

Allocating Variance to Maximize Expectation

Renato Purita Paes Leme^{*}, Cliff Stein[†], Yifeng Teng[‡], Pratik Worah[§]

February 26, 2025

Abstract

We design efficient approximation algorithms for maximizing the expectation of the supremum of families of Gaussian random variables. In particular, let $\text{OPT} := \max_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^m \max_{i \in S_j} X_i$, where X_i are Gaussian, $S_j \subset [n]$ and $\sum_i \sigma_i^2 = 1$, then our theoretical results include:

- We characterize the optimal variance allocation – it concentrates on a small subset of variables as $|S_j|$ increases,
- A polynomial time approximation scheme (PTAS) for computing OPT when $m = 1$, and
- An $O(\log n)$ approximation algorithm for computing OPT for general $m > 1$.

Such expectation maximization problems occur in diverse applications, ranging from utility maximization in auctions markets to learning mixture models in quantitative genetics.

1 Introduction

The total accuracy of a machine learning (ML) model is constrained by several factors such as the available training data, model architecture, and training algorithms, and while it may not be possible to improve the average model accuracy past a certain point in a given setup, one still has freedom to tune the model to trade-off accuracy in one subset of examples for accuracy in another subset. One approach is to reweigh the data [Quionero-Candela et al., 2009, Cortes et al., 2008, Awasthi et al., 2024]. Consider the well-known problem of predicting a protein’s 3D structure, using ML algorithms to learn from labeled examples. One may want to tune the model to be more accurate for predicting the structure of cell surface proteins for designing drugs that target surface proteins [Watson et al., 2023]; but one may want to tune the model to be more accurate for predicting the structure of DNA binding enzymes [Ruffolo et al., 2024], for designing gene editing therapies. In principle, both can be achieved, using the same labeled training dataset, by reweighing examples appropriately. One critical question is: how much to up-weight or down-weight any given training example?

For an ML algorithm, the accuracy of predictions in a neighborhood of the data-space may be approximated by the variance of predictions in that neighborhood. So, making predictions more accurate in a given neighborhood, by up-weighting training data-points from that neighborhood, should closely correspond to

^{*}Google inc.

[†]Google inc. and Columbia U.

[‡]Google inc.

[§]Google inc., pworah@google.com

lowering the *local variance* in a neighborhood.¹ If one can formulate the (weighted) loss function as a function of corresponding local variances, then the problem becomes one of computing optimal variance allocation to minimize the (training or validation) loss, or equivalently maximize a reward. Thus, in this paper, we focus on designing efficient algorithms for how to optimally allocate variance for a simple class of objective functions involving expectation maximization.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Subsection 1.1, we formulate the abstract optimization problems formally; in Subsection 1.2, we state our main structural lemma and theorems, which correspond to the proofs of correctness of the approximation algorithm mentioned above; in Subsection 1.3, we provide figures (Figures 1 and 2) that show general trends in the solution as the dependency among the Gaussians increases; in Subsection 1.4 we discuss applications to machine learning and auctions; in Subsection 1.5, we discuss related works, especially how our results compare to prior extensive work in this area [Talagrand, 2021]; and finally in Section 2 we describe an overview our theorems, and prove Lemma 2.1, which contains a modified chaining argument that may be of independent interest. The appendix contains the remaining theorems and proofs.

1.1 Problem formulation

We are motivated by trade-offs in the accuracy of ML models, but we defer any motivational details to Subsection 1.4, and formulate our main question as a stochastic optimization problem. We start by defining its basic version (dense and independent) and later consider correlated and sparse variants.

Variance Allocation Problem: We are given n independent Gaussian random variables (X_1, \dots, X_n) with means μ_1, \dots, μ_n . Our goal is to assign values to the variances, $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_n^2$, so as to maximize the expected value of the maximum X_i subject to the constraint that the total variance is bounded, that is the variance vector satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 = 1$. We let OPT denote the optimal objective in this setting, and summarize the problem as (VarAlloc):

$$\text{OPT} = \max_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \tag{1}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 = 1. \tag{2}$$

Correlated Variance Allocation: The above formulation (VarAlloc) uses independent Gaussians, but we also consider the non-independent case, where we have covariances. We are again given means μ_1, \dots, μ_n and are asked to choose a covariance matrix Σ to maximize the expected maximum of $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ such that the total variance is bounded $\sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma_{ii} = 1$. Thus we get (CorrVarAlloc):

$$\text{OPT} = \max_{\Sigma} \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \tag{3}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma_{ii} = 1 \tag{4}$$

$$\Sigma \text{ is PSD} \tag{5}$$

Graph Variance Allocation: We generalize (VarAlloc) in a different way by allowing grouping among variables. We are now given, in addition to the n independent and normally distributed variables, m subsets

¹In fact, it is easy to explicitly relate reweighing the loss function to the variance allocation problem, when training linear regression models (see Subsection 1.4).

$S_j \subseteq [n]$. We denote the contribution of the set S_j by: $\max_{i \in S_j} X_i$, and our objective is to allocate the variance with the same constraint (2) and maximize the total expected contribution of the m sets. More formally (GraphVarAlloc):

$$\text{OPT} = \max_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^m \max_{i \in S_j} X_i \quad (6)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 = 1. \quad (7)$$

Correlated Graph Variance Allocation: We can also generalize (GraphVarAlloc) to use correlated Gaussians. We are again given means μ_1, \dots, μ_n and m subsets $S_j \subseteq [n]$, and want to choose a covariance matrix Σ to maximize the sum of the contribution $\max_{i \in S_j} X_i$ of each set S_j such that the total variance is bounded $\sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma_{ii} = 1$. More formally (CorrGraphVarAlloc):

$$\text{OPT} = \max_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^m \max_{i \in S_j} X_i \quad (8)$$

$$\Sigma \text{ is PSD.} \quad (9)$$

Note that, when Σ is assumed diagonal:

- CorrVarAlloc is equivalent to VarAlloc, and
- CorrGraphVarAlloc is equivalent to GraphVarAlloc;

and when $m = 1$, GraphVarAlloc is equivalent to VarAlloc. In each case, we want to compute the optimal σ s or Σ using an efficient approximation algorithm. We will use OBJ to denote the objective function studied in each case: $\text{OBJ} = \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i$ for VarAlloc and CorrVarAlloc, and $\text{OBJ} = \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^m \max_{i \in S_j} X_i$ for GraphVarAlloc.

1.2 Algorithmic Results

We state our main technical results here. Our algorithms for VarAlloc and CorrVarAlloc will be stated as additive approximations, while for GraphVarAlloc, it is stated a multiplicative approximation. For VarAlloc and CorrVarAlloc, the additive PTAS is at least as strong as a multiplicative PTAS, since OPT is at least $\Omega(1)$: when setting $\sigma_1 = 1$ and $\sigma_i = 0$ for $i \geq 2$, $\mathbb{E} \max_i X_i = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}$ for $n \geq 2$ and 0 for $n = 1$.

Theorem 1.1. *Given an input to VarAlloc with $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \geq 0$ and constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm with running time polynomial in n , that computes a variance vector $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n)$ such that $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \geq \text{OPT} - \epsilon$.*

Theorem 1.2. *Given an input to CorrVarAlloc and constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm with running time polynomial in n , that computes a covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$ such that for $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\Sigma})$, $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \geq \text{OPT} - \epsilon$.*

Theorem 1.3. *Given an input to GraphVarAlloc, there exists an algorithm with a running time polynomial in n that computes a variance vector $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n)$ such that $\mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^m \max_{i \in S_j} X_i \geq \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\log n}\right) \text{OPT}$.*

Theorem 1.4. *Given an input to CorrGraphVarAlloc, there exists an algorithm with running time polynomial in n that computes a covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$ such that for $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\Sigma})$, $\mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^m \max_{i \in S_j} X_i \geq \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\log n}\right) \text{OPT}$.*

The main proof ideas and algorithms are discussed in Section 2. For complete proofs, the optimization problem with a single set is discussed in Section A. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is discussed in Section A.1. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is discussed in Section A.2. The optimization problem with multiple sets is discussed in Section B. The proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 are discussed in Section B.2.

1.3 Properties of optimal solution

In order to understand the structure of the optimal variance allocations, we run Monte-Carlo simulations on the Erdős-Renyi random graphs and obtain the following plots (Figures 1 and 2) that characterize the optimal value (OPT) and the corresponding variance allocation for GraphVarAlloc. We found OPT to be concave, and the corresponding allocation to be concentrated on a few variables, as the density of the instance increased – a somewhat counterintuitive pattern – even for small random graphs (see Figures 1 and 2):

- *Concavity:* The solution value OPT appears to be concave as a function of $p = \frac{|S_j|}{n}$, irrespective of whether the Gaussian random variables are restricted to be independent, positive or negatively correlated (see Figure 1). The concavity is formally verified in Theorem 1.5, which shows that the objective for GraphVarAlloc, as a function of p , here $p = \frac{|S_j|}{n}$, is concave. The key to the proof is the submodularity of the objective function.
- *Concentration:* The variances tend to concentrate, i.e., they are supported on a smaller subset of variables with increasing p , where $p = \frac{|S_j|}{n}$ (see Figure 2(a,b,c,d)). This concentration is formally verified in Theorem 1.6, which shows that only $\Theta\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)$ variables are allocated a variance $\Omega(p)$ in the optimal allocation, i.e., most variances are small in the optimal allocation as p increases. The proof of this theorem relies on Lemma 2.1, which is our key structural lemma, and also is used in the proof of correctness of our approximation algorithms (c.f. Subsection 1.2).

Theorem 1.5. *Let I_k be an instance for GraphVarAlloc with all $\binom{n}{k}$ sets of size k : for every $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n$, there is a set $S_j = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ in this instance. Let $f(k) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \text{OPT}_{I_k}$ be the per-set contribution to the optimal objective in instance I_k . Then $f(k)$ is a concave function.*

Theorem 1.6. *For any $\delta > 0$ and a random instance of GraphVarAlloc with $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, with probability $p > 1 - \delta$, there are $\Theta\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)$ variables allocated variance $\Omega(p)$.*

1.4 Motivating applications

In this subsection, we outline some motivating applications. The theoretically inclined reader may skip this subsection. It is well-known that the study of bounds on the maximum value of stochastic processes







Figure 1: Concavity of optimal objective value per set (i.e. $\frac{1}{m}$ OPT) when the Gaussians are restricted to be independent, be positively, or be negatively correlated in GraphVarAlloc, as a function of p for Erdős-Renyi graphs with $p \in \{\frac{1}{8}, \frac{2}{8}, \dots, \frac{8}{8}\}$ and $n = 8$. To improve the simulation speed the positive and negative correlations are limited to block-diagonal matrices with block sizes 2×2 , and $\Sigma_{2i+1,2i+2} = \pm \sqrt{\Sigma_{2i+1,2i+1} \cdot \Sigma_{2i+2,2i+2}}$. See also Theorem 1.5 for the discussion of the independent case.




