

Entropy-Optimal Algorithms for Multiple-Choice Secretary

Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi^{*1}, Dariusz R. Kowalski^{†2}, Piotr Krysta³, and Jan Olkowski⁴

^{1,4}Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, USA.
hajiagha,olkowski@umd.edu.

²School of Computer and Cyber Sciences, Augusta University, Augusta, Georgia, USA.
dkowalski@augusta.edu.

³Department of Computer Science, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.
pkrysta@liverpool.ac.uk.

Abstract

In the *secretary* problem, our goal is to stop a sequence of values at the moment it observes the maximum value in the sequence. While there is an algorithm that succeeds with probability $1/e$ if the sequence is presented in uniformly random order, no non-trivial performance guarantee is possible if the elements arrive in worst-case order. In real-world applications, though, it is plausible to assume some randomness in the input sequence, but not reasonable to assume the arrival ordering is uniformly random. Motivated by this, the seminal work of Kesselheim, Kleinberg, and Niazadeh [28] (STOC'15) initiates an investigation into relaxations of the random-ordering assumption for the secretary problem. In particular, they define a distribution over permutations to be *admissible*, if there exist an algorithm which guarantees at least a constant probability of selecting the element of maximum value over permutations from this distribution; the distribution is *optimal*, if the constant probability approaches the best secretary bound (e.g., $1/e$ for the classic one) as the number of elements, n , tends to infinity. Motivated by the theory of pseudorandomness, Kesselheim, Kleinberg, and Niazadeh [28] raise the question of the minimum entropy of an admissible/optimal distribution over permutations and whether there is an explicit construction that achieves the minimum entropy. Though they prove tight bound $\Theta(\log \log n)$ for minimum entropy of an admissible distribution for the secretary problem, bounds that they obtain for the classic *multiple-choice secretary* (a.k.a. k -secretary) are far from being tight.

In this paper, we study the problem for the entropy of both admissible and optimal distributions of permutations to the multiple-choice secretary problem and provide tight bounds for the problem. This completely resolves the entropy-optimality question for the multiple-secretary problem. In particular, we construct a distribution with entropy $\Theta(\log \log n)$ such that a deterministic threshold-based algorithm gives a nearly-optimal competitive ratio $1 - O(\log(k)/k^{1/3})$ for $k = O((\log n)^{3/14})$. Our error is simultaneously nearly-optimal and with optimal entropy $\Theta(\log \log n)$. Our result improves in two ways the previous best construction by Kesselheim, Kleinberg and Niazadeh [28] whose competitive ratio is $1 - O(1/k^{1/3}) - o(1)$. First, our solution works for exponentially larger range of parameters k , as in [28] $k = O((\log \log \log n)^\epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Second, our algorithm is a simple deterministic *single-threshold* algorithm (only drawing a permutation from a stochastic uniform distribution), while the algorithm in [28] uses additional randomness. We also prove a corresponding lower bound for entropy of optimal solutions to the k -secretary problem, matching the entropy of our algorithm. No previous lower bound on entropy was known for the k -secretary problem.

We further show the strength of our techniques by obtaining fine-grained results for optimal distributions of permutations for the secretary problem (equivalent to 1-secretary). For optimal entropy

^{*}Supported in part by NSF CCF grant-2114269 and an Amazon AWS award.

[†]Partially supported by the NSF grant 2131538.

$\Theta(\log \log n)$, we precisely characterize the success probability of uniform distributions that is below, and close to, $1/e$, and construct such distributions in polynomial time. Furthermore, we prove even higher entropy $\Theta(\log(n))$ suffices for a success probability above $1/e$, but, no uniform probability distribution with small support and entropy strictly less than $\log(n)$ can have success probability above $1/e$. For maximum entropy $\Theta(n \log(n))$, improving upon a result of Samuels from 1981 [41], we find the precise formula for the optimal success probability of any secretary algorithm. Our results indeed give a profound understanding of limiting randomness for stopping theory and in particular for the (multiple-choice) secretary problem.

Keywords: Multiple-choice secretary, secretary problem, online algorithms, approximation algorithms, entropy, derandomization.

1 Introduction

We often assume random order arrival in theoretical studies of online algorithms to obtain much better performance guarantees than under worst-case assumptions. This means that we have full randomness knowledge about an instance before it is handed to an algorithm. In practice, however, often this assumption is not quite right; although it is reasonable to assume some randomness in the input sequence, but not reasonable to assume that the arrival ordering is uniformly random. We study the limits of this randomness for the secretary problems in this paper.

The secretary problem was introduced as the problem of irrevocably hiring the best secretary out of n rankable applicants and first analyzed in [35, 13, 8, 18]. In this problem the goal is to find the best strategy when choosing between a sequence of alternatives. In particular, asymptotically optimal algorithm with success probability $\frac{1}{e}$ was proposed, when perfect randomness is available (i.e., random orders are chosen uniformly at random from the set of all $n!$ permutations). Gilbert and Mosteller [18] showed with perfect randomness, no algorithm could achieve better probability of success than some simple *wait-and-pick* algorithm with specific threshold $m \in [n - 1]$ (which can be proved to be in $\{\lfloor n/e \rfloor, \lceil n/e \rceil\}$). Wait-and-pick are deterministic algorithms observing values until some pre-defined threshold step $m \in [n - 1]$, and after that they accept the first value that is larger than all the previously observed ones, or the last occurring value otherwise.

The seminal work of Kesselheim, Kleinberg, and Niazadeh [28] (STOC'15) initiates an investigation into relaxations of the random-ordering assumption for the secretary problem. In particular, they define a distribution over permutations to be *admissible*, if there exists an algorithm which guarantees at least a constant probability of selecting the element of maximum value over permutations from this distribution, no matter what values the adversary assigns to elements; the distribution is *optimal*, if the constant probability approaches the best secretary bound (e.g., $1/e$ for the classic one) as the number of elements, n , goes to infinity. They specifically raise the following main question for the secretary problem.

“What natural properties of a distribution suffice to guarantee that it is admissible? What properties suffice to guarantee that it is optimal?” [28]

For example, they show two sets of properties of distributions over permutations, namely *block-independence* and *uniform-induced-ordering*, result in optimal distributions.

More importantly, motivated by the theory of pseudorandomness, Kesselheim et al. [28] raise the question of the minimum entropy of an admissible/optimal distribution over permutations and whether there is an explicit construction that achieves the minimum entropy. They prove tight bound $\Theta(\log \log n)$ for minimum entropy of an admissible distribution for the secretary problem. More precisely, they prove if a distribution over permutations has entropy $o(\log \log n)$ then no algorithm (deterministic or randomized) achieves a constant probability of success. They also present a polynomial-time construction of a set of $\text{polylog}(n)$ permutations such that wait-and-pick algorithm choosing a random order uniformly from this set (i.e., with entropy $O(\log \log n)$) achieves probability of success $\frac{1}{e} - \omega(\frac{1}{(\log \log \log(n))^c})$, for any positive constant $c < 1$. Their construction includes several reduction steps, uses composition of

three Reed-Solomon codes and auxiliary composition functions (see their full ArXiv version [29] for more details and a better understanding of their approach). Though they also consider entropy of admissible distributions for the classic *multiple-choice secretary* (a.k.a. k -secretary, used interchangeably in this paper; see [26, 31, 6] for introduction and analysis), bounds that they obtain are far from being tight as we describe next.

In this paper, we study the problem for the entropy of both admissible and optimal distributions of permutations to the multiple-choice secretary problem and provide tight bounds for the problem. This completely resolves the entropy-optimality question for the multiple-secretary problem. In particular, we construct a distribution with entropy $\Theta(\log \log n)$ such that a deterministic threshold-based algorithm gives a nearly-optimal competitive ratio $1 - O(\log(k)/k^{1/3})$ for $k = O((\log n)^{3/14})$, which improves in two ways the previous best construction by Kesselheim, Kleinberg and Niazadeh [28]. First, our solution works for exponentially larger range of parameters k , as in [28] $k = O((\log \log \log n)^\epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Second, our algorithm is a simple deterministic *single-threshold* algorithm (only drawing a permutation from a stochastic uniform distribution), while the algorithm in [28] uses additional randomness. We also prove a corresponding lower bound for entropy of optimal solutions to the k -secretary problem, matching the entropy of our algorithm. No previous lower bound was known for the k -secretary problem.

We further show the strength of our techniques by obtaining fine-grained results for optimal distributions of permutations for the secretary problem (equivalent to 1-secretary). For entropy $\Theta(\log \log n)$, we precisely characterize the success probability of uniform distributions that is below, and close to, $1/e$, and construct such distributions in polynomial time. Furthermore, we prove even higher entropy $\Theta(\log(n))$ suffices for a success probability above $1/e$, but, no uniform probability distribution with small support and entropy strictly less than $\log(n)$ can have success probability above $1/e$. Last but not least, with maximum entropy, $\Theta(n \log(n))$, of the uniform distribution with support $n!$, we find the precise formula OPT_n for the optimal success probability of any secretary algorithm. In addition, we prove that any secretary algorithm that uses any, not necessarily uniform distribution, has success probability at most OPT_n . This improves the result of Samuels from 1981 [41], who proved that under uniform distribution no secretary algorithm can achieve success probability of $1/e + \varepsilon$, for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$.

1.1 Preliminaries

Let $[i] = \{1, 2, \dots, i\}$, and n be the number of arriving elements/items. Each of them has a unique index $i \in [n]$, and corresponding unique value $v(i)$ assigned to it by an adversary. The adversary knows the algorithm and the distribution of random arrival orders.

Let Π_n denote the set of all $n!$ permutations of the sequence $(1, 2, \dots, n)$. A *probability distribution* p over Π_n is a function $p : \Pi_n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{\pi \in \Pi_n} p(\pi) = 1$. *Shannon entropy*, or simply, *entropy*, of the probability distribution p is defined as $\mathcal{H}(p) = -\sum_{\pi \in \Pi_n} p(\pi) \cdot \log(p(\pi))$, where \log has base 2, and if $p(\pi) = 0$ for some $\pi \in \Pi_n$, then we assume that $0 \cdot \log(0) = 0$. Given a distribution \mathcal{D} on Π_n , $\pi \sim \mathcal{D}$ means that π is sampled from \mathcal{D} . A special case of a distribution, convenient to design efficiently, is when we are given a (multi-)set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Pi_n$ of permutations, called a *support*, and random order is selected uniformly at random (u.a.r. for short) from this set; in this case we write $\pi \sim \mathcal{L}$. The entropy of this distribution is $\log |\mathcal{L}|$. We call such an associated probabilistic distribution *uniform*, and otherwise *non-uniform*. We often abbreviate “random variable” to r.v., and “uniformly at random” to u.a.r.

For a positive integer $k < n$, let $[n]_k$ be the set of all k -element subsets of $[n]$. Given a sequence of (not necessarily sorted) values $v(1), v(2), \dots, v(n) \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $ind(k') \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ the index of the element with the k' th largest value, that is, the k' th largest value is $v(ind(k'))$.

Wait-and-pick algorithms. An algorithm for the k -secretary problem is called *wait-and-pick* if it only observes the first m values ($m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$) is a fixed observation period threshold, called a *time*

threshold), selects one of the observed values x (x is a fixed *value threshold*), and then selects every value of at least x received after position m ; however, it cannot select more than k values in this way, and it may also select the last i values (even if they are smaller than x) provided it selected only $k - i$ values before that.

We also consider a sub-class of wait-and-pick algorithms, which as their value threshold x choose the τ -th largest value, for some $\tau \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, among the first m observed values. In this case we say that such wait-and-pick algorithm has a *statistic* τ and value x is also called a statistic in this case.

The definition of the wait-and-pick algorithms applies also to the secretary problem, i.e., with $k = 1$. It has been shown that some wait-and-pick algorithms are optimal in case of perfect randomness in selection of random arrival order, see [18].

2 Our results and techniques

2.1 Multiple-choice secretary (k -secretary) problem

Main contribution: algorithmic results. Our algorithms, as well as many algorithms in the literature, are of wait-and-pick type. Our main result is a tight result for optimal policy for multiple choice secretary problem under low entropy distributions. In the two theorems below we assume that the adversarial values are such that $v(1) \geq v(2) \geq \dots \geq v(n)$.

Theorem 1 *For any $k < (\log \log n)^{1/4}$ there exists a permutations distribution \mathcal{D} such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{D}}(ALG(\sigma)) \geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\log n \log n}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{4 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i),$$

where ALG is a deterministic wait-and-pick multiple-choice secretary algorithm with time threshold $m = n/k^{1/3}$. The distribution \mathcal{D} has the optimal entropy $O(\log \log n)$ and can be computed in polynomial time in n .

Theorem 2 *For any $k < \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$ there exists a permutations distribution \mathcal{D} such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{D}}(ALG(\sigma)) \geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{5 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i),$$

where ALG is a deterministic wait-and-pick multiple-choice secretary algorithm with threshold $m = \frac{n}{k^{1/3}}$. The distribution \mathcal{D} has the optimal entropy $O(\log \log n)$ and can be computed in polynomial time in n .

Detailed analysis of these results can be found in Section 8: that of Theorem 1 as Theorem 11, and that of Theorem 2 as Theorem 12, respectively.

Optimality of our results vs previous results. Theorem 2 achieves nearly-optimal competitive ratio $1 - O(\log(k)/k^{1/3})$, with provably minimal entropy $O(\log \log n)$, when $k = O((\log n)^{3/14})$, for the k -secretary problem. The ratio $(1 - O(1/\sqrt{k}))$ is best possible for the k -secretary problem in the random order model, see [31, 23, 2]. The previous best result was by Kesselheim, Kleinberg and Niazadeh [28], and their competitive ratio is $(1 - O(1/k^{1/3}) - o(1))$ and uses entropy $O(\log \log n)$. Optimality of the entropy follows by our new lower bounds in Theorem 3 and 4, see the discussion after Theorem 4 below. Note that such lower bounds we not known before for the k -secretary problem.

Theorems 1 and 2 improve the previous best results by Kesselheim, Kleinberg and Niazadeh [28] even more: our solution works for exponentially larger range of parameters k , as in [28] $k =$

$O((\log \log \log n)^\epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. And, finally, our algorithm is a simple deterministic *single-threshold* algorithm (only drawing a permutation from a stochastic uniform distribution with entropy $O(\log \log n)$), while the algorithm in [28] uses additional randomness. In fact, the randomized algorithm in [28] uses internal randomness that has entropy at least $\Omega((\log k)^2)$, see Proposition 1 in Section 9.3. Their construction of the distribution on random orders that their algorithm uses, has entropy $O(\log \log n)$, but it only applies to $k = O((\log \log \log n)^\epsilon)$ for some fixed $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. However, if their randomized algorithm would be used with higher values of parameter k , for example $k = \Theta(\log n)$ as in our case, the entropy of its internal randomization would be $\Omega((\log \log n)^2)$, which is asymptotically larger than the optimal entropy $O(\log \log n)$ for the random orders.

Technical contributions. Our starting point to obtain Theorem 1 and 2 is a probabilistic analysis in Section 4 of wait-and-pick multiple-choice secretary algorithms. In this analysis we exploit the fact that the indicator random variables, which indicate if indices fall in an interval in a random permutation, are *negatively associated*, see, e.g., [43]. Kesselheim, Kleinberg and Niazadeh [28] provide explicit constructions of small entropy probability distributions for the k -secretary algorithms (for both $k = 1$ and $k > 1$) by using a product of three Reed-Solomon codes and explicit enumeration of the resulting lower-dimensional permutations. Our approach builds on their idea of using Reed-Solomon codes, by formalizing a notion of *dimensionality-reduction*, see Section 7. We provide two dimension reduction constructions. The first one (Theorem 1) uses only a product of two Reed-Solomon codes and explicit enumeration. The second one (Theorem 2) uses only one Reed-Solomon code and instead of explicit enumeration, its second step is completely new – an algorithmic derandomization of our probabilistic analysis from Section 4. Our new derandomization technique is based on the method of conditional expectation with a special pessimistic estimator for the failure probability. This estimator is derived from the proof of Chernoff bound and is inspired by Young’s [46] oblivious rounding. We obtain it by first combinatorializing the Hoeffding argument in Theorem 7 by defining the notion of $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuples and replacing Hoeffding argument by Chernoff argument (combinatorialization introduces $0/1$ r.v.’s, instead of r.v.’s that assume adversarial values in Theorem 7).

We show two applications of this technique of dimension reduction followed by the Chernoff bound derandomization: to the k -secretary problem and to the classic 1-secretary problem. For the former problem, it implies an entropy-optimal algorithm with optimal competitive factor (our main results in Theorems 1 and 2), and for the latter it gives a fine-grained analysis of the best possible success probability of algorithms (see Theorems 5 and 6 below). The only problem-specific parts of this new derandomization technique are the combinatorialization ($k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuples for k -secretary in Section 5, and k -tuples for 1-secretary in Section B) and computation of conditional probabilities (see Algorithms 2 and 4). The rest of the technique, e.g., pessimistic estimator, the main algorithm and its analysis, are the same for both problems.

The running time of the resulting derandomization algorithm is at least n^k and to make it polynomial, we design *dimension reductions*. We propose two dimension reduction methods based on a refined use of Reed-Solomon codes. As a new technical ingredient, we construct a family of functions that have bounded number of collisions and their preimages are of almost same sizes (up to additive 1), by carefully using algebraic properties of polynomials (see Lemma 5). This gives our first dimension reduction construction, which together with derandomization leads to Theorem 2, see details in Section 8. Our second construction of such function family is based on a direct product of two Reed-Solomon codes in Section 7.2, leading to Theorem 1, see details in Section 8. The use of Reed-Solomon codes are inspired by Kesselheim, Kleinberg and Niazadeh [28, 29]. Our construction significantly improves and simplifies their constructions by adding the constraint on sizes of preimages and using only one or two, instead of three, codes and we do not need any auxiliary composition functions. The constraint on preimages, precisely tailored for the k -secretary problem, allows us to apply more direct techniques of finding permutations distributions over a set with reduced dimension. This constraint is crucial for proving the competitive ratios. Both constructions are computable in polynomial time and we believe

that they are of independent interest. We augment the dimension reductions with a detailed analysis of how they relate to the error guarantees of the k -secretary (1-secretary, resp.) algorithms, see Section 8 (Appendix D, resp.).

Lower bounds. We are the first to prove two lower bounds on entropy of k -secretary algorithms achieving expected competitive ratio $1 - \epsilon$. Their proofs can be found in Section 9. The first one is for any algorithm, but works only for $k \leq \log^a n$ for some constant $a \in (0, 1)$.

Theorem 3 *Assume $k \leq \log^a n$ for some constant $a \in (0, 1)$. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ be a given parameter. Then, any algorithm (even fully randomized) solving k -secretary problem while drawing permutations from some distribution on Π_n with an entropy $H \leq \frac{1-\epsilon}{9} \log \log n$, cannot achieve the expected competitive ratio of at least $1 - \epsilon$ for sufficiently large n .*

The second lower bound on entropy is for the wait-and-pick algorithms for any $k < n/2$.

Theorem 4 *Any wait-and-pick algorithm solving k -secretary problem, for $k < n/2$, with expected competitive ratio of at least $(1 - \epsilon)$ requires entropy $\Omega(\min\{\log 1/\epsilon, \log \frac{n}{2k}\})$.*

It follows from Theorem 3 that entropy $\Omega(\log \log n)$ is necessary for any algorithm to achieve even a constant positive competitive ratio $1 - \epsilon$, for $k = O(\log^a n)$, where $a < 1$. In particular, it proves that our upper bounds in Theorems 1 and 2 are tight. Theorem 4 implies that entropy $\Omega(\log \log n)$ is necessary for any wait-and-pick algorithm to achieve a close-to-optimal competitive ratio $1 - \Omega(\frac{1}{k^a})$, for any $k < n/2$, where constant $a \leq 1/2$. Even more, in such case entropy $\Omega(\log k)$ is necessary, which could be as large as $\Omega(\log n)$ for k being a polynomial in n .

Technical contributions. The lower bound for all algorithms builds on the concept of semitone sequences with respect to the set of permutation used by the algorithm. It was proposed in [28] in the context of 1-secretary problem. Intuitively, in each permutation of the set, the semitone sequence always positions next element before or after the previous elements of the sequence (in some permutations, it could be before, in others – after). Such sequences occurred useful in cheating 1-secretary algorithms by assigning different orders of values, but occurred hard to extend to the general k -secretary problem. The reason is that, in the latter, there are two challenges requiring new concepts. First, there are k picks of values by the algorithm, instead of one – this creates additional dependencies in probabilistic part of the proof (c.f., Lemma 8), which we overcome by introducing more complex parametrization of events and inductive proof. Second, the algorithm does not always have to choose maximum value to guarantee approximation ratio $1 - \epsilon$, or can still choose the maximum value despite of the order of values assigned to the semitone sequence – to address these challenges, we not only consider different orders the values in the proof (as was done in case of 1-secretary in [28]), but also expand them in a way the algorithm has to pick the largest value but it cannot pick it without considering the order (which is hard for the algorithm working on semitone sequences). It leads to so called hard assignments of values and their specific distribution in Lemma 8 resembling biased binary search, see details in Section 9.1.

The lower bound for wait-and-pick algorithms, presented in Section 9.2, is obtained by constructing a virtual bipartite graph with neighborhoods defined based on elements occurring on left-hand sides of the permutation threshold, and later by analyzing relations between sets of elements on one side of the graph and sets of permutations represented by nodes on the other side of the graph.

2.2 Classical secretary (1-secretary) problem

Characterization and lower bounds. We prove in Proposition 2 a characterization of the optimal success probability OPT_n of secretary algorithms, which is complemented by an existential result in Theorem 13. When the entropy is maximum, $\Theta(n \log(n))$, of the uniform distribution on the set of

permutations with support $n!$, we find the precise formula for the optimal success probability of the best secretary algorithm, $OPT_n = 1/e + c_0/n + \Theta((1/n)^{3/2})$, where $c_0 = 1/2 - 1/(2e)$, see Proposition 2, Part 1. We prove that any secretary algorithm that uses any, not necessarily uniform distribution, has success probability at most OPT_n (Part 2, Proposition 2). This improves the result of Samuels [41], who proved that under uniform distribution no secretary algorithm can achieve success probability of $1/e + \varepsilon$, for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$. We then prove that even entropy $\Theta(\log(n))$ suffices for a success probability above $1/e$ (Corollary 3). But, interestingly, no uniform probability distribution with small support and entropy strictly less than $\log(n)$ can have success probability above $1/e$ (Part 3, Proposition 2).

Algorithmic results. By adapting the same techniques of dimension reduction and derandomization via Chernoff bound developed for the k -secretary problem, we obtain the following fine-grained analysis results for the classical secretary problem.

Theorem 5 *There exists a permutation distribution \mathcal{D}_n with entropy $O(\log \log n)$, such that the wait-and-pick 1-secretary algorithm with time threshold $\lfloor n/e \rfloor$, executed on \mathcal{D}_n picks the highest element with probability at least $\frac{1}{e} - 3 \frac{(\log \log \log n)^{5/2}}{\sqrt{\log \log n}}$. Distribution \mathcal{D}_n can be computed in time polynomial in n .*

Theorem 6 *There exists a permutation distribution \mathcal{D}_n that can be computed in time $O(n)$ and has entropy $O(\log \log n)$, such that the wait-and-pick 1-secretary algorithm with time threshold $\lfloor n/e \rfloor$, executed on the permutation drawn from \mathcal{D}_n picks the best element with probability of at least $\frac{1}{e} - \frac{(C_1 \log \log n)^2}{\log^{C/2} n} - o\left(\frac{(\log \log n)^2}{\log^{C/2} n}\right)$, where $C > 0$ can be any fixed constant and $C_1 = \frac{C}{\log(e/(e-1))}$.*

Our results vs previous results. Proofs of Theorem 5 and 6 can be found in Appendix D. The original analysis in [35, 13] shows that this algorithm's success probability with full $\Theta(n \log n)$ entropy is at least $1/e - 1/n$. Theorem 6 has better error bound than Theorem 5, but is more complex and builds on the first result. Theorem 6 guarantees almost the same success probability as that in our existential proof (Theorem 13) and the entropy of these distributions is optimal $O(\log \log(n))$. It also improves, over doubly-exponentially, on the additive error to OPT_n of $\omega\left(\frac{1}{(\log \log \log(n))^c}\right)$ due to Kesselheim, Kleinberg and Niazadeh [28, 29], which holds for any positive constant $c < 1$.

Technical contributions. We obtain Theorems 5 and 6 by the same dimension reduction and derandomization techniques designed for the k -secretary problem. To apply these techniques, we need to develop problem-specific parts for the 1-secretary problem: probabilistic analysis, leading to combinatorialization, and an algorithm for computing conditional probabilities (see Algorithm 4). We present a new probabilistic analysis of the 1-secretary problem in Theorem 13. Towards this aim we identify a useful parameterization of the problem, denoted $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, which is interpreted as corresponding to k largest adversarial values. We characterize precise probability of success of any wait-and-pick algorithm with time threshold m by analyzing how the set of k largest adversarial values is located with respect to the threshold m . This leads to Theorem 13. This analysis lets us combinatorialize the problem by defining k -tuples, which are ordered subsets of size k of $[n]$. While all other parts of the derandomization are the same as for the k -secretary problem, the main derandomization algorithm is now Algorithm 3 (instead of Algorithm 1), and the conditional probabilities Algorithm 4 replaces Algorithm 2.

3 Further related work

In this section, we present recent literature on important online stopping theory concepts such as secretary, prophet inequality, and prophet secretary.

Secretary Problem. In this problem, we receive a sequence of randomly permuted numbers in an online fashion. Every time we observe a new number, we have the option to stop the sequence and

select the most recent number. The goal is to maximize the probability of selecting the maximum of all numbers. The pioneering work of Lindley [35] and Dynkin [13] present a simple but elegant algorithm that succeeds with probability $1/e$. In particular, they show that the best strategy, a.k.a. wait-and-pick, is to skip the first $1/e$ fraction of the numbers and then take the first number that exceeds all its predecessors. Although simple, this algorithm specifies the essence of best strategies for many generalizations of secretary problem. Interestingly, Gilbert and Mosteller [18] show that when the values are drawn i.i.d. from a known distribution, there is a wait-and-pick algorithm that selects the best value with probability approximately 0.5801 (see [15] for generalization to non-identical distributions).

The connection between secretary problem and online auction mechanisms has been explored by the work of Hajiaghayi, Kleinberg and Parkes [26] and has brought lots of attention to this classical problem in computer science theory. In particular, this work introduces the *multiple-choice value version* of the problem, also known as the k -secretary problem (the original secretary problem only considers rankings and not values), in which the goal is to maximize the expected sum of the selected numbers, and discusses its applications in limited-supply online auctions. Kleinberg [31] later presents a tight $(1 - O(\sqrt{1/k}))$ -approximation algorithm for multiple-choice secretary resolving an open problem of [26]. The bipartite matching variant is studied by Kesselheim et al. [30] for which they give a $1/e$ -approximation solution using a generalization of the classical algorithm. Babaioff et al. [6] consider the *matroid* version and give an $\Omega(1/\log k)$ -approximation algorithm when the set of selected items have to be an independent set of a rank k matroid. Other generalizations of secretary problem such as the submodular variant has been initially studied by the Bateni, Hajiaghayi, and ZadiMoghaddam [7] and Gupta, Roth, Schoenebeck, and Talwar [22].

