
Online Resource Allocation under Horizon Uncertainty

Santiago Balseiro
Columbia University
srb2155@columbia.edu

Christian Kroer
Columbia University
christian.kroer@columbia.edu

Rachitesh Kumar
Columbia University
rk3068@columbia.edu

Abstract

We study stochastic online resource allocation: a decision maker needs to allocate limited resources to stochastically-generated sequentially-arriving requests in order to maximize reward. Motivated by practice, we consider a data-driven setting in which requests are drawn independently from a distribution that is unknown to the decision maker. Online resource allocation and its special cases have been studied extensively in the past, but these previous results crucially and universally rely on a practically-untenable assumption: the total number of requests (the horizon) is known to the decision maker in advance. In many applications, such as revenue management and online advertising, the number of requests can vary widely because of fluctuations in demand or user traffic intensity. In this work, we develop online algorithms that are robust to horizon uncertainty. In sharp contrast to the known-horizon setting, we show that no algorithm can achieve a constant asymptotic competitive ratio that is independent of the horizon uncertainty. We then introduce a novel algorithm that combines dual mirror descent with a carefully-chosen target consumption sequence and prove that it achieves a bounded competitive ratio. Our algorithm is near-optimal in the sense that its competitive ratio attains the optimal rate of growth when the horizon uncertainty grows large.

1 Introduction

Online resource allocation is a general framework that includes as special cases various fundamental problems like network revenue management [22], online advertising [19], online linear/convex programming [1, 2, 9, 16], bidding in repeated auctions [7], and assortment optimization under inventory constraints [13]. It captures any setting in which a decision-maker endowed with a limited amount of resources faces sequentially-arriving requests, each of which consumes a certain amount of resources and generates a reward. At each time step, the decision maker observes the request and then takes an action, with the overarching aim of maximizing cumulative reward subject to resource constraints. In this work, we focus on the setting in which requests are generated by some stationary distribution unknown to the decision maker. We impose very mild assumptions on this distribution, and in particular do not require the requests to satisfy common convexity assumptions.

To the best of our knowledge, all of the previous works on stochastic online resource allocation assume that the total number of requests is known to the decision maker (we provide a more detailed discussion of related work in Appendix A). Importantly, this assumption is vital for their algorithms and performance guarantees, because it allows them to compute the per-period resource budget and use it as the target consumption in each time step.

Juxtapose this with a world in which viral trends are becoming ever more common, causing online advertising platforms and retailers to routinely experience traffic spikes. These spikes inject uncertainty into the system and make it difficult to accurately predict the total number of requests that will arrive. In fact, these spikes are very lucrative opportunities for the advertiser/retailer, which makes addressing the uncertainty even more pertinent [10]. This motivates us to relax the previously-Preprint. Under review.

ubiquitous known-horizon assumption and develop robust algorithms that only require the horizon to lie in some known uncertainty window $[\tau, \alpha\tau]$. Here, α captures the uncertainty in the horizon, and τ is a lower bound on the horizon. We use as our benchmark the hindsight optimal allocation that can be computed with full knowledge of all requests and the time horizon. While our analysis holds for every value of $\alpha \geq 1$, we aim to develop algorithms that are near-optimal when the horizon is highly uncertain, i.e., the case when the value of α is large.

Main Contributions We begin by showing that, in sharp contrast to the known-horizon setting, no algorithm can achieve vanishing regret with respect to the hindsight optimal allocation. Specifically, we show that no algorithm can achieve even a constant asymptotic competitive ratio by proving an upper bound of $e \cdot \ln(\alpha)/\ln(\alpha)$ on the best-possible competitive ratio (Theorem 1). This upper bound shows that, unlike online convex optimization [21, 14], the known and unknown horizon settings are fundamentally different in stochastic online resource allocation. This follows because resource constraints link requests together and prevent the use of standard ideas to handle unknown horizons such as the doubling trick [21].

Next, we introduce a novel algorithm that enhances dual mirror descent by introducing a decreasing sequences of target consumptions, which we dub *Variable Target Dual Mirror Descent*. Even though it was known that dual mirror descent has good performance in the known-horizon setting when using a fixed target consumption [5], nothing was known about its performance for unknown horizons and variable target consumptions. Here our technical contribution is two fold: (i) We define a natural modification of dual mirror descent that incorporates variable target consumptions (Algorithm 1); (ii) We exploit the structural properties of the dual problem to obtain guarantees for general decreasing target consumption sequences (Theorem 2). A salient feature of our work is that it provides a principled approach to adapt mirror descent to uncertain horizons and yields an algorithm that can be easily implemented (either from scratch or deployed in many existing system with minimal changes in their implementation).

Finally, we develop an efficient dynamic-programming-based procedure (Algorithm 2) to compute the target consumption sequence which maximizes the competitive ratio of Variable Target Dual Mirror Descent. Additionally, we also describe a simple decreasing sequence that allows dual mirror descent to achieve a competitive ratio of $1/(1 + \ln(\alpha))$. In light of our upper bound, our algorithm attains the optimal rate as a function of α when α grows large.

2 Model

Notation We use \mathbb{R}_+ to denote the set of non-negative real numbers and \mathbb{R}_{++} to denote the set of positive real numbers. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and a scalar $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, v/a denotes the scalar multiplication of v by $1/a$. For vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}_m$ and a relation $R \in \{\geq, >, \leq, <\}$, we write $u R v$ whenever the relation holds component wise: $u_i R v_i$ for all $i \in [m]$.

We consider a general online resource allocation problem with m resources, in which requests arrive sequentially. At time t , a request $\gamma_t = (f_t, b_t, \mathcal{X}_t)$ arrives, which is composed of a reward function $f_t : \mathcal{X}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, a resource consumption function $b_t : \mathcal{X}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a compact action set $\mathcal{X}_t \subset \mathbb{R}_+^d$. We assume that $0 \in \mathcal{X}_t$ and $b_t(0) = 0$ for all t . This ensures that the decision maker has the option to not spend any resources at each time step. We make no assumptions about the convexity/concavity of either f_t , b_t or \mathcal{X}_t .

Let \mathcal{S} represent the set of all possible requests. We make standard regularity assumptions: there exist constants $\bar{f}, \bar{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that, for every request $\gamma = (f, b, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $|f(x)| \leq \bar{f}$ and $\|b(x)\|_\infty \leq \bar{b}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Furthermore, we assume that the requests are drawn i.i.d. from some distribution \mathcal{P} over \mathcal{S} that is not known to the decision maker. The decision maker has an initial resource endowment of $B = (B_1, \dots, B_m) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^m$, where B_i denotes the initial amount of resource i available to the decision maker. We will use $\rho_T = B/T$ to denote the per-period resource endowment that is available to the decision maker if the total number of requests is T .

Let T denote the total number of requests that will arrive (also called the horizon). In contrast to previous work, we do not assume that T (or its distribution) is known to the decision maker, and instead only assume that it lies in some known uncertainty set $[\tau, \alpha\tau]$, where $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\tau, \alpha\tau \in \mathbb{N}$. Looking ahead, this uncertainty is what makes our problem much harder than vanilla online resource allocation where the horizon is known, as evidenced by the fact that no algorithm can attain even an

asymptotic competitive ratio independent of α (Theorem 1), which is a far-cry from the no-regret property exhibited by algorithms for the known-horizon setting.

At each time step $t \leq T$, the following sequence of events take place: (i) A request $\gamma_t = (f_t, b_t, \mathcal{X}_t)$ arrives and is observed by the decision maker; (ii) The decision maker selects an action $x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$ from the action set based on the information seen so far; (iii) The decision maker receives a reward of $f_t(x_t)$ and the request consumes $b_t(x_t)$ resources. The goal of the decision maker is to take actions that maximize her total reward while keeping the total consumption of resources below the initial resource endowment. We measure the performance of an algorithm for the decision maker by comparing it to the hindsight optimal solution that has access to all the requests and the value of T . More concretely, for an horizon $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$ and a sequence of requests $\vec{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_T)$, the hindsight-optimal reward $\text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma})$ is defined as the optimal value of the following hindsight optimization problem:

$$\text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) := \max_{x \in \prod_t \mathcal{X}_t} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T b_t(x_t) \leq B. \quad (1)$$

An online algorithm (for the decision maker) takes an action $x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$ at each time step $t \leq T$ based on the current request $\gamma_t = (f_t, b_t, \mathcal{X}_t)$ and the history observed so far $\mathcal{H}_t = \{\gamma_s, x_s\}_{s=1}^t$ such that the resource constraints $\sum_{t=1}^T b_t(x_t) \leq B$ are satisfied almost surely w.r.t. $\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T$. Our results continue to hold even if the actions $\{x_t\}_t$ are randomized, but we work with deterministic actions for ease of exposition. Since we assume that T is not known to the decision maker, the actions of the online algorithm cannot depend on T . We do allow the actions to depend on the known uncertainty set $[\tau, \alpha\tau]$. The total reward of algorithm A on a sequence of requests $\vec{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_T)$ is given by $R(A|T, \vec{\gamma}) = \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t)$.

We measure the performance of an algorithm by its competitive regret. Formally, for an online algorithm A , constant $c > 0$ and request distribution \mathcal{P} , we define

$$c\text{-Regret}(A|\tau, \mathcal{P}) := \max_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} [c \cdot \text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) - R(A|T, \vec{\gamma})]$$

In particular, observe that 1-Regret is simply the standard notion of regret. We say that an algorithm A is c -competitive or algorithm A has a competitive ratio of c if, for all input distributions \mathcal{P} , it satisfies $c\text{-Regret}(A|\tau, \mathcal{P}) = o(\tau)$ when $B_j = \Theta(\tau)$ for all $j \in [m]$. In other words, algorithm A is c -competitive if it attains a c fraction of the hindsight optimal solution as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ when the initial resources are scaled simultaneously with the horizon. The assumption that the initial resources scales linearly with the number of requests is pervasive in the literature and well-motivated in applications such as internet advertising [19] and revenue management [22]. We conclude this section by noting that our model is a generalization of the model of [5]. The latter can be recovered by setting $\alpha = 1$, in which case the decision maker knows the number of requests T .

3 Upper Bound on the Competitive Ratio

The special case of $\alpha = 1$ (when T is known) has been studied extensively in the literature, resulting in a myriad of algorithms that are 1-competitive, i.e., asymptotically optimal (see Appendix A). Perhaps one of them can be modified to attain a constant competitive ratio independent of α for our model with horizon uncertainty? In this section, we answer this question in the negative: we show that no online algorithm can attain a competitive ratio of one as soon as $\alpha > 1$ and, moreover, when α is large the competitive ratio degrades at a rate of $e \cdot \ln \ln(\alpha) / \ln(\alpha)$. In other words, the competitive ratio of every algorithm degrades to 0 as α grows large. In fact, we prove that this upper bound on the best-possible competitive ratio holds even when (i) there is only 1 resource, (ii) the decision maker receives the same request at each time step, (iii) this request is known to the decision maker ahead of time, and (iv) the request has a smooth concave reward function and linear resource consumption.

