

# Estimation of Standard Auction Models

**Yeshwanth Cherapanamjeri**

University of California Berkeley  
yeshwanth@berkeley.edu

**Constantinos Daskalakis**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
costis@csail.mit.edu

**Andrew Ilyas**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
ailyas@mit.edu

**Manolis Zampetakis**

University of California Berkeley  
mzampet@berkeley.edu

## Abstract

We provide efficient estimation methods for first- and second-price auctions under independent (asymmetric) private values and partial observability. Given a finite set of observations, each comprising the identity of the winner and the price they paid in a sequence of identical auctions, we provide algorithms for non-parametrically estimating the bid distribution of each bidder, as well as their value distributions under equilibrium assumptions. We provide finite-sample estimation bounds which are uniform in that their error rates do not depend on the bid/value distributions being estimated. Our estimation guarantees advance a body of work in Econometrics wherein only identification results have been obtained (e.g. [AH02; AH07]), unless the setting is symmetric (e.g. [Mor11; MM13]), parametric (e.g. [ALS11]), or all bids are observable (e.g. [GPV00]). Our guarantees also provide computationally and statistically effective alternatives to classical techniques from reliability theory [Mei81]. Finally, our results are immediately applicable to Dutch and English auctions.

## 1 Introduction

Estimating value and/or bid distributions from an observed sequence of auctions is a fundamental challenge in Econometrics with direct practical applications. For example, these fundamentals allow one to analyze the performance of an auction and make counterfactual predictions about alternatives. The difficulty of this problem depends on the format of the auctions and the structure of the observed information from each one, as well as how the fundamentals of bidders are interrelated and vary across the sequence of observations.

In this paper, we study a basic version of the afore-described estimation challenge, wherein the auction format and the bidder distributions stay fixed across observations, and the bidders have independent private values (which are independently resampled across different observations). The auction formats that we consider are first- and second-price auctions, as well as Dutch and English auctions. What will make our problem challenging is that (i) our bidders are *ex ante* asymmetric, drawing their independent private values from different distributions; (ii) we will make no parametric assumptions about these distributions; and (iii) we will only be observing the

identity of the winner and the price they paid but not the losing bids. Under this observational model and our independent private values assumption above, we can focus our attention on first- and second-price auctions, and our results automatically extend to Dutch and English auctions.

In the above settings, we give computationally and sample efficient methods for estimating all agents' bid distributions and (under equilibrium assumptions) value distributions:

- In the case of first-price auctions, we provide finite-sample estimation guarantees under Lévy, Kolmogorov and Total Variation distance with minimal assumptions. Under (a condition weaker than) a lower bound on the density of the bid distributions (although we actually do not need existence of densities), Theorem 2.2 shows that the bid distributions can be estimated to within  $\varepsilon$  in Lévy distance, using  $1/\varepsilon^{O(k)}$  samples, where  $k$  is the number of bidders. Theorem 2.6 shows that the exponential dependence on  $k$  is necessary, and Theorem 2.7 shows that Lévy distance cannot be strengthened to Kolmogorov distance. Sidestepping the exponential sample dependence on  $k$ , strengthening the estimation distance, and removing the density lower bound assumption, Theorem 2.3 shows that, assuming only continuity of their cumulative functions, the bid distributions can be estimated to within  $\varepsilon$  in Kolmogorov distance on their effective supports, i.e. the part of the support that is likely to be observed, defined in Blum, Mansour, and Morgenstern [BMM15]. Finally, under Lipschitzness assumptions on the densities of the bid distributions, Theorem 2.4 improves the latter to  $\varepsilon$ -error in Total Variation distance. Our sample requirements for estimation over the effective supports of the bid distributions under either Kolmogorov or TV distance are dramatically improved to logarithmic in the number of bidders and benign in  $1/\varepsilon$ . Finally, assuming that bidders use Bayesian Nash equilibrium strategies, Theorems 2.20 and 2.15 show that bidders' value distributions can be estimated over their full and, respectively, effective supports with similar sample sizes as those needed for the estimation of bid distributions.

All of our estimation algorithms run in polynomial time in their sample sizes, and all our estimation error bounds are uniform in that they do not depend on the bid/value distributions being estimated, unlike the instance-dependent rates that commonly arise from the use of kernel density estimation methods. It is also important to note that we estimate the value distributions in Lévy distance (in fact, in the stronger notion of Wasserstein distance) and this is sufficient for the purposes of performing counter-factual predictions about the revenue that would result from running alternative auctions [BCD20].

- In the case of second-price auctions, Theorem 3.3 establishes that bid distributions can be estimated to within  $\varepsilon$  in Kolmogorov distance over their entire supports assuming upper and lower bounds on their density functions. Again the sample complexity scales as  $1/\varepsilon^{O(k)}$ . This result poses major technical challenges, requiring a computationally and statistically effective, fixed point computation alternative to Meilijson [Mei81]'s method. We again sidestep the exponential dependence of the required sample size on  $k$ , by considering estimation over the effective support of the distributions in a setting, similar to that proposed by [BMM15] for first-price auctions, where we can insert bids to the auction or, equivalently, set a reserve price (see discussion in Section 2.3). In this setting, Theorem 3.21 shows that bid distributions can be estimated to within  $\varepsilon$  in Kolmogorov distance over their effective supports, using a sample size that is polynomial in both  $1/\varepsilon$  and  $k$ . Similar to Theorem 2.4 estimation in Kolmogorov distance can be turned to estimation in Total Variation distance under Lipschitzness of the densities. Of course, assuming that the bidders bid according to the truthful

bidding equilibrium, our estimation results for bid distributions automatically translate to estimation results for value distributions.

To the best of our knowledge, our results are the first finite-sample estimation guarantees for the general problem we consider. In particular:

- There is an extensive line of work on identification of bid and value distributions from complete or partial observations of bids; see [AH07] for a survey. In our setting of independent private values, [AH02] show that with infinite samples, bid distributions are identifiable from the distribution of the winners' identity and paid price.

Identification results for bid and value distributions have been established in the presence of correlated values, alternative auction formats, and unobserved heterogeneity, or unknown numbers of bidders [Paa92; LV93; LOV95; DP96; BMR97; DPR03; BY03; Hai01; LX20; HHS03; Mba17; HMS13]. In contrast, here we focus on the IPV framework (albeit, in its more challenging asymmetric case) and standard auction mechanisms (first-price, second-price, Dutch, and English auctions), and provide finite-sample estimation results in these settings.

- On the estimation front, Morganti [Mor11] and Menzel and Morganti [MM13] both provide estimators of bid distributions in first- and second-price auctions (in fact they provide estimation using any order statistics of the bid distributions) under the restrictive assumption that the bidders are symmetric. They obtain rates for estimation of the bid distributions over the full support, which degrade exponentially with the number of bidders. In comparison, we get similar rates for the significantly more challenging asymmetric setting, and also provide drastically better estimation rates (with logarithmic dependence on the number of bidders) on the effective supports of the distributions.
- In terms of non-parametric estimation of value distributions from bid distributions in first-price auctions, [GPV00] provide estimation algorithms which operate under the restrictive assumption that the bidders are symmetric. Their estimation makes use of the explicit formula for the Bayesian Nash equilibrium in the symmetric case. Later work [CPV03; BY03; Kra11; HHS03] extends these results to the more general asymmetric setting, where the Bayesian Nash equilibrium has no closed-form expression; as such, these analyses are typically limited to the setting with only two unique bidder types. Our algorithms operate in the latter (significantly more challenging) setting, with the additional challenges of (a) allowing each bidder to have their own unique value distribution (b) only observing the winning bid, rather than all agents' bids; (c) not using higher-order differentiability assumptions used in prior work while providing uniform convergence bounds (i.e., not depending on the distributions being estimated).
- In the computer science literature, there has been work on non-parametric estimation of bid distributions in first-price auctions, under the stronger assumption that the econometrician can insert bids which do not influence the bidding behavior of the bidders [BMM15]. We compare to that setting and work in Section 2.3, explaining that our work obtains substantial improvements on their rates.

Besides the non-parametric identification work on auctions, discussed above, there has been more extensive work on estimation and identification under parametric or semi-parametric assumptions: see [DP96] and [AH06] for an overview. For example, Athey, Levin, and Seira [ALS11]

fit the parameters of Weibull distributions to observed maximum bids in to estimate bid distributions in USFS timber auctions.

## 1.1 Preliminaries

**The (asymmetric) independent private values model.** In this work, we consider the asymmetric independent private values (IPV) model, with the additional stipulation that not all bids are observed. In this model, we observe a series of identical auctions between  $k$  agents (known  $k \geq 2$ ): in each auction, every agent  $i$  submits a bid  $X_i$ , sampled independently from a (fixed) distribution with cumulative distribution function  $F_i$ . The sampled bids, together with the auction type, determine the winner  $Z$  of each auction (typically  $Z = \arg \max_i X_i$ ) and a transaction price  $Y$ , i.e., what the winner pays for the auctioned item. In this work, we will only observe  $Z$  and (sometimes)  $Y$ , and rather than all bids  $X_i$ .

Two key differences between our setting and the typical IPV setup are (a) the aforementioned partial observability; and (b) asymmetry—in particular, a typical assumption is that all agents bid according to the same fixed distribution  $F$ , which simplifies both bid and value estimation significantly (e.g., we could estimate a first-price auction by learning the CDF of the largest bid, and then estimate the individual bid distributions as the  $k$ -th root).

**Statistical distances.** Throughout our work, we provide finite-sample convergence bounds in terms of the Wasserstein, Lévy, and Kolmogorov distances, depending on the setting. The Wasserstein distance  $\mathcal{W}$  between two distributions  $P, Q$  supported on  $[0, 1]$  is

$$\mathcal{W}(P, Q) \triangleq \inf_R \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim R} [|x - y|],$$

where the infimum is over all joint distributions  $R$  with support  $[0, 1]^2$  such that the marginal of  $x$  is equal to  $P$  and the marginal of  $y$  is equal to  $Q$  when  $(x, y) \sim R$ . The Kolmogorov distance  $d_K$  between two distributions  $P$  and  $Q$  over an interval  $I$  is defined as

$$d_K(P, Q) \triangleq \sup_{x \in I} |F_P(x) - F_Q(x)|,$$

where  $F_P$  and  $F_Q$  are the cumulative distribution functions of  $P$  and  $Q$ , respectively. Finally, the Lévy distance  $D_L$  between  $P$  and  $Q$  is given by

$$D_L(P, Q) = \min \{ \epsilon : F_P(x - \epsilon) - \epsilon \leq F_Q(x) \leq F_P(x + \epsilon) + \epsilon \}.$$

Note that Lévy distance is a strictly weaker notion than Wasserstein distance and Kolmogorov distance, in the sense that both  $D_L(P, Q) \leq d_K(P, Q)$  and  $D_L(P, Q) \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{W}(P, Q)}$ . Thus, all of our results in Wasserstein and Kolmogorov distance also effectively bound Lévy distance.

**Finite-sample rates.** We present our convergence results using order notation: in particular, the constants omitted from all order notation in this paper are absolute constants that do not depend on the distributions being estimated or any other parameters of the setting being considered. In other words, our bounds are uniform. For example, whenever a bound in a theorem statement reads as  $O(f(k, 1/\epsilon, L))$ , where  $f$  is some function and  $k, \epsilon, L$  are parameters of the setting, this means that there is an absolute constant  $C$  such that for any setting conforming to the setting examined in this theorem we can replace  $O(f(k, 1/\epsilon, L))$  in the theorem statement by  $C \cdot f(k, 1/\epsilon, L)$ .

Recall that  $\tilde{O}(f(\cdot))$  means that for some absolute constants  $C$  and  $k \geq 1$ , the bound can be replaced by  $Cf(\cdot) \log^k f(\cdot)$ . Finally, in this work we present most of our bounds in terms of the number of samples necessary to attain a specific learning error  $\varepsilon$ —these can be straightforwardly converted to bounds on  $\varepsilon$  in terms of the number of samples  $n$ , providing estimation rates as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

## 2 Estimation from First-price Auction Data

In this section we show how to estimate the bid distributions from a finite number of first-price auction observations. We consider two regimes:

- ▶ In the *full-support* regime, our goal is to provide an estimation of the bid distributions in their whole support  $[0, 1]$ . As shown in [Theorem 2.2](#), in this regime we estimate the probability distributions within  $\varepsilon$  in Wasserstein distance. The sample complexity here is  $\approx (1/\varepsilon)^k$  and has exponential dependence on the number of the agents  $k$ . As we explain in [Subsection 2.2](#), this dependence on  $k$  is necessary for the full-support regime (due to the exponentially low probability of observing winning bids near zero).
- ▶ In the *effective-support* regime, our goal is to provide an estimation of the bid distributions only at the bid values that have probability at least  $\lambda$  to be observed as an outcome of the first-price auction. As we show in [Theorem 2.3](#), in this regime we avoid the exponential dependence on  $k$  and we are able to get an algorithm that depends only polynomially in  $\varepsilon$  and  $\gamma$  and only logarithmically in  $k$ . This is a doubly exponential improvement over the full-support regime and an exponential improvement on the best known effective-support result from [\[BMM15\]](#). This result also provides the first algorithm with sublinear sample complexity for this problem.

Our first step is to formally define the procedure from which the first-price auction data are generated. The observation access that we assume is minimal in the sense that we only observe the outcome of the auction; who wins and how much they pay.

**Definition 2.1** (First-Price Auction Data). Let  $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^k$  be  $k$  cumulative distribution functions with support  $[0, 1]$ , i.e.  $F_i(x) = 0 \forall x < 0$  and  $F_i(1) = 1$ . A sample  $(Y, Z)$  from a first-price auction with bid distributions  $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^k$  is generated as follows:

1. first generate  $X_i \sim F_i$  independently for all  $i \in [k]$ ,
2. observe the tuple  $(Y, Z) \triangleq (\max_{i \in [k]} X_i, \arg \max_{i \in [k]} X_i)$ .

A different access model explored in [\[BMM15\]](#) gives the econometrician control over an additional agent that has the ability to bid arbitrarily, but only allows them to observe the identity of the winner of each auction (not the transaction price). Using our result we can also improve the result of [\[BMM15\]](#) under this model (see [Subsection 2.3](#)).

### 2.1 Estimation of Bid Distributions

We are now ready to state our main results for the estimation of the bid distributions given sample access to first-price auction data as defined in [Definition 2.1](#). We start with our result for the full-support regime.

**Theorem 2.2** (First-Price Auctions – Full Support). *Let  $\{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be  $n$  i.i.d. samples from the first-price auction as per [Definition 2.1](#). Assume that the cumulative distribution functions  $F_i$  are continuous and satisfy  $|F_i(x) - F_i(y)| \geq \lambda|x - y|$  for all  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ . Then, there is a polynomial-time algorithm that computes functions  $\widehat{F}_i$  for  $i \in [k]$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{W}(\widehat{F}_i, F_i) \leq \varepsilon\right) \geq 1 - \delta$$

for all  $i \in [k]$  assuming that  $n = \tilde{\Theta}\left(\left(\frac{2}{\lambda \cdot \varepsilon}\right)^{4k} \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ , where  $\mathcal{W}$  is the Wasserstein distance.

As we show in [Subsection 2.2](#), the sample complexity of [Theorem 2.2](#) is almost optimal. Nevertheless, as we already explained, the exponential dependence on the number of agents  $k$  can be reduced to only logarithmic dependence if we only focus on the part of the support that is likely to be observed. In this case, our estimation guarantee is also simpler: we estimate the cumulative distribution functions with additive error  $\varepsilon$ .

**Theorem 2.3** (First-Price Auctions – Effective Support). *Let  $\{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be  $n$  i.i.d. samples from the same first-price auction as per [Definition 2.1](#) and assume that the cumulative distribution functions  $F_i$  are continuous. Then, there exists a polynomial-time estimation algorithm, that computes the cumulative distribution functions  $\widehat{F}_i$  for  $i \in [k]$ , such that for every  $p, \gamma \in \{p, \gamma \geq 0 : \mathbb{P}_{(Y,Z) \sim \mathcal{P}_1}(Y \leq p) \geq \gamma\}$ , and every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \gamma/2]$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{x \in [p, 1]} |\widehat{F}_i(x) - F_i(x)| \leq \varepsilon\right) \geq 1 - \delta$$

for all  $i \in [k]$  assuming that  $n = \tilde{\Theta}(\log(k/\delta)/(\gamma^4 \varepsilon^2))$ .

Finally, we establish estimation of the corresponding probability density functions  $\{f_i\}$ :

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $\{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be  $n$  i.i.d. samples from the same first-price auction as per [Definition 2.1](#) and assume the densities  $f_i$  of  $F_i$  are well-defined and Lipschitz continuous, i.e.,*

$$|f_i(x) - f_i(y)| \leq L|x - y| \text{ for all } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

Then, there exists a polynomial-time estimation algorithm, that computes functions  $\widehat{f}_i$  for  $i \in [k]$ , with the following guarantee; for every  $p, \gamma \geq 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(Y \leq p) \geq \gamma$ , and for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \gamma/2]$  it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_p^1 |\widehat{f}_i(x) - f_i(x)| dx \leq \varepsilon\right) \geq 1 - \delta$$

for all  $i \in [k]$  assuming that  $n = \tilde{\Theta}(L^2 \cdot \log(k/\delta)/(\gamma^4 \cdot \varepsilon^4))$ .

Before explaining the formal proofs of the above theorems we give some intuition behind our estimation algorithm. This intuition is given in a simplified setting where: (1) we assume the population model where we have access to infinitely many samples from the first-price auction data defined in [Definition 2.1](#), and (2) the distributions are smoothed enough so that all the probability density functions that are involved are well defined. In this simplified setting we have access to the following distributions:

- ▷  $H_i$  is the cumulative distribution function of  $Y$  conditioned on  $Z = i$ , for  $i \in [k]$  and
- ▷  $H$  is the cumulative distribution function of  $Y$  with no conditioning on  $Z$ .

If we assume that all the  $H_i$ 's have well-defined densities  $h_i$ , then

$$h_i(x) = f_i(x) \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x), \quad H(x) = \prod_{j \in [k]} F_j(x), \quad \text{and} \quad H(x) = \sum_{j \in [k]} H_j(x).$$

Based on the above relations we can solve for the distribution  $F_1$  as follows

$$\frac{d}{dx} \log(F_i(x)) = \frac{f_i(x)}{F_i(x)} = \frac{h_i(x)}{H(x)} \implies F_i(x) = \exp \left( - \int_x^1 \frac{h_i(z)}{H(z)} dz \right).$$

This simple idea summarizes our approach in the population setting where infinite samples are available. Moving to the finite sample case an important observation is that the aforementioned expression of  $F_i$  can be also written as

$$F_i(x) = \exp \left( - \mathbb{E}_{(y,z) \sim \mathcal{P}_1} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{z = i\}}{H(y)} \mid y \geq x \right] \right).$$

The above expression allows the expectation involved to be estimated with an empirical expectation instead of an integral, assuming that a good estimation of  $H(z)$  is computed. Towards designing our actual estimation algorithm and proving its exact sample complexity we face the following additional technical difficulties:

1. in the above outline we assume that all the distributions are smooth enough so that all the densities are well defined—in our main theorem this assumption is not necessary,
2. the usual estimation of  $H$  has an additive error, whereas in the above expression a multiplicative error guarantee is needed,
3. the term  $1/H(z)$  that is crucial in our estimation is not numerically stable for  $z$  close to 0 where  $H(z)$  can also be very close to 0 as well.