Prophet Inequality. In prophet inequality, we are initially given n distributions for each of the numbers in the sequence. Then, similar to the secretary problem setting, we observe the numbers one by one, and can stop the sequence at any point and select the most recent observation. The goal is to maximize the ratio between the expected value of the selected number and the expected value of the maximum of the sequence. This problem was first introduced by Krengel-Sucheston [33, 34], for which they gave a tight $1/2$ -approximation algorithm. Later on, the research investigating the relation between prophet inequalities and online auctions was initiated by the work of the Hajiaghayi, Kleinberg, and Sandholm [25]. In particular this work considers the multiple-choice variant of the problem in which a selection of k numbers is allowed and the goal is to maximize the ratio between the sum of the selected numbers and the sum of the k maximum numbers. The best result on this topic is due to Alaei [3] who gives a $(1 - 1/\sqrt{k+3})$ -approximation algorithm. This factor almost matches the lower bound of $1 - \Omega(\sqrt{1/k})$ already known from the prior work of Hajiaghayi et al. [25]. Motivated by applications in online ad-allocation, Alaei, Hajiaghayi and Liaghat [4] study the bipartite matching variant of prophet inequality and achieve the tight factor of $1/2$. Feldman et al. [16] study the generalizations of the problem to combinatorial auctions in which there are multiple buyers and items and every buyer, upon her arrival, can select a bundle of available items. Using a posted pricing scheme they achieve the same tight bound of $1/2$. Furthermore, Kleinberg and Weinberg [32] study the problem when a selection of multiple items is allowed under a given set of matroid feasibility constraints and present a $1/2$ -approximation algorithm. Yan [44] improves this bound to $1 - 1/e \approx 0.63$ when the arrival order can be determined by the algorithm. More recently Liu, Paes Leme, Pál, Schneider, and Sivan [36] obtain the first Efficient PTAS (i.e., a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation for any constant $\epsilon > 0$) when the arrival order can be determined by the algorithm.

Prophet inequality (as well as the secretary problem) has also been studied beyond a matroid or a matching. For the intersection of p matroids, Kleinberg and Weinberg [32] gave an $O(1/p)$ -approximation prophet inequality. Later, Dütting and Kleinberg [12] extended this result to polymatroids. Rubinstein [39] and Rubinstein and Singla [40] consider prophet inequalities and secretary problem for arbitrary downward-closed set systems. Babaioff et al. [6] show a lower bound of

$\Omega(\log n \log \log n)$ for this problem. Prophet inequalities have also been studied for many combinatorial optimization problems (see e.g. [11, 17, 19, 37]).

Prophet Secretary. The original prophet inequality setting assumes either the buyer values or the buyer arrival order is chosen by an adversary. In practice, however, it is often conceivable that there is no adversary acting against you. Can we design better strategies in such settings? The *prophet secretary* model introduced by the Esfandiari, Hajiaghayi, Liaghat, and Monemizadeh [14] is a natural way to consider such a process where we assume both *stochastic knowledge* about buyer values and that the buyers arrive in a uniformly random order. The goal is to design a strategy that maximizes expected accepted value, where the expectation is over the random arrival order, the stochastic buyer values, and also any internal randomness of the strategy.

This work indeed introduced a natural combination of the fundamental problems of prophet and secretary above. More formally, in the *prophet secretary* problem we are initially given n distributions $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n$ from which X_1, \dots, X_n are drawn. Then after applying a random permutation $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(n)$ the values of the items are given to us in an online fashion, i.e., at step i both $\pi(i)$ and $X_{\pi(i)}$ are revealed. The goal is to stop the sequence in a way that maximizes the expected value¹ of the most recent item. Esfandiari, Hajiaghayi, Liaghat, and Monemizadeh [14] provide an algorithm that uses different thresholds for different items, and achieves an approximation factor of $1 - 1/e$ when n tends to infinity.

Beating the factor of $1 - \frac{1}{e} \approx 0.63$ substantially for the prophet secretary problems, however, has been very challenging. A recent result by Azar et al. [5] and then Correa et al. [10] improves this bound by $\frac{1}{30}$ to $1 - \frac{1}{e} + \frac{1}{30} \approx 0.665$. For the special case of *single item i.i.d.*, Hill and Kertz [27] give a characterization of the hardest distribution, and Abolhasani et al. [1] show that one can get a 0.73-approximation. Recently, this factor has been improved to the tight bound of 0.745 by Correa et al. [9]. However finding the tight bound for the general prophet secretary problem still remains the main open problem.

4 Probabilistic analysis of k -secretary algorithms

Let $v(1), v(2), \dots, v(n)$ be the sequence of values chosen by the adversary. Let a_1, \dots, a_k be the indices of k biggest values in non-increasing order. In this section we consider a wait-and-pick algorithm with time threshold m and statistic $k \cdot \frac{m}{n}$. The algorithm reads first m values from the input. Then, it assigns t (statistic value) to the value of $k \cdot \frac{m}{n}$ -th largest value from the already seen set of values. From this point, it adds to the final value the first k values that are greater than t which is also the output of the algorithm. We will provide in this section a probabilistic analysis of such k -secretary algorithms under uniform distribution over the set Π_n of all permutations.

In the next lemma we will exploit the fact that the indicator random variables which indicate if indices fall in an interval in a random permutation are *negatively associated*, see, e.g., [43].

Lemma 1 *Let X denote a random variable that counts the number of values from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, a\}$, for an integer number $1 \leq a \ll n$, that are on positions smaller than the threshold m in a random permutation $\sigma \sim \Pi_n$. Define $\mu = \mathbb{E}(X) = a \frac{m}{n}$. Then for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we obtain that*

$$\Pr(|X - \mu| \geq \delta\mu) \leq 2 \exp(-\delta^2\mu/3) .$$

Proof. For a number i in the set $\{1, 2, \dots, a\}$ consider an indicator random variable X_i equal to 1 if the position of the number i is in the first m positions of a random permutation σ , and equal to 0 otherwise. We have that $X = \sum_{i=1}^a X_i$. Using standard techniques, for instance Lemma 8 and Lemma 9ii) from [43], we obtain that random variables X_1, \dots, X_n are negatively associated (NA) and we can apply the

¹Over all random permutations and draws from distributions

Chernoff concentration bound to their mean. Observe here, that $\mathbb{E}(X) = \mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=1}^a X_i) = \mu$. Therefore, by Theorem 5 in [43], we have that

$$\mathbb{Pr}(X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu) \leq \left(\frac{\exp(\delta)}{(1 + \delta)^{(1+\delta)}} \right)^\mu \text{ for any } \delta > 0,$$

and

$$\mathbb{Pr}(X \leq (1 - \delta)\mu) \leq \left(\frac{\exp(-\delta)}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)}} \right)^\mu \text{ for any } \delta \in (0, 1).$$

By a well known bound, shown for instance in [20, page 5], we have that $\left(\frac{\exp(\delta)}{(1+\delta)^{(1+\delta)}} \right)^\mu \leq \exp(-\frac{\delta^2 \mu}{2+\delta}) < \exp(-\delta^2 \mu/3)$, where the last inequality follows by $\delta < 1$. Similarly, it is known that $\left(\frac{\exp(-\delta)}{(1-\delta)^{(1-\delta)}} \right)^\mu \leq \exp(-\delta^2 \mu/2)$ [24], which together with the above implies that

$$\mathbb{Pr}(|X - \mu| \geq \delta\mu) \leq 2 \cdot \exp(-\delta^2 \mu/3) \text{ for any } \delta \in (0, 1),$$

see [20, Corollary 5]. □

In the next lemma, we analyze the expected result of the wait-and-pick algorithm on a random permutation. Recall here how the algorithm works. First, it reads the first m elements. Then, it calculates $k \frac{m}{n}$ -th greatest so far read element whose value we denote t (the statistic). Finally, it reads the remaining portion of the elements one by one and adds up the values of the first k elements whose values are greater than t . This sum is the final result of the algorithm.

Since we draw from the uniform distribution over all permutation, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $v(1) \geq v(2) \geq \dots \geq v(k)$, in other words k greatest values chosen by the adversary are on positions $1, \dots, k$.

Lemma 2 *For a given adversarial sequence of values $v(1) \geq v(2) \geq \dots \geq v(k) \geq \dots \geq v(n)$, consider a wait-and-pick algorithm ALG with time threshold $m = \frac{n}{k^{1/3}}$ and statistic threshold $\tau = k \frac{m}{n} = k^{2/3}$, where k is large enough, $\log k \geq 8$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma \sim \Pi_n}(ALG(\sigma)) \geq \left(1 - \frac{3 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i),$$

where $ALG(\sigma)$ is a random variable denoting the output of the algorithm on a random permutation $\sigma \sim \Pi_n$.

Proof. First, we show that with high probability the statistic value t used by the algorithm is a value from the set $\{v(k - k^{2/3} \log k), v(k - k^{2/3} \log k + 1), \dots, v(k + k^{2/3} \log k)\}$.

Let us define $a = k - k^{2/3} \log k$ and a random variable X denoting the number of values from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, a\}$ that are on the first m positions in a random permutation σ , as defined in the proof of Lemma 1. Also denote $\mu_X = \mathbb{E}(X) = \frac{m}{n}(k - k^{2/3} \log k)$. By the choice of m , we have $\mu_X = k^{2/3} - k^{1/3} \log k$. Let $\delta = k^{1/3} \log k / \mu_X$. By Lemma 1, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{Pr}(|X - \mu_X| \geq \delta \cdot \mu_X = k^{1/3} \log k) \leq 2 \exp(-\delta^2 \mu_X/3) \implies$$

$$\mathbb{Pr}(X \geq \mu_X + k^{1/3} \log k) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{k^{2/3} \log^2 k}{3\mu_X}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2k},$$

where the last inequality holds because $\log k \geq 8$. We observe that $\mu_X + k^{1/3} \log k = k^{2/3} - k^{1/3} \log k + k^{1/3} \log k = \tau$. This yields

$$\mathbb{Pr}(X \geq \tau) \leq \frac{1}{2k},$$

which proves that with probability at most $\frac{1}{2k}$, the statistic t will be assigned to a value smaller than $v(k - k^{2/3} \log k)$.

Let $b = k + k^{2/3} \log k$ and Y be a random variable denoting the number of values from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, b\}$ that are on the first m positions in a random permutation σ . Observe, that $\mu_Y = E(Y_m) = \frac{m}{n}(k + k^{2/3} \log k)$. We will now show that by an analogical Chernoff bound argument as before we have

$$\mathbb{P}\text{r}(Y \leq \tau) \leq \frac{1}{2k}.$$

Namely, $\mu_Y = k^{2/3} + k^{1/3} \log k$, and let $\delta = k^{1/3} \log k / \mu_Y$. By Lemma 1

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\text{r}(|Y - \mu_Y| \geq \delta \cdot \mu_Y = k^{1/3} \log k) &\leq 2 \exp(-\delta^2 \mu_Y / 3) \implies \\ \mathbb{P}\text{r}(Y \leq \underbrace{\mu_Y - k^{1/3} \log k}_{=\tau}) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{k^{2/3} \log^2 k}{3\mu_Y}\right) = 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2k^{2/3} \log^2 k}{6(k^{2/3} + k^{1/3} \log k)}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2k}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because $\log k \geq 8$.

Next, we observe that the event $t \in \{v(k - k^{2/3} \log k), v(k - k^{2/3} \log k + 1), \dots, v(k + k^{2/3} \log k)\}$ is a complement of the union of events $X \geq \tau$ and $Y \leq \tau$, therefore by the union bound we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\text{r}(t \in \{v(k - k^{2/3} \log k), v(k - k^{2/3} \log k + 1), \dots, v(k + k^{2/3} \log k)\}) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{k}.$$

Consider now the i -th greatest value $v(i)$ from the $(1 - \epsilon)k$ greatest values assigned by the adversary, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, (1 - \epsilon)k\}$, where $\epsilon \geq \frac{\log k}{k^{1/3}}$, and for simplicity we write $(1 - \epsilon)k$ instead of $\lfloor (1 - \epsilon)k \rfloor$. Note that in order for the algorithm to choose $v(i)$, it is necessary that the largest possible value of the statistic t (attained at position $k - k^{2/3} \log k$) must be smaller than the smallest possible value of $v(i)$ (attained at position $i = (1 - \epsilon)k$); hence we need to assume that $(1 - \epsilon)k \leq k - k^{2/3} \log k$, implying that $\epsilon \geq \frac{\log k}{k^{1/3}}$. Let us indeed take $\epsilon = \frac{\log k}{k^{1/3}}$.

Let V_i be an indicator random variable denoting whether the algorithm added element $v(i)$ to its sum or not. First, we observe that with probability $(1 - \frac{m}{n})$ the index i is on positions $\{m + 1, \dots, n\}$ in a random permutation σ . Next, by the argument in the previous paragraph, with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{k}$ we obtain that $t \in \{v(k - k^{2/3} \log k), v(k - k^{2/3} \log k + 1), \dots, v(k + k^{2/3} \log k)\}$. The algorithm chooses the first k values that are greater than t that lie on positions $\{m + 1, \dots, n\}$. Assuming that $t \in \{v(k - k^{2/3} \log k), v(k - k^{2/3} \log k + 1), \dots, v(k + k^{2/3} \log k)\}$, there are at most $k + k^{2/3} \log k$ values greater than t in the whole permutation, thus the probability that the algorithm picks value $v(i)$, conditioned on the fact that this value appears on positions $\{m + 1, \dots, n\}$, is at least $(1 - \frac{1}{k})(\frac{k}{k + k^{2/3} \log k}) \geq (1 - \frac{1}{k})(1 - k^{-1/3} \log k)$. In consequence, the random variable V_i is one with probability at least $(1 - \frac{m}{n})(1 - \frac{1}{k})(1 - k^{-1/3} \log k)$. By the linearity of expectation, we obtain the following bound on the competitive ratio of the wait-and-pick algorithm ALG :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(ALG(\sigma)) &\geq \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{(1-\epsilon)k} V_i\right) \geq \left(1 - \epsilon\right)\left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)\left(1 - k^{-1/3} \log k\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{3 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i), \end{aligned}$$

since $\epsilon = k^{-1/3} \log^3 k$ and $\frac{m}{n} = \frac{1}{k^{1/3}}$, which proves the lemma. \square

In the last theorem, we use the probabilistic method to leverage any competitive multiple-choice secretary algorithm working on the uniform distribution of all permutations to an algorithm working on distributions of permutations with much smaller entropy. Denote $V = \sum_{i=1}^k v(i)$. The following result holds.

Theorem 7 Consider any algorithm ALG solving the multiple-choice secretary problem with the following competitive ratio

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \Pi_n}(ALG(\pi)) \geq (1 - \epsilon_2) \cdot V ,$$

for some $\epsilon_2 \in (0, 1)$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a multi-set \mathcal{L} of permutations of size at most $\ell = \frac{k(\log n + \log k)}{\delta^2(1 - \epsilon_2)^2}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{L}}(ALG(\pi)) \geq (1 - \delta)(1 - \epsilon_2) \cdot V .$$

Proof. Fix any particular ordering of adversarial values. Let $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_\ell\}$ be random permutations drawn independently from the uniform distribution of all permutations. Define $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}(ALG(\pi_i))$. By the properties of the algorithm ALG we get that $\mathbb{E}(ALG(\pi_i)) \geq (1 - \epsilon_2) \cdot V$, which implies $\mu \geq (1 - \epsilon_2)\ell V$. We also note that $ALG(\pi_i) \leq V$ with probability 1. Thus, from Hoeffding theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} ALG(\pi_i) < (1 - \delta)\mu\right) &\leq \exp\left(\frac{-2\delta^2\mu^2}{\ell V^2}\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-2\delta^2((1 - \epsilon_2)\ell V)^2}{\ell V^2}\right) \\ &= \exp(-2\delta^2(1 - \epsilon_2)^2\ell) . \end{aligned}$$

Now, there are at most $\binom{n}{k} \cdot k! \leq \exp(k \log n + k \log k)$ possibilities of assigning k biggest values to different positions in a permutation. Thus, assuming that $\ell \geq \frac{k \log n + k \log k}{\delta^2(1 - \epsilon_2)^2}$, the union bound implies that there exists a (deterministic) (multi-)set of permutations π'_1, \dots, π'_ℓ such that for each adversarial order, the inequality $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} ALG(\pi'_i) \geq (1 - \delta)(1 - \epsilon_2) \cdot V$ holds. Selecting the set $\{\pi'_1, \dots, \pi'_\ell\}$ as \mathcal{L} guarantees the bound stated in the theorem. \square

Remark. Taking as algorithm ALG in Theorem 7 the wait and pick algorithm from Lemma 2, we can plug $1 - \epsilon_2 = \left(1 - \frac{3 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)$, and obtain a $(1 - \delta)(1 - \epsilon_2)$ -competitive algorithm using a small entropy uniform distribution on the multi-set \mathcal{L} of permutations.

5 Derandomization via Chernoff bound for the k -secretary problem

Our goal here is to derandomize the Hoeffding argument from Theorem 7. Unlike that theorem, we will use Chernoff bound to derandomize (see below for details). We will first precisely model the random experiment and events from Lemma 2 to be able to compute their (conditional) probability. For simplicity of notation we will, in this section, write $(1 - \epsilon)k$ and $k \frac{m}{n}$ instead of $\lfloor (1 - \epsilon)k \rfloor$ and $\lfloor k \frac{m}{n} \rfloor$, respectively.

Combinatorialization. Let $\hat{S} = \{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}\}$, called a $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple, be an ordered subset $\{j_1, \dots, j_{k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}\} \subseteq [n]$ of $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ indices with a distinguished index $j_0 \in \{j_1, \dots, j_{(1 - \epsilon)k}\}$. The idea of \hat{S} is to model the positions in the adversarial permutation of the $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ largest adversarial values $v(1), v(2), \dots, v(k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor)$ and j_0 is the position of one of the first $(1 - \epsilon)k$ largest values. Let \mathcal{K} be the set of all such $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuples.

To be precise, the adversary assigned value $v(u)$ (the u -th largest adversarial value, $u \geq 1$) to the position j_u in his/her permutation and the random permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$ places this value at the position $\pi^{-1}(j_u)$, for each $u \in \{1, 2, \dots, k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor\}$.

Let us choose independently and u.a.r. a permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$. Recall that we consider the following algorithm. First, it reads the first m elements $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(m)$. Then, it calculates $k \frac{m}{n}$ -th greatest so far read element among $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(m)$, whose (adversarial) value we denote t , the statistic. Finally, it reads the remaining elements $\pi(m + 1), \dots, \pi(n)$ one by one, and adds up the

values of the first k elements whose values are greater than t . This sum is the final result of the algorithm.

Re-proving Lemma 2. Under the experiment of choosing independently and u.a.r a permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$, referring to Lemma 2, we define an event A_{j_0} that the distinguished value $v(u')$ where $j_0 = j_{u'}$, appears to the right of position m in π , that is, $A_{j_0} = \{\pi^{-1}(j_0) > m\}$. We define event B_u that the statistic $t = v(u)$, that is, $B_u = \{t = v(u)\}$, for each $u \in \{k - \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor, k - \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor + 1, \dots, k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor\}$. Let finally C_{j_0} be the event that the algorithm chooses, among the k elements, the distinguished value $v(u')$, where $j_0 = j_{u'}$ for some $u' \in \{1, 2, \dots, (1 - \epsilon)k\}$. In the proof of Lemma 2, we show that

$$\Pr \left[A_{j_0} \cap \left(\bigcup_{u=k-\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor} B_u \right) \cap C_{j_0} \right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) = \rho_k, \quad (1)$$

where event A_{j_0} holds with probability $1 - m/n$, and conditioned on A_{j_0} , event $B = \bigcup_{u=k-\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor} B_u$ holds with probability at least $1 - 1/k$, and conditioned on these two previous events, event C_{j_0} holds with probability $1 - \frac{\log^3(k)}{k^{1/3}}$. Observe that events B_u are mutually disjoint, therefore $\Pr \left[A_{j_0} \cap \left(\bigcup_{u=k-\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor} B_u \right) \cap C_{j_0} \right] = \sum_{u=k-\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor} \Pr[A_{j_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{j_0}]$.

First, as noted above, $\Pr[A_{j_0}] = 1 - m/n$. Conditioned on A_{j_0} , event B_u holds iff there exists a subset of indices $J \subseteq \{j_1, \dots, j_{u-1}\} \setminus \{j_0\}$ such that $|J| = k \frac{m}{n} - 1$, and $\forall j \in J : \pi^{-1}(j) \leq m$, $\pi^{-1}(u) \leq m$, and $\forall j' \in \{j_1, \dots, j_{u-1}\} \setminus J : \pi^{-1}(j') > m$. By using Bayes' formula on conditional probabilities, this leads to (proof of Lemma 4 in Section 6.1 has a detailed justification of this formula):

$$\Pr[A_{j_0} \cap B_u] = \Pr[A_{j_0}] \cdot \binom{u-2}{k \frac{m}{n} - 1} \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k \frac{m}{n}} \frac{m - (j-1)}{n - 1 - (j-1)} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{j'=1}^{u-k \frac{m}{n} - 1} \frac{n - m - j'}{n - (1 + k \frac{m}{n}) - (j' - 1)} \right).$$

Conditioned on A_{j_0} and B_u , when such a set J is chosen, event C_{j_0} holds iff $v(u')$ (where $j_0 = j_{u'}$ for some $u' \in \{1, 2, \dots, (1 - \epsilon)k\}$) appears in permutation π among the first k values to the right from threshold m that are greater than the statistic $t = v(u)$. This surely happens (with probability 1) if $u \in \{k - \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor, \dots, k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor\}$ is such that $|\{j_1, \dots, j_{u-1}\} \setminus J| \leq k$. If, on the other hand $u \in \{k - \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor, \dots, k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor\}$ is such that $|\{j_1, \dots, j_{u-1}\} \setminus J| > k$, then this happens with probability $k/|\{j_1, \dots, j_{u-1}\} \setminus J|$, as the probability that index $j_{u'}$ is on any of the k first positions among elements $\{j_1, \dots, j_{u-1}\} \setminus J$ is $(w-1)!/w! = 1/w$, where $w = |\{j_1, \dots, j_{u-1}\} \setminus J|$. Therefore we finally obtain

$$\Pr[A_{j_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{j_0}] = \Pr[A_{j_0} \cap B_u] \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{k}{u - k \frac{m}{n}}, 1 \right\}.$$

Probabilistic existence proof (Theorem 7). Let us fix a $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple $\hat{S} = \{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}\} \in \mathcal{K}$. We say that an independently and u.a.r. chosen $\pi \in \Pi_n$ is *successful* for \hat{S} iff event $A_{j_0} \cap B \cap C_{j_0}$ holds. We also say that π *covers* \hat{S} if π is successful for \hat{S} . By the above argument π is successful with probability at least ρ_k from (1). We choose independently ℓ permutations π_1, \dots, π_ℓ from Π_n u.a.r., as in Theorem 7, and $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_\ell\}$. Let $X_1^{\hat{S}}, \dots, X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$ be random variables such that $X_s^{\hat{S}} = 1$ if the corresponding random permutation π_t is successful for $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple \hat{S} , and $X_s^{\hat{S}} = 0$ otherwise, for $s = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$. Then for $X^{\hat{S}} = X_1^{\hat{S}} + \dots + X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$ we have that $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] \geq \rho_k \ell$ and by the Chernoff bound, like in Theorem 7, we have

$$\Pr[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \rho_k \ell] < \exp(-\delta^2 \rho_k \ell / 2), \quad (2)$$

for any $0 < \delta < 1$; note we use here Chernoff rather than Hoeffding bound, because r.v.'s $X_s^{\hat{S}}$ are 0/1.

The probability that there exists a $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$ for which there does not exist a $(1 - \delta)\rho_k$ fraction of successful permutations among these ℓ random permutations, by the union bound, is:

$$\Pr[\exists \hat{S} \in \mathcal{K} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \rho_k \ell] < |\mathcal{K}| \cdot \exp(-\delta^2 \rho_k \ell / 2).$$

Observe that $|\mathcal{K}| = \binom{n}{k'} (k')! (1 - \epsilon)k$ and $\binom{n}{k'} \cdot (k')! \leq \exp(k' \log n + k' \log k')$, where $k' = k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$. This gives $|\mathcal{K}| \leq \exp(k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1 - \epsilon)k))$. This implies that the above probability is strictly smaller than 1 if $\ell \geq \frac{k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1 - \epsilon)k)}{\delta^2 \rho_k / 2}$. Therefore, all $|\mathcal{K}| = \binom{n}{k'} (k')! (1 - \epsilon)k$ of the $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuples \hat{S} are covered with strictly positive probability for such ℓ . This means that there exist $\Theta\left(\frac{k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1 - \epsilon)k)}{\delta^2 \rho_k}\right)$ permutations such that if we choose one of them u.a.r., then for any $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuples \hat{S} , this permutation will be successful with probability at least $(1 - \delta)\rho_k$, which is the competitive ratio of the k -secretary algorithm with threshold m .

5.1 Derandomization of Theorem 7

Theorem 8 Suppose that we are given integers n and k , such that $n \geq 1$, $n > k$, $\log k \geq 8$, and error parameters $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon = \frac{\log k}{k^{1/3}}$. Define $\rho_k = (1 - \frac{m}{n}) (1 - \frac{1}{k}) (1 - \frac{\log k}{k^{1/3}})$. Then for

$$\ell \geq \frac{k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1 - \epsilon)k)}{\delta^2 \rho_k / 2}, \text{ where } k' = k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor,$$

there exists a deterministic algorithm (Algorithm 1) that finds a multi-set $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_\ell\}$ of n -element permutations $\pi_j \in \Pi_n$, for $j \in [\ell]$, such that for every $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple there are at least $(1 - \delta) \cdot \rho_k \ell$ successful permutations from \mathcal{L} (for the k -secretary wait-and-pick algorithm with time threshold m and statistic $k \frac{m}{n}$). The running time of this algorithm to compute the multi-set \mathcal{L} is

$$O\left((1 - \epsilon) \cdot \ell \cdot k^{k+1} \cdot n^{k+2} \cdot \left(k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor\right)^{km/n} \cdot \text{poly} \log(n)\right).$$

The resulting k -secretary wait-and-pick algorithm with time threshold m and statistic $k \frac{m}{n}$ chooses a permutation $\pi \in \mathcal{L}$ u.a.r. and achieves an expected competitive ratio of at least $(1 - \epsilon) \cdot (1 - \delta) \cdot \rho_k$.

We present here the proof of Theorem 8, whose missing details can be found in Section 6.

