

# A Simple $O(\log \log(\text{rank}))$ -Competitive Algorithm for the Matroid Secretary Problem

Moran Feldman\*, Ola Svensson†, Rico Zenklusen‡

July 7, 2014

## Abstract

Only recently progress has been made in obtaining  $o(\log(\text{rank}))$ -competitive algorithms for the matroid secretary problem. More precisely, Chakraborty and Lachish (2012) presented a  $O(\sqrt{\log(\text{rank})})$ -competitive procedure, and Lachish (2014) later presented a  $O(\log \log(\text{rank}))$ -competitive algorithm. Both these algorithms and their analyses are very involved, which is also reflected in the extremely high constants in their competitive ratios.

Using different tools, we present a considerably simpler  $O(\log \log(\text{rank}))$ -competitive algorithm for the matroid secretary problem. Our algorithm can be interpreted as a distribution over a simple type of matroid secretary algorithms which are easy to analyze. Due to the simplicity of our procedure, we are also able to vastly improve on the hidden constant in the competitive ratio.

**Keywords:** matroids, online algorithms, secretary problem

---

\*School of Computer and Communication Sciences, EPFL. Email: moran.feldman@epfl.ch. Supported by ERC Starting Grant 335288-OptApprox.

†School of Computer and Communication Sciences, EPFL. Email: ola.svensson@epfl.ch. Supported by ERC Starting Grant 335288-OptApprox.

‡Department of Mathematics, ETH Zurich and Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Johns Hopkins University. Email: ricoz@math.ethz.ch. Partially supported by NSF grant CCF-1115849.

# 1 Introduction

The secretary problem is a classical online selection problem, whose origins remain unclear [9, 11, 12, 13, 21]. In its original form, the task is to select the best out of a set  $N$  of  $n$  secretaries (also called *elements* or *items*). Secretaries appear one by one in a uniformly random order. Whenever a secretary appears, he can be compared against all previously appeared secretaries. Then, the algorithm has to decide, before the arrival of the next secretary, whether to select the current secretary or not. A well-known classical algorithm [9] selects the best secretary with probability at least  $1/e$ , and this is known to be asymptotically optimal.

Recently, there has been an increased interest in variations of the secretary problem. Such variants have numerous applications in mechanism design for settings involving the selling of a good to agents arriving online. In this context, the secretaries correspond to the agents, and their values are the prices they are willing to pay for the available goods (see [1, 3, 4, 17] and the references therein). These applications naturally lead to generalized secretary problems, where more than one element can be selected. In such problems, one typically assumes that each element  $e \in N$  reveals a positive weight  $w(e)$ , and the goal is to select a maximum weight set of elements subject to some constraints. Most of these problems preserve the uniformly random arrival order of the elements, but allow adversarial assignment of weights. Like in the original problem, whenever an element appears, the algorithm must decide immediately, and irrevocably, whether to select it.

The arguably most canonical generalization of the secretary problem was introduced by Kleinberg [17], who considered the problem of selecting  $k$  out of  $n = |N|$  secretaries. However, many applications require more general constraints, and thus, interest arose in finding relevant and general constraint classes for which strong online algorithms exist. This led to the introduction of the matroid secretary problem [4], where the underlying constraint set is assumed to be a matroid  $M = (N, \mathcal{I})$  defined over the set  $N$  of all  $n$  items.<sup>1</sup> Matroid constraints model many interesting settings, and it was conjectured that there exists an algorithm which is  $O(1)$ -competitive for any matroid constraint [4]. We recall that an algorithm is  $c$ -competitive for some  $c \geq 1$  if it returns an independent set  $I \in \mathcal{I}$  whose expected weight is at least  $\frac{1}{c}w(\text{OPT})$ , where  $w(\text{OPT})$  is the weight of the offline optimum  $\text{OPT}$ , i.e., the maximum weight independent set.<sup>2</sup> Motivated by the above conjecture,  $O(1)$ -competitive algorithms have been obtained for a wide variety of special classes of matroids including graphic matroids [4, 18], transversal matroids [4, 7, 18], co-graphic matroids [26], linear matroids with at most  $k$  non-zero entries per column [26], laminar matroids [15, 16, 22], regular matroids [8], and some types of decomposable matroids, including max-flow min-cut matroids [8]. However, progress on the general case has been much slower. Since the introduction of the matroid secretary problem, a simple  $O(\log \rho)$ -competitive algorithm was known [4], where  $\rho$  is the rank of the underlying matroid, i.e., the cardinality of a maximum size independent set. Improving on this bound has shown to be surprisingly difficult. So far, the only improvements on this bound are an  $O(\sqrt{\log \rho})$ -competitive algorithm by Chakraborty and Lachish [6], and a very recent  $O(\log \log(\rho))$ -competitive procedure by Lachish [19]. Both algorithms use a careful bucketing of the ground set and their competitive ratios are derived through very involved analyses. The complexity of the analyses of the above algorithms is also reflected in the hidden constant of the competitive ratio which is at least  $2^{64}$  for the  $O(\sqrt{\log \rho})$ -competitive algorithm suggested in [6], and at least  $2^{2^{34}}$  for

---

<sup>1</sup> A matroid  $M = (N, \mathcal{I})$  is a tuple consisting of a finite ground set  $N$ , and a nonempty family  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$  of subsets of the ground set, called *independent* sets, which satisfy: (i)  $I \subseteq J \in \mathcal{I} \Rightarrow I \in \mathcal{I}$ , and (ii)  $I, J \in \mathcal{I}, |I| > |J| \Rightarrow \exists e \in I \setminus J$  s.t.  $J \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$ .

<sup>2</sup>For simplicity, we assume all weights are disjoint, which implies the existence of a unique maximum weight independent set (which is also a base of  $M$ , i.e., its size is equal to the rank of  $M$ ). This assumption is without loss of generality since one can break ties between weights arbitrarily.

the  $O(\log \log(\rho))$ -competitive procedure by Lachish [20].

In this paper we present a much simpler  $O(\log \log \rho)$  procedure for the matroid secretary problem, which also vastly improves the hidden constant of the competitive ratio. Our algorithm is *order-oblivious*, which implies that it extends to single-sample prophet inequalities as introduced by Azar, Kleinberg and Weinberg [1]. We expand on this connection below in Section 1.1.

We would like to highlight that like some previous matroid secretary algorithms, all the information our algorithm needs to know upfront is the size  $n$  of the matroid. During its execution, the algorithm only checks the independence of subsets of elements revealed so far.

## 1.1 Single-sample prophet inequalities and order-obliviousness

Prophet inequalities are a class of problems that is closely related to secretary problems and has interesting applications in mechanism design. Unlike in secretary problems, in prophet inequality problems the weight of each element  $e \in N$  is drawn from an element specific distribution  $\mathcal{D}_e$  (the amount of knowledge the algorithm has on  $\mathcal{D}_e$  varies according to the specific variant at hand). However, the order in which elements arrive is adversarial (rather than random), and might depend on the realization of the weights. Azar, Kleinberg and Weinberg [1] showed that interesting results can often be obtained even if one only knows a single sample from each distribution  $\mathcal{D}_e$ , which is a setting they call *single-sample prophet inequalities*.

More precisely, they showed that any  $c$ -competitive algorithm for the secretary problem can be transformed into a  $c$ -competitive algorithm for single-sample prophet inequalities, if the secretary algorithm is *order-oblivious*. An order-oblivious procedure is one that consists of two phases: in the first phase the algorithm specifies a (possibly random) number  $m$  of the elements, and then observes a uniformly random subset of  $m$  elements without selecting any of them. The rest of the elements arrive in the second phase, and the algorithm can select them. However, the competitive ratio of the algorithm must hold for any order in which the elements of the second phase arrive. In other words, the elements of the second phase might arrive in an adversarial order. Thus, an order-oblivious algorithm uses only a small amount of the randomness of the arrival order, namely, whether each element appears among the first  $m$  elements or not.

