

Revisiting Ranking for Online Bipartite Matching with Random Arrivals: the Primal-Dual Analysis

Bo Peng^{*} Zhihao Gavin Tang[†]

Abstract

We revisit the celebrated Ranking algorithm by Karp, Vazirani, and Vazirani (STOC 1990) for online bipartite matching under the random arrival model, that is shown to be 0.696-competitive for unweighted graphs by Mahdian and Yan (STOC 2011) and 0.662-competitive for vertex-weighted graphs by Jin and Williamson (WINE 2021).

In this work, we explore the limitation of the primal-dual analysis of Ranking and aim to bridge the gap between unweighted and vertex-weighted graphs. We show that the competitive ratio of Ranking is between 0.686 and 0.703, under our current knowledge of Ranking and the framework of primal-dual analysis. This confirms a conjecture by Huang, Tang, Wu, and Zhang (TALG 2019), stating that the primal-dual analysis could lead to a competitive ratio that is very close to 0.696. Our analysis involves proper discretizations of a variational problem and uses LP solver to pin down the numerical number. As a bonus of our discretization approach, our competitive analysis of Ranking applies to a more relaxed random arrival model. E.g., we show that even when each online vertex arrives independently at an early or late stage, the Ranking algorithm is at least 0.665-competitive, beating the $1 - 1/e \approx 0.632$ competitive ratio under the adversarial arrival model.

1 Introduction

In a seminal work, Karp, Vazirani, and Vazirani [30] introduced the online bipartite matching problem and the Ranking algorithm. Consider a bipartite graph whose two sides of the vertices being offline and online respectively. The offline vertices are known in advance and the online vertices arrive one by one in a sequence. Upon the arrival of an online vertex, its incident edges are revealed and the algorithm chooses immediately one of its unmatched neighbor (if any) to match to. The goal is to maximize the size of the selected matching. The Ranking algorithm works as the following: it uniformly at random permutes all offline vertices in advance and then matches each online vertex to the first unmatched neighbor with respect to the permutation. The algorithm is shown to be $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -competitive and this ratio is the best possible in the worst case.

Since then, online bipartite matching has become an exceptionally active and productive topic within the online algorithms community. A rich variants of the online bipartite matching problems have been proposed and Ranking is mostly the first algorithm to be investigated for its viability. Aggarwal et al. [1] generalized the Ranking algorithm to vertex-weighted graphs and proved an optimal $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ competitive ratio. Karande, Mehta, and Tripathi [29], and Mahdian and Yan [32] examined the performance of Ranking in the of random arrival model and established a competitive ratio of 0.696. Huang et al. [23] studied the combination of the two settings, i.e., for vertex-weighted

^{*}ITCS, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, ahqspb@163.sufe.edu.cn

[†]ITCS, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, tang.zhihao@mail.shufe.edu.cn

graphs with random arrivals and proved that the Ranking algorithm achieves a competitive ratio of 0.653. The competitive ratio is later improved by Jin and Williamson [28] to 0.662.

The analysis of Ranking has also been simplified by a series of work [3, 15, 9, 10]. Remarkably, the randomized primal-dual analysis by Devanur, Jain, and Kleinberg [9] unified the competitive analysis of Ranking on unweighted and vertex-weighted graphs. The framework has been further developed and applied to other online matching problems and an important merit of the primal-dual analysis is its intrinsic robustness for vertex-weighted graphs. Many variants of the online matching problem that employ the primal-dual analysis thus share the same state-of-the-art competitive ratio for unweighted graphs and vertex-weighted graphs. One exception is the significant gap between the state-of-the-art competitive ratios for unweighted and vertex-weighted graphs in the random arrival model. The analysis of Mahdian and Yan is not primal-dual based and it remains unclear whether their 0.696 competitive ratio carries over to the vertex-weighted case, since Jin and Williamson observed a 0.668 barrier of the previous randomized primal-dual analysis of Huang et al. [23].

In addition, the primal-dual analysis admits a folklore economic interpretation, refer to e.g. [10, 17]. In fact, it simulates a dynamic pricing process. Given a bipartite graph $G = (L, R, E)$, consider the offline vertices L as goods and the online vertices R as utility-maximizing unit-demand buyers. Then in the primal-dual analysis, each dual variable t_v for $v \in L$ corresponds to the price of good v ; and each dual variable t_u for $u \in R$ corresponds to the utility of buyer u .

In this work, we revisit the randomized primal-dual analysis of Ranking for online bipartite matching with random arrivals and aim to bridge the existing gap between the unweighted case and the vertex-weighted case. We formalize the best factor-revealing optimization using our current knowledge of Ranking¹ under the randomized primal-dual framework, and explore the limitation of this approach. We provide a lower bound of 0.6862 and an upper bound of 0.7027.

Theorem 1.1. *The Ranking algorithm is at least 0.6862-competitive for the vertex-weighted online bipartite matching problem with random arrivals.*

Theorem 1.2 (Informal, refer to Theorem 2.1). *Under the current randomized primal-dual framework, it is impossible to establish a competitive ratio better than 0.7027 of Ranking in the random arrival model, even for unweighted graphs.*

Our positive result confirms a conjecture of Huang et al. [23], stating that the primal-dual analysis could lead to a competitive ratio that is very close to 0.696. Our analysis involves proper discretizations of the optimization problem and uses LP solver to pin down the numerical number. As a bonus of our discretization approach, our positive result holds with respect to a family of *independent random arrival* model, that smoothly bridge the worst-case arrival order and the classical random arrival model.

Independent Random Arrival. Let there be n online vertices and m stages from early to late. We assume that each online vertex arrives independently at one of the stages. Among the vertices that arrive at the same stage, their relative order is arbitrary. Notice that when $m = 1$, the model degenerates to the worst-case arrival order; when $m \rightarrow \infty$, the model becomes the classical random arrival model as the probability of having two vertices at the same stage is $o(1)$.

Theorem 1.3. *When each online vertex arrives independently at early or late stage (i.e., $m = 2$), the Ranking algorithm is at least 0.6656-competitive. When each online vertex arrives independently at an early, middle, or late stage (i.e., $m = 3$), the Ranking algorithm is at least 0.6763-competitive.*

¹We do not define accurately what we mean by the best factor-revealing optimization. We remark that our formulation utilizes the same structural properties of Ranking as Mahdian and Yan and shall make further remarks regarding this statement in Section 3.2.

