T^{1-\alpha}).$$

And the analysis of estimation error is the same as that in subsection B.2 and B.3. Therefore, we can derive that Algorithm 2 is also Pareto optimal.

D. Technical Lemmas

Theorem D.1 (Bernstein's Inequality). *Let X_1, X_2, \dots be a martingale difference sequence, such that $|X_t| \leq \alpha_t$ for a non-decreasing deterministic sequence $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$ with probability 1. Let $M_t := \sum_{\tau=1}^t X_\tau$ be a martingale. Let $\bar{V}_1, \bar{V}_2, \dots$ be a deterministic upper bound on the variance $V_t := \sum_{\tau=1}^t \mathbb{E}[X_\tau^2 \mid X_1, \dots, X_{\tau-1}]$ of the martingale M_t , such that $\bar{V}_t - s$ satisfies $\sqrt{\frac{\ln(\frac{2}{\delta})}{(e-2)\bar{V}_t}} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_t}$. Then, with probability greater than $1 - \delta$ for all t :*

$$|M_t| \leq 2 \sqrt{(e-2)\bar{V}_t \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}.$$

Theorem D.2 (Neyman-Pearson Lemma). *Let \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 be two probability measures. Then for any test ψ , it holds*

$$\mathbb{P}_0(\psi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_1(\psi = 0) \geq \int \min(p_0, p_1).$$

Moreover, the equality holds for the Likelihood Ratio test $\psi^* = \mathbb{I}(p_1 \geq p_0)$.

Corollary D.3.

$$\inf_{\psi} [\mathbb{P}_0(\psi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_1(\psi = 0)] = 1 - TV(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1).$$

Proof. Denote that \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 are defined on the probability space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$. By the definition of the total variation distance,

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 TV(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1) &= \sup_{R \in \mathcal{A}} |\mathbb{P}_0(R) - \mathbb{P}_1(R)| \\
 &= \sup_{R \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \int_R p_0 - p_1 \right| \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \int |p_0 - p_1| \\
 &= 1 - \int \min(p_0, p_1) \\
 &= 1 - \inf_{\psi} [\mathbb{P}_0(\psi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_1(\psi = 0)].
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where the last equality applies the Neyman-Pearson Lemma, and the fourth equality holds due to the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int |p_0 - p_1| &= \int_{p_1 \geq p_0} (p_1 - p_0) + \int_{p_1 < p_0} (p_0 - p_1) \\
 &= \int_{p_1 \geq p_0} p_1 + \int_{p_1 < p_0} p_0 - \int \min(p_0, p_1) \\
 &= 1 - \int_{p_1 < p_0} p_1 + 1 - \int_{p_1 \geq p_0} p_0 - \int \min(p_0, p_1) \\
 &= 2 - 2 \int \min(p_0, p_1).
 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

□

Theorem D.4 (Pinsker's Inequality). *Let \mathbb{P}_1 and \mathbb{P}_2 be two probability measures such that $\mathbb{P}_1 \ll \mathbb{P}_2$. Then,*

$$TV(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} KL(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)}.$$