

# Query-Based Selection of Optimal Candidates under the Mallows Model

Xujun Liu<sup>†</sup>, Olgica Milenkovic<sup>†</sup> and George V. Moustakides<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>†</sup>University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA

<sup>\*</sup>University of Patras, Greece

January 19, 2021

## Abstract

We introduce the problem of query-based selection of the optimal candidate in rank-ordered lists generated by the Mallows model. In this setting, one is presented with a list of candidates drawn according to a Gaussian-like distribution for permutations and the goal is to identify the highest ranked candidate through a sequential interview process that does not allow rejected candidates to be revisited. The new modeling assumption consists in being able to query a Genie at the time a selection is to be made. The query provides an answer indicating if the candidate in question is the highest-ranked or not. If the Genie confirms the query, the selection process terminates. Otherwise, the sequential examinations continue until a new potentially optimal candidate is identified. Our results include optimal interview strategies for a bounded number of queries that can be exactly determined through numerical evaluations as well as the expected number of interviews until the optimal candidate is identified or the interview process completed. Although the problem exhibits similarities with the Dowry problem with multiple choices of Gilbert and Mosteller [14], the proposed Genie-based model substantially differs from it as it allows for early stopping and addresses nonuniform candidate interview distributions.

## 1 Introduction

The secretary problem was formally introduced by Gardner [10, 11] and is considered a typical example in sequential analysis and optimization. The secretary problem may be stated as follows:  $N$  individuals are assumed to be ranked from best to worst according to their qualifications. They apply for a “secretary” position, and are interviewed one by one, in random order. When the  $i^{\text{th}}$  candidate appears, one can only rank her/him with respect to the  $i - 1$  already interviewed individuals. At the time of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  interview, the employee can make the decision to hire the person presented or continue with the interview process by rejecting the candidate; rejected candidates cannot be revisited at a later time. If only one selection is to be made, what selection strategy (i.e., stopping rule) maximizes the probability of selecting the best (highest ranked) candidate?

The first published solution is due to Lindley [16] in 1961 and based on algebraic methods. Dynkin [5] solved the problem in 1963 by viewing the selection process as a Markov chain. The solution to the problem comprises two stages. In the first stage, the first  $n/e$  candidates are automatically rejected (here  $e$  is the base of the natural logarithm). In the second stage, the first candidate that outranks all previously seen candidates is selected for an offer. This strategy ensures a probability of successful identification of the best candidate equal to  $1/e$ , provided that  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

The secretary problem has been extended in many directions. Examples include full information games [14], the classical secretary problem on posets [8, 12, 13, 20] and matroid theory [2, 23]. For more extensions and a detailed history of the development of secretary problem, the readers are referred to [6, 7]. In particular, an extension of the classical secretary problem, known as the *Dowry problem with multiple choices* (henceforth, the Dowry problem) was studied by Gilbert and Mosteller in their seminal work [14]. In the Dowry problem, one is allowed to select  $s > 1$  candidates during the interview process, and the criteria for success is that the selected group includes the optimal candidate. This review process can be motivated

or extended in many different ways: For example, one may view the  $s$ -collection to represent candidates invited for a second round of interviews.

For both the secretary and Dowry problem, the modeling assumption is that the candidates are presented to the evaluator uniformly at random. Nevertheless, it is often the case that the candidates are presented in an order that is nonuniform [4, 15, 17] and dictated by various practical constraints. This consideration lends itself to a generalization of the secretary problem introduced by Jones in [15]. The paper [15] considers candidates arriving in an order dictated by a sample permutation from the Mallows distribution [18]. Its focus is on the secretary problem, while a recent extension [17] describes analogue results for the so-called postdoc problem [21, 24], introduced by Dynkin in the 1980s, for which the goal is to identify the second-best candidate (as the best candidate may accept an offer from another institution).

Motivated by a recent line of problems considering learning problems with queries [1, 3, 9, 19], we introduce the problem of query-based (i.e, expert- or Genie-aided) sequential analysis under the Mallows model. In our setting, we extend the secretary problem under the Mallows distribution<sup>1</sup> and assume that the decision making entity has access to a limited number of infallible Genies (experts). When faced with a candidate identified by an exploration-exploitation procedure as the potentially optimal choice, a Genie provides an answer of the form “Best” and “Not the best.” If the answer is “Not the best,” a new exploration-exploitation stage is initiated, with the potential of using another query at the end of the process. If the answer is “Best,” the sequential examination process terminates. The questions of interest is, given a budget of  $s' = s - 1$  queries, where  $s$  is usually a relatively small positive integer, e.g.,  $2 \leq s \leq 5$ , to find the optimal interview strategy, the optimal probability of success and the expected number of candidates interviewed or Genies queried until success or termination.

When applied on the random interview model, the above setting resembles the Dowry problem as both approaches allow for selecting  $s$  candidates. In the Dowry problem, one is allowed to make  $s$  selections without the information about the global ranking of the selected candidates while in our Genie-based setting the Genie is asked if the candidate is the globally best candidate. Furthermore, it assumes that candidate lists are Mallows samples and even for the Dowry problem, such a distribution assumption was not considered in the past. The above addition to the original secretary problem can be justified in practice by observing that queries of experts are frequently used in interview processes as additional sources of information.

We focus on the asymptotic behavior ( $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) of the solution of the problem as there are usually many candidates for every position (For example, it is common to have more than 500 candidates applying for one academic position). For a Mallows distribution parametrized by  $\theta > 0$ , the case  $\theta > 1$  corresponds to a decreasing trend in the quality of candidates while the case  $0 < \theta < 1$  corresponds to an increasing trend in the quality of candidates. The case  $\theta = 1$  corresponds to a uniform distribution.

In our Genie-query model, we are provided with  $s - 1$  ( $s \geq 1$ ) opportunities to query a Genie whether the current candidate is the best or not. If the best candidate is not identified after these queries we are still allowed to make a final selection without querying experts. In terms of the optimal probability of winning and the optimal strategy, the Genie model with  $s - 1$  queries is equivalent to the Dowry problem with  $s$  selections, since (i) they both have in total a maximum budget of  $s$  selections; (ii.1) if a selected candidate presented as the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection, where  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ , is the globally best candidate then in the Genie model we accept this candidate and stop our search. In the Dowry model we select, save, and move on since we still have at least one selection left, which will not influence the result as we already picked the best candidate; (ii.2) if the  $s^{\text{th}}$  selection is the best candidate, the two models are equivalent as we will save the selected candidate in both models; (iii.1) if a candidate at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection time, where  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ , is not the globally best candidate then in the Genie-based model we will be informed about this fact and will continue the search while in the Dowry model we will not have this information available but will still continue since there is at least one selection left; (iii.2) if a selected candidate at the  $s^{\text{th}}$  selection point is not the best, then under both models we will save the candidate and terminate.

---

<sup>1</sup>Our results actually apply to a broader class of distributions represented by prefix-equivalent statistics, as will be apparent from our proofs.

The optimal query and selection strategies for both our Genie model and the Dowry model depend on the value of the parameter  $\theta$  of the Mallows model. For  $\theta > 1$ , the optimal strategy<sup>2</sup> is an  $s$ -threshold  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy with  $0 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_s \not\rightarrow \infty$ , where  $k_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , is the threshold for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection. In this setting, an optimal strategy is as follows: When making the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection, for each  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , we reject all candidates up until position  $k_i$ , then select the next left-to-right maxima (a candidate which is the best when compared with all examined candidates up to that point). For  $0 < \theta < 1$ , the optimal strategy is also an  $s$ -threshold  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy; however, in this case,  $k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_s \leq N - 1$  and  $N - k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty$ .

Furthermore, for each fixed  $\theta > 0$  and any positive integer  $N$  there exists a sequence of numbers  $a_1(\theta), a_2(\theta), \dots$  that depends only on  $\theta$ , such that  $a_1(\theta) \geq a_2(\theta) \geq a_3(\theta) \geq \dots$  and an optimal strategy for the proposed  $s - 1$  Genie-based model is the  $s$ -threshold  $(a_s(\theta), \dots, a_1(\theta))$ -strategy. In addition, the thresholds in the  $(a_s(\theta), \dots, a_1(\theta))$ -strategy do not change with the value of  $s$  if read from the right. Moreover, our results provide, to the best of our knowledge, the first completely combinatorial proof for the uniform case, with results that agree with those presented by Gilbert and Mosteller in [14]. The authors of [14] provided a heuristic argument describing the idea behind their approach and the optimal strategy. Sakaguchi [22] later on reestablished the findings and supported the result with a formal proof based on dynamic programming.

Although some of our proofs build upon the method first described in [15], the problem studied is novel and most of the derived results require new combinatorial ideas.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the relevant concepts, terminology and models used throughout the paper. The same section also contains a number of technical lemmas that help in establishing our main results pertaining to the optimal selection strategies. An in-depth analysis of the exploration stages and the probabilities of success for the optimal selection processes under the Mallows distribution are presented in Section 3. Numerical results for the exploration phase lengths and optimal winning probabilities versus  $\theta$  are discussed in Section 4. An analysis for the expected number of Genies (selections) used and the expected stopping positions are provided in Section 5. A specialization for the uniform model is presented in Section 6.

## 2 Preliminaries

The sample space is the set of all permutations of  $N$  elements, i.e. the symmetric group  $S_N$ , with the underlying  $\sigma$ -algebra equal to the power set of  $S_N$ . The best candidate is indexed by  $N$ , the second-best candidate by  $N - 1, \dots$ , and the worst candidate is indexed by 1. The interview committee can accurately compare the candidates presented up to a certain time point of time, but cannot completely assess the quality of the future interviewees. We also assume that there is a budget of  $s - 1$  queries one can make that produce an answer whether a current candidate is the globally best one or not, as well as a final selection (without a query). These modelling postulates are equivalent to those of the Dowry problem with  $s$  selections if one only considers the optimal probability of success and winning strategy; differences in the expected interview times are discussed in Section 5.

Unlike the standard model of the secretary and Dowry problem, our framework assumes that the candidates are presented according to a permutation (order) dictated by the Mallows distribution  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$ , parametrized by a real number  $\theta > 0$ . The probability of presenting a permutation  $\pi \in S_N$  to the hiring committee equals

$$f(\pi) = \frac{\theta^{c(\pi)}}{\sum_{\pi \in S_N} \theta^{c(\pi)}},$$

where  $c : S_N \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  equals the smallest number of adjacent transpositions needed to transform  $\pi$  into the identity permutation [12 ...  $N$ ]. Equivalently,  $c(\pi)$  equals the number of pairwise element inversions, and is known under the name *Kendall  $\tau$*  distance between the permutation  $\pi$  and the identity permutation [12 ...  $N$ ]. Note that the notation for a permutation in square bracket form should not be confused with

---

<sup>2</sup>Since there may exist more than one optimal strategies which can obtain the optimal winning probability, we use “an optimal strategy” to refer to one of the optimal strategies and “the optimal strategy” to refer to all optimal strategies.

the notation for a set  $[a, b] = \{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$ ,  $b \geq a$ , and the meaning of the notation used will be clear from the context.

For a given permutation  $\pi \in S_N$  drawn according to the Mallows model, we say that a strategy *wins* if it correctly identifies the best candidate when presented with  $\pi$ .

**Definition 1.** Given a  $\pi \in S_N$ , the  $k^{(th)}$  prefix of  $\pi$ , denoted by  $\pi|_k$ , is a permutation in  $S_k$  and it represents the relabelling of the first  $k$  elements of  $\pi$  according to their relative order. For example, if  $\pi = [635124] \in S_6$  and  $k = 4$ , then  $\pi|_4 = [4231]$ .

**Definition 2.** A *strike set* is a *complete* set of prefixes that leads to an acceptance decision for the last candidate observed and any selection strategy can be represented by a strike set. During the interview process, if the prefix we have seen so far is not in the strike set corresponding to the winning strategy, we reject the current candidate and continue.

**Definition 3.** Let  $\sigma \in \cup_{i=1}^N S_i$  and assume that the length of the permutation,  $|\sigma|$ , equals  $k$ . We say that a  $\pi \in S_N$  is  $\sigma$ -prefixed if  $\pi|_k = \sigma$ . For example,  $\pi = [165243] \in S_6$  is  $\sigma = [1432]$ -prefixed. Given that  $\pi$  is  $\sigma$ -prefixed we say that  $\pi$  is  $\sigma$ -winnable if accepting the prefix  $\sigma$ , i.e. if accepting the  $|\sigma|^{th}$  candidate when the order  $\sigma$  is encountered identifies the best candidate with interview order  $\pi$ . More precisely, for  $\sigma = [\sigma(1)\sigma(2)\dots\sigma(k)]$ , we have that  $\pi$  is  $\sigma$ -winnable if  $\pi$  is  $\sigma$ -prefixed and  $\pi(k) = N$ .

Strike sets are key to determining the optimal strategy and the largest possible probability of winning the game, as described in Theorem 18. Two other important concepts in our analysis are three conditional probabilities of winning the game based on the type of prefix encountered, defined below, and the notion of a prefix equivalent statistic (which includes the Kendall statistic).

**Definition 4.** A *left-to-right maxima* in a permutation  $\pi \in S_N$  is a position whose value is the larger than all values to the left of the position.

**Definition 5.** We say a prefix  $\sigma$  is *eligible* if it ends in a left-to-right maxima or has length  $N$ . A strike set is *valid* if it

- (i) Comprises prefixes that are eligible.
- (ii) It is impossible to have  $s + 1$  elements  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{s+1}$  in the strike set such that  $\sigma_{i+1}$  is a prefix of  $\sigma_i$ , for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ . Note that the set may contain elements  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_s$  such that  $\sigma_{i+1}$  is a prefix of  $\sigma_i$ , for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s - 1\}$ . We call such a set  $s$ -minimal.
- (iii) Every permutation in  $S_N$  contains some element of the strike set as a prefix (i.e., based on a valid strike set one can always make a selection).

It is straightforward to see that any optimal strategy only selects candidates that are left-to-right maxima. It follows from the definition above and the fact that we are allowed to make at most  $s$  selections (and thus (ii) in the above definition is satisfied) that any optimal strategy for our problem can be represented by a valid strike set. A detailed analysis of this claim is provided in Proposition 15 and Theorem 18.

**Definition 6.** Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation of length  $k \leq N$ . We define *the standard denominator*  $SD(\sigma)$  of  $\sigma$  as

$$SD(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma\text{-prefixed } \pi \in S_N} \theta^{c(\pi)}.$$

Throughout the remainder of the paper we also use  $\oplus$  for the operator defined according to  $\frac{a}{b} \oplus \frac{c}{d} = \frac{a+c}{b+d}$ . Using the standard denominator with the  $\oplus$  operator allows for simplifying all pertinent explanations as one can only focus on the numerators of fractions.

**Definition 7.** For each  $\sigma$  of length  $\ell - 1$ , where  $\ell \leq N$ , we define  $\sigma_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ , to be the  $\sigma$ -prefixed permutation of length  $\ell$  such that its last position has value  $j$  after relabelling according to the first  $\ell - 1$  positions of  $\sigma$ . For example, for  $\sigma = [123]$ , a permutation of length 3, we have  $\sigma_1 = [2341]$ ,  $\sigma_2 = [1342]$ ,  $\sigma_3 = [1243]$  and  $\sigma_4 = [1234]$ .

Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation of length  $1 \leq k \leq N$ . We start by defining the probabilities  $Q_0(\sigma), Q_0^o(\sigma), \bar{Q}_0(\sigma)$ ; these correspond to the case that there are no Genies left to be queried before processing the  $k^{\text{th}}$  candidate of a  $\sigma$ -prefixed permutation (and only one final selection is left). We then proceed to extend the definition of the above probabilities for the case when  $i > 0$  queries remain.

