

Optimizing over iid distributions and the Beat the Average game

Pierre C Bellec and Tobias Fritz

ABSTRACT. A casino offers the following game. There are three cups each containing a die. You are being told that the dice in the cups are all the same, but possibly nonstandard. For a bet of \$1, the game master shakes all three cups and lets you choose one of them. You win \$2 if the die in your cup displays at least the average of the other two, and you lose otherwise. Is this game fair? If not, how should the casino design the dice to maximize their profit?

This problem is a special case of the following more general question: given a measurable space X and a bounded measurable function $f : X^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, how large can the expectation of f under probability measures of the form $\mu^{\otimes n}$ be? We develop a general method to answer this kind of question. As an example application that is harder than the casino problem, we show that the maximal probability of the event $X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4$ for nonnegative iid random variables lies between 0.4 and 0.422, where the upper bound is obtained by mixed integer linear programming. We conjecture the lower bound to be the exact value.

CONTENTS

1. The Beat the Average game	2
2. Optimizing over iid distributions in general	7
3. Maximizing the probability of a strict inequality	9
4. The case of $\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes 4}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4]$	12
5. Open problems	19
References	20

This paper studies the problem of maximizing, over a common probability measure μ in \mathbb{R}_+ , the probability of a strict linear inequality between iid random variables X_1, X_2, \dots all distributed according to μ . A curious reader seeking new problems might consider the exercise of proving $\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}[2X_1 < X_2 + X_3] = \frac{2}{3}$, or the open problem of determining $\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4]$, for which we will provide partial answers in Section 4 below. In the meantime, let us resolve the first version of this problem in the context of betting games in a casino.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 53C12; Secondary: 13N15, 58C25.

Acknowledgements. We thank Stephan Eckstein, Daniel Lacker, Lyuben Lichev, Gonzalo Muñoz and Will Sawin for generously sharing their ideas, pointers to the literature, and comments on a draft.

1. The Beat the Average game

If we throw two identical dice A and B , then they are equally likely to beat each other:

$$\mathbb{P}[A \geq B] = \mathbb{P}[B \geq A]. \quad (1.1)$$

This is obvious not just for standard dice, where the outcomes are $1, \dots, 6$ with equal probability, but also for any other kind of “non-standard” dice as long as they are identical. Formally, (1.1) can be seen by noting that the joint distribution is invariant under swapping the two dice. Moreover, since the two events $A \geq B$ and $B \geq A$ are complementary, it follows that their probability is $\geq \frac{1}{2}$. In fact, it is a nice exercise in elementary probability to show that

$$\mathbb{P}[A \geq B] = \mathbb{P}[B \geq A] = \frac{1 + \mathbb{P}[A = B]}{2}.$$

Now what happens when we have three identical dice, and we ask whether die A beats the *average* of dice B and C ? That is, what can we say about the probability

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A \geq \frac{B+C}{2}\right] ?$$

To start, let us consider standard dice first. In this case, there is another nice symmetry: the distribution of outcomes for a single die is symmetric around its expectation value $3\frac{1}{2}$. This implies that we have similar properties as for (1.1), namely

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A \geq \frac{B+C}{2}\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[A \leq \frac{B+C}{2}\right] > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.2)$$

The probability is strictly bounded by $\frac{1}{2}$ because both events occur if $A = \frac{B+C}{2}$, and this happens with nonzero probability.

What can we say if the dice are possibly non-standard? Let’s think about this in more fun terms:

Game 1.1 (Beat the Average, dice version). *There are three cups containing three identical dice. For a bet of \$1, the game master shakes all three cups and lets you choose one of them. You win \$2 if the die in your cup displays at least the average of the other two, and you lose otherwise.*

A first observation is that because of the symmetry, the choice of cup does not matter: we may as well always choose the cup on the left in every round. The purpose of letting you choose is merely to give you the illusion of control. Mathematically, deciding whether the game is in your favour reduces to analyzing the first probability in (1.2). As we noted above, this probability is $> \frac{1}{2}$ for standard dice. Thus if the dice are standard dice, then you should play!

But of course, you are smart enough to know that the casino would not offer this game if it was in your favour. So what tricks could they have up their sleeve to rip you off? Short of more dubious practices, the only way to turn the tables in their favour is to design suitable dice. But which dice should they use in order to maximize the probability of the event $A < \frac{B+C}{2}$ that you lose, and how large can they make this probability? Now we have a mathematical problem on our hands:

Problem 1.2 (Casino owner problem (COP)). *What is the largest probability of $A < \frac{B+C}{2}$, given that A, B, C are \mathbb{N} -valued iid random variables? And which distribution achieves this maximum, if it is achievable?*

Here, we have formalized a die as a distribution over natural number outcomes, which amounts to allowing dice with infinitely many sides. But as we will see, the maximal

probability can be approached by a sequence of dice with an increasing finite number of sides.

As mathematicians, we may want to start thinking about the most degenerate case first: what happens for *one-sided* dice? Or equivalently, with dice which display the same number on all sides? In this case, our random variables are deterministic, and the iid assumption implies that they must be equal. Thus the probability in question is 0: the player always wins! Using one-sided dice, or dice displaying the same number on all sides, is the worst thing to do for the casino.

For two-sided dice, we can take the outcomes to be 0 and 1 without loss of generality. Let's say that throwing such a die gives 1 with probability p and 0 with probability $1 - p$. Then the casino wins the game if $A = 0$ and $B = 1$ or $C = 1$, resulting in

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2}\right] = (1-p)(1 - (1-p)^2) = p^3 - 3p^2 + 2p.$$

This function with domain $[0, 1]$ has its maximum at $p = 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$, where it evaluates to

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2}\right] = \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \approx 0.385.$$

So with two-sided dice, the casino can do better than with one-sided ones, but will still end up losing on average.

Determining the optimal three-sided dice is already a more involved calculation and we will not perform it here. But it is instructive to calculate the winning probability for a three-sided dice with values 1, 2, 4 having probability $\frac{1}{3}$ each. There are $3^3 = 27$ possible outcomes in this case, and the winning ones for the casino are precisely the following combinations:

A	B	C
1	1	2
1	1	4
1	2	1
1	2	2
1	2	4
1	4	1
1	4	2
1	4	4
2	1	4
2	2	4
2	4	1
2	4	2
2	4	4

Hence for dice like this, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2}\right] = \frac{13}{27} \approx 0.481.$$

So in this case, the casino is almost breaking even, while the player still has a small edge left. If the value 4 on the dice was a 3 instead, then we would have a symmetric distribution again and the game would be even better for the player. This underlines that in order to optimize the dice, the casino should aim for a certain skewness in the distribution.

It still remains unclear whether you are safe playing the game, or whether the casino can rig the dice in their favour. In order to finally solve this problem, let's consider a slightly different game first.

Game 1.3 (Beat the Average, card version). *For a bet of \$1, the game master shuffles a deck of cards with distinct values, draws three without replacement, and lets you choose one of them. You get \$2 if the value of your card is at least the average of the other two, and you lose otherwise.*

Similar to the dice version, the casino can try to stack the deck in their favour by choosing the cards in a clever way. For example, suppose that the deck contains only three cards—the minimum for the game to make sense—with values 1, 2, 4. Then there are only six possible outcomes in total, among which the winning combinations for the casino are:

A	B	C
1	2	4
1	4	2
2	1	4
2	4	1

Thus, in this setting, the player has a winning probability $\mathbb{P}[A \geq \frac{B+C}{2}]$ of only $\frac{1}{3}$! An excellent *deal* for the casino.

