

# Splitting Guarantees for Prophet Inequalities via Nonlinear Systems

Johannes Brustle <sup>\*</sup>      Sebastian Perez-Salazar <sup>†</sup>      Victor Verdugo <sup>‡§</sup>

## Abstract

The prophet inequality is one of the cornerstone problems in optimal stopping theory and has become a crucial tool for designing sequential algorithms in Bayesian settings. In the i.i.d.  $k$ -selection prophet inequality problem, we sequentially observe  $n$  non-negative random values sampled from a known distribution. Each time, a decision is made to accept or reject the value, and under the constraint of accepting at most  $k$ . For  $k = 1$ , Hill and Kertz [Ann. Probab. 1982] provided an upper bound on the worst-case approximation ratio that was later matched by an algorithm of Correa et al. [Math. Oper. Res. 2021]. The worst-case tight approximation ratio for  $k = 1$  is computed by studying a differential equation that naturally appears when analyzing the optimal dynamic programming policy. A similar result for  $k > 1$  has remained elusive.

In this work, we introduce a nonlinear system of differential equations for the i.i.d.  $k$ -selection prophet inequality that generalizes Hill and Kertz's equation when  $k = 1$ . Our nonlinear system is defined by  $k$  constants that determine its functional structure, and their summation provides a lower bound on the optimal policy's asymptotic approximation ratio for the i.i.d.  $k$ -selection prophet inequality. To obtain this result, we introduce for every  $k$  an infinite-dimensional linear programming formulation that fully characterizes the worst-case tight approximation ratio of the  $k$ -selection prophet inequality problem for every  $n$ , and then we follow a dual-fitting approach to link with our nonlinear system for sufficiently large values of  $n$ . As a corollary, we use our provable lower bounds to establish a tight approximation ratio for the stochastic sequential assignment problem in the i.i.d. non-negative regime.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Computer and Systems Sciences, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Computational Applied Mathematics and Operations Research, Rice University, USA.

<sup>‡</sup>Institute for Mathematical and Computational Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile.

<sup>§</sup>Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile.

# 1 Introduction

The prophet inequality problem is one of the cornerstone problems in optimal stopping theory [Krengel and Sucheston, 1977]. In the i.i.d. version of the problem, introduced by Hill and Kertz [1982], a sequence of  $n$  i.i.d. non-negative values  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are presented one by one to a decision-maker. At each time, the decision-maker faces the choice of either selecting the value or rejecting it entirely, moving on to observe the next value if available, with no option to reconsider previously rejected values. The quality of the policy, or algorithm, implemented by the decision-maker is measured by means of the approximation ratio with respect to the expected value of the optimal hindsight (offline benchmark) solution, that is,  $\mathbb{E}[\max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}]$ .

Hill and Kertz [1982] provided an algorithm that guarantees an approximation ratio of  $1 - 1/e$  and an upper bound of  $\gamma \approx 0.745$  on the approximation ratio by studying the optimal dynamic program for the worst-case distributions. Later, Kertz [1986] used the recursion from the optimal dynamic program in [Hill and Kertz, 1982] to provide an ordinary differential equation (ODE)—that we termed Hill and Kertz equation for simplicity and in honor to both authors—where the  $\gamma$  bound is embedded as a *unique constant* that guarantees crucial analytical properties of the solution of the ODE:  $y' = y(\ln y - 1) - 1/\gamma + 1$ ,  $y(0) = 1$ ,  $y(1) = 0$ . However, the lower bound on the approximation remained  $1 - 1/e$  for many years until Correa et al. [2021] used the Hill and Kertz equation to provide an algorithm that attains an approximation ratio of at least  $\gamma$  for any  $n$ .

In recent years, there has been substantial progress in understanding the approximation limits for prophet inequality problems, mainly driven by their applicability in mechanism design [Lucier, 2017]. One of the most prominent settings is the i.i.d.  $k$ -selection prophet inequality problem, where the decision-maker selects at most  $k$  values from the  $n$  observed and aims to maximize the expected sum of values selected. The offline benchmark in this case is  $\sum_{i=n-k+1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{(i)}]$  where  $X_{(1)} \leq X_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq X_{(n)}$  are the ordered statistics of the random values  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . Observe that when  $k = 1$ , this setting corresponds to the classic i.i.d. prophet inequality problem. We refer to this problem as  $(k, n)$ -PIP when the length of the sequence is  $n$  and  $k$  selections can be made.

The approximation ratio of the i.i.d.  $k$ -selection prophet inequality problem has been proven to be at least  $1 - k^k e^{-k}/k! \approx 1 - 1/\sqrt{2\pi k}$  (see, e.g., [Chakraborty et al., 2010, Yan, 2011, Dütting et al., 2020, Beyhaghi et al., 2021, Arnosti and Ma, 2023]). Using a different approach, Jiang et al. [2023] recently introduced an optimization framework to characterize worst-case approximation ratios for prophet inequality problems, including the i.i.d.  $k$ -selection setting for a fixed  $n$ ; however, it is unclear how to use their framework to obtain provable worst-case lower bounds for  $k \geq 2$ .

Over the years, it has remained elusive to get a result analogous to the Hill and Kertz equation for  $k \geq 2$ , that is, to obtain provable lower bounds on the approximation ratios via studying a closed-form differential equation related to the optimal dynamic programming solution. This motivates the central question of this work: *Can we find a closed-form nonlinear system of differential equations to lower bound the optimal asymptotic approximation ratio for the i.i.d.  $k$ -selection prophet inequality?*

## 1.1 Our Contributions and Techniques

Our main contribution is to provide a positive answer to the previous question. We introduce for every  $k \geq 1$  a nonlinear system of differential equations from which we can get provable lower bounds on the worst-case approximation ratio of the i.i.d.  $k$ -selection prophet inequality. In particular, our

nonlinear system captures the one of Hill and Kertz when  $k = 1$ .

As a first step, we present an infinite-dimensional linear programming formulation that characterizes the optimal approximation ratio for the  $(k, n)$ -PIP, inspired by writing the optimal dynamic programming policy in the quantile space. While there exist other linear programming formulations for this problem (see, e.g., [Jiang et al. \[2023\]](#)), using our new formulation, we are able to provide an analysis as  $n$  grows that organically offers the nonlinear system of differential equations that we later use to get provable analytical lower bounds. More specifically, for every positive integers  $k$  and  $n$ , with  $n \geq k$ , consider the following infinite dimensional linear program:

$$\inf \quad d_{1,k} \tag{P}_{n,k}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad d_{t,\ell} \geq \int_0^q f(u) du + qd_{t+1,\ell-1} + (1-q)d_{t+1,\ell}, \text{ for every } t \in [n], \ell \in [k], \text{ and } q \in [0, 1], \tag{1}$$

$$\int_0^1 g_{n,k}(u) f(u) du \geq 1, \tag{2}$$

$$f(u) \geq f(w) \text{ for every } u \leq w, \text{ with } u, w \in [0, 1], \tag{3}$$

$$d_{t,\ell} \geq 0 \text{ for every } t \in [n+1] \text{ and every } \ell \in \{0\} \cup [k], \tag{4}$$

$$f(u) \geq 0 \text{ for every } u \in [0, 1] \text{ and } f \text{ is continuous in } (0, 1), \tag{5}$$

where  $g_{n,k}(u) = \sum_{j=n-k+1}^n j \binom{n}{j} (1-u)^{j-1} u^{n-j}$  for every  $u \in [0, 1]$ . In the program  $(P)_{n,k}$ , the variables  $f(u)$  represent the values of a non-negative and non-increasing function  $f$  in  $[0, 1]$ , and therefore we have infinitely many of them, while the variables  $d$  are finitely many. We remark the continuity for  $f$  in the program is mainly for the sake of simplicity in our analysis but does not represent a strict requirement. In particular, a finite linear programming counterpart of  $(P)_{n,k}$  can be solved by a simple discretization of the space. The following theorem is the first ingredient in our construction.

**Theorem 1.** *The optimal approximation ratio for  $(k, n)$ -PIP is equal to the optimal value of  $(P)_{n,k}$ .*

The proof of Theorem 1 can be found in Section 3. Analyzing our infinite-dimensional program as  $n$  approaches infinity leads us to introduce a system of  $k$  coupled nonlinear differential equations, extending the Hill and Kertz equation ( $k = 1$ ). This new nonlinear system is parameterized by  $k$  nonnegative values  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$ , and we look for functions  $y_1, \dots, y_k$  satisfying the following in the interval  $[0, 1]$ :

$$(\Gamma_k(-\ln y_k))' = k! (1 - 1/(k\theta_k)) - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_k), \tag{6}$$

$$(\Gamma_k(-\ln y_j))' = k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_j) - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{j+1})) \text{ for every } j \in [k-1], \tag{7}$$

$$y_j(0) = 1 \text{ and } \lim_{t \uparrow 1} y_j(t) = 0 \text{ for every } j \in [k], \tag{8}$$

where  $\Gamma_\ell(x) = \int_x^\infty t^{\ell-1} e^{-t} dt$  is the upper incomplete gamma function. Let  $\gamma_{n,k}$  denote the optimal approximation ratio for  $(k, n)$ -PIP. Note that for  $k = 1$  in (6)-(8) we recover the Hill and Kertz differential equation. Our main theorem is the following.

**Theorem 2.** *For every  $k \geq 1$ , there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for every  $n \geq n_0$  we have*

$$\gamma_{n,k} \geq \left( 1 - 24k \frac{\ln(n)^2}{n} \right) \sum_{j=1}^k \theta_j^*,$$

where  $\theta_1^*, \dots, \theta_k^*$  are the values for which there exists a solution to the nonlinear system of differential equations (6)-(8).

The proof of Theorem 2 can be found in Section 4. We highlight that the lower bound on the approximation ratio given by the nonlinear system is simply obtained by the summation of the  $k$  constants that define it. For instance, when  $k = 2$ , the two constants for which the nonlinear system has a solution are  $\theta_1^* \approx 0.346$  and  $\theta_2^* \approx 0.483$ , and therefore we get a provable lower bound of  $\approx 0.829$  on the optimal approximation ratio for any  $n \geq n_0$ . In Table 1, we report our lower bounds for small values of  $k$ .

To prove Theorem 2 we employ a dual-fitting approach within our infinite-dimensional linear program. Namely, we introduce a dual infinite-dimensional program of  $[P]_{n,k}$ , and using the solution of the nonlinear system (6)-(8), we explicitly construct feasible solutions for this dual. Then, the theorem is obtained by a weak-duality argument, and our optimality result in Theorem 1. We remark that our analysis requires a careful study of the nonlinear system (6)-(8); which we also provide in Section 4. The small multiplicative loss  $(1 - 24k \ln(n)^2/n)$  appears when we construct the dual feasible solution and it's needed in our analysis to ensure feasibility in the dual problem; note that this loss vanishes as  $n$  grows. We note that any feasible solution to our dual program can be implemented using a quantile-based algorithm, and therefore, our lower bounds obtained in Theorem 2 can be implemented as such.

$k$	1	2	3	4	5
Our approach	0.7454	0.8290	0.8648	0.8875	0.9035
Beyhaghi et al. [2021]	0.6543	0.7427	0.7857	0.8125	0.8311

Table 1: Comparison of known provable lower bounds for  $\gamma_{n,k}$  when  $n$  is large and  $k \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ . The bounds of Beyhaghi et al. [2021] hold for every  $n$ .

We note that by using our linear programming characterization in Theorem 1, it is possible to obtain, numerically, the approximation ratio for a fixed value of  $n$ ; for instance, Jiang et al. [2023] follow this approach to report numerical bounds for  $n = 8000$ . We remark that such values just provide upper bounds on the worst-case approximation guarantees (i.e., when taking infimum over every  $n$ ) and not lower bounds.

Finally, in Section 5, we use our new provable lower bounds to provide the tight optimal approximation ratio for the classic stochastic sequential assignment problem by Derman et al. [1972]. We first characterize the optimal approximation ratio for this problem to be equal to  $\alpha_n = \min_{k \in [n]} \gamma_{n,k}$ . This immediately implies that  $\limsup_n \alpha_n \leq \gamma \approx 0.745$ . To the best of the authors' knowledge, the best current provable lower bounds over  $\gamma_{n,k}$  are: (1) for  $k = 1$ ,  $\gamma_{n,1} \geq 0.745$  [Correa et al., 2021]; (2) for any  $k \geq 1$ ,  $\gamma_{n,k} \geq 1 - k^k e^{-k}/k!$  (see, e.g., [Dütting et al., 2020, Beyhaghi et al., 2021]); (3) the values reported by Beyhaghi et al. [2021] in Table 1. These three results together imply in principle that  $\alpha_n \geq 0.7427$ ; hence, there is a constant gap between the lower and the upper bound on  $\alpha_n$ . The  $1 - k^k e^{-k}/k!$  lower bound for the  $k$ -selection prophet inequality problem is at least 0.78 for  $k \geq 3$  which is in particular larger than  $\liminf_n \gamma_{n,1} \approx 0.745$ . Nevertheless, to the best of the authors' knowledge, no monotonicity in  $k$  is known for the values  $\gamma_{n,k}$ . Therefore, our new provable 0.829 lower bound for  $k = 2$  allows us to conclude that the approximation ratio for the stochastic sequential assignment problem is exactly  $\gamma \approx 0.745$  for  $n$  sufficiently large, fully characterizing the approximation ratio of the problem.

## 1.2 Related Work

*Prophet inequalities and pricing.* The basic prophet inequality problem, as introduced by Krengel and Sucheston [1977], was resolved by the authors using a dynamic program which gave a tight approximation ratio of  $1/2$ . Samuel-Cahn [1984] later showed that a simple threshold algorithm yields the same guarantee. Since then, there have been a number of generalizations spanning combinatorial constraints, different valuation functions and arrival orders, resource augmentation, and limited knowledge of the distributions [Kleinberg and Weinberg, 2012, Ehsani et al., 2018, Correa et al., 2019a,b].

A major reason for the renewed interest in prophet inequalities is their relevance to auctions, specifically posted priced mechanisms (PPM) in online sales [Alaei, 2014, Chawla et al., 2010, Dütting et al., 2020, Hajiaghayi et al., 2007, Kleinberg and Weinberg, 2012, Correa and Cristi, 2023]. It was implicitly shown by Chawla et al. [2010] and Hajiaghayi et al. [2007] that every prophet-type inequality implies a corresponding approximation guarantee in a PPM, and the converse holds as well [Correa et al., 2019c]. Using these well-known reductions, our lower bounds for the i.i.d.  $k$ -selection prophet inequality problem also yield PPM’s for the problem of selling  $k$  homogeneous goods to  $n$  unit-demand buyers who arrive sequentially with independent and identically distributed valuations.

