

On the Hardness of Deriving the Arithmetic Mean Component Competitive Ratio

TOSHIYA ITOH¹
titoh@c.titech.ac.jp

YOSHINORI TAKEI²
ytakei@akita-nct.ac.jp

Abstract: For the multi-objective time series search problem, Hasegawa and Itoh [Theoretical Computer Science, Vo.718, pp.58-66, 2018] presented the best possible online algorithm *balanced price policy* (BPP) for any monotone function $f : \mathbf{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Specifically, the competitive ratio with respect to the monotone function $f(c_1, \dots, c_k) = (c_1 + \dots + c_k)/k$ is referred to as the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio. Hasegawa and Itoh derived the closed formula of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for $k = 2$, but it has not been known for any integer $k \geq 3$. In this paper, we show that it is \mathcal{NP} -hard to derive closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for general integer $k \geq 2$. On the the hand, we derive closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for $k = 3$ and $k = 4$.

Key Words: multi-objective time series search problem, monotone functions, arithmetic mean component competitive ratio.

1 Introduction

There are many single-objective online optimization problems such as paging and caching (see [11] for a survey), metric task systems (see [7] for a survey), asset conversion problems (see [8] for a survey), buffer management of network switches (see [4] for a survey), etc., and Sleator and Tarjan [9] introduced a notion of competitive analysis to measure the efficiency of online algorithms for single-objective online optimization problems. For online problems of multi-objective nature, Tiedemann, et al. [10] presented a framework of multi-objective online problems as an online version of multi-objective optimization problems [2] and formulated a notion of the competitive ratio for multi-objective online problems as the extension of the competitive ratio for single-objective online problems. On defining the competitive ratio for k -objective online problems, Tiedemann, et al. [10] regarded multi-objective online problems as a family of (possibly dependent) single-objective online problems and applied a monotone function $f : \mathbf{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ to the family of the single-objective online problems. Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm for a k -objective online problem. Then we regard the algorithm \mathcal{A} as a family of algorithms \mathcal{A}_i for the i th objective. For c_1, \dots, c_k , where c_i is the competitive ratio of the algorithm \mathcal{A}_i , we say that the algorithm \mathcal{A} is $f(c_1, \dots, c_k)$ -competitive with respect to a monotone function $f : \mathbf{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. In fact, Tiedemann, et al. [10] defined the competitive ratio by several monotone (continuous) functions, e.g., the worst component competitive ratio by $f_1(c_1, \dots, c_k) = \max(c_1, \dots, c_k)$, the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio by $f_2(c_1, \dots, c_k) = (c_1 + \dots + c_k)/k$, and the geometric mean component competitive ratio by $f_3(c_1, \dots, c_k) = (c_1 \times \dots \times c_k)^{1/k}$.

1.1 Previous Work

A single-objective time series search problem (initially investigated by El-Yaniv, et al. [3]) is defined as follows: Let ALG be a player that searches for the maximum price in a sequence of prices. At the beginning of each time period $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, the player ALG receives a price $p_t \in \mathbf{R}_+$ and

¹ Dept. of Mathematical and Computing Science, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan.

² Dept. of Electrical and Information Engineering, National Institute of Technology, Akita College, Japan.

must decide whether to accept or reject the price p_t . Assume that prices are chosen from the interval $\text{ITV} = [m, M]$, where $0 < m \leq M$. If the player ALG accepts p_t , then the game ends and the return for ALG is p_t . If the player ALG rejects p_t for every $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, then the return for ALG is defined to be m . Let $r = M/m$ be the *fluctuation ratio* of possible prices. For the case that m and M are known to online algorithms, El-Yaniv, et al. [3] presented a (best possible) deterministic algorithm *reservation price policy* RPP, which is \sqrt{r} -competitive, and a randomized algorithm *exponential threshold* EXPO, which is $O(\log r)$ -competitive³.

As a natural extension of the single-objective time series search problem, a multi-objective (k -objective) time series search problem [10] can be defined as follows: At the beginning of each time period $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, the player ALG_k receives a price vector $\vec{p}_t = (p_t^1, \dots, p_t^k) \in \mathbf{R}_+^k$ and must decide whether to accept or reject the price vector \vec{p}_t . As in the case of a single-objective time series search problem, assume that price p_t^i is chosen from the interval $\text{ITV}_i = [m_i, M_i]$, where $0 < m_i \leq M_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and that the player ALG_k knows m_i and M_i for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. If the player ALG_k accepts \vec{p}_t , then the game ends and the return for ALG_k is \vec{p}_t . If the player ALG_k rejects \vec{p}_t for every $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, then the return for ALG_k is defined to be the *minimum* price vector $\vec{p}_{\min} = (m_1, \dots, m_k)$. Without loss of generality, assume that $M_1/m_1 \geq \dots \geq M_k/m_k$. For the case that all of $\text{ITV}_1 = [m_1, M_1], \dots, \text{ITV}_k = [m_k, M_k]$ are *real* intervals, Tiedemann, et al. [10] presented best possible online algorithms for the multi-objective time series search problem with respect to the monotone functions f_1, f_2 , and f_3 , i.e., the best possible online algorithm RPP-HIGH for the multi-objective time series search problem with respect to the monotone function f_1 [10, Theorems 1 and 2], the best possible online algorithm RPP-MULT for the bi-objective time series search problem with respect to the monotone function f_2 [10, Theorems 3 and 4] and the best possible online algorithm RPP-MULT for the bi-objective time series search problem with respect to the monotone function f_3 [10, §3.2]. Recently, Hasegawa and Itoh [5] presented the deterministic online algorithm *balanced price policy* BPP and showed that BPP is best possible for any monotone function $f : \mathbf{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and for any integer $k \geq 2$.

1.2 Our Contribution

In this paper, we show that it is \mathcal{NP} -hard to derive closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for general integer $k \geq 2$, but this does not necessarily imply that it is difficult to write out closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for a fixed integer $k \geq 2$. In fact, Hasegawa and Itoh [5] derived a closed formula of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for $k = 2$. In this paper, we also derive closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for $k = 3$ and $k = 4$.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notations

Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $\text{ITV}_i = [m_i, M_i]$ be the interval of the i th component of price vectors for the k -objective time series search problem, and we use $r_i = M_i/m_i$ to denote the *fluctuation ratio* of the interval $\text{ITV}_i = [m_i, M_i]$. Without loss of generality, we as-

³ We can show that if only the fluctuation ratio $r = M/m$ is known (but not m or M) to the (deterministic) player ALG, then no better competitive ratio than the trivial one of r is achievable.

sume that $r_1 \geq \dots \geq r_k \geq 1$. For any monotone continuous function $f : \mathbf{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, define

$$\mathcal{S}_f^k = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \text{ITV}_1 \times \dots \times \text{ITV}_k : f\left(\frac{x_1}{m_1}, \dots, \frac{x_k}{m_k}\right) = f\left(\frac{M_1}{x_1}, \dots, \frac{M_k}{x_k}\right) \right\},$$

and Hasegawa and Itoh [5, Theorem 3.1] showed that with respect to any monotone function $f : \mathbf{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, the competitive ratio for the k -objective time series search problem is given by

$$z_f^k = \sup_{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{S}_f^k} f\left(\frac{M_1}{x_1}, \dots, \frac{M_k}{x_k}\right).$$

For the monotone function $f(c_1, \dots, c_k) = (c_1 + \dots + c_k)/k$, we refer to z_f^k as the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for the k -objective time series search problem. In the rest of this paper, we focus on the function $f(c_1, \dots, c_k) = (c_1 + \dots + c_k)/k$. For the bi-objective time series search problem, Tiedemann, et al. [10, Theorem 3] derived the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio $(r_1 r_2)^{1/4}$, which is disproved by Hasegawa and Itoh [5, Theorem 4.1], i.e.,

$$z_f^2 = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_2 - 1)^2} + (r_2 + 1) \right\} \geq (r_1 r_2)^{1/4}, \quad (1)$$

where the equality holds in the last inequality of Eq.(1) if $r_1 = r_2 = 1$.

