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Abstract

Consider the problem of sequentially estimating quantiles of any distribution over a complete, fully-ordered set, based on a stream of i.i.d. observations. We propose new, theoretically sound and practically tight confidence sequences for quantiles, that is, sequences of confidence intervals which are valid uniformly over time. We give two methods for tracking a fixed quantile and two methods for tracking all quantiles simultaneously. Specifically, we provide explicit expressions with small constants for intervals whose widths shrink at the fastest possible $\sqrt{t - \frac{1}{\log \log t}}$ rate, as determined by the law of the iterated logarithm (LIL). As a byproduct, we give a non-asymptotic concentration inequality for the empirical distribution function which holds uniformly over time with the LIL rate, thus strengthening Smirnov’s asymptotic empirical process LIL, and extending the famed Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DKW) inequality to hold uniformly over all sample sizes while only being about twice as wide in practice. This inequality directly yields sequential analogues of the one- and two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, and a test of stochastic dominance. We apply our results to the problem of selecting an arm with an approximately best quantile in a multi-armed bandit framework, proving a state-of-the-art sample complexity bound for a novel allocation strategy. Simulations demonstrate that our method stops with fewer samples than existing methods by a factor of five to fifty. Finally, we show how to compute confidence sequences for the difference between quantiles of two arms in an A/B test, along with corresponding always-valid $p$-values.

1 Introduction

A fundamental problem in statistics is the estimation of the location of a distribution based on independent and identically distributed samples. While the mean is the most common measure of location, the median and other quantiles are important alternatives. Quantiles are more robust to outliers and are well-defined for ordinal variables, and sample quantiles exhibit favorable concentration properties, which allow for strong estimation guarantees with minimal assumptions.

In this paper, we consider the sequential estimation of quantiles. Our key tool is the confidence sequence: a sequence of confidence intervals which are guaranteed to contain the desired quantile uniformly over an unbounded time horizon, with the desired coverage probability. For example, if $Q(1/2)$ denotes the true median and $\hat{Q}_t(1/2)$ denotes the sample quantile function after having observed $t$ samples (see Section 3 for precise definitions), then for any desired coverage level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, Theorem 1(a) yields the following confidence sequence guarantee:

$$P \left( \forall t \in \mathbb{N} : \hat{Q}_t(1/2 - u_t) \leq Q(1/2) \leq \hat{Q}_t(1/2 + u_t) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha,$$

where $u_t := 0.72 \sqrt{t^{-1} \log \log(2.04t) + \log(9.97/\alpha)}$. (1)

In addition to confidence sequences for a fixed quantile, we also derive families of confidence sequences which hold uniformly both over time and over all quantiles. For example, if $Q(p)$ is the true quantile function, then
for any $\alpha \in (0, 0.25)$, Corollary 2 together with (20) yields

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, p \in (0, 1) : \hat{Q}_t(p - u_t) \leq Q(p) \leq \hat{Q}_t(p + u_t) \right) \geq 1 - \alpha,$$

where $u_t := 0.85 \sqrt{t^{-1} \log \log (et) + 0.8 \log (1612/\alpha)}$. (2)

The closed form for $u_t$ given above is one of many possibilities, but Corollary 2 offers better constants, and permits any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, if one is willing to perform numerical root-finding. For example, with $\alpha = 0.05$, we can take $u_t := 0.85 \sqrt{t^{-1} \log \log (et) + 8.12}$ in (2).

For a fixed sample size, the celebrated Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DKW) inequality (Dvoretzky et al., 1956, Massart, 1990) bounds the uniform-norm deviation of the empirical CDF from the truth with high probability. Corollary 2 follows from Theorem 2, which gives an extension of the DKW inequality that holds uniformly over time. From a theoretical point of view, Theorem 2 gives a non-asymptotic strengthening of the empirical process law of the iterated logarithm (LL) by Smirnov (1944). From a practical point of view, as Figure 2 illustrates, our time-uniform DKW inequality of Theorem 2 is only about a factor of about two wider in the radius of the high-probability bound, relative to the fixed-sample DKW inequality. This factor grows at a slow $\sqrt{\log \log t}$ rate, so holds over a very long time horizon. Figure 1 illustrates our confidence sequences both for a fixed quantile and for the entire CDF.

In practice, rather than estimating the quantile of a single distribution, one often wishes to estimate the difference between quantiles of two distributions, as in a randomized experiment or “A/B test”. We discuss how to construct confidence sequences for such pairwise differences directly, with greater efficiency than a simple Bonferroni correction over per-arm estimates. We also present an equivalent formulation in terms of one-sided or two-sided, always-valid $p$-value processes (Johari et al., 2015).

Our quantile confidence sequences provide strong guarantees under minimal assumptions while granting the decision-maker a great deal of flexibility. We emphasize the following specific benefits of our confidence sequences (Howard et al., 2018b):

(P1) **Non-asymptotic and distribution-free**: our confidence sequences offer coverage guarantees for all sample sizes in any i.i.d. sampling scenario, regardless of the underlying distribution.
Unbounded sample size: our methods do not require a final sample size to be chosen ahead of time. They may be tuned for a planned sample size but always permit additional sampling.

Arbitrary stopping rules: we make no assumptions on the stopping rule used to decide when to stop collecting data and act on given inferences. A user may even perform inference in hindsight based on a previously-seen sample size. That is, the “stopping rule” can be any random time and does not need to be a formal stopping time.

Asymptotically zero width: our confidence bounds for the $p$-quantile are based on $p \pm O(t^{-1/2})$ sample quantiles, ignoring log factors. In this sense, our confidence intervals shrink in width at nearly the same rate as pointwise confidence intervals.

Beyond estimation, one may choose to actively seek a distribution which maximizes a particular quantile, as in a multi-armed bandit setup. We discuss an extended application of our bounds to the problem of finding an arm having an approximately best quantile with high probability, while minimizing the total number of samples drawn. Our algorithm, and the corresponding sample complexity analysis, improve on the current state of the art, both in rates and in simulation.

1.1 Related work

The pioneering work of Darling and Robbins (1967a) introduced the idea of a confidence sequence, as far as we are aware, and gave a confidence sequence for the median. Their method exploits a standard connection between concentration of quantiles and concentration of the empirical CDF, as does our work, and their method extends trivially to estimating any other fixed quantile. Their confidence sequence was based on the iterated-logarithm, time-uniform bound derived in Darling and Robbins (1967b), and so shrinks in width at the fastest possible $\sqrt{t^{-1}\log\log t}$ rate, like our Theorem 1(a). For the median, their constants are excellent, but the lack of dependence on which quantile is being estimated leads to looseness for tail quantiles, as illustrated in Figure 2. Our results for fixed-quantile estimation yield significantly tighter confidence sequences for tail quantiles (and are also slightly tighter for the median). Our proof techniques lean heavily upon recent advances in the theory of time-uniform martingale concentration developed in Howard et al. (2018a,b). Brunel et al. (2019) give another iterated-logarithm rate confidence sequence for quantiles, a special case of their general method for $M$-estimators.

The problem of selecting an approximately best arm, as measured by the largest mean, was studied by Even-Dar et al. (2002) and Mannor and Tsitsiklis (2004), who gave an algorithm and sample complexity upper and lower bounds within a logarithmic factor of each other. The best-arm identification or pure exploration problem has received a great deal of attention since then; we mention the influential work of Bubeck et al. (2009) and the proposals of Jamieson et al. (2014), Kaufmann et al. (2016), and Zhao et al. (2016), whose methods included iterated-logarithm inequalities.

The problem of seeking an arm with the largest median (or other quantile), rather than mean, was first considered by Yu and Nikolova (2013), as far as we are aware. Szörényi et al. (2015) proposed the problem formulation that we use, and gave an algorithm with a sample complexity upper bound mirroring that of Even-Dar et al., including the logarithmic factor. Szörényi et al. include a confidence sequence valid over quantiles and time, derived via a union bound applied to the DKW inequality (Dvoretzky et al., 1956, Massart, 1990), similar to the bound used by Darling and Robbins (1968, Theorem 4). Szörényi et al. also analyzed a quantile-based regret-minimization problem, recently studied by Torossian et al. (2019) as well. David and Shimkin (2016) extended the sample complexity of Szörényi et al. to include dependence on the quantile being optimized. Our procedure is a variant of the LUCB algorithm by Kalyanakrishnan et al. (2012); we improve the upper bounds of Szörényi et al. by replacing the logarithmic factor by an iterated-logarithm one, and we achieve considerably better performance in simulations.

Shorack and Wellner (1986) give an extensive survey of results for the empirical process $(\hat{F}_t - F)_{t=1}^{\infty}$ for uniform observations, and by extension, the empirical distribution function for any sequence of i.i.d. observations. Of particular relevance is the LIL proved by Smirnov (1944), and the proof given by Shorack and Wellner (1986), based on an improvement of a maximal inequality due to James (1975). This maximal inequality is the key to our sophisticated non-asymptotic empirical process iterated logarithm inequality, Theorem 2. The latter leads to new quantile confidence sequences that are uniform over both quantiles and time which are significantly tighter than the bounds of Szörényi et al. mentioned earlier.
1.2 Paper outline

After an introduction to the conceptual ideas of the paper in Section 2, we present our confidence sequences for estimation of a fixed quantile in Section 3, while Section 4 gives confidence sequences for all quantiles simultaneously. Section 5 offers a graphical comparison of our bounds with each other and existing bounds from the literature, as well as advice for tuning bounds in practice. In Section 6, we analyze a new algorithm for quantile $\epsilon$-best-arm identification in a multi-armed bandit, with a state-of-the-art sample complexity bound, while Section 7 presents sequential hypothesis tests: A/B tests based on quantiles, sequential one- and two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests for equality of distributions, and a sequential test of stochastic dominance. We gather proofs in Section 8. Implementations are available online for all confidence sequences presented here\(^1\), along with code to reproduce all plots and simulations\(^2\).

2 Warmup: linear boundaries and quantile confidence sequences

Before stating our main results in the next section, we first walk through the derivation of a simple confidence sequence for quantiles to illustrate basic techniques. For this section only, let $(X_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of i.i.d., real-valued observations from some continuous distribution, and for some $p \in (0, 1)$, let $q \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq q) = p$. We wish to sequentially estimate this $p$-quantile, $q$, based on the observations $(X_i)$. At a high level, our strategy is as follows:

1. We first imagine testing a specific hypothesis $H_{0,x} : q = x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Using the standard duality between tests and confidence intervals, we will then construct a confidence interval for $q$ consisting of all those values of $x \in \mathbb{R}$ for which we fail to reject $H_{0,x}$. 

2. To test $H_{0,x}$ for some fixed $x$, we observe that $H_{0,x}$ is true if and only if the random variables $(1_{X_i \leq x})_{i=1}^\infty$ are i.i.d. draws from a Bernoulli($p$) distribution. Hence, if the number of samples were fixed in advance, testing $H_{0,x}$ would be equivalent to a standard parametric test: we observe a set of coin flips $(1_{X_i \leq x})$, and the null hypothesis states that the bias of this coin is $p$. Inverting this test, as mentioned in the previous point, yields a fixed-sample confidence interval for $q$.

3. Instead of a fixed-sample test, we could apply a sequential hypothesis test, one which can be repeatedly conducted after each new sample $X_t$ is observed, with the guarantee that, with the desired, high probability, we will never reject $H_{0,x}$ when it is true. For example, appropriate variants of Wald’s Sequential Probability Ratio Test (SPRT) would suffice. Inverting such a sequential test, we upgrade our fixed-sample confidence interval to a confidence sequence, a sequence of confidence intervals $(CI_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ which is guaranteed to contain $q$ uniformly over time with high probability: $\mathbb{P}(\forall t : q \in CI_t) \geq 1 - \alpha$.

To give a rigorous example, consider the random variables $\xi_t := 1_{X_t \leq x}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. We cannot observe $\xi_t$ since $q$ is unknown, but we know $(\xi_t)$ is a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli($p$) random variables. A standard result due to Hoeffding (1963) shows that the centered random variable $\xi_1 - p$ is sub-Gaussian with variance parameter $1/4$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda(\xi_1 - p)} \leq e^{\lambda^2/8}$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Writing $L_0 := 1$ and, for $t \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$L_t := \exp \left\{ \frac{\lambda}{8} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t (\xi_i - p) - \frac{\lambda^2 t}{8} \right) \right\},$$

we observe the well-known fact that $(L_t)_{t=0}^\infty$ is a positive supermartingale for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, Ville’s inequality (Ville, 1939) yields $\mathbb{P}(\exists t \geq 1 : L_t \geq 1/\alpha) \leq \alpha$, or equivalently,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \exists t \geq 1 : \sum_{i=1}^t \xi_i \geq tp + \frac{\log \alpha^{-1}}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda t}{8} \right) \leq \alpha.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

The sequence $(\frac{\log \alpha^{-1}}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda t}{8})_{t=1}^\infty$ gives a boundary, linear in $t$, which the centered process $(\sum_{i=1}^t (\xi_i - p))_{t=1}^\infty$ is unlikely to ever cross. For $\lambda > 0$, this bounds the upper deviations of the partial sums $(\sum_{i=1}^t \xi_i)_{t=1}^\infty$ above

\(^1\)https://github.com/gostevehoward/confseq
\(^2\)https://github.com/gostevehoward/quantilecs
their expectations, while for \( \lambda < 0 \), this bounds the lower deviations. Thus, writing \( u_t := \lambda/8 + (\log \alpha^{-1})/2(\lambda t) \), we have \( t(p - u_t) < \sum_{i=1}^{t} \xi_i < t(p + u_t) \) uniformly over all \( t \in \mathbb{N} \) with probability at least \( 1 - \alpha \). Observe that \( \sum_{i=1}^{t} \xi_i = \{i \in [t] : X_i \leq q\} \), the number of observations up to time \( t \) which lie below \( q \). So if \( \sum_{i=1}^{t} \xi_i < t(p + u_t) \), then we must have \( q < X_{(t(p + u_t))}^t \), where \( X_{(k)}^t \) is the \( k \)th order statistic of \( X_1, \ldots, X_t \). Likewise, \( \sum_{i=1}^{t} \xi_i > t(p - u_t) \) implies \( q > X_{(t(p - u_t))}^t \). In other words, with probability at least \( 1 - \alpha \),

\[
q \in \left( X_{(t(p - u_t))}^t, X_{(t(p + u_t))}^t \right) \quad \text{simultaneously for all } t \in \mathbb{N},
\]

yielding a confidence sequence for the \( p \)-quantile, \( q \). The main drawback of this confidence sequence is that \( u_t \) does not decrease to zero as \( t \uparrow \infty \), so that we do not, in general, expect the confidence sequence to approach zero width as our sample size grows without bound. In other words, the precision of this estimation strategy is unnecessarily limited. The confidence sequences of Section 3 remove this restriction by replacing the \( O(t) \) boundary of (4) with a curved boundary growing at the rate \( \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{t \log t}) \) or \( \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{t \log \log t}) \).

