

Submodular Ground-Set Pruning: Monotone Tightness and a Non-Monotone Separation

Alan Kuhnle
 Department of Computer Science & Engineering
 Texas A&M University
 kuhnle@tamu.edu

May 7, 2026

Abstract

Large-scale subset selection asks for a small useful set of examples, features, sensors, seed users, or context passages from an enormous ground set. Submodular maximization is a canonical model for such diminishing-returns problems, but rapidly growing datasets make even linear-time algorithms ever costlier. We study *containment pruning*: first reduce the ground set to a smaller core P , then require that P contain a near-optimal feasible solution for every downstream budget up to k . Prior work has formulated many heuristics, but the theoretical limits of this preprocessing problem are largely unknown. For monotone submodular objectives, we prove that $1 - 1/e$ is tight: greedy achieves this containment factor, and no algorithm can beat it even with a larger pruning budget. For non-monotone objectives, we give the first $1/2 - \varepsilon$ containment algorithms under cardinality constraints and extend the approach to knapsack constraints. This $1/2$ factor exceeds the best known algorithmic ratio and the known hardness threshold for non-monotone maximization, showing that pruning can be provably easier than optimization. Empirically, pruning lets an exact IP solver run on the reduced MaxCut instance with a $\approx 620\times$ speedup, and proof-of-concept experiments on LLM context selection demonstrate the utility of non-monotone submodular proxies and our proposed containment algorithms.

1 Introduction

Large-scale subset selection. Many machine-learning and data-analysis tasks ask for a small useful subset of a much larger ground set: seed users in a social network, sensors or experiment locations, predictive features, representative documents, or context passages for an LLM [10, 11, 12, 40, 21, 22]. Submodular maximization is a canonical model for these problems because it captures diminishing returns: once a subset already covers a concept, feature, region, or piece of evidence, adding another similar item helps less. The ground sets in these applications keep growing: the NCBI Sequence Read Archive has sustained exponential growth for over a decade [43, 44], and machine-learning training corpora have grown at roughly $3.7\times$ per year [45]. Even theoretically efficient submodular algorithms cannot avoid this growth: in the value-oracle model they require at least linear time in the ground-set size [9]. Larger ground sets therefore mean more oracle queries, higher latency, and larger downstream solver instances.

Why pruning can help. When the target solution size k is small compared with the ground-set size n , much of the data is often redundant or irrelevant. Documents may be near duplicates, features may become correlated after a few predictors are selected, retrieved passages may be

distractors or paraphrases, and many graph vertices may have interchangeable marginal value. This suggests a two-stage workflow: first reduce the large ground set to a smaller core $P \subseteq N$, then run a more expensive optimizer on P alone. This idea appears in pruned submodularity graphs, multi-stage selection, candidate reduction, learned graph pruning, and many heuristics [26, 36, 35, 13, 27, 28, 29, 19]. The key question is not whether pruning can speed up a particular implementation, but whether the pruned universe still contains high-quality feasible solutions for a downstream optimizer to find. Moreover, the allowable core size may be set by memory, latency, parallelism, or the largest instance an exact solver can handle. Following Nath and Kuhnle [19], we study containment as a function of a pruning budget $p \geq k$, and ask for one core that supports every downstream target size $k' \leq k$.

Problem 1.1 (Budget-Range Submodular Pruning). Given N , $f: 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (submodular), and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for a pruning budget $p \geq k$, find $P \subseteq N$ with $|P| \leq p$ such that

$$\max_{T \subseteq P, |T| \leq k'} f(T) \geq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}_{k'}, \quad \forall k' \leq k,$$

where $\text{OPT}_{k'} = \max_{|T| \leq k'} f(T)$. We call α the *containment factor*.

The pruning algorithm does not need to identify the final solution. It only has to output a smaller universe in which good solutions still exist. This distinction is what makes containment different from ordinary optimization.

The gap. Existing pruning methods have largely been heuristic: pruned submodularity graphs [26] and learned policies such as GCOMB, LeNSE, and COMBHelper [27, 28, 29] reduce search spaces empirically, but do not give worst-case guarantees that a good downstream solution remains in the pruned set. The main theoretical exception is Nath and Kuhnle’s QUICKPRUNE [19], which achieves $\alpha \geq 1/24 - \varepsilon$ for monotone weakly submodular objectives under a knapsack constraint.

Intuitively, pruning may be easier than direct optimization, as we are not required to find an optimal solution, merely to contain it; but the complexity of containment pruning is still unclear even for monotone submodular functions, and essentially open for non-monotone functions. We investigate this complexity directly: can larger pruning budgets beat the classical $1 - 1/e$ monotone barrier, and can non-monotone objectives admit constant-factor budget-range containment?

1.1 Contributions

- **Tight monotone pruning.** We fully characterize monotone cardinality pruning: standard greedy gives simultaneous $(1 - 1/e)$ -containment for every $k' \leq k$ [1, 19], and no algorithm can guarantee a larger factor for any pruning budget $p \geq k$, even when it may output any set P with $|P| \leq p$ (Theorem 3.1). The hardness extends to monotone γ -weakly DR functions and yields the tight $1 - \kappa/e$ curvature barrier (Corollary 3.3). We also give a near-linear threshold-greedy variant that obtains $(1 - 1/e - \varepsilon)$ -containment with $O(k/\varepsilon)$ elements and $\tilde{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$ value queries (Theorem C.1).
- **Non-monotone pruning at $1/2$.** We give the first constant-factor budget-range containment guarantees for non-negative non-monotone submodular functions under cardinality constraints. Sequential disjoint greedy and a one-pass window method both approach $\alpha = 1/2$ while preserving every budget $k' \leq k$ (Theorems 4.1 and 4.3). This factor strictly exceeds the best known non-monotone maximization ratio (0.401 [4]) and the best possible optimization ratio under standard assumptions (0.478 [5]). This is possible because containment only asks

Question	Setting	Prior	This paper
Does extra pruning budget help?	Monotone card.	Greedy: $1 - 1/e$ at $p = k$	$1 - 1/e$ for every $p \geq k$, with matching hardness
Can pruning be faster?	Monotone card.	Greedy: $O(nk)$ queries	$1 - 1/e - \varepsilon$ with $ P = O(k/\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$ queries
Can we prune non-monotone objectives?	Non-monotone card.	No constant-factor budget-range guarantee	$1/2 - \varepsilon$ via sequential disjoint greedy or window pruning
Can this extend beyond cardinality?	Non-monotone knapsack	No non-monotone guarantee; NK25 gives monotone weak-submodular	$1/2 - \varepsilon$ minus boundary term; clean under small items

Table 1: Main theoretical results, organized by the questions they answer. Blue marks new contributions. The first row closes monotone cardinality pruning: extra pruning budget cannot beat greedy’s $1 - 1/e$ factor. For non-monotone cardinality, the gap between $1/2$ and the inherited $1 - 1/e$ upper bound remains open; the knapsack result has the boundary-term caveat shown in the table, with a clean small-item corollary.

the pruned set to *contain* a good feasible solution, not to extract it. Thus, containment pruning is provably easier than optimization in this setting.

- **Extensions beyond cardinality.** The non-monotone analysis extends to knapsack constraints via sequential disjoint density-greedy (Theorem 4.5). The split-item analysis gives $(1/2 - \varepsilon)\text{OPT}_{B'}$ minus an explicit boundary-fragment term for every budget $B' \leq B$. This term accounts for the last density-greedy item crossing the budget boundary. Under a standard small-item condition, it is absorbed and the clean $1/2 - \varepsilon$ guarantee is recovered (Corollary 4.6). The output has total cost $O(B/\varepsilon)$ and uses $O(n^2/\varepsilon)$ value queries.
- **Empirical validation.** On MaxCut, pruning a $G(300, 4500)$ instance to $p = 50$ vertices lets an exact IP solver finish in 0.19s instead of 120s, a $\approx 620\times$ speedup while preserving $\alpha = 1.000$. An adapted COMBHelper baseline is competitive on in-distribution random graphs but degrades on out-of-distribution SNAP graphs; our provable methods require no training data. For LLM context selection, 38.7% of HotpotQA questions exhibit non-monotone context effects. A non-monotone proxy $\hat{f}(S) = \text{FL}(S) - \theta(|S|)$ shows promise as a context-selection objective: on a 50-question MuSiQue pilot, relevance-gated pruning improves gold-passage recall by +9.2 percentage points at $k = 10$.

Paper organization. Section 2 collects notation and background. Section 3 presents the monotone hardness result. Section 4 develops both non-monotone containment algorithms. Section 5 reports experiments on LLM context selection, MaxCut, and synthetic non-monotone instances. Section 6 discusses open problems. Appendix A compares containment with bicriteria approximation, composable coresets, streaming summaries, and two-stage optimization.

2 Preliminaries

This section fixes notation and collects the density-dependent maximization bounds that serve as reference points throughout the paper. The two key quantities to keep in mind are the *containment factor* α (how well a pruned set represents the full ground set) and the *density* $c = k/n$ (which governs both the best achievable approximation and the composition bound of §3). Readers familiar with submodular maximization may skim this section and refer back as needed.

Let N be a finite ground set with $|N| = n$. A function $f: 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *submodular* if for all $A \subseteq B \subseteq N$ and $x \notin B$, $f(x | A) \geq f(x | B)$, where $f(x | A) = f(A \cup \{x\}) - f(A)$ denotes the marginal gain. We assume f is non-negative; note that $f(\emptyset) = 0$ is *not* required—our proofs carry $f(\emptyset)$ explicitly where it appears. The function is *monotone* if $f(A) \leq f(B)$ whenever $A \subseteq B$. For $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, the function is γ -*weakly DR* (diminishing returns) if $f(x | A) \geq \gamma \cdot f(x | B)$ for all $A \subseteq B$ and $x \notin B$; at $\gamma = 1$ this is ordinary submodularity. The *total curvature* of a monotone function is $\kappa = 1 - \min_{j \in N} f(j | N \setminus \{j\})/f(\{j\})$; at $\kappa = 0$ the function is modular.

We write O for an optimal solution: $O \in \arg \max_{|T| \leq k} f(T)$, and $\text{OPT} = f(O)$. The *density* of the constraint is $c = k/n$.

2.1 Known density-dependent results

Monotone. The Measured Continuous Greedy (MCG)—a continuous-relaxation algorithm that iteratively pushes a fractional solution toward the multilinear extension’s gradient—achieves approximation ratio $\alpha^*(c) = 1 - (1 - c)^{1/c}$ at density c , which is tight (Feldman & Kuhnle [2], Theorems 4–5). Concretely: $\alpha^*(c) \rightarrow 1 - 1/e \approx 0.632$ as $c \rightarrow 0$, $\alpha^*(1/2) \approx 0.750$, $\alpha^*(0.9) \approx 0.935$, and $\alpha^*(c) \rightarrow 1$ as $c \rightarrow 1$. This function governs the composition bound in §3 and tells us how much “easier” maximization becomes as the pruned set shrinks the effective ground set.

Non-monotone. Buchbinder, Feldman, Naor, and Schwartz (BFNS) [3] give the density-dependent bound

$$\alpha_{\text{nm}}^*(c) = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{e} + 0.004, \left(1 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{c(1-c)}} \right)^{-1} \right\} - o(1).$$

Concretely, this function is nearly flat across the density regime relevant to pruning: $\alpha_{\text{nm}}^*(0.01) \approx 0.372$, $\alpha_{\text{nm}}^*(0.1) \approx 0.400$, $\alpha_{\text{nm}}^*(0.2) \approx 0.444$, rising to $1/2$ at $c = 1/2$ (tight by the symmetry gap [6, 7]). Buchbinder and Feldman [4] subsequently achieved 0.401 for all down-closed constraints (density-independent). The combined best is $\max(0.401, \alpha_{\text{nm}}^*(c))$. The strongest hardness is 0.478 due to Qi [5], improving the earlier 0.491 of Gharan and Vondrák [6]. The small spread $[0.401, 0.5]$ across all densities is why the composition bound does essentially no work in the non-monotone setting (§4).

One additional non-monotone baseline—the three-term CDG guarantee of [3]—is used only in the warm-start analysis and is stated in Appendix B.

3 Monotone Pruning

Does extra budget help? The simplest way to analyze pruning is *composition*: prune to p elements, then run the best optimization algorithm on the pruned set. If the pruned set has containment factor α and the optimizer has approximation ratio $\alpha^*(k/p)$, the combined guarantee is at most $\alpha \cdot \alpha^*(k/p)$. Since this cannot exceed the information-theoretic limit on the original problem, we obtain $\alpha \leq \alpha^*(k/n)/\alpha^*(k/p)$. At $p = k$ this recovers $\alpha \leq 1 - 1/e$, but it weakens as p

grows. The following theorem resolves the remaining question directly: extra budget truly cannot help.

Theorem 3.1 (Pruning Hardness for Monotone γ -Weakly DR Functions). *For every $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, every $\varepsilon > 0$, and every polynomial $C(\cdot)$, there exists $k_0 = k_0(\gamma, \varepsilon, C)$ such that for all $k \geq k_0$ and every $p \geq k$: no (possibly randomized) algorithm making at most $C(|N|)$ value queries and outputting $P \subseteq N$ with $|P| \leq p$ can guarantee*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{S \subseteq P, |S| \leq k} f(S) \right] > (1 - e^{-\gamma} + \varepsilon) \cdot \text{OPT}_k$$

for all monotone γ -weakly DR $f: 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $|N| = \lceil 60p/\varepsilon \rceil$. At $\gamma = 1$ (full submodularity), this recovers the tight bound $\alpha \leq 1 - 1/e$. In particular, extra budget beyond k provably does not improve the containment factor for any constant or growing multiple of k .

Proof sketch (full proof in Appendix E). The core idea is a cancellation that neutralizes extra budget. We set $|N| = \lceil 3p/\varepsilon' \rceil$ and plant a random optimum \tilde{T} of size k using the construction of Harshaw et al. [16]. Any algorithm's output P (with $|P| \leq p$) is indistinguishable from the null instance, so P is effectively fixed before \tilde{T} is drawn. The expected overlap is then at most $\mathbb{E}[|P \cap \tilde{T}|] \leq pk/|N| \leq \varepsilon'k/3$, which is *independent of p* : the pruning-budget factor in the numerator cancels with the one in the denominator ($|N| \propto p$). A concentration bound shows that with high probability, P has too little overlap with \tilde{T} for any k -subset of P to beat the null-instance value $1 - e^{-\gamma} + O(\varepsilon)$. \square

Remark 3.2. The proof uses two separate hypergeometric tails. First, along the null-instance transcript, every query is hidden unless it has unusually large overlap with the random planted set; a two-regime bound covers both $p = O(k)$ and $p \gg k$. Second, after the null transcript fixes the output P , the expected overlap $\mathbb{E}[|P \cap \tilde{T}|] \leq \varepsilon'k/3$ is independent of p . Thus the extra budget cancels in the hiding argument rather than revealing more of the planted optimum.

Real-world submodular functions—coverage, influence, facility location—often have total curvature $\kappa < 1$, meaning elements retain marginal value even in the presence of many others. For maximization, low curvature yields strictly better approximation ($1 - \kappa/e$ vs. $1 - 1/e$). One might hope that low curvature similarly helps pruning. The next result shows it does not: greedy at $p = k$ is already optimal for every curvature level.

Corollary 3.3 (Pruning Hardness with Bounded Total Curvature). *Let $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ denote total curvature: $\kappa = 1 - \min_{j \in N} f(j \mid N \setminus \{j\})/f(j)$. For every $p \geq k$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, no algorithm using polynomially many value queries can prune to p elements with containment $\alpha > 1 - \kappa/e + \varepsilon$ for all monotone submodular functions with total curvature at most κ . Since the algorithm of Sviridenko, Vondrák & Ward [18] achieves $\alpha = 1 - \kappa/e$, this bound is tight. (At $\kappa = 0$ the function is modular, so exact containment is trivial.)*

Proof. See Appendix F. \square

For general monotone submodular functions, greedy achieves $1 - 1/e$ and the hardness matches it at every pruning budget $p \geq k$. Table 4 (Appendix F) records how this compares with the composition benchmark.

