

Near-Optimal Bayesian Online Assortment of Reusable Resources

Yiding Feng

Industrial Engineering and Decision Analytics, Hong Kong University of Science & Technology (HKUST), ydfeng@ust.hk

Rad Niazadeh

University of Chicago Booth School of Business, Chicago, IL, rad.niazadeh@chicagobooth.edu

Amin Saberi

Management Science and Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, saberi@stanford.edu

Motivated by the applications of rental services in e-commerce, we consider revenue maximization in online assortment of reusable resources for a stream of arriving consumers with different types. We design competitive online algorithms with respect to the optimum online policy in the Bayesian setting, in which types are drawn independently from known heterogeneous distributions over time. In the regime where the minimum of initial inventories c_{\min} is large, our main result is a near-optimal $1 - \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, \sqrt{\log(c_{\min})/c_{\min}}\right)$ competitive algorithm for the general case of reusable resources. Our algorithm relies on an expected LP benchmark for the problem, solves this LP, and simulates the solution through an independent randomized rounding. The main challenge is obtaining point-wise inventory feasibility in a computationally efficient fashion from these simulation-based algorithms. To this end, we use several technical ingredients to design *discarding policies* – one for each resource. These policies handle the trade-off between the inventory feasibility under reusability and the revenue loss of each of the resources. However, discarding a unit of a resource changes the future consumption of other resources. To handle this new challenge, we also introduce *post-processing* assortment procedures that help with designing and analyzing our discarding policies as they run in parallel, which might be of independent interest. As a side result, by leveraging techniques from the literature on prophet inequality, we further show an improved near-optimal $1 - 1/\sqrt{c_{\min} + 3}$ competitive algorithm for the special case of non-reusable resources. We finally evaluate the performance of our algorithms using the numerical simulations on the synthetic data.

1. Introduction

Assortment planning refers to the decision of a revenue-maximizing firm as to which subset of products to display to its consumers. In classic retail applications, the focus is mostly on sale; however, with the advent of online e-commerce platforms, several applications have emerged where the focus is on renting out *reusable resources*. A reusable resource – also referred to as a rental product – leaves the stock for some time duration after being assigned to a consumer, and can be reassigned to a new consumer once it is back. Examples are virtual machines in cloud computing platforms such as AWS, houses in vacation rental online marketplaces such as Airbnb, and local

professional services in online labor platforms such as Thumbtack. In order to extract more revenue, a (personalized) assortment policy can decide to display a different subset of these resources once a new consumer interacts with the platform; the task of such a policy is to manage the sequence of assortments in long-run given the inventory restrictions.

Motivated by the above applications, we study the online assortment of reusable resources, in which a platform sequentially makes irrevocable assortment decisions for a stream of arriving consumers. Each consumer has a *type* that determines her choice probabilities given each possible assortment – referred to as the consumer’s choice model. The platform collects a one-time personalized payment each time a consumer rents a product. Different products have different rental fees that are determined by the consumer’s type. To model the uncertainty about the duration of a rental, we consider a stochastic model where the rental durations are drawn independently each time a product is rented. The type of the arriving consumer also determines her rental duration distributions for different products. To model the platform’s prior information about its future consumers – which is usually formed based on the past consumers’ data in an online platform – we take a Bayesian approach. We assume the types are drawn independently over time from *known heterogeneous distributions*.

Once a new consumer arrives, the platform observes her realized type from the known type distribution, displays a new subset of products, and allows the consumer to select a product stochastically from this subset based on her choice model. The goal is to design an online assortment algorithm in order to maximize the expected total collected rental fees (also known as the revenue) during the decision making horizon. Importantly, we consider the setting where each product has an initial inventory and the algorithm should always assort an available subset of products. Availabilities are determined by the current inventory levels of the products – quantities that decrease as a unit of the product is rented and increase as it is returned to the stock.

Given the sequence of distributions for the entire decision making horizon, a *revenue benchmark* in our problem is an upper-bound on the expected revenue of any feasible online algorithm as the platform, where the expectation is over the randomness in the algorithm, the type sequence, and the consumers’ choices. We measure the performance of our online algorithms using the notion of *competitive ratio*, i.e., the worst-case ratio between the expected revenue of the online algorithm and the targeted revenue benchmark.

As is common in the literature and practice of assortment optimization, we assume general consumer choice models that are weak substitute, i.e., assorting a new product only weakly decreases the choice probability of another assorted product (see Assumption 1). With no further assumptions, even the one-shot assortment optimization can be computationally hard. To resolve this issue, we assume having oracle access to a blackbox algorithm that can solve the one-shot assortment optimization (see Assumption 3). Again, this is a common assumption in the literature to get around

the computational issue associated with the one-shot problem when general consumer choice models are considered (Golrezaei et al. 2014, Rusmevichientong et al. 2020). In the oracle-access computational model, we aim to design polynomial-time competitive online algorithms with respect to an appropriate revenue benchmark for our problem.

In this setting, the question of finding the optimum online policy that maximizes the expected total revenue is purely computational, and an exponential-size dynamic programming (DP) can formulate the optimum online. While no formal computational hardness is known for computing the optimum online in our problem, it is conjectured to be computationally hard, even in the oracle-access model.¹ Therefore, it is natural to consider the expected revenue of the optimum online policy as a revenue benchmark, and study whether it is amenable to polynomial-time competitive online algorithms. More specifically, we ask the following question in this paper:

How close a polynomial time online algorithm can be to the optimum online policy in terms of expected revenue? In particular, can we obtain constant or near-optimal competitive online algorithms with respect to the optimum online policy (when initial inventories are large)?

A significant progress towards providing a compelling answer to the above question is the result of Rusmevichientong et al. (2020), which establishes an approximate dynamic programming approach for the exponential-size optimum online DP. They show that a greedy algorithm that uses a linear approximation of the optimal revenue-to-go function obtains at least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the expected revenue of the optimum online. They further study the setting when rental durations are infinite (i.e., the resources are not reusable) and rental fees are type-independent. In this setting, they show how to perform a rollout on a simple static policy to obtain $1 - \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{c_{\min}}}\right)$ fraction of the expected revenue of the optimum online policy, where c_{\min} is the minimum initial inventory across different products.² This last result is essentially a near-optimal competitive algorithm when the initial inventories are large and the resources are non-reusable. Note that the large initial inventory regime is relevant in many applications of assortment optimization and it is the main focus of our paper as well.

1.1. Our Contributions

The main contribution of our paper is the following result.

(Main Result) *For the general case of Bayesian online assortment of reusable resources, we propose a polynomial-time online algorithm that obtains a near-optimal competitive ratio of $1 - \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, \varepsilon^*(c_{\min})\right)$, where $\varepsilon^*(x) = O\left(\sqrt{\log(x)/x}\right)$.*

¹ For example, see Papadimitriou and Tsitsiklis (1987) for PSPACE-hardness of finding the optimum policy in partially observable Markov decision processes, and related discussions in Rusmevichientong et al. (2020), Anari et al. (2019).

² If rental fees are type-dependent, Rusmevichientong et al. (2020) show the same policy obtains $1 - \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{R}{\sqrt[3]{c_{\min}}}\right)$ competitive ratio guarantee, where R is the ratio between maximum and minimum rentals fees across different types.

The above competitive ratio guarantee holds even when the rental fees, consumer choices, and rental duration distributions are type-dependent and vary arbitrarily across different types.

To obtain the above result, our work diverges from [Rusmevichientong et al. \(2020\)](#) by considering a different revenue benchmark. In particular, we consider a linear programming relaxation of the optimum online policy, referred to as the *Bayesian expected LP*. To define this benchmark, suppose a feasible online policy knows the exact realizations of future types, but does not know the realizations of consumer choices and rental durations. The optimum such policy, known as the *clairvoyant optimum online*, clearly provides a revenue benchmark. Now consider a relaxation of this policy by only requiring the inventory feasibility constraints of reusable resources to hold in expectation over the randomness in types, consumer choices, and rental durations. Given the sequence of type distributions, this relaxation is encoded by an LP with exponential number of variables and polynomial number of time-varying packing constraints to ensure the inventory feasibility of reusable resources in-expectation. See Section 2.2 for details.

It turns out that we can simply solve the Bayesian expected LP in polynomial-time by solving its dual program using the ellipsoid method – given access to the offline assortment oracle. Given the LP solution, a simple but powerful technique in the Bayesian online optimization is to use a *simulation-based* rounding algorithm to mimic the optimal solution of this LP (for examples of this approach, refer to [Alaei et al. 2012](#), [Devanur et al. 2012](#), [Ma et al. 2018](#), [Gallego et al. 2016](#), [Wang et al. 2018](#), [Dickerson et al. 2018](#), [Baek and Ma 2019](#)). After observing the type of the arriving consumer, this algorithm independently samples an assortment from a distribution over subsets of products that comes from the LP solution, ignoring the inventory constraints. This algorithm has no loss in terms of the expected revenue compared to the LP solution; however, it only respects the inventory constraints of each product in expectation – and not necessarily under every sample path of the existing randomness.

Our main technical contribution is providing techniques to transform the simulation-based algorithm into a point-wise feasible online algorithm in polynomial-time, with constant or negligible multiplicative loss in the expected revenue. To this end, we run a separate procedure over time – one for each product – together with the simulation-based policy. After an assortment is sampled at each time, each procedure decides whether or not to *discard* the corresponding product if it is in the sampled subset to maintain the inventory feasibility of this product. This specific architecture of sampling according to the LP solution and then using product-specific discarding rules have been explored in the past, e.g., see [Alaei et al. \(2012\)](#), [Gallego et al. \(2016\)](#), [Wang et al. \(2018\)](#), [Dickerson et al. \(2018\)](#), [Baek and Ma \(2019\)](#).³ Similarly, we aim to design polynomial-time online discarding

³ See specifically the “Primal Routing Algorithm” in Section 7 of [Gallego et al. \(2016\)](#) and the “Separation Algorithm” in Section 4.2 of [Wang et al. \(2018\)](#).

policies (and other necessary algorithmic constructs) that handle the trade-off between maintaining the inventory feasibility and the discarding revenue loss for each product. The main new challenges specific to our problem is that (i) products are reusable, (ii) products are weak-substitute — and hence discarding a product increases the choice probability of other products, and (iii) discarding can be potentially randomized — which combined with reusability creates complicated correlation structures among selection indicator random variables across time and makes it challenging to argue about point-wise feasibility of policies. In what follows, we sketch our main technical contributions and how they overcome these challenges.

(I) *General rental duration distributions/ near-optimal discarding (Section 3.2)*: The main idea behind our near-optimal discarding procedure is discarding each available sampled product independently at random with a small probability. This is a simple yet reasonable approach (cf. [Hajiaghayi et al. 2007](#)) as the simulation-based algorithm respects the inventory constraints of each product in expectation. By independent randomized discarding with probability $\gamma > 0$, we leave some slack in the inventory feasibility constraint by ensuring that the expected value of the number of units of the product under rental is at most $(1 - \gamma)$ times its initial inventory amount at any time. If this quantity as a sum of independent rental indicator random variables concentrates around its expectation, we will then avoid violation of the inventory constraint with high probability when $\gamma = O\left(\sqrt{\log(c_{\min})/c_{\min}}\right)$. Moreover, it only loses γ fraction of the expected revenue from this product, as desired.

However, the above simple approach does not work as described, because (i) the resources are reusable and the inventories are limited, hence the rental indicator random variable of a product at some time $\tau < t$ can be correlated with the rental indicator random variable of the same product at time t if the rental duration of time τ is at least $t - \tau$ and the last unit of the product is rented at τ ; (ii) once a discarding procedure drops a product from the sampled assortment, there will be less cannibalization of other products – as the consumer choices are weak substitute. This in turn increases the probability of other products being chosen by the arriving consumer, and hence increases the expected number of units of different products under rental in future for the resulting algorithm – compared to what is expected from the simulation-based algorithm.

We fix the above issues by proposing a post-processing step after the independent randomized discarding, which we refer to as *sub-assortment sampling*. In a nutshell, the goal of the sub-assortment sampling is to find a distribution over available subsets, so that the products which are not discarded will be rented with *exactly* the same probability as in the optimal solution of the Bayesian expected LP. It is not even clear a priori whether such a distribution exists; nevertheless, we show it does and provide a polynomial-time construction to sample from this distribution. Using the properties of the sub-assortment sampling, we propose a coupling trick to show our desired concentration despite the

fact that the rental indicator random variables are correlated across time. Note that the task of sub-assortment sampling is quite general, and it might be of independent interests in other applications.⁴

(II) *General rental duration distributions/ $\frac{1}{2}$ -competitive discarding (Section 3.3)*: As an alternative discarding policy for the general case of reusable resources, consider an exponential-size DP that keeps track of the state of each unit of the product (i.e., when each unit returns to the inventory) and solves the discarding task optimally. We introduce an approximate version of this DP, which we also refer to as *optimistic DP*, that can be solved in polynomial-time. The goal is to maximize the per-unit revenue-to-go of the product when the inventory is automatically *replenished* by an exogenous process every time we make a discarding decision, so that the entire inventory of the product is always available on-hand. This new DP is inventory independent and thus is polynomial-size. We then consider a discarding algorithm that makes the same decisions as the optimistic DP. The result is a non-adaptive thresholding discarding rule, that is, an available product is only discarded if its rental fee is below a certain threshold. These thresholds are computed upfront and only depend on the product, time, and the realized type.

The main intuition behind why the above discarding algorithm is a reasonable approximation is as follows. We can show the expected revenue-to-go of this algorithm is a concave function of the inventory level – i.e., the higher the inventory level, the lower the per-unit expected revenue-to-go. As a result, when there is no replenishment in reality, it obtains at least the same expected per-unit revenue-to-go as the DP with replenishment. We then analyze the worst-case ratio between the value of this inventory independent DP and the per-unit revenue of the expected LP using a “factor revealing linear program” and its dual. This approach establishes a lower-bound of $\frac{1}{2}$ for this ratio. It is worth noting that similar proof techniques based on dual-fitting have been used in the literature for other problems with non-reusable resources (e.g., see [Zhang and Adelman 2009](#), [Adelman 2007](#), [Alaei et al. 2012](#), [Gallego et al. 2016](#), [Wang et al. 2018](#)). Our work extends the existing analysis to prove performance guarantees for LP-based discarding policies when resources are reusable.

We highlight that our DP for designing the above approximate discarding policy given the expected LP solution shares similar but not completely identical recursive structures with the approximate dynamic programming approach in [Rusmevichientong et al. \(2020\)](#) for directly approximating the optimum online policy; in fact, in contrast to their approach, the Bellman update equation of our DP uses the the solution of the expected LP (the optimal assortment sampling probabilities). Therefore, while both DPs provide the same approximation factor of $\frac{1}{2}$, ours is with respect to the *stronger* benchmark of expected LP, versus theirs that is with respect to the optimum online policy. This subtle

⁴ We would like to highlight that after appearance of an online version of our paper, through a personal communication with authors of [Goyal et al. \(2020a\)](#), we were informed that this paper (which was not available online at the time) independently and concurrently discovered a procedure similar to our sub-assortment sampling for settings with adversarial arrival and reusable resources.

difference turns out to be the key in combining the performance guarantees of our two algorithms in Section 3.2 and Section 3.3, in order to obtain a simple hybrid algorithm that achieves the theoretical “*best of both worlds*” competitive ratio guarantee with respect to the stronger expected LP benchmark (and as we observe later, improved performance in numerical simulations).

(III) *Hybrid simulation-based algorithm (Section 3.4)*: Having access to the above simulation-based algorithms with different discarding rules, we aim to define a *hybrid algorithm* that enjoys the competitive ratios of both small and large inventory regimes. To this end, we make an upfront decision on which discarding policy to use for each product. In particular, we use the value function of the optimistic DP for each product separately to calculate the ratio \mathcal{R}_i between the expected revenue-to-go of following the optimistic DP for this product and the contribution of this product to the expected-LP’s objective. We then compare this ratio with $1 - \varepsilon^*(c_i)$ (see (1) for definition of function $\varepsilon^*(\cdot)$) to partition the products into *large inventory* (i.e., when $\mathcal{R}_i + \varepsilon^*(c_i) < 1$) and *small inventory* (i.e., when $\mathcal{R}_i + \varepsilon^*(c_i) > 1$). For each large inventory product, we run the randomized discarding policy in Section 3.2, and for each small inventory product we run the optimistic DP discarding policy in Section 3.3. We also use the sub-assortment sampling procedure for post-processing to correct the resulting increase in choice probabilities of non-discarded products due to weak-substitution. By using the facts that (i) the competitive ratio analyses of both algorithms decouple across products, (ii) both analyses compare the expected revenue obtained from each product with the contribution of that product to the expected-LP’s objective, and that (iii) sub-assortment sampling corrects the choice probabilities of non-discarded products, we show the resulting hybrid policy combines the two competitive ratios.⁵ While this hybrid algorithm attains the best of both worlds competitive ratio of $1 - \min(\frac{1}{2}, \varepsilon^*(c_{\min}))$, it is also likely to outperform both policies in practical scenarios; the results of our numerical simulations in Section EC.8 empirically support this claim. We also present a second hybrid algorithm using the method of conditional expectations. See Section 3.4 for more details.

We also complement our results by considering the special case of non-reusable resources. By leveraging techniques from the literature on prophet inequality and extending them to the Bayesian assortment optimization problem, we provide a near-optimal improved competitive ratio of $\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{\min}+3}}\right)$ with respect to the expected LP in this setting. See Section EC.3 and Section EC.7 for more details.

(iii) *Numerical simulations (Section EC.8)*: We finally provide numerical justification for the revenue performance of our proposed policies. Adapting the setups of the numerical experiments in Golrezaei et al. (2014), Rusmevichientong et al. (2020) to our setting, we compare the revenue of our proposed policies — i.e., the hybrid algorithm and the simulation with optimal discarding under infinite rental durations — with other policies in the literature. In our numerical simulations,

⁵ It is worth noting that the $\frac{1}{2}$ -competitive approximate DP algorithm of Rusmevichientong et al. (2020) cannot be combined using this approach with our near-optimal discarding policy, as this approximate DP algorithm competes with the optimum online policy and not the expected-LP.

we consider various scenarios with both general rental duration distributions and infinite rental durations. In all of these scenarios, our policies noticeably outperform the other policies in terms of the expected revenue.

