

# The IID Prophet Inequality with Limited Flexibility

Sebastian Perez-Salazar\*

Mohit Singh<sup>†</sup>

Alejandro Toriello<sup>‡</sup>

December 12, 2022

## Abstract

In online sales, sellers usually offer each potential buyer a posted price in a take-it-or-leave fashion. Buyers can sometimes see posted prices faced by other buyers, and changing the price frequently could be considered unfair. The literature on posted price mechanisms and prophet inequality problems has studied the two extremes of pricing policies, the fixed price policy and fully dynamic pricing. The former is suboptimal in revenue but is perceived as fairer than the latter. This work examines the middle situation, where there are at most  $k$  distinct prices over the selling horizon. Using the framework of prophet inequalities with independent and identically distributed random variables, we propose a new prophet inequality for strategies that use at most  $k$  thresholds. We present asymptotic results in  $k$  and results for small values of  $k$ . For  $k = 2$  prices, we show an improvement of at least 11% over the best fixed-price solution. Moreover,  $k = 5$  prices suffice to guarantee almost 99% of the approximation factor obtained by a fully dynamic policy that uses an arbitrary number of prices. From a technical standpoint, we use an infinite-dimensional linear program in our analysis; this formulation could be of independent interest to other online selection problems.

## 1 Introduction

Pricing is one of the elements of a business operation with the highest impact on profitability [37]. A recent survey by McKinsey [6] shows that a 1% improvement in pricing can yield a 6% increase in profits, while in contrast a 1% reduction in variable costs can produce up to a 3.8% increase in profits. Strategic and dynamic pricing is as old as business and widely studied. Nevertheless, the deregulation of airline prices in the US in 1978 and the development of revenue management generated significant interest in pricing from the research community [43]. Despite the success of dynamic pricing from a profitability viewpoint, in many businesses changing prices too often could be considered unfair from the customers' standpoint, particularly when customers can learn the prices faced by others [21, 38, 39]. Therefore, fixed-price policies are often preferred over dynamic pricing, particularly in retail transactions [37]. Although a fixed price is considered fairer than its dynamic counterpart, it can lead to suboptimal revenues; this generates a natural tension between revenue and customer goodwill. Particularly for products that will perish over time, such as food, airplane seats, and sponsored ads, it is natural to consider price variation. In this work

---

\*Rice University, sperez@rice.edu

<sup>†</sup>Georgia Institute of Technology, mohit.singh@isye.gatech.edu

<sup>‡</sup>Georgia Institute of Technology, atoriello@isye.gatech.edu

we explore a middle ground, dynamic pricing with limited prices, using the context of Bayesian online selection and, more precisely, the prophet inequality problem.

We use the prophet inequality problem as an underlying model for online selection. The prophet inequality problem is one of the classical problems in *stopping theory*, and has recently gained increasing attention for its deep connections with pricing problems [10, 14, 23]. In the classical formulation of the prophet inequality problem, there are  $n$  nonnegative independent random variables (r.v.)  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , and a decision-maker (DM) observes their values sequentially. Upon observing a value, the DM must immediately decide whether to accept or reject the value. Accepting stops the process, and the DM gets the observed value as a reward, while rejecting the value is irrevocable and allows the DM to observe the next random variable's value. The DM's goal is to maximize their expected value. To benchmark the DM's strategy, the value obtained by the DM is compared against the maximum value in hindsight,  $\mathbf{E}[\max_i X_i]$  – the so-called *prophet value* – and the goal is to obtain a lower bound on the ratio between the DM's value and the prophet value. It is known that a simple *threshold* strategy that computes a value  $x$  and accepts the first observed value that surpasses  $x$  attains a ratio of  $1/2$ , and this result is tight; see e.g. [32, 42]. This simple threshold solution is appealing for pricing mechanism design in online sales, as we can interpret the threshold as a price [10]. A posted-price mechanism (PPM) is a method to sell items where a seller offers a menu of prices to each buyer in a take-it-or-leave-it fashion. The solution to the classical prophet inequality problem exhibits this posted pricing form, where the value of  $X_i$  could be interpreted as the valuation of the  $i$ -th buyer. Recent works have established the equivalence between PPMs and prophet inequalities in several settings [10, 23, 14].

In massive markets, assuming identical valuations is reasonable when granular information about buyers' valuations is hard to come by. In this case, the prophet inequality problem corresponds to the observation of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . Hill & Kertz [25] were the first to show that a prophet inequality with an approximation ratio better than  $1/2$  can be obtained in the i.i.d. setting, with an impossibility result showing that no ratio better than  $\bar{\gamma} \approx 0.745$  can be attained, where  $\bar{\beta} = 1/\bar{\gamma}$  is the (unique) solution of the equation  $\int_0^1 (\beta - 1 + y(\log y - 1))^{-1} dy = 1$ . Recently, Correa et al. [13] showed an algorithm that attains a prophet inequality of  $\bar{\gamma}$  for any number of random variables  $n$ .

As opposed to the solution of the prophet inequality problem for general independent random variables, which we can solve by computing a single threshold (for instance, the median of  $\max\{X_i : i \in [n]\}$ ), the optimal solution for the i.i.d. prophet inequality problem consists of  $n$  decreasing thresholds, computed via dynamic programming [25] or by sampling  $n$  thresholds from a tailored distribution [13]. These solutions are fully dynamic as they change the thresholds of acceptance as time progresses. In the pricing language, this is equivalent to every buyer observing a new posted price. On the other hand, the best fixed threshold policy for the i.i.d. prophet inequality guarantees a fraction  $(1 - 1/e)$  of the prophet value [13]. In this work, we fill the gap between these two extremes. Using the lens of optimization, we provide near-optimal solutions for the problem of selecting at most  $k$  thresholds over a time horizon of length  $n$ .

## 1.1 Problem Formulation and Summary of Contributions

The inputs of the problem are (1) a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  with nonnegative support, (2)  $n$  i.i.d. random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \mathcal{D}$  drawn from this distribution, and (3) a fixed integer  $k \geq 1$ . A decision-maker (DM) observes the realizations of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  sequentially and needs to decide whether to accept the observed value and stop the process, or irrevocably move on to the next value; the goal




Figure 1: Illustration of a  $k$ -dynamic policy, with thresholds plotted over the time horizon. For each interval  $I_t = [i_{t-1} + 1, i_t]$ , we have an associated threshold  $\bar{x}_t$ . The first outcome of the random variables with index in  $I_t$  that surpasses  $\bar{x}_t$  is accepted. In the picture, this occurs at the second value observed in the third interval  $I_3$ .

is to maximize the expected accepted value. If the DM implements an algorithm or policy  $A$ , we denote the value collected by  $A$  as  $\mathbf{E}[X_A]$ . The algorithm  $A$  is said to attain a  $\gamma$ -approximation (of the prophet value) if  $\mathbf{E}[X_A] \geq \gamma \mathbf{E}[\max_{i \in [n]} X_i]$  for any input distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ . The prophet inequality literature has focused on finding an algorithm  $A^*$  that maximizes  $\gamma$ .

In this work, we are interested in  $k$ -dynamic algorithms (or policies), which choose at most  $k$  time intervals  $[1, i_1], [i_1 + 1, i_2], \dots, [i_{k-1} + 1, n]$  and compute a static threshold in each window  $\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_k$  such that the first value  $X_i$  observed in  $[i_t + 1, i_{t+1}]$  that exceeds  $\bar{x}_t$  is accepted; see Figure 1.1.

Formally, we are interested in solving

$$\gamma_{n,k}^* = \sup_{\substack{A \\ k\text{-dynamic}}} \inf_{\substack{\mathcal{D} \text{ distr.} \\ X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \mathcal{D}}} \frac{\mathbf{E}[X_A]}{\mathbf{E}[\max_{i \in [n]} X_i]}.$$

For  $k = 1$ , we obtain the *static solution* that guarantees  $\gamma_{n,1}^* \approx 1 - 1/e$  for  $n$  large. For  $k = n$  we obtain the *fully dynamic* solution that guarantees  $\gamma_{n,n}^* = \bar{\gamma} \approx 0.745$ . Our goal is to understand  $\gamma_{n,k}^*$  for intermediate values of  $k$  and provide new prophet inequalities for the i.i.d. problem under  $k$ -dynamic policies.

**Summary of Contributions** We present an extensive study of  $k$ -dynamic policies and new prophet inequalities. We restrict our attention to solutions where the sizes of the intervals  $[1, i_1], [i_1 + 1, i_2], \dots, [i_{k-1} + 1, n]$  are fixed up front. Our first result is a universal lower bound for  $\gamma_{n,k}^*$  via an infinite linear program. This infinite linear program is oblivious to the input distribution and its solution yields a distribution for each interval that computes a value  $q \in [0, 1]$ , from which we obtain a threshold  $x_t$  via the equation  $q = 1 - F(x_t)$ , where  $F$  is the CDF of the input distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ . We characterize the optimal solution of this infinite linear program using duality. Since the optimal solution is difficult to analyze for finite  $n$ , we study its asymptotic behavior when  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $k$  is fixed. We show that the asymptotic behavior of the objective of the infinite linear program is  $\bar{\gamma}(1 - C \log k/k)$ , for  $k$  large but constant. This shows that as  $k$  grows,  $k$ -dynamic algorithms

obtain the optimal ratio of a fully dynamic solution. We also provide results for  $k = 1, \dots, 10$ , which empirically show that  $\gamma_{n,k}^*$  is already close to the optimal approximation  $\bar{\gamma}$  for  $k \geq 5$ ; see Figure 1.2 below.

## 1.2 Technical Results

As in [13], we focus on quantile-based policies. The idea is to compute  $k$  values  $q_1, \dots, q_k$  independently from the input distribution, and then compute  $k$  thresholds  $x_1, \dots, x_k$ , where  $q_t = \mathbf{P}(X \geq x_t)$ . The algorithm splits the time horizon into  $k$  windows of time and in the  $t$ -th interval accepts the first value exceeding  $x_t$ , if one is observed. The  $k$  values  $q_1, \dots, q_k$  are randomly sampled from  $k$  distributions. Our first result establishes a lower bound over  $\gamma_{n,k}^*$  and a mechanical way to construct these  $k$  distributions.

**Theorem 1** (Approximation Guarantee for Fixed Time Windows). *Let  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_k$  be nonnegative integers such that  $n = \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \dots + \tau_k$ . Then,  $\gamma_{n,k}^*$  is at least the value of*

$$(P)_{n,k} \quad \sup_{\alpha: [k] \times [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+} \inf_{u \in [0,1]} \frac{\sum_{t=1}^k \int_u^1 q^{-1} (1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}) \alpha_{t,q} dq}{n(1-u)^{n-1}}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \int_0^1 \alpha_{1,q} dq \leq 1$$

$$\int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,q} dq \leq \int_0^1 (1-q)^{\tau_t} \alpha_{t,q} dq \quad \forall t \in [k-1].$$

Furthermore, we fully characterize the optimal solutions of the program  $(P)_{n,k}$  when  $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_{k-1} \geq \tau_k \geq 0$ .

Notice that  $(P)_{n,k}$  is independent of the input distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , yet it provides a prophet inequality. Moreover, from a solution of  $(P)_{n,k}$  we can obtain a policy as follows. Given a solution  $\alpha = \{\alpha_{t,q}\}_{t,q}$  of  $(P)_{n,k}$ , we sample  $q_t$  according to the probability mass distribution  $\alpha_{t,q} / \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} dq$ . The feasible region codifies all the policies that work by sampling values  $q_1, \dots, q_k$ , while the objective is a lower bound of the ratio  $\mathbf{E}[X_A] / \mathbf{E}[\max_{i \in [n]} X_i]$ , where  $A$  is the policy that uses thresholds  $x_t$  computed via  $q_t = \mathbf{P}(X \geq x_t)$ . We reformulate  $(P)_{n,k}$  as an infinite-dimensional linear program. This allows us to use duality to fully characterize the optimal solution when  $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_{k-1} = \tau$  and  $n/k \leq \tau \leq n/(k-1)$ . The optimal solution  $\alpha = \{\alpha_{t,q}\}_{t,q}$  exhibits disjoint consecutive supports in  $[0, 1]$  for different  $t$ . As a consequence, the sampled values  $q_1, \dots, q_k$  are increasing, and the resulting thresholds are decreasing. For the case  $k = n$  and  $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_n = 1$ , the optimal solution of  $(P)_{n,k}$  recovers the distributions from [13].

We further the study of  $v_{n,k}^*$ , the optimal value of  $(P)_{n,k}$  and approximation for the  $k$ -dynamic policies, in the particular case of  $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_{k-1} = \lceil n/k \rceil$ ,  $\tau_k = n - (k-1)\lceil n/k \rceil$ . Our next result gives an asymptotic lower bound on  $v_{n,k}^*$  and hence, also an asymptotic lower bound over  $\gamma_{n,k}^*$ .

**Theorem 2** (Asymptotic Lower Bound). *There is a constant  $c_1$  such that for  $n$  large and  $k \ll n$ ,*

$$\gamma_{n,k}^* \geq v_{n,k}^* \geq \bar{\gamma} \left( 1 - c_1 \left( \frac{\log k}{k} + \frac{k^2}{n} \right) \right).$$

Here,  $\bar{\beta} = 1/\bar{\gamma}$  is the unique solution of  $\int_0^1 (\beta - 1 + y(\log y - 1))^{-1} dy = 1$ .




Figure 2: Asymptotic approximations obtained by our method. The plot represents  $v_{\infty,k}^*$  for  $k \leq 5$ .

Thus, if  $n$  goes to infinity, the optimal prophet inequality for  $k$ -dynamic algorithms approaches  $\bar{\gamma}$  at least as fast as  $(1 - c_1 \log k/k)$ . To show Theorem 2, we let the number of random variables  $n$  grow with an appropriate scaling of the time horizon  $[n]$ , and we analyze a version of  $(P)_{n,k}$  that is free from  $n$ . We call this model the *infinite model*, while for finite  $n$ , we refer to the problem as the *finite model*. We also characterize the optimal solutions of this infinite model, and show that the optimal value  $v_{n,k}^*$  in the finite case converges to  $v_{\infty,k}^*$ , the optimal value of the infinite model. We also show that the solution in the infinite model approaches the points of an ordinary differential equation (ODE) that has appeared before in the literature; see e.g., [13, 29]. This allows us to show that  $v_{\infty,k}^* \geq \bar{\gamma}(1 - c'' \log k/k)$ , where  $c''$  is a universal constant independent of  $k$ . By backtracking from the infinite model, we can recover solutions for the finite model with the guarantee exhibited in Theorem 2.

From the infinite model, we can deduce a limit to our approach with intervals of the same length. This partially complements Theorem 2, by showing an upper bound over  $v_{\infty,k}^*$  that converges to  $\bar{\gamma}$ .

**Theorem 3 (Asymptotic Upper Bound).** *There is a constant  $c_2$  such that for  $k$  large enough*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_{n,k}^* = v_{\infty,k}^* \leq \bar{\gamma} \left( 1 - c_2 \frac{\log k}{k} \right).$$

We also examine the setting with a small number of thresholds,  $k$ -dynamic policies for small values of  $k$ . As we indicated, we can obtain policies for the finite model from its infinite counterpart. Moreover, a simple greedy procedure allows us to compute optimal solutions of the infinite model, provided that we can compute the integral of  $-\log y/(1 - y^{1/k})$ . In Figure 1.2, we present some of the values computed for small  $k$ . In Section 6, we present further approximations for  $k \leq 10$ .

We remark that there is a gap between  $v_{n,k}^*$  and  $\gamma_{n,k}^*$ . One part of this gap is introduced because we use a lower bound on the ratio  $\mathbb{E}[X_A]/\mathbb{E}[\max_{i \in [n]} X_i]$ . For instance, for  $k = 1$ ,  $v_{\infty,1}^* = 6/\pi^2 \approx 0.607$  (see Corollary 13 in Section 5), while it is known that  $\gamma_{\infty,1}^* \doteq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{n,1}^* = 1 - 1/e \approx 0.632$  [13]. Equivalently, it can be shown that the dual of the linearized version of  $(P)_{n,k}$  (see

Section 4) has a feasible region that strictly contains (the inverse of) all possible distributions for the prophet inequality problem. A second part of the gap is introduced because we use intervals  $[1, i_1], \dots, [i_{k-1} + 1, n]$  of equal length. Our results show that these gaps disappear as  $k$  grows (Theorems 2 and 3).