## 1.2 Our results

Our main result is the following.

**Theorem 1.1.** *There exists an order-oblivious  $2560[\log_2 \log_2(4\rho) + 5]$ -competitive algorithm for the matroid secretary problem, which only needs to know the cardinality of the matroid upfront.*

Our algorithm considerably improves on the previous  $o(\log \rho)$ -competitive algorithms in terms of simplicity, and we believe that a key contribution of our work lies in the employed techniques and, arguably, concise analysis. These also lead to a vastly reduced hidden constant in the competitive ratio. We recall that the hidden constant of Lachish's  $O(\log \log(\rho))$ -competitive algorithm is at least  $2^{2^{34}}$ .

The order-obliviousness of our algorithm allows us to leverage the recent reduction by Azar, Kleinberg and Weinberg [1] to transform our procedure into an algorithm for single-sample prophet inequalities on matroids, leading to the following.

**Corollary 1.2.** *There exists a  $2560[\log_2 \log_2(4\rho) + 5]$ -competitive single-sample prophet inequality for any matroid.*

### 1.3 Further related results

Some progress has been made in obtaining  $O(1)$ -competitive algorithms for restricted variants of the matroid secretary problem. In particular, if a set of  $n$  weights is assigned uniformly at random to the elements of the ground set, then a 5.7187-competitive algorithm can be obtained for any matroid [25, 26]. Additionally, a  $16(1 - 1/e)$ -competitive algorithm can be obtained even with adversarial arrival order of the elements as long as the weight assignment is still done at random [23, 26]. Furthermore, a 4-competitive algorithm can be obtained in the so-called *free order model*, which assumes adversarial weight assignment, but allows the algorithm to choose the order in which the elements appear [1, 16].

Variants of the matroid secretary problem involving nonlinear objective functions, including submodular and convex objectives, were also considered [2, 5, 10, 14, 22].

### 1.4 A rough outline of our approach

Our approach involves roughly three steps. The first step is a basic reduction that allows us to assume a known upper bound  $\tilde{\rho}$  on the rank  $\rho$  of the matroid and that all weights are within a range  $(W/(8\tilde{\rho}), W]$  for some known value  $W$ . The second step is a simple secretary algorithm, which we call the *bucketing-based algorithm*. This algorithm gets a partition (bucketing) of the secretaries, and produces a feasible solution whose quality depends on the input bucketing. Our final algorithm simply picks a bucketing from an appropriately chosen distribution, and then feeds it into the bucketing-based algorithm. The three steps roughly correspond, in that order, to Sections 2, 3 and 4.

Our bucketing-based algorithm, which we introduce formally in Section 3, uses the bucketing it receives to define two collections of matroids  $M_1, M_3, \dots, M_{2k-1}$  and  $M_2, M_4, \dots, M_{2k}$  with disjoint ground sets  $N_1, N_2, \dots, N_{2k} \subseteq N$ , having the following property: if  $I_i \subseteq N_i$  is independent in  $M_i$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2k\}$ , then  $\bigcup_{i=1}^k I_{2i-1} \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $\bigcup_{i=1}^k I_{2i} \in \mathcal{I}$ . The bucketing-based algorithm chooses one of these collections at random, and then simply selects greedily an independent set for each matroid  $M_i$  in the chosen collection. The output of the algorithm is the union of the selected sets. Similar decomposition ideas have been used previously in the context of the matroid secretary problem (see, e.g., [16, 26]). The main challenge lies in finding an elegant way to analyze the behavior of such algorithms as a function of the decomposition, and then leveraging this analysis to find an appropriate probability distribution over the possible decompositions. We achieve this goal for the bucketing-based algorithm by presenting lower bounds on the probability that elements get selected by the algorithm.

## 2 Preliminaries and basic reductions

Let us formally state the Matroid Secretary Problem (MSP). An instance of MSP consists of a matroid  $M = (N, \mathcal{I})$  and a positive weight function  $w : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . The objective of an algorithm for MSP is to select a maximum weight independent set of  $M$ . Initially, the algorithm knows the size of the ground set  $n = |N|$ , but has no other information about either  $M$  or  $w$ . Then, the elements of  $N$  are revealed to the algorithm in a uniformly random order. Each time an element  $e \in N$  is revealed, the algorithm learns its weight  $w(e)$  and must decide immediately, and irrevocably, whether to select it. The algorithm also has access to an independence oracle that, given a subset  $T \subseteq N$  of elements that *already* arrived, answers whether  $T \in \mathcal{I}$ .

To simplify the exposition of our algorithm, we show how to apply it to a close variant of MSP that we call *Sample-Based Matroid Secretary Problem* (SB-MSP). SB-MSP shares the instance

structure and objective of **MSP**. However, the interaction of the algorithm with the instance is different and it does not know the size  $n$  of the matroid in advance. Initially, the algorithm must specify a (possibly random) sampling probability  $p_s$ . The instance is then revealed in two phases. In the first phase a random set  $S \subseteq N$  containing every element  $e \in N$  with probability  $p_s$  is revealed to the algorithm (along with the corresponding weights). The algorithm, however, is not able to select any element of  $S$ . In the second phase, the elements of  $N \setminus S$  are revealed (together with their weights) in an adversarial order that might depend on the set  $S$ . Like in **MSP**, the algorithm also has access to an independence oracle that given a subset  $T \subseteq N$  of elements that *already* arrived answers whether  $T \in \mathcal{I}$ .

**Reduction 1.** *Any  $\alpha$ -competitive algorithm for SB-MSP can be transformed efficiently into an order-oblivious  $\alpha$ -competitive algorithm for MSP.*

The above reduction follows from standard arguments, and we defer its formal proof to Appendix A. Intuitively, an algorithm for **MSP** can be obtained from an algorithm for **SB-MSP** (using sample probability  $p_s$ ) as follows: let the sample set  $S$  be roughly  $p_s n$  of the first elements arriving according to the random permutation; and then proceed exactly in the same manner. The resulting algorithm is order oblivious as the algorithm for **SB-MSP** did not use any assumption about the arrival order of the elements in the second phase. Note also that it is necessary to know the cardinality  $n$  of the matroid in the **MSP** problem (in contrast to **SB-MSP**) so as to be able to form a sample set  $S$  that contains each element with probability  $p_s$ .

Before presenting our algorithm, we need another simple reduction that allows the algorithm to assume a certain knowledge about the rank  $\rho$  of the underlying matroid  $M = (N, \mathcal{I})$  and the weights of its elements. More precisely, we call an algorithm for **SB-MSP** *aided* if it assumes access to two additional values  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $W$  such that the considered matroid and these values satisfy:

- (i)  $\tilde{\rho} \geq \rho$ , where  $\rho$  is the rank of  $M$ ,
- (ii) for every element  $e \in N$ ,  $w(e) \in (W/(8\tilde{\rho}), W]$ .

