

Prophet-Inequalities over Time

Andreas Abels¹, Elias Pitschmann², and Daniel Schmand²

¹RWTH Aachen University, Germany

²University of Bremen, Germany

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce an over-time variant of the well-known prophet-inequality with i.i.d. random variables. Instead of stopping with one realized value at some point in the process, we decide for each step how long we select the value. Then we cannot select another value until this period is over. The goal is to maximize the expectation of the sum of selected values. We describe the structure of the optimal stopping rule and give upper and lower bounds on the prophet-inequality. – Which, in online algorithms terminology, corresponds to bounds on the competitive ratio of an online algorithm.

We give a surprisingly simple algorithm with a single threshold that results in a prophet-inequality of ≈ 0.396 for all input lengths n . Additionally, as our main result, we present a more advanced algorithm resulting in a prophet-inequality of ≈ 0.598 when the number of steps tends to infinity. We complement our results by an upper bound that shows that the best possible prophet-inequality is at most $1/\varphi \approx 0.618$, where φ denotes the golden ratio. As part of the proof, we give an advanced bound on the weighted mediant.

1 Introduction

Prophet-inequalities are a well-known concept from stopping theory. A decider, the gambler, samples independent random variables one-by-one. She stops this process at any point and selects the current value. Her goal is to select the largest among all observed and future values. Then the prophet-inequality is the ratio between the expected value selected by the decider and the expected value selected by an omniscient prophet that knows the outcome of all the random samples in advance. In the late seventies, Krengel and Sucheston, and Garling [16] showed that this ratio is $\frac{1}{2}$ even if the variables are distributed differently.

One solution, due to Samuel-Cahn [18], to this problem is to simply select the first sample that beats some pre-computed threshold. Over the last decade, this has sparked renewed interest in prophet-inequalities because such thresholds can be interpreted as prices in online mechanisms. Here, random samples represent customers that arrive one by one and are interested in a good. The threshold price is an individual take-it-or-leave-it offer for each customer. Similar models are used for online ad pricing and pricing of cloud services. If nothing is known about the types of customers, it is natural to assume that all customers are identically distributed. In this case, Correa et al. [2] have shown that the ratio is at least 0.745.

We extend this line of work and, instead of selling goods to customers, we lend them over time. There is a single good and customers arrive online one by one. The value of each customer is an

i.i.d. random variable and the decider decides whether she lends to the customer and for how long. The value collected through the customer is his value times the number of steps that he borrows. Please note that, once we have selected a customer, we cannot cancel this commitment and we have to reject all customers that arrive until the lease expires.

Our approach gives an over-time flavor to prophet-inequalities that allows us to apply them to applications with limited, but non-depleting resources. The optimal prophet-inequality corresponds to the competitive ratio of an optimal online algorithm for this problem, where the online algorithm describes the decision routine of the decider. Similar to classical prophet-inequalities, our algorithms constitute threshold functions that depend on the distribution of the random variables and the number of steps remaining.

1.1 Related Work

Classical prophet-inequalities go back to Gilbert and Mosteller [10] and Krenzel and Sucheston, and Garling [16, 17]. The latter showed a stopping rule that for n non-negative, independent random variables drawn one after the other, in expectation, collects at least half the maximum value. And they showed that this is best possible. Samuel-Cahn [18] simplified the solution and noted that a single threshold suffices for all steps of the sequence.

Interest in prophet-inequalities resurged with research on the posted-price mechanism and online mechanism design. Hajiaghayi et al. [11] and Chawla et al. [1] pointed out the connection and first used stopping rules for prophet-inequalities as prices in online mechanisms. Starting from this perspective, a lot of work has been done on different kinds of prophet-inequalities, and we can only present a small fraction of this body of work. Kleinberg and Weinberg [15] extended prophet-inequalities to matroid and matroid intersection constraints, and Dütting and Kleinberg [6] covered polymatroids. Feldmann et al. [8] analyzed combinatorial auctions with posted-prices, and Dütting et al. [5] presented a unifying framework for many different types of combinatorial prophet-inequalities.

All these results only assume that number of random variables and their distributions are known. In many applications, it is reasonable to assume that all numbers are drawn i.i.d. from the same distribution. Hill and Kertz [12, 13] studied this case and gave a recursive characterization of the prophet-inequality for different numbers n of random variables. Correa et al. [2] show that this characterization gives tight bounds on the prophet-inequality with i.i.d. random variables and that its value is 0.745. More recently, Correa et al. [3] considered the prophet-inequality with i.i.d. random variables with an unknown distribution. They showed that this prophet-inequality is $\frac{1}{e}$, and that this bound holds for a sublinear number of additional samples on the distribution, whereas $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ samples are equivalent to full knowledge of the distribution.

In contrast to the prophet-inequalities discussed above, the work on models that are over time is sparse. For secretary problems, Fiat et al. [9] have coined the temp secretary problem, where each random variable arrives uniformly distributed over a period of time. There is a fixed duration λ for all random variables and each random variable has an individual value. Then the decider online selects a subset of the random variables such that no two random variables overlap. Kesselheim and Tönnis [14] improved and generalized the result and gave a $\frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\lambda})$ -competitive algorithms for the basic problem. In the prophet-inequality minimization domain, Disser et al. [4] showed that, for the minimization version of the problem considered in this paper, it is possible to achieve constant prophet-inequalities if the algorithm is required to cover every step of the online process. This means, there is no restriction on the number of values selected simultaneously. In addition,

they showed that this is not possible if the decider is restricted to selecting only a single number at a time. This result is in contrast to the impossibility result by Esfandiari et al. [7] who showed that even for i.i.d. random variables, there is no constant prophet-inequality for the minimization version.

1.2 Our Contribution

We introduce an over-time component to prophet-inequalities with i.i.d. distributed random variables. Instead of stopping at some point, we decide for how many steps we want to select a value, and then we cannot select another one until the period is over. The objective is to maximize the expectation of the sum of values taken in each step.

It is easy to see that, if the distribution of the random variables is known, the optimal algorithm for this problem results from a simple dynamic program. We show that the result of this dynamic program is well structured in that the decider selects a value either for one step, until the end of the input sequence, or not at all. Like with ordinary prophet-inequalities, it is not clear how to compute the value of this prophet-inequality, the competitive ratio of this optimal algorithm. We show that the optimal online algorithm has a simple form where – when it has no value selected for the current step – selects the current value either for a single step or until the end of the input sequence. Based on this paradigm, we give a simple single-threshold algorithm where the threshold is a specific quantile of the distribution that only depends on the total length of the input sequence. We show that this simple algorithm results in a prophet-inequality of $\frac{2+e^{-2}}{3-e^{-2}} \approx 0.396$ for *all lengths* of the input sequence n .

Our main result is two-fold, as an upper bound we show that the prophet-inequality is at most $\frac{1}{\varphi} \approx 0.618$ where φ is the golden ratio. This is a strict separation from classical prophet-inequalities with i.i.d. random variables where a prophet-inequality of value 0.745 exists [2]. We complement this bound with a threshold rule, where the threshold is a quantile that changes over the input sequence. We bound this prophet-inequality in the limit and show that it is 0.598 when n , the length of the input sequence, tends to infinity.

From independent interest is an advanced bound on the weighted median, the ratio of two sums. We show and use that for non-negative a_i , positive b_i and non-decreasing w_i the following inequality holds $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i} \geq \min_{s \in [n]} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^s a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^s b_i}$.

2 The Model

For a natural number n , let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Consider a sequence of $n > 0$ i.i.d. random variables x_1, \dots, x_n , from the common continuous distribution D . We denote the corresponding density function as f and the cumulative distribution function as F . Further, we assume that D assigns positive probability to non-negative numbers only, that is $F(0) = 0$. In every step $i \in [n]$, the task is to choose a number of steps $t_i \in [n - i + 1]$ for the value in step i to be *selected*. We gain a value of x_i for t_i steps. Please note that throughout the paper we overload notation like this and write x_i both for the random variable and its realization. In case we already have some other value selected in step i , we have to discard the random variable and set $t_i = 0$. The objective is to maximize the expected overall gained value $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^n x_i t_i]$.

A *decision procedure* for this problem can also be seen as an online algorithm, which we denote by ALG. It has access to the number of steps n , the distribution D of the random variables,

and in step i to the realizations x_1, \dots, x_i as well as its own decisions t_1, \dots, t_{i-1} . The prophet-inequality compares the expected value obtained by a gambler, i.e. the online algorithm ALG to a prophet, an omniscient *offline algorithm* OPT. The prophet sees all the realizations of the random variables beforehand and thus makes optimal decisions that maximize the objective function. The competitive analysis of online algorithms corresponds to the prophet-inequalities in this setting. For any given algorithm ALG, we denote the expected overall value it achieves on an input of length n as $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n]$. We call the ratio $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n]/\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]$, the prophet-inequality over time.

Our algorithms are based on thresholds on the value that is realized in a step. For these thresholds, we use quantiles of the distribution D . Throughout the paper, we write δ_p for the p -quantile of the given distribution D , i.e. the value such that $\mathbb{P}_{x \sim D}[x \leq \delta_p] = p$. In case p is negative, we assume $\delta_p = 0$.

3 Structure of an Optimal Decision Procedure

We derive and discuss a short description of an optimal decision procedure. Let \mathbf{G}_n denote the expected value achieved by an optimal procedure for n steps. Define $\tau_{n-i} := \mathbf{G}_{n-i}/(n-i)$ for $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ and $\tau_0 = 0$, i.e., τ_{n-i} denotes the expected average value per step of an optimal procedure for $n-i$ random variables. Consider the following algorithm.

Algorithm 1: An Optimal Decision Procedure for Prophet-Inequalities over Time

```

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
  | if  $x_i > \tau_{n-i}$  then
  |   | select  $x_i$  for all  $n-i+1$  remaining steps;
  |   | break
  | else
  |   | select  $x_i$  only in step  $i$ ;

```

Algorithm 1: An Optimal Decision Procedure for Prophet-Inequalities over Time.

Interestingly, for a given realization of a random variable, the procedure either selects the value for all remaining steps or a single step. We will show that [Algorithm 1](#) is indeed optimal among all possible online procedures.

Theorem 1. *Algorithm 1 is an optimal online algorithm for prophet-inequalities over time.*

Proof. We provide a proof by induction over n that a) [Algorithm 1](#) is optimal for a sequence of n random variables and b) $\tau_n \geq \tau_{n-1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

For $n = 1$, both claims are obvious.

