

Submodular Matroid Secretary Problem with Shortlists

Mohammad Shadravan *

Abstract

In the *matroid secretary problem*, which is a generalization of the classic secretary problem, the elements of a matroid \mathcal{M} arrive in random order. Once we observe an item we need to irrevocably decide whether or not to accept it. The set of selected elements should form an independent set of the matroid. The goal is to maximize the total sum of the values assigned to these elements. The existence of a constant competitive algorithm is a long standing open problem.

In this paper, we introduce a version of this problem, which we refer to as submodular matroid secretary problem with shortlists (motivated by the *shortlist* model in [2]). In this setting, the algorithm is allowed to choose a subset of items as part of a shortlist, possibly more than $k = rk(\mathcal{M})$ items. Then, after seeing the entire input, the algorithm can choose an independent subset from the shortlist. Furthermore we generalize the objective function to any monotone submodular function. The main question is that can an online algorithm achieve a constant competitive ratio using a shortlist of size $O(k)$?

We design an algorithm that achieves a $\frac{1}{2}(1 - 1/e^2 - \epsilon - O(1/k))$ competitive ratio for any constant $\epsilon > 0$, using a shortlist of size $O(k)$. This is especially surprising considering that the best known competitive ratio for the matroid secretary problem is $O(\log \log k)$. We are also able to get a constant competitive algorithm using shortlist of size at most k and also a constant competitive algorithm in the preemption model.

An important application of our algorithm is for the random order streaming of submodular functions. We show that our algorithm can be implemented in the streaming setting using $O(k)$ memory. It achieves a $\frac{1}{2}(1 - 1/e^2 - \epsilon - O(1/k))$ approximation. The previously best known approximation ratio for streaming submodular maximization under matroid constraint is 0.25 (adversarial order) due to Feldman et al. [12], Chekuri et al. [8] and Chakrabarti and Kale [7]. Moreover, we generalize our results to the case of p -matchoid constraints and give a $\frac{1}{p+1}(1 - 1/e^{p+1} - \epsilon - O(1/k))$ approximation using $O(k)$ memory, which asymptotically (as p and k increase) approaches the best known offline guarantee $\frac{1}{p+1}$ [22].

1 Introduction

In recent years, submodular optimization has found applications for different machine learning and data mining applications including data summarization, sparsity, active learning, recommendation, high-order graphical model inference, determinantal point processes [12, 4, 19], network inference, network design [15, 13], and influence maximization in social networks [19].

In these applications, the data is generated in a real time, and it is important to keep track of the data that is seen so far. Consequently, a line of recent papers studied streaming algorithms for maximizing a submodular function. The first one-pass streaming algorithm for maximizing a

*Columbia University, ms4961@columbia.edu

monotone submodular function subject to a k -cardinality constraint is due to Badanidiyuru et al. [4], who propose a $(1/2 - \epsilon)$ -approximation streaming algorithm, with a memory of size $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon}k \log k)$. Recently, Kazemi et al. [19] proposed a new algorithm with the same approximation ratio but with improved memory $O(k)$.

Norouzi-Fard et al. [23] give an upper bound of $1/2 + o(1)$ on the approximation ratio achievable by any algorithm for streaming submodular maximization that only queries the value of the submodular function on feasible sets (sets of size at most k) while using $o(n)$ memory. Consequently, they initiate the study of the random order streaming model in order to go beyond this worst case analysis for the adversarial order inputs. They achieve a $1/2 + 8 \times 10^{-14}$ approximation for maximizing a monotone submodular function in the random order model, using a memory buffer of size $O(k \log k)$. Subsequently, Agrawal et al. [2] substantially improve their result to $1 - 1/e - \epsilon - O(1/k)$ approximation which is close to the best possible guarantee in the offline setting, i.e., $1 - 1/e$ (assuming $P \neq NP$). Furthermore, they improve the required memory buffer to only $O(k)$.

In addition to the simple cardinality constraint, more general constraints have been studied in the literature. Chakrabarti and Kale [7] give a $1/4p$ approximation algorithm for streaming monotone submodular functions maximization subject to the intersection of p matroid constraints. Chekuri et al. [8] extend it to p -matchoids constraints. A precise definition of a p -matchoid is given in Section 5. These constraints are generalization of constraints such as the cardinality constraint, the intersection of p matroids, and matchings in graphs and hyper-graphs [8]. Recently, Feldman et al. [12] designed a more efficient algorithm with lower number of function evaluations achieving the same approximation $1/4p$.

The algorithms of Feldman et al. [12], for monotone submodular objective functions require only $O(k)$ memory (k is the size of the largest feasible set) and using only $O(kq)$ value and independence oracle queries for processing each element of the stream (q is the number of matroids used to define the p -matchoid constraint).

Moreover, the greedy algorithm achieves a $1/(p + 1)$ approximation for p -independent systems [22], which is tight for all p , even for the case of p -matroid constraints. Also it is NP -hard to approximate the p -dimensional matching within an $\Omega(\log p/p)$ approximation for large but fixed p [18].

The shortlist model. In [2], a relaxation of the secretary problem is introduced where the algorithm is allowed to select a *shortlist* of items that is larger than the number of items that ultimately need to be selected. after seeing the entire input, the algorithm can choose from the bigger set of items in the shortlist. This model is closely related to the random order streaming model. A comprehensive comparison between these two models can be found in [2]. The main result of [2] is an online algorithm for submodular k -secretary problem with shortlists that, for any constant $\epsilon > 0$, achieves a competitive ratio of $1 - \frac{1}{e} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k})$ with shortlist of size $O(k)$. They also provide an implementation of their algorithm in the streaming setting with the same approximation ratio and memory $O(k)$.

The submodular matroid secretary problem with shortlists. Motivated by the improvements achieved for the competitive ratio of submodular k -secretary problem in the *shortlist* model, we ask if similar improvements can be achieved by relaxing the submodular matroid secretary problem to have a shortlist. That is, instead of choosing an independent set of a matroid \mathcal{M} with

$rk(\mathcal{M}) = k$, the algorithm is allowed to choose $\eta(k)$ items as part of a shortlist, for some function η ; and at the end of all inputs, the algorithm chooses an independent subset of items from the $\eta(k)$ selected items. Then what is the best competitive ratio that we can achieve in this model for example when $\eta(k) = O(k)$? Is it possible to improve the best known competitive ratio for matroid secretary problem in this model?

1.1 Problem definition

We now give a more formal definition. We are given matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{I})$, with $rk(\mathcal{M}) = k$. Items from a set $\mathcal{U} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ (pool of items) arrive in a uniformly random order over n sequential rounds. The set \mathcal{U} is apriori fixed but unknown to the algorithm, and the total number of items n is known to the algorithm. In each round, the algorithm irrevocably decides whether to add the arriving item to a shortlist A or not. The algorithm's value at the end of n rounds is given by

$$\text{ALG} = \mathbb{E}[\max_{S \subseteq A, S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)]$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is a monotone submodular function. The algorithm has value oracle access to this function. The optimal offline utility is given by

$$\text{OPT} := f(S^*), \text{ where } S^* = \arg \max_{S \subseteq [n], S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S).$$

We say that an algorithm for this problem achieves a competitive ratio c using shortlist of size $\eta(k)$, if at the end of n rounds, $|A| \leq \eta(k)$ and $\frac{\text{ALG}}{\text{OPT}} \geq c$.

Given the shortlist A , since the problem of computing the solution $\arg \max_{S \subseteq A, S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$ can itself be computationally intensive, our algorithm will also track and output a subset $A^* \subseteq A, |A^*| \leq k$.

