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Abstract

In stochastic simulation, input uncertainty (IU) is caused by the error in estimating the input distributions using finite real-world data. When it comes to simulation-based Ranking and Selection (R&S), ignoring IU could lead to the failure of many existing selection procedures. In this paper, we study R&S under IU by allowing the possibility of acquiring additional data. Two classical R&S formulations are extended to account for IU: (i) for fixed confidence, we consider when data arrive sequentially so that IU can be reduced over time; (ii) for fixed budget, a joint budget is assumed to be available for both collecting input data and running simulations. New procedures are proposed for each formulation using the frameworks of Sequential Elimination and Optimal Computing Budget Allocation, with theoretical guarantees provided accordingly (e.g., upper bound on the expected running time and finite-sample bound on the probability of false selection). Numerical results demonstrate the effectiveness of our procedures through a multi-stage production-inventory problem.
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1 Introduction

Stochastic simulation has been used to model a wide variety of complex real-world systems. In building a simulation model, one often needs to specify a set of probability distributions, which capture the stochasticity in the physical system being modeled (e.g., customer demand, traveling time, and so forth). Theses distributions are first estimated/fitted using real-world data, and then plugged into the simulation model as an input, hence the name “input distributions”. However, due to the estimation error caused by finite data, simulation output suffers from the so-called “input uncertainty” (IU). Another source of uncertainty, which we call “simulation uncertainty” (SU), is the error caused by using finite simulation runs to evaluate a design’s performance. The major difference between IU and SU is that, while SU can be controlled by investing simulation effort, IU can only be reduced by collecting more real-world input data. Quantifying the mixed impact of IU and SU on a single design’s
output has been an active research topic, and we refer the reader to [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] and the references therein.

In this paper, we study the problem of Ranking and Selection (R&S), or Discrete Optimization via Simulation (DOvS), which is concerned with using simulation to efficiently identify the best system design among a finite number of alternatives. Traditionally, R&S has been studied by assuming that there is no IU, while the focus is on tackling SU. Two major formulations of R&S are: (i) the fixed confidence setting, where one seeks to achieve a desired guarantee on the probability of correct selection or the probability of good selection ([7]) using as little simulation effort as possible; (ii) the fixed budget setting, where the goal is to maximize the probability of correctly selecting the best design using a finite budget of simulation runs (or running time). Interestingly, the R&S problem has attracted independent interest from both the simulation community and researchers who work on the Multi-Armed Bandits problem (see, e.g., [8]), and as a result, both formulations have been studied extensively in the literature. We make no attempt to provide a comprehensive overview but instead point the reader to [9, 10] for excellent reviews. In particular, we find two general frameworks the most relevant to us. One is a Sequential Elimination framework for fixed confidence ([11, 12, 13]), and the other is the Optimal Computing Budget Allocation (OCBA) framework for fixed budget ([14, 15]). A more detailed introduction to these frameworks will be provided later on, along with a discussion on why other methods do not conveniently apply to the settings considered in this paper.

In practice, directly applying traditional R&S procedures while ignoring IU can be misleading and may render selection guarantees invalid ([16]). In light of such observations, recent effort has been made to account for IU when the input dataset is given and fixed. For instance, in the fixed confidence setting, [17] take a Bayesian perspective and select the design with the best performance averaged over the posterior distribution of input models; [16] and [18] consider a fixed confidence formulation under an Indifference-Zone (IZ) setting, and both discover that a larger IZ parameter is required to maintain the desired statistical guarantee under IU; [19] take a distributionally robust approach (see, e.g., [20, 21, 22, 23]) by comparing the designs based on their worst-case performance over a finite set of possible input distributions. In the fixed budget setting, [24] seems to be the only work in this category, where they combine a distributionally robust perspective with the OCBA framework. Aside from selection procedures, [25] propose a comparison procedure which exploits the common input distribution effect to construct simultaneous confidence intervals for all designs’ performance. Nevertheless, despite these efforts devoted to R&S under IU, the problem is not nearly as well-studied as its traditional counterpart without IU.

The aforementioned works all assume a static (fixed) input dataset, because in some applications the cost of collecting additional data is prohibitively high (e.g., collecting experimental data by running clinical trials). However, there are also cases where new data can be accessed at a reasonable pace and cost. For instance, an online retailer gets to observe the demand of a certain product every week. Similarly, a wind power plant has built-in sensors that gather wind data on a daily basis. In these scenarios, a moderate amount of data can be collected periodically, and it motivates us to think about input data from a dynamic rather than a static viewpoint. In such a context, we propose to study the following two settings.

**Fixed confidence.** Suppose that data become available to us in an online fashion, e.g., new data arrive sequentially over time. For the purpose of R&S, the new data can be used to refine our input distribution estimates, and additional simulations can be run to improve the estimates of the designs’ performance. The question, then, is how to leverage the streaming
data to identify the best design (say, with 95% probability of correct selection) as quickly as possible. A hidden challenge here lies in aggregating simulation outputs that are generated under different input distributions.

**Fixed budget.** Suppose that a certain form of budget is given, which can be used to collect input data as well as run simulations. The goal is to maximize the probability of correct selection by striking a balance between data acquisition and simulation experimentation. A natural case is when both costs are measured in time units, so long as they are on comparable scales. The budget could also be measured in terms of monetary value, since some data can be purchased from data vendors (e.g., financial transaction data vendors), and simulations can be run on commercial cloud computing platforms, which is usually priced based on running time and the type of machines used.

The above settings essentially raise two central questions. First, what can we do if we can acquire more data? Second, how much data is “enough”? Our paper addresses these questions through the following contributions.

1. In the fixed confidence setting, we extend and modify a Sequential Elimination framework to allow pairwise comparisons, which significantly improves selection efficiency compared with directly extending the Sequential Elimination framework. We provide upper bounds on the expected total running time of our procedures, and propose a heuristic method to further boost efficiency.

2. In the fixed budget setting, we propose a procedure, OCBAIU, which can effectively balance IU and SU, and achieve a near-optimal probability of correct selection for different configurations of problem instances and cost parameters. A finite-sample bound is also provided on the probability of false selection.

3. In designing the aforementioned procedures, we establish a few asymptotic normality results for online as well as nested estimators, which are of independent interest. Our result on an online estimator explicitly characterizes the bias-variance tradeoff in aggregating simulation outputs under repeatedly updated input distributions. Meanwhile, our result for a nested estimator closely mirrors a classical result in [1] on decomposing the variance caused by IU and SU.

4. Finally, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our procedures on a multi-stage production-inventory problem. The numerical results suggest that the proposed methods work well for both single input distribution (one source of IU) and multiple input distributions (four independent sources of IU).

The fixed budget part in this paper can also be found in [26], but the results there only consider a single input distribution, and no finite-sample guarantee is provided for OCBAIU. This paper substantially extends [26] by strengthening the theoretical results, as well as studying a new fixed confidence problem. On a further note, we are not the first to consider the joint decision of controlling IU and SU. For example, [27] studies how to balance input data size and simulation effort to minimize the asymptotic variance of a single design’s performance estimator. However, to the best of our knowledge, we are among the first to consider such tradeoff in an optimization (R&S) context. In addition, our fixed budget setting is somewhat related to [28], in which the authors weigh the benefit of running simulations against the opportunity cost of delay in decision making, but their setting does not have IU as a concern.
The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The basic settings and notations are reviewed in Section 2. Sections 3 and 4 introduce the fixed confidence and fixed budget formulations, respectively, with corresponding procedures developed along the way. After that, we present the numerical results in Section 5 and conclude in Section 6.

2 Basic Settings

The R&S problem studied in this paper is concerned with identifying the design with the highest expected performance among \( K \) alternatives. Denote by \( \mathcal{I} := \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \) the enumeration of all designs. For a design \( i \in \mathcal{I} \), let \( h_i : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R} \) be its performance measure function, and let \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^m \) be a random vector capturing the stochasticity in the system. Similar to [25], we study a case where all \( K \) designs share the same input distribution \( P^c \) ("c" means "correct"). The best design is defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
  b := \arg\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{E}_{P^c}[h_i(\xi)],
\end{align*}
\]

where the expectation is assumed to be finite. We will assume that \( b \) is unique to avoid technicality. Furthermore, we make some specific assumptions on the structure of \( P^c \). Suppose that \( P^c \) consists of several mutually independent distributions, where each input distribution belongs to a known parametric family but with unknown parameter. More precisely, we lay down the following notations to facilitate further discussion.

(i) We have \( Q \) mutually independent input distributions \( \{P_{\theta^c(1)}, P_{\theta^c(2)}, \ldots, P_{\theta^c(Q)}\} \), where each \( \theta^c(q), 1 \leq q \leq Q \) lives in a closed parameter space \( \Theta(q) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_q} \).

(ii) Then, \( P^c \) can be specified as a product measure \( P_{\theta^c} := P_{\theta^c(1)} \times \cdots \times P_{\theta^c(Q)} \), where \( \theta^c = [\theta(1)^\top, \ldots, \theta(Q)^\top]^\top \) is the collection of all parameters, and \( ^\top \) denotes matrix transpose.

(iii) Let \( \Theta := \prod_{q=1}^{Q} \Theta(q) \) and \( \sum_{q=1}^{Q} d_q = d \), so \( \theta^c \) lives in a parameter space \( \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \).

(iv) Similarly, we can decompose \( \xi \) into \( [\xi(1)^\top, \xi(2)^\top, \ldots, \xi(Q)^\top]^\top \), where each \( \xi(q), 1 \leq q \leq Q \) is a random vector in \( \mathbb{R}^{m_q} \) with distribution \( P_{\theta^c(q)} \), and \( \sum_{q=1}^{Q} m_q = m \).

(v) The input data for the the \( q \)th input distribution, denoted by \( \{\zeta_1(q), \zeta_2(q), \ldots\} \), are i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) samples from \( P_{\theta^c(q)} \).

For example, an M/M/1 queue simulation model has \( Q = 2 \) input distributions, where \( P_{\theta^c(1)} \) is the inter-arrival time distribution, and \( P_{\theta^c(2)} \) is the service time distribution. Both distributions are exponential, with \( \theta^c(1) > 0 \) and \( \theta^c(2) > 0 \) being their means.

The parametric assumption on \( P^c \) can be justified by allowing a mixture of multiple parametric distributions (see the discussion in [1]), provided that the parameter space is finite-dimensional. The following notations will be used throughout the paper.

(i) \( H_i(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_{P^c}[h_i(\xi)] \), i.e., the true performance of design \( i \) under input distribution \( P^c \).

(ii) \( \delta_{ij}(\theta) := H_i(\theta) - H_j(\theta) \), i.e., the difference between designs \( i \) and \( j \)’s performances under input distribution \( P^c \).

(iii) \( \sigma^2_i(\theta) := \text{Var}_{P^c}[h_i(\xi)] \), i.e., the variance of design \( i \)'s simulation output under input distribution \( P^c \).
In traditional R&S, the true input distribution $P_{\theta^c}$ is assumed to be known accurately, and the only source of uncertainty is SU. For a given parameter $\theta$, let $\hat{H}_i(\theta)$ denote the estimate of $H_i(\theta)$. If design $i$ has been simulated $M_i$ times, then we have

$$\hat{H}_i(\theta^c) := \frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{r=1}^{M_i} h_i(\xi_{ir}), \quad \{\xi_{ir}\}_{r=1}^{M_i} \sim P_{\theta^c} \text{ i.i.d.,}$$

where the samples $\{\xi_{ir}\}_r$ are independent across different designs unless otherwise specified. Due to the estimation error in $\hat{H}_i(\theta^c)$, our selected design may not be the best one. Thus, a commonly used measure of selection quality is the probability of correct selection (PCS), which is defined as

$$\text{PCS} := \mathbb{P}\left\{ b = \arg \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \hat{H}_i(\theta^c) \right\} = \mathbb{P}\left\{ \bigcap_{i \neq b} \left\{ \hat{\delta}_{bi}(\theta^c) > 0 \right\} \right\},$$

where $\hat{\delta}_{ij}(\theta) := \hat{H}_i(\theta) - \hat{H}_j(\theta)$ for any two designs $i$ and $j$. Informally, the two classical formulations of R&S, i.e., fixed confidence and fixed budget, are both concerned with achieving a satisfactory PCS through efficient simulation experiments. As is indicated by existing literature, R&S is already a difficult problem even without IU.