Now assume both claims to be true for all numbers of steps $1, \dots, n-1$. First, we prove statement a) for n steps. The best possible decision procedure for the prophet-inequality over time problem can easily be characterized through a dynamic program. Denote the realization of the first random variable by x_1 . Clearly, $\mathbf{G}_0 = 0$ and

$$\mathbf{G}_n = \max_{t \in [n]} \{tx_1 + \mathbf{G}_{n-t}\}. \tag{1}$$

We distinguish two cases. First, consider $x_1 > \tau_{n-1}$. We have to show that the maximum (1) is attained for $t = n$. By induction hypothesis, $\tau_{n-1} \geq \dots \geq \tau_0$, so for all $t = 1, \dots, n-1$,

$$nx_1 + \mathbf{G}_0 > tx_1 + (n-t)\tau_{n-1} \geq tx_1 + (n-t)\tau_{n-t} = tx_1 + \mathbf{G}_{n-t}.$$

Next, consider $x_1 \leq \tau_{n-1}$. We have to show that the maximum (1) is attained for $t = 1$. By induction hypothesis, $\tau_{n-1} \geq \dots \geq \tau_0$, so for all $t = 1, \dots, n$,

$$x_1 + \mathbf{G}_{n-1} = x_1 + (t-1)\tau_{n-1} + (n-t)\tau_{n-1} \geq x_1 + (t-1)x_1 + (n-t)\tau_{n-t} = tx_1 + \mathbf{G}_{n-t}.$$

It remains to show $\tau_n \geq \tau_{n-1}$. From the above, we have

$$\mathbf{G}_n = \mathbb{P}[x > \tau_{n-1}]n\mathbb{E}[x|x > \tau_{n-1}] + \mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau_{n-1}](\mathbb{E}[x|x \leq \tau_{n-1}] + \mathbf{G}_{n-1}).$$

Plugging this into the definition of τ_n and using the law of total probability yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n &= \mathbb{P}[x > \tau_{n-1}]\mathbb{E}[x|x > \tau_{n-1}] + \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau_{n-1}](\mathbb{E}[x|x \leq \tau_{n-1}] + \mathbf{G}_{n-1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[x] - \frac{n-1}{n}\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau_{n-1}](\mathbb{E}[x|x \leq \tau_{n-1}] - \tau_{n-1}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[x] - \frac{n-2}{n-1}\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau_{n-1}](\mathbb{E}[x|x \leq \tau_{n-1}] - \tau_{n-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because by induction hypothesis, $\tau_{n-1} \geq \tau_1 = \mathbf{G}_1 = \mathbb{E}[x]$, so $\mathbb{E}[x|x \leq \tau_{n-1}] - \tau_{n-1} \leq 0$. Applying [Lemma 1](#) with $\tau_{n-1} \geq \tau_{n-2}$ by induction hypothesis, we finally find that

$$\tau_n \leq \mathbb{E}[x] - \frac{n-2}{n-1}\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau_{n-2}](\mathbb{E}[x|x \leq \tau_{n-2}] - \tau_{n-2}) = \tau_{n-1},$$

where the latter equality can be derived with analogous calculations to those for τ_n . \square

Lemma 1. *The function $g(\tau) := \mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau](\mathbb{E}[x|x \leq \tau] - \tau)$ is non-increasing.*

Proof. We rewrite $g(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} xf(x) dx - \tau\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau]$, where f is the density of D . Then, for $\tau' > \tau$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\tau') - g(\tau) &= \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} xf(x) dx - \tau'\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau'] + \tau\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau] \\ &\leq \tau' \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} f(x) dx - \tau'\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau'] + \tau\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau] \\ &= (\tau - \tau')\mathbb{P}[x \leq \tau] \\ &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Interestingly, the structure of [Algorithm 1](#) is very easy and its thresholds directly come from the dynamic program for \mathbf{G}_n . Unfortunately, it is not clear how to use the recursive structure of the thresholds to derive a lower bound on the obtained prophet-inequality. At the same time, we cannot derive a usable closed form of the thresholds to work with. Consequently, we will describe other procedures that perform well and are possible to analyze.

4 A Simple Lower Bound on the Prophet-Inequality over Time

We derive a first lower bound on the prophet-inequality over time through the analysis of a surprisingly simple online algorithm, which we call SIMPLE, using only one threshold $\delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}$ for some fixed value $a \in (0, n)$ for a given number of steps $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Note that this procedure only uses a single threshold that only depends on the distribution and on the number of drawn random variables n and stays constant throughout the whole procedure.

Algorithm 2: SIMPLE

```

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
  if  $x_i > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}$  then
    select  $x_i^n$  for all  $n - i + 1$  remaining steps;
    break
  else
    select  $x_i$  only in step  $i$ ;

```

Algorithm 2: A Simple Decision Procedure for Prophet-Inequalities over Time with Only One Threshold

Theorem 2. *The SIMPLE algorithm with threshold $\delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}$ provides a lower bound of $\frac{1+e^{-2}}{3-e^{-2}} > 0.396$ for the prophet-inequality over time for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.*

To prove the theorem, we will show a lower bound on the expected value of the SIMPLE algorithm and an upper bound on the expected value of the omniscient optimal offline algorithm OPT that knows all realizations in advance. We will parameterize the proof for SIMPLE in $a \in (0, n)$ to optimize over a afterward.

Lemma 2. *The expected value of the SIMPLE algorithm for n steps with threshold $\delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}$ can be lower bounded by*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{SIMPLE}_n] \geq \left(n \left(1 - \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{a} e^{-a} \right) + 1 - (a+2)e^{-a} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}].$$

Proof. Assume the first realized value that is greater than $\delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}$ appears in step $i \in [n]$. Then, the algorithm selects this value x_i for the current and the remaining $(n-i)$ steps. The expected realized value is $\mathbb{E}[x_i] = \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}]$. For the simplicity of this analysis, we ignore all values from steps before step i here. It turns out that this does not significantly impact the bound on the prophet-inequality because our analysis is in quantile space. (There can be a large gap in the value distribution below the threshold.) We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{SIMPLE}_n] &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{a}{n} \right)^{i-1} \frac{a}{n} (n-i+1) \mathbb{E}[x_i] \\ &= \left(a \frac{n+1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{a}{n} \right)^{i-1} - \frac{a}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n i \left(1 - \frac{a}{n} \right)^{i-1} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] \\ &= \left(a \frac{n+1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{a}{n} \right)^i - \frac{a}{n} \frac{n \left(1 - \frac{a}{n} \right)^{n+1} - (n+1) \left(1 - \frac{a}{n} \right)^n + 1}{\left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{a}{n} \right) \right)^2} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(a \frac{n+1}{n} \frac{1 - \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^n}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)} - \frac{n}{a} \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^n \left((n-a) - (n+1) \right) - \frac{n}{a} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] \\
&= \left((n+1) \underbrace{\left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^n\right)}_{\leq e^{-a}} + \left(\frac{n}{a} - 1\right) \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-1}}_{\geq e^{-a}} (a+1) - \frac{n}{a} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] \\
&\geq \left(n - ne^{-a} + 1 - e^{-a} + \frac{n(a+1)}{a} e^{-a} - (a+1)e^{-a} - \frac{n}{a} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] \\
&= \left(n \left(1 - \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{a} e^{-a}\right) + 1 - (a+2)e^{-a} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}],
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Next, we upper bound the value of the optimal offline algorithm.

Lemma 3. *The expected value of the optimal offline algorithm OPT for n steps can be upper bounded by*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] \leq \left(n \left(\frac{a}{2} + \frac{1}{a} - \frac{1}{a} e^{-a} \right) + \frac{a}{2} + 2e^{-a} - 1 \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}].$$

Proof. The optimal offline algorithm has the so-far best-realized value selected in each step, that is

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\}].$$

We provide an upper bound for each summand separately. In case none of the first i random variables realize above $\delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}$, we can upper bound the expected maximum by $\mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}]$. In case exactly $j \geq 1$ of the first i random variables have a realization greater than $\delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}$, the expected maximum is at most $j\mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}]$ due to the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_j\}] \leq j\mathbb{E}[x_1]$ for i.i.d. random variables x_1, \dots, x_j . Formally, for all $i \in [n]$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\}] \leq \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^i \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] + \sum_{j=1}^i \binom{i}{j} \left(\frac{a}{n}\right)^j \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^{i-j} j \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}],$$

where the latter sum equals the expectation of a $(i, a/n)$ -distributed binomial variable, which is ia/n . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^i + i \frac{a}{n} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] \\
&= \left(\frac{\left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right) \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^n\right)}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)} + \frac{a}{n} \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] \\
&= \left(\left(\frac{n}{a} - 1\right) \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right) \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^{n-1}}_{\geq e^{-a}}\right) + (n+1) \frac{a}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{n}{a} - \frac{n}{a} e^{-a} + e^{-a} - 1 + e^{-a} - \frac{a}{n} e^{-a} + n \frac{a}{2} + \frac{a}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(n \left(\frac{a}{2} + \frac{1}{a} - \frac{1}{a} e^{-a} \right) + \frac{a}{2} + 2e^{-a} - 1 - \frac{a}{n} e^{-a} \right) E[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}] \\
&\leq \left(n \left(\frac{a}{2} + \frac{1}{a} - \frac{1}{a} e^{-a} \right) + \frac{a}{2} + 2e^{-a} - 1 \right) E[x \mid x > \delta_{1-\frac{a}{n}}]
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to prove the claimed lower bound on the prophet-inequality of SIMPLE, [Theorem 2](#).

Proof of [Theorem 2](#). First, note that for $n = 1$, every procedure has to select the single value for one step, which yields a prophet-inequality of 1.

Next, for $a = 2$ and general value of $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>1}$, the corresponding fraction of the bounds from the lemmas is non-increasing in n :

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{SIMPLE}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]} \geq \frac{n \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} e^{-2} \right) + 1 - 4e^{-2}}{n \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} e^{-2} \right) + 2e^{-2}} \geq \frac{(n+1) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} e^{-2} \right) + 1 - 4e^{-2}}{(n+1) \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} e^{-2} \right) + 2e^{-2}},$$

where the latter inequality can be shown by multiplying the numerator of one fraction with the denominator of the other and comparing the terms. Consequently, the fraction is lower bounded for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ by

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{SIMPLE}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} e^{-2} \right) + 1 - 4e^{-2}}{n \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} e^{-2} \right) + 2e^{-2}} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} e^{-2}}{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} e^{-2}} = \frac{1 + e^{-2}}{3 - e^{-2}} \approx 0.3963,$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Note that a numerical optimization over a yields a best possible lower bound obtainable by this approach of 0.3965 when choosing $a \approx 2.083$.

5 Upper Bound on the Prophet-Inequality over Time

In this section, we provide an upper bound on the best possible prophet-inequality that is achievable by any online algorithm. We show the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *For $n \rightarrow \infty$, the prophet-inequality over time is at most $1/\varphi \approx 0.618$, where φ denotes the golden ratio.*

To prove the statement of the theorem, we construct a specific example instance, i.e. a distribution D , where the behavior of a best possible procedure is easy to analyze. We choose D such that the value x is given by

$$x = \begin{cases} \varphi n & \text{with prob. } \frac{1}{n^2}, \\ 1 & \text{with prob. } \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \\ 0 & \text{with prob. } 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2}. \end{cases}$$

Note that this is a discrete probability distribution. However, a slight perturbation of the drawn values yields a continuous probability distribution.

We derive a closed form for the expected profit of a best possible online algorithm. Let $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n]$ denote this expectation for an instance of n steps with random variables distributed according to D . Obviously, $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_1]$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_1] = \mathbb{E}[x] = \varphi n \cdot \frac{1}{n^2} + 1 \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{\varphi}{n} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

In [Section 3](#), we have shown that an optimal algorithm can be described by a dynamic program. The optimal decision in step $n - k - 1$ is to select the current realization for all remaining steps if and only if the value is at least $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k]/k$. Otherwise, the value is only selected for the current step.

We observe that an optimal algorithm has the following behavior on the constructed instance: If a random variable realizes at φn , we select the value for all remaining steps and stop. If it realizes at 0, we reject it. If it realizes at 1, we select it for all remaining steps if and only if $1 > \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k]/k$ when k steps follow.

Recall that $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k]/k$ is monotonically increasing by [Theorem 1](#). Thus for sufficiently large n , there is a step k' for which $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{k'}/k'] \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k]/k > 1$ for all $k > k'$. For our bound, we derive k' for the 3-point distribution D . To do so, we use the fact that we know the exact behavior of the algorithm and show a closed form for $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k]$ for all $k \leq k'$ by induction over k . The proof is rather technical and can be found in the appendix.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k]$ denote the expected value of an optimal algorithm for the instance with k steps and distribution D defined as above. For $k \leq k'$, we can write*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k] = \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left(k + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^k - 1 \right) \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right).$$

To calculate k' , we aim for finding the largest k such that $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k] \leq k$. For a fixed n , we denote $k = an$ for some $a \in [0, 1]$. By using [Lemma 4](#), we show in the appendix that the condition $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k] \leq k$ can be written as

$$\left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{an} - 1 \right) \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{\sqrt{n} + n^2} \leq a \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} - \varphi n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right).$$

For $n \rightarrow \infty$ we get $(0 - 1) \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \leq -a\varphi \Leftrightarrow a \leq \frac{1}{\varphi}$.

Thus, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is an n' such that for all $n \geq n'$ the condition is fulfilled for all k with $k \leq (\frac{1}{\varphi} - \epsilon)n$ and not fulfilled for all k with $k \geq (\frac{1}{\varphi} + \epsilon)n$. Thus, $k' \in [(\frac{1}{\varphi} - \epsilon)n, (\frac{1}{\varphi} + \epsilon)n]$.