In this paper, we show that it is \mathcal{NP} -hard to derive closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for general integer $k \geq 2$. For $f(c_1, \dots, c_k) = (c_1 + \dots + c_k)/k$, it is immediate to see that \mathcal{S}_f^k and z_f^k are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_f^k &= \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \text{ITV}_1 \times \dots \times \text{ITV}_k : \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{x_1}{m_1} + \dots + \frac{x_k}{m_k} \right) = \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{M_1}{x_1} + \dots + \frac{M_k}{x_k} \right) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \text{ITV}_1 \times \dots \times \text{ITV}_k : \left(\frac{x_1}{m_1} - \frac{M_1}{x_1} \right) + \dots + \left(\frac{x_k}{m_k} - \frac{M_k}{x_k} \right) = 0 \right\}; \\ z_f^k &= \sup_{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{S}_f^k} \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{M_1}{x_1} + \dots + \frac{M_k}{x_k} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \sup_{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{S}_f^k} \left(\frac{M_1}{x_1} + \dots + \frac{M_k}{x_k} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \sup_{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{S}_f^k} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{x_1}{m_1} + \dots + \frac{x_k}{m_k} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{M_1}{x_1} + \dots + \frac{M_k}{x_k} \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2k} \sup_{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{S}_f^k} \left\{ \left(\frac{x_1}{m_1} + \frac{M_1}{x_1} \right) + \dots + \left(\frac{x_k}{m_k} + \frac{M_k}{x_k} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let $\alpha_i = \sqrt{M_i/m_i} = \sqrt{r_i}$. Since $r_1 \geq \dots \geq r_k \geq 1$, we have that $\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_k \geq 1$. For $x > 0$, let $\phi(x) = \frac{x - x^{-1}}{2}$ and for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let

$$\xi_i = \alpha_i \phi\left(\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}}\right). \quad (2)$$

Note that the function ϕ is monotonically increasing and it is immediate that $\phi(x^{-1}) = -\phi(x)$. So the correspondence $x_i \rightarrow \xi_i$ in Eq.(2) bijectively maps the interval $\text{ITV}_i = [m_i, M_i]$ to

$$\left[\alpha_i \phi\left(\frac{m_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}}\right), \alpha_i \phi\left(\frac{M_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}}\right) \right] = [\alpha_i \phi(\alpha_i^{-1}), \alpha_i \phi(\alpha_i)] = [-\alpha_i \phi(\alpha_i), \alpha_i \phi(\alpha_i)].$$

For simplicity, set $\beta_i = \alpha_i \phi(\alpha_i)$. Then for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, we have that $2\beta_i = \alpha_i^2 - 1 = r_i - 1$ and let $\text{ITV}'_i = [-\alpha_i \phi(\alpha_i), \alpha_i \phi(\alpha_i)] = [-\beta_i, \beta_i]$. Note that $\beta_1 \geq \dots \geq \beta_k \geq 0$.

2.2 Observations

In this subsection, we present several observations that are crucial in the subsequent discussions.

Proposition 2.1: *Assume that the correspondence $x_i \rightarrow \xi_i$ is given by Eq.(2) for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{S}_f^k$ iff both of the following conditions hold: (i) $\xi_i \in [-\beta_i, \beta_i]$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$ and (ii) $\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k = 0$.*

Proof: From the definition of the correspondence by Eq.(2), we have that

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{x_i}{m_i} - \frac{M_i}{x_i} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{\frac{M_i}{m_i}} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}} - \frac{\sqrt{m_i M_i}}{x_i} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \phi \left(\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i.$$

Then it is easy to see that $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{S}_f^k$ iff both of the conditions (i) and (ii) hold. \blacksquare

For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $\text{ITV}'_i = [-\beta_i, \beta_i]$. Define $H(x_1, \dots, x_k)$, $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$, \mathcal{T}_f^k as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H(x_1, \dots, x_k) &= \frac{1}{2k} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{x_i}{m_i} + \frac{M_i}{x_i} \right); \\ G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k) &= \frac{1}{k} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{\alpha_i^2 + \xi_i^2} = \frac{1}{2k} \cdot \left(2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{\alpha_i^2 + \xi_i^2} \right); \\ \mathcal{T}_f^k &= \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k) \in \text{ITV}'_1 \times \dots \times \text{ITV}'_k : \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.2: *Assume that the correspondence $x_i \rightarrow \xi_i$ is given by Eq.(2) for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then the problem of maximizing the function $H(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ over \mathcal{S}_f^k is equivalent to the problem of maximizing the function $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ over \mathcal{T}_f^k .*

Proof: By straightforward calculations, we have that for each $1 \leq i \leq k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x_i}{m_i} + \frac{M_i}{x_i} &= 2\sqrt{\frac{M_i}{m_i}} \cdot \frac{\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}} + \frac{\sqrt{m_i M_i}}{x_i}}{2} = 2\alpha_i \sqrt{\left(\frac{\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}} + \frac{\sqrt{m_i M_i}}{x_i}}{2} \right)^2} \\ &= 2\alpha_i \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}} - \frac{\sqrt{m_i M_i}}{x_i}}{2} \right)^2} = 2\alpha_i \sqrt{1 + \phi^2 \left(\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}} \right)} \\ &= 2\sqrt{\alpha_i^2 + \alpha_i^2 \phi^2 \left(\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{m_i M_i}} \right)} = 2\sqrt{\alpha_i^2 + \xi_i^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the correspondence $x_i \rightarrow \xi_i$ in Eq.(2). Thus it is immediate that the problem of maximizing the function $H(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ over \mathcal{S}_f^k is equivalent to the problem of maximizing the function $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ over \mathcal{T}_f^k . \blacksquare

For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, we say that $\xi_i \in \text{ITV}'_i$ is *filled* if $\xi_i = \beta_i$ or $\xi_i = -\beta_i$ (and we say that $\xi_i \in \text{ITV}'_i$ is *unfilled* if it is not filled). Then we can show the following lemma:

Lemma 2.1: *If $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ maximizes the function $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$, then (i) there exists at most a single unfilled variable ξ_h^* and (ii) $-\vec{\xi}^* \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ maximizes the function $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$.*

Proof: For the statement (i), assume that there exist two distinct unfilled variables $\xi_{j_1}^*$ and $\xi_{j_2}^*$, i.e., $-\beta_{j_1} < \xi_{j_1}^* < \beta_{j_1}$ and $-\beta_{j_2} < \xi_{j_2}^* < \beta_{j_2}$. So we have that

$$G(\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) = \frac{1}{2k} \cdot 2 \left(\sqrt{\alpha_{j_1}^2 + (\xi_{j_1}^*)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_{j_2}^2 + (\xi_{j_2}^*)^2} + \sum_{j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{j_1, j_2\}} \sqrt{\alpha_j^2 + \beta_j^2} \right).$$

Then there exists $\eta \neq 0$ such that $\xi_{j_1}^* + \eta \in \text{ITV}'_{j_1}$ and $\xi_{j_2}^* - \eta \in \text{ITV}'_{j_2}$. Let $\xi'_{j_1} = \xi_{j_1}^* + \eta$, $\xi'_{j_2} = \xi_{j_2}^* - \eta$, and $\xi'_j = \xi_j^*$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{j_1, j_2\}$. It is immediate that $(\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_k) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$. For the rest of the proof, we use the following claim (the proof of the claim is given in Appendix A).

