
Uniformly Bounded Regret in Dynamic Fair Allocation

Santiago R. Balseiro

Decision, Risk and Operations Division
Columbia Business School
New York, NY 10027
srb2155@columbia.edu

Shangzhou Xia

Decision, Risk and Operations Division
Columbia Business School
New York, NY 10027
sx2182@columbia.edu

Abstract

We study a dynamic allocation problem in which T sequentially arriving divisible resources need to be allocated to n fixed agents with additive utilities. Agents' utilities are drawn stochastically from a known distribution, and decisions are made immediately and irrevocably. Most works on dynamic resource allocation aim to maximize the utilitarian welfare of the agents, which may result in unfair concentration of resources at select agents while leaving others' demands under-fulfilled. In this paper, we consider the egalitarian welfare objective instead, which aims at balancing the efficiency and fairness of the allocation. To this end, we first study a fluid-based policy derived from a deterministic approximation to the underlying problem and show that it attains a regret of order $\Theta(\sqrt{T})$ against the hindsight optimum, i.e., the optimal egalitarian allocation when all utilities are known in advance. We then propose a new policy, called Backward Infrequent Re-solving with Thresholding (BIRT), which consists of re-solving the fluid problem at most $O(\log \log T)$ times. We prove the BIRT policy attains $O(1)$ regret against the hindsight optimum, independently of the time horizon length T and initial welfare. We also present numerical experiments to illustrate the significant performance improvement against several benchmark policies.

1 Introduction

Fair resource allocation has been widely studied in economics and operations research, with applications in school seat allocation [1, 2], work visa lotteries [68], affordable housing allocation [59, 10], machine load balancing [16, 14] etc. Involving multiple parties stipulates fairness as a crucial concern to the allocator. To this end, allocations are often evaluated on a balance between efficiency and fairness across the agents [26, 27, 5, 45, 81]. One popular fairness notion is the egalitarian welfare, based on the theory of distributive justice by Rawls [69, 70], whose difference principle maximizes the welfare of the worst-off group of agents. The egalitarian welfare objective defines a max-min welfare optimization problem, whose indivisible variant is dubbed the Santa Claus problem [21, 23, 33]. Other common fairness notions studied in the literature include Nash social welfare [55, 48, 31, 38], envy freeness [2], and Pareto efficiency [75].

Allocation problems in real life, however, often concern dynamic and irrevocable decisions where either agents or resources arrive in a sequential manner [67, 43, 35]. Some literature has referred to this variant as the online rationing problem, with applications in allocating computational resources to cloud users [44, 82, 32] and most recently in medical equipment and vaccine rationing during the COVID-19 pandemic [42, 53, 8].

This work focuses on the specific variant of allocating resources arriving sequentially to heterogeneous agents, which is particularly relevant when resources are perishable and require immediate

allocation decisions. Applications include allocating donated organs to hospitals [3], donated food to local charities [7, 64], and online advertisement slots to advertisers [36, 78, 51, 62, 22, 11], etc. Our objective is to design computationally efficient dynamic policies that maximize the welfare of the worst-off agent.

Contributions In this work, we consider the dynamic max-min fair allocation problem, where T resources arriving sequentially are to be immediately and irrevocably allocated to n agents. The agents’ utilities are drawn independently from a distribution that is known to the decision maker. An optimal policy could, in principle, be computed using dynamic programming but, because of the so-called *curse of dimensionality*, solving the problem to optimality is impractical when the number of time periods or agents is large. We therefore seek to design policies that are computationally efficient and with provable performance guarantees.

We first consider a static policy that is obtained by solving a fluid relaxation (which amounts to solving a linear program) in which all stochastic quantities are replaced by their mean values. This policy, while simple, is shown to attain regret of order $\Theta(\sqrt{T})$ against the hindsight optimal solution, i.e., the optimal egalitarian allocation when all utilities are known in advance.

Our main contribution is proposing the Backward Infrequent Re-solving with Thresholding (BIRT) policy. Our policy is based on [30], who designed similar policies for utilitarian objectives, and consists of updating and re-solving the fluid problem at most $O(\log \log T)$ times. Utilitarian objectives are simpler to handle because they are separable over time, i.e., the total utility is just the sum of the utilities of each time period. By contrast, the egalitarian objective in our paper is non-linear and not time separable, which requires a different analysis. We prove that the BIRT policy achieves $O(1)$ regret against the hindsight optimum, namely uniformly bounded over the time horizon length T and the initial welfare B_0 . The uniformly bounded regret guarantee implies that the BIRT policy performs almost comparably to a clairvoyant who foresees all arrivals in advance before acting.

Our main result is uniform over initial conditions. In particular, it is insensitive to whether or not the original fluid problem is degenerate. This is in drastic contrast to previous works on online stochastic optimization whose $O(1)$ -loss results rely heavily on nondegeneracy conditions on the underlying fluid problem. In fact, this is also the foundation on which we can inductively analyze the policy, and that even with updating and re-solving the fluid problem multiple times, our policy can stay intact from falling into possible degeneracy traps.

We summarize findings on the benchmarks and performance of heuristic policies on the vertical axis in Figure 1. Shown on the right are respective suprema of differences (i.e. worst-case scenarios in terms of underlying distributions) between them.




Figure 1: Summary of benchmark values and performances of heuristic policies

1.1 Related work

Our work contributes to the literature on fair resource allocation and, more generally, to the literature on dynamic resource allocation problems.

Fair allocation There is a stream of literature studying the online version of the problem in which the arrival process is unknown to the decision maker. Devanur et al. [42] consider the egalitarian

objective when the utilities of the agents are drawn independently from a distribution that is unknown to the decision maker (the unknown IID model) and design an algorithm that attains $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret. Agrawal and Devanur [4] consider general online allocation problems with concave non-separable objectives, which subsumes our problem, and propose an algorithm based on multiplicative weight updates method [12] that also attains $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret. Balseiro et al. [19] study similar general online allocation with hard resource constraints and propose fast algorithms, which do not require solving auxiliary optimization problems, based on mirror descent. More recently, Kawase and Sumita [61] consider the max-min fair allocation of indivisible resources arriving online to heterogeneous agents. They propose a deterministic policy that achieves an asymptotic approximation ratio of n in the adversarial arrival model, which they show is optimal. In the case of unknown IID arrivals, they give a policy that achieves $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret against the hindsight optimum benchmark, based on the multiplicative weights updates [12].

In contrast to the previous line of work, we consider the case where the distribution of utilities is known to the decision maker. The $O(1)$ regret bound of the BIRT policy in the known IID model significantly improves upon the unknown IID model, in which the best known attainable regret is $O(\sqrt{T})$ [4, 42, 61, 19]. The drastic performance improvement with the help of exact specification of the underlying distribution shows that distributional knowledge can be of great use. This is similar in spirit to [20], who show in maximizing Nash social welfare, agents' utility predictions significantly improve the approximation ratio of online algorithms in adversarial settings to $O(\log(n \wedge T))$ from a trivial $\Theta(n)$.

The particular case of identical agents has been studied for decades as the online machine covering problem in the context of scheduling [40, 15, 50, 79]. Moreover, there is a line of work studying an offline version of the max-min fair allocation problem (the case when all utilities are known in advance), which is referred to as the Santa Claus problem [63, 13, 60, 28, 52, 46, 33, 54].

In this paper, we study an *online supply* version of the dynamic fair allocation problem in which resources arrive online and the population of agents are fixed. The *online demand* version of the problem in which resources are fixed and agents arrive online has also been studied in the literature [67, 66, 65, 64].

Finally, there is a long line of literature on online allocation with other fairness notions, including Nash social welfare [20, 47, 73], envy [81, 24], envy-freeness (up to 1 item) [56, 7], Pareto efficiency [81] and more general concave returns [41]. We recommend to the reader the recent survey by Aleksandrov and Walsh [6] for an overview of the literature of variants of online fair allocation problems.

Dynamic resource allocation Our work is also closely related methodologically to the stream of literature on dynamic resource allocation, especially revenue management, that aims at maximizing revenue or efficiency of an allocation given limited resources. Our policy is based on re-solving the fluid problem, a specific form of certainty equivalent of dynamic stochastic optimization problems when the problem instances are independent and identically distributed according to a distribution known to the decision maker. The main difference with this line of work is that the egalitarian objective we consider is not time separable, which calls for a different theoretical analysis.

The seminal works by Gallego and Van Ryzin [49] and Talluri and Van Ryzin [74] show fluid policies based on solving the fluid problem only once at the beginning suffice to achieve an $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret against the hindsight optimum. Reiman and Wang [71] show a heuristic based on re-solving the fluid policy exactly once only incurs an $o(\sqrt{T})$ asymptotic revenue loss. Re-solving multiple times or even every period can give $O(1)$ loss under the assumption that the fluid problem admits a nondegenerate optimal solution [57, 80]. Bumpensanti and Wang [30] propose the Infrequent Re-solving with Thresholding heuristic policy, which incurs an $O(1)$ loss, and dispenses with the nondegeneracy condition. Our heuristic policy is based thereupon. Most recently, Vera and Banerjee [76] and Vera et al. [77] propose a general Bayes selector policy that attains low regret for a number of dynamic allocation problems. A specific variant called the multi-secretary problem also witnessed heuristic policies incurring $O(1)$ [9] or $O(\log T)$ [29] regret. We recommend to the reader a recent survey by Balseiro et al. [18] for an overview of dynamic allocation problems.

Notation For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $[m] := \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, the probability m -simplex by $\Delta_m := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m : \|x\|_1 = 1\}$, a column m -vector of ones by $\mathbf{1}_m$ and a column m -vector of zeros by $\mathbf{0}_m$.

For $w \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\lfloor w \rfloor := \max\{m \in \mathbb{Z} : m \leq w\}$ the largest integer smaller than or equal to w , and by $\lceil w \rceil := \min\{m \in \mathbb{Z} : m \geq w\}$ the smallest integer larger than or equal to w . We use boldface alphabets to denote 2-dimensional matrices. For any two positive-valued functions f and g , we denote $f(T) = O(g(T))$ when $\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} f(T)/g(T) < \infty$, $f(T) = \Omega(g(T))$ when $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} f(T)/g(T) > 0$, and $f(T) = \Theta(g(T))$ when $f(T) = \Omega(g(T))$ and $f(T) = O(g(T))$.

2 Problem formulation

In this work, we consider the problem of dynamically allocating resources to $n > 1$ heterogeneous agents. Suppose each agent i starts with an initial welfare of B_0^i at the beginning and over time additively accumulates welfare while receiving allocations. The decision maker receives a sequence of $T > 1$ online divisible resources, each endowed with a marginal utility vector $b_t \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, and immediately makes an allocation decision $x_t \in \Delta_n$ to the agents for each arriving resource. In the sequel, we refer to the t -th resource and the t -th period exchangeably, and to resources and arrivals exchangeably. By the end, agent i would have a cumulative welfare of $B_T^i = B_0^i + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t^i x_t^i$.