1.2 Our Results

We design an algorithm that achieves a $\frac{1}{2}(1 - 1/e^2 - \epsilon - O(1/k))$ competitive ratio for any constant $\epsilon > 0$, using a shortlist of size $O(k)$ for the matroid secretary problem with shortlists. This is especially surprising considering that the best known competitive ratio for the matroid secretary problem is $O(\log \log k)$. We are also able to get a constant competitive algorithm using shortlist of size at most k and also a constant competitive algorithm in the preemption model.

Theorem 1. *For any constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an online algorithm (Algorithm 2) for the submodular matroid secretary problem with shortlists that achieves a competitive ratio of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{e^2} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k}))$, with shortlist of size $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(k)$. Here, $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(2^{\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)}k)$. The running time of this online algorithm is $O(nk)$.*

Theorem 2. *For the matroid secretary problem in the preemption model, and matroid secretary problem that uses shortlist of size at most $\eta(k) = k$, there is an algorithm that achieves a constant competitive ratio.*

Furthermore, for a more general constraint, namely p -matchoid constraints (defined in section 5) we prove:

Theorem 3. For any constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an online algorithm for the submodular secretary problem with p -matchoid constraints that achieves a competitive ratio of $\frac{1}{p+1}(1 - \frac{1}{e^{p+1}} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k}))$, with shortlist of size $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(k)$. Here, $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(2^{\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)}k)$. The running time of this online algorithm is $O(n\kappa^p)$, where $\kappa = \max_{i \in [q]} rk(\mathcal{M}_i)$.

The proposed algorithm also has implications for another important problem of submodular function maximization under random order streaming model and matchoid constraints. $\frac{1}{p+1}(1 - 1/e^{p+1} - \epsilon - O(1/k))$ approximation.

Theorem 4. For any constant $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists an algorithm for the submodular random order streaming problem with matroid constraints that achieves $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{e} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k}))$ approximation to OPT while using a memory buffer of size at most $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(k)$. Also, the number of objective function evaluations for each item, amortized over n items, is $O(pk + \frac{k^2}{n})$.

Theorem 5. For any constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm for the submodular random order streaming problem with p -matchoid constraints that achieves $\frac{1}{p+1}(1 - \frac{1}{e^{p+1}} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k}))$ approximation to OPT while using a memory buffer of size at most $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(k)$. Also, the number of objective function evaluations for each item, amortized over n items, is $O(p\kappa + \kappa^p + \frac{k^2}{n})$, where $\kappa = \max_{i \in [q]} rk(\mathcal{M}_i)$.

1.3 Related Work

In this section, we overview some of the related online problems. In the *submodular k -secretary problem* introduced by Bateni et al. [5] and Gupta et al. [17], the algorithm selects k items, but the value of the selected items is given by a monotone submodular function. The algorithm can select at most k items $S = \{a_1 \dots, a_k\}$, from a randomly ordered sequence of n items. The goal is to maximize $f(S)$. Currently, the best result for this setting is due to Kesselheim and Tönnis [20], who achieve a $1/e$ -competitive ratio in exponential time in k , or $\frac{1}{e}(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ in polynomial time in n and k . Submodular functions also has been used in the network design problems [15, 14]. There are also some related online coloring problems in the literature [16, 1].

In the *matroid secretary problem*, the elements of a matroid \mathcal{M} arrive in random order. Once we observe an item we need to irrevocably decide whether or not to accept it. The set of selected elements should form an independent set of the matroid. The goal is to maximize the total sum of the values assigned to these elements. It has applications in online mechanism design, in particular when the set of acceptable agents form a matroid [3].

The existence of a constant competitive algorithm is a long-standing open problem. Lachish [21] provides the first $O(\log \log(k))$ -competitive algorithm (the hidden constant is $2^{2^{34}}$). Feldman et al. [11] give a simpler order-oblivious $2560(\log \log 4k + 5)$ -competitive algorithm for the matroid secretary problem, by knowing only the cardinality of the matroid in advance. There are some $O(1)$ -competitive algorithms for special variants of the matroid secretary problem. For example, the elements of the ground set are assigned to a set of weights uniformly at random then a 5.7187-competitive algorithm is possible for any matroid [24]. Furthermore, a $16(1 - 1/e)$ -competitive algorithm can be achieved as long as the weight assignment is done at random, even if we assume the adversarial arrival order.

Recently, Buchbinder et al. [6] considered a different relaxation which is called preemptions model. In this model, elements added to S can be discarded later. The main result of [6], is a randomized 0.0893-competitive algorithm for cardinality constraints using $O(k)$ memory.

2 Algorithm description

Before describing our main algorithm we design a subroutine for a problem that we call it *secretary problem with replacement*: we are given a matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{I})$ and an independent set $S \in \mathcal{I}$. A pool of items $I = (a_1, \dots, a_N)$ arriving sequentially in a uniformly random order, find an element e from I that can be added to S after removing possibly one element e' from S such that the set remains independent, i.e., $S + e - e' \in \mathcal{I}$. The goal is to choose element e and e' in an online manner with maximum marginal increment $g(e, S) = f(S + e - e') - f(S)$. More precisely define function g as:

$$g(e, S) := f(S + e - \theta(e, S)) - f(S), \quad (1)$$

where θ is defined as:

$$\theta(e, S) := \arg \max_{e' \in S} \{f(S + e - e') \mid S + e - e' \in \mathcal{I}\}$$

We will consider the variant in which we are allowed to have a shortlist, where the algorithm can add items to a shortlist and choose one item from the shortlist at the end.

For the *secretary problem with replacement*, we give Algorithm 1 which is a simple modification of the *online max algorithm* in [2].

Lemma 1. *Algorithm 1, returns element e with maximum $g(e, S)$ with probability $1 - \delta$, thus it achieves a $1 - \delta$ competitive ratio for the secretary problem with replacement. The size of the shortlist that it uses is logarithmic in $1/\delta$.*

Algorithm 1 Secretary Problem with Replacement

- 1: Inputs: number of items N , an independent set S , items in $I = \{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$ arriving sequentially, $\delta \in (0, 1]$.
 - 2: Initialize: $A \leftarrow \emptyset$, $u = n\delta/2$, $M = -\infty$
 - 3: $L \leftarrow 4 \ln(2/\delta)$
 - 4: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 5: **if** $g(a_i, S) > M$ **then**
 - 6: $M \leftarrow g(a_i, S)$
 - 7: **if** $i \geq u$ and $|A| < L$ **then**
 - 8: $A \leftarrow A \cup \{a_i\}$
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: **end if**
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: return A , and $A^* := \max_{i \in A} g(a_i, S)$
-

Similar to [2], we divide the input into sequential blocks that we refer to as (α, β) windows. Here $k = rk(\mathcal{M})$.