The minimal independent random arrival that goes beyond the worst-case arrival is when $m = 2$. Even for this case, our 0.6656 competitive ratio improves the previous best 0.6629 ratio of Jin and Williamson [28]. And when $m = 3$, our result surpasses the 0.6688 barrier of previous approaches. Refer to Section 4.1 Table 1 for more competitive ratios of different m .

Finally, we would like to remark that the current best ratios (i.e., 0.6862 and 0.7027) are limited by computational power, but not our approach. We also observe that the current randomized primal-dual analysis leads to numerically close competitive ratios as those ratios of the strongly factor-revealing linear program of Mahdian and Yan². More details are provided in the discussion section.

1.1 Further Related Works

Besides the series of works simplifying the competitive analysis of Ranking, Uriel Feige [12] improved the analysis of Ranking for lower order terms. Moreover, the Ranking algorithm has also been studied for other variants of maximum matching problems. In the fully online matching setting, Huang et al. established a 0.567-competitive ratio for bipartite graphs [20] and a 0.521-competitive ratio for general graphs [19]. In the oblivious matching problem, Chan et al. [8, 7] established a 0.526-competitive ratio for general graphs.

The randomized primal-dual approach has been further developed beyond the classical online bipartite matching problem, including edge-weighted online bipartite matching [11, 4], AdWords [34, 26], fully online matching [19, 24, 20], oblivious matching [39], online matching with stochastic rewards [25, 18], and streaming submodular matching [31], etc. Remarkably, the state-of-the-art competitive ratios of these settings are all primal-dual based analysis.

Beyond the random arrival order setting, there is a line of work studying online stochastic matching. Feldman et al. [13] introduced the known i.i.d. arrival model in 2009, earlier than the time when the random arrival model is studied, and provided the first competitive algorithm that surpasses the $1 - 1/e$ barrier. The competitive ratio is later improved by a series of works [2, 6, 27, 33, 21, 38, 22]. The stochastic setting is further extended to vertex-weighted graphs [27, 21, 38, 22], edge-weighted graphs [6, 16, 14, 40], and non-identical arrival setting [38]. Recently, there is a growing interest in designing computationally efficient algorithms against the optimal online algorithm [36, 37, 5, 35] for stochastic matching.

2 Preliminaries

Let there be an underlying vertex-weighted bipartite graph $G = (L, R, E)$, where L denotes the set of offline vertices and R denotes the set of online vertices. Each offline vertex $v \in L$ is associated with a non-negative weight w_v .

(Vertex-Weighted) Ranking. The vertex-weighted Ranking algorithm is characterized by a function $f : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Each offline vertex v draws in advance an independent random variable $y_v \in [0, 1]$ uniformly at random. We refer to y_v the rank of v . Each online vertex u draws an independent variable $x_u \in [0, 1]$ uniformly at random. We refer to x_u the arrival time of u . The time flows continuously from 0 to 1. Upon the arrival of vertex u , it matches the unmatched neighbor v (if exists) with maximum $w_v \cdot (1 - f(x_u, y_v))$.

²The current state-of-the-art 0.696 competitive ratio is also limited by computational power. Mahdian and Yan showed that their approach would lead to a ratio between 0.6961 and 0.7014.

We shall focus on functions f that satisfies the following three conditions: 1) f is non-increasing in the first dimension; 2) f is non-decreasing in the second dimension; 3) $f(x, 1) = 1$ and $f(1, y) = 0$ for every $x \in [0, 1]$ and $y \in [0, 1)$. We use \mathcal{F} to denote the set of all such functions. We remark that for unweighted graphs, any choice of the function f that is strictly monotone in the second dimension would lead to the same classical Ranking algorithm by Karp et al. [30].

Primal-dual Analysis. We follow the (randomized) primal dual analysis of Devanur, Jain, and Kleinberg [9]. Consider the following linear program of the vertex-weighted bipartite matching problem and its dual.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\max : & \sum_{(u,v) \in E} w_v \cdot s_{uv} \\
\text{s.t.} & \sum_{u:(u,v) \in E} s_{uv} \leq 1 \quad \forall v \in L \\
& \sum_{v:(u,v) \in E} s_{uv} \leq 1 \quad \forall u \in R \\
& s_{uv} \geq 0 \quad \forall (u,v) \in E \\
\min : & \sum_{v \in L} t_v + \sum_{u \in R} t_u \\
\text{s.t.} & t_u + t_v \geq w_v \quad \forall (u,v) \in E \\
& t_v \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in L \\
& t_u \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in R
\end{array}$$

The Ranking algorithm induces a natural assignment to the primal and dual variables for any $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^R$ and $\mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^L$. Whenever an edge (u, v) is matched, let $s_{uv} = 1$, $t_u = (1 - f(x_u, y_v)) \cdot w_v$, and $t_v = f(x_u, y_v) \cdot w_v$. By Lemma 2.1 of Huang et al. [23], to establish a competitive ratio of Γ , it suffices to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} [t_u + t_v] \geq \Gamma \cdot w_v .$$

Economic Interpretation. The Ranking algorithm and the primal-dual analysis admit a folklore economic interpretation, refer to e.g. [10]. Consider the offline vertices as goods and the online vertices as buyers. Then, $w_v \cdot f(x, y_v)$ is the price of good v at time x . When buyer u arrives at time x_u , she buys the good that gives her the largest utility, i.e., $w_v \cdot (1 - f(x_u, y_v))$. In this language, each dual variable t_v for $v \in L$ corresponds to the price of selling of good v ; and each dual variable t_u for $u \in R$ correspond to the utility of buyer u .

Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 3.1 of Huang et al. [23]. Refer to Figure 1a). *Fix an arbitrary edge $(u, v) \in E$ and arbitrary $\mathbf{x}_{-u} \in [0, 1]^{R-u}$, $\mathbf{y}_{-v} \in [0, 1]^{L-v}$. For each $x \in [0, 1]$, there exist thresholds $0 \leq \beta(x) \leq \alpha(x) \leq 1$, such that when u arrives at time $x_u = x$:*

- if $y_v < \beta(x)$, v is matched when u arrives;
- if $y_v \in (\beta(x), \alpha(x))$, edge (u, v) is matched;
- if $y_v > \alpha(x)$, v is unmatched after u 's arrival.

Moreover, $\beta(x)$ is a non-decreasing function.