Now we are ready to derive a formula for the expected value of ALG. Note that as long as the number of remaining steps is larger than k' , we have already observed that an optimal online algorithm will select values φn for all steps and all other values only for a single step. Thus, for some step $i \in \{1, \dots, n - k' - 1\}$, there is a probability of $(1 - 1/n^2)^{i-1}$ that none of the previous values was selected for the whole period. In this case, we see a realization with value φn with probability $1/n^2$ and select it for $n - i + 1$ steps. With probability $1/\sqrt{n}$, we see a realization with value 1 and select it for one step. Finally, with probability $(1 - 1/n^2)^{n-k'-1}$ we switch to the case described in [Lemma 4](#) and realize $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{k'}]$.

Lemma 5. Let $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n]$ denote the expected value of an optimal online algorithm for the instance with n steps and distribution D defined above. Let k' be defined as described above. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n] &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-k'-1} \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{i-1} \left(\frac{1}{n^2} n \varphi(n-i+1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{n-k'-1} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{k'}]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it holds for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$ that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n] \leq \frac{1}{\varphi} + \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \left(2 - \varepsilon \frac{\varphi}{2}\right)$$

The proof for the second statement of the lemma is highly technical and needs both some additional technical and highly non-trivial lemmas and some very careful reformulations to be able to derive the limit. The complete proof, as well as a proof for the following lemma for the omniscient prophet, is included in the appendix.

Lemma 6. Let $\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]$ denote the expected profit of the offline algorithm for the instance with n steps and distribution D defined above. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\varphi n \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^i\right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^i - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^i \right).$$

Furthermore, it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] = \frac{\varphi}{2} + 1.$$

We combine the two lemmas to derive the desired result.

Proof of Theorem 3. By Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, it holds for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$ that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{\varphi} + \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \left(2 - \varepsilon \frac{\varphi}{2}\right)}{\frac{\varphi}{2} + 1}.$$

For $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ this ratio is arbitrarily close to

$$\frac{\frac{1}{\varphi} + \frac{1}{2}}{\frac{\varphi}{2} + 1} = \frac{2(2 + \varphi)}{2\varphi(\varphi + 2)} = \frac{1}{\varphi}.$$

□

6 A Better Lower Bound on the Prophet-Inequality over Time

In this section, we introduce a more sophisticated algorithm, which has the exact same structure as the optimal Algorithm 1, but uses different thresholds that permit analysis.

The algorithm's threshold in step $i = 1, \dots, n$ is the quantile $\delta_{p(i)}$, where $p(i)$ denotes some probability. For technical reasons, let $p(0) = 1$, $p(n+1) = p(n+2) = 0$. A large part of our analysis is independent of $p(i)$ and thus can be used as a building block for other decision rules.

Algorithm 3: ONL

```
for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do  
  if  $x_i > \delta_{p(i)}$  then  
    select random variable for all  $n - i + 1$  remaining steps;  
    break  
  else  
    select random variable for one step;
```

Algorithm 3: An Advanced Decision Procedure for Prophet-Inequalities over Time

Theorem 4. *The algorithm ONL with threshold $\delta_{p(i)}$ where $p(i) = e^{-\frac{ci}{n^2}}$ and $c = 9.71$ gives a lower bound of 0.598 for the prophet-inequality over time for $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

For the proof, we separately bound the expected value of the algorithm $\mathbb{E}[\text{ONL}_n]$ and the offline optimal solution $\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]$. We express both expectations as a weighted sum over the expected value that the algorithm extracts from realized random variables in the range of the distribution between two adjacent quantiles $\delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}$. This results in the following two lemmas for monotonically decreasing probabilities $p(k)$. As the offline optimal algorithm selects the maximum value so far in each step, we bound this value using a fragmentation into possible events. The full proof of the next lemma is rather technical and can be found in the appendix.

Lemma 7.

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] \leq \sum_{k=0}^n \alpha_k^* \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}],$$

where

$$\alpha_0^* = (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n p(1)^i - p(2)^i - i \cdot p(2)^{i-1} (p(1) - p(2)),$$

and for all $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_k^* &= \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot p(k+1)^{i-1} (p(k) - p(k+1)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^n (p(k+1)^i - p(k+2)^i - i \cdot p(k+2)^{i-1} (p(k+1) - p(k+2))). \end{aligned}$$

For the analysis of ONL, we bound in each step the probability that the current value falls into each range, that it is selected, and the number of steps for which it is selected.

Lemma 8.

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{ONL}_n] = \sum_{k=0}^n \alpha_k \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}],$$

where for all $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$,

$$\alpha_k = (p(k) - p(k+1)) \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} p(j) + \sum_{i=k+1}^n (n-i+1) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} p(j) \right).$$

Proof. We split the expected value of ONL into two parts: The expected value collected from draws above or below some threshold:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{ONL}_n] = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} p(j) \right) (1 - p(i))(n - i + 1) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{p(i)}] + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\prod_{j=1}^i p(j) \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid x \leq \delta_{p(i)}].$$

Now observe that:

- $\mathbb{E}[x \mid x > \delta_{p(i)}] = \frac{1}{1 - p(i)} \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (p(k) - p(k+1)) \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]$, and
- $\mathbb{E}[x \mid x \leq \delta_{p(i)}] = \frac{1}{p(i)} \sum_{k=i}^n (p(k) - p(k+1)) \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]$.

Plugged into the formula from above, this results in

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{ONL}_n] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} p(j) \right) (n - i + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (p(k) - p(k+1)) \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} p(j) \right) \sum_{k=i}^n (p(k) - p(k+1)) \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]. \end{aligned}$$

The statement of the lemma can be read from this. \square

Unfortunately, the expressions for α_k and α_k^* cannot be easily simplified without a loss in the resulting bound. Before we tackle the problem of simplification, we explain the next step of our proof.

To combine the two lemmas and bound the prophet-inequality, we require an advanced bound on the weighted mediant. We show

Proposition 1 (Advanced lower bound on the weighted mediant). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. For non-negative values a_i and positive values b_i and w_i for $i \in [n]$, where the values w_i are non-increasing, it holds that*

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i} \geq \min_{s \in [n]} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^s a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^s b_i}.$$

The proof is by strong induction and can be found in the appendix. We can use this bound in the following argument, since it is easy to verify that for a strictly decreasing function $p(k)$, each α_k^* and each expectation value in the dominator are in fact strictly positive. Consequently, the prophet-inequality is bounded as follows.

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{ONL}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]} \geq \frac{\sum_{k=0}^n \alpha_k \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]}{\sum_{k=0}^n \alpha_k^* \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]} \geq \min_{s \in \{0, \dots, n\}} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k}{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^*}, \quad (2)$$

where the definitions of α_k^* and α_k were made in [Lemma 7](#) and [Lemma 8](#). Clearly, the right-hand side heavily depends on the choice of $p(k)$ that occurs in the formulas. As already stated in [Theorem 4](#), we choose $p(k) = e^{-\frac{ck}{n^2}}$ with $c = 9.71$. For this choice, we derive tight bounds on the

sums of α_k^* and α_k . What makes the further analysis complicated is the fact that, depending on the value of s , different terms of the respective sums dominate their value. Also, in order to bound the prophet-inequality tightly, we need simple functions, e.g. small-degree polynomials in s . Therefore, in the remainder of the proof, we make a case distinction over the different possible values of s and bound the minimizing ratio for each case separately. For a sufficiently small constant ε , we consider the cases where s is in any of the following intervals $[0, \varepsilon n]$, $[\varepsilon n, \frac{n}{4}]$, $[\frac{n}{4}, \frac{n}{2}]$, $[\frac{n}{2}, n - 2]$, or if it is $n - 1$ or n . Then the prophet-inequality is the minimum over all cases. It turns out that our choice of c gives a tight bound for the edge-cases $s = 0$ and $s = n$, such that the minimum on the right hand side of Eq. (2) gets at least 0.598 for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

References

- [1] S. Chawla, J. Hartline, D. Malec, and B. Sivan. Multi-parameter mechanism design and sequential posted pricing. In *Proceedings of the 42nd Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 311–320, 2010.
- [2] J. Correa, P. Foncea, R. Hoeksma, T. Oosterwijk, and T. Vredeveld. Posted price mechanisms for a random stream of customers. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 169–186, 2017.
- [3] José R. Correa, Paul Dütting, Felix A. Fischer, and Kevin Schewior. Prophet inequalities for independent and identically distributed random variables from an unknown distribution. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 47(2):1287–1309, 2022.
- [4] Y. Disser, J. Fearnley, M. Gairing, O. Göbel, M. Klimm, D. Schmand, A. Skopalik, and A. Tönnis. Hiring secretaries over time: The benefit of concurrent employment. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 45(1):323–352, 2020.
- [5] P. Dütting, M. Feldman, T. Kesselheim, and B. Lucier. Prophet inequalities made easy: Stochastic optimization by pricing nonstochastic inputs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 49(3):540–582, 2020.
- [6] P. Dütting and R. Kleinberg. Polymatroid prophet inequalities. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual European Symposium on Algorithms*, volume 9294, pages 437–449, 2015.
- [7] H. Esfandiari, M. Hajiaghayi, V. Liaghat, and M. Monemizadeh. Prophet secretary. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 31(3):1685–1701, 2017.
- [8] M. Feldman, N. Gravin, and B. Lucier. Combinatorial auctions via posted prices. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 123–135, 2015.
- [9] A. Fiat, I. Gorelik, H. Kaplan, and S. Novgorodov. The temp secretary problem. In *23rd Annual European Symposium on Algorithms*, volume 9294, pages 631–642, 2015.
- [10] J.P. Gilpert and F. Mosteller. Recognizing the maximum of a sequence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 61(313):35–76, 1966.
- [11] M. Hajiaghayi, R. Kleinberg, and T. Sandholm. Automated online mechanism design and prophet inequalities. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 58–65, 2007.

- [12] T.P. Hill and R.P. Kertz. Comparisons of stop rule and supremum expectations of i.i.d. random variables. *Annals of Probability*, 10(2):336–345, 1982.
- [13] R.P. Kertz. Stop rule and supremum expectations of i.i.d. random variables: A complete comparison by conjugate duality. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 19(1):123–136, 1986.
- [14] T. Kesselheim and A. Tönnis. Think eternally: Improved algorithms for the temp secretary problem and extensions. In *24th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms*, volume 57, pages 54:1–54:17, 2016.
- [15] R. Kleinberg and M. Weinberg. Matroid prophet inequalities and applications to multi-dimensional mechanism design. *Games Econ. Behav.*, 113:97–115, 2019.
- [16] U. Krengel and L. Sucheston. Semimarts and finite values. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 83(4):745–745, 1977.
- [17] U. Krengel and L. Sucheston. On semimarts, amarts, and processes with finite value. *Adv. in Probability*, 4:197–266, 1978.
- [18] E. Samuel-Cahn. Comparisons of threshold stop rule and maximum for independent nonnegative random variables. *The Annals of Probability*, 12(4):1213–1216, 1983.

A Missing Proofs of Section 5

A.1 Proof of Lemma 4

We restate Lemma 4 and provide a proof by induction.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k]$ denote the expected value of an optimal algorithm for the instance with k steps and distribution D defined as above. For $k \leq k'$, we can write*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k] = \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left(k + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^k - 1 \right) \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right).$$

Proof. As $k \leq k'$, we know the exact behavior of an optimal online algorithm. A random variable with value 0 will be selected for a single step and a random variable with strictly positive value will be selected for all remaining steps. We prove the claimed formula by an induction over k .