**Reduction 2.** *Any  $\alpha(\tilde{\rho})$ -competitive aided algorithm for SB-MSP, where  $\alpha(\cdot)$  is a non-decreasing function, can be transformed efficiently into a  $160 \cdot \alpha(4\rho)$ -competitive (non-aided) algorithm for SB-MSP.*

The main idea of the above reduction is to sample half of the elements, and based on this sample estimate  $W$  and  $\rho$ . Using these estimates, the aided algorithm is then applied to the remaining elements whose weight fall inside the range  $(W/(8\tilde{\rho}), W]$ . The details of the proof are quite standard and are also deferred to Appendix A. In the rest of this paper, we focus on obtaining an  $O(\log \log \tilde{\rho})$ -competitive aided algorithm for **SB-MSP**.

To simplify notation, we use '+' and '-' for addition and subtraction of a single element from a set, e.g.,  $S + e - f = (S \cup \{e\}) \setminus \{f\}$ . We denote by  $r$  the *rank* function of the matroid  $M$ , i.e., for any subset  $S \subseteq N$ :  $r(S) = \max\{|I| \mid I \in \mathcal{I}, I \subseteq S\}$  is the size of a maximum cardinality independent set in  $S$ . Furthermore, the *span* of a subset  $S \subseteq N$  is given by  $\text{span}(S) = \{e \in N \mid r(S + e) = r(S)\}$ , and its total weight is given by  $w(S) = \sum_{e \in S} w(e)$ . We refer the reader to [24] for further matroidal concepts, such as contractions and restrictions of matroids.

Throughout the paper we assume that the rank  $\rho$  of the matroid under consideration is at least 1. Clearly, if  $\rho = 0$ , then any algorithm returning a feasible solution, which means the empty set in this case, is 1-competitive.

### 3 Bucketing-based algorithm

**Weight classes and buckets.** Our bucketing-based algorithm distinguishes items based on their weight. We define  $h = \lceil 3 + \log_2 \tilde{\rho} \rceil$  *weight classes* as follows. For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ , let

$$C_i = \left\{ e \in N \mid w(e) \in \left( \frac{W}{2^{h-i+1}}, \frac{W}{2^{h-i}} \right] \right\}.$$

Notice that every element belongs to exactly one class; class  $C_1$  contains the lightest elements,  $C_2$  slightly less light elements and so on. Moreover, it is possible to determine upon arrival which class an element belongs to.

Our bucketing-based algorithm takes as input a *bucketing*  $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_b)$ , which is a partition of the weight classes such that each bucket  $B_i$  is the union of a consecutive set of weight classes. More formally, every bucket  $B_i$  is associated with two numbers  $f(B_i) \leq \ell(B_i)$ , where  $f(B_i)$  and  $\ell(B_i)$  are the first and last index of the weight classes composing  $B_i$ , respectively, i.e.,  $B_i = \bigcup_{j=f(B_i)}^{\ell(B_i)} C_j$ . As the bucketing  $\mathbf{B}$  partitions the weight classes, its buckets satisfy

$$1 = f(B_1), \quad \ell(B_i) + 1 = f(B_{i+1}) \quad \forall 1 \leq i < b, \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(B_b) = h.$$

For ease of notation, we define  $B_{b+1} = \emptyset$  and  $f(B_i) = \ell(B_i) = 0$  for every  $i \leq 0$ . Furthermore, let  $B_{\geq i} = \bigcup_{j=i}^b B_j$ .

**Algorithmic overview.** Like many other secretary algorithms, our bucketing-based algorithm first observes a random set  $S$  containing each element with probability  $1/2$ , without selecting any element of  $S$ . Based on the set  $S$  we define a matroid  $M_i$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$  as follows.  $M_i$  is the matroid obtained from  $M$  by first contracting  $S \cap B_{\geq i+1}$  and then restricting the resulting matroid to the elements in  $B_i \cap \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1})$  (for  $i = 1$ , we restrict to  $B_1$  instead). The restrictions and contractions effectively partition the problem into disjoint matroids, from which we independently pick elements greedily. The aim of this partition is to protect heavy elements from being spanned by lighter elements. Notice that we restrict to  $B_i \cap \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1})$  instead of, the perhaps more natural,  $B_i \cap \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i})$ . This choice of the restriction is required for ensuring the performance guarantee of the algorithm as analyzed in Lemma 3.4. In typical matroid notation, where contractions are denoted by a slash ( $/$ ) and restrictions by a vertical bar ( $|$ ), the  $M_i$ 's are defined as

$$M_1 = (M/(S \cap B_{\geq 2}))|_{B_1} \quad \text{and} \quad M_i = (M/(S \cap B_{\geq i+1}))|_{B_i \cap \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1})} \quad \forall i \in \{2, \dots, h\}.$$

In particular, the ground set of  $M_1$  is  $N_1 = B_1$ , and the ground set of  $M_i$  for  $i \in \{2, \dots, h\}$  is  $N_i = B_i \cap \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1})$ . Furthermore, for  $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ , let  $\mathcal{I}_i$  be the collection of  $M_i$ 's independent sets; hence,  $M_i = (N_i, \mathcal{I}_i)$ . We partition the matroids  $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^h$  into two groups according to the parity of their index. Let  $H_{\text{odd}} = \{i \in \{1, \dots, h\} \mid i \text{ odd}\}$ , and  $H_{\text{even}} = \{i \in \{1, \dots, h\} \mid i \text{ even}\}$ .

After having observed  $S$ , our bucketing-based algorithm chooses at random  $H \in \{H_{\text{odd}}, H_{\text{even}}\}$ , and then greedily accepts elements from each matroid  $M_i$  with  $i \in H$  as long as independence is preserved within  $M_i$ . At the end of the algorithm, a set  $T_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$  has been selected for each  $i \in H$  and the algorithm returns  $T = \bigcup_{i \in H} T_i$ , which, as we show later, satisfies  $T \in \mathcal{I}$ . The reason why the algorithm restricts itself to either the odd index or even index matroids is to ensure the feasibility of  $T$ . The random choice of  $H$  averages over the two possibilities, and allows elements of both even and odd buckets a chance to be selected.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Bucketing-based algorithm( $B$ )

---

```

1 Let  $S$  be a set containing every element with probability  $1/2$ .
2 Let  $H = H_{\text{odd}}$  with probability  $1/2$ , and  $H = H_{\text{even}}$  otherwise.
3 Let  $T_i \leftarrow \emptyset$  for  $i \in H$ .
4 for every element  $e \in N \setminus S$  revealed do
5   Let  $i$  be the index of the bucket containing  $e$  (i.e.,  $e \in B_i$ ).
6   if  $i \in H$  and  $e \in N_i$  and  $e + T_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$  then
7     Add  $e$  to  $T_i$ .
8 Return  $T = \bigcup_{i \in H} T_i$ .
```

---

**Analysis of feasibility.** Algorithm 1 is a pseudocode representation of our bucketing-based algorithm. Our first step is to verify that the conditions of accepting an element, described in line 6, can indeed be verified with the information available to the algorithm at that point. To this end we show that the conditions  $e \in N_i$  and  $e + T_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$  (where  $e \in B_i$ ) are equivalent to

- (a)  $i = 1$  **or**  $e \in \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1})$  if  $i > 1$ , and
- (b)  $e \notin \text{span}(T_i \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1}))$ .

