

# Bounds, Heuristics, and Prophet Inequalities for Assortment Optimization

Guillermo Gallego\*

Gerardo Berbeglia<sup>†</sup>

May 25, 2022

## Abstract

We address two important concerns faced by assortment managers, namely constrained assortment optimization and assortment personalization. We contribute to addressing these concerns by developing bounds and heuristics based on auxiliary multinomial logit (MNL) models. More precisely, we first provide easily computable upper and lower bounds for the unconstrained assortment optimization problem (TAOP) for every regular choice model and then extend the bounds to important versions of the constrained problem. We next provide an upper bound on the expected revenue of a clairvoyant firm that offers to each consumer the most profitable product that she is willing to buy. We then use the upper bound to assess the maximum benefits of personalization relative to a firm that does not personalize assortments. The standard prophet inequality is then used to show that the ratio is at most 2 for discrete choice models with *independent* value gaps. For random utility models with dependent value gaps the ratio can be as large as the number of products. We find sufficient conditions to show that the prophet inequality holds for the  $\alpha$ -shaken multinomial logit ( $\alpha$ -MNL), a generalization of the MNL introduced here, that has the MNL and the generalized attraction model (GAM) as special cases. The prophet inequality also holds for the some versions of the Nested Logit model. For the latent-class MNL, the ratio is at most 1.5 when the coefficient of variation of the utilities goes to infinity. We show that consumers do not necessarily suffer under a clairvoyant firm and in fact their surplus may improve. On the other hand, when the clairvoyant firm has pricing power it can extract all of the consumers' surplus. We show that for the MNL model the clairvoyant can make up to  $e$  times more than its non-clairvoyant counterpart.

---

\*Industrial Engineering and Decision Analytics Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Kowloon, Hong Kong, ggallego@ust.hk. Supported by RGC project 16211619.

<sup>†</sup>Melbourne Business School, The University of Melbourne, Australia, g.berbeglia@mbs.edu.

# 1 Introduction

Two key problems faced by assortment managers are how to find optimal or near-optimal constrained or un-constrained assortments and whether or not to personalize assortments. Constraints on assortments are typically totally unimodular (TUM) including, for example, cardinality and precedence constraints. The *Traditional Assortment Optimization Problem* (TAOP) is in general NP-hard, and even versions that are polynomially solvable often become NP-hard under TUM constraints [Sumida et al., 2021, Désir et al., 2020].

Personalization is particularly important in e-commerce as online retailers have more flexibility than their brick and mortar counterparts. Indeed, assortments offered by brick and mortar stores are of a more strategic nature as they are designed to show the products in an attractive way and to lure consumers into the store. Changing the offered assortment requires reorganizing the store and to have a backroom to hide the products that the store currently does not desire to offer. In contrast, an online platform can make instant changes depending on the information it gathers about consumers. The platform may gather information about the consumers' location and search keywords and then decide what products to display in real-time. This has led online firms to create consumer segments based on such information and solve an assortment optimization problem for each segment. Several papers addressed personalized assortment optimization policies and study their benefits and limitations (see, e.g. Golrezaei et al. [2014], Bernstein et al. [2015], El Housni and Topaloglu [2021]). As e-commerce firms collect more detailed personal information about web searches, click-through paths and past purchases, they become more able to create segments of size one and truly offer personalized assortments and personalized prices. This has raised the concern of public and policy makers (see, Tucker [2014], Goldfarb and Tucker [2012]) and to welfare studies of personalized assortments and personalized pricing (see e.g. Ichihashi [2020]).

It is therefore important for firms and policy makers to understand the impact of personalization when it is taken to a very high degree. In this paper, we take a step in this direction by asking how much more a clairvoyant firm, that maximizes its expected revenues by offering each consumer the most profitable product that she is willing to buy, can make relative to TAOP firm. Although firms may never develop the power to read consumer minds, the analysis of this extreme case is useful since it provides a quantifiable limit to the firm's benefits of doing any personalization strategy. Moreover, the resulting upper bounds are elegant, tight, and, for some families of choice

models, only a constant factor away from the revenue of a TAOP firm.

The bounds also open possibilities to the development of new heuristics and to the study of the worst case performance of known heuristics. We show for instance that, under any latent-class MNL (LC-MNL) model, a clairvoyant firm cannot earn more than twice as much as a firm who personalize assortments for each consumer segment. We also find that the consumer’s surplus may be surprisingly larger under the clairvoyant firm than under the non-clairvoyant firm. This suggests that regulators need to be extremely carefully in regulating personalized assortments.

Our main contributions include the following:

- We provide easily computable upper and lower bounds for the TAOP and from these bounds derive heuristic and performance guarantees for constrained and unconstrained problems. These heuristics are quite general, run very fast, and fill a large void as little is known on how to handle problems with general TUM constraints. While our heuristics are not designed to compete with PTAS designed for sub-families of choice models and particular TUM constraints, they typically capture a large fraction of specialized heuristics and run much faster.
- We introduce clairvoyant firms as a limit of personalization in assortment optimization and show that the expected revenue of the clairvoyant firm that is at most twice the expected revenue of an auxiliary MNL with attraction vector equal to the last-choice probabilities of the underlying choice model.<sup>1</sup>
- We show that sequentially offering products may allow a TAOP firm to earn as much as the clairvoyant firm when consumers are patient and use a satisfying policy.
- We make a connection between the TAOP and the prophet inequality problem and show that it holds for independent value gaps, meaning that a TAOP firm can make at least half as much as the clairvoyant firm. This is true, for example, for the Random Consideration Set (RCS) model and for RUMS with independent utilities for which the utility of the no-purchase alternative is deterministic.
- We show that there is no hope for a full generalization of the prophet inequality to general discrete choice models as the ratio can be as large as the number of products for RUMs even when restricted to the class of Markov Chain models.

---

<sup>1</sup>The last-choice probability for product  $i$  is given by  $\omega_i = \mathcal{P}(i, \{i\}), i \in N$ , see Section 2.

- We establish sufficient conditions for the prophet inequality to hold and show that if  $\mathcal{P}(0, N) > 0$  and  $\mathcal{P}(i, N) \geq 1/k$  for every  $i \in N$  then the prophet cannot make more than  $k/2$  times the expected revenue of the TAOP.
- We introduce the  $\alpha$ -shaken MNL model a new variant of the MNL model that has  $2n$  parameters and includes the MNL and the generalized attraction model (GAM) as special cases.
- We show that prophet inequality holds for a large class of  $\alpha$ -MNL models, including the MNL and the GAM.
- We show that a revenue-order heuristic is optimal for the LC-MNL model when the coefficient of variation of all of the utilities go to infinity, and that in this case a stronger version of the prophet inequality holds with factor 1.5 instead of 2.
- Numerical experiments based on the latent-class MNL show that revenue-ordered heuristic performs well even when compared against the expected revenues of a clairvoyant firm.
- Our analysis shows that a clairvoyant firm does not necessarily hurts consumer surplus relative to a non-clairvoyant firm.
- Extensions to pricing show that a prophet-like inequality holds for the MNL with factor  $e \approx 2.71828$  instead of 2, with the difference stemming from the freedom of the clairvoyant firm to use prices that are different from those chosen by the TAOP firm.

## 1.1 Related literature

The literature on assortment optimization has increased dramatically during the last 15 years starting with the seminal paper of Talluri and Van Ryzin [2004] where the authors assume that consumer preferences can be described by an MNL model. Reviews of the subject can be found in Strauss et al. [2018], Den Boer [2015], and the recent book by Gallego and Topaloglu [2019]. The assortment optimization problem has been studied under different choice models (see, e.g. Blanchet et al. [2016] and Davis et al. [2014]). In addition, it has also been studied in different settings such as where the firm faces cardinality limitations on the offer sets and similar constraints (see e.g. Rusmevichientong et al. [2010], Désir et al. [2020], Sumida et al. [2021]) and in settings where inventory is limited (see e.g. Topaloglu [2009]). Recently, there has been an interest in understanding the limitations of traditional assortment optimization and assessing the benefits

of enlarging the possible actions taken by the firm such as using lotteries [Ma, 2022], reducing product utilities [Bereglia et al., 2021b], increasing product advertisement [Wang et al., 2021], and customizing the assortment offered (see e.g. Bernstein et al. [2015] and references in the following paragraph).

While the benefits of personalization has been recognized several decades ago (see, e.g. Surprenant and Solomon [1987]), it is only recently that researchers began to study personalized assortment optimization problems. In these problems, consumers are divided into types, and each type follows a discrete choice model that has residual uncertainty. The objective is to choose a (possibly) different assortment to offer to each segment to maximize expected revenues. One of the earliest works in personalized assortments was carried out by Bernstein et al. [2015] who studied a finite-horizon setting in which consumers follow a mixed MNL model, demand is stationary, and the seller is able to observe the segment class of the incoming consumer. In their model, all products have the same revenue, products are limited in inventory, and the seller must choose a personalized assortment at each period. The authors provide structural results about the optimal policy and develop some heuristics. Chan and Farias [2009] studies a framework of stochastic depletion processes that contains the previous model but allows non-stationary demand and different product prices and showed that a myopic policy guarantees at least half of the revenue of the optimal control policy. Golrezaei et al. [2014] also extended the model of Bernstein et al. [2015] to non-stationary demand and allowing different prices and proposed a personalized assortment policy that achieves 50 percent of the optimal revenue even against an adversarial chosen demand. The authors showed that the bound is tight. Gallego et al. [2015a] considers a similar model but allows for product revenues to be dependent on the consumer segments. The authors propose online algorithms to offer personalized assortments that guarantee a factor of  $(1 - \epsilon)$  of the optimal offline revenue (under complete information) where  $\epsilon$  is the error in computing an optimal solution to the choice based linear program (CDLP). Bernstein et al. [2019] proposes an exploration-exploitation framework to learn consumer preferences and personalize assortments under a finite-horizon. They develop a dynamic clustering estimation algorithm that maps customer segments to clusters. In a case study, the authors show that the clustering policy increased transactions by more than 37% with respect to learning and treating each consumer segment separately. Kallus and Udell [2020], who considers a similar framework, argues that the amount of data required to estimate a LC-MNL model is orders of magnitude larger than the data available in practice. To overcome this issue, they impose that the parameter matrix associated to the LC-MNL has a low rank and showed that the model

can be learned quickly. They also showed that an exploration-exploitation algorithm that is rank aware and does assortment personalization has much lower regret with respect to those who ignore the rank structure. Cheung and Simchi-Levi [2017] studies another exploration-exploitation setting in which each consumer follows its own MNL model according to their observable attributes. They develop a Thompson sampling based policy to personalize assortments and prove regret bounds with respect to the optimal policy. Jagabathula et al. [2020] developed algorithms to perform personalized promotions in real-time. The authors consider a choice model in which consumers have a partial order among the products which is combined with an MNL. They develop a MILP which, for an incoming consumer, would personalize the assortment of products offered at a fixed discounted price. Chen et al. [2021] consider a learning problem where a firm uses transactions to personalize prices or assortments. The authors developed a unified logit modeling framework in which products and consumers have a feature vector that lie in a multi-dimensional real space. The nominal value of a product to a given consumer is a linear function of the product and consumer features and the error terms follow a Gumbel distribution. They establish finite-sample convergence guarantees that are later traduced into out-of-sample performance bounds.

A personalized assortment may reveal private customer data about the consumer to third-parties. Recently, Lei et al. [2020] considers the personalized assortment optimization problem when the firm must ensure that the assortment policy doesn't reveal private information using the differential privacy framework [Dwork, 2006]. Berbeglia et al. [2021b] provides tight revenue guarantees on the performance of the well-known revenue-ordered assortment strategy with respect to the optimal personalized assortment solution. Their result holds for regular choice models (which includes all RUMs) and works even under *personalized refined assortment optimization* where the firm may reduce the product utilities to some consumer segments. El Housni and Topaloglu [2021] studies a two-stage personalized assortment optimization problem with capacity constraint under the LC-MNL model. In their model, consumers follow a LC-MNL and the firm is able to observe the segment of the incoming consumer to customize the final assortment offered. After proving that the problem is NP-hard, they developed an efficient algorithm that guarantees  $\Omega(\frac{1}{\log(m)})$ -fraction of the optimal revenue where  $m$  is the number of segments. We strengthen that result and show that the same revenue guarantee holds with respect to a clairvoyant firm (see Section 5.4). More recently, Udwani [2021] provided a  $(0.5-\epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for the same problem.

Many researchers have studied settings where the firm can customize product prices. One key advantage of a personalized assortment policy with respect to personalized pricing is that

it is easier to implement as there is no need to calibrate a price-aware discrete choice model. In addition, personalized pricing is sometimes banned by law<sup>2</sup> and it is generally perceived as an unfair practice [Haws and Bearden, 2006]. A personalized assortment strategy can better deal with those issues. For instance, a firm doing personalized assortments may simply personalize the products that appear at a prominent position (e.g. in the first page of results) but allow all consumers see the same set of products if they keep browsing down. Although the offer set is actually the same for all consumers, this policy has a similar effect in consumers as personalized assortments [Abeliuk et al., 2016, Gallego et al., 2020, Aouad and Segev, 2021, Berbeglia et al., 2021a]. The reader interested in personalized pricing is referred to Elmachoub et al. [2021], Chen et al. [2020] and Gallego and Berbeglia [2021] and references therein. In Section 6.4 we prove that; under the MNL model; a clairvoyant firm who can customize product prices to each consumer can extract up to  $e \simeq 2.718$  times more revenue with respect to the firm who must set the same prices to each consumer.

## 2 MNL bounds for the TAOP and constrained TAOP

In this section we will briefly review the traditional assortment optimization problem (TAOP) and provide lower and upper bounds on the optimal expected revenue for all regular discrete choice models for the unconstrained assortment optimization problem as well as some bounds for the constrained TAOP. These bounds are based on auxiliary MNL models.

Let  $N = [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$  denote a set of products that the firm can potentially offer to consumers, and let 0 represent the outside alternative that is assumed to be always available. Under a discrete choice model  $\mathcal{P}$ , if the firm offers assortment  $S \subset N$  an arriving consumer selects an alternative in  $S_+ := S \cup \{0\}$  with probability  $\mathcal{P}(i, S), i \in N_+$  with the property that  $\sum_{i \in S_+} \mathcal{P}(i, S) = 1$  for all  $S \subset N$ .

A discrete choice model is a random utility model (RUM) if

$$\mathcal{P}(i, S) := \Pr(U_i \geq U_j \ \forall j \in S_+), \quad i \in S_+, \quad S \subset N$$

for some random utilities  $U_i, i \in N_+$ . RUMs can be also characterized by a distribution over preference ordering [Block and Marschak, 1960]. In that setting, an arriving consumer draws a preference ordering and identifies the highest ranked product that is being offered. If that product

---

<sup>2</sup>For example, Tinder settled a class action lawsuit for \$17.3 million for charging higher prices to people over 30 years old. URL: <https://www.theverge.com/2019/1/25/18197575/tinder-plus-age-discrimination-lawsuit-settlement-super-likes>

ranks higher than the outside alternative, the product is purchased. Otherwise the consumer selects the outside alternative. A discrete choice model is regular if  $\mathcal{P}(i, S)$  is decreasing<sup>3</sup> in  $S$ . All RUMs are regular discrete choice models [McFadden and Richter, 1990].