Definition 1 ((α, β) windows). *Let $X_1, \dots, X_{k\beta}$ be a $(n, k\beta)$ -ball-bin random set. Divide the indices $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into $k\beta$ slots, where the j -th slot, s_j , consists of X_j consecutive indices in the natural way, that is, slot 1 contains the first X_1 indices, slot 2 contains the next X_2 , etc. Next, we define k/α windows, where window i consists of $\alpha\beta$ consecutive slots, in the same manner as we assigned slots.*

Algorithm 2 Algorithm for submodular matroid secretary with shortlist

- 1: Inputs: number of items n , submodular function f , parameter $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$.
- 2: Initialize: $S_0 \leftarrow \emptyset, R_0 \leftarrow \emptyset, A \leftarrow \emptyset, A^* \leftarrow \emptyset$, constants $\alpha \geq 1, \beta \geq 1$ which depend on the constant ϵ .
- 3: Divide indices $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into (α, β) windows.
- 4: **for** window $w = 1, \dots, k/\alpha$ **do**
- 5: **for** every slot s_j in window w , $j = 1, \dots, \alpha\beta$ **do**
- 6: Concurrently for all subsequences of previous slots $\tau \subseteq \{s_1, \dots, s_{j-1}\}$ of length $|\tau| < \alpha$
- 7: in window w , call the online algorithm in Algorithm 1 with the following inputs:
 - number of items $N = |s_j| + 1$, $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, and
 - item values $I = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{N-1})$, with

$$a_0 := \max_{x \in R_{1, \dots, w-1}} \Delta(x | S_{1, \dots, w-1} \cup \gamma(\tau) \setminus \zeta(\tau))$$

$$a_\ell := \Delta(s_j(\ell) | S_{1, \dots, w-1} \cup \gamma(\tau) \setminus \zeta(\tau)), \forall 0 < \ell \leq N - 1$$

where $s_j(\ell)$ denotes the ℓ^{th} item in the slot s_j .

- 8: Let $A_j(\tau)$ be the shortlist returned by Algorithm 1 for slot j and subsequence τ . Add
- 9: all items except the dummy item 0 to the shortlist A . That is,

$$A \leftarrow A \cup (A(j) \cap s_j)$$

- 10: **end for**
 - 11: After seeing all items in window w , compute R_w, S_w and \bar{S}_w as before
 - 12: $S_{1, \dots, w} \leftarrow S_{1, \dots, w-1} \cup S_w \setminus \bar{S}_w$
 - 13: $A^* \leftarrow A^* \cup (S_w \cap A) \setminus \bar{S}_w$
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: return A, A^* .
-

Intuitively, for large enough α and β , roughly α items from the optimal set S^* are likely to lie in each of these windows, and further, it is unlikely that two items from S^* will appear in the same slot.

The algorithm can focus on identifying a constant number (roughly α) of optimal items from each of these windows, with at most one item coming from each of the $\alpha\beta$ slots in a window. Similar to [2], the core of our algorithm is a subroutine that accomplishes this task in an online manner using a shortlist of constant size in each window. But the difference is that adding items from a new window to the current solution S could make it a non-independent set of \mathcal{M} . In order to make the new set independent we have to remove some items from S . The removed item corresponding to e will be $\theta(e, S)$. We need to take care of all the removals for newly selected items in a window. Therefore we have to slightly change the definitions in [2]. We introduce $\zeta(\tau)$ which is counterpart of $\gamma(\tau)$ for the removed elements. More precisely, for any subsequence $\tau = (s_1, \dots, s_\ell)$ of the $\alpha\beta$ slots in window w , recall the greedy subsequence $\gamma(\tau)$ of items as:

$$\gamma(\tau) := \{i_1, \dots, i_\ell\} \tag{2}$$

where

$$i_j := \arg \max_{i \in s_j \cup R_{1,\dots,w-1}} g(i, S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}) \quad (3)$$

now define $\zeta(\tau) := \{c_1, \dots, c_\ell\}$ where

$$c_j := \theta(i_j, S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}) \quad (4)$$

Recall the definition of R_w in [2], which is the union of all greedy subsequences of length α , and S_w to be the best subsequence among those. That is,

$$R_w = \cup_{\tau: |\tau|=\alpha} \gamma(\tau) \quad (5)$$

and

$$S_w = \gamma(\tau^*), \quad (6)$$

now define

$$\bar{S}_w = \zeta(\tau^*), \quad (7)$$

where

$$\tau^* := \arg \max_{\tau: |\tau|=\alpha} f((S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \gamma(\tau)) \setminus \zeta(\tau)) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1}). \quad (8)$$

also define

$$\hat{S}_w = \{c_{j_1}, \dots, c_{j_t}\}, \text{ where } (S_w \cap A) = \{i_{j_1}, \dots, i_{j_t}\} \quad (9)$$

In other words, \hat{S}_w is counterpart of elements of $S_w \cap A$ that are removed by g . Also note that in the main Algorithm 2, we remove $\zeta(\tau^*)$ from $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup S_w$ at the end of window w and make $S_{1,\dots,w}$ an independent set of \mathcal{M} .

In order to find the item with the maximum g value (3), among all the items in the slot. We use an online subroutine that employs the algorithm (Algorithm 1) for the *secretary problem with replacement* described earlier. Note that R_w , S_w and \bar{S}_w can be computed *exactly at the end* of window w .

The algorithm returns both the shortlist A which similar to [2] is of size $O(k)$ as stated in the following proposition, as well the set A^* . Note that we remove \hat{S}_w from A^* at the end of window w . In the next section, we will show that $\mathbb{E}[f(A^*)] \geq (1 - \frac{1}{e^2} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k}))f(S^*)$ to provide a bound on the competitive ratio of this algorithm. As it is proved in [2],

Proposition 1. *Given k, n , and any constant α, β and ϵ , the size of shortlist A selected by Algorithm 2 is at most $4k\beta \binom{\alpha\beta}{\alpha} \log(2/\epsilon) = O(k)$.*

3 Preliminaries

The following properties of submodular functions are well known (e.g., see [6, 9, 10]).

Lemma 2. *Given a monotone submodular function f , and subsets A, B in the domain of f , we use $\Delta_f(A|B)$ to denote $f(A \cup B) - f(B)$. For any set A and B , $\Delta_f(A|B) \leq \sum_{a \in A \setminus B} \Delta_f(a|B)$*

Lemma 3. *Denote by $A(p)$ a random subset of A where each element has probability at least p to appear in A (not necessarily independently). Then $E[f(A(p))] \geq (1 - p)f(\emptyset) + (p)f(A)$*

We will use the following well known deviation inequality for martingales (or supermartingales/submartingales).

Lemma 4 (Azuma-Hoeffding inequality). *Suppose $\{X_k : k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ is a martingale (or super-martingale) and $|X_k - X_{k-1}| < c_k$, almost surely. Then for all positive integers N and all positive reals r ,*

$$P(X_N - X_0 \geq r) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-r^2}{2 \sum_{k=1}^N c_k^2}\right).$$

And symmetrically (when X_k is a sub-martingale):

$$P(X_N - X_0 \leq -r) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-r^2}{2 \sum_{k=1}^N c_k^2}\right).$$

Lemma 5 (Chernoff bound for Bernoulli r.v.). *Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$, where $X_i = 1$ with probability p_i and $X_i = 0$ with probability $1 - p_i$, and all X_i are independent. Let $\mu = \mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$. Then,*

$$P(X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu) \leq e^{-\delta^2 \mu / (2 + \delta)}$$

for all $\delta > 0$, and

$$P(X \leq (1 - \delta)\mu) \leq e^{-\delta^2 \mu / 2}$$

for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$.