The equivalence between  $e \in N_i$  and (a) for an element  $e \in B_i$  follows immediately from the definition of  $N_i$ , since  $N_1 = B_1$  and  $N_i = B_i \cap \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1})$  for  $i \geq 2$ . Furthermore, Lemma 3.1 below shows the equivalence between  $e + T_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$  and (b). Notice that (a) and (b) only depend on the element  $e$ , the set  $S$ , and the set  $T_i$  of elements selected so far within  $N_i$ . Thus, these conditions can be checked by the algorithm on line (6) without knowing the matroid  $M$  in advance.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $S \subseteq N$ ,  $T_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$  and  $e \in N_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ . Then  $T_i + e \in \mathcal{I}_i$  if and only if  $e \notin \text{span}(T_i \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1}))$ .*

Before proving the lemma, we recall that since  $M_i$  is a contraction and restriction of  $M$ , we can use standard results in matroid theory to express the rank function  $r_i$  of  $M_i$  in terms of the rank function  $r$  of  $M$  as follows.

$$r_i(U) = r(U \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1})) - r(S \cap B_{\geq i+1}) \quad \forall U \subseteq N_i. \quad (1)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.1.* We have  $T_i + e \in \mathcal{I}_i$  if and only if  $r_i(T_i + e) = r_i(T_i) + 1$ , which, by (1), is equivalent to

$$r((T_i + e) \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1})) = 1 + r(T_i \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1})),$$

which in turn is equivalent to  $e \notin \text{span}(T_i \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1}))$ . □

It is clear that the sets  $\{T_i\}_{i \in H}$  constructed by Algorithm 1 indeed satisfy  $T_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$ , since the property  $T_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$  is preserved throughout the algorithm. Lemma 3.2 below implies that the returned set  $T$  is independent in  $M$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $H \in \{H_{\text{odd}}, H_{\text{even}}\}$  and let  $I_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$  for  $i \in H$ . Then  $\bigcup_{i \in H} I_i \in \mathcal{I}$ .*

Whereas a formal proof of Lemma 3.2 can be found in Appendix B, we still want to give some intuition and link the lemma to previous work. For simplicity we focus on the case  $H = H_{\text{even}}$ , and assume  $h = 2k$  is even. For  $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ , let  $A_i = \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i})$ . Hence,  $A_1 \supseteq A_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq A_h$ . Notice that for  $i \in H_{\text{even}}$ , we have  $M_i = (M/A_{i+1})|_{B_i \cap A_{i-1}}$ , and hence,  $M_i$  is a restriction of the matroid  $M'_i = (M/A_{i+1})|_{A_{i-1}}$ . Therefore, any independent set  $I_i$  of  $M_i$  is also independent in  $M'_i$ .

However, for any sequence of matroids defined by  $M'_i = (M/A_{i+1})|_{A_{i-1}}$  where the sets  $A_i$  form a chain  $A_1 \supseteq A_3 \supseteq \dots \supseteq A_{h-1}$ , one can easily verify that if  $I_i$  is independent in  $M_i$  for all  $i \in H_{\text{even}}$ , then  $\bigcup_{i \in H_{\text{even}}} I_i$  is independent in  $M$ . Actually, this reasoning—for a chain formed by different sets  $A_i$ —has already been used in the context of the matroid secretary problem by Soto [26].

**Corollary 3.3.** *Algorithm 1 returns an independent set  $T \in \mathcal{I}$ .*

*Proof.* This is an immediate result of Lemma 3.2 and the fact that each set in  $\{T_i\}_{i \in H}$  constructed by Algorithm 1 is independent in its corresponding matroid  $M_i$ .  $\square$

**Analysis of performance guarantees.** Whereas decomposition approaches similar to the above have already been used (see, e.g., [16, 26]), a main novelty of our approach is the way we lower bound the likelihood of elements to be selected. It turns out that selection probabilities can be elegantly lower bounded in terms of the following probabilities

$$p_{e,i} = \Pr[e \in \text{span}(S \cap C_{\geq i}) \mid e \notin S] \quad \forall e \in N, i \in \{1, \dots, h\},$$

where  $C_{\geq i} = \bigcup_{j=i}^h C_j$ . We remind the reader that  $C_j$  denotes the  $j$ -th weight class. For consistency, we also define  $p_{e,0} = 1$  for every  $e \in N$ . Notice that  $p_{e,i}$  is non-increasing in  $i$ . The following two lemmata describe lower bounds on the selection probabilities. We recall that for any bucket  $B_i$ , the expression  $f(B_i) \in \{1, \dots, h\}$  denotes the lowest index of all weight classes contained in  $B_i$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *For every element  $e \in B_i$ ,*

$$\Pr[e \in T] \geq \frac{p_{e,f(B_{i-1})} - p_{e,f(B_i)}}{4}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be the event that  $i \in H$ . If  $G$  does not occur, then, clearly,  $e \notin T$ . Thus, in the rest of the proof we assume  $G$  occurs, and implicitly condition all the expectations on this assumption. As a result, the lower bound we prove applies in fact to  $\Pr[e \in T \mid G] = 2 \cdot \Pr[e \in T]$ .

Recall that  $e$  gets selected by Algorithm 1 if  $e \notin S$  and it obeys two conditions:  $e \in N_i$  and  $e + T_i^e \in \mathcal{I}_i$ , where  $T_i^e$  is the set  $T_i$  immediately before  $e$  is revealed.

If  $i = 1$ , then the first condition always holds since then  $e \in B_1 = N_1$ , i.e., it holds with a probability of  $1 = p_{e,f(B_{i-1})} = p_{e,0}$ . Otherwise,  $N_i = B_i \cap \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1})$ , which implies, together with  $e \in B_i$ , the equality:

$$\Pr[e \in N_i \mid e \notin S] = \Pr[e \in \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1}) \mid e \notin S] = p_{e,f(B_{i-1})}.$$

Hence, in both cases, the first condition is satisfied (conditioned on  $e \notin S$ ) with probability  $p_{e,f(B_{i-1})}$ .

We now proceed to analyze the probability of the second condition  $e + T_i^e \in \mathcal{I}_i$ , which, by Lemma 3.1, can be equivalently stated as  $e \notin \text{span}(T_i^e \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1}))$ . Let  $\bar{S} = N \setminus S$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[e + T_i^e \notin \mathcal{I}_i \mid e \notin S] &= \Pr[e \in \text{span}(T_i^e \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1})) \mid e \notin S] \\ &\leq \Pr[e \in \text{span}((\bar{S} \cap B_i) \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1})) \mid e \notin S] \\ &= \Pr[e \in \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i}) \mid e \notin S] = p_{e,f(B_i)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from  $T_i^e \subseteq \bar{S} \cap B_i$ , and the second equality follows from the fact that  $\bar{S} \cap B_i$  and  $S \cap B_i$  are identically distributed and both sets are independent of  $S \cap B_{\geq i+1}$ .

In conclusion,  $e$  is accepted (conditioned on  $G$ ) with probability

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[e \notin S \text{ and } e \in N_i \text{ and } e + T_i^e \in \mathcal{I}_i] &\geq \Pr[e \notin S] \cdot \left( \Pr[e \in N_i \mid e \notin S] - \Pr[e + T_i^e \notin \mathcal{I}_i \mid e \notin S] \right) \\ &\geq \frac{p_{e,f(B_{i-1})} - p_{e,f(B_i)}}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$



**Lemma 3.5.** For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, b\}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[|T \cap B_i|] \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{e \in B_i \cap \text{OPT}} p_{e, f(B_{i-1})} \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{e \in B_i \cap \text{OPT}} p_{e, f(B_i)}.$$

The proof of the above Lemma is deferred to Appendix B. Notice that the second inequality of Lemma 3.5 follows immediately from the fact that  $p_{e,i}$  is non-increasing in  $i$ .