Let  $r_i$  be the unit revenue associated with the sale of one unit of product  $i \in N$ . Without loss of generality, we will assume that each product has a unit cost of zero, so  $r_i$  can also be interpreted as the unit profit of product  $i$ . We assume without loss of generality that the products are sorted in decreasing order of their revenues, so  $r_1 \geq \dots \geq r_n > 0$ . For convenience we also define  $r_0 := 0$ . For any discrete choice model  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $r = (r_i)_{i \in N}$ , the expected revenue associated with assortment  $S$  is given by

$$R(S) := \sum_{i \in S} r_i \mathcal{P}(i, S) \quad S \subset N.$$

The problem of finding an assortment to maximize  $\mathcal{R}(S)$  is known as the traditional assortment optimization problem (TAOP). We call a firm that faces the TAOP, a TAOP-firm. We will denote the optimal expected revenue by

$$\mathcal{R}^* := \max_{S \subset N} R(S)$$

and an optimal assortment by  $S^* \in \arg \max_S R(S)$ . The TAOP is NP-hard<sup>4</sup> although polynomial algorithms exist for some important subfamilies. As the TAOP is NP-hard, a reasonable heuristic is to limit the firm's offerings to the class of revenue-ordered assortments. These are of the form  $S(\tau) := \{i \in N : r_i > \tau\}$ ; we denote by  $\mathcal{R}^o := \max_{\tau > 0} R(S(\tau))$  the optimal expected revenue among this class. Given our sorting convention, a revenue-ordered assortment is of the form  $S_i := [i]$  for some  $i \in N$ . An optimal revenue-ordered assortment can be found in  $O(n)$  time by maximizing over  $R(S_i), i \in N$ . Performance guarantees for the revenue-ordered assortment can be found in Rusmevichientong et al. [2014], Berbeglia and Joret [2020] and Berbeglia et al. [2021b].

Assortment managers often face constraints on the assortments they can offer. These constraints typically satisfy the total unimodularity (TUM) property. Examples include cardinality constraints that require that the offered assortment is  $S = A \cup B$  where  $A \subset C$ ,  $B \subset D$ ,  $|A| \leq c_a$  and  $|B| \leq c_b$ . Precedence constraints, where product  $i$  can only be offered if product  $j$  is also offered are also TUM. We refer to the TAOP under TUM constraints as the  $k$ -TAOP problem. Let  $S^k$  and  $\mathcal{R}^k = R(S^k)$  be, respectively, an optimal solution and the corresponding optimal expected revenue for the  $k$ -TAOP. For most discrete choice models finding  $S^k$  is NP-hard even when finding an optimal unconstrained

---

<sup>3</sup>We use the term increasing and decreasing in the weak sense unless stated otherwise.

<sup>4</sup>In fact, for general RUMs it is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard to approximate TAOP to within a factor of  $\Omega(1/n^{1-\epsilon})$  for every  $\epsilon > 0$  [Aouad et al., 2018].



assortment is not. As an example, the unconstrained TAOP can be solved by linear programming for the Markov Chain model but the problem becomes NP-hard when a cardinality constraints is added [Désir et al., 2020].

The multinomial logit (MNL) model is a RUM that will play a central role in this paper as an auxiliary model to develop bounds and heuristics for regular discrete choice models. In an MNL model, the random utilities

$$U_i = u_i + \epsilon_i, i \in N_+$$

are assumed to be independent Gumbel random variables with a common scale parameter, typically normalized to one, and location parameters  $u_i, i \in N$  with  $u_0 := 0$ . Let  $v_i := \exp(u_i), i \in N_+$  and let  $v = (v_i)_{i \in N}$  be the vector of the products' attraction values. We will use the notation  $\mathcal{M}(i, S)$  to denote the choice probabilities under the MNL. These probabilities are given by

$$\mathcal{M}(i, S) := \frac{v_i}{1 + V(S)} \quad i \in S_+, \quad S \subset N$$

where for any  $S \subset N$ ,  $V(S) := \sum_{j \in S} v_j$ . We will write  $\mathcal{M}_v(i, S)$  and  $R_v(S) := \sum_{i \in S} r_i \mathcal{M}_v(i, S)$  when we need to emphasize the dependence of these quantities on the attraction vector  $v$ , and define

$$\mathcal{R}_v^* := \max_{S \subset N} R_v(S).$$

It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{R}_v^*$  is increasing in  $v$ . The revenue-ordered assortment

$$S_v^* := \{i \in N : r_i > \mathcal{R}_v^*\}$$

is known to be an optimal assortment for the MNL, and  $\mathcal{R}_v^*$  is known to be the unique root of the equation  $\sum_{i \in N} v_i(r_i - \tau)^+ = \tau$  (see, e.g. Gallego and Topaloglu [2019]). For the MNL model, the  $k$ -TAOP problem under TUM constraints can be found by solving a linear programming [Sumida et al., 2021].

For any regular choice model  $\mathcal{P}$  and any  $S$  such that  $\mathcal{P}(0, S) > 0$  we define the odds ratio

$$\mathcal{O}(i, S) := \mathcal{P}(i, S) / \mathcal{P}(0, S) \quad \forall \quad i \in S.$$

Notice that for an MNL with attraction vector  $v$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(i, S) = v_i$  for all  $S \ni i$ . We now introduce notation to develop bounds on  $\mathcal{O}(i, S)$ . For any regular choice model  $\mathcal{P}$ , let

$$\lambda_i : = \mathcal{P}(i, N) \quad i \in N \tag{1}$$

$$\omega_i : = \mathcal{P}(i, \{i\}) \quad i \in N. \tag{2}$$

Let  $\lambda := (\lambda_i)_{i \in N}$  be the vector of first-choice probabilities, and  $\omega := (\omega_i)_{i \in N}$  be the vector of last-choice probabilities. The notion of first-choice probabilities was introduced in Blanchet et al. [2016] as an input for the Markov Chain model. The notion of the last-choice probabilities is introduced here for the first time and will play an important role in the development of bounds and heuristics.

We will assume that  $\lambda_0 := \mathcal{P}(0, N) > 0$ , so there is a positive probability that an arriving consumer will walk away without purchasing. By regularity  $\mathcal{P}(0, S) \geq \mathcal{P}(0, N) > 0$  so all of the odds ratios are well defined under the assumption that  $\lambda_0 > 0$ . Moreover,  $1 - \omega_i = \mathcal{P}(0, \{i\}) \geq \lambda_0 > 0$  shows that the last-choice probabilities are bounded away from one. Let  $a$  and  $b$  be vectors with components

$$a_i := \lambda_i / (1 - \omega_i) \quad \text{and} \quad b_i := \omega_i / \lambda_0 \quad \forall \quad i \in N. \quad (3)$$

Notice that  $a$  and  $b$  are well defined for regular choice models under the assumption that  $\lambda_0 > 0$ . We can think of  $a \geq \lambda$  as a vector of modified first-choice probabilities and of  $b$  as a vector of modified last-choice probabilities. The vectors  $a$  and  $b$  will play an important role in bounding the odds ratio  $\mathcal{O}(i, S)$  of product  $i \in S$  relative to the outside alternative. Let  $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^*, \mathcal{R}_a^*, \mathcal{R}_\omega^*$  and  $\mathcal{R}_b^*$  be, respectively, the optimal expected revenues associated with auxiliary MNL models with attraction vectors  $\lambda, a, \omega$  and  $b$ , and recall that  $\mathcal{R}^* = \max_{S \subset N} R(S)$  is the optimal expected revenue for the underlying regular choice model  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Theorem 1.** *For all regular choice models with  $\mathcal{P}(0, N) > 0$ ,*

$$a_i \leq \mathcal{O}(i, S) \leq b_i \quad \forall \quad i \in N \quad \forall \quad S \subset N, S \ni i \quad (4)$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_\lambda^* \leq \mathcal{R}_a^* \leq \mathcal{R}^o \leq \mathcal{R}^* \leq \mathcal{R}_b^* \leq \frac{\mathcal{R}_\omega^*}{\lambda_0}. \quad (5)$$

*Proof.* By regularity,

$$\mathcal{O}(i, S) = \frac{\mathcal{P}(i, S)}{\mathcal{P}(0, S)} \geq \frac{\mathcal{P}(i, S)}{\mathcal{P}(0, \{i\})} \geq \frac{\mathcal{P}(i, N)}{\mathcal{P}(0, \{i\})} = \frac{\lambda_i}{1 - \omega_i} = a_i$$

holds for all  $S$  containing  $i$ . Similarly,

$$\mathcal{O}(i, S) = \frac{\mathcal{P}(i, S)}{\mathcal{P}(0, S)} \leq \frac{\mathcal{P}(i, \{i\})}{\mathcal{P}(0, S)} \leq \frac{\mathcal{P}(i, \{i\})}{\mathcal{P}(0, N)} = \frac{\omega_i}{\lambda_0} = b_i$$

holds for all  $S$  containing  $i$ , so (4) holds.

As  $\mathcal{R}_a^*$  is the root of the equation  $\sum_{i \in N} a_i(r_i - \tau)^+ = \tau$  and  $S_a^* = \{i \in N : r_i > \mathcal{R}_a^*\}$  is an optimal assortment for model  $\mathcal{M}_a$ . It follows that

$$\sum_{i \in S_a^*} (r_i - \mathcal{R}_a^*) \mathcal{P}(i, S_a^*) \geq \mathcal{P}(0, S_a^*) \sum_{i \in S_a^*} a_i(r_i - \mathcal{R}_a^*) = \mathcal{P}(0, S_a^*) \mathcal{R}_a^*.$$

Moving the terms  $\sum_{i \in S_a^*} \mathcal{R}_a^* \mathcal{P}(i, S_a^*)$  to the right, adding and collecting terms results in

$$R(S_a^*) = \sum_{i \in S_a^*} r_i \mathcal{P}(i, S_a^*) \geq \mathcal{R}_a^*.$$

Consequently

$$\mathcal{R}^* = \max_{S \subseteq N} R(S) \geq R(S_a^*) \geq \mathcal{R}_a^*$$

as claimed. Since  $S_a^*$  is a revenue ordered assortment, it follows that  $\mathcal{R}_a^* \leq \mathcal{R}^o \leq \mathcal{R}^*$ . Moreover, since  $\mathcal{R}_v^*$  is increasing in  $v$  and  $\lambda \leq a$  it follows that  $\mathcal{R}_\lambda^* \leq \mathcal{R}_a^*$ .

Now suppose that  $S^* = \arg \max_{S \subseteq N} R(S)$ . Then,

$$[\mathcal{P}(0, S^*) + \sum_{i \in S^*} \mathcal{P}(i, S^*)] \mathcal{R}^* = \mathcal{R}^* = \sum_{i \in S^*} r_i \mathcal{P}(i, S^*).$$

Subtracting  $\sum_{i \in S^*} \mathcal{P}(i, S^*) \mathcal{R}^*$  from both sides and dividing by  $\mathcal{P}(0, S^*)$  yields

$$\mathcal{R}^* = \sum_{i \in S^*} (r_i - \mathcal{R}^*) \mathcal{O}(i, S^*).$$

The right hand side of  $\mathcal{R}^*$  may have non-positive terms, so an upper bound can be obtained by taking only the positive terms. Consequently,

$$\mathcal{R}^* \leq \sum_{i \in S^*} (r_i - \mathcal{R}^*)^+ \mathcal{O}(i, S) \leq \sum_{i \in S^*} (r_i - \mathcal{R}^*)^+ b_i \leq \sum_{i \in N} b_i (r_i - \mathcal{R}^*)^+$$

where the second inequality follows from (4), and the third by adding over all  $N$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{R}^* \leq \sum_{i \in N} b_i (r_i - \mathcal{R}^*)^+$  so  $\mathcal{R}^*$  is to the left of the root,  $\mathcal{R}_b^*$ , of  $\tau = \sum_{i \in N} b_i (r_i - \tau)^+$ , implying that  $\mathcal{R}^* \leq \mathcal{R}_b^*$  as claimed.

Notice that  $\omega = \lambda_0 b$ , so

$$\lambda_0 \mathcal{R}_b^* = \sum_{i \in S_b^*} \frac{r_i \lambda_0 b_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_b^*} b_i} \leq \sum_{i \in S_b^*} \frac{r_i \omega_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_b^*} \omega_i} = R_\omega(S_b^*) \leq \mathcal{R}_\omega^*$$

where the first inequality follows since  $\omega_i \leq b_i$  for all  $i \in N$  and the second since  $S_b^*$  is a heuristic for the problem of maximizing  $R_\omega(S)$ . Consequently,

$$\mathcal{R}_b^* \leq \frac{\mathcal{R}_\omega^*}{\lambda_0}.$$

□

The bounds from Theorem 1 suggest heuristics for the  $k$ -TAOP. Indeed, the  $k$ -TAOP can be solved by linear programming for any auxiliary MNL model with attraction vector  $x$  resulting in

an optimal solution, say  $S_x^k$ , for the  $k$ -TAOP for MNL- $x$ . Then  $S_x^k$  can be used as a heuristic for the original  $\mathcal{P}$  resulting in expected revenues  $R(S_x^k)$ . Candidates for  $x$  include  $\lambda, a, \omega$  and  $b$ . We can think of  $S_\lambda^k$  as the first-choice heuristic, and of  $S_a^k$  as a modified first-choice heuristic. Similarly  $S_\omega^k$  and  $S_b^k$  are the last-choice and modified last-choice heuristics. We tested numerically the four heuristics in a series of LC-MNL instances constructed following the methodology used in Désir et al. [2020]. For each value of  $n = \{10, 12, 14, 16, 18\}$  and  $m = \{2, 4, 8, 16, 32\}$ , we created 50 instances of  $n$  products and  $m$  segments. The maximum cardinality allowed is set to  $\lceil n/3 \rceil$ . Figure 1 reports the performance of the heuristic assortment  $S_x^k$  for  $x \in \{a, \lambda, \omega, b\}$  as a percentage of the optimal revenue. As one can observe, these heuristics perform quite well, with  $S_a^k$  performing better on average than the other heuristics, although in some particular instances the other heuristics can do better.

First Choice Heuristic						Last Choice Heuristic					
n=10 n=12 n=14 n=16 n=18	99.7%	99.1%	98.3%	98.1%	97.4%	n=10	98.6%	98.7%	96.9%	97.6%	97.1%
	98.7%	98.0%	98.2%	97.3%	97.6%	n=12	96.7%	97.5%	97.1%	96.2%	97.4%
	99.5%	96.7%	97.4%	97.7%	96.7%	n=14	98.6%	95.1%	96.0%	96.0%	96.0%
	98.1%	98.1%	98.0%	95.5%	95.7%	n=16	96.3%	96.6%	96.1%	94.3%	94.5%
	98.5%	97.7%	96.5%	96.1%	95.7%	n=18	94.1%	96.1%	94.5%	95.1%	95.4%
	m=2	m=4	m=8	m=16	m=32		m=2	m=4	m=8	m=16	m=32
Adapted First Choice Heuristic						Adapted Last Choice Heuristic					
n=10 n=12 n=14 n=16 n=18	99.7%	99.3%	99.1%	98.8%	98.2%	n=10	95.1%	97.4%	96.1%	95.6%	95.6%
	98.9%	98.3%	98.4%	97.9%	98.1%	n=12	91.5%	95.0%	94.6%	94.5%	96.7%
	99.0%	98.5%	98.0%	98.6%	98.3%	n=14	94.0%	93.5%	93.8%	93.8%	95.5%
	99.5%	98.3%	98.6%	97.1%	97.2%	n=16	89.5%	90.3%	92.8%	92.1%	93.6%
	99.2%	98.7%	97.3%	97.7%	97.4%	n=18	88.0%	89.5%	89.1%	92.1%	94.3%
	m=2	m=4	m=8	m=16	m=32		m=2	m=4	m=8	m=16	m=32

Figure 1: Performance of the four heuristics for cardinality constrained TAOP as a percentage of optimal value under the LC-MNL model. For each value of  $n$  and  $m$ , we performed 50 experiments.

