

Online Stochastic Matching with Unknown Arrival Order: Beating 0.5 against the Online Optimum

Enze Sun* Zhihao Gavin Tang† Yifan Wang‡

Abstract

We study the online stochastic matching problem. Against the offline benchmark, Feldman, Gravin, and Lucier (SODA 2015) designed an optimal 0.5-competitive algorithm. A recent line of work, initiated by Papadimitriou, Pollner, Saberi, and Wajc (MOR 2024), focuses on designing approximation algorithms against the online optimum. The online benchmark allows positive results surpassing the 0.5 ratio.

In this work, adapting the order-competitive analysis by Ezra, Feldman, Gravin, and Tang (SODA 2023), we design a $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ order-competitive algorithm against the online benchmark with unknown arrival order. Our algorithm is significantly different from existing ones, as the known arrival order is crucial to the previous approximation algorithms.

1 Introduction

We study the “Bernoulli” online stochastic bipartite matching problem. Let there be an edge-weighted graph $G = (U \cup V, E, w)$. One side of the graph U , known as offline vertices, is given upfront. Another side V contains online vertices that arrive sequentially. At each step, a vertex $t \in V$ (an online vertex) arrives and is realized (with possibly non-zero edge weights w_{it}) independently with probability p_t , and with probability $1 - p_t$ the vertex comes with edge weights 0. The algorithm then decides immediately whether and how to match t if t is realized. The matching decisions are irrevocable and the goal is to maximize the total weight of the matching. Notice that the probabilities $\{p_t\}$ and weights $\{w_{it}\}$ are known upfront, while the actual realizations of vertices are only observed upon arrival. ¹

The problem is extensively studied in the literature and the conventional wisdom is to use the offline optimum (a.k.a. prophet) as the benchmark. A tight 0.5 competitive ratio is established by Feldman, Gravin, and Lucier [FGL15] and is further generalized to the setting of online stochastic matching on non-bipartite graphs [EFGT22]. Restricted to the unweighted and vertex-weighted version of the problem, the optimal competitive ratio is in between 0.69 and 0.75 [TWW22, CHS24].

Recently, Papadimitriou, Pollner, Saberi, and Wajc [PPSW24] revisited the online stochastic matching problem by switching the benchmark from the offline optimum to the online optimum.

*The University of Hong Kong (sunenze@connect.hku.hk). Supported by NSFC6212290003.

†ITCS, Key Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Research of Computation and Economics, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics (tang.zhihao@mail.shufe.edu.cn). Supported by National Key R&D Program of China (2023YFA1009500).

‡School of Computer Science, Georgia Tech (ywang3782@gatech.edu). Supported in part by NSF awards CCF-2327010 and CCF-2440113.

¹A more general version of the problem assumes independent random types of online vertices, where the type of vertex t determines the edge weights $\{w_{it}\}_i$.

They focused on the computational perspective of the problem, proving that the online optimum is PSPACE-hard to approximate within a factor of $(1 - \Omega(1))$. On the positive side, the authors designed an efficient 0.51-approximation algorithm against the online optimum. The ratio is improved by a series of subsequent works [SW21, BDL22, NSW23, BDP⁺24], and the state-of-the-art approximation ratio is 0.678 by Braverman, Derakhshan, Pollner, Saberi, and Wajc [BDP⁺24].

Another line of work by Ezra, Feldman, Gravin, and Tang [EFGT23] proposed the concept of order-competitive ratio that measures the value of knowing the arrival order of an online problem. Specifically, the framework also considers the online optimum benchmark but aims at designing online algorithms with unknown arrival order. They focused on the single-choice setting and designed optimal deterministic order-competitive algorithms. The results are improved through randomized algorithms [CST24], and are generalized to combinatorial settings [EG23].

The research agenda of designing online algorithms against the online optimum opens avenues for online stochastic optimization, and fits into the trend of “beyond worst-case analysis”. Besides the obvious fact that the worst-case competitive ratio lower bounds are surpassed using the new benchmark, the framework has also witnessed new algorithmic ideas and useful technical tools in online optimization.

1.1 Our Contributions

In this work, we adapt the order-competitive analysis framework and study the online stochastic matching problem with *unknown arrival order*,

Our main result confirms that the 0.5 barrier is beatable against the online optimum, even without the prior knowledge of the arrival order.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a poly-time $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ order-competitive algorithm for the online stochastic matching problem.*

Our result is aligned with the traditional online algorithm literatures, as the main difficulty comes from the lack of information, i.e., the arrival order. It complements the existing approximation results that focus on the computational perspective of the online stochastic matching problem with known arrival order.

The exact ratio of our order-unaware algorithm, provided in Section 5.1, is significantly smaller than the state-of-the-art approximation ratio by Braverman et al. [BKPS24]. On the other hand, due to the order-unawareness of our algorithm, our result implies a $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ approximation algorithm for *stochastic* arrival orders. To the best of our knowledge, previous approximation algorithms only work for deterministic arrivals.

Techniques. Observe that the online optimum is defined with respect to a fixed arrival order of the online vertices. All previous approximation algorithms rely on the same LP relaxation which utilizes the knowledge of the arrival order, hence, are not applicable in our setting.

To beat the 0.5 barrier, we first examine the performance of the following class of algorithms: upon the arrival of an online vertex t , the online vertex proposes to offline vertex i with probability x_{it}/p_t . Then, from the perspective of each offline vertex i , this can be viewed as a single-choice prophet inequality problem. We then examine whether the standard fixed-threshold algorithm, which is known to be 0.5 competitive against offline optimum, already achieves a $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ competitive ratio. Furthermore, it is without loss of generality to assume that the online optimum is sufficiently close to the offline optimum. Indeed, if we can design a $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ order-competitive

algorithm under the assumption, a randomization between the classic 0.5 competitive algorithm and the new algorithm would then guarantee a $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ order-competitive algorithm for every instance. Our approach heavily exploits the above two observations.

- We first introduce a family of non-adaptive algorithms whose behaviors are independent of the arrival order. These are natural generalizations of fixed-threshold algorithms in the single-choice setting. We prove that if none of the non-adaptive algorithms can guarantee a $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ competitive ratio, the instance must be shaped in a so-called “free-deterministic” structure. This structure is motivated from the classic hard instance for single-choice setting (a.k.a., the prophet inequality): The first value 1 arrives with probability 1, while the second value $1/\epsilon$ arrives with probability ϵ . As this instance suggests that no algorithm for single-choice setting can be $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ competitive, we provide a reversed lemma for the hard instance: For a single-choice instance, if no fixed-threshold algorithm can be $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ competitive, the instance can be decomposed into two parts: the free part and the deterministic part. Both parts contribute half of the expected reward while the total arrival probability of the free part is sufficiently close to 0.

By further applying the “free-deterministic” structure to the matching setting, we may partition the edges into two parts: the free edges and the deterministic edges. Both parts contribute half of the expected reward, while the matching probability of the free edges is close to 0. The formal statements are provided in Section 4. We believe the lemmas shall find further applications in beating the worst-case competitive ratio against the online optimum. E.g., for designing $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ order-competitive algorithm (or even approximation algorithm) for matroid online Bayesian selection [DP24].

- Furthermore, we show that each online vertex has at most one free edge. En route, we introduce a novel linear program that we name as the slackness LP. Informally, the LP relaxation examines if there are two approximately optimal, but significantly different offline matching solutions. If so, we prove that there must exist a $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ competitive algorithm against the offline optimum.

A technical highlight is that approximating the diameter (e.g., L1-norm) of a polytope is generally computationally hard. Our relaxation relies on the “free-deterministic” decomposition from the first step. The formal statement is provided in Section 7.

- Finally, we focus on those restricted instances that satisfy the properties as derived above. We provide an $5/8 - o(1)$ order-competitive algorithm when the online optimum is $o(1)$ -close to the offline optimum.

Our new order-unaware algorithm puts every offline vertex into two stages. At the first stage of an offline vertex, it keeps collecting the corresponding free edges until it collects (almost) all these free rewards, at which moment the offline vertex switches to the second stage and commits to a (fractional) matching of the deterministic edges immediately.

According to the property of the free edges, our algorithm collects in expectation close to half of the offline matching from the first stage, while each offline vertex is only matched with probability close to 0 at the end of its first stage. We then utilize the assumption that the online optimum approximately equals to the offline optimum and deduce that the optimal order-aware algorithm must make the same matching decisions as ours at the first stage. As a consequence, half of the expected matching produced by the optimal order-aware algorithm is from the second stage deterministic edges. The corresponding second-stage matching problem

corresponds to an online edge-weighted matching setting, with the role of online and offline vertices being swapped.

A warm-up version of our order-unaware algorithm is given in Section 3 with extra assumptions on the input. The formal algorithm and analysis are provided in Section 6. An important remark is that even under the assumption that the online optimum equals the offline optimum, no order-unaware algorithm can achieve an order-competitive ratio better than $1 - \omega(1)$ (see Observation 3.1). This is in contrast to the single-choice Bayesian selection problem according to the result of Chen, Sun, and Tang [CST24]. We interpret this observation as an extra difficulty of online matching, in comparison to the online single-choice setting, complementing the computational hardness result of Papadimitriou et al. [PPSW24].

1.2 Further Related Works

Besides the above mentioned papers, there are more recent works on studying online optimum. In the single-choice setting, Niazadeh, Saberi, and Shamsi [NSS18] studied fixed-threshold algorithms; Ezra, Feldman, and Tang [EFT24] studied anonymous (blind-to-identity) algorithms. As a generalization of online stochastic matching, Braun, Kesselheim, Pollner, and Saberi [BKPS24] designed a $0.5 + \Omega(1)$ approximation algorithm for online capacitated resource allocation, where each online vertex can be matched to multiple offline vertices.

The 0.5 impossibility result of online stochastic matching against the offline optimum is inherited from the single-choice setting, a.k.a., the prophet inequality [KS77, KS78, SC84]. Besides comparing against the online optimum, researches have studied multiple variants of the single-choice setting for beyond worst-case results, including i.i.d. arrivals [HK82, AEE⁺17, CFH⁺21, MGLP24], random arrivals [EHL17, CFH⁺21, EHKS18, ACK18, CSZ21, Har23], order selection settings [CHMS10, BGL⁺21, ASZ20, PT22, BC23], and with cancellation costs [ENNV24]. Beyond single-choice setting, the prophet inequality model has been extensively studied for multiple classes of combinatorial value functions, including submodular/XOS functions [FGL15, DFKL17] and subadditive functions [DKL20, CC23]. All these function classes include the matching setting (unit-demand function) as a special case.

The study of online bipartite matching dates back to the seminal work of Karp, Vazirani, and Vazirani [KVV90]. A number of variants have been studied in the literature. Below, we discuss the most related works. Refer to a recent survey by Huang, Tang, and Wajc [HTW24] for a more detailed discussion. A restricted version of our online stochastic matching is to assume i.i.d. arrivals. This problem was first introduced by Feldman, Mehta, Mirrokni, and Muthukrishnan [FMMM09] for unweighted graphs. This line of research [JL14, BGMS21, HS21, HSY22, TWW22, MGS12, Yan24, QFZW23] has been focused on beating the $1 - 1/e$ barrier from the adversarial setting. An important component of our algorithm is the edge-weighted online bipartite matching with free disposal. The problem was introduced by Feldman et al. [FKM⁺09], who designed an optimal $1 - 1/e$ competitive fractional algorithm. The breakthrough result by Fahrback, Huang, Tao, and Zadimoghaddam [FHTZ22] designed a randomized integral algorithm, beating the trivial 0.5 ratio for the first time. The ratio is further improved by [GHH⁺21, BC21].

2 Preliminaries

An instance I of our problem consists of an edge-weighted bipartite graph $G = (U \cup V, E, w)$, a probability vector $p \in [0, 1]^V$, and an arrival order of the online vertices V . We use $i \in U = [n]$ to

denote an offline vertex and $t \in V = [T]$ to denote an online vertex.

At each step t , our algorithm observes the identity of the arriving vertex t . The vertex is realized independently with probability p_t . The algorithm decides immediately whether and how to match t if it is realized. If an online vertex t is matched to an offline vertex i , reward $w_{it} \geq 0$ is collected. Each offline vertex i can be matched to at most one online vertex t .

We focus on designing order-unaware algorithms that only know the graph (i.e., edge weights $\{w_{it}\}_{i \in U, t \in V}$) and the probabilities $\{p_t\}_{t \in V}$ in advance, but not the arrival order. Our goal is to compete against the optimal order-aware online algorithm that also knows the arrival order in advance. We abuse $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}}$ to denote both the optimal online algorithm that knows the order and its expected performance. More formally, the order-competitive ratio of an order-unaware algorithm with ALG being its expected performance is defined as

$$\min_I \frac{\text{ALG}(I)}{\text{OPT}_{\text{online}}(I)},$$

In contrast, the traditional competitive analysis studies competitive ratio, that sets the expected optimal offline matching as the benchmark / denominator.

2.1 Ex-ante optimum and Online optimum

Consider the ex-ante optimum as an upper bound of the offline optimum matching.

$$\begin{aligned} \max_x : & \sum_{i,t} w_{it} \cdot x_{it} && (\text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}) \\ \text{subject to :} & \sum_i x_{it} \leq p_t && \forall t \in R \\ & \sum_t x_{it} \leq 1 && \forall i \in L \end{aligned}$$

We use x^* to denote the optimal solution of the ex-ante relaxation. For any x , let $\text{LP}_i(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_t w_{it} \cdot x_{it}$ and $\text{LP}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i \text{LP}_i(x)$. We use \mathcal{P} to denote the set of feasible solutions of the ex-ante relaxation.

For any $x \in \mathcal{P}$, we define $q_i(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{t \in V} x_{it}$ and $q_t(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in U} x_{it}$, i.e., notation $q_i(x)$ and $q_t(x)$ represent the total probability spent by an offline vertex i and an online vertex t respectively. A solution x is feasible ($x \in \mathcal{P}$) iff $q_i(x) \leq 1$ and $q_t(x) \leq p_t$ are simultaneously satisfied for every $i \in U$ and $t \in V$.

We use y_{it}^* to denote the probability that edge (i, t) is matched by the optimal online algorithm $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}}$. Then y^* naturally satisfies the constraints of the ex-ante optimum. Hence,

$$\text{OPT}_{\text{online}} = \text{LP}(y^*) \leq \text{LP}(x^*) = \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$$

Existing works [SW21, BDL22, NSW23, BDP+24] all make use of the following constraints on y^* :

$$y_{it}^* \leq \left(1 - \sum_{s < t} y_{is}^*\right) \cdot p_t, \quad \forall (i, t) \in E \quad (1)$$

since the realization of vertex t is independent of previous matching decisions. We note that the

arrival order of online vertices is not provided to our algorithm, and thus we cannot use (1) in advance. Nevertheless, we shall also use (1) to bound the performance of $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}}$ in Section 6.

