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1. Introduction. In [1], Moser derives a recurrence relation and studies the limiting behaviour of the Expectations $E_{n}$ of the following game. "A real number is drawn at random from $[0,1]$. We may either keep the number selected, or reject it and draw again. We can then either keep the second number chosen or reject it, and draw again, and so on. Suppose we have at most $n$ choices. What stopping rule gives the largest $E_{n}$ and how can we estimate $E_{n}$ ?"

The solution turns out to be that, given at most $m=n+1$ choices, we should stop after the first choice if and only if we have found at least $E_{n}$. Following a request made in the second last sentence of [1], we consider the effect of the same procedure when the choices are made at random from the normal distribution, mean zero, variance one, and then compare the $E_{n}{ }^{\prime} s$ of Moser's game with the $E_{n}{ }^{\prime} s$ of picking from a normal distribution, mean $1 / 2$, variance $1 / 12$.
2. Derivation of the recurrence relation for arbitrary distributions. Let $f(x)$ be a probability density defined for $a \leqslant x \leqslant b$ ( $a$ and $b$ may be $-\infty$ and $+\infty$ ), and further let $f(x)$ be continuous in $[a, b]$. Let $E_{j}$ denote the expectation when picking at random from $f(x)$, when we have at most $j$ choices. Let $E_{0}=0, E_{1}=\mu$, where $\mu$ is the mean value of $f(x)$, i.e., $\mu=\int_{a}^{b} x f(x) d x$. (We will use the symbol $\sigma^{2}$ to denote the variance, i.e., $\left.\sigma^{2}=\int_{a}^{b}(x-\mu)^{2} f(x) d x.\right)$
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If we follow the Moser procedure, and if we are given at most $n+l$ choices, we stop after the firs. choice if we have found at least $E_{n}$. This occurs with probability

$$
\int_{E_{n}}^{b} f(x) d x
$$

The mean value obtainable in this case is

$$
\int_{E_{n}}^{b} x f\left(x \mid E_{n} \leqslant x \leqslant b\right) d x
$$

where the function $f$ in the integrand is the conditional probability density of $x$, given that $x$ lies in $\left[E_{n}, b\right]$. But this probability censity function is

$$
f\left(x \mid E_{n} \leqslant x \leqslant b\right)=f(x) / \int_{E_{n}}^{b} f(x) d x .
$$

The probability that we draw again is now

$$
\int_{a}^{E_{n}} f(x) d x
$$

and since there are now $n$ choices left, the expectation is $E_{n}$.
Hence, the total expectation is
$E_{n+1}=\int E_{n}^{b} f(x) d x \cdot \int E_{n}^{b} x f\left(x \mid E_{n} \leqslant x \leqslant b\right) d x+E_{n} \cdot \int_{a}^{E_{n}} f(x) d x$.
That is, we now have that

$$
E_{n+1}=\int_{E_{n}}^{b} x f(x) d x+E_{n} \cdot \int_{a}^{E_{n}} f(x) d x, \quad n=0,1,2, \ldots
$$

with $E_{0}=0, E_{1}=\mu$.
For example, if $f_{1}(x)=1$, when $0 \leqslant x \leqslant 1$, the above becomes

$$
E_{n+1}=\frac{1}{2}\left(1-E_{n}^{2}\right)+E_{n}^{2}
$$

i.e., $E_{n+1}=\frac{1}{2}\left(1+E_{n}{ }^{2}\right)$, which, of course, is the recurrence relation found by Moser. For the sequel, it is important to note
that $\mu=1 / 2, \sigma^{2}=1 / 12$ for the uniform distribution $f_{1}(x)=1$, ( $0 \leqslant x \leqslant 1$ ) 。

If we now consider picking from

$$
f_{2}(x)=(1 / \sqrt{2 \pi}) \dot{\exp }\left(-\frac{1}{2} x^{2}\right), \quad-\infty \leqslant x \leqslant \infty,
$$

the normal density with $\mu=0, \sigma^{2}=1$, then we have that

$$
E_{n+1}=\int_{E_{n}}^{\infty} x(1 / \sqrt{2 \pi}) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} x^{2}\right) d x+E_{n} \cdot \int_{-\infty}^{E_{n}}(1 / \sqrt{2 \pi}) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} x^{2}\right) d x
$$

The second term, using an approximating function found in [2], significant to 8 figures, was programmed for the IBM 650 by Miss Gillian Richardson of Statistical Techniques Research Group, Princeton University, and a set of $E_{n+1}$ 's generated for the normal density $f_{2}(x)$. (We use the notation $E_{n+1}^{(2)}$ to denote these $E^{\prime} s$, and $E_{n+1}^{(1)}$ to denote the expectations when picking from $\left.f_{1}(x).\right) E_{n+1}^{(1)}$ and $E_{n+1}^{(2)}$ are tabulated in tables 1 and 2.