(a) Optimal variance allocation for non-zero mean independent Gaussians, where the mean vector is $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$



(b) Optimal variance allocation for zero mean independent Gaussians



(c) Optimal variance allocation for zero mean positively correlated Gaussians



(d) Optimal variance allocation for zero mean negatively correlated Gaussians

Figure 2: Simulations for Erdős-Renyi graphs $G(n, p)$ for GraphVarAlloc (n is held constant). x -axis corresponds to the n variances (sorted by increasing values) and y -axis corresponds to their optimal values in allocation. Note the increasingly concentrated variance allocation with increasing p . See also Theorem 1.6.

$\mathbb{E}[\max_t X_t]$ has important applications, both practical ('What is the maximum magnitude of an earthquake in this region?' or 'What is the maximum level a river will rise?') as well as theoretical ones such a relation between properties of metrics spaces and bounds on stochastic processes. Those are discussed in detail in Talagrand [2021].

Stochastic Gradient Descent The study of upper bounds on the expected behavior of stochastic processes also plays a vital role in ML. The stochastic gradient descent procedure (SGD) can be linearized near the local minima² and viewed in the limit of small step size as an Ornstein Uhlenbeck (OU) process, which is a Ito diffusion of the form:

$$d\vec{X}(t) = \Phi(\vec{\mu} - \vec{X}(t))dt + \sigma dW(t), \quad (10)$$

where $\vec{X}, \vec{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\Phi, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $W(t)$ is n -dimensional Standard Brownian Motion (see Oksendal [2013] for details). When Φ is a diagonal matrix, it corresponds to changing the relative weight of different features. The long-term distribution of \vec{X} (obtained after many steps of SGD), can be shown to be a Gaussian with variance $\Sigma\Sigma^T := \Phi^{-1}\sigma\sigma^T$ whenever Σ, σ , and Φ are diagonal.

Computational biology Expectation maximization is a common objective used for estimating parameters of mixture models in quantitative biology applications [Timothy and Charles, 1994, Wei et al., 2022, Tuerk et al., 2017, Diffey et al., 2017]. Whenever the components X_i represent the likelihood of different events predicted by the ML system optimized by SGD, then the objective function $\mathbb{E}[\max X_i]$ corresponds to the maximum likelihood associated with the prediction (a common proxy for the log-likelihood obtained by replacing the softmax by a max). From that perspective, the Variance Allocation problem is a way of studying how the maximum likelihood changes based on changing the relative weight of the features Φ which are in one-to-one correspondence with the covariance matrix Σ .

Auction Optimization A recent trend in the intersection of auction theory and ML [Bergemann et al., 2022, Chen et al., 2024] is to maximize utility by making the predictions that are fed into the auction more accurate (as opposed of optimizing auction rules directly). Previous papers in that line of work optimize the auction by introducing complex correlations between the predictions associated with different auction participants. From this perspective, the Variance Allocation Problem can be seen as a way to optimize auctions by changing the accuracy/variance of the prediction associated with different auction participants.

To make this precise, consider the setting of an advertising auction where the platform chooses the winner based on the product between their bid and a predicted click-through-rate and assume that the prediction system has the property that the limit distributions are Gaussian with variances controlled by the weights given to the different features, as in the SGD-example above. If the platform is using a first price auction (which is the common practice in display ads), the maximum $\mathbb{E}[\max_i X_i]$ corresponds to the revenue of the auction platform. From that perspective, the Variance Allocation problem is revenue optimization where the decision variable is the relative weight allocated to each feature in the prediction model.

1.5 Related work

Talagrand [Talagrand, 2021] has extensively studied problems of the form $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in T} \{X_t\}]$, where X_t are Gaussian. However, we are not aware of any of his work for the corresponding problems VarAlloc, CorrVarAlloc, GraphVarAlloc, or CorrGraphVarAlloc, where we have (1) a budget on the total variance of the underlying Gaussian variables, and (2) the variables may have non-zero means. That said, our main structural lemma (Lemma 2.1) does rely on a chaining argument (as do many other results in this area), which has been discussed thoroughly in Chapter 2 of Talagrand [2021]. However, a direct application of methods in Chapter 2 of Talagrand [2021] would give an upper bound of $O(\epsilon\sqrt{\log n})$ as opposed to $O(\epsilon\sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}})$ (cf. Lemma 2.1).

²See also the literature on wide neural networks as Gaussian processes [Gao et al., 2023].

Our approximation algorithms corresponding to Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 rely crucially on Lemma 2.1. We are able to obtain a PTAS because Lemma 2.1 implies that most of the variables will be set to zero in the optimal solution (a version of that result is in Theorem 1.6). The logarithmic approximation algorithm on the other hand is from a reduction to submodular maximization, which is NP-hard but admits an efficient approximation algorithm [Nemhauser et al., 1978]. As an aside, it’s worth noting that many variants of submodular maximization have been studied before [Vondrák, 2013], including for non-monotone submodular functions [Buchbinder and Feldman, 2018], monotone submodular functions [Feige et al., 2011], and submodular maximization with a matroid constraint [Buchbinder and Feldman, 2024].

2 Overview of technical results and proofs

In this section we provide an overview of the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 from Section 1.2. The proof of Lemma 2.1, which may be of independent interest, is presented in this section as well. The remaining detailed proofs are deferred to the appendix.

2.1 Expectation maximization for a single set with independent variables

As the optimization problem underlying VarAlloc, CorrVarAlloc, and GraphVarAlloc are non-convex, even when there is a single set, it is hard to find an efficient algorithm to solve the problem exactly. Although the solution space of the problem has n dimensions for the independent setting and n^2 dimensions for joint Gaussian variables, it is still possible to find a polynomial-time approximation scheme, either additive or multiplicative.

The main intuition for the PTAS is as follows. We want to reduce the search space of near-optimal solutions. Firstly, all random variables with variance at most ϵ^2 can only contribute to $\tilde{O}(\epsilon)$ in the optimization objective.³ Such an observation is formally shown by Lemma 2.1. Therefore, we only need to consider solutions with positive variances of the variables being large enough ($\geq \epsilon^2$), and there can only be $O(\epsilon^{-2})$ such variables, which is a constant for any fixed ϵ .

Lemma 2.1. *For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and positive integer m , let m zero-mean Gaussian random variables $(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ satisfy $0 \leq \Sigma_{11}, \Sigma_{22}, \dots, \Sigma_{mm} \leq \epsilon^2$ and $\sum_i \Sigma_{ii} \leq 1$, we have $\mathbb{E} \max(0, \max_{i \in [m]} Y_i) = O(\epsilon \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}})$.*

We observe that a weaker bound of $O(\epsilon \sqrt{\log n})$ follows from directly applying Talagrand’s chaining arguments in Chapter 2 of Talagrand [2021]. The weaker bound leads to a QPTAS (i.e. it runs in $n^{\text{polylog}(n)}$ time) since we can only guarantee $\text{polylog}(n)$ variables with negligible variance. Here we are able to obtain the stronger bound of $O(\epsilon \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}})$, which is essential to the PTAS.

Our proof begins by following the approach in Talagrand [2021] of approximating the maximum as a sum over maximums of smaller subsets of random variables. However, crucially, since the total variance is bounded, we are able to prove tighter upper bounds on the contribution of each group (Equation 12). The upshot of these improved bounds is to replace a $\log n$ factor by a $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Firstly, we group these random variables into groups G_1, G_2, \dots according to their variance. Each group G_j contains all random variables Y_i with variance Σ_{ii} satisfying $2^{-j}\epsilon < \sqrt{\Sigma_{ii}} \leq 2^{1-j}\epsilon$. For variables in group G_j , let $Z_j = \max(0, \max_{Y_i \in G_j} Y_i)$ be the maximum of all variables in this

³ $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ means the standard big O notation ignoring any poly-logarithmic factor.

group (lower-bounded by 0). Let $m_j = |G_j|$ be the number of variables in this group. We have for any $t \geq 0$,

$$e^{t\mathbb{E}Z_j} \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{tZ_j}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{t \max(0, \max_{Y_i \in G_j} Y_i)}] = \mathbb{E} \max \left(e^{t \cdot 0}, \max_{Y_i \in G_j} e^{Y_i} \right)$$

by the convexity of the exponential function and Jensen's inequality and the definition of Z_j . Now, since the expectation of maximum is at least the sum we have:

$$e^{t\mathbb{E}Z_j} \leq 1 + \sum_{Y_i \in G_j} \mathbb{E}[e^{tY_i}] = 1 + \sum_{Y_i \in G_j} e^{t^2 \Sigma_{ii}/2} \leq 1 + m_j e^{2^{1-2j} t^2 \epsilon^2}$$

where the equality follows by the expectation of the exponential of normal variables and the last inequality by $\Sigma_{ii} \leq 2^{2-2j} \epsilon$ for any $Y_i \in G_j$. Taking the logarithm of both sides, we get

$$t\mathbb{E}Z_j \leq \ln(1 + m_j e^{2^{1-2j} t^2 \epsilon^2}) \leq \ln((1 + m_j) e^{2^{1-2j} t^2 \epsilon^2}) = \ln(1 + m_j) + 2^{1-2j} t^2 \epsilon^2.$$

By taking $t = \frac{2^{j-1} \sqrt{2 \ln(1+m_j)}}{\epsilon}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}Z_j \leq 2^{1-j} \epsilon \sqrt{2 \ln(1 + m_j)}. \quad (11)$$

As the total variance of all variables is upper bounded by 1, we know that

$$1 \geq \sum_{Y_i \in G_j} \Sigma_{ii} > \sum_{Y_i \in G_j} 2^{-2j} \epsilon^2 = 2^{-2j} \epsilon^2 m_j. \quad (12)$$