### 2.1.1 Proof of [Theorem 2.3](#)

We start by considering the effective-support setting. Our first result will be an information theoretic result enabling identification of  $F_i$  with access to the function  $H$  and the measure  $H_i$  (without requiring a density function).

**Lemma 2.5.** *For all  $i \in [k]$  and all  $x \in (0, 1)$  such that  $F_i(x) > 0$  and  $H(x) > 0$ ,*

$$F_i(x) = \exp \left( - \int_x^1 \frac{1}{H(y)} dH_i \right).$$

*Proof.* Using Lemma 3.1 from [\[Nor02\]](#) we have that

$$\log(F_i(1)) - \log(F_i(x)) = \int_x^1 \frac{1}{F_i(y)} dF_i = \int_x^1 \frac{\prod_{j \neq i} F_j(y)}{\prod_{j \in [k]} F_j(y)} dF_i = \int_x^1 \frac{1}{H(y)} dH_i,$$

where the last equality follows from the continuity of  $F_i$ 's and the properties of Riemann-Stieltjes integration. The lemma follows by observing that  $F_i(1) = 1$ .  $\square$

We now focus our attention on obtaining good estimates of the quantity within the exponential on the right hand side in [Lemma 2.5](#). We introduce the following notation:

$$\widehat{H}(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{Y_j \leq x\} \quad \widehat{G}_i(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{\widehat{H}(Y_j)} \mathbf{1}\{Y_j \geq x \text{ and } Z_j = i\}$$

Based on the above definitions we can define our estimate for  $F_i$  as  $\widehat{F}_i(x) = \exp\left(-\widehat{G}_i(x)\right)$ .

Our next goal is to prove that  $\widehat{F}_i$  is close to  $F_i$  for every value  $y \in [0, 1]$  such that  $H(y) \geq \gamma$ .

Now we establish concentration of  $\widehat{H}$ . By the DKW inequality [\[DKW56\]](#):

$$\max_{x \in [0,1]} \left| \widehat{H}(x) - H(x) \right| \leq \frac{1}{20} \cdot \gamma^2 \varepsilon$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$  for our setting of  $n$ . Conditioning on the above event and observing that  $H(x) \geq \gamma$  for all  $x \geq p$ ,

$$\max_{x \in [p,1]} \left| 1/H(x) - 1/\widehat{H}(x) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{10}. \quad (1)$$

To establish concentration of  $\widehat{G}_i(x)$ , we introduce another quantity  $\widetilde{G}_i$ , defined as follows:

$$\widetilde{G}_i(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{H(Y_j)} \mathbf{1}\{Y_j \geq x \text{ and } Z_j = i\}.$$

We have from (1) that  $|\widehat{G}_i(x) - \widetilde{G}_i(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{10}$  for all  $x \in [p, 1]$ . Thus, it suffices to establish concentration of  $\widetilde{G}$  around  $G$ . We first prove concentration on a discrete set of points and interpolate to the rest of the interval. Define  $U_i$  and  $V_i$  as:

$$U_i = \left\{ \gamma + i \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{10} : i \in [N] \cup \{0\} \text{ and } \gamma + i \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{10} \leq 1 \right\} \cup \{1\} \text{ and } V_i = F_i^{-1}(U_i).$$

and let  $V = \cup_{i \in [k]} V_i$ . We have for all  $x \in V, i \in [k]$ , by Hoeffding's inequality that:

$$|\widetilde{G}_i(x) - G_i(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{10} \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - \delta/2. \quad (2)$$

We now condition on the above event as well. By combining [Eqs. \(1\) and \(2\)](#), we get:

$$\forall x \in V, i \in [k] : |\widehat{G}_i(x) - G_i(x)| \leq \varepsilon/5, \text{ and so for all } x \in V, i \in [k], \text{ we have:}$$

$$\exp\{-\varepsilon/5\} \cdot F_i(x) \leq \widehat{F}_i(x) \leq \exp\{\varepsilon/5\} \cdot F_i(x).$$

We now extend from  $V$  to the rest of  $[p, 1]$ . Note that  $\widehat{G}_i(x)$  is a decreasing function of  $x$ . Hence,  $\widehat{F}_i$  is an increasing function of  $x$ . Now, let  $x \in (p, 1) \setminus V$  and  $i \in [k]$ . We must have  $x_l, x_h \in V$  with  $x_l < x \leq x_h$  satisfying  $F_i(x_h) - F_i(x_l) \leq \varepsilon/10$ . We now get:

$$\widehat{F}_i(x) \leq \widehat{F}_i(x_h) \leq \exp\{\varepsilon/5\} \cdot F_i(x_h) \leq \exp\{\varepsilon/5\} F_i(x_l) + \varepsilon/8 \leq \exp\{\varepsilon/5\} F_i(x) + \varepsilon/8,$$

$$\widehat{F}_i(x) \geq \exp\{-\varepsilon/5\} F_i(x_l) \geq \exp\{-\varepsilon/5\} F_i(x_h) + \varepsilon/10 \geq \exp\{-\varepsilon/5\} F_i(x) + \varepsilon/10.$$

The above two inequalities and our condition on  $\varepsilon$  conclude the proof.  $\square$

### 2.1.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2

We now leverage our effective-support recovery result to recover bid distributions on their full support (in Wasserstein distance). Under the “lower bound on density” assumption,

$$H(\eta) = \prod_{j \in [k]} F_j(\eta) \geq (\lambda \cdot \eta)^k. \quad (3)$$

Now, setting  $\gamma = (\lambda \cdot \eta)^k$  and using Theorem 2.3 we have that  $\tilde{\Theta} \left( \frac{\log(k/\delta)}{\lambda^k \cdot \eta^k \cdot \eta^2} \right)$  samples suffice to find estimates  $\hat{F}_i$  such that the additive error between  $\hat{F}_i$  and  $F_i$  is at most  $\eta$  in the interval  $[\eta, 1]$ . For every  $i$ , the maximum possible mass in the interval  $[0, \eta]$  with respect to the measure  $F_i$  is 1. Therefore, any two measures with support  $[0, \eta]$  mass at most 1 have a Wasserstein distance of at most  $\eta$ . Also, in the subset  $[\eta, 1]$  of the support we have that since the longest distance in the support is at most 1 and  $\max_{x \in [\eta, 1]} |\hat{F}_i(x) - F_i(x)| \leq \eta$  we have that the Wasserstein distance of the measures  $\hat{F}_i$  and  $F_i$  conditioned on the support  $[\eta, 1]$  is at most  $\varepsilon \cdot 1$ . Thus,

$$\mathcal{W}(\hat{F}_i, F_i) \leq 2 \cdot \eta.$$

Setting  $\eta = \varepsilon/2$  the theorem follows.  $\square$

### 2.1.3 Proof of Theorem 2.4

We are going to use the estimation  $\hat{F}_i$  from Theorem 2.3 together with the Lipschitzness of  $f_i$  to prove this theorem. Let  $h > 0$  and  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  be parameters that we will determine later. We define, for every  $x \in [p, 1]$ , a density estimate

$$\hat{f}_i(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{h} (\hat{F}_i(x+h) - \hat{F}_i(x)),$$

where due to Theorem 2.3 we have  $|\hat{F}_i(x+h) - F_i(x+h)| \leq \varepsilon_0$  and  $|\hat{F}_i(x) - F_i(x)| \leq \varepsilon_0$  for  $n = \tilde{\Theta} \left( \frac{\log(k/\delta)}{\gamma^4 \varepsilon^2} \right)$  samples. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_p^1 |\hat{f}_i(x) - f_i(x)| dx &= \int_p^1 \left| \frac{1}{h} (\hat{F}_i(x+h) - \hat{F}_i(x)) - f_i(x) \right| dx \\ &\leq \int_p^1 \left| \frac{1}{h} (F_i(x+h) - F_i(x)) - f_i(x) \right| dx + 2\varepsilon \\ &= \int_p^1 \left| \frac{1}{h} \left( \int_x^{x+h} f_i(z) dz \right) - f_i(x) \right| dx + \frac{2\varepsilon}{h} \\ &\leq \int_p^1 \frac{1}{h} \left( \int_x^{x+h} |f_i(z) - f_i(x)| dz \right) dx + \frac{2\varepsilon}{h} \end{aligned}$$

now due to the Lipschitzness of  $f_i$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_p^1 |\hat{f}_i(x) - f_i(x)| dx &\leq \int_p^1 \frac{1}{h} \left( \int_x^{x+h} L \cdot |z - x| dz \right) dx + \frac{2\varepsilon}{h} \\ &= \int_p^1 \frac{L}{h} \left( \frac{(x+h)^2}{2} - \frac{x^2}{2} - h \cdot x \right) dx + \frac{2\varepsilon}{h} \\ &= \int_p^1 \frac{L}{h} \cdot h^2 dx + 2\varepsilon \leq L \cdot h + \frac{2\varepsilon}{h}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we choose  $h = \sqrt{\varepsilon_0/L}$  and we also set  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0^2/(9L)$  the theorem follows.

## 2.2 Lower Bound for Full-Support Estimation

Here, we establish lower bounds proving the optimality of [Theorem 2.2](#). We prove:

1. the exponential dependence on  $k$  incurred in [Theorem 2.2](#) is necessary and
2. the distributions cannot be recovered in Kolmogorov distance in their whole support.

In both these cases, we will construct a pair of distributions  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^k$  and  $\{f'_i\}_{i=1}^k$  satisfying the bounded density condition of [Theorem 2.2](#) such that:

1.  $f_1$  and  $f'_1$  have  $\mathcal{W}(f_1, f'_1) \geq \Omega(\varepsilon)$  and  $d_K(f_1, f'_1) \geq 1/2$  and
2. Fewer than  $\Omega((\lambda\varepsilon)^{-(k-1)})$  fail to distinguish them with large probability.

The main intuition behind our construction is that learning the behavior of any of the densities below  $\varepsilon$  requires observing  $Y \leq \varepsilon$  and this only happens with probability  $\varepsilon^{-k}$ .

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $\varepsilon, \lambda \in (0, 1/2)$ . Then, there exist two tuples of distributions  $\mathcal{D} = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^k$  and  $\mathcal{D}' = \{f'_i\}_{i=1}^k$  with the first price auction model ([Definition 2.1](#)) on  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$  satisfies the density bound condition from [Theorem 2.2](#) such that for any estimator  $\hat{\mu}$ , we have:*

$$\max \left( \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{W}(\hat{\mu}(\{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n), \mathcal{D}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \right\}, \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{W}(\hat{\mu}(\{(Y'_i, Z'_i)\}_{i=1}^n), \mathcal{D}') \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \right\} \right) \geq \frac{1}{3}$$

where  $(Y_i, Z_i), (Y'_i, Z'_i)$  are drawn i.i.d from  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'$  respectively if  $n \leq \frac{1}{10} \cdot (\lambda\varepsilon)^{-(k-1)}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{D}_1 = \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{f'_1, \dots, f'_k\}$  denote the two sets of distributions characterizing our first price auction model ([Definition 2.1](#)). We will have  $f_i = f'_i$  for all  $i > 1$ .

$$f'_i = f_i = \lambda \cdot \text{Unif}([0, 1]) + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \text{Unif}([3/4, 1]) \quad \text{for all } i > 1.$$

However,  $f_1$  and  $f'_1$  will have large Wasserstein and Kolmogorov distance:

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= \lambda \cdot \text{Unif}([0, 1]) + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \text{Unif}([0, \varepsilon/4]) \\ f'_1 &= \lambda \cdot \text{Unif}([0, 1]) + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \text{Unif}([3\varepsilon/4, \varepsilon]). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $(Y, Z)$  and  $(Y', Z')$  be distributed according to the first price auction model with respect to  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . We now define the events  $E$  and  $E'$  on  $(Y, Z)$  and  $(Y', Z')$  as follows:

$$E = \{Y \in (\varepsilon, 1]\} \text{ and } E' = \{Y' \in (\varepsilon, 1]\} \implies \mathbb{P}\{E\} = \mathbb{P}\{E'\} = 1 - (\lambda\varepsilon)^{k-1} \quad (4)$$

By construction,  $(Y, Z)$  and  $(Y', Z')$  have the same distribution conditioned on  $E$  and  $E'$ .

Now, let  $\mathbf{W} = \{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$  and  $\mathbf{W}' = \{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be collections of  $n$  i.i.d samples from  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'$  respectively, and let  $\hat{\mu}$  denote any estimator of the first price auction model. We show that  $\hat{\mu}$  has large error on at least one of  $\mathcal{D}$  or  $\mathcal{D}'$ . Letting  $F$  (respectively,  $F'$ ) denote the event that  $E$  (respectively,  $E'$ ) holds for all of the  $(Y_i, Z_i)$  (respectively,  $(Y'_i, Z'_i)$ ), we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{D}) \leq \varepsilon/8) = \mathbb{P}(F) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{D}) \leq \varepsilon/8 | F) + \mathbb{P}(\bar{F}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{D}) \leq \varepsilon/8 | \bar{F}).$$

Now, if  $n \leq \frac{1}{10}(\lambda\varepsilon)^{-(k-1)}$ , we have from [Eq. \(4\)](#) and a union bound that  $\mathbb{P}(F) \geq 9/10$ . Furthermore, note that conditioned on  $F$  and  $F'$ ,  $\mathbf{W}$  and  $\mathbf{W}'$  have the same distribution and  $\mathcal{W}(f_1, f'_1) \geq$

$\varepsilon/4$ . Assuming the probability in the above equation is greater than  $2/3$ , we may re-arrange the above equation as follows:

$$\frac{2}{3} \leq \mathbb{P}(F) \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{W}(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{D}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \middle| F \right\} + \frac{1}{10} \leq \mathbb{P}(F') \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{W}(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}'), \mathcal{D}') \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \middle| F' \right\} + \frac{1}{10}.$$

By re-arranging the above equation, we have that either:

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{W}(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{D}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \right\} \leq \frac{2}{3}, \text{ or } \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{W}(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}'), \mathcal{D}') \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \right\} \leq \frac{2}{3}$$

concluding the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

Note that the probabilities  $1/3$  chosen in the above theorem is not a substantial restriction as any algorithm successfully distinguishing between  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'$  with probability bounded away from  $1/2$  can be boosted to arbitrarily high probability by simple repetition. As a simple consequence of this construction, we can rule out estimation in Kolmogorov distance:

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\hat{\mu}$  be an estimator for the First-Price-Auction model. Then, for all  $\delta > 0$ , there exists a First-Price-Auction model characterized by  $\mathcal{D} = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^k$  satisfying the bounded density condition of [Theorem 2.2](#) satisfying:*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( d_K(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{D}) \leq \frac{1}{4} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \delta.$$

where  $\mathbf{W} = \{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  are drawn i.i.d from the first price auction model on  $\mathcal{D}$ .

*Proof.* We will prove the lemma via contradiction. Let  $n, \hat{\mu}$  be such that there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for all First-Price-Auction models,  $\mathcal{D}$ , satisfying the bounded density condition:

$$\mathbb{P} \left( d_K(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{D}) \leq \frac{1}{4} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \delta.$$

Note that by repeating the experiment  $\Omega(1/\delta^2)$  times, we may boost the success probability to  $9/10$  by taking the pointwise median of the resulting estimates. However, from our construction in the proof of [Theorem 2.6](#), we have by picking  $\varepsilon$  small enough in the construction that there exists a distribution,  $\mathcal{D}$  such that:

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ d_K(\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{D}) \geq \frac{1}{4} \right\} \geq \frac{1}{3}$$

as all the distributions we construct have Kolmogorov distance greater than  $1/2$  between them. This yields the contradiction, proving the theorem.  $\square$

### 2.3 Estimation from Partial Observations

In this section we show how our results in the previous sections can be translated to the partial observation model introduced by [\[BMM15\]](#) defined below.

**Definition 2.8** (Partial Observation Data). Let  $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^k$  be  $k$  cumulative distribution functions with support  $[0, 1]$ , i.e.  $F_i(x) = 0 \forall x < 0$  and  $F_i(1) = 1$ . A sample  $(r, Y, Z)$  from a first-price auction with bid distributions  $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^k$  is generated as follows:

1. we, the observer, pick a price  $r \in [0, 1]$ , and let  $X_{k+1} = r$
2. generate  $X_i \sim F_i$  independently for all  $i \in [k]$ ,
3. observe a winner  $Z = \arg \max_{i \in [k+1]} X_i$ .

At first glance, it seems like the access to partial observation data is more restrictive than the access to the first-price auction data that we defined in [Definition 2.1](#). Nevertheless, we show that partial observations suffice to run the same estimation used in [Subsection 2.1](#).

**Theorem 2.9** (First-Price Auctions – Partial Observations). *Let  $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be  $n$  i.i.d. partially observed samples from the same first-price auction as per [Definition 2.8](#) and assume that the cumulative distribution functions  $F_i$  are continuous and admit Lipschitz-continuous densities  $f_i$  with constant  $L$ . Then, given  $p, \gamma \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(X_{i \in [k]} \leq p) \geq \gamma$ , there exists a polynomial-time estimation algorithm, that computes the cumulative distribution functions  $\hat{F}_i$  for  $i \in [k]$ , so that for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \gamma/2]$  it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \max_{x \in [p, 1]} \left| \hat{F}_i(x) - F_i(x) \right| \leq \varepsilon \right) \geq 1 - \delta$$

for all  $i \in [k]$  assuming that  $n = \Theta \left( \frac{k}{\gamma^6 \varepsilon^5} \log \left( \frac{k}{\gamma^2 \varepsilon \alpha} \right) \log \left( \frac{L}{\gamma^2 \varepsilon} \right) \right)$

*Proof.* Note that under the partial observation model, we can estimate  $\mathbb{P}(Y \geq x)$  for any fixed  $x$  by setting the reserve price to  $x$  (i.e., bidding  $x$ ) and counting the number of times that the planted bid wins the auction. More precisely, we can define

$$\hat{H}(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbf{1} \{Z_i = k + 1\}.$$

We can similarly define, for any given agent  $i$ , an estimator for the probability that the agent wins with price less than or equal to  $x$ :

$$\hat{H}_i(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \mathbf{1} \{Z_j = i \text{ at reserve price } 0\} - \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \mathbf{1} \{Z_j = i \text{ at reserve price } x\}.$$

By construction  $\hat{H}_i \rightarrow H_i$  and  $\hat{H} \rightarrow H$  where  $H_i$  and  $H$  are as defined earlier. Similarly to our strategy in the proof of [Theorem 2.3](#), let

$$U = \{\gamma + i \cdot \delta : i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \text{ and } \gamma + i \cdot \delta \leq 1\} \cup \{1\} \text{ and } V = H^{-1}(U) \text{ and } W = H_i^{-1}(U)$$

For convenience, define  $N = |U| \leq \delta^{-1}$ , and recall that  $k$  is the number of agents in the auction. Our first goal is to obtain a set of estimates  $\hat{v}_j \approx v_j$  for the quantiles of  $H$  and another set  $\hat{w}_j \approx w_j$  for the quantiles of each  $H_i$ . To accomplish this, we will run, for each  $u_j \in U$ ,  $T$  iterations of binary search between 0 and 1. In particular, we initialize  $\hat{v}_j^{(0)} = 1$  then, for each successive iteration  $t$ , a Hoeffding bound shows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \hat{H}(\hat{v}_j^{(t)}) - H(\hat{v}_j^{(t)}) \right| \geq \varepsilon_1/2 \right) < 2 \exp \left\{ -2 (\varepsilon_1/2)^2 n \right\}. \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \hat{H}_i(\hat{w}_j^{(t)}) - H_i(\hat{w}_j^{(t)}) \right| \geq \varepsilon_1/2 \right) < 2 \exp \left\{ -(\varepsilon_1/2)^2 n/2 \right\}. \quad (6)$$

We condition on the above events by taking a union bound over all agents, all search steps, and all points  $u_j \in U$ . Now, for each iteration  $t$  of the binary search:

1. If  $|\widehat{H}(\widehat{v}_i^{(t)}) - u_t| \leq \epsilon_1/2$ , then  $|H(\widehat{v}_i^{(t)}) - u_t| \leq \epsilon_1$ , so we terminate and set  $\widehat{v}_i = \widehat{v}_i^{(t)}$ ,
2. otherwise if  $\widehat{H}(\widehat{v}_i^{(t)}) - u_t > \epsilon_1/2$  then  $H(\widehat{v}_i^{(t)}) > u_t$  and we search the upper interval,
3. otherwise  $\widehat{H}(\widehat{v}_i^{(t)}) - u_t < -\epsilon_1/2$  and so  $H(\widehat{v}_i^{(t)}) < u_t$  and we search the lower interval.

