

# Optimal Guarantees for Online Selection Over Time

Sebastian Perez-Salazar \*

Victor Verdugo ‡

## Abstract

Prophet inequalities are a cornerstone in optimal stopping and online decision-making. Traditionally, they involve the sequential observation of  $n$  non-negative independent random variables and face irrevocable accept-or-reject choices. The goal is to provide policies that provide a good approximation ratio against the optimal offline solution that can access all the values upfront—the so-called prophet value. In the *prophet inequality over time problem* (POT), the decision-maker can commit to an accepted value for  $\tau$  units of time, during which no new values can be accepted. This creates a trade-off between the duration of commitment and the opportunity to capture potentially higher future values.

In this work, we provide best possible worst-case approximation ratios in the IID setting of POT for single-threshold algorithms and the optimal dynamic programming policy. We show a single-threshold algorithm that achieves an approximation ratio of  $(1 + e^{-2})/2 \approx 0.567$ , and we prove that no single-threshold algorithm can surpass this guarantee. With our techniques, we can analyze simple algorithms using  $k$  thresholds and show that with  $k = 3$  it is possible to get an approximation ratio larger than  $\approx 0.602$ . Then, for each  $n$ , we prove it is possible to compute the tight worst-case approximation ratio of the optimal dynamic programming policy for instances with  $n$  values by solving a convex optimization program. A limit analysis of the first-order optimality conditions yields a nonlinear differential equation showing that the optimal dynamic programming policy's asymptotic worst-case approximation ratio is  $\approx 0.618$ . Finally, we extend the discussion to adversarial settings and show an optimal worst-case approximation ratio of  $\approx 0.162$  when the values are streamed in random order.

---

\*Department of Computational Applied Mathematics and Operations Research, Rice University, USA.

†Institute for Mathematical and Computational Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile.

‡Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile.

# 1 Introduction

Prophet inequalities [Hill and Kertz, 1982, Kertz, 1986, Krengel and Sucheston, 1977, Samuel-Cahn, 1984] have become a fundamental model for studying Bayesian problems in the last fifty years. In the classic prophet inequality formulation, a sequence of non-negative independent random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  with known distributional information is revealed one by one to a decision-maker. Upon observing  $X_t$  and unaware of future values, the decision-maker has to irrevocably accept the value  $X_t$  and stop the process or disregard the value forever to observe the value  $t + 1$ , if any. Hence, the decision-maker faces the dilemma of accepting a value that seems favorable versus the opportunity to observe a better value in the future. The decision-maker is interested in finding an algorithm (a.k.a., policy or strategy) to maximize her expected accepted value. To measure the quality guarantee of such an algorithm, we use the *approximation ratio*, which is the ratio between the expected value obtained by the algorithm and the expected offline maximum  $\mathbf{E}[\max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}]$ —the so-called *prophet value*. This ratio can be interpreted as a measure of the *price paid* by a decision-maker who cannot observe the future. It is known that a simple single threshold rule produces a strategy where the decision-maker can obtain at least an approximation ratio of  $1/2$ , and this is best possible [Krengel and Sucheston, 1977, Samuel-Cahn, 1984].

In this work, we focus on *prophet inequality over time* (POT) models [Abels et al., 2023, Disser et al., 2020]. As opposed to the classic prophet inequality problem, in this variant, the decision-maker can accept a value for several units of time. Once the decision-maker commits to accept a value  $X_t$  for the next  $\tau$  units (assuming  $\tau + t \leq n$ ), she will be unable to accept values during the times  $t + 1, \dots, t + \tau - 1$ . The model has been studied in its cost-minimization version by Disser et al. [2020] and in its profit-maximization version by Abels et al. [2023]. Both versions have implications for procurement problems (see, e.g., [Aminian et al., 2023, Qin et al., 2023]). Models over time pose a new dilemma for the online decision-maker: In the profit-maximization case, for instance, if the decision-maker accepts a value for too long, she risks missing higher values observed during the committed time, whereas if the decision-maker accepts a value for a short time, this value might have been the largest in the remainder of the time. A similar trade-off occurs in the cost-minimization case.

Despite both models being captivating in their own right, we focus on the profit-maximization case in the rest of this work. In this setting, the optimal offline value corresponds to  $\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbf{E}[\max\{X_1, \dots, X_t\}]$ . Abels et al. [2023] focus on the independent and identically distributed (IID) setting, where all the observed values share a common distribution. The authors characterize the optimal policy as the one that computes a sequence of decreasing thresholds such that if the  $t$ -th observed value  $X_t$  is larger than the  $t$ -th threshold, the value  $X_t$  is accepted for the remainder  $n - t + 1$  units of time. They provide a single threshold algorithm with an approximation ratio of  $\approx 0.396$  and an algorithm with several decreasing thresholds that attain an asymptotic approximation ratio of  $0.598$  when  $n$  goes to infinity. The authors also provide an upper bound on the worst-case approximation ratio of the optimal policy, given by the inverse of the golden ratio  $\varphi^{-1} = 2/(1 + \sqrt{5}) \approx 0.618$ . In recent work, Cristi and Oren [2024] provide an algorithm with an approximation ratio of  $0.5$ , which also works for instances with independent but not necessarily identically distributed random variables.

## 1.1 Our Contribution and Results

In this work, we provide best possible worst-case approximation ratios in the IID setting for single-threshold algorithms and the optimal dynamic programming policy. In what follows, we summarize our results and techniques according to the nature of the algorithm and model variant: algorithms with few thresholds,

optimal dynamic programming policy, and adversarially valued settings.

**Improved guarantees via simple algorithms.** We first focus on algorithms that use a limited number of thresholds. This class of algorithms splits the integer interval  $1, \dots, n$  into  $k$  consecutive intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  and in each interval assigns a threshold  $x_1, \dots, x_k > 0$ , respectively. Then, if  $X_t \geq x_i$  and  $t \in I_i$ , the value  $X_t$  is accepted for the remaining  $n - t + 1$  units of time; otherwise,  $X_t$  is accepted only for one unit of time. In our first contribution, we show a single-threshold algorithm (i.e.,  $k = 1$ ) achieving an approximation ratio of  $(1 + e^{-2})/2 - o(n) \approx 0.567 - o(n)$ . Furthermore, we show this guarantee is tight, as for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists an instance for which the approximation ratio of any single-threshold algorithm can not be larger than  $(1 + e^{-2})/2 + \varepsilon$ . In particular, our approximation ratio improves upon the 0.396 previously single-threshold best-known guarantee provided by [Abels et al. \[2023\]](#).

Our single-threshold algorithm is quantile-based: it receives a quantile  $q \in (0, 1)$  and computes the threshold  $x$  such that  $q = \mathbf{P}(X \geq x)$ . We prove an instance-independent lower bound on the approximation ratio of any algorithm that uses a quantile  $q$  and use this bound to show that the quantile  $q = 2/(n + 1)$  produces the desired approximation. We remark that a similar quantile was computed by [Abels et al. \[2023\]](#), but our general quantile lower bound provides a tighter analysis. In a nutshell, we stray from the standard approximate stochastic dominance technique used in prophet inequalities, and instead, we use a functional density argument to compute the value of the algorithm and the optimal offline value in terms of the derivative of the inverse of the probability distribution. This permits a sharper ratio comparison between the value of the algorithm and the optimal offline value. We provide the details in [Section 2](#).

Our methodology is highly generalizable for larger number of thresholds. For any  $k$ , we prove a general instance-independent lower bound for the approximation ratio obtained by algorithms that use  $k$  thresholds  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  that are computed via  $q_t = \mathbf{P}(X \geq x_t)$ . We utilize this formula to provide asymptotic approximations for a small number of thresholds: for  $k = 2$  thresholds, we obtain an approximation of at least 0.587, and for  $k = 3$  thresholds, we obtain an approximation ratio of at least 0.602. In particular, this shows that three thresholds are sufficient to surpass the best current asymptotic approximation ratio of 0.598 by [Abels et al. \[2023\]](#).

**Optimal policy guarantees via convex optimization.** Next, we study the approximation ratio of the optimal policy. We show that for each  $n$ , the optimal policy’s worst-case approximation ratio  $\gamma_n$  can be obtained by solving a convex optimization program over a simple polyhedron in the positive orthant. In a nutshell, the variables of this program represent the difference between consecutive optimal thresholds in a worst-case instance, and the constraints encode the monotonicity requirements to have thresholds achievable by the optimal policy. On the other hand, the objective captures the difference between the optimal policy value, scaled up by a factor of  $1 + \varepsilon$ , and the benchmark; we show this function is, in fact, convex in the feasible region. We remark that finding the smallest  $\varepsilon$  for which the optimal value is non-negative is equivalent to finding the worst-case approximation factor, which is recovered by  $1/(1 + \varepsilon)$ .

Our approach is based on two key steps. In the first step, we reduce the problem of finding the worst-case approximation ratio to an infinite-dimensional optimization problem over the set of positive sequences satisfying three particular monotonicity properties. We show that these monotonicity properties capture precisely the space of possible threshold sequences defined by the optimal policy. While the first step already allows us to reduce the problem to a constrained problem in infinite dimension, in the second step, we study the structure of the infinite-dimensional optimization problem and show that it can be further reduced to a nicely behaved finite-dimensional convex optimization problem. We provide the details in [Section 3](#).

Our characterization theorem allows us to recover the tight worst-case approximation ratio of the optimal policy for each value of  $n$ , which is equal to  $1/(1 + \varepsilon_n)$ , where  $\varepsilon_n$  is an optimal parameter associated with

the convex program. Using the system of first-order optimality conditions, we can compute explicitly  $\varepsilon_n$ , and by performing a limit analysis of this system when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain a differential equation where the optimal asymptotic approximation ratio is embedded as a parameter. More specifically, we seek a function  $y : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

$$h(-\ln(y(t)))' = (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot t \cdot \exp\left(\int_t^1 \ln(y(s)) ds\right) \text{ for every } t \in (0, 1), \quad (1)$$

$$y(0) = 0, \quad y(1) = 1, \quad (2)$$

where  $h(u) = (1 - e^{-u}(1 + u))/u^2$  and  $\varepsilon$  is the limit of  $\varepsilon_n$ . We provide more details of this asymptotic analysis in Appendix D. By solving numerically this differential equation, we obtain a guarantee for the optimal policy given by  $\liminf_n 1/(1 + \varepsilon_n) \approx 0.618$ . We leave as an open question whether  $\varepsilon$  is equal to the inverse of the golden ratio,  $\varphi^{-1} = 2/(1 + \sqrt{5}) \approx 0.618$ . In Table 1, we summarize our improved guarantees and comparison with existing results.

Type of result	Lower bounds		Upper bounds
Our results	$k$ thresholds	Optimal policy	$1/(1 + \varepsilon_n)$ (opt., any $n$ ) $(1/e^2 + 1)/2$ ( $k = 1$ threshold)
	$(1/e^2 + 1)/2$ ( $k = 1, \text{ large } n$ )	$1/(1 + \varepsilon_n)$ (opt., any $n$ )	
	0.587 ( $k = 2, n \rightarrow \infty$ ) 0.602 ( $k = 3, n \rightarrow \infty$ )	0.618 ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ )	
Abels et al. [2023]	0.398 ( $k = 1, \text{ any } n$ )	0.598 ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ )	$1/\varphi \approx 0.618$
Cristi and Oren [2024]	-	0.5 (any $n$ , non-IID)	-

Table 1: Known approximation factors for POT.

**Adversarial settings.** Finally, we further the discussion of models over time by studying settings with less distributional information. In this variant, a sequence of values  $u_1 > \dots > u_n \geq 0$  is streamed one by one to the decision-maker, who must then decide how long to accept each value. First, we note that if the decision-maker observes the sequence in an adversarial order, then no algorithm can guarantee a constant approximation ratio of  $\text{OPT} = n \cdot u_1$ . We then examine the random order model, where the values  $u_1, \dots, u_n$  are presented to the decision-maker according to an order chosen uniformly at random, and we term this problem the *secretary over time* (SOT) problem. We show that a simple sample-and-then-exploit strategy attains a constant worst-case approximation ratio of  $\approx 0.1619$ , which is the best possible. Our algorithmic solution follows a similar approach to the solution of the classical secretary problem but also incorporates the structure found in the single-threshold solutions for POT. We provide the details in Section 4.

## 1.2 Related Work

The prophet inequality problem was introduced by Krengel, Sucheston, and Garling [Krengel and Sucheston, 1977]. In the last decade, the prophet inequality problems has gained increasing attention for its applicability in mechanism design and pricing [Alaei, 2014, Chawla et al., 2010, Dütting et al., 2020, Hajiaghayi et al., 2007, Kleinberg and Weinberg, 2012, Correa and Cristi, 2023]. The IID prophet inequality introduced by Hill and Kertz [1982] is a special case interesting in its own right. Hill and Kertz [1982] initially proved that an approximation of  $1 - 1/e$  was possible with a single threshold algorithm while an upper bound of  $1/\beta^* \approx 0.745$  was proven, where  $\beta^*$  is the unique parameter such that the ordinary differential equation  $y'(t) = y(t)(\ln y(t) - 1) - (\beta - 1)$  with  $y(0) = 1$ , has a solution  $y : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $y(1) = 1$  [Kertz, 1986]. It was recently proved that an algorithm with an approximation  $1/\beta^*$  exists for the IID prophet inequality [Correa et al., 2021].

In the original work by [Abels et al. \[2023\]](#), the authors provide the first 0.396 approximation ratio with an algorithm using one threshold. Single-threshold algorithms are ubiquitous in prophet inequalities, and in fact, the solution presented by [Samuel-Cahn \[1984\]](#) for the classic prophet inequality uses a single threshold. At the same time, the first guarantee of  $1 - 1/e$  for the IID prophet inequality problem by [Hill and Kertz \[1982\]](#) is also based on using a single threshold. Single-threshold algorithms play a major role in optimal stopping problems due to their simplicity, interpretability, and connection to posted price mechanisms [[Arnosti and Ma, 2023](#), [Chawla et al., 2023](#), [Correa et al., 2019](#)]. In recent years, there has been a growing interest in understanding the value of using a larger number of thresholds in different problems as a way to interpolate between the single-threshold and the optimal dynamic policy [[Hoefer and Schewior, 2023](#), [Hoefer et al., 2024](#), [Perez-Salazar et al., 2022](#)].

Random order models provide a midpoint between Bayesian and adversarial settings. Arguably, the most well-known random order problem is the secretary problem introduced by [Gilbert and Mosteller \[1966\]](#); see [[Freeman, 1983](#)] for a classic survey on secretary problems. Random order models have been extensively studied in several online selection problems, including matchings [[Bernstein, 2023](#)], knapsacks [[Kesselheim et al., 2014](#), [Albers et al., 2021](#)], and matroids [[Babai et al., 2018](#), [Soto et al., 2021](#), [Feldman et al., 2018](#)]; we refer to [Gupta and Singla \[2021\]](#) for a recent survey in random order models. A related problem with the POT is the *temp secretary problem* [[Fiat et al., 2015](#), [Kesselheim and Tönnis, 2016](#)] in which multiple selections can be made, and each selection lasts some fixed amount of time. Unlike this model, our selection can be arbitrarily short or large.

## 2 Improved Guarantees for Small Number of Thresholds

In what follows, we denote by  $\mathcal{F}$  the set of distributions  $F$  over the non-negative reals, with finite positive expectation, and such that  $\omega_0(F) < \omega_1(F)$ , where  $\omega_0(F) = \inf\{y : F(y) > 0\}$  and  $\omega_1(F) = \sup\{y : F(y) < 1\}$  are the left and right endpoints of the support of  $F$ . For every non-negative integer  $n$ , we denote by  $G_n(F)$  the optimal dynamic programming policy value for the POT problem. [Abels et al. \[2023, Theorem 1\]](#) show that the sequence  $(G_n(F))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ <sup>1</sup> is given by the following recurrence:  $G_0(F) = 0$ ,  $G_1(F) = \mathbf{E}[X]$ , and

$$G_{n+1}(F) = \mathbf{E}[X] + \mathbf{E}[\max(G_n(F), nX)],$$

where  $X$  is distributed according to  $F$ . We denote  $E_0(F) = 0$ , and for every positive integer  $n$  we denote by  $E_n(F)$  the optimal offline value  $\sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathbf{E}[\max\{X_1, \dots, X_\ell\}] = \int_0^\infty (n - \sum_{\ell=1}^n F(x)^\ell) dx$ , where  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are i.i.d. random variables distributed according to  $F$ . Our quantity of interest is the worst-case approximation for POT. Namely,  $\gamma_n = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}} G_n(F)/E_n(F)$  and  $\gamma = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_n$ .

The value  $\gamma_n$  corresponds to the worst-case approximation ratio of the optimal dynamic programming policy over POT instances with  $n$  periods and is our main object of study in [Section 3](#). On the other hand,  $\gamma$  corresponds to the worst-case approximation ratio when we range over every possible number of periods.

In this section, we provide improved analyses for algorithms using a few thresholds. Similar to [Perez-Salazar et al. \[2022\]](#), we give lower bounds using the distribution inverse; however, this function might not exist for general instances. The following proposition guarantees that if we have a good approximation for instances where the probability distribution  $F$  is strictly increasing and smooth, the same guarantee holds for general instances. Making  $F$  continuous is already a standard technique (see, e.g., [Liu et al. \[2021\]](#)); however, the requirement that  $F$  is strictly increasing is new as we need to guarantee that the derivative of  $F^{-1}$  exists and it is strictly positive. We defer the proof of the following proposition to [Appendix A](#).

<sup>1</sup>The set  $\mathbb{N}$  denotes the non-negative integers  $\{0, 1, \dots\}$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\pi$  be a policy that guarantees an approximation ratio of  $\beta > 0$  in the POT problem for all probability distributions  $F$  that are strictly increasing and infinitely differentiable. Then,  $\gamma \geq \beta$ .*

A consequence of the previous assumption is that  $F^{-1}$  exists and is infinitely differentiable, as guaranteed by standard inverse function theorems. For the purpose of this section, we only require it to be differentiable. Our density assumptions allow us to conduct refined analyses. Our results are twofold: they improve upon current analyses and bounds, and they quantify the value of using few thresholds. Our findings show that using a few thresholds yields remarkably good results. We first provide a general lower bound for algorithms with  $k$  thresholds. We later use this formula to provide tight guarantees for  $k = 1$ —in combination with a hard distribution showing that our analysis is tight. We also provide guarantees for  $k \in \{2, 3\}$  thresholds.