### 3 Confidence sequences for a fixed quantile

We now state our general problem formulation, which removes the assumption that observations are real-valued or from a continuous distribution. Let \( (X_i)_{i=1}^\infty \) be a sequence of i.i.d. observations taking values in some complete, totally-ordered set \( (X, \leq) \). We shall also make use of the corresponding relations \( \geq, < \) and \( \succ, \prec \) on \( X \). Write \( F(x) := P(X_1 \leq x) \) for the cumulative distribution function (CDF), \( F^{-}(x) := P(X_1 < x) \), and define the empirical versions of these functions \( \hat{F}_t(x) := t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{t} 1_{X_i \leq x} \) and \( \hat{F}_{-t}(x) := t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{t} 1_{X_i < x} \). Define the (standard) upper quantile function as \( Q(p) := \sup\{x \in X : F(x) \leq p\} \) and the lower quantile function \( Q^{-}(p) := \sup\{x \in X : F(x) < p\} \). Finally, define the corresponding upper and lower empirical quantile functions \( \hat{Q}_t(p) := \sup\{x \in X : \hat{F}_t(x) \leq p\} \) and \( \hat{Q}_{-t}(p) := \sup\{x \in X : \hat{F}_{-t}(x) < p\} \). We extend the empirical quantile functions to hold over domain \( p \in \mathbb{R} \) by taking the convention that the supremum of the empty set is \( \inf X \), so that \( \hat{Q}_t(p) = \hat{Q}_{-t}(p) = \inf X \) for \( p < 0 \) while \( \hat{Q}_t(p) = \hat{Q}_{-t}(p) = \sup X \) for \( p > 1 \). The following remarks will aid intuition:

- \( Q(p) \) and \( \hat{Q}_t(p) \) are right-continuous, while \( Q^{-}(p) \) and \( \hat{Q}_{-t}(p) \) are left-continuous.
- \( \hat{Q}_t(p) \) is the \( \lfloor tp \rfloor \) order statistic of \( X_1, \ldots, X_t \), and \( \hat{Q}_{-t}(p) \) is the \( \lceil tp \rceil \) order statistic.
- \( Q^{-}(p) \leq Q(p) \), and \( Q^{-}(p) = Q(p) \) unless the \( p \)-quantile is ambiguous, that is, \( F(x) = F(x') = p \) for some \( x \neq x' \).
- \( \hat{Q}_t(p) \leq \hat{Q}_{-t}(p) \), and \( \hat{Q}_{-t}(p) = \hat{Q}_t(p) \) for all \( p \notin \{1/t, 2/t, \ldots, (t - 1)/t\} \).
- \( Q^{-} \) is ordinarily denoted \( F^{-} \) (e.g., Shorack and Wellner, 1986, p. 3, equation (13)). We adopt alternative notation to maximize clarity in the case of ambiguous quantiles.

Fixing any \( p \in (0, 1) \) and \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), our goal in this section is to give a \((1 - \alpha)\)-confidence sequence for the true quantiles \( Q^{-}(p), Q(p) \) in terms of sample quantiles. In particular, we posit one's proposal, real-valued sequences \( l_t(p) \) and \( u_t(p) \) for \( t \in \mathbb{N} \), each decreasing to zero as \( t \uparrow \infty \), satisfying

\[
P \left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} : Q^{-}(p) < \hat{Q}_t(p - l_t(p)) \text{ or } Q(p) > \hat{Q}_{-t}(p + u_t(p)) \right) \leq \alpha.
\]

(6)

Stated differently, for any \( q \in [Q^{-}(p), Q(p)] \), we would have

\[
P \left( \forall t \in \mathbb{N} : q \in [\hat{Q}_t(p - l_t(p)), \hat{Q}_{-t}(p + u_t(p))] \right) \geq 1 - \alpha.
\]

(7)

The sequences \( (l_t(p), u_t(p))_{t=1}^\infty \) characterize the widths of the confidence intervals in “\( p \)-space”, before passing through the sample quantile functions \( \hat{Q}_t \) and \( \hat{Q}_{-t} \) to obtain final confidence bounds in \( X \). In what follows, we characterize the asymptotic rates of our confidence intervals widths in terms of these “\( p \)-space” widths.

Note that (7) implies that the running intersection of confidence intervals also yields a valid confidence sequence:

\[
P \left( \forall t \in \mathbb{N} : q \in \left[ \max_{s \leq t} \hat{Q}_s(p - l_s(p)), \min_{s \leq t} \hat{Q}_{-s}(p + u_s(p)) \right] \right) \geq 1 - \alpha.
\]

(8)
This intersection yields smaller confidence intervals. On the other hand, it may be desirable for inference at time $t$ to include all observations up to that time. More concretely, the intersection method may lead to an empty confidence interval on the miscoverage event of probability $\alpha$, or if the assumption of identically distributed observations is violated, which is perhaps more relevant to practice. This can be viewed as a benefit, as an empty confidence interval is evidence of problematic assumptions. In such cases, however, it may also lead to misleadingly small, but not empty, confidence intervals, which may be harder to detect. See Howard et al. (2018b, Section 6.1) for further discussion.

We propose two specific confidence sequences. The first can be expressed in closed form with small constants, and its width also has the smallest possible asymptotic rate of $O(\sqrt{t^{-1}\log \log t})$, but it tends to yield marginally wider confidence intervals in practice. This confidence sequence is based on the stitching method (Howard et al., 2018b, Theorem 1), in which we divide time into geometrically-spaced epochs $[mn^k, mn^{k+1})$, and bound the miscoverage event within the $k$th epoch by a probability which decays like $k^{-\eta}$. Fix any $\eta > 1, s > 1$, which control the shape of the confidence radius over time, and $m \geq 1$, the time at which the confidence sequence starts to be tight. For each $p \in (0, 1)$, define

$$ S_p(t) := \sqrt{k^2_1 p(1 - p)t\ell(t) + k^2_2 c_p E^2(t)} + c_p k_2 \ell(t), \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{cases} \ell(t) := s \log \log \left(\frac{m^2}{m^2} + \log \left(\frac{2\tilde{c}(s)}{s\log s}\right)\right) \\ k_1 := (\eta^{1/4} + \eta^{-1/4})/\sqrt{2} \\ k_2 := (\sqrt{\eta} + 1)/2 \\ c_p := (1 - 2p)/3. \end{cases} \quad (9) $$

As a specific example which performs well in practice, take $\eta = 2.04, s = 1.4$ to obtain

$$ S_p(t) = \sqrt{2.06p(1 - p)t\ell(t) + 0.16(1 - 2p)^2 E^2(t)} + 0.4(1 - 2p)\ell(t), \quad \text{where} \quad \ell(t) = 1.4 \log \log(2.04t/m) + \log(9.97/\alpha). \quad (10) $$

The second method requires numerical root-finding to compute, and has a worse asymptotic rate of $O(\sqrt{t^{-1}\log t})$ (Howard et al., 2018b, Proposition 10), but is usually preferable in practice, as we explore in Section 5. This method uses the beta-binomial bound of Howard et al. (2018b, Proposition 6). Below, we denote the beta function by $B(a, b) = \int_0^1 u^{a-1}(1 - u)^{b-1} du$. Fix any $r > 0$, a tuning parameter which controls the range of times over which the confidence sequence is tight, as we explain in Section 5. Define

$$ \bar{f}_t(p) := \sup \left\{ s \in \left[ 0, \frac{r + p(1 - p)t}{p} \right] : M_{p, r}(s, p(1 - p)t) < \frac{1}{\alpha} \right\}, \quad (11) $$

where

$$ M_{p, r}(s, v) := \frac{1}{p^v/(1 - p) + s(1 - p)^v/p^s} \cdot \frac{B(r + s, r + v + s)}{B(r, r + v - 1/p)}. \quad (12) $$

The following result shows that both the above methods yield valid confidence sequences for any fixed $p$.

**Theorem 1** (Confidence sequence for a fixed quantile). Defining $f_t(p) := S_p(t \vee m)$ from (9) for any $p \in (0, 1)$ and any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$ P \left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} : Q^-(p) < \hat{Q}_t \left( p - \frac{f_t(1 - p)}{t} \right) \text{ or } Q(p) > \hat{Q}_t \left( p + \frac{f_t(p)}{t} \right) \right) \leq \alpha. \quad (13) $$

The same holds with $\bar{f}_t$ from (11) in place of $f_t$.

The proof, given in Section 8.1, involves constructing a martingale having bounded increments as a function of the true quantiles $Q^-(p)$ and $Q(p)$. Then uniform concentration arguments from Howard et al. (2018b) show that $f_t(p)$ and $\bar{f}_t(p)$ bound the deviations of this martingale from zero, uniformly over time, with high probability. We deduce plausible values for the true quantiles from this high-probability restriction on the values of the martingale. Although simpler boundaries could be derived from a sub-Gaussian argument, we instead use sub-gamma (for $f_t$) and sub-Bernoulli (for $\bar{f}_t$) arguments (Howard et al., 2018a). The resulting bounds are never looser than those obtained by a sub-Gaussian argument, and will be much tighter when $p$ is close to zero or one, as we later illustrate in Figure 2(b).

Inspection of (9) reveals that $f_t(p)/t = O\left( \sqrt{t^{-1}\log \log t} \right)$ as $t \to \infty$. It is a straightforward consequence of the law of the iterated logarithm that this rate is the best possible:
Proposition 1 (Quantile confidence sequence lower bound). If \( u_t = o\left(\sqrt{t^{-1} \log t}\right) \) as \( t \to \infty \), then for any \( p \in (0, 1) \) such that \( F(Q(p)) = p \), we have

\[
P(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : Q(p) \geq \hat{Q}_t(p + u_t)) = 1. \tag{14}
\]

This result is proved in Section 8.2. Note that the condition \( F(Q(p)) = p \) holds for all \( p \in (0, 1) \) when \( F \) is continuous.

We briefly remark on a related problem, that of estimating the least nonnegative quantile, or more generally, \( F^{-1}(x) \leq p \iff x \leq Q(p) \), we see that the smallest \( p \) satisfying \( F(p) \geq x \) is exactly \( F^{-1}(x) \). We can therefore solve this problem with a confidence sequence for \( F^{-1}(x) \), which is unbiasedly estimated by \( \hat{F}^{-1}_t(x) \), an average of i.i.d. Bernoulli observations. One valid confidence sequence is given by \( \{ p \in [0, 1] : M_{p,r}(\hat{F}^{-1}_t(x) - p) < (1 - p)t < 1/\alpha \} \) for any fixed \( r > 0 \), where \( M_{p,r}(s, u) \) is defined in (12) (Howard et al., 2018b).

Having presented our confidence sequences for a fixed quantile, we next present bounds that are uniform over both quantiles and time.

## 4 Confidence sequences for all quantiles simultaneously

Theorem 1 is useful when the experimenter has decided ahead of time to focus attention on a particular quantile, or perhaps a small number of quantiles (via a union bound). In some cases, however, it may be preferable to estimate all quantiles simultaneously, so that the experimenter may adaptively choose which quantiles to estimate after seeing the data. Recall that for a fixed time \( t \) and \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), the DKW inequality (Dvoretzky et al., 1956; Massart, 1990) states that

\[
P\left( \left\| \hat{F}_t - F \right\|_{\infty} > \sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{1}{\alpha}}{2t}} \right) \leq \alpha. \tag{15}
\]

In tandem with equations (52) and (54) of Section 8, the DKW inequality yields

\[
P\left( \exists p \in (0, 1) : Q^{-1}(p) < \hat{Q}_t^{-1}(p - l_t) \text{ or } Q(p) > \hat{Q}_t(p + u_t) \right) \leq \alpha, \quad \text{where } l_t = u_t = \sqrt{\frac{\log \frac{1}{\alpha}}{2t}}. \tag{16}
\]

In this section, we derive \((1 - \alpha)\)-confidence sequences which are valid uniformly over both quantiles and time, based on function sequences \( l_t(p) \), \( u_t(p) \) decreasing to zero pointwise as \( t \uparrow \infty \):

\[
P\left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N}, p \in (0, 1) : Q^{-1}(p) < \hat{Q}_t^{-1}(p - l_t(p)) \text{ or } Q(p) > \hat{Q}_t(p + u_t(p)) \right) \leq \alpha. \tag{17}
\]

As in Section 3, we propose two methods. The first is based on the following non-asymptotic iterated logarithm inequality for the empirical process \( (\hat{F}_t - F)_{t=1}^\infty \), which may be of independent interest. We use it, in tandem with Theorem 1, to prove our sample complexity bound for quantile \( \epsilon \)-best-arm identification in Section 6.