### 1.3 Organization

We follow this section with a summary of related work. In Section 3, we present our algorithm, and we show that the solutions of  $(P)_{n,k}$  offer an approximation that implies a prophet inequality for our problem. In Section 4, we characterize the optimal solutions of  $(P)_{n,k}$  for a particular choice of size of intervals. Since the optimal value of  $(P)_{n,k}$  is hard to analyze for finite  $n$ , in Section 5, we present an asymptotic analysis of  $v_{n,k}^*$  by studying the infinite model. In Section 6, we present analysis for small number of thresholds  $k$ .

## 2 Related Work

The prophet inequality problem was introduced by Krengel & Sucheston [32]. The initial solution was fully dynamic and obtained via dynamic programming, with a tight approximation factor guarantee of  $1/2$  of the prophet value; see also [24]. Samuel-Cahn [42] showed that a simple threshold strategy is enough to achieve the same guarantee; a byproduct is that the order in which the random variables are observed is immaterial. The survey [26] offers a classical overview of prophet inequalities, while [12] present recent advancements.

The study of the i.i.d. prophet inequality problem started with Hill & Kertz [25]. For every  $n$ , they provided constants  $1.1 < a_n < 1.6$  so that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \right] \leq a_n \sup \{ \mathbf{E}[X_\tau] : \tau \in \mathcal{T}_n \},$$

where  $\mathcal{T}_n$  is the set of stopping times for  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ ; the bound  $a_n$  is best possible. Later, Kertz [29] showed that  $a_n$  has a limit  $\bar{\beta} \approx 1.341$ , which is the unique solution to the equation  $\int_0^1 (y(1 - \log y) + (\beta - 1))^{-1} dy = 1$ . Nevertheless, for finite  $n$ , the best known prophet inequality was  $(1 - 1/e)$  until [1] showed that a prophet inequality of 0.738 was possible. Recently, [13] showed that the approximation  $1/\bar{\beta} \approx 0.745$  of the prophet value is achievable for any finite  $n$ . This approach is based on quantile stopping rules, computing  $n$  probabilities of acceptance  $q_1 < \dots < q_n$  (independent of the input random variables) and converting these into thresholds via  $q_t = \mathbf{P}(X_t \geq x_t)$ . The values  $q_t$  are obtained from distributions in a similar fashion to our method, and for  $k = n$  thresholds, we recover their distribution. Nevertheless, unlike their approach, we obtain the distributions as a byproduct of an optimization problem. The idea of quantile stopping rules can be found in [42] and has been used to construct strategies for other problems, such as the secretary prophet problem [15].

The theory of prophet inequalities has resurfaced in recent years because of its connections with auctions and, in particular, with posted priced mechanisms (PPM), which are now used in on-line sales (see, e.g., [2, 10, 16, 23, 31, 40]). The first works showcasing the applicability of prophet inequalities in PPMs were [10, 23]. They show that any prophet-type inequality implies a PPM with the same approximation guarantee; the converse was recently shown in [14]. In particular,

our results for  $k$ -dynamic policies imply PPMs with few prices. The connection with pricing problems has motivated extensions of prophet inequalities with knapsack constraints [28, 16], matroid constraints [23, 31] and other combinatorial constraints [40, 18]. For an overview of prophet inequalities and pricing, see [35]. Pricing problems with limited prices have recently been studied in [3], in the context of multi-unit prophet inequalities where at most  $m$  values are selected. This model selects  $k$  prices and runs at most  $k$  passes over the values, selecting at most  $m$ . In contrast, we make only one pass over the values; see also [28, 17, 9].

Recent works have also focused on models without complete knowledge of the underlying distribution of the random variables. For the general case where random variables do not necessarily share the same distribution, it is known that one sample from each distribution is enough to guarantee (asymptotically in  $n$ ) an approximation of  $1/2$  of the prophet value; see, e.g., [4]. For the i.i.d. prophet inequality problem, more samples are required to improve the guarantee. In [11], it was shown that  $\mathcal{O}(n^2/\varepsilon)$  samples from the distribution are enough to learn it and guarantee a factor  $\bar{\gamma} - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ . This result was improved in [41] by requiring only  $\mathcal{O}(n/\varepsilon^6)$  samples. Even though in this article we assume knowledge about the common distribution of the random variables, our results extend to the sampling setting by adapting the methods from [11, 41].

Our analysis uses linear programs, and several (different) linear programs have appeared in the design of algorithms for online/sequential problems. Examples include online/stochastic matching [36, 22] and online knapsack [5, 30]. Closer to our problem is the design and analysis of algorithms via linear programs for secretary problems [7, 8]. In prophet inequality problems, the literature has several factor-revealing linear programs, e.g., see [19, 33]. Recently, [28] presented tight guarantees for the multi-unit prophet inequality problem using a linear program. In contrast to this and other works, our (infinite-dimensional) linear program is indexed by quantiles  $q \in [0, 1]$ , where  $q$  is tail probability of obtaining a value of at least  $x$ . This differs from formulations in the literature based on the support of the random variables, with most of them assuming finite supports. To our knowledge, linear programs similar to ours have not appeared in the literature.

### 3 Prophet Inequality with a Bounded Number of Thresholds

In this section, we introduce our algorithm and the main idea of the analysis. Given  $n$  and  $k$ , we split the times  $1, \dots, n$  into  $k$  consecutive intervals of size  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$  ( $\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_k = n$ ). Namely,  $I_t = [i_{t-1} + 1, i_t]$  for  $t \in [k]$ , where  $i_0 = 0$  and  $i_t = i_{t-1} + \tau_t$ , for  $t \in [k]$ . We solve an infinite-dimensional linear program that receives  $n, k, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$  as parameters and use its solution to compute distributions from which we sample  $k$  numbers  $q_1, \dots, q_k \in [0, 1]$ . We compute  $k$  thresholds  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  from these numbers via  $q_t = \mathbf{P}(X \geq x_t)$ , and the algorithm accepts the first value that exceeds its corresponding threshold. We assume the input distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  is continuous; this is a typical assumption in the literature (e.g., [34]), since we can smooth a discrete distribution by adding some small random noise at the expense of a small loss in value. We present the formal meta-algorithm in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1: Meta-Algorithm**


---

**Input:** Integers  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$ . Continuous distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  with nonnegative support. Functions  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ .

- 1 Let  $i_0 = 0$ .
  - 2 **for**  $t = 1, \dots, k$  **do**
  - 3     Sample  $q_t \sim \mathcal{Q}_t$ , where  $\mathcal{Q}_t$  is the distribution with CDF  $\int_0^q \alpha_{t,q} dq / \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} dq$ .
  - 4     Compute largest  $\bar{x}_t$  such that  $q_t = \mathbf{P}(X \geq x_t)$ .
  - 5     Upon scanning  $X_{i_{t-1}+1}, \dots, X_{i_{t-1}+\tau_t}$ , accept the first value that is at least  $x_t$ , if any.
  - 6     Update  $i_t = i_{t-1} + \tau_t$ .
- 

The meta-algorithm (Algorithm 1) accepts any set of non-negative integrable functions  $\{\alpha_{t,q}\}_t$  with  $\int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} dq > 0$ . We obtain prophet inequalities by considering solutions  $\{\alpha_{t,q}\}_t$  of the following infinite-dimensional linear program, a reformulation of  $(P)_{n,k}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ll} \sup & v \\ \alpha: [k] \times [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+ & \\ v \geq 0 & \\ \text{s.t.} & \int_0^1 \alpha_{1,q} dq \leq 1 \end{array} \quad (1)$$

$$(CLP)_{\substack{n,k \\ \tau_1, \dots, \tau_k}} \quad \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,q} dq \leq \int_0^1 (1-q)^{\tau_t} \alpha_{t,q} dq \quad \forall t \in [k-1] \quad (2)$$

$$vn(1-u)^{n-1} \leq \sum_{t=1}^k \int_u^1 \left( \frac{1-(1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) \alpha_{t,q} dq \quad \forall u \in [0,1]. \quad (3)$$

We add variable  $v$  to linearize the objective.

For the sake of clarity, we suppress the subscripts  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$  from  $(CLP)_{n,k}$ . In the next section, for the case  $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_{k-1} \geq \tau_k \geq 0$ , we characterize the optimal solution of  $(CLP)_{n,k}$ . The next result shows that we can obtain prophet inequalities from solutions of  $(CLP)_{n,k}$ ; a byproduct of this result is that  $\gamma_{n,k}^* \geq v_{n,k}^*$ , where  $v_{n,k}^*$  is the optimal value of  $(CLP)_{n,k}$ .

**Proposition 4.** *Suppose that  $(\alpha = \{\alpha_{t,q}\}_{t \in [k]}, v)$  is a feasible solution for  $(CLP)_{n,k}$ . Then Algorithm 1, run with the input  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$  and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ , guarantees  $\mathbf{E}[X_A] \geq v \mathbf{E}[\max_i X_i]$  for any distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  with nonnegative support and  $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \mathcal{D}$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\alpha$  satisfies constraints (1)-(2) at equality. Let  $F$  be the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of  $\mathcal{D}$  (and so  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ ). For simplicity, we refer to Algorithm 1 by  $A$  when run with  $\alpha$  and  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k$ . We also denote by  $M_t = \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} dq$  the integral of  $\alpha_{t,q}$  in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $Q_t$  be the random  $q_t$  selected during the scanning of interval  $I_t$ ; hence, the density of  $Q_t$ , the quantile of the  $t$ -th interval in Algorithm 1, is  $\alpha_{t,q} / M_t$ . We say that  $A$  reaches interval  $I_t$  if  $A$  has not chosen a value in the intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_{t-1}$ .

**Claim.** *The probability that  $A$  reaches interval  $I_t$  is  $\mathbf{P}(A \text{ reaches } I_t) = \int_0^1 (1-q)^{\tau_{t-1}} \alpha_{t-1,q} dq = M_t$ , with  $\alpha_{0,q} = 1$  for all  $q \in [0, 1]$  and  $\tau_0 = 0$ .*

*Proof of claim.* We prove this by induction in  $t$ . For  $t = 1$ , we have,

$$\mathbf{P}(A \text{ reaches } I_1) = 1 = \int_0^1 \alpha_{0,q} dq = \int_0^1 \alpha_{1,q} dq = M_1.$$



Assume that the result is true for  $t \geq 1$  and let us show it for  $t + 1$ . Note that

$$\mathbf{P}(A \text{ reaches } I_t) = \int_0^1 (1-q)^{\tau_{t-1}} \alpha_{t-1,q} dq = \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} dq = M_t,$$

using Constraints (1)-(2). Then, using  $q = \mathbf{P}(X \geq \bar{x})$  if and only if  $\bar{x} = F^{-1}(1-q)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(A \text{ reaches } I_{t+1}) &= \mathbf{P}(A \text{ reaches } I_t) \times \mathbf{P}(\text{No value} \geq x_t \text{ in } I_t) \\ &= M_t \times \int_0^1 \frac{\alpha_{t,q}}{M_t} \mathbf{P}(\text{No value} \geq x_t \text{ in } I_t \mid Q_t = q) dq \\ &= \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} \mathbf{P}(\forall i = 1, \dots, \tau_t : X_i < F^{-1}(1-q)) dq \quad (\text{using } x_t = F^{-1}(1-Q_t)) \\ &= \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} \mathbf{P}(X_t < F^{-1}(1-q))^{\tau_t} dq \\ &= \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} (1-q)^{\tau_t} dq. \end{aligned}$$

In the first equality, we used the independence of values in  $I_t$  with respect to values in  $I_1, \dots, I_{t-1}$ . From the first to second equality, we conditioned on the event  $Q_t = q$  and the inductive hypothesis. The equality  $\mathbf{P}(A \text{ reaches } I_{t+1}) = M_{t+1}$  follows from Constraint (2) and the assumption that it is tight.  $\square$

**Claim.** *The expected value obtained in interval  $I_t$  by  $A$ , conditioned on being reached, is*

$$\int_0^1 F^{-1}(1-u) \int_u^1 \frac{\alpha_{t,q}}{M_t} \left( \frac{1-(1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) dq du.$$

*Proof of claim.* Suppose we sample  $Q_t = q$  for interval  $I_t$ ; then, if we ever observe an  $X_i$  with value at least  $x_t = F^{-1}(1-Q_t)$  in  $I_t$ , the expected value obtained equals  $\mathbf{E}[X \mid X \geq x_t]$ . Thus, the expected value obtained in interval  $I_t$  can be computed by conditioning on  $Q_t = q$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 \frac{\alpha_{t,q}}{M_t} \mathbf{P}(\exists i = 1, \dots, \tau_t : X_i \geq F^{-1}(1-q)) \mathbf{E}[X \mid X \geq F^{-1}(1-q)] dq \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{\alpha_{t,q}}{M_t} (1-(1-q)^{\tau_t}) \frac{1}{q} \int_{F^{-1}(1-q)}^{\infty} x dF(x) dq \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{\alpha_{t,q}}{M_t} \left( \frac{1-(1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) \int_0^q F^{-1}(1-u) du dq. \quad (\text{Change of variable } x = F^{-1}(1-u).) \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows by changing the order of integration between  $u$  and  $q$ .  $\square$

Using these two claims together, we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}[X_A] = \sum_{t=1}^k \int_0^1 F^{-1}(1-u) \int_u^1 \alpha_{t,q} \left( \frac{1-(1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) dq du.$$

A similar calculation yields

$$\mathbf{E}[\max_i X_i] = \int_0^1 F^{-1}(1-u) n(1-u)^{n-1} du.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[X_A]}{\mathbf{E}[\max_i X_i]} \geq \inf_{u \in [0,1]} \frac{\sum_{t=1}^k \int_u^1 \alpha_{t,q} \left( \frac{1-(1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) dq}{n(1-u)^{n-1}} \geq v,$$

which finishes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Optimal Solution for Equidistant Thresholds

In this section, we characterize the optimal solution of  $(CLP)_{n,k}$  when  $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \dots = \tau_{k-1} \geq \tau_k \geq 0$  proving the second part of Theorem 1. Since this optimal solution is hard to study for finite values of  $n$ , in the next section (Section 5), we study its asymptotic behavior in  $n$  for any fixed  $k$ .

Let  $\tau = \tau_1 = \dots = \tau_{k-1}$  and  $\sigma = \tau_k = n - (k-1)\tau \geq 0$ . We assume that  $\tau, \sigma \geq 1$ . By abusing notation, we keep denoting the infinite dimensional linear program by  $(CLP)_{n,k}$ ,

$$(CLP)_{n,k} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \sup & v \\ \alpha: [k] \times [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+ \\ v \geq 0 \\ \text{s.t.} & \int_0^1 \alpha_{1,q} \, dq \leq 1 \\ & \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,q} \, dq \leq \int_0^1 (1-q)^\tau \alpha_{t,q} \, dq \quad \forall t \in [k-1] \\ & vn(1-u)^{n-1} \leq \sum_{t=1}^k \int_u^1 \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) \alpha_{t,q} \, dq \quad \forall u \in [0,1]. \end{array} \quad (4)$$

In order to characterize the optimal solution of  $(CLP)_{n,k}$  we use duality theory. The dual of  $(CLP)_{n,k}$  corresponds to the problem  $(DLP)_{n,k}$ ,

$$(DLP)_{n,k} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \inf & d_1 \\ \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+[0,1] \\ d \geq 0 \\ \text{s.t.} & d_t \geq \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) \mu[0,q] + (1-q)^{\tau_t} d_{t+1} \quad \forall t \in [k-1], \forall q \in [0,1] \\ & 1 \leq \int_0^1 n(1-u)^{n-1} \, d\mu(u), \end{array} \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_+[0,1]$  is the space of positive Borel measures over  $[0,1]$ . We also use the notation  $\int_a^b f(u) \, d\mu(u) = \int_{[a,b]} f(u) \, d\mu(u)$ .