## 2.1 General Multiple Threshold Analysis

In this subsection, we lay the generic lower bounds we will utilize in the remainder. First, we introduce the following three auxiliary functions that we will use in this section.

$$g_n(v) = \int_0^v \sum_{t=1}^n t(1-q)^{t-1} dv = n - (1-v) \frac{(1 - (1-v)^n)}{v}, \quad v \in [0, 1],$$

$$A_{\ell, \ell'}(q) = \sum_{t=0}^{\ell'-1} (\ell-t)(1-q)^t = \frac{(1-q)^{\ell'}(1 - (\ell - \ell' + 1)q) + q(\ell + 1) - 1}{q^2}, \quad q \in [0, 1], \ell' \leq \ell \leq n,$$

$$B_{\ell}(q) = \sum_{t=0}^{\ell-1} (1-q)^t = \frac{1 - (1-q)^{\ell}}{q}, \quad v \in [0, 1], \ell \in [n].$$

We consider the following class of fixed-threshold algorithms: Fix  $n_1, \dots, n_k \geq 1$  integers such that  $n_1 + \dots + n_k = n$  and quantiles  $0 < q_k < \dots < q_1 < 1$ . The algorithm divides the time interval  $[1, n]$ , into intervals  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  where  $I_t = [\sum_{\tau < t} n_{\tau}, \sum_{\tau \leq t} n_{\tau}]$  and computes thresholds  $z_t = F^{-1}(1 - q_t)$ , which is well defined by our assumptions over  $F$ . Now, from  $t = n, \dots, 1$ , if  $t \in I_{t'}$  and  $X_t \geq z_{t'}$ , then the algorithm accepts the value  $X_t$  for the remaining  $t$  units of time, while if  $X_t < z_{t'}$ , then the algorithm accepts the value  $X_t$  for 1 unit of time and go to  $t - 1$ . Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_k)$  and  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_k)$ . The expected value collected by the quantile-based algorithm described above, denoted  $G_{n,k} = G_{n,k}(F, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{q})$ , is

$$G_{n,k} = \sum_{s=1}^k \prod_{\tau > s} (1 - q_{\tau})^{n_{\tau}} \left( A_{N_s, n_s}(q_s) \int_0^{q_s} F^{-1}(1-u) du + B_{n_s}(q_s) \int_{q_s}^1 F^{-1}(1-u) du \right) \quad (3)$$

where  $N_s = \sum_{\tau \leq s} n_{\tau}$ . The proof follows by a simple inductive construction. To see this, denote by  $\mathbf{n}_{1, \dots, s} = (n_1, \dots, n_s)$  the prefix of the first  $s$  entries of  $\mathbf{n}$  and  $\mathbf{q}_{1, \dots, s} = (q_1, \dots, q_s)$  the prefix of the first  $s$  entries of  $\mathbf{q}$ , then if  $d_s$  represents  $G_{T_s, n_s}(F, \mathbf{n}_{1, \dots, s}, \mathbf{q}_{1, \dots, s})$  and  $d_0 = 0$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} d_s &= \sum_{t=0}^{n_s-1} F(z_s)^t (\bar{F}(z_s) \mathbf{E}[X_t | X_t \geq z_s](N_s - t) + F(z_s) \mathbf{E}[X_t | X_t < z_s]) + F(z_s)^{n_s} d_{s-1} \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^{n_s-1} (N_s - t)(1 - q_s)^t \int_0^{q_s} F^{-1}(1-u) du + \sum_{t=0}^{n_s-1} (1 - q_s)^t \int_{q_s}^1 F^{-1}(1-u) du + (1 - q_s)^{n_s} d_{s-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This poses a recursion that upon unrolling gives the stated equation for  $G_{n,k}$ . We are interested in computing

$$\gamma_{n,k} = \inf_F \sup_{\tau, \mathbf{q}} \frac{G_{n,k}(F, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{q})}{E_n(F)},$$

which is the value of the worst-case instance for quantile-based algorithms over continuous distributions. Note that  $\gamma_{n,k} \leq \gamma_n$ ; hence, providing lower bounds for  $\gamma_{n,k}$  provides lower bounds on  $\alpha_n$ .

The following lemma allows us to find a lower bound on  $\gamma_{n,k}$  by solely focusing on the optimization of  $\mathbf{q}$  and  $\mathbf{n}$  as opposed to a specific instance of the problem.

**Lemma 1 (Key Lower Bound).** *For any smooth and strictly increasing distribution  $F$ , we have*

$$\frac{G_{n,k}}{E_n} \geq \inf_{v \in [0,1]} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^k \prod_{\tau>s} (1 - q_\tau)^{n_\tau} \frac{\min\{v, q_s\}}{g_n(v)} A_{N_s, n_s}(q_s) \right\}$$

where  $\prod_{\tau>k} (1 - q_\tau)^{n_\tau} = 1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $F^{-1}(1 - u)$  is decreasing and differentiable due to our assumptions, there exists  $r(v) > 0$  such that  $F^{-1}(1 - u) = \int_u^1 r(v) dv$ . Then, dropping the terms multiplying  $B_{n_s}$  in (3) and changing the order of integration, we obtain the following lower bound

$$G_{n,k} \geq \sum_{s=1}^k \int_0^1 r(v) \min\{v, q_s\} A_{N_s, n_s}(q_s) \prod_{\tau>s} (1 - q_\tau)^{n_\tau} dv.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} E_n &= \sum_{t=1}^n \int_0^\infty x \cdot t F(x)^{t-1} dF(x) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n \int_0^1 F^{-1}(1 - u) \cdot t(1 - u)^{t-1} du \\ &= \int_0^1 r(v) \int_0^v \sum_{t=1}^n t(1 - u)^{t-1} du dv = \int_0^1 r(v) g_n(v) dv. \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows by taking the ratio between the lower bound for  $G_{n,k}$  and  $E_n$  and using the standard inequality  $\int_0^1 a(v) dv / \int_0^1 b(v) dv \geq \inf_{v \in [0,1]} a(v)/b(v)$  for  $a(v), b(v) > 0$  for  $v \in [0, 1]$ .  $\square$

In the following subsection, we will utilize the key inequality to obtain tight guarantees for  $k = 1$  threshold and new guarantees for  $k \in \{2, 3\}$ . The following are technical propositions needed in the following subsections; their proof is deferred to Appendix A.

**Proposition 2.** *For  $v \in [0, 1]$ , the following holds:*

- (i)  $g_n(v)$  is increasing.
- (ii)  $g_n(v)/v$  is decreasing.

We define the following two auxiliary functions that will serve us as limits of  $A_{N_s, n_s}$  and  $g_n$ ,

$$\bar{A}_{\phi, \theta}(\alpha) = \frac{e^{-\alpha\theta}(1 - (\phi - \theta)\alpha) + \alpha\phi - 1}{\alpha^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{g}(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-\lambda} + \lambda - 1}{\lambda} = \lambda \cdot \bar{A}_{1,1}(\lambda).$$

**Proposition 3.** *The following limits hold:*

- (i) For  $1 \geq \phi \geq \theta \geq 0$ , and  $\alpha \geq 0$ , we have  $A_{\phi n, \theta n}(\alpha/n)/n^2 \rightarrow \bar{A}_{\phi, \theta}(\alpha)$ .
- (ii) For  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,  $g_n(\lambda/n)/n \rightarrow \bar{g}(\lambda)$ .

## 2.2 Optimal Analysis for Single-Threshold Algorithms

In this subsection, we focus on single-threshold algorithms. We first prove an improved guarantee compared to [Abels et al. \[2023\]](#). We then show that our analysis is tight. The two results presented in this subsection conclude that  $\gamma_{n,1} \approx (1+e^{-2})/2 \approx 0.567$  for  $n$  large. The improved guarantee for single-threshold algorithms follows from the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\alpha \geq 1$  fixed. Then, for any  $n \geq \alpha^2 + \alpha - 1$ , the single-threshold algorithm that uses the quantile  $q = \alpha/(n+1)$  guarantees*

$$\frac{G_{n,1}}{E_n} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{n+1-\alpha}\right) \min\{2, \alpha\} \left(\frac{e^{-\alpha} + \alpha - 1}{\alpha^2}\right)$$

on any smooth and strictly increasing distribution  $F$ .

We first show the improved guarantee. Let  $f(\alpha) = \min\{2, \alpha\}(e^{-\alpha} + \alpha - 1)/\alpha^2$ . Then,  $f$  is increasing in  $[0, 2]$  and decreasing in  $[2, +\infty)$ . Hence, the maximum of  $f$  is attained at  $\alpha = 2$  with  $f(2) = (1/2) \cdot (e^{-2} + 1) \approx 0.567$ . Hence,  $\gamma_{n,1} \geq (1 - 4/(n-1))(1 + e^{-2})/2$  for any  $n \geq 5$ . Note that this almost coincide with the quantile considered by [Abels et al. \[2023\]](#); however, our analysis provides a better bound. For  $n \geq 15$ , our guarantee is already better than the original bound 0.396. At the end of the subsection, we show that our analysis is tight.

*Proof of Lemma 2.* We use the [Lemma 1](#) with  $k = 1$ ,  $n_1 = n$  to obtain

$$\frac{G_{n,1}}{E_n} \geq \inf_{v \in [0,1]} \left\{ \frac{\min\{v, \alpha/(n+1)\}}{g_n(v)} A_{n,n}(\alpha/n) \right\}.$$

We analyze separately the cases where  $v \leq \alpha/(n+1)$  and  $v > \alpha/(n+1)$ . Note that for  $v \leq \alpha/(n+1)$ ,

$$\frac{\min\{v, \alpha/(n+1)\}}{g_n(v)} = \frac{v}{g_n(v)}$$

By [Proposition 2](#), this last function is increasing in  $v$  so it attains its minimum at  $v = 0$ . Furthermore,  $\lim_{v \rightarrow 0} g_n(v)/v \rightarrow 2/(n(n+1))$  which can be easily computed using the definition of  $g_n(v)$ . Now, for  $v \geq \alpha/(n+1)$ ,

$$\frac{\min\{v, \alpha/(n+1)\}}{g_n(v)} = \frac{\alpha}{(n+1)g_n(v)}$$

and this last function is decreasing by [Proposition 2](#); hence, it attains its minimum at  $v = 1$  with  $\lim_{v \rightarrow 1} g_n(v) = n$ . Putting these two results together, we obtain

$$\frac{G_{n,1}}{E_n} \geq \frac{\min\{2, \alpha\}}{n(n+1)} A_{n,n}(\alpha/(n+1)) \geq \min\{2, \alpha\} \frac{(1 - \alpha/(n+1))^{n+1} + \alpha - 1}{\alpha^2}.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{G_{n,1}}{E_n} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{n+1-\alpha}\right) \min\{2, \alpha\} \left(\frac{e^{-\alpha} + \alpha - 1}{\alpha^2}\right). \quad \square$$

We present a tight upper bound for the analysis of single-threshold algorithms. Fix  $\beta \in [1, n]$ . We present the inverse of a distribution  $f(u) = F^{-1}(1-u)$  as the analysis for quantiles is more amenable. Consider

$$f(u) = \begin{cases} 2n \left(\frac{e^2-3}{e^2+1}\right) & u \in [0, 1/n^3), \\ \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{4}{e^2+1}\right) & u \in [1/n^3, 1/n^3 + \beta/n), \\ 0 & u \in [1/n^3 + \beta/n, 1). \end{cases}$$



Note that  $f$  is nonincreasing and discontinuous. However, by using a regularizer, we can obtain a infinite differentiable approximation to  $f$  where the same results that we present here hold, up to an error that can be made arbitrarily small.

The following two proposition provide asymptotic exact value and upper bound on the prophet value and the single-threshold algorithm, respectively. We defer their proof to Appendix A.

**Proposition 4.** *We have  $E_n \rightarrow (e^2 - 3)/(e^2 + 1) + 4(e^{-\beta} + \beta - 1)/(\beta(e^2 + 1))$  for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

**Proposition 5.** *We have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_{n,1} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{a}{2}, (a + b\beta) \left( \frac{e^{-\beta} + \beta - 1}{\beta^2} \right), \max_{\lambda \in [0, \beta]} \left\{ \left( \frac{e^{-\lambda} + \lambda - 1}{\lambda^2} \right) (a + \lambda b) \right\} \right\},$$

where  $a = 2(e^2 - 3)/(e^2 + 1)$  and  $b = 4/(e^2 + 1)$ .

Using these two propositions,

$$\lim_n \frac{G_{n,1}}{E_n} \leq \frac{\max \left\{ a/2, (a + b\beta) \left( \frac{e^{-\beta} + \beta - 1}{\beta^2} \right), \max_{\lambda \in [0, \beta]} \left\{ \left( \frac{e^{-\lambda} + \lambda - 1}{\lambda^2} \right) (a + \lambda b) \right\} \right\}}{(e^2 - 3)/(e^2 + 1) + 4(e^{-\beta} + \beta - 1)/(\beta(e^2 + 1))}$$

for any  $\beta > 0$ . Note that the denominator in the right hand side of the inequality tends to 1 when  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence,

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G_{n,1}}{E_n} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{e^2 - 3}{e^2 + 1}, \frac{4}{e^2 + 1}, \max_{\lambda \in [0, \infty)} \left\{ \left( \frac{e^{-\lambda} + \lambda - 1}{\lambda^2} \right) \left( 2 \frac{e^2 - 3}{e^2 + 1} + \lambda \frac{4}{e^2 + 1} \right) \right\} \right\}$$

The function  $\lambda \mapsto (2(e^2 - 3) + 4\lambda)(e^{-\lambda} + \lambda - 1)/\lambda^2$  is increasing between  $[0, 2]$  and decreasing in  $[2, +\infty)$  (see Proposition 8 in Appendix A). Hence, the maximum of such a function happens at  $\lambda = 2$ . Therefore,

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G_{n,1}}{E_n} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{e^2 - 3}{e^2 + 1}, \frac{4}{e^2 + 1}, \frac{1}{2e^2} (e^2 + 1) \right\} = \frac{1 + e^{-2}}{2}.$$

### 2.3 Analysis and Guarantees for Multiple Thresholds

We start this subsection with 2-threshold algorithms. In this case, we can still provide a refined analysis with a value that improves upon the approximation obtained with single-threshold algorithms. For  $k \geq 3$  thresholds, analyzing intervals of different sizes becomes nontrivial, so we focus on intervals of the same size.

**Analysis for  $k = 2$  Thresholds.** We set  $k = 2$ ,  $n_1 = (1 - \theta)n$  and  $n_2 = \theta n$  with  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . To avoid notational clutter, we assume that  $n_1, n_2$  are integers. The following lemma gives us a lower bound on the asymptotic value of the approximation ratio.

**Lemma 3.** *For  $0 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_1 < n$  fixed, the 2-threshold algorithm that uses quantile  $q_2/n$  in the first  $n_2 = \theta n$  observed values and quantile  $q_1 = \alpha_1/n$  in the remaining  $n_1 = (1 - \theta)n$  values attains an asymptotic approximation ratio of*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G_{n,2}}{E_n} \geq \min \left\{ 2 \left( \bar{A}_{1,\theta}(\alpha_2) + \bar{A}_{1-\theta,1-\theta}(\alpha_1) e^{-\alpha_2 \theta} \right), \alpha_2 \bar{A}_{1,\theta}(\alpha_2) + \alpha_1 \bar{A}_{1-\theta,1-\theta}(\alpha_1) e^{-\alpha_2 \theta}, \inf_{\lambda \in [\alpha_2, \alpha_1]} \left\{ \frac{\alpha_2}{\bar{g}(\lambda)} \bar{A}_{1,\theta}(\alpha_2) + \frac{\lambda}{\bar{g}(\lambda)} \bar{A}_{1-\theta,1-\theta}(\alpha_1) e^{-\alpha_2 \theta} \right\} \right\}.$$

Optimizing over  $\alpha_2 < \alpha_1$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ , we get  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{n,2} \geq 0.587$  for  $\alpha_2 \approx 0.671$ ,  $\alpha_1 \approx 3.210$  and  $\theta \approx 0.160$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.* The proof of this lemma follows a similar scheme as in the proof of Lemma 2. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{G_{n,2}}{E_n} &\geq \inf_{v \in [0,1]} \left\{ \frac{\min\{v, \alpha_2/n\}}{g_n(v)} A_{n,\theta n}(\alpha_2/n) + \frac{\min\{v, \alpha_1/n\}}{g_n(v)} (1 - \alpha_2/n)^n A_{(1-\theta)n, (1-\theta)n}(\alpha_1/n) \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \frac{2}{n(n+1)} A_{n,\theta n}(\alpha_2/n) + \frac{2}{n(n+1)} (1 - \alpha_2/n)^{\theta n} A_{(1-\theta)n, (1-\theta)n}(\alpha_1/n), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{\alpha_2}{n^2} A_{n,\theta n}(\alpha_2/n) + \frac{\alpha_1}{n^2} (1 - \alpha_2/n)^{\theta n} A_{(1-\theta)n, (1-\theta)n}(\alpha_1/n), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \inf_{v \in [\alpha_2/n, \alpha_1/n]} \left\{ \frac{\alpha_2/n}{g_n(v)} A_{n,\theta n}(\alpha_2/n) + \frac{v}{g_n(v)} (1 - \alpha_2/n)^{\theta n} A_{(1-\theta)n, (1-\theta)n}(\alpha_1/n) \right\} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where in the first line we used the Key Lemma 1 and in the second line we broke down the interval  $[0, 1]$  into  $[0, \alpha_2/n]$ ,  $[\alpha_2/n, \alpha_1/n]$  and  $[\alpha_1/n, 1]$  and used Proposition 2. The result now follows by taking limit in  $n$  and using Proposition 3.  $\square$

**Thresholds with Equidistant Intervals.** We consider  $k \geq 1$  thresholds  $0 < \alpha_k/n < \alpha_{k-1}/n < \dots < \alpha_1/n < 1$  and  $n_s = n/k$  for all  $s = 1, \dots, k$ , where we assumed that  $k$  divides  $n$ . This last assumption is to avoid notational clutter; otherwise, we would have  $n_s \in \{\lfloor n/k \rfloor, \lceil n/k \rceil\}$  for all  $s = 1, \dots, k$ , but since  $n_s/n \rightarrow 1/k$  when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the asymptotic behavior is unaltered when we focus on  $n$  divisible by  $k$ . Then, similar as in the previous cases, using Lemma 1 and breaking down the interval of optimization, we obtain

**Lemma 4.** *For any fixed  $0 < \alpha_k < \alpha_{k-1} < \dots < \alpha_1 < n$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G_{n,k}}{E_n} &\geq \min \left\{ 2 \sum_{t=1}^k e^{-\sum_{\tau>t} \alpha_\tau/k} \bar{A}_{t/k, 1/k}(\alpha_t), \sum_{t=1}^k \alpha_t e^{-\sum_{\tau>t} \alpha_\tau/k} \bar{A}_{t,k}(\alpha_t), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \inf_{\substack{j \in [k-1] \\ \lambda \in [\alpha_{j+1}, \alpha_j]}} \left\{ \frac{\lambda}{\bar{g}(\lambda)} \sum_{t \leq j} e^{-\sum_{\tau>t} \alpha_\tau/k} \bar{A}_{t/k, 1/k}(\alpha_t) + \frac{1}{\bar{g}(\lambda)} \sum_{t>j} \alpha_t e^{-\sum_{\tau>t} \alpha_\tau/k} \bar{A}_{t/k, 1/k}(\alpha_t) \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We skip the proof as it follows the same construction as in the previous subsections. For  $k = 3$ , via inspection on values  $\alpha_3 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_1$ , we get  $\alpha_1 \approx 62.74$ ,  $\alpha_2 \approx 5.55$ ,  $\alpha_3 \approx 0.960$  and  $\lim_n \gamma_{n,3} \geq 0.60265$ .