Theorem 2 (Empirical process finite LIL bound). For any \( m \geq 1 \), \( A > 1/\sqrt{2} \), and \( C > 0 \), we have

\[
P\left( \exists t \geq m : \left\| \hat{F}_t - F \right\|_{\infty} > A \sqrt{\frac{\log \log(et/m) + C}{t}} \right) \leq \alpha_{A,C} := \inf_{\eta \in (1, 2A^2), \gamma(A,C,\eta) > 1} 4e^{-\gamma^2(A,C,\eta)C} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\gamma^2(A,C,\eta) - 1} \log \eta \right), \tag{18}
\]

where \( \gamma(A,C,\eta) := \sqrt{2/\eta} \left( A - \sqrt{2(\eta - 1)/C} \right) \). Furthermore,

\[
P\left( \left\| \hat{F}_t - F \right\|_{\infty} > A \sqrt{t^{-1}(\log \log(et/m) + C)} \text{ infinitely often} \right) = 0. \tag{19}
\]
We give the proof in Section 8.3, based on a maximal inequality due to James (1975) and Shorack and Wellner (1986) combined with a union bound over exponentially-spaced epochs. To better understand the quantity $\alpha_{A,C}$, note that any value of $\eta \in (1,2A^2)$ satisfying $\gamma(A,C,\eta)$ gives an upper bound for $\alpha_{A,C}$. For fixed $A$, any value $\eta \in (1,2A^2)$ is feasible for sufficiently large $C$, while for fixed $C$, any value $\eta > 1$ is feasible for sufficiently large $A$. In either case, $\gamma^2(A,C,\eta) \sim 2A^2/\eta$ as $A \to \infty$ or $C \to \infty$, which yields $\log \alpha_{A,C} = O(-A^2C)$, as may be expected from a typical exponential concentration bound. For an explicit example, take $A = 0.85$ and any $C \geq 7$, and observe that the value $\eta = 1.01$ ensures that $\gamma^2(0.85,C,1.01) \geq 1.25$ and is thus feasible for the right-hand side of (18), yielding

$$\alpha_{0.85,C} \leq 1612e^{−1.25C}, \text{ for } C \geq 7. \quad (20)$$

Starting from (19), taking $A$ arbitrarily close to $1/\sqrt{2}$ immediately implies the following asymptotic upper LIL.

**Corollary 1 (Smirnov, 1944).** For any (possibly discontinuous) $F$, we have

$$\limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{\|\hat{F}_t - F\|_{\infty}}{\sqrt{(1/2)t^{-1}\log \log t}} \leq 1 \text{ almost surely.} \quad (21)$$

A comprehensive overview of results for the empirical process $\sqrt{t}(\hat{F}_t - F)$ can be found in Shorack and Wellner (1986). We mention in particular the law of the iterated logarithm derived by Smirnov (1944) (cf. Shorack and Wellner, 1986, page 12, equation (11)), which says that for continuous $F$, the bound (21) holds with equality, seeing as the lower bound on the lim sup follows directly from the original LIL (Khintchine, 1924) applied to $\hat{F}_t(Q(1/2))$, an average of i.i.d. Bernoulli(1/2) random variables. Theorem 2 strengthens Smirnov’s asymptotic upper bound to one holding uniformly over time.

The following confidence sequence follows immediately from Theorem 2, as detailed in Section 8.5.

**Corollary 2** (Quantile-uniform confidence sequence 1). For any $m$, $A$, and $C$ satisfying the conditions of Theorem 2, letting $g_t := A\sqrt{t(\log \log(\epsilon t/m) + C)}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left( \exists t \geq m, p \in (0,1) : Q^- (p) < \hat{Q}_t \left( p - \frac{g_t}{t} \right) \text{ or } Q(p) > \hat{Q}_t \left( p + \frac{g_t}{t} \right) \right) \leq \alpha_{A,C}, \quad (22)$$

where $\alpha_{A,C}$ is defined as in Theorem 2.

For a specific example, take $m = 1$, $A = 0.85$, $C = 8.13$, and $\eta = 1.009$, so that $g_t = 0.85\sqrt{t(\log \log(\epsilon t) + 8.12)}$ and $\alpha_{A,C} = 0.05$, yielding

$$\mathbb{P}\left( \exists t \geq 1, p \in (0,1) : Q^- (p) < \hat{Q}_t \left( p - \frac{g_t}{t} \right) \text{ or } Q(p) > \hat{Q}_t \left( p + \frac{g_t}{t} \right) \right) \leq 0.05. \quad (23)$$

Figure 2(a) shows that Corollary 2 yields a confidence sequence which is considerably tighter than existing methods based on the fixed-time DKW inequality combined with a naive union bound over time.

Note that $g_t$ does not depend on $p$, like the DKW-based fixed-time inequality (16). The second method yields a $\tilde{g}_t$ that depends on $p$; it is notionally quite cumbersome, but often yields tighter bounds, especially for $p$ near zero and one. This confidence sequence is derived by following the same contours as those of the stitching technique behind the fixed-quantile bound (9) (Howard et al., 2018, Theorem 1). However, within each epoch, rather than focus on a single quantile, we take a union bound over a grid of quantiles, with the grid becoming finer as time increases. Below, we write $\logit(p) := \log(p/(1-p))$ and $\logit^{-1}(l) = e^l/(1+e^l)$. Fix $\delta > 0$, a parameter controlling the fineness of the quantile grid, and fix $\eta > 1$, $s > 1$, and $m \geq 1$ as in
We require the following notation to state our bound:

\[
\begin{align*}
    r(p, t) &:= \begin{cases} 
        p, & p \geq 1/2, \\
        \frac{1}{2} \wedge \logit^{-1} \left( \logit(p) + 2\delta \sqrt{\frac{m - \ell}{\ell}} \right), & p < 1/2
    \end{cases} \\
    \sigma^2(p, t) &:= r(p, t)(1 - r(p, t)) \\
    j(p, t) &:= \sqrt{\frac{t \wedge m}{m} \logit(p)} + 1 \\
    \ell(p, t) &:= s \log \left( \log \left( \frac{\eta(t \wedge m)}{m} \right) \right) + s \log j(p, t) + \log \left( \frac{2\zeta(s)(2\zeta(s) + 1)}{\alpha \log^s \eta} \right) \\
    c_p &:= 1 - 2p \\
    \tilde{g}_t(p) &:= \delta \sqrt{\frac{\eta(t \wedge m)\sigma^2(p, t)}{m}} + \sqrt{k_2^2\sigma^2(p, t)(t \wedge m)\ell(p, t) + k_2^2c_p^2\ell^2(p, t) + c_p k_2 \ell(p, t)}.
\end{align*}
\]

With all the required notation in place, we now state our final confidence sequence.

**Theorem 3** (Quantile-uniform confidence sequence II). For any \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \),

\[
P \left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N}, p \in (0, 1) : Q^- (p) < \tilde{Q}_t \left( p - \frac{\tilde{g}_t(1 - p)}{t} \right) \right) \leq \alpha.
\]

The proof is provided in Section 8.6. Note that \( \tilde{g}_t(p) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{t \log t}) \), owing to the \( \log j(p, t) \) term in (27), while \( \tilde{g}_t(p) = \mathcal{O}(\log \log p) \) as \( p \to 0 \) and \( \tilde{g}_t(p) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{(1 - p) \log \log (1 - p)}) \) as \( p \to 1 \). Though the above expressions look complicated, implementation is straightforward, and performance in practice is compelling. We demonstrate this performance in Figure 2 of the following section, graphically comparing all of our bounds to visualize their tightness.

## 5 Graphical comparison of bounds

Figure 2 compares our four quantile confidence sequences with a variety of alternatives from the literature. In each case, we show the upper confidence bound radius \( u_t \) which satisfies \( Q_t(p + u_t) \geq Q(p) \) with high probability, uniformly over \( t, p, \) or both. Figure 7 in Appendix A includes an additional plot with all bounds together, along with details on all bounds displayed.

Among bounds holding uniformly over both time and quantiles, Corollary 2 and Theorem 3 yield the tightest bounds outside of a brief time window near the start. The bound of Theorem 3 gives \( u_t \) growing at an \( \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{t^{-1} \log t}) \) rate for all \( p \neq 1/2 \), which is worse than that of Corollary 2, but the superior constants of Theorem 3 and its dependence on \( p \) give it the advantage in the plotted range. Szörényi et al. (2015) also give a bound which grows as \( \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{t^{-1} \log t}) \), but with worse constants due to the application of a union bound over individual time steps \( t \in \mathbb{N} \). A similar technique was employed by Darling and Robbins (1968, Theorem 4), but using worse constants in the DKW bound, as their work preceded Massart (1990). Finally, Corollary 2 gives an \( \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{t^{-1} \log \log t}) \) bound which is especially useful for theoretical work, as in our proof of Theorem 4.

Among bounds holding uniformly over time for a fixed quantile, the beta-binomial confidence sequence of Theorem 1(b) performs best over the plotted range, slightly outperforming its stitching-based counterpart from Theorem 1(a). It is evident, though, that the stitched bound will become tighter for large enough \( t \), thanks to its smaller asymptotic rate. Darling and Robbins (1967a, Section 2) give a similar bound based on a sub-Gaussian uniform boundary, which is only slightly worse than Theorem 1(a) for the median, but substantially worse for \( p \) near zero and one.

Figure 2 starts at \( t = 32 \) and all bounds have been tuned to optimize for, or start at, \( t = 32 \), in order to ensure a fair comparison. For Theorem 1(a), Corollary 2, and Theorem 3, we simply set \( m = 32 \). For Theorem 1(b), we suggest setting \( r \) as follows to optimize for time \( t = m \):

\[
r = \frac{m}{-W_1(-\alpha^2/e) - 1} - gh \approx \frac{m}{2\log(\alpha^{-1}) + \log \log (c\alpha^{-2})} - gh,
\]

(9).
Figure 2: Plot of upper confidence bound radii $u_t$, normalized by $\sqrt{t}$ to facilitate comparison. Each panel shows estimation radius for a different quantile, $p = 0.05$, 0.5, and 0.95, respectively. All bounds correspond to two-sided $\alpha = 0.05$. Upper row (a) shows confidence sequences valid uniformly over both time and quantiles. Lower row (b) shows confidence sequences valid uniformly over either time for a fixed quantile. In rightmost panels, lines start at the sample size for which the upper confidence bound becomes nontrivial. See Appendix A for details of each bound shown.

Figure 3: Plot of upper confidence bound radii $u_t$, normalized by $\sqrt{t}$ to facilitate comparison, for the confidence sequence of Theorem 1(b) optimized for three different times $m = 100, 1,000$, and 10,000, according to (31).
where $W_{-1}(x)$ is the lower branch of the Lambert $W$ function, the most negative real-valued solution in $z$ to $ze^z = x$, and the second expression uses the asymptotic expansion of $W_{-1}$ near the origin (Corless et al., 1996). See Howard et al. (2018b, Proposition 2, Proposition 6, and discussion therein) for details on this choice. Figure 3 illustrates the effect of this choice. The confidence radius $u_t$ gets loose very quickly for values of $t$ lower than about $m/2$, but grows quite slowly for values of $t > m$. For this reason, we suggest setting $m$ around the smallest sample size at which inferences are desired.

## 6 Quantile $\epsilon$-best-arm identification

As an application of our quantile confidence sequences, we present and analyze a novel algorithm for identifying an arm with an approximately optimal quantile in a multi-armed bandit setting. Our problem setup matches that of Szörényi et al. (2015). We assume $K$ arms are available, numbered 1, ..., $K$, and each arm $k$ may be pulled to obtain an i.i.d. sample from a distribution $F_k$ over $\mathcal{X}$. Write $Q_k$ for the quantile function on arm $k$: $Q_k(p) := \sup\{x \in \mathcal{X} : F_k(x) \leq p\}$. Fixing some $\pi \in (0, 1)$, our goal is to select an $\epsilon$-optimal arm with high probability, according to the following definition:

**Definition 1.** For $\epsilon \in (0, 1 - \pi)$, we say arm $k$ is $\epsilon$-optimal if $Q_k(\pi + \epsilon) \geq Q_j(\pi)$ for all $j \neq k$.