**Definition 8.** For a permutation  $\sigma$  of length  $k$ , where  $1 \leq k \leq N$ , define

$Q_0(\sigma) = P[\text{identify the best candidate with the strategy accepting } \sigma \mid \pi \text{ is } \sigma\text{-prefixed and no Genie is available before interviewing the candidate at position } k];$

$Q_0^o(\sigma) = P[\text{identify the best candidate with the best strategy available after rejecting } \sigma \mid \pi \text{ is } \sigma\text{-prefixed and no Genie is available before interviewing the candidate at position } k];$

$\bar{Q}_0(\sigma) = P[\text{identify the best candidate with the best strategy available after rejecting } \sigma \mid_{k-1} \mid \pi \text{ is } \sigma\text{-prefixed and no Genie is available before interviewing the candidate at position } k].$

Clearly,

$$Q_0(\sigma) = \frac{\sum_{\substack{\sigma\text{-winnable} \\ \pi \in S_N}} \theta^{c(\pi)}}{\sum_{\sigma\text{-prefixed } \pi \in S_N} \theta^{c(\pi)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Q}_0(\sigma) = \max(Q_0(\sigma), Q_0^o(\sigma)). \quad (1)$$

Moreover, let  $1 \leq |\sigma| = k \leq N - 1$ . Then  $Q_0^o(\sigma)$  can be viewed as a fraction with denominator  $SD(\sigma)$  and numerator equal to the sum of  $\theta^{c(\pi)}$  over all  $\sigma$ -prefixed permutations  $\pi$  such that the best candidate (indexed by  $N$ ) in  $\pi$  can be selected using an optimal strategy after rejecting the  $|\sigma|^{\text{th}}$  candidate. Note that in this case only one selection is allowed. Thus,

$$Q_0^o(\sigma) = \bar{Q}_0(\sigma_1) \oplus \dots \oplus \bar{Q}_0(\sigma_{k+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad SD(\sigma) = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} SD(\sigma_j). \quad (2)$$

In Definition 9, we define the analogues of the above probabilities when there are  $i > 0$  Genies available right before processing the  $k^{\text{th}}$  candidate of a  $\sigma$ -prefixed permutation. Note that if we choose to ask the Genie if the  $k^{\text{th}}$  position of  $\sigma$  corresponds to the best candidate the number of Genies available drops by one; if we choose to reject the  $k^{\text{th}}$  candidate then the number of Genies available does not change.

**Definition 9.** For a prefix  $\sigma$  of length  $k$ , where  $1 \leq k \leq N$ , and  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s - 1\}$ , we define and make use of the following probabilities in all our subsequent derivations:

$Q_i(\sigma) = P[\text{identify the best candidate with the strategy accepting } \sigma \text{ and using the best strategy thereafter } \mid \pi \text{ is } \sigma\text{-prefixed and } i \text{ Genies are available before interviewing the candidate at position } k];$

$Q_i^o(\sigma) = P[\text{identify the best candidate with the best strategy available after rejecting } \sigma \mid \pi \text{ is } \sigma\text{-prefixed and } i \text{ Genies are available before interviewing the candidate at position } k];$

$\bar{Q}_i(\sigma) = P[\text{identify the best candidate with the best strategy available after rejecting } \sigma \mid_{k-1} \mid \pi \text{ is } \sigma\text{-prefixed and } i \text{ Genies are available before interviewing the candidate at position } k].$

Moreover, for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, s - 1\}$ , we have by the definitions of  $Q_i, Q_i^o$  and  $\bar{Q}_i$  that

$$\bar{Q}_i(\sigma) = \max\{Q_i(\sigma), Q_i^o(\sigma)\} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_i(\sigma) = Q_0(\sigma) + Q_{i-1}^o(\sigma). \quad (3)$$

**Proposition 10.** Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation of length  $k$  with  $1 \leq k \leq N - 1$  and let  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ . Then  $Q_i(\sigma), Q_i^o(\sigma), \bar{Q}_i(\sigma)$  can be expressed as fraction with denominator  $SD(\sigma)$  and

$$Q_i^o(\sigma) = \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_1) \oplus \dots \oplus \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_{k+1}). \quad (4)$$

*Proof.* The case of  $i = 0$  is covered by (1) and (2). By Definition 9, we know that  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$  can be expressed as a fraction with denominator  $SD(\sigma)$  and the numerator equal to the sum of  $\theta^{c(\pi)}$  over the collection of  $\sigma$ -prefixed permutations such that the best candidate can be selected using an optimal strategy available after rejecting the  $|\sigma|^{\text{th}}$  candidate in  $\pi$ , conditioned on the event that there are  $i$  Genies left after rejecting the  $|\sigma|^{\text{th}}$  candidate in  $\pi$ . By (3), the statement also holds for  $Q_i(\sigma)$  and  $\bar{Q}_i(\sigma)$ .

Therefore, the  $\oplus$  operation can be used to describe the relationship between the probabilities  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$  and  $\bar{Q}_i(\sigma_1), \dots, \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_{k+1})$ , and Equation (4) holds.  $\square$

In our subsequent proof, following the method suggested by Jones [15], we make extensive use of **prefix trees** which naturally capture the inclusion-relationship between prefixes of permutations. The concept is best described by an illustrative example, depicted for the case of  $S_4$  in Figure 1.

**Definition 11.** We define  $\bar{T}(\sigma)$  to be the subtree comprising  $\sigma$  and its children and  $T^o(\sigma) = \bar{T}(\sigma) - \sigma$  to be the forest obtained by deleting  $\sigma$  from  $\bar{T}(\sigma)$ .

**Definition 12.** We say that a prefix  $\sigma$  is *type  $i$ -positive* if  $Q_i(\sigma) \geq Q_i^o(\sigma)$  and *type  $i$ -negative* otherwise, for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}$ .

Recall that by (1),  $Q_0(\sigma)$  may be written as a fraction with denominator  $SD(\sigma)$  and the numerator equal to the sum of  $\theta^{c(\pi)}$  over all  $\pi$  that are  $\sigma$ -winnable. Next, we show in Proposition 13 that  $Q_0^o(\sigma)$  can be expressed in a similar manner.

**Proposition 13.** *Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation of length  $\ell - 1$  with  $\ell \leq N$ . There is a collection of  $\sigma$ -prefixed permutations  $G^{\sigma,0}$  such that each  $\mu \in G^{\sigma,0}$  is of length larger than  $|\sigma|$ , 1-minimal, type 0-positive, and*

$$Q_0^o(\sigma) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in G^{\sigma,0}} Q_0(\mu).$$

Moreover, the above expression is equivalent to

$$Q_0^o(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) = \sum_{\mu \in G^{\sigma,0}} Q_0(\mu) \cdot SD(\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad SD(\sigma) = \sum_{\mu \in G^{\sigma,0}} SD(\mu). \quad (5)$$

*Proof.* By (2), we know that  $Q_0^o(\sigma) = \bar{Q}_0(\sigma_1) \oplus \bar{Q}_0(\sigma_2) \oplus \dots \oplus \bar{Q}_0(\sigma_\ell)$  holds.

**Claim 14.** *Let  $\tau$  be any permutation of length at most  $N$ . The probabilities  $Q_0^o(\tau)$ ,  $Q_0(\tau)$ , and  $\bar{Q}_0(\tau)$  can be pre-calculated using a sequential procedure.*

*Proof.* We first observe that the prefixes of length  $N$  are type 0-positive, which serves as a base case for induction on the length of a prefix. More precisely, for a permutation  $\tau$  of length  $N$ , if  $\tau(N) = N$  then  $Q_0(\tau) = \bar{Q}_0(\tau) = 1$  and  $Q_0^o(\tau) = 0$ ; if  $\tau(N) < N$  then  $Q_0(\tau) = Q_0^o(\tau) = \bar{Q}_0(\tau) = 0$ .

Assume that the probabilities  $Q_0, Q_0^o, \bar{Q}_0$  for permutations of length longer than  $k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq N-1$ , are already known. We show that  $Q_0^o(\tau), Q_0(\tau)$ , and  $\bar{Q}_0(\tau)$  can be pre-calculated, where now  $\tau$  is a permutation of length  $k$ . By (1), we know the value of  $Q_0(\tau)$ ; the probability  $Q_0^o(\tau)$  can be obtained from  $Q_0^o(\tau) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k+1} \bar{Q}_0(\tau_j)$ , since each  $\tau_j$  has length larger than that of  $\tau$ ; the  $\bar{Q}_0(\omega)$  probabilities can be determined from  $Q_0(\tau) = \max\{Q_0(\tau), Q_0^o(\tau)\}$ . □

We now describe an algorithm that establishes the proof of the proposition.

Initialization step: Let  $G^{\sigma,0} = \emptyset$  and  $B = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_\ell\}$ .

We repeat the Main step below until the process terminates.

Main step: Check if  $B = \emptyset$ , if yes then stop and return the set  $G^{\sigma,0}$ ; if no then do the following: Pick a  $\phi \in B$ , say of length  $q$  with  $|\sigma| < q \leq N$ , check if both  $\phi$  is eligible and  $Q_0(\phi) \geq Q_0^o(\phi)$  holds, If yes, then  $G^{\sigma,0} = G^{\sigma,0} \cup \phi$  and  $B = B - \phi$ ; if no, then do not update  $G^{\sigma,0}$  and let  $B = B \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{q+1} \phi_j$ .

Since the prefixes of length  $N$  are type 0-positive, the algorithm will terminate. The Main step of the algorithm will produce a set  $G^{\sigma,0}$  of type 0-positive eligible prefixes that are 1-minimal. At the end of the process,  $B$  is an empty set. To see this, we make the following two observations.

**Observation (i):** There is no pair of elements  $\alpha, \beta \in G^{\sigma,0}$  such that  $\alpha$  is a prefix of  $\beta$ , i.e.,  $G^{\sigma,0}$  contains minimal prefixes only, since otherwise the forest  $T^o(\alpha)$  will not be processed in the algorithm and it will be impossible for  $\beta$  to be selected for inclusion in  $G^{\sigma,0}$ .

**Observation (ii):** Since we choose a prefix only if it is type 0-positive and eligible, every prefix in  $G^{\sigma,0}$  is type 0-positive and eligible.

Therefore, we can write  $G^{\sigma,0} = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r\}$  where each of the  $\mu \in G^{\sigma,0}$  has length larger than  $|\sigma|$ . Furthermore, by the Main step of the algorithm,

$$Q_0^o(\sigma) = Q_0(\mu_1) \oplus Q_0(\mu_2) \oplus \dots \oplus Q_0(\mu_r). \quad (6)$$

Moreover, by (6),  $Q_0^o(\sigma)$  can be expressed as a fraction where the numerator is the sum of  $\theta^{c(\pi)}$  over all  $\sigma$ -prefixed permutations  $\pi$  whose best candidate can be captured by an optimal strategy after rejecting the  $|\sigma|^{\text{th}}$  candidate, i.e., the collection of  $\mu_1$ -winnable,  $\mu_2$ -winnable,  $\dots$ ,  $\mu_r$ -winnable permutations in  $S_N$ . The denominator is the standard denominator, i.e.,  $\sum_{\sigma\text{-prefixed } \pi \in S_N} \theta^{c(\pi)}$ .  $\square$

In Proposition 15 below we show that the probabilities  $Q_i(\sigma), Q_i^o(\sigma)$  can also be expressed as fractions with the standard denominator  $SD(\sigma)$  and evaluate the numerator. To this end, note that for a permutation  $\sigma$  of length at least  $N - i$ , with  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ ,  $Q_i(\sigma) = Q_{i+1}(\sigma) = \dots = Q_{s-1}(\sigma)$ . Furthermore,  $Q_{i-1}^o(\sigma) = Q_i^o(\sigma) = \dots = Q_{s-1}^o(\sigma)$ .

**Proposition 15.** *For each  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$  and a permutation  $\sigma$  of length  $\ell$  with  $\ell \leq N - i$ , there is a collection of  $\sigma$ -prefixed permutations  $G^{\sigma,i}$  that can be partitioned into  $\Gamma_1^{\sigma,i}, \dots, \Gamma_i^{\sigma,i}$  such that each  $\mu \in G^{\sigma,i}$  is of length larger than  $|\sigma|$ , the set  $G^{\sigma,i}$  is  $i$ -minimal, each  $\gamma \in \Gamma_j^{\sigma,i}$  is type  $j$ -positive where  $1 \leq j \leq i$ , and*

$$Q_i(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) = Q_0(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) + \sum_{\mu \in G^{\sigma,i-1}} Q_0(\mu) \cdot SD(\mu), \quad \text{and} \quad (7)$$

$$Q_i^o(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_i^{\sigma,i}} Q_i(\gamma) \cdot SD(\gamma) = \sum_{\mu \in G^{\sigma,i}} Q_0(\mu) \cdot SD(\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad SD(\sigma) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_i^{\sigma,i}} SD(\gamma). \quad (8)$$

**Remark 16.** *Note that Equation (7) implies that the numerator of  $Q_i(\sigma)$ , i.e.  $Q_i(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma)$ , can be interpreted as the sum of  $\theta^{c(\pi)}$  over  $\sigma$ -winnable permutations in  $S_N$  and the  $\mu$ -winnable permutations in  $S_N$ , where  $\mu \in G^{\sigma,i-1}$ . Equation (8) implies the numerator of  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$  can be interpreted in a similar way.*

*Proof.* Since  $Q_1(\sigma) = Q_0(\sigma) + Q_0^o(\sigma)$ , by Proposition 13, there is a set  $G^{\sigma,0}$  such that

$$Q_1(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) = Q_0(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) + Q_0^o(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) = Q_0(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) + \sum_{\mu \in G^{\sigma,0}} Q_0(\mu) \cdot SD(\mu),$$

where  $G^{\sigma,0}$  is minimal (1-minimal) and consists of type 0-positive permutations of length  $> |\sigma|$ .

Next, we assume the claim is true for  $Q_i(\sigma)$  and  $Q_{i-1}^o(\sigma)$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ , and then prove the same for  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$  and then for  $Q_{i+1}(\sigma)$  (except when  $i = s - 1$  since  $Q_s(\sigma)$  is not defined). The values  $Q_{i+1}(\tau)$  for  $|\tau| \geq N - i - 1$  and  $Q_i^o(\tau)$  for  $|\tau| \geq N - i - 1$  are already known; also, when considering  $\sigma$  of length  $\ell$ , with  $\ell \leq N - i - 1$ , we assume the values  $Q_{i+1}(\tau), Q_i^o(\tau)$  are already known for permutations  $\tau$  of length larger than  $\ell$  (to see this, we may use an inductive argument with the base case covered by those permutations).

**Claim 17.** *Let  $\tau$  be any permutation of length  $k$ , where  $1 \leq k \leq N$ . The probabilities  $Q_i^o(\tau), Q_i(\tau), \bar{Q}_i(\tau)$  for each  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s - 1\}$  can be pre-calculated using a sequential procedure.*

*Proof.* In order to compute the probabilities  $Q_i^o(\tau), Q_i(\tau)$  for each  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s - 1\}$ , we use double induction on the subscript  $i$  and the length of the prefix.

The base case corresponds to  $i = 0$  and is covered in Claim 14. Assume now that we know for each  $0 \leq q \leq i - 1, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s - 1\}$ , the  $Q_q, Q_q^o, \bar{Q}_q$  probabilities for every prefix in  $\bigcup_{j=1}^N S_j$ . We prove the result

for  $i$ . The probabilities  $Q_i, \bar{Q}_i$  of prefixes of length  $N$  take either the value 1 or 0 depending on whether the last position has value  $N$ , while the probabilities  $Q_i^o$  are all 0. This serves as the base case for the induction argument on the length of the prefixes. Thus, we may assume that  $1 \leq |\tau| = k \leq N - 1$ .

Given the probabilities  $Q_i, Q_i^o, \bar{Q}_i$  for prefixes of lengths greater than  $k$ , the  $Q_i^o(\tau)$  probabilities for prefixes  $\tau$  of length  $k$  can be obtained by  $Q_i^o(\tau) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k+1} \bar{Q}_i(\tau_j)$  from Proposition 10. The probability  $\bar{Q}_i(\tau_j)$  is the maximum of  $Q_i(\tau_j)$  and  $Q_i^o(\tau_j)$ , both of which are known based on the inductive hypothesis. Moreover, we have  $Q_i(\tau) = Q_0(\tau) + Q_{i-1}^o(\tau)$ , and all these probabilities are available by the inductive hypothesis and from the base case. Furthermore,  $\bar{Q}_i(\tau)$  is the maximum of  $Q_i(\tau)$  and  $Q_i^o(\tau)$ .  $\square$

Next, recall the definition of the probability  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$ , which represents the probability of selecting the best candidate with an optimal strategy available after we reject the  $|\sigma|^{\text{th}}$  candidate (without a Genie query), conditioned on  $i$  Genies being left. Thus, after rejecting the  $|\sigma|^{\text{th}}$  candidate (without a Genie query), an optimal strategy will examine the children of  $\sigma$ , i.e.  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{\ell+1}$ , in the prefix tree and then make a decision.

We describe the following algorithm to prove the proposition pertaining to  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$ .

Initialization step: Let  $\Gamma_i = \emptyset$  and  $B = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{\ell+1}\}$ .

We next repeat the main step until the process terminates.

Main step: Check if  $B = \emptyset$ ; if yes, stop and return the set  $\Gamma_i$ ; if no, then do the following: Pick an arbitrary permutation  $\phi \in B$ , say of length  $q$ , with  $|\sigma| < q \leq N$ ; check if  $\phi$  is both eligible and type  $i$ -positive ( $Q_i(\phi) \geq Q_i^o(\phi)$ ); if yes, set  $\Gamma_i = \Gamma_i \cup \phi$  and  $B = B - \phi$ ; if no, do not update  $\Gamma_i$  and let  $B = B \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{q+1} \phi_j$ .

