Bandit algorithms in nevenue optimization

(The value of knowing a demand curve! - Kleinbergh Leighton)

· We now see how bandit algorithms (and in Particular, UCB) can be used to perform revenue optimization without knowing prices

· Model -

- n buyers arrive sequentially
- Seller makes a 'posted price' take-it-or-lear-it offer to each byer.
- Each buyer have i.i.d value $V_t \sim F$, E[0,1]a.s.If posted price = P_t , then buyer purchaser iff $P_t \leq V_t$ Fis unknown
- If Fis known, can use monopolist price R(p) $P^* = \arg\max_{P} \left[P \left[1 F(P) \right] \right]$
 - Assume Fishegular => unique P*, R(P) quasiconcave
 If instead we know Vi, Vz,..., Vn, can choose Popi to maximize heremo

1

Then - Assuming R(p) = p F(p) has unique global maximum p^* , and $R'(p^*)$ exists and is strictly negative, then there is an online pricing strategy which achieves an expected negret of $O(\sqrt{n \log n})$

Notes

Let
$$R_n^* = \sum_{t=1}^n P^* 1 \{v_t > p^* \} = n R(p^*)$$

$$R_n^{opt} = \sum_{t=1}^n P 1 \{v_t > p^* \} = n R(p^*)$$

$$R_n^{opt} = \sum_{t=1}^n P 1 \{v_t > p^* \}$$

$$R_n^{opt} = E \sum_{t=1}^n P_t 1 \{v_t > p_t \}$$
where $P_t = Policy T$

$$R_n^{opt} = R_n^{opt} = O(\sqrt{n \log n})$$
and $R_n^{opt} = R_n^* = O(\sqrt{n \log n})$

Thus we have small region with an oracle bound - this is stronger than competing with pt

Why regret? It was known that there are transformized pricing algos s.t \mathbb{R}^{T} > $\frac{1}{1+\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Regret captures the lower order dependence on n

· This was the first regret bound for an infinite arm setting

· In particular, given K, we consider the price. $\{\frac{1}{K}, \frac{2}{K}, \dots, \frac{K}{K}\}$ as arms' (we leter choose $K=(\frac{n}{\log n})^{\frac{1}{4}}$)

- Now we can use UCB.

For Pi= i/k, the payoff is X:= {i/k if \forall > i/k}

O ow

 $=) \quad \mathcal{U}_{i} = \mathbb{E}\left[X_{i}\right] = \frac{i}{K} \overline{F}\left(\frac{i}{K}\right)$

· lot Given K, let (i*, p*) = best arm i*/K $\Delta_i \equiv (\mathcal{N} - \mathcal{N}_i)$

- We want to show we get close to $n p^*$, and also that np^* is close to $np^* \overline{F}(p^*)$.

Lorma: \exists constants C_1, C_2 s.t $C_1(p^2-p^2)^2 \leq R(p^4) \leq C_2(p^2-p^2)^2$ for all PELO,1]

 $Pf - Far pe[p^*-e, p^*+e], use Taylor (:R(p^*)-o)$ $R(p) \approx R(p^*) + C(p-p^*)^2, C = R^*(p^*)$ For PE [0, p*-E] U[p*+E, 1], sinothe set is compad and R(P) < R(P*), we can

Now take G=min(G,B) find B, B2 s.t B, (p*-p)2 < R(p*)-R(n) < B2(p*-p)2.

$$P_{3} - 3 i \text{ s.t. } | p^{*} - i/k | \leq 1/k$$

 $P_{4} - 3 i \text{ s.t. } | p^{*} - i/k | \leq 1/k$
 $P_{5} - 3 i \text{ s.t. } | p^{*} - i/k | \leq 1/k$

Lemma - Suppose we sort Di as
$$\tilde{D}_0 \leq \tilde{D}_1 \leq ... \leq \tilde{D}_K$$

Then $\tilde{D}_j \geq C_1 (j/2K)^2$

Nowconsider
$$R_n^{TT} - np^*$$

From UCB $- (R_n^{TT} - np^*) \leq \sum_{i:p_i < p^*} (8 \log n + 2)$
 $32k^2$ $T_i^2 \log n + 2k$

$$\leq \frac{32k^2}{C_1^2} \cdot \frac{T_1^2 l_{gn+}}{6} 2k$$

$$= O\left(k^2 l_{gn}\right)$$

. On the other hand,
$$nR(p^*) - \overline{R} n p^* \leq \frac{nC_2}{K^2} = O(\frac{n}{K^2})$$

· Choosing
$$K = \left(\frac{n}{\ln n}\right)^{1/2} \Rightarrow n R(p^*) - \overline{R}_n^{\pi} \leq O(\sqrt{n \log n})$$

(5)

- · However we do not know n
 - Doubling trick
 - · Use no=1, n=2, n=4..., n=2
 - This continues till 2 n => ltaQ(log, n) as
 - However region = $\sum_{l=0}^{e^*} (n_l \log n_l)^{l/2} = \sum_{l=0}^{\log n_l} (l 2^l)^{l/2}$
 - = O (Inlogn)
- · Finally, we can also show $R_n^{opt} R_n^* = O(\sqrt{n}\log n)$
 - this follows from Chernoff bounds See KL'03
- · This result is also near-optimal
- Then (KL'03) No policy TT can achieve RIT QUI)
- · Intuition Consider 2 coins of prob 1/2, 1/2+E
 We need $\Omega(1/E^2)$ trials to accurately identify the better

Coin

Now we can use this to construct a worst-case F s.t iget= 2(57)