Kalyanakrishnan et al. (2012) introduced the LUCB algorithm for highest mean identification, for which Jamieson and Nowak (2014) gave a simplified analysis in the $\epsilon = 0$ case. Both are key inspirations for our QLUCB (quantile LUCB) algorithm and following sample complexity analysis. QLUCB proceeds in rounds indexed by $t$. At the start of round $t$, $N_{k,t}$ denotes the number of observations from arm $k$. Write $X_{k,t}$ for the $i$th observation from arm $k$, and let $\hat{Q}_{k,t}(p)$ denote the sample quantile function for arm $k$ at round $t$:

\begin{align}
\hat{F}_{k,t}(x) &:= \frac{1}{N_{k,t}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{k,t}} 1_{X_{k,i} \leq x}, \quad (32) \\
\hat{Q}_{k,t}(p) &:= \sup \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X} : \hat{F}_{k,t}(x) \leq p \right\}. \quad (33)
\end{align}

QLUCB requires a sequence $(l_n(p), u_n(p))$ which yields fixed-quantile confidence sequences, as in (6). Our analysis is based on confidence sequences given by (10), by using $\alpha = 2\delta/K$; the factor of two gives us one-sided instead of two-sided coverage at level $\delta/K$, which is all that is needed. Let

\[ f_n(p) = \sqrt{2.06p(1-p)\ell(t) + 0.16(1 - 2p)^2\ell^2(t) + 0.4(1 - 2p)\ell(t)}, \]

where $\ell(t) = 1.4 \log \log(2.04t/m) + \log(4.99K/\delta)$, \quad (34)

and let $l_n(p) := f_{n\vee m}(1 - p)/n$ and $u_n(p) := f_{n\vee m}(p)/n$. We write $L_{k,t}^{\pi + \epsilon}$ and $U_{k,t}^{\pi + \epsilon}$ for the lower and upper confidence sequences on $Q(\pi + \epsilon)$ and $Q(\pi)$, respectively, for arm $k$ at time $t$:

\begin{align}
L_{k,t}^{\pi + \epsilon} &:= \hat{Q}_{k,t} \left( \pi + \epsilon - l_{N_{k,t}}(\pi + \epsilon) \right), \quad (35) \\
U_{k,t}^{\pi + \epsilon} &:= \hat{Q}_{k,t} \left( \pi + u_{N_{k,t}}(\pi) \right). \quad (36)
\end{align}

QLUCB is described in Figure 4. Theorem 4 below bounds the expected sample complexity of QLUCB and shows that it successfully selects an $\epsilon$-optimal arm with high probability. The sample complexity is determined by the following quantities, which capture how difficult the problem is based on the sub-optimality of the $\pi$-quantiles of each arm; here we take the supremum of the empty set to be zero:

\[ \Delta_k := \sup \left\{ \Delta \geq 0 : Q_k(\pi + \Delta) < \max_{j \in [K]} Q_j(\pi) \right\}. \quad (37) \]

**Theorem 4.** For any $\pi \in (0, 1)$, $\epsilon \in (0, 1 - \pi)$, and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, QLUCB stops with probability one, and chooses an $\epsilon$-optimal arm with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Furthermore, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the total number of samples $T$ taken by QLUCB satisfies

\[ T = O \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K} (\epsilon \vee \Delta_k)^{-2} \log \left( \frac{K \log(\epsilon \vee \Delta_k)}{\delta} \right) \right). \quad (38) \]
Input target quantile $\pi \in (0,1)$, approximation error $\epsilon \in (0,1-\pi)$, and error probability $\delta \in (0,1)$.

Sample each arm once, set $N_{k,1} = 1$ for all $k \in [K]$ and set $t = 1$.

\begin{algorithm}
\begin{algorithmic}
\While{$L_{k,t}^{\pi+\epsilon} < \max_{j \neq k} U_{j,t}^{\pi}$ for all $k \in [K]$} \\
\State Set $h_t = \arg \max_{k \in [K]} L_{k,t}^{\pi+\epsilon}$ and $l_t = \arg \max_{k \in [K]} \{h_t \mid U_{k,t}^{\pi}\}$.
\State Sample arms $h_t$ and $l_t$.
\State Set $N_{k,t+1} = N_{k,t} + 1$ if $k = h_t$ or $k = l_t$, and $N_{k,t+1} = N_{k,t}$ otherwise.
\State Increment $t \leftarrow t + 1$.
\EndWhile
\State Output any element of $\arg \max_{k \in [K]} L_{k,t}^{\pi+\epsilon}$.
\end{algorithmic}
\end{algorithm}

The above theorem is proved in Section 8.7. In brief, the algorithm can only stop with a sub-optimal arm if one of the confidence sequences $L_{k,t}^{\pi+\epsilon}$ or $U_{k,t}^{\pi}$ fails to correctly cover its target quantile, and Theorem 1 bounds the probability of such an error. Furthermore, Theorem 2 ensures that the confidence bounds converge towards their target quantiles at a $O(\sqrt{\log \log t})$ rate, with high probability, so that the algorithm must stop after all arms have been sufficiently sampled, and the allocation strategy given in the algorithm ensures we achieve sufficient sampling with the desired sample complexity. While our proof borrows many ideas from the proofs of Kalyanakrishnan et al. (2012) and Jamieson and Nowak (2014), the fact that quantile confidence bounds are determined by the random sample quantile function, rather than simply as deterministic offsets from the sample mean, introduces new difficulties which require novel techniques to overcome.

As an alternative to (34), one may use a one-sided variant of $\tilde{f}_t$ from (11). This confidence sequence is computed exactly as in (11) and (12), but we replace the beta function $B(a,b)$ in (12) with the incomplete beta function $B_{1-p}(a,b) = \int_0^{1-p} u^{a-1} (1-u)^{b-1} \, du$. See Howard et al. (2018a, Proposition 7) for details. As seen below, this alternative performs well in practice, though the rate of the sample complexity bound suffers slightly, replacing the $\log(\log(\epsilon \lor \Delta_k))$ term with $\log(\epsilon \lor \Delta_k)$.
We wish to estimate the quantile difference \( Q(p) - Q(\pi) \) for simplicity. We continue to operate in the multi-armed bandit setup of Section 6 with \( K \) arms. Define the following one-sided variant based on Proposition 7 of Howard et al. (2018b): write \( \tilde{Q}(p, r) \) to denote the empirical quantile function for arm \( k \) at time \( t \), and use the same notation: \( \tilde{Q}_k(t) \) denotes the right-continuous empirical quantile function for arm \( k \) at time \( t \). As in Section 6, the choice of which arm to sample at time \( t \) may depend on the past in an arbitrary manner. Fix \( p \in (0, 1) \), the quantile of interest, and \( r > 0 \), the only tuning parameter used in \( \tilde{f} \) of Theorem 1.

We run QPAC both in its original form and with the beta-binomial confidence sequence of Theorem 1(b). We also run QLUCB with three confidence sequences: the choice analyzed in Theorem 4 with the confidence sequence (34) based on Theorem 1(a); a one-sided variant of the beta-binomial confidence sequence of Theorem 1(b) (see Howard et al., 2018b, Proposition 7); and the same naive DKW-based confidence sequence used in the original QPAC algorithm.

The results show that QLUCB provides a substantial improvement on QPAC and Doubled Max-Q, reducing mean sample size by a factor of at least five among the cases considered, and often much more, when using the one-sided beta-binomial confidence sequence. As Figure 8 in Appendix C shows, most of the improvement appears to be due to the tighter confidence sequence given by Theorem 1, although the QLUCB sampling procedure also gives a noticeable improvement. The stitched confidence sequence in QLUCB performs similarly to the beta-binomial one, staying within a factor of three across all scenarios and usually within a factor of 1.5.

7 Sequential hypothesis tests based on quantiles

7.1 Quantile A/B testing

A/B testing, the use of randomized experiments to compare two or more versions of an online experience, is a widespread practice among internet firms (Kohavi et al., 2013). While most A/B tests compare treatments by mean outcome, in many cases it is preferable to compare quantiles, for example to evaluate response latency (Liu et al., 2019). In such experiments, our Theorem 1, Corollary 2, and Theorem 3 may be used to sequentially estimate quantiles on each treatment arm, and the resulting confidence bounds can be viewed as often as one likes without risk of inflated miscoverage rates. However, it is typically more desirable to estimate the difference in quantiles between two treatment arms. Naturally, simultaneous confidence bounds for the arm quantiles can be used to accomplish this goal: the minimum and maximum distances between points in the per-arm confidence intervals yield bounds on the difference in quantiles. Furthermore, by finding the smallest \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) such that the two arms have disjoint confidence intervals, an always-valid \( p \)-value process is obtained for testing the null hypothesis of equal quantiles (Johari et al., 2015). However, the following result gives tighter bounds by more efficiently combining evidence from both arms to directly estimate the difference in quantiles.

In order for distances between quantiles to be well-defined, \( \mathcal{X} \) must be a metric space, and we assume \( \mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R} \) for simplicity. We continue to operate in the multi-armed bandit setup of Section 6 with \( K = 2 \), and use the same notation: \( Q_k \) denotes the right-continuous quantile function for arm \( k \in \{1, 2\} \). \( \tilde{F}_{k,t} \) and \( \tilde{Q}_{k,t} \) denote the empirical CDF and right-continuous empirical quantile function for arm \( k \) at time \( t \in \mathbb{N} \), and \( N_{k,t} \) denotes the number of samples observed from arm \( k \) at time \( t \). As in Section 6, the choice of which arm to sample at time \( t \) may depend on the past in an arbitrary manner. Fix \( p \in (0, 1) \), the quantile of interest, and \( r > 0 \), the same tuning parameter used in \( \tilde{f} \) of Theorem 1.

We wish to estimate the quantile difference \( Q_2(p) - Q_1(p) \). Recall the definition of \( M_{p,r} \) from (12), and define the following one-sided variant based on Proposition 7 of Howard et al. (2018b): Write \( B_x(a, b) = \int_0^x p^{a-1}(1-p)^{b-1} \, dp \) for the incomplete beta function, and define

\[
M_{p,r}^1(s, v) := \frac{1}{p^v/(1-p)^{v+s}(1-p)^{v/p-s}} \cdot \frac{B_{1-p} \left( \frac{r+z}{p}, \frac{r+z}{1-p} + s \right)}{B_{1-p} \left( \frac{r}{p}, \frac{r}{1-p} \right)}.
\]  

(39)
For each $k$ and $t$, define $G_{k,t}$, $G^+_{k,t}$, and $G^-_{k,t}$ by

$$
G_{k,t}(x) := \min_{a \in \mathcal{D}_{k,t}(x)} \log M_{p,r} \left( (a - p)N_{k,t}, p(1-p)N_{k,t} \right) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{D}_{k,t}(x) := \left[ \hat{F}_{k,t}(x), \tilde{F}_{k,t}(x) \right],
$$

$$
G^+_{k,t}(x) := \log M^1_{p,r} \left( (\hat{F}_{k,t}(x) - p)N_{k,t}, p(1-p)N_{k,t} \right),
$$

$$
G^-_{k,t}(x) := \log M^1_{1-p,r} \left( -(\tilde{F}_{k,t}(x) - p)N_{k,t}, p(1-p)N_{k,t} \right).
$$

As detailed in the proofs, the functions $G_{k,t}$, $G^+_{k,t}$, and $G^-_{k,t}$ give the logarithm of the minimum possible value of an appropriate supermartingale, under the premise that $Q_k(p) = x$. A large value of $G$ indicates that the supermartingale must be large, which in turn gives evidence against the premise $Q_k(p) = x$. With the above definitions in place, we are ready to state the main result of this section.

**Theorem 5** (Two-sample sequential quantile tests). For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (0, 1)$ and $r > 0$, under the two-sided null hypothesis $H_0 : Q_2(p) - Q_1(p) = \delta_\star$, we have

$$
P \left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} : \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[ G_{1,t}(x) + G_{2,t}(x + \delta^*) \right] \geq \log \alpha^{-1} \right) \leq \alpha.
$$

Furthermore, under the one-sided null hypothesis $H_0 : Q_2(p) - Q_1(p) \leq \delta_\star$, we have

$$
P \left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} : \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[ G^+_{1,t}(x) + G^-_{2,t}(x + \delta^*) \right] \geq \log \alpha^{-1} \right) \leq \alpha.
$$

Theorem 5 gives two-sided or one-sided sequential hypothesis tests for a given difference in quantiles between two arms. Inverting the two-sided test (43) yields a confidence sequence: with probability at least $1 - \alpha$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the quantile difference $Q_2(p) - Q_1(p)$ is contained in the set

$$
\left\{ \delta \in \mathbb{R} : \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[ G_{1,t}(x) + G_{2,t}(x + \delta) \right] < \log \alpha^{-1} \right\}.
$$

Alternatively, we can obtain a two-sided, always-valid $p$-value process from (43) for the null hypothesis $H_0 : Q_2(p) = Q_1(p)$,

$$
p_t^{(2)} = \exp \left\{ -\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[ G_{1,t}(x) + G_{2,t}(x) \right] \right\},
$$

or a one-sided, always-valid $p$-value process from (44) testing $H_0 : Q_2(p) \leq Q_1(p)$,

$$
p_t^{(1)} = \exp \left\{ -\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[ G^+_{1,t}(x) + G^-_{2,t}(x) \right] \right\}.
$$

Each always-valid $p$-value process satisfies $P(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : p_t \leq x)$ for all $x \in (0, 1)$, so $p_t$ serves as a valid $p$-value regardless of how the experiment is stopped, adaptively or otherwise (Johari et al., 2015). Note that, since these $p$-values only involve evaluating $h_t(x, 0)$, they can be used when $\mathcal{X}$ is not a metric space.

The proof of Theorem 5 is given in Section 8.8, and exploits the product supermartingale technique of Kaufmann and Koolen (2018). In brief, for each individual arm, we have a nonnegative supermartingale quantifying information about the true quantile for that arm, and the product of these two supermartingales will still be a supermartingale, one which jointly captures evidence against the null from both arms. We use the one- and two-sided beta-binomial mixture supermartingales from Howard et al. (2018b, Propositions 6 and 7), as with Theorem 1(b). Other supermartingales are available, but the beta-binomial mixture performs well in practice, as we have discussed in Section 5. Appendix B discusses implementation details for the necessary optimizations in (43) and (44), which require $O(t \log t)$ time in the worst case.