Definition 2. (Matroids). *A matroid is a finite set system $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{I})$, where \mathcal{N} is a set and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{N}}$ is a family of subsets such that: (i) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$, (ii) If $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, and $B \in \mathcal{I}$, then $A \in \mathcal{I}$, (iii) If $A, B \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|A| < |B|$, then there is an element $b \in B \setminus A$ such that $A + b \in \mathcal{I}$. In a matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{I})$, \mathcal{N} is called the ground set and the members of \mathcal{I} are called independent sets of the matroid. The bases of \mathcal{M} share a common cardinality, called the rank of \mathcal{M} .*

Lemma 6. (Brualdi) *If A, B are any two bases of matroid M then there exists a bijection π from A to B , fixing $A \cap B$, such that $A - x + \pi(x) \in M$ for all $x \in A$.*

3.1 Some useful properties of (α, β) windows

In [2], we proved some useful properties of (α, β) windows, defined in Definition 1 and used in Algorithm 2. which we summarize it in this section.

The first observation is that every item will appear uniformly at random in one of the $k\beta$ slots in (α, β) windows.

Definition 3. *For each item $e \in I$, define $Y_e \in [k\beta]$ as the random variable indicating the slot in which e appears. We call vector $Y \in [k\beta]^n$ a configuration.*

Lemma 7. *Random variables $\{Y_e\}_{e \in I}$ are i.i.d. with uniform distribution on all $k\beta$ slots.*

This follows from the uniform random order of arrivals, and the use of the balls in bins process to determine the number of items in a slot during the construction of (α, β) windows.

Next, we make important observations about the probability of assignment of items in S^* in the slots in a window w , given the sets $R_{1, \dots, w-1}, S_{1, \dots, w-1}$ (refer to (5), (6) for definition of these sets). To aid analysis, we define the following new random variable T_w that will track all the useful information from a window w .

Definition 4. Define $T_w := \{(\tau, \gamma(\tau))\}_\tau$, for all α -length subsequences $\tau = (s_1, \dots, s_\alpha)$ of the $\alpha\beta$ slots in window w . Here, $\gamma(\tau)$ is a sequence of items as defined in (2). Also define $\text{Supp}(T_{1,\dots,w}) := \{e | e \in \gamma(\tau) \text{ for some } (\tau, \gamma(\tau)) \in T_{1,\dots,w}\}$ (Note that $\text{Supp}(T_{1,\dots,w}) = R_{1,\dots,w}$).

Lemma 8. For any window $w \in [W]$, $T_{1,\dots,w}$ and $S_{1,\dots,w}$ are independent of the ordering of elements within any slot, and are determined by the configuration Y .

Following the above lemma, given a configuration Y , we will some times use the notation $T_{1,\dots,w}(Y)$ and $S_{1,\dots,w}(Y)$ to make this mapping explicit.

Lemma 9. For any item $i \in S^*$, window $w \in \{1, \dots, W\}$, and slot s in window w , define

$$p_{is} := \mathbb{P}(i \in s \cup \text{Supp}(T) | T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T). \quad (10)$$

Then, for any pair of slots s', s'' in windows $w, w+1, \dots, W$,

$$p_{is'} = p_{is''} \geq \frac{1}{k\beta}. \quad (11)$$

Lemma 10. For any window w , $i, j \in S^*, i \neq j$ and $s, s' \in w$, the random variables $\mathbf{1}(Y_i = s | T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T)$ and $\mathbf{1}(Y_j = s' | T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T)$ are independent. That is, given $T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T$, items $i, j \in S^*, i \neq j$ appear in any slot s in w independently.

Lemma 11. Fix a slot s' , T , and $j \notin \text{Supp}(T)$. Suppose that there exists some configuration Y' such that $T_{1,\dots,w-1}(Y') = T$ and $Y'_j = s'$. Then, given any configuration Y'' with $T_{1,\dots,w-1}(Y'') = T$, we can replace Y''_j with s' to obtain a new configuration \bar{Y} that also satisfies $T_{1,\dots,w-1}(\bar{Y}) = T$.

4 Analysis of the algorithms

In this section we show that for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, Algorithm 2 with an appropriate choice of constants α, β , achieves the competitive ratio claimed in Theorem 1 for the submodular matroid secretary problem with shortlists.

First, we use the observations from the previous sections to show the existence of a random subsequence of slots $\tilde{\tau}_w$ of window w such that we can lower bound $f((S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \gamma(\tilde{\tau}_w)) \setminus \zeta(\tilde{\tau}_w)) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1})$ in terms of $\text{OPT} - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1})$. This will be used to lower bound increment $f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \gamma(\tau^*) \setminus \zeta(\tau^*)) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1})$ in every window.

Definition 5 (Z_s and $\tilde{\gamma}_w$). Create sets of items $Z_s, \forall s \in w$ as follows: for every slot s , add every item from $i \in S^* \cap s$ independently with probability $\frac{1}{k\beta p_{is}}$ to Z_s . Then, for every item $i \in S^* \cap T$, with probability α/k , add i to Z_s for a randomly chosen slot s in w . Define subsequence $\tilde{\tau}_w$ as the sequence of slots with $Z_s \neq \emptyset$.

Similar to [2], we have the following property for Z_s :

Lemma 12. Given any $T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T$, for any slot s in window w , all $i, i' \in S^*, i \neq i'$ will appear in Z_s independently with probability $\frac{1}{k\beta}$. Also, given T , for every $i \in S^*$, the probability to appear in Z_s is equal for all slots s in window w . Further, each $i \in S^*$ occurs in Z_s of at most one slot s .

Lemma 13. We can show that for all $i, i' \in S^* \setminus \{Z_{s_1} \cup \dots \cup Z_{s_{j-1}}\}$,

$$\Pr(i \in Z_{s_j} | Z_{s_1} \cup \dots \cup Z_{s_{j-1}}) = \Pr(i' \in Z_{s_j} | Z_{s_1} \cup \dots \cup Z_{s_{j-1}}) \geq \frac{1}{k}. \quad (12)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to Lemma 12 in [2], and it is based on Lemma 12, \square

In the following lemma we lower bound the marginal gain of a randomly picked element of optimal solution in slot s_j with respect to previously selected items.

Lemma 14. *Suppose the sequence $\tilde{\tau}_w = (s_1, \dots, s_t)$ defined as in Definition 5, let $\gamma(\tilde{\tau}_s) = (i_1, \dots, i_t)$, with $\gamma(\cdot)$ as defined in (2). Then, for all $j = 1, \dots, t$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\Delta_f(a | S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{k} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}\right) f(S^*) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We can lower bound the increment assuming a is randomly picked item from $Z_{s_j} \cap S^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\Delta_f(a, S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T, i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in S^* \setminus \{Z_1, \dots, Z_{s_{j-1}}\}} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_f(a, S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) | T, i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}] \right] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}[(f(S^* \setminus \{Z_1, \dots, Z_{s_{j-1}}\}) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup i_{1,\dots,s-1} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\})) | T] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}[(f(S^* \setminus \cup_{s' \in w} Z_{s'}) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup i_{1,\dots,s-1} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\})) | T] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{k} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}\right) f(S^*) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup i_{1,\dots,s-1} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality uses Lemma 3 for submodular function f . and the observation from Lemma 12 that given T , every $i \in S^*$ appears in $\cup_{s' \in w} Z_{s'}$ independently with probability α/k , so that every $i \in S^*$ appears in $S^* \setminus \cup_{s' \in w} Z_{s'}$ independently with probability $1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}$; \square

Lemma 15. *Suppose the sequence $\tilde{\tau}_w = (s_1, \dots, s_t)$ defined as in Definition 5, let $\gamma(\tilde{\tau}_s) = (i_1, \dots, i_t)$, with $\gamma(\cdot)$ as defined in (2). Moreover, let S' be the extension of $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}$ to an independent set in \mathcal{M} , and π be the bijection from Brualdi lemma (refer to Lemma 6) from S^* to S' . Then, for all $j = 1, \dots, t$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}, \pi(a)\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \\ & \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{k - \alpha}\right) f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since π is a bijection from S^* to S' , from Brualdi's lemma (lemma 6), there is an onto mapping π' from S^* to $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ such that $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\} - \pi'(a) + a \in M$, for all $a \in S^*$. Further, $\pi'(a) = \pi(a)$ if $\pi(a) \in S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}$ and $\pi'(a) = \emptyset$ otherwise.