Claim 2.1: For $a, b, c, d > 0$, let $h(x) = \sqrt{a^2 + (b+x)^2} + \sqrt{c^2 + (d-x)^2}$. Then $h'(x)$ and $h''(x)$ are continuous, and (i) $\text{sgn } h'(0) = \text{sgn}(cb - ad)$ and (ii) $h''(0) > 0$.

For Claim 2.1, set $a = \alpha_{j_1}$, $b = \xi_{j_1}^*$, $c = \alpha_{j_2}$, and $d = \xi_{j_2}^*$. If $h'(0) = \text{sgn}(\alpha_{j_2}\xi_{j_1}^* - \alpha_{j_1}\xi_{j_2}^*) \neq 0$, then by the continuity of h' , we can take a small $\eta \neq 0$ to satisfy the following conditions: $\text{sgn } \eta = \text{sgn } h'(0)$ and $\text{sgn } h'(x) = \text{sgn } h'(0)$ for all x between 0 and η . On the other hand, if $h'(0) = \text{sgn}(\alpha_{j_2}\xi_{j_1}^* - \alpha_{j_1}\xi_{j_2}^*) = 0$, then by the continuity of h'' , we can take a small $\eta \neq 0$ to satisfy the following conditions: $\text{sgn } \eta = \pm 1$ and $\text{sgn } h''(x) = \text{sgn } h''(0)$ for all x between 0 and η . Then in either case, it follows from the mean value theorem that

$$\sqrt{\alpha_{j_1}^2 + (\xi_{j_1}^*)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_{j_2}^2 + (\xi_{j_2}^*)^2} < \sqrt{\alpha_{j_1}^2 + (\xi_{j_1}^* + \eta)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_{j_2}^2 + (\xi_{j_2}^* - \eta)^2},$$

where the inequality follows from Claim 2.1-(i) for the case that $\alpha_{j_2}\xi_{j_1}^* - \alpha_{j_1}\xi_{j_2}^* \neq 0$ and from Claim 2.1-(ii) for the case that $\alpha_{j_2}\xi_{j_1}^* - \alpha_{j_1}\xi_{j_2}^* = 0$. This implies that $G(\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) < G(\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_k)$, i.e., $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ is not a maximizer of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$.

For the statement (ii), it is immediate from the fact that $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k) = G(-\xi_1, \dots, -\xi_k)$ and the definition of \mathcal{T}_f^k , i.e., $-(\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k) = 0$ for any $\vec{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$. ■

We have an immediate corollary (to Lemma 2.1) that is crucial in the subsequent discussions.

Corollary 2.1: For a maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of the function $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$, there exist subsets $J_+, J_- \subseteq I = \{1, \dots, k\}$ that satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $J_+ \cap J_- = \emptyset$ and $|J_+| + |J_-| = k - 1$;
- (2) $\xi_i^* = \beta_i$ for each $i \in J_+$;
- (3) $\xi_i^* = -\beta_i$ for each $i \in J_-$;
- (4) For the index $h \in I \setminus (J_+ \cup J_-)$, $\sum_{i \in J_-} \beta_i - \sum_{i \in J_+} \beta_i = \xi_h^* \in [-\beta_h, \beta_h]$.

From Corollary 2.1, we have that for the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$,

$$\begin{aligned} z_f^k &= G(\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) = \frac{1}{2k} \cdot \left\{ 2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{\alpha_i^2 + (\xi_i^*)^2} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2k} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4\alpha_h^2 + (2\xi_h^*)^2} + \sum_{i \in J_+} \sqrt{4\alpha_i^2 + (2\xi_i^*)^2} + \sum_{i \in J_-} \sqrt{4\alpha_i^2 + (2\xi_i^*)^2} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2k} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_h + (2\xi_h^*)^2} + \sum_{i \in J_+} \sqrt{4r_i + (2\beta_i)^2} + \sum_{i \in J_-} \sqrt{4r_i + (2\beta_i)^2} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2k} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_h + (2\xi_h^*)^2} + \sum_{i \in J_+} \sqrt{4r_i + (r_i - 1)^2} + \sum_{i \in J_-} \sqrt{4r_i + (r_i - 1)^2} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2k} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_h + (2\xi_h^*)^2} + \sum_{i \in J_+ \cup J_-} (r_i + 1) \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

If $|\xi_h^*| = \beta_h$, then the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ has no unfilled variables, and we have that $4r_h + (2\xi_h^*)^2 = 4r_h + (2\beta_h)^2 = 4r_h + (r_h - 1)^2 = (r_h + 1)^2$. If $|\xi_h^*| < \beta_h$, then the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ has the single unfilled variable ξ_h^* such that $\sum_{i \in J_-} \beta_i - \sum_{i \in J_+} \beta_i = \xi_h^* \in (-\beta_h, \beta_h)$, and we have that

$$4r_h + (2\xi_h^*)^2 = 4r_h + \left(\sum_{i \in J_-} 2\beta_i - \sum_{i \in J_+} 2\beta_i \right)^2 = 4r_h + \left\{ \sum_{i \in J_-} (r_i - 1) - \sum_{i \in J_+} (r_i - 1) \right\}^2.$$

Thus from Eq.(3), it follows that for the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$, if the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of G has no unfilled variable, then

$$z_f^k = G(\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) = \frac{1}{2k} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k (r_i + 1), \quad (4)$$

and if the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of G has the single unfilled variable ξ_h^* , then

$$z_f^k = G(\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) = \frac{1}{2k} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_h + \left\{ \sum_{i \in J_-} (r_i - 1) - \sum_{i \in J_+} (r_i - 1) \right\}^2} + \sum_{i \in J_+ \cup J_-} (r_i + 1) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

2.3 Definitions

From Propositions 2.1 and 2.2, it follows that maximizing $H(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ over \mathcal{S}_f^k is equivalent to maximizing $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ over \mathcal{T}_f^k . Our goal is to decide the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$, which is equivalent to decide $J_+, J_- \subseteq I = \{1, \dots, k\}$ that satisfies the conditions (1), (2), (3), and (4) of Corollary 2.1. We use AMCCR_k to denote the problem of deciding the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$.

Definition 2.1 (AMCCR_k): For $\beta_1 \geq \dots \geq \beta_k \geq 0$, find a pair $J_+, J_- \subseteq I = \{1, \dots, k\}$ of index sets that satisfies the conditions (1), (2), (3), and (4) of Corollary 2.1 for a maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of the function $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$.

