

Optimal single threshold stopping rules and sharp prophet inequalities*

A. Goldenshluger[†] Y. Malinovsky[‡] A. Zeevi[§]

July 23, 2024

Abstract

This paper considers a finite horizon optimal stopping problem for a sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables. The objective is to design stopping rules that attempt to select the random variable with the highest value in the sequence. The performance of any stopping rule may be benchmarked relative to the selection of a “prophet” that has perfect foreknowledge of the largest value. Such comparisons are typically stated in the form of “prophet inequalities.” In this paper we characterize *sharp* prophet inequalities for *single threshold* stopping rules as solutions to infinite two person zero sum games on the unit square with special payoff kernels. The proposed game theoretic characterization allows one to derive sharp non-asymptotic prophet inequalities for different classes of distributions. This, in turn, gives rise to a simple and computationally tractable algorithmic paradigm for deriving optimal single threshold stopping rules.

Keywords: prophet inequalities, optimal stopping, single threshold stopping rules, iid random variables, optimization problems.

2000 AMS Subject Classification: 60G40, 62L12, 91A05

1 Introduction

Optimal stopping problems have a long and storied academic history and have recently found various applications also in modern practical domains that arise in technological platforms; see further discussion and references below. At the core, the problem can be stated as a sequential selection objective: given a horizon of length n , one observes sequentially random variables and needs to stop them at some (random) time perceived to be associated with the largest value in the sequence. The objective is typically to both identify such optimal stopping rules, but more practically to consider rules that are perhaps suboptimal but simple in structure, broad in scope of application, and enjoy theoretical performance guarantees. Let us now formalize this set up.

Optimal stopping. For a given integer n , serving as the problem horizon, let X_1, \dots, X_n be integrable independent non-negative random variables with joint distribution $F^{(n)} = F_1 \times \dots \times F_n$ defined on an underlying probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Let \mathcal{X}_t be the σ -field generated by X_1, \dots, X_t , $\mathcal{X}_t = \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_t)$, $1 \leq t \leq n$, and let $\mathcal{X} := \{\mathcal{X}_t, 1 \leq t \leq n\}$ be the corresponding filtration. By definition, a *stopping*

*The research is supported by the BSF grant 2020063.

[†]Department of Statistics, University of Haifa, Haifa 31905, Israel. e-mail: goldensh@stat.haifa.ac.il.

[‡]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA. e-mail: yaakovm@umbc.edu

[§]Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA. e-mail: assaf@gsb.columbia.edu.

time τ with respect to (wrt) \mathcal{X} is a random variable on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\mathbb{P}\{\tau \in \{1, \dots, n\}\} = 1$, and $\{\tau = t\} \in \mathcal{X}_t$ for any $1 \leq t \leq n$. The set of all stopping times wrt filtration \mathcal{X} is denoted \mathcal{T}_{all} .

The *reward* of a given stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}$ is defined by

$$V_n(\tau; F^{(n)}) := \mathbb{E}X_\tau.$$

The problem of optimal stopping is to find a stopping rule τ^* such that

$$V_n(\tau^*; F^{(n)}) = V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F^{(n)}) := \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}} \mathbb{E}X_\tau.$$

It is well known that the optimal stopping rule τ^* is given by

$$\tau^* := \min\{1 \leq t \leq n-1 : X_t > v_{n-t}\},$$

and $\tau^* = n$ otherwise. Here the sequence of thresholds $\{v_t\}$ is defined by backward induction

$$v_1 = \mathbb{E}X_n, \quad v_{t+1} = \mathbb{E}\{X_{n-t} \vee v_t\}, \quad t = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

and the optimal value of the problem is $V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F^{(n)}) = v_n$.

Prophet inequalities and minimax formulation. In any specific problem instance when $F^{(n)}$ is given, the optimal stopping rule τ^* and the optimal value $V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F^{(n)})$ can be computed numerically. However, in general, it is difficult to assess the performance of optimal stopping rules, and *prophet inequalities* are very useful tools for this purpose. Prophet inequalities compare the optimal value of the stopping problem with the expected value of the maximal observation

$$M_n(F^{(n)}) := \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} X_t.$$

The latter is the performance of the ‘‘prophet’’ with complete foresight. There are two commonly used measures of stopping rule performance relative to the prophet: *the ratio-type* and *difference-type prophet inequalities*.

Let $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ be a family of distribution functions on $[0, \infty) \times \dots \times [0, \infty)$, and let \mathcal{T} be a class of stopping rules of \mathcal{X} . The *competitive ratio* of a stopping rule $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ under distribution $F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\tau; F^{(n)}) = \frac{V_n(\tau; F^{(n)})}{M_n(F^{(n)})}.$$

The competitive ratio is well defined unless X_1, \dots, X_n are all identically zero; this trivial case is excluded from consideration. The optimal stopping rule τ^* in class \mathcal{T} , $\tau^* \in \mathcal{T}$, for given $F^{(n)}$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\tau^*; F^{(n)}) = \mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}; F^{(n)}) := \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{R}_n(\tau; F^{(n)}).$$

A *ratio-type prophet inequality* associated with class of stopping rules \mathcal{T} and family of distributions $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ is a lower bound on $\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}; F^{(n)})$ uniform over $F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}$:

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}; F^{(n)}) \geq \psi_n, \quad \text{for all } F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\{\psi_n\}$ is a numerical sequence with values in $(0, 1]$. The *worst-case competitive ratio* of the optimal rule in \mathcal{T} over the family of distributions $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ is

$$\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{F}^{(n)}) = \inf_{F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}} \mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}; F^{(n)}) = \inf_{F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{R}_n(\tau; F^{(n)}).$$

We say that a ratio-type prophet inequality (1.1) is *(asymptotically) sharp* if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\psi_n^{-1} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{F}^{(n)})\} = 1. \quad (1.2)$$

The asymptotically sharp *difference-type prophet inequality* is defined similarly. First, consider the *regret* of a stopping rule $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ under $F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ to be the difference between the prophet performance and the reward of τ ,

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\tau; F^{(n)}) := M_n(F^{(n)}) - V_n(\tau; F^{(n)}),$$

and the regret of the optimal stopping rule for given $F^{(n)}$ is

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\mathcal{T}; F^{(n)}) := \inf_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{A}_n(\tau; F^{(n)}) = \inf_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \{M_n(F^{(n)}) - V_n(\tau; F^{(n)})\}.$$

The *difference-type prophet inequality* associated with class of stopping rules \mathcal{T} and family of probability distributions $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ is an upper bound on the regret of the optimal stopping rule which holds uniformly over $F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}$:

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\mathcal{T}; F^{(n)}) \leq \delta_n, \quad \text{for all } F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\{\delta_n\}$ is a non-negative numerical sequence. The worst-case regret over a family $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ of distributions is

$$\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{F}^{(n)}) := \sup_{F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}} \mathcal{A}_n(\mathcal{T}; F^{(n)}),$$

and the difference-type prophet inequality is said to be (*asymptotically*) *sharp* if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\delta_n^{-1} \mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{F}^{(n)})\} = 1. \quad (1.4)$$

There is a great deal of interest in the derivation of sharp prophet inequalities and determination of sequences $\{\psi_n\}$ and $\{\delta_n\}$ for various families of distributions and classes of stopping rules. Typically, the derivation of a sharp prophet inequality over a fixed class of distributions $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ involves two steps: first, performance of the optimal stopping rule in class \mathcal{T} is studied, and an inequality of the type (1.1) or (1.3) is established; and, second, a sequence of distributions $F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ is found such that (1.2) or (1.4) holds true. Recently there has been a renewed interest in the topic in view of applications of optimal stopping theory in economics and computer science. For comprehensive review of the area and for additional pointers to the literature we refer to surveys by Hill & Kertz (1992), Lucier (2017) and Correa et al. (2018). Below we discuss selected results that are most relevant to our study.

Prophet inequalities for optimal stopping rules. The classical *ratio-type prophet inequality* (Krengel & Sucheston 1978) states that for any joint probability distribution $F^{(n)} = F_1 \times \dots \times F_n$ one has

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F^{(n)}) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.5)$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}^{(n)}$ be the family of all possible product form distributions with marginals supported on $[0, \infty)$. Then the prophet inequality (1.5) is asymptotically sharp over $\mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}^{(n)}$:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}^{(n)}) = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.6)$$

In words, for any $F^{(n)}$ the optimal reward of stopping rules in the class \mathcal{T}_{all} is at least within factor 1/2 of the value that can be achieved by a prophet with complete foresight, and there exists a distribution $F_*^{(n)}$ such that this factor cannot be improved upon asymptotically as n tends to infinity. We refer to Krengel & Sucheston (1978); see also the survey Hill & Kertz (1992) for detailed discussion.

As for the difference-type prophet inequalities, Hill & Kertz (1981a) considered the family $\mathcal{F}_{[0, 1]}^{(n)}$ of all product form distributions with marginals supported on $[0, 1]$ and showed that

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F^{(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{4}, \quad \forall F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}_{[0, 1]}^{(n)}. \quad (1.7)$$

This inequality is asymptotically sharp, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}^{(n)}) = \frac{1}{4}.$$

The choice of the class $\mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}^{(n)}$ was motivated by Hill & Kertz (1981a), given that if the support is unbounded then the regret can be arbitrarily large. A case with unbounded support was in fact considered by Kennedy & Kertz (1997), who focused on the family $\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{(n)}$ of all distributions $F^{(n)} = F_1 \times F_2 \times \cdots \times F_n$ with marginals having bounded variance, $\text{var}(X_i) \leq \sigma^2 < \infty$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. They proved that

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F^{(n)}) \leq c_n \sigma \sqrt{n-1}, \quad \forall F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma^{(n)},$$

where $c_n \leq 1/2$, $\liminf_n c_n \geq \sqrt{\ln 2 - 1/2} \approx 0.439$. However, no statement on sharpness of this inequality is made. The problem of deriving such results in more general (than bounded support) settings remains open to the best of our knowledge.

If X_1, \dots, X_n is a sequence of independent identically distributed (iid) random variables with common distribution F , then the prophet inequalities (1.5) and (1.7) can be improved. It is worth noting however that proofs of sharpness in this case are more involved because the family of distributions is much narrower given the homogeneity assumption. In what follows, in the setting of iid random variables, with slight abuse of notation in all formulas we drop the superscript (n) and replace $F^{(n)}$ by F , $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ by \mathcal{F} , etc.

In this setting, Hill & Kertz (1982) show that

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F) \geq \frac{1}{a_n}, \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}$$

with numerical constants $\{a_n\}$ satisfying $1.1 < a_n < 1.6$. Kertz (1986) strengthened this result by proving that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}} \mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F) = \frac{1}{1 + \alpha_*} \approx 0.746,$$

where infimum is taken over all possible distributions, and α_* is the unique solution to the equation $\int_0^1 (y - y \ln y + \alpha)^{-1} dy = 1$. The aforementioned paper also provides a characterization of the region where pairs $\{M_n(F), V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F)\}$ may take values. We refer also to Correa et al. (2021, Corollary 2 and Theorem 5) for related results and additional lower bounds for specific cases.

In the case of iid random variables the difference-type prophet inequality (1.7) can be improved as well: Hill & Kertz (1982) show that for any F supported on $[0, 1]$ and for some universal constants $0 < b_n < \frac{1}{4}$ with $b_2 \approx 0.0625$, $b_{100} \approx 0.110$ and $b_{10,000} \approx 0.111$ one has

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F) \leq b_n, \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]},$$

and this inequality is asymptotically sharp. In particular, in Proposition 5.3, Hill & Kertz (1982) present extremal distributions for which the claimed sequence $\{b_n\}$ is attained.