We perform an analogous process to find the  $\widehat{w}_j$ . This ensures the correctness of the binary search, and setting  $T = \log(2L/\epsilon_1)$ , where  $L$  is a Lipschitz constant of  $H$  and all  $H_i$ , guarantees that after performing this search for each  $u_i$ , we will find  $\widehat{V}$  and  $\widehat{W}$  such that

$$|H(\widehat{v}_j) - u_j| \leq \epsilon_1 \quad \text{for all } j \in [|U|], \text{ and} \quad (7)$$

$$|H_i(\widehat{w}_j) - u_j| \leq \epsilon_1 \quad \text{for all } j \in [|U|] \text{ and } i \in [k] \quad (8)$$

$$\text{w.p. } 1 - 2TN \exp\{-2(\epsilon_1/2)^2\} - 2kTN \exp\{-(\epsilon_1/2)^2/2\}$$

In order to define our approximation of  $G_i$ , we will consider the list of indices  $X = V \cup W_i$ , i.e., the union of the estimated quantiles of  $H$  and  $H_i$ . Using Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |H(x_j) - \widehat{H}(x_j)| &\leq \beta \quad \text{for all } j \in [|X|], \text{ and} \\ |H_i(x_j) - \widehat{H}_i(x_j)| &\leq \beta \quad \text{for all } j \in [|X|], \text{ and} \\ \text{w.p. } 1 - 4kN \exp\{2n\beta^2\} &\geq 1 - \frac{4k}{\delta} \exp\{2n\beta^2\} \end{aligned}$$

We further condition on the above and define an estimate of  $G_i(x_j) = \int_{x_j}^1 \frac{1}{H(z)} dH_i(z)$ ,

$$\widehat{G}_i(x_j) = \sum_{s=j}^{|X|-1} \left( \widehat{H}_i(x_{s+1}) - \widehat{H}_i(x_s) \right) / \widehat{H}(x_s).$$

Using the mean value theorem (see Appendix A.1 for more detail),

$$\begin{aligned} |G_i(\widehat{v}_t) - \widehat{G}_i(\widehat{v}_t)| &\leq \frac{2}{\gamma} \cdot \sum_{s=1}^{|X|} |H_i(x_s) - \widehat{H}_i(x_s)| + \max_{s \in [|X|]} \left| \frac{1}{H(x_{s+1})} - \frac{1}{\widehat{H}(x_s)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{2|X|\beta}{\gamma} + \frac{\delta + 2 \cdot \epsilon_1 + \beta}{\gamma^2} \end{aligned}$$

We now extend our approximation from the set of points  $\{x_i\}$  to the entire interval  $[\rho, 1]$ . Note that for any  $x$  in this interval, there exists an  $x_h, x_{h+1} \in X$  such that  $x \in (x_h, x_{h+1}]$ . Furthermore, both  $G_i$  and  $\widehat{G}_i$  are monotonic in  $x$  by construction, and

$$|G_i(x_{h+1}) - G_i(x_h)| = \left| \int_{x_h}^{x_{h+1}} \frac{1}{H(z)} dH_i \right| \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot (\delta + 2\epsilon_1),$$

since the  $x_i$  are at least as close as the quantiles of  $H_i$ , while  $\frac{1}{H(z)} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}$  by assumption. Using this inequality and the monotonicity of  $G_i$  yields:

$$\begin{aligned} G_i(x) &\geq G_i(x_h) \geq \widehat{G}_i(x_{h+1}) - \frac{1}{\gamma}(\delta + 2\epsilon_1) - \frac{2|X|\beta\gamma + \delta + 2\epsilon_1 + \beta}{\gamma^2} \\ &\geq \widehat{G}_i(x_{h+1}) - \frac{(2|X|\gamma + 1)\beta + (\gamma + 1)(\delta + 2\epsilon_1)}{\gamma^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \widehat{G}_i(x) - \frac{4(k+1)\gamma\beta/\delta + 2\delta + 4\epsilon_1}{\gamma^2}$$

Analogously,  $G_i(x) \leq \widehat{G}_i(x) + \frac{4(k+1)\gamma\beta/\delta + 2\delta + 4\epsilon_1}{\gamma^2}$

Now, set:  $\delta = \frac{\gamma^2\epsilon}{6}$ ,  $\epsilon_1 = \frac{\gamma^2\epsilon}{24}$ , and  $\beta = \frac{\gamma\epsilon^2}{24(k+1)}$ , so that  $|\widehat{G}_i(x) - G_i(x)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$  with probability

$$1 - \frac{12}{\gamma^2\epsilon} \log\left(\frac{48L}{\gamma^2\epsilon}\right) \exp\left\{-\frac{\gamma^4\epsilon^2}{1152}n\right\} - \frac{12k}{\gamma^2\epsilon} \log\left(\frac{48L}{\gamma^2\epsilon}\right) \exp\left\{-\frac{\gamma^4\epsilon^2}{4608}n\right\} - \frac{24k}{\gamma^2\epsilon} \exp\left\{-\frac{\gamma^2\epsilon^4}{288(k+1)^2}n\right\}.$$

Thus, setting

$$n = \frac{4608(k+1)^2}{\gamma^4\epsilon^4} \log\left(\frac{3}{\alpha} \frac{24k}{\gamma^2\epsilon} \log\left(\frac{48L}{\gamma^2\epsilon}\right)\right)$$

makes this probability  $1 - \alpha$ . Now, the total number of samples required for this approach is  $O(N \cdot k \cdot T \cdot n)$ , concluding the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.10** (Inserting bids may change equilibria). As we highlighted above, using access to the partial observation data we can estimate the distributions  $H_i$  to within  $\epsilon$  error and thus apply a similar algorithm to the ordinary first-price setting. Observe, however, that by inserting arbitrary bids to get good estimates of the functions  $F_i$ , the econometrician can affect the bidding strategy of the agents and thus interfere with the equilibrium point of the first-price auction. This is not true for our model in [Definition 2.1](#), where the econometrician is a passive observer (in particular, observations do not interfere with the equilibrium of the agents) and hence the bid distributions can lead to an estimation of the value distributions as well (as we show in [Subsection 2.4](#)).

## 2.4 Estimation of Value Distributions

Theorems [2.2](#), [2.3](#), and [2.4](#) establish recovery results for the bid distribution of each agent. In a first-price auction at (Bayes-Nash) equilibrium, however, these bid distributions do not correspond to agents' value distributions. Instead, at equilibrium, each agent draws a value  $v_i \sim G_i(\cdot)$  and bids the best responses to other agents, i.e.,

$$\beta_i(v_i) = \arg \max_b u_i(b; v_i) := \arg \max_b (v_i - b) \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(b). \quad (9)$$

As discussed in the introduction, in our asymmetric IPV setting, we (a) cannot write an explicit form for the optimal bid for a given value; and (b) cannot derive smoothness results for the bid distribution from smoothness assumptions on the value distribution. In fact, a unique Bayes-Nash equilibrium is not even guaranteed to exist.

**Approach.** Lebrun [[Leb06](#)] provides the following characterization of Bayes-Nash equilibria for asymmetric first-price auctions, and shows that such equilibria exist and are unique under some (relatively mild) assumptions:

**Lemma 2.11** (Lebrun [[Leb06](#)]). *Suppose the agents' values are distributed according to the right-continuous cumulative distribution functions  $G_i(\cdot)$  with support  $[0, 1]$  and whose derivatives (i.e., the value density functions)  $g_i(\cdot)$  are locally bounded away from zero. Then, a set of strategies (bid functions)  $\alpha_i(\cdot) : [0, 1] \rightarrow$*

$[0, \infty)$  is a Bayesian equilibrium if and only if there exists an  $\eta \in [0, 1]$  such that the inverses  $\alpha_i(\cdot) = \beta_i^{-1}(\cdot)$  exist, are strictly increasing, and form a solution over  $[0, \eta]$  of the following system of differential equations:

$$\frac{d}{db} \log G_i(\alpha_i(b)) = \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \frac{-(n-2)}{\alpha_i(b) - b} + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{\alpha_j(b) - b} \right), \quad \alpha_i(0) = 0, \quad \alpha_i(\eta) = 1. \quad (10)$$

If bidders are not permitted to bid above their values, and if one of the following two conditions are met, then the set of strategies  $\beta_i(\cdot)$  represents a unique equilibrium:

- (i) The value distributions have an atom at zero, i.e.,  $G_i(0) > 0$ ,
- (ii) There exists  $\delta > 0$  such that the cumulative density function of the  $i$ -th agent's value is strictly log-concave over  $(0, \delta)$  for all  $i$ .

**Corollary 2.12.** Rearranging Equation (10) from Lemma 2.11 yields

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \frac{d}{db} \log G_j(\alpha_j(b)) = \frac{1}{\alpha_i(b) - b}, \quad \text{and in turn} \quad \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{f_j(b)}{F_j(b)} = \frac{1}{\alpha_i(b) - b}. \quad (11)$$

Since Lemma 2.11 guarantees that the inverse bidding strategies are strictly increasing at equilibrium, the inverse mapping theorem dictates that  $G_i(v) = F_i(\beta_i(v))$ . If the equilibrium strategies  $\beta_i(\cdot)$  were known, we could apply our results for the bid distributions to estimate  $G_i(v)$  directly. In our setting, however, we do not have access to the strategies  $\beta_i(\cdot)$ —in fact, a general closed form does not exist for asymmetric auctions.

Instead, we will use the characterization given by Equation (9) of the equilibrium bid as the best response to other bidders. In particular, since we have accurate estimates for each  $F_i(\cdot)$ , we can define the following empirical versions of each quantity introduced so far, including  $\widehat{G}_i$ , an estimate for the cumulative distribution functions of each agent's value:

$$\widehat{u}_i(b; v_i) = (v_i - b) \prod_{j \neq i} \widehat{F}_j(b), \quad \widehat{\beta}_i(v) = \arg \max_b \widehat{u}_i(b; v_i), \quad \widehat{G}_i(v) = \widehat{F}_i(\widehat{\beta}_i(v)). \quad (12)$$

Turning this into a formal argument requires tackling the following technical challenges:

1. Approximating the utility function via  $\widehat{u}_i(\cdot; v_i)$  and efficiently maximizing the estimated utility function to find the optimal bid.
2. Showing that the maximizer of the  $\widehat{u}_i(\cdot; v_i)$  is close to that of the true utility.
3. Bounding the combined error incurred from our empirical approximations.

We will start by tackling the above challenges in the effective-support regime. The following characterizes the setup as well as the additional assumptions used to estimate the value distribution:

**Assumption 2.13** (Value Estimation). We assume the preconditions of Lemma 2.11, as well as an upper bound on the density of the value distributions, i.e.,  $g_i(b) \leq \zeta$  for all  $i \in [k]$ .

**Definition 2.14** (Effective Support). In the effective-support setting, we are given  $(p, \gamma) \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\prod_{i \in [k]} F_i(p) \geq \gamma$ . This is identical to the effective-support setting for bid estimation, with the addition that  $p$  is pre-defined, since it is part of the estimation algorithm.

We are now prepared to tackle recovery of the valuation distribution in the effective-support regime. Our main result is captured in [Theorem 2.15](#) below. After proving the result, we will show how it straightforwardly extends to full-support estimation, in a similar manner to our bid estimation results.

**Theorem 2.15** (Estimation of Value Distributions – Effective Support). *Let  $\{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be  $n$  i.i.d. samples from the same first-price auction as per [Definition 2.1](#). Under the setup of [Definition 2.14](#), there exists a polynomial-time estimation algorithm that computes cumulative distribution functions  $\widehat{G}_i(\cdot)$  for  $i \in [k]$  with the following guarantee:*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{v \in [p, 1]} \left| \widehat{G}_i(v) - G_i(v) \right| &\leq \epsilon && \text{if } n = \widetilde{\Theta} \left( \frac{k^2 \zeta^2 L^6 \log(1/\delta)}{\gamma^{10} \epsilon^6} \right) \text{ and } F_i \text{ is } L\text{-Lipschitz} \\ D_L \left( \widehat{G}_i \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[p, 1]}, G_i \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[p, 1]} \right) &\leq \epsilon && \text{if } n = \widetilde{\Theta} \left( \frac{k^2 \zeta^2 \log(1/\delta)}{\gamma^{16} \epsilon^{12}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i \in [k]$ , where  $D_L(\cdot, \cdot)$  is distance in the Lévy metric.

**Remark 2.16** (Testing Lipschitzness). The first guarantee given by [Theorem 2.15](#) depends on the (global) Lipschitzness of the bid CDFs  $F_i$ . While efficiently testing global Lipschitzness of  $F_i$  from samples is impossible, if we have a specific  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  in mind, we can instead test

$$\widehat{L} = \max_{|x-y|=\epsilon_0} \frac{1}{\epsilon_0} \left( \left| \widehat{F}_i(x) - \widehat{F}_i(y) \right| + 2\epsilon \right).$$

This maximization can be done efficiently in  $n$  steps, since  $\widehat{F}_i$  is piecewise constant. Since we condition on accurate bid CDF estimation, we have that for any  $x$  and  $y$ ,

$$\left| \widehat{F}_i(x) - \widehat{F}_i(y) \right| \geq |F_i(x) - F_i(y)| - 2\epsilon,$$

and so  $\widehat{L} \geq \max_{|x-y|=\epsilon_0} \frac{1}{\epsilon_0} |F_i(x) - F_i(y)|$ , and so we can use  $\widehat{L}$  in place of  $L$  in the theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 2.15.* In this effective-support setup, [Theorem 2.3](#) guarantees that with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we can learn the bid CDFs on the interval  $[\beta_i(\rho), 1]$  up to additive error  $\epsilon_0$ , for any  $\epsilon_0 > 0$ , in  $n = \widetilde{\Theta} \left( \frac{\log(k/\delta)}{\gamma^4 \epsilon_0^2} \right)$  queries. We thus assume that we have CDF estimates  $\widehat{F}_i(\cdot)$  that are within  $\epsilon_0$  of the corresponding true CDFs in the effective support.

Our point of start is to show that we can estimate the approximate utility function efficiently. For each agent  $i$ , we can relabel each observed data point  $(Y, Z)$  as  $(Y, \mathbf{1}_{Z=i})$  and run our estimation procedure on the corresponding two-agent auction to get piecewise-constant  $\epsilon_0$ -approximations of  $\prod_{j \neq i} F_j(b)$  for all  $i \in [k]$ . Since  $v_i, b \in [0, 1]$ , we can condition on the event that  $\widehat{u}_i(\cdot, v_i)$  is an  $\epsilon_0$ -approximate estimate of the true utility function.

Now, the form of our estimate for  $\prod_{j \neq i} F_j(b)$  is piecewise constant (with  $n$  pieces, where  $n$  is the sample complexity of [Theorem 2.3](#)) and monotonically increasing in  $b$ . Meanwhile,  $(v_i - b)$  is strictly decreasing in  $b$  along any interval. We can thus exactly maximize  $\widehat{u}_i$  by evaluating it at  $n$  locations (i.e., the beginning of each piecewise-constant interval).