For the purposes of this section, set the number of resources to $m = 1$ and $B = \tau$ (which implies $\rho_\tau = 1$). Moreover, define the singleton request space $\mathcal{S}_r = \{(f_r, I, \mathcal{X})\}$ for a parameter $r \in (0, 1]$, where $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$, and $f_r(x) = x^r$, $I(x) = x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Note that f_r is concave for all $r \in (0, 1)$. Let \mathcal{P}_r be the canonical distribution on \mathcal{S}_r that serves the request (f_r, I, \mathcal{X}) with probability one. Since all requests are identical, we abuse notation and use $\text{OPT}(T, r)$ (similarly $R(A|T, r)$) to denote the hindsight-optimal reward $\text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma})$ (total reward $R(A|T, \vec{\gamma})$ of algorithm A) when $\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}_r^T$, i.e., $\gamma_t = (f_r, I, \mathcal{X})$ for all $t \leq T$. We are now ready to state the main result of this section.




Figure 1: Upper bound on the competitive ratio and lower bounds on the competitive ratios for different target consumption sequences. Here we have $\tau = 50$.

Theorem 1. For all $r \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\tau \geq 1$, every online algorithm A satisfies

$$\min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} \frac{R(A|T, r)}{\text{OPT}(T, r)} \leq \frac{1}{\left(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha) + \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\right)\right)^r}.$$

In particular, for $r = 1 - \{1/\ln \ln(\alpha)\}$, $\alpha > e^e$ and $\tau \geq 1$, every online algorithm A satisfies

$$\min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} \frac{R(A|T, r)}{\text{OPT}(T, r)} \leq \frac{e \cdot \ln \ln(\alpha)}{\ln(\alpha)}.$$

The above bounds hold even for online algorithms that have prior knowledge of \mathcal{P}_r before time $t = 1$.

Figure 1 plots the value of the upper bound on the competitive ratio as a function of α . Using the previous result, we can provide bounds on the weighted regret of every online algorithm.

Corollary 1. If an online algorithm A that has competitive ratio of c for the input distribution \mathcal{P}_r , i.e., A satisfies c -Regret($A|\tau, \mathcal{P}_r$) = $o(\tau)$, for all $r \in (0, 1)$, then $c \leq \inf_{r \in (0, 1)} \{1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha)\}^{-r}$. In particular, for $r = 1 - \{1/\ln \ln(\alpha)\}$ and $\alpha > e^e$, we have $c \leq e \cdot \ln \ln(\alpha) / \ln(\alpha)$. These upper bounds hold even if the online algorithm A has prior knowledge of \mathcal{P}_r before time $t = 1$.

4 The Algorithm

To complement our upper bound on the competitive ratio, we next describe an algorithm that (nearly) achieves this upper bound. In particular, we describe a dual-mirror-descent-based algorithm that matches our upper bound up to constants and the $\ln \ln(\alpha)$ factor. As the name suggests, this algorithm maintains and updates dual variables, and uses them to compute the action x_t at time t . Before moving onto the description of the algorithm, we define the dual problem that we work with.

4.1 The Dual Problem

The Lagrangian dual problem to the hindsight optimization problem (1) is obtained by moving the resource constraints to the objective using multipliers $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$. Intuitively, the dual variable μ_j acts as the price of resource j and accounts for the opportunity cost of consuming resource j . This allows us to define the objective function of the dual optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma}) &:= \sup_{x \in \prod_t \mathcal{X}_t} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) + \mu^\top \left(B - \sum_{t=1}^T b_t(x_t) \right) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \sup_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t} \{ f_t(x_t) + \mu^\top (\rho_T - b_t(x_t)) \} = \sum_{t=1}^T (f_t^*(\mu) + \mu^\top \rho_T), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation follows because the objective is separable and denoting $\rho_T = B/T$, and the last by defining the opportunity-cost-adjusted reward to be $f_t^*(\mu) := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}_t} \{ f_t(x) - \mu^\top b_t(x) \}$.

Algorithm 1: Variable Target Dual Mirror Descent Algorithm

Input: Initial dual solution μ_1 , initial resource endowment $B_1 = B$, target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$, reference function $h : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and step-size η .

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

 Receive request $(f_t, b_t, \mathcal{X}_t) \sim \mathcal{P}$.

 Make the primal decision x_t and update the remaining resources B_t :

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_t &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathcal{X}_t} \{f_t(x) - \mu_t^\top b_t(x)\}, \\ x_t &= \begin{cases} \tilde{x}_t & \text{if } b_t(\tilde{x}_t) \leq B_t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\ B_{t+1} &= B_t - b_t(x_t). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

 Obtain a sub-gradient of the dual function: $g_t = \lambda_t - b_t(\tilde{x}_t)$.

 Update the dual variable by mirror descent: $\mu_{t+1} = \operatorname{arg min}_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} g_t^\top \mu + \frac{1}{\eta} V_h(\mu, \mu_t)$, where

$V_h(x, y) = h(x) - h(y) - \nabla h(y)^\top (x - y)$ is the Bregman divergence.

The dual problem is simply $\min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+} D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma})$. Importantly, we get weak duality: $\operatorname{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) \leq D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma})$ for all dual solutions μ .

Recall that, in our definition of competitive ratio (4), we are interested in the expectation of $\operatorname{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma})$ when $\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T$. Weak duality allows us to bound this quantity from above as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} [\operatorname{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma})] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} [D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma})] = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\gamma \sim \mathcal{P}} [f_t^*(\mu)] + \rho_T^\top \mu. \tag{2}$$

This motivates us to define the following single-period dual function with target consumption $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ as $\tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda, \mathcal{P}) := \mathbb{E}_{\gamma \sim \mathcal{P}} [f^*(\mu)] + \lambda^\top \mu$. The following lemma notes some important properties of the single-period dual objective.

Lemma 1. $\tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda, \mathcal{P})$ is convex in $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$. Moreover, for every $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $T \geq 1$, the following properties hold:

- (a) *Separability:* $\mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} [D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma})] = T \cdot \tilde{D}(\mu|\rho_T, \mathcal{P})$
- (b) *Sub-homogeneity:* For $a \in [0, 1]$, $a \cdot \tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda, \mathcal{P}) \leq \tilde{D}(\mu|a \cdot \lambda, \mathcal{P})$.
- (c) *Monotonicity:* If $\lambda \leq \kappa$, then $\tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda, \mathcal{P}) \leq \tilde{D}(\mu|\kappa, \mathcal{P})$.

4.2 Variable Target Dual Mirror Descent

Algorithm 1 is a highly-flexible stochastic dual descent algorithm that allows the decision maker to specify the target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$, in addition to the initial dual variable μ_1 , the reference function $h(\cdot)$ and the step-size η needed to specify the mirror-descent procedure. This flexibility allows us to seamlessly analyze a variety of different algorithms using the same framework. As is standard in the literature on mirror descent [21, 14], we require the reference function $h(\cdot)$ to be either differentiable or essentially smooth [8], and be σ -strongly convex in the $\|\cdot\|_1$ norm. Moreover, Algorithm 1 is efficient when an optimal solution for the per-period optimization problem in equation (3) can be computed efficiently. This is possible for many applications, see [5] for details.

A key input to our algorithm is the target consumption sequence, which we formally define next.

Definition 1. We call a sequence $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\alpha\tau})$ a target consumption sequence if $\lambda_t \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ for all $t \leq \alpha\tau$ and $0 < \sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t \leq B$. It is called decreasing if $\lambda_t \geq \lambda_{t'}$ whenever $t \leq t'$.

For notational convenience, we assume $\lambda_t = 0$ for all $t > \alpha\tau$. Given a target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$, we use $\bar{\lambda} = \max_{t,j} \lambda_{t,j}$ to denote the largest target consumption of any resource at any time step. Moreover, we use $\underline{\lambda} = \min\{\lambda_{t,j} > 0 \mid 1 \leq t \leq \alpha\tau; j \in [m]\}$ to denote the smallest positive target consumption of any resource at any time step.

The algorithm maintains a dual variable μ_t at each time step, which acts as the price of the resources and accounts for the opportunity cost of spending them at time t . Then, for a request $\gamma_t = (f_t, b_t, \mathcal{X}_t)$ at time t , it chooses the action x_t that maximizes the opportunity-cost-adjusted

reward $x_t \in \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathcal{X}_t} \{f_t(x) - \mu_t^\top b_t(x)\}$. As our goal here is to build intuition, we ignore the minor difference between \tilde{x}_t and x_t which ensures that we never overspend resources. The dual variable is updated using mirror descent with reference function $h(\cdot)$, step-size η , and using $g_t = \lambda_t - b_t(x_t)$ as a subgradient. Intuitively, mirror descent seeks to make the subgradients as small as possible, which in our settings translates to making the expected resource consumption in period t as close as possible to the target consumption λ_t . As a result, the target consumption sequence can be interpreted as the ideal expected consumption per period the algorithm seeks to track.

We conclude by discussing some common choices for the reference function. If the reference function is the squared-Euclidean norm, i.e., $h(\mu) = \|\mu\|_2^2$, then the update rule is $\mu_{t+1} = \max\{\mu_t - \eta g_t, 0\}$ and the algorithm implements subgradient descent. If the reference function is the negative entropy, i.e., $h(\mu) = \sum_{j=1}^m \mu_j \log(\mu_j)$, then the update rule is $\mu_{t+1,j} = \mu_{t,j} \exp(-\eta g_{t,j})$ and the algorithm implements multiplicative weights.

4.3 Worst-case Performance Guarantees

In this section, we provide worst-case performance guarantees for our algorithm under arbitrary decreasing target consumption sequences. Before stating our result, we provide further intuition on our algorithm. Consider the single-period dual function with target consumption λ , given by

$$\tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda, \mathcal{P}) = \mathbb{E}_{\gamma \sim \mathcal{P}} [f^*(\mu)] + \lambda^\top \mu = \mathbb{E}_{\gamma \sim \mathcal{P}} \left[\sup_{s \in \mathcal{X}} \{f(s) - \mu^\top b(s)\} \right] + \lambda^\top \mu$$

Then, by Danskin's Theorem, its subgradient is given by $\mathbb{E}_{\gamma \sim \mathcal{P}} [\lambda - b(x_\gamma(\mu))] \in \partial_\mu \tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda, \mathcal{P})$ where $x_\gamma(\mu) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{f(x) - \mu^\top b(x)\}$ is an optimal decision when the request is $\gamma = (f, b, \mathcal{X})$ and the dual variable is μ . Therefore, $g_t = \lambda_t - b_t(x_t)$ is a random unbiased sample of the subgradient of $\tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda, \mathcal{P})$. Now, if we wanted to minimize the dual objective $\mathbb{E}[D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma})] = T \cdot \tilde{D}(\mu|\rho_T, \mathcal{P})$ for some known T , we can run mirror descent on the function $\tilde{D}(\mu|\rho_T, \mathcal{P})$ by setting $\lambda_t = \rho_T$ for all $t \leq T$. This is exactly the approach taken by [5]. Unfortunately, this method does not extend to our setting because the horizon T is unknown. Nonetheless, as has been repeatedly observed in the past, the analysis of mirror descent is incredibly robust and we can obtain regret guarantees even if the single-period duals $\tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda_t, \mathcal{P})$ vary with time due to the changing target consumptions. However, when $\lambda_t \neq \rho_T$ for some $t \leq T$, it is no longer the case that $\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda_t, \mathcal{P})$ provides an upper bound on the hindsight optimization problem. This is where parts (b) and (c) of Lemma 1 come into play. When the target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$ is decreasing, they allow us to relate the reward of mirror descent, when applied to time-varying single-period duals, to the expected dual objective $\mathbb{E}[D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma})]$ for all $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$. We now state the performance guarantee for Algorithm 1.