Prophet inequalities for single threshold stopping rules. One of the remarkable observations in this area is that an inequality such as (1.5) holds even if the class of all possible stopping rules \mathcal{T}_{all} is replaced by a much smaller class of simple stopping rules – the stopping rules with a single threshold. Specifically, let

$$\mathcal{T}_0 = \{\tau_0(\theta), \theta \geq 0\}, \quad \mathcal{T}_1 = \{\tau_1(\theta), \theta \geq 0\}$$

be the classes of single threshold stopping rules such that

$$\tau_0(\theta) := \min\{1 \leq t \leq n-1 : X_t > \theta\}, \quad \tau_1(\theta) := \min\{1 \leq t \leq n-1 : X_t \geq \theta\}, \quad (1.8)$$

and $\tau_i(\theta) = n$, $i = 0, 1$ when the set in the parentheses is empty. The classes \mathcal{T}_0 and \mathcal{T}_1 are equivalent in terms of performance of the corresponding stopping rules; taking this fact into account in the sequel we

use notation \mathcal{T}_s for \mathcal{T}_0 or \mathcal{T}_1 . However, sometimes it will be convenient to distinguish between classes \mathcal{T}_0 and \mathcal{T}_1 .

The main observation for the single threshold stopping rules \mathcal{T}_s dates back to Samuel–Cahn (1984) which shows that relations (1.5)–(1.6) remain true if \mathcal{T}_{all} is replaced by \mathcal{T}_s :

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}_s; F^{(n)}) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}^{(n)} \quad (1.9)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}^{(n)}) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

It is evident that the lower bound (1.9) also holds in the iid case. In addition, Samuel–Cahn (1984) in Theorem 2 proves that this bound is asymptotically sharp for the single threshold rules even in the iid case:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}) = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.10)$$

It turns out that the constant 1/2 can be improved for continuous distributions. In particular, let

$$\mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}^c := \{F : F \text{ is continuous on } [0, \infty)\};$$

then it follows from results in Correa et al. (2021) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}^c) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e}.$$

In addition, we refer to Ehsani et al. (2018) for the prophet inequality in the iid setting with constant $1 - e^{-1}$, but for randomized single threshold stopping rules. However, sharpness of these inequalities is still an open problem; a detailed discussion of this issue is given in the next paragraph.

As for the difference–type prophet inequalities for the optimal single threshold stopping rules, we are not aware of any results in this direction to date.

Further related literature. Recently there has been a renewed interest in prophet inequalities due to relations between optimal stopping theory and design of online auction mechanisms. In one such scenario, a seller has a single item to sell to n customers where the i -th customer, $i = 1, \dots, n$, has random valuation X_i for the item. The valuations of different customers are assumed to be independent. The customers arrive sequentially, and they are presented with a price (perhaps, customer-dependent). The customer purchases the item if his/her valuation exceeds the quoted price. The goal of the seller is to design a pricing policy so as to maximize the revenue. This setting is often referred to as a *posted-price auction*.

The *prophet secretary* model in Esfandiari et al. (2017) and Ehsani et al. (2018) assumes that valuations X_1, \dots, X_n are independent random variables with distributions F_1, \dots, F_n , and customers arrive sequentially in a random order. This implies that the realized sequence of valuations is $X_{\pi_1}, \dots, X_{\pi_n}$, where $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$ is a random permutation of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, independent of X_1, \dots, X_n . Various pricing policies were studied in this setting and corresponding prophet inequalities were derived. We refer to Correa et al. (2018) for review of results in this area.

As it is mentioned above, Correa et al. (2021) showed that

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}_s; F) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e}, \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}^c. \quad (1.11)$$

A similar result has been obtained in Ehsani et al. (2018) for the class of all distributions $\mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}$, but that paper considered stopping rules with random breaking of ties when the observed random variable X_t is *exactly equal to* a chosen threshold. Ehsani et al. (2018) in Section 5.1 claims that the prophet inequality (1.11) is sharp in the setting of iid random variables. However, it should be noted that in spite of the close

connection between optimal stopping and online auctions, the algorithms considered in the latter area [see, e.g., Esfandiari et al. (2017), Ehsani et al. (2018), Correa et al. (2021), etc.] are not completely equivalent to those in optimal stopping problems [see, e.g., Chow et al. (1971), Hill & Kertz (1981b), Samuel–Cahn (1984), Hill & Kertz (1992), Bruss & Ferguson (1996), Assaf et al. (2002), etc.]. In particular, the decision rules in Esfandiari et al. (2017), Ehsani et al. (2018) and Correa et al. (2021) (which are fully in line with various other papers in this strand of literature) are not, strictly speaking, stopping times because they are left undefined on the event where all observations are below the corresponding thresholds. In contrast, stopping times are naturally defined to be equal to the terminal value of the sequence at the end of the horizon n , i.e., the last observation is selected. Therefore, it is worth pointing out, and we discuss this further in Section 2.2, that this distinction will affect statements about sharpness of prophet inequalities derived in the online auctions literature, and the comparison across literatures should take this into consideration.

Main contributions. As noted above, prophet inequalities for sequences of independent random variables have been derived for a multitude of different problem instances. These are distinguished by their type (ratio or difference), and by the classes of considered stopping rules \mathcal{T} and underlying distributions $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$. Usually the derivation of a sharp prophet inequality in a particular problem instance consists of two steps: first, a stopping rule in a given class is proposed and a lower (upper) bound on the competitive ratio (regret) of the rule is derived for any distribution from given class $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$; second, a least favorable distribution $F_*^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ is exhibited such that the derived bounds are achieved.

The majority of prophet inequalities found in the literature are asymptotic as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Typically, they are derived for classes of all possible distributions, $\mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}$ or $\mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}$. In general, very little is known about sharp constants in prophet inequalities in the non-asymptotic setting when the horizon n is fixed, or under additional constraints on the set of underlying distributions, e.g., for the set of all distributions with the bounded second moment. In this paper our goal is to shed some light on these issues.

We focus on the iid setting and develop a unified and principled framework for the derivation of non-asymptotic sharp prophet inequalities for single threshold stopping rules. Following Ehsani et al. (2018), we study randomized single threshold stopping rules. In fact, randomization aggregates stopping rules $\tau_0(\theta)$ and $\tau_1(\theta)$ in (1.8) and allows one to achieve much better performance relative to the prophet. We show that for such rules there exists a simple re-formulation of the problem, which can be cast as a two-person zero-sum infinite game on the unit square. Then for any fixed problem horizon n the optimal value of the aforementioned game yields a sharp non-asymptotic prophet inequality, while the solution of the game provides both the optimal single threshold stopping rule as well as the least favorable distribution. This unifies much of the antecedent results which were derived mostly on a case-by-case basis using the earlier mentioned two-step “blueprint.” Beyond unification, the developed framework supports simple computational procedures to derive sharp non-asymptotic prophet inequalities for restricted classes of distributions, characterizes numerical (discretization) errors in said computation, and illustrates efficacy on an array of test problems.

Notation. Throughout the paper we use the following notation. Let F be a distribution function; then we define the quantile function $F^{\leftarrow} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} = [0, \infty]$ of F by

$$F^{\leftarrow}(t) := \inf\{x \in [0, \infty) : F(x) \geq t\}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

The quantile function F^{\leftarrow} is left continuous inverse to F . We also denote $U(t)$, $t \geq 1$, the $(1 - 1/t)$ -quantile of F :

$$U(t) := \left(\frac{1}{1 - F} \right)^{\leftarrow}(t) = F^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1}{t}\right) = \inf\{x \in [0, \infty) : F(x) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{t}\}, \quad t \geq 1. \quad (1.12)$$

In what follows the range of a distribution function is denoted $\text{range}(F) := \{F(x) : x \in [0, \infty)\}$. A *realizable t -quantile* of F is any value $z \in [0, \infty)$ such that $F(z) = t$.

Organization. The rest of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we provide the main results concerning performance of single threshold rules in the iid setting and related prophet inequalities. Section 3

develops a game theoretic formulation that characterizes the optimal single threshold rules and corresponding prophet inequalities. In Section 4 we detail how this game-theoretic formulation can be leveraged towards theoretical guarantees, and discuss some of the computational aspects related to the underlying optimization problems. Section 5 contains discussion and examples that illustrate application of the developed approach for restricted families of probability distributions. Section 6 presents proofs of the main results of this paper.

2 Single threshold stopping rules

We slightly extend the definition of the single threshold stopping rules in (1.8) to allow randomization. Let $\{\xi_t, 1 \leq t \leq n\}$ be iid Bernoulli random variables with success probability $p \in [0, 1]$, independent of \mathcal{X} . Define

$$\tau_p(\theta) := \min \{1 \leq t \leq n-1 : (X_t > \theta) \cup (X_t = \theta, \xi_t = 1)\}, \quad (2.1)$$

and $\tau_p(\theta) = n$ if the set in the parentheses is empty. In words, $\tau_p(\theta)$ stops at the first time t when the observed value X_t exceeds the fixed threshold θ or if $X_t = \theta$ and the outcome ξ_t of the Bernoulli trial with success probability p equals one. Let

$$\mathcal{T}_{s,r} := \{\tau_p(\theta) : \theta \geq 0, p \in [0, 1]\}$$

be the set of all such stopping rules. The stopping rule $\tau_p(\theta)$ is determined by two parameters: the threshold θ and the success probability p . Note that \mathcal{T}_0 and \mathcal{T}_1 are subsets of $\mathcal{T}_{s,r}$ corresponding to $p = 0$ and $p = 1$ respectively.

The randomization in the construction of $\tau_p(\theta)$ admits very simple interpretation in terms of the stopping rules $\tau_0(\theta)$ and $\tau_1(\theta)$ defined in (1.8). If, for a given threshold θ , both rules $\tau_0(\theta)$ and $\tau_1(\theta)$ prescribe to stop at the same time instance $t = 1, \dots, n-1$ then $\tau_p(\theta) = t$ as well. But if $\tau_1(\theta) = t$ and $\tau_0(\theta) > \tau_1(\theta)$ then the decision to stop or not to stop at t is made according to the outcome of the Bernoulli experiment with success probability p .

2.1 Main results

We begin with a simple result that establishes the exact formula for the reward of the optimal single threshold stopping rule from $\mathcal{T}_{s,r}$.

Theorem 1. (Performance of optimal single threshold rules) *Let X_1, \dots, X_n are iid random variables with common distribution F , and*

$$\Delta(x) := F(x) - F(x-), \quad F_p(x) := pF(x-) + (1-p)F(x), \quad \forall x, p \in [0, 1]. \quad (2.2)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; F) \\ &= \sup_{\theta \geq 0, p \in [0, 1]} \left\{ [1 - F_p^n(\theta)] \left[\theta + \frac{\int_{\theta}^{\infty} (1 - F_p(x)) dx}{1 - F_p(\theta)} \right] + F_p^{n-1}(\theta) \left[\int_{[0, \theta]} x dF(x) - p\theta\Delta(\theta) \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

$$= \sup_{\theta \geq 0, p \in [0, 1]} \left\{ [1 - F_p^{n-1}(\theta)] \left[\theta + \frac{\int_{\theta}^{\infty} (1 - F_p(x)) dx}{1 - F_p(\theta)} \right] + F_p^{n-1}(\theta) \int_0^{\infty} [1 - F_p(x)] dx \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 6.1.

