

Budget Pacing in Repeated Auctions: Regret and Efficiency without Convergence*

Jason Gaitonde[†] Yingkai Li[‡] Bar Light[§] Brendan Lucier[¶] Aleksandrs Slivkins^{||}

Initial version: February 2022

This version: September 2022.

Abstract

We study the aggregate welfare and individual regret guarantees of dynamic *pacing algorithms* in the context of repeated auctions with budgets. Such algorithms are commonly used as bidding agents in Internet advertising platforms. We show that when agents simultaneously apply a natural form of gradient-based pacing, the liquid welfare obtained over the course of the learning dynamics is at least half the optimal expected liquid welfare obtainable by any allocation rule. Crucially, this result holds *without requiring convergence of the dynamics*, allowing us to circumvent known complexity-theoretic obstacles of finding equilibria. This result is also robust to the correlation structure between agent valuations and holds for any *core auction*, a broad class of auctions that includes first-price, second-price, and generalized second-price auctions. For individual guarantees, we further show such pacing algorithms enjoy *dynamic regret* bounds for individual value maximization, with respect to the sequence of budget-pacing bids, for any auction satisfying a monotone bang-for-buck property.

*The results have been obtained while J. Gaitonde was a research intern at Microsoft Research NE.

Compared to the initial version, the current version revises presentation and fixes an inaccuracy in the definition of the MBB property.

[†]Cornell University, Ithaca NY, USA. Email: jsg355@cornell.edu.

[‡]Northwestern University, Chicago IL, USA. Email: yingkai.li@u.northwestern.edu.

[§]Microsoft Research, New York NY, USA. Email: barlight@microsoft.com.

[¶]Microsoft Research, Cambridge MA, USA. Email: brlucier@microsoft.com.

^{||}Microsoft Research, New York NY, USA. Email: slivkins@microsoft.com.

1 Introduction

Online advertising increasingly dominates the marketing landscape, accounting for 54.2% of total media ad spending in the US in 2019 (\$129 billion) [26]. Such ads are predominantly allocated by auction: advertisers submit bids to an Internet platform to determine whether they will be displayed as part of a given page view and at what price. A typical advertiser participates in many thousands of auctions each day, across a variety of possible ad sizes and formats, payment options (pay per impression, per click, per conversion, etc.), and bids tailored to a variety of signals about user demographics and intent. To further complicate the decision-making process from the advertiser’s perspective, these many auction instances are strategically linked through a *budget constraint*, the total amount of money that can be allocated to advertising. An advertiser therefore faces the daunting task of choosing how to appropriately allocate a global budget across a complex landscape of advertising opportunities, and then convert that intent into a bidding strategy.

To help address this difficulty, all major online platforms now provide automated budget management services that adjust campaign parameters on an advertiser’s behalf. This is most commonly achieved via budget pacing: an advertiser specifies a global budget target and a maximum willingness-to-pay for different types of advertising opportunities, and these maximums are then scaled down (or “paced”) by a multiplier so that the realized daily spend matches the target budget. An algorithmic bidding agent learns, online, how best to pace the advertiser’s bids as it observes auction outcomes. This campaign management service lowers the barrier to entry into the online advertising ecosystem and removes the need for the advertiser to constantly adjust their campaign in the face of changing market conditions. Moreover, the platform is often better positioned to manage the budget since they have direct access to detailed market statistics.

Bidding agents are now near-universally adopted across all mature advertising platforms, but this success raises some pressing questions about the whole-market view. What can we say about the aggregate market outcomes when nearly all advertiser spend is controlled by automated bidding agents that are simultaneously learning to budget-pace? And to what extent does this depend on the details of the underlying auction?

Central to our question is the interplay between individual learning and aggregate market efficiency, each of which has been studied on its own. For example, when each advertising opportunity is sold by a second-price auction, it is known that linear pacing strategies are in fact optimal over all possible bidding functions, and that gradient-based methods can be used by an agent to achieve vanishing regret relative to the best pacing strategy in hindsight [16, 12]. On the other hand, when multiple bidding agents participating in second-price auctions choose pacing factors that form a pure Nash equilibrium, the resulting outcome is known to be approximately efficient (in the sense of maximizing expected liquid welfare; more on this below) [1, 7]. At first glance this combination of results seems to address the question of aggregate performance of bidding agents in second-price auctions. But convergence of online learning algorithms to a Nash equilibrium should not be taken for granted. A recent result by Chen et al. [17] shows that finding a pure Nash equilibrium of the pacing game is PPAD-hard for second-price auctions, and hence we should not assume that bidding agents employing polynomial-time online learning strategies will efficiently converge to equilibrium. So the question remains: *if bidding agents do not converge, what happens to overall market performance?*

1.1 Our Contributions

We provide (classes of) bidding algorithms that simultaneously admit good *aggregate guarantees* in terms of overall market efficiency, *without relying on convergence*, while still providing good *individual guarantees* as online learning algorithms that benefit a particular advertiser. Closely related are three literatures: (i) on aggregate outcomes in single-shot budget-constrained ad auctions, without regard to bidding dynamics, (ii) on online learning with budget constraints, without regard to the aggregate performance, and (iii) conditions under which learning agents converge to equilibrium in repeated games. With this perspective in mind, we match a state-of-art aggregate guarantee from (i), while being qualitatively on par with state-of-art individual guarantees

in (ii), without relying on convergence and thereby side-stepping conditions from (iii). We accomplish this with bidding algorithms that are arguably quite natural and for a broad class of auctions.

In our model there are T rounds, each corresponding to an auction instance. All of our results apply to multiple auction rules, including first-price, second-price, and GSP auctions. The private values (i.e., maximum bids) observed by the agents are randomly drawn in each round and can be arbitrarily correlated with each other, capturing scenarios where the willingness to pay of different advertisers is correlated through characteristics of the impression.¹ In each round the bidding agents place bids on behalf of their respective advertisers. The agents operate independently of each other, interacting only through the feedback they receive from the auction.

We focus on a simple gradient-based pacing algorithm (Algorithm 1), which was first introduced by Bal-seiro and Gur [12] in the context of second-price auctions. They derive this algorithm via the Lagrangian dual of the (quasilinear) utility maximization problem. We directly extend their algorithm to a richer class of allocation problems and auction formats. Underlying this extension is a modified interpretation of this algorithm as stochastic gradient descent on a certain artificial objective that applies even beyond second-price auctions.

First Result: Aggregate Market Performance. We prove that when the bidding agents employ Algorithm 1 to tune their pacing multipliers, the resulting market outcome over the full time horizon achieves at least half of the expected optimal *liquid welfare*. This efficiency metric, liquid welfare, corresponds to the maximum amount that the advertisers are jointly willing to pay for the allocation they receive.² It is geared towards budget-constrained auctions (specializing to utilitarian welfare when budgets are infinite), and is a standard objective in the analysis thereof [25, 6, 1, 7].³ Crucially, our liquid welfare result does not depend on the convergence of the actions prescribed by the algorithms to a stationary equilibrium of the bidding game. Nevertheless, our approximation guarantee—half of the optimal expected liquid welfare—matches the best possible bound even for a pure Nash equilibrium in a static truthful auction [1, 7].

While our discussion has focused mainly on second-price single-item auctions, our approximation result actually holds for a far richer set of allocation problems and auction formats, including those used in real-world advertising platforms. We allow arbitrary downward-closed constraints on the set of feasible allocations of a single divisible good,⁴ which captures single-item auctions as well as complex settings such as sponsored search auctions with multiple slots and separable click rates. Further, our result applies even when the underlying mechanism is not truthful. We accommodate any *core auction*: an auction that generates outcomes in the core, meaning that no coalition of advertisers could improve their joint utility by renegotiating the outcome with the auctioneer [5]. This is a well-studied class of auctions that includes both first and second-price auctions, as well as the generalized second price (GSP) auction, and has previously been studied in the context of advertising auctions [27, 31]. We emphasize, however, that the problem remains non-trivial (and almost as challenging) in a much simpler model with a repeated single-item auction and constant private values.

Second Result: Individual Regret Guarantees. We have analyzed aggregate market performance for a broad class of (possibly non-truthful) auctions including first-price and GSP auctions, but is gradient-based pacing an effective learning method in those settings? Regret guarantees are known when the underlying auction is truthful [12, 15], but what about non-truthful auctions? To address this question, we bound the regret obtained by an individual bidding agent participating in any auction format that satisfies a *monotone bang-per-buck* condition, which implies that the marginal value obtained per dollar spent weakly decreases in an agent’s bid. For example, first and second-price auctions satisfy this condition, as does the GSP auction. We show that the

¹An *impression* is the industry term for an “atomic” advertising opportunity: a specific slot on a specific webpage when this webpage is rendered for a specific user. Impression characteristics depend on the slot, the page, and the user.

²In fact, our approximation result is with respect to an even stronger benchmark: the optimal *ex ante liquid welfare*, the maximum amount that advertisers would be willing to pay for their *expected* allocation under any feasible market outcome.

³While one could reasonably consider utilitarian welfare as an alternative objective in budget-constrained ad auctions, strong impossibility results are known even in a single-shot (non-repeated) setting for a single good [25].

⁴*I.e.*, a good that can be divided fractionally among the agents. Any item can be interpreted as divisible via probabilistic allocation.

total value obtained by the bidding agent has regret $O(T^{3/4})$ relative to the best pacing multiplier in hindsight, in a stochastic environment where the profile of opposing bids is drawn independently each round.⁵

When the underlying auction is truthful, the best fixed pacing multiplier in hindsight is known to be optimal over the class of all possible bidding strategies (i.e., mappings from value to bid, which may not be linear) [21, 12, 11]. This means that, for truthful auctions such as the second-price auction, our benchmark for regret is actually the optimal bidding policy in hindsight. But even beyond truthful auctions, we argue that the best linear policy (i.e., best pacing multiplier) is an appropriate benchmark. First, while we abstractly model agent values as a willingness to pay per impression, in practice the variation in values is primarily driven by click rate estimates that are internal to the platform. In such an environment, an advertiser bidding manually would necessarily be limited to a linear policy: it is not possible to directly condition one’s bid on the platform’s click rate estimate, so an impression with half the click rate would necessarily receive half the effective per-impression bid. The benchmark therefore tracks the best performance that one could achieve in hindsight with a manual bid. Second, linear pacing is commonly used in practice as an algorithmic bidding policy even for non-truthful auctions [20], so from a practical perspective it is useful to focus attention on linear pacing policies. Third, linear pacing is reasonable from the online learning perspective: it is typical to choose a subset of policies as a hypothesis class (even if this class is not known to contain an optimal policy), and the set of linear policies is a common and natural class to consider.

We framed our regret bounds in a stochastic environment, but in fact we prove an even stronger individual guarantee by considering *dynamic* regret, permitting the opposing bids to change adaptively (and adversarially) based on the auction history. In such an environment, we show that gradient-based pacing achieves vanishing regret relative to the *perfect pacing sequence*, which is the sequence of pacing multipliers such that the expected spend in each round is precisely the per-round budget.⁶ In a stochastic environment, this perfect pacing sequence is precisely the single best fixed pacing multiplier in hindsight. More generally, this sequence may not be uniform and is not necessarily the sequence that maximizes expected value subject to the budget constraint. Achieving low regret against the latter objective in an adversarial environment is essentially hopeless (more on this in Section 1.2). Therefore, we suggest the perfect pacing sequence as a reasonable and tractable benchmark for this problem, and one particularly suitable for our algorithm (see Remark 4.10). In fact, following this sequence (i.e., matching a target spend rate as closely as possible across time) can be a natural and desirable goal for a budget management system.

1.2 Related Work

Pacing in Ad auctions. Budget-pacing is a popular approach for repeated bidding under budget, both in practice and in theory [11]. Balseiro and Gur [12] attain convergence guarantees in repeated second-price auctions, under strong convexity-like assumptions. Borgs et al. [16] attain a similar result for first-price auctions, without convexity assumptions (via a different algorithm). Our emphasis on welfare guarantees *without requiring convergence* appears novel, and possibly necessary given the aforementioned PPAD-hardness result [17].

Balseiro and Gur [12] establish individual regret guarantees for repeated second-price auctions, for both stochastic and adversarial environments, under various convexity assumptions. Balseiro et al. [15] extend similar guarantees to repeated *truthful* auctions, without convexity assumptions. In particular, both papers obtain regret-optimal guarantees for the stochastic environment. Balseiro et al. [15] obtain bounds on dynamic regret for an adversarial environment that does not deviate too much from a stochastic one. Our individual guarantee is different from theirs in several respects: (i) it applies to a much wider family of auctions, (ii) the problem instance can deviate arbitrarily far from any fixed stochastic instance, but (iii) the benchmark is the perfect pacing sequence rather than the best outcome in hindsight.

⁵A typical goal in regret minimization is regret $\tilde{O}(T^\gamma)$ for some constant $\gamma \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. As a baseline, regret $O(\sqrt{T})$ is the best possible in the worst case, even in a stochastic environment with only two possible actions [3].

⁶This guarantee is parameterized by the total round-to-round change in the “perfect” pacing multipliers.