Theorem 2. *Consider Algorithm 1 with initial dual solution μ_1 , initial resource endowment $B_1 = B$, a decreasing target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$, reference function $h(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and step-size η . Suppose Assumptions 1-2 are satisfied. For any $T \geq 1$, if we set*

$$c(\vec{\lambda}, T) := \max_{t \leq T} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{T,j}} \right\}, 1 \right\} \right) \cdot \frac{t}{T} = \max_{t \leq T} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j} \cdot t}{B_j} \right\}, \frac{t}{T} \right\} \right) \quad (4)$$

then it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \cdot \operatorname{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) - R(A|T, \vec{\gamma}) \right] \leq C_1 + C_2 \eta T + \frac{C_3}{\eta}. \quad (5)$$

where $C_1 = \bar{f}\bar{b}/\underline{\lambda}$, $C_2 = (\bar{b} + \bar{\lambda})^2/2\sigma$, $C_3 = \max \{V_h(\mu, \mu_1) : \mu \in \{0, (\bar{f}/\underline{\lambda})e_1, \dots, (\bar{f}/\underline{\lambda})e_m\}\}$. Here $e_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the j -th unit vector.

We pause to provide some intuition for $c(\vec{\lambda}, T)$, which gives the competitive ratio when the horizon is $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$. Lemma 1 and weak duality allow us to show that Algorithm 1 achieves a per-period reward of $\kappa \cdot \operatorname{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma})/T$ or greater for every time step $s \leq T$ in which $\lambda_s \geq \kappa \cdot \rho_T$ for some $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, i.e., we can guarantee a constant fraction κ from the optimal solution in hindsight if the target consumption is a constant fraction of the optimal one when the horizon is T . For a fixed $t \leq T$, set $\kappa = \min \{\min_j \{\lambda_{t,j}/\rho_{T,j}\}, 1\}$. This guarantees $\lambda_t \geq \kappa \cdot \rho_T$. Moreover, since $\vec{\lambda}$ is decreasing, $\lambda_t \geq \kappa \cdot \rho_T$ implies $\lambda_s \geq \kappa \cdot \rho_T$ for all $s \leq t$, and this translates to a total reward of $\kappa \cdot \operatorname{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) \cdot (t/T)$ in the first t time steps. In other words, we can guarantee a competitive ratio of

at least $\min \{ \min_j \{ \lambda_{t,j} / \rho_{T,j} \}, 1 \} \cdot (t/T)$. Since the choice of $t \leq T$ was arbitrary, we can optimize this guarantee by maximizing over $t \leq T$, which yields $c(\vec{\lambda}, T)$.

The competitive ratio of our algorithm is obtained by taking the lowest possible competitive ratio $c(\vec{\lambda}, T)$ over the horizon uncertainty $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$, i.e., $c(\vec{\lambda}) := \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}, T)$. Optimizing over the step-size in (5) yields $\eta = \sqrt{C_3 / \{C_2 \alpha \tau\}}$ and the weighted regret is

$$c(\vec{\lambda})\text{-Regret}(A|\tau, \mathcal{P}) \leq C_1 + 2\sqrt{C_2 C_3 \alpha \tau}.$$

Thus, if we are able to show that there is a constant $\kappa > 0$, and a way of selecting the target consumption sequence for each $\tau \geq 1$, such that $\liminf_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} c(\vec{\lambda}) > \kappa$, then combining this choice of $\vec{\lambda}$ with Algorithm 1 would yield a κ -competitive algorithm. This motivates us to abuse terminology and refer to $c(\vec{\lambda})$ as the competitive ratio of the target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$. The next section describes a variety of target consumption sequences and their competitive-ratio guarantees.

5 Choice of Target Consumption Sequence

Theorem 2 characterizes the performance of Algorithm 1 in terms of $\vec{\lambda}$. How should we choose $\vec{\lambda}$? In particular, which decreasing target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$ maximizes the competitive ratio of Algorithm 1? Are there simple near-optimal sequences? What is the best fixed target rate sequence? This section is dedicated to providing answers to these questions.

5.1 Simple Target Consumption Sequences

Before describing an algorithm that computes an optimal target consumption sequence that maximizes the competitive ratio, we describe two simple target consumption sequences. The first one achieves a competitive ratio of $1/(1 + \ln(\alpha))$, which is the same as the upper bound established in Section 3 up to the $e \cdot \ln \ln(\alpha)$ factor (for context, $\ln \ln(10^9) \approx 3$). The second one is the best fixed target consumption sequence and achieves a competitive ratio of $1/\sqrt{\alpha}$.

The first sequence, which we dub the *proportional sequence*, is given as follows

$$\lambda_t := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1+\ln(\alpha)} \cdot \frac{B}{\tau} = \frac{1}{1+\ln(\alpha)} \cdot \rho_\tau & \text{if } t \leq \tau, \\ \frac{1}{1+\ln(\alpha)} \cdot \frac{B}{t} = \frac{1}{1+\ln(\alpha)} \cdot \rho_t & \text{if } \tau + 1 \leq t \leq \alpha\tau. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The target consumption is constant and proportional to ρ_τ for all periods below τ . For time periods in the uncertainty set $[\tau, \alpha\tau]$, the target consumption is proportional to ρ_t . Intuitively, this sequence seeks to track the optimal target consumption when the horizon is known in advance, which is ρ_T when the horizon is T . Such choice is of course not feasible because, for every $T > \tau$ the sum of target consumptions would exceed the amount of initial resources, i.e., $\tau\rho_\tau + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T \rho_t > B$. The proportional sequence “proportionally” reduces all consumptions by the largest possible factor that guarantees feasibility. Using a factor of $1/(1 + \ln(\alpha))$ we obtain that

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t = \frac{B}{1 + \ln(\alpha)} \cdot \left(\tau \cdot \frac{1}{\tau} + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} \frac{1}{t} \right) \leq \frac{B}{1 + \ln(\alpha)} \cdot \left(1 + \ln \left(\frac{\alpha\tau}{\tau} \right) \right) = B,$$

and the resulting sequence is valid. Moreover, for $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$, it is straightforward to see that satisfies $c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \geq 1/(1 + \ln(\alpha))$ because $\lambda_T = \rho_T/(1 + \ln(\alpha))$ and we can set $t = T$ in (4). Theorem 2 implies that the proportional target consumption sequence has the following competitive ratio.

Proposition 1. *For $\tau \geq 1$ and $\alpha \geq 1$, $\vec{\lambda}$ as defined in (6) is a decreasing target consumption sequence that satisfies $c(\vec{\lambda}) \geq 1/(1 + \ln(\alpha))$.*

Next, we describe a fixed target consumption sequence and show that it achieves a competitive ratio of $1/\sqrt{\alpha}$. Fixed target consumption sequences are appealing because they are simple to implement and lead to good competitive ratios for low values of α . Formally, a target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$ is called fixed if there exists a $T^* \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$ such that $\lambda_t = \rho_{T^*}$ for $t \leq T^*$ and $\lambda_t = 0$ otherwise. While many choices are valid for the fixed target consumption sequence, it is not hard to see that setting $T^* \approx \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \tau$ leads to the highest possible competitive ratio within this class. The following result characterizes the competitive ratio of such a sequence.

Algorithm 2: Optimal Decreasing Target Consumption Sequence

Input: $\tau \geq 1$, uncertainty parameter $\alpha \geq 1$, initial resources $B \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^m$ and tolerance parameter $\epsilon > 0$.

Initialize: $l = 1/\alpha$ and $u = 1$.

While $u - l > \epsilon$:

1. Set $\ell(T) = 0$ for $\tau \leq T \leq \alpha\tau$ and $\kappa = (u + l)/2$.
2. For $T = \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil - 1$ to τ : Compute $\ell(T)$ using (8).
3. If $\kappa + \kappa \cdot \ell(\tau) > 1$, set $u = \kappa$. Else, set $l = \kappa$.

Set $\ell(T) = 0$ for $\tau \leq T \leq \alpha\tau$, $\kappa = l$ and $t_1 = \tau$. Run one iteration of the above ‘For’ loop.

While $t_i < \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$: Set t_{i+1} to be a minimizer for the optimization problem in (8) with $T = t_i$.

Return: For switch times \vec{t} , return $\vec{\lambda}^*$ as defined in Lemma 2.




Figure 2: A structured target consumption sequence with switch times $t_1 = \tau < t_2 < t_3 < \alpha\tau$ as defined in Lemma 2. The height of the bars represents λ_t .

Proposition 2. *The fixed target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$ with $T^* = \lceil \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \tau \rceil$ satisfies $c(\vec{\lambda}) \geq 1/(\sqrt{\alpha} + 1/\tau)$. Moreover, $c(\vec{\lambda}) \leq 1/\sqrt{\alpha}$ for all fixed target consumption sequences $\vec{\lambda}$.*

5.2 Maximizing the Competitive Ratio

In this subsection, we characterize the target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$ that maximizes the competitive ratio $c(\vec{\lambda})$. Let Λ denote the set of all decreasing target consumption sequences. We begin by establishing the existence of a structured target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}^*$ which achieves the optimal competitive ratio that can be achieved by Algorithm 1. We use the term *switch times* to refer to a variable-length sequence of time-steps $1 \leq t_1 < \dots < t_n$, where n is a variable that denotes the length of the sequence. Moreover, we represent the switch times by \vec{t} when in need of brevity.

Lemma 2. *For $\alpha \geq 1$, $\tau \geq 1$ and $\kappa \leq \max_{\vec{\lambda} \in \Lambda} c(\vec{\lambda})$, there exist switch times $\tau = t_1 < \dots < t_n \leq \alpha\tau$ such that:*

- (1) $t_i/(t_{i+1} - 1) \geq \kappa$ for all $i \in [n - 1]$ and $t_n/(\alpha\tau) \geq \kappa$.
- (2) If we define $\vec{\lambda}^*$ as
 - (a) $\lambda_{t_i}^* = \kappa \cdot \rho_{t_i}$ for all $t_i \in \{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$,
 - (b) $\lambda_t^* = \kappa \cdot \rho_{t_i}$ if $t_{i-1} < t < t_i$ (where $t_0 = 0$) for some $i \leq n$ and $\lambda_t^* = 0$ if $t_n < t \leq \alpha\tau$,
 then $\vec{\lambda}^* \in \Lambda$ and $c(\vec{\lambda}^*) \geq \kappa$.