*LP approaches in online selection.* Linear and convex programming have been a powerful tool for the design of online algorithms. For instance, in online and Bayesian matching problems [Mehta et al., 2007, Goyal and Udmani, 2023], online knapsack [Babaioff et al., 2007, Kesselheim et al., 2014], secretary problem [Buchbinder et al., 2014, Chan et al., 2014, Perez-Salazar et al., 2021], factor-revealing linear programs [Feldman et al., 2016, Lee and Singla, 2018], and competition complexity [Brustle et al., 2023]. Similar to us, Perez-Salazar et al. [2022] use a quantile-based linear programming formulation to provide optimal policies in the context of decision-makers with a limited number of actions.

*Limit models.* We recall that central to our analysis is the nonlinear system of differential equations, which extends the ordinary differential equation by Hill and Kertz for  $k = 1$ . Although the Hill and Kertz equation has been used in various recent works [Correa et al., 2021, Liu et al., 2021, Perez-Salazar et al., 2022, Brustle et al., 2023], to the best of the authors’ knowledge, our result for multiple selections, where the approximation ratio is embedded in a nonlinear system, has not been previously explored.

## 2 Preliminaries

An instance of  $(k, n)$ -PIP is given by a tuple  $(n, k, F)$ , where  $n$  is the number of values  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  that are drawn i.i.d according to the continuous distribution  $F$  supported on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . This assumption is commonly made in the literature (e.g., Liu et al. [2021]), as we can perturb a discrete distribution by introducing random noise at the cost of a negligible loss in the objective. Given an instance of  $(k, n)$ -PIP, observe that we can always scale the values  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  by a positive factor so the optimal value is equal to 1, and the reward of the optimal policy is scaled by the same amount. In particular, the approximation ratio of the optimal policy remains the same.

Given an instance  $(n, k, F)$ , we use dynamic programming to compute the optimal reward of

the optimal sequential policy. Let  $A_{t,\ell}(F)$  be the reward of the optimal policy when  $\ell \leq k$  choices are still to be made in periods  $\{t, \dots, n\}$ . Then, for every  $t \in [n]$  and  $\ell \in [k]$ , the following holds:

$$A_{t,\ell}(F) = \max_{x \geq 0} \left\{ (\mathbb{E}[X \mid X \geq x] + A_{t+1,\ell-1}(F))\mathbb{P}[X \geq x] + A_{t+1,\ell}(F)\mathbb{P}[X < x] \right\}, \quad (9)$$

$$A_{n+1,\ell}(F) = 0, \text{ and } A_{t,0}(F) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Equation (9) corresponds to the continuation value condition in optimality; the term in the braces is the expected value obtained when a threshold  $x$  is chosen when at period  $t$  and  $\ell$  choices can still be made. In (10) we have the border conditions. In particular, it holds

$$\gamma_{n,k} = \inf \left\{ A_{1,k}(F) : \text{instances } (n, k, F) \text{ with } \text{OPT}_{n,k}(F) = 1 \right\}. \quad (11)$$

### 3 An Infinite-Dimensional Formulation

In this section, we provide the proof of Theorem 1. We denote by  $v_{n,k}$  the optimal value of  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$ . We show that  $v_{n,k} = \gamma_{n,k}$  in Theorem 1 by proving both inequalities,  $v_{n,k} \leq \gamma_{n,k}$  and  $v_{n,k} \geq \gamma_{n,k}$ , separately. For the first inequality, we argue that any instance of  $(k, n)$ -PIP with  $\text{OPT}_{n,k}(F) = 1$ , produces a feasible solution to  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$  with an objective value equal to the reward of the optimal sequential policy. For the second, we show that any feasible solution  $(d, f)$  to  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$  produces an instance of  $(k, n)$ -PIP such that the reward of the optimal policy is no larger than the objective value of the instance  $(d, f)$ .

Before we prove the inequalities, we leave a proposition with some preliminary properties that we use in our analysis. The proof can be found in Appendix A.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $F$  be a continuous and strictly increasing distribution over the non-negative reals. Then, the following properties hold:*

- (i) *For every  $n$  and  $k$  with  $n \geq k$ , we have  $\text{OPT}_{n,k}(F) = \int_0^1 g_{n,k}(u)F^{-1}(1-u) du$ .*
- (ii) *Suppose that  $X$  is a random variable distributed according to  $F$ . Then, for every  $x \geq 0$ , it holds  $\mathbb{E}[X \mid X \geq x]\mathbb{P}[X \geq x] = \int_0^q F^{-1}(1-u) du$ , where  $q = \mathbb{P}[X \geq x]$ .*

We use the following two lemmas to prove Theorem 1.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $F$  be a continuous and strictly increasing distribution over the non-negative reals such that  $\text{OPT}_{n,k}(F) = 1$ , and let  $f(u) = F^{-1}(1-u)$  for every  $u \in [0, 1]$ . Then,  $(A(F), f)$  is feasible for  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$ , where  $A(F) = (A_{t,\ell}(F))_{t,\ell}$  is defined according to (9)-(10).*

*Proof.* By construction, we have  $f \geq 0$  and  $f$  is non-increasing, therefore constraints (3)-(5) are satisfied by  $(A(F), f)$ . Furthermore, we have

$$\int_0^1 g_{n,k}(u)f(u) du = \int_0^1 g_{n,k}(u)F^{-1}(1-u) du = \text{OPT}_{n,k}(F) = 1,$$

where the second equality holds by Proposition 1(i). Then, constraint (2) is satisfied by  $(A(F), f)$ . Let  $q \in [0, 1]$ , and  $x \geq 0$  such that  $q = \mathbb{P}[X \geq x]$ . Then, for every  $t \in [n]$  and every  $\ell \in [k]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{t,\ell}(F) &\geq (\mathbb{E}[X \mid X \geq x] + A_{t+1,\ell-1}(F))\mathbb{P}[X \geq x] + A_{t+1,\ell}(F)\mathbb{P}[X < x] \\ &= \int_0^q f(u) du + qA_{t+1,\ell-1}(F) + (1-q)A_{t+1,\ell}(F), \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used condition (9), while in the second inequality, we used that  $q = \mathbb{P}[X \geq x]$  and Proposition 1(ii). Then,  $(A(F), f)$  satisfies constraint (1), and we conclude that  $(A(F), f)$  is feasible for  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $(d, f)$  be any feasible solution for  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$ . Then, there exists a probability distribution  $G$ , such that  $d_{t,\ell} \geq A_{t,\ell}(G)$  for every  $t \in [n]$  and  $\ell \in [k]$ .*

*Proof.* Given a feasible solution  $(d, f)$  for  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$ , consider the random variable  $f(1 - Q)$ , where  $Q$  is a uniform random variable over the interval  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $G$  be the probability distribution of  $f(1 - Q)$ . Then,  $G$  is continuous and non-decreasing. Since  $f$  is a non-increasing function, we have  $\mathbb{P}[f(1 - Q) \leq f(u)] \geq \mathbb{P}[1 - Q \geq u] = \mathbb{P}[1 - u \geq Q] = 1 - u$ , and therefore  $G^{-1}(1 - u) \leq f(u)$ . We prove the inequalities in the lemma statement for  $d$  and the probability distribution  $G$  via backward induction in  $t \in \{1, \dots, n + 1\}$ . For  $t = n + 1$  we have  $d_{n+1,\ell} = 0 = A_{n+1,\ell}(G)$  for any  $\ell \in [k]$ . Assume the result holds true for  $\{t + 1, \dots, n + 1\}$ . If  $\ell = 0$ , we have  $d_{t,\ell} = 0 = A_{t,\ell}(G)$ , and for  $\ell \in [k]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{t,\ell} &\geq \sup_{q \in [0,1]} \left\{ \int_0^q f(u) \, du + q d_{t+1,\ell-1} + (1 - q) d_{t+1,\ell} \right\} \\ &\geq \sup_{q \in [0,1]} \left\{ \int_0^q f(u) \, du + q A_{t+1,\ell-1}(G) + (1 - q) A_{t+1,\ell}(G) \right\} \\ &\geq \sup_{q \in [0,1]} \left\{ \int_0^q G^{-1}(1 - u) \, du + q A_{t+1,\ell-1}(G) + (1 - q) A_{t+1,\ell}(G) \right\} \\ &= \max_{x \geq 0} \{ (\mathbb{E}[X \mid X \geq x] + A_{t+1,\ell-1}(G)) \mathbb{P}[X \geq x] + A_{t+1,\ell}(G) \mathbb{P}[X < x] \} \\ &= A_{t,\ell}(G), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since  $(d, f)$  satisfies constraint (1); the second inequality holds by induction; the third holds since  $G^{-1}(1 - u) \leq f(u)$ , and the first equality by Proposition 1(ii). This concludes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* By Lemma 1, for every probability distribution  $F$  we have that  $(A(F), f)$  is feasible for  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$ , and its objective value is equal to  $A_{1,k}(F)$ . This implies that  $A_{1,k}(F) \geq v_{n,k}$  for every  $F$ , and therefore  $\gamma_{n,k} \geq v_{n,k}$ . By Lemma 2, for every feasible solution  $(d, f)$  in  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$  there exists a probability distribution  $G$  such that  $d_{1,k} \geq A_{1,k}(G)$ , and therefore, the optimal value of  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$  is lower bounded by the infimum in (11), which is equal to  $\gamma_{n,k}$ . We conclude that  $v_{n,k} \geq \gamma_{n,k}$ , and therefore both values are equal.  $\square$

## 4 Lower Bound on the Approximation Ratio

In this section, we prove Theorem 2. Our proof is organized into three main steps. In the first step, we introduce a *maximization* infinite-dimensional linear program that we call  $[\mathbf{D}]_{n,k}$ , and we prove that weak duality holds for the pair  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$  and  $[\mathbf{D}]_{n,k}$ . Namely, the optimal value of  $[\mathbf{D}]_{n,k}$  provides a lower bound on the optimal value of  $[\mathbf{P}]_{n,k}$ .

In the second step, we introduce a second maximization infinite-dimensional linear program parametrized by a value  $\bar{n} \leq n$ , namely  $[\mathbf{D}]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$ . This program is akin to  $[\mathbf{D}]_{n,k}$ , but is described

by a set of constraints that become more handy when analyzing the nonlinear system. Furthermore,  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$  restricts the time horizon until  $\bar{n}$ . We show that the optimal value of  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$  provides a lower bound on the program  $[D]_{n,k}$ , and therefore, it gives a lower bound on the optimal value of  $[P]_{n,k}$  as well.

In the third step, we build an explicit feasible solution to the problem  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$  starting from a solution of the nonlinear system of differential equations (6)-(8). Using the valid bounds found in the previous two steps, we can provide a lower bound on the value  $\gamma_{n,k}$  for  $n$  large enough. In particular, we show, as  $n$  grows, that the sequence of lower bounds provides a lower bound on the optimal asymptotic approximation factor.

**First step: Weak duality.** For every  $\ell \in [k]$ , let  $\mathbf{1}_k(\ell) = 1$  if  $\ell = k$  and  $\mathbf{1}_k(\ell) = 0$  for  $\ell \neq k$ . Consider the following infinite-dimensional linear program:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup v && [D]_{n,k} \\ \text{s.t.} & \int_0^1 \beta_{1,\ell}(q) dq \leq \mathbf{1}_k(\ell), \quad \text{for all } \ell \in [k], && (12) \end{aligned}$$

$$\int_0^1 \beta_{t+1,k}(q) dq \leq \int_0^1 (1-q)\beta_{t,k}(q) dq, \quad \text{for all } t \in [n-1], \quad (13)$$

$$\int_0^1 \beta_{t+1,\ell}(q) dq \leq \int_0^1 (1-q)\beta_{t,\ell}(q) dq + \int_0^1 q\beta_{t,\ell+1}(q) dq, \quad \text{for all } t \in [n-1], \ell \in [k-1], \quad (14)$$

$$vg_{n,k}(u) \leq \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_u^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) dq, \quad \text{for } u \in [0,1] - \text{a.e.}, \quad (15)$$

$$\beta_{t,\ell}(q) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } q \in [0,1], t \in [n] \text{ and } \ell \in [k]. \quad (16)$$

The variables  $\beta_{t,\ell}(q)$  represent the probability density of an optimal algorithm choosing quantile  $q$  at time  $t$  when  $\ell$  items can still be chosen, and variable  $v$  captures the approximation factor of the policy.<sup>1</sup> We denote by  $w_{n,k}$  the optimal value of  $[D]_{n,k}$ . The following lemma shows that weak duality holds for the pair of infinite-dimensional programs  $[P]_{n,k}$  and  $[D]_{n,k}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *For every  $n \geq 1$  and every  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have  $v_{n,k} \geq w_{n,k}$ .*

*Proof.* Consider a feasible solution  $(d, f)$  for  $[P]_{n,k}$  and a feasible solution  $(\beta, v)$  for  $[D]_{n,k}$ . Since  $[P]_{n,k}$  is a minimization problem, we can assume that  $d_{n+1,\ell} = 0$  for every  $\ell \in [k]$  and  $d_{0,\ell} = 0$  for every  $t \in [n]$ ; if they are non-zero, we can easily make them zero without changing the objective value of  $(d, f)$ . In what follows, we show that  $v \leq d_{1,k}$ . Since  $(\beta, v)$  satisfies constraint

---

<sup>1</sup> “[0, 1]-a.e.” means almost everywhere in  $[0, 1]$  w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure [Kolmogorov and Fomin, 1975].



(15) and  $f(u) \geq 0$  by constraint (5), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
v \int_0^1 g_{n,k}(u) f(u) \, du &\leq \int_0^1 \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left( \int_u^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq \right) f(u) \, du \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_0^1 \int_u^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) f(u) \, dq \, du \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \int_0^q f(u) \, du \, dq, \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by exchanging the summation and the integrals, and the second equality holds by exchanging the integration order for  $u$  and  $q$ . Then, inequality (17) together with constraint (2) imply that

$$v \leq \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \int_0^q f(u) \, du \, dq. \tag{18}$$

On the other hand, from constraint (1), for every  $t \in [n]$  and every  $\ell \in [k]$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \int_0^q f(u) \, du \, dq \\
&\leq d_{t,\ell} \int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq - d_{t+1,\ell-1} \int_0^1 q \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq - d_{t+1,\ell} \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq, \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\beta_{t,\ell} \geq 0$ , and then we integrated over  $q \in [0, 1]$ . When  $\ell = k$ , note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=1}^n d_{t,k} \int_0^1 \beta_{t,k}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^n d_{t+1,k} \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,k}(q) \, dq \\
&= d_{1,k} \int_0^1 \beta_{1,k}(q) \, dq + \sum_{t=2}^n d_{t,k} \int_0^1 \beta_{t,k}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^n d_{t+1,k} \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,k}(q) \, dq \\
&\leq d_{1,k} + \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} d_{t+1,k} \int_0^1 \beta_{t+1,k}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^n d_{t+1,k} \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,k}(q) \, dq \\
&\leq d_{1,k} + \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} d_{t+1,k} \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,k}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} d_{t+1,k} \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,k}(q) \, dq \leq d_{1,k}, \tag{20}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds by constraint (12) and by changing the index range in the first summation, and the second inequality holds by inequality (13) and the fact that  $d_{n+1,k} = 0$ . On

the other hand, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{t,\ell} \int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k d_{t+1,\ell-1} \int_0^1 q \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{t+1,\ell} \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{t,\ell} \int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{t+1,\ell} \int_0^1 q \beta_{t,\ell+1}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{t+1,\ell} \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{t,\ell} \int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{t+1,\ell} \left( \int_0^1 q \beta_{t,\ell+1}(q) \, dq + \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{t,\ell} \int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{t+1,\ell} \int_0^1 \beta_{t+1,\ell}(q) \, dq \\
&= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{1,\ell} \int_0^1 \beta_{1,\ell}(q) \, dq \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} d_{1,\ell} \mathbf{1}_k(\ell) = 0, \tag{21}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by changing the index range of the second summation and  $d_{t+1,0} = 0$  for every  $t \in [n]$ , the second equality holds by factoring the summations and  $d_{n+1,\ell} = 0$  for every  $\ell \in [k-1]$ , the first inequality holds by inequality (14), and the last inequality by constraint (12).