2.1 Formulating the Optimization Problem

We establish the following lower bound on the expected sum of the dual variables $t_u + t_v$ over the randomness of x_u, y_v . The bound is suggested by Huang et al. [23] in the discussion section of their work (with different notations). Indeed, it is the most natural bound that utilizes all combinatorial




Figure 1: Illustration of Lemma 2.1 and 2.2

properties of our current understanding of the Ranking algorithm in the online bipartite matching problem with random arrivals. However, both works of Huang et al. [23] and Jin and Williamson [28] are only able to analyze a relaxed version of it and a 0.6688 barrier is established for the relaxed optimization by Jin and Williamson. For completeness, we provide a proof of the lemma. Refer to Figure 1 .

Lemma 2.2. *For any edge $(u, v) \in E$ and any $\mathbf{x}_{-u} \in [0, 1]^{R-u}, \mathbf{y}_{-v} \in [0, 1]^{L-v}$, let $\alpha(x), \beta(x)$ be defined as in Lemma 2.1 and $\beta^{-1}(y)$ be the inverse function of $\beta(x)$, i.e., $\beta^{-1}(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{x : \beta(x) \leq y\}$. Then we have $\mathbb{E}_{x_u, y_v} [t_u + t_v] \geq \Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta) \cdot w_v$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^1 \alpha(x) dx - \int_0^1 \beta(x) dx && ((u, v) \text{ matched}) \\ &+ \int_0^1 (1 - \alpha(x) + \beta(x)) \cdot (1 - f(x, \alpha(x))) dx && (\mathbb{E}[t_u], \text{Figure 1b}) \\ &+ \int_0^1 (1 - \beta^{-1}(y)) \cdot f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy + \int_0^1 \int_{\alpha(x)}^1 f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy dx && (\mathbb{E}[t_v], \text{Figure 1c}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Notice that for any $x_u \in [0, 1]$, if $y_v \in (\beta(x_u), \alpha(x_u))$, u, v are matched to each other and $t_u + t_v = w_v$. Hence we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_u, y_v} [(t_u + t_v) \cdot \mathbb{1}[\beta(x_u) < y_v < \alpha(x_u)]] = \left(\int_0^1 \alpha(x) dx - \int_0^1 \beta(x) dx \right) \cdot w_v.$$

Next, we consider the gain of t_u when u is matched to $z \neq v$. Refer to Figure 1b. For any x_u , $t_u \geq (1 - f(x_u, \alpha(x_u))) \cdot w_v$ holds trivially for the special case when $\alpha(x_u) = 1$, due to the boundary condition that $f(x, 1) = 1$. Otherwise, when $y_v = \alpha(x_u) + \varepsilon$, v remains unmatched after u 's arrival, which implies that $t_u \geq (1 - f(x_u, \alpha(x_u))) \cdot w_v$. The same inequality then holds for every $y_v > \alpha(x_u)$. For $y_v < \beta(x_u)$, by the Monotonicity Lemma (refer to Lemma 2.3 of [9]), t_u can only be larger in $G = (L, R)$ than that in $G = (L \setminus \{v\}, R)$. Thus, we still have $t_u \geq (1 - f(x_u, \alpha(x_u))) \cdot w_v$. To sum up,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_u, y_v} [t_u \cdot \mathbb{1}[y_v < \beta(x_u) \text{ or } y_v > \alpha(x_u)]] \geq \int_0^1 (1 - \alpha(x) + \beta(x)) \cdot (1 - f(x, \alpha(x))) dx \cdot w_v.$$

Similarly, we have that $t_v \geq f(\beta^{-1}(y_v), y_v) \cdot w_v$ for $y_v > \alpha(x_u)$ or $y_v < \beta(x_u)$. Refer to Figure 1c. But we integrate the two parts from different directions.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x_u, y_v} [t_v \cdot \mathbb{1}[y_v < \beta(x_u)]] &\geq \int_0^1 (1 - \beta^{-1}(y)) \cdot f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy \cdot w_v \\ \mathbb{E}_{x_u, y_v} [t_v \cdot \mathbb{1}[y_v > \alpha(x_u)]] &\geq \int_0^1 \int_{\alpha(x)}^1 f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy dx \cdot w_v \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

Remark 2.1. For unweighted graphs, it can be shown that $\alpha(x)$ must also be non-decreasing and we can define its inverse function as $\alpha^{-1}(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{x : \alpha(x) \leq y\}$. This would allow us to simplify the third line of the equation above to $\int_0^1 (1 - \beta^{-1}(y) + \alpha^{-1}(y)) \cdot f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy$, so that $\Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta)$ becomes symmetric for $\alpha(x)$ and $\beta^{-1}(y)$. However, for vertex-weighted graphs, $\alpha(x)$ is not necessarily monotone (refer to Remark 3.2 of [23]). Our lower bound result in Section 3.1 shall treat the two curves α, β in an asymmetric way and our upper bound result in Section 3.2 shall treat the two curves in a symmetric way.

For an arbitrary $f \in \mathcal{F}$, let S_f denote the set of all possible pairs (α, β) that admit a graph G , an edge (u, v) and $\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{y}_v$ that implements the two curves. Hereafter, we focus on solving the following optimization problem.

$$\textbf{Optimization:} \quad \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \inf_{(\alpha, \beta) \in S_f} \Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta). \quad (1)$$

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 2.1. *The value of optimization (1) is between 0.6862 and 0.7027.*

3 Discretization

Despite the closed-form formulation of the max-min optimization problem, it is unclear how to solve it even numerically. Observe that the inner optimization itself is essentially a variational problem, i.e., finding α, β 's to minimize $\Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta)$ against a fixed f . We would like to remark that the previous works by Huang et al. [23] and Jin and Williamson [28] are aware of this optimization problem but failed to solve it. Indeed, both works state as an interesting question to solve optimization (1). In this section, we establish two family of linear programs that lower and upper bound optimization (1) respectively. A key observation is that for any fixed α and β , $\Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta)$ is linear as a functional of f . This observation is crucial for constructing our linear programs.

3.1 Lower Bound

We first restrict ourselves to discretized functions f in the current form. Given an $g : \{0, 1, \dots, m\} \times \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that is 1) non-increasing in the first dimension, 2) non-decreasing in the second dimension, and 3) $g(i, n) = 1, g(m, j) = 0$ for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ and $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$, let f be defined as $f(x, y) = g(\lfloor mx \rfloor, \lfloor ny \rfloor)$. Refer to Figure 2a.

Our first lemma states that for such discretized functions f , it suffices to study discretized functions α, β . More formally, we defined grid paths on the $m \times n$ grid.