Next, define  $b^*$  and  $\widehat{b}$  to be the maximizer of  $u_i(\cdot; v_i)$  and  $\widehat{u}_i(\cdot; v_i)$  respectively over the interval  $[p, 1]$ . Since we have an  $\epsilon_0$ -approximation of utility within this interval,

$$\left| u_i(b^*; v_i) - u_i(\widehat{b}; v_i) \right| \leq 2\epsilon_0. \tag{13}$$

Our next goal is to translate this proximity in utility-space to proximity in parameter-space, i.e., to show that  $b^* \approx \hat{b}$ . To do so, we use the derivative of the utility function with respect to the bid, which is given by the following result:

**Lemma 2.17** (Derivative of utility function). *Fix any  $v_i \in [0, 1]$ , and let  $b^* = \beta_i(v_i)$  be the equilibrium bid for the  $i$ -th agent corresponding to value  $v_i$ . Let  $u_i(\cdot; v_i)$  denote the utility function as in (9). Then,*

$$\frac{d}{db} u_i(b; v) = (\alpha_i(b^*) - \alpha_i(b)) \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{f_j(b)}{F_j(b)} \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(b).$$

*Proof.* Recalling the definition of the utility function from (9),

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(b; v) &= (v - b) \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(b) \\ \frac{d}{db} u_i(b; v) &= - \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(b) + (v - b) \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(b) \prod_{k \neq j, i} F_k(b) \\ &= \left( (v - \alpha_i(b)) \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{f_j(b)}{F_j(b)} + (\alpha_i(b) - b) \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{f_j(b)}{F_j(b)} - 1 \right) \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(b). \end{aligned}$$

Observing that  $v_i = \alpha_i(b^*)$  and using [Corollary 2.12](#) concludes the proof.  $\square$

Now, returning to (13),

$$2\epsilon_0 \geq \left| \int_{\hat{b}}^{b^*} (\alpha_i(b^*) - \alpha_i(x)) \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha_i(x) - x} \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x) dx \right|. \quad (\text{Corollary 2.12}) \quad (14)$$

In order to bound  $|b^* - \hat{b}|$ , we need the following lower bound on the derivative  $\alpha'_i(x)$ :

**Lemma 2.18.** *Under the conditions of [Assumption 2.13](#), for all  $b \in [\rho, 1]$ ,*

$$\frac{d}{db} \log G_i(\alpha_i(b)) > L(b) \quad \text{where } L(b) := \frac{\alpha_i(b) - b}{(k-1)^2 \cdot \zeta}.$$

We defer the proof of [Lemma 2.18](#) to the Online Appendix (the proof is nearly identical to that of Lemma A-1 in [\[Leb06\]](#), with the exception that we keep better track of constants to get a non-zero lower bound), and state the corollary:

**Corollary 2.19.** *Under the conditions of [Lemma 2.18](#),*

$$\alpha'_i(b) = \frac{\gamma}{\zeta} \cdot \left( \frac{d}{db} \log G_i(\alpha_i(b)) \right) \geq \frac{\gamma}{(k-1)^2 \cdot \zeta^2} \cdot (\alpha_i(b) - b).$$

Now, let  $\bar{b} = (\hat{b} + b^*)/2$ . By positivity of the integrand in (14),

$$2\epsilon_0 \geq \left| \int_{\bar{b}}^{\hat{b}} (\alpha_i(x) - \alpha_i(\bar{b})) \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha_i(x) - x} \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x) dx \right|.$$

Using the intermediate value theorem, there exists  $z \in [\min(x, \bar{b}), \max(x, \bar{b})]$  so that

$$2\epsilon_0 \geq \left| \int_{\bar{b}}^{\hat{b}} \frac{(x - \bar{b}) \alpha'_i(z)}{\alpha_i(x) - x} \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x) dx \right| \geq \int_{\bar{b}}^{\hat{b}} \frac{\gamma |x - \bar{b}|}{(k-1)^2 \cdot \zeta^2} \cdot \frac{\alpha_i(z) - z}{\alpha_i(x) - x} \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x) dx.$$

Using our effective support definition and bid optimality,

$$(\alpha_i(z) - z) \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(z) \geq (\alpha_i(z) - p) \cdot \gamma \geq (z - p) \cdot \gamma \geq (\Delta/2) \cdot \gamma,$$

where  $\Delta = |\widehat{b} - b^*|$ . Thus, since  $\alpha_i(x) - x \leq 1$ ,

$$\frac{\alpha_i(z) - z}{\alpha_i(x) - x} \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x) \geq (\Delta/2) \cdot \gamma \cdot \left( \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x) / \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(z) \right) \geq (\Delta/2) \cdot \gamma^2$$

Returning to the integral,

$$2\epsilon_0 \geq \frac{\Delta \gamma^3}{2(k-1)^2 \cdot \zeta^2} \cdot \int_{\bar{b}}^{\widehat{b}} |x - \bar{b}| dx \geq \frac{\Delta \gamma^3}{2(k-1)^2 \cdot \zeta^2} \cdot \left( \frac{\Delta^2}{8} \right). \quad (15)$$

Thus, for any  $\epsilon_1 > 0$ , setting  $\epsilon_0 = \frac{\epsilon_1^3 \Gamma^3}{32k^2 \zeta^2}$  implies that  $\Delta < \epsilon_1$ .

We are now ready to bound the error in our estimate of the valuation distribution. We consider two cases: first, when the bid CDFs  $F_i(\cdot)$  satisfy a Lipschitz-like constraint; second, a more general setting where we only require a lower bound on the valuation densities  $g_i(\cdot)$ . In the first case, we learn the valuation distributions in Kolmogorov distance over the interval  $[\rho, 1]$ , whereas in the second case we learn in 1-Wasserstein distance.

In both cases, our estimate will be given by:

$$\widehat{G}_i(v) := \mathbf{1}\{v \in [p, 1]\} \cdot \widehat{F}_i(\widehat{b}(v))$$

**Case 1: Lipschitz bid CDF** In the first case, we assume that the cumulative distribution function of each bid distribution is  $L$ -Lipschitz continuous (note that any bid distribution with density bounded by  $L$  satisfies this). Then, for any  $v \in [p, 1]$ ,

$$\left| G_i(v) - \widehat{F}_i(\widehat{b}(v)) \right| \leq |G_i(v) - F_i(b(v))| + |F_i(\widehat{b}(v)) - F_i(b(v))| + \epsilon_0 \leq L \cdot \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_0 < 2L\epsilon_1,$$

where we recall that  $\widehat{G}_i(v) := \widehat{F}_i(\widehat{b}(v))$ . Thus, we define  $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon / (2L)$  so that

$$\sup_{v \in [p, 1]} \left| G_i(v) - \widehat{G}_i(v) \right| \leq \epsilon \text{ using } n = \widetilde{\Theta} \left( \frac{k^2 \zeta^2 \log(1/\delta)}{\gamma^{10} \epsilon_1^6} \right) = \widetilde{\Theta} \left( \frac{k^2 \zeta^2 L^6 \log(1/\delta)}{\gamma^{10} \epsilon^6} \right)$$

samples, which concludes the proof.

**Case 2: General case.** We can also obtain a convergence guarantee that is independent of the Lipschitz continuity of  $F_i$  by considering a slightly smaller interval  $[p + d, 1]$  for some  $d > 0$ . In this setting, the ‘‘best response’’ property of bids implies that, for any  $b \in [p + d, 1]$ ,

$$(\alpha_i(b) - b) \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(b) \geq (\alpha_i(b) - p) \cdot \gamma \geq (b - p) \cdot \gamma \geq d \cdot \gamma.$$

Thus from [Corollary 2.12](#),

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \frac{f_j(b)}{\widehat{F}_j(b)} = \frac{1}{\alpha_i(b) - b} \leq \frac{1}{d \cdot \gamma} \implies f_j(b) \leq \frac{1}{d \cdot \gamma} \text{ for all } j \in [k].$$

Using the same method as Case I (with  $L = 1/(d \cdot \gamma)$ ), we can guarantee that for  $d > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{v \in [p+d, 1]} \left| \widehat{G}_i(v) - G_i(v) \right| < \epsilon, \text{ as long as } n \in \tilde{\Theta} \left( \frac{k^2 \zeta^2 \log(1/\delta)}{\gamma^{16} d^6 \epsilon^6} \right). \quad (16)$$

Setting  $d = \epsilon$  concludes the proof of the Theorem.  $\square$

As a consequence of [Theorem 2.15](#), we can accurately estimate valuation distributions in Wasserstein distance when the bid densities are lower bounded:

**Theorem 2.20** (Estimation of Value Distributions – Full Support). *Let  $\{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be  $n$  i.i.d. samples from the same first-price auction as per [Definition 2.1](#). Under the setup of [Definition 2.14](#) and assuming  $|F_i(x) - F_i(y)| \geq \lambda|x - y|$  for all  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ , there exists a polynomial-time estimation algorithm that computes cumulative distribution functions  $\widehat{G}_i(\cdot)$  for  $i \in [k]$  with the following guarantee for all  $i \in [k]$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}(\widehat{G}_i(v), G_i(v)) &\leq \epsilon && \text{if } n = \tilde{\Theta} \left( \left( \frac{1024}{\lambda^{10} \epsilon^{10}} \right)^k \zeta^2 L^6 \log(1/\delta) \right) \text{ and } F_i \text{ is } L\text{-Lipschitz,} \\ \mathcal{W}(\widehat{G}_i(v), G_i(v)) &\leq \epsilon && \text{if } n = \tilde{\Theta} \left( \left( \frac{2048^2 \cdot (11/8)^{16} \cdot (11/3)^6}{\lambda^{16} \epsilon^{22}} \right)^k \zeta^2 \log(1/\delta) \right) \text{ otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We proceed identically to the proof of [Theorem 2.2](#). In particular, for any  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$H(\eta) = \prod_{j \in [k]} F_j(\eta) \geq (\lambda \cdot \eta)^k.$$

Set  $\gamma = (\lambda \cdot \eta)^k$  and we use the first case of theorem [Theorem 2.15](#), such that with

$$\tilde{\Theta} \left( \frac{k^2 \zeta^2 L^6 \log(1/\delta)}{\lambda^{10k} \cdot \eta^{10k} \cdot \eta^6} \right)$$

samples we can find estimates  $\widehat{G}_i$  for all  $i$  such that the additive error between  $\widehat{G}_i$  and  $G_i$  is at most  $\eta$  in the interval  $[\eta, 1]$ . From here an identical argument to that of the proof of [Theorem 2.2](#) (i.e., [Subsection 2.1.2](#)) shows that  $\mathcal{W}(\widehat{G}_i, G_i) \leq 2 \cdot \eta$ , after which setting  $\eta = \epsilon/2$  the first case in the theorem follows. For the second case, we use (16) with  $p = 8\eta/11$ ,  $d = 3\eta/11$ ,  $\gamma = (8\lambda\eta/11)^k$ , and  $\eta = \epsilon/2$ .  $\square$

### 3 Estimation from Second-price Auction Data

In this section, we will state and prove our main result for the estimation of bid distributions from second-price auction observations. Unlike the first-price-auction setting, our main result in this setting involves estimating the bid distributions under the *full-support* regime where we aim to obtain distributions approximating  $F_i$  up to small error in Kolmogorov distance. As in the first-price-setting, this incurs an exponential dependence on  $k$ . We leave the problem of estimation in the *effective-support* regime as an open problem for future work. (We do show in [Subsection 3.4](#) that if the econometrician can insert bids of their own, then even just the identity of the winner and an indicator of whether the reserve price was paid suffice to estimate bid distributions over the effective support [[Theorem 3.21](#)], using a very simple algorithm.) The identification of the

cumulative density functions,  $F_i$ , given access to the distribution of  $(Y, W)$  was previously established in [AH02] building on techniques from reliability theory [Mei81]. However, this is to our knowledge, the first result establishing non-parametric finite-sample recovery from observations of second-price-auction data. We now formalize our considered observation model:

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^k$  be  $k$  probability density functions on  $[0, 1]$ . An observation from the second-price selection model on  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^k$  is defined as follows:

1. First generate  $X_i \sim f_i$  independently for  $i \in [k]$
2. Define  $W := \arg \max_{i \in [k]} X_i$
3. Observe the tuple  $(Y, W)$  where  $Y := \max_{i \in [k] \setminus \{W\}} X_i$ .

We now state the assumptions on  $F_i$  required for our guarantees to hold:

**Assumption 3.2.** The distributions  $F_i$  admit densities  $f_i$  with  $\alpha \leq f_i \leq \eta$  for constants  $\alpha, \eta > 0$ .

Note that in comparison to [Theorem 2.2](#), we require an upper bound on the densities,  $f_i$ , in addition to the lower bound property used previously. Our main result in this setting is the following theorem where we establish efficient, finite sample recovery guarantees from second-price-auction data satisfying [Assumption 3.2](#):

**Theorem 3.3.** Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\mathbf{X} = \{(Y_i, W_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  denote  $n$  i.i.d observations from a Second-Price-Selection model ([Definition 3.1](#)) satisfying [Assumption 3.2](#). Then, it is possible to learn in polynomial time cumulative distribution functions  $\hat{F}_i$  satisfying:

$$\sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |\hat{F}_i(x) - F_i(x)| \leq \varepsilon \text{ with probability at least } 1 - \rho$$

as long as  $\varepsilon \leq e^{-C_{\eta, \alpha}^1 k}$  and  $n \geq \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{C_{\eta, \alpha}^2 k} \log 1/\rho$  for some absolute constants  $C_{\eta, \alpha}^1, C_{\eta, \alpha}^2$ .

In the rest of the section, we prove [Theorem 3.3](#). In [Subsection 3.1](#), we present a high level overview of our proof strategy where analogously to the first-price case, we derive a differential equation relating the densities,  $f_i$  to the distribution of  $(Y, W)$  ([Definition 3.1](#)) leading to a fixed point equation satisfied by the cumulative functions  $\{F_i\}$ . Subsequently, in [Subsection 3.2](#), we present a discretized version of the fixed point iteration that we analyze to prove our theorem. We carry out the formal analysis of our in [Subsection 3.3](#).

### 3.1 Approach

We now provide a high-level overview of our proof of [Theorem 3.3](#). For clarity, we will first outline the proof in the idealized population (infinite-sample) setting. In the next section, we formalize this outline and establish finite-sample guarantees.

We start by deriving a fixed point equation which plays a central part in our analysis. Note that in the population setting, we have access to the functions

$$G_i(x) = \mathbb{P}(W = i, Y \leq x). \tag{17}$$

For each  $G_i(x)$ , we can use the independence of the bid distributions  $F_i$  and some simple calculations to define a valid corresponding density:

$$g_i(x) = (1 - F_i(x)) \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(x) \prod_{l \neq i, j} F_l(x).$$

Rearranging and taking advantage of the product rule allows us to simplify this as

$$\prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x) = \int_0^x \frac{1}{1 - F_i(z)} g_i(z) dz.$$

Re-parameterizing the above by letting  $U_i^* = \prod_{j \neq i} F_j$ , we obtain the fixed point equation:

$$U_i^*(x) = \int_0^x \frac{1}{1 - H_i(U_i^*(z))} g_i(z) dz \quad \text{where } H_i(v) = \frac{\left( \prod_{j \neq i} v_j^{1/(k-1)} \right)}{v_i^{(k-2)/(k-1)}}$$

We divide the domain into smaller intervals and approximate  $\tilde{F}_i$  by a piecewise-constant function on each. The Banach fixed-point theorem [Ban22] is crucial to our analysis:

**Theorem 3.4** (Banach Fixed-Point Theorem [Ban22; Pat19]). *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space with mapping  $T : X \rightarrow X$  contractive with respect to  $d$ ; i.e there exists  $\rho < 1$  such that:*

$$\forall x, y \in X : d(T(x), T(y)) \leq \rho \cdot d(x, y).$$

*Then,  $T$  admits a unique fixed-point  $x^* \in X$ . Furthermore, for any  $x_0 \in X$ , the sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , defined by  $x_n := T(x_{n-1})$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , satisfies:*

$$\forall n \geq 0 : d(x_n, x^*) \leq \rho^n \cdot d(x_0, x^*).$$

Unfortunately, it turns out that the fixed point iteration just described is not contractive with respect to its input—instead, we proceed iteratively, starting with the origin and estimating  $\tilde{F}_i$  for each successive interval in turn. After solving for a set of intervals, we treat them as fixed, and construct a new fixed-point iteration for the next interval. We make this argument precise in the following sections. In doing so, the key technical difficulty faced by our approach is in the *amplification* of errors incurred at earlier stages of the algorithm into later stages. As we shall see, errors due to approximation, sampling or computation are compounded exponentially over the running of the algorithm (Lemma 3.11). Therefore, we use a careful data-based approach where samples are used to decide the widths of successive intervals, ensuring both that the fixed point equation remains contractive and crucially, that there are not too many stages where successive intervals are constructed (Lemma 3.17).

### 3.2 Fixed Point Definition

Here, we formally define the version of the fixed point iteration used in our algorithm. Recall that the CDFs of the bid generating distributions,  $F_i$ , satisfy:

$$\forall i \in [k] : U_i^*(x) := \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x) = \int_0^x \frac{1}{1 - F_i(z)} \cdot g_i(z) dz.$$

Recasting the above equation in terms of the functions,  $U_i^*$ , we obtain:

$$\forall i \in [k] : U_i^*(x) := \prod_{j \neq i} F_j(x) = \int_0^x \frac{g_i(z)}{1 - H_i(z)} dz \text{ with } H_i(z) = \frac{\prod_{j \neq i} (U_j^*(z))^{1/(k-1)}}{(U_i^*(z))^{(k-2)/(k-1)}}. \quad (\text{FP-CONT})$$

In our algorithm, we approximate the functions,  $U_i^*$ , by piecewise constant functions on intervals of width  $\delta$  (a parameter which we set later, in [PAR](#)) and approximate solutions to the above fixed-point equation. We will prove that the approximation errors as well as errors due to computational and statistical constraints remain small despite these choices.

In the finite sample setting, we do not have access to the precise population functions,  $G_i$  and hence, approximate them with their empirical counterparts:

$$\forall x \in [0, 1] : \widehat{G}_i(x) := \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{W_j = i, Y_j \leq x\}$$

Before running our main algorithm, we first compute (very) coarse approximations  $\widehat{U}_i(\cdot)$  to the functions  $U_i^*(\cdot)$ ; it turns out (see [Algorithm 2](#) and [Lemma 3.6](#)) that we can compute such loose approximations efficiently as a simple consequence of the DKW inequality [[DKW56](#)].

Our algorithm then operates in stages: we divide the interval  $[v, 1 - \theta]$  (we set  $v$  and  $\theta$  later, in [PAR](#)) into a finite number of “macro-intervals”, each of which contains a number of micro-intervals of width  $\delta$ . The macro-intervals are defined by endpoints  $v := x_0 < x_1 \cdots < x_T \leq 1 - \theta/2$ , where  $T$  and the width of each macro-interval are chosen dynamically based on observed data. Within each macro-interval  $[x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau]$  are  $\ell^{(\tau)}$  micro-intervals of width  $\delta$ , defined by endpoints  $x_{\tau-1} := x_{\tau,0} < x_{\tau,1} < \dots < x_{\tau,\ell^{(\tau)}} := x_\tau$ . Picking the endpoints  $\{x_\tau\}_{\tau \in [T]}$  requires balancing contractivity of the fixed-point iteration with the overall number of macro-intervals which determine the accuracy of the final solution. We formally describe our algorithm for computing the endpoints in [Algorithm 3](#). To ease notation in the remainder of the section, we use  $\Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)}$  to denote differentials of  $\widehat{G}_i$  across the grid points and extend the definition of  $x_{\tau,\ell}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \forall i \in [k], \tau \in [T], l \in [\ell^{(\tau)}] : \Delta_{i,l}^{(\tau)} &:= \widehat{G}_i(x_{\tau,l}) - \widehat{G}_i(x_{\tau,l-1}) \\ \forall \tau \in [T], \ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : x_{\tau,\ell} &:= x_{\tau-1} + \ell \cdot \delta. \end{aligned}$$

The resulting intervals define a discretization of the fixed-point equation ([FP-CONT](#)). As we previously discussed, our algorithm operates in stages: at stage  $\tau$ , we assume access to an estimate  $V_i^{(\tau)} \approx U_i^*(x_{\tau,0})$  from the previous stage (recall that  $x_{\tau,0} = x_{\tau-1,\ell^{(\tau-1)}}$  by definition). We instantiate  $U^{(\tau)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times \ell^{(\tau)}}$  where  $U_{i,l}^{(\tau)}$  is designed to approximate  $U_i^*(x_{\tau,l})$ . We estimate the elements of  $U^{(\tau)}$  via the following discretized fixed-point iteration:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}) &= \text{clip} \left( \sum_{m=1}^l \frac{1}{1 - H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} + V_i^{(\tau)}, \frac{1}{2\eta} \cdot \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l}), \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l}) \right) \\ H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}) &= \text{clip} \left( \frac{\prod_{j \neq i} (U_{j,m}^{(\tau)})^{\frac{1}{k-1}}}{(U_{i,m}^{(\tau)})^{\frac{k-2}{k-1}}}, \alpha x_{\tau,m}, \min(1 - \alpha(1 - x_{\tau,m}), \eta x_{\tau,m}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{FP})$$

In [\(FP\)](#),  $\widehat{U}_i(\cdot)$  are the aforementioned coarse approximations to  $U_i^*(\cdot)$ , and  $V_i^{(\tau)}$  is the estimate of  $U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})$  obtained by running  $L$  iterations of the fixed point iteration  $\phi^{(\tau-1)}$  on the previous

macro-interval (where  $L$  is set in (PAR)). We initialize the algorithm with

$$V_i^{(0)} := \widehat{G}_i(\nu).$$

We present a summary of the entire algorithm corresponding to [Theorem 3.3](#) in [Algorithm 1](#), and spend the remainder of this section proving that this algorithm yields an  $\varepsilon$ -approximation to  $U_i^*(\cdot)$  for all  $i \in [k]$ : The precise choices of our parameters are provided below:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &:= \frac{\varepsilon}{16\eta}, \quad \delta := \left(\frac{\alpha}{8\eta}\nu\right)^{32k}, \quad \varepsilon_g := \delta \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha\nu}{8\eta}\right)^{32k}, \quad L := \log(4/\varepsilon_g) \\ \nu &:= \min \left\{ \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\eta}\right)^{256}, \exp\left(-2^{32k}\left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)\log\left(\frac{2\eta}{\alpha}\right)\right), \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{4\eta}{\alpha}\right)^{16}}, \left(\frac{\alpha\varepsilon}{32\eta}\right)^{24} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{PAR})$$

The parameter  $\theta$  is chosen to be suitable small such that  $F_i(x)$  is well approximated by 0 when  $x \leq \theta$  and 1 when  $x \geq 1 - \theta$ . Hence, we only need to obtain good estimates in the range  $[\theta, 1 - \theta]$ . However, as shown in [Subsection 3.3.4](#), our estimation errors grow exponentially in the number of macro-intervals,  $T$  but drop rapidly as our start point decreases ([Lemma 3.11](#)). Consequently,  $\nu$  is picked to be significantly smaller than  $\theta$  to ensure our starting error is small. The parameters  $\delta$  and  $\varepsilon_g$  are then chosen small with respect to  $\nu$  to ensure the approximation errors caused by the discretization of our fixed point iteration and statistical errors from approximating the functions  $G_i(\cdot)$  with  $\widehat{G}_i$  remain small. Finally, the parameter which determines how many times we iterate our fixed point equation,  $L$ , is picked to control errors due to computational limits.