Preliminaries. To derandomize the Hoeffding argument of Theorem 7, we will derive a special conditional expectations method with a pessimistic estimator. We will model an experiment to choose u.a.r. a permutation $\pi_j \in \Pi_n$ by independent “index” r.v.’s X_j^i : $\Pr[X_j^i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - i + 1\}] = 1/(n - i + 1)$, for $i \in [n]$, to define $\pi = \pi_j \in \Pi_n$ “sequentially”: $\pi(1) = X_j^1$, $\pi(2)$ is the X_j^2 -th element in $I_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\pi(1)\}$, $\pi(3)$ is the X_j^3 -th element in $I_2 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\pi(1), \pi(2)\}$, etc, where elements are increasingly ordered. Suppose random permutations $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_\ell\}$ are generated using $X_j^1, X_j^2, \dots, X_j^n$ for $j \in [\ell]$. Given a $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$, recall the definition of r.v. $X_j^{\hat{S}}$ for $j \in [\ell]$ given above. For $X^{\hat{S}} = X_1^{\hat{S}} + \dots + X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we have that $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] \geq \rho_k \ell$ and $\Pr[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \rho_k \ell] < \exp(-\delta^2 \rho_k \ell / 2)$, and

$$\Pr[\exists \hat{S} \in \mathcal{K} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \rho_k \ell] < 1 \text{ for } \ell \geq \frac{k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1 - \epsilon)k)}{\delta^2 \rho_k / 2}.$$

We call the $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$ *not well-covered* if $X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \rho_k \ell$ (then a new r.v. $Y^{\hat{S}} = 1$), and *well-covered* otherwise (then $Y^{\hat{S}} = 0$). Let $Y = \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} Y^{\hat{S}}$. By the above argument $\mathbb{E}[Y] = \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[Y^{\hat{S}}] < 1$ if $\ell \geq 2[k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1 - \epsilon)k)]/\delta^2 \rho_k$. We will keep the expectation

$\mathbb{E}[Y]$ below 1 in each step of derandomization, and these steps will sequentially define the permutations in \mathcal{L} .

Outline of derandomization. We will choose permutations $\{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_\ell\}$ sequentially, one by one, where $\pi_1 = (1, 2, \dots, n)$ is the identity permutation. For some $s \in [\ell - 1]$ let permutations π_1, \dots, π_s have already been chosen (“fixed”). We will choose a “semi-random” permutation π_{s+1} position by position using X_{s+1}^i . Suppose that $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ are already chosen for some $r \in [n - 1]$, where all $\pi_{s+1}(i)$ ($i \in [r - 1]$) are fixed and final, except $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ which is fixed but not final yet. We will vary $\pi_{s+1}(r) \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r - 1)\}$ to choose the best value for $\pi_{s+1}(r)$, assuming that $\pi_{s+1}(r + 1), \pi_{s+1}(r + 2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(n)$ are random. Permutations π_{s+2}, \dots, π_n are “fully-random”.

Conditional probabilities. Given $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$ and $r \in [n - 1]$, observe that $X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}}$ depends only on $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$. We will show how to compute the **conditional probabilities** (Algorithm 2 in Appendix 6.1) $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$ ($= \mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1]$ if $r = 0$), where randomness is over random positions $\pi_{s+1}(r + 1), \pi_{s+1}(r + 2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(n)$. Theorem 9 is proved in Section 6.1.

Theorem 9 Suppose that values $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ have already been fixed for some $r \in \{0\} \cup [n]$. There exist a deterministic algorithm (Algorithm 2, Section 6.1) to compute $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$, where the random event is the random choice of the semi-random permutation π_{s+1} conditioned on its first r elements already being fixed. Its running time is

$$O((k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor)^{km/n} \cdot n \cdot \text{poly} \log(n)),$$

and $m \in \{2, 3, \dots, n - 1\}$ is the threshold of the k -secretarial algorithm.

Pessimistic estimator. Let $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$. Denote $\mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}] = \mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_j^{\hat{S}} = 1] = \mu_j$ for each $j \in [\ell]$, and $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mu_j = \mu$. By (1) we have that $\mu_j \geq \rho_k$, for each $j \in [\ell]$. We will now use Raghavan’s proof of the Hoeffding bound, see [46], for any $\delta > 0$, using that $\mu_j \geq \rho_k$ (see more details in Section 6.2):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \ell \cdot \rho_k] &\leq \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\rho_k}} < \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{\exp(-\delta \mu_j)}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\rho_k}} \leq \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{\exp(-\delta \rho_k)}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\rho_k}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp(b(-\delta)\ell\rho_k)} < \frac{1}{\exp(\delta^2 \ell \rho_k / 2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $b(x) = (1 + x) \ln(1 + x) - x$, and the last inequality follows by $b(-x) > x^2/2$, see, e.g., [46]. Thus, union bound implies:

$$\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[\exists \hat{S} \in \mathcal{K} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \ell \rho_k] \leq \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\rho_k}}. \quad (3)$$

We will derive a pessimistic estimator of this failure probability in (3). Let $\phi_j(\hat{S}) = 1$ if π_j is successful

for \hat{S} , and $\phi_j(\hat{S}) = 0$ otherwise, and failure probability (3) is at most:

$$\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_j(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \quad (4)$$

$$= \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_j(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right)^{\ell-s-1} \quad (5)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \delta \cdot \rho_k}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right)^{\ell-s-1} \\ = \Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)), \quad (6)$$

where equality (5) is conditional expectation under: (fixed) permutations π_1, \dots, π_s for some $s \in [\ell - 1]$, the (semi-random) permutation π_{s+1} currently being chosen, and (fully random) permutations $\pi_{s+2}, \dots, \pi_{\ell}$. The first term (4) is less than $|\mathcal{K}| / \exp(\delta^2 \ell \rho_k / 2)$, which is strictly smaller than 1 for large ℓ . Let us denote $\mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})] = \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}) | \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau] = \mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 | \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau]$, where positions $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ were fixed in the semi-random permutation π_{s+1} , $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ was fixed in particular to $\tau \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$, and it can be computed by using the algorithm from Theorem 9. This gives our pessimistic estimator Φ . Because s is fixed for all steps where the semi-random permutation is being decided, Φ is uniformly proportional to Φ_1 :

$$\Phi_1 = \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s (1 - \delta \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})) \right) \cdot (1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]), \\ \Phi_2 = \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s (1 - \delta \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})) \right) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]. \quad (7)$$

Recall $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ in semi-random permutation was fixed but not final. To make it final, we choose $\pi_{s+1}(r) \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$ that minimizes Φ_1 , which is equivalent to maximizing Φ_2 . Proof of Lemma 3 can be found in Section 6.2.

Lemma 3 $\Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r))$ is a pessimistic estimator of the failure probability in (3), if $\ell \geq 2[k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1 - \epsilon)k)] / [\delta^2 \rho_k]$.

Proof. (of Theorem 8) See the precise details of this proof in Section 6.2. \square

6 Derandomization for k -secretary: details of the proof of Theorem 7

6.1 Conditional probabilities and proof of Theorem 9

Let $\hat{S} = \{\hat{s}_0, \hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}\} \in \mathcal{K}$ be a $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple. Recall the process of generating a random permutation π_j by the index random variables $X_j^1, X_j^2, \dots, X_j^n$, which generate elements $\pi_j(1), \pi_j(2), \dots, \pi_j(n)$ sequentially, one-by-one, in this order.

We will define an algorithm to compute $\mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 | \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$ for the semi-random permutation π_{s+1} , by using an approach of re-proving Lemma 2 from Section 5. Slightly abusing notation we let for $r = 0$ to have that $\mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 | \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)] = \mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1]$. In this case, we will also show below how to compute $\mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1]$ when π_{s+1} is fully random.

Algorithm 1: Find permutations distribution (k -secretary)

Input: Positive integers $n, k \leq n, \ell \geq 2$, such that $\log k \geq 8$.
Output: A multi-set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Pi_n$ of ℓ permutations.

```
1 /* This algorithm uses Function Prob( $A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}, \hat{S}$ ) from Algorithm 2, Section 6.1. */
2  $\pi_1 := (1, 2, \dots, n)$  /* Identity permutation */
3  $\mathcal{L} := \{\pi_1\}$ 
4 Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the set of all  $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuples.
5 for  $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$  do
6    $w(\hat{S}) := 1 - \delta \cdot \phi_1(\hat{S})$ 
7 for  $s = 1 \dots \ell - 1$  do
8   for  $r = 1 \dots n$  do
9     for  $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$  (let  $\hat{S} = \{\hat{s}_0, \hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}\}$ ) do
10      for  $\tau \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$  do
11         $\Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0} \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau] :=$ 
12          Prob( $A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}, \hat{S}$ ), for
13             $u = k - \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor, k - \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor + 1, \dots, k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ .
14           $\mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}) \mid \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau] :=$ 
15             $\sum_{u=k-\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor} \Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0} \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau]$ 
16        Choose  $\pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau$  for  $\tau \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$  to maximize
17           $\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} w(\hat{S}) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}) \mid \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau]$ .
18       $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L} \cup \{\pi_{s+1}\}$ 
19   for  $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$  do
20      $w(\hat{S}) := w(\hat{S}) \cdot (1 - \delta \cdot \phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}))$ 
21 return  $\mathcal{L}$ 
```

Proof of Theorem 9. We will now present the proof of Theorem 9. Recall that $\hat{S} = \{\hat{s}_0, \hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}\}$. If $r = 0$ and π_{s+1} is fully random then by the approach of re-proving Lemma 2 from Section 5, we have that

$$\Pr[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1] = \Pr \left[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap \left(\bigcup_{u=k-\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor} B_u \right) \cap C_{\hat{s}_0} \right] = \sum_{u=k-\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor} \Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] &= \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right) \cdot \binom{u-2}{k \frac{m}{n} - 1} \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k \frac{m}{n}} \frac{m - (j-1)}{n - 1 - (j-1)} \right) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\prod_{j'=1}^{u-k \frac{m}{n} - 1} \frac{n - m - j'}{n - (1 + k \frac{m}{n}) - (j' - 1)} \right) \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{k}{u - k \frac{m}{n}}, 1 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Assume from now on that $r \geq 1$. Suppose now that values $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ have already been chosen for some $r \in [n]$, i.e., they all are fixed and final, except that $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ is fixed but not final. The algorithm will be based on an observation that the random process of generating the remaining values $\pi_{s+1}(r+1), \pi_{s+1}(r+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(n)$ can be viewed as choosing u.a.r. a random permutation of values in the set $[n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$; so this random permutation has length $n - r$.

Algorithm 2: Conditional probabilities (k -secretary)

```

1 Function Prob ( $A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}, \hat{S}$ ) :
2    $p := 0; q := 0;$  /* For loop below iterates over all subsets  $J$  of size  $k\frac{m}{n} - 1$ . */
3   for  $J$  s.t.  $J \subseteq \{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus \{\hat{s}_0\}$  and  $|J| = k\frac{m}{n} - 1$  do
4     if  $(\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J) \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(\min(r, m))\} \neq \emptyset$  then
5        $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 0$ 
6     else
7       /* Now  $(\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J) \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(\min(r, m))\} = \emptyset$ . */
8       if  $r \leq m$  then
9         Let  $J' = (J \cup \{\hat{s}_u\}) \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$ .
10        if  $|J'| + m - r < k\frac{m}{n}$  then
11           $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 0$ 
12        else
13          if  $r = m$  then
14             $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = \min \left\{ \frac{k}{u - k\frac{m}{n}}, 1 \right\}$ 
15          if  $r < m$  then
16             $k' := k\frac{m}{n} - |J'|$ 
17             $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = \frac{n-m}{n-r} \cdot \left( \prod_{j=1}^{k'} \frac{m-r-(j-1)}{n-r-1-(j-1)} \right) \cdot$ 
18               $\left( \prod_{j'=1}^{u-k'-1} \frac{n-m-j'}{n-r-(1+k')-(j'-1)} \right) \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{k}{u - k\frac{m}{n}}, 1 \right\}$ 
19        else
20          /* We have now  $r > m$  */
21          if  $J \cup \{\hat{s}_u\} \not\subseteq \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(m)\}$  then
22             $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 0$ 
23          else
24            /* We have here  $J \cup \{\hat{s}_u\} \subseteq \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(m)\}$  */
25            Let  $T = \{\pi_{s+1}(m+1), \pi_{s+1}(m+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$ .
26            if  $|\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J| \leq k$  then
27               $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 1$ 
28            else
29              if  $\hat{s}_0 \in T$  then
30                Let  $\hat{s}_0 = \pi_{s+1}(\tau)$  for some  $\tau \in \{m+1, m+2, \dots, r\}$ .
31                Let  $J'' = (\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J) \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(m+1), \pi_{s+1}(m+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(\tau-1)\}$ .
32                if  $|J''| < k$  then
33                   $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 1$ 
34                if  $|J''| \geq k$  then
35                   $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 0$ 
36              else
37                Let  $J'' =$ 
38                   $(\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J) \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(m+1), \pi_{s+1}(m+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$ .
39                if  $|J''| \geq k$  then
40                   $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 0$ 
41                if  $|J''| < k$  then
42                   $q := \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = \min \left\{ \frac{k - |J''|}{u - |J''| - k\frac{m}{n}}, 1 \right\}$ 
43     $p := p + q;$ 
44  return  $\mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = p;$ 

```

To compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{Pr}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)] = \\ &= \sum_{u=k-\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor} \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0} \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)], \end{aligned}$$

we proceed as follows. For simplicity, we will write below $\mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}]$ instead of $\mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0} \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$. We will only show in Algorithm 2 how to compute probabilities $\mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}]$, and to obtain $\mathbb{Pr}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1]$ one needs to compute $\sum_{u=k-\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor}^{k+\lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor} \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}]$.

Lemma 4 *Algorithm 2* $\text{Prob}(A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}, \hat{S})$ correctly computes $\mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = \mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0} \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$ in time $O((k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor)^{km/n} \cdot n \cdot \text{poly} \log(n))$.

Proof. We will show first the correctness. When computing conditional probability $\mathbb{Pr}[A_{j_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{j_0}] = \mathbb{Pr}[A_{j_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{j_0} \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$, we iterate fro all subsets J in the for loop and sum up these probabilities in variable p . This reflects the binomial formula $\binom{u-2}{k\frac{m}{n}-1}$ in the equation (8).

Recall the discussion in re-proving Lemma 2 in Section 5, where index \hat{s}_u is supposed to be the statistic t that needs to be in positions $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ of permutation π_{s+1} . The set $J \subseteq \{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus \{\hat{s}_0\}$ contains $k\frac{m}{n} - 1$ indices which correspond to values that are larger than value corresponding to \hat{s}_u . Indices from J are also supposed to be in positions $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ of π_{s+1} . The other indices from set $\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J$ correspond to values higher than value of \hat{s}_u and they must be in positions $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, n\}$ of π_{s+1} . These conditions together mean that the value of \hat{s}_u defines the statistic t .

Therefore, when condition in line 4 of Algorithm 2 holds, then not all of indices from $\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J$ are in positions $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, n\}$, meaning that $\mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 0$. When this condition does not hold then we consider two cases, $r \leq m$ in line 8, and $r > m$ in line 19.

When $r \leq m$ holds in line 8, then we know that indices $\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J$ are in random positions $\{r+1, r+2, \dots, n\}$ of π_{s+1} . These indices are in positions $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, n\}$ in line 13 surely (with probability 1) when $r = m$, and we will compute the probability that they are in positions $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, n\}$ in line 15 when $r < m$.

Now, recall that the indices from $J \cup \{\hat{s}_u\}$ define the statistic t , so they must be in positions $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Set $J' \subseteq J$ from line 9 contains those indices from J which are on the fixed (non-random) positions $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$, so we need to compute the probability that the remaining indices $J \setminus J'$ are in positions $\{r+1, r+2, \dots, m\}$, which will be done in line 15 when $r < m$.

When $|J'| + m - r < k\frac{m}{n}$ in line 10, then set $J \cup \{\hat{s}_u\}$ does not fit in positions from 1 up to m in π_{s+1} , therefore $\mathbb{Pr}[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 0$.

Otherwise, if $|J'| + m - r \geq k\frac{m}{n}$, then if $r = m$ in line 13, then observe that at this point all indices from $J \cup \{\hat{s}_u\}$ are surely in positions $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, and all indices from $\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J$ are surely in positions $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, n\}$. Now, we only need to compute the probability that the index \hat{s}_0 will be chosen by the k -secretary algorithm as one of the first k indices with values larger than that of the statistic t .

This surely happens if $|\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J| \leq k$. If, on the other hand $|\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J| > k$, then this happens with probability $k/|\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J|$, as the probability that index $\hat{s}_{u'}$ is on any of the k first positions among elements $\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J$ is $(w-1)!/w! = 1/w$, where $w = |\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J|$. Observing that $|\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J| = u-1 - (k\frac{m}{n} - 1) = u - k\frac{m}{n}$, we have $\mathbb{Pr}[A_{j_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{j_0}] = \min\left\{\frac{k}{u-k\frac{m}{n}}, 1\right\}$ as in line 14.

Coming to line 15 when $r < m$, with probability $\frac{n-m}{n-r}$ in line 17, the index \hat{s}_0 will be on positions $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, n\}$ among random positions $\{r+1, r+2, \dots, n\}$ of π_{s+1} . Conditioned on this event, the probability that indices $J \setminus J'$ ($|J \setminus J'| = k'$) are in random positions $\{r+1, r+2, \dots, m\}$ is

$$\prod_{j=1}^{k'} \frac{m-r-(j-1)}{n-r-1-(j-1)}$$

in line 17. Conditioned on all those events (about index \hat{s}_0 and about indices $J \setminus J'$), the probability that the remaining indices from the set $R = \{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}, \hat{s}_u\} \setminus ((J \setminus J') \cup \{\hat{s}_0\})$ (noting that $|R| = u - k' - 1$) are in random positions $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, n\}$ (conditioning on the fact that $k'+1$ of the random positions $\{r+1, r+2, \dots, n\}$ are already occupied by the previous $k'+1$ indices from the set $(J \setminus J') \cup \{\hat{s}_0\}$) is

$$\prod_{j'=1}^{u-k'-1} \frac{n-m-j'}{n-r-(1+k')-(j'-1)}$$

in line 17. Finally, the last part, $\min\left\{\frac{k}{u-k\frac{m}{n}}, 1\right\}$, in the probability calculated in line 17, is the probability that index \hat{s}_0 is among the first k largest values chosen by the k -secretary algorithm. The argument for this last part is the same as above argument for line 14.

We will now analyze the case of $r > m$ from line 19. In this case, the probability $\Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}]$ can only be non-zero if $J \cup \{\hat{s}_u\} \subseteq \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(m)\}$.

Let us summarize the situation now. The indices $J \cup \{\hat{s}_u\}$ are surely in positions $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ as they should be. The indices $\{\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J$ are surely in positions $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, n\}$ as they should be, because condition in line 7 holds.

Therefore, the only property that we need to ensure now is that the index \hat{s}_0 is among the first k largest values chosen by the k -secretary algorithm. We will do that by using the same argument as that for line 14 above.

Let $T = \{\pi_{s+1}(m+1), \pi_{s+1}(m+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$, see line 24. If $|\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J| \leq k$ then \hat{s}_0 is surely among the first k largest chosen values, so $\Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 1$.

We analyze now the lines 28-34. If index \hat{s}_0 is in set T on position τ in permutation π_{s+1} , then set J'' contains all indices from $\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J$ that are before position τ in permutation π_{s+1} and have (adversarial) values higher than that of the statistic t . So if $|J''| < k$ then index \hat{s}_0 is surely chosen as the first k values larger than t and $\Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 1$. If $|J''| \geq k$, then index \hat{s}_0 is surely not chosen as the first k values larger than t and so $\Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 0$.

To conclude the proof now, we analyze now lines 36-40. We have that $\hat{s}_0 \notin T$, so \hat{s}_0 is on random positions $\{r+1, r+2, \dots, n\}$ in π_{s+1} . Set J'' contains all indices from $\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{u-1}\} \setminus J$ that are on non-random positions $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, r\}$ in π_{s+1} . Therefore, if $|J''| \geq k$, then index \hat{s}_0 is surely not chosen as the first k values larger than t and $\Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = 0$. If $|J''| < k$, then index \hat{s}_0 will be chosen as the first k values larger than t with probability $\Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}] = \min\left\{\frac{k-|J''|}{u-|J''|-k\frac{m}{n}}, 1\right\}$, where the argument is the same as that for line 14 above.

We now argue about the implementation of the algorithm. The main for loop iterates for all subsets J of size $k\frac{m}{n}-1$ of set of size $u-2$. Because $u \leq k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$, there are at most $(k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor)^{km/n}$ such subsets.

The main kind of operations inside each iteration of the for loop are operations on subsets of set $[n]$, which are set membership and set intersections, which can easily be implemented in time $O(n)$. The other kind of operations in computing $\Pr[A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}]$ are divisions of numbers from the set $[n]$ and multiplications of the resulting rational expressions. Clearly, each of these arithmetic operations can be performed in time $O(\text{poly} \log(n))$. This means that this algorithm can be implemented in the total running time of $O((k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor)^{km/n} \cdot n \cdot \text{poly} \log(n))$ as claimed. \square

The proof of the above lemma finishes the proof of Theorem 9.

6.2 Pessimistic estimator

Let $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$ be a $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple. Recall that $X^{\hat{S}} = X_1^{\hat{S}} + \dots + X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$. Denote also $\mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}] = \Pr[X_j^{\hat{S}} = 1] = \mu_j$ for each $j \in [\ell]$, and $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] = \sum_{j=1}^\ell \mu_j = \mu$. We will now use Raghavan's proof of the Hoeffding bound, see [46], for any $\delta > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \mu] &= \Pr\left[\prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{(1 - \delta)^{X_j^{\hat{S}}}}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\mu_j}} \geq 1\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{1 - \delta \cdot X_j^{\hat{S}}}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\mu_j}}\right] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\mu_j}} \\ &< \prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{\exp(-\delta\mu_j)}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\mu_j}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp(b(-\delta)\mu)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $b(x) = (1+x) \ln(1+x) - x$, and the second step uses Bernoulli's inequality $(1+x)^r \leq 1+rx$, that holds for $0 \leq r \leq 1$ and $x \geq -1$, and Markov's inequality, and the last inequality uses $1-x \leq \exp(-x)$, which holds for $x \geq 0$ and is strict if $x \neq 0$.

By (1) we have that $\mu_j \geq \rho_k$, for each $j \in [\ell]$. Then we can further upper bound the last line of Raghavan's proof to obtain $\frac{1}{\exp(b(-\delta)\mu)} \leq \frac{1}{\exp(b(-\delta)\ell\rho_k)}$. Theorem 7 guarantees existence of the multi set \mathcal{L} of permutations by bounding $\Pr[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \rho_k \ell] \leq \exp(\delta^2 \rho_k \ell / 2)$, see (2); note that we use here Chernoff rather than Hoeffding bound, as in that theorem. Now, repeating the Raghavan's proof with each μ_j replaced by ρ_k implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \ell \cdot \rho_k] &\leq \prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\rho_k}} \tag{9} \\ &< \prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{\exp(-\delta\mu_j)}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\rho_k}} \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{\exp(-\delta\rho_k)}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\rho_k}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp(b(-\delta)\ell\rho_k)} < \frac{1}{\exp(\delta^2 \ell \rho_k / 2)}, \tag{10} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by a well known fact that $b(-x) > x^2/2$, see, e.g., [46]. By this argument and by the union bound we obtain that:

$$\Pr[\exists \hat{S} \in \mathcal{K} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \ell \rho_k] \leq \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1 - \delta)\rho_k}}. \tag{11}$$

Let us define a function $\phi_j(\hat{S})$ which is equal to 1 if permutation π_j is successful for the $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple \hat{S} , and 0 otherwise. The above proof upper bounds the probability of failure by the

expected value of

$$\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}},$$

the expectation of which is less than $|\mathcal{K}| / \exp(\delta^2 \ell \rho_k / 2)$, which is strictly smaller than 1 for appropriately large ℓ .

Suppose that we have so far chosen the (fixed) permutations π_1, \dots, π_s for some $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1\}$, the (semi-random) permutation π_{s+1} is currently being chosen, and the remaining (fully random) permutations, if any, are $\pi_{s+2}, \dots, \pi_\ell$. The conditional expectation is then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_j(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right)^{\ell-s-1} \\ & \leq \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s \frac{1 - \delta \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \delta \cdot \rho_k}{(1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)\rho_k}} \right)^{\ell-s-1} \\ & = \Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)), \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where in the inequality, we used that $\mathbb{E}[\phi_j(\hat{S})] \geq \rho_k$. Note, that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})] &= \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}) \mid \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau], \end{aligned}$$

where positions $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ have already been fixed in the semi-random permutation π_{s+1} , $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ has been fixed in particular to $\tau \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$, and this value can be computed by using the algorithm from Theorem 9. This gives the pessimistic estimator Φ of the failure probability in (11) for our derandomization.

Because s is fixed for all steps where the semi-random permutation is being decided, this pessimistic estimator is uniformly proportional to

$$\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s (1 - \delta \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})) \right) \cdot (1 - \delta \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]).$$

Recall that the value of $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ in the semi-random permutation was fixed but not final. To make it fixed and final, we simply choose the value $\pi_{s+1}(r) \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$ that minimizes this last expression, which is equivalent to maximizing

$$\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s (1 - \delta \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})) \right) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]. \tag{13}$$

Proof. (of Lemma 3) This follows from the following 3 properties: (a) it is an upper bound on the conditional probability of failure; (b) it is initially strictly less than 1; (c) some new value of the next index variable in the partially fixed semi-random permutation π_{s+1} can always be chosen without increasing it.

Property (a) follows from (9) and (11). To prove (b) we see by (10) and (11) that

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists \hat{S} \in \mathcal{K} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \delta) \cdot \ell \rho_k] < |\mathcal{K}| / \exp(\delta^2 \ell \rho_k / 2).$$

Observe that $|\mathcal{K}| = \binom{n}{k'}(k'!(1-\epsilon)k)$ and $\binom{n}{k} \cdot k! \leq \exp(k \log n + k \log k)$, where $k' = k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$. So $|\mathcal{K}| \leq \exp(k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1-\epsilon)k))$. Therefore we obtain the following condition on ℓ

$$\frac{\exp(k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1-\epsilon)k))}{\exp(\delta^2 \ell \rho_k / 2)} \leq 1 \Leftrightarrow \ell \geq \frac{2 \cdot [k' \log n + k' \log k' + \log((1-\epsilon)k)]}{\delta^2 \rho_k}.$$

(a) and (b) follow easily by the above arguments and by the assumption about ℓ .