Our individual regret guarantees hold under a bandit feedback model, where the agent learns only the allocation and payment obtained by their chosen bid. We are not aware of any published individual regret guarantees for *non-truthful auctions*, even in the stochastic environment and even under the more relaxed full-feedback model.

A static (single-shot) game between budget-constrained bidders who tune their pacing multipliers, a.k.a. the *pacing game*, along with the appropriate equilibrium concept was studied in Conitzer et al. [21, 20], in the context of first- and second-price auctions with quasilinear utilities, and then extended to more general payment constraints [1] and utility measures [7]. In particular, any pure Nash equilibrium of this game achieves at least half of the optimal liquid welfare when the underlying auction is truthful. In a related contextual auction setting and simultaneously with our work, Balseiro et al. [14] establishes a similar bound on liquid welfare at any (possibly non-linear) Bayes-Nash equilibrium for i.i.d. bidders, for a class of standard auctions that includes first-price and second-price auctions. In contrast to these results, our efficiency result does not rely on convergence to equilibrium, and applies to all core auctions.

A growing line of work in mechanism design targets bidding agents that maximize value or utility under spending constraints and are assumed to reach equilibrium [38, 13, 24]. In contrast, our emphasis is not on mechanism design: we take the auction specification as exogenous and focus on the learning dynamics.

Throttling (a.k.a. *probabilistic pacing*) is an alternative approach: instead of pacing their bids, agents participate in only a fraction of the auctions [11]. Very recently, Chen et al. [18] proved that throttling converges to a Nash equilibrium in the first-price auctions (albeit without any stated implications on welfare or liquid welfare). On the other hand, no such convergence is possible for second-price auctions since a Nash equilibrium is PPAD-hard to compute [17]. The equilibria obtained by throttling and pacing dynamics in the first-price auction can differ in revenue by at most a factor of 2 [18].

Learning theory. Repeated bidding with a budget is a special case of multi-armed bandit problems with global constraints, a.k.a. *bandits with knapsacks* (BwK) [9, 2, 33] (see Chapter 10 in [40] for a survey). BwK problems in adversarial environments do not admit regret bounds: instead, one is doomed to approximation ratios, even against a time-invariant benchmark and even in relatively simple examples [33]. A similar impossibility result is derived in [12] specifically for repeated budget-constrained bidding in second-price auctions. Several known algorithms for BwK are potentially applicable to our problem, and the corresponding individual guarantees may be within reach for the stochastic environment (but haven't been published).⁷ However, it is unclear how to derive aggregate guarantees for such algorithms.

Stochastic gradient descent is a standard, well-understood algorithm in online convex optimization [32].

A long line of work targets convergence of learning algorithms in repeated games (not specifically focusing on ad auctions). When algorithms achieve low regret (in terms of cumulative payoffs), the *average play* (time-averaged distribution over chosen actions) converges to a (coarse) correlated equilibrium [4, 37, 30], and this implies welfare bounds for various auction formats in the absence of budget constraints [39]. In contrast, we show in Appendix E that for repeated auctions with budgets, low individual regret on its own does not imply any bounded approximation for liquid welfare. Convergence in the last iterate is more challenging: strong negative results are known even for two-player zero-sum games [10, 36, 19]. Yet, a recent line of work (starting from Daskalakis et al. [23], see [22, 29, 41] and references therein) achieves last-iterate convergence under full feedback and substantial convexity-like assumptions, using two specific regret-minimizing algorithms. To the best of our understanding, these positive results do not apply to the setting of repeated auctions with budgets.

⁷ Formally, one could discretize bids as multiples of some $\epsilon > 0$ and run a BwK algorithm on these discretized bids. Individual guarantees for such algorithms would depend on bounding the discretization error, which is known to be challenging in the context of BwK [9, 8]. We are only aware of one such result for BwK when one has contexts (in our case, private values) and a "continuous" action set (in our case, bids). This result concerns a different problem: *dynamic pricing*, where actions correspond to posted prices rather than bids, and only achieves regret $\tilde{O}(T^{4/5})$ in the stochastic environment, relative to a given policy class [8].

2 Our Model and Preliminaries

The Allocation Problem. Our setting is a repeated auction with budgets. There is one seller (the platform) and n bidding agents. In each time $t = 1, \dots, T$, the seller has a single unit of a good available for sale. We will sometimes refer to the good as a (divisible) *item*. An *allocation profile* is a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in [0, 1]^n$ where x_k is the quantity of the good allocated to agent k . There is a convex and closed set $X \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ of feasible allocation profiles, which is assumed to be downward closed. An allocation profile is feasible if $\mathbf{x} \in X$. An allocation sequence is a sequence of allocation profiles $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_T)$ where $\mathbf{x}_t = (x_{1t}, \dots, x_{nt})$ is the allocation profile at time t .

At each time t , each agent k has a value $v_{k,t} \in [0, \bar{v}]$ per unit of the item received. By scaling values, we will assume that $\bar{v} \geq 1$. The value profile $\mathbf{v}_t = (v_{1,t}, \dots, v_{n,t})$ at time t is drawn from a distribution function F independently across different time periods. We emphasize that F is not necessarily a product distribution, so the values held by different agents can be arbitrarily correlated within each round.

Two special cases of our model are of particular interest in the context of ad auctions. In *single-slot* ad auctions, the “item” for sale is an opportunity to display one ad to the current user. *Multi-slot* ad auctions is a natural generalization in which multiple ads can be displayed in each round. The formal details are standard, we provide them in Appendix A.1.

Auctions and Budgets. At each time t the good is allocated using an auction mechanism that we now describe. In round t , each agent $k \in [n]$ first observes her value $v_{k,t} \geq 0$. After all agents have observed their values, each agent k then submits a bid $b_{k,t} \geq 0$ to the auction. All agents submit bids simultaneously. The auction is defined by an allocation rule \mathbf{x} and a payment rule \mathbf{p} , where $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}) \in X$ is the allocation profile generated under a bid profile \mathbf{b} , and $p_k(\mathbf{b}) \geq 0$ is the payment made by agent k . All of the auction formats we consider will have weakly monotone allocation and payment rules, so we will assume this for the remainder of the paper. That is, for any k and any bids of the other agents \mathbf{b}_{-k} , both $x_k(b_k, \mathbf{b}_{-k})$ and $p_k(b_k, \mathbf{b}_{-k})$ are weakly increasing in b_k .

Each agent k has a fixed budget B_k that can be spent over the T time periods. Once an agent has run out of budget she can no longer bid in future rounds. We emphasize that this budget constraint binds ex post, and must be satisfied on every realization of value sequences.⁸ An important quantity in our analysis is the *target expenditure rate* for agent k which is defined by $\rho_k \triangleq B_k/T$.

Each agent k applies a dynamic bidding strategy that, in each round t , maps the observed history of auction outcomes and the realized valuation $v_{k,t}$ to a bid $b_{k,t}$. In a slight abuse of notation we will tend to write $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{v})$ for the sequence of bid profiles that are generated when the sequence of value profiles is \mathbf{v} . In this paper we will focus on a particular class of bidding strategies (gradient-based pacing) described later in this section.

Given an execution of the auction over T rounds, we will typically write $x_{k,t}$ for the realized allocation obtained by agent k in time t , and $z_{k,t}$ for the realized payment of agent k in time t . This notation omits the dependency on the agents’ bids when this dependency is clear from the context.

Core Auctions. Our results apply to *Core Auctions* [5], a wide class of auction mechanisms which includes standard auctions such as first-price auctions, second-price auctions for single-slot allocations, and generalized second-price (GSP) auctions for multi-slot allocations.⁹ Roughly speaking, no subset of players (which may or may not include the seller) could jointly benefit by renegotiating the auction outcome among themselves. Stated more formally in our context, a core auction satisfies the following two properties:

1. The auction is *individually rational* (IR): each agent’s payment does not exceed her declared welfare for the allocation received. That is, $p_k(\mathbf{b}) \leq b_k x_k(\mathbf{b})$ for every agent k and every bidding profile \mathbf{b} .

⁸All of the auctions we consider satisfy the property that each agent’s payment will be at most her bid, so it is always possible to bid in such a way that does not overspend one’s remaining budget.

⁹For the sake of completeness, these special cases are defined in Appendix A.2.

2. The seller and any subset of agents $S \subseteq [n]$ could not strictly benefit by jointly abandoning the auction and deviating to another outcome. That is, for any bidding profile \mathbf{b} and any allocation profile $\mathbf{y} \in X$,

$$\sum_{k \notin S} p_k(\mathbf{b}) + \sum_{k \in S} b_k x_k(\mathbf{b}) \geq \sum_{k \in S} b_k y_k. \quad (2.1)$$

The left-hand (resp., right-hand) side of Eq. (2.1) is the total welfare obtained by the seller and the agents in S under the auction (resp., under a deviation to allocation \mathbf{y}). Note that on both sides, the summation over agents in S accounts not only for the agent utilities, but also those agents' payments to the seller.

The second property implies that a core auction must always maximize declared welfare. Indeed, taking $S = [n]$, Eq. (2.1) states that $\sum_k b_k x_k(\mathbf{b}) \geq \sum_k b_k y_k$ for all feasible allocation profiles \mathbf{y} . Also, the first property is simply a restatement of the core condition that no subset of buyers could jointly benefit by renegotiating an auction outcome that does not include the seller, i.e. no buyer (and hence no set of buyers) would strictly prefer to switch to the null outcome in which no goods are allocated and no payments are made.

Monotone Bang-Per-Buck. Our guarantees on individual regret require an additional property of the auction mechanism called *monotone bang-per-buck* (MBB). Roughly speaking, if increasing one's bid leads to an increased allocation, then the increase in payment per unit of new allocation is at least the minimum bid needed for the increase. Formally, an auction mechanism satisfies MBB if for any agent k , any profile of bids \mathbf{b}_{-k} of the other agents, and any bids $b_k \leq b'_k$ of agent k , we have

$$p_k(b'_k, \mathbf{b}_{-k}) - p_k(b_k, \mathbf{b}_{-k}) \geq b_k \times (x_k(b'_k, \mathbf{b}_{-k}) - x_k(b_k, \mathbf{b}_{-k})). \quad (2.2)$$

One can readily check that the MBB property is satisfied by many common auction formats, such as first-price and second-price auctions as well as generalized second-price auctions (see Appendix A for further discussion). The name MBB is motivated by a simple observation that in a MBB auction each buyer's expected payment per expected unit of allocation received is weakly increasing in their bid, for any distribution of competing bids. See, for example, inequality (4.8) in Section 4.3.

Liquid Welfare. Liquid welfare is a measure of welfare in settings where agents have non-quasi-linear utilities. Intuitively, an agent's liquid welfare for an allocation sequence is the agent's *maximum willingness to pay for the allocation*. This generalizes the common notion of welfare in quasi-linear environments, and motivates the choice to measure welfare in transferable units of money. In our setting with a budget constraint that binds across rounds, liquid welfare is defined as follows.

Definition 2.1. Given a sequence of value profiles $\mathbf{v} = (v_{k,t}) \in [0, \bar{v}]^{nT}$ and any sequence of feasible allocations $\mathbf{x} = (x_{k,t}) \in X^T$, the *liquid value* obtained by agent k is $W_k(\mathbf{x}) = \min \left\{ B_k, \sum_{t=1}^T x_{k,t} v_{k,t} \right\}$. The *liquid welfare* of allocation sequence $\mathbf{x} \in X^T$ is $W(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^n W_k(\mathbf{x})$.

We emphasize that liquid welfare depends on the allocations, but not on the agents' payments.

Our objective of interest is the *expected* liquid welfare obtained by the platform over any randomness in the valuation sequence and the agents' bidding strategies (which induces randomness in the allocation sequence). Since the bid placed in one round can depend on allocations obtained in the previous rounds, we define a mapping from the entire sequence of T value profiles to an allocation sequence. An *allocation sequence rule* is a function $\mathbf{x}: [0, \bar{v}]^{nT} \rightarrow X^T$, where $x_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T)$ is the allocation obtained by agent k in round t . Then the expected liquid welfare of allocation sequence rule \mathbf{x} is $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T \sim F} [W(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T))]$.

Pacing Algorithm. We use a budget-pacing algorithm motivated by stochastic gradient descent, which was introduced and analyzed in [12] in the context of second-price auctions. See Algorithm 1. Each bidder k maintains a *pacing multiplier* $\mu_{k,t} \in [0, \bar{\mu}]$ for each round t . Multiplier $\mu_{k,t}$ is determined by the algorithm before the value $v_{k,t}$ is revealed. The bid is set to $v_{k,t}/(1 + \mu_{k,t})$, or the remaining budget $B_{k,t}$ if the latter is

smaller. Once the round's outcome is revealed, the multiplier is updated as per Line 5, where $P_{[a,b]}$ denotes the projection onto the interval $[a, b]$. Intuitively, the agent's goal is to keep expenditures near the expenditure rate ρ_k . Hence, if ρ_k is above (resp., below) the current expenditure $z_{k,t}$, the agent decreases (resp., increases) her multiplier, by the amount proportional to the current "deviation" from the target expenditure rate ρ_k .