Recall the definition of Z_{s_j} . Suppose a is a randomly picked item from $S^* \cap Z_{s_j}$. Note that from Lemma 12, conditioned on $T_{1,\dots,w-1}$, the element a can be equally any element of $S^* \setminus \{Z_1, \dots, Z_{s_{j-1}}\}$ with probability at least $1/(k - \alpha)$. Therefore, $\pi'(a)$ would be any of $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}$ with probability at most $1/(k - \alpha)$ (since π' might map some elements of S^* to the empty set). Now based on the definition of π and lemma 3 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_a[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}, \pi(a)\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \\ \geq (1 - \frac{1}{k - \alpha})f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 16. Suppose function g is as defined in equation 1. For the sequence $\tilde{\tau}_w = (s_1, \dots, s_t)$, and $\gamma(\tilde{\tau}_s) = (i_1, \dots, i_t)$. Then, for all $j = 1, \dots, t$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[g(i_j, S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}] \\ \geq \frac{1}{k} \left((1 - \frac{\alpha}{k - \alpha})f(S^*) - 2f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. In the algorithm 2, at the end of window w , we set $S_{1,\dots,w} = S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup S_w \setminus \bar{S}_w$. Suppose $a \in s_j \cap S^*$. Moreover, let S' be the extension of $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}$ to an independent set in \mathcal{M} , and π be the bijection from Brualdi lemma (refer to Lemma 6) from S^* to S' . Thus the expected value of the function g on the element selected by the algorithm in slot s_j (the element with maximum g in the slot s_j) would be

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_j\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}] \\ \geq & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}, a\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}, \pi(a)\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \\ \geq & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}, \pi(a)\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \\ & + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_f(a | S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}, \pi(a)\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \\ \geq & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}, \pi(a)\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \\ & + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_f(a | S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is from the definition of function g as it is defined in equation 1. The last inequality from submoularity of f . Now from the last inequality and lemma 15 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_j\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}] \\ \geq & (1 - \frac{1}{k - \alpha})f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \\ & + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_f(a | S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \end{aligned}$$

Now from lemma 14 and the above inequality we can show

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_j\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}] \\ \geq & (1 - \frac{1}{k - \alpha})f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \\ & + \frac{1}{k} \left((1 - \frac{\alpha}{k})f(S^*) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_j\}) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \quad (13)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{k} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}\right) f(S^*) - 2f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \right). \quad (14)$$

□

Using standard techniques for the analysis of greedy algorithm, the following corollary of the previous lemma can be derived,

Lemma 17.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}\right) f(S^*) - 2f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \gamma(\tilde{\tau}_w) \setminus \zeta(\tilde{\tau}_w)) | T \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{2|\tilde{\tau}_w|}{k}} | T \right] \left(\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}\right) f(S^*) - 2f(S_{1,\dots,w-1}) \right)$$

Proof. Let $\pi_0 = (1 - \frac{\alpha}{k})f(S^*) - 2\mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T]$, and for $j \geq 1$,

$$\pi_j := \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}\right) f(S^*) - 2\mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_j\}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T, i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}],$$

Then, subtracting and adding $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k})f(S^*)$ from the left hand side of lemma 16, and taking expectation conditional on $T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T, i_1, \dots, i_{j-2}$, we get

$$-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{E}[\pi_j | T, i_1, \dots, i_{j-2}] + \pi_{j-1}) \geq \frac{1}{k}\pi_{j-1}$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\pi_j | T, i_1, \dots, i_{j-2}] \leq \left(1 - \frac{2}{k}\right) \pi_{j-1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2}{k}\right)^j \pi_0.$$

By martingale stopping theorem, this implies:

$$\mathbb{E}[\pi_t | T] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{2}{k}\right)^t | T \right] \pi_0 \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-2t/k} | T \right] \pi_0.$$

where stopping time $t = |\tilde{\tau}_w|$. ($t = |\tilde{\tau}_w| \leq \alpha\beta$ is bounded, therefore, martingale stopping theorem can be applied).

□

Next, we compare $\gamma(\tilde{\tau}_w)$ to $S_w = \gamma(\tau^*)$. Here, τ^* was defined as the ‘best’ greedy subsequence of length α (refer to (6) and (8)). To compare it with $\tilde{\tau}_w$, we need a bound on size of $\tilde{\tau}_w$. We use concentration inequalities proved in [2]:

Lemma 18 (proved in [2]). *For any real $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, if parameters k, α, β satisfy $k \geq \alpha\beta$, $\beta \geq \frac{8}{(\delta')^2}$, $\alpha \geq 8\beta^2 \log(1/\delta')$, then given any $T_{1,\dots,w-1} = T$, with probability at least $1 - \delta' e^{-\alpha/k}$,*

$$|\tilde{\tau}_w| \geq (1 - \delta')\alpha.$$

Lemma 19. *For any real $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, if parameters k, α, β satisfy $k \geq \alpha\beta$, $\beta \geq \frac{8}{(\delta')^2}$, $\alpha \geq 8\beta^2 \log(1/\delta')$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{k - \alpha}{k} OPT - 2f(S_{1,\dots,w}) | T_{1,\dots,w-1} \right] \leq (1 - \delta') e^{-2\alpha/k} \left(\frac{k - \alpha}{k} OPT - 2f(S_{1,\dots,w-1}) \right).$$

Proof. The lemma follows from substituting Lemma 18 in Lemma 17. \square

Theorem 1. *For any constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an online algorithm (Algorithm 2) for the submodular matroid secretary problem with shortlists that achieves a competitive ratio of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{e^2} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k}))$, with shortlist of size $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(k)$. Here, $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(2^{\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)}k)$. The running time of this online algorithm is $O(nk)$.*

Proof. Now from Lemma 19, we have, for any real $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, if parameters k, α, β satisfy $k \geq \alpha\beta$, $\beta \geq \frac{8}{(\delta')^2}$, $\alpha \geq 8\beta^2 \log(1/\delta')$, then the set $S_{1,\dots,W}$ tracked by Algorithm 2 satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,W})] \geq (1 - \delta')^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}(1 - 1/e^2)\right) \text{OPT}.$$

Now, we compare $f(S_{1,\dots,W})$ to $f(A^*)$, where $A^* = S_{1,\dots,W} \cap A$, with A being the shortlist returned by Algorithm 2. The main difference between the two sets is that in construction of shortlist A , Algorithm 1 is being used to compute the argmax in the definition of $\gamma(\tau)$, in an online manner. This argmax may not be computed exactly, so that some items from $S_{1,\dots,W}$ may not be part of the shortlist A .