Then, by summing over  $t \in [n]$  and  $\ell \in [k]$  in inequality (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \int_0^q f(u) \, du \, dq \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k d_{t,\ell} \int_0^1 \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k d_{t+1,\ell-1} \int_0^1 q \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq - \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^k d_{t+1,\ell} \int_0^1 (1-q) \beta_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq, \\
&\leq d_{1,k}, \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality comes from (20) and (21) together. Finally, (18) and (22) imply that  $v \leq d_{1,k}$ , which concludes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**Second step: A truncated LP with a useful structure.** Consider the following infinite-dimensional linear program: For  $\bar{n} \leq n$ , we consider the following LP

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup \quad v \tag{D}]_{n,k}(\bar{n}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,k}(q) \, dq + \int_0^1 \sum_{\tau < t} q \alpha_{\tau,k}(q) \, dq \leq 1, \quad \text{for all } t \in [\bar{n}], \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\int_0^1 \alpha_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq + \int_0^1 \sum_{\tau < t} q \alpha_{\tau,\ell}(q) \, dq \leq \int_0^1 \sum_{\tau < t} q \alpha_{\tau,\ell+1}(q) \, dq, \quad \text{for all } t \in [\bar{n}], \ell \in [k-1], \tag{24}$$

$$v g_{n,k}(u) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\bar{n}_k} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_u^1 \alpha_{t,\ell}(q) \, dq, \quad \text{for } u \in [0, 1] - \text{a.e.}, \tag{25}$$

$$\alpha_{t,\ell}(q) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } q \in [0, 1], t \in [\bar{n}] \text{ and } \ell \in [k], \tag{26}$$

We will prove that the optimal value of  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$  is a lower bound to the optimal value of  $[D]_{n,k}$ . The following technical proposition allows us to ensure that any feasible solution to  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$  induces a feasible solution to  $[D]_{n,k}$ . We present the proof of the proposition in Appendix B.

**Proposition 2.** *For every feasible solution  $(\alpha, v)$  to  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$ , there is  $(\alpha', v)$  feasible to  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$  for which all constraints (23) and (24) are tightened.*

The following proposition states the lower bound we need in the rest of our analysis.

**Proposition 3.** *For every  $k < n$ , and every  $\bar{n} \leq n$ , the optimal value of  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$  is at most the optimal value of  $[D]_{n,k}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\alpha, v)$  be a feasible solution to  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$ . By the previous proposition, we can assume that  $\alpha$  tightens all Constraints (23) and (24). From here, we can deduce that for  $0 \leq t < \bar{n}_k$

$$\int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,k}(q) dq = 1 - \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,k}(q) dq = \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} dq - \int_0^1 q \alpha_{t,q} dq$$

and for  $\ell < k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,\ell}(q) dq &= \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,\ell+1}(q) dq - \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,\ell}(q) dq \\ &= \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,q} dq + \int_0^1 q \alpha_{t,\ell+1}(q) dq - \int_0^1 q \alpha_{t,\ell}(q) dq \\ &= \int_0^1 (1-q) \alpha_{t,\ell}(q) dq + \int_0^1 q \alpha_{t,\ell+1}(q) dq. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\alpha$  satisfies constraints (12) (13) (14) for  $t < \bar{n}_k$ . If we define  $\bar{\alpha}$  as follows

$$\bar{\alpha}_{t,\ell}(q) = \begin{cases} \alpha_{t,\ell}(q), & t \leq \bar{n}_k, \\ 0, & t > \bar{n}_k, \end{cases}$$

then,  $(\bar{\alpha}, v)$  is a feasible solution to  $[D]_{n,k}$ . From here, the result follows immediately.  $\square$

**Third step: From the nonlinear system to LP.** Since  $\gamma_{n,k}$  is equal to the value of  $[P]_{n,k}$ , which in turn is at least the value of  $[D]_{n,k}$ , the previous result implies that we only need to provide a feasible solution to  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$  to provide a lower bound on  $\gamma_{n,k}$ . The latter will be defined by a solution to the non-linear system of equations (6)-(8). For a given  $\theta$ , we denote it by  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta)$ . The following lemma summarizes some properties of  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta)$  that we use in our analysis.

**Lemma 4.** *For every positive integer  $k$ , the following holds:*

- (i) *There exists  $\theta^*$  for which  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta^*)$  has a solution. We denote such a solution by  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$ .*
- (ii) *The vector  $\theta^*$  satisfies that  $0 < \theta_1^* < \theta_2^* < \dots < \theta_k^* < 1/k$ .*
- (iii) *For every  $j \in [k]$ , the function  $Y_j$  is non-increasing.*

We defer the proof of Lemma 4 to Subsection 4.1. Let  $\bar{n}_k = n - k - 1$  and let  $y_{j,t} = Y_j(t/\bar{n}_k)$ . Let us define  $\varepsilon_{j,t} = -\ln(y_{j,t})/\bar{n}_k$ , for  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, \bar{n}_k - 1\}$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , and  $\varepsilon_{j,\bar{n}_k} = 1$ . We can show that for  $n$  large enough,  $-\ln(y_{j,t})/\bar{n}_k \leq 1$  for  $t \in \{0, \dots, \bar{n}_k - 1\}$  (see Proposition 8); hence,  $0 \leq \varepsilon_{1,j} \leq \dots \leq \varepsilon_{j,\bar{n}_k} \leq 1$ . Let  $B_\ell = (\ell - 1) \cdot (4c_k^\ell + c_k/k!)$  for  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , where

$c_k = 24k! \max \{ \theta_{\ell+1}^* / \theta_\ell^* : \ell \in \{1, \dots, k-1\} \}$ . Now, consider the following family of functions:

$$\alpha_{t,\ell}^*(q) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \leq k - \ell, \\ \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right)^{-(k-\ell+1)} \left( B_\ell \ln(\bar{n}_k) \mathbf{1}_{[0,1/\bar{n}_k]}(q) - \theta_j^* g'_{n,k}(q) \mathbf{1}_{(0,\varepsilon_{\ell,t})}(q) \right), & t = k - \ell + 1, \\ \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right)^{-(k-\ell+1)} \left( -\theta_j^* g'_{n,k}(q) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(\varepsilon_{j,t-1}, \varepsilon_{j,t})}(q), & t > k - \ell + 2. \end{cases}$$

Note that for all  $u \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_u^1 \alpha_{t,\ell}^*(q) \, dq &\geq \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right)^{-k} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^k \theta_\ell^* \right) g_{n,k}(u) \\ &\geq \left(1 - 12k \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^k \theta_\ell^* \right) g_{n,k}(u), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where in the first inequality we used that  $(1 + 12 \ln(\bar{n}_k)^2 / \bar{n}_k)^{-(k-\ell+1)}$  is increasing in  $\ell$  and in the second inequality we used the standard Bernoulli inequality. Inequality (27) guarantees that  $(\alpha^*, v^*)$  satisfies constraint (25) with  $v^* = (1 - 12k \cdot \ln(\bar{n}_k)^2 / \bar{n}_k) \sum_{\ell=1}^k \theta_\ell^*$ . Before proving Theorem 2 we need the following lemma; we defer the proof to section 4.2.

**Lemma 5.** For  $\bar{n}_k = n - k - 1$ , and  $n$  large enough,  $\alpha^*$  satisfies constraints (23) and (24).

*Proof of Theorem 2.* As a consequence of Lemma 5, we have that  $(\alpha^*, v^*)$  is a feasible solution to  $[D]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$ . In particular, we obtain the approximation

$$\gamma_{n,k} \geq v^* = \left(1 - 12k \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \sum_{\ell=1}^k \theta_\ell^* \geq \left(1 - 24k \frac{\ln(n)^2}{n}\right) \sum_{\ell=1}^k \theta_\ell^*,$$

when  $n$  is sufficiently large. □

#### 4.1 Analysis of $\text{NLS}_k(\theta)$ and Proof of Lemma 4

In this section, we analyze the nonlinear system  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta)$  in terms of the existence of solutions. Given functions  $y_1, \dots, y_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , let  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$ , and for each pair  $r, \ell \in [k]$ , define  $\phi_{r,\ell,y}(t) = \Gamma_r(-\ln y_\ell(t))$  for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Observe that by simple differentiation, we have

$$\phi'_{r,\ell,y}(t) = -\Gamma'_r(-\ln y_\ell(t)) \frac{y'_\ell(t)}{y_\ell(t)} = (-\ln y_\ell(t))^{r-1} y'_\ell(t), \quad (28)$$

since  $\Gamma'_r(x) = -x^{r-1} e^{-x}$ . Furthermore, when  $r \geq 2$ , observe that  $\phi'_{r,\ell,y}(t) = -\phi'_{r-1,\ell,y}(t) \ln y_\ell(t)$ , which is a consequence of the derivative formula in (28). For a vector  $\theta_{\ell:k} = (\theta_\ell, \dots, \theta_k)$ , we define the system  $\text{NLS}_{\ell,k}(\theta_{\ell:k})$  to be the subsystem of  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta)$  that only consider the differential equations from  $\ell, \dots, k$  and the terminal conditions, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Gamma_k(-\ln y_k))' &= k! (1 - 1/(k\theta_k)) - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_k), \\ (\Gamma_k(-\ln y_j))' &= k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_j) - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{j+1})) \text{ for every } j \in \{\ell, \dots, k-1\}, \\ y_j(0) &= 1 \text{ and } \lim_{t \uparrow 1} y_j(t) = 0 \text{ for every } j \in \{\ell, \dots, k\}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $\ell = 1$ , the system  $\text{NLS}_{1,k}(\theta)$  is exactly the system  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta)$ . We also remark that, by replacing, any solution  $y$  of  $\text{NLS}_{\ell,k}(\theta_{\ell:k})$  satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi'_{k,k,y} &= k! \left(1 - \frac{1}{k\theta_k}\right) - \phi_{k+1,k,y}, \\ \phi'_{k,j,y} &= k! - \phi_{k+1,j,y} - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} (k! - \phi_{k+1,j+1,y}) \text{ for every } j \in \{\ell, \dots, k-1\}.\end{aligned}\quad (29)$$

In the following proposition, we provide some useful identities for our analysis.

**Proposition 4.** *Consider  $\ell \in [k-1]$ , and let  $\theta_{\ell,k}$  be such that there is a solution  $y = (y_\ell, \dots, y_k)$  for  $\text{NLS}_{\ell,k}(\theta_{\ell:k})$ , and such that  $y'_j(s) \neq 0$  for every  $j$  and every  $s \in (0, 1)$ . Then, the following holds:*

$$(i) \quad \phi'_{k,k,y}(t) \exp\left(\int_t^1 \ln y_k(s) \, ds\right) = k! \left(1 - \frac{1}{k\theta_k}\right).$$

(ii) For every  $j \in \{\ell, \dots, k-1\}$ , we have that  $\phi'_{k,j,y}(t) \exp\left(\int_t^1 \ln y_j(s) \, ds\right)$  is equal to

$$k! \left(1 - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j}\right) + \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} \int_t^1 \phi'_{k,j+1,y}(\tau) \ln y_{j+1}(\tau) \exp\left(\int_\tau^1 \ln y_j(s) \, ds\right) \, d\tau.$$

*Proof.* We start by observing the following:  $\phi''_{k,k,y} = -\phi'_{k+1,k,y} = -(-\ln y_k)^k y'_k = \phi'_{k,k,y} \ln y_k$ , where the first equality holds from the first identity in (29), and the other two equalities come from (28). From here, by integrating, we have that for every  $t, r \in (0, 1)$  with  $r \geq t$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\phi'_{k,k,y}(t) \exp\left(\int_t^r \ln y_k(s) \, ds\right) &= \phi'_{k,k,y}(t) \exp\left(\int_t^r \frac{\phi''_{k,k,y}(s)}{\phi'_{k,k,y}(s)} \, ds\right) \\ &= \phi'_{k,k,y}(t) \exp\left(\ln \phi'_{k,k,y}(r) - \ln \phi'_{k,k,y}(t)\right) = \phi'_{k,k,y}(r).\end{aligned}$$

We conclude part (i) by doing  $r \rightarrow 1$ : We use that  $y_k(r) \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta)$ , therefore  $\phi_{k+1,k,y}(r) \rightarrow 0$ , and then  $\phi'_{k,k,y}(r) \rightarrow k!(1 - 1/(k\theta_k))$ , using the first equality in (29).