### 3 Tightness via Convex Optimization

Given a distribution  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , the value  $(1 + \varepsilon)G_n(F) - E_n(F)$  measures the difference between the optimal policy value  $G_n(F)$ , scaled by  $1 + \varepsilon$ , and the benchmark  $E_n(F)$ . Consider the following quantity:  $\varepsilon_n = \inf\{\varepsilon \geq 0 : (1 + \varepsilon)G_n(F) - E_n(F) \geq 0 \text{ for every } F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Observe that for every positive integer  $n$ , it holds directly from the definition of  $\gamma_n$  and  $\varepsilon_n$  that  $\gamma_n = 1/(1 + \varepsilon_n)$ .

In what follows, we fix a positive integer  $n$  and  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ . Furthermore, for notation simplicity, we denote by  $P_n(t)$  the value  $n - \sum_{\ell=1}^n t^\ell$ . For every  $j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$ , let  $A_j : \mathbb{R}^{j+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function defined as

$$A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}) = \frac{j+2}{j+1} y_{j+1} - \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \sum_{\ell=1}^j y_\ell,$$

and let  $L_{n,\varepsilon} : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the linear function defined as

$$L_{n,\varepsilon}(y) = (1 + \varepsilon)n \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j \right) - \frac{n(n+1)}{2(n-1)} \left( n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j - (n-1) \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} y_j \right).$$

Consider the function  $\Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon} : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$\Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}(y) = L_{n,\varepsilon}(y) - P_n(2y_1) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} y_j P_n(A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1})/y_j).$$

Let  $K_n$  be the polyhedron in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  defined as follows:

$$K_n = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n-1} : A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}) \geq 0 \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\} \right\}.$$

The following is the main result of this section.

**Theorem 1.** *For every positive integer  $n$ , there exists  $\varepsilon'_n \geq \varepsilon_n$  such that for every  $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n]$ , the following holds:*

- (i)  $(1 + \varepsilon)G_n(F) \geq E_n(F)$  for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  if and only if the value of the optimization problem

$$\min \left\{ \Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}(y) : y \in K_n \right\} \quad [C]_{n,\varepsilon}$$

is non-negative.

- (ii) *There exists a unique point  $y^*$  satisfying  $\nabla \Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}(y^*) = 0$ , and furthermore, we have  $y^* \in K_n$ . Then, in particular,  $y^*$  is the unique global minimum of  $[C]_{n,\varepsilon}$ .*

We prove Theorem 1 in Section 3.1. In Proposition 7, we show that the objective function  $\Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}$  in the optimization problem  $[C]_{n,\varepsilon}$  is convex. Then, we get the following consequences. First, from Theorem 1(i), we get that the optimal value of  $[C]_{n,\varepsilon}$  is non-negative for every  $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n]$ . Furthermore, from Theorem 1(ii), for every  $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n]$  the unique global minimum is obtained by solving the system of first-order optimality conditions. We can exploit this property to reduce the problem of finding  $\varepsilon_n$  to studying the system  $\nabla \Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}(y) = 0$ . We show this system behaves nicely in the range of  $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n]$ : it is linear in  $y$ , and after a convenient linear change of variables, we obtain a system  $[FO]_{n,\varepsilon}$  that maps to the space of values achievable in the optimal policy with  $n$  periods in the POT problem. This way, not only can we interpret the solution of this linear system as worst-case instances for the POT problem, but we can also compute, up to arbitrary precision, the value of  $\varepsilon_n$ , as we just need to compute the smallest  $\varepsilon$  for which the linear system has a solution. We provide all the details of our analysis in Section 3.1.

**Analysis roadmap.** We organize the proof of Theorem 1 into two key steps. In the first key step (Lemma 7), we reduce the problem of finding the worst-case approximation ratio to an infinite-dimensional optimization problem over the set of positive sequences satisfying three particular monotonicity properties (see (I)-(III) in Section 3.1). To prove this equivalence, we show that the space of worst-case distributions can be fully characterized by the threshold sequences  $(\tau_n(F))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in the optimal dynamic programming policy, and furthermore, the set of threshold sequences via the optimal dynamic programming policy is precisely the space of sequences satisfying (I)-(III) (Lemma 5 and Lemma 6). While the first step already allows us to reduce the problem to a constrained problem in infinite dimension, in the second step, we study the structure of the infinite-dimensional optimization problem and show that it can be further reduced to the nicely behaved finite-dimensional convex optimization problem  $[C]_{n,\varepsilon}$  (Lemma 8 and Lemma 10).

### 3.1 Proof of Theorem 1

For every distribution  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , we denote by  $\tau(F) = (\tau_j(F))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  the sequence such that  $\tau_0(F) = 0$  and  $\tau_n(F) = G_n(F)/n$  for every positive integer  $n$ . It can be shown that the optimal policy can be implemented by using the sequence  $(\tau_j(F))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  as thresholds: if we have  $n$  periods to go, we accept the value if it exceeds the threshold  $\tau_n(F)$  [Abels et al., 2023, Theorem 1].

For a sequence  $T = (T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we define  $\mu_0(T) = 2(T_2 - T_1)$ , and

$$\mu_j(T) = \frac{j+2}{j+1}T_{j+2} - \frac{j+1}{j}T_{j+1} + \frac{T_1}{j(j+1)} \text{ for } j \geq 1.$$

In the following proposition, we provide an identity satisfied by the sequence  $\tau(F)$  that will be useful in our analysis.

**Proposition 6.** *For every distribution  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , and every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have*

$$\int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} F(x) dx = \mu_j(\tau(F)).$$

*The sequence  $(\tau_j(F))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is strictly increasing and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_j(F) = \omega_1(F)$ . Furthermore, we have  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_j(F)/j = 0$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We first consider  $j = 0$ . In this case, considering  $X$  distributed according to  $F$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tau_2(F) &= G_2(F) \\ &= G_1(F) + \mathbf{E}[\max(G_1(F), X)] \\ &= 2G_1(F) + \mathbf{E}[\max(0, X - G_1(F))] \\ &= 2\tau_1(F) + \mathbf{E}[\max(0, X - \tau_1(F))] \\ &= 2\tau_1(F) + \int_{\tau_1(F)}^{\infty} (1 - F(x)) dx \\ &= 2\tau_1(F) + \tau_1(F) - \int_0^{\tau_1(F)} (1 - F(x)) dx \\ &= 2\tau_1(F) + \tau_1(F) - \tau_1(F) + \int_0^{\tau_1(F)} F(x) dx = 2\tau_1(F) + \int_{\tau_0(F)}^{\tau_1(F)} F(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality holds since  $G_1(F) = \tau_1(F)$ , and the fifth holds from the fact that  $\tau_1(F) = \mathbf{E}(X) = \int_0^{\infty} (1 - F(x)) dx$ . Since  $\mu_0(\tau(F)) = 2(\tau_2(F) - \tau_1(F))$ , the above chain of equalities implies the identity for this case.

For  $j \geq 1$ , from the recurrence satisfied by the optimal policy, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (j+1)\tau_{j+1}(F) &= G_1(F) + \mathbf{E}[\max(G_j(F), jX)] \\ &= \tau_1(F) + \mathbf{E}[\max(j\tau_j(F), jX)] \\ &= \tau_1(F) + j\mathbf{E}[\max(\tau_j(F), X)], \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, the following equality holds:

$$\frac{(j+1)\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_1(F)}{j} = \mathbf{E}[\max(\tau_j(F), X)]. \quad (4)$$

By applying (4) for both  $j$  and  $j + 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_j(\tau(F)) &= ((j+2)\tau_{j+2}(F) - \tau_1(F))/(j+1) - ((j+1)\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_1(F))/j \\
&= \mathbf{E}[\max(\tau_{j+1}(F), X)] - \mathbf{E}[\max(\tau_j(F), X)] \\
&= \tau_{j+1}(F) + \mathbf{E}[\max(0, X - \tau_{j+1}(F))] - \tau_j(F) - \mathbf{E}[\max(0, X - \tau_j(F))] \\
&= \tau_{j+1}(F) + \int_{\tau_{j+1}(F)}^{\infty} (1 - F(x))dx - \tau_j(F) - \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\infty} (1 - F(x))dx \\
&= \tau_{j+1}(F) + \tau_1(F) - \int_0^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} (1 - F(x))dx - \tau_j(F) - \tau_1(F) + \int_0^{\tau_j(F)} (1 - F(x))dx \\
&= \int_0^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} F(x)dx - \int_0^{\tau_j(F)} F(x)dx = \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} F(x)dx,
\end{aligned}$$

where the fifth equality holds by using that  $\tau_1(F) = \mathbf{E}[X] = \int_0^{\infty} (1 - F(x))dx$ . This finishes the proof of the first part of the proposition.

We now show that  $\tau(F)$  is a strictly increasing sequence. Observe that since  $\omega_0(F) < \omega_1(F)$ , the expectation of  $F$ , which is equal to  $\tau_1(F)$ , is strictly positive, and therefore  $\tau_1(F) > 0 = \tau_0(F)$ . We proceed by induction; suppose that  $\tau_j(F) < \tau_{j+1}(F)$  for every  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$  and  $\ell \geq 0$ . Observe that from the identity shown in the first part of the proof, we have

$$0 < \int_{\tau_\ell(F)}^{\tau_{\ell+1}(F)} F(x)dx = \mu_\ell(\tau(F)) = \frac{\ell+2}{\ell+1}\tau_{\ell+2}(F) - \frac{\ell+1}{\ell}\tau_{\ell+1}(F) + \frac{\tau_1(F)}{\ell(\ell+1)},$$

where the inequality holds since  $\tau_\ell(F)$  is strictly less than  $\tau_{\ell+1}(F)$ . Therefore,

$$\tau_{\ell+2}(F) > \frac{(\ell+1)^2}{\ell(\ell+2)}\tau_{\ell+1}(F) - \frac{\tau_1(F)}{\ell(\ell+2)} = \tau_{\ell+1}(F) + \frac{\tau_{\ell+1}(F) - \tau_1(F)}{\ell(\ell+2)} > \tau_{\ell+1}(F),$$

where the last inequality follows since  $\tau_1(F) < \tau_{\ell+1}(F)$ . This concludes the proof of this part.

Finally, we prove that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_j(F) = \omega_1(F)$ , and we proceed by contradiction. Suppose  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_j(F) = \mathcal{T} < \omega_1(F)$ , with  $\mathcal{T}$  finite, and let  $M$  be the minimum between  $\mathcal{T} + 0.5$ , and  $(\mathcal{T} + \omega_1(F))/2$ . We remark that as  $\omega_1(F)$  could be  $\infty$ , this definition of  $M$  guarantees that  $M$  is finite and strictly less than  $\omega_1(F)$  in any case. Observe that since  $\tau_j(F)$  is non-decreasing, it holds that  $\tau_j(F) \leq \mathcal{T}$  for every  $j$ . Then, from the identity (4), for every  $j \geq 1$  we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(j+1)\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_1(F)}{j} - \tau_j(F) &= \mathbf{E}[\max(0, X - \tau_j(F))] \\
&= \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\infty} (1 - F(x))dx \\
&= \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\omega_1(F)} (1 - F(x))dx \\
&\geq \int_{\mathcal{T}}^M (1 - F(x))dx \geq (M - \mathcal{T})(1 - F(M)), \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality holds since  $F(x) = 1$  for  $x > \omega_1(F)$ , the first inequality holds since  $\tau_j(F) \leq \mathcal{T} < M < \omega_1(F)$ , and the last inequality follows from  $1 - F$  being non-increasing. Observe that  $(M - \mathcal{T})(1 - F(M))$

is strictly positive, since  $F(M) < 1$ , as  $M < \omega_1(F)$ . Then, for every  $k, \ell \geq 1$ , with  $k \geq \ell + 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_k(F) - \tau_\ell(F) &= \sum_{j=\ell}^{k-1} (\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)) \\
&= \sum_{j=\ell}^{k-1} \left( \frac{j+1}{j} \tau_{j+1}(F) - \frac{\tau_1(F)}{j} - \tau_j(F) \right) - \sum_{j=\ell}^{k-1} \frac{\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_1(F)}{j} \\
&\geq (k - \ell)(M - \mathcal{T})(1 - F(M)) - \sum_{j=\ell}^{k-1} \frac{\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_1(F)}{j}, \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds from (5). To conclude the proof, we use the following claim.

**Claim 1.**  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_j(F)/j = 0$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)) = 0$ .

We defer the proof of Claim 1 to Appendix B. In particular, this implies the existence of an integer  $j_0$  such that  $(\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_1(F))/j < (M - \mathcal{T})(1 - F(M))/2$  for every  $j \geq j_0$ . Together with (6), this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_k(F) - \tau_\ell(F) &\geq (k - \ell)(M - \mathcal{T})(1 - F(M)) - \frac{1}{2}(k - \ell)(M - \mathcal{T})(1 - F(M)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(k - \ell)(M - \mathcal{T})(1 - F(M)) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts that  $\tau_k(F) \leq \mathcal{T} < M$ . This finishes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

**Step 1: An Infinite-Dimensional Optimization Problem.** In what follows, we provide the first reduction for studying the approximation ratio of the optimal policy. Consider the following conditions for a sequence  $T = (T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ :

- (I)  $T_0 = 0$ ,  $T_j$  is strictly increasing in  $j$ ,  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} T_j/j = 0$ , and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (T_{j+1} - T_j) = 0$ .
- (II)  $\mu_j(T) \leq T_{j+1} - T_j$  for every  $j$ .
- (III)  $\mu_j(T)/(T_{j+1} - T_j)$  is non-decreasing in  $j$ .

In the following lemma, we show that the sequence of thresholds  $(\tau_j(F))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies the previous monotonicity properties and that we can upper bound the offline benchmark  $E_n(F)$  in terms of the thresholds sequence.

**Lemma 5.** *For every distribution  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , the following holds:*

- (i) *The sequence  $\tau(F) = (\tau_j(F))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies conditions (I)-(III).*
- (ii) *For every positive integer  $n$ , we have*

$$E_n(F) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(\tau(F))}{\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)} \right).$$

*Proof.* We start by proving (i). Condition (I) is directly satisfied by Proposition 6. By the integral equality in Proposition 6, and the fact that  $F(x) \leq 1$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , we have

$$\frac{\mu_j(\tau(F))}{\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)} = \frac{1}{\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)} \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} F(x) dx \leq \frac{1}{\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)} \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} dx = 1,$$

and therefore  $\tau(F)$  satisfies condition (II). Finally, since  $F$  is non-decreasing, we have

$$F(\tau_j(F))(\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)) \leq \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} F(x)dx \leq F(\tau_{j+1}(F))(\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)),$$

and therefore, these inequalities, together with the integral equality from Proposition 6 imply that

$$F(\tau_j(F)) \leq \frac{\mu_j(\tau(F))}{\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)} \leq F(\tau_{j+1}(F)),$$

thus the sequence  $\tau(F)$  satisfies condition (III).

Now we proceed to prove part (ii). For every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\Lambda_j(y) = 1/(\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F))$ . Then, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} E_n(F) &= \int_0^\infty \left( n - \sum_{\ell=1}^n F(x)^\ell \right) dx \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^\infty \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} \left( n - \sum_{\ell=1}^n F(x)^\ell \right) dx \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^\infty \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} P_n(F(x)) dx = \sum_{j=0}^\infty (\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)) \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} P_n(F(x)) \Lambda_j(x) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the first equality holds since  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_j(F) = \omega_1(F)$  by Proposition 6 and  $F(x) = 1$  for every  $x > \omega_1(F)$ , the second equality holds by partitioning the non-negative reals according to  $\tau(F)$  strictly increasing, the fourth by exchanging the integral with the finite sum, and the last equality follows from the definition of  $\Lambda_j$  for every  $j$ . Since  $P_n$  is concave and  $\Lambda_j$  is a probability density function over  $[\tau_j(F), \tau_{j+1}(F))$  for every  $j$ , Jensen's inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} P_n(F(x)) \Lambda_j(x) dx \\ &\leq P_n \left( \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} F(x) \Lambda_j(x) dx \right) \\ &= P_n \left( \frac{1}{\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)} \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\tau_{j+1}(F)} F(x) dx \right) = P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(\tau(F))}{\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the first equality holds from the definition of  $\Lambda_j$  and the second by Proposition 6. Then, from inequalities (7)-(8), we get the upper bound on  $E_n(F)$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

In the following lemma, we show that for any sequence satisfying the monotonicity properties (I)-(III), there is a distribution for which this sequence gives the corresponding thresholds precisely.

**Lemma 6.** *For every sequence  $T = (T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  that satisfies conditions (I)-(III), there exists a distribution  $H \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $G_\ell(H) = \ell \cdot T_\ell$  for every  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , and*

$$E_n(H) = \sum_{j=0}^\infty (T_{j+1} - T_j) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j} \right).$$

*Proof.* Note that condition (II) implies that the sequence  $(\mu_j(T)/(T_{j+1} - T_j))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is upper bounded by one, and non-decreasing by condition (III), therefore, it has a limit  $\mathcal{L} \in (0, 1]$ .

**Claim 2.** When  $\mathcal{L} < 1$ , there exists a finite value  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} T_j = \mathcal{T}$ .

We defer the proof of Claim 2 to Appendix B, and we show how to construct  $H$  using this claim. Let  $H : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function defined by parts as follows: for every non-negative integer  $j$ , let  $H(x) = \mu_j(T)/(T_{j+1} - T_j)$  for every  $x \in [T_j, T_{j+1})$ ,  $H(x) = 0$  for every  $x \in (-\infty, 0)$ , and  $H(x) = 1$  for every  $x \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} T_j$ . We show first that  $H$  is, in fact, a distribution. The non-negativity holds by construction, and the monotonicity condition (III) satisfied by  $T$  implies directly that  $H$  is non-decreasing. Then, it just remains to show that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} H(x) = 1$ . We have two cases. When  $\mathcal{L} = 1$  we directly get that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} H(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(T)/(T_{j+1} - T_j) = \mathcal{L} = 1$ . Otherwise, if  $\mathcal{L} < 1$ , by Claim 2 we have that  $(T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to a finite value  $\mathcal{T}$  and, by construction,  $H(x) = 1$  for every  $x \geq \mathcal{T}$ ; thus in this case we also have that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} H(x) = 1$ . We conclude that  $H$  is a distribution.

Now we show  $G_j(H)/j = \tau_j(H) = T_j$  for every  $j$ . By construction, we have  $G_0(H) = T_0 = 0$ .