2.2 Baseline algorithms

Feldman, Gravin, and Lucier [FGL15], and Ezra, Feldman, Gravin, and Tang [EFGT22] designed two different 0.5-competitive algorithms, even against the ex-ante optimum. The first algorithm is threshold-based using static prices, and the second is probability-based using techniques from online contention resolution schemes.

For our purpose, we consider the following baseline algorithm, that can be viewed as a mixture of the existing two algorithms. Specifically, our baseline algorithm is probability-based for online vertices; and is threshold-based for offline vertices.

Given an arbitrary $x \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\text{Alg}^b(x)$ be the following baseline algorithm:

- Upon the arrival of an online vertex t , it non-adaptively proposes to one of its neighbors with probability x_{it}/p_t . The first family of constraints guarantees the validity of this step, i.e., $\sum_i x_{it}/p_t \leq 1$.
- From the perspective of each offline vertex i , it receives a proposal from t with probability x_{it} independently. This can be interpreted as a single-choice prophet problem and we consider a single-threshold algorithm that accepts the first proposed edge whose value is at least $\tau_i(x)$. Here, $\tau_i(x)$ is defined as the maximizer of the following quantity:

$$\text{LB}_i(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\tau} \sum_t \prod_{s: \tau \leq w_{is} < w_{it}} (1 - x_{is}) \cdot x_{it} \cdot w_{it} .$$

The quantity $\text{LB}_i(x)$ is a lower bound of the expected weight we collect from vertex i . Indeed, it is the value when the edges (or their corresponding vertices) arrive in ascending order of their weights. Moreover, the classic prophet inequality tells us that the above value is at least half of the ex-ante optimum, i.e., $\text{LP}_i(x)$. Let $\text{Alg}_i^b(x)$ be the expected weight we collect from vertex i using $\text{Alg}^b(x)$. We summarize the above discussion and omit the folklore proof.

Lemma 2.1. $\text{Alg}_i^b(x) \geq \text{LB}_i(x) \geq 0.5 \cdot \text{LP}_i(x)$.

A natural choice of the parameter is to use x^* , the optimal ex-ante solution. As a consequence of Lemma 2.1, it is at least 0.5-competitive against the ex-ante optimum.

Corollary 2.2. $\text{Alg}^b(x^*) \geq 0.5 \cdot \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$.

3 Warm up: the deterministic and free vertices setting

As a warm up and to convey our main algorithmic idea, we focus on a special yet non-trivial family of instances with the following two extra assumptions:

1. Every online vertex is either *deterministic* with $p_t = 1$ or *free* with $p_t = 0^+ = o(1/(nT))$. We use DT to denote the set of deterministic vertices and FR to denote the set of free vertices.
2. The graph is online-vertex-weighted, i.e., $w_{it} = w_t$ for every $(i, t) \in E$. Without loss of generality, we assume each online vertex has at least one neighbor, as otherwise we can

simply remove the vertex from the instance. Furthermore, let $v_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} w_t \cdot p_t$ be the expected value of vertex t . We note that the magnitude of v_t is roughly the same for deterministic and free vertices, i.e., we have $w_t \gg w_{t'}$ for a free vertex t and a deterministic vertex t' .

This family of instances play an important role in the literature of prophet inequalities, i.e., when there is only one offline vertex. Indeed, both the optimal $1/2 = 0.5$ competitive ratio upper bound [KS77, KS78, SC84] and the optimal $1/\varphi \approx 0.618$ order-competitive ratio upper bound [EFGT23] for deterministic algorithms are established by this family of instances.

Disclaimer. We are not going to present any formal proofs within this section, although we have already made strong assumptions on the input instance. Our plan is to sketch an order-unaware algorithm with order-competitive ratio strictly greater than 0.5, and highlight the main difficulty of our analysis, so that the formal (and mathematically heavy) analysis provided in later sections become easier to digest for our readers. We shall make hand-waving arguments that are *with loss of generality*. Indeed, naively formalizing the analysis below can only lead to an improved order-competitive ratio of $0.5 + o(1)$. To get a constant improvement, we have to include significantly many technical details that might distract readers from our algorithmic idea. To this end, we hide these details and make statements in an informal but hopefully intuitive way.

Ex-ante optimum. Let M^* be the maximum matching between U and DT. For each $i \in U$, we use i^* to denote the neighbor of i in M^* . Let $w_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} w_{i,i^*}$ be the weight of the edge (i, i^*) . If i is unmatched in M^* , let $i^* = \perp$ and $w_i = 0$.

Furthermore, since vertices in FR are realized with negligible probability that can be taken for free, the expected offline maximum matching equals

$$\text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}} = \sum_{i \in U} w_i + \sum_{t \in \text{FR}} v_t .$$

Baseline algorithm. We consider the following baseline algorithm that is captured by a function $x : \text{FR} \rightarrow U$, where $x(t)$ is a neighbor of t . For each offline vertex $i \in U$, let $\text{FR}_i(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{t \in \text{FR} : x(t) = i\}$ and $v_i(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{s \in \text{FR}_i(x)} v_s$. Each offline vertex i weighs the following two options:

- waits until the arrival of $i^* \in \text{DT}$, and collects w_i ;
- greedily accepts any free neighbors from $\text{FR}_i(x)$ if realized, and collects $v_i(x)$. Recall that each free vertex s is realized with only negligible probability but contributes v_s in expectation.

The better of the options provide an expected reward of $\max(w_i, v_i(x))$.

This baseline algorithm is order-unaware and produces a matching with expected weight

$$\text{Alg}^b(x) = \sum_{i \in U} \max(w_i, v_i(x)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{i \in U} (w_i + v_i(x)) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}} , \quad (2)$$

where the inequality achieves equality only when $w_i = v_i(x)$ for every i .

Online optimum. As a consequence of equation (2), if the online optimum is strictly less than the offline optimum, the baseline algorithm then has an order-competitive ratio strictly greater than 0.5. Thus, we can restrict ourselves to instances with the following assumption.

3. $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}}$ equals to $\text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$ asymptotically, i.e., $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}} \rightarrow \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$ when $p_t \rightarrow 0$ for all free vertices.

Balancedness and Uniqueness. Furthermore, equation (2) asserts that an arbitrary choice of the mapping x gives an at least 0.5 competitive ratio against the optimal ex-ante benchmark. Thus, if the baseline algorithm fails to achieve a competitive ratio strictly greater than 0.5 (i.e., (2) becomes an equality), the instance must satisfy the following two conditions:

4. (Balancedness) The contribution of each offline vertex to the ex-ante optimum can then be separated to the deterministic part w_i and the free part $v_i(x)$, and they must be balanced, i.e., $w_i = v_i(x)$, since otherwise $\max(w_i, v_i(x))$ is strictly greater than the average value $1/2 \cdot (w_i + v_i(x))$. Consequently, we have that $\sum_{i \in U} v_i(x) = 1/2 \cdot \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$;
5. (Uniqueness) Each free vertex has a unique neighbor. Otherwise consider two mappings x, x' whose only difference is that $x(t) \neq x'(t)$ for some t . Then, the two solutions x, x' cannot meet the balancedness assumption at the same time for vertices $x(t)$ and $x'(t)$. As a consequence, it cannot happen that $\text{Alg}^b(x) = \text{Alg}^b(x') = 1/2 \cdot \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$. In other words, there exists a unique valid mapping x .

Order-unaware algorithm. So far, our main character of the problem, the arrival order, has not been involved. We now design an order-unaware algorithm that produces a matching with expected weight $0.75 \cdot \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$, with all the above 5 assumptions.

Order-unaware algorithm under the 5 assumptions

Initialization:

1. Let $x(t)$ be the unique neighbor of $t \in \text{FR}$ and define $x(t) = \perp$ for $t \in \text{DT}$.
2. Let all offline vertices be in stage 1.

Upon the arrival of t :

Step 1: Match t to $x(t)$ if t is realized and $x(t)$ is unmatched.

Step 2: If t is the last free neighbor of vertex i , move vertex i to stage 2, set $t_i = t$, and update $x(s) = i$ for the largest weight deterministic unassigned neighbor s of i , i.e.,

$$s = \arg \max_{s > t} \{w_s : x(s) = \perp, s \in \text{DT}_i\} .$$

Observe that, each offline vertex i collects an expected reward of $v_i(x)$ in stage 1 and then switches to stage 2. According to the balancedness assumption, this guarantees an expected reward of $1/2 \cdot \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$ in total and we are left to show that the algorithm collects at least $1/4 \cdot \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$ from stage 2. This can be derived through the following two steps:

- According to the assumption 5 (the uniqueness property), if an offline vertex i is matched to a deterministic vertex before free vertex t that satisfies $x(t) = i$ arrives, the online algorithm fails to collect v_t compared to the offline optimum. Since assumption 3 suggests that the online optimum equals to offline optimum, this case cannot happen. Therefore, our matching decisions in stage 1 are optimal. That is, the optimal order-aware online algorithm also

ignores all deterministic neighbors of i when i is in stage 1. In other words, half of the online optimum comes from second-stage deterministic edges:

$$E_{(2)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(i, t) \in \text{DT} : t > t_i\} .$$

Consequently, we have that

$$\text{MWM}(E_{(2)}) = 1/2 \cdot \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}} , \tag{3}$$

where $\text{MWM}(F)$ is the maximum weight matching on the edge set F .

• Finally, consider an online bipartite matching algorithm as the following:

- Let the underlying graph be $(U, V, E_{(2)})$, and each $t \in V$ is associated with a weight v_t .
- Vertices V are given upfront, while vertices $i \in U$ arrive in a sequence in ascending order of t_i .
- Upon the arrival of i , its incident edges are revealed and we make matching decisions between i and V .

Notice that in this problem, U and V switch the role of online and offline vertices as in the original problem; and this is a standard online (offline-vertex-weighted) bipartite matching problem. The step 2 of our algorithm can then be interpreted as a straightforward greedy algorithm for this problem, that is $1/2$ -competitive with respect to the benchmark $\text{MWM}(E_{(2)})$. Together with (3), we conclude the analysis.

Remark. The step 2 of our order-unaware algorithm can be substituted by a better vertex-weighted online bipartite matching algorithm, e.g., the Ranking algorithm [AGKM11]. This would result in a $1 - 1/2e$ order-competitive algorithm under the same 5 assumptions above. Nevertheless, any constant competitive algorithm here serves the purpose for beating the 0.5 order-competitive ratio. Moreover, we construct an instance below showing that any order-unaware algorithm cannot achieve the optimal performance guarantee, even under the 5 assumptions above. This observation contrasts with the single-choice setting, where [CST24] established a 1 order-competitive ratio under only assumption 3.

Observation 3.1. *No order-unaware algorithm can achieve an order-competitive strictly better than $\frac{11}{12}$, even for instances satisfying the 5 assumptions above.*

Proof. Consider the example as shown in the figure below. There are three offline vertices, labeled as 1, 2, 3. For the online vertices, there are 3 free vertices F_1, F_2, F_3 and three deterministic vertices D_{12}, D_{13}, D_{23} . All vertices have the same vertex weight.

The arrival order of online vertices is stochastic. We consider the following two arrival orders, each with probability 0.5:

- Order 1: $F_1, F_2, D_{12}, D_{13}, F_3, D_{23}$.
- Order 2: $F_1, F_2, D_{12}, D_{23}, F_3, D_{13}$

It is easy to verify that the input graph satisfies all 5 assumptions listed in this section. Now, we show that no order-unaware algorithm can achieve an order-competitive ratio strictly better




Figure 1: Hard Instance

than $11/12$ against online optimum (note that the online optimum equals to offline optimum for this instance).

Consider all possible actions for the first three arriving online vertices F_1, F_2, D_{12} . The algorithm must take the value of F_1 and F_2 , otherwise the optimal competitive ratio is at most $5/6$. For D_{12} , there can be three possible actions:

- Algorithm matches D_{12} to offline vertex 1. In this case, the algorithm loses at least $\frac{1}{6}$ of the online optimum when the arrival order is Order 1, because either it matches D_{13} to offline vertex 3 and misses F_3 , or it misses D_{13} . Therefore, the competitive ratio is at most $\frac{11}{12}$.
- Algorithm matches D_{12} to offline vertex 2. In this case, the algorithm loses at least $\frac{1}{6}$ of the online optimum when the arrival order is Order 2. The proof is symmetric to the first case.
- Algorithm skips D_{12} . In this case, the competitive ratio is at most $\frac{5}{6}$.

□

4 Free-deterministic Decomposition and Pruning

Starting from this section, we generalize the algorithm in Section 3 by removing those extra assumptions we made in Section 3. Those assumptions might look quite strong at the first glance. But recall that the baseline algorithm is at least 0.5-competitive against the ex-ante optimum, we only need to worry about those instances when the baseline algorithm is no better than $(0.5 + \varepsilon)$ -competitive. Intuitively, this would lead to quite restrictive instances.

Our first step is to formalize the free-deterministic structure, that corresponds to assumptions 1 and 4 in Section 3. The following lemma studies single-choice prophet inequalities when no fixed-threshold algorithm can guarantee a competitive ratio strictly better than 0.5. We believe the lemma can find further applications in online stochastic optimization against the online optimum.

Lemma 4.1. *For every $\mu < 0.5, \beta > 0.5 + \mu$, if $\text{LB}_i(x) < (0.5 + \mu) \cdot \text{LP}_i(x)$, where we recall*

$$\text{LB}_i(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\tau} \sum_t \prod_{s: \tau \leq w_{is} < w_{it}} (1 - x_{is}) \cdot x_{it} \cdot w_{it}$$

represents the lower bound of the expected weight we can collect from offline vertex i via a fixed-

threshold algorithm, we have

$$1) \sum_t x_{it} \cdot \mathbf{1}[w_{it} > \beta \cdot \text{LP}_i(x)] \leq \delta = \sqrt{\frac{4\mu}{\beta - 0.5 - \mu}};$$

$$2) \sum_t x_{it} \cdot w_{it} \cdot \mathbf{1}[w_{it} > \beta \cdot \text{LP}_i(x)] \leq \frac{0.5 + \mu}{1 - \delta} \cdot \text{LP}_i(x).$$

Proof. For notation simplicity, within the proof of this lemma, we normalize the value of $\text{LP}_i(x)$ to be 1 and enumerate the edges in ascending order of their edges, i.e., we reorder the online vertices so that $w_{i1} \leq w_{i2} \leq \dots \leq w_{in}$. Let k, l be the indices that

$$w_{i,k-1} < (0.5 + \mu) \leq w_{i,k} \quad \text{and} \quad w_{i,l-1} < \beta \leq w_{i,l}$$

Then $\sum_t x_{it} \cdot \mathbf{1}[w_{it} > \beta] = \sum_{t=l}^n x_{it}$, and we denote this value by δ . Since $\text{LP}_i(x) = 1$, we have that

$$\sum_{t=k}^n x_{it} \cdot w_{it} = 1 - \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} x_{it} \cdot w_{it} \geq 1 - (0.5 + \mu) \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{t=k}^n x_{it}\right), \quad (4)$$

where the inequality holds since $w_{it} \leq 0.5 + \mu$ for every $t \leq k - 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{it} \leq 1$.