**Proposition 5** (Weak duality). *For any feasible  $(\alpha, v)$  for  $(CLP)_{n,k}$  and feasible  $(\mu, d)$  for  $(DLP)_{n,k}$  we have  $d_1 \geq v$ .*

*Proof.* Integrating Inequality (6) with respect to  $\mu$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} v \int_0^1 n(1-u)^{n-1} \, d\mu(u) &\leq \int_0^1 \sum_{t=1}^k \int_u^1 \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) \alpha_{t,q} \, dq \, d\mu(u) \\ &= \int_0^1 \sum_{t=1}^k \alpha_{t,q} \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) \int_0^q \, d\mu(u) \, dq \\ &\quad \text{(Change order of integration since everything is nonnegative)} \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} \alpha_{t,q} (d_t - (1-q)^{\tau_t} d_{t+1}) \, dq + \int_0^1 \alpha_{k,q} d_k \, dq \\ &\quad \text{(By using Inequality (7))} \\ &= d_1 \int_0^1 \alpha_{1,q} \, dq + \sum_{t=2}^k d_t \left( \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} \, dq - \int_0^1 (1-q)^{\tau_t} \alpha_{t-1,q} \, dq \right) \\ &\leq d_1 \quad \text{(By using Inequalities (4) and (5))} \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows by using Inequality (8) in the first line.  $\square$

We prove strong duality between  $(CLP)_{n,k}$  and  $(DLP)_{n,k}$  by exhibiting primal and dual solutions with the same objective value. We devote the rest of the section to this task, proving the next result.

**Theorem 6.** *Strong duality holds between  $(CLP)_{n,k}$  and  $(DLP)_{n,k}$  if  $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_{k-1} = \tau$ , with  $n/k \leq \tau \leq n/(k-1)$ .*

#### 4.1 Primal Feasible Solution

Consider the functions

$$\alpha_{t,q} = \begin{cases} v \frac{q}{1-(1-q)^\tau} n(n-1)(1-q)^{n-2} \mathbf{1}_{[\varepsilon_{t-1}, \varepsilon_t]}(q) & t = 1, \dots, k-1 \\ v \frac{q}{1-(1-q)^\sigma} n(n-1)(1-q)^{n-2} \mathbf{1}_{[\varepsilon_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k]}(q) & t = k, \end{cases}$$

where  $0 = \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1 \leq \dots \leq \varepsilon_k \leq 1$ . The goal is to demonstrate that there is a choice of  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k$  such that  $(\alpha, v)$  is a feasible solution for  $(CLP)_{n,k}$ . Using Constraints (4)-(5), this is the case if

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= vn(n-1) \int_0^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{q}{1-(1-q)^\tau} (1-q)^{n-2} dq \\ \int_{\varepsilon_{t-1}}^{\varepsilon_t} \frac{(1-q)^\tau q (1-q)^{n-2}}{1-(1-q)^\tau} dq &= \int_{\varepsilon_t}^{\varepsilon_{t+1}} \frac{q(1-q)^{n-2}}{1-(1-q)^\tau} dq, \quad t = 1, \dots, k-2, \\ \int_{\varepsilon_{k-2}}^{\varepsilon_{k-1}} \frac{(1-q)^\tau q (1-q)^{n-2}}{1-(1-q)^\tau} dq &= \int_{\varepsilon_{k-1}}^{\varepsilon_k} \frac{q(1-q)^{n-2}}{1-(1-q)^\sigma} dq, \end{aligned}$$

and  $\varepsilon_k = 1$ ; this last constraint on  $\varepsilon_k$  is necessary to satisfy Constraint (6). From this system of equations, for a fixed  $v \geq 0$  we can define  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(v)$  uniquely. Once  $\varepsilon_1$  is defined,  $\varepsilon_2$  is uniquely defined by  $\varepsilon_1$ , itself defined as a function of  $v$ . In general, every  $\varepsilon_t$  is uniquely defined as a function of  $v$ . In the next proposition we show that the  $\varepsilon_t$  are decreasing as a function of  $v$ , and that there is a  $v^* \geq 0$  such that  $\varepsilon_k(v^*) = 1$ .

**Proposition 7.** *For  $t = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon_t(v)$  is differentiable and strictly decreasing in  $v$ . Moreover,  $\varepsilon'_t \leq -1/(v^2 n(n-1))$ .*

The proof of this proposition is deferred to Appendix A. As a corollary, we obtain that  $\alpha$  defined as above is feasible for  $(CLP)_{n,k}$ .

**Corollary 8.** *There is a  $v^* > 0$  such that  $\varepsilon_k(v^*) = 1$ . Hence, the solution  $(\alpha, v^*)$  is feasible for  $(CLP)_{n,k}$  and has objective value equal to  $v^*$ . Thus,  $v_{n,k}^* \geq v^*$ .*

*Proof.* A simple calculation shows that  $\varepsilon_k(1) < 1$  (see Proposition 21 in Appendix A). Also, for any differentiable function  $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$  such that  $f'(x) \leq -c/x^2$  we must have  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f(x) = +\infty$  (here  $c$  is a constant). Thus, using the previous proposition, we can find a value  $0 < v^* < 1$  such that  $\varepsilon_k = \varepsilon_k(v^*) = 1$ . The remaining conclusions follow from the construction of  $\alpha$  and  $v^*$ .  $\square$

#### 4.2 Dual Feasible Solution and Strong Duality

In this subsection, we construct a feasible solution for  $(DLP)_{n,k}$  with objective value  $v^*$ . This shows that strong duality holds and  $v_{n,k}^* = v^*$ . Let  $\varepsilon_1 \leq \dots \leq \varepsilon_k$  be the values obtained in the previous

subsection. We define a set of auxiliary quantities that help define a measure  $\mu$ . With this measure  $\mu$ , we define a sequence of  $d = \{d_t\}_{t \in [k]}$  such that  $(\mu, d)$  is feasible for  $(DLP)_{n,k}$  and has objective value  $d_1 = v^*$ . Recall that  $\tau = \tau_1 = \dots = \tau_{k-1}$  and  $\sigma = \tau_k$ . For  $r = 1, \dots, k-1$ , let

$$h_r = (1 - \varepsilon_r)^{\tau_{r+1}} \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_r)^{\tau_t}}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_r)^{\tau_{t+1}}} \right)$$

and

$$a_t = v^* \left( \frac{1 + \sum_{s=t}^{k-1} \prod_{r=s}^{k-1} h_r}{1 + \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} \prod_{r=s}^{k-1} h_r} \right).$$

These values hold several important properties that we list in the following proposition. The proof is a simple calculation, skipped for brevity.

**Proposition 9.** *The values  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  satisfy the following properties:*

1. For any  $t \leq k-1$ ,  $a_t \geq a_{t+1}$ .
2. For any  $t \leq k-1$ ,  $\frac{(a_t - a_{t+1})(1 - \varepsilon_t)^{\tau_t} \varepsilon_t}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_t)^{\tau_t}} = \frac{(a_{t+1} - a_{t+2})(1 - \varepsilon_t)^{\tau_{t+1}} \varepsilon_t}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_t)^{\tau_{t+1}}}$ .
3. For any  $t \leq k-1$ ,  $(a_t - a_{t+1}) = (a_{t+1} - a_{t+2})h_t$ .

Now, consider the function  $F$  defined over  $[0, 1]$  as

$$F(q) = \sum_{t=1}^k \frac{(a_t - a_{t+1})(1 - q)^{\tau_t} q}{1 - (1 - q)^{\tau_t}} \mathbf{1}_{[\varepsilon_{t-1}, \varepsilon_t)}(q),$$

with  $a_{k+1} = 0$ ,  $\tau = \tau_1 = \dots = \tau_{k-1}$  and  $\sigma = \tau_k$ . Then, by the construction of  $a_1, \dots, a_k$ ,  $F$  is continuous over  $[0, 1)$ . Moreover,  $F$  is strictly increasing, which can be verified by deriving the function  $F$  in each interval  $(\varepsilon_{t-1}, \varepsilon_t)$ .

We extend  $F$  to  $\mathbf{R}$  by setting the extension to 0 in  $(-\infty, 0)$  and  $F(1)$  in  $[1, +\infty)$ . We keep denoting this extension by  $F$ . The function  $F$  is right-continuous and nondecreasing. Thus, we can define the Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure  $\mu_F$  generated by the function  $F$  (see Chapter 1 in [20]). Note that  $\mu_F \in \mathcal{M}_+[0, 1]$ ,  $\mu_F(0, q] = F(q) - F(0)$  and  $\mu[0, q] = F(q)$ .

We construct  $d_k, d_{k-1}, \dots, d_1$  to satisfy Constraints (7) as

$$\begin{aligned} d_t &= \sup_{q \in [0, 1]} \left\{ \left( \frac{1 - (1 - q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) \mu_F[0, q] + (1 - q)^{\tau_t} d_{t+1} \right\} \\ &= \sup_{q \in [0, 1]} \left\{ \left( \frac{1 - (1 - q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) F(q) + (1 - q)^{\tau_t} d_{t+1} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with  $d_{k+1} = 0$ .

**Lemma 10.** *The solution  $(\mu_F, v)$  is feasible for  $(DLP)_{n,k}$ . Moreover, it has objective value  $d_1 = v^*$ .*

In the rest of this subsection, we present the proof of this lemma. We verify first that  $\mu_F$  satisfies Constraint (8); indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 n(1-u)^{n-1} d\mu_F(u) &= \int_0^1 n(n-1) \int_u^1 (1-q)^{n-2} dq d\mu_F(u) \\
&= n(n-1) \int_0^1 \int_0^q d\mu_F(u) (1-q)^{n-2} dq \\
&= n(n-1) \sum_{t=1}^k \int_{\varepsilon_{t-1}}^{\varepsilon_t} \frac{(a_t - a_{t+1}(1-q)^{\tau_t})q}{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}} (1-q)^{n-2} dq \\
&= n(n-1) \left( a_1 \int_0^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{q(1-q)^{n-2}}{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_1}} dq \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} a_{t+1} \left( \int_{\varepsilon_t}^{\varepsilon_{t+1}} \frac{q(1-q)^{n-2}}{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_{t+1}}} dq - \int_{\varepsilon_{t-1}}^{\varepsilon_t} \frac{q(1-q)^{\tau_t+n-2}}{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}} dq \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{a_1}{v^*} = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

By construction,  $(\mu_F, v)$  satisfies Constraint (7). To finish the proof of Lemma 10, we need to show that  $d_1 = v^*$ . This is a consequence of the following more general result.

**Proposition 11.** *For any  $t = 1, \dots, k$ , we have  $d_t = a_t$ . In particular, for  $t = 1$ ,  $d_1 = a_1 = v^*$ .*

To prove this proposition we define  $g_t(q) = (1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t})q^{-1}F(q) + (1-q)^{\tau_t}a_{t+1}$ . Starting at  $t = k$ , we show that  $d_k = \sup_{s \in [k]} \{g_k(\varepsilon_s)\}$  and that  $g_k(\varepsilon_1) \leq \dots \leq g_k(\varepsilon_k) = a_k$ . This shows  $d_k = a_k$ . Now, assuming that the result is true for  $t + 1$ , we can proceed by backward induction and show that  $d_t = \sup\{\sup_{s \leq t} \{g_t(\varepsilon_s)\}, \sup_{s > t} \{g_t(\varepsilon_{s-1})\}\}$ . We again show  $g_t(\varepsilon_1) \leq \dots \leq g_t(\varepsilon_t) = a_t$  and  $g_t(\varepsilon_{k-1}) \leq g_t(\varepsilon_{k-2}) \leq \dots \leq g_t(\varepsilon_t) = a_t$  and this shows  $d_t = a_t$ . We defer the details to Appendix A.

## 5 Asymptotic Analysis

We characterized the optimal solution of  $(CLP)_{n,k}$  in the previous section. This characterization is implicit in terms of  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k$ , and thus not easy to analyze for finite  $n$ . In this section, we focus on analyzing the optimal value  $v_{n,k}^*$  for  $k$  fixed and large values of  $n$ . For this, we let  $n$  go to infinity and study a model independent of  $n$  that we call the *infinite model*. We also show that the infinite model is not far from the finite model; specifically, we show that  $v_{n,k}^*$  converges to the optimal value  $v_{\infty,k}^*$  of the infinite model, and, as a byproduct of our analysis, we show that from solutions to the infinite model, we can recover solutions to the finite model (see Theorem 14).

Our approach can be interpreted as follows. By re-scaling the index  $q \in [0, 1]$  in both  $(CLP)_{n,k}$  and  $(DLP)_{n,k}$  via the transformation  $q = -\log y/n$  and letting  $n$  go to infinity, we obtain two new problems that are independent of  $n$ . The limits of these optimization problems are

$$\begin{array}{ll} \sup & v \\ \omega: [k] \times [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+ & \\ v \geq 0 & \\ \text{s.t.} & \int_0^1 \frac{\omega_{1,y}}{y} dy \leq 1 \end{array} \quad (9)$$

$$(CLP)_{\infty,k} \quad \int_0^1 \frac{\omega_{t+1,y}}{y} dy \leq \int_0^1 y^{1/k} \frac{\omega_{t,y}}{y} dy \quad \forall t \in [k-1] \quad (10)$$

$$v\bar{y} \leq \sum_{t=1}^k \int_0^{\bar{y}} \left( \frac{1-y^{1/k}}{-y \log y} \right) \omega_{t,y} dy \quad \forall \bar{y} \in [0,1], \quad (11)$$

and

$$(DLP)_{\infty,k} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \inf & d_1 \\ \bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_+[0,1] & \\ d \geq 0 & \\ \text{s.t.} & d_t \geq \left( \frac{1-\bar{y}^{1/k}}{-\log \bar{y}} \right) \bar{\mu}[\bar{y}, 1] + \bar{y}^{1/k} d_{t+1} \quad \forall t \in [k], \forall \bar{y} \in [0,1] \end{array} \quad (12)$$

$$1 \leq \int_{[0,1]} y d\bar{\mu}(y). \quad (13)$$

**Proposition 12** (Existence of Solutions and Strong Duality). *(DLP) $_{\infty,k}$  and (CLP) $_{\infty,k}$  both have finite optimal solutions and their optimal values coincide.*

The proof is similar to the analogous proof for finite  $n$ , and is deferred to the Appendix. As in the previous section, we can characterize the optimal solution of (CLP) $_{\infty,k}$  as

$$\omega_{t,y} = -v_{\infty,k}^* \frac{y \log y}{1-y^{1/k}} \mathbf{1}_{(y_t, y_{t-1})}(y),$$

with  $y_0 = 1 \geq y_1 \geq \dots \geq y_k = 0$ , and  $v_{\infty,k}^*$  is the optimal value of (CLP) $_{\infty,k}$ . A byproduct of this characterization is the following simple result.

**Corollary 13.** *For  $k = 1$ , we have  $v_{\infty,1}^* = 6/\pi^2$ .*

*Proof.* For  $k = 1$ , the optimal solution of (CLP) $_{\infty,1}$  becomes

$$\omega_{1,y} = -v_{\infty,1}^* \frac{y \log y}{1-y}.$$

The value  $v_{\infty,1}^*$  is then determined by

$$v_{\infty,1}^* = \left( \int_0^1 -\frac{\log y}{1-y} dy \right)^{-1} = \left( \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k^2} \right)^{-1} = \frac{6}{\pi^2}.$$

□

Notice that  $v_{\infty,k}^*$  is also defined implicitly as a function of  $y_1, \dots, y_k$ . In Section 5.1, we show that  $y_1, \dots, y_k$  converge to the points produced by an ODE. This will allow us to produce tight guarantees for  $v_{\infty,k}^*$ . Before this, we show that the finite model converges to the infinite model.