Figure 6 illustrates the performance of the two-sided test (43) relative to the naive strategy mentioned at the beginning of this section, based on simultaneously-valid confidence sequences for the mean of each arm. Across most scenarios, Theorem 5 achieves significance with about 25% fewer samples than the naive strategy. The exceptional cases involve extreme quantiles, with $p$ close to zero or one. In these cases, the minimization over $x$ in (43), which requires that all values of $x$ are implausible based on combined evidence,
sometimes leads to more conservative behavior than the use of simultaneous confidence sequences, which require only the existence of some value of \( x \) which is implausible for both arms.

Typically, A/B tests are run with a single control or baseline arm to be compared against multiple treatment arms (Kohavi et al., 2009). In such cases, rather than computing a \( p \)-value for each pairwise comparison of treatment arm to control, we may wish to compute a \( p \)-value for the null hypothesis that the control is no worse than any of the treatment arms. Formally, we have \( K \) arms in total, arm \( k = 1 \) is the control arm, and we wish to test the global null hypothesis \( H_0 : Q_1(p) \geq \max_k Q_k(p) \). Note \( H_0 = \bigcap_{k \geq 2} H_{0k} \), where we define \( H_{0k} : Q_1(p) \geq Q_k(p) \) for \( k = 2, \ldots, K \). Using a Bonferroni correction across \( k = 2, \ldots, K \), it follows that

\[
p_t = (K - 1) \exp \left\{ - \max_{k=2,\ldots,K} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[ G_{1,x}^+(x) + G_{k,x}^-(x) \right] \right\}
\]

(48)

gives an always-valid \( p \)-value process for the global null \( H_0 \).

Any of the \( p \)-values obtained in this section may be used for online control of the false discovery rate in large-scale, “doubly-sequential” experimentation, when one is faced with a potentially infinite sequence of sequential experiments (Yang et al., 2017; Zrnic et al., 2018).

### 7.2 Sequential Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests and a test of stochastic dominance

As an easy consequence of Theorem 2, we obtain a sequential analogue of the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Suppose we wish to sequentially test the null hypothesis \( H_0 : F = F_0 \) for some fixed distribution \( F_0 \). Write

\[
C(A, \alpha) := \inf \{ c > 0 : \alpha_{A,c} \leq \alpha \},
\]

(49)

where \( \alpha_{A,c} \) is defined in Theorem 2.

**Corollary 3.** For any \( \alpha \in (0,1) \) and \( A > 1/\sqrt{2} \), the test which rejects \( H_0 : F = F_0 \) as soon as \( \|\hat{F}_t - F_0\|_\infty > A \sqrt{t^{-1} \log \log (et/m) + C(A, \alpha)} \) gives a valid, open-ended sequential test of \( H_0 \) with power one. That is, if \( H_0 \) is true, the probability of stopping is at most \( \alpha \), while if \( H_0 \) is false, the probability of stopping is one.

The fact that this test has power one follows from the Glivenko-Cantelli theorem and the fact that the boundary becomes arbitrarily small, \( A \sqrt{t^{-1} \log \log (et/m) + C(A, \alpha)} \to 0 \) as \( t \to \infty \) (Robbins, 1970). A sequential two-sample test follows from an application of the triangle inequality and a union bound, by applying Theorem 2 to each sample with error probability \( \alpha/2 \). Here we suppose \( (X_{it})_{t \geq 1} \) are i.i.d. from distribution \( F \), while \( (Y_{it})_{t \geq 1} \) are i.i.d. from distribution \( G \), and we wish to test the null hypothesis \( H_0 : F = G \). We denote the empirical CDF of \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_t \) by \( \hat{G}_t \).
Corollary 4. For any $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $A > 1/\sqrt{2}$, the test which rejects $H_0 : F = G$ as soon as $\|\hat{F}_t - \hat{G}_t\|^\infty > 2A/\sqrt{t-1}(\log\log et/m + C(A,\alpha/2))$ gives a valid, open-ended sequential test of $H_0$ with power one.

A one-sided variant of Corollary 4 tests $H_0 : F \leq G$ against $H_1 : F \geq G$ and $F(x) > G(x)$ for some $x \in X$. This yields a sequential test of stochastic dominance.

Corollary 5. For any $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $A > 1/\sqrt{2}$, the test which rejects $H_0 : F \leq G$ as soon as
\[
\inf_{x \in X} \left[ \hat{F}_t(x) - \hat{G}_t(x) \right] \geq 2A/\sqrt{t-1}(\log\log et/m + C(A,\alpha)),
\]
with strict inequality for some $x$, (50) gives a valid, open-ended sequential test of $H_0$ with power one.

In Corollary 5, we are able to use error probability $\alpha$ in our application of Theorem 2 to each sample, rather than $\alpha/2$. This holds because we need only a one-sided confidence bound on each CDF rather than the two-sided bound of Theorem 2. Since the proof of Theorem 2 involves a union bound over the upper and lower confidence bounds, it yields valid one-sided bounds as well, each with half the total error probability.

8 Proofs

We make use of many results from Howard et al. (2018a,b) as well as the definitions of sub-Bernoulli, sub-gamma, and sub-Gaussian processes and uniform boundaries.

The functions $\bar{Q}_t$ and $\bar{Q}_t$ act as “inverses” for $\hat{F}_t$ and $\hat{F}_t^-$ in the following sense: for any $x \in X$ and any $p \in \mathbb{R}$, we have
\[
\hat{F}_t(x) > p \Rightarrow x \geq \bar{Q}_t(p) \quad (51)
\]
\[
\hat{F}_t(x) \geq p \iff x \geq \bar{Q}_t(p) \quad (52)
\]
\[
\hat{F}_t(x) < p \iff x < \bar{Q}_t(p) \quad (53)
\]
\[
\hat{F}_t^-(x) \leq p \Rightarrow x \leq \bar{Q}_t(p) \quad (54)
\]
\[
\hat{F}_t^-(x) > p \iff x > \bar{Q}_t(p) \quad (55)
\]
\[
\hat{F}_t^-(x) \geq p \iff x \geq \bar{Q}_t(p) \quad (56)
\]
\[
\hat{F}_t^-(x) < p \iff x \leq \bar{Q}_t(p) \quad (57)
\]
\[
\hat{F}_t^-(x) \leq p \iff x \leq \bar{Q}_t(p) \quad (58)
\]

Our strategy in the proofs of both Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 will be to construct a martingale $(S_t(p))_{t=1}^{\infty}$ which satisfies
\[
\hat{F}_t^-(Q(p)) \leq p + S_t(p)/t \leq \hat{F}_t(Q^-)(p) \quad (59)
\]
for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ a.s. Applying a time-uniform concentration inequality to bound the deviations of $(S_t(p))$, we obtain a time-uniform lower bound $\hat{F}_t(Q^-)(p) > p - l_t(p)$ and a time-uniform upper bound $\hat{F}_t(Q^-)(p) < p + u_t(p)$, both of which hold with high probability. We then invoke equations (51) and (57) to obtain a confidence sequence for $Q^-(p)$, $(Q(p))$ of the form (6).

The martingale $(S_t(p))$ is defined as follows. Let
\[
\pi(p) := \begin{cases} 
0, & F(Q(p)) = F^-(Q(p)), \\
\frac{p - F^{-}(Q(p))}{F(Q(p)) - F^{-}(Q(p))}, & F(Q(p)) > F^-(Q(p)), \\
\frac{p - F^{-}(Q(p))}{F(Q(p)) - F^{-}(Q(p))}, & F(Q(p)) < F^-(Q(p)), \end{cases} \quad (60)
\]
noting that $\pi(p) \in [0,1]$ since $F^-(Q(p)) \leq p \leq F(Q(p))$. Now define $S_0(p) = 0$ and
\[
S_t(p) := \sum_{i=1}^{t} [1_{x_i < Q(p)} + \pi(p)1_{x_i = Q(p)} - p] \quad (61)
\]
for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. When $F(Q(p)) = F^-(Q(p))$, so that $\mathbb{P}(X_1 = Q(p)) = 0$, we have $\hat{F}_t(Q(p)) = p + S_t(p)/t = \hat{F}_t(Q(p))$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ a.s. When $F(Q(p)) > F^-(Q(p))$, we are still assured $\hat{F}_t^-(Q(p)) \leq p + S_t(p)/t \leq \hat{F}_t(Q(p))$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, as desired. In either case, the increments $\Delta S_t(p) := S_t(p) - S_{t-1}(p)$ are i.i.d., mean-zero, and bounded in $[-p,1-p]$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. This key fact allows us to bound the deviations of $S_t(p)$ using time-uniform concentration inequalities for Bernoulli random walks.
8.1 Proof of Theorem 1

As defined in (61), the increments of the process \((S_t(p))_{t=1}^{\infty}\),
\[
S_t(p) - S_{t-1}(p) = 1_{X_t < Q(p)} + \pi(p)1_{X_t = Q(p)} - p,
\]
are i.i.d., mean-zero, and bounded in \([-p, 1-p]\). Fact 1(b) and Lemma 2 of Howard et al. (2018a) verify that the process \((S_t(p))\) is a sub-Bernoulli process with range parameters \(g = p, h = 1 - p\). In fact, defining \(V_t := p(1-p)t\) and
\[
\psi(\lambda) := \frac{1}{p(1-p)} \log \left( p e^{(1-p)\lambda} + (1-p)e^{-p\lambda} \right),
\]
it is straightforward to verify that the process \((\exp \{\lambda S_t(p) - \psi(\lambda) V_t\})_{t=1}^{\infty}\) is a supermartingale for all \(\lambda \geq 0\).
We now invoke results from Howard et al. (2018b) to construct time-uniform bounds for the process \((S_t(p))\) based on the above property:

- The sequence \(f_t(p)\) is based on the polynomial stitched boundary of Howard et al. (2018b, equation 6), using the fact that a sub-Bernoulli process with range parameters \(g = p\) and \(h = 1 - p\) is also sub-gamma with scale \(c = (1-2p)/3\) (Howard et al., 2018a, Proposition 1). So Theorem 1 of Howard et al. (2018b) yields
  \[
  \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : S_t(p) \geq f_t(p)) \leq \alpha/2. \tag{64}
  \]
  If we replace \((S_t(p))\) with \((-S_t(p))\), which is sub-Bernoulli with range parameters \(g = 1 - p\) and \(h = p\) and therefore sub-gamma with scale \(c = 2p - 1\), we obtain
  \[
  \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : S_t(p) \leq -f_t(1-p)) \leq \alpha/2. \tag{65}
  \]
  A union bound yields the two-sided result
  \[
  \mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : S_t(p) \notin (-f_t(1-p), f_t(p))) \leq \alpha. \tag{66}
  \]

- The sequence \(\tilde{f}_t(p)\) is based on a two-sided beta-binomial mixture boundary drawn from Proposition 6 of Howard et al. (2018b), which therefore satisfies
  \[
  \mathbb{P} \left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} : S_t(p) \notin (-\tilde{f}_t(1-p), \tilde{f}_t(p)) \right) \leq 1 - \alpha. \tag{67}
  \]
  By construction, \(\tilde{F}_t^{-}(Q(p)) \leq p + S_t(p)/t \leq \tilde{F}_t(Q(p))\) for all \(t\), so that with (66) we have
  \[
  \mathbb{P} \left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} : \tilde{F}_t(Q^{-}(p)) < p - \frac{f_t(1-p)}{t} \text{ or } \tilde{F}_t^{-}(Q(p)) \geq p + \frac{f_t(p)}{t} \right) \leq \alpha. \tag{68}
  \]
  We now use implications (51) and (57) to conclude
  \[
  \mathbb{P} \left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} : Q^{-}(p) < Q_t \left( p - \frac{f_t(1-p)}{t} \right) \text{ or } Q(p) > \tilde{Q}_t \left( p + \frac{f_t(p)}{t} \right) \right) \leq \alpha, \tag{69}
  \]
which is the desired conclusion. The same conclusion follows for \(\tilde{f}\) by using (67) in place of (66).

8.2 Proof of Proposition 1

The classical law of the iterated logarithm implies
\[
\limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{\tilde{F}_t(Q(p)) - p}{\sqrt{t^{-1} \log \log t}} = \sqrt{2p(1-p)}.
\]

Since \(u_t = o(\sqrt{t^{-1} \log \log t})\), we have \(\limsup_{t \to \infty} (\tilde{F}_t(Q(p)) - p)/u_t = \infty\). Hence, with probability one, there exists \(t_0\) such that \(\tilde{F}_{t_0}(Q(p)) > p + u_{t_0}\). Then property (51) implies \(Q(p) \geq \tilde{Q}_{t_0}(p + u_{t_0})\), which yields the desired conclusion.
8.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Our proof is based on inequality 13.2.1 of Shorack and Wellner (1986, p. 511) (cf. James, 1975). We repeat the following special case: here $(\cdot)_\pm$ denotes that we may take either the positive part of $(\cdot)$ on both sides of the inequality, or the negative part on both sides.