To evaluate allocation decisions on their balance between efficiency and fairness, we aim at maximizing the cumulative welfare of the worst-off agent, namely the *egalitarian welfare* $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} B_T^i$. This is in stark contrast to the utilitarian welfare $\sum_{i=1}^n B_T^i$, which, neglecting any fairness concerns, could and most often lead to highly unfair concentration of resources at select agents or groups. An *online policy* must be non-anticipative, or in other words, choose allocations based on the history observed so far. More formally, an online policy allocates $x_t \in \sigma(b_1, \dots, b_t)$ for all $t \in [T]$, where $\sigma(b_1, \dots, b_t)$ is the σ -algebra generated by the sequence of utility vectors. We denote the egalitarian welfare generated by the sequence of allocations $(x_t)_t$ according to the policy π by

$$\text{ALG}(\pi) := \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(B_0^i + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t^i x_t^i \right). \quad (1)$$

Our problem can be formulated as a max-min optimization problem, i.e., to find a non-anticipative policy that maximizes the minimum welfare across agents. Notice we assumed that online policies are deterministic in evaluating the egalitarian welfare generated—this is without loss of optimality because deterministic online policies weakly dominate their randomized counterparts (Lemma 9).

A conventional benchmark used to evaluate online policies is the *hindsight optimum*, defined as the maximum egalitarian welfare (1) if allocations $(x_t)_t$ are allowed to be anticipative, i.e., all utility vectors are known in advance. We denote by OPT the hindsight optimum, as well as any such optimal policy with a slight abuse of notation. Formally, the hindsight optimum is the optimal value of the max-min optimization problem

$$\text{OPT} := \max_{(x_t)_t \in \Delta_n^T} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(B_0^i + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t^i x_t^i \right). \quad (2)$$

Arrival model We consider the IID arrival model. More formally, we assume arrival utility vectors b_t are independent and identically distributed according to some known distribution P in the class \mathcal{P} .

Definition 1. The class of *admissible* probability distributions \mathcal{P} is the set of all finite probability distributions P with support in $[0, 1]^n$.

To be more precise, any admissible distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}$ has a finite support $\{\beta_\ell \in [0, 1]^n : \ell \in [L]\}$ and is given by $P\{b = \beta_\ell\} = p_\ell$, where $L \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of distinct arrival types, and $(p_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]} \in \Delta_L$ is a probability vector. In the sequel, the underlying distribution P is omitted when implied in the context. We denote the number of type- ℓ arrivals by $N_\ell := \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{1}\{b_t = \beta_\ell\}$, which clearly follows a multinomial distribution, so that $N_\ell \sim \text{Bin}(T, p_\ell)$ with T trials and success probability p_ℓ . While we assume that utilities are IID over time, our model does allow for utilities to be arbitrarily correlated across agents in a given time period.

We evaluate a policy using its expected egalitarian welfare loss against the hindsight optimum. More rigorously, if $b_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P$, we define the *regret* of a policy π by

$$\mathcal{R}(\pi) := \mathbb{E}_P [\text{OPT} - \text{ALG}(\pi)]. \quad (3)$$

3 Fluid problem and static policies

In general dynamic stochastic optimization problems, *certainty equivalents* [25] are widely used to design simple heuristics with good performance guarantees. Certainty equivalent policies seek to approximate the offline optimization by replacing stochastic quantities with fixed, known deterministic values. A popular alternative is to replace all random quantities by their means. The resulting optimization problem is usually referred to as the *fluid problem*, or the deterministic program. The optimal solution to the fluid problem prescribes a simple static policy, which can be implemented in the original stochastic program.

Before moving forward, we formally define the collection of *static policies*, which will play an important role in our analysis. A static policy specifies a vector of allocation $\xi_\ell \in \Delta_n$ over agents for each type $\ell \in [L]$ and allocates accordingly $x_t = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \xi_\ell \mathbf{1}\{b_t = \beta_\ell\}$. With an abuse of notation, we also refer to the underlying matrix $\xi \equiv (\xi_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]}$ as a static policy. In other words, a static policy is one that allocates incoming resources only depending on their types, i.e., it makes identical allocation decisions for the same type resource across time. In fact, any hindsight optimal policy can always be implemented as a static policy (see Lemma 10 in Appendix B).

We now formally define the fluid problem. Consider the IID arrival model with distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}$, which is known to the online decision maker. In the fluid problem, the decision maker assumes that the number of type- ℓ arrivals is exactly $\mathbb{E}[N_\ell] = Tp_\ell$. Because there is no uncertainty, it is easy to see that static policies are optimal and the fluid problem is defined as

$$\text{FLU} := \underset{(\xi_\ell)_\ell \in \Delta_n^L}{\text{maximize}} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ B_0^i + T \sum_{\ell \in [L]} p_\ell \beta_\ell^i \xi_\ell^i \right\}. \quad (4)$$

In the fluid problem, the decision maker maximizes the minimum *expected* welfare over agents, where the expected welfare of agent i under the static policy ξ is $B_0^i + T \sum_{\ell \in [L]} p_\ell \beta_\ell^i \xi_\ell^i$. With an abuse of notation, we also denote by FLU its optimum value, a.k.a. the *fluid benchmark*.

An optimal solution to the fluid problem (4) is called a *fluid (static) policy*, denoted by ξ^F or F . Fluid policies are classical heuristic policies that serve as a powerful tool for the online decision maker who has no other knowledge than the underlying arrival distribution. The classical literature in revenue management have shown that for utilitarian welfare objectives, fluid policies incur a regret by at most an order of \sqrt{T} [49, 74], which is tight in the worst case. Here we recover similar results for our egalitarian welfare maximization problem.

Proposition 1. *Let F be a fluid policy. Then, $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}(F) = \Theta(\sqrt{T})$.*

Proposition 1 is in fact a corollary of the next three results. The first result establishes a gap at most of order \sqrt{T} between the fluid benchmark and the fluid policy performance, following from a concentration of measure argument. Namely, the expected minimum welfare over agents under the fluid policy is close to the minimum of the expected welfare over agents. (See proof in Appendix A.1.)

Lemma 1. *Let F be a fluid policy. Then, $\text{FLU} - \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}(F)] \leq \sqrt{T}$ for any $P \in \mathcal{P}$.*

The next lemma establishes the fluid benchmark as an upper bound of the expected hindsight optimum. The result is standard and follows from Jensen's inequality and the concavity of the minimum (see proof in Appendix A.2). Lemmata 1 and 2 together imply the upper bound in Proposition 1. However, it is a rather loose upper bound, as the difference can be as large as $\Omega(\sqrt{T})$ (Lemma 11).

Lemma 2. *For any $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}] \leq \text{FLU}$.*

We finally show that a regret of order \sqrt{T} is essentially unimprovable for fluid policies by providing a simple example in which the fluid policy incurs $\Omega(\sqrt{T})$ regret. See Appendix A.3 for the proof.

Lemma 3. *Let F be a fluid policy. Then, $\mathcal{R}(F) = \Omega(\sqrt{T})$ for some $P \in \mathcal{P}$.*

4 A policy with uniformly bounded regret

We propose a collection of heuristic policies called Backward Infrequent Re-solving with Thresholding (BIRT) given in Algorithm 1, inspired by previous fluid-based re-solving heuristics in the

literature, especially by Reiman and Wang [71] and Bumpensanti and Wang [30]. They are indexed by a hyperparameter η and are denoted by BIRT_η . The design of BIRT is characterized by the following three key elements: (i) the fluid problem is periodically re-solved after updating the deterministic surrogate quantities with their realizations so far, and the resulting policy is static between consecutive re-solving epochs; (ii) re-solving occurs only $O(\log \log T)$ times, based on a schedule designed such that the remaining schedule starting from each re-solving epoch is similar; and (iii) upon each solving and re-solving epoch, static policies are adjusted by a thresholding rule.

Updated fluid problem. At each re-solving epoch, by updating forecast utilities with realizations observed so far, the BIRT policies react to the stochastic deviations from the expected path initially predicted by the fluid problem. More formally, with agent i 's welfare $B_t^i = B_0^i + \sum_{s=1}^t b_s^i x_s^i$ by time $t \in [T]$, where x_s^i is the proportion of the s -th resource that is allocated to agent i , the updated fluid problem at time t would be to

$$\underset{(\xi_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]} \in \Delta_n^L}{\text{maximize}} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ B_t^i + (T-t) \sum_{\ell \in [L]} p_\ell \beta_\ell^i \xi_\ell^i \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $B_t^i + (T-t) \sum_{\ell \in [L]} p_\ell \beta_\ell^i \xi_\ell^i$ is the expected total welfare of agent i under the static policy ξ .

Re-solving schedule (η). We now define the re-solving schedule, illustrated in Figure 2. Given a fixed time horizon length T and a hyper-parameter $\eta \in (1, 4/3)$, we set the number of re-solving epochs as $K = \lceil \log \log T / \log \eta \rceil$. The re-solving epochs, after the initial solving epoch $t_0^* = 0$, are given by $t_k^* = T - \lfloor \exp(\eta^{K-k}) \rfloor$ for $k \in [K]$.




Figure 2: Re-solving schedule of the BIRT heuristic policies

An important structural feature of the re-solving schedule is its self-similarity, i.e., looking into the future from any re-solving epoch gives a similar schedule. More specifically, for a re-solving epoch (except the last) τ periods from the end, the next re-solving epoch is approximately $\tau^{1/\eta}$ periods from the end. We will detail in Section 4.1 how this greatly facilitates BIRT's performance analysis.

The re-solving frequency increases over time, and most re-solving epochs are concentrated near the end of the horizon, though shown spread out in Figure 2 for illustration. Resolving more frequently near the end of the horizon is beneficial to the decision maker because stochastic deviations from the predictions of the fluid policy are larger later on. In addition to incorporating more historical information, decisions closer to the end are more consequential due to the limited time left to make corrections. Indeed, the regret analysis in A.4 will show that almost all regret is incurred near the end.

Thresholding Rule (γ). Given a static policy $\xi \in \Delta_n^L$ and a threshold $\gamma \in (0, 1/n)$, we define its corresponding thresholded static policy $\tilde{\xi}$ by implementing the following procedure for each $\ell \in [L]$. After thresholding we will arrive at a static policy $\tilde{\xi}$ such that $\tilde{\xi}_\ell^i \in \{0\} \cup [\gamma, 1]$ for all i and ℓ .

1. Pick an agent that is to receive the largest type- ℓ allocation $j \in \arg \max_i \xi_\ell^i$.
2. For other agents $i \neq j$, implement allocations only if they exceed the threshold γ and withhold the rest, i.e., set $\tilde{\xi}_\ell^i \leftarrow \xi_\ell^i \mathbf{1}\{\xi_\ell^i \geq \gamma\}$.
3. Allocate the remaining resource to agent j , i.e. set $\tilde{\xi}_\ell^j \leftarrow 1 - \sum_{i \neq j} \tilde{\xi}_\ell^i$.