---

**Algorithm 1** Our algorithm for estimating value distributions in second-price auctions.

---

```

1: procedure ESTIMATE-SECOND-PRICE( $\{(Y_j, Z_j)\}_{j=1}^n, \delta, \alpha, \eta, \nu, \theta$ )
2:    $\{x_{\tau,m} : \tau \in [T], m \in [\ell^{(\tau)}]\} \leftarrow$  CONSTRUCT-MACRO-INTERVALS( $\{(Y_j, Z_j)\}_{j=1}^n, \delta, \alpha, \eta, \nu, \theta$ )
3:   for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  do
4:      $V_i^{(0)} := \widehat{G}_i(\nu)$ 
5:      $\widehat{U}_i(\cdot) \leftarrow$  COARSE-APPROXIMATE- $U(\{(Y_j, Z_j)\}_{j=1}^n, i)$  ▷ See Lemma 3.6
6:      $U_i(x) \leftarrow \widehat{G}_i(\nu) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{x \leq \nu\}$  ▷ Estimate of  $U_i^*$ 
7:   end for
8:   for  $\tau \in \{1, \dots, T\}$  do
9:     Initialize  $U^{(\tau)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times \ell^{(\tau)}}$  such that  $U_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \leftarrow \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,m})$  ▷ Initialize with coarse approx.
10:    Define  $\phi^{(\tau)} : \mathbb{R}^{k \times \ell^{(\tau)}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k \times \ell^{(\tau)}}$  as in (FP)
11:    repeat  $L$  times:  $U^{(\tau)} \leftarrow \phi^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})$ 
12:     $U_i(x) \leftarrow U_i(x) + \sum_{m=1}^{\ell^{(\tau)}} U_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{x \in [x_{\tau,m-1}, x_{\tau,m}]\}$  ▷ Extend our estimate
13:     $V_i^{(\tau+1)} \leftarrow U_{i,\ell^{(\tau)}}^{(\tau)}$ 
14:  end for
15:  return  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^k$ 
16: end procedure

```

---

### 3.3 Proof of [Theorem 3.3](#)

In this subsection, we prove [Theorem 3.3](#). The sole probabilistic condition we require is the empirical concentration of the functions  $\widehat{G}_i$  around  $G_i$  (defined in (17)), which we establish below:

**Lemma 3.5.** We have, for  $\varepsilon_g$  as defined in (PAR), as long as  $n \geq \log(2k/\rho)/(2\varepsilon_g^2)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \forall i \in [k] : \|\widehat{G}_i - G_i\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_g \right\} \geq 1 - \rho.$$

*Proof.* For each  $i \in [k]$  and  $j \in [n]$ , define the random variables,  $A_j^i := Y_j \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_j = i\} + \mathbf{1}\{Z_j \neq i\}$ . The CDFs of the  $A_j^i$  variables correspond to  $G_i$ , while their empirical CDFs correspond to  $\widehat{G}_i$ . The lemma thus follows from the DKW inequality [DKW56] and a union bound over  $i$ .  $\square$

For the the rest of the proof, we condition on the result of Lemma 3.5 and proceed as follows:

- In Subsection 3.3.1, we show the functions  $\widehat{U}_i$  in the definition of  $\phi^{(\tau)}$  (FP) (i.e., the coarse approximations of  $U_i^*$ ) may be efficiently estimated from data.
- In Subsection 3.3.2, we show how to construct the aforementioned data-driven micro- and macro-intervals using the functions  $\widehat{U}_i$ .
- Subsequently, in Subsection 3.3.3, we analyze the contractivity properties of  $\phi^{(\tau)}$  over each macro-interval, allowing application of Theorem 3.4.
- In Subsection 3.3.4, we show how errors incurred in early stages of the procedure are exponentially compounded for each new *macro-interval* requiring careful control over the number of such intervals,  $T$ .
- Finally, we bound  $T$  and prove Theorem 3.3 in Subsection 3.3.5.

### 3.3.1 Approximate Estimation

---

**Algorithm 2** Constructing macro- and micro-intervals for the fixed-point iteration.

---

- 1: **procedure** COARSE-APPROXIMATE- $U(\{(Y_j, Z_j)\}_{j=1}^n, i)$
  - 2:     **return**  $x \mapsto \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{1-Y_j} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_j = i, Y_j \leq x\}$
  - 3: **end procedure**
- 

Here we describe the construction of  $\widehat{U}_i$  used in (FP), ensuring the truncation range contains the true parameter values; i.e. we establish the following lemma:

**Lemma 3.6.** Let  $\widehat{U}_i : [0, 1 - \theta/4] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be monotonic functions defined as follows:

$$\widehat{U}_i(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{1-Y_j} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{W_j = i, Y_j \leq x\}.$$

Then, for all  $x, y \in [0, 1 - (\theta/4)]$  such that  $\max\{U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y), \widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y)\} \geq \left(\frac{\alpha\nu}{8\eta}\right)^{32k}$ , we have:

$$\frac{\alpha}{2}(U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y)) \leq \widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y) \leq 2\eta(U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y)).$$

*Proof.* Fix  $x, y$  satisfying the required constraints. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\widehat{U}^i(x) - \widehat{U}^i(y)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{1-Y} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{W = i, y < Y \leq x\}\right] \\ &= \int_x^y \frac{1}{(1-z)} \cdot (1 - F_i(z)) \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(z) \prod_{k \neq j, i} F_k(z) dz,\end{aligned}$$

and hence (since  $\alpha z \leq F_i(z) \leq \eta z$ ), we get:

$$\alpha(U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y)) \leq \mathbb{E}[\widehat{U}^i(x) - \widehat{U}^i(y)] \leq \eta(U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y)).$$

Now, we will show that the estimate  $U^i$  can be uniformly estimated for all  $i, x, y$ . For empirical analysis, we have by the integration by parts formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y) &:= \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{1-Y_j} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{W_j = i, y < Y_j \leq x\} \\ &= \left(\frac{\widehat{G}_i(y)}{1-y} - \frac{\widehat{G}_i(x)}{1-x}\right) - \int_y^x \frac{1}{(1-z)^2} \widehat{G}_i(z) dz.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have for the population counterparts:

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{U}^i(x) - \widehat{U}^i(y)] = \left(\frac{G_i(y)}{1-y} - \frac{G_i(x)}{1-x}\right) - \int_y^x \frac{1}{(1-z)^2} \cdot G_i(z) dz.$$

From the previous two displays (and conditioning on [Lemma 3.5](#)), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}|\widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y) - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{U}^i(x) - \widehat{U}^i(y)]| &\leq 2 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon_g}{\theta/4} + \int_y^x \frac{\varepsilon_g}{(\theta/4)^2} dz \\ &\leq (\theta/2) \cdot \frac{16\varepsilon_g}{\theta^2} + (x-y) \frac{16\varepsilon_g}{\theta^2} \leq \frac{32\varepsilon_g}{\theta^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get:

$$\alpha(U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y)) - \frac{32\varepsilon_g}{\theta^2} \leq \widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y) \leq \eta(U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y)) + \frac{32\varepsilon_g}{\theta^2}$$

By [PAR](#), this concludes the proof when  $U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y) \geq (\alpha\nu/8\eta)^{32k}$ . In the alternative case (i.e. when  $\widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y) \geq (\alpha\nu/8\eta)^{32k}$ ), we again get from the above equation:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y)) &\leq \widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y) + \frac{32\varepsilon_g}{\theta^2} \leq 2 \cdot (\widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y)) \\ \eta(U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y)) &\geq \widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y) - \frac{32\varepsilon_g}{\theta^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\widehat{U}_i(x) - \widehat{U}_i(y))\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof in this case as well.  $\square$

### 3.3.2 Defining Macro- and Micro-Intervals

We now describe our procedure for splitting up our estimation interval  $[v, 1 - \theta]$  into macro- and micro-intervals. Recall that the micro-intervals (of fixed length  $\delta$ ) define the intervals on which our approximation will be piecewise-constant, while the macro-intervals (consisting of collections of micro-intervals whose size is dynamically determined by data) define which groups of micro-intervals are estimated simultaneously in each stage (i.e., by the same fixed-point iteration ([FP](#))).

We construct these macro- and micro-intervals according to a few different considerations:

- The length of the micro-intervals  $\delta$  must be small enough to bound the approximation error of our estimates (we set  $\delta$  in (PAR));
- We set the length of the macro-intervals (dynamically) to ensure that the discretized version of fixed-point iteration remains contractive
- At the same time, we must ensure that the total number of macro-intervals,  $T$ , does not grow too rapidly, as estimation errors incurred in earlier stages of the algorithm are exponentially amplified in later stages.

We construct our micro- and macro-intervals in a recursive fashion, detailed in [Algorithm 3](#). The algorithm assumes access to the coarse approximations  $\widehat{U}_i$  to  $U_i^*$  for any  $i \in [k]$ —we established access to such approximations in the previous section ([Lemma 3.6](#)). In particular, starting from  $\nu$  as the first endpoint, we set the macro-interval length based on a worst-case estimate of the resulting fixed-point contractivity, obtained using the coarse approximations. This quantity which plays a crucial role in our algorithm design and subsequent analysis is defined below:

$$\forall \tau \in [T], \ell \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } x_{\tau, \ell} \leq 1 - \frac{\theta}{2} : \gamma_\ell^{(\tau)} := \max_{i \in [k]} 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \frac{x_{\tau, m}}{(1 - x_{\tau, m})^2} \cdot \Delta_{i, m}^{(\tau)}.$$

---

**Algorithm 3** Constructing macro- and micro-intervals for the fixed-point iteration.

---

```

1: procedure CONSTRUCT-MACRO-INTERVALS( $\{(Y_j, Z_j)\}_{j=1}^n, \delta, \alpha, \eta, \nu, \theta$ )
2:    $x_0 \leftarrow \nu, \tau \leftarrow 1$ 
3:   Let  $\widehat{U}_i(\cdot) \leftarrow \text{COARSE-APPROXIMATE-}U(\{(Y_j, Z_j)\}_{j=1}^n, i)$  for all  $i \in [k]$     $\triangleright$  See Lemma 3.6
4:   while  $x_{\tau-1} < 1 - \theta$  do
5:     Number of micro-intervals in this macro-interval:
6:      $\ell^{(\tau)} \leftarrow \max \left\{ \ell \in \mathbb{N} : x_{\tau, \ell} \leq \min(2 \cdot x_{\tau-1}, 1 - \theta/2) \text{ and } \gamma_\ell^{(\tau)} \leq 1/4 \right\}$ .
7:      $x_\tau \leftarrow x_{\tau, \ell^{(\tau)}}, \tau \leftarrow \tau + 1$ 
8:   end while
9:    $T \leftarrow \tau - 1$ 
10:  return  $\{x_t\}_{t \in [T]}$ 
11: end procedure

```

---

### 3.3.3 Contractivity Analysis

We now establish contractivity of the mappings,  $\phi^{(\tau)}$  in [Lemma 3.8](#), allowing us to apply Banach's fixed point theorem ([Theorem 3.4](#)). In particular, we establish contractivity in the infinity-norm; i.e, for some  $\rho < 1$ :

$$\left\| \phi^{(\tau)}(U) - \phi^{(\tau)}(U') \right\|_\infty \leq \rho \|U - U'\|_\infty \text{ where } \|M\|_\infty = \max_{i,j} |M_{i,j}|.$$

Denoting the Jacobian of  $\phi^{(\tau)}$  by  $J_{\phi^{(\tau)}}(\cdot)$ , we consequently bound its 1-norm defined below:

$$\left\| J_{\phi^{(\tau)}}(U^{(\tau)}) \right\|_1 := \max_{i,l} \sum_{\substack{j \in [k] \\ m \in [\ell^{(\tau)}]}} \left( J_{\phi^{(\tau)}}(U^{(\tau)}) \right)_{(i,l),(j,m)} = \max_{i,l} \sum_{\substack{j \in [k] \\ m \in [\ell^{(\tau)}]}} \left| \frac{\partial \phi_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})}{\partial U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} \right|$$

Before proceeding further, we first establish that  $\phi^{(\tau)}$  is a valid fixed-point iteration, in the sense that it maps a compact set  $S$  to itself:

**Lemma 3.7.** *The mapping  $\phi^{(\tau)}$  maps the set  $S^{(\tau)}$  defined as follows onto itself:*

$$S^{(\tau)} := \left\{ U^{(\tau)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times \ell^{(\tau)}} : \frac{1}{2\eta} \cdot \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l}) \leq U_{i,l}^{(\tau)} \leq \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l}) \text{ and } U_{i,l}^{(\tau)} \leq U_{i,l+1}^{(\tau)} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* The first constraint follows from [FP](#) while the second follows from the fact that  $\phi^\tau$  is a clipping of a monotonic function onto a monotonically growing range ([Lemma 3.6](#)).  $\square$

Having established the existence of a set  $S^{(\tau)}$  such that  $\phi^{(\tau)} : S^{(\tau)} \rightarrow S^{(\tau)}$ , we can proceed to bounding the contractivity of the fixed-point iteration itself:

**Lemma 3.8.** *We have, for all  $U^{(\tau)} \in S^{(\tau)}$ ,*

$$\|J_{\phi^{(\tau)}}(U^{(\tau)})\|_1 \leq \max_{i \in [k]} 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell^{(\tau)}} \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)}.$$

*Proof.* First, define the function  $\Gamma_{i,l}^{(\tau)}$  as

$$\Gamma_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}) := \sum_{m=0}^l \frac{1}{1 - H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} + V_i^{(\tau)},$$

so that  $\phi_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}) = \text{clip}(\Gamma_{i,l}^{(\tau)}, \frac{1}{2\eta} \cdot \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l}), \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l}))$ . Direct calculation shows for any  $i, j, l, m$ ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} \Gamma_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}) = \frac{1}{(1 - H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}))^2} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \cdot \frac{\partial H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})}{\partial U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}}. \quad (18)$$

It remains to compute the partial derivative  $\partial H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}) / \partial U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}$ , which (from [FP](#)) corresponds to

$$\frac{\partial H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})}{\partial U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} = \left( \frac{1}{k-1} - \mathbf{1}\{i=j\} \right) \frac{1}{U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}). \quad (19)$$

Now, combining [\(18\)](#) and [\(19\)](#) allows us to consider a single term in the Jacobian of  $\phi^{(\tau)}$ :

$$\left| \frac{\partial \phi_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})}{\partial U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\partial \Gamma_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})}{\partial U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{k-1} - \mathbf{1}\{i=j\} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})}{(1 - H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}))^2} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \cdot \frac{1}{U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} \right|.$$

By construction (i.e., by the clipping in [FP](#)),  $H_{i,m}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)}) \leq \min(\eta \cdot x_{\tau,m}, 1 - \alpha(1 - x_{\tau,m}))$ , and so:

$$\left| \frac{\partial \phi_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})}{\partial U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} \right| \leq \frac{\eta}{\alpha^2} \cdot \left| \frac{1}{k-1} - \mathbf{1}\{i=j\} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \right|.$$

Now, note that  $U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}$  is either equal to  $\widehat{U}_j(x_{\tau,m})$  (at initialization), or it is the output of  $\phi_{j,m}^{(\tau)}$ . As a result (again, by the clipping construction in (FP)), we must have (also using our approximation result from Lemma 3.6)

$$U_{j,m}^{(\tau)} \geq \frac{1}{2\eta} \widehat{U}_j(x_{\tau,m}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{4\eta} U_j^*(x_{\tau,m}).$$

We will also need the following Lemma relating the functions  $U_i^*(\cdot)$  across agents:

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $U_i^*(\cdot)$  be as defined in (FP-CONT). Then, for all  $i, j \in [k]$  and for any  $x, y \in [0, 1]$  with  $x > y$ , we have that:*

$$\left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^3 (U_j^*(x) - U_j^*(y)) \leq U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y) \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^3 (U_j^*(x) - U_j^*(y)).$$

*Proof.* Algebraic manipulation of (FP-CONT) and Assumption 3.2—full proof in Appendix B.1.  $\square$

Applying both of these results to the Jacobian entry and applying Lemma 3.6 again,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial \phi_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(U^{(\tau)})}{\partial U_{j,m}^{(\tau)}} \right| &\leq 4 \cdot \frac{\eta}{\alpha^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^4 \cdot \left| \frac{1}{k-1} - \mathbf{1}\{i=j\} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{U_i^*(x_{\tau,m})} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \right| \\ &\leq 8 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \left| \frac{1}{k-1} - \mathbf{1}\{i=j\} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, summing the previous equation over all  $j, m$  yields:

$$\|J_{\phi^{(\tau)}}\|_1 \leq \max_{i \in [k]} 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell^{(\tau)}} \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)}.$$

$\square$

As a direct consequence of this Lemma, we can show that  $\phi^{(\tau)}(\cdot)$  is  $1/4$ -contractive for our particular setting of  $\delta$ :

**Corollary 3.10.** *For any  $\tau \in [T]$ , let  $\phi^{(\tau)}$  be as defined in (FP) and  $\delta$  as set in (PAR),*

$$\|J_{\phi^{(\tau)}}\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

### 3.3.4 Error Propagation

One consequence of our stagewise estimation procedure is that error incurred during the early stages compounds into the later stages. In this subsection, we establish a bound on the rate at which this error grows—in particular, we show that the total error incurred over the course of our entire estimation procedure is at most exponential in the number of *macro-intervals*,  $T$ .