Remark 1. *Letting $p = 0$ or $p = 1$ in (2.3)–(2.4) of Theorem 1 we obtain the exact formulas for the reward of the optimal single threshold stopping rules from \mathcal{T}_s .*

Remark 2. Since $M_n(F) \geq V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F) \geq V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; F)$, the theorem implies lower bounds on $M_n(F) = \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} X_t$, and on the performance of the optimal stopping rule in the class of all stopping rules, $V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; F)$. It is worth noting that (2.3) provides an improvement of Markov's inequality for random variables of the type $\max_{1 \leq t \leq n} X_t$, where X_1, \dots, X_n are non-negative iid random variables.

Some implications of Theorem 1 are contained in the following two corollaries.

Corollary 1. Let X_1, \dots, X_n be iid random variables with common distribution $F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}$. Then

$$V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; F) \geq \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-1}\right] M_n(F) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-1} M_1(F). \quad (2.5)$$

Therefore, for every n one has

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; F) \geq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e}, \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}. \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. Let $\theta = U(n)$, and

$$p = \begin{cases} 0, & F(U(n)) = 1 - 1/n, \\ \frac{F(U(n)) - (1 - \frac{1}{n})}{F(U(n)) - F(U(n)-)}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

where $U(t)$ is the $(1 - 1/t)$ -quantile of distribution F [see (1.12)]. With this choice, $F_p(U(n)) = 1 - 1/n$, and therefore it follows from (2.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; F) &\geq V_n(\tau_p(U(n)); F) \\ &= \left[1 - F_p^{n-1}(U(n))\right] \left\{U(n) + n \int_{U(n)}^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx\right\} + F_p^{n-1}(U(n)) \int_0^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Note also that

$$M_n(F) = \int_0^{\infty} [1 - F^n(x)] dx \leq U(n) + n \int_{U(n)}^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx. \quad (2.9)$$

Therefore

$$V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; F) \geq V_n(\tau_p(U(n)); F) = \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-1}\right] M_n(F) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-1} M_1(F),$$

as claimed in (2.5). The same chain of inequalities applied to (2.3) leads to

$$V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; F) \geq \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n\right] M_n(F) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-1} \int_{[0, U(n))} x dF(x), \quad (2.10)$$

which implies (2.6). \square

The proof shows that inequality (2.6) holds for the stopping rule $\tau_p(\theta)$ with threshold $\theta = U(n)$ and parameter p defined in (2.7). Note that if the class \mathcal{T}_s is considered, then (2.6) is still fulfilled, but only for all distributions F with the realizable $(1 - 1/n)$ -quantile. Thus, the following non-asymptotic prophet inequality holds

$$\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{G}^n) \geq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e}, \quad \forall n,$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}^n := \left\{F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)} : 1 - \frac{1}{n} \in \text{range}(F)\right\}. \quad (2.11)$$

Note that class \mathcal{G}^n is rather rich: it includes all continuous distributions on $[0, \infty)$, and discrete distributions with realizable $(1 - 1/n)$ -quantile. In particular, if $F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}^c$ then, obviously, $\text{range}(F) \supseteq [0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}^c \subset \mathcal{G}^n$ for all n . Therefore

$$\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}^c) \geq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e}, \quad \forall n.$$

The above prophet inequality holds *asymptotically* as $n \rightarrow \infty$ under much weaker conditions when F is continuous on the right tail. In particular, if for $x_0 > 0$

$$\mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}^c(x_0) := \{F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)} : F \text{ is continuous on } [x_0, \infty)\},$$

then for any $x_0 > 0$ there exists $n_0 = n_0(x_0)$ such that $1 - 1/n \in \text{range}(F)$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Therefore

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}^c(x_0)) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e}.$$

Remark 3. *The inequality (2.10) implies that $M_n(F) - V_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; F) \leq (1 - \frac{1}{n})^n M_n(F)$, and therefore*

$$\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n. \quad (2.12)$$

A similar difference-type prophet inequality with constant $(1 - 1/n)^n$ has been established in the literature for the problem of stopping the sequence $\{Y_t = X_t - ct : t = 1, \dots, n\}$ with the cost of observation $c \geq 0$, where X_1, \dots, X_n are independent (Jones 1990) or iid (Samuel-Cahn 1992) random variables. It is worth noting that the optimal rule in the stopping problem with the iid random variables and cost of observations is the single threshold stopping rule; so there is a close connection between (2.12) and the results in Samuel-Cahn (1992). It is proved in Samuel-Cahn (1992) that the constant $(1 - 1/n)^n$ is sharp. However, sharpness of the inequality is understood not only in the sense of the least favorable distribution F , but also in the sense of the least favorable observation cost c . In fact, our results below demonstrate that inequality (2.12) can be improved when there is no observation cost, $c = 0$.

A byproduct of the proof of Corollary 1 is the following distribution-free inequality on the sequence $\{M_n(F), n \geq 1\}$ of maximal order statistics corresponding to sample sizes $n = 1, 2, \dots$. This result is interesting in its own right.

Corollary 2. (Distribution free bounds on the growth of expected extremes) *Let X_1, X_2, \dots be iid random variables with common distribution function F , and let $M_t(F) := \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} X_i$ for any $t \geq 1$. Then for integers $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$ and any $F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}$ one has*

$$M_n(F) \geq (1 - \lambda_{n,k})M_{n+k}(F) + \lambda_{n,k}M_1(F), \quad \lambda_{n,k} := \left(1 - \frac{1}{n+k}\right)^{n-1}.$$

Proof. It follows from (2.4) that for any $\alpha \geq 1$ and $p \in [0, 1]$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} M_n(F) &\geq V_n(\tau_p(U(\alpha)); F) \\ &= [1 - F_p^{n-1}(U(\alpha))] \left\{ U(\alpha) + \frac{\int_{U(\alpha)}^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx}{1 - F_p(\alpha)} \right\} + F_p^{n-1}(U(\alpha)) \int_0^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\alpha = n + k$ and p such that $F_p(U(n + k)) = 1 - 1/(n + k)$ [see (2.7)] in the previous formula and applying (2.9) with n replaced by $n + k$ we complete the proof. \square

Remark 4. *Downey & Maier (1993) study the rate of growth of the sequence $\{M_n(F), n \geq 1\}$, and define ordering of distribution functions based on $\{M_n(F), n \geq 1\}$. Among other results, this paper proves the inequality*

$$M_n(F) \geq (1 - e^{-1}) \left\{ U(n) + n \int_{U(n)}^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx \right\}, \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}.$$

This inequality is an immediate consequence of (2.3) with $\theta = U(n)$ and p given in (2.7). For additional results on behavior of the sequence of expectations of the maximum of iid random variables we refer to Downey (1990) and Correa & Romero (2021).

2.2 Remarks on the sharpness of prophet inequality (2.6)

Some statements about sharpness of prophet inequalities for single threshold stopping rules appeared in previous literature. We discuss these results in the remarks below.

1. Samuel–Cahn (1984, Theorem 2) asserts that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (2.13)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}$ is the class of all distributions on $[0, \infty)$. In the proof of (2.13) Samuel–Cahn (1984) considers a discrete least favorable distribution F_* having three atoms at 0, $a \in (0, 1)$ and 1 with probabilities $1 - (b+c)/n$, c/n and b/n , respectively; here $b > 0$, $c > 0$ and $b + c < n$. Thus, the distribution F_* is

$$F_*(x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{b+c}{n}, & 0 \leq x < a, \\ 1 - \frac{b}{n}, & a \leq x < 1, \\ 1, & x \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

In this example a straightforward calculation yields

$$M_n(F_*) = a \left[\left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right)^n - \left(1 - \frac{b+c}{n}\right)^n \right] + 1 - \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right)^n.$$

For the stopping rule $\tau_0(\theta)$ in (1.8) there are three possible thresholds $\theta = 0$, $\theta = a$ and $\theta = 1$. In view of (2.4) with $p = 0$, the corresponding values are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(0)} &= \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{b+c}{n}\right)^{n-1} \right] \frac{ac+b}{c+b} + \left(1 - \frac{b+c}{n}\right)^{n-1} \frac{ac+b}{n}, \\ \mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(a)} &= 1 - \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right)^{n-1} + \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right)^{n-1} \frac{ac+b}{n}, \\ \mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(1)} &= \mathbb{E}(X_1) = \frac{ac+b}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, put $a = a_n = 1/n$, $b = b_n = 1/n$, and $c = c_n = \sqrt{n}$, and let F_n stand for the distribution F_* with parameters a_n , b_n and c_n . Then, asymptotically,

$$M_n(F_n) \sim \frac{2}{n}, \quad \mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(0)} \sim \frac{1}{n}, \quad \mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(a_n)} \sim \frac{1}{n}, \quad \mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(1)} \sim \frac{1}{n^{3/2}},$$

where $v_n \sim w_n$ means that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (v_n/w_n) = 1$. Thus, the limit $1/2$ is achieved asymptotically for $\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}_s; F_n)$.

It is instructive to calculate the competitive ratio of the best stopping rule from $\mathcal{T}_{s,r}$ on the sequence of the least favorable distributions $\{F_n\}$ given above. Consider the stopping rule $\tau_p(\theta)$ with

$$\theta = a_n = \frac{1}{n}, \quad p = \frac{F_n(a_n) - (1 - \frac{1}{n})}{F_n(a_n) - F_n(a_n^-)} = \frac{1 - b_n}{c_n} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{n}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

With this choice of parameters, in view of (2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_{\tau_p(a_n)} &\geq \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \right] \left[a_n + n \int_{a_n}^{\infty} (1 - F_n(x)) dx \right] \\ &= \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \right] \left[a_n + b_n(1 - a_n) \right] = \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \right] \left(\frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $M_n(F_n) \sim 2/n$, on the sequence of distributions $\{F_n\}$ one has

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}X_{\tau_p(a_n)}}{M_n(F_n)} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e},$$

as stated in Corollary 1.

2. Ehsani et al. (2018) in Theorem 21 claim that the prophet inequality $\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}^c) \geq 1 - e^{-1}$ is asymptotically sharp in the iid setting. In the proof of this statement the authors first consider the distribution F_* having two atoms at $n/(e-1)$ and $(e-2)/(e-1)$ with probabilities $1/n^2$ and $1 - 1/n^2$ respectively. For this distribution there are two possible choices of the threshold: $\theta_1 = 0$ and $\theta_2 = (e-2)/(e-1)$. Then Ehsani et al. (2018) show that the best single threshold stopping rule achieves the competitive ratio at most 0.58. Furthermore, the authors argue that this bound can be improved by randomization to $1 - e^{-1}$.

For the distribution F_* we have

$$M_n(F) = \frac{e-2}{e-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^n + \frac{n}{e-1} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^n\right].$$

Using (2.4) for the single threshold rule with no randomization ($p = 0$), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(\theta_1)} = \frac{e-2}{e-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) + \frac{1}{n(e-1)},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(\theta_2)} = \frac{n}{e-1} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{n-1}\right] + \left[\frac{e-2}{e-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) + \frac{1}{n(e-1)}\right] \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{n-1}.$$

These formulas imply that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n(F_*) = 1, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(\theta_1)} = \frac{e-2}{e-1}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}X_{\tau_0(\theta_2)} = 1,$$

so that for the specified distribution $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{T}_s; F_*) = 1$. Thus, for the distribution F_* the stopping rules from \mathcal{T}_s achieve a factor of one as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In fact, for any distribution with two atoms the single threshold rules achieve the factor one; this has been already pointed out in Remark 1 in Samuel-Cahn (1984).