For the base case, let $k = 1$. We observe

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_1] = \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \varphi n + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{\varphi}{n} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

According to the formula in the lemma we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_1] &= \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) - 1 \right) \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} + \left(\frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) \left(\frac{-1 - n\sqrt{n}}{n^2} \right) \left(\frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} - \frac{(\varphi n + n\sqrt{n})(n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1)}{n^2(1 + n\sqrt{n})} \\ &= \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n} - \varphi n + \varphi\sqrt{n} + \frac{\varphi}{n} - n\sqrt{n} + n + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \\ &= \frac{\varphi}{n} \left(\frac{n\sqrt{n} + 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{n\sqrt{n} + 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the base case. We continue by assuming the formula for $k - 1$ and proving it for $k \leq \min\{n, k'\}$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k] &= \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \varphi n \cdot k + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} k + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{k-1}] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \varphi n \cdot k + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} k \\ &+ \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left(k - 1 + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{k-1} - 1 \right) \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ &= k \left(\frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{n^2} + \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{n^2} \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ &+ \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left(- \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{k-1} - 1 \right) \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= k \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{1 + n\sqrt{n}}{n^2} + \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{n^2} \right) \\
&+ \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left(-\frac{1 + n\sqrt{n}}{n^2} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^k - \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{n^2} \right) \\
&= k \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^k - 1 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

A.2 Calculation of k'

In order to calculate k' , we aim for finding the largest k such that $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k] \leq k$. For a fixed n , we denote $k = an$ for some $a \in [0, 1]$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{an}] &= \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left(an + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) \\
&= an \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \\
&= \sqrt{n} \left(a\sqrt{n} \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{\sqrt{n} + n^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the condition $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_k] \leq k$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{n} \left(a\sqrt{n} \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{\sqrt{n} + n^2} \right) \leq an \\
&\Leftrightarrow a\sqrt{n} \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{\sqrt{n} + n^2} \leq a\sqrt{n} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{\sqrt{n} + n^2} \leq a\sqrt{n} \left(1 - \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) \\
&\Leftrightarrow \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{\sqrt{n} + n^2} \leq a \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} - \varphi n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For $n \rightarrow \infty$ we get

$$(0 - 1) \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \leq -a\varphi \Leftrightarrow a \leq \frac{1}{\varphi}.$$

Thus, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is an n' such that for all $n \geq n'$ the condition is fulfilled for all k with $k \leq (\frac{1}{\varphi} - \epsilon)n$ and not fulfilled for all k with $k \geq (\frac{1}{\varphi} + \epsilon)n$. Thus, $k' \in [(\frac{1}{\varphi} - \epsilon)n, (\frac{1}{\varphi} + \epsilon)n]$.

A.3 Proofs of Lemma 5 and Lemma 6

Before proving Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, we need the following additional technical lemma.

Lemma 9. *For constant $a \geq 0$, the following three statements are true:*

$$(i) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} = 1,$$

$$(ii) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) = -a,$$

$$(iii) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \left(n \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) + a \right) = \frac{a^2}{2}.$$

Proof. In order to prove (i) observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left(\ln \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} \right) \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left(an \ln \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \right) \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} an \ln \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \right) \right) = \exp \left(a \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \right)}{\frac{1}{n}} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{l'Hospital}}{=} \exp \left(a \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{2}{n^3-n}}{-\frac{1}{n^2}} \right) = \exp \left(a \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-2n^2}{n^3-n} \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Before showing (ii), we calculate

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} = \frac{a \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} (2 + (n^2 - 1) \ln(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}))}{(n^2 - 1)},$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (n^2 - 1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) = \ln \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{n^2-1} = \ln \frac{1}{e} = -1. \quad (3)$$

Together with (i) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} - 1 \right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} - 1 \right)}{\frac{1}{n}} \stackrel{\text{l'Hospital}}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{a \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} (2 + (n^2 - 1) \ln(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}))}{(n^2 - 1)}}{-\frac{1}{n^2}} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{n^2}{n^2 - 1} a \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} \left(2 + (n^2 - 1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \right) \\ &= -1(a \cdot 1(2 + (-1))) = -a, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of (ii).

In order to show (iii), we need the following limit.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(2n + 2n^3 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \right) = 2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 + n^2 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)}{\frac{1}{n}}$$

Analogously to Eq. (3), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^2 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) = -1$, so we get by l'Hospital's rule

$$\begin{aligned} &= 2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2n \left(\frac{1}{n^2-1} + \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \right)}{-\frac{1}{n^2}} \\ &= 2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(-\frac{2n^3}{n^2-1} - 2n^3 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \right) \\ &= -4 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{n^3}{n^2-1} + n^3 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= -4 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(n + n^3 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) + \frac{n}{n^2 - 1} \right).$$

Suppose, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n + n^3 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) = c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$. Then, by limit rules we get

$$2c = -4(c + 0),$$

i.e., we conclude

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2n + 2n^3 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) = 0. \quad (4)$$

Additionally, we will first show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} (n^2 - 1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \right) = a. \quad (5)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} (n^2 - 1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} (n^2 - 1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)}{\frac{1}{n}} \right)$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} = 1$ by (i) and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (n^2 - 1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) = -1$ due to Eq. (3), we can apply l'Hospital's rule and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} \left(2 + 2n(a + n) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) + an (n^2 - 1) (\ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right))^2 \right)}{-\frac{1}{n^2}} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} \\ &\quad \left(2n + 2n^2(a + n) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) + an^2 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) (n^2 - 1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an}}_{\rightarrow -1 \text{ by (i)}} \\ &\quad \left(\underbrace{2n + 2n^3 \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{n^2} \right)}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ by Eq. (4)}} + \underbrace{2an^2 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)}_{\rightarrow -2a} + \underbrace{an^2 \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)}_{\rightarrow -a} \underbrace{(n^2 - 1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)}_{\rightarrow -1} \right) \\ &= a. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by showing (iii).

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \left(n \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} - 1 \right) + a \right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^2 \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} - 1 + \frac{a}{n} \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} - 1 + \frac{a}{n}}{\frac{1}{n^2}} \stackrel{\text{l'Hospital}}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{an} (2a + (n^2 - 1)a \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right))}{(n^2 - 1)} - \frac{a}{n^2}}{-\frac{2}{n^3}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{n^3}{n^2-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} \left(2a + (n^2-1)a \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right) + \frac{an^3}{n^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^2}{n^2-1} \left(-2an \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} - an \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} (n^2-1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right) + a \left(n - \frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^2}{n^2-1} \left(-\frac{a}{n} - 2an \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} - 1\right) - an - an \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} (n^2-1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underbrace{\frac{n^2}{n^2-1}}_{\rightarrow 1} \left(\underbrace{-\frac{a}{n}}_{\rightarrow 0} - \underbrace{2an \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} - 1\right)}_{\rightarrow -2a^2 \text{ by (ii)}} - \underbrace{an \left(1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} (n^2-1) \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right)}_{\rightarrow a^2 \text{ by Eq. (5)}}\right) \\
&= \frac{a^2}{2}
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of (3) and the lemma. \square

Now, we restate [Lemma 5](#) and provide a proof.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n]$ denote the expected value of an optimal online algorithm for the instance with n steps and distribution D defined above. Let k' be defined as described above. We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n] &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-k'-1} \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{i-1} \left(\frac{1}{n^2} n \varphi(n-i+1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \\
&\quad + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{n-k'-1} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{k'}].
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it holds for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$ that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n] \leq \frac{1}{\varphi} + \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \left(2 - \varepsilon \frac{\varphi}{2}\right)$$

Proof. Note that as long as the number of remaining steps is larger than k' , we have already observed that an optimal online algorithm will select a random variable with value φn for all steps and select all other random variables only for a single step. Thus, for some step $i \in \{1, \dots, n-k'-1\}$, there is a probability of $(1-1/n^2)^{i-1}$ that none of the previous random variables was selected for the whole period. In this case, we see a random variable with value φn with probability $1/n^2$ and select it for $n-i+1$ steps. With probability $1/\sqrt{n}$, we see a random variable with value 1 and select it for one step. Finally, with probability $(1-1/n^2)^{n-k'-1}$ we switch to the case described in [Lemma 4](#) and realize $\mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{k'}]$.

For showing the second statement of the lemma, we set $a = 1 - \frac{1}{\varphi} - \varepsilon$ for some small $\varepsilon > 0$, i.e., for n large enough we have $k' \leq (1-a)n$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{n-k'-1} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{k'}] &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{n-k'} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{k'}] \\
&\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_{(1-a)n}]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} \frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \left((1-a)n + \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{(1-a)n} - 1 \right) \frac{n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1}{1 + n\sqrt{n}} \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1-a) \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an}}_{\rightarrow 1 \text{ by Lemma 9 (i)}} \underbrace{\frac{\varphi n + n\sqrt{n}}{1 + n\sqrt{n}}}_{\rightarrow 1} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{an} \frac{(\varphi n + n\sqrt{n})(n^2 - n\sqrt{n} - 1)}{(1 + n\sqrt{n})(1 + n\sqrt{n})}}_{\rightarrow 0, \text{ as in } \Theta\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{n}\right)} \underbrace{\left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{(1-a)n} - 1 \right)}_{\text{in } \mathcal{O}(1), \text{ as } 1 - \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \in [0,1] \text{ for } n \text{ large enough}} \\
&= 1 - a = \frac{1}{\varphi} + \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Additionally, for $b = (1 - \frac{1}{\varphi} + \epsilon)$ we have $k' + 1 \geq (1 - b)n$ for n large enough. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k'-1} \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{i-1} \left(\frac{1}{n^2} n\varphi(n-i+1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \\
&\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-(1-b)n} \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{i-1} \left(\frac{1}{n^2} n\varphi(n-i+1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{bn} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{i-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \varphi \frac{n+1}{n} \right) - \varphi \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{bn} \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{i-1} i \right) \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} + \varphi \frac{n+1}{n^2} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{bn} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{i-1} \right) - \varphi \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{bn} \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{i-1} i \right) \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} + \varphi \frac{n+1}{n^2} \right) \left(n^2 \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{bn} \right) \right) - \varphi \left(n^2 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{bn} (n^2 + nb) \right) \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \varphi \frac{n+1}{n} \right) \left(n \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{bn} \right) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \varphi n \left(n \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{bn} - 1 \right) + b \right) + \varphi bn \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{bn} - 1 \right) + n^2\varphi - \varphi bn + \varphi bn - n^2\varphi \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \varphi \frac{n+1}{n} \right)}_{\rightarrow \varphi} \underbrace{\left(n \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{bn} \right) \right)}_{\rightarrow b \text{ by Lemma 9 (ii)}} \right) \\
&\quad + \varphi n \underbrace{\left(n \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{bn} - 1 \right) + b \right)}_{\rightarrow \varphi \frac{b^2}{2} \text{ by Lemma 9 (iii)}} + \varphi bn \underbrace{\left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{bn} - 1 \right)}_{\rightarrow \varphi b(-b) \text{ by Lemma 9 (ii)}} \\
&= \varphi b + \varphi \frac{b^2}{2} - \varphi b^2 = \varphi b \left(1 - \frac{b}{2}\right) = \varphi \left(1 - \frac{1}{\varphi} + \epsilon\right) \left(\frac{1 + \frac{1}{\varphi} - \epsilon}{2} \right) = \frac{\varphi}{2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} - \epsilon\right)^2\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{\varphi}{2} - \frac{\varphi}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\varphi^2} - 2\epsilon \frac{1}{\varphi} + \epsilon^2 \right) = \frac{\varphi}{2} - \frac{1}{2\varphi} + \epsilon \left(1 - \epsilon \frac{\varphi}{2} \right) .$$

with $\varphi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - \frac{2}{1+\sqrt{5}} \right) + \epsilon \left(1 - \epsilon \frac{\varphi}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(1+\sqrt{5})^2 - 4}{2(1+\sqrt{5})} + \epsilon \left(1 - \epsilon \frac{\varphi}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1+2\sqrt{5}+5-4}{2(1+\sqrt{5})} + \epsilon \left(1 - \epsilon \frac{\varphi}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon \left(1 - \epsilon \frac{\varphi}{2} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Together with the other part of the limit we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{ALG}_n] \leq \frac{1}{\varphi} + \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon \left(1 - \epsilon \frac{\varphi}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{\varphi} + \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon \left(2 - \epsilon \frac{\varphi}{2} \right) ,$$

which finishes the proof. \square

We restate [Lemma 6](#) and provide a proof.

Lemma 6. *Let $\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]$ denote the expected profit of the offline algorithm for the instance with n steps and distribution D defined above. We have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\varphi n \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i \right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i \right) .$$

Furthermore, it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] = \frac{\varphi}{2} + 1 .$$

Proof. Note that in all steps the selected random variable is the one that has the best value seen so far. Thus, we get φn in step i unless we have not seen a random variable with value φn in all steps 1 to i , which happens with probability $(1 - 1/n^2)^i$. Similarly, with probability $(1 - 1/n^2)^i - (1 - 1/\sqrt{n} - 1/n^2)^i$ we have not seen a random variable with value φn and not seen y 0-items, which implies that the largest value seen so far is equal to 1.