2. Preliminaries

We first formalize our problem, the model, and all the required assumptions in Section 2.1. We then briefly explain various aspects of our expected LP benchmark in Section 2.2.

2.1. Model and Problem Definition

The platform offers n different rental products, indexed by $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Each rental product i has an initial inventory of $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Consumers who are interested to rent these products arrive sequentially at times $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$. Consumer t has type $z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t$, where \mathcal{Z}_t denotes the (discrete) space of possible types at time t . We assume types are drawn independently from *known* probability distributions $F_t : \mathcal{Z}_t \rightarrow [0, 1]$ at times $t = 1, \dots, T$.

Upon the arrival of consumer t , her type z_t is revealed to the platform. Given this type and the history up to time t , the platform offers an assortment of available products $S_t \in \mathcal{S}$ from its inventory, where $\mathcal{S} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is the collection of all feasible assortments that can be offered ignoring the inventory availability. Given the assortment S_t , the consumer chooses a rental product $i_t \in S_t$, pays a rental fee to the platform, and keeps the product for a stochastic rental duration $d_t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

We consider the setting where the consumer choice behavior, rental fees of different products, and rental duration distributions of different products depend on the type z_t at each time t . Formally, a consumer type z is defined as a tuple $\langle \phi^z, \mathbf{r}^z, \mathbf{G}^z \rangle$, so that:

- The choice of a consumer with type z is modeled by a general choice model function $\phi^z : \mathcal{S} \times [n] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where $\phi^z(S, i)$ is the probability that consumer with type z chooses product i to rent when assortment set $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is offered.
- For a consumer with type z , $\mathbf{r}^z = (r_1^z, r_2^z, \dots, r_n^z) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where r_i^z denotes the rental fee of product i . Moreover, $\mathbf{G}^z = (G_1^z, G_2^z, \dots, G_n^z)$, where G_i^z denotes the c.d.f. of rental duration of product i for type z . We use $g_i^z : [T] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ to denote the p.d.f. of rental duration of product i for type z . Moreover, let $\bar{G}_i^z(\cdot) \triangleq 1 - G_i^z(\cdot)$.

Note that we assume rental durations are independent across time, that is, if at time t a consumer of type z chooses a product i , a fresh sample $d_t \sim G_i^z$ is realized as the rental duration of this product. We further impose the following assumptions on our choice models and feasible assortments, which are common in previous literature (cf. Golrezaei et al. 2014, Rusmevichientong et al. 2014)

ASSUMPTION 1 (Weak substitutability). For all $t \in [T]$, $z \in \mathcal{Z}_t$ and $i \in [n]$, $\phi^z(\emptyset, i) = 0$. Moreover, for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, $\phi^z(S, i) \geq \phi^z(S \cup \{j\}, i)$.

ASSUMPTION 2 (Downward-closed feasibility). *If $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $S' \subseteq S$ then $S' \in \mathcal{S}$, i.e., a feasible assortment will remain feasible after removing any subset of its offered products.*

REMARK 1. In online hospitality services such as Airbnb, users report the duration of their stay to the platform before platform shows them a listing. In such a variation, the platform makes the assortment decision by using the exact realizations of current rental times for the arriving type. Indeed, this is a special case of our model where the rental time distributions are point mass.

Given type distributions $\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T$, the goal is to design online algorithms – playing the role of the platform – that maximize the expected revenue granted from rental fees; here, the expectation is over randomness of the algorithm (if randomized) and the environment, i.e., types, consumer choices, and rental durations. A revenue benchmark for this problem is defined to be any upper-bound on the expected revenue obtained by any feasible online algorithm (which might or might not be achievable by a feasible online algorithm). Fixing a revenue benchmark, we evaluate the performance of any online algorithm by its *competitive ratio* against this benchmark. Informally speaking, competitive ratio is the worst-case ratio between the expected total revenue of the online algorithm and the benchmark, where the worst-case is over all possible type distributions.

DEFINITION 1 (COMPETITIVE RATIO). An online algorithm \mathcal{A} is α -competitive against a given revenue benchmark if

$$\inf_{T \geq 1} \inf_{\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T} \frac{\mathbf{Rev}_{\mathcal{A}}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]}{\mathbf{OPT}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]} \geq \alpha ,$$

where $\mathbf{Rev}_{\mathcal{A}}[\cdot]$ is the expected revenue of algorithm \mathcal{A} and $\mathbf{OPT}[\cdot]$ is the given revenue benchmark.

For a general consumer choice model, the exact or even approximate offline assortment optimization can be computationally hard (Kök et al. 2008). In order to avoid this obstacle when designing polynomial time online algorithms for general consumer choice models, we assume having access to an algorithm that solves the offline assortment problem. For simplicity, we assume the solver is exact throughout the paper, but all of our results still hold with a multiplicative degrade of β in the competitive ratios if the solver is a β -approximation algorithm for some $0 < \beta < 1$.

ASSUMPTION 3 (Offline oracle). *For all $t \in [T]$, $z \in \mathcal{Z}_t$, and $\hat{\mathbf{R}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we have oracle access to an algorithm that finds a subset $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that:*

$$\hat{S} \in \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{R}_i \phi^z(S, i)$$

2.2. Bayesian Expected LP Benchmark

A key ingredient in all of our algorithms is the *Bayesian expected LP benchmark* – a concept commonly used in previous literature on online allocations, mechanism design, and assortment optimization to remedy issues of the above benchmarks (e.g., see [Chawla et al. 2010](#), [Alaei 2014](#), [Ma et al. 2018](#), [Gallego et al. 2016](#), [Wang et al. 2018](#), [Anari et al. 2019](#)). This benchmark, denoted by $\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$, uses linear programming to capture the optimum algorithm that only requires to satisfy the inventory constraints in expectation, where expectation is taken over randomness in rental durations and consumer types given type distributions $\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}} \quad & \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i=1}^n F_t(z_t) r_i^{z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) y_{S,t,z_t} & \text{s.t.} \\ & \sum_{\tau=1}^t \sum_{z_\tau \in \mathcal{Z}_\tau} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} F_\tau(z_\tau) \bar{G}_i^{z_\tau}(t - \tau) \phi^{z_\tau}(S, i) y_{S,\tau,z_\tau} \leq c_i & i \in [n], t \in [T] \\ & \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} y_{S,t,z_t} \leq 1 & t \in [T], z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t \\ & & (\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]) \end{aligned}$$

Here, variables $\{y_{S,t,z_t}\}_{t \in [T], S \in \mathcal{S}, z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t}$ correspond to probabilities that assortment S is offered to consumer t given type z_t is realized, and first constraint shows inventory feasibility in expectation.

A few explanations are in order. First, the optimal objective value of this LP is an upper-bound on the expected revenue of the clairvoyant optimum online benchmark, and hence the weaker non-clairvoyant optimum online (Proposition 1; see Section EC.4 for the proof). Second, $\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ can be solved efficiently using an oracle for the offline assortment (Proposition 2; see Section EC.4 for the proof). We use this computational block as a pre-processing step in all of our algorithms.⁶

PROPOSITION 1. *For any type distributions $\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T$, the expected total revenue of the clairvoyant optimum online benchmark is upper-bounded by $\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$.*

PROPOSITION 2. *Given an algorithm for offline assortment (Assumption 3), an optimal assignment $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}$ of $\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ can be computed efficiently in time $\text{Poly}(n, T, \sum_{t \in [T]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|)$. Moreover, $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}$ has no more than $\text{Poly}(n, T, \sum_{t \in [T]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|)$ non-zero entries.*

In Section EC.2, we compare the Bayesian expected LP benchmark with other benchmarks considered in the literature.

⁶ In fact, one needs to run the ellipsoid method for the dual of this LP using the offline assortment solver as the separation oracle in order to find the optimal solution. In practice, to obtain a faster algorithm, one can use *cutting plane* methods such as [Vaidya \(1996\)](#) or even faster almost-linear-time cutting plane methods such as [Lee et al. \(2015\)](#) that use the separation oracle more efficiently.

3. Near-optimal Algorithm for General Rental Durations

In this section, we present our main result – a near-optimal online simulation-based algorithm with competitive ratio at least $\max(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - \varepsilon^*(c_{\min}))$ against Bayesian expected LP benchmark, where

$$\varepsilon^*(x) \triangleq \min_{\gamma \in [0,1]} 1 - (1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\gamma^2 x}{2 - \gamma} \right) \right) \quad (1)$$

Let $\gamma^*(c_{\min})$ be the optimal assignment of γ in Equation (1). It is not hard to verify that $\varepsilon^*(c_{\min}) = O\left(\sqrt{\log(c_{\min})/c_{\min}}\right)$ and is achieved at $\gamma^*(c_{\min}) = O\left(\sqrt{\log(c_{\min})/c_{\min}}\right)$. We first sketch our approach in Section 3.1. We then introduce a simulation-based algorithm with competitive ratio $1 - \varepsilon^*(c_{\min})$ in Section 3.2, and a different simulation-based algorithm to guarantee a competitive ratio of at least $\frac{1}{2}$ (even for small c_{\min}) in Section 3.3. We finally present two simple hybrid algorithms that can obtain the best of two competitive ratios in Section 3.4.

3.1. High-level Sketch of Our Approach

Let $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}$ be the optimal assignment of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$. As $\emptyset \in \mathcal{S}$, without loss of generality we can only consider optimal assignments where:

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} y_{S,t,z_t}^* = 1 \quad \forall t \in [T], z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t$$

All of our simulation-based online algorithms in this paper follow four steps:

- At time $t = 0$ (before starting):
 - (i) **Pre-processing:** Compute an optimal assignment $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}$ of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ by invoking the offline oracle described in Assumption 3. Also, compute any other offline parameters that are occasionally needed by the algorithm.
- At each time $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$:
 - (ii) **Simulation:** Upon realizing consumer type z_t at time t , an outer procedure suggests $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{S}$ to be assorted by sampling \hat{S} from the distribution $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$ over \mathcal{S} .
 - (iii) **Discarding:** For each product $i \in \hat{S}$, a separate inner discarding procedure decides whether to remove this product from the final assortment, given the history up to time t and realized type z_t . If no units of product i is available on-hand, it is discarded automatically to guarantee inventory feasibility. Otherwise, the inner procedure of product i decides to discard or not. Let $\bar{S} \subseteq \hat{S}$ be the set of undiscarded products.
 - (iv) **Post-processing:** Given z_t , \hat{S} and \bar{S} , pick a probability distribution $\mathcal{F}_{z_t, \hat{S}, \bar{S}}$ over all subsets of \bar{S} . Then sample an assortment $\tilde{S} \sim \mathcal{F}_{z_t, \hat{S}, \bar{S}}$ and offer it to the consumer.

In the above four-step layout, step (ii) is a loss-less randomized rounding for the optimal solution of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$; however the resulting assortment only guarantees inventory feasibility of each product in expectation. The role of step (iii) and step (iv) is to identify a (randomized) subset of this feasible in-expectation assortment, to not only guarantee inventory feasibility in each sample path, but to also guarantee that the expected loss due to discarded products is small.

3.2. Large Initial Inventory: Towards Competitive Ratio $1 - \varepsilon^*(c_{\min})$

The main idea behind the algorithm of this subsection is discarding each product independently at random with probability $\gamma = O(\sqrt{\log(c_{\min})/c_{\min}})$ in step (iii) at each time t . Intuitively speaking, this discarding tries to leave enough probability for not violating any of the inventory constraints at each time t . To see this, if discarding a product does not change the choice probability of another assorted product, the expected number of unavailable units of each product i at each time t is at most $(1 - \gamma)c_i$ – due to the feasibility in-expectation of sampled sets in step (ii). Now consider the rental indicator random variables of product i , i.e., random variables indicating whether this product is rented at each time or not. If these random variables are mutually independent across time, then we can use simple concentration bounds for the sum of independent random variables to prove our claim.

There are two major issues with the above approach:

- (I) Under weak substitutability (Assumption 1), discarding product i weakly increases the choice probability of another assorted product $j \neq i$. Therefore, the probability of an available unit of product j being rented at each time $\tau < t$ becomes larger than expected, which in turn increases the expected number of unavailable units of this product at time t if we only simulate the expected LP's optimal solution and discard each product independently with probability γ .
- (II) As resources are reusable and inventories are limited, the rental indicator random variable of product i at time $\tau < t$ is possibly positively correlated with the rental indicator random variable of the same product at time t ; in fact, first indicator forces the second indicator to be zero when the realized rental duration d_τ at time t is no smaller than $t - \tau$, last unit of the product is rented at time τ , and no units of the product return during $[\tau + 1, t]$.

We address the first issue in Section 3.2.1 by changing the algorithm, and address the second issue in Section 3.2.2 by modifying the analysis.

3.2.1. Sub-assortment Sampling To fix the first issue, we propose the *sub-assortment sampling* procedure – a post-processing procedure to be used in step (iv). This procedure ensures that products which were not discarded in step (ii) are rented by the arriving consumer with *exactly* the same probability as in the optimal solution of the expected LP benchmark. More formally, the sub-assortment sampling induces a distribution $\mathcal{F}_{z_t, \hat{S}, \bar{S}}$ over subsets of \bar{S} at each time t , so that

$$\forall i \in \bar{S}: \quad \mathbf{E}_{\tilde{S} \sim \mathcal{F}_{z_t, \hat{S}, \bar{S}}} \left[\phi^{z_t}(\tilde{S}, i) \right] = \phi^{z_t}(\hat{S}, i). \quad (2)$$

It is not clear a priori whether such a distribution $\mathcal{F}_{z_t, \hat{S}, \bar{S}}$ exists, yet alone can be sampled from in polynomial time (polynomial in number of products n); nevertheless, for any general choice model satisfying weak substitutability (Assumption 1) and downward-closed feasibility (Assumption 2), we show such a distribution $\mathcal{F}_{z_t, \hat{S}, \bar{S}}$ exists and we introduce Procedure 1 that recursively samples a set from $\mathcal{F}_{z_t, \hat{S}, \bar{S}}$ in polynomial time.⁷

Procedure 1: SUB-ASSORTMENT SAMPLING

Input: choice model ϕ , assortment $S = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, target probabilities $\{p_i\}_{i \in S}$

```

1 Let  $\sigma : [m] \rightarrow [m]$  be a permutation such that  $1 \geq \frac{p_{\sigma(1)}}{\phi(S, \sigma(1))} \geq \frac{p_{\sigma(2)}}{\phi(S, \sigma(2))} \geq \dots \geq \frac{p_{\sigma(m)}}{\phi(S, \sigma(m))} \geq 0$ 
  /* Define  $\frac{p_{\sigma(j)}}{\phi(S, \sigma(j))} = 1$  if  $\phi(S, \sigma(j)) = 0$  or  $S = \emptyset$ . */
2 if  $\frac{p_{\sigma(m)}}{\phi(S, \sigma(m))} = 1$  then
3   return  $\tilde{S} \leftarrow S$ 
4 else
5   Let  $q_0 = 1 - \frac{p_{\sigma(1)}}{\phi(S, \sigma(1))}$ ,  $q_m = \frac{p_{\sigma(m)}}{\phi(S, \sigma(m))}$ , and  $q_j = \frac{p_{\sigma(j)}}{\phi(S, \sigma(j))} - \frac{p_{\sigma(j+1)}}{\phi(S, \sigma(j+1))}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m-1$ 
  /* Note that  $\sum_{j=0}^m q_j = 1$  */
6   Sample  $j^* \sim \{q_j\}_{j=0}^m$ 
7   if  $j^* = 0$  then
8     return  $\emptyset$ 
9   if  $j^* = m$  then
10    return  $S$ 
11   Let  $S' \leftarrow \{\sigma^{-1}(j)\}_{j=1}^{j^*}$ 
12  return  $\tilde{S} \leftarrow \text{SUB-ASSORTMENT SAMPLING}(\phi, S', \{\phi(S, i)\}_{i \in S'})$ 

```

PROPOSITION 3. For any weak substitutable and downward-closed feasible choice model ϕ , any assortment $S \in \mathcal{S}$, and any target probabilities $\{p_i\}_{i \in S}$ such that $p_i \leq \phi(S, i)$ for all $i \in S$, Procedure 1 outputs a randomized assortment \tilde{S} that satisfies (i) $\tilde{S} \subseteq S$; (ii) $\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{S}}[\phi(\tilde{S}, i)] = p_i$ for all $i \in S$. Moreover, it runs in time $\text{Poly}(n)$.

REMARK 2. To guarantee Equation (2) given any (z_t, \hat{S}, \bar{S}) at step (iv), we invoke Proposition 3 by setting $\phi \leftarrow \phi^{z_t}$, $S \leftarrow \bar{S}$, and $p_i \leftarrow \phi^{z_t}(\hat{S}, i)$ for all $i \in \bar{S}$. Note that $p_i = \phi^{z_t}(\hat{S}, i) \leq \phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i)$ for all $i \in \bar{S}$, simply because of weak substitutability and the fact that $\bar{S} \subseteq \hat{S}$.

Proof of Proposition 3. Without loss of generality, we assume σ is the identity permutation, i.e., $\sigma(i) = i$ for $i \in [m]$. To show the polynomial running time, observe that (a) the running time in each

⁷ It is noteworthy that Goyal et al. (2020a) independently and concurrently discovered an idea similar to our sub-assortment sampling for settings with adversarial arrival and reusable resources.

recursion is $\text{Poly}(n)$; and (b) the number of iterations of this recursive algorithm is at most n , since $|S| \leq n$ at the beginning and the size of the S' that is the input of the next recursive call shrinks by 1 at each iteration, i.e., $|S'| \leq |S| - 1$.

Property (i) holds by construction. We show property (ii) by induction on $m = |S|$, i.e., size of assortment S . In this induction, we use another simple property (iii) that $\phi(S, i) \left(\sum_{j=i}^m q_j \right) = p_i$ for all $i \in S$, which immediately hold by construction.

Base Case ($m = 1$). In this case Procedure 1 randomly outputs \emptyset or S . By property (iii), the induction statement holds.

