

Approximately Efficient Bilateral Trade with Samples

Yuan Deng
Google Research
dengyuan@google.com

Jieming Mao
Google Research
maojm@google.com

Balasubramanian Sivan
Google Research
balusivan@google.com

Kangning Wang
Rutgers University
kn.w@rutgers.edu

Jinzhao Wu
Yale University
jinzhao.wu@yale.edu

Abstract

We study the social efficiency of bilateral trade between a seller and a buyer. In the classical Bayesian setting, the celebrated Myerson–Satterthwaite impossibility theorem states that no Bayesian incentive-compatible, individually rational, and budget-balanced mechanism can achieve full efficiency. As a counterpoint, Deng, Mao, Sivan, and Wang (STOC 2022) show that if pricing power is delegated to the right person (either the seller or the buyer), the resulting mechanism can guarantee at least a constant fraction of the ideal (yet unattainable) gains from trade.

In practice, the agent with pricing power may not have perfect knowledge of the value distribution of the other party, and instead may rely on samples of that distribution to set a price. We show that for a broad class of sampling and pricing behaviors, the resulting market still guarantees a constant fraction of the ideal gains from trade in expectation. Our analysis hinges on the insight that social welfare under sample-based pricing approximates the seller’s optimal revenue—a result we establish via a reduction to a random walk.

1 Introduction

1.1 Approximately Efficient Bilateral Trade

In various economies, sellers and buyers exchange goods for money; such a process is referred to as *bilateral trade*. In a simple and canonical bilateral trade setting, a seller has one indivisible item for sale, and a buyer is interested in acquiring it. If the item is sold, the seller incurs a cost of v_s , which represents either a production cost or the disutility of parting with the item. The buyer, in turn, derives a value of v_b from obtaining the item.

We aim to design mechanisms that facilitate such trades and, first, it helps to describe the classical Bayesian model of bilateral trade. In this model, the seller's cost v_s and the buyer's value v_b are independently drawn from known distributions F_s and F_b , respectively. Although these distributions F_s and F_b are common knowledge, the actual realized values v_s and v_b remain private to the seller and the buyer, respectively. They interact through a mechanism and have standard quasilinear utilities:

- The utility of the buyer is given by his value v_b multiplied by the probability of obtaining the item, minus his expected payment.
- The utility of the seller is given by the expected payment she received, minus her cost v_s multiplied by the probability of losing the item.

A valid mechanism must satisfy three standard conditions in the field of mechanism design:

- *Bayesian Incentive-Compatibility* (BIC): Neither the seller nor the buyer can improve their utility by misreporting their private information.
- *Individual Rationality* (IR): Neither the seller nor the buyer should receive negative utility by participating in the mechanism.
- *Budget Balance* (BB): The mechanism cannot subsidize trades. In other words, the buyer's payment to the mechanism must at least cover the payment to the seller.

Our goal is to design a trading mechanism that maximizes social efficiency. From a utilitarian perspective, if the buyer values an item more than the seller, then a successful trade between them will improve social efficiency. Quantitatively, a trade between a buyer with value v_b and a seller with cost v_s contributes a net utility of $v_b - v_s$ to society. Ideally, a bilateral trade mechanism should guarantee full efficiency, that is, trade should occur whenever the realized value $v_b \sim F_b$ is higher than the realized cost $v_s \sim F_s$.

However, in general, no mechanism that satisfies the three standard conditions can guarantee full efficiency. This fundamental limitation of efficient trading, known as the Myerson–Satterthwaite impossibility theorem [MS83], is a landmark result in the field of mechanism design and a key reference in the 2007 Nobel Prize in Economics.

Influenced by the growing interdisciplinary collaboration in the field of economics and computation, researchers have explored the topic of bilateral trade efficiency through the lens of competitive analysis.

Indeed, the *gains from trade* in an ideal situation can be quantified as

$$\mathbb{E}_{v_b \sim F_b, v_s \sim F_s} [\max(v_b - v_s, 0)],$$

which we refer to as the *first best*. A natural question is whether a mechanism can guarantee at least a constant fraction of the first best.

The work of [McA08] was the first to examine efficient trading mechanisms in this framework and showed that the fixed-price mechanism can guarantee a $\frac{1}{2}$ -fraction of the first best when the median of F_b is higher than the median of F_s . The work of [DMSW22] was the first to prove it without additional assumptions, showing that a mechanism can achieve at least a constant fraction of the first best regardless of the distributions F_b and F_s . Specifically, it turns out that delegated pricing is sufficient; here, either the buyer or the seller has the power to set the price to maximize their own expected utility. Researchers have since shown that, for any prior distributions F_b and F_s , one of these two delegation mechanisms can guarantee at least a $\frac{1}{3.15}$ -fraction of the first best [Fei22, DMSW22].

1.2 Pricing with Sample Access

In real-world applications, the entity setting the price often lacks perfect knowledge of the other party’s value or cost distribution. Instead, it typically relies on samples from the underlying distribution and uses the observed empirical distribution as a proxy of the true prior. A newcomer to an economy might have only a handful of samples, while a powerful entity in today’s data-driven world may have access to millions. Furthermore, the price-setting entity can base its decision only on existing samples, or it can adopt an adaptive strategy and collect additional samples until it determines a price. We admit a broad range of possible behaviors of the price-setting entity, but assume that ultimately, this entity will choose a price to approximately optimize its utility with respect to the empirical distribution formed by samples it has observed so far.

Pricing with sample access has been extensively studied in the literature. In standard pricing and auction settings without additional assumptions, sellers with such behaviors typically fail to achieve a constant approximation to optimal revenue. Likewise, in these settings, the economy as a whole typically fails to achieve a constant approximation to optimal social welfare.

In this article, we explore the extent to which pricing with sample access differs from pricing with full knowledge of the prior distributions in bilateral trade. We ask specifically:

Is pricing with sample access in bilateral trade approximately efficient, that is, does it guarantee a constant fraction of gains from trade compared to the first-best outcome?

1.3 Our Results

We answer this question in the affirmative. In our main result ([Theorem 3.1](#) with $c = 1$), we consider the situation in which we delegate the pricing power to the seller or the buyer who only has sample access to the other’s prior distribution and can employ a wide range of strategies. We show that the resulting

mechanism guarantees at least a $\frac{1}{25.2}$ -fraction of the first-best gains from trade, as long as the agent with pricing power chooses to optimize its empirical profit.

A key step in the proof of this result is the observation below ([Theorem 4.2](#) with $\delta = \frac{1}{4}$).

Consider a seller (with cost of 0) who has access to samples of the buyer’s value distribution and chooses to optimize her empirical revenue. It always holds in expectation that the resulting *welfare* (with respect to the buyer’s true value distribution) is at least a $\frac{1}{8}$ -fraction of the optimal *revenue* (again, with respect to the buyer’s true value distribution).

