

# A Reinforcement Learning Method to Select Ad Networks in Waterfall Strategy

Reza Refaei Afshar, Yingqian Zhang, Murat Firat and Uzay Kaymak  
*School of Industrial Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands*

**Keywords:** Online AD Auction, Real Time Bidding, Ad Network, Supply Side Platform, Reinforcement Learning, Predictive Model.

**Abstract:** A high percentage of online advertising is currently performed through real time bidding. Impressions are generated once a user visits the websites containing empty ad slots, which are subsequently sold in an online ad exchange market. Nowadays, one of the most important sources of income for publishers who own websites is through online advertising. From a publisher's point of view it is critical to send its impressions to most profitable ad networks and to fill its ad slots quickly in order to increase their revenue. In this paper we present a method for helping publishers to decide which ad networks to use for each available impression. Our proposed method uses reinforcement learning with initial state-action values obtained from a prediction model to find the best ordering of ad networks in the waterfall fashion. We show that this method increases the expected revenue of the publisher.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, online advertising plays a great role in the income of a company who owns websites (i.e., publisher). The publisher can easily place ad slots on its websites and increase its revenue by selling these ad slots to advertisers. The traditional way of filling ad slots involves publishers directly contacting advertisers. However, this process is not efficient for both stakeholders as it takes time and effort to find a proper website or advertisement.

Real time bidding (RTB) is the process of providing advertisements for ad slots in a few milliseconds through ad auction markets. In the ad auction system, Supply Side Platforms (SSP) are developed to help publishers in managing their ad slots and Demand Side Platforms (DSP) for assisting advertisers in making advertisement campaigns. Ad networks are entities between DSPs and SSPs. From the publisher side, whenever a user opens a website containing an ad slot a request is sent to an ad network. The outcome is either an advertisement filling the ad slot successfully, i.e. impression, or a message showing that this attempt was unsuccessful.

There are many ad networks that connect to different sets of advertisers through different DSPs. One approach to choose a particular ad network given the available ad slot is through the so called waterfall strategy

(Wang et al., 2017). In the waterfall strategy, different ad networks in a list are tried sequentially to sell an ad slot by sending ad requests. Ad requests continue till obtaining an advertisement unless a timeout is encountered or the list is exhausted.

In common practice, the ordering of ad networks is predefined and fixed based on experience of publishers. However, this strategy is inefficient in terms of time and revenue because often the first selected ad networks cannot provide advertisements successfully.

This real time bidding process is completed in a few milliseconds that takes a webpage to open. For this reason, it is important not to waste time in making unsuccessful requests to the ad networks. Besides, publishers want to maximize their revenue obtained through online advertising. Hence, maximizing the revenue should be considered in selecting an ad network as well. In this paper we focus on designing the optimal ad network ordering to increase the revenue and reduce the number of unsuccessful ad requests.

The ad network selection problem is a sequential decision making problem. At each step, the decision maker decides an ad network to send the ad request. Then, a reward is received and the next state is determined accordingly. Therefore, we model this problem as a reinforcement learning problem. In this model, the states are sets of ad requests and the actions are different ad networks. We consider the sequences

of requests for ad slot filling as episodes and we use the Monte Carlo algorithm to learn state-action values based on averaging sample returns (Sutton et al., 1998). Because there are not enough data to estimate all state-action values, we use a prediction model to find initial state-action values and use these initial values in the averaging part of Monte Carlo algorithm, given a real bidding dataset provided by our industrial partner. For each ad request, the prediction model outputs the probability of filling the ad slot when a certain ad network is selected. We then use these values to find state-action values. Finally, using experiments on real bidding dataset, we show that the expected revenue is increased if we choose ad networks based on the state-action values.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents a brief literature review. In section 3 the proposed method is discussed. The result of applying our method to a real time bidding dataset is presented in Section 4. Finally, in Section 5, we make our concluding remarks and discuss future work.

## 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

There is a lot of research on defining a method to increase the publisher's revenue through online advertising. Most of them focus on setting the floor price dynamically. There are few approaches considering the ad networks ordering in the waterfall strategy. In this section we review some of these works.