Part (1) says that the switch times are almost within a multiplicative factor of κ of each other. Part (2) says that setting $\lambda_t^* = \kappa \cdot \rho_{t_i}$ at the switch times and $\lambda_t^* = \kappa \cdot \rho_{t_i}$, where t_i is the smallest switch time t_i larger than t , at other times, yields a valid target consumption sequence that has a competitive ratio of at least κ . This step-like structure is depicted in Figure 2.

For $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, let $\vec{\lambda}^*$ be a decreasing sequence that satisfies (a) and (b) for switch times $\tau = t_1 < \dots < t_n \leq \alpha\tau$. Note that, we do not assume $\sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t^* \leq B$. Then,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t^* \leq B \Leftrightarrow \tau \cdot \kappa \cdot \rho_\tau + \sum_{i=2}^n (t_i - t_{i-1}) \cdot \kappa \cdot \rho_{t_i} \leq B \Leftrightarrow \kappa + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i}\right) \cdot \kappa \leq 1 \quad (7)$$

where we have used the fact that $\rho_t = B/t$. Let $\mathcal{T}(\kappa)$ be the set of all switch times $\tau = t_1 < \dots < t_n = \alpha\tau$ that start at τ , end before $\alpha\tau$, and satisfy $t_i/(t_{i+1} - 1) \geq \kappa$ for all $i \in [n - 1]$ and

$t_n/(\alpha\tau) \geq \kappa$. The following lemma employs (7) and Lemma 2 to reframe the problem of computing the optimal competitive ratio as an optimization problem over switch times.

Lemma 3. For $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\tau \geq 1$, we have

$$\max_{\vec{\lambda} \in \Lambda} c(\vec{\lambda}) = \max \left\{ \kappa \in [0, 1] \mid \min_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa)} \kappa + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i} \right) \cdot \kappa \leq 1 \right\}$$

In light of Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, maximizing the competitive ratio boils down to solving the following optimization problem: $\min_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa)} \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i} \right)$. If the latter problem can be solved efficiently, we can then perform a line search over κ to find the largest value of κ that satisfies the inequality in the statement of Lemma 3. We solve it via dynamic programming.

First observe that, for a given $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, any optimal $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa)$ satisfies $t_n = \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$ because the objective function of the above optimization problem increases with t_n and $t_n/(\alpha\tau) \geq \kappa$. For $\tau \leq T \leq \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$, let $\mathcal{S}(\kappa, T)$ denote the set of all switch times $T = t_1 < \dots < t_n = \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$ that start at T , end at $\lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$, and satisfy $t_i/(t_{i+1} - 1) \geq \kappa$ for all $i \in [n - 1]$. This allows us to define a cost function for $\tau \leq T \leq \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$:

$$\ell(T) := \min_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa, T)} \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i} \right)$$

where we interpret $\ell(\lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil) = 0$. The next lemma forms the foundation of our dynamic program.

Lemma 4. For $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ and $\tau \leq T < \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$,

$$\ell(T) = \min_{T^*} \left(1 - \frac{T}{T^*} \right) + \ell(T^*) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad T < T^* \leq \min\{\lfloor (T/\kappa) + 1 \rfloor, \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil\} \quad (8)$$

Lemma 4 allows us to use dynamic programming to compute the optimal decreasing target consumption sequence (Algorithm 2). The following theorem records the performance guarantee of Algorithm 2 and follows from Lemma 3 and Lemma 4.

Theorem 3. Given $\tau \geq 1$, uncertainty parameter $\alpha \geq 1$, initial resources $B \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^m$ and tolerance parameter $\epsilon > 0$ as input, let $\vec{\lambda}^*$ be the output of Algorithm 2. Then, $\vec{\lambda}^*$ is a decreasing target consumption sequence such that $c(\vec{\lambda}^*) \geq \max_{\vec{\lambda} \in \Lambda} c(\vec{\lambda}) - \epsilon$.

Figure 1 compares the performance of Algorithm 2 against the upper bound established in Theorem 1 and the simple target consumption sequences discussed in the previous subsection.

References

- [1] Shipra Agrawal and Nikhil 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.
- [2] Shipra Agrawal, Zizhuo Wang, and Yinyu Ye. A dynamic near-optimal algorithm for online linear programming. *Operations Research*, 62(4):876–890, 2014.
- [3] Alessandro Arlotto and Itai Gurvich. Uniformly bounded regret in the multisecretary problem. *Stochastic Systems*, 9(3):231–260, 2019.
- [4] Michael O Ball and Maurice Queyranne. Toward robust revenue management: Competitive analysis of online booking. *Operations Research*, 57(4):950–963, 2009.
- [5] Santiago Balseiro, Haihao Lu, and Vahab Mirrokni. The best of many worlds: Dual mirror descent for online allocation problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.10124*, 2020.
- [6] Santiago Balseiro, Omar Besbes, and Dana Pizarro. Survey of dynamic resource constrained reward collection problems: Unified model and analysis. *Available at SSRN 3963265*, 2021.
- [7] Santiago R Balseiro and Yonatan Gur. Learning in repeated auctions with budgets: Regret minimization and equilibrium. *Management Science*, 65(9):3952–3968, 2019.

- [8] Heinz H Bauschke, Jonathan M Borwein, and Patrick L Combettes. Essential smoothness, essential strict convexity, and legendre functions in banach spaces. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, 3(04):615–647, 2001.
- [9] Nikhil R Devanur, Kamal Jain, Balasubramanian Sivan, and Christopher A Wilkens. Near optimal online algorithms and fast approximation algorithms for resource allocation problems. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 29–38, 2011.
- [10] Hossein Esfandiari, Nitish Korula, and Vahab Mirrokni. Online allocation with traffic spikes: Mixing adversarial and stochastic models. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 169–186, 2015.
- [11] Jon Feldman, Nitish Korula, Vahab Mirrokni, Shanmugavelayutham Muthukrishnan, and Martin Pál. Online ad assignment with free disposal. In *International workshop on internet and network economics*, pages 374–385. Springer, 2009.
- [12] Jon Feldman, Monika Henzinger, Nitish Korula, Vahab S Mirrokni, and Cliff Stein. Online stochastic packing applied to display ad allocation. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 182–194. Springer, 2010.
- [13] Negin Golrezaei, Hamid Nazerzadeh, and Paat Rusmevichientong. Real-time optimization of personalized assortments. *Management Science*, 60(6):1532–1551, 2014.
- [14] Elad Hazan et al. Introduction to online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, 2(3-4):157–325, 2016.
- [15] Richard M Karp, Umesh V Vazirani, and Vijay V Vazirani. An optimal algorithm for on-line bipartite matching. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 352–358, 1990.
- [16] Thomas Kesselheim, Andreas Tönnis, Klaus Radke, and Berthold Vöcking. Primal beats dual on online packing lps in the random-order model. In *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 303–312, 2014.
- [17] Xiaocheng Li, Chunlin Sun, and Yinyu Ye. Simple and fast algorithm for binary integer and online linear programming. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9412–9421, 2020.
- [18] Will Ma and David Simchi-Levi. Algorithms for online matching, assortment, and pricing with tight weight-dependent competitive ratios. *Operations Research*, 68(6):1787–1803, 2020.
- [19] Aranyak Mehta. Online matching and ad allocation. 2013.
- [20] Aranyak Mehta, Amin Saberi, Umesh Vazirani, and Vijay Vazirani. Adwords and generalized online matching. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 54(5):22–es, 2007.
- [21] Shai Shalev-Shwartz et al. Online learning and online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 4(2):107–194, 2012.
- [22] Kalyan T Talluri and Garrett Van Ryzin. *The theory and practice of revenue management*, volume 1. Springer, 2004.

A Additional Related Work

Online resource allocation is an extremely general framework that captures a wide range of problems, which together have received significant attention in the past. Here, we focus on works that present results which hold at the level of generality of online linear packing or higher, and refer the reader to Mehta et al. [20] and [6] for a discussion of other special sub-problems like Adwords, network revenue management, repeated bidding in auctions, online assortment optimization etc.

Online linear packing is a special case of online resource allocation in which the reward and consumption functions are linear. It has been studied in the random permutation model, which assumes that the requests arrive in a random order and is slightly more general than the i.i.d. stochastic arrival

assumption. Most of the results on online linear packing described here hold for this more general model. [12] present an algorithm that uses the initial requests to learn the dual variables and then subsequently uses these to make accept/reject decisions. It can be shown to have a regret of $O(T^{2/3})$. [2] improved this to $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret by repeatedly re-learning the dual variables by solving LPs at intervals of geometrically-increasing lengths. [9] and [16] provide algorithms with $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret but better dependence of the constants on the number of resources. [17] give a dual-stochastic-gradient-based algorithm which achieves $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret without solving computationally-expensive LPs, albeit with a slightly worse dependence on the number of resources.

[1] study online resource allocation with concave rewards and a convex constraint set. They describe a dual-based algorithm which achieves $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret. The work that is most closely related to ours is [5]. It studies the fully-general online resource allocation under a variety of assumptions on the request-generation process including stochastic i.i.d. They describe a dual mirror descent algorithm and show that it is optimal for a variety of assumptions on the requests. In particular, their algorithm achieves a $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret when requests are stochastic. In light of the lower bound of $\Omega(\sqrt{T})$ proven by [3] for the multi-secretary problem, which is a special case of online resource allocation, their result is tight in its dependence of \sqrt{T} . Crucially, all of the aforementioned results rely on knowledge of the horizon (total number of requests) T , and no longer hold in its absence (see Theorem 1). In this work, we describe a generalization of the dual mirror descent algorithm of [5] which is robust to horizon uncertainty.

There is also a line of work studying online allocation problems when requests are adversarially chosen. Naturally, the fully-adversarial model subsumes our input model, in which requests are drawn i.i.d. from an unknown distribution and the horizon is uncertain. Therefore, guarantees for adversarial algorithms carry over to our setting. We remark, however, that it is not possible to obtain bounded competitive ratio for the general online allocation problems we study in this paper (see, e.g., Feldman et al. 11). Notable exceptions are online matching [15], the AdWords problem [20], or personalized assortment optimization [13], which are linear problems in which rewards are proportional to resource consumption. When rewards are not proportional to resource consumption, there is a stream of literature studying algorithms with parametric competitive ratios. These competitive ratios either depend on the range of rewards (see, e.g., Ball and Queyranne 4, Ma and Simchi-Levi 18) or the ratio of budget to resource consumption (see, e.g., Balseiro et al. 5). Our work leverages the fact that requests are drawn i.i.d. from an unknown distribution to derive stronger competitive ratios that only depend on horizon uncertainty (and that are independent of all other problem parameters). In particular, our competitive ratios are bounded, while the parametric competitive ratios of the aforementioned papers can be made arbitrarily large if an adversary can choose the distribution of requests.