Similar to Lemma 16 in [2], we can show that each element in A gets selected by the algorithm with probability at least $1 - \delta$. More precisely, let A be the shortlist returned by Algorithm 2, and δ is the parameter used to call Algorithm 1 in Algorithm 2. Then, for given configuration Y , for any item a , we have

$$\Pr(a \in A | Y, a \in S_{1,\dots,w}) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Therefore using Lemma 3,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(A^*)] := \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,W} \cap A)] \geq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,W})]$$

where $A^* := S_{1,\dots,W} \cap A$ is the subset of shortlist A returned by Algorithm 2. The proof is similar to the proof in [2]. \square

4.1 Preemption model and Shortlist of size at most k

Finally we focus on the special case where the size of shortlist is at most k . We can get a constant competitive algorithm even with the slight relaxation of the *matroid secretary problem* to the case that we allow the algorithm to select a shortlist of size at most $k = rk(\mathcal{M})$. The algorithm finally outputs an independent subset of this shortlist of size k . There was no constant competitive algorithm even for this natural relaxation of *matroid secretary problem*. Also we are not aware of any direct way to prove a constant factor guarantee for this simple relaxation without using the techniques that we develop using (α, β) -windows.

Theorem 2. *For the matroid secretary problem in the preemption model, and matroid secretary problem that uses shortlist of size at most $\eta(k) = k$, there is an algorithm that achieves a constant competitive ratio.*

Proof. We show that algorithm 2 with parameter $\alpha = \beta = 1$ satisfies the above mentioned properties. Firstly, algorithm 2 (with $\alpha = 1$, and $\beta = 1$) uses shortlist of size $\eta(k) \leq k$. The reason is that the algorithm divides the input into exactly k slots. Also each window contains exactly one slot. The function γ tries all α -subsequences of a window which is exactly one slot. Thus γ returns one element in that slot with high value of $g(e, S)$ as defined in 1, which might cause removal of at most one element $\theta(S, e)$ from the current solution S . Therefore the algorithm has shortlist size at most k and also satisfies the preemption model. Now by setting $\alpha = 1, \beta = 1$ we can get a constant competitive ratio that the error rate comes from lemma 19. \square

5 p -matchoid constraints

In this section, we present algorithms for monotone submodular function maximization subject to p -matchoid constraints. These constraints generalize many basic combinatorial constraints such as the cardinality constraint, the intersection of p matroids, and matchings in graphs. Throughout this section, k would refer to the size of the largest feasible set. A formal definition of a p -matchoid is as follows:

Definition 6. (*Matchoids*). Let $\mathcal{M}_1 = (\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{I}_1), \dots, \mathcal{M}_q = (\mathcal{N}_q, \mathcal{I}_q)$ be q matroids over overlapping groundsets. Let $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{N}_q$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{S \subseteq \mathcal{N} : S \cap \mathcal{N}_\ell \in \mathcal{I}_\ell, \forall \ell\}$. The finite set system $\mathcal{M}_p = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{I})$ is a p -matchoid if for every element $e \in \mathcal{N}$, e is a member of \mathcal{N} for at most p indices $\ell \in [q]$.

There are some subtle differences in the algorithm as well as in the analysis. The main difference in the algorithm is that instead of removing one item from the current independent set S , we might remove up to p items from S . Each removed item corresponds to different ground set \mathcal{N}_i , in which the new item lies (based on the definition of p -matchoid constraints, Definition 6, there are at most p such elements).

For each index $\ell \in [q]$ define:

$$\Omega_\ell(e, S) := \{e' \in S \mid S + e - e' \in \mathcal{I}_\ell\} \quad (15)$$

For an element e in the input, suppose $e \in \mathcal{N}_{\ell_i}$, for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Define

$$\lambda(e, S) := \prod_{i=1}^p \Omega_{\ell_i}(e, S) \quad (16)$$

For a combination vector $r = (r_1, \dots, r_p) \in \lambda(e, S)$, where $r_i \in \Omega_{\ell_i}(e, S)$, define:

$$\mu(r) := \{r_1, \dots, r_p\} \quad (17)$$

$$g_r(e, S) := f(S + e - \mu(r)) - f(S) \quad (18)$$

Also define:

$$\theta(e, S) := \mu(\arg \max_{r \in \lambda(e, S)} g_r(e, S)) \quad (19)$$

Furthermore define,

$$g(e, S) := \max_{r \in \lambda(e, S)} g_r(e, S) \quad (20)$$

As in the online subroutine for the main algorithm, we run Algorithm 1 with the new function g defined in equation 20. It returns element e with maximum $g(e, S)$, and it achieves a $1 - \delta$ competitive ratio with shortlists of size logarithmic in $1/\delta$.

Additionally, we make some changes in the main algorithm 2. In particular, we define γ similar to equation 2 but using the new definition of g in equation 20. Moreover, for a subsequence $\tau = (s_1, \dots, s_\ell)$ define

$$\zeta(\tau) := \bigcup_{j=1}^{\ell} C_j \quad (21)$$

where each C_j is a set defined as

$$C_j := \theta(i_j, S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}) \quad (22)$$

Note that in contrast with the definition of $\zeta(\tau)$ for the matroid constraints equation 22, in which c_j is only one item, now each C_j is a subset of the current independent set S . Further, the definition of \bar{S}_w , in equation 7, will be updated accordingly using the new definition of $\zeta(\tau)$.

Now we can generalize Lemma 15 to p -matchoid constraints.

Lemma 20. *Suppose the sequence $\tilde{\tau}_w = (s_1, \dots, s_t)$ defined as in Definition 5, let $\gamma(\tilde{\tau}_s) = (i_1, \dots, i_t)$, with $\gamma(\cdot)$ as defined in (2). For any $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, and element $b \in \mathcal{N}_\ell$, let S'_ℓ be the extension of $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r$ to an independent set in \mathcal{M}_ℓ , and π_ℓ be the bijection from Brualdi lemma (refer to Lemma 6) from S^* to S'_ℓ . Further, let's denote by $\pi(b) := \{\pi_\ell(b) | b \in \mathcal{N}_\ell\}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus (\bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r \cup \pi(a) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j})] \\ \geq (1 - \frac{p}{k}) f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}\}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 15. For $\ell \in [q]$, since π_ℓ is a bijection from $S^* \cap \mathcal{N}_\ell$ to S'_ℓ , from Brualdi's lemma (lemma 6), there is an onto mapping π'_ℓ from $S^* \cap \mathcal{N}_\ell$ to $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus (\bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r \cup \pi(a)) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ such that $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus (\bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r \cup \pi(a)) - \pi'_\ell(a) + a \in M_\ell$, for all $a \in S^*$. Further, $\pi'_\ell(a) = \pi_\ell(a)$ if $\pi_\ell(a) \in S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r$ and $\pi'_\ell(a) = \emptyset$ otherwise.

Recall the definition of Z_{s_j} (refer to definition 5). Suppose a is a randomly picked item from $S^* \cap Z_{s_j}$. Note that from Lemma 12, conditioned on $T_{1,\dots,w-1}$, the element a can be equally any element of $S^* \setminus \{Z_1, \dots, Z_{s_{j-1}}\}$ with probability at least $1/k$. Therefore, $\pi'_\ell(a)$ would be any of $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r$ with probability at most $1/k$ (since π'_ℓ might map some elements of S^* to the empty set).