Given a solution J_+, J_- to AMCCR_k , it is easy to write out closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for any integer $k \geq 2$ as given in the form of Eq.(4) or Eq.(5). To discuss the hardness of AMCCR_k , we reduce the problem PARTITION to AMCCR_k .

Definition 2.2 (PARTITION): For a set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ of positive integers, i.e., $a_i \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ for each $i \in I = \{1, \dots, k\}$, decide whether or not there exists $J \subseteq I$ such that

$$\sum_{i \in J} a_i = \sum_{i \in I \setminus J} a_i. \quad (6)$$

It is known that PARTITION is \mathcal{NP} -complete [6]. We say that A is a *positive* instance if there exists $J \subseteq I$ that satisfies Eq.(6) and A is a *negative* instance if there exists no $J \subseteq I$ that satisfies Eq.(6). Without loss of generality, we assume that $a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_k \geq 1$. If $a_1 + \dots + a_k$ is odd, then there exist no $J \subseteq I$ that satisfies Eq.(6). For the case that $a_1 = \dots = a_k = 1$, there exists $J \subseteq I$ that satisfies Eq.(6) iff k is even. Then in the subsequent discussions, we assume that $a_1 + \dots + a_k$ is even and there exists $i \in I$ such that $a_i \geq 2$.

3 AMCCR_k is \mathcal{NP} -Hard

In this section, we show that it is \mathcal{NP} -hard to compute AMCCR_k by the reduction from PARTITION to AMCCR_k. We assume that there exists a polynomial-time algorithm ALG_A for AMCCR_k. Let $I = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ be an instance to PARTITION. Consider the following algorithm ALG_P for PARTITION with access to ALG_A for AMCCR_k:

Algorithm: ALG_P

- (1) For the instance $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ to PARTITION, set $\beta_i = a_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$;
- (2) On input β_1, \dots, β_k , run the algorithm ALG_A for AMCCR_k. Let $J_+, J_- \subseteq I = \{1, \dots, k\}$ be the sets returned by ALG_A satisfying the conditions (1), (2), (3), and (4) of Corollary 2.1. A maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ is induced from J_+ and J_- according to the conditions (2), (3), and (4) of Corollary 2.1. Let $h \in I$ be the index that is determined by the condition (4) of Corollary 2.1.
- (3) Return YES if $|\xi_h^*| = \beta_h$; otherwise return NO.

On the properties of the above algorithm, the following lemmas hold.

Lemma 3.1: *If $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ is a positive instance, then the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ induced from $(J_+, J_-) = \text{ALG}_A(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ has no unfilled variable.*

Proof: If $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ is a positive instance, then there exists $J \subseteq I$ that satisfies Eq.(6). By setting $\xi_i^* = \beta_i = a_i \in \mathbf{Z}$ for each $i \in J$ and $\xi_i^* = -\beta_i = -a_i \in \mathbf{Z}$ for each $i \in I \setminus J$, we have that $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ and $\xi_i^* \in \text{ITV}'_i$ is filled for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus it follows that

$$G(\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) = \frac{1}{2k} \sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{\alpha_i^2 + \beta_i^2}.$$

Let $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ be a maximizer of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ and assume that $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ has an unfilled variable ξ_h . Then it is immediate that

$$0 \leq G(\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) - G(\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) = \frac{1}{2k} \left(\sqrt{\alpha_h^2 + (\xi_h^*)^2} - \sqrt{\alpha_h^2 + \beta_h^2} \right),$$

which is possible only if $\xi_h^* = \pm\beta_h$ since $\xi_h^* \in \text{ITV}'_h = [-\beta_h, \beta_h]$. This contradicts the assumption that ξ_h^* is an unfilled variable, and complete the proof. ■

Lemma 3.2: *If $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ is a negative instance, then the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ induced from $(J_+, J_-) = \text{ALG}_A(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ has a single unfilled variable.*

Proof: Assume that ξ_i^* is filled for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, i.e., $\xi_i^* \in \{-\beta_i, \beta_i\}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, and let $J = \{i \in I : \xi_i^* = \beta_i\}$. Note that $\xi_1^* + \dots + \xi_k^* = 0$ for $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$. Thus it follows that

$$\sum_{i \in J} a_i = \sum_{i \in J} \beta_i = \sum_{i \in J} \xi_i^* = - \sum_{i \in I \setminus J} \xi_i^* = - \sum_{i \in J} (-\beta_i) = \sum_{i \in I \setminus J} \beta_i = \sum_{i \in I \setminus J} a_i,$$

which implies that $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ is a positive instance. ■

Then from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, we can show the following theorem:

Theorem 3.1: *If there exists a polynomial-time algorithm ALG_A for AMCCR_k , then there exists a polynomial-time algorithm ALG_P for PARTITION .*

Proof: Let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ be an instance to PARTITION and $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ be a maximizer of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ that is induced from $(J_+, J_-) = \text{ALG_A}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$. If A is a *positive* instance, then by Lemma 3.1, the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ has no unfilled variable and the algorithm ALG_P returns YES in Step (3). If A is a *negative* instance, then by Lemma 3.2, the maximizer $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \dots, \xi_k^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^k$ of $G(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ has a single unfilled variable and the algorithm ALG_P returns NO in Step (3). ■

In Theorem 3.1, we have shown that AMCCR_k is \mathcal{NP} -hard for general integer $k \geq 2$, however, this does not necessarily imply that it is difficult to write out closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for a fixed integer $k \geq 2$. Then as an application of Corollary 2.1, we derive closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for $k = 2$, $k = 3$, and $k = 4$ in Sections 4, 5, and 6, respectively, in order to enable a precise analysis of the multi-objective time series search problem.

4 Competitive Ratio for $k = 2$

As we have mentioned, Hasegawa and Itoh [5] derived a closed formula of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for $k = 2$. In this section, we derive a closed formula of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for $k = 2$ given in Eq.(1) as an application of Corollary 2.1 for $k = 2$. For $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^2$ that maximizes $G(\xi_1, \xi_2)$, let us consider the following cases: (2.0) ξ_1^* and ξ_2^* are filled, (2.1) ξ_1^* is unfilled, and (2.2) ξ_2^* is unfilled.

The case (2.0) is possible only when $\beta_1 = \beta_2$. From Eq.(4), it is immediate that

$$G(\pm\beta_1, \mp\beta_2) = G(\pm\beta_2, \mp\beta_2) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_2 - 1)^2} + (r_2 + 1) \right\}.$$

For the case (2.1), we have that ξ_2^* is filled, i.e., $\xi_2^* = \pm\beta_2$. Since $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^2$, it is obvious that $\xi_1 = -\xi_2 = \mp\beta_2$. Then from Eq.(5), it follows that

$$G(\pm\beta_2, \mp\beta_2) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot 2 \left(\sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} \right) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_2 - 1)^2} + (r_2 + 1) \right\}.$$

For the case (2.2), we have that ξ_1^* is filled, i.e., $\xi_1^* = \pm\beta_1$. Without loss of generality, assume by Lemma 2.1-(ii) that $\xi_1^* = \beta_1$. Since ξ_2^* is unfilled and $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^2$, it is obvious that $-\beta_2 < \xi_2^* = -\xi_1 = -\beta_1$, which contradicts the assumption that $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq 1$. Thus the case (2.2) never occurs. Then the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio z_f^2 is given by

$$z_f^2 = G(\pm\beta_2, \mp\beta_2) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_2 - 1)^2} + (r_2 + 1) \right\}.$$

In the following sections, we extend the above argument for the case that $k = 2$ to the case that $k = 3$ (see Section 5) and the case that $k = 4$ (see Section 6).