B Proofs for Section 3

To prove Theorem 1, it suffices to prove the stronger statement which holds for online algorithms with prior knowledge of (r, \mathcal{P}_r) before time $t = 1$. Consequently, we assume that online algorithms have this prior knowledge in the remainder of this section. Any algorithm without this knowledge can only do worse. We begin by utilizing the concavity of f_r to evaluate the optimal reward, which we note in the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *For $r \in (0, 1)$ and $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$, we have $\text{OPT}(T, r) = T \cdot (B/T)^r = B^r \cdot T^{1-r}$.*

Because the reward function f_r is concave, it is optimal to spread resources uniformly over time and the an optimal action with the benefit of hindsight is $x_t = B/T$.

Proof of Lemma 5. Fix $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$. As the resource consumption function is given by $I(\cdot)$, we get that

$$\text{OPT}(T, r) = \max_x \sum_{t=1}^T f_r(x_t) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T x_t \leq B$$

Let x be a feasible solution of the above optimization problem. Then,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T f_r(x_t) = T \cdot \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T f_r(x_t)}{T} \leq T \cdot f_r\left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^T x_t}{T}\right) \leq T \cdot f_r\left(\frac{B}{T}\right)$$

where the first inequality follows from the concavity of f_r and the second inequality follows from the resource constraint $\sum_{t=1}^T x_t \leq B$. Hence, we get that $x_t^* = B/T$ for all $t \leq T$ is an optimal solution to the above optimization problem and as a consequence, $\text{OPT}(T, r) = T \cdot f_r(B/T) = B^r \cdot T^{1-r}$. \square

Next, we provide an alternative characterization of the competitive ratio that is more tractable.

Lemma 6. *For $r \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\tau \geq 1$, we have $\sup_A \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} R(A|T, r)/\text{OPT}(T, r)$ is equal to*

$$\max \left\{ c \in [0, 1] \mid \tau \cdot f_r^{-1}\left(c \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau}\right) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} f_r^{-1}(c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)) \leq B \right\},$$

where $\Delta \text{OPT}(t, r) = \text{OPT}(t, r) - \text{OPT}(t-1, r)$ and the sup is taken over all online algorithms.

Before getting into the proof, we provide some intuition for it. The main step involves showing that, for a given competitive ratio c , the minimum amount of resources that any online algorithm A needs to be spend in order to satisfy $\min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} R(A|T, r)/\text{OPT}(T, r) \geq c$ is given by

$$\tau \cdot f_r^{-1}\left(c \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau}\right) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} f_r^{-1}(c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r))$$

This is because f_r is concave for all $r \in (0, 1)$ and the resource consumption function I is linear, which together imply that the marginal bang-per-buck $f_r'(x)$ (amount of reward per marginal unit of resource spent) decreases with x . As a consequence, an online algorithm, that does not have any knowledge of T (other than $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$) and needs to satisfy $R(A|T, r) \geq c \cdot \text{OPT}(T, r)$ for all $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$, would spend the minimum amount of resources in doing so if (i) it attains a reward of $c \cdot \text{OPT}(\tau, r)$ by evenly spending resources in the first τ steps, and (ii) it spends just enough resources to attain a reward of $c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)$ at each time step $t \geq \tau + 1$. Proving (ii) requires showing that $\Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)$ decreases with an increase in t , which follows from Lemma 5. In particular, this ensures that obtaining all of $\Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)$ at time t is cheaper than obtaining some of that value at an earlier time $t' < t$.

Proof of Lemma 6. We begin by noting that our use of max instead of sup is justified in the right-hand side of the equality in Lemma 6 because f_r^{-1} is continuous for all $r \in (0, 1]$. Now, fix $r \in (0, 1]$, $\alpha > e$ and $\tau \geq 1$. Let

$$c \in \operatorname{argmax} \left\{ c' \mid \tau \cdot f_r^{-1}\left(c' \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau}\right) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} f_r^{-1}(c' \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)) \leq B \right\},$$

and define

$$x_t := \begin{cases} f_r^{-1}\left(c \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau}\right) & \text{if } t \leq \tau \\ f_r^{-1}(c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)) & \text{if } \tau < t \leq \alpha\tau \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Then, by definition of c , we have $\sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} I(x_t) = \sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} x_t \leq B$. Moreover, observe that $\text{OPT}(\tau, r)/\tau = (B/\tau)^r = 1$ and

$$\Delta \text{OPT}(t, r) = \text{OPT}(t, r) - \text{OPT}(t-1, r) = B^r \cdot (t^{1-r} - (t-1)^{1-r}) \leq B^r \cdot \frac{1-r}{(t-1)^r} \leq 1.$$

To see why the second-last inequality holds, note that the Intermediate Value Theorem applied to the function $t \mapsto t^{1-r}$ between the points t and $t-1$ yields the existence of an $s \in [t-1, t]$ such that $t^{1-r} - (t-1)^{1-r} = (1-r)/s^r$, which implies $t^{1-r} - (t-1)^{1-r} \leq (1-r)/(t-1)^r$.

Therefore, $x_t \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq t \leq \alpha\tau$. Consider the algorithm that selects action x_t at time t . Then, in $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$ time steps, it receives a reward of

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T f_r(x_t) &= \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} f_r \left(f_r^{-1} \left(c \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau} \right) \right) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T f_r \left(f_r^{-1} (c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)) \right) \\ &= c \cdot \text{OPT}(\tau, r) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r) \\ &= c \cdot \text{OPT}(T, r). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have shown that

$$\sup_A \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} \frac{R(A|T, r)}{\text{OPT}(T, r)} \geq \max \left\{ c \in [0, 1] \mid \tau \cdot f_r^{-1} \left(c \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau} \right) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} f_r^{-1} (c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)) \leq B \right\}$$

Next, we prove the above inequality in the opposite direction. Consider an online algorithm A such that

$$\frac{R(A|T, r)}{\text{OPT}(T, r)} \geq c \quad \forall T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau],$$

for some constant $c > 0$. Let $x(A)_t$ represent the random action taken by A at time t . Since the action of an online algorithm cannot depend on future information, $x(A)_t$ represents the action taken by algorithm A for all horizons $T \geq t$. Let $\{x(\tilde{A})_t\}_t$ represent the sequence obtained by sorting $\{x(A)_t\}_t$ in decreasing order, and let \tilde{A} represent the algorithm that takes action $x(\tilde{A})_t$ at time t . Then, we have

$$\frac{\sum_{t=1}^T f_r(x(\tilde{A})_t)}{\text{OPT}(T, r)} \geq \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T f_r(x(A)_t)}{\text{OPT}(T, r)} \geq c \quad \forall T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau],$$

which allows us to assume that $\{x(A)_t\}_t$ is sorted in decreasing order without loss of generality.

Since $\sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} x(A)_t \leq B$, to complete the proof it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} x_t = \tau \cdot f_r^{-1} \left(c \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau} \right) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} f_r^{-1} (c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} x(A)_t$$

where the equality follows from the definition of x_t (9). We will prove this via induction by inductively proving the following statement for all $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T x_t = \tau \cdot f_r^{-1} \left(c \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau} \right) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^T f_r^{-1} (c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(t, r)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T x(A)_t$$

To do so, we will maintain variables $\{w(T)_t\}_{t \leq T}$ that we initialize to be 0 and update inductively. At a high level, they capture a water-filling procedure. Suppose there is a container corresponding to each time step t with a capacity of $x(A)_t$. We assume that these containers can be connected to each other so that water always goes to the lowest level, which corresponds to the highest marginal reward since f_r is concave. Moreover, we will assume that container T becomes available at time T and is connected to containers $t < T$ at that point. Finally, we also freeze the newly-added water at the end of each time step to inductively use the properties of the water level from the previous time step. We would like to caution the reader that this water-filling interpretation is just a tool that guided our intuition, and the mathematical quantities defined below may not match it exactly.

Base Case $T = \tau$: Let $\{w(\tau)_t\}_{t=1}^{\tau}$ be a decreasing sequence that satisfies the following properties:

- I. $\sum_{t=1}^{\tau} f_r(w(\tau)_t) = c \cdot \text{OPT}(\tau, r)$.
- II. $w(\tau)_t \leq x(A)_t$ for all $t \leq \tau$.
- III. $w(\tau)_t < w(\tau)_1 \implies w(\tau)_t = x(A)_t$.

Such a sequence is guaranteed to exist because $\{x(A)_t\}_{t=1}^\tau$ satisfies properties (II - III') trivially, and satisfies (I) as $\sum_{t=1}^\tau f_r(x(A)_t) \geq c \cdot \text{OPT}(\tau, r)$ and f_r is a continuous increasing function. If $\{w(\tau)_t\}_{t=1}^\tau$ is a constant sequence, then its is easy to see that

$$w(\tau)_t = f_r^{-1} \left(c \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau} \right) \quad \forall t \leq \tau$$

Suppose $w(\tau)_t\}_{t=1}^\tau$ is not a constant sequence. Then, the strict concavity of f_r implies that

$$f_r \left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^\tau w(\tau)_t}{\tau} \right) > \frac{\sum_{t=1}^\tau f_r(w(\tau)_t)}{\tau} = \frac{c \cdot \text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau},$$

which implies

$$w(\tau)_1 \geq \frac{\sum_{t=1}^\tau w(\tau)_t}{\tau} > f_r^{-1} \left(c \cdot \frac{\text{OPT}(\tau, r)}{\tau} \right) = x_\tau.$$

Therefore, we have established:

- III. $w(\tau)_t < x_t \implies w(\tau)_t = x(A)_t$.
- IV. $\sum_{t=1}^\tau w(\tau)_t \geq \sum_{t=1}^\tau x_t = \tau \cdot x_\tau$.

Induction Hypothesis $\tau \leq T < \alpha\tau$: Suppose there exists a decreasing sequence $\{w(T)_t\}_{t=1}^T$ that satisfies the following properties:

- I. $\sum_{t=1}^T f_r(w(T)_t) = c \cdot \text{OPT}(T, r)$.
- II. $w(T)_t \leq x(A)_t$ for all $t \leq T$.
- III. $w(T)_t < x_t \implies w(T)_t = x(A)_t$.
- IV. $\sum_{t=1}^T w(T)_t \geq \sum_{t=1}^T x_t$.

Induction Step $T + 1$: If $x(A)_{T+1} \geq x_{T+1}$, then set $w(T + 1)_{T+1} = x_{T+1}$ and $w(T + 1)_t = w(T)_t$ for all $t \leq T$. In this case, it is easy to see that conditions (I-IV) hold for $\{w(T + 1)_t\}_t$. Next, assume $x(A)_{T+1} < x_{T+1}$. In this case, set $w(T + 1)_{T+1} = x(A)_{T+1}$. Moreover, let $\{w(T + 1)_t\}_{t=1}^T$ be a decreasing sequence that satisfies the following properties:

- I. $\sum_{t=1}^T f_r(w(T + 1)_t) = c \cdot \text{OPT}(T, r) + f_r(x_{T+1}) - f_r(x(A)_{T+1})$.
- II. $w(T + 1)_t \leq x(A)_t$ for all $t \leq T$.
- III'. $w(T)_t \leq w(T + 1)_t$ for all $t \leq T$.