The process of *programmatic advertising* is defined as the automated serving of digital ads in real time based on individual ad impression opportunities (Busch, 2016). Programmatic advertising helps publishers and advertisers to reach their goals and increase the efficiency of online advertising. The programmatic buying and selling of ad slots prepares new environment for publishers and advertisers to better communicate with each other. Publishers may easily find suitable advertisements for their ad slots while advertisers may target suitable users, thus increasing potential product sales and brand visibility (Wang et al., 2017).

An important factor in determining publisher revenue is the *reserve price*. Reserve price or floor price is the minimum price that a publisher expects to obtain (Zhang et al., 2014). If it is too high and no advertiser is willing to pay it, the advertisement slot will not be sold, whereas if this price is set too low the publisher's profit is affected. For this reason, specifying that price is important and adjustments in reserve price may lead to increase in publisher revenue. The adjustment of the reserve price is not a trivial

issue and has motivated a lot of research.

Wu et al. utilize a censor regression model to fit the censor bidding data that a DSP suffers from these censored information especially for lost bids (Wu et al., 2015). Because the assumption of censored regression does not hold on the real time bidding data, they proposed a mixture model namely a combination of linear regression for observed data and censored regression for censored data, so as to predict the winning price.

Xie et al. present a method in which the calculation of reserve price is based on their prediction of distinguished top bid and the difference between top bid and second bid (Xie et al., 2017). They have built several families of classifiers and fit them with historical data. They convert the identification of high value inventories to a binary decision. They also convert the gap between the top and the second bid to a binary value, by assigning 1 for significant and 0 for not significant difference compared to a threshold. In the next step they use the idea of cascading (Quinlan, 1986) and try to reduce the false positive rate of the prediction algorithm by combining the series of classifiers obtained before. They inspire (Jones and Viola, 2001) who follow the same basic idea with their own feature and classification models. After predicting whether the top bid is high or low and the difference between top bid and second bid is significant or not, they change the reserve price for high top bids. In other research, the reserve price is predicted through optimizing the weight of features (Austin et al., 2016). In this paper, two vectors define feature values and feature weights respectively. The inner product of these two vectors computes the value of the reserve price. The main process lies in learning the feature weight vector. For this purpose, they use gradient descent. Yuan et al. model real time bidding as a dynamic game and adjust the reserve price by following a game between publisher and advertiser (Yuan et al., 2014). The game is to increase or decrease the current value of reserve price based on the auction. There are some other works in the context of optimizing the floor price e.g. (Cesa-Bianchi et al., 2015).

The other research area that is the main topic of this paper, is to choose proper ad networks in the waterfall strategy. Finding the best ad network for each user impression is a research topic which has gained less attention in recent years in comparison to reserve price optimization. However, it is an important topic. Sometimes there is a contract between a publisher and an ad network. There should be a balance between selecting this ad network and other ad networks that may achieve higher revenue (Muthukrishnan, 2009). According to (Ghosh et al., 2009), when the number

of ad networks increases, the most important factor in selection policy is the expected revenue. However, sometimes the better ad network may not fill the ad slot and the publisher should try other ad networks. This latency in filling ad slots may have bad effects on the performance of publishers website. In other research, (Balseiro et al., 2014) optimize the trade-off between the short-term revenue from ad exchange and the long-term benefits of delivering good spots to the reservation ads. They formalize this combined optimization problem as a multi-objective stochastic control problem. In (Rhuggenaath et al., 2018), the authors study a variant of the ad allocation problem to help online publisher to decide which subset of advertisement slots should be used in order to fulfill guaranteed contracts and which subset should be sold on SSPs in order to maximize the expected revenue. They propose a two-stage stochastic programming approach to formulate and solve the display-ad allocation problem.

Reinforcement learning in real-time bidding is also one of the hot topics during the last few years. However, most of the research in this field is from the advertiser's point of view. In research done by (Vengero, 2007), a reinforcement learning algorithm is proposed to determine the best bidding strategy. In other approaches, a reinforcement learning framework is used for assisting advertiser bidding (Cai et al., 2017). In the work of (Nanduri and Das, 2007) the focus is again on the bidder side. The focus of the work we discuss in our paper lies rather in the publisher side.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

In this section we present our method to select the most profitable ad network for each set of information about an ad request. We use reinforcement learning to find an ordering of ad networks in the waterfall strategy that fills the ad slots in the shortest time and with the highest revenue.