Part (c) follows because Φ is an expected value conditioned on the choices made so far. For the precise argument let us observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)] \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in T} \frac{1}{n-r+1} \cdot \Pr[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau], \end{aligned}$$

where $T = [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$. Then by (12) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)) \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in T} \frac{1}{n-r+1} \cdot \Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi(r) = \tau) \\ &\geq \min\{\Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi(r) = \tau) : \tau \in T\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies part (c). \square

Proof. (of Theorem 8) The computation of the conditional probabilities $\text{Prob}(A_{\hat{s}_0} \cap B_u \cap C_{\hat{s}_0}, \hat{S})$ by Algorithm 2 is correct by Theorem 9. Algorithm 1 is a direct translation of the optimization of the pessimistic estimator Φ . In particular, observe that the correctness of the weight initialization in Line 6 of Algorithm 1, and of weight updates in Line 16, follow from the form of the pessimistic estimator objective function in (13).

The value of the pessimistic estimator Φ is strictly smaller than 1 at the beginning and in each step, it is not increased by properties of the pessimistic estimator (Lemma 3). Moreover, at the last step all values of all ℓ permutations will be fixed, that is, there will be no randomness in the computation of Φ . Observe that Φ is an upper bound on the expected number of $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuples from \mathcal{K} that are not well-covered. So at the end of the derandomization process the number of such $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuples will be 0, implying that all these $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuples will be well-covered, as desired.

A straightforward analysis of the running time of Algorithm 1 and Lemma 4 imply that its running time can be bounded by $O((1-\epsilon) \cdot \ell \cdot k^{k+1} \cdot n^{k+2} \cdot (k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor)^{km/n} \cdot \text{poly} \log(n))$. \square

7 Improved dimension reduction for the k -secretary problem

A set \mathcal{F} of functions $f : [n] \rightarrow \ell$ is called a *dimensionality-reduction* set with parameters (n, ℓ, d) if it satisfies the following two conditions:

(1) the number of functions that have the same value on any element of the domain is bounded:

$$\forall_{i,j \in [n], i \neq j} : |\{f \in \mathcal{F} : f(i) = f(j)\}| \leq d;$$

(2) for each function, the elements of the domain are almost uniformly partitioned into the elements of the image: $\forall_{i \in [\ell], f \in \mathcal{F}} : |f^{-1}(i)| \leq \frac{n}{\ell} + o(\ell)$.

The dimensionality-reduction set of functions is key in our approach to find probability distribution that guarantees a high success probability for wait-and-pick k -secretarial algorithms. When applied once, it reduces the size of permutations needed to be considered for optimal success probability from

n -elements to ℓ -elements. The above conditions (1) and (2) are to ensure that the found set of ℓ -element permutations can be reversed into n -element permutations without much loss of success probability. Kesselheim, Kleinberg and Niazadeh [28] were first who used this type of reduction in context of secretary problems. Our refinement is adding the new condition 2). This condition significantly strengthens the reduction for wait-and-pick algorithms and has large consequences on later constructions of low entropy distributions. In particular condition 2) is crucial in proving the bounds on the competitive ratio.

7.1 A polynomial time construction of the set \mathcal{F}

We show a general pattern for constructing a set of functions that reduce the dimension of permutations from n to $q < n$ for which we use refined Reed-Solomon codes.

Lemma 5 *There exists a set \mathcal{F} of functions $f : [n] \rightarrow [q]$, for some prime integer $q \geq 2$, such that for any two distinct indices $i, j \in [n]$, $i \neq j$, we have*

$$|\{f \in \mathcal{F} : f(i) = f(j)\}| \leq d \quad \text{and} \quad \forall q' \in [q] : |f^{-1}(q')| \in \{\lfloor n/q \rfloor, \lfloor n/q \rfloor + 1\},$$

where $1 \leq d < q$ is an integer such that $n \leq q^{d+1}$. Moreover, $|\mathcal{F}| = q$ and set \mathcal{F} can be constructed in deterministic polynomial time in n, q, d .

Proof. Let us take any finite field \mathbb{F} of size $q \geq 2$. It is known that q must be of the following form: $q = p^r$, where p is any prime number and $r \geq 1$ is any integer; this has been proved by Galois, see [42, Chapter 19]. We will do our construction assuming that $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$ is the Galois field, where q is a prime number.

Let us take the prime q and the integer $d \geq 1$ such that $q^{d+1} \geq n$. We want to take here the smallest such prime number and an appropriate smallest d such that $q^{d+1} \geq n$.

Let us now consider the ring $\mathbb{F}[x]$ of univariate polynomials over the field \mathbb{F} of degree d . The number of such polynomials is exactly $|\mathbb{F}[x]| = q^{d+1}$. By the field \mathbb{F}_q we chose, we have that $\mathbb{F}_q = \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$. We will now define the following $q^{d+1} \times q$ matrix $M = (M_{i,q'})_{i \in [q^{d+1}], q' \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}}$ whose rows correspond to polynomials from $\mathbb{F}[x]$ and columns – to elements of the field \mathbb{F}_q .

Let now $\mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{F}[x]$ be the set of all polynomials from $\mathbb{F}[x]$ with the free term equal to 0, that is, all polynomials of the form $\sum_{i=1}^d a_i x^i \in \mathbb{F}[x]$, where all coefficients $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_q$, listed in *any* fixed order: $\mathbb{G} = \{g_1(x), g_2(x), \dots, g_{q^d}(x)\}$. To define matrix M we will list all polynomials from $\mathbb{F}[x]$ in the following order $\mathbb{F}[x] = \{f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_{q^{d+1}}(x)\}$, defined as follows. The first q polynomials $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_q(x)$ are $f_i(x) = g_i(x) + i - 1$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$; note that here $i - 1 \in \mathbb{F}_q$. The next q polynomials $f_{q+1}(x), f_{q+2}(x), \dots, f_{2q}(x)$ are $f_{qj+i}(x) = g_{qj+i}(x) + i - 1$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, and so on. In general, to define polynomials $f_{qj+1}(x), f_{qj+2}(x), \dots, f_{qj+q}(x)$, we have $f_{qj+i}(x) = g_{qj+i}(x) + i - 1$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, for any $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, q^d - 1\}$.

We are now ready to define matrix M : $M_{i,q'} = f_i(q')$ for any $i \in [q^{d+1}]$, $q' \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$. From matrix M we define the set of functions \mathcal{F} by taking precisely n first rows of matrix M (recall that $q^{d+1} \geq n$) and letting the columns of this truncated matrix define functions in the set \mathcal{F} . More formally, $\mathcal{F} = \{h_{q'} : q' \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}\}$, where each function $h_{q'} : [n] \rightarrow [q]$ for each $q' \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$ is defined as $h_{q'}(i) = f_i(q')$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

We will now prove that $|h_{q'}^{-1}(q'')| \in \{\lfloor \frac{n}{q} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{n}{q} \rfloor + 1\}$ for each function $h_{q'} \in \mathcal{F}$ and for each $q'' \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$. Let us focus on column q' of matrix M . Intuitively the property that we want to prove follows from the fact that when this column is partitioned into q^{d+1}/q “blocks” of q consecutive elements, each such block is a permutation of the set $\{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$ of elements from the field \mathbb{F}_q . More formally, the j th such “block” for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, q^d - 1\}$ contains the elements $f_{qj+i}(q')$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$. But by our construction we have that $f_{qj+i}(q') = g_{qj+i}(q') + i - 1$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$. Here, $g_{qj+i}(q') \in \mathbb{F}_q$ is a fixed element from the Galois field \mathbb{F}_q and elements

$f_{qj+i}(q')$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ of the “block” are obtained by adding all other elements $i - 1$ from the field \mathbb{F}_q to $g_{qj+i}(q') \in \mathbb{F}_q$. This, by properties of the field \mathbb{F}_q imply that $f_{qj+i}(q')$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ are a permutation of the set $\{0, 1, \dots, q - 1\}$.

Claim. For any given $j \in \mathbb{F}_q = \{0, 1, \dots, q - 1\}$ the values $j + i$, for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, q - 1\}$, where the addition is in the field \mathbb{F}_q modulo q , are a permutation of the set $\{0, 1, \dots, q - 1\}$, that is, $\{j + i : i \in \{0, 1, \dots, q - 1\}\} = \{0, 1, \dots, q - 1\}$.

Proof. In this proof we assume that addition and subtraction are in the field \mathbb{F}_q . The multiset $\{j + i : i \in \{0, 1, \dots, q - 1\}\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q$ consists of q values, thus it suffices to show that all values from the multiset are distinct. Assume contrary the there exists two different elements $i, i' \in \mathbb{F}_q$ such that $j + i = j + i'$. It follows that $i' - i = 0$. This cannot be true since $|i'|, |i| < q$ and i' and i are different. \square

The property that $|h_{q'}^{-1}(q'')| \in \left\{ \lfloor \frac{n}{q} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{n}{q} \rfloor + 1 \right\}$ now follows from the fact that in the definition of the function $h_{q'}$ all the initial “blocks” $\{f_{qj+i}(q') : i \in \{1, \dots, q\}\}$ for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{q} \rfloor - 1\}$ are fully used, and the last “block” $\{f_{qj+i}(q') : i \in \{1, \dots, q\}\}$ for $j = \lfloor \frac{n}{q} \rfloor$ is only partially used.

Finally, we will prove now that $|\{f \in \mathcal{F} : f(i) = f(j)\}| \leq d$. This simply follows from the fact that for any two polynomials $g, h \in \mathbb{F}[x]$, they can assume the same values on at most d , their degree, number of elements from the field $\mathbb{F}_q = \{0, 1, \dots, q - 1\}$. This last property is true because the polynomial $g(x) - h(x)$ has degree d and therefore it has at most d zeros in the field $\mathbb{F}[x]$.

Let us finally observe that the total number of polynomials, q^{d+1} , in the field $\mathbb{F}[x]$ can be exponential in n . However, this construction can easily be implemented in polynomial time in n, q, d , because we only need the initial n of these polynomials. Thus we can simply disregard the remaining $q^{d+1} - n$ polynomials. \square

Corollary 1 *Observe that setting $q \in \Omega(\log n)$, $d \in \Theta(q)$ in Lemma 5 results in a dimensionality-reduction set of functions \mathcal{F} with parameters (n, q, \sqrt{q}) . Moreover, set \mathcal{F} has size q and as long as $q \in O(n)$, it can be computed in polynomial time in n .*

7.2 Product of two Reed-Solomon codes

In the following we show that Reed-Solomon codes composed twice can produce a set of dimensionality-reduction functions with parameters $(n, \log n \log n, \sqrt{\log \log n})$.

Assume we are given an integer n . Let ℓ_2 be a prime number and $d_2 = \lceil \sqrt{\ell_2} \rceil$. Choose ℓ_1 to be a prime number in the interval $\left[\frac{1}{2} \ell_2^{d_2}, \ell_2^{d_2} \right]$ and $d_1 = \lceil \sqrt{\ell_1} \rceil$. The number ℓ_1 exists due to the distribution of prime numbers. Additionally, the choice of numbers ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 must be such that

$$\text{a) } \ell_1^{d_1} \geq n, \text{ and b) } \ell_2^{d_2} = O(\text{poly}(n))$$

If those two conditions are satisfied, Lemma 5 ensures we can construct a set \mathcal{F}_1 of functions $f : [n] \rightarrow [\ell_1]$ with parameters $n, q := \ell_1, d := d_1$ in time $O(\text{poly}(n))$. Let \mathcal{F}_2 be another set of functions: $f : [\ell_1] \rightarrow [\ell_2]$ specified by Lemma 5 with parameters $n, q := \ell_2, d := d_2$. The set \mathcal{F}_2 can also be constructed in polynomial time in n .

We compose a set \mathcal{F} of functions $f : [n] \rightarrow [\ell_2]$ from sets \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 in the following way: $\mathcal{F} = \{f_2 \circ f_1 : f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2\}$. Observe, that $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{F}_1| \cdot |\mathcal{F}_2| = \ell_1 \ell_2$. Next, we show that properties obtained from Lemma 5 for sets \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 lift to the set \mathcal{F} .

Lemma 6 *For any two distinct numbers $i, j \in [n]$ we have:*

$$|\{f \in \mathcal{F} : f(i) = f(j)\}| \leq \ell_2 d_1 + \ell_1 d_2$$

Proof. Take two distinct $i, j \in [n]$. Consider a function $f \in \mathcal{F}$. From the construction of \mathcal{F} we know that $f = f_2 \circ f_1$ for some $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$. Now, if $f(i) = f(j)$ then $f_2(f_1(i)) = f_2(f_1(j))$, which means that either $f_1(i) = f_1(j)$ or $f_2(i') = f_2(j')$, where $i' = f_1(i), j' = f_1(j)$ and $i' \neq j'$. For the fixed pair of indices i, j the number of functions $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ such that $f_1(i) = f_1(j)$ is at most d_1 , therefore the first case can happen at most $|\mathcal{F}_2|d_1 = \ell_2 d_1$ times. Similarly, the second case can happen at most $|\mathcal{F}_1|d_2 = \ell_1 d_2$ times. The sum of these two bounds gives us the desired estimation. \square

Lemma 7 *For any function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ we have:*

$$\forall \ell' \in [\ell_2] : |f^{-1}(\ell')| \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_2} \rfloor + 3 \lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_1} \rfloor$$

Proof. Let us fix an integer $\ell' \in [\ell_2]$ and a function $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Observe, that the function f has a unique decomposition $f = f_2 \circ f_1, f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$, thus $|f^{-1}(\ell')| = |(f_2 \circ f_1)^{-1}(\ell')|$. From Lemma 5 we have that the set $f_2^{-1}(\ell')$ has either $\lfloor \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} \rfloor$ or $\lfloor \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} \rfloor + 1$ elements. Similarly, for fixed $\ell'' \in [\ell_1]$ the set $f_1^{-1}(\ell'')$ has either $\lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_1} \rfloor$ or $\lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_1} \rfloor + 1$ elements. These two bounds combined give us

$$\begin{aligned} |(f_2 \circ f_1)^{-1}(\ell')| &\in \left[\lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_1} \rfloor \lfloor \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_1} \rfloor \lfloor \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_1} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} \rfloor + 1 \right] \implies \\ |(f_2 \circ f_1)^{-1}(\ell')| &\in \left[\lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_1} \rfloor \lfloor \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_1} \rfloor + 3 \lfloor \frac{n}{\ell_1} \rfloor \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last implication follows from the fact that: $\lfloor \frac{a}{b} \rfloor \lfloor \frac{b}{c} \rfloor \leq \lfloor \frac{a}{c} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{b}{c} \rfloor + 1$. \square

Corollary 2 *For any $q \leq \log \log n$ there exists a dimensionality-reduction set of functions with parameters (n, q, \sqrt{q}) . Moreover, such set has size $q^{\sqrt{q}}$ and can be computed in polynomial time in $q^{\sqrt{q}}$.*

Proof. Consider the above construction for parameters $\ell_2 := q$ and $\ell_1 := q^{\sqrt{q}}$. We can easily check that these parameters satisfy the conditions a) and b) of the above constructions. Sets \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 can be computed in time $O(q^{\sqrt{q}})$ and $O(q)$, respectively, due to Lemma 5. The correctness follows from Lemmas 6 and 7. \square

8 Low entropy distributions for the k -secretary problem

In this section, we give a general framework of leveraging dimensionality-reduction set of functions with a set of permutations over dimension ℓ to a set of permutations over a dimension $n > \ell$ such that wait-and-pick multiple-choice secretary algorithm executed on the latter distributions achieve the competitive ratio of the former distribution.

For simplicity of notation we assume in this section that $v(1) \geq v(2) \geq \dots \geq v(n)$. Let us set a dimensionality-reduction set of functions \mathcal{F} , a set \mathcal{L} of ℓ -element permutations, and a wait-and-pick algorithm ALG such that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{L}}(ALG(\pi)) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i).$$

Consider the following random experiment: first we draw u.a.r a function f from \mathcal{F} and then draw u.a.r a permutation π from \mathcal{L} . We can relate an n -element permutation to such experiment as follows. First, function f determines for each $u \in [n]$ number of the block $f(u) \in [\ell]$ to which u is assigned. The permutation π sets the order of these blocks. Ultimately, the n -element permutation is created as first ordering blocks according π , and then listing numbers from each block in one sequence preserving

the order of blocks. The order of numbers inside a single block is irrelevant. Let $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{L}$ be the set of n -element permutations which are the support of the constructed distribution.

The key properties in this random construction are twofold. First, if the probability that a pair of fixed indices i, j will end up in the same block is $\frac{d}{\ell}$, then from union bound we conclude that the probability that indices of k largest adversary elements will be assigned to different blocks is at least $1 - \frac{k^2 d}{\ell}$. On the other hand, if the blocks are roughly the same size, the relative order of the blocks assigned to which these indices are assigned will be the same as the relative order of these indices in the larger permutation. Moreover, the order of the blocks with respect to the time threshold in the smaller permutation will be the same as the order of these indices with respect to the threshold in the larger permutation. These properties let us carry smoothly properties of the wait-and-pick algorithm, e.g., a successful wait-and-pick algorithm on the smaller ℓ -element permutation will be also successful on the larger n -element permutation. The above reasoning gives us Theorem 10.

Theorem 10 *Let \mathcal{F} be a set of dimensionality-reduction functions with parameters (n, ℓ, d) s.t. $\ell^2 < \frac{n}{d}$, and \mathcal{L} be a multiset of ℓ -element permutations. Let ALG be a wait-and-pick algorithm with a time threshold $m \in [\ell - 1]$ that achieves $(1 - \epsilon)$ competitive ratio on the uniform distribution over \mathcal{L}*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{L}}(ALG(\pi)) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i).$$

Then, a wait-and-pick algorithm ALG' with a time threshold $\lfloor m \frac{n}{\ell} \rfloor \in [n - 1]$ executed on the uniform distribution over the set $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{L}$ achieves

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{L}}(ALG'(\pi)) \geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{d}\right) (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i),$$

The set $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{L}$ can be computed in time $O(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot |\mathcal{L}|)$.

The first application of the introduced framework comes from combining double dimensionality-reductions set of functions with the set of all permutations of size $\log \log n$.

Theorem 11 *For any $k < (\log \log n)^{1/4}$ there exists a permutations distribution \mathcal{D} such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{D}}(ALG(\sigma)) \geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\log \log n}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{4 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i),$$

where ALG is a wait-and-pick multiple-choice secretary algorithm with time threshold $m = n/k^{1/3}$. The distribution \mathcal{D} has the optimal entropy $O(\log \log n)$ and can be computed in polynomial time in n .

Proof. Let us set $\ell = \log \log n$. Consider a dimensionality-reduction set of functions \mathcal{F} given by Corollary 2 with parameters $(n, \ell, \sqrt{\ell})$. Note, that the size of set \mathcal{F} is $O(\ell^{\sqrt{\ell}}) = O(\log n)$. Let \mathcal{L} be the set of all ℓ elements permutations. From Stirling's approximation we obtain that $\log(|\mathcal{L}|) = \log(\ell!) = O(\ell \log \ell) = O(\log \log n)$, thus $|\mathcal{L}| = O(\log(n))$ and we can enumerate all permutations in \mathcal{L} in time polynomial in n . By Lemma 2, we get that the wait-and-pick algorithm ALG' executed on uniform distribution over set \mathcal{L} with time threshold $m = \frac{\ell}{k^{1/3}} = \frac{\log \log n}{k^{1/3}}$ gives the following competitive ratio:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{L}}(ALG'(\pi)) \geq \left(1 - \frac{3 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i).$$

By Theorem 10 applied to sets \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{L} , the wait-and-pick algorithm with time threshold $m' := \frac{n}{k^{1/3}}$ achieves the following competitive ratio

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{L}'}(ALG(\pi)) &\geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\log \log n}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{3 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\log \log n}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{4 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i),\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{L}' is the multi-set derived from the construction of Theorem 10. As the distribution \mathcal{D} we take the uniform distribution on the multi-set \mathcal{L}' . Since $|\mathcal{L}'| = O(\log n)$, the theorem is proven. \square

A much stronger implication of the reduction framework can be proven when instead of the set of all permutations of size $O(\log \log n)$ we consider the set of $\log n$ -elements permutations constructed by the method of pessimistic estimator from Section 5. This yields the following.

Theorem 12 *For any $k \leq \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$ there exists a permutations distribution \mathcal{D} such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{D}}(ALG(\sigma)) \geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{5 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i),$$

where ALG is a wait-and-pick multiple-choice secretary algorithm with time threshold $m = n/k^{1/3}$. The distribution \mathcal{D} has the optimal entropy $O(\log \log n)$ and can be computed in polynomial time in n .

Proof. Let us set $\ell = \log n$. Consider a dimensionality-reduction set of functions \mathcal{F} given by Corollary 1 with parameters $(n, \ell, \sqrt{\ell})$. Note, that the size of set \mathcal{F} is $O(\text{poly} \log(n))$.

Next, consider a set \mathcal{L} of ℓ -elements permutations given by Theorem 8 with parameters $\delta = \frac{1}{k^{1/3}}$ and $\epsilon = \frac{\log k}{k^{1/3}}$. The set has size

$$|\mathcal{L}| \leq \frac{k' \log \ell + k' \log k' + \log((1 - \epsilon)k)}{\delta^2 \rho_k / 2} \leq O(k^2 \log \ell),$$

where $k' = k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$, and can be computed in time

$$O\left((1 - \epsilon) \cdot \ell \cdot k^{k+1} \cdot \ell^{k+2} \cdot \left(k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor\right)^{km/\ell} \cdot \text{poly} \log(\ell)\right),$$

which is $O(\text{poly}(n))$ for our choice of parameters ℓ, k and ϵ and $m = \frac{\ell}{k^{1/3}}$. Theorem 8 implies also that for every $k + \lfloor k^{2/3} \log k \rfloor$ -tuple of adversarial values there are at least $(1 - \frac{1}{k^{1/3}})\rho_k |\mathcal{L}|$ successful permutations. In consequence, the wait-and-pick algorithm ALG with time threshold $\frac{\ell}{k^{1/3}}$ has the following competitive ratio when executed on the uniform distribution over the set \mathcal{L} .

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{L}}(ALG(\sigma)) &\geq (1 - \epsilon)(1 - \delta)\rho_k \sum_{i=1}^k v(i) = (1 - \epsilon)(1 - \delta) \left(1 - \frac{m}{\ell}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{5 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we combine sets \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{L} using Theorem 10 and obtain a set of n -elements permutations $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{L}$. Let \mathcal{D} be the uniform distribution over the set $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{L}$. By Theorem 10 we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma \sim \mathcal{D}}(ALG(\sigma)) \geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{5 \log k}{k^{1/3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k v(i),$$

where ALG is the wait-and-pick algorithm with threshold $m' = \frac{n}{k^{1/3}}$, which proves that claimed competitive ratio. By Corollary 1, $|\mathcal{F}| = \ell$. Since $|\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{L}| = |\mathcal{F}| \cdot |\mathcal{L}| \leq \log n \cdot O(k^2 \cdot \log \log n)$, the entropy of the distribution is $O(\log \log n)$. The polynomial time computability also follows from the upper bounds on sizes of sets \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{L} . \square

9 Lower bounds for the k -secretary problem

9.1 Entropy lower bound for $k = O(\log^a n)$, for some constant $a \in (0, 1)$

Our proof of a lower bound on the entropy of any k -secretary algorithm achieving ratio $1 - \epsilon$, for a given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, stated in Theorem 3, generalizes the proof for the (classic) secretary problem in [28]. This generalization is in two ways: first, we reduce the problem of selecting the largest value to the k -secretary problem of achieving ratio $1 - \epsilon$, by considering a special class of hard assignments of values. Second, when analyzing the former problem, we have to accommodate the fact that our algorithm aiming at selecting the largest value can pick k elements, while the classic adversarial algorithm can pick only one element. Below is an overview of the lower bound analysis.

We consider a subset of permutations, $\Pi \subseteq \Pi_n$, of size ℓ on which the distribution is concentrated enough (see Lemma 10 proved in [28]). Next, we fix a semitone sequence (x_1, \dots, x_s) w.r.t. Π of length $s = \frac{\log n}{\ell+1}$ and consider a specific class of hard assignments of values, defined later. A semitone sequence with respect to π , introduced in [28], is defined recursively as follows: an empty sequence is semitone with respect to any permutation π , and a sequence (x_1, \dots, x_s) is semitone w.r.t. π if $\pi(x_s) \in \{\min_{i \in [s]} \pi(x_i), \max_{i \in [s]} \pi(x_i)\}$ and (x_1, \dots, x_{s-1}) is semitone w.r.t. π . It has been showed that for any given set Π of ℓ permutations of $[n]$, there is always a sequence of length $s = \frac{\log n}{\ell+1}$ that is semitone with respect to all ℓ permutations.

Let $V^* = \{1, \frac{k}{1-\epsilon}, (\frac{k}{1-\epsilon})^2, \dots, (\frac{k}{1-\epsilon})^{n-1}\}$. An assignment is *hard* if the values of the semitone sequence form a permutation of some subset of V^* while elements not belonging to the semitone sequence have value $\frac{1-\epsilon}{k}$. Note that values allocated by hard assignment to elements not in the semitone system are negligible, in the sense that the sum of any k of them is $1 - \epsilon$ while the sum of k largest values in the whole system is much bigger than k . Intuitively, every k -secretary algorithm achieving ratio $1 - \epsilon$ must select largest value in hard assignments (which is in the semitone sequence) with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ – this requires analysis of how efficient are deterministic online algorithms selecting k out of s values in finding the maximum value on certain random distribution of hard assignments (see Lemma 8) and applying Yao's principle to get an upper bound on the probability of success on any randomized algorithm against hard assignments (see Lemma 9).

For the purpose of this proof, let us fix $k \leq \log^a n$ for some constant $a \in (0, 1)$, and parameter $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ (which could be a function of n, k).

Lemma 8 *Consider a set of $\ell < \log n - 1$ permutations $\Pi \subseteq \Pi_n$ and a semitone sequence (x_1, \dots, x_s) w.r.t. set Π of length $s = \frac{\log n}{\ell+1} < \log n$. Consider any deterministic online algorithm that for any given $\pi \in \Pi$ aims at selecting the largest value, using at most k picks, against the following distribution of hard assignments.*

Let $V = V^$. We proceed recursively: $v(x_s)$ is the middle element of V , and we apply the recursive procedure u.a.r.: (i) on sequence (x_1, \dots, x_{s-1}) and new set V containing $|V|/2$ smallest elements in V with probability $\frac{1}{s}$ (i.e., $v(x_s)$ is larger than values of the remaining elements with probability $1/s$), and (ii) on sequence (x_1, \dots, x_{s-1}) and new set V containing $|V|/2$ largest elements in V with probability $\frac{s-1}{s}$ (i.e., $v(x_s)$ is smaller than values of the remaining elements with probability $(s-1)/s$).*

Then, for any $\pi \in \Pi$, the algorithm selects the maximum value with probability at most $\frac{k}{s}$.

Proof. We start from observing that the hard assignments produced in the formulation of the lemma are disjoint – it follows directly by the fact that set V of available values is an interval in V^* and it shrinks by half each step; the number of steps $s < \log n$, so in each recursive step set V is non-empty.