Note that we are showing that the resulting *welfare* can approximate the optimal *revenue*. This observation is in contrast to the facts that (1) the resulting welfare cannot guarantee a constant fraction of the public-prior-case welfare, let alone the optimal welfare, and (2) the resulting revenue cannot guarantee a constant fraction of the public-prior-case revenue, which is exactly the optimal revenue. (See [Appendix A.1](#) for proofs.) We think that this observation can be of independent interest. To prove it, we formulate our problem in the language of random walks and provide characterizations of its worst-case instances. The details are in [Sections 4.1](#) to [4.3](#).

Finally, we consider the robustness of our results in the full version of [Theorem 3.1](#), and show that the constant-factor approximation is robust to alternative pricing strategies. Specifically, even if the price-setting entity only *approximately* optimizes its empirical profit, our constant-factor efficiency guarantee still holds.

1.4 Further Related Work

Bilateral Trade. There is a large body of literature on bilateral trade since the seminal work of [[MS83](#)]. We do not intend to be comprehensive, but instead we mention some of the works that are most related to ours.

The fixed-price mechanism is one that announces a price p and lets the seller and the buyer trade at price p if the buyer’s value is higher and the seller’s cost is lower. The work of [[McA08](#)] shows that the fixed-price mechanism achieves a $\frac{1}{2}$ -approximation of the first best (gains from trade) when the median of the buyer’s value (which is a random variable) is at least the median of the seller’s cost. [[BD21](#)] show that the fixed-price mechanism can achieve a $\frac{1}{e}$ -approximation of the first best when the buyer’s value distribution has monotone hazard rate. However, for general instances, [[BM16](#)] show that the fixed-price mechanism cannot always achieve a constant-approximation. Instead, the random-offerer mechanism, which uniformly randomly delegates the pricing power to the seller or the buyer, can provide such a guarantee [[DMSW22](#)]. The state-of-the-art approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{3.15}$ to the first-best is obtained by the delegation mechanisms [[Fei22](#)], and it is known that no mechanism can guarantee a ratio better than $\frac{2}{e}$ [[BM16](#)].

In addition to bilateral trade with independent valuations, efficiency approximations in bilateral trade have also been studied in settings with double auctions and matching markets (e.g., [[BCWZ17](#), [BCGZ18](#), [CGMZ21](#), [CLMZ24](#)]), with correlated valuations [[Mot21](#), [DS24](#)], and with a broker [[HHPS25](#)]. In addition to the objective of maximizing gains from trade, the different perspective of welfare maximization has

also been extensively studied. [BD21] provide a $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation to the first-best welfare. [KPV22] improve the approximation ratio to $(1 - \frac{1}{e} + 10^{-4})$; and recently in a pair of independent works, [CW23] and [LRW23] further improve the ratio to 0.72 with an upper bound of 0.7381. Sample-based bilateral trade has received increasing attention recently for welfare optimization using the fixed-price mechanism. [DFL⁺21] demonstrate a $\frac{1}{2}$ -approximation by using a single sample from the seller’s cost distribution as the posted price, and [KPV22] show a $\frac{3}{4}$ -approximation in a symmetric setting. [CW23] propose a new family of sample-based fixed-price mechanisms and provide a complete characterization of their approximation ratios for any fixed number of samples. In contrast, our work focuses on developing sampled-based mechanisms for approximating the first-best gains from trade, which is a mathematically more challenging objective to provide approximations guarantees for.

Pricing and Auctions with Sample Access. Our work also sits in the area of sample-based mechanism design with applications in pricing and auctions. Existing literature on sample-based mechanism design mostly focuses on two regimes: (1) determine the number of samples required to design a $(1 - \epsilon)$ -optimal mechanism [CR14, MM14, MR15, MR16, Syr17, CD17, GHZ19, BCD20, GHZ20, GW21, BSV23]; and (2) determine the best approximation ratio a sample-based mechanism can obtain using a small fixed number of samples [DRY10, BGMM18, DZ20, ABB21, DFL⁺21, CW23]. In comparison to our work, all these works consider a sampling process fully controlled by the mechanism designer, while our work assumes that the sampling process is delegated to either the seller or the buyer, and they can employ a broad range of sampling strategies.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Bilateral Trade

We study the bilateral trade problem in which a seller and a buyer trade an indivisible item. The seller, denoted by S , initially holds the item and incurs a private cost v_s , drawn from a distribution F_s , if the item is sold. Similarly, the buyer assigns a private value v_b to the item, which is drawn from a distribution F_b . Both v_s and v_b are private information known only to the seller and the buyer, respectively.

We are interested in analyzing the *gains from trade* achieved by a mechanism. Let $x(v_s, v_b)$ be the probability of trade between the seller with cost v_s and the buyer with value v_b in a given mechanism. We define gains from trade as the expected improvement in total utility resulting from the trade, that is,

$$\text{GFT} = \mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s, v_b \sim F_b} [(v_b - v_s) \cdot x(v_s, v_b)].$$

Ideally, trade occurs when $v_b > v_s$ and does not occur when $v_s > v_b$. Therefore, the maximum possible gains from trade, called the *first best*, can be expressed as

$$\text{FB} = \mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s, v_b \sim F_b} [(v_b - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b > v_s]].$$

In this article, we compare the gains from trade of the mechanism we propose with those of the *seller-pricing mechanism* and the *buyer-pricing mechanism*.

In the seller-pricing mechanism, the seller posts a take-it-or-leave-it price r_{v_s} based on her private cost v_s in order to maximize her utility. The buyer observes the price and chooses to purchase the item if and only if $v_b \geq r_{v_s}$. The gains from trade in the seller-pricing mechanism, denoted by `SellerP`, can be expressed as

$$\text{SellerP} = \mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s, v_b \sim F_b} [(v_b - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_{v_s}]], \quad \text{where } r_{v_s} \in \arg \max_p (p - v_s) \cdot \Pr_{v_b \sim F_b} [v_b \geq p].$$

The buyer-pricing mechanism is symmetric to the seller-pricing mechanism. The key difference is that now it is the buyer who posts a price r'_{v_b} based on his private value v_b , and the seller then decides whether to accept that price. Similarly, the gains from trade in the buyer-pricing mechanism, denoted by `BuyerP`, can be expressed as

$$\text{BuyerP} = \mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s, v_b \sim F_b} [(v_b - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_s \leq r'_{v_b}]], \quad \text{where } r'_{v_b} \in \arg \max_p (v_b - p) \cdot \Pr_{v_s \sim F_s} [v_s \leq p].$$

It is shown in the work of [DMSW22, Fei22] that either the seller-pricing mechanism or the buyer-pricing mechanism can approximate the first best, the optimal gains from trade. Specifically, we have the following guarantee.

$$3.15 \cdot \max(\text{SellerP}, \text{BuyerP}) \geq \text{FB}.$$

2.2 Agents' Behavior with Sample Access

In this article, we assume that the entity that sets the price only has sample access to the prior distribution of the other party. For example, suppose that we are running the seller-pricing mechanism and the seller has the power to set a price. In this case, the seller knows her private cost v_s but lacks the knowledge of the prior distribution F_b of the buyer, and therefore she chooses her price based on samples from F_b instead. The seller can repeatedly draw i.i.d. samples from the buyer's distribution F_b and can adaptively decide when to stop sampling and select a price. We make the following two assumptions about the seller's behavior.