Remark 3.4 (Fast budget-range pruning). Standard greedy attains $\alpha = 1 - 1/e$ in $O(nk)$ queries via its prefix property [19]. A small-budget grid plus a geometric sweep of $O((1 + \log k)/\varepsilon)$ calls to the threshold greedy of [38] achieves exact-size $(1 - 1/e - \varepsilon)$ -containment for all $k' \leq k$ simultaneously,

with $|P| = O(k/\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$ total queries (Theorem C.1, Appendix C). The proof first obtains a slightly oversized witness and then thins it to size k' ; monotone submodularity loses only an $O(\varepsilon)$ multiplicative factor.

4 Non-Monotone Pruning

Why composition fails for non-monotone functions. In the monotone setting, composition at least gives the right answer at $p = k$ (even though it fails at larger budgets). For non-monotone objectives, composition is nearly useless even at $p = k$. The reason is that non-monotone approximation ratios barely change with density: the best ratio ranges from 0.401 at low density to 0.5 at high density. Since the numerator and denominator of the composition bound $\alpha \leq \alpha_{\text{nm}}^*(k/n)/\alpha_{\text{nm}}^*(k/p)$ are nearly equal, the bound stays close to 1 for moderate pruning budgets and approaches the vacuous bound 1 as p grows. Entirely new techniques are needed.

Can we prune non-monotone functions? We show that $O(k)$ elements suffice for 1/2-factor containment. For the top budget k , storing the output of the 0.401-approximation of [4] gives only a single-budget optimization baseline; our guarantee is budget-range containment.

Theorem 4.1 (Universal 1/2 Containment). *Let f be a non-negative submodular function on ground set N , and let $k \leq n$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a set $G \subseteq N$ with $|G| = O(k/\varepsilon)$ such that for every $k' \leq k$, (if $|N| < \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil k$, take $G = N$; containment is exact and $|G| < \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil k = O(k/\varepsilon)$)*

$$\max_{T \subseteq G, |T| \leq k'} f(T) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon\right) \cdot \text{OPT}_{k'},$$

where $\text{OPT}_{k'} = \max_{|S| \leq k'} f(S)$. Moreover, G can be constructed in $O(nk/\varepsilon)$ oracle queries ($\ell = \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil$ greedy passes, each scanning $O(n)$ elements at k steps).

Proof sketch (full proof in Appendix G). Construction. Run ℓ independent greedy runs G_1, \dots, G_ℓ , each of size k , on disjoint portions of the ground set. The pruned set is $G = \bigcup_i G_i$ with $|G| = \ell k$. Some optimal elements may lie outside G ; call these $\hat{O} = O \setminus G$ (“missed” elements, $b = |\hat{O}|$), and let A_i be the first b elements of each greedy run i .

Averaging. Because the runs are disjoint, their collective “damage” to $f(O)$ is bounded: the total loss $\sum_i [f(O) - f(O \cup A_i)]$ is at most $f(O)$. By averaging, some run i^* satisfies $f(O \cup A_{i^*}) \geq (1 - 1/\ell)f(O)$.

Greedy domination. The key insight is that greedy run i^* had access to the missed elements \hat{O} as candidates but chose A_{i^*} instead. So each greedy pick has marginal gain at least as large as the corresponding missed element. Telescoping this chain gives $2f(A) - f(\emptyset) \geq f(\hat{O} \cup A)$: the greedy prefix captures at least half the value of the prefix augmented with the missed elements.

Combining. A submodularity decomposition yields $\max(f(A), f(\hat{O} \cup A)) \geq (1 - 1/\ell)f(O)/2$, where $\hat{O} = O \cap G$ is the part of OPT already in G . Both candidates are feasible subsets of G with size at most k' , giving $\alpha \geq (1/2)(1 - 1/\ell)$. The argument applies uniformly to every target budget $k' \leq k$. \square

Remark 4.2 (Where the 1/2 comes from, and why it is robust). The 1/2 factor arises from two tight ingredients: (a) the greedy domination bound $2f(A) - f(\emptyset) \geq f(\hat{O} \cup A)$, where the non-monotone marginal chain only gives a factor of 2 (vs. the $(1 - 1/e)^{-1}$ one gets for monotone); and (b) the $\max \geq \text{sum}/2$ split in the final step. Neither bound depends on $|G|$, so the 1/2 is robust to increasing the pruning budget—with pruning budget $p = \ell k$, the containment factor is

$\frac{1}{2}(1 - 1/\ell)$: $\ell = 2$ gives $\alpha \geq 1/4$, while $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ recovers $1/2$. Note this is *not* bicriteria: both candidate solutions A and $\dot{O} \cup A$ satisfy $|T| \leq k$, improving over the bicriteria result of Feldman and Kuhnle [2] ($(1/2 - \varepsilon)$ with output size $\sim 1.44k$). The $1/2$ is reminiscent of the unconstrained non-monotone hardness of [8], but the analogy is suggestive rather than exact, and closing the gap to $1 - 1/e$ remains open (§6).

A natural warm-start approach via the BFNS continuous double greedy [3] peaks at $4/9 \approx 0.444$ and cannot beat $1/2$; see Appendix I for details.

A second proof via window containment. Sequential disjoint greedy requires ℓ independent passes over the ground set. We now give a structurally distinct proof of $1/2$ -containment using a single-pass *window* algorithm (Algorithm 1, Appendix J) that achieves the same factor with a larger accumulated-window output. At each step, we maintain a window W_t of the top- ωk elements by marginal gain and pick one uniformly at random; the window parameter $\omega \geq 1$ controls the width of exploration (larger ω means a wider pool of candidates per step, at the cost of retaining all windows and hence a larger pruned set of size at most $k + \omega k^2$). This simultaneously guarantees *domination* (every window element has marginal gain at least as large as any non-window element, so a random pick dominates any missed OPT element) and *degradation control* (the OPT value is not destroyed by the elements we commit to: $\mathbb{E}[f(O \cup S_m)] \geq e^{-1/\omega} f(O)$).

Theorem 4.3 (Window Containment — Unconditional). *For any non-negative submodular f and window parameter $\omega \geq 1$, Algorithm 1 returns an accumulated-window set $P_k \subseteq N$ with $|P_k| \leq k + \omega k^2$ such that, for every $k' \leq k$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{|T| \leq k', T \subseteq P_k} f(T) \right] \geq \frac{e^{-1/\omega}}{2} \cdot \text{OPT}_{k'} \quad (\text{asymptotically as } k \rightarrow \infty).$$

The finite- k lower bound from the proof is $(1 - 1/(\omega k))^k / 2 = e^{-1/\omega} (1 - O(1/(\omega^2 k))) / 2$; in particular, $\alpha \rightarrow 1/2$ as $\omega \rightarrow \infty$. Total query complexity: $O(nk)$. Full proof in Appendix J; see Table 5 there for the guarantee as a function of ω (at $\omega = 5$, $\alpha \geq 0.410 > 0.401$).

Remark 4.4 (Window Pruning). Window containment is structurally distinct from sequential disjoint greedy (Theorem 4.1): it makes a single wide-exploration pass rather than ℓ independent narrow searches. Both converge to the same $1/2$ barrier, suggesting it may be a fundamental limit.

Knapsack extension. The SDG argument extends beyond cardinality constraints to knapsack constraints, where each element u has a positive cost p_u and a feasible solution must have total cost at most B . (We assume $p_u \leq B$ for every element, since items too expensive to use alone can be discarded.) The key change is replacing greedy—which picks the element with the highest marginal gain—by *density-greedy*, which picks the element with the highest *value-per-unit-cost*: at each step, select u maximizing $f(u | A)/p_u$, and keep it if adding it stays within cost $3B$. Running ℓ disjoint density-greedy passes (with dummy zero-value items to fill each run to cost $2B$, following [2]) produces the pruned set.

Theorem 4.5 (Knapsack budget-range containment). *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, sequential disjoint density-greedy with $\ell = \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil$ runs produces a set $P \subseteq N$ with $c(P) \leq 3\ell B = O(B/\varepsilon)$ such that for every $B' \in (0, B]$ there exists $Q \subseteq P$ with*

$$c(Q) \leq B', \quad f(Q) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon\right) \text{OPT}_{B'} - \Delta_{B'},$$

where $\Delta_{B'} \geq 0$ is a boundary-fragment loss that arises when the density-greedy prefix crosses the budget threshold mid-item. When no item is split, $\Delta_{B'} = 0$. Total query complexity: $O(n^2\ell) = O(n^2/\varepsilon)$ (ℓ adaptive density-greedy runs, each scanning $O(n)$ candidates per step).

The boundary term $\Delta_{B'}$ arises when the density-greedy prefix “overshoots” the budget—the last item added may cost more than the remaining budget allows. In that case, only a fraction γ of the item’s value is captured, and the remaining value is lost. Formally, $\Delta_{B'} = \gamma_{i^*} f(\{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}\})$, where $a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}$ is the item that crosses the budget boundary; see Appendix D for precise definitions. The split item may cost more than B' itself, so $\Delta_{B'}$ cannot be bounded simply by the value of the best affordable item.

Corollary 4.6 (Small-item knapsack containment). *Fix a budget range $\mathcal{B} \subseteq (0, B]$ and let $B_{\min} = \inf \mathcal{B} > 0$. Run sequential disjoint density-greedy with a sufficiently small internal accuracy parameter. Suppose that the item sizes are small at the density prefix scale used in the proof: for every $B' \in \mathcal{B}$, if the proof for B' selects a split boundary item $a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}$ with residual outside-core cost $\beta = c(O \setminus P)$, then*

$$p_{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}} \leq \eta\beta.$$

In particular, this is the usual no-large-items regime when the relevant residual prefixes have cost comparable to the query budget; over a fixed range it is ensured by $p_{\max} \leq \eta B_{\min}$ together with $\beta = \Omega(B_{\min})$ for the budgets under consideration. There is a universal constant C such that, if $\eta \leq \varepsilon/C$, then for every $B' \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists $Q \subseteq P$ with

$$c(Q) \leq B', \quad f(Q) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon\right) \text{OPT}_{B'}.$$

The proof adapts the sequential disjoint greedy argument of Theorem 4.1 to density-greedy with item splitting, using the machinery of [2]. The proof sketch, simultaneous budget-range guarantee, knapsack hardness argument, and boundary-term discussion appear in Appendix D; the full proof is in Appendix H.3.

5 Experiments

In this section, we ask whether containment cores are useful preprocessing objects. We show three messages. First, on MaxCut, our pruning algorithms usually retain an optimal or near-optimal k -cut and can shrink an exact IP solve by orders of magnitude. Second, on HotpotQA, LLM context selection is genuinely non-monotone: adding passages can hurt answer quality, and pruning a non-monotone proxy improves downstream F1/EM while using fewer passages. Third, on MuSiQue, the task has the containment structure pruning is designed for: keep evidence-bearing passages in a reduced pool while filtering distractors. We show that relevance-gated submodular diversity improves gold-passage recall over relevance ranking alone.

Section 5.1 studies MaxCut on random and real-world graphs, including exact solving on pruned instances. Section 5.2 studies LLM context selection. Appendices L and M report COMBHelper details and synthetic separations. Unless stated otherwise, an algorithm receives a ground set \mathcal{N} , cardinality k , and pruning budget $p = \omega k$, outputs P with $|P| \leq p$, and then a k -subset is extracted from P by greedy or by exact IP. When exact optimization is feasible, the containment ratio is $\alpha = f(S_P^*)/\text{OPT}_k$, where S_P^* is the best k -set inside the pruned universe. When OPT is unavailable, we explicitly say which full-ground-set reference is used.

Algorithms. We compare seven methods: **SeqDisjoint** (Theorem 4.1): ω disjoint greedy runs of size k ; **WindowMax** / **WindowRand**: practical window heuristics with argmax / random selection from top- ωk marginals; **QuickPrune** [19]: streaming threshold pruning (monotone only—no guarantee for non-monotone); **StdGreedy**: standard greedy for p steps; **Random**: uniform random p elements; **COMBHelper** [29]: a learned GNN pruning baseline, adapted to MaxCut; architecture, training, seed variance, and out-of-distribution behavior are deferred to Appendix L.

5.1 MaxCut on random and real-world graphs

MaxCut asks whether pruning can preserve good solutions for a standard non-monotone objective. The objective is $f(S) = |\{(u, v) \in E : u \in S, v \notin S\}|$. It is non-monotone because adding a vertex can remove edges from the cut. We test on Erdős–Rényi random graphs $G(n, m)$, planted partition graphs, and SNAP social networks (Facebook, $n = 4039$, $m = 88,234$). For the small instances in Table 2, OPT is computed exactly via integer programming (CBC). For the larger SNAP instances, OPT is estimated by greedy on the full ground set, so reported α values are upper bounds on the true containment ratio rather than certified guarantees. The table also includes COMBHelper on its in-distribution Erdős–Rényi setting; we defer its teacher/student split and transfer behavior to the appendix.

Algorithm	Random $G(100, 1000)$, $k = 15$			Planted(200, 20)		
	$\omega = 2$	$\omega = 3$	$\omega = 5$	$\omega = 2$	$\omega = 3$	$\omega = 5$
SeqDisjoint	0.997	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
WindowMax	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
WindowRand	0.975	0.967	0.984	0.988	0.983	0.982
QuickPrune	0.868	0.878	0.853	0.865	0.876	0.874
StdGreedy	0.997	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
COMBHelper [†]	0.997	1.000	1.000	–	–	–
Random	0.877	0.921	0.966	0.699	0.805	0.902

Table 2: MaxCut containment on small instances, where exact IP gives the true denominator OPT_k . SeqDisjoint (Thm 4.1) and WindowMax consistently achieve $\alpha \geq 0.99$, far above the worst-case $1/2$ guarantee. Results are stable across graph topologies: over 5 ER seeds, SeqDisjoint and WindowMax have mean $\alpha \geq 0.996$ (std ≤ 0.004), while the random baseline has std in $[0.013, 0.040]$. COMBHelper[†] is the adapted learned baseline on the ER setting; teacher and student give the same values there, so we show one compact row and defer the full learned-pruning comparison to Appendix L. QuickPrune, designed for monotone functions, plateaus at $\alpha \approx 0.87$ regardless of budget: once the non-monotone marginal sequence turns negative, its streaming threshold accepts too few elements ($|P| \approx 18\text{--}27 \ll p$).

SNAP social networks and exact solving. The same pattern persists on larger graphs, but the interpretation changes. On Facebook ($n = 4039$) and Wiki-Vote ($n = 7115$) with $k = 50$, exact OPT is unavailable; using the full-ground-set greedy solution as the reference, SeqDisjoint, WindowMax, and StdGreedy all obtain ratio 1.000 at every tested budget, while QuickPrune plateaus near 0.87 (details in Appendix L). These are empirical ratios against the greedy reference, not certified OPT ratios.

Pruning also reduces solver size. On a medium instance $G(300, 4500)$ with $k = 25$, where full IP still finishes, solving MaxCut on the full graph takes 120 s. After SeqDisjoint pruning to $p = 50$

vertices ($\omega = 2$), the same IP solve on the reduced instance takes 0.19s—a $\approx 620\times$ **speedup** with $\alpha = 1.000$.

Baselines and separations. COMBHelper is competitive in distribution, but it is a learned baseline that requires exact training labels; Appendix L gives the teacher/student results, seed-variance check, and out-of-distribution SNAP comparison. The appendix also reports synthetic interference-coverage instances where SeqDisjoint contains the true optimum more often than a single greedy run (78% vs. 60% at $n = 20$, $k = 3$, $\omega = 2$; Appendix M).