Since the heuristics  $S_x^k, x \in \{a, b, \lambda, \omega\}$  can be computed very rapidly, it makes sense to define an aggregated heuristic called Max-H which consists of solving each of the four mentioned heuristics and selecting the best assortment. Let  $\mathcal{R}_x^k = \max\{R(S_a^k), R(S_b^k), R(S_\lambda^k), R(S_\omega^k)\}$  denote the expected revenue of Max-H. A natural alternative to our Max-H for the LC-MNL is to use yet another MNL based on the average of the attractiveness over the market segments. More precisely, if  $v_{ij}$  is the

attraction value of product  $i \in N$  in segment  $j$ , and  $\theta_j$  is the weight of segment  $j \in M$ , then we can use  $v_i = \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j v_{ij}$  and then solve the constrained problem for  $\mathcal{M}_v$  and obtain expected revenue  $R(S_v^k)$  against which to compare more sophisticated heuristics as proposed in [Désir et al., 2020]. To see whether there is any benefit of using our Max-H instead  $S_v^k$ , we computed the Captured Opportunity Gap (COP) defined as  $\text{COP} := \frac{\mathcal{R}^k - R(S_v^k)}{\mathcal{R}^k - R(S_v^k)}$  where  $\mathcal{R}^k$  is the optimal revenue of the  $k$ -TAOP. Figure 2 reports the performance of the Max-H (left) and the average COP out of those instances in which  $R(S_v^k)$  is more than 5 percent away from  $\mathcal{R}^k$ . Our numerical results suggest that the Max-H is consistently but marginally better than the adapted first choice heuristic capturing at least 97.5% of the revenue of  $\mathcal{R}^k$ , and substantially closes the gap when  $R(S_v^k)$  underperforms  $\mathcal{R}^k$  by more than 5%.

Max heuristic						Captured Opportunity Gap (COG)					
n=10 n=12 n=14 n=16 n=18	99.9%	99.6%	99.3%	98.9%	98.7%	n=10 n=12 n=14 n=16 n=18	100.0%	91.8%	82.1%	75.7%	76.4%
	99.2%	99.0%	98.6%	98.2%	98.2%		69.2%	66.4%	67.2%	71.4%	55.4%
	99.7%	98.7%	98.2%	98.8%	98.6%		90.0%	73.3%	64.4%	74.8%	76.3%
	99.8%	98.9%	98.7%	97.1%	97.3%		92.5%	74.1%	75.0%	62.0%	59.0%
	99.7%	99.1%	97.8%	97.8%	97.5%		92.5%	89.0%	67.6%	58.0%	58.9%
	m=2	m=4	m=8	m=16	m=32		m=2	m=4	m=8	m=16	m=32

Figure 2: Left figure displays the performance of the best heuristic as a percentage of optimal value under the LC-MNL instances for cardinality constrained TAOP. Right figure shows the Captured Opportunity Gap of the Max-H.

Knowing that  $\mathcal{R}_a^* \leq \mathcal{R}^* \leq \mathcal{R}_b^*$ , begs the question of whether or not the following inequalities hold:

$$\mathcal{R}_a^k \leq \mathcal{R}^k \leq \mathcal{R}_b^k. \quad (6)$$

Unfortunately the bounds (6) do not hold for all TUM constraints, but they do hold under mild additional conditions. To show the precise conditions we need some preliminary technical results. With slight abuse of notation we define

$$R_b^*(S) := \max_{T \subset S} R_b(T).$$

As  $S$  increases, the optimization is carried over a larger space of assortments implying that  $R_b^*(S)$  is increasing in  $S$ . Notice that our earlier definition  $\mathcal{R}_b^* := \max_{S \subset N} R_b(S)$  is just short-hand

notation to the more cumbersome  $\mathcal{R}_b^*(N)$ .

Let  $T(S) \in \arg \max_{T \subset S} R_b(T)$ , then  $R_b^*(S) = R_b(T(S))$ . The next Lemma shows that an upper bound on  $R(S)$  is not directly  $R_b(S)$  but  $R_b(T(S))$ .

**Lemma 1.** *For any choice model  $\mathcal{P}$  with  $\mathcal{P}(0, N) > 0$ ,*

$$R(S) = \sum_{i \in S} (r_i - R(S)) \mathcal{O}(i, S) \quad \forall \quad S \subset N. \quad (7)$$

*Moreover, for any regular choice model there is a subset  $T(S) \subset S$  such that*

$$R(S) \leq R_b(T(S)).$$

*Proof.* For any choice model  $\mathcal{P}$ , and any  $S \subset N$ , notice that

$$[\mathcal{P}(0, S) + \sum_{i \in S} \mathcal{P}(i, S)] R(S) = \sum_{i \in S} r_i \mathcal{P}(i, S).$$

Subtracting  $\sum_{i \in S} \mathcal{P}(i, S) R(S)$  from both sides and dividing by  $\mathcal{P}(0, S) > 0$  yields (7). Consequently,

$$R(S) = \sum_{i \in S} (r_i - R(S)) \mathcal{O}(i, S) \leq \sum_{i \in S} (r_i - R(S))^+ b_i,$$

This shows that  $R(S)$  is to the left of the root, of the equation  $\tau = \sum_{i \in S} (r_i - \tau)^+ b_i$ , which is precisely  $\mathcal{R}_b^*(S)$ . Let  $T(S) = \arg \max_{T \subset S} R_b(T)$ , then

$$R(S) \leq \mathcal{R}_b^*(S) = R_b(T(S))$$

as claimed. □

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose that  $S^k$  is an optimal solution to the  $k$ -TAOP. If  $T(S^k)$  satisfies the TUM constraints then*

$$\mathcal{R}^k \leq \mathcal{R}_b^k.$$

*Proof.* Clearly

$$\mathcal{R}^k = R(S^k) \leq R_b^*(S^k) = R_b(T(S^k)) \leq \mathcal{R}_b^k,$$

where the first inequality follows from (7), and the second since  $T(S^k)$  is a feasible solution to the optimization problem  $\mathcal{R}_b^k := \max R_b(S)$  over the collection of assortments that satisfy the TUM constraints. □

Lemma 1, and Proposition 1 are very general. The limitation to regular choice model applies only to  $a$  and  $b$  defined through (3). More generally, they also hold for any positive vectors  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $a_i < \mathcal{O}(i, S) < b_i$  for all  $i \in N$  even if the model is not regular.

The condition of Proposition 1 may be difficult to check directly if  $S^k$  is unknown. To overcome this limitation we may use a stronger sufficient condition, namely that if  $S$  is a feasible solution for the  $k$ -TUM then so are subsets of  $S$ . If this holds, then we know that  $T(S^k)$  is feasible even if we do not know  $S^k$ . Subsets of feasible assortments remain feasible for some TUM constraints, but not all. In particular, subsets of feasible sets are feasible for cardinality constraints but may fail to be feasible under precedence constraints where removing a product may render a subset of  $S^k$  infeasible.

The next results shows sufficient conditions for  $R_a(S) \leq R(S)$  and  $\mathcal{R}_a^k \leq \mathcal{R}^k$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $S$  be a subset such  $r_i \geq R_a(S)$  for all  $i \in S$ . Then  $R_a(S) \leq R(S)$ . Moreover, if all subsets of  $S_a^k$  satisfy the TUM constraints, then  $\mathcal{R}_a^k \leq \mathcal{R}^k$ .*

*Proof.* From (7) we have

$$R_a(S) = \sum_{i \in S} (r_i - R_a(S))a_i,$$

and by assumption all of terms are non-negative. Consequently,

$$R_a(S) = \sum_{i \in S} (r_i - R_a(S))a_i \leq \sum_{i \in S} (r_i - R_a(S))\mathcal{O}(i, S).$$

Multiplying by  $\mathcal{P}(0, S)$  and rearranging terms we obtain

$$R_a(S) = R_a(S)\mathcal{P}(0, S) + \sum_{i \in S} R_a(S)\mathcal{P}(i, S) \leq \sum_{i \in S} r_i\mathcal{P}(i, S) = R(S).$$

Let  $S_a^k$  be an optimal solution for the  $k$ -TAOP for  $\mathcal{M}_a$ . Then  $\mathcal{R}_a^k$  is the root of the equation

$$\sum_{i \in S_a^k} a_i(r_i - \tau) = \tau = \sum_{i \in S_a^k} a_i(r_i - \tau)^+$$

where the second equality follows because if  $r_i < R_a(S_a^k)$  for some  $i \in S_a^k$  then a higher expected revenue could be obtained by removing  $i$  from  $S_a^k$  while remaining feasible contradicting the optimality of  $S_a^k$ . Therefore  $r_i - R_a(S_a^k) \geq 0$  for all  $i \in S_a^k$  and by the first part of this proposition we have

$$\mathcal{R}_a^k = R_a(S_a^k) \leq R(S_a^k) \leq R(S^k) = \mathcal{R}^k$$

completing the proof. □

We summarize the results in the following theorem

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $S_a^k, S^k$  and  $S_b^k$  be, respectively, optimal solutions for the  $k$ -TAOP problem. If all subsets of  $S^k$  and  $S_a^k$  are also feasible for the TUM constraints, then*

$$\mathcal{R}_a^k \leq \mathcal{R}^k \leq \mathcal{R}_b^k.$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}(S_a^k)}{\mathcal{R}^k} \leq \frac{\mathcal{R}_b^k}{\mathcal{R}_a^k}$$

provides a performance guarantee for the heuristic  $S_a^k$ .

*Proof.* The proof of the lower bound follows from Proposition 2. The upper bound follows from Proposition 1. Consider now  $S_a^k$  as a heuristic. Then

$$\mathcal{R}_a^k \leq R(S_a^k) \leq \mathcal{R}^k \leq \mathcal{R}_b^k.$$

Dividing by  $\mathcal{R}_a^k$  we obtain

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}^k}{R(S_a^k)} \leq \frac{\mathcal{R}_b^k}{\mathcal{R}_a^k}.$$

□

Based on the same instances, Figure 3 reports the average theoretical guarantees resulting from Theorem 2 for the adapted first choice heuristic. Although these theoretical guarantees are lower than the actual effectiveness reported in Figure 2, they have the advantage that do not require to solve the optimal constrained TAOP for the LC-MNL instances and can be computed easily even in scenarios where the number of products is very large.

Theoretical Guarantee for Adapted First Choice Heuristic

n=10	50.2%	53.1%	51.1%	49.0%	48.1%
n=12	52.1%	48.1%	48.0%	47.5%	46.6%
n=14	44.3%	48.9%	45.1%	44.0%	42.7%
n=16	47.2%	46.9%	43.5%	43.7%	43.1%
n=18	47.8%	46.1%	44.8%	43.8%	42.1%
	m=2	m=4	m=8	m=16	m=32

Figure 3: Average theoretical revenue guarantee for the adapted-first choice heuristic based on Theorem 2.



### 3 Clairvoyant Firms

In this section we study the limits of personalization by modeling a clairvoyant firm that knows which products an arriving consumer is willing to buy. This allows the firm to tailor the assortment to extract as much revenue as possible from each consumer. Clearly, the revenue obtained by a clairvoyant firm is an upper bound on the maximum revenue a firm can achieve by doing assortment personalization regardless of how sophisticated such personalization is. After formally introducing the clairvoyant firm, we will provide a mathematical expression for the expected revenue of the clairvoyant firm and an upper bound on its expected revenue based on an auxiliary  $\mathcal{M}_\omega$  model.

Let  $B_i$  be a Bernoulli random variable taking value one with probability  $\omega_i = \mathcal{P}(i, \{i\})$ ,  $i \in N$  and value zero with probability  $1 - \omega_i$ . Then  $B_i$  is an indicator variable of whether or not product  $i$  would be purchased if offered by itself. For RUMs,  $B_i$  is the indicator of the value gap  $U_i - U_0$ , so  $B_i = 1$  if  $U_i - U_0 \geq 0$  and 0 otherwise. This shows that for RUMs the  $B_i, i \in N$  may be positively correlated through  $U_0$  even if the  $U_i, i \in N$  are independent.

We say that a firm is clairvoyant if it is able to observe the  $B_i, i \in N$  for every consumer. The clairvoyant firm then knows  $X_i = r_i B_i, i \in N$  and can obtain random revenue  $\max_{i \in N} X_i$  by offering the consumer the highest revenue product that she is willing to buy. More precisely, if  $\sum_{i \in N} B_i \geq 1$ , then the clairvoyant firm offers product  $I(B) := \min\{i \in N : B_i = 1\}$ . For convenience we set  $I(B) := 0$  when  $\sum_{i \in N} B_i = 0$ . Then the expected clairvoyant revenue is given by,

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} = E[\max_{i \in N} X_i] = E[r_{i(B)}] = \sum_{i \in N} r_i \Pr(I(B) = i) \quad (8)$$

and

$$\Pr(I(B) = i) = \Pr\left(\sum_{j \in N, j < i} B_j = 0, B_i = 1\right) \quad i \in N,$$

where for convenience we treat the sums over empty sets as zero.

For the MNL model with attraction vector  $v$ , the clairvoyant firm makes

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{R}}_v &= \sum_{i \in N} r_i \Pr(I(B) = i) \\ &= \sum_{i \in N} r_i \mathcal{M}_v(0, S_{i-1}) \mathcal{M}_v(i, S_i) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from a result in Beggs and Cardell (1981),  $S_i := [i]$  for  $i \in N$  and  $S_0 = \emptyset$ .

Clearly  $\mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}}$  and a great deal of attention in this paper is to understand how large the gap can be between these two quantities. The following upper bound on  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  uses the last choice probabilities  $\omega_i, i \in N$  given by equation (2), and the optimal expected revenue, say  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$ , of an auxiliary MNL model with attraction vector  $\omega$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be any discrete choice model with  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = E[\max_{i \in N} X_i]$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}_\omega^*.$$

*Proof.* Notice that  $(X_i - \tau)^+ = (r_i B_i - \tau)^+ = B_i(r_i - \tau)^+$ . It follows that  $E[(r_i B_i - \tau)^+] = \omega_i(r_i - \tau)^+$  for all  $i \in N$ , so by the Lai-Robbins upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{R}} &= E[\max_{i \in N} X_i] \\ &\leq \tau + \sum_{i \in N} E[(X_i - \tau)^+] \\ &= \tau + \sum_{i \in N} \omega_i(r_i - \tau)^+ \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$  is the root of the equation  $\sum_{i \in N} \omega_i(r_i - \tau)^+ = \tau$ , we have

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq \mathcal{R}_\omega^* + \sum_{i \in N} \omega_i(r_i - \mathcal{R}_\omega^*)^+ = 2\mathcal{R}_\omega^*.$$

□

We remark that Theorem 3 holds for all RUMs and implies that the TAOP revenue  $\mathcal{R}^*$  is bounded above  $2\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$ . This new bound improves on our earlier bound  $\mathcal{R}^* \leq \mathcal{R}_\omega^*/\lambda_0$  when  $\lambda_0 < 0.5$ .

It is natural to ask how much more can a clairvoyant firm make relative to a TAOP firm that does not personalize assortments and whether there are instances where a TAOP firm can earn  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  without personalizing assortments. The next two results answer these questions.