5 Competitive Ratio for $k = 3$

In this section, we derive closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for $k = 3$. In fact, we show the following theorems.

Theorem 5.1: If $(r_1 - 1) \geq (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)$, then the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for the 3-objective time series search problem is

$$z_f^3 = \frac{1}{6} \cdot \left[\sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) \right].$$

Theorem 5.2: If $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)$, then the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for the 3-objective time series search problem is

$$z_f^3 = \frac{1}{6} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_1 - r_2)^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) \right\}.$$

Let $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*, \xi_3^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^3$ be a maximizer of $G(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$. By Lemma 2.1-(i), there can exist a unfilled variable $\xi_h^* \in \{\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*, \xi_3^*\}$. According to a unfilled variable, consider the following cases: (3.1) none of the variables ξ_1^* , ξ_2^* , and ξ_3^* is unfilled or the variable ξ_1^* is unfilled, (3.2) the variable ξ_2^* is unfilled, and (3.3) the variable ξ_3^* is unfilled.

For the case (3.1), two cases (3.1.1) $\xi_1^* = \pm(\beta_2 + \beta_3)$ and (3.1.2) $\xi_1^* = \pm(\beta_2 - \beta_3)$ are possible, for the case (3.2), two cases (3.2.1) $\xi_2^* = \pm(\beta_1 + \beta_3)$ and (3.2.2) $\xi_2^* = \pm(\beta_1 - \beta_3)$ are possible, and for the case (3.3), two cases (3.3.1) $\xi_3^* = \pm(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$ and (3.3.2) $\xi_3^* = \pm(\beta_1 - \beta_2)$ are possible. Then it is immediate to observe that

Case (3.1.1) Possible only if $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 + \beta_3$.	Case (3.1.2) Always possible.
Case (3.2.1) Impossible.	Case (3.2.2) Possible only if $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3$.
Case (3.3.1) Impossible.	Case (3.3.2) Possible only if $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3$.

We classify the problem instances based on the magnitude of β_1 , i.e., $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 + \beta_3$ and $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3$. Then the possibilities for the cases (3.1.1), ..., (3.3.2) can be summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Conditions Among β_1 , β_2 , and β_3 for $k = 3$

	$\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 + \beta_3$	$\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3$
Case (3.1.1)	possible	—
Case (3.1.2)	possible	possible
Case (3.2.1)	—	—
Case (3.2.2)	—	possible
Case (3.3.1)	—	—
Case (3.3.2)	—	possible

5.1 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Assume that $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 + \beta_3$, i.e., $(r_1 - 1) \geq (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)$. For the cases (3.1.1) and (3.1.2), we use $V_{(3.1.1)}$ and $V_{(3.1.2)}$ to denote the potential maximum values of the function $6 \cdot G(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$ over \mathcal{T}_f^3 , respectively. Then from Eq.(5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(3.1.1)} &= 6 \cdot G(\pm(\beta_2 + \beta_3), \mp\beta_2, \mp\beta_3) = 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (\beta_2 + \beta_3)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1); \\ V_{(3.1.2)} &= 6 \cdot G(\pm(\beta_2 - \beta_3), \mp\beta_2, \pm\beta_3) = 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (\beta_2 - \beta_3)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) - (r_3 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $r_2 \geq r_3 \geq 1$, it is immediate to see that $V_{(3.1.1)} \geq V_{(3.1.2)}$. Thus for the case that $(r_1 - 1) \geq (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)$, we can conclude that

$$z_f^3 = \frac{V_{(3.1.1)}}{6} = \frac{1}{6} \cdot \left[\sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) \right].$$

5.2 Proof of Theorem 5.2

The following proposition is crucial (and its proof is given in Appendix B).

Proposition 5.1: Let $F_3(x, y, z) = \sqrt{4y + (x - z)^2} + (x - y) - \sqrt{4x + (y - z)^2}$. For any $x \geq y$,

- (a) if $z \leq x$ and $y \geq x - z + 1$, then $F_3(x, y, z) \geq 0$;
- (b) if $y \geq z - x + 1$, then $F_3(x, y, z) \geq 0$.

Assume that $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3$, i.e., $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)$. For the cases (3.1.2), (3.2.2), and (3.3.2), we use $V_{(3.1.2)}$, $V_{(3.2.2)}$ and $V_{(3.3.2)}$ to denote the potential maximum values of the function $6 \cdot G(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$, respectively. Then from Eq.(5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(3.1.2)} &= 6 \cdot G(\pm(\beta_2 - \beta_3), \mp\beta_2, \pm\beta_3) = 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (\beta_2 - \beta_3)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_2 - r_3)^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1); \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(3.2.2)} &= 6 \cdot G(\pm\beta_1, \mp(\beta_1 - \beta_3), \mp\beta_3) = 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_3)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_1 - r_3)^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_3 + 1); \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(3.3.2)} &= 6 \cdot G(\pm\beta_1, \mp\beta_2, \mp(\beta_1 - \beta_2)) = 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_1 - r_2)^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

In the following lemmas, we show that $V_{(3.3.2)}$ is the maximum in $V_{(3.1.2)}$, $V_{(3.2.2)}$, and $V_{(3.3.2)}$ for the case that $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)$.

Lemma 5.1: $V_{(3.2.2)} \geq V_{(3.1.2)}$.

Proof: From (8) and (7), it is immediate that

$$V_{(3.2.2)} - V_{(3.1.2)} = \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_1 - r_3)^2} + (r_1 - r_2) - \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_2 - r_3)^2}.$$

Set $x = r_1$, $y = r_2$, and $z = r_3$. From the fact that $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq 1$, we have that $x \geq y$ and $z \leq x$, and from the assumption that $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)$, it follows that $y > x - z + 1$. Thus from Proposition 5.1-(a), the lemma follows. \blacksquare

Lemma 5.2: $V_{(3.3.2)} \geq V_{(3.2.2)}$.

Proof: From (9) and (8), it is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(3.3.2)} - V_{(3.2.2)} &= \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_1 - r_2)^2} + (r_2 - r_3) - \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_1 - r_3)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_2 - r_1)^2} + (r_2 - r_3) - \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_3 - r_1)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $x = r_2$, $y = r_3$, and $z = r_1$. From the fact that $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq 1$, we have that $x \geq y$ and from the assumption that $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)$, it follows that $y > z - x + 1$. Thus from Proposition 5.1-(b), the lemma follows. \blacksquare

From Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2, it follows that $V_{(3.3.2)}$ is the maximum in $V_{(3.1.2)}$, $V_{(3.2.2)}$ and $V_{(3.3.2)}$. Thus Theorem 5.2 holds, i.e., if $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1)$, then

$$z_f^3 = \frac{V_{(3.3.2)}}{6} = \frac{1}{6} \cdot \left\{ \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_1 - r_2)^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) \right\}.$$

6 Competitive Ratio for $k = 4$

In this section, we derive closed formulas of the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for $k = 4$. In fact, we show the following theorems.