For the card version, determining the winning probability for a given deck is a combinatorial problem. If the deck consists of m cards, then the game has

$$\binom{m}{3} \cdot 3$$

possible outcomes, corresponding to the possible choices of three cards times the number of ways to assign one of them to the player. So to determine the winning probability for the casino, we need to count how many of these combinations are winning. How large can this number get? Or as the player, at which bet value can you be confident that the game is in your favour, regardless of the deck used? Here's the result.

Proposition 1.4. *In the card version, the largest winning probability $\mathbb{P}[A < \frac{B+C}{2}]$ for the casino is $\frac{2}{3}$, independently of the number of cards $m \geq 3$.*

PROOF. To achieve this number, we can use a deck with values generalizing the example above, namely

$$1, 2, 4, \dots, 2^{m-1}. \tag{1.3}$$

To determine the number of winning combinations for the casino, note that for any triple of such numbers, the inequality $2A < B + C$ is equivalent to $A < \min(B, C)$. There are exactly four ways that this holds for every unordered triple of cards, namely with the arrangements

$$A < B < C, \quad A < C < B, \quad B < A < C, \quad C < A < B.$$

Therefore this choice of deck indeed achieves a winning probability of $\frac{2}{3}$.

There is a neat trick, based on the probabilistic method [1], to show that the winning probability cannot be higher than $\frac{2}{3}$. Namely if we have a deck with m cards, then for any $m' < m$, we can randomly pick a subset of m' cards and discard the rest. In this way, we obtain a deck with m' cards that we can play the game with. Now the winning probability for the original m -card deck is the expectation of the winning probabilities for all these decks with m' many cards. Therefore, for *at least one of these*, the winning probability must be at least as high as for the original deck. Since we know that the winning probability $\mathbb{P}[A < \frac{B+C}{2}]$ cannot exceed $\frac{2}{3}$ for $m = 3$, it follows that this is also the case for all m by using $m' = 3$ in the preceding argument. An alternative (but essentially equivalent) argument is

$$3 \mathbb{P}[A < \frac{B+C}{2}] = \mathbb{E}[I\{A < \frac{B+C}{2}\} + I\{B < \frac{A+C}{2}\} + I\{C < \frac{A+B}{2}\}] \leq 2. \tag{1.4}$$

This equality holds because $(A, B, C) \stackrel{d}{=} (B, A, C) \stackrel{d}{=} (C, A, B)$, where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution. The inequality holds because only two of the three indicator functions inside the expectation can be one simultaneously, as the sum of the three inequalities gives the contradiction $0 < 0$. \square

In this way, we have essentially solved the card version of the Beat the Average game: you should play if the casinos offers more than three times your bet if you win, but if not then the casino can rip you off by making a clever choice of deck.

But how about the dice version? We still don't know whether the casino can rig the dice in their favour! Fortunately, having solved the card version will let us solve the dice version as well. To note the relation, we may think of the dice version as a limiting case of the card version obtained by replacing the deck by a large number of copies of itself.¹ But more importantly, we can use the probabilistic method in a similar way as in the proof of Proposition 1.4 to solve the casino owner problem.

Theorem 1.5. *For any $m \geq 1$, the die with values (1.3) and equal outcome probabilities achieves*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2}\right] \geq \frac{2}{3} - \frac{3}{m}. \quad (1.5)$$

On the other hand, every iid non-negative random variables (A, B, C) satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2}\right] \leq \frac{2}{3}, \quad (1.6)$$

and this inequality is strict if A has at least one atom, i.e., $\mathbb{P}[A = a] > 0$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

So by the first statement, the casino can indeed rig the dice against you! In fact, they can rig the dice such that their winning probability is arbitrarily close to $\frac{2}{3}$, and they can have the edge as soon as the number of sides is

$$m > 3 \left(\frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{2}\right)^{-1} = 18.$$

The proof will also tell us which dice they can use in order to achieve this.

PROOF. We start with the proof of the lower bound (1.5) for given m . Given a deck of m cards with distinct values, we can construct a die with m sides having the same values on the faces as on the cards, and such that all sides have equal probability $\frac{1}{m}$. Then if we exclude all rounds in which at least two of the dice land on the same side, the losing probability of the dice version trivially coincides with the losing probability of the card version.

More formally, consider the following joint distribution. Throwing the die countably many times results in a sequence of outcomes $(X_t)_{t \geq 1}$, which are independent and uniformly distributed in $\{1, 2, 4, \dots, 2^{m-1}\}$. Then let

$$S := \min\{s \geq 1 : X_s \neq X_1\}, \quad T := \min\{t \geq 1 : X_t \neq X_1, X_S\}$$

be the first times at which distinct outcomes are obtained. We take

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= X_1, & B &:= X_2, & C &:= X_3, \\ A' &:= X_1, & B' &:= X_S, & C' &:= X_T. \end{aligned}$$

¹We can also consider the dice version as like the card version with replacement: a drawn card is immediately put back into the deck and may be drawn again. But we will not need this point of view.

Then (A', B', C') has the same distribution as three cards drawn without replacement, and

$$\mathbb{P}[(A, B, C) = (A', B', C')] \geq \mathbb{P}[S = 2, T = 3] = \frac{(m-1)(m-2)}{m^2} \geq 1 - \frac{3}{m}.$$

Since the cards (A', B', C') drawn without replacement from the values in (1.3) have the optimal probability $\mathbb{P}\left[A' < \frac{B'+C'}{2}\right] = \frac{2}{3}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2}\right] \geq \mathbb{P}\left[A' < \frac{B'+C'}{2}\right] - \mathbb{P}[(A, B, C) \neq (A', B', C')] \geq \frac{2}{3} - \frac{3}{m},$$

as was to be shown in (1.5). Inequality (1.4) holds for iid (A, B, C) which proves (1.6).

It remains to be shown that the upper bound is not achieved for any die with $m < \infty$ many sides. To this end, consider the three events corresponding to the number of distinct values,

$$E_1 := \{|\{A, B, C\}| = 1\}, \quad E_2 = \{|\{A, B, C\}| = 2\}, \quad E_3 = \{|\{A, B, C\}| = 3\}.$$

The inequality $A < \frac{B+C}{2}$ obviously does not hold on E_1 . Conditionally on E_3 , the values (A, B, C) are distributed as three cards drawn without replacement, and hence $\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2} \mid E_3\right] \leq \frac{2}{3}$ by Proposition 1.4. Conditionally on E_2 , we have $\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2} \mid E_2\right] = \frac{1}{2}$. This implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2}\right] = \frac{2}{3}\mathbb{P}[E_3] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}[E_2] = \frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{6}\mathbb{P}[E_2] - \frac{2}{3}\mathbb{P}[E_1].$$

Finally, $\mathbb{P}[E_1] \geq \mathbb{P}[A = a]^3$ is strictly positive if A satisfies $\mathbb{P}[A = a] > 0$. \square

Let us consider a concrete example of a die design that rigs the game in the casino's favour. The above proof with $m = 4$ suggests trying a four-sided dice with values 1, 2, 4, 8 and equal probabilities. Then there are $4^3 = 64$ possible outcomes, among which we determine the winning ones for the casino are the following:

- ▷ If all three dice land differently: there are $4! = 24$ such outcomes, and we already know from the card version that $\frac{2}{3} \cdot 24 = 16$ of them are winning for the casino.
- ▷ If $A = B$ and $A \neq C$: there are $4 \cdot 3 = 12$ such outcomes, of which precisely those with $A < C$ are winning, which is $\frac{12}{2} = 6$ of them.
- ▷ Likewise if $A \neq B$ and $A = C$.
- ▷ If $A \neq B = C$: again there are $4 \cdot 3 = 12$ such outcomes, of which those with $A < B$ are winning, which is $\frac{12}{2} = 6$ of them.
- ▷ If all three are the same: none of these outcomes is winning.