**Theorem 4.** *For all regular choice models*

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq n\mathcal{R}^o \leq n\mathcal{R}^* \tag{9}$$

*Moreover, the upper bound is tight even within the class of Markov chain models.*

It is interesting to contrast the factor  $n$  gap between  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  and  $\mathcal{R}^*$  within the class of Markov chain models with a recent result in Ma [2022]. That paper studies how much can a firm increase its expected revenue relative to TAOP by allowing certain products to be only available through

lotteries. While the gap can be arbitrarily large for RUMs, it was shown that the firm cannot increase their revenue using lotteries with respect to TAOP when consumers follow the Markov chain choice model.

A consumer is said to follow a satisfying policy, see [Gao et al., 2021], if she makes a purchase as soon as she sees a product that is preferred to the outside alternative. A consumer that follows a satisfying policy is said to be persistent if she continues examining products until she either finds a satisfying product or exhausts the product list.

**Proposition 3.** *A non-clairvoyant firm can earn  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  by offering products sequentially, from high-to-low revenues, to consumers who follow a persistent-satisfying policy.*

*Proof.* Suppose that the firm offers the products one-by-one in the order  $1, 2, \dots, n$  to consumers that follow a persistent-satisfying search policy. Then the consumer would buy product  $I(B)$  and the firm will earn  $r_{I(B)}$ . In expectation, the firm earns  $E[r_{I(B)}] = \bar{\mathcal{R}}$ .  $\square$

We remark that a firm with consumers that follow a persistent-satisfying policy can earn  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  without even knowing the specific form of the discrete choice model or its underlying parameters. An interesting question is to examine the expected revenue that a firm can earn from consumers that follow a satisfying policy but have patience level  $k < n$ , so they abandon the system after seeing  $k$  products if none of them is satisfying. The problem is combinatorial and requires finding an assortment of cardinality  $k$ . Once the assortment of size  $k$  is found, it is optimal to offer it in decreasing order of revenues. Let  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_k$  be the optimal expected revenue that can be obtained from satisfying consumers with patience level  $k$ . It can be shown that  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_k/k$  is decreasing in  $k$  for all regular choice models, so  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_k \geq k\bar{\mathcal{R}}/n$  for all RUMs, see Gallego et al. [2022]. Moreover,  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_k$  is at least as large as that of solving the TAOP with cardinality constraint  $|S| \leq k$ .

### 3.1 Clairvoyant Firms and the Basic Prophet Inequality

In this section we will highlight interesting the connection between the assortment optimization problem and the classical prophet problem (see, e.g. Lucier [2017]). In the prophet problem, the rewards  $X_i$  are non-negative independent random variables, and the decision maker sees the  $X_i$ 's, one at a time, in a given order, say  $\sigma(i)$   $i \in N$ , where  $\sigma$  is a permutation of  $N$ . Upon observing  $X_{\sigma(i)}$  she decides whether to take the reward  $X_{\sigma(i)}$  or move on to product  $\sigma(i+1)$  without recourse. The problem is to compare the expected reward of the decision maker to a prophet that knows the realized values of the  $X_i, i \in N$  and earns  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = E[\max_{i \in N} X_i]$  in expectation. Krenzel and

Sucheston (1978, 1977) show that there exists a heuristic for the decision maker that yields at least half of  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  in expectation. The heuristic is in the form of a threshold policy, where the decision maker selects the first product with reward exceeding the threshold.

Notice that both clairvoyant firm and the prophet earn  $E[\max_{i \in N} X_i]$ . One difference between the two problems is that for the clairvoyant firm the  $X_i$ s are in general positively dependent random variables, while they are independent for the prophet problem. In addition, in the clairvoyant problem the  $X_i$ s can only take values in  $\{0, r_i\}$ , whereas in the prophet problem the  $X_i$ s do not have this restriction. There is also a parallel between the TAOP firm and the decision maker in the prophet problem. The main difference is that the TAOP firm decides the assortment and consumer select a product in the assortment or the outside alternative, whereas in the prophet problem the decision maker observes the products in a certain order and must make a selection without recourse.

Given these parallels, the reader may wonder whether a prophet type inequality holds for the clairvoyant firm. If so, we would be able to assert that the TAOP firm earns at least half as much as the clairvoyant firm. The answer is yes for the set of discrete choice models that have independent  $B_i, i \in N$ .<sup>5</sup>

**Proposition 4.** *The prophet inequality applies to the assortment optimization problem with independent  $B_i, i \in N$ , implying that*

$$\mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}^o \leq 2\mathcal{R}^*. \quad (10)$$

*Moreover, the bound is tight.*

The main idea is that for the threshold policy  $\tau$  in the prophet problem, there is a corresponding revenue-ordered assortment  $S(\tau) = \{i \in N : r_i > \tau\}$ . The argument then reduces to showing that  $R(S(\tau))$  is at least as large as the expected reward of the threshold policy under the worst possible ordering. Notice that the worst possible ordering for the decision maker is the one that ranks products from the lowest to the highest  $r_i, i \in N$ . If product  $i$  with  $X_i > \tau$  is selected by the decision maker then  $B_i = 1$  and  $r_i > \tau$ , implying that  $i \in S(\tau)$ . Moreover,  $B_j = 0$  for all  $j \in S(\tau)$  with  $r_j < r_i$ , so a consumer offered  $S(\tau)$  would either buy  $i \in S(\tau)$  or another product in  $S(\tau)$  with  $r_j > r_i$ . This shows that the firm offering assortment  $S(\tau)$  earns at least as much as the decision maker using threshold  $\tau$  who sees the products sequentially in increasing order of revenues. Since the prophet inequality asserts that even under the worst ordering the decision maker earns at least  $0.5\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  it follows that  $0.5\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq R(S(\tau))$ .

---

<sup>5</sup>All missing proofs can be found in the Appendix.

Proposition 4 applies directly to RUMs where the value gaps  $U_i - U_0, i \in N$  are independent random variables. This holds, for example if the  $U_i, i \in N$  are independent and  $U_0$  is deterministic. The resulting model is NP-hard as shown by [Wang, 2021] for the special case of independent and Gumbel distributed  $U_i, i \in N$ . By Proposition 4 the revenue-ordered heuristic has expected revenues that are at least one half of  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  and therefore of  $\mathcal{R}^*$ .

The random variables  $B_i, i \in N$  are also *independent* in the random consideration set (RCS) model [Manzini and Mariotti, 2014], where the probabilities  $\Pr(B_i = 1)$  are known as attention-probabilities. The assortment optimization problem for the RCS model was first considered by Gallego and Li [2017], who proved that the revenue-ordered heuristic has a 1/2 performance guarantee. By Theorem 3 the revenue-ordered heuristic yields at least half of the expected profits of the clairvoyant firm strengthening their result.

A slightly weaker assumption than independence is that the partial sums  $T_j := \sum_{i=1}^j (B_i - E[B_i]), j \in N$  form a martingale, or equivalently that the  $B_i - E[B_i], i \in N$ s are martingale differences. The proof of this extension is based on the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality [Azuma, 1967].

## 4 Sufficient Conditions for Prophet Inequality and its Variants

Given that clairvoyant firms can make up to  $n$  times more than TAOP firms, but not more than 2 times more for independent  $B_i, i \in N$ , the reader may wonder whether it is possible to develop methodologies to bound the performance of clairvoyant firms relative to TAOP firms for particular choice models. To that end, we develop sufficient conditions for prophet type inequalities to hold. In particular, we show that  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 0.5k\mathcal{R}^*$  when  $\lambda_i > 1/k$  for all  $i \in N$  and  $\lambda_0 > 0$ .

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}^o$  denote the expected revenue for the revenue-ordered heuristic. A sufficient condition for the prophet inequality (10) to hold is*

$$\mathcal{R}_\omega^* \leq \mathcal{R}^o. \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* Clearly  $\mathcal{R}^o \leq \mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$ , or equivalently

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \leq \frac{2\mathcal{R}_\omega^*}{\mathcal{R}^o}.$$

Consequently, if  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^* \leq \mathcal{R}^o$ , then the right hand is at most 2. □

Thus, with  $O(n)$  computations we can verify the sufficient condition and if it is satisfied, declare that the prophet inequality holds even if there is no polynomial-time algorithm to compute  $\mathcal{R}^*$  or  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ .

The problem with condition  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^* \leq \mathcal{R}^o$  is that in most cases it needs to be verified numerically which limits the opportunity of obtaining analytical results. For this reason we next seek sufficient conditions that are easier to verify that are useful in establishing prophet-type inequalities for a larger class of discrete choice models.

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$  and  $S_\omega^*$  be the optimal expected revenue and an optimal assortment for an auxiliary MNL model with attraction vector  $\omega$  where  $\omega_i = \mathcal{P}(i, \{i\})$   $i \in N$ . If  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfies*

$$\mathcal{O}(i, S_\omega^*) = \mathcal{P}(i, S_\omega^*) / \mathcal{P}(0, S_\omega^*) \geq \omega_i \quad \forall i \in S_\omega^* := \{i \in N : r_i > \mathcal{R}_\omega^*\} \quad (12)$$

*then the prophet inequality holds for  $\mathcal{P}$ . Moreover, the revenue-ordered heuristic  $\mathcal{R}^o$  achieves at least half as much as the clairvoyant firm.*

*Proof.* Condition (12) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{P}(i, S_\omega^*) \geq \omega_i \mathcal{P}(0, S_\omega^*) \quad \forall i \in S_\omega^*. \quad (13)$$

Multiplying both sides of (13) by  $(r_i - \mathcal{R}_\omega^*)$  and adding over  $i \in S_\omega^*$  we obtain

$$\sum_{i \in S_\omega^*} (r_i - \mathcal{R}_\omega^*) \mathcal{P}(i, S_\omega^*) \geq \mathcal{P}(0, S_\omega^*) \sum_{i \in S_\omega^*} (r_i - \mathcal{R}_\omega^*) \omega_i = \mathcal{P}(0, S_\omega^*) \sum_{i \in N} (r_i - \mathcal{R}_\omega^*)^+ \omega_i = \mathcal{P}(0, S_\omega^*) \mathcal{R}_\omega^*$$

where the last equality follows since  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$  is the root of  $\sum_{i \in N} (r_i - \tau)^+ \omega_i = \tau$ . Moving the terms involving  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$  to the right we obtain

$$R(S_\omega^*) = \sum_{i \in S_\omega^*} r_i \mathcal{P}(i, S_\omega^*) \geq \mathcal{R}_\omega^* \cdot \left[ \mathcal{P}(0, S_\omega^*) + \sum_{i \in S_\omega^*} \mathcal{P}(i, S_\omega^*) \right] = \mathcal{R}_\omega^*.$$

It follows that

$$\mathcal{R}_\omega^* \leq R(S_\omega^*) \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}_\omega^*,$$

so the prophet inequality holds. Since  $S_\omega^*$  is a revenue-ordered set it follows that  $R(S_\omega^*) \leq \mathcal{R}^o \leq \mathcal{R}^*$  which implies that  $\mathcal{R}^o \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}^o$ .  $\square$

We remark that condition (12) ensures that  $\mathcal{P}(0, S_\omega^*)$  is sufficiently small to guarantee that  $R(S_\omega^*)$  is at least as large as  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$ . Verifying condition (12) requires  $O(n)$  work.

We now provide a weaker test to obtain a weaker version of the prophet inequality in case condition (12) fails. Let  $\phi$  be a scalar in  $(0, 1)$  and consider the vector  $\phi\omega$  with components  $\phi\omega_i, i \in N$ . Let  $\mathcal{R}_{\phi\omega}^*$  be the expected revenue of an auxiliary MNL with parameters  $\phi\omega$ , and let  $S_{\phi\omega}^* = \{i \in N : r_i > \mathcal{R}_{\phi\omega}^*\}$ .

**Corollary 1.** *If*

$$\mathcal{O}(i, S_{\phi\omega}^*) \geq \phi\omega_i \quad \forall i \in S_{\phi\omega}^* \quad (14)$$

*then*

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \leq \frac{2}{\phi}.$$

*Moreover, the revenue order heuristic  $\mathcal{R}^o$  achieves at least the fraction  $2/\phi$  obtained by the clairvoyant firm.*

*Proof.* If (14) holds, then following the steps of Theorem 5 we see that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\phi\omega}^* \leq R(S_{\phi\omega}) \leq \mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}_{\phi\omega}^*.$$

Notice that for  $\phi \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\phi\mathcal{R}_{\phi\omega}^* = \sum_{i \in S_{\phi\omega}^*} \frac{r_i\phi\omega_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_{\phi\omega}^*} \omega_i} \leq \sum_{i \in S_{\phi\omega}^*} \frac{r_i\phi\omega_i}{1 + \sum_{i \in S_{\phi\omega}^*} \phi\omega_i} \leq \mathcal{R}_{\phi\omega}^*.$$

Consequently

$$\mathcal{R}_{\phi\omega}^* \leq \mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}_{\phi\omega}^* \leq \frac{2}{\phi}\mathcal{R}_{\phi\omega}^*,$$

so

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \leq \frac{2}{\phi}$$

as claimed. Since  $\mathcal{R}^{\phi\omega} \leq \mathcal{R}^o \leq \mathcal{R}^*$  it also follows that

$$\mathcal{R}^o \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq \frac{2}{\phi}\mathcal{R}^o$$

so

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^o} \leq \frac{2}{\phi}$$

as claimed. □

If all is needed is a crude bound, then we can bypass the line search and select  $\phi$  based on the lower bound on  $\mathcal{O}(i, S)$ . More precisely, it is enough to find  $\phi$  such that for all  $i \in N$ ,  $\min_{S \subset N: i \in S} \mathcal{O}(i, S) \geq a_i \geq \phi\omega_i$  for all  $i \in N$ . This yields

$$\phi_{\min} = \min_{i \in N} \frac{a_i}{\omega_i} = \min_{i \in N} \frac{\lambda_i}{\omega_i(1 - \omega_i)}.$$

**Corollary 2.** *For all regular choice models with  $\lambda_0 > 0$ , if  $\phi_{\min} \geq 1$ , then the prophet inequality holds. Otherwise,*

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^o} \leq \frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \leq \frac{2}{\phi_{\min}} = 2 \max_{i \in N} \frac{\omega_i(1 - \omega_i)}{\lambda_i}.$$

Moreover, if  $\lambda_i > 1/k$  for all  $i \in N$ , then

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^o} \leq \frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \leq \frac{k}{2}.$$

*Proof.* The first part follows directly from Corollary 1 applied to  $\phi_{\min}$ . Now if  $\lambda_i \geq 1/k$  then  $1/\lambda_i \leq k$ , so

$$\frac{2}{\phi_{\min}} = 2 \max_{i \in N} \frac{\omega_i(1 - \omega_i)}{\lambda_i} \leq 2k \max_{i \in N} \omega_i(1 - \omega_i) \leq \frac{k}{2}$$

where the last inequality follows since  $x(1 - x) \leq 0.25$  attains its maximum at  $x = 0.5$  over the interval  $[0, 1]$ .  $\square$

## 5 Applications to Some Random Utility Models

We next show that the prophet inequality holds for the MNL model.