**Theorem 14.** *Fix  $k \geq 1$ . There is a constant  $c > 0$  such that for large  $n$*

$$v_{\infty,k}^* \left( 1 + 4 \frac{\log y_{k-1}}{n-1} - c \frac{k^2}{n} \right) \leq v_{n,k}^* \leq v_{\infty,k}^* (1 + c_{n,k}),$$

where  $c_{n,k} \rightarrow 0$  in  $n$  for  $k$  fixed. In particular, since  $y_{k-1}$  does not depend on  $n$ , we have  $v_{n,k}^* \rightarrow v_{\infty,k}^*$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

In the next subsection we show that  $y_{k-1} \geq 1/32k$ . Hence, the theorem implies a prophet inequality guarantee of  $v_{n,k}^* \geq v_{\infty,k}^*(1 - Ck^2/n)$ , where  $C$  is a constant. It is worth remarking that Corollary 13 and Theorem 14 imply  $v_{n,1}^* \rightarrow 6/\pi^2$ ; hence, the objective value of  $(P)_{n,1}$  has a gap with the best prophet inequality for nonadaptive policies.

To prove Theorem 14, we use the optimal solution of  $(CLP)_{\infty,k}$ , still denoted  $(\omega, v_{\infty,k}^*)$ , and we construct a solution  $(\alpha, v^*)$  of  $(CLP)_{n,k}$ , where the value  $v^*$  approaches  $v_{\infty,k}^*$ . This shows the lower bound for  $v_{n,k}^*$ . For the upper bound, we use the optimal solution  $(\bar{\mu}, d)$  of  $(DLP)_{\infty,k}$  and construct a solution  $(\mu, d^*)$  of  $(DLP)_{n,k}$ , where  $d_1^*$  is at most  $v_{\infty,k}^*(1 + c_{n,k})$ . In the remainder of the section, we prove the lower bound, because it also presents a way to construct policies from the infinite model. The term  $c_{n,k}$  in the upper bound of Theorem 14 converges to 0 due to Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem and it does not have a closed form that depends only on  $k$  and  $n$  as the lower bound does. We defer the complete proof of Theorem 14 to Appendix B.

## 5.1 Approximation of the Limit Guarantee

In this subsection, we prove tight bounds on  $v_{\infty,k}^*$  for large values of  $k$ , showing that  $v_{\infty,k}^* \rightarrow \bar{\gamma}$  when  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . More specifically, we show the following result.

**Theorem 15.** *There are constants  $a, b \geq 0$  such that for  $k$  large enough,*

$$\bar{\gamma} \left(1 - a \frac{\log k}{k}\right) \leq v_{\infty,k}^* \leq \bar{\gamma} \left(1 - b \frac{\log k}{k}\right),$$

where  $\bar{\beta} = 1/\bar{\gamma} \approx 1.341$  is the unique solution of  $\int_0^1 (w(1 - \log w) + (\beta - 1))^{-1} dw = 1$ .

The idea of the proof is the following. For  $k$  large enough, the values  $1 = y_0 \geq y_1 \geq \dots \geq y_{k-1} \geq y_k = 0$  that define the optimal solution of  $(CLP)_{\infty,k}$  approach points in the solution of the ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$\begin{aligned} w'(t) &= w(t)(\log w(t) - 1) - (\bar{\beta} - 1) \\ w(0) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Specifically, we show that the sequence  $x_t$  defined by Euler's method (see Chapter 1 of [27]) of the ODE is  $\mathcal{O}(\log k/k)$  away from  $y_t$ . This allows us to produce an approximate upper bound of  $y_t$  in terms of  $w(t/k)$ , where  $w$  is the solution of the ODE. If  $\beta_{\infty,k}^*$  were larger than  $(1 + c)\bar{\beta}$ , with  $c = \mathcal{O}(\log k/k)$ , our bound would imply  $y_k < 0$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $\beta_{\infty,k}^* \leq (1 + c)\bar{\beta}$ , which means  $v_{\infty,k}^* \geq \bar{\gamma}(1 - c)$ . The proof of the upper bound is similar. In the remainder of the section, we formalize each of these steps for the lower bound on  $v_{\infty,k}^*$ ; we defer the details of the upper bound to Appendix B.4.

To ease notation, we write  $\beta^*$  for  $\beta_{\infty,k}^*$ . We also assume  $\beta^* \geq 1.25$ , which we validate later. From the solution  $(\omega, 1/\beta^*)$  of  $(CLP)_{\infty,k}$ , we can deduce that the sequence  $1 = y_0 \geq y_1 \geq \dots \geq y_{k-1} \geq y_k = 0$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^* &= \int_{y_1}^{y_0} \frac{-\log y}{1 - y^{1/k}} dy \\ \int_{y_{t+1}}^{y_t} \frac{-y^{1/k} \log y}{1 - y^{1/k}} dy &= \int_{y_t}^{y_{t-1}} \frac{-\log y}{1 - y^{1/k}} dy \quad t = 1, \dots, k-1. \end{aligned}$$

From this system, we obtain the implicit recursion

$$\int_{y_{t+1}}^{y_t} \frac{-\log y}{1 - y^{1/k}} dy = \beta^* - 1 + y_t(1 - \log y_t), \quad (14)$$

for  $t = 0, \dots, k - 1$ . Note that the right-hand side of this expression corresponds to the negative of the ODE right-hand side if we replace  $w(t)$  by  $y_t$ . From here, we can extract a sequence defined as

$$x_0 = 0 \\ x_{t+1} = \max \left\{ 0, x_t - \frac{1}{k} ((\beta^* - 1) + x_t(1 - \log x_t)) \right\}.$$

This sequence can be interpreted as the output of Euler's method applied to the ODE with step-size  $1/k$ . We can then show the following lemma.

**Lemma 16.** *For any  $t = 0, 1, \dots, k$ ,  $x_t \leq y_t \leq x_t + 4 \log(32k)/k$ .*

For the proof of this lemma, we define an additional sequence  $z_t$  that can also be interpreted the output of Euler's method with a slightly different step size. We show that  $x_t \leq y_t \leq z_t \leq x_t + 4 \log(32k)/k$ , from which the result follows; the details are deferred to Appendix B.3.

Let  $w$  be the solution of the ODE; since  $\beta^* \geq \bar{\beta}$ ,  $w(\rho^*) = 0$  for some  $\rho^* \in [0, 1]$ . We extend  $w$  to  $[0, 1]$  by setting  $w(t) = 0$  for  $t \in [\rho^*, 1]$ , and keep denoting this extension by  $w$ .

**Lemma 17.** *For any  $t = 0, 1, \dots, k$ ,  $x_t \leq w(t/k)$ .*

The proof of this lemma is by induction in  $t$ , and is similar to the proof of Lemma 7 in [13]. However, there are some technical details that must be addressed in our case, since we are utilizing a different sequence of points to approximate  $w(t/k)$ . We defer the proof to Appendix B.3.

Before presenting the bound over  $\beta^*$ , we need to quantify  $\rho^*$ . Using Equation (14), we can show that  $y_{k-\ell} \geq \ell/(32k)$  (see Proposition 27 in Appendix B.3). This result combined with Lemmas 16 and 17 show that  $\rho^* \geq 1 - 256 \log(32k)/k$ .

Now, let  $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \rho^*]$  be the inverse function of  $w$ , the solution of the ODE. We show in the Appendix that  $w$  is strictly decreasing and at least twice differentiable, which implies that  $\rho$  is also strictly decreasing and differentiable. Then,

$$\rho(1) - \rho(0) = \int_0^1 \rho'(w) dw = \int_0^1 (w'(\rho(w)))^{-1} dw = \int_0^1 \frac{-dw}{(\beta^* - 1) + w(1 - \log w)}.$$

Thus,

$$\int_0^1 \frac{dw}{\beta^* - 1 + w(1 - \log w)} = \rho^* \geq 1 - c,$$

where  $c = 256 \log(32k)/k$ .

Let  $I(\beta) = \int_0^1 (\beta - 1 + w(1 - \log w))^{-1} dw$ . Function  $I$  is strictly decreasing and for  $\bar{\beta} \approx 1.341$  we have  $I(\bar{\beta}) = 1$ ; see, e.g. [29, 13].

**Lemma 18.** *We have  $\beta^* \leq \bar{\beta}(1 + 2c)$ .*



*Proof.* By contradiction, assume that  $\beta^* > \bar{\beta}(1 + 2c)$ . Now, for any  $w \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$(1 + 2c)\bar{\beta} - 1 + w(1 - \log w) \geq (1 + 2c)(\bar{\beta} - 1 + w(1 - \log w)).$$

Thus, rearranging this last inequality and integrating over  $w \in [0, 1]$ , we obtain

$$I((1 + 2c)\bar{\beta}) \leq \frac{1}{1 + 2c} I(\bar{\beta}) = \frac{1}{1 + 2c} < 1 - c \leq \rho^* = I(\beta^*).$$

Using the monotonicity of  $I$ ,  $\beta^* \leq (1 + 2c)\bar{\beta}$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

This result implies

$$v_{\infty, k}^* = \frac{1}{\beta^*} \geq \bar{\gamma}(1 - 2c) = \bar{\gamma} \left( 1 - 512 \frac{\log(32k)}{k} \right),$$

which finishes the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 15. The proof of the upper bound is similar; the details are in Appendix B.4.

## 6 Prophet Inequalities for a Small Number of Thresholds

### 6.1 Prophet Inequality for $k = 2$ Thresholds

In this subsection, we numerically compute the prophet inequality that our methodology attains for  $k = 2$  thresholds. We work with the infinite model, and parameterize our solution via  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , such that  $\tau_1 = \theta n$  in the finite model. Optimizing over  $\theta$  then gives the optimal threshold.

Repeating the same process as in the previous section, we can compute  $v_{\infty, 2}^*(\alpha)$  by solving

$$\begin{aligned} (CLP)_{\infty, 2}(\theta) \quad & \sup_{\omega \geq 0} \quad \inf_{\bar{y} \in [0, 1]} \left\{ \int_0^{\bar{y}} \left( \frac{1 - y^\theta}{-\log y} \right) \omega_{1, y} + \left( \frac{1 - y^{1-\theta}}{-\log y} \right) \omega_{2, y} \, dy \right\} \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \int_0^1 \frac{\omega_{1, y}}{y} \, dy \leq 1 \\ & \quad \int_0^1 \frac{\omega_{2, y}}{y} \, dy \leq \int_0^1 y^\theta \frac{\omega_{1, y}}{y} \, dy, \end{aligned}$$

with  $\theta \geq 1/2$ ; recall that our guarantees work for  $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2$ , which in the infinite model translates into  $\theta \geq 1/2$ . For any  $0 < v \leq v_{\infty, 2}^*(\theta)$ , we can construct feasible solutions of the form

$$\bar{\omega}_{1, y} = -v \frac{y \log y}{1 - y^\theta} \mathbf{1}_{(y_1, y_0)}(y), \quad \bar{\omega}_{2, y} = -v \frac{y \log y}{1 - y^{1-\theta}} \mathbf{1}_{(y_2, y_1)}(y),$$

where  $y_0 = 1$ ,  $y_1 \in [0, 1]$  and  $y_2 = 0$ . The existence of  $y_1 \in [0, 1]$  such that  $(\bar{\omega}_{t, \cdot})_{t=1, 2}$  is a feasible solution to  $(CLP)_{\infty, 2}(\theta)$  can be deduced from Proposition 7 and the limit model; we skip details for brevity. Note that the value  $y_1$  is implicitly defined in terms of  $v$ . To find  $y_1$ , we proceed as follows. Let  $H_\varphi(x) = \int_0^x -(1 - y^\varphi)^{-1} \log y \, dy$  with  $\varphi \in \{\theta, 1 - \theta\}$ . Note that

$$H_\theta(y_0) - H(y_1) = \frac{1}{v} \int_0^1 \frac{\bar{\omega}_{t, 1}}{y} \, dy \quad \text{and} \quad H_{1-\theta}(y_1) - H_{1-\theta}(y_2) = \frac{1}{v} \int_0^1 \frac{\bar{\omega}_{t, 2}}{y} \, dy.$$

Then, from the constraints of  $(CLP)_{\infty,2}(\theta)$ , we deduce that  $(\bar{\omega}_{t,\cdot})_{t=1,2}$  is feasible if there is  $y_1 \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$\frac{1}{v} - H_\theta(y_0) + H_\theta(y_1) \geq 0 \quad (15)$$

$$H_\theta(y_0) - H_\theta(y_1) - H_{1-\theta}(y_1) + H_{1-\theta}(y_2) + y_0(\log y_0 - 1) - y_1(\log y_1 - 1) \geq 0 \quad (16)$$

holds, where  $y_0 = 1$  and  $y_2 = 0$ . We compute  $y_1$  by setting

$$y_1 = \min \{y \in [0, 1] : 1/v - H_\theta(1) + H_\theta(y) \geq 0\}.$$

It is easy to verify that  $y_1$  tightens Inequality (15). Moreover, Inequality (16) will hold if and only if  $v \leq v_{\infty,2}^*(\theta)$ . When  $v = v_{\infty,2}^*(\theta)$ , both Inequalities (15)-(16) must be tight; then we have the following result.

**Proposition 19.** *Let  $\theta \geq 1/2$ . If  $v = v_{\infty,2}^*(\theta)$  and  $y_1$  is defined as above, then  $y_1$  defines the optimal threshold for the optimal solution of  $(CLP)_{\infty,2}(\theta)$ .*

Given a fixed  $\theta \geq 1/2$  and  $v \leq v_{\infty,2}^*(\theta)$ , the value  $y_1$  can be approximately computed by a simple bisection procedure. We discretize  $[0, 1]$  in intervals of length  $1/\ell$  and in  $\mathcal{O}(\log \ell)$  bisection operations we obtain an approximate optimal solution  $y_1$ . We can also run a bisection over  $v$  and obtain a solution  $v$  with  $|v - v_{\infty,2}^*(\theta)| \leq \delta$  in  $\mathcal{O}(\log 1/\delta)$ . We finally discretize  $[1/2, 1]$  in multiples of  $1/r$  and run the aforementioned subroutine for each  $\theta$ . Overall, computing an approximation ratio that is at worst  $\delta$  units off from the best approximation that our methodology can attain takes  $\mathcal{O}(r \log(1/\delta) \log(\ell))$  iterations. Each iteration requires computing  $H_\theta$ , which we perform numerically.

We set  $r = 1000$ ,  $\delta = 10^{-8}$  and  $\ell = 10^{12}$ . With these values, we obtain an experimental maximum at  $\theta^* = 0.610$  with  $v_{\infty,2}^*(\theta^*) \approx 0.7048$  and  $y_1 \approx 0.2620$ ; see Figure 3 for other values  $v_{\infty,2}^*(\theta)$  as a function of  $\theta \in [1/2, 1]$ . Numerically, we observe that as  $\theta$  goes to 1,  $v_{\infty,2}^*$  goes to  $v_{\infty,1}^* = 6/\pi^2$  (see Corollary 13). Also, the difference between  $v_{\infty,2}^*(1/2) \approx 0.701$  and  $v_{\infty,2}^*(\theta^*) \approx 0.704$  is less than 0.4%. Nonetheless, empirically we observe that optimizing over the length of the intervals does give a significant improvement over the approximation.

## 6.2 Prophet Inequality for $k = 3, \dots, 10$ Thresholds

We extend the approach in the previous subsection to find nearly optimal solutions of  $(CLP)_{\infty,k}$  for equidistant time intervals. In this case, for  $0 < v \leq v_{\infty,k}^*$  we can construct feasible solutions of  $(CLP)_{\infty,k}$  by using the functions

$$\bar{\omega}_{t,y} = -v \frac{y \log y}{1 - y^{1/k}} \mathbf{1}_{(y_t, y_{t-1})}(y),$$

where  $1 = y_0 \geq y_1 \geq \dots \geq y_{k-1} \geq y_k = 0$ . Again, the values  $y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}$  are implicitly defined as a function of  $v$ . Thus we use auxiliary optimization problems to find them. Let  $H(x) = \int_0^x -(1 - y^{1/k})^{-1} \log y \, dy$ . Then,

$$H(y_{t-1}) - H(y_t) = \frac{1}{v} \int_0^1 \frac{\bar{\omega}_{t,y}}{y} \, dy.$$




Figure 3: The line represents the numerical values of  $v_{\infty,2}^*(\theta)$  computed with the procedure described in this subsection. As  $\theta$  goes to 1, we observe numerically that  $v_{\infty,2}^*$  goes to  $6/\pi^2$ .