We first introduce some notation. Let  $\widetilde{U}^{(\tau)}$  be estimates resulting from running the fixed-point iteration  $\phi^{(\tau)}$  (FP)  $L$  times—the results of the last subsection (in particular, Corollary 3.10) imply the existence of a unique fixed-point  $\widetilde{U}^{(\tau)}_{\text{fixed}}$  for which

$$\|\widetilde{U}^{(\tau)} - \widetilde{U}^{(\tau)}_{\text{fixed}}\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{4^L}. \quad (20)$$

We will compare the estimates  $\tilde{U}^{(\tau)}$  to the “ground-truth” variables  $\bar{U}^{(\tau)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times \ell^{(\tau)}}$ , defined as:

$$\forall \tau \in [T], i \in [k], l \in \ell^{(\tau)} : \bar{U}_{i,l}^{(\tau)} := U_i^*(x_{\tau,l}).$$

With this notation in hand, we can bound the total error incurred from our stage-wise estimation algorithm, which we accomplish via induction:

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  be the number of macro-intervals in our estimation algorithm. Then,*

$$\max_{\tau \in [T]} \left\| \tilde{U}^{(\tau)} - \bar{U}^{(\tau)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq 2^T (2\eta\nu)^k.$$

*Proof.* We will prove the lemma by induction on the number of macro intervals. Concretely, we will prove the following claim via induction on  $\tau$ :

$$\left\| \tilde{U}^{(\tau)} - \bar{U}^{(\tau)} \right\| \leq 2^{\tau} (2\eta\nu)^k. \quad (\text{IND})$$

We first establish the base case:

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{G}_i(\nu) - U_i^*(\nu)| &\leq \varepsilon_g + |G_i(\nu) - U_i^*(\nu)| \\ &= \varepsilon_g + \int_0^{\nu} (1 - (1 - F_i(z))) \cdot \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(z) \prod_{m \neq i,j} F_m(z) dz \\ &\leq \varepsilon_g + \eta\nu \int_0^{\nu} \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(z) \prod_{m \neq i,j} F_m(z) dz \\ &\leq \varepsilon_g + \eta\nu U_i^*(\nu) \leq (2\eta\nu)^k \end{aligned}$$

For the induction step, suppose (IND) is true for all intervals up to  $\tau - 1$ . From (20), it suffices to bound the error between  $U_{\text{fixed}}^{(\tau)}$  and  $\bar{U}^{(\tau)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{U}^{(\tau)} - U_{\text{fixed}}^{(\tau)}\|_{\infty} &\leq \|\bar{U}^{(\tau)} - \phi^{(\tau)}(\bar{U}^{(\tau)})\|_{\infty} + \|\phi^{(\tau)}(\bar{U}^{(\tau)}) - U_{\text{fixed}}^{(\tau)}\|_{\infty} \\ &= \|\bar{U}^{(\tau)} - \phi^{(\tau)}(\bar{U}^{(\tau)})\|_{\infty} + \|\phi^{(\tau)}(\bar{U}^{(\tau)}) - \phi^{(\tau)}(U_{\text{fixed}}^{(\tau)})\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \|\bar{U}^{(\tau)} - \phi^{(\tau)}(\bar{U}^{(\tau)})\|_{\infty} + \|\bar{U}^{(\tau)} - U_{\text{fixed}}^{(\tau)}\|_{\infty} / 4 \\ \|\bar{U}^{(\tau)} - U_{\text{fixed}}^{(\tau)}\|_{\infty} &\leq \frac{4}{3} \|\bar{U}^{(\tau)} - \phi^{(\tau)}(\bar{U}^{(\tau)})\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

For the RHS, we have for fixed  $i \in [k], \ell \in [\ell^{(\tau)}]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bar{U}_{i,\ell}^{(\tau)} - (\phi^{(\tau)}(\bar{U}^{(\tau)}))_{i,\ell} \right| &= \left| \bar{U}_{i,\ell} - \sum_{l=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{1 - H_{i,l}^{(\tau)}(\bar{U}^{(\tau)})} \Delta_{i,l}^{(\tau)} - V_i^{(\tau)} \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{x_{\tau-1}}^{x_{\tau,\ell}} \frac{1}{1 - F_i(z)} \cdot g_i(z) dz + U_i^*(x_{\tau-1}) - \sum_{l=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{1 - F_i(x_{\tau,l})} \Delta_{i,l}^{(\tau)} - V_i^{(\tau)} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{x_{\tau-1}}^{x_{\tau,\ell}} \frac{1}{1 - F_i(z)} \cdot g_i(z) dz - \sum_{l=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{1 - F_i(x_{\tau,l})} \Delta_{i,l}^{(\tau)} \right| + \left| U_i^*(x_{\tau-1}) - V_i^{(\tau)} \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \left| \int_{x_{\tau-1}}^{x_{\tau,\ell}} \frac{1}{1-F_i(z)} \cdot g_i(z) dz - \sum_{l=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{1-F_i(x_{\tau,l})} \Delta_{i,l}^{(\tau)} \right| + \left\| \tilde{U}^{(\tau-1)} - \bar{U}^{(\tau-1)} \right\|_{\infty}. \quad (22)$$

The second term in the above expression is bounded by our induction hypothesis—for the first term, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{x_{\tau-1}}^{x_{\tau,\ell}} \frac{1}{1-F_i(z)} \cdot g_i(z) dz - \sum_{l=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{1-F_i(x_{\tau,l})} \Delta_{i,l}^{(\tau)} \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{l=1}^{\ell} \int_{x_{\tau,l-1}}^{x_{\tau,l}} \frac{1}{1-F_i(z)} \cdot g_i(z) dz - \frac{1}{1-F_i(x_{\tau,l})} (\widehat{G}_i(x_{\tau,l}) - \widehat{G}_i(x_{\tau,l-1})) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{l=1}^{\ell} \int_{x_{\tau,l-1}}^{x_{\tau,l}} \left( \frac{1}{1-F_i(z)} - \frac{1}{1-F_i(x_{\tau,l})} \right) \cdot g_i(z) dz \right| + \\ &\quad \left| \sum_{l=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{1-F_i(x_{\tau,l})} (\widehat{G}_i(x_{\tau,l}) - \widehat{G}_i(x_{\tau,l-1}) - (G_i(x_{\tau,l}) - G_i(x_{\tau,l-1}))) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^{\ell} \int_{x_{\tau,l-1}}^{x_{\tau,l}} \frac{(F_i(x_{\tau,l}) - F_i(z))}{(1-F_i(z))(1-F_i(x_{\tau,l}))} \cdot g_i(z) dz + \frac{8\varepsilon_g \ell^{(\tau)}}{\alpha\theta} \\ &\leq \frac{4\eta\delta}{(\alpha\theta)^2} \int_{x_{\tau,0}}^{x_{\tau,\ell}} g_i(z) dz + \frac{8\varepsilon_g \ell^{(\tau)}}{\alpha\theta} \\ &\leq \frac{4\eta\delta}{(\alpha\theta)^2} + \frac{8\varepsilon_g \ell^{(\tau)}}{\alpha\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Eqs. (20) and (21) to (23) conclude the induction step with (PAR) and (IND).  $\square$

### 3.3.5 Bounding the Number of Macro Intervals

We now turn to the most technical component of our proof of [Theorem 3.3](#), namely bounding  $T$  (the number of macro-intervals in our algorithm). In [Lemma 3.17](#), we employ a potential function argument and track the growth of  $U_i^*$  at the end points of the macro-intervals  $\{x_{\tau}\}_{\tau \in [T]}$  to argue that the total number of such intervals must be bounded.

**Preliminaries.** Before proving [Lemma 3.17](#), we establish a few preliminary results. Our first proves establishes a threshold beyond which the functions  $U_i^*$  are lower bounded by a constant.

**Lemma 3.12.** *We have:*

$$\forall i \in [k], x \in \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{4\eta k}, 1 \right] : U_i^*(x) \geq \frac{3}{4}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $X_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F_i$ . Then, by the union bound:  $\mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists i : X_i \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4\eta k} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ , concluding the proof.  $\square$

Our second result is an upper bound on the densities of the “densities”  $g_i(\cdot)$ .

**Lemma 3.13** (Bounding the density of  $g_i(\cdot)$ ). *Under [Assumption 3.2](#), we have that for all  $i \in [k]$  and all  $x \in [0, 1]$ , the density  $g_i$  satisfies:*

$$g_i(x) \leq \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha}.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in [0, 1]$  and let  $i^* = \arg \max_{i \in [k]} F_i(x)$ . Then, for any  $i \in [k]$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} g_i(x) &= (1 - F_i(x)) \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(x) \prod_{\ell \neq i, j} F_\ell(x) \leq \eta(1 - F_i(x)) \sum_{j \neq i} \prod_{\ell \neq i, j} F_\ell(x) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\eta^2}{\alpha}\right) \cdot (1 - F_{i^*}(x)) \sum_{j \neq i} \prod_{\ell \neq i, j} F_\ell(x) \leq \left(\frac{\eta^2}{\alpha}\right) \cdot (1 - F_{i^*}(x)) \sum_{j \neq i} \prod_{\ell \neq i, j} F_{i^*}(x) \\ &= (k-1) \left(\frac{\eta^2}{\alpha}\right) (1 - F_{i^*}(x)) (F_{i^*}(x))^{k-2} \leq \left(\frac{\eta^2}{\alpha}\right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{k-1}\right)^{k-2} \leq \frac{\eta^2}{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is [Assumption 3.2](#), and the second is  $(k-1)(1-x)x^{k-2} \leq 1 \forall k \geq 2$ .  $\square$

Our next three results prove coarse niceness properties on the macro-intervals constructed by [Algorithm 3](#). The first proves that [Algorithm 3](#) constructs a finite number of intervals and hence, terminates in polynomial time from our settings of  $\delta$  ([PAR](#)).

**Lemma 3.14** (Macro-intervals are non-empty). *Running [Algorithm 3](#) with our particular parameters ([PAR](#)) yields a set of non-empty macro-intervals that cover the interval  $[v, 1 - \theta]$ . That is,*

$$\ell^{(\tau)} > 0 \forall \tau \in [T] \quad \text{and} \quad x_T \geq 1 - \theta.$$

*Proof.* First, from [Algorithm 3](#), we have that  $x_{\tau,0} < 1 - \theta$  (otherwise the algorithm terminates). Furthermore, we have  $x_{\tau,0} + \delta < 2x_{\tau,0}$ , since  $x_{\tau,0} > v > \delta$  from our definition of  $\delta$  and  $v$  ([PAR](#)). Similarly,  $x_{\tau,0} + \delta < 1 - \theta/2$  since  $x_{\tau,0} < 1 - \theta$  and  $\delta < \theta/2$  (again, by ([PAR](#))).

It only remains to show that  $\gamma^{(\tau)}(1)$  as defined in Line 8 of [Algorithm 3](#) is less than  $1/4$ . From [Lemmas 3.6](#) and [3.13](#), our bounds on  $\varepsilon_g, \theta, \delta$  ([PAR](#)) and the fact that  $U_i^*(v) \geq (\alpha v)^{k-1}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1^{(\tau)} &:= \max_{i \in [k]} 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot \frac{x_{\tau-1} + \delta}{(1 - x_{\tau-1} - \delta)^2} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [k]} 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot \frac{x_{\tau-1} + \delta}{(1 - x_{\tau-1} - \delta)^2} \cdot (\widehat{G}_i(x_{\tau-1} + \delta) - \widehat{G}_i(x_{\tau-1})) \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [k]} 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot \frac{x_{\tau-1} + \delta}{(1 - x_{\tau-1} - \delta)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta^2 \delta}{\alpha} + 2\varepsilon_g\right) \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [k]} 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{U_i^*(v)} \cdot \frac{1 + \delta}{(\theta/2 - \delta)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta^2 \delta}{\alpha} + 2\varepsilon_g\right) < \frac{1}{4} \end{aligned}$$

establishing the first claim. Note that the previous argument also establishes the second claim as if  $x_T < 1 - \theta$ , a new macro-interval exists.  $\square$

The next lemma lower bounds the value of our contractivity proxy,  $\gamma_{\ell^{(\tau)}}^{(\tau)}$ , for intervals,  $[x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau]$  where  $x_\tau$  is not too large either with respect to  $x_{\tau-1}$  or the upper threshold  $1 - \theta/2$ . We will subsequently establish in the proof of [Lemma 3.17](#) that most intervals satisfy this condition and such intervals guarantee substantial growth in the potential functions employed in [Lemma 3.17](#).

**Lemma 3.15.** *Consider the context of our interval-construction algorithm ([Algorithm 3](#)). We have:*

$$\forall \tau \in [T] \text{ s.t. } x_{\tau-1, \ell^{(\tau)+1}} \leq \min(2x_{\tau-1}, 1 - \theta/2) : \gamma_{\ell^{(\tau)}}^{(\tau)} \geq \frac{1}{8}.$$

*Proof.* We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{\ell^{(\tau)}}^{(\tau)} &= \max_{i \in [k]} 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell^{(\tau)}} \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \\
&= \max_{i \in [k]} 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \left( \sum_{m=1}^{\ell^{(\tau)+1}} \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} - \frac{x_{\tau,\ell^{(\tau)+1}}}{(1-x_{\tau,\ell^{(\tau)+1})^2} \Delta_{i,\ell^{(\tau)+1}}^{(\tau)} \right) \\
&\geq \gamma_{\ell^{(\tau)+1}}^{(\tau)} - 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot \frac{1-\theta/4}{(\theta/4)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta^2\delta}{\alpha} + 2\varepsilon_g\right) \\
&\geq \gamma_{\ell^{(\tau)+1}}^{(\tau)} - 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot \frac{1-\theta/4}{(\theta/4)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta^2\delta}{\alpha} + 2\varepsilon_g\right) \\
&\geq \gamma_{\ell^{(\tau)+1}}^{(\tau)} - 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{U_i^*(\nu)} \cdot \frac{1-\theta/4}{(\theta/4)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta^2\delta}{\alpha} + 2\varepsilon_g\right) \geq \frac{1}{8}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from [Lemma 3.13](#) and noting  $\delta < \theta/4$  and  $x_T \leq 1 - \theta/2$  and the next two from [Lemma 3.6](#), our bounds on  $\varepsilon_g, \delta, \theta$  ([PAR](#)) and observing  $U_i^*(\nu) \geq (\alpha\nu)^{k-1}$ .  $\square$

The final preliminary result guarantees that the conclusion of [Lemma 3.6](#) holds for all intervals  $[x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau]$  constructed by [Algorithm 3](#) and will be used to guarantee large potential growth for intervals satisfying the conclusion of [Lemma 3.15](#).

**Lemma 3.16.** *Consider the context of our interval-construction algorithm ([Algorithm 3](#)). We have:*

$$\forall \tau \in [T], i \in [k] : U_i^*(x_\tau) - U_i^*(x_{\tau-1}) \geq \frac{1}{2048} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^{10} \cdot \theta \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha\nu}{2}\right)^{k-1}.$$

*Proof.* To start, suppose  $\tau \in [T]$ . We prove the lemma in three cases:

**Case 1:**  $x_{\tau-1, \ell^{(\tau)+1}} \leq \min(2x_{\tau-1}, 1 - \theta/2)$ . [Lemma 3.15](#) implies  $\gamma_{\ell^{(\tau)}}^{(\tau)} \geq 1/8$ . We have for some  $i$  from the facts that  $x_{\tau,m} < 1 - \theta/2$  for all  $m \in [\ell^{(\tau)}]$  and  $\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1}) \geq \widehat{G}_i(\nu) \geq (1 - \eta\nu)(\alpha\nu)^{k-1} - \varepsilon_g$  along with our parameter settings ([PAR](#)):

$$64 \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \frac{1}{(\alpha\nu)^{k-1}} \frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell^{(\tau)}} \frac{1}{(1-x_{\tau,m})} \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \geq 16 \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell^{(\tau)}} \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \geq \frac{1}{8}$$

Re-arranging the above and applying [Lemmas 3.9, 3.15](#) and [B.1](#) yields for all  $j \in [k]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^4 (U_j^*(x_\tau) - U_j^*(x_{\tau-1})) &\geq 2\eta(U_i^*(x_\tau) - U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})) \\
&\geq \widehat{U}_i(x_\tau) - \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1}) \geq \frac{1}{1024} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^6 \cdot \theta \cdot (\alpha\nu)^{k-1}
\end{aligned}$$

proving the claim in this case.

**Case 2:**  $x_{\tau-1, \ell^{(\tau)+1}} > 2x_{\tau-1}$ . As  $x_{\tau-1} \geq \nu$ ,  $x_\tau \geq \frac{3}{2}x_{\tau-1}$  from our setting of  $\delta$  and the claim follows:

$$U_i^*(x_\tau) - U_i^*(x_{\tau-1}) = \int_{x_{\tau-1}}^{x_\tau} \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(z) \prod_{m \neq i, j} F_m(z) dz \geq (k-1)\alpha \int_0^{\frac{\nu}{2}} (\alpha z)^{k-2} dz \geq \frac{(\alpha\nu)^{k-1}}{2^{k-1}}.$$

**Case 3:**  $x_{\tau-1, \ell(\tau)+1} > 1 - \theta/2$ . Note that [Lemma 3.15](#) and [Algorithm 3](#) imply  $\tau = T$ ,  $x_{\tau-1} < 1 - \theta$  and  $x_\tau + \delta \geq 1 - \theta/2$ . We obtain from our choice of  $\delta$  that  $x_\tau \geq 1 - (3\theta)/4$ . Furthermore, since  $x_{\tau-1} < 1 - \theta$ , we have from [Lemma 3.12](#) and the constraint on  $\varepsilon$  in [Theorem 3.3](#):

$$\begin{aligned} U_i^*(x_\tau) - U_i^*(x_{\tau-1}) &\geq U_i^*\left(1 - \frac{3\theta}{4}\right) - U_i^*(1 - \theta) = \int_{1-\theta}^{1-\frac{3\theta}{4}} \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(z) \prod_{m \neq i, j} F_m(z) dz \\ &\geq \alpha \int_{1-\theta}^{1-\frac{3\theta}{4}} \sum_{j \neq i} \prod_{m \neq i, j} F_m(z) dz \geq \alpha \int_{1-\theta}^{1-\frac{3\theta}{4}} (k-1) U_i^*(1 - \theta) dz \geq \frac{\alpha\theta}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

A key observation behind our proof is that when  $x_{\tau,0}$  is smaller than an appropriately chosen constant  $c_{\eta, \alpha}$ , the rate of growth of  $U_i^*$  is doubly exponential, in that

$$U_i^*(x_{\tau+1,0}) \geq U_i^*(x_{\tau,0})^{1 - \frac{1}{2(k-1)}}.$$

This rate of growth allows us to bound  $T$ . Hence, the rate of growth is *doubly exponential* before  $c_{\eta, \theta}$  allowing the bound on  $T \approx \log_2(1/\nu) + k \log \log(1/\nu)$  while the initial error scales is at most  $\nu^k$ . With [Lemma 3.11](#), a simple post-processing step proves [Theorem 3.3](#). Auxiliary results needed in the proof are included in [Appendix B.1](#).