## 4 Full algorithm

Our full algorithm chooses a random bucketing  $\mathbf{B}$  according to a well-chosen distribution and then calls the bucketing-based algorithm with  $\mathbf{B}$  as input. The random bucketing  $\mathbf{B}$  is chosen such that all buckets  $B_i$  have the same length  $\ell(B_i) - f(B_i)$ , i.e., each contains the same number of weight classes, except for, possibly, the first and last buckets, which may be shorter. This common length of the buckets is chosen to be a power of two,  $2^\tau$ , drawn uniformly at random from all lengths that are powers of two and lie between 1 and the first power of two that is at least  $h+1$ . In other words,  $\tau$  is drawn uniformly at random from  $0, 1, \dots, \lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil$ . Furthermore, a uniform random shift  $\Delta \in \{0, \dots, 2^\tau - 1\}$  defines where the first bucket ends: the first bucket contains the lightest  $2^\tau - \Delta$  weight classes, and, as described, each following bucket bundles  $2^\tau$  weight classes until the last bucket which may have a shorter length. Figure 1 exemplifies the bucketing.




Figure 1: An illustration of how the bucketing is done for  $\Delta = 3$  and  $\tau = 2$ .

Algorithm (2) is a pseudocode description of our algorithm. For ease of notation, we assume in the algorithm that  $C_i = \emptyset$  whenever  $i > h$  or  $i \leq 0$ . This assumption allows us to write expressions of the form  $\bigcup_{j=i}^{i'} C_j$  where  $i' > h$  and/or  $i \leq 0$ . Also, recall that, by definition,  $f(B_i) = \ell(B_i) = 0$  for every  $i \leq 0$ .

---

### Algorithm 2: Matroid Secretary Algorithm

---

- 1 Let  $\tau$  be a uniformly random number from the range  $0, 1, \dots, \lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil$ .
- 2 Let  $\Delta$  be a uniformly random number from the range  $0, 1, \dots, 2^\tau - 1$ .
- 3 Let  $\mathbf{B}$  be a bucketing with  $\lceil (h + \Delta)/2^\tau \rceil$  buckets, where bucket  $B_i$  is defined as follows:

$$B_i = \bigcup_{j=2^\tau \cdot (i-1) - \Delta + 1}^{2^\tau \cdot i - \Delta} C_j.$$

- 4 Execute Algorithm 1 with bucketing  $\mathbf{B}$  and return resulting  $T \in \mathcal{I}$ .
- 

To analyze Algorithm 2 we leverage the two lower bounds on selection probabilities derived for the bucketing-based algorithm, i.e., Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.4. More precisely, we use Lemma 3.5 to analyze the case when Algorithm 2 runs with  $\tau = 0$ , and employ Lemma 3.4 for  $\tau \geq 1$ . We start with the case  $\tau = 0$ . As usual, let  $T$  be the set returned by Algorithm 2.

**Lemma 4.1.** *For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|T \cap C_i| \mid \tau = 0] \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{e \in C_i \cap \text{OPT}} p_{e,i}.$$

*Proof.* For  $\tau = 0$ , the bucketing  $\mathbf{B}$  consists of the weight classes, i.e.,  $\mathbf{B} = \{C_1, \dots, C_h\}$ . The result then immediately follows from Lemma 3.5.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$  and  $e \in C_i$ ,*

$$\Pr[e \in T \mid \tau \geq 1] \geq \frac{1 - p_{e,i}}{8 \cdot \lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil}.$$

Before proving Lemma 4.2, we show how to derive from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 an upper bound of  $O(\log \log \tilde{\rho})$  on the competitive ratio of Algorithm 2. Combining both lemmata we first obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.3.** *For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|T \cap C_i|] \geq \frac{|C_i \cap \text{OPT}|}{8(\lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil + 1)}.$$

*Proof.* By summing the inequality of Lemma 4.2 over all elements  $e \in C_i$  we get

$$\mathbb{E}[|T \cap C_i| \mid \tau \geq 1] \geq \frac{\sum_{e \in C_i} (1 - p_{e,i})}{8 \lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil} \geq \frac{\sum_{e \in C_i \cap \text{OPT}} (1 - p_{e,i})}{8 \lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil}. \quad (2)$$

It remains to combine (2) with Lemma 4.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|T \cap C_i|] &= \Pr[\tau = 0] \cdot \mathbb{E}[|T \cap C_i| \mid \tau = 0] + \Pr[\tau \geq 1] \cdot \mathbb{E}[|T \cap C_i| \mid \tau \geq 1] \\ &= \frac{1}{\lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil + 1} \cdot \left( \mathbb{E}[|T \cap C_i| \mid \tau = 0] + \lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil \cdot \mathbb{E}[|T \cap C_i| \mid \tau \geq 1] \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil + 1} \cdot \left( \frac{\sum_{e \in C_i \cap \text{OPT}} p_{e,i}}{4} + \frac{\sum_{e \in C_i \cap \text{OPT}} (1 - p_{e,i})}{8} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{|C_i \cap \text{OPT}|}{8(\lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil + 1)}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

A lower bound on the competitiveness of Algorithm 2 can now easily be derived from Corollary 4.3. The following Theorem states this lower bound, and shows that it implies Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 4.4.** *Algorithm 2 is an aided algorithm for SB-MSP whose competitive ratio is at most  $16 \cdot (\lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil + 1) = 16 \cdot (\lceil \log_2(4 + \lceil \log_2 \tilde{\rho} \rceil) \rceil + 1) \leq 16 \lceil \log_2 \log_2(\max\{\tilde{\rho}, 4\}) \rceil + 5$ . Hence, by Reductions 1 and 2 there exists a (non-aided)  $2560 \lceil \log_2 \log_2(4\rho) \rceil + 5$ -competitive algorithm for MSP.*

*Proof.* By Corollary 4.3 and the fact that the weights of the elements within each weight class differ by a factor of at most 2, the expected weight of the elements selected from any  $C_i$  is at least a  $[16(\lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil + 1)]^{-1}$ -fraction of  $w(C_i \cap \text{OPT})$ . By summing this bound over all weight classes, we obtain that Algorithm 2 is  $16(\lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil + 1)$ -competitive.  $\square$

Hence, it remains to prove Lemma 4.2.




Figure 2: An illustration of how the indices  $a_i$  are chosen.

*Proof of Lemma 4.2.* One can think of the expression  $1 - p_{e,i} = p_{e,0} - p_{e,i}$  in the statement of the lemma as the change in  $p_{e,j}$  as  $j$  goes from  $j = i$  to  $j = 0$ . We analyze this change by considering smaller intervals. Let  $k = \lceil \log_2(i+1) \rceil$ , and define  $a_j = i - 2^j + 1$  for  $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ . Notice that  $a_j \in \{1, \dots, i\}$  for  $j < k$  and  $a_k \leq 0$ . Figure 2 illustrates our choice of the indices  $a_i$ . Observe that the distance  $a_{j-1} - a_j$  doubles each time  $j$  increases by 1.