We use reinforcement learning to derive the best ordering, namely the one maximizing expected revenue. In reinforcement learning, an agent learns through interaction with the environment and estimates the value of each action in each state. Basically the agent observes the current state of the environment and decides which action to take. However, the publishers do not have access to the real time bidding system. Due to this limitation it is not possible to explore the state-action space and evaluate our method in the real environment. Therefore, we use historical data and consider each sequence of ad requests to

fill a certain ad slot as an episode. We estimate the state-action values for those pairs of states and actions that are observed in our historical data. In order to model an ad network selection problem as a reinforcement learning problem, we need to define states, actions, reward function, algorithms for learning state-action values and action selection policy (Sutton et al., 1998).

#### 3.1 States

Features in ad requests influence the bidding process and an advertiser uses them and decides whether to bid or not. Therefore, states should be related to the ad requests. One approach to define a state is to consider each unique ad request as an individual state. This approach is not efficient because sometimes there is no data sample for some pairs of states and actions. If the data comes from a waterfall strategy, whereby the ad requests are sent to the ad networks in a predefined order, then there is only one observed action for almost all the states. Hence, the problem is to find the best ordering of one ad network which is already solved. There is a trade-off in defining the states. On one hand, if the states are more specific, there is not enough ad requests in the RTB data obtained from a predefined ordering of ad networks. On the other hand, if each state contains large number of ad requests, the approach is similar to the predefined ordering because the method selects the same action for large number of ad requests.

In order to solve this problem, we select some of the features and partition their values into intervals to define the states. In our preliminary work, we tested different subsets of features and different thresholds on their values to find the states. Among them, the combination of *ad tag id*, *floor price* and *request order* make a balance between the number of states and the number of observed ad networks for each state. Table 1 contains the definition of these features. We also set two thresholds named  $t_{fp}$  for floor price and  $t_{ro}$  for request order to group ad requests based on these thresholds. In the new states, values of floor price are divided into two categories: below  $t_{fp}$  and over  $t_{fp}$ . The same approach has been followed for request order: below  $t_{ro}$  and over  $t_{ro}$ . Equation (1) defines the states in our model.

$$s(x_i) = ( \begin{array}{l} Ad\_tag\_id(x_i), \\ floor\_price\_range(x_i), \\ request\_order\_range(x_i) \end{array} ), \quad (1)$$

$$x_i \in D : i^{th} \text{ ad request},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{floor\_price\_range}(x_i) = & \\ \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{floor\_price}(x_i) \in [0, t_{fp}) \\ 1 & \text{if } \text{floor\_price}(x_i) \in [t_{fp}, m_f] \end{cases} & \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{request\_order\_range}(x_i) = & \\ \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{request\_order}(x_i) \in [0, t_{ro}) \\ 1 & \text{if } \text{request\_order}(x_i) \in [t_{ro}, m_r] \end{cases} & \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

$$m_r = \max_{x_i \in D}(\text{request\_order}(x_i)) \quad (4)$$

$$m_f = \max_{x_i \in D}(\text{floor\_price}(x_i)) \quad (5)$$

where  $m_f$  and  $m_r$  indicate the maximum values for floor price and request order in the RTB data.  $D$  contains all of the ad requests that we use for our method.

### 3.2 Actions

The objective of our method is to decide which ad network will be better in case of time and revenue. Hence, in the reinforcement learning modeling of real time bidding problem, the actions stand for selections of ad networks. In each state, the model decides which ad network makes the most revenue in the shortest time. There are  $N$  possible ad networks and each ad request could be sent to any one of them. Usually ad networks are selected in some predefined order depending on different situations by human decision makers. Therefore, the number of samples for each state-action pairs is different. In sum, the actions are ad networks and there are at most  $N$  possible actions in each state.

Equation (6) is the definition of the possible actions in each state. Since some combinations of states and actions do not exist in the historical data, the actions set of each state is a subset of all actions.

$$a(x_i) \in \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N\} \quad (6)$$

In this formulation  $a_1, \dots, a_N$  are ad networks. Based on these definitions of states and actions, there are more than one action for each state in historical data. Therefore, the problem is the ordering of these actions. Figure 1 illustrates the formation of a sample state and actions.