In practice, since $\theta^c$ is usually estimated using finite real-world data, IU is inevitable and it can affect R&S adversely. To see this, consider the following set

$$\mathcal{P} := \{ \theta \in \Theta \mid H_b(\theta) < \max_{i \neq b} H_i(\theta) \},$$

which is the set of parameters under which the best design is perturbed into a design other than $b$. We will refer to $\mathcal{P}$ as the perturbation region. In general, $\mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$ and our estimate of $\theta^c$ can fall into $\mathcal{P}$ with a nonzero probability. If this happens, then a suboptimal design will be selected even using infinite simulation budget (see the $(s,S)$ inventory optimization example in [25]). Therefore, it is important to take IU into account when designing R&S procedures. However, unlike SU, IU cannot be controlled by increasing simulation effort. Instead, it can only be reduced by enlarging the input dataset. In what follows, we discuss how to account for IU in both the fixed confidence and the fixed budget formulations when it is possible to collect additional input data.

### 3 Fixed Confidence Formulation

In general, the fixed confidence formulation of R&S aims to provide a statistical selection guarantee (e.g., 95% PCS) using minimal simulation effort or other resources. In the case without IU, a large body of literature studies the Indifference-Zone (IZ) formulation, which allows the user to specify the smallest difference in performance worth detecting. Most IZ procedures construct a continuation region for all pairs of designs $(i,j)$ such that, if $\hat{\delta}_{ij}(\theta^c)$ escapes the region, then the sign of $\delta_{ij}(\theta^c)$ can be determined confidently based on which side $\hat{\delta}_{ij}(\theta^c)$ exits from. The key is to find a small continuation region for fast stopping without compromising the selection guarantee. Procedures of this type include the KN procedure ([29]), the BIZ procedure ([30]), the IZ-free procedures ([31]) among several others.
In the presence of IU, we consider a multi-stage scenario, where incremental data become available at each stage. This allows us to update the estimate of $\theta^c$ and run further simulations to refine the estimates of $\delta_{ij}(\theta^c)$. With sequential input data, our goal is to deliver a PCS guarantee after a small number of “stages” (defined in Section 3.1). A motivating example is simulating different pricing strategies and promotion plans for a ride-hailing platform, where data about riders’ preference, drivers’ behavior, and traffic conditions can be collected periodically.

The major challenge in this setting is that many existing procedures cannot be extended easily to handle IU. For example, most IZ procedures rely on a normality assumption on the simulation outputs, as this would admit the use of well-established tools associated with Brownian motion. While normality is justified by batching and the Central Limit Theorem (CLT), the assumption typically fails when simulations are run under an estimate of $\theta^c$, especially if such an estimate is updated in an online fashion. In this paper, we build our procedures on a Sequential Elimination framework ([11, 12, 13]), as it allows us to construct valid continuation regions even in the presence of IU. Here we use a production-inventory problem (see Section 5 for details) to illustrate how our procedure works.

Figure 1: Continuation region: accounting for IU and ignoring IU.

Figure 1 shows two continuation regions for comparing designs 4 and 5, where the area between the blue curves is the region constructed by our procedure, and the area between the red curves is the region constructed by ignoring IU. The dashed line is the trajectory of $\hat{\delta}_{45}$ across different stages. A continuation region works as follows. If $\hat{\delta}_{45}$ exits the region from above, then we conclude $\delta_{45} > 0$ and vice versa. Notice that in the early stages, the estimate $\hat{\delta}_{45}$ deviates from $\delta_{45}(\theta^c) \approx -0.1$ due to IU and SU. If we use the continuation region constructed by ignoring IU, then we would mistakenly conclude that $\delta_{45} > 0$. In contrast, our procedure accounts for IU by enlarging the continuation region, which ensures a correct comparison result with a desired probability.

The road map for the fixed confidence formulation is laid out as follows. First, we formulate the problem mathematically in Section 3.1. Then, we develop a procedure, SE-IU, in Section 3.3 by extending the Sequential Elimination framework. In Section 3.4, we improve SE-IU by proposing a pairwise comparison procedure. Theoretical guarantees are provided for both procedures when using the true values of parameters. In addition, we propose a heuristic method to further boost selection efficiency in Section 3.5. Finally, Section 3.6 gives some guidance on implementation.
3.1 Problem setup

Suppose that new batches of i.i.d. input data arrive sequentially, and our goal is to continuously reduce IU and SU in order to identify the best design with high confidence. More specifically, we would like our R&S procedure to run over a number of “stages”, where at each stage the following two steps are carried out.

(i) For each input distribution \( P_{\theta^c(q)} \), collect \( k_q > 0 \) additional new data samples to update the estimate of \( \theta^c(q) \).

(ii) For each design, run additional \( R > 0 \) replications under the new estimate of \( \theta^c \), and update the estimate of \( H_i(\theta^c) \).

For simplicity, \( k_q \) and \( R \) are assumed to be fixed constants across different stages. We call a procedure valid if it selects the best design with a guaranteed PCS upon termination at a certain stage. The validness of a procedure hinges on three aspects.

1. **Choice of estimator.** What estimator is used to estimate \( \theta^c(q) \)? The choice will affect the properties of the online estimator of \( H_i(\theta^c) \), as well as the difficulty of designing a continuation region.

2. **Online estimation.** Although the estimate of \( \theta^c \) gets increasingly accurate over the stages, the estimate of \( H_i(\theta^c) \) cannot converge to its true value without reusing the simulation outputs from previous stages. How should we approach this online estimation problem?

3. **Procedure design.** The fixed confidence formulation essentially seeks to find a stopping time \( \tau^* \) such that by the \( \tau^* \)th stage, we can confidently determine which design is the best one. How can we design \( \tau^* \) to make \( \mathbb{E}[\tau^*] \) as small as possible?

Regarding the first aspect, we will restrict our discussion to a specific type of estimator. Let \( \hat{\theta}_{N_q}(q) \) be the estimate of \( \theta^c(q) \) using \( N_q \) data samples, and recall that \( \{\zeta_1(q), \ldots, \zeta_{N_q}(q)\} \) are the input data. The following assumption is made to make the analysis more tractable.

**Assumption 3.1.** For each input parameter \( \theta^c(q) \), its estimator can be written in the form of \( \hat{\theta}_{N_q}(q) = \frac{1}{N_q} \sum_{j=1}^{N_q} G_q(\zeta_j(q)) \), where \( G_q : \mathbb{R}^{m_q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_q} \) and \( \mathbb{E}[G_q(\zeta_1(q))] = \theta^c(q) \).

Assumption 3.1 can often be satisfied through reparametrization. For example, the normal distribution can be reparametrized by its first two moments, and then \( \hat{\theta}_{N_q}(q) \) corresponds to the moment estimators. Under Assumption 3.1, our problem setting can be simplified considerably. During the \( n \)th stage, we collect \( k_q \) additional data samples \( \{\zeta_j(q) \mid j = (n-1)k_q + 1, \ldots, nk_q\} \) for the \( q \)th input model, and the sample mean of these incremental data samples is

\[
D_n(q) := \frac{1}{k_q} \sum_{j=(n-1)k_q+1}^{nk_q} G_q(\zeta_j(q)),
\]

which can be viewed as a single batched data sample with variance shrunk by a factor of \( k_q \). It can be easily checked that

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} D_j(q) = \frac{1}{nk_q} \sum_{j=1}^{nk_q} G_q(\zeta_j(q)), \quad \forall 1 \leq q \leq Q.
\]
We may therefore gather these incremental estimates into a vector
\[ D_n := [D_n(1), \ldots, D_n(Q)]^\top \]
in \( \mathbb{R}^d \). In other words, without loss of generality, we can assume that at the end of the \( n \)th stage, the estimator of \( \theta^c \) takes the form of 
\[ \hat{\theta}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n D_j, \]
where \( D_j \) are i.i.d. samples with \( \mathbb{E}[D_1] = \theta^c \). Similarly, it suffices to consider \( R = 1 \), i.e., when only one additional simulation replication is run at each stage. From this point on, our problem setting is simplified as follows. During the \( n \)th stage,

(i) first collect one data sample \( D_n \), and compute
\[ \hat{\theta}_n = \frac{n-1}{n} \hat{\theta}_{n-1} + \frac{1}{n} D_n; \]

(ii) then, for each design, run one more independent simulation replication under \( \hat{\theta}_n \), and aggregate the simulation output with the previous ones.

### 3.2 Moving average estimator

For the online estimation problem described in Section 3.1, a consistent estimator of \( H_i(\theta^c) \) can be constructed in various ways. For instance, simply averaging all the simulation outputs \( \{h_i(\xi_m)\}_n \) usually ensures consistency. An alternative is to use a likelihood ratio estimator by reweighting the simulation outputs, but due to the correlation among \( \{\hat{\theta}_n\} \), the resulting estimator will be biased (see [32] for insights into this observation).

Since our ultimate goal is to solve the R&S problem, the main challenge lies in finding an estimator which facilitates the design of a valid procedure. Let \( \hat{H}_{i,n} \) denote the estimate of \( H_i(\theta^c) \) at the end of the \( n \)th stage. We construct an estimator by discarding the first (or the “oldest”) \( n_\eta := \lfloor \eta n \rfloor, \eta \in (0,1) \), simulation outputs and then averaging the rest, i.e.,

\[ \hat{H}_{i,n} := \frac{1}{n - n_\eta} \sum_{r=n_\eta+1}^{n_\eta} h_i(\xi_{ir}), \quad i \in I. \] (3.1)

The estimator in (3.1) will be referred to as a moving average estimator, since it averages simulation outputs within a moving and expanding time window. The motivation is to throw away some of those “outdated” simulation outputs which were generated under less accurate estimates of \( \theta^c \). We establish the asymptotic normality of \( \hat{H}_{i,n} \) in the following theorem, where \( \mathcal{N} \) denotes normal distribution, and “\( \Rightarrow \)” denotes convergence in distribution.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Further suppose that \( \Sigma_G := \text{Cov}[D_1] \) exists and \( H_i \) is twice continuously differentiable at \( \theta^c \). Then, for any \( \eta \in [0,1) \),

\[ \sqrt{n}[\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c)] \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \tilde{\sigma}_{i,\infty}^2) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty, \]

where

\[ \tilde{\sigma}_{i,\infty}^2 := w_\eta \nabla H_i(\theta^c)^\top \Sigma_G \nabla H_i(\theta^c) + \frac{1}{1 - \eta} \sigma_i^2(\theta^c), \]

with \( \nabla \) being the gradient, and

\[ w_\eta := \frac{2}{1 - \eta} + \frac{2\eta \log \eta}{(1 - \eta)^2}. \]

Theorem 3.1 is an interesting result in its own right. It shows that the limiting variance \( \tilde{\sigma}_{i,\infty}^2 \) is again a weighted sum of variances caused by IU and SU, which are \( \tilde{V}_I := \nabla H_i(\theta^c)^\top \Sigma_G \nabla H_i(\theta^c) \) and \( \tilde{V}_S := \sigma_i^2(\theta^c) \), respectively. To interpret the weights, we look at the following cases.
(i) Setting $\eta = 0$ gives $w_\eta = 2$, meaning that if we retain all the outputs, then the variance caused by IU, corresponding to $\tilde{V}_I$, will be doubled.

(ii) Sending $\eta \to 1$ gives $w_\eta \to 1$. This loosely corresponds to the case of $\hat{H}_{i,n} = h_i(\xi_{in})$, where we only retain the single most recent output. As a result, $\hat{H}_{i,n}$ is free from the error accumulated over previous estimates of $\theta^c$, and thus $\tilde{V}_I$ is not inflated. However, $\tilde{V}_S$ is inflated by a factor $1/(1 - \eta) \to \infty$, since the effective number of outputs is not tending to $\infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

(iii) A balance between IU and SU can be achieved by choosing the $\eta$ that minimizes $\tilde{\sigma}^2_{i,\infty}$.

Roughly speaking, the parameter $\eta$ captures a bias-variance tradeoff. On the one hand, discarding previous outputs helps reduce the bias $H_i(\hat{\theta}_n) - H_i(\theta^c)$ due to IU. On the other hand, the variance caused by SU gets inflated if we average fewer simulation outputs. In Section 3.3, we will explain the role of moving average estimator in designing a valid procedure.

At this point, an important note is that simply ignoring IU and applying existing procedures may result in undershooting the PCS target. For example, in the production-inventory problem to be considered in Section 5, if we apply a traditional Sequential Elimination procedure for $k_q = R = 100$ with a target PCS of 95%, then the resulting PCS will only be around 86%.