Definition 3.1. *A function $\theta : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called a grid path on the $m \times n$ grid if*




Figure 2: Illustration of the discretization for $m = 3, n = 4$

- $\theta(x) = \theta(x'), \forall x, x' \in [0, 1]$ s.t. $\lfloor mx \rfloor = \lfloor mx' \rfloor$;
- $\theta(x) \in \{0, \frac{1}{n}, \frac{2}{n}, \dots, 1\}, \forall x \in [0, 1]$;
- $\theta(1) = 1$.

Lemma 3.1. For the family of discretized functions f above, without loss of generality, we can restrict ourselves to grid paths α, β on the $m \times n$ grid, where β is further monotonic (refer to Figure 2b).

Proof. By discretizing the x -axis, we are effectively studying the independent random arrival model:

- Let there be m stages (from early to late).
- Each online vertex u draws independently $j_u \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ uniformly at random and arrives at the j_u -th stage. Then, $x_u \in [\frac{j-1}{n}, \frac{j}{m})$ corresponds to case when u arrives at the j -th stage.
- If there are multiple vertices arriving at the same stage j , order them arbitrarily but in a consistent manner³.

Observe that when $m = 1$, we are effectively studying the online bipartite matching problem with the worst-case arrival order; when $m \rightarrow \infty$, we are effectively studying the random arrival order model since with $o(1)$ probability, two vertices would arrive at the same stage. Thus, $\alpha(x) = \alpha(x')$ (and $\beta(x) = \beta(x')$) for every $x, x' \in [\frac{j}{m}, \frac{j+1}{m}), j \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, since x, x' induces the same arrival order.

By discretizing the y -axis, we are effectively running a discretized version of Ranking where each offline vertices have only n different ranks rather than a continuous rank between $[0, 1]$. If $y, y' \in [\frac{i}{n}, \frac{i+1}{n}), i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, the corresponding prize of v at any time x are the same, i.e., $w_v \cdot (1 - f(x, y)) = w_v \cdot (1 - f(x, y'))$. Hence, they would lead to the same matching by Ranking. According to our definition of $\alpha(x)$ (and $\beta(x)$), the matching status is changed when y_v goes from

³Let R_j be the set of online vertices that arrive in the j -th stage. They might arrive in an arbitrary order as long as it satisfies the following consistency condition. If a vertex $u \in R_j$ is switched to another stage, the relative arrival order of the remaining vertices in R_j does not change.

$\alpha^-(x)$ to $\alpha^+(x)$ (resp., from $\beta^-(x)$ to $\beta^+(x)$). It must be the case that $\alpha(x)$ (and $\beta(x)$) take values of $\frac{i}{n}$ for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$.

The two observations together lead to the conclusion that $\alpha(x), \beta(x)$ are both grid paths on the $m \times n$ grid. \square

We introduce an alternative discretized representation of a grid path that is more convenient for our further analysis. Refer to Figure 2c for the following observation and definition.

Observation 3.1. *Every grid path β on the $m \times n$ grid can be represented by a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}^{m+1}$ that are indexed from 0 to m , where $b_i = n \cdot \beta\left(\frac{i}{m}\right)$.*

Definition 3.2. *We use \mathcal{B} to denote the set of non-decreasing vectors $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}^{m+1}$, i.e., $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{b} : b_i \geq b_{i'}, \forall i > i'\}$. For each $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}$, we use \mathbf{b}^- to denote the inverse vector of \mathbf{b} , i.e., $b_j^- \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{i : b_i > j\}$.*

Now, we are ready to establish a linear program that serves as a lower bound of Optimization (1).

Lemma 3.2. *The value of optimization (1) is at least the value of the following linear program:*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\Gamma, g, h} : \Gamma && \text{(LP: Lower Bound)} \\
& \text{s.t. : } \Gamma \leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{b_j^-}{m}\right) \cdot g(b_j^-, j) - \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{b_i}{n} + \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} h(i, \mathbf{b}) \quad \forall \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B} \\
& h(i, \mathbf{b}) \leq \frac{j}{n} + \left(1 - \frac{j}{n} + \frac{b_i}{n}\right) \cdot (1 - g(i, j)) + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{k=j}^{n-1} g(b_k^-, k) \quad \forall i, \mathbf{b}, b_i \leq j \leq n \\
& g(i, j) \leq g(i, j+1) && \forall 0 \leq i \leq m, 0 \leq j < n \\
& g(i, j) \geq g(i+1, j) && \forall 0 \leq i < m, 0 \leq j \leq n \\
& g(i, n) = 1 && \forall 0 \leq i \leq m \\
& g(m, j) = 0 && \forall 0 \leq j < n
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We use g^*, h^*, Γ^* to denote the optimal solution of the above linear program. And let $f(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g^*(\lfloor mx \rfloor, \lfloor ny \rfloor)$. We rearrange the bound of $\Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta)$ from Lemma 2.2 as the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta) &= \int_0^1 (1 - \beta^{-1}(y)) \cdot f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy - \int_0^1 \beta(x) dx \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 \left(\alpha(x) + (1 - \alpha(x) + \beta(x)) \cdot (1 - f(x, \alpha(x))) + \int_{\alpha(x)}^1 f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy \right) dx
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1, it suffices to study grid paths α, β and we use $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}^{m+1}$ to denote

the corresponding vector of α, β respectively. Then we have that

$$\int_0^1 (1 - \beta^{-1}(y)) \cdot f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy - \int_0^1 \beta(x) dx = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{b_j^-}{m}\right) \cdot g^*(b_j^-, j) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{b_i}{n};$$

and $\int_0^1 \alpha(x) dx + \int_0^1 (1 - \alpha(x) + \beta(x)) \cdot (1 - f(x, \alpha(x))) dx + \int_0^1 \int_{\alpha(x)}^1 f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy dx$

$$= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{a_i}{n} + \left(1 - \frac{a_i}{n} + \frac{b_i}{n}\right) \cdot (1 - g^*(i, a_i)) + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{k=a_i}^{n-1} g^*(b_k^-, k) \right)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \min_{j \geq b_i} \left(\frac{j}{n} + \left(1 - \frac{j}{n} + \frac{b_i}{n}\right) \cdot (1 - g^*(i, j)) + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{k=j}^{n-1} g^*(b_k^-, k) \right) \geq \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} h^*(i, \mathbf{b}),$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that $a_i \in \{b_i, \dots, n\}$ and the last inequality follows from the second family of constraints of our linear program. Putting the two bounds together concludes that $\Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta) \geq \Gamma^*$ for all α, β . \square

3.2 Upper Bound

In this subsection, we establish a linear program that upper bounds optimization (1). We shall again focus on grid paths α, β . We first show that all such grid paths are implementable.