In the remainder we prove the sought probability. Let A_t^i , for $1 \leq t \leq s$ and $0 \leq i \leq k$, be the event that the algorithm picks at most i values from $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_t)$. Let B_t be the probability that the algorithm picks the largest of values $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_t)$, in one of its picks. Let C_t be the probability that the algorithm picks value $v(x_t)$. We prove, by induction on lexicographic pair (t, i) , that $\mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i] \leq \frac{i}{t}$. Surely, the beginning of the inductive proof for any pair of parameters $(t, i = t)$ is correct: $\mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^t] \leq 1$.

Consider an inductive step for $i < t \leq s$. Since, by the definition of semitone sequence (x_1, \dots, x_s) , element x_t could be either before all elements x_1, \dots, x_{t-1} or after all elements x_1, \dots, x_{t-1} in permutation π , we need to analyze both of these cases:

Case 1: $\pi(x_t) < \pi(x_1), \dots, \pi(x_{t-1})$. Consider the algorithm when it receives the value of x_t . It has not seen the values of elements x_1, \dots, x_{t-1} yet. Assume that the algorithm already picked $k - i$ values before processing element x_t . Note that, due to the definition of the hard assignment in the formulation of the lemma, the knowledge of values occurring by element x_t only informs the algorithm about set V from which the adversary draws values for sequence (x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}) ; thus this choice of values is independent, for any fixed prefix of values until the occurrence of element x_t . We use this property when deriving the probabilities in this considered case.

We consider two conditional sub-cases, depending on whether either C_t or $\neg C_t$ holds, starting from the former:

$$\mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i \& C_t] = \frac{1}{t} + \frac{t-1}{t} \cdot \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^{i-1} \& C_t] = \frac{1}{t} + \frac{t-1}{t} \cdot \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^{i-1}] = \frac{1}{t} + \frac{t-1}{t} \cdot \frac{i-1}{t-1} = \frac{i}{t},$$

where

- the first equation comes from the fact that $val(x_t)$ is the largest among $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_t)$ with probability $\frac{1}{t}$ (and it contributes to the formula because of the assumption C_t that algorithm picks $v(x_t)$) and $v(x_t)$ is not the largest among $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_t)$ with probability $\frac{t-1}{t}$ (in which case the largest value must be picked within the first $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_{t-1})$ using $i - 1$ picks), and
- the second equation comes from the fact that B_{t-1} and C_t are independent, and
- the last equation holds by inductive assumption for $(t - 1, i - 1)$.

In the complementary condition $\neg C_t$ we have:

$$\mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i \& \neg C_t] = \frac{t-1}{t} \cdot \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^i \& \neg C_t] = \frac{t-1}{t} \cdot \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^i] = \frac{t-1}{t} \cdot \frac{i}{t-1} = \frac{i}{t},$$

where

- the first equation follows because if the algorithm does not pick $v(x_t)$ then the largest of values $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_t)$ must be within $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_{t-1})$ and not $v(x_t)$ (the latter happens with probability $\frac{t-1}{t}$), and
- the second equation comes from the fact that B_{t-1} and $\neg C_t$ are independent, and
- the last equation holds by inductive assumption for $(t - 1, i)$.

Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i] = \mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i \& C_t] \cdot \mathbb{P}r [C_t] + \mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i \& \neg C_t] \cdot \mathbb{P}r [\neg C_t] = \frac{i}{t} \cdot (\mathbb{P}r [C_t] + \mathbb{P}r [\neg C_t]) = \frac{i}{t}.$$

It concludes the analysis of Case 1.

Case 2: $\pi(x_t) > \pi(x_1), \dots, \pi(x_{t-1})$. Consider the algorithm when it receives the value of x_t . It has already seen the values of elements x_1, \dots, x_{t-1} ; therefore, we can only argue about conditional event on the success in picking the largest value among $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_{t-1})$, i.e., event B_{t-1} .

Consider four conditional cases, depending on whether either of $C_t, \neg C_t$ holds and whether either of $B_{t-1}, \neg B_{t-1}$ holds, starting from sub-case $B_{t-1} \& C_t$:

$$\mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i \& B_{t-1} \& C_t] = \frac{\mathbb{P}r [B_t \& B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& C_t]}{\mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& C_t]} = \frac{\mathbb{P}r [B_t \& B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& C_t]}{\mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^{i-1}]} = 1,$$

since the algorithm already selected the largest value among $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_{t-1})$ (by B_{t-1}) and now it also selects $v(x_t)$ (by C_t). We also used the observation $A_t^i \& C_t = A_{t-1}^{i-1}$. Next sub-case, when the conditions $\neg B_{t-1} \& C_t$ hold, implies:

$$\mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i \& \neg B_{t-1} \& C_t] = \frac{\mathbb{P}r [B_t \& \neg B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& C_t]}{\mathbb{P}r [\neg B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& C_t]} = \frac{\mathbb{P}r [B_t \& \neg B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& C_t]}{1 - \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^{i-1}]} = \frac{1}{t},$$

because when the maximum value among $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_{t-1})$ was not selected (by $\neg B_{t-1}$) the possibility that the selected (by C_t) $v(x_t)$ is the largest among $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_t)$ is $\frac{1}{t}$, by definition of values $v(\cdot)$. As in the previous sub-case, we used $A_t^i \& C_t = A_{t-1}^{i-1}$. When we put the above two sub-cases together, for $B_{t-1} \& C_t$ and $\neg B_{t-1} \& C_t$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}r [B_t \& B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& C_t] + \mathbb{P}r [B_t \& \neg B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& C_t] &= \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^{i-1}] \cdot 1 + (1 - \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^{i-1}]) \cdot \frac{1}{t} = \\ &= \frac{i-1}{t-1} + \left(1 - \frac{i-1}{t-1}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{t} = \frac{(i-1)t + (t-i)}{(t-1)t} = \frac{(t-1)i}{(t-1)t} = \frac{i}{t}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equation comes from the previous sub-cases, the second is by inductive assumption, and others are by simple arithmetic.

We now consider two remaining sub-cases, starting from $B_{t-1} \& \neg C_t$:

$$\mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i \& B_{t-1} \& \neg C_t] = \frac{\mathbb{P}r [B_t \& B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& \neg C_t]}{\mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& \neg C_t]} = \frac{\mathbb{P}r [B_t \& B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& \neg C_t]}{\mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^i]} = \frac{t-1}{t},$$

since the algorithm already selected the largest value among $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_{t-1})$ (by B_{t-1}) and now it also selects $v(x_t)$ (by C_t). We also used the observation $A_t^i \& \neg C_t = A_{t-1}^i$. Next sub-case, when the conditions $\neg B_{t-1} \& \neg C_t$ hold, implies:

$$\mathbb{P}r [B_t | A_t^i \& \neg B_{t-1} \& \neg C_t] = \frac{\mathbb{P}r [B_t \& \neg B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& \neg C_t]}{\mathbb{P}r [\neg B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& \neg C_t]} = \frac{\mathbb{P}r [B_t \& \neg B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& \neg C_t]}{1 - \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^i]} = 0,$$

because when the maximum value among x_1, \dots, x_{t-1} was not selected (by $\neg B_{t-1}$) the possibility that the selected (by C_t) $v(x_t)$ is the largest among $v(x_1), \dots, v(x_t)$ is $\frac{1}{t}$, by definition of values $v(\cdot)$. We also used the observation $A_t^i \& \neg C_t = A_{t-1}^i$. When we put the last two sub-cases together, for $B_{t-1} \& \neg C_t$ and $\neg B_{t-1} \& \neg C_t$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}r [B_t \& B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& \neg C_t] + \mathbb{P}r [B_t \& \neg B_{t-1} | A_t^i \& \neg C_t] &= \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^i] + (1 - \mathbb{P}r [B_{t-1} | A_{t-1}^i]) \cdot \frac{1}{t} = \\ &= \frac{i-1}{t-1} + \left(1 - \frac{i-1}{t-1}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{t} = \frac{(i-1)t + (t-i)}{(t-1)t} = \frac{(t-1)i}{(t-1)t} = \frac{i}{t}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equation comes from the previous sub-cases, the second is by inductive assumption, and others are by simple arithmetic.

Hence, similarly as in Case 1, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_r [B_t | A_t^i] = \mathbb{P}_r [B_t | A_t^i \& C_t] \cdot \mathbb{P}_r [C_t] + \mathbb{P}_r [B_t | A_t^i \& \neg C_t] \cdot \mathbb{P}_r [\neg C_t] = \frac{i}{t} \cdot (\mathbb{P}_r [C_t] + \mathbb{P}_r [\neg C_t]) = \frac{i}{t}.$$

It concludes the analysis of Case 2, and also the inductive proof.

It follows that $\mathbb{P}_r [B_s | A_t^k] = \frac{k}{s}$, and since $\mathbb{P}_r [A_s^k] = 1$ (as the algorithm does k picks in the whole semitone sequence), we get $\mathbb{P}_r [B_s] = \frac{k}{s}$. \square

Applying Yao's principle [45] to Lemma 8, we get:

Lemma 9 Fix any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. For any set $\Pi \subseteq \Pi_n$ of an $\ell < \log n - 1$ permutations and any probabilistic distribution on it, and for any online algorithm using k picks to select the maximum value, there is an adversarial (worst-case) hard assignment of values to elements in $[n]$ such that:

- (i) the maximum assigned value is unique and bigger by factor at least $\frac{k}{1-\epsilon}$ from other used values,
- (ii) highest $s = \frac{\log n}{\ell+1}$ values are at least 1, while the remaining ones are $\frac{1-\epsilon}{k}$,
- (iii) the algorithm selects the maximum allocated value with probability at most $\frac{k}{s}$.

Proof. Consider a semitone sequence w.r.t. the set of permutations Π , which has length $s = \frac{\log n}{\ell+1}$ (it exists as shown in [28]), and restrict for now to this sub-sequence of the whole n -value sequence. Consider any online algorithm that ignores elements that are not in this sub-sequence. We apply Yao's principle [45] to Lemma 8: the latter computes a lower bound on the cost (probability of selecting largest value) of a deterministic k -secretary algorithm, for inputs being hard assignments selected from distribution specified in Lemma 8. The Yao's principle implies that there is a deterministic (worst-case) adversarial hard assignment values from set $V^* \cup \{\frac{1-\epsilon}{k}\}$ such that for any (even randomized) algorithm and probabilistic distribution on Π , the probability of the algorithm to select the largest of the assigned values with at most k picks is at most $\frac{k}{s}$. The hard assignment satisfies, by definition, also the first two conditions in the lemma statement. \square

We can extend Lemma 9 to any distribution on a set Π of permutations of $[n]$ with an entropy H , by using the following lemma from [28], in order to obtain the final proof of Theorem 3 (re-stated below).

Lemma 10 ([28]) Let π be drawn from a finite set Π_n by a distribution of entropy H . Then, for any $\ell \geq 4$, there is a set $\Pi \subseteq \Pi_n$, $|\Pi| \leq \ell$, such that $\mathbb{P}_r [\pi \in \Pi] \geq 1 - \frac{8H}{\log(\ell-3)}$.

Theorem 3 Assume $k \leq \log^a n$ for some constant $a \in (0, 1)$. Then, any algorithm (even fully randomized) solving k -secretary problem while drawing permutations from some distribution on Π_n with an entropy $H \leq \frac{1-\epsilon}{9} \log \log n$, cannot achieve the expected ratio of at least $1 - \epsilon$, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and sufficiently large n .

Proof. Let us fix $\ell = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{k}} - 1$. By Lemma 10, there is a set $\Pi \subseteq \Pi_n$ of size at most ℓ such that $\mathbb{P}_r [\pi \in \Pi] \geq 1 - \frac{8H}{\log(\ell-3)}$. Let $s = \frac{\log n}{\ell+1}$ be the length of a semitone sequence w.r.t. Π .

By Lemma 9 applied to the conditional distribution on set Π , there is an adversarial hard assignment of values such that the probability of selecting the largest value is at most $\frac{k}{s}$. Summing up the events and using Lemma 10, the probability of the algorithm selecting the largest value is at most

$$\frac{k}{s} \cdot 1 + \frac{8H}{\log(\ell-3)} = \frac{k \cdot (\ell+1)}{\log n} + \frac{8H}{\log(\ell-3)} = \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log n}} + \frac{8H}{\log(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{k}} - 4)},$$

which is smaller than $1 - \epsilon$, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, for sufficiently large n , because $k \leq \log^a n$, where $a \in (0, 1)$ is a constant, and $H \leq \frac{1-\epsilon}{9} \log \log n$.

To complete the proof, recall that, by the definition of hard assignments and statements (i) and (ii) in Lemma 9, the maximum value selected from V is unique, and is bigger from other values by factor at least $\frac{k}{1-\epsilon}$, therefore the event of selecting k values with ratio $1 - \epsilon$ is a sub-event of the considered event of selecting largest value. Thus, the probability of the former is upper bounded by the probability of the latter and so the former cannot be achieved as well. \square

9.2 Entropy lower bound for wait-and-pick algorithms

Assume that there is a deterministic wait-and-pick algorithm for the k -secretary problem with competitive ratio $1 - \epsilon$. Let m be the time threshold and τ be any statistic (i.e., the algorithm selects τ -th largest element among the first m elements as chosen element, and then from the elements after position m , it selects every element greater than or equal to the statistic). Our analysis works for any statistics. Let ℓ be the number of permutations, from which the order is chosen uniformly at random. We prove that no wait-and-pick algorithm achieves simultaneously a inverse-polynomially (in k) small error ϵ and entropy asymptotically smaller than $\log k$. More precisely, we re-state and prove Theorem 4.

Theorem 4 *Any wait-and-pick algorithm solving k -secretarial problem with competitive ratio of at least $(1 - \epsilon)$ requires entropy $\Omega(\min\{\log 1/\epsilon, \log \frac{n}{2k}\})$.*

Proof. W.l.o.g. and to simplify the analysis, we could assume that $1/\epsilon$ is an integer. We create a bipartite graph $G = (V, W, E)$, where V is the set of n elements, W corresponds to the set of ℓ permutations, and a neighborhood of node $i \in W$ is defined as the set of elements (in V) which are on the left hand side of threshold m in the i -th permutation. It follows that $|E| = \ell \cdot m$. Let d denote an average degree of a node in V , i.e., $d = \frac{|E|}{n} = \frac{\ell \cdot m}{n}$.

Consider first the case when $m \geq k$. We prove that $\ell \geq 1/\epsilon$. Consider a different strategy of the adversary: it processes elements $i \in W$ one by one, and selects $\epsilon \cdot k$ neighbors of element i that has not been selected before to set K . This is continued until set K has k elements or all elements in W has been considered. Note that if during the above construction the current set K has at most $k(1 - \epsilon)$ elements, the adversary can find $\epsilon \cdot k$ neighbors of the currently considered $i \in W$ that are different from elements in K and thus can be added to K , by assumption $m \geq k$. If the construction stops because K has k elements, it means that $\ell \geq 1/\epsilon$, because $1/\epsilon$ elements in W have had to be processed in the construction. If the construction stops because all the elements in W have been processed but K is of size smaller than k , it means that $|W| = \ell < 1/\epsilon$; however, if we top up the set K by arbitrary elements in V so that the resulting K is of size k , no matter what permutation is selected the algorithm misses at least $\epsilon \cdot k$ elements in K , and thus its value is smaller by factor less than $(1 - \epsilon)$ from the optimum. and we get a contradiction. Thus, we proved $\ell \geq 1/\epsilon$, and thus the entropy needed is at least $\log 1/\epsilon$, which for optimal algorithms with $\epsilon = \Theta(k^{-1/2})$ gives entropy $\Theta(\log k)$.

Consider now the complementary case when $m < k$. The following has to hold: $\ell \cdot (m + k) \geq n$. This is because in the opposite case the adversary could allocate value 1 to an element which does not occur in the first $m + k$ positions of any of the ℓ permutations, and value $\frac{1-\epsilon}{k}$ to all other elements – in such scenario, the algorithm would pick the first k elements after the time threshold position m (as it sees, and thus chooses, the same value all this time – it follows straight from the definition of wait-and-pick thresholds), for any of the ℓ permutations, obtaining the total value of $1 - \epsilon$, while the optimum is clearly $1 + (k - 1) \cdot \frac{1-\epsilon}{k} > 1$ contradicting the approximation ratio $1 - \epsilon$ of the algorithm. It follows from the equation $\ell \cdot (m + k) \geq n$ that $\ell \geq \frac{n}{m+k} > \frac{n}{2k}$, and thus the entropy is $\Omega(\log \frac{n}{2k})$.

To summarize both cases, the entropy is $\Omega(\min\{\log 1/\epsilon, \log \frac{n}{2k}\})$. \square

In particular, it follows from Theorem 4 that for k such that k is super-polylogarithmic and sub- $\frac{n}{\text{polylog } n}$, the entropy of approximation-optimal algorithms is $\omega(\log \log n)$. Moreover, if k is within range of some polynomials of n of degrees smaller than 1, the entropy is $\Omega(\log n)$.

9.3 $\Omega(\log \log n + (\log k)^2)$ entropy of previous solutions

All previous solutions but [28] used uniform distributions on the set of all permutations of $[n]$, which requires large entropy $\Theta(n \log n)$.² In [28], the k -secretary algorithm uses $\Theta(\log \log n)$ entropy to choose a permutation u.a.r. from a given set, however, it also uses recursively additional entropy to choose the number of blocks q' . It starts with q' being polynomial in k , and in a recursive call it selects a new q' from the binomial distribution $\text{Binom}(q', 1/2)$. It continues until q' becomes 1. Below we estimate from below the total entropy needed for this random process.

Let X_i , for $i = 1, \dots, \tau$, denote the values of q' selected in subsequent recursive calls, where τ is the first such that $X_\tau = 1$. We have $X_1 = \text{Binom}(q', 1/2)$ and recursively, $X_{i+1} = \text{Binom}(X_i, 1/2)$. We need to estimate the joint entropy $\mathcal{H}(X_1, \dots, X_\tau)$ from below. Joint entropy can be expressed using conditional entropy as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(X_1, \dots, X_\tau) = \mathcal{H}(X_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{\tau} \mathcal{H}(X_i | X_{i-1}, \dots, X_1). \quad (14)$$

By the property of $\text{Binom}(q', 1/2)$ and the fact that q' is a polynomial on k , its entropy $\mathcal{H}(X_1) = \Theta(\log q') = \Theta(\log k)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(X_i | X_{i-1}, \dots, X_1) &= \sum_{q_i \geq \dots \geq q_{i-1}} \mathbb{P}r[X_1 = q_1, \dots, X_{i-1} = q_{i-1}] \cdot \mathcal{H}(X_i | X_1 = q_1, \dots, X_{i-1} = q_{i-1}) \\ &= \sum_{q_i \geq \dots \geq q_{i-1}} \mathbb{P}r[X_1 = q_1, \dots, X_{i-1} = q_{i-1}] \cdot \mathcal{H}(X_i | X_{i-1} = q_{i-1}) \\ &= \Theta \left(\mathbb{P}r \left[X_1 \in \left(\frac{1}{3}q', \frac{2}{3}q' \right), X_2 \in \left(\frac{1}{3}X_1, \frac{2}{3}X_1 \right), \dots, X_{i-1} \in \left(\frac{1}{3}X_{i-2}, \frac{2}{3}X_{i-2} \right) \right] \right) \cdot \mathcal{H} \left(X_i | X_{i-1} \in \left(\frac{1}{3^{i-1}}q', \frac{2^{i-1}}{3^{i-1}}q' \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equation is the definition of conditional entropy, second follows from the fact that once q_{i-1} is fixed, the variable X_1 does not depend on the preceding q_{i-2}, \dots, q_1 , and the final asymptotics follows from applying Chernoff bound to each X_1, \dots, X_{i-1} and taking the union bound. Therefore, for $i \leq \frac{1}{2} \log_3 q'$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}(X_i | X_{i-1}, \dots, X_1) = (1 - o(1)) \cdot \mathcal{H}(X_i | X_{i-1} \in \Theta(\text{poly}(k))) = \Theta(\log k).$$

Consequently, putting all the above into Equation (14), we get

$$\mathcal{H}(X_1, \dots, X_\tau) = \Theta(\log_3 k \cdot \log k) = \Theta(\log^2 k).$$

The above proof leads to the following.

Proposition 1 *The randomized k -secretary algorithm of Kesselheim, Kleinberg and Niazadeh [28] uses randomization that has a total entropy $\Omega(\log \log n + (\log k)^2)$, where entropy $\log \log n$ corresponds to the distribution from which it samples a random order, and entropy $(\log k)^2$ corresponds to the internal random bits of the algorithm.*

Our algorithm shaves off the additive $\Theta(\log^2 k)$ from the formula for all k up to nearly $\log n$.

²Some of them also used additional randomness, but with negligible entropy $o(n \log n)$.

10 Lower bounds and characterization for the classical secretary problem

Unlike the k -secretary, given a wait-and-pick algorithm for the classical secretary (1-secretary) problem, we will denote its time threshold by m_0 (we will reserve m to be used as a variable threshold in the analysis).

We will first understand the optimal success probability of the best secretary algorithms. Let $f(k, m) = \frac{m}{k}(H_{k-1} - H_{m-1})$, where H_k is the k -th harmonic number, $H_k = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{k}$. It is easy to prove that $f(n, m_0)$ is the exact success probability of the wait-and-pick algorithm with threshold m_0 when random order is given by choosing u.a.r. a permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$, see [23].

Lemma 11 *The following asymptotic behavior holds, if $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $j \leq \sqrt{k}$ is such that $m = k/e + j$ is an integer in $[k]$:*

$$f\left(k, \frac{k}{e} + j\right) = \frac{1}{e} - \left(\frac{1}{2e} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{ej^2}{2k}\right) \frac{1}{k} + \Theta\left(\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{3/2}\right).$$

The proof of Lemma 11 is in Appendix A.1. We will now precisely characterize the maximum of function f . Recall that, $f(k, m) = \frac{m}{k}(H_{k-1} - H_{m-1})$, and note that $1 \leq m \leq k$. We have the discrete derivative of f : $h(m) = f(k, m+1) - f(k, m) = \frac{1}{k}(H_{k-1} - H_m - 1)$, which is positive for $m \leq m_0$ and negative otherwise, for some $m_0 = \max\{m > 0 : H_{k-1} - H_m - 1 > 0\}$.

Lemma 12 *There exists an absolute constant $c > 1$ such that for any integer $k \geq c$, we have that $h(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1) > 0$ and $h(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 1) < 0$. Moreover, function $f(k, \cdot)$ achieves its maximum for $m \in \{\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 1\}$, and is monotonically increasing for smaller values of m and monotonically decreasing for larger values of m .*

Lemma 12 is proved in Appendix A.2. Proposition 2 below shows a characterization of the optimal success probability OPT_n of secretary algorithms, complemented by existential result in Theorem 13.

Proposition 2

1. *The optimal success probability of the best secretarial algorithm for the problem with n items which uses a uniform random order from Π_n is $OPT_n = 1/e + c_0/n + \Theta((1/n)^{3/2})$, where $c_0 = 1/2 - 1/(2e)$.*
2. *The success probability of any secretarial algorithm for the problem with n items which uses any probabilistic distribution on Π_n is at most $OPT_n = 1/e + c_0/n + \Theta((1/n)^{3/2})$.*
3. *There exists an infinite sequence of integers $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \dots$, such that the success probability of any deterministic secretarial algorithm for the problem with $n \in \{n_1, n_2, n_3, \dots\}$ items which uses any uniform probabilistic distribution on Π_n with support $\ell < n$ is strictly smaller than $1/e$.*

Proof. Part 1. Gilbert and Mosteller [18] proved that under maximum entropy, the probability of success is maximized by wait-and-pick algorithm with some threshold. Another important property, used in many papers (c.f., Gupta and Singla [23]), is that function $f(n, m)$ describes the probability of success of the wait-and-pick algorithm with threshold m .

Consider wait-and-pick algorithms with threshold $m \in [n-1]$. By Lemma 12, function $f(n, \cdot)$ achieves its maximum for threshold $m \in \{\lfloor \frac{n}{e} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{n}{e} \rfloor + 1\}$, and by Lemma 11, taken for $k = n$, it could be seen that for any admissible value of j (i.e., such that $n/e + j$ is an integer and $|j| \leq 1$,

thus also for $j \in \{\lfloor \frac{n}{e} \rfloor - n/e, \lfloor \frac{n}{e} \rfloor + 1 - n/e\}$ for which $f(n, m)$ achieves its maximum), and for $c_0 = 1/2 - 1/(2e)$: $f(n, \frac{n}{e} + j) = \frac{1}{e} + \frac{c_0}{n} + \Theta\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{3/2}\right)$.

Part 2. Consider a probabilistic distribution on set Π_n , which for every permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$ assigns probability p_π of being selected. Suppose that the permutation selected by the adversary is $\sigma \in \Pi_n$. Given a permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$ selected by the algorithm, let $\chi(\pi, \sigma) = 1$ if the algorithm is successful on the adversarial permutation σ and its selected permutation π , and $\chi(\pi, \sigma) = 0$ otherwise.

Given a specific adversarial choice $\sigma \in \Pi_n$, the total weight of permutations resulting in success of the secretarial algorithm is $\sum_{\pi \in \Pi_n} p_\pi \cdot \chi(\sigma, \pi)$.

Suppose now that the adversary selects its permutation σ uniformly at random from Π_n . The expected total weight of permutations resulting in success of the secretarial algorithm is $\sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_n} q_\sigma \cdot (\sum_{\pi \in \Pi_n} p_\pi \cdot \chi(\sigma, \pi))$, where $q_\sigma = 1/n!$ for each $\sigma \in \Pi_n$. The above sum can be rewritten as follows: $\sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_n} q_\sigma \cdot (\sum_{\pi \in \Pi_n} p_\pi \cdot \chi(\sigma, \pi)) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_n} p_\pi \cdot (\sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_n} q_\sigma \cdot \chi(\sigma, \pi))$, and now we can treat permutation π as fixed and adversarial, and permutation σ as chosen by the algorithm uniformly at random from Π_n , we have by Part 1 that $\sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_n} q_\sigma \cdot \chi(\sigma, \pi) = OPT_n$. This implies that the expected total weight of permutations resulting in success of the secretarial algorithm is at most $\sum_{\pi \in \Pi_n} p_\pi \cdot \chi(\sigma, \pi) \leq \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_n} p_\pi \cdot OPT_n = OPT_n$. Therefore, there exists a permutation $\sigma \in \Pi_n$ realizing this adversarial goal. Thus it is impossible that there is a secretarial algorithm that for any adversarial permutation $\sigma \in \Pi_n$ has success probability $> OPT_n$.

Part 3. Let $\ell_i = 10^i$ and $n_i = 10\ell_i$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. Let us take the infinite decimal expansion of $1/e = 0.367879441171442\dots$ and define as $d_i > 1$ the integer that is build from the first i digits in this decimal expansion after the decimal point, that is, $d_1 = 3, d_2 = 36, d_3 = 367$, and so on. The sequence d_i/ℓ_i has the following properties: $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} d_i/\ell_i = 1/e$, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$ we have that $d_i/\ell_i < 1/e < (d_i + 1)/\ell_i$ and, moreover, $j/\ell_i \notin [1/e, 1/e + 1/n_i]$ for all $j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \ell_i\}$.