For  $v \leq v_{\infty,k}^*$ , we can rewrite the constraints satisfied by  $(\bar{\omega}_{t,\cdot})_{t=1}^k$  as a function of  $H$ ,

$$\frac{1}{v} - H(y_0) + H(y_1) \geq 0 \quad (17)$$

$$H(y_0) - 2H(y_1) + H(y_2) + y_0(\log y_0 - 1) - y_1(\log y_1 - 1) \geq 0 \quad (18)$$

⋮

$$H(y_{k-3}) - 2H(y_{k-2}) + H(y_{k-1}) + y_{k-3}(\log y_{k-3} - 1) - y_{k-2}(\log y_{k-2} - 1) \geq 0 \quad (19)$$

$$H(y_{k-2}) - 2H(y_{k-1}) + H(y_k) + y_{k-2}(\log y_{k-2} - 1) - y_{k-1}(\log y_{k-1} - 1) \geq 0, \quad (20)$$

where  $y_0 = 1$  and  $y_k = 1$ . We compute  $y_1$  by solving

$$y_1 = \min\{y \in [0, 1] : 1/v - H(y_0) + H(y) \geq 0\}.$$

Once  $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}$  have been determined, we find  $y_t$  by solving

$$y_t = \min\{y \in [0, y_{t-1}] : H(y_{t-2}) - 2H(y_{t-1}) + H(y) + y_{t-2}(\log y_{t-2} - 1) - y_{t-1}(\log y_{t-1} - 1) \geq 0\}.$$

Similar to the previous subsection, since  $H$  is monotone, we can guarantee that  $y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}$  defined above satisfy Inequalities (17)-(20), if and only if  $v \leq v_{\infty,k}^*$ . Thus, we have the following result.

**Proposition 20.** *If  $v = v_{\infty,k}^*$  and  $y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}$  are defined as above,  $y_1 \geq y_2 \geq \dots \geq y_{k-1}$  are the optimal thresholds defining the optimal solution  $\omega$  of  $(CLP)_{\infty,k}$ .*

We numerically compute the values  $y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}$ . Given an equidistant discretization of the interval  $[0, 1]$  with step size  $1/\ell$ , we can solve each problem in time  $\mathcal{O}(\log \ell)$  via bisection. Therefore,

$k$	Approximation
1	$6/\pi^2$
2	0.704
3	0.7233
4	0.7321
5	0.7364
6	0.7389
7	0.7405
8	0.7416
9	0.7423
10	0.7428
$k$ large	$(1 - \Theta(\log k/k))\bar{\gamma}$
$\infty$	$\bar{\gamma} \approx 0.745$

Table 1: Numerical values of  $v_{\infty,k}^*$  computed with the aforementioned procedure, where  $k$  is the number of threshold used.

in  $\mathcal{O}(k \log \ell)$  time we can compute the  $k - 1$  values  $y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}$  that by construction satisfy Constraints (17)-(19). If they also satisfy Constraint (20) then we have successfully constructed a feasible solution. We run a bisection in  $v \leq v_{\infty,k}^*$  to obtain a solution that is at most  $\delta$  far away from the optimal solution, in  $\mathcal{O}(\log 1/\delta)$  iterations of the subroutine.

Table 1 details the values obtained for  $k = 3, \dots, 10$ . We numerically computed these values for  $\ell = 10^{12}$  and  $\delta = 10^{-8}$ . We skip the description of  $y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}$  for conciseness.

## 7 Final Remarks

In this work, we examined a version of the classical i.i.d. prophet inequality problem, where at most  $k$  thresholds are selected. We presented an infinite linear program that provides a lower bound over the optimal approximation factor that a  $k$ -dynamic policy can attain, and characterized the optimal solutions using duality. Since the optimal value of this linear program,  $v_{n,k}^*$ , is hard to analyze for finite  $n$ , we provided an asymptotic analysis in  $n$ . We showed that for  $k$  large,  $v_{\infty,k}^* = \lim_n v_{n,k}^* = \bar{\gamma} (1 - \Theta(\log k/k))$ . We also provided results for small values of  $k$ .

Surprisingly, for small values of  $k$ , we obtain significant improvements over the best static solution. For example, just considering  $k = 2$  thresholds already gives an 11% improvement over the best static solution. Furthermore, for  $k = 5$  thresholds our approximation is roughly 1.2% far from the optimal approximation attainable by a fully dynamic solution. We hope this motivates the study of policies that constrain the number of decisions over time in different decision-making settings that include multi-unit/cardinality constraints, combinatorial constraints, and other problems, such as secretary problems.

As we saw in Section 5, our results exhibit a gap between  $v_{n,k}^*$  and  $\gamma_{n,k}^*$ . This gap is composed of two parts. The first part of the gap comes from considering a lower estimate on the approximation ratio  $\mathbf{E}[X_{ALG}] / \mathbf{E}[\max_i X_i]$ . The second part of the gap comes from considering equidistant intervals. Our results show that this gap vanishes as  $k$  grows. The first part of the gap is the most influential one, as even when  $k = 1$ , we already have that  $v_{\infty,k}^* = 6/\pi^2$ , while  $\gamma_{\infty,k}^* = 1 - 1/e$ ; see Corollary 13. By considering a formulation with extended indices (quantile  $q$ , index of the interval  $t$ , length of the interval  $\tau_t$ ), we can eliminate the second part of the gap. This creates a more convoluted

formulation from which we can recover algorithms in the same manner as in this work. However, the practical benefits of this may be minimal. As we show in Section 6, for  $k = 2$  the solution that sets the interval lengths to  $n/2$  guarantees a competitive ratio of 0.701, while optimizing over the length of the intervals only yields a competitive ratio of 0.704.

## References

- [1] Melika Abolhassani, Soheil Ehsani, Hossein Esfandiari, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Robert Kleinberg, and Brendan Lucier, *Beating  $1-1/e$  for ordered prophets*, Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, 2017, pp. 61–71.
- [2] Saeed Alaei, *Bayesian combinatorial auctions: Expanding single buyer mechanisms to many buyers*, SIAM Journal on Computing **43** (2014), no. 2, 930–972.
- [3] Saeed Alaei, Ali Makhdoumi, Azarakhsh Malekian, and Rad Niazadeh, *Descending price auctions with bounded number of price levels and batched prophet inequality*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.01384 (2022).
- [4] Pablo D Azar, Robert Kleinberg, and S Matthew Weinberg, *Prophet inequalities with limited information*, Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms, SIAM, 2014, pp. 1358–1377.
- [5] Moshe Babaioff, Nicole Immorlica, David Kempe, and Robert Kleinberg, *A knapsack secretary problem with applications*, Approximation, randomization, and combinatorial optimization. Algorithms and techniques, Springer, 2007, pp. 16–28.
- [6] Walter Baker, Manish Chopra, Alexandra Nee, and Shivanand Sinha, *Pricing: The next frontier of value creation in private equity*, <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/growth-marketing-and-sales/our-insights/pricing-the-next-frontier-of-value-creation-in-private-equity>, 2019.
- [7] Niv Buchbinder, Kamal Jain, and Mohit Singh, *Secretary problems via linear programming*, Mathematics of Operations Research **39** (2014), no. 1, 190–206.
- [8] TH Hubert Chan, Fei Chen, and Shaofeng H-C Jiang, *Revealing optimal thresholds for generalized secretary problem via continuous lp: impacts on online k-item auction and bipartite k-matching with random arrival order*, Proceedings of the twenty-sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SIAM, 2014, pp. 1169–1188.
- [9] Shuchi Chawla, Nikhil Devanur, and Thodoris Lykouris, *Static pricing for multi-unit prophet inequalities*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07990 (2020).
- [10] Shuchi Chawla, Jason D Hartline, David L Malec, and Balasubramanian Sivan, *Multi-parameter mechanism design and sequential posted pricing*, Proceedings of the forty-second ACM symposium on Theory of computing, 2010, pp. 311–320.
- [11] José Correa, Paul Dütting, Felix Fischer, and Kevin Schewior, *Prophet inequalities for iid random variables from an unknown distribution*, Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, 2019, pp. 3–17.
- [12] Jose Correa, Patricio Foncea, Ruben Hoeksma, Tim Oosterwijk, and Tjark Vredeveld, *Recent developments in prophet inequalities*, ACM SIGecom Exchanges **17** (2019), no. 1, 61–70.
- [13] José Correa, Patricio Foncea, Ruben Hoeksma, Tim Oosterwijk, and Tjark Vredeveld, *Posted price mechanisms and optimal threshold strategies for random arrivals*, Mathematics of Operations Research **46** (2021), no. 4, 1452–1478.
- [14] José Correa, Patricio Foncea, Dana Pizarro, and Victor Verdugo, *From pricing to prophets, and back!*, Operations Research Letters **47** (2019), no. 1, 25–29.

- [15] Jose Correa, Raimundo Saona, and Bruno Ziliotto, *Prophet secretary through blind strategies*, *Mathematical Programming* **190** (2021), no. 1, 483–521.
- [16] Paul Dütting, Michal Feldman, Thomas Kesselheim, and Brendan Lucier, *Prophet inequalities made easy: Stochastic optimization by pricing nonstochastic inputs*, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **49** (2020), no. 3, 540–582.
- [17] Paul Dütting, Felix Fischer, and Max Klimm, *Revenue gaps for static and dynamic posted pricing of homogeneous goods*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.07105 (2016).
- [18] Soheil Ehsani, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Thomas Kesselheim, and Sahil Singla, *Prophet secretary for combinatorial auctions and matroids*, *Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual acm-siam symposium on discrete algorithms*, SIAM, 2018, pp. 700–714.
- [19] Moran Feldman, Ola Svensson, and Rico Zenklusen, *Online contention resolution schemes*, *Proceedings of the twenty-seventh annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, SIAM, 2016, pp. 1014–1033.
- [20] Gerald B Folland, *Real analysis: modern techniques and their applications*, vol. 40, John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [21] Ellen Garbarino and Olivia F Lee, *Dynamic pricing in internet retail: effects on consumer trust*, *Psychology & Marketing* **20** (2003), no. 6, 495–513.
- [22] Vineet Goyal and Rajan Udwani, *Online matching with stochastic rewards: Optimal competitive ratio via path based formulation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12778 (2019).
- [23] Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, Robert Kleinberg, and Tuomas Sandholm, *Automated online mechanism design and prophet inequalities*, *AAAI*, vol. 7, 2007, pp. 58–65.
- [24] Theodore P Hill and Robert P Kertz, *Ratio comparisons of supremum and stop rule expectations*, *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* **56** (1981), no. 2, 283–285.
- [25] ———, *Comparisons of stop rule and supremum expectations of iid random variables*, *The Annals of Probability* (1982), 336–345.
- [26] ———, *A survey of prophet inequalities in optimal stopping theory*, *Contemp. Math* **125** (1992), 191–207.
- [27] Arieh Iserles, *A first course in the numerical analysis of differential equations*, no. 44, Cambridge university press, 2009.
- [28] Jiashuo Jiang, Will Ma, and Jiawei Zhang, *Tight guarantees for multi-unit prophet inequalities and online stochastic knapsack*, *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, SIAM, 2022, pp. 1221–1246.
- [29] Robert P Kertz, *Stop rule and supremum expectations of iid random variables: a complete comparison by conjugate duality*, *Journal of multivariate analysis* **19** (1986), no. 1, 88–112.
- [30] Thomas Kesselheim, Andreas Tönnis, Klaus Radke, and Berthold Vöcking, *Primal beats dual on online packing lps in the random-order model*, *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 2014, pp. 303–312.
- [31] Robert Kleinberg and Seth Matthew Weinberg, *Matroid prophet inequalities*, *Proceedings of the forty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 2012, pp. 123–136.
- [32] Ulrich Krengel and Louis Sucheston, *Semiamarts and finite values*, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* **83** (1977), no. 4, 745–747.
- [33] Euiwoong Lee and Sahil Singla, *Optimal online contention resolution schemes via ex-ante prophet inequalities*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.09251 (2018).
- [34] Allen Liu, Renato Paes Leme, Martin Pál, Jon Schneider, and Balasubramanian Sivan, *Variable decomposition for prophet inequalities and optimal ordering*, *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 2021, pp. 692–692.

- [35] Brendan Lucier, *An economic view of prophet inequalities*, ACM SIGecom Exchanges **16** (2017), no. 1, 24–47.
- [36] Aranyak Mehta, Amin Saberi, Umesh Vazirani, and Vijay Vazirani, *Adwords and generalized online matching*, Journal of the ACM (JACM) **54** (2007), no. 5, 22–es.
- [37] Robert Phillips, *Why are prices set the way they are?*, (2012).
- [38] Praveen K Kopalle PK Kannan, *Dynamic pricing on the internet: Importance and implications for consumer behavior*, International Journal of Electronic Commerce **5** (2001), no. 3, 63–83.
- [39] Julio J Rotemberg, *Fair pricing*, Journal of the European Economic Association **9** (2011), no. 5, 952–981.
- [40] Aviad Rubinstein and Sahil Singla, *Combinatorial prophet inequalities*, Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SIAM, 2017, pp. 1671–1687.
- [41] Aviad Rubinstein, Jack Z Wang, and S Matthew Weinberg, *Optimal single-choice prophet inequalities from samples*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.07945 (2019).
- [42] Ester Samuel-Cahn, *Comparison of threshold stop rules and maximum for independent nonnegative random variables*, the Annals of Probability (1984), 1213–1216.
- [43] Kalyan T Talluri, Garrett Van Ryzin, and Garrett Van Ryzin, *The theory and practice of revenue management*, vol. 1, Springer, 2004.

## A Missing Proofs from Section 4

*Proof of Proposition 7.* For short, we are going to write  $\varepsilon'_t$  to denote  $\varepsilon'_t(v)$ , the derivative of  $\varepsilon_t$  with respect to  $v$ . The proof of the proposition proceeds by induction in  $t$ . For  $t = 1$  we have

$$\frac{1}{n(n-1)v} = \int_0^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{q}{1-(1-q)^\tau} (1-q)^{n-2} dq \implies \frac{-1}{v^2 n(n-1)} = \frac{\varepsilon_1(1-\varepsilon_1)^{n-2}}{1-(1-\varepsilon_1)^\tau} \varepsilon'_1.$$

From here, we can deduce that  $\varepsilon'_1 < 0$ . Before proving the inductive case, let's show an identity.

**Claim 1.** For any  $t = 0, \dots, k-1$ ,

$$\int_{\varepsilon_t}^{\varepsilon_{t+1}} \frac{q(1-q)^{n-2}}{1-(1-q)^{\tau_{t+1}}} dq = \frac{1}{vn(n-1)} - \int_0^{\varepsilon_t} q(1-q)^{n-2} dq.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$A_t = \int_{\varepsilon_{t-1}}^{\varepsilon_t} \frac{q(1-q)^{n-2}}{1-(1-q)^{\tau_t}} dq.$$

For  $t = 1, \dots, k-2$ , we have

$$A_{t+1} - A_t = - \int_{\varepsilon_{t-1}}^{\varepsilon_t} q(1-q)^{n-2} dq.$$

For  $t < k-1$ ,  $\tau_t = \tau$  and we can telescope the RHS of this identity, while the RHS will be an integral from 0 to  $\varepsilon_t$ . This exactly gives us the result of the claim for  $t < k-1$ . To prove the result for  $t = k-1$ , we just need to notice that

$$\int_{\varepsilon_{k-1}}^{\varepsilon_k} \frac{q(1-q)^{n-2}}{1-(1-q)^\sigma} dq = A_{k-1} - \int_{\varepsilon_{k-2}}^{\varepsilon_{k-1}} q(1-q)^{n-2} dq.$$

Here we use the identity of the claim for  $A_{k-1}$  one more time and conclude the result.  $\square$

Using the claim, we can derive  $v$  and obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon_{t+1}(1-\varepsilon_{t+1})^{n-2}}{1-(1-\varepsilon_{t+1})^{\tau_{t+1}}}\varepsilon'_{t+1} &= \frac{-1}{v^2n(n-1)} - \varepsilon_t(1-\varepsilon_t)^{n-2}\varepsilon'_t + \frac{\varepsilon_t(1-\varepsilon_t)^{n-2}}{1-(1-\varepsilon_t)^{\tau_{t+1}}}\varepsilon'_t \\ &= \frac{-1}{v^2n(n-1)} + \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^{\tau_{t+1}}}{1-(1-\varepsilon_t)^{\tau_{t+1}}}\varepsilon_t(1-\varepsilon_t)^{n-2}\varepsilon'_t. \end{aligned}$$

Using induction, we can show that the RHS of the equality is negative. Therefore,  $\varepsilon'_{t+1} < 0$ .