By defining, for ease of notation,  $p_{e,a_k} = 1$ , we can write  $1 - p_{e,i} = \sum_{j=1}^k (p_{e,a_j} - p_{e,a_{j-1}})$ . We show the following:

$$\Pr[e \in T \mid \tau = j] \geq \frac{1}{8} (p_{e,a_j} - p_{e,a_{j-1}}) \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, k\}. \quad (3)$$

First, observe that the lemma follows easily from the above inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[e \in T \mid \tau \geq 1] &\geq \sum_{j=1}^k \underbrace{\Pr[\tau = j \mid \tau \geq 1]}_{= \frac{1}{\lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil}} \cdot \Pr[e \in T \mid \tau = j] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{8 \lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^k (p_{e,a_j} - p_{e,a_{j-1}}) = \frac{1 - p_{e,i}}{8 \lceil \log_2(h+1) \rceil}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it remains to show (3). Fix some  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , and consider an execution of Algorithm 2 with  $\tau = j$ . Let  $B_s$  be the (random) bucket containing  $C_i$ . We denote by  $G$  the event that the random shift  $\Delta$  of Algorithm 2 is such that  $f(B_s) \in \{a_{j-1}, a_{j-1} + 1, \dots, a_0\}$  (see Figure 3 for an illustration). Since the shift  $\Delta$  is chosen uniformly at random within  $0 \leq \Delta \leq 2^\tau - 1$ , we get




Figure 3: For  $j = 3$ , this is a realization of the random bucketing where the event  $G$  occurred.  $G$  occurs when  $a_2 \leq f(B_s)$ , i.e., in 4 offsets out of the 8 possible offsets in this case.

$$\Pr[G] = \frac{a_0 - a_{j-1} + 1}{2^\tau} = \frac{2^{j-1}}{2^\tau} = \frac{1}{2},$$

where the last equality follows by  $\tau = j$ . Notice that when  $G$  occurs, we have  $f(B_s) \geq a_{j-1}$  and  $f(B_{s-1}) = f(B_s) - 2^\tau \leq i - 2^\tau < a_j$ . Hence, we obtain by Lemma 3.4,

$$\Pr[e \in T \mid \tau = j, G] \geq \frac{1}{4} (p_{e,f(B_{s-1})} - p_{e,f(B_s)}) \geq \frac{1}{4} (p_{e,a_j} - p_{e,a_{j-1}}),$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact that  $p_{e,t}$  is non-increasing in  $t$ . Finally, (3) now easily follows:

$$\Pr[e \in T \mid \tau = j] \geq \Pr[G] \cdot \Pr[e \in T \mid \tau = j, G] \geq \frac{1}{8} (p_{e,a_j} - p_{e,a_{j-1}}). \quad \square$$

## References

- [1] P. D. Azar, R. Kleinberg, and S. M. Weinberg. Prophet inequalities with limited information. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1358–1377, 2014.
- [2] Siddharth B., Seeun U., Shuchi C., and David M. Secretary problems with convex costs. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP): Part I*, pages 75–87, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012. Springer-Verlag.
- [3] M. Babaioff, N. Immorlica, D. Kempe, and R. Kleinberg. Online auctions and generalized secretary problems. *SIGecom Exchanges*, 7(2):7:1–7:11, June 2008.
- [4] M. Babaioff, N. Immorlica, and R. Kleinberg. Matroids, secretary problems, and online mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 434–443, 2007.
- [5] M. Bateni, M. Hajiaghayi, and M. Zadimoghaddam. Submodular secretary problem and extensions. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 9(4):32:1–32:23, October 2013.
- [6] S. Chakraborty and O. Lachish. Improved competitive ratio for the matroid secretary problem. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1702–1712, 2012.
- [7] N. B. Dimitrov and C. G. Plaxton. Competitive weighted matching in transversal matroids. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP): Part I*, pages 397–408, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer-Verlag.
- [8] M. Dinitz and G. Kortsarz. Matroid secretary for regular and decomposable matroids. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 108–117, 2013.
- [9] E. B. Dynkin. The optimum choice of the instant for stopping a markov process. *Soviet Mathematics, Doklady* 4, 1963.
- [10] M. Feldman, J. Naor, and R. Schwartz. Improved competitive ratios for submodular secretary problems. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Workshop and 15th International Workshop on Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM)*, 2011.
- [11] T. S. Ferguson. Who solved the secretary problem? *Statistical Science*, 4(3):282–296, 1989.
- [12] M. Gardner. Mathematical games column. *Scientific American*, 202(2):150–154, February 1960.
- [13] M. Gardner. Mathematical games column. *Scientific American*, 202(3):172–182, March 1960.
- [14] A. Gupta, A. Roth, G. Schoenebeck, and K. Talwar. Constrained non-monotone submodular maximization: offline and secretary algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Internet and Network Economics (WINE)*, pages 246–257, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer-Verlag.

- [15] S. Im and Y. Wang. Secretary problems: Laminar matroid and interval scheduling. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1265–1274, 2011.
- [16] P. Jaillet, J. A. Soto, and R. Zenklusen. Advances on matroid secretary problems: Free order model and laminar case. In *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (IPCO)*, pages 254–265, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer-Verlag.
- [17] R. Kleinberg. A multiple-choice secretary algorithm with applications to online auctions. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 630–631, 2005.
- [18] N. Korula and M. Pál. Algorithms for secretary problems on graphs and hypergraphs. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP): Part II*, pages 508–520, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009. Springer-Verlag.
- [19] O. Lachish.  $O(\log \log \text{rank})$  competitive-ratio for the matroid secretary problem, 2013. To appear in Proceedings of FOCS 2014.
- [20] O. Lachish.  $O(\log \log \text{rank})$  competitive-ratio for the matroid secretary problem, 2014. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.7343>.
- [21] D. V. Lindley. Dynamic programming and decision theory. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 10(1):39–51, March 1961.
- [22] T. Ma, B. Tang, and Y. Wang. The simulated greedy algorithm for several submodular matroid secretary problems. In *Proceedings of 30th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2013)*, pages 478–489, 2013.
- [23] S. Oveis Gharan and J. Vondrák. On variants of the matroid secretary problem. *Algorithmica*, 67(4):472–497, 2013.
- [24] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization, Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer, 2003.
- [25] J. A. Soto. Matroid secretary problem in the random assignment model. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1275–1284, 2011.
- [26] J. A. Soto. Matroid secretary problem in the random-assignment model. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 42(1):178–211, 2013.

## A Formal Proofs of Reductions

In this section we give the formal proofs of the reductions from Section 2. We start by Reduction 1 and then continue with Reduction 2.

**Reduction 1.** *Any  $\alpha$ -competitive algorithm for SB-MSP can be transformed efficiently into an order-oblivious  $\alpha$ -competitive algorithm for MSP.*

Before proving the reduction itself, let us prove a technical helper lemma (similar lemmata can be found, e.g., in [17]).

**Lemma A.1.** *Given a random permutation  $\pi$  of  $N$  and a binomial random variable  $X \sim B(n, p)$ , the set  $S$  of the first  $X$  elements in  $\pi$  contains every element  $e \in N$  with probability  $p$ , independently.*

*Proof.* Consider a set  $S \subseteq N$  containing every element of  $e \in N$  with probability  $p$ , independently. Let us construct a permutation  $\pi$  of  $N$  from  $S$  as follows. The first  $|S|$  elements of  $\pi$  are a uniformly random permutation of  $S$ , and the  $n - |S|$  other elements of  $\pi$  are a uniformly random permutation of  $N \setminus S$ . Also, let  $X = |S|$ . Notice that  $X$  is distributed according to  $B(n, p)$ , and by definition  $S$  contains exactly the first  $X$  elements of  $\pi$ .

By symmetry,  $\pi$  is a uniformly random permutation even when conditioned on  $X$ . Hence,  $X$  and  $\pi$  are independent, which completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Reduction 1.