Algorithm 1: Gradient-based pacing algorithm for agent k

- Input:** Budget B_k , time horizon T , learning rate $\epsilon_k > 0$, pacing upper bound $\bar{\mu}$
- 1 Initialize $\mu_{k,1} = 0$ (pacing multiplier), $B_{k,1} = B_k$ (remaining budget), $\rho_k = B_k/T$ (target spend rate).
 - 2 **for** round $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 3 Observe value $v_{k,t}$, submit bid $b_{k,t} = \min \{v_{k,t}/(1 + \mu_{k,t}), B_{k,t}\}$;
 - 4 Observe expenditure $z_{k,t}$;
 - 5 Update $\mu_{k,t+1} \leftarrow P_{[0,\bar{\mu}]}(\mu_{k,t} - \epsilon_k(\rho_k - z_{k,t}))$ and $B_{k,t+1} \leftarrow B_{k,t} - z_{k,t}$.
-

Parameters $\bar{\mu}$ and ϵ_k will be specified later. While the upper bound $\bar{\mu}$ could in general depend on the agent k , as in $\bar{\mu} = \bar{\mu}_k$, we suppress this dependence for the sake of clarity. Our bounds depend on $\max_k \bar{\mu}_k$.

A convenient property of Algorithm 1 is that it does not run out of budget too early.¹⁰

Lemma 2.2 ([12]). *Fix agent k in a core auction. Let τ_k be the stopping time of Algorithm 1 for some (possibly adaptive, randomized, adversarially generated) set of valuations and competing bids. Assume all valuations are at most \bar{v} , and the parameters satisfy $\bar{\mu} \geq \bar{v}/\rho_k - 1$ and $\epsilon_k \bar{v} \leq 1$. Then $T - \tau_k \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}}{\epsilon_k \rho_k} + \frac{\bar{v}}{\rho_k}$ almost surely.*

3 Aggregate Guarantee: Approximate Liquid Welfare

We show that when all agents use Algorithm 1, the expected liquid welfare is at least half of the optimal, minus regret term. In fact, our guarantee applies to a wider class of algorithms that do not overbid ($b_{k,t} \leq v_{k,t}$), bid their full value when $\mu_{k,t} = 0$, and are not constrained otherwise.

Definition 3.1. Consider a measurable bidding algorithm which inputs the same parameters as Algorithm 1, internally updates multipliers $\mu_{k,t}$ in the same way, and never overbids: $b_{k,t} \leq v_{k,t}$ for all rounds t . Call it a **generalized pacing algorithm** if $(\mu_{k,t} = 0) \Rightarrow (b_{k,t} = v_{k,t})$ for all rounds t ("no unnecessary pacing").

We use a stronger benchmark: optimal *ex ante* liquid welfare, which is each agent's willingness to pay for her *expected* allocation sequence. It upper-bounds the expected (ex post) liquid welfare by Jensen's inequality.

Definition 3.2. Fix distribution F over valuation profiles and allocation rule $\mathbf{y}: [0, \bar{v}]^n \rightarrow X$. The *ex ante liquid value* of each agent k is $\bar{W}_k(\mathbf{y}, F) = T \times \min \left[\rho_k, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim F} [y_k(\mathbf{v}) v_k] \right]$ and the ex ante liquid welfare is $\bar{W}(\mathbf{y}, F) = \sum_{k=1}^n \bar{W}_k(\mathbf{y}, F)$.

In this definition, the restriction that the same allocation rule y is used in every round is without loss of generality. Indeed, given any allocation sequence rule there is a single-round allocation rule with the same ex ante liquid welfare. This property is formally stated and proved as Lemma B.1 in Appendix B.

Now we are ready to state the main result: liquid welfare guarantee without convergence.

Theorem 3.3. *Fix any core auction and any distribution F over agent value profiles. Suppose that each agent employs a generalized pacing algorithm to bid, and write $\mathbf{x}: [0, \bar{v}]^{nT} \rightarrow X^T$ for the corresponding allocation sequence rule. Then for any allocation rule $\mathbf{y}: [0, \bar{v}]^n \rightarrow X$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T \sim F} [W(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T))] \geq \frac{\bar{W}(\mathbf{y}, F)}{2} - O\left(n\bar{v}\sqrt{T \log(\bar{v}nT)}\right). \quad (3.1)$$

¹⁰This result is proven in [12] (Eq. (A-4) of Theorem 3.3) for second-price auctions, but an inspection of their proof shows this holds surely for any sequence of valuations and competing prices so long the price is at most the bid if the agent wins.

3.1 Proof Intuition

Before proving Theorem 3.3, let us sketch the proof and provide intuition. One easy observation is that since B_k is an upper bound on the liquid welfare obtainable by agent k , any agents who are (approximately) exhausting their budgets in our dynamics are achieving optimal liquid welfare. We therefore focus on agents who do not exhaust their budgets. We'd like to argue that such agents are often bidding very high, frequently choosing pacing multipliers equal to 0 (i.e., bidding their values). This would be helpful because our auction is assumed to be a core auction, which implies that either the high-bidding agents are winning (and generating high liquid welfare) or other, budget-exhausting agents are generating high revenue for the seller (which likewise implies high liquid welfare).

Why should agents who are underspending their budget be placing high bids in many rounds? While it's true that the pacing dynamics increases the next-round bid whenever spend is below the per-round target, this is only a local adjustment and does not depend on total spend. We make no convergence assumptions about the dynamics and, as we show in Appendix E, regret bounds do not directly imply a bound on liquid welfare. So how do we analyze bidding patterns in aggregate across rounds?

It is here where we use the fact that agents use generalized pacing algorithms. We introduce the notion of an *epoch*, which roughly corresponds to a maximal contiguous sequence of rounds in which an agent's pacing multiplier is strictly greater than 0. In Lemma 3.6 we show that an agent k 's total spend over an epoch of length t must be (approximately) $t\rho_k$. In other words, the average spend over an epoch approximately matches the target per-round spend. This is a direct implication of the update rule for the pacing multiplier: since multiplier increases and decreases balance out (approximately) over the course of an epoch, the budget deficits and surpluses must balance out as well. An immediate implication is that an agent whose total spend is much less than $T\rho_k$ must often have her pacing multiplier set equal to 0.

To summarize, each agent either spends most of her budget by time T or spends many rounds bidding her value. It might seem that by combining these two cases we should obtain a constant approximation factor, and not just in expectation but for every realized value sequence \mathbf{v} . But this is too good to be true. Indeed, this proof sketch misses an important subtlety: whether an agent exhausts her budget or not depends on the realization of the value sequence, which is also correlated with the benchmark allocation \mathbf{y} . For example, what if an agent under-spends her budget precisely on those value sequences where it would have been optimal (according to the benchmark \mathbf{y}) for her liquid welfare to equal her budget? This could result in a situation where, conditional on $\mu_{k,t} = 0$, the value obtained by the benchmark is much higher than expected and cannot be approximated. To compare against the liquid welfare of \mathbf{y} we must control the extent of this correlation. To this end we employ a variation of the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (Lemma 3.7) to argue that since value realizations are independent across time, the pacing sequence and the benchmark allocation cannot be too heavily correlated.

3.2 Proof Preliminaries

Before getting into the details of the proof of Theorem 3.3, we first introduce some notation and define an epoch more formally. Write $\mu_{k,t} = \flat$ if at time t , the agent's algorithm has stopped, i.e., if the agent is out of money or if $t = T + 1$. For $t_1 \leq t_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, we slightly abuse notation and write $[t_1, t_2] \triangleq \{t_1, \dots, t_2\}$ to be the set of integers between them, inclusive, when the meaning is clear. Similarly, we write $[t_1, t_2) \triangleq \{t_1, \dots, t_2 - 1\}$ for the half-open set of integers between them and analogously for $(t_1, t_2]$ and (t_1, t_2) .

Definition 3.4. Fix an agent k , time horizon T , and a sequence of pacing multipliers $\mu_{k,1}, \dots, \mu_{k,T}$. A half-open interval $[t_1, t_2)$ is an **epoch** with respect to these multipliers if it holds that $\mu_{t_1} = 0$ and $\mu_t > 0$ for each $t_1 < t < t_2$ and t_2 is maximal with this property.

Remark 3.5. Because we initialized any generalized pacing algorithm at $\mu_{k,1} = 0$ for all $k \in [n]$, the epochs completely partition the set of times the agent is bidding. Moreover, if the pacing multipliers at times t_1 and $t_1 + 1$ are both zero, then $[t_1, t_1 + 1)$ is an epoch; we refer to this as a trivial epoch.

The following lemma shows that an agent's total spend over a maximal epoch can be bounded from below by an amount roughly equal to the target spend rate ρ_k times the epoch length, plus an adjustment for the first round of the epoch. This lemma is crucial in proving Theorem 3.3 and is proved in Appendix B.

Lemma 3.6. *Fix an agent k , fix any choice of core auction and any sequence of bids of other agents $(\mathbf{b}_{-k,1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{-k,T})$. Fix any realization of values $(v_{k,1}, \dots, v_{k,T})$ for agent k and suppose that $\mu_{k,1}, \dots, \mu_{k,T}$ is the sequence of multipliers generated by the generalized pacing algorithm given the auction format and the other bids. Then for any epoch $[t_1, t_2)$ where $\mu_{k,t_2} \neq \flat$, we have*

$$\sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-1} x_{k,t} v_{k,t} \geq x_{k,t_1} v_{k,t_1} - z_{k,t_1} + \rho_k \cdot (t_2 - t_1 - 1). \quad (3.2)$$

Next, motivated by the intuition in Section 3.1, we introduce a concentration inequality that will be helpful for our analysis. Roughly speaking, we will use this lemma to show that the sequence of values obtained by agent k in the benchmark on rounds in which $\mu_{k,t} = 0$ are not ‘‘far from expectation,’’ in the sense that the total expected value obtained over such rounds is not much greater than ρ_k per round.

Lemma 3.7. *Let Y_1, \dots, Y_T be random variables and $\mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_T$ be a filtration such that:*

1. $0 \leq Y_t \leq \bar{v}$ with probability 1 for some parameter $\bar{v} \geq 0$ for all t .
2. $\mathbb{E}[Y_t] \leq \rho$ for some parameter $\rho \geq 0$ for all t .
3. For all t , Y_t is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable but is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} .

Suppose that $X_1, \dots, X_n \in [0, 1]$ are random variables such that X_t is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable. Then

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t Y_t + (1 - X_t) \rho \geq \rho \cdot T + \theta \right) \leq \exp \left(\frac{-2\theta^2}{T\bar{v}^2} \right). \quad (3.3)$$

The proof of Lemma 3.7 appears in Appendix B. We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.3.

3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

We first introduce some notations. Fix the generalized pacing dynamics algorithm used by each agent. We will then write $\mathbf{x} = \{x_{k,t}\}_{k \in [n], t \in [T]}$ for the random variable corresponding to the allocation obtained under these bidding dynamics, given the values $\{v_{k,t}\}$. We also write $\mu_{k,t}$ for the pacing multiplier of agent k in round t , and $z_{k,t}$ for the realized spend of agent k in round t , which are likewise random variables. For notational convenience we will write $\text{WEL}_{GPD}(\mathbf{v})$ for the liquid welfare obtained under the GPD bidding dynamics given valuation sequence \mathbf{v} . That is,

$$\text{WEL}_{GPD}(\mathbf{v}) \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^n \min \left\{ B_k, \sum_{t=1}^T x_{k,t} v_{k,t} \right\}. \quad (3.4)$$

We also write $\text{WEL}_{k,GPD}(\mathbf{v})$ for the liquid welfare obtained by agent k , and $\text{WEL}_{GPD}(F)$ for the total expected liquid welfare $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim F}[\text{WEL}_{GPD}(\mathbf{v})]$.

We claim that to prove Theorem 3.3, it is sufficient to show that inequality (3.1) holds for any allocation rule \mathbf{y} such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim F}[y_k(\mathbf{v})v_k] \leq \rho_k \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{W}_k(\mathbf{y}, F) = T \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim F}[y_k(\mathbf{v})v_k] \leq \rho_k \cdot T \quad \forall k \in [n]. \quad (3.5)$$

This is sufficient because if one of the above conditions is violated, one can always decrease the allocation for agent k , which maintains the feasibility (since we assume that the set of feasible allocations X is downward

closed) without affecting the ex ante liquid welfare $\overline{W}(\mathbf{y}, F)$. We will therefore assume without loss that \mathbf{y} satisfies (3.5).

Preliminaries completed, we now prove Theorem 3.3 in three steps. First, we will define a “good” event in which the benchmark allocations are not too heavily correlated with the pacing multipliers of the generalized pacing dynamics, and show that this good event happens with high probability. Second, for all valuation sequences \mathbf{v} that satisfy the good event, we bound the liquid welfare obtained by the pacing dynamics in terms of the benchmark allocation and the payments collected by the auctioneer. In the third and final step we take expectations over all valuation profiles to bound the expected liquid welfare.

Step 1: A Good Event. For each agent $k \in [n]$, we define the following quantity, whose significance will become apparent shortly:

$$R_k(\mathbf{v}) \triangleq \sum_{t=1}^T [\mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} = 0\}y_k(\mathbf{v})v_{k,t} + \mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} \neq 0\}\rho_k].$$

$R_k(\mathbf{v})$ is the total value obtained by agent k under allocation rule \mathbf{y} , except that in any round in which $\mu_{k,t} \neq 0$ this value is replaced by the target spend ρ_k .