1. She observes at least one sample above her private cost before setting her price. (An alternative assumption is that she sets the price at her cost if she fails to observe any sample above her cost.)
2. When she sets the price based on the samples she has observed so far, the empirical profit of the chosen price must be at least a c -fraction of the empirical profit of any price. Here, the empirical profit refers to the profit evaluated on the collection of samples of $v_b \sim F_b$ that the seller has observed.

[Definition 2.1](#) below captures these assumptions formally.

Definition 2.1 (Seller c -EO). Suppose that the seller with private cost v_s is trying to decide her price by adaptively observing samples from the value distribution F_b of the buyer. Let $v_b^{(1)}, v_b^{(2)}, v_b^{(3)}, \dots \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} F_b$

be the stream of samples drawn independently from F_b . Assume that the seller determines the price r_s after drawing k samples, where k may be adaptively chosen based on the seller's strategy and the sample stream. For any constant $c \in (0, 1]$, the pricing strategy is said to be c -EO ("EO" stands for "empirically optimal") for the seller if and only if the following two conditions hold.

- $\exists i \in [k]$ s.t. $v_b^{(i)} > v_s$: At least one sample has a value greater than v_s .¹
- $(r_s - v_s) \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [k] \mid v_b^{(i)} \geq r_s\}|}{k} \geq c \cdot \max_{p \in \mathbb{R}} (p - v_s) \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [k] \mid v_b^{(i)} \geq p\}|}{k}$: The empirical profit of r_s is at least a c -fraction of the optimal empirical profit.

Consider the following variant of the seller-pricing mechanism in which the seller sets the take-it-or-leave-it price to be r_s chosen by any c -EO pricing strategy and the buyer decides whether to purchase based on the condition that $v_b \geq r_s$. The gains from trade generated by this mechanism are represented as c -SellerSample, defined as

$$c\text{-SellerSample} = \mathbb{E}_{v_b \sim F_b, v_s \sim F_s} [(v_b - v_s) \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_s]].$$

Alternatively, when the buyer has the power to set the price, his behavior is symmetric to that of the seller. The buyer can draw samples from the seller's distribution F_s and adaptively use the empirical distribution to determine the price. We similarly require that the buyer observes at least one sample with a cost no greater than his private value and selects a price such that the empirical utility of the buyer is at least a c -fraction of the optimal utility.

Definition 2.2 (Buyer c -EO). Suppose that a buyer with private value v_b has access to a stream of samples $v_s^{(1)}, v_s^{(2)}, v_s^{(3)}, \dots \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} F_s$ and uses them to select a price r_b . Assume that the buyer sets the price r_b after observing k samples, where k is adaptively determined based on the buyer's strategy and the observed sample stream sampled from the distribution of the seller. For any constant $c \in (0, 1]$, the pricing strategy is said to be c -EO for the buyer if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- $\exists i \in [k]$ s.t. $v_s^{(i)} < v_b$: At least one sample has a cost less than v_b .²
- $(v_b - r_b) \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [k] \mid v_s^{(i)} \leq r_b\}|}{k} \geq c \cdot \max_{p \in \mathbb{R}} (v_b - p) \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [k] \mid v_s^{(i)} \leq p\}|}{k}$: The empirical utility of r_b is at least a c -fraction of the optimal empirical utility.

Similarly, we consider the variant of the buyer-pricing mechanism in which the buyer sets the price to be r_b decided by the pricing strategy. We use c -BuyerSample to represent the gains from trade induced by such mechanism.

$$c\text{-BuyerSample} = \mathbb{E}_{v_b \sim F_b, v_s \sim F_s} [(v_b - v_s) \mathbb{I}[v_s \leq r_b]].$$

¹In the case in which no sample has value larger than v_s , the seller effectively learns no information from the buyer's distribution for setting the price. Therefore, we omit this case from consideration.

²Similarly, we omit the case in which no sample can be lower than v_b .

3 Main Result

We now present our main theorem, demonstrating that when both the seller and the buyer employ c -EO pricing strategies, at least one of the two pricing mechanisms provides an $O(c)$ -approximation to the optimal gains from trade. The main result is formally stated as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Fix the distributions F_s and F_b of the seller and the buyer. Suppose that the seller and the buyer determine their prices according to arbitrary c -EO pricing strategies for a constant $c \in (0, 1]$. Let c -SellerSample and c -BuyerSample respectively represent the gains from trade induced by the seller's and buyer's c -EO pricing strategies. It holds that*

$$\frac{25.2}{c} \cdot \max(c\text{-SellerSample}, c\text{-BuyerSample}) \geq \text{FB}.$$

As an important special case, when the seller and the buyer use 1-EO (exactly empirically optimal) strategies, then

$$25.2 \cdot \max(1\text{-SellerSample}, 1\text{-BuyerSample}) \geq \text{FB}.$$

Our proof proceeds as follows. Observe that, for the seller-pricing mechanism, the gains from trade

$$\mathbb{E}[(v_b - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_{v_s}]]$$

can be decomposed into two components:

- the profit of the seller, $\mathbb{E}[(r_{v_s} - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_{v_s}]]$, and
- the utility of the buyer, $\mathbb{E}[(v_b - r_{v_s}) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_{v_s}]]$.

We denote these two components as **SPro** and **SUti** respectively, and define them as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SPro} &= \mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s, v_b \sim F_b} [(r_{v_s} - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_{v_s}]], \\ \text{SUti} &= \mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s, v_b \sim F_b} [(v_b - r_{v_s}) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_{v_s}]]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we define analogous terms for the buyer-pricing mechanism as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BPro} &= \mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s, v_b \sim F_b} [(v_b - r_{v_b}) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_s \leq r_{v_b}]], \\ \text{BUti} &= \mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s, v_b \sim F_b} [(r_{v_b} - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_s \leq r_{v_b}]]. \end{aligned}$$

Existing results [DMSW22, Fei22] on the efficiency of the seller-pricing and buyer-pricing mechanisms provide a stronger claim: the seller's profit from the seller-pricing mechanism, combined with the buyer's profit from the buyer-pricing mechanism, suffices to approximate the optimal gains from trade.

Lemma 3.2 ([Fei22]). *For any F_s and F_b , we have*

$$3.15 \cdot \max(\text{SPro}, \text{BPro}) \geq \text{FB}.$$

When the seller or buyer lacks full knowledge of the distributions and instead employs a c -EO pricing strategy to determine their prices in the seller-pricing or buyer-pricing mechanisms, we aim to demonstrate that the gains from trade generated by these mechanisms are sufficient to cover the *profits* achieved in the original seller-pricing or buyer-pricing mechanisms.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume that the seller and the buyer are running any c -EO pricing strategies to determine their prices for some arbitrary constant $c \in (0, 1]$. Let c -SellerSample and c -BuyerSample respectively denote the gains from trade resulting from these c -EO strategies. Then we have*

$$c\text{-SellerSample} \geq \frac{c}{8} \cdot \text{SPro} \quad \text{and} \quad c\text{-BuyerSample} \geq \frac{c}{8} \cdot \text{BPro}.$$

[Theorem 3.3](#) serves as our main technical result, and its proof is deferred to [Section 4](#). Combining [Lemma 3.2](#) and [Theorem 3.3](#), we can directly establish our main theorem.