Equation (7) defines the ad requests for each state-action pair. In this equation,  $D(s, a)$  is the list of ad requests that their corresponding state and action are  $(s, a)$ .

$$D(s, a) = \{x_i \in D | (s(x_i), a(x_i)) = (s, a)\} \quad (7)$$




Figure 1: State and Actions.

### 3.3 Reward Function

We consider two objectives at the same time to decide which action is better. High revenue is the first objective. The second one is providing advertisements as soon as possible. Hence, a publisher should select an action that has the most success probability and highest expected revenue. As we cannot observe the actual revenue of selling one impression<sup>1</sup> and the floor price is the lower bound of revenue for an impression (ad request with event state = 1), we assign the value of floor price as the reward of successful ad requests. Conversely, unsuccessful attempts are penalized by the value -1. This forces the agent (SSP) to find the advertisement in the shortest time possible. Equation (8) defines the reward function of our model.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reward}^{x_i}(s, a) = & \\ \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } \text{event\_state}(x_i) = 0 \\ \text{floor\_price}(x_i) & \text{if } \text{event\_state}(x_i) = 1 \end{cases} & \quad x_i \in D(s, a) \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

$\text{floor\_price}$  and  $\text{event\_state}$  come from the ad request  $x_i$ .

### 3.4 Finding Initial Values for Reinforcement Learning Algorithm

Because many of the SSPs select ad networks in a predefined order, usually there are not enough data to estimate all state-action values. For this reason we build a prediction model to estimate an initial value for all state-action values.

In order to find initial state-action values, we first find the success probability of sending requests to a certain ad network. We use supervised learning methods. The feature vector contains information related

<sup>1</sup>This is the case for online publishers who rely on SSPs to sell their impressions.

Table 1: Information in each ad request.

Field name	Definition	Type
Event state	The result of attempt: 0: fail, 1: success	Numerical
Timestamp	time of ad request (hour of a day)	Numerical
Opportunity order	shows how many times a user has entered our system	Numerical
Country code	A code specify country of the user visiting publishers website.	Nominal
Ad tag id	A unique string corresponds to an advertisement slot	Nominal
Ad network id	Id of each ad network (Ad exchange, AdSense, AOL, )	Nominal
Referrer URL	URL of the server that shows the ad	Nominal
Referrer domain	Domain of the server that shows the ad	Nominal
Page URL	URL of the webpage containing the ad slot	Nominal
Page domain	Domain of publishers website	Nominal
Device name	Name of user device	Nominal
OS name	Users operating system	Nominal
Browser name	Users browser	Nominal
Floor price	The amount of floor price (reserve price)	Numerical
Request order	Order of current attempt in a sequence of attempts.	Numerical

to the ad request and the target value is whether selecting an ad network will provide an advertisement or not.

The dataset is provided by an online publisher, which contains ad requests that are the information of interactions between a publisher and ad networks to fill the ad slots. The publisher is an entertainment company website, using ad networks such as Google ad exchange, AOL and SpotX to sell their ad slots. Each webpage of this website has some advertising slots which should be filled with ads provided by the ad networks. In the dataset there are lots of different ad requests. The majority are unsuccessful attempts in finding an advertisement and the rest are impressions. Table 1 illustrates the features of an ad request in our data.

Our feature vector is a selected subset of the features illustrated in Table 1, which has shown to provide the best prediction after experimentation. The most promising combination of features contains floor price, time, ad tag id, request order, ad networks, page domain, device name, operating system, opportunity order, browser name and URL. From the time feature, we consider the hour of a day. In Table 1, the *Type* attribute indicates the data type: numerical or nominal. We use one-hot encoding method to convert nominal data to numerical (Harris and Harris, 2010). The one-hot encoder assigns a data column for each value of each nominal data. Hence, there are many columns for features that accept wide range of values. For instance, there are many thousands URLs in the dataset and if we use one-hot encoder to convert values of this feature into numerical data, the length of

feature vector will be very high. To overcome this problem, we use a subset of values for each nominal feature. First, we count the frequency of each nominal value in our dataset and we sort the results by inverted frequency, i.e. highest first. We then keep those values with high frequencies and group the rest under a single value name, e.g. *low frequency*.