Such a sequence is guaranteed to exist because $\{x(A)_t\}_{t=1}^T$ satisfies property (II) trivially, (III') as a consequence of the inductive hypothesis, and (I) due to f_r being a continuous increasing function and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} f_r(x(A)_t) \geq c \cdot \text{OPT}(T + 1, r) &\iff \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} f_r(x(A)_t) \geq c \cdot \text{OPT}(T, r) + c \cdot \Delta \text{OPT}(T + 1, r) \\ &\iff \sum_{t=1}^T f_r(x(A)_t) \geq c \cdot \text{OPT}(T, r) + f_r(x_{T+1}) - f_r(x(A)_{T+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that (III') and $w(T + 1)_{T+1} = x(A)_{T+1}$ implies

- III. $w(T + 1)_t < x_t \implies w(T + 1)_t = x(A)_t$

Now, only (IV) remains. First, note that the Intermediate Value Theorem applied to $t \mapsto t^{1-r}$ implies

$$\Delta \text{OPT}(T + 1, r) = B^r \cdot [(T + 1)^{1-r} - T^{1-r}] \leq B^r \cdot \frac{1-r}{T^{1-r}} \leq B^r \cdot [T^{1-r} - (T - 1)^{1-r}] = \Delta \text{OPT}(T, r),$$

and as a consequence, we get $x_{T+1} \leq x_T$. This further implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\sum_{t=1}^T w(T+1)_t - \sum_{t=1}^T w(T)_t \right] f'_r(x_{T+1}) &\geq \left[\sum_{t=1}^T w(T+1)_t - \sum_{t=1}^T w(T)_t \right] f'_r(x_T) \\
&\geq \sum_{t=1}^T [w(T+1)_t - w(T)_t] f'_r(w(T)_t) \\
&\geq \sum_{t=1}^T [f_r(w(T+1)_t) - f_r(w(T)_t)] \\
&= f(x_{T+1}) - f(x(A)_{T+1}) \\
&\geq [x_{T+1} - x(A)_{T+1}] f'_r(x_{T+1})
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the concavity of f_r and the fact that $x_{T+1} \leq x_T$; the second inequality follows from concavity of f_r and the observation that the induction hypothesis and (III') imply $w(T)_t = w(T+1)_t = x(A)_t$ whenever $w(T)_t < x_T \leq x_t$, i.e., $w(T+1)_t - w(T)_t > 0$ implies $w(T)_t \geq x_T$; the third and the fourth inequalities follow from the Intermediate Value Theorem applied to f_r ; and the equality follows from (I). Therefore, we get (IV) by using the inductive hypothesis and $w(T+1)_{T+1} = x(A)_{T+1}$:

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T+1} w(T+1) \geq \sum_{t=1}^T w(T)_t + x_{T+1} - x(A)_{T+1} + w(T+1)_{T+1} \geq \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} x_t$$

This concludes the induction step and thereby the proof, since (II) and (IV) together imply $\sum_{t=1}^T x_t \leq \sum_{t=1}^T x(A)_t$. \square

Combining Lemma 6 and Lemma 5 yields

$$\tau \cdot \left(c^* \cdot \frac{B^r \tau^{1-r}}{\tau} \right)^{1/r} + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} (c^* \cdot [B^r t^{1-r} - B^r (t-1)^{1-r}])^{1/r} \leq B$$

for $c^* = \sup_A \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} R(A|T, r) / \text{OPT}(T, r)$. The above equation specifies an upper bound on c^* , which upon simplification leads to Theorem 1. We provide the details below.

Proof of Theorem 1. Recall that combining Lemma 6 and Lemma 5 yields

$$\tau \cdot \left(c^* \cdot \frac{B^r \tau^{1-r}}{\tau} \right)^{1/r} + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} (c^* \cdot [B^r t^{1-r} - B^r (t-1)^{1-r}])^{1/r} \leq B, \quad (10)$$

where $c^* = \sup_A \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} R(A|T, r) / \text{OPT}(T, r)$. First, note that the Intermediate Value Theorem applied to $t \mapsto t^{1-r}$ implies

$$t^{1-r} - (t-1)^{1-r} \geq \frac{1-r}{t^r} \quad \forall T \geq \tau + 1,$$

which allows us to derive the following inequality from (10):

$$\begin{aligned}
(c^*)^{1/r} + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} \left(c^* \cdot \frac{1-r}{t^r} \right)^{1/r} &\leq 1 \\
\iff (c^*)^{1/r} &\leq \frac{1}{1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} 1/t}
\end{aligned}$$

Using $\sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} 1/t \geq \ln(\alpha\tau/(\tau+1)) = \ln(\alpha) + \ln(\tau/(\tau+1))$ and $(1-r)^{1/r} < 1$, we get the first half of Theorem 1:

$$c^* \leq \frac{1}{\left(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha) + (1-r)^{1/r} \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\right) \right)^r} \leq \frac{1}{\left(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha) + \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\right) \right)^r}.$$

To get the second half, note that $1 + \ln(\tau/(\tau + 1)) \geq 0$, which allows us to write:

$$c^* \leq \frac{1}{(1-r)\ln(\alpha)^r}$$

Finally, define $g : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $g(r) = (1-r)\ln(\alpha)^r$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(g(r)) &= \ln(1-r) + r \cdot \ln \ln(\alpha) \\ \implies \frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} &= -\frac{1}{1-r} + \ln \ln(\alpha) \\ \implies g'(r) &= -\ln(\alpha)^r + \ln \ln(\alpha)g(r) \\ \implies g''(r) &= -\ln \ln(\alpha)\ln(\alpha)^r + \ln \ln(\alpha)f(r) = -\ln \ln(\alpha) \cdot r \cdot \ln(\alpha)^r \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\alpha > e^e$, g is concave and is maximized at $r = 1 - (1/\ln \ln(\alpha))$. Plugging in $r = 1 - (1/\ln \ln(\alpha))$ yields

$$c^* \leq \frac{\ln \ln(\alpha)}{\ln(\alpha)^{1 - \frac{1}{\ln \ln(\alpha)}}} = \frac{e \cdot \ln \ln(\alpha)}{\ln(\alpha)}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Corollary 1 is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 1.

Proof of Corollary 1. Consider an algorithm A which satisfies $c\text{-Regret}(A|\tau, \mathcal{P}_r) = o(\tau)$ for all $r \in (0, 1)$. For contradiction, assume

$$c > \frac{1}{(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha))^r}.$$

Then, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \cdot \max_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} [c \cdot \text{OPT}(T, r) - R(A|T, r)] < c - \frac{1}{\left(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha) + \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\right)\right)^r} \quad (11)$$

and

$$c > \frac{1}{\left(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha) + \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\right)\right)^r}$$

since $\tau/\tau + 1 \rightarrow \infty$ when $\tau \rightarrow \infty$.

By Theorem 1, there exists a $T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$ such that the following equivalent statements hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R(A|T, r)}{\text{OPT}(T, r)} &\leq \frac{1}{\left(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha) + \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\right)\right)^r} \\ \iff R(A|T, r) &\leq \frac{\text{OPT}(T, r)}{\left(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha) + \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\right)\right)^r} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Combining (11) and (12) yields

$$\frac{\text{OPT}(T, r)}{\tau} \left[c - \frac{1}{\left(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha) + \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\right)\right)^r} \right] < c - \frac{1}{\left(1 + (1-r)^{1/r} \cdot \ln(\alpha) + \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\right)\right)^r}$$

which further implies $\text{OPT}(T, r) < \tau$. Observe that Lemma 5 and $B = \tau$ imply $\text{OPT}(T, r) = \tau^r \cdot T^{1-r} \geq \tau$. Hence, we have arrived at a contradiction, thereby completing the proof. \square

C Proofs for Section 4

We begin by formally stating and proving weak duality

Proposition 3. For every $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $T \geq 1$ and $\vec{\gamma} \in \mathcal{S}^T$, we have $\text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) \leq D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma})$.

Proof. Consider any $x \in \prod_t \mathcal{X}_t$ such that $\sum_{t=1}^T b_t(x_t) \leq B$. Then, for $\mu \geq 0$, we have

$$D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma}) \geq \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t) \right\} + \mu^\top \left(B - \sum_{t=1}^T b_t(x_t) \right) \geq \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(x_t)$$

Since $x \in \prod_t \mathcal{X}_t$ satisfied $\sum_{t=1}^T b_t(x_t) \leq B$ was otherwise arbitrary, we have shown $\text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) \leq D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma})$. \square

Proof of Lemma 1. The convexity of $\tilde{D}(\cdot|\lambda, \mathcal{P})$ follows from part (a) and the fact that the dual objective $D(\mu|T, \vec{\gamma})$ is always convex since it is a supremum of a collection of linear functions.

- (a) Shown in equation 2.
- (b) For $a \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\tilde{D}(\mu|a \cdot \lambda, \mathcal{P}) - a \cdot \tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda, \mathcal{P}) = (1 - a)\mathbb{E}_{\gamma \sim \mathcal{P}} [f^*(\mu)] \geq 0$$

where we have used the fact that $f^*(\mu) \geq 0$ for all $\gamma = (f, b, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathcal{S}$, which holds because $0 \in \mathcal{X}$.

- (c) For $\lambda \leq \kappa$, we have

$$\tilde{D}(\mu|\kappa, \mathcal{P}) - \tilde{D}(\mu|\lambda, \mathcal{P}) = (\kappa - \lambda)^\top \mu \geq 0$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that $\kappa - \lambda, \mu \geq 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. To simplify notation, set $\lambda_{t,0} = \rho_{t,0} = 1$ for all $t \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$. Then,

$$\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{T,j}} \right\}, 1 \right\} = \min_{0 \leq j \leq m} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{T,j}} \right\}$$

Fix $T \geq 1$ and let

$$t^* \in \operatorname{argmax}_{t \leq T} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{T,j}} \right\}, 1 \right\} \right) \cdot \frac{t}{T}$$

We split the proof into four steps: (1) The first step involves lower bounding the performance of our algorithm in terms of single-period duals and the complementary slackness term; (2) The second step involves bounding the complementary slackness term using standard regret analysis of mirror descent; (3) The third step involves bounding the optimal from above using the single-period dual; (4) The final step puts it all together. There is considerable overlap in the analysis of dual mirror descent with and without horizon uncertainty. Our proof generalizes the proof of Balseiro et al. [5], who proved this result for the known-horizon case of $\alpha = 1$ with the constant target consumption rate $\lambda_t = \rho_T$ for all $t \leq T$. The main technical contribution of the current proof is establishing a performance guarantee for dual-mirror descent for *all* decreasing target consumption sequences, which will prove critical in getting a asymptotically-near-optimal competitive ratio.