Figure 3: The red vertices correspond to the online vertices and the numbers written in the circles correspond to their arrival time. The blue vertices correspond to the offline vertices and the number written in the circles correspond to their ranks.

Lemma 3.3. *For any non-decreasing grid paths α, β on the $m \times n$ grid with $\beta(x) \leq \alpha(x)$, there exists an unweighted graph G , an edge $e = (u, v) \in G$ and $\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{y}_v$ that implements $\alpha(x), \beta(x)$. I.e., α, β satisfy the conditions as stated in Lemma 2.1.*

Proof. Consider a graph with $4m + 2$ vertices including u, v and $4m + 1$ edges (refer to Figure 3). The red vertices correspond to the online vertices and the numbers therein indicate their arrival times. The blue vertices correspond to the offline vertices and the numbers therein indicate their ranks. Suppose that the vertex u arrives at time $x_u \in (\frac{i}{m}, \frac{i+1}{m})$. Then if $y_v < \beta(\frac{i}{m})$, v must be matched

before time $\frac{i}{m}$; otherwise, u 's best choice is between y_v and $\alpha\left(\frac{i}{m}\right)$. That is, if $y_v \in \left(\beta\left(\frac{i}{m}\right), \alpha\left(\frac{i}{m}\right)\right)$, (u, v) is matched and otherwise u matches to a neighbor with rank $\alpha\left(\frac{i}{m}\right)$. \square

Remark 3.1. *This lemma justifies the optimality of Optimization (1) under our current knowledge of the Ranking algorithm and the randomized primal-dual framework. Indeed, if we restrict the analysis to set the dual variables as we do, i.e., $t_u = 1 - f(x_u, y_v)$ and $t_v = f(x_u, y_v)$ when (u, v) is matched by the algorithm, the above lemma gives a graph for which $\mathbb{E}[t_u + t_v] = \Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta)$.*

Lemma 3.4. *The value of optimization (1) is at most the value of the following linear program:*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\Gamma, g} : \Gamma && \text{(LP: Upper Bound)} \\
& \text{s.t. : } \Gamma \leq \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{a_i}{n} - \frac{b_i}{n} \right) + \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(1 - \frac{a_i}{n} + \frac{b_i}{n} \right) (1 - g(i+1, a_i)) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{b_j^-}{m} \right) \cdot g(b_j^-, j+1) + \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=a_i}^{n-1} g(b_j^-, j+1) \right) \quad \forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B} \text{ s.t. } a_i \geq b_i \\
& g(i, j) \leq g(i, j+1) && \forall 0 \leq i \leq m, 0 \leq j < n \\
& g(i, j) \geq g(i+1, j) && \forall 0 \leq i < m, 0 \leq j \leq n \\
& g(i, n) = 1 && \forall 0 \leq i \leq m \\
& g(m, j) = 0 && \forall 0 \leq j < n
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For an arbitrary function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we use $g : \{0, 1, \dots, m\} \times \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ to denote the function values of f on grid points, i.e., $g(i, j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f\left(\frac{i}{m}, \frac{j}{n}\right)$. According to Lemma 3.3, all grid paths α, β on the $m \times n$ grid are implementable. In other words, we have that

$$\Gamma^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{(\alpha, \beta) \in S_f} \Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta) \leq \min_{\text{grid } \alpha, \beta} \Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta).$$

It suffices to show that Γ^* and g are feasible to the linear program as stated in the lemma. For any non-decreasing grid paths α, β , we use $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}^{m+1}$ to denote their corresponding vectors as in Observation 3.1. Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(f, \alpha, \beta) &= \int_0^1 \alpha(x) dx - \int_0^1 \beta(x) dx + \int_0^1 (1 - \alpha(x) + \beta(x)) \cdot (1 - f(x, \alpha(x))) dx \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 (1 - \beta^{-1}(y)) \cdot f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy + \int_0^1 \int_{\alpha(x)}^1 f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy dx \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int_{\frac{i}{m}}^{\frac{i+1}{m}} (\alpha(x) - \beta(x)) dx + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int_{\frac{i}{m}}^{\frac{i+1}{m}} (1 - \alpha(x) + \beta(x)) \cdot (1 - f(x, \alpha(x))) dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_{\frac{j}{n}}^{\frac{j+1}{n}} (1 - \beta^{-1}(y)) \cdot f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int_{\frac{i}{m}}^{\frac{i+1}{m}} \sum_{j=a_i}^{n-1} \int_{\frac{j}{n}}^{\frac{j+1}{n}} f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) dy dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{a_i}{n} - \frac{b_i}{n} \right) + \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(1 - \frac{a_i}{n} + \frac{b_i}{n} \right) (1 - g(i+1, a_i)) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{b_j^-}{m} \right) g(b_j^-, j+1) + \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=a_i}^{n-1} g(b_j^-, j+1) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds by the fact that $f(x, \alpha(x)) \geq f\left(\frac{i+1}{m}, \alpha\left(\frac{i}{m}\right)\right) = g(i+1, a_i)$ for $x \in \left(\frac{i}{m}, \frac{i+1}{m}\right)$ and that $f(\beta^{-1}(y), y) \leq f\left(\beta^{-1}\left(\frac{j}{m}\right), \frac{j+1}{m}\right) = g(b_j^-, j+1)$ for $y \in \left(\frac{j}{m}, \frac{j+1}{m}\right)$. Here, we use the property that f is non-increasing in the first dimension and non-decreasing in the second dimension. This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

4 Numerical Results

In this section, we discuss our numerical results for solving the two linear programs established in Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.4 and their implications. Notice that although we have transferred the continuous max-min optimization problem (1) to linear programs, our linear programs (LP: Lower Bound) and (LP: Upper Bound) consist of exponential number of constraints. All the numerical experiments below are conducted using Gurobi solver on a personal laptop⁴.