The prediction model is applied on a subset of the dataset. This subset contains only those samples that are in a sequence which the event state of its last ad request is one. In other words, each sequence of ad requests of each ad slot contains a set of data samples that is sorted by request order and the request order of the first sample is 1. Usually, datasets do not contain explicit information about sequences of ad requests. Hence, we need to infer them. We extract the sequences by comparing the feature values of ad requests that are sent within a very small difference in time. If two ad requests sent within few milliseconds differ only in floor price, ad network and request order, while the rest of the values are the same, then we consider them as different sequential attempts to fill the same ad slot. For this purpose, we start by sorting the ad requests by date and time. Then, we make separate lists for each sequence and gradually insert each data sample to the appropriate list. Initially all lists are empty. We start from the first ad request of the sorted dataset and add it to the first list. At each stage, we compare the current add request with the last ad request of all lists. If there is a list where the last ad request has the same values with the current except for a lower value in request order, then this new ad request is added to that list. There should be

at most one ad request with event state equal to 1 for each sequence. Thus, a list is closed, whenever an impression is added. Using this method we managed to retrieve almost all ad request sequences. After this process, there are some sequences without an impression. Since we do not have any information about why these sequences are incomplete, we treat them as errors and all such incomplete sequences are removed from the dataset. The new dataset contains only those sequences that end with an ad request with event state equal to one.

The prediction task is to classify each ad request into one of two classes: 0 for unsuccessful and 1 for successful. In other words, the target is the value of the event state and the objective of the prediction model is to predict this value.

Event state is a binary variable. The classifier receives an ad request and finds the probability of event state equal to one for that ad request. Hence, for each ad request containing an ad network id, we obtain a probability which determines the likelihood of filling the ad slot. The multiplication of this probability to the floor price of the current ad request yields the expected lower bound for the revenue of the ad request. Equation (9) shows this expected lower bound of revenue.

$$E[\underline{R}(x_i, a(x_i))] = P(event\_state(x_i) = 1 | x_i, a(x_i)) \times floor\_price(x_i) \quad (9)$$

In this equation  $x_i$  is an ad request,  $a(x_i)$  is the ad network id of  $x_i$ ,  $event\_state(x_i)$  is the event state of  $x_i$  and shows whether this ad request is successful or not,  $P(event\_state(x_i) = 1)$  is the success probability acquired from the prediction model,  $floor\_price(x_i)$  is the floor price of  $x_i$ , and  $E[\underline{R}]$  is the expected lower bound of the revenue when ad request  $x_i$  is successful. Because the revenue is zero for  $event\_state = 0$ , it is not written in the equation. Through this formula we can find an initial value for state-action pairs.

These initial values are not sufficient for deciding which action to take because there is no information about the long term revenue in these values. In other words, these values are just useful to find the ad network that will provide the advertisements in the shortest time. For instance, if the success probability of an ad network is 0.9, the floor price is 0.5 and the request order is 1, this method does not care about the revenue that another ad network may make when this request fails. To consider long term revenue as well as time, we model the problem as a reinforcement learning problem. For this reason we merely use these as initial values in the reinforcement learning process. Then, the reinforcement learning process takes into

consideration the long term revenue when selecting ad networks.

The revenue obtained from (9) is used for learning state-action values. As we said before, we need these values because there are not enough data to compute all state-action values.

### 3.5 Learning State-action Values

SSPs in each state act as agents and select one of the ad networks to send the ad request. Based on the event state, the reward might be -1 or the value of floor price. The problem is episodic where, as explained in section 3.4, each episode consists of an ad request sequence. We use a policy Monte Carlo method to learn state action values. In the Monte Carlo algorithm, state-action values are obtained through averaging over all observed values in the episodes. Since in each episode there is at most one occurrence of a certain state-action pair, the first visit Monte Carlo can do well (Sutton et al., 1998).