Let us now take any $n = n_i$ for some (large enough) $i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ and consider the secretary problem with $n = n_i$ items. Consider also any deterministic secretarial algorithm for this problem that uses any uniform probability distribution on the set Π_{n_i} with support ℓ_i . By Part 2 the success probability of this algorithm using this probability distribution is at most $OPT_{n_i} = 1/e + c_0/n_i + \Theta((1/n_i)^{3/2})$. Because the algorithm is deterministic, all possible probabilities in this probability distribution belong to the set $\{j/\ell_i : j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \ell_i\}\}$. We observe now that $j/\ell_i \notin [1/e, 1/e + c_0/n_i + \Theta((1/n_i)^{3/2})]$ for $j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \ell_i\}$. This fact holds by the construction and by the fact that constant $c_0 \in (0, 1)$, and we may also need to assume that $i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ is taken to be large enough to deal with the term $\Theta((1/n_i)^{3/2})$. Thus the success probability of this algorithm is strictly below $1/e$. \square

11 Probabilistic analysis of classical secretary algorithms

Theorem 13 *Given any integer parameter $3 \leq k \leq n - m_0$, there exists a multi-set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Pi_n$ (that is, it may contain multiple copies of some permutations) of the set of all permutations of size $|\mathcal{L}| \leq O\left(\frac{k \cdot \log n}{(\varepsilon')^2}\right)$ such that if we choose one of these permutations u.a.r. from \mathcal{L} , then the optimal wait-and-pick 1-secretary algorithm with time threshold m_0 achieves a success probability of at least*

$$(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k, \text{ where } \rho_k = OPT_n - \frac{2}{k} \left(\frac{n - m_0}{n - 1} \right)^k,$$

and any $0 < \varepsilon' < 1$. The value OPT_n denotes the probability of success of the algorithm with time threshold m_0 when a permutation is chosen u.a.r. from set Π_n . We assume here that $m_0 = \alpha n$ for a constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $\rho_3 = \Theta(1)$ (this holds, e.g., when $\alpha = 1/e$ and n are large enough).

Proof sketch. The complete proof is deferred to Appendix B. We will use the probabilistic method to show existence of the set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Pi_n$. First, consider a random experiment that is choosing

u.a.r. a single permutation π from Π_n . We estimate the probability of success of the secretarial algorithm with time threshold m_0 . (Below, $\text{ind}(i)$ refers to the position of the i -th largest adversarial value from $v(1), \dots, v(n)$ in permutation π , i.e., $\pi(\text{ind}(i))$.) This probability is lower bounded by the probability of union of the following disjoint events E_i , $i = 2, 3, \dots, k$, where $E_i = A_i \cap B_i \cap C_i$, $A_i = \{\text{ind}(i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}\}$, $B_i = \bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \{\text{ind}(j) \in \{m_0 + 1, \dots, n\}\}$, and $C_i = \{\forall j = 2, 3, \dots, i-1 : \text{ind}(1) < \text{ind}(j)\}$. We say that π *covers* the ordered i -tuple $\hat{S} = \{\pi(\text{ind}(i)), \pi(\text{ind}(1)), \pi(\text{ind}(2)), \dots, \pi(\text{ind}(i-1))\}$ if event E_i holds. By applying the Bayes' formula on conditional probabilities, by conditioning on the events as they are listed below from left to right, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = \mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[A_i \cap B_i \cap C_i] = \frac{m_0}{n} \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{n - m_0 - (j-1)}{(n-1) - (j-1)} \right) \cdot \frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} OPT_n &= \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n-m_0+1} \mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] \leq \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} \mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] + \frac{m_0}{n \cdot k} \left(\frac{n - m_0}{n-1} \right)^k \cdot \frac{n-1}{m_0-1}, \text{ and then} \\ \sum_{i=2}^k \mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] &\geq OPT_n - \frac{n-1}{m_0-1} \cdot \frac{m_0}{n \cdot k} \left(\frac{n - m_0}{n-1} \right)^k \geq OPT_n - \frac{2}{k} \left(\frac{n - m_0}{n-1} \right)^k. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Combinatorialization. Let us define an ordered k -tuple $\hat{S} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\} \subseteq [n]$. We say that an independently and u.a.r. chosen $\pi \in \Pi_n$ is *successful* for \hat{S} iff event $\bigcup_{i=2}^k E_i$ holds, where $E_i = \{\pi \text{ covers } i\text{-tuple } \{j_i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{i-1}\}\}$, for $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$. By above argument π is successful with probability ρ_k .

Next, we choose independently $\ell = c \log(n^k)$ permutations π_1, \dots, π_ℓ from Π_n u.a.r., for a fixed constant $c \geq 1$. These permutations will comprise the multi-set \mathcal{L} . Let $X_1^{\hat{S}}, \dots, X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$ be random variables such that $X_t^{\hat{S}} = 1$ if the corresponding random permutation π_t is successful for k -tuple \hat{S} , and $X_t^{\hat{S}} = 0$ otherwise, for $t = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$. Then for $X^{\hat{S}} = X_1^{\hat{S}} + \dots + X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$ we have that $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] = \rho_k \ell = c \rho_k \log(n^k)$ and by the Chernoff bound $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \rho_k \ell] \leq 1/n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2}$, for any constant $0 < \varepsilon' < 1$.

Now, the probability that there exists a k -tuple $\hat{S} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$ for which there does not exist a $(1 - \varepsilon') \rho_k$ fraction of successful permutations among these $\ell = c \log(n^k)$ random permutations is

$$\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[\exists k\text{-tuple } \hat{S} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') c \rho_k \log(n^k)] \leq \binom{n}{k} \cdot k! / n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2} \leq \frac{1}{n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2 - k}},$$

by union bound. Thus all $\binom{n}{k} k!$ ordered k -tuples \hat{S} are covered with probability $\geq 1 - \frac{1}{n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2 - k}} > 0$, for $c > 4/(\rho_k (\varepsilon')^2) = \Theta(1/(\varepsilon')^2)$. So, there exist $\Theta(\log(n^k)/(\varepsilon')^2)$ permutations such that if we choose one of them u.a.r., then for any k -tuples \hat{S} , this permutation will be successful with probability $(1 - \varepsilon') \rho_k$, which is success probability of the algorithm with threshold m_0 .

In this proof we have a multi-set \mathcal{L} of $\Theta(\log(n^k)/(\varepsilon')^2)$ permutations, and taking $k = \Theta(\log(n))$ and $\varepsilon' = \Theta(1/n)$, we see by Theorem 13 and by Part 1 in Theorem 2 that with entropy $O(\log(n))$ we can achieve the success probability above $1/e$:

Corollary 3 *There exists a multi-set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Pi_n$ of size $|\mathcal{L}| \leq O(\log^2(n) \cdot n^2)$ such that if we choose one of these permutations u.a.r. from \mathcal{L} , then the optimal secretarial algorithm with time threshold $m_0 = \lfloor n/e \rfloor$ achieves a success probability of at least $\frac{1}{e} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$.*

12 Derandomization via Chernoff bound for the 1-secretary problem

Theorem 14 Suppose that we are given integers n and k , such that $n \geq 1$ and $n > k \geq 3$, and an error parameter $\varepsilon' > 0$. Define $\rho_k = OPT_n - \frac{2}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^k$. Then for $\ell = \Theta\left(\frac{2k \log n}{\rho_k (\varepsilon')^2}\right)$ there exists a deterministic algorithm (Algorithm 3) that finds a multi-set $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_\ell\}$ of n -element permutations $\pi_j \in \Pi_n$, for $j \in [\ell]$, such that for every k -tuple there are at least $(1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \rho_k \ell$ successful permutations from \mathcal{L} . The running time of this algorithm is $O(k \cdot \ell \cdot n^{k+2} \cdot \text{poly} \log(n))$.

We will present now the proof of Theorem 14. Missing details in this section and the full proof of Theorem 14 can be found in Appendix C.

Preliminaries. To derandomize Chernoff argument of Theorem 13, we will use the same method of conditional expectations method with a pessimistic estimator as for the k -secretary problem, with only some problem-specific differences. We will model an experiment to choose u.a.r. a permutation $\pi_j \in \Pi_n$ by independent “index” r.v.’s X_j^i : $\mathbb{P}[X_j^i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - i + 1\}] = 1/(n - i + 1)$, for $i \in [n]$, to define $\pi = \pi_j \in \Pi_n$ “sequentially”: $\pi(1) = X_j^1$, $\pi(2)$ is the X_j^2 -th element in $I_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\pi(1)\}$, $\pi(3)$ is the X_j^3 -th element in $I_2 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\pi(1), \pi(2)\}$, etc, where elements are increasingly ordered. Suppose random permutations $\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_\ell\}$ are generated using $X_j^1, X_j^2, \dots, X_j^n$ for $j \in [\ell]$. Given a k -tuple $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$, recall definition of r.v. $X_j^{\hat{S}}$ for $j \in [\ell]$ from proof of Theorem 13. For $X^{\hat{S}} = X_1^{\hat{S}} + \dots + X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$ and $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1)$, we have $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] = \rho_k \ell$, and $\mathbb{P}[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \rho_k \ell] \leq 1/\exp((\varepsilon')^2 \rho_k \ell / 2) = 1/n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k / 2}$, where $\ell = c \log(n^k)$. We call the k -tuple $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$ *not well-covered* if $X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \rho_k \ell$ (then a new r.v. $Y^{\hat{S}} = 1$), and *well-covered* otherwise (then $Y^{\hat{S}} = 0$). Let $Y = \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} Y^{\hat{S}}$. By the above argument $\mathbb{E}[Y] = \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[Y^{\hat{S}}] < 1$ if $c \geq 1/(\varepsilon')^2$. We will keep the expectation $\mathbb{E}[Y]$ below 1 in each step of derandomization, where these steps will sequentially define these permutations for set \mathcal{L} .

Outline of derandomization. Let π_1 be identity permutation. For some $s \in [\ell - 1]$ let permutations π_1, \dots, π_s have already been chosen (“fixed”). We will chose a “semi-random” permutation π_{s+1} position by position using X_{s+1}^i . Suppose that $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ are already chosen for some $r \in [n - 1]$, where all $\pi_{s+1}(i)$ ($i \in [r - 1]$) are fixed and final, except $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ which is fixed but not final yet. We will vary $\pi_{s+1}(r) \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r - 1)\}$ to choose the best value for $\pi_{s+1}(r)$, assuming that $\pi_{s+1}(r + 1), \pi_{s+1}(r + 2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(n)$ are random. Permutations π_{s+2}, \dots, π_n are “fully-random”.

Deriving a pessimistic estimator. Given $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$, observe $X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}}$ depends only on $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$. We will show how to compute the **conditional probabilities** (Algorithm 4 in App. C.3.1) $\mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$ ($= \mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1]$ if $r = 0$), where randomness is over random positions $\pi_{s+1}(r + 1), \pi_{s+1}(r + 2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(n)$. Theorem 15 is proved in App. C.3.1.

Theorem 15 Suppose that values $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ have already been fixed for some $r \in \{0\} \cup [n]$. There exist a deterministic algorithm (Algorithm 4, Appendix C.3.1) to compute $\mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$, where the random event is the random choice of the semi-random permutation π_{s+1} conditioned on its first r elements already being fixed. Its running time is $O(k \cdot n \cdot \text{poly} \log(n))$, and $m_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, n - 1\}$ is the threshold of the secretarial algorithm.

Pessimistic estimator. Let $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$. Denote $\mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}] = \mathbb{P}[X_j^{\hat{S}} = 1] = \mu_j$ for each $j \in [\ell]$, and $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mu_j = \mu$. By Theorem 2, $f\left(n, \frac{n}{e}\right) = OPT_n = \frac{1}{e} + \frac{c_0}{n} + \Theta\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{3/2}\right)$, where $c_0 = 1/2 - 1/(2e)$. By (15) in the proof of Theorem 13 and by Lemma 11, we obtain that $\mu_j \geq \rho_k \geq \frac{1}{e} - \Theta(1/k)$, for each $j \in [\ell]$. We will now use Raghavan’s proof of the Chernoff bound, see [46], for any $\varepsilon' > 0$, using that

$\mu_j \geq \rho_k$ (see more details in Appendix C.3.2):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_r \left[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \ell \cdot \rho_k \right] &\leq \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} < \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{\exp(-\varepsilon' \mu_j)}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \leq \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{\exp(-\varepsilon' \rho_k)}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp(b(-\varepsilon')\ell\rho_k)} < \frac{1}{\exp((\varepsilon')^2\ell\rho_k/2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where last inequality follows by $b(-x) > x^2/2$, see, e.g., [46]. Thus, the union bound implies:

$$\mathbb{P}_r \left[\exists \hat{S} \in \mathcal{K} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \ell \rho_k \right] \leq \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}}. \quad (16)$$

Let $\phi_j(\hat{S}) = 1$ if π_j is successful for \hat{S} , and $\phi_j(\hat{S}) = 0$ otherwise, and failure probability (16) is at most:

$$\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_j(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \quad (17)$$

$$= \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_j(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right)^{\ell-s-1} \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \rho_k}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right)^{\ell-s-1} \\ &= \Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where equality (18) is conditional expectation under: (fixed) permutations π_1, \dots, π_s for some $s \in [\ell - 1]$, the (semi-random) permutation π_{s+1} currently being chosen, and (fully random) permutations $\pi_{s+2}, \dots, \pi_{\ell}$. The first term (17) is less than $|\mathcal{K}| / \exp((\varepsilon')^2\ell\rho_k/2)$, which is strictly smaller than 1 for large ℓ . Let us denote $\mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})] = \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}) | \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau] = \mathbb{P}_r[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 | \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau]$, where positions $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ were fixed in the semi-random permutation π_{s+1} , $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ was fixed in particular to $\tau \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$, and it can be computed by using the algorithm from Theorem 15. This gives our pessimistic estimator Φ . Because s is fixed for all steps where the semi-random permutation is being decided, Φ is uniformly proportional to Φ_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 &= \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s (1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})) \right) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]), \\ \Phi_2 &= \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s (1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})) \right) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Recall $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ in semi-random permutation was fixed but not final. To make it final, we choose $\pi_{s+1}(r) \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$ that minimizes Φ_1 , which is equivalent to maximizing Φ_2 . Proof of Lemma 13 can be found in Appendix C.3.2.

Lemma 13 $\Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r))$ is a pessimistic estimator of the failure probability (16) if $\ell \geq \frac{2k \ln(n)}{\rho_k(\varepsilon')^2}$.

Proof. (of Theorem 14) See Appendix C.3.2. □

Algorithm 3: Find permutations distribution (1-secretary)

Input: Positive integers $n \geq 2$, $2 \leq k \leq n$, $\ell \geq 2$.
Output: A multi-set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Pi_n$ of ℓ permutations.

```
1 /* This algorithm uses Function Prob( $E_i, \hat{S}$ ) from Algorithm 4 in Appendix C.3.1. */
2  $\pi_1 \leftarrow (1, 2, \dots, n)$  /* Identity permutation */
3  $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \{\pi_1\}$ 
4 Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the set of all ordered  $k$ -element subsets of  $[n]$ .
5 for  $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$  do
6    $w(\hat{S}) \leftarrow 1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_1(\hat{S})$ 
7   for  $s = 1 \dots \ell - 1$  do
8     for  $r = 1 \dots n$  do
9       for  $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$  do
10        for  $\tau \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$  do
11           $\Pr[E_i \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau] \leftarrow \text{Prob}(E_i, \hat{S}), \text{ for } i = 2 \dots k.$ 
12           $\mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}) \mid \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau] \leftarrow$   

               $\sum_{i=2}^k \Pr[E_i \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau]$ 
13          Choose  $\pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau$  for  $\tau \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$  to maximize  

               $\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} w(\hat{S}) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}) \mid \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau].$ 
14         $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} \cup \{\pi_{s+1}\}$ 
15      for  $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$  do
16         $w(\hat{S}) \leftarrow w(\hat{S}) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}))$ 
17 return  $\mathcal{L}$ 
```

References

- [1] Melika Abolhassani, Soheil Ehsani, Hossein Esfandiari, MohammadTaghi HajiAghayi, Robert Kleinberg, and Brendan Lucier. Beating 1-1/e for ordered prophets. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 61–71. ACM, 2017.
- [2] Shipra Agrawal, Zizhuo Wang, and Yinyu Ye. A dynamic near-optimal algorithm for online linear programming. *Operations Research*, 62(4):876–890, 2014.
- [3] Saeed Alaei. Bayesian combinatorial auctions: Expanding single buyer mechanisms to many buyers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 43(2):930–972, 2014.
- [4] Saeed Alaei, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, and Vahid Liaghat. The online stochastic generalized assignment problem. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems (APPROX)*, pages 11–25, 2013.
- [5] Yossi Azar, Ashish Chiplunkar, and Haim Kaplan. Prophet secretary: Surpassing the 1-1/e barrier. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, Ithaca, NY, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pages 303–318, 2018.
- [6] Moshe Babaioff, Nicole Immorlica, and Robert Kleinberg. Matroids, secretary problems, and online mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the eighteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 434–443. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2007.

- [7] Mohammadhossein Bateni, Mohammadtaghi Hajiaghayi, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Submodular secretary problem and extensions. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 9(4):Art. 32, 23, 2013.
- [8] Y. S. Chow, S. Moriguti, H. Robbins, and S. M. Samuels. Optimal selection based on relative rank (the "secretary" problem). *Israel J. Math.*, 2:81–90, 1964.
- [9] José Correa, Patricio Foncea, Ruben Hoeksma, Tim Oosterwijk, and Tjark Vredeveld. Posted price mechanisms for a random stream of customers. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 169–186. ACM, 2017.
- [10] José R. Correa, Raimundo Saona, and Bruno Ziliotto. Prophet secretary through blind strategies. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, San Diego, California, USA, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 1946–1961. SIAM, 2019.
- [11] Sina Dehghani, Soheil Ehsani, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Vahid Liaghat, and Saeed Seddighin. Stochastic k-server: How should uber work? In *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2017, July 10-14, 2017, Warsaw, Poland*, pages 126:1–126:14, 2017.
- [12] Paul Dütting and Robert Kleinberg. Polymatroid prophet inequalities. In *Algorithms-ESA 2015*, pages 437–449. Springer, 2015.
- [13] Eugene B Dynkin. The optimum choice of the instant for stopping a markov process. In *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, volume 4, 1963.
- [14] Hossein Esfandiari, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Vahid Liaghat, and Morteza Monemizadeh. Prophet secretary. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 31(3):1685–1701, 2017.
- [15] Hossein Esfandiari, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Brendan Lucier, and Michael Mitzenmacher. Prophets, secretaries, and maximizing the probability of choosing the best. In Silvia Chiappa and Roberto Calandra, editors, *The 23rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2020, 26-28 August 2020, Online [Palermo, Sicily, Italy]*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3717–3727. PMLR, 2020. URL: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v108/esfandiari20a.html>.
- [16] Michal Feldman, Nick Gravin, and Brendan Lucier. Combinatorial auctions via posted prices. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 123–135. SIAM, 2015.
- [17] Naveen Garg, Anupam Gupta, Stefano Leonardi, and Piotr Sankowski. Stochastic analyses for online combinatorial optimization problems. In *SODA*, pages 942–951. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2008.
- [18] J. Gilbert and F. Mosteller. Recognizing the maximum of a sequence. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 61:35–73, 1966.
- [19] Oliver Göbel, Martin Hoefer, Thomas Kesselheim, Thomas Schleiden, and Berthold Vöcking. Online independent set beyond the worst-case: Secretaries, prophets, and periods. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 508–519. Springer, 2014.
- [20] Michel X. Goemans. Chernoff bounds, and some applications. *Lecture notes*: <https://math.mit.edu/goemans/18310S15/chernoff-notes.pdf>, 2015.
- [21] Louis Gordon. A stochastic approach to the gamma function. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 101(9):858–865, 1994.

- [22] Anupam Gupta, Aaron Roth, Grant Schoenebeck, and Kunal Talwar. Constrained non-monotone submodular maximization: Offline and secretary algorithms. In Amin Saberi, editor, *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Internet and Network Economics (WINE'10)*, volume 6484 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 246–257. Springer, 2010.
- [23] Anupam Gupta and Sahil Singla. Random-order models. In Tim Roughgarden, editor, *Beyond the Worst-Case Analysis of Algorithms*, pages 234–258. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [24] Torben Hagerup and Christine Rüb. A guided tour of chernoff bounds. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 33(6):305–308, 1990.
- [25] Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, Robert Kleinberg, and Tuomas Sandholm. Automated online mechanism design and prophet inequalities. In *AAAI*, volume 7, pages 58–65, 2007.
- [26] Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, Robert D. Kleinberg, and David C. Parkes. Adaptive limited-supply online auctions. In Jack S. Breese, Joan Feigenbaum, and Margo I. Seltzer, editors, *Proceedings 5th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC-2004)*, New York, NY, USA, May 17-20, 2004, pages 71–80. ACM, 2004.
- [27] Theodore P Hill and Robert P Kertz. Comparisons of stop rule and supremum expectations of iid random variables. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 336–345, 1982.
- [28] Thomas Kesselheim, Robert D. Kleinberg, and Rad Niazadeh. Secretary problems with non-uniform arrival order. In Rocco A. Servedio and Ronitt Rubinfeld, editors, *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015, Portland, OR, USA, June 14-17, 2015*, pages 879–888. ACM, 2015.
- [29] Thomas Kesselheim, Robert D. Kleinberg, and Rad Niazadeh. Secretary problems with non-uniform arrival order. *CoRR*, abs/1502.02155, 2015.
- [30] Thomas Kesselheim, Klaus Radke, Andreas Tönnis, and Berthold Vöcking. An optimal online algorithm for weighted bipartite matching and extensions to combinatorial auctions. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 589–600. Springer, 2013.
- [31] Robert Kleinberg. A multiple-choice secretary algorithm with applications to online auctions. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 630–631. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2005.
- [32] Robert Kleinberg and S. Matthew Weinberg. Matroid prophet inequalities. In *Proceedings of the 44th Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC 2012, New York, NY, USA, May 19 - 22, 2012*, pages 123–136, 2012.
- [33] Ulrich Krengel and Louis Sucheston. Semiamarts and finite values. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.*, 1977.
- [34] Ulrich Krengel and Louis Sucheston. On semiamarts, amarts, and processes with finite value. *Advances in Prob.*, 4:197–266, 1978.
- [35] D. V. Lindley. Dynamic programming and decision theory. *Appl. Statist.*, 10:39–51, 1961.
- [36] Allen Liu, Renato Paes Leme, Martin Pál, Jon Schneider, and Balasubramanian Sivan. Variable decomposition for prophet inequalities and optimal ordering. In Péter Biró, Shuchi Chawla, and Federico Echenique, editors, *EC '21: The 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, Budapest, Hungary, July 18-23, 2021*, page 692. ACM, 2021. [doi:10.1145/3465456.3467598](https://doi.org/10.1145/3465456.3467598).

- [37] Adam Meyerson. Online facility location. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2001. Proceedings. 42nd IEEE Symposium on*, pages 426–431. IEEE, 2001.
- [38] Prabhakar Raghavan. Probabilistic construction of deterministic algorithms: Approximating packing integer programs. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 37(2):130–143, 1988.
- [39] Aviad Rubinstein. Beyond matroids: Secretary problem and prophet inequality with general constraints. *arXiv preprint [arXiv:1604.00357](https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.00357)*, 2016.
- [40] Aviad Rubinstein and Sahil Singla. Combinatorial prophet inequalities. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1671–1687. SIAM, 2017.
- [41] S.M. Samuels. Minimax stopping rules when the underlying distribution is uniform. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 76:188–197, 1981.
- [42] I. Stewart. *Galois Theory*. CRC Press, 4th edition, 2015.
- [43] David Wajc. Negative association - definition, properties, and applications. *Lecture notes: [https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~dwajc/notes/Negative 20Association.pdf](https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~dwajc/notes/Negative%20Association.pdf)*, 2017.
- [44] Qiqi Yan. Mechanism design via correlation gap. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 710–719. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2011.
- [45] Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. Probabilistic computations: Toward a unified measure of complexity (extended abstract). In *18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Providence, Rhode Island, USA, 31 October - 1 November 1977*, pages 222–227. IEEE Computer Society, 1977.
- [46] Neal E. Young. Randomized rounding without solving the linear program. In Kenneth L. Clarkson, editor, *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, 22-24 January 1995. San Francisco, California, USA*, pages 170–178. ACM/SIAM, 1995.

A Proofs from Section 10

A.1 Proof of Lemma 11

Proof. To prove this expansion we extend the harmonic function H_n to real numbers. Namely, for any real number $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we use the well known definition:

$$H_x = \psi(x + 1) + \gamma ,$$

where ψ is the digamma function and γ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant. Digamma function is just the derivative of the logarithm of the gamma function $\Gamma(x)$, pioneered by Euler, Gauss and Weierstrass. Both functions are important and widely studied in real and complex analysis.