4.1 Lower Bound

We first study the program (LP: Lower Bound). The bottleneck is to consider all possible monotone grid paths \mathbf{b} on the $m \times n$ grid and there are $\binom{m+n}{m}$ many of such paths. We would like to remark that there are two interesting regimes regarding the choice of m and n : 1) when $m = n$, this is the most natural choice of the discretization, especially for the case when the graph is unweighted, since the two sides of the graph are symmetric; 2) when m is a constant and $n \rightarrow \infty$, this regime corresponds to the competitive ratio of Ranking under the independent random arrival model with m stages, as a corollary of our Lemma 3.1. Our results are summarized in Table 1.

m	$n = m$	$n \rightarrow \infty$	polyLP'(n) of [32]
1	0.5	$1 - 1/e \approx 0.632120$	0.5
2	0.625	0.665640 when $n = 240$	0.625
3	0.641723	0.676339 when $n = 90$	0.641723
4	0.657429	0.681097 when $n = 50$	0.657429
5	0.667052	0.683205 when $n = 30$	0.667052
6	0.673323	0.683958 when $n = 20$	0.673323
7	0.677328	0.684458 when $n = 16$	0.677393
8	0.680347	0.685325 when $n = 15$	0.680363
9	0.682680	0.685399 when $n = 13$	0.682681
10	0.684397	0.685568 when $n = 12$	0.684413
11	0.685694	0.686254 when $n = 12$	0.685728

Table 1: Numerical results of (LP: Lower Bound)

The best lower bound 0.6862 of Theorem 2.1 is achieved when $m = 11, n = 12$, the largest regime that we can afford. Observe that there are $\binom{23}{11} = 1352078$ number of different grid paths to be considered, leaving alone the complexity of solving the linear program.

We would like to remark that when $m = 1, n \rightarrow \infty$, our linear program is able to reproduce the tight competitive analysis of Ranking (that corresponds to $f(x, y) = e^{y-1}$). To the best of our knowledge, our results for constant number of m establish the first non-trivial competitive ratio (i.e. beating $1 - 1/e$) of Ranking beyond the classical random arrival order assumption, even for unweighted graphs. Specifically, we show that $m^{|R|}$ number of different orders suffices to bypass

⁴Our code is available at https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Ranking_alg-52D9

the $1 - 1/e$ barrier. In terms of entropy, our relaxed version of the random arrival has entropy $|R| \cdot \log m$ while the classical random arrival order has entropy $|R| \cdot \log |R|$.

Theorem. *When each online vertex arrives independently at early or late stage (i.e., $m = 2$), the Ranking algorithm is at least 0.6656-competitive. When each online vertex arrives independently at early, middle, or late stage (i.e., $m = 3$), the Ranking algorithm is at least 0.6763-competitive.*

Notice that the case when $m = 2$ is the minimal independent arrival order and our ratio of 0.6656 has already improved upon the 0.6629 competitive ratio of Jin and Williamson [28]; and when $m = 3$, our ratio of 0.6763 surpasses the 0.6688 barrier of previous approaches, as observed by Jin and Williamson.

Finally, we would like to remark that our numerical results of the $m = n$ regime mysteriously matches the factor-revealing LP of Mahdian and Yan [32] as summarized in Table 1. For $n \leq 6$, the numerical results match exactly; and for $7 \leq n \leq 11$, the gaps are no larger than 10^{-4} . We shall elaborate more on this observation in the discussion section.

4.2 Upper Bound

Next, we study the program (LP: Upper Bound), which has more constraints than (LP: Lower Bound) as we now need to study all possible grid path pairs (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) on the $m \times n$ grid. If we ignore the dominance of \mathbf{a} over \mathbf{b} (i.e., $a_i \geq b_i$), there are $\binom{m+n}{m} \cdot \binom{m+n}{m}$ possible combinations. If we stick to the exact solution, the largest regime that we can afford is when $m = n = 7$, which lead to an upper bound of 0.7189.

Nevertheless, in order to establish a valid upper bound, we can choose an arbitrary subset S of all grid path pairs and only apply the corresponding constraints to the original linear program. We use $\text{LP}(S)$ to denote the linear program by restricting the first family of constraints in (LP: Upper Bound) only to pairs $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in S$, and use $\Gamma(S)$ to denote the value of $\text{LP}(S)$. Our main contribution is an iterative local search algorithm for finding a good set S of small size so that the linear program can be solved efficiently. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to the case when $m = n$.

Algorithm 1 A Local Search Algorithm

Input : a set of grid path pairs S

Output: a valid upper bound Γ^* of (LP: Upper Bound)

```

1 Let  $\Gamma^* = 1 + 1 \times 10^{-9}$ . // the current best bound
2 Solve  $\text{LP}(S)$  and let  $f_S$  be the corresponding solution. // initialization
3 while  $\Gamma(S) \leq \Gamma^* - 1 \times 10^{-9}$  do
4   Let  $\Gamma^* = \Gamma(S)$ . // update the upper bound
5   for each  $(\alpha, \beta)$  in  $S$  do
6     if  $\Gamma(f_S, \alpha, \beta) > \Gamma(S)$  then
7       Remove  $(\alpha, \beta)$  from  $S$ . // clean up non-binding constraints
8     else
9       Let  $T$  be the set of local perturbations of  $(\alpha, \beta)$ . // local perturbations
10      Add every  $(\alpha', \beta') \in T$  to  $S$  with  $\Gamma(f_S, \alpha', \beta') < \Gamma(S) - 1 \times 10^{-5}$ .
11    end
12   Solve  $\text{LP}(S)$  and let  $f_S$  be the corresponding solution. // solve the new  $\text{LP}(S)$ 
13 end
14 return  $\Gamma^*$ 

```

At each iteration, we first remove redundant constraints from S so that we are able to keep the size of S small; and then we add grid path pairs to S if the corresponding ratio is smaller than $\Gamma(S)$ by a significant amount. This step can be inefficient if we examine all possible grid path pairs (α', β') 's. Indeed, this step can be viewed as a variational problem for finding the pair α, β to minimize $\Gamma(f_S, \alpha, \beta)$ against a given function f_S . Suppose we further fix β , then the problem becomes a standard calculus of variation. The Euler-Lagrange equations give a system of second-order ordinary differential equations stating that the optimal solution α^* must be locally stationary.

Motivated by this, we restrict our attentions to local perturbations of the grid path pairs from S . Specifically, for each grid path θ , we define $N(\theta)$ to be the set of grid paths that differs from θ by just a single unit square. Refer to Figure 4. Then, the set of local perturbations T of (α, β) is defined as the following and this completes our local search algorithm:

$$T(\alpha, \beta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\alpha', \beta) : \alpha' \in N(\alpha)\} \cup \{(\alpha, \beta') : \beta' \in N(\beta)\} .$$

Observe that $|T(\alpha, \beta)| = O(m)$. This makes our algorithm efficient, as long as the size of S is small.