Step 1: Lower bound on algorithm's reward. Consider the filtration $\mathcal{F} = \{\sigma(\xi_t)\}_t$, where $\xi_t = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t\}$ the set of all requests seen till time t and $\sigma(\xi_t)$ is the sigma algebra generated by it. Note that Algorithm 1 only collects rewards when there are enough resources left. Let ζ_A be first time less than t^* for which there exists a resource j such that $\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} b_{t,j}(x_t) + \bar{b} \geq B_j$. Here, $\zeta_A = t^*$ if this inequality is never satisfied. Observe that ζ_A is a stopping time w.r.t. \mathcal{F} and it is defined so that we cannot violate the resource constraints before ζ_A . In particular, $x_t = \tilde{x}_t$ for all $t \leq \zeta_A$. Therefore, we get

$$f_t(x_t) = f^*(\mu_t) + \mu_t^\top b_t(x_t)$$

Observe that μ_t is measurable w.r.t. $\sigma(\xi_{t-1})$ and γ_t is independent of $\sigma(\xi_{t-1})$, which allows us to take conditional expectation w.r.t. $\sigma(\xi_{t-1})$ to write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[f_t(x_t)|\sigma(\xi_{t-1})] &= \mathbb{E}_{\gamma_t \sim \mathcal{P}}[f^*(\mu_t)] + \mu_t^\top \lambda_t + \mu_t^\top (\mathbb{E}[b_t(x_t)|\sigma(\xi_{t-1})] - \lambda_t) \\ &= \tilde{D}(\mu_t|\lambda_t, \mathcal{P}) - \mathbb{E}[\mu_t^\top (\lambda_t - b_t(x_t))|\sigma(\xi_{t-1})]\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

where the second equality follows the definition of the single-period dual function.

Define $Z_t = \sum_{s=1}^t \mu_s^\top (\lambda_s - b_s(x_s)) - \mathbb{E}[\mu_s^\top (\lambda_s - b_s(x_s))|\sigma(\xi_{s-1})]$. Then, $\{Z_t\}_t$ is a martingale w.r.t. the filtration \mathcal{F} because $Z_t \in \sigma(\xi_t)$ and $\mathbb{E}[Z_{t+1}|\sigma(\xi_t)] = Z_t$. As ζ_A is a bounded stopping time w.r.t. \mathcal{F} , the Optional Stopping Theorem yields $\mathbb{E}[Z_{\zeta_A}] = 0$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \mu_t^\top (\lambda_t - b_t(x_t))\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \mathbb{E}[\mu_t^\top (\lambda_t - b_t(x_t))|\sigma(\xi_{t-1})]\right].$$

A similar argument yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} f_t(x_t)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \mathbb{E}[f_t(x_t)|\sigma(\xi_{t-1})]\right].$$

Hence, summing over (13) and taking expectations, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} f_t(x_t)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \tilde{D}(\mu_t|\lambda_t, \mathcal{P})\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \mu_t^\top (\lambda_t - b_t(x_t))\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \tilde{D}(\mu_t|\lambda_{t^*}, \mathcal{P})\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \mu_t^\top (\lambda_t - b_t(x_t))\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\zeta_A \tilde{D}(\bar{\mu}_{\zeta_A}|\lambda_{t^*}, \mathcal{P})\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \mu_t^\top (\lambda_t - b_t(x_t))\right].\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

where $\bar{\mu}_{\zeta_A} = \frac{1}{\zeta_A} \sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \mu_t$. The first inequality follows from part (c) of Lemma 1 and the fact that $\bar{\lambda}$ is a decreasing sequence. The second inequality follows from the convexity of the single-period dual function (Lemma 1).

Step 2: Complementary slackness. Define $w_t(\mu) := \mu^\top (\lambda_t - b_t(x_t))$. Then, Algorithm 1 can be seen as running online mirror descent on the choice of the dual variables with linear losses $\{w_t(\cdot)\}_t$. The gradients of these loss functions are given by $\nabla w_t(\mu) = \lambda_t - b_t(x_t)$, which satisfy $\|\nabla w_t(\mu)\|_\infty \leq \|b_t(x_t)\|_\infty + \|\lambda(t)\|_\infty \leq \bar{b} + \bar{\lambda}$. Therefore, Proposition 5 of Balseiro et al. [5] implies that for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$:

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} w_t(\mu_t) - w_t(\mu) \leq E(\zeta_A, \mu) \leq E(T, \mu), \quad (15)$$

where $E(t, \mu) = \frac{1}{2\sigma}(\bar{b} + \bar{\lambda})^2 \eta \cdot t + \frac{1}{\eta} V_h(\mu, \mu_1)$ is the regret bound of the online mirror descent algorithm after t iterations, and the second inequality follows because $\zeta_A \leq T$ and the error term $E(t, \mu)$ is increasing in t .

Step 3: Upper bound on the optimal reward. For every $\zeta_A \in [0, t^*]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \tilde{D}^T} \left[c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \cdot \text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) \right] \\
&= \frac{\zeta_A}{t^*} \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \cdot \text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) \right] + \frac{t^* - \zeta_A}{t^*} \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \cdot \text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\zeta_A}{t^*} \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[\min_{0 \leq j \leq m} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{T,j}} \right\} \cdot \frac{t^*}{T} \cdot \text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) \right] + \frac{t^* - \zeta_A}{t^*} \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[\frac{t^*}{T} \cdot \text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) \right] \quad (\text{Defn. of } c(\vec{\lambda}, T)) \\
&\leq \zeta_A \cdot \min_{0 \leq j \leq m} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{T,j}} \right\} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \tilde{D}^T} [\text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma})]}{T} + (t^* - \zeta_A) \bar{f} \quad (\text{OPT}(T) \leq T \cdot \bar{f}) \\
&\leq \zeta_A \cdot \min_{0 \leq j \leq m} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{T,j}} \right\} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \tilde{D}^T} [D(\bar{\mu}_{\zeta_A} | T, \vec{\gamma})]}{T} + (t^* - \zeta_A) \bar{f} \quad (\text{weak duality}) \\
&\leq \zeta_A \cdot \min_{0 \leq j \leq m} \{ \lambda_{t^*,j} / \rho_{T,j} \} \cdot \tilde{D}(\bar{\mu}_{\zeta_A} | \rho_T, \mathcal{P}) + (t^* - \zeta_A) \bar{f} \quad (\text{Part (a) of Lemma 1}) \\
&\leq \zeta_A \cdot \tilde{D} \left(\bar{\mu}_{\zeta_A} \middle| \min_{0 \leq j \leq m} \{ \lambda_{t^*,j} / \rho_{T,j} \} \rho_T, \mathcal{P} \right) + (t^* - \zeta_A) \bar{f} \quad (\text{Part (b) of Lemma 1}) \\
&\leq \zeta_A \cdot \tilde{D}(\bar{\mu}_{\zeta_A} | \lambda(t^*), \mathcal{P}) + (t^* - \zeta_A) \bar{f}, \quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from part (c) of Lemma 1 because $\min_{0 \leq j \leq m} \{ \lambda_{t^*,j} / \rho_{T,j} \} \rho_T \leq \lambda(t^*)$.

Step 4: Putting it all together. Combining the results from steps 1-3 yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \cdot \text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) - R(A|T, \vec{\gamma}) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \cdot \text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) - \sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} f_t(x_t) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \cdot \text{OPT}(T, \vec{\gamma}) - \zeta_A \tilde{D}(\bar{\mu}_{\zeta_A} | \lambda_{t^*}, \mathcal{P}) + \sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \mu_t^\top (\lambda_t - b_t(x_t)) \right] \quad (\text{Equation 14}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[(t^* - \zeta_A) \bar{f} + \sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} w_t(\mu_t) \right] \quad (\text{Equation 16}) \\
&\leq \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\vec{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{P}^T} \left[(t^* - \zeta_A) \bar{f} + \sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} w_t(\mu) + E(T, \mu) \right]}_{\clubsuit} \quad (\text{Equation 15})
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$. All that remains to complete the proof is choosing the right μ . If $\zeta_A = t^*$ (no resource was completely depleted), set $\mu = 0$. If $\zeta_A < t^*$, then there exists a resource $j \in [m]$ that nearly got depleted, i.e., $\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} b_{t,j}(x_t) + \bar{b} \geq B_j$. Moreover, recall that the definition of a target consumption sequence implies $\sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \lambda_{t,j} \leq B_j$. Thus, $\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} b_{t,j}(x_t) \geq -\bar{b} + \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \lambda_{t,j}$. Therefore, setting $\mu = (\bar{f}/\lambda) e_j$, where $e_j \in \mathbb{R}_m$ is the j -th unit vector, yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} w_t(\mu) &= \sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \frac{\bar{f}}{\lambda} e_j^\top (\lambda_t - b_t(x_t)) \\
&= \frac{\bar{f}}{\lambda} \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \lambda_{t,j} - \sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} b_{t,j}(x_t) \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{f}}{\lambda} \cdot \left(\bar{b} - \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \lambda_{t,j} - \sum_{t=1}^{\zeta_A} \lambda_{t,j} \right\} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{f}}{\lambda} \cdot (\bar{b} - (t^* - \zeta_A) \lambda)
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the observation that $\lambda_{t^*} > 0$ due to the definition of t^* and the assumption that $\bar{\lambda}$ is decreasing, which together imply $\lambda_t \geq \bar{\lambda}$ for all $t \leq t^*$. Finally, if we put everything together, we get

$$\clubsuit \leq \frac{\bar{f}\bar{b}}{\bar{\lambda}} + E(T, \mu) \leq \frac{\bar{f}\bar{b}}{\bar{\lambda}} + \frac{1}{2\sigma}(\bar{b} + \bar{\lambda})^2\eta \cdot T + \frac{1}{\eta}V_h(\mu, \mu_1),$$

where we have used the definition of $E(T, \mu)$. The theorem follows from observing that all of our choices of μ in the above discussion lie in the set $\{0, (\bar{f}/\bar{\lambda})e_1, \dots, (\bar{f}/\bar{\lambda})e_m\}$. \square

D Proofs for Section 5

Proof of Proposition 2. Consider the fixed target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$ defined as

$$\lambda_t := \begin{cases} \frac{B}{\lceil \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \tau \rceil} & \text{if } t \leq \lceil \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \tau \rceil \\ 0 & \text{if } \lceil \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \tau \rceil + 1 \leq t \leq \alpha\tau \end{cases}$$

Then, for $T \in [\tau, \lceil \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \tau \rceil]$

$$\begin{aligned} c(\vec{\lambda}, T) &= \max_{t \leq T} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j} \cdot t}{B_j} \right\}, \frac{t}{T} \right\} \right) \\ &= \min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{T,j} \cdot T}{B_j} \right\}, \frac{T}{T} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{\tau}{\lceil \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \tau \rceil} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha} + 1/\tau} \end{aligned}$$