### 3.3 The SE-IU procedure

Our first procedure is a direct extension of a Sequential Elimination framework proposed by [11, 12], which is also discussed in [13] recently. This general paradigm has a simple structure and can be extended to handle IU. Given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the idea is to construct confidence bounds $\{c_{i,n}\}$ on $\hat{H}_{i,n}$ for each design $i$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\{|\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c)| \leq c_{i,n}, \forall i, n\} \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1),$$

where $c_{i,n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. At each stage $n$, a design $i$ gets eliminated if

$$\hat{H}_{i,n} + c_{i,n} < \max_{j \neq i} \left\{\hat{H}_{j,n} - c_{j,n}\right\}.$$ 

In other words, a design is eliminated if its upper confidence bound is below some other design’s lower confidence bound. Then, on the event $\mathcal{E} := \left\{|\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c)| \leq c_{i,n}, \forall i, n\right\}$, we have for any $i \neq b$,

$$\hat{H}_{b,n} + c_{b,n} - (\hat{H}_{i,n} - c_{i,n}) \geq \delta_{b}(\theta^c) > 0, \quad \forall n.$$ 

Therefore, design $b$ will never be eliminated on event $\mathcal{E}$. Since $c_{i,n} \to 0$, the procedure terminates almost surely, and $b$ will survive all eliminations with probability at least $1 - \alpha$. By (3.2), this delivers the desired PCS guarantee.

The key to efficiently ruling out inferior designs is to find tight confidence bounds $\{c_{i,n}\}$ that satisfy (3.2). When there is no IU, this can be easily done using well-known concentration inequalities on $H_i(\theta^c)$, such as the Chernoff bound and Hoeffding’s inequality. In the presence of IU, these inequalities do not apply directly and a new concentration bound needs to be derived for $\hat{H}_{i,n}$. The following assumption will be useful to this end. Recall that a random variable $X$ is sub-Gaussian with parameter $\sigma$ if $\mathbb{E}[e^{sX}] \leq \exp(\sigma^2 s^2/2)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. 


Assumption 3.2.

(i) For all $1 \leq j \leq d$, the $j$th coordinate of $D_n$ is sub-Gaussian with parameter $\nu_j$.

(ii) For any $\theta \in \Theta$, if $\xi \sim P_{\theta}$, then $h_i(\xi)$ is sub-Gaussian.

(iii) For all $u > 0$ and any design $i$, there exists a function $L_i(\cdot) > 0$ such that

$$\|H_i(\theta_1) - H_i(\theta_2)\| \leq L_i(u)\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|, \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \{\theta \in \Theta \mid \|\theta - \theta^c\| \leq u\},$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm.

(iv) For any design $i$, $\sigma^2_i(\theta)$ is a continuous function of $\theta$.

Assumption 3.2 (i) and (ii) may appear restrictive at first sight. For example, the input distributions in an M/M/1 queue simulation model are sub-exponential but not sub-Gaussian. However, we make these assumptions mainly to avoid unnecessary technicality, and we will show numerically that our procedure works even if these conditions are not met.

To get a sense of how to meet the guarantee in (3.2), consider constructing confidence bounds $c_{i,n}$ such that

$$P\left\{\{\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c)\| \leq c_{i,n}, \forall n\}^c\right\} \leq \beta \quad (3.3)$$

for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$, where “$c$” denotes set complement. One way is to consider an event

$$A_u := \{\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^c\| \leq u, \forall n\}$$

for some $u > 0$. Then, the guarantee in (3.3) can be met if we can control

$$P\left\{A_u \cap \{\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c)\| \leq c_{i,n}, \forall n\}^c\right\} + P(A_u^c), \quad (3.4)$$

since it is an upper bound on the left-hand side (LHS) of (3.3). Note that $P(A_u^c)$ can be controlled by enlarging $u$. Meanwhile, on the event $A_u$, we have $H_i$ being Lipschitz continuous and $\sigma_i(\hat{\theta}_n)$ being bounded, where it is possible to derive a concentration bound for $|\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c)|$ through a decomposition,

$$|\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c)| \leq |\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\hat{\theta}_n)| + |H_i(\hat{\theta}_n) - H_i(\theta^c)|.$$

The rest is to combine all the bounds through a union bound, where the choice of the estimator $\hat{H}_{i,n}$ is crucial. For example, if we simply average all the simulation outputs, then the bound will be infinite due to cumulative bias. Using the moving average estimator, however, we are able to construct $c_{i,n}$ that satisfies (3.3) by virtue of a bias-variance tradeoff (as long as $\eta > 0$).

The upcoming SE-IU procedure relies on some key parameters including $\{\nu_j\}$, $\{\sigma_i\}$ and $\{L_i\}$. For now, we present an ideal version of the procedure by assuming full knowledge of these parameters, and defer implementation details to Section 3.6.

Procedure: SE-IU (ideal version)

- **Input.** $\alpha \in (0, 1), \eta \in (0, 1), K \geq 2, n_0 \geq 10.$
• **Step 1.** Solve the following equation in $u$, and let $u^*$ be the solution.

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{d} \frac{\exp\left( - \frac{(n_0+1)u^2}{2d\nu_j^2} \right)}{1 - \exp\left( - \frac{u^2}{2d\nu_j^2} \right)} = \frac{\alpha}{6}.
$$

(3.5)

• **Step 2.** For each design, compute

$$
\bar{\sigma}_i := \sup_{\|\theta - \theta^c\| \leq u^*} \sigma_i(\theta), \quad \bar{L}_i := L_i(u^*),
$$

as well as the constants

$$
\kappa_{n_0} := \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} n^{-2}, \quad \beta_{n_0} := \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} (n - n_\eta)^{-2}.
$$

Let $\bar{\nu} := \max_j \nu_j$. Run $n_0$ stages and set $n \leftarrow n_0 + 1$. Also set $S \leftarrow \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$.

• **Step 3.** Run an additional stage for all designs $1, 2, \ldots, K$, and compute their estimates $\hat{H}_{i,n}$ using the moving average estimator in (3.1).

• **Step 4.** Compute the confidence bounds $c_{i,n}$ for each design $i$, where $c_{i,n} = t_{i,n} + r_{i,n}$ and

$$
t_{i,n} := 2\bar{\sigma}_i \sqrt{\ln \left( \frac{6dK\kappa_{n_0} n}{\alpha} \right) \frac{1}{n - n_\eta}}, \quad r_{i,n} := \bar{\nu} \bar{L}_i \sqrt{\frac{6d \ln \left( \frac{6dK\beta_{n_0}}{\alpha} \right) \frac{1}{n_\eta} (n - n_\eta)}{n_\eta + 1}}.
$$

(3.6)

For each $i \in S$, if

$$
\hat{H}_{i,n} + c_{i,n} < \max_{j \neq i} \left( \hat{H}_{j,n} - c_{j,n} \right),
$$

then set $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{i\}$. Go to Output if $|S| = 1$; otherwise, set $n \leftarrow n + 1$ and go to Step 3.

• **Output.** Select the only design in $S$ as the best one.

Some important features of SE-IU are outlined as follows.

1. First, the width of $\{c_{i,n}\}$ is of order $O(\sqrt{\ln(n)/n})$, which is standard for Sequential Elimination procedures. However, the confidence bounds are widened compared with the case without IU, since $t_{i,n}$ and $r_{i,n}$ correspond to SU and IU, respectively.

2. Second, we do not eliminate any design in the first $n_0$ stages. In view of (3.5), a larger $n_0$ leads to a smaller $u^*$, which in turn gives us smaller $\bar{\sigma}_i, \bar{L}_i, \kappa_{n_0}$ and $\beta_{n_0}$, hence tighter confidence bounds. Also, equation (3.5) always has a unique solution, since the LHS is a continuous and monotone function of $u$ with range $(0, \infty)$.

3. Third, the running time of SE-IU primarily depends on the parameters $\nu_j, \bar{\sigma}_i, \bar{L}_i$, and $\delta_{b\eta}(\theta^c)$. For instance, if $\bar{\sigma}_i$ is increased by a factor of $k > 1$, then it would take at least $k^2$ times as many stages to reach the same width of confidence bounds.
Let $\tau^*$ be the number of stages until the procedure terminates. A nice property of the Sequential Elimination framework is that it is automatically equipped with an upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[\tau^*]$.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let Assumption 3.2 hold. Then, the SE-IU procedure guarantees to select the best design with probability at least $1 - \alpha$. Furthermore,

$$
\mathbb{E}[\tau^*] \leq 2 \sum_{i \neq b} \tau^*_i + 4(K - 1)(\alpha + 2de^{-K}(1 - e^{-K})^{-2}),
$$

where $\tau^*_i := \inf\{n > n_0 \mid 2(c_{i,n} + c_{i,n}) \leq \delta_{bi}(\theta^c)\}$ and $K := \eta(u^*)^2/(2\bar{d}^2)$.

The dominating term in Theorem 3.2’s bound is $\sum_{i \neq b} \tau^*_i$, where each $\tau^*_i$ characterizes the difficulty in eliminating design $i$. For example, if design $i$ has a large variance $\sigma^2_i(\theta^c)$ and a small gap $\delta_{bi}(\theta^c)$, then $\tau^*_i$ would be large, and it will take longer to eliminate design $i$. Given the same performance gap $\delta_{bi}(\theta^c)$, $\tau^*_i$ primarily depends on $\{c_{i,n}\}$, i.e., the width of the confidence bounds. In Sections 3.4 and 3.5, we discuss how to tighten the confidence bounds in order to achieve faster stopping.

### 3.4 The Pairwise SE-IU procedure

Despite the elegance of the Sequential Elimination framework, it overlooks two important factors in stochastic simulation: (i) as a variance reduction technique, common random numbers (CRN), i.e., sharing the same $\{\xi_{ir}\}_r$ across all designs, often sharpens the comparison between designs; (ii) the common input distribution is another form of CRN, except that it is beyond our control. The best way to exploit these factors is to use pairwise comparisons, i.e., comparing each pair of designs, and eliminate a design whenever it is clearly dominated by another one. Pairwise comparison is fairly common in traditional R&S procedures (e.g., KN), but it has not been explored in the context of Sequential Elimination. We will show that, with a slight modification, SE-IU can be compatible with pairwise comparisons, and it can substantially enhance selection efficiency.

Define $\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} := \hat{H}_{i,n} - \hat{H}_{j,n}$. Suppose that for any pair of designs $(i, j)$, we can find confidence bounds $\{c_{ij,n}\}$ such that

$$
\mathbb{P}\left\{|\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} - \delta_{ij}(\theta^c)| \leq c_{ij,n}, \forall n\right\} \geq 1 - \frac{2\alpha}{K(K - 1)},
$$

(3.7)

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $K \geq 2$. Then, we can apply a pairwise elimination rule:

Eliminate design $j$ (or $i$) if $\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} > c_{ij,n}$ (or if $\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} < -c_{ij,n}$) \hspace{1cm} (3.8)

**Proposition 3.1.** Assume that (3.7) holds for any pair of designs $(i, j)$, $c_{ij,n} = c_{ji,n}$ for all $n$, and $c_{ij,n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Then, the pairwise elimination rule in (3.8) guarantees that $PCS \geq 1 - \alpha$.

**Proof of Proposition 3.1.** Consider the event

$$
E := \bigcap_{i=1}^{K} \bigcap_{j=i+1}^{K} \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{|\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} - \delta_{ij}(\theta^c)| \leq c_{ij,n}\right\}.
$$
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By (3.7) and a union bound, we have $\mathbb{P}(E) \geq 1 - \alpha$, so it suffices to show that a correct selection happens almost surely on $E$. For any pair of designs $i$ and $j$, assume without loss of generality that $\delta_{ij}(\theta^c) > 0$. First, notice that on $E$,

$$\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} > \hat{\delta}_{ij,n} - \delta_{ij}(\theta^c) \geq -c_{ij,n}, \quad \forall n,$$

so design $i$ will never get eliminated by design $j$. Moreover, since $c_{ij,n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, there exists a positive constant $N$ such that $c_{ij,N} < \delta_{ij}(\theta^c)/2$. If design $j$ has not been eliminated in the first $N - 1$ stages, then at the $N$th stage,

$$\hat{\delta}_{ij,N} \geq \delta_{ij}(\theta^c) - c_{ij,N} > \delta_{ij}(\theta^c)/2 > c_{ij,N},$$

which means that design $j$ will be eliminated. Therefore, all the inferior designs will be eliminated on event $E$.

In light of Proposition 3.1, a valid procedure can be designed by constructing confidence bounds $\{c_{ij,n}\}$ satisfying (3.7). For any pair of designs $(i, j)$, let

$$\sigma_{ij}^2(\theta) := \text{Var}_{\theta} [h_i(\xi) - h_j(\xi)],$$

and assume that there is a function $L_{ij}(\cdot)$ such that

$$|\delta_{ij}(\theta_1) - \delta_{ij}(\theta_2)| \leq L_{ij}(u) \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|, \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \{\theta \in \Theta \mid \|\theta - \theta^c\| \leq u\}.$$

We have the following pairwise version of SE-IU.

**Procedure: Pairwise SE-IU (ideal version)**

- **Input.** $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $K \geq 2$, $n_0 \geq 10$.
- **Step 1.** Solve the following equation in $u$, and let $u^*$ be the solution.