Thresholding is a defining characteristic of the BIRT policies and will prove crucial in our regret analysis in Section 4.1. The intuition behind thresholding is that BIRT is aimed at recovering the hindsight optimum by the end of the horizon; in particular and more ambitiously, it aspires to replicate the exact amount of resources of each type ℓ allocated to each agent i by the hindsight optimal policy. Though re-solving helps approximate these hindsight optimal allocations, exact replication

is hindered by stochasticity, especially for (ℓ, i) where the fluid policy yields allocations $(\xi^F)_\ell^i$ close to zero. The hindsight optimal policy is likely to end up allocating none of type- ℓ resources to agent i , in which case the replication goal fails completely as allocations are irrevocable. Hence, it is best to altogether adjust these allocations to zero, leaving more leeway for better informed allocations in the future.

Moreover, thresholding becomes more aggressive with larger thresholds over time. While thresholding allows to postpone allocation decisions that are close to zero or one, it introduces artificial adjustments that deviate from the fluid “optimal” path. To minimize such deviation from expected paths, the threshold should be smaller if the waiting time to the next re-solving epoch is large in relative terms, as later re-solving poses a larger risk of excessive deviation. Since the proportion of time left to the next re-solving epoch $(t_{k+1}^* - t_k^*)/(T - t_k^*)$ decreases over $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$, thresholds increase accordingly, leading to more aggressive thresholding toward the end.

Algorithm 1: Backward Infrequent Re-solving with Thresholding (BIRT $_\eta$)

Input: time horizon length $T \in \mathbb{N}$, initial welfare $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, hyper-parameter $\eta \in (1, 4/3)$.

Initialize: set $K \leftarrow \lceil \log \log T / \log \eta \rceil$;

set $t_0^* \leftarrow 0$ and $t_k^* \leftarrow T - \lfloor \exp(\eta^{K-k}) \rfloor$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$;

set $\gamma_k \leftarrow (T - t_{k+1}^*)/2n^2(T - t_k^*)$ for $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$ and $\gamma_K \leftarrow 0$;

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ **do**

 solve the updated fluid problem with updated welfare

$$\xi^F \in \arg \max \left\{ \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[B_{t_k^*}^i + (T - t_k^*) \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} p_\ell \beta_\ell^i \xi_\ell^i \right] : \xi_\ell \in \Delta_n, \forall \ell \in [L] \right\};$$

for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, L$ **do** // threshold the static solution

 pick some agent $j \in \arg \max_i (\xi^F)_\ell^i$;

for $i \neq j$ **do**

 set $(\xi^k)_\ell^i \leftarrow (\xi^F)_\ell^i \mathbf{1}\{(\xi^F)_\ell^i \geq \gamma_k\}$;

 set $(\xi^k)_\ell^j \leftarrow 1 - \sum_{i \neq j} (\xi^k)_\ell^i$;

for $t = t_k^* + 1, \dots, t_{k+1}^*$ **do** // implement the thresholded static policy

 observe incoming supply with utility vector b_t ;

for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, L$ **do**

if $b_t = \beta_\ell$ **then**

 allocate $x_t \leftarrow (\xi^k)_\ell$;

 update welfare $B_t^i \leftarrow B_{t-1}^i + b_t^i x_t^i$ for every agent $i \in [n]$;

Output: allocations $(x_t : t = 1, 2, \dots, T)$ and egalitarian welfare $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} B_T^i$.

4.1 Performance analysis

In this section, we first present the main result on a uniform performance guarantee of the BIRT policies and then provide intuition on the regret analysis. The proof can be found in Appendix A.4.

Theorem 1. Fix $P \in \mathcal{P}$. For any $\eta \in (1, 4/3)$,

$$\mathcal{R}(\text{BIRT}_\eta) = O(1).$$

The constant factor is determined by P , independent of time horizon length T and initial welfare B_0 .

Remark. More generally, uniformly bounded regret can be incurred by a BIRT $_\eta$ policy, even if we do not fix the distribution P but rather allow for some dependency on the time horizon T . Specifically, if $\min_\ell p_\ell = \Omega(T^{-1/2+\varepsilon})$ for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$, then $\mathcal{R}(\text{BIRT}_\eta) = O(1)$ for choices of $\eta \in (1, (1 - \varepsilon/2)^{-1})$. See Theorem 2 in Appendix B for a formal exposition.

The implication of Theorem 1 is twofold. The regret of non-anticipative policies against the hindsight optimum can be attributed to either lack of clairvoyance or suboptimal design. The uniform

bound demonstrates that our BIRT policies are near-optimal in both dimensions. In particular, with BIRT attaining performance almost comparable to a clairvoyant, Theorem 1 showcases that decision makers can greatly benefit from distributional knowledge.

We next give an outline of the proof, inspired by the analysis in [30], hinging on the structure of BIRT. In particular, the self-similar re-solving schedule warrants a serial regret analysis. More specifically, the regret of BIRT can be decomposed into a series of expected egalitarian welfare losses against the hindsight optimum, each attributed to one re-solving epoch in the schedule. To this end, we introduce a series of auxiliary policies OPT^k for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$, where OPT^k acts exactly the same as BIRT does until t_k^* and allocates in the hindsight optimal way afterwards, i.e., it picks the optimal allocation for the remaining time periods given the decisions up to time t_k^* . With an abuse of notation, we also denote by OPT^k the expected egalitarian welfare generated by the OPT^k policy. More precisely,

$$\text{OPT}^k := \max \left\{ \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(B_{t_k^*}^i + \sum_{t=t_k^*+1}^T b_t^i x_t^i \right) : x_t \in \Delta_n, t = t_k^* + 1, \dots, T \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where B_t^i is agent i 's welfare by t under the BIRT policy. In particular, $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^0$. Notice, however, the auxiliary OPT^k policy is not an online policy, as it is anticipative starting from $t_k^* + 1$.

The auxiliary policies are introduced to quantify the expected egalitarian welfare loss due to each re-solving epoch. For example, comparing OPT and OPT^1 would give us that in the first epoch, as OPT^1 acts optimally with clairvoyance after t_1^* . Hence, we can decompose the regret of BIRT into

$$\mathcal{R}(\text{BIRT}) = \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT} - \text{ALG}(\text{BIRT})] = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}^{k-1} - \text{OPT}^k] + \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}^K - \text{ALG}(\text{BIRT})].$$

The telescopic decomposition is useful for two reasons. First, since the problems OPT^{k-1} and OPT^k share the same decisions up to time t_{k-1}^* and the re-solving schedule is self-similar, their difference in egalitarian welfare $\text{OPT}^{k-1} - \text{OPT}^k$ is isomorphic to $\text{OPT} - \text{OPT}^1$, with appropriately chosen initial welfare and horizon lengths. Second, we can analyze each term $\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}^{k-1} - \text{OPT}^k]$ without considering inter-epoch interactions, i.e., consequences of previous allocations on subsequent periods. In other words, analyses of disjoint epochs are decoupled from one another. This follows because we can provide guarantees for each term that are *uniform over the initial welfare of the agents*.

The decomposition warrants an inductive argument to show the main theorem using the following result on one-epoch expected egalitarian welfare loss.

Proposition 2. *Fix an arrival distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}$, initial welfare $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a time horizon length T . Suppose the first re-solving occurs at some $t_1 \in [T]$, and the initial threshold is set as $\gamma_0 = (T - t_1)/2n^2T$, then for a constant $C > 0$ determined by P and independent of T , t_1 and B_0 ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT} - \text{OPT}^1 | B_0] \leq 3Lt_1 \exp\left(-C \frac{(T - t_1)^4}{T^3}\right). \quad (7)$$

The complete proof can be found in Appendix A.5. Its main idea is to focus on the coupling event $\{\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^1\}$, where the egalitarian welfare loss is zero. On the complementary event $\{\text{OPT} \neq \text{OPT}^1\}$, we can control the difference using the uniform bound $\text{OPT} - \text{OPT}^1 \leq t_1$ (Lemma 4), which follows because any loss the clairvoyant OPT^1 can experience relative to OPT should stem from the suboptimal allocations by the static policy during the first t_1 time periods. The most complex step of the proof involves showing that $\{\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^1\}$ is a high probability event. We do so by invoking sensitivity analysis results for linear programming to provide sufficient conditions in terms of the arrival process under which OPT and OPT^1 generate the same egalitarian welfare, and then proving that these sufficient conditions hold with high probability using Hoeffding's inequality. As discussed above, thresholding the fluid policy is critical to proving that the concentration inequalities hold uniformly over the initial agents' utilities as, otherwise, BIRT would unlikely replicate hindsight optimal allocations.

5 Numerical experiment

We run simulation experiments to evaluate the following four heuristic policies:

1. BIRT: the Backward Infrequent Re-solving with Thresholding policies (Algorithm 1).
2. BIR: the Backward Infrequent Re-solving policies (Algorithm 2 in Appendix D), which re-solve the fluid problems on the same schedule as BIRT does but without thresholding (i.e., the updated fluid policy ξ^F at re-solving epoch t_k^* is directly used as ξ^k for implementation).
3. DEMD: the Dual Entropic Mirror Descent policy (Algorithm 3 in Appendix D), also known as the multiplicative weights update algorithm.
4. F: the fluid static policy based on the initial fluid problem (Algorithm 4 in Appendix D).

We include BIR to evaluate whether thresholding is a crucial component of BIRT that improves its performance. We consider a simple setup with two agents, fix the distribution P such that $P(b = (1, 1/2)) = 1/2 = P(b = (1/2, 1))$, and start with zero initial welfare $B_0 = (0, 0)$. The hyperparameter $\eta = 1.1$ is chosen for the BIRT and BIR policies. Results are shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Comparison of regrets of F, DEMD, BIR and BIRT policies

First, we observe from Figure 3 that even without thresholding, BIR greatly outperforms the DEMD policy, which is agnostic to the underlying distribution. This shows distributional knowledge can bring about significant performance improvement to the decision maker. Second, BIR greatly improves upon the fluid policy, which means re-solving the fluid problems helps making better informed allocation decisions. In addition, we observe that with thresholding, BIRT incurs a drastically smaller regret than BIR does, especially for longer horizons, which demonstrates that thresholding is crucial to improving policy performance by controlling for excessive variation in allocations. Lastly, the numerical experiment corroborates our uniformly bounded regret result of BIRT (Theorem 1), as the regret constantly remains at a low level as time horizon length T grows large.