We would like to apply Lemma 3.7 to bound $R_k(\mathbf{v})$. Some notation: we will write $Y_t = y_k(\mathbf{v}_t)v_{k,t}$ and $X_t = \mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} = 0\}$ with $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_t)$. Then because $\mu_{k,t}$ is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} measurable and the sequence $\{\mathbf{v}_j\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables, Lemma 3.7 implies that with probability at least $1 - 1/(\overline{v}nT)^2$, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T [\mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} = 0\}y_k(\mathbf{v})v_{k,t} + \mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} \neq 0\}\rho_k] \leq \rho_k \cdot T + \overline{v}\sqrt{T \log(\overline{v}nT)}.$$

Taking a union bound over $k \in [n]$, with probability at least $1 - 1/(\overline{v}nT)^2$ over the randomness in the sequence $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T)$, we have that

$$R_k(\mathbf{v}) \leq \rho_k \cdot T + \overline{v}\sqrt{T \log(\overline{v}nT)}, \quad \forall k \in [n]. \quad (3.6)$$

We will write E_{GOOD} for the event in which (3.6) holds. Going back to the intuition provided before the statement of Lemma 3.7, E_{GOOD} is the event that the value each agent obtains in the benchmark allocation \mathbf{y} is not “too high” on rounds in which their pacing multipliers are 0.

Step 2: A Bound on Liquid Welfare For “Good” Value Realizations. Fix any realized sequence $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T$ such that (3.6) holds. We will now proceed to derive a lower bound on the liquid welfare of the agents (under allocation \mathbf{x}) by considering the two different possible cases for $\text{WEL}_{k,GPD}(\mathbf{v})$. Recall that the liquid welfare $\text{WEL}_{k,GPD}(\mathbf{v})$ of any agent k is either $B_k = \rho_k \cdot T$ or is $\sum_{t=1}^T x_{k,t}v_{k,t}$. For any k such that $\text{WEL}_{k,GPD}(\mathbf{v}) = B_k$, we obtain via (3.6) that

$$\text{WEL}_{k,GPD}(\mathbf{v}) = B_k \geq R_k(\mathbf{v}) - \overline{v}\sqrt{T \log(\overline{v}nT)}. \quad (3.7)$$

We now consider all of the remaining agents. Let $A \subseteq [n]$ be the set of agents k such that $\sum_{t=1}^T x_{k,t}v_{k,t} < B_k$ on this realized sequence \mathbf{v} , and hence $\text{WEL}_{k,GPD}(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{t=1}^T x_{k,t}v_{k,t}$. That is, each of their contributions to the liquid welfare on this realized sequence is uniquely determined by their true value for winning the items in the auction. Note that this further implies that no agent in A runs out of budget early because the generalized pacing algorithm does not allow overbidding (i.e., bidding above the value). Thus for all $k \in A$, $\mu_{k,T} \neq 0$ and $\mu_{k,t} \geq 0$ surely for all t . We claim that

$$\sum_{k \in A} \text{WEL}_{k,GPD}(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{k \in A} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{k,t}v_{k,t} \geq \sum_{k \in A} R_k(\mathbf{v}) - \sum_{k \in [n]} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{k,t}. \quad (3.8)$$

To show that the inequality holds, we partition the interval $[1, T]$ into maximal epochs for each agent k and bound the value obtained by agent k on each maximal epoch separately. Fix any agent $k \in A$ and suppose that

$[t_1, t_2]$ is a maximal epoch inside $[1, T]$. Since agent k does not run out of budget on the entire interval $[1, T]$, she does not run out of budget on this epoch in particular. We can therefore apply Lemma 3.6 to obtain

$$\sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-1} x_{k,t} v_{k,t} \geq x_{k,t_1} v_{k,t_1} - z_{k,t_1} + \rho_k \cdot (t_2 - t_1 - 1).$$

Since $[1, T]$ can be partitioned into maximal epochs for each agent $k \in A$, we can sum over all time periods and apply the definition of a maximal epoch to conclude that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T x_{k,t} v_{k,t} \geq \sum_{t=1}^T [\mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} = 0\} (x_{k,t} v_{k,t} - z_{k,t}) + \mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} \neq 0\} \cdot \rho_k].$$

Summing over all $k \in A$ and changing the order of the summations implies that

$$\sum_{k \in A} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{k,t} v_{k,t} \geq \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k \in A} [\mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} = 0\} (x_{k,t} v_{k,t} - z_{k,t})] + \sum_{k \in A} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} \neq 0\} \cdot \rho_k. \quad (3.9)$$

We will now use the assumption that the auction is a core auction. For any $t \in [1, T]$, let $S \subseteq A$ be the set of agents in A for which $\mu_{k,t} = 0$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in A} [\mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} = 0\} (x_{k,t} v_{k,t} - z_{k,t})] &= \sum_{k \in S} (x_{k,t} v_{k,t} - z_{k,t}) \\ &\geq \sum_{k \in S} y_k(\mathbf{v}_t) v_{k,t} - \sum_{k=1}^n z_{k,t} = \sum_{k \in A} \mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} = 0\} y_k(\mathbf{v}_t) v_{k,t} - \sum_{k=1}^n z_{k,t}. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows from the definition of a core auction and the no unnecessary pacing condition (which implies $b_{k,t} = v_{k,t}$ for all $k \in S$), by considering the deviation in which the agents in S jointly switch to allocation $\{y_k(\mathbf{v}_t)\}$. Substituting the above inequality into (3.9) and rearranging yields (3.8).

Summing over (3.7) for each $k \notin A$ and combining it with (3.8), we obtain that as long as inequality (3.6) holds (i.e., event E_{GOOD} occurs), we have

$$\sum_{k \in [n]} \text{WEL}_{k, \text{GPD}}(\mathbf{v}) \geq \sum_{k \in [n]} R_k(\mathbf{v}) - \sum_{k \in [n]} \sum_{t \in [T]} z_{k,t} - n\bar{v} \sqrt{T \log(\bar{v}nT)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Step 3: A Bound on Expected Liquid Welfare. Since the liquid welfare is nonnegative, we can take expectations over $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T$ to conclude from (3.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^n \text{WEL}_{k, \text{GPD}}(\mathbf{v}) \right] &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}\{E_{\text{GOOD}}\} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n \text{WEL}_{k, \text{GPD}}(\mathbf{v}) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}\{E_{\text{GOOD}}\} \cdot \sum_{k \in [n]} R_k(\mathbf{v}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T z_{k,t} \right] - n\bar{v} \sqrt{T \log(\bar{v}nT)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where the last inequality holds via (3.10).

It remains to analyze the expectations on the right side of the inequality. First, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}\{E_{\text{GOOD}}\} \sum_{k \in [n]} R_k(\mathbf{v}) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in [n]} R_k(\mathbf{v}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \mathbf{1}\{E_{\text{GOOD}}\}) \sum_{k \in [n]} R_k(\mathbf{v}) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in [n]} R_k(\mathbf{v}) \right] - \frac{n\bar{v}T}{n\bar{v}T^2} = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k \in [n]} R_k(\mathbf{v}) \right] - 1/T. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality holds due to the fact that $R_k(\mathbf{v}) \leq \bar{v}T$ as well as our bound on the probability that event (3.6) does not hold. Let $q_{k,t}$ be the unconditional probability that $\mu_{k,t} = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[R_k(\mathbf{v}) \right] &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} = 0\} \mathbb{E}[y_k(v_{k,t}) v_{k,t} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + \mathbf{1}\{\mu_{k,t} \neq 0\} \rho_k \right] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T [q_{k,t} \mathbb{E}[y_k(v_k) v_k] + (1 - q_{k,t}) \rho_k] \geq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[y_k(v_k) v_k] = \bar{W}_k(\mathbf{y}, F). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality uses the conditional independence of $y_k(v_{k,t})v_{k,t}$ on $\mu_{k,t}$, as this is already determined by time $t - 1$. The inequality holds since $\mathbb{E}[y_k(v_k)v_k] \leq \rho_k$ according to our assumption on \mathbf{y} . Substituting the inequalities into (3.11), we obtain that

$$\text{WEL}_{GPD}(F) \geq \sum_{k=1}^n \overline{W}_k(\mathbf{y}, F) - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T z_{k,t} \right] - n\bar{v}\sqrt{T \log(\bar{v}nT)} - 1/T. \quad (3.12)$$

Recall that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T z_{k,t} \right] = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} [z_{k,t}] = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[P_k] \leq \text{WEL}_{GPD}(F), \quad (3.13)$$

where P_k is the total expenditure of agent k , and this is upper bounded by the liquid value they obtain. Substituting into (3.12) and rearranging the terms, then noting that $\text{WEL}_{GPD}(F)$ is precisely the left-hand side of (3.1), we conclude that inequality (3.1) holds.

4 An Individual Guarantee: Vanishing Regret for MBB Auctions

In this section, we supplement our aggregate welfare guarantees with bounds on the individual performance of Algorithm 1 when used in any auction that satisfies the monotone bang-for-buck (MBB) condition.

We focus on a particular single agent k , henceforth called simply *the agent*. Its objective is value maximization subject to the budget constraint.¹¹ The other agents' bidding strategies \mathbf{b}_{-k} can depend arbitrarily on the realized values and the observed history. In each round t , let G_t be the joint distribution of value $v_{k,t}$ and other agents' bids $\mathbf{b}_{-k,t}$ given the history in the previous rounds. Thus, one can think of pair $(v_{k,t}, \mathbf{b}_{-k,t})$ as being drawn from a distribution G_t that could depend on the history up to time t . Let $V_t(\mu_{k,t})$ and $Z_t(\mu_{k,t})$ be, respectively, the agent's expected value and expected payment in round t for a particular multiplier $\mu_{k,t}$, where the expectation is taken over the distribution G_t . More formally, for a given auction defined by an allocation rule \mathbf{x} and a payment rule \mathbf{p} (see Section 2) and a given distribution G_t we have

$$Z_t(\mu_{k,t}) = \mathbb{E} \left[p_k(b_{k,t}, \mathbf{b}_{-k,t}) \right] \text{ and } V_t(\mu_{k,t}) = \mathbb{E} \left[v_{k,t} \cdot x_k(b_{k,t}, \mathbf{b}_{-k,t}) \right], \quad (4.1)$$

where the bid is $b_{k,t} = v_{k,t}/(1 + \mu_{k,t})$ and the expectations are over $(v_{k,t}, \mathbf{b}_{-k,t}) \sim G_t$.

We obtain regret relative to a non-standard benchmark called the *perfect pacing sequence*: essentially, a sequence $(\mu_1^*, \dots, \mu_T^*)$ such that the expected spend $Z_t(\mu_t^*)$ is exactly ρ in each round t (the precise definition is below). Our guarantee holds as long as the environment does not change too quickly, as quantified by the path-length $\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} |\mu_{t+1}^* - \mu_t^*|$. In the important special case of *stochastic environment* — when the distribution G_t is the same in all rounds — we obtain regret relative to the best fixed pacing multiplier in hindsight.

Remark 4.1. The perfect pacing sequence μ^* does not necessarily optimize value in hindsight, but regret against a best-in-hindsight benchmark would be too good to be true. More formally, after the auction is run for T rounds, let G_1, \dots, G_T be the resulting sequence of distributions. Fixing these distributions, let $V(\mu) = \sum_{t \in [T]} V_t(\mu_{k,t})$ be the expected value collected by agent k with a particular sequence of pacing multipliers $\mu = (\mu_{k,1}, \dots, \mu_{k,T})$. Then μ^* does not necessarily optimize $V(\mu)$ among all μ . However, one should not hope to obtain regret against $\sup_{\mu} V(\mu)$, as discussed in Section 1.2.

Now let us state our results more precisely. We will drop the dependence on the agent's index k from our notation. For each round t , we write v_t, μ_t , for the agent's value and multiplier, and $b_t = v_t/(1 + \mu_t)$ for its bid.

Consider $V_t(\cdot)$ and $Z_t(\cdot)$ as functions $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Both functions are monotonically non-increasing, by monotonicity of the auction allocation and payment rules. It will also be convenient for us to assume that the expenditure function Z_t almost surely satisfies the following smoothness assumptions:

¹¹Value-optimization is becoming a standard objective in online advertising markets [13].

Assumption 4.2. *There exists $\lambda \geq 0$ such that Z_t is λ -Lipschitz for all t .*

Assumption 4.3. *There exists $\delta > 0$ such that $Z_t(0) \geq \delta$ for all t . As our bounds will depend inversely on δ , we assume without loss of generality that $\delta \leq \rho$.¹²*

We argue that these assumptions are mild in the context of advertising auctions. Indeed, the variation in impression types, click rate estimates, etc., and possibly also the randomness in the auction and/or the bidding algorithms would likely introduce some smoothness into the expected payment $Z_t(\cdot)$, and ensure that the maximum allowable bid would result in a non-trivial payment. In fact, one could eliminate the need for Assumptions 4.2 and 4.3 by adding a small amount of noise to the auction allocation rule, such as by perturbing bids slightly, and/or a small but positive reserve price, at the cost of a similarly small loss of welfare.

We next formalize our notion of the perfect pacing sequence.