**Theorem 6.** *The prophet inequality (10) holds and is tight for the MNL model.*

*Proof.* From the upper bound of Theorem 3 applied to an MNL model with attraction vector  $v$  and  $v_0 = 1$ , we know that

$$\mathcal{R}^o = \mathcal{R}_v^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}}_v \leq 2\mathcal{R}_\omega^*,$$

where for the MNL

$$\omega_i = \frac{v_i}{1 + v_i} \leq v_i \quad \forall \quad i \in N.$$

It is easy to show that the expected revenue  $\mathcal{R}_v^*$  is increasing in  $v$ , so  $\omega \leq v$  implies that  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^* \leq \mathcal{R}_v^* = \mathcal{R}^o$ . The result then follows from Proposition 5.

To see that the bound is tight consider an MNL with  $n = 2$ ,  $r_1 = 1$  and  $r_2 = r_1 \mathcal{M}(1, \{1\}) = v_1/(1 + v_1)$ . Then,  $S^* = \{1\}$  and  $\mathcal{R}^* = r_2$  while

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}}_v = [1 + \mathcal{M}(0, S_1) \mathcal{M}(2, S_2)] \mathcal{R}^*.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}_v}{\mathcal{R}_v^*} = 1 + \frac{1}{1 + v_1} \frac{v_2}{1 + v_1 + v_2} \rightarrow 2$$

as  $v_1 \downarrow 0$  and  $v_2 \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$



We remark that establishing the bound  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_v \leq 2\mathcal{R}_v^*$  for the MNL from first principles is non-trivial without the specific form of the upper bound in Theorem 3 and the observation that  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^* \leq \mathcal{R}_v^*$ .

We next apply Theorem 5 and Corollary 1 to a variety of models that go beyond the MNL, including the  $\alpha$ -MNL, the Nested Logit Model (NL) and the latent class MNL (LC-MNL).

The  $\alpha$ -MNL model, introduced here, is a generalization of the MNL model that may be useful in its own right as it joins a small group of parsimonious models that are completely characterized by  $2n$  parameters<sup>6</sup>. Such parsimonious models have the right balance between flexibility and out-of-sample performance for situations where models with  $n$  parameters exhibit significant biases and the data set is not large enough to support more flexible models with more than  $2n$  parameters. The  $\alpha$ -MNL model has been justified axiomatically and tested in Guillermo et al. [2022].

We say that a choice model is an  $\alpha$ -MNL, or an  $\alpha$ -shaken MNL for a vector  $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i \in N}$  of non-negative numbers, if the choice probabilities are given by:

$$\mathcal{P}(i, S) := \alpha_i \mathcal{M}(i, S) \quad \forall S \subset N, \quad \forall i \in S$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}(0, S) := 1 - \sum_{i \in S} \mathcal{P}(i, S), \quad \forall S \subset N$$

where  $\mathcal{M}(i, S)$  are the choice probabilities of some MNL model with a product attraction vector  $v$ . We require that  $\alpha$  satisfies the condition:  $\sum_{i \in S} (\alpha_i - 1)v_i \leq 1$  for all  $S$  to ensure that  $\mathcal{P}(0, S) \geq 0$ . The reader can verify that

$$\sum_{i \in N} (\alpha_i - 1)^+ v_i \leq 1 \tag{15}$$

is a sufficient condition<sup>7</sup> for  $\mathcal{P}(0, S) \geq 0$  for all  $S \subset N$ , so the  $\alpha$ -MNL model is well defined under condition (15). By setting  $\alpha_i = 1$  for all  $i \in N$  we recover the MNL. Our next result shows that the  $\alpha$ -MNL includes the generalized attraction model (GAM), see [Gallego et al., 2015b], as a special case.

**Proposition 6.** *The  $\alpha$ -MNL model includes the GAM as a special case.*

*Proof.* Given  $v_0 = 1$ ,  $v_i > 0, i \in N$  and  $w_i \in [0, v_i), i \in N$ , the GAM is given by

$$\mathcal{P}(i, S) = \frac{v_i}{1 + V(S) + W(S')} \quad i \in S,$$

---

<sup>6</sup>These models include the GAM and the RCS.

<sup>7</sup>This condition assumes that the MNL is normalized to have  $v_0 = 1$

where  $V(S) = \sum_{i \in S} v_i$  and  $W(S') = \sum_{i \in N: i \notin S} w_i$ . Notice that

$$\mathcal{P}(0, S) = 1 - \sum_{i \in S} \mathcal{P}(i, S) = \frac{1 + W(S')}{1 + V(S) + W(S')} \geq 0$$

so the GAM is well defined.

These choice probabilities for the GAM can be written as

$$\mathcal{P}(i, S) = \frac{v_i}{\tilde{v}_i} \cdot \frac{\tilde{v}_i}{\tilde{v}_0 + \tilde{V}(S)} \quad i \in N.$$

where  $\tilde{v}_i = v_i - w_i, i \in N$  and  $\tilde{v}_0 = 1 + \sum_{i \in N} w_i$ . Let  $\alpha_i = v_i/\tilde{v}_i, i \in N$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$  is an MNL with parameters  $\tilde{v}_i, i \in N_+$  normalized so that  $\tilde{v}_0 = 1$ . Then, we can write

$$\mathcal{P}(i, S) = \alpha_i \tilde{\mathcal{M}}(i, S)$$

showing that the GAM can be written as an  $\alpha$ -MNL model. Since  $\mathcal{P}(0, S) \geq 0$  for all  $S \subset N$ , condition (15) holds.  $\square$

The expected revenue of the  $\alpha$ -MNL model is given by

$$R(S) = \sum_{i \in S} r_i \mathcal{P}(i, S) = \sum_{i \in S} r_i \alpha_i \tilde{\mathcal{M}}(i, S).$$

This is equivalent to the expected revenue of an MNL model with transformed revenues  $r_i \leftarrow r_i \alpha_i$ . Therefore, the TAOP can easily be solved by computing the best revenue order assortment relative to the modified revenues  $r_i \alpha_i, i \in N$ . The reader may be tempted to conclude that the prophet inequality holds for the  $\alpha$ -MNL using a modified vector of revenues and our previous results for the MNL model. Such an approach, however, would require strong assumptions about the behavior of the clairvoyant firm. In particular, it would be necessary to assume that the clairvoyant firm observes the utilities of the underlying MNL model and then selects the product with the highest  $r_i \alpha_i$  that the consumer is willing to purchase. The argument would then reduce to that of the MNL, but the assumed behavior of the prophet is not consistent with  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = E[\max_{i \in N} X_i]$  where  $X_i = r_i B_i$  and  $B_i$  is a Bernoulli random variable taking value 1 with probability  $\omega_i = \alpha_i v_i / (1 + v_i)$  and  $B_i = 0$  otherwise. Therefore the reduction to the MNL leads to an unsatisfactory result. We next show that under mild assumptions the prophet inequality holds for the  $\alpha$ -MNL model.

**Theorem 7.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{P}$  is an  $\alpha$ -MNL, and let*

$$\phi = \min_{i \in N} \frac{1 + v_i}{1 + \sum_{j \in N} (1 - \alpha_j)^+ v_j}. \quad (16)$$

If  $\phi \geq 1$ , then the prophet inequality holds. This is true if

$$v_i \geq \sum_{j \in S_\omega^*} (1 - \alpha_j) v_j \quad \forall \quad i \in S_\omega^*. \quad (17)$$

Moreover, (17) holds for the GAM. If  $\phi < 1$ , then Corollary 1 holds so

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^o} \leq \frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \leq \frac{2}{\phi}.$$

*Proof.* For the  $\alpha$ -MNL model the condition

$$\mathcal{O}(i, S) = \frac{\mathcal{P}(i, S)}{\mathcal{P}(0, S)} \geq \phi \omega_i \quad i \in S \subset N$$

is equivalent to

$$\phi \leq \frac{1 + v_i}{1 + \sum_{j \in S} (1 - \alpha_j) v_j} \quad \forall \quad i \in S \subset N.$$

It is easy to verify that the choice of  $\phi$  given by equation (16) satisfies this inequality for all  $i$  and all  $S$ . Therefore, Corollary 1 applies for  $\phi$  given by equation (16) when  $\phi < 1$ . Under condition (17), the right hand side of (11) is greater or equal to one, so the result holds for  $\phi = 1$  resulting in the prophet inequality. For the GAM, we have  $\alpha_i = v_i / (v_i - w_i) \geq 1$  so condition (17) reduces to  $v_i \geq 0$  which hold vacuously. □

Theorem 7 not only bounds the performance of  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$  relative to the correct form of the expected revenue of the clairvoyant firm, but also shows that the revenue-ordered heuristic relative to the *original ordering* of the  $r_i$ s, satisfies  $\mathcal{R}^o \leq \mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}^o$ .

## 5.1 The Nested Logit Model

In the nested logit (NL) model, the products are organized into nests such that the products in the same nest are regarded as closer substitutes of each other relative to the products in different nests. Under the NL model, the selection process of a consumer proceeds in two stages. First, the consumer selects either one of the nests or decides to leave without making a purchase. Second, if the consumer selects one of the nests, then the consumer chooses one of the products offered in this nest. To formulate the NL model, we use  $M := \{1, \dots, m\}$  to denote the set of nests. For notational brevity, we assume that the number of products in each nest is the same and we use  $N$  to denote the set of products available in each nest. It is straightforward to generalize our formulation to the case where different nests have different numbers of products. We use  $S_i \subseteq N$  to denote the

set of products offered in nest  $i$ . Therefore, the sets of products offered over all nests are given by  $\{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ . The attraction value of product  $j$  in nest  $i$  is given by  $v_{ij} = e^{u_{ij}/\gamma_i}$  for all  $i \in M$ ,  $j \in N$  where  $\gamma_i$  is a measure of how easily the products in nest  $i$  substitute for each other. Under the NL model, if a consumer has already decided to make a purchase in nest  $i$  and the set  $S_i \subseteq N$  of products is offered in this nest, then the consumer selects product  $j \in S_i$  with probability

$$q_{j|i}(S_i) := \frac{v_{ij}}{V_i(S_i)},$$

where  $V_i(S_i) := \sum_{j \in S_i} v_{ij}$ . If the sets of products offered over all nests are given by  $\{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ , then a consumer chooses nest  $i$  with probability

$$Q_i(S_1, \dots, S_m) := \frac{V_i(S_i)^{\gamma_i}}{v_0 + \sum_{l \in M} V_l(S_l)^{\gamma_l}},$$

where  $v_0$  denotes the attraction value of the no-purchase alternative. Thus, if we offer the sets of products  $\{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ , then the selection probability of product  $j$  in nest  $i$  is given by

$$Q_i(S_1, \dots, S_m) q_{j|i}(S_i) = \frac{V_i(S_i)^{\gamma_i}}{v_0 + \sum_{l \in M} V_l(S_l)^{\gamma_l}} \frac{v_{ij}}{V_i(S_i)}.$$

**Theorem 8.** *A sufficient condition for the prophet inequality (10) to hold for the Nested Logit Model is*

$$\frac{v_0 + v_{ij}^{\gamma_i}}{v_0} \geq \frac{v_{ij}^{\gamma_i - 1}}{V_i(S)^{\gamma_i - 1}}$$

*holds for all  $j \in N$  and all  $i \in M$ .*

*Proof.* Consider now the case where  $S_i = \{j\}$  and  $S_l = \emptyset$  for all  $l \neq i$ . Then

$$w_{ij} = \frac{v_{ij}^{\gamma_i}}{v_0 + v_{ij}^{\gamma_i}} \quad \forall j \in N \quad \forall i \in M$$

is the last choice probability for product  $j$  in nest  $i$ . Similarly,

$$\mathcal{P}(0, S_1, \dots, S_m) = \frac{v_0}{v_0 + \sum_{l \in M} V_l(S_l)^{\gamma_l}}$$

is the probability that the no-purchase alternative is selected when the assortment  $(S_1, \dots, S_m)$  is offered. With this notation, condition (12) holds if

$$\frac{V_i(S_i)^{\gamma_i}}{v_0 + \sum_{l \in M} V_l(S_l)^{\gamma_l}} \frac{v_{ij}}{V_i(S_i)} \geq \frac{v_0}{v_0 + \sum_{l \in M} V_l(S_l)^{\gamma_l}} \frac{v_{ij}^{\gamma_i}}{v_0 + v_{ij}^{\gamma_i}},$$

or equivalently if

$$\frac{v_0 + v_{ij}^{\gamma_i}}{v_0} \geq \frac{v_{ij}^{\gamma_i - 1}}{V_i(S)^{\gamma_i - 1}}$$

holds for all  $j \in N$  and all  $i \in M$ .

□

We remark that the prophet inequality holds for the non-standard NLM where  $\gamma_i \geq 1$  for all  $i \in M$  as then the left hand side is greater than one while the right hand side is equal to one. Empirical evidence suggests that the non-standard NL fits data well. The special case  $\gamma_i = 1$  for all  $i \in N$  reduces to the MNL. For the case  $\gamma_i \leq 1$  for all  $i \in N$ , the result holds only if  $v_0$  is sufficiently small.

If (12) fails, we can search for a  $\phi < 1$  such that condition (14) holds and obtain a weaker version of the prophet inequality.

## 5.2 The latent class MNL

Since any RUM can be approximated arbitrarily close by a latent class MNL (LC-MNL) model [Chierichetti et al., 2018], Theorem 4 shows that there is no hope for a general prophet inequality for the LC-MNL. A latent-class MNL (LC-MNL) model arises from the MNL model when each consumer belongs to class  $j \in M$  with probability  $\theta_j, j \in M$  and class  $j$  follows MNL model  $\mathcal{M}_j, j \in M$ . More precisely,

$$\mathcal{P}(i, S) := \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{M}_j(i, S) \quad \forall \quad i \in S$$

where  $\theta_j > 0, j \in M, \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j = 1$ , and

$$\mathcal{M}_j(i, S) = \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + V_j(S)} \quad \forall \quad i \in S, \quad \forall \quad S \subset N,$$

where  $V_j(S) := \sum_{k \in S} v_{kj}$  for all  $j \in M$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{M}_j$  is an MNL with attraction vector  $v_{ij}, i \in N$ .

The expected revenue of assortment  $S$  is given by

$$R(S) = \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j R_j(S)$$

where

$$R_j(S) = \sum_{i \in S} r_i \mathcal{M}_j(i, S).$$

It is well known that maximizing  $R(S)$  over  $S \subset N$  is NP-hard.

We first consider the case where the firm can identify consumers by their MNL type, and offer them personalized assortments. More precisely, if the firm knows the consumer is of type  $j$ , it would offer them assortment  $S_j^* = \arg \max R_j(S)$ . Such a firm earns  $\sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{R}_j^*$  where  $\mathcal{R}_j^* := R_j(S_j^*)$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{R}_j^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}}_j$  where  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_j$  is the expected revenue that the clairvoyant firm can make for type  $j$  consumers. The following result is a direct consequence Theorem 6 and shows that the prophet inequality holds for personalized assortment optimization.

**Proposition 7.**

$$\sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{R}_j^* \leq \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \bar{\mathcal{R}}_j = \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2 \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{R}_j^*$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 6, for every  $j \in M$ ,

$$\mathcal{R}_j^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}}_j \leq 2\mathcal{R}_j^*.$$

Since the clairvoyant firm makes  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \bar{\mathcal{R}}_j$ , it follows that

$$\sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{R}_j^* \leq \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \bar{\mathcal{R}}_j = \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2 \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{R}_j^*$$

□

We conclude that for the personalized version, the prophet inequality holds.