6 Conclusion

In this work we study dynamic policies for allocating T divisible items arriving sequentially to a fixed set of n agents. We evaluate policies based on the expected egalitarian welfare generated, which entails maximizing the worst-off agent’s welfare and addressing the tradeoff between efficiency and fairness. We show the classical fluid policy based on certainty equivalents incurs $\Theta(\sqrt{T})$ regret against the expected hindsight optimal egalitarian welfare. We propose the Backward Infrequent Re-solving with Thresholding (BIRT) policies, which incur an $O(1)$ regret, uniformly bounded over time horizon length T and initial welfare B_0 .

It would be interesting to extend the work to problems defined on more general fairness objectives such as the Nash social welfare, on an infinite time horizon, or with infinitely many arrival types. To allow for flexibility in the arrival model, an open question is to design dynamic allocation policies that are robust against distribution mis-specification in the IID case (inaccurate utilities), and

that work well when arrivals are inter-temporally dependent (e.g., autocorrelated, evolving under a Markov chain model).

References

- [1] A. Abdulkadiroğlu and T. Sönmez. School choice: A mechanism design approach. *American economic review*, 93(3):729–747, 2003.
- [2] A. Abdulkadiroglu, Y.-K. Che, P. A. Pathak, A. E. Roth, and O. Tercieux. Minimizing justified envy in school choice: the design of new orleans’ oneapp. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2017.
- [3] N. Agarwal, I. Ashlagi, M. A. Rees, P. J. Somaini, D. C. Waldinger, et al. *An empirical framework for sequential assignment: The allocation of deceased donor kidneys*. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2019.
- [4] S. Agrawal and N. R. Devanur. Fast algorithms for online stochastic convex programming. In *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1405–1424. SIAM, 2014.
- [5] F. Ahmed, J. P. Dickerson, and M. Fuge. Diverse weighted bipartite b-matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.07134*, 2017.
- [6] M. Aleksandrov and T. Walsh. Online fair division: A survey. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 13557–13562, 2020.
- [7] M. D. Aleksandrov, H. Aziz, S. Gaspers, and T. Walsh. Online fair division: Analysing a food bank problem. In *Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [8] F. Alkaabneh, A. Diabat, and H. O. Gao. A unified framework for efficient, effective, and fair resource allocation by food banks using an approximate dynamic programming approach. *Omega*, 100:102300, 2021.
- [9] A. Arlotto and I. Gurvich. Uniformly bounded regret in the multisecretary problem. *Stochastic Systems*, 9(3):231–260, 2019.
- [10] N. Arnosti and P. Shi. Design of lotteries and wait-lists for affordable housing allocation. *Management Science*, 66(6):2291–2307, 2020.
- [11] N. Arnosti, M. Beck, and P. Milgrom. Adverse selection and auction design for internet display advertising. *American Economic Review*, 106(10):2852–66, 2016.
- [12] S. Arora, E. Hazan, and S. Kale. The multiplicative weights update method: a meta-algorithm and applications. *Theory of computing*, 8(1):121–164, 2012.
- [13] A. Asadpour and A. Saberi. An approximation algorithm for max-min fair allocation of indivisible goods. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(7):2970–2989, 2010.
- [14] Y. Azar. On-line load balancing. *Online algorithms*, pages 178–195, 1998.
- [15] Y. Azar and L. Epstein. On-line machine covering. *Journal of Scheduling*, 1(2):67–77, 1998.
- [16] Y. Azar, J. Naor, and R. Rom. The competitiveness of on-line assignments. *Journal of Algorithms*, 18(2): 221–237, 1995.
- [17] S. Balseiro, H. Lu, and V. Mirrokni. The best of many worlds: Dual mirror descent for online allocation problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.10124*, 2020.
- [18] S. Balseiro, O. Besbes, and D. Pizarro. Survey of dynamic resource constrained reward collection problems: Unified model and analysis. *Available at SSRN 3963265*, 2021.
- [19] S. Balseiro, H. Lu, and V. Mirrokni. Regularized online allocation problems: Fairness and beyond. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 630–639. PMLR, 2021.
- [20] S. Banerjee, V. Gkatzelis, A. Gorokh, and B. Jin. Online nash social welfare maximization with predictions. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1–19, 2022. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611977073.1. URL <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611977073.1>.

- [21] N. Bansal and M. Sviridenko. The santa claus problem. In *Proceedings of the thirty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 31–40, 2006.
- [22] M. Bateni, Y. Chen, D. F. Ciocan, and V. Mirrokni. Fair resource allocation in a volatile marketplace. *Operations Research*, 70(1):288–308, 2022.
- [23] M. BEN-ARI. How to solve the santa claus problem. *Concurrency: Practice and Experience*, 10(6): 485–496, 1998.
- [24] G. Benade, A. M. Kazachkov, A. D. Procaccia, and C.-A. Psomas. How to make envy vanish over time. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 593–610, 2018.
- [25] D. Bertsekas. *Dynamic programming and optimal control: Volume I*, volume 1. Athena scientific, 2012.
- [26] D. Bertsimas, V. F. Farias, and N. Trichakis. The price of fairness. *Operations research*, 59(1):17–31, 2011.
- [27] D. Bertsimas, V. F. Farias, and N. Trichakis. On the efficiency-fairness trade-off. *Management Science*, 58(12):2234–2250, 2012.
- [28] I. Bezáková and V. Dani. Allocating indivisible goods. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 5(3):11–18, 2005.
- [29] R. L. Bray. Logarithmic regret in multisecretary and online linear programming problems with continuous valuations. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–1912, 2019.
- [30] P. Bumpensanti and H. Wang. A re-solving heuristic with uniformly bounded loss for network revenue management. *Management Science*, 66(7):2993–3009, 2020.
- [31] I. Caragiannis, D. Kurokawa, H. Moulin, A. D. Procaccia, N. Shah, and J. Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum nash welfare. *ACM Trans. Econ. Comput.*, 7(3), sep 2019. ISSN 2167-8375. doi: 10.1145/3355902. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3355902>.
- [32] S. Cayci, S. Gupta, and A. Eryilmaz. Group-fair online allocation in continuous time. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:13750–13761, 2020.
- [33] D. Chakrabarty, J. Chuzhoy, and S. Khanna. On allocating goods to maximize fairness. In *2009 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 107–116. IEEE, 2009.
- [34] L. Chen and T. Homem-de Mello. Re-solving stochastic programming models for airline revenue management. *Annals of Operations Research*, 177(1):91–114, 2010.
- [35] W. C. Cheung, G. Lyu, C.-P. Teo, and H. Wang. Online planning with offline simulation. *Available at SSRN 3709882*, 2020.
- [36] H. Choi, C. F. Mela, S. R. Balseiro, and A. Leary. Online display advertising markets: A literature review and future directions. *Information Systems Research*, 31(2):556–575, 2020.
- [37] M. C. Cohen, A. N. Elmachtoub, and X. Lei. Price discrimination with fairness constraints. *Management Science*, 2022.
- [38] V. Conitzer, R. Freeman, and N. Shah. Fair public decision making. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, EC '17, page 629–646, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450345279. doi: 10.1145/3033274.3085125. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3033274.3085125>.
- [39] W. L. Cooper. Asymptotic behavior of an allocation policy for revenue management. *Operations Research*, 50(4):720–727, 2002.
- [40] B. L. Deuermeier, D. K. Friesen, and M. A. Langston. Scheduling to maximize the minimum processor finish time in a multiprocessor system. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 3(2):190–196, 1982.
- [41] N. R. Devanur and K. Jain. Online matching with concave returns. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '12, page 137–144, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450312455. doi: 10.1145/2213977.2213992. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2213977.2213992>.
- [42] N. R. Devanur, K. Jain, B. Sivan, and C. A. Wilkens. Near optimal online algorithms and fast approximation algorithms for resource allocation problems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 66(1):1–41, 2019.

- [43] J. P. Dickerson, K. A. Sankararaman, A. Srinivasan, and P. Xu. Balancing relevance and diversity in online bipartite matching via submodularity. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 1877–1884, 2019.
- [44] T. Q. Dinh, B. Liang, T. Q. Quek, and H. Shin. Online resource procurement and allocation in a hybrid edge-cloud computing system. *IEEE transactions on wireless communications*, 19(3):2137–2149, 2020.
- [45] K. Donahue and J. Kleinberg. Fairness and utilization in allocating resources with uncertain demand. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 658–668, 2020.
- [46] U. Feige. On allocations that maximize fairness. In *SODA*, volume 8, pages 287–293. Citeseer, 2008.
- [47] R. Freeman, S. M. Zahedi, and V. Conitzer. Fair and efficient social choice in dynamic settings. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-17*, pages 4580–4587, 2017. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2017/639. URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2017/639>.
- [48] R. Freeman, N. Shah, and R. Vaish. Best of both worlds: Ex-ante and ex-post fairness in resource allocation. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, EC '20*, page 21–22, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450379755. doi: 10.1145/3391403.3399537. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3391403.3399537>.
- [49] G. Gallego and G. Van Ryzin. A multiproduct dynamic pricing problem and its applications to network yield management. *Operations research*, 45(1):24–41, 1997.
- [50] W. Gálvez, J. A. Soto, and J. Verschae. Symmetry exploitation for online machine covering with bounded migration. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 16(4):1–22, 2020.
- [51] S. Gollapudi and D. Panigrahi. Fair allocation in online markets. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM International Conference on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1179–1188, 2014.
- [52] D. Golovin. *Max-min fair allocation of indivisible goods*. School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University, 2005.
- [53] A. Grigoryan. Effective, fair and equitable pandemic rationing. *Available at SSRN 3646539*, 2021.
- [54] B. Haeupler, B. Saha, and A. Srinivasan. New constructive aspects of the lovász local lemma. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 58(6):1–28, 2011.
- [55] F. Hahn, K. Arrow, and M. Intriligator. *Handbook of mathematical economics*, 1982.
- [56] J. He, A. D. Procaccia, C. Psomas, and D. Zeng. Achieving a fairer future by changing the past. *IJCAI'19*, 2019.
- [57] S. Jasin and S. Kumar. A re-solving heuristic with bounded revenue loss for network revenue management with customer choice. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 37(2):313–345, 2012.
- [58] S. Jasin and S. Kumar. Analysis of deterministic lp-based booking limit and bid price controls for revenue management. *Operations Research*, 61(6):1312–1320, 2013.
- [59] E. H. Kaplan. *Managing the demand for public housing*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1984.
- [60] Y. Kawase and H. Sumita. On the max-min fair stochastic allocation of indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 2070–2078, 2020.
- [61] Y. Kawase and H. Sumita. Online max-min fair allocation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.07235*, 2021.
- [62] X. Li, Y. Rong, R. Zhang, and H. Zheng. Online advertisement allocation under customer choices and algorithmic fairness. *Available at SSRN 3538755*, 2021.
- [63] Y. Li, C. He, Y. Jiang, W. Wu, J. Jiang, W. Zhang, and H. Fan. Max-min fair allocation for resources with hybrid divisibilities. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 124:325–340, 2019.
- [64] R. W. Lien, S. M. Iravani, and K. R. Smilowitz. Sequential resource allocation for nonprofit operations. *Operations Research*, 62(2):301–317, 2014.