For our purpose, it suffices to use the following inequalities that hold for any real $x > 0$ (see Theorem 5 in [21]):

$$\ln(x) - \frac{1}{2x} - \frac{1}{12x^2} + \frac{1}{120(x + 1/8)^4} < \psi(x) < \ln(x) - \frac{1}{2x} - \frac{1}{12x^2} + \frac{1}{120x^4} .$$

Now we use these estimates for $f(k, m)$ for $\psi(k)$ and $\psi(m)$ with $m = k/e + j$:

$$\begin{aligned} f(k, m) &= \frac{m}{k}(\psi(k) - \psi(m)) = \\ &= \frac{m}{k} \left(\ln(k) - \frac{1}{2k} - \frac{1}{12k^2} + \frac{1}{120(k + \theta(k))^4} - \ln(m) + \frac{1}{2m} + \frac{1}{12m^2} - \frac{1}{120(m + \theta(m))^4} \right) \\ &= \frac{m}{k} \left(1 + \ln\left(\frac{k}{em}\right) - \frac{1}{2k} + \frac{1}{2m} - \frac{1}{12k^2} + \frac{1}{12m^2} + \frac{1}{120(k + \theta(k))^4} - \frac{1}{120(m + \theta(m))^4} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta(x) \in (0, 1/8)$. Now, taking into account that $m \in [k]$, we can suppress the low order terms under $\Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(k, m) &= \frac{m}{k} \left(1 + \ln\left(\frac{k}{em}\right) - \frac{1}{2k} + \frac{1}{2m} \right) + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{m}{k} - \frac{m}{k} \ln\left(\frac{em}{k}\right) - \frac{m}{2k^2} + \frac{1}{2k} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} + \frac{j}{k} - \left(\frac{1}{e} + \frac{j}{k}\right) \ln\left(\frac{k + je}{k}\right) - \frac{k/e + j}{2k^2} + \frac{1}{2k} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} + \frac{j}{k} - \left(\frac{1}{e} + \frac{j}{k}\right) \ln\left(\frac{k + je}{k}\right) - \frac{1}{2ek} + \frac{1}{2k} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^{3/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We will now use the following well known Taylor expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \ln\left(\frac{k + je}{k}\right) &= \left(\frac{k + je}{k} - 1\right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{k + je}{k} - 1\right)^2 + \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{k + je}{k} - 1\right)^3 - \dots \\ &= \frac{je}{k} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{je}{k}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{je}{k}\right)^3 - \dots = \frac{je}{k} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{je}{k}\right)^2 + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^{3/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using this expansion, we can continue from above as follows

$$\begin{aligned} f(k, m) &= \frac{1}{e} + \frac{j}{k} - \left(\frac{1}{e} + \frac{j}{k}\right) \ln\left(\frac{k + je}{k}\right) - \frac{1}{2ek} + \frac{1}{2k} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^{3/2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} + \frac{j}{k} - \left(\frac{1}{e} + \frac{j}{k}\right) \left(\frac{je}{k} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{je}{k}\right)^2\right) - \frac{1}{2ek} + \frac{1}{2k} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^{3/2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} + \frac{1}{2e} \left(\frac{je}{k}\right)^2 - \frac{j^2e}{k^2} + \frac{j^3e^2}{k^3} - \frac{1}{2ek} + \frac{1}{2k} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^{3/2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} + \frac{1}{2e} \left(\frac{je}{k}\right)^2 - \frac{j^2e}{k^2} - \frac{1}{2ek} + \frac{1}{2k} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^{3/2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} - \frac{j^2e}{2k^2} - \frac{1}{2ek} + \frac{1}{2k} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^{3/2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{e} - \left(\frac{1}{2e} + \frac{ej^2}{2k} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{1}{k} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k^{3/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

A.2 Proof of Lemma 12

Proof. We first argue that function $f(n, \cdot)$ has exactly one local maximum, which is also global maximum. To see it, observe that function $h(m)$ is positive until $H_m + 1$ gets bigger than H_{k-1} , which occurs

for a single value m (as we consider function h for discrete arguments) and remains negative afterwards. Thus, function $f(n, \cdot)$ is monotonically increasing until that point, and decreasing afterwards. Hence, it has only one local maximum, which is also global maximum.

It remains to argue that the abovementioned argument m in which function $f(n, \cdot)$ achieves maximum is in $\{\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 1\}$. We will make use of the following known inequalities.

Lemma 14 *The following bounds hold for the harmonic and logarithmic functions:*

- (1) $\frac{1}{2(x+1)} < H_x - \ln x - \gamma < \frac{1}{2x}$,
- (2) $\frac{1}{24(x+1)^2} < H_x - \ln(x + 1/2) - \gamma < \frac{1}{24x^2}$,
- (3) $\frac{x}{1+x} \leq \ln(1+x) \leq x$, which holds for $x > -1$.

Using the first bound (1) from Lemma 14, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
k \cdot h\left(\left\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \right\rfloor - 1\right) &= H_{k-1} - H_{\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1} - 1 \\
&> \ln(k-1) + \frac{1}{2k} - \ln\left(\left\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \right\rfloor - 1\right) - \frac{1}{2(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1)} - 1 \\
&= \ln\left(\frac{e(k-1)}{e(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1)}\right) + \frac{1}{2k} - \frac{1}{2(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1)} - 1 \\
&= \ln\left(\frac{k-1}{e(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1)}\right) + \frac{1}{2k} - \frac{1}{2(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1)} \\
&\quad \text{Rewriting inequality (3) in Lemma 14 as } \ln(y) \geq 1 - 1/y, \text{ we obtain:} \\
&\geq 1 - \frac{e(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1)}{k-1} + \frac{1}{2k} - \frac{1}{2(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1)} \\
&> 1 - \frac{e(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1)}{k-1} - \frac{1}{2(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor - 1)} \\
&> 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because it is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
2(k-1)(\lfloor k/e \rfloor - 1) &> 2e(\lfloor k/e \rfloor - 1)^2 + k - 1 \Leftrightarrow 2k\lfloor k/e \rfloor + (4e-2)\lfloor k/e \rfloor > 2e(\lfloor k/e \rfloor)^2 + 3k + 2e - 3 \\
&\Leftrightarrow 2k\lfloor k/e \rfloor > 2e(\lfloor k/e \rfloor)^2 \text{ and } (4e-2)\lfloor k/e \rfloor \geq 3k + 2e - 3, \\
&\Leftrightarrow k/e > \lfloor k/e \rfloor \text{ and } (4e-2)(k/e - 1) \geq 3k + 2e - 3,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is obvious and the second holds for $k = \Omega(1)$.

For the second part we again use the first bound (1) from Lemma 14, to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
k \cdot h\left(\left\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \right\rfloor + 1\right) &= H_{k-1} - H_{\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 1} - 1 \\
&< \ln(k-1) + \frac{1}{2(k-1)} - \ln\left(\left\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \right\rfloor + 1\right) - \frac{1}{2(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 2)} - 1 \\
&= \ln\left(\frac{e(k-1)}{e(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 1)}\right) + \frac{1}{2(k-1)} - \frac{1}{2(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 2)} - 1 \\
&= \ln\left(\frac{k-1}{e(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 1)}\right) + \frac{1}{2(k-1)} - \frac{1}{2(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 2)} \\
&< 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because it follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \left(\frac{k-1}{e(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 1)} \right) &< 0 \text{ and } \frac{1}{2(k-1)} - \frac{1}{2(\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 2)} < 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow k/e < \lfloor k/e \rfloor + 1 + 1/e \text{ and } \lfloor k/e \rfloor < k-3, \\ &\Leftarrow k/e < \lfloor k/e \rfloor + 1 + 1/e \text{ and } \lfloor k/e \rfloor \leq k/e \leq k-3, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is obvious and the second holds for $k \geq \frac{e-1}{3e}$.

The second part of the lemma that function f achieves its maximum for $m \in \{\lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{k}{e} \rfloor + 1\}$ follows directly from the first part of that lemma and from the definition of the discrete derivative $h(\cdot)$. \square

B Probabilistic analysis of classical secretary algorithms: full proof of Theorem 13

Proof. (of Theorem 13) Let us consider an instance of the secretarial problem, where an adversary has already assigned the values $v(1), v(2), \dots, v(n)$ to all items $1, 2, \dots, n$. We will refer by parameter $k' \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ to the k' th largest among these values. Thus, $k' = 1$ refers to the largest value among $v(1), v(2), \dots, v(n)$, $k' = 2$ refers to the second largest value among $v(1), v(2), \dots, v(n)$, and so on. Note that the k' th and $(k' + 1)$ st largest values might be the same.

We also denote by $\text{ind}(k') \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ the index of the element with the k' th largest value, that is, the k' th largest value is $v(\text{ind}(k'))$.

We will use the probabilistic method to show existence of the set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Pi_n$.

Let us first consider a random experiment that is choosing u.a.r. a single permutation π from Π_n . We will now estimate the probability of success of the secretarial algorithm with threshold m_0 . (Below, $\text{ind}(i)$ refers to the position of the i -th largest adversarial value from $v(1), \dots, v(n)$ in permutation π , i.e., $\pi(\text{ind}(i))$.) This probability is lower bounded by the probability of union of the following disjoint events $E_i, i = 2, 3, \dots, k$, where

$$\begin{aligned} E_i &= A_i \cap B_i \cap C_i, \quad A_i = \{\text{ind}(i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}\}, \quad B_i = \bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \{\text{ind}(j) \in \{m_0 + 1, \dots, n\}\}, \\ C_i &= \{\forall j = 2, 3, \dots, i-1 : \text{ind}(1) < \text{ind}(j)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combinatorialization. We say that π covers the ordered i -tuple $\hat{S} = \{\pi(\text{ind}(i)), \pi(\text{ind}(1)), \pi(\text{ind}(2)), \dots, \pi(\text{ind}(i-1))\}$ if event E_i holds. Now using the Bayes' formula on conditional probabilities, we obtain, following precisely the order of the events which are connected by the intersection sign “ \cap ”, that is, when we compute the probability of the j 'th event, we condition on all previous events $0, 1, 2, \dots, j-1$, where $j = 0$ 'th event is A_i , $j = 1$ 'st event is $\{\text{ind}(1) \in \{\lfloor n/e \rfloor + 1, \dots, n\}\}$, $j = 2$ 'nd event is $\{\text{ind}(2) \in \{\lfloor n/e \rfloor + 1, \dots, n\}\}$, and so forth, and, finally, $j = i$ 'th event is C_i :

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[E_i] &= \Pr \left[A_i \cap \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \{\text{ind}(j) \in \{m_0 + 1, \dots, n\}\} \right) \cap C_i \right] \\ &= \frac{m_0}{n} \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{n - m_0 - (j-1)}{(n-1) - (j-1)} \right) \cdot \frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we observe that the union of events $\cup_{i \in \{2, \dots, n-m_0+1\}} E_i$ is precisely the event that the secretarial algorithm with threshold m_0 will be successful on a random permutation from uniform distribution. By Theorem 2 we know that the latter probability is $OPT_n = \frac{1}{e} + \frac{c_0}{n} + \Theta((\frac{1}{n})^{3/2})$, where $c_0 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2e}$.

Observe now, that for every $j \geq 1$ we have

$$\frac{n - m_0 - (j - 1)}{(n - 1) - (j - 1)} \leq \frac{n - m_0}{n - 1},$$

therefore the following inequalities hold

$$\begin{aligned} OPT_n &= \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n-m_0+1} \mathbb{P}[E_i] \leq \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} \mathbb{P}[E_i] + \sum_{k+1 \leq i \leq n-m_0+1} \frac{m_0}{n} \left(\frac{n - m_0}{n - 1} \right)^{i-1} \frac{1}{i - 1} \\ &\leq \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} \mathbb{P}[E_i] + \frac{m_0}{n \cdot k} \sum_{k \leq i \leq n-m_0} \left(\frac{n - m_0}{n - 1} \right)^i \\ &\leq \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k} \mathbb{P}[E_i] + \frac{m_0}{n \cdot k} \left(\frac{n - m_0}{n - 1} \right)^k \cdot \frac{n - 1}{m_0 - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows that the success probability of the secretarial algorithm with threshold m_0 , when a single permutation is chosen u.a.r. from Π_n , is lower bounded by the claimed value ρ_k :

$$\sum_{i=2}^k \mathbb{P}[E_i] \geq OPT_n - \frac{n - 1}{m_0 - 1} \cdot \frac{m_0}{n \cdot k} \left(\frac{n - m_0}{n - 1} \right)^k \geq OPT_n - \frac{2}{k} \left(\frac{n - m_0}{n - 1} \right)^k. \quad (21)$$

Let $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$. If $\pi \in \Pi_n$ is an independently and u.a.r. chosen permutation, then the fact that the event E_i holds means that π covers an i -tuple $\hat{S} = \{\pi(\text{ind}(i)), \pi(\text{ind}(1)), \pi(\text{ind}(2)), \dots, \pi(\text{ind}(i - 1))\}$.

Let us fix a particular ordered k -tuple $\hat{S} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\} \subseteq [n]$. We say that an independently and u.a.r. chosen permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$ is *successful* for \hat{S} iff event $\bigcup_{i=2}^k E_i$ holds, where

$$E_i = \{\pi \text{ covers } i\text{-tuple } \{j_i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{i-1}\}\},$$

for $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$. By the argument above π is successful with probability ρ_k .

Let us now choose independently and uniformly at random $\ell = c \log(n^k)$ permutations π_1, \dots, π_ℓ from Π_n , for a fixed constant $c \geq 1$. These permutations will comprise the multi-set \mathcal{L} .

Then, let $X_1^{\hat{S}}, \dots, X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$ be random variables such that $X_t^{\hat{S}} = 1$ if the corresponding random permutation π_t is successful for \hat{S} , and $X_t^{\hat{S}} = 0$ otherwise, for $t = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$. Note that “successful” refers here to the above fixed k -tuple $\hat{S} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$.

Then for $X^{\hat{S}} = X_1^{\hat{S}} + \dots + X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$ we have that $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] = \rho_k \ell = c \rho_k \log(n^k)$ and by the Chernoff bound

$$\mathbb{P}[X < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \rho \ell] \leq 1/e^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k \log(n^k)/2} = 1/n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2},$$

for any constant ε' such that $0 < \varepsilon' < 1$.

This means that for the specific fixed ordered k -tuple $\hat{S} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$, with probability at least $1 - 1/n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2}$, at least $(1 - \varepsilon') \cdot c \rho_k \log(n^k)$ among these $\ell = c \log(n^k)$ random permutations, that is, a $(1 - \varepsilon') \rho_k$ fraction of them, are successful for the k -tuple \hat{S} . Now, the probability that there exists a k -tuple $\hat{S} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$ for which there does not exist a $(1 - \varepsilon') \rho_k$ fraction of successful permutations among these $c \log(n^k)$ random permutations is by the union bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\exists k\text{-tuple } \hat{S} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') c \rho_k \log(n^k)] &\leq \binom{n}{k} \cdot k! / n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2} \\ &\leq n^k / n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2} \leq \frac{1}{n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2 - k}}. \end{aligned}$$

So all $\binom{n}{k}k!$ ordered k -tuples \hat{S} are covered with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k/2 - k}} > 0$. Thus, it suffices to choose c such that $(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k/2 > 2$, that is $c > 4/(\rho_k(\varepsilon')^2)$. In fact we will choose a slightly larger c such that $c > 4/(\rho_3(\varepsilon')^2) = \Theta(1/(\varepsilon')^2)$.

This means that there exist $\Theta(\log(n^k)/(\varepsilon')^2)$ permutations such that if we choose one among these permutations u.a.r., then for any k -tuples \hat{S} , this permutation will be successful with probability at least $(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k$. This will be the success probability of the secretarial algorithm with threshold m_0 .

We will now argue about the ordered k' -tuples for $k' \in \{2, 3, \dots, k-1\}$.

Claim 1 *If a random permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$ is successful for all k -tuples, for a given k such that $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, then π is successful for all k' -tuples for all $k' \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that π is successful for all k -tuples and let $\hat{S}' = \{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{k'}\} \subseteq [n]$ be any k' -tuple, for some $k' \in \{2, 3, \dots, k-1\}$. Let us now define a new k -tuple \hat{S} from \hat{S}' by adding to the end of \hat{S}' any $k - k'$ distinct elements from $[n] \setminus \hat{S}'$. More formally, we have that $\hat{S} = \{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{k'}, \hat{s}_{k'+1}, \dots, \hat{s}_k\}$, where $\{\hat{s}_{k'+1}, \dots, \hat{s}_k\}$ is any $k - k'$ element subset of $[n] \setminus \hat{S}'$.

Permutation π is successful for \hat{S} , i.e., event $E_i = \{\pi \text{ covers } i\text{-tuple } \{\hat{s}_i, \hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}\}$ holds for any $i = 2, 3, \dots, k$. But then, in particular, event E_i also holds for $i = 2, 3, \dots, k'$ because $k' < k$, that is, π is also successful for \hat{S}' . \square

This claim and the definition of events E_i imply for every such k' -tuple with $k' \in \{2, 3, \dots, k-1\}$, at least a fraction $(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_{k'}$ of permutations from set \mathcal{L} will also be successful for that k' -tuple.

We finally argue that with set \mathcal{L} the secretarial algorithm can deal with all k' -tuples with the success probability $(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k$ (note that we have here ρ_k , not $\rho_{k'}$), for any $k' \in \{k+1, k+2, \dots, n\}$. The argument is as follows. Let us take any such k' -tuple \hat{S}' with $k' \in \{k+1, k+2, \dots, n\}$. Then observe that the set of permutations \mathcal{L} might not have permutations for which the algorithm is successful for \hat{S}' . In particular, observe, that none of the permutations in \mathcal{L} may cover $\hat{S} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{k+1}\}$. For instance, the event $E_{k+1} = \{\pi \text{ covers } (k+1)\text{-tuple } \{j_{k+1}, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}\}$ might not hold at all for any $\pi \in \mathcal{L}$. However, we can take the k -tuple $\hat{S}' = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\} \subset \hat{S}$ and we know that a random permutation from \mathcal{L} will be successful for \hat{S}' with probability at least $(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k$, by the above arguments. This implies that the algorithm is successful with a random permutation from \mathcal{L} also for \hat{S} , with probability at least $(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k$. We finally note that we can disregard the contributions to the probability of success from such k' -tuples for $k' \geq k+1$ because its probability mass, as shown above, is at most $\frac{2}{k} \left(\frac{n-m_0}{n-1}\right)^k$, and thus it is very tiny. \square

C Derandomization via Chernoff bound for the 1-secretary problem: proofs from Section 5.1

Remark for Theorem 14. Note, that classic secretarial algorithm with threshold $\lfloor \frac{n}{e} \rfloor$ executed on the uniform distribution over the set of permutations \mathcal{L} achieves $(1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \left(OPT_n - \frac{2}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^k \right)$ success probability. However, unless $k = O(1)$, the construction time of multi-set \mathcal{L} is superpolynomial in n , which makes this result inefficient as is. We will show how to use it efficiently in the next section in conjunction with a dimension reduction technique.

C.1 Proof preparation

Before formally proving Theorem 14, we will first outline the main ideas behind the proof and introduce some preliminaries. Towards this aim we will use Chernoff bound argument from the proof of Theorem

13, and a specially tailored method of conditional expectations to derandomize it. We will also need to derive a special pessimistic estimator for our derandomization.

In the proof of Theorem 13 we have random variables X_1, \dots, X_ℓ , where random variable X_j corresponds to choosing independently and u.a.r. a permutation $\pi_j \in \Pi_n$. Thus, each random variable X_j has Π_n as its domain and the size of the domain is exponential in n . For our derandomization we need that these domains are of polynomial size.

To achieve this, we will simulate this random experiment of choosing u.a.r. a permutation from Π_n by introducing for each X_j additional “index” random variables X_j^i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Each X_j^i chooses independently (from all other random variables) and u.a.r. an integer from $\{1, 2, \dots, n - i + 1\}$, that is, X_j^i is equal to one of the integers from $\{1, 2, \dots, n - i + 1\}$ with probability $1/(n - i + 1)$. Although the random variables $X_j^1, X_j^2, \dots, X_j^n$ are mutually independent, they define a random permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$ by the following sequential interpretation: $\pi(1) = X_j^1$, $\pi(2)$ is the X_j^2 -th element from set $I_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\pi(1)\}$, $\pi(3)$ is the X_j^3 -th element from set $I_2 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\pi(1), \pi(2)\}$, etc, where the elements are ordered in an increasing order in sets I_1, I_2 , respectively. In general, $\pi(i)$ is the X_j^i -th element from the set $I_{i-1} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(i-1)\}$, for $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$, where the elements are ordered in an increasing order in set I_{i-1} . Observe that the last value $\pi(n)$ is uniquely determined by all previous values $\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(n-1)$, because $|I_{n-1}| = 1$.

Since the probability of choosing the index $\pi(i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ is $1/(n - i + 1)$, and these random choices are independent, the final probability of choosing a specific random permutation is

$$\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{n-1} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{1}{n-n+1} = \frac{1}{n!},$$

thus, this probability distribution is uniform on the set Π_n as we wanted. To summarise, we generate the set of random permutations, π_1, \dots, π_ℓ , where permutation π_j is generated by the index random variables $X_j^1, X_j^2, \dots, X_j^n$.

Suppose we are given the random permutations π_1, \dots, π_ℓ . Given an k -tuple $\hat{S} = \{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_k\} \subseteq [n]$, i.e., an ordered k -element subset, let us also introduce a random variable $X_j^{\hat{S}}$ such that $X_j^{\hat{S}} = 1$ if permutation π_j is successful for k -tuple \hat{S} (with probability ρ_k), and $X_j^{\hat{S}} = 0$ otherwise, for $j \in [\ell]$. Then for $X^{\hat{S}} = X_1^{\hat{S}} + \dots + X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$ we have that $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] = \rho_k \ell$. Given any ε' such that $0 < \varepsilon' < 1$, by Chernoff bound

$$\Pr[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \rho_k \ell] \leq 1/\exp((\varepsilon')^2 \rho_k \ell / 2) = 1/n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k / 2},$$

where $\ell = c \log(n^k)$.

Let \mathcal{K} be the set of all ordered k -element subsets of $[n]$. Notice that $|\mathcal{K}| = \binom{n}{k} \cdot k! < n^k$. We call the k -tuple $\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}$ *not well-covered* if $X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \rho_k \ell$, and *well-covered* otherwise. Note that the k -tuple \hat{S} is well-covered if at least $(1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \rho_k \ell$ permutations from set \mathcal{L} are successful for \hat{S} . We define a random variable $Y^{\hat{S}}$ such that $Y^{\hat{S}} = 1$ if \hat{S} is not well-covered, and $Y^{\hat{S}} = 0$ otherwise. Let $Y = \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} Y^{\hat{S}}$. By the above argument the expected number of not well-covered k -tuples is:

$$\mathbb{E}[Y] = \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E}[Y^{\hat{S}}] < 1,$$

provided that $c \geq 1/(\varepsilon')^2$. We will maintain the expectation $\mathbb{E}[Y]$ below 1 in each step of our derandomization, where these steps will sequentially define these permutations for set \mathcal{L} permutation by permutation.

C.2 Outline of derandomization

We will choose permutations $\{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_\ell\}$ sequentially, one by one. As the first permutation π_1 , because of symmetry, we choose any, e.g., identity, permutation. Now, suppose that we have already chosen permutations π_1, \dots, π_s for some $s \leq \ell$; for $s = 1$, π_1 is the identity permutation. We will now describe how to choose the next permutation π_{s+1} , conditioning on permutations π_1, \dots, π_s being fixed and assuming that permutations π_{s+2}, \dots, π_n are fully random, i.e., chosen independently and u.a.r. from Π_n . The next permutation π_{s+1} will be generated by choosing its indices $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(n)$ sequentially one by one. In a general case, we will condition on a prefix of its indices $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ up to r being already chosen, where elements $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)$ are fixed and *final*, i.e., they will not change, but element $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ is also fixed but not final yet, i.e., we will vary $\pi_{s+1}(r) \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$ to choose the best value for $\pi_{s+1}(r)$. We will do this choice assuming that the rest of the elements $\pi_{s+1}(r+1), \pi_{s+1}(r+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(n)$ are random; when computing probabilities this randomness can be viewed as choosing a random permutation from $\Pi_{n-(r+1)+1}$. After the value $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ is finally decided it will be fixed and final. Then, we will decide the value $\pi_{s+1}(r+1)$ in the same way, and so on.

For any fixed k -tuple \hat{S} we will first show how to compute the conditional probability that \hat{S} is not well-covered. This for the fixed permutations π_1, \dots, π_s is an easy check if they cover \hat{S} or not. For the “fully random” permutations π_{s+2}, \dots, π_n this probability will be obtained by the above Chernoff bound argument, we will derive and use here a special pessimistic estimator. For the “semi-random” permutation π_{s+1} , we will compute the conditional probability that it covers the tuple \hat{S} or not, conditioning on positions $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ being fixed, where $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ is not final but the rest are final. The probability over the fully random permutations π_{s+2}, \dots, π_n can easily be computed without conditioning because they are independent from the fixed and semi-random permutations.

C.3 Deriving a pessimistic estimator

We will use an approach inspired by Young [46] to derive a pessimistic estimator for our derandomization. We will use for this purpose part of the proof of Chernoff bound from Raghavan [38]. From the above argument we have

$$\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \rho_k \ell] \leq 1 / \exp((\varepsilon')^2 \rho_k \ell / 2) = 1 / n^{(\varepsilon')^2 c \rho_k k / 2},$$

where $\ell = c \log(n^k)$. Recall that $X^{\hat{S}} = X_1^{\hat{S}} + \dots + X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$. In our derandomization, we will have the fixed Bernoulli r.v.’s $X_1^{\hat{S}}, \dots, X_s^{\hat{S}}$ for the first s fixed permutations π_1, \dots, π_s , where for each $j \in [s]$ we have $X_j^{\hat{S}} = 1$ with probability 1, when permutation π_j is successful for \hat{S} , and $X_j^{\hat{S}} = 0$ with probability 1, otherwise. For the fully random Bernoulli r.v.’s $X_{s+2}^{\hat{S}}, \dots, X_n^{\hat{S}}$, for each $j \in \{s+2, \dots, n\}$ we have $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_j^{\hat{S}} = 1] = \rho_k$. And finally, we will also derive an expression (algorithm) for $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1]$ for the semi-random permutation π_{s+1} .

C.3.1 Conditional probabilities and proof of Theorem 15

Let $\hat{S} = \{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_k\} \subseteq [n]$ be a k -tuple, i.e., an ordered k -element subset. Recall the process of generating a random permutation π_j by the index random variables $X_j^1, X_j^2, \dots, X_j^n$, which generate elements $\pi_j(1), \pi_j(2), \dots, \pi_j(n)$ sequentially, one-by-one, in this order.

We will define an algorithm to compute $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$ for the semi-random permutation π_{s+1} , by using an approach from the proof of Theorem 13. We will slightly abuse the notation and let for $r = 0$ to have that $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)] = \mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1]$. In this case, we will also show below how to compute $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1]$ when π_{s+1} is fully

random.

Proof of Theorem 15. We will present the proof of Theorem 15. Let $\hat{S} = \{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_k\} \subseteq [n]$ be a k -tuple. Recall that an independently and u.a.r. chosen permutation $\pi \in \Pi_n$ is *successful* for \hat{S} iff event $\bigcup_{i=2}^k E_i$ holds, where

$$E_i = \{\pi \text{ covers } i\text{-tuple } \{\hat{s}_i, \hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}\},$$

for $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$. By the argument in Theorem 13, π is successful with probability ρ_k . Recall the definitions of events E_i , for $i = 2, 3, \dots, k$ from the proof of Theorem 13:

$$E_i = A_i \cap B_i \cap C_i, \quad A_i = \{\pi^{-1}(\hat{s}_i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}\}, \quad B_i = \bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \{\pi^{-1}(\hat{s}_j) \in \{m_0 + 1, \dots, n\}\},$$

$$C_i = \{\forall j = 2, 3, \dots, i-1 : \pi^{-1}(\hat{s}_1) < \pi^{-1}(\hat{s}_j)\}.$$

We have also shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[E_i] &= \mathbb{P}\left[A_i \cap \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \{\pi^{-1}(\hat{s}_j) \in \{m_0 + 1, \dots, n\}\}\right) \cap C_i\right] \\ &= \frac{m_0}{n} \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{n - m_0 - (j-1)}{(n-1) - (j-1)}\right) \cdot \frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

If $r = 0$ then $\mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1] = \sum_{i=2}^k \mathbb{P}[E_i]$, where each $\mathbb{P}[E_i]$, for $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$, is computed by the above formula. Assume from now on that $r \geq 1$.

Suppose now that values $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ have already been chosen for some $r \in [n]$, i.e., they all are fixed and final, except that $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ is fixed but not final. The algorithm will be based on an observation that the random process of generating the remaining values $\pi_{s+1}(r+1), \pi_{s+1}(r+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(n)$ can be viewed as choosing u.a.r. a random permutation of values in the set $[n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$; so this random permutation has length $n - r$.