Since the prefixes of length  $N$  are type  $i$ -positive for each  $0 \leq i \leq s - 1$ , the algorithm eventually terminates. By the criteria on the main step of the algorithm, it will produce a set  $\Gamma_i$  of type  $i$ -positive eligible prefixes that are minimal and each of the  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$  has length larger than  $|\sigma|$ . At the end of the process,  $B$  is an empty set. To see this, we make the following two observations.

**Observation (i):** There is no pair of elements  $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma_i$  such that  $\alpha$  is a prefix of  $\beta$ , i.e.,  $\Gamma_i$  contains minimal prefixes, since otherwise the sub-tree rooted at  $\alpha$  will not be processed by the algorithm and it will be impossible for  $\beta$  to be selected for inclusion in  $\Gamma_i$ .

**Observation (ii):** Since we choose a prefix only if it is type  $i$ -positive and eligible, every prefix in  $\Gamma_i$  is type  $i$ -positive and eligible.

Furthermore, by the main step of the algorithm and the induction hypothesis,

$$Q_i^o(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_i} Q_i(\gamma) \cdot SD(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad SD(\sigma) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_i} SD(\gamma).$$

Equivalently, if we divide by  $SD(\sigma)$  on both sides, then

$$Q_i^o(\sigma) = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \Gamma_i} Q_i(\gamma). \tag{9}$$

By the induction hypothesis, for each  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$  there exists a set  $G^{\gamma, i-1}$  of  $(i-1)$ -minimal permutations of length larger than  $|\gamma|$ , which can be partitioned into  $\Gamma_1^{\gamma, i-1} \cup \dots \cup \Gamma_{i-1}^{\gamma, i-1}$ . In this case, each  $\gamma_j \in \Gamma_j^{\gamma, i-1}$  is type  $j$ -positive with  $1 \leq j \leq i-1$ , and

$$Q_i(\gamma) \cdot SD(\gamma) = Q_0(\gamma) \cdot SD(\gamma) + \sum_{\mu \in G^{\gamma, i-1}} Q_0(\mu) \cdot SD(\mu).$$

Let  $\Gamma_i^{\sigma, i} = \Gamma_i$  and  $\Gamma_j^{\sigma, i} = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_i} \Gamma_j^{\gamma, i-1}$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq i-1$ . The set  $G^{\sigma, i} := \bigcup_{j=1}^i \Gamma_j^{\sigma, i}$  comprises  $i$ -minimal permutations, and there is a partition of  $G^{\sigma, i}$  into  $\Gamma_1^{\sigma, i}, \dots, \Gamma_i^{\sigma, i}$  such that each  $\gamma \in \Gamma_j^{\sigma, i}$  is type  $j$ -positive,



where  $1 \leq j \leq i$ , and Equation (8) holds, i.e.,

$$Q_i^o(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_i^{\sigma, i}} Q_i(\gamma) \cdot SD(\gamma) = \sum_{\mu \in G^{\sigma, i}} Q_0(\mu) \cdot SD(\mu).$$

To prove the corresponding formula for  $Q_{i+1}(\sigma)$ , note that  $Q_{i+1}(\sigma) = Q_0(\sigma) + Q_i^o(\sigma)$  and invoke the result of Equation (7). Finally, we show (8) holds for  $Q_{s-1}^o$  by  $\square$

**Theorem 18.** *There exists a set  $A$  of valid prefixes which can be partitioned as  $A_{s-1} \cup \dots \cup A_1 \cup A_0$ , where each  $A_i$  is a set of type  $i$ -positive minimal prefixes, for  $0 \leq i \leq s-1$ , and the maximum probability of winning equals  $\bigoplus_{\sigma \in A_{s-1}} Q_{s-1}(\sigma)$ . In addition, for  $j = s-1, \dots, 1$  we also have that the optimal winning probability equals*

$$\frac{\sum_{\sigma \in A_{s-1} \cup \dots \cup A_j} Q_0(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma) + \sum_{\sigma \in A_{j-1}} Q_{j-1}(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma)}{\sum_{\pi \in S_N} \theta^{c(\pi)}}.$$

Furthermore, the probability of winning equals

$$\frac{\sum_{\sigma \in A} Q_0(\sigma) \cdot SD(\sigma)}{\sum_{\pi \in S_N} \theta^{c(\pi)}}.$$

*Proof.* The optimal winning probability is equal to  $\bar{Q}_{s-1}([1])$ . The proof of Proposition 15 for  $\sigma = [1]$  establishes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

**Definition 19.** Define  $g_\tau$  to be an action on the symmetric group that arranges (permutes) a prefix  $\sigma = [12 \dots k]$  to some other prefix  $\tau$  of the same length  $k$ . This action can be extended to  $\bar{T}(\sigma)$  and is denoted by  $g_\tau \cdot \pi$ : It similarly permutes the first  $k$  entries and fixes the remaining entries of  $\pi \in \bar{T}(\sigma)$ . It is easy to see that  $g_\tau$  is a bijection from  $\bar{T}(\sigma)$  to  $\bar{T}(\tau)$ .

**Example 20.** Let  $N = 6$ ,  $\tau = [132]$ , and  $\pi = [245361]$ . Clearly,  $\pi$  is  $[123]$ -prefixed. Then  $g_\tau \cdot \pi = [254361]$ .

**Definition 21.** A statistic  $c$  is said to be *prefix equivalent* if it satisfies  $c(\pi) - c(g_\tau \cdot \pi) = c([12 \dots k]) - c(\tau)$  for all prefixes  $\tau$  and all  $\pi \in \bar{T}([12 \dots k])$ , where  $k$  is the length of  $\tau$ .

Intuitively, the condition  $c(\pi) - c(g_\tau \cdot \pi) = c([12 \dots k]) - c(\tau)$  enforces the statistic  $c$  to have the property that permuting the first  $k$  entries does not create or remove any “structures” counted by the statistic  $c$  that exist at positions larger than  $k$ . The condition also ensures many useful properties for the probabilities  $Q, Q^o, \bar{Q}$ , including invariance under local changes (say, permuting the elements in a prefix). Prefix equivalence will be extensively in the proofs of the theorems and lemmas to follow. Before proceeding with proving more involved results, we demonstrate in Example 22 that the Kendall statistic is prefix equivalent.

**Example 22.** To see that the Kendall statistic is prefix equivalent, note that it counts the number of inversions in a permutation  $\pi$ . Permuting the first  $k$  entries does not influence the number of inversions involving elements at positions  $\{k+1, \dots, N\}$  and an inversion involving an entry at a position at most  $k$  and another entry at a position above  $k$  remains an inversion as the relative order of the two sets of elements remains unchanged.

Consider an arbitrary permutation  $\sigma \in S_N$ , and let  $0 \leq i \leq s-1$ .

**Case 1:** The last position of  $\sigma$  is  $N$ . In this case we have  $Q_i(\sigma) = 1$ ,  $Q_i^o(\sigma) = 0$ , and  $\bar{Q}_i^o(\sigma) = 1$ .

**Case 2:** The last position of  $\sigma$  is not  $N$ . In this case we have  $Q_i(\sigma) = 0$ ,  $Q_i^o(\sigma) = 0$ , and  $\bar{Q}_i^o(\sigma) = 0$ .

To proceed with our analysis, we invoke the following result.

**Lemma 23** (Adapted from the Proof of Theorem 3.5 in [15]). *Suppose that  $c$  is a prefix equivalent statistic. For all prefixes  $\tau$ , the  $Q_0$  probabilities are preserved under the restricted bijection  $g_\tau : T^o(12 \cdots k) \rightarrow T^o(\tau)$ , where  $k \leq N - 1$  is the length of  $\tau$ . If  $\tau$  is eligible then  $Q_0([12 \cdots k]) = Q_0(\tau)$ .*

*Consequently, for  $\sigma \in T^o(12 \cdots k)$  (and, additionally, for  $[12 \cdots k]$  if  $\tau$  is eligible), we have*

- (a) *The probabilities  $Q_0^o(\sigma)$  are preserved by  $g_\tau$ ;*
- (b) *The probabilities  $Q_0(\sigma)$  are preserved by  $g_\tau$ ;*
- (c) *If  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are eligible, we have that  $\sigma$  is type 0-positive if and only if  $g_\tau \cdot \sigma$  is type 0-positive.*

We show that the above result can be extended to the  $Q_i, Q_i^o, \bar{Q}_i$  probabilities, where  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ .

**Lemma 24.** *Suppose  $c$  is a prefix equivalent statistic. For all prefixes  $\tau$ , the probabilities  $Q_i$  for each  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s - 1\}$  are preserved under the restricted bijection  $g_\tau : T^o(12 \cdots k) \rightarrow T^o(\tau)$ , where  $k \leq N - 1$  is the length of  $\tau$ . If  $\tau$  is eligible then  $Q_i([12 \cdots k]) = Q_i(\tau)$ .*

*Consequently, for  $\sigma \in T^o(12 \cdots k)$  (and, additionally, for  $\sigma = [12 \cdots k]$  if  $\tau$  is eligible), we have*

- (a) *The probabilities  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$  are preserved by  $g_\tau$ ;*
- (b) *The probabilities  $Q_i(\sigma)$  are preserved by  $g_\tau$ ;*
- (c) *If  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are eligible, we have that  $\sigma$  is type  $i$ -positive if and only if  $g_\tau \cdot \sigma$  is type  $i$ -positive.*

*Proof.* The proof proceeds by induction on the subscript  $i$  of the probabilities  $Q_i, Q_i^o, \bar{Q}_i$ . By Lemma 23, the claim is true for  $i = 0$ . Assume that the result holds for the probabilities  $Q_m, Q_m^o, \bar{Q}_m$  with  $m \leq i - 1$ . We next prove the claimed result for  $Q_i, Q_i^o, \bar{Q}_i$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ .

Let  $\sigma \in T^o(12 \cdots k)$ . We have

$$Q_i(g_\tau \cdot \sigma) = Q_0(g_\tau \cdot \sigma) + Q_{i-1}^o(g_\tau \cdot \sigma) = Q_0(\sigma) + Q_{i-1}^o(\sigma) = Q_i(\sigma).$$

If  $\tau$  is eligible then we apply the argument to the restricted bijection  $T^o([12 \cdots (k - 1)]) \rightarrow T^o(\tau|_{k-1})$ .

**Claim 25.** *For  $\sigma$  of length  $k < \ell \leq N$ ,  $Q_i^o(g_\tau \cdot \sigma) = Q_i^o(\sigma)$ .*

*Proof.* We use induction on the length of  $\sigma$ . When  $\sigma$  has length  $N$  it holds that  $Q_i^o(g_\tau \cdot \sigma) = Q_i^o(\sigma) = 0$ . Assume now that statement (a) holds for prefixes of length at least  $\ell + 1$ . We next present an argument for the case when  $\sigma$  is of length  $\ell$ , where  $k < \ell \leq N - 1$ .

By the already proved statement for the probability  $Q_i$  and the induction hypothesis, the probabilities  $Q_i$  and  $Q_i^o$  for a permutation  $\mu$  of length larger than  $\ell$  only depend on the length of  $\mu$  and the value of the last position of  $\mu$ . By the Main Step of the algorithm described in the proof of Proposition 15, if we process  $\sigma$  and end up obtaining a set  $\Gamma_i = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r\}$ , then when we process  $g_\tau \cdot \sigma$  we end up obtaining the set  $\Gamma'_i = \{g_\tau \cdot \gamma_1, \dots, g_\tau \cdot \gamma_r\}$ . Therefore, by Proposition 15,

$$Q_i^o(g_\tau \cdot \sigma) = Q_i(g_\tau \cdot \gamma_1) \oplus Q_i(g_\tau \cdot \gamma_2) \oplus \cdots \oplus Q_i(g_\tau \cdot \gamma_r) \tag{10}$$

$$= Q_i(\gamma_1) \oplus Q_i(\gamma_2) \oplus \cdots \oplus Q_i(\gamma_r) = Q_i^o(\sigma). \tag{11}$$

□

By Claim 25, statement (a) is true.

Claims (b) and (c) can be established from the previous results and the fact  $\bar{Q}_i(\sigma) = \max\{Q_i(\sigma), Q_i^o(\sigma)\}$ . This completes the main part of the proof.

Each of statements (a), (b), and (c) hold for  $\sigma = [12 \cdots k]$  and a permutation  $\tau$  which is eligible and of length  $k$ , since we can apply the corresponding argument to the restricted bijection  $T^o(12 \cdots (k - 1)) \rightarrow T^o(\tau|_{k-1})$ . □

For  $0 \leq i \leq s - 1$ , we know from Lemma 23 and 24 that the probabilities  $Q_i(\sigma), Q_i^o(\sigma), \bar{Q}_i(\sigma)$  only depend on the length and the value of the last position of  $\sigma$ . Moreover, we prove next that  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$  only depends on the length of  $\sigma$  and does not depend on the value of the last position of  $\sigma$ .

**Lemma 26.** For all  $0 \leq i \leq s - 1$ , the probability  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$  only depends on the length of  $\sigma$ .

*Proof.* We know  $Q_i^o(\sigma) = 0$  for every  $\sigma$  of length  $N$ . Let  $\sigma'$  and  $\sigma''$  be two permutations of length  $k - 1$ , where  $k \leq N$ . For each permutation  $\sigma$  of length  $k - 1$ , we define  $\sigma_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , as in Definition 7. Let  $\phi = [12 \cdots (k - 1)]$ . By Lemma 23 and 24, and using the bijections  $g_{\sigma'} : T^o(12 \cdots (k - 1)) \rightarrow T^o(\sigma')$  and  $g_{\sigma''} : T^o(12 \cdots (k - 1)) \rightarrow T^o(\sigma'')$ , we have

$$Q_i^o(\sigma') = \bar{Q}_i(\sigma'_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus \bar{Q}_i(\sigma'_k) = \bar{Q}_i(\phi'_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus \bar{Q}_i(\phi'_k) = \bar{Q}_i(\sigma''_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus \bar{Q}_i(\sigma''_k) = Q_i^o(\sigma'').$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

In order to simplify our exposition, we henceforth change the notation and let  $Q_i(\sigma)$ ,  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$ ,  $\bar{Q}_i(\sigma)$  stand for the *numerators* in the definition of the underlying probabilities, each with respect to the standard denominator  $SD(\sigma)$ .

Next, let  $\sigma = [12 \cdots (k - 1)]$ ,  $\sigma_j = [12 \cdots (j - 1)(j + 1)kj]$ , and  $\sigma_k = [12 \cdots k]$ , with  $k \leq N$ . Once again we recall a result from [15].

**Lemma 27** (Theorem 3.6 in [15]). *The following two expressions hold true.*

$$Q_0^o(\sigma) = \bar{Q}_0(\sigma_k) + Q_0^o(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_0(\sigma) = Q_0(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)}.$$

**Lemma 28.** For  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ , one has

$$Q_i^o(\sigma) = \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_k) + Q_i^o(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_i(\sigma) = \bar{Q}_{i-1}(\sigma_k) + Q_i(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)}.$$

*Proof.* We first consider  $Q_i^o(\sigma)$ . We know that  $\sigma$  has  $k$  children in the prefix tree, and denote these children by  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ . The prefix  $\sigma_k$  itself is an eligible child thus  $\bar{Q}_i(\sigma_k)$  is the optimal probability for the subtree rooted at  $\sigma_k$ . The subtrees beneath each of the permutations  $\sigma_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$ , are isomorphic to  $T^o(\sigma_k)$  via the bijections  $g_{\sigma_i}$ . For each  $\sigma_i$ -prefixed  $\pi' \in S_N$ , we have to account for a factor of  $\theta^{c(\sigma_i) - c(\sigma_k)}$ . This is due to the fact that  $\pi'$  corresponds to a  $\sigma_k$ -prefixed permutation of  $\pi$  via  $g_{\sigma_i}$ , such that  $\pi' = g_{\sigma_i} \cdot \pi$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$ .

By Definition 21 and the fact that  $c$  is prefix equivalent,

$$\theta^{c(\pi')} = \theta^{c(\pi) - (c(\sigma_i) - c(\sigma_k))}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i^o(\sigma) &= \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_1) + \cdots + \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_{k-1}) + \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_k) \\ &= Q_i^o(\sigma_1) + \cdots + Q_i^o(\sigma_{k-1}) + \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_k) = Q_i^o(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)} + \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_k). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 27,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i(\sigma) &= Q_0(\sigma) + Q_{i-1}^o(\sigma) = Q_0(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)} + \bar{Q}_{i-1}(\sigma_k) + Q_{i-1}^o(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)} \\ &= Q_i(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)} + \bar{Q}_{i-1}(\sigma_k). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$




Figure 1: The prefix tree and the probabilities  $Q_0, Q_0^o, Q_1, Q_1^o$  for our problem with four candidates.