Then we have $m_j < 2^{2j} \epsilon^{-2}$, and applying to (11) we get

$$\mathbb{E}Z_j \leq 2^{1-j} \epsilon \sqrt{2 \ln(1 + 2^{2j} \epsilon^{-2})} < 2^{1-j} \epsilon \sqrt{2 + 2 \ln(2^{2j} \epsilon^{-2})} = 2^{1-j} \epsilon \cdot \left(\sqrt{j} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right) \cdot O(1). \quad (13)$$

Here the second inequality comes from $\ln(1+x) < 1 + \ln x$ for $x > 1$; the last equality comes from extracting the dominant terms below the square root. By taking the max of Z_j over all groups, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \max(0, \max_{i \in [m]} Y_i) = \mathbb{E} \max_j Z_j \leq \sum_j \mathbb{E}Z_j < \sum_j 2^{1-j} \epsilon \left(\sqrt{j} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right) \cdot O(1)$$

where the last inequality follows from (13). Finally, notice that the sum with \sqrt{j} terms is $O(\epsilon)$, which has a lower order compared to the sum with $\sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}}$ terms, from which we conclude that:

$$\mathbb{E} \max(0, \max_{i \in [m]} Y_i) \leq O \left(\epsilon \sqrt{\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right)$$

□

Secondly, for any two vectors of independent normal variables with small ℓ_1 distance in variances, their respective expected maximum values are close. Thus to search for a near-optimal solution, it suffices to do a grid search on all possible variance vectors with each positive element being an integral multiple of $\text{poly}(\epsilon)$ (we use ϵ^{-3} in Algorithm 1). Any variance vector not being a grid point has a similar objective due to Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 2.2. Consider two vectors of standard deviations $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$ and $(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \dots, \sigma'_n)$. Let X_1, \dots, X_n and Y_1, \dots, Y_n be normal variables with $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$ and $Y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i'^2)$, then

$$|\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i - \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} Y_i| \leq O(1) \cdot \sum_{i \in [n]} |\sigma_i - \sigma'_i|.$$

Algorithm 1 A PTAS algorithm distributing variances to independent arbitrary-mean variables

```

1: Input:  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 0$ 
2:  $k \leftarrow \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$ ;
3: Set current maximum  $M = 0$ ;
4: for all possible  $k$  indices  $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_k \leq n$  do
5:   for any  $i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  do
6:     Set  $\hat{\sigma}_i = 0$ ;
7:   end for
8:   for all possible  $(\sigma_{i_1}, \dots, \sigma_{i_k})$ , where  $\sigma_{i_j}$  is an integral multiple of  $\epsilon^3$  for every  $i_j \in [n]$  do
9:     if  $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i > M$  then
10:       $(\hat{\sigma}_{i_1}, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{i_k}) \leftarrow (\sigma_{i_1}, \dots, \sigma_{i_k})$ ;
11:       $M \leftarrow \text{OBJ}(\hat{\sigma})$ ;
12:     end if
13:   end for
14: end for
15: Output:  $\hat{\sigma} = (\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n)$ 

```

2.2 Expectation maximization for a single set with correlated variables

When all random variables come from a multi-dimensional Gaussian distribution, we need to have a different algorithm. While Lemma 2.1 was already shown for correlated Gaussian variables, which means that we only need to search for covariance matrices with $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ positive dimensions, the smoothness condition from Lemma 2.2 no longer works. Instead, we observe that for any two vectors of random variables with small Earth Mover's distance, their respective expected maximum values are close. Another observation is that for two multi-dimensional Gaussian random vectors, if the square roots of their covariance matrices are close in entry-wise ℓ_1 distance, then they have a small Earth Mover's distance.

Lemma 2.3. For two random vectors $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ drawn from distribution D_X and D_Y respectively, if the Earth Mover's Distance $d_{EMD}(D_X, D_Y)$ (defined by ℓ_1 norm) between two distributions is at most ϵ , then $|\mathbb{E} \max_i X_i - \mathbb{E} \max_i Y_i| \leq \epsilon$.

Lemma 2.4. For any two dimension- k Gaussian distributions with $D_1 = \mathcal{N}(\mu, A)$ and $D_2 = \mathcal{N}(\mu, B)$, suppose that covariance matrices A and B are close in entry-wise ℓ_1 distance: $\|A - B\|_{1,1} = \sum_{i,j} |A_{ij} - B_{ij}| \leq \epsilon$. Then the Earth Mover Distance between D_1 and D_2 is bounded by $O(k^{2.75} \epsilon^{0.5})$.

Combining the previous observations, to search for a near-optimal solution, it suffices to do a grid search on the covariance matrices with each element being an integral multiple of $\text{poly}(\epsilon)$. We can design the following efficient algorithm that obtains a near-optimal solution with $O(\epsilon)$ loss for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$. The algorithm performs grid search on $O(\epsilon^{-2})$ of the variables with each variable having variance being multiples of $\text{poly}(\epsilon)$ (we use $\epsilon^{8.5}$ here due to a worse smoothness lemma).

Algorithm 2 A PTAS algorithm distributing variances to arbitrary-mean correlated variables

Input: $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 0$
 $k \leftarrow \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$;
Set current maximum $M = 0$;
for all possible k indices $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_k \leq n$ **do**
 for any $i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ **do**
 for any $\ell \in [n]$ **do**
 set $\widehat{\Sigma}_{i\ell} = \widehat{\Sigma}_{\ell i} = 0$;
 end for
 end for
 for any $i, j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ **do**
 for all possible values of (Σ_{ij}) being an integral multiple of ϵ^3 with value in $[-1, 1]$ **do**
 if Σ is positive semi-definite and $\text{OBJ}(\Sigma) > M$ **then**
 $\widehat{\Sigma} \leftarrow \Sigma$;
 $M \leftarrow \text{OBJ}(\Sigma)$;
 end if
 end for
 end for
end for
Output: $\widehat{\Sigma}$

2.3 Expectation maximization for multiple sets

When there are multiple sets, the problem is much more complicated. The PTAS technique for the single-set setting no longer works as the scale of the optimal objective can be very different. For example, when each set have small cardinality, the optimal way to distribute the variance may become uniformly split the variance budget to all variables, which means that all variables have $O(\frac{1}{n^2})$ variance. The previous grid search algorithm will no longer be efficient as there can be $\Omega(n)$ variables with small variance and contribute significantly to the optimal objective. One example is when each set contains two variables and the sets form a cycle graph.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that $m = n$, and $S_j = \{X_j, X_{j+1}\}$ for every $j \in [n]$ (assume that $X_{n+1} = X_1$). When all variables have the same mean μ , the optimal way to distribute variance is to set $\sigma_i^2 = \frac{1}{n}$ for every i .*

For the most general case of the problem, we obtain an efficient approximation algorithm with a competitive ratio $O(\log n)$. The main intuition is as follows. Firstly, for any solution, variables with tiny variance $< \frac{1}{n}$ only have negligible contribution to the total objective. For the rest of the variables, we can group the variables according to their variances such that each group contains variables with variance differences bounded by a constant factor. Then since there are only $O(\log n)$ groups, one group of variables contribute $\Omega(\frac{1}{\log n})$ fraction of the optimal objective. Secondly, when the standard deviation of each variable perturbs by a factor of 2, the overall objective also only changes by at most a factor of 2. This means that if we can solve the problem with each variable having a variance of either 0 or some fixed value, we can obtain $\Omega(\frac{1}{\log n})$ fraction of the optimal objective.

Algorithm 3 An $O(\log n)$ -approx algorithm distributing variances to variables in multiple sets

Input: Means (μ_1, \dots, μ_n) , Sets S_1, \dots, S_m
Initialize current best objective $M \leftarrow 0$;
Initialize current best $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n) \leftarrow (0, \dots, 0)$;
Remove all sets with $|S_j| = 1$;
for $k \leftarrow 0$ to $\log_2 n$ **do**
 $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \leftarrow (0, \dots, 0)$;
 while # variables with variance $4^{-k} < \min(4^k, n)$ **do**
 Find the variable i with $\sigma_i = 0$ such that after setting $\sigma_i = 4^{-k}$, $\text{OBJ}(\sigma)$ is maximized;
 $\sigma_i \leftarrow 4^{-k}$;
 end while
 if $\text{OBJ}(\sigma) > M$ **then**
 $M \leftarrow \text{OBJ}(\sigma)$;
 $\hat{\sigma} \leftarrow \sigma$;
 end if
end for
Output: $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n)$

Lemma 2.6. For n zero-mean normally distributed variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n with standard deviation $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$, suppose that there are n other zero-mean normally distributed variables X'_1, X'_2, \dots, X'_n with standard deviation $\sigma'_1, \dots, \sigma'_n$ satisfying $\sigma_i \leq \sigma'_i \leq 2\sigma_i$, then $\mathbb{E} \max X'_i \leq 2\mathbb{E} \max X_i$.

The last observation is that, for each set, the marginal gain of setting one more variable with a fixed variance is a decreasing function.

Lemma 2.7. For n zero-mean normally distributed variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n and $\sigma_0 > 0$, let $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a set function such that for any $S \subseteq [n]$, $f(S) = \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i$ where $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_0^2)$ for $i \in S$ and $X_i \equiv 0$ for $i \notin S$. Then f is a submodular function.

This means that the problem with each variable having a variance being either 0 or some fixed value is actually a submodular maximization problem, and can be solved efficiently with approximation factor $1 - \frac{1}{e}$ via a greedy algorithm. The complete approximation algorithm for multiple sets is summarized in Algorithm 3.

For CorrGraphVarAlloc that allows covariance, exactly the same algorithm gives a logarithmic approximation since the optimal objective between the independent case GraphVarAlloc and the correlated case CorrGraphVarAlloc are bounded by a constant due to a constant correlation gap of the optimization problem.