For the induced single-choice prophet problem for vertex i , consider using the single-threshold algorithm with $(0.5 + \mu)$. According to the definition of LB_i , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (0.5 + \mu) > \text{LB}_i(x) &\geq \sum_{t=k}^n \prod_{s=k}^{t-1} (1 - x_{is}) \cdot x_{it} \cdot w_{it} \\ &= \sum_{t=k}^n \left[\prod_{s=k}^{t-1} (1 - x_{is}) - \prod_{s=k}^{n-1} (1 - x_{is}) \right] \cdot x_{it} \cdot w_{it} + \prod_{s=k}^{n-1} (1 - x_{is}) \cdot \sum_{t=k}^n x_{it} \cdot w_{it} \\ &\geq \sum_{t=k}^n \left[\prod_{s=k}^{t-1} (1 - x_{is}) - \prod_{s=k}^{n-1} (1 - x_{is}) \right] \cdot x_{it} \cdot (0.5 + \mu) + \sum_{t=l}^n \left[\prod_{s=k}^{t-1} (1 - x_{is}) - \prod_{s=k}^{n-1} (1 - x_{is}) \right] \cdot x_{it} \cdot (\beta - 0.5 - \mu) \\ &\quad + \prod_{s=k}^{n-1} (1 - x_{is}) \cdot \left[1 - (0.5 + \mu) \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{t=k}^n x_{it}\right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{t=k}^n \prod_{s=k}^{t-1} (1 - x_{is}) \cdot x_{it} \cdot (0.5 + \mu) + \sum_{t=l}^n \left[\prod_{s=k}^{t-1} (1 - x_{is}) - \prod_{s=k}^{n-1} (1 - x_{is}) \right] \cdot x_{it} \cdot (\beta - 0.5 - \mu) \\ &\quad + \prod_{s=k}^{n-1} (1 - x_{is}) \cdot (1 - (0.5 + \mu)) . \end{aligned}$$

Here, the last inequality follows from the definitions of k and l , and inequality (4). Notice that for the first term of the right hand side, we have $\sum_{t=k}^n \prod_{s=k}^{t-1} (1 - x_{is}) \cdot x_{it} = 1 - \prod_{t=k}^n (1 - x_{it})$. Thus, the inequality simplifies as the following:

$$(0.5 + \mu) > (0.5 + \mu) \left(1 - \prod_{t=k}^n (1 - x_{it})\right) + \prod_{t=k}^{n-1} (1 - x_{it}) \cdot (0.5 - \mu)$$

$$+ \prod_{t=k}^{l-1} (1 - x_{it}) \cdot \left(1 - \prod_{t=l}^{n-1} (1 - x_{it}) - \prod_{t=l}^{n-1} (1 - x_{it}) \cdot \sum_{t=l}^n x_{it} \right) \cdot (\beta - 0.5 - \mu).$$

Dividing the two sides by $\prod_{t=k}^n (1 - x_{it})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0.5 + \mu &\geq \frac{0.5 - \mu}{1 - x_{in}} + (\beta - 0.5 - \mu) \cdot \left[\prod_{t=l}^n (1 - x_{it})^{-1} - 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=l}^n x_{it}}{1 - x_{in}} \right] \\ &\geq 0.5 - \mu + (\beta - 0.5 - \mu) \cdot \left[\prod_{t=l}^n (1 - x_{it})^{-1} - 1 - \sum_{t=l}^n x_{it} \right] \\ &\geq 0.5 - \mu + (\beta - 0.5 - \mu) \cdot (e^\delta - 1 - \delta) \\ &\geq 0.5 - \mu + (\beta - 0.5 - \mu) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \delta^2 \end{aligned}$$

This concludes that $\delta \leq \sqrt{\frac{4\mu}{\beta - 0.5 - \mu}}$.

Finally, consider using threshold $\tau = \beta \cdot \text{LP}_i(x)$ for the induced single-choice prophet problem for vertex i . According to the definition of LB_i , we have that

$$0.5 + \mu > \text{LB}_i(x) \geq \sum_{t=l}^n \prod_{s=l}^{n-1} (1 - x_{is}) \cdot x_{it} \cdot w_{it} \geq \left(1 - \sum_{t=l}^n x_{it} \right) \cdot \sum_{t=l}^n x_{it} \cdot w_{it} \geq (1 - \delta) \cdot \sum_{t=l}^n x_{it} \cdot w_{it}.$$

□

Intuitively, Lemma 4.1 suggests that for any single-item Prophet Inequality instance where the optimal fixed-threshold algorithm achieves a $(0.5 + o(1))$ -competitive ratio, we can decompose the instance into high-value and low-value parts, with each part contributing approximately 0.5 of the LP value, while the high-value part consumes only an $o(1)$ fraction of the probability. We then generalize Lemma 4.1 to the Prophet matching setting, showing that any feasible solution $a \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\text{LB}(a) < (0.5 + \gamma)\text{LP}(a)$ can be pruned so that the resulting instance consists of a “free” part that contributes almost half of the total weight while only consumes negligible matching probability of each offline vertex.

Lemma 4.2 (Decomposition Lemma). *For every $\gamma < 10^{-4}$, $\alpha \geq 1$, and $a \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\text{LB}(a) \leq (0.5 + \gamma) \cdot \text{LP}(a)$, there exists \tilde{a} such that*

- $\forall (i, t) \in E, \tilde{a}_{it} \leq a_{it}$;
- $\text{LP}(\tilde{a}) \geq (1 - \gamma^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}(a)$.

Furthermore, for every $i \in U$, let $\tilde{a}_{it}^L = \tilde{a}_{it} \cdot \mathbf{1}[w_{it} > \alpha \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a})]$. We have

- $\sum_t \tilde{a}_{it}^L \leq \gamma^{1/4}$;
- $(0.5 - (\alpha + 2)\gamma^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) \leq \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}^L) \leq (0.5 + \gamma^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a})$.

Proof. Let $U_0 = \{i : \text{LB}_i(a) < (0.5 + \gamma^{3/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(a)\}$. We construct \tilde{a} as the following by pruning a :

$$\tilde{a}_{it} = \begin{cases} a_{it} & i \in U_0 \\ 0 & i \notin U_0 \end{cases}$$

We start with the first part of the statement. Straightforwardly, we have $\tilde{a}_{it} \leq a_{it}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} (0.5 + \gamma) \cdot \text{LP}(a) &> \text{LB}(a) = \sum_i \text{LB}_i(a) \geq 0.5 \cdot \sum_{i \in U_0} \text{LP}_i(a) + (0.5 + \gamma^{3/4}) \cdot \sum_{i \notin U_0} \text{LP}_i(a) \\ &= (0.5 + \gamma^{3/4}) \cdot \text{LP}(a) - \gamma^{3/4} \cdot \sum_{i \in U_0} \text{LP}_i(a) = (0.5 + \gamma^{3/4}) \cdot \text{LP}(a) - \gamma^{3/4} \cdot \text{LP}(\tilde{a}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the assumption of the lemma, and the second inequality follows from Lemma 2.1 and the definition of U_0 . Rearranging the inequality finishes the proof.

For the second part of the statement, it trivially holds for all $i \notin U_0$, since all $a_{it} = 0$.

For $i \in U_0$, by applying Lemma 4.1 to \tilde{a} with parameters $\mu = \gamma^{3/4}$ and $\beta_1 = \alpha$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 1) \sum_t \tilde{a}_{it}^L &= \sum_t \tilde{a}_{it} \cdot \mathbf{1}[w_{it} > \alpha \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a})] \leq \sqrt{\frac{4\gamma^{3/4}}{\alpha - 0.5 - \gamma^{3/4}}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{4\gamma^{3/4}}{1 - 0.5 - 0.001}} < \gamma^{1/4}, \\ 2) \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}^L) &= \sum_t \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \leq \frac{0.5 + \gamma^{3/4}}{1 - 3\gamma^{3/8}} \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) \leq 0.5 + \gamma^{1/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by applying Lemma 4.1 to \tilde{a} with parameters $\mu = \gamma^{3/4}$ and $\beta_2 = 0.5 + \gamma^{1/4} + \gamma^{3/4}$, we have that

$$\sum_t \tilde{a}_{it} \cdot \mathbf{1}[w_{it} > \beta \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a})] \leq \sqrt{\frac{4\gamma^{3/4}}{\beta_2 - 0.5 - \gamma^{3/4}}} = \gamma^{1/4}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) &= \sum_{t: w_{it}/\text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) > \alpha} \tilde{a}_{it} \cdot w_{it} + \sum_{t: w_{it}/\text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) \in (\beta_2, \alpha]} \tilde{a}_{it} \cdot w_{it} + \sum_{t: w_{it}/\text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) \leq \beta_2} \tilde{a}_{it} \cdot w_{it} \\ &\leq \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}^L) + \alpha\gamma^{1/4} \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) + \beta_2 \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the inequality gives that

$$\text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}^L) \geq (1 - \alpha \cdot \gamma^{1/4} - \beta_2) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) \geq (0.5 - (\alpha + 2)\gamma^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}(\tilde{a}). \quad \square$$

5 Main Algorithm and Proof Overview

We now present our main algorithm for proving Theorem 1.1. Starting from this section, for the ease of notation, we normalize

$$\text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}} = 1.$$

Our algorithm consists of three parameters $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_o, \varepsilon_s$, that are constants to be optimized. Our target is to have a $(0.5 + \varepsilon)$ order-competitive ratio. The meaning of the other two parameters shall be clear soon.

Step 1: As the first step, we solve the ex-ante relaxation and check if the following inequality holds:

$$\text{LB}(x^*) \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon. \quad (5)$$

Recall that $\text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$ is renormalized as 1. Therefore, if (5) is satisfied, the baseline algorithm $\text{Alg}^b(x^*)$ is at least $(0.5 + \varepsilon)$ -competitive and we simply run this algorithm. Observe that the quantity $\text{LB}(x^*)$ can be efficiently calculated, and hence, this procedure is efficient.

Step 2: From now on, we assume that

$$\text{LB}(x^*) < 0.5 + \varepsilon . \quad (6)$$

Applying Lemma 4.2 to x^* and $\alpha = 2$, we calculate \tilde{x} and \tilde{x}^L with the following properties.

- $\text{LP}(\tilde{x}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon^{1/4})$;
- $q_i(\tilde{x}^L) = \sum_t \tilde{x}_{it}^L \leq \delta_x$ for every $i \in U$, where we define $\delta_x := \varepsilon^{1/4}$.
- $(0.5 - 4\varepsilon^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) \leq \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}^L) \leq (0.5 + \varepsilon^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})$, which implies $(0.5 - 4.5\varepsilon^{1/4}) \leq \text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) \leq 0.5 + \varepsilon^{1/4}$.

For the rest of the paper, we use L to denote the edge set

$$L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(i, t) \in E : w_{it} \geq 2 \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})\} . \quad (7)$$

This notation is consistent with \tilde{x}^L as it can be interpreted as $\tilde{x}_{it}^L = \tilde{x}_{it} \cdot \mathbf{1}[(i, t) \in L]$.

Each edge in L is referred to as the “free” edges of our instance, while each $(i, t) \in E \setminus L$ is considered a “deterministic” edge. These two concepts correspond to the “free” and “deterministic” vertices discussed in Section 3. As we extend the vertex-weighted setting from Section 3 to the edge-weighted setting, the definitions of “free” and “deterministic” vertices are similarly generalized to “free” and “deterministic” edges.

Step 3: In step 1, we checked whether $\text{LB}(x^*)$ is large enough so that the baseline algorithm $\text{Alg}^b(x^*)$ can achieve a competitive ratio strictly greater than 0.5. A natural extension is to examine the following statement:

$$\exists x, \quad \text{LB}(x) > 0.5 + \varepsilon . \quad (8)$$

If so, we could simply apply the baseline algorithm with the corresponding x ; else, it should provide more information of the instance. Informally, the instance should satisfy an appropriate notion of uniqueness (assumptions 5 of Section 3) when (8) fails. Unfortunately, it is computationally inefficient to verify (8), since $\text{LB}(x)$ is generally non-concave in x . To resolve this issue, we introduce the following *slackness LP*.

$$\begin{aligned} \max_y : & \sum_{(i,t) \in E} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{it}}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{(i,t) \in L} w_{it} \cdot y_{it} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) & (\text{LP}_{\text{slack}}) \\ \text{subject to:} & \sum_{(i,t) \in E} w_{it} \cdot y_{it} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_o \\ & \sum_i y_{it} \leq p_t & \forall t \in R \\ & \sum_t y_{it} \leq 1 & \forall i \in L \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively speaking, the slackness LP verifies if there is an ε_o -approximately optimal solution y with a large distance from \tilde{x} on large edges L , where ε_o is the second parameter of our algorithm. Note that

$$\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} \geq \sum_{(i,t) \in L} w_{it} \cdot (\tilde{x}_{it}^L - y_{it})^+ + \sum_{(i,t) \in L} w_{it} \cdot (y_{it} - \tilde{x}_{it}^L)^+ = \sum_{(i,t) \in L} w_{it} \cdot |\tilde{x}_{it}^L - y_{it}|,$$

where notation r^+ represents $\max\{r, 0\}$. Therefore, when LP_{slack} is small, it implies either $\text{LP}(y^*)$ is bounded by $1 - \varepsilon_o$, or the decisions made by y^* and \tilde{x} on free edges are almost the same, where we recall y^* is the corresponding solution of $\text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$ for the optimal online algorithm.

Motivated by the above observation, depending on the value of LP_{slack} and using ε_s as the cutting point, we branch with two different algorithms. The exact use of the slackness LP shall be highlighted in the next two sections.

Modeling the assumptions in Section 3. We have addressed all the five assumptions from Section 3 through the slackness LP. Before continuing to present the branched algorithms, we provide a brief summary of how these assumptions are modeled in our main algorithm.