Adding this up thus shows that there are $16 + 3 \cdot 6 = 34$ winning outcomes, resulting in a winning probability of

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2}\right] = \frac{34}{64} = \frac{17}{32} \approx 0.531$$

for the casino, which finally gives them the edge in Game 1.1. So you should be wary of playing, or at least demand a higher payout if you win!

The card version of the game is fair if the casino uses the cards (1.3) and offers three times your bet if you win, since in this case the probability $\mathbb{P}\left[A < \frac{B+C}{2}\right]$ is exactly $\frac{2}{3}$. However, by Theorem 1.5, such a fair game with winning probability $\frac{2}{3}$ cannot be achieved with dice with discrete outcomes. It is still unclear if $\frac{2}{3}$ in Theorem 1.5, which is the supremum of the probability in (1.6) over all distributions on \mathbb{R}_+ , can be achieved by distributions with no atom. We will come back to this question regarding attainability of the supremum in Section 5.

Because the optimal winning probability of $\frac{2}{3}$ cannot be achieved by dice with discrete distributions (as is always the case in practice), the casino decides to change the game: Allow customers to bring their own die and offer them a payout if $A < \frac{B+C}{2}$ (instead of $A \geq \frac{B+C}{2}$ in previous games).

Game 1.6 (Bring Your Own Die). *The casino invites you to bring one die with outcomes in \mathbb{N} and arbitrary outcome probabilities. For a bet of \$2, the game master rolls the die three times to get A, B, C . You win \$3 if $A < \frac{B+C}{2}$ and lose otherwise.*

Despite the apparent agency for customers in bringing their own die, and the possibility to get arbitrarily close to a fair game by choosing a suitable die, on average the casino always has a strict advantage by the non-achievability part of Theorem 1.5. The player cannot argue that the payout should be strictly larger than \$3 either, since any strictly larger payout would be unfair to, and could objectively bankrupt, the casino.

2. Optimizing over iid distributions in general

As we have just seen, the casino owner's problem is an interesting and nontrivial mathematical question. Let us now describe the general form of this kind of question and try to answer it. Most of the developments in this section will be more general and more formal variations of the ideas we have already seen in the previous section. As will show, determining the optimal probability is much harder in general; the casino owner's problem has been a particularly simple case.

Problem 2.1. *Let X be a measurable space and $f : X^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a bounded measurable function. Then find an algorithm to determine the quantity*

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[f]. \quad (2.1)$$

This specializes to the casino owner's problem upon taking $X = \mathbb{N}$ and considering the indicator function of the event

$$E = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{N}^3 \mid x_1 \geq \frac{x_2+x_3}{2}\}.$$

In order to generalize our solution of this problem into a general method, it will be useful to have a simple notation for averaging over a finite set.

Notation 2.2. *For a finite set A and $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we write*

$$\int_{x \in A} f(x) := \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{x \in A} f(x).$$

That is, when no measure is specified for an integral, then we leave it understood that we are averaging uniformly over a finite set. This also applies to averaging over maps: with B^A denoting the set of maps $A \rightarrow B$ for finite sets A and B , for any $\Phi : B^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we write

$$\int_{g:A \rightarrow B} \Phi(g) := \frac{1}{|B|^{|A|}} \sum_{g:A \rightarrow B} \Phi(g).$$

If $|A| \leq |B|$, then it is also meaningful to average over all injections $i : A \hookrightarrow B$, which we denote by

$$\int_{i:A \hookrightarrow B} \Phi(i) := \frac{1}{|B|(|B|-1) \cdots (|B|-|A|+1)} \sum_{i:A \hookrightarrow B} \Phi(i).$$

Given a third set C with $|B| \leq |C|$, we can average over injections $A \hookrightarrow C$ by averaging over injections $A \hookrightarrow B$ and injections $B \hookrightarrow C$ separately. In other words, we have

$$\int_{i:A \hookrightarrow C} \Phi(i) = \int_{j:A \hookrightarrow B} \int_{k:B \hookrightarrow C} \Phi(k \circ j). \quad (2.2)$$

This equation will come in handy in our proofs.

Let us start the general development by deriving an upper bound on (2.1), the quantity we are interested in.

Lemma 2.3. *For every $m \geq n$, we have*

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[f] \leq \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_m \in X} \int_{i:[n] \hookrightarrow [m]} f(x_{i(1)}, \dots, x_{i(n)}). \quad (2.3)$$

PROOF. For fixed μ , for every $i : [n] \hookrightarrow [m]$ we have by exchangeability

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[f] = \int_{x_1, \dots, x_n \in X} f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mu^{\otimes n}(dx) = \int_{x_1, \dots, x_m \in X} f(x_{i(1)}, \dots, x_{i(n)}) \mu^{\otimes m}(dx).$$

This equality still holds if i itself is chosen uniformly at random from all injections $[n] \hookrightarrow [m]$. This gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[f] = \int_{x_1, \dots, x_m \in X} \int_{i:[n] \hookrightarrow [m]} f(x_{i(1)}, \dots, x_{i(n)}) \mu^{\otimes m}(dx). \quad (2.4)$$

The claim now follows from the fact that an integral with respect to a probability measure is bounded by the supremum of the integrand. \square

As we show next, this upper bound can only get better as the free parameter m increases, and in fact it converges to the exact value we are interested in.

Theorem 2.4. *Let X be a measurable space and $f : X^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ bounded measurable. Then*

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[f] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_m \in X} \int_{i:[n] \hookrightarrow [m]} f(x_{i(1)}, \dots, x_{i(n)}),$$

where the limit is over a monotonically nonincreasing sequence.

The second part of the following proof was suggested to us by Will Sawin.² It can be understood as an application of Freedman's bound on the total variation distance between sampling with and without replacement [2].

PROOF. For the monotonicity in m , consider $m' \geq m$. Then using (2.2), the averaging over injections $[n] \hookrightarrow [m']$ can be achieved by separately averaging over injections $[n] \hookrightarrow [m]$ and injections $[m] \hookrightarrow [m']$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_{m'} \in X} \int_{i:[n] \hookrightarrow [m']} f(x_{i(1)}, \dots, x_{i(n)}) \\ &= \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_{m'} \in X} \int_{j:[n] \hookrightarrow [m]} \int_{k:[m] \hookrightarrow [m']} f(x_{k(j(1))}, \dots, x_{k(j(n))}) \\ &\leq \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_{m'} \in X} \sup_{k:[m] \hookrightarrow [m']} \int_{j:[n] \hookrightarrow [m]} f(x_{k(j(1))}, \dots, x_{k(j(n))}) \\ &= \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_m \in X} \int_{j:[n] \hookrightarrow [m]} f(x_{j(1)}, \dots, x_{j(n)}), \end{aligned}$$

²See the discussion at mathoverflow.net/questions/474916/how-large-can-mathbfp-x-1-x-2-x-3-2-x-4-get/#comment123450475013.

where the inequality step is once again thanks to the fact that an expectation is bounded by the supremum.