Proof of [Theorem 3.1](#). First, note that [Theorem 3.3](#) establishes the following bounds.

$$c\text{-SellerSample} \geq \frac{c}{8} \cdot \text{SPro} \quad \text{and} \quad c\text{-BuyerSample} \geq \frac{c}{8} \cdot \text{BPro}. \tag{1}$$

Additionally, [Lemma 3.2](#) states

$$3.15 \cdot \max(\text{SPro}, \text{BPro}) \geq \text{FB}. \tag{2}$$

Combining [Eqs. \(1\) and \(2\)](#), we derive

$$\frac{25.2}{c} \cdot \max(c\text{-SellerSample}, c\text{-BuyerSample}) \geq \text{FB}.$$

This completes the proof. □

4 Sample-Based Welfare Approximates Optimal Revenue

In this section, we complete our proof of [Theorem 3.3](#) and aim to show that

$$c\text{-SellerSample} \geq \frac{c}{8} \cdot \text{SPro}.$$

We only focus on the case in which the seller has the pricing power, since the proof for the buyer-pricing case is completely symmetric.

To establish this approximation of c -SellerSample to SPro, we begin by fixing the seller's cost, v_s , and normalizing it to 0. Note that this normalization reduces our problem to the one in [Definition 4.1](#) below.

Definition 4.1 (Sample-Based Welfare Approximates Optimal Revenue). Consider an unknown distribution F supported on \mathbb{R} , with the assumption that the optimal revenue derived from this distribution is

positive. Specifically, we have

$$\max_{p \in \mathbb{R}} p \cdot \Pr_{v \sim F} [v \geq p] > 0.$$

The seller is allowed to sample repeatedly from the distribution F . She may choose to stop at any time and post an arbitrary price r , subject to the two requirements of c -EO.

- The empirical revenue achieved at price r must be at least a c -fraction of the optimal empirical revenue.
- The optimal empirical revenue at the stopping point must be positive.

Fix the distribution F . We define $\text{Wel}(p)$ and $\text{Rev}(p)$ as the welfare and the revenue induced by posting a price p , respectively. Specifically, we have

$$\text{Wel}(p) = \mathbb{E}_{v \sim F} [v \cdot \mathbb{I}[v \geq p]] \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Rev}(p) = p \cdot \Pr_{v \sim F} [v \geq p].$$

Our objective is to show that the welfare at the price r chosen by the seller is at least a constant fraction of the optimal revenue. Formally, we aim to prove

$$\text{Wel}(r) \geq \Omega(c) \cdot \max_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \text{Rev}(p).$$

[Theorem 4.2](#) below asserts that, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta/c$, the seller will set a price such that the welfare is no less than δ times the optimal revenue, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and any strategy employed by the seller.

Theorem 4.2. *For any $\delta > 0$ and $c \in [2\delta, 1]$, in all instances and for all c -EO strategies of the seller, the probability that she picks a price with welfare less than δ times the optimal revenue is at most $2\delta/c$.*

[Proposition 4.3](#) below states that [Theorem 4.2](#) is tight up to a constant of 2. The proof of [Proposition 4.3](#) is deferred to [Appendix A.2](#).

Proposition 4.3. *For any $\delta > 0$ and $c \in [\delta, 1]$, there exists an instance and a seller's c -EO strategy such that the probability of selecting a price with welfare less than δ times the optimal revenue is exactly δ/c .*

Before proving [Theorem 4.2](#), we first show how it can imply [Theorem 3.3](#).

Proof of [Theorem 3.3](#) assuming [Theorem 4.2](#). Fix the seller's cost v_s . Define F as the distribution obtained by shifting F_B to the left by v_s . Since the seller decides the price according to some c -EO pricing strategy in the old setting, it is equivalent to our new setting in which the seller observes at least one positive sample from the distribution F , and then selects a price so that the empirical revenue is at least c fraction of the optimal empirical revenue. As the seller observes at least one positive sample, the optimal empirical revenue is positive. Therefore, by [Theorem 4.2](#), with a probability of at least $1 - 2\delta/c$, the generated welfare of the selected price r_s is at least δ fraction of the optimal revenue. This implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{v_b \sim F_b} [(v_b - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_s]] \geq \left(1 - \frac{2\delta}{c}\right) \cdot \delta \cdot \max_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{v_b \sim F_b} [(p - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq p]].$$

By setting $\delta = c/4$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{v_b \sim F_b} [(v_b - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_s]] \geq \frac{c}{8} \cdot \max_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{v_b \sim F_b} [(p - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq p]].$$

Now taking the expectation with respect to $v_s \sim F_s$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s, v_b \sim F_b} [(v_b - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq r_s]] \geq \frac{c}{8} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{v_s \sim F_s} \left[\max_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{v_b \sim F_b} [(p - v_s) \cdot \mathbb{I}[v_b \geq p]] \right].$$

Note that the left-hand side corresponds to the definition of `c-SellerSample`, while the right-hand side matches the definition of `SPro`. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\text{c-SellerSample} \geq \frac{c}{8} \cdot \text{SPro},$$

which completes the proof. \square

It remains to prove [Theorem 4.2](#). In particular, we aim to characterize the worst-case combination of the buyer's distribution and the seller's sampling strategy that maximizes the seller's probability of selecting a price that yields a welfare less than a δ -fraction of the optimal revenue in hindsight. Given the buyer's distribution, the worst-case sampling strategy for the seller is straightforward: the seller keeps sampling until the seller can post a price such that the price can achieve an empirical revenue of at least a c -fraction of the optimal empirical revenue and generate welfare less than a δ -fraction of the optimal revenue in hindsight. Thus, the main technical challenge lies in characterizing the worst-case distribution.

Our proof consists of three steps:

1. As our first (and easy) step, we demonstrate that it is without loss of generality to consider simple forms of distributions. Firstly, it is sufficient to focus on distributions with discrete supports. Furthermore, we show that, without loss of generality, the distribution has an optimal revenue of 1 achieved at a price of 1. This implies that in the worst-case distributions, no probability mass exists below 1. The formal proof of these results is provided in [Section 4.1](#).
2. As the second step, we consider the case where the support of the distribution consists exclusively of integer multiples of $\frac{1}{c}$. We demonstrate that, in this scenario, the worst-case distributions have binary supports. The formal proof is presented in [Section 4.2](#).
3. As the final step, we apply the results from the integer case to address the general case. The formal proof is provided in [Section 4.3](#).

4.1 Structure of Worst-Case Distributions

For any distribution F with a strictly positive optimal revenue, it can always be assumed, without loss of generality, that F achieves its optimal revenue at a price of 1. To see this, let $p \in \arg \max \{p \cdot \Pr[v \geq p]\}$ be an arbitrary optimal price for the distribution. It is clear that p is positive, as its revenue is positive. By rescaling the distribution by a factor of $1/p$, we can normalize the optimal price to 1.

We now prove that it is also without loss of generality to assume that the distribution has no probability mass below 1.