This establishes the first part of the theorem. For the second part, consider a fixed target consumption sequence $\vec{\lambda}$ for some $T^* \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]$. If $T^* \leq \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \tau$, then

$$\begin{aligned} c(\vec{\lambda}, \alpha\tau) &= \max_{t \leq \alpha\tau} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{\alpha\tau,j}} \right\}, 1 \right\} \right) \cdot \frac{t}{\alpha\tau} \\ &= \min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\rho_{T^*,j}}{\rho_{\alpha\tau,j}} \right\}, 1 \right\} \cdot \frac{T^*}{\alpha\tau} \\ &= \frac{T^*}{\alpha\tau} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider $T^* \geq \sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \tau$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} c(\vec{\lambda}, \tau) &= \max_{t \leq \tau} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{\tau,j}} \right\}, 1 \right\} \right) \cdot \frac{t}{\tau} \\ &= \max_{t \leq \tau} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\rho_{T^*,j}}{\rho_{\tau,j}} \right\}, 1 \right\} \right) \cdot \frac{t}{\tau} \\ &= \min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\rho_{T^*,j}}{\rho_{\tau,j}} \right\}, 1 \right\} \cdot \frac{\tau}{\tau} \\ &= \frac{\tau}{T^*} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have shown that for all $c(\vec{\lambda}) \leq 1/\sqrt{\alpha}$. As $\vec{\lambda}$ was an arbitrary fixed target consumption sequence, this completes the proof. \square

The following upper bound on the competitive ratio $c(\vec{\lambda}, T)$ will prove useful in the proofs that follow. It is tight whenever the maximum is achieved at a $t \geq \tau$.

$$c(\vec{\lambda}, T) = \max_{t \leq T} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j} \cdot t}{B_j} \right\}, \frac{t}{T} \right\} \right) \leq \max_{t \leq T} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{t,j}} \right\}, \frac{t}{T} \right\} \right) \quad (17)$$

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $\vec{\lambda}$ be such that $c(\vec{\lambda}) = \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \geq \kappa$. Set $t_1 = \tau$ and define $S := \{t \in [\tau + 1, \alpha\tau] \mid \lambda_t \geq \kappa \cdot \rho_t\}$. Let $t_2 < \dots < t_n$ denote the elements of S sorted in increasing order. First, consider $T = t_{i+1} - 1$ for some $i \in [n - 1]$. For contradiction, suppose $t_i < \kappa \cdot T$. Then, we have

- $t/T < \kappa$ for all $t \leq t_i$.
- $\lambda_t < \kappa \cdot \rho_t$ for all $t_i + 1 \leq t \leq T$.

Therefore, (17) implies

$$c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \leq \max_{t \leq T} \left(\min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\rho_{t,j}} \right\}, \frac{t}{T} \right\} \right) < \kappa,$$

which contradicts the definition of $\vec{\lambda}$, and as a consequence, we get $t_i/(t_{i+1} - 1) \geq \kappa$ for all $i \in [n - 1]$. Next, consider $T = \alpha\tau$. Repeating the above argument with $i = n$ yields $t_n/(\alpha\tau) \geq \kappa$, thereby establishing (1).

Define $\vec{\lambda}^*$ using statements (a) and (b) from Lemma 2 using the switching times derived from $\vec{\lambda}$. It is straightforward to see that $\vec{\lambda}^*$ is decreasing in t . Next, we show $\sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t^* \leq B$. Observe that

$$c(\vec{\lambda}, \tau) \geq \kappa \implies \exists t' \leq \tau \text{ s.t. } \lambda_{t'} \cdot t' \geq \kappa \cdot B \implies \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \lambda_t \geq \sum_{t=1}^{t'} \lambda_t \geq \lambda_{t'} \cdot t' \geq \kappa \cdot B$$

Moreover, note that $\lambda_t^* \leq \lambda_t$ for all $t > \tau$ because $\lambda_{t_i} \geq \lambda_{t_i}^*$ for all $i \geq 2$ and λ is a decreasing sequence. Hence,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t^* = \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \lambda_t^* + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t^* \leq \kappa \cdot B + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t = \sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t \leq B$$

To finish the proof, we need to prove $\min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}^*, T) \geq \kappa$. We do so by showing that statements (1), (a) and (b) of the lemma together imply $\min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}^*, T) \geq \kappa$. First, as $\lambda_{t_i}^* = \kappa \cdot \rho_{t_i}$, we get $c(\vec{\lambda}^*, t_i) \geq \kappa$ for all $i \in [n]$. Moreover, if $t_{i-1} < T < t_i$ for some $i \leq n$, then statement (1) and $\lambda_{t_{i-1}}^* = \kappa \cdot \rho_{t_{i-1}}$ yield

$$c(\vec{\lambda}^*, T) \geq \min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t_{i-1},j}^* \cdot t_{i-1}}{B_j} \right\}, \frac{t_{i-1}}{T} \right\} \geq \min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t_{i-1},j}^*}{\rho_{t_{i-1},j}^*} \right\}, \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_{i-1}} \right\} \geq \kappa$$

Finally, a similar argument for $t_n < T \leq \alpha\tau$ gives us

$$c(\vec{\lambda}^*, T) \geq \min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t_n,j}^* \cdot t_n}{B_j} \right\}, \frac{t_n}{T} \right\} \geq \min \left\{ \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{t_n,j}^*}{\rho_{t_n,j}^*} \right\}, \frac{t_n}{\alpha\tau} \right\} \geq \kappa,$$

thereby establishing statement (2). □

Proof of Lemma 3. Lemma 2 and (7) immediately imply

$$\max_{\vec{\lambda} \in \Lambda} \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \leq \max \left\{ \kappa \in [0, 1] \mid \min_{\vec{i} \in \mathcal{F}(\kappa)} \kappa + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i} \right) \cdot \kappa \leq 1 \right\}$$

For the other direction, consider a $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ and switch times $\tau = t_1 < \dots < t_n = \alpha\tau$ in $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ such that

$$\kappa + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i} \right) \cdot \kappa \leq 1$$

Define $\vec{\lambda}^*$ using statements (a) and (b) from the lemma. Then, (7) implies $\sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t^* \leq B$. Moreover, recall from the proof of Lemma 2 that $t \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa)$ combined with statements (a) and (b) implies $\min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}^*, T) \geq \kappa$. Thus, we have

$$\max_{\vec{\lambda} \in \Lambda} \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}, T) \geq \max \left\{ \kappa \in [0, 1] \mid \min_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa)} \kappa + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i}\right) \cdot \kappa \leq 1 \right\},$$

thereby completing the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 4. Consider a $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ and $\tau \leq T < \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$. Let $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa, T)$ be switch times that satisfy

$$\ell(T) = \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i}\right)$$

Set $T^* = t_2$ and let $\vec{t}^* \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa, T^*)$ denote the switch times given by $T^* = t_1^* < \dots < t_{n-1}^* = \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$ where $t_i^* = t_{i+1}$ for all $i \leq n$. Then, the definition of $\ell(T^*)$ implies

$$\ell(T) = \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{T}{T^*}\right) + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}^*}{t_i^*}\right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{T}{T^*}\right) + \ell(T^*)$$

Moreover, note that $T/(t_2 - 1) = T/(T^* - 1) \geq \kappa$ implies $T^* \leq \lfloor (T/\kappa) + 1 \rfloor$. Therefore, we get

$$\ell(T) \geq \min_{T^*} \left(1 - \frac{T}{T^*}\right) + \ell(T^*) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad T < T^* \leq \min\{\lfloor (T/\kappa) + 1 \rfloor, \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil\}$$

For the other direction, consider $T < T^* \leq \min\{\lfloor (T/\kappa) + 1 \rfloor, \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil\}$. Let $\vec{t}^* \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa, T^*)$ be switch times $T^* = t_1^* < \dots < t_n^* = \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil$ that satisfy

$$\ell(T^*) = \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}^*}{t_i^*}\right)$$

As $T^* \leq \lfloor (T/\kappa) + 1 \rfloor \implies T/(T^* - 1) \geq \kappa$, we can define switch times $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa, T)$ as $t_1 = T$ and $t_{i+1} = t_i^*$ for all $i \in [n]$. Therefore, by the definition of $\ell(T)$, we get

$$\ell(T) \leq \left(1 - \frac{T}{T^*}\right) + \ell(T^*)$$

Since $T < T^* \leq \min\{\lfloor (T/\kappa) + 1 \rfloor, \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil\}$ was arbitrary, we have shown that

$$\ell(T) \leq \min_{T^*} \left(1 - \frac{T}{T^*}\right) + \ell(T^*) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad T < T^* \leq \min\{\lfloor (T/\kappa) + 1 \rfloor, \lceil \kappa \cdot \alpha\tau \rceil\},$$

as required. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Recall that $\mathcal{S}(\kappa)$ is the set of all switch times $\tau = t_1 < \dots < t_n = \alpha\tau$ that start at τ , end before $\alpha\tau$, and satisfy $t_i/(t_{i+1} - 1) \geq \kappa$ for all $i \in [n-1]$ and $t_n/(\alpha\tau) \geq \kappa$. Therefore, for $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$, we have $\mathcal{S}(\kappa_2) \subset \mathcal{S}(\kappa_1)$. Hence, invoking Lemma 3, we get that

$$I := \left\{ \kappa \in [0, 1] \mid \min_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa)} \kappa + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i}\right) \cdot \kappa \leq 1 \right\}$$

is a closed interval with its largest point equal to $\max_{\vec{\lambda} \in \Lambda} \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}, T)$. Moreover, Proposition 1 implies that this largest point of I is greater than $1/\alpha$, since $\alpha \leq 1 + \ln(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \geq 1$. Thus, if we have a membership test for this interval, then we can run binary search to find its largest point. This is exactly what Algorithm 2 does. To see this, note that Lemma 4 implies that Algorithm 2 correctly computes

$$\ell(\tau) = \min_{\vec{t} \in \mathcal{S}(\kappa)} \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i}\right)$$

Thus, $\kappa + \kappa \cdot \ell(\tau) \leq B$ if and only if $\kappa \in I$. As a consequence, we get that $\ell \leq \max_{\vec{\lambda} \in \Lambda} \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}, T) < u$ throughout the run of Algorithm 2, and at the termination of the first while loop, we get $\ell \geq \max_{\vec{\lambda} \in \Lambda} \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}, T) - \epsilon$ because $u - \ell < \epsilon$. After the termination of the first while loop, Algorithm 2 simply finds switch times $\vec{t} \in \mathcal{F}(\ell)$ that satisfy

$$\ell + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i}\right) \cdot \ell \leq 1$$

Finally, recall from the proof of Lemma 2 that $t \in \mathcal{T}(\kappa)$, (a) and (b) together imply $\min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}^*, T) \geq \kappa$. Thus, if we define $\vec{\lambda}^*$ using (a) and (b) from Lemma 2 with $\kappa = \ell$, like we do in Algorithm 2, we get

$$\min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}^*, T) \geq \ell \geq \max_{\vec{\lambda} \in \Lambda} \min_{T \in [\tau, \alpha\tau]} c(\vec{\lambda}, T) - \epsilon.$$

Finally note that (7) implies

$$\ell + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{t_{i-1}}{t_i}\right) \cdot \ell \leq 1 \iff \sum_{t=1}^{\alpha\tau} \lambda_t^* \leq B$$

thereby showing that $\vec{\lambda}^* \in \Lambda$, which completes the proof. □