It remains to show the second statement. In order to do so, we first observe

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \frac{\left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^n \right) (n^2 - n^{3/2} - 1)}{n^{3/2} + 1} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \frac{n^2 - n^{3/2} - 1}{n^{3/2} + 1} = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

Note that $1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2}$ is positive for $n \geq 2$, and thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i \geq 0$. We observe $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i = 0$. Now, we are ready to prove the second statement of the lemma. We obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\varphi n \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i \right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\varphi n \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i \right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi n - \varphi \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi n + \left(\frac{1}{n} - \varphi \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^i \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi n + \left(\frac{1}{n} - \varphi \right) \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^n \right) (n^2 - 1) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi n + \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^n \right) \left(n - \frac{1}{n} - n^2 \varphi + \varphi \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi n + n - \frac{1}{n} - n^2 \varphi + \varphi + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^n \left(n^2 \varphi - n - \varphi + \frac{1}{n} \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underbrace{n \varphi \left(n \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^n - 1 \right) + 1 \right)}_{\rightarrow \frac{\varphi}{2} \text{ by Lemma 9 (iii) for } a=1} - \underbrace{n \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^n - 1 \right)}_{\rightarrow 1 \text{ by Lemma 9 (ii) for } a=1} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\varphi \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^n - 1 \right)}_{\rightarrow 0} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^n - 1 \right)}_{\rightarrow 0} \\
&= \frac{\varphi}{2} + 1. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

B Missing Proofs of Section 6

B.1 Proof of Lemma 7

We restate Lemma 7 and provide a proof.

Lemma 7.

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] \leq \sum_{k=0}^n \alpha_k^* \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}],$$

where

$$\alpha_0^* = (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n p(1)^i - p(2)^i - i \cdot p(2)^{i-1} (p(1) - p(2)),$$

and for all $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_k^* &= \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot p(k+1)^{i-1} (p(k) - p(k+1)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^n (p(k+1)^i - p(k+2)^i - i \cdot p(k+2)^{i-1} (p(k+1) - p(k+2))).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\}].$$

Again, we provide an upper bound for each summand separately. In order to do so, for all $i \in [n]$ and $k \in [n]$, let

$$\mathcal{E}_{i,k,=1} = [|\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \cap (\delta_{p(k+1)}, \delta_{p(k)}]| = 1 \text{ and } |\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \cap (\delta_0, \delta_{p(k)}]| = i]$$

be the event where the maximum of i draws is in the interval $(\delta_{p(k+1)}, \delta_{p(k)})$ but all other $i - 1$ draws are not. Analogously, we define

$$\mathcal{E}_{i,k,>1} = [|\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \cap (\delta_{p(k+1)}, \delta_{p(k)}]| > 1 \text{ and } |\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \cap (\delta_0, \delta_{p(k)}]| = i]$$

to be the event where the maximum of i draws is again in the interval $(\delta_{p(k+1)}, \delta_{p(k)})$, but at least one more of the other $i - 1$ draws is in the same interval. Lastly, for $k = 0$, we define

$$\mathcal{E}_{i,0,\geq 1} = [|\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \cap (\delta_{p(1)}, \delta_{p(0)}]| \geq 1]$$

as the event that the maximum of i draws is larger than the largest threshold $\delta_{p(1)}$. Since for fixed $i \in [n]$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,0,\geq 1}] + \sum_{k=1}^n (\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k,=1}] + \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k,>1}]) = 1,$$

we can use the law of total probability in order to derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\}] &= \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,0,\geq 1}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \mid \mathcal{E}_{i,0,\geq 1}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n (\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k,=1}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \mid \mathcal{E}_{i,k,=1}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k,>1}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \mid \mathcal{E}_{i,k,>1}]). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Next, we determine upper bounds on the occurring conditional expected values. For $k \in [n]$, we have that

- $\mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \mid \mathcal{E}_{i,k,=1}] = \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]$, and
- $\mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \mid \mathcal{E}_{i,k,>1}] \leq \delta_{p(k)} < \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k-1)}]$,

and for $k = 0$, we can count the number j of draws in the interval $(\delta_{p(1)}, \delta_{p(0)})$ through analogously defined events $\mathcal{E}_{i,0,=j}$. Using the inequality $\mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_j\}] \leq j\mathbb{E}[x_1]$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \bullet \mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \mid \mathcal{E}_{i,0,\geq 1}] &= \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,0,=j}]}{\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,0,\geq 1}]} \mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\} \mid \mathcal{E}_{i,0,=j}] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,0,\geq 1}]} \sum_{j=1}^i \binom{i}{j} (1 - p(1))^j p(j)^{i-j} j \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(0)}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,0,\geq 1}]} i(1 - p(1)) \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(0)}], \end{aligned}$$

where the latter sum equals the expected value of a $(i, 1-p(1))$ -distributed binomial variable, which is $i(1-p(1))$. Applying the three listed bounds on Equation 6 yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\max\{x_1, \dots, x_i\}] &\leq i(1-p(1))\mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(0)}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,1,>1}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(0)}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k,=1}] + \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k+1,>1}]) \cdot \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,n,=1}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(n+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(n)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we determine the occurring probabilities, which are

$$\bullet \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k,=1}] = \begin{cases} p(n), & \text{if } k = n, i = 1 \\ 0, & \text{if } k = n, i > 1 \\ i \cdot (p(k) - p(k+1))p(k+1)^{i-1}, & \text{if } k \in [n-1] \end{cases}$$

- For all $k = 0 \dots, n-1$ and $i > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k+1,>1}] &= \mathbb{P}[\forall j \in [i] : x_j \leq \delta_{p(k+1)}] - \mathbb{P}[\forall j \in [i] : x_j \leq \delta_{p(k+2)}] - \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k+1,=1}] \\ &= p(k+1)^i - p(k+2)^i - i \cdot (p(k+1) - p(k+2))p(k+2)^{i-1}, \end{aligned}$$

otherwise $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,k+1,>1}] = 0$.

Plugging the probabilities into the previous inequality and summed over all steps $i \in [n]$, we overall obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n] &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot (1-p(1)) + \sum_{i=2}^n p(1)^i - p(2)^i - i \cdot (p(1) - p(2))p(2)^{i-1} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(0)}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{i=2}^n p(k+1)^i - p(k+2)^i - i \cdot (p(k+1) - p(k+2))p(k+2)^{i-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot (p(k) - p(k+1))p(k+1)^{i-1} \right) \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}] \\ &\quad + p(n)\mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(n+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(n)}]. \end{aligned}$$

The statement of the lemma can be read from this. □

B.2 Proof of Proposition 1

We restate Proposition 1 and provide a proof.

Proposition 1 (Advanced lower bound on the weighted median). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. For non-negative values a_i and positive values b_i and w_i for $i \in [n]$, where the values w_i are non-increasing, it holds that*

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i} \geq \min_{s \in [n]} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^s a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^s b_i}.$$

For the proof, we need the following technical lemma on the ordering of specific fractions.

Lemma 10. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $s \in [n - 1]$. For positive values b_i and w_i for $i \in [n]$, where the values w_i are non-increasing, it holds that*

$$\frac{\sum_{i=s+1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=s+1}^n b_i} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i}.$$

Proof. It is known for weighted mediant of positive fractions x_i/y_i with positive weights b_i , that $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i y_i}$ is smaller or equal to the greatest of the fractions among the x_i/y_i . Due to the monotonicity of the w_i , here it holds for all $s \in [n - 1]$ that

$$\frac{\sum_{i=s+1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=s+1}^n b_i} \leq w_{s+1} \leq w_s = \frac{w_s b_s}{b_s}.$$

Here, applying the standard mediant inequality, $\frac{a}{b} \leq \frac{a+c}{b+d}$ for fractions of non-negative numbers a, c and positive numbers b, d with $\frac{a}{b} \leq \frac{c}{d}$, yields that

$$\frac{\sum_{i=s+1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=s+1}^n b_i} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=s}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=s}^n b_i}.$$

Since this holds for all $s \in [n - 1]$, the lemma directly follows. \square

Now, we can prove our advanced lower bound on the weighted mediant.

Proof of Proposition 1. We proceed with a proof by induction. For $n = 1$, we have $\frac{w_1 a_1}{w_1 b_1} \geq \frac{a_1}{b_1}$. For the induction step to $n \geq 2$, we will use strong induction. First, define

$$s^* = \arg \min_{s \in [n-1]} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^s a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^s b_i}, \text{ and}$$

$$t^* = \arg \min_{s \in \{s^*+1, \dots, n\}} \frac{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^s a_i}{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^s b_i}.$$

Clearly, $s^* \geq n - 1$ and $n - s^* \geq n - 1$ so splitting up the sum and using the induction hypothesis on each sum separately implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i a_i &= \sum_{i=1}^{s^*} w_i a_i + \sum_{i=s^*+1}^n w_i a_i \\ &\geq \min_{s \in [s^*]} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^s a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^s b_i} \sum_{i=1}^{s^*} w_i b_i + \min_{s \in \{s^*+1, \dots, n\}} \frac{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^s a_i}{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^s b_i} \sum_{i=s^*+1}^n w_i b_i \\ &\geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \sum_{i=1}^{s^*} w_i b_i + \frac{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^{t^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^{t^*} b_i} \sum_{i=s^*+1}^n w_i b_i. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Here, we make a case distinction. Either,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^{t^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^{t^*} b_i} \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i},$$

such that Eq. (7) implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i a_i \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i \geq \min_{s \in [n]} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^s a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^s b_i} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i,$$

finishing the proof for that case. In the other case, applying the standard mediant inequality once on the two fractions implies that

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{t^*} b_i} < \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i}. \quad (8)$$

Note that for $t^* \in \{s^* + 1, \dots, n-1\}$, this would be a contradiction to the definition of s^* . Thus, we deduce that $t^* = n$. Plugging this into Eq. (7) and rearranging terms yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i a_i &\geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \sum_{i=1}^{s^*} w_i b_i + \frac{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n b_i} \sum_{i=s^*+1}^n a_i \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \sum_{i=1}^{s^*} w_i b_i + \frac{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n b_i} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i \right) \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \sum_{i=1}^{s^*} w_i b_i + \frac{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n b_i} \left(\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n b_i + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \sum_{i=s^*+1}^n b_i \right) \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i + \frac{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n b_i} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n b_i. \end{aligned}$$

Here, note that

$$\frac{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=s^*+1}^n b_i} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i}$$

by Lemma 10. Further, recall that by Eq. (8) together with $t^* = n$, $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} < 0$, so we can finally deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i a_i &\geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i + \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{s^*} b_i} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i \\ &\geq \min_{s \in [n]} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^s a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^s b_i} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i b_i. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

B.3 Proof of Theorem 4

We restate Theorem 4 and provide a proof.

Theorem 4. *The algorithm ONL with threshold $\delta_{p(i)}$ where $p(i) = e^{-\frac{c_i}{n^2}}$ and $c = 9.71$ gives a lower bound of 0.598 for the prophet-inequality over time for $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Before we come to the final proof of [Theorem 4](#), we recall the outline of the proof and state some technical lemmas. Recall from [Section 6](#) that we bound the prophet-inequality by

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{ONL}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]} \geq \frac{\sum_{k=0}^n \alpha_k \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]}{\sum_{k=0}^n \alpha_k^* \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]} \geq \min_{s \in \{0, \dots, n\}} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k}{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^*},$$

where the definitions of α_k^* and α_k were made in [Lemma 7](#) and [Lemma 8](#).

In order to find the minimum, we start by bounding the sum of α_k^* values from [Lemma 7](#). Subsequently, we make a case distinction over the different possible values of s in order to find simple functions in s that will be easy to calculate with. Then, we proceed analogously for the sum of α_k values and finally calculate lower bounds on the prophet-inequality for the respective ranges of s , resulting in the bound from [Theorem 4](#). Especially recall the choice of $p(k) = e^{-\frac{ck}{n^2}}$ with $c = 9.71$ in [Theorem 4](#).