Lemma 4.4. *Fix any distribution $F \in \Delta(\mathbb{R})$ with an optimal price of 1 and assume the worst-case strategy of the seller. Let ℓ be the probability that the seller selects a price r resulting in welfare less than a δ -fraction of the optimal revenue. Then, there exists another distribution F' with no probability mass below 1 and a seller's strategy such that the probability of selecting a price r with welfare less than a δ -fraction of the optimal revenue is at least ℓ .*

Proof. We first notice that the welfare function is non-increasing over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Specifically, for any $x \geq y \geq 0$, it holds that $\text{Wel}(x) \geq \text{Wel}(y)$. Intuitively, this implies that under the worst-case strategy, the seller will never choose a price below 1. Therefore, we can remove the probability mass below 1 and this only increases the probability that a bad price is chosen. The formal proof is provided below.

Define $F_{\geq 1}$ as the conditional distribution of F given that the value is at least 1. Formally,

$$\Pr_{v \sim F_{\geq 1}} [v \geq x] = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq 1, \\ \frac{\Pr_{v \sim F} [v \geq x]}{\Pr_{v \sim F} [v \geq 1]} & x \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Now suppose that the seller employs the worst-case strategy on both distributions F and $F_{\geq 1}$, and we couple these two random processes as follows. The seller draws a sample x from F and updates her empirical distribution for F . If $x \geq 1$, the same sample x is also used to update the empirical distribution of $F_{\geq 1}$. Since the seller is following the worst-case strategy, she will stop the sampling process and select a price r if and only if a price r satisfies $\text{Wel}(r) < \delta \cdot \text{Rev}(1)$ and has empirical revenue exceeding a c -fraction of the optimal revenue.

Since the welfare function is monotone, for any $r \leq 1$, it follows that

$$\text{Wel}(r) \geq \text{Wel}(1) \geq \text{Rev}(1).$$

This implies that during the sampling process of the distribution F , the seller will only stop at a price $r > 1$ such that $\text{Wel}(r) < \delta \text{Rev}(1)$. Let $\widetilde{\text{Rev}}(x)$ and $\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_{\geq 1}(x)$ denote the empirical revenue at price x based on the sampling processes of F and $F_{\geq 1}$, respectively, at the time the seller stops sampling and selects the price r for F . It is known that r has an empirical revenue of at least a c -fraction of the optimal empirical revenue, that is,

$$\widetilde{\text{Rev}}(r) \geq c \cdot \max_p \widetilde{\text{Rev}}(p).$$

Similarly, let $\tilde{F}(x)$ and $\tilde{F}_{\geq 1}(x)$ denote the complementary cumulative distribution functions (denoting $\Pr[X \geq x]$ for a distribution X) of the empirical distribution at the time the seller stops. Then, the empirical revenue functions are given by:

$$\widetilde{\text{Rev}}(x) = x\tilde{F}(x), \quad \widetilde{\text{Rev}}_{\geq 1}(x) = x\tilde{F}_{\geq 1}(x).$$

Given our sampling process, it is clear that the samples with value at least 1 are exactly the same for

F and $F_{\geq 1}$. Therefore, the following holds for any $a, b \geq 1$.

$$\frac{\tilde{F}(a)}{\tilde{F}(b)} = \frac{\tilde{F}_{\geq 1}(a)}{\tilde{F}_{\geq 1}(b)}.$$

Combining with the inequality above and the definition of the empirical revenue function, it follows that

$$\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_{\geq 1}(r) \geq c \cdot \max_{p \geq 1} \widetilde{\text{Rev}}_{\geq 1}(p).$$

Note that in the distribution $F_{\geq 1}$, the welfare induced by r is also less than a δ -fraction of the optimal revenue. Thus, the seller will also terminate and output price r in this case. This completes our proof. \square

Until now, we have shown that the distribution has no probability mass below 1 and achieves its maximum revenue at a price of 1. Since the optimal revenue is normalized to 1 and there is no probability mass below 1, the empirical optimal revenue is always at least 1. In the remainder of this proof, we establish a stronger result: we now assume that the seller can select a price with welfare below δ whenever its empirical revenue is at least c , rather than when it is at least a c -fraction of the optimal empirical revenue, which is always weakly higher. This assumption strengthens the worst-case strategy by making it easier for the seller to choose an undesired price. Under this stronger assumption, we demonstrate that it is sufficient to restrict the analysis to discrete distributions.

Lemma 4.5. *Consider any (potentially non-discrete) distribution F with no probability mass below 1 and an optimal revenue of 1 achieved at a price of 1. For any $\delta > 0$, assume that, with probability ℓ , there exists a price with welfare not exceeding δ such that its empirical revenue is at least c after a certain number of samples. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a corresponding discrete distribution F' such that a price also exists with welfare at most $(\delta + \varepsilon)$ and empirical revenue of at least c , after sampling a certain number of times, with probability at least ℓ .*

The proof of [Lemma 4.5](#) is deferred to [Appendix A.3](#). Leaving $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, it follows that we can restrict our consideration to discrete distributions without loss of generality.

4.2 Integer Support

As described in [Section 4.1](#), we assume that the distribution F is structured as follows: it assigns a value v_i with probability p_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, where k may potentially be infinite. We further assume that $v_i < v_{i+1}$ and $v_0 = 1$. Additionally, the optimal revenue is achieved at 1. Formally, for any $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, the following inequality holds:

$$v_i \cdot \left(\sum_{j=i}^k p_j \right) \leq 1.$$

In this section, we focus on the case where all support values are integer multiples of $1/c$. Specifically, we assume that each v_i/c is integer for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, k\}$.

We begin by analyzing the case of binary support. The following lemma provides a complete characterization of this scenario.

Lemma 4.6. *Consider a binary support distribution where $k = 1$ and $\frac{v_1}{c}$ is an integer. Assume that $\frac{p_1 v_1}{c} \leq 1$. Let $\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(x)$ denote the empirical revenue of price x after t samples. The probability that there exists some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(v_1) \geq c$ is precisely $\frac{p_1 v_1}{c}$.*

Proof. Consider the following random walk over \mathbb{Z} . Let $X_0 = a \in \mathbb{R}$, and define X_i as follows:

$$X_i = \begin{cases} X_{i-1} - 1 & \text{with probability } p_0, \\ X_{i-1} + \frac{v_1}{c} - 1 & \text{with probability } p_1. \end{cases}$$

We first argue that the probability of there existing some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that the empirical revenue of v_1 after t samples is at least c is identical to the probability that there exists some $t > 0$ for which $X_t \geq 0$, given the initialization $X_0 = 0$. This equivalence is established by coupling the sampling process with the random walk defined above.

For any $i \geq 1$, if $X_i = X_{i-1} - 1$, we assume that the corresponding sample is $x_i = 1$; otherwise, it is $x_i = v_1$. Clearly, the sequence $\{x_i\}$ corresponds to a stream of i.i.d. samples from the binary distribution.