- [65] W. Ma, P. Xu, and Y. Xu. Group-level fairness maximization in online bipartite matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13908*, 2020.
- [66] V. Manshadi, R. Niazadeh, and S. Rodilitz. Fair dynamic rationing. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 694–695, 2021.
- [67] V. Nanda, P. Xu, K. A. Sankararaman, J. Dickerson, and A. Srinivasan. Balancing the tradeoff between profit and fairness in rideshare platforms during high-demand hours. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 2210–2217, 2020.
- [68] P. A. Pathak, A. Rees-Jones, and T. Sönmez. Immigration lottery design: engineered and coincidental consequences of h-1b reforms. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020.
- [69] J. Rawls. *Justice as fairness: A restatement*. Harvard University Press, 2001.
- [70] J. Rawls. A theory of justice. In *A theory of justice*. Harvard university press, 2020.
- [71] M. I. Reiman and Q. Wang. An asymptotically optimal policy for a quantity-based network revenue management problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 33(2):257–282, 2008.
- [72] A. Schrijver. *Theory of linear and integer programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 1998.
- [73] S. R. Sinclair, G. Jain, S. Banerjee, and C. L. Yu. Sequential fair allocation of limited resources under stochastic demands. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.14382*, 2020.
- [74] K. Talluri and G. Van Ryzin. An analysis of bid-price controls for network revenue management. *Management science*, 44(11-part-1):1577–1593, 1998.
- [75] H. R. Varian. Equity, envy, and efficiency. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 9(1):63–91, 1974. ISSN 0022-0531. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531\(74\)90075-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(74)90075-1). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022053174900751>.
- [76] A. Vera and S. Banerjee. The bayesian prophet: A low-regret framework for online decision making. *Management Science*, 67(3):1368–1391, 2021.
- [77] A. Vera, S. Banerjee, and I. Gurvich. Online allocation and pricing: Constant regret via bellman inequalities. *Operations Research*, 69(3):821–840, 2021.
- [78] A. Watts. Fairness and efficiency in online advertising mechanisms. *Games*, 12(2):36, 2021.
- [79] G. J. Woeginger. A polynomial-time approximation scheme for maximizing the minimum machine completion time. *Operations Research Letters*, 20(4):149–154, 1997.
- [80] H. Wu, R. Srikant, X. Liu, and C. Jiang. Algorithms with logarithmic or sublinear regret for constrained contextual bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- [81] D. Zeng and A. Psomas. Fairness-efficiency tradeoffs in dynamic fair division. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 911–912, 2020.
- [82] J. Zhang, N. Xie, X. Zhang, and W. Li. An online auction mechanism for cloud computing resource allocation and pricing based on user evaluation and cost. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 89:286–299, 2018.

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Fix $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Under the fluid static policy ξ^F , which allocates $x_t = \sum_{\ell} (\xi^F)_{\ell} \mathbf{1}\{b_t = \beta_{\ell}\}$, agent i accumulates a welfare of

$$B_T^i = B_0^i + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t^i x_t^i = B_0^i + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\ell=1}^L \beta_{\ell}^i (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i \mathbf{1}\{b_t = \beta_{\ell}\} = B_0^i + \sum_{\ell \in [L]} N_{\ell} \beta_{\ell}^i (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i,$$

whose expectation is

$$\mathbb{E}[B_T^i] = B_0^i + \sum_{\ell \in [L]} \mathbb{E}[N_{\ell}] \beta_{\ell}^i (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i = B_0^i + T \sum_{\ell \in [L]} p_{\ell} \beta_{\ell}^i (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i \geq \text{FLU},$$

where the last inequality follows by the definition of FLU. Recalling the egalitarian welfare objective $\text{ALG}(F) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} B_T^i$, we rewrite the gap as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FLU} - \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}(F)] &= \text{FLU} - \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} B_T^i \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\text{FLU} - B_T^i) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\mathbb{E}[B_T^i] - B_T^i) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{\ell \in [L]} \underbrace{(\mathbb{E}[N_{\ell}] - N_{\ell}) \beta_{\ell}^i (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i}_{=: Y_{\ell}^i}, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote $Y_{\ell}^i := (\mathbb{E}[N_{\ell}] - N_{\ell}) \beta_{\ell}^i (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i$ for all ℓ and i , for ease of notation. Notice

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{\ell \in [L]} Y_{\ell}^i \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{\ell \in [L]} Y_{\ell}^i \right)^2} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(\sum_{\ell \in [L]} Y_{\ell}^i \right)^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{\ell \in [L]} Y_{\ell}^i \right)^2},$$

where the first inequality follows from Jensen's inequality, the second because $(\max_i \Upsilon_i)^2 \in \{\Upsilon_i^2\}$ for any finite collection $(\Upsilon_i)_i$, and the last because squares are nonnegative. To upper bound the last term, we note that $(N_{\ell})_{\ell \in [L]}$ follows a multinomial distribution with T trials and a probability vector $(p_{\ell})_{\ell \in [L]}$, so for any $k, \ell \in [L]$,

$$\mathbb{E} [Y_k^i Y_{\ell}^i] = T p_{\ell} (\beta_{\ell}^i (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i)^2 \mathbf{1}\{k = \ell\} - T \cdot p_k \beta_k^i \xi_k^i \cdot p_{\ell} \beta_{\ell}^i \xi_{\ell}^i \leq T p_{\ell} (\beta_{\ell}^i (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i)^2 \mathbf{1}\{k = \ell\}. \quad (8)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{\ell \in [L]} Y_{\ell}^i \right)^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k, \ell \in [L]} \mathbb{E} [Y_k^i Y_{\ell}^i] \\ &\leq T \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\ell \in [L]} p_{\ell} (\beta_{\ell}^i (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i)^2 \\ &\leq T \sum_{\ell \in [L]} p_{\ell} \sum_{i=1}^n (\xi^F)_{\ell}^i \\ &\leq T, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows by Fubini, the first inequality follows by Equation (8), the second inequality follows because $\beta_{\ell}^i \in [0, 1]$ and $(\xi^F)_{\ell}^i \in [0, 1]$, and the last because $(\xi^F)_{\ell} \in \Delta_n$ and $\sum_{\ell} p_{\ell} = 1$. Therefore,

$$\text{FLU} - \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}(F)] \leq \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{\ell \in [L]} Y_{\ell}^i \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{\ell \in [L]} Y_{\ell}^i \right)^2} \leq \sqrt{T}.$$

A.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Fix $P \in \mathcal{P}$. By Lemma 10, P -almost surely, there is a static policy ξ^* that is hindsight optimal, i.e.,

$$\text{OPT} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(B_0^i + \sum_{\ell=1}^L N_\ell \beta_\ell^i (\xi^*)_\ell^i \right).$$

Consider an alternate static policy ξ given by

$$\xi_\ell^i := \frac{\mathbb{E}[N_\ell (\xi^*)_\ell^i]}{\mathbb{E}[N_\ell]}, \quad \forall i, \ell.$$

The static policy is well-defined because $\xi_\ell^i \geq 0$ for all i, ℓ , and $\sum_i \xi_\ell^i = \mathbb{E}[N_\ell \sum_i (\xi^*)_\ell^i] / \mathbb{E}[N_\ell] \leq 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(B_0^i + \sum_{\ell=1}^L N_\ell \beta_\ell^i (\xi^*)_\ell^i \right) \right] \\ &\leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(B_0^i + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \beta_\ell^i \mathbb{E}[N_\ell (\xi^*)_\ell^i] \right) \\ &= \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(B_0^i + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E}[N_\ell] \beta_\ell^i \xi_\ell^i \right) \leq \text{FLU}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows by definition of ξ^* , the first inequality by Jensen's inequality, the second equality by definition of ξ , and the second inequality by definition of FLU.

A.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Consider the arrival distribution P where $P\{b = (1, 1/2)\} = 1/2 = P\{b = (1/2, 1)\}$. The hindsight optimum is $\text{OPT} = T/2 - |N_1 - N_2|/6$. WLOG suppose $N_1 \leq N_2$, then this is attained by the offline policy $\xi_1 = (1, 0)$ and $\xi_2 = (4N_2 - 2T, 2T - N_2)/3N_2$. The fluid policy is $(\xi^F)_1 = (1, 0)$ and $(\xi^F)_2 = (0, 1)$, which achieves only $\text{ALG}(F) = T/2 - |N_1 - N_2|/2$. Hence, Lemma 12 implies

$$\mathcal{R}(F) = \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT} - \text{ALG}(F)] = \frac{2}{3} \mathbb{E} \left| N_1 - \frac{T}{2} \right| = \Theta(\sqrt{T}).$$

A.4 Proof of Theorem 1

We start with the telescopic decomposition of the regret:

$$\mathcal{R}(\text{BIRT}) = \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT} - \text{ALG}(\text{BIRT})] = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}^{k-1} - \text{OPT}^k] + \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}^K - \text{ALG}(\text{BIRT})], \quad (9)$$

where we recall $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^0$, and OPT^k is the hindsight optimal egalitarian welfare starting with welfare $B_{t_k^*}$ at time t_k^* . First notice the last term is subject to an almost sure uniform bound

$$\text{OPT}^K - \text{ALG}(\text{BIRT}) \leq T - t_K^* = 2, \quad (10)$$

implied by Lemma 4 as if the last re-solving occurs at T , because OPT^K and BIRT agree on all actions by $t_K^* = T - 2$. Now we proceed with the first terms. For $k = 1, \dots, K$, the policies OPT^{k-1} and OPT^k agree on all allocations by t_{k-1}^* , so Proposition 2 implies (as if time is relabeled to starting at t_{k-1}^*)

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}^{k-1} - \text{OPT}^k | B_{t_{k-1}^*}] \leq 3L(T - t_{k-1}^*) \exp\left(-C \frac{(T - t_k^*)^4}{(T - t_{k-1}^*)^3}\right).$$

Notice the constant C stays the same for all k , as it is determined only by the distribution P and is independent of time T and initial welfare $B_{t_{k-1}^*}$. To simplify the right hand side, we lower bound $T - t_k^*$ and upper bound $T - t_{k-1}^*$ as follows.