As stated above, we start by bounding the sum of α_k^* values from [Lemma 7](#).

Lemma 11. *For all $s \in [n - 2]$ and large n , it holds that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* \leq n + 1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} + \left(\frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} - \frac{c}{2} - 1 \right) e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} + o(1).$$

Proof. We begin by summing the terms in [Lemma 7](#) for arbitrary $s \in [n]$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* &\leq (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n p(1)^i - p(2)^i - i \cdot p(2)^{i-1} (p(1) - p(2)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot p(2)^{i-1} (p(1) - p(2)) + \sum_{i=2}^n p(2)^i - p(3)^i - i \cdot p(3)^{i-1} (p(2) - p(3)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot p(3)^{i-1} (p(2) - p(3)) + \sum_{i=2}^n p(3)^i - p(4)^i - i \cdot p(4)^{i-1} (p(3) - p(4)) \\ &\quad + \dots \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n i \cdot p(s+1)^{i-1} (p(s) - p(s+1)) \\ &\quad \quad + \sum_{i=2}^n p(s+1)^i - p(s+2)^i - i \cdot p(s+2)^{i-1} (p(s+1) - p(s+2)) \\ &= (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n p(1)^i \\ &\quad + (p(1) - p(2)) + (p(2) - p(3)) + \dots + (p(s) - p(s+1)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^n -p(s+2)^i - i \cdot p(s+2)^{i-1} (p(s+1) - p(s+2)) \\ &= (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^n p(1)^i - p(s+1) - \sum_{i=2}^n p(s+2)^i + i \cdot p(s+2)^{i-1} (p(s+1) - p(s+2)). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing $i - 1$ in the exponent in the latter sum by n in the formula and rewriting the sums in closed form yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* &\leq (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \frac{p(1)(1 - p(1)^n)}{1 - p(1)} - p(s+1) - \frac{p(s+2)(p(s+2) - p(s+2)^n)}{1 - p(s+2)} \\ &\quad - \frac{n^2 + n - 2}{2} p(s+2)^n (p(s+1) - p(s+2)). \end{aligned}$$

From here on, we assume that $s \leq n - 2$, because we claim that it holds for all $s \leq n - 2$ that

$$p(s+1) - p(s+2) \geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2}. \quad (9)$$

For a proof of the claim, observe that the function $f(k) := p(k) - p(k+1)$ is decreasing in k for $k \leq n - 1$ for the choice $p(k) = e^{-\frac{ck}{n^2}}$ with $c = 9.71$: Its derivative is $-\frac{c}{n^2} f(k)$, and since $p(k)$ is obviously strictly decreasing in k , this is negative. It follows that $f(k) \geq f(n-1)$ for all $k \leq n-1$. Applying appropriate Taylor-expansions in the right direction yields that for all $k \leq n-1$,

$$f(k) \geq f(n-1) = p(n-1) - p(n) = e^{-\frac{c}{n}} \left(e^{\frac{c}{n^2}} - 1 \right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \left(1 + \frac{c}{n^2} - 1\right) = \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2}.$$

Consequently, we use [Eq. \(9\)](#) to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* &\leq (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \frac{p(1)(1 - p(1)^n)}{1 - p(1)} - p(s+1) - \frac{p(s+2)(p(s+2) - p(s+2)^n)}{1 - p(s+2)} \\ &\quad - \frac{n^2 + n - 2}{2} p(s+2)^n \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} \\ &= (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \frac{p(1)(1 - p(1)^n)}{1 - p(1)} - p(s+1) - \frac{p(s+2)(p(s+2) - p(s+2)^n)}{1 - p(s+2)} \\ &\quad - \frac{c}{2} p(s+2)^n \pm o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where applying $p(k) = e^{-\frac{ck}{n^2}}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* &\leq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{n^2}}\right) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \frac{e^{-\frac{c}{n^2}}(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{n}})}{1 - e^{-\frac{c}{n^2}}} - e^{-\frac{c(s+1)}{n^2}} - \frac{e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n^2}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n^2}}} \left(e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n^2}} - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{c}{2} e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \pm o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where applying $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$ at some points yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* &\leq \frac{c}{n} \frac{n+1}{2} + \frac{e^{-\frac{c}{n^2}}(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{n}})}{1 - e^{-\frac{c}{n^2}}} - 1 + \frac{c(s+1)}{n^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} \left(1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n^2} - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}}\right) - \frac{c}{2} e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \pm o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Further using that $e^{-\frac{c}{n^2}} \leq 1 - \frac{c}{n^2} + \frac{c^2}{2n^4}$ and $e^{-\frac{c}{n}} \geq 1 - \frac{c}{n} + \frac{c^2}{2n^2} - O\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right)$ implies

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* \leq \frac{c}{n} \frac{n+1}{2} + \frac{\left(1 - \frac{c}{n^2} + \frac{c^2}{2n^4}\right) \left(\frac{c}{n} - \frac{c^2}{2n^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right)\right)}{\frac{c}{n^2} - \frac{c^2}{2n^4}} - 1 + \frac{c(s+1)}{n^2}$$

$$-\frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} \left(1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n^2} - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}}\right) - \frac{c}{2} e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \pm o(1).$$

Note that $\left(1 - \frac{c}{n^2} + \frac{c^2}{2n^4}\right) \left(\frac{c}{n} - \frac{c^2}{2n^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right)\right) = \frac{c}{n} - \frac{c^2}{2n^2} \pm O\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right)$ and $1/\left(\frac{c}{n^2} - \frac{c^2}{2n^4}\right) = \frac{2n^4}{2n^2c - c^2} = \frac{n^2}{c} + \frac{c}{4n^2 - 2c} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{n^2}{c} + O(1)$, such that the corresponding fraction from the earlier formula equals $n - \frac{c}{2} \pm O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$, such that the overall sum can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* &\leq n - 1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} \left(1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n^2} - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}}\right) - \frac{c}{2} e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \pm o(1) \\ &= n - 1 + \left(1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)}\right) \left(1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n^2} - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}}\right) - \frac{c}{2} e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \pm o(1) \\ &= n - 1 + 1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} - \frac{c(s+2)}{n^2} + 1 - \left(1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} + \frac{c}{2}\right) e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} + o(1) \\ &\leq n + 1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} + \left(\frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} - \frac{c}{2} - 1\right) e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \pm o(1). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

At this point, we make a case distinction and consider different ranges of values that s can take. Then, we bound the sum over the α_k^* values from [Lemma 7](#) by simple functions in s .

Lemma 12. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a small constant. Then,*

$$\alpha_0^* \leq \frac{c}{2} + o(1).$$

For $0 < s < \varepsilon n$, define $\varepsilon'' = \varepsilon \frac{c(c+2)}{2}$, then

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* \leq \frac{c(s+1)}{2} + \varepsilon'' \pm o(1).$$

For all $\varepsilon n \leq s \leq 0.25n$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* \leq \frac{c}{2}s - \frac{64 - 16c + 2c^2 - 64e^{-\frac{c}{4}}}{nc} s^2 \pm O(1).$$

For all $0.25n \leq s \leq n - 2$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* \leq n - \frac{n^2}{cs} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{4}}\right) \pm O(1).$$

For $s \in \{n - 1, n\}$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* \leq n \pm O(1).$$

Proof. First, consider $s = 0$, where we know from [Lemma 7](#) that

$$\alpha_0^* = \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{n^2}}\right) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n e^{-\frac{ci}{n^2}} - e^{-\frac{2ci}{n^2}} - i \cdot e^{-\frac{2c(i-1)}{n^2}} \left(e^{-\frac{c}{n^2}} - e^{-\frac{2c}{n^2}}\right).$$

Replacing the $i-1$ by n and applying Taylor-approximations on e^{-x} in $x=0$ in the right directions yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_0^* &\leq \frac{c}{n^2} \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n 1 - \frac{ci}{n^2} + \frac{c^2 i^2}{2n^4} - 1 + \frac{2ci}{n^2} - i \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{c}{n^2} - 1 + \frac{2c}{n^2} - \frac{c^2}{n^4}\right) \\
&= \frac{c}{2} \frac{n+1}{n} + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{ci}{n^2} + \frac{c^2 i^2}{2n^4} - i \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2c}{n}\right) \left(\frac{c}{n^2} - \frac{c^2}{n^4}\right) \\
&= \frac{c}{2} \frac{n+1}{n} + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{c^2 i^2}{2n^4} - \frac{c^2 i}{n^4} + \frac{2c^2 i}{n^3} - \frac{2c^3 i}{n^5} \leq \frac{c}{2} \frac{n+1}{n} + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{c^2 i^2}{2n^4} + \frac{2c^2 i}{n^3} \\
&\leq \frac{c}{2} \frac{n+1}{n} + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{c^2}{2n^2} + \frac{2c^2}{n^2} = \frac{c}{2} \frac{n+1}{n} + (n-1) \frac{5c^2}{2n^2} = \frac{c}{2} + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Second, consider $1 \leq s < \varepsilon n$ for small $\varepsilon > 0$. In this case, we use the inequality $e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \leq 1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n} + \frac{c^2(s+2)^2}{2n^2}$ on [Lemma 11](#) in order to see that

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* \leq n+1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} + \left(\frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} - \frac{c}{2} - 1\right) \left(1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n} + \frac{c^2(s+2)^2}{2n^2}\right) + o(1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} - \frac{c}{2} - 1\right) \left(1 - \frac{c(s+2)}{n} + \frac{c^2(s+2)^2}{2n^2}\right) \\
&= \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} - \frac{c}{2} - 1 - n + \frac{c^2(s+2)}{2n} + \frac{c(s+2)}{n} + \frac{c(s+2)}{2} - \frac{c^3(s+2)^2}{4n^2} - \frac{c^2(s+2)^2}{2n^2} \\
&= \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} + \frac{c(s+1)}{2} - 1 - n + \frac{c^2 s}{2n} + \frac{cs}{n} - \frac{c^3 s^2}{4n^2} - \frac{c^2 s^2}{2n^2} \pm o(1) \\
&\leq \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} + \frac{c(s+1)}{2} - 1 - n + \varepsilon \frac{c(c+2)}{2} \pm o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into the earlier formula yields the result.

Third, consider $\varepsilon n \leq s \leq 0.25n$. Recall from [Lemma 11](#), that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* &\leq n+1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} + \left(\frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} - \frac{c}{2} - 1\right) e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \pm o(1) \\
&= n+1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}}\right) - \left(\frac{c}{2} + 1\right) e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}} \pm o(1) \\
&\leq n+1 - \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}}\right) \pm o(1) \\
&= n+1 - \left(\frac{n^2}{cs} + \frac{n^2}{c(s+2)} - \frac{n^2}{cs}\right) \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}}\right) \pm o(1) \\
&= n+1 - \left(\frac{n^2}{cs} - \frac{2n^2}{cs(s+2)}\right) \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}}\right) \pm o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= n - \frac{n^2}{cs} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c(s+2)}{n}}\right) \pm O(1) \\
&\leq n - \frac{n^2}{cs} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{cs}{n}}\right) \pm O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, note that the cubic function g fulfilling to cross $e^{-\frac{cs}{n}}$ in $s = 0$ and $s = 0.25n$ and to have the same slope and curvature in $s = 0$ is $g(s) = 1 - \frac{c}{n}s + \frac{c^2}{2n^2}s^2 - \frac{64-16c+2c^2-64e^{-\frac{c}{4}}}{n^3}s^3$. We show that $g(s) \geq e^{-\frac{cs}{n}}$ in the interval of interest by defining $\hat{g}(s) = g(s) - e^{-\frac{cs}{n}}$ and showing $\hat{g}(s) \geq 0$ for all $s \in [0, 0.25n]$. By construction, it holds that $\hat{g}(0) = \hat{g}'(0) = \hat{g}''(0) = 0$. Further, one can easily calculate $\hat{g}'''(s) = \frac{1}{n^3} \left(c^3 e^{-\frac{cs}{n}} - z\right)$, where $z = 6(64 - 16c + 2c^2 - 64e^{-0.25c})$. Due to the monotonicity of the exponential function, \hat{g}''' takes its lowest value at $s = 0.25n$, but one can easily check that this is still positive for $c = 9.71$. Consequently, the change of the curvature of g is always positive over $[0, 0.25n]$. Since $\hat{g}''(0) = 0$, this means that g is convex in the whole interval, and due to $g(0) = 0$, this shows the claim. Plugging it into the earlier formula, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* &\leq n - \frac{n^2}{cs} \left(1 - 1 + \frac{c}{n}s - \frac{c^2}{2n^2}s^2 + \frac{64 - 16c + 2c^2 - 64e^{-\frac{c}{4}}}{n^3}s^3\right) \pm O(1) \\
&= \frac{c}{2}s - \frac{64 - 16c + 2c^2 - 64e^{-\frac{c}{4}}}{nc}s^2 \pm O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Fourth, consider $0.25n \leq s \leq n - 2$. Analogous calculations to the previous case and observing that $e^{-\frac{cs}{n}} \leq e^{-\frac{c}{4}}$ directly implies the result.