The difference between the above calculation and the conclusion in Ehsani et al. (2018) stems from the fact that in said paper as well as in all other papers on online auctions, such as Esfandiari et al. (2017) and Correa et al. (2021), the decision rules are left undefined on the event where the random variables X_1, \dots, X_n do not exceed the corresponding thresholds [see, e.g., Algorithm Prophet Secretary on page 1687 in Esfandiari et al. (2017) and Algorithm 1 in Correa et al. (2021)]. Thus, strictly speaking, the considered decision rules are not stopping times. Effectively, the implication of this fact is that if X_1, \dots, X_n are below the respective thresholds then the obtained reward is equal to zero. This formally corresponds to computation of the reward of a single threshold rule without the last term on the right hand side of (2.4), which affects statements about sharpness of the derived prophet inequalities.

The above discussion implies that sharpness of the inequality (2.6) is still an open question. In the next section we demonstrate that derivation of sharp non-asymptotic prophet inequalities for the stopping rules from the class $\mathcal{T}_{s,r}$ is equivalent to the solution of a two-person zero-sum infinite game on the unit square with particular pay-off kernels. The value of this game provides a sharp constant in the prophet inequality, while the optimal solution yields the least favorable distribution.

3 Characterization of prophet inequalities via a game theoretic formulation

Let us introduce the following notation. For $(x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ define

$$R(x, y) := \frac{1 - x^{n-1}}{1 - y^n} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1 - y}{1 - x} \right\} + x^{n-1} \frac{1 - y}{1 - y^n} = \begin{cases} \frac{1 - x^{n-1}y}{1 - y^n}, & x > y, \\ \frac{1 - y}{1 - y^n} \frac{1 - x^n}{1 - x}, & x < y, \\ 1, & x = y, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A(x, y) &:= 1 - y^n - (1 - x^{n-1}) \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1 - y}{1 - x} \right\} - x^{n-1}(1 - y) \\ &= \begin{cases} y(x^{n-1} - y^{n-1}), & x > y \\ (1 - y) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (y^k - x^k), & x \leq y. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

For probability distributions λ and μ on $[0, 1]$ we put

$$\bar{R}(\lambda, \mu) := \int_0^1 \int_0^1 R(x, y) d\lambda(x) d\mu(y), \quad \bar{A}(\lambda, \mu) := \int_0^1 \int_0^1 A(x, y) d\lambda(x) d\mu(y). \quad (3.3)$$

The main result of this section is given in the next theorem.

Theorem 2. (Saddlepoint characterization) *For any fixed n the following representations hold:*

$$\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}) = \inf_{\mu} \sup_{\lambda} \left\{ \bar{R}(\lambda, \mu) : \lambda \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}, \mu \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]} \right\}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}) = \sup_{\mu} \inf_{\lambda} \left\{ \bar{A}(\lambda, \mu) : \lambda \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}, \mu \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]} \right\}, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}$ are the classes of all distributions on the respective domain.

Theorem 2 provides characterization of the worst-case competitive ratio $\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)})$ and the worst-case regret $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]})$ via two-person zero-sum infinite games on the unit square. We refer to Karlin (1959) for detailed discussion of such problems. The interpretation of the games in (3.4)–(3.5) is evident: the decision maker generates a random value x from distribution λ on $[0, 1]$ and sets the stopping rule threshold $\theta_x = F^{\leftarrow}(x)$ and the success probability $p_x = (F(\theta_x) - x)/(F(\theta_x) - F(\theta_x -))$, while the nature selects the distribution μ on $[0, 1]$ which is directly related to the quantile function of F . In particular, as the proof of Theorem 2 shows, for the ratio-type prophet inequality the quantile function F^{\leftarrow} of the least favorable distribution is related to the optimal solution of the game by relationship $d\mu(y) := (1 - y^n)dF^{\leftarrow}(y)$, $\forall y \in [0, 1]$, while for the difference-type prophet inequality we have $d\mu(y) = dF^{\leftarrow}(y)$, $y \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 2 enables us to establish minimax results for the ratio-type and difference-type prophet inequalities.

Corollary 3. (Interchange results and minimax) *The infinite games (3.4) and (3.5) have solutions, i.e.,*

$$\inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{s,r}} \mathcal{R}_n(\tau; F) = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{s,r}} \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}} \mathcal{R}_n(\tau; F), \quad (3.6)$$

$$\sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}} \inf_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{s,r}} \mathcal{A}_n(\tau; F) = \inf_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{s,r}} \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}} \mathcal{A}_n(\tau; F). \quad (3.7)$$

The existence of the value of the infinite game (3.5) follows from continuity of the pay-off kernel $A(x, y)$ on $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$; see, e.g., Kuhn (2003, Section 4.5). Hence (3.7) holds. The kernel $R(x, y)$ is positive, bounded

above by one, but, in contrast to $A(x, y)$, it is discontinuous at $(x, y) = (1, 1)$. Indeed, it follows from (3.1) that $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} R(1 - \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon) = 1$, but $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} R(1, 1 - \epsilon) = 1/n$. However, $R(x, y)$ is upper semi-continuous because for every sequence $\{(x_m, y_m)\}$ such that $(x_m, y_m) \rightarrow (1, 1)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ one has $\limsup_m R(x_m, y_m) \leq R(1, 1) = 1$. Therefore (3.6) is a consequence of the minimax theorem in Glicksberg (1950).

It is worth mentioning that a game theoretic interpretation of prophet inequalities has been discussed, e.g., in Schmitz (1992) and Meyerthole & Schmitz (2000). For independent random variables Schmitz (1992) studies the question of existence of minimax strategies in games against a prophet with ratio-type and difference-type pay-off functions, while Meyerthole & Schmitz (2000) focuses on prophet games for martingales and general stochastic processes. Corollary 3 deals with iid random variables, and single threshold stopping rules; these results complement the ones in the aforementioned papers.

4 Computation of sharp constants

Theorem 2 shows that sharp constants in prophet inequalities for single threshold stopping rules are determined by the optimal values of the two-person zero-sum infinite games on the unit square (3.4) and (3.5). These games can be approximated to any prescribed accuracy by finite games which are efficiently solved using simple computational procedures.

Specifically, for $R(x, y)$ and $A(x, y)$ defined in (3.1) and (3.2) and integer number N define matrices $R_N := \{R(\frac{i}{N}, \frac{j}{N}) : i, j = 1, \dots, N - 1\}$, and $A_N := \{A(\frac{i}{N}, \frac{j}{N}) : i, j = 1, \dots, N - 1\}$, i.e.,

$$[R_N]_{ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{1 - (\frac{i}{N})^{n-1} \frac{j}{N}}{1 - (\frac{i}{N})^n}, & 1 \leq j \leq i \leq N - 1, \\ \frac{1 - (\frac{i}{N})^n}{1 - \frac{j}{N}} \frac{1 - \frac{j}{N}}{1 - (\frac{j}{N})^n}, & 1 \leq i < j \leq N - 1, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

$$[A_N]_{ij} := \begin{cases} (1 - \frac{j}{N}) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(\frac{i}{N})^k - (\frac{j}{N})^k], & 1 \leq i \leq j \leq N - 1, \\ \frac{j}{N} [(\frac{i}{N})^{n-1} - (\frac{j}{N})^{n-1}], & 1 \leq j < i \leq N - 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Consider the associated matrix games

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^* := \min_{\mu} \max_{\lambda} \left\{ \lambda^T R_N \mu : \lambda^T \mathbf{1} = 1, \mu^T \mathbf{1} = 1, \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,N}^* := \max_{\mu} \min_{\lambda} \left\{ \lambda^T A_N \mu : \lambda^T \mathbf{1} = 1, \mu^T \mathbf{1} = 1, \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ stands for the vector of ones, and λ and μ correspond to the stopping strategy and the least favorable distribution respectively.

Our current goal is to establish bounds on the accuracy of approximation of optimal values of the infinite games in (3.4) and (3.5), $\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)})$ and $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]})$, by the matrix games $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*$ and $\mathcal{A}_{n,N}^*$ respectively. First, we show that the optimal values $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*$ and $\mathcal{A}_{n,N}^*$ of matrix games (4.3) and (4.4) admit interpretations as the rewards of optimal single threshold stopping rules for discrete distributions of special type.

Theorem 3. (Discrete approximations) *Let $0 \leq u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_N$ be real numbers, and consider the family of all discrete distribution functions with at most N atoms and probabilities taking values in the set $\{i/N : i = 1, \dots, N\}$,*

$$\mathcal{D}_N := \left\{ F : F(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N I\{u_i \leq x\}, \quad u = (u_1, \dots, u_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \right\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^ = \mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{D}_N)$, $\mathcal{A}_{n,N}^* = \mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{D}_N)$.*

Theorem 4 shows that the optimal values of the finite matrix games in (4.3) and (4.4) provide sharp constants in the prophet inequalities for stopping rules in \mathcal{T}_s and the class of distributions \mathcal{D}_N . It is worth mentioning that for fixed n and any N_1 and N_2 such that $N_1 > N_2$ and $\mathcal{D}_{N_1} \subset \mathcal{D}_{N_2}$ we have that $\mathcal{R}_{n,N_1}^* \leq \mathcal{R}_{n,N_2}^*$ and $\mathcal{A}_{n,N_1}^* \geq \mathcal{A}_{n,N_2}^*$.

The next statement provides two-sided bounds on $\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)})$ and $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]})$ in terms of the optimal values of the matrix games (4.3) and (4.4).

Theorem 4. (Bounds for discrete approximations)

(i) For any $n \geq 2$ one has

$$|\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}) - \mathcal{A}_{n,N}^*| \leq \frac{n-1}{2N}. \quad (4.5)$$

(ii) For $n \geq 4$ one has

$$|\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}) - \mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*| \leq \frac{n-1}{2N[(1-e^{-1})^2 - \frac{1}{n-1}]}. \quad (4.6)$$

The theorem shows that sharp non-asymptotic constants in prophet inequalities for single threshold rules in $\mathcal{T}_{s,r}$ can be computed with any prescribed accuracy by solution of the finite games in (4.3)–(4.4). For any horizon n , choosing sufficiently large N , we can achieve desired precision in computation of the sharp constants. In particular, the bounds of Theorem 4 show that in order to achieve fixed precision ϵ , the discretization parameter N should grow as n increases.

According to Theorem 3, the developed discrete approximation corresponds to the single threshold stopping rules in \mathcal{T}_s with no randomization. Note that the finite games (4.3)–(4.4) are reduced to linear programs which can be efficiently solved using standard computational tools. We provide the details below.

4.1 Ratio-type prophet inequalities

To compute the sharp constants in ratio-type prophet inequalities we solve the game (4.3) as follows. Let r_i^T denote the i th row of matrix R_N , i.e., $R_N = [r_1^T; r_2^T; \dots; r_{N-1}^T]$. Then the problem (4.3) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mu} \quad & \max_{i=1, \dots, N-1} r_i^T \mu \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mu^T \mathbf{1} = 1 \\ & \mu \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

which is directly cast as a linear optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mu, t} \quad & t \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & r_i^T \mu \leq t, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1 \\ & \mu^T \mathbf{1} = 1 \\ & \mu \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{R})$$

If (μ^*, t^*) is the optimal solution of (R) then the value of the matrix game (4.3) is $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^* = t^*$, and the least favorable distribution has N atoms with i/N -quantiles $\{u_i, i = 1, \dots, N-1\}$ determined by the relationships

$$u_i := \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{\mu_j^*}{1 - (\frac{j}{N})^n}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1.$$

The optimal stopping time is associated with the threshold $\theta^* = u_{i^*}$, where i^* satisfies $r_{i^*}^T \mu^* = t^*$.