For  $j \in \{\ell, \dots, k-1\}$ , we proceed in a similar way. From the second equality in (29) we get

$$\phi''_{k,j,y} = -\phi'_{k+1,j,y} + \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} \phi'_{k+1,j+1,y} = \phi'_{k,j,y} \ln y_k - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} \phi'_{k,j+1,y} \ln y_{j+1}, \quad (30)$$

where the last equality comes from the observation after the derivative formula in (28). On the other hand, for every  $r, \tau \in (0, 1)$  with  $r \geq \tau$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left( \phi'_{k,j,y}(\tau) \exp\left(\int_\tau^r \ln y_j(s) \, ds\right) \right) \\ &= \phi''_{k,j,y}(\tau) \exp\left(\int_\tau^r \ln y_j(s) \, ds\right) - \phi'_{k,j,y}(\tau) \exp\left(\int_\tau^r \ln y_j(s) \, ds\right) \ln y_j(\tau) \\ &= \left( \phi''_{k,j,y}(\tau) - \phi'_{k,j,y}(\tau) \ln y_j(\tau) \right) \exp\left(\int_\tau^r \ln y_j(s) \, ds\right) \\ &= -\frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} \phi'_{k,j+1,y}(\tau) \ln y_{j+1}(\tau) \exp\left(\int_\tau^r \ln y_j(s) \, ds\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from the equality in (30). We conclude part (ii) by doing  $r \rightarrow 1$  and then integrating  $\tau$  between  $t$  and one: We use that  $y_j(r) \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta)$ , therefore  $\phi_{k+1,j,y}(r) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\phi_{k+1,j+1,y}(r) \rightarrow 0$ , and then  $\phi'_{k,j,y}(r) \rightarrow k!(1 - \theta_{j+1}/\theta_j)$ , using the second equality in (29).  $\square$

**Proposition 5.** *Consider  $\ell \in [k-1]$ , and let  $\theta_{\ell,k}$  be such that there is a solution  $y = (y_\ell, \dots, y_k)$  for  $\text{NLS}_{\ell,k}(\theta_{\ell,k})$ , and let  $j \in \{\ell, \dots, k-1\}$ . If  $y_{j+1}$  is non-increasing, and if there is  $t_1 \in [0, 1)$  such that  $y'_j(t_1) < 0$  and  $y_j(t_1) < 1$ , then  $y'_j(t) < 0$  for all  $t \in [t_1, 1)$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the result by contradiction. Suppose there exists  $t_2 \in (t_1, 1)$  such that  $y'_j(t_2) \geq 0$ . By the continuity of  $y_j$ , the value  $\min\{y_j(t) : t \in [t_1, t_2]\}$  is well-defined, the minimum in  $[t_1, t_2]$  is attained at  $t' \in [t_1, t_2]$ , and  $y_j(t') < 1$  since  $y_j(t_1) < 1$ . Then, in a neighborhood of  $t'$ , there is  $t'_1 < t'_2$  such that  $y_j(t'_1) = y_j(t'_2) < 1$  and  $y'_j(t'_1) < 0$  and  $y'_j(t'_2) \geq 0$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 > (-\ln y_j(t'_1))^{r-1} y'_j(t'_1) &= \phi'_{k,j,y}(t'_1) = k! \left(1 - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j}\right) - \phi'_{k+1,j,y}(t'_1) + \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} \phi_{k+1,j+1,y}(t'_1) \\ &\geq k! \left(1 - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta}\right) - \phi'_{k+1,j,y}(t'_2) + \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} \phi_{k+1,j+1,y}(t'_2) \\ &= \phi'_{k,j,y}(t'_2), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used that  $y_{j+1}$  is non-increasing. From here, the contradiction follows since  $\phi'_{k,j,y}(t'_2) = (-\ln y_j(t))^{r-1} y'_j(t'_2) \geq 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.** *Consider  $\ell \in [k-1]$ , and let  $\theta_{\ell,k}$  be such that there is a solution  $y = (y_\ell, \dots, y_k)$  for  $\text{NLS}_{\ell,k}(\theta_{\ell,k})$ . Then, the following conditions are necessary: For every  $j \in \{\ell, \dots, k\}$ ,  $y_j$  is strictly decreasing in  $[0, 1)$ ,  $\theta_j < \theta_{j+1}$  for all  $j < k$ , and  $\theta_k < 1/k$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction. Since  $y_k(0) = 1$ ,  $y_k(t) \rightarrow 0$  for  $t \rightarrow 1$  from the left, and  $y_k$  is differentiable in  $(0, 1)$ , there is a value  $t_k \in (0, 1)$  such that  $y'_k(t_k) < 0$  and  $y_k(t_k) < 1$ . Since  $\phi'_{k,k,y}(t) = y'_k(t)(-\ln y_k(t))^{k-1}$ , we have  $\phi'_{k,k,y}(t_k) < 0$ . Then, from Proposition 4(i), it must be that  $1 - 1/k\theta_k < 0$ , that is,  $\theta_k < 1/k$ . Together with Proposition 4(i), this implies that for every  $t \in (0, 1)$  it holds  $\phi'_{k,k,y}(t) < 0$ , that is,  $\phi_{k,k,y} = \Gamma_k(-\ln y_k)$  is strictly decreasing in  $(0, 1)$ . We conclude that  $y_k$  strictly decreases in  $[0, 1)$ .

Assume inductively that  $y_{j+1}, \dots, y_k$  are strictly decreasing for some  $j < k$ . We will show that  $\theta_j < \theta_{j+1}$  and  $y_j$  is strictly decreasing. Note that for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\phi'_{k,j+1,y}(t) \ln y_{j+1}(t) = -y'_{j+1}(t)(-\ln y_{j+1}(t))^k > 0, \quad (31)$$

where the inequality follows by our inductive assumption and the equality by the derivative formula in (28). Now, if  $\theta_{j+1} \leq \theta_j$ , for every  $t \in (0, 1)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi'_{k,j,y}(t) \exp\left(\int_t^1 \ln y_j(s) ds\right) \\ &= k! \left(1 - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j}\right) + \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} \int_t^1 \phi'_{k,j+1,y}(\tau) \ln y_{j+1}(\tau) \exp\left(\int_\tau^1 \ln y_j(s) ds\right) d\tau \\ &\geq \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} \int_t^1 \phi'_{k,j+1,y}(\tau) \ln y_{j+1}(\tau) \exp\left(\int_\tau^1 \ln y_j(s) ds\right) d\tau \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by Proposition 4(ii), the first inequality holds by  $\theta_{j+1} \leq \theta_j$ , and in the last inequality we used inequality (31) and the inductive assumption. Therefore, for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ , we have  $\phi'_{k,j,y}(t) \geq 0$ , which cannot happen since the differentiability of  $y_j$  and the border conditions imply that we can always find  $t_j \in (0, 1)$  such that  $y'_j(t_j) < 0$  and  $y_j(t_j) < 1$ , i.e.,

$$\phi'_{k,j,y}(t_j) = y'_j(t_j)(-\ln y_j(t_j))^{k-1} < 0.$$

We conclude that  $\theta_j < \theta_{j+1}$ .

We prove next the monotonicity of  $y_j$ . Consider  $t' = \inf\{t \in [0, 1] : y'_j(t) < 0, y_j(t) < 1\}$ , which is well-defined since the set is non-empty. If  $t' = 0$ , then there is a sequence  $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $(0, 1)$  such that  $t'_n \rightarrow 0$ ,  $y'_j(t_n) < 0$ , and  $y_j(t_n) < 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, since  $y_{j+1}$  is strictly decreasing, by Proposition 5 we get that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and every  $t \in [t'_n, 1)$  we have  $y'_j(t) < 0$ . Since  $t'_n \rightarrow 0$ , we conclude that  $y'_j$  is strictly decreasing in  $[0, 1)$ . Otherwise, suppose that  $t' > 0$ . Then,  $y'_j(t) \geq 0$  or  $y_j(t) \geq 1$  for every  $t \in (0, t')$ . Assume that  $y_j(s) > 1$  for some  $s \in (0, t')$ . Then, since  $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} y_j(q) = 0$ , the continuity of  $y_j$  and the fact that  $y_j(t') \leq 1$ , imply the existence of a value  $t'' \in (0, t']$  such that  $y_j(t'') = 1$ . Note that  $0 = y'_j(t'')(-\ln y_j(t''))^{k-1} = \phi'_{k,j,y}(t'')$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_{k,j,y}(t'') &= k! - \phi_{k+1,j,y}(t'') - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} (k! - \phi_{k+1,j+1}(t'')) \\ &= k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(0) - \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} (k! - \phi_{k+1,j+1}(t'')) \\ &= -\frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{j+1}(t''))) < 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction; the first equality holds from (29), the second holds since  $y_j(t'') = 1$ , the third since  $\Gamma_{k+1}(0) = k!$ , and the inequality follows from  $y_{j+1}$  being strictly decreasing. Therefore, we have  $y_j(t) \leq 1$  for all  $t \in (0, t')$ , which further implies that  $y_j(t) \leq 1$  for all  $t \in (0, 1)$ .

If  $y_j(s) < 1$  for some  $s \in [0, t']$ , then there exists  $t''' \in (0, t')$  such that  $y'_j(t''') < 0$  and  $y_j(t''') < 1$ , which contradicts the minimality of  $t'$ . Then,  $y_j(t) = 1$  for every  $t \in (0, t']$ . But this implies that  $\phi'_{k,j,y}(t) = 0$  and  $\phi_{k+1,j,y}(t) = k!$  for every  $t \in (0, t']$ , and therefore from (29) we get that  $k! = \phi_{k+1,j+1,y}(t) = \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{j+1}(t))$  for every  $t \in (0, t']$ . This implies that  $y_{j+1}(t) = 1$  for every  $t \in (0, t']$ , which contradicts the fact that  $y_{j+1}$  is strictly decreasing. We conclude that  $t' = 0$  and, therefore,  $y_j$  is strictly decreasing. This finishes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* In what follows, we show that there is a choice of  $\theta$  such that the system  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta)$  has a solution. We proceed inductively. We show that there is a solution to this system for an appropriate choice of  $\theta_{j:k}$ . Using this solution, we can extend it to a solution for  $\text{NLS}_{j-1,k}(\theta_{j-1:k})$ , where  $\theta_{j-1:k} = (\theta_{j-1}, \theta_{j:k})$  for an appropriate choice of  $\theta_{j-1}$ . For every  $\ell$  we denote by  $y_\ell(1)$  the value  $\lim_{t \uparrow 1} y_\ell(t)$ .

We start with  $j = k$ . In this case, the  $\text{NLS}_{k,k}(\theta_k)$  is the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_k(-\ln y_k)' &= k! - k!/(\theta_k k) - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_k), \\ y_k(0) &= 1 \text{ and } y_k(1) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We can analyze this system in the same way as the Hill and Kertz differential equation when  $k = 1$  (see, e.g., Correa et al. [2021], Brustle et al. [2023]). There is a solution to this system if and only

if  $\theta_k$  satisfies the following integral equation:

$$1 = \int_0^1 \frac{(-\ln y)^{k-1}}{(k!/(k\theta_k)) - k! + \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y)} dy.$$

This holds by noting that  $\Gamma_k(-\ln y_k)' = (-\ln y_k)^{k-1} y_k'$ ; we integrate over  $[0, 1]$  and use the border conditions in the system, and perform a change of variables. From here, we get a unique  $\theta_k^*$  that satisfies the requirements since the value of the integral is monotone as a function of  $\theta_k$ , and there exists one for which the integral is exactly equal to 1. Furthermore, there exists a unique solution  $Y_k$  to  $\text{NLS}_{k,k}(\theta_k^*)$ .

Assume inductively that we have found a  $\theta_{j+1:k}^*$  where we have a solution  $(Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_k)$  to  $\text{NLS}_{j+1,k}(\theta_{j+1:k}^*)$  for some  $j < k$ . We now show that the system  $\text{NLS}_{j,k}(\theta_j, \theta_{j+1}^*, \dots, \theta_k^*)$  is feasible for a choice of  $\theta_j$ . This boils down to finding a solution for the following:

$$\Gamma_k(-\ln Y_j)' = k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_j) - \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{\theta_j} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1})) \quad (32)$$

$$Y_j(0) = 1, \text{ and } Y_j(1) = 0. \quad (33)$$

where  $\theta_{j+1}^*$  and  $Y_{j+1}$  are given and satisfy  $Y_{j+1}(0) = 1, Y_{j+1}(1) = 0$ . By Proposition 6 we have that  $Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_k \in [0, 1]$  are strictly decreasing and  $\theta_{j+1}^* < \dots < \theta_k^* < 1/k$ .

Let  $\theta_j > 0$  and consider the following Euler approximation to a candidate solution to (32)-(33). Let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  be non-negative and consider the following recursion:  $y_{m,j,0} = 1$ , and  $\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t+1})$  is equal to

$$\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t}) + \frac{1}{m} \left( k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,t}) - \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{\theta_j} \left( k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}(t/m)) \right) \right). \quad (34)$$

Note that the sequence is well-defined for  $y_{m,j,t} \geq 0$ . Let  $t' = \max\{t \in [m] \cup \{0\} : y_{m,j,t} \geq 0\}$ . For  $t = 0$ , we have  $\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,1}) = (k-1)!$  and therefore  $y_{m,j,1} = 1$ . For  $t = 1$ , we have

$$\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{j,2}^{(m)}) = (k-1)! - \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{\theta_j m} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}(1/m))) < (k-1)!,$$

which implies that  $y_{m,j,2} < 1$  for any  $\theta_j > 0$ . We note that if  $\theta_j \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,2}) \rightarrow (k-1)!$ . Inductively, we can show that for  $\theta_j \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $y_{j,t} = 1$  for all  $t$ ; in particular,  $t' = m$ .

We now show that  $y_{m,j,t}$  is decreasing in  $t$  as long as  $y_{m,j,t} \geq 1/m$  and  $m$  is such that  $m/\ln(m) \geq 1$  which holds for  $m \geq 2$ . We know this is true for  $t \in \{1, 2\}$ . We assume the result holds from 1



up to  $t$ , and we show next the result holds for  $t + 1$ , with  $t \geq 2$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t+1}) - \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t}) \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \left( k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,t}) - \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{\theta_j} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}(t/m))) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} (\Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,\tau}) - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,\tau+1})) \\
&\quad - \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{m\theta_j} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} (\Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}(\tau/m)) - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}((\tau+1)/m))) \\
&= \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t}) - \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t-1}) + \frac{1}{m} (\Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,t-1}) - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,t})) \\
&\quad - \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{m\theta_j} (\Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}((t-1)/m)) - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}(t/m))),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by writing the previous expression using two telescopic sums, and the third equality holds by rearranging terms and using the Euler approximation recursion. Note that  $y_{m,j,t+1} < y_{m,j,t}$  if and only if  $\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t+1}) < \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t})$ . Since  $Y_{j+1}$  is strictly decreasing, the result follows after the following claim. The proof of Claim 1 is in Appendix B.

**Claim 1.**  $\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t}) - \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t-1}) + \frac{1}{m} (\Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,t-1}) - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,t})) \leq 0$ .

We now show that  $\partial y_{m,j,t} / \partial \theta_j \geq 0$  for all  $t \leq t'$  and such that  $y_{m,j,t} \geq 1/m$ . Furthermore, we show that for  $t \geq 1$  as before, we have  $\partial y_{m,j,t} / \partial \theta_j > 0$ . We proceed by induction in  $t$ . The result is clearly true for  $t = 0$ . Suppose that  $\partial y_{m,j,t} / \partial \theta_j \geq 0$  and let's show the result for  $t + 1$ . By deriving in  $\theta_j$  in the Euler recursion (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (-\ln y_{m,j,t+1})^{k-1} \frac{\partial y_{m,j,t+1}}{\partial \theta_j} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t}) - \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,t}) + \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j^2 m} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}(t/m))) \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t}) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{m} \ln y_{m,j,t} \right) + \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j^2 m} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}(t/m))) \\
&\geq \frac{\theta_{j+1}}{\theta_j^2 m} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln Y_{j+1}(1/m)))
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $y_{m,j,t} \geq m$ . Since  $y_{m,j,t} \in (0, 1)$ , we obtain that  $\partial y_{m,j,t+1} / \partial \theta_j > 0$  and the result follows. Notice that the right-hand side of the inequality is independent of  $t$  and grows as  $1/\theta_j^2$ . Hence, as  $\theta_j \rightarrow 0$ , we have that  $t' \rightarrow 1$  and so  $y_{m,j,t} \rightarrow 1$  for  $t \leq t'$ . As a byproduct of this analysis, we also see that  $t'$  is strictly increasing in  $\theta_j$ . Now, let  $\theta_j(m)$  be such that  $2/m \geq y_{m,j,m-\sqrt{m}} \geq 1/m$ . Since  $\{\theta_j(m)\}_m$  is bounded, if we let  $m$  tend to infinity, we can find a convergent subsequence  $\{\theta_j(m_\ell)\}_\ell$  with a limit denoted as  $\theta_j^*$ .