5.2 Non-monotone LLM context selection

This subsection separates two roles for LLM context selection. HotpotQA tests whether context selection is genuinely non-monotone and whether a cheap submodular proxy can guide pruning toward higher-quality reader inputs. MuSiQue then tests the containment claim: when supporting evidence is dispersed across hops, a pruner should keep evidence-bearing passages available for a downstream selector or reader rather than output the final context itself.

Adding context passages to an LLM prompt initially improves answer quality but degrades it beyond a threshold—the “lost in the middle” effect [24, 25]. This makes context selection a natural source of non-monotone objectives: more candidate passages can improve coverage, but more prompt context can also dilute attention or introduce distracting evidence.

A non-monotone submodular proxy. We introduce a *non-monotone submodular proxy* $\hat{f}(S) = \text{FL}(S) - \theta(|S|)$, where FL is facility location on TF-IDF passage similarities and θ is a convex, non-decreasing penalty fitted via isotonic regression from LLM evaluation data. Departing from prior submodular-LLM work [21, 22, 23, 40], which uses monotone facility location exclusively, our proxy captures the empirically observed quality degradation from context overload. The function \hat{f} is submodular (proof in Appendix L).

HotpotQA proxy containment. We test on HotpotQA (distractor setting) with expanded ground sets of $n = 50$ ($k = 3$) and $n = 500$ ($k = 5$); setup details are in Appendix L. On the fitted proxy, SeqDisjoint and WindowMax achieve $\alpha = 1.0$ at every budget (Table 7, Appendix L); a larger $n = 500$ FL-only stress test in Appendix L shows that $50\times$ compression preserves FL containment $\alpha = 1.000$.

Non-monotonicity prevalence and LLM validation. Among 200 HotpotQA questions evaluated with a local 120B-parameter LLM, $77/199 = 38.7\%$ have some shorter prefix with higher F1 than the full 10-passage context, confirming that non-monotonicity is common enough that monotone-only pruning can miss the relevant regime. To verify that proxy containment translates to real answer quality, we evaluate the final k -subsets with the LLM (Table 3). At $\omega = 2$ ($p = 6$), proxy-guided greedy selects only $k = 3$ passages yet achieves F1/EM = 0.599/0.42, surpassing the all-original baseline (F1/EM = 0.556/0.40, all 10 passages). This supports the proxy claim: pruning can remove distractors while preserving enough evidence for the reader. QuickPrune, which collapses on non-monotone inputs, scores only F1 = 0.262—no better than random.

Relevance-gated passage selection (MuSiQue). HotpotQA supports the proxy claim, but its gold passages are highly query-salient (top- k TF-IDF already achieves $\sim 80\%$ gold recall). MuSiQue [42] stresses the harder setting: gold passages span different Wikipedia entities (BM25@5

gold recall only 39%), and 48% of questions require 3–4 supporting passages. We define a *restricted facility-location* (RFL) function that diversifies within the query-relevant neighborhood (Appendix L). On a 50-question pilot, RFL with embedding-based gating achieves gold-passage recall of 0.740 at $k = 10$, versus 0.648 for top- k TF-IDF (+9.2 percentage points; bootstrap 95% CI [+2.8, +15.5] percentage points, $n = 50$); per- k breakdowns are in Appendix L. These experiments suggest that non-monotone submodular pruning is a viable approach to LLM context selection; a comprehensive study across tasks and reader models is future work (downstream F1 and reader saturation in Appendix L).

Algorithm	F1	EM	Proxy α	Gold/ k	$ P $
<i>Gold only</i>	0.641	0.44	—	2.00	2
<i>All original</i>	0.556	0.40	—	2.00	10
StdGreedy ($\omega=2$)	0.599	0.42	1.00	1.02	6
SeqDisjoint ($\omega=2$)	0.595	0.40	1.00	1.02	6
SeqDisjoint ($\omega=5$)	0.509	0.36	1.00	1.02	15
WindowMax ($\omega=5$)	0.431	0.26	1.00	0.74	5.2
QuickPrune	0.262	0.12	0.84	0.36	1.1
Random	0.274	0.16	0.79	0.38	15

Table 3: LLM validation of proxy-guided pruning on HotpotQA ($n = 50$, $k = 3$, 50 questions). Proxy α is measured on \hat{f} ; F1/EM are computed by the LLM on the selected k -subsets, and Gold/ k is the average number of gold passages selected. Proxy-guided pruning at $\omega = 2$ matches or exceeds the full-context baseline while using only $k = 3$ passages. The gold-only oracle (F1 = 0.641 > 0.556) confirms non-monotonicity of the true quality function.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we make substantial progress towards resolving the complexity of pruning for submodular maximization. Monotone containment is tight at $1 - 1/e$: greedy achieves it and no algorithm can beat it, regardless of pruning budget (Theorem 3.1). For non-monotone functions, two independent algorithms achieve $1/2 - \varepsilon$ containment under cardinality constraints (Theorems 4.1, 4.3), with a knapsack extension (Theorem 4.5). Since $1/2$ exceeds the best non-monotone maximization ratio (0.401) and the known hardness threshold (0.478), pruning is provably easier than optimization. Several open questions remain: the gap from $[1/2, 1 - 1/e]$ in the non-monotone setting, and tight algorithms for more sophisticated constraints in the monotone setting. Empirically, pruning let an exact IP solver run $\approx 620\times$ faster on a reduced MaxCut instance; LLM context selection exhibited genuinely non-monotone behavior in the HotpotQA study (38.7% of questions), and a relevance-gated submodular proxy improved gold-passage recall by +9.2 percentage points on a 50-question MuSiQue pilot.

References

- [1] G. L. Nemhauser, L. A. Wolsey. Best algorithms for approximating the maximum of a submodular set function. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 3(3):177–188, 1978.
- [2] M. Feldman, A. Kuhnle. Bicriteria submodular maximization. *Mathematical Programming*, submitted, 2025. arXiv:2507.10248.

- [3] N. Buchbinder, M. Feldman, J. Naor, R. Schwartz. Submodular maximization with cardinality constraints. *Proc. SODA*, 2014.
- [4] N. Buchbinder, M. Feldman. Constrained submodular maximization via new bounds for DR-submodular functions. *Proc. STOC*, 2024. arXiv:2311.01129.
- [5] B. Qi. On maximizing sums of non-monotone submodular and linear functions. *Proc. ISAAC*, 2022. arXiv:2205.15874.
- [6] S. Oveis Gharan, J. Vondrák. Submodular maximization by simulated annealing. *Proc. SODA*, 2011. arXiv:1007.1632.
- [7] J. Vondrák. Symmetry and approximability of submodular maximization problems. *SIAM J. Computing*, 42(1):265–304, 2013.
- [8] U. Feige, V. S. Mirrokni, J. Vondrák. Maximizing non-monotone submodular functions. *SIAM J. Computing*, 40(4):1133–1153, 2011.
- [9] A. Kuhnle. Quick streaming algorithms for maximization of monotone submodular functions in linear time. *Proc. AISTATS*, 2021.
- [10] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, E. Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. *Proc. KDD*, 2003.
- [11] A. Krause, A. Singh, C. Guestrin. Near-optimal sensor placements in Gaussian processes: Theory, efficient algorithms and empirical studies. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9:235–284, 2008.
- [12] A. Das, D. Kempe. Submodular meets spectral: Greedy algorithms for subset selection, sparse approximation and dictionary selection. *Proc. ICML*, 2011.
- [13] B. Mirzasoleiman, A. Badanidiyuru, A. Karbasi, J. Vondrák, A. Krause. Lazier than lazy greedy. *Proc. AAAI*, 2015. arXiv:1409.7938.
- [14] S. Tang. Data summarization beyond monotonicity: Non-monotone two-stage submodular maximization. arXiv:2309.05183, 2023.
- [15] N. Alaluf, A. Ene, M. Feldman, H. L. Nguyen, A. Suh. Optimal streaming algorithms for submodular maximization with cardinality constraints. *Proc. ICALP*, 2020. arXiv:1911.12959.
- [16] C. Harshaw, M. Feldman, J. Ward, A. Karbasi. Submodular maximization beyond non-negativity: Guarantees, fast algorithms, and applications. *Proc. ICML*, 2019. arXiv:1904.09354.
- [17] W. Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 58(301):13–30, 1963.
- [18] M. Sviridenko, J. Vondrák, J. Ward. Optimal approximation for submodular and supermodular optimization with bounded curvature. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 42(4):1197–1218, 2017. arXiv:1311.4728.
- [19] A. Nath, A. Kuhnle. Theoretically grounded pruning of large ground sets for constrained, discrete optimization. *Proc. AISTATS*, 2025. arXiv:2410.17945.

- [20] Y. Chen, W. Chen, A. Kuhnle. Breaking barriers: Combinatorial algorithms for non-monotone submodular maximization with sublinear adaptivity and $1/e$ approximation. *Proc. ICML*, 2025. arXiv:2502.07062.
- [21] L. Kumari, S. Wang, A. Das, T. Zhou, J. Bilmes. An end-to-end submodular framework for data-efficient in-context learning. *Proc. NAACL (Findings)*, 2024.
- [22] L. Kumari, S. Wang, T. Zhou, N. Sarda, A. Rowe, J. Bilmes. BumbleBee: Dynamic KV-cache streaming submodular summarization for infinite-context transformers. *Proc. COLM*, 2024.
- [23] I. Agarwal, K. Killamsetty, L. Popa, M. Danilevsky. DELIFT: Data efficient language model instruction fine-tuning. *Proc. ICLR*, 2025. arXiv:2411.04425.
- [24] N. F. Liu, K. Lin, J. Hewitt, A. Paranjape, M. Bevilacqua, F. Petroni, P. Liang. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173, 2024. arXiv:2307.03172.
- [25] Y. Du, M. Tian, S. Ronanki, S. Rongali, S. Bodapati, A. Galstyan, A. Wells, R. Schwartz, E. A. Huerta, H. Peng. Context length alone hurts LLM performance despite perfect retrieval. *Proc. EMNLP (Findings)*, 2025. arXiv:2510.05381.
- [26] T. Zhou, H. Ouyang, J. Bilmes, Y. Chang, C. Guestrin. Scaling submodular maximization via pruned submodularity graphs. *Proc. AISTATS*, 2017. arXiv:1606.00399.
- [27] S. Manchanda, A. Mittal, A. Dhawan, S. Medya, S. Ranu, A. Singh. GCOMB: Learning budget-constrained combinatorial algorithms over billion-sized graphs. *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [28] D. Ireland, G. Montana. LeNSE: Learning to navigate subgraph embeddings for large-scale combinatorial optimisation. *Proc. ICML*, 2022.
- [29] H. Tian, S. Medya, W. Ye. COMBHelper: A neural approach to reduce search space for graph combinatorial problems. *Proc. AAAI*, 2024.
- [30] J. Leskovec and A. Krevl. SNAP Datasets: Stanford large network dataset collection. <https://snap.stanford.edu/data>, 2014.
- [31] J. J. McAuley and J. Leskovec. Learning to discover social circles in ego networks. *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2012.
- [32] Z. Yang, P. Qi, S. Zhang, Y. Bengio, W. W. Cohen, R. Salakhutdinov, and C. D. Manning. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. *Proc. EMNLP*, 2018.
- [33] V. S. Mirrokni, M. Zadimoghaddam. Randomized composable core-sets for distributed submodular maximization. *Proc. STOC*, 2015.
- [34] P. Indyk, S. Mahabadi, M. Mahdian, V. S. Mirrokni. Composable core-sets for diversity and coverage maximization. *Proc. PODS*, 2014.
- [35] E. Balkanski, B. Mirzasoleiman, A. Krause, Y. Singer. Learning sparse combinatorial representations via two-stage submodular maximization. *Proc. ICML*, 2016.
- [36] K. Wei, R. Iyer, J. Bilmes. Fast multi-stage submodular maximization. *Proc. ICML*, 2014.

- [37] A. Badanidiyuru, B. Mirzasoleiman, A. Karbasi, A. Krause. Streaming submodular maximization: Massive data summarization on the fly. *Proc. KDD*, 2014.
- [38] A. Badanidiyuru, J. Vondrák. Fast algorithms for maximizing submodular functions. *Proc. SODA*, 2014.
- [39] M. Feldman, A. Karbasi, E. Kazemi. Do less, get more: Streaming submodular maximization with subsampling. *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2018. arXiv:1802.07098.
- [40] H. Lin, J. Bilmes. A class of submodular functions for document summarization. *Proc. ACL*, 2011.
- [41] L. Mualem, M. Feldman. Using partial monotonicity in submodular maximization. *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2022. arXiv:2202.03051.
- [42] H. Trivedi, N. Balasubramanian, T. Khot, A. Sabharwal. MuSiQue: Multihop questions via single hop question composition. *Trans. ACL*, 10:539–554, 2022.
- [43] Y. Kodama, M. Shumway, and R. Leinonen. The Sequence Read Archive: explosive growth of sequencing data. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 40(D1):D54–D56, 2012.
- [44] K. Katz, O. Shutov, R. Lapoint, M. Kimelman, J. R. Brister, and C. O’Sullivan. The Sequence Read Archive: a decade more of explosive growth. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 50(D1):D387–D390, 2022.
- [45] P. Villalobos, A. Ho, J. Sevilla, T. Besiroglu, L. Heim, and M. Hobbhahn. Will we run out of data? Limits of LLM scaling based on human-generated data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.04325*, 2022.

A Additional Related Work

Ground-set pruning. Nath and Kuhnle [19] introduced containment pruning and gave the first constant-factor guarantee ($\alpha \geq 1/24 - \varepsilon$) for monotone, γ -weakly submodular functions under a knapsack constraint via QUICKPRUNE. Zhou et al. [26] gave a heuristic ground-set reduction via “pruned submodularity graphs,” but without containment guarantees. Several learned approaches—GCOMB [27], LeNSE [28], and COMBHelper [29]—train pruning policies from data but likewise lack approximation guarantees; Nath and Kuhnle showed that QUICKPRUNE empirically dominates them on the monotone benchmarks studied there.

Bicriteria vs. containment. The bicriteria framework of Feldman and Kuhnle [2] outputs $1.44k$ elements containing a $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximate *solution*. This differs from containment in three respects: (i) bicriteria finds a specific approximate solution, whereas containment guarantees that near-optimal solutions *exist* in the pruned set for downstream re-optimization; (ii) bicriteria relaxes the budget ($1.44k$ vs. strict k), whereas containment enforces $|T| \leq k'$; (iii) bicriteria targets a single budget, whereas our model requires containment at all $k' \leq k$ simultaneously. The two models are complementary: bicriteria is stronger when one approximate solution suffices, containment is stronger when the pruned set must support multiple downstream tasks or budgets.

Coresets and distributed reduction. Composable coresets [33, 34] reduce the ground set to $O(k)$ elements for distributed submodular maximization. Mirrokni and Zadimoghaddam [33] achieve $1/3$ -approximation for monotone functions by merging local greedy summaries—this can be viewed as fixed-budget containment. However, their guarantee holds for a single fixed k and monotone objectives only; our budget-range formulation requires containment at all $k' \leq k$ simultaneously, our $1/2$ containment handles non-monotone functions, and our monotone bound $1 - 1/e$ is strictly stronger than $1/3$.

Two-stage and streaming approaches. Balkanski et al. [35] study a two-stage model achieving $\approx (1 - 1/e)$ -approximation, but their output is a *solution*, not a pruned universe with containment guarantees. Streaming algorithms similarly produce approximate solutions rather than pruned universes amenable to re-optimization: Sieve-Streaming [37] achieves $(1/2 - \varepsilon)$, and the optimal streaming bound was established by Alaluf et al. [15]. Wei et al. [36] use cheap surrogate submodular functions for multi-round data selection—the “optimize a proxy, then solve downstream” paradigm that our LLM experiments instantiate with the non-monotone proxy \hat{f} .