Inductive step ($m > 1$). Fix an arbitrary product $i \in S$. Notice that by construction $\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{S}}[\phi(\tilde{S}, i) \mid j^* < i] = 0$, and $\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{S}}[\phi(\tilde{S}, i) \mid j^* = m] = \phi(S, i)$. For any realized value $j^* = i, \dots, m-1$, and its corresponding $S' = \{1, \dots, j^*\}$, we can use the induction hypothesis for the assortment S' with probabilities $p'_i = \phi(S, i)$ for each $i \in S'$. This is true simply because $|S'| \leq m-1$ and that $\phi(S, i) \leq \phi(S', i)$ for each $i \in S'$ as the choice model ϕ is weak substitute. By invoking the induction hypothesis when we use S' in the next recursive call, we have $\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{S}}[\phi(\tilde{S}, i) \mid j^* = j] = \phi(S, i)$ for all $j = i, \dots, m-1$. Thus, invoking property (iii),

$$\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{S}}[\phi(\tilde{S}, i)] = \sum_{j=0}^m q_j \mathbf{E}_{\tilde{S}}[\phi(\tilde{S}, i) \mid j^* = j] = \left(\sum_{j=i}^m q_j \right) \phi(S, i) = p_i$$

which completes the inductive step and finishes the proof. \square

3.2.2. The Algorithm and Analysis Now we present our first simulation-based algorithm (Algorithm 2) with its competitive ratio guarantee (Theorem 1). We defer the formal proof of Theorem 1 to Section EC.5.

THEOREM 1. *By setting $\gamma = \gamma^*(c_{\min})$, the competitive ratio of Algorithm 2 against the Bayesian expected LP benchmark $\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ is at least $1 - \varepsilon^*(c_{\min}) = 1 - O\left(\sqrt{\log(c_{\min})/c_{\min}}\right)$. Moreover, it runs in time $\text{Poly}(n, T, \sum_{t \in [T]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|)$ given oracle access to an offline algorithm for assortment optimization (Assumption 3).*

Before presenting the proof sketch of Theorem 1, we first discuss how to use a simple concentration argument to obtain a competitive ratio upper bound of $1 - O\left(\sqrt{\log(c_{\min} n T)/c_{\min}}\right)$ for a slightly modified version of Algorithm 2. The simple concentration argument works as follows: consider a modified version of Algorithm 2 where the random discarding step is fully correlated. Namely, instead of flipping an independent coin for each product $i \in \bar{S}_t$, we flip a single coin, and set \bar{S}_t as all available products in \hat{S}_t with probability γ , and empty set otherwise. Consider this modified Algorithm 2 until the first time that one of the sampled products is not available. Note that before such a bad event happens, all allocations are independent over consumers, and the sub-assortment sampling step is trivial (i.e., return $\tilde{S}_t = \bar{S}_t$ deterministically). We can bound the probability of this bad event at

Algorithm 2: Simulation-based Algorithm with Random Discarding**Input:** discarding probability $\gamma \in [0, 1]$

```

1 Pre-processing: Compute the optimal assignment  $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}$  of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$  by invoking
   the offline assortment oracle (Assumption 3)

2 for  $t = 1$  to  $T$  do
   /* consumer  $t$  with type  $z_t \sim F_t$  arrives */
3   Simulation: Upon realizing consumer type  $z_t$ , sample  $\hat{S}_t \sim \{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$ 
4   Discarding: Initialize  $\bar{S}_t \leftarrow \hat{S}_t$ 
5   for each product  $i \in \hat{S}_t$  do
6     Flip an independent coin and remove  $i$  from  $\bar{S}_t$  with probability  $\gamma$ 
7     if there is no available unit of product  $i$  then
8       Remove  $i$  from  $\bar{S}_t$ 
9   Post-processing: Let  $\tilde{S}_t \leftarrow \text{SUB-ASSORTMENT SAMPLING}(\phi^{z_t}, \bar{S}_t, \{\phi(\hat{S}_t, i)\}_{i \in \bar{S}_t})$ 
   /* Send a query call to Procedure 1 with appropriate input arguments */
10  Offer assortment  $\tilde{S}_t$  to consumer  $t$ 

```

each time and for each product by an exponentially small probability in c_{\min} due to the Chernoff bound. Applying union bound for every time $t \in [T]$ and every $i \in [n]$, and using the fact that when such a bad event happens we have no control over the revenue, the resulting competitive ratio can be upper-bounded by $1 - O\left(\sqrt{\log(c_{\min}nT)/c_{\min}}\right)$. Note that this competitive ratio has an extra $\sqrt{\log(nT)}$ dependence, and thus is strictly worse than the competitive ratio $1 - \varepsilon^*(c_{\min})$ stated in Theorem 1, which is independent of the number of products n and the number of consumers T .

To prove Theorem 1 with the competitive ratio $1 - \varepsilon^*(c_{\min})$ that is independent of the number of products n and the number of consumers T , we use a careful coupling argument in our analysis of Algorithm 2 that couples the rental indicator random variables of our algorithm with an alternative hypothetical algorithm. This hypothetical algorithm *ignores* inventory constraints of all the products and only simulates the expected LP's optimal solution combined with independent discarding of each product with probability γ . This algorithm generates an independent sequence of rental indicator random variables, allowing us to use simple concentration bounds. Importantly, this coupling trick is only possible because of the guarantee of the sub-assortment sampling procedure in Equation (2) (see the formal proof in Section EC.5).

REMARK 3. Our analysis in this section mainly focuses on the asymptotic regime where c_{\min} is large; however, we can still plot the competitive ratio $1 - \varepsilon^*(c_{\min})$ of Algorithm 2 for small values of c_{\min} by numerically evaluating $\varepsilon^*(c_{\min})$ using Equation (1). See the black solid curve in Figure 1.




Figure 1 Competitive ratio of simulation-based algorithms: Black solid curve corresponds to Algorithm 2; blue dashed curve corresponds to the hybrid between Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 (see Section 3.4).

3.3. Small Initial Inventory: Towards Competitive Ratio $\frac{1}{2}$

In this subsection, we propose our second simulation-based algorithm. The main difference between this algorithm and Algorithm 2 is in the discarding step: if no units of product i is available on-hand, it is discarded automatically to guarantee inventory feasibility; otherwise, it is only selected in the final assortment if $r_i^{z_t} \geq P_{i,t}^{z_t}$, where $P_{i,t}^{z_t}$ are *non-adaptive* thresholds computed by the algorithm up-front (will be discussed later). The aim of this discarding procedure is to guarantee that only available products with high enough rental fees are assorted.

Technically speaking, for each product i one can consider a separate DP to optimally make discarding decisions. This DP will maximize per-unit revenue-to-go of assorted units of product i over the finite time horizon $[1 : T]$, given the randomized suggestion of step (ii) (recall Section 3.1). The drawback is the need for a high-dimensional state variable that keeps track of the on-hand product inventories, as well the inventory of units of the product that are in use (and will return to inventory at different times). A major ingredient of our algorithm is to replace this high-dimensional DP with a simple one that is *inventory independent*, and uses an optimistic upper-bound of c_i on the actual inventory in the Bellman equation for updating optimal per-unit revenue-to-go of product i .

3.3.1. Dynamic Programming for Per-unit Revenue-to-go with Replenishment. In the rest of this subsection, let $X_{S,t,z_t} \triangleq y_{S,t,z_t}^* F_t(z_t)$ for every S, t and z_t . Suppose at each time t , a new independent consumer type $z_t \sim F_t$ is realized. Let $\hat{S} \sim X_{S,t,z_t}$ denote the randomized subset sampled in step (ii)(simulation step). Fix a product $i \in [n]$, with initial inventory of c_i units. Now, consider a hypothetical scenario where an exogenous process *replenishes the inventory* at each time to guarantee we always have c_i units of the product on-hand, no matter how many units are currently under rental. In this new problem, the goal is to design an online policy to discard or accept units of

the reusable product once suggested in step (ii), in order to maximize the per-unit revenue-to-go of renting this product. We can formulate this problem using a simple dynamic programming, where $\mathcal{V}_{i,t}$ is the optimal per-unit revenue-to-go of product i during time interval $[t : T]$. Compared to the original high-dimensional DP for solving the optimum discarding, this DP is *optimistic* in that it “imagines” the deficiency in inventory is replenished every period.

As a convention, let $\mathcal{V}_{i,T+1} = 0$. To write the Bellman update equation of the optimistic DP at time t using backward induction, suppose type z_t is realized and $\hat{S} = S$ (which happens w.p. X_{S,t,z_t}). If optimal policy decides to discard product i , then per-unit revenue-to-go will be $\mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}$. If optimal policy decides to not discard i , then with probability $(1 - \phi^{z_t}(S, i))$ the per-unit revenue-to-go will still be $\mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}$.⁸ However, with probability $\phi^{z_t}(S, i)$ consumer rents one of the c_i units (remember that inventory will always be full), and therefore generates a total revenue-to-go of $(c_i - 1)\mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}$ (i.e., due to contribution of units not rented at time t ; these units will transfer to the inventory at time $t + 1$) plus $r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d}$ upon realization of rental time $d \sim G_i^{z_t}$ (i.e., due to contribution of the rented unit). To summarize, we will have the following Bellman update equation:

$$\mathcal{V}_{i,t} = \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \times \max \left\{ \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}, (1 - \phi^{z_t}(S, i)) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} + \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \left(\frac{1}{c_i} \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d}) + \frac{c_i - 1}{c_i} \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \right) \right\} \quad (3)$$

Note the update rule of the above dynamic programming can be simplified by rearranging the terms; Interestingly, the rule will be independent of c_i and $\phi^{z_t}(S, i)$ as they cancel out:

$$\left[\text{At time } t \text{ with type } z_t, i \in \hat{S} \text{ will be accepted} \right] \iff r_i^{z_t} \geq \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} - \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d} \quad (4)$$

REMARK 4. Later in Section EC.3 and EC.7, we will replace this simple DP with a slightly modified one that has *inventory dependent* state, but is still low dimensional when rental times are infinite. This allows us to obtain (an almost) optimal competitive ratio for this special case.

3.3.2. The Algorithm and Analysis We now present our second simulation-based algorithm (Algorithm 3), with its competitive ratio guarantee (Theorem 2).⁹

THEOREM 2. *The competitive ratio of Algorithm 3 against offline Bayesian expected LP benchmark, i.e., Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$, is at least $1/2$. Moreover, it runs in time $\text{Poly}(n, T, \sum_{t \in [T]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|)$ given oracle access to an offline algorithm for assortment optimization (Assumption 3).*

⁸ In this hypothetical scenario, we assume that the probability that the consumer select product i equals $\phi^{z_t}(S, i)$ regardless of whether another product i' is discarded from S .

⁹ The competitive ratio in Theorem 2 is optimal even if rental times are infinite. Consider the following example: there is a single non-reusable product with a single unit. There are two time periods $T = 2$. Consumer 1 has a deterministic type that deterministically purchases this item with fee 1. With probability ϵ , consumer 2 has a type that deterministically purchases this item with fee $1/\epsilon$. Otherwise (i.e., with probability $1 - \epsilon$), consumer 2 has a type that purchases nothing. In this example, the expected revenue of the Bayesian Expected LP benchmark as well as the clairvoyant policy is $2 - \epsilon$, while the expected revenue of any online policy is at most 1.

Algorithm 3: Simulation-based Algorithm with Non-adaptive Per-unit Revenue Thresholds

```

1 Pre-processing:
    • Compute the optimal assignment  $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}$  of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$  by invoking the offline
      assortment oracle (Assumption 3)
    • Set  $X_{S,t,z_t} \triangleq y_{S,t,z_t}^* F_t(z_t)$  for every  $S, t$  and  $z_t$  where optimal assignment has a non-zero entry
    • Solve the dynamic programming with Bellman update described in eq. (3) and boundary
      condition  $\mathcal{V}_{i,T+1} = 0$  for every product  $i$  to obtain  $\{\mathcal{V}_{i,t}\}_{i \in [n], t \in [T]}$ 
    • Let  $P_{i,t}^{z_t} \triangleq \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} - \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d}$ , for all  $i \in [n], t \in [T], z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t$ .

for  $t = 1$  to  $T$  do
    /* consumer  $t$  with type  $z_t \sim F_t$  arrives */
2   Simulation: Upon realizing consumer type  $z_t$ , sample  $\hat{S}_t \sim \{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$ 
3   Discarding: Initialize  $\bar{S}_t \leftarrow \hat{S}_t$ 
4   for each product  $i \in \hat{S}_t$  do
5       if  $r_i^{z_t} < P_{i,t}^{z_t}$  or there is no available unit of product  $i$  then
6           Remove  $i$  from  $\bar{S}_t$ 
    /* Per-unit revenue thresholds  $\{P_{i,t}^{z_t}\}$  are computed once, i.e., are non-adaptive */
7   Post-processing: Let  $\tilde{S}_t \leftarrow \text{SUB-ASSORTMENT SAMPLING}(\phi^{z_t}, \bar{S}_t, \{\phi(\hat{S}_t, i)\}_{i \in \bar{S}_t})$ 
    /* Send a query call to Procedure 1 with appropriate input arguments */
8   Offer assortment  $\tilde{S}_t$  to consumer  $t$ 

```

Proof sketch of Theorem 2. The running time is proved by Proposition 2, and the fact that the simple DP in Section 3.3.1 can be solved in polynomial time. The analysis of the competitive ratio can be decoupled across products. For each fixed product i , we do the analysis in two parts, each sketched below (see the full details in Section EC.6):

- **Part (i)** – Section EC.6.1: we first compare Algorithm 3 with the simple optimistic dynamic programming described in Section 3.3.1 and show the total expected revenue of Algorithm 3 due to rentals of product i is at least $c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1}$. We prove this claim using induction, and the fact that showing a subset \tilde{S}_t of sampled assortment \hat{S}_t can only increase the revenue-to-go of the discarding policy that follows the thresholds of the optimistic DP (as in the algorithm).
- **Part (ii)** – Section EC.6.2: We then compare this simple dynamic programming with expected LP benchmark and show for each product i , $c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1}$ is at least 1/2 of the contribution of product i to the optimal objective value of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ (**Part (ii)**). In order to prove this part, we use the connection between the optimistic DP of Section 3.3.1 and a related factor-revealing LP that characterizes the competitive ratio of the optimistic DP. This connections leads us to

apply duality arguments to find a lower-bound on the ratio of $c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1}$ and the contribution of product i to the optimal objective value of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$.

3.4. Hybrid between Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3

Best of both worlds discarding. In both Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3, we have discarding policies (one for each of the products) that run independently from each other. Also, both competitive ratio analyses essentially decouple across different products, as we analyze the revenue performances of these discarding policies for each product separately. Moreover, in both analyses, we compare the expected revenue of each product i with the contribution of that product in the expected-LP.

Considering all of the above design and analysis aspects of our two algorithms, we can propose a hybrid algorithm where we decide on the choice of the discarding policy for each product i based on its initial inventory c_i upfront. Once we finalize these choices, we run the (possibly different) discarding algorithms in parallel and separately for different products during the discarding step of our final hybrid algorithm. In order to achieve the best of both worlds revenue performance guarantees of small and large inventory regimes, we partition the set of products into those with large initial inventory and those with small initial inventory (will be formally defined later) at the beginning. Given this partition, we assign a “randomized discarding” policy (as described in in Algorithm 2) to make discarding decisions of product i across times $t \in [T]$ if c_i is large, and we use a “discarding with per-unit revenue thresholds” (as described in in Algorithm 3) if c_i is small.

To distinguish between large and small c_i , we first solve the dynamic programming of the optimistic DP discarding policy in Section 3.3 for each product $i \in [n]$, by using its Bellman update equation (described in Equation (3)). We then use the value function $\mathcal{V}_{i,1}$ of the optimistic DP for product i to label this product as either large or small inventory. In particular, define \mathcal{R}_i to be the ratio between the expected revenue-to-go of the optimistic DP for product i and the contribution of this product to the expected-LP’s objective, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R}_i \triangleq \frac{c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1}}{\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) r_i^{z_t}}$$

Note that $\mathcal{R}_i \in [0.5, 1]$ from Theorem 2. Also note that $\varepsilon^*(c)$ is continuous and monotone increasing in c , $\varepsilon^*(0) = 1$, and $\varepsilon^*(+\infty) = 0$ — see Equation (1) for the definition $\varepsilon^*(\cdot)$. We next compare the ratio \mathcal{R}_i with $1 - \varepsilon^*(c_i)$. In fact, if $\mathcal{R}_i + \varepsilon^*(c_i) < 1$, we then except the competitive ratio of randomized discarding to be no smaller than that of the optimistic DP, and hence we label the product as “large inventory”. Otherwise, we expect the optimistic DP to beat the randomized discarding in terms of the competitive ratio, and hence we label the product as “small invenotry”. Finally, we perform the sub-assortment sampling as a post-processing step in order to correct the choice probabilities of non-discarded products (which might have been increased due to weak-substitution and that other

products are either discarded or not even selected in the assortment as they were not available at the first place). We denote the resulting algorithm by **Sim+Hybrid(i)**.

THEOREM 3. *The competitive ratio of **Sim+Hybrid(i)** against offline Bayesian expected LP benchmark, i.e., $\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$, is at least $1 - \min(\frac{1}{2}, \varepsilon^*(c_{\min}))$ (see Figure 1).*

Proof sketch. As it can be seen by following the lines of both the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 3.2.2 and the proof of Theorem 2 in Section EC.6, the arguments for the revenue performance of the corresponding discarding policies for each product i (and also the resulting competitive ratio) is independent of how discarding of another product i' is handled, and therefore the competitive ratio guarantees of the randomized discarding and the optimistic DP from these theorems still hold for the hybrid algorithm. For brevity, we do not repeat these proofs. We conclude that the proposed hybrid algorithm has a competitive ratio of at least $\max(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - \varepsilon^*(c_{\min}))$. \square

Monte-Carlo simulation to help. In principle, given the sequence of type distributions $\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T$, one can simulate both Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 and estimate their expected future revenues using Monte-Carlo simulation, starting at any time $t \in [T]$ (given any history up to time t). Now, a simple hybrid algorithm can switch to the algorithm with the higher expected revenue and runs this algorithm for the next time step given the current history of rental products. By repeatedly applying this method at each time t given the history up to this time – a technique known as the *method of conditional expectation* – we end up with an alternative hybrid algorithm that essentially is the Be-The-Leader policy among the two policies at each time, meaning that its expected future revenue at each time is at least the expected future revenue of each of the two policies (which can be proved using induction). Hence, this hybrid algorithm clearly obtains the best of both worlds competitive ratio of $1 - \min(\frac{1}{2}, \varepsilon^*(c_{\min}))$ similar to our previous hybrid algorithm. Such a policy can also choose to switch at a lower frequency; but no matter what frequency it picks, it is expected to outperform both policies in expectation, both in theory and practice. We use this alternative hybrid algorithm, which is denoted by **Sim+Hybrid(ii)**, in our numerical simulations in Section EC.8 as well.