Let  $y_{\ell,j} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be the piece-wise linear interpolation of the points  $\{y_{m_\ell,j,t}\}_t$ , where  $y_{m_\ell,j,t}$  is assigned as the image to the point  $t/m_\ell \leq 1$ . By a standard argument we can show that the sequence  $\{y_{\ell,j}\}_\ell$  has a uniformly convergent subsequence to a function  $Y_j : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  (see, e.g., [Kolmogorov and Fomin, 1975, Chapter 3]). Furthermore, this function  $Y_j$  is differentiable and satisfies (32)-(33). Hence, we have found  $\theta_{j:k}^*$  such that the system NLS $_{k,j}(\theta_{j:k}^*)$  is feasible.  $\square$

## 4.2 Feasibility Analysis and Proof of Lemma 5

In this subsection, we prove Lemma 5. The crux of the proof follows by analyzing the functions  $\alpha_{t,j}(q) = (1 + 12 \ln(\bar{n}_k)^2 / \bar{n}_k)^{k-j+1} \alpha_{t,j}^*(q)$ . These functions hold the following two claims:

**Claim 2.** *There is  $n_0 \geq 1$  such that for any  $n \geq n_0$  and for any  $t \in \{0, \dots, \bar{n}_k - 1\}$ , we have*

$$\int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,k}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,k}(q) dq \leq 1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}.$$

**Claim 3.** *There is  $n_0 \geq 1$  such that for any  $n \geq n_0$ , for any  $j < k$ , and for any  $t \in \{0, \dots, \bar{n}_k - 1\}$ , we have*

$$\int_0^1 \alpha_{t,j}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}(q) dq \leq \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}(q) dq.$$

Using these two claims, we show how to conclude Lemma 5 and then prove them.

*Proof of Lemma 5.* First, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,k}^*(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,k}^*(q) dq \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + 12 \ln(\bar{n}_k)^2 / \bar{n}_k} \left( \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,k}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,k}(q) dq \right) \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Claim 2, which shows that  $\alpha^*$  satisfies constraints (23). Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,j}^*(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}^*(q) dq \\ &= \frac{1}{(1 + 12 \ln(\bar{n}_k)^2 / \bar{n}_k)^{k-j+1}} \left( \int_0^1 \alpha_{t,j}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}(q) dq \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1 + 12 \ln(\bar{n}_k)^2 / \bar{n}_k)^{k-j}} \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}(q) dq \\ &= \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}^*(q) dq, \end{aligned}$$

where in the inequality we used Claim 3; which shows that  $\alpha^*$  satisfies constraints (24). This concludes the lemma.  $\square$

We devote the rest of this section to prove Claims 2 and 3. The two claims follow by a careful analysis of the solution to  $\text{NLS}_{n,k}(\theta^*)$  as well as the function  $g_{n,k}$ . In the following proposition, we leave some useful properties satisfied by the function  $g_{n,k}$ . Recall that we set  $\bar{n}_k = n - k - 1$ . The proof can be found in Appendix B.

**Proposition 7.** *For every  $u \in (0, 1)$ , the following holds:*

- (i)  $g'_{n,k}(u) = -(n-k+1)(n-k) \binom{n}{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} u^{k-1}$ .
- (ii)  $g'_{n+1,k+1}(u) = \frac{n+1}{k} u g'_{n,k}(u)$ .
- (iii) If  $n > (k+1) + 2(k+1)^2$ ,  $-g'_{n,k}(u) \leq -n \left(1 + 4\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \frac{\Gamma_k(\bar{n}_k u)'}{(k-1)!}$ .
- (iv) If  $n > 4k$  and  $u \in (0, s)$ , with  $s \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\bar{n}_k}}$ , then  $-n \left(1 - 4\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\bar{n}_k s^2}{1-s}\right) \frac{\Gamma_k(\bar{n}_k u)'}{(k-1)!} \leq -g'_{n,k}(u)$ .

Recall that for every  $r, \ell \in [k]$  we defined  $\Phi_{r,\ell} = \Gamma_r(-\ln(Y_\ell))$ . Observe that conditions (6)-(7) for the nonlinear system  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta^*)$  can be rewritten to get the following identities in  $[0, 1]$ :

$$\Phi'_{k,k} = k! (1 - 1/(k\theta_k^*)) - \Phi_{k+1,k}, \quad (35)$$

$$\Phi'_{k,\ell} = k! - \Phi_{k+1,\ell} - \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} (k! - \Phi_{k+1,\ell+1}) \text{ for every } \ell \in [k-1], \quad (36)$$

Furthermore, since the functions  $Y_j$  are non-increasing,  $\Phi_{k,j}$  are also non-increasing. Recall that  $\Gamma'_r(x) = -x^{r-1}e^{-x}$  and therefore, when  $r \geq 2$ , we have  $\Phi'_{r,\ell}(t) = -\Phi'_{r-1,\ell}(t) \ln Y_\ell(t)$ . We use the following technical proposition in the rest of our analysis. For the sake of presentation, we defer its proof to Appendix B.

**Proposition 8.** *For every positive integer  $k$ , the following holds:*

- (i) Let  $b_k = 4k! \max\{\theta_{\ell+1}^*/\theta_\ell^* : \ell \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}\}$ . Then, for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ , every  $\ell \in [k]$ , and every  $r \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ , we have  $Y_\ell(t)(-\ln Y_\ell(t))^r \leq b_k(1-t)$ .
- (ii) Let  $d_k = \min\{\theta_{j+1}^*/\theta_j^* : j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}\} - 1 > 0$ . There exists  $\Delta_k > 0$  such that for every  $t \in (\Delta_k, 1]$  and  $\ell \in [k]$ , it holds  $Y_j(t) \geq d_k(1-t)^2$ .
- (iii) Let  $c_k = 6b_k$ . We have  $\Phi''_{k,k}(t) \geq 0$  for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Furthermore, there is an integer  $N_k$ , such that for every  $n \geq N_k$ , every  $\ell \in [k-1]$ , and every  $t \in (0, 1 - 1/n]$ , we have  $|\Phi''_{k,\ell}(t)| \leq c_k \ln(n)$ .
- (iv) Let  $\bar{c}_k = (kc_k)^{1/k}$  and  $N_k$  as in (iii). There is  $\delta_k > 0$  such that for any  $n \geq N_k$ ,  $j < k$ , and every  $t \leq \min\{\delta_k, 1 - 1/n\}$ , we have  $Y_j(t) \geq 1 - \bar{c}_k \ln(n)^{1/k} t^{2/k}$ .

*Proof of Claim 2.* For  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, \bar{n}_k - 1\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,k}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,k}(q) dq \\ &= \theta_k^* \left( \int_{\varepsilon_{k,t}}^{\varepsilon_{k,t+1}} (-g'_{n,k}(q)) dq + \int_0^{\varepsilon_{k,t}} q (-g'_{n,k}(q)) dq \right) + B_k \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Now, we bound the term in parenthesis:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\varepsilon_{k,t}}^{\varepsilon_{k,t+1}} (-g'_{n,k}(q)) dq + \int_0^{\varepsilon_{k,t}} q(-g'_{n,k}(q)) dq \\
&= \int_{\varepsilon_{k,t}}^{\varepsilon_{k,t+1}} (-g'_{n,k}(u)) du + \frac{k}{n+1} \int_0^{\varepsilon_{k,t}} (-g'_{n+1,k+1}(u)) du \\
&\leq \left(1 + 16\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \left(\frac{n}{(k-1)!} \int_{\varepsilon_{k,t}}^{\varepsilon_{k,t+1}} -(\Gamma_k(\bar{n}_k u))' du + \frac{k}{n+1} \frac{n+1}{k!} \int_0^{\varepsilon_{k,t}} -(\Gamma_{k+1}(\bar{n}_k u))' du\right) \\
&= \frac{n}{(k-1)!} \left(1 + 16\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \left(\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{k,t}) - \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{k,t+1}) + \frac{1}{n}(k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{k,t}))\right) \\
&\leq \frac{n}{(k-1)!} \left(1 + 16\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \left(\frac{1}{\bar{n}_k}(k! - \frac{(k-1)!}{\theta_k^*} - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{k,t})) - (\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{k,t+1}) - \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{k,t}))\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{n}{\bar{n}_k} \left(1 + 16\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \frac{1}{\theta_k^*} \\
&= \frac{n}{(k-1)!} \left(1 + 16\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \left(\Phi'_{k,k}(t/\bar{n}_k) - \bar{n}_k \left(\Phi_{k,k}((t+1)/\bar{n}_k) - \Phi_{k,k}(t/\bar{n}_k)\right)\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{n}{\bar{n}_k} \left(1 + 16\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \frac{1}{\theta_k^*} \\
&\leq \frac{n}{\bar{n}_k(k-1)!} \left(1 + 16\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \left(\Phi'_{k,k}\left(\frac{t}{\bar{n}_k}\right) - \frac{\Phi_{k,k}((t+1)/\bar{n}_k) - \Phi_{k,k}(t/\bar{n}_k)}{1/\bar{n}_k}\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\theta_k^*} \left(1 + 20\frac{k^2}{n}\right). \tag{38}
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality and inequality follow by Proposition 7, where we used implicitly that  $1 + 4(k+1)^2/(n+1) \leq 1 + 16k^2/n$  for any  $k \geq 1$ . The next equality follows by computing the integrals. The next inequality follows by bounding  $1/n \leq 1/\bar{n}_k$  and adding and subtracting  $1/\theta_k^*$ . The last equality follows by rearranging terms and the last inequality follows by bounding  $n/\bar{n}_k(1 + 16k^2/n) \leq 1 + 20k^2/n$  for  $n \geq 20k^2(k+1)/(4k^2 - k - 1)$  and any  $k \geq 1$ .

The following claim allows us to bound the first term in (38). We defer the proof of the claim to Appendix B.

**Claim 4.** *It holds that  $\Phi'_{k,k}\left(\frac{t}{\bar{n}_k}\right) - \frac{\Phi_{k,k}((t+1)/\bar{n}_k) - \Phi_{k,k}(t/\bar{n}_k)}{1/\bar{n}_k} \leq 0$ .*

Then, in (37), we have

$$\int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,k}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,k}(q) dq \leq \left(1 + 20\frac{k^2}{n}\right) + B_k \frac{\ln(\bar{n})}{\bar{n}} \leq 1 + 12\frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k},$$

where the last inequality holds for  $n$  large enough. This concludes the proof of Claim 2.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 3.* For  $j < k$ , and  $t = k - j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,j}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j}(q) dq \leq B_j \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} + \theta_j^* \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,k-j+1}} (-g_{n,k})'(q) dq \\ & = B_j \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} + \theta_j^* \int_{\varepsilon_{j,k-j}}^{\varepsilon_{j,k-j+1}} (-g_{n,k})'(q) dq + \theta_j^* \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,k-j}} (-g_{n,k})'(q) dq, \end{aligned}$$

and for  $t > k - j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,j}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j}(q) dq \\ & \leq B_j \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} + \theta_j^* \left( \int_{\varepsilon_{j,t}}^{\varepsilon_{j,t+1}} (-g_{n,k})'(q) dq + \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,t}} q (-g_{n,k})'(q) dq \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any  $t \geq k - j$ , we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,j}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j}(q) dq \\ & \leq B_j \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} + \theta_j^* \left( \int_{\varepsilon_{j,t}}^{\varepsilon_{j,t+1}} (-g_{n,k})'(q) dq + \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,t}} q (-g_{n,k})'(q) dq \right) + \theta_j^* \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,k-j}} (-g_{n,k})'(q) dq. \quad (39) \end{aligned}$$

We upper bound separately the terms in parenthesis in (39). For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ \frac{n}{(k-1)!} \left( 1 + 16 \frac{k^2}{n} \right) \right]^{-1} \left( \int_{\varepsilon_{j,t}}^{\varepsilon_{j,t+1}} (-g_{n,k})'(u) du + \frac{k}{n+1} \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,t}} (-g_{n+1,k+1})'(u) du \right) \\ & \leq \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{j,t}) - \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{j,t+1}) + \frac{1}{\bar{n}_k} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{j,t})) \\ & = \frac{1}{\bar{n}_k} \left( \Gamma_k(-\ln y_j)' \left( \frac{t}{\bar{n}_k} \right) - \frac{\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{j,t+1}) - \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{j,t})}{1/\bar{n}_k} + \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{\theta_j^*} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{j+1,t})) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{\bar{n}_k} \left( \Phi'_{k,\ell}(t/\bar{n}_k) - \frac{\Phi_{k,\ell}((t+1)/\bar{n}_k) - \Phi_{k,\ell}(t/\bar{n}_k)}{1/\bar{n}_k} + \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{\theta_j^*} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{j+1,t})) \right). \quad (40) \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows by Proposition 7. The following allows us to bound the first two terms in the parenthesis of (40). We defer its proof to Appendix B.

**Claim 5.** *It holds that  $\bar{n}_k(\Phi_{k,\ell}(t/\bar{n}_k) - \Phi_{k,\ell}((t+1)/\bar{n}_k)) + \Phi'_{k,\ell}(t/\bar{n}_k) \leq c_k \ln(\bar{n}_k)/\bar{n}_k$ , where  $c_k > 0$  is defined in Proposition 8.*

The following claim allows us upper bound terms that appear after applying 7(iv). We defer its proof to Appendix B.