We solve problem (R) for different values of horizon $n \in \{10, 25, 50, 100, 300, 500, 1000, 2000, 3000\}$ with fixed discretization parameter, $N = 13500^1$, using Mosek optimization solver Mosek ApS (2019). The results

¹This choice of N is dictated by the computer power limitations. The computations were performed on a laptop with 32GB RAM and i7 11th generation processor.

| n | $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*$ | $[\underline{\mathcal{R}}_{n,N}^*, \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{n,N}^*]$ | $\mathcal{A}_{n,N}^*$ | $[\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{n,N}^*, \overline{\mathcal{A}}_{n,N}^*]$ |
|------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| 10 | 0.6698 | [0.669, 0.671] | 0.1395 | [0.139, 0.140] |
| 25 | 0.6540 | [0.651, 0.656] | 0.1572 | [0.156, 0.158] |
| 50 | 0.6458 | [0.641, 0.651] | 0.1644 | [0.163, 0.166] |
| 75 | 0.6427 | [0.636, 0.649] | 0.1671 | [0.164, 0.170] |
| 100 | 0.6411 | [0.634, 0.650] | 0.1699 | [0.166, 0.172] |
| 200 | 0.6392 | [0.633, 0.658] | 0.1708 | [0.163, 0.178] |
| 500 | 0.6409 | [0.632, 0.688] | 0.1723 | [0.153, 0.191] |
| 1000 | 0.6468 | [0.632, 0.739] | 0.1729 | [0.135, 0.211] |
| 2000 | 0.6595 | [0.632, 0.845] | 0.1733 | [0.096, 0.250] |
| 3000 | 0.6726 | [0.632, 0.951] | 0.1731 | [0.058, 0.288] |

Table 1: Optimal values $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*$ and $\mathcal{A}_{n,N}^*$ of problems (R) and (A) and bounds on $\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)})$ and $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]})$ for different values of n , where $N = 13500$ for problem (R) and $N = 13000$ for problem (A).

are reported in the second and third columns of Table 1. The second column presents the values $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*$, while the third column gives the interval $[\underline{\mathcal{R}}_{n,N}^*, \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{n,N}^*]$, where

$$\underline{\mathcal{R}}_{n,N}^* = \max \left\{ 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n, \mathcal{R}_{n,N}^* - \frac{n-1}{2N[(1-e^{-1})^2 - \frac{1}{n-1}]} \right\},$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{n,N}^* = \mathcal{R}_{n,N}^* + \frac{n-1}{2N[(1-e^{-1})^2 - \frac{1}{n-1}]}.$$

Note that $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_{n,N}^*$ is defined as the maximum of two numbers: the lower bound of Theorem 4 and $1 - (1 - \frac{1}{n})^n$, given by the prophet inequality (2.6).

Accuracy of the presented bounds deteriorates as n grows; computation of more accurate bounds requires selecting much bigger values of N . For instance, in order to compute the sharp constant in the prophet inequality for $n = 100$ with accuracy 10^{-3} , it is required to have $N > 1.25 \cdot 10^5$, which leads to a linear program with non-sparse matrices of dimensionality of several hundred thousands.

The numbers presented in the second and third columns of Table 1 do not provide a formal proof of asymptotic sharpness of the prophet inequality (2.6); however some very useful conclusions on sharp constants can be reliably drawn. For instance, if $n = 100$ then the prophet inequality (2.6) states that

$$\mathcal{R}_{100}^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}) \geq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{100}\right)^{100} \approx 0.6340.$$

The row corresponding to $n = 100$ in Table 1 shows that there exists a distribution $F_* \in \mathcal{D}_{13500}$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{100}(\mathcal{T}_s; F_*) \approx 0.6411$, and

$$0.634 \leq \mathcal{R}_{100}^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}) \leq 0.650.$$

Based on the results given in Table 1 one can assert that for all practical purposes the prophet inequality (2.6) is sharp.

4.2 Difference-type prophet inequalities

The sharp constants for the difference-type prophet inequality are obtained as solution of the finite matrix game (4.4) with pay-off matrix A_N defined in (4.2). If a_i^T denotes the i th row of matrix A_N , i.e., $A_N =$

$[a_1^T; a_2^T; \dots; a_{N-1}^T]$, then (4.2) is equivalent to the linear program

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\mu, t} && t \\ \text{s.t.} &&& a_i^T \mu \geq t, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1 \\ &&& \mu^T \mathbf{1} = 1 \\ &&& \mu \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{A}$$

If (μ^*, t^*) is the optimal solution of (A) then $\mathcal{A}_{n,N}^* = t^*$, and the least favorable distribution F_* is the discrete distribution with i/N -quantiles u_i determined by $u_i = \sum_{j=1}^i \mu_j^*$, $i = 1, \dots, N-1$.

The problem (A) is solved for $n \in \{10, 25, 50, 100, 300, 500, 1000, 2000, 3000\}$, and $N = 13000$. The last two columns in Table 1 contain the optimal value $\mathcal{A}_{n,N}^*$, and $\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{n,N}^* := \mathcal{A}_{n,N}^* - \frac{1}{2}(n-1)/N$ and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}_{n,N}^* := \mathcal{A}_{n,N}^* + \frac{1}{2}(n-1)/N$, which are the lower and upper bounds on the sharp constant $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]})$ in the difference-type prophet inequality. The existing literature does not contain prophet inequalities for single threshold stopping rules in the iid setting. However, the numbers in the last two columns on Table 1 can be compared to the bounds on the values $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]})$ reported in Hill & Kertz (1982) for the class of all possible stopping rules: $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}) \leq b_n$ with $b_{10,000} \approx 0.111$. The inferiority the optimal single threshold stopping rule in comparison with the optimal stopping rule is moderate: the regret increases from 0.11 to 0.17.

5 Discussion and examples

The proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 heavily exploit the fact that both the expected value of the maximum, $M_n(F) = \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} X_t$, and the reward $V_n[\tau_{p_x}(\theta_x); F]$ of a single threshold stopping rule associated parameters θ_x and p_x , are linear functionals of the quantile function F^{\leftarrow} . In particular, it is shown that

$$V_n(\tau_{p_x}(\theta_x); F) = \int_0^1 \left[(1-x^{n-1}) \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1-y}{1-x} \right\} + x^{n-1}(1-y) \right] dF^{\leftarrow}(y),$$

and

$$M_n(F) = \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} X_t = \int_0^1 (1-y^n) dF^{\leftarrow}(y).$$

Another step in our derivation of the sharp constants is the approximation of F by the class of discrete distributions \mathcal{D}_N . This allows one to reduce optimization problems to finite-dimensional ones and to efficiently solve them on a computer. It is worth noting that any distribution function F can be approximated in the \mathbb{L}_∞ -norm by a function from \mathcal{D}_N with accuracy $1/N$. Since the value of N can be chosen (at least, theoretically) as large as wished, the sharp constants in prophet inequalities can be computed with any prescribed accuracy.

Specifically, the proof of Theorem 3 demonstrates that for $F \in \mathcal{D}_N$ one has

$$M_n(F) = d^T v, \quad d = [d_1; \dots; d_{N-1}], \quad d_j = 1 - \left(\frac{j}{N}\right)^n, \quad j = 1, \dots, N-1,$$

and $V_n(\tau_0(u_i); F) = b_i^T v$, $b_i = [b_{i,1}; \dots; b_{i,N-1}]$, where

$$b_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 - \left(\frac{i}{N}\right)^{n-1} \frac{j}{N}, & 1 \leq j \leq i \leq N-1, \\ \frac{1 - \left(\frac{i}{N}\right)^n}{1 - \frac{i}{N}} \left(1 - \frac{j}{N}\right), & 1 \leq i < j \leq N-1, \end{cases}$$

and $v = [v_1; \dots; v_{N-1}]$, $v_j = u_j - u_{j-1}$, $j = 1, \dots, N-1$ with u_j 's being the (j/N) -quantiles of F . Then the derivation of the ratio-type and different-type prophet inequalities are formulated as optimization problems

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_v && \max_{i=1, \dots, N-1} \frac{b_i^T v}{d^T v} \\ \text{s.t.} &&& v \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_v \quad & \min_{i=1, \dots, N-1} [d^T v - b_i^T v] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{1}^T v = 1 \\ & v \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

It is readily seen that (5.1) and (5.2) are equivalent to (R) and (A) respectively. These problems are reduced to linear programs that are efficiently solved on a computer. The corresponding optimal values provide approximate sharp constants with accuracy guarantees given in Theorem 4.

What is perhaps more important is that the proposed approach can be used in order to compute approximate sharp prophet inequalities for restricted families of distributions, such as distributions with bounded variance, second moment, or other constraints on the tail behavior. In fact, prophet inequalities under any condition on the quantile function that results in convex constraints in (5.1)–(5.2) can be efficiently computed. We illustrate this fact in the following two examples.

Difference–type prophet inequality for distributions with bounded variance. Let \mathcal{F}_σ be the class of distribution functions on $[0, \infty)$ with variance bounded by constant $\sigma^2 < \infty$,

$$\mathcal{F}_\sigma := \left\{ F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)} : \text{var}(X_i) = \int_{(0,1)} \int_{(0,1)} [x \wedge y - xy] dF^{\leftarrow}(x) dF^{\leftarrow}(y) \leq \sigma^2 \right\}.$$

If $F \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma \cap \mathcal{D}_N$ then the condition $\text{var}(X_i) \leq \sigma^2$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left(\frac{i}{N} \wedge \frac{j}{N} - \frac{ij}{N^2} \right) (u_i - u_{i-1})(u_j - u_{j-1}) = v^T Q v,$$

where, as before, $v = [v_1; \dots; v_{N-1}]$ with $v_i = u_i - u_{i-1}$, and $Q_{ij} = \frac{i \wedge j}{N} - \frac{ij}{N^2}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N-1$.

The problem (5.1) associated with the ratio–type prophet inequality is scale invariant in the sense that its optimal solution is defined up to a scale parameter. Therefore the optimal value does not change when an upper bound on variance is added. The same is true when any one–sided linear constraint on v is imposed. Therefore we discuss only the difference–type prophet inequality for the family $\mathcal{F}_\sigma \cap \mathcal{D}_N$.

In this situation in the problem (5.2) the constraint $\mathbf{1}^T v = 1$ should be replaced by the quadratic constraint $v^T Q v \leq \sigma^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_v \quad & \min_{i=1, \dots, N-1} [d^T v - b_i^T v] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & v^T Q v \leq \sigma^2 \\ & v \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The optimal value of this problem is $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{S}_s; \mathcal{F}_\sigma \cap \mathcal{D}_N) = \kappa_n \sigma$, where κ_n is given by

$$\kappa_n := \max_{z, t} \left\{ t : (\mathbf{1}d^T - B)z - t\mathbf{1} \geq 0, \|Q^{1/2}z\|_2 \leq 1, z \geq 0, t \geq 0 \right\}, \tag{5.3}$$

where $B = \{b_{i,j}\}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N-1$. Table 2 displays values of κ_n for $n \in \{10, 25, 50, 75, 100, 250, 500, 750, 1000\}$ obtained by solving optimization problem in (5.3) for $N = 7000$; we used CVX package for specifying and solving convex programs Grant & Boyd (2014) together with the Mosek optimization solver.