Lemma 1 (Shorack and Wellner, 1986, Inequality 13.2.1). Fix $\lambda > 0$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, and $\eta > 1$ satisfying $(1 - \beta)^2 \lambda^2 \geq 2(\eta - 1)$. Then for all integers $n' \leq n''$ having $n''/n' \leq \eta$, we have

$$\Pr \left( \max_{n' \leq t \leq n''} \left\| \sqrt{t} (\hat{F}_t - F) \right\|_{\infty} > \lambda \right) \leq 2 \Pr \left( \left\| \sqrt{n'} (\hat{F}_{n'} - F) \right\|_{\infty} > \beta \lambda / \sqrt{\eta} \right). \tag{71}$$

Now fix any $\eta \in (1, 2A^2)$ satisfying $\gamma(A, C, \eta) > 1$, and for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$, define the event

$$A_k^\pm := \left\{ \exists t \in [m\eta^k, m\eta^{k+1}) : \left\| \sqrt{m\eta^k} (\hat{F}_t - F) \right\|_{\infty} > \frac{\beta \lambda}{\sqrt{\eta}} \right\}. \tag{72}$$

On the one hand, we have

$$\{ \exists t \geq m : \left\| \hat{F}_t - F \right\|_{\infty} > \frac{g_t}{t} \} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{ \exists t \in [m\eta^k, m\eta^{k+1}) : \left\| \sqrt{m\eta^k} (\hat{F}_t - F) \right\|_{\infty} > \frac{g_t}{t} \} \subseteq \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (A_k^+ \cup A_k^-). \tag{73}$$

On the other hand, we will show that, for each $k \geq 0$, the conditions of Lemma 1 are satisfied with $\lambda := A \sqrt{\log \log(\eta \eta^k) + C}$ and $\beta := 1 - \sqrt{2(\eta - 1)/(A^2C)} = \gamma(A, C, \eta) / \sqrt{2A^2}$. It is clear that $\beta \in (0, 1)$ since $A$, $C$, $\eta$, and $\gamma(A, C, \eta)$ are all required to be positive. Also,

$$2(\eta - 1) = (1 - \beta)^2 A^2 C \leq (1 - \beta)^2 A^2 (\log \log(\eta \eta^k) + C) = (1 - \beta)^2 \lambda^2, \quad \forall k \geq 0. \tag{74}$$

Hence, for each $k$, Lemma 1 implies

$$\Pr(A_k^+) \leq 2 \Pr \left( \left\| \sqrt{\eta^{k+1}} (\hat{F}_{\eta^{k+1}} - F) \right\|_{\infty} > \frac{\beta A \sqrt{\log \log(\eta \eta^k) + C}}{\sqrt{\eta}} \right). \tag{75}$$

Applying the one-sided DKW inequality (Massart, 1990, Theorem 1) then yields

$$\Pr(A_k^+) \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -2e^{-2}(\log \log (\eta t_k) + C) \right\} = \frac{2e^{-\gamma(A, C, \eta)C}}{1 + k \log \eta \gamma(A, C, \eta)}. \tag{76}$$

Since $\gamma(A, C, \eta) > 1$, a union bound yields

$$\Pr \left( \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (A_k^+ \cup A_k^-) \right) \leq 4e^{-\gamma(A, C, \eta)C} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1 + k \log \eta) \gamma(A, C, \eta)} \tag{77}$$

$$\leq 4e^{-\gamma(A, C, \eta)C} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{(\gamma^2(A, C, \eta) - 1) \log \eta} \right), \tag{78}$$

after bounding the sum by an integral. Combining (73) with (78), we conclude

$$\Pr \left( \exists t \geq m : \left\| \hat{F}_t - F \right\|_{\infty} > \frac{g_t}{t} \right) \leq 4e^{-\gamma(A, C, \eta)C} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{(\gamma^2(A, C, \eta) - 1) \log \eta} \right). \tag{79}$$

We note that Theorem 1 of Massart (1990) requires that the tail probability bound in (76) is less than 1/2. If this is not true, however, then our final tail probability will be at least one, so that the result holds vacuously. This completes the proof of the first part of the theorem.

To obtain the final claim, (19), note that the calculations in (76) and (78), together with the first Borel-Cantelli lemma, imply $\Pr(A_k^+ \text{ or } A_k^- \text{ infinitely often}) = 0$. 

\[\square\]
8.4 Proof of Corollary 1

Fix any $\epsilon > 0$ and let $A_\epsilon = 1/\sqrt{2} + \epsilon$. Applying Theorem 2 with $m = 1$ and any $C > 0$, the second result (19) implies

$$\limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{\|F_t - F\|_\infty}{A_\epsilon \sqrt{t^{-1} \log\log(\epsilon t) + C}} = \limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{\|\hat{F}_t - F\|_\infty}{A_\epsilon \sqrt{t^{-1} \log log t}} \leq 1 \text{ almost surely.}$$

The conclusion follows since $\epsilon$ was arbitrary.

8.5 Proof of Corollary 2

Theorem 2 implies that $\hat{F}_t(Q^-(p)) \geq F(Q^-(p)) - g_t/t$ uniformly over $t \geq m$ and $p \in (0, 1)$ with high probability. Hence (52) implies $Q^-(p) \geq \hat{Q}_t(F(Q^-(p)) - g_t/t) \geq \hat{Q}_t(p - g_t/t)$. Likewise, Theorem 2 implies $\hat{F}_t(x) \leq F(x) + g_t/t$ uniformly over $t \geq m$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with high probability, and taking limits from the left, we also have $\hat{F}_t^-(x) \leq F^-(x) + g_t/t$. Hence $\hat{F}_t^-(Q(p)) \leq F^-(Q(p)) + g_t/t$, and (58) implies $Q(p) \leq \hat{Q}_t(F^-(Q(p)) + g_t/t) \leq \hat{Q}_t(p + g_t/t)$. $\square$

8.6 Proof of Theorem 3

Our strategy is to show that $\tilde{g}_t$ yields a time- and quantile-uniform boundary for the sequence of functions $S_t$:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N}, p \in (0, 1) : S_t(p) \notin (-\tilde{g}_t(1 - p), \tilde{g}_t(p))) \leq \alpha.$$  

The conclusion then follows by the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 1, inequalities (68) and (69).

Our argument is adapted from the proof of Theorem 1 of Howard et al. (2018b). Similar to that proof, here we divide time $t$ into an exponential grid of epochs demarcated by $m\eta^k$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For each epoch, we further divide quantile space $(0, 1)$ into a grid demarcated by $p_{kj}$ based on evenly-spaced log-odds. We then choose error probabilities $\alpha_{kj}$ for each epoch in the time-quantile grid, so that $\sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \alpha_{kj} \leq \alpha/2$, giving a total error probability of $\alpha/2$ for the upper bound on $S_t(p)$, with the remaining $\alpha/2$ reserved for the lower bound.

We make use of the function $\psi_{G,c}(\lambda) := \lambda^2/[2(1 - c\lambda)]$ for each $c \in \mathbb{R}$ (Howard et al., 2018a). For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$p_{kj} := \frac{1}{1 + \exp\{-2\hat{d}_j/\eta^{k/2}\}}$$

and

$$\alpha_{kj} := \frac{\alpha/2}{(k + 1)^s(j + 1)^s(2\zeta(s) + 1)}.$$  

For the $(k,j)$ epoch in the time-quantile grid, we define the boundary

$$h_{kj}(t) := \frac{\log \alpha_{kj}^{-1} + \psi_{G,c_{kj}}(\lambda_{kj})p_{kj}(1 - p_{kj})t}{\lambda_{kj}},$$

where $c_{kj} := (1 - 2p_{kj})/3$, and $\lambda_{kj} \geq 0$ is chosen so that $\psi_{G,c_{kj}}(\lambda_{kj}) = \log(\alpha_{kj}^{-1})/\eta^{k+1/2}$ (note $\psi_{G,c_{kj}}(\lambda)$ increases from zero to $\infty$ as $\lambda$ increases from zero towards $1/c_{kj}$, so such a $\lambda_{kj}$ can always be found). As in the proof of Theorem 1, we use the fact that $S_t(p)$ is a sub-gamma process with scale $c = (1 - 2p)/3$ and variance process $V_t = p(1 - p)t$ for each $p \in (0, 1)$. Then Theorem 1(a) of Howard et al. (2018a) implies that, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists t \in \mathbb{N} : S_t(p_{kj}) \geq h_{kj}(t)) \leq \alpha_{kj}.$$  

Taking a union bound over $k$ and $j$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \geq 1 - \alpha$ where $\mathcal{G}$ is the “good” event

$$\mathcal{G} = \{S_t(p_{kj}) < h_{kj}(t), \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, j \in \mathbb{Z}, t \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$
Now fix any \( t \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( p \in (0, 1) \), and let
\[
k_t = \left\lfloor \log_\eta \left( \frac{t \vee m}{m} \right) \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad j_{tp} = \left\lceil \frac{\eta k^2/2 \log(p/(1-p))}{2\delta} \right\rceil. \tag{87}\]
These choices ensure that \( m \eta k^t \leq t \vee m < m \eta k^{t+1} \) and \( p_{k_t(j_{tp} - 1)} < p \leq p_{k_t(j_{tp})} \). From the definition of \( S_t(p) \), for any \( p \in (0, 1) \) we have, on the event \( \mathcal{G} \),
\[
S_t(p) \leq S_t(p_{k_t(j_{tp})}) + t(p_{k_t(j_{tp})} - p) \leq h_{k_t,j_{tp}}(t) + t(p_{k_t(j_{tp})} - p). \tag{88}\]
The remainder of the argument involves upper bounding the right-hand side of (88) by an expression involving only \( t \) and \( p \) to recover (29).

To upper bound \( h_{k_t,j_{tp}}(t) \), we follow the steps in the proof of Theorem 1 of Howard et al. (2018b) (see eq. 41) to find, for all \( t \in \mathbb{N} \),
\[
h_{k_t,j_{tp}}(t) \leq \sqrt{\frac{k^2(t \vee m)p_{k_t,j_{tp}}(1 - p_{k_t,j_{tp}})\log \alpha_{k_t,j_{tp}}^{-1}}{2}} + c_{k_t,j_{tp}}^2 k^3_2 \log^2 \alpha_{k_t,j_{tp}}^{-1} + c_{k_t,j_{tp}} k_2 \log \alpha_{k_t,j_{tp}}^{-1}. \tag{89}\]
Assume \( p \geq 1/2 \) (we will discuss the case \( p < 1/2 \) afterwards). Since \( p_{k_t,j_{tp}} \geq p \geq 1/2 \), we have \( p_{k_t,j_{tp}}(1 - p_{k_t,j_{tp}}) \leq p(1 - p) = r(p,t)(1 - r(p,t)) \). By (87), we have \( k_t \leq \log_\eta((t \vee m)/m) \) and \( |j_{tp}| \vee 1 = j_{tp} \vee 1 \leq \sqrt{(t \vee m)/m \log(p/(1-p))}/(2\delta) + 1 \). Hence
\[
\log \alpha_{k_t,j_{tp}}^{-1} \leq s \log \left( \log_\eta \left( \frac{t \vee m}{m} \right) + 1 \right) + s \log \left( \sqrt{\frac{t \vee m \log(p/(1-p))}{2\delta} + 1} \right) + \log \left( \frac{s(2s)}{\alpha} \right) \tag{90}\]
\[
= \ell(p, t \vee m). \tag{91}\]
This completes the upper bound for \( h_{k_t,j_{tp}}(t) \); it remains to upper bound \( t(p_{k_t,j_{tp}} - p) \). Note that, by the definition of \( p_{kj} \),
\[
\frac{p_{kj}}{1 - p_{kj}} = \exp \left\{ \frac{2\delta j}{\eta k^2} \right\}. \tag{92}\]
Our choice of \( j_{tp} \) in (87) implies
\[
\exp \left\{ \frac{2\delta}{\eta k^2} \right\} \frac{p}{1 - p} > \frac{p_{kj}}{1 - p_{kj}}. \tag{93}\]
The following technical result bounds the spacing between two probabilities in terms of their odds ratio:

**Lemma 2.** Fix any \( a > 0 \) and \( p \in [1/2, 1) \), and define \( q_p \) by \( q_p/(1 - q_p) = e^a p/(1 - p) \). Then \( q_p - p \leq (a/2)\sqrt{p(1-p)} \).

We prove Lemma 2 below. Invoking Lemma 2 with \( a = 2\delta/\eta k^2/2 \), we conclude
\[
t(p_{k_t,j_{tp}} - p) \leq t(q_p - p) \leq t\delta \sqrt{p(1-p)/\eta k^t} \leq \delta \sqrt{\frac{\eta(t \vee m)p(1-p)}{m}} = \delta \sqrt{\frac{\eta(t \vee m)r(p,t)(1 - r(p,t))}{m}}. \tag{94}\]
where the last step uses \( \eta k^{t+1} > (t \vee m)/m \). Combining (88) with (89), (91), and (94) yields the boundary \( \tilde{g} \).

The case \( p < 1/2 \) is very similar. Note that, by our choice of \( j_{tp} \) in (87) and the definitions (82) of \( p_{kj} \) and (24) of \( r(p,t) \), we are assured \( p \leq p_{k_t,j_{tp}} \leq r(p,t) \) \leq 1/2. Starting at the step below (89), we again have \( p_{k_t,j_{tp}}(1 - p_{k_t,j_{tp}}) \leq r(p,t)(1 - r(p,t)) \), as desired. Also, \( |j_{tp}| \vee 1 = -j_{tp} \vee 1 \leq \sqrt{t \log(p/(1-p))}/(2\delta) + 1 \), as desired. This shows that (91) continues to hold. Finally, using Lemma 2, we have
\[
t(p_{k_t,j_{tp}} - p) = t((1 - p) - (1 - p_{k_t,j_{tp}})) \leq \delta \sqrt{\frac{\eta(t \vee m)(1 - p_{k_t,j_{tp}})p_{k_t,j_{tp}}}{m}} \leq \delta \sqrt{\frac{\eta(t \vee m)r(p,t)(1 - r(p,t))}{m}}, \tag{95}\]
showing (94) holds.