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\exp \left( \frac{-(n_0+1)u^2}{2dv_j^2} \right)}{1 - \exp \left( -\frac{u^2}{2dv_j^2} \right)} = \frac{\alpha}{6}.$$ 

- **Step 2.** For each design, compute

$$\bar{\sigma}_{ij} := \sup_{\|\theta - \theta^c\| \leq u^*} \sigma_{ij}(\theta), \quad \bar{L}_{ij} := L_{ij}(u^*),$$

as well as the constants

$$\kappa_{n_0} := \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} n^{-2}, \quad \beta_{n_0} := \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} (n - n_0)^{-2}.$$ 

Let $\bar{v} := \max_j v_j$. Run $n_0$ stages and set $n \leftarrow n_0 + 1$. Also set $S \leftarrow \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$.

- **Step 3.** Run an additional stage for all designs $\{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$ using CRN, and compute their estimates $\hat{H}_{i,n}$ using the moving average estimator in (3.1).
• **Step 4.** For any pair of surviving designs $i$ and $j$, compute $c_{ij,n} = t_{ij,n} + r_{ij,n}$, where

$$
t_{ij,n} := 2\bar{\sigma}_{ij} \sqrt{\frac{3K(K-1)\eta_{n_0}}{\alpha n_n}} n - n_\eta, \quad r_{ij,n} := \bar{\nu} \bar{L}_{ij} \sqrt{\frac{6d \ln \left( \frac{3dK(K-1)\beta_{n_0}}{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} (n - n_\eta)}} \left( n_\eta + 1 \right) .
$$

(3.9)

Set $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{i\}$ (or $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{j\}$) if $\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} > c_{ij,n}$, (or $\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} < -c_{ij,n}$). Go to Output if $|S| = 1$; otherwise, set $n \leftarrow n + 1$ and go to Step 3.

• **Output.** Select the only design in $S$ as the best one.

The Pairwise SE-IU procedure differs from SE-IU in that the confidence bounds $\{c_{ij,n}\}$ are computed based on $\sigma_{ij}$ and $L_{ij}$, instead of $\sigma_i$ and $L_i$. We argue that this difference is the key to faster stopping. Indeed, with a slight abuse of notation, SE-IU can be viewed as pairwise comparison with $c_{ij,n} = c_i,n + c_j,n$. However, the confidence bounds in Pairwise SE-IU tend to be much narrower, since (i) we typically have $\sigma_{ij} < \sigma_i + \sigma_j$ due to CRN; (ii) the common input distribution effect often results in $L_{ij} < L_i + L_j$. Let $\tilde{\tau}$ denote the number of stages it takes for the Pairwise SE-IU to terminate. We provide the following theoretical guarantee on $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}]$.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let Assumption 3.2 hold. Then, the Pairwise SE-IU procedure guarantees to select the best design with probability at least $1 - \alpha$. Furthermore,

$$
\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}] \leq 2 \sum_{i \neq b} \tilde{\tau}_i + 2(K - 1)(\alpha + 2de^{-K}(1 - e^{-K})^{-2}),
$$

where $\tilde{\tau}_i := \inf\{n > n_0 \mid 2c_{bi,n} \leq \delta_{bi}(\theta^c)\}$ and $K := \eta(u^*)^2/(2d\bar{\nu}^2)$.

**Proof of Theorem 3.3.** Notice that under Assumption 3.2, $h_i(\xi) - h_j(\xi)$ is again sub-Gaussian, and $L_{ij}$ is guaranteed to exist ($L_{ij}(u) \leq L_i(u) + L_j(u)$). The rest of the proof is almost identical to that of Theorem 3.2 and is therefore omitted.

If CRN and the common input distribution effect achieve variance reduction (which is often the case in practice), then the $\tilde{\tau}_i$ in Theorem 3.3 is much smaller than the $\tau_i^*$ in Theorem 3.2. Thus, the advantage of Pairwise SE-IU is also reflected in the upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}]$.

### 3.5 A heuristic procedure

The SE-IU and Pairwise SE-IU procedures are usually conservative, so we further propose a heuristic procedure that works well in practice. The idea is to construct pairwise confidence bounds $\tilde{c}_{ij,n}$ approximately using our asymptotic normality result for the moving average estimator. By a straightforward extension of Theorem 3.1 we have that

$$
\sqrt{n}[\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} - \delta_{ij}(\theta^c)] \Rightarrow \mathcal{N} \left( 0, \tilde{\sigma}_{ij,\infty}^2 \right), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,
$$

where

$$
\tilde{\sigma}_{ij,\infty}^2 := w_\eta \nabla \delta_{ij}(\theta^c) \Sigma_G \nabla \delta_{ij}(\theta^c) + \frac{1}{1 - \eta} \sigma_{ij}^2(\theta^c),
$$

and $\Sigma_G$ is given by

$$
\Sigma_G := \Xi_0 \Sigma_0 \Xi_0\Sigma_0^{\top} + \sigma_{ij}^2(\theta^c) + 2\sigma_{ij}^2(\theta^c) \Xi_0 \Sigma_0 \Xi_0\Sigma_0^{\top}.
$$
and
\[ w_\eta := \frac{2}{1 - \eta} + \frac{2\eta \log \eta}{(1 - \eta)^2}. \]

Therefore, we may view \( \hat{\delta}_{ij,n} - \delta_{ij}(\theta^c) \) as being approximately distributed as \( \mathcal{N}(0, \tilde{\sigma}_{ij,\infty}/\sqrt{n}) \).

If this were accurate, then using the following confidence bounds,
\[ \tilde{c}_{ij,n} = 2\tilde{\sigma}_{ij,\infty} \sqrt{\frac{\ln \left( \sqrt{\frac{K(K-1)\pi^2}{6\alpha}} \right)}{n}}, \]
we would have
\[
\text{PFS} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sum_{j=i+1}^{K} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{ |\hat{\delta}_{ij,n} - \delta_{ij}(\theta^c)| > \tilde{c}_{ij,n} \right\} \\
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sum_{j=i+1}^{K} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2 \exp \left( -\frac{n\tilde{c}_{ij,n}^2}{2\tilde{\sigma}_{ij,\infty}^2} \right) < \alpha,
\]
by a Gaussian tail bound. Of course, the approximation is not accurate for \( n \) being small, and no theoretical guarantee can be provided on its performance. Nonetheless, its practical advantage will be demonstrated numerically in Section 5.

### 3.6 Implementation guidance

We briefly discuss how to estimate the unknown quantities in all three fixed confidence procedures we proposed. One may start off by collecting a small size of input data for initial estimation. If IU or SU is high (relative to the estimates of \( \delta_{ij}(\theta^c) \)), then consider using a larger \( n_0 \) for SE-IU and Pairwise SE-IU. The case for the heuristic procedure is straightforward. In SE-IU, the difficult parameters are \( \bar{\sigma}_i \) and \( \bar{L}_i \), which are the suprema of \( \sigma_i(\cdot) \) and \( \|\nabla H_i(\cdot)\| \) over a small neighborhood of \( \theta^c \). While one can attempt to maximize the corresponding likelihood ratio estimators, we suggest simply replacing them with estimates of \( \sigma_i(\theta^c) \) and \( \|\nabla H_i(\theta^c)\| \) for the following reasons: (i) estimates based on such maximization often suffer from high variance and severe overestimation; (ii) the Sequential Elimination framework is already conservative since it resorts to loose union bounds, so highly accurate estimates are unlikely to be necessary. The same is also recommended for Pairwise SE-IU.

### 4 Fixed Budget Formulation

#### 4.1 Problem setup

In this section, we consider a fixed budget setting where acquiring additional data is possible, albeit at some cost (see Section 1 for examples). Suppose that there is a total budget \( T \), which can be used to collect input data as well as run simulation experiments. For simplicity, assume that the cost per data sample for the \( q \)th input distribution is \( c_{D,q} \), and the cost per simulation run is \( c_S \) (“D” for “Data”, and “S” for “Simulation”). As is mentioned in Section 1, the budget could be time or money, as long as \( c_{D,q} \) and \( c_S \) are measured in the same unit.
and are on comparable scales. The goal is to maximize the PCS by wisely allocating the budget between data collection and simulation experimentation.

The problem we described is a two-stage decision-making problem. In the first stage, we decide how much data to collect, and estimate the input distributions. In the second stage, simulations are used to select the best design under the estimated input distributions. There is a clear tradeoff between IU and SU: while collecting excessive data leaves little budget for running simulations, insufficient input data leads to high IU that cannot be reduced by simulation effort. Due to the extra layer of uncertainty, this problem is at least as difficult as traditional fixed budget R&S, and one can only hope to solve it approximately. In the upcoming section, we develop an approximate solution that allows a closed form of the quantity of input data to collect (for each individual input distribution).

4.2 An approximate solution

Using the OCBA framework, we derive an approximate solution to our fixed budget R&S problem. Let \( N_q \) be the number of input data samples we collect for the \( q \)-th distribution, and let \( M_i \) be the number of simulation runs allocated to design \( i \). For convenience, let \( N := [N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_Q]^T \) and \( M := [M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_K]^T \). Also let \( \hat{\theta}_N := [\hat{\theta}_{N_1}(1), \ldots, \hat{\theta}_{N_Q}(Q)]^T \) be the estimates of \( \theta^c \). Different from Assumption 3.1, here we do not assume specific structure on \( \hat{\theta}_N \). The problem described in Section 4.1 is an intractable stochastic dynamic program (see [33] for insights from this perspective), and thus is simplified as the following static optimization problem,

\[
\text{max}_{N, M} \text{PCS := } P \left\{ \bigcap_{i \neq b} \left\{ \hat{\delta}_b(\hat{\theta}_N) > 0 \right\} \right\}
\]

s.t.
\[
\sum_{q=1}^Q c_{D,q} N_q + c_S \sum_{i=1}^K M_i = T,
\]
\[
N_q \in \mathbb{Z}^+, M_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+, \quad \forall q, i,
\]

where \( \mathbb{Z}^+ \) denotes the set of all positive integers. Since the PCS does not have a closed form, it is usually approximated by the Bonferroni inequality,

\[
\text{PCS} \geq 1 - \sum_{i \neq b} P \left\{ \hat{\delta}_b(\hat{\theta}_N) \leq 0 \right\},
\]

where the right-hand side (RHS) of (4.1) is referred to as the approximate PCS (APCS). In OCBA’s framework, \( \hat{\delta}_b(\theta^c) \) can be roughly viewed as normally distributed due to CLT. When there is IU, CLT is not applicable and a new asymptotic result is in need. The following assumption is made for this purpose.

Assumption 4.1.

1. For any \( 1 \leq q \leq Q \), \( \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n(q) - \theta^c(q)) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\theta^c(q)}) \) as \( n \to \infty \) for some positive definite covariance matrix \( \Sigma_{\theta^c(q)} \).

2. \( \theta \) has a density \( f_\theta(\xi) \) that is differentiable w.r.t. \( \theta \) for all \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m_q} \).

3. \( \int [h_i(\xi)]^2 f_\theta(\xi) d\xi < \infty, \forall \theta \in \Theta, i \in I \).
(4) For almost all \( \xi \) (up to a set of Lebesgue measure 0),
\[
|f(\xi; \theta_1) - f(\xi; \theta_2)| \leq L(\xi)\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|, \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta,
\]
where \( \int |h_i(\xi)|L(\xi) < \infty, \int [h_i(\xi)]^2L(\xi) < \infty, \forall i \in I. \)

In Assumption 4.1 (1) holds for many estimators. For example, the maximum likelihood estimator satisfies (1) with \( \Sigma_{\theta^c(q)} \) being the inverse of Fisher information; (2) also holds for many parametric families. If instead \( P_\theta \) is a discrete distribution, then all integrals can easily be replaced by summations; (3) ensures that the first two moments of \( h_i(\xi) \) are well-defined; (4) is a commonly imposed Lipschitz-type condition, which together with the Dominated Convergence Theorem implies that
\[
\partial_\theta \int h_i(\xi)f(\xi; \theta) d\xi = \int h_i(\xi)\partial_\theta f(\xi; \theta) d\xi,
\]
\[
\partial_\theta \int [h_i(\xi)]^2f(\xi; \theta) d\xi = \int [h_i(\xi)]^2\partial_\theta f(\xi; \theta) d\xi.
\]

In the following theorem, \( N \) and \( M \) are viewed as deterministic functions of \( T \). Proofs not included in the paper can be found in the appendix.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let Assumption 4.1 hold. If there exists positive constants \( \rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots, \rho_Q \) and \( \pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_K \) such that \( N_q/T \to \rho_q \) and \( M_i/T \to \pi_i \) as \( T \to \infty \), then for any two designs \( i \) and \( j \),
\[
\sqrt{T} \left[ \hat{\delta}_{ij}(\hat{\theta}_N) - \delta_{ij}(\theta^c) \right] \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_{ij,\infty}) \quad \text{as} \quad T \to \infty,
\]
where
\[
\sigma^2_{ij,\infty} := \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{\psi^2_{ij}(q)}{\rho_q} + \frac{\sigma_i^2(\theta^c)}{\pi_i} + \frac{\sigma_j^2(\theta^c)}{\pi_j},
\]
and
\[
\psi^2_{ij}(q) := \left( \frac{\partial \delta_{ij}(\theta)}{\partial \theta(q)} \right)^T \Sigma_{\theta^c(q)} \left( \frac{\partial \delta_{ij}(\theta)}{\partial \theta(q)} \right).
\]

Theorem 4.1 echoes a classical result in [1] for a single design with a single input distribution (i.e., \( \theta^c = \theta^c(1) \), \( N = N_1, M = M_1 \)), which states that
\[
\text{Var}[\hat{H}_i(\hat{\theta}_N)] = \frac{\nabla H_i(\theta^c)^T \Sigma_{\theta^c(1)} \nabla H_i(\theta^c)}{N_1} + \frac{\sigma^2_i(\theta^c)}{M_i} + \mathcal{R},
\]
where \( \mathcal{R} \to 0 \) as \( N_1 \) and \( M_i \) tend to infinity. In other words, the variance of \( \hat{H}_i(\hat{\theta}_N) \) can be decomposed into two parts corresponding to IU and SU, respectively. Our result not only extends it to multiple independent input distributions, but also characterizes the asymptotic distribution of \( \hat{\delta}_{ij}(\hat{\theta}_N) \), which will be useful for approximating the APCS.