**Corollary 29** (Corollary 3.7 in [15]). *For all increasing prefixes  $\sigma = [12 \cdots (k-1)]$  and  $\sigma_k = [12 \cdots k]$ , we have that if  $\sigma_k$  is type 0-negative then  $\sigma$  is type 0-negative.*

**Corollary 30.** *For increasing prefixes  $\sigma = [12 \cdots (k-1)]$  and  $\sigma_k = [12 \cdots k]$ , we have that if  $\sigma_k$  is type  $i$ -negative then  $\sigma$  is type  $i$ -negative, where  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\sigma$  is type  $i$ -negative, i.e., such that  $Q_i^o(\sigma_k) > Q_i(\sigma_k)$ . Since  $\bar{Q}_i(\sigma_k) \geq \bar{Q}_{i-1}(\sigma_k)$  we have

$$Q_i^o(\sigma) = Q_i^o(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)} + \bar{Q}_i(\sigma_k) > Q_i(\sigma_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \theta^{c(\sigma_j) - c(\sigma_k)} + \bar{Q}_{i-1}(\sigma_k) = Q_i(\sigma).$$

□

Next, observe that  $Q_i^o(\sigma) \geq Q_{i-1}^o(\sigma)$ ,  $Q_i(\sigma) \geq Q_{i-1}(\sigma)$ , and  $Q_i(\sigma) \geq Q_{i-1}^o(\sigma)$  always hold true for every  $\sigma \in S_N$  and  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$ . Let  $Q_i(k)$  denote the probability  $Q_i$  of eligible prefixes of length  $k$ , where  $0 \leq i \leq s-1$ . The probabilities  $Q_i^o(k)$  and  $\bar{Q}_i(k)$ , where  $0 \leq i \leq s-1$ , are defined similarly.

**Example 31.** To clarify the above observations and concepts, we present an example for the case  $\theta = 1$ ,  $s = 2$ , and  $N = 4$ . An optimal strategy is the  $(0, 1)$ -strategy where we accept the first candidate, ask the Genie whether this candidate is the best, and then accept the next left-to-right maxima. The optimal winning probability is  $17/24$ , an improvement of  $6/24$  when compared with the optimal winning probability (equal to  $11/24$ ) for the case when only one selection is allowed (see Figure 1). Note that for each prefix  $\sigma \in S_4$ , we list the probabilities  $Q_0, Q_0^o$  in the first line and the probabilities  $Q_1, Q_1^o$  in the second line underneath each prefix shown in Figure 1.

**Theorem 32.** *Suppose that the probability distribution on  $S_N$  is governed by a prefix-equivalent statistic (which includes the Kendall statistic)  $c$ . For each fixed  $\theta > 0$ , an optimal strategy for our problem with  $s-1$  Genies (and  $s$  selections for the Dowry version) is a positional  $s$ -thresholds strategy, i.e., there are  $s$  numbers  $k_1(\theta) \leq k_2(\theta) \leq \dots \leq k_s(\theta)$  such that when considering the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection, where  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , we reject the first  $k_i$  candidates, wait for the  $(i-1)^{\text{th}}$  selection, and then accept the next left-to-right maxima.*

*Proof.* By the algorithms described in Theorem 18 (Proposition 15), when deciding about the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection when there are  $j = s - i$  Genies left,  $0 \leq j \leq s - 1$ , and before  $\sigma$  appears, we check if  $\sigma$  is eligible and type  $j$ -positive (i.e., if  $Q_j(\sigma) \geq Q_j^o(\sigma)$ ); if yes, we accept the current candidate and query the Genie (if there is one left); if no, we reject the current candidate and continue our search. This algorithm produces a valid strike set which guarantees the optimal winning probability. By Corollary 29 and 30, there exists some  $k_i(\theta)$  such that  $Q_j(k) \geq Q_j^o(k)$  for  $k \geq k_i(\theta) + 1$  and  $Q_j(k) < Q_j^o(k)$  for all  $k \leq k_i(\theta)$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . Therefore, an optimal strategy is to reject the first  $k_i(\theta)$  candidates and then accept the next left-to-right maxima thereafter. It is also clear that every optimal strategy needs to proceed until the  $(i-1)^{\text{th}}$  selection is made before considering the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection. Thus,  $k_{i-1}(\theta) \leq k_i(\theta)$  for each  $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$ . □

By the definition of the  $Q_j(k), Q_j^o(k), \bar{Q}_j(k)$  probabilities, we know that they only depend on  $\theta, k, N$  and  $j$ , the number of Genies left before interviewing the current candidate, i.e., the candidate at position  $k$ . Thus, for two models with  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  selections ( $s_1 - 1$  and  $s_2 - 1$  Genies, respectively), and the same values of  $\theta$  and  $N$ , and  $0 \leq j \leq \min\{s_1, s_2\} - 1$ , we have that the thresholds  $k'_{s_1-j}(\theta)$  for the model with  $s_1 - 1$  Genies and  $k''_{s_2-j}(\theta)$  for the model with  $s_2 - 1$  Genies are the same. In other words, for each fixed  $\theta > 0$ , our optimal strategy is right-hand based; and Corollary 33 holds.

**Corollary 33.** *Let  $N$  be a fixed positive integer (can be as large as possible). There is a sequence of numbers  $a_1(\theta), a_2(\theta), \dots$ , such that when the number of selections  $s > 0$  is fixed, then an optimal strategy is the  $(a_s(\theta), a_{s-1}(\theta), \dots, a_1(\theta))$ -strategy. In other words, the  $(s + 1 - i)^{\text{th}}$  threshold  $k_{s+1-i}(\theta)$  (the  $i^{\text{th}}$  from the right) does not depend on the number of selections allowed and always equals  $a_i(\theta)$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ .*

### 3 Results for the Mallows Distribution

**Definition 34.** Let  $P_N(\theta)$  (henceforth written as  $P_N$  to avoid notational clutter) be the polynomial in  $\theta$  equal to  $1 + \theta + \dots + \theta^{N-1}$ ; by convention, we set  $P_0(\theta) = 0$ . Furthermore, let  $(P_N)!$  be the polynomial in  $\theta$  equal to  $(P_N)! = P_N P_{N-1} \dots P_1$ .

The following result is well-known and also proved in [15].

**Lemma 35** (Lemma 6.2 in [15], [18]). *We have*

$$(P_N)! = \sum_{\pi \in S_N} \theta^{\#\text{inversions in } \pi}.$$

For the set  $[1, n + m]$ , an ordered 2-partition of the values into two parts  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  with  $|\Pi_1| = n$  and  $|\Pi_2| = m$  is a partition where all values in  $\Pi_1$  are positioned before all values in  $\Pi_2$ , while the internal order within  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  is irrelevant.

We define

$$B(n, m) := \sum_{\text{All } \Pi_1, \Pi_2 \text{ ordered partitions of } [n+m]} \theta^{\#\text{crossing inversions of } (\Pi_1, \Pi_2)},$$

where a crossing inversion with respect to  $(\Pi_1, \Pi_2)$  is an inversions of the form  $(a, b)$  where  $a \in \Pi_1, b \in \Pi_2$ , and  $a > b$ . A straightforward induction argument can be used to prove that if  $\theta = 1$  then

$$B(n, m) = \binom{n+m}{n}.$$

In a companion paper [17] we established the following result.

**Lemma 36** ([17]). *For  $\theta \neq 1, n, m \geq 1$ ,*

$$B(n, m) = \frac{(1 - \theta^{n+m}) \cdot (1 - \theta^{n+m-1}) \dots (1 - \theta^{n+1})}{(1 - \theta^m) \cdot (1 - \theta^{m-1}) \dots (1 - \theta)}, \text{ with } B(n, 0) = B(0, m) = 1.$$

Note that

$$B(n, m) = \frac{P_{n+m} \cdot \dots \cdot P_{n+2} \cdot P_{n+1}}{P_m \cdot \dots \cdot P_2 \cdot P_1} = \frac{(P_{n+m})!}{(P_m)! \cdot (P_n)!} =: \binom{P_{n+m}}{P_n}.$$

We call a permutation  $\pi \in S_N$   $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -winnable if the value  $N$  would be picked using the  $s$ -thresholds  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy, where  $s \geq 1$  is an integer. We call a permutation  $\pi \in S_N$  a  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ - $\leq r$ -pickable permutation, for  $0 \leq r \leq s - 1$ , if it ends up being selected with at most  $r$  selections. In addition, we define

$$T_{\leq r}(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) = \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_s)\text{-}\leq r\text{-pickable permutations } \pi \in S_N} \theta^{\#\text{inversions in } \pi}.$$

For consistency of notation, we allow  $N < k_r$  for  $1 \leq r \leq s$ . Note that if  $N \leq k_{r+1}$  then every permutation in  $S_N$  entails at most  $r$  selections. Moreover, if  $N \geq k_{r+1} + 1$  then  $(k_1, \dots, k_{r+1})$ - $\leq r$ -pickable permutations are equivalent to  $(k_1, \dots, k_{r+2})$ - $\leq r$ -pickable permutations,  $\dots$ ,  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ - $\leq r$ -pickable permutations. Thus, we collectively refer to all these permutations as  $(k_1, \dots, k_{r+1})$ - $\leq r$ -pickable permutations.

Another result of interest establishes a formula for  $T_0(m, k)$ .

**Lemma 37** ([17]). *We have  $T_0(m, 0) = 0$  and for  $k \geq 1$ ,*

$$T_0(m, k) = (\theta^{m-1} + \dots + \theta^{m-k}) \cdot (P_{m-1})! = \theta^{m-k} \cdot P_k \cdot (P_{m-1})!$$

**Lemma 38.** *For each  $1 \leq r \leq s$  and  $m \geq k_r + 1$ ,*

$$T_{\leq r-1}(m, k_1, \dots, k_r) = (P_{m-1})! \cdot \theta^{m-k_r} \cdot P_{k_r} + (P_{m-1})! \cdot \sum_{i=k_r}^{m-1} \frac{T_{\leq r-2}(i, k_1, \dots, k_{r-1})}{(P_i)!} \cdot \theta^{m-1-i}.$$

*Proof.* We have to address two cases depending on the position of the value  $m$ .

**Case 1:** The value  $m$  is at a position  $i \in [1, k_r]$ . If the value  $m$  is at a position  $i$  in  $[1, k_{r-1}]$ , we make at most  $r-1$  selections; if the value  $m$  is at a position  $i \in [k_{r-1} + 1, k_r]$ , then we either have made at most  $r-2$  selections before position  $i$ , and end up without any further selections after position  $i$ ; or, we made the  $(r-1)$ <sup>th</sup> selection at some position  $j \in [k_{r-1} + 1, i-1]$  (note that using our strategy we cannot make the  $r$ <sup>th</sup> selection until after position  $k_r$ ), and once again end up without any further selections after position  $i$ . In the latter case, we do not select the candidate at position  $i$ . The other positions can be represented by an arbitrary permutation in  $S_{m-1}$ . This argument accounts for the term

$$(\theta^{m-1} + \theta^{m-2} + \dots + \theta^{m-k_r}) \cdot (P_{m-1})! = (P_{m-1})! \cdot \theta^{m-k_r} \cdot P_{k_r}.$$

**Case 2:** The value  $m$  is at a position  $i \in [k_r + 1, m]$ . Then the entries at positions  $[1, i-1]$  must form a  $(k_1, \dots, k_r)$ - $\leq r-2$ -pickable permutation, since if  $r-1$  selections were made before the position  $i$ , then the  $r$ <sup>th</sup> selection will occur either before position  $i$  or at position  $i$ . There are no restrictions for entries at positions  $[i+1, m]$ . The value  $m$  itself contributes  $\theta^{m-i}$  to the claimed expression. Therefore, for Case 2, we have the following contributing term

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=k_r+1}^m \theta^{m-i} \cdot T_{\leq r-2}(i-1, k_1, \dots, k_{r-1}) \cdot B(i-1, m-i) \cdot (P_{m-i})! = \\ & (P_{m-1})! \cdot \sum_{i=k_r+1}^m \frac{T_{\leq r-2}(i-1, k_1, \dots, k_{r-1})}{(P_{i-1})!} \cdot \theta^{m-i}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 39.** *For each  $1 \leq r \leq s$  we have*

$$T_{\leq r-1}(k_r, k_1, \dots, k_r) = (P_{k_r})!$$

*since  $k_r$  is equal to the threshold for the  $r$ <sup>th</sup> selection. Thus, in this case we are not allowed to make the  $r$ <sup>th</sup> selection. For  $m \geq k_r + 1$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T_{\leq r-1}(m, k_1, \dots, k_r)}{(P_m)!} &= \frac{1}{P_m} \cdot (\theta^{m-k_r} \cdot P_{k_r} + \theta^{m-k_{r-1}-1} \cdot P_{k_{r-1}} \cdot \sum_{i=k_r}^{m-1} \frac{1}{P_i} + \theta^{m-k_{r-2}-2} \cdot P_{k_{r-2}} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_r}^{m-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_1}} \sum_{i_2=k_{r-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_2}} \\ &+ \dots + \theta^{m-k_1-r+1} \cdot P_{k_1} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_r}^{m-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_1}} \cdot \sum_{i_2=k_{r-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_2}} \sum \dots \sum_{i_{r-1}=k_2}^{i_{r-2}-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_{r-1}}}). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof follows by induction. The case  $r = 1$  holds by Lemma 37. Assume the result is true for all number of queries less than  $r$ , where  $1 \leq r \leq s$ . We prove that it holds for  $r$  as well. By Lemma 38,  $T_{\leq r-1}(m, k_1, \dots, k_r)$  can be expressed in terms of  $T_{\leq r-2}(i, k_1, \dots, k_{r-1})$ ,  $k_r \leq r \leq m-1$ . Thus, by using the formula for  $T_{\leq r-2}(i, k_1, \dots, k_{r-1})$ , guaranteed by the inductive hypothesis, we obtain the claimed formula for  $\frac{T_{\leq r-1}(m, k_1, \dots, k_r)}{(P_m)!}$ . The actual derivations are omitted.  $\square$

We introduce the notion of a  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -winnable permutation, corresponding to a permutation  $\pi \in S_N$  such that the best candidate (the value  $N$ ) can be selected using the  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy. Furthermore, we define

$$W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) := \sum_{\pi \in S_N \text{ is } (k_1, \dots, k_s)\text{-winnable}} \theta^{\# \text{ of inversions in } \pi}.$$

**Theorem 40** (Jones [15]). *For  $k_1 \geq 1$ ,*

$$W(N, k_1) = \theta^{N-k_1-1} \cdot (P_{N-1})! \cdot P_{k_1} \cdot \sum_{i=k_1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{P_i}.$$

**Lemma 41.** *For  $1 \leq r \leq s$  and  $N \geq k_r + 1$ ,*

$$W(N, k_1, \dots, k_r) = \theta \cdot P_{N-1} \cdot W(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_r) + T_{\leq r-1}(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_r).$$

*Proof.* We consider the value at position  $N$ . There are two possible cases.

**Case 1:** The value is  $N$ . Then, in order to select the value  $N$  at the last position, we require that there are at most  $r-1$  selections made for the first  $N-1$  positions. This case contributes  $T_{\leq r-1}(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_r)$ .