THEOREM 4. *The competitive ratio of **Sim+Hybrid(ii)** against offline Bayesian expected LP benchmark, i.e., $\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$, is at least $1 - \min(\frac{1}{2}, \varepsilon^*(c_{\min}))$ (see Figure 1).*

Proof sketch. Consider the following backward induction. The induction hypothesis is that given current state \mathbf{J} (i.e., the number of available units of each product in the inventory, as well as the return time of each allocated unit of every product), and time period t , the expected revenue from time t to time T in **Hybrid-Sim(ii)** is weakly higher than Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3. Base case $t = T$ is straightforward. Suppose the induction hypothesis is correct for $t + 1, \dots, T$. Consider the inductive step for time t and current state \mathbf{J} . Suppose Monte-Carlo simulation suggests that given state \mathbf{J} , Algorithm 2 achieves higher expected revenue from time t to time T , and its induced new

state is \mathbf{J}' (the analysis for the other case is similar). In this case, we know that the expected revenue in **Hybrid-Sim(ii)** from time t to time T can be decomposed into the following two terms: (i) the expected revenue in **Hybrid-Sim(ii)** at time t , and (ii) the expected revenue in **Hybrid-Sim(ii)** from time $t+1$ to time T under state \mathbf{J}' . By construction, term (i) equals to the expected revenue in Algorithm 2 at time t . By our induction hypothesis for time $t+1$ with state \mathbf{J}' , term (ii) is weakly higher than the expected revenue in Algorithm 2 from time $t+1$ to time T given state \mathbf{J}' . Hence, the expected revenue in **Hybrid-Sim(ii)** from time t to time T given state \mathbf{J} is weakly higher than Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 as well, which concludes the backward induction. \square

REMARK 5. We would like to highlight that while both **Sim+Hybrid(i)** and **Sim+Hybrid(ii)** attain the theoretical best of both worlds competitive ratio that was mentioned earlier, and as we see in our numerical simulations in Section EC.8 they both outperforms other existing policies in practical scenarios of our problem, they differ in terms of computational requirements. In fact, **Sim+Hybrid(i)** can easily make upfront decisions for the choice of discarding policy of each product i , with almost no extra computation compared to Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3; nevertheless, **Sim+Hybrid(ii)** needs to run Monte-Carlo simulation several times (depending on the switching frequency) by sampling from future types, which makes it less practically appealing.

4. Conclusion

We studied designing near-optimal algorithms for the online assortment of reusable resources in the Bayesian setting. We proposed an algorithmic framework based on four modular steps: (i) solving the expected LP, (ii) simulating the solution, (iii) running a separate discarding procedure for each product to maintain point-wise inventory feasibility (while only losing a negligible fraction of the revenue of each product), and (iv) performing a post-processing step to adjust choice probabilities of non-discarded items. Using this framework, we designed an algorithm that is $1 - \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, O\left(\sqrt{\log(c_{\min})/c_{\min}}\right)\right)$ under the general rental duration distributions, and an improved near-optimal algorithm with competitive ratio $1 - 1/\sqrt{(c_{\min} + 3)}$ under infinite rental durations. Not only our algorithms outperform the existing algorithms in the literature theoretically, we further verified their revenue performance advantages through numerical simulations.

As a road-map for future, it is interesting to study what other practical aspects of a real-world assortment problem beyond reusable resources can be modeled, and to what extent mathematical programming techniques can be used to design competitive algorithms there. On the technical side, the most immediate open problem stemming from our work is finding the optimal competitive ratio for the case of general rental duration distributions. In particular, can one shave the logarithmic factor in our competitive ratio and obtain a $1 - O(1/\sqrt{c_{\min}})$ competitive algorithm, similar to the best known competitive ratio in the non-reusable case? As a different yet more ambitious future

direction, it would be interesting to study classes of stochastic online optimization similar to the Bayesian online assortment further, in order to discover the computational hardness of computing or approximating the optimum online policy, i.e., the DP policy. An interesting discovery here would be obtaining improved approximations against the optimum online benchmark versus the expected LP benchmark through polynomial-time policies, à la Anari et al. (2019), or proving its impossibility.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the anonymous associate editor and the referees for their comments and feedback throughout the revision process. Rad Niazadeh’s research is partially supported by an Asness Junior Faculty Fellowship from the University of Chicago Booth School of Business.

References

- Daniel Adelman. Dynamic bid prices in revenue management. *Operations Research*, 55(4):647–661, 2007.
- Saeed Alaei. Bayesian combinatorial auctions: Expanding single buyer mechanisms to many buyers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 43(2):930–972, 2014.
- Saeed Alaei, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, and Vahid Liaghat. Online prophet-inequality matching with applications to ad allocation. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 18–35. ACM, 2012.
- Nima Anari, Rad Niazadeh, Amin Saberi, and Ali Shameli. Nearly optimal pricing algorithms for production constrained and laminar bayesian selection. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 91–92. ACM, 2019.
- Ali Aouad, Vivek Farias, Retsef Levi, and Danny Segev. The approximability of assortment optimization under ranking preferences. *Operations Research*, 66(6):1661–1669, 2018.
- Ali Aouad, Vivek Farias, and Retsef Levi. Assortment optimization under consider-then-choose choice models. *Management Science*, 2020.
- Jackie Baek and Will Ma. Bifurcating constraints to improve approximation ratios for network revenue management with reusable resources. *Available at SSRN 3482457*, 2019.
- Siddhartha Banerjee and Daniel Freund. Uniform loss algorithms for online stochastic decision-making with applications to bin packing. In *Abstracts of the 2020 SIGMETRICS/Performance Joint International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems*, pages 1–2, 2020.
- Fernando Bernstein, A Gürhan Kök, and Lei Xie. Dynamic assortment customization with limited inventories. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 17(4):538–553, 2015.
- Brian Brubach, Nathaniel Grammel, Will Ma, and Aravind Srinivasan. Improved guarantees for offline stochastic matching via new ordered contention resolution schemes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- Carri W Chan and Vivek F Farias. Stochastic depletion problems: Effective myopic policies for a class of dynamic optimization problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 34(2):333–350, 2009.

- Shuchi Chawla, Jason D Hartline, David L Malec, and Balasubramanian Sivan. Multi-parameter mechanism design and sequential posted pricing. In *Proceedings of the forty-second ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 311–320, 2010.
- Shuchi Chawla, Nikhil R Devanur, Alexander E Holroyd, Anna R Karlin, James B Martin, and Balasubramanian Sivan. Stability of service under time-of-use pricing. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 184–197, 2017.
- Xi Chen, Will Ma, David Simchi-Levi, and Linwei Xin. Assortment planning for recommendations at checkout under inventory constraints. *Available at SSRN 2853093*, 2016.
- Yiwei Chen, Retsef Levi, and Cong Shi. Revenue management of reusable resources with advanced reservations. *Production and Operations Management*, 26(5):836–859, 2017.
- Herman Chernoff et al. A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 23(4):493–507, 1952.
- Nikhil R Devanur, Balasubramanian Sivan, and Yossi Azar. Asymptotically optimal algorithm for stochastic adwords. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 388–404, 2012.
- John Dickerson, Karthik Sankararaman, Aravind Srinivasan, and Pan Xu. Allocation problems in ride-sharing platforms: Online matching with offline reusable resources. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Paul Dütting, Michal Feldman, Thomas Kesselheim, and Brendan Lucier. Prophet inequalities made easy: Stochastic optimization by pricing non-stochastic inputs. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on*, pages 540–551. IEEE, 2017.
- Vivek F Farias, Srikanth Jagabathula, and Devavrat Shah. A nonparametric approach to modeling choice with limited data. *Management science*, 59(2):305–322, 2013.
- Moran Feldman, Ola Svensson, and Rico Zenklusen. Online contention resolution schemes. In *Proceedings of the twenty-seventh annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1014–1033. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2016.
- Yiding Feng, Rad Niazadeh, and Amin Saberi. Linear programming based online policies for real-time assortment of reusable resources. *Available at SSRN 3421227*, 2019.
- Yiding Feng, Rad Niazadeh, and Amin Saberi. Online assortment of reusable resources with exogenous replenishment. *Available at SSRN 3795056*, 2021.
- Guillermo Gallego, Garud Iyengar, Robert Phillips, and Abhay Dubey. Managing flexible products on a network. *Available at SSRN 3567371*, 2004.
- Guillermo Gallego, Anran Li, Van-Anh Truong, and Xinshang Wang. Online personalized resource allocation with customer choice. *Working Paper*, 2016.
- Vishal Gaur and Dorothee Honhon. Assortment planning and inventory decisions under a locational choice model. *Management Science*, 52(10):1528–1543, 2006.
- Negin Golrezaei, Hamid Nazerzadeh, and Paat Rusmevichientong. Real-time optimization of personalized assortments. *Management Science*, 60(6):1532–1551, 2014.
- Xiao-Yue Gong, Vineet Goyal, Garud N Iyengar, David Simchi-Levi, Rajan Udwani, and Shuangyu Wang. Online assortment optimization with reusable resources. *Management Science*, 2021.

- Vineet Goyal, Retsef Levi, and Danny Segev. Near-optimal algorithms for the assortment planning problem under dynamic substitution and stochastic demand. *Operations Research*, 64(1):219–235, 2016.
- Vineet Goyal, Garud Iyengar, and Rajan Udwani. Online allocation of reusable resources via algorithms guided by fluid approximations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03983*, 2020a.
- Vineet Goyal, Garud Iyengar, and Rajan Udwani. Online allocation of reusable resources: Achieving optimal competitive ratio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.02430*, 2020b.
- Martin Grötschel, László Lovász, and Alexander Schrijver. The ellipsoid method and its consequences in combinatorial optimization. *Combinatorica*, 1(2):169–197, 1981.
- Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, Robert Kleinberg, and Tuomas Sandholm. Automated online mechanism design and prophet inequalities. In *AAAI*, volume 7, pages 58–65, 2007.
- Teck-Hua Ho and Christopher S Tang. *Product variety management: research advances*, volume 10. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- Dorothee Honhon, Vishal Gaur, and Sridhar Seshadri. Assortment planning and inventory decisions under stockout-based substitution. *Operations research*, 58(5):1364–1379, 2010.
- John A Howard and Jagdish N Sheth. The theory of buyer behavior. *New York*, 63, 1969.
- Robert Kleinberg and Seth Matthew Weinberg. Matroid prophet inequalities. In *Proceedings of the forty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 123–136. ACM, 2012.
- A Gürhan Kök, Marshall L Fisher, and Ramnath Vaidyanathan. Assortment planning: Review of literature and industry practice. In *Retail supply chain management*, pages 99–153. Springer, 2008.
- Ulrich Krengel and Louis Sucheston. On semiamarts, amarts, and processes with finite value. *Probability on Banach spaces*, 4:197–266, 1978.
- Kelvin Lancaster. The economics of product variety: A survey. *Marketing science*, 9(3):189–206, 1990.
- Euiwoong Lee and Sahil Singla. Optimal online contention resolution schemes via ex-ante prophet inequalities. In *26th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2018)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong. A faster cutting plane method and its implications for combinatorial and convex optimization. In *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 1049–1065. IEEE, 2015.
- Retsef Levi and Ana Radovanović. Provably near-optimal lp-based policies for revenue management in systems with reusable resources. *Operations Research*, 58(2):503–507, 2010.
- Qian Liu and Garrett van Ryzin. On the choice-based linear programming model for network revenue management. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 10(2):288–310, 2008.
- Brendan Lucier. An economic view of prophet inequalities. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 16(1):24–47, 2017.
- Will Ma and David Simchi-Levi. Algorithms for online matching, assortment, and pricing with tight weight-dependent competitive ratios. *Operations Research*, 2020.
- Will Ma, David Simchi-Levi, and Jinglong Zhao. Dynamic pricing under a static calendar. *Available at SSRN 3251015*, 2018.
- Vahideh Manshadi and Scott Rodilitz. Online policies for efficient volunteer crowdsourcing. *Management Science*, 2022.

- Aranyak Mehta, Amin Saberi, Umesh Vazirani, and Vijay Vazirani. Adwords and generalized on-line matching. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'05)*, pages 264–273. IEEE, 2005.
- Rad Niazadeh, Amin Saberi, and Ali Shameli. Prophet inequalities vs. approximating optimum online. In *International Conference on Web and Internet Economics*, pages 356–374. Springer, 2018.
- Zachary Owen and David Simchi-Levi. Price and assortment optimization for reusable resources. *Available at SSRN 3070625*, 2018.
- Christos H Papadimitriou and John N Tsitsiklis. The complexity of markov decision processes. *Mathematics of operations research*, 12(3):441–450, 1987.
- Paat Rusmevichientong, David Shmoys, Chaoxu Tong, and Huseyin Topaloglu. Assortment optimization under the multinomial logit model with random choice parameters. *Production and Operations Management*, 23(11):2023–2039, 2014.
- Paat Rusmevichientong, Mika Sumida, and Huseyin Topaloglu. Dynamic assortment optimization for reusable products with random usage durations. *Management Science*, 66(7):2820–2844, 2020.
- Ester Samuel-Cahn et al. Comparison of threshold stop rules and maximum for independent nonnegative random variables. *the Annals of Probability*, 12(4):1213–1216, 1984.
- Jennie Si, Andrew G Barto, Warren B Powell, and Don Wunsch. *Handbook of learning and approximate dynamic programming*, volume 2. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- Stephen A Smith and Narendra Agrawal. Management of multi-item retail inventory systems with demand substitution. *Operations Research*, 48(1):50–64, 2000.
- Kalyan Talluri and Garrett van Ryzin. Revenue management under a general discrete choice model of consumer behavior. *Management Science*, 50(1):15–33, 2004.
- Huseyin Topaloglu. Joint stocking and product offer decisions under the multinomial logit model. *Production and Operations Management*, 22(5):1182–1199, 2013.
- Pravin M Vaidya. A new algorithm for minimizing convex functions over convex sets. *Mathematical programming*, 73(3):291–341, 1996.
- Garrett van Ryzin and Siddharth Mahajan. On the relationship between inventory costs and variety benefits in retail assortments. *Management Science*, 45(11):1496–1509, 1999.
- Alberto Vera and Siddhartha Banerjee. The bayesian prophet: A low-regret framework for online decision making. *Management Science*, 67(3):1368–1391, 2021.
- Xinshang Wang, Van-Anh Truong, and David Bank. Online advance admission scheduling for services with customer preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.10412*, 2018.
- Dan Zhang and Daniel Adelman. An approximate dynamic programming approach to network revenue management with customer choice. *Transportation Science*, 43(3):381–394, 2009.

This page is intentionally blank. Proper e-companion title page, with INFORMS branding and exact metadata of the main paper, will be produced by the INFORMS office when the issue is being assembled.

EC.1. Further Related Work

Assortment planning for revenue management has an extensively growing literature over the recent decades. We refer the reader to related surveys and books (cf. [Kök et al. 2008](#), [Lancaster 1990](#), [Ho and Tang 1998](#)) for a comprehensive study. [van Ryzin and Mahajan \(1999\)](#) study the static model which captures the trade-offs between inventory costs and product variety under the multinomial logit consumer choice model. Later work have considered assortment under various consumer choice models, e.g., demand substitution model ([Smith and Agrawal 2000](#)), multinomial logit models ([Talluri and van Ryzin 2004](#), [Gallego et al. 2004](#), [Liu and van Ryzin 2008](#), [Topaloglu 2013](#)), the Lancaster choice model ([Gaur and Honhon 2006](#)), ranked-list preference ([Honhon et al. 2010](#), [Goyal et al. 2016](#), [Aouad et al. 2018](#)), consider-then-choose choice models ([Aouad et al. 2020](#)), and non-parametric (data-driven) choice models ([Farias et al. 2013](#)).

Online assortment has been studied more recently, both under the prior-free/adversarial and the Bayesian settings. For non-reusable products, [Bernstein et al. \(2015\)](#) study a model with two products, i.i.d. consumer types and Poisson arrivals. [Chan and Farias \(2009\)](#) study a model with non-stationary consumer types and show $\frac{1}{2}$ performance guarantee with respect to the clairvoyant optimum online benchmark. [Golrezaei et al. \(2014\)](#) introduce “inventory balancing” algorithms – inspired by the seminal work of [Mehta et al. \(2005\)](#) for online ad allocation – and analyze their performance guarantee in the prior-free setting using a primal-dual approach. This analysis is later improved and generalized by [Ma and Simchi-Levi \(2020\)](#). [Chen et al. \(2016\)](#) consider another variant, in which assortments are offered as add-ons with discounted price. The idea of discarding to ensure point-wise inventory feasibility is also used in this paper, and they face a similar challenge due to product substitution. To overcome this challenge, the authors introduce a sampling procedure with error for their specific goal. In contrast, our sub-assortment sampling does not incur any errors and can be used for more general purposes.

For online assortment of reusable products, [Levi and Radovanović \(2010\)](#) study a model that assumes independent demands across products, without any choice behavior for the customers with infinite selling horizon. A follow up work from [Owen and Simchi-Levi \(2018\)](#) extend this work to incorporate customer choice behavior and a finite selling horizon. [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#) study a model with multiple units of a single reusable product. They consider stochastic usage durations and advance reservations, and obtain data-dependent performance guarantees that are asymptotically optimal when the product inventory and the customer arrival rate scale up linearly at the same rate. Finally, [Rusmevichientong et al. \(2020\)](#) study the Bayesian setting and [Gong et al. \(2021\)](#), [Feng et al. \(2019, 2021\)](#), [Goyal et al. \(2020b\)](#) study the prior-free/adversarial setting where both rental fees and rental duration distributions are type-independent and identical across time.