Some insights can be developed on why the linear asymptotic regime (i.e., \( N_q/T \to \rho_q, M_i/T \to \pi_i \)) is crucial. For simplicity, consider the case of \( Q = 1 \). Notice that for a design \( i \), we have the following decomposition.
\[
\sqrt{N_1}[\hat{H}_i(\hat{\theta}_{N_1}) - H_i(\theta^c)] = \sqrt{N_1}[\hat{H}_i(\hat{\theta}_{N_1}) - H_i(\hat{\theta}_{N_1})] + \sqrt{N_1}[H_i(\hat{\theta}_{N_1}) - H_i(\theta^c)], \tag{4.2}
\]
where (*) captures SU and (**) captures IU. For (**) the Delta Theorem (see, e.g., [34]) can be applied to get
\[ \sqrt{N_1} [H_i(\hat{\theta}_{N_1}) - H_i(\theta^c)] \Rightarrow \nabla H_i(\theta^c)^T \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\theta^c(1)}) \quad \text{as } N_1 \to \infty. \]

For (*), it is possible to use the characteristic function to show that
\[ \sqrt{M_i} [\hat{H}_i(\hat{\theta}_{N_1}) - H_i(\hat{\theta}_{N_1})] \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_i(\theta^c)) \quad \text{as } M_i \to \infty, \]
provided that \( N_1, M_i \to \infty \) simultaneously. If \( N_1/M_i \to 0 \) as \( N_1 \to \infty \), the RHS of (4.2) can be rewritten as
\[ \sqrt{N_1M_i} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2_i(\theta^c)}{M_i}} \left[ \hat{H}_i(\hat{\theta}_{N_1}) - H_i(\hat{\theta}_{N_1}) \right] \]
where the first term converges to 0 in probability, and the sum converges in distribution to \( \nabla H_i(\theta^c)^T \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\theta^c(1)}) \) as \( N_1 \to \infty \), meaning that IU dominates SU. A symmetric conclusion can also be drawn for the case of \( M_i/N_1 \to 0 \).

We now use Theorem 4.1 to derive an approximate solution to (P1). By Theorem 4.1, we have \( \hat{\delta}_{ij}(\hat{\theta}_{N_1}) \approx N(\delta_{ij}(\theta^c), \Psi_{ij}^2) \), where \( \approx \) stands for “approximately distributed as”, and
\[ \Psi_{ij}^2 := \frac{\sigma_{ij(\theta^c)}^2}{T} \approx \frac{1}{\sum_{q=1}^Q \psi_{ij}^2(q)} + \frac{\sigma^2_i(\theta^c)}{M_i} + \frac{\sigma^2_j(\theta^c)}{M_j}. \]

For simplicity, we will drop \( \theta^c \) when there is no ambiguity. Since PCS \( \geq 1 - \sum_{i\neq b} \mathbb{P} \{ \hat{\delta}_{bi}(\hat{\theta}_{N_1}) \leq 0 \} \), we can approximate the APCS as
\[ \widehat{\text{APCS}} = 1 - \sum_{i\neq b} \int_{-\delta_{bi}}^{-\delta_{bi}\psi_{bi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt. \]

Following the OCBA framework, we further drop the integrality and nonnegativity constraints on \( N_q \) and \( M_i \). Using the Lagrangian function
\[ \mathcal{L} := \widehat{\text{APCS}} + \lambda \left( \sum_{q=1}^Q c_{D,q}N_q + c_S \sum_{i=1}^K M_i - T \right), \]
we have the following KKT conditions.

\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial N_q} = c_{D,q} \lambda - \sum_{i \neq b} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left( -\frac{\delta_{bi}^2}{2\psi_{bi}^2} \right) \delta_{bi} \psi_{bi}^2 q \psi_{bi}^3 N_q = 0, \quad (4.3) \]
\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial M_i} = c_S \lambda - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left( -\frac{\delta_{bi}^2}{2\psi_{bi}^2} \right) \frac{\delta_{bi} \sigma_i^2}{\psi_{bi}^3 M_i^2} = 0 \quad \forall i \neq b, \quad (4.4) \]
\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial M_b} = c_S \lambda - \sum_{i \neq b} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left( -\frac{\delta_{bi}^2}{2\psi_{bi}^2} \right) \frac{\delta_{bi} \sigma_b^2}{\psi_{bi}^3 M_b^2} = 0, \quad (4.5) \]
\[ \sum_{q=1}^{Q} c_{D,q} N_q + c_S \sum_{i=1}^{K} M_i = T. \]  

(4.6)

From (4.4) we have

\[ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left( \frac{-\delta_{bi}^2}{2\psi_{bi}^2} \right) \frac{\delta_{bi}}{\psi_{bi}} = c_S \lambda \frac{M_i^2}{\sigma_i^2}, \]

and plugging it into (4.3) yields

\[ N_q = \sqrt{\frac{c_S}{c_{D,q}} \sum_{i \neq b} \frac{M_i^2 \psi_{bi}^2(q)}{\sigma_i^2}}, \quad \forall 1 \leq q \leq Q, \]  

(4.7)

where

\[ \psi_{bi}^2(q) := \left( \frac{\partial \delta_{bi}(\theta)}{\partial \theta(q)} \right)^\top \Sigma_{\theta(q)} \left( \frac{\partial \delta_{bi}(\theta)}{\partial \theta(q)} \right). \]

Therefore, our derivation leads to a closed-form approximate solution of \( N_q \).

A few remarks on (4.7) are made as follows. First, the optimal \( N_q \) depends on the cost ratio \( c_S/c_D \): the cheaper data is relative to simulation, the more data we should collect. Second, \( N_q \) is related to the squared sum of \( \{M_i\} \) weighted by \( \psi_{bi}^2(q)/\sigma_i^2 \). Note that \( \psi_{bi}^2(q) \) depends on \( \partial \delta_{ij}(\theta)/\partial \theta(q) \), which captures the relative sensitivity of designs \( b \) and \( i \)'s difference in expected performance with respect to the estimation error in \( \hat{\theta}_N \).

The relative sensitivity information also appeared in [25] as a way to exploit the common input distribution effect. For a quick intuition, consider a special case where there exist constants \( C_i \) such that \( H_i(\theta) = C_i + \theta \). As \( \theta \) varies, every design's expected performance shifts by the same amount, and their relative order will never be perturbed. Data collection is unnecessary in this case since plugging in any \( \theta \) would suffice. This coincides with the result yielded by (4.7), since \( \partial \delta_{ij}(\theta)/\partial \theta(q) = 0 \) for any pair of designs \( i \) and \( j \). Similarly, a large \( \psi_{bi}^2(q) \) relative to \( \sigma_i^2 \) suggests that \( \delta_{ij}(\cdot) \) is very sensitive to the estimation error of \( \hat{\theta}_N \), and a larger \( N_q \) should be anticipated.

While the solution for \( \{M_i\} \) does not seem to admit a closed form, in principle the KKT conditions (4.3) - (4.6) can be solved using any off-the-shelf commercial solver. For a fast heuristic solution, one may turn to the well-known OCBA allocation rule (see (1.8) in Section 4.3).

### 4.3 The OCBAIU procedure

With the closed form solution of \( N_q \) in (4.7), we can compute \( N \) and \( M \) by plugging in estimates of \( H_i(\theta^c), \sigma_i^2(\theta^c) \) and \( \psi_{ij}^2 \). However, directly implementing the resulting \( N \) and \( M \) is not necessarily the best practice. Observe that the PCS can be decomposed as

\[ \text{PCS} = \mathbb{P}\{\hat{b} = b \mid \hat{\theta}_N \in \mathcal{P}\} \cdot \mathbb{P}\{\hat{\theta}_N \in \mathcal{P}\} + \mathbb{P}\{\hat{b} = b \mid \hat{\theta}_N \notin \mathcal{P}\} \cdot \mathbb{P}\{\hat{\theta}_N \notin \mathcal{P}\}, \]

where \( \hat{b} \) is the estimated best design and \( \mathcal{P} \) is the perturbation region defined in (2.2). If \( \hat{\theta}_N \) falls in \( \mathcal{P} \), then no reasonable procedure is expected to deliver a good \( \mathbb{P}\{\hat{b} = b \mid \hat{\theta}_N \in \mathcal{P}\} \). Thus, the only hope is to maximize \( \mathbb{P}\{\hat{b} = b \mid \hat{\theta}_N \notin \mathcal{P}\} \). But if \( \hat{\theta}_N \notin \mathcal{P} \), then the second-stage problem reduces to the traditional R&S without IU, where existing procedures apply
readily. In this paper, we build on the OCBA procedure, which asymptotically implements the following allocation rule

\[ M_b = \sigma_b \sqrt{\sum_{i \neq b} \frac{M_i^2}{\sigma_i^2}}, \quad M_i = \frac{\sigma_i^2 / \delta_{bi}}{\sigma_j^2 / \delta_{bj}}, \quad i \neq j \neq b, \]  

(4.8)

through dynamic sequential allocation. For more implementation details, we refer the reader to [14, 15] for a full description of the procedure.

A number of issues need to be addressed when it comes to implementation. First, to obtain initial estimates of \( \hat{H}_i(\theta^c), \sigma_i^2(\theta^c) \) and \( \psi_{ij}^2 \), we begin by collecting \( N_0 \) data samples for each input distribution. The input data can be used to estimate \( \hat{\theta}_N \), which are also shared across different designs to run simulations for estimating \( H_i(\theta^c) \) and \( \sigma_i^2(\theta^c) \). In particular, the partial derivatives \( \partial H_i(\theta) / \partial \theta(q) \) can be estimated in many ways. For instance, [25] estimate it by fitting a linear regression model. In this paper, we use a likelihood ratio estimator

\[ \frac{\partial H_i(\theta)}{\partial \theta(q)} \approx \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{r=1}^{N_0} h_i(\xi_r) \frac{\partial f_0(\xi_r) / \partial \theta(q)}{f_0(\xi_r)}, \]

where \( \{\xi_r\}_{r=1}^{N_0} \) are the input data. In addition, we need to decide \( N_0 \) and \( M_0 \), where the latter is the size of OCBA’s initial simulation runs for each design. As is revealed in [35], a budget-independent \( M_0 \) can result in a polynomial convergence rate of the probability of false selection (PFS, i.e., 1 - PCS). Therefore, we choose positive constants \( \rho_0 \) and \( \pi_0 \) and set \( N_0 = \lfloor \rho_0 T \rfloor \) and \( M_0 = \lfloor \pi_0 T \rfloor \). Our OCBAIU procedure is presented as follows.

**Procedure: OCBAIU**

- **Input:** \( \rho_0, \pi_0, T \) and other parameters for OCBA.
- **Initialization:** Collect \( N_0 = \lfloor \rho_0 T \rfloor \) input data samples, compute \( \hat{\theta}_N \) and estimate \( H_i(\theta^c), \sigma_i^2(\theta), \partial H_i(\theta) / \partial \theta(q) \) for all designs and all input distributions.
- **Step 1:** Compute \( N \) using (4.7) and (4.8). For each input distribution, if \( N_q > N_0 \), then collect additional \( N_q - N_0 \) input data and update the estimate of \( \hat{\theta}_N \).
- **Step 2:** Run the OCBA procedure using the remaining budget, where \( M_0 = \lfloor \pi_0 T \rfloor \) and the random samples \( \{\xi_{ir}\} \) are drawn independently from \( P_{\hat{\theta}_N} \).
- **Output:** \( \hat{b} := \text{arg max}_{i \in I} \hat{H}_i(\hat{\theta}_N) \).