**Case 2:** The value is  $i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ . Then, the first  $N-1$  positions form a  $(k_1, \dots, k_r)$ -winnable permutation. The value  $i$  at the last position contributes  $\theta^{N-i}$  to the overall expression. Therefore, the total contribution equals

$$(\theta^{N-1} + \dots + \theta) \cdot W(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_r) = \theta \cdot P_{N-1} \cdot W(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_r).$$

$\square$

**Lemma 42.** *For each  $1 \leq s$  and  $N \geq k_s + 1$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!} &= \frac{1}{P_N} \cdot \left( (\theta^{N-k_1-1} \cdot P_{k_1} \cdot \sum_{i=k_1}^{k_2-1} \frac{1}{P_i}) + (\theta^{N-k_2-1} \cdot P_{k_2} \cdot \sum_{i=k_2}^{k_3-1} \frac{1}{P_i}) \right. \\ &\quad + \theta^{N-k_1-2} \cdot P_{k_1} \cdot \delta(k_2, k_3) \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_2+1}^{k_3-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_1}} \sum_{i_2=k_2}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_2}} \left. + (\theta^{N-k_3-1} \cdot P_{k_3} \cdot \sum_{i=k_3}^{k_4-1} \frac{1}{P_i}) \right. \\ &\quad + \delta(k_3, k_4) \cdot (\theta^{N-k_2-2} \cdot P_{k_2} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_3+1}^{k_4-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_1}} \sum_{i_2=k_3}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_2}} + \theta^{N-k_1-3} \cdot P_{k_1} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_3+1}^{k_4-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_1}} \sum_{i_2=k_3}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_2}} \sum_{i_3=k_2}^{i_2-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_3}}) \\ &\quad \left. + \dots + (\theta^{N-k_s-1} \cdot P_{k_s} \cdot \sum_{i=k_s}^{N-1} \frac{1}{P_i} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \delta(k_s, N) \cdot (\theta^{N-k_s-1-2} \cdot P_{k_{s-1}} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_s+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_1}} \sum_{i_2=k_s}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_2}} + \dots + \theta^{N-k_1-s} \cdot P_{k_1} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_s+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_1}} \sum_{i_2=k_s}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_2}} \dots \sum_{i_s=k_2}^{i_{s-1}-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_s}}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta(k_i, k_{i+1})$  (by default,  $k_{s+1} = N$ ) equals 1 if  $k_{i+1} \geq k_i + 2$  and 0 otherwise, for  $2 \leq i \leq s$ .

*Proof.* We prove it by induction. The case  $s = 1$  holds by Theorem 40. Assume the claim holds for  $W(N, k_1, \dots, k_r)/(P_N)!$ , where  $r < s$ . We prove the result holds for  $r = s$ . By Lemma 41,

$$\begin{aligned} W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) &= \theta \cdot P_{N-1} \cdot W(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) + T_{\leq s-1}(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \\ &= \theta \cdot P_{N-1} \cdot (\theta \cdot P_{N-2} \cdot W(N-2, k_1, \dots, k_s) + T_{\leq s-1}(N-2, k_1, \dots, k_s)) + T_{\leq s-1}(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) = \dots = \\ &= \theta^{N-k_s} \cdot \frac{(P_{N-1})!}{(P_{k_s-1})!} \cdot W(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1}, k_s) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-k_s} \theta^{i-1} \cdot \frac{(P_{N-1})!}{(P_{N-i})!} \cdot T_{\leq s-1}(N-i, k_1, \dots, k_s) = \\ &= \theta^{N-k_s} \cdot \frac{(P_{N-1})!}{(P_{k_s-1})!} \cdot W(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-k_s} \theta^{i-1} \cdot \frac{(P_{N-1})!}{(P_{N-i})!} \cdot T_{\leq s-1}(N-i, k_1, \dots, k_s). \end{aligned}$$

By the inductive hypothesis, we can use the formula for  $W(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1})$ , and the formula of  $T_{\leq s-1}(m, k_1, \dots, k_s)$  in Lemma 39 to establish the claim. The derivations are omitted.  $\square$

**Remark 43.** A  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy with  $k_i = k_{i+1}$  is equivalent to a  $(k'_1, \dots, k'_s)$ -strategy with  $k'_j = k_j$  for  $j \neq i+1$  and  $k'_{i+1} = k_i + 1$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . Thus, we may assume that when  $k_1 = 0$  we have  $k_2 \geq 1$ . Furthermore, for  $k_1 = 0$ ,

$$W(N, 0, k_2, \dots, k_s) = \theta^{N-1} \cdot (P_{N-1})! + W(N, k_2, \dots, k_s) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!} = \frac{\theta^{N-1}}{P_N} + \frac{W(N, k_2, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!}.$$

**Theorem 44.** An asymptotically optimal strategy for  $\theta < 1$  has to satisfy  $N - k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* The proof is postponed to the Appendix (Section 7).  $\square$

**Theorem 45.** An asymptotically optimal strategy for  $\theta > 1$  has to satisfy  $k_s \not\rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* The proof is postponed to the Appendix (Section 7).  $\square$

By Lemma 44, we know for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $0 < \theta < 1$ , the optimal strategy is a  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy for some  $k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_s$  with  $N - k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty$ . By Lemma 42 and the fact that  $\frac{1}{P_i} = \frac{1-\theta}{1-\theta^i} \rightarrow 1 - \theta$  when  $i \rightarrow \infty$  and  $0 < \theta < 1$ , the optimal probability is a function of  $N - k_1, \dots, N - k_s$  and does not depend on  $N$ . By Corollary 33, we also know that for a fixed  $0 < \theta < 1$ , there is an optimal strategy satisfying  $k_i = a_{s+1-i}(\theta)$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . We henceforth use  $a_j$  to denote  $a_j(\theta)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq s$ , whenever the notation is clear from the context.

First, note that  $\frac{1}{1-\theta^i} \rightarrow 1$  when  $0 < \theta < 1$  and  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Let

$$H'_1 = \theta^{N-a_1} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right) \cdot \sum_{i=a_1}^{N-1} 1,$$

$$H'_2 = \theta^{N-a_2} \cdot \left(\left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right) \cdot \sum_{i=a_2}^{a_1-1} 1 + \left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right)^2 \cdot \delta(a_1, N) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_1+1}^{N-1} \sum_{i_2=a_1}^{i_1-1} 1\right),$$

$$H'_3 = \theta^{N-a_3} \cdot \left(\left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right) \cdot \sum_{i=a_2}^{a_3-1} 1 + \left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right)^2 \cdot \delta(a_2, a_1) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_2+1}^{a_1-1} \sum_{i_2=a_2}^{i_1-1} 1 + \left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right)^3 \cdot \delta(a_1, N) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_1+1}^{N-1} \sum_{i_2=a_1}^{i_1-1} \sum_{i_3=a_2}^{i_2-1} 1\right),$$

...

$$H'_s = \theta^{N-a_s} \cdot \left(\left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right) \cdot \sum_{i=a_s}^{a_{s-1}-1} 1 + \left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right)^2 \cdot \delta(a_{s-1}, a_{s-2}) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_{s-1}+1}^{a_{s-2}-1} \sum_{i_2=a_{s-1}}^{i_1-1} 1 + \left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right)^3 \cdot \delta(a_{s-2}, a_{s-3}) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_{s-2}+1}^{a_{s-3}-1} \sum_{i_2=a_{s-2}}^{i_1-1} \sum_{i_3=a_{s-1}}^{i_2-1} 1\right)$$

$$+ \dots + \left(\frac{1}{\theta} - 1\right)^s \cdot \delta(a_1, N) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_1+1}^{N-1} \sum_{i_2=a_1}^{i_1-1} \sum_{i_3=a_2}^{i_2-1} \dots \sum_{i_s=a_{s-1}}^{i_{s-1}-1} 1,$$



where  $\delta(x, y) = 1$  if  $y \geq x + 2$ , equals 0 otherwise.

Hence, after reorganizing and simplifying the formula presented in Lemma 42, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W(N, a_s, \dots, a_1)}{(P_N)!} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^s H'_i =: P'.$$

By Lemma 45, we know that for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\theta > 1$ , the optimal strategy is a  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy for some  $0 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_s \not\rightarrow \infty$ . By Lemma 42, the fact that  $\frac{1}{P_i} = \frac{\theta-1}{\theta^{i-1}}$  when  $\theta > 1$ , and that each of the terms

$$\sum_{i_1=k_s+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_1-1}} \sum_{i_2=k_s}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_2-1}} \cdots \sum_{i_r=k_{s+2}-r}^{i_{r-1}-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_r-1}}, \quad \text{where } 2 \leq r \leq s,$$

converges when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the optimal probability is a function of  $k_1, \dots, k_s$  and does not depend on  $N$ . By Corollary 33, we similarly know that for a fixed  $\theta > 1$ , there is an optimal strategy satisfies  $k_i = a_{s+1-i}(\theta)$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . We henceforth use  $a_j$  to denote  $a_j(\theta)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq s$ , whenever the notation is clear from the context.

Next, let

$$\begin{aligned} H''_1 &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta^{a_1}}\right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right) \cdot \sum_{i=a_1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\theta^i - 1}, \\ H''_2 &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta^{a_2}}\right) \cdot \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right) \cdot \sum_{i=a_2}^{a_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^i - 1} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2 \cdot \delta(a_1, N) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_1+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_1} - 1} \sum_{i_2=a_1}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_2} - 1}\right), \\ H''_3 &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta^{a_3}}\right) \cdot \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right) \cdot \sum_{i=a_3}^{a_2-1} \frac{1}{\theta^i - 1} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2 \cdot \delta(a_2, a_1) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_2+1}^{a_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_1} - 1} \sum_{i_2=a_2}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_2} - 1} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)^3 \cdot \delta(a_1, N) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_1+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_1} - 1} \sum_{i_2=a_1}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_2} - 1} \sum_{i_3=a_2}^{i_2-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_3} - 1}\right), \\ &\quad \dots \\ H''_s &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta^{a_s}}\right) \cdot \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right) \cdot \sum_{i=a_s}^{a_{s-1}-1} \frac{1}{\theta^i - 1} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2 \cdot \delta(a_{s-1}, a_{s-2}) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_{s-1}+1}^{a_{s-2}-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_1} - 1} \sum_{i_2=a_{s-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_2} - 1} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)^3 \cdot \delta(a_{s-2}, a_{s-3}) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_{s-2}+1}^{a_{s-3}-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_3} - 1} \sum_{i_2=a_{s-2}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_2} - 1} \sum_{i_3=a_{s-1}}^{i_2-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_3} - 1} + \dots + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)^s \cdot \delta(a_1, a_N) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_1+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_1} - 1} \sum_{i_2=a_1}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_2} - 1} \sum_{i_3=a_2}^{i_2-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_3} - 1} \cdots \sum_{i_s=a_{s-1}}^{i_{s-1}-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_s} - 1}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta(x, y) = 1$  if  $y \geq x + 2$  and is 0 otherwise.

Hence, after reorganizing terms and simplifying the formula presented in Lemma 42, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W(N, a_s, \dots, a_1)}{(P_N)!} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^s H''_i =: P''.$$

By Theorems 44 and 45, and the formulas above, when  $0 < \theta < 1$ ,  $P'$  is a function of  $b_1 := N - a_1, \dots, b_s := N - a_s$  with  $1 \leq b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_s$ , and is maximized at some  $b'_1, \dots, b'_s$  with  $b'_s \not\rightarrow \infty$ . When  $\theta > 1$ ,  $P''$  is a function of  $a_1, \dots, a_s$  with  $0 \leq a_s \leq a_{s-1} \leq \dots \leq a_1$ , and is maximized at some  $a''_1, \dots, a''_s$  with  $a''_1 \not\rightarrow \infty$ . By Corollary 33, for each fixed  $0 < \theta < 1$  we can pick some large enough constant, say 1000 (1000 is a large enough value to serve as a “proxy” for  $\infty$  in our subsequent numerical computations for values of  $\theta$  as small as 0.01 and  $s$  as large as 5), and perform a computer search for  $a''_1$  (and  $b'_1$ ). Recall that this value characterizes our optimal strategy for  $s = 1$ . We then proceed to search for  $a''_2 \leq a''_1$  ( $b'_2 \geq b'_1$ ), which jointly with  $a''_1$  ( $b'_1$ ) characterize our optimal strategy for  $s = 2$ . We then search for  $a''_3, \dots, (b'_3, \dots)$  following the same procedure.

## 4 Numerical Results

All results presented herein apply when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . By Corollary 33, an optimal strategy for  $s' = s - 1 \geq 0$  queries and a fixed  $\theta > 1$  is an  $(a_s(\theta), \dots, a_1(\theta))$ -strategy, where  $a_i(\theta) \not\rightarrow \infty$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . For the case  $0 < \theta < 1$ , we let  $b_i(\theta) = N - a_i(\theta)$ , where  $i \geq 1$ . An optimal strategy for  $s' = s - 1 \geq 0$  queries and a fixed  $0 < \theta < 1$  is an  $(N - b_s(\theta), \dots, N - b_1(\theta))$ -strategy, where  $b_i(\theta) \not\rightarrow \infty$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . Since the maximum probability of success increases very slowly as  $s$  increases above 5, and since the corresponding computational times increase as well, we only numerically computed the maximum probability of success and an exactly determined optimal strategy for  $s \leq 5$ . The results are presented in Table 1.

As expected, for each fixed  $s \geq 1$  the smallest probability of success holds for  $\theta = 1$  for  $\theta > 0$ ; moreover, the optimal probability of success tends to 1 as  $\theta \rightarrow 0$  and  $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ , respectively. It is also intuitively clear that when  $0 < \theta < 1$ , as  $\theta$  decreases, the Mallows distribution concentrates around the identity permutation  $[12 \cdots N]$ ; in this setting, a  $(N - b_s, \dots, N - b_1)$ -strategy with “small” values of  $b_1, \dots, b_s$  has a high probability to identify the best candidate. When  $\theta > 1$ , the Mallows distribution concentrates around the permutation  $[N(N-1) \cdots 21]$  and as  $\theta$  increases, a  $(a_s, \dots, a_1)$ -strategy with “small” values of  $a_1, \dots, a_s$  has a high probability to identify the best candidate. Note that for  $\theta > 1$  and a fixed  $(a_s, \dots, a_1)$ -strategy, the value of  $\theta$  for which the probability of success is maximized does not occur when  $\theta \rightarrow 1+$  or  $\theta \rightarrow \infty$  but at some other fixed value. This is the reason for the observable small decreases in the optimal probability of success for  $\theta > 1$ , depicted in Figure 2.

For each fixed  $i \geq 1$ ,  $a_i \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\theta \rightarrow 1+$  and the number  $b_i \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\theta \rightarrow 1-$ . Those values correspond to the ratios  $x_i$  (as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) described later on in Section 6 for the uniform distribution with  $\theta = 1$ .

Furthermore, for each fixed  $\theta > 0$ , the optimal probability of winning increases as  $s$  increases and tends to 1 as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . This is also intuitively clear, since for fixed  $\theta > 0$  there is a better chance of succeeding when more queries are allowed, and we are guaranteed to succeed if we have infinitely many selections. Note that this probability increases dramatically when  $s$  is small and then increases very slowly afterwards. In particular, for  $s > 5$  the smallest probability of success exceeds 0.9; this is the main reason why we focus our attention on results for  $s \leq 5$ .

## 5 Expected Number of Queries and Candidates Examined

Since a query to a Genie (expert) is costly in practice, it is also of interest to examine the expected number of queries or interviews made during the process.

### 5.1 Expected Number of Queries

In this setting, we are interested in two expectations: **Unconditional expectations:** The expected number of selections made using the optimal strategy (described in Table 1); **Conditional expectations:** The expected number of selections made conditioned on the event that the best candidate is selected using the optimal strategy (described in Table 1).

**Claim 46.** *The conditional and unconditional expected number of selections for the Genie model is the same as for the Dowry model.*

*Proof.* Assume that under the Genie model we made a total  $r$ , where  $0 \leq r \leq s$ , selections using our optimal  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy, with  $k_i = a_{s+1-i}(\theta)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . We show next that the the Dowry model makes the same number of selections.

First, assume that  $r = 0$ . Then the value  $N$  is located at a position  $j \leq k_1$ , since otherwise there is at least one left-to-right maxima at a position in  $[k_1, N]$  and thus our optimal query strategy will result in at least one selection in both cases.

Next, assume that  $1 \leq r \leq s - 1$ . Say the  $r^{\text{th}}$  query is made at a position  $j \geq k_r + 1$ . The value  $N$  must be at a position  $h$  such that  $h \geq j$ , since if  $h < j$  there would have been no query at position  $j$ .