We change the Monte Carlo algorithm in order to fit with our objectives. In our approach, the revenue lower bound (as discussed in Section 3.4) is considered in the averaging. The number of data samples used for prediction model is used as a weight for these initial values. The Monte Carlo algorithm yields the expected revenue of each state-action pair. The modified averaging part of the Monte Carlo algorithm is defined in (10).

$$Q(s, a) = \frac{\left( \sum_{j=1}^{n_1(s, a)} Reward_j^{x_i}(s, a) + E[\underline{R}(x_i, a)] \times n_2(s, a) \right)}{(n_1(s, a) + n_2(s, a)), \quad s.t. \ x_i \in D(s, a) \quad (10)$$

Where  $n_1(s, a)$  is the number of  $s(x_i)$  and  $a(x_i)$  pair in the data samples observed so far, and  $n_2(s, a)$  is the number of  $s(x_i)$  in the dataset used for initialization when its ad network id is  $a(x_i)$ . In other words,  $n_1(s, a)$  is the length of  $D(s, a)$ . Before computing the average and updating  $Q(s, a)$ , the current ad request should be added to  $D(s, a)$ .

The final output of this method is the state-action values. The publisher can decide which ad networks to send the ad requests to achieve the maximum expected revenue in the shortest time. In the next section, we discuss the results and evaluate our method by comparing the expected rewards using our method to actual revenues obtained in the dataset. Figure 2 provides an overview of our proposed method.




Figure 2: Proposed method for learning the expected revenue of selecting each ad network in each state. First, some of ad requests are used by the prediction model to find an expected lower bound of the revenue. Then, we use these expected values and new ad requests to find state-action values through Monte Carlo algorithm. Finally, greedy action selection policy will select the best action in each state.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

In this section, the results of our proposed method on real time bidding auction data are discussed. The method requires initial state-action values and uses the ad requests to learn final values for state-action pairs. For the evaluation of the initial values obtained from the prediction model, we use binary classification performance measures. Since it is not feasible to test our method in the real environment, we compare the expected revenue of selecting the action with the highest value for each state with the actual revenue obtained from the historical data. We consider the floor price as a lower bound of revenue for impressions.

The dataset  $D$  contains the ad requests of one week (20-26 November 2017) for users in the Netherlands. We use some part of this dataset for finding the initial state-action values and the rest for the Monte Carlo algorithm. The attributes of our dataset are shown on Table 1.

### 4.1 Initial Values Evaluation

In this section we discuss the result of event state prediction on the dataset that does not contain any incomplete sequences. As we will see, if we ensure that there is not any incomplete sequence of attempts, we can predict the ad network response to a request with an acceptable precision.

As we mentioned earlier, we have seven datasets that each one corresponds to a day of week in the pe-

riod of 20th to 26th of November 2017. Briefly speaking, the prediction model is a classifier that labels each data sample with 0 or 1. A zero value denotes that this attempt to get an advertisement from specified ad network will not be successful. Conversely, if the prediction result is one, then the request to this ad network will result in filling the advertising slot. Our classifier is evaluated for this task using standard classification performance measures, namely precision, recall, F1 score, kappa and ROC curve.

Through applying the data preparation explained in section 3.4, the feature vector consists of 673 features. We tested different classification methods such as Bayesian classifier, support vector machine and random forest classifier. We finally opted for the random forest classifier as it has shown to achieve the best performance on our data.

In each sequence of ad requests there is only one impression which is always the last ad request of each sequence. Therefore, the number of requests with event state equal to 0 is far larger than the number of impressions. In order to balance the dataset, there are various approaches. For example, the SMOTE NC is reported to be a good method for oversampling (Chawla et al., 2002). However, this method does not consider the dependencies between features. For instance, if the browser of all ad requests from a given user is Chrome but the prevalent browser of the nearest neighbors is Firefox, then sampling using SMOTE NC would result in an incorrect sample combining this user characteristics to Firefox. Because

Table 2: Performance measures for prediction model.