Theorem 6.1: *If $(r_1 - 1) \geq (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)$, then the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for the 4-objective time series search problem is*

$$z_f^4 = \frac{1}{8} \cdot \left[\sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1) \right].$$

Theorem 6.2: *If $(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1) \leq (r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)$, then the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for the 4-objective time series search problem is*

$$z_f^4 = \frac{1}{8} \cdot \left[\sqrt{4r_4 + \{(r_1 - 1) - (r_2 - 1) - (r_3 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) \right].$$

Theorem 6.3: *If $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1)$, then the arithmetic mean component competitive ratio for the 4-objective time series search problem is*

$$z_f^4 = \frac{1}{8} \cdot \left[\sqrt{4r_3 + \{(r_1 - 1) - (r_2 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) + (r_4 + 1) \right].$$

Let $\vec{\xi}^* = (\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*, \xi_3^*, \xi_4^*) \in \mathcal{T}_f^3$ be a maximizer of $G(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4)$. By Lemma 2.1-(i), there can exist a unfilled variable $\xi_h^* \in \{\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*, \xi_3^*, \xi_4^*\}$. Let us consider the following cases: (4.1) none of the variables ξ_1^* , ξ_2^* , ξ_3^* , and ξ_4^* is unfilled or the variable ξ_1^* is unfilled, (4.2) the variable ξ_2^* is unfilled, (4.3) the variable ξ_3^* is unfilled, and (4.4) the variable ξ_4^* is unfilled.

For the case (4.1), we have four cases (4.1.1) $\xi_1^* = \pm(\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)$, (4.1.2) $\xi_1^* = \pm(\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4)$, (4.1.3) $\xi_1^* = \pm(\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4)$, and (4.1.4) $\xi_1^* = \pm(-\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)$. Then it is immediate that

Case (4.1.1) Possible only if $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$. Case (4.1.3) Always possible.
Case (4.1.2) Possible only if $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4$. Case (4.1.4) Always possible.

For the case (4.2), we have four cases (4.2.1) $\xi_2^* = \pm(\beta_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)$, (4.2.2) $\xi_2^* = \pm(\beta_1 + \beta_3 - \beta_4)$, (4.2.3) $\xi_2^* = \pm(\beta_1 - \beta_3 + \beta_4)$, and (4.2.4) $\xi_2^* = \pm(-\beta_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)$. Then it is immediate that

Case (4.2.1) Impossible. Case (4.2.3) Possible only if $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4$.
Case (4.2.2) Impossible. Case (4.2.4) Possible only if $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$.

For the case (4.3), we have four cases (4.3.1) $\xi_3^* = \pm(\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_4)$, (4.3.2) $\xi_3^* = \pm(\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_4)$, (4.3.3) $\xi_3^* = \pm(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_4)$, and (4.3.4) $\xi_3^* = \pm(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_4)$. Then it is immediate that

Case (4.3.1) Impossible. Case (4.3.3) Possible only if $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4$.
Case (4.3.2) Impossible. Case (4.3.4) Possible only if $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$.

For the case (4.4), we have four cases (4.4.1) $\xi_4^* = \pm(\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)$, (4.4.2) $\xi_4^* = \pm(\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3)$, (4.4.3) $\xi_4^* = \pm(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3)$, and (4.4.4) $\xi_4^* = \pm(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)$. Then it is immediate that

Case (4.4.1) Impossible. Case (4.4.3) Impossible.
Case (4.4.2) Impossible. Case (4.4.4) Possible only if $\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$.

We classify the problem instances based on the magnitude of β_1 , i.e., consider the cases $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$, $\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 \leq \beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$, and $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4$. Then the possibilities for the cases (4.1.1), ..., (4.4.4) can be summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Conditions Among β_1 , β_2 , β_3 , and β_4 for $k = 4$

	$\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$	$\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 \leq \beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$	$\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4$
Case (4.1.1)	possible	—	—
Case (4.1.2)	possible	possible	—
Case (4.1.3)	possible	possible	possible
Case (4.1.4)	possible	possible	possible
Case (4.2.1)	—	—	—
Case (4.2.2)	—	—	—
Case (4.2.3)	—	—	possible
Case (4.2.4)	—	possible	possible
Case (4.3.1)	—	—	—
Case (4.3.2)	—	—	—
Case (4.3.3)	—	—	possible
Case (4.3.4)	—	possible	possible
Case (4.4.1)	—	—	—
Case (4.4.2)	—	—	—
Case (4.4.3)	—	—	—
Case (4.4.4)	—	possible	—

6.1 Proof of Theorem 6.1

Assume that $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$, i.e., $(r_1 - 1) \geq (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)$. For the cases (4.1.1), (4.1.2), (4.1.3), and (4.1.4), let $V_{(4.1.1)}$, $V_{(4.1.2)}$, $V_{(4.1.3)}$, and $V_{(4.1.4)}$ be the potential maximum values of the function $8 \cdot G(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4)$, respectively. Then From Eq.(5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_{(4.1.1)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm(\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4), \mp\beta_2, \mp\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\
 &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\
 &= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \\
 V_{(4.1.2)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm(\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4), \mp\beta_2, \mp\beta_3, \pm\beta_4) \\
 &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\
 &= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \\
 V_{(4.1.3)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm(\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4), \mp\beta_2, \pm\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\
 &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\
 &= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) - (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \\
 V_{(4.1.4)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm(-\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4), \pm\beta_2, \mp\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\
 &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (-\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\
 &= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{-(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq r_4 \geq 1$, it is easy to see that $V_{(4.1.1)} \geq V_{(4.1.2)}$, $V_{(4.1.1)} \geq V_{(4.1.3)}$, and $V_{(4.1.1)} \geq V_{(4.1.4)}$. i.e., $V_{(4.1.1)}$ is the maximum in $V_{(4.1.1)}$, $V_{(4.1.2)}$, $V_{(4.1.3)}$, and $V_{(4.1.4)}$. Thus for the case that

$(r_1 - 1) \geq (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)$, we can conclude that

$$z_f^4 = \frac{V_{(4.1.1)}}{8} = \frac{1}{8} \cdot \left[\sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1) \right].$$

6.2 Proof of Theorem 6.2

The following proposition is crucial (and its proof is given in Appendix C).