**Claim 3.** It holds  $G_1(H) = T_1$ .

We defer the proof of Claim 3 to Appendix B, and now proceed by induction for  $j \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $\tau_j(H) = T_j$  for every  $j \in \{0, \dots, \ell + 1\}$  for some  $\ell$ ; since  $\tau_1(H) = G_1(H)$ , Claim 3 implies that  $T_1 = \tau_1(H)$ . By applying Proposition 6 with the distribution  $H$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\ell(\tau(H)) &= \int_{\tau_\ell(H)}^{\tau_{\ell+1}(H)} H(x) dx \\ &= \int_{T_\ell}^{T_{\ell+1}} H(x) dx = \int_{T_\ell}^{T_{\ell+1}} \frac{\mu_\ell(T)}{T_{\ell+1} - T_\ell} dx = \mu_\ell(T), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the second equality holds since  $\tau_\ell(H) = T_\ell$  and  $\tau_{\ell+1}(H) = T_{\ell+1}$ , and the third equality follows from the definition of  $H$  in  $[T_\ell, T_{\ell+1})$ . On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\ell(\tau(H)) &= \frac{\ell + 2}{\ell + 1} \tau_{\ell+2}(H) - \frac{\ell + 1}{\ell} \tau_{\ell+1}(H) + \frac{\tau_1(H)}{\ell(\ell + 1)} \\ &= \frac{\ell + 2}{\ell + 1} \tau_{\ell+2}(H) - \frac{\ell + 1}{\ell} T_{\ell+1} + \frac{T_1}{\ell(\ell + 1)} \\ &= \mu_\ell(T) + \frac{\ell + 2}{\ell + 1} \tau_{\ell+2}(H) - \frac{\ell + 2}{\ell + 1} T_{\ell+2} = \mu_\ell(\tau(H)) + \frac{\ell + 2}{\ell + 1} \tau_{\ell+2}(H) - \frac{\ell + 2}{\ell + 1} T_{\ell+2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds since  $\tau_1(H) = T_1$  and  $\tau_{\ell+1}(H) = T_{\ell+1}$ , the third by adding and subtracting a term to get  $\mu_\ell(T)$ , and last equality follows from (9). Therefore, we conclude that  $\tau_{\ell+2}(H) = T_{\ell+2}$ , which finishes the inductive step.



Finally, we compute  $E_n(H)$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_n(H) &= \int_0^\infty P_n(H(x))dx \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^\infty \int_{\tau_j(H)}^{\tau_{j+1}(H)} P_n(H(x))dx \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^\infty \int_{T_j}^{T_{j+1}} P_n(H(x))dx \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^\infty \int_{T_j}^{T_{j+1}} P_n\left(\frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j}\right) dx = \sum_{j=0}^\infty (T_{j+1} - T_j) P_n\left(\frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds since  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_j(H) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} T_j = \mathcal{T}$  and  $P_n(H(x)) = 0$  for every  $x \geq \mathcal{T}$ , the third equality holds since  $\tau(H) = T$ , and the fourth by replacing with the definition of  $H$  in every interval  $[T_j, T_{j+1})$ . This finishes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

By using Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, we can construct an infinite-dimensional constrained problem that captures the first key step of our analysis. Consider the following problem:

$$\min \left\{ (1 + \varepsilon)nT_n - \sum_{j=0}^\infty (T_{j+1} - T_j) P_n\left(\frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j}\right) : (T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ satisfies (I)-(III) and } T_1 = 1 \right\} \quad [I]_{n,\varepsilon}$$

The following lemma summarizes our first key step towards the proof of Theorem 1.

**Lemma 7.** *The optimal value of  $[I]_{n,\varepsilon}$  is non-negative if and only if  $(1 + \varepsilon)G_n(F) - E_n(F) \geq 0$  for every distribution  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose the optimal value of  $[I]_{n,\varepsilon}$  is non-negative and consider any distribution  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Consider the distribution  $F_\mu$  such that  $F_\mu(t) = F(\mu t)$ , where  $\mu$  is the expectation of  $F$ . Namely,  $F_\mu$  is the normalization of  $F$ , so the expectation of  $F_\mu$  is equal to one. In particular, we have  $G_n(F_\mu) = G_n(F)/\mu$  and  $E_n(F_\mu) = E_n(F)/\mu$  for every  $n$ . By Lemma 5 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\mu}((1 + \varepsilon)G_n(F) - E_n(F)) &= (1 + \varepsilon)G_n(F_\mu) - E_n(F_\mu) \\
&\geq (1 + \varepsilon)n\tau_n(F_\mu) - \sum_{j=0}^\infty (\tau_{j+1}(F_\mu) - \tau_j(F_\mu)) P_n\left(\frac{\mu_j(\tau(F_\mu))}{\tau_{j+1}(F_\mu) - \tau_j(F_\mu)}\right) \\
&\geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since  $\tau_1(F_\mu) = \tau_1(F)/\mu = \mu/\mu = 1$ , and therefore  $\tau(F_\mu)$  is feasible for the optimization problem  $[I]_{n,\varepsilon}$ .

Now, for the converse, consider the feasible sequence  $T = (T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  feasible for  $[I]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , i.e., satisfying (I)-(III) and  $T_1 = 1$ . By Lemma 6, there exists a distribution  $H$  for which  $T_j = G_j(H)/j = \tau_j(H)$ , and furthermore,

$$(1 + \varepsilon)nT_n - \sum_{j=0}^\infty (T_{j+1} - T_j) P_n\left(\frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j}\right) = (1 + \varepsilon)G_n(H) - E_n(H),$$

where the equality for the summation also holds from Lemma 6. Since  $(1 + \varepsilon)G_n(H) - E_n(H) \geq 0$ , we conclude that the objective value of  $T$  is non-negative in  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ . As this holds for any feasible sequence  $T$ , the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  is non-negative.  $\square$

**Step 2: The Convex Optimization Problem.** In what follows, we show the second reduction in our analysis, which finally yields the convex optimization problem in Theorem 1. We start by showing the convexity of the function  $\Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}$ .

**Proposition 7.** *The function  $\Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}$  is convex in the interior of  $K_n$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that the function  $L_{n,\varepsilon}$  is linear, and  $P_n(2y_1)$  is concave. Then, to show the convexity of the function  $\Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}$ , it is sufficient to study the function  $y_j P_n(A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1})/y_j)$  for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} y_j P_n(A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1})/y_j) &= y_j \left( n - \sum_{\ell=1}^n (A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1})/y_j)^\ell \right) \\ &= n y_j - \sum_{\ell=1}^n (A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}))^\ell y_j^{1-\ell}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, it is sufficient to study for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$ , and each  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  the function  $f_{j,\ell}(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}) = (A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}))^\ell y_j^{1-\ell}$ . We will show in what follows that  $f_{j,\ell}$  is convex in the region

$$R_j = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^{j+1} : A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}) > 0, y_1, \dots, y_{j+1} > 0 \right\}.$$

In particular, this implies that  $f_{n-2,\ell}$  is convex in  $R_n \supset K_n$  for each  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , which implies the convexity of  $\Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}$  in  $K_n$ .

We perform one more reduction to simplify the analysis of  $f_{j,\ell}$ . In what follows we fix  $j \geq 2$  and  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ; we study at the end the case of  $j = 1$ . When  $\ell = 1$ , we have  $f_{j,\ell} = A_j$ , which is a linear function, therefore convex; so we suppose  $\ell \geq 2$  in what follows. Consider the linear function given by  $Q(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}) = (\sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} y_\ell, y_j, y_{j+1})$ , and let  $g(u, v, w) = (h(u, v, w))^\ell v^{1-\ell}$  where  $h(u, v, w) = h_u u + h_v v + h_w w$  with  $h_u = h_v = -1/(j(j+1))$  and  $h_w = (j+2)/(j+1)$ . Then, we have  $f_{j,\ell}(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}) = g(Q(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}))$ . Since  $Q$  is linear, to conclude the convexity of  $f_{j,\ell}$  in  $R_j$  it is sufficient to check that  $g$  is convex in  $S = \{(u, v, w) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : h(u, v, w) > 0, u, v, w > 0\}$ .

We observe that all the second derivatives of  $g$  have an strictly positive common factor of  $b(u, v, w) = \ell(\ell-1)(h(u, v, w))^{\ell-2} v^{1-\ell}$ , and therefore we will study the simplified matrix  $H(u, v, w) = \nabla^2 g(u, v, w)/b(u, v, w)$ . We denote by  $C(u, v, w)$  the submatrix of  $H(u, v, w)$  corresponding to the derivatives respect to  $v$  and  $w$ , namely,

$$\begin{aligned} C(u, v, w) &= \frac{1}{b(u, v, w)} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{vv} g(u, v, w) & \partial_{vw} g(u, v, w) \\ \partial_{wv} g(u, v, w) & \partial_{ww} g(u, v, w) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} h_v^2 v^2 - 2h_v h(u, v, w)v + h^2(u, v, w) & h_v h_w v^2 - h_w h(u, v, w)v \\ h_v h_w v^2 - h_w h(u, v, w)v & h_w^2 v^2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (h_u u + h_w w)^2 & -h_w h_u u v - h_w^2 w v \\ -h_w h_u u v - h_w^2 w v & h_w^2 v^2 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,  $H_{uu}(u, v, w) = h_u^2 v^2 > 0$  in  $S$ , and therefore,  $H$  is positive semidefinite if and only if its Schur complement

$$F(u, v, w) = C(u, v, w) - \frac{1}{H_{uu}(u, v, w)} B^\top(u, v, w) B(u, v, w)$$

is positive semidefinite [Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Appendix A.5], where

$$\begin{aligned} B(u, v, w) &= \begin{bmatrix} H_{uv}(u, v, w) & H_{uw}(u, v, w) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{b(u, v, w)} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{uv} g(u, v, w) & \partial_{uw} g(u, v, w) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} -h_u^2 uv - h_u h_w wv & h_u h_w v^2 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by replacing with the explicit expression for  $B(u, v, w)$ , the second term in the Schur complement  $F(u, v, w)$  is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{h_u^2 v^2} B^\top(u, v, w) B(u, v, w) \\ &= \frac{1}{h_u^2 v^2} \begin{bmatrix} (h_u^2 uv + h_u h_w wv)^2 & -(h_u^2 uv + h_u h_w wv) h_u h_w v^2 \\ -(h_u^2 uv + h_u h_w wv) h_u h_w v^2 & h_u^2 h_w^2 v^4 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (h_u u + h_w w)^2 & -(h_u uv + h_w wv) h_w \\ -(h_u uv + h_u h_w wv) h_w & h_w^2 v^2 \end{bmatrix} = C(u, v, w), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore the Schur complement  $F(u, v, w)$  is equal to zero matrix. We therefore conclude that  $H(u, v, w)$  is positive semidefinite in  $S$ , i.e.,  $g$  is convex in  $S$ .

Finally, we go back to the case of  $j = 1$  and  $\ell \geq 2$ ; the case of  $\ell = 1$  is direct as  $f_{1,1} = A_1$  is a linear function and therefore convex. We have  $f_{1,\ell}(y_1, y_2) = 2^{-\ell} (3y_2 - y_1)^\ell y_1^\ell$ . In this case, by direct computation, we get that the eigenvalues of  $\nabla^2 f_{1,\ell}(y_1, y_2)$  are  $\lambda_1(y_1, y_2) = 0$  and  $\lambda_2(y_1, y_2) = 9\ell(\ell - 1)y_1^{-1-\ell}(y_1^2 + y_2^2)(3y_2 - y_1)^{\ell-2}$ , and  $\lambda_2(y_1, y_2)$  is always non-negative when  $A_1(y_1, y_2) = (3/2)y_2 - (1/2)y_1 > 0$  and  $y_1, y_2 > 0$ , i.e., in  $R_1$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

In the following lemma, we provide a way of lower-bounding the tail contribution to the objective in the optimization problem  $[J]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , that only depends on the values  $T_1, \dots, T_n$ . This allows, in particular, to reduce the number of variables for the problem.

**Lemma 8.** *For every sequence  $T = (T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $T_1 = 1$  that satisfies (I)-(III), and such that  $\mu_{n-1}(T)/(T_n - T_{n-1}) < 1$ , there exists  $\delta < 1$  such that*

$$\sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (T_{j+1} - T_j) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j} \right) \leq \frac{P_n(\delta)}{1 - \delta} \left( \frac{n}{n-1} T_n - T_{n-1} - \frac{1}{n-1} \right).$$

*Proof.* Consider the function  $\mathcal{G}$  defined over the space of sequences  $D = (D_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $D_0 = 1$  such that

$$\mathcal{G}(D) = \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} D_j P_n \left( \frac{j+2}{j+1} \cdot \frac{D_{j+1}}{D_j} - \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{D_k}{D_j} - \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \right).$$

Given any sequence  $(T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , if we define  $\hat{T}_j = T_{j+1} - T_j$ , we have

$$\mathcal{G}(\hat{T}) = \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (T_{j+1} - T_j) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j} \right),$$

namely, the function  $\mathcal{G}$  corresponds to the contribution of the total summation after performing a change of variables and working with the consecutive differences of the sequence. In particular, if we denote

$$\nu_j(D) = \frac{j+2}{j+1} \cdot \frac{D_{j+1}}{D_j} - \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{D_k}{D_j} - \frac{1}{j(j+1)},$$

the conditions (I)-(III) translate into the following: (i)  $\hat{T}_0 = 1$ , (ii)  $\nu_j(\hat{T}) \leq 1$  for every  $j$ , and (iii)  $\nu_j(\hat{T})$  is non-decreasing in  $j$ . We use the following property of  $\mathcal{G}$  to prove the lemma.

**Claim 4.** *For every  $j \geq n$ , the function  $\mathcal{G}(D)$  is non-decreasing in  $D_j$ .*

We defer the proof of Claim 4 to Appendix B, as it involves several derivatives computations. To prove this lemma, given any sequence  $T$  satisfying (I)-(III), i.e.,  $\hat{T}$  satisfying (i)-(iii), we will show the existence of a sequence  $R$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (A)  $\hat{R}_j = \hat{T}_j$  for every  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ .
- (B)  $\hat{R}_j \geq \hat{T}_j$  for every  $j \geq n-1$ .
- (C)  $\nu_j(\hat{R}) = \delta$  for every  $j \geq n-1$  and some  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ .

Before proving the existence of such sequence  $R$ , we show how to conclude the lemma. By Claim 4, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (T_{j+1} - T_j) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j} \right) &= \mathcal{G}(\hat{T}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{G}(\hat{R}) = \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (R_{j+1} - R_j) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(R)}{R_{j+1} - R_j} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Since the sequence  $R$  satisfies condition (C), for every  $j \geq n-1$  we have

$$\mu_j(R) = \frac{j+2}{j+1} R_{j+2} - \frac{j+1}{j} R_{j+1} + \frac{R_1}{j(j+1)} = \delta(R_{j+1} - R_j).$$

If we let  $\mathcal{S}^* = \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (R_{j+1} - R_j)$ , by rearranging terms in the above equality and taking summation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathcal{S}^* &= \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (R_{j+2} - R_{j+1}) + \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{j+1} R_{j+2} - \frac{1}{j} R_{j+1} + \frac{R_1}{j(j+1)} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S}^* - (R_n - R_{n-1}) + \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{j+1} (R_{j+2} - R_1) - \frac{1}{j} (R_{j+1} - R_1) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S}^* - (R_n - R_{n-1}) - \frac{1}{n-1} (R_n - R_1), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $\mathcal{S}^* = (1 - \delta)^{-1} ((n/(n-1))R_n - R_{n-1} - R_1/(n-1))$ . By using this in (10) we get

$$\sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (T_{j+1} - T_j) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j} \right) \leq \mathcal{S}^* P_n(\delta) = \frac{P_n(\delta)}{1 - \delta} \left( \frac{n}{n-1} R_n - R_{n-1} - \frac{R_1}{n-1} \right).$$

We conclude by observing that (A) guarantees that  $R_1 = T_1 = 1$ ,  $R_{n-1} = T_{n-1}$ , and  $R_n = T_n$ .

We now show the existence of the sequence  $R$  satisfying (A)-(C). Suppose that  $T$  does not satisfy these properties. Then, it must be that (C) is violated, and let  $k \geq n$  be the smallest integer such that  $v_k(\hat{T}) > v_{k-1}(\hat{T})$ . In particular,  $v_j(\hat{T}) = v_{n-1}(\hat{T})$  for every  $j \in \{n-1, \dots, k-1\}$ . We will construct a new sequence  $U$  satisfying conditions (I)-(III), for which (A)-(B) hold, and  $v_j(\hat{U}) = v_{n-1}(\hat{U})$  for every  $j \in \{n-1, \dots, k\}$ , that is, all these ratios are now equal up to  $k$ . The final sequence  $R$  that satisfies (C) is obtained by applying this same construction iteratively.

For each  $j \geq n-1$ , consider the function

$$\bar{v}_j(D_0, D_1, \dots, D_{j+1}) = \frac{j+2}{j+1} \cdot \frac{D_{j+1}}{D_j} - \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{D_k}{D_j} - \frac{1}{j(j+1)}.$$

Let  $\Delta = v_k(\hat{T})$  and define  $\hat{U} = (\hat{U}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  as follows. Let  $\hat{U}_j = \hat{T}_j$  for every  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ , and  $\hat{U}_j = \hat{T}_j$  for every  $j \geq k+1$ . For each  $j \in \{n, \dots, k\}$ , and given  $\theta \in (v_{n-1}(\hat{T}), \Delta)$ , we define  $y_j(\theta)$  according to the following:  $y_n(\theta)$  is such that

$$\bar{v}_{n-1}(\hat{T}_0, \hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, y_n(\theta)) = \theta, \quad (11)$$

and for each  $j \in \{n+1, \dots, k\}$ , the value  $y_j(\theta)$  is such that

$$\bar{v}_{j-1}(\hat{T}_0, \hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, y_n(\theta), \dots, y_{j-1}(\theta), y_j(\theta)) = \theta. \quad (12)$$

The function  $\bar{v}_{n-1}$  is linear in  $D_n$ , and since  $\bar{v}_{n-1}(\hat{T}_0, \dots, \hat{T}_n) = v_{n-1}(\hat{T}) < \Delta$ , there exists a unique value  $y_n(\theta) \geq \hat{T}_n$  such that (11) holds. Then, by using the same argument, for each  $j \in \{n+1, \dots, k\}$ , and given the values  $y_n(\theta), \dots, y_{j-1}(\theta)$ , there exists a unique value  $y_j(\theta) \geq \hat{T}_j$  such that (12) holds. Since  $h(\theta) = \bar{v}_k(\hat{T}_0, \dots, y_k(\theta), \hat{T}_{k+1})$  is strictly decreasing in  $\theta$ , there exists a value  $\theta^* \in (v_{n-1}(\hat{T}), \Delta)$  such that  $\bar{v}_{k-1}(\hat{T}_0, \dots, y_k(\theta^*)) = \theta^* = \bar{v}_k(\hat{T}_0, \dots, y_k(\theta^*), \hat{T}_{k+1})$ .

Finally, we let  $\hat{U}_j = y_j(\theta^*)$  for every  $j \in \{n, \dots, k\}$ . Observe that (A) and (B) are satisfied by construction, and (C) is satisfied for  $j \in \{n-1, \dots, k\}$  by the explicit construction shown before with  $\delta = \theta^*$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Given  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , consider the following system in the variables  $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-2})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} P'_n(\alpha_{n-2}) &= (n-1)(1+\varepsilon) - n(n+1)/2, & [\text{S}]_{n,\varepsilon} \\ P'_n(\alpha_{n-3}) - P'_n(\alpha_{n-2}) &= \left( \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \beta_n(\alpha_{n-2}) \right) \frac{n-2}{n-1}, \\ P'_n(\alpha_j) - P'_n(\alpha_{j+1}) &= \left( \beta_n(\alpha_{j+2}) - \beta_n(\alpha_{j+1}) \right) \frac{j+1}{j+2}, \text{ for } j \in \{0, \dots, n-4\}, \end{aligned}$$

with  $\beta_n(t) = P_n(t) - tP'_n(t)$ . In the following lemma, we provide a structural result of the previous system that we further use to analyze the optimization problem  $[\text{C}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ .

**Lemma 9.** *There exists  $\varepsilon'_n \geq \varepsilon_n$  such that for every  $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n]$ , the following holds:*

- (i) *There is a unique non-negative vector  $\alpha(\varepsilon, n) = (\alpha_0(\varepsilon, n), \dots, \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n))$  that satisfies  $[\text{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ .*
- (ii)  $0 < \alpha_0(\varepsilon, n) < \alpha_1(\varepsilon, n) < \dots < \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) < 1$ .
- (iii) *Let  $y_\ell(\varepsilon, n) = x_{\ell+1}(\varepsilon, n)/(\ell+1) - x_\ell(\varepsilon, n)/\ell$  for each  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , where*

$$\begin{aligned} x_1(\varepsilon, n) &= 1, & [\text{FO}]_{n,\varepsilon} \\ x_2(\varepsilon, n) &= 2 + \alpha_0(\varepsilon, n), \text{ and} \\ \frac{x_j(\varepsilon, n)}{j-1} &= \alpha_{j-2}(\varepsilon, n) \left( \frac{x_{j-1}(\varepsilon, n)}{j-1} - \frac{x_{j-2}(\varepsilon, n)}{j-2} \right) + \frac{x_{j-1}(\varepsilon, n)}{j-2} - \frac{x_1(\varepsilon, n)}{(j-1)(j-2)} \end{aligned}$$

for every  $j \in \{3, \dots, n\}$ . Then,  $y(\varepsilon, n)$  is in the interior of  $K_n$  and  $\nabla Y_{n,\varepsilon}(y(\varepsilon, n)) = 0$ .

Since the proof of Lemma 9 is highly technical, we present it after finishing the proof of Theorem 1. Given  $x_1(\varepsilon, n), \dots, x_n(\varepsilon, n)$  as in  $[\text{FO}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , for every value  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  and every  $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n]$ , consider the sequence  $X_\eta(\varepsilon, n) = (X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  defined as follows:  $X_{0,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) = 0$ ,  $X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) = x_j(\varepsilon, n)/j$  for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and

$$X_{j+2,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) = \frac{j+1}{j+2} \left( \eta \left( X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) \right) + \frac{j+1}{j} X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - \frac{x_1(\varepsilon, n)}{j(j+1)} \right),$$

for every integer  $j \geq n-1$ . In the following lemma, we show that the sequences  $(X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  are feasible for  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ .

**Lemma 10.** *For every  $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n]$  there exists  $\eta_0(\varepsilon, n) \in (0, 1)$  such that for every  $\eta \in [\eta_0(\varepsilon, n), 1)$ , the sequence  $(X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies conditions (I)-(III).*

*Proof.* From the definition of the sequence, we have

$$\mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n)) = \begin{cases} \alpha_j(\varepsilon, n)(X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)) & \text{for } j \in \{0, \dots, n-2\}, \\ \eta(X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)) & \text{for } j \geq n-1. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Let  $\eta_0(\varepsilon, n) = \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)$  and in what follows we consider  $\eta \in [\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n), 1)$ ; we remark that  $\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) < 1$  by Lemma 9. We first show that the sequence  $X_\eta(\varepsilon, n)$  satisfies condition (I). Since  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n))/(X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)) = \eta \in (0, 1)$ , by Claim 2 there exists a finite value  $\xi$  such that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) = \xi$ . In particular, this implies that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)/j = 0$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)) = 0$ .

We proceed by induction to show that the sequence  $X_\eta(\varepsilon, n)$  is strictly increasing. By construction  $X_{1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) = 1 > X_{0,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)$ , and suppose the sequence is strictly increasing up to  $\ell+1$ . Together with the equality in (13), the fact that  $X_{\ell+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{\ell,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) > 0$  implies that

$$0 < \mu_\ell(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n)) = \frac{\ell+2}{\ell+1} X_{\ell+2,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - \frac{\ell+1}{\ell} X_{\ell+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) + \frac{X_{1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)}{\ell(\ell+1)},$$

and therefore, we get

$$X_{\ell+2,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) > \frac{(\ell+1)^2}{\ell(\ell+2)} X_{\ell+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - \frac{1}{\ell(\ell+2)} = X_{\ell+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) + \frac{X_{\ell+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - 1}{\ell(\ell+2)} > 0,$$

where the last inequality holds since the sequence is strictly increasing up to  $\ell+1$  and  $1 = X_{1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)$ . Therefore, (I) is satisfied.

Since, by Lemma 9,  $\alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) \in (0, 1)$  for every  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$  and  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ , from (13) we get  $\mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n)) \leq X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)$  for every  $j$ , that is, (II) is satisfied. Finally, also from (13), observe that  $\mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n))/(X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n))$  is equal to  $\alpha_j(\varepsilon, n)$  for  $j \leq n-2$ , and is equal to  $\eta$  for  $j \geq n-1$ . By Lemma 9 we have  $\alpha_0(\varepsilon, n) < \dots < \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) \leq \eta$  and we conclude that  $\mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n))/(X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n))$  is non-decreasing. Therefore, (III) is satisfied. This concludes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We are ready to prove the main result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* In what follows, recall that  $y_\ell(\varepsilon) = x_{\ell+1}(\varepsilon, n)/(\ell + 1) - x_\ell(\varepsilon, n)/\ell$  for each  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , where  $x_1(\varepsilon, n), \dots, x_n(\varepsilon, n)$  are defined by  $[\text{FO}]_{n, \varepsilon}$ . Lemma 9(iii) guarantees that  $\nabla Y_{n, \varepsilon}(y(\varepsilon, n)) = 0$  and  $y(\varepsilon, n)$  is in the interior of  $K_n$  for every  $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n]$ . By Proposition 7, the function  $Y_{n, \varepsilon}$  is convex in the interior of  $K_n$ , and therefore the point  $y^* = y(\varepsilon, n) \in K_n$  must be the unique optimal solution, which yields (ii).

By Lemma 7, to conclude (i) is sufficient to prove that when  $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon'_n]$ , the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n, \varepsilon}$  is non-negative if and only if the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{C}]_{n, \varepsilon}$  is non-negative. First, we show that the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n, \varepsilon}$  is upper-bounded by the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{C}]_{n, \varepsilon}$ . For every value  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  consider the sequence  $(X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  as defined in (3.1). By Lemma 10, the sequence  $(X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies the properties (I)-(III) for every  $\eta \in [\eta_0(\varepsilon, n), 1)$ , and therefore, it is feasible for the optimization problem  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n, \varepsilon}$ . Observe that by construction, for each  $\eta$ , we have  $\mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n))/(X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)) = \eta$  for every  $j \geq n-1$ .

**Claim 5.** For each  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)) P_n(\eta) = \frac{P_n(\eta)}{1-\eta} \cdot \frac{x_n(\varepsilon, n) - x_{n-1}(\varepsilon, n) - x_1(\varepsilon, n)}{n-1},$$

We defer the proof of Claim 5 to Appendix B. Therefore, the objective value of  $(X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n, \varepsilon}$  satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + \varepsilon)nX_{n, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n))}{X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)} \right) \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon)x_n(\varepsilon, n) - \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n))}{X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)} \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{P_n(\eta)}{1-\eta} \cdot \frac{x_n(\varepsilon, n) - x_{n-1}(\varepsilon, n) - x_1(\varepsilon, n)}{n-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the equality holds since the summation from  $n-1$  is given by Claim 5, and  $X_{n, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) = x_n(\varepsilon, n)/n$ . Now we study the summation term between zero and  $n-2$ . For  $j=0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (X_{1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{0, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)) P_n \left( \frac{\mu_0(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n))}{X_{1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{0, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)} \right) &= x_1(\varepsilon, n) P_n \left( \frac{x_2(\varepsilon, n) - 2x_1(\varepsilon, n)}{x_1(\varepsilon, n)} \right) \\ &= P_n(x_2(\varepsilon, n) - 2x_1(\varepsilon, n)) \\ &= P_n(2y_1(\varepsilon, n)), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds since  $x_1(\varepsilon, n)$ . For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$ , we have  $X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) = y_j(\varepsilon, n)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n)) &= \frac{j+2}{j+1} X_{j+2, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - \frac{j+1}{j} X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) + \frac{X_{1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)}{j(j+1)} \\ &= \frac{j+2}{j+1} y_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n) - \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \sum_{\ell=1}^j y_\ell(\varepsilon, n) = A_j(y_1(\varepsilon, n), \dots, y_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & (X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n))P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n))}{X_{j+1,\eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n)} \right) \\ &= y_j(\varepsilon, n)P_n (A_j(y_1(\varepsilon, n), \dots, y_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n))/y_j(\varepsilon, n)). \end{aligned}$$

By replacing in (14), the objective value of  $(X_{j,\eta}(\varepsilon, n))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} V_\eta &= (1 + \varepsilon)x_n(\varepsilon, n) - P_n(2y_1(\varepsilon, n)) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} y_j(\varepsilon, n)P_n (A_j(y_1(\varepsilon, n), \dots, y_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n))/y_j(\varepsilon, n)) \\ &\quad - \frac{P_n(\eta)}{1 - \eta} \cdot \frac{x_n(\varepsilon, n) - x_{n-1}(\varepsilon, n) - x_1(\varepsilon, n)}{n - 1} \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon)n \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j(\varepsilon, n) \right) - P_n(2y_1(\varepsilon, n)) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} y_j(\varepsilon, n)P_n \left( \frac{A_j(y_1(\varepsilon, n), \dots, y_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n))}{y_j(\varepsilon, n)} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{P_n(\eta)}{1 - \eta} \cdot \frac{1}{n - 1} \left( n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j(\varepsilon, n) - (n - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} y_j(\varepsilon, n) \right) \\ &= \Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}(y(\varepsilon, n)) + \frac{x_n(\varepsilon, n) - x_{n-1}(\varepsilon, n) - x_1(\varepsilon, n)}{n - 1} \left[ \frac{n(n + 1)}{2} - \frac{P_n(\eta)}{1 - \eta} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second and third equalities hold by noting that  $x_n(\varepsilon, n) - x_{n-1}(\varepsilon, n) - x_1(\varepsilon, n) = n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j(\varepsilon, n) - (n - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} y_j(\varepsilon, n)$ .

**Claim 6.**  $x_n(\varepsilon, n) \geq x_{n-1}(\varepsilon, n) + x_1(\varepsilon, n)$ .

We defer the proof of Claim 6 to Appendix B. Then, using the above equality, we get that the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  is upper bounded by

$$\inf_{\eta \in (\eta_0(\varepsilon, n), 1)} V_\eta = \Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}(y(\varepsilon, n)),$$

where the equality holds by Claim 6 and since  $P_n(\eta)/(1 - \eta)$  is at most  $n(n + 1)/2$  for  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ . This concludes the first part of the proof.

We show next that the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  is lower bounded by the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{C}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ . Consider any sequence  $T = (T_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfying (I)-(III) with  $T_1 = 1$ , i.e., a feasible sequence for the problem  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ . Suppose that  $\mu_{n-1}(T)/(T_n - T_{n-1}) < 1$ . By Lemma 8, there exists  $\delta < 1$  such that the objective value of  $T$  in  $[\mathcal{I}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  can be lower bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + \varepsilon)nT_n - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (T_{j+1} - T_j)P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j} \right) \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon)nT_n - \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (T_{j+1} - T_j)P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j} \right) - \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (T_{j+1} - T_j)P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j} \right) \\ &\geq (1 + \varepsilon)nT_n - \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (T_{j+1} - T_j)P_n \left( \frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j} \right) - \frac{P_n(\delta)}{1 - \delta} \left( \frac{n}{n - 1}T_n - T_{n-1} - \frac{T_1}{n - 1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$



**Claim 7.**  $\frac{n}{n-1}T_n - T_{n-1} - \frac{T_1}{n-1} \geq 0$ .

We defer the proof of Claim 7 to Appendix B. For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , let  $z_j = T_{j+1} - T_j$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{T}_1 = 1$  since  $T_1 = 1$ . Then, from Claim 7, and the fact that  $P_n(\delta)/(1-\delta) \leq n(n+1)/2$  for  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , we get that (15) can be lower bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & (1+\varepsilon)nT_n - \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} (T_{j+1} - T_j) P_n\left(\frac{\mu_j(T)}{T_{j+1} - T_j}\right) - \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \left(\frac{n}{n-1}T_n - T_{n-1} - \frac{T_1}{n-1}\right) \\ &= \Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}(z_1, \dots, z_n) \geq \min_{y \in \mathcal{K}_n} \Upsilon_{n,\varepsilon}(y), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{T}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  is lower-bounded by the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{C}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ . Observe that when  $\mu_{n-1}(T)/(T_n - T_{n-1}) = 1$ , condition (III) implies that  $\mu_j(T)/(T_{j+1} - T_j) = 1$  for every  $j \geq n-1$ , and therefore the second summation in the chain (15) is equal to zero. Then, we can use the same arguments as before to lower-bound the objective of  $T$  by the optimal value of  $[\mathcal{C}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ . This concludes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 9.* We first focus on proving that there is  $\varepsilon' > 0$  such that for any  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'$ ,  $[\mathcal{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  has a solution  $\alpha(\varepsilon, n) = (\alpha_0(\varepsilon, n), \dots, \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n))$  such that  $0 < \alpha_0(\varepsilon, n) < \dots < \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) < 1$ . Next, we show that the largest  $\varepsilon' > 0$  such that the above holds, denoted by  $\varepsilon'_n$ , holds that  $\varepsilon'_n \geq \varepsilon_n$ . Furthermore,  $\alpha(\varepsilon, n)$  will be a unique non-negative solution to  $[\mathcal{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  due to the monotonicity of  $P'_n$  and  $\beta_n$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . From here, we will obtain immediately (i) and (ii).

Before we go into the main proof, we prove two properties of non-negative solutions to  $[\mathcal{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ . First, we show that  $\alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) < \alpha_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n)$  for  $j \in \{0, \dots, n-3\}$  and  $\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) < 1$ . Second, we show that  $\alpha_j(\varepsilon, n)$  is differentiable and decreasing in  $\varepsilon$ , for every  $j \in \{0, \dots, n-2\}$ .

**The  $\alpha_j$ 's are monotone in  $j$ .** Note that the function  $P'_n(t) = -\sum_{\ell=1}^n \ell t^{\ell-1}$  is decreasing for  $t \geq 0$ ,  $P'_n(0) = -1$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} P'_n(t) = -n(n+1)/2$ . Using the first equation in  $[\mathcal{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , we have  $P'_n(\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)) = (n-1)(1+\varepsilon) - n(n+1)/2 > P'_n(1)$ , which implies that  $\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) < 1$ . From the second equation in  $[\mathcal{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , we have

$$P'_n(\alpha_{n-3}(\varepsilon, n)) = P'_n(\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)) + \frac{n-2}{n-1} \left( \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \beta_n(\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)) \right).$$

The function  $\beta_n(t)$  is strictly increasing in  $(0, 1)$ , with  $\beta_n(0) = n$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \beta_n(t) = n(n+1)/2$ . Since we have  $P'_n(\alpha_{n-3}(\varepsilon, n)) > P'_n(\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n))$ , this implies that  $\alpha_{n-3}(\varepsilon, n) < \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)$ . For  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-4\}$ , observe that  $P'_n(\alpha_j(\varepsilon, n)) - P'_n(\alpha_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n)) > 0$  if and only if  $\beta_n(\alpha_{j+2}(\varepsilon, n)) - \beta_n(\alpha_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n)) > 0$ . Since  $\beta_n$  is increasing, the latter holds inductively, which together with  $P'_n$  being decreasing implies that  $\alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) < \alpha_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n)$ . Second, we show that the  $\alpha_j$  satisfying  $[\mathcal{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  must be differentiable and monotonic in  $\varepsilon$ .

**Differentiability and monotonicity in  $\varepsilon$ .** Assume that the  $\alpha_j$ 's satisfying  $[\mathcal{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  exist. Now, inductively for  $j = n-2, \dots, 0$ , we prove that  $\alpha_j$  is differentiable and decreasing. From the first equation in  $[\mathcal{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , we observe that  $\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)$  is differentiable. This is because  $P'_n$  is invertible, strictly monotone with differentiable inverse. Now, by deriving the same equation in  $\varepsilon$ , we obtain

$$P''_n(\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) = n-1.$$

Since  $P''_n(\cdot) < 0$ , we deduce that  $\partial \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) / \partial \varepsilon < 0$  and so  $\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)$  is decreasing in  $\varepsilon$ . We proceed similarly for  $\alpha_{n-3}(\varepsilon, n)$ . From the second equation in  $[\mathcal{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , we obtain immediately the differentiability of

$\alpha_{n-3}(\varepsilon, n)$  in  $\varepsilon$ , and deriving the same equation gives us

$$P_n''(\alpha_{n-3}(\varepsilon, n)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \alpha_{n-3}(\varepsilon, n) = \left( 1 + \left( \frac{n-2}{n-1} \right) \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) \right) P_n''(\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n).$$

Given that  $\alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)$  is decreasing in  $\varepsilon$ , we have that the right-hand side of the equation is a positive term and from where we deduce that  $\alpha_{n-3}(\varepsilon, n)$  is differentiable and decreasing in  $\varepsilon$ . Inductively, we assume that the functions  $\alpha_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n), \dots, \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n)$  are differentiable and decreasing in  $\varepsilon$ . We now prove that  $\alpha_j(\varepsilon, n)$  is differentiable and decreasing in  $\varepsilon$ .

Using the equations linking the  $\alpha_j$ 's in  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , we can deduce the following recursion

$$\left( \frac{j+2}{j+1} \right) P_n'(\alpha_j) = \sum_{i=j+1}^{n-3} \frac{P_n'(\alpha_i)}{i(i+1)} + \frac{P_n'(\alpha_{n-2})}{n-2} - \beta_n(\alpha_{j+1}) + (n-1)(1+\varepsilon) \quad (16)$$

for  $j = 0, \dots, n-4$ . The proof of this recursion is a simple rearrangement of  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  and we skip it for brevity. (See also Appendix D for a similar deduction in the context of the asymptotic analysis of  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ .)