Figure 4: Local Perturbations



m	$m = n$	polyLP(n) of [32]
1	1	1
2	0.75	0.75
3	0.740741	0.740741
4	0.733333	0.732456
5	0.726562	0.725007
6	0.722371	0.720263
7	0.718931	0.716508
10	0.713035	0.710998
20	0.706086	0.704906
40	0.702633	0.701950

Figure 5: Local search algorithm for $n = 20$ Table 2: Numerical results of (LP: Upper Bound)

The last missing piece of our approach is the initial choice of the set S , which potentially affect the rate of convergence of our algorithm. To this end, we use the set of S_n that we have solved on the $n \times n$ grid as the starting configuration for the $2n \times 2n$ grid. Notice that any grid path on the $n \times n$ grid must also be a grid path on the $2n \times 2n$ grid. This approach proves to be more effective than using randomly generated grid path pairs, according to our numerical experiments.

As an illustration, when $n = 20$, we start with the set of binding constraints S_{10} that we have solved for $n = 10$. Our local search algorithm converges in about 70 iterations. As shown in Figure 5, the size of S_{20} is less than 6100 throughout the execution of our algorithm so that each iteration costs less than a minute using Gurobi on a personal laptop. Notice that the original (LP: Upper Bound) have about $\binom{40}{20} \cdot \binom{40}{20} > 10^{22}$ number of constraints, making it impossible to solve exactly. Our numerical results are summarize in Table 2. Here, the stated upper bounds for $m = n \leq 7$ are exact solutions of (LP: Upper Bound) and the bounds for $m = n \in \{10, 20, 40\}$ are achieved by our local search algorithm. The best upper bound 0.7027 as stated in Theorem 2.1 is achieved when $n = 40$. A final remark is that the upper bounds we have achieved are also numerically close to the bounds of Mahdian and Yan [32].

5 Discussion

In this work, we revisit the randomized primal-dual analysis of Ranking algorithm for (vertex-weighted) online bipartite matching with random arrivals. We establish upper and lower bounds of the competitive ratio that are numerically close. Below, we discuss a few interesting open questions and we hope that our work shed light on characterizing the tight competitive ratio of Ranking for the random arrival model.

n	Heuristic algorithm	LP: Lower Bound	polyLP'(n) of [32]
1	0.5	0.5	0.5
2	0.625	0.625	0.625
3	0.641723	0.641723	0.641723
4	0.657429	0.657429	0.657429
5	0.667052	0.667052	0.667052
6	0.673323	0.673323	0.673323
7	0.677328	0.677328	0.677393
8	0.680347	0.680347	0.680363
9	0.682680	0.682680	0.682681
10	0.684397	0.684397	0.684413
11	0.685720	0.685694	0.685728
12	0.686771	-	0.686781
13	0.687719	-	0.687726
14	0.688533	-	0.688544
15	0.689275	-	0.689285
16	0.689922	-	0.689931
17	0.690502	-	0.690511
18	0.691053	-	0.691008
19	0.691433	-	0.691425
20	0.691775	-	0.691783

Table 3: Numerical results: Heuristic

- We observe that the randomized primal-dual analysis of our paper and the analysis of Mahdian and Yan [32] share numerically close competitive ratios for small m, n . We conjecture the two analysis would lead to the same competitive ratio when $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, supported by further numerical experiments. Apart from the numerical results reported in Section 4, we also

adapt the local search algorithm of Section 4.2 as a heuristic to solve (LP: Lower Bound)⁵. Although the heuristic algorithm only provides an upper bound of (LP: Lower Bound) as we restrict the first family of constraints to a proper subset, we believe the numerical numbers are meaningful and are close to the optimal value of the program. Indeed, for $n \leq 10$, our heuristic algorithm is able to find the optimal value of (LP: Lower Bound). The numerical results are summarized in Table 3.

- There remains a relatively large gap between the barrier of the current analysis and the upper bound of Ranking’s competitive ratio in the random arrival model. Both analysis of our work and Mahdian and Yan [32] is upper bounded by 0.703, while the best known upper bound of Ranking’s competitive ratio is 0.724 by Chan et al. [8]. We suggest to study the independent random arrival model when $m = 2$ as the first step towards a tight competitive ratio of Ranking. A concrete question is to first solve the optimization (LP: Lower Bound) for $m = 2, n \rightarrow \infty$ in a closed form.
- What is the minimal assumption on the arrival order that allows a better than $1 - 1/e$ competitive ratio for the online bipartite matching problem? Our independent random arrival model nicely bridges the adversarial arrival model and the classical random arrival model, but it unavoidably requires exponential number of different orders. It is interesting to explore whether polynomial number of different arrival orders suffice.

References

- [1] Gagan Aggarwal, Gagan Goel, Chinmay Karande, and Aranyak Mehta. Online vertex-weighted bipartite matching and single-bid budgeted allocations. In *SODA*, pages 1253–1264. SIAM, 2011.
- [2] Bahman Bahmani and Michael Kapralov. Improved bounds for online stochastic matching. In *ESA (1)*, volume 6346 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 170–181. Springer, 2010.
- [3] Benjamin Birnbaum and Claire Mathieu. On-line bipartite matching made simple. *ACM SIGACT News*, 39(1):80–87, 2008.
- [4] Guy Blanc and Moses Charikar. Multiway online correlated selection. In *FOCS*, pages 1277–1284. IEEE, 2021.
- [5] Mark Braverman, Mahsa Derakhshan, and Antonio Molina Lovett. Max-weight online stochastic matching: Improved approximations against the online benchmark. In *EC*, pages 967–985. ACM, 2022.
- [6] Brian Brubach, Karthik Abinav Sankararaman, Aravind Srinivasan, and Pan Xu. Online stochastic matching: New algorithms and bounds. *Algorithmica*, 82(10):2737–2783, 2020.
- [7] T.-H. Hubert Chan, Fei Chen, and Xiaowei Wu. Analyzing node-weighted oblivious matching problem via continuous LP with jump discontinuity. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(2):12:1–12:25, 2018.

⁵Here, we maintain a set S of grid paths \mathbf{b} for implementing the first and second family of constraints. In each iteration, we examine all local perturbations of the current set and update S .