Hardness constructions. Our monotone lower bound uses the planted-set construction of Harshaw et al. [16], which hides a planted optimal set in the ground set: until the query set crosses an overlap threshold, the function is indistinguishable from a null instance with no hidden structure. This makes planted-set constructions well-suited to pruning hardness, because any algorithm’s output looks random with respect to the hidden optimum. The key technical insight for our result is that scaling $|N| \propto p$ makes the expected overlap between a p -element pruned set and the planted optimum *independent of p* , so extra budget provably does not help. This differs fundamentally from the *symmetry gap* technique [7, 6, 5]—the standard tool for submodular maximization hardness—which exploits group-invariance: the hard instance is a symmetrized function whose value depends only on a coarse orbit statistic (roughly, how the queried set distributes across a hidden partition of N), so *every* orbit-balanced subset of sufficient size is near-optimal. Any pruning algorithm that

retains an orbit-balanced slice of N —e.g., a uniform random $O(k)$ -subset—thus achieves containment close to the maximization ratio, making symmetry-gap constructions unsuitable for pruning lower bounds. The curvature-dependent hardness of Sviridenko et al. [18] inspires Corollary 3.3.

Non-monotone submodular maximization. Our containment results sit within the non-monotone approximation landscape anchored by two numbers: the 0.401-approximation of Buchbinder and Feldman [4] (best algorithm) and the 0.478-hardness of Qi [5] (strongest lower bound). The 1/2-hardness of Feige et al. [8] for unconstrained non-monotone maximization is suggestive—our two independent 1/2-containment proofs match this threshold—but no formal reduction to the containment setting is known.

Submodular optimization for NLP and LLMs. Lin and Bilmes [40] introduced facility-location functions for document summarization, establishing the submodular proxy paradigm. A growing line of work applies such proxies to LLM pipelines: Kumari et al. [21] for in-context example retrieval, BumbleBee [22] for KV-cache management, DELIFT [23] for instruction fine-tuning. All perform *selection*—choosing a single set of items to include—using monotone proxies, and none address what guarantees the pruning stage itself provides. Our work differs in two ways: we study *pruning* (reducing the ground set so that downstream solvers can find near-optimal solutions at any budget), and we introduce the first *non-monotone* proxy for context selection.

Non-monotonicity in LLM context. Liu et al. [24] document the “lost in the middle” phenomenon—LLMs degrade when relevant information is buried in long contexts—and Du et al. [25] show that context length alone hurts performance even with perfect retrieval. These findings motivate our non-monotone proxy $\hat{f} = \text{FL} - \theta$: the convex penalty θ , fitted from LLM evaluations via isotonic regression, models the empirical quality degradation that monotone proxies cannot capture.

B Deferred Preliminaries

BFNS Continuous Double Greedy with warm start. For completeness, we state the three-term guarantee from the Continuous Double Greedy (CDG) of [3], which we use in Appendix I to analyze a natural warm-start approach (and show it cannot beat 1/2):

Theorem B.1 (BFNS Theorem 3.7, adapted). *For a non-negative submodular function g on a ground set of size n with cardinality constraint k , let $v = n/k - 1$ and $s = \sqrt{v}$. CDG outputs a set D with $|D| \leq k$ satisfying*

$$g(D) \geq \frac{2s}{(s+1)^2} g(\text{OPT}_g) + \frac{v}{(s+1)^2} g(\emptyset) + \frac{1}{(s+1)^2} g(N).$$

In particular, at $v = 4$ (density $c = 1/5$), the coefficients on $g(\text{OPT}_g)$ and $g(\emptyset)$ are both 4/9.

The $g(\emptyset)$ term is normally zero for normalized functions, but becomes significant when CDG is applied to $g(S) = f(S \cup A)$ for a “warm start” set A : then $g(\emptyset) = f(A)$, which can be large.

C Fast Budget-Range Pruning

The monotone hardness shows that $\alpha = 1 - 1/e$ is the information-theoretic ceiling, and standard greedy [1] attains it at $|P| = k$ in $O(nk)$ value queries by virtue of its prefix property [19]: the size- k'

prefix of greedy's output achieves $(1 - 1/e) \text{OPT}_{k'}$ for every $k' \leq k$. For very large ground sets the $O(nk)$ query cost is the bottleneck, so it is natural to ask whether budget-range containment at the full $(1 - 1/e - \varepsilon)$ ratio is attainable with near-linear queries.

A simple application of existing single-budget machinery answers this affirmatively. Let $\text{THRESHOLDGREEDY}(N)$ denote Badanidiyuru and Vondrák's decreasing-threshold algorithm [38], which for monotone submodular f returns S with $|S| \leq k'$, $f(S) \geq (1 - 1/e - \eta) \text{OPT}_{k'}$, and query complexity $O((n/\eta) \log(n/\eta))$.

Theorem C.1 (Fast budget-range pruning). *Let $f: 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be monotone submodular, $k \leq |N|$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$. Set $\eta = \varepsilon/4$ and*

$$\mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, \min\{k, \lceil 1/\eta \rceil\}\} \cup \{\min\{k, \lceil (1 + \eta)^j \rceil\} : j = 0, 1, \dots, \lceil \log_{1+\eta} k \rceil\}.$$

let

$$P = \bigcup_{q \in \mathcal{K}} S_q, \quad S_q = \text{THRESHOLDGREEDY}(N, f, q, \eta).$$

Then $|P| = O(k/\varepsilon)$, the construction uses $\tilde{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$ value queries, and for every $k' \leq k$ there exists $Q \subseteq P$ with $|Q| \leq k'$ and

$$f(Q) \geq (1 - 1/e - \varepsilon) \text{OPT}_{k'}.$$

Proof overview. The proof uses two external tools and is otherwise a direct construction.

Step 1: Threshold greedy (imported). Run Badanidiyuru & Vondrák's decreasing-threshold algorithm [38] at a geometric grid of budgets. Its guarantee is stated in Fact C.2 below.

Step 2: Rounding down (imported). When the witness S_q overshoots the target budget k' , thin it to a random k' -subset using the standard monotone-submodular random-subset bound (Fact C.3).

Step 3: Union bound (original). The union of all threshold-greedy outputs has total size $O(k/\varepsilon)$ and query cost $\tilde{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$.

Fact C.2 (ThresholdGreedy guarantee). The decreasing-threshold greedy algorithm of Badanidiyuru and Vondrák [38] has the following guarantee. For monotone submodular f with cardinality constraint k' and accuracy parameter $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $\text{THRESHOLDGREEDY}(N, f, k', \eta)$ returns S with $|S| \leq k'$, $f(S) \geq (1 - 1/e - \eta) \text{OPT}_{k'}$, using $O((n/\eta) \log(n/\eta))$ value queries.

Fact C.3 (Random-subset bound). For monotone submodular functions, the following standard random-subset bound follows from Nemhauser and Wolsey [1]. Let f be monotone submodular and let S be a set of size s . If Q is a uniformly random q -subset of S with $q \leq s$, then $\mathbb{E}[f(Q)] \geq (q/s) f(S)$.

Proof. Size. The exact small-budget part contributes at most $O(\min\{k^2, \eta^{-2}\})$, which is $O(k/\eta)$ whether $k \leq 1/\eta$ or $k > 1/\eta$. The geometric part contributes $\sum_j O((1 + \eta)^j) = O(k/\eta)$. Thus $|P| \leq \sum_{q \in \mathcal{K}} q = O(k/\eta) = O(k/\varepsilon)$.

Queries. There are $O(\eta^{-1} + \log k/\eta)$ calls to THRESHOLDGREEDY , each using $O((n/\eta) \log(n/\eta))$ queries, for a total of $\tilde{O}(n/\eta^2) = \tilde{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$.

Containment. Fix $k' \leq k$. By construction there is a $q \in \mathcal{K}$ with $k' \leq q \leq (1 + 2\eta)k'$: if $k' \leq \lceil 1/\eta \rceil$ then take $q = k'$, and otherwise take the first geometric budget at least k' (the ceiling contributes at most $\eta k'$). By monotonicity of f , $\text{OPT}_q \geq \text{OPT}_{k'}$, so Fact C.2 gives

$$f(S_q) \geq (1 - 1/e - \eta) \text{OPT}_q \geq (1 - 1/e - \eta) \text{OPT}_{k'}.$$

If $|S_q| \leq k'$, take $Q = S_q$. Otherwise, let Q be a uniformly random k' -subset of S_q . By Fact C.3 with $s = |S_q|$ and $q = k'$:

$$\mathbb{E}[f(Q)] \geq \frac{k'}{|S_q|} f(S_q) \geq \frac{1}{1+2\eta} f(S_q) \geq (1-2\eta)f(S_q).$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[f(Q)] \geq (1-2\eta)(1-1/e-\eta) \text{OPT}_{k'} \geq (1-1/e-\varepsilon) \text{OPT}_{k'},$$

where the last inequality uses $\eta = \varepsilon/4$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$. Hence some realization of the thinning gives the claimed exact-size witness. \square

Remark C.4 (Rounding down witnesses). The thinning step is used only to certify exact-size containment. The pruning set itself still has size $O(k/\varepsilon)$; whether one can achieve the same all-budget guarantee with a core of size $O(k)$ and $o(nk)$ queries remains open.

D Knapsack Proof Sketch and Additional Remarks

Proof sketch. This sketches Theorem 4.5; the full proof appears in Appendix H.3. Fix a query budget $B' \in (0, B]$ and rerun the analysis for this budget. Let O be optimal for B' , let $\hat{O} = O \setminus P$ and $\dot{O} = O \cap P$, and set $\beta = c(\hat{O}) \leq B'$. If $\beta = 0$, then $O \subseteq P$ and $Q = O$ proves the claim. Assume $\beta > 0$.

For each density-greedy run i , take the prefix whose cost is exactly β . If this prefix cuts through original item $a_{j_i}^{(i)}$, apply the split operation of Definition H.1: write τ_i for the included fragment of $a_{j_i}^{(i)}$ and let the other fragment remain excluded. Thus A'_i is a set in the split ground set with $c(A'_i) = \beta$; it is either a real prefix or a real prefix plus the single included boundary fragment τ_i . Let f^* be the resulting split extension, and write S^\uparrow for the full lift of an original set S .

The sets A'_i are disjoint, so the same averaging step as in Theorem 4.1 gives a run i^* such that

$$f^*(O^\uparrow \cup A'_{i^*}) \geq (1-1/\ell)f(O).$$

Set $A = A'_{i^*}$. Since every element of \hat{O} survives all previous runs and is therefore a candidate throughout run i^* , the density-domination lemma (Lemma H.5) gives

$$f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A) \leq 2f^*(A) - f(\emptyset).$$

Submodularity applied to $\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A$ and $\dot{O}^\uparrow \cup A$ then implies

$$\max\{f^*(A), f^*(\dot{O}^\uparrow \cup A)\} \geq (1/2 - \varepsilon) \text{OPT}_{B'}.$$

To report a real feasible subset, delete the included boundary fragment from A if one exists; call the resulting original set \hat{A} . The candidates \hat{A} and $\dot{O} \cup \hat{A}$ both have cost at most B' . If the selected run has boundary fragment τ_{i^*} , let $a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}$ be the original item containing it and let γ_{i^*} be the included fraction of that item. Deleting the fragment loses at most $\Delta_{B'} = \gamma_{i^*} f(\{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}\})$; if no split occurs, $\Delta_{B'} = 0$. In the split case, the item $a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}$ is budget-specific, but it may still have $p_{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}} > B'$, so this loss cannot in general be charged to the best feasible singleton at budget B' . \square

Remark D.1 (Simultaneous guarantee across budgets). The pruned set P depends only on the master budget B , not on B' ; for each $B' \in (0, B]$, rerun the proof with that budget. The values β , the boundary fragments, and the averaged run i^* may all change with B' , but the underlying pruned set P is fixed. This extends the budget-range containment model of [19] (cardinality) to knapsack, with the explicit boundary-fragment loss in Theorem 4.5. The item-splitting machinery is imported from Feldman and Kuhnle [2], originally developed for their bicriteria knapsack algorithm; we restate the needed pieces self-contained in Appendix H and adapt the density-domination invariant to the source/target pair (\hat{O}, A) rather than their (E_2, E_1) .

Remark D.2 (Knapsack hardness inherited from cardinality). The monotone hardness of Theorem 3.1 ($1 - 1/e$ for every pruning budget) transfers verbatim to knapsack: a unit-cost instance is a cardinality instance, so any knapsack pruning algorithm that beat the $1 - 1/e$ barrier would also beat it under cardinality—a contradiction. The same argument shows the non-monotone upper bound $\leq 1 - 1/e$ holds for knapsack, placing all three settings in Table 1 within the gap $[1/2, 1 - 1/e]$.

Remark D.3 (Why the boundary term is explicit). A tempting shortcut is to drop the boundary fragment and compare the lost value to the singleton value of the boundary item. This gives a clean singleton-style guarantee for a *fixed* budget when the boundary item is itself feasible for that budget. For a query budget B' , however, the boundary item is simply the item that crosses the residual cost in the density order for the proof at B' . It can have cost larger than B' even though the included fragment has cost at most the residual budget, so the original item is not a feasible singleton witness. For this reason Theorem 4.5 keeps the boundary-fragment loss explicit instead of hiding it inside a best-feasible-singleton term.

E Full Proof of Theorem 3.1

Theorem (Theorem 3.1, restated). For every $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, every $\varepsilon > 0$, and every polynomial $C(\cdot)$, there exists $k_0 = k_0(\gamma, \varepsilon, C)$ such that for all $k \geq k_0$ and *every* $p \geq k$: no (possibly randomized) algorithm making at most $C(|N|)$ value queries and outputting $P \subseteq N$ with $|P| \leq p$ can guarantee

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{S \subseteq P, |S| \leq k} f(S) \right] > (1 - e^{-\gamma} + \varepsilon) \cdot \text{OPT}_k$$

for all monotone γ -weakly DR $f: 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $|N| = \lceil 60p/\varepsilon \rceil$. At $\gamma = 1$ (full submodularity), this recovers the tight bound $\alpha \leq 1 - 1/e$.

The proof builds on the hard-instance family of Harshaw, Feldman, Ward & Karbasi [16] (hereafter HFWK). We first state the construction in the form used here, then give a proof overview that separates the HFWK import from our adaptations.

Proposition (HFWK planted family, adapted form). Fix $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1/6)$, and integers $k \geq 1/\varepsilon'$ and $m \geq \lceil 3k/\varepsilon' \rceil$. Let \mathcal{N} be a ground set of size m and set $g = \lceil \varepsilon'k + 3k^2/m \rceil$. For every k -subset $T \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, the HFWK construction gives functions $f_T: 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that depend on T through the statistic

$$t_T(S) = |S \setminus T| + \min\{g, |S \cap T|\}.$$

The resulting family $\{f_T\}_{T \in \binom{\mathcal{N}}{k}}$ satisfies:

(P1) f_T is non-negative, monotone, and γ -weakly diminishing returns;

(P2) $f_T(S) \leq 1$ for all $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, with equality when $S = T$;

(P3) $f_{\emptyset}(S) \leq 1 - e^{-\gamma} + 12\varepsilon'$ for all S with $|S| \leq k$;

(P4) $f_T(S) = f_{\emptyset}(S)$ whenever $|S \cap T| \leq g$ or $|S| \geq 3k - g$.

The case $m = \lceil 3k/\varepsilon' \rceil$ is HFWK Proposition 14. The extension to any larger ground set is the adaptation used here: inspecting their proof shows that properties (P1)–(P4) use only $m \geq 3k/\varepsilon'$; no step requires equality.

Proof overview. The proof of Theorem 3.1 proceeds in three steps.