For element $e \in S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r$, let $\mathcal{N}(e)$ be the set of indices ℓ such that $e \in \mathcal{N}_\ell$. Because of the p -matchoid constraint, we have $|\mathcal{N}(e)| \leq p$. Define

$$\pi^{-1}(e) := \{t | t \in \mathcal{N}_\ell, \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathcal{N}(e) \text{ and } \pi_\ell(t) = e\}$$

we have also $|\pi^{-1}(e)| \leq p$. Thus, each element $e \in S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r$ belongs to $\pi(a)$ with probability at most p/k :

$$\Pr(e \in \pi(a) | a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}) = \Pr(a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j} \cap \pi^{-1}(a)) \leq \frac{p}{k}$$

Now we apply Lemma 3. It is crucial to note that in Lemma 3 each element do not need to be selected necessarily independently. Definition of π and lemma 3 imply the lemma. \square

Furthermore the main difference in the analysis is that instead of recursion 13, we get the following new recursion:

Lemma 21. *Suppose function g is as defined in equation 20. For the sequence $\tilde{\tau}_w = (s_1, \dots, s_t)$, and $\gamma(\tilde{\tau}_s) = (i_1, \dots, i_t)$. Then, for all $j = 1, \dots, t$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[g(i_j, S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1} \right] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{k} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}\right) f(S^*) - (p+1) f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 16 with some changes regarding matchoid constraints. In the algorithm 2, at the end of window w , we set $S_{1,\dots,w} = S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup S_w \setminus \bar{S}_w$. Suppose $a \in s_j \cap S^*$. Moreover, let S'_ℓ be the extension of $S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r$ to an independent set in \mathcal{M}_ℓ , and π_ℓ be the bijection in Brualdi lemma (refer to Lemma 6) from S^*_ℓ to S'_ℓ . Thus the expected value of the function g on the element selected by the algorithm in slot s_j (the element with maximum g in the slot s_j) would be

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j} C_r) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}, a\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r \cup \pi(a) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j})] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r \cup \pi(a) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j})] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_f(a | S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r \cup \pi(a) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j})] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r \cup \pi(a) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j})] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_f(a | S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is from the definition of function g as it is defined in equation 20 and the fact that the algorithm selects an element in slot s_j with maximum value of g . The second inequality is from submodularity and the last inequality is from monotonicity of f . Now from the last inequality and Lemma 21, we can show,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j} C_r) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}] \\ & \geq (1 - \frac{p}{k}) f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_f(a | S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}, a \in S^* \cap Z_{s_j}] \end{aligned}$$

Now from lemma 14 and the above inequality we can show

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j} C_r) | T_{1,\dots,w-1}, i_{1,\dots,j-1}] \\ & \geq (1 - \frac{p}{k}) f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{k} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}\right) f(S^*) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j} C_r) - f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r) \quad (23)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{k} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{k}\right) f(S^*) - (p+1) f(S_{1,\dots,w-1} \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \leq j-1} C_r) \right). \quad (24)$$

□

By solving the recursion and similar to the analysis for matroid constraints we can show the following theorem:

Theorem 3. *For any constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an online algorithm for the submodular secretary problem with p -matchoid constraints that achieves a competitive ratio of $\frac{1}{p+1}(1 - \frac{1}{e^{p+1}} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k}))$, with shortlist of size $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(k)$. Here, $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(2^{\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)} k)$. The running time of this online algorithm is $O(n\kappa^p)$, where $\kappa = \max_{i \in [q]} rk(\mathcal{M}_i)$.*

6 Streaming

In this section, we show that Algorithm 2 can be implemented in a way that it uses a memory buffer of size at most $\eta(k) = O(k)$; also we compute the number of objective function evaluations for each arriving item as follows.

Theorem 4. *For any constant $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists an algorithm for the submodular random order streaming problem with matroid constraints that achieves $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{e} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k}))$ approximation to OPT while using a memory buffer of size at most $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(k)$. Also, the number of objective function evaluations for each item, amortized over n items, is $O(pk + \frac{k^2}{n})$.*

Similarly for p -matchoid constraint we have the following result for the streaming setting:

Theorem 5. *For any constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an algorithm for the submodular random order streaming problem with p -matchoid constraints that achieves $\frac{1}{p+1}(1 - \frac{1}{e^{p+1}} - \epsilon - O(\frac{1}{k}))$ approximation to OPT while using a memory buffer of size at most $\eta_\epsilon(k) = O(k)$. Also, the number of objective function evaluations for each item, amortized over n items, is $O(pk + \kappa^p + \frac{k^2}{n})$, where $\kappa = \max_{i \in [q]} rk(\mathcal{M}_i)$.*

Proof. The difference between Algorithm 2 in this paper and the main Algorithm in [2] is that, we remove elements of \bar{S}_w from S at the end of each window w . Therefore, with the same argument in the proof of Theorem 2 in [2], we keep track of all parameters in Algorithm 2 including $\bar{S}_w, S_w, R_w, \hat{S}_w$ in a memory efficient way using memory $O(k)$. The other difference between the two algorithms is in the subroutine 1 that finds the element with maximum g in a slot. In [2], $g(e, S)$ can be computed using only one oracle access, whereas in the new definition of g in equation 20, we need access to independence oracle of p matroids that e belongs to, in order to check the independence of $S + e - e'$ for each $e' \in S$. At most $p\kappa$ elements of S are eligible (they are in the ground set of a matroid that e also member of). Hence, in order to create $\Omega_\ell(e, S)$, for each arriving element e in the input, we need $O(p\kappa)$ access to Independence oracle. Similarly the

total access to the value oracle is $O(p\kappa)$. In order to compute $\lambda(e, S)$, we need to consider all κ^p combinations and have access to value oracle. Therefore the number of access to the value oracle is $O(p\kappa + \kappa^p)$ per element. But, since the first element a_0 is computed in the beginning of each slot for each τ , we would have in average an additional $O(k^2/n)$ function evaluation per element. \square

In the next section, we empirically compare our streaming algorithms with the state of the art algorithms in the streaming setting.

6.1 Experiment

In this section, we consider different types of constraints including uniform matroid, intersection of partition matroids and p -matchoid constraints. We compare our algorithm with state of the art algorithm for each type of constraint using YouTube dataset and Twitter dataset described in the next section.

6.1.1 DataSets

The experiments will be on a Twitter stream summarization task and a YouTube Video summarization task similar to the one in Kazemi et al. [19].

Twitter Stream Summarization In this application, we want to produce real-time summaries for Twitter feeds. It is valuable to create a succinct summary that contains all the important information. We use the dataset created by [19]. They gather recent tweets from 30 different popular news accounts, to collect a total of 42,104 unique tweets. They also define a monotone submodular function f that measure the redundancy of important stories in a set S . It is defined as follows on a set $S \subseteq V$ of tweets:

$$f(S) := \sum_{w \in W} \sqrt{\sum_{e \in S} score(w, e)}$$

function f defined over a ground set V of tweets. Each tweet $e \in V$ consists of a positive value $vale$ denoting its number of retweets and a set of ℓ_e keywords $W_e = \{w_{e,1}, \dots, w_{e,\ell_e}\}$ from a general set of keywords W . The score of a word $w \in W_e$ for a tweet e is defined by $score(w, e) = vale_e$. If $w \notin W_e$. Define $score(w, e) = 0$.

YouTube Video Summarization For the YouTube dataset, we want to select a subset of frames from video feeds which are representative of the entire video. We use the same dataset as in [19], which is YouTube videos of New Years Eve celebrations from ten different cities around the world.

They compresses each frame into a 4-dimensional representative vector. Given a ground set V of such vectors, define a matrix M such that $M_{ij} = e - dist(v_i, v_j)$, where $dist(v_i, v_j)$ is the euclidean distance between vectors $v_i, v_j \in V$. Intuitively, M_{ij} encodes the similarity between the frames represented by v_i and v_j . They define a function that intuitively measure the diversity of the vectors in a set S as follows: $f(S) = \log det(I + \alpha M_S)$, where I is the identity matrix, $\alpha > 0$ and M_S is the principal sub-matrix of M indexed by S .