$\theta$	$b_1$	$p$	$b_2$	$p$	$b_3$	$p$	$b_4$	$p$	$b_5$	$p$
0.01	1	0.99	2	0.9999	3	0.999999	4	0.99999999	5	0.9999999999
0.1	1	0.9	2	0.99	3	0.999	4	0.9999	5	0.99999
0.2	1	0.8	2	0.96	3	0.992	4	0.9984	5	0.99968
0.3	1	0.7	2	0.91	3	0.973	4	0.9919	5	0.99757
0.4	1	0.6	2	0.84	3	0.936	4	0.9744	5	0.98976
0.5	1	0.5	2	0.75	3	0.875	4	0.9375	5	0.96875
0.6	2	0.48	3	0.72	5	0.84672	6	0.916992	7	0.955008
0.7	3	0.441	5	0.67767	6	0.814527	8	0.89181519	9	0.9367475
0.8	4	0.4096	7	0.6455296	9	0.78394163	12	0.86742506	14	0.91836337
0.9	9	0.38742049	14	0.61618841	19	0.75683265	24	0.84462315	28	0.90023365
0.91	11	0.38552196	16	0.61384283	21	0.75431993	26	0.84249939	31	0.8984815
0.92	12	0.38365188	18	0.61122396	24	0.75183545	30	0.84029209	35	0.89669505
0.93	14	0.38150867	21	0.60859444	28	0.74920064	34	0.83810534	40	0.89490443
0.94	16	0.37948013	25	0.60588389	32	0.74670942	40	0.83589721	47	0.89310511
0.95	19	0.3773536	29	0.60328914	39	0.74418598	48	0.8337195	56	0.89132711
0.96	24	0.37541325	37	0.60083222	49	0.74172818	60	0.83157908	70	0.88956127
0.97	33	0.37353448	50	0.59832096	65	0.73930464	80	0.82945187	94	0.88780406
0.98	49	0.37160171	74	0.59585024	97	0.73687357	119	0.82732738	141	0.88604612
0.99	99	0.36972964	149	0.59341831	195	0.73448001	239	0.82521971	282	0.8842961
$\theta$	$a_1$	$p$	$a_2$	$p$	$a_3$	$p$	$a_4$	$p$	$a_5$	$p$
1.01	46	0.36918367	25	0.59372585	15	0.73609875	9	0.82818603	6	0.8884655
1.02	23	0.37052858	12	0.59643023	7	0.74010572	4	0.83314574	3	0.89440668
1.03	15	0.37184338	8	0.59927181	5	0.74430003	3	0.83883113	2	0.90046661
1.04	11	0.37307045	6	0.60209564	4	0.74764429	2	0.84437558	1	0.90873876
1.05	9	0.37453849	5	0.60494232	3	0.75260449	2	0.84770309	1	0.9146162
1.06	8	0.37555657	4	0.60780968	2	0.75709372	1	0.85599814	1	0.91585315
1.07	6	0.376652	3	0.60956208	2	0.76137673	1	0.86299515	0	0.92841571
1.08	6	0.3782214	3	0.61365158	2	0.76357932	1	0.86737476	0	0.94144883
1.09	5	0.37998224	3	0.61493159	1	0.7678056	1	0.86916554	0	0.95173435
1.1	5	0.38013275	2	0.61811891	1	0.77490222	1	0.86897463	0	0.95988372
1.2	2	0.3946616	1	0.65166097	0	0.81832763	0	0.95363085	0	0.99176211
1.3	1	0.40196949	1	0.66305426	0	0.89382349	0	0.98072423	0	0.99771086
1.4	1	0.42452167	0	0.71023596	0	0.93366818	0	0.99101943	0	0.9992478
1.5	1	0.43301723	0	0.76635056	0	0.95655232	0	0.99547373	0	0.99972306
1.6	1	0.43330022	0	0.80830022	0	0.97048698	0	0.99757918	0	0.99988899
1.7	1	0.42868095	0	0.84044565	0	0.97935572	0	0.99864254	0	0.9999524
1.8	0	0.44444444	0	0.86557747	0	0.98520273	0	0.9992085	0	0.99997843
1.9	0	0.47368421	0	0.88555846	0	0.98917129	0	0.999523	0	0.99998975
2	0	0.5	0	0.90167379	0	0.99193195	0	0.99970422	0	0.99999493
3	0	0.66666667	0	0.969846	0	0.99918728	0	0.99999306	0	0.99999998
4	0	0.75	0	0.98686745	0	0.99983997	0	0.99999953	0	0.999999999
5	0	0.8	0	0.99310967	0	0.99995498	0	0.99999994	0	0.999999999

Table 1: Maximum probability of success  $p$  and an optimal strategy for  $0 < \theta < 1$  and  $\theta > 1$  under the Mallows model.




Figure 2: The maximum probability of success using our optimal strategy under the Mallows model.

Under the above assumption, we have to examine two scenarios. First, assume that  $h = j$ . In the Dowry model, the 1<sup>st</sup>, ...,  $(r - 1)$ <sup>th</sup> selections/queries are the same as the Genie keeps giving a negative answer, we then pick up the value  $N$  at position  $j$  (without knowing this fact in the Dowry model) and examine the list until the end; we do not make the  $(r + 1)$ <sup>th</sup> selection since there is no left-to-right maxima after position  $j$ . Next, assume that  $h > j$ . Then we must have  $h \leq k_{r+1}$  since otherwise the  $(r + 1)$ <sup>th</sup> selection will be made. In the Dowry model, the 1<sup>st</sup>, ...,  $(r - 1)$ <sup>th</sup>, and  $r$ <sup>th</sup> selections are the same as those in the Genie model as the latter gives negative answers. We do not make another selection until position  $k_{r+1}$  since the  $(r + 1)$ <sup>th</sup> selection is not allowed until after position  $k_{r+1}$ , and we cannot perform the  $(r + 1)$ <sup>th</sup> selection after position  $k_{r+1}$  since there is no left-to-right maxima following position  $h$ .

The last case to consider is  $r = s$ . We used all  $s - 1$  queries to ask a Genie, received  $s - 1$  negative answers, and then make a final decision at position  $j \geq k_s + 1$ . In the Dowry model, we make the same  $s - 1$  selections, without knowing that they are not the best, then make the final selection at the same position  $j$ .

Similarly, we can show that if  $r$ ,  $1 \leq r \leq s$ , selections are made in the Dowry model then the same number of selections will be made using the Genie model. Similar arguments apply for the case when we condition on the event of identifying the best candidate.  $\square$

We call a permutation  $\pi \in S_N$  *exactly  $r$ -( $k_1, \dots, k_s$ )-winnable* if the best value  $N$  is selected as the  $r$ <sup>th</sup> selection when using the  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy, where  $1 \leq r \leq s$ . For simplicity, we abbreviate the name to  $r$ -winnable whenever the strategy is clear. Moreover, we call a permutation  $\pi \in S_N$  *exactly  $r$ -( $k_1, \dots, k_s$ )-pickable* if it results in exactly  $r$  selections using the  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy, where  $0 \leq r \leq s$ . We also abbreviate this name to  $r$ -pickable whenever the strategy is clear.

For  $1 \leq r \leq s$ , we define

$$W_r(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) = \sum_{r\text{-winnable } \pi \in S_N} \theta^{c(\pi)}$$

and for  $0 \leq r \leq s$ , we let

$$T_r(m, k_1, \dots, k_s) = \sum_{r\text{-pickable } \pi \in S_N} \theta^{c(\pi)}.$$

**Proposition 47.**  $W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) = \sum_{i=1}^s W_i(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ .

### 5.1.1 The Unconditional Expectations

It is straightforward to see that the expected number of selections made using the  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^s i \cdot \frac{T_i(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!}.$$

**Lemma 48.** For  $N \geq k_s + 1$ , we have  $T_0(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) = T_0(N, k_1)$ , and for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ ,

$$T_i(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) = T_{\leq i}(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) - T_{\leq i-1}(N, k_1, \dots, k_s).$$

Every permutation uses at most  $s$  selections by the definition of the  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy. By Lemma 39, when  $\theta > 1$  and  $1 \leq r \leq s$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_{\leq r-1}(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_{\leq r-1}(N, k_1, \dots, k_r)}{(P_N)!} = (1 - \frac{1}{\theta^{k_r}}) + \\ &(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}) \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{\theta^{k_{r-1}}}) \cdot \sum_{i=k_r}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\theta^i - 1} + (1 - \frac{1}{\theta})^2 \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{\theta^{k_{r-2}}}) \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_r}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_1} - 1} \sum_{i_2=k_{r-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_2} - 1} + \dots + \\ &(1 - \frac{1}{\theta})^{r-1} \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{\theta^{k_1}}) \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_r}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_1} - 1} \sum_{i_2=k_{r-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_2} - 1} \sum \dots \sum_{i_{r-1}=k_2}^{i_{r-2}-1} \frac{1}{\theta^{i_{r-1}} - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $0 < \theta < 1$  and  $1 \leq r \leq s$ , since  $N - k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_{\leq r-1}(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_{\leq r-1}(N, k_1, \dots, k_r)}{(P_N)!} = \theta^{N-k_r} + \\ &\theta^{N-k_{r-1}} \cdot (\frac{1}{\theta} - 1) \cdot \sum_{i=k_r}^{N-1} 1 + \theta^{N-k_{r-2}} \cdot (\frac{1}{\theta} - 1)^2 \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_r}^{N-1} \sum_{i_2=k_{r-1}}^{i_1-1} 1 + \dots + \\ &\theta^{N-k_1} \cdot (\frac{1}{\theta} - 1)^{r-1} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_r}^{N-1} \sum_{i_2=k_{r-1}}^{i_1-1} \sum \dots \sum_{i_{r-1}=k_2}^{i_{r-2}-1} 1. \end{aligned}$$

These expression can be evaluated numerically and the results will be presented in subsequent sections.

### 5.1.2 The Unconditional Expectations

The expected number of queries made conditioned on successfully identifying the best candidate  $N$  using the  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy equals

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^s i \cdot W_i(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) / ((P_N)!) }{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) / ((P_N)!) } = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^s i \cdot W_i(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}.$$

Assume that  $N \geq k_s + 1$  and observe that  $\frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!}$  represents the probability of selecting the best candidate using the  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy. Fix  $k_1, \dots, k_s$ . Since there can be at most  $s$  selections when using

$\theta$	Unconditional	Conditional	$\theta$	Unconditional	Conditional
0.01	4.95	4.95	1.01	2.62667769	2.6972733
0.1	4.5	4.500045	1.02	2.62685978	2.68959942
0.2	4	4.00128041	1.03	2.59496416	2.66220979
0.3	3.5	3.50852572	1.04	2.79034804	2.80523622
0.4	3	3.03103783	1.05	2.64119948	2.68710199
0.5	2.5	2.58064516	1.06	2.49825217	2.57955508
0.6	2.7629312	2.81568154	1.07	3.29738824	3.17161865
0.7	2.64786481	2.71674096	1.08	3.20212123	3.09601664
0.8	2.6662117	2.73919532	1.09	3.12062719	3.02727948
0.9	2.63578947	2.71329095	1.10	3.04382379	2.96407481
0.91	2.61849239	2.69864672	1.2	2.54054933	2.52012037
0.92	2.63266523	2.70893875	1.3	2.26194433	2.25566216
0.93	2.63017179	2.70570293	1.4	2.07936215	2.07716359
0.94	2.63844464	2.71288008	1.5	1.94829005	1.94744469
0.95	2.62322511	2.7016097	1.6	1.84863362	1.84828375
0.96	2.62165305	2.69958325	1.7	1.76979138	1.76963762
0.97	2.6297567	2.70548721	1.8	1.70556686	1.70549578
0.98	2.62015186	2.69950777	1.9	1.65206303	1.65202872
0.99	2.61956681	2.69846554	2	1.60669004	1.60667284
			3	1.36430699	1.36430692
<b>1</b>	<b>2.61986256</b>	<b>2.69822343</b>	4	1.26329306	1.26329306
			5	1.20693541	1.20693541

Table 2: Unconditional and conditional expectations of the number of selections used in the optimal strategies and  $\theta > 0$ ,  $s = 5$ .

the  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy,  $\frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!}$  represents the entity of interest when at most  $s$  selections are made,  $\frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1})}{(P_N)!}$  represents the entity of interest when at most  $s - 1$  selections are made,  $\dots$ , and  $\frac{W(N, k_1)}{(P_N)!}$  represents the entity of interest when at most 1 selection is made using the  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy. This implies the following lemma.

**Lemma 49.** For  $N \geq k_s + 1$ , we have  $W_1(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) = W(N, k_1)$ , and for  $2 \leq i \leq s$ ,

$$W_i(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) = W(N, k_1, \dots, k_i) - W(N, k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}).$$

### 5.1.3 Numerical Results for $s = 5$

We focus our attention on  $s' = s - 1 = 4$  due to reasons previously described.

Both types of expectations based on the formulas from the previous subsections and for the optimal strategy described in Table 1 are listed in Table 2. The following observations are in place.

- The unconditional and conditional expectations do not differ significantly. This is true in particular when  $\theta \rightarrow 0+$  and  $\theta \rightarrow \infty$  since the optimal probability of success approaches 1.
- Both types of expectations approach  $s$  (equal to 5 in our setting) for  $\theta \rightarrow 0+$  and 1 for  $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ . This is intuitively clear since when  $\theta \rightarrow 0+$  the distribution is concentrated on the permutation  $[12 \dots N]$  and our optimal strategy is the  $(N - s, \dots, N - 2, N - 1)$ -strategy, which will most likely find the best candidate during the last selection if presented with the permutation  $[12 \dots N]$ .

- Both expectations show a globally decreasing trend when  $\theta$  increases, but this decrease is not monotone since the optimal strategy is changing with  $\theta$ .
- For the case of a uniform distribution and when at most 5 selections are allowed, one expected to use around 2.6 queries using our derived optimal strategy and around 2.7 queries to identify the best candidate using our optimal strategy, conditioned on the event that the best candidate is identified.

## 5.2 The Expected Number of Candidates Interviewed

The results for the Genie-based and the Dowry model differ in this setting. For the Genie model, we are informed when the best candidate is selected and thus stop interviewing. However, for the Dowry model, we do not have this information and will continue interviewing until the last candidate, except if we run out of selections.

The results below pertain to the case that we are performing interviews using a  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy, where  $k_i = a_{s+1-i}$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . As before, we examine both the unconditional expectations and the conditional expectation given that best candidate is identified.

### 5.2.1 The Genie Query Model

**Case 1: Unconditional expectations.** Define

$$Y'(m) = \sum_{\pi \in S_N \text{ s.t. we terminate at } m \text{ using the } (k_1, \dots, k_s)\text{-strategy}} \theta^{c(\pi)}.$$

We are interested in

$$\sum_{j=k_1+1}^N j \cdot \frac{Y'(j)}{(P_N)!}.$$

Let  $k_1 + 1 \leq m \leq N$ . There are three cases to consider for the position  $m$  at which we stop interviewing the candidates in  $\pi$ .

**Case 1.1:**  $k_i + 1 \leq m \leq k_{i+1}$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$ . The position  $m$  must contain the value  $N$  and at most  $i - 1$  selections can be made before position  $m$ , since if the former constraint does not hold we will continue interviewing until the  $s^{\text{th}}$  selection and if the latter constraint does not hold then we cannot select the best candidate at position  $m$  and thus will not stop at position  $m$ .

Therefore,

$$Y'(m) = \theta^{N-m} \cdot B(m-1, N-m) \cdot T_{\leq i-1}(k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot (P_{N-m})! = \frac{(P_{N-1})!}{(P_{m-1})!} \cdot \theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{\leq i-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s).$$

**Case 1.2:**  $k_s + 1 \leq m \leq N - 1$ . Then interviewing candidates in  $\pi$  terminates at  $m$  if either  $m$  is a left-to-right maxima and all  $s - 1$  Genies were queried before position  $m$  (with a final selection left for position  $m$ ); or position  $m$  has value  $N$  and at most  $s - 2$  Genies were queried before position  $m$ . To see this, if we stop at position  $m$  then position  $m$  must be a left-to-right maxima and either no selection is left after the final selection at position  $m$  (i.e., we cannot continue interviewing) or position  $m$  has the value  $N$  and there is at least one query left before interviewing position  $m$  (thus we query the Genie and get the answer that we found the best candidate and stop at position  $m$ ).

In the former case, the first  $m$  positions are arbitrary elements from  $\{1, \dots, N\}$ ; the  $m^{\text{th}}$  position has the largest value among the first  $m$  positions; and exactly  $s - 1$  selections were used for positions in  $[1, m - 1]$ . Now,  $T_{s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)$  counts the inversions within the first  $m$  positions,  $(P_{N-m})!$  counts the inversions within positions  $[m+1, N]$ , while  $B(m, N-m)$  counts the inversions between the two sets. Moreover,  $\theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{\leq s-2}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot B(m-1, N-m) \cdot (P_{N-m})!$  accounts for the case when position  $m$  has value  $N$  and at most  $s - 2$  queries are made before position  $m$ .

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Y'(m) &= B(m, N-m) \cdot T_{s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot (P_{N-m})! + \theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{\leq s-2}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot B(m-1, N-m) \cdot (P_{N-m})! \\ &= T_{s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot \frac{(P_N)!}{(P_m)!} + \theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{\leq s-2}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot \frac{(P_{N-1})!}{(P_{m-1})!}. \end{aligned}$$

**Case 1.3:**  $m = N$ . Since the interviewing process must stop at  $N$  we have

$$Y'(N) = (P_N)! - \sum_{j=k_1+1}^{N-1} Y'(j).$$

**Case 2: Conditional Expectations.** Define

$$Y''(m) = \sum_{\pi \in S_N \text{ is } (k_1, \dots, k_s)\text{-winnable and the search terminates at } m} \theta^{c(\pi)}.$$

We are interested in

$$\frac{\sum_{j=k_1+1}^N j \cdot Y''(j) / (P_N)!}{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) / (P_N)!} = \frac{\sum_{j=k_1+1}^N j \cdot Y''(j)}{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}.$$

There are two cases to consider.