Lemma 2.8. For any multi-dimensional Gaussian vector $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, consider independent Gaussian variables with the same means and variances $(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \text{diag}(\Sigma))$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \max(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leq \frac{2e}{e-1} \mathbb{E} \max(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n).$$

References

- Pranjal Awasthi, Corinna Cortes, and Mehryar Mohri. Best-Effort Adaptation. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 92:393–438, 2024.
- Dirk Bergemann, Paul Duetting, Renato Paes Leme, and Song Zuo. Calibrated click-through auctions. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 47–57, 2022.
- Niv Buchbinder and Moran Feldman. Deterministic algorithms for submodular maximization problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(3):32:1–32:20, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3184990. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3184990>.
- Niv Buchbinder and Moran Feldman. Deterministic algorithm and faster algorithm for submodular maximization subject to a matroid constraint. In *65th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2024, Chicago, IL, USA, October 27-30, 2024*, pages 700–712. IEEE, 2024. doi: 10.1109/FOCS61266.2024.00050. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS61266.2024.00050>.
- Junjie Chen, Minming Li, Haifeng Xu, and Song Zuo. Bayesian calibrated click-through auctions. In *51st International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2024, July 8-12, 2024, Tallinn, Estonia*, volume 297 of *LIPICs*, pages 44:1–44:18, 2024.
- Corinna Cortes, Mehryar Mohri, Michael Riley, and Afshin Rostamizadeh. Sample selection bias correction theory. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, 2008.
- S. M. Diffey, A. B. Smith, A. H. Welsh, and B. R. Cullis. A new REML (parameter expanded) EM algorithm for linear mixed models. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 59(4):433–448, 2017.
- Uriel Feige, Vahab S. Mirrokni, and Jan Vondrák. Maximizing non-monotone submodular functions. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(4):1133–1153, 2011. doi: 10.1137/090779346. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/090779346>.
- Tianxiang Gao, Xiaokai Huo, Hailiang Liu, and Hongyang Gao. Wide Neural Networks as Gaussian Processes: Lessons from Deep Equilibrium Models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Z2he2Y0MoH>.
- George L Nemhauser, Laurence A Wolsey, and Marshall L Fisher. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—i. *Mathematical programming*, 14:265–294, 1978.
- Bernt Oksendal. *Stochastic Differential Equations: An Introduction with Applications*. Springer, Berlin, 2013.
- Joaquin Quionero-Candela, Masashi Sugiyama, Anton Schwaighofer, and Neil D. Lawrence. *Dataset Shift in Machine Learning*. The MIT Press, 2009. ISBN 0262170051.
- Jeffrey A. Ruffolo, Stephen Nayfach, Joseph Gallagher, Aadyot Bhatnagar, Joel Beazer, Riffat Hussain, Jordan Russ, Jennifer Yip, Emily Hill, Martin Pacesa, Alexander J. Meeske, Peter Cameron, and Ali Madani. Design of highly functional genome editors by modeling the universe of CRISPR-Cas sequences. *bioRxiv*, 2024. URL <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2024/04/22/2024.04.22.590591>.

- Michel Talagrand. *Upper and Lower Bounds for Stochastic Processes*. Springer Cham, 2021.
- Bailey Timothy and Elkan Charles. Fitting a mixture model by expectation maximization to discover motifs in biopolymers. *Proc Int Conf Intell Syst Mol Biol.*, 1994.
- Andreas Tuerk, Gregor Wiktorin, and Serhat G uler. Mixture models reveal multiple positional bias types in RNA-Seq data and lead to accurate transcript concentration estimates. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 2017.
- Jan Vondrák. Symmetry and approximability of submodular maximization problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(1):265–304, 2013. doi: 10.1137/110832318. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/110832318>.
- Joseph L. Watson, David Juergens, Nathaniel R. Bennett, Brian L. Trippe, Jason Yim, Helen E. Eisenach, Woody Ahern, Andrew J. Borst, Robert J. Ragotte, Lukas F. Milles, Basile I. M. Wicky, Nikita Hanikel, Samuel J. Pellock, Alexis Courbet, William Sheffler, Jue Wang, Preetham Venkatesh, Isaac Sappington, Susana Vázquez Torres, Anna Lauko, Valentin De Bortoli, Emile Mathieu, Sergey Ovchinnikov, Regina Barzilay, Tommi S. Jaakkola, Frank DiMaio, Minkyung Baek, and David Baker. De novo design of protein structure and function with RFdiffusion. *Nature*, 2023.
- Xin Wei, Ziyi Li, Hongkai Ji, and Hao Wu. EDClust: an EM–MM hybrid method for cell clustering in multiple-subject single-cell RNA sequencing. *Bioinformatics*, 38(10):2692–2699, 2022.

A More Details on Variance Allocation in One Set

A.1 Variance allocation for multiple independent variables

In this section, we propose several efficient approximation schemes that find near-optimal ways to distribute the variance across all random variables. We start with the simplest case VarAlloc, where there are n normally distributed random variables $X_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_1^2), X_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_2^2), \dots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$, and the to be distributed variances satisfy $\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 + \dots + \sigma_n^2 = 1$.

Recall that OPT denotes the optimal objective of the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT} &= \max_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem A.1. *For any constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm with running time polynomial in n , which computes a variance vector $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$ satisfying the optimization constraint, such that for $X_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_1^2), X_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_2^2), \dots, X_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$, $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \geq \text{OPT} - \epsilon$.*

The main intuition for the PTAS is as follows. Firstly, all random variables with variance less than ϵ^2 can be ignored, as their total contribution to the objective is negligible (i.e. $\tilde{O}(\epsilon)$). Secondly, the objective is Lipschitz with respect to each σ_i , thus we may only need to consider solutions with discrete σ_i values. The above intuitions are formally described by Lemma 2.1 (main paper) and Lemma 2.2 (below).

Lemma 2.2. *Consider two vectors of standard deviations $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$ and $(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \dots, \sigma'_n)$. Let X_1, \dots, X_n and Y_1, \dots, Y_n be normal variables with $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$ and $Y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i'^2)$, then*

$$|\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i - \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} Y_i| \leq O(1) \cdot \sum_{i \in [n]} |\sigma_i - \sigma'_i|.$$

To prove Lemma 2.2, we prove the following much stronger lemma, and Lemma 2.2 can be viewed as a corollary by repeatedly applying the Lemma A.2 to each index $i \in [n]$.

Lemma A.2. *Consider two normal variables $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma_1)$ and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma_2)$ with the same mean. For any random variable T that is independent with X and Y , let $X' = \max(X, T)$, and $Y' = \max(Y, T)$. Then*

$$|\mathbb{E} X' - \mathbb{E} Y'| \leq O(1) \cdot |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|.$$

Proof of Lemma A.2. Firstly, we can assume that X and Y have mean 0 by shifting X, Y, T by μ (thus X' and Y' are also shifted by μ). Secondly, observe that we only need to prove the lemma for $T = t \in \mathbb{R}$ being a constant, and in this case, $X' = \max(X, t)$, and $Y' = \max(Y, t)$. With the lemma proven for a constant t , the original lemma can be shown by taking the expectation over all $t \sim T$.

Without loss of generality, assume that $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2$. Let Φ_1 and Φ_2 be the CDF of X and Y , and ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 be the PDF X and Y respectively. Suppose we define $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2}$ to be the PDF of a standard

normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 1, and $\Phi(x) = \int_0^x \phi(z)dz$ to be the CDF of a standard normal distribution, then $\phi_i(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma_i}\phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma_i}\right)$, $\Phi_i(x) = \Phi\left(\frac{x}{\sigma_i}\right)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}X' - \mathbb{E}Y'| &= \left| \left(\int_{-\infty}^t t\phi_1(x)dx + \int_t^{\infty} x\phi_1(x)dx \right) - \left(\int_{-\infty}^t t\phi_2(x)dx + \int_t^{\infty} x\phi_2(x)dx \right) \right| \\
&= \left| \left(t\Phi_1(t) + \sigma_1\phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_1}\right) \right) - \left(t\Phi_2(t) + \sigma_2\phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_2}\right) \right) \right| \\
&= \left| t\left(\Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_1}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_2}\right) \right) + \left(\sigma_1\phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_1}\right) - \sigma_2\phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_2}\right) \right) \right| \\
&\leq \left| t\left(\Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_1}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_2}\right) \right) \right| + \left| \sigma_1\phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_1}\right) - \sigma_2\phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_2}\right) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Here the first equality is from the definition of X' and Y' ; the second equality is from the expectation of truncated normal distributions. Let

$$Z_1 = t\left(\Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_1}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_2}\right) \right)$$

and

$$Z_2 = \sigma_1\phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_1}\right) - \sigma_2\phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_2}\right).$$

To prove the lemma, it suffices to show that both $|Z_1|$ and $|Z_2|$ are bounded by $O(|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|)$. As replacing t with $-t$ does not change the value of both terms, we can assume without loss of generality that $t \geq 0$.

Bounding $|Z_1|$. We prove that when $\sigma_1 > 2\sigma_2$, $|Z_1|$ is upper bounded by $O(\sigma_1)$; when $\sigma_2 \leq \sigma_1 \leq 2\sigma_2$, $|Z_1|$ is upper bounded by $O(|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|)$.

If $\sigma_1 > 2\sigma_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|Z_1| &= t \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{t/\sigma_1}^{t/\sigma_2} e^{-x^2/2} dx \\
&\leq \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{t/\sigma_1}^{\infty} e^{-x^2/2} dx \\
&= \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-(x+\frac{t}{\sigma_1})^2/2} dx \\
&\leq \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-(x^2+(\frac{t}{\sigma_1})^2)/2} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2}te^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{e}}\sigma_1 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}}(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the first line is from the definition of Φ ; the last line is by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-x^2/2} dx = \frac{1}{2}$, and function $\frac{1}{2}xe^{-x^2/2}$ is maximized at $x = 1$ with maximum value $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{e}}$.

If $\sigma_1 \leq 2\sigma_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|Z_1| &= t \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{t/\sigma_1}^{t/\sigma_2} e^{-x^2/2} dx \\
&\leq \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{t}{\sigma_2} - \frac{t}{\sigma_1} \right) e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{t^2}{\sigma_1\sigma_2} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \cdot \frac{t^2}{\sigma_1^2} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \cdot \frac{2}{e} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the second line is by $e^{-x^2/2}$ is decreasing on $[\frac{t}{\sigma_1}, \frac{t}{\sigma_2}]$; the fourth line is by $\sigma_1 \leq 2\sigma_2$; the last line is by function $xe^{-x/2}$ is maximized at $x = 2$ with maximum value $\frac{2}{e}$. Thus in both cases, we have shown that $|Z_1|$ is upper bounded by $O(|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|)$ (with small constant < 1).