The rest of this section will be concerned with the non-personalized version. The last-choice probabilities for the LC-MNL are given by

$$\omega_i = \mathcal{P}(i, \{i\}) = \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{M}_j(i, \{i\}) = \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \omega_{ij}, i \in N$$

where  $\omega_{ij} = v_{ij}/(1 + v_{ij})$ . Given the vector  $\omega$ , we can find  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$  and  $S_\omega^*$ . Then condition (12) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j \in M} \theta_j (v_{ij} - \omega_i) \mathcal{M}_j(0, S_\omega^*) \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in S_\omega^*. \quad (18)$$

We remark that condition (18) can be checked very efficiently for  $\omega$  as it merely requires computing  $\omega$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$  and  $S_\omega^*$  and verifying whether or not (18) holds.

**Theorem 9.** *Consider the LC-MNL model. If condition (18) , then the prophet inequality (10) holds for the LC-MNL.*

*Proof.* Let  $S_\omega^* = \{i \in N : r_i > \mathcal{R}_\omega^*\}$  since condition (18) holds for all  $i \in S_\omega^*$ , it follows from Theorem 5 that  $\mathcal{R}_\omega^* \leq \mathcal{R}^o \leq \mathcal{R}^*$ . The upper bound  $\mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$  also follows from Theorem 2, and together these two results imply the desired prophet inequality. □

By Corollary 1, if (18) fails then there is a largest  $\phi < 1$  such that condition (14) holds. For the LC-MNL, this is the largest  $\phi$  such that

$$\sum_{j \in M} \theta_j (v_{ij} - \phi \omega_i) \mathcal{M}_j(0, S) \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in S_{\phi\omega}^*,$$

resulting in

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^o} \leq \frac{2}{\phi}.$$

A quick and conservative lower bound for  $\phi$  can be obtained by noticing that for every  $i \in S$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(i, S) \geq v_i^- := \min_{j \in S} v_{ij}$ . Then a sufficient condition for  $\mathcal{O}(i, S) \geq \phi \omega_i$  is that  $\phi \leq \frac{v_i^-}{\omega_i}$  for all  $i \in N$ . Thus, if

$$\phi = \min_{i \in N} \frac{v_i^-}{\omega_i} \geq 1,$$

then prophet inequality holds, and otherwise

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}_\omega^*} \leq \frac{2}{\phi}.$$

We next take a deeper dive into the structure of the LC-MNL in an attempt to try to predict how valuable it may be for the firm to know the consumer type  $j \in M$  and its associated mean utilities, and the additional value of knowing the full realization of the utilities of each arriving consumer. In the process we will show that condition (18) holds with probability one in some regimes, and so with probability one, the prophet inequality (10) holds.

We assume without loss of generality that the random utilities,  $U_{ij}, i \in N$  have independent Gumbel distribution with location parameter  $u_{ij}$  and scale parameter 1 for each  $j \in M$ . We further assume without loss of generality that utilities are normalized so that  $u_{0j} = 0$  for all  $j \in M$ . To study the effect of the coefficient of variation on the value of information, we will consider the model  $u_{ij} = a_{ij}/\beta$  for some real numbers  $a_{ij}, i \in N, j \in M$  and a scalar  $\beta > 0$ . Then the coefficient of variation of  $U_{ij}, i \in N$  is given by  $\beta\pi/u_{ij}\sqrt{6}$ .

When  $\beta$  is large the coefficients of variation are all large and the signal  $u_{ij}$  may be swamped by the noise. As a result, we expect that the ability to identify the consumer types to be of little value compared to knowing the noise  $U_{ij} - u_{ij}$ . Let  $\mathcal{R}^*(\beta)$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}(\beta)$  be the optimal expected revenues, respectively for the TAOP and the clairvoyant firm. Also, let  $e$  be the vector of ones. The next result shows that a stronger form of the prophet inequality holds in the limit as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Theorem 10.** *The prophet inequality (10) holds as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, the stronger bound holds:*

$$\mathcal{R}_e^* = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}^*(\beta) \leq \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{R}}(\beta) = \bar{\mathcal{R}}_e \leq 1.5\mathcal{R}_e^*.$$

*Proof.* We will first show that  $\mathcal{P}(i, S) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_e(i, S) = 1/(1 + |S|)$  for all  $i \in S_+$  and all  $S \subset N$ . Notice that for  $i \in S$ ,

$$\mathcal{P}_j(i, S) = \frac{\exp(a_{ij}/\beta)}{1 + \sum_{k \in S} \exp(a_{kj}/\beta)} \rightarrow \frac{1}{1 + |S|}$$

as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\exp(a_{kj}/\beta) \rightarrow \exp(0) = 1$  for all  $k \in S$ . Consequently,

$$\mathcal{P}(i, S) = \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{P}_j(i, S) \rightarrow \frac{1}{1 + |S|} = \mathcal{M}_e(i, S) \quad i \in S$$

as claimed. This shows that in the limit the LC-MNL model is just an MNL model with  $v = e$ , so the optimal expected revenue for the TAOP is  $\mathcal{R}_e^*$  and the optimal expected revenue for the clairvoyant firm is  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_e$ . From this we see that  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_e \leq 2\mathcal{R}_{e/2}^* \leq 2\mathcal{R}_e^*$  since  $\mathcal{R}_v^*$  is increasing in  $v$ , showing that the prophet inequality (10) holds.

We next sketch the proof of the stronger  $3/2$  bound leaving some details to the reader. Recall that  $\mathcal{R}_e^*$  is the root of  $\sum_{i \in N} (r_i - \tau)^+ = \tau$ . To compute  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  we use the formula

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}}_v = \sum_{i \in N} r_i \Pr(I(B) = i) = \sum_{i \in N} r_i \mathcal{M}_v(0, S_{i-1}) \mathcal{M}_v(i, S_i)$$

which follows from a result in Beggs and Cardell (1981). When applied to  $v = e$  we see that  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_e = \sum_{i \in N} r_i / i(i+1)$ . Set  $r_1 = 2$  and consider the case  $n = 2$  with  $r_2 = r \in [0, 2]$ . The reader can verify that  $\mathcal{R}_e^* = \max(1, (2+r)/3)$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_e = 2/2 + r/6$  and that the worst case ratio is attained at  $r = 1$ , so  $\mathcal{R}_e^* = 1$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_e = 1 + 1/6$  for  $n = 2$ . An easy induction reveals that for general  $n$  the worst case is  $r_1 = 2$  and  $r_i = 1$  for  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$  so  $\mathcal{R}_e^* = 1$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_e = 1/2 + \sum_{i=1}^n 1/i(i+1)$ . Another easy induction shows that  $\sum_{i=1}^n 1/i(i+1) = n/(n+1)$ , so the worst cost ratio is  $1/2 + n/(n+1) \rightarrow 3/2$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

At a high level, our analysis shows that a stronger form of the prophet inequality (10) holds for the LC-MNL model when  $\beta$  is high, or equivalently when the coefficient of variation is high. Our model extends to the case where each customer segment has a different  $\beta_j, j \in M$  as long as all of the  $\beta_j \rightarrow \infty$ . In practice, it does not take a very large  $\beta$  for  $\mathcal{R}^*(\beta)$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}(\beta)$  to be well approximated by  $\mathcal{R}_e^*$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_e$ . Also the sharper bound of  $3/2$  explains why for high  $\beta$  the worst case is always below 1.5 in our computational experiments as well as the computational experiments appearing in other papers.

In contrast, when  $\beta$  is small the signal  $u_{ij}$  is significant relative to the noise and in the extreme case when  $\beta \downarrow 0$ , the choice model becomes a convex combination of maximum utility models, so knowing the types is as good as knowing the realizations of the random variables. In the limit, a firm that can personalize assortments should make as much as the clairvoyant firm, which can be up to  $n$  times more than a TAOP-firm as shown in Theorem 4.



### 5.3 Computational Results

We performed a series of computational experiments under the LC-MNL model to study the relative performance of traditional assortment optimization, personalized assortment optimization and the clairvoyant firm. We present these results as percentages of the revenue obtained for a TAOP firm that employs the revenue-ordered assortment heuristic.

The utility of product  $i \in N$  to market segment  $j \in M$  is modeled as  $U_{ij} = u_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij}$  where  $u_{ij} = a_{ij}/\beta$  is the deterministic part of the utility and  $\epsilon_{ij}, i \in N_+$  are standard Gumbel random variables with mean zero and variance  $\pi^2/6$ , corresponding to scale parameter 1 and location parameter  $-\gamma$  where  $\gamma$  is the Euler's constant. In our experiments, we fixed the lowest revenue to 1 and the highest revenue to 10, and select the revenues of the rest of the products uniformly between 1 and 10. For each combination of  $(m, n)$  we generated 300 random instances. For each instance, the  $a_{ij}, i \in N_+$  are chosen randomly following a procedure proposed by Rusmevichientong et al. [2014]<sup>8</sup> and  $\theta \in (0, 1]$ . We report experiments based on four values of  $\theta$ : 0.02 (fig. 4); 0.2 (fig. 5); 2 (fig. 6), and 20 (fig. 7). For each of those four scenarios, we calculate the optimal revenue obtained under TAOP; personalized TAOP (p-TAOP)<sup>9</sup>; and the clairvoyant firm ( $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ ) as a percentage of the revenue obtained using revenue-ordered assortments heuristic under traditional assortment optimization. Each figure reports the average and maximum percentage across the 300 instances.

Previous experimental work have shown that revenue-ordered assortments are surprisingly good at approximating the optimal assortment revenue (TAOP) under the LC-MNL [Rusmevichientong et al., 2014]. Our computational experiments push those results even further showing that revenue assortment performs well even against a clairvoyant firm. Indeed, from our experiments we see that the clairvoyant revenues, on average, are only between 0.5% to 19% higher than those obtained under revenue-ordered assortments. We also see that there is not even a single instance in which the clairvoyant revenue exceeded revenue-ordered by more than twice.

We also tested whether the instances satisfied the condition of Proposition 9 that would guarantee  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}^o$ . Overall, the percentage of the instances that satisfied this condition was 38.7%, 51%, 99.99% and 99.99% for scenario 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively.

---

<sup>8</sup>Specifically,  $a_{ij}$  (which represents the nominal utility of product  $i$  in segment  $j$  in their paper), is defined as zero in case  $i = 0$ , otherwise  $a_{ij} := \ln((1 - \sigma_i)\ell_{ij}/n)$  with probability  $p = 0.5$  and  $a_{ij} := \ln((1 + \sigma_i)\ell_{ij}/n)$  in the other case. The values  $\ell_{ij}$  and  $\sigma_i$  are realizations from a uniform distribution  $(0, 10]$  and  $(0, 1]$  respectively.

<sup>9</sup>This is the optimal revenue obtained when the firm can offer a personalized assortment to each consumer segment. Namely,  $R^{p-TAOP} := \sum_{j=1}^m w_j R_j(S_j^*)$  where  $S_j^*$  is an optimal assortment to segment  $j$ ,  $w_j$  is the segment  $j$  weight and  $R_j(S)$  is the revenue obtained from segment  $j$  when offered assortment  $S$ . See Section 6.2

Another observation is about how the performances are affected by the value  $\beta$ . For large  $\beta$  the optimal revenue under TAOP as well as under p-TAOP gets closer to that obtained under revenue-ordered. On the other hand, the opposite happens to the clairvoyant revenue: as  $\beta$  increases the clairvoyant revenue gets higher relative to revenue-ordered. In particular, when  $\beta = 0.02$  (fig 4) personalized assortment revenue and clairvoyant revenues are very similar. For example, the maximum average revenue is 110.8% for p-TAOP and 111.4% for the clairvoyant firm. On the other extreme, when  $\beta = 20$  (fig 7), the maximum average revenue is only 100%! for p-TAOP but it is 119% for the clairvoyant firm. This is consistent with Theorem 10.




Figure 4: Scenario 1:  $\beta = 0.02$ . Performance of TAOP, personalized TAOP and a clairvoyant as a percentage of revenue-ordered profits under the LC-MNL model. For each value of  $n$  and  $m$ , we performed 300 experiments.




Figure 5: Scenario 2:  $\beta = 0.2$ . Performance of TAOP, personalized TAOP and a clairvoyant as a percentage of revenue-ordered profits under the LC-MNL model. For each value of  $n$  and  $m$ , we performed 300 experiments.




Figure 6: Scenario 3:  $\beta = 2$ . Performance of TAOP, personalized TAOP and a clairvoyant as a percentage of revenue-ordered profits under the LC-MNL model. For each value of  $n$  and  $m$ , we performed 300 experiments.




Figure 7: Scenario 4:  $\beta = 20$ . Performance of TAOP, personalized TAOP and a clairvoyant as a percentage of revenue-ordered profits under the LC-MNL model. For each value of  $n$  and  $m$ , we performed 300 experiments.

## 6 Discussion

We proposed a set of auxiliary MNL models that allowed us to provide lower and upper bounds on the optimal expected revenue for all regular discrete choice models for the unconstrained and constrained assortment optimization problem. We then studied the limits of assortment personalization by considering the extreme case in which a firm is a clairvoyant who can personalize the assortments to each consumer. Based on an auxiliary MNL model, we have shown that a clairvoyant firm can make no more than twice as much as the best revenue-ordered assortment for the MNL and, more broadly, for the  $\alpha$ -shaken MNL - a new model we introduce that subsumes the MNL and the GAM. We have shown also that the bound of two holds for some cases of the LC-MNL and that an even sharper bound holds when the coefficient of variation of all the products is large. Our computational results for the LC-MNL model show that revenue-ordered assortments does remarkably well even against a clairvoyant firm. For instance, those results show that the increase in profits when switching from a TAOP firm that uses revenue-ordered assortments to a clairvoyant firm was never more than 20 percent on average ( $n \leq 15, m \leq 16$ ). On the flip side, we have also shown theoretically that for general RUMs the clairvoyant firm can make up to  $n$  times as much as the non-clairvoyant firm even within the class of Markov Chain models. We now discuss some

extensions to our model as well as some further ramifications.

## 6.1 Consumer Surplus

Intuitively a firm that can read the minds of individuals will be able to extract more of their surplus. This intuition may alert regulators that worry that e-commerce firms may be able to improve their profits and reduce consumer surplus by getting into the minds of consumers. This intuition is correct when clairvoyant firms can do personalized pricing. For assortments, that have exogenous prices, the situation is more subtle. While it is possible to construct examples where the consumer surplus suffers significantly, it is also possible to construct examples where the consumer is better off with a clairvoyant firm. This is indeed true in all of the worst cases examples analyzed in the paper. These worst cases include the construction provided in the proof Theorem 4 to show that the clairvoyant firm can make  $n$  times more than the TAOP-firm. It is also true for the tight worst case example of the MNL model (Theorem 6) and for the 1.5 bound for the uniform MNL model with  $v = e$  (Theorem 10). In all of these cases, the TAOP firm offers  $S^* = \{1\}$ , so the consumer makes a purchase if and only if  $B_1 = 1$  in which case the clairvoyant firm will also make the same amount. However, when  $B_1 = 0$  the consumer walks away without purchasing under the TAOP while the firm offers  $S_{I(B)}$  for some  $I(B) > 1$  as long as there is a product with a positive value gap. In other words, the clairvoyant firm is able to offer a lower revenue product when the consumer rejects the only product that the TAOP firm is willing to offer. More research about the impact of clairvoyant firms in the context of assortment optimization is needed but is beyond the scope of this paper. For now we can say that although intuitive, it is not correct to say that the clairvoyant  $B$ -adapted assortment  $S_{I(B)}$  will lead to lower expected surplus for consumers than  $S^*$ .