First, $T - t_k^* = \lfloor \exp(\eta^{K-k}) \rfloor \geq \lfloor e \rfloor = 2$ implies

$$\frac{T - t_k^*}{\exp(\eta^{K-k})} = \frac{\lfloor \exp(\eta^{K-k}) \rfloor}{\exp(\eta^{K-k})} \geq \frac{\lfloor \exp(\eta^{K-k}) \rfloor}{\lfloor \exp(\eta^{K-k}) \rfloor + 1} \geq \frac{2}{3}.$$

Then notice $T - t_{k-1}^* = \lfloor \exp(\eta^{K-k+1}) \rfloor \leq \exp(\eta^{K-k+1})$ for $k = 2, \dots, K$. For the corner case $k = 1$, $T - t_0^* = T \leq \exp(\eta^K)$ by definition of $K = \lceil \log \log T / \log \eta \rceil$. Hence, denoting $C' := (2/3)^4 C$, we have for any $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\text{OPT}^{k-1} - \text{OPT}^k \right] \leq 3L e^{\eta^{K-k+1}} \exp \left(-C' e^{(4-3\eta)\eta^{K-k}} \right).$$

Then we know

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\text{BIRT}) &\leq 2 + 3L \sum_{k=1}^K e^{\eta^{K-k+1}} \exp \left(-C' e^{(4-3\eta)\eta^{K-k}} \right) \\ &= 2 + 3L \sum_{k=1}^K e^{\eta^k} \exp \left(-C' e^{(4-3\eta)\eta^{k-1}} \right) \\ &\leq 2 + 3L \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{\eta^k} \exp \left(-C' e^{(4\eta^{-1}-3)\eta^k} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the telescopic decomposition (9) and the almost sure uniform bound (10), the equality by re-ordering the terms, and the last inequality by non-negativity.

Finally, we invoke Lemma 13, a result on the infinite series sum, to conclude that

$$\mathcal{R}(\text{BIRT}) = \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT} - \text{ALG}(\text{BIRT})] \leq 2 + 3LC'^{-\eta/(4-3\eta)} h(\eta, 4\eta^{-1} - 3) = O(1).$$

A.5 Proof of Proposition 2

We first give the following uniform bound on the difference between OPT and OPT^1 , before proceeding to bound the probability that the difference is nonzero. The proof is deferred to Appendix A.6.

Lemma 4. *Suppose all arrival utilities are bounded $b_t \in [0, 1]$ for all t , and OPT^1 is the hindsight optimal egalitarian welfare starting with utilities B_{t_1} at time $t_1 \in [T]$, with $B_{t_1} \geq B_0$. Then its egalitarian welfare loss against the hindsight optimum starting with utilities B_0 at time 0 is at most*

$$\text{OPT} - \text{OPT}^1 \leq t_1.$$

Now it remains to bound the decoupling probability $\mathbb{P}\{\text{OPT} \neq \text{OPT}^1\}$, because

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT} - \text{OPT}^1 | B_0] = \mathbb{E}[(\text{OPT} - \text{OPT}^1) \mathbf{1}\{\text{OPT} \neq \text{OPT}^1\} | B_0] \leq t_1 \mathbb{P}\{\text{OPT} \neq \text{OPT}^1 | B_0\}.$$

We next provide a general sufficient condition on the coupling event $\{\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^1\}$. For ease of notation, we denote the number of type- ℓ arrivals by t_1 by $N_\ell^{\leq} := \sum_{t=1}^{t_1} \mathbf{1}\{b_t = \beta_\ell\}$, and that of those after t_1 by $N_\ell^{\geq} := \sum_{t=t_1+1}^T \mathbf{1}\{b_t = \beta_\ell\}$. We denote using tilted notation the deviation from their respective means (e.g., $\tilde{N}_\ell := N_\ell - \mathbb{E}[N_\ell]$). The proof is deferred to Appendix A.7.

Lemma 5. *Suppose the online player acts according to a static policy $\xi^0 \in \Delta_n^L$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots, t_1$. Then $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^1$ if there is a hindsight optimal static solution $\xi^* \in \Delta_n^L$ such that*

$$N_\ell(\xi^*) \geq N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0), \quad \forall \ell. \tag{11}$$

Now that we have a general sufficient condition for $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^1$, the remaining parts of the proof can be outlined as the following three steps: 1) invoking sensitivity analysis results for linear programming to show the existence of a hindsight optimal policy that is close to the fluid policy, 2) providing sufficient conditions on the arrivals under which the problem OPT and OPT^1 are equivalent, and 3) proving that these sufficient conditions hold with high probability using Hoeffding's inequality.

We start by showing that there exists a hindsight optimal policy that is close to the fluid policy, by invoking the LP sensitivity analysis literature against right-hand side constants and exploiting the similarity between the offline problem and the fluid problem. Since the BIRT policy is constructed based on the fluid policy, this guarantees the BIRT policy is close to the hindsight optimal policy, i.e., stochastic fluctuations are small compared to the leeway that the prophet OPT^1 has after time t_1 to make up for previous suboptimal allocations. Hence, we will be able to show that OPT^1 can recover the exact same utilities for all agents as OPT does with high probability.

Lemma 6 (Theorem 10.5 in [72]). *Let A be an $p \times m$ -matrix, and let S be such that for each nonsingular submatrix M of A all entries of M^{-1} are at most S in absolute value. Let c be a row n -vector, and let b' and b'' be column m -vectors such that $\max\{cx \mid Ax \leq b'\}$ and $\max\{cx \mid Ax \leq b''\}$ are finite. Then for each optimum solution x' of the first maximum there exists an optimum solution x'' of the second maximum with*

$$\|x' - x''\|_\infty \leq mS \|b' - b''\|_\infty.$$

To apply the sensitivity analysis result, we rewrite in the linear program form the offline problem as (with optimal solution $(y^*)_\ell^i = N_\ell(\xi^*)_\ell^i$)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT} = \max \quad & U \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & U \leq B_0^i + \sum_\ell \beta_\ell^i y_\ell^i, & \forall i, \\ & y_\ell^i \geq 0, & \forall i, \ell, \\ & \sum_i y_\ell^i = N_\ell, & \forall \ell, \end{aligned}$$

and the initial fluid problem can be rewritten as (with optimal solution $(z^*)_\ell^i := \text{Tp}_\ell(\xi^F)_\ell^i$)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FLU} = \max \quad & U \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & U \leq B_0^i + \sum_\ell \beta_\ell^i z_\ell^i, & \forall i, \\ & z_\ell^i \geq 0, & \forall i, \ell, \\ & \sum_i z_\ell^i = \text{Tp}_\ell, & \forall \ell. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6 implies for any optimal solution \mathbf{z} to the fluid problem, there exists an optimal solution \mathbf{y} to the offline problem such that

$$\max\{|\text{FLU} - \text{OPT}|, \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}\|_\infty\} \leq (nL + 1)S \|\tilde{N}\|_\infty,$$

where S is larger than any absolute value of entries in the inverse of any nonsingular submatrix of

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_n & \text{diag}(-\beta_1) & \cdots & \text{diag}(-\beta_L) \\ \mathbf{0}_{n \times L} & -I_{n \times L} & & \\ \mathbf{0}_L & \mathbf{1}_n^\top & \cdots & 0 \\ & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & 0 & \cdots & \mathbf{1}_n^\top \\ \mathbf{0}_L & -\mathbf{1}_n^\top & \cdots & 0 \\ & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & 0 & \cdots & -\mathbf{1}_n^\top \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here the decision variable x in the statement of the lemma is $x = (U, y_1, \dots, y_L)$ or $x = (U, z_1, \dots, z_L)$ and the right-hand side vector of the constraints is $(B_0, \mathbf{0}_{n \times L}, \tilde{N}, -\tilde{N})$ or $(B_0, \mathbf{0}_{n \times L}, T\vec{p}, -T\vec{p})$, respectively. We note the constant S is determined solely by $(\beta_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]}$, the support of the arrival distribution P . In particular, we also observe $S \geq 1$.

As a result, we arrive at the following lemma on the proximity between fluid policies and hindsight optimal policies.

Lemma 7. For any fluid policy ξ^F , there exists an hindsight optimal policy ξ^* such that

$$\max_{i,\ell} |N_\ell(\xi^*)^i - T p_\ell(\xi^F)^i| \leq (nL+1)S \|\tilde{N}\|_\infty.$$

Now we detail, in Lemma 8, sufficient conditions specific to thresholded fluid policies under which Equation (11) is satisfied, so that Lemma 5 can be used to argue $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^1$. The proof can be found in Appendix A.8.

Lemma 8. Suppose ξ^F is a fluid policy, and the online player acts ξ^0 constructed by applying the thresholding rule with $\gamma \in [0, (T-t_1)/2n^2T]$, for $t = t_1+1, \dots, T$. Then $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^1$ if

$$\tilde{N}_\ell^{\leq} \leq \frac{(T-t_1)p_\ell}{2} \text{ for all } \ell, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{N}\|_\infty \leq \frac{(T-t_1)\underline{p}}{2} \frac{\gamma}{S(nL+1)}, \quad (12)$$

where we define $\underline{p} := \min_\ell p_\ell$.

Using the union bound, Lemma 8 implies

$$\mathbb{P}\{\text{OPT} \neq \text{OPT}^1 | B_0\} \leq \sum_{\ell \in [L]} \mathbb{P}\left\{\tilde{N}_\ell^{\leq} > \frac{(T-t_1)p_\ell}{2}\right\} + \sum_{\ell \in [L]} \mathbb{P}\left\{|\tilde{N}_\ell| > \frac{(T-t_1)\underline{p}}{2} \frac{\gamma}{S(nL+1)}\right\}.$$

We then proceed to invoke Hoeffding's inequality to bound the probabilities. With $N_\ell^{\leq} \sim \text{Bin}(t_1, p_\ell)$ and $N_\ell \sim \text{Bin}(T, p_\ell)$, we have for all $\ell \in [L]$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\tilde{N}_\ell^{\leq} > \frac{(T-t_1)p_\ell}{2}\right\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(T-t_1)^2 p_\ell^2}{2t_1}\right), \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{|\tilde{N}_\ell| > \frac{(T-t_1)\underline{p}}{2} \frac{\gamma}{S(nL+1)}\right\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{(T-t_1)^2}{2T} \frac{\gamma^2}{S^2(nL+1)^2 \underline{p}^2}\right).$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\text{OPT} \neq \text{OPT}^1 | B_0\} \leq L \left[\exp\left(-\frac{(T-t_1)^2 p_\ell^2}{2t_1}\right) + 2 \exp\left(-\frac{(T-t_1)^2}{2T} \frac{\gamma^2}{S^2(nL+1)^2 \underline{p}^2}\right) \right].$$

In particular, we can take the threshold $\gamma = (T-t_1)/2n^2T$ for the tightest bound, so that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\text{OPT} \neq \text{OPT}^1 | B_0\} \leq L \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\underline{p}^2 (T-t_1)^2}{2t_1}\right) + 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\underline{p}^2}{8n^4 S^2(nL+1)^2} \frac{(T-t_1)^4}{T^3}\right) \right].$$

Since $(T-t_1)^2/t_1 \geq (T-t_1)^4/T^3$ and $S \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\text{OPT} \neq \text{OPT}^1 | B_0\} \leq 3L \exp\left(-\frac{\underline{p}^2}{8n^4 S^2(nL+1)^2} \frac{(T-t_1)^4}{T^3}\right),$$

and the proof is concluded upon invoking Lemma 4.