- Assumption 1 (free/deterministic vertices), Assumption 2 (vertex-weighted), and Assumption 4 (balance between free and deterministic parts): These assumptions are addressed by our free-deterministic decomposition. When applying Lemma 4.2 to the solution x^* , the free/deterministic vertices assumption is generalized to free/deterministic edges (edge sets L and $E \setminus L$), and the vertex-weighted assumption is extended to edge weights. The balance between the free and deterministic parts is ensured by Lemma 4.2.
- Assumption 3 ($\text{OPT}_{\text{online}} = \text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$): We make use of this assumption by only considering solutions y with $\text{LP}(y) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_o$. If $\text{LP}(y^*) < 1 - \varepsilon_o$, we will show later in Corollary 5.3 that running $\text{Alg}^b(x^*)$ in this case is sufficient.
- Assumption 5 (uniqueness): We extend the uniqueness assumption by requiring that the solution y^* is unique for free edges. This holds when LP_{slack} is bounded by ε_s , as the weighted difference between \tilde{x} and y^* on free edges is limited by ε_s (see the discussion above). When $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} > \varepsilon_s$, we will demonstrate below in Theorem 5.1 that a separated algorithm can identify a solution z such that $\text{LB}(z)$ is at least $0.5 + \varepsilon$.

Now, we continue to discuss our branched algorithm, which is based on whether $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} \leq \varepsilon_s$.

Step 3a, Large Slackness. When LP_{slack} is large (at least ε_s), we show the existence of a good baseline algorithm, i.e., we prove (8). To be specific, we give the following Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 5.1. *If $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} \geq \varepsilon_s$, there exists $z \in P$ with $\text{LB}(z) \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon$ when $10^{-4} \geq \varepsilon_o \geq 3\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_s \geq 150(\varepsilon^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o^{1/4})$ are both satisfied.*

Furthermore, the solution z can be computed efficiently.

Let y^o be the optimal solution of LP_{slack} . Intuitively, when LP_{slack} is large, \tilde{x} and y^o are both high-value solutions, but make different decisions on edge set L . We make use of this difference to properly merge solutions \tilde{x} and y^o into z , and show that $\text{LB}(z)$ is sufficiently large. The detailed proof of Theorem 5.1 is provided in Section 7.

Step 3b, Small Slackness. The challenging case is when LP_{slack} is small (at most ε_s). Indeed, this is the only place where our algorithm adapts to the arrival order. And we are now in a similar situation as in the warm-up section. We generalize the algorithm of Section 3 so that it works well when $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}}$ is sufficiently close to $\text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}} = 1$. The proof of the following theorem is provided in Section 6.

Theorem 5.2. *If $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} < \varepsilon_s$, there exists an order-unaware algorithm ALG that achieves an expected reward of $0.625 - 1.5\varepsilon_s^{1/3} - \varepsilon_o - 6\varepsilon^{1/4} - \varepsilon_s$, as long as the optimal order-aware algorithm is ε_o -approximate to the ex-ante optimum, i.e., when $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_o$.*

We defer the detailed proof of Theorem 5.2 to Section 6, and first show how to use Theorem 5.2 to give a $0.5 + \varepsilon$ order-competitive algorithm. Recall that Theorem 5.1 assumes $\varepsilon_s \geq \Omega(\varepsilon^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o^{1/4})$. With this extra assumption, we give the following corollary:

Corollary 5.3. *If $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} < \varepsilon_s$, while we have $10^{-4} \geq \varepsilon_s \geq 150(\varepsilon^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o^{1/4})$, there exists an order-unaware algorithm with order-competitive ratio $0.5 + (1/16 - \varepsilon_s^{1/3}) \cdot \varepsilon_o$.*

Proof. Let

$$c = 0.625 - 1.5\varepsilon_s^{1/3} - \varepsilon_o - 6\varepsilon^{1/4} - \varepsilon_s - 0.5 \geq 0.125 - 2\varepsilon_s^{1/3},$$

where the second inequality holds when $10^{-4} \geq \varepsilon_s \geq 150(\varepsilon^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o^{1/4})$ is satisfied. We run the algorithm ALG from Theorem 5.2 with probability δ_{ALG} , and $\text{Alg}^b(x^*)$ with probability $1 - \delta_{\text{ALG}}$. This is a randomized order-unaware algorithm. Note that

- If $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}} < 1 - \varepsilon_o$, the expected reward of our algorithm is at least

$$(1 - \delta_{\text{ALG}}) \cdot 0.5 \geq 0.5 \cdot \frac{1 - \delta_{\text{ALG}}}{1 - \varepsilon_o} \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{online}}.$$

- If $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_o$, the expected reward of our algorithm is at least

$$\delta_{\text{ALG}} \cdot (0.5 + c) + (1 - \delta_{\text{ALG}}) \cdot 0.5 = 0.5 + c \cdot \delta_{\text{ALG}} \geq (0.5 + c \cdot \delta_{\text{ALG}}) \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{online}}$$

By setting $\delta_{\text{ALG}} = \frac{\varepsilon_o}{1 + 2c(1 - \varepsilon_o)}$, the randomized algorithm guarantees an order competitive ratio of

$$\Gamma = 0.5 + \frac{c \cdot \varepsilon_o}{1 + 2c \cdot (1 - \varepsilon_o)} \geq 0.5 + \left(\frac{1}{16} - \varepsilon_s^{1/3} \right) \cdot \varepsilon_o,$$

where we use $c \geq 0.125 - 2\varepsilon_s^{1/3}$ and $1 + 2c \cdot (1 - \varepsilon_o) \leq 1 + 2 \cdot 0.125 < 2$ in the last inequality. \square

5.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Finally, we prove Theorem 1.1 by combining Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.3.

We set $\varepsilon = 10^{-27}$, $\varepsilon_o = 256 \cdot 10^{-27}$, and $\varepsilon_s = 10^{-6} \geq 150(\varepsilon^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) = 7.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$. Since the condition for Theorem 5.1 is satisfied, we have a feasible solution z of $\text{LP}_{\text{ex-ante}}$, such that $\text{Alg}^b(z) \geq \text{LB}(z) \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon$, which implies a $(0.5 + \varepsilon)$ order-competitive algorithm when $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} \geq \varepsilon_s$. On the other hand, when $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} < \varepsilon_s$, Corollary 5.3 guarantees the order competitive ratio is at least $0.5 + (\frac{1}{16} - \varepsilon_s^{1/3}) \cdot \varepsilon_o \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon$. Therefore, we have a $(0.5 + \varepsilon)$ order-competitive algorithm in both cases, which proves Theorem 1.1.

Why is ε so small. We remark that the constants in our analysis are not fully optimized. We believe the value of ε can be improved to approximately 10^{-20} by providing a more careful analysis. However, from Theorem 5.2, we require $O(\varepsilon_s^{1/3}) \leq 0.125$ to achieve a competitive ratio greater than 0.5, and Theorem 5.1 implies that $\varepsilon_s \geq \Omega(\varepsilon^{1/4})$. We remark that the exponent $1/4$ from our free-deterministic decomposition and the exponent $1/3$ from our algorithm for the small slackness case are both tight. Consequently, the maximum possible ε following the current analysis is bounded by $(0.125)^{12}$. Our ratio suffers an additional significant constant loss from Theorem 5.1.

6 Small slackness

In this section, we study the case when the slackness of instance is small and prove Theorem 5.2, which is restated below for convenience:

Theorem 5.2. *If $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} < \varepsilon_s$, there exists an order-unaware algorithm ALG that achieves an expected reward of $0.625 - 1.5\varepsilon_s^{1/3} - \varepsilon_o - 6\varepsilon^{1/4} - \varepsilon_s$, as long as the optimal order-aware algorithm is ε_o -approximate to the ex-ante optimum, i.e., when $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_o$.*

6.1 Our Algorithm

Our algorithm consists of two components: 1) an online algorithm that maintains a *dynamic* fractional solution $\{x_{it}\}$ of the instance; 2) an online rounding algorithm applying to our fractional solution $\{x_{it}\}$. The formal description of our small slackness algorithm is provided below. It is a generalization of the algorithm described in Section 3.

Algorithm when LP_{slack} is small

Initialization:

- (1) Initiate $x_{it} = \tilde{x}_{it}^L$ for every $(i, t) \in E$.
- (2) Initiate $t_i = \infty$ for every $i \in U$. If $t \leq t_i$, we say vertex i is in the first stage, else we say i is in the second stage. Initially, all offline vertices are in the first stage.
- (3) For notation simplicity, we introduce a dummy offline vertex 0 with $w_{0t} = 0$ for every $t \in V$, and let $x_{0t} = p_t - \sum_i x_{it}$. During the algorithm, condition $q_t(x) = p_t$ is always satisfied.

Upon the arrival of t :

Step 1: Let t propose to i with probability $\frac{x_{it}}{p_t}$ if t is realized.

Step 2: If i receives a proposal from t :

- if $t_i = \infty$, greedily select the edge (i, t) if i is unmatched at time t ;
- Otherwise, select the edge (i, t) if i is unmatched at time t with probability:

$$\frac{1}{2(1 - 1/2 \cdot \sum_{t_i < s < t} x_{is})}.$$

Step 3: **Update the stages of offline vertices:**

For every i in stage 1 (i.e., $t_i = \infty$), set $t_i = t$ and claim i is moved to stage 2 iff

$$\sum_{s \leq t} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{is}^L \geq (1 - \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}) \cdot \sum_s w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{is}^L, \quad (9)$$

where ε_{Alg} is a parameter to be optimized.

Algorithm when LP_{slack} is small (cont'd)

Step 4: **Update the weights for stage 2 vertices:**

For each $t_i = t$:

- (a) Sort edges $\{(j, s)\}$ that satisfy $(i, s) \notin L$, $x_{js} > 0$, and $s > t$ in descending order based on the value of $\widehat{w}_{is} - \widehat{w}_{js}$, where $\widehat{w}_{js} = 2 \cdot w_{js}$ for $(j, s) \in L$ and $\widehat{w}_{js} = w_{js}$ for $(j, s) \notin L$.
- (b) For each edge (j, s) in the above sorted list, let

$$\Delta_{i,j,s} = \min\{1 - \delta_x - \sum_{s':(i,s') \notin L} x_{is'}, x_{js}\} .$$

. Update $x_{is} \leftarrow \Delta_{i,j,s}$ and $x_{js} \leftarrow x_{js} - \Delta_{i,j,s}$.

- (c) Stop the above loop when $\sum_{s':(i,s') \notin L} x_{is'}$ reaches $1 - \delta_x$.

6.2 Analysis of the Algorithm

To begin, we introduce some extra notations that shall be useful for our analysis.

- For every $(i, s) \in E$ and $t \in V$, we use $x_{is}^{(t)}$ to denote the value of x_{is} when t arrives. Note the following properties for $x_{is}^{(t)}$:
 - For $(i, s) \in L$, $x_{is}^{(t)}$ is non-increasing with respect to t , i.e., $x_{is}^{(t)} \leq \tilde{x}_{is}^L$ for every t .
 - For $(i, s) \notin L$, $x_{is}^{(t)} \leq x_{is}^{(t_i)}$.
 - The above two properties imply $\sum_{s \in V} x_{is}^{(t)} \leq \sum_{s:(i,s) \notin L} x_{is}^{(t_i)} + \delta_x \leq 1$. Therefore, in Step 2 the matching probability is feasible since $\frac{1}{2(1-1/2 \cdot \sum_{t_i < s < t} x_{is})}$ is bounded by 1.
- We define $E_1 = \{(i, t) : t \leq t_i\}$ and $E_2 = \{(i, t) : t > t_i\}$ as a partition of the set of edges, i.e., $(i, t) \in E_1$ implies that vertex i is still in stage 1; $(i, t) \in E_2$ implies that i moves to stage 2.

Next, we provide the step-by-step analysis of the algorithm.

Online rounding. (Step 1 and 2) Recall that in the warm up section (the deterministic and free vertices setting), there is no component of rounding as we abstract out the random realization of online vertices. Our rounding algorithm is rather straightforward. Upon the arrival of an online vertex t , it proposes to at most one of its neighbors, with probability x_{it}/p_t each. Then, each offline vertex accept proposals greedily in stage 1, and runs an $1/2$ -selectable online contention resolution scheme (OCRS) in stage 2. The following lemma characterizes the loss of our rounding algorithm.

Lemma 6.1.

$$\text{ALG} \geq (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,t) \in E_1} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} \right)$$

Intuitively, our algorithm collects almost entire value of $w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)}$ when i is in stage 1, as i is only matched to free edges. Therefore, the probability that i got matched in stage 1 should be bounded by δ_x . When i moves to stage 2, the OCRS framework guarantees that half of the value $w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)}$ is collected. We deferred the detailed proof of Lemma 6.1 to Appendix A.1.

Fractional solution. (Step 3 and 4) We are left to analyze our fractional solution x . We shall prove that our fractional algorithm achieves a total reward of at least $0.625 - o(1)$.

Our analysis proceeds similarly as in Section 3. For each offline vertex, we keep collecting free edges until $1 - \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}$ fraction of the free edges have arrived (refer to equation (9)). According to the slackness check of our algorithm, since the slackness of the optimal online algorithm y^* is bounded by ε_s , intuitively, y^* should have the same behavior as solution \tilde{x} , i.e., the optimal algorithm also only collect free edges in stage 1, implying that each offline vertex is still free with high probability when switching to stage 2, and in stage 2 the optimal algorithm should mainly collect reward from deterministic edges. As a result, the optimal algorithm collects a sufficiently high reward stage 2 even if we exclude those large-value edges in L . Formally, we give the following Lemma 6.2:

Lemma 6.2. $\sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \geq 0.5 - \varepsilon_o - \varepsilon^{1/4} - \varepsilon_s - 4\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}}}$.

Lemma 6.2 is where we uses the fact that the slackness of y^* is bounded by ε_s . We defer the proof of Lemma 6.2 to Section 6.3.