Event state = 1	Nov 20	Nov 21	Nov 22	Nov 23	Nov 24	Nov 25	Nov 26
Precision	0.7388	0.7668	0.7468	0.7382	0.7816	0.7991	0.8012
Recall	0.7165	0.7291	0.6781	0.6967	0.7486	0.7598	0.7662
F1	0.7275	0.7475	0.7108	0.7168	0.7647	0.7790	0.7833
Accuracy	0.7314	0.7549	0.7240	0.7261	0.7700	0.7844	0.7879
Kappa	0.4628	0.5098	0.4480	0.4521	0.5400	0.5689	0.5758




Figure 3: ROC curve for 7 datasets.

the number of samples per day are too high (about 1 million), oversampling makes the dataset very large and loading the data for the classifier is not practical. The samples with event state 1 are more important in our prediction model because they provide the initial state-action values for our method. For this reason, we opted for the random under-sampling method for balancing our dataset (Japkowicz et al., 2000). Using this sampling method prevents information loss, because these values are initial state-action values and the rest of data samples containing incomplete sequences will be used in the Monte Carlo algorithm.

Table 2 contains the performance measures of the prediction model. We applied the classifier separately on each day. For each day, we considered a holdout cross validation with 20% of the sequences as a test set and the remainder as the training set. As illustrated in Table 2, if there is not any incomplete sequences we can predict whether an ad request will provide an advertisement or not with a good F1 score (above 0.7). Figure 3 shows the ROC curves of predicting impressions (event state = 1) for seven consecutive days. The average value of AUC for these seven dataset is 0.74.

The success probabilities for each ad network may be obtained with a good precision when there is not any incomplete sequences. Through multiplying the probability of  $event\_state = 1$  for each ad request and

ad network to the value of  $floor\_price$  of that ad request, a lower bound of revenue is obtained.

## 4.2 State-action Values Evaluation

The application of reinforcement learning modeling to our dataset, as explained in Section 3, resulted in almost 3000 states and 5 actions. We use the initial revenue obtained from the prediction model as a weighted value in the averaging step of the Monte Carlo algorithm. There are about 1 million ad requests per day. For this reason, it is not possible to load all the data in the memory and perform the prediction procedure. However, because the reinforcement learning step requires merely one sequence at a time, we do not have to load all data into memory and we are thus able to process a large number of data samples.

As mentioned before, the dataset contains the ad requests of one week. The episodes used in the Monte Carlo algorithm are obtained by considering the chronological ordering of ad requests. We used the ad requests of 20<sup>th</sup> of November for the initialization and found initial state-action values. Then, we used the data samples of the next five days in the Monte Carlo algorithm. Finally, we compared the real revenue (based on sum of the values of floor prices for ad requests with  $eventstate = 1$  as a lower bound for revenue) with the expected revenue that is based on a greedy policy with respect to the state-action values.

To determine the threshold values  $t_{fp}$  and  $t_{ro}$ , we tested different values and found that 6 as floor price threshold and 3 as request order threshold make the best balance between the number of states and the number of observed actions for each state. Figure 4 illustrates the cumulative revenue prediction for the test dataset (red curve) compared to the real revenue earned (blue curve). The ad requests of November 26 were used for testing the method. As you can see in the figure, there is noticeable difference between the two curves. For each episode, we considered only the first ad request, because the state-action value of each state-action pair is the expected revenue of a sequence starting from that state. Therefore, if a SSP






Figure 4: Expected revenue vs. real revenue.

acts greedily with respect to the state-action values and selects the ad network with the highest value, the resulting revenue would be far more than following the predefined ordering approach.

Theoretically there are huge differences between these two values which indicate the potential of our proposed method. In the future we will test it on the real platform and compare the theoretical results with the observed ones.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

We proposed an ad network ordering method in waterfall strategy based on reinforcement learning. We modeled ad requests as states and ad networks as actions. Then, we estimated the state-action values using Monte Carlo algorithm. When a user visits a web page of a publisher, the ad network that gives the highest state-action value is chosen for making the first ad request. If this request does not get an impression, then the next ad network is chosen among the remaining ones maximizing the state-action values. This continues till an impression is obtained.

Our experimental results using real data show that our approach could help publishers not only to fill their ad slots in the shortest time, but also to increase their revenue.

We use Monte Carlo algorithm to learn the state-action values. This algorithm is useful when there are enough episodes for each state-action pairs in the data, which is often not the case. As future research, we will investigate function approximation algorithms for finding the state-action values which are not observed in the data (Sutton et al., 1998), (Szepesvári, 2010).