Moreover, for any  $t \geq 0$  we have

$$\varepsilon'_{t+1} \leq -\frac{1}{v^2n(n-1)} \left( \frac{1-(1-\varepsilon_{t+1})^{\tau_{t+1}}}{\varepsilon_{t+1}(1-\varepsilon_{t+1})^{n-2}} \right) \leq \frac{-1}{v^2n(n-1)},$$

where we used the fact that  $1-(1-\varepsilon_{t+1})^{\tau_{t+1}} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\tau_{t+1}-1} \varepsilon_{t+1}(1-\varepsilon_{t+1})^\ell \geq \varepsilon_{t+1}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 21.** *We have  $\varepsilon_k(1) < 1$ .*

*Proof.* First, we prove by induction in  $t$  that  $\varepsilon_t(1) \leq t\tau/(n(n-1))$  for  $t \leq k-1$ . We use this result to show that  $\varepsilon_k(1) \leq ((k-1)\tau + \sigma)/(n(n-1)) = 1/(n-1)$ , which implies the result.

For the sake of notation, we write  $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon_t(1)$ . Now, for  $t = 1$  we have

$$\frac{1}{n(n-1)} = \int_0^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{q(1-q)^{n-1}}{1-(1-q)^\tau} dq \geq \frac{1}{\tau(n-1)}(1-(1-\varepsilon_1)^{n-1}).$$

From here, by rearranging the inequality and using Bernoulli's inequality, we obtain  $\varepsilon_1 \leq \tau/(n(n-1))$ .

Assume the result for  $t \geq 1$  and let us show it for  $t+1 \leq k-1$ . By using the identity in the previous proposition's proof, we have

$$\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \geq \int_{\varepsilon_t}^{\varepsilon_{t+1}} \frac{q(1-q)^{n-2}}{1-(1-q)^\tau} dq \geq \frac{1}{\tau(n-1)}((1-\varepsilon_t)^{n-1} - (1-\varepsilon_{t+1})^{n-1}).$$

Rearranging terms, using the inductive hypothesis over  $\varepsilon_t$  and Bernoulli's inequality, we obtain

$$(1-\varepsilon_{t+1})^{n-1} \geq (1-\varepsilon_t)^{n-1} - \frac{\tau}{n} \geq \left(1 - \frac{t\tau}{n}\right) - \frac{\tau}{n} = 1 - (t+1)\frac{\tau}{n}.$$

Using Bernoulli's inequality one more time and rearranging terms we obtain  $\varepsilon_{t+1} \leq (t+1)\tau/(n(n-1))$ .

The calculation for  $\varepsilon_k$  is similar to the previous analysis and is skipped for brevity.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 11.* We prove the result by backward induction in  $t = k, k-1, \dots, 1$ . Before we proceed with the proof, we need a fact that can be deduced from Proposition 9.

**Claim 2.** *Fix  $t \in [k]$ . Then for any  $s$ ,*

$$(a_s - a_{s+1}) \left( \frac{1-(1-\varepsilon_s)^{\tau_t}}{1-(1-\varepsilon_s)^{\tau_s}} \right) = (a_{s+1} - a_{s+2})(1-\varepsilon_s)^{\tau_{s+1}} \left( \frac{1-(1-\varepsilon_s)^{\tau_t}}{1-(1-\varepsilon_s)^{\tau_{s+1}}} \right).$$

Now, let

$$g_t(q) = \left( \frac{1-(1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) F(q) + (1-q)^{\tau_t} a_{t+1}.$$



We begin the backward induction for the proof at  $t = k$ . Using  $\tau_k = \sigma \leq \tau_s$  for any  $s$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_k &= \sup_{q \in [0,1]} \{g_k(q)\} \\ &= \sup_{\substack{s \in [k] \\ q \in [\varepsilon_{s-1}, \varepsilon_s]}} \left\{ (a_s - a_{s+1}) \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_k}}{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_s}} \right) + (1 - (1-q)^{\tau_k}) a_{s+1} \right\} \\ &= \sup_{s \in [k]} \{g_k(\varepsilon_s)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that the function  $q \mapsto (1 - (1-q)^a)/(1 - (1-q)^b)$  is nondecreasing if  $b \geq a$ , and the function  $q \mapsto (1 - (1-q)^a)$  is always increasing. Note that for  $s = k$ ,  $g_k(\varepsilon_k) = a_k$ . We claim that for any  $s < k$ ,  $g_k(\varepsilon_s) \leq g_k(\varepsilon_{s+1})$ . Indeed, using Claim 2 with  $t = k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_k(\varepsilon_s) &= (a_s - a_{s+1}) \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_k}}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_s}} \right) + (1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_k}) a_{s+1} \\ &= (a_{s+1} - a_{s+2}) (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_{s+1}} \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_t}}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_{s+1}}} \right) + (1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_k}) a_{s+1} \\ &= (a_{s+1} - a_{s+2}) \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_t}}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_{s+1}}} \right) + (1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_k}) a_{s+2} \\ &\leq (a_{s+1} - a_{s+2}) \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{s+1})^{\tau_t}}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{s+1})^{\tau_{s+1}}} \right) + (1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{s+1})^{\tau_k}) a_{s+2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the monotonicity of  $q \mapsto (1 - (1-q)^a)/(1 - (1-q)^b)$  and the function  $q \mapsto (1 - (1-q)^a)$ . This shows that  $g_k(\varepsilon_s) \leq g_k(\varepsilon_{s+1})$ . From here we deduce that  $d_k = a_k$ .

Now, assume the result is true for  $t + 1$  and let us show it for  $t < k$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} d_t &= \sup_{q \in [0,1]} \left\{ \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) F(q) + (1-q)^{\tau_t} d_{t+1} \right\} \\ &= \sup_{q \in [0,1]} \{g_t(q)\} \tag{Induction} \\ &= \sup_{\substack{s \in [k] \\ q \in [\varepsilon_{s-1}, \varepsilon_s]}} \left\{ (a_s - a_{s+1}) \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}}{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_s}} \right) + (1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}) a_{s+1} + (1-q)^{\tau_t} a_{t+1} \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \sup_{s \leq t} \{g_t(\varepsilon_s)\}, \sup_{s > t} \{g_t(\varepsilon_{s-1})\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality can be justified as follows

- For  $s \leq t$ ,  $\tau_s = \tau_t = \tau$  and so, for  $q \in [\varepsilon_{s-1}, \varepsilon_s]$ , we have

$$g_t(q) = (a_s - a_{s+1}) + (1 - (1-q)^\tau) a_{s+1} + (1-q)^\tau a_{t+1}$$

since  $a_{s+1} \geq a_{t+1}$  (Proposition 9), we have that  $g_t(q)$  is increasing in  $[\varepsilon_{s-1}, \varepsilon_s]$ . Thus,

$$\sup_{q \in [\varepsilon_{s-1}, \varepsilon_s]} \{g_t(q)\} = g_t(\varepsilon_s).$$

- For  $s > t$ , we have  $\tau_s \leq \tau_t$  and so, for  $q \in [\varepsilon_{s-1}, \varepsilon_s]$ , we have

$$g_t(q) = (a_s - a_{s+1}) \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}}{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_s}} \right) + (1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}) a_{s+1} + (1-q)^{\tau_t} a_{t+1}.$$

The function  $q \mapsto (1 - (1 - q)^{\tau_t}) / (1 - (1 - q)^{\tau_s})$  is nonincreasing since  $\tau_t \geq \tau_s$ . Also,  $a_{s+1} \leq a_{t+1}$ . Thus,

$$\sup_{q \in [\varepsilon_{s-1}, \varepsilon_s]} \{g_t(q)\} = g_t(\varepsilon_{s-1}).$$

Now, for  $s = t$ ,  $g_t(\varepsilon_s) = g_t(\varepsilon_t) = a_t$ . Using Claim 2, we can show again that  $g_t(\varepsilon_s) \leq g_t(\varepsilon_{s+1})$  for  $s < t$ . To conclude, we will show that  $g_t(\varepsilon_s) \leq g_t(\varepsilon_{s-1})$  for  $s > t$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} g_t(\varepsilon_{s-1}) &= \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_t}}{\varepsilon_{s-1}} \right) F(\varepsilon_{s-1}) + (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_t} a_{t+1} \\ &= \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_t}}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_s}} \right) (a_s - a_{s+1} (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_s}) + (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_t} a_{t+1} \\ &\quad \text{(Using continuity of } F. \text{ See also Proposition 9)} \\ &= (a_s - a_{s+1}) \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_t}}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_s}} \right) + (1 - (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_t}) a_{s+1} + (1 - \varepsilon_{s-1})^{\tau_t} a_{t+1} \\ &\geq (a_s - a_{s+1}) \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_t}}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_s}} \right) + (1 - (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_t}) a_{s+1} + (1 - \varepsilon_s)^{\tau_t} a_{t+1} \\ &= g_t(\varepsilon_s), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used again that the function  $q \mapsto (1 - (1 - q)^{\tau_t}) / (1 - (1 - q)^{\tau_s})$  is nonincreasing since  $\tau_t \geq \tau_s$ , and that  $a_{s+1} \leq a_{t+1}$ . Thus,  $d_t = a_t$  and this finishes the proof.  $\square$

## B Missing Proofs of Section 5

*Proof of Strong Duality in the Infinite Model.* The proof is similar to the finite model case, with finite  $n$ . We set the primal solution of  $(CLP)_{k,\infty}$  to be

$$\omega_{t,y} = -v^* \frac{y \log y}{1 - y^{1/k}} \mathbf{1}_{(y_t, y_{t-1})}(y)$$

with  $y_0 = 1 \geq y_1 \geq \dots \geq y_k$  and  $v^*$  such that  $y_k = 0$ . Repeating verbatim the proof in Section 4, we can easily show the existence of such a  $v^*$  and that the value of  $(CLP)_{k,\infty}$ , namely  $v_{\infty,k}^*$ , is at least  $v^*$ .

To show the optimality of  $v^*$ , we produce a dual solution of  $(DLP)_{\infty,k}$  with objective value  $v^*$ . Define

$$a_t = v^* \left( \frac{1 + \sum_{\tau=t}^k \prod_{\sigma=\tau}^k y_{\sigma}^{1/k}}{1 + \sum_{\tau=1}^k \prod_{\sigma=\tau}^k y_{\sigma}^{1/k}} \right)$$

and  $a_{k+1} = 0$ . Then, the function

$$G(u) = u \sum_{t=1}^k \left( \frac{a_t - a_{t+1} e^{-u/k}}{1 - e^{-u/k}} \right) \mathbf{1}_{[u_{t-1}, u_t]}(u)$$

is right-continuous in  $(0, +\infty)$  and increasing for  $u \geq 0$ , where  $u_t = -\log y_t$  for all  $t$ , and we use  $u_k = +\infty$ . The function  $G$  defines a Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure  $\mu_G$  over  $[0, +\infty)$  via

$$\mu_G(E) = \delta_{\{0\}}(E)G(0) + \int_{E \cap (0, +\infty)} G'(u) \, d\mu,$$

where  $G(0) = \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} G(u)$ .

Let  $\bar{\mu}_G(E) = \mu(P^{-1}(E))$  be the pushforward measure, where  $P : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$  is  $P(u) = e^{-u}$ . Then  $P^{-1}(y) = -\log y$ . So, for  $\bar{y} > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mu}[\bar{y}, 1] &= \mu_G[0, -\log \bar{y}] \\ &= G(0) + \mu_G(0, -\log \bar{y}] \\ &= G(0) + G(-\log \bar{y}) - G(0) \\ &= G(-\log \bar{y}) = -\log \bar{y} \sum_{t=1}^k \left( \frac{a_t - a_{t+1} \bar{y}^{1/k}}{1 - \bar{y}^{1/k}} \right) \mathbf{1}_{(y_t, y_{t-1}]}(\bar{y}).\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{[0,1]} y \, d\bar{\mu}(y) &= \int_{[0,1]} \int_0^1 d\bar{y} \, d\bar{\mu}(y) \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_{[\bar{y},1]} d\mu_G(y) \, d\bar{y} \\ &= \int_0^1 -\log \bar{y} \sum_{t=1}^k \left( \frac{a_t - a_{t+1} \bar{y}^{1/k}}{1 - \bar{y}^{1/k}} \right) \mathbf{1}_{(y_t, y_{t-1}]}(\bar{y}) \, d\bar{y} \\ &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

We define  $d_1, \dots, d_{t+1}$  recursively as follows. Let  $d_{t+1} = 0$ ; for  $t \leq k$ , we have

$$d_t = \sup_{y \in [0,1]} \left\{ \left( \frac{1 - y^{1/k}}{-\log y} \right) \mu[y, 1] + y^{1/k} d_{t+1} \right\}.$$

Thus, the solution  $(\bar{\mu}_G, d)$  is feasible for  $(DLP)_{\infty, k}$ . Moreover,  $d_1 = v^*$  as a byproduct of the following general result.

**Proposition 22.** *For all  $t = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $d_t = a_t$ .*

The proof of this proposition is analogous to the proof of Proposition 11 in Section 4.  $\square$

## B.1 Proof of Lower Bound in Theorem 14

In this subsection, we show that  $v_{n,k}^*$  is lower bounded by the term  $(1 + 4 \log y_{k-1} / (n-1) - ck^2/n)v_{\infty, k}^*$ , where  $c$  is a constant. To prove this bound, we take the optimal solution of  $(CLP)_{\infty, k}$ , denoted  $(\omega, v_{\infty, k}^*)$  and we construct a solution  $(\alpha, v^*)$  of  $(CLP)_{n, k}$ , where the value  $v^*$  holds the aforementioned lower bound.

Before describing  $\alpha$ , we need to introduce some intermediary values. Fix  $\delta > 0$  to be a small number, and let  $n$  be large enough so that  $y_{k-1} > e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}$ . In principle,  $n$  could depend on  $\delta$ ; however, if we assume  $\delta \leq 1/2$ , it is enough to take any  $n \geq -\log \sqrt{y_{k-1}}$ , which is independent of  $\delta$ ; this is crucial for the conclusion of the proof. Consider the scalars

$$c_1 = \left( \frac{n-1}{n} \right) \left( 1 + 4 \frac{\log y_{k-1}}{k(n-1)} \right)^{t-1},$$

for  $t = 1, \dots, k$ . Note that  $c_{t+1} < c_t$  since  $y_{k-1} \in (0, 1)$ . Define the family of functions  $\alpha$  as

$$\alpha_{t,q} = c_t n \omega_{t, e^{-q(n-1)}} \mathbf{1}_{[0, 1-\delta)}(q) + \left( \frac{1-\delta}{\delta} \right) \mathbf{1}_{[1-\delta, 1]}(q) \int_0^{e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}} n \omega_{t,y} \left( \frac{1-y^{1/k}}{-y \log y} \right) dy.$$

First, we verify that Constraints (4)-(5) hold, and then we define  $v^*$  such that  $(\alpha, v^*)$  is feasible for  $(CLP)_{n, k}$ , with  $v^* = (1 + 4 \log y_{k-1} / (n-1) - ck^2/n)v_{\infty, k}^*$  for an appropriate constant  $c$ .