Setup. We import the HFWK planted family and properties (P1)–(P4), but instantiate it on an *enlarged* ground set with $m = |\mathcal{N}| = \lceil 3p/\varepsilon' \rceil$ instead of $m = \lceil 3k/\varepsilon' \rceil$. The enlargement is our adaptation: it ensures that $|P| \leq p \leq \varepsilon' m/3$, making the p -cancellation below possible.

Indistinguishability. We show that a polynomial-query algorithm cannot distinguish $f_{\tilde{T}}$ from the null instance f_{\emptyset} with high probability, using a *two-regime* hypergeometric tail argument (Fact E.1 below) that covers both $p = O(k)$, where the additive tail suffices, and $p \gg k$, where the multiplicative tail is needed. This two-regime analysis is new; HFWK’s original argument handles only $m = \Theta(k/\varepsilon')$.

Overlap bound. Since the algorithm’s output P is fixed by the null transcript, the expected overlap satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[|P \cap \tilde{T}|] \leq \frac{pk}{m} \leq \frac{\varepsilon' k}{3}.$$

The upper bound is *independent of p* because the p in the pruning budget cancels with the p in $m = |\mathcal{N}| \propto p$. Concentration shows the overlap stays below the threshold g , so property (P4) forces all k -subsets of P to match the null-instance value, bounded by (P3).

The p -cancellation mechanism is the central insight: enlarging the ground set in proportion to the pruning budget neutralizes the additional budget, yielding a hardness bound that holds uniformly for all $p \geq k$. We state the concentration tools used throughout, then give the full proof.

Fact E.1 (Hypergeometric concentration [17]). Let $X \sim \text{Hypergeometric}(m, K, n)$, i.e., X counts marked items when drawing n items without replacement from a population of m containing K marked items. Write $\mu = nK/m$.

(i) (Additive tail.) For every $t > 0$, $\Pr[X - \mu \geq t] \leq \exp(-2t^2/n)$.

(ii) (Multiplicative tail.) For every integer $a > \mu$, $\Pr[X \geq a] \leq (e\mu/a)^a$.

Both follow from Hoeffding’s Theorem 4, which shows that hypergeometric tails are dominated by binomial tails; bound (i) is then the standard sub-Gaussian tail, and (ii) is the Chernoff–Poisson bound applied to the dominating binomial.

Fix $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, $p \geq k$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. We may assume $\varepsilon \leq 1$; larger ε only weakens the target bound. Set $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/20$, so $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1/6)$, and take k large enough that $k \geq 1/\varepsilon'$, as required by the HFWK construction; this lower bound is absorbed into the theorem’s constant k_0 . Set $m = \lceil 3p/\varepsilon' \rceil = \lceil 60p/\varepsilon \rceil$. We instantiate the adapted HFWK family stated above on a ground set \mathcal{N} of size m . Since $m \geq 3p/\varepsilon' \geq 3k/\varepsilon'$, all properties (P1)–(P4) hold for this instance. The only quantity that changes relative to HFWK’s original setting is the overlap threshold

$$g = \left\lceil \varepsilon' k + \frac{3k^2}{m} \right\rceil \leq \left\lceil \varepsilon' k \left(1 + \frac{k}{p} \right) \right\rceil \leq 2\varepsilon' k + 1,$$

where the last inequality uses $k/p \leq 1$. By Yao's minimax principle, it suffices to show the bound for deterministic algorithms against the uniform distribution over $\{f_{\tilde{T}}\}$, where \tilde{T} is a random k -subset of \mathcal{N} . Let ALG be a deterministic algorithm making at most $C(|\mathcal{N}|)$ queries. Write $C(x) \leq Ax^d$ for constants A, d and all $x \geq 1$.

Step 1: Indistinguishability. Goal: show that the algorithm cannot tell whether it is facing the null instance f_\emptyset (which has no planted optimum) or the real instance $f_{\tilde{T}}$ (which does). If the algorithm cannot distinguish the two, its output P_0 is the same in both cases, and any analysis under the null instance applies to the real one.

When given f_\emptyset , ALG makes queries S_1, \dots, S_ℓ ($\ell \leq C(|\mathcal{N}|)$) and outputs P_0 with $|P_0| \leq p$. Fix any query set S on the null-instance transcript. If $|S| \geq 3k - g$ (a large query), then $f_{\tilde{T}}(S) = f_\emptyset(S)$ for every \tilde{T} by (P4)—the query is too large to reveal the planted set. Otherwise $|S| < 3k - g$, so the query can differ only if the overlap $X = |S \cap \tilde{T}|$ exceeds the threshold g . The random variable X is hypergeometric with mean $\mu = k|S|/m$. Since $|S| < 3k - g$ and $g \geq \varepsilon'k + 3k^2/m$, we have $g/k - |S|/m \geq (\varepsilon' + 3k/m) - (3k - g)/m \geq \varepsilon'$, so the gap between g and the mean satisfies $g - \mu \geq \varepsilon'k$. Fact E.1(i) with $t = \varepsilon'k$ and $n = k$ gives

$$\Pr[X > g] \leq \exp(-2\varepsilon'^2k).$$

We also apply Fact E.1(ii) with $a = \lceil \varepsilon'k \rceil$: since $|S| < 3k$ and $m \geq 3p/\varepsilon'$,

$$\Pr[X > g] \leq \Pr[X \geq \varepsilon'k] \leq \left(\frac{ek}{p}\right)^{\varepsilon'k}.$$

The two bounds complement each other across all pruning budgets. When p is small (at most $2ek$), the ground set is only $O(k/\varepsilon')$ and the additive tail decays fast enough: $C(|\mathcal{N}|) \exp(-2\varepsilon'^2k) \leq \varepsilon/40$ for sufficiently large k . When p is large ($p > 2ek$), the multiplicative tail dominates because $ek/p < 1/2$:

$$C(|\mathcal{N}|) \left(\frac{ek}{p}\right)^{\varepsilon'k} \leq A \left(\frac{4p}{\varepsilon'}\right)^d \left(\frac{ek}{p}\right)^{\varepsilon'k} \leq \varepsilon/40$$

for sufficiently large k , uniformly over all $p > 2ek$: writing $r = p/k > 2e$, the middle expression is $A(4/\varepsilon')^d k^d r^d (e/r)^{\varepsilon'k}$, whose maximum over $r > 2e$ occurs at the boundary once $\varepsilon'k > d$ and then decays exponentially in k . By a union bound over the at most $C(|\mathcal{N}|)$ null-transcript queries, the event $\mathcal{E} = \{f_\emptyset(S_i) = f_{\tilde{T}}(S_i) \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, \ell\}$ satisfies $\Pr[\mathcal{E}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon/40$ for sufficiently large k . Under \mathcal{E} , every query returns the same value as under f_\emptyset , so ALG follows the same execution path and outputs P_0 .

Step 2: Overlap concentration. Goal: show that the algorithm's output P_0 has too little overlap with the planted optimum \tilde{T} to contain a good solution.

Since Step 1 established that P_0 is determined by the null transcript (independent of \tilde{T}), the overlap $|P_0 \cap \tilde{T}|$ is hypergeometric with

$$\mathbb{E}[|P_0 \cap \tilde{T}|] = \frac{k \cdot |P_0|}{|\mathcal{N}|} \leq \frac{k \cdot p}{3p/\varepsilon'} = \frac{\varepsilon'k}{3}.$$

Note that p cancels: the expected overlap is *independent* of the pruning budget. From the definition $g = \lceil \varepsilon'k + 3k^2/|\mathcal{N}| \rceil \geq \varepsilon'k$ (the ceiling dominates the first summand), the gap satisfies $g - \mathbb{E}[|P_0 \cap \tilde{T}|] \geq 2\varepsilon'k/3$. By Fact E.1(i) with $n = k$ and $t = 2\varepsilon'k/3$:

$$\Pr[|P_0 \cap \tilde{T}| > g] \leq e^{-2t^2/k} = e^{-8\varepsilon'^2k/9} = e^{-\Omega(\varepsilon^2k)} \leq \varepsilon/20$$

for sufficiently large k .

Step 3: Containment bound. Goal: combine Steps 1 and 2 to bound the expected containment.

Define the good event $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{E} \cap \{|P_0 \cap \tilde{T}| \leq g\}$. By union bound, $\Pr[\mathcal{G}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon/10$. Under \mathcal{G} :

- ALG outputs P_0 (by \mathcal{E});
- every $S \subseteq P_0$ with $|S| \leq k$ satisfies $|S \cap \tilde{T}| \leq |P_0 \cap \tilde{T}| \leq g$, so $f_{\tilde{T}}(S) = f_{\emptyset}(S)$ by (P4);
- $\max_{S \subseteq P_0, |S| \leq k} f_{\tilde{T}}(S) = \max_{S \subseteq P_0, |S| \leq k} f_{\emptyset}(S) \leq 1 - e^{-\gamma} + 12\varepsilon'$ by (P3).

Since $\text{OPT} = f_{\tilde{T}}(\tilde{T}) = 1$ by (P2) and $f_{\tilde{T}}(S) \leq 1$ always:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{S \subseteq P, |S| \leq k} f_{\tilde{T}}(S) \right] &\leq \Pr[\mathcal{G}] \cdot (1 - e^{-\gamma} + 12\varepsilon') + \Pr[\neg\mathcal{G}] \cdot 1 \\ &\leq (1 - e^{-\gamma} + 12\varepsilon') + \varepsilon/10 = 1 - e^{-\gamma} + \frac{7\varepsilon}{10} < 1 - e^{-\gamma} + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

F Proof of Corollary 3.3

Corollary (Corollary 3.3, restated). Let $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ denote total curvature: $\kappa = 1 - \min_{j \in N} f(j | N \setminus \{j\})/f(j)$. For every $p \geq k$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, no algorithm using polynomially many value queries can prune to p elements with containment $\alpha > 1 - \kappa/e + \varepsilon$ for all monotone submodular functions with total curvature at most κ . Since the algorithm of Sviridenko, Vondrák & Ward [18] achieves $\alpha = 1 - \kappa/e$, this bound is tight. (At $\kappa = 0$ the function is modular, so exact containment is trivial.)

Proof overview. The proof is a two-step reduction.

Step 1: SVW augmentation (imported). Sviridenko, Vondrák & Ward [18] show that augmenting the normalized planted-optimum family used in their curvature lower bound with a linear term produces controlled curvature without altering the information-theoretic landscape (Fact F.1 below).

Step 2: Transfer from Theorem 3.1 (original). Because the linear term depends only on $|A|$, it carries no information about the planted set T ; the indistinguishability and overlap arguments from Theorem 3.1 transfer directly.

Fact F.1 (SVW curvature augmentation). In the normalized form used by Sviridenko, Vondrák, and Ward [18], the curvature augmentation has the following form. Let $\{f_T\}$ be a planted-optimum family on ground set \mathcal{N} in the normalization used by the SVW lower bound, with $f_T(T) = k p_{\max}$ and $p_{\max} = \max_i f_T(\{i\})$. For $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, define $\hat{f}_T(A) = f_T(A) + \frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa} |A| p_{\max}$. Then: (i) \hat{f}_T is monotone submodular with total curvature $\leq \kappa$; (ii) $\hat{f}_T(T) = k p_{\max}/\kappa$; (iii) the linear term is determined by $|A|$ alone and therefore provides no information about T .

Proof of Corollary 3.3. Step 1 (SVW augmentation). Apply Fact F.1 to the HFWK family from Theorem 3.1 with the same enlarged ground set $m = \lceil 3p/\varepsilon' \rceil$. The resulting \hat{f}_T has curvature $\leq \kappa$.

Step 2 (Transfer from Theorem 3.1). By Fact F.1(iii), the linear term carries no information about the planted set. All queries on \hat{f}_T reduce to queries on f_T plus a cardinality lookup, so the indistinguishability and overlap concentration arguments from Theorem 3.1 apply unchanged. Under the good event (overlap below g), every k -subset $S \subseteq P$ satisfies

$$\hat{f}_T(S) \leq (1 - 1/e + O(\varepsilon)) k p_{\max} + \frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa} k p_{\max} = \frac{1-\kappa/e+O(\varepsilon)}{\kappa} k p_{\max},$$

while $\hat{f}_T(T) = k p_{\max}/\kappa$ by Fact F.1(ii). The ratio is $1 - \kappa/e + O(\varepsilon)$. \square

p	$c' = k/p$	Composition $\alpha \leq$	Hardness $\alpha \leq$	Best algo α	Status
k	1	$1 - 1/e$	$1 - 1/e$	$1 - 1/e$	Tight
$2k$	1/2	0.843	$1 - 1/e$	$1 - 1/e$	Tight
ck (fixed $c > 1$)	1/c	$(1 - 1/e)/\alpha^*(1/c)$	$1 - 1/e$	$1 - 1/e$	Tight
$\omega(k)$	$\rightarrow 0$	$\rightarrow 1$	$1 - 1/e$	$1 - 1/e$	Tight

Table 4: Monotone containment landscape at $\gamma = 1$ (full submodularity). The composition column is the benchmark obtained by “prune then optimize”; it matches $1 - 1/e$ only at $p = k$ and weakens for larger pruning budgets (approaching 1 only when p/k grows). The hardness and best-algorithm columns show that the true monotone containment factor remains exactly $1 - 1/e$ for every $p \geq k$. For γ -weakly DR functions, replace $1 - 1/e$ with $1 - e^{-\gamma}$; for curvature κ , use $1 - \kappa/e$ (Corollary 3.3).

G Full Proof of Theorem 4.1

Theorem (Theorem 4.1, restated). Let f be a non-negative submodular function on ground set N , and let $k \leq n$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a set $G \subseteq N$ with $|G| = O(k/\varepsilon)$ such that for every $k' \leq k$,

$$\max_{T \subseteq G, |T| \leq k'} f(T) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon\right) \cdot \text{OPT}_{k'},$$

where $\text{OPT}_{k'} = \max_{|S| \leq k'} f(S)$. Moreover, G can be constructed in $O(nk/\varepsilon)$ oracle queries.

Proof overview. The proof uses the *sequential disjoint greedy* (SDG) scheme and proceeds in four steps, all original to this paper. The high-level idea: run greedy many times on disjoint parts of the ground set, find the best run by averaging, then show that this run’s greedy prefix captures at least half the optimal value.

Step 1: Averaging. Build ℓ disjoint greedy solutions. Because the runs use disjoint elements, their total “damage” to the optimal value is bounded by submodularity (Fact G.1). Averaging selects the run that complements OPT best, losing only a $(1 - 1/\ell)$ factor.

Step 2: Partial-greedy domination. The elements of $\hat{O} = O \setminus G$ (the “missed” OPT elements) were available as candidates during the chosen greedy run but were not picked. Since greedy always picks the highest-marginal element, each greedy pick dominates the corresponding missed element. Telescoping gives $f(\hat{O} \cup A) \leq 2f(A) - f(\emptyset)$: the greedy prefix captures at least half the value of the prefix augmented with the missed elements.

Step 3: Submodularity decomposition. The lattice inequality $f(X \cup Y) + f(X \cap Y) \leq f(X) + f(Y)$, applied to $X = \hat{O} \cup A$ and $Y = \dot{O} \cup A$, relates the value of $O \cup A$ to the two feasible candidates A and $\dot{O} \cup A$.

Step 4: Feasibility. Both A and $\dot{O} \cup A$ have size at most k' and lie in G , so the maximum over them gives the claimed $1/2 - \varepsilon$ containment.