In addition, there is an interesting research question on how the developed prediction models influ-

ence the subsequent decision making, e.g., (Verwer et al., 2017). In the future, we will experiment the significance of each component of our method to find out dependencies between each component and how they effect the performance of the ad network selection problem.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by NWO (project 628.010.001) and EU EUROSTARS (Project E! 11582).

## REFERENCES

- Austin, D., Seljan, S., Monello, J., and Tzeng, S. (2016). Reserve price optimization at scale. In *2016 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*, pages 528–536. IEEE.
- Balseiro, S. R., Feldman, J., Mirrokni, V., and Muthukrishnan, S. (2014). Yield optimization of display advertising with ad exchange. *Management Science*, 60(12):2886–2907.
- Busch, O. (2016). The programmatic advertising principle. In *Programmatic Advertising*, pages 3–15. Springer.
- Cai, H., Ren, K., Zhang, W., Malialis, K., Wang, J., Yu, Y., and Guo, D. (2017). Real-time bidding by reinforcement learning in display advertising. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 661–670. ACM.
- Cesa-Bianchi, N., Gentile, C., and Mansour, Y. (2015). Regret minimization for reserve prices in second-price auctions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(1):549–564.
- Chawla, N. V., Bowyer, K. W., Hall, L. O., and Kegelmeyer, W. P. (2002). Smote: synthetic minority oversampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 16:321–357.
- Ghosh, A., McAfee, P., Papineni, K., and Vassilvitskii, S. (2009). Bidding for representative allocations for display advertising. In *International Workshop on Internet and Network Economics*, pages 208–219. Springer.
- Harris, D. and Harris, S. (2010). *Digital design and computer architecture*. Morgan Kaufmann.
- Japkowicz, N. et al. (2000). Learning from imbalanced data sets: a comparison of various strategies. In *AAAI workshop on learning from imbalanced data sets*, volume 68, pages 10–15. Menlo Park, CA.
- Jones, M. J. and Viola, P. (2001). Robust real-time object detection. In *Workshop on statistical and computational theories of vision*, volume 266, page 56.
- Muthukrishnan, S. (2009). Ad exchanges: Research issues. In *International Workshop on Internet and Network Economics*, pages 1–12. Springer.

- Nanduri, V. and Das, T. K. (2007). A reinforcement learning model to assess market power under auction-based energy pricing. *IEEE transactions on Power Systems*, 22(1):85–95.
- Quinlan, J. R. (1986). Induction of decision trees. *Machine learning*, 1(1):81–106.
- Rhuggenaath, J., Zhang, Y., Akcay, A., and Kaymak, U. (2018). Optimal display-ad allocation with guaranteed contracts and supply side platforms. Working paper.
- Sutton, R. S., Barto, A. G., et al. (1998). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press.
- Szepesvári, C. (2010). Algorithms for reinforcement learning. *Synthesis lectures on artificial intelligence and machine learning*, 4(1):1–103.
- Vengerov, D. (2007). A gradient-based reinforcement learning approach to dynamic pricing in partially-observable environments.
- Verwer, S., Zhang, Y., and Ye, Q. C. (2017). Auction optimization using regression trees and linear models as integer programs. *Artificial Intelligence*, 244:368–395.
- Wang, J., Zhang, W., Yuan, S., et al. (2017). Display advertising with real-time bidding (rtb) and behavioural targeting. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 11(4-5):297–435.
- Wu, W. C.-H., Yeh, M.-Y., and Chen, M.-S. (2015). Predicting winning price in real time bidding with censored data. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1305–1314. ACM.
- Xie, Z., Lee, K.-C., and Wang, L. (2017). Optimal reserve price for online ads trading based on inventory identification. In *Proceedings of the ADKDD'17*, page 6. ACM.
- Yuan, S., Wang, J., Chen, B., Mason, P., and Seljan, S. (2014). An empirical study of reserve price optimization in real-time bidding. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1897–1906. ACM.
- Zhang, W., Yuan, S., and Wang, J. (2014). Optimal real-time bidding for display advertising. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1077–1086. ACM.