It is seen that the sequence $\{\kappa_n\}$ increases with n . The growth of $\{\kappa_n\}$ can be compared with results of Kennedy & Kertz (1997), who considered the setting of independent random variables, $F^{(n)} = F_1 \times \dots \times F_n$, with marginal distributions F_i 's having bounded variance, $\text{var}\{X_i\} \leq \sigma^2$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. They established an upper bound on the worst–case regret of the optimal stopping rules; specifically

$$\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}; \mathcal{F}_\sigma^{(n)}) = \sup_{F^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma^{(n)}} \mathcal{A}_n(\mathcal{S}_{\text{all}}; F^{(n)}) \leq c_n \sigma \sqrt{n-1},$$

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| n | 10 | 25 | 50 | 75 | 100 | 250 | 500 | 750 | 1000 |
| κ_n | 0.594 | 0.957 | 1.361 | 1.670 | 1.930 | 3.056 | 4.319 | 5.280 | 6.082 |

Table 2: The values of κ_n in (5.3) as a function of n .

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| n | 10 | 25 | 50 | 75 | 100 | 250 | 500 | 750 | 1000 |
| $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*(p_0, p_1)$ | 0.897 | 0.865 | 0.846 | 0.837 | 0.831 | 0.815 | 0.806 | 0.802 | 0.799 |

Table 3: The optimal values $\mathcal{R}_n^*(p_0, p_1)$ of (5.5) as a function of n for $p_1 = 5$, $p_0 = 20$ and $N = 7000$.

where $c_n \leq 1/2$, $\liminf_n c_n \geq \sqrt{\ln 2 - 1/2} \approx 0.439$. Since the setting of the iid random variables is a specific case, we also have $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{\text{all}}; \mathcal{F}_\sigma) \leq c_n \sigma \sqrt{n-1}$. Note that for large N , the value $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{F}_\sigma \cap \mathcal{D}_N)$ approximates $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_\sigma)$. For data in Table 2 we have $\max_n \{\kappa_n / c_n \sqrt{n-1}\} \leq 0.451$, where the maximum is taken over $n \in \{10, 25, 50, 75, 100, 250, 500, 750, 1000\}$. Thus, the upper bound of Kennedy & Kertz (1997) is at least twice higher than the actual worst-case regret of the optimal single threshold stopping rule on the class $\mathcal{F}_\sigma \cap \mathcal{D}_N$ with the values of n and N indicated above. Note, however, that Kennedy & Kertz (1997) consider more general setting of independent random variables, and do not make statements on sharpness of the derived prophet inequality.

Ratio-type prophet inequality for Pareto-like distributions. Let $1 < p_1 < p_0$ be real numbers and consider the family of distributions

$$\mathcal{F}(p_0, p_1) = \left\{ F \in \mathcal{F}_{[1, \infty)} : 1 - x^{-p_0} \leq F(x) \leq 1 - x^{-p_1}, \quad \forall x \in [1, \infty) \right\}.$$

If $F \in \mathcal{F}(p_0, p_1)$ then $(1-t)^{-1/p_0} \leq F^{\leftarrow}(t) \leq (1-t)^{-1/p_1}$, and for $F \in \mathcal{F}(p_0, p_1) \cap \mathcal{D}_N$ we have

$$q_{1,i} := \left(\frac{N}{N-i} \right)^{1/p_0} \leq u_i \leq \left(\frac{N}{N-i} \right)^{1/p_1} =: q_{0,i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (5.4)$$

The condition in the definition of $\mathcal{F}(p_0, p_1)$ imposes restrictions on the distribution tail. Bigger values of p_1 result in lighter distribution tails, and it is expected that in such situation the worst-case competitive ratio of the single threshold stopping rules will be closer to one.

The optimization problem associated with the family $\mathcal{F}(p_0, p_1) \cap \mathcal{D}_N$ takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_v \quad & \max_{i=1, \dots, N-1} \frac{b_i^T v}{d^T v} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & q_0 \leq Qv \leq q_1 \\ & v \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

where Q is the lower triangular matrix with all entries equal to one, and $q_0 = [q_{0,1}; \dots; q_{0,N-1}]$ and $q_1 = [q_{1,1}; \dots; q_{1,N-1}]$; see (5.4). The optimal values $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*(p_0, p_1) := \mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_s; \mathcal{F}(p_0, p_1) \cap \mathcal{D}_N)$ of (5.5) for $p_1 = 5$, $p_0 = 20$, $n \in \{10, 25, 50, 75, 100, 250, 500, 750, 1000\}$ computed with $N = 7000$ are presented in Table 3. These values can be compared with values of $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*$ in Table 1. As expected, $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*(p_0, p_1) > \mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*$ because the family of considered distributions is narrower. Note also that the values of $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*(p_0, p_1)$ decrease as n increases.

In general, sharp constants in ratio-type and difference-type prophet inequalities for single threshold rules can be efficiently computed for a variety of different families of distributions.

6 Proofs of main results

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\theta \geq 0$ be a fixed real number, $p \in [0, 1]$, and consider the stopping rule $\tau_p(\theta)$ defined in (2.1). In the subsequent proof by convention we set $\prod_{j=1}^0 = 1$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}X_{\tau_p(\theta)} &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} X_t [\mathbf{1}(X_t > \theta) + \mathbf{1}(X_t = \theta, \xi_t = 1)] \prod_{j=1}^{t-1} [\mathbf{1}(X_j < \theta) + \mathbf{1}(X_j = \theta, \xi_j = 0)] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}X_n \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} [\mathbf{1}(X_j < \theta) + \mathbf{1}(X_j = \theta, \xi_j = 0)] \\
&= [\mathbb{E}X_t \mathbf{1}(X_t > \theta) + \theta p \Delta(\theta)] \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} [F(\theta-) + (1-p)\Delta(\theta)]^{t-1} + \mathbb{E}X_n [F(\theta-) + (1-p)\Delta(\theta)]^{n-1} \\
&= [\mathbb{E}X_t \mathbf{1}(X_t > \theta) + \theta p \Delta(\theta)] \frac{1 - F_p^{n-1}(\theta)}{1 - F_p(\theta)} + F_p^{n-1}(\theta) \mathbb{E}X_n \\
&= [\theta(1 - F_p(\theta)) + \int_{\theta}^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx] \frac{1 - F_p^{n-1}(\theta)}{1 - F_p(\theta)} + F_p^{n-1}(\theta) \mathbb{E}X_n,
\end{aligned}$$

and (2.4) follows because $\int_{\theta}^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx = \int_{\theta}^{\infty} [1 - F_p(x)] dx$. Thus, (2.4) is proved.

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}X_{\tau_p(\theta)} &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{t=1}^n X_t [\mathbf{1}(X_t > \theta) + \mathbf{1}(X_t = \theta, \xi_t = 1)] \prod_{j=1}^{t-1} [\mathbf{1}(X_j < \theta) + \mathbf{1}(X_j = \theta, \xi_j = 0)] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}X_n \prod_{j=1}^n [\mathbf{1}(X_j < \theta) + \mathbf{1}(X_j = \theta, \xi_j = 0)] \\
&= [\mathbb{E}X_t \mathbf{1}(X_t > \theta) + \theta p \Delta(\theta)] \sum_{t=1}^n [F(\theta-) + (1-p)\Delta(\theta)]^{t-1} \\
&\quad + [\mathbb{E}X_n \mathbf{1}\{X_n < \theta\} + \theta(1-p)\Delta(\theta)] [F(\theta-) + (1-p)\Delta(\theta)]^{n-1} \\
&= \left\{ \theta(1 - F_p(\theta)) + \int_{\theta}^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx \right\} \frac{1 - F_p^n(\theta)}{1 - F_p(\theta)} + F_p^{n-1}(\theta) \left\{ \int_{[0, \theta]} x dF(x) - p\theta \Delta(\theta) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (2.3).

6.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0, \infty)}$ be a fixed distribution, and for fixed $\theta \geq 0$ and $p \in [0, 1]$ let $F_p(\theta)$ be defined in (2.2). For any $x \in [0, 1]$ there exists pair $(\theta_x, p_x) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, 1]$ such that $F_{p_x}(\theta_x) = x$. Indeed, by definition of $F_p(\theta)$,

- (a) if $\theta_x := F^{\leftarrow}(x)$ and $F(\theta_x) = x$ then for any $p_x \in [0, 1]$ one has $F_{p_x}(\theta_x) = x$;
- (b) if $\theta_x := F^{\leftarrow}(x)$ and $F(\theta_x) > x$ then for $p_x := (F(\theta_x) - x)/(F(\theta_x) - F(\theta_x-))$ one has $F_{p_x}(\theta_x) = x$.

Then, according to (2.4), the reward of $\tau_{p_x}(\theta_x)$ is given by

$$V_n(\tau_{p_x}(\theta_x); F) = (1 - x^{n-1}) \left[F^{\leftarrow}(x) + \frac{1}{1-x} \int_{F^{\leftarrow}(x)}^{\infty} [1 - F(t)] dt \right] + x^{n-1} \int_0^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] dx$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (1 - x^{n-1}) \left[F^{\leftarrow}(x) + \frac{1}{1-x} \int_x^1 (1-y) dF^{\leftarrow}(y) \right] + x^{n-1} \int_0^1 (1-y) dF^{\leftarrow}(y) \\
&= \int_0^1 \left[(1 - x^{n-1}) \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1-y}{1-x} \right\} + x^{n-1}(1-y) \right] dF^{\leftarrow}(y).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Furthermore,

$$M_n(F) = \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} X_t = \int_0^1 (1 - y^n) dF^{\leftarrow}(y).$$

Therefore the constant in the sharp ratio-type prophet inequality is equal to the optimal value of the following optimization problem

$$\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{T}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,\infty)}) = \inf_{F^{\leftarrow}} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \frac{\int_0^1 \left[(1 - x^{n-1}) \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1-y}{1-x} \right\} + x^{n-1}(1-y) \right] dF^{\leftarrow}(y)}{\int_0^1 (1 - y^n) dF^{\leftarrow}(y)}, \tag{6.2}$$

where infimum is taken over all quantile functions of probability distributions on $[0, \infty)$. The problem is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{F^{\leftarrow}} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \int_0^1 \left[(1 - x^{n-1}) \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1-y}{1-x} \right\} + x^{n-1}(1-y) \right] dF^{\leftarrow}(y) \\
&\text{s.t.} \quad \int_0^1 (1 - y^n) dF^{\leftarrow}(y) = 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Let μ be the right continuous function such that $d\mu(y) := (1 - y^n) dF^{\leftarrow}(y)$ for all $y \in [0, 1]$. Then μ is a probability distribution on $[0, 1]$. Considering the randomized choice of $x \in [0, 1]$ according to a distribution λ on $[0, 1]$, we observe that the optimal values of (6.2) and (3.4) are equal. This proves the first statement of the theorem.

As for the game-theoretic representation for the difference-type prophet inequality, we observe that

$$\sup_{F^{\leftarrow}} \inf_{0 \leq x \leq 1} [M_n(F) - V_n(\tau_{p_x}(\theta_x); F)] = \sup_{F^{\leftarrow}} \inf_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \int_0^1 A(x, y) dF^{\leftarrow}(y),$$

where the supremum is taken over all quantile functions of distributions on $[0, 1]$. This constraint can be written in the form $F^{\leftarrow}(1) = \int_0^1 dF^{\leftarrow}(t) \leq 1$. Defining the right-continuous function μ such that $d\mu(y) = dF^{\leftarrow}(y)$ and using the same reasoning as above, we come to (3.5).