## 6.2 Personalized assortments

Often a discrete choice model is used to represent choices of heterogeneous consumer types and is of the form  $\mathcal{P}(i, S) = \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{P}_j(i, S)$  where  $\mathcal{P}_j(i, S)$  is the discrete choice model corresponding to type  $j$  consumers, with  $\theta_j > 0$  and  $\sum_{j \in M} \theta_j = 1$ . The firm's expected revenue for a given assortment is  $R(S) = \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j R_j(S)$  where  $R_j(S) = \sum_{i \in S} r_i \mathcal{P}_j(i, S)$ . With a slight abuse of notation<sup>10</sup> we let  $\mathcal{R}_j^* = \arg \max_{S \subset N} R_j(S)$  denote the maximum expected revenue that can be earned from type  $j \in M$  consumers. We call a firm that can personalize assortments a p-TAOP firm to distinguish it from TAOP and clairvoyant firms. Let  $\mathcal{R}^{p-TAOP} := \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \mathcal{R}_j^*$ . Clearly a p-TAOP firm can earn

---

<sup>10</sup>The distinction between  $\mathcal{R}_j^*, j \in M$  and  $\mathcal{R}_v^*$  for a vector  $v$  should be clear from the context.

higher expected revenues than a TAOP firm. The p-TAOP has been the subject of recent attention, see e.g. El Housni and Topaloglu [2021], Chen et al. [2021]) and is also related to the personalized refined assortment optimization problem (p-RAOP) introduced by Berbeglia et al. [2021b]. Under the RAOP a firm is allowed to make some products less attractive to avoid demand cannibalization. This is a more refined approach than simply removing such products as done in the TAOP. Likewise the p-RAOP performs as least as well as the p-TAOP. However, not even the p-RAOP can do as well as the clairvoyant firm as it still has to deal with some residual uncertainty. Consequently

**Corollary 3.** *For any vector  $a$  that satisfies condition (12) of Theorem 3 we have*

$$\mathcal{R}_a^* \leq \mathcal{R}^o \leq \mathcal{R}^* \leq \mathcal{R}^{p-taop} \leq \mathcal{R}^{p-raop} \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}_\omega^*$$

where  $\mathcal{R}^{p-raop}$  denotes the optimal expected of a p-RAOP firm. Moreover if  $a = \omega$  then  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2\mathcal{R}^{p-taop}$ .

Berbeglia et al. [2021b] also provided a revenue guarantee for revenue-ordered assortments in relation to  $\mathcal{R}^{p-raop}$  in settings where each consumer segment satisfies regularity. They showed that  $\mathcal{R}^{p-raop} \leq (1 + \ln(r_1/r_n))\mathcal{R}^o$ . Under any RUM, this bound also works with the clairvoyant firm (i.e. replacing  $\mathcal{R}^{p-raop}$  with  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ ) since we can interpret each joint realization of the product utilities as a different consumer type<sup>11</sup> and each of them satisfy the regularity condition. Therefore

**Theorem 11.** *For every RUM,*

$$\mathcal{R}^{p-taop} \leq \mathcal{R}^{p-raop} \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq [1 + \ln(r_1/r_n)]\mathcal{R}^o.$$

Since it is possible to construct examples where  $\mathcal{R}^*$  can be made as close as possible to  $(1 + \ln(r_{max}/r_{min}))\mathcal{R}^o$  (see Berbeglia and Joret [2020]), the bound is tight.

Additionally, when we restrict to the LC-MNL model, we have that (i)  $\mathcal{R}^{raop} \leq \mathcal{R}^{p-taop}$  for every such model; and (ii)  $\frac{\mathcal{R}^{p-taop}}{\mathcal{R}^{taop}} \geq \min\{n, m\}$  for some LC-MNL models (see Berbeglia et al. [2021b]).

An even sharper upper bound on  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  can be constructed as follows: Let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^j := \min_{\tau > 0} \left\{ \tau + \sum_{i \in N} (r_i - \tau)^+ \omega_{ij} \right\} \quad j \in M.$$

This is just an application of the best Lai-Robbins bound to consumer type  $j \in M$ . If the discrete choice model  $\mathcal{P}_j$  is regular, then

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^j \leq 2\bar{\mathcal{R}}_\omega.$$

---

<sup>11</sup>There may be an infinite number of consumer types.

### 6.3 A joint assortment and customization problem

Recently, El Housni and Topaloglu [2021] considered a joint assortment and customization problem under the LC-MNL model. This problem, called the *Customized Assortment Problem* (CAP), consists of two stages. In the first stage, the firm needs to select a subset  $T$  of at most  $k$  products. In the second stage, the firm observes the consumer segment  $j \in M$  and chooses a personalized subset  $S_j \subseteq T$  of products to offer. Thus, the CAP consists of the following optimization problem:

$$\mathcal{R}_{cap}^* = \max_{T \subseteq N, |T| \leq k} \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \max_{S \subseteq T} \mathcal{R}_j(S)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_j(S) = \sum_{i \in S} \mathcal{M}_j(i, S) r_i$  denotes the expected revenue for segment  $j$  when we offer assortment  $S$ .

El Housni and Topaloglu [2021] proved that CAP is NP-hard<sup>12</sup> and proposed a polynomial-time algorithm called *Augmented Greedy* that guarantees at least a  $\Omega(1/(\ln(m)))$ -fraction of the optimal revenue. More recently, Udwani [2021] improved the revenue guarantees by constructing a  $(0.5 - \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for the same problem.

A natural way to extend the CAP is to let the firm be a clairvoyant at the second stage so that it can customize the assortment offered to the specific individual rather than to the consumer segment. The *clairvoyant-CAP* is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}_{clairvoyant-cap}^* = \max_{T \subseteq N, |T| \leq k} \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \bar{\mathcal{R}}_j(T)$$

where  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_j(T)$  denotes the expected revenue obtained by a clairvoyant firm with universe of products  $T$  that is faced by segment  $j$  consumers.

Clearly,  $\mathcal{R}_{cap}^* \leq \mathcal{R}_{clairvoyant-cap}^*$ . Combining some of our clairvoyant results with results from El Housni and Topaloglu [2021] and Udwani [2021] it is straightforward to show the following propositions.

**Proposition 8.**  $\mathcal{R}_{clairvoyant-cap}^* \leq 2\mathcal{R}_{cap}^*$

*Proof.* Let  $T_{c-CAP}^*$ ,  $T_{CAP}^*$  denote the optimal assortments chosen in the first stage for the *clairvoyant*-

---

<sup>12</sup>Finding an optimal assortment  $T$  is the hard problem since the second stage assortment  $S$  is simply a revenue-ordered assortment subset from  $T$  which can be quickly computed.

*ant*-CAP and CAP respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_{clairvoyant-cap}^* &= \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \bar{\mathcal{R}}_j(T_{c-CAP}^*) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \max_{S \subseteq T_{c-CAP}^*} 2 \cdot \mathcal{R}_j(S) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in M} \theta_j \max_{S \subseteq T_{CAP}^*} 2 \cdot \mathcal{R}_j(S) \\
&= 2 \cdot \mathcal{R}_{cap}^*
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from Theorem 6 and the second from the optimality of assortment  $T_{CAP}^*$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 9.** *Clairvoyant-CAP is NP-hard.*

*Proof.* Observe that in the case where all products have the same prices, the clairvoyant expected revenue ( $\mathcal{R}_{clairvoyant-cap}^*$ ), is the same as the CAP revenue ( $\mathcal{R}_{cap}^*$ ). Since El Housni and Topaloglu [2021] proved that CAP is NP-hard even in the case where all revenues are the same, the result follows.  $\square$

Given the NP-hardness result for *clairvoyant*-CAP, we are interested in approximation algorithms. We will consider algorithms to approximate *clairvoyant* – CAP that observe the consumer segment but not the Gumbel noises associated to each specific consumer. The following two propositions directly follow from Proposition 8 and the revenues guarantees obtained by El Housni and Topaloglu [2021] and Udvani [2021].

**Proposition 10.** *The Augmented-Greedy algorithm [El Housni and Topaloglu, 2021] provides an  $\Omega(1/\ln(m))$ -approximation to clairvoyant-CAP.*

**Proposition 11.** *Algorithm 1 from Udvani [2021] provides a  $(0.25-\epsilon)$ -approximation to clairvoyant-CAP.*

Similarly, one can show that when the number of segments  $m$  is fixed, *clairvoyant*-CAP has a  $(1/2 - \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm since El Housni and Topaloglu [2021] proved the existence of a FPTAS for CAP in this case.

## 6.4 Clairvoyant pricing

Consider now a clairvoyant firm that observes the gross utilities  $U_i, i \in N_+$  of each incoming consumer. How should such a clairvoyant firm set prices to maximize expected revenues? For



$n = 1$ , it is optimal to set  $p_1$  as the largest non-negative price such that  $U_1 - p_1 \geq U_0$ . Then a sale occurs at  $p_1 = U_1 - U_0$  if  $U_1 \geq U_0$ . On the other hand, if  $U_1 < U_0$  the firm sets the price at  $p_1 = 0$  and the consumer walks away without buying. Consequently, for the case of a single product the firm prices at  $p_1 = (U_1 - U_0)^+$  and earns  $E[(U_1 - U_0)^+]$  in expectation. Notice here that a product may be sold at a positive price even if  $U_1 < 0$  provided that  $U_0 < U_1$ . For multiple products, let  $U_N := \max_{i \in N} U_i$ . Then the firm should set  $p_i = (U_N - U_0)^+$  for all  $i \in N$ , so the clairvoyant firm earns

$$\bar{R} = E[(U_N - U_0)^+].$$

On the other hand, a non-clairvoyant firm will obtain an expected profit of

$$\mathcal{R}^* = \max_p \sum_{i \in N} p_i \mathcal{P}(U_i - p_i \geq U_j - p, j \in N, j \neq i, \quad U_i - p_i \geq U_0).$$

Clearly  $\mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{R}$ . As usual we seek bounds for the ratio of  $\bar{R}$  to  $\mathcal{R}^*$ .

**Proposition 12.** *The ratio can be arbitrarily large.*

*Proof.* Suppose there is a single product with gross utility  $U$  and that  $U_0 = 1$  almost surely. Suppose further that

$$\mathcal{P}(U > p) = \min(1, 1/p) \quad 0 < p \leq 1 + a$$

for some constant  $a > 0$ . The clairvoyant firm observes  $U$  and prices at  $p = U$  obtaining expected profit  $\bar{R} = E[U] = (1 + \ln(1 + a))$ . On the other hand, the non-clairvoyant firm obtains profit  $\mathcal{R}^* = 1$  by using any price  $p \in [1, 1 + a]$ . The ratio is therefore  $1 + \ln(1 + a)$  which can be made arbitrarily large as  $a \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

The next result shows that things are significantly better for the MNL model. The ratio we obtain next is not 2 as in the case of exogenous prices, and the reason is that the clairvoyant firm is no longer restricted to using the same prices as the non-clairvoyant firm.

**Proposition 13.** *For the MNL model the ratio is at most  $e = \exp(1)$ , and the bound is tight.*

*Proof.* From our analysis for the general case we know that

$$\bar{R} = E[(U_N - U_0)^+] = E[\max(U_N, U_0)] - E[U_0] = E[\max(U_N, U_0)]$$

when  $E[U_0] = 0$  as in the normalized MNL case. Thus, for the MNL

$$\bar{R} = E[\max(U_N, U_0)] = \ln(1 + V(N)),$$

where  $V(N) = \sum_{i \in N} e^{u_i}$  [Gumbel, 1935]. For the non-clairvoyant firm, it is well known that  $p_i = p$  for all  $i \in N$ , so

$$\mathcal{R}^* = \max_p \frac{pV(N)}{\exp(p) + V(N)}.$$

It is easy to show that at optimality  $p$  satisfies that  $(p-1)\exp(p) = V(N)$ , so that  $\mathcal{R}^* = p-1$ . Since the optimal profit is positive, it must be that an optimal price is at least 1. Thus,

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^*} = \frac{\ln(1 + (p-1)\exp(p))}{p-1} = \frac{\ln(1 + x\exp(x+1))}{x} = f(x),$$

where  $x \in (0, \infty)$ .

The derivative is

$$f'(x) = \frac{\frac{\exp(x+1)x(x+1)}{\exp(x+1)x+1} - \ln(\exp(x+1)x+1)}{x^2},$$

and one can verify that  $f'(x) < 0$  for all  $x > 0$  so  $f(x)$  is a decreasing function. Thus,

$$\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\ln(1 + x\exp(x+1))}{x} = e = \exp(1).$$

We can also see that the bound is tight in the limit when  $p \downarrow 1$ , which occurs when  $V(N) \downarrow 0$ . □

The result for the MNL readily extends to the LC-MNL problem if personalized pricing is allowed, so if  $\mathcal{R}^{p-taop}$  is the expected profit from personalized pricing, then  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq \exp(1)\mathcal{R}^{p-taop}$ . Furthermore, we can obtain a worst case bound for  $\mathcal{R}^*$  relative to  $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$  that is  $\exp(1)$  times larger the worst-case bounds in Gallego and Berbeglia [2021] for  $\mathcal{R}^{p-taop}$  relative to  $\mathcal{R}^*$ .

The reader may wonder what would happen if the clairvoyant firm was constraint to use the same price  $p^*$  as the non-clairvoyant profit optimizing firm. For the MNL, and in fact for any model for which a constant price policy is optimal, the clairvoyant firm cannot do better than the non-clairvoyant counterpart, so the ratio is exactly one.

## Acknowledgments

The authors give thanks Wentao Lu and Zhuodong Tang for their insightful comments. We are also very grateful to Danny Segev for giving us very valuable comments and pointing out relevant references.

## References

- Andrés Abeliuk, Gerardo Berbeglia, Manuel Cebrian, and Pascal Van Hentenryck. Assortment optimization under a multinomial logit model with position bias and social influence. *4OR*, 14(1):57–75, 2016.
- Ali Aouad and Danny Segev. Display optimization for vertically differentiated locations under multinomial logit preferences. *Management Science*, 67(6):3519–3550, 2021.
- Ali Aouad, Vivek Farias, Retsef Levi, and Danny Segev. The approximability of assortment optimization under ranking preferences. *Operations Research*, 66(6):1661–1669, 2018.
- Kazuoki Azuma. Weighted sums of certain dependent random variables. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series*, 19(3):357–367, 1967.
- Franco Berbeglia, Gerardo Berbeglia, and Pascal Van Hentenryck. Market segmentation in online platforms. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 295(3):1025–1041, 2021a.
- Gerardo Berbeglia and Gwenaél Joret. Assortment optimisation under a general discrete choice model: A tight analysis of revenue-ordered assortments. *Algorithmica*, 82(4):681–720, 2020.
- Gerardo Berbeglia, Alvaro Flores, and Guillermo Gallego. The refined assortment optimization problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.03043*, 2021b.
- Fernando Bernstein, A Gürhan Kök, and Lei Xie. Dynamic assortment customization with limited inventories. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 17(4):538–553, 2015.
- Fernando Bernstein, Sajad Modaresi, and Denis Sauré. A dynamic clustering approach to data-driven assortment personalization. *Management Science*, 65(5):2095–2115, 2019.
- Jose Blanchet, Guillermo Gallego, and Vineet Goyal. A markov chain approximation to choice modeling. *Operations Research*, 64(4):886–905, 2016.
- Henry David Block and Jacob Marschak. Random orderings and stochastic theories of responses. *Contributions to probability and statistics*, 2:97–132, 1960.
- Carri W Chan and Vivek F Farias. Stochastic depletion problems: Effective myopic policies for a class of dynamic optimization problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 34(2):333–350, 2009.