A.6 Proof of Lemma 4

Suppose a hindsight optimal policy allocates $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Delta_n^T$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{OPT} - \text{OPT}^1 &= \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left(B_0^j + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t^j (x_t^*)^j \right) - \max_{(x_t)_t} \min_i \left(B_{t_1}^i + \sum_{t=t_1+1}^T b_t^i x_t^i \right) \\
&\leq \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left(B_0^j + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t^j (x_t^*)^j \right) - \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(B_{t_1}^i + \sum_{t=t_1+1}^T b_t^i (x_t^*)^i \right) \\
&= \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[\min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left(B_0^j + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t^j (x_t^*)^j \right) - \left(B_{t_1}^i + \sum_{t=t_1+1}^T b_t^i (x_t^*)^i \right) \right] \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(B_0^i - B_{t_1}^i + \sum_{t=1}^{t_1} b_t^i (x_t^*)^i \right) \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{t=1}^{t_1} b_t^i (x_t^*)^i \\
&\leq t_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows by definition of \mathbf{x}^* , the first inequality because $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Delta_n^T$, the second equality because $-\min = \max$, the second inequality by taking the minimizing agent i in the latter term, the third inequality because $B_0 \leq B_{t_1}$, and the last inequality because $b_t^i \leq 1$ and $(x_t^*)^i \leq 1$.

A.7 Proof of Lemma 5

Clearly, $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^1$ if for any arrival type, any agent can get as much utility from OPT^1 's policy as from OPT 's policy, i.e. there exists $\xi \in \Delta_n^L$ such that

$$N_\ell(\xi^*)_\ell^i = N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0)_\ell^i + N_\ell^> \xi_\ell^i.$$

Fix arrival type ℓ . If $N_\ell^> = 0$, then we claim Equation 11 holds with equality. Otherwise, $N_\ell = \sum_i N_\ell(\xi^*)_\ell^i > \sum_i N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0)_\ell^i = N_\ell^{\leq} = N_\ell$, which is absurd. Now we have shown $N_\ell(\xi^*)_\ell^i = N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0)_\ell^i$ for all i , i.e., all agents have accumulated the exact welfare needed from type- ℓ arrivals by time t_1 . An arbitrary allocation for type ℓ would satisfy the condition, since there will be no such arrivals.

If $N_\ell^> > 0$, the proof is concluded by simply taking the static policy $\xi \in \Delta_n^L$ given by

$$\xi_\ell = \frac{N_\ell(\xi^*)_\ell - N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0)_\ell}{N_\ell^>}, \quad \forall \ell \in [L].$$

A.8 Proof of Lemma 8

First, Lemma 7 implies the existence of a hindsight optimal static policy $\xi^* \in \Delta_n^L$ such that

$$\max_{i, \ell} |N_\ell(\xi^*)_\ell^i - T p_\ell(\xi^F)_\ell^i| \leq (nL + 1)S \left\| \tilde{N} \right\|_\infty,$$

so for all i and ℓ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
N_\ell(\xi^*)_\ell^i - N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^F)_\ell^i &\geq \left[T p_\ell(\xi^F)_\ell^i - (nL + 1)S \left\| \tilde{N} \right\|_\infty \right] - \left[t_1 p_\ell + \tilde{N}_\ell^{\leq} \right] (\xi^F)_\ell^i \\
&= \left[(T - t_1) p_\ell - \tilde{N}_\ell^{\leq} \right] (\xi^F)_\ell^i - (nL + 1)S \left\| \tilde{N} \right\|_\infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Lemma 5 implies that it suffices to show $N_\ell(\xi^*)_\ell^i \geq N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0)_\ell^i$ for all i and ℓ . Now we check condition (11) element-wise. Recall from the thresholding rule that $(\xi^0)_\ell^i \in \{0\} \cup [\gamma, 1]$ for all i and ℓ .

- If $(\xi^0)_\ell^i = 0$, then $N_\ell(\xi^*)^i \geq 0 = N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0)_\ell^i$.
- If $(\xi^0)_\ell^i \geq \gamma$ and $i \neq j$, then $(\xi^F)_\ell^i = (\xi^0)_\ell^i \geq \gamma$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
N_\ell(\xi^*)^i - N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0)_\ell^i &= N_\ell(\xi^*)^i - N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^F)_\ell^i \\
&\geq \left[(T - t_1)p_\ell - \tilde{N}_\ell^{\leq} \right] (\xi^F)_\ell^i - (nL + 1)S \left\| \tilde{N} \right\|_\infty \\
&\geq \frac{(T - t_1)p_\ell}{2} (\xi^F)_\ell^i - \frac{(T - t_1)p_\ell}{2} \gamma \\
&\geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows because $(\xi^F)_\ell^i = (\xi^0)_\ell^i$, the first inequality by Equation (13), the second by assumption (12), and the last because $(\xi^F)_\ell^i = (\xi^0)_\ell^i \geq \gamma$.

- Agent $j \in \arg \max_i (\xi^F)_\ell^i$ is the only one receiving positive adjustment. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
N_\ell(\xi^*)^j - N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0)_\ell^j &= N_\ell(\xi^*)^j - N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^F)_\ell^j - N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0 - \xi^F)_\ell^j \\
&\geq N_\ell(\xi^*)^j - N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^F)_\ell^j - n\gamma N_\ell^{\leq} \\
&\geq \left[Tp_\ell(\xi^F)_\ell^j - (nL + 1)S \left\| \tilde{N} \right\|_\infty \right] - N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^F)_\ell^j - n\gamma N_\ell^{\leq} \\
&= \left[(T - t_1)p_\ell - \tilde{N}_\ell^{\leq} \right] \left[(\xi^F)_\ell^j + n\gamma \right] - (nL + 1)S \left\| \tilde{N} \right\|_\infty - n\gamma Tp_\ell \\
&\geq \frac{(T - t_1)p_\ell}{2} \left[(\xi^F)_\ell^j + n\gamma \right] - \frac{(T - t_1)p_\ell}{2} \gamma - n\gamma Tp_\ell \\
&\geq nTp_\ell \left[\frac{T - t_1}{2n^2T} - \gamma \right] + \frac{(T - t_1)p_\ell}{2} (n - 1)\gamma \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows by rearranging terms, the first inequality because the adjustment is at most $(\xi^0 - \xi^F)_\ell^j = -\sum_{i \neq j} (\xi^0 - \xi^F)_\ell^i < n\gamma$, the second inequality by Equation (13), the second equality because $N_\ell^{\leq} = t_1 p_\ell + \tilde{N}_\ell^{\leq}$, the third inequality by assumption (12), the fourth inequality because $(\xi^F)_\ell^j = \max_i (\xi^F)_\ell^i \geq 1/n$, and the last inequality by the threshold rule $0 \leq \gamma_0 \leq (T - t_1)/2n^2T$.

Therefore, we conclude $N_\ell(\xi^*)^i \geq N_\ell^{\leq}(\xi^0)_\ell^i$ for all i and ℓ , and so $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}^1$ by Lemma 5.

B Additional results

Lemma 9. (*Futility of randomization*) Consider the online convex optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{maximize} && r \left(B_0 + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t x_t \right) \\
&\text{subject to} && x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t, \\
&&& x_t \perp \sigma(b_{t+1}, \dots, b_T)
\end{aligned}$$

where $r : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a concave function, $b_t \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ are fixed arrivals, and $\mathcal{X}_t \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex set for every t . Then in expectation, any randomized online policy is weakly dominated by some deterministic online policy.

Proof. Fix any randomized online policy π , and suppose it outputs random actions $(x_t(\pi) : t \in [T])$. Jensen's inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[r \left(B_0 + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t x_t(\pi) \right) \right] \leq r \left(B_0 + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t \mathbb{E}_\pi [x_t(\pi)] \right).$$

Notice the mean policy $\bar{\pi}$ given by actions $x_t(\bar{\pi}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi [x_t(\pi)]$ is feasible, because $x_t(\bar{\pi}) \in \mathcal{X}_t$ by the convexity of the action domains \mathcal{X}_t , so it is an online policy, and the RHS is simply its objective. \square

Lemma 10. (Static policies suffice) *P*-almost surely, there is a static policy that is optimal in hindsight.

Proof. Based on any hindsight optimal policy $(x_t)_t$, the proof is immediate by defining the static policy given by

$$\xi_\ell := \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T x_t \mathbf{1}\{b_t = \beta_\ell\}}{\max\left(1, \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{1}\{b_t = \beta_\ell\}\right)} \quad \text{for all } \ell \in [L],$$

because this static policy satisfies $\xi_\ell \in \Delta_n$ and gives agents the same utilities as the hindsight optimal policy does. \square

Lemma 11. *There exists some $P \in \mathcal{P}$ under which $\text{FLU} - \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}] = \Omega(\sqrt{T})$.*

Proof. Take a simple example where $n = 2$ agents start with zero utilities $B_0 = (0, 0)$, and the arrival structure is given by $\beta_1 = (1, 0)$ and $\beta_2 = (0, 1)$ with respective probabilities $p_1 = 1/2$ and $p_2 = 1/2$. Clearly the optimal value of the fluid problem is $\text{FLU} = T/2$, attained by the fluid policy $\xi_1 = (1, 0)$ and $\xi_2 = (0, 1)$.

To compute OPT, note the trivial bound $\text{OPT} \leq \min(\sum_{t=1}^T b_t^1, \sum_{t=1}^T b_t^2) = \min(N_1, N_2)$; in fact, it can be attained by the naïve policy $x_t = b_t$, so $\text{OPT} = \min(N_1, N_2)$. We then know

$$\text{FLU} - \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}] = \mathbb{E}\left|N_1 - \frac{T}{2}\right| = \Theta(\sqrt{T}),$$

by invoking Lemma 12 in Appendix C. \square

We give a generalization of Theorem 1 below, allowing for dependency of the distribution on time horizon length T .

Definition 2. Given a finite support $\beta \equiv (\beta_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]} \in [0, 1]^{n \times L}$ and a positive $\underline{p} \in (0, 1/2)$, the class of *restricted admissible* probability distributions $\mathcal{P}(\underline{p}, \beta)$ is the set of all finite probability distributions P with support $(\beta_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]}$ where $P(b = \beta_\ell) \geq \underline{p}$ for all $\ell \in [L]$.