For  $t = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \alpha_{1,q} dq &= c_1 \frac{n}{n-1} \int_{e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}}^1 \frac{\omega_{1,y}}{y} dy && \text{(change of variable, } q = -\log y / (n-1)) \\ &\leq c_1 \frac{n}{n-1} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we implicitly use that the support of  $\omega_{1,q}$  is in  $[y_1, 1]$ , and  $y_1 \geq y_{k-1} > e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}$ .

The following proposition bounds the error of approximating  $y^{1/k}$  by  $(1 + \log y / (n-1))^\tau$ , where  $\tau = \lceil n/k \rceil$ . The proof is a simple calculation, deferred to Appendix B.

**Proposition 23.** *For  $y \geq y_{k-1}$  we have*

$$\left(1 + \frac{\log y}{n-1}\right)^\tau \geq y^{1/k} \left(1 + 4 \frac{\log y_{k-1}}{k(n-1)}\right).$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log y}{n-1} &= -\frac{\tau k}{n-1} \int_{y^{1/\tau k}}^1 \frac{1}{u} du \\ &\geq -\frac{\tau k}{n-1} \left(1 - y^{1/\tau k}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$1 + \frac{\log y}{n-1} \geq 1 - \frac{\tau k}{n-1} \left(1 - y^{1/\tau k}\right) \geq y^{1/\tau k} \left(1 + \left(\frac{\tau k - (n-1)}{n-1}\right) \left(1 - y_{k-1}^{-1/\tau k}\right)\right),$$

where we used  $y \geq y_{k-1}$ . Now,

$$y_{k-1}^{-1/\tau k} = e^{-\log y_{k-1}/\tau k} \leq 1 - 2 \frac{\log y_{k-1}}{\tau k} \implies 1 - y_{k-1}^{-1/\tau k} \geq 2 \frac{\log y_{k-1}}{\tau k},$$

using  $y_{k-1} \geq e^{-(1-\varepsilon)(n-1)}$  and for  $n$  large,  $-\log y_{k-1} \leq \tau k$ . We now elevate  $1 + \log y / (n-1)$  to the power  $\tau$  and use the previous bound to obtain

$$\left(1 + \frac{\log y}{n-1}\right)^\tau \geq y^{1/k} \left(1 + 2 \left(\frac{\tau k - (n-1)}{k}\right) \frac{\log y_{k-1}}{n-1}\right),$$

where in the last inequality we used Bernoulli's inequality,  $(1+x)^r \geq 1+rx$ . The conclusion now follows by using  $\tau = \lceil n/k \rceil < n/k + 1$ , and so

$$\frac{\tau k - (n-1)}{k} = \tau - \frac{n}{k} + \frac{1}{k} < 1 + \frac{1}{k} \leq 2,$$

which finishes the proof. □

Now, for  $1 \leq t \leq k-1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 (1-q)^\tau \alpha_{t,q} dq &\geq c_t \frac{n}{n-1} \int_{e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}}^1 \left(1 + \frac{\log y}{n-1}\right)^\tau \frac{\omega_{t,y}}{y} dy \\ &\geq c_t \frac{n}{n-1} \left(1 + 4 \frac{\log y_{k-1}}{k(n-1)}\right) \int_0^1 y^{1/k} \frac{\omega_{t,q}}{y} dy, \end{aligned}$$

since the support of  $\omega_{t,q}$  is contained in  $[y_t, y_{t-1}]$  and  $y_t \geq y_{k-1}$ . Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,q} dq &= c_{t+1} \frac{n}{n-1} \int_{e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}}^1 \frac{\omega_{k,y}}{y} dy + c_{t+1} n \int_0^{e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}} \omega_{t,y} \left( \frac{1-y^{1/k}}{-y \log y} \right) dy \\
&\leq c_{t+1} \frac{n}{n-1} \int_0^1 \frac{\omega_{t,y}}{y} dy \\
&\leq c_{t+1} \frac{n}{n-1} \int_0^1 y^{1/k} \frac{\omega_{t+1,y}}{y} dy \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} (1-q)^{n/k} dq.
\end{aligned}$$

In the equality we use the fact that  $\frac{-\log y}{1-y^{1/k}} \geq (1-\delta)(n-1)$  for  $y \leq e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}$ , and in the last inequality we use  $c_{t+1} = c_t \left(1 + 4 \frac{\log y_{k-1}}{k(n-1)}\right)$ . With this, we have shown that  $\alpha$  satisfies Constraints (4)-(5).

Let  $v = \bar{c}_k v_{\infty,k}^*$  where  $\bar{c}_k = (1-\delta)(1-k^2/n)c_k$ . We now prove that  $(\alpha, v)$  satisfies Constraint 6. Before we do this, we need the following facts, proved in Appendix B.

**Proposition 24.** For any  $y \in [0, 1]$  and  $t \in [k]$ ,

$$1 - \left(1 + \frac{\log y}{n-1}\right)^{\tau_t} \geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{n}\right) (1 - y^{1/k})$$

where  $\tau_t = \lceil n/k \rceil$  if  $t < k$  and  $\tau_k = n - (k-1)\lceil n/k \rceil$ .

*Proof.* We do the case  $\tau_t = \tau = \lceil n/k \rceil$  for  $t < k$  and the case  $\tau_k$  separately:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(1 + \frac{\log y}{n-1}\right)^{\tau} &\leq y^{\tau/(n-1)} \\
&\leq y^{n/(k(n-1))} && \text{(since } \lceil n/k \rceil \geq n/k \text{ and } y \leq 1) \\
&\leq y^{1/k}.
\end{aligned}$$

From here, we can deduce the inequality for  $t < k$ . For  $\tau_k$  we have the following. First, it is easy to verify that

$$\tau_k = n - (k-1)\lceil n/k \rceil \geq (1 - k^2/n)\lceil n/k \rceil = (1 - k^2/n)\tau.$$

Thus, repeating the same calculations as before, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(1 + \frac{\log y}{n-1}\right)^{\tau_k} &\leq y^{\tau_k/(n-1)} \\
&\leq y^{(1-k^2/n)\tau/(n-1)} \\
&\leq y^{(1-k^2/n)/k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, an easy calculation shows that  $\inf_{v \in [0,1]} (1 - v^{(1-k^2/n)/(1-v)}) \geq (1 - k^2/n)$ . Thus, for any  $y \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$1 - \left(1 + \frac{\log y}{n-1}\right)^{\tau_k} \geq 1 - y^{(1-k^2/n)/k} \geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{n}\right) (1 - y^{1/k}).$$

□

Let  $u \in [0, 1 - \delta]$ ; using the definition of  $\alpha$  and the previous proposition, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^k \int_u^1 \alpha_{t,q} \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) dq &= n \sum_{t=1}^k \int_{e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}}^{e^{-u(n-1)}} c_t \frac{\omega_{t,y}}{y} \left( \frac{1 - (1 + \log y/n)^{n/k}}{-\log y} \right) dy \\
&\quad + (1-\delta)n \sum_{t=1}^k c_t \int_0^{e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}} \omega_{t,y} \left( \frac{1 - y^{1/k}}{-y \log y} \right) dy \\
&\geq \bar{c}_k n \sum_{t=1}^k \int_0^{e^{-u(n-1)}} \omega_{t,y} \frac{1 - y^{1/k}}{-y \log y} dy \\
&\geq \bar{c}_k n v_{\infty,k}^* e^{-u(n-1)} \\
&\geq v^* n (1-u)^{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $u \in [1 - \delta, 1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^k \int_u^1 \alpha_{t,q} \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\tau_t}}{q} \right) dq &= (1-\delta)n \frac{(1-u)}{\delta} \sum_{t=1}^k \int_0^{e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}} \omega_{t,y} \left( \frac{1 - y^{1/k}}{-y \log t} \right) dy \\
&\geq \bar{c}_k v_{\infty,k}^* n \frac{(1-u)}{\delta} e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)} \\
&\geq v^* n (1-u)^{n-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used the fact that the function  $f(u) = (1-u)e^{-(1-\delta)(n-1)}/\delta - (1-u)^{n-1}$  is concave,  $f(1-\delta) > 0$ ,  $f(1) = 0$  and  $f'(1-\delta) > 0$ ,  $f'(1) < 0$ ; hence,  $f(u) \geq 0$  in  $[1-\delta, 1]$ .

This shows that  $(\alpha, v^*)$  is a feasible solution of  $(CLP)_{k,n}$ , and therefore  $v_{n,k}^* \geq \bar{c}_k v_{\infty,k}^*$ . Since  $v_{n,k}^*$  is independent of  $\delta$ , we can take  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  and obtain  $v_{n,k}^* \geq (1 - k^2/n)c_k v_{\infty,k}^*$ . By using Bernoulli's inequality over  $c_k$ , we conclude

$$v_{n,k}^* \geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{n}\right) \left(1 + 4 \frac{\log y_{k-1}}{n-1}\right) v_{\infty,k}^*.$$

This finishes the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 14.

## B.2 Proof of Upper Bound in Theorem 14

In this Subsection, we show that  $v_{n,k}^*$  is upper bounded by a term that converges to  $v_{\infty,k}^*$ . We take the optimal solution  $(\bar{\mu}, d)$  of  $(DLP)_{\infty,k}$  and we construct a new solution  $(\mu, d^*)$  of  $(DLP)_{n,k}$  that shows the desired property.

For simplicity, we assume that  $n/k$  is an integer, thus  $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_k = n/k$ . This fundamentally does not change the upper bound.

Recall the definition of  $G$  given at the beginning of this section,

$$G(u) = u \sum_{t=1}^k \left( \frac{a_t - a_{t+1} e^{-u/k}}{1 - e^{-u/k}} \right) \mathbf{1}_{[u_{t-1}, u_t)}(u).$$

This function is right-continuous and nondecreasing. Now, let  $F(q) = G(qn)/n$ . Then,  $F$  is also right-continuous and nondecreasing. Thus, we can consider the Lebesgue–Stieltjes measure generated by  $F$ , that we denote  $\mu_F$ . Note that

$$\mu_F[0, q] = F(q) = \frac{1}{n} G(qn) = \frac{1}{n} \bar{\mu}_G[e^{-qn}, 1],$$

where  $\bar{\mu}_G$  is the pushforward measure induced by  $G$  and the function  $P(u) = e^{-u}$  (see the proof at the beginning of the section). Let  $c_n = \int_0^1 n(1-u)^{n-1} d\mu_F(u)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} c_n &= \int_0^1 n(n-1)(1-q)^{n-2} \mu_F[0, q] dq \\ &= \int_0^1 n(n-1)(1-q)^{n-2} F(q) dq \\ &= \int_0^1 (n-1)(1-q)^{n-2} \bar{\mu}_G[e^{-qn}, 1] dq \\ &= \int_{e^{-n}}^1 (n-1)(1+\log y/n)^{n-2} \bar{\mu}_G[y, 1] \frac{1}{y^n} dy \\ &= \left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right) \int_{e^{-n}}^1 \int_{e^{-n}}^s \frac{(1+\log y/n)^{n-2}}{y} dy d\bar{\mu}_G(s). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $f_n(s) = \mathbf{1}_{[e^{-n}, 1]}(s) \int_{e^{-n}}^s y^{-1} (1+\log y/n)^{n-2} dy$ . A simple proof shows that  $f_n(s) \rightarrow f(s) = s$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover,  $f_n(s)$  is bounded by the function  $e^2 f(s) = e^2 s$  which is integrable with respect to  $\bar{\mu}_G$ . Thus, using Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$c_n \rightarrow \int_0^1 f(s) d\bar{\mu}_G(s) = \int_0^1 s d\bar{\mu}_G(s) = 1.$$

Define  $\mu'_F = \mu_F/c_n$ . Then,

$$\int_0^1 n(1-u)^{n-1} d\mu'_F(u) = 1.$$

Let

$$d_t^* = c_n^{-1} \alpha_{n,t}^{-1} d_t,$$

where  $\alpha_{n,t} = (1 - 20k/n)^{k-t+1}$ . We now prove that  $(\mu'_F, d^*)$  is feasible for  $(DLP)_{n,k}$ . For this, we need the following result. The proof is deferred to end of the subsection.

**Proposition 25.** For any  $q \in [0, 1]$ ,  $1 - e^{-qn/k} \geq (1 - 20k/n) \left(1 - (1-q)^{n/k}\right)$ .

To prove that  $(\mu'_F, d_t^*)$  is feasible for  $(DLP)_{n,k}$ , we only need to show that

$$d_t^* \geq \sup_{q \in [0, 1]} \left\{ \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{n/k}}{q} \right) \mu'_F[0, q] + (1-q)^{n/k} d_{t+1}^* \right\}.$$

Let  $q \in [0, 1]$ ; then

$$\begin{aligned} c_n \alpha_{n,t} d_t^* &= d_t \\ &\geq \left( \frac{1 - e^{-qn/k}}{qn} \right) \bar{\mu}_G[e^{-qn}, 1] + e^{-qn} d_{t+1} && (y = e^{-qn}) \\ &\geq \left(1 - 20\frac{k}{n}\right) \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{n/k}}{q} \right) \mu'_F[0, q] c_n + (1-q)^{n/k} d_{t+1} && (\text{Prop. 25}) \\ &\geq \left(1 - 20\frac{k}{n}\right) c_n \alpha_{n,t+1} \left( \left( \frac{1 - (1-q)^{n/k}}{q} \right) \mu'_F[0, q] + (1-q)^{n/k} d_{t+1}^* \right). && (\text{Def. of } d_{t+1}^*) \end{aligned}$$

We can use  $\alpha_{n,t} = (1 - 20k/n) \alpha_{n,t+1}$ , with  $\alpha_{n,k+1} = 1$ , to simplify terms. From here we deduce the feasibility of  $(\mu'_F, d^*)$  in  $(DLP)_{n,k}$ .

Now, to show the upper bound of  $v_{n,k}^*$ , we can minimize over  $(\mu, d)$  feasible for  $(DLP)_{n,k}$  and obtain the guarantee

$$v_{n,k}^* \leq d_1^* = c_n^{-1} \alpha_{n,1}^{-1} d_1 = c_n^{-1} \alpha_{n,1}^{-1} v_{\infty,k}^*,$$

which concludes the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 14.

We close this subsection with the proof of Proposition 25.

*Proof of Proposition 25.* Recall that  $e^{-q} \leq 1 - q + q^2/2$ . Thus, it is enough to show that for any  $q \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$20 \frac{k}{n} \geq \frac{(1 - q - q^2/2)^{n/k} - (1 - q)^{n/k}}{1 - (1 - q)^{n/k}} = \frac{f(1 - q + q^2/2) - f(1 - q)}{f(1) - f(1 - q)},$$

where  $f(q) = x^{n/k}$ . Note that  $f$  is convex. Now, we divide the proof into two cases:  $q \leq 10k/n$  and  $q > 10k/n$ .

- For  $q \leq 10k/n$ , note that

$$\frac{q}{2} \cdot 1 + \left(1 - \frac{q}{2}\right) \cdot (1 - q) = 1 - q + \frac{q^2}{2}.$$

Thus, using the convexity of  $f$ , we have

$$\frac{f(1 - q + q^2/2) - f(1 - q)}{f(1) - f(1 - q)} \leq \frac{q}{2} \leq 5 \frac{k}{n}.$$

- For  $q > 10k/n$ ,  $1 - (1 - q)^{n/k} \geq 1 - (1 - 10k/n)^{n/k} \geq 1 - e^{-10}$ . Thus,

$$\frac{f(1 - q + q^2/2) - f(1 - q)}{f(1) - f(1 - q)} \leq \frac{(n/k)(1 - q + q^2/2)^{n/k-1} q^2/2}{1 - e^{-10}},$$

where we used the mean value theorem on  $f$  and the monotonicity of  $f'(x) = (n/k)x^{n/k-1}$  to bound the numerator. Now, if  $q \geq 1/2$ , then

$$\frac{f(1 - q + q^2/2) - f(1 - q)}{f(1) - f(1 - q)} \leq \frac{n}{k} \left(\frac{5}{8}\right)^{n/k-1} \leq 5 \frac{k}{n}$$

for  $n$  large enough.