Bounding $|Z_2|$. To show that $|Z_2| = \left| \sigma_1 \phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_1}\right) - \sigma_2 \phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_2}\right) \right|$ is bounded by $O(|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|)$, it suffices to show that function $g(x) = x\phi\left(\frac{t}{x}\right)$ has bounded derivative. In fact, we can rewrite $g'(x)$ as

$$g'(x) = \phi\left(\frac{t}{x}\right) + x\phi'\left(\frac{t}{x}\right) = \phi\left(\frac{t}{x}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \frac{t^2}{x^2} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2x^2}}$$

being the sum of two positive terms with each term being bounded by some absolute constant. Actually when $x = t$, $|g'(x)|$ is maximized with value $\sqrt{\frac{2}{e\pi}}$. Thus by the mean value theorem, $|Z_2| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{e\pi}} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)$.

Combining the bounds for $|Z_1|$ and $|Z_2|$, we get $|\mathbb{E}X' - \mathbb{E}Y'| \leq O(|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|)$, finishing the proof of the theorem. □

Now with the help of Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we are ready to prove Theorem A.1.

Proof of Theorem A.1. Let $k = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$. We first show that we only need to distribute variance to at most k variables.

When $n \geq k$, first observe that $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i$ and $\mathbb{E} \max(0, \max_{i \in [n]} X_i)$ are close (up to $O(2^{-1/\epsilon^2})$). This is true since $\Pr[\max_{i \in [n]} X_i < 0] = 2^{-k}$, and $\mathbb{E}[\max_{i \in [n]} X_i | \max_{i \in [n]} X_i < 0] \geq \mathbb{E}[X_1 | X_1 < 0] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sigma_1 = O(1)$ for $\sigma_1 \leq 1$.

Then for any variance allocation $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_n$, we know that the objective value

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]}(0, \max X_i) \leq \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [k]}(0, \max X_i) + \mathbb{E} \max_{k+1 \leq i \leq n}(0, \max X_i) = \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [k]}(0, \max X_i) + O(\epsilon)$$

by Lemma 2.1⁴. Therefore, an algorithm that wants to obtain $O(\epsilon)$ loss does not need to distribute variance $< \epsilon^2$ to any variable. Also, as the total variance budget is 1, there can be at most $\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$ variables with variance

⁴For clearance of presentation we do not optimize the small terms.

$> \epsilon^2$, thus $k \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$. This means that an algorithm that wants to obtain $O(\epsilon)$ loss only needs to distribute at least ϵ^2 variance to at most $\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$ variables.

By Lemma 2.2, if an algorithm can obtain the optimal objective conditioned on each ϵ_i being an integer times ϵ^3 , the algorithm will have a loss at most $k\epsilon^3$, if at most k variables have positive variance. Thus the following algorithm has $O(\epsilon)$ loss compared to the optimal objective:

Algorithm 4 A PTAS algorithm distributing variances to zero-mean variables

Input: $n \geq 0$
 $k \leftarrow \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$;
Set current maximum $M = 0$;
for any $i > k$ **do**
 $\hat{\sigma}_i \leftarrow 0$
end for
for all possible $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$, where $\hat{\sigma}_i$ is an integral multiple of ϵ^3 for every $i \in [k]$ **do**
 if $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [k]} X_i > M$ **then**
 Set $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_k) \leftarrow (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$;
 $M \leftarrow \text{OBJ}(\sigma)$;
 end if
end for
Output: $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n)$

Now we analyze the running time of the algorithm. There are at most $(\epsilon^{-3})^{1/\epsilon^2}$ different vectors of $\hat{\sigma}$, and for each vector, we can efficiently compute the max of k normal variables with given variance. Thus the algorithm is a polynomial time approximation scheme of the original objective. □

The algorithm can be easily extended to the case where the means of the variables are no longer 0.

Theorem 1.1. *Given an input to VarAlloc with $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \geq 0$ and constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm with running time polynomial in n , that computes a variance vector $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n)$ such that $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \geq \text{OPT} - \epsilon$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.1. For any variance allocation $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$, let $G_1 \cup G_2$ be the partition of all variables such that G_1 contains all variables X_i with $\sigma_i > \epsilon^2$; G_2 contains all variables X_i with $\sigma_i \leq \epsilon^2$. For each variable X_i , define $X'_i = X_i - \mu_i$. Then $X'_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2)$ is a zero-mean variable. We can bound the original objective as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i &= \mathbb{E} \max \left(\max_{X_i \in G_1} X_i, \max_{X_i \in G_2} X_i \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \max \left(\max_{X_i \in G_1} X_i, \max_{X_i \in G_2} \mu_i + \max \left(0, \max_{X_i \in G_2} X'_i \right) \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \max \left(\max_{X_i \in G_1} X_i, \max_{X_i \in G_2} \mu_i \right) + \mathbb{E} \max \left(0, \max_{X_i \in G_2} X'_i \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \max \left(\max_{X_i \in G_1} X_i, \max_{X_i \in G_2} \mu_i \right) + O(\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the first line is by splitting the objective into two groups of variables; the second line is by decomposing X_i to $X'_i + \mu_i$, and upper-bounding X'_i by $\max(0, X'_i)$; the third line is by getting the positive term outside of the outer maximization; the last line is by using Lemma 2.1 to bound the maximum of multiple zero-mean variables. This means that to get $O(\epsilon)$ loss in the objective, it suffices to only distribute variance to $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2})$ variables, with each having variance at least ϵ^2 .

Algorithm 1 A PTAS algorithm distributing variances to independent arbitrary-mean variables

```

1: Input:  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 0$ 
2:  $k \leftarrow \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$ ;
3: Set current maximum  $M = 0$ ;
4: for all possible  $k$  indices  $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_k \leq n$  do
5:   for any  $i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  do
6:     Set  $\hat{\sigma}_i = 0$ ;
7:   end for
8:   for all possible  $(\sigma_{i_1}, \dots, \sigma_{i_k})$ , where  $\sigma_{i_j}$  is an integral multiple of  $\epsilon^3$  for every  $i_j \in [n]$  do
9:     if  $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i > M$  then
10:       $(\hat{\sigma}_{i_1}, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{i_k}) \leftarrow (\sigma_{i_1}, \dots, \sigma_{i_k})$ ;
11:       $M \leftarrow \text{OBJ}(\sigma)$ ;
12:     end if
13:   end for
14: end for
15: Output:  $\hat{\sigma} = (\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n)$ 

```

Similar to Theorem A.1, we can use a similar algorithm to enumerate all possible ways to distribute variances being multiple of ϵ^3 , see Algorithm 1 for details. The only difference from the zero-mean Algorithm 4 is that we now need to guess which $\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$ variables should be distributed variances. The algorithm runs in polynomial time for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, and obtains a solution with $O(\epsilon)$ loss compared to the optimal objective. □

A.2 Variance distribution for correlated variables

We now proceed to the more general case, where there are n jointly normally distributed random variables $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$. We still assume that the total variance of the variables is bounded: $\sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma_{ii} \leq 1$, and we are also free to determine the positive semi-definite covariance matrix Σ satisfying the constraint. Let OPT denote the optimal objective in this setting:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT} &= \max_{\Sigma} \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma_{ii} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Given an input to CorrVarAlloc and constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm with running time polynomial in n , that computes a covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$ such that for $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\Sigma})$, $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i \geq \text{OPT} - \epsilon$.*

The algorithm would be almost the same as Algorithm 1. Although we proved that all random variables with small variance $< \epsilon^2$ can be ignored in Lemma 2.1 for the correlated case, the Lemma that proves the smoothness of the objective with respect to the covariance is only shown for the independent case (Lemma 2.2). Therefore, we need to get a stronger smoothness lemma. We prove the following two lemmas: one shows that for any two joint distributions over n variables, if they have small Earth Mover's Distance, then their objective OBJ would be close; the other shows that for two Gaussian distributions with covariance matrices close element-wise, their Earth Mover's distance is small.

Lemma 2.3. *For two random vectors $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$ drawn from distribution D_X and D_Y respectively, if the Earth Mover's Distance $d_{EMD}(D_X, D_Y)$ (defined by ℓ_1 norm) between two distributions is at most ϵ , then $|\mathbb{E} \max_i X_i - \mathbb{E} \max_i Y_i| \leq \epsilon$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Consider the coupling γ between D_X and D_Y that defines the Earth Mover's Distance

$$d_{EMD}(D_X, D_Y) = \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \gamma} \|X - Y\|_1.$$

Notice that for any two vectors X and Y , $|\max_i X_i - \max_i Y_i| \leq \|X - Y\|_1$. Thus

$$|\mathbb{E} \max_i X_i - \mathbb{E} \max_i Y_i| = \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \gamma} |\mathbb{E} \max_i X_i - \mathbb{E} \max_i Y_i| \leq \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \gamma} \|X - Y\|_1 = d_{EMD}(D_X, D_Y) \leq \epsilon.$$

□

Lemma 2.4. *For any two dimension- k Gaussian distributions with $D_1 = \mathcal{N}(\mu, A)$ and $D_2 = \mathcal{N}(\mu, B)$, suppose that covariance matrices A and B are close in entry-wise ℓ_1 distance: $\|A - B\|_{1,1} = \sum_{i,j} |A_{ij} - B_{ij}| \leq \epsilon$. Then the Earth Mover Distance between D_1 and D_2 is bounded by $O(k^{2.75} \epsilon^{0.5})$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.4. For any zero-mean multi-dimensional Gaussian distributions with Positive Semi-Definite (PSD) matrices A and B , we upper bound the Earth Mover's Distance with their Wasserstein-2 (W_2) distance. The W_2 distance is defined similarly to the EMD distance, where EMD distance describes the smallest effort to transport between the two distributions using ℓ_1 distance, while W_2 distance uses ℓ_2 distance in the coupling. It is known that

$$d_{EMD}(D_1, D_2) \leq \sqrt{k} \cdot d_{W_2}(D_1, D_2),$$

and

$$d_{W_2}(D_1, D_2) = \text{tr} \left(A + B - 2(A^{1/2} B A^{1/2})^{1/2} \right).$$

Now we look at the entry-wise ℓ_1 distance between A^2 and $A^{1/2} B A^{1/2}$. As $\text{tr}(A), \text{tr}(B) \leq 1$, we have every element in $A, B, A^{1/2}, B^{1/2}$ have absolute value bounded below 1.