In the Bayesian setting, our problem resembles some aspects of the “prophet inequality” problem. This problem is originated from the seminal work of [Krengel and Sucheston \(1978\)](#) in the 70’s, and has since been studied quite extensively. Combinatorial generalizations of this problem are also studied in the literature. Examples are prophet inequalities for matroids ([Samuel-Cahn et al. 1984](#), [Hajiaghayi et al. 2007](#), [Kleinberg and Weinberg 2012](#)), matchings ([Alaei et al. 2012](#)), and combinatorial auctions ([Düetting et al. 2017](#)). In these generalizations, the natural dynamic programming for computing the optimum online policy are exponential-size ([Niazadeh et al. 2018](#), [Anari et al. 2019](#)), similar to our problem. See [Lucier \(2017\)](#), for a comprehensive survey.

Some of our techniques resemble those used for the prophet inequality matching ([Alaei et al. 2012](#)), the Magician’s problem and online contention resolution schemes ([Alaei 2014](#), [Brubach et al. 2021](#), [Feldman et al. 2016](#)), the pricing with static calendar problem ([Ma et al. 2018](#)), online bipartite matching with reusable offline nodes ([Dickerson et al. 2018](#)), and the volunteer crowdsourcing problem ([Manshadi and Rodilitz 2022](#)). The closest to us is the work of ([Baek and Ma 2019](#)) for the network revenue management problem with reusable resource, in which the authors have independently and concurrently discovered policies similar to our algorithm for the small inventory regime.

Other expected LP benchmarks have been used in the literature under the name of “ex-ante relaxation” for various stochastic online optimization and mechanism design problems. For example, see [Alaei et al. \(2012\)](#), [Düetting et al. \(2017\)](#), [Lee and Singla \(2018\)](#), [Vera and Banerjee \(2021\)](#), [Ma et al. \(2018\)](#), [Anari et al. \(2019\)](#). The factor-revealing technique we use to analyze our DP-based thresholding discarding rule resemble the LP-method of [Adelman \(2007\)](#), the dual-fitting methods in [Alaei \(2014\)](#), [Wang et al. \(2018\)](#), and also other LP-based methods for approximate dynamic programming (see [Si et al. \(2004\)](#) for a comprehensive study).

Some of our techniques resemble those used for the prophet inequality matching ([Alaei et al. 2012](#)), the Magician’s problem ([Alaei 2014](#)), the pricing with static calendar problem ([Ma et al. 2018](#)) (which also studies static assortment policies without reusable resources), and the volunteer crowdsourcing problem ([Manshadi and Rodilitz 2022](#)). Similar to our Bayesian expected LP, other expected LP benchmarks have been used in the literature under the name of “ex-ante relaxation” for various stochastic online optimization and mechanism design problems. For example, see [Alaei et al. \(2012\)](#), [Devanur et al. \(2012\)](#), [Feldman et al. \(2016\)](#), [Düetting et al. \(2017\)](#), [Chawla et al. \(2017\)](#), [Lee and Singla \(2018\)](#), [Vera and Banerjee \(2021\)](#), [Ma et al. \(2018\)](#), [Anari et al. \(2019\)](#), [Dickerson et al. \(2018\)](#).

Another interesting line of work related to us is the work of [Vera and Banerjee \(2021\)](#) and [Banerjee and Freund \(2020\)](#). The goal here is to obtain improved (additive or regret-based) approximations for various stochastic online optimization problems with packing constraints. These papers diverges from ours by taking a different technical approach and considering a different regime (i.e., when inventories increase with horizon); nevertheless, carrying over their techniques to the reusable resources problem stands as an interesting future research direction.

EC.2. Comparison Between Different Benchmarks

Consider the following hierarchy of revenue benchmarks, based on the given information on future uncertainty and required computational power:

1. *Optimum offline*: the expected revenue of the optimum offline algorithm that has full information about the realized type sequence $\{z_t\}_{t=1}^T$, exact realizations of rental durations for each type z_t and product i , and exact realizations of consumer choices for each possible assortment.
2. *Clairvoyant optimum online*: the expected revenue of the optimum online algorithm that has full information about the realized type sequence $\{z_t\}_{t=1}^T$, but does not know the exact realizations of rental durations, nor the consumer choices.
3. *Non-clairvoyant optimum online*: the expected revenue of the optimum online algorithm that only knows the sequence of type distributions $\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T$.




Figure EC.1 Comparing different revenue benchmarks

Figure EC.1 compares these benchmarks in terms of their expected revenue. No constant competitive online algorithm exists against optimum offline, even when resources are not reusable; see Appendix EC.2.1. (Non-clairvoyant) Optimum online is a weaker benchmark and requires solving an exponential-size dynamic programming (Rusmevichientong et al. 2020). Clairvoyant optimum online – introduced by Golrezaei et al. (2014) for non-reusable products and extended to reusable products by Gong et al. (2021) – is a middle ground benchmark in terms of expected revenue; moreover, it has to solve an exponential-size dynamic programming to compute its assortment decisions given the extra information $\{z_t\}_{t=1}^T$ (which is not provided to a normal online algorithm).

EC.2.1. Unbounded Competitiveness of Optimum Offline

In this subsection, we construct a simple instance which shows the Bayesian expected LP Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ is at most a $O(1/T)$ -approximation to the optimum offline. Combining with Proposition 1, it implies that no online algorithm can achieve a (T -independent) bounded competitive ratio against optimum offline.

THEOREM EC.1. *The Bayesian expected LP Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ is at most a $O(1/T)$ -approximation to the optimum offline.*

COROLLARY EC.1. *No online algorithm can achieve a (T -independent) bounded competitive ratio against optimum offline.*

Proof of Theorem EC.1. Consider the following instance where there is a single product and a single consumer type. For this product, its initial inventory is one, reward is one. Once this product is allocated, the realized rental duration is one (i.e., becoming available in the next time period) with probability $1/2$, and infinite otherwise. At every time period $t \in [T]$, a consumer with this single consumer type arrives the platform with probability one. Consumers select this product (if assorted) with probability one.

First, we claim that the expected revenue of the optimum offline is at least $T/2$. Note that the optimum offline observe the realization of rental duration of the product at each time period before assorting, and thus it can assort the product whenever the realized rental duration at that time period is one. Since the expected number of such time period is $T/2$, the expected revenue of optimum offline is at least $T/2$.

Next, we consider the Bayesian expected LP Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ and its dual program on this instance:

$$\begin{array}{llll} \max & \sum_{t=1}^T y_t & \text{s.t.} & \min \sum_{t=1}^T \theta_t \quad \text{s.t.} \\ & \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{1}{2} y_{\tau} \leq 1 & t \in [T] & \sum_{\tau=t}^T \frac{1}{2} \theta_{\tau} \geq 1 \quad t \in [T] . \end{array}$$

Consider the following feasible dual solution with objective value 2 in the dual program:

$$\theta_t = 0, \quad \forall t \in [T-1], \quad \theta_T = 2.$$

Invoking the weak duality between the above primal-dual linear programs finishes the proof. \square

EC.3. Discussions and Subsidiary Results

EC.3.1. Static vs. dynamic substitution and sub-assortment sampling.

In this section, we discuss the connection between the sub-assortment sampling and the assortment optimization for both static substitution and dynamic substitution studied in the literature (cf.

Ma et al. 2018). We first introduce the definitions of static substitution and dynamic substitution, then discuss their connection with the sub-assortment sampling in the offline (single-shot) assortment problem, and finally we extend the discussion to the online (multi-period) assortment problem considered in this paper.

In our model, the platform can only form assortments of *available* products. An alternative modeling assumption is that the platform can form assortments regardless of availability of the products. In this alternative model, we distinguish two setups on how consumers make their decision based on the displayed assortment and availability of the products.

- *Static substitution:* Given assortment S and availability status of all the products, a consumer with choice model ϕ chooses item i with probability $\phi(S, i)$, and the sale is only final if the selected product i is available.
- *Dynamic substitution:* Given assortment S and availability status of all the products, a consumer with choice model ϕ chooses item i with probability $\phi(\hat{S}, i)$ where assortment $\hat{S} \subseteq S$ contains all available products in S . By definition, the consumer never chooses an unavailable product.

Notably, in the offline (single-shot) assortment problem, the sub-assortment sampling builds the following connection between the static substitution and dynamic substitution.

PROPOSITION EC.1. *For any weak substitutable and downward-closed feasible choice model ϕ , any assortment $S \in \mathcal{S}$, and any possible availability of products, there exists an randomized assortment \tilde{S} such that for every product $i \in [n]$, the probability that product i is allocated under assortment S in the static substitution equals to the expected probability (over the randomness of \tilde{S}) that product i is allocated under assortment \tilde{S} in the dynamic substitution.*

Proof. Invoking Proposition 3 by setting $\phi \leftarrow \phi$, $S \leftarrow S$ and $p_i \leftarrow \phi(S, i)$ for all $i \in S$ finishes the proof. \square

In the online (multi-period) assortment problem, our simulation-based algorithms first samples assortment \hat{S}_t based on the optimal assignment of the Bayesian expected LP Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ and then constructs assortment \bar{S}_t by removing unavailable products as well as products that the discarding procedure suggests to discard. We adapt the definition of static substitution as follows.

- *Static substitution with cancellation:* Given assortment S , a consumer with choice model ϕ chooses product i with probability $\phi(S, i)$. After observing the realized choice of the consumer, the platform can take back this product i immediately with no cost for the purpose of discarding or due to the unavailability.

Under static substitution with cancellation, we can simplify our simulation-based algorithms (Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3) and preserve the same competitive ratio guarantee (Theorem 1 and Theorem 2) by modifying the post-processing step as follows: offer assortment \hat{S}_t to consumer t , and take back product i selected by consumer t if $i \notin \bar{S}_t$. The competitive ratio guarantee for the

aforementioned modified Algorithm 3 follows exactly the same argument as before. To see why the competitive ratio is preserved for the aforementioned modified Algorithm 2, note that the similar argument as the one in Theorem 1 for Algorithm 2 still holds. In particular, we can consider a hypothetical scenario where we run the modified Algorithm 2 without inventory constraint and the normal run of the modified Algorithm 2; Interestingly, under static substitution with cancellation, the coupling between two scenarios this time becomes trivial, and then the concentration argument for the hypothetical scenario concludes the argument.

On the other hand, the online (multi-period) assortment problem with dynamic substitution is essentially the exact problem considered in the main text. In this sense, the sub-assortment sampling and the coupling argument in the proof of Theorem 1 can be interpreted as a reduction from the online assortment problem with dynamic substitution to the online assortment problem with static substitution (with cancellation).

EC.3.2. Improved competitive ratio for non-reusable case.

As a side result and mainly for the purpose of our numerical simulations, we consider the special case of Bayesian online assortment for non-reusable resources in Section EC.7, which was studied in Rusmevichientong et al. (2020). We follow our simulation-based approach, and then similar to Section 3.3.1 we use a dynamic programming that captures the expected revenue-to-go of the optimal discarding policy for this product, when the product receives (probabilistic) suggestions from the simulation-based outer algorithm for being placed in the assortment.¹⁰ The main difference this time is that we can actually compute and run the *exact optimum* discarding DP. To see this, fix a product $i \in [n]$. Notice that in the case of infinite rental durations, the current inventory level plays the role of the state (which is a monotone decreasing quantity, as units of the product never return to the inventory); thus the DP has polynomial-size state space and in principle can be computed efficiently, i.e., in polynomial time.

It turns out that solving this DP is intimately related to the “magician problem”, introduced and studied in Alaei (2014), which itself is an special case of online contention resolution schemes for a simple uniform matroid environment (Feldman et al. 2016). By leveraging the techniques introduced in this paper and extending them to the Bayesian online assortment optimization problem, we show that a discarding algorithm that follows the optimum DP loses no more than $\frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{\min}+3}}$ fraction of the expected LP’s revenue (which is the same near-optimal approximation factor as in the magician problem).

Specifically, let $\mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I$ denote the expected revenue-to-go of product i during $[t, T]$ from the optimal discarding policy, when I is the remaining inventory at time t . Similar to the discussion about the

¹⁰ This dynamic programming is a generalization of the dynamic programming for prophet inequality matching in Alaei et al. (2012).

per-unit revenue thresholds in Section 3.3.1, suppose assortment $\hat{S} \sim X_{S,t,z_t}$ is sampled at time t . If the DP discarding policy discards the product i from the sampled assortment \hat{S} , the expected revenue-to-go becomes $\mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I$; otherwise, with probability $\phi^{z_t}(\hat{S}, i)$ ¹¹ the consumer selects product i and the expected revenue-to-go becomes $\mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^{I-1} + r_i^{z_t}$. With the remaining probability, product i is not selected and the expected revenue-to-go is $\mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I$. Hence, we can calculate $\mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I$ using dynamic programming (i.e., backward induction), with the following Bellman equation:

$$\mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I = \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \max\{\mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I, \phi^{z_t}(S, i)(r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^{I-1}) + (1 - \phi^{z_t}(S, i))\mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I\}, \quad (\text{EC.1})$$

After rearranging the terms, it is easy to observe that DP decisions are made by an inventory-dependent revenue thresholding rule (that is independent of $\{\phi^{z_t}(S, i)\}$, as these terms cancel out):

$$\left[\text{At time } t \text{ with type } z_t \text{ and inventory } I_i, i \in \hat{S} \text{ will be accepted} \right] \iff r_i^{z_t} \geq \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^{I_i} - \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^{I_i-1}$$

We are now ready to present our refined simulation-based policy with a new discarding rule. This rule uses the above inventory-dependent thresholds, where these thresholds are computed upfront, but they depend on the product, time, and the current remaining inventory level of the product. See Algorithm 4 for details.

THEOREM EC.2. *Let $c_{\min} = \min_{i \in [n]} c_i$ be the smallest inventory. The competitive ratio of Algorithm 4 against offline Bayesian expected LP benchmark, i.e., $\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ is at least $\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{\min}+3}}\right)$. Moreover, it runs in time $\text{Poly}(n, T, \sum_{t \in [T]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|)$ given oracle access to an offline algorithm for assortment optimization (Assumption 3).*

The proof follows a similar structure as in proof of Theorem 2. See Section EC.7 for details.

EC.4. Omitted Proofs in Section 2

PROPOSITION 1. *For any type distributions $\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T$, the expected total revenue of the clairvoyant optimum online benchmark is upper-bounded by $\text{Expected-LP}[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$.*

Proof. Let $I_{S,t}(\mathbf{z}) \in \{0, 1\}$ be the indicator that clairvoyant optimum online benchmark offers set S at time t for a given type sequence $\mathbf{z} = \{z_t\}_{t=1}^T$. As clairvoyant optimum online benchmark is inventory feasible for any sample path of rental durations $\mathbf{d} = \{d_t\}_{t=1}^T$, for all $i \in [n]$, $t \in [T]$ we have:

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{1}\{d_\tau \geq t - \tau\} \phi^{z_\tau}(S, i) I_{S,t}(\mathbf{z}) \leq c_i$$

Now, note that random variable d_τ is independent from random variable $I_{S,\tau}(\mathbf{z})$, as clairvoyant optimum online benchmark does not get to see d_τ when assorts a set at time τ . Therefore, setting $y_{S,t,z_t} = \mathbf{E}[I_{S,t}(\mathbf{z}) | z_t]$ results in a feasible assignment in the corresponding linear program

¹¹ Similiar to Section 3.3.1, here we consider a hypothetical scenario where the probability that the consumer select product i equals $\phi^{z_t}(\hat{S}, i)$ regardless whether another product i' is discarded from \hat{S} .

Algorithm 4: Simulation-based Algorithm with Inventory-dependent Revenue Thresholds1 *Pre-processing:*

- Compute the optimal assignment $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}$ of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ by invoking the offline assortment oracle (Assumption 3)
- Set $X_{S,t,z_t} \triangleq y_{S,t,z_t}^* F_t(z_t)$ for every S, t and z_t where optimal assignment has a non-zero entry
- Solve the dynamic programming with Bellman update described in Equation (EC.1) and boundary condition $\mathcal{E}_{i,T+1}^I = \mathcal{E}_{i,t}^0 = 0$ for every product i and $I \in [c_i]$ to obtain $\{\mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I\}_{i \in [n], t \in [T]}^{I \in [c_i]}$
- Let $Q_{i,t}^I \triangleq \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I - \mathcal{E}_{i,t}^{I-1}$, for all $i \in [n], t \in [T], I \in [c_i]$.

for $t = 1$ **to** T **do**

/* consumer t with type $z_t \sim F_t$ arrives */

2 *Simulation:* Upon realizing consumer type z_t , sample $\hat{S}_t \sim \{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$

3 *Discarding:* Initialize $\bar{S}_t \leftarrow \hat{S}_t$

4 **for each** product $i \in \hat{S}_t$ **do**

5 Let $I_{i,t}$ be the currently available units of product i for product i .

6 **if** $r_i^{z_t} < Q_{i,t}^{I_{i,t}}$ **or there is no available unit of product i** **then**

7 Remove i from \bar{S}_t

/* Inventory-dependent revenue thresholds $\{Q_{i,t}^I\}$ are computed once upfront */

8 *Post-processing:* Let $\tilde{S}_t \leftarrow \text{SUB-ASSORTMENT SAMPLING}(\phi^{z_t}, \bar{S}_t, \{\phi(\hat{S}_t, i)\}_{i \in \bar{S}_t})$

/* Send a query call to Procedure 1 with appropriate input arguments */

9 Offer assortment \tilde{S}_t to consumer t

Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ for any sequence of type distributions $\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T$; to see this, take expectation of the LHS of the above inequality over rental durations first, and then over \mathbf{z} considering that types are independent. Moreover, the objective value of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ under this assignment will be equal to the expected revenue of the clairvoyant optimum online benchmark, which finishes the proof. \square

PROPOSITION 2. *Given an algorithm for offline assortment (Assumption 3), an optimal assignment $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}$ of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ can be computed efficiently in time $\text{Poly}(n, T, \sum_{t \in [T]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|)$. Moreover, $\{y_{S,t,z_t}^*\}$ has no more than $\text{Poly}(n, T, \sum_{t \in [T]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|)$ non-zero entries.*

Before proving the above proposition, we first state a technical lemma regarding the ellipsoid algorithm and sketch its proof (see Grötschel et al. 1981, for a detailed proof).