Under appropriate regularity conditions, a statistical guarantee can be provided on OCBAIU’s finite-sample performance. For each design \( i \neq b \), let \( z_i > 0 \) be a number such that

\[ \inf_{\theta \in \Theta, \|\theta - \theta^c\| \leq z_i} \delta_{bi}(\theta) \geq \delta_{bi}(\theta^c)/2, \]  

(4.9)

and let \( z^* := \min_{i \neq b} z_i \). Since we assume that \( \delta_{bi}(\theta^c) > 0 \), such an \( z_i \) exists by the continuity of \( H_i(\cdot) \) and the closedness of \( \Theta \). With the following additional assumption, we provide a finite-sample bound on the PFS.

**Assumption 4.2.**
(i) For each $\hat{\theta}_n(q)$, there exists functions $B_q(\cdot) > 0$ and $C_q(\cdot) > 0$ such that for any $t > 0$,
\[ P\left\{ \| \hat{\theta}_n(q) - \theta^c(q) \| > t \right\} \leq B_q(t)e^{-C_q(t)n}, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \]

(ii) For any $\theta \in \Theta$, if $\xi \sim P_{\theta}$, then for every design $i$, $h_i(\xi)$ is a sub-Gaussian r.v.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 hold. Also let $\bar{\sigma}^i := \sup_{\|\theta - \theta^c\| \leq z^*, \theta \in \Theta} \sigma_i(\theta)$ and $\bar{C}_q := C_q(z^*/\sqrt{Q})$. Then, for the OCBA-IU procedure, there exist positive constants $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ (both independent of $T$) such that
\[ PFS(T) \leq \Gamma_1 \sum_{q=1}^Q \exp\left( -\bar{C}_q[\rho_0T] \right) + \Gamma_2 \sum_{i=1}^K \exp\left( -\frac{\Delta_i^2[\pi_0T]}{32\bar{\sigma}^2_i} \right), \quad \forall T \geq 0, \]
where $\Delta_i := \delta_{ib}(\theta^c)$ if $i \neq b$ and $\Delta_b := \min_{i \neq b} \Delta_i$.

Theorem 4.2 guarantees an exponential convergence rate of PFS for OCBAIU, which is not surprising since (i) $\hat{\theta}_n(q)$ and $h_i(\xi)$ are assumed to be light-tailed; (ii) $N_0$ and $M_0$ are required to increase linearly in $T$.

5 Numerical Results

5.1 Production-inventory example

We test our procedures on a production-inventory problem borrowed from [36]. In this problem, the objective function does not have a closed form and simulation is required for evaluating a design’s performance. Suppose that we are running a capacitated production system and we want to minimize the expected total cost over a finite number of periods. The decision variable is the order-up-to level, i.e., the quantity we should fill up to once the inventory falls below that level. Meanwhile, there is an upper bound on the production amount in each period. Within every period, production from the last period arrives first. Then, we observe the demand and fill or backlog them based on the on-hand inventory. Decision of the production amount is carried out at the end of the period. The variables are listed as follows.

1. The order-up-to level: $s$.
2. Inventory level at the $t$th period: $I_t$.
3. Demand at the $t$th period: $D_t$.
4. Production amount at the $t$th period: $R_t$.

Let $I_0 = s$ and $R_0 = 0$. The system dynamics evolve according to the following equations,
\[ I_{t+1} = I_t - D_t + R_{t-1}, \]
\[ R_t = \min\{R^*, (s - I_{t+1})^+\}, \]
where $a^+ := \max\{0, a\}$ and $R^*$ is the maximum production amount. Assume that the demands are independent random variables, and each $D_t$ follows an exponential distribution.
with mean $\theta_c^i$. Let $c_H$ be the holding cost per unit and $c_B$ be the backlog cost per unit. Then, we have the cost at the $t$th period as

$$c_t := c_H(R_{t-1} + I_t^+) + c_B I_t^-,$$

where $a^- := -\min\{a, 0\}$. The expected total cost over $T$ period is therefore

$$H_s(\theta^c) := \mathbb{E}[h_s(\xi)] = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T} c_t\right),$$

where $\xi = [D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_T]^\top$ and $h_s(\cdot)$ denotes the objective function corresponding to the order-up-to level $s$. In all of our experiments, we set the parameters as $R^* = 0.5, c_H = 0.1, c_B = 0.2$ and $T = 12$, where each period represents a month. Two cases will be investigated.

(i) **Single source of IU**: the demands are assumed to be i.i.d. exponential r.v.s with mean $\theta^c = 1$.

(ii) **Multiple sources of IU**: the demands are independent exponential r.v.s, but the means for each quarter are $\theta_c = [1, 0.8, 0.5, 0.5]^\top$.

![Objective function](image)

(a) Single source of IU: perturbing $\theta^c$.

(b) Multiple sources of IU: $\theta^c = (1, 0.8, 0.5, 0.5)$.

Figure 2: Production-inventory problem: true objective functions.

We will consider selecting the best design among $s = \{1, 2, \ldots, 20\}$. The objective functions for both cases are plotted in Figure 2, where Figure 2(a) shows how sensitive the best design is to IU in case (i). Notice that the best design under the true parameter $\theta^c$ is 5, but it gets perturbed into designs 4 and 6 for $\theta^c = 0.9$ and $\theta^c = 1.1$, respectively. In Figure 2(b), design 3 is the best one. In addition, in case (i), the likelihood ratio for $\nabla H_i(\theta)$ is

$$\frac{\nabla \theta f(\xi; \theta)}{f(\xi; \theta)} = \sum_{t=1}^{T} D_t - T \theta^2.$$

Similarly, the likelihood ratio for $\partial H(\theta)/\partial \theta(q)$ in case (ii) is

$$\frac{\partial H(\theta)}{\partial \theta(q)} = \frac{\sum_{i=3q-2}^{3q} D_t - 3\theta(q)}{[\theta(q)]^2}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq 4.$$

Also, we have $\Sigma_\theta(q) = [\theta(q)]^2$ and $\Sigma_{\theta^c} = \text{diag}([\theta^c(1)]^2, [\theta^c(2)]^2, [\theta^c(3)]^2, [\theta^c(4)]^2)$, where “diag” denotes a diagonal matrix.
5.2 Results for OCBAIU

**Single source of IU.** We test OCBAIU on two cost configurations: $c_D = 2, c_S = 1$ and $c_D = 10, c_S = 1$. First, we use (4.7) to compute $c_D N_1 / T$, i.e., the fraction of budget allocated to data collection, and compare it with the optimal fractions under $T = 2,000, 4,000, 6,000$. To find out the optimal fraction empirically, we let $c_D N_1 / T$ take values on a grid $0.1, 0.2, \ldots, 0.9$ and use OCBA in the second stage. When implementing OCBA, we use $20\%$ of the simulation budget for initial estimation, and the budget increment per iteration is 20. The results are shown in Figure 3, where the dashed line is the fraction computed by OCBAIU using the true values of $\delta_{ij}(\theta^c), \sigma^2_i(\theta^c)$, etc. It can be seen that OCBAIU’s fraction achieves near-optimal PCS for both configurations of cost parameters.

![Figure 3: Fraction of budget allocated to data collection computed using true values.](image)

Next, we examine the performance of OCBAIU when plug-in estimates of $\delta_{ij}(\theta^c), \sigma^2_i(\theta^c)$, etc. are used to solve for the optimal $N$. In doing so, we collect $N_0 = 20 + 0.002 \times (T - 2000)$ data samples to obtain $\hat{\theta}_{N_0}$, and then run $N_0$ replications for each design using CRN to obtain initial estimates of $\delta_{ij}(\theta^c), \sigma^2_i(\theta^c)$ etc. In particular, the simulation outputs are reused as initial estimates for OCBA. Figure 4 compares the PCS of using true and estimated parameters under growing budget. It can be seen that although estimation error lowers PCS for $T$ small, the gap diminishes quickly as $T$ gets larger.

**Multiple sources of IU.** When there are four independent sources of IU, we also consider two cost configurations: $c_D = [2, 2, 3, 3]^T$ and $c_D = [10, 10, 2, 2]^T$ ($c_S$ is always set to 1 for simplicity). We cannot visualize the empirical optimal fractions in a 4-d space, so instead the fractions computed by OCBAIU (using true parameters) are shown in Figure 5. One can see that, as data for the last two quarters become cheaper compared with the first two quarters, OCBAIU effectively recommends collecting more data for the third and fourth input distributions. The comparison of PCS between using the true and estimated parameters is displayed in Figure 6 where similar observations can be made about the gap between them.

Based on the above results, we conclude that OCBAIU is able to adapt to different configurations of IU and cost parameters, and achieve a near-optimal PCS even if the unknown parameters are subject to estimation error.
5.3 Results for fixed confidence procedures

We test SE-IU, Pairwise SE-IU and the heuristic procedure in the same settings of single and multiple sources of IU. Specifically, we run these procedures under batches of input data and simulation outputs. The batch sizes per stage are 100, 1,000 and 10,000. For example, if the batch size is 100, then at each stage we collect a batch of 100 additional data samples for each input distribution, and average each batch into a single aggregated sample; similarly, 100 additional replications are run for each design, and the simulation outputs are aggregated into a single output through averaging. The different batching schemes help us test our procedures under different degrees of IU and SU.

In all our experiments, we set $\eta = 0.2$ for the moving average estimators, i.e., the first 20\% of the simulation outputs are discarded. For an intuitive comparison, we plot out some realizations of the three procedures’ confidence bounds $\{c_{45,n}\}$ and $\{c_{23,n}\}$ under batch size 1,000 in Figure 7. It can be seen that our pairwise Sequential Elimination framework indeed leads to smaller continuation regions. The dashed lines in Figure 7 (a) and (b) are the trajectories of $\delta_{45,n}$ and $\delta_{23,n}$, respectively. On these illustrative sample paths, the heuristic procedure is the fastest one to eliminate the inferior designs (i.e., designs 4 and 2). In
Figure 6: Multiple sources of IU: PCS curves for OCBAIU using true and estimated parameters.

Figure 7: Continuation regions.

particular, in Figure 7 (b), it is able to eliminate design 2 right from the first stage. In contrast, the other two procedures need more stages to distinguish between the designs.

Next, we estimate the expected running time (in terms of stages) for different batch sizes using 1,000 independent replications. We set $n_0 = 1$ for SE-IU and Pairwise SE-IU. The results are summarized in Table 5.1 where the PCS for all the experiments are close to 1 and thus is omitted. Clearly, SE-IU is too conservative and it has impractical running times on this problem instance. Pairwise SE-IU has a more reasonable running time, but the heuristic procedure has much higher efficiency. Notably, under batch size 10,000, the heuristic procedure only takes on average one stage to terminate. In that case, the IU and SU are sufficiently low and the confidence bounds reduce to simultaneous confidence intervals. This means that Pairwise SE-IU can be useful even if no further data can be collected, as it can serve as a tool for checking whether the existing simulation outputs let us confidently select the best design.
Table 5.1: Expected number of stages used by different procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch size per stage</th>
<th>Single source of IU</th>
<th>Multiple sources of IU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE-IU</td>
<td>Pairwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>≥ 10,000</td>
<td>3,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>≥ 5,000</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>≥ 10,000</td>
<td>4,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Conclusion

We study Ranking and Selection under input uncertainty in cases where additional data can be collected. Two classical formulations, fixed confidence and fixed budget, are extended to the new settings. For fixed confidence, we extend and modify a Sequential Elimination framework to allow pairwise comparisons, which leads to procedures that are more efficient than a direct extension of Sequential Elimination. For fixed budget, we propose the OCBAIU procedure, which achieves near-optimal PCS by balancing input uncertainty and simulation uncertainty. Numerical results demonstrate the effectiveness of our procedures. Overall speaking, our fixed confidence procedures tend to overshoot the PCS target. Our future plan is to explore other methods to construct tighter confidence bounds so that the efficiency can be further enhanced.

A Appendix: Technical Proofs

A.1 Proofs for fixed confidence

The following lemmas will be useful in proving Theorem 3.1.

Lemma A.1 (The Lindeberg-Feller Theorem (see, e.g., Theorem 3.4.5 [37])). For each $n$, let $Y_{n,i}, 1 \leq i \leq n$ be independent r.v.s with $EY_{n,i} = 0$. Suppose

(i) $\sum_{i=1}^{n} EY_{n,i}^2 \to \sigma^2 > 0$.