**Claim 6.** *For  $n$  sufficiently large, we have*

$$\left( 1 - 4 \frac{(k+1)^2}{n+1} \right)^{-1} \left( 1 - \frac{\bar{n}_k \varepsilon_{j+1,t}^2}{1 - \varepsilon_{j+1,t}} \right)^{-1} \leq 1 + 10 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}.$$

Hence, we can further bound (40) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{\bar{n}_k} \left( c_k \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} + \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{\theta_j^*} (k! - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{j+1,t})) \right) \quad (\text{Using Claim 5}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\bar{n}_k} \left( c_k \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} + \left(1 - \frac{4(k+1)^2}{n+1}\right)^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{n}_k \varepsilon_{j+1,t}^2}{1 - \varepsilon_{j+1,t}}\right)^{-1} \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{\theta_j^*} (k-1)! \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j+1,t}} (-g'_{n,k}(u)) u \, du \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\bar{n}_k} \left( c_k \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} + \left(1 + 10 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \frac{\theta_{j+1}^*}{\theta_j^*} (k-1)! \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j+1,t}} (-g'_{n,k}(u)) u \, du \right) \quad (\text{Using Claim 6}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\theta_j^* \bar{n}_k} \left(1 + 10 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \left( \theta_j^* c_k \frac{\ln \bar{n}_k}{\bar{n}_k} + \theta_{j+1}^* (k-1)! \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j+1,t}} (-g'_{n,k}(u)) u \, du \right).
\end{aligned}$$

From here, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_j^* \left( \int_{\varepsilon_{j,t}}^{\varepsilon_{j+1,t}} (-g_{n,k})'(q) \, dq + \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,t}} q (-g_{n,k})'(q) \, dq \right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \frac{c_k \ln(\bar{n}_k)}{k! \bar{n}_k} + \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j+1,t}} \theta_{j+1}^* q (-g_{n,k})'(q) \, dq \\
&\leq \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \frac{c_k \ln(\bar{n}_k)}{k! \bar{n}_k} + \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \left( \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}(q) \, dq - B_{j+1} \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We now bound the last term in (39). We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_j^* \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,k-j}} (-g_{n,k})'(q) \, dq \\
&\leq \frac{1}{k} \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,k}} (-g_{n,k})'(q) \, dq \quad (\text{Since } \varepsilon_{j,k-j} \leq \varepsilon_{j,k} \text{ and } \theta_j^* \leq 1/k) \\
&\leq \frac{n}{k!} \left(1 + 4 \frac{k^2}{n}\right) \int_0^{\varepsilon_{j,k}} (-\Gamma_k(\bar{n}_k u))' \, du. \quad (\text{Using Proposition 7})
\end{aligned}$$

The following claim allows us to guarantee that  $\varepsilon_{j,k}$  is close to zero. The proof simply uses Proposition 8(iv) for  $\bar{n}_k \geq N_k$  and we skip it for brevity.

**Claim 7.** *We have  $\varepsilon_{j,k} \leq 2\bar{c}_k \ln(\bar{n}_k)^{1/k} / \bar{n}_k^{1+2/k}$ , where  $\bar{c}_k$  is defined in Proposition 8.*

Since  $-\Gamma_k(\bar{n}_k u) = \bar{n}_k (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} e^{-\bar{n}_k u}$  and this function is increasing in  $[0, (k-1)/\bar{n}_k]$  and decreasing in  $[(k-1)/\bar{n}_k, +\infty)$ , for  $n$  large enough, we have that  $\varepsilon_{j,k} \leq (k-1)/\bar{n}_k$  and so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{n}{k!} \left(1 + 4 \frac{k^2}{n}\right) \bar{n}_k^k \left(2\bar{c}_k \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^{1/k}}{\bar{n}_k^{1+2/k}}\right)^k \\
&\leq \frac{2^k k^{1/k}}{k!} c_k^k \left(1 + 8 \frac{k^2}{n}\right) \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} \\
&\leq 4c_k^k \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $2^k k^{1/k} \leq 4k!$  for all  $k \geq 1$  and the bound  $8k^2/n \leq 12 \ln(\bar{n}_k)^2/\bar{n}_k$  for  $n$  large. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^1 \alpha_{t+1,j}(q) dq + \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j}(q) dq \\
& \leq \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}(q) dq \\
& \quad + 4c_k^k \left(1 + 8 \frac{k^2}{n}\right) \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} + B_j \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} + \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \frac{c_k \ln(\bar{n}_k)}{k! \bar{n}_k} \\
& \quad - \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} B_{j+1} \\
& \leq \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}(q) dq + \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)}{\bar{n}_k} \left(4c_k^k + \frac{c_k}{k!} + B_j - B_{j+1}\right) \\
& = \left(1 + 12 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}\right) \sum_{\tau \leq t} \int_0^1 q \alpha_{\tau,j+1}(q) dq,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $B_j = (4c_k^k + c_k/k!) \cdot (j-1)$  for  $j \geq 1$ . This finishes the proof of Claim 3.  $\square$

## 5 A Tight Prophet Inequality for Sequential Assignment

In this section, we show that our new provable lower bounds for the  $k$ -selection prophet inequality imply a tight approximation ratio for the i.i.d. sequential stochastic assignment problem by Derman et al. [1972], that we call SSAP in what follows. We provide the proof in two steps. Firstly, we show that SSAP is more general than  $(k, n)$ -PIP in the sense that any policy for the sequential stochastic assignment problem with  $n$  time periods implies a policy for  $(k, n)$ -PIP for any  $k \in [n]$  (Proposition 9). This shows that the approximation ratio cannot be larger than  $\min_{k \in [n]} \gamma_{n,k}$ . Secondly, we match the upper bound by using the structure of the optimal policy for SSAP (Proposition 10).

In the SSAP, the input is given by  $n$  non-negative values (rewards)  $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_n$  and we observe exactly  $n$  non-negative values, presented one after the other in  $n$  time periods, and drawn independently from a distribution  $F$ . For notational convenience, we assume that time starts at  $t = n$  and decreases all the way down to  $t = 1$ , i.e., the value  $t$  represents the number of time periods that remain to go before the next value is presented. For every period  $t$ , we observe the value  $X_t \sim F$ , and we have to irrevocably assign the value  $X_t$  to one of the unassigned rewards  $r_\tau$ 's. The goal is to find a sequential policy  $\pi$  that maximizes  $v_{n,F,r}(\pi) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^n X_t r_{\pi(t)} \right]$  where  $\pi$  is a permutation of  $[n]$ . Note that the optimal offline value corresponds to  $\sum_{t=1}^n r_t \mathbb{E} [X_{(t)}]$ . We denote by  $\alpha_n$  the largest approximation ratio that any policy can attain in SSAP for instances with  $n$  time periods.

**Proposition 9.** *For every  $n$ , it holds that  $\alpha_n \leq \min_{k \in [n]} \gamma_{n,k}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\pi$  be a policy for SSAP with approximation ratio  $\alpha$ . Given  $k \in [n]$ , we use  $\pi$  to construct a policy  $\pi'$  for  $(k, n)$ -PIP. Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\text{OPT}_{n,k} = 1$ .

Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/n^2)$  and consider the following instance for SSAP:  $r_i = \varepsilon i$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n-k\}$  and  $r_i = 1$  for each  $i \in \{n-k+1, \dots, n\}$ . The policy  $\pi'$  simulates  $\pi$  by creating  $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_n$  as defined before. When  $\pi$  assigns  $X_t$  to some  $r_i = 1$ , then  $\pi'$  selects the value  $X_t$ , while if  $\pi$  assigns  $X_t$  to some  $r_i = \varepsilon i$ , then  $\pi'$  discards  $X_t$ . Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^n X_t \mathbf{1}_{\{t \text{ selected by } \pi\}} \right] &\geq \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^n r_t X_{(t)} \right] - \varepsilon n \\ &\geq \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^k X_{(n-t+1)} \right] - (1+\alpha)\varepsilon n = \alpha - (1+\alpha)\varepsilon n. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the approximation ratio of  $\pi'$  is at least  $\alpha - (1+\alpha)\varepsilon n$ . Since this holds for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/n^2)$ , we conclude that  $\pi'$  has an approximation ratio of at least  $\alpha$ . Since this holds for any SSAP policy for  $n$  time periods and any  $k \in [n]$ , we conclude the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 10.** *For every  $n$ , it holds that  $\alpha_n \geq \min_{k \in [n]} \gamma_{n,k}$ .*

To prove this proposition, we need to use the structure of the optimal dynamic programming policy for SSAP shown by [Derman et al. \[1972\]](#), which we describe in what follows. For each time distribution  $F$  and each time  $t$ , there exist values  $0 = \mu_{0,t}(F) \leq \mu_{1,t}(F) \leq \dots \leq \mu_{t,t}(F)$ , where the value  $\mu_{i,t}$  is the optimal expected value in problem with  $t-1$  time periods in which the reward  $r_i$  is assigned under the optimal policy. If  $X_t \in [\mu_{\tau-1,t}(F), \mu_{\tau,t}(F)]$  then, the optimal policy assigns  $X_t$  with the  $\tau$ -th smallest available reward for  $\tau \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ . Furthermore, [Derman et al. \[1972\]](#) show that  $v_{n,F,r}(\pi^*) = \sum_{t=1}^n r_t \mu_{t,n+1}(F)$ . Note that the values  $\mu$  are completely independent of the rewards, and they just depend on the distribution  $F$  and  $n$ .

*Proof of Proposition 10.* For every  $\ell \in [n]$ , let  $d_\ell = r_\ell - r_{\ell-1}$  where  $r_0 = 0$ . Since the rewards  $r_t$  are non-decreasing in  $t$ , we have  $d_\ell \geq 0$  for every  $\ell \in [n]$ , and  $r_j = \sum_{\ell=1}^j d_\ell$ . Then, for every distribution  $F$ , we have

$$\frac{\sum_{t=1}^n r_t \mu_{t,n+1}(F)}{\sum_{t=1}^n r_t \mathbb{E}[X_{(t)}]} = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^n d_\tau \sum_{t=\tau}^n \mu_{t,n+1}(F)}{\sum_{\tau=1}^n d_\tau \sum_{t=\tau}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{(t)}]} \geq \min_{\tau \in [n]} \frac{\sum_{t=\tau}^n \mu_{t,n+1}(F)}{\sum_{t=\tau}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{(t)}]}.$$

Note that  $\sum_{t=\tau}^n \mu_{t,n+1}(F)$  is the reward collected by the optimal policy  $\pi^*$  in the instance  $r_1 = \dots = r_{\tau-1} = 0 < 1 = r_\tau = \dots = r_n$ . Furthermore,  $\sum_{t=\tau}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{(t)}]$  is the sum of the  $n-\tau+1$  largest values in a sequence of  $n$  i.i.d. samples from  $F$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{t=\tau}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{(t)}] = \text{OPT}_{n,n-\tau+1}(F)$ . Therefore, the ratio inside the minimization operator can be interpreted as the ratio in a  $(k, n)$ -PIP with  $k = n - \tau + 1$ . Since  $\pi^*$  is optimal for the instance  $r$  described above, then it must be the case that  $v_{n,F,r}(\pi^*) = \sum_{t=\tau}^n r_t \mu_{t,n+1}(F) \geq \gamma_{n,n-\tau+1} \text{OPT}_{n,n-\tau+1}(F)$ . The proof follows since this holds for every  $\tau \in [n]$ .  $\square$

Proposition 9 and Proposition 10 imply that  $\alpha_n = \min_{k \in [n]} \gamma_{n,k}$  for every  $n$ . The  $1 - k^k e^{-k}/k!$  lower bound on  $\gamma_{n,k}$  imply that  $\gamma_{n,k}$  is at least 0.78 for  $k \geq 3$  (see, e.g., [\[Dütting et al., 2020, Beyhaghi et al., 2021\]](#)) which is in particular larger than  $\liminf_n \gamma_{n,1} \approx 0.745$ . Since our results imply that  $\liminf_n \gamma_{n,2} \geq 0.829$ , we conclude that  $\liminf_n \alpha_n = \liminf_n \gamma_{n,1} \approx 0.745$ .



## References

- S. Alaei. Bayesian combinatorial auctions: Expanding single buyer mechanisms to many buyers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 43(2):930–972, 2014.
- N. Arnosti and W. Ma. Tight guarantees for static threshold policies in the prophet secretary problem. *Operations research*, 71(5):1777–1788, 2023.
- M. Babaioff, N. Immorlica, D. Kempe, and R. Kleinberg. A knapsack secretary problem with applications. In *Approximation, randomization, and combinatorial optimization. Algorithms and techniques*, pages 16–28. 2007.
- H. Beyhaghi, N. Golrezaei, R. P. Leme, M. Pál, and B. Sivan. Improved revenue bounds for posted-price and second-price mechanisms. *Operations Research*, 69(6):1805–1822, 2021.
- J. Brustle, J. Correa, P. Duetting, and V. Verdugo. The competition complexity of dynamic pricing. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2023.
- N. Buchbinder, K. Jain, and M. Singh. Secretary problems via linear programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(1):190–206, 2014.
- T. Chakraborty, E. Even-Dar, S. Guha, Y. Mansour, and S. Muthukrishnan. Approximation schemes for sequential posted pricing in multi-unit auctions. In *WINE 2010*, pages 158–169, 2010.
- T. H. Chan, F. Chen, and S. 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. In *SODA 2014*, pages 1169–1188, 2014.
- S. Chawla, J. D. Hartline, D. L. Malec, and B. Sivan. Multi-parameter mechanism design and sequential posted pricing. In *STOC 2010*, page 311–320, 2010.
- J. Correa and A. Cristi. A constant factor prophet inequality for online combinatorial auctions. In *STOC 2023*, page 686–697, 2023.
- J. Correa, P. Dütting, F. Fischer, and K. Schewior. Prophet inequalities for i.i.d. random variables from an unknown distribution. In *EC 2019*, page 3–17, 2019a.
- J. Correa, P. Foncea, R. Hoeksma, T. Oosterwijk, and T. Vredeveld. Recent developments in prophet inequalities. *SIGecom Exch.*, 17(1):61–70, may 2019b.
- J. Correa, P. Foncea, D. Pizarro, and V. Verdugo. From pricing to prophets, and back! *Operations Research Letters*, 47(1):25–29, 2019c.
- J. Correa, P. Foncea, R. Hoeksma, T. Oosterwijk, and T. Vredeveld. Posted price mechanisms and optimal threshold strategies for random arrivals. *Mathematics of operations research*, 46(4):1452–1478, 2021.
- C. Derman, G. J. Lieberman, and S. M. Ross. A sequential stochastic assignment problem. *Management Science*, 18(7):349–355, 1972.
- P. Dütting, M. Feldman, T. Kesselheim, and B. Lucier. Prophet inequalities made easy: Stochastic optimization by pricing nonstochastic inputs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 49(3):540–582, 2020.
- S. Ehsani, M. Hajiaghayi, T. Kesselheim, and S. Singla. Prophet secretary for combinatorial auctions and matroids. In *SODA 2018*, pages 700–714, 2018.
- M. Feldman, O. Svensson, and R. Zenklusen. Online contention resolution schemes. In *SODA 2016*, pages 1014–1033, 2016.