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^{1/2} A - A^{1/2} B\|_{1,1} &= \sum_{i,j} \left| \sum_r A_{ir}^{1/2} (A - B)_{rj} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_r \left(\sum_i |A_{ir}^{1/2}| \right) \left(\sum_j (A - B)_{rj} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_r \left(\sum_i 1 \right) \left(\sum_j (A - B)_{rj} \right) \\ &\leq k \|A - B\|_{1,1} \leq k\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\|A^{1/2}AA^{1/2} - A^{1/2}BA^{1/2}\|_{1,1} \leq k\|A^{1/2}A - A^{1/2}B\|_{1,1} \leq k^2\epsilon.$$

Notice that for two matrices with small ℓ_1 distance, their spectrum is similar. Let $P = A^2$, $Q = A^{1/2}BA^{1/2}$. Let $\lambda_i(P)$ denote the i th largest eigenvalue of P . By Weyl's inequality,

$$|\lambda_i(P) - \lambda_i(Q)| \leq \|P - Q\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{k}\|P - Q\|_{1,1} \leq k^{2.5}\epsilon.$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ is the operator norm. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{tr}(P^{1/2}) - \operatorname{tr}(Q^{1/2})| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{\lambda_i(P)} - \sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{\lambda_i(Q)} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| \sqrt{\lambda_i(P)} - \sqrt{\lambda_i(Q)} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| \sqrt{|\lambda_i(P) - \lambda_i(Q)|} \right| \\ &\leq k \cdot k^{1.25}\epsilon^{0.5} = k^{2.25}\epsilon^{0.5}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} d_{W_2}(D_1, D_2) &= \operatorname{tr}(A) + \operatorname{tr}(B) - 2\operatorname{tr}(Q^{1/2}) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}(A) + \operatorname{tr}(B) - 2\operatorname{tr}(Q^{1/2}) + 2\operatorname{tr}(P^{1/2}) - 2\operatorname{tr}(A) \\ &\leq |\operatorname{tr}(A) - \operatorname{tr}(B)| + 2|\operatorname{tr}(P^{1/2}) - \operatorname{tr}(Q^{1/2})| \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and } d_{EMD}(D_1, D_2) \leq \sqrt{k}d_{W_2}(D_1, D_2) = O(k^{2.75}\epsilon^{0.5}) \quad \square$$

Now we are ready to propose and analyze the algorithm for Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The algorithm and its analysis are almost identical to Theorem 1.1, except we need a more fine-grained search due to the loss in smoothness lemma (Lemma 2.4 vs. Lemma 2.2). Let $k = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$ and δ be to-be-determined parameters. When we search for the variance allocation, instead of searching for the variance vector with at most k positive terms, we search for the covariance matrix of size at most k^2 for a subset of variables. As $|\Sigma_{ij}| \leq \sqrt{\Sigma_{ii}\Sigma_{jj}} \leq 1$, we only need to search for a covariance matrix with each element being integral multiples of δ bounded between -1 and 1 .

The ℓ_1 accuracy of the covariance matrix we get is $k^2\delta$. By Lemma 2.4, the Earth Mover's distance of the optimal solution and the matrix we get from the grid search algorithm is $O(k^{2.75} \cdot \sqrt{k^2\delta}) = O(k^{3.75}\delta)$. Thus a grid size $\delta = \epsilon^{8.5}$ is enough. See Algorithm 2 for the full algorithm. □

B More Details on Variance Allocation in Multiple Subsets

In this section, we study the multi-subset setting where there are $m > 1$ sets. Recall that each set's contribution is again defined by $\max_{i \in S_j} X_i$, and our objective is to maximize the total expected contribution of

Algorithm 2 A PTAS algorithm distributing variances to arbitrary-mean correlated variables

Input: $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \geq 0$
 $k \leftarrow \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$;
 Set current maximum $M = 0$;
for all possible k indices $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_k \leq n$ **do**
 for any $i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ **do**
 for any $\ell \in [n]$ **do**
 set $\widehat{\Sigma}_{i\ell} = \widehat{\Sigma}_{\ell i} = 0$;
 end for
 end for
 for any $i, j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ **do**
 for all possible values of (Σ_{ij}) being an integral multiple of ϵ^3 with value in $[-1, 1]$ **do**
 if Σ is positive semi-definite and $\text{OBJ}(\Sigma) > M$ **then**
 $\widehat{\Sigma} \leftarrow \Sigma$;
 $M \leftarrow \text{OBJ}(\Sigma)$;
 end if
 end for
 end for
end for
Output: $\widehat{\Sigma}$

the m sets. We assume that the n variables $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$ are independent and normally distributed, and we need to distribute a total variance budget 1. To be more precise, the optimal objective OPT is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{OPT} &= \max_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^m \max_{i \in S_j} X_i \\
 \text{subject to} & \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 = 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

An equivalent way to define the instance is to use a bipartite graph. The characterization graph of the instance is a bipartite graph with n vertices on one side representing variables X_i for $i \in [n]$, and m vertices on the other side representing sets S_j for $j \in [m]$, with edge (i, j) exists if and only if $i \in S_j$.

When the sets are large in size, the PTAS algorithms in the previous sections are still applicable. Intuitively, this is true since OPT is of order $\Theta(m)$, and an additive loss $O(\epsilon)$ for each set leads to a total loss $O(m\epsilon)$. However, when the sets are relatively small, it is possible that the optimal variance allocation algorithm splits the total budget evenly to all variables, resulting in each set having $o(\epsilon)$ contribution to the total objective. In this case, a grid search algorithm with grid points being small constants is even not sufficient to get a subpolynomial competitive ratio.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that $m = n$, and $S_j = \{X_j, X_{j+1}\}$ for every $j \in [n]$ (assume that $X_{n+1} = X_1$). When all variables have the same mean μ , the optimal way to distribute variance is to set $\sigma_i^2 = \frac{1}{n}$ for every i .*

Proof of Theorem 2.5. For the special case where there are only two variables in each set, the optimization

objective can be expressed by σ in a closed form. Notice that the contribution of each set S_j is

$$\mathbb{E} \max(X_j, X_{j+1}) = \mathbb{E} \frac{X_j + X_{j+1} + |X_j - X_{j+1}|}{2} = \mu + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} |X_j - X_{j+1}|.$$

As $X_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma_j^2)$ and $X_{j+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma_{j+1}^2)$, $|X_j - X_{j+1}|$ is the absolute value of a normally distributed variable with variance $\sigma_j^2 + \sigma_{j+1}^2$, and has mean $\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \cdot \sqrt{\sigma_j^2 + \sigma_{j+1}^2}$. Thus, the total objective can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \max(X_j, X_{j+1}) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\mu + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}} \cdot \sqrt{\sigma_j^2 + \sigma_{j+1}^2} \right) \\ &= n\mu + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sqrt{\sigma_j^2 + \sigma_{j+1}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it suffices to optimize the second term. By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \sqrt{\sigma_j^2 + \sigma_{j+1}^2} \right)^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (\sigma_j^2 + \sigma_{j+1}^2) \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n 1^2 \right) \\ &= 2n. \end{aligned}$$

The equality holds if and only if $\sigma_j + \sigma_{j+1} = \sigma_{j+1} + \sigma_{j+2} = \frac{2}{n}$ for every $j \in [n]$. Thus, setting all variables to have variance $\frac{1}{n}$ is an optimal solution to the original optimization problem. \square

B.1 Instance generated by a random graph

In this section, we study the setting where all variables are independent with mean $\mu_i = 0$ and total variance budget 1. The bipartite characterization graph generation follows Erdős–Rényi model with each edge appearing in the graph with probability p . In other words, for any variable $X_i, i \in S_j$ with probability p .

We observe that for a denser random graph (with larger p), fewer variables will have non-negligible variance in the optimal allocation. This is formally characterized in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.6. *For any $\delta > 0$ and a random instance of GraphVarAlloc with $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, with probability $p > 1 - \delta$, there are $\Theta(\frac{1}{p})$ variables allocated variance $\Omega(p)$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.6. We first give an upper bound on the objective we can obtain in the random graph. Consider the following variance allocation: $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = \dots = \sigma_{\frac{1}{p}}^2 = p, \sigma_{\frac{1}{p}+1} = \dots = \sigma_n = 0$. Then for every set S_j , as any $i \in [n]$ appears in S_j with probability p , the probability that S_j contains at least one element in range $[1, \frac{1}{p}]$ is at least $1 - (1 - \frac{1}{p})^p > 1 - \frac{1}{e}$. Notice that when at least one X_i in S_j has variance p , the contribution of S_j to the objective is at least $\mathbb{E} \max(X_1, 0) = \sqrt{\frac{2p}{\pi}} = \Omega(\sqrt{p})$. Thus, the optimal objective of the random graph is at least $\Omega(m\sqrt{p})$.

As the total variance budget of all variables is 1, there can be at most $O(\frac{1}{p})$ variables with large variance $\Omega(p)$. Now we show that if there are $o(\frac{1}{p})$ variables with variance $\Omega(p)$, then the total objective value is much smaller than the objective obtained by the allocation in the previous paragraph. To be more precise,

we prove that for small constant $\epsilon > 0$, if there are less than $\frac{\epsilon}{p}$ variables with variance at least ϵp , the total objective is only $o(m\sqrt{p})$.