6.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Assume that $F \in \mathcal{D}_N$, i.e., $F(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N I(u_i \leq x)$ with some $0 = u_0 \leq u_1 \leq \dots \leq u_N$ for $x \geq 0$. For such distributions the set of all possible thresholds of stopping rules is restricted to the (i/N) -quantiles $\{u_i, i = 0, \dots, N-1\}$ of F . Note that the reward of the stopping rule with threshold u_N coincides with the reward of the rule with threshold u_0 ; that is why we consider the thresholds $\{u_i, i = 0, \dots, N-1\}$. Define

$$v_j := u_j - u_{j-1}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N.$$

Then it follows from (6.1) that the reward of the stopping rule $\tau_0(u_i)$ with threshold u_i , $i = 0, \dots, N-1$ (and $p = 0$) is

$$\begin{aligned}
V_n(\tau_0(u_i); F) &= \sum_{j=1}^N R_N\left(\frac{i}{N}, \frac{j}{N}\right) [u_j - u_{j-1}] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left[\left(1 - \left(\frac{i}{N}\right)^{n-1}\right) \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1-\frac{j}{N}}{1-\frac{i}{N}} \right\} + \left(\frac{i}{N}\right)^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{j}{N}\right) \right] v_j.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Observe that

$$V_n(\tau_0(u_0); F) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{j}{N}\right) v_j < V_n(\tau_0(u_1); F) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \frac{1 - \left(\frac{1}{N}\right)^n}{1 - \frac{1}{N}} \left(1 - \frac{j}{N}\right) v_j;$$

therefore we can restrict ourselves with the stopping rules having thresholds $\{u_i : i = 1, \dots, N-1\}$. It follows from (6.4) that

$$V_n(\tau_0(u_i); F) = b_i^T v, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1,$$

where $b_i = [b_{i,1}; \dots; b_{i,(N-1)}]$, $i = 1, \dots, N-1$ are vectors with entries

$$b_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 - \left(\frac{i}{N}\right)^{n-1} \frac{j}{N}, & 1 \leq j \leq i \leq N-1, \\ \frac{1 - \left(\frac{i}{N}\right)^n}{1 - \frac{i}{N}} \left(1 - \frac{j}{N}\right), & 1 \leq i < j \leq N-1. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for $F \in \mathcal{D}_N$ we have

$$M_n(F) = \mathbb{E} \max_{1 \leq t \leq n} X_t = \sum_{j=1}^N \left[1 - \left(\frac{j}{N}\right)^n\right] v_j = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left[1 - \left(\frac{j}{N}\right)^n\right] v_j = d^T v,$$

where $d \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, $d_j = 1 - \left(\frac{j}{N}\right)^n$, $j = 1, \dots, N-1$. Then (6.3) implies that

$$\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{D}_N) = \max_{\lambda} \min_v \left\{ \lambda^T B v : \lambda^T \mathbf{1} = 1, d^T v = 1, \lambda \geq 0, v \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (6.5)$$

where $B = [b_1^T; b_2^T; \dots; b_{N-1}^T]$, and λ stands for the probability vector that defines the single threshold rule: the threshold u_i is selected with the probability λ_i , $i = 1, \dots, N-1$. Observing that $R_N = [b_1^T/d_1; b_2^T/d_2; \dots; b_{N-1}^T/d_{N-1}]$ we conclude that (6.5) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{R}_n^*(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{D}_N) = \max_{\lambda} \min_{\mu} \left\{ \lambda^T R_N \mu : \lambda^T \mathbf{1} = 1, \mu^T \mathbf{1} = 1, \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0 \right\} = \mathcal{R}_{n,N}^*.$$

To prove that $\mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{D}_N) = \mathcal{A}_{n,N}^*$ we note that with the introduced notation for any $F \in \mathcal{D}_N$ the regret of the stopping rule $\tau_0(u_i)$ associated with the threshold u_i is

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\tau_0(u_i); F) = M_n(F) - V_n(\tau_0(u_i); F) = d^T v - b_i^T v, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1.$$

For $F \in \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]}$ one has $v^T \mathbf{1} \leq 1$; therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{D}_N) &= \max_v \min_{i=1, \dots, N-1} \{d^T v - b_i^T v : v^T \mathbf{1} \leq 1, v \geq 0\} \\ &= \max_v \min_{\mu} \left\{ \mu^T (\mathbf{1} d^T - B) v : \mu^T \mathbf{1} = 1, v^T \mathbf{1} = 1, v \geq 0, \mu \geq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The statement of the theorem follows from the fact that $A_N = \mathbf{1} d^T - B$.

6.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof of statement (i). 1^0 . We begin with a simple lemma.

Lemma 1. *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} |A(x, y) - A(x', y)| &\leq (n-1)|x - x'|, \quad \forall x, x', y \in [0, 1] \\ |A(x, y) - A(x, y')| &\leq (n-1)|y - y'|, \quad \forall x, y, y' \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We note that $A(x, y)$ is continuous on $[0, 1]^2$. We have for any $y \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial A(x, y)}{\partial x} \right| &= (n-1)yx^{n-2} \leq n-1, \quad \forall (x, y) : x > y \\ \left| \frac{\partial A(x, y)}{\partial x} \right| &= (1-y) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} kx^{k-1} = (1-y) \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (j+1)x^j}{\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} x^j} \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} x^j \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1-y}{1-x} \right) \max_{j=0, \dots, n-2} \{(j+1)\} \leq n-1, \quad \forall (x, y) : x < y. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore for any fixed $y \in [0, 1]$ if $x > y$ and $x' > y$ then $|A(x, y) - A(x', y)| \leq (n-1)|x - x'|$, and the same inequality holds for any fixed $y \in [0, 1]$ and $x < y$ and $x' < y$. Thus, for any $y \in [0, 1]$

$$|A(x, y) - A(x', y)| \leq (n-1)|x - x'|, \quad \forall x, x' \in [0, 1].$$

Similarly, for any $x \in [0, 1]$

$$\left| \frac{\partial A(x, y)}{\partial y} \right| = |x^{n-1} - ny^{n-1}| \leq n-1, \quad \forall (x, y) : x > y.$$

For $x < y$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial A(x, y)}{\partial y} &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} ky^{k-1} - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (k+1)y^k + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} x^k \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} ky^{k-1}(1-y) \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} ky^{k-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} y^{k-1}} (1-y) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} y^{k-1} \leq \max_{j=0, \dots, n-2} \{(j+2)\} \leq n-1. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the above expression implies that

$$\frac{\partial A(x, y)}{\partial y} = 1 - ny^{n-1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} x^k \geq 1 - n.$$

Thus, $|\partial A(x, y)/\partial y| \leq n-1$ which implies that

$$|A(x, y) - A(x, y')| \leq (n-1)|y - y'|, \quad \forall (x, y) : x < y.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

2^0 . For brevity we write $\mathcal{A}_n^* = \mathcal{A}_n^*(\mathcal{F}_{s,r}; \mathcal{F}_{[0,1]})$, and recall that $\mathcal{A}_n^* = \sup_{\mu} \inf_{\lambda} \bar{A}(\lambda, \mu)$, where $\bar{A}(\lambda, \mu)$ is defined in (3.3). Consider the finite matrix game (4.4) associated with A_N whose value is $\mathcal{A}_{n,N}^*$. Assume that $\lambda^N = (\lambda_1^N, \dots, \lambda_{N-1}^N)$ and $\mu^N = (\mu_1^N, \dots, \mu_{N-1}^N)$ are the optimal mixed strategies in this game, i.e., $\bar{A}(\lambda^N, \mu^N) = \mathcal{A}_{n,N}^*$.

Let δ_y denote the degenerate distribution at $y \in [0, 1]$. First, we note that $\max_y \bar{A}(\lambda^N, \delta_y) \geq \mathcal{A}_n^*$. Therefore, there exists point y , say y_* , such that $\bar{A}(\lambda^N, \delta_{y_*}) \geq \mathcal{A}_n^*$. By Lemma 1, there exists index $j_* \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ such that

$$|\bar{A}(\lambda^N, \delta_{y_*}) - \bar{A}(\lambda^N, \delta_{j_*/N})| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \lambda_i^N |A(\frac{i}{N}, y_*) - A(\frac{i}{N}, \frac{j_*}{N})| \leq (n-1)|y_* - \frac{j_*}{N}| \leq \frac{n-1}{2N}.$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{A}_n^* \leq \bar{A}(\lambda^N, \delta_{y_*}) \leq \bar{A}(\lambda^N, \delta_{j_*/N}) + \frac{n-1}{2N} \leq \mathcal{A}_{n,N}^* + \frac{n-1}{2N}.$$

which yields the upper bound in (4.5).

Furthermore, note that if δ_x is the degenerate distribution at $x \in [0, 1]$ then $\min_x \bar{A}(\delta_x, \mu^N) \leq \mathcal{A}_n^*$. Therefore there exists x_* such that $\bar{A}(\delta_{x_*}, \mu^N) \leq \mathcal{A}_n^*$. By Lemma 1, there exists index $i_* \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ such that

$$|\bar{A}(\delta_{x_*}, \mu^N) - \bar{A}(\delta_{i_*/N}, \mu^N)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \mu_j^N |A(x_*, \frac{j}{N}) - A(\frac{i_*}{N}, \frac{j}{N})| \leq (n-1)|x_* - \frac{i_*}{N}| \leq \frac{n-1}{2N}.$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{A}_n^* \geq \bar{A}(\delta_{x_*}, \mu^N) \geq \bar{A}(\delta_{i_*/N}, \mu^N) - \frac{n-1}{2N} \geq \mathcal{A}_{n,N}^* - \frac{n-1}{2N}.$$

which completes the proof of the statement (i).

Proof of statement (ii). ¹⁰. We begin with an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 2. Let $\mathcal{R}_n^* := \inf_{\mu} \sup_{\lambda} \bar{R}(\lambda, \mu)$ be the value of the game on the unit square with pay-off kernel $R(x, y)$ (see (3.1) and (3.3)), and let λ_* and μ_* be the optimal strategies. Let

$$c_n := -\ln \left\{ 1 - (1 - e^{-1})^2 + \frac{1}{n-1} \right\}; \quad (6.6)$$

if $n \geq 4$ then the interval $[1 - c_n/n, 1]$ does not belong to the support of λ_* .