(ii) For all $\epsilon > 0$, $\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} E[|Y_{n,i}|^2 1_{|Y_{n,i}| > \epsilon}] = 0$.

Then $\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{n,i} \to N(0, \sigma^2)$ as $n \to \infty$.

Lemma A.2. Let $\{X_n\}$ be independent r.v.s with $EX_n = 0$. If $X_n \Rightarrow X$ and $EX_n^2 \to EX^2$ as $n \to \infty$, then for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n - n_0}} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} X_i \Rightarrow N(0, EX^2) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$
Proof of Lemma A.2. Let \( Y_{n,i} := 0 \) if \( i \leq n \eta \) and \( X_i/\sqrt{n - n \eta} \) otherwise. We will apply Lemma A.1 to \( Y_{n,i} \). Condition (i) is satisfied since

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} Y_{n,i}^2 = \sum_{i=n+1}^{n} \mathbb{E} X_i^2/(n - n \eta) \to \mathbb{E} X^2.
\]

In addition, \( X_n \Rightarrow X \) implies that there exists \( \tilde{X}_n \overset{D}{=} X_n, \tilde{X} \overset{D}{=} X \) such that \( \tilde{X}_n \to \tilde{X} \) almost surely (a.s.) as \( n \to \infty \). Since \( \{\tilde{X}_n\} \) is a.s. finite,

\[
\mathbb{E} [|X_n|^2 \mathbb{1}_{(|X_n| > \epsilon \sqrt{n - n \eta})}] = \mathbb{E} [|\tilde{X}_n|^2 \mathbb{1}_{(|\tilde{X}_n| > \epsilon \sqrt{n - n \eta})}] \to 0
\]

by a generalized Dominated Convergence Theorem (note that the integrand is dominated by \( |\tilde{X}_n| \) and \( \mathbb{E} \tilde{X}_n \to \mathbb{E} \tilde{X} \)). Thus, as \( n \to \infty \),

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} [|Y_{n,i}|^2 \mathbb{1}_{(|Y_{n,i}| > \epsilon \sqrt{n - n \eta})}] = \frac{1}{n - n \eta} \sum_{i=n+1}^{n} \mathbb{E} [|X_i|^2 \mathbb{1}_{(|X_i| > \epsilon \sqrt{n - n \eta})}] \to 0,
\]

which verifies condition (ii), and the result follows. \( \square \)

Lemma A.3. Let \( \gamma_{n,i} := \sum_{j=i}^{n} \frac{1}{j} \) and \( a_k := \sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_{n,i}^2 \). Then, for all \( k \leq n - 1 \),

\[
a_k = k - \gamma_{k,1} + k (1 + \gamma_{k+1,1})^2,
\]

and for \( k = n \), \( a_n = 2n - \gamma_{n,1} \).

Proof of Lemma A.3. For \( k \leq n - 1 \), we have by induction

\[
a_k = (1 + \gamma_{n,2})^2 + \gamma_{n,2}^2 + \gamma_{n,3}^2 + \cdots + \gamma_{n,k}^2
= 1 + 2\gamma_{n,2} + 2\gamma_{n,2}^2 + \gamma_{n,3}^2 + \cdots + \gamma_{n,k}^2
= 1 + 2\gamma_{n,2} + 2\left( \frac{1}{2} + \gamma_{n,3} \right)^2 + \gamma_{n,3}^2 + \cdots + \gamma_{n,k}^2
= 1 + \frac{1}{2} + 2(\gamma_{n,2} + \gamma_{n,3}) + 3\gamma_{n,3}^2 + \cdots + \gamma_{n,k}^2
\]

\[
= \gamma_{k-1,1} + 2 \sum_{i=2}^{k} \gamma_{n,i} + k \gamma_{n,k}^2,
\]

where note that

\[
\sum_{i=2}^{k} \gamma_{n,i} = \sum_{i=2}^{k} \sum_{j=i}^{n} \frac{1}{j} = \sum_{j=2}^{k} \sum_{i=2}^{j} \frac{1}{j} + (k - 1) \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \frac{1}{j}
= \frac{k}{j} \cdot \frac{1}{j} + (k - 1) \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \frac{1}{j}
= (k - 1) - \sum_{j=2}^{k} \frac{1}{j} + (k - 1) \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \frac{1}{j}.
\]

The result is clear from a direct computation, and the case of \( k = n \) follows similarly. \( \square \)
Proof of Theorem 3.1. For simplicity, we suppress the subscript $i$ and replace the scaling factor $\sqrt{n}$ with $\sqrt{n-n_\eta}$.

$$\sqrt{n-n_\eta} \left( \frac{1}{n-n_\eta} \sum_{j=n_\eta+1}^n h(\xi_j) - H(\theta^c) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-n_\eta}} \sum_{j=n_\eta+1}^n [h(\xi_j) - H(\hat{\theta}_j)] + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-n_\eta}} \sum_{j=n_\eta+1}^n \left[ H(\hat{\theta}_j) - H(\theta^c) \right].$$

Let $F_n := \sigma(D_1, \ldots, D_n)$. The characteristic function of $X_n + Y_n$ is

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{it(X_n+Y_n)}] = \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{itY_n} \mathbb{E}[e^{itX_n} | F_n] \right\}.$$ 

Note that conditioned on $F_n$, $h(\xi_j) - H(\hat{\theta}_j)$ are independent r.v.s with mean 0 and variance $\sigma^2(\hat{\theta}_j)$. Since $\hat{\theta}_n \to \theta^c$ a.s. by the Strong Law of Large Numbers, $\sigma^2(\hat{\theta}_n) \to \sigma^2(\theta^c)$, and Lemma A.2 implies that $\mathbb{E}[e^{itX_n} | F_n] \to \exp(-\sigma^2(\theta^c)t^2/2)$ a.s. On the other hand, apply a Taylor expansion to $Y_n$ around $\theta^c$ and we have

$$Y_n = \frac{\nabla H(\theta^c)^T}{\sqrt{n-n_\eta}} \sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n (\hat{\theta}_i - \theta^c) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-n_\eta}} \sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n (\hat{\theta}_i - \theta^c)^T \nabla^2 H(\hat{\theta}_i)(\hat{\theta}_i - \theta^c), \quad (A.1)$$

where $\hat{\theta}_i = \lambda \hat{\theta} + (1 - \lambda) \theta^c$ for some $\lambda \in [0,1]$. For the first term in the RHS of (A.1), we focus on the case of $\theta^c \in \mathbb{R}$ since it can be easily extended to $\mathbb{R}^d$ via the Cramér-Wold device (see Theorem 3.9.5 in [37]). We will apply Lemma A.1 to the second term. By assumption $\hat{\theta}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i/n$, thus

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-n_\eta}} \sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n (\hat{\theta}_i - \theta^c) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-n_\eta}} \sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=1}^i (D_j - \theta^c)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-n_\eta}} \sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n \gamma_{n,i}(D_i - \theta^c),$$

where $\gamma_{n,i} := \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{j}$. Noting that $(D_i - \theta^c)$ are i.i.d. r.v.s with mean 0 and variance $\Sigma_G$,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n \gamma_{n,i}^2}{n-n_\eta} \mathbb{E}[|D_1 - \theta^c|^2] \to (1 - \eta)w_\eta \Sigma_G \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

where the factor $(1 - \eta)w_\eta$ is a consequence of Lemma A.3. Furthermore, it follows from $\gamma_{n,1} \sim \log n$ that $\sqrt{n-n_\eta/\gamma_{n,1}} \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{n,i}^2}{n-n_\eta} (D_i - \theta^c)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma_{n,i}|D_i-\theta^c|>\epsilon\sqrt{n-n_\eta}\}} \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{\sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n \gamma_{n,i}^2}{n-n_\eta} \mathbb{E} \left[ (D_1 - \theta^c)^2 \mathbb{1}_{|D_1-\theta^c|>\epsilon\sqrt{n-n_\eta}/\gamma_{n,1}} \right] \to 0.$$
by the Dominated Convergence Theorem, and Lemma A.1 implies that
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{n - n_\eta}} \sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n (\hat{\theta}_i - \theta^c) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, (1 - \eta) w_\eta \Sigma_G).
\]

It remains to show that the last term in (A.1) vanishes. Let \(\lambda_i(A)\) denote the \(i\)th largest eigenvalue of a matrix \(A\) and define \(\lambda^*(A) = \max_i \vert \lambda_i(A) \vert\). It follows from the continuity of \(\nabla^2 H(\cdot)\) that \(\lambda^*(\nabla^2 H(\hat{\theta}_n)) \to \lambda^*(\nabla^2 H(\theta^c))\) a.s. as \(n \to \infty\), so there exists a.s. \(M_1 > 0\) such that \(\lambda^*(\nabla^2 H(\hat{\theta}_n)) < M_1\) for all \(n\). Also, by the Law of the Iterated Logarithm (see, e.g., [37]), there exists a.s. \(M_2 > 0\) such that
\[
\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^c\| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^d \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (D_{ij} - \theta^c_j) \right| \leq M_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{n}}, \quad \forall n \geq 3,
\]
where \(D_{ij}\) and \(\theta^c_j\) denote the \(j\)th coordinate of \(D_i\) and \(\theta^c\), respectively. Combining these two bounds and by increasing \(M_2\) if necessary, we have for all \(n\) large enough,
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{n - n_\eta}} \sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n (\hat{\theta}_i - \theta^c)^T \nabla^2 H(\bar{\theta}_i)(\hat{\theta}_i - \theta^c) \\
\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n - n_\eta}} \sum_{i=n_\eta+1}^n \lambda^*(\nabla^2 H(\bar{\theta}_i)) \|\hat{\theta}_i - \theta^c\|^2 \\
\leq M_1 M_2^2 \sum_{i=3}^n \frac{\log \log i}{i} \leq M_1 M_2^2 \frac{\log \log n}{\sqrt{n - n_\eta}} \sum_{i=3}^n \frac{1}{i} \leq M_1 M_2^2 \frac{(\log n)^2}{\sqrt{n - n_\eta}},
\]
which converges to 0 as \(n \to \infty\). Following the argument in the proof of Theorem 4.1 for the characteristic function of \(X_n + Y_n\), we have
\[
\sqrt{n - n_\eta} [\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c)] \Rightarrow N(0, (1 - \eta) \sigma_{i,\infty}^2), \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.
\]
Finally, rescaling the limiting variance by a factor of \((1 - \eta)^{-1}\) concludes the proof.

**Proof of Theorem 5.2.** First, we show the validity of SE-IU. According to our discussion in Section 3.3 it suffices to show that \(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n_0}^c) \leq \alpha\), where
\[
\mathcal{E}_{n_0} := \left\{ \left| \hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c) \right| \leq c_{i,n}, \forall i, n \geq n_0 + 1 \right\}.
\]
Letting \(A^*_{u^*} := \bigcap_{n=n_0+1}^\infty \{ \|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^c\| \leq u^* \}\), we have the following upper bound,
\[
\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n_0}^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n_0}^c \cap A^*_{u^*}) + \mathbb{P}(A^*_{u^*}).
\]
Furthermore, let \(\bar{H}_{i,n} := \frac{1}{n - n_\eta} \sum_{j=n_\eta+1}^n H_i(\hat{\theta}_j)\) and we have
\[
\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n_0}^c) \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{n=n_0+1}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \bar{H}_{i,n} - \bar{H}_{i,n} \right| > t_{i,n} \right\} + \mathbb{P}(A^*_{u^*}) + \mathbb{P}(A^*_{u^*}).
\]
In particular, due to Assumption 3.2 (iii),

$$\{ |\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c) | > r_{i,n} \} \cap A_{u^*} = \left\{ \left| \sum_{j=n_0+1}^{n} [H_i(\hat{\theta}_j) - H_i(\theta^c)] \right| > (n - n_\eta) r_{i,n} \right\} \cap A_{u^*}$$

$$\subseteq \bigcup_{j=n_0+1}^{n} \left\{ ||\hat{\theta}_j - \theta^c|| > r_{i,n}/L_i \right\} \cap A_{u^*}.$$ 

Putting all these together, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n_0}^c) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{K}} \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \{ \hat{H}_{i,n} - \bar{H}_{i,n} \} \cap A_{u^*} \right\}$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{K}} \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=n_0+1}^{n} \mathbb{P} \left\{ ||\hat{\theta}_j - \theta^c|| > r_{i,n}/L_i \right\} + \mathbb{P}(A_{u^*}^c).$$

We will bound each term in this upper bound.