We have thus verified the high-probability, time- and quantile-uniform upper bound $S_t(p) \leq \tilde{g}_t(p)$ in (81). For the lower bound, we repeat the above argument to construct a time- and quantile-uniform upper bound on $\hat{S}_t(p) = -S_t(1-p)$. The process $(\hat{S}_t(p))_{t=1}^{\infty}$ is also sub-gamma with scale $(1-2p)/3$, and for $0 < p_1 < p_2 < 1$, the relation $\hat{S}_t(p_1) \leq \hat{S}_t(p_2) + t(p_2 - p_1)$ continues to hold, so that the step leading to inequality (88) remains valid. Then the above argument yields $\hat{S}_t(p) \leq \tilde{g}_t(p)$ uniformly over $t$ and $p$ with high probability, i.e., $S_t(p) \geq -\tilde{g}_t(1-p)$, as required in (81).

\[ \text{Proof of Lemma 2.} \] Some algebra shows that

\[ \frac{q-p}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}} = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)(e^a-1)}{1+p(e^a-1)}}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (96)

For $p = 1/2$, the right-hand side is decreasing in $p$, hence is maximized at $p = 1/2$:

\[ \frac{q-p}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}} \leq \frac{e^a-1}{e^a+1} = \tanh(a/2). \]  \hspace{1cm} (97)

Since $\frac{d}{dx} \tanh x \big|_{x=0} = 1$ and $\frac{d^2}{dx^2} \tanh x \leq 0$ for $x \geq 0$, we have $\tanh x \leq x$ for $x \geq 0$, from which the conclusion follows.

\[ \text{\hspace{1cm} } \blacksquare \]

### 8.7 Proof of Theorem 4

Let $k^* \in \arg \max_{k \in [K]} Q_k(\pi)$ denote an arm with optimal $\pi$-quantile, and $q^* := Q_{k^*}(\pi)$ the corresponding optimum quantile value. Denote the set of $\epsilon$-optimal arms by $\mathcal{A} := \{ k \in [K] : Q_k(\pi + \epsilon) \geq q^* \}$.

First, we prove that if QLUCB stops, it selects an $\epsilon$-optimal arm with probability at least $1 - \delta$. By our choice of $u_n$ and $l_n$ to give one-sided coverage at level $\delta/K$, the proof of Theorem 1 and a union bound show that

\[ \mathbb{P} \left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } k \neq k^* : U_{k^*,t}^- < q^* \text{ or } L_{k^*,t}^+ > Q_{k^*}(\pi + \epsilon) \right) \leq \delta. \]  \hspace{1cm} (98)

Suppose QLUCB stops at time $T$ with some arm $k \in \mathcal{A}$, so that $Q_k(\pi + \epsilon) < q^*$. Then it must be true that $L_{k^*,T}^+ \geq U_{k^*,T}^-$, which implies that $L_{k^*,T}^+ > Q_k(\pi + \epsilon)$ or $U_{k^*,T}^- < q^*$ must hold. But (98) shows that this can only occur on an event of probability at most $\delta$. So with probability at least $1 - \delta$, QLUCB can only stop with an $\epsilon$-optimal arm.

Next, we prove that QLUCB stops with probability one and obeys the sample complexity bound (38) with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Let

\[ g_n := 0.85 \sqrt{n^{-1} \left( \log \log(\varepsilon n) + 0.8 \log \left( \frac{1612K^2}{\delta(K-1)} \right) \right)}, \]  \hspace{1cm} (99)

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We choose this quantity to eventually control the deviations of $\hat{Q}_{k,t}(p)$ from $Q_k(p)$ uniformly over $k$, $t$ and $p$, via Corollary 2 and (20). For each $k \in [K]$, define

\[ \tau_k := \min \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : g_n + \left[ u_n(\pi) + l_n(\pi + \epsilon) \right] \leq \frac{\Delta_k + \epsilon}{2} \right\}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (100)

We will show that, once each arm has been sampled $\tau_k$ times, the confidence bounds are sufficiently well-behaved to ensure that QLUCB must stop, on a “good” event with probability at least $1 - \delta$. This will imply that QLUCB stops after no more than $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \tau_k$ rounds on the “good” event, and this sum has the desired rate.

Define the “bad” event at time $t$, $B_t = B^1_t \cup B^2_t$, where

\[ B^1_t := \{ U_{k^*,t}^- < q^* \}, \quad \text{and} \]

\[ B^2_t := \{ \exists k \in [K], p \in (0, 1) : \hat{Q}_{k,t}(p) < Q_k(p - g_{N_k}) \text{ or } \hat{Q}_{k,t}(p) > Q_k(p + g_{N_k}) \}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (101) \hspace{1cm} (102)

We exploit our previous results to bound the probability that $B_t$ ever occurs:
Proof. First, by the definition of $B_s$, sufficiently, so long as $\alpha_{0.85,C} \leq (K - 1)\delta/K^2$, noting that $K \geq 2$ implies $C > 7$ as required in (20). Hence, by a union bound,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} B_t^1 \right) \leq \frac{(K - 1)\delta}{K}.\quad(104)$$

Combining (103) with (104) via a union bound, we have $\mathbb{P}(\cup_{t=1}^{\infty} B_t) \leq \delta$ as desired.

The following lemma verifies that an arm’s confidence bounds are well-behaved, in a specific sense, once the arm has been sampled $\tau_k$ times and $B_t^2$ does not occur.

**Lemma 4.** Fix any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in [K]$. On $(B_t^2)^c$, if $N_{k,t} \geq \tau_k$, then

(a) $L_{k,t}^{\pi+\epsilon} \geq U_{k,t}^{\pi}$ if $k \in \mathcal{A}$, and

(b) $U_{k,t}^{\pi} < q^*$ if $k \in \mathcal{A}^c$.

**Proof.** Suppose first that $k \in \mathcal{A}$, which implies $\Delta_k \leq \epsilon$. From the definition of $L_{k,t}^{\pi+\epsilon}$,

$$L_{k,t}^{\pi+\epsilon} = \hat{Q}_{k,t} (\pi + \epsilon - l_{N_k,t}(\pi + \epsilon)) \geq \hat{Q}_k (\pi + \epsilon - l_{N_k,t}(\pi + \epsilon) - g_{N_k,t}),\quad(105)$$

$$\geq Q_k (\pi + \epsilon - l_{N_k,t}(\pi + \epsilon) - g_{N_k,t}),\quad(106)$$

since we are on $(B_t^2)^c$. Now using the definition of $\tau_k$ twice, we have

$$Q_k (\pi + \epsilon - l_{N_k,t}(\pi + \epsilon) - g_{N_k,t}) \geq Q_k (\pi + \epsilon/2) \geq Q_k (\pi + u_{N_k,t}(\pi) + g_{N_k,t}) \geq \hat{Q}_k (\pi + u_{N_k,t}(\pi)),\quad(107)$$

$$\geq Q_k (\pi + u_{N_k,t}(\pi) + g_{N_k,t}),\quad(108)$$

$$\geq \hat{Q}_k (\pi + u_{N_k,t}(\pi)),\quad(109)$$

again since we are on $(B_t^2)^c$. This last expression is the definition of $U_{k,t}^{\pi}$, so we are done with the first case.

Now suppose instead that $k \in \mathcal{A}^c$, which implies $\Delta_k \geq \epsilon$. The definition of $U_{k,t}^{\pi}$ yields

$$U_{k,t}^{\pi} = \hat{Q}_{k,t} (\pi + u_{N_k,t}(\pi)) \leq Q_k (\pi + u_{N_k,t}(\pi) + g_{N_k,t}),\quad(110)$$

$$\leq Q_k (\pi + u_{N_k,t}(\pi)) + g_{N_k,t},\quad(111)$$

since we are on $(B_t^2)^c$. Now the definition of $\tau_k$ yields

$$Q_k (\pi + u_{N_k,t}(\pi) + g_{N_k,t}) \leq Q_k (\pi + \Delta_k/2) < q^*,\quad(112)$$

using the definition of $\Delta_k$ in the final step.

Using Lemma 4, we can prove the above claim that QLUCB must stop when arms have been sampled sufficiently, so long as $B_t$ does not occur.

**Lemma 5.** On $B_t^1$, if $N_{h,t} \geq \tau_{h,t}$ and $N_{l,t} \geq \tau_{l,t}$, then QLUCB must stop at time $t$.

**Proof.** We consider three cases in turn.

1. Suppose $l_t \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $L_{h,t}^{\pi+\epsilon} \geq L_{l,t}^{\pi+\epsilon}$ by the definition of $h_t$, and $L_{l,t}^{\pi+\epsilon} \geq U_{l,t}^{\pi}$ by Lemma 4(a). So $L_{h,t}^{\pi+\epsilon} \geq U_{l,t}^{\pi}$ and QLUCB must stop.
2. Suppose \( l_t \in A^c \) and \( h_t = k^* \). Then \( L_{h_t}^{k^*} \geq U_{h_t}^{k^*} \) by Lemma 4(a), while \( U_{h_t}^{k^*} \geq \Delta^* \) by the definition of even \( B_t \). Also, \( \Delta^* > U_{h_t}^{k^*} \) by Lemma 4(b). Hence \( L_{h_t}^{k^*} > U_{h_t}^{k^*} \) and QLUCB must stop.

3. Suppose \( l_t \in A^c \) and \( h_t \neq k^* \). Then \( U_{h_t}^{k^*} \leq U_{l_t}^{k^*} \) by the definition of \( l_t \), and \( U_{l_t}^{k^*} < \Delta^* \) by Lemma 4(b). But \( U_{h_t}^{k^*} < \Delta^* \) implies \( B_t \) and hence \( B_t \), which contradicts our assumption. So this case cannot occur on \( B_t \).

\[ \Box \]

We can now show that QLUCB stops after no more than \( \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k \) rounds with probability at least \( 1 - \delta \). On \( B_t \), Lemma 5 allows us to write

\[
T \leq \sum_{t=1}^\infty \left\{ N_{h_t,t} < \tau_t \right\} \cup \left\{ N_{l_t,t} < \tau_t \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{t=1}^\infty \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ h_t = k \text{ or } l_t = k \right\} \cap \left\{ N_{k,t} < \tau_k \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k,
\]

since whenever \( h_t = k \text{ or } l_t = k \), we have \( N_{k,t+1} = N_{k,t} + 1 \). Hence \( \mathbb{P}(T \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k) \geq 1 - \mathbb{P}(\cup_{t=1}^\infty B_t) \geq 1 - \delta \) using Lemma 3. It remains to show that \( T < \infty \) a.s., and to show that \( \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k \) has the desired rate.

First, Corollary 1 of Howard et al. (2018) implies that \( \mathbb{P}(B_t^2 \text{ infinitely often}) = 0 \), while Theorem 2 implies \( \mathbb{P}(B_t^1 \text{ infinitely often}) = 0 \). So, with probability one, there exists \( t_0 \) such that \( B_t^1 \) occurs for no \( t \geq t_0 \), and the above calculations show that \( T \leq t_0 + \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k \). We conclude \( T < \infty \) almost surely.

Second, to show that \( \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k \) has the rate given in (38), we use the following lemma, which bounds the time for an iterated-logarithm confidence sequence radius to shrink to a desired size.

**Lemma 6.** Suppose \( (a_n(C))_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) is a real-valued sequence satisfying \( a_n = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n^{-1} \log \log n + C}) \) as \( n \to \infty \). Then

\[
\min \{ n \in \mathbb{N} : a_n(C) \leq x \} = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\log \log x^{-1} + C}{x} \right) \text{ as } x \downarrow 0, C \uparrow \infty.
\]

**Proof.** Our condition on \( a_n(C) \) implies, for small enough \( x \) and large enough \( C \),

\[
\min \{ n \in \mathbb{N} : a_n(C) \leq x \} \leq \min \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \frac{\log(1 + \log n) + C}{n} \leq \frac{x^2}{A^2} \right\} =: t(x).
\]

Use \( \log(1 + x) \leq x \) to see that \( \log x = 2 \log \sqrt{x} \leq 2(\sqrt{x} - 1) \), and that

\[
\frac{\log(1 + \log n) + C}{n} \leq \frac{\log n + C}{n} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{C - 2}{n} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}},
\]

as \( n \geq \sqrt{n} \). So \( n \geq C^2 A^4 / x^4 \) implies that \( (\log(1 + \log n) + C) / n \leq x^2 / A^2 \), and we must have \( t(x) \leq C^2 A^4 / x^4 + 1 \). Hence we may write

\[
t(x) = \min \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \frac{\log(1 + \log(1 + C^2 A^4 / x^4)) + C}{n} \leq \frac{x^2}{A^2} \right\},
\]

which immediately yields

\[
t(x) \leq A^2 \left[ \log(1 + \log(1 + C^2 A^4 / x^4)) + C \right] + 1 = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\log \log x^{-1} + C}{x^2} \right),
\]

as desired. \( \Box \)

Examining the form of \( u_n \) and \( t_n \) given in (9) along with the definition of \( g_n \), we see that \( a_n(C) = g_n + [u_n(\pi) \lor t_n(\pi + \epsilon)] \) satisfies the condition of Lemma 6 with \( C = \log(K/\delta) \), which implies

\[
\tau_k = \mathcal{O} \left( (\epsilon \lor \Delta_k)^{-2} \log \left( \frac{K \log(\epsilon \lor \Delta_k)}{\alpha} \right) \right),
\]

Summing over \( k \) yields the desired sample complexity (38), completing the proof. \( \Box \)
8.8 Proof of Theorem 5

We extend the definition of $S_t(p)$ from (61) to the two-armed setup: for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, let

$$
\pi_k(p) := \begin{cases} 
0, & F_k(Q_k(p)) = F_k^-(Q_k(p)), \\
\frac{p-F_k^-(Q_k(p))}{p-F_k^-(Q_k(p)) - F_k(Q_k(p))}, & F_k(Q_k(p)) > F_k^-(Q_k(p)),
\end{cases}
$$

(122)

and define $S_{k,0}(p) = 0$ and, for $t \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$
S_{k,t}(p) := \sum_{i=1}^{N_{k,t}} [1_{X_{k,i}<Q_k(p)} + \pi_k(p)1_{X_{k,i}=Q_k(p)} - p].
$$

(123)

The increments are mean-zero and bounded on $[-p, 1-p]$ conditional on the past, so the process $(S_{k,t}(p))$ is sub-Bernoulli with variance process $p(1-p)t$ and scale parameters $q = p, h = 1 - p$ (Howard et al., 2018a, Fact 1(b)). Then the proof of Propositions 6 and 7 of Howard et al. (2018b) shows that the processes

$$
L_{k,t} := M_{p,r}(S_{k,t}(p), p(1-p)N_{k,t}),
$$

(124)

$$
L_{k,t}^+ := M_{p,r}^1(S_{k,t}(p), p(1-p)N_{k,t}),
$$

(125)

$$
L_{k,t}^- := M_{1-p,r}^1(\pi_k(p), p(1-p)N_{k,t}),
$$

(126)

are nonnegative supermartingales with $\mathbb{E}L_{k,0} = \mathbb{E}L_{k,0}^+ = \mathbb{E}L_{k,0}^- = 1$, with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ generated by the observations.