By induction, the right hand-side of Equation (16) is differentiable in  $\varepsilon$ ; hence,  $\alpha_j$  is differentiable in  $\varepsilon$ . Then, by deriving (16) in  $\varepsilon$ , we obtain

$$\left( \frac{j+2}{j+1} \right) P_n''(\alpha_j) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \alpha_j = \sum_{i=j+1}^{n-3} \frac{P_n''(\alpha_i)}{i(i+1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \alpha_i + \frac{P_n''(\alpha_{n-2})}{n-2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \alpha_{n-2} + \alpha_{j+1} P_n''(\alpha_{j+1}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \alpha_{j+1} + n - 1.$$

Again, by induction, the right-hand side of this equation is positive. Putting everything together, we conclude that  $\alpha_j$  is decreasing in  $\varepsilon$ . Also, from this last equation, it is possible to show that there are constants  $a_{j,n} > 0, b_{j,n}$  such that  $\alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) \leq -\varepsilon \cdot a_j + b_j$  for all  $j$ . This, in particular, shows that  $\alpha_0(\varepsilon, n)$  is 0 at some point. (Recall that up to this point, we have assumed that  $\alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) > 0$ , so the system has a solution.)

We now move to prove the existence of a non-negative solution to  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ . We do this by showing that for  $\varepsilon = 0$  there is a strictly positive solution to  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  ( $\varepsilon = 0$ )—which in turn will be unique. Due to the differentiability of  $\alpha$ , we will be able to find a neighborhood  $\varepsilon' > 0$  where  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  have a unique non-negative solution for  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'$ .

**For  $\varepsilon = 0$ ,  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  has a strictly positive solution.** Fix  $\varepsilon = 0$ . Using the first equation of  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , we have

$$P_n'(\alpha_{n-2}(0, n)) = (n-1) - \frac{n(n+1)}{2} < -1 = P_n'(0)$$

Since  $P_n'$  is monotonic for  $t \geq 0$ , we obtain that there is a unique  $\alpha_{n-2}(0, n)$  satisfying the equation. Furthermore, from the inequality, we obtain  $\alpha_{n-2}(0, n) > 0$ . Now, before we proceed, note that for  $t \in (0, 1]$ , we have  $\beta_n(t) = n + \sum_{\ell=1}^n (\ell-1)t^\ell > n$ . Hence, using the second equation in  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_n'(\alpha_{n-3}(0, n)) &= P_n'(\alpha_{n-2}(0, n)) + \frac{n-2}{n-1} \left( \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \beta_n(\alpha_{n-2}(0, n)) \right) \\ &= (n-1) - \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n-2} \right) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \frac{n-2}{n-1} \beta_n(\alpha_{n-2}(0, n)) \\ &< n-1 - \frac{n(n+1)}{2(n-2)} - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n-2} \right) n \\ &= -1 - \frac{n(n+1)/2 - n}{n-2} \leq -1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used that  $\beta_n(\alpha_{n-2}(0, n)) > n$ . From here, we obtain that there is  $\alpha_{n-3}(0, n) > 0$  satisfying the second equation in  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n, \varepsilon}$ . Assume inductively that we have found  $\alpha_{j+1}(0, n), \dots, \alpha_{n-2}(0, n) > 0$ . Now, using (16), we have

$$\left(\frac{j+2}{j+1}\right) P'_n(\alpha_j(0, n)) < -\sum_{i=j+1}^{n-3} \frac{1}{i(i+1)} - \frac{1}{n-2} - n + (n-1) = -\frac{1}{j+1} - 1 = -\frac{j+2}{j+1}$$

where in the first inequality, we used the inductive hypothesis and so  $P'_n(\alpha_i(0, n)) < -1$  for  $i = j+1, \dots, n-2$ , and  $\beta_n(\alpha_{j+1}(0, n)) > n$ . From here, we obtain  $P'_n(\alpha_j(0, n)) < -1$  and so there is  $\alpha_j(0, n) > 0$  such that the equalities in  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n, \varepsilon}$  indexed by  $j, j+1, \dots$  are satisfied. The previous results all together, imply that there is  $0 < \varepsilon'_n$  such that there is a unique solution  $\alpha(\varepsilon, n)$  to  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n, \varepsilon}$  satisfying  $0 < \alpha_0(\varepsilon, n) < \alpha_1(\varepsilon, n) < \dots < \alpha_{n-2}(\varepsilon, n) < 1$  for all  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'_n$ , and  $\alpha_0(\varepsilon'_n, n) = 0$ .

Now, we focus on proving that  $\varepsilon'_n \geq \varepsilon_n$ . First, we show that for any  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'_n$ ,  $y$  constructed from  $\alpha$  as in  $[\mathbf{FO}]_{n, \varepsilon}$ , is an optimal solution of  $Y_{n, \varepsilon}(y)$  in  $K_n$ . Then, we use this fact to show that  $Y_{n, \varepsilon'_n}(y(\varepsilon'_n, n)) > 0$ ; hence,  $\varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon'_n$  by minimality of  $\varepsilon_n$ .

**For  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'_n$ ,  $y(\varepsilon, n)$  is in the interior of  $K_n$ .** Let  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'$ . Let  $y(\varepsilon, n) = (y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})$  obtained from the  $\alpha_j$ 's. Then, upon rearranging terms, we obtain

$$y_1(\varepsilon, n) = \alpha_0(\varepsilon, n)/2,$$

$$y_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n) = \alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) \left(\frac{j+1}{j+2}\right) y_j(\varepsilon, n) + \frac{1}{j(j+2)} \sum_{k=1}^j y_k(\varepsilon, n), \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}.$$

By applying an induction in  $j$ , we have  $y(\varepsilon, n) > 0$ . Furthermore,  $A_j(y_1, \dots, y_{j+1}) = \alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) y_j(\varepsilon, n) > 0$ ; hence,  $y(\varepsilon, n) \in K_n$ . For notational convenience, we set  $y_0 = 1$ .

**For  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'_n$ , we have  $\nabla Y_{n, \varepsilon}(y(\varepsilon, n)) = 0$ .** We note that  $[\mathbf{FO}]_{n, \varepsilon}$  is just the first-order conditions of the problem  $\min_{y \geq 0} Y_{n, \varepsilon}(y)$  written in terms of the  $x$  variables. From here,  $\nabla Y_{n, \varepsilon}(y(\varepsilon, n)) = 0$ . Due to the convexity of  $Y_{n, \varepsilon}$  in  $K_n$ , we have that  $y(\varepsilon, n) \in K_n$  is the unique minimizer of  $Y_{n, \varepsilon}$  in  $K_n$ . Now, if  $\varepsilon'_n \geq 1$ , then, we are done with the proof of (i), (ii) and (iii) as  $\varepsilon_n \leq 1$ . Let's assume that  $\varepsilon'_n < 1$ . To show that  $\varepsilon'_n \geq \varepsilon_n$ , it is enough to show that  $Y_{n, \varepsilon'_n}(y(\varepsilon'_n, n)) = \min_{y \in K_n} Y_{n, \varepsilon'_n}(y) > 0$ , because from the definition of  $\varepsilon_n$  we will obtain that  $\varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon'_n$ .

Note that  $Y_{n, \varepsilon}(y)$  is linear in  $\varepsilon$  for any fixed  $y$ , and so  $v(\varepsilon) = \min_{y \in K_n} Y_{n, \varepsilon}(y)$  is concave. In particular,  $v(\varepsilon)$  is continuous. Now, let  $\varepsilon^1 \leq \varepsilon^2 \leq \dots < \varepsilon'_n$  be a sequence of increasing values such that  $\varepsilon^k \rightarrow \varepsilon'_n$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\alpha_0(\varepsilon^k, n) = 1/k$ . The sequence  $\{\varepsilon^k\}_{k \geq 1}$  exists since  $\alpha_0(\cdot, n)$  is continuous. Note that  $\alpha_0(\varepsilon^k, n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We claim that there is  $c > 0$  such that  $\alpha_1(\varepsilon^k, n) \geq c$  for any  $k$ . By contradiction, if  $\alpha_1(\varepsilon^k, n) \rightarrow \alpha_1(\varepsilon'_n, n) = 0$ , then using  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n, \varepsilon}$ , we can obtain that  $\alpha_j(\varepsilon'_n, n) = 0$  for all  $j$ . However, this is impossible for  $j = n-2$  because  $P'_n(\alpha(\varepsilon'_n, n)) = (n-1)(1 + \varepsilon_n) - n(n+1)/2 < -1$  as  $\varepsilon'_n < 1$ . Hence,  $\alpha_1(\varepsilon'_n, n) \geq c > 0$  for some constant  $c$ . The following claim states that the  $y_j$ 's are linearly dependent on  $\alpha_0$  for  $j \geq 1$ . We defer its proof to Appendix B.

**Claim 8.** For  $j \geq 1$ , there are  $\hat{y}_j(\varepsilon, n) > 0$  such that  $y_j(\varepsilon, n) = \alpha_0(\varepsilon, n) \hat{y}_j(\varepsilon, n)$ .

From the claim, we obtain immediately that  $n > \hat{y}_j(\varepsilon'_n, n) \geq c' > 0$  for some constant  $c'$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{n, \varepsilon^k}(y(\varepsilon^k, n)) &= (1 + \varepsilon^k)n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} y_j(\varepsilon^k, n) - \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} y_j(\varepsilon^k, n) P_n(A_j(y(\varepsilon^k, n))/y_j(\varepsilon^k, n)) \\ &\quad - \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \left( \frac{n}{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} y_j(\varepsilon^k, n) - \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} y_j(\varepsilon^k, n) - \frac{y_0(\varepsilon^k, n)}{n-1} \right) \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon^k)n - P_n(2y_1(\varepsilon^k, n)) - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} \hat{y}_j(\varepsilon^k, n) P_n \left( A_j(y(\varepsilon^k, n))/y_j(\varepsilon^k, n) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{k} \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \left( \frac{n}{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \hat{y}_j(\varepsilon^k, n) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} \hat{y}_j(\varepsilon^k, n) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we used that  $y_0(\varepsilon, n) = 1$  and the claim. Now, note that

$$\frac{A_j(y(\varepsilon^k, n))}{y_j(\varepsilon^k, n)} = \frac{j+2}{j+1} \frac{\hat{y}_{j+1}(\varepsilon^k, n)}{\hat{y}_j(\varepsilon^k, n)} - \sum_{\ell=1}^j \frac{\hat{y}_\ell(\varepsilon^k, n)}{\hat{y}_j(\varepsilon^k, n)}$$

and for any  $k$ , this value remains non-negative and bounded. Hence, taking the limit in  $k$ , we obtain  $\Upsilon_{n, \varepsilon^k}(y(\varepsilon^k, n)) \rightarrow (1 + \varepsilon'_n)n - P_n(0) = \varepsilon'_n n > 0$ . From here, we obtain that  $\varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon'_n$ . Now, (i), (ii), and (iii) follow immediately.  $\square$

## 4 Random Order Model

In this section, we examine the more restrictive setting where no informational values are provided. There are  $n$  unknown values  $u_1 > u_2 > \dots > u_n \geq 0$ . The optimal offline value is then  $\text{OPT} = nu_1$ . We observe that no algorithm can obtain a constant approximation ratio if the order in which the values are presented is adversarial. Indeed, consider  $u_i = n^{n-i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Note that  $\text{OPT} = n^n$ . However, if we present the values sequentially to any sequential algorithm in the order  $u_n, \dots, u_1$ , no algorithm can obtain a value larger than  $n^{n-1} + n \cdot n^{n-2} = 2n^{n-1}$ .

In what follows, the decision-maker observes the values sequentially according to a uniformly chosen random order. In the classic secretary problem, the optimal algorithm has the structure of sampling the first  $\theta n$  observed value, and then in the remaining values select the first one that is better than the ones observed in the sampling phase. We combine this algorithm with the structure of the optimal policy for the POT problem to design the Sample-the-Select-Forever algorithm. In a nutshell, we divide the algorithm into two phases: the sampling phase and then the exploitation phase. In the first phase, the algorithm sample the first  $\tau = \lfloor \theta n \rfloor$  observed values and record the maximum value observed, say  $u^*$ . In the remaining  $t = \tau + 1, \dots, n$  values, the algorithm accepts the first value that surpasses  $u^*$  for the next  $n - t + 1$  units of time. A formal description of the algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1. We denote the value obtained by the Sample-then-Select-Forever algorithm via  $\text{ALG}_\theta$ .

**Lemma 11.** *For any  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , the approximation ratio of the sample-then-select algorithm is asymptotically at least  $\theta(\theta - 1 - \ln \theta)$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the following random variables,  $X_t$  is the index of the value observed at time  $t$ ,  $Y_t$  is the relative position of the value at time  $t$  among the first  $t$  observed values. Hence,  $\mathbf{P}(X_t = \ell) = 1/n$  for any

---

**Algorithm 1** Sample-then-Select-Forever

---

```
1:  $u^* = 0$ 
2: for  $t = 1, \dots, \tau$  do
3:   Let  $v_t$  be the value observed at  $t$ .
4:   Set  $u^* \leftarrow \max\{u^*, v_t\}$ .
5: for  $t = \tau + 1, \dots, n$  do
6:   Let  $v_t$  be the value observed at  $t$ .
7:   if  $v_t \geq u^*$  then
8:     Accept  $v_t$  for the remaining  $n - t + 1$  units of time.
9:   else
10:    Accept  $v_t$  for only 1 unit of time.
```

---

$\ell = 1, \dots, n$  and  $\mathbf{P}(Y_{t+1} = k \mid Y_t = \ell) = 1/(t+1)$  for any  $k \in [t+1]$  and  $\ell \in [t]$ . Then, the expected value of the algorithm can be lower bounded by the chance of picking the maximum value  $u_1$ ; hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{ALG}_\theta}{\text{OPT}} &\geq \frac{1}{nu_1} \sum_{t=\tau+1}^n (n-t+1)u_1 \mathbf{P}(X_t = 1 \mid Y_t = 1) \mathbf{P}(Y_t = 1, Y_{t'} > 1 \text{ for all } t' \in \{\tau+1, \dots, t\}) \\ &= \sum_{t=\tau+1}^n \left(1 - \frac{t-1}{n}\right) \frac{t}{n} \frac{\tau}{t(t-1)} = \frac{\tau}{n} \sum_{t=\tau+1}^n \frac{(1 - (t-1)/n) 1}{(t-1)/n} \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned}$$

The function  $x \mapsto (1-x)/x$  is decreasing; hence  $(1-(t-1)/n)/((t-1)/n) \geq (1-x)/x$  for  $x \in [(t-1)/n, t/n]$ . From here, we obtain

$$\frac{\text{ALG}_\theta}{\text{OPT}} \geq \frac{\tau}{n} \sum_{t=\tau+1}^n \int_{(t-1)/n}^{t/n} \frac{(1-x)}{x} dx = \frac{\tau}{n} \int_{\tau/n}^1 \frac{(1-x)}{x} dx = \frac{\tau}{n} \left( \frac{\tau}{n} - 1 - \ln\left(\frac{\tau}{n}\right) \right).$$

Note this last bound is independent of  $u_1, \dots, u_n$ . For  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

The function  $\theta \in [0, 1] \mapsto \theta(\theta - 1 - \ln \theta)$  attains its maximum in  $\theta^* = -(1/2)W_0(-2/e^2) \approx 0.2039$ , where  $W_0$  is the principal branch of the Lambert function<sup>2</sup>, with a value of  $\approx 0.16190$ . See Proposition 9 in Appendix C for details.

We can show that our analysis is tight. We can construct an instance where the optimal policy is almost like an ordinal policy.<sup>3</sup> Specifically, up to a small vanishing error in  $n$ , we can show that the best ordinal policy is as good as the best online policy that observes the values. With this, we can compute the optimal value of an ordinal policy via dynamic programming. Furthermore, this dynamic program has an explicit solution with same structure as Sample-then-Select-Forever. This result, together with the vanishing error in  $n$ , shows that Sample-then-Select-Forever is optimal under the optimal choice of  $\theta$ . We defer the details to Appendix C.1.

## References

A. Abels, E. Pitschmann, and D. Schmand. Prophet inequalities over time. In *EC*, pages 1–20, 2023.

<sup>2</sup>The principal branch of the Lambert function  $W_0$  satisfies that  $we^w = z$  iff  $w = W_0(z)$  for  $z \geq 0$ .

<sup>3</sup>That is, the policy makes decision based on comparisons rather than the actual values.

- S. Alaei. Bayesian combinatorial auctions: Expanding single buyer mechanisms to many buyers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 43(2):930–972, 2014.
- S. Albers, A. Khan, and L. Ladewig. Improved online algorithms for knapsack and gap in the random order model. *Algorithmica*, 83:1750–1785, 2021.
- M. R. Aminian, W. Ma, and L. Xin. Real-time personalized order holding. *Available at SSRN 4644495*, 2023.
- N. Arnosti and W. Ma. Tight guarantees for static threshold policies in the prophet secretary problem. *Operations Research*, 71(5):1777–1788, 2023.
- M. Babaioff, N. Immorlica, D. Kempe, and R. Kleinberg. Matroid secretary problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 65(6):1–26, 2018.
- A. Bernstein. Improved bounds for matching in random-order streams. *Theory of Computing Systems*, pages 1–15, 2023.
- S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- S. Chawla, J. D. Hartline, D. L. Malec, and B. Sivan. Multi-parameter mechanism design and sequential posted pricing. In *STOC*, page 311–320, 2010.
- S. Chawla, N. Devanur, and T. Lykouris. Static pricing for multi-unit prophet inequalities. *Operations Research*, 2023.
- J. Correa and A. Cristi. A constant factor prophet inequality for online combinatorial auctions. In *STOC*, page 686–697, 2023.
- J. Correa, P. Foncea, D. Pizarro, and V. Verdugo. From pricing to prophets, and back! *Operations Research Letters*, 47(1):25–29, 2019.
- J. Correa, P. Foncea, R. Hoeksma, T. Oosterwijk, and T. Vredeveld. Posted price mechanisms and optimal threshold strategies for random arrivals. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 46(4):1452–1478, 2021.
- J. R. Correa and M. Romero. On the asymptotic behavior of the expectation of the maximum of iid random variables. *Operations Research Letters*, 49(5):785–786, 2021.
- A. Cristi and S. Oren. Planning against a prophet: A graph-theoretic framework for making sequential decisions. In *EC*, 2024.
- Y. Disser, J. Fearnley, M. Gairing, O. Göbel, M. Klimm, D. Schmand, A. Skopalik, and A. Tönnis. Hiring secretaries over time: The benefit of concurrent employment. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 45(1):323–352, 2020.
- P. J. Downey. Distribution-free bounds on the expectation of the maximum with scheduling applications. *Operations Research Letters*, 9(3):189–201, 1990.
- P. Dütting, M. Feldman, T. Kesselheim, and B. Lucier. Prophet inequalities made easy: Stochastic optimization by pricing nonstochastic inputs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 49(3):540–582, 2020.
- M. Feldman, O. Svensson, and R. Zenklusen. A simple  $o(\log \log(\text{rank}))$ -competitive algorithm for the matroid secretary problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 43(2):638–650, 2018.
- A. Fiat, I. Gorelik, H. Kaplan, and S. Novgorodov. The temp secretary problem. In *ESA*, pages 631–642. Springer, 2015.
- P. Freeman. The secretary problem and its extensions: A review. *International Statistical Review/Revue Internationale de Statistique*, pages 189–206, 1983.
- J. P. Gilbert and F. Mosteller. Recognizing the maximum of a sequence. *Journal of the American Statistical*

- Association*, 61(313):35–73, 1966.
- A. Gupta and S. Singla. Random-order models. *Beyond the Worst-Case Analysis of Algorithms*, page 234, 2021.
- M. T. Hajiaghayi, R. Kleinberg, and T. Sandholm. Automated online mechanism design and prophet inequalities. In *AAAI*, page 58–65, 2007.
- T. P. Hill and R. P. Kertz. Comparisons of stop rule and supremum expectations of iid random variables. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 336–345, 1982.
- M. Hoefer and K. Schewior. Threshold testing and semi-online prophet inequalities. In *ESA*, page 62, 2023.
- M. Hoefer, K. Schewior, and D. Schmand. Stochastic probing with increasing precision. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 38(1):148–169, 2024.
- R. P. Kertz. Stop rule and supremum expectations of iid random variables: a complete comparison by conjugate duality. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 19(1):88–112, 1986.
- T. Kesselheim and A. Tönnis. Think eternally: Improved algorithms for the temp secretary problem and extensions. In *ESA*, 2016.
- T. Kesselheim, A. Tönnis, K. Radke, and B. Vöcking. Primal beats dual on online packing lps in the random-order model. In *STOC*, pages 303–312, 2014.
- R. Kleinberg and S. M. Weinberg. Matroid prophet inequalities. In *STOC*, page 123–136, 2012.
- U. Krengel and L. Sucheston. Semiamarts and finite values. 1977.
- A. Liu, R. P. Leme, M. Pál, J. Schneider, and B. Sivan. Variable decomposition for prophet inequalities and optimal ordering. In *EC*, page 692, 2021.
- S. Perez-Salazar, M. Singh, and A. Toriello. The iid prophet inequality with limited flexibility. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05634*, 2022.
- M. L. Puterman. *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- J. Qin, S. Vardi, and A. Wierman. Minimization fractional prophet inequalities for sequential procurement. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2023.
- E. Samuel-Cahn. Comparison of threshold stop rules and maximum for independent nonnegative random variables. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1213–1216, 1984.
- J. A. Soto, A. Turkieltaub, and V. Verdugo. Strong algorithms for the ordinal matroid secretary problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 46(2):642–673, 2021.