To compute

$$\mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)] = \sum_{i=2}^k \mathbb{P}[E_i \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)],$$

we proceed as follows. For simplicity, we will write below $\mathbb{P}[E_i]$ instead of $\mathbb{P}[E_i \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$; we will use analogous convention for $\mathbb{P}[A_i]$, $\mathbb{P}[B_i]$ and $\mathbb{P}[C_i]$. Below, we will only show how to compute probabilities $\mathbb{P}[E_i]$, and to obtain $\mathbb{P}[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1]$ one needs to compute $\sum_{i=2}^k \mathbb{P}[E_i]$.

Algorithm 4: Conditional probabilities (1-secretary)

```

1 Function Prob ( $E_i, \hat{S}$ ) :
2   if  $\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(\min(r, m_0))\} \neq \emptyset$  then
3      $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = 0$ 
4   else
5     /* Now  $\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(\min(r, m_0))\} = \emptyset$  */
6     if  $r \leq m_0$  then
7       if  $\hat{s}_i \in \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$  then
8          $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = \left( \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{n-m_0-(j-1)}{(n-r)-(j-1)} \right) \cdot \frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}$ 
9       if  $\hat{s}_i \notin \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$  then
10         $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = \frac{m_0-r}{n-r} \cdot \left( \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{n-m_0-(j-1)}{(n-r-1)-(j-1)} \right) \cdot \frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}$ 
11      else
12        /* We have now  $r > m_0$  */
13        if  $\hat{s}_i \notin \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(m_0)\}$  then
14           $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = 0$ 
15        else
16          /* We have here  $\hat{s}_i \in \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(m_0)\}$  */
17          Let  $T = \{\pi_{s+1}(m_0 + 1), \pi_{s+1}(m_0 + 2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$ .
18          if  $\hat{s}_1 \in T$  and  $|\{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap T| \geq 1$  then
19            if  $\exists \kappa \in \{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap T : \pi_{s+1}^{-1}(\kappa) < \pi_{s+1}^{-1}(\hat{s}_1)$  then
20               $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = 0$ 
21            if  $\forall \kappa \in \{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap T : \pi_{s+1}^{-1}(\kappa) > \pi_{s+1}^{-1}(\hat{s}_1)$  then
22               $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = 1$ 
23          if  $\hat{s}_1 \notin T$  then
24            if  $\{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap T \neq \emptyset$  then
25               $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = 0$ 
26            if  $\{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap T = \emptyset$  then
27               $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = \frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}$ 
28  return  $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i]$ 

```

Lemma 15 Algorithm Prob(E_i, \hat{S}) correctly computes $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = \mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i | \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)]$ in time $O(n \cdot \text{poly} \log(n))$.

Proof. In Case/step 2 of the algorithm at least one of the elements $\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}$ is before position m_0 in permutation π_{s+1} which falsifies event B_i . Therefore $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[B_i] = 0$, implying $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[E_i] = 0$. This means that from now on we can assume that

$$\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(\min(r, m_0))\} = \emptyset. \quad (23)$$

To analyse Case/step 6 let us assume that $r \leq m_0$. If $\hat{s}_i \in \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$ then element \hat{s}_i is before position m_0 in π_{s+1} , meaning that event A_i holds, thus $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{r}[A_i] = 1$. By assumption (23) all elements $\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}$ are in the fully random part of permutation π_{s+1} of length $n - r$,

thus calculation (22) of events B_i and C_i implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[E_i] = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{n - m_0 - (j-1)}{(n-r) - (j-1)} \right) \cdot \frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}.$$

If $\hat{s}_i \notin \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$ then element \hat{s}_i is after last fixed position r in π_{s+1} , so the only chance for event A_i to hold is if the position of \hat{s}_i is chosen in the random part between positions $r+1$ and m_0 . The probability of this event is $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[A_i] = \frac{m_0-r}{n-r}$, and therefore by (22) we have

$$\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[E_i] = \frac{m_0-r}{n-r} \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{n - m_0 - (j-1)}{(n-r-1) - (j-1)} \right) \cdot \frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}.$$

Let us now assume for Case/step 12 that $r > m_0$. If $\hat{s}_i \notin \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(m_0)\}$ then event A_i is false, which implies that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[A_i] = 0$, and consequently $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[E_i] = 0$. Suppose otherwise that $\hat{s}_i \in \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(m_0)\}$, which makes event A_i to hold and so $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[A_i] = 1$. Under this assumption, the algorithm considers the following cases:

- Let us assume first that $\hat{s}_1 \in \{\pi_{s+1}(m_0+1), \pi_{s+1}(m_0+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$ and $|\{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(m_0+1), \pi_{s+1}(m_0+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}| = r'$ for some $r' \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, then
 - If there is $\kappa \in \{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(m_0+1), \pi_{s+1}(m_0+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$ such that κ is before \hat{s}_1 in π_{s+1} , i.e., $\pi_{s+1}^{-1}(\kappa) < \pi_{s+1}^{-1}(\hat{s}_1)$, then this falsifies event C_i , thus $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[C_i] = 0$, which implies that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[E_i] = 0$.
 - Let now for any $\kappa \in T = \{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(m_0+1), \pi_{s+1}(m_0+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$ we have that $\pi_{s+1}^{-1}(\kappa) > \pi_{s+1}^{-1}(\hat{s}_1)$. This means that all elements from set T are after element \hat{s}_1 in permutation π_{s+1} . In case if $T \neq \{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}$, let us denote $T' = \{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \setminus T$. By assumption (23) all elements from set $\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}$ are after position m_0 in permutation π_{s+1} , implying that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[B_i] = 1$. This also means that when finally all positions in permutation π_{s+1} will be fixed, elements from set T' will certainly be put after position r . We also have that element \hat{s}_1 is before position r in π_{s+1} . This reasoning shows that all elements from set T are after element \hat{s}_1 in permutation π_{s+1} , implying that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[C_i] = 1$. It also implies that all elements from and also $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[C_i] = 1$. And because we also work under the assumption that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[A_i] = 1$, we finally have that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[E_i] = 1$.
- Suppose now that $\hat{s}_1 \notin \{\pi_{s+1}(m_0+1), \pi_{s+1}(m_0+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$. This by assumption (23) implies that element \hat{s}_1 is after position r in π_{s+1} .

If $\{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(m_0+1), \pi_{s+1}(m_0+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\} \neq \emptyset$ then there exists at least one element from set $\{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}$ that is before position r , that is, before element \hat{s}_1 in π_{s+1} , which falsifies event C_i , so $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[C_i] = 0$. This implies that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[E_i] = 0$.

Finally, in Case/step 26, we assume that

$$\{\hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\} \cap \{\pi_{s+1}(m_0+1), \pi_{s+1}(m_0+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\} = \emptyset.$$

This, by assumption (23) means that all elements $\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}$ are in the fully random part $\{\pi_{s+1}(r+1), \pi_{s+1}(r+2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(n)\}$ of permutation π_{s+1} . Also, recall that we work under the assumption that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[A_i] = 1$, and by a similar reasoning as above we have that $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[B_i] = 1$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[E_i] = \mathbb{P}\mathbf{r}[C_i] = \frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}.$$

Note that the case in Step 26 is only possible if $|\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}| = i-1 \leq n-r$. If $i-1 > n-r$ then some of the elements from $\{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_{i-1}\}$ must belong to $\{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)\}$, but such case have already been considered as one of the previous cases in the algorithm.

We now argue about the implementation of the algorithm. The main kind of operations are operations on subsets of set $[n]$, which are set membership and set intersections, which can easily be implemented in time $O(n)$. The other kind of operations in computing $\mathbb{P}[E_i]$ are divisions of numbers from the set $[n]$ and multiplications of the resulting rational expressions. Observe that, in particular, when computing $\frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!}$ we simply use $\frac{(i-2)!}{(i-1)!} = \frac{1}{i-1}$. Clearly, each of these arithmetic operations can be performed in time $O(\text{poly} \log(n))$. \square

The proof of the above lemma finishes the proof of Theorem 15.

C.3.2 Pessimistic estimator

Let $\hat{S} = \{\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \dots, \hat{s}_k\} \subseteq [n]$ be a k -tuple, i.e., an ordered k -element subset. Recall that $X^{\hat{S}} = X_1^{\hat{S}} + \dots + X_\ell^{\hat{S}}$. Denote also $\mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}] = \mathbb{P}[X_j^{\hat{S}} = 1] = \mu_j$ for each $j \in [\ell]$, and $\mathbb{E}[X^{\hat{S}}] = \sum_{j=1}^\ell \mu_j = \mu$. We will now use Raghavan's proof of the Chernoff bound, see [46], for any $\varepsilon' > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \mu] &= \mathbb{P}\left[\prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{(1 - \varepsilon')^{X_j^{\hat{S}}}}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\mu_j}} \geq 1\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot X_j^{\hat{S}}}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\mu_j}}\right] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\mu_j}} \\ &< \prod_{j=1}^\ell \frac{\exp(-\varepsilon' \mu_j)}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\mu_j}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp(b(-\varepsilon')\mu)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $b(x) = (1+x) \ln(1+x) - x$, and the second step uses Bernoulli's inequality $(1+x)^r \leq 1+rx$, that holds for $0 \leq r \leq 1$ and $x \geq -1$, and Markov's inequality, and the last inequality uses $1-x \leq \exp(-x)$, which holds for $x \geq 0$ and is strict if $x \neq 0$.

By Theorem 2, $f(n, \frac{n}{e}) = OPT_n = \frac{1}{e} + \frac{c_0}{n} + \Theta\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{3/2}\right)$, where $c_0 = 1/2 - 1/(2e)$. By (21) in the proof of Theorem 13 and by Lemma 11, we obtain that $\mu_j \geq \rho_k \geq \frac{1}{e} - \Theta(1/k)$, for each $j \in [\ell]$.

Then we can further upper bound the last line of Raghavan's proof to obtain $\frac{1}{\exp(b(-\varepsilon')\mu)} \leq \frac{1}{\exp(b(-\varepsilon')\ell\rho_k)}$. Theorem 13 guarantees existence of the multi set \mathcal{L} of permutations by bounding $\mathbb{P}[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \ell \cdot \rho_k]$. Now, repeating the Raghavan's proof with each μ_j replaced by ρ_k implies

that

$$\mathbb{P}r \left[X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \ell \cdot \rho_k \right] \leq \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &< \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{\exp(-\varepsilon' \mu_j)}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{\exp(-\varepsilon' \rho_k)}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp(b(-\varepsilon')\ell\rho_k)} < \frac{1}{\exp((\varepsilon')^2\ell\rho_k/2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the last inequality follows by a well known fact that $b(-x) > x^2/2$, see, e.g., [46]. By this argument and by the union bound we obtain that:

$$\mathbb{P}r \left[\exists \hat{S} \in \mathcal{K} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \ell \rho_k \right] \leq \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j^{\hat{S}}]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}}, \quad (26)$$

where \mathcal{K} is the set of all ordered k -element subsets of the set $[n]$.

Let us define a function $\phi_j(\hat{S})$ which is equal to 1 if permutation π_j is successful for the k -tuple \hat{S} , and it is equal to 0 otherwise. The above proof upper bounds the probability of failure by the expected value of

$$\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}},$$

the expectation of which is less than $|\mathcal{K}| / \exp((\varepsilon')^2\ell\rho_k/2)$, which is strictly smaller than 1 for appropriately large ℓ .

Suppose that we have so far chosen the (fixed) permutations π_1, \dots, π_s for some $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1\}$, the (semi-random) permutation π_{s+1} is currently being chosen, and the remaining (fully random) permutations, if any, are $\pi_{s+2}, \dots, \pi_{\ell}$. The conditional expectation is then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_j(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right)^{\ell-s-1} \\ &\leq \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s \frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \rho_k}{(1 - \varepsilon')^{(1 - \varepsilon')\rho_k}} \right)^{\ell-s-1} \\ &= \Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where in the inequality, we used that $\mathbb{E}[\phi_j(\hat{S})] \geq \rho_k$. Note, that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})] &= \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S}) \mid \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau] \\ &= \mathbb{P}r[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau], \end{aligned}$$

where positions $\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r)$ have already been fixed in the semi-random permutation π_{s+1} , $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ has been fixed in particular to $\tau \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$, and this value can be computed by using the algorithm from Theorem 15. This gives the pessimistic estimator Φ for our derandomization.

Because s is fixed for all steps where the semi-random permutation is being decided, this pessimistic estimator is uniformly proportional to

$$\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s (1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})) \right) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})]) .$$

Recall that the value of $\pi_{s+1}(r)$ in the semi-random permutation was fixed but not final. To make it fixed and final, we simply choose the value $\pi_{s+1}(r) \in [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$ that minimizes this last expression, which is equivalent to maximizing

$$\sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s (1 - \varepsilon' \cdot \phi_j(\hat{S})) \right) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\phi_{s+1}(\hat{S})] . \quad (28)$$

Proof. (of Lemma 13) This follows from the following 3 properties: (a) it is an upper bound on the conditional probability of failure; (b) it is initially strictly less than 1; (c) some new value of the next index variable in the partially fixed semi-random permutation π_{s+1} can always be chosen without increasing it.

Property (a) follows from (24) and (26). To prove (b) we see by (25) and (26) that

$$\mathbb{P}r \left[\exists \hat{S} \in \mathcal{K} : X^{\hat{S}} < (1 - \varepsilon') \cdot \ell \rho_k \right] \leq |\mathcal{K}| / \exp((\varepsilon')^2 \ell \rho_k / 2) .$$

Observe further that $|\mathcal{K}| = \binom{n}{k} k! = \frac{n!}{(n-k)!} < n^k$, for $2 \leq k \leq n$. Therefore we obtain the following condition on ℓ

$$\frac{n^k}{\exp((\varepsilon')^2 \ell \rho_k / 2)} \leq 1 \Leftrightarrow \ell \geq \frac{2k \ln(n)}{\rho_k (\varepsilon')^2} .$$

(a) and (b) follow easily by the above arguments and by the assumption about ℓ .

Part (c) follows because Φ is an expected value conditioned on the choices made so far. For the precise argument let us observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}r[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)] \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in T} \frac{1}{n - r + 1} \cdot \mathbb{P}r[X_{s+1}^{\hat{S}} = 1 \mid \pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi_{s+1}(r) = \tau] , \end{aligned}$$

where $T = [n] \setminus \{\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)\}$. Then by (27) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1)) \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in T} \frac{1}{n - r + 1} \cdot \Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi(r) = \tau) \\ &\geq \min\{\Phi(\pi_{s+1}(1), \pi_{s+1}(2), \dots, \pi_{s+1}(r-1), \pi(r) = \tau) : \tau \in T\} , \end{aligned}$$

which implies part (c). \square

Proof. (of Theorem 14) The computation of the conditional probabilities $\text{Prob}(E_i, \hat{S})$ by Algorithm 4 is correct by Theorem 15. Algorithm 3 is a direct translation of the optimization of the pessimistic estimator Φ . In particular, observe that the correctness of the weight initialization in Line 6 of Algorithm 3, and of weight updates in Line 16, follow from the form of the pessimistic estimator objective function in (28).

The value of the pessimistic estimator Φ is strictly smaller than 1 at the beginning and in each step, it is not increased by properties of the pessimistic estimator (Lemma 13). Moreover, at the last step all

values of all ℓ permutations will be fixed, that is, there will be no randomness in the computation of Φ . Observe that Φ is an upper bound on the expected number of not well-covered k -tuples from \mathcal{K} . So at the end of the derandomization process the number of such k -tuples will be 0, implying that all these k -tuples will be well-covered, as desired.

A straightforward analysis of the running time of Algorithm 3 and Lemma 15 imply that its running time can be bounded by $O(k \cdot \ell \cdot n^{k+2} \cdot \text{poly} \log(n))$. \square

D Proofs from Section 2.2

We start by generalizing Theorem 10 on compositions of a dimension reduction set of functions \mathcal{F} with a permutation distribution in the context of the classic secretary problem. The difference between this theorem and Theorem 10 are only technical.

Theorem 16 *Let \mathcal{F} be a set of dimensionality-reduction functions with parameters (n, ℓ, d) s.t. $\ell^2 < \frac{n}{d}$, and \mathcal{L} be a multiset of ℓ -element permutations s.t. at least a fraction ρ_k of these permutations in \mathcal{L} are successful for each k -tuple, for some constant ρ_k . Then there exists a set of n -element permutations \mathcal{L}' s.t. the wait-and-pick secretarial algorithm executed with uniform distribution on set \mathcal{L}' has success probability $\geq \left(1 - \frac{k^2 d}{\ell}\right) \rho_k$. The set \mathcal{L}' can be computed in time $O(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot |\mathcal{L}|)$.*

Proof. For a given function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and a permutation $\pi \in \mathcal{L}$ we denote by $\pi \circ f : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ any permutation σ over set $[n]$ satisfying the following: $\forall_{i,j \in [n], i \neq j}$ if $\text{ind}_\pi(f(i)) < \text{ind}_\pi(f(j))$ then $\text{ind}_\sigma(i) < \text{ind}_\sigma(j)$. The aforementioned formal definition has the following natural explanation. The function $f \in \mathcal{F}, f : [n] \rightarrow [\ell]$ may be interpreted as an assignment of each element from set $[n]$ to one of ℓ blocks. Next, permutation $\pi \in \mathcal{L}$ determines the order of those blocks. So, the final permutation is obtained by listing the elements from the blocks in the order given by π . The order of elements inside the blocks is irrelevant.

The set \mathcal{L}' of permutations over $[n]$ is defined as $\mathcal{L}' = \{\pi \circ f : \pi \in \mathcal{L}, f \in \mathcal{F}\}$, and its size is $|\mathcal{L}| \cdot |\mathcal{F}|$. It is easy to observe that \mathcal{L}' can be computed in $O(|\mathcal{F}| \cdot |\mathcal{L}|)$ time.

Let us set an adversarial order (permutation) of elements π_1 . We will show that with probability $\left(1 - \frac{k^2 d}{\ell}\right) \rho_k$ a successful permutation from \mathcal{L}' for the k -tuple $\hat{S} = \{\pi_1(1), \pi_1(2), \dots, \pi_1(k)\}$ is picked. This will conclude the theorem.

Observe, that the random experiment of choosing $\pi \circ f \in \mathcal{L}'$ can be seen as choosing random $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and random $\pi \in \mathcal{L}$ independently. That is true, because \mathcal{L}' consists of compositions of each function from \mathcal{F} with each permutation from \mathcal{L} .

Denote $f(\hat{S}) = \{f(\pi_1(1)), \dots, f(\pi_1(k))\}$ a random variable being an image of the k -tuple under random function $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Assumed that \mathcal{F} is a dimensionality-reduction set of functions with parameters (n, ℓ, d) we have that for any two indices $i, j \in [k], i \neq j$ the probability that $f(\pi_1(i)) = f(\pi_1(j))$ is at most $\frac{d}{\ell}$. By the union bound argument we conclude that the probability that for all $i, j \in [k], i \neq j$ it holds $f(\pi_1(i)) \neq f(\pi_1(j))$ is at least $1 - \frac{k^2 d}{\ell}$.

Assume now, that the k -tuple $f(\hat{S})$ consists of pair-wise different elements. Quite naturally, we will show, that if $\pi \in \mathcal{L}$ is successful for $f(\hat{S})$, then the classic algorithm picks the highest element executed on permutation $\pi \circ f$. This will prove the claimed result since the probability that a uniform random permutation $\pi \in \mathcal{L}$ is successful for any k -tuple is at least ρ_k .

If a permutation $\pi \in \mathcal{L}$ is successful for $f(\hat{S}) = \{f(\pi_1(1)), \dots, f(\pi_1(k))\}$, then the following properties hold for some constant c and some integer $k' \in \{2, \dots, k\}$:

$$\text{ind}_\pi(f(\pi_1(2))) < \lfloor \ell/e \rfloor - c,$$

$$\forall_{i \in [k'] \setminus \{2\}} : \text{ind}_\pi(f(\pi_1(i))) > \lfloor \ell/e \rfloor + c,$$

and

$$\forall_{3 \leq i \leq k'} : \text{ind}_\pi(f(\pi_1(1))) < \text{ind}_\pi(f(\pi_1(i))).$$

In other words, the permutation π covers some k' -tuple that is contained in k -tuple $f(\hat{S})$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $k' = k$. Otherwise, we can repeat the same reasoning for a tuple of the smaller size k' .

Now, the permutation $\pi \circ f$ is any permutation σ of n -elements such that if we have that $\text{ind}_\pi(f(\pi_1(i))) < \text{ind}_\pi(f(\pi_1(j)))$, then $\text{ind}_\sigma(\pi_1(i)) < \text{ind}_\sigma(\pi_1(j))$. From this and the assumption that k -tuple $f(\hat{S})$ consists of pair-wise different elements, we have that the order of elements of k -tuple $f(\hat{S})$ in π is the same as the order of elements of k -tuple \hat{S} in $\pi \circ f$. It has left to show, that element $\pi_1(2)$ is placed before the threshold $\lfloor n/e \rfloor$ in permutation $\pi \circ f$ and all other elements of \hat{S} are placed after. However, the definition of dimensionality-reduction set guarantees that

$$\forall_{j \in [\ell]} : |f^{-1}(j)| \leq \frac{n}{\ell} + o(\ell).$$

Since $\text{ind}_\pi(f(\pi_1(2))) < \lfloor \ell/e \rfloor - c$ and the operation $\pi \circ f$ preserves the order of elements from $[n]$ that are in different blocks after f is applied, therefore we see that if σ is the n -element permutation $\pi \circ f$ then

$$\text{ind}_\sigma(\pi_1(2)) < (\lfloor \ell/e \rfloor - c) \left(\frac{n}{\ell} + o(\ell) \right) \leq \lfloor n/e \rfloor - \frac{cn}{\ell} + o(\ell^2/e).$$

Since we assumed that $\frac{n}{\ell} > \ell^2$, we conclude that

$$\text{ind}_\sigma(\pi_1(2)) < \lfloor n/e \rfloor.$$

The same reasoning shows that every other element than $\pi_1(2)$ of the k -tuple \hat{S} is placed on position greater than $\lfloor n/e \rfloor$ in any permutation $\pi \circ f$. It is clear then, that the classic algorithm executed on permutation $\pi \circ f$ encounters element $\pi_1(2)$ before it passes the threshold. It stores this element as the maximum of elements before the threshold, and then picks element $\pi_1(1)$ as the first element greater than $\pi_1(2)$ after the threshold. Thus $\pi \circ f$ is successful for \hat{S} , which proves the theorem. \square

Proof. (of Theorem 5) Let us set $\ell = \frac{\log \log n}{\log \log \log n}$ and $k = \log \ell$. Consider a dimensionality-reduction set of functions \mathcal{F} given by Corollary 2 with parameters $(n, \ell, \sqrt{\ell})$. Since $\frac{\log \log n}{\log \log \log n} > (\log \log n)^{1/2}$, the construction given in Corollary 2 is valid. Note also, that the size of set \mathcal{F} is $O(\ell^{\sqrt{\ell}}) = O(\log n)$. Let \mathcal{L} be the set of all ℓ elements permutations. By the proof of Theorem 13, we see that every k -tuple has at least a $\rho_k = OPT_\ell - \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^k$ fraction of successful permutations in set \mathcal{L} . From Stirling's approximation we obtain that $\log(|\mathcal{L}|) = \log(\ell!) = O(\ell \log \ell) = O(\log \log n)$, thus $|\mathcal{L}| = O(\log(n))$ and we can enumerate all permutations in \mathcal{L} in time polynomial in n .

Finally, we use Theorem 16 to compose set \mathcal{F} with set \mathcal{L} and obtain a set of n -element permutations \mathcal{L}' on which we define a uniform distribution \mathcal{D}_n . Since we considered the uniform distribution on \mathcal{L}' we obtain that the entropy of \mathcal{D}_n is $\log |\mathcal{L}'| = \log |\mathcal{F}| + \log |\mathcal{L}| = O(\log \log n)$. The probability of success of the classic secretarial algorithm is, according to Theorem 16, the following:

$$\left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\ell}}\right) \left(OPT_\ell - \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^k\right).$$

Substituting $\ell = \frac{\log \log n}{\log \log \log n}$, $k = \log \ell$ and skipping some basic calculations we finally obtain that the probability can be lower bounded by

$$\frac{1}{e} - 3 \frac{(\log \log \log n)^{5/2}}{\sqrt{\log \log n}},$$

which proves the theorem. \square

Proof. (of Theorem 6) Let us set $\ell := \log^C n$, $k := C \log_{e/(e-1)} \log n$ and $\epsilon' := \frac{1}{\log^C n}$, for any constant $C > 1$. Consider a dimension-reduction set \mathcal{F} constructed as in Corollary 1 with parameters $(n, \ell, \sqrt{\ell})$. Observe that set \mathcal{F} has size $O(\ell) = O(\log^C n)$ and can be computed in time polynomial in n . Next, let \mathcal{L} be a set of ℓ -element permutations obtained from Theorem 14 with parameters $n := \ell$, k and ϵ' , such that least $(1 - \epsilon') \left(OPT_\ell - \frac{2}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^k \right)$ fraction of permutations from \mathcal{L} are successful for every k -tuple. From Theorem 14, we have that $|\mathcal{L}| = O(\log^{4C} n)$ and \mathcal{L} can be computed in polynomial time in n . The last follows because $\ell^k = O(e^{(\log \log n)^2})$ is polynomial in n .

We define the final permutations distribution \mathcal{D}_n to be a uniform distribution over set of n elements permutations set \mathcal{L}' provided by Theorem 16 from the conjugation of set \mathcal{F} and set \mathcal{L} . Clearly, size of \mathcal{L}' is polynomial in $\log n$, thus the entropy of \mathcal{D}_n is $O(\log \log n)$. Also, Theorem 16 implies that the classic secretarial algorithm executed on \mathcal{D}_n achieves a probability of success of at least

$$\left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\ell}}\right) (1 - \epsilon') \left(OPT_\ell - \frac{2}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^k \right).$$

From Theorem 2 we obtain that $OPT_\ell = \frac{1}{e} + \frac{c_0}{\ell} + O\left(\left(\frac{1}{\ell}\right)^{3/2}\right)$, where $c_0 = 1/2 - 1/(2e)$. Therefore, we can calculate the success probability of the classic algorithm as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{\ell}}\right) (1 - \epsilon') \left(OPT_\ell - \frac{2}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^k \right) \\ & \geq \left(1 - \frac{(C_1 \log \log n)^2}{\log^{C/2} n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log^C n}\right) \left(\frac{1}{e} + \frac{c_0}{\log^C n} - \frac{2}{(\log^C n) \cdot C_1 \log \log n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log^C n}\right) \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{e} - \frac{(C_1 \log \log n)^2}{\log^{C/2} n} + o\left(\frac{(\log \log n)^2}{\log^{C/2} n}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = \frac{C}{\log(e/(e-1))}$, and $C > 1$. □