Definition 4.4. Fix some $\bar{\mu} \geq \bar{v}/\rho$, where \bar{v} is an upper bound on the values. For each round t , the *perfect pacing multiplier* is any $\mu_t^* \in [0, \bar{\mu}]$ such that $Z_t(\mu_t^*) = \rho$, or $\mu_t^* = 0$ if $Z_t(0) < \rho$. A *perfect pacing sequence* is $(\mu_1^*, \dots, \mu_T^*)$, where each μ_t^* is a perfect pacing multiplier.

Remark 4.5. To see that μ_t^* is well-defined, note that $Z_t(\bar{\mu}) \leq \bar{v}/(1 + \bar{\mu}) \leq \rho$. The Lipschitzness and monotonicity of Z_t therefore imply that if there does not exist any μ such that $Z_t(\mu) = \rho$, then it must be that $Z_t(0) < \rho$ (and hence $Z_t(\mu) < \rho$ for all $\mu \in [0, \bar{\mu}]$). This latter case occurs if even bidding the true value v_t generates an expected spend less than ρ . In this case we take $\mu_t^* = 0$, which corresponds to the most that the agent can bid without violating the mandate to not bid more than the value v_t .

With these definitions in place, we state our main result of this section:

Theorem 4.6. *Consider a repeated auction that is individually rational (IR) and satisfies monotone bang-per-buck (MBB) property. Posit Assumptions 4.2 and 4.3. Suppose the path-length $\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} |\mu_{t+1}^* - \mu_t^*|$ is upper-bounded by some number P with probability 1. Then, letting $\text{REG}_1 \triangleq ((P + 1)\bar{\mu}^2 + (\rho + \bar{v})^2)\sqrt{T}$, Algorithm 1 with a step size $\epsilon_k = 1/\sqrt{T}$ satisfies*

$$\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[V_t(\mu_t^*)] - \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[V_t(\mu_t)] = O\left(\frac{\bar{v}}{\delta} \sqrt{2\lambda T \cdot \text{REG}_1} + \frac{\bar{v}\bar{\mu}\sqrt{T}}{\rho}\right). \quad (4.2)$$

When parameters $(\bar{v}, \bar{\mu}, \lambda, \delta)$ are absolute constants, the right-hand side of (4.2) is $O(\sqrt{P+1} \cdot T^{3/4})$.

4.1 Corollaries and Extensions

We emphasize that we allow the environment to change over time. The dependence on the change is summarized by the path-length $\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} |\mu_{t+1}^* - \mu_t^*|$. Our guarantees are non-trivial when this quantity is $o(T^{1/4})$.

Our guarantees go beyond slight perturbations of the same stochastic environment: in fact, our environment may be very far from any one stochastic environment. To make this point concrete, consider a ‘‘piecewise stochastic’’ environment, when the sequence of distributions G_1, \dots, G_T has a few ‘‘switches’’ (changes from one round to another) and stays the same in between.

Corollary 4.7. *If the sequence G_1, \dots, G_T has at most N switches, the Theorem 4.6 holds with $P = \bar{\mu}N$.*

Our guarantees extend beyond the original model: the marginal distribution of the agent’s value and the auction itself can change over time, as long as the assumptions hold.

¹²We only require the weaker condition: $Z_t(0) \geq \delta \times \frac{V_t(0)}{\bar{v}}$ for all t . In particular, this allows $Z_t(0) = 0$ if $V_t(0) = 0$.

Extension 4.8. *Theorem 4.6 holds as written if the marginal distribution of the agent’s value v_t and the auction itself can arbitrarily change from one round to another, possibly depending on the previous rounds.*

For the stochastic environment, the perfect pacing multiplier is close to the value-optimizing fixed multiplier, and we obtain a regret bound against the latter. Formally, suppose distribution G_t does not change over time almost surely. Then neither does the perfect pacing multiplier or the $V_t(\cdot)$ function, so $\mu_t^* = \mu^*$ and $V_t = V$. Let $Y(\mu)$ be the expected value of the bidding strategy that paces with multiplier μ for each round, $b_t = v_t/(1 + \mu)$, until running out of budget. Thus, we are interested in the multiplier that maximizes $Y(\cdot)$.

Corollary 4.9. *Suppose distribution G_t does not change over time almost surely, and assume that parameters $(\bar{v}, \bar{\mu}, \lambda, \delta)$ are absolute constants. Then $\sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[V_t(\mu_t)] \geq \max_{\mu \in [0, \bar{\mu}]} Y(\mu) - O(T^{3/4})$.*

Corollary 4.9 is proved in Appendix D.1, by relating $\sup Y(\mu)$ and $V(\mu^*)$.

4.2 Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) interpretation

To prove Theorem 4.6 it will be helpful to interpret Algorithm 1 as using *stochastic gradient descent* (SGD), a standard algorithm in online convex optimization (see Appendix C). Here, SGD uses pacing multipliers μ as actions, and optimizes an appropriately-defined artificial objective $H_t(\cdot)$ in each round t , where

$$H_t(\mu) = \rho \cdot \mu - \int_0^\mu Z_t(x) dx. \quad (4.3)$$

The per-round spend z_t provides a stochastic signal that in expectation equals the gradient of H_t :

$$H'_t(\mu_t) = \rho - Z_t(\mu_t) = \rho - \mathbb{E}_{G_t}[z_t(\mu_t)]. \quad (4.4)$$

The SGD machinery applies because the function H_t is convex and $(\bar{v} + \rho)$ -Lipschitz (see Appendix D.2).

This interpretation provides a concrete intuition for what Algorithm 1 actually does: for better or worse, it optimizes the aggregate artificial objective $\sum_{t \in [T]} H_t(\mu_t)$, whose optimum is precisely $\sum_t H_t(\mu_t^*)$. The analysis simplifies accordingly, as we can directly invoke the known guarantees for SGD and conclude that the artificial objective comes close to this target optimum. Much of the proof of Theorem 4.6 involves relating this artificial objective to value optimization.

Remark 4.10. The fact that Algorithm 1 optimizes an artificial objective whose optimum is attained by the perfect pacing sequence suggests the latter as an appropriate benchmark for analyzing this algorithm.

A similar (but technically different) interpretation appeared in [12] in the context of second-price auctions. Their interpretation relies on Lagrangian duality and does not appear to extend beyond second-price auctions.

Remark 4.11. Our analysis only uses two properties of the dynamics. First, that the dynamics obtains low regret with respect to an adversarially generated sequence of convex functions H_t (we inherit this from SGD). Second, that the dynamics do not terminate too early to bound any possible loss on these periods. The proof of Theorem 4.6 generalizes almost immediately to any algorithm satisfying these properties (Lemma 2.2).

4.3 Proof of Theorem 4.6

Our analysis proceeds in three steps. First, we invoke the SGD machinery to show that the sequence of chosen multipliers (μ_t) approximates the target optimum $\sum_t H_t(\mu_t^*)$. Second, we relate the H_t functions to the per-round payments to show that the expected payment is not too far from ρ in each round. Finally, we use the MBB property of the auctions to bound the total loss in value.

The following technical lemma will enable us to meaningfully relate the Z_t and H_t functions whose proof is deferred to the Appendix:

Lemma 4.12. *Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an increasing, λ -Lipschitz function such that $f(0) = 0$. Let $R = \int_0^x f(y)dy$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $|f(x)| \leq \sqrt{2\lambda R}$.*

To begin, observe that Algorithm 1 is equivalent to running (projected) stochastic gradient descent on the sequence of H_t functions from (4.3), where the maximum norm of the gradient is at most \bar{v} using the assumption that the payment is at most the bid, which in turn is at most the maximum possible value. Note that these functions are indeed convex and Lipschitz (see Appendix D.2 for a proof) and indeed, $H'_t(\mu) = \rho - Z_t(\mu) = \rho - \mathbb{E}_{G_t}[z_t(\mu)]$ by construction of H_t . We now wish to bound the sequence regret, $\sum_t \mathbb{E}[H_t(\mu_t) - H_t(\mu^*)]$. While the dynamics may end before time T , we may upper bound the regret by continuing to time T , as each term is nonnegative. Standard analysis of SGD (see Proposition C.1 in Appendix D.2 for details) then implies

$$\text{REG}_1 \triangleq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[H_t(\mu_t) - H_t(\mu^*)] = O\left((P\bar{\mu}^2 + (\rho + \bar{v})^2)\sqrt{T}\right). \quad (4.5)$$

Our goal is to translate (4.5) into a bound on values. From Lemma 2.2, we may assume that the dynamics continue until time T without stopping at the cost of $O(\bar{v}\bar{\mu}\sqrt{T}/\rho)$ loss in value which we will account for at the end. Define the function $W_t(\mu)$ by

$$W_t(\mu) = \begin{cases} V_t(\mu) & \text{if } Z_t(\mu) < \rho \\ V_t(\mu) \times \frac{\rho}{Z_t(\mu)} & \text{if } Z_t(\mu) \geq \rho. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $W_t(\mu) \leq V_t(\mu)$ by construction; it can be viewed as (approximately) the per-round value obtained by bidding with pacing multiplier μ — if the environment at time t persisted for all rounds — until the budget is expected to terminate due to overspending. We further observe that $V_t(\mu_t) - V_t(\mu_t^*) \geq W_t(\mu_t) - W_t(\mu_t^*)$ for all t . To see this, note that $V_t(\mu_t^*) = W_t(\mu_t^*)$ since $Z_t(\mu_t^*) \leq \rho$, and moreover, the first term on the right side equals the first term of the left side, which is non-negative, with some scaling factor at most 1. Therefore,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T (V_t(\mu_t^*) - V_t(\mu_t)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T (W_t(\mu_t^*) - W_t(\mu_t)), \quad (4.6)$$

so it will suffice to show that the right side is not too large.

For any round t , we now consider two cases depending on the value of μ_t and derive a lower bound on the difference in W_t values:

1. **Case 1:** $\mu_t < \mu_t^*$. Note that in this case we must have $\mu_t^* > 0$ and hence $Z_t(\mu_t) \geq Z_t(\mu_t^*) = \rho$, and therefore

$$W_t(\mu_t) = V_t(\mu_t) \times \frac{\rho}{Z_t(\mu_t)} \geq W_t(\mu_t^*) \times \frac{\rho}{Z_t(\mu_t)}.$$

By rearranging and adding $W_t(\mu_t^*)$ to each side of the last inequality, it follows that

$$W_t(\mu_t^*) - W_t(\mu_t) \leq \frac{Z_t(\mu_t) - \rho}{Z_t(\mu_t)} \cdot W_t(\mu_t^*) \leq (Z_t(\mu_t) - \rho) \cdot \frac{\bar{v}}{\rho}, \quad (4.7)$$

where we use the fact that $Z_t(\mu_t) \geq \rho$ as well as $W_t(\mu_t^*) \leq \bar{v}$.

2. **Case 2:** $\mu_t \geq \mu_t^*$. In this case, we have $Z_t(\mu_t) \leq Z_t(\mu_t^*) \leq \rho$ by assumption, and hence $W_t(\mu_t^*) = V_t(\mu_t^*)$ and $W_t(\mu_t) = V_t(\mu_t)$. We now claim that the MBB property of the auction implies

$$\frac{W_t(\mu_t^*)}{W_t(\mu_t)} = \frac{V_t(\mu_t^*)}{V_t(\mu_t)} \leq \frac{Z_t(\mu_t^*)}{Z_t(\mu_t)}. \quad (4.8)$$

To prove (4.8), define $\gamma = Z_t(\mu_t)/V_t(\mu_t)$ and note that since the auction is individually rational, it must be that an agent bidding $v_t/(1 + \mu_t)$ pays at most $v_t/(1 + \mu_t)$ per unit allocated, and hence $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{1 + \mu_t}$. If

we write $Z_t(\mu_t | v_t)$ for the expected value of $Z_t(\mu_t)$ conditional on the realization of v_t (recalling that v_t can be correlated with the competing bids), and similarly for $V_t(\mu_t | v_t)$, then by MBB and linearity of expectation

$$Z_t(\mu_t^* | v_t) - Z_t(\mu_t | v_t) \geq \frac{1}{1 + \mu_t} (V_t(\mu_t^* | v_t) - V_t(\mu_t | v_t))$$

where we used the fact that the bid given v_t and μ_t is $v_t/(1 + \mu_t)$, and $V_t(\cdot | v_t)$ is precisely v_t times the agent's expected allocation. Taking expectations over v_t then implies $Z_t(\mu_t^*) - Z_t(\mu_t) \geq \frac{1}{1 + \mu_t} (V_t(\mu_t^*) - V_t(\mu_t))$. Rearranging and recalling that $Z_t(\mu_t) = \gamma V_t(\mu_t)$, we conclude

$$Z_t(\mu_t^*) \geq \gamma V_t(\mu_t) + \frac{1}{1 + \mu_t} (V_t(\mu_t^*) - V_t(\mu_t)) \geq \gamma V_t(\mu_t^*)$$

which implies (4.8). A rearrangement of (4.8) then implies

$$W_t(\mu_t^*) - W_t(\mu_t) \leq \frac{V_t(\mu_t^*)}{Z_t(\mu_t^*)} \times (Z_t(\mu_t^*) - Z_t(\mu_t)) \leq \frac{\bar{v}}{\min\{\rho, \delta\}} (Z_t(\mu_t^*) - Z_t(\mu_t)). \quad (4.9)$$

The second inequality comes from considering the cases that $\mu_t^* = 0$ (and applying Assumption 4.3) and $\mu_t^* > 0$.