Finally, we interpret the Step 4 of our algorithm as an “online weighted matching with free disposal” algorithm for solving the below online problem. Define

$$\widehat{w}_{it} = \begin{cases} 2 \cdot w_{it} & (i, t) \in L \\ w_{it} & (i, t) \in E_2 \setminus L \\ 0 & (i, t) \in E_1 \setminus L \end{cases} .$$

Consider the following way of understand our algorithm:

- Initially, only the set of large edges L is given at the beginning, each with weight \widehat{w}_{it} . Each vertex $i \in U$ has capacity 1 and each vertex $t \in V$ has capacity p_t . The matching is initiated as $x = \tilde{x}^L$.
- At time t_i (in ascending order of t_i), the edge set $\{(i, t)\}_{t \in V} \cap (E_2 \setminus L)$ is observed, each with weight \widehat{w}_{it} . The algorithm (fractionally) matches the newly observed immediately. Previously selected edges (including those large edges provided at the beginning) can be freely disposed of, while they cannot be retrieved once we proceeds to the next time step.
- The goal of Step 4 is to maximize the total increment over the original matching, under an extra constraint that the total probability on the newly observed edges (i.e., $\sum_{t: (i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} x_{it}^{(t)}$) is bounded by $1 - \delta_x$.

Note that if we proceed Step 4 in an offline manner, the optimal increment of the above problem can be characterized as the following linear program.

$$\begin{aligned} \max : & \sum_{(i,t) \in E} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot (z_{it} - \tilde{x}_{it}^L) \\ \text{subject to :} & \sum_{t: (i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} z_{it} \leq 1 - \delta_x & \forall i \in U \\ & \sum_{i: (i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} z_{it} + \sum_{i: (i,t) \in L} z_{it} \leq p_t & \forall t \in V \\ & z_{it} \leq \tilde{x}_{it}^L & \forall (i, t) \in L \end{aligned}$$

As the Step 4 in our algorithm is essentially a greedy algorithm that maximizes the marginal increment, the total increment gained by our algorithm should be at least $\frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{(i,t) \in E} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot (\tilde{z}_{it} - \tilde{x}_{it}^L)$ for any feasible solution $\{z_{it}\}$. Note that

$$z_{it} = \begin{cases} \min(\tilde{x}_{it}^L, y_{it}^*) & (i, t) \in L \\ (1 - \delta_x) \cdot y_{it}^* & (i, t) \in E_2 \setminus L \\ 0 & (i, t) \in E_1 \setminus L \end{cases}$$

is a feasible solution of the above LP. Then, the following lemma suggests that the total increment of our algorithm is at least one half of the increment given by the above solution:

Lemma 6.3. *We have*

$$\sum_{(i,t) \in E} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((1 - \delta_x) \cdot \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot (\tilde{x}_{it}^L - y_{it}^*)^+ \right),$$

where we use notation r^+ to denote $\max\{r, 0\}$.

We defer the proof of Lemma 6.3 to Appendix A.2.

With the help of Lemma 6.1, Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 6.3, we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 5.2.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Recall that Lemma 6.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ALG} &\geq (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,t) \in E_1} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} \right) \\ &\geq (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,t) \in E_1} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} + \sum_{(i,t) \in L} w_{it} \cdot (x_{it}^{(t)} - \tilde{x}_{it}^L) \right) \right) \\ &= (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,t) \in E_1} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,t) \in E} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \right) \right) \\ &\geq (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,t) \in E_1} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left((1 - \delta_x) \cdot \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot (\tilde{x}_{it}^L - y_{it}^*)^+ \right) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where the first inequality holds by Lemma 6.1, the second inequality uses the fact that in stage 1 we only collect rewards from $(i, t) \in E_1 \cap L$ and the fact that $x_{it}^{(t)} \leq \tilde{x}_{it}^L$ for $(i, t) \in E_2 \cap L$, the third equality uses the fact that $x_{it}^{(t)} = 0$ for $(i, t) \in E_1 \setminus L$ and the definition of \widehat{w}_{it} , and the last inequality holds by Lemma 6.3.

Now, we bound the terms in (10) separately. We first have

$$\sum_{(i,t) \in E_1} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \geq (1 - \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}) \cdot \text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L),$$

because the algorithm collects at least $1 - \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}$ fraction of the reward from free edges in stage 1.

Next, Lemma 6.2 guarantees

$$\sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* = \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \geq 0.5 - \varepsilon_o - \varepsilon^{1/4} - \varepsilon_s - 4\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}}}.$$

For the last term in (10), we have

$$\sum_{(i,t) \in L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot (\tilde{x}_{it}^L - y_{it}^*)^+ = 2 \sum_{(i,t) \in L} w_{it} \cdot (\tilde{x}_{it}^L - y_{it}^*)^+ \leq 2 \sum_{(i,t) \in L} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{it}^*}{p_t}\right) \leq 2\varepsilon_s.$$

Applying the above three inequalities to (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ALG} &\geq (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \left((1 - \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}) \cdot \text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left(0.5 - \varepsilon_o - \varepsilon^{1/4} - \varepsilon_s - 4\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}}} - \delta_x - 2\varepsilon_s \right) \right) \\ &\geq 0.625 - \delta_x - \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}}{2} - 4.5\varepsilon^{1/4} - \frac{\varepsilon_o + \varepsilon^{1/4} + 3\varepsilon_s}{4} - \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}}} \\ &\geq 0.625 - 1.5\varepsilon_s^{1/3} - \varepsilon_o - 6\varepsilon^{1/4} - \varepsilon_s, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is satisfied when taking $\varepsilon_{\text{Alg}} = \varepsilon_s^{1/3}$. \square

6.3 Proof of Lemma 6.2

Let $U_0 \subseteq U$ be the set of vertices that the optimal algorithm matches with probability less than δ_0 , i.e.,

$$U_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ i \in U : \sum_{t < t_i} y_{it}^* \leq \delta_0 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{U_0} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U \setminus U_0,$$

where δ_0 is defined to be $\sqrt{\varepsilon_s/\varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}}$. Since the realization of online vertex t is independent to the event that a vertex i is matched before t , we have that

$$y_{it}^* \leq p_t \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{s < t} y_{is}^* \right), \quad \forall i \in U, t \in V.$$

We remark that this is the crucial constraint of previous works [SW21, BDL22, NSW23, BDP⁺24] for approximating the online optimum with known arrival orders. Applying this inequality to $t \geq t_i$, we have that

$$\frac{y_{it}^*}{p_t} \leq 1 - \sum_{s < t} y_{is}^* \leq 1 - \sum_{s < t_i} y_{is}^* \leq 1 - \delta_0, \quad \forall i \in \overline{U_0}, t \geq t_i.$$

Furthermore, since $\{y_{it}^*\}$ is a feasible solution of LP_{slack} , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_s &\geq \text{LP}_{\text{slack}} \geq \sum_{i,t} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{it}^*}{p_t} \right) + \sum_L w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t} \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in \overline{U_0}} \sum_{t \geq t_i} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{it}^*}{p_t} \right) + \sum_L w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \delta_0 \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}} \cdot \sum_{i \in \overline{U_0}} \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}^L) + \sum_L w_{it} \cdot (y_{it}^* - \tilde{x}_{it}^L)^+,$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that online vertices $t \geq t_i$ contributes at least ε_{Alg} fraction of $\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}^L)$. Therefore, the above inequality gives

$$\sum_{i \in \overline{U_0}} \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}^L) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_s}{\delta_0 \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_L w_{it} \cdot (y_{it}^* - \tilde{x}_{it}^L)^+ \leq \varepsilon_s.$$

Now, we are ready to lower-bound $\sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^*$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* &= \text{OPT}_{\text{online}} - \sum_{(i,t) \in E_1 \cup L} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \\ &\geq \text{OPT}_{\text{online}} - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* - \sum_{(i,t) \in E_1 \setminus L \wedge i \in U_0} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* - \sum_{(i,t) \in E_1 \setminus L \wedge i \in \overline{U_0}} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

It remains to bound the three summations in (11) separately. For the first summation, we have

$$\sum_L w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \leq \sum_L w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L + \sum_L w_{it} \cdot (y_{it}^* - \tilde{x}_{it}^L)^+ \leq \text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) + \varepsilon_s. \quad (12)$$

For the second summation, we have

$$\sum_{(i,t) \in E_1 \setminus L \wedge i \in U_0} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \leq \sum_{i \in U_0} \sum_{t: (i,t) \in E_1 \setminus L} 2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) \cdot y_{it}^* \leq 2\delta_0 \cdot \text{LP}(\tilde{x}), \quad (13)$$

where the first inequality uses the fact that $w_{it} \leq 2\text{LP}_i(x)$ for $(i,t) \notin L$, and the second inequality uses the fact that for every $i \in U_0$, we have

$$\sum_{t: (i,t) \in E_1 \setminus L} y_{it}^* \leq \sum_{t < t_i} y_{it}^* \leq \delta_0.$$

Here, we use a critical observation that $(i, t_i) \in L$.

For the third summation in (11), we have

$$\sum_{(i,t) \in E_1 \setminus L \wedge i \in \overline{U_0}} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \leq \sum_{i \in \overline{U_0}} \sum_{t: (i,t) \in E_1 \setminus L} 2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) \cdot y_{it}^* \leq 2 \sum_{i \in \overline{U_0}} \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) \leq \frac{2\varepsilon_s}{\delta_0 \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}}, \quad (14)$$

where the inequality uses the fact that $w_{it} \leq 2\text{LP}_i(x)$ for $(i,t) \notin L$.

Finally, applying the above (12), (13) and (14) to (11) together with the assumption that $\text{OPT}_{\text{online}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_o$ gives

$$\sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* \geq 1 - \varepsilon_o - \text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) - \varepsilon_s - 2\delta_0 - \frac{2\varepsilon_s}{\delta_0 \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}} \geq 0.5 - \varepsilon_o - \varepsilon^{1/4} - \varepsilon_s - 4\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}}},$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $\text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) \leq 0.5 + \varepsilon^{1/4}$ and that $\delta_0 := \sqrt{\varepsilon_s / \varepsilon_{\text{Alg}}}$.

7 Large Slackness

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 5.1, which is restated below for convenience:

Theorem 5.1. *If $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} \geq \varepsilon_s$, there exists $z \in P$ with $\text{LB}(z) \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon$ when $10^{-4} \geq \varepsilon_o \geq 3\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_s \geq 150(\varepsilon^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o^{1/4})$ are both satisfied.*

Furthermore, the solution z can be computed efficiently.

7.1 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Let y^o be the optimal solution of LP_{slack} . Since we assume $\text{LP}_{\text{slack}} \geq \varepsilon_s$, we have

$$\sum_{(i,t) \in E} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{it}^o}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{(i,t) \in L} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^o \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) \geq \varepsilon_s.$$

The first step of our algorithm is to check whether $\text{LB}(y^o) \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon$. If so, then returning y^o as the desired solution is sufficient. Otherwise, we apply Lemma 4.2 to solution y^o . Recall that LP_{slack} guarantees that $\text{LP}(y^o) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_o$. Therefore, we have $\text{LB}(y^o) \leq \text{LP}(y^o) \cdot \frac{0.5 + \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon_o} \leq 0.5 + \varepsilon$, where the last inequality holds when $\varepsilon_o \geq 3\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_o \leq 10^{-4}$. Then, applying Lemma 4.2 with $\gamma = \varepsilon_o$ and $\alpha = 1$ gives

- $\text{LP}(\tilde{y}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}(y^o) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_o^{1/4} - \varepsilon_o$
- $q_i(\tilde{y}^L) = \sum_t \tilde{y}_{it}^L \leq \varepsilon_o^{1/4}$ for every $i \in U$
- $\tilde{y}_{it}^L = \mathbf{1}[w_{it} > \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})] \cdot \tilde{y}_{it}$
- $\text{LP}(\tilde{y}^L) \geq (0.5 - 3\varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}(\tilde{y}) \geq 0.5 - 3.5\varepsilon_o^{1/4}$, which further implies $\text{LP}(y^L) \geq 0.5 - 3.5\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - \varepsilon_o$.

After decomposing y^o into \tilde{y} and \tilde{y}^L , we first show that \tilde{y} is also with a large slackness. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(i,t) \in L(\tilde{x})} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{y}_{it}}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{(i,t) \in L(\tilde{x})} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{y}_{it} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) \\ & \geq \sum_{(i,t) \in L(\tilde{x})} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{it}^o}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{(i,t) \in L(\tilde{x})} w_{it} \cdot y_{it}^o \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) - \sum_{(i,t) \in L(\tilde{x})} w_{it} \cdot (y_{it}^o - \tilde{y}_{it}) \\ & \geq \varepsilon_s - (\text{LP}(y^o) - \text{LP}(\tilde{y})) \geq \varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where the second line uses the fact that $\tilde{y}_{it} \leq y_{it}^o$, and the third line uses the assumption that the slackness of y^o is at least ε_s . Therefore, the slackness of solution \tilde{y} is also sufficiently large.

We further decompose (15) into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(i,t) \in L(\tilde{x})} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{y}_{it}}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{(i,t) \in L(\tilde{x})} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{y}_{it} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{(i,t)} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{y}_{it}}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{(i,t)} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{y}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{\substack{(i,t): \\ 2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) < w_{it} \leq \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})}} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{y}_{it} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{(i,t)} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{y}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{(i,t)} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{y}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{i: 2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) < \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})} \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}) \\
&\leq \sum_{(i,t)} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{y}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{(i,t)} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{y}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) \\
&\quad + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in U} (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}) - \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})) \cdot \mathbf{1}[2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) < \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})],
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses the fact that $\tilde{y}_{it}^L \leq \tilde{y}_{it}$ and the fact that $\tilde{y}_{it}^L = \tilde{y}_{it} \cdot \mathbf{1}[w_{it} > \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})]$, the second inequality follows from the observation that the last term sums over edges such that $w_{it} \leq \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})$, while $\sum_t \tilde{y}_{it} \leq 1$ for every i . Combining the above inequality with (15) implies that either we have

$$\sum_{i,t} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{y}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{i,t} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{y}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) \geq 0.6 \cdot (\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}), \quad (16)$$

or we have

$$\sum_{i \in U} (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}) - \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})) \cdot \mathbf{1}[2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) < \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})] \geq 0.2 \cdot (\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}). \quad (17)$$

Then, the following two lemmas suggest that we can find a good solution in either case:

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose we are given $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{x}^L, \tilde{y}^L$ that are generated by Lemma 4.2. Assume the following inequality holds:*

$$\sum_{i,t} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{y}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) + \sum_{i,t} w_{it} \cdot \tilde{y}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t}\right) \geq \varepsilon_{s1}.$$

When $\varepsilon_o, \varepsilon \leq 10^{-4}$ and $\varepsilon_o \geq 3\varepsilon$ are satisfied, there exists a solution a , such that $\text{LB}(a) \geq \min\{0.5 + \varepsilon, 0.5 + \varepsilon_a\}$, where ε_a is a constant that satisfies

$$\varepsilon_a \geq \frac{\varepsilon_{s1}}{32} - 2.5\varepsilon^{1/4} - 2.5\varepsilon_o^{1/4}.$$

Furthermore, solution a can be computed efficiently.