6.1.2 Uniform Matroid

The simplest constraint that we can impose is the uniform matroid or equivalently the cardinality constraint. In the simplest form our algorithm is similar to [2]. We compare our algorithm to the state of the art algorithm in the streaming setting [19]. As we established an upper bound on the constant factor $\eta_\epsilon(k)$ in theorem 3, the performance of our algorithm crucially depends on the choice of α and β . The running time also is a function of α and β , and it grows rapidly as we increase α and β . Surprisingly, our algorithm outperforms [19] substantially even with relatively small choices of $\alpha = 6$ and $\beta = 2$. We also observe that the utility of the output returned by our algorithm can be very close to what the optimal offline algorithm, namely the Greedy algorithm achieves. In Figure 1, we have plotted the performance of all three algorithms on the YouTube dataset. Note that in our experiment we use a simplistic version of our algorithm in which we subsample from the shortlist in beginning of each window and only use that subsample rather than the entire shortlist. Furthermore we observe that our algorithm is slower than [19], but the interesting fact about our algorithm as stated in Theorem 3 is that it is highly parallel thus it has the potential to become $\eta_\epsilon(k)$ times faster.




Figure 1: The plot is for uniform matroid, $\alpha = 6$ and $\beta = 2$

6.1.3 p -matchoid constraints

For the case of p -matchoid constraints, state of the art algorithm for general streaming setting is due to Feldman et al. [12]. In our experiment, we divide the elements of input into q categories $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{N}_q$. We assign p tags to each element e . Each tag belongs to one of the categories $1, \dots, q$ (generated randomly). Further, we impose a cardinality constraint 3 for each category (i.e, \mathcal{I}_ℓ is a cardinality constraint). The objective is to select at most 3 elements from each category. In other words, an independent set of p -matchoid is defined as

$$\mathcal{I} = \{S \subseteq \mathcal{N} : |S \cap \mathcal{N}_i| \leq 3, \forall i \in [q]\}$$

In our algorithm, we set $\alpha = 3$ and $\beta = 2$. We have plotted the performance of our algorithms and [12] on the Twitter dataset below. The first plot, Figure 2, is for fixed $p = 3$ and different

number of categories q . The second plot, Figure 3, is for fixed number of categories $q = 30$ and different values of p from $1, \dots, 10$. As the competitive ratio of our algorithm suggests, by increasing p the ratio of our utility versus the utility of [12] increases.




Figure 2: The plot is for 3-matchoid constraint, and $\alpha = 3, \beta = 2$




Figure 3: The plot is for p -matchoid constraint, for $p = 1, \dots, 10$, and $\alpha = 3, \beta = 2$ and fixed $k = 30$.

References

- [1] MA Abam, MJ Rezaei Seraji, and M Shadravan. Online conflict-free coloring of intervals. *Scientia Iranica*, 21(6):2138–2141, 2014.
- [2] Shipra Agrawal, Mohammad Shadravan, and Cliff Stein. Submodular secretary problem with shortlists. In *10th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.

- [3] Moshe Babaioff, Nicole Immorlica, David Kempe, and Robert Kleinberg. Online auctions and generalized secretary problems. *SIGecom Exch.*, 7(2):7:1–7:11, June 2008.
- [4] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Baharan Mirzasoleiman, Amin Karbasi, and Andreas Krause. Streaming submodular maximization: Massive data summarization on the fly. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '14, pages 671–680, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.
- [5] Mohammadhossein Bateni, Mohammadtaghi Hajiaghayi, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Submodular secretary problem and extensions. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 9(4):32:1–32:23, October 2013.
- [6] Niv Buchbinder, Moran Feldman, Joseph (Seffi) Naor, and Roy Schwartz. Submodular maximization with cardinality constraints. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '14, pages 1433–1452, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2014. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [7] Amit Chakrabarti and Sagar Kale. Submodular maximization meets streaming: matchings, matroids, and more. *Mathematical Programming*, 154(1):225–247, Dec 2015.
- [8] Chandra Chekuri, Shalmoli Gupta, and Kent Quanrud. Streaming algorithms for submodular function maximization. In Magnús M. Halldórsson, Kazuo Iwama, Naoki Kobayashi, and Bettina Speckmann, editors, *Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 318–330, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2015. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-662-47672-7.
- [9] Uriel Feige, Vahab S. Mirrokni, and Jan Vondrák. Maximizing non-monotone submodular functions. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(4):1133–1153, July 2011.
- [10] Moran Feldman and Rico Zenklusen. The submodular secretary problem goes linear. In *Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, FOCS '15, pages 486–505, Washington, DC, USA, 2015. IEEE Computer Society.
- [11] Moran Feldman, Ola Svensson, and Rico Zenklusen. A simple $o(\log \log(\text{rank}))$ -competitive algorithm for the matroid secretary problem. In *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1189–1201. SIAM, 2014.
- [12] Moran Feldman, Amin Karbasi, and Ehsan Kazemi. Do less, get more: Streaming submodular maximization with subsampling, 2018.
- [13] Zachary Friggstad, Jochen Könemann, Young Kun-Ko, Anand Louis, Mohammad Shadravan, and Madhur Tulsiani. Linear programming hierarchies suffice for directed steiner tree. In *International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 285–296. Springer, 2014.
- [14] Zachary Friggstad, Jochen Könemann, and Mohammad Shadravan. A Logarithmic Integrality Gap Bound for Directed Steiner Tree in Quasi-bipartite Graphs . In *15th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory (SWAT 2016)*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), pages 3:1–3:11, 2016.

- [15] Rohan Ghuge and Viswanath Nagarajan. Quasi-polynomial algorithms for submodular tree orienteering and other directed network design problems. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1039–1048. SIAM.
- [16] Dion Gijswijt, Vincent Jost, and Maurice Queyranne. Clique partitioning of interval graphs with submodular costs on the cliques. *RAIRO-Operations Research*, 41(3):275–287, 2007.
- [17] Anupam Gupta, Aaron Roth, Grant Schoenebeck, and Kunal Talwar. Constrained non-monotone submodular maximization: Offline and secretary algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Internet and Network Economics*, WINE’10, pages 246–257, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer-Verlag.
- [18] Elad Hazan, Shmuel Safra, and Oded Schwartz. On the complexity of approximating k-set packing. *computational complexity*, 15(1):20–39, 2006.
- [19] Ehsan Kazemi, Marko Mitrovic, Morteza Zadimoghaddam, Silvio Lattanzi, and Amin Karbasi. Submodular streaming in all its glory: Tight approximation, minimum memory and low adaptive complexity, 2019.
- [20] Thomas Kesselheim and Andreas Tönnis. Submodular Secretary Problems: Cardinality, Matching, and Linear Constraints. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2017)*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), pages 16:1–16:22, 2017.
- [21] Oded Lachish. $O(\log \log \text{rank})$ competitive-ratio for the matroid secretary problem. *CoRR*, abs/1403.7343, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.7343>.
- [22] George L Nemhauser, Laurence A Wolsey, and Marshall L Fisher. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions. *Mathematical programming*, 14(1):265–294, 1978.
- [23] Ashkan Norouzi-Fard, Jakub Tarnawski, Slobodan Mitrovic, Amir Zandieh, Aidasadat Mousavifar, and Ola Svensson. Beyond $1/2$ -approximation for submodular maximization on massive data streams. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80, pages 3829–3838. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018.
- [24] José A Soto. Matroid secretary problem in the random-assignment model. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 42(1):178–211, 2013.