In either case, (4.7) and (4.9) implies that (recalling the assumption $\delta \leq \rho$)

$$W_t(\mu_t^*) - W_t(\mu_t) \leq \frac{\bar{v}}{\delta} |Z_t(\mu_t^*) - Z_t(\mu_t)|. \quad (4.10)$$

We now relate this bound to the H_t functions. Observe that

$$H_t(\mu_t) - H_t(\mu_t^*) = \int_{\mu_t^*}^{\mu_t} [\rho - Z_t(x)] dx = \int_0^{\mu_t - \mu_t^*} [\rho - Z_t(\mu_t^* + x)] dx,$$

and moreover that the integrand $f(x) = \rho - Z_t(\mu_t^* + x)$ is increasing and λ -Lipschitz by the assumption on Z_t . In general, $f(0) \geq 0$ (with equality if $Z_t(\mu_t^*) = \rho$). If we consider $g(x) = f(x) - f(0)$ and apply Lemma 4.12, we obtain

$$|Z_t(\mu_t) - Z_t(\mu_t^*)| = |f(\mu_t - \mu_t^*) - f(0)| \leq \sqrt{2\lambda(H_t(\mu_t) - H_t(\mu_t^*) - (\mu_t - \mu_t^*)(\rho - Z_t(\mu_t^*)))}.$$

Note that if $\mu_t < \mu_t^*$, then $\rho = Z_t(\mu_t^*)$ so the last subtracted term is zero, while if $\mu_t \geq \mu_t^*$, then the last subtracted term is nonnegative. In either case, we deduce that

$$|Z_t(\mu_t) - Z_t(\mu_t^*)| \leq \sqrt{2\lambda(H_t(\mu_t) - H_t(\mu_t^*))} \quad (4.11)$$

By combining these inequalities, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T V_t(\mu_t^*) - V(\mu_t) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T W_t(\mu_t^*) - W_t(\mu_t) \right] && \text{(by (4.6))} \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{v}}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T |Z_t(\mu_t^*) - Z_t(\mu_t)| \right] && \text{(by (4.10))} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2\lambda} \frac{\bar{v}}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \sqrt{H_t(\mu_t) - H_t(\mu_t^*)} \right] && \text{(by (4.11))} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2\lambda T} \frac{\bar{v}}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T H_t(\mu_t) - H_t(\mu_t^*)} \right] && \text{(by Cauchy-Schwarz)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2\lambda T} \frac{\bar{v}}{\delta} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T H_t(\mu_t) - H_t(\mu_t^*) \right]} && \text{(by Jensen's inequality)} \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{v}}{\delta} \sqrt{2\lambda T \cdot \text{REG}_1} && \text{(by (4.5)).} \end{aligned}$$

Accounting for the $O(\bar{\mu}\bar{v}\sqrt{T}/\rho)$ loss from possibly terminating early gives the claim.

5 Conclusions and Open Questions

We have shown that a natural budget-pacing algorithm achieves good aggregate and individual performance guarantees for a wide class of auctions and arbitrarily correlated private values, without relying on convergence to an equilibrium.

Some questions left open by our work concern simultaneously achieving similar individual and aggregate guarantees. Particularly, can such results be extended to other (classes of) algorithms, perhaps bringing to bear the “generalized pacing” notion from Definition 3.1? Can one improve the individual guarantees while keeping the same liquid welfare guarantee?¹³

While achieving optimal individual regret guarantees is not our goal per se, it would be interesting to improve regret bounds for repeated non-truthful auctions, particularly for repeated first-price auctions, even if they are not accompanied by aggregate guarantees. Improved regret bounds for the stochastic environment are especially interesting when combined with some guarantees for the adversarial environment. As linear policies (mappings from values to bids) are not necessarily value-optimizing for non-truthful auctions, an important sub-question is which class(es) of policies one would want to optimize over.

References

- [1] Gagan Aggarwal, Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, and Aranyak Mehta. Autobidding with constraints. In Ioannis Caragiannis, Vahab S. Mirrokni, and Evdokia Nikolova, editors, *Web and Internet Economics - 15th International Conference, WINE 2019, New York, NY, USA, December 10-12, 2019, Proceedings*, volume 11920 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 17–30. Springer, 2019. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-35389-6_2. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35389-6_2.
- [2] Shipra Agrawal and Nikhil R. Devanur. Bandits with global convex constraints and objective. *Operations Research*, 67(5):1486–1502, 2019. Preliminary version in *ACM EC 2014*.
- [3] Peter Auer, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, Yoav Freund, and Robert E. Schapire. The nonstochastic multiarmed bandit problem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 32(1):48–77, 2002. Preliminary version in *36th IEEE FOCS*, 1995.
- [4] Robert J. Aumann. Subjectivity and correlation in randomized strategies. *J. of Mathematical Economics*, 1:67–96, 1974.
- [5] Lawrence M Ausubel and Paul R Milgrom. Ascending auctions with package bidding. *Advances in Theoretical Economics*, 1(1), 2002.
- [6] Yossi Azar, Michal Feldman, Nick Gravin, and Alan Roytman. Liquid price of anarchy. In Vittorio Bilò and Michele Flammini, editors, *Algorithmic Game Theory - 10th International Symposium, SAGT 2017, L’Aquila, Italy, September 12-14, 2017, Proceedings*, volume 10504 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 3–15. Springer, 2017. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-66700-3_1. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66700-3_1.
- [7] Moshe Babaioff, Richard Cole, Jason D. Hartline, Nicole Immorlica, and Brendan Lucier. Non-quasi-linear agents in quasi-linear mechanisms (extended abstract). In James R. Lee, editor, *12th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2021, January 6-8, 2021, Virtual Conference*, volume 185 of *LIPICs*, pages 84:1–84:1. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi: 10.4230/LIPICs.ITCS.2021.84. URL <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ITCS.2021.84>.
- [8] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, John Langford, and Aleksandrs Slivkins. Resourceful contextual bandits. In *27th Conf. on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2014.

¹³Regret $\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$ is likely the best possible individual guarantee, even in the stochastic environment, under Lipschitz assumptions, and without budget constraints, given the impossibility results on related bandit problems [34, 35].

- [9] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Robert Kleinberg, and Aleksandrs Slivkins. Bandits with knapsacks. *J. of the ACM*, 65(3):13:1–13:55, 2018. Preliminary version in *FOCS 2013*.
- [10] James P. Bailey and Georgios Piliouras. Multiplicative weights update in zero-sum games. In *ACM Conf. on Economics and Computation (ACM-EC)*, pages 321–338, 2018.
- [11] Santiago Balseiro, Anthony Kim, Mohammad Mahdian, and Vahab Mirrokni. Budget-management strategies in repeated auctions. *Operations Research*, 69(3):859–876, 2021.
- [12] Santiago R. Balseiro and Yonatan Gur. Learning in repeated auctions with budgets: Regret minimization and equilibrium. *Manag. Sci.*, 65(9):3952–3968, 2019. Preliminary version in *ACM EC 2017*.
- [13] Santiago R Balseiro, Yuan Deng, Jieming Mao, Vahab S Mirrokni, and Song Zuo. The landscape of auto-bidding auctions: Value versus utility maximization. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 132–133, 2021.
- [14] Santiago R Balseiro, Christian Kroer, and Rachitesh Kumar. Contextual standard auctions with budgets: Revenue equivalence and efficiency guarantees. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 476–476, 2022.
- [15] Santiago R. Balseiro, Haihao Lu, and Vahab S. Mirrokni. The best of many worlds: Dual mirror descent for online allocation problems. *Operations Research*, 2022. Forthcoming. Preliminary version in *ICML 2020*.
- [16] Christian Borgs, Jennifer T. Chayes, Nicole Immorlica, Kamal Jain, Omid Etesami, and Mohammad Mahdian. Dynamics of bid optimization in online advertisement auctions. In Carey L. Williamson, Mary Ellen Zurko, Peter F. Patel-Schneider, and Prashant J. Shenoy, editors, *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2007, Banff, Alberta, Canada, May 8-12, 2007*, pages 531–540. ACM, 2007. doi: 10.1145/1242572.1242644. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1242572.1242644>.
- [17] Xi Chen, Christian Kroer, and Rachitesh Kumar. The complexity of pacing for second-price auctions. In Péter Biró, Shuchi Chawla, and Federico Echenique, editors, *EC '21: The 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, Budapest, Hungary, July 18-23, 2021*, page 318. ACM, 2021. doi: 10.1145/3465456.3467578. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3465456.3467578>.
- [18] Xi Chen, Christian Kroer, and Rachitesh Kumar. Throttling equilibria in auction markets. *CoRR*, abs/2107.10923, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.10923>.
- [19] Yun Kuen Cheung and Georgios Piliouras. Vortices instead of equilibria in minmax optimization: Chaos and butterfly effects of online learning in zero-sum games. In *Conf. on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 807–834, 2019.
- [20] Vincent Conitzer, Christian Kroer, Debmalya Panigrahi, Okke Schrijvers, Eric Sodomka, Nicolas E Stier-Moses, and Chris Wilkens. Pacing equilibrium in first-price auction markets. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 587–587, 2019.
- [21] Vincent Conitzer, Christian Kroer, Eric Sodomka, and Nicolas E Stier-Moses. Multiplicative pacing equilibria in auction markets. *Operations Research*, 2021.
- [22] Constantinos Daskalakis and Ioannis Panageas. Last-iterate convergence: Zero-sum games and constrained min-max optimization. In *10th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conf. (ITCS)*, volume 124, pages 27:1–27:18, 2019.
- [23] Constantinos Daskalakis, Andrew Ilyas, Vasilis Syrgkanis, and Haoyang Zeng. Training gans with optimism. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [24] Yuan Deng, Jieming Mao, Vahab Mirrokni, and Song Zuo. Towards efficient auctions in an auto-bidding world. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pages 3965–3973, 2021.

- [25] Shahar Dobzinski and Renato Paes Leme. Efficiency guarantees in auctions with budgets. In Javier Esparza, Pierre Fraigniaud, Thore Husfeldt, and Elias Koutsoupias, editors, *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 41st International Colloquium, ICALP 2014, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 8-11, 2014, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 8572 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 392–404. Springer, 2014. doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-43948-7_33. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-43948-7_33.
- [26] Jasmine Enberg. Us digital ad spending 2019, Mar 2019. URL <https://www.emarketer.com/content/us-digital-ad-spending-2019>.
- [27] Gagan Goel, Mohammad Reza Khani, and Renato Paes Leme. Core-competitive auctions. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 149–166, 2015.
- [28] Gagan Goel, Vahab Mirrokni, and Renato Paes Leme. Polyhedral clinching auctions and the adwords polytope. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 62(3):1–27, 2015.
- [29] Noah Golowich, Sarath Pattathil, and Constantinos Daskalakis. Tight last-iterate convergence rates for no-regret learning in multi-player games. In *33rd Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- [30] Sergiu Hart and Andreu Mas-Colell. A simple adaptive procedure leading to correlated equilibrium. *Econometrica*, 68:1127–1150, 2000.
- [31] Jason Hartline, Nicole Immorlica, Mohammad Reza Khani, Brendan Lucier, and Rad Niazadeh. Fast core pricing for rich advertising auctions. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 111–112, 2018.
- [32] Elad Hazan. Introduction to online convex optimization. *Found. Trends Optim.*, 2(3-4):157–325, 2016. doi: 10.1561/24000000013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1561/24000000013>.
- [33] Nicole Immorlica, Karthik Abinav Sankararaman, Robert Schapire, and Aleksandrs Slivkins. Adversarial bandits with knapsacks. *J. of the ACM*, 2022. To appear. Preliminary version in *60th IEEE FOCS*, 2019.
- [34] Robert Kleinberg. Nearly tight bounds for the continuum-armed bandit problem. In *18th Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2004.
- [35] Robert D. Kleinberg and Frank T. Leighton. The value of knowing a demand curve: Bounds on regret for online posted-price auctions. In *IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 594–605, 2003.
- [36] Panayotis Mertikopoulos, Christos H. Papadimitriou, and Georgios Piliouras. Cycles in adversarial regularized learning. In *29th ACM-SIAM Symp. on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2703–2717, 2018.
- [37] Herve Moulin and Jean-Paul Vial. Strategically zero-sum games: the class of games whose completely mixed equilibria cannot be improved upon. *Intl. J. of Game Theory*, 7(3):201–221, 1978.
- [38] Malleesh M Pai and Rakesh Vohra. Optimal auctions with financially constrained buyers. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 150:383–425, 2014.
- [39] Tim Roughgarden, Vasilis Syrgkanis, and Éva Tardos. The price of anarchy in auctions. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 59: 59–101, 2017. doi: 10.1613/jair.5272. URL <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.5272>.
- [40] Aleksandrs Slivkins. Introduction to multi-armed bandits. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 12(1-2):1–286, November 2019. Published with Now Publishers (Boston, MA, USA). Also available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.07272>. Latest online revision: Jan 2022.
- [41] Chen-Yu Wei, Chung-Wei Lee, Mengxiao Zhang, and Haipeng Luo. Linear last-iterate convergence in constrained saddle-point optimization. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.