Lemma 7.2. *Suppose we are given $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{x}^L, \tilde{y}^L$ that are generated by Lemma 4.2. Assume the following inequality holds:*

$$\sum_{i \in U} (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}) - \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})) \cdot \mathbf{1}[\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}) \geq 2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})] \geq \varepsilon_{s2}$$

When $\varepsilon_o, \varepsilon \leq 10^{-4}$ and $\varepsilon_o \geq 3\varepsilon$ are satisfied, there exists a solution b such that $\text{LB}(b) \geq \min\{0.5 + \varepsilon, 0.5 + \varepsilon_b\}$, where ε_b is a constant that satisfies

$$\varepsilon_b \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{s2} - 6\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - 6\varepsilon^{1/4}.$$

Furthermore, solution b can be computed efficiently.

We use Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.2 to prove Theorem 5.1. It can be verified that when $\varepsilon_s \geq$

$150(\varepsilon^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o^{1/4})$ and $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_o \leq 10^{-4}$, both

$$\frac{0.6(\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_o^{1/4})}{32} - 2.5(\varepsilon_o^{1/4} + \varepsilon_s^{1/4}) \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{0.2(\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_o^{1/4})}{4} - 6(\varepsilon_o^{1/4} + \varepsilon_s^{1/4}) \geq \varepsilon$$

hold. Therefore, we receive at least one solution z that satisfies $\text{LB}(z) \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon$ from either Lemma 7.1 or Lemma 7.2, which proves Theorem 5.1.

7.2 Proof of Lemma 7.1

Let $\tilde{a} = \frac{\tilde{x} + \tilde{y}}{2}$ and $\tilde{a}^L = \frac{\tilde{x}^L + \tilde{y}^L}{2}$. Define solution \bar{a} to be the following: for every $i \in U, t \in V$, we set

$$\bar{a}_{it} = \min \left\{ 2, \frac{pt}{q_t(\bar{a}^L)} \right\} \cdot \tilde{a}_{it}^L.$$

Consider the following two cases:

Case 1: $\text{LP}(\bar{a}) \geq \frac{0.5 + \varepsilon}{1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$. Note that $q_i(\bar{a}) \leq 2 \cdot \frac{q_i(\tilde{x}^L) + q_i(\tilde{y}^L)}{2} \leq \delta_x + \varepsilon_o^{1/4}$. Then, if $\text{LP}(\bar{a}) \geq \frac{0.5 + \varepsilon}{1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$, there must be

$$\text{LB}(\bar{a}) \geq \sum_{i \in U} (1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\bar{a}) \geq (1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}(\bar{a}) \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, \bar{a} would be the desired solution for Lemma 7.1 when $\text{LP}(\bar{a}) \geq \frac{0.5 + \varepsilon}{1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$.

Case 2: $\text{LP}(\bar{a}) < \frac{0.5 + \varepsilon}{1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$. In this case, define U_1, U_2 to be two subsets of offline vertices. For each $i \in U$, let i be included in U_1, U_2 with probability 0.5 respectively. Now consider the following solution a (note the difference between \tilde{a}_{it}^L and \bar{a}_{it}):

$$\begin{aligned} a_{it} &:= \tilde{a}_{it}^L + \sum_{j \in U_2} \tilde{a}_{jt}^L \cdot \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L}{p_t}, \quad \forall i \in U_1 \\ a_{it} &:= \tilde{a}_{it} - \sum_{j \in U_1} \tilde{a}_{jt}^L \cdot \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L}{p_t}, \quad \forall i \in U_2 \end{aligned}$$

To check the feasibility of solution a (whether $a \in P$), note that for $i \in U_1$, we have

$$a_{it} \leq \tilde{a}_{it}^L + \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot \frac{\sum_{j \in U} \tilde{a}_{jt}^L}{p_t} \leq 2\tilde{a}_{it}^L,$$

so $q_i(a) \leq \delta_x + \varepsilon_o^{1/4} \leq 1$, and for $i \in U_2$, we have $q_i(a) \leq q_i(\tilde{a}) \leq 1$. For $q_t(a)$, we have

$$q_t(a) = \sum_{i \in U_1} a_{it} + \sum_{i \in U_2} a_{it} = \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{a}_{it}^L + \sum_{i \in U_1} \sum_{j \in U_2} \tilde{a}_{jt}^L \cdot \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L}{p_t} - \sum_{i \in U_2} \sum_{j \in U_1} \tilde{a}_{jt}^L \cdot \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L}{p_t} = q_t(\tilde{a}^L) \leq p_t.$$

Therefore, we have $a \in P$.

Now consider the value of $\text{LB}(a)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\text{LB}(a)] &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in U_1} \text{LB}_i(a) + \sum_{i \in U_2} \text{LB}_i(a) \right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in U_1} (1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(a) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in U_2} \text{LP}_i(a) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in U_1} (1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}^L) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in U_2} \text{LP}_i(\tilde{a}) + (0.5 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \sum_{i \in U_1} \sum_{j \in U_2} \sum_{t \in V} \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot \tilde{a}_{jt}^L}{p_t} \cdot w_{it} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}(\tilde{a}^L) + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \text{LP}(\tilde{a}) + (0.5 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sum_{i \in U} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{t \in V} \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot \tilde{a}_{jt}^L}{p_t} \cdot w_{it}, \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second line is from the observation that $q_i(a) \leq \delta_x + \varepsilon_o^{1/4}$ for $i \in U_1$.

Note that for every t , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in U} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot \tilde{a}_{jt}^L}{p_t} \cdot w_{it} &= \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \left(\frac{q_t(\tilde{a}^L)}{p_t} - \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L}{p_t} + 1 - 1 \right) \\
&= \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L}{p_t} \right) + \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \left(\frac{q_t(\tilde{a}^L)}{p_t} - 1 \right) \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term of (19), note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L}{p_t} \right) &= \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L + \tilde{y}_{it}^L}{2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L + \tilde{y}_{it}^L}{2p_t} \right) \\
&= \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L + \tilde{y}_{it}^L}{4} + \frac{p_t \cdot (\tilde{x}_{it}^L + \tilde{y}_{it}^L) - (\tilde{x}_{it}^L + \tilde{y}_{it}^L)^2}{4p_t} \\
&\geq \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L + \tilde{y}_{it}^L}{4} + \frac{(\tilde{x}_{it}^L)^2 + (\tilde{y}_{it}^L)^2 - (\tilde{x}_{it}^L + \tilde{y}_{it}^L)^2}{4p_t} \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{y}_{it}^L}{p_t} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \tilde{y}_{it}^L \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{i \in U} \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L}{p_t} \right) \geq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{x}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{y}_{it}^L}{p_t} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{y}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{x}_{it}^L}{p_t} \right). \tag{20}$$

For the second term of (19), note that

$$\tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \left(\frac{q_t(\tilde{a}^L)}{p_t} - 1 \right) \geq \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \left(1 - \min \left\{ 2, \frac{p_t}{q_t(\tilde{a}^L)} \right\} \right),$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that $q_t(\tilde{a}^L)/p_t + p_t/q_t(\tilde{a}^L) \geq 2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \left(\frac{q_t(\tilde{a}^L)}{p_t} - 1 \right) &\geq \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} - \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} \cdot \min \left\{ 2, \frac{p_t}{q_t(\tilde{a}^L)} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in U} \tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot w_{it} - \sum_{i \in U} \bar{a}_{it} \cdot w_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Applying (20) and (21) to (19) and summing the inequality over all $t \in V$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in U} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{t \in V} \frac{\tilde{a}_{it}^L \cdot \tilde{a}_{jt}^L}{p_t} \cdot w_{it} \geq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \varepsilon_{s1} + \text{LP}(\tilde{a}^L) - \text{LP}(\bar{a}).$$

Finally, applying the above inequality to (18), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{LB}(a)] \geq \frac{5}{8} \text{LP}(\tilde{a}^L) + \frac{1}{4} \text{LP}(\tilde{a}) + \frac{1}{32} \varepsilon_{s1} - \frac{1}{8} \text{LP}(\bar{a}) - \frac{3}{4} \delta_x - \frac{3}{4} \varepsilon_o^{1/4}.$$

Applying the fact that $a = \frac{x+y}{2}$ and $\tilde{a}^L = \frac{\tilde{x}^L + \tilde{y}^L}{2}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{LB}(a)] \geq \frac{1}{8} (\text{LP}(\tilde{x}) + \text{LP}(\tilde{y})) + \frac{5}{16} (\text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) + \text{LP}(\tilde{y}^L)) + \frac{1}{32} \varepsilon_{s1} - \frac{1}{8} \text{LP}(\bar{a}) - \frac{3}{4} \delta_x - \frac{3}{4} \varepsilon_o^{1/4}.$$

Finally, applying the bounds for $\text{LP}(\tilde{x})$, $\text{LP}(\tilde{y})$, $\text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L)$, $\text{LP}(\tilde{y}^L)$ and the assumption $\text{LP}(\bar{a}) < \frac{0.5+\varepsilon}{1-\delta_x-\varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$ to the above inequality shows that $\mathbb{E}[\text{LB}(a)]$ is at least $0.5 + \varepsilon_a$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_a &\geq \frac{\varepsilon_{s1}}{32} - \frac{1}{8} \cdot (\varepsilon^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o) - \frac{5}{16} \cdot (3.5\varepsilon_o^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o + 4.5\varepsilon^{1/4}) - \frac{1}{8} \cdot (\varepsilon + \delta_x + \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) - \frac{3}{4} \delta_x - \frac{3}{4} \varepsilon_o^{1/4} \\ &\geq \frac{\varepsilon_{s1}}{32} - 2.5\varepsilon^{1/4} - 2.5\varepsilon_o^{1/4}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use in the first inequality that $\text{LP}(\bar{a}) \leq \frac{0.5+\varepsilon}{1-\delta_x-\varepsilon_o^{1/4}} \leq 0.5 + \varepsilon + \delta_x + \varepsilon_o^{1/4}$, which is true when $\varepsilon_o, \varepsilon \leq 10^{-4}$, and the second inequality uses the assumption that $\delta_x = \varepsilon^{1/4}$ and $\varepsilon_o, \varepsilon \leq 10^{-4}$, which allows us to further upper bound the extra $O(\varepsilon_o)$ and $O(\varepsilon)$ terms by $O(\varepsilon_o^{1/4})$ and $O(\varepsilon^{1/4})$ respectively.

7.3 Proof of Lemma 7.2

We first construct solution \tilde{b} via the following process:

- Initiate $\tilde{b} = \tilde{y}^L$.
- For each t such that $q_t(\tilde{b}) > q_t(\tilde{x}^L)$, arbitrarily reduce the value of \tilde{b}_{it} until $q_t(\tilde{b}) = q_t(\tilde{x}^L)$ is satisfied.

The generated z satisfies $q_t(\tilde{b}) \leq q_t(\tilde{x}^L)$ for every $t \in V$. Let solution $\bar{b} = \tilde{x}^L + \tilde{y}^L - \tilde{b}$. Then, solution \bar{b} satisfies $\bar{b} \in$, because we have $q_i(\bar{b}) \leq q_i(\tilde{x}^L) + q_i(\tilde{y}^L) \leq \delta_x + \varepsilon_o^{1/4}$ for every $i \in U$, and $q_t(\bar{b}) \leq q_t(\tilde{y}^L) \leq p_t$ for every $t \in V$. Consider the following two cases:

Case 1: $\text{LP}(\bar{b}) \geq \frac{0.5+\varepsilon}{1-\delta_x-\varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$. Note that $q_i(\bar{b}) \leq 2 \cdot \frac{q_i(\tilde{x}^L)+q_i(\tilde{y}^L)}{2} \leq \delta_x + \varepsilon_o^{1/4}$. Then, if $\text{LP}(\bar{b}) \geq \frac{0.5+\varepsilon}{1-\delta_x-\varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$, there must be

$$\text{LB}(\bar{b}) \geq \sum_{i \in U} (1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\bar{b}) \geq (1 - \delta_x - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}(\bar{b}) \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, \bar{b} would be the desired solution for Lemma 7.2 when $\text{LP}(\bar{b}) \geq \frac{0.5+\varepsilon}{1-\delta_x-\varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$.

Case 2: $\text{LP}(\bar{b}) < \frac{0.5+\varepsilon}{1-\delta_x-\varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$. In this case, consider the solution

$$b = (1 - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot (\tilde{x} - \tilde{x}^L) + \tilde{b}.$$

Solution b is feasible because for $i \in U$, we have

$$q_i(b) \leq (1 - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot q_i(\tilde{x}) + q_i(\tilde{b}) \leq 1 - \varepsilon_o^{1/4} + q_i(\tilde{y}^L) \leq 1,$$

On the other hand, for $t \in V$, we have

$$q_t(b) = (1 - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot (q_t(\tilde{x}) - q_t(\tilde{x}^L)) + q_t(\tilde{b}) \leq q_t(\tilde{x}) - q_t(\tilde{x}^L) + q_t(\tilde{x}^L) \leq p_t.$$

Therefore, we have $b \in P$.

Now consider the value of $\text{LB}(b)$. Let $U_3 = \{i : 2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) \leq \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})\}$ and $U_4 = \{i : 2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) > \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})\}$. For $i \in U_3$, a feasible baseline algorithm would be setting a threshold $\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})$. Since $\tilde{x}_{it} - \tilde{x}_{it}^L > 0$ only when $w_{it} < 2\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}) \leq \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})$, setting the threshold to be $\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})$ could only take values when $\tilde{b}_{it} > 0$. Note that $q_i(\tilde{b}) \leq q_i(\tilde{y}^L) \leq \varepsilon_o^{1/4}$, so setting the threshold to be $\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y})$ gets at least $(1 - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{b})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LB}(b) &\geq \sum_{i \in U_3} (1 - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \text{LP}_i(\tilde{b}) + \sum_{i \in U_4} \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{LP}_i(b) \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in U_3} \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{LP}_i(b) + \sum_{i \in U_3} \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{b}) + \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}^L) - \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})) + \sum_{i \in U_4} \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{LP}_i(b) - \varepsilon_o^{1/4} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \text{LP}(b) - \varepsilon_o^{1/4} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in U_3} (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}^L) - (0.5 + 4\varepsilon^{1/4}) \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in U_3} (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{b}) - \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}^L)), \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where the second inequality uses the fact that $\tilde{b} = \frac{1}{2}b + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{b} - \frac{1-\varepsilon_o^{1/4}}{2} \cdot (\tilde{x} - \tilde{x}^L)$, and the third inequality uses the fact that $\text{LP}_i(\tilde{x}^L) \geq (0.5 - 4\varepsilon^{1/4}) \cdot \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})$.