(i) By applying a sub-Gaussian tail bound to each dimension of $(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^c)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{u^*}^c) \leq \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ ||\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^c|| > u^* \right\}$$

$$\leq \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \mathbb{P} \left\{ |\hat{\theta}_{n,j} - \theta^c_j| > u^*/\sqrt{d} \right\}$$

$$\leq 2 \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \exp \left(-\frac{n(\alpha^2)}{2d\nu_j^2} \right)$$

$$= 2 \sum_{j=1}^{d} \exp \left(-\frac{(n_0+1)\alpha^2}{2d\nu_j^2} \right) = \frac{\alpha}{3},$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of $u^*$.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{F}_n := \sigma(D_1, \ldots, D_n)$ and $\mathcal{F}_\infty := \sigma(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma(\mathcal{F}_n))$. We have

$$\sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \{ \hat{H}_{i,n} - \bar{H}_{i,n} \} \cap A_{u^*} \right\}$$

$$= \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P} \left\{ \{ \hat{H}_{i,n} - \bar{H}_{i,n} \} \cap A_{u^*} \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{F}_\infty} \right\}$$

$$\leq \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{1}{n - n_\eta} \sum_{j=n_0+1}^{n} [h_i(\xi_{ij}) - H_i(\hat{\theta}_j)] \right| > t_{i,n} \right| \mathcal{F}_\infty \right\} \mathbb{I}_{A_{u^*}} \right\}$$

$$\leq \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} 2 \exp \left( -\frac{(n - n_\eta)^2 t_{i,n}^2}{2\sigma_i^2} \right) = \frac{\alpha}{3K},$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of $t_{i,n}$.
(iii) Again, using a sub-Gaussian bound on each dimension of \((\hat{\theta}_j - \theta^c)\),

\[
\sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=\tau_i+1}^{n} \mathbb{P}\left\{ \|\hat{\theta}_j - \theta^c\| > r_{i,n}/\bar{L}_i \right\} \\
\leq \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=\tau_i+1}^{n} 2d \exp \left( -\frac{j^2 r_{i,n}^2}{2dL_i^2\nu^2} \right) \\
\leq \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} 2d(n - n_\eta) \exp \left( -\frac{(n_\eta + 1)^2 r_{i,n}^2}{2dL_i^2\nu^2} \right) = \frac{\alpha}{3K},
\]

where the last inequality follows form the definition of \(r_{i,n}\).

Gather all the inequalities and we have \(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n_\eta}) \leq \frac{\alpha}{3} + K \frac{\alpha}{3K} + K \frac{\alpha}{3K} = \alpha\), thus proving the validity of SE-IU. Next, we prove the upper bound on \(\mathbb{E}[\tau^*]\). Let \(n_i\) be the number of stages design \(i\) is in the set \(\mathcal{S}\). If we can show that

\[
\mathbb{E}[n_i] \leq \tau_i^* + 2(\alpha + 2de^{-K}(1 - e^{-K})^{-2}), \quad \forall i \neq b,
\]

then the upper bound on \(\mathbb{E}[\tau^*]\) follows from \(\mathbb{E}[\tau^*] \leq 2 \sum_{i \neq b} \mathbb{E}[n_i]\). To show (A.2), let

\[
S_{i,n} := \{i \in \mathcal{S} \text{ at the } n\text{th stage}\}.
\]

By the definition of \(\tau_i^*\), we have \(c_{b,n} + c_{i,n} < \delta_b(\theta^c)/2\) and \(S_{i,n} \subseteq \{\hat{H}_{b,n} - \hat{H}_{i,n} < c_{b,n} + c_{i,n}\}\) for all \(n > \tau_i^*\). It follows that

\[
\mathbb{E}[n_i] = \sum_{n=1}^{\tau_i^*} \mathbb{P}(S_{i,n}) + \sum_{n=\tau_i^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(S_{i,n}) \\
\leq \tau_i^* + \sum_{n=\tau_i^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{ \hat{H}_{b,n} - \hat{H}_{i,n} < c_{b,n} + c_{i,n} \right\} \\
\leq \tau_i^* + \sum_{n=\tau_i^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{ \hat{H}_{b,n} - \hat{H}_{i,n} - (H_b(\theta^c) - H_i(\theta^c)) < -\delta_b(\theta^c)/2 \right\} \\
\leq \tau_i^* + \sum_{n=\tau_i^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{ \hat{H}_{b,n} - \hat{H}_{i,n} - (H_b(\theta^c) - H_i(\theta^c)) < -(c_{b,n} + c_{i,n}) \right\} \\
\leq \tau_i^* + \sum_{n=\tau_i^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\{\hat{H}_{b,n} - H_b(\theta^c) < -c_{b,n}\} + \sum_{n=\tau_i^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\{\hat{H}_{i,n} - H_i(\theta^c) > c_{i,n}\}.
\]

We bound the first sum in the last inequality, since the other can be bounded similarly. Consider

\[
B_n := \bigcap_{\ell=n_\eta+1}^{n} \{\|\hat{\theta}_\ell - \theta^c\| \leq u^*\}.
\]

Then, we have

\[
\sum_{n=\tau_i^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\{\hat{H}_{b,n} - H_b(\theta^c) < -c_{b,n}\}
\]
where the first term is \( \leq \alpha \) since \( B_n \subseteq A_{\nu^*} \), and for the second term,

\[
\sum_{n=t_1^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(B_n^c) \leq \sum_{n=t_1^*+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=n_\eta+1}^{n} 2d \exp \left( -\frac{\ell(u^*)^2}{2d\nu^2} \right)
\]

\[
\leq 2d \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \exp \left( -\frac{(n_\eta + 1)(u^*)^2}{2d\nu^2} \right)
\]

\[
\leq 2d \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \exp (-Kn),
\]

where \( K := \eta(u^*)^2/(2d\nu^2) \). By a direct computation, we have

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \exp (-Kn) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \exp (-Kn) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \exp (-Kn) = \frac{e^{-K}}{(1 - e^{-K})^2}.
\]

We therefore conclude that \( \sum_{n=t_1^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(B_n^c) \leq 2de^{-K}(1 - e^{-K})^{-2} \). Putting all the bounds together yields \( (A.2) \).

\[\Box\]

### A.2 Proofs for fixed budget

**Proof of Theorem 4.1** We work with the following decomposition.

\[
\sqrt{T} \left[ \delta_{ij}(\hat{\theta}_N) - \delta_{ij}(\theta^c) \right] = \sqrt{T} \left[ \delta_{ij}(\hat{\theta}_N) - \delta_{ij}(\hat{\theta}_N) \right] + \sqrt{T} \left[ \delta_{ij}(\hat{\theta}_N) - \delta_{ij}(\theta^c) \right]
\]

Let \( i \) denote the imaginary number \( \sqrt{-1} \). For any \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), we have

\[
\mathbb{E}[e^{it(X_Tt+Y_T^2)}] = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[e^{it(X_Tt+Y_T^2)} | \hat{\theta}_N] \right\} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ e^{itY_T} \mathbb{E}[e^{itX_T} | \hat{\theta}_N] \right\}
\]

The rest of the proof is carried out in the following steps.

(i) \( Y_T \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sum_{q=1}^{Q} \frac{\sigma_i^2(q)}{\rho_q}) \) as \( T \rightarrow \infty \).

Due to Assumption 4.1 (i), we have \( \sqrt{T}(\hat{\theta}_N - \theta^c) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \bar{\Sigma}) \) as \( T \rightarrow \infty \), where \( \bar{\Sigma} := \text{blkdiag} \left( \Sigma_{\theta^c(1)/\rho_1}, \ldots, \Sigma_{\theta^c(Q)/\rho_Q} \right) \) and “blkdiag” denotes a block diagonal matrix. Then, the convergence follows from the Delta Theorem (see, e.g., [34]).

(ii) \( \mathbb{E}[e^{itX_T} | \hat{\theta}_N] \Rightarrow \exp \left( -\sigma_i^2(\theta^c)t^2/2\pi_i \right) \) as \( T \rightarrow \infty \).

Note that conditioned on \( \hat{\theta}_N \), \( Z_{ir}(\hat{\theta}_N) := h_i(\xi_{ir}) - H_i(\hat{\theta}_N), r = 1, 2, \ldots, M_i \) are i.i.d. random variables with mean 0 and variance \( \sigma_i^2(\hat{\theta}_N) \). Thus, it can be checked that

\[
\mathbb{E}[e^{itX_T} | \hat{\theta}_N] = \left[ \phi_{Z_{i1}(\theta_N)} \left( \frac{t\sqrt{T}}{M_i} \right) \right]^{M_i} \cdots \left[ \phi_{Z_{ij}(\theta_N)} \left( \frac{t\sqrt{T}}{M_j} \right) \right]^{M_j},
\]
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where \( \phi_X(\cdot) \) denotes the characteristic function of \( X \). Furthermore, by Theorem 3.3.8 from [37],
\[
\phi_{Z_i}(\hat{\theta}_N) \left( \frac{t\sqrt{T}}{M_i} \right) = 1 - \sigma_i^2(\hat{\theta}_N) \frac{T^2}{2M_i M_i} + o \left( \frac{1}{M_i} \right).
\]

Since \( \hat{\theta}_N \Rightarrow \theta^c \), \( \sigma_i^2(\hat{\theta}_N) \Rightarrow \sigma_i^2(\theta^c) \) by the continuity of \( \sigma_i^2(\cdot) \), and
\[
\sigma_i^2(\hat{\theta}_N) \frac{T^2}{2M_i} \Rightarrow \frac{\sigma_i^2(\theta^c)T^2}{2\pi_i} \quad \text{as} \quad T \to \infty.
\]

Let \( \mathbb{C} \) denote the set of all complex numbers. Using the fact that if \( c_n \to c \in \mathbb{C} \), then
\[
(1 + c_n/n)^n \to e^c \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty,
\]
we further have
\[
\left[ \phi_{Z_i}(\hat{\theta}_N) \left( \frac{t\sqrt{T}}{M_i} \right) \right]^{M_i} \Rightarrow \exp \left( -\frac{\sigma_i^2(\theta^c)t^2}{2\pi_i} \right) \quad \text{as} \quad T \to \infty.
\]

(iii) Combining observations (i) and (ii) together with the Dominated Convergence Theorem (since the integrand is dominated by 1), we have
\[
\mathbb{E}[e^{i(tX_T + Y_T)}] \to \exp \left( -\sum_{q=1}^Q \psi_i^2(q)\frac{t^2}{2\rho_q} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{\sigma_i^2(\theta^c)t^2}{2\pi_i} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{\sigma_j^2(\theta^c)t^2}{2\pi_j} \right),
\]
which implies the desired result.

\[ \square \]

**Proof of Theorem 4.2.** Let \( E := \bigcap_{q=1}^Q \bigcap_{n=N_0}^\infty \left\{ \| \hat{\theta}_n(q) - \theta^c(q) \| \leq z^*/\sqrt{Q} \right\} \). Then, we have
\[
PFS \leq \mathbb{P}(FS \cap E) + \mathbb{P}(E^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(FS \mid E) + \mathbb{P}(E^c),
\]
where “FS” denotes the false selection event.

(i) Bounding \( \mathbb{P}(E^c) \).
\[
\mathbb{P}(E^c) \leq \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{n=N_0}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left\{ \| \hat{\theta}_n(q) - \theta^c(q) \| > z^*/\sqrt{Q} \right\}
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{n=N_0}^\infty B_q(z^*/\sqrt{Q})e^{-C_qn}
\]
\[
\leq \max_q \left\{ \frac{B_q(z^*/\sqrt{Q})}{1 - e^{-C_q}} \right\} \sum_{q=1}^Q e^{-C_q[\rho_0T]}
\]

(ii) Bounding \( \mathbb{P}(FS \mid E) \).

Note that on event \( E \), we have \( \| \hat{\theta}_N - \theta^c \| \leq z^* \) almost surely. Moreover, it follows from the definition of \( z^* \) that conditioned on \( E \),
\[
\bigcap_{i=1}^K \bigcap_{n=M_0}^\infty \left\{ |\hat{H}_i(\hat{\theta}_N) - H_i(\hat{\theta}_N)| \leq \frac{\Delta_i}{4} \right\} \subseteq CS,
\]
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where “CS” denotes the correct selection event. Applying a sub-Gaussian bound,

\[
P(\text{FS} \mid E) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sum_{n=M_0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ |\hat{H}_i(\hat{\theta}_N) - H_i(\hat{\theta}_N)| > \frac{\Delta_i}{4} \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \max_i \left\{ \frac{2}{1 - \exp \left( -\frac{\Delta_i^2}{32\sigma_i^2} \right)} \right\} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \exp \left( -\frac{\Delta_i^2 |\pi_0 T|}{32\sigma_i^2} \right),
\]

where \( \sigma_i < \infty \) since \( \sigma_i(\cdot) \) is continuous and \( \{ \theta \in \Theta \mid \|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq z^* \} \) is compact.

Defining the constants \( \Gamma_1 \) and \( \Gamma_2 \) accordingly gives the desired bound. \( \square \)
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