Proposition 6.1: *Let $F_4(x, y, z, p) = \sqrt{4y + (z - x - p)^2} + (x - y) - \sqrt{4x + (z - y - p)^2}$. For any $x \geq y$, if $y \geq z - x - p + 1$, then $F_4(x, y, z, p) \geq 0$.*

Assume that $\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4 \leq \beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$, i.e.,

$$(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1) \leq (r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1).$$

For the cases (4.1.2), (4.1.3), and (4.1.4), let $V_{(4.1.2)}$, $V_{(4.1.3)}$, and $V_{(4.1.4)}$ be the potential maximum values of the function $8 \cdot G(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4)$, respectively. Then from Eq.(5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(4.1.2)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm(\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4), \mp\beta_2, \mp\beta_3, \pm\beta_4) \\ &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \quad (10) \\ V_{(4.1.3)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm(\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4), \mp\beta_2, \pm\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\ &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) - (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \\ V_{(4.1.4)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm(-\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4), \pm\beta_2, \mp\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\ &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (-\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{-(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq r_4 \geq 1$, it is obvious that $V_{(4.1.2)} \geq V_{(4.1.3)}$ and $V_{(4.1.2)} \geq V_{(4.1.4)}$, i.e., $V_{(4.1.2)}$ is the maximum among $V_{(4.1.2)}$, $V_{(4.1.3)}$, and $V_{(4.1.4)}$. For the cases (4.2.4), (4.3.4), and (4.4.4), let $V_{(4.2.4)}$, $V_{(4.3.4)}$, and $V_{(4.4.4)}$ be the potential maximum values of the function $8 \cdot G(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4)$, respectively. Then from Eq.(5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(4.2.4)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm\beta_1, \pm(-\beta_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_4), \mp\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\ &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + (-\beta_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\ &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_3 - \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_2 + \{(r_1 - 1) - (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \quad (11) \\ V_{(4.3.4)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm\beta_1, \mp\beta_2, \pm(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_4), \mp\beta_4) \\ &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + (-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \\ &= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sqrt{4r_3 + \{(r_1 - 1) - (r_2 - 1) - (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \quad (12) \\
\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm\beta_1, \mp\beta_2, \mp\beta_3, \pm(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)) \\
&= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + (-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} \right\} \\
&= 2 \left\{ \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} \right\} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_4 + \{(r_1 - 1) - (r_2 - 1) - (r_3 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1). \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

In the following lemmas, we show that $\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)}$ is the maximum in $\mathbf{V}_{(4.1.2)}$, $\mathbf{V}_{(4.2.4)}$, $\mathbf{V}_{(4.3.4)}$, and $\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)}$ for the case that $(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1) \leq (r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)$.

Lemma 6.1: $\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)} \geq \mathbf{V}_{(4.1.2)}$.

Proof: From (13) and (10), it is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)} - \mathbf{V}_{(4.1.2)} &= \sqrt{4r_4 + (r_1 - r_2 - r_3 + 1)^2} + (r_1 - r_4) - \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_2 + r_3 - r_4 - 1)^2} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_4 + (r_2 + r_3 - r_1 - 1)^2} + (r_1 - r_4) - \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_2 + r_3 - r_4 - 1)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Set $x = r_1$, $y = r_4$, $z = r_2 + r_3$, and $p = 1$. From the fact that $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq r_4 \geq 1$, we have that $x \geq y$, and from the assumption that $(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1) \leq (r_1 - 1)$, it follows that $y \geq z - x - p + 1$. Thus from Proposition 6.1, the lemma follows. \blacksquare

Lemma 6.2: $\mathbf{V}_{(4.3.4)} \geq \mathbf{V}_{(4.2.4)}$.

Proof: From (12) and (11), it is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{V}_{(4.3.4)} - \mathbf{V}_{(4.2.4)} &= \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_1 - r_2 - r_4 + 1)^2} + (r_2 - r_3) - \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_1 - r_3 - r_4 + 1)^2} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_1 - r_4 - r_2 + 1)^2} + (r_2 - r_3) - \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_1 - r_4 - r_3 + 1)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Set $x = r_2$, $y = r_3$, $z = r_1 - r_4$, and $p = -1$. From the fact that $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq r_4 \geq 1$, we have that $x \geq y$, and from the the assumption that $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)$, it follows that $y > z - x - p + 1$. Thus from Proposition 6.1, the lemma follows. \blacksquare

Lemma 6.3: $\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)} \geq \mathbf{V}_{(4.3.4)}$.

Proof: From (13) and (12), it is immediate that

$$\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)} - \mathbf{V}_{(4.3.4)} = \sqrt{4r_4 + (r_1 - r_2 - r_3 + 1)^2} + (r_3 - r_4) - \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_1 - r_2 - r_4 + 1)^2}.$$

Set $x = r_3$, $y = r_4$, $z = r_1 - r_2$, and $p = -1$. From the fact that $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq r_4 \geq 1$, we have that $x \geq y$, and from the the assumption that $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)$, it follows that $y > z - x - p + 1$. Thus from Proposition 6.1, the lemma follows. \blacksquare

From Lemmas 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, it is immediate that $\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)}$ is the maximum in $\mathbf{V}_{(4.1.2)}$, $\mathbf{V}_{(4.2.4)}$, $\mathbf{V}_{(4.3.4)}$, and $\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)}$. Thus Theorem 6.2 holds, i.e., if $(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1) \leq (r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)$, then it follows that

$$z_f^4 = \frac{\mathbf{V}_{(4.4.4)}}{8} = \frac{1}{8} \cdot \left[\sqrt{4r_4 + \{(r_1 - 1) - (r_2 - 1) - (r_3 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) \right].$$

6.3 Proof of Theorem 6.3

Assume that $\beta_1 < \beta_2 + \beta_3 - \beta_4$, i.e., $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1)$. For the cases (4.1.3), (4.1.4), (4.2.3), (4.2.4), (4.3.3), and (4.3.4), we use $V_{(4.1.3)}$, $V_{(4.1.4)}$, $V_{(4.2.3)}$, $V_{(4.2.4)}$, $V_{(4.3.3)}$, and $V_{(4.3.4)}$ to denote the potential maximum values of the function $8 \cdot G(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4)$, respectively. Then from Eq.(5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{(4.1.3)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm(\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4), \mp\beta_2, \pm\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\
&= \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (\beta_2 - \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{(r_2 - 1) - (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \quad (14) \\
V_{(4.1.4)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm(-\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4), \pm\beta_2, \mp\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\
&= \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + (-\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_1 + \{-(r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_2 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \\
V_{(4.2.3)} &= 8 \cdot G(\mp\beta_1, \pm(\beta_1 - \beta_3 + \beta_4), \pm\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\
&= \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_2 + \{(r_1 - 1) - (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \quad (15) \\
V_{(4.2.4)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm\beta_1, \pm(-\beta_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_4), \mp\beta_3, \mp\beta_4) \\
&= \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + (-\beta_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + \beta_3^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_2 + \{-(r_1 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_3 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \\
V_{(4.3.3)} &= 8 \cdot G(\mp\beta_1, \pm\beta_2, \pm(\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_4), \mp\beta_4) \\
&= \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_3 + \{(r_1 - 1) - (r_2 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) + (r_4 + 1); \quad (16) \\
V_{(4.3.4)} &= 8 \cdot G(\pm\beta_1, \mp\beta_2, \pm(-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_4), \mp\beta_4) \\
&= \sqrt{\alpha_3^2 + (-\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_4)^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_2^2} + \sqrt{\alpha_4^2 + \beta_4^2} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_3 + \{-(r_1 - 1) + (r_2 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) + (r_4 + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

From the fact that $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq r_4 \geq 1$, it is immediate that $V_{(4.1.3)} \geq V_{(4.1.4)}$, $V_{(4.2.3)} \geq V_{(4.2.4)}$, and $V_{(4.3.3)} \geq V_{(4.3.4)}$. In the following lemmas, we show that $V_{(4.3.3)}$ is the maximum in $V_{(4.1.3)}$, $V_{(4.2.3)}$, and $V_{(4.3.3)}$ for the case that $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1)$.

Lemma 6.4: $V_{(4.2.3)} \geq V_{(4.1.3)}$.