Now, we have mentioned that the mean and variance of $f_{l}(x)$ are $1 / 2$ and $1 / 12$ respectively. If we take $E$ 's of the normal distribution and make the transformation

$$
E_{n+1}^{(3)}=E_{n+1}^{(2)} / \sqrt{12}+\frac{1}{2}
$$

we will have generated a set of $E^{\prime}$ s when following Moser's procedure, with choices made from

$$
f_{3}(x)=(\sqrt{12} / \sqrt{2 \pi}) \exp \left(-6\left(x-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2}\right), \quad-\infty \leq x \leq \infty
$$

that is, from a normal distribution with mean $1 / 2$, variance $1 / 12$. Table 3 shows $E_{n+1}^{(3)}-E_{n+1}^{(1)}$. The table shows that if a benefactor offers a player $m$ choices from either $f_{1}(x)$ or $f_{3}(x)$, then it is to the player's advantage if he picks from $f_{1}(x)$ for $m \leqslant 8$, but if $m>8$ he should pick from $f_{3}(x)$.
3. Optimality of the procedure. Let $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{n}+1}$ denote "a game in which a player is allowed at most $n+1$ choices from an arbitrary probability density function $f(x)$ " and let Moser's procedure be followed. Further, denote $E_{n+1}$ by $\xi\left(g_{n+1}\right)$, that is, the expectation of the player's winnings (no entrance fee demanded) of the game $g_{n+1}$. It is clear that $E_{i} \leqslant E_{j}$ as long as $\mathrm{i}<\mathrm{j}$.

Now from a basic definition of expectation we have

$$
\varepsilon\left(g_{n+1}\right)=E\left\{\varepsilon\left(g_{n+1} \mid x_{1}\right)\right\}
$$

where $x_{1}$ denotes the outcome of the first choice; that is, we have

$$
\xi\left(g_{n+1}\right)=\int_{a}^{b} \varepsilon\left(g_{n+1} \mid x_{1}\right) f\left(x_{1}\right) d x_{1}
$$

Clearly then, to maximize $\mathcal{E}\left(g_{n+1}\right)$ is to maximize $\mathcal{E}\left(g_{n+1} \mid x_{1}\right)$, the conditional expectation of the game, given the outcome of the first choice. It is clear that this is maximized if $x_{1}>\mathcal{E}\left(g_{n}\right)$ and that if this be the case, the player should stop, for he now has n choices left, and his expectation is $E_{n}=\xi\left(g_{n}\right)$, which is less than $E_{n+1}$.
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TABLE 1.
$E_{\mathrm{m}}^{(1)}$ of Moser's Procedure; $\mathrm{f}_{1}(\mathrm{x})=1,0<\mathrm{x}<1$

| m | $E_{\mathrm{m}}$ | m | $E_{\mathrm{m}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1 | .50000000 | 20 | .91988745 |
| 2 | .62500000 | 40 | .95611755 |
| 3 | .69531250 | 60 | .96967375 |
| 4 | .74172975 | 80 | .97680340 |
| 5 | .77508150 | 100 | .98120855 |
| 6 | .80037565 | 150 | .98724655 |
| 7 | .82030060 | 200 | .99034290 |
| 8 | .83644655 | 250 | .99222765 |
| 9 | .84982140 | 300 | .99349595 |
| 10 | .86109820 | 350 | .99440815 |

TABLE 2
$E_{m}^{(2)}$ of Moser's Procedure; $f_{2}(x)=(1 / \sqrt{2 \pi}) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} x^{2}\right)$,

- $\infty \leqslant \mathrm{x} \leqslant \infty$.

| m | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | m | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{m}}$ |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| 1 | .00000000 | 20 | 1.6120126 |
| 2 | .39916388 | 40 | 1.9203302 |
| 3 | .62976442 | 60 | 2.0887212 |
| 4 | .79036107 | 80 | 2.2029409 |
| 5 | .91266925 | 100 | 2.2885865 |
| 6 | 1.0108734 | 150 | 2.4378909 |
| 7 | 1.0925556 | 200 | 2.5392308 |
| 8 | 1.1622448 | 250 | 2.6154736 |
| 9 | 1.2228589 | 300 | 2.6763849 |
| 10 | 1.2763842 | 350 | 2.7270036 |

TABLE 3

$$
D_{m}=E_{m}^{(3)}-E_{m}^{(1)}
$$

where $f_{3}(x)=(\sqrt{12} / \sqrt{2 \pi}) \exp \left(-6\left(x-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2}\right), \quad-\infty \leqslant x \leqslant \infty$

| m | $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | m | $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{m}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1 | .00000000 | 20 | .04546051 |
| 2 | -.00977131 | 40 | .09823400 |
| 3 | -.01351517 | 60 | .13328810 |
| 4 | -.01357216 | 80 | .15913090 |
| 5 | -.01161658 | 100 | .17944940 |
| 6 | -.00856130 | 150 | .21651190 |
| 7 | -.00490696 | 200 | .24266990 |
| 8 | -.00093537 | 250 | .26279450 |
| 9 | +.00318756 | 300 | .27910980 |
| 10 | +.00736218 | 350 | .29280990 |
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