The argument uses one standard submodularity fact for disjoint sets, stated for reference:

Fact G.1 (Submodularity of disjoint-union marginals). Let f be non-negative and submodular, and let A_1, \dots, A_ℓ be pairwise disjoint. Then for any set O :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(A_i \mid O) &\geq f(\cup_i A_i \mid O), \\ f(\cup_i A_i \mid O) &\leq f(\cup_i A_i \cup O). \end{aligned}$$

This follows from repeated application of the diminishing-returns property of submodularity: adding disjoint sets one at a time, each marginal is at least as large as the joint marginal.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Set $\ell = \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil$. If $|N| < \ell k$, output $G = N$; containment is exact since every k' -subset of N is available, and $|G| = |N| < \ell k = O(k/\varepsilon)$. Otherwise, build ℓ disjoint greedy solutions sequentially: $G_1 = \text{greedy}(N, k)$, $G_2 = \text{greedy}(N \setminus G_1, k)$, \dots , $G_\ell = \text{greedy}(N \setminus \bigcup_{j < \ell} G_j, k)$. Let $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} G_i$, so $|G| = \ell k$.

Fix any $k' \leq k$. Write O for an optimal feasible set: $|O| \leq k'$ and $f(O) = \text{OPT}_{k'}$. Let $b = |O \setminus G|$ and decompose:

$$\hat{O} = O \cap G, \quad \hat{O} = O \setminus G, \quad |\hat{O}| = |O| - b, \quad |\hat{O}| = b.$$

Step 1 (Averaging). For each i , let A_i denote the first b elements of greedy run i . Since $A_i \subseteq G_i$ and the G_i are disjoint, the A_i are disjoint. By Fact G.1 applied to the disjoint collection:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} [f(O) - f(O \cup A_i)] = - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(A_i | O) \leq -f(\bigcup A_i | O) = f(O) - f(O \cup \bigcup A_i) \leq f(O).$$

By averaging, there exists i^* with $f(O \cup A_{i^*}) \geq (1 - 1/\ell) f(O)$. Set $A = A_{i^*}$.

Step 2 (Partial greedy). Recall $A = A_{i^*}$, the first b elements of greedy run i^* (note $b \leq k' \leq k$, so these elements are well-defined). Since $\hat{O} \cap G_j = \emptyset$ for every j (by definition of $\hat{O} = O \setminus G$), every element of \hat{O} is available as a candidate in greedy run i^* . Thus each greedy pick a_j satisfies $f(a_j | A_{j-1}) \geq f(\hat{o}_j | A_{j-1})$ for some ordering $\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_b$ of \hat{O} (since greedy picks the maximum marginal and \hat{o}_j is available).

By the telescoping chain and submodularity:

$$\begin{aligned} f(A) - f(\emptyset) &= \sum_{j=1}^b f(a_j | A_{j-1}) \geq \sum_{j=1}^b f(\hat{o}_j | A_{j-1}) \geq \sum_{j=1}^b f(\hat{o}_j | A) \\ &\geq f(\hat{O} | A) = f(\hat{O} \cup A) - f(A). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Therefore $2f(A) - f(\emptyset) \geq f(\hat{O} \cup A)$.

Step 3 (Submodularity decomposition). Apply submodularity with $X = \hat{O} \cup A$ and $Y = \dot{O} \cup A$: $f(X \cup Y) + f(X \cap Y) \leq f(X) + f(Y)$. Since $X \cup Y = O \cup A$ and $X \cap Y = A$:

$$f(O \cup A) + f(A) \leq f(\hat{O} \cup A) + f(\dot{O} \cup A).$$

Using (1): $f(\hat{O} \cup A) \leq 2f(A) - f(\emptyset)$, so

$$f(O \cup A) \leq f(A) - f(\emptyset) + f(\dot{O} \cup A). \tag{2}$$

Step 4 (Feasibility and conclusion). Both candidates are feasible subsets of G : $A \subseteq G_{i^*} \subseteq G$ with $|A| = b \leq k'$; and $\dot{O} \cup A \subseteq G$ with $|\dot{O} \cup A| \leq |\dot{O}| + |A| = |O| \leq k'$. From (2) and Step 1:

$$\max(f(A), f(\dot{O} \cup A)) \geq \frac{f(O \cup A) + f(\emptyset)}{2} \geq \frac{(1 - 1/\ell) \cdot \text{OPT}_{k'} + f(\emptyset)}{2}.$$

Since $f(\emptyset) \geq 0$ and $k' \leq k$ was arbitrary with $\ell = \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil$, the set G achieves containment factor $\alpha \geq (1 - 1/\ell)/2 \geq 1/2 - \varepsilon$ simultaneously at every scale $k' \leq k$. \square

H Item-Splitting Machinery and Proof of Theorem 4.5

This appendix makes the knapsack extension fully self-contained.

Why item splitting is needed. In the cardinality setting, each greedy prefix of length b matches the budget exactly. With knapsack constraints, a density-greedy prefix may overshoot the target budget: the last item added may have cost larger than the remaining budget allows. Item splitting resolves this by conceptually breaking the boundary item into two fragments—one that fits the budget and one that does not—while preserving submodularity of the objective function.

The item-splitting construction is due to Feldman and Kuhnle [2] (Definitions 7.13 and 7.15 there); we restate the pieces needed for Theorem 4.5 and defer the submodularity-preservation proof to [2].

H.1 The γ -split extension

Definition H.1 (Gamma-split). This is the split operation of Feldman and Kuhnle [2]. Let $f: 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be submodular with positive price vector p . For $s \in N$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, the γ -split of s produces a new ground set $N^* = (N \setminus \{s\}) \cup \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$, prices $p_{\sigma_1}^* = \gamma p_s$, $p_{\sigma_2}^* = (1 - \gamma)p_s$, $p_u^* = p_u$ otherwise, and function

$$f^*(S) = f(\widehat{S}) + \gamma \cdot f(s \mid \widehat{S}) \cdot \mathbb{I}[\sigma_1 \in S] + (1 - \gamma) \cdot f(s \mid \widehat{S}) \cdot \mathbb{I}[\sigma_2 \in S],$$

where $\widehat{S} = S \setminus \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$. When $S \cap \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} = \emptyset$, $f^*(S) = f(S)$. When $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} \subseteq S$, $f^*(S) = f(\widehat{S} + s)$.

Lemma H.2 (Split preserves submodularity). *Feldman and Kuhnle [2, Lemma 7.14] prove that the function f^* of Definition H.1 is non-negative and submodular on N^* . Iterating the split operation finitely many times preserves both properties.*

Observation H.3 (Density preservation). *This is the density-preservation property from Feldman and Kuhnle [2, Obs. 7.16]. After a γ -split of s , for any set $S \subseteq N^*$ with $\sigma_1 \notin S$ resp. $\sigma_2 \notin S$,*

$$f^*(\sigma_1 \mid S) = \gamma \cdot f(s \mid \widehat{S}), \quad f^*(\sigma_2 \mid S) = (1 - \gamma) \cdot f(s \mid \widehat{S}).$$

Together with $p_{\sigma_i}^ = \gamma_i p_s$ (with $\gamma_1 = \gamma$, $\gamma_2 = 1 - \gamma$), this gives the density equality $f^*(\sigma_i \mid A_{\sigma_i})/p_{\sigma_i}^* = f(s \mid A_s)/p_s$, where A_s is the greedy prefix up to s and A_{σ_i} is its image under the split. Moreover, the equality is stable under iteration: if s itself was produced by a prior γ' -split of an ancestor \tilde{s} , then $f^*(s \mid A_s)/p_s^* = f^{**}(\tilde{s} \mid A_{\tilde{s}})/p_{\tilde{s}}^{**}$ by the same identity applied to that earlier split, and inductively every fragment u in the descendants of \tilde{s} satisfies $f^*(u \mid A_u)/p_u^* = f(\tilde{s} \mid A_{\tilde{s}})/p_{\tilde{s}}$, i.e. the density class of an element is preserved across any finite sequence of splits applied to it or to disjoint elements of the prefix.*

H.2 The θ -construction

In this subsection U and V live in the current split ground set. We write p_x^* for the cost of a split-ground-set element x ; for an unsplit original item, $p_x^* = p_x$. Given finite sets U, V with $c(U) \leq c(V)$ and a greedy ordering on V , the following iterative procedure builds a mapping $\theta: U \rightarrow V$ (after possibly splitting some elements of U) maintaining the invariant $\sum_{u \in \theta^{-1}(a)} p_u^* \leq p_a^*$ for every $a \in V$.

Definition H.4 (Iterative theta-construction). This is the iterative construction of Feldman and Kuhnle [2, Def. 7.15]. Initially θ is undefined on U . Repeat: if θ is defined on all of U , terminate. Otherwise let u be the last element of U for which θ is undefined, and a the last element of V for which $\sum_{u' \in \theta^{-1}(a)} p_{u'}^* < p_a^*$. If $p_u^* \leq p_a^* - \sum_{u' \in \theta^{-1}(a)} p_{u'}^*$, set $\theta(u) = a$. Otherwise perform a γ -split of u with $\gamma = (p_a^* - \sum_{u' \in \theta^{-1}(a)} p_{u'}^*)/p_u^*$, set $\theta(\sigma_2) = a$, and leave σ_1 undefined to be processed in a later iteration.

Termination. Call $a \in V$ *tight* once $\sum_{u' \in \theta^{-1}(a)} p_{u'}^* = p_a^*$, and let $T = \#\{a \in V : a \text{ tight}\}$, D the number of $u \in U$ on which θ is undefined. Each iteration falls into one of three cases: (i) $\theta(u) = a$ with strict inequality after, in which case D decreases by 1 and T is unchanged; (ii) $\theta(u) = a$ with equality after, in which case D decreases by 1 and T increases by 1; or (iii) u is split into σ_1, σ_2 , $\theta(\sigma_2) = a$ makes a tight, and σ_1 replaces u in the undefined set, so D is unchanged and T increases by 1. Thus the lexicographic monovariant $(|V| - T, D)$ strictly decreases each iteration and is bounded below by $(0, 0)$, so the construction terminates after at most $|V| + |U|$ iterations, of which at most $|V|$ are splits. The hypothesis $c(U) \leq c(V)$ guarantees that whenever some u is undefined, $\sum_{a \in V} p_a^* > \sum_{a \in V} \sum_{u' \in \theta^{-1}(a)} p_{u'}^*$, so a non-tight a exists and the construction never blocks. After all splits, $c(U)$ summed over the post-split elements still equals the pre-split $c(U)$.

Lemma H.5 (Density-domination lemma). *This lemma is adapted from the density-preservation observation of Feldman and Kuhnle [2, Obs. 7.16]. Let $\theta: U \rightarrow V$ be the mapping of Definition H.4, where V is a density-greedy-ordered prefix of a greedy run, possibly with its last item replaced by an included boundary fragment. Assume every original element from which an element of U descends was a density-greedy candidate at every step of that run. Then for every $a \in V$ and every $u \in \theta^{-1}(a)$,*

$$\frac{f^*(u | A_a)}{p_u^*} \leq \frac{f^*(a | A_a)}{p_a^*}.$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_{u \in \theta^{-1}(a)} f^*(u | A_a) \leq \frac{f^*(a | A_a)}{p_a^*} \sum_{u \in \theta^{-1}(a)} p_u^* \leq f^*(a | A_a),$$

where A_a is the greedy prefix strictly preceding a and the last inequality uses the invariant $\sum_{u \in \theta^{-1}(a)} p_u^* \leq p_a^*$.

Proof idea. Let $s(u)$ be the original item from which u descends, and let $b(a)$ be the original greedy item from which a descends (so $b(a) = a$ if a is not a boundary fragment). Observation H.3 gives

$$\frac{f^*(u | A_a)}{p_u^*} = \frac{f^*(s(u) | A_a)}{p_{s(u)}}, \quad \frac{f^*(a | A_a)}{p_a^*} = \frac{f^*(b(a) | A_a)}{p_{b(a)}}.$$

The original item $s(u)$ was a density-greedy candidate when $b(a)$ was selected from prefix A_a , hence its density was no larger than the density of $b(a)$. This gives the individual density bound. Multiplying it by p_u^* and summing over $u \in \theta^{-1}(a)$ gives the displayed consequence; no sum of densities is compared directly to a single density. \square

H.3 Full proof of Theorem 4.5

Theorem (Theorem 4.5, restated). For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, sequential disjoint density-greedy with $\ell = \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil$ runs produces a set $P \subseteq N$ with $c(P) \leq 3\ell B = O(B/\varepsilon)$ such that for every $B' \in (0, B]$ there exists $Q \subseteq P$ with

$$c(Q) \leq B', \quad f(Q) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon\right) \text{OPT}_{B'} - \Delta_{B'},$$

where $\Delta_{B'} \geq 0$ is a boundary-fragment loss that arises when the density-greedy prefix crosses the budget threshold mid-item. When no item is split, $\Delta_{B'} = 0$. Total query complexity: $O(n^2/\varepsilon)$.

Proof overview. This is the most technical proof in the paper, and the reader may wish to first read the simpler cardinality proof (Theorem 4.1, Appendix G) for the core ideas.

The main complication beyond cardinality is that density-greedy prefixes may not align cleanly with a target budget: the last item added may overshoot, requiring the item to be “split” into a used and unused fragment. The item-splitting machinery of Feldman & Kuhnle [2] (stated above) handles this by creating a new ground set where the split item is replaced by two fragments whose costs sum to the original. The proof then proceeds in five steps:

Step 1: Boundary split (imported machinery). For each density-greedy run, identify the prefix whose total cost equals the residual budget β , splitting the boundary item if needed via Definition H.1. Split-submodularity (Lemma H.2) ensures the resulting function f^* is still submodular.

Step 2: Averaging (original, analogous to the cardinality case). The disjoint-collection argument from Fact G.1, now applied to the split function f^* , identifies the best run i^* with $f^*(O^\uparrow \cup A) \geq (1 - 1/\ell)f(O)$.

Step 3: Density domination (imported+original). Apply the θ -construction (Definition H.4) to map \hat{O} into the greedy prefix A . The density-domination lemma (Lemma H.5, adapted from [2]) then yields $f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A) \leq 2f^*(A) - f(\emptyset)$.

Step 4: Submodular decomposition (original). Apply the lattice inequality $f^*(X \cup Y) + f^*(X \cap Y) \leq f^*(X) + f^*(Y)$ to relate $f^*(O^\uparrow \cup A)$ to the two candidates.

Step 5: Feasible real subset (original). Convert the split-function guarantee back to a real-set guarantee, paying the boundary-fragment loss $\Delta_{B'}$.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, $\ell = \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil$, and $B' \in (0, B]$. Let O achieve $\text{OPT}_{B'}$; set $\hat{O} = O \setminus P$, $\dot{O} = O \cap P$, $\beta = c(\hat{O}) \leq B'$. If $\beta = 0$, then $O \subseteq P$, so taking $Q = O$ proves the theorem. Assume below that $\beta > 0$.

Step 1 (Budget-specific prefix and boundary split). For each run $i \in [\ell]$, order $A_i = \{a_1^{(i)}, \dots, a_{m_i}^{(i)}\}$ by density-greedy selection time. Let j_i be the first index for which

$$\sum_{r \leq j_i} p_{a_r^{(i)}} \geq \beta.$$

Since $c(A_i) \geq 2B \geq 2\beta$, such j_i exists and $\sum_{r < j_i} p_{a_r^{(i)}} < \beta$. Let

$$r_i = \beta - \sum_{r < j_i} p_{a_r^{(i)}}, \quad \gamma_i = r_i / p_{a_{j_i}^{(i)}} \in (0, 1].$$

If $\gamma_i < 1$, apply a γ_i -split to the boundary item $a_{j_i}^{(i)}$, producing an included fragment $\tau_i = \sigma_1^{(i)}$ with cost $p_{\tau_i}^* = r_i$ and an excluded fragment $\sigma_2^{(i)}$. Define $A'_i = \{a_1^{(i)}, \dots, a_{j_i-1}^{(i)}, \tau_i\}$. If $\gamma_i = 1$, no split is needed; set $A'_i = \{a_1^{(i)}, \dots, a_{j_i}^{(i)}\}$ and say that run i has no boundary fragment. In either case $c(A'_i) = \beta$ exactly. Let f^* denote the function after all actual boundary splits. For an original set $S \subseteq N$, write S^\uparrow for its full lift in the split ground set, replacing any split item by both fragments; then $f^*(S^\uparrow) = f(S)$. The A'_i are disjoint because the greedy runs use disjoint ground sets.