**Case 2.1:**  $k_i + 1 \leq m \leq k_{i+1}$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$ . Then the value  $N$  had to be at position  $m$  and at most  $i-1$  selections were made before position  $m$ , since position  $m$  must contain the value  $N$  in order for the process to terminate successfully and since if  $i$  selections were made before position  $m$ , we cannot choose the value  $N$  at position  $m$ . Therefore, for this case

$$Y''(m) = \theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{\leq i-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot B(m-1, N-m) \cdot (P_{N-m})! = \frac{(P_{N-1})!}{(P_{m-1})!} \cdot \theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{\leq i-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s).$$

**Case 2.2:**  $m \geq k_s + 1$ . Again the value  $N$  had to be at position  $m$  and at most  $s-1$  selections were made before position  $m$ . Therefore, for this case

$$Y''(m) = \theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{\leq s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot B(m-1, N-m) \cdot (P_{N-m})! = \frac{(P_{N-1})!}{(P_{m-1})!} \cdot \theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{\leq s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s).$$

### 5.2.2 The Expectations for the Dowry Model

In the Dowry model, the aim is to use all  $s$  selections if possible, since we do not have the information whether each of our selection is the best or not. Hence,  $m \geq k_s + 1$ .

**Case 1: Unconditional Expectations.** Define

$$Z'(m) = \sum_{\pi \in S_N \text{ terminate at } m \text{ using the } (k_1, \dots, k_s)\text{-strategy}} \theta^{c(\pi)}$$

and the value of interest is

$$\sum_{j=k_s+1}^N j \cdot \frac{Z'(j)}{(P_N)!}.$$

**Case 1.1:**  $k_s + 1 \leq m \leq N-1$ . We only care whether the  $s^{\text{th}}$  selection is made at position  $m$ . Thus, for each subset  $S$  of  $m$  values of  $\{1, \dots, N\}$ , since the largest value of  $S$  must be placed at position  $m$  and exactly  $s-1$  selections had to be made before position  $m$ ,  $T_{s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)$  counts the number of inversions within the first  $m$  positions for each fixed  $S$ ,  $B(m, N-m)$  counts the number of inversions



between the two sets in partitions of  $N$ ,  $|\Pi_1| = m$  and  $|\Pi_2| = N - m$ , while  $(P_{N-m})!$  counts the number of inversions within positions  $[m + 1, N]$ . Therefore, in this case,

$$Z'(m) = T_{s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot B(m, N-m) \cdot (P_{N-m})! = T_{s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot \frac{(P_N)!}{(P_m)!}.$$

**Case 1.2:**  $m = N$ . All cases not covered by Case 1.1 include terminating at the last position and thus in this case

$$Z'(m) = (P_N)! - \sum_{j=k_s+1}^{N-1} Z'(j).$$

**Case 2: Conditional Expectations.** Define

$$Z''(m) = \sum_{\pi \in S_N \text{ is } (k_1, \dots, k_s)\text{-winnable and terminates at } m} \theta^{c(\pi)}.$$

The entity of interest is

$$\frac{\sum_{j=k_s+1}^N j \cdot Z''(j) / (P_N)!}{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s) / (P_N)!} = \frac{\sum_{j=k_s+1}^N j \cdot Z''(j)}{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}.$$

**Case 2.1:** Terminate at a position  $k_s + 1 \leq j \leq N - 1$  and identify the optimal candidate. Then, the  $s^{\text{th}}$  selection is made at position  $m$  and position  $m$  has value  $N$ . Therefore, in this case,

$$Z''(j) = \theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot B(m-1, N-m) \cdot (P_{N-m})! = \theta^{N-m} \cdot T_{s-1}(m-1, k_1, \dots, k_s) \cdot \frac{(P_{N-1})!}{(P_{m-1})!}.$$

**Case 2.2:** Terminate at position  $N$  and identify the optimal candidate. It is possible that not all of the  $s - 1$  selections were used before and the best candidate is picked at position  $N$ ; it is also possible that the best candidate was picked at some position in  $[k_{s+1}, N - 1]$  but not all selections were used before the position  $N$  and thus the search continued until after position  $N$  (those two possibilities do not account for all possible cases). In this case,

$$\frac{Z''(N)}{(P_N)!} = \frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!} - \sum_{j=k_s+1}^{N-1} \frac{Z''(j)}{(P_N)!}.$$

### 5.2.3 The Analysis for $\theta > 0$

For both the Genie model and the Dowry model, since our optimal strategy for  $0 < \theta < 1$  is a  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy such that  $N - k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty$  when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the expected number of interviews  $E$  also satisfies  $N - E \not\rightarrow \infty$ . We also know that in this setting the distribution is concentrated around the permutation  $[12 \dots N]$  and the optimal strategy is approaching an  $(N - s, \dots, N - 1)$ -strategy as  $\theta \rightarrow 0+$ . Furthermore, we know  $E \rightarrow N$  as  $\theta \rightarrow 0+$ . Similar observations are in place when conditioning on the event that the optimal candidate is successfully identified.

For both model, our optimal strategy for  $\theta > 1$  is a  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy such that  $k_s \not\rightarrow \infty$  and the distribution is concentrated on the permutation  $[N \dots 21]$  as  $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ . In the Dowry model, (i) if we successfully picked the best candidate at the time of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection, with  $i \leq s - 1$ , then since we do not know that we succeeded we continue to interview; (ii) if we made the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection at a position  $j \in [k_i + 1, k_{i+1}]$  and  $N$  is at a position in  $[j + 1, k_{i+1}]$ , for some  $i \leq s - 1$ , we again continue to interview. Note that (ii) also applies to the Genie model. The probability that (i) or (ii) occur is (typically) not equal to 0: This fact, especially when  $\theta$  is close to  $1+$ , causes the expected number of interviews  $\rightarrow \infty$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  despite the best candidate being identified earlier (Note that the thresholds for the optimal strategy differ significantly when  $\theta \rightarrow 1+$  and thus the probability that (i) or (ii) occur is larger than the corresponding probability when  $\theta$

is large, in which case the thresholds of the optimal strategy are very close). When  $\theta$  is large we know the optimal success probability is close to 1 and our optimal winning strategy is the  $(0, 1, 2, \dots, s-1)$ -strategy which can identify the best candidate with high probability; thus, we expect to identify the best candidate early on. Similar observations hold for the conditional expectations.

However, the above mentioned results do not hold for the case of a uniform distribution and it is of interest to compare the behavior of all four types of expectations number of interviews in this case. The results are presented in Section 6.2.

## 6 The Uniform Distribution ( $\theta = 1$ ) Revisited

Throughout this section we fix  $\theta = 1$ .

### 6.1 The Optimal Strategy and the Optimal Probability of Success

First, note that  $T_0(m, k_1) = k_1 \cdot (m-1)!$  and  $T_{\leq i-1}(k_i, k_1, \dots, k_i) = k_i!$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$ . Moreover, we have  $T_{\leq s}(m, k_1, \dots, k_s) = m!$ . By Lemma 39, for  $1 \leq r \leq s$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T_{\leq r-1}(m, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{m!} &= \frac{1}{m} \cdot (k_r + k_{r-1} \cdot \sum_{i=k_r}^{m-1} \frac{1}{i} + k_{r-2} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_r}^{m-1} \frac{1}{i_1} \sum_{i_2=k_{r-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{i_2} + \dots + \\ &k_1 \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_r}^{m-1} \frac{1}{i_1} \cdot \sum_{i_2=k_{r-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{i_2} \sum \dots \sum_{i_{r-1}=k_2}^{i_{r-2}-1} \frac{1}{i_{r-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= \frac{a_1}{N} \cdot \sum_{i=a_1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{i}, \quad H_2 = \frac{a_2}{N} \cdot \left( \sum_{i=a_2}^{a_1-1} \frac{1}{i} + \delta(a_1, N) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_1+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{i_1} \sum_{i_2=a_1}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{i_2} \right), \\ H_3 &= \frac{a_3}{N} \cdot \left( \sum_{i=a_3}^{a_2-1} \frac{1}{i} + \delta(a_2, a_1) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_2+1}^{a_1-1} \frac{1}{i_1} \sum_{i_2=a_2}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{i_2} + \delta(a_1, N) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_1+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{i_1} \sum_{i_2=a_1}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{i_2} \sum_{i_3=a_2}^{i_2-1} \frac{1}{i_3} \right) \\ &\dots \\ H_s &= \frac{a_s}{N} \cdot \left( \sum_{i=a_s}^{a_{s-1}-1} \frac{1}{i} + \delta(a_{s-1}, a_{s-2}) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_{s-1}+1}^{a_{s-2}-1} \frac{1}{i_1} \sum_{i_2=a_{s-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{i_2} + \delta(a_{s-2}, a_{s-3}) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_{s-2}+1}^{a_{s-3}-1} \frac{1}{i_1} \sum_{i_2=a_{s-2}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{i_2} \sum_{i_3=a_{s-1}}^{i_2-1} \frac{1}{i_3} + \dots + \right. \\ &\left. \delta(a_1, N) \cdot \sum_{i_1=a_1+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{i_1} \sum_{i_2=a_1}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{i_2} \sum_{i_3=a_2}^{i_2-1} \frac{1}{i_3} \dots \sum_{i_s=a_{s-1}}^{i_{s-1}-1} \frac{1}{i_s} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta(x, y) = 1$  if  $y \geq x + 2$  and 0 otherwise. For each  $1 \leq s$  and  $N \geq a_1 + 1$ , we hence have

$$\frac{W(N, a_s, \dots, a_1)}{N!} = \sum_{i=1}^s H_i.$$

Let  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and define  $x_i = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_i}{N}$ . For  $0 \leq x_s \leq x_{s-1} \leq \dots \leq x_1 \leq 1$ , and  $1 \leq r \leq s$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} H_r &\rightarrow x_r \cdot \left( \int_{x_r}^{x_{r-1}} \frac{1}{t} dt + \int_{x_{r-1}}^{x_{r-2}} \frac{1}{t_1} \int_{x_{r-1}}^{t_1} \frac{1}{t_2} dt_2 dt_1 + \int_{x_{r-2}}^{x_{r-3}} \frac{1}{t_1} \int_{x_{r-2}}^{t_1} \frac{1}{t_2} \int_{x_{r-1}}^{t_2} \frac{1}{t_3} dt_3 dt_2 dt_1 + \dots + \right. \\ &\left. \int_{x_1}^1 \frac{1}{t_1} \int_{x_1}^{t_1} \frac{1}{t_2} \int_{x_2}^{t_2} \dots \int_{x_{r-1}}^{t_{r-1}} \frac{1}{t_r} dt_r dt_{r-1} \dots dt_1 \right) =: H'_r \end{aligned}$$

	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$x_4$	$x_5$	...
Thresholds	0.3678794412	0.2231301601	0.1410933807	0.0910176906	0.0594292419	...
Optimal probability	0.3678794412	0.5910096013	0.7321029820	0.8231206726	0.8825499146	...

Table 3: The optimal thresholds (threshold ratios) and success probabilities for  $\theta = 1$ .

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W(N, a_s, \dots, a_1)}{N!} = \sum_{r=1}^s H'_r =: P.$$

By this definition, and for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , the optimal probability is a function of  $x_1, \dots, x_s$  and does not depend on  $N$ . By Corollary 33, we find the ratio  $x_1$  for the case  $s = 1$ , then we find  $x_2$  for the case  $s = 2, \dots$ , finally we find  $x_s$  for the case of  $s$  selections allowed. An optimal strategy has to such that if: (i)  $a_i = o(N)$ , then  $x_i = 0$ ; (ii)  $N - a_i = o(N)$ , then  $x_i = 1$ ; (iii) and, otherwise,  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_i}{N} = x_i \in (0, 1)$ . Next, we show that only (iii) is possible, i.e., each  $x_i \in (0, 1)$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ .

Let

$$\mathcal{I}_{r-1} = \int_{x_{r-1}}^{x_{r-2}} \frac{1}{t_1} \int_{x_{r-1}}^{t_1} \frac{1}{t_2} dt_2 dt_1 + \int_{x_{r-2}}^{x_{r-3}} \frac{1}{t_1} \int_{x_{r-2}}^{t_1} \frac{1}{t_2} \int_{x_{r-1}}^{t_2} \frac{1}{t_3} dt_3 dt_2 dt_1 + \dots + \int_{x_1}^1 \frac{1}{t_1} \int_{x_1}^{t_1} \frac{1}{t_2} \int_{x_2}^{t_2} \dots \int_{x_{r-1}}^{t_{r-1}} \frac{1}{t_r} dt_r dt_{r-1} \dots dt_1.$$

We know that  $\mathcal{I}_{r-1}$  is a constant when  $x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}$  are given and the optimal value of  $x_r$  which realizes the maximum value of  $P$  equals  $x_{r-1} \cdot e^{\mathcal{I}_{r-1}-1}$ . Thus, we can compute  $x_{r-1}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{r-1}$  sequentially.

We computed the optimal thresholds for the case of up to five selections and their corresponding probabilities of success. When  $N$  is large, by Corollary 33, the optimal strategy for the case of  $s$  selections is the  $(x_s \cdot N, \dots, x_1 \cdot N)$ -strategy: We reject the first  $x_s \cdot N$  candidates and then select the first left-to-right maxima candidate thereafter; for the second selection, we wait until after the  $x_{s-1} \cdot N^{\text{th}}$  position and then select the left-to-right maxima after the first selection made,  $\dots$ , for the  $s^{\text{th}}$  selection, we wait until after the  $x_1 \cdot N^{\text{th}}$  position and then select the left-to-right maxima after the  $(s-1)^{\text{th}}$  selection is made. The results for  $s \leq 5$  are shown in Table 3.

## 6.2 Expected Number of Candidates Interviewed under the Genie Query Model

We computed all four different types of expectations corresponding to the formulas in Section 5.2.

- In the secretary setting (1 selection allowed without querying), it is expected to interview  $2/e \approx 73.57\%$  of the candidate before making the decision and there is a probability  $1/e \approx 36.79\%$  that we will examine the whole list. When conditioning on the event that the best candidate is identified, we obtain that approximately 63.21% of the candidates are interviewed before making the decision. For both models, the conditional probability of having to wait until the last candidate  $\rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  since we are guaranteed to succeed and

$$P(\text{the best candidate is at position } N \mid \text{success}) = \frac{P(\text{succeed and the best candidate is at position } N)}{P(\text{success})} \leq \frac{P(\text{the best candidate is at position } N)}{P(\text{success})} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{N}}{\frac{1}{e}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (12)$$

- In the Genie query setting (with  $s-1$  queries), the results are very different from those of the Dowry model (with  $s$  selections).

The expected stopping position/ $N$  (*expected stopping ratio*, abbreviated by *ESR*) is decreasing when  $s$  is increasing for the Genie-based model and is increasing when  $s$  is increasing for the Dowry model. This is true for both the unconditional and conditional expectations. As  $s$  increases, the ESR decreases

**Genie model, unconditional expectation**

Number of queries	0	1	2	3	4
Expected position of stopping/ $N$	0.7357	0.6860	0.6350	0.5949	0.5304
Probability of examining the whole list	0.3679	0.2563	0.1740	0.1175	0.0056

**Genie model, conditional expectation**

Number of queries	0	1	2	3	4
Expected position of stopping/ $N$	0.6321	0.5870	0.5582	0.5392	0.5265
Probability of examining the whole list	0	0	0	0	0

**Dowry model, unconditional expectation**

Number of selections	1	2	3	4	5
Expected position of stopping/ $N$	0.7357	0.8473	0.9061	0.9405	0.9617
Probability of examining the whole list	0.3679	0.5910	0.7321	0.8231	0.8825

**Dowry model, conditional expectation**

Number of selections	1	2	3	4	5
Expected position of stopping/ $N$	0.6321	0.8600	0.9285	0.9590	0.9751
Probability of examining the whole list	0	0.5663	0.7623	0.8573	0.9103

Table 4: The expected stopping position/ $N$  under the optimal strategy for the uniform case, when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

and approaches 0.5 for the Genie-based model while the ESR increases and approaches 1 for the Dowry model. This can be justified as follows. When  $s$  is sufficiently large, we have a success probability close to 1 and will stop at the position at which the value  $N$  appears if this is identified during the  $s - 1$  queries (even for  $s = 6$  we will have a probability  $> 0.9$  of identifying the best candidate). Thus,  $ESR \rightarrow 0.5$ , the expected position of  $N$ . However, in the Dowry model, the probability of successfully identifying the best candidate during the first  $s - 1$  selections  $\rightarrow 1$  as  $s$  increases. Furthermore, since we have no information about whether the selected candidate is the best or not, we try our best to use all selections and thus have probabilities  $\rightarrow 1$  of stopping at the end of the list. Thus,  $ESR \rightarrow 1$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in the Dowry model.