LEMMA EC.1. *Suppose a primal linear program is bounded and feasible. Moreover, suppose its dual has a separation oracle with running time at most τ . Then primal admits an optimal solution that*

has $\text{Poly}(\tau, m)$ non-zero entries and can be computed in $\text{Poly}(\tau, m)$ time, where m is the number of dual variables (primal constraints).

Proof sketch of Lemma EC.1. Because primal LP is feasible and bounded, dual is also feasible and bounded. Now consider running ellipsoid algorithm with the separation oracle to solve the dual. Ellipsoid can solve the dual in $\text{Poly}(\tau, m)$ time. Now by looking at the run of ellipsoid and considering only dual constraints that ellipsoid returns as violated, we can find $\text{Poly}(\tau, m)$ many constraints in the dual such that the dual value does not change if we throw away the remaining constraints. Note that constraints in the dual correspond to variables in the primal. So, we can throw away all the variables in the primal except the ones corresponding to the constraints in the dual that the separation oracles asks us to keep, and the LP value does not change. Now we have a compact LP in the primal, which we can again solve to get the succinct primal solution with $\text{Poly}(\tau, m)$ non-zero entries and in time $\text{Poly}(\tau, m)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. Given Lemma EC.1, we are ready to show that expected LP can be solved efficiently by the offline oracle. Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ has exponentially many variables and $(nT + T)$ constraints. Hence its dual has only $(nT + T)$ variables and exponentially many constraints. Here is the dual LP, with dual variable $\theta_{i,t}$ and λ_t :

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta, \lambda \geq 0} \quad & \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \theta_{i,t} + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \lambda_{t,z_t} \quad \text{s.t.} \\ & \lambda_{t,z_t} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\tau=t}^T F_t(z_t) \bar{G}_i^{z_t}(\tau - t) \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \theta_{i,\tau} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n r_i^{z_t} F_t(z_t) \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \quad S \in \mathcal{S}, t \in [T], z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t \end{aligned}$$

Now, fix $t \in [T]$, $z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t$, and consider the group of dual constraints corresponding to t and z_t . In order to obtain a separation oracle for this group of constraints, given λ_{t,z_t} and $\{\theta_{i,\tau}\}$ one needs to find a set $\hat{S} \in \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{R}_i \phi^{z_t}(S, i)$, where

$$\hat{R}_i \triangleq F_t(z_t) \left(r_i^{z_t} - \sum_{\tau=t}^T \bar{G}_i^{z_t}(\tau - t) \theta_{i,\tau} \right)$$

Then if $\lambda_{t,z_t} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{R}_i \phi^{z_t}(\hat{S}, i)$ these constraints are satisfied and if not the constraint corresponding to t, z_t, \hat{S} is a separating hyperplane. Note that because of downward-closeness of \mathcal{S} , i.e., Assumption 2, and weak-substitutability of $\phi^{z_t}(S, i)$, i.e., Assumption 1, we can discard products for which $\hat{R}_i < 0$, and hence without loss of generality assume $\hat{R}_i \geq 0$. Therefore, thanks to Assumption 3, one can find such a subset \hat{S} with one call to the oracle. By a polynomial time search over all possible t and z_t , dual will have a separation oracle with running time $\text{Poly}(n, T, \sum_{t \in [T]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|)$. Invoking Lemma EC.1 finishes the proof. \square

EC.5. Omitted Technical Details of Section 3.2 (Large Inventory)

In this section, we provide the detailed analysis of the competitive ratio of Algorithm 2, stated in Theorem 1.

In Section 3.2, we highlighted the one major issue due to the possibly positive correlation among allocations of the same product across time. To work around this issue, we use a careful coupling argument in our analysis of Algorithm 2 that couples the rental indicator random variables of our algorithm with an alternative hypothetical algorithm. This hypothetical algorithm *ignores* inventory constraints of all the products and only simulates the expected LP's optimal solution combined with independent discarding of each product with probability γ . This algorithm generates an independent sequence of rental indicator random variables, allowing us to use simple concentration bounds. Importantly, this coupling trick is only possible because of the guarantee of the sub-assortment sampling procedure in Equation (2), which will be clear later in the proof.

Before the proof of Theorem 1, we recall the multiplicative form of Chernoff concentration bound (Chernoff et al. 1952) that is used in the proof.

LEMMA EC.2 (Multiplicative Chernoff Bound). *Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t are independent random variables taking values in $\{0, 1\}$. Let X denote their sum and let $\mu = \mathbf{E}[X]$ denote the sum's expected value. Then for any $\delta > 0$,*

$$\Pr[X > (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2\mu}{2 + \delta}\right)$$

Proof of Theorem 1. Running time is easily proved by Proposition 2 and Proposition 3. For the proof of competitive ratio, we first claim that for any time period t and product i , the probability that there exists an available unit of product i is at least $1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2 c_{\min}}{2 - \gamma}\right)$. To show this claim, define the following indicator random variables and their corresponding events:

$\mathbf{I}_{i,t}$: event that a unit of product i is allocated at time t ;

$\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)}$: event that product i is in assortment \hat{S}_t ;

$\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)}$: event that product i is not removed from assortment \bar{S}_t in line 6 of Algorithm 2 ;

$\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)}$: event that a unit of product i is available in the inventory at the beginning of time t ;

$\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)}$: event that product i is in assortment \tilde{S}_t and selected by consumer t ;

$\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}$: event that rental duration of product i at time τ is at least $t - \tau$.

Notice that by definition, $\mathbf{I}_{i,t} = \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)}$. Now, our claim is equivalent to

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{\tau < t} \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t} \geq c_i\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2 c_{\min}}{2 - \gamma}\right) , \quad (\text{EC.2})$$

for any time t and product i . To show inequality (EC.2), one concern is that $\{\mathbf{I}_{i,t}\}$ are not independent across t . To resolve this issue, consider a hypothetical scenario where we run Algorithm 2 without inventory constraints, and define random variables $\left\{z_t^\dagger, \hat{S}_t^\dagger, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^\dagger, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)\dagger}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)\dagger}, \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger\right\}_{i,t,\tau}$ exactly in the same way as in a normal run of Algorithm 2 with inventory constraints. Note that by definition, (i) $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)\dagger}$ is deterministically equal to 1; (ii) $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^\dagger = \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)\dagger} = \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)\dagger}$; and (iii) $\{\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger\}_\tau$ are mutually independent across τ .

We now use a coupling between this hypothetical scenario and the normal run of Algorithm 2 with inventory constraints, in which $\sum_{\tau < t} \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger \geq \sum_{\tau < t} \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}$ for all i, t . Clearly, we can define the coupling such that $z_t^\dagger \leftarrow z_t$, $\hat{S}_t^\dagger \leftarrow \hat{S}_t$ (and therefore $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger} = \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)}$), $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger} \leftarrow \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)}$, and $\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger \leftarrow \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}$. Additionally, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} = 1 \mid \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)}\right] &= \phi^{z_t}(\hat{S}_t^\dagger, i) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} = \phi^{z_t^\dagger}(\hat{S}_t^\dagger, i) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} \\ &= \Pr\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} = 1 \mid \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds due to the guarantee of the sub-assortment sampling in Proposition 3 and the second equality holds because of the coupling above. Also, the third equality holds automatically when $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} = 0$, and when $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} = 1$ it holds because of the guarantee of sub-assortment sampling in Proposition 3 and the fact that $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} = \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)\dagger}$. Again – because of the coupling above – we conclude that:

$$\Pr\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} = 1 \mid \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)}\right] = \Pr\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} = 1 \mid \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger}\right].$$

Hence, we can further couple random variables $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} \leftarrow \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)}$. Therefore, $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)\dagger} \geq \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} = \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)}$, which guarantees that $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger \geq \mathbf{I}_{i,t} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}$ for all i, t, τ in this coupling. Thus, it is sufficient to show that

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{\tau < t} \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger \geq c_i\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2 c_{\min}}{2 - \gamma}\right).$$

To show the above bound, we first rewrite the expectation $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger]$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger] &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(1)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(2)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(4)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(1)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(2)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(4)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger \mid \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(1)\dagger}, \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(2)\dagger}\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(1)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(2)\dagger} \cdot \left(\phi^{z_\tau^\dagger}(\hat{S}_\tau^\dagger, i) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(1)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(2)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(1)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^{(2)\dagger} \cdot \phi^{z_\tau^\dagger}(\hat{S}_\tau^\dagger, i) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger\right] = (1 - \gamma) \sum_{z_\tau \in \mathcal{Z}_\tau} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} F_\tau(z_\tau) \bar{G}_i^{z_\tau}(t - \tau) \phi^{z_t}(S, i) y_{S,t,z_t}^*, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the facts that $\mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)\dagger} \mid \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger}\right] = \phi^{z_t^\dagger}(\hat{S}_t^\dagger, i) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger}$ by Proposition 3; $\mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)\dagger} \mid \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger}\right] = (1 - \gamma) \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)\dagger}$ by construction; and random variables $\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^\dagger$ and $\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger$ are independent conditioned on z_τ . Thus,

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{\tau < t} \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger\right] = (1 - \gamma) \sum_{\tau < t} \sum_{z_\tau \in \mathcal{Z}_\tau} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} F_\tau(z_\tau) \bar{G}_i^{z_\tau}(t - \tau) \phi^{z_t}(S, i) y_{S,t,z_t}^*$$

$$\leq (1 - \gamma) c_i$$

We finish the proof of our claim – i.e., tail bound in (EC.2) – by applying the multiplicative form of Chernoff bound (Lemma EC.2) for the sequence of independent random variables $\{\mathbf{I}_{i,\tau}^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,\tau,t}^\dagger\}_{\tau=1}^{t-1}$.

Now, fix any time t and product i . Consider the expected contribution of product i at time period t in the revenue of Algorithm 2. By definition, it is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[r_i^{z_t} \mathbf{I}_{i,t}] &= \mathbf{E}\left[r_i^{z_t} \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)}\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[r_i^{z_t} \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} \cdot \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(4)} \mid \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)}, \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)}\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[r_i^{z_t} \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)} \cdot \left(\phi^{z_t}(\hat{S}_t, i) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)}\right)\right] \\ &\geq (1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2 c_{\min}}{2 - \gamma}\right)\right) \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} F_t(z_t) r_i^{z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) y_{S,t,z_t}^* \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality holds by Proposition 3; and the last inequality holds since $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)}$ is mutually independent from $r_i^{z_t}$, $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(1)}$, $\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(2)}$ and \hat{S}_t , and the fact that by our tail bound in (EC.2) we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{I}_{i,t}^{(3)}\right] \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2 c_{\min}}{2 - \gamma}\right)$$

Thus, Algorithm 2 is at least $(1 - \gamma) \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2 c_{\min}}{2 - \gamma}\right)\right)$ -competitive against the Bayesian expected LP benchmark for any $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. Finally, setting $\gamma = \gamma^*(c_{\min})$ finishes the proof. \square

EC.6. Omitted Technical Details of Section 3.3 (Small Inventory)

In this section, we provide the detailed analysis of the competitive ratio of Algorithm 3, stated in Theorem 2. The analysis consists of two major parts, as mentioned in the sketch of the proof of Theorem 2. We first compare Algorithm 3 with the simple dynamic programming described in Section 3.3.1 and show the total expected revenue of Algorithm 3 due to rentals of product i is at least $c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1}$ (Part (i), Appendix EC.6.1). We then compare this simple dynamic programming with the expected linear programming benchmark and show for each product i , $c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1}$ is at least 1/2 of the contribution of product i to the optimal objective value of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ (Part (ii), Appendix EC.6.2). Combining the two parts finishes the proof of Theorem 2.

EC.6.1. Part (i) of the Proof: Comparing with the Optimistic DP

In this part, we use vector variable $\mathbf{J} = (J_1, \dots, J_T)$ to track the state of inventory of the fixed product i , where J_t is the number of copies of product i that will return to inventory at time t . Note that at each time t , a *possible state* \mathbf{J} has the form

$$\mathbf{J} = (0, \dots, 0, J_t, J_{t+1}, \dots, J_T),$$

where $\sum_{\tau=t}^T J_\tau = c_i$. Now suppose $\mathcal{Q}_{i,t}(\mathbf{J})$ denotes the per-unit revenue of product i generated by Algorithm 3 from time t to T , when algorithm starts from initial state \mathbf{J} at time t .¹² As a convention,

¹² Equivalently, $\mathcal{Q}_{i,t}(\mathbf{J})$ is equal to the total revenue of product i generated in $[t : T]$ divided by J_t , which is the number of on-hand units of product i at the starting time t .

let $\mathcal{Q}_{i,T+1}(\mathbf{J}) = 0$. We prove the following stronger lemma, which also shows total revenue generated from product i is no less than $c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1}$. The intuition behind Lemma EC.3 is as follows: $\mathcal{V}_{i,t}$ is computed by an *optimistic DP* that “imagines” the deficiency in inventory is replenished every period, and the expected revenue-to-go is a concave function of inventory level – i.e., the higher the inventory level, the lower the per-unit expected revenue-to-go.

LEMMA EC.3. *For every $t \in [T]$ and every possible inventory state \mathbf{J} at time t , $\mathcal{Q}_{i,t}(\mathbf{J}) \geq \mathcal{V}_{i,t}$.*

Proof. To simplify the proof, we first assume that the algorithm does not perform the sub-assortment sampling as the post-processing step (and hence \tilde{S}_t is the same as \bar{S}_t). We finish the proof first under this simplifying assumption. Then, we show why the proof still remains intact when we replace the assortment set \bar{S}_t in the proof with $\tilde{S}_t \subseteq \bar{S}_t$, which is the relevant case when use the sub-assortment sampling procedure in the post-processing step of Algorithm 3.

The proof is based on backward induction on t . For the base of induction, $\mathcal{Q}_{i,T+1}(\mathbf{J}) = \mathcal{V}_{i,T+1} = 0$. Now suppose for any time in $[t+1 : T]$ and possible state \mathbf{J} the statement of lemma holds. We can simply write the following update equation for $\mathcal{Q}_{i,t}(\mathbf{J})$ (following exactly the same logic as the update rule of the dynamic programming in eq. (3), but considering that only J_t products are on-hand):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{i,t}(\mathbf{J}) = & \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \left(\mathbb{1}\{r_i^{z_t} < P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \mathcal{Q}_{i,t+1}(\mathbf{J}') \right. \\ & + \mathbb{1}\{r_i^{z_t} \geq P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \left((1 - \phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i)) \mathcal{Q}_{i,t+1}(\mathbf{J}') \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{\phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i)}{J_t} \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) \left(r_i^{z_t} + \mathbf{E} \left[\mathcal{Q}_{i,t+d}(\tilde{\mathbf{J}}^{(d,d)}) + (J_t - 1) \mathcal{Q}_{i,t+1}(\tilde{\mathbf{J}}^{(1,d)}) \right] \right) \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.3})$$

where $\bar{S} \subseteq S$ is the assortment offered in Algorithm 3 for consumer t after the discarding step, $\mathbf{J}' \triangleq (0, \dots, 0, J_t + J_{t+1}, J_{t+2}, \dots, J_T)$ is the next state at time $t+1$ if no rental happens at time t , and $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}^{(\tau,d)}$ is the (randomized) state of Algorithm 3 at time $t+\tau$ if a rental happens at time t with rental duration d (where the randomness in this state comes from all type realizations and consumer choices during future times $[t+1 : t+d-1]$). Now, By applying our inductive hypotheses to eq. (EC.3) and the weak-substitution (i.e., $\phi(S, i) \leq \phi(\bar{S}, i)$ for all $i \in \bar{S}$), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{i,t}(\mathbf{J}) \geq & \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \left(\mathbb{1}\{r_i^{z_t} < P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \right. \\ & + \mathbb{1}\{r_i^{z_t} \geq P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \left((1 - \phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i)) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} + \frac{\phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i)}{J_t} \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d} + (J_t - 1) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}) \right) \Big) \\ \geq & \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \left(\mathbb{1}\{r_i^{z_t} < P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \right. \\ & + \mathbb{1}\{r_i^{z_t} \geq P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \left((1 - \phi^{z_t}(S, i)) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} + \frac{\phi^{z_t}(S, i)}{J_t} \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d} + (J_t - 1) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}) \right) \Big) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.4})$$

Note also that the RHS of above inequality is non-increasing as a function of J_t , simply because if $\frac{1}{J_t}$ increases by additive $\epsilon > 0$ then RHS increases by

$$\begin{aligned} & \epsilon \cdot \mathbb{1} \{r_i^{z_t} \geq P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \cdot \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \cdot \left(\sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d} - \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}) \right) \\ &= \epsilon \cdot \mathbb{1} \{r_i^{z_t} \geq P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \cdot \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \cdot (r_i^{z_t} - P_{i,t}^{z_t}) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as $J_t \leq c_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{i,t}(\mathbf{J}) &\geq \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \left(\mathbb{1} \{r_i^{z_t} < P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{1} \{r_i^{z_t} \geq P_{i,t}^{z_t}\} \left((1 - \phi^{z_t}(S, i)) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} + \frac{\phi^{z_t}(S, i)}{c_i} \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d} + (c_i - 1) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}) \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \\ &\quad \times \max \left\{ \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}, (1 - \phi^{z_t}(S, i)) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} + \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \left(\frac{1}{c_i} \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d}) + \frac{c_i - 1}{c_i} \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \right) \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{V}_{i,t} \quad (\text{holds because of Bellman update in eq. (3)}) \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose we use the sub-assortment sampling (Procedure 1) in the post-processing step. Performing this post-processing step does not decrease the revenue guarantee of discarding with “per-unit revenue thresholds” $P_{i,t}^{z_t}$ in Algorithm 3. In fact, showing any subset of \bar{S} (for example, the output $\tilde{S} \subseteq \bar{S}$ of the sub-assortment sampling procedure at each time) can only increase the per-unit revenue-to-go of the policy that follows the thresholds of the optimistic DP. To be more precise, look at the inductive step in the above proof at some time t . When $r_i^{z_t} \geq P_{i,t}^{z_t}$, the right-hand-side of the first inequality in Equation (EC.4) can only *increase* if we replace \bar{S} with $\tilde{S} \subseteq \bar{S}$, simply because $\phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i) < \phi^{z_t}(\tilde{S}, i)$ due to weak-substitution and the coefficient of $\phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i)$ in the right-hand-side of the first inequality in Equation (EC.4) is non-negative when $r_i^{z_t} \geq P_{i,t}^{z_t}$. The rest of the induction follows similar to the simplified case, which finishes the final proof. \square

EC.6.2. Part (ii): Comparing the Optimistic DP with the Expected-LP

In order to prove this part, we use the connection between DP of Section 3.3.1 and a related LP. This connections leads us to apply simple duality arguments to find a lower-bound on the ratio of $c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1}$ and the contribution of product i to the optimal objective value of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$.