- V. Goyal and R. Udwani. Online matching with stochastic rewards: Optimal competitive ratio via path-based formulation. *Operations Research*, 71(2):563–580, 2023.
- M. T. Hajiaghayi, R. Kleinberg, and T. Sandholm. Automated online mechanism design and prophet inequalities. In *AAAI 2007*, page 58–65, 2007.
- T. P. Hill and R. P. Kertz. Comparisons of Stop Rule and Supremum Expectations of I.I.D. Random Variables. *The Annals of Probability*, 10(2):336 – 345, 1982.
- J. Jiang, W. Ma, and J. Zhang. Tightness without counterexamples: A new approach and new results for prophet inequalities. In *EC 2023*, page 909, 2023.
- R. P. Kertz. Stop rule and supremum expectations of iid random variables: a complete comparison by conjugate duality. *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 19(1):88–112, 1986.
- T. Kesselheim, A. Tönnis, K. Radke, and B. Vöcking. Primal beats dual on online packing lps in the random-order model. In *STOC 2014*, pages 303–312, 2014.
- R. Kleinberg and S. M. Weinberg. Matroid prophet inequalities. In *STOC 2012*, page 123–136, 2012.
- A. N. Kolmogorov and S. V. Fomin. *Introductory real analysis*. 1975.
- U. Krengel and L. Sucheston. Semiamarts and finite values. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 83(4):745–747, 1977.
- E. Lee and S. Singla. Optimal online contention resolution schemes via ex-ante prophet inequalities. In *ESA 2018*, 2018.
- A. Liu, R. P. Leme, M. Pál, J. Schneider, and B. Sivan. Variable decomposition for prophet inequalities and optimal ordering. In *EC 2021*, page 692, 2021.
- B. Lucier. An economic view of prophet inequalities. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 16(1):24–47, 2017.
- A. Mehta, A. Saberi, U. Vazirani, and V. Vazirani. Adwords and generalized online matching. *Journal of the ACM*, 54(5):22–es, 2007.
- S. Perez-Salazar, M. Singh, and A. Toriello. Robust online selection with uncertain offer acceptance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00842*, 2021.
- S. Perez-Salazar, M. Singh, and A. Toriello. The iid prophet inequality with limited flexibility. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05634*, 2022.
- E. Samuel-Cahn. Comparison of Threshold Stop Rules and Maximum for Independent Nonnegative Random Variables. *The Annals of Probability*, 12(4):1213 – 1216, 1984.
- Q. Yan. Mechanism design via correlation gap. In *SODA 2011*, pages 710–719, 2011.

## A Missing Proof from Section 3

*Proof of Proposition 1.* We show that for any  $j \in [n]$ ,  $\int_0^1 j \binom{n}{j} (1-u)^{j-1} u^{n-j} F^{-1}(1-u) du = \mathbb{E}[X_{(j)}]$ . This is sufficient since summing over all  $j \in \{n-k+1, \dots, n\}$  will then complete the proof. By performing a change of variables  $x = F^{-1}(1-u)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 j \binom{n}{j} (1-u)^{j-1} u^{n-j} F^{-1}(1-u) du \\ &= \int_0^1 j \binom{n}{j} (F(x))^{j-1} (1-F(x))^{n-j} x (-f(x)) dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{n!}{(j-1)!(n-j)!} f(x) (F(x))^{j-1} (1-F(x))^{n-j} x dx = \mathbb{E}[X_{(j)}], \end{aligned}$$

where  $f(x) = F'(x)$ . The final equality simply follows from the known fact that the probability density function  $f_{X_{(j)}}(x) = n! f(x) (F(x))^{j-1} (1-F(x))^{n-j} / ((j-1)!(n-j)!)$ . This finishes part (i).

For part (ii), recall that  $\mathbb{E}[X|X \geq x] \mathbb{P}[X \geq x] = \mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}_{\{X \geq x\}}]$ . On the other hand, we have that

$$\int_0^q F^{-1}(1-u) du = \int_\infty^{F^{-1}(1-q)} z (-f(z)) dz = \int_x^\infty z f(z) dz = \mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}_{\{X \geq x\}}],$$

where we used the change of variable  $z = F^{-1}(1-u)$ , and in the second to last equality, we use that  $q = \mathbb{P}[X \geq x] = 1 - F(x)$ . This finished the proof.  $\square$

## B Missing Proofs from Section 4

*Proof of Claim 1.* By induction  $y_{m,j,t-1} > y_{m,j,t}$ . Then, we can compare the following ratio

$$\begin{aligned} m \cdot \frac{\Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t-1}) - \Gamma_k(-\ln y_{m,j,t})}{\Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,t-1}) - \Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_{m,j,t})} &= m \cdot \frac{\int_{-\ln y_{m,j,t-1}}^{-\ln y_{m,j,t}} x^{k-1} e^{-x} dx}{\int_{-\ln y_{m,j,t-1}}^{-\ln y_{m,j,t}} x^k e^{-x} dx} \\ &\geq m \inf_{x \in [-\ln y_{m,j,t-1}, -\ln y_{m,j,t}]} \frac{1}{x} \\ &= m \cdot \frac{1}{-\ln y_{m,j,t}} = \frac{m}{\ln m} \geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

From here, the claim follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.* In what follows, we use the convention that an empty sum is equal to zero. We also avoid writing the limits in the integrals and the differentials “dq” as they are clear from the context. More specifically, we write  $\int_0^1 h(q) dq = \int h$  for any integrable function  $h$  in  $[0, 1]$ . We simply say that  $(\alpha, v)$  is *feasible* if  $(\alpha, v)$  is feasible to  $[\mathbf{D}]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$ . We also use the notation  $\bar{n} = \bar{n}_k$  to avoid notational clutter.

We fix  $v \geq 0$  such that  $(\alpha, v)$  is a feasible solution to  $[\mathbf{D}]_{n,k}(\bar{n})$ . Let’s define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} J_k^{(\alpha,v)} &= \{t \in [\bar{n}_k] : (\alpha, v) \text{ does not tighten constraint (23) for } t\} \\ J_\ell^{(\alpha,v)} &= \{t \in [\bar{n}_k] : (\alpha, v) \text{ does not tighten constraint (24) for } t, \ell\}, \quad \ell < k \end{aligned}$$

Let  $t'_{(\alpha,v)} = \max\{t \in J_1^{(\alpha,v)} \cup \dots \cup J_k^{(\alpha,v)}\}$ . If

$$J_1^{(\alpha,v)} \cup \dots \cup J_k^{(\alpha,v)} = \emptyset,$$

then we define  $t'_{(\alpha,v)} = \bar{n} + 1$ ; otherwise,  $t' \in [\bar{n}]$ . Let  $p'_{(\alpha,v)} = |\{\ell \in [k] : t'_{(\alpha,v)} \in J_\ell^{(\alpha,v)}\}|$  be the number of constraints of type (23)-(24) for which the  $t'_{(\alpha,v)}$ -th constraint is not tight.

Now, among all possible feasible solution  $(\alpha, v)$ , for a fixed  $v$ , choose the one that maximizes  $t'_{(\alpha,v)}$ . If  $t'_{(\alpha,v)} = \bar{n} + 1$ , then we are done. Otherwise, let  $t' \in [\bar{n}]$  be the maximum value for such a solution. Among all feasible solutions  $(\alpha, v)$  such that  $t'_{(\alpha,v)} = t'$  choose the one that minimizes  $p' = p'_{(\alpha,v)}$ . Note that  $p' \geq 1$ . Now, we will modify  $(\alpha, v)$  by finitely many mass transfers and additions yielding a new feasible solution  $(\alpha', v)$  such that either  $t'_{(\alpha',v)} > t'$  or either  $t'_{(\alpha',v)} = t'$  and  $p'_{(\alpha',v)} < p'$ . In any case, we will obtain a contradiction.

Let's assume first that  $t' \in J_k^{(\alpha,v)}$ —the general case is handled similarly; we explain at the end the minor changes. We analyze two different cases:

**Case 1.** If  $t' = \bar{n}$ , then, we consider the solution  $\bar{\alpha}_{t,k} = \alpha_{t,k}$  for  $t < \bar{n}$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_{\bar{n},k} = \alpha_{\bar{n},k} + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{(0,1)}$  with  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\int \alpha_{\bar{n},k} + \varepsilon + \sum_{\tau < \bar{n}} \int q \alpha_{\tau,k} = 1$ . Also,  $\bar{\alpha}_{t,\ell} = \alpha_{t,\ell}$  for  $\ell < k$ . Note that  $(\bar{\alpha}, v)$  remains feasible and tightens one more constraint in (23); this contradicts our choice of  $p'$ .

**Case 2.** If  $t' < n$ , we define

$$\bar{\alpha}_{t,k} = \begin{cases} \alpha_{t,k}, & t < t', \\ \alpha_{t',k} + \sum_{\tau > t'} \omega_\tau \alpha_{t,k}, & t = t', \\ (1 - \omega_t) \alpha_{t,k}, & t > t', \end{cases}$$

where  $\omega_{t'+1}, \dots, \omega_n \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $\bar{\alpha}_{t,\ell} = \alpha_{t,\ell}$  for  $\ell < k$ . Note that  $(\bar{\alpha}, v)$  satisfies (25), it satisfies (23) for  $t < t'$ , and for  $t > t'$ , we have  $\int \bar{\alpha}_{t,k} + \sum_{\tau < t} \int q \bar{\alpha}_{\tau,k} = \int (1 - \omega_t) \alpha_{t,k} + \sum_{\tau < t} \int q \alpha_{\tau,k} + \sum_{\tau \geq t} \omega_\tau \int q \alpha_{\tau,k}$ , which is increasing in  $\omega_\tau$  for  $\tau > t$  and decreasing in  $\omega_t$ .

We start with the values  $\omega_{t'+1}, \dots, \omega_n = 0$  and at this point  $(\bar{\alpha}, v)$  is feasible. By the choice of  $t'$ , we have  $\int \alpha_{t',k} + \sum_{\tau > t'} \omega_\tau \int \alpha_{\tau,k} + \sum_{\tau < t'} \int q \alpha_{\tau,k} \leq 1$  for  $\omega_{t'+1}, \dots, \omega_n > 0$  small enough. Now, we increment  $\omega_{t'+1}$  as much as possible while keeping feasibility of  $(\bar{\alpha}, v)$ . We repeat the same process in the order  $\omega_{t'+2}, \dots, \omega_n$ . We note that  $\omega_{t'+1}, \dots, \omega_n$  are not all 0's.

Suppose that we have  $\int \bar{\alpha}_{t',k} + \sum_{\tau < t'} \int q \bar{\alpha}_{\tau,k} = \int \alpha_{t',k} + \sum_{\tau > t'} \omega_\tau \int \alpha_{\tau,k} + \sum_{\tau < t'} \int q \alpha_{\tau,k} < 1$ . Then, we claim that  $\omega_{t'+1}, \dots, \omega_{\bar{n}} = 1$ . Indeed, let  $\tau' > t'$  be the smallest  $\tau$  such that  $\omega_\tau < 1$ . Then,  $\bar{\alpha}_{t,k} = 0$ , for  $t \in \{t'+1, \dots, \tau-1\}$ . Furthermore, constraints (23) for  $t \in \{t', t'+1, \dots, \tau-1\}$  are not tight, because they are dominated by constraint (23) for  $t = t'$  which is not tight. Since increasing  $\omega_\tau$  does not affect constraints (23) for  $t \geq \tau$ , we can increase slightly  $\omega_\tau$  and contradict the choice of  $\omega_{t'+1}, \dots, \omega_{\bar{n}}$ . From this analysis, we also deduce that every constraint (23) for  $t = t', \dots, \bar{n}$  is not tight. Furthermore,  $\bar{\alpha}_{t,k} = 0$  for  $t > t'$ . Define

$$\hat{\alpha}_{t,k}(q) = \begin{cases} \bar{\alpha}_{t,k}(q) (= \alpha_{t,k}(q)), & t < t', \\ \bar{\alpha}_{t,k}(q) + c_t \delta_{\{1\}}(q), & t \geq t', \end{cases}$$

where  $\delta_{\{1\}}(\cdot)$  is the Dirac delta at one. We define  $\hat{\alpha}_{t,\ell} = \bar{\alpha}_{t,\ell} = \alpha_{t,\ell}$  for  $\ell < k$ . Note that  $(\hat{\alpha}, v)$  satisfies constraints (24) and constraints (25), and constraints (23) for  $t < t'$ . If we define

$c_{t'} = 1 - \int \bar{\alpha}_{t',k} - \sum_{\tau < t} \int q \bar{\alpha}_{\tau,k} > 0$  we have that  $\hat{\alpha}$  satisfies constraint (23) at  $t = t'$  with equality. For  $t > t'$  we define  $c_t = 1 - \sum_{\tau < t} \int q \hat{\alpha}_{\tau,k} \geq 0$ . A small computation shows that  $(\hat{\alpha}, v)$  is again feasible and tightens (23) for  $t'$ . Furthermore, all the other constraints (24) remain unchanged for  $t \leq t'$  as they are only affected by terms  $\alpha_{j,\tau}$  with  $\tau < t'$ . This implies that either  $p'_{(\hat{\alpha},v)} < p'$  if  $p' > 1$  or  $t'_{(\hat{\alpha},v)} > t'$  if  $p' = 1$ . In any case, this leads again to a contradiction to our choice of  $(\alpha, v)$ .