Proof. Let $x_0 = 1 - c/n$ with for some $c \in (0, c_n)$, and assume to the contrary that $x_0 \in \text{supp}(\lambda_*)$. Under this assumption we have $\bar{R}(\delta_{x_0}, \mu^*) = \mathcal{R}_n^*$; see, e.g., (Karlin 1959, Lemma 2.2.1). Now let $y_0 = 1 - \frac{1}{n}$; since $x_0 > y_0$, it follows from (3.1) that

$$\bar{R}(\delta_{x_0}, \delta_{y_0}) = R(x_0, y_0) = \frac{1 - (1 - \frac{c}{n})^{n-1} (1 - \frac{1}{n})}{1 - (1 - \frac{1}{n})^n} \leq \frac{1}{1 - e^{-1}} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right)^n + \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right)^n \frac{1-c}{n-c} \right].$$

Because $e^{-c} \geq (1 - \frac{c}{n})^n \geq e^{-c} (1 - \frac{c^2}{2(n-1)})$ we obtain

$$\bar{R}(\delta_{x_0}, \delta_{y_0}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - e^{-1}} \left[1 - e^{-c} \left(1 - \frac{c^2}{2(n-1)} - \frac{1}{n-c} \right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{1 - e^{-1}} \left[1 - e^{-c} + \frac{e^{-c}(c^2 + 2)}{2(n-1)} \right].$$

For $c \in (0, 1)$ one has $e^{-c}(c^2 + 2) \leq 2$; therefore

$$\bar{R}(\delta_{x_0}, \delta_{y_0}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - e^{-1}} \left[1 - e^{-c} + \frac{1}{n-1} \right].$$

This inequality shows that for any pair of numbers n and $c \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$1 - e^{-c} + \frac{1}{n-1} < (1 - e^{-1})^2 \quad (6.7)$$

we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}_n^* = \bar{R}(\delta_{x_0}, \mu_*) \leq \bar{R}(\delta_{x_0}, \delta_{y_0}) = R(x_0, y_0) < 1 - e^{-1}.$$

In particular, if $n \geq 4$ and

$$c_n = -\ln \left\{ 1 - (1 - e^{-1})^2 + \frac{1}{n-1} \right\} \approx -\ln \left\{ 0.6004 + \frac{1}{n-1} \right\}$$

then (6.7) holds for all $c \in (0, c_n)$. This, however, stands in contradiction to inequality (2.6). Therefore $x_0 \notin \text{supp}(\lambda_*)$, and the proof is completed. \square

²⁰. The next result is an analogue of Lemma 1 for function $R(x, y)$.

Lemma 3. For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ one has

$$|R(x, y) - R(x', y)| \leq \frac{n-1}{1-(1-\epsilon)^n} |x - x'|, \quad \forall x, x' \in [0, 1-\epsilon], \forall y \in [0, 1], \quad (6.8)$$

$$|R(x, y) - R(x, y')| \leq \frac{n-1}{1-(1-\epsilon)^n} |y - y'|, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1-\epsilon], \forall y, y' \in [0, 1]. \quad (6.9)$$

Proof. Let $y \in [0, 1]$ be fixed. By (3.1), if $0 \leq x < y \leq 1$ then

$$\frac{\partial R(x, y)}{\partial x} = \frac{1-y}{1-y^n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} jx^{j-1} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (j+1)x^j}{\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} x^j} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} x^j}{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} y^j} \leq \max_{0 \leq j \leq n-2} \{(j+1)\} \leq n-1,$$

and for $0 \leq y < x \leq 1-\epsilon$

$$\left| \frac{\partial R(x, y)}{\partial x} \right| = \frac{(n-1)x^{n-2}y}{1-y^n} \leq \frac{n-1}{1-(1-\epsilon)^n}.$$

In view of the above inequalities, for all x, x' such that $0 \leq x < y < x' \leq 1-\epsilon$ we have

$$|R(x, y) - R(x', y)| \leq |R(x, y) - R(y, y)| + |R(y, y) - R(x', y)| \leq \frac{n-1}{1-(1-\epsilon)^n} |x - x'|.$$

The above inequalities imply (6.8).

Similarly, if $x \in [0, 1-\epsilon]$ is fixed, and $x \leq y \leq 1$ then

$$\left| \frac{\partial R(x, y)}{\partial y} \right| = \frac{1-x^n}{1-x} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (j+1)y^j}{(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} y^j)^2} \leq \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} x^j}{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} y^j} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (j+1)y^j}{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} y^j} \leq \max_{0 \leq j \leq n-2} \{(j+1)\} \leq n-1,$$

and for $y < x \leq 1-\epsilon$

$$\frac{\partial R(x, y)}{\partial y} = -\frac{x^{n-1}}{1-y^n} + \frac{(1-x^{n-1})ny^{n-1}}{(1-y^n)^2} \leq \frac{(n-1)x^{n-1}}{1-y^n} \leq \frac{n-1}{1-(1-\epsilon)^n},$$

and the same inequality holds for $|\partial R(x, y)/\partial y|$. Combining these inequalities we obtain (6.9). \square

3⁰. Now, using Lemmas 2 and 3 we complete the proof of statement (ii) of Theorem 4. The proof goes along the lines of the proof of statement (i), part 2⁰ with the following minor changes: the pay-off function $A(x, y)$ is replaced by $R(x, y)$, and the infinite game is considered on the rectangle $[0, 1 - c_n/n] \times [0, 1]$. Lemma 2 ensures that the optimal values of the game on this set coincides with the one on the unit square.

Recall that $\mathcal{R}_n^* = \inf_{\mu} \sup_{\lambda} \bar{R}(\lambda, \mu)$, and $\mathcal{R}_{n,N}^* = \bar{R}(\lambda^N, \mu^N)$, where $\lambda^N = (\lambda_1^N, \dots, \lambda_{N-1}^N)$ and $\mu^N = (\mu_1^N, \dots, \mu_{N-1}^N)$ are optimal mixing strategies in the finite matrix game (4.3). It follows from Lemma 2 that $\lambda_i^N = 0$ for $[(1-c_n)N] \leq i \leq N-1$, where c_n is given in (6.6). The definitions imply that $\min_y \bar{R}(\lambda^N, \delta_y) \leq \mathcal{R}_n^*$, i.e., there exists $y_* \in [0, 1]$ such that $\bar{R}(\lambda^N, \delta_{y_*}) \leq \mathcal{R}_n^*$. By Lemma 3 applied with $\epsilon = c_n/n$ for some j_*

$$|\bar{R}(\lambda^N, \delta_{y_*}) - \bar{R}(\lambda^N, \delta_{j_*/N})| \leq \frac{n-1}{1-(1-\frac{c_n}{n})^n} |y_* - \frac{j_*}{N}| \leq \frac{n-1}{2N(1-(1-\frac{c_n}{n})^n)}$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{R}_n^* \geq \bar{R}(\lambda^N, \delta_{y_*}) \geq \bar{R}(\lambda^N, \delta_{j_*/N}) - \frac{n-1}{2N(1-(1-\frac{c_n}{n})^n)} \geq \mathcal{R}_{n,N}^* - \frac{n-1}{2N(1-(1-\frac{c_n}{n})^n)}.$$

Then the lower bound in (4.6) follows by substitution of (6.6). The upper bound on \mathcal{R}_n^* is proved similarly.

References

- ASSAF, D., GOLDSTEIN, L. and SAMUEL-CAHN, E. (2002). Ratio prophet inequalities when the mortal has several choices. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **12**, 972–984.
- BRUSS, F. T. and FERGUSON, T. S. (1996). Half-prophets and Robbins’ problem of minimizing the expected rank. Athens Conference on Applied Probability and Time Series Analysis, Vol. I (1995), 1–17. *Lect. Notes Stat.* **114**. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- CHOW, Y. S., ROBBINS, H. and SIEGMUND, D. (1971). *Great Expectations: the Theory of Optimal Stopping*. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, Massachusetts.
- CORREA, J., FONCEA, P., HOEKSMAS, R., OOSTERWIJK, T. and VREDEVELD, T. (2018). Recent developments in prophet inequalities. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges* **17**, 61–70.
- CORREA, J., FONCEA, P., HOEKSMAS, R., OOSTERWIJK, T. and VREDEVELD, T. (2021). Posted price mechanisms and optimal threshold strategies for random arrivals. *Math. Oper. Res.* **46**, 1452–1478.
- CORREA, J. and ROMERO, M. (2021). On the asymptotic behavior of the expectation of the maximum of i.i.d. random variables. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **49**, 785–786.
- CORREA, J., SAONA, R. and ZILOTTO, B. (2021). Prophet secretary through blind strategies. *Math. Programming* **190**, 482–521.
- DOWNNEY, P. (1990). Distribution-free bounds on the expectation of the maximum with scheduling applications. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **9**, 189–201.
- DOWNNEY, P. and MAIER, R. (1993). Orderings arising from expected extremes, with an application. *Stochastic Inequalities*. IMS Lecture Notes - Monograph Series Vol. 22, 66–75.
- EHSANI, S., HAJIAGHAYI, M., KESSELHEIM, T. and SINGLA, S. (2018). Prophet inequality for combinatorial auctions and matroids. *Proceedings of the 2018 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 700–714.
- ESFANDIARI, H., HAJIAGHAYI, M., LIAGHAT, V. and MONEMIZADE, M. (2017). Prophet secretary. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **31**, 1685–1701.
- GLICKSBERG, I. (1950). Minimax theorem for upper and lower semi-continuous payoffs. *Research Memorandum RM-478*, RAND Corporation.
- GRANT, M. and BOYD, S. (2014). CVX: Matlab Software for Disciplined Convex Programming, version 2.2, <https://cvxr.com/cvx>.
- HILL, T. P. and KERTZ, R. P. (1981a). Additive comparisons of stop rule and supremum expectations of uniformly bounded independent random variables. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **83**, 582–585.
- HILL, T. P. and KERTZ, R. P. (1981b). Ratio comparisons of supremum and stop rule expectations. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **56**, no. 2, 283–285.
- HILL, T. P. and KERTZ, R. P. (1982). Comparisons of stop rule and supremum expectations of i.i.d. random variables. *Ann. Probab.* **10**, 336–345.
- HILL, T. P. and KERTZ, R. P. (1992). A survey of prophet inequalities in optimal stopping theory. *Strategies for sequential search and selection in real time (Amherst, MA, 1990)*, 191–207, Contemp. Math., 125, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.
- JONES, M. (1990). Prophet inequalities for cost of observation stopping problems. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **34**, 238–253.
- KARLIN, S. (1959). *Mathematical Methods and Theory in Games, Programming and Economics. Vol. II: The Theory of Infinite Games*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass.-London.
- KENNEDY, D. P. and KERTZ, R. P. (1997). A prophet inequality for independent random variables with finite variances. *J. Appl. Probab.* **34**, 945–958.
- KERTZ, R. P. (1986). Stop rule and supremum expectations of i.i.d. random variables: a complete comparison by conjugate duality. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **19**, no. 1, 88–112.
- KRENGEL, U. and SUCHESTON, L. (1978). On semiamarts, amarts, and processes with finite value. *Probability on Banach spaces*. Edited by J. Kuebls, 197–266, Advances in Probability and Related Topics, 4, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York.
- KUHN, H. W. (2003). *Lectures on the Theory of Games*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, 37. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

- LUCIER, B. (2017). An economic view of prophet inequalities. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges* **16**, 26–49.
- MEYERTHOLE, A. and SCHMITZ, N. (2000). Games against a prophet for stochastic processes. *Game Theory, Optimal Stopping, Probability and Statistics: Papers in Honor of Thomas S. Ferguson*. Editors F. T. Bruss, L. Le Cam, 53–69. IMS Lecture Notes Monogr. Ser., 35.
- MOSEK APS. *The MOSEK Optimization Toolbox for MATLAB Manual. Ver.9.0.*, <http://docs.mosek.com/9.0/toolbox/index.html>
- SAMUEL-CAHN, E. (1984). Comparison of threshold stop rules and maximum for independent nonnegative random variables. *Ann. Probab.* **12**, 1213–1216.
- SAMUEL-CAHN, E. (1992). A difference prophet inequality for bounded i.i.d. random variables, with cost for observations. *Ann. Probab.* **20**, 1222–1228.
- SCHMITZ, N. (1992). Games against a prophet. *Strategies for sequential search and selection in real time (Amherst, MA, 1990)*, 239–248, Contemp. Math., 125, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.