A Examples of Auctions

In this section we provide the details of the ad-auctions we mentioned in Section 2.

A.1 Single-slot and Multiple-slot Ad Auctions

- *Single-Slot Ad Auctions:* A round corresponds to an ad impression, and there is a single ad slot available for each impression. An impression has a type $\theta_t \in \Theta$; this type might describe, for example, a keyword being searched for, user demographics, intent prediction, etc. In each round t the impression type θ_t is drawn independently from a distribution over types. Each agent k has a fixed value function $v_k: \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that maps each impression type to a value for being displayed. The value profile in round t is then $\mathbf{v}_t = (v_1(\theta_t), \dots, v_n(\theta_t))$. A single ad can be displayed each round. We then interpret $x_{k,t} \in [0, 1]$ as the probability that advertiser k is allocated the ad slot, and an allocation profile \mathbf{x}_t is feasible if and only if $\sum_k x_{k,t} \leq 1$.

- *Multiple-Slot Pay-per-click Ad Auctions:* We can generalize the previous example to allow multiple ad slots, using a polymatroid formulation due to [28]. Impression types and agent values are as before, but we now think of there as being $m \geq 1$ slots available in each round, with click rates $1 \geq \alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_m \geq 0$. If ad k is placed in slot i , the value to agent k is $v_k(\theta_t) \times \alpha_i$. That is, we think of $v_k(\theta_t)$ as representing both the advertiser-specific click rate (which can depend on the impression type) as well as the advertiser's value for a click. In this case we would take $v_{k,t} = v_k(\theta_t)$ and $x_{k,t} = \alpha_i$. The set of feasible allocation profiles $X \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ is then a polymatroid: $\mathbf{x}_t \in X$ if and only if, for each $\ell \leq m$ and each $S \subseteq [n]$ with $|S| = \ell$, $\sum_{k \in S} x_{k,t} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i$.

A.2 Examples of Core Auctions

The following are some notable examples of core auctions. Note that all of the following auction formats satisfy the monotone bang-per-buck property.

- *First-Price Auction* chooses a welfare-maximizing allocation $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} \{\sum_k b_k x_k\}$. Each agent k then pays her bid for the allocation obtained: $p_k(\mathbf{b}) = b_k x_k(\mathbf{b})$. To see this auction is MBB, first note that $x_k(\mathbf{b})$ is nondecreasing in b_k . Then observe that if \mathbf{b}_{-k} is fixed, and $b_k < b'_k$, then setting $\mathbf{b}' = (b'_k, \mathbf{b}_{-k})$, we clearly have

$$p_k(\mathbf{b}') - p_k(\mathbf{b}) = b'_k x_k(\mathbf{b}') - b_k x_k(\mathbf{b}) \geq b_k (x_k(\mathbf{b}') - x_k(\mathbf{b})),$$

as needed.

- *Second-Price Auction for a Single Slot.* Consider the single-slot environment described earlier; recall that feasible allocations \mathbf{x} satisfy $\sum_k x_k \leq 1$. The second-price auction chooses a welfare-maximizing allocation $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}) \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} \{\sum_k b_k x_k\}$, then each agent k pays x_k times the second-highest bid.
- *Generalized Second-Price (GSP) Auction.* Consider the multi-slot environment described earlier. In the GSP auction, slots are allocated greedily by the respective bid, and each agent pays a price per unit equal to the next-highest bid. Formally, given the bids \mathbf{b} , we let π be a permutation of the agents so that $b_{\pi(1)} \geq b_{\pi(2)} \geq \dots \geq b_{\pi(n)}$. That is, $\pi(1)$ is the highest-bidding agent, then $\pi(2)$, etc. Agent $\pi(k)$ is then allocated to slot k for each $k \leq m$. That is, $x_{\pi(k)} = \alpha_k$ for each $k \leq m$ and $x_{\pi(k)} = 0$ for each $k > m$. The payments are set so that $p_{\pi(k)} = x_{\pi(k)} b_{\pi(k+1)}$ for all $k < n$, and $p_{\pi(n)} = 0$.¹⁴ We note that GSP is a core auction; see Appendix F for a proof. To see the MBB property, let $b_k < b'_k$ and suppose that with bid profiles \mathbf{b} , agent k is assigned the j th slot, while under \mathbf{b}' , the agent is assigned the $\ell \leq j$ th

¹⁴Note that $p_{\pi(k)} = 0$ whenever $x_{\pi(k)} = 0$.

slot (where we allow the value of a slot to be 0 if the agent is not in the top m bids). If $j = \ell$, then it is easy to see that the price and allocation of agent k is unchanged, trivially confirming the MBB condition. If instead $j > \ell$, then it is easy to see that $b_{\pi'(\ell+1)} \geq b_k$, with π' the permutation under \mathbf{b}' , and hence

$$p_k(\mathbf{b}') - p_k(\mathbf{b}) \geq \alpha_\ell b_k - \alpha_\ell b_{\pi(j+1)} \geq b_k(\alpha_\ell - \alpha_j) = b_k(x_k(\mathbf{b}') - x_k(\mathbf{b})).$$

This clearly implies the MBB property for single-slot auctions.

B Omitted Proofs from Section 3

B.1 Motivating ex ante liquid welfare

Our definition of ex ante liquid welfare assumes that the same allocation rule y is used in every round. We now show that this is without loss of generality. The following lemma shows that given any allocation sequence rule there is a single-round allocation rule with the same ex ante liquid welfare.

Lemma B.1. *Let $\tilde{y} : [0, \bar{v}]^{nT} \rightarrow X^T$ be an allocation sequence rule that takes in the entire sequence $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T$ and allocates $\tilde{y}_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T)$ units to agent k at time t . Then there exists a (single-round) allocation rule $y : [0, \bar{v}]^n \rightarrow X$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}(\tilde{y}, F) &\triangleq \sum_{k=1}^n \min \left\{ B_k, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T \sim F} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{y}_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T) v_{k,t} \right] \right\} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n T \cdot \min \left\{ \rho_k, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim F} [y_k(\mathbf{v}) v_k] \right\} = \bar{W}(\mathbf{y}, F). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For each t , by slightly abusing notation, we define an allocation rule $\hat{y}_t : [0, \bar{v}]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ by

$$\hat{y}_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_t) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_{-t} \in F^{T-1}} [y_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T) | \mathbf{v}_t],$$

Note that this is a feasible allocation rule as the set of feasible allocations is convex and closed. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T \sim F} [y_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T) \cdot v_{k,t}] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_t} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_{-t}} [y_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T) \cdot v_{k,t} | \mathbf{v}_t] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_t} [\hat{y}_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_t) \cdot v_{k,t}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim F} [\hat{y}_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}) \cdot v_k]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we define the allocation rule \tilde{y} by setting $\tilde{y}_k = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{y}_{k,t}$ for each $k \in [n]$, which is again feasible because the set of feasible allocations is convex. By the linearity of the expectations operator, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T \sim F} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T y_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T) \cdot v_{k,t} \right] &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T \sim F} [y_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_T) \cdot v_{k,t}] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim F} [\hat{y}_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}) \cdot v_k] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim F} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{y}_{k,t}(\mathbf{v}) \cdot v_k \right] = T \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim F} [\tilde{y}_k(\mathbf{v}) \cdot v_k]. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the Lemma. □

B.2 Proof of Lemma 3.6

Proof. The assumption that $\mu_{k,t_2} \neq \flat$ means that the agent participates in all periods of $[t_1, t_2]$. Moreover, if $t_2 = t_1 + 1$, then (3.2) is trivial as the third term on the right hand of side of inequality (3.2) is zero and $z_{k,t_1} \geq 0$. Therefore, we may assume $t_2 \geq t_1 + 2$.

By the definition of an epoch, there is no negative projection in the dynamics on the epoch until possibly time t_2 . I.e., $\mu_{k,t} > 0$ for all $t_1 \leq t < t_2$. The pacing recurrence condition implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mu_{k,t_2-1} &= P_{[0,\bar{\mu}]}(\mu_{k,t_2-2} + \epsilon(z_{k,t_2-2} - \rho_k)) \leq \mu_{k,t_2-2} + \epsilon(z_{k,t_2-2} - \rho_k) \\ &\leq \epsilon \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-2} (z_{k,t} - \rho_k) = \epsilon \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-2} (z_{k,t} - (t_2 - t_1 - 1)\rho_k). \end{aligned}$$

The first and second inequalities follow because the multipliers are positive during an epoch. The third inequality follows from applying the second inequality repeatedly. Note that the inequality holds even if there is a positive projection during the epoch (i.e., if $\mu_{k,t} = \bar{\mu}$ for some $t \in [t_1, t_2)$).

Thus, the expenditure of agent k on this epoch is at least $\sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-2} z_{k,t} \geq (t_2 - t_1 - 1)\rho_k$. Let us now consider the *value* obtained by the agent on this epoch. Because agents never overbid in the pacing algorithm and because payments are always lower than the value in a core auction, the value obtained by the agent on the epoch is at least the expenditure, which we just lower bounded. To get a slight sharpening of this, note that on the first period of the epoch, the agent actually receives $x_{k,t_1}v_{k,t_1}$ value and pays z_{k,t_1} , which we know is at most $x_{k,t_1}v_{k,t_1}$ from the first property of core auctions and the no overbidding condition. Therefore, we can trade z_{k,t_1} expenditure for $x_{k,t_1}v_{k,t_1}$ value. It follows from the above bound and this observation that

$$\sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-1} x_{k,t}v_{k,t} \geq x_{k,t_1}v_{k,t_1} - z_{k,t_1} + \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-2} z_{k,t} \geq x_{k,t_1}v_{k,t_1} - z_{k,t_1} + (t_2 - t_1 - 1)\rho_k. \quad \square$$

B.3 Proof of Lemma 3.7

Proof. Let $\Delta_t = X_t Y_t + (1 - X_t)\rho - (\mathbb{E}[X_t Y_t + (1 - X_t)\rho | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}])$. Clearly, the sequence Δ_t forms a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale difference sequence by construction. Moreover, we observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t Y_t + (1 - X_t)\rho | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = X_t \mathbb{E}[Y_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + (1 - X_t)\rho = X_t \mathbb{E}[Y_t] + (1 - X_t)\rho,$$

where we use the facts that X_t is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable and Y_t is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . It follows that $\Delta_t \in [-\mathbb{E}[Y_t], \bar{v} - \mathbb{E}[Y_t]]$. As an immediate consequence of the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, we obtain

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \Delta_t \geq \theta \right) \leq \exp \left(\frac{-2\theta^2}{T\bar{v}^2} \right). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

But observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T \Delta_t \geq \theta \right\} &= \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T [X_t Y_t + (1 - X_t)\rho] \geq \theta + \sum_{t=1}^T [X_t \mathbb{E}[Y_t] + (1 - X_t)\rho] \right\} \\ &\supseteq \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T [X_t Y_t + (1 - X_t)\rho] \geq \theta + T \cdot \rho \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

using the assumption $\mathbb{E}[Y_t] \leq \rho$. This inclusion together with (B.1) yields (3.3). \square

C Dynamic Regret Guarantees for SGD

Recall that our general approach for establishing individual guarantees is through a reduction to regret bounds for *projected stochastic gradient descent*. The general goal of stochastic gradient descent is to obtain a sequence of points x_1, \dots, x_T in an online fashion that achieve low-regret with respect to the loss of a sequence of convex functions f_1, \dots, f_T compared to the best fixed point in some convex set \mathcal{K} . Moreover, at each time t , the agent receives noisy feedback via a noisy, but unbiased estimate of $\nabla f_t(x_t)$. The general form of the algorithm is given below:

Algorithm 2: Stochastic Gradient Descent

Input: \mathcal{K} convex set, T time horizon, $\epsilon > 0$ learning rate

Output: Sequence $x_1, \dots, x_T \in \mathcal{K}$

- 1 Initialize $x_1 \in \mathcal{K}$.
 - 2 **for** $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**
 - 3 Observe $\tilde{\nabla}_t$, an unbiased estimator of $\nabla f_t(x_t)$, where f_t is a (adversarially chosen) convex function (i.e. $\mathbb{E}_t[\tilde{\nabla}_t] = \nabla f_t(x_t)$ where the expectation is over any randomness in the dynamics after x_t and f_t are chosen);
 - 4 Update $x_{t+1} = P_{\mathcal{K}}(x_t - \epsilon \tilde{\nabla}_t)$.
-

It is well-known that Algorithm 2 attains vanishing regret with respect to the loss of the best fixed action in \mathcal{K} on the sequence of function f_1, \dots, f_T . For completeness, we give the following guarantee on *path-length (dynamic) guarantees* for stochastic gradient descent that is immediately obtained by combining standard regret bounds.