For the convergence, let $x_1, \dots, x_m \in X$ be given and consider the uniform distribution over these values,

$$\mu := \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{m} \delta_{x_i}. \quad (2.5)$$

The probability that a uniformly random map $k : [n] \rightarrow [m]$ is injective is

$$\frac{m-1}{m} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{m-n+1}{m} \geq \left(1 - \frac{n}{m}\right)^n. \quad (2.6)$$

Therefore, assuming $f \geq 0$ without loss of generality, we can bound

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[f] = \int_{k:[n] \rightarrow [m]} f(x_{k(1)}, \dots, x_{k(n)}) \geq \left(1 - \frac{n}{m}\right)^n \int_{i:[n] \hookrightarrow [m]} f(x_{i(1)}, \dots, x_{i(n)}).$$

Hence the upper bound (2.3) coincides with the actual value up to a factor of $\left(1 - \frac{n}{m}\right)^n$, which converges to 1 as $m \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Remark 2.5. As the proof shows, the sequence of upper bounds does not only converge to the actual value, but we also get a bound on how far we are from the actual value, namely for $f \geq 0$ we are off by at most a factor of

$$\frac{m-1}{m} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{m-n+1}{m} \geq \left(1 - \frac{n}{m}\right)^n.$$

Also for every m , by (2.5) there is a measure supported on m points that achieves the supremum up to such a factor.

3. Maximizing the probability of a strict inequality

Let us consider more concretely the problem of maximizing the probability of a strict inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0 \quad (3.1)$$

to hold, where the coefficients $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are fixed and the X_i are iid real-valued random variables. That is, we try to determine

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0 \right] = ? \quad (3.2)$$

where μ ranges over all probability measures on \mathbb{R} . As already noted in Section 1, it is essential to use strict inequality, since with non-strict inequality we can trivially achieve probability 1 by taking $X_1 = \dots = X_n = 0$ deterministically. In addition, the problem is interesting only if $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i = 0$, since otherwise (3.1) also has a deterministic solution given by $X_1 = \dots = X_n = 1$ if $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \geq 0$ and by $X_1 = \dots = X_n = -1$ if $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \leq 0$.

As a variation on this theme, we can also consider the case where the X_i are nonnegative, or equivalently where μ is supported on \mathbb{R}_+ . This is the setting of the Beat the Average game, and the general problem that we will focus on in the following. As per the above, this problem is nontrivial as soon as $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \leq 0$, which we assume to be the case. For example, the casino owner's problem is concerned with the inequality

$$X_1 + X_2 - 2X_3 > 0.$$

In this case, we had found that the sequence of bounds of Theorem 2.4 is constant in m , and therefore already tight at $m = n = 3$. In Example 3.2 below, which is motivated by the law of large numbers, we will see that this is not the case in general.

Remark 3.1. There is a peculiar tension which makes problems of the form (3.2) seem particularly interesting: on the one hand, a distribution that is close to optimal cannot be supported away from 0, since otherwise one could improve the probability of (3.1) by shifting the distribution towards the left; on the other hand, it cannot have too much weight on 0, since the probability of $X_1 = \dots = X_n = 0$ cannot be too high.

Example 3.2. The solution to the casino owner's problem, which we considered in Section 1, is

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes 3}}[2X_3 < X_1 + X_2] = \frac{2}{3}, \quad (3.3)$$

where μ ranges over all probability measures on \mathbb{N} or \mathbb{R}_+ .³

This problem can be seen as an instance of the following: for $n > m$ and $\alpha > 0$, what is

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i > \frac{\alpha}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i \right], \quad (3.4)$$

where μ ranges over all probability measures on \mathbb{R}_+ ? This question is motivated by the law of large numbers: how much can the same average grow with the number of samples? Surprisingly, there are nontrivial universal bounds on these quantities, even without assuming that μ has moments of any order. Our (3.3) is exactly the $n = 3$, $m = 1$ and $\alpha = 1$ case of this.

In order to address (3.2) in general, we can use Lemma 2.3 to derive upper bounds. For fixed $m \geq n$ and a given injection $\alpha : [n] \hookrightarrow [m]$, let us call

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i x_{\alpha(i)} > 0$$

a **version** of the inequality under consideration. Thus the total number of versions of the inequality is equal to the falling factorial $m(m-1) \cdots (m-n+1)$.⁴ Then Lemma 2.3 states that (2.3) is upper bounded by the largest number of versions that are jointly satisfied for any deterministic assignment $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \mathbb{R}_+$ divided by the total number of versions. Calculating this upper bound is an instance of the **maximum feasible subsystem** problem with strict linear inequalities, which is NP-hard in general [3, Theorem 4].⁵

As for lower bounds, Remark 2.5 lets us turn these upper bounds into concrete μ 's which provide lower bounds. But in the present setting of linear inequalities, the following observations, whose present formulation we owe to Will Sawin,⁶ provide better lower bounds. The basic idea is as follows. The casino wins if $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0$, and loses if either

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i < 0$$

³Note that our derivation from Section 1 applies either way.

⁴If some of the coefficients c_i coincide, then there are additional symmetries which effectively reduce the number of versions, as we will see in Example 3.2.

⁵It is conceivable that the instances of the maximum feasible subsystem problem which arise in our context are easier. The fact that all constraints coincide up to permutations of the variables equips these instances with additional structure that can possibly be exploited.

⁶See the comment mathoverflow.net/questions/474916/how-large-can-mathbfp-x-1-x-2-x-3-2-x-4-get/475013#comment123474927.

holds. While the strict inequalities are preserved with high probability if the X_i are perturbed a little bit, the equality case is unstable as even small perturbations to the X_i may push $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i$ to either side of 0. Thus consider replacing X_i by

$$Y_i := X_i + \eta U_i, \quad (3.5)$$

where the U_i are also nonnegative iid random variables independent of the X_i , and $\eta > 0$ is deterministic and small. Then the perturbations ηU_i decide the sign of $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i Y_i$ in the case of an equality $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i = 0$ between the original X_i , irrespective of how small $\eta > 0$ is. This is the intuitive idea for why, with these perturbed variables, the casino wins with the following probability.

Lemma 3.3. *In the above notation, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i Y_i > 0\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i = 0\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i U_i > 0\right] + o_{\eta \rightarrow 0}(1). \quad (3.6)$$

PROOF. For given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\eta \sum_{i=1}^n c_i U_i \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)\right] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i \in (0, \varepsilon]\right] \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i Y_i > 0\right] &\geq \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > \varepsilon \wedge \eta \sum_{i=1}^n c_i U_i > -\varepsilon\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i = 0 \wedge \eta \sum_{i=1}^n c_i U_i > 0\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > \varepsilon\right] \cdot (1 - \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i = 0\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i U_i > 0\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i = 0\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i U_i > 0\right] - 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

This proves the \geq direction of (3.6). For the other direction, note first that replacing all random variables by their negatives gives the analogous inequality for $\mathbb{P}[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i Y_i < 0]$. Furthermore, we obviously have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i Y_i = 0\right] \geq \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i = 0\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i U_i = 0\right].$$

The claim now follows by noting that the total probability of the events $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i Y_i > 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i Y_i = 0$, and $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i Y_i < 0$ is 1. \square

For $\eta \ll 1$, the gain of (3.6) relative to the original winning probability $\mathbb{P}[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0]$ is given by the second term. Hence to maximize the winning probability, the casino should choose the law of the U_i such as to maximize $\mathbb{P}[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i U_i > 0]$. This is the same maximization problem as the original (3.2). If μ is a good candidate for the maximization problem (3.2), then it makes sense to take both $X_i \sim \mu$ and $U_i \sim \mu$, so that the perturbations U_i are independent copies of the original values X_i .