We further bound the last two terms of (22). For the third term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in U_3} (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}^L) - (0.5 + 4\varepsilon^{1/4}) \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})) &\geq \sum_{i \in U_3} ((0.5 - 3\varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}) - (0.5 + 4\varepsilon^{1/4}) \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in U_3} (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}) - \text{LP}_i(\tilde{x})) - 3\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - 4\varepsilon^{1/4} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{s2} - 3\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - 4\varepsilon^{1/4}, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption in Lemma 7.2. For the last term of (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in U_3} (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{b}) - \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}^L)) &\geq \sum_{i \in U} (\text{LP}_i(\tilde{b}) - \text{LP}_i(\tilde{y}^L)) \\ &= \text{LP}(\tilde{b}) - \text{LP}(\tilde{y}^L) = \text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) - \text{LP}(\bar{b}) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Now apply (23) and (24) back to (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LB}(b) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\text{LP}(b) - \varepsilon_o^{1/4} + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{s2} - \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - 2\delta_x + \frac{1}{2}\text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) - \frac{1}{2}\text{LP}(\bar{b}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) \cdot (\text{LP}(\tilde{x}) - \text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L)) + \frac{1}{2}(\text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) + \text{LP}(\tilde{y}^L) - \text{LP}(\bar{b})) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) - \frac{1}{2}\text{LP}(\bar{b}) + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{s2} - \frac{5}{2}\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - 2\varepsilon^{1/4} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}(\text{LP}(\tilde{x}) + \text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L) + \text{LP}(\tilde{y}^L) - 2\text{LP}(\bar{b})) + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{s2} - 3\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - 2\varepsilon^{1/4}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line uses the definition of b and the fact that $\tilde{b} = \tilde{x}^L + \tilde{y}^L - \bar{b}$. Finally, applying the bounds for $\text{LP}(\tilde{x}), \text{LP}(\tilde{x}^L), \text{LP}(\tilde{y}^L)$ and the assumption $\text{LP}(\bar{b}) < \frac{0.5+\varepsilon}{1-\delta_x-\varepsilon_o^{1/4}}$ to the above inequality gives $\text{LB}(b) \geq 0.5 + \varepsilon_b$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_b &\geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{s2} - \frac{1}{2}(3.5\varepsilon_o^{1/4} + \varepsilon_o + 5.5\varepsilon^{1/4}) - (\varepsilon + \delta_x + \varepsilon_o^{1/4}) - 3\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - 2\varepsilon^{1/4} \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{s2} - \frac{23}{4}\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - \frac{23}{4}\delta_x - \varepsilon - \varepsilon_o \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{s2} - 6\varepsilon_o^{1/4} - 6\varepsilon^{1/4}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use in the first inequality that $\text{LP}(\bar{a}) \leq \frac{0.5+\varepsilon}{1-\delta_x-\varepsilon_o^{1/4}} \leq 0.5 + \varepsilon + \delta_x + \varepsilon_o^{1/4}$, which is true when $\varepsilon_o, \varepsilon \leq 10^{-4}$, and the second inequality uses the assumption that $\delta_x = \varepsilon^{1/4}$ and $\varepsilon_o, \varepsilon \leq 10^{-4}$, which allows us to further upper bound the extra $O(\varepsilon_o)$ and $O(\varepsilon)$ terms by $O(\varepsilon_o^{1/4})$ and $O(\varepsilon^{1/4})$ respectively.

References

- [ACK18] Yossi Azar, Ashish Chiplunkar, and Haim Kaplan. Prophet secretary: Surpassing the $1-1/e$ barrier. In Éva Tardos, Edith Elkind, and Rakesh Vohra, editors, *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, Ithaca, NY, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pages 303–318. ACM, 2018.
- [AEE⁺17] Melika Abolhassani, Soheil Ehsani, Hossein Esfandiari, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Robert D. Kleinberg, and Brendan Lucier. Beating $1-1/e$ for ordered prophets. In Hamed Hatami, Pierre McKenzie, and Valerie King, editors, *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2017, Montreal, QC, Canada, June 19-23, 2017*, pages 61–71. ACM, 2017.
- [AGKM11] Gagan Aggarwal, Gagan Goel, Chinmay Karande, and Aranyak Mehta. Online vertex-weighted bipartite matching and single-bid budgeted allocations. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1253–1264. SIAM, 2011.
- [ASZ20] Shipra Agrawal, Jay Sethuraman, and Xingyu Zhang. On optimal ordering in the optimal stopping problem. In Péter Biró, Jason D. Hartline, Michael Ostrovsky, and Ariel D. Procaccia, editors, *EC '20: The 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, Virtual Event, Hungary, July 13-17, 2020*, pages 187–188. ACM, 2020.
- [BC21] Guy Blanc and Moses Charikar. Multiway online correlated selection. In *FOCS*, pages 1277–1284. IEEE, 2021.
- [BC23] Archit Bubna and Ashish Chiplunkar. Prophet inequality: Order selection beats random order. In *EC*, pages 302–336. ACM, 2023.
- [BDL22] Mark Braverman, Mahsa Derakhshan, and Antonio Molina Lovett. Max-weight online stochastic matching: Improved approximations against the online benchmark. In *ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, EC, 2022*.
- [BDP⁺24] Mark Braverman, Mahsa Derakhshan, Tristan Pollner, Amin Saberi, and David Wajc. New philosopher inequalities for online bayesian matching, via pivotal sampling. *CoRR*, abs/2407.15285, 2024.
- [BGL⁺21] Hedyeh Beyhaghi, Negin Golrezaei, Renato Paes Leme, Martin Pál, and Balasubramanian Sivan. Improved revenue bounds for posted-price and second-price mechanisms. *Oper. Res.*, 69(6):1805–1822, 2021.
- [BGMS21] Brian Brubach, Nathaniel Grammel, Will Ma, and Aravind Srinivasan. Improved guarantees for offline stochastic matching via new ordered contention resolution schemes. In *NeurIPS*, pages 27184–27195, 2021.
- [BKPS24] Alexander Braun, Thomas Kesselheim, Tristan Pollner, and Amin Saberi. Approximating optimum online for capacitated resource allocation. *CoRR*, abs/2406.07757, 2024.
- [CC23] José Correa and Andrés Cristi. A constant factor prophet inequality for online combinatorial auctions. In Barna Saha and Rocco A. Servedio, editors, *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023*, pages 686–697. ACM, 2023.

- [CFH⁺21] José Correa, Patricio Foncea, Ruben Hoeksma, Tim Oosterwijk, and Tjark Vredeveld. Posted price mechanisms and optimal threshold strategies for random arrivals. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 46(4):1452–1478, 2021.
- [CHMS10] Shuchi Chawla, Jason D. Hartline, David L. Malec, and Balasubramanian Sivan. Multi-parameter mechanism design and sequential posted pricing. In Leonard J. Schulman, editor, *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, pages 311–320. ACM, 2010.
- [CHS24] Ziyun Chen, Zhiyi Huang, and Enze Sun. Stochastic online correlated selection. *CoRR*, abs/2408.12524, 2024.
- [CST24] Liyan Chen, Nuo Zhou Sun, and Zhihao Gavin Tang. Setting targets is all you need: improved order competitive ratio for online selection. *CoRR*, abs/2406.15192, 2024.
- [CSZ21] José Correa, Raimundo Saona, and Bruno Ziliotto. Prophet secretary through blind strategies. *Math. Program.*, 190(1):483–521, 2021.
- [DFKL17] Paul Dütting, Michal Feldman, Thomas Kesselheim, and Brendan Lucier. Prophet inequalities made easy: Stochastic optimization by pricing non-stochastic inputs. In *IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, 14-17 October, 2017*, pages 540–551, 2017.
- [DKL20] Paul Dütting, Thomas Kesselheim, and Brendan Lucier. An $o(\log \log m)$ prophet inequality for subadditive combinatorial auctions. In Sandy Irani, editor, *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020, Durham, NC, USA, November 16-19, 2020*, pages 306–317. IEEE, 2020.
- [DP24] Ian DeHaan and Kanstantsin Pashkovich. Matroid bayesian online selection. In *SAGT*, volume 15156 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 405–422. Springer, 2024.
- [EFGT22] Tomer Ezra, Michal Feldman, Nick Gravin, and Zhihao Gavin Tang. Prophet matching with general arrivals. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 47(2):878–898, 2022.
- [EFGT23] Tomer Ezra, Michal Feldman, Nick Gravin, and Zhihao Gavin Tang. ”who is next in line?” on the significance of knowing the arrival order in bayesian online settings. In *SODA*, pages 3759–3776. SIAM, 2023.
- [EFT24] Tomer Ezra, Michal Feldman, and Zhihao Gavin Tang. Choosing behind the veil: Tight bounds for identity-blind online algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/2402.17160, 2024.
- [EG23] Tomer Ezra and Tamar Garbuz. The importance of knowing the arrival order in combinatorial bayesian settings. In *WINE*, volume 14413 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 256–271. Springer, 2023.
- [EHKS18] Soheil Ehsani, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Thomas Kesselheim, and Sahil Singla. Prophet secretary for combinatorial auctions and matroids. In Artur Czumaj, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 7-10, 2018*, pages 700–714. SIAM, 2018.

- [EHL17] Hossein Esfandiari, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Vahid Liaghat, and Morteza Monezadeh. Prophet secretary. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 31(3):1685–1701, 2017.
- [ENNV24] Farbod Ekbatani, Rad Niazadeh, Pranav Nuti, and Jan Vondrák. Prophet inequalities with cancellation costs. In Bojan Mohar, Igor Shinkar, and Ryan O’Donnell, editors, *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 24–28, 2024*, pages 1247–1258. ACM, 2024.
- [FGL15] Michal Feldman, Nick Gravin, and Brendan Lucier. Combinatorial auctions via posted prices. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 123–135, 2015.
- [FHTZ22] Matthew Fahrbach, Zhiyi Huang, Runzhou Tao, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Edge-weighted online bipartite matching. *J. ACM*, 69(6):45:1–45:35, 2022.
- [FKM⁺09] Jon Feldman, Nitish Korula, Vahab S. Mirrokni, S. Muthukrishnan, and Martin Pál. Online ad assignment with free disposal. In *WINE*, volume 5929 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 374–385. Springer, 2009.
- [FMMM09] 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.
- [GHH⁺21] Ruiquan Gao, Zhongtian He, Zhiyi Huang, Zipei Nie, Bijun Yuan, and Yan Zhong. Improved online correlated selection. In *FOCS*, pages 1265–1276. IEEE, 2021.
- [Har23] Elfarouk Harb. New prophet inequalities via poissonization and sharding. *CoRR*, abs/2307.00971, 2023.
- [HK82] T. P. Hill and Robert P. Kertz. Comparisons of Stop Rule and Supremum Expectations of I.I.D. Random Variables. *The Annals of Probability*, 10(2):336 – 345, 1982.
- [HS21] Zhiyi Huang and Xinkai Shu. Online stochastic matching, poisson arrivals, and the natural linear program. In *STOC*, pages 682–693. ACM, 2021.
- [HSY22] Zhiyi Huang, Xinkai Shu, and Shuyi Yan. The power of multiple choices in online stochastic matching. In *STOC*, pages 91–103. ACM, 2022.
- [HTW24] Zhiyi Huang, Zhihao Gavin Tang, and David Wajc. Online matching: A brief survey. *CoRR*, abs/2407.05381, 2024.
- [JL14] Patrick Jaillet and Xin Lu. Online stochastic matching: New algorithms with better bounds. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 39(3):624–646, 2014.
- [KS77] Ulrich Krengel and Louis Sucheston. Semiamarts and finite values. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 83(4):745–747, 1977.
- [KS78] Ulrich Krengel and Louis Sucheston. On semiamarts, amarts, and processes with finite value. *Probability on Banach spaces*, 4:197–266, 1978.
- [KVV90] Richard M Karp, Umesh V Vazirani, and Vijay V Vazirani. An optimal algorithm for on-line bipartite matching. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 352–358, 1990.

- [MGLP24] Mathieu Molina, Nicolas Gast, Patrick Loiseau, and Vianney Perchet. Prophet inequalities: Competing with the top items is easy. *CoRR*, abs/2408.07616, 2024.
- [MGS12] 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.
- [NSS18] Rad Niazadeh, Amin Saberi, and Ali Shameli. Prophet inequalities vs. approximating optimum online. In *WINE*, volume 11316 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 356–374. Springer, 2018.
- [NSW23] Joseph Naor, Aravind Srinivasan, and David Wajc. Online dependent rounding schemes. *CoRR*, abs/2301.08680, 2023.
- [PPSW24] Christos H. Papadimitriou, Tristan Pollner, Amin Saberi, and David Wajc. Online stochastic max-weight bipartite matching: Beyond prophet inequalities. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 49(3):1607–1628, 2024.
- [PT22] Bo Peng and Zhihao Gavin Tang. Order selection prophet inequality: From threshold optimization to arrival time design. In *FOCS*, pages 171–178. IEEE, 2022.
- [QFZW23] Guoliang Qiu, Yilong Feng, Shengwei Zhou, and Xiaowei Wu. Improved competitive ratio for edge-weighted online stochastic matching. In *WINE*, volume 14413 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 527–544. Springer, 2023.
- [SC84] Ester Samuel-Cahn. Comparison of threshold stop rules and maximum for independent nonnegative random variables. *the Annals of Probability*, pages 1213–1216, 1984.
- [SW21] 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.
- [TWW22] Zhihao Gavin Tang, Jinzhao Wu, and Hongxun Wu. (fractional) online stochastic matching via fine-grained offline statistics. In *STOC*, pages 77–90. ACM, 2022.
- [Yan24] Shuyi Yan. Edge-weighted online stochastic matching: Beating $1-1/e$. In *SODA*, pages 4631–4640. SIAM, 2024.