- [8] T.-H. Hubert Chan, Fei Chen, Xiaowei Wu, and Zhichao Zhao. Ranking on arbitrary graphs: Rematch via continuous linear programming. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(4):1529–1546, 2018.
- [9] Nikhil R. Devanur, Kamal Jain, and Robert D. Kleinberg. Randomized primal-dual analysis of RANKING for online bipartite matching. In *SODA*, pages 101–107. SIAM, 2013.
- [10] Alon Eden, Michal Feldman, Amos Fiat, and Kineret Segal. An economics-based analysis of RANKING for online bipartite matching. In *SOSA*, pages 107–110. SIAM, 2021.
- [11] Matthew Fahrbach, Zhiyi Huang, Runzhou Tao, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Edge-weighted online bipartite matching. *J. ACM*, 69(6):45:1–45:35, 2022.
- [12] Uriel Feige. Tighter bounds for online bipartite matching. *CoRR*, abs/1812.11774, 2018.
- [13] Jon Feldman, Aranyak Mehta, Vahab S. Mirrokni, and S. Muthukrishnan. Online stochastic matching: Beating $1-1/e$. In *FOCS*, pages 117–126. IEEE Computer Society, 2009.
- [14] Yilong Feng, Guoliang Qiu, Xiaowei Wu, and Shengwei Zhou. Improved competitive ratio for edge-weighted online stochastic matching. 2023, to appear.
- [15] Gagan Goel and Aranyak Mehta. Online budgeted matching in random input models with applications to adwords. In *SODA*, pages 982–991, 2008.
- [16] Bernhard Haeupler, Vahab S. Mirrokni, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Online stochastic weighted matching: Improved approximation algorithms. In *WINE*, volume 7090 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 170–181. Springer, 2011.
- [17] Jason D. Hartline. Online bipartite matching via smoothness. *CoRR*, abs/2203.13140, 2022.
- [18] Zhiyi Huang, Hanrui Jiang, Aocheng Shen, Junkai Song, Zhiang Wu, and Qiankun Zhang. Online matching with stochastic rewards: Advanced analyses using configuration linear programs. In *WINE*, 2023, to appear.
- [19] Zhiyi Huang, Ning Kang, Zhihao Gavin Tang, Xiaowei Wu, Yuhao Zhang, and Xue Zhu. Fully online matching. *J. ACM*, 67(3):17:1–17:25, 2020.
- [20] Zhiyi Huang, Binghui Peng, Zhihao Gavin Tang, Runzhou Tao, Xiaowei Wu, and Yuhao Zhang. Tight competitive ratios of classic matching algorithms in the fully online model. In *SODA*, pages 2875–2886. SIAM, 2019.
- [21] Zhiyi Huang and Xinkai Shu. Online stochastic matching, poisson arrivals, and the natural linear program. In *STOC*, pages 682–693. ACM, 2021.
- [22] Zhiyi Huang, Xinkai Shu, and Shuyi Yan. The power of multiple choices in online stochastic matching. In *STOC*, pages 91–103. ACM, 2022.
- [23] Zhiyi Huang, Zhihao Gavin Tang, Xiaowei Wu, and Yuhao Zhang. Online vertex-weighted bipartite matching: Beating $1-1/e$ with random arrivals. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(3):38:1–38:15, 2019.
- [24] Zhiyi Huang, Zhihao Gavin Tang, Xiaowei Wu, and Yuhao Zhang. Fully online matching II: beating ranking and water-filling. In *FOCS*, pages 1380–1391. IEEE, 2020.

- [25] Zhiyi Huang and Qiankun Zhang. Online primal dual meets online matching with stochastic rewards: configuration LP to the rescue. In *STOC*, pages 1153–1164. ACM, 2020.
- [26] Zhiyi Huang, Qiankun Zhang, and Yuhao Zhang. Adwords in a panorama. In *FOCS*, pages 1416–1426. IEEE, 2020.
- [27] Patrick Jaillet and Xin Lu. Online stochastic matching: New algorithms with better bounds. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 39(3):624–646, 2014.
- [28] Billy Jin and David P. Williamson. Improved analysis of RANKING for online vertex-weighted bipartite matching in the random order model. In *WINE*, volume 13112 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 207–225. Springer, 2021.
- [29] Chinmay Karande, Aranyak Mehta, and Pushkar Tripathi. Online bipartite matching with unknown distributions. In *STOC*, pages 587–596. ACM, 2011.
- [30] Richard M. Karp, Umesh V. Vazirani, and Vijay V. Vazirani. An optimal algorithm for on-line bipartite matching. In *STOC*, pages 352–358. ACM, 1990.
- [31] Roie Levin and David Wajc. Streaming submodular matching meets the primal-dual method. In *SODA*, pages 1914–1933. SIAM, 2021.
- [32] Mohammad Mahdian and Qiqi Yan. Online bipartite matching with random arrivals: an approach based on strongly factor-revealing lps. In *STOC*, pages 597–606. ACM, 2011.
- [33] Vahideh H. Manshadi, Shayan Oveis Gharan, and Amin Saberi. Online stochastic matching: Online actions based on offline statistics. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 37(4):559–573, 2012.
- [34] Aranyak Mehta, Amin Saberi, Umesh V. Vazirani, and Vijay V. Vazirani. Adwords and generalized online matching. *J. ACM*, 54(5):22, 2007.
- [35] Joseph Naor, Aravind Srinivasan, and David Wajc. Online dependent rounding schemes. *CoRR*, abs/2301.08680, 2023.
- [36] Christos H. Papadimitriou, Tristan Pollner, Amin Saberi, and David Wajc. Online stochastic max-weight bipartite matching: Beyond prophet inequalities. In *EC*, pages 763–764. ACM, 2021.
- [37] Amin Saberi and David Wajc. The greedy algorithm is not optimal for on-line edge coloring. In *ICALP*, volume 198 of *LIPICs*, pages 109:1–109:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [38] Zhihao Gavin Tang, Jinzhao Wu, and Hongxun Wu. (fractional) online stochastic matching via fine-grained offline statistics. In *STOC*, pages 77–90. ACM, 2022.
- [39] Zhihao Gavin Tang, Xiaowei Wu, and Yuhao Zhang. Towards a better understanding of randomized greedy matching. *J. ACM*, oct 2023. Just Accepted.
- [40] Shuyi Yan. Edge-weighted online stochastic matching: Beating. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 4631–4640. SIAM, 2024.