Of course, the greedy casino can push this further, and in turn perturb the initial perturbations U_i with new independent copies times a small η . Iterating this process k times leads to random variables $(\bar{X}_i^{(k)})_{i=1}^n$ defined by

$$\bar{X}_i^{(k)} := \sum_{j=1}^k \eta^{j-1} X_{i,j}, \quad (3.8)$$

where the $(X_{i,j})_{i \in [n], j \in [k]}$ are iid with distribution μ . So with

$$p = \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_{i,j} > 0 \right] \quad \text{and} \quad q = \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_{i,j} = 0 \right],$$

iterating (3.6) for fixed k gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \bar{X}_i^{(k)} > 0 \right] &= p + q \left(p + q \left(p + q \left(p + q \left(\dots \left(p + qp \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \\ &= p \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} q^j = \frac{p(1-q^k)}{1-q}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$ proves the first claim of the following proposition.

Proposition 3.4. *Let μ be a probability measure on \mathbb{R}_+ , and let E be the event (3.1). Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a probability measure ν on $[0, 1]$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu^{\otimes n}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0 \right] \geq \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}} [\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0]}{1 - \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}} [\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i = 0]} - \varepsilon. \quad (3.9)$$

If furthermore μ is discrete with finitely many atoms, then there exists a measure ν satisfying (3.9) with $\varepsilon = 0$.

PROOF. We have already proven everything except the last statement. If μ is discrete with finitely many atoms, then we may choose η in (3.5) smaller than the ratio of the smallest positive atom in μ to its largest atom. Then the inequalities (3.7) hold with $\varepsilon = 0$, and the perturbed random variables Y_i are also discrete with finitely many atoms.

We can then define $X_i^{(\infty)}$ as in (3.8) with $k \rightarrow \infty$, where the series converges since the terms are nonnegative but expectationally decreasing. Thus taking ν to be the distribution of $X_i^{(\infty)}$ gives the desired result. \square

Remark 3.5. Another intuition behind this scheme, in the finitely many atoms case, is that the sign of $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \bar{X}_i^{(\infty)}$ is determined by the first j at which $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_{i,j} \neq 0$. More precisely, the events

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \bar{X}_i^{(\infty)} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \bar{X}_{i,\ell} > 0$$

coincide, where $\ell = \min \{j : \sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_{i,j} \neq 0\}$. The event $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_{i,\ell} > 0$ can be thought of as a sampling procedure for the conditional probability

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0 \mid \sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i \neq 0 \right] = \frac{p}{1-q},$$

which explains again why the ratio $\frac{p}{1-q}$ appears above.

4. The case of $\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes 4}} [X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4]$

While determining (3.4) in general seems to be challenging open problem, let us consider one further instance of it. For $n = 3$, $m = 4$ and $\alpha = 9/8$, the problem (3.4) is equivalent to determining

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes 4}} [X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4].$$

We now use the results obtained so far to derive lower and upper bounds for this quantity which are given by

$$0.4 = \frac{2}{5} \leq \sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] \leq \frac{2304}{5460} \leq 0.422 \quad (4.1)$$

where μ ranges over all probability measures on \mathbb{R}_+ . The precise value remains unknown.

Lower bound. We now sketch the path that we took towards the lower bound in (4.1) before presenting the statement and proof as Proposition 4.1.

Proving a lower bound requires the construction of a measure μ with large probability for the event $X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4$. Let us consider finitely supported μ for the moment, so that μ consists of finitely many atoms. Then it is quite clear that 0 should be such an atom μ ; ⁷ because otherwise, subtracting the smallest atom from X_i would yield new variables with a higher probability for the strict inequality in (4.1). Then, the presence of an atom at 0 implies that the event $X_1 + X_2 + X_3 = 2X_4$ also has positive probability, namely

$$\mathbb{P}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 = 2X_4] \geq 3\mu(\{0\}) \sum_{i \geq 1} \mu(\{a_i\})^3,$$

since the desired equality holds as soon as one term on the left is zero and the three other variables coincide. The utility behind Proposition 3.4 is now that it lets us reallocate some of the probability mass that is “lost” to $\mathbb{P}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 = 2X_4]$ in the presence of an atom at 0.

Proposition 3.4 applied to $\mu = \text{Bernoulli}(p)$ and $\varepsilon = 0$ and optimizing over $p \in (0, 1)$ yields that the lower bound (3.9), namely

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu^{\otimes n}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] = \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4]}{1 - \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 = 2X_4]} \quad (4.2)$$

is at least 0.343 at $p \approx 0.404$. A better lower bound can be obtained with three atoms: With further numerical experimentation, taking

$$\mu := \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{6}\delta_5 + \frac{1}{3}\delta_9 \quad (4.3)$$

results in ⁸

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes 4}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] = \frac{26}{81}, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes 4}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 = 2X_4] = \frac{1}{8}.$$

Hence in combination with Proposition 3.4, this distribution μ provides a lower bound (4.2) equal to $\frac{208}{567} \approx 0.367$.

Further numerical experimentation involving slowly growing the number of atoms, and for each new support optimizing the probability mass function using gradient ascent, led to the following distribution with 5 atoms:

$$\mu = 0.50329784 \delta_0 + 0.08757447 \delta_9 + 0.08673626 \delta_{13} + 0.09737799 \delta_{15} + 0.22501344 \delta_{16}.$$

This gives an improved lower bound of 0.381 in (4.2). Growing the number of atoms a few more times and adding small random perturbations to their locations suggested to consider distributions with support

⁷In other words, the essential infimum $\text{ess inf } \mu$ should be 0.

⁸For the second probability, note that $0+0+0 = 2 \cdot 0$ is the only solution to $X_1 + X_2 + X_3 = 2X_4$ with $X_i \in \{0, 5, 9\}$. For the inequality, the solutions are the following, with braces denoting either possibility: $0+0+0 < 2 \cdot \{5, 9\}$; $0+0+\{5, 9\} < 2 \cdot \{5, 9\}$; $0+5+5 < 2 \cdot 9$; $0+5+9 \leq 2 \cdot 9$; $5+5+5 < 2 \cdot 9$; and their permutations.

{0, 268.0000001, 414.00000001, 482, 483.0000000001, 507.01,
510.001, 522.00001, 525.0001, 526.1, 527.000000001},

for which (4.2) ends up slightly above 0.390. A pattern emerged from optimizing the weights of the probability mass functions over these atoms to maximize (4.2) with gradient descent: good distributions were approximately of the form

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1-q}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{1-2^{-i}} + \frac{q}{2}\delta_{1-2^{-(N+1)}}$$

with parameters $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q \in (0, 1)$. The values $N = 61$ and $q = 0.0546388$ achieve 0.398 in (4.2). Based on these experiments, we arrived at the following lower bound of 0.4.