## A Proofs Deferred from Section 2

*Proof of Proposition 1.* We denote by  $\text{val}(\pi, F, n)$  the value obtained by running policy  $\pi$  in an instance with cumulative distribution  $F$  and  $n$  periods. We have that for any  $F$  strictly increasing and infinitely differentiable,  $\text{val}(\pi, F, n) \geq \beta \cdot E_n(F)$ . We aim to show that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a policy  $\pi'$  (possibly different from  $\pi$ ) that guarantees  $\text{val}(\pi', F, n) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \beta \cdot E_n(F)$  for every distribution  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Let  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  the  $n$  random variables observed sequentially and distributed according to  $F$ . Using standard arguments, we can assume that  $F$  is infinitely differentiable (see, e.g., Liu et al. [2021]).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup>For instance, by adding a small exponential noise to each observation, we can show that the resulting distribution is infinitely differentiable and there is a small loss in the approximation guarantee that can be made arbitrarily small.

Furthermore, by rescaling the random variables, we can assume that  $E_n(F) = \sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathbf{E}[\max_{i \leq \ell} X_i] = 1$ . Now, let  $\varepsilon > 0$  small and define

$$\hat{F}(x) = \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon/n^3} F(x) + \frac{\varepsilon/n^3}{1 + \varepsilon/n^3} (1 - e^{-x}).$$

This is the distribution of the random variable  $\hat{X}_t$  that with probability  $1/(1 + \varepsilon/n^3)$  follows  $F$  and otherwise it follows an exponential distribution with parameter 1. Note that  $\hat{F}'(x) > 0$ ; hence  $\hat{F}$  is strictly increasing. Then,  $\text{val}(\pi, \hat{F}, n) \geq \beta \cdot E_n(\hat{F})$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} E_n(\hat{F}) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathbf{E}[\max\{\hat{X}_1, \dots, \hat{X}_\ell\}] \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \int_0^\infty x \cdot (\hat{F}(x))^{\ell-1} d\hat{F}(x) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \int_0^\infty x \left( \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon/n^3} F(x) + \frac{\varepsilon/n^3}{1 + \varepsilon/n^3} (1 - e^{-x}) \right)^{\ell-1} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon/n^3} \frac{dF}{dx}(x) + \frac{\varepsilon/n^3}{1 + \varepsilon/n^3} e^{-x} \right) dx \\ &\geq \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon/n^3)^\ell} \int_0^\infty x F(x)^{\ell-1} dF(x) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{n^2}\right) \sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathbf{E}[\max\{X_1, \dots, X_\ell\}] \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{n^2}\right) E_n(F). \end{aligned}$$

On the other side, consider the following policy  $\hat{\pi}$  running on  $F$  for an instance with  $n$  periods: At time  $t$ , with probability  $1/(1 + \varepsilon/n^2)$  observe value  $X_t$ ; otherwise sample  $E_t$  from an exponential distribution of parameter 1, and let  $\hat{X}_t$  be the value observed; run  $\pi$  on that value. If  $\pi$  doesn't accept  $\hat{X}_t$ , then don't accept  $X_t$ ; otherwise, if  $\hat{X}_t$  is coming from  $X_t$ , accept  $X_t$  while if  $\hat{X}_t$  is coming from  $E_t$ , then stop the process and don't receive any value. Note that policy  $\hat{\pi}$  gets a reward only when  $\pi$  accepts  $\hat{X}_t$  and  $\hat{X}_t$  comes from  $X_t$ . Hence, the value collected by  $\hat{\pi}$  can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}(\hat{\pi}, F, n) &\geq \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon/n^3} \text{val}(\pi, \hat{F}, n) - n^2 \frac{\varepsilon/n^3}{1 + \varepsilon/n^3} \\ &\geq \beta \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{n^2}\right)^2 E_n(F) - \frac{\varepsilon}{n} \geq \beta \left(1 - \frac{3\varepsilon}{n}\right) E_n(F), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $E_n(F) = 1$ . Since we can make  $\varepsilon$  arbitrarily small, the result follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Note that  $g'_n(v) = (1 - (1 - v)^n(1 + nv))/v^2 \geq 0$  by using that  $(1 - v)^n(1 + nv) \leq e^{-nv} e^{nv} = 1$  with equality only occurring at  $v = 0$ . By deriving  $g_n(v)/v$  we get

$$\frac{1}{v^3} \left( 2 - 2(1 - v)^n - (1 + n - (1 - v)^n + n(1 - v)^n)v \right).$$

We now show that this derivative is non-positive, equivalently,

$$2 \leq 2(1 - v)^n + (1 + n - (1 - v)^n + n(1 - v)^n)v.$$

Let  $f_n(v) = 2(1 - v)^n + (1 + n - (1 - v)^n + n(1 - v)^n)v$ . We now show that  $f_n(v) \geq 2$  for all  $v$ . First, we have  $f_n(0) = 2$ . Now we show that  $f'_n(v) = ((1 + n)(1 - (1 - v)^n - v + (1 - v)^n v - n(1 - v)^n v))/(1 - v) \geq 0$ .



Indeed, for  $v \in (0, 1)$ , we have  $f'_n(v) \geq 0$  if and only if  $1 - v - (1 - v)^n + v(1 - v)^n - nv(1 - v)^n \geq 0$ , which in turns is equivalent to  $1 \geq (1 - v)^{n-1}(1 + v(n - 1))$ , which holds by the standard Bernoulli's inequality.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A_{\phi n, \theta n}(\alpha/n)}{n^2} &= \frac{(1 - \alpha/n)^{\theta n} (1 - (\phi - \theta + 1/n)\alpha) + (\phi + 1/n)\alpha - 1}{\alpha^2} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{e^{-\alpha\theta} (1 - (\phi - \theta)\alpha) + \phi\alpha - 1}{\alpha^2} = \bar{A}_{\phi, \theta}(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\frac{g_n(\lambda/n)}{n} = \left(1 - (1 - \lambda/n) \left(\frac{1 - (1 - \lambda/n)^n}{\lambda}\right)\right) \rightarrow \bar{g}(\lambda). \quad \square$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.* Call  $a = 2(e^2 - 3)/(e^2 + 1)$  and  $b = 4/(e^2 + 1)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} E_n &= \sum_{t=1}^1 \int_0^1 f(u) t(1-u)^{t-1} du \\ &= an \int_0^{1/n^3} \sum_{t=1}^n t(1-u)^{t-1} du + \frac{b}{n} \int_{1/n^3}^{1/n^3 + \beta/n} \sum_{t=1}^n t(1-u)^{t-1} du \\ &= anE_{n,1} + \frac{b}{n}E_{n,2} \end{aligned}$$

First, we have  $1 - 1/n^2 \leq (1 - 1/n^3)^n \leq (1 - u)^t \leq 1$  for  $u \in [0, 1/n^3]$ , where in the first inequality we used Bernoulli's inequality. Hence,

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \frac{n+1}{2n^2} \leq E_{n,1} \leq \frac{n+1}{2n^2}.$$

and so  $anE_{n,1} \rightarrow a/2$  when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand,

$$E_{n,2} = \sum_{t=1}^n \int_{1/n^3}^{1/n^3 + \beta/n} t(1-u)^{t-1} du = \sum_{t=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^3}\right)^t - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^3} - \frac{\beta}{n}\right)^t$$

By using that  $1 - 1/n^2 \leq (1 - 1/n^3)^t \leq 1$ , we have the following bounds on  $E_{n,2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)n - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^3} - \frac{\beta}{n}\right) \left(\frac{1 - (1 - 1/n^3 - \beta/n)^n}{1/n^3 + \beta/n}\right) \\ \leq E_{n,2} \leq n - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^3} - \frac{\beta}{n}\right) \left(\frac{1 - (1 - 1/n^3 - \beta/n)^n}{1/n^3 + \beta/n}\right) \end{aligned}$$

From here, we get that  $(b/n)E_{n,2} \rightarrow b(1 - (1 - e^{-\beta})/\beta)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5.* Fix  $n$ . We use the same notation  $a = (e^2 - 3)/(e^2 + 1)$  and  $b = 4/(e^2 + 1)$  as in the previous proposition. We compute first,

$$\int_0^q f(u) du = \begin{cases} anq & q \in [0, 1/n^3], \\ a/n^2 + (b/n)(q - 1/n^3) & q \in [1/n^3, 1/n^3 + \beta/n), \\ a/n^2 + b\beta/n^2 & q \in [1/n^3 + \beta/n, 1]. \end{cases}$$

and

$$\int_q^1 f(u) du = \begin{cases} an(1/n^3 - q) + b\beta/n^2 & q \in [0, 1/n^3), \\ (b/n)(1/n^3 + \beta/n - q) & q \in [1/n^3, 1/n^3 + \beta/n), \\ 0 & q \in [1/n^3 + \beta/n, 1]. \end{cases}$$

We now upper-bound

$$\begin{aligned} G_{n,1} &= \sup_{q \in [0,1]} \left\{ A_{n,n}(q) \int_0^q f(u) du + B_n(q) \int_q^1 f(u) du \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ G_n^{[0,1/n^3]}, G_n^{[1/n^3, 1/n^3 + \beta/n]}, G_n^{[1/n^3 + \beta/n, 1]} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $G_n^{[a,b]} = \sup_{q \in [a,b]} \{A_{n,n}(q) \int_0^q f(u) du + B_n(q) \int_q^1 f(u) du\}$ . We now analyze each term in  $G_{n,1}$ .

For  $G_n^{[0,1/n^3]}$ , we have

$$G_n^{[0,1/n^3]} = \sup_{q \in [0,1/n^3]} \left\{ A_{n,n}(q)anq + B_n(q)(an(1/n^3 - q) + b\beta/n^2) \right\}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{n^2} B_n(q) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} (1-q)^t \leq \frac{1}{n},$$

thus,

$$\sup_{q \in [0,1/n^3]} \{anqA_{n,n}(q)\} \leq G_n^{[n,1/n^3]} \leq \sup_{q \in [0,1/n^3]} \{anqA_{n,n}(q)\} + \frac{a}{n} + \frac{b\beta}{n}.$$

We can use that the function  $A_{n,n}(q)q = q \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} (n-t)(1-q)^t$  is increasing for  $q < 1/(n+1)$  to obtain that

$$\sup_{q \in [0,1/n^3]} \{anqA_{n,n}(q)\} = \frac{a}{n^2} \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} (n-t) \left(1 - 1/n^3\right)^t \in \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \frac{a(n+1)}{2n}, \frac{a(n+1)}{2n} \right].$$

Hence,  $G_n^{[0,1/n^3]} \rightarrow a/2$ . For  $G_n^{[1/n^3, 1/n^3 + \beta/n]}$ , we have

$$G_n^{[1/n^3, 1/n^3 + \beta/n]} = \sup_{q \in [1/n^3, 1/n^3 + \beta/n]} \left\{ A_{n,n}(q) \left( \frac{a}{n^2} + \frac{b}{n} \left( q - \frac{1}{n^3} \right) \right) + B_n(q) \frac{b}{n} \left( \frac{1}{n^3} + \frac{\beta}{n} - q \right) \right\}.$$

By doing the change of variable  $q = \lambda/n$ , we have  $\lambda \in [1/n^2, 1/n^2 + \beta]$  and we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_{n,n}^{[1/n^3, 1/n^3 + \beta/n]} = \max_{\lambda \in [0, \beta]} \{ \bar{A}_{1,1}(\lambda)(a + \lambda b) \}.$$

For  $G_n^{[1/n^3 + \beta/n, 1]}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_n^{[1/n^3, 1/n^3 + \beta/n, 1]} &= \sup_{q \in [1/n^3 + \beta/n, 1]} \left\{ A_{n,n}(q) \left( \frac{a}{n^2} + \frac{b\beta}{n^2} \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{A_{n,n}(1/n^3 + \beta/n)}{n^2} (a + b\beta) \rightarrow \bar{A}_{1,1}(\beta)(a + b\beta) \end{aligned}$$

since the function  $A_{n,n}(q)$  is decreasing. □

**Proposition 8.** The function  $\lambda \mapsto (e^{-\lambda} + \lambda - 1)(2(e^2 - 3) + 4\lambda)/\lambda^2$  is increasing in  $[0, 2]$  and decreasing in  $[2, +\infty)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $d(\lambda) = (e^{-\lambda} + \lambda - 1)(2(e^2 - 3) + 4\lambda)/\lambda^2$ . A simple calculation shows

$$d'(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{\lambda^3} \left( 6 - e^\lambda(6 - 5\lambda) + e^{\lambda+2}(2 - \lambda) + \lambda - 2\lambda^2 - e^2(2 + \lambda) \right).$$

Note that the function  $\bar{d}(\lambda) = 6 - e^\lambda(6 - 5\lambda) + e^{\lambda+2}(2 - \lambda) + \lambda - 2\lambda^2 - e^2(2 + \lambda)$  is dominated by the term  $-\lambda e^{\lambda+2}$  for large  $\lambda$ , so  $\bar{d}(\lambda) \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . In fact, this term dominates  $\bar{d}$  for  $\lambda > 2$  as we can observe in Figure 1. By inspection, we conclude that  $d'(\lambda) > 0$  in  $[0, 2]$  and  $d'(\lambda) < 0$  in  $[2, +\infty)$  which concludes the proof.  $\square$




Figure 1: Plot of  $\bar{d}$  in the range  $[0, 2.2]$ . We note that  $\bar{d}$  is 0 at  $\lambda = 0$  and  $\lambda = 2$ .

## B Proofs Deferred from Section 3

*Proof of Claim 1.* We have  $G_j(F)/j^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^j \mathbf{E}[\max\{X_1, \dots, X_i\}]/j^2 \leq \mathbf{E}[\max\{X_1, \dots, X_j\}]/j$ , and  $\mathbf{E}[\max\{X_1, \dots, X_j\}] = o(j)$  (see, e.g., [Correa and Romero \[2021\]](#), [Downey \[1990\]](#)). We conclude that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tau_j(F)/j = 0$ . Observe that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)) = 0$  directly when there exists a finite value  $\tau$  such that  $\tau_j(F) \rightarrow \tau$ . Otherwise, suppose that  $G_j(F)/j = \tau_j(F) \rightarrow \infty$ . From the recurrence satisfied by the optimal policy, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{j+1}{j} \tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F) &= \frac{G_{j+1}(F)}{j} - \frac{G_j(F)}{j} \\ &= \frac{1}{j} + \mathbf{E}[\max(0, X - G_j(F)/j)] = \frac{1}{j} + \int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\infty} (1 - F(s)) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where  $X$  is distributed according to  $F$ . Since the expectation of  $F$  is finite, and  $\tau_j(F) \rightarrow \infty$ , we have that  $\int_{\tau_j(F)}^{\infty} (1 - F(s)) ds$  converges to zero as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , and therefore we conclude that  $(1+1/j)\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F) \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\tau_{j+1}(F)/j = (1+1/j) \cdot \tau_{j+1}(F)/(j+1) \rightarrow 0$  by the first part of the claim, and  $(1+1/j)\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F) = \tau_{j+1}(F)/j + \tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F)$ , we conclude that  $\tau_{j+1}(F) - \tau_j(F) \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 2.* Since the sequence  $T$  is strictly increasing, proving that the sequence is upper-bounded is sufficient to show the convergence. Since  $\mu_j(T) \leq \mathcal{L}(T_{j+1} - T_j)$  for every  $j \geq 0$ , we have for every  $k \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (T_{j+1} - T_j) &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left( \frac{j+2}{j+1} T_{j+2} - \frac{j+1}{j} T_{j+1} + \frac{T_1}{j(j+1)} \right) \\ &= \frac{k+1}{k} T_{k+1} - 2T_2 + T_1 - \frac{T_1}{k}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, by expanding the telescopic sum on the left-hand side, we get

$$\mathcal{L}(T_k - T_1) \geq \frac{k+1}{k} T_{k+1} - 2T_2 + T_1 - \frac{T_1}{k}.$$

Since  $2T_2 - 2T_1 = \mu_0(T) \leq \mathcal{L}T_1$ , the following inequality holds for every  $k \geq 2$ :

$$\mathcal{L}T_k \geq \frac{k+1}{k} T_{k+1} - T_1(1 + 1/k),$$

which further implies that  $2T_1 + \mathcal{L}T_k \geq T_{k+1}$  for every  $k \geq 2$ . Consider  $M = 2T_1/(1 - \mathcal{L}) + 0.1$ . We are done if  $T_j \leq M$  for every  $j$ , as the sequence is therefore upper-bounded. Otherwise, let  $k(M)$  be the last time that the strictly increasing sequence  $T$  is below  $M$ , namely,  $T_{k(M)+1} \geq M$  and  $T_{k(M)} < M$ . Then, since  $2T_1 + \mathcal{L}T_{k(M)} \geq T_{k(M)+1}$ , we get  $2T_1 + \mathcal{L}M > M$ , that is,  $M < 2T_1/(1 - \mathcal{L})$ , which is a contradiction. We conclude that  $T_j \leq M$  for every  $j$ ; therefore, the sequence is bounded.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 3.* Just by expanding the expectation using the definition of  $H$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(H) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \int_{T_\ell}^{T_{\ell+1}} (1 - H(x)) dx \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \int_{T_\ell}^{T_{\ell+1}} \left( 1 - \frac{\mu_\ell(T)}{T_{\ell+1} - T_\ell} \right) dx = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (T_{\ell+1} - T_\ell - \mu_\ell(T)), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