For the two-sided test, we form the product $\tilde{L}_t := L_{1,t}L_{2,t}$, which is also a nonnegative supermartingale. Indeed, if we choose to sample arm 1 at time $t$, a choice which is predictable with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_t)$, then $L_{2,t} = L_{2,t-1}$, so $\mathbb{E}L_{1,t} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} = L_{2,t-1}E(L_{1,t} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq L_{t-1}$; likewise if we choose to sample arm 2. Then Ville’s inequality yields

$$
\mathbb{P}\left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} : \tilde{L}_t \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \leq \alpha.
$$

(127)

Our goal is to lower bound $\tilde{L}_t$ under the null hypothesis $H_0 : Q_2(p) - Q_1(p) = \delta_*$. Suppose we strengthen this hypothesis to $Q_1(p) = x_1$ and $Q_2(p) = x_2 := x_1 + \delta_*$ for some $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. We still cannot compute $S_{k,t}(p)$ without knowledge of $\pi_k(p)$. But since $\pi_k(p) \in [0, 1]$, we are assured $S_{k,t}(p)/N_{k,t} \in D_{k,t}(x_k)$ for all $t$, so that

$$
\log L_{k,t} \geq G_{k,t}(x_k) \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, 2.
$$

Hence, on the stronger hypothesis, we have

$$
\log \tilde{L}_t \geq G_{1,t}(x_1) + G_{2,t}(x_1 + \delta_*), \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \mathbb{N}.
$$

(128)

On $H_0$, then, we have

$$
\log \tilde{L}_t \geq \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [G_{1,t}(x) + G_{2,t}(x + \delta_*)] \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \mathbb{N},
$$

(129)

and the conclusion (43) for the two-sided test follows from (127) and (129).

For the one-sided test, we follow a similar argument. Form the product $\tilde{L}_t := L_{1,t}^+L_{2,t}^-$, which is a supermartingale by an analogous argument as that above for $\tilde{L}_t$. Ville’s inequality yields $\mathbb{P}\left( \exists t \in \mathbb{N} : \tilde{L}_t^+ \geq 1/\alpha \right) \leq \alpha$.

Now since $M_{p,r}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is nondecreasing (Howard et al., 2018b, Appendix C and proof of Proposition 7), $G_{k,t}^+$ is nondecreasing while $G_{k,t}^-$ is nonincreasing, which implies

$$
G_{k,t}^+(x) = \min_{a \in D_{k,t}(x)} \log M_{1-p,r}^1 ((a - p)N_{k,t}, p(1-p)N_{k,t}),
$$

(130)

$$
G_{k,t}^-(x) = \min_{a \in D_{k,t}(x)} \log M_{1-p,r}^1 (- (a - p)N_{k,t}, p(1-p)N_{k,t}).
$$

(131)

Suppose we strengthen the null hypothesis to $Q_1^p(p) = x_1$ and $Q_2^p(p) = x_2 \leq x_1 + \delta_*$ for some $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the argument above shows that

$$
\log \tilde{L}_t^+ \geq G_{1,t}^+(x_1) + G_{2,t}^-(x_2)
$$

(132)

$$
\geq G_{1,t}^+(x_1) + G_{2,t}^-(x_1 + \delta_*),
$$

(133)
since $x_2 \leq x_1 + \delta_*$ and $G_{2,t}^{-}$ is nonincreasing. On $H_0 : Q_2(p) - Q_1(p) \leq \delta_*$, then, we have
\[
\log \tilde{L}_t \geq \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left[ G_{1,t}^{+}(x) + G_{2,t}^{-}(x + \delta_*) \right] \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{N},
\] (134)
and the conclusion (44) for the one-sided test follows as before.
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A Details of Figure 2

Here we give details for each of the bounds presented in Figure 2. Additionally, Figure 7 includes all bounds together in a single plot, along with two more bounds: the DKW bounds which is uniform over quantiles for a fixed time, and the pointwise Bernoulli bound which is valid for a fixed quantile at a fixed time. In all cases, we use a two-sided error probability of 0.05, and all bounds are tuned for a minimum sample size of \( m = 32 \).

- **Darling and Robbins (1968, Theorem 4)** give a test based on a bound for \( \| \hat{F}_t - F \|_\infty \) which achieves uniformity over time via a union bound over \( t \geq m \). We follow their guidance in remark (d), p. 808 to choose \( u_t = \sqrt{t^{-2}(t+1)(2 \log t + 0.601)} \).

- **Szörényi et al. (2015, Proposition 1)** uses a similar union-bounding argument on the optimal DKW inequality of Massart (1990). We adjust their result so that the union bound only applies over \( t \geq 32 \), yielding \( u_t = \sqrt{t^{-1}(\log(t-31) + 2.093)} \).

- For Corollary 2, we set \( A = 0.85 \) and numerically choose \( C = 8.123 \), so \( u_t = 0.85 \sqrt{t^{-1}(\log \log(\epsilon t/32) + 8.123)} \).
Figure 7: Plot of upper confidence bound radii $u_t$, normalized by $\sqrt{t}$ to facilitate comparison. Each panel shows estimation radius for a different quantile, $p = 0.05$, 0.5, and 0.95, respectively. All bounds correspond to two-sided $\alpha = 0.05$. Dotted line is valid for a fixed quantile at a fixed time, dashed lines are valid uniformly over either time or quantiles, and solid lines are valid uniformly over both time and quantiles. In right panel, lines start at the sample size for which the upper confidence bound becomes nontrivial. See Appendix A for details of each bound shown.
For Theorem 3, we set $\delta = 0.5$, $\eta = 2.041$, and $s = 1.4$.

Darling and Robbins (1967a, Section 2) give an explicit confidence sequence for the median, which applies to other quantiles as well. In this case, $u_t = (3/2\sqrt{2})\sqrt{t^{-1}(\log \log t + 1.457)}$.

For Theorem 1(a), we set $\eta = 2.041$ and $s = 1.4$, as in (10).

For Theorem 1(b), we set $r = 0.145$ for $p = 0.05$ and $p = 0.95$, while $r = 0.758$ for $p = 0.5$, in accordance with (31).

The fixed-sample Bernoulli bound is based on Hoeffding (1963, equation 2.1), and is given by the solution in $x$ to $t \text{KL}(p + x \parallel p) = \log(2/0.05)$, where $\text{KL}(q \parallel p) = q \log \left( \frac{q}{p} \right) + (1 - q) \log \left( \frac{1 - q}{1 - p} \right)$ denotes the Bernoulli Kullback-Leibler divergence.

B Implementation details for Theorem 5

The tests in Theorem 5 involve minimizing over possibly multimodal sums of the functions $G_{k,t}(x)$, $G_{k,t}^+(x)$, and $G_{k,t}^-(x)$, with $G_{k,t}$ itself defined in terms of a minimization. In this section, we discuss details for implementing these tests, which require $O(G)$ and $G$ on the domain $s$ convex, but we do not use that fact here.) Let to together with (53) and (55), we have $G_{k,t}(x) = \arg \min_{G(s,v)} M_{p,v}(a - p)N_{k,t}, p(1-p)N_{k,t},$ (135)

which may be found via numerical optimization. Then from the definition of $G_{k,t}(x)$ and its unimodality, together with (53) and (55), we have

$$G_{k,t}(x) = \begin{cases} M_{p,v}(a - p)N_{k,t}, p(1-p)N_{k,t}, & x < \hat{Q}_{k,t}^-(a_{k,t}), \\ M_{p,v}(a - p)N_{k,t}, p(1-p)N_{k,t}, & \hat{Q}_{k,t}^-(a_{k,t}) \leq x \leq \hat{Q}_{k,t}(a_{k,t}), \\ M_{p,v}(a - p)N_{k,t}, p(1-p)N_{k,t}, & x > \hat{Q}_{k,t}(a_{k,t}). \end{cases}$$

So once the value $a_{k,t}$ has been found, $G_{k,t}(x)$ is given in closed form for any $x$. Note also that $G_{k,t}(x)$ is nonincreasing on $x < \hat{Q}_{k,t}^-(a_{k,t})$, nondecreasing on $x > \hat{Q}_{k,t}(a_{k,t})$, and constant on $\hat{Q}_{k,t}^-(a_{k,t}) \leq x \leq \hat{Q}_{k,t}(a_{k,t})$.

Unfortunately, the objective $l(x) := G_{1,t}(x) + G_{2,t}(x + \delta^*)$ is not unimodal in general. Suppose without loss of generality that $\hat{Q}_{1,t}(a_{1,t}) \leq \hat{Q}_{2,t}(a_{2,t}) - \delta^*$, so that $G_{1,t}(x)$ begins increasing before $G_{2,t}(x + \delta^*)$ does, and define $x_- := \hat{Q}_{1,t}(a_{1,t})$ and $x_+ := \hat{Q}_{2,t}(a_{2,t}) - \delta^*$. Then $l(x)$ is nonincreasing on $x < x_-$ and nondecreasing on $x > x_+$, but in general may achieve many local minima on $[x_-, x_+]$. On this interval, $l(x)$ only decreases at values $x = X_{2,s} + \delta^*$ for some $s \leq t$, i.e., $l(x)$ decreases at values of $x$ which have been observed from the second arm. So to find the minimum, we must evaluate $l(x)$ at each point $x \in \{x_-, x_+\} \cup \{X_{2,s} + \delta^* : s \leq t, x_- \leq X_{2,s} + \delta^* \leq x_+\}$. This requires $O(N_{2,t})$ time in general, though the use of $x_-$ and $x_+$ will improve constants. In the corner case $x_+ \leq x_-$, we must have $l(x)$ achieving its minimum at $x = x_-$.

We also need to efficiently evaluate the empirical CDFs $\hat{F}_{k,t}$ and $\hat{F}_{k,t}^-$ and the empirical quantile functions $\hat{Q}_{k,t}$ and $\hat{Q}_{k,t}^-$. For this, we use a balanced binary tree in which each node is augmented with the size of the subtree rooted at that node. This allows evaluation of the empirical CDFs and quantile functions in $O(\log N_{k,t})$ time.

For the one-sided test (44), we have that $G_{k,t}^+(x)$ is nondecreasing and $G_{k,t}^-(x)$ is nonincreasing over all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, since $M_{p,v}(s,v)$ is nondecreasing (Howard et al., 2018b, Appendix C). We must therefore search over all values $x \in \{X_{2,s} + \delta^* : s \leq t\}$.
Figure 8: Average sample size for various quantile best-arm identification algorithms based on 64 simulation runs, with $\epsilon = 0.025$ and $\pi = 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, \ldots, 0.8, 0.9, 0.95$. Left panel shows results for arms with uniform distributions on intervals of length one; middle panel shows arms with Cauchy distributions have unit scale; and right panel shows arms with standard normal distributions except for one, which has a standard deviation of two instead of one. In this last case, the exceptional arm is best for quantiles above 0.53, while for quantiles below 0.45, the other arms are all $\epsilon$-optimal. Plot includes Algorithm 2 of David and Shimkin (2016), Algorithm 1 of Szörényi et al. (2015), and a modification of Algorithm 1 of Szörényi et al. (2015), “QPAC B-B”, which uses the one-sided variant of our beta-binomial confidence sequence Theorem 1(b). We compare our QLUCB algorithm based on three different confidence sequences: the stitched confidence sequence (34) based on Theorem 1(a); a one-sided variant of the beta-binomial (“B-B”) confidence sequence, Theorem 1(b); and the same DKW-plus-union-bound confidence sequence as QPAC, for comparison. Observe that our proposed changes in algorithm and in confidence sequences both yield improvements, separately and together.

C Full comparison of quantile best-arm strategies

Figure 8 adds to Figure 5 two additional best-arm strategies. First, we include a variant of Algorithm 1 from Szörényi et al. (2015), “QPAC”, in which we simply replace their confidence sequence with our tighter confidence sequence based on a one-sided variant of the beta-binomial confidence sequence Theorem 1(b). This shows the improvement due to our confidence sequence alone under the QPAC sampling strategy. Second, we include our QLUCB algorithm with the same confidence sequence as in Szörényi et al. (2015). Comparing this to the original algorithm of Szörényi et al. (2015) shows the improvement due to our sampling strategy alone. The plot shows that both the confidence sequence and the sampling strategy lead to improvements, but the confidence sequence contributes more to the overall improvement.