Note that scaling $\{r_i^{z_t}\}$ does not change the ratio. Hence, without loss of generality, we normalize the contribution of product i to the optimal objective value of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) r_i^{z_t} = 1$$

Given the above observation and the Bellman update in (3), consider the following primal linear program that gives a lower-bound on worst-case value of the ratio:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{V} \geq \mathbf{0}} \quad c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1} \quad \text{s.t.} \\
& \mathcal{V}_{i,t} \geq \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \quad \forall t \\
& \times \max \left\{ \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1}, (1 - \phi^{z_t}(S, i)) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} + \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \left(\frac{1}{c_i} \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d}) + \frac{c_i-1}{c_i} \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \right) \right\} \\
& \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) r_i^{z_t} \geq 1
\end{aligned} \tag{EC.5}$$

in which we allow both $\mathbf{V} = \{\mathcal{V}_{i,t}\}_{t=1}^T$ and $\mathbf{r} = \{r_i^{z_t}\}_{t \in [T], z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t}$ to be variables (and this is an important feature of this technique). We first relax and simplify this program by switching the outer summation and max operator in the RHS of the first constraint (which only makes RHS smaller, hence a relaxation). Note also that:

$$\sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} = \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \triangleq A,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \left((1 - \phi^{z_t}(S, i)) \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} + \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \left(\frac{1}{c_i} \sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d}) + \frac{c_i-1}{c_i} \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \right) \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{c_i} \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \left(\sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d}) - \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \right) + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \triangleq B
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by replacing the new constraint $\mathcal{V}_{i,t} \geq \max\{A, B\}$ with two constraints $\mathcal{V}_{i,t} \geq A$ and $\mathcal{V}_{i,t} \geq B$, we get the following final primal linear programming:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{V} \geq \mathbf{0}} \quad c_i \mathcal{V}_{i,1} \quad \text{s.t.} \\
& \mathcal{V}_{i,t} \geq \frac{1}{c_i} \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t, S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \left(\sum_d g_i^{z_t}(d) (r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+d}) - \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \right) + \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \quad t \in [T] \quad \langle \alpha_t \rangle \\
& \mathcal{V}_{i,t} \geq \mathcal{V}_{i,t+1} \quad t \in [T] \quad \langle \beta_t \rangle \\
& \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) r_i^{z_t} \geq 1 \quad \langle \mu \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{Primal-LP1}$$

Now, we write its dual program with dual variable $\{\alpha_t\}$, $\{\beta_t\}$ and μ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\alpha, \beta, \mu \geq 0} \quad \mu \quad \text{s.t.} \\
& \mu \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) X_{S,t,z_t} \right) \leq \frac{1}{c_i} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) X_{S,t,z_t} \alpha_t \right) \quad z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t \quad \langle r_i^{z_t} \rangle \\
& \alpha_t - \alpha_{t-1} + \beta_t - \beta_{t-1} \leq \frac{1}{c_i} \sum_{z_{t-1} \in \mathcal{Z}_{t-1}, S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t-1,z_{t-1}} \phi^{z_{t-1}}(S, i) \alpha_{t-1} \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{c_i} \sum_{d < t} \sum_{z_{t-d} \in \mathcal{Z}_{t-d}, S \in \mathcal{S}} g_i^{z_{t-d}} X_{S,t-d,z_{t-d}} \phi^{z_{t-d}}(S, i) \alpha_{t-d} \quad t \in [2:T] \quad \langle \mathcal{V}_{i,2:T} \rangle \\
& \alpha_1 + \beta_1 \leq c_i \quad \langle \mathcal{V}_{i,1} \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{Dual-LP1}$$

Now, we try to guess a feasible solution for the dual program to obtain our desired lower-bound on the optimal primal objective. To this end, let $\forall t: \alpha_t = \mu c_i$ (therefore, first set of constraints will be satisfied automatically) and let all other constraints to be tight. In particular, $\beta_1 = c_i - \alpha_1 = c_i(1 - \mu)$ and for all $t \in [2: T]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_t &= \beta_{t-1} + \frac{1}{c_i} \sum_{z_{t-1} \in \mathcal{Z}_{t-1}, S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t-1,z_{t-1}} \phi^{z_{t-1}}(S, i) \alpha_{t-1} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{c_i} \sum_{d < t} \sum_{z_{t-d} \in \mathcal{Z}_{t-d}, S \in \mathcal{S}} g_i^{z_{t-d}} X_{S,t-d,z_{t-d}} \phi^{z_{t-d}}(S, i) \alpha_{t-d} \\
&= \beta_{t-1} + \mu \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_{t-1}, S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t-1,z} \phi^z(S, i) \\
&\quad - \mu \sum_{d < t} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_{t-d}, S \in \mathcal{S}} g_i^z X_{S,t-d,z} \phi^z(S, i) \\
&\stackrel{(1)}{=} \beta_1 - \mu \sum_{\tau \leq t} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_\tau, S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,\tau,z} \phi^z(S, i) \sum_{d \geq t-\tau} g_i^z(d) \\
&\stackrel{(2)}{\geq} c_i(1 - \mu) - \mu c_i = c_i(1 - 2\mu),
\end{aligned}$$

where (1) can be obtained by changing the order of summations and rearranging the terms, and (2) holds because of inventory feasibility of $\{y_{S,t,z}^*\}$ in expectation in Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$. Now, setting $\mu = 1/2$ guarantees dual feasibility as $\forall t: \alpha_t \geq 0, \beta_t \geq 0$, and other constraints of the dual are satisfied by construction. By applying weak duality, the desired ratio is at least $\mu = 1/2$, which finishes the proof.

EC.7. Omitted Details for the Special Case of Infinite Rental Durations

In this section, we consider the setting where the rental times are infinite, i.e., once products are purchased by consumers, they never return to the platform. In this setting, the inventory level of each product is weakly decreasing over time. This enables us to develop inventory-dependent discarding policies in polynomial time using dynamic programming. These discarding policies are more refined than the per-unit revenue thresholding policy discussed in Section 3.3.1 and achieve a better competitive ratio (i.e., $1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{\min} + 3}}$), which is near-optimal when inventories are large.

THEOREM EC.2. *Let $c_{\min} = \min_{i \in [n]} c_i$ be the smallest inventory. The competitive ratio of Algorithm 4 against offline Bayesian expected LP benchmark, i.e., Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ is at least $(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{\min} + 3}})$. Moreover, it runs in time $\text{Poly}(n, T, \sum_{t \in [T]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|)$ given oracle access to an offline algorithm for assortment optimization (Assumption 3).*

The proof of Theorem EC.2 follows a similar structure as for Theorem 2: we first use induction to show $\{\mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I\}$ are lower-bounds the for future revenue-to-go of Algorithm 4 (**Part (i)**), then introduce a linear program to show $\mathcal{E}_{i,1}^{c_i}$ is at least $1 - 1/\sqrt{c_i + 3}$ of the contribution of product i to the objective value of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ (**Part (ii)**).

Proof of Theorem EC.2. The running time is proved by Proposition 2, and the fact that the simple DP in Section 3.3.1 can be solved in polynomial time. The proof of competitive has two parts:

Part (i). Here we show for any product i , time t and inventory I , the future expected revenue in Algorithm 4 from product i with current inventory I at time t is at least $\mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I$ by induction on time t from $T+1$ to 1. The base case $t=T+1$ is satisfied due to our boundary assumption that $\mathcal{E}_{i,T+1}^I = 0$. Now, suppose from time $t+1$ to $T+1$, the induction hypothesis holds. Consider the algorithm at time t . An assortment \hat{S} is sampled with probability X_{S,t,z_t} . Let $\bar{S} \subseteq \hat{S}$ be the assortment offered to consumer at time t after discarding. For any product i with inventory I , the algorithm discards it if $\mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^{I-1} + r_i^{z_t} < \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I$. By induction hypothesis at time $t+1$, it guarantees to gain future expected utility at least $\max\{\mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I, \phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i)(r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^{I-1}) + (1 - \phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i))\mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I\}$. Since the choice model satisfies substitutability (Assumption 1), $\phi^{z_t}(\hat{S}, i) \leq \phi^{z_t}(\bar{S}, i)$ for all $i \in \bar{S}$. Therefore, by similar calculations as in the proof of Lemma EC.3, the induction hypothesis holds at time t , i.e., $\mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I$ lower-bounds the future expected revenue from product i with inventory I at time t . Thus, the expected revenue of Algorithm 4 from product i from time 1 is at least $\mathcal{E}_{i,1}^{c_i}$.

Part (ii). Here we show $\mathcal{E}_{i,1}^{c_i}$ is at least $\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_i+3}}\right)$ fraction of the contribution of product i to the objective value of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$. Note that scaling $\{r_i^{z_t}\}$ does not change the ratio. Hence, without loss of generality, we normalize the contribution of product i to the optimal objective value of Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) r_i^{z_t} = 1$$

Given the above observation and the Bellman update in (EC.1), consider the following primal linear program that gives a lower-bound on worst-case value of the ratio:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{r}, \mathcal{E} \geq \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathcal{E}_{i,1}^{c_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \\ & \mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I \geq \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \max \left\{ \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \phi^{z_t}(S, i)(r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^{I-1}) + (1 - \phi^{z_t}(S, i))\mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I \right\} \quad t \in [T], \quad I \in [c_i] \\ & \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} r_i^{z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) X_{S,t,z_t} \geq 1 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.6})$$

where the variables are $\{r_i^{z_t}\}$ and $\{\mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I\}$. To prove our result, it is sufficient to show that for all inventory feasible $\{X_{S,t,z_t}\}$ (i.e., $\sum_{t,z_t,S} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \leq c_i$), the value of program (EC.6) is at least $1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_i+3}}$. To see this, we relax the first constraint in (EC.6) by switching the outer summation and max operator, which provides a relaxed linear program as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{r}, \mathcal{E} \geq \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathcal{E}_{i,1}^{c_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \\ & \mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I \geq \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i)(r_i^{z_t} + \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^{I-1}) \\ & \quad + \left(1 - \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i)\right) \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I \quad t \in [T], \quad I \in [c_i] \quad \langle \alpha_t^I \rangle \\ & \mathcal{E}_{i,t}^I \geq \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I \quad t \in [T], \quad I \in [c_i] \quad \langle \beta_t^I \rangle \\ & \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} r_i^{z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) X_{S,t,z_t} \geq 1 \quad \langle \mu \rangle \end{aligned}$$

We write its dual program with dual variable α_t^I , β_t^I and γ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\alpha, \beta, \mu \geq 0} \quad \mu && \text{s.t.} \\
& \alpha_1^{c_i} + \beta_1^{c_i} \leq 1 && \langle \mathcal{E}_{i,1}^{c_i} \rangle \\
& \alpha_1^I + \beta_1^I \leq 0 && I \in [c_i - 1] \quad \langle \mathcal{E}_{i,1}^I \rangle \\
& \alpha_{t+1}^I + \beta_{t+1}^I \leq \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) \alpha_t^{I+1} + \\
& \quad + \left(1 - \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i)\right) \alpha_t^I + \beta_t^I \quad t \in [T-1], \quad I \in [c_i] \quad \langle \mathcal{E}_{i,t+1}^I \rangle \\
& \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \phi^{z_t}(S, i) X_{S,t,z_t} \mu \\
& \quad \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\phi^{z_t}(S, i) X_{S,t,z_t} \left(\sum_{I=1}^{c_i} \alpha_t^I \right) \right) \quad z_t \in \mathcal{Z} \quad \langle r_i^{z_t} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

By weak duality, any feasible dual solution offers a lower bound for the primal.

Let $q_t \triangleq \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} X_{S,t,z_t} \phi^{z_t}(S, i)$. By definition, $\sum_{t=1}^T q_t \leq c_i$. Now, suppose we are interested in generating a feasible dual assignment where the all the constraints corresponding are tight, i.e., a solution assignment for the following program (EC.7).

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\alpha, \beta, \mu \geq 0} \quad \mu && \text{s.t.} \\
& \alpha_1^{c_i} + \beta_1^{c_i} = 1 \\
& \alpha_1^I + \beta_1^I = 0 && I \in [c_i - 1] \\
& \alpha_{t+1}^I + \beta_{t+1}^I = q_t \alpha_t^{I+1} + (1 - q_t) \alpha_t^I + \beta_t^I \quad t \in [T-1], \quad I \in [c_i] \\
& \mu = \sum_{I=1}^{c_i} \alpha_t^I && z \in \mathcal{Z}
\end{aligned} \tag{EC.7}$$

Notice that Lemma EC.4 below is sufficient to finish the proof of Theorem EC.2.

LEMMA EC.4. *For any non-negative sequence $\{q_t\}_{t=1}^T$ such that $\sum_{t=1}^T q_t \leq c_i$, the objective value of program (EC.7) is at least $1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_i+3}}$.*

To show Lemma EC.4, we use a technical lemma (Definition EC.1, Lemma EC.5) developed in Alaei (2014) described below.

DEFINITION EC.1 (SAND/BARRIER PROCESS, ALAEI 2014). Consider a tape of infinite length with one unit of infinitely divisible sand at position 0 and a barrier at position 1. A sequence of q_1, \dots, q_T (with all $q_t \in [0, 1]$) and a parameter $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ are given as the input. The sand and the barrier are gradually moved to the right in T rounds. At the t -th round the following takes place. The left most γ fraction of the sand on the tape is selected and the q_t fraction of this sand is moved one position to the right. This can be defined formally as follows. Let s_t^j denote the amount of sand at position j at the beginning of round t and let $y_t^j \in [0, 1]$ denote the fraction of sand selected from position j during round t . y_t^j are chosen such that $\sum_i s_t^j y_t^j = \gamma$ and such that for some integer θ_t , $y_t^j = 1$ for any $j < \theta_t$, and $y_t^j = 0$ for any $j > \theta_t$. So during round t , a $q_t y_t^j s_t^j$ amount of sand is moved

from each position j to position $j + 1$. The barrier is moved one position to the right at the end of any round when the total amount of sand at the position of the barrier is more than $1 - \gamma$. We will use λ_t to denote the position of the barrier at the beginning of round t .

LEMMA EC.5 (Sand/Barrier Process, Alaei 2014). *For any γ and any sequence q_1, \dots, q_n , throughout the sand/barrier process the position of the barrier at the beginning of round t , i.e., λ_t , satisfies*

$$\lambda_t \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} q_\tau \gamma + \frac{1 - \gamma^{\lambda_t}}{1 - \gamma}.$$

Proof of Lemma EC.4. We now construct such a feasible solution of program (EC.7) by using the sand/barrier argument. Let $\{s_t^j\}$, $\{y_t^j\}$, and $\{\lambda_t\}$ be variables defined in sand/barrier process of Definition EC.1, with parameter T , $\{q_t\}_{t \in [T]}$ and $\gamma = 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_i+3}}$. Think of different inventory levels as different positions on the tape of sands, but in reverses order. In other words, position $c_i - I$ corresponds to inventory level I (basically, sand moves from higher to lower inventory levels). We have T number of rounds of sand/barrier process. At round t of the process, there is a total of $s_t^{c_i-I}$ unit of sand at each position $c_i - I$ for $I \in [c_i]$. The amount of sand $s_t^{c_i-I}$ is divided into selected sand $s_t^{c_i-I} y_t^{c_i-I}$ that determines α_t^I , and non-selected sand $s_t^{c_i-I} (1 - y_t^{c_i-I})$, that determines β_t^I . In summary, we construct the dual solution as follows,

$$\mu = \gamma, \quad \alpha_t^I = s_t^{c_i-I} y_t^{c_i-I}, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_t^I = s_t^{c_i-I} (1 - y_t^{c_i-I}).$$

Note that all constraint in program (EC.7) is satisfied by above dual construction. Based on the description of sand/barrier process in Definition EC.1, only c_i positions of tape will have sand (and hence this construction is well-defined) if the barrier never passes position c_i , i.e., $\lambda_{T+1} \leq c_i$. Invoking Lemma EC.5 and rearranging the terms finish the proof. \square

EC.8. Numerical Experiments

Experimental setup. In our test problems, we have six products indexed by $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$. Each product has an initial inventory $c_i = 30$. We consider consumers who choose from their own “consideration sets” (Howard and Sheth 1969, Aouad et al. 2020). Given the consideration set of a consumer, we assume she chooses a product from this set based on a Multinomial Logit (MNL) choice model. More specifically, we have six types of consumers. Consumer of type $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ considers products $[1 : j]$. Given assortment set S , she chooses product $i \in S$ with probability $\phi^j(S, i) = \alpha_i^j / (\alpha_0^j + \sum_{l \in S} \alpha_l^j)$. For a consumer of type j , $\alpha_i^j = 0$ for $i > j$ (i.e., she does not pick a product outside of her consideration set). Each non-zero α_i^j is drawn independently and uniformly at random from interval $[0.9, 1.1]$. To give consumers the possibility of picking an outside option, we set α_0^j so

that $\alpha_0^j/(\alpha_0^j + \sum_{l \in [1:j]} \alpha_l^j) = 0.1$. Note that consumers of type 1 are the most choosy ones (single-minded), while the consumers of type 6 are the least choosy ones. For a consumer of type j , the rental fee r_i^j of product i is drawn uniformly at random from the interval $[10 \cdot \eta(j, \kappa), 25 \cdot \eta(j, \kappa)]$ where $\eta(j, \kappa) \triangleq 1 + 2\kappa \cdot \frac{6-j}{5}$, and $\kappa \geq 0$ is a parameter that varies in our simulation cases (will be specified later). After generating rental fees $\mathbf{r}^j = (r_1^j, \dots, r_6^j)$ for consumer of type j , we reorder them so that $r_1^j \geq r_2^j \geq \dots \geq r_6^j$.