For the Genie query model, the conditional expectation is smaller than its unconditional counterpart. However, in the Dowry model, except when  $s = 1$ , the conditional expectation is larger than the unconditional one. Intuitively, for the Dowry model, when conditioning on the event of successfully identifying the best candidate, we have a larger probability of waiting until the end of the list (if success is guaranteed, the best candidate is always selected before the last selection and thus we need to wait until the end to interview all candidates). For the Genie model (with  $s - 1 \geq 1$  queries), the probability of examining the whole list  $\rightarrow 0$  when conditioning on successful identification, which can be seen by an argument similar to (12). In contrast, in the Genie model without conditioning we have a nonzero probability of examining the whole list: It is possible to encounter while applying our optimal  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategy the case that we made the  $i^{\text{th}}$  selection at position  $j \in [k_i + 1, k_{i+1}]$ , and queried a Genie whether the current candidate is the best or not and get the answer “no” while the best candidate is at  $h \in [j + 1, k_{i+1}]$ . Thus we cannot make the  $(i + 1)^{\text{th}}$  selection and after position  $h$  there are no left-to-right maxima left, which means that we will have to interview until the end (and fail). When  $s$  increases, the probability of winning  $\rightarrow 1$  and thus the probability of the above described scenario  $\rightarrow 0$ .

**Acknowledgment.** The work was supported in part by the NSF grants NSF CCF 15-26875 and The Center for Science of Information at Purdue University, under contract number 239 SBC PURDUE 4101-38050. Part of the work was support by the DARPA molecular informatics program. This work was supported by the US National Science Foundation under Grant CIF 1513373, through Rutgers University.

## References

- [1] H. Ashtiani, S. Kushagra, S. Ben-David, “Clustering with same-cluster queries,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pp. 3224–3232, 2016.
- [2] M. Babaioff, N. Immorlica, R. Kleinberg, “Matroids, secretary problems, and online mechanisms” *ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pp. 434–443, 2007.
- [3] I. Chien, C. Pan, and O. Milenkovic, “Query k-means clustering and the double dixie cup problem,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 31, pp. 6649–6658, 2018.
- [4] M. Crews, B. Jones, K. Myers, L. Taalman, M. Urbanski and B. Wilson, “Opportunity Costs in the Game of Best Choice,” *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, vol. 26, no. 1, #P1.45, 2019.
- [5] E.B. Dynkin, “The optimal choice of the stopping moment for a Markov process,” *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR*, vol. 150, pp. 238–240, 1963.
- [6] T. Ferguson, “Who solved the secretary problem?,” *Statistical science*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 282–289, 1989.
- [7] P. R. Freeman, “The secretary problem and its extensions - A review,” *Internat. Statist. Rev.* vol.51, pp. 189–206, 1983.
- [8] R. Freij, J. Wastlund, “Partially ordered secretaries,” *Electron Commun Probab*, vol. 15, pp. 504–507, 2010.
- [9] W. Huleihel, A. Mazumdar, M. Medard, and S. Pal, “Same-cluster querying for overlapping clusters,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 30, pp. 10485–10495, 2019.
- [10] M. Gardner, “Mathematical games”, *Scientific American*, vol. 202, no. 2, pp. 152, 1960a.
- [11] M. Gardner, “Mathematical games”, *Scientific American*, vol. 202, no. 3, pp. 178–179, 1960b.
- [12] B. Garrod and R. Morris, “The secretary problem on an unknown poset,” *Random Structures & Algorithms*, vol. 43, pp. 429–451, 2012.
- [13] N. Georgiou, M. Kuchta, M. Morayne, J. Niemiec, “On a universal best choice algorithm for partially ordered sets”, *Random Structures & Algorithms*, vol. 32, pp. 263–273, 2008.
- [14] J. Gilbert and F. Mosteller, “Recognizing the maximum of a sequence,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, vol. 61, pp. 35–73, 1966.
- [15] B. Jones, “Weighted games of best choice,” *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 399–414, 2020.
- [16] D.V. Lindley, “Dynamic programming and decision theory,” *Appl. Statist.*, vol.10, pp. 39–52, 1961.
- [17] X. Liu and O. Milenkovic, “Finding the second-best candidate under the Mallows model”, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2011.07666.pdf>
- [18] C. L. Mallows, “Non-null ranking models,” *Biometrika*, vol. 44, no. 1/2, pp. 114–130, 1957.
- [19] A. Mazumdar and B. Saha, “Clustering with noisy queries,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pp. 5788–5799, 2017.
- [20] J. Preater, “The best-choice problem for partially ordered objects”, *Oper Res Lett*, vol. 25, pp. 187–190, 1999.
- [21] J. S. Rose, “A problem of optimal choice and assignment,” *Operations Research*, vol. 30, pp. 172–181, 1982.
- [22] M. Sakaguchi, “Dowry problems and OLA policies,” *Rep. Stat. Appl. Res. JUSE*, vol. 25, pp. 124–128, 1978.
- [23] J.A. Soto, “Matroid secretary problem in the random assignment model”, *ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pp. 1275–1284, 2011.

[24] R. J. Vanderbei, “The postdoc variant of the secretary problem,” Technical report, Princeton University, Tech. Rep., 2012.

## 7 Appendix

We make use of the following two results.

**Theorem 50** (Jones [15], Theorem 6.5). *For  $\theta < 1$ , the optimal asymptotic selection strategy for the secretary problem is to reject  $N - j(\theta) \not\rightarrow \infty$  (not depending on  $N$ ) candidates and then accept the next left-to-right maxima thereafter.*

**Theorem 51** (Jones [15], Corollary 6.6). *For  $\theta > 1$ , the optimal asymptotic selection strategy for the secretary problem is to reject  $j(\theta) \not\rightarrow \infty$  (not depending on  $N$ ) candidates and then accept the next left-to-right maxima thereafter.*

**Proof of Theorem 44.** The proof follows by induction.

First, note that  $N - k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty$  implies  $N - k_2, \dots, N - k_s \not\rightarrow \infty$ . The base case for one threshold hold by Theorem 50. We assume the argument works for  $\leq s - 1$  thresholds and prove the result for  $s$ -thresholds with  $s \geq 2$ .

By Lemma 41 and the fact  $T_{\leq s-1}(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1}, k_s) = (P_{k_s})!$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!} &= \frac{1}{P_N} \cdot \left( \frac{\theta^{N-k_s} \cdot P_{k_s} \cdot W(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1})}{(P_{k_s})!} + \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-1})!} + \right. \\ &\left. \theta \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-2, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-2})!} + \dots + \theta^{N-k_s-2} \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(k_s+1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{k_s+1})!} + \theta^{N-k_s-1} \cdot 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Step 1: Suppose that  $N - k_s \not\rightarrow \infty$  does not hold, i.e., that  $N - k_s \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, since the probability

$$\frac{W(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1})}{(P_{k_s})!} \leq 1, \quad \text{we have}$$

$$\frac{\theta^{N-k_s} \cdot P_{k_s} \cdot W(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1})}{(P_{k_s})!} \rightarrow \frac{\theta^{N-k_s}}{1-\theta} \cdot \frac{W(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1})}{(P_{k_s})!} \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 39, for  $0 \leq j \leq N - k_s - 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^j \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-j-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-j-1})!} &= \\ &\frac{1}{P_{N-j-1}} \cdot (\theta^{N-k_s-1} \cdot P_{k_s} + \theta^{N-k_s-2} \cdot P_{k_s-1} \cdot \sum_{i=k_s}^{N-j-2} \frac{1}{P_i} + \\ &\theta^{N-k_s-3} \cdot P_{k_s-2} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_s}^{N-j-2} \frac{1}{P_{i_1}} \sum_{i_2=k_{s-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_2}} + \dots + \theta^{N-k_1-s} \cdot P_{k_1} \cdot \sum_{i_1=k_s}^{N-j-2} \frac{1}{P_{i_1}} \cdot \sum_{i_2=k_{s-1}}^{i_1-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_2}} \sum \dots \sum_{i_{s-1}=k_2}^{i_{s-2}-1} \frac{1}{P_{i_{s-1}}}). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

For each term inside the bracket of (14), since  $N - k_i \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\theta^{N-k_i} \rightarrow 0$  exponentially, and the sum part (without the multiplier) of each term approaches infinity as a polynomial function in  $N - k_{i+1} \leq N - k_i$ . The latter claim holds since  $\frac{1}{P_i} = \frac{1-\theta}{1-\theta^i} \leq 1$  when  $i \geq 1$  and the smallest value of the subscript equals  $k_2 \geq 1$ .

Since  $N - j - 1 \geq k_s + 1$ , we have

$$\theta^j \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-j-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-j-1})!} \leq (\theta^{N-k_s-1} + \theta^{N-k_s-2} \cdot (N - k_{s-1}) + \theta^{N-k_s-3} \cdot (N - k_{s-2})^2 + \dots$$

$$+\theta^{N-k_1-s} \cdot (N-k_1)^{s-1} \leq s \cdot \max_{q=1}^s \{\theta^{N-k_q-(s+1-q)} \cdot (N-k_q)^{s-q}\} \rightarrow 0.$$

Above, the convergence rate  $\rightarrow 0$  is exponential. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-1})!} + \theta \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-2, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-2})!} + \dots + \theta^{N-k_s-2} \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(k_s+1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{k_s+1})!} + \theta^{N-k_s-1} \\ & \leq (N-k_s) \cdot s \cdot \max_{q=1}^s \{\theta^{N-k_q-(s+1-q)} \cdot (N-k_q)^{s-q}\} \leq s \cdot \max_{q=1}^s \{\theta^{N-k_q-(s+1-q)} \cdot (N-k_q)^{s+1-q}\} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: Suppose that  $N-k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty$  does not hold, i.e., that  $N-k_1 \rightarrow \infty$ .

From Step 1, we know that for an optimal strategy,  $N-k_s \not\rightarrow \infty$  has to hold. We also know that  $k_s - k_1 \rightarrow \infty$ . By the induction hypothesis,

$$\frac{W(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1})}{(P_{k_s})!} \text{ is maximized when } k_s - k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty \text{ (and is not maximized when } k_s - k_1 \rightarrow \infty). \quad (15)$$

Moreover, for each  $0 \leq j \leq N-k_s-1$ , by Lemma 39 and (14),

$$\theta^j \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-j-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-j-1})!} \text{ is maximized when } N-k_s, \dots, N-k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty. \quad (16)$$

To see why this is the case, say  $N-k_i \rightarrow \infty$  and  $N-k_{i+1} \not\rightarrow \infty$ . Then the term involving  $\theta^{N-k_q-(s+1-q)}$  approaches zero for  $1 \leq q \leq i$  (when  $k_1 = 0$ , the last term is zero by default).

Therefore, by (15) and (16),

$$\frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!} \text{ is maximized only when } N-k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty,$$

which also implies  $N-k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty, \dots, N-k_s \not\rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 45:** The proof proceeds by induction. For consistency, we define  $k_0 = -1$  and  $k_{s+1} = N$ .

Note that  $k_s \not\rightarrow \infty$  implies  $k_{s-1}, \dots, k_1 \not\rightarrow \infty$ . By Theorem 51, the argument works for one threshold. Suppose now that the argument works for at most  $s-1$  thresholds. We prove the claimed result for  $s$  thresholds. To this end, we show that the choice  $k_i \not\rightarrow \infty$  and  $k_{i+1} \rightarrow \infty$  is always at least as good as the choice  $k_{i-1} \not\rightarrow \infty$  and  $k_i \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$ .

**Claim 52.** For the case  $k_i \rightarrow \infty$  and  $k_{i-1} \not\rightarrow \infty$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq s$  we have

$$\frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!} \rightarrow \frac{W(k_i, k_1, \dots, k_{i-1})}{(P_{k_i})!}.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 41 and  $T_{\leq s-1}(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1}, k_s) = (P_{k_s})!$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{W(N, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_N)!} &= \frac{1}{P_N} \cdot \left( \frac{\theta^{N-k_s} \cdot P_{k_s} \cdot W(k_s, k_1, \dots, k_{s-1})}{(P_{k_s})!} + \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-1})!} + \right. \\ & \quad \left. \theta \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-2, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-2})!} + \dots + \theta^{N-k_s-2} \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(k_s+1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{k_s+1})!} + \theta^{N-k_s-1} \right) \\ &= \dots = \\ & \quad \frac{1}{P_N} \cdot \left( \frac{\theta^{N-k_i} \cdot P_{k_i} \cdot W(k_i, k_1, \dots, k_{i-1})}{(P_{k_i})!} + \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-1})!} + \theta \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-2, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-2})!} + \dots + \theta^{N-k_s-2} \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(k_s+1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{k_s+1})!} + \theta^{N-k_s-1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \dots + \\
& + \theta^{N-k_{i+1}} \cdot \frac{T_{\leq i}(k_{i+1}-1, k_1, \dots, k_i)}{(P_{k_{i+1}-1})!} + \dots + \theta^{N-k_i-2} \cdot \frac{T_i(k_i+1, k_1, \dots, k_i)}{(P_{k_i+1})!} + \theta^{N-k_i-1}. \quad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $T_j(m, k_1, \dots, k_{j+1}) \leq (P_m)!$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-1})!} + \theta \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(N-2, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{N-2})!} + \dots + \theta^{N-k_s-2} \cdot \frac{T_{\leq s-1}(k_s+1, k_1, \dots, k_s)}{(P_{k_s+1})!} + \theta^{N-k_s-1} \\
& + \dots + \\
& + \theta^{N-k_{i+1}} \cdot \frac{T_{\leq i}(k_{i+1}-1, k_1, \dots, k_i)}{(P_{k_{i+1}-1})!} + \dots + \theta^{N-k_i-2} \cdot \frac{T_i(k_i+1, k_1, \dots, k_i)}{(P_{k_i+1})!} + \theta^{N-k_i-1} \\
& \leq 1 + \theta + \dots + \theta^{N-k_i-1} = \frac{\theta^{N-k_i} - 1}{\theta - 1},
\end{aligned}$$

and thus (17) converges to

$$\frac{1}{1 - 1/(\theta^N)} \cdot ((1 - 1/\theta^{k_i}) \cdot \frac{W(k_i, k_1, \dots, k_{i-1})}{(P_{k_i})!} + (1/\theta^{k_i} - 1/(\theta^N))) \rightarrow \frac{W(k_i, k_1, \dots, k_{i-1})}{(P_{k_i})!} \text{ as } k_i \rightarrow \infty.$$

□

We compare the class of  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategies for which  $k_{i-1} \not\rightarrow \infty$  (Case 1) and  $k_i \rightarrow \infty$ , with the class of  $(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ -strategies for which  $k_i \not\rightarrow \infty$  and  $k_{i+1} \rightarrow \infty$  (case 2).

**Claim 53.** *For every strategy  $(k'_1, \dots, k'_s)$  covered under Case 1 there is a strategy covered under Case 2 which performs better than the  $(k'_1, \dots, k'_s)$ -strategy.*

*Proof.* Let  $(k'_1, \dots, k'_s)$  be a strategy with  $k'_{i-1} \not\rightarrow \infty$  and  $k'_i \rightarrow \infty$  (Case 1) and let  $(k''_1, \dots, k''_s)$  be a strategy such that  $k''_j = k'_j$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, s\} - \{i\}$ ,  $k''_i \not\rightarrow \infty$ . Note that  $k''_i \not\rightarrow \infty$ ,  $k''_{i+1} \rightarrow \infty$  and thus the  $(k''_1, \dots, k''_s)$ -strategy is also covered under Case 2.

By Claim 52, the probability of success for the  $(k'_1, \dots, k'_s)$ -strategy is

$$\lim_{k_i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W(k'_i, k'_1, \dots, k'_{i-1})}{(P_{k'_i})!} < \lim_{k''_{i+1} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W(k''_{i+1}, k''_1, \dots, k''_{i-1}, k''_i)}{(P_{k''_{i+1}})!},$$

which is the winning probability for the  $(k''_1, \dots, k''_s)$ -strategy since the latter case has one more selection than the former case and the value  $k''_i$  can be placed anywhere as long as  $k''_i \geq k''_{i-1}$  and  $k''_i \not\rightarrow \infty$ .

□

By Claim 53, the proof follows. □