Now, suppose $X_t \geq 0$ for some $t > 0$. Let ℓ denote the number of steps with $X_i = X_{i-1} + \frac{v_1}{c} - 1$ in the first t steps of the random walk. Notice that ℓ also represents the number of occurrences of v_1 in the first t samples x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t . We observe that

$$X_t \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow \ell \cdot \frac{v_1}{c} \geq t \Leftrightarrow v_1 \cdot \frac{\ell}{t} \geq c \Leftrightarrow \widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(v_1) \geq c.$$

Thus, we establish that $X_t \geq 0$ if and only if $\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(v_1) \geq c$. In the following, we aim to characterize the probability that $X_t \geq 0$ for some $t > 0$.

Let $f(a)$ denote the probability that, starting from $X_0 = a$, there exists some $t > 0$ such that $X_t \geq 0$. Similarly, let $g(a)$ represent the probability that, starting from $X_0 = a$, there exists some $t > 0$ such that $X_t > 0$.

Given the recursion of the random walk, the following fact about $g(a)$ holds.

$$g(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & a \geq 1, \\ p_1 \cdot g(a + \frac{v_1}{c} - 1) + (1 - p_1) \cdot g(a - 1) & a < 1. \end{cases}$$

Now, define $h(a) = g(1 - a) - g(-a)$. The definition of $h(a)$ gives the following fact.

$$h(a) = \begin{cases} 0 & a < 0, \\ \frac{p_1}{1 - p_1} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{v_1}{c} - 1} h(a - i) & a > 0. \end{cases}$$

To see why $h(a)$ takes this form when $a > 0$, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
h(a) &= g(1-a) - g(-a) \\
&= \left(p_1 \cdot g\left(\frac{v_1}{c} - a\right) + (1-p_1) \cdot g(-a) \right) - g(-a) \\
&= p_1 \left(g\left(\frac{v_1}{c} - a\right) - g(-a) \right) \\
&= p_1 \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{v_1}{c}-1} g(i-a+1) - g(i-a) \\
&= p_1 \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{v_1}{c}-1} h(a-i).
\end{aligned}$$

By moving $h(a)$ from the right hand side to the left hand side, it follows that

$$h(a) = \frac{p_1}{1-p_1} \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{v_1}{c}-1} h(a-i).$$

It is straightforward that $\lim_{a \rightarrow -\infty} g(a) = 0$. Therefore, This means that

$$\sum_{a=0}^{\infty} h(a) = g(1) - \lim_{a \rightarrow -\infty} g(a) = 1. \quad (3)$$

From the recursion of $h(a)$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a=0}^{\infty} h(a) &= h(0) + \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} h(a) \\
&= h(0) + \frac{p_1}{1-p_1} \cdot \left(\frac{v_1}{c} - 1\right) \cdot \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} h(a).
\end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Combining Eqs. (3) and (4), it follows that

$$h(0) = 1 - \frac{p_1}{1-p_1} \cdot \left(\frac{v_1}{c} - 1\right).$$

Therefore,

$$g(0) = g(1) - h(0) = \frac{p_1}{1-p_1} \cdot \left(\frac{v_1}{c} - 1\right).$$

Finally, observe that $f(0) = p_1 + (1-p_1) \cdot g(0)$. This follows because, with probability p_1 , we directly have $X_1 > 0$; otherwise, with probability $1-p_1$, the random walk starts at -1 and continues until it reaches a non-negative point, which is precisely described by $g(0)$. Substituting, we have

$$f(0) = p_1 + (1-p_1) \cdot g(0) = \frac{p_1 v_1}{c}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

In the following, we show that binary support is the worst-case distribution. The following lemma states that the probability that a price with welfare less than δ is chosen is at most δ/c .

Lemma 4.7. *Consider an arbitrary distribution where $\frac{v_i}{c}$ is an integer for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Let $\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(x)$ denote the empirical revenue of price x after t samples. For any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, the probability that there exists some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $j \geq i$ such that $\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(v_j) \geq c$ is at most $\text{Wel}(v_i)/c$.*

Proof. We begin by defining the event \mathcal{F}_i : there exists some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that the empirical revenue of v_i after t samples is at least c , while for all $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the empirical revenue of v_{i+1} remains below c . Specifically, for $i = k$, we define v_{k+1} and p_{k+1} to be 0. We aim to show that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{F}_i] \leq \frac{p_i v_i}{c}.$$

To establish this, we define two events, \mathcal{G}_i and \mathcal{H}_i . The event \mathcal{G}_i occurs if there exists some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that the empirical revenue of v_i after t samples is at least c . Similarly, the event \mathcal{H}_i occurs if there exists some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that the empirical revenue of v_i after t samples is at least c , while for some (not necessarily the same) $t' \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the empirical revenue of v_{i+1} after t' samples is also at least c .

From Lemma 4.6, it directly follows that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{G}_i] = \frac{v_i \cdot \sum_{j=i}^k p_j}{c},$$

because if we focus solely on the empirical revenue of v_i , it is equivalent to a binary support case where the value v_i has a probability of $\sum_{j=i}^k p_j$, and the value is 1 otherwise.

We now provide a lower bound for \mathcal{H}_i . To demonstrate this, we consider the following coupled sampling process. Let x_t denote the t -th sample drawn from the current distribution. Additionally, define x'_t as follows: $x'_t = v_i$ if $x_t \geq v_{i+1}$, and $x'_t = 1$ otherwise. Similarly, we define $\widetilde{\text{Rev}}'_t(r)$ as the empirical revenue at price r based on the first t samples $\{x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_t\}$. Formally,

$$\widetilde{\text{Rev}}'_t(r) = r \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [t] \mid x'_i \geq r\}|}{t}.$$

Now assume that there exists some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that

$$\widetilde{\text{Rev}}'_t(v_i) \geq c.$$

By the definition of the sampling process, we have

$$\{i \in [t] \mid x_i \geq v_{i+1}\} = \{i \in [t] \mid x'_i \geq v_i\}$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(v_i) &= v_i \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [t] \mid x_i \geq v_i\}|}{t} \geq v_i \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [t] \mid x_i \geq v_{i+1}\}|}{t} = v_i \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [t] \mid x'_i \geq v_i\}|}{t} \\ &= \widetilde{\text{Rev}}'_t(v_i) \geq c,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(v_{i+1}) &= v_{i+1} \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [t] \mid x_i \geq v_{i+1}\}|}{t} \geq v_i \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [t] \mid x_i \geq v_{i+1}\}|}{t} = v_i \cdot \frac{|\{i \in [t] \mid x'_i \geq v_i\}|}{t} \\ &= \widetilde{\text{Rev}}'_t(v_i) \geq c.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that \mathcal{H}_i occurs whenever v_i achieves an empirical revenue of at least c with respect to the sampling process $\{x'_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$. Furthermore, observe that x'_i is a sample from a binary distribution, where the value is v_i with probability $\sum_{j=i+1}^k p_j$, and 1 otherwise. By Lemma 4.6, it holds that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{H}_i] \geq \frac{v_i \cdot \sum_{j=i+1}^k p_j}{c}.$$

Finally, it is clear that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{F}_i] = \Pr[\mathcal{G}_i] - \Pr[\mathcal{H}_i] \leq \frac{v_i p_i}{c}.$$

For any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, the probability that there exists some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $j \geq i$ such that the empirical revenue of v_j after sampling t times is at least c is clearly upper bounded by

$$\sum_{j=i}^k \Pr[\mathcal{F}_j] \leq \sum_{j=i}^k \frac{p_j v_j}{c} = \frac{\text{Wel}(v_i)}{c}.$$

This completes the proof. □

4.3 General Support

In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem 4.2 for general supports. As in Section 4.2, we consider a distribution where each value v_i occurs with probability p_i for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}$, where k may be infinite. Additionally, we assume that $v_i < v_{i+1}$ and that the distribution achieves an optimal revenue of 1 at $v_0 = 1$. Unlike Section 4.2, we do not require v_i/c to be an integer in this section.