Theorem 2. (Extension of Theorem 1) Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$. Fix any sequence $\underline{p}(T) \in (0, 1/2)$ with $\underline{p}(T) = \Omega(T^{-1/2+\varepsilon})$. Then for any $\eta \in (1, (1 - \varepsilon/2)^{-1})$,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\underline{p}(T), \beta)} \mathcal{R}(\text{BIRT}_\eta) = O(1). \quad (14)$$

Proof. By assumption there exist $T_0 > 1$ and $\sigma > 0$ such that $\underline{p}(T) \geq \sigma T^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$ for all $T > T_0$. It suffices to assume $T > T_0$. Recall Proposition 2 shows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\text{OPT} \neq \text{OPT}^1\} &\leq 3L \exp\left(-\frac{\underline{p}^2}{8n^4 S^2(nL+1)^2} \frac{(T-t_1)^4}{T^3}\right) \\ &\leq 3L \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{8n^4 S^2(nL+1)^2} \frac{(T-t_1)^4}{T^{4-2\varepsilon}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for re-solving points defined in the BIRT_η policy, we can show, similar to the proof of Theorem 1 (Appendix A.4), that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\text{OPT}^{k-1} - \text{OPT}^k\right] \leq 3Le^{\eta^{K-k+1}} \exp\left(-C'' e^{(4-(4-2\varepsilon)\eta)\eta^{K-k}}\right),$$

for some constant $C'' > 0$ determined by σ, T_0 , and the *support* of the distribution. Finally, we invoke Lemma 13 to conclude, following a similar convergence argument as in the proof of Theorem 1 (Appendix A.4), that for any $P \in \mathcal{P}(\underline{p}(T), \beta)$ and any choice of $\eta \in (1, (1 - \varepsilon/2)^{-1})$,

$$\mathcal{R}(\text{BIRT}) \leq 2 + 3LC''^{-1/\zeta} h(\eta, \zeta) = O(1),$$

where $\zeta = 4\eta^{-1} - (4 - 2\varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$. \square

C Additional proofs

Lemma 12. *Suppose $N_T \sim \text{Bin}(T, 1/2)$ for $T \geq 1$. Then*

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}|N_T - T/2|}{\sqrt{T}} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Define the sequence $M_T := (2N_T - T)/\sqrt{T}$ for $T \geq 1$. Then it suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}|M_T| \rightarrow \sqrt{2/\pi}$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Observe that $\mathbb{E}M_T = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}M_T^2 = 4\text{Var}(N_T)/T = 1$ for all T , so $\{M_T\}$ is uniformly integrable, and that the Central Limit Theorem implies $M_T \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. By Skorokhod's Representation Theorem, there exists a sequence of random variables $(Z_T : T \geq 1)$ such that $M_T \stackrel{d}{=} Z_T$ and $Z_T \rightarrow Z$ almost surely, where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. This means the class $\{Z_T : T \geq 1\}$ is also uniformly integrable, so $Z_T \rightarrow Z$ in L^1 , implying in particular $\mathbb{E}|Z_T| \rightarrow \mathbb{E}|Z| = \sqrt{2/\pi}$. Hence, we conclude that $\mathbb{E}|M_T| = \mathbb{E}|Z_T| \rightarrow \sqrt{2/\pi}$. \square

Lemma 13. *Given $\eta > 1$ and $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, for any $C > 0$,*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{\eta^k} \exp\left(-C\eta^{k\zeta}\right) \leq C^{-1/\zeta} h(\eta, \zeta),$$

where

$$h(\eta, \zeta) := \frac{1}{\zeta \log \eta} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{\zeta}\right) + 2\zeta^{-1/\zeta}.$$

Proof. For ease of notation, we define a function $a : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $a(w) = \eta^w - C\eta^{w\zeta}$ so that the LHS of the inequality we are to show is $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{a(k)}$. Clearly $a(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable in $(0, \infty)$, and its first-order derivative is

$$a'(w) = \left(1 - C\zeta\eta^{w\zeta}\right)\eta^w \log \eta.$$

If $C\zeta \geq 1$, then $a'(w) < 0$ for all $w > 0$, so that $a(\cdot)$ is monotonically decreasing, and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{a(k)} \leq \int_0^{\infty} e^{a(w)} dw$. Otherwise, $a'(w) > 0$ and $a(w)$ is increasing for $w \in (0, w^*)$, and $a'(w) < 0$ and $a(w)$ is decreasing for $w \in (w^*, \infty)$, where

$$w^* := \frac{1}{\log \eta} \log\left(\frac{-\log(C\zeta)}{\eta}\right) > 0.$$

This means $a(\cdot)$ is maximized at w^* , where it takes value

$$a(w^*) = \frac{-\log(C\zeta) - 1}{\zeta}.$$

Denoting $k^* := \lfloor w^* \rfloor \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{a(k)} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{k^*-1} e^{a(k)} + e^{a(k^*)} + e^{a(k^*+1)} + \sum_{k=k^*+2}^{\infty} e^{a(k)} \\ &\leq \int_0^{k^*} e^{a(w)} dw + 2e^{a(w^*)} + \int_{k^*+1}^{\infty} e^{a(w)} dw \\ &\leq \int_0^{\infty} e^{a(w)} dw + 2(C\zeta)^{-1/\zeta}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we assume $\sum_{k=p}^q \cdot = 0$ for any $p > q$, the second follows because $a(w)$ increases in $(0, k^*)$ and decreases in $(k^* + 1, \infty)$, and the last by definition of w^* .

Now it remains to bound the integral $\int_0^\infty e^{a(w)} dw$. In fact, we conclude using change of variables that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\infty e^{a(w)} dw &= \int_0^\infty \exp(\eta^w - Ce^{\eta^w \zeta}) dw \\
&= \int_1^\infty \exp(u - Ce^{\zeta u}) \frac{1}{u \log \eta} du \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\log \eta} \int_1^\infty \exp(u - Ce^{\zeta u}) du \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\log \eta} \int_0^\infty \exp(u - Ce^{\zeta u}) du \\
&= \frac{C^{-1/\zeta}}{\log \eta} \int_0^\infty \exp(-v^\zeta) dv \\
&= C^{-1/\zeta} \frac{\Gamma(1/\zeta)}{\zeta \log \eta},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is by definition of $a(\cdot)$, the second equality by change of variables $u = \eta^w$, the first inequality because $u \geq 1$, the second inequality by non-negativity, the third equality by change of variables $v = C^{-1/\zeta} e^{\zeta u}$, and the last equality by definition of the Gamma function $\Gamma(\cdot)$. \square

D Additional policies

Algorithm 2: Backward Infrequent Re-solving (BIR_η)

Input: time horizon length $T \in \mathbb{N}$, initial welfare $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, hyper-parameter $\eta \in (1, 4/3)$.

Initialize: set $K \leftarrow \lceil \log \log T / \log \eta \rceil$;

set $t_0^* \leftarrow 0$, $t_k^* \leftarrow T - \lfloor \exp(\eta^{K-k}) \rfloor$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$, and $t_{K+1}^* \leftarrow T$;

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ **do**

 solve the fluid problem with updated welfare:

$$\xi^F \in \arg \max \left\{ \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[B_{t_k}^i + (T - t_k) \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} p_\ell \beta_\ell^i \xi_\ell^i \right] : \xi_\ell \in \Delta_n, \forall \ell \in [L] \right\}$$

for $t = t_k^* + 1, \dots, t_{k+1}^*$ **do** // implement the updated fluid policy

 observe incoming supply with utility vector b_t ;

if $b_t = \beta_\ell$ **then**

 act $x_t \leftarrow (\xi^F)_\ell$;

 update $B_t^i \leftarrow B_{t-1}^i + b_t^i x_t^i$ for every agent $i \in [n]$;

Output: actions $(x_t : t = 1, 2, \dots, T)$ and objective $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} B_T^i$.

Algorithm 3: Dual Entropic Mirror Descent (DEMD)

Input: time horizon length $T \in \mathbb{N}$, initial welfare $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Initialize: set step size $h = \sqrt{\log n / T}$;

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

 set initial dual variable

$$\nu_1^i \leftarrow \frac{\exp(-hB_0^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^n \exp(-hB_0^j)}$$

for $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**

 receive arrival utility vector $b_t \in [0, 1]^n$;

 pick agent $j_t \in \arg \max_i \nu_t^i b_t^i$, with random tiebreaking;

 make primal decision $x_t \leftarrow e^{j_t}$;

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

 update dual variable

$$\nu_{t+1}^i \leftarrow \frac{\nu_t^i \exp(-hb_t^i x_t^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^n \nu_t^j \exp(-hb_t^j x_t^j)}$$

Output: actions $(x_t : t = 1, 2, \dots, T)$ and objective $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} B_T^i$.

We give a brief background of the Dual Entropic Mirror Descent algorithm. The mirror descent algorithm is aimed at approximating the solution to the convex optimization problem

$$\text{minimize } f(x) \text{ subject to } x \in X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where X is a closed convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n with an nonempty interior, $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex continuous function, and a subgradient of f at $x \in X$ is computable (denoted by $f'(x)$). Consider the Bregman-distance-like function $B_\psi : X \times X^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$B_\psi(x, y) = \psi(x) - \psi(y) - \langle x - y, \nabla \psi(y) \rangle, \quad (15)$$

where $\psi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strongly convex function. Assuming ψ is continuously differentiable on X , the mirror descent algorithm starts from $x_1 \in X^\circ$ and generates the sequence $\{x_t\}$ via the recursion

$$x_{t+1} = \arg \min_{x \in X} \left\{ \langle x, f'(x_t) \rangle + \frac{1}{\eta_t} B_\psi(x, x_t) \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where $f'(x_t) \in \partial f(x_t)$ is one subgradient of f at x_t , and $\eta_t > 0$ is the step size.

In particular, one choice of $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the entropy function given by

$$\psi(\nu) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^n \nu^i \log \nu^i, & \nu \in \Delta_n \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

It is clear that ψ is a 2-strongly convex function with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_1$ norm. In this case, the recursive relation for generating the sequence $\{\nu_t\}$ can be rewritten in closed form:

$$\nu_{t+1}^i \propto \nu_t^i \exp(-\eta_t f'^i(\nu_t)) \quad (18)$$

with appropriate normalization so that $\nu_{t+1} \in \Delta_n$. This is also known as the *exponential weights updates algorithm*.

Algorithm 4: Fluid Policy (F)

Input: time horizon length $T \in \mathbb{N}$, initial welfare $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
solve the fluid problem with initial welfare:

$$\xi^F \in \arg \max \left\{ \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left[B_0^i + T \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} p_\ell \beta_\ell^i \xi_\ell^i \right] : \xi_\ell \in \Delta_n, \forall \ell \in [L] \right\}$$

for $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do** // implement the fluid policy

 observe incoming supply with utility vector b_t ;

if $b_t = \beta_\ell$ **then**

 act $x_t \leftarrow (\xi^F)_\ell$;

 update $B_t^i \leftarrow B_{t-1}^i + b_t^i x_t^i$ for every agent $i \in [n]$;

Output: actions $(x_t : t = 1, 2, \dots, T)$ and objective $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} B_T^i$.