When  $t' \notin J_k^{(\alpha,v)}$ , we have  $t' \in J_\ell^{(\alpha,v)}$  for some  $\ell < k$ . In this case, the analysis is the same with the only difference that the constraints will have the value  $\sum_{\tau < t} \int q \alpha_{\tau,\ell+1}$  on the right-hand side instead of 1. It is crucial to notice that this value is a non-negative constant when modifying  $\alpha_{t,\ell}$ ; hence, our mass transfers and additions still work. We skip the details for brevity.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 7.* Part (i) follows directly by computing the derivative:

$$\begin{aligned}
g'_{n,k}(u) &= \sum_{j=n-k+1}^n j \binom{n}{j} \left( -(j-1)(1-u)^{j-2} u^{n-j} + (n-j)(1-u)^{j-1} u^{n-j-1} \right) \\
&= \sum_{j=n-k+1}^{n-1} j \binom{n}{j} (n-j)(1-u)^{j-1} u^{n-j-1} - \sum_{j=n-k+1}^n j(j-1) \binom{n}{j} (1-u)^{j-2} u^{n-j} \\
&= \sum_{j=n-k+2}^n (j-1) \binom{n}{j-1} (n-j+1)(1-u)^{j-2} u^{n-j} - \sum_{j=n-k+1}^n j(j-1) \binom{n}{j} (1-u)^{j-2} u^{n-j} \\
&= \sum_{j=n-k+2}^n \frac{n!}{(j-2)!(n-j)!} (1-u)^{j-2} u^{n-j} - \sum_{j=n-k+1}^n \frac{n!}{(j-2)!(n-j)!} (1-u)^{j-2} u^{n-j} \\
&= -(n-k+1)(n-k) \binom{n}{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} u^{k-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the same line, part (ii) follows by evaluating directly  $g'_{n+1,k+1}$  using the previous formula:

$$g'_{n+1,k+1}(u) = -(n-k+1)(n-k) \binom{n+1}{k} (1-u)^{n-k-1} u^k = \frac{n+1}{k} u g'_{n,k}(u).$$

For part (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-g'_{n,k}(u) &= (n-k+1)(n-k) \binom{n}{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} u^{k-1} \\
&= \frac{(n-k+1)}{\bar{n}_k^{k-1}} \binom{n}{k-1} (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} (\bar{n}_k + 1) \\
&= \frac{(\bar{n}_k + 2)}{\bar{n}_k^{k-1}} \frac{n \cdot (n-1) \cdots (n-(k-1)+1)}{(k-1)!} (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} (\bar{n}_k + 1) \\
&\leq \frac{n}{(k-1)!} \left( \frac{n-k/2}{\bar{n}_k} \right)^{k-1} (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} (\bar{n}_k + 1) \\
&\leq \frac{n}{(k-1)!} \left( 1 + \frac{4k^2}{n} \right) (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} e^{-\bar{n}_k u} (\bar{n}_k + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

The final inequality follows by the bound  $(1-u)^x \leq e^{-ux}$  for  $u \in [0, 1]$  and observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{n-k/2}{\bar{n}_k}\right)^{k-1} &= \left(1 + \frac{k/2+1}{n-k-1}\right)^{k-1} \leq \left(1 + \frac{k+1}{n-(k+1)}\right)^{k+1} \\ &\leq \exp((k+1)^2/(n-(k+1))) \end{aligned}$$

Rewrite  $n = (k+1) + c(k+1)^2$  for some  $c > 1$ . We get  $\exp((k+1)^2/(n-(k+1))) = \exp(1/c)$  and we can compute  $(1 + 4k^2/n) \geq 1 + 2/c$ . Thus the inequality holds when  $\frac{1}{c} \leq \ln(1 + 2/c)$ , which is true for any  $c > 2$ . That is, letting  $n \geq (k+1) + 2(k+1)^2$  suffices. This proves the claim as the above inequality can be slightly strengthened by a factor of  $\bar{n}_k/(\bar{n}_k+1)$ .

For (iv), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -g'_{n,k}(u) &= (n-k+1)(n-k) \binom{n}{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} u^{k-1} \\ &\geq \frac{\bar{n}_k^2}{\bar{n}_k^{k-1}} \binom{n}{k-1} (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} \\ &= \frac{\bar{n}_k^2}{\bar{n}_k^{k-1}} \frac{n \cdot (n-1) \cdots (n-(k-1)+1)}{(k-1)!} (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} \\ &\geq \frac{n \cdot \bar{n}_k}{(k-1)!} \left(1 - \frac{k}{\bar{n}_k}\right)^{k-1} (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} (1-u)^{n-k-1} \\ &\geq \frac{n \cdot \bar{n}_k}{(k-1)!} \left(1 - 4\frac{k}{n}\right)^k (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} e^{-\bar{n}_k u/(1-u)} \\ &\geq \frac{n}{(k-1)!} \left(1 - 4\frac{k^2}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\bar{n}_k u^2}{1-u}\right) (\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} e^{-\bar{n}_k u \bar{n}_k} \end{aligned}$$

where in the third equality we use that  $(1-u)^{-1} = 1 + u/(1-u) \leq \exp(u/(1-u))$ , and in last inequality we use  $\exp(-\bar{n}_k u/(1-u)) = \exp(-\bar{n}_k u - \bar{n}_k u^2/(1-u)) \geq \exp(-\bar{n}_k u)(1 - \bar{n}_k u^2/(1-u))$ . Observe that  $\Gamma_k(\bar{n}_k u)' = \Gamma_k'(\bar{n}_k u) \bar{n}_k = -(\bar{n}_k u)^{k-1} e^{-\bar{n}_k u} \bar{n}_k$ . We conclude by noting that the function  $1 - \bar{n}_k x^2/(1-x)$ , in  $[0, 1]$ , is decreasing, positive at zero, and it has a unique root in the value  $(\sqrt{4\bar{n}_k+1}-1)/(2\bar{n}_k)$ . Since this value is larger than  $1/(2\sqrt{\bar{n}_k})$ , the conclusion follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 8.* Note that by (36), for every  $t \in (0, 1)$  we have

$$|\Phi'_{k,\ell}(t)| \leq k! + |\Phi_{k+1,\ell}(t)| + \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} k! + \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} |\Phi_{k+1,\ell+1}(t)| \leq 4k! \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*},$$

where the last inequality holds since  $\Phi_{k+1,r} \leq k!$  in  $(0, 1)$  for every  $r \in [k]$ , and  $\theta_\ell^* < \theta_{\ell+1}^*$  by Proposition 4(ii). Let  $b_k = 4k! \max_\ell \theta_{\ell+1}^*/\theta_\ell^*$ . Then, since  $\Phi_{k,\ell}(1) = 0$ , using the Taylor first-order approximation for  $\Phi_{k,\ell}$  in one, for every  $t \in (0, 1)$  we have  $\Phi_{k,\ell}(t) \leq b_k(1-t)$ . For each  $\ell \in [k]$ , by the formula  $\Gamma_k(x) = (k-1)! \cdot e^{-x} \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} x^r/r!$  applied with  $x = -\ln(Y_\ell(t))$  we conclude that  $b_k(1-t) \geq \Phi_{k,\ell}(t) = (k-1)! \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} Y_\ell(t) (-\ln Y_\ell(t))^r/r!$ , and then  $Y_\ell(t) (-\ln Y_\ell(t))^r \leq b_k \cdot r!/(k-1)! \leq b_k$ , where the first inequality holds since  $Y_\ell(t) \in [0, 1]$  for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ . This concludes part (i).

For the second part, by (36), for each  $\ell \neq k$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Phi_{k,\ell}(t) &= \int_t^1 \Phi'_{k,\ell}(\tau) d\tau = \int_t^1 \left( k! - \Phi_{k+1,\ell}(\tau) - \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} (k! - \Phi_{k+1,\ell+1}(\tau)) \right) d\tau \\ &\leq (1-t)k! \left( 1 - \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} \right) + \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} \int_t^1 \Phi_{k+1,\ell+1}(\tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

For each  $\ell \neq k$ , choose  $\delta_\ell > 0$  such that  $\Phi_{k+1,\ell+1}(t) \leq k!(1 - \theta_\ell^*/\theta_{\ell+1}^*)/2$  and  $Y_\ell(t)^{1/2}(-\ln Y_k(t))^{k-1} \leq 1$  for  $t \in (\delta_\ell, 1)$ . Using the first inequality, get

$$\begin{aligned} &(1-t)k! \left( 1 - \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} \right) + \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} \int_t^1 \Phi_{k+1,\ell+1}(\tau) d\tau \\ &\leq (1-t)k! \left( 1 - \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} \right) + (1-t)k! \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} - 1 \right) = -k!(1-t) \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence for this interval, using the bound  $\Phi_{k,\ell}(t) = \Gamma_k(-\ln Y_\ell(t)) \leq k!Y_\ell(t)(-\ln Y_\ell(t))^{k-1}$ , we have  $Y_\ell(t) \geq (1-t)^2(\theta_{\ell+1}^*/\theta_\ell^* - 1)^2/4$ . For  $\ell = k$ , we have

$$(1-t)k! \left( \frac{1}{k\theta_k} - 1 \right) \leq \Gamma_k(-\ln Y_k(t)) \leq k!Y_k(t)(-\ln Y_k(t))^{k-1}.$$

By part (i), we know that  $Y_k(t) \leq b_k(1-t)$ . Hence, for some  $\delta_k > 0$ ,  $Y_k(t)^{1/2}(-\ln Y_k(t))^{k-1} \leq 1$  for all  $t \in (\delta_k, 1)$ . Hence,  $Y_k(t) \geq (1-t)^2(1/k\theta_k - 1)^2$ . Part (ii) follows by taking  $\Delta_k = \max\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k\}$  and  $d_k = \min\{(\theta_{j+1}^*/\theta_j^*) - 1 : j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}\}/4$ . Using Lemma 4, we can conclude that  $d_k > 0$ .

From (35) we have  $\Phi''_{k,k}(t) = -\Phi'_{k+1,k}(t) \geq 0$ , since  $\Phi_{k+1,k}$  is non-increasing. For  $\ell \neq k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi''_{k,\ell}(t)| &= |-\Phi'_{k+1,\ell}(t) + \Phi'_{k+1,\ell+1}(t)| \\ &\leq |\Phi'_{k,\ell}(t)(-\ln Y_\ell(t))| + |\Phi'_{k,\ell+1}(t)(-\ln Y_{\ell+1}(t))| \\ &\leq b_k(-\ln Y_\ell(t) - \ln Y_{\ell+1}(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $N_k = \max\{1/(1 - \Delta_k) + 1, 1/d_k\}$ . Then, for every  $n \geq N_k$  we have  $1 - 1/n > \Delta_k$ . By the previous part we have that  $Y_\ell(1 - 1/n) \geq d_k n^{-2}$  for all  $\ell$ . Let  $c_k = 6b_k$ . Since  $-\ln Y_\ell(t) - \ln Y_{\ell+1}(t)$  is increasing as a function of  $t$ , for every  $t \in (0, 1 - 1/n)$  we have  $|\Phi''_{k,\ell}(t)| \leq b_k \cdot 2 \ln(n^2/d_k) \leq b_k \cdot 2 \ln(n^3) = c_k \ln(n)$ . This concludes the proof of part (iii).

For (iv), for  $\ell \geq 2$ , using a Taylor expansion around zero, for some  $\xi \in (0, t)$  and  $t < 1 - 1/n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{k,\ell}(t) &= \Gamma_k(-\ln Y_\ell(0)) + \Gamma_k(-\ln Y_\ell)'(0)t + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_k(-\ln Y_\ell)''(\xi)t^2 \\ &\geq (k-1)! - \frac{\theta_{\ell+1}^*}{\theta_\ell^*} k!t - \frac{c_k \ln(n)}{2} t^2 \\ &\quad \text{(Using the previous part and } \Gamma_k(-\ln Y_\ell)(0) = 0 \text{ using NLS)} \\ &\geq (k-1)! - \frac{c_k \ln(n)}{2} t^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the properties of  $\text{NLS}_k(\theta^*)$  and the definition of  $b_k$ . Since  $Y_\ell(0) = 1$ , for some  $\delta_k > 0$  we have that  $Y_\ell(t) = 1 - \varepsilon_\ell(t)$  for  $t \in [0, \delta]$  with  $\varepsilon_\ell(t) \leq 1/2$  for  $t \in [0, \delta]$  and  $\varepsilon_\ell(t) \rightarrow 0$  when  $t \rightarrow 1$ .

We simply write  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_\ell(t)$  for convenience. Then, using the characterization of the gamma function  $\Gamma_k$  as a Poisson distribution, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_k \ln(n)}{2} t^2 &\geq \int_0^{-\ln Y_\ell(t)} s^{k-1} e^{-s} ds \\ &\geq \int_0^\varepsilon s^{k-1} e^{-s} ds \\ &= (k-1)! \sum_{j \geq k} e^{-\varepsilon} \frac{\varepsilon^j}{j!} \\ &\geq \frac{(k-1)!}{k!} \varepsilon^k e^{-\varepsilon} \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{(k-1)!}{k!} \varepsilon^k, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used that  $\ln(1 - \varepsilon) \leq -\varepsilon$  and the other inequalities follow by straightforward computations. From here, we obtain that  $\varepsilon \leq \bar{c}_k \ln(n)^{1/k} t^{2/k}$ , where  $\bar{c}_k = (kc_k)^{1/k}$ . This concludes (iv).  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 4.* Using a Taylor expansion, we have

$$\Phi'_{k,k} \left( \frac{t}{\bar{n}_k} \right) - \frac{\Phi_{k,k}((t+1)/\bar{n}_k) - \Phi_{k,k}(t/\bar{n}_k)}{1/\bar{n}_k} = -\frac{1}{2\bar{n}_k} \Phi''_{k,k}(\xi) \quad (\text{For some } \xi \in (t/\bar{n}_k, (t+1)/\bar{n}_k))$$

We have  $\Phi''_{k,k} = -\Gamma_{k+1}(-\ln y_k)' = -(-\ln y_k)^k y_k' \geq 0$ . This concludes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 5.* Using a Taylor expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{n}_k (\Phi_{k,\ell}((t-1)/\bar{n}_k) - \Phi_{k,\ell}(t/\bar{n}_k)) + \Phi'_{k,\ell}((t-1)/\bar{n}_k) \\ &= \bar{n}_k \left( \frac{1}{\bar{n}_k} \Phi'_{k,\ell} \left( \frac{t-1}{\bar{n}_k} \right) + \Phi_{k,\ell} \left( \frac{t-1}{\bar{n}_k} \right) - \Phi_{k,\ell} \left( \frac{t}{\bar{n}_k} \right) \right) = -\bar{n}_k \cdot \frac{1}{2\bar{n}_k^2} \Phi''_{k,\ell}(\xi) = -\frac{1}{2\bar{n}_k} \Phi''_{k,\ell}(\xi), \end{aligned}$$

for some value  $\xi \in ((t-1)/\bar{n}_k, t/\bar{n}_k)$ . Since  $t/\bar{n}_k \leq (\bar{n}_k - 1)/\bar{n}_k = 1 - 1/\bar{n}_k$ , by Proposition 8(iii) we have  $-\Phi''_{k,\ell}(\xi) \leq c_k \ln(\bar{n}_k)$ , which concludes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 6.* We first verify that for every  $\ell \in [k]$ , for  $\bar{n}_k \geq 1/d_k$ , and  $t \leq \bar{n}_k - 1$  we have  $\varepsilon_{\ell,t} \leq 3 \ln(\bar{n}_k)/\bar{n}_k$ , where  $d_k$  is defined in Proposition 8. Indeed, using Proposition 8(ii) we obtain

$$-\ln Y_j(1 - 1/\bar{n}_k) \leq -\ln(d_k)/\bar{n}_k + 2 \ln(\bar{n}_k)/\bar{n}_k.$$

For  $\bar{n}_k \geq 1/d_k = 4/\min\{\theta_{\ell+1}^*/\theta_\ell^* - 1 : \ell \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}\}$ , we obtain the desired result. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left( 1 - 4 \frac{(k+1)^2}{n+1} \right)^{-1} \left( 1 - \frac{\bar{n}_k \varepsilon_{j+1,t}^2}{1 - \varepsilon_{j+1,t}} \right)^{-1} &\leq \left( 1 + 40 \frac{k^2}{n} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k - \ln(\bar{n}_k)} \right)^{-1} \\ &\leq 1 + 10 \frac{\ln(\bar{n}_k)^2}{\bar{n}_k}, \end{aligned}$$

which holds for  $n$  large.  $\square$