---

**Algorithm 3:** Algorithm for Reduction 1( $ALG$ )

---

- 1 Let  $p_s$  be the sampling probability reported by  $ALG$ .
  - 2 Sample  $X \sim B(n, p_s)$ .
  - 3 Let  $S$  be the set of the first  $X$  elements in the random input permutation.
  - 4 Run  $ALG$  with  $S$  as the first stage and  $N \setminus S$  as the second stage.
- 

*Proof.* Fix an  $\alpha$ -competitive algorithm  $ALG$  for SB-MSP. Algorithm 3 is an algorithm for MSP which uses  $ALG$ . The algorithm begins by sampling  $X \sim B(n, p_s)$  and then collects the first  $X$  elements of the random input permutation into a set  $S$ . By Lemma A.1,  $S$  contains every element  $e \in N$  with probability  $p_s$ , independently. Hence,  $S$  can be used as the input for the first stage of  $ALG$ . The rest of the elements (i.e., the elements of  $N \setminus S$ ) are then passed, when revealed, to  $ALG$  as the second phase input. Since Algorithm 3 produces a solution as valuable as  $ALG$ , it is also  $\alpha$ -competitive. It is important to stress that Algorithm 3 is order oblivious since  $ALG$  assumes nothing about the order in which the elements are revealed in the second phase; in particular, they might be ordered adversarially.  $\square$

The rest of this section is devoted to proving the following reduction.

**Reduction 2.** *Any  $\alpha(\bar{\rho})$ -competitive aided algorithm for SB-MSP, where  $\alpha(\cdot)$  is a non-decreasing function, can be transformed efficiently into a  $160 \cdot \alpha(4\rho)$ -competitive (non-aided) algorithm for SB-MSP.*

---

**Algorithm 4:** Algorithm for Reduction 2( $ALG$ )

---

- 1 Let  $S$  be a set containing every element  $e \in N$  with probability  $1/2$ .
  - 2 Let  $W \leftarrow \max_{e \in S} w(e)$  and  $\tilde{\rho} \leftarrow 4 \cdot r(S)$ .
  - 3 **with probability  $1/2$  do:**
  - 4     Pick the first element of  $N \setminus S$  whose value is at least  $W$ .
  - 5 **else**
  - 6     Run  $ALG$  with  $\tilde{k}$  and  $W$  on the elements of  $N \setminus S$ , ignoring elements of weight  $W/(8\tilde{\rho})$  or less.
- 

Reduction 2 is implemented by Algorithm 4. Observe that Algorithm 4 can be implemented as an SB-MSP algorithm if  $ALG$  can (if  $ALG$  declares a sampling probability  $p_s$ , then Algorithm 4

declares a sampling probability of  $(1 + p_s)/2$ . To prove Reduction 2, we show that Algorithm 4 is  $160 \cdot \alpha(4k)$ -competitive whenever  $ALG$  is an  $\alpha(\tilde{k})$ -competitive aided algorithm. The proof follows immediately from the following claims. The first claim analyzes the case where there exists a single element which has, alone, much of the weight of  $OPT$ .

**Claim A.2.** *If there exists an element  $e \in N$  such that  $w(e) \geq w(OPT)/20$ , then Algorithm 4 is at least 160-competitive.*

*Proof.* Let  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  be the elements with the highest and second highest weights, respectively. Consider the event when  $e_1 \notin S$ ,  $e_2 \in S$  and Algorithm 4 decides not to execute  $ALG$ . Clearly, this event happens with probability  $1/8$ . When it happens, Algorithm 4 is guaranteed to pick  $e_1$ , and get a value of  $w(OPT)/20$ .  $\square$

The two next claims analyze the case where no single element is very valuable. Let  $V \subseteq N$  be the set of elements of weight strictly more than  $W/(8\tilde{\rho})$ , and let  $G$  be the event that all the following happens:

- (i) Algorithm 4 executes  $ALG$ .
- (iii)  $|S \cap OPT| \geq \rho/4$ .
- (ii)  $w((OPT \cap V) \setminus S) \geq w(OPT)/8$ .
- (iv) The heaviest element of  $N$  is in  $S$ .

**Claim A.3.** *Conditioned on  $G$  happening, Algorithm 4 outputs a solution of expected value at least  $(8 \cdot \alpha(4\rho))^{-1} \cdot w(OPT)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary set  $S$  for which  $G$  happens. We show that Algorithm 4 outputs a solution of expected value at least  $(8 \cdot \alpha(\tilde{\rho}))^{-1} \cdot w(OPT)$  conditioned on any such set  $S$ .

Notice that  $ALG$  observes the instance of SB-MSP corresponding to the matroid  $M|_{V \setminus S}$ , i.e., the matroid  $M$  restricted to those elements not appearing in  $S$  that have weight at least  $W/(8\tilde{\rho})$ . Let us verify that the values  $W$  and  $\tilde{\rho}$  supplied to  $ALG$  are appropriate for this instance. Since  $W$  is the weight of the heaviest element in  $N$  (by (iv)), the weight of every element  $e \in V \setminus S$  is within the range  $(W/(8\tilde{\rho}), W]$ . On the other hand, using that (iii) holds

$$\tilde{\rho} = 4 \cdot r(S) \geq 4 \cdot r(S \cap OPT) = 4 \cdot |S \cap OPT| \geq \rho.$$

Since  $ALG$  is  $\alpha(\tilde{\rho})$ -competitive when supplied with appropriate  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $W$  values, it is guaranteed to pick, in expectation, a solution of value at least  $w((OPT \cap V) \setminus S)/\alpha(\tilde{\rho}) \geq (8 \cdot \alpha(\tilde{\rho}))^{-1} \cdot w(OPT)$ , where we used that (ii) holds for the inequality. The claim now follows since:

$$\tilde{\rho} = 4 \cdot r(S) \leq 4\rho. \quad \square$$

The above claim shows that whenever  $G$  happens, Algorithm 4 performs well. We finish the proof of the reduction by lower bounding the probability of  $G$ .

**Claim A.4.** *If  $w(e) \leq w(OPT)/20$  for every element  $e \in N$ , then  $G$  happens with probability at least  $1/20$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $G'$  be the event that (iii) and (iv) hold and in addition  $w(OPT \setminus S) \geq w(OPT)/7$ . We continue by first lower bounding  $\Pr[G \mid G']$  by  $1/2$  and then  $\Pr[G']$  by  $1/10$  which in turn implies the claim as  $\Pr[G] = \Pr[G \mid G'] \Pr[G']$ .

To bound  $\Pr[G \mid G']$  notice that it equals the probability that Algorithm 4 executes  $ALG$  and the probability that  $w((OPT \cap V) \setminus S) \geq w(OPT)/8$  conditioned on  $G'$ . Clearly the probability of

$ALG$  being executed is  $1/2$  and independent of the event  $G'$ . We shall now prove that  $G'$  in fact implies  $w((OPT \cap V) \setminus S) \geq w(OPT)/8$ , and therefore,  $\Pr[G \mid G'] = 1/2$ . Observe that by (iii):

$$\tilde{\rho} = 4 \cdot r(S) \geq 4 \cdot r(S \cap OPT) = 4 \cdot |S \cap OPT| \geq \rho,$$

and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} w((OPT \cap V) \setminus S) &\geq w(OPT \setminus S) - w(OPT \setminus V) \geq \frac{w(OPT)}{7} - \rho \cdot \frac{W}{8\tilde{\rho}} \\ &\geq \frac{w(OPT)}{7} - \rho \cdot \frac{w(OPT)}{160\rho} \geq \frac{w(OPT)}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from the fact that  $w(OPT \setminus V)$  contains at most  $\rho$  elements, each having a weight of at most  $W/(8\tilde{\rho})$ ; the third follows from the inequality  $\tilde{\rho} \geq \rho$  and the assumption of the claim, i.e., that any element has weight at most  $w(OPT)/20$  and therefore  $W \leq w(OPT)/20$ .

Having proved  $\Pr[G \mid G'] = 1/2$ , we continue by lower bounding  $\Pr[G']$ . We shall do so by upper bounding the probability that each of its conditions is violated, and then applying the union bound.