Given any $\delta > 0$, let $i^* = \min \{i \mid \text{Wel}(v_i) \leq \delta\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that such i^* exists. Our goal is to show the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(x)$ denote the empirical revenue of price x after t samples. For any $i^* \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, the probability of there existing some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $j \geq i^*$ such that*

$$\widetilde{\text{Rev}}_t(v_j) \geq c$$

is at most $2\text{Wel}(i^)/c$.*

Before proving [Lemma 4.8](#), observe that it directly implies [Theorem 4.2](#). Note that the optimal empirical revenue after any number of samples is always at least 1, achieved at $v_0 = 1$, since all samples have a value of at least 1. Applying [Lemma 4.8](#) to i^* , it follows that, with probability at most $2\text{Wel}(v_i)/c \leq 2\delta/c$, there will exist a price v_j such that $j \geq i^*$ achieving an empirical revenue exceeding c . This implies that, with probability at most $2\delta/c$, a price v_j with induced welfare at most δ will achieve an empirical revenue of at least a c -fraction of the optimal empirical revenue after a certain number of samples. Therefore, even under the seller's worst-case strategy, the probability remains at most $2\delta/c$, which completes the proof of [Theorem 4.2](#).

Proof of Lemma 4.8. Consider a new distribution $F' = \{(v'_0, p'_0), (v'_1, p'_1), \dots, (v'_k, p'_k)\}$ constructed as follows. Let $v'_0 = 1$ and $p'_i = p_i$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, define

$$v'_i = c \left\lceil \frac{v_i}{c} \right\rceil.$$

Given that $v_i > 1$ and $c < 1$, it is evident that

$$v_i \leq v'_i \leq v_i + 1 \leq 2v_i.$$

For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, since $v_i \leq v'_i$ and $p_i = p'_i$, it follows directly that switching the distribution from F to F' can only increase the probability that there exist some $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $j \geq i^*$ such that the empirical revenue of v_j after t samples is at least c . Notice that for distribution F' , the quantity v'_i/c is always an integer for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Therefore, applying [Lemma 4.7](#) to F' , it follows that such probability is at most

$$\frac{\sum_{j=i^*}^k p'_j v'_j}{c} \leq \frac{2 \sum_{j=i^*}^k p_j v_j}{c} = \frac{2\text{Wel}(i^*)}{c}. \quad \square$$

References

- [ABB21] Amine Allouah, Achraf Bahamou, and Omar Besbes. Revenue maximization from finite samples. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, EC '21, page 51, 2021.
- [BCD20] Johannes Brustle, Yang Cai, and Constantinos Daskalakis. Multi-item mechanisms without item-independence: Learnability via robustness. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 715–761, 2020.
- [BCGZ18] Moshe Babaioff, Yang Cai, Yannai A. Gonczarowski, and Mingfei Zhao. The best of both worlds: Asymptotically efficient mechanisms with a guarantee on the expected gains-from-trade. In *EC*, page 373, 2018.
- [BCWZ17] Johannes Brustle, Yang Cai, Fa Wu, and Mingfei Zhao. Approximating gains from trade in two-sided markets via simple mechanisms. In *EC*, pages 589–590, 2017.

- [BD21] Liad Blumrosen and Shahar Dobzinski. (almost) efficient mechanisms for bilateral trading. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 130:369–383, 2021.
- [BGMM18] Moshe Babaioff, Yannai A Gonczarowski, Yishay Mansour, and Shay Moran. Are two (samples) really better than one? In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 175–175, 2018.
- [BM16] Liad Blumrosen and Yehonatan Mizrahi. Approximating gains-from-trade in bilateral trading. In *WINE*, pages 400–413, 2016.
- [BSV23] Maria-Florina Balcan, Tuomas Sandholm, and Ellen Vitercik. Generalization guarantees for multi-item profit maximization: Pricing, auctions, and randomized mechanisms. *Operations Research*, 2023.
- [CD17] Yang Cai and Constantinos Daskalakis. Learning multi-item auctions with (or without) samples. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 516–527, 2017.
- [CGMZ21] Yang Cai, Kira Goldner, Steven Ma, and Mingfei Zhao. On multi-dimensional gains from trade maximization. In *SODA*, pages 1079–1098, 2021.
- [CLMZ24] Yang Cai, Christopher Liaw, Aranyak Mehta, and Mingfei Zhao. The power of two-sided recruitment in two-sided markets. In *STOC*, pages 201–212, 2024.
- [CR14] Richard Cole and Tim Roughgarden. The sample complexity of revenue maximization. In *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 243–252, 2014.
- [CW23] Yang Cai and Jinzhao Wu. On the optimal fixed-price mechanism in bilateral trade. In *STOC*, pages 737–750, 2023.
- [DFL⁺21] Paul Dütting, Federico Fusco, Philip Lazos, Stefano Leonardi, and Rebecca Reiffenhäuser. Efficient two-sided markets with limited information. In *STOC*, pages 1452–1465, 2021.
- [DMSW22] Yuan Deng, Jieming Mao, Balasubramanian Sivan, and Kangning Wang. Approximately efficient bilateral trade. In *STOC*, pages 718–721, 2022.
- [DRY10] Peerapong Dhangwatnotai, Tim Roughgarden, and Qiqi Yan. Revenue maximization with a single sample. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM conference on Electronic commerce (EC)*, pages 129–138, 2010.
- [DS24] Shahar Dobzinski and Ariel Shaulker. Bilateral trade with correlated values. In *STOC*, 2024.
- [DZ20] Constantinos Daskalakis and Manolis Zampetakis. More revenue from two samples via factor revealing sdps. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 257–272, 2020.