Fifth, consider $s = n - 1$. The formula from the proof of [Lemma 11](#) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^* &\leq (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n p(1)^i - p(s+1) - \sum_{i=2}^n p(s+2)^i + i \cdot p(s+2)^{i-1} (p(s+1) - p(s+2)) \\
&= (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^n p(1)^i - p(n) \\
&\leq (1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^n p(1)^i.
\end{aligned}$$

We have already seen in the proof of [Lemma 11](#) that $(1 - p(1)) \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \leq \frac{c}{2} \pm o(1)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n p(1)^i \leq n - \frac{c}{2} \pm o(1)$, so we directly get the result. Lastly, note that the same argument works for $s = n$. \square

With [Lemma 12](#), we have a set of bounds for different sets of values that s can take for the denominator of our prophet-inequality. What remains is a similar bound for the numerator. Analogously to the previous set of lemmas, we start with a general bound on the sum of α_k , and then we make a similar case distinction.

Lemma 13. *For all $s = 0, \dots, n$ and $n \geq \sqrt{c}$,*

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k \geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \left((s+1) \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) - \frac{c}{n} + e^{-\frac{c}{2}}\right)\right)$$

$$+ n - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}}(n + c(s + 1)) \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}\right) - (n + 1)e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}}).$$

Proof. First, recall from [Eq. \(9\)](#) that it holds for all $k \leq n - 1$ that

$$p(k) - p(k + 1) \geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2}.$$

Also note that $p(n) - p(n + 1) = p(n) - 0 = e^{-\frac{c}{n}} \geq 1 - \frac{c}{n} \geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2}$ for $n \geq \sqrt{c}$. The imprecision of this bound does not hurt our overall result. Applying this to [Lemma 8](#) yields that for large values of n and all $s = 0, \dots, n$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_k &\geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} p(j) + \sum_{i=k+1}^n (n - i + 1) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} p(j) \right) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k e^{-\frac{ci^2}{2n^2}} + \sum_{i=k+1}^n (n - i + 1) e^{-\frac{ci^2}{2n^2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for all $s = 0, \dots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k &\geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} \sum_{k=0}^s \left(\sum_{i=1}^k e^{-\frac{ci^2}{2n^2}} + \sum_{i=k+1}^n (n - i + 1) e^{-\frac{ci^2}{2n^2}} \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^s ((s + 1 - k) + k(n - k + 1)) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} + \sum_{k=s+1}^n (s + 1)(n - k + 1) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} (s + 1) \left(\sum_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{k(n - k)}{s + 1} + 1 \right) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} + \sum_{k=s+1}^n (n - k + 1) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} (s + 1) \left(\sum_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{k(n - k)}{s + 1} - (n - k) \right) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} + \sum_{k=1}^n (n - k + 1) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} (s + 1) \left(\sum_{k=1}^n (n - k + 1) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} - \sum_{k=1}^s (n - k) \left(\frac{s - k + 1}{s + 1} \right) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} \left((s + 1) \sum_{k=1}^n (n - k + 1) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} - \sum_{k=1}^s (n - k)(s - k + 1) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the summands in both sums are monotonically decreasing in k , so that we can approximate them by using integrals:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k &\geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} \left((s + 1) \int_1^n (n - k + 1) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} dk - \int_0^s (n - k)(s - k + 1) e^{-\frac{ck^2}{2n^2}} dk \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \frac{c}{n^2} \left((s + 1) \frac{n^2}{c} \left(\frac{n + 1}{n} \sqrt{\frac{\pi c}{2}} \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) - \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{1}{n}\right) \right) + \left(e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - e^{-\frac{c}{2n^2}} \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{n^2}{c} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} (c(s + 1) + n) \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}\right) + (n + 1) e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} - n - (s + 1) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \left((s+1) \left(\frac{n+1}{n} \sqrt{\frac{\pi c}{2}} \left(\operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) - \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{1}{n}\right) \right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - e^{-\frac{c}{2n^2}} + 1 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + n - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} (c(s+1) + n) \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}\right) - (n+1) e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $n \leq n+1$ and that the part multiplied with it is greater than 0. Also, $e^{-\frac{c}{2n^2}} \leq 1$. Further, Taylor-expansion of $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ in $x=0$ yields that $\operatorname{erf}(x) \leq (2x)/\sqrt{\pi}$ for all $x \geq 0$. Applying this expansion at $x = \sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{1}{n}$ as well as the other bounds implies the result. \square

As before, we distinguish different possible ranges for the value of s in the following Lemma.

Lemma 14. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a small constant and define $b_1 = \sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - 1 \approx 2.906$ and $\varepsilon' = c\varepsilon \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) \approx 37.928\varepsilon$. Then, for $s < \varepsilon n$,*

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k \geq (s+1)b_1 - \varepsilon' - o(1).$$

For $\varepsilon n \leq s \leq 0.25n$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k \geq s \left(b_1 - \frac{cs}{n} \frac{64+c}{128} \right) \pm O(1).$$

For $0.25n < s \leq 0.5n$,

define $b_2 = \sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} + 4e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right) - e^{-0.85^2} - c\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \left(\operatorname{erf}(0.85) - \frac{1.7e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \approx 3.994$ and $b_3 = 1 - e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(2e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \left(\operatorname{erf}(0.85) - \frac{1.7e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \approx -0.302$. Then,

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k \geq s \left(b_2 - \frac{cs}{n} e^{-0.85^2} \right) + nb_3 \pm O(1).$$

For $0.5n < s \leq 0.75n$,

define $b_4 = \sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} + 4e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 1 \right) - e^{-1.35^2} - c\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \left(\operatorname{erf}(1.35) - \frac{2.7e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \approx 1.948$ and $b_5 = 1 - e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(3e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 2 \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \left(\operatorname{erf}(1.35) - \frac{2.7e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \approx -0.041$. Then,

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k \geq s \left(b_4 - \frac{cs}{n} e^{-1.35^2} \right) + nb_5 \pm O(1).$$

For $0.75n < s \leq n$,

define $b_6 = \sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} + 4e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 1 \right) - c\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) \approx 0.237$ and $b_7 = 1 - e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(4e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 3 \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) \approx 0.361$. Then,

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k \geq sb_6 + nb_7 \pm O(1).$$

Proof. The structure of the proof is as follows. In all cases, we will use [Lemma 13](#), which says for all $s = 0, \dots, n$ and $n \geq \sqrt{c}$ that

$$\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k \geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \left((s+1) \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) - \frac{c}{n} + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) \right. \\ \left. + n - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}}(n + c(s+1)) \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}\right) - (n+1)e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \right).$$

Then, in all five cases, we will

1. upper bound $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ by some linear function $f \in \{f_1, \dots, f_5\}$ and then apply it for $x = \sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}$,
2. upper bound $e^{-\frac{cx^2}{2n^2}}$ by some polynomial function $g \in \{g_1, \dots, g_5\}$ and then apply it for $x = s$,
3. simplify.

For an overview, we will next specify all of the functions described above. For approximating the error function, generally note that a linear function $ax + b$ that crosses $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ in $x = d$ and has the same slope in $x = d$ fulfills $a = \frac{2e^{-d^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}$ and $b = \operatorname{erf}(d) - \frac{2de^{-d^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}$. Since $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ is concave for $x \geq 0$, such linear functions are upper bounds on $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ by construction. For the first two cases, we choose $d = 0$, for the third case $d = 0.85$ and for the fourth case $d = 1.35$, so we upper bound $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ by

$$f_1(x) = f_2(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}x, \\ f_3(x) = \frac{2e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}x + \operatorname{erf}(0.85) - \frac{1.7e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}, \\ f_4(x) = \frac{2e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}x + \operatorname{erf}(1.35) - \frac{2.7e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}.$$

Lastly, since $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ is monotonically increasing and the greatest x we ever apply it for is $\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}$, we choose

$$f_5(x) = \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right).$$

For approximating $e^{-\frac{cx^2}{2n^2}}$ in the first case, we choose the trivial upper bound

$$g_1(x) = 1.$$

Second, we choose the Taylor-expansion in $x = 0$ of the next higher degree that is an upper bound,

$$g_2(x) = 1 - \frac{cx^2}{2n^2} + \frac{c^2x^4}{8n^4}.$$

In the third case, we choose the linear function which crosses $e^{-\frac{cx^2}{2n^2}}$ in $x = 0.25n$ and $x = 0.5n$,

$$g_3(x) = -\frac{4e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right)}{n}x + e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(2e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right).$$

In order to see that this is in fact an upper bound between $x = 0.25n$ and $x = 0.5n$, note that $e^{-\frac{cx^2}{2n^2}}$ has exactly one inflection point for $x \geq 0$, which is at $x = n/\sqrt{c} \in (0.25n, 0.5n)$. Before this point, the function is concave and afterwards it is convex. Further, the slope of $e^{-\frac{cx^2}{2n^2}}$ in $x = 0.25n$ is steeper than the slope of $g_3(x)$. Consequently, it has exactly two intersections with $g_3(x)$ which we know by construction and we can conclude our claim.

The last two cases will have two linear functions as upper bounds on $e^{-\frac{cx^2}{2n^2}}$ that are constructed analogously to the previous case. They are upper bounds by construction because we have already seen that $e^{-\frac{cx^2}{2n^2}}$ is convex in the interval starting from $x = 0.5n$. The remaining functions are

$$g_4(x) = -\frac{4e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 1 \right)}{n}x + e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(3e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 2 \right),$$

$$g_5(x) = -\frac{4e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 1 \right)}{n}x + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(4e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 3 \right).$$

Now, for the first case, $s < \varepsilon n$, we use $\operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\frac{s}{n}\right) \leq f_1\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\frac{s}{n}\right) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\frac{s}{n}$ and $e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \leq g_1(s) = 1$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k &\geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \left((s+1) \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) - \frac{c}{n} + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + n - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}}(n + c(s+1)) \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n} - (n+1) \cdot 1 \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \left((s+1) \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) - \frac{c}{n} + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) - 1 - (n + c(s+1)) \frac{s}{n} \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) (s+1) \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) - \frac{c(s+1)}{n} + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - 1 \right) \\ &= (s+1) \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - 1 \right) - \frac{c}{n}(s+1) \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - \frac{c(s+1)}{n} \right) \\ &\geq (s+1) \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - 1 \right) - c\varepsilon \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) - o(1). \end{aligned}$$

For the second case, $\varepsilon n \leq s \leq 0.25n$, we use $\operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\frac{s}{n}\right) \leq f_2\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\frac{s}{n}\right) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\frac{s}{n}$ and $e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \leq g_2(s) = 1 - \frac{cs^2}{2n^2} + \frac{c^2s^4}{8n^4}$. Before we plug that in [Lemma 11](#), we combine all up to constant terms into $O(1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k &\geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{n}\right) \left((s+1) \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) - \frac{c}{n} + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + n - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}}(n + c(s+1)) \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\frac{s}{n}\right) - (n+1)e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \right) \\ &= s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) + n - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}}(n + cs) \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\frac{s}{n}\right) - n \cdot e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \pm O(1) \\ &\geq s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) + n - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}}(n + cs) \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n} - n \left(1 - \frac{cs^2}{2n^2} + \frac{c^2s^4}{8n^4} \right) \pm O(1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) - (n + cs) \frac{s}{n} + n \left(\frac{cs^2}{2n^2} - \frac{c^2s^4}{8n^4} \right) \pm O(1) \\
&= s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - 1 - \frac{cs}{n} \right) + \frac{cs^2}{2n} - \frac{c^2s^4}{8n^3} \pm O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