**Condition (iv):** It is clear that the the heaviest element of  $N$  is *not* in  $S$  with probability  $1/2$  because each element is in  $S$  with probability  $1/2$ .

**Condition (iii):** By the conditions of the claim,  $OPT$  must contain at least 20 elements. Since each element appears in  $S$  with probability  $1/2$ , we get by the Chernoff bound<sup>3</sup> that

$$\Pr[\neg(iii)] = \Pr[|S \cap OPT| < \rho/4] \leq e^{-|OPT|/16} \leq e^{-20/16} \leq 0.287.$$

**Condition  $w(OPT \setminus S) \geq w(OPT)/7$ :** Let us upper bound the probability that this condition does not hold, i.e.,  $\Pr[w(OPT \setminus S) < w(OPT)/7]$ . Notice that

$$\mathbb{E}[w(OPT \setminus S)] = \frac{w(OPT)}{2},$$

and because  $S$  contains each element with probability  $1/2$ , independently,

$$\text{Var}[w(OPT \setminus S)] = \sum_{e \in OPT} \text{Var}[w(\{e\} \setminus S)] = \sum_{e \in OPT} \frac{[w(e)]^2}{4},$$

which in turn, as  $w(e) \leq w(OPT)/20$  for each element  $e \in N$ , is upper bounded by

$$\frac{w(OPT)}{20} \cdot \sum_{e \in OPT} \frac{w(e)}{4} = \frac{w(OPT)}{20} \cdot \frac{w(OPT)}{4} = \frac{[w(OPT)]^2}{80}.$$

Combining these observations, we get by Chebyshev's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left[w(OPT \setminus S) < \frac{w(OPT)}{7}\right] &\leq \Pr\left[|w(OPT \setminus S) - \mathbb{E}[w(OPT \setminus S)]| > \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{7}\right) w(OPT)\right] \\ &\leq \Pr\left[|w(OPT \setminus S) - \mathbb{E}[w(OPT \setminus S)]| > \sqrt{10} \cdot \sqrt{\text{Var}[w(OPT \setminus S)]}\right] \leq \frac{1}{10}. \end{aligned}$$

To summarize, we have by the union bound,  $\Pr[G'] \geq 1 - (1/2 + 0.287 + 1/10) > 1/10$ .  $\square$

---

<sup>3</sup>To be precise, we use that  $\Pr[X \leq (1 - \delta)\mu] \leq e^{-\frac{\delta^2\mu}{2}}$ ,  $0 < \delta < 1$ . In our setting  $X := |S \cap OPT|$ ,  $\mu := |OPT|/2 = \rho/2$  and  $\delta := 1/2$ .



## B Missing Proofs of Section 3

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* For every  $j \in H$ , let  $F_j = \bigcup_{i \in H, i \geq j} I_i$ . We show by induction that  $F_j \in \mathcal{I}$  for all  $j \in H$ . The result then follows by choosing  $j$  to be the smallest index in  $H$ . Clearly  $F_j \in \mathcal{I}$  when  $j$  is the largest index in  $H$ , since in this case  $F_j = I_j \in \mathcal{I}_j \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  (the last inclusion holds since  $M_j$  is obtained from  $M$  by restrictions and contractions).

Now assume that  $j \in H$  is not the largest index in  $H$ . Then,  $F_j = F_{j+2} \cup I_j$  since  $H$  contains either odd or even indices. By the induction hypothesis we obtain  $F_{j+2} \in \mathcal{I}$ . Also, since  $I_i \subseteq N_i \subseteq \text{span}(S \cap B_{i-1})$ , we have  $F_{j+2} \subseteq \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq j+1})$ . The fact that  $I_j \in \mathcal{I}_j$ , implies

$$\begin{aligned} |I_j| &= r_j(I_j) = r(I_j \cup (S \cap B_{\geq j+1})) - r(S \cap B_{\geq j+1}) && \text{(by the definition of } r_j \text{ (1))} \\ &= r(I_j \cup \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq j+1})) - r(\text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq j+1})) \\ &\leq r(I_j \cup F_{j+2}) - r(F_{j+2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the equality on the second line follows since  $r(A + e) = r(A)$  for any  $e \in \text{span}(A)$ , and the inequality follows from the submodularity (diminishing returns) of  $r$  and our previous observation that  $F_{j+2} \subseteq \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq j+1})$ . It remains to observe that  $r(F_{j+2}) = |F_{j+2}|$  since  $F_{j+2} \in \mathcal{I}$ , and hence, the above inequality implies  $r(I_j \cup F_{j+2}) \geq |I_j| + |F_{j+2}|$ . Thus,  $F_j = F_{j+2} \cup I_j \in \mathcal{I}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* Conditioned on  $i \in H$ , Algorithm 1 selects elements of  $N_i \setminus S$  greedily, and thus, the number of elements selected from  $B_i$  is  $r(N_i \setminus S)$ . The key observation for lower bounding  $r(N_i \setminus S)$  is that  $N_i \cap \text{OPT}$  is independent in  $M_i$ , which we prove first. Since  $\text{OPT}$  is a maximum weight independent set, we have

$$B_{\geq i+1} \subseteq \text{span}(\text{OPT} \cap B_{\geq i+1}). \quad (4)$$

This easily follows by recalling that the greedy algorithm produces  $\text{OPT}$ , and thus,  $r(\text{OPT} \cap B_{\geq i+1}) = r(B_{\geq i+1})$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} r_i(N_i \cap \text{OPT}) &= r((N_i \cap \text{OPT}) \cup (S \cap B_{\geq i+1})) - r(S \cap B_{\geq i+1}) && \text{(by (1))} \\ &\geq r((N_i \cap \text{OPT}) \cup (\text{OPT} \cap B_{\geq i+1})) - r(\text{OPT} \cap B_{\geq i+1}) && \text{(by (4) and submodularity)} \\ &= |(N_i \cap \text{OPT}) \cup (\text{OPT} \cap B_{\geq i+1})| - |\text{OPT} \cap B_{\geq i+1}| \\ &= |N_i \cap \text{OPT}|, \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate equality follows by observing that  $(N_i \cap \text{OPT}) \cup (\text{OPT} \cap B_{\geq i+1})$  is independent in  $M$  since it is a subset of  $\text{OPT}$ . Hence, we showed that  $N_i \cap \text{OPT}$  is independent in  $M_i$ . Therefore,  $r(N_i \setminus S) \geq |N_i \cap \text{OPT} \cap \bar{S}|$ , where  $\bar{S} = N \setminus S$ , and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|T \cap B_i|] &= \Pr[i \in H] \cdot \mathbb{E}[r(N_i \setminus S)] \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[|N_i \cap \text{OPT} \cap \bar{S}|] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{e \in B_i \cap \text{OPT}} \left[ \underbrace{\Pr[e \in \bar{S}]}_{=1/2} \cdot \Pr[e \in N_i \mid e \notin S] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to observe that for any element  $e \in B_i$ ,

$$\Pr[e \in N_i \mid e \notin S] = p_{e, f(B_{i-1})}.$$

Indeed, if  $i = 1$  this follows from  $N_1 = B_1$  and  $p_{e,0} = 1$  (we recall that  $f(B_0) = 0$  by convention). Otherwise, for  $i > 1$ , we have  $N_i = B_i \cap \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1})$ , and thus, for any  $e \in B_i$ ,

$$\Pr[e \in N_i \mid e \notin S] = \Pr[e \in \text{span}(S \cap B_{\geq i-1}) \mid e \notin S] = p_{e, f(B_{i-1})}. \quad \square$$