- Xi Chen, David Simchi-Levi, and Yining Wang. Privacy-preserving dynamic personalized pricing with demand learning. *Available at SSRN 3700474*, 2020.
- Xi Chen, Zachary Owen, Clark Pixton, and David Simchi-Levi. A statistical learning approach to personalization in revenue management. *Management Science*, 2021.
- Wang Chi Cheung and David Simchi-Levi. Thompson sampling for online personalized assortment optimization problems with multinomial logit choice models. *Available at SSRN 3075658*, 2017.
- Flavio Chierichetti, Ravi Kumar, and Andrew Tomkins. Discrete choice, permutations, and reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 576–586. SIAM, 2018.
- James M Davis, Guillermo Gallego, and Huseyin Topaloglu. Assortment optimization under variants of the nested logit model. *Operations Research*, 62(2):250–273, 2014.
- Arnoud V Den Boer. Dynamic pricing and learning: historical origins, current research, and new directions. *Surveys in operations research and management science*, 20(1):1–18, 2015.
- Antoine Désir, Vineet Goyal, Danny Segev, and Chun Ye. Constrained assortment optimization under the markov chain-based choice model. *Management Science*, 66(2):698–721, 2020.
- Cynthia Dwork. Differential privacy. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 1–12. Springer, 2006.
- Omar El Housni and Huseyin Topaloglu. Joint assortment optimization and customization under a mixture of multinomial logit models: On the value of personalized assortments. *Available at SSRN 3830082*, 2021.
- Adam N Elmachtoub, Vishal Gupta, and Michael L Hamilton. The value of personalized pricing. *Management Science*, 2021.
- Guillermo Gallego and Gerardo Berbeglia. Bounds and heuristics for multi-product personalized pricing. *Available at SSRN 3778409*, 2021.
- Guillermo Gallego and Anran Li. Attention, consideration then selection choice model. *SSRN*, 2017.

- Guillermo Gallego and Huseyin Topaloglu. *Revenue management and pricing analytics*, volume 209. Springer, 2019.
- Guillermo Gallego, Anran Li, Van-Anh Truong, and Xinshang Wang. Online resource allocation with customer choice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.01837*, 2015a.
- Guillermo Gallego, Richard Ratliff, and Sergey Shebalov. A general attraction model and sales-based linear program for network revenue management under customer choice. *Operations Research*, 63(1):212–232, 2015b.
- Guillermo Gallego, Anran Li, Van-Anh Truong, and Xinshang Wang. Approximation algorithms for product framing and pricing. *Operations Research*, 68(1):134–160, 2020.
- Guillermo Gallego, Irvani, and Talebian. Consumer patience and assortment optimization. 2022.
- Pin Gao, Yuhang Ma, Ningyuan Chen, Guillermo Gallego, Anran Li, Paat Rusmevichientong, and Huseyin Topaloglu. Assortment optimization and pricing under the multinomial logit model with impatient customers: Sequential recommendation and selection. *Operations Research*, 2021.
- Avi Goldfarb and Catherine Tucker. Shifts in privacy concerns. *American Economic Review*, 102(3):349–53, 2012.
- Negin Golrezaei, Hamid Nazerzadeh, and Paat Rusmevichientong. Real-time optimization of personalized assortments. *Management Science*, 60(6):1532–1551, 2014.
- Gallego Guillermo, Lu Wentao, and Tang Zhuodong. Axiomatic justification and additional results for the  $\alpha$ -mnl. *Working paper*, 2022.
- Emil Julius Gumbel. Les valeurs extrêmes des distributions statistiques. In *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré*, volume 5, pages 115–158, 1935.
- Kelly L Haws and William O Bearden. Dynamic pricing and consumer fairness perceptions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33(3):304–311, 2006.
- Shota Ichihashi. Online privacy and information disclosure by consumers. *American Economic Review*, 110(2):569–95, 2020.
- Srikanth Jagabathula, Dmitry Mitrofanov, and Gustavo Vulcano. Personalized retail promotions through a dag-based representation of customer preferences. *Available at SSRN 3258700*, 2020.

- Nathan Kallus and Madeleine Udell. Dynamic assortment personalization in high dimensions. *Operations Research*, 68(4):1020–1037, 2020.
- Ulrich Krengel and Louis Sucheston. Semiamarts and finite values. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 83(4):745–747, 1977.
- Ulrich Krengel and Louis Sucheston. On semiamarts, amarts, and processes with finite value. *Probability on Banach spaces*, 4:197–266, 1978.
- Yanzhe Murray Lei, Sentao Miao, and Ruslan Momot. Privacy-preserving personalized revenue management. *Sentao and Momot, Ruslan, Privacy-Preserving Personalized Revenue Management (October 3, 2020)*, 2020.
- Brendan Lucier. An economic view of prophet inequalities. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 16(1):24–47, 2017.
- Will Ma. When is assortment optimization optimal? *Management Science (Forthcoming)*, 2022.
- Paola Manzini and Marco Mariotti. Stochastic choice and consideration sets. *Econometrica*, 82(3):1153–1176, 2014.
- Daniel McFadden and Marcel K Richter. Stochastic rationality and revealed stochastic preference. *Preferences, Uncertainty, and Optimality, Essays in Honor of Leo Hurwicz*, Westview Press: Boulder, CO, pages 161–186, 1990.
- Paat Rusmevichientong, Zuo-Jun Max Shen, and David B Shmoys. Dynamic assortment optimization with a multinomial logit choice model and capacity constraint. *Operations Research*, 58(6):1666–1680, 2010.
- Paat Rusmevichientong, David Shmoys, Chaoxu Tong, and Huseyin Topaloglu. Assortment optimization under the multinomial logit model with random choice parameters. *Production and Operations Management*, 23(11):2023–2039, 2014.
- Arne K Strauss, Robert Klein, and Claudius Steinhardt. A review of choice-based revenue management: Theory and methods. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 271(2):375–387, 2018.
- Mika Sumida, Guillermo Gallego, Paat Rusmevichientong, Huseyin Topaloglu, and James Davis. Revenue-utility tradeoff in assortment optimization under the multinomial logit model with totally unimodular constraints. *Management Science*, 67(5):2845–2869, 2021.

- Carol F Surprenant and Michael R Solomon. Predictability and personalization in the service encounter. *Journal of Marketing*, 51(2):86–96, 1987.
- Kalyan Talluri and Garrett Van Ryzin. Revenue management under a general discrete choice model of consumer behavior. *Management Science*, 50(1):15–33, 2004.
- Huseyin Topaloglu. Using lagrangian relaxation to compute capacity-dependent bid prices in network revenue management. *Operations Research*, 57(3):637–649, 2009.
- Catherine E Tucker. Social networks, personalized advertising, and privacy controls. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 51(5):546–562, 2014.
- Rajan Udhwani. Submodular order functions and assortment optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02743*, 2021.
- Chenhao Wang, Yao Wang, and Shaojie Tang. When advertising meets assortment planning: Joint advertising and assortment optimization under multinomial logit model. *Available at SSRN 3908616*, 2021.
- Ruxian Wang. What is the impact of nonrandomness on random choice models? *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 2021.

## 7 Appendix

*Proof.* (Proposition 4) The proof is based on the classical prophet inequality and given here mostly to show that revenue assortments guarantee at least half of the optimal expected revenue of the clairvoyant firm. The prophet inequality guarantees that there is a threshold, say  $\tau$ , such that the expected revenue of the decision maker who selects the first product with reward at least  $\tau$ , obtains a reward at least  $0.5E[\max_{i \in N} X_i] = 0.5\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ , when the  $X_i$ s are independent. The prophet inequality holds in particular for the case  $X_i := r_i B_i$  with independent  $B_i, i \in N$ .

We remark that the result is independent of the order in which the decision maker considers the product, and holds in particular if the decision maker sees the products in the order  $n, n-1, \dots, 1$  and buys the first product, in this order whose reward exceeds the threshold. By doing this the decision maker selects the lowest revenue product that exceeds the threshold. In contrast, if a non-clairvoyant firm offers the revenue-ordered assortment with threshold  $\tau$ , the consumer can select

any of the products in this that is preferred to the outside alternative and may either select the same product as the decision maker or a more expensive one.

More formally, let  $L(\tau)$  denote the expected revenue that the decision maker obtains from selecting the first product whose reward exceeds  $\tau$  when the products are presented in the order  $n, n-1, \dots, 1$ . This means that the decision maker obtains the smallest possible reward among all of those with reward exceeding  $\tau$ . From the classic prophet inequality we know that  $L(\tau) \geq 0.5\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ .

Consider now the assortment  $S(\tau) = \{i \in N : r_i > \tau\}$  and  $R(S(\tau))$  the expected reward from a firm offering assortment  $S(\tau)$ . We will show that  $R(S(\tau)) \geq L(\tau) \geq 0.5\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ , implying that  $\mathcal{R}^o \geq 0.5\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ .

More precisely, we want to show that

$$L(S) = \sum_{i \in S(\tau)} r_i P(B_i = 1, B_j = 0 \ \forall j > i, j \in S(\tau)) \leq R(S(\tau)).$$

To justify the first equality notice that  $X_i = r_i B_i > \tau$  only if  $B_i = 1$  and  $r_i > \tau$ , so only the products in  $S(\tau)$  can be selected by the decision maker using threshold policy  $\tau$ . Second, product  $i$  will be selected only when  $B_i = 1$  and there is no other product  $j > i$  (with lower reward than  $i$ ) with  $B_j = 1$ . Thus  $i$  is selected only if  $B_i = 1, B_j = 0 \ \forall j > i, j \in S(\tau)$ .

For a firm offering assortment  $S(\tau)$ , the consumer can select any of the products  $k \in S(\tau)$  with  $B_k = 1$ . We claim that the revenue of such product is at least as much as the revenue obtained by the decision maker. To see this, suppose that the decision maker selects product  $i$ , so  $B_i = 1$  and  $B_j = 0, j > i, j \in S(\tau)$ , so the consumer can only select from  $k \in S(\tau), B_k = 1, k \leq i$ . This is a non-empty set with associated revenues  $r_k \geq r_i$ . Taking expectation over all sample paths we see that  $L(\tau) \leq R(S(\tau))$  completing the proof.

□

*Proof.* (Theorem 4) Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a regular choice model. As usual, we assume that the revenues are decreasing in  $i$ . By regularity, if a firm offers the best revenue-ordered assortment, say  $S_{i^*} \in \arg \max_{S_i} \sum_{j \leq i} r_j \mathcal{P}(j, S_i) = \mathcal{R}^o$ , we have that  $\mathcal{R}^o = R(S_{i^*}) \geq \max_{i \in N} r_i \mathcal{P}(i, \{i\}) = \max_{i \in N} r_i \omega_i$ . Thus, a non-clairvoyant firm applying revenue-ordered assortments can make at least  $\max_{i \in N} r_i \omega_i$ . Clearly  $\mathcal{R}^o \leq \mathcal{R}^* \leq \bar{\mathcal{R}}$  as the clairvoyant firm can make at least as much in revenues in every sample



path. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathcal{R}} &= E[r_{I(B)}] \\
&= \sum_{i \in N} r_i P(I(B) = i) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in N} r_i P(B_i = 1) \\
&= \sum_{i \in N} r_i \omega_i \\
&\leq n \max_{i \in N} r_i \omega_i,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows since for all  $i \in N$ , the event  $I(B) = i$  implies the event  $B_i = 1$  and therefore  $P(I(B) = i) \leq P(B_i = 1)$ . The third inequality is straightforward. This establishes that

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq n \max_{i \in N} r_i \omega_i \leq n\mathcal{R}^o \leq n\mathcal{R}^*$$

To see that there are examples in which  $\mathcal{R}^* = \mathcal{R}^o$  and the bound  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} \leq n\mathcal{R}^*$  is tight, we first consider a RUM model with deterministic utilities  $U_i = u_i, i \in N$ , and assume that  $u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_n$  so the preference order is  $1 \prec \dots \prec n$ . Let  $U_0$  be a random variable with cumulative distribution  $F(x) = \mathcal{P}(U_0 \leq x)$ . Then

$$\omega_i = \mathcal{P}(U_i \geq U_0) = \mathcal{P}(U_0 \leq u_i) = F(u_i) \quad \forall \quad i \in N.$$

Moreover,  $U_0 \leq u_i$  implies  $U_0 \leq u_j$  for all  $j > i$  so the utilities are strongly dependent. Given any set  $S \subset N$ , let  $i(S) = \max\{i \in S\}$ . If  $U_0 > u_{i(S)}$  the consumer walks away, otherwise the consumer buys choice  $i(S)$ . Consequently,  $\mathcal{P}(i, S) = \omega_i$  if  $i = i(S)$  and is zero otherwise.

Clearly,  $\mathcal{R}^o = \mathcal{R}^* = \max_{i \in N} r_i \omega_i$  is the expected revenue for the firm. It is optimal for the clairvoyant firm to offer choice set  $\{i\}$  when  $u_{i-1} < U_0 \leq u_i$  as  $r_i$  is the highest revenue he can get in this case. The prophet therefore earns

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_{i \in N} r_i (F(u_i) - F(u_{i-1})) = \sum_{i \in N} r_i (\omega_i - \omega_{i-1}).$$

Suppose that the revenues are given by  $r_i = \omega_1 / \omega_i, i \in N$ . Since  $\omega_i = F(u_i)$  is increasing in  $i$ , we see that  $r_i$  is decreasing in  $i \in N$ . Since  $r_i \omega_i = \omega_1$  for all  $i \in N$  it follows that  $\mathcal{R}^o = \mathcal{R}^* = \omega_1$

while

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathcal{R}} &= \sum_{i \in N} r_i (\omega_i - \omega_{i-1}) \\
&= \sum_{i \in N} \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_i} (\omega_i - \omega_{i-1}) \\
&= \sum_{i \in N} \omega_1 \left( 1 - \frac{\omega_{i-1}}{\omega_i} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Set  $\omega_i := \epsilon^n (\epsilon^{-i} - 1)$ . Then  $\omega_i$  is increasing in  $i$  with  $\omega_n = 1 - \epsilon^n < 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}{\mathcal{R}^*} &= \sum_{i \in N} \left( 1 - \frac{\omega_{i-1}}{\omega_i} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i \in N} \frac{1 - \epsilon^i}{1 - \epsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

with the sum converging to  $n$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ .

We next show that the RUM model constructed above can also be represented by an instance of the Markov chain model. To see this, consider a Markov chain model in which consumers visit the products following the order  $(n, n-1, \dots, 1)$  but may leave without purchase at any time. Thus, the transition probabilities satisfy  $\rho_{ij} = 0$  if  $j \neq i-1$  for all  $i = n, n-1, \dots, 2$ . Let the first-choice probabilities be given by  $\lambda_i = 0$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ , and  $\lambda_n = F(u_n)$ . The transition matrix is given by  $\rho_{i,i-1} = \frac{F(u_{i-1})}{F(u_i)}$  then, if  $i = i(S)$ ,

$$\mathcal{P}(i, S) = F(u_n) \prod_{j=n}^{i+1} \rho_{j,j-1} = F(u_i) = \omega_i$$

and  $\mathcal{P}(i, S) = 0$  otherwise, as desired. Then  $\mathcal{R}^* = \max_{i \in N} r_i \omega_i$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_{i \in N} r_i (F(u_i) - F(u_{i-1})) = \sum_{i \in N} r_i (\omega_i - \omega_{i-1})$ .

□