If  $q \leq 1/2$ , we proceed as follow. Let  $h(q) = (1 - q + q^2/2)^{n/k-1} q^2/2$ . Then,  $h(0) = 0$ ,  $h(1) = (1/2)^{n/k-1}$ , and, using basic calculus,  $h$  has two critical points,

$$q_1 = \frac{1 + (k/n) - \sqrt{1 - 6k/n + (k/n)^2}}{2}, \quad q_2 = \frac{1 + (k/n) + \sqrt{1 - 6k/n + (k/n)^2}}{2}.$$

It can be shown that  $h$  is increasing in  $[0, q_1]$  and decreasing in  $[q_1, q_2]$ . Moreover,  $q_2 \geq 1/2$ , and we know the behavior of  $\frac{f(1 - q + q^2/2) - f(1 - q)}{f(1) - f(1 - q)}$  in that case. Thus, we only need to bound the value of  $h(q_1)$  to conclude. It can be shown that  $q_1 \leq 6k/n$ ; hence  $h(q_1) \leq 18 \frac{k}{n}$ . Thus,

$$\frac{f(1 - q + q^2/2) - f(1 - q)}{f(1) - f(1 - q)} \leq 20 \frac{k}{n},$$

which finishes the proof. □



### B.3 Missing Proofs of Subsection 5.1

In this subsection, we present the proofs of Lemma 16 and Lemma 17. We begin with the proof of Lemma 16. We divide its proof in several lemmas and propositions.

**Lemma 26.** *For any  $t \leq k - 1$ , we have*

$$k(y_t - y_{t+1}) \leq \int_{y_{t+1}}^{y_t} \frac{-\log y}{1 - y^{1/k}} dy \leq \frac{k^2}{k-1} (y_t^{(k-1)/k} - y_{t+1}^{(k-1)/k}).$$

*Proof.* The proof follows by simply making the change of variable  $x = y^{1/k}$  in the integral and using the fact that  $1 \leq -\log v/(1-v) \leq 1/v$  for any  $v \in (0,1)$ .  $\square$

As a corollary, we have the following lower bound over  $y_t$ .

**Proposition 27.** *For  $k \geq 4$  and for any  $\ell$  we have  $y_{k-\ell} \geq \ell/(32k)$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $w \in [0,1]$ , we have  $w(1 - \log w) \geq 0$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^* - 1 &\leq \beta^* - 1 + y_t(1 - \log y_t) \\ &= \int_{y_{t+1}}^{y_t} -\frac{\log y}{1 - y^{1/k}} dy \\ &\leq \frac{k^2}{k-1} (y_t^{(k-1)/k} - y_{t+1}^{(k-1)/k}). \end{aligned}$$

Using  $y_k = 0$ , this shows that for  $t = 0, \dots, k-1$ ,

$$y_{t-\ell}^{(k-1)/k} \geq \ell \frac{(\beta^* - 1)(k-1)}{k^2}.$$

The bound now follows because  $\beta^* \geq 1.25$ .  $\square$

From the corollary, we obtain the lower bound  $y_{k-1} \geq 1/(32k)$ .

Define the two following sequences. Let  $x_0 = 1, z_0 = 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= \max \left\{ 0, x_t - \frac{1}{k} (\beta^* - 1 + x_t(1 - \log x_t)) \right\}, \\ z_{t+1} &= \max \left\{ 0, z_t - \frac{1}{(32k)^{1/k} k} (\beta^* - 1 + z_t(1 - \log z_t)) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If we ignore the max operator, the sequences represent the Euler method applied to (ODE) with step-sizes  $1/k$  and  $1/((32k)^{1/k} k)$ , respectively. The following result states the order between elements  $x_t, y_t$  and  $z_t$ .

**Proposition 28.** *For any  $t = 0, \dots, k$ , we have  $x_t \leq y_t \leq z_t$ .*

*Proof.* For the first bound, we use the lower bound found in Lemma 26 to deduce that for any  $t = 1, \dots, k-1$ ,

$$y_{t+1} \geq y_t - \frac{1}{k} (\beta^* - 1 + y_t(1 - \log y_t)).$$

From here, it is evident that  $x_t \leq y_t$  for all  $t = 0, \dots, k$ .

For the second bound, we need to use the fact that  $y_{k-1} \geq 1/(32k)$ . Let  $t + 1 \leq k - 1$ ; then

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^* - 1 + y_t(1 - \log y_t) &= \int_{y_{t+1}}^{y_t} -\frac{\log y}{1 - y^{1/k}} dy \\ &\leq \frac{k^2}{k-1} (y_t^{(k-1)/k} - y_{t+1}^{(k-1)/k}) \\ &= k(\xi)^{-1/k} (y_t - y_{t+1}) && \text{(Mean value theorem)} \\ &\leq k(32k)^{1/k} (y_t - y_{t+1}). && (y_{k-1} \geq 1/(32k)) \end{aligned}$$

Reordering terms, we obtain

$$y_{t+1} \leq y_t - \frac{1}{(32k)^{1/k} k} (\beta^* - 1 + y_t(1 - \log y_t)),$$

from which the bound  $y_t \leq z_t$  follows for  $t = 0, \dots, k-1$ . Since  $z_k \geq 0 = y_k$ , the bound holds for any  $t = 0, \dots, k$ .  $\square$

The next result states that the sequence  $x_t$  and  $z_t$  are at most  $\mathcal{O}(\log k/k)$  far from each other.

**Proposition 29.**  $z_t - x_t \leq 4 \log(32k)/k$ , for any  $t = 0, \dots, k$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f(x) = x(1 - \log x)$ . Let  $e_t = z_t - x_t \geq 0$ . We show that  $e_t \leq 4t \log(32k)/k^2$ . The result is true if  $z_{t+1} = 0$ . So, for  $z_{t+1} > 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{t+1} &= z_{t+1} - x_{t+1} \\ &\leq z_t - \frac{1}{(32k)^{1/k} k} (\beta^* - 1 + f(z_t)) - x_t + \frac{1}{k} (\beta^* - 1 + f(x_t)) \\ &= e_t + \frac{\beta^* - 1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{(32k)^{1/k}}\right) + \frac{1}{k} (f(x_t) - f(z_t)) + f(z_t) \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{(32k)^{1/k}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$1 - \frac{1}{(32k)^{1/k}} \leq (32k)^{1/k} - 1 = e^{\log(32k)/k} - 1 \leq 2 \frac{\log(32k)}{k},$$

for  $k \geq 6$ , using  $e^x \leq 1 + 2x$  for  $x \leq 1$ . Since  $\beta^* \leq 2$  and  $f(x) \leq 1$  for any  $x \in [0, 1]$  and  $f(x_t) \leq f(z_t)$  since  $z_t \geq x_t$ , we have

$$e_{t+1} \leq e_t + 4 \frac{\log(32k)}{k^2}.$$

Solving this recursion gives us the desired inequality.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 16.* Proposition 28 immediately gives us  $x_t \leq y_t$  for all  $t = 0, \dots, k$ . Proposition 28 in combination with Proposition 29 gives us the bound  $y_t \leq x_t + 4 \log(32k)/k$  for all  $t = 0, \dots, k$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 17.* For the proof of this lemma, we need several properties of  $w$ , the solution of (ODE), that we list below. Property 1 and 2 are easy to deduce, while the proof of property 3 appears in [13].

1.  $w'' = w' \log w \geq 0$ , and so  $w$  is convex.
2.  $w''' \geq 0$ . In particular,  $w'$  is a convex function.
3.  $w + w(\log w - 1)/k + \log(w)(w(\log w - 1) - (\beta^* - 1))/(2k^2) \geq w^{k/(k-1)}(k-1)/k$ , for any real  $k \geq 2$ . This is a byproduct of Proposition D.1 in [13].

We show that  $x_t \leq w(t/k)$  by induction in  $t$ . For  $t = 0$ , we have  $w(0) = 1 = x_0$ . For  $t = 1$ , using the convexity of  $w$ , we have  $w(1/k) \geq w(0) + w'(0)/k = 1 - \beta^*/k$ . On the other side,

$$x_1 = x_0 - \frac{1}{k} (\beta^* - 1 + x_0(1 - \log x_0)) = 1 - \frac{\beta^*}{k} \leq w\left(\frac{1}{k}\right).$$

Assume the result is true for  $t$  and let us show it for  $t + 1$ . If  $w(t/k) = 0$ , then  $x_t = 0$  by the inductive hypothesis; hence,  $x_{t+1} = 0 = w((t+1)/k)$ . Let's assume that  $w(t/k) > 0$ .

**Claim 3.** *Let  $\rho \in [t/k, (t+1)/k]$ ; if  $w(\rho) > 0$ , then*

$$w(\rho) \geq x_t - \frac{1}{k} (\beta^* - 1 + x_t(1 - \log x_t)).$$

*Proof.* The result is immediate if  $x_t = 0$ . Thus, let us assume that  $x_t > 0$ . Using the Taylor expansion around  $t/k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(\rho) &= w(t/k) + (\rho - t/k)w'(t/k) + \frac{(\rho - t/k)^2}{2}w''(t/k) + \frac{(\rho - t/k)^3}{6}w'''(\xi) \\ &\geq w(t/k) + (\rho - t/k)w'(t/k) + \frac{(\rho - t/k)^2}{2}w''(t/k), \end{aligned}$$

since  $w''' \geq 0$  by the second property listed above. Now, the function

$$\rho \mapsto (\rho - t/k)w'(t/k) + \frac{(\rho - t/k)^2}{2}w''(t/k)$$

is decreasing because its derivative is upper bounded by  $w'(\rho) \leq 0$  due to the convexity of  $w'$  (see the second property of  $w$  above). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} w(\rho) &\geq w\left(\frac{t}{k}\right) + \frac{1}{k}w'\left(\frac{t}{k}\right) + \frac{1}{2k^2}w''\left(\frac{t}{k}\right) \\ &= w\left(\frac{t}{k}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{2k} \log w\left(\frac{t}{k}\right)\right) \left(\frac{w(t/k)(\log w(t/k) - 1) - (\beta^* - 1)}{k}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{k-1}{k}w\left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k/(k-1)} - \frac{\beta^* - 1}{k} \\ &\geq \frac{k-1}{k}x_t^{k/(k-1)} - \frac{\beta^* - 1}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality we used the third property of  $w$  listed above, and in the last inequality we used the inductive hypothesis. Now,

$$x_t^{k/(k-1)} = x_t \cdot x_t^{1/(k-1)} = x_t e^{\log(x_t)/(k-1)} \geq x_t \left(1 + \frac{1}{k-1} \log x_t\right) = \frac{k}{k-1}x_t + \frac{x_t}{k-1}(\log x_t - 1)$$

by using the standard inequality  $1 + x \leq e^x$  for any  $x$ . The claim now follows by plugging this inequality in the inequality above.  $\square$

Thus, for  $\rho \in [t/k, (t+1)/k]$  with  $w(\rho) > 0$ , we have

$$x_{t+1} = \max \left\{ 0, x_t - \frac{1}{k} (\beta_\infty^* - 1 + x_t(1 - \log x_t)) \right\} \leq w(\rho).$$

If  $\rho^* \in [t/k, (t+1)/k]$ , since  $w(t/k) > 0$ , then  $\rho^* > t/k$ , where  $\rho^* = \inf\{\rho \in [0, 1] : w(\rho) = 0\}$ . By the continuity of  $w$  we obtain

$$w\left(\frac{t+1}{k}\right) = 0 = w(\rho^*) = \lim_{\rho \nearrow \rho^*} w(\rho) \geq x_{t+1}.$$

If  $\rho^* \notin [t/k, (t+1)/k]$ , then we obtain immediately that  $w((t+1)/k) \geq x_{t+1}$ . This finishes the proof of Lemma 17.  $\square$

#### B.4 Proof of $v_{\infty,k} \leq \bar{\gamma}(1 - c \log k/k)$

To achieve an upper bound for  $v_{\infty,k}$ , we follow a similar approach to the one used in the proof of a lower bound of  $v_{\infty,k}$ . The idea is to study  $\rho^*$ , the value  $\rho \in [0, 1]$  such that  $w(\rho) = 0$ , where  $w$  is the solution of (ODE). For the lower bound of  $v_{\infty,k}^*$  we showed that  $\rho^* \geq 1 - C \log k/k$ . We defined

$$I(\beta) = \int_0^1 \frac{dw}{\beta - 1 + w(1 - \log w)},$$

which is decreasing in  $\beta$  and  $I(\bar{\beta}) = 1$ . Using these two facts, we deduced that  $\beta^* \leq \bar{\beta}(1 + C' \log k/k)$ . We plan to use a similar approach for the upper bound of  $v_{\infty,k}$ . We aim to show that  $\rho^* \leq 1 - c \log k/k$  for some  $c$ , which will imply that  $\beta^* \geq \bar{\beta}(1 - c' \log k/k)$ .

Recall the definition of the sequence  $z_t$  presented in the previous subsection:

$$\begin{aligned} z_0 &= 0 \\ z_{t+1} &= \max \left\{ 0, z_t - \frac{1}{(32k)^{1/k} k} (\beta^* - 1 + z_t(1 - \log z_t)) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By repeating the same analysis as in the previous subsection (see the proof of Lemma 17), we obtain the following result.

**Lemma 30.**  $w(t/k(32k)^{1/k}) \geq z_t$  for any  $t = 1, \dots, k$ .

The following result controls the distance between  $w(t/k)$  and  $w(t/(k(32k)^{1/k}))$ . The proof follows by the convexity of  $w$  and we skip it for brevity.

**Proposition 31.** For any  $t = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $w(t/k) \geq w(t/(k(32k)^{1/k})) - 2 \log(32k)/k$ .

The next proposition controls the error of  $\rho^*$  from above.

**Proposition 32.** We have  $\rho^* \leq 1 - 32 \log(32k)/k$ .

*Proof.* Using the two previous results and Proposition 28 we obtain

$$w(t/k) \geq y_t - 2 \log(32k)/k.$$

Let  $t' \in [k]$  be the minimum value such that  $w(t'/k) = 0$ . Thus,  $\rho^* \leq t'/k$ . Using Proposition 27, we have

$$0 = w(t'/k) \geq \frac{k - t'}{32k} - 2 \frac{\log(32k)}{k} \implies \frac{t'}{k} \geq 1 - 64 \frac{\log(32k)}{k}.$$

Therefore,  $\rho^* \leq 1 - 32 \log(32k)/k$ . □

Let

$$I(\beta) = \int_0^1 \frac{dw}{\beta - 1 + w(1 - \log w)},$$

so  $I(\bar{\beta}) = 1$ , with  $\bar{\beta} = 1/\bar{\gamma}$ , and  $I(\beta^*) = \rho^* \leq 1 - 32 \log(32k)/k$ .

**Lemma 33.** We have  $\beta^* \geq \bar{\beta}(1 + 16 \log(32k)/k)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $c = 8 \log(32k)/k$ . We assume by contradiction that  $\beta^* < \bar{\beta}(1 + c)$ . Then,

$$(1 + c)\bar{\beta} - 1 + w(1 - \log w) \leq (1 + 4c)(\bar{\beta} - 1 + w(1 - \log w)),$$

for any  $w \in [0, 1]$ . Thus,  $I((1 + c)\bar{\beta}) \geq I(\bar{\beta})/(1 + 4c) \geq 1 - 4c$ . Since the function  $I(\cdot)$  is strictly decreasing, we must have  $I(\beta^*) > 1 - 4c = 1 - 32 \log(32k)/k$ , which is a contradiction. □

From this lemma, we obtain that

$$v_{\infty,k}^* = \frac{1}{\beta^*} \leq \frac{\bar{\gamma}}{(1 + 8 \log(32k)/k)} \leq \bar{\gamma} \left(1 - 4 \frac{\log(32k)}{k}\right),$$

which finishes the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 15.