Proposition 4.1 (Lower bound). *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a discrete measure ν supported on $(0, 1)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu^{\otimes n}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] \geq \frac{2}{5} - \varepsilon.$$

PROOF. We choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$, for which we will take $N \rightarrow \infty$ at the end. In terms of this, define the atomic measure μ as

$$\mu := \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{1-2^{-i}}.$$

Then the probability of strict inequality is bounded from below as

$$\mathbb{P}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] \geq \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}[X_1 = 0, X_2 = 0, X_3 = 0, X_4 > 0] \\ + 3 \mathbb{P}[X_1 = 0, X_2 = 0, X_3 > 0, X_4 > 0, X_3 < 2X_4] \\ + 3 \mathbb{P}[X_1 = 0, X_2 > 0, X_3 > 0, X_4 > 0, X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] \end{cases}$$

since the events in the terms on the right-hand side are disjoint, and each implies $X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4$. The event on the first line has probability $1/2^4 = 1/16$. The factor three on the second line stems from the three ways to choose exactly two variables being zero among $\{X_1, X_2, X_3\}$; furthermore since $2X_4 \geq 1$ as soon as $X_4 \neq 0$ and $X_3 < 1$ always holds, the second line equals

$$3\mathbb{P}[X_1 = X_2 = 0, X_3 > 0, X_4 > 0] = \frac{3}{16}.$$

By the definition of conditional probability, the third line equals

$$3\mathbb{P}[X_1 = 0, X_2 > 0, X_3 > 0, X_4 > 0] \mathbb{P}[X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4 \mid X_2 > 0, X_3 > 0, X_4 > 0].$$

If X_2, X_3, X_4 are positive, then they all belong to $\{1 - \frac{1}{2^i} : i = 1, \dots, N\}$ and the implication

$$X_3 < X_4 \Rightarrow X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4 \tag{4.4}$$

holds thanks to the following argument. Since the values of all variables are of the form $1 - \frac{1}{2^i}$, it is easy to see that $X_3 < X_4$ implies⁹

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}X_3 \leq X_4.$$

Since $\frac{1}{2}X_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, the implication (4.4) is proved. Similarly by exchanging the roles of X_2 and X_3 , the implication

$$X_2 < X_4 \Rightarrow X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4 \tag{4.5}$$

⁹This is seen most easily by considering the $Y_i := 1 - X_i$.

also holds. Denoting by $E := \{X_2 > 0, X_3 > 0, X_4 > 0\}$ the conditioning event for brevity, we clearly have $\mathbb{P}[E] = \frac{1}{16}$. By the earlier considerations, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4 \mid E] &\geq \mathbb{P}[\min(X_2, X_3) < X_4 \mid E] && \text{[by implications (4.4)-(4.5)]} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}[\min(X_2, X_3) < X_4 \wedge X_2, X_3, X_4 \text{ distinct} \mid E] && \text{[inclusion]} \\ &= \frac{2}{3} \mathbb{P}[X_2, X_3, X_4 \text{ distinct} \mid E] && \text{[by symmetry]} \\ &= \frac{2}{3} N(N-1)(N-2)/N^3 && \text{[counting distinct triples].} \end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have established the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] &\geq \frac{1}{16} + \frac{3}{16} + \frac{3}{16} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{N(N-1)(N-2)}{N^3} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{3}{N}\right). \end{aligned}$$

For the probability of equality appearing in the denominator of (3.9), we simply use

$$\mathbb{P}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 = 2X_4] \geq \mathbb{P}[X_1 = X_2 = X_3 = X_4 = 0] = \frac{1}{16}.$$

Applying Proposition 3.4 with $\varepsilon = 0$ now yields the existence of a measure ν on $[0, 1]$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu^{\otimes n}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] \geq \frac{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{3}{N}\right)}{1 - \frac{1}{16}} = \frac{2}{5} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right).$$

Taking $N \rightarrow \infty$ completes the proof of the lower bound in (4.1). \square

Upper bound. Before proving the upper bound given in (4.1), it is instructive to first derive weaker bounds. To this end, we apply Lemma 2.3 first with $m = 4$ and then with $m = 6$; this is interesting insofar as it provides an example where the upper bound improves with increasing m . The bound for $m = 6$, which will be $\frac{7}{15} \leq 0.467$, is also the best upper bound that we know of which can be verified by hand. In the next subsection, we will then present the computer-assisted proof of the upper bound in (4.1).

For $m = 4$, the four versions of the inequality are

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 + X_2 + X_3 &< 2X_4, \\ X_1 + X_2 + X_4 &< 2X_3, \\ X_1 + X_3 + X_4 &< 2X_2, \\ X_2 + X_3 + X_4 &< 2X_1. \end{aligned}$$

To apply Lemma 2.3, we need to determine how many of these are jointly satisfiable. Assuming $X_1 \leq X_2 \leq X_3 \leq X_4$ without loss of generality, it is clear that at most the first two are jointly satisfiable, and this is possible with

$$X_1 = X_2 = 0, \quad X_3 = X_4 = 1.$$

Therefore by Lemma 2.3, we can conclude

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes 4}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] \leq \frac{2}{4} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4.6)$$

For general m , there are

$$4 \cdot \binom{m}{4} = (m-3) \cdot \binom{m}{3} \quad (4.7)$$

different versions of the inequality

$$X_i + X_j + X_k < 2X_\ell, \quad (4.8)$$

corresponding to all possible ways of choosing indices $i < j < k$ and ℓ modulo permutations of the first three. Indeed determining a version amounts to choosing a four-element subset of $[m]$ and picking one element of it to be on the right-hand side, which gives the $4\binom{m}{4}$ in (4.7). Assuming $X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \dots \leq X_m$ without loss of generality, a version of the inequality is automatically violated if the right-hand side index ℓ is the smallest or second smallest of the four selected, or equivalently if $\ell < j$. This partitions the set of all versions of the inequality into two disjoint subsets

$$\left\{ (i, j, k, \ell) \in [m]^4 : i < j < k, i \neq \ell < j \right\} \cup \left\{ (i, j, k, \ell) \in [m]^4 : i < j < k, j < \ell \neq k \right\}, \quad (4.9)$$

where only the quadruples of the second subset need to be considered further to determine a maximal feasible subsystem. Both subsets have cardinality $2\binom{m}{4}$.

For $m = 6$, this leaves us with 30 versions of the inequality (4.8). Our next task is to understand how many of these are jointly satisfiable. Among these 30 are the six versions

$$\begin{aligned} X_3 + X_4 + X_5 &< 2X_6, & X_3 + X_4 + X_6 &< 2X_5, \\ X_1 + X_2 + X_5 &< 2X_3, & X_1 + X_2 + X_6 &< 2X_3, \\ X_1 + X_3 + X_6 &< 2X_4, & & \\ X_2 + X_4 + X_6 &< 2X_5. & & \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

The four versions on the left are already not jointly satisfiable, since adding them results in a contradiction by $X_1, X_2 \geq 0$. And likewise for the two inequalities on the right, where one now also uses $X_3 \leq X_4$ and $X_5 \leq X_6$ in addition. Therefore at least two versions of the 30 must be violated, resulting in an upper bound of 28 for a maximal feasible subsystem. And indeed one can check that the assignment

$$X_1 = X_2 = 0, \quad X_3 = 4, \quad X_4 = 6, \quad X_5 = X_6 = 7.$$

satisfies all 30 versions under consideration except for the bottom one on each side of (4.10). Therefore the maximal feasible subsystems consist of 28 inequalities, and we can improve (4.6) to

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes 4}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] \leq \frac{28}{60} = \frac{7}{15}.$$

Since this is smaller than the upper bound in (4.1), we conclude that the upper bounds of Lemma 2.3 do improve with increasing m in general.