To get rid of the s^4 , we apply $s \leq 0.25n$ twice, yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k &\geq s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - 1 - \frac{cs}{n} \right) + \frac{cs^2}{2n} - \frac{c^2s^2}{128n} \pm O(1) \\
&= s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - 1 - \frac{cs}{n} \right) + s \frac{cs}{n} \left(\frac{64-c}{128} \right) \pm O(1) \\
&= s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - 1 - \frac{cs}{n} \frac{64+c}{128} \right) \pm O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

For the third case, $0.25n < s \leq 0.5n$, we use $\operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}\right) \leq f_3\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}\right) = \frac{2e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n} + \operatorname{erf}(0.85) - \frac{1.7e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}$ and $e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \leq g_3(s) = -4e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right) \frac{s}{n} + e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(2e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right)$. Before we plug that in [Lemma 11](#), recall that with combined up to constant terms, this yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k &\geq s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) + n \left(1 - e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} (n + cs) \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}\right) \pm O(1) \\
&\geq s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) + n \left(1 + 4e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right) \frac{s}{n} - e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(2e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right) \right) \\
&\quad - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} (n + cs) \left(\frac{2e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n} + \operatorname{erf}(0.85) - \frac{1.7e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \pm O(1) \\
&= s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} + 4e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right) - \left(1 + \frac{cs}{n} \right) e^{-0.85^2} \right) \\
&\quad + n \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(2e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right) \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} (n + cs) \left(\operatorname{erf}(0.85) - \frac{1.7e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \pm O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

For the fourth case, $0.5n < s \leq 0.75n$, we use $\operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}\right) \leq f_4\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}\right) = \frac{2e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n} + \operatorname{erf}(1.35) - \frac{2.7e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}$ and $e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \leq g_4(s) = -4e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 1 \right) \frac{s}{n} + e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(3e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 2 \right)$. The calculation is fully analogous to the previous case, yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k &\geq s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) + n \left(1 + 4e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 1 \right) \frac{s}{n} - e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(3e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 2 \right) \right) \\
&\quad - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} (n + cs) \left(\frac{2e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n} + \operatorname{erf}(1.35) - \frac{2.7e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \pm O(1) \\
&= s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} + 4e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 1 \right) - \left(1 + \frac{cs}{n} \right) e^{-1.35^2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ n \left(1 - e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(3e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 2 \right) \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}}(n + cs) \left(\operatorname{erf}(1.35) - \frac{2.7e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \pm O(1).$$

Lastly, for the fifth case, $0.75n < s \leq n$, we use $\operatorname{erf}(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}) \leq f_5(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \frac{s}{n}) = 1$ and $e^{-\frac{cs^2}{2n^2}} \leq g_5(s) = -4e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 1 \right) \frac{s}{n} + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(4e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 3 \right)$. With analogous calculation, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k &\geq s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) + n \left(1 + 4e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 1 \right) \frac{s}{n} - e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(4e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 3 \right) \right) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}}(n + cs) \cdot \operatorname{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \right) \pm O(1) \\ &= s \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} + 4e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 1 \right) \right) + n \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(4e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 3 \right) \right) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}}(n + cs) \operatorname{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}} \right) \pm O(1). \end{aligned}$$

□

Finally, we are ready to prove our main result. For the final proof of the theorem, we compare the different cases of [Lemma 12](#) and [Lemma 14](#) individually and, each time, take the limit for n towards infinity. The minimum ratio over all the cases is our result.

Proof of Theorem 4. Combining the results of [Lemma 7](#) and [Lemma 8](#) with the bound from [Proposition 1](#), we get that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{ONL}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}_n]} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^n \alpha_k \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]}{\sum_{k=0}^n \alpha_k^* \mathbb{E}[x \mid \delta_{p(k+1)} < x \leq \delta_{p(k)}]} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{s \in \{0, \dots, n\}} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k}{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^*}. \quad (10)$$

In order to find the minimum, we will go through all possible value ranges of s that arose in [Lemma 12](#) and [Lemma 14](#). Recall the constants $c = 9.71$, $b_1 = \sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} - 1 \approx 2.906$ and $\varepsilon' = c\varepsilon \left(\sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \right) \approx 37.928\varepsilon > 0$.

First, consider $s = 0$. We get that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_0^*} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(0+1)b_1 - \varepsilon' - o(1)}{\frac{c}{2} + o(1)} = \frac{b_1 - \varepsilon'}{\frac{c}{2}},$$

which for a very small choice of ε is arbitrarily close to $\frac{2b_1}{c} \approx 0.598572 > 0.598$.

Next, for $0 < s \leq \varepsilon n$, recall the constant $\varepsilon'' = \varepsilon \frac{c(c+2)}{2} > 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k}{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^*} &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(s+1)b_1 - \varepsilon' - o(1)}{\frac{c(s+1)}{2} + \varepsilon'' \pm o(1)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1 - \frac{\varepsilon'}{s+1} - o(1)}{\frac{c}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon''}{s+1} \pm o(1)} \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1 - \varepsilon' - o(1)}{\frac{c}{2} + \varepsilon'' \pm o(1)} = \frac{b_1 - \varepsilon'}{\frac{c}{2} + \varepsilon''}, \end{aligned}$$

which again for a very small choice of ε is arbitrarily close to $\frac{2b_1}{c}$.

Next, for $\varepsilon n \leq s \leq 0.25n$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k}{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^*} &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s \left(b_1 - \frac{cs}{n} \frac{64+c}{128} \right) \pm O(1)}{\frac{c}{2}s - \frac{64-16c+2c^2-64e^{-\frac{c}{4}}}{nc} s^2 \pm O(1)} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1 - \frac{c(64+c)}{128} \frac{s}{n} \pm o(1)}{\frac{c}{2} - \frac{64-16c+2c^2-64e^{-\frac{c}{4}}}{c} \frac{s}{n} \pm o(1)} \\ &= \frac{b_1 - \frac{c(64+c)}{128} a}{\frac{c}{2} - \frac{64-16c+2c^2-64e^{-\frac{c}{4}}}{c} a}, \end{aligned}$$

where we rewrote $s = an$. We need to maximize this term as a function in $a \in [\varepsilon, 0.25]$. To find extreme points, we use the quotient rule in order to calculate the first derivative. Note that for two linear functions, this always yields a constant value. It is easy to verify that this constant value is unequal to zero for our functions, such that the quotient has no extreme point. Also, the only zero of the denominator is for some $a > 0.5$, such that there is no pole in the range of interest. Consequently, we only need to check the left and right boundaries, which are $a = \varepsilon$ and $a = 0.25$, where choosing a small ε again yields $\frac{2b_1}{c}$, and the second one equals

$$\frac{b_1 - \frac{c(64+c)}{128} 0.25}{\frac{c}{2} - \frac{64-16c+2c^2-64e^{-\frac{c}{4}}}{c} 0.25} \approx 0.603837 > 0.598.$$

Next, for $0.25n \leq s \leq 0.5n$, recall the constants $b_2 = \sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} + 4e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right) - e^{-0.85^2} - c\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \left(\operatorname{erf}(0.85) - \frac{1.7e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \approx 3.994$ and $b_3 = 1 - e^{-\frac{c}{8}} \left(2e^{\frac{3c}{32}} - 1 \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \left(\operatorname{erf}(0.85) - \frac{1.7e^{-0.85^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \approx -0.302$. We get that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k}{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^*} &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s \left(b_2 - \frac{cs}{n} e^{-0.85^2} \right) + nb_3 \pm O(1)}{n - \frac{n^2}{cs} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{4}} \right) \pm O(1)} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{s}{n} \left(b_2 - \frac{cs}{n} e^{-0.85^2} \right) + b_3 \pm o(1)}{1 - \frac{n}{cs} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{4}} \right) \pm o(1)} \\ &= \frac{a \left(b_2 - cae^{-0.85^2} \right) + b_3}{1 - \frac{1}{ca} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{4}} \right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we again rewrote $s = an$. We need to minimize this term as a function in $a \in [0.25, 0.5]$. To find extreme points, we use the quotient rule in order to calculate the first derivative and set it equal to zero. Multiplying both sides with a^2 , we can see that fact we search for the zeros of a cubic function, which has three zeros, of which only one is in the interval $[0.25, 0.5]$, at approximately $a \approx 0.37264$. Plugging the exact value of a into the original fraction yields a value of approximately $0.710687 > 0.598$. Also, the denominator of the fraction has exactly one zero outside of the interval $[0.25, 0.5]$, such that there is no pole in the range of interest. Consequently, we only need to check the left and right boundaries, which are $a = 0.25$ and $a = 0.5$, where the first one yields a value of

approximately $0.643427 > 0.598$ and the second one a value of approximately $0.635727 > 0.598$. Next, for $0.5n \leq s \leq 0.75n$, recall the constants $b_4 = \sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} + 4e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 1\right) - e^{-1.35^2} - c\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \left(\operatorname{erf}(1.35) - \frac{2.7e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}\right) \approx 1.948$ and $b_5 = 1 - e^{-\frac{9c}{32}} \left(3e^{\frac{5c}{32}} - 2\right) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \left(\operatorname{erf}(1.35) - \frac{2.7e^{-1.35^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}\right) \approx -0.041$. Since the lower bound in this case results from the same formula as in the previous case, only with b_2 switched to b_4 and b_3 switched to b_5 , we can use analogous calculations. Here, we find that the quotient has one extreme point in the range of interest at approximately $a \approx 0.5558$ with a value of approximately $0.669426 > 0.598$, but no poles in the range of interest. The left boundary at $a = 0.5$ has a value of $0.664978 > 0.598$ and the right boundary at $a = 0.75$ has a value of $0.613443 > 0.598$.

Next, for $0.5n \leq s \leq n - 2$, recall the constants $b_6 = \sqrt{\frac{c\pi}{2}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) + e^{-\frac{c}{2}} + 4e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 1\right) - c\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) \approx 0.237$ and $b_7 = 1 - e^{-\frac{c}{2}} \left(4e^{\frac{7c}{32}} - 3\right) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \operatorname{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{c}{2}}\right) \approx 0.361$. We get that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k}{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^*} &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{sb_6 + nb_7 \pm O(1)}{n - \frac{n^2}{cs} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{4}}\right) \pm O(1)} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{s}{n}b_6 + b_7 \pm o(1)}{1 - \frac{n}{cs} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{4}}\right) \pm o(1)} \\ &= \frac{ab_6 + b_7}{1 - \frac{1}{ca} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{c}{4}}\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we again rewrote $s = an$. We need to minimize this term as a function in $a \in [0.75, 1]$. To find extreme points, we use the quotient rule in order to calculate the first derivative and set it equal to zero. Multiplying both sides with a^2 , we can see that fact we search for the zeros of a quadratic function, where we can use the p-q-formula in order to derive the two zeros which are both not in the range of interest. The unique pole is at approximately $a = 0.0938973$, which is also not in the range of interest. The left boundary at $a = 0.75$ has a value of $0.616382 > 0.598$ and the right boundary at $a = 1$ has a value of $0.660554 > 0.598$.

Lastly, for $s \in \{n - 1, n\}$, we get that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k}{\sum_{k=0}^s \alpha_k^*} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{sb_6 + nb_7 \pm O(1)}{n \pm O(1)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{s}{n}b_6 + b_7 \pm o(1)}{1 \pm o(1)} = b_6 + b_7 \approx 0.598529 > 0.598.$$

Overall, we found that for every possible value of s , the fraction on the right hand side of [Eq. \(10\)](#) is always greater than 0.598 for $n \rightarrow \infty$, such that the corresponding minimum gives a lower bound on the prophet-inequality of ONL of 0.598 . \square