We consider a discrete-time selling/renting horizon of length $T = 300$, and a non-stationary model for the arrival of different types in a similar fashion to [Rusmevichientong et al. \(2020\)](#). Roughly speaking, in order to have worst-case sequence of type distributions, we intend to have an arrival ordering where choosy consumers arrive later in the selling horizon. In this way, policies need to either carefully preserve enough inventories for these consumers (in case of no rental), or take finite rental durations of products into account and carefully manage in a way that enough items return to the inventory when choosy consumers arrive (in case of rentals). To capture this style of arrival, we divide the selling horizon into chunks of equal length $\tau = T/6$. Let $\tau^j = (6-j)\tau + 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, 6$. At each time t , a consumer of type j arrives with probability proportional to $e^{-0.001\kappa|t-\tau^j|}$, i.e.,

$$\text{Probability of type } j \text{ arriving at time } t = \frac{e^{-0.001\kappa|t-\tau^j|}}{\sum_{l=1}^6 e^{-0.001\kappa|t-\tau^l|}}, \quad (\text{EC.8})$$

Note that $\kappa = 0$ corresponds to i.i.d. arrival of types from the uniform distribution. As κ increases, the arrival becomes more heterogeneous (converging towards a deterministic arrival in a descending order of types).

We consider two categories of scenarios: first without rentals (see Figure [EC.2](#)) and second with rentals (see Figure [EC.3](#)). For each category, we consider four test scenarios corresponding to $\kappa \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. In the first case, we set initial inventory $c_i = 30$ for each product i . In the second case, we set initial inventory $c_i = 20$ for each product i and consider stochastic rental durations. The rental duration of a product i for a consumer of type j is set to be the random variable $T/10 + X_j$, where X_j is geometrically distributed with a mean that is drawn uniformly at random from interval $[20 \cdot \eta(7-j, \kappa), 30 \cdot \eta(7-j, \kappa)]$ at the beginning of the simulation.

In order to measure the expected revenue of different policies in each scenario, we consider running the target policy over independent sample paths of the input (including type realizations, consumer choices, and rental durations) by doing 50 iterations of Monte-Carlo simulation. We then record the generated revenues of all runs/sample paths, and use “box and whisker” plots to demonstrate the median revenues and the resulting confidence intervals for these quantities (Figure [EC.2](#) and Figure [EC.3](#)). Moreover, we compute average revenue over all runs/sample paths as an estimate for expected revenue of each policy (Table [EC.1](#) and Table [EC.2](#)).

Policies. In our numerical experiments, we compare the expected revenue of eleven different policies/benchmarks that are proposed in this paper or previous work:

1. *Inventory Balancing* (IB): an adaptation of the inventory balancing algorithm in [Golrezaei et al. \(2014\)](#) by keeping track of inventory levels of reusable products. For our experiments, we consider a variant that uses exponential penalty function $\Psi(x) = \frac{e^{1-x}-e}{1-e}$.
2. *Myopic greedy policy* (GR): given available products at each time, GR offers the (myopic) optimal assortment at this time. This policy is a special case of IB when $\Psi(x) = \mathbb{1}\{x > 0\}$.
3. *Greedy with linear approximate of value-to-go* (GR-APXLinValue): this policy is the approximate DP policy suggested in [Rusmevichientong et al. \(2020\)](#), which is essentially a greedy myopic policy with respect to a linear approximation of optimal revenue-to-go function. See Section 3 of [Rusmevichientong et al. \(2020\)](#) for more details.
4. *Rollout policy* (Rollout): this policy is obtained by applying rollout¹³ on the static policy proposed in Section 4 of [Rusmevichientong et al. \(2020\)](#).
5. *Decomposition* (Decomp): this policy is another approximate DP policy suggested in [Liu and van Ryzin \(2008\)](#), which first decomposes the original DP across the products and then constructs value function approximations by solving a separate DP for each product. This policy is a widely used heuristics in practice, but has no theoretical performance guarantees.
6. *Simulation-based policy with random discarding* (Sim+Random): this policy is the simulation-based policy that randomly discard each product with probability γ and is discussed in Section 3.2 (Algorithm 2). For our experiments, we set $\gamma = 0.1$.
7. *Simulation-based policy with per-unit revenue thresholds* (Sim+Infusion): this policy is the simulation-based policy that assumes infusion/replenishment of inventories to compute its discarding rule and is discussed in Section 3.3 (Algorithm 3).
8. *Simulation-based policy with inventory-dependent revenue thresholds* (Sim+OPTDis): this policy is designed for the special case of no rentals. It combines an exact randomized rounding of expected LP with the optimum online discarding rules for each product to maintain inventory feasibility of all the products. We implement this policy for the no-rental scenario. See its formal description in Section EC.7 (Algorithm 4).
9. *Simulation-based policy with hybrid discarding rules* (Sim+Hybrid(i)): this policy is the first type of simulation-based hybrid policy discussed in Section 3.4. Specifically, for each product, it compares the approximation guarantees for different discarding policies, i.e., random discarding in Algorithm 2 and per-unit revenue thresholds in Algorithm 3 (as well as inventory-dependent revenue thresholds in Algorithm 4 for the no rental scenario). Then it chooses the discarding policy with higher approximation guarantee for each product separately.

¹³ In this context, rollout of a static policy is computed by first computing the revenue-to-go function of the static policy using backward induction, and then greedily picking the best assortment at each time assuming future revenues are equal to the computed revenue-to-go values of the static policy.

10. *Simulation-based policy with hybrid by Monte-Carlo simulation (Sim+Hybrid(ii))*: this policy is the second type of simulation-based hybrid policy discussed in Section 3.4. Specifically, after every 10 periods, it estimates the expected future revenue of Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 (as well as Algorithm 4 for the no rental scenario) by doing 20 iterations of Monte-Carlo simulation; and switches to the policy with higher estimated future revenue.
11. *Bayesian expected LP*: this benchmark is the Bayesian LP benchmark Expected-LP $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ defined in Section 2. It provides an upper-bound on the expected revenue of any feasible online policy (when the expectation is taken over the randomness of types, consumer choices, and rental durations, as well as internal randomness of the policy).

Table EC.1 Comparing average revenue of different policies; No rentals and $\forall i: c_i = 30$; Policies/benchmarks with * are proposed or analyzed in this paper.

	$\kappa = 0$	$\kappa = 1$	$\kappa = 2$	$\kappa = 3$
Expected-LP*	3540.84	7156.37	11277.60	14898.52
IB	3217.19	6061.12	8983.46	11223.27
GR	3010.94	5312.55	7587.48	9097.80
GR-APXLinValue	2985.39	5297.21	7203.79	9310.97
Rollout	3127.90	5514.05	7606.67	9406.78
Decomp	3054.57	5785.07	8521.41	10227.28
Sim+Random*	3185.99	6382.40	10455.97	13741.67
Sim+Infusion*	3353.12	6715.98	10415.32	13718.31
Sim+OPTDis*	3339.37	6389.41	9905.52	13723.17
Sim+Hybrid(i)*	3358.77	6392.97	10537.14	13799.11
Sim+Hybrid(ii)*	3345.92	6774.01	10827.79	14286.46

Table EC.2 Comparing average revenue of different policies; With rentals and $\forall i: c_i = 20$; Policies/benchmarks with * are proposed or analyzed in this paper.

	$\kappa = 0$	$\kappa = 1$	$\kappa = 2$	$\kappa = 3$
Expected-LP*	5224.14	10142.05	15163.47	17552.75
IB	4600.11	7864.58	10577.72	12096.74
GR	4321.88	7052.60	9191.56	10387.23
GR-APXLinValue	3860.43	5968.55	8148.01	9234.32
Rollout	3970.43	6373.85	8828.02	10012.41
Decomp	4417.60	7148.10	9484.07	10580.31
Sim+Random*	4405.69	8110.84	12139.91	13531.74
Sim+Infusion*	4576.72	8025.13	11531.98	13253.71
Sim+Hybrid(i)*	4583.40	8228.66	12109.57	13578.05
Sim+Hybrid(ii)*	4590.80	8540.15	12683.29	14223.66




Figure EC.2 Box and whisker comparison of different policies in terms of expected revenue when there is no rental. Results are based on 50 iterations of Monte-Carlo simulation.

Results. To summarize our findings from simulations we have run in this section, we consider the two categories mentioned above separately:

1. *No rentals:* in this case, it is clear from both Table EC.1 and Figure EC.2 that **Sim+Hybrid(i)** and **Sim+Hybrid(ii)** have better performance than others for all κ . Specifically, compare other policies with our hybrid policies by averaging over scenarios $\kappa \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$: **Sim+Hybrid(ii)** achieves 15.90%, 34.59%, 35.92%, 31.01%, 23.35%, 4.67%, 4.52%, 3.08%, 2.97% higher performance than **IB**, **GR**, **GR+APXLinValue**, **Rollout**, **Decomp**, **Sim+Random**, **Sim+Infusion**, **Sim+OPTDis**, **Sim+Hybrid(i)** on average, respectively.¹⁴ Notably, both hybrid policies

¹⁴ An important point to mention is that [Rusmevichientong et al. \(2020\)](#) reports a better performance for **Rollout** compared to **IB** in a very similar simulation setup. While this looks contradictory at the surface level, we verified the




Figure EC.3 Box and whisker comparison of different policies in terms of expected revenue when there are type-dependent rentals with stochastic durations. Results are based on 50 iterations of Monte-Carlo simulation.

Sim+Hybrid(i) and Sim+Hybrid(ii) are better than their components, i.e., Sim+Random, Sim+Infusion and Sim+OPTDis in almost all parameter regimes. In Sim+Hybrid(i), on average there are 58.9% products using the uniform discarding procedure, and the remaining 41.1% products using inventory-dependent revenue threshold discussed in Section EC.7. The running times of two hybrid policies differ significantly. Specifically, the running time of Sim+Hybrid(i) is almost the same as all other policies except Sim+Hybrid(ii) whose running time is 766.39x slower due to its Monte-Carlo simulation. See Table EC.3.

reason behind this discrepancy is that they recompute the approximate values used by Rollout every 100 time periods, which improves its performance. We did not recompute any of the parameters for the sake of having a fair comparison.

2. *Stochastic and finite rentals*: in this case, it is clear from both Table EC.2 and Figure EC.3 that both `Sim+Hybrid(i)` and `Sim+Hybrid(ii)` perform noticeably better than other policies for all κ . Specifically, `Sim+Hybrid(ii)` achieves 11.47%, 25.56%, 42.92%, 33.84%, 22.89%, 4.77%, 5.17%, 3.36% higher performance than `IB`, `GR`, `GR+APXLinValue`, `Rollout`, `Decomp`, `Sim+Random`, `Sim+Infusion`, `Sim+Hybrid(i)` on average, respectively. Notably, both hybrid policies `Sim+Hybrid(i)` and `Sim+Hybrid(ii)` are better than their components, i.e., `Sim+Random` and `Sim+Infusion`. In `Sim+Hybrid(i)`, on average there are 57.0% products using the uniform discarding procedure, and the remaining 43.0% products using per-unit revenue threshold discussed in Section 3.3. The running times of two hybrid policies differ significantly. Specifically, the running time of `Sim+Hybrid(i)` is similar to all other policies except `Sim+Hybrid(ii)` whose running time is 511.18x slower due to its Monte-Carlo simulation. See Table EC.3.

Table EC.3 Comparing normalized average running time of different policies; Policies/benchmarks with * are proposed or analyzed in this paper.

	no rentals	stochastic rentals
IB	1.06	0.96
GR	1.04	0.92
GR-APXLinValue	1.10	0.94
Rollout	1.10	0.95
Decomp	4.57	1.85
Sim+Random*	0.98	0.98
Sim+Infusion*	1.00	0.97
Sim+OPTDis*	0.99	
Sim+Hybrid(i)*	1	1
Sim+Hybrid(ii)*	766.39	511.18

EC.9. Application of Sub-Assortment Sampling in Advanced Booking of Upgrades

To demonstrate the power of our framework and to show why the sub-assortment sampling procedure (Algorithm 1) can be helpful in other related problems, we introduce and briefly sketch a variation of our model which we call “*advanced booking of upgrades*” in this section. This variation has applications in hotel upsell revenue management.

Advanced booking of upgrades model. Suppose a hotel booking management system would like to sell upgrade options to the users who have already booked rooms. These upgrade options should be thought of as a combination of reusable resources (e.g., upgrade to a suite, or access to parking) and non-reusable resources (e.g., breakfast at the hotel). Each arriving booking request at time t encodes a check-in time $s_t \geq t$, and customer type z_t . We assume (s_t, z_t) is drawn from known distribution $\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T$. Customer type z_t specifies the rental fees, duration distributions and choice model as our

original model. After observing the request at time t , the platform *immediately* display an assortment of possible upgrade options, the customer selects one upgrade option based on her choice model given by type z_t . Then at time s_t when the customer actually checks in, the platform finalizes the decision of whether or not to fulfill the customer's selected option. If the upgrade is allocated, the platform collects the reward. Note that at the check-in time s_t , the platform makes the decision to finalize the upgrade options based on the realized requests between t and s_t as well as their realized selected options.

Bayesian expected LP benchmark. In this model, there exists a Bayesian expected LP benchmark as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} \geq 0} \quad & \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s_t=t}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i=1}^n F_t(s_t z_t) r_i^{z_t} y_{S,t,s_t,z_t,i} & \text{s.t.} \\
& \sum_{\tau=1}^t \sum_{s_t=t}^T \sum_{z_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} F_\tau(s_\tau, z_\tau) \bar{G}_i^{z_\tau}(t - s_\tau) y_{S,\tau,s_\tau,z_\tau,i} \leq c_i & i \in [n], t \in [T] \\
& \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} x_{S,t,s_t,z_t} \leq 1 & t \in [T], s_t \in [t:T], z_t \in \mathcal{Z} \\
& y_{S,t,s_t,z_t,i} \leq \phi^{z_t}(S, i) x_{S,t,s_t,z_t} & i \in [n], t \in [T], s_t \in [t:T], z_t \in \mathcal{Z}
\end{aligned}$$

(Expected-LP-AdvBooking $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$)

Here, variables $\{x_{S,t,s_t,z_t}\}$ correspond to the probabilities that assortment S is offered to consumer t given check-in time s_t and type z_t is realized; and variables $\{y_{S,t,s_t,z_t,i}\}$ correspond to the probabilities that assortment S is offered to consumer t and upgrade option i is allocated at check-in time s_t given check-in time s_t and type z_t is realized.

Similar to Proposition 1, the Bayesian expected LP benchmark Expected-LP-AdvBooking $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ is an upper bound on the clairvoyant optimum online benchmark, and hence the weaker non-clairvoyant optimum online.¹⁵

PROPOSITION EC.2. *For any distributions $F_{t=1}^T$, the expected total revenue of the clairvoyant optimum online benchmark is upper-bounded by Expected-LP-AdvBooking $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$.*

Simulation-based Algorithm. We construct a simulation-based algorithm given the optimal solution of above benchmark and using random discarding and sub-assortment sampling as follows:

- at time t , for consumer t with check-in time s_t and type z_t
 1. sample assortment \hat{S}_t based on $\{x_{S,t,s_t,z_t}\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$;
 2. randomly discard each option with probability γ , and obtain assortment $\bar{S}_t \subseteq \hat{S}_t$;
 3. use sub-assortment sampling to match probability $y_{\hat{S}_t,t,s_t,z_t,i}$, and obtain assortment \tilde{S}_t ;
 4. offer assortment \tilde{S}_t to consumer t ;

¹⁵ All the analysis in this section for advanced booking of upgrades model is similar to the ones in our original model. We omit them to avoid repetition.

Algorithm 5: Simulation-based Algorithm for Advanced Booking of Upgrades

Input: discarding probability $\gamma \in [0, 1]$

```

1 Pre-processing: Compute the optimal assignment  $\{x_{S,t,s_t,z_t}^*, y_{S,t,s_t,z_t,i}^*\}$  of
   Expected-LP-AdvBooking $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ 

2 for  $t = 1$  to  $T$  do
   /* consumer  $t$  with check-in time  $s_t$ , type  $z_t$  such that  $(s_t, z_t) \sim F_t$  arrives */
3   Simulation: Upon realizing consumer check-in time  $s_t$  and type  $z_t$ , sample  $\hat{S}_t \sim \{x_{S,t,s_t,z_t}^*\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$ 
4   Discarding: Initialize  $\bar{S}_t \leftarrow \hat{S}_t$ 
5   for each product  $i \in \hat{S}_t$  do
6     Flip an independent coin and remove  $i$  from  $\bar{S}_t$  with probability  $\gamma$ 
7     if there is no available unit of product  $i$  then
8        $\bar{S}_t \leftarrow \bar{S}_t \setminus \{i\}$ 
9   Post-processing: Let  $\tilde{S}_t \leftarrow \text{SUB-ASSORTMENT SAMPLING}(\phi^{z_t}, \bar{S}_t, \{y_{\tilde{S}_t,t,s_t,z_t,i}^*\}_{i \in \tilde{S}_t})$ 
   /* Send a query call to Procedure 1 with appropriate input arguments */
10  Offer assortment  $\tilde{S}_t$  to consumer  $t$ , and fulfill consumer  $t$ 's selected option if it is still
   available at check-in time  $s_t$ 

```

- at check-in time s_t , fulfill the customer t 's selected option with probability one if it is still available

See the formal description of the simulation-based algorithm in Algorithm 5.

Similar to the analysis in Theorem 1, our simulation-based algorithm achieves near-optimal competitive ratio in the advanced booking of upgrades model when the initial inventory is large. As the proof is almost identical, we omit the details for brevity.

THEOREM EC.3. *By setting $\gamma = \gamma^*(c_{\min})$, the competitive ratio of Algorithm 5 against the Bayesian expected LP benchmark *Expected-LP-AdvBooking* $[\{F_t\}_{t=1}^T]$ is at least $1 - \varepsilon^*(c_{\min}) = 1 - O\left(\sqrt{\log(c_{\min})/c_{\min}}\right)$.*