Upper bound for larger m by Mixed Integer Linear Programming. While we have found a maximal feasible subsystem for $m = 6$ by hand, the combinatorial nature of the problem makes it impractical to do so for larger m . Since the maximum feasible subsystem problem (with strict linear inequalities) is NP-hard in general [3, Theorem 4], we do not expect there to be a simple solution to the problem for large m , whether by hand or algorithmically.

Still, one may hope that this specific instance is endowed with a specific structure that makes it possible to scale the strategy (4.10) algorithmically to larger m . As we will see, maximum feasible subsystem problems can be cast as Mixed Integer Linear Programs (MILP) and solved with software such as Gurobi or CPLEX.

We scaled strategy used for the $m = 4$ and $m = 6$ cases above up to $m = 15$ using two MILPs. The first MILP that we consider attempts to find real numbers $0 \leq x_1 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_m \leq 1$ satisfying as many of the constraints

$$x_i + x_j + x_k \leq 2x_\ell - \text{threshold} \quad (4.11)$$

as possible, where threshold is a small positive constant used to force a strict inequality, since MILP constraints require non-strict inequalities for numerical stability. First, for a given integer $m \geq 6$, we consider the second set in (4.9),

$$\mathcal{T} = \left\{ (i, j, k, \ell) \in [m]^4 : i < j < k, j < \ell \neq k \right\}, \quad (4.12)$$

The set \mathcal{T} contains all the versions of the inequalities that cannot be discarded right away by the argument directly following (4.6). Based on this, the first MILP we consider is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t, && (4.13) \\ & \text{with respect to} && y_t \in \{0, 1\} && \text{for each } t \in \mathcal{T}, \\ & && x_i \in [0, 1] && \text{for each } i \in [m], \\ & \text{subject to} && 0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_m \\ & && x_i + x_j + x_k + M(y_t - 1) \leq 2x_\ell - \text{threshold} && \text{for each } t = (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathcal{T}. \end{aligned}$$

where $M := 3 + \text{threshold}$. The term $M(y_t - 1)$ in the last linear constraint is the standard “big-M method” to encode the implication

$$y_t = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad x_i + x_j + x_k + \leq 2x_\ell - \text{threshold} \quad (4.14)$$

as a linear inequality involving a binary variable $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$. Indeed, if $y_t = 0$ the constraint is always satisfied for any values $x_i, x_j, x_k, x_\ell \in [0, 1]$ thanks to the $M(y_t - 1)$ term, while if $y_t = 1$ the $M(y_t - 1)$ term vanishes and $x_i + x_j + x_k \leq 2x_\ell - \text{threshold}$ must hold. This shows that (4.14) is equivalent to the last constraint in (4.13). In fact, our implementation using the Gurobi solver works with the implication (4.14) directly as it supports logical constraints of the form (4.14) without the need to explicitly introduce the big-M term. Our implementation also sets $x_m = 1$ without loss of generality.

We have implemented this MILP in Python using the Gurobi solver, and our implementation `milp1.py` is available on the arXiv together with this paper. This MILP terminates overnight on a desktop computer for up to $m = 15$ with $\text{threshold} = 2 \cdot 10^{-5}$. The solution is given by

$$\begin{array}{cccc} x_1 = 0.0 & x_2 = 0.0 & x_3 = 0.0 & x_4 = 0.00008 \\ x_5 = 0.00012 & x_6 = 0.00014 & x_7 = 0.00014 & x_8 = 0.50015 \\ x_9 = 0.750155 & x_{10} = 0.8751575 & x_{11} = 0.93765875 & x_{12} = 0.968909375 \\ x_{13} = 0.9845346875 & x_{14} = 0.99234734375 & x_{15} = 1.0. & \end{array} \quad (4.15)$$

The number of linear inequalities (4.11) is $|\mathcal{T}| = 2730$. Among these, 2304 inequalities are satisfied and the remaining 426 inequalities are violated. Following the argument for $m = 6$ in (4.10), this suggests an upper bound of

$$\frac{2304}{5460} \approx 0.42198 \quad (4.16)$$

for the problem (4.1), where the denominator is (4.7) for $m = 15$.

If the MILP terminates, its optimal value tells us the maximal number of jointly satisfiable inequality versions $x_i + x_j + x_k \leq 2x_\ell - \text{threshold}$. However, due to the threshold, this does not directly give the maximal number of jointly satisfiable strict inequalities we are interested in. We therefore do not yet get a formal proof of the upper bound in (4.1) from the MILP solution.

In order to formally prove the upper bound in (4.1), we mimic the strategy explained in (4.10) as follows. From the solution to (4.13), we obtain a formally provable upper bound

using a second MILP, whose goal is to output disjoint subsystems of inequalities as in (4.10), with each subsystem unsatisfiable. The solution to the MILP (4.13) above provides $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^s \cup \mathcal{T}^v$, where \mathcal{T}^s contains the tuples $t = (i, j, k, \ell)$ corresponding to inequalities (4.11) satisfied by the solution, while \mathcal{T}^v contains those that are violated. The second MILP we consider is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{find any feasible } y_{tu} \in \{0, 1\} && \text{for each } (t, u) \in \mathcal{T}^s \times \mathcal{T}^v, \\ & \text{subject to } \sum_{u \in \mathcal{T}^v} y_{tu} \leq 1 && \text{for each } t \in \mathcal{T}^s, \\ & F(q, u) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}^s} F(q, t) y_{tu} \geq 0 && \text{for each } q \in [m] \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{T}^v, \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

where $F(q, t)$ is defined for general $t = (i, j, k, \ell) \in \mathcal{T}$ by

$$F(q, t) := \delta_{q \leq i} + \delta_{q \leq j} + \delta_{q \leq k} - 2\delta_{q \leq \ell}.$$

The reason for considering this MILP is as follows.

Lemma 4.2. *If the above MILP (4.17) is feasible, then \mathcal{T}^s is the set of indices of a maximal feasible subsystem of the inequalities $X_i + X_j + X_k < 2X_\ell$.*

PROOF. We explain how a feasible solution amounts to a certificate of maximality for \mathcal{T}^s . As mentioned, the idea is analogous to the argument for $m = 6$ in (4.10).

Given a feasible solution $(y_{tu})_{t \in \mathcal{T}^s, u \in \mathcal{T}^v}$, for each $u \in \mathcal{T}^v$ we consider the inequality associated to u together with all those associated to the $t \in \mathcal{T}^s$ with $y_{tu} = 1$. Then the first constraint $\sum_{u \in \mathcal{T}^v} y_{tu} \leq 1$ for every t is precisely what enforces these systems of inequalities to be disjoint as u varies.