Step 2 (Averaging). By Fact G.1 applied to the disjoint collection $\{A'_i\}$ under the split function

f^* :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} [f(O) - f^*(O^\uparrow \cup A'_i)] &= - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f^*(A'_i | O^\uparrow) \\ &\leq -f^*(\bigcup_i A'_i | O^\uparrow) \\ &= f(O) - f^*(O^\uparrow \cup \bigcup_i A'_i) \leq f(O), \end{aligned}$$

using $f^*(O^\uparrow) = f(O)$ and non-negativity of f^* . Averaging yields some i^* with $f^*(O^\uparrow \cup A'_{i^*}) \geq (1 - 1/\ell)f(O)$. Write $A = A'_{i^*}$ and $j^* = j_{i^*}$. If run i^* has an included boundary fragment τ_{i^*} , then τ_{i^*} is a fragment of the original item $a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}$, and its included fraction is γ_{i^*} . Set $\hat{A} = A \setminus \{\tau_{i^*}\} = \{a_1^{(i^*)}, \dots, a_{j^*-1}^{(i^*)}\}$ and $\Delta_{B'} = \gamma_{i^*} f(\{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}\})$; otherwise set $\hat{A} = A$ and $\Delta_{B'} = 0$.

Step 3 (Density domination). Apply Definition H.4 with source $U = \hat{O}$ and target $V = A$ in the current split ground set. The hypothesis $c(U) = \beta = c(V)$ is met, and every $u \in \hat{O}$ was a density-greedy candidate at every step of run i^* (because $\hat{O} \cap P = \emptyset$ and run i^* 's candidate pool is $N \setminus \bigcup_{j < i^*} G_j \supseteq N \setminus P$). The θ -construction may split elements of \hat{O} ; after it terminates, let \hat{O}^\uparrow denote the resulting set of source fragments. Continue to write \hat{O}^\uparrow and O^\uparrow for the full lifts after these additional source splits. By Lemma H.5, for each $a \in A$, $\sum_{u \in \theta^{-1}(a)} f^*(u | A_a) \leq f^*(a | A_a)$, where A_a is the f^* -greedy prefix strictly before a in run i^* . Summing and applying submodularity of f^* ($A_a \subseteq A$ for every $a \in A$),

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A) - f^*(A) &= \sum_{u \in \hat{O}^\uparrow} f^*(u | A \cup \{\text{prior } u'\}) \\ &\leq \sum_{u \in \hat{O}^\uparrow} f^*(u | A) \leq \sum_{u \in \hat{O}^\uparrow} f^*(u | A_{\theta(u)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in A} f^*(a | A_a) = f^*(A) - f(\emptyset), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality telescopes over any ordering of \hat{O}^\uparrow , the first two inequalities are submodularity of f^* , the third inequality is Lemma H.5, and the last equality telescopes the greedy chain. Conclusion: $f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A) \leq 2f^*(A) - f(\emptyset)$.

Step 4 (Submodular decomposition). Apply submodularity of f^* to $X = \hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A$ and $Y = \hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A$. Then $X \cap Y = A$ and $X \cup Y = \hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A$, so

$$f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A) + f^*(A) \leq f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A) + f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A) \leq 2f^*(A) - f(\emptyset) + f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A).$$

Combining with Step 2,

$$(1 - 1/\ell)f(O) - f^*(A) \leq f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A) - f^*(A) \leq f^*(A) - f(\emptyset) + f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A),$$

so $\max(f^*(A), f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A)) \geq \frac{1}{2}[(1 - 1/\ell)f(O) + f(\emptyset)] \geq (1/2 - \varepsilon)\text{OPT}_{B'}$.

Step 5 (Reporting a feasible real subset). If no split occurred in run i^* , then $A = \hat{A}$ is already a real set and $\Delta_{B'} = 0$. When a split did occur, the sets A and $\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A$ may contain the included boundary fragment τ_{i^*} ; let $\hat{A}^+ = \hat{A} \cup \{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}\}$. Definition H.1 gives

$$f^*(A) \leq f(\hat{A}) + \Delta_{B'}, \quad f^*(\hat{O}^\uparrow \cup A) \leq f(\hat{O} \cup \hat{A}) + \Delta_{B'}. \quad (3)$$

Indeed, in the split case this follows from $f^*(A) = (1 - \gamma_{i^*})f(\widehat{A}) + \gamma_{i^*}f(\widehat{A}^+)$ and $f(\widehat{A}^+) \leq f(\widehat{A}) + f(\{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}\})$. For the second inequality, if $a_{j^*}^{(i^*)} \in \dot{O}$ then $f^*(\dot{O}^\uparrow \cup A) = f(\dot{O} \cup \widehat{A})$ already; otherwise $f^*(\dot{O}^\uparrow \cup A) = (1 - \gamma_{i^*})f(\dot{O} \cup \widehat{A}) + \gamma_{i^*}f(\dot{O} \cup \widehat{A}^+)$ and submodularity gives $f(\dot{O} \cup \widehat{A}^+) \leq f(\dot{O} \cup \widehat{A}) + f(\{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}\})$. In the no-split case (3) is equality.

Feasibility: $c(\widehat{A}) \leq \beta \leq B'$ and $c(\dot{O} \cup \widehat{A}) \leq c(\dot{O}) + \beta \leq c(O) \leq B'$ (both strict in general). Thus \widehat{A} and $\dot{O} \cup \widehat{A}$ are both feasible at budget B' . The reported set is

$$Q = \arg \max\{f(T) : T \in \{\widehat{A}, \dot{O} \cup \widehat{A}\}, c(T) \leq B'\},$$

giving

$$f(Q) \geq (1/2 - \varepsilon)\text{OPT}_{B'} - \Delta_{B'}.$$

The boundary item $a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}$ belongs to the chosen density-greedy run for this budget-specific analysis, but it may have $p_{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}} > B'$ and therefore need not be a feasible singleton for the query budget. This is why the theorem keeps the loss as the explicit boundary-fragment term $\Delta_{B'}$ rather than replacing it by the best feasible singleton. \square

Corollary (Corollary 4.6, restated). Fix a budget range $\mathcal{B} \subseteq (0, B]$ and let $B_{\min} = \inf \mathcal{B} > 0$. Run sequential disjoint density-greedy with a sufficiently small internal accuracy parameter. Suppose that the item sizes are small at the density prefix scale: for every $B' \in \mathcal{B}$, the boundary item satisfies $p_{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}} \leq \eta\beta$ where $\beta = c(O \setminus P)$. There is a universal constant C such that, if $\eta \leq \varepsilon/C$, then for every $B' \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists $Q \subseteq P$ with $c(Q) \leq B'$ and $f(Q) \geq (\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon)\text{OPT}_{B'}$.

Proof overview. The corollary absorbs the boundary-fragment loss $\Delta_{B'}$ from Theorem 4.5 under the small-item assumption. The argument proceeds in two steps, both original:

Step 1. Bound the true split loss $L_{B'}$ by the density-prefix average times the fragment cost, using the fact that density-greedy marginals are nonincreasing.

Step 2. The small-item assumption gives $r_{i^*} \leq \eta\beta$, so $L_{B'} \leq \eta M$, and choosing $\eta = \varepsilon/8$ absorbs the loss into the ε slack.

Proof of Corollary 4.6. Run the algorithm and the proof above with internal accuracy $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon/4$. Fix $B' \in \mathcal{B}$ and use the notation from the proof of Theorem 4.5. If no boundary split occurs in the selected run i^* , then $\Delta_{B'} = 0$ and the theorem already gives the desired guarantee after the constant adjustment. Suppose a split occurs.

Let

$$r_{i^*} = \gamma_{i^*} p_{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}}$$

be the cost of the included boundary fragment τ_{i^*} , and let

$$d_{i^*} = \frac{f(a_{j^*}^{(i^*)} \mid \widehat{A})}{p_{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}}}$$

be the density of its original item at the moment it is selected. If this marginal is negative, deleting the boundary fragment can only increase the reported real values, so assume $d_{i^*} \geq 0$. The true loss from deleting the split fragment is not the crude singleton bound $\Delta_{B'}$; by the split definition it is

$$L_{B'} := \gamma_{i^*} f(a_{j^*}^{(i^*)} \mid \widehat{A}) = r_{i^*} d_{i^*}$$

for the candidate A , and at most the same quantity for $\dot{O}^\dagger \cup A$ by submodularity:

$$f^*(\dot{O}^\dagger \cup A) - f(\dot{O} \cup \widehat{A}) \leq L_{B'}.$$

We now bound this loss by the density-prefix average. Along the density-greedy order defining A , marginal densities are nonincreasing; dummy zero-marginal items ensure that the prefix of cost at most B used here has nonnegative densities unless the boundary loss is already nonpositive. Therefore the boundary density is at most the average density of the split prefix:

$$d_{i^*} \leq \frac{f^*(A) - f(\emptyset)}{\beta}.$$

The small-item assumption gives $r_{i^*} \leq p_{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}} \leq \eta\beta$, and hence

$$L_{B'} \leq \eta(f^*(A) - f(\emptyset)) \leq \eta f^*(A),$$

using nonnegativity of $f(\emptyset)$.

Let

$$M = \max\{f^*(A), f^*(\dot{O}^\dagger \cup A)\}.$$

Step 4 of the theorem proof gives $M \geq (1/2 - \varepsilon_0)\text{OPT}_{B'}$, while the preceding paragraph shows that replacing the split candidate(s) by the feasible real candidates \widehat{A} and $\dot{O} \cup \widehat{A}$ loses at most $L_{B'} \leq \eta f^*(A) \leq \eta M$. Thus one of these real feasible candidates has value at least

$$(1 - \eta)M \geq (1 - \eta)(1/2 - \varepsilon_0)\text{OPT}_{B'}.$$

Choosing $\eta \leq \varepsilon/8$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon/4$ yields $(1/2 - \varepsilon)\text{OPT}_{B'}$, after adjusting constants. \square

Remark on the boundary term. The additive loss $\Delta_{B'} = \gamma_{i^*} f(\{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}\})$ is inherent to this density-greedy knapsack analysis with item splitting: when the residual budget crosses a large boundary item, the split fraction γ_{i^*} can approach 1 and the loss approaches $f(\{a_{j^*}^{(i^*)}\})$. In the *algorithmic* (non-pruning) setting, standard fixes—guessing the top constant-many items by enumeration (see [2], Section 7)—preserve the clean $(1/2 - \varepsilon)$ ratio, but enumeration is incompatible with pruning because the guess depends on the query budget B' . A fully bicriteria variant (allowing $c(Q) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)B'$) admits \widehat{A}^+ directly and removes the boundary term without assumption.

I Warm-Start BFNS Barrier

Overview. This section explores whether combining the averaging idea of Theorem 4.1 (Step 1) with the CDG algorithm of [3] (Theorem B.1 in Appendix B) can beat the $1/2$ barrier. The CDG guarantee (imported) supplies a three-term bound that converts a warm-start value $g(\emptyset) = f(A)$ into additional containment; the analysis below (original) shows that the adversary's value-split degree of freedom limits the combined guarantee to $\frac{4}{9}(1 - 1/\ell)$, which exceeds 0.401 only for small warm-start sizes $b/k \leq 0.35$. Beyond that breakpoint, the direct 0.401-approximation of [4] dominates.

For each $b \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, run $\ell(b)$ disjoint greedy rounds of size b on N , producing sets A_1, \dots, A_ℓ . By the averaging argument (Step 1 of Theorem 4.1), the best A_i satisfies $f(O \cup A_i) \geq (1 - 1/\ell)\text{OPT}$.

Apply CDG (Theorem B.1) to $g(S) = f(S \cup A_i)$ over $G \setminus A_i$ with budget $k - b$, at density tuned to $v = 4$ (i.e., $|G \setminus A_i| = 5(k - b)$). The warm-start gives $g(\emptyset) = f(A_i) = V$.

At $v = 4$, Theorem B.1 gives equal coefficients:

$$g(D) \geq \frac{4}{9} g(\text{OPT}_g) + \frac{4}{9} g(\emptyset) = \frac{4}{9} (W + V),$$

where $W = g(\text{OPT}_g) = \max_{|T| \leq k-b} f(T \cup A_i)$ and $V = f(A_i)$. From the submodularity decomposition: $(1 - 1/\ell) \text{OPT} \leq f(O \cup A_i) \leq V + W$. Therefore:

$$f(\text{output}) \geq \frac{4}{9} (1 - 1/\ell) \text{OPT}.$$

The guarantee is independent of the value split between V and W .

The number of greedy rounds needed to achieve $v = 4$ is $\ell(b) = 5(k - b)/b + 1$. The overall guarantee is $\frac{4}{9}(1 - 1/\ell)$:

b/k	ℓ	Total elements	Guarantee	> 0.401?
0.10	46	$\sim 460k$	0.434	Yes
0.20	21	$\sim 420k$	0.423	Yes
0.30	12.7	$\sim 380k$	0.409	Yes
0.35	10.3	$\sim 360k$	0.401	Breakeven
0.40	8.5	$\sim 340k$	0.392	No

When $|\hat{O}|$ is large (many OPT elements outside G), the budget b must be large to dominate them, forcing ℓ small, and the $(1 - 1/\ell)$ factor eats the $4/9$ gain. The crossover is at $b/k \approx 0.35$; for larger b , one falls back to the direct 0.401 of [4]. Adding a random-greedy fallback branch does not help: the adversary controls the value split $\beta = f(\hat{O})/\text{OPT}$, and for any density c , the guarantee is at most $1/e$ in the worst case.

Observation I.1. *For any fixed warm-start size b , the CDG inner density $v = 4$ is the unique optimal choice of the inner ground-set size parameter. Writing α_v, β_v for the CDG coefficients on $g(\text{OPT}_g)$ and $g(\emptyset)$ respectively (Theorem B.1): at $v < 4$, $\alpha_v > \beta_v$ and the adversary sets $V = 0$; at $v > 4$, $\beta_v > \alpha_v$ and the adversary sets $W = 0$. Only at $v = 4$ are the coefficients equal, eliminating the adversary's value-split degree of freedom. The b/k table above holds $v = 4$ fixed and varies the warm-start size; the bound $\frac{4}{9}(1 - 1/\ell(b))$ then peaks at small b/k , where ℓ is large.*

J Window Containment Analysis

Algorithm 1: Window Containment

Input: Ground set N , oracle for f , constraint k , window parameter $\omega \geq 1$

Output: Pruned set P_k with $|P_k| \leq k + \omega k^2$

```

1  $S_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
2  $U_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
3 for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$  do
4    $W_t \leftarrow$  top-min( $\omega k$ ,  $|N \setminus S_t|$ ) elements of  $N \setminus S_t$  by  $f(\cdot \mid S_t)$ ;
5    $U_{t+1} \leftarrow U_t \cup W_t$ ;
6    $w_t \leftarrow$  uniformly random element of  $W_t$ ;
7    $S_{t+1} \leftarrow S_t \cup \{w_t\}$ ;
8 return  $P_k = U_k \cup S_k = S_k \cup \bigcup_{t=0}^{k-1} W_t$ ;
```

ω	Window size ωk	$e^{-1/\omega}/2$	Output $ P_k \leq k + \omega k^2$
1	k	0.184	$k + k^2$
2	$2k$	0.303	$k + 2k^2$
5	$5k$	0.410	$k + 5k^2$
10	$10k$	0.452	$k + 10k^2$
20	$20k$	0.476	$k + 20k^2$
100	$100k$	0.495	$k + 100k^2$

Table 5: Window containment guarantee vs. window parameter ω (non-monotone, unconditional). At $\omega = 5$ the guarantee exceeds BF’s 0.401; at $\omega = 20$ it approaches Qi’s 0.478 hardness.