A Missing Proofs in Section 6

A.1 Proof of Lemma 6.1

Lemma 6.1.

$$\text{ALG} \geq (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,t) \in E_1} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} \right)$$

Proof. We consider the contribution of each offline vertex i to our algorithm separately. Let $r_i = \Pr [i \text{ is matched in stage 1}]$. We first show that $r_i \leq \delta_x$:

$$\begin{aligned} r_i = \Pr [i \text{ is matched in stage 1}] &= \Pr [i \text{ is proposed by some } t \leq t_i] \\ &= 1 - \prod_{t \leq t_i} (1 - x_{it}^{(t)}) \leq \sum_{t \leq t_i} x_{it}^{(t)} \leq \sum_{t \leq t_i} \tilde{x}_{it}^L \leq \delta_x, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $x_{it}^{(t)}$ is at most the initial value of x_{it} when $(i, t) \in L$. Then, the expected matching of i from the first stage is

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t \leq t_i} w_{it} \cdot \Pr [i \text{ is proposed by } t] \cdot \Pr [i \text{ is unmatched before } t] \\ &\geq \sum_{t \leq t_i} w_{it} \cdot \Pr [i \text{ is proposed by } t] \cdot \Pr [i \text{ is unmatched at } t_i] \\ &\geq \sum_{t \leq t_i} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} \cdot (1 - \delta_x) = (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \sum_{t:(i,t) \in E_1} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider the expected reward from the second stage. We prove by induction that every edge (i, t) from the second stage (i.e., $t > t_i$) is matched with probability $\frac{1-r_i}{2}$. Suppose the statement holds for every $t_i < s < t$. Consider the edge (i, t) . According to the design of our algorithm, (i, t) is selected with probability:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2(1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{t_i < s < t} x_{is}^{(s)})} \cdot \Pr [i \text{ is proposed by } t] \cdot \Pr [i \text{ is unmatched before } t] \\ &= \frac{1}{2(1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{t_i < s < t} x_{is}^{(s)})} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} \cdot \left(1 - r_i - \frac{1 - r_i}{2} \cdot \sum_{t_i < s < t} x_{is}^{(s)} \right) = \frac{1 - r_i}{2} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equation holds by induction hypothesis. Therefore, the contribution from the second stage equals

$$\sum_{t > t_i} w_{it} \cdot \frac{1 - r_i}{2} \cdot x_{it} \geq (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{t:(i,t) \in E_2} w_{it} \cdot x_{it}.$$

Summing the above equations over all $i \in U$ concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

A.2 Proof of Lemma 6.3

Lemma 6.3. *We have*

$$\sum_{(i,t) \in E} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((1 - \delta_x) \cdot \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot (\tilde{x}_{it}^L - y_{it}^*)^+ \right),$$

where we use notation r^+ to denote $\max\{r, 0\}$.

Proof. Recall that we modeled the Step 4 of our algorithm as an “online matching with free disposal” process, while the main idea of Lemma 6.3 is that the increment of the matching value of greedy algorithm achieves at least one-half times the optimal offline increment. However, we find it involved to prove Lemma 6.3 via the online matching with free disposal process. To further simplify the proof, we view the Step 4 of our algorithm as a more general “online submodular welfare maximization” process, and show that greedy algorithm is a $\frac{1}{2}$ -approximation.

To be specific, consider to view $i \in U$ as “online items”, and $t \in V$ are “offline agents”. Without loss of generality, we assume that offline vertices $i \in U$ are relabeled according to the time of stage transition, i.e., for $i, j \in U$, we assume $t_i \leq t_j$ for $i < j$. Furthermore, when $t_i = t_j$ while $i < j$, we assume i is proceeded in Step 4 for transitioning to stage 2 earlier than j . Then, the order of i represents the arrival order of online items in our submodular welfare maximization process.

For the submodular welfare function, we define the following function $f_t(\{r_{it}\}_{(i,t) \notin L}; \{\tilde{x}_{it}^L\}_{(i,t) \in L})$. The value of $f_t(\{r_{it}\}_{(i,t) \notin L}; \{\tilde{x}_{it}^L\}_{(i,t) \in L})$ is defined as the objective of the following LP:

$$\begin{aligned} \max : & \sum_{(i,t) \in E} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot z_{it} - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \widehat{w}_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L && \text{LP}_{\text{submod}} \\ \text{subject to :} & \sum_{i \in U} z_{it} \leq p_t \\ & z_{it} \leq \tilde{x}_{it}^L && \forall i : (i, t) \in L \\ & z_{it} \leq r_{it} && \forall i : (i, t) \notin L, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall \widehat{w}_{it} is defined as

$$\widehat{w}_{it} = \begin{cases} 2 \cdot w_{it} & (i, t) \in L \\ w_{it} & (i, t) \in E_2 \setminus L \\ 0 & (i, t) \in E_1 \setminus L \end{cases}.$$

For simplicity, we will abbreviate the notation $f_t(\{r_{it}\}_{(i,t) \notin L}; \{\tilde{x}_{it}^L\}_{(i,t) \in L})$ as $f_t(\{r_{it}\})$ in the following proof. Note that function $f_t(\{r_{it}\})$ is monotone and non-negative, where the non-negativity is guaranteed by the observation that setting $z_{it} = \tilde{x}_{it}^L$ is a feasible solution of $\text{LP}_{\text{submod}}$. Furthermore, the following claim shows that f_t is a submodular function:

Claim A.1. *Function $f_t(\{r_{it}\})$ is submodular, that is, given $\{r_{it}\}$ and $\{r'_{it}\}$ such that for every $(i, t) \notin L$ we have $0 \leq r_{it} \leq r'_{it}$, for $j : (j, t) \notin L$ and $\Delta_r \geq 0$, we have*

$$f_t(\{r_{it}\}_{-j} \cup \{r_{jt} + \Delta_r\}) - f_t(\{r_{it}\}) \geq f_t(\{r'_{it}\}_{-j} \cup \{r'_{jt} + \Delta_r\}) - f_t(\{r'_{it}\}),$$

where the notations $\{r_{it}\}_{-j}$ and $\{r'_{it}\}_{-j}$ represent $\{r_{it}\}_{i:(i,t) \notin L \wedge i \neq j}$ and $\{r'_{it}\}_{i:(i,t) \notin L \wedge i \neq j}$ respectively.

Intuitively, Claim A.1 holds because $\text{LP}_{\text{submod}}$ can be viewed as the solution of a fractional knapsack problem, and function $f_t(\{r_{it}\})$ can be viewed as taking the concave closure of some unit-demand function. We defer the proof of Claim A.1 to the end of this subsection.

Now, we show how to understand the Step 4 of our algorithm as an online submodular welfare maximization process. For each $i \in [|U|]$ and $t : (i, t) \notin L$, define $\hat{r}_{it} = x_{it}^{(t_i)}$, i.e., the initial value we set for deterministic edges when i is transitioned from stage 1 to stage 2. For $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, |U|\}$, further define $\hat{r}_{it}^{(j)} = \mathbf{1}[j \geq i] \cdot \hat{r}_{it}$. Then, the Step 4 of our algorithm can be viewed as setting $\{\hat{r}_{jt}\}$ subject to the constraint $\sum_{t:(j,t) \notin L} \hat{r}_{jt} \leq 1 - \delta_x$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, |U|$, such that the marginal gain $\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j)}\}) - \sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j-1)}\})$ is maximized.

Define $\tilde{r}_{it} = (1 - \delta_x) \cdot y_{it}^*$ for $(i, t) \notin L$. Note that $\{\tilde{r}_{it}\}$ also satisfies the constraint that $\sum_{t:(i,t) \notin L} \tilde{r}_{it} \leq 1 - \delta_x$. Since Step 4 of our algorithm is a greedy approach that maximizes the marginal gain, the total welfare of $\{\hat{r}_{it}\}$ should be at least one half times the total welfare of $\{\tilde{r}_{it}\}$. To be specific, define $\bar{r}_{it} = \max\{\hat{r}_{it}, \tilde{r}_{it}\}$. For each $t \in V$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(\{\tilde{r}_{it}\}) - f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}) &\leq f_t(\{\bar{r}_{it}\}) - f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{|U|} (f_t(\{\bar{r}_{it}\}_{i < j} \cup \{\bar{r}_{jt}\} \cup \{\hat{r}_{it}\}_{i > j}) - f_t(\{\bar{r}_{it}\}_{i < j} \cup \{\hat{r}_{jt}\} \cup \{\hat{r}_{it}\}_{i > j})) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{|U|} (f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}_{i < j} \cup \{\bar{r}_{jt}\} \cup \{0\}_{i > j}) - f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}_{i < j} \cup \{\hat{r}_{jt}\} \cup \{0\}_{i > j})) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{|U|} (f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}_{i < j} \cup \{\tilde{r}_{jt}\} \cup \{0\}_{i > j}) - f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}_{i < j} \cup \{r_{jt} = 0\} \cup \{0\}_{i > j})), \end{aligned}$$

where the second line is the telescoping sum, the third line uses the submodularity (Claim A.1) and the fact that $\hat{r}_{it} \leq \bar{r}_{it}$, and the last line uses the fact that $\bar{r}_{jt} - \hat{r}_{jt} = (\bar{r}_{jt} - \hat{r}_{jt})^+ \leq \tilde{r}_{jt}$, and the submodularity. Summing the above inequality for $t \in V$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\tilde{r}_{it}\}) - \sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{|U|} \left(\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j-1)}\}_{-j} \cup \{\tilde{r}_{jt}\}) - \sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j-1)}\}) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{|U|} \left(\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j-1)}\}_{-j} \cup \{\hat{r}_{jt}\}) - \sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j-1)}\}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{|U|} \left(\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j)}\}) - \sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j-1)}\}) \right) = \sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second line uses the fact that $\{\hat{r}_{jt}\}$ maximizes the marginal gain of $\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\})$. Rearrange the above inequality, we have

$$\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\tilde{r}_{it}\}). \quad (25)$$

It remains to further bound the values of $\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\})$ and $\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\tilde{r}_{it}\})$. For $\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\})$, we note the following two properties of our algorithm:

- At each $t \in V$, the value of $\{x_{is}^{(t)}\}$ records the optimal solution of $\text{LP}_{\text{submod}}$ with respect to the current $\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j)}\})$, where j is the last vertex which is transitioned to stage 2 before t . This is true by observing that the Step 4 of our algorithm is a greedy algorithm that maintains the highest weight edges for $\{\hat{r}_{it}^{(j)}\}$.
- The value of $f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\})$ is settled when online vertex t arrives. This is true because for every j which is still in stage 1 (i.e., $t_j \geq t$), there must be $\hat{w}_{jt} = 0$. Therefore, the arrival of j can't change the value of $f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\})$.

With the above two observations, we have

$$\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\hat{r}_{it}\}) = \sum_{(i,t) \in E} \hat{w}_{it} \cdot x_{it}^{(t)} - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \hat{w}_{it} \cdot \tilde{x}_{it}^L. \quad (26)$$

For $\sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\tilde{r}_{it}\})$, note that the following is a feasible solution of $\text{LP}_{\text{submod}}$ with respect to $\{\tilde{r}_{it}\}$:

$$z_{it} = \begin{cases} \min(\tilde{x}_{it}^L, y_{it}^*) & (i, t) \in L \\ (1 - \delta_x) \cdot y_{it}^* & (i, t) \in E_2 \setminus L \\ 0 & (i, t) \in E_1 \setminus L \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in V} f_t(\{\tilde{r}_{it}\}) &\geq (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} \hat{w}_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* + \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \hat{w}_{it} \cdot (\min(\tilde{x}_{it}^L, y_{it}^*) - \tilde{x}_{it}^L) \\ &\geq (1 - \delta_x) \cdot \sum_{(i,t) \in E_2 \setminus L} \hat{w}_{it} \cdot y_{it}^* - \sum_{(i,t) \in L} \hat{w}_{it} \cdot (\tilde{x}_{it}^L - y_{it}^*)^+ \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Applying (26) and (27) to (25) proves Lemma 6.3.

Finally, we finish the proof of Lemma 6.3 by presenting the missing proof of Claim A.1.

Proof of Claim A.1 It's sufficient to consider the case where $\Delta_r = \delta_r \rightarrow 0$. For the general Δ_r , applying the inequality for $\delta_r \rightarrow 0$ together with an integral is sufficient.

Let z^{it} be the optimal solution of $\text{LP}_{\text{submod}}$ with respect to rit . Now, consider increasing the value of r_{jt} by δ_r . The following greedy approach updates z^{it} to maintain its optimality for $\text{LP}_{\text{submod}}$ after r_{jt} is incremented by δ_r :

- Case 1: If $\sum_{i \in U} z_{it}^* < p_t$, increase z_{jt}^* by δ_r .
- Case 2: Otherwise, let $\ell = \arg \min_{i: z_{it}^* > 0} \hat{w}_{it}$. Decrease $z_{\ell t}^*$ by δ_r and increase z_{jt}^* by δ_r if $\hat{w}_{jt} > \hat{w}_{\ell t}$.

Recall that we assume $\delta_r \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, the feasibility of above approach is guaranteed by the fact that we have $\sum_{i \in U} z_{it}^* + \delta_r \leq p_t$ for Case 1 and $z_{\ell t}^* - \delta_r \geq 0$ for Case 2 when δ_r is sufficiently small.

Define

$$\tau = \mathbf{1} \left[\sum_{i \in U} z_{it}^* = p_t \right] \cdot \min_{i: z_{it}^* > 0} \hat{w}_{it}.$$

to be the “threshold value” of the above greedy process. Note that in Case 1, the value of τ is 0 before making the update, while in Case 2, we only decrease the value of the LP variable with a minimum weight. Therefore, the value of τ is non-decreasing during the above greedy process.

Let τ_r be the threshold value τ with respect to solution $\{r_{it}\}$. Starting from $\{r_{it}\}$, consider to repeatedly perform the above approach for each coordinate of $\{r_{it}\}$ and maintain the optimality of solution $\{z_{it}^*\}$, until $\{r_{it}\}$ is updated to $\{r'_{it}\}$. Let $\tau_{r'}$ be the corresponding threshold value with respect to the converted solution $\{r'_{it}\}$. Then, we have $\tau_r \leq \tau_{r'}$.

We finish the proof by noting that when $\delta_r \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(\{r_{it}\}_{-j} \cup \{r_{jt} + \Delta_r\}) - f_t(\{r_{it}\}) &= (\widehat{w}_{jt} - \min\{\widehat{w}_{jt}, \tau_r\}) \cdot \delta_r \\ &\geq (\widehat{w}_{jt} - \min\{\widehat{w}_{jt}, \tau_{r'}\}) \cdot \delta_r \\ &= f_t(\{r'_{it}\}_{-j} \cup \{r'_{jt} + \Delta_r\}) - f_t(\{r'_{it}\}), \end{aligned}$$

where the two equalities follow from the fact that $(\widehat{w}_{jt} - \min\{\widehat{w}_{jt}, \tau_r\}) \cdot \delta_r$ and $(\widehat{w}_{jt} - \min\{\widehat{w}_{jt}, \tau_{r'}\}) \cdot \delta_r$ are the marginal gains of the greedy process for solutions $\{r_{it}\}$ and $\{r'_{it}\}$ respectively. \square