- [Fei22] Yumou Fei. Improved approximation to first-best gains-from-trade. In *WINE*, pages 204–218, 2022.
- [GHZ19] Chenghao Guo, Zhiyi Huang, and Xinzhi Zhang. Settling the sample complexity of single-parameter revenue maximization. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 662–673, 2019.
- [GHZ20] Chenghao Guo, Zhiyi Huang, and Xinzhi Zhang. Sample complexity of single-parameter revenue maximization. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 17(2):62–70, 2020.
- [GW21] Yannai A Gonczarowski and S Matthew Weinberg. The sample complexity of up-to- ϵ multi-dimensional revenue maximization. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 68(3):1–28, 2021.
- [HHPS25] Ilya Hajiaghayi, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Gary Peng, and Suho Shin. Gains-from-trade in bilateral trade with a broker. In *SODA*, pages 4827–4860, 2025.
- [KPV22] Zi Yang Kang, Francisco Pernice, and Jan Vondrák. Fixed-price approximations in bilateral trade. In *SODA*, pages 2964–2985, 2022.
- [LRW23] Zhengyang Liu, Zeyu Ren, and Ziheng Wang. Improved approximation ratios of fixed-price mechanisms in bilateral trades. In *STOC*, pages 751–760, 2023.
- [McA08] R. Preston McAfee. The gains from trade under fixed price mechanisms. *Applied economics research bulletin*, 1(1):1–10, 2008.
- [MM14] Mehryar Mohri and Andres Munoz Medina. Learning theory and algorithms for revenue optimization in second price auctions with reserve. In *International conference on machine learning (ICML)*, pages 262–270. PMLR, 2014.
- [Mot21] Daniel Motoc. The bilateral trade problem: The case of correlated values. Undergraduate thesis, University of Michigan, 2021.
- [MR15] Jamie H Morgenstern and Tim Roughgarden. On the pseudo-dimension of nearly optimal auctions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- [MR16] Jamie Morgenstern and Tim Roughgarden. Learning simple auctions. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1298–1318. PMLR, 2016.
- [MS83] Roger B. Myerson and Mark A. Satterthwaite. Efficient mechanisms for bilateral trading. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 29(2):265–281, 1983.
- [Syr17] Vasilis Syrgkanis. A sample complexity measure with applications to learning optimal auctions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.

A Omitted Proofs

A.1 Proof Sketch of Revenue-Revenue and Welfare-Welfare Inapproximability

Here we sketch the proofs that for a 1-EO (Definition 2.1) seller with cost $c = 0$, we have that (1) the resulting revenue may not be a constant-factor approximation of the public-prior-case revenue, and (2) the resulting welfare may not be a constant-factor approximation of the public-prior-case welfare.

- It is relatively easy to see that the resulting revenue may not approximate the optimal revenue. As an example, let the buyer's value be equal to 1 with high probability and equal to M^2 with probability $\frac{1}{M}$ for a large number M . If the seller only gets a few samples, then she is likely to set the price at 1 with revenue of 1. However, the optimal revenue is $M^2 \cdot \frac{1}{M} = M$ if the seller knows the prior distribution of the buyer F_b .
- As for welfare approximation, consider a seller who always decides the price after getting exactly $k \gg M_m$ samples. Let $M_0 < M_1 < M_2 < \dots < M_m$ be a sequence of numbers where M_i is sufficiently large compared to M_{i-1} , and $\ln M_0 \gg m$. Let the values be supported on

$$S = \{1\} \cup [2, M_0] \cup \{M_1, M_2, \dots, M_m\}.$$

Define the buyer's value distribution F_b (supported on S) in the following way.

- Posting a price of $p = M_i$ for $i \geq 1$ gives a revenue of $1 - \varepsilon$ for an infinitesimally small $\varepsilon > 0$.
- Posting a price of $p \in [2, M_0]$ gives a revenue of $\frac{1}{2}$.

We point out that a seller with full information of F_b will set the price at 1, resulting in a welfare of at least $\Omega(\log M_0)$. However, the 1-EO seller with k samples will post a price of at least M_1 with probability of about $1 - \frac{1}{m+1}$, and if this happens, then the resulting welfare is at most m . To see why the probability is about $1 - \frac{1}{m+1}$, note that $p \in [2, M_0]$ are unlikely to be the optimal price, and the revenue distributions at $p = 1$ and $p = M_1, M_2, \dots, M_m$ are almost i.i.d. when each $M_i \gg M_{i-1}$ and $k \gg M_m$.

A.2 Proof of Proposition 4.3

For any $\delta > 0$ and $c \in [\delta, 1]$, consider the distribution F defined as follows:

$$v \sim F, \quad v = \begin{cases} 2c & \text{with probability } \delta/2c, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that F has binary support, where the higher value is an integer multiple of c . Applying Lemma 4.6, we conclude that with probability exactly δ/c , the empirical revenue of $2c$ reaches c after a certain number of samples. Moreover, the welfare induced by the price $2c$ is precisely δ . Thus, we have established that with probability exactly δ/c , the worst-case strategy selects a price with induced welfare less than δ , completing the proof.

A.3 Proof of Lemma 4.5

Given an arbitrary (potentially non-discrete) distribution F , we construct a discrete distribution F' by rounding up values of F to the nearest multiple of ε . Formally, we define τ as

$$\tau = \inf\{x \mid \text{Wel}(x) \leq \delta\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $\text{Wel}(\tau) > \delta$. If instead $\text{Wel}(\tau) \leq \delta$, the proof proceeds similarly with a modified discretization approach. Since Wel is non-increasing, it follows that for all $x > \tau$, we have $\text{Wel}(x) \leq \delta$.

Now we define the discretized distribution F' by rounding up the values above τ .

$$\Pr_{v \sim F'}[v = x] = \begin{cases} \Pr_{v \sim F}[v \leq \tau], & \text{if } x = 1, \\ \Pr_{v \sim F}[x - \varepsilon < v \leq x], & \text{if } x = \tau + k\varepsilon \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Define the welfare function with respect to the distribution F' as

$$\text{Wel}'(x) = \mathbb{E}_{v \sim F'}[v \cdot \mathbb{I}[v \geq x]].$$

By the definition of c , it follows that

$$\text{Wel}'(\tau + \varepsilon) = (\tau + \varepsilon) \Pr_{v \sim F'}[v > \tau] \leq \delta + \varepsilon.$$

Similarly, since $\text{Wel}'(x)$ is also non-increasing, any price greater than $\tau + \varepsilon$ results in a welfare of at most $\delta + \varepsilon$.

Next, we couple the sampling processes of F and F' as follows. Given a sample x from F , if $x \leq \tau$, we assume that the corresponding sample from F' is 1. Otherwise, we define

$$x' = \left\lceil \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil \varepsilon$$

as the smallest multiple of ε that is at least x . This construction ensures that sampling x' from F' is equivalent to the process described.

Define $\tilde{F}_s^{(k)}$ and $\tilde{F}'_s^{(k)}$ as the complementary cumulative distribution functions of the empirical distributions after k samples. Suppose that after k samples, there exists a price $x > \tau$ such that its empirical revenue satisfies

$$x \cdot \tilde{F}_s^{(k)}(x) \geq c.$$

Next, define

$$x' = \left\lceil \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil \varepsilon$$

as the smallest multiple of ε that is at least x . By our coupled sampling procedure, the number of sam-

ples from F' that are at least x' must be no less than the number of samples from F that are at least x . Consequently, we obtain

$$x' \cdot \tilde{F}'_s^{(k)}(x') \geq x \cdot \tilde{F}_s^{(k)}(x) \geq c.$$

This implies that the probability of the existence of a price with induced welfare at most $\delta + \varepsilon$ achieving an empirical revenue of at least c under F' is no less than the probability of the existence of a price with induced welfare at most δ achieving an empirical revenue of at least c under F . This completes the proof.