Proposition C.1. *Let \mathcal{K} be a convex set with diameter D , and suppose that f_1, \dots, f_T is a sequence of convex functions, where f_t can be adversarially chosen depending on the previous f_1, \dots, f_{t-1} as well as x_1, \dots, x_t . Suppose that the sequence x_1, \dots, x_T is obtained by running Algorithm 2 and it further holds that $\|\tilde{\nabla}_t\| \leq G$ with probability 1. Then for any (not necessarily fixed) sequence $u_1, \dots, u_T \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfying $\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|u_{t+1} - u_t\|_2 + 1 \leq P$ with probability one, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(u_t) \right] \leq O \left(\frac{D^2 P}{\epsilon} + \epsilon G^2 T \right). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of combining standard analyses of stochastic gradient descent and dynamic regret. We have deterministically by convexity that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(u_t) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \nabla f_t(x_t)^T (x_t - u_t) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\nabla}_t^T (x_t - u_t) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation is over all random choices in the dynamics using the assumption on the gradient estimates. At this point, the dynamics follow online gradient descent with cost functions $\tilde{f}_t(x) = \tilde{\nabla}_t^T x$. Hence we may

invoke Theorem 10.1.1 of [32] to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(u_t) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\nabla}_t^T(x_t - u_t) \right] \\ &\leq O \left(\frac{D^2 P}{\epsilon} + \epsilon G^2 T \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the assumption that $\|\tilde{\nabla}_t\| \leq G$ almost surely as well as the almost sure path-length assumption. \square

D Omitted Proofs from Section 5

D.1 Stochastic environment: Proof of Corollary 4.9

Proposition D.1 (Stochastic Environment). *Suppose that G_t does not change over time almost surely. Define μ^* , $V(\cdot)$ and $Y(\cdot)$ as in Corollary 4.9. Assume that the auction satisfies MBB and posit Assumption 4.2. Then*

$$Y(\mu) \leq T \cdot V(\mu^*) + \bar{v}^2/\rho \quad \forall \mu \in [0, \bar{\mu}].$$

Proof. Fix $\mu \in [0, \bar{\mu}]$. Define the random process $M_k = \sum_{t=1}^k [x_t v_t - V(\mu)]$, where x_t and v_t are the (random) allocation and valuations at each time t when bidding with multiplier μ . Notice that M_k is a martingale by construction and $\mathbb{E}[M_1] = 0$. Define τ_μ to be first time that such a bidding algorithm runs out of money at the end of the period, or T if this does not occur. Because M_k is a martingale, by the Optional Stopping Theorem,

$$Y(\mu) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_\mu} x_t v_t \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_\mu} V(\mu) \right] = \mathbb{E}[\tau_\mu] \cdot V(\mu), \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where the inequality occurs because the stopping rule counts the value obtained on the period where the agent may (strictly) exceed the budget, and then using Wald's identity in the last step as the function $V(\mu)$ is constant over time by assumption so independent of τ_μ .

We now derive an upper bound on the expectation of the stopping time. On the one hand, we certainly have $\mathbb{E}[\tau_\mu] \leq T$ as $\tau_\mu \leq T$ by definition. An analogous martingale argument with $N_k = \sum_{t=1}^k [z_t - Z(\mu)]$ (where z_t is the (random) expenditure at time t) similarly implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_\mu] \cdot Z(\mu) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_\mu} z_t \right] \leq B + \bar{v}, \quad (\text{D.2})$$

where the extra term arises in the analysis because the agent may spend \bar{v} on the final round before she exceeds her budget. Combining (D.1) and (D.2) implies that $Y(\mu) \leq V(\mu) \cdot \min \left\{ T, \frac{B+\bar{v}}{Z(\mu)} \right\}$.

Suppose first that $\mu \geq \mu^*$ so that $V(\mu) \leq V(\mu^*)$. As we have seen, this implies that $Y(\mu) \leq V(\mu) \cdot T \leq V(\mu^*) \cdot T$ as claimed. If instead $\mu < \mu^*$, note that by definition this implies that $Z(\mu^*) = \rho$, and our inequality implies that $Y(\mu) \leq (B + \bar{v}) \cdot V(\mu)/Z(\mu) \leq (B + \bar{v}) \cdot V(\mu^*)/Z(\mu^*)$ by the monotone bang-for-buck property (see the proof of Theorem 4.6). This yields $Y(\mu) \leq V(\mu^*) \cdot (T + \bar{v}/\rho) \leq V(\mu^*) \cdot T + \bar{v}^2/\rho$. In either case, we get the obtained bound. \square

D.2 Artificial objective H_t

Lemma D.2. *The function H_t is convex and is $(\bar{v} + \rho)$ -Lipschitz.*

Proof. The convexity is immediate from the fundamental theorem of calculus and monotonicity assumption on Z_t , as the expected expenditure is a weakly decreasing function of the multiplier. To show that the Lipschitz condition holds note that

$$|H_t(y) - H_t(x)| \leq \rho|y - x| + \left| \int_x^y Z_t(s) ds \right| \leq (\rho + Z_t(0))|y - x|.$$

The proof of the Lipschitz condition follows from the fact the expected expenditure function is at most the expected valuation. \square

D.3 Proof of Lemma 4.12

Proof. The conclusion is trivial if $\lambda = 0$, so we assume $\lambda > 0$. Moreover, note that we always have $R \geq 0$, and by considering the function $-f(-y)$ if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $x \geq 0$ and thus the same for $f(x)$.

For a contradiction, suppose that $f(x) > \sqrt{2\lambda R}$. Then by the assumption that f is λ -Lipschitz, it follows that $f(y) > \sqrt{2\lambda R} - \lambda(x - y)$ for all $y \in [x - \sqrt{2R/\lambda}, x]$ (note $f(y) > 0$ on this region so this region is contained in $[0, x]$, where $f(y) \geq 0$). Hence, we have

$$\int_0^x f(y) dy \geq \int_{x - \sqrt{2R/\lambda}}^x f(y) dy > \int_{x - \sqrt{2R/\lambda}}^x [\sqrt{2\lambda R} - \lambda(x - y)] dy.$$

This latter integral gives the area of a right triangle with height $\sqrt{2\lambda R}$ and base $\sqrt{2R/\lambda}$, which is clearly equal to R . This contradicts the assumption that $R = \int_0^x f(y) dy$, proving the lemma. \square

E Vanishing Regret Does Not Imply Approximately Optimal Liquid Welfare

In this Section we present an example showing that a dynamic bidding strategy that achieves vanishing (in fact, zero) regret for all agents might still have an unbounded approximation factor with respect to the liquid welfare of the allocation sequence.

Proposition E.1. *There exists an instance of a second-price auction for a single good and two agents, described by a distribution over valuations, and a pair of no-regret bidding strategies such that when both agents follow the pair of no-regret bidding strategies, the resulting expected liquid welfare is arbitrarily small compared to the optimal liquid welfare.*

Proof. We'll begin by showing something simpler: there exists a distribution over valuations and a bidding strategy for each agent such that, under these strategies, both agents have zero regret. We will then show how to extend this construction to one in which each agent is using a truly no-regret bidding strategy.

The per-round auction in our example is a second-price auction for a single good. There are two agents. The distribution F over value profiles is such that $(v_1, v_2) = (2, 1)$ with probability 1. The target per-round spend rates for the agents are $(\rho_1, \rho_2) = (1/(1 + \bar{\mu}), 1)$, where $\bar{\mu}$ is some arbitrarily large constant independent of T .

Consider the following bidding strategies for the agents. Agent 1 bids value 2 for all periods and agent 2 bids 0 for all periods. Under this strategy profile, agent 1 receives all the items over the T rounds, and both agents pay nothing.

Under these strategies, agent 1 has zero regret as she obtains the maximum possible value. Agent 2 likewise has zero regret, since no choice of bid less than v_2 can cause her to win in any round. Note that the agents would still have zero regret if their objective were changed to maximizing value minus (any scalar multiple $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ times) payments.

The liquid welfare of this equilibrium is $T/(\bar{\mu} + 1)$, the total budget of agent 1. However, allocating all goods to agent 2 achieves a liquid welfare of T . Since $\bar{\mu}$ is an arbitrarily large constant, this approximation factor is unbounded.

One possible critique of the above construction is that the strategy each agent chooses only achieves no-regret for a particular adversary. We now show that the ideas of the construction can be generalized to the situation where both agents are choosing strategies that achieves no-regret against any adversaries, while the approximation ratio of the equilibrium liquid welfare is arbitrarily large.

Let σ be any no-regret bidding strategy against any adversary. Let σ_1 be the bidding strategy that always bid value v if the historical bids of the opponent is always 0, and follows the bidding strategy σ otherwise. Let σ_2 be the bidding strategy that always bid 0 if the historical bids of the opponent is always 2, and follows the bidding strategy σ otherwise. Note that given any adversary, strategy σ_1 achieves no-regret for agent 1 given any adversary, and strategy σ_2 achieves no-regret for agent 2. This is because both agents achieve no-regret when the adversary proceeds as anticipated, and the remaining budget of the agent until detecting any deviation does not decrease.

Finally, when both agents follow the strategy profile (σ_1, σ_2) , no agent will deviate to strategy σ and the equilibrium liquid welfare is $T/(\bar{\mu} + 1)$, which can be unboundedly smaller than the optimal liquid welfare. \square

F Generalized Second Price is a Core Auction

In this section we show that the GSP auction for sponsored search allocation with separable click rates is a core auction. Recall the definition of a GSP auction. There are $m \geq 1$ slots with click rates $1 \geq \alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_m \geq 0$. There are n bidders, each bidder placing a bid $b_i \geq 0$. We will reindex agents in order of bid, so that $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_n$. Without loss of generality we will assume $m = n$ (by adding extra bidders with bid 0 or extra slots with click rate 0), and we will define $b_{n+1} = \alpha_{m+1} = 0$ for convenience.

In the GSP auction, slots are allocated greedily by bid, and each agent pays a price per unit equal to the next-highest bid. That is, agent i receives slot i for a declared value of $b_i \alpha_i$, and pays $b_{i+1} \alpha_i$.

We claim that the GSP auction is a core auction. First, since $b_{i+1} \leq b_i$ for all i , we have that $b_{i+1} \alpha_i \leq b_i \alpha_i$, and hence each bidder pays at most her declared welfare for the allocation received.

It remains to show the second property of a core auction. Choose any subset of bidders $S \subseteq [n]$. The allocation \mathbf{y} to agents in S that maximizes declared welfare is the one that allocates greedily in index order. More formally, for each $i \in S$, let $\sigma(i)$ be 1 plus the number of elements of S with index less than i . For example, if $S = \{2, 6, 7\}$, then $\sigma(2) = 1$, $\sigma(6) = 2$, and $\sigma(7) = 3$. Then the declared-welfare-maximizing allocation \mathbf{y} to agents in S is such that $y_i = \alpha_{\sigma(i)}$ for each i , for a total declared welfare of $\sum_{i \in S} b_i \alpha_{\sigma(i)}$. The core auction property on subset of bidders S therefore reduces to showing that

$$\sum_{i \notin S} b_{i+1} \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in S} b_i \alpha_i \geq \sum_{i \in S} b_i \alpha_{\sigma(i)}. \quad (\text{F.1})$$

To establish inequality (F.1), we first note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in S} b_i \alpha_{\sigma(i)} - \sum_{i \in S} b_i \alpha_i &= \sum_{i \in S} b_i (\alpha_{\sigma(i)} - \alpha_i) \\
&= \sum_{i \in S} \sum_{j=\sigma(i)}^{i-1} b_i (\alpha_j - \alpha_{j+1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in S} \sum_{j=\sigma(i)}^{i-1} b_{j+1} (\alpha_j - \alpha_{j+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

This final double summation contains an instance of the term $b_{j+1}(\alpha_j - \alpha_{j+1})$ for each $i \in S$ such that $\sigma(i) \leq j < i$. But for each j and each i such that $\sigma(i) \leq j < i$ (i.e., such that the “new” allocation to agent i under \mathbf{y} is slot j or better, and the “old” allocation is worse than slot j), there must be some $k \leq j$ such that $k \notin S$. The number of such i is therefore at most the number of agents at index j or less that are not in S . More precisely, observe that $j \geq |\{i \in S : i \leq j\}| + |\{i \in S : \sigma(i) \leq j < i\}|$. This holds as $\sigma(i) \leq i$ for all i and is injective, so the sets on the right hand side are evidently disjoint and σ maps each such element to a unique index in $[j]$. But $j = |\{i \in S : i \leq j\}| + |\{k \notin S : k \leq j\}|$, so cancelling terms shows that $|\{k \notin S : k \leq j\}| \geq |\{i \in S : \sigma(i) \leq j < i\}|$. Thus, by rearranging the order of summation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in S} \sum_{j=\sigma(i)}^{i-1} b_{j+1} (\alpha_j - \alpha_{j+1}) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m b_{j+1} (\alpha_j - \alpha_{j+1}) \times |\{k \leq j : k \notin S\}| \\
&= \sum_{k \notin S} \sum_{j \geq k} b_{j+1} (\alpha_j - \alpha_{j+1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k \notin S} \sum_{j \geq k} b_{k+1} (\alpha_j - \alpha_{j+1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k \notin S} b_{k+1} \alpha_k
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality is a telescoping sum. We therefore conclude that

$$\sum_{i \in S} b_i \alpha_{\sigma(i)} - \sum_{i \in S} b_i \alpha_i \leq \sum_{k \notin S} b_{k+1} \alpha_k$$

and rearranging yields the desired inequality (F.1).