For any variance vector σ , partition the variables into two groups G_1 and G_2 . G_1 contains variables with variance at least $\frac{1}{\epsilon}p$, while G_2 contains all other variables with small variance. For any set S_j , let $s_j = \sum_{i \in S_j} \sigma_i^2$. The set's contribution to the total objective can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} X_i &\leq \mathbb{E} \max \left(0, \max_{i \in S_j \cap G_1} X_i, \max_{i \in S_j \cap G_2} X_i \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in S_j \cap G_1} \max(0, X_i) + \mathbb{E} \max \left(0, \max_{i \in S_j \cap G_2} X_i \right) \\
&= \sum_{i \in S_j \cap G_1} \max(0, X_i) + \sqrt{s_j} \mathbb{E} \max \left(0, \max_{i \in S_j \cap G_2} \frac{X_i}{\sqrt{s_j}} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in S_j \cap G_1} \max(0, X_i) + \sqrt{s_j} \cdot O \left(\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon p}{s_j} \ln \frac{s_j}{\epsilon p}} \right) \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sum_{i \in S_j \cap G_1} \sigma_i + \sqrt{\epsilon p} \cdot O \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{s_j}{\epsilon p}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

here the last inequality is by Lemma 2.1. If we sum up the total contribution for all sets S_j , notice that with high probability every variable X_i is only in $O(pm)$ sets, and $s_j = O(p)$. Thus with high probability

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in [m]} \max_{i \in S_j} X_i \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sum_{i \in G_1} \sigma_i \sum_{j: S_j \ni i} 1 + m \cdot O \left(\sqrt{\epsilon p \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i \in G_1} \sigma_i \cdot O(pm) + O \left(m \sqrt{\epsilon p \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right) \\
&\leq O(pm) \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i \in G_1} \sigma_i^2 \right)} \cdot \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i \in G_1} 1^2 \right)} + O \left(m \sqrt{\epsilon p \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right) \\
&\leq O(pm) \cdot 1 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{p}} + O \left(m \sqrt{\epsilon p \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right) \\
&= O \left(m \sqrt{p \epsilon \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This means that such an allocation only leads to $O(\sqrt{\epsilon \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}})$ fraction of the optimal objective (which is $O(m\sqrt{p})$), thus is negligible when ϵ is small. □

B.2 Instance generated by arbitrary graph

In this section, we provide an efficient approximation algorithm for GraphVarAlloc with competitive ratio $O(\log n)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Given an input to GraphVarAlloc, there exists an algorithm with a running time polynomial in n that computes a variance vector $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n)$ such that $\mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^m \max_{i \in S_j} X_i \geq \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\log n}\right) \text{OPT}$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We will iteratively simplify the problem and reduce the search space of the optimal variance vector, each time only losing a small approximation factor.

Firstly, we can remove all sets S_j with size 1. This is because no matter what variance we allocate to the variable X_i in the set, its contribution to the total objective $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} X_i = \mu_i$ does not change. Therefore, if after removing all singleton sets we get a competitive ratio α to the new instance, the algorithm gets α competitive ratio to the original instance.

Next, we will transform our problem to remove the dependency on μ_i and only lose a constant factor in the competitive ratio. For each $i \in [n]$, let $X'_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2)$ be a zero-mean normal variable with the same variance as X_i . For any set S_j , by Lemma B.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} X_i = \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} (\mu_i + X'_i) \leq \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} \mu_i + \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} \max(0, X'_i) \leq \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} \mu_i + 2\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} \max(0, X_i).$$

Notice that $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} \mu_i$ is an obtainable objective via setting $\sigma_i = 0$ for every variable X_i ; for any σ vector that maximizes $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} \max(0, X_i)$, using the same variance allocation only leads to a larger objective in the original instance with $\mu_i \geq 0$. Thus solving the problem with each variable having zero mean leads to a 3-approximation of the original problem. In the following proof, we just assume $\mu_i = 0$ for every i .

Next, we will bound the search range of σ . By Lemma 2.6, considering σ_i^2 being powers of 4 only loses a factor of 2 compared to the optimal solution. Thus we will only search for σ with each $\sigma_i = 4^{-k}$ or 0 for some integer k .

For any such σ , partition the variables X_1, \dots, X_n to the following $O(\log n)$ groups. Let $K = \log_2 n$. For each $k \leq K$, let G_k contains all variables with variance 4^{-k} . Let G_{K+1} contains all other variables with variance smaller than $\frac{1}{n^2}$. Then for any set S_j ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sum_j \max_{i \in S_j} X_i &= \mathbb{E} \sum_j \max \left(\max_{X_i \in S_j \cap G_0} X_i, \max_{X_i \in S_j \cap G_1} X_i, \dots, \max_{X_i \in S_j \cap G_{K+1}} X_i \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^K \sum_j \mathbb{E} \max(0, \max_{X_i \in S_j \cap G_k} X_i) + \sum_j \mathbb{E} \max(0, \max_{X_i \in S_j \cap G_{K+1}} X_i) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^K \sum_j \mathbb{E} \max(0, \max_{X_i \in S_j \cap G_k} X_i) + \sum_j O\left(\frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\ln n}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

here the last inequality is by Lemma 2.1. When setting all variables to have variance $\frac{1}{n}$, for each set S_j , $\mathbb{E} \max_{i \in S_j} X_i = \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = \omega\left(\frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\ln n}\right)$, thus the contribution from variables in group G_{K+1} in (14) is negligible and we can ignore them. Notice that when setting all variables to have variance either 4^{-k} or 0, the optimal objective is at least $\sum_j \mathbb{E} \max(0, \max_{X_i \in S_j \cap G_k} X_i)$ from this specific σ .⁵ Thus by solving the

⁵For every set S_j , if S_j contains variables from only 1 group, the objective we get is actually $\mathbb{E} \max_{X_i \in S_j \cap G_k} X_i$ instead of $\mathbb{E} \max(0, \max_{X_i \in S_j \cap G_k} X_i)$.

problem where all variables have the same variance 2^{-k} , the obtained objective is at least $O(\frac{1}{\log n})$ fraction of the optimal objective for one of $k \leq \log_2 n$.

Algorithm 3 An $O(\log n)$ -approx algorithm distributing variances to variables in multiple sets

Input: Means (μ_1, \dots, μ_n) , Sets S_1, \dots, S_m
Initialize current best objective $M \leftarrow 0$;
Initialize current best $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n) \leftarrow (0, \dots, 0)$;
Remove all sets with $|S_j| = 1$;
for $k \leftarrow 0$ to $\log_2 n$ **do**
 $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \leftarrow (0, \dots, 0)$;
 while # variables with variance $4^{-k} < \min(4^k, n)$ **do**
 Find the variable i with $\sigma_i = 0$ such that after setting $\sigma_i = 4^{-k}$, $\text{OBJ}(\sigma)$ is maximized;
 $\sigma_i \leftarrow 4^{-k}$;
 end while
 if $\text{OBJ}(\sigma) > M$ **then**
 $M \leftarrow \text{OBJ}(\sigma)$;
 $\hat{\sigma} \leftarrow \sigma$;
 end if
end for
Output: $(\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_n)$

Now we want to solve the following problem: find the set $S \subseteq [n]$ of variables with $|S| \leq 4^k$, such that when all variables $X_i \in S$ have variance $\sigma_i^2 = 4^{-k}$ and all variables not in S have variance 0, the total objective is maximized. By Lemma 2.7 this is a submodular maximization problem with a cardinality constraint, and a greedy solution obtains $1 - \frac{1}{e}$ fraction of the optimal solution Nemhauser et al. [1978]. The complete $O(\log n)$ -approx algorithm is specified in Algorithm 3. □

Lemma B.1. For $n \geq 2$ independent normally distributed variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n with non-negative means $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \max(X_1, \dots, X_n) \geq (1 - 2^{1-n}) \mathbb{E} \max(0, X_1, \dots, X_n).$$

Proof. We consider the following way to generate each $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i)$. Firstly, a positive value Y_i is generated from a half-normal distribution with variance σ_i^2 . In other words, Y_i is the absolute value of a normal variable with mean 0 and variance σ_i^2 . Next, a sign Z_i is generated uniformly from $\{-1, 1\}$, and X_i is determined by $\mu_i + Y_i Z_i$. For any fixed Y_1, \dots, Y_n we show that

$$\mathbb{E}_Z \max(\mu_1 + Y_1 Z_1, \dots, \mu_n + Y_n Z_n) \geq \mathbb{E}_Z \max(0, \mu_1 + Y_1 Z_1, \dots, \mu_n + Y_n Z_n).$$

Suppose that $k = \arg \max_i (\mu_i + Y_i)$. Notice that when $Z_k = 1$, which happens with probability $\frac{1}{2}$, $\max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i) = \max(0, \max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i)) = \mu_k + Y_k$. When $Z_1 = Z_2 = \dots = Z_n = -1$, which happens with probability $\frac{1}{2^n}$, let $t = \max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i)$, then $t \geq -\mu_k - Y_k$. In other cases, $\max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i) = \max(0, \max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i)) \geq 0$, and let $W \geq 0$ be the conditional expectation of $\max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i)$ in this case. Then we have

$$\mathbb{E} \max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_k + Y_k) + \frac{1}{2^n} t + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^n}\right) W,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \max(0, \max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i)) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_k + Y_k) + \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \max(0, t) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^n}\right) W.$$

As $t \geq -\mu_k - Y_k$,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E} \max(0, \max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i))}{\mathbb{E} \max(\mu_i + Y_i Z_i)} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^n}} = \frac{2^{n-1}}{2^{n-1} - 1}$$

for $n \geq 2$. Then the original lemma holds by taking the expectation of the above inequality over all possible Y . \square

Lemma 2.6. For n zero-mean normally distributed variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n with standard deviation $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$, suppose that there are n other zero-mean normally distributed variables X'_1, X'_2, \dots, X'_n with standard deviation $\sigma'_1, \dots, \sigma'_n$ satisfying $\sigma_i \leq \sigma'_i \leq 2\sigma_i$, then $\mathbb{E} \max X'_i \leq \mathbb{E} \max X'_i \leq 2\mathbb{E} \max X_i$.

Proof of Lemma 2.6. For each $i \in [n]$, we couple the generation of X_i and X'_i as follows. Firstly, a positive value Y_i is generated from a half-normal distribution with variance σ_i^2 . Next, a sign Z_i is generated uniformly from $\{-1, 1\}$. Then let $X_i = Y_i Z_i$, and $X'_i = \alpha_i Y_i Z_i$ where $\alpha_i = \frac{\sigma'_i}{\sigma_i}$. Denote $Y'_i = \alpha_i Y_i$. As X'_i has the same distribution as $\alpha_i X_i$, the above procedure correctly generates $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2)$ and $X'_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i'^2)$.