On the other hand, by expanding  $\mu_\ell(T)$ , we get that for every  $k$  the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=1}^k (T_{\ell+1} - T_\ell - \mu_\ell(T)) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left( T_{\ell+1} - T_\ell - \left( \frac{\ell+2}{\ell+1} T_{\ell+2} - \frac{\ell+1}{\ell} T_{\ell+1} + \frac{T_1}{\ell(\ell+1)} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left( T_{\ell+1} - T_\ell - \left( \frac{\ell+2}{\ell+1} T_{\ell+2} - \frac{\ell+1}{\ell} T_{\ell+1} \right) - \left( \frac{T_1}{\ell} - \frac{T_1}{\ell+1} \right) \right) \\ &= T_{k+1} - T_1 + 2T_2 - \frac{k+2}{k+1} T_{k+2} - T_1 + \frac{T_1}{k+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and therefore, from (17) and (18) we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(H) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( T_1 - \mu_0(T) + T_{k+1} - T_1 + 2T_2 - \frac{k+2}{k+1} T_{k+2} - T_1 + \frac{T_1}{k+1} \right) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( T_1 - (2T_2 - 2T_1) + T_{k+1} - T_1 + 2T_2 - \frac{k+2}{k+1} T_{k+2} - T_1 + \frac{T_1}{k+1} \right) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( T_1 + T_{k+1} - \frac{k+2}{k+1} T_{k+2} + \frac{T_1}{k+1} \right) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( T_1 + T_{k+1} - T_{k+2} + \frac{T_{k+2}}{k+1} + \frac{T_1}{k+1} \right) = T_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last limit holds from conditions (I)-(III). This finishes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 4.* Consider  $f_k(D) = D_k P_n(v_k(D))$  for each  $k \geq n-1$ . Then, from the definition of  $v_k(D)$ , we have

$$\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial D_j}(D) = \begin{cases} \frac{j+1}{j} P'_n(v_{j-1}(D)) & \text{when } k = j-1, \\ P_n(v_j(D)) - P'_n(v_j(D)) \left( v_j(D) + \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \right) & \text{when } k = j, \\ -\frac{1}{k(k+1)} P'_n(v_k(D)) & \text{when } k \geq j+1, \end{cases}$$

and zero otherwise. Therefore, overall, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial G}{\partial D_j}(D) \\ &= \frac{j+1}{j} P'_n(v_{j-1}(D)) + P_n(v_j(D)) - P'_n(v_j(D)) \left( v_j(D) + \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \right) - \sum_{k=j+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} P'_n(v_k(D)) \\ &= P_n(v_j(D)) - P'_n(v_j(D)) v_j(D) + \frac{j+1}{j} P'_n(v_{j-1}(D)) - \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} P'_n(v_k(D)) \\ &\geq P_n(v_j(D)) - P'_n(v_j(D)) v_j(D) + \frac{j+1}{j} P'_n(v_j(D)) - \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} P'_n(v_j(D)) \\ &= P_n(v_j(D)) + (1 - v_j(D)) P'_n(v_j(D)) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since  $P'_n$  is decreasing in  $(0, 1)$  and  $(v_\ell(D))_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  is non-decreasing in  $\ell$ , and the last inequality follows since  $P_n(x) + (1-x)P'_n(x)$  is strictly positive in  $(0, 1)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 5.* For every  $j \geq n-1$  we have  $\mu_j(X_\eta(\varepsilon, n)) = \eta(X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n))$ . If we let  $\mathcal{S}^\star = \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n))$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \mathcal{S}^\star &= \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} (X_{j+2, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)) + \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{j+1} X_{j+2, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - \frac{1}{j} X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) + \frac{1}{j(j+1)} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S}^\star - (X_{n, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{n-1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)) + \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{j+1} (X_{j+2, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - 1) - \frac{1}{j} (X_{j+1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - 1) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{S}^\star - (X_{n, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - X_{n-1, \eta}(\varepsilon, n)) - \frac{1}{n-1} (X_{n, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) - 1) \\ &= \mathcal{S}^\star - \left( \frac{x_n(\varepsilon, n)}{n-1} - \frac{x_{n-1}(\varepsilon, n)}{n-1} - \frac{x_1(\varepsilon, n)}{n-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $\mathcal{S}^\star P_n(\eta) = \frac{P_n(\eta)}{1-\eta} \cdot \frac{x_n(\varepsilon, n) - x_{n-1}(\varepsilon, n) - x_1(\varepsilon, n)}{n-1}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 6.* Consider a value of  $\eta \in (\eta_0(\varepsilon, n), 1)$ . By Lemma 10, the sequence  $X_\eta(\varepsilon, n)$  satisfies the conditions (I)-(III). Therefore, by Lemma 6, there exists a distribution  $H$  such that  $X_{j, \eta}(\varepsilon, n) = G_j(H)/j$  for every  $j$ . In particular, this implies that  $x_j(\varepsilon, n) = G_j(H)$  for every  $j \leq n$ , and therefore  $G_1(H) = x_1(\varepsilon, n) = 1$ . On the other hand, from the recursion satisfied by the optimal policy, for every  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ , we have  $x_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n) = G_{j+1}(H) = G_1(H) + \mathbf{E}[\max(G_j(H), jZ)] \geq G_1(H) + G_j(H) = x_1(\varepsilon, n) + x_j(\varepsilon, n)$ , with  $Z$  distributed according to  $H$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 7.* By Lemma 6, there exists a distribution  $H$  such that  $T_j = G_j(H)/j$  for every  $j$ . On the other hand, from the recursion satisfied by the optimal policy, we have  $nT_n = G_n(H) = G_1(H) + \mathbf{E}[\max(G_{n-1}(H), (n-1)Z)] \geq G_1(H) + G_{n-1}(H) = T_1 + (n-1)T_{n-1}$ , with  $Z$  distributed according to  $H$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 8.* For  $j = 1$ , the result is immediately true with  $\hat{y}_1(\varepsilon, n) = 1/2$ . Assume that the result is also true for  $1, \dots, j$  for some  $j \geq 1$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} y_{j+1}(\varepsilon, n) &= \alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) \left( \frac{j+1}{j+2} \right) y_j + \frac{1}{j(j+2)} \sum_{k=1}^j y_k \\ &= \alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) \left( \frac{j+1}{j+2} \right) \alpha_0(\varepsilon, n) \hat{y}_j(\varepsilon, n) + \frac{1}{j(j+2)} \sum_{k=1}^j \alpha_0(\varepsilon, n) \hat{y}_k(\varepsilon, n) \\ &= \alpha_0(\varepsilon, n) \left( \alpha_j(\varepsilon, n) \left( \frac{j+1}{j+2} \right) \hat{y}_j(\varepsilon, n) + \frac{1}{j(j+2)} \sum_{k=1}^j \hat{y}_k(\varepsilon, n) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we use the inductive hypothesis. From the last line, the proof follows.  $\square$

## C Proofs Deferred from Section 4

**Proposition 9.** *The function  $\theta(\theta - 1 - \ln \theta)$  in  $[0, 1]$  attains its maximum at  $\theta^* = -(1/2)W_0(-2/e^2)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $d(\theta) = \theta(\theta - 1 - \ln \theta)$ . Then,  $d'(\theta) = 2(\theta - 1) - \ln \theta$ . Note that  $2(\theta - 1)$  is linear while  $\ln \theta$  is strictly concave; therefore,  $2(\theta - 1)$  and  $\ln \theta$  intersect in at most 2 points. Clearly,  $d'(1) = 0$ . Now, suppose that  $\theta \neq 1$ , and note that  $d'(\theta) = 2(\theta - 1) - \ln \theta = -\ln(2\theta e^{-2\theta}) - 2 + \ln 2 = -\ln(2\theta e^{-2\theta}) + \ln(2/e^2)$ . From here, we get  $\theta$  is such that  $d'(\theta) = 0$ , that is,  $2\theta e^{-2\theta} = 2/e^2$ .

Let  $w = -2\theta$ . Then, we have  $w e^w = -2/e^2$ , and therefore  $w = W_0(-2/e^2)$ . This implies that  $\theta = -(1/2)W_0(-2/e^2)$ . Note that  $d''(\theta) = 2 - 1/\theta$ . For  $\theta = -(1/2)W_0(-2/e^2) \approx 0.203$ , we have  $d''(\theta) < 0$ ; hence,  $\theta = -(1/2)W_0(-2/e^2)$  is a local maximum. For  $\theta = 1$ , we have  $d''(1) = 2 > 0$ ; hence, it is a local minimum. From here, we deduce that the maximum value of  $d$  in  $[0, 1]$  occurs at  $\theta^* = -(1/2)W_0(-2/e^2)$ .  $\square$

### C.1 Tight Upper Bound

In this subsection, we show that the algorithm Sample-then-Select-Forever is optimal. We provide an instance where no algorithm can obtain an approximation larger than 0.16190. Consider the instance  $u_1 = 1$  and  $u_i = \varepsilon^i$  for  $i \geq 2$  with  $\varepsilon \leq 1/n^3$ . Then,  $\text{OPT} = n$ . Fix an algorithm ALG. Then, the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ALG} &\leq \sum_{t=1}^n (n-t+1) \cdot \mathbf{P}(\text{ALG accept } u_1 \text{ at } t) + n \cdot \frac{1}{n^3} \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^n (n-t+1) \cdot \mathbf{P}(\text{ALG accepts the maximum value at } t) + \frac{1}{n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality tells us that we only need to focus on algorithms that, up to a small error, maximize the chances of selecting the largest value in the sequence. Note that this can be easily solved via an ordinal

algorithm that makes decisions only based on the relative position of values observed and not their actual values. We can solve this later problem optimally via a dynamic program. Consider the dynamic program that gets as a reward  $n - t + 1$  if the maximum value is selected and 0 otherwise. Let  $v_t(1)$  be the optimal expected reward when at time  $t$  the observed value is the best so far. Likewise, let  $v_t(0)$  be the optimal expected reward when at time  $t$  the observed value is not the best so far. Then, we obtain the following optimality recursion:

$$v_t(s) = \begin{cases} \max \left\{ \frac{t}{n}(n - t + 1), \frac{1}{t+1}v_{t+1}(1) + \frac{t}{t+1}v_{t+1}(0) \right\}, & s = 1, \\ \frac{1}{t+1}v_{t+1}(1) + \frac{t}{t+1}v_{t+1}(0), & s = 0, \end{cases}$$

with  $v_{n+1}(s) = 0$  for any  $s \in \{0, 1\}$ . Indeed, if  $s = 1$  at time  $t$ , the optimal policy has to decide between choosing the value and obtains as a reward  $(n - t + 1)\mathbf{P}(X_t = 1 \mid Y_t = 1) = (n - t + 1)(t/n)$ , while if it decides not choosing the value, then it moves to  $t + 1$  and we have  $1/(t + 1)$  probability of observing  $Y_{t+1} = 1$  and  $t/(t + 1)$  probability of observing  $Y_{t+1} \neq 1$ . A similar argument works for  $v_t(0)$ . Stochastic dynamic programming theory [Puterman, 2014] guarantees that the optimal policy has a threshold over time. That is, there is a  $\tau \in [n]$  such that the policy does not accept any value between  $1, \dots, \tau$  and then, in the remaining  $\tau + 1, \dots, n$ , accepts the first value that is better than the previously observed ones. Hence, the analysis of the lower bound for ALG $_{\theta}$ /OPT presented in Section 4 is exactly the value of  $v_t(s)$ , up to a factor of  $n$ . Thus,

$$v_1(1) = \tau \sum_{t=\tau+1}^n \frac{1 - (t - 1)/n}{(t - 1)/n} \cdot \frac{1}{n}.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\text{ALG}}{\text{OPT}} = \frac{\text{ALG}}{n} \leq \frac{\tau}{n} \sum_{t=\tau+1}^n \frac{1 - (t - 1)/n}{(t - 1)/n} \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n^3},$$

and if we take  $\tau = \theta n$ , we have that the right-hand side of this last inequality tends to  $\theta(\theta - 1 - \ln \theta)$  when  $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ . By the analysis in Section 4, we obtain that  $\lim_n \text{ALG}/\text{OPT}$  is upper bounded by  $\approx 0.16190$ , and this concludes that our analysis is tight and Sample-then-Select-Forever is an optimal algorithm.

## D Limit Behavior of $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$

In this section, we provide a limit analysis relating the first-order optimality conditions derived from  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$  and the integro-differential equation (1)-(2). To keep the notation simple throughout this section, we write  $P = P_n$ ,  $\beta = \beta_n$ , and  $\alpha_j = \alpha_j(\varepsilon, n)$ . Additionally, we avoid taking a convergent subsequence of  $\varepsilon_n$  that converges to some  $\varepsilon$  to keep the notation simple. That is, we assume that  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow \varepsilon$ . Now, rearranging  $[\mathbf{S}]_{n,\varepsilon}$ , we obtain

$$P'(\alpha_{n-2}) = (n - 1)(1 + \varepsilon) - n(n + 1)/2, \quad (19)$$

$$\left(\frac{n-1}{n-2}\right) (P'(\alpha_{n-3}) - P'(\alpha_{n-2})) = \left(\frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \beta(\alpha_{n-2})\right), \quad (20)$$

$$\left(\frac{j+2}{j+1}\right) (P'(\alpha_j) - P'(\alpha_{j+1})) = (\beta(\alpha_{j+2}) - \beta(\alpha_{j+1})), \text{ for } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-4\}. \quad (21)$$

We now sum Equations (19), (20) and Equations (21) for  $j = i, \dots, n-4$  and obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & P'(\alpha_{n-2}) + \left(\frac{n-1}{n-2}\right) (P'(\alpha_{n-3}) - P'(\alpha_{n-2})) + \dots + \left(\frac{j+2}{j+1}\right) (P'(\alpha_j) - P'(\alpha_{j+1})) \\ &= (n-1)(1+\varepsilon) - \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \left(\frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \beta(\alpha_{n-2})\right) \\ & \quad + (\beta(\alpha_{n-2}) - \beta(\alpha_{n-3})) + \dots + (\beta(\alpha_{j+2}) - \beta(\alpha_{j+1})). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this equation and replacing  $\alpha_j = 1 - u_j/n$  with  $0 \leq u_j \leq n$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{P'\left(1 - \frac{u_j}{n}\right) - P'\left(1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n}\right)}_A + \underbrace{\sum_{i=j}^{n-3} \frac{1}{i+1} \left(P'\left(1 - \frac{u_i}{n}\right) - P'\left(1 - \frac{u_{i+1}}{n}\right)\right)}_B \\ &= (n-1)(1+\varepsilon) - \underbrace{\left(P\left(1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n}\right) + \frac{u_{j+1}}{n} P'\left(1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n}\right)\right)}_C \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We normalize this equation by  $1/n$  and analyze the asymptotic behavior of each term  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  separately. We let  $j/n \rightarrow x \in (0, 1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We let also  $u(x)$  be the limit of the piece-wise function obtained by joining the points  $u_1, \dots, u_n$ . Formally, for each  $n$ , we define the piece-wise linear function  $u_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  via  $u_n(i/n) = u_i$  and the function is linear between  $u_n((i-1)/n)$  and  $u_n(i/n)$ . Then  $u(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n(i/n)$ . Now, for  $A$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \left( P'\left(1 - \frac{u_j}{n}\right) - P'\left(1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n}\right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\ell}{n} \left( \left(1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n}\right)^{\ell-1} - \left(1 - \frac{u_j}{n}\right)^{\ell-1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\ell}{n} \frac{\left( \left(1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n}\right)^{\ell-1} - \left(1 - \frac{u_j}{n}\right)^{\ell-1} \right)}{1/n} \frac{1}{n} \\ &= n \left( \frac{1 - \left(1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n}\right)^n - u_{j+1} \left(1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n}\right)^n}{u_{j+1}^2} - \frac{1 - \left(1 - \frac{u_j}{n}\right)^n - u_j \left(1 - \frac{u_j}{n}\right)^n}{u_j^2} \right) \\ &\rightarrow \left( \frac{1 - e^{-u(x)}(1+u(x))}{u(x)^2} \right)' = h(u(x))', \end{aligned}$$

where  $h(u) = \int_0^1 t e^{-ut} dt = (1 - e^{-u}(1+u))/u^2$ .



For  $B$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=j}^{n-3} \frac{1}{i+1} \left( P' \left( 1 - \frac{u_j}{n} \right) - P' \left( 1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=j}^{n-3} \frac{1}{(i+1)/n} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\ell \left( \left( 1 - \frac{u_{i+1}}{n} \right)^{\ell-1} - \left( 1 - \frac{u_i}{n} \right)^{\ell-1} \right) \frac{1}{n}}{1/n} \frac{1}{n} \right) \frac{1}{n} \\
&\rightarrow \int_x^1 \frac{1}{s} \int_0^1 t (e^{-u(s)t})' dt ds = \int_x^1 \frac{1}{s} h(u(s))' ds.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $C$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \left( P \left( 1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n} \right) + \frac{u_{j+1}}{n} P' \left( 1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n} \right) \right) &= 1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^n \left( 1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n} \right)^{\ell} \frac{1}{n} - u_{j+1} \sum_{\ell}^n \frac{\ell}{n} \left( 1 - \frac{u_{j+1}}{n} \right)^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{n} \\
&\rightarrow 1 - \int_0^1 e^{-u(x)t} dt - u(x) \int_0^1 t e^{-u(x)t} dt \\
&= 1 - \int_0^1 e^{-u(x)t} dt - u(x) h(u(x)).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, taking limit in Equation (22), we obtain

$$h(u(x))' + \int_x^1 \frac{1}{s} h(u(s))' ds - \int_0^1 e^{-u(x)t} dt - u(x) h(u(x)) = \varepsilon, \quad (23)$$

with the conditions  $u(0) = +\infty$  and  $u(1) = 0$ . Evaluating (23) in  $x = 1$ , gives us  $h(u)'(1) = 1 + \varepsilon$ . Now, if we derive (23) in  $x$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= h(u(x))'' - \frac{1}{x} h(u(x))' + h(u(x))u'(x) - u'(x)h(u(x)) - u(x)h(u(x))' \\
&= h(u(x))'' - \frac{1}{x} h(u(x))' - u(x)h(u(x))' \\
&= h(u(x))'' - h(u(x))'(1/x + u(x)).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by rearranging terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{h(u)''}{h(u)'} &= \frac{1}{x} + u \implies \ln((1 + \varepsilon)) - \ln(h(u)'(x)) = -\ln x + \int_x^1 u(s) ds \\
&\implies h(u)'(x) = (1 + \varepsilon)x e^{-\int_x^1 u(s) ds}.
\end{aligned}$$

From here, the change of variable  $y(x) = e^{-u(x)}$  gives us the system (1)-(2).