The second constraint involving the function F ensures that for each u , the system of inequalities described in the previous paragraph is infeasible. The idea is that as in (4.10), one simply sums these inequalities and uses $0 \leq X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \dots \leq X_m$ to arrive at a contradiction. Indeed summing these inequalities results in a new inequality of the form

$$a_1 X_1 + a_2 X_2 + \dots + a_m X_m < 0. \quad (4.18)$$

Our goal is to show that this inequality together with $0 \leq X_1 \leq X_2 \leq \dots \leq X_m$ leads to a contradiction. The final coefficient is given by

$$F(m, u) + \sum_{t: y_{tu}=1} F(m, t) = a_m.$$

Therefore the second MILP constraint for $q = m$ ensures that $a_m \geq 0$. Next, for $q = m - 1$, the definition of F shows that

$$F(m - 1, t) + \sum_{u: y_{tu}=1} F(m - 1, u) = a_{m-1} + a_m,$$

so that the second constraint requires $a_{m-1} + a_m \geq 0$. For general $q \in [m]$, we obtain similarly that

$$F(q, t) + \sum_{u: y_{tu}=1} F(q, u) = a_q + \dots + a_m =: S_q.$$

Defining $X_0 := 0$ for convenience, we then have the identity

$$\sum_{q=1}^m a_q X_q = \sum_{q=1}^m S_q X_q - \sum_{q=1}^{m-1} S_{q+1} X_q = \sum_{q=1}^m S_q (X_q - X_{q-1}).$$

Since $S_q \geq 0$ and $X_q - X_{q-1} \geq 0$ for all $q \in [m]$, we obtain that the left-hand side of (4.18) is non-negative, contradicting the strict inequality. Therefore for every monotone assignment of numbers to the variables X_1, \dots, X_m , at least one of the strict inequalities we summed up must be violated.

To sum up, we have $|\mathcal{T}^s|$ disjoint systems of inequalities, each of which is infeasible. Therefore any feasible subsystem of the original inequalities must violate at least one inequality in each of these systems. Thus the maximal number of inequalities that can be satisfied is $|\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^v| = |\mathcal{T}^s|$, as was to be shown. \square

There is no reason, a priori, for the MILP (4.17) to be feasible because summing the inequalities with uniform weights as we do above may not be a necessary condition for the corresponding subsystem to be infeasible.¹⁰ In other words, one would not expect the converse of Lemma 4.2 to hold in general, unless there is additional structure in the systems under consideration that would allow a reduction to the case of uniform weights.

Again we have implemented this MILP in Python using the Gurobi solver, and our implementation `milp2.py` is available on the arXiv together with this paper. Taking $m = 15$ and using the set of inequalities $\mathcal{T}^s \cup \mathcal{T}^v$ returned by the first MILP, which we make available as `ineqs_m_is_15.log`, the MILP (4.17) terminates and outputs a feasible solution $(y_{tu})_{t \in \mathcal{T}^v, u \in \mathcal{T}^s}$. Hence Lemma 4.2 applies and provides a certificate of maximality for \mathcal{T}^s , consisting of a $|\mathcal{T}^v| = 426$ disjoint subsystems of inequalities, each infeasible. For a formal proof of maximality, one can now also check the infeasibility of each subsystem by summing the corresponding inequalities, and verifying in addition that these systems are disjoint. Since $|\mathcal{T}^s| = 2304$, this finishes the proof of the upper bound in (4.1).¹¹

5. Open problems

The 2/5 conjecture. In light of the bounds of (4.1), it is natural to suspect that the lower bound is tight.

Conjecture 5.1. *We have*

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4] = \frac{2}{5}.$$

The following piece of evidence makes this plausible. In the proof of Proposition 4.1, the distribution was obtained by combining δ_0 with a uniform distribution over the points $(1 - 2^{-i})_{i=1}^N$ and repeating this pattern at a smaller scale using the construction of Proposition 3.4. The striking observation is now that this is mirrored in the output of the first MILP (4.13). Despite having no knowledge of our strategy involving the pattern of the distributions which led to the lower bound, the MILP for $m = 15$ outputs a solution (4.15) that mimics this pattern: up to rescaling by 1.0030 and small numerical discrepancies, we have

$$x_8 = 1 - 2^{-1}, \quad x_9 = 1 - 2^{-2}, \quad \dots, \quad x_{14} = 1 - 2^{-7},$$

and at the next scale,

$$x_4 = (1 - 2^{-1}) \cdot \eta, \quad x_5 = (1 - 2^{-2}) \cdot \eta, \quad x_6 = (1 - 2^{-3}) \cdot \eta,$$

with $\eta = 0.00016$ as in (3.5). On the other hand, $x_7 = x_6$ breaks the pattern—this might be due to boundary effects as x_7 is the last point before the upper scale. A similar phenomenon

¹⁰By Farkas' lemma, summing with general nonnegative coefficients gives a necessary and sufficient condition.

¹¹Similarly for $m = 6$, our implementation recovers the two systems displayed in (4.10), which we had used to prove the upper bound of $\frac{28}{60}$.

is seen in the solutions of the MILP (4.13) for all $m \in \{10, 11, 12, 13\}$. Smaller values of m do not display this multiple scales pattern. While not formal evidence, the fact that the MILP solution mimics the pattern of the lower bound supports Conjecture 5.1.

By using faster computers than the desktop used to solve (4.13), it is likely that the upper bound 0.422 can be pushed down a little further by solving the MILP for $m > 15$. However, even for $m \in \{16, 17, 18\}$ the number of variables and constraints is quite large, since the set \mathcal{T} in (4.12) has cardinality growing as m^4 . Smarter MILP than the ones used above may also push the upper bound further down, perhaps by leveraging more of the symmetries of the problem. However, by nature these numerical methods are helpless to compute the theoretical limit of this strategy as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ and see if it converges to $2/5$.

We are not aware of existing mathematical ideas that could solve Conjecture 5.1, either building on the exchangeability strategy of the previous sections or by leveraging completely different arguments. We hope that the present work, and the apparent difficulty of determining $\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 2X_4]$, will raise interest in problems of this type and lead to new arguments resolving Conjecture 5.1.

Attainability of the supremum. Another interesting open question is the following.

Problem 5.2. For coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i < 0$, is the supremum

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_i > 0 \right]$$

ever achieved?

As a first observation, if μ has an atom at 0, then Proposition 3.4 shows that it is not optimal. Therefore any putative optimizer must satisfy $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$. Furthermore an optimal μ cannot be finitely supported, since then (as already noted in Section 4) one can assume μ to have an atom at 0, which we have just ruled out.

Fair games. Instead of focusing on fixed values c_1, \dots, c_n , one could ask for specific coefficients that make games like Beat the Average fair.

Problem 5.3. Determine a real $c_* \in (2, 3)$ such that

$$\sup_{\mu} \mathbb{P}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[X_2 + X_2 + X_3 < c_* X_4] = \frac{1}{2} \tag{5.1}$$

where μ ranges over all probability measures on \mathbb{R}_+ .

References

- [1] N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method*, 3rd. John Wiley & Sons, 2008 (cit. on p. 4).
- [2] D. Freedman, “A remark on the difference between sampling with and without replacement,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, vol. 72, no. 359, pp. 681–681, 1977 (cit. on p. 8).
- [3] E. Amaldi and V. Kann, “The complexity and approximability of finding maximum feasible subsystems of linear relations,” *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 147, no. 1-2, pp. 181–210, 1995 (cit. on pp. 10, 16).

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, USA
 Email address: pierre.bellec@rutgers.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF INNSBRUCK, AUSTRIA
 Email address: tobias.fritz@uibk.ac.at