For fixed $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$, we study the relationship between $\mathbb{E} \max X'_i$ and $\mathbb{E} \max X_i$. Let $Y^{(k)}$ denote the k th largest element in Y . Notice that when the largest element in Y has sign $Z_i = 1$, $\max_i X_i = Y^{(1)}$, and this happens with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. When $Y^{(1)}$ has sign -1 and $Y^{(2)}$ has sign $+1$, $\max_i X_i = Y^{(2)}$ and this happens with probability $\frac{1}{4}$. Similarly, for every $k \leq n$, $\max_i X_i = Y^{(k)}$ with probability 2^{-k} . When all Z_i are -1 , $\max_i X_i = -Y^{(n)}$, and this happens with probability 2^{-n} . Thus

$$\mathbb{E} \max_i X_i = \sum_{k=1}^n 2^{-k} Y^{(k)} + 2^{-n} (-Y^{(n)}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} 2^{-k} Y^{(k)}.$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \max_i X'_i = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} 2^{-k} Y'^{(k)}.$$

For $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ and $Y' = (\alpha_1 Y_1, \alpha_2 Y_2, \dots, \alpha_n Y_n)$ with $1 \leq \alpha_i \leq 2$ for every $i \in [n]$, $Y^{(k)} \leq Y'^{(k)} \leq 2Y^{(k)}$ for every $k \in [n]$. Thus for any fixed Y ,

$$\mathbb{E} \max_i X_i = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} 2^{-k} Y^{(k)} \leq \mathbb{E} \max_i X'_i = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} 2^{-k} Y'^{(k)} \leq 2\mathbb{E} \max_i X_i.$$

The original theorem holds by taking the expectation of the above inequality over all possible Y . \square

Lemma 2.7. For n zero-mean normally distributed variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n and $\sigma_0 > 0$, let $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a set function such that for any $S \subseteq [n]$, $f(S) = \mathbb{E} \max_{i \in [n]} X_i$ where $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_0^2)$ for $i \in S$ and $X_i \equiv 0$ for $i \notin S$. Then f is a submodular function.

Proof of Lemma 2.7. It suffices to prove the lemma for $\sigma_0 = 1$, as the expected maximum with $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_0^2)$ is just σ_0 fraction of the expected maximum with $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

For any $k \in [n]$, let $g(k) = \mathbb{E} \max(0, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k)$. Then for any S with $|S| = k$, $f(S) = g(k)$, except when $|S| = n$, $g(n) = \mathbb{E} \max(0, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) > \mathbb{E} \max(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) = f(S)$. Thus to

prove $f(S)$ is submodular, we only need to prove the submodularity of g , or equivalently for any $k \geq 1$, $g(k+1) - g(k) < g(k) - g(k-1)$.

Let Φ be the CDF of the standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Then $\max(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ has CDF Φ^k , and

$$g(k) = \mathbb{E} \max(0, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k) = \int_0^\infty (1 - \Phi^k(x)) dx.$$

Then for any k ,

$$\begin{aligned} g(k) - g(k-1) &= \int_0^\infty (1 - \Phi^k(x)) dx - \int_0^\infty (1 - \Phi^{k-1}(x)) dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty \Phi^{k-1}(x)(1 - \Phi(x)) dx \\ &\geq \int_0^\infty \Phi^k(x)(1 - \Phi(x)) dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty (1 - \Phi^{k+1}(x)) dx - \int_0^\infty (1 - \Phi^k(x)) dx \\ &= g(k+1) - g(k). \end{aligned}$$

Thus g is a submodular function, which implies that f is a submodular set function. □

Lemma B.2. For any $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\max(a, b) + \max(a, c) \geq \max(a, b, c) + a.$$

Proof of Lemma B.2. As b and c are symmetric in the desired inequality, without loss of generality assume $b \geq c$. Discuss the order of the variables as follows.

- When $a \geq b \geq c$: $LHS = a + a \geq a + a = RHS$.
- When $b \geq a \geq c$: $LHS = b + a \geq b + a = RHS$.
- When $b \geq c \geq a$: $LHS = b + c \geq b + a = RHS$.

Thus the lemma holds for all possible orderings of a, b, c . □

Lemma B.3. For any $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &3 \max(a, b, c, d) + \max(a, d) + \max(b, d) + \max(c, d) \\ &\leq 2 \max(a, b, d) + 2 \max(a, c, d) + 2 \max(b, c, d). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma B.3. By applying Lemma B.2 to $\max(a, d)$, b and c , we get

$$\max(a, b, d) + \max(a, c, d) \geq \max(a, b, c, d) + \max(a, d).$$

In the same way we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \max(a, b, d) + \max(b, c, d) &\geq \max(a, b, c, d) + \max(b, d), \\ \max(a, c, d) + \max(b, c, d) &\geq \max(a, b, c, d) + \max(c, d). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma holds by adding the above three inequalities. □

Theorem 1.5. Let I_k be an instance for GraphVarAlloc with all $\binom{n}{k}$ sets of size k : for every $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n$, there is a set $S_j = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ in this instance. Let $f(k) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \text{OPT}_{I_k}$ be the per-set contribution to the optimal objective in instance I_k . Then $g(k)$ is a concave function.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. For any variance allocation σ , we prove that $f_\sigma(k) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \text{OBJ}_{I_k}(\sigma)$ is a concave function. Then $f = \max_\sigma f_\sigma$ is also concave, as it's the maximum over a set of concave functions.

For any fixed σ , for simplicity let $g = f_\sigma$. To prove the concavity of g , we prove that for any $k \geq 3$,

$$g(k) + g(k-2) \leq 2g(k-1). \quad (15)$$

Notice that $g(k)$ is the per-set contribution to the objective. We can get an equivalent definition: randomly sample k elements (i_1, \dots, i_k) from $[n]$ without replacement, then

$$g(k) = \mathbb{E}_{(X_1, \dots, X_n)} \mathbb{E}_{(i_1, \dots, i_k)} \max(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}).$$

Such a sampling can be viewed as first sample $k-3$ elements (i_4, \dots, i_k) without replacement, then sample 3 more elements (i_1, i_2, i_3) without replacement. $g(k-1)$ can be viewed as first sample $k-3$ elements (i_4, \dots, i_k) without replacement, then sample 3 more elements (i_1, i_2, i_3) without replacement, then choose two variables from X_{i_1}, X_{i_2} and X_{i_3} :

$$\begin{aligned} g(k-1) = \mathbb{E}_{(X_1, \dots, X_n)} \mathbb{E}_{(i_1, \dots, i_k)} & \frac{1}{3} \left(\max(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \right. \\ & + \max(X_{i_1}, X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \\ & \left. + \max(X_{i_2}, X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

$g(k-2)$ can be viewed as first sample $k-3$ elements (i_4, \dots, i_k) without replacement, then sample 3 more elements (i_1, i_2, i_3) without replacement, then choose one variable from X_{i_1}, X_{i_2} and X_{i_3} :

$$\begin{aligned} g(k-2) = \mathbb{E}_{(X_1, \dots, X_n)} \mathbb{E}_{(i_1, \dots, i_k)} & \frac{1}{3} \left(\max(X_{i_1}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \right. \\ & + \max(X_{i_2}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \\ & \left. + \max(X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

To prove that $g(k) + g(k-2) \leq 2g(k-1)$, it suffices to show that this inequality holds even for every realization of (X_1, \dots, X_n) and (i_1, \dots, i_k) . After removing the expectation quantifier, we get

$$\begin{aligned} g(k) &= \max(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}), \\ g(k-1) &= \frac{1}{3} \left(\max(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) + \max(X_{i_1}, X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \max(X_{i_2}, X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \right), \\ g(k-2) &= \frac{1}{3} \left(\max(X_{i_1}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) + \max(X_{i_2}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \max(X_{i_3}, X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By applying $a = X_{i_1}, b = X_{i_2}, c = X_{i_3}$ and $d = \max(X_{i_4}, \dots, X_{i_k})$, we exactly get $3g(k) + 3g(k-2) \leq 6g(k-1)$. By taking the expectation over all possible realizations of (X_1, \dots, X_n) and (i_1, \dots, i_k) we have finished the proof of (15), thus the concavity of the function. \square

Lemma 2.8. *For any multi-dimensional Gaussian vector $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, consider independent Gaussian variables with the same means and variances $(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \text{diag}(\Sigma))$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \max(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leq \frac{2e}{e-1} \mathbb{E} \max(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n).$$

Proof of Lemma 2.8. For any $t \geq 0$, we analyze $\Pr[\max_i X_i \geq t]$ and $\Pr[\max_i Y_i \geq t]$. We first prove that

$$\Pr[\max_i Y_i \geq t] \geq \frac{e-1}{e} \Pr[\max_i X_i \geq t]. \quad (16)$$

For any $i \in [n]$, let $q_i = \Pr[Y_i \geq t]$. Notice that the marginal distributions X_i and Y_i are exactly the same normal distributions with identical mean μ_i and variance Σ_{ii} , we have $\Pr[X_i \geq t]$ is also q_i . Then for correlated variables X_1, \dots, X_n , $\Pr[\max_i X_i \geq t] \leq \sum_i q_i$; for independent variables Y_1, \dots, Y_n ,

$$\Pr[\max_i Y_i \geq t] = 1 - \prod_i (1 - q_i) \geq 1 - \prod_i e^{-q_i} = 1 - e^{-\sum_i q_i}.$$

Let $q = \sum_i q_i$. When $q \geq 1$,

$$\frac{\Pr[\max_i Y_i \geq t]}{\Pr[\max_i X_i \geq t]} \geq \Pr[\max_i Y_i \geq t] \geq 1 - e^{-q} \geq 1 - e^{-1}.$$

When $q < 1$,

$$\frac{\Pr[\max_i Y_i \geq t]}{\Pr[\max_i X_i \geq t]} \geq \frac{1 - e^{-q}}{q}.$$

Let $g(q) = \frac{1-e^{-q}}{q}$. As $g'(q) = \frac{e^{-q}q - 1 + e^{-q}}{q^2} < 0$ for $0 < q < 1$, we have g is a decreasing function on $(0, 1)$. Thus $g(q) > g(1) = 1 - e^{-1}$ for $0 < q < 1$. This finishes the proof of (16) for every $t \geq 0$.

Now we are ready to prove the original lemma using (16). Actually,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \max(X_1, \dots, X_n) &\leq \mathbb{E} \max(0, X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \Pr[\max_i X_i \geq t] dt \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \frac{e}{e-1} \Pr[\max_i Y_i \geq t] dt \\ &= \frac{e}{e-1} \mathbb{E} \max(0, Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \\ &\leq \frac{2e}{e-1} \mathbb{E} \max(Y_1, \dots, Y_n). \end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality is from Lemma B.1 for $n \geq 2$. This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square