**Lemma 3.17.** *We have:*

$$T \leq 2(k-1) \log \log(1/(\alpha\nu)) + \log_2(1/\nu) + 2^{20} \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^{14} (k^2 \log(2\eta/\alpha) + k \log_2(2/\theta)).$$

*Proof.* To bound  $T$ , we break  $[\nu, 1 - \theta]$  into three segments and handle each separately:

$$I_1 : \left[ \nu, \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\eta}\right)^{32} \right], I_2 : \left[ \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\eta}\right)^{32}, 1 - \frac{1}{4\eta k} \right], \text{ and } I_3 : \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{4\eta k}, 1 - \frac{\theta}{2} \right].$$

Before we proceed, we prove a simple claim allowing us to restrict ourselves to intervals,  $[x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau]$  such that  $\gamma_{\ell(\tau)}^\tau$  is large ( $> 1/8$ ).

**Claim 3.18.** *We have:*

$$|S| \leq \log_2(4/\nu) \text{ where } S := \left\{ \tau : \gamma_{\ell(\tau)}^\tau \geq \frac{1}{8} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Consider  $\tau \in S$ . Then, we have from [Lemma 3.15](#) that either  $x_\tau \geq 1 - \theta$  ( $\tau = T$  as [Algorithm 3](#) now terminates) or  $x_{\tau, \ell(\tau)+1} \geq 2x_{\tau-1}$ . In the second case, we get:

$$x_{\tau, \ell(\tau)+1} = x_\tau + \delta \geq 2x_{\tau-1} \implies x_\tau \geq \left(2 - \frac{\delta}{x_{\tau-1}}\right) \cdot x_{\tau-1} \geq x_\tau \geq \left(2 - \frac{\delta}{\nu}\right) \cdot x_{\tau-1}.$$

Letting  $T_S = |S \setminus \{T\}|$ , we get by iterating the above inequality and noting that  $x_\tau$  are monotonic:

$$1 \geq \left(2 - \frac{\delta}{\nu}\right)^{T_S} \cdot \nu$$

and hence, [PAR](#) yields:

$$T_S \leq \frac{1}{\log_2(2 - \delta/\nu)} \cdot \log_2(1/\nu) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \delta/\nu} \cdot \log_2(1/\nu) \leq \left(1 + 2 \cdot \frac{\delta}{\nu}\right) \cdot \log_2(1/\nu) \leq \log_2(2/\nu).$$

Noting that  $|S| \leq T_S + 1$  concludes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

**Case 1:**  $I_1$ . We restrict ourselves to the intervals  $[x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau] \subset I_1$  where  $\gamma_{\ell(\tau)}^{(\tau)} \geq 1/8$ . From the definition of  $\gamma_{\ell(\tau)}^{(\tau)}$ , there exists some  $i \in [k]$  such that:

$$16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell(\tau)} \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \geq \frac{1}{8}$$

$$U_i^*(x_{\tau-1}) \geq (\alpha x_{\tau-1})^{k-1} \implies x_{\tau-1} \leq \frac{U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})^{1/(k-1)}}{\alpha}$$

and as a result, we obtain from [Lemmas 3.6, 3.16](#) and [B.1](#):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{8} &\leq 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot \frac{2x_{\tau-1}}{(1-x_\tau)} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell(\tau)} \frac{1}{(1-x_{\tau,m})} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \\ &\leq 32 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})^{1/(k-1)}}{(1-x_\tau)} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell(\tau)} \frac{1}{(1-x_{\tau,m})} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \\ &\leq 512 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^8 \cdot \frac{1}{U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})^{(k-2)/(k-1)}} \cdot (U_i^*(x_\tau) - U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Re-arranging the above, two applications of [Lemma 3.9](#) with the fact  $U_j^*(x) \leq (\eta x)^{k-1}$ :

$$j \in [k] : U_j^*(x_\tau) \geq \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\eta}\right)^{14} \cdot U_j^*(x_{\tau-1})^{(k-2)/(k-1)} \geq U_j^*(x_{\tau-1})^{1-\frac{1}{2(k-1)}}.$$

Defining  $S_1 := \{\tau : [x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau] \subset I_1 \text{ and } \gamma_{\ell(\tau)}^{(\tau)} \geq 1/8\}$ ,  $T_1 := |S_1|$  and  $\tau_1^* := \max S_1$ , we get by a recursive application of the above inequality for all  $j \in [k]$ :

$$e^{-(k-1)} \geq U_j^*(x_{\tau_1^*}) \geq (U_j^*(x_0))^{(1-\frac{1}{2(k-1)})^{T_1}} \geq (\alpha\nu)^{(k-1)(1-\frac{1}{2(k-1)})^{T_1}}.$$

Iteratively taking logs,

$$\exp\left\{-\frac{T_1}{2(k-1)}\right\} \log(\alpha\nu) \geq 1 \implies T_1 \leq 2(k-1) \log \log(1/(\alpha\nu)).$$

**Case 2:**  $I_2$ . As before, we restrict to intervals  $[x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau] \subset I_2$  with  $\gamma_{\ell(\tau)}^{(\tau)} \geq 1/8$ . Noting that  $1-x_\tau \geq 1/(4\eta k)$ , we have from [Lemmas 3.6, 3.16](#) and [B.1](#) for some  $i \in [k]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{8} &\leq 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot \frac{2x_{\tau-1}}{(1-x_\tau)} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell(\tau)} \frac{1}{(1-x_{\tau,m})} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \\ &\leq 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot 8\eta k \cdot \sum_{m=1}^{\ell(\tau)} \frac{1}{(1-x_{\tau,m})} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \\ &\leq 1024k \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^8 \cdot \frac{1}{U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})} \cdot (U_i^*(x_\tau) - U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Re-arranging the above inequality and two applications of [Lemma 3.9](#) yield:

$$\forall j \in [k] : U_j^*(x_\tau) - U_j^*(x_{\tau-1}) \geq \frac{1}{8192k} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^{11} \cdot U_i^*(x_{\tau-1}) \geq \frac{1}{8192k} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^{14} \cdot U_j^*(x_{\tau-1}).$$

Define  $S_2 := \{\tau : [x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau] \subset I_2 \text{ and } \gamma_{\ell(\tau)}^{(\tau)} \geq 1/8\}$ ,  $T_2 := |S_2|$  and  $\tau_2^* := \max S_2$  as before. As  $x_{\tau-1} \geq (\eta/2\alpha)^{32}$  for all  $\tau \in S_2$ , recursively applying the above inequality yields:

$$1 \geq U_j^*(x_{\tau_2^*}) \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{8192k} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^{14}\right)^{T_2} U_j^* \left(\left(\frac{\alpha}{2\eta}\right)^{32}\right).$$

Again, noting  $U_j^*(x) \geq (\alpha x)^{k-1}$  and taking logs, the current case follows:

$$1 \geq \exp \left\{ \frac{T_2}{16384k} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^{14} \right\} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\eta}\right)^{64(k-1)} \implies T_2 \leq 2^{20} k^2 \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^{14} \log(2\eta/\alpha).$$

**Case 3:**  $I_3$ . We start by subdividing  $I_3$  into  $r$  subintervals  $\{I_{3,p} := [1 - 2^p\theta, 1 - 2^{p-1}\theta]\}_{p=0}^r$ . Note  $r \leq \log_2(2/\theta) + 1$ . We now bound the number of intervals in each of these sub-intervals and restrict ourselves to intervals  $[x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau] \subset I_{3,p}$  for some  $p$  with  $\tau < T$ . Note this excludes at most  $2(r+1)$  intervals. For one such interval  $[x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau] \in I_{3,p}$ , note that  $\gamma_{\ell(\tau)}^{(\tau)} \geq 1/8$  from [Lemma 3.15](#) and the definition of  $I_3$ . Similarly, we have for some  $i$  using [Lemmas 3.6, 3.12, 3.16](#) and [B.1](#):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{8} &\leq 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell(\tau)} \frac{x_{\tau,m}}{(1-x_{\tau,m})^2} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \\ &\leq 16 \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^6 \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1})} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell(\tau)} \frac{1}{(1-x_{\tau,m})(2^{p-1}\theta)} \cdot \Delta_{i,m}^{(\tau)} \\ &\leq \frac{256}{2^{p-1}\theta} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^7 \cdot (U_i^*(x_\tau) - U_i^*(x_{\tau-1})) \end{aligned}$$

which yields:

$$U_i^*(x_\tau) - U_i^*(x_{\tau-1}) \geq \frac{2^{p-1}\theta}{2048} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^7 \implies \forall j \in [k] : U_j^*(x_\tau) - U_j^*(x_{\tau-1}) \geq \frac{2^{p-1}\theta}{2048} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^{10}.$$

Again, defining  $S_{3,p} = \{\tau < T : [x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau] \subset I_{3,p}\}$ ,  $T_{3,p} := |S_{3,p}|$ , we have from the above:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{3,p} &\leq \frac{2048}{2^{p-1}\theta} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^{10} \left( U_i^*(1 - 2^{p-1}\theta) - U_i^*(1 - 2^p\theta) \right) \\ &= \frac{2048}{2^{p-1}\theta} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^{10} \cdot \int_{1-2^p\theta}^{1-2^{p-1}\theta} \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(x) \prod_{q \neq i,j} F_q(x) dx \\ &\leq \frac{2048}{2^{p-1}\theta} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^{10} \cdot (\eta k \cdot 2^{p-1}\theta) \leq 2048k \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^{11}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up over  $p$ , we get that:

$$T_3 := \sum_{p=0}^r T_{3,p} \leq 4096k \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^{11} \log_2(2/\theta).$$

Finally, [Claim 3.18](#), accounting for intervals  $[x_{\tau-1}, x_\tau] \subsetneq I_j$  for all  $j \in [3]$  and the previous three cases establish the lemma as:

$$T \leq T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + 2(r+1) + \log_2(4/v) + 2.$$

□

### 3.3.6 Completing the Proof of Theorem 3.3

To complete the proof of Theorem 3.3, we have from Lemmas 3.11 and 3.17 and our setting of the parameter,  $\nu$ , that

$$\|\bar{U} - \tilde{U}\|_\infty \leq 2^T (2\eta\nu)^k \leq (2\eta\nu)^{k/8} \leq (\alpha \cdot \varepsilon / 32\eta)^{2k}.$$

We now recover estimates of  $F_i$  from estimates of  $U_i^*$ . Note, when  $x \leq \theta$ ,  $F_i(x) \leq \varepsilon/16$  and hence, 0 is suitable in this range. Likewise, when  $x \geq 1 - \theta$ ,  $F_i(x) \geq 1 - \varepsilon/16$  and 1 is correspondingly accurate. For the final case, assume  $\theta \leq x \leq 1 - \theta$ . We will first estimate  $F_i$  on the grid points,  $x_{\tau,l}$ . Suppose now that  $x = x_{\tau,l}$  for some  $\tau, l$ . We have:

$$U_i^*(x) \geq \int_0^x \sum_{j \neq i} f_j(z) \prod_{m \neq i,j} F_m(z) dz \geq (k-1)\alpha^{k-1} \int_0^x z^{k-2} dz \geq \left(\frac{\alpha\varepsilon}{16}\right)^{k-1}.$$

And, as a consequence, we get:  $(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{16}) \leq \frac{U_i^*(x)}{\tilde{U}_{i,l}^{(\tau)}} \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{16})$ . Defining our estimate:

$$\hat{F}_i(x) := \prod_{j \neq i} (\tilde{U}_{j,l}^{(\tau)})^{1/(k-1)} / \left( (U_{i,l}^{(\tau)})^{(k-2)/(k-1)} \right)$$

we get by noting that  $F_i(x) = \frac{\prod_{j \neq i} (U_j^*(x))^{1/(k-1)}}{(U_i^*(x))^{(k-2)/(k-1)}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_i(x) &\leq F_i(x) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{16}\right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{16}\right)^{-1} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) \cdot F_i(x) \\ \hat{F}_i(x) &\geq F_i(x) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{16}\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{16}\right)^{-1} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) \cdot F_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for any  $\theta \leq x \leq 1 - \theta$ , there exists  $x_{\tau,l}$  such that  $|x - x_{\tau,l}| \leq \delta$ . And we have:

$$\frac{|F_i(x) - \hat{F}_i(x_{\tau,l})|}{F_i(x)} \leq \frac{|F_i(x) - F_i(x_{\tau,l})| + |F_i(x_{\tau,l}) - \hat{F}_i(x_{\tau,l})|}{F_i(x_{\tau,l}) - |F_i(x_{\tau,l}) - F_i(x)|} \leq \frac{\delta\eta + (\varepsilon/4)F_i(x_{\tau,l})}{F_i(x_{\tau,l}) - \delta\eta} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

from our setting of  $\delta$  and  $\theta$ . This concludes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## 3.4 Estimation from Partial Observations

Finally, we explore a second-price analogue of the ‘‘partial observability’’ setting (introduced by Blum, Mansour, and Morgenstern [BMM15]) that we studied in the context of first-price auctions in Section 2.3. In particular, in this setting we observe the winner of each auction and a binary indicator of whether the reserve price was triggered, but not the price that the winner pays for the auctioned good. On the other hand, as in [BMM15], in this setting the econometrician is given the ability to set the reserve price (or equivalently, insert bids into the auction). We formally define the setting below:

**Definition 3.19** (Partial Observation Data – Second-price). Let  $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^k$  be  $k$  cumulative distribution functions with support  $[0, 1]$ , i.e.  $F_i(x) = 0 \forall x < 0$  and  $F_i(1) = 1$ . A sample  $(r, Y, Z)$  from a first-price auction with bid distributions  $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^k$  is generated as follows:

1. we, the observer, pick a price  $r \in [0, 1]$ , and let  $X_{k+1} = r$
2. generate  $X_i \sim F_i$  independently for all  $i \in [k]$ ,

3. observe a winner  $Z = \arg \max_{i \in [k+1]} X_i$  and an indicator  $Q$  indicating whether the reserve price  $r$  was triggered.

We again operate in the effective-support setting (cf. [Theorem 2.3](#)), and—that is, we a tuple  $p, \gamma \in [0, 1]$  such that for all  $j \in [k]$ ,  $\prod_{l \neq j} F_l(p) \geq \gamma$ . In other words, the transaction price of the auction will be less than  $p$  with probability at least  $\gamma$ .

It turns out that in this seemingly limited observation model, a very simple algorithm suffices for recovering agents' value distributions. We begin with the Lemma demonstrating pointwise recovery of the bid distributions for any  $x \in [p, 1]$ :

**Lemma 3.20.** *Fix any  $x \in [p, 1]$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Using  $n$  samples from the we can obtain as estimate  $\widehat{F}_{j \in [k]}(x)$  satisfying, for all  $j \in [k]$ ,*

$$\left| \widehat{F}_j(x) - F_j(x) \right| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - \delta,$$

as long as  $n \geq \frac{48}{\gamma \epsilon^2} \log(2k/\delta)$ .

*Proof.* First, suppose we set the reserve price of the auction to  $x$ , and define the random variable  $Z_j$  as the indicator of whether either (a) agent  $j$  won the auction and the reserve price was triggered; or (b) no one won the auction and the reserve price was triggered. By construction (and since (a) and (b) are disjoint),

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_j = 1) = \mathbb{P}(X_j \geq x, X_{-j} \leq x) + \mathbb{P}(X_{[k]} \leq x) = (1 - F_j(x)) \prod_{l \neq j} F_l(x) + \prod_{l \in [k]} F_l(x) = \prod_{l \neq j} F_l(x).$$

Thus, applying a (multiplicative) Chernoff bound combined with the lower bound  $\prod_{l \neq j} F_l(x) \geq \gamma$  given by our effective support assumption,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_j^{(i)} - \prod_{l \neq j} F_l(x) \right| \geq \epsilon \cdot \prod_{l \neq j} F_l(x) \right) \leq 2 \exp \{ -\epsilon^2 \gamma n / 3 \}$$

Now, by our effective support assumption, as long as  $k \geq 2$ ,

$$\widehat{F}_j(x) := \frac{\prod_{l \in [k]} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n Z_j^{(i)} \right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}}{\left( \sum_{i=1}^n Z_j^{(i)} \right)} \leq \frac{(1 + \epsilon)^{k/(k-1)} \prod_{l \in [k]} F_l(x)}{(1 - \epsilon) \prod_{l \neq j} F_l(x)} \leq (1 + 4\epsilon) F_j(x)$$

and an identical argument for the lower bound shows that  $|\widehat{F}_j(x) - F_j(x)| \leq 4\epsilon$ . Applying a union bound over all agents completes the proof.  $\square$

We can use this result to construct piecewise-constant approximations of  $F_j(x)$  that is  $\epsilon$ -close to the true bid distributions:

**Theorem 3.21.** *Assume the partially observed second-price setting, and suppose the cumulative density functions  $F_{[k]}$  are all Lipschitz-continuous with Lipschitz constant  $L$ . For any pair  $p, \gamma \in [0, 1]$  that define an effective support, we can find piecewise-constant functions  $\widehat{F}_j(\cdot)$  satisfying*

$$\sup_{x \in [p, 1]} \left| \widehat{F}_j(x) - F_j(x) \right| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - \delta,$$

using  $n = \Theta \left( \frac{k \log(k/\epsilon) \log(L/\epsilon)^2}{\epsilon^3 \gamma} \right)$  samples from the partially observed second-price model.

Given [Lemma 3.20](#), we can use the exact binary search and estimation procedure from [Subsection 2.3](#) to prove [Theorem 3.21](#)—we give the full proof in [Appendix B.2](#).

## 4 Conclusion

In this work, we presented efficient methods for estimating first- and second-price auctions under independent (asymmetric) private values and partial observability. Our methods come with convergence guarantees that are uniform in that their error rates do not depend on the bid/value distributions being estimated. These methods and the corresponding finite-sample guarantees build on a long line of work in Econometrics that establishes either identification results, or estimation results under restrictive assumptions such as symmetry or full bid observability.

## 5 Acknowledgements

This work is supported by NSF Awards CCF-1901292, DMS-2022448 and DMS2134108, a Simons Investigator Award, the Simons Collaboration on the Theory of Algorithmic Fairness, a DSTA grant, the DOE PhILMs project (DE-AC05-76RL01830), an Open Philanthropy AI Fellowship and a Microsoft Research-BAIR Open Research Commons grant.