Proof: From (15) and (14), it is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{(4.2.3)} - V_{(4.1.3)} &= \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_1 - r_3 + r_4 - 1)^2} + (r_1 - r_2) - \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_2 - r_3 + r_4 - 1)^2} \\
&= \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_3 - r_4 - r_1 + 1)^2} + (r_1 - r_2) - \sqrt{4r_1 + (r_3 - r_4 - r_2 + 1)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Set $x = r_1$, $y = r_2$, $z = r_3 - r_4$, and $p = -1$. Since $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq r_4 \geq 1$, we have that $x \geq y$ and

$$y - z + x + p - 1 = r_2 - r_3 + r_4 + r_1 - 2 = (r_2 - r_3) + (r_4 - 1) + (r_1 - 1) \geq 0,$$

i.e., $y \geq z - x - p + 1$. Thus from Proposition 6.1, the lemma follows. \blacksquare

Lemma 6.5: $V_{(4.3.3)} \geq V_{(4.2.3)}$.

Proof: From (16) and (15), it is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(4.3.3)} - V_{(4.2.3)} &= \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_1 - r_2 + r_4 - 1)^2} + (r_2 - r_3) - \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_1 - r_3 + r_4 - 1)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{4r_3 + (r_1 + r_4 - r_2 - 1)^2} + (r_2 - r_3) - \sqrt{4r_2 + (r_1 + r_4 - r_3 - 1)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $x = r_2$, $y = r_3$, $z = r_1 + r_4$, and $p = 1$. From the fact that $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq r_3 \geq r_4 \geq 1$, we have that $x \geq y$, and from the assumption that $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1)$, it follows that $y > z - x - p + 1$. Thus from Proposition 6.1, the lemma follows. \blacksquare

From Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5, it follows that $V_{(4.3.3)}$ is the maximum in $V_{(4.1.3)}$, $V_{(4.2.3)}$, and $V_{(4.3.3)}$. Thus Theorem 6.3 holds, i.e., if $(r_1 - 1) < (r_2 - 1) + (r_3 - 1) - (r_4 - 1)$, then

$$z_f^4 = \frac{V_{(4.3.3)}}{8} = \frac{1}{8} \cdot \left[\sqrt{4r_3 + \{(r_1 - 1) - (r_2 - 1) + (r_4 - 1)\}^2} + (r_1 + 1) + (r_2 + 1) + (r_4 + 1) \right].$$

References

- [1] A. Borodin and R. El-Yaniv. *Online Computation and Competitive Analysis*. Cambridge University Press (1998).
- [2] M. Ehrgott. *Multicriteria Optimization*. Springer (2005).
- [3] R. El-Yaniv, A. Fiat, R. M. Karp, and G. Turpin. Optimal Search and One-Way Trading Online Algorithms. *Algorithmica*, 30(1), pp.101-139 (2001).
- [4] M. H. Goldwasser. A Survey of Buffer Management Policies for Packet Switches. *ACM SIGACT News*, 41(1), pp.100-128 (2010).
- [5] S. Hasegawa and T. Itoh. Optimal Online Algorithms for the Multi-Objective Time Series Search Problem. in *Proc. of the 10th International Workshop on Algorithms and Computation, WALCOM 2016, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 9627*, pp. 201-212 (2016).
- [6] R.M. Karp. Reducibility Among Combinatorial Problems. In *Proc. of Complexity of Computer Computations*, Plenum Press, pp.85-103 (1972).
- [7] E. Koutsoupias. The k -Server Conjecture. *Computer Science Review*, 3(2), pp.105-118 (2009).
- [8] E. Mohr, I. Ahmad, and G. Schmidt. Online Algorithms for Conversion Problems: A Survey. *Survey in Operations Research and Management Science*, 19(2), pp.87-104 (2014).
- [9] D. D. Sleator and R. Tarjan. Amortized Efficiency of List Update and Paging Rules. *Communication of the ACM*, 28(2), pp.202-208 (1985).
- [10] M. Tiedemann, J. Ide, and A. Schöbel. Competitive Analysis for Multi-Objective Online Algorithms. in *Proc. of the 9th International Workshop on Algorithms and Computation, WALCOM 2015, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 8973*, pp.210-221 (2015).
- [11] N. E. Young. *Online Paging and Caching*. *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, Springer (2008).

A Proof of Claim 2.1

By straightforward calculations, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} h'(x) &= \frac{x+b}{\sqrt{a^2+(x+b)^2}} + \frac{x-d}{\sqrt{c^2+(d-x)^2}}; \\ h''(x) &= \frac{a^2}{\{a^2+(x+b)^2\}^{3/2}} + \frac{c^2}{\{c^2+(d-x)^2\}^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to show that h' and h'' are continuous. For the statement (ii), it is obvious that $h''(0) > 0$. For the statement (i), it is also immediate that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{sgn} h'(0) &= \operatorname{sgn} \left(\frac{b}{\sqrt{a^2+b^2}} - \frac{d}{\sqrt{c^2+d^2}} \right) \\ &= \operatorname{sgn}(b\sqrt{c^2+d^2} - d\sqrt{a^2+b^2}) \\ &= \operatorname{sgn}(b^2(c^2+d^2) - d^2(a^2+b^2)) \\ &= \operatorname{sgn}(c^2b^2 - a^2d^2) \\ &= \operatorname{sgn}(cb - ad). \end{aligned}$$

B Proof of Proposition 5.1

By straightforward calculations, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} F_3(x, y, z) &= \sqrt{4y+(x-z)^2} + (x-y) - \sqrt{4x+(y-z)^2} \\ &= \frac{\{\sqrt{4y+(x-z)^2} + (x-y)\}^2 - \{\sqrt{4x+(y-z)^2}\}^2}{\sqrt{4y+(x-z)^2} + (x-y) + \sqrt{4x+(y-z)^2}} \\ &= \frac{2(x-y)\{\sqrt{4y+(x-z)^2} + (x-z-2)\}}{\sqrt{4y+(x-z)^2} + (x-y) + \sqrt{4x+(y-z)^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the statement (a), it is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{4y+(x-z)^2} + (x-z-2) &\geq \sqrt{4(x-z+1)+(x-z)^2} + (x-z-2) \\ &= \sqrt{(x-z+2)^2} + (x-z-2) = 2(x-z) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the 1st inequality follows from the condition that $y \geq x-z+1$, and the last equality and the 2nd inequality follow from the condition that $z \leq x$. Thus the statement (a) holds.

For the statement (b), it is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{4y+(x-z)^2} + (x-z-2) &\geq \sqrt{4(z-x+1)+(x-z)^2} + (x-z-2) \\ &= \sqrt{(x-z-2)^2} + (x-z-2) \\ &= \sqrt{(z-x+2)^2} - (z-x+2) \\ &= |z-x+2| - (z-x+2) \\ &\geq (z-x+2) - (z-x+2) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the 1st inequality is due to the condition that $y \geq z-x+1$. Thus the statement (b) holds.

C Proof of Proposition 6.1

Substitute $z - p$ for z in $F_3(x, y, z)$ of Proposition 5.1. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} F_4(x, y, z, p) &= F_3(x, y, z - p) \\ &= \sqrt{4y + (x - z + p)^2} + (x - y) - \sqrt{4x + (y - z + p)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{4y + (z - x - p)^2} + (x - y) - \sqrt{4x + (z - y - p)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the proposition immediately follows from Proposition 5.1-(b).