## References

- [AH02] Susan Athey and Philip A Haile. “Identification of standard auction models”. In: *Econometrica* 70.6 (2002), pp. 2107–2140.
- [AH06] Susan Athey and Philip Haile. “Empirical models of auctions”. In: (2006).
- [AH07] Susan Athey and Philip A Haile. “Nonparametric approaches to auctions”. In: *Handbook of econometrics* 6 (2007), pp. 3847–3965.
- [ALS11] Susan Athey, Jonathan Levin, and Enrique Seira. “Comparing open and sealed bid auctions: Evidence from timber auctions”. In: *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126.1 (2011), pp. 207–257.
- [Ban22] Stefan Banach. “Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales”. In: *Fund. Math.* 3 (1922), pp. 133–181. ISSN: 0016-2736.
- [BCD20] Johannes Brustle, Yang Cai, and Constantinos Daskalakis. “Multi-item mechanisms without item-independence: Learnability via robustness”. In: *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*. 2020, pp. 715–761.
- [BMM15] Avrim Blum, Yishay Mansour, and Jamie Morgenstern. “Learning valuation distributions from partial observation”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Vol. 29. 1. 2015.
- [BMR97] Laura H Baldwin, Robert C Marshall, and Jean-Francois Richard. “Bidder collusion at forest service timber sales”. In: *Journal of Political Economy* 105.4 (1997), pp. 657–699.
- [BY03] Patrick Bajari and Lixin Ye. “Deciding between competition and collusion”. In: *Review of Economics and statistics* 85.4 (2003), pp. 971–989.
- [CPV03] Sandra Campo, Isabelle Perrigne, and Quang Vuong. “Asymmetry in First-Price Auctions with Affiliated Private Values”. In: *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 18.2 (2003), pp. 179–207. ISSN: 08837252, 10991255.

- [DKW56] A. Dvoretzky, J. Kiefer, and J. Wolfowitz. "Asymptotic minimax character of the sample distribution function and of the classical multinomial estimator". In: *Ann. Math. Statist.* 27 (1956), pp. 642–669. ISSN: 0003-4851.
- [DP96] Stephen G Donald and Harry J Paarsch. "Identification, estimation, and testing in parametric empirical models of auctions within the independent private values paradigm". In: *Econometric Theory* (1996).
- [DPR03] S Donald, H Paarsch, and Jacques Robert. "An Empirical Model of Multi-Unit Sequential, Ascending-Price Auctions". In: *Document de Travail, University of Iowa* (2003).
- [GPV00] Emmanuel Guerre, Isabelle Perrigne, and Quang Vuong. "Optimal nonparametric estimation of first-price auctions". In: *Econometrica* 68.3 (2000), pp. 525–574.
- [Hai01] Philip A Haile. "Auctions with resale markets: An application to US forest service timber sales". In: *American Economic Review* 91.3 (2001), pp. 399–427.
- [HHS03] Philip Haile, Han Hong, and Matthew Shum. *Nonparametric tests for common values at first-price sealed-bid auctions*. 2003.
- [HMS13] Yingyao Hu, David McAdams, and Matthew Shum. "Identification of first-price auctions with non-separable unobserved heterogeneity". In: *Journal of Econometrics* 174.2 (2013), pp. 186–193.
- [Kra11] Elena A. Krasnokutskaya. "Identification and Estimation of Auction Models with Unobserved Heterogeneity". In: *The Review of Economic Studies* 78 (2011), pp. 293–327.
- [Leb06] Bernard Lebrun. "Uniqueness of the equilibrium in first-price auctions". In: *Games and Economic Behavior* (2006).
- [LOV95] Jean-Jacques Laffont, Herve Ossard, and Quang Vuong. "Econometrics of first-price auctions". In: *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* (1995), pp. 953–980.
- [LV93] Jean Jacques Laffont and Quang Vuong. "Structural econometric analysis of descending auctions". In: *European Economic Review* 37.2-3 (1993), pp. 329–341.
- [LX20] Yao Luo and Ruli Xiao. "Identification of auction models using order statistics". In: *Available at SSRN 3599045* (2020).
- [Mba17] Eric Mbakop. *Identification of auctions with incomplete bid data in the presence of unobserved heterogeneity*. Tech. rep. Working paper, Northwestern University, 2017.
- [Mei81] Isaac Meilijson. "Estimation of the lifetime distribution of the parts from the autopsy statistics of the machine". In: *Journal of Applied Probability* (1981), pp. 829–838.
- [MM13] Konrad Menzel and Paolo Morganti. "Large sample properties for estimators based on the order statistics approach in auctions". In: *Quantitative Economics* 4.2 (2013).
- [Mor11] Paolo Riccardo Morganti. "Estimating Auction Models from Transaction Prices with Extreme Value Theory". In: (2011).
- [Nor02] R. Norvaiša. "Chain rules and  $p$ -variation". In: *Studia Math* 149 (2002), pp. 197–238.
- [Paa92] Harry J Paarsch. "Deciding between the common and private value paradigms in empirical models of auctions". In: *Journal of econometrics* 51.1-2 (1992), pp. 191–215.
- [Pat19] Vittorino Pata. *Fixed point theorems and applications*. Vol. 116. Unitext. La Matematica per il 3+2. Springer, Cham, 2019, pp. xvii+171. ISBN: 978-3-030-19669-1.

## A Omitted Proofs for First-Price Auctions

### A.1 Omitted Calculations from Proof of Theorem 2.9

We further condition on the above and define an estimate of  $G_i(x_j) = \int_{x_j}^1 \frac{1}{H(z)} dH_i(z)$ ,

$$\widehat{G}_i(x_j) = \sum_{s=j}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1} \left( \widehat{H}_i(x_{s+1}) - \widehat{H}_i(x_s) \right) / \widehat{H}(x_s).$$

Using the mean value theorem, there exists a set of points  $\{\zeta_j\}$  with  $\zeta_j \in (x_j, x_{j+1}]$  and

$$G_i(x_j) = \int_{x_j}^1 \frac{1}{H(z)} dH_i(z) = \sum_{s=j}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1} \frac{H_i(x_{s+1}) - H_i(x_s)}{H(\zeta_s)}.$$

We first bound the difference between our piecewise estimate and the true  $G_i$  on the set  $X$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |G_i(\widehat{v}_t) - \widehat{G}_i(\widehat{v}_t)| &= \left| \sum_{s=j}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1} \frac{H_i(x_{s+1}) - H_i(x_s)}{H(\zeta_s)} - \sum_{s=j}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1} \frac{\widehat{H}_i(x_{s+1}) - \widehat{H}_i(x_s)}{\widehat{H}(x_s)} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{s=j}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1} \frac{H_i(x_{s+1}) - H_i(x_s)}{H(\zeta_s)} - \sum_{s=j}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1} \frac{\widehat{H}_i(x_{s+1}) - \widehat{H}_i(x_s)}{H(\zeta_s)} \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \sum_{s=j}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1} \frac{\widehat{H}_i(x_{s+1}) - \widehat{H}_i(x_s)}{H(\zeta_s)} - \sum_{s=j}^{|\mathcal{X}|-1} \frac{\widehat{H}_i(x_{s+1}) - \widehat{H}_i(x_s)}{\widehat{H}(x_s)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\gamma} \cdot \sum_{s=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} |H_i(x_s) - \widehat{H}_i(x_s)| + \max_{s \in [|\mathcal{X}|]} \left| \frac{1}{H(x_{s+1})} - \frac{1}{\widehat{H}(x_s)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|\beta}{\gamma} + \frac{\delta + 2 \cdot \epsilon_1 + \beta}{\gamma^2} \\ &\leq \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|\beta}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \max_{s \in [|\mathcal{X}|]} |H(\zeta_s) - \widehat{H}(x_s)| \end{aligned}$$

### A.2 Proof of Lemma 2.18

We will proceed similarly to the proof of [Leb06], who use a similar technique to prove strict monotonicity (i.e., a lower bound of zero). In particular, proving a quantitative lower bound requires carefully controlling additional terms that cancel in the original proof.

For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we define

$$b'_i = \inf \left\{ b' \in [0, 1] : \frac{d}{db} \log(G_i(v_i(b))) > L(b) \text{ for all } b \in (b', 1] \right\},$$

and let  $i$  be such that  $b'_i = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} b'_k$ . Our goal is to prove that  $b'_i < \rho$ , since (by construction) this would imply that our desired property is true on the entire range.

By continuity of  $(d/db) \log G_i(v_i(b))$  and of  $L(b)$ , at the point  $b'_i$  we must have that

$$\frac{d}{db} \log G_i(\alpha_i(b)) = L(b).$$

Suppose that  $b'_i \geq \rho$ —by our definition of effective support,  $G_i(\alpha_i(b'_i)) \geq \gamma$ . Re-arranging the characterization of the Bayes-Nash equilibrium (10) (cf. Lemma 2.11),

$$(v_i(b) - b) \cdot \frac{d}{db} \log(G_i(v_i(b))) = \frac{1}{n-1} \left( -(n-2) + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{v_i(b) - b}{v_j(b) - b} \right).$$

Taking the derivative with respect to  $b$  yields

$$D(b) = \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{v'_i(b)}{v_j(b) - b} - \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{(v_i(b) - b)v'_j(b)}{(v_j(b) - b)^2} + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{v_i(b) - v_j(b)}{(v_j(b) - b)^2}. \quad (24)$$

Our next goal is to upper-bound the value of (24) at  $b'_i$ . First, note that for all  $j \neq i$ , our construction of  $b'_i$  implies that  $b'_i \in [b'_j, 1]$  (since  $i = \arg \max_k b'_k$ ), and so

$$\frac{1}{v_i(b'_i) - b'_i} - \frac{1}{v_j(b'_i) - b'_i} = \frac{d}{db} \log(G_j(v_j(b'_i))) - \frac{d}{db} \log(G_i(v_i(b'_i))) \geq 0,$$

meaning that

$$\alpha_i(b'_i) \leq \alpha_j(b'_i) \implies \frac{v_i(b) - v_j(b)}{(v_j(b) - b)^2} \leq 0. \quad (25)$$

Thus, we can safely ignore the (negative) final term when upper bounding (24). Turning our attention to the second term, (11) implies the existence of at least one  $j \neq i$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{db} \log G_j(\alpha_j(b)) &\geq \frac{1}{n-1} \frac{1}{v_i(b) - b}, \text{ and rearranging,} \\ (v_i(b) - b)v'_j(b'_i) &\geq \frac{G_j(v_j(b'_i))}{(n-1) \cdot g_j(v_j(b'_i))} \geq \frac{\gamma}{(n-1) \cdot \eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Since  $v_j(b), b \in [0, 1]$  and  $v_j(b'_i) \geq v_i(b'_i)$ , we have  $0 \leq v_j(b'_i) - b'_i \leq 1$ , and in turn

$$\frac{(v_i(b) - b)v'_j(b'_i)}{(v_j(b'_i) - b'_i)^2} \geq \frac{\gamma}{(n-1) \cdot \eta} \quad (27)$$

for at least one  $j \neq i$ , and thus

$$-\sum_{j \neq i} \frac{(v_i(b) - b)v'_j(b'_i)}{(v_j(b'_i) - b'_i)^2} \leq -\frac{\gamma}{(n-1) \cdot \eta}. \quad (28)$$

Finally, recall that

$$L(b'_i) = \frac{v'_i(b'_i) \cdot g_i(\alpha_i(b'_i))}{G_i(\alpha_i(b'_i))} \implies v'_i(b'_i) = \frac{L(b'_i) \cdot G_i(\alpha_i(b'_i))}{g_i(\alpha_i(b'_i))}.$$

Combining this with (25) and (26), and using that  $\alpha_j(b'_i) \geq \alpha_i(b'_i)$  yields

$$D(b'_i) \leq \frac{-\gamma}{(n-1) \cdot \eta} + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{L(b'_i)}{v_j(b'_i) - b'_i} \leq \frac{-\gamma}{(n-1) \cdot \eta} + \frac{(n-1) \cdot L(b'_i)}{\alpha_i(b'_i) - b'_i} = 0,$$

where the last equality is by definition of  $L$ . Meanwhile, by definition

$$\begin{aligned} D(b) &= \frac{d}{db} \left\{ (v_i(b) - b) \cdot \frac{d}{db} \log(G_i(v_i(b))) \right\} \\ &= (v_i'(b) - 1) \cdot \frac{d}{db} \log G_i(\alpha_i(b)) + (v_i(b) - b) \cdot \frac{d^2}{db^2} \log G_i(v_i(b)) \\ D(b'_i) &\geq (0 - 1) \cdot L(b'_i) + (v_i(b'_i) - b'_i) \cdot \frac{d^2}{db^2} \log G_i(v_i(b)). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Combining the above results yields  $(v_i(b'_i) - b'_i) \cdot \frac{d^2}{db^2} \log G_i(v_i(b)) \leq -L(b'_i) < 0$ , and since  $v_i(b'_i) - b'_i > 0$ , this must mean  $\frac{d}{db} \log G_i(\alpha_i(b)) < 0$ . However, this in turn implies that there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\log G_i(\alpha_i(b'_i)) < x$ , which is a contradiction of our definition of  $\beta_i(\cdot)$ . Thus, our initial assumption ( $b'_i > \delta$ ) is impossible, which proves the desired result.

## B Omitted Proofs for Second-Price Auctions

### B.1 Miscellaneous Results

Here, we present miscellaneous results used in various parts of our proof. The first lemma shows that the functions,  $U_i^*$ , for different  $i$  are within a constant factor of each other.

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $U_i^*(\cdot)$  be as defined in (FP-CONT). Then, for all  $i, j \in [k]$  and for any  $x, y \in [0, 1]$  with  $x > y$ , we have that:*

$$\left(\frac{\alpha}{\eta}\right)^3 (U_j^*(x) - U_j^*(y)) \leq U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y) \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^3 (U_j^*(x) - U_j^*(y)).$$

*Proof.* We have:

$$U_i^*(x) - U_i^*(y) = \int_y^x \sum_{l \neq i} f_l(z) \prod_{m \neq i, l} F_m(z) dz \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^3 (U_j^*(x) - U_j^*(y))$$

where the second inequality follows from [Assumption 3.2](#):

$$\forall l, l', z \in [0, 1] : f_l(z) \prod_{m \neq i, l} F_m(z) \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)^3 \cdot f_{l'}(z) \prod_{m \neq j, l'} F_m(z).$$

□

**Lemma B.1.** *We have, for all  $i \in [k]$  and all  $\tau \in [T]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall l \in \ell^{(\tau)} : \left( \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau, l}) - \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau, l-1}) \right) &\leq \frac{1}{1 - x_{\tau, l}} \cdot \Delta_{i, l}^{(\tau)} \leq 2 \left( \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau, l}) - \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau, l-1}) \right) \\ \forall \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau}) - \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1}) &\leq \sum_{l=1}^{\ell^{(\tau)}} \frac{1}{1 - x_{\tau, l}} \cdot \Delta_{i, l}^{(\tau)} \leq 2 \cdot \left( \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau}) - \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau-1}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* For the lower bound, we have  $\forall l \in \ell^{(\tau)}$ :

$$\frac{1}{1 - x_{\tau, l}} \cdot \Delta_{i, l}^{(\tau)} = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(1 - x_{\tau, l})} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_j = i, x_{\tau, l-1} < Y_j \leq x_{\tau, l}\}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(1-Y_j)} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_j = i, x_{\tau,l-1} < Y_j \leq x_{\tau,l}\} = \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l}) - \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l-1}).$$

Summing the above inequality over  $l$  concludes the proof of the lower bound. Similarly, for the upper bound, we get  $\forall l \in \ell^{(\tau)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{1-x_{\tau,l}} \cdot \Delta_{i,l}^{(\tau)} - (\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l}) - \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l-1})) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{(1-x_{\tau,l})} - \frac{1}{(1-Y_j)} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_j = i, x_{\tau,l-1} < Y_j \leq x_{\tau,l}\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{\delta}{(1-x_{\tau,l})(1-Y_j)} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_j = i, x_{\tau,l-1} < Y_j \leq x_{\tau,l}\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{2 \cdot (1-Y_j)} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_j = i, x_{\tau,l-1} < Y_j \leq x_{\tau,l}\} = \frac{1}{2} (\widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l}) - \widehat{U}_i(x_{\tau,l-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Again, re-arranging and summing over  $l$  concludes the proof.  $\square$

## B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.21

We combine this result with the same binary search from [Subsection 2.3](#) to identify quantiles of the functions  $\widehat{F}_j$ . In particular, fix  $\epsilon > 0$  and let

$$W = \{w_a := \gamma + a \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2} \mid a \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \gamma + a \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2} \leq 1\} \cup \{1\}.$$

An identical argument from the one from the proof of [Theorem 2.9](#) shows that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can use binary search to find  $\widehat{z}_{j,a}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |F_j(\widehat{z}_{j,a}) - w_a| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ for all } j \in [k] \text{ and } a \in [|W|] \\ \text{w.p.} \quad & 1 - \frac{4k}{\epsilon} \log \left( \frac{4L}{\epsilon} \right) \exp \{-\epsilon^2 \gamma n_1 / 192\} \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

using  $C \cdot n_1 \cdot k \cdot \log(4L/\epsilon)/\epsilon$  samples for a universal constant  $C$  (in particular, see the proof of [Theorem 2.9](#), set  $\delta = \epsilon_1 = \epsilon/2$ , and use [Lemma 3.20](#) for the pointwise guarantee in place of (5)).

Conditioning on this event, we can thus define the piecewise-constant functions  $\widehat{F}_j$  for  $j \in [k]$  as

$$\widehat{F}_j(x) = \sum_{a \in [|W|]} \mathbf{1}\{x \in [z_{j,a}, z_{j,a+1}]\} \cdot \left( \gamma + a \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right)$$

Now, consider any  $x \in [p, 1]$  and define  $a \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x \in [\widehat{z}_{j,a}, \widehat{z}_{j,a+1}]$ , so that by construction  $\widehat{F}_j(x) = w_{j,a}$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} F_j(x) &\geq F_j(\widehat{z}_{j,a}) && \text{(monotonicity of CDF)} \\ &= w_{j,a+1} + (F_j(\widehat{z}_{j,a}) - w_{j,a}) + (w_{j,a} - w_{j,a+1}) \\ &\geq w_{j,a+1} - \epsilon/2 - \epsilon/2 && \text{(definition of } W \text{ and (30))} \\ &\geq \widehat{F}_j(x) - \epsilon && \text{(definition of } \widehat{F}_j) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,  $F_j(x) \leq \widehat{F}_j(x) + \epsilon$ .

It remains to handle  $x \in [p, \widehat{z}_{j,0}]$ : note that by (strict) monotonicity of the  $\widehat{F}_j$ , we must have  $\widehat{F}_j^{-1}(\gamma) \leq p$ . Thus, if  $p \leq x \leq \widehat{z}_{j,0}$ ,

$$F_i(x) \geq F_i(p) \geq \gamma = \widehat{F}_i(x), \quad \text{and} \quad F_i(x) \leq F_i(\widehat{z}_{j,0}) \leq \gamma + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \leq \widehat{F}_i(x) + \epsilon.$$

Thus,  $|F_j(x) - \widehat{F}_j(x)| \leq \epsilon$  over the entire interval  $[p, 1]$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , as long as

$$n \geq \frac{Ck \log(k/\epsilon) \log(L/\epsilon)^2}{\epsilon^3 \gamma},$$

for a universal constant  $C$ , completing the proof. □