Proof overview. The analysis is entirely original and proceeds through two supporting lemmas and a main proof. The key tension: to dominate missed OPT elements, we want to pick the best marginal-gain element at each step; but to avoid destroying OPT’s value, we want to pick randomly (so no single OPT element is too likely to be displaced). The window resolves this by ensuring *every* element in the top- ωk window dominates every element outside it—so a random pick from the window simultaneously achieves both goals.

Lemma 1: Window domination. At each step, the window W_t contains the ωk elements with highest marginal gain. Any OPT element outside the window is therefore dominated by every window element, including the random pick w_t . A telescoping argument (analogous to Step 2 of the SDG proof) yields $2f(S_m) - f(\emptyset) \geq f(D \cup S_m)$, where D collects the dominated elements.

Lemma 2: Degradation bound. Picking uniformly at random from a window of size ωk reduces the residual OPT value by a factor of $(1 - 1/(\omega k))$ per step. After k steps, this compounds to $e^{-1/\omega}$ by Fact J.1.

Main proof. Combine the two lemmas via the lattice inequality, just as in the SDG proof. Both candidate sets (S_m and $\hat{O} \cup S_m$) are feasible subsets of the accumulated window P_k .

Fact J.1 (Compound decay). For $x \geq 2$ and integer $0 \leq m \leq x$:

$$(1 - 1/x)^m \geq e^{-m/x} (1 - m/x^2).$$

In particular, with $x = \omega k$ and $m \leq k$:

$$(1 - 1/(\omega k))^m \geq e^{-1/\omega} (1 - 1/(\omega^2 k)).$$

This follows from the elementary bound $\ln(1 - u) \geq -u - u^2$ for $0 \leq u \leq 1/2$, applied with $u = 1/x$, and then $e^{-z} \geq 1 - z$.

Lemma J.2 (Window Domination). Fix any set O with $|O| \leq k$. Run the retirement process in the proof below, and let $m \leq |O|$ be its stopping time. There exists an injective pairing $\pi: \{0, \dots, m - 1\} \leftrightarrow O$ with $\pi(t) \in \hat{O}_t$ (the unretired outside-window set from that process) and $f(w_t | S_t) \geq f(\pi(t) | S_t)$ for all $t < m$. Telescoping gives $2f(S_m) - f(\emptyset) \geq f(D \cup S_m)$, where $D = \{\pi(0), \dots, \pi(m - 1)\}$ is the set of dominated OPT elements.

Lemma J.3 (Degradation Bound). In the nontrivial case where every window used before the stopping time has size ωk , uniformly random selection from W_t gives $\mathbb{E}[f(O \cup S_t)] \geq (1 - 1/(\omega k)) f(O \cup S_{t-1})$. Iterating $m \leq k$ steps:

$$\mathbb{E}[f(O \cup S_m)] \geq (1 - 1/(\omega k))^k f(O) = e^{-1/\omega} (1 - O(1/(\omega^2 k))) f(O).$$

Proof of Lemma J.2. We construct the pairing π greedily. Let $R_0 = O$ (all OPT elements are “unretired”).

At step t , define $\hat{O}_t = R_t \setminus (S_t \cup W_t)$: the unretired OPT elements outside both the solution and the window. Since W_t consists of the top- (ωk) elements by $f(\cdot | S_t)$, every $o \in \hat{O}_t$ satisfies $f(w | S_t) \geq f(o | S_t)$ for all $w \in W_t$. In particular, the uniformly random pick w_t dominates o .

If $\hat{O}_t \neq \emptyset$: choose $\pi(t) \in \hat{O}_t$ arbitrarily and set $R_{t+1} = R_t \setminus \{\pi(t)\}$.

If $\hat{O}_t = \emptyset$: every unretired OPT element is in $W_t \cup S_t$; set $m = t$ and **stop**.

Since $|R_0| = |O|$ and we remove one element per non-stopping step, and $\hat{O}_t \subseteq R_t$, the process terminates at some $m \leq |O|$. At termination, the remaining set $\dot{O} := R_m = O \setminus D$ (where $D = \{\pi(0), \dots, \pi(m-1)\}$) satisfies either $\dot{O} = \emptyset$ (all OPT elements have been retired) or $\dot{O} \subseteq W_m \cup S_m$.

For the value bound, telescope over the m paired steps:

$$\begin{aligned} f(S_m) - f(\emptyset) &= \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} f(w_t | S_t) \geq \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} f(\pi(t) | S_t) \geq \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} f(\pi(t) | S_m) \\ &\geq f\left(\bigcup_{t=0}^{m-1} \{\pi(t)\} \mid S_m\right) = f(D | S_m) = f(D \cup S_m) - f(S_m), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses submodularity ($S_t \subseteq S_m$) and the third uses submodularity on individual vs. joint marginals. Rearranging: $2f(S_m) - f(\emptyset) \geq f(D \cup S_m)$. \square

Proof of Lemma J.3. If some window contains all remaining elements, then $P_k = N$ from that step onward and containment is exact. Thus assume $|W_t| = \omega k$ for the steps considered below. By submodularity applied to the ωk window elements at step t :

$$\sum_{v \in W_t} [f(O \cup S_t \cup \{v\}) - f(O \cup S_t)] \geq f(O \cup S_t \cup W_t) - f(O \cup S_t) \geq -f(O \cup S_t),$$

where the last step uses non-negativity of f . For a uniformly random $w_t \in W_t$ (size ωk):

$$\mathbb{E}[f(O \cup S_{t+1}) | S_t] \geq (1 - 1/(\omega k)) f(O \cup S_t).$$

Iterating over $m \leq k$ steps and applying Fact J.1 with $x = \omega k$ and $m \leq k$:

$$\mathbb{E}[f(O \cup S_m)] \geq (1 - 1/(\omega k))^k f(O) \geq e^{-1/\omega} (1 - 1/(\omega^2 k)) f(O).$$

\square

Theorem (Theorem 4.3, restated). For any non-negative submodular f and window parameter $\omega \geq 1$, Algorithm 1 returns an accumulated-window set $P_k \subseteq N$ with $|P_k| \leq k + \omega k^2$ such that, for every $k' \leq k$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\substack{|T| \leq k' \\ T \subseteq P_k}} f(T) \right] \geq \frac{e^{-1/\omega}}{2} \cdot \text{OPT}_{k'} \quad (\text{asymptotically as } k \rightarrow \infty).$$

Total query complexity: $O(nk)$.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Algorithm 1 returns $P_k = S_k \cup \bigcup_{t=0}^{k-1} W_t$, so $|P_k| \leq k + \omega k^2$. Fix any target budget $k' \leq k$ and let O be an optimal feasible solution with $|O| \leq k'$. At the termination step $m \leq k'$ of Lemma J.2, the dominated set D and the remaining set $\dot{O} = O \setminus D$ satisfy $D \cap \dot{O} = \emptyset$.

The lemma’s termination condition gives either $\dot{O} = \emptyset$ or $\dot{O} \subseteq W_m \cup S_m$; in both cases $\dot{O} \subseteq P_k$, because every window W_m used by the process is accumulated in P_k and $S_m \subseteq S_k \subseteq P_k$.

Both S_m and $\dot{O} \cup S_m$ are k' -feasible subsets of P_k : $|S_m| = m \leq k'$ and $|\dot{O} \cup S_m| \leq |\dot{O}| + m \leq |O| \leq k'$.

By submodularity with $A = \dot{O} \cup S_m$ and $B = D \cup S_m$ (so $A \cap B = S_m$ and $A \cup B = O \cup S_m$):

$$f(O \cup S_m) + f(S_m) \leq f(\dot{O} \cup S_m) + f(D \cup S_m).$$

Substituting the domination bound $f(D \cup S_m) \leq 2f(S_m) - f(\emptyset)$:

$$f(\dot{O} \cup S_m) \geq f(O \cup S_m) - f(S_m) + f(\emptyset),$$

so $\max(f(\dot{O} \cup S_m), f(S_m)) \geq (f(O \cup S_m) + f(\emptyset))/2$. In expectation, Lemma J.3 gives $\mathbb{E}[f(O \cup S_m)] \geq e^{-1/\omega}(1 - O(1/(\omega^2 k))) \text{OPT}_{k'}$, yielding the claimed bound asymptotically in k . Since $k' \leq k$ was arbitrary, the same accumulated set P_k certifies containment at every scale. \square

Why random selection resolves the tension. The earlier conditional version required max-marginal selection for domination and random selection for degradation—conflicting requirements. Window containment resolves this because the top- w construction ensures *every* window element dominates every non-window element, including the uniformly random pick. No max-marginal selection within W_t is needed.

K Additional Open Problems

The two central open problems (tight non-monotone containment and extraction beyond the 0.401 maximization barrier) are stated in §6. We collect here three further structural questions suggested by our proofs.

Open Question K.1 (Non-monotone lower bounds). Develop pruning lower-bound techniques beyond density composition. Composition is structurally inadequate for non-monotone due to the flat approximation landscape. Information-theoretic arguments about distinguishing “useful” from “poisonous” elements may be needed.

Open Question K.2 (Density-dependent hardness for non-monotone). Is there a density-dependent inapproximability result for non-monotone cardinality-constrained maximization? The current hardness of 0.478 (Qi) is essentially density-independent. A density-dependent hardness that approaches $1/e$ at low density would restore the composition technique’s power for non-monotone pruning.

Open Question K.3 (Monotonicity of the top- k set). If M_i (the top k marginals at step i of random greedy) could be shown to induce a “locally monotone” subproblem—that is, if f restricted to subsets of M_i were monotone—then $(1 - 1/e)$ containment would follow immediately. OPT “witnesses” this: f restricted to subsets of O is monotone (by optimality). Can this structural property be extended to algorithmically identified sets without knowledge of O ?

L Additional Experimental Results

SNAP social networks (MaxCut). On Facebook ($n = 4039$, $m = 88,234$) and Wiki-Vote ($n = 7115$, $m = 100,762$) with $k = 50$, SeqDisjoint, WindowMax, WindowRand, and StdGreedy all

round to $\alpha = 1.000$ at every budget $\omega \in \{2, 3, 5\}$ against the full-ground-set greedy reference (all are at least 0.9995). QuickPrune plateaus at $\alpha \approx 0.87$; random drops to $\alpha = 0.13$ on Wiki-Vote at $\omega = 2$. The structured algorithms consistently recover the greedy reference even when $|P| \ll n$. Since exact MaxCut is NP-hard on these graphs, OPT is estimated by the greedy cut on the full ground set; reported α values are therefore upper bounds on the true containment ratio.

Scaling to $n = 500$ (LLM context). Expanding the HotpotQA ground set to $n = 500$ passages ($k = 5, 50$ questions), SeqDisjoint and StdGreedy maintain FL containment $\alpha = 1.000$ at every ω and achieve F1 = 0.48 at $\omega = 2$ ($50\times$ compression)— $3\times$ higher than random (F1 = 0.16). A stochastic thresholded variant uses $2.2\times$ fewer oracle queries and matches at $\omega \geq 5$.

Comparison with learned pruning (COMBHelper). We compare against COMBHelper [29], a recent GNN-based method that trains a student network via knowledge distillation to predict which vertices belong to the optimal solution. Since COMBHelper supports only vertex cover and MIS, we adapt its architecture (4-layer GraphSAGE teacher, 3-layer student) to MaxCut, training on 20 Erdős–Rényi graphs $G(100, 500)$ with exact k -MaxCut labels from an IP solver. Both networks use GraphSAGE layers with sum aggregation, normalization, ReLU between layers, and dropout probability 0.5. Node features are degree, degree divided by the maximum degree, and local clustering coefficient. The teacher has hidden width 64 and the student has hidden width 32. We train with Adam, learning rate 0.01, weight decay $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$, and 200 epochs. Training labels are binary membership indicators for the exact k -MaxCut solution; each graph uses a random 50/50 node train/validation split. The student is trained by knowledge distillation from the teacher with temperature $T = 4$ and loss $0.5 \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} + 0.5 \mathcal{L}_{\text{KD}}$. The reported variance check retrains the whole pipeline with training seeds 42, 123, 256, 512, 1024. Table 6 reports containment ratios alongside our provable algorithms.

Instance	ω	CH-Teacher	CH-Student	SeqDisjoint	StdGreedy	Random
$G(100, 1000)$	2	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.877
$G(200, 2000)$	2	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.825
$G(300, 4500)$	2	0.999	0.999	1.000	1.000	0.845
SNAP/Facebook	2	0.975	0.998	1.000	1.000	0.255
SNAP/Facebook	3	0.978	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.379
SNAP/Facebook	5	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.523

Table 6: COMBHelper (learned) vs. provable pruning on MaxCut. On in-distribution random graphs, COMBHelper matches our algorithms. On the out-of-distribution SNAP/Facebook graph ($n = 4039$), the teacher network drops to $\alpha = 0.975$ at $\omega = 2$ while SeqDisjoint and StdGreedy maintain $\alpha = 1.000$.

On random graphs drawn from the same family as the training data, COMBHelper is competitive—both teacher and student achieve $\alpha \geq 0.997$. The gap appears on out-of-distribution inputs: on the SNAP/Facebook graph, which differs in scale ($n = 4039$ vs. training on $n = 100$) and topology (power-law vs. Erdős–Rényi), the teacher drops to $\alpha = 0.975$ at $\omega = 2$. By contrast, our provable algorithms maintain $\alpha = 1.000$ without any training data or graph-specific adaptation. Beyond the generalization gap, learning-based pruning faces a structural limitation: COMBHelper requires *exact solutions* on training instances to generate supervision labels—precisely the expensive computation that pruning is meant to avoid. Our algorithms sidestep this circular dependency entirely, requiring only query access to f . We note that COMBHelper’s in-distribution performance is robust

to initialization: retraining with 5 seeds yields identical or near-identical α on the test instances (maximum std 0.0008), so the results above are not a lucky seed.

LLM proxy containment on HotpotQA. Table 7 reports proxy containment on HotpotQA with expanded ground sets.

Algorithm	$\omega = 2$	$\omega = 3$	$\omega = 5$	$\omega = 8$	$ P $ at $\omega=5$
SeqDisjoint	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	15
WindowMax	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	7
WindowRand	0.984	0.985	0.979	0.978	7
QuickPrune	0.836	0.836	0.836	0.836	3
StdGreedy	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	15
Random	0.791	0.869	0.933	0.966	15

Table 7: Proxy containment on HotpotQA with expanded ground sets ($n = 50$, $k = 3$, 50 questions). WindowMax achieves $\alpha = 1.0$ with $|P| = 7$ ($1.4\times$ compression vs. $|P| = 15$ for SeqDisjoint at $\omega = 5$). QuickPrune outputs only $|P| \approx 3$ elements regardless of budget—the streaming threshold is too conservative on non-monotone inputs.

LLM experiment details. *Reader model and decoding.* All LLM reader evaluations use `openai/gpt-oss-120b` served locally through the OpenAI-compatible vLLM API. The model is the Apache 2.0 open-weight reader listed in Appendix N. We query two local endpoints in round-robin order, `localhost:8000/v1` and `localhost:8003/v1`. Decoding is deterministic: temperature 0.0 and `max_tokens=256`. For every evaluated passage set, the prompt template is:

Answer the following question based on the provided context. Give a short, direct answer.

Context:

[title] passage text

Question: question text

Answer:

For multiple passages, the context block concatenates titled passages separated by blank lines. For `gpt-oss` responses we read the first nonempty field among `message.content`, `reasoning`, and `reasoning.content`, matching the local vLLM behavior.

Scoring. HotpotQA answers are scored by normalized token F1 and exact match: lowercase, remove punctuation and the articles “a”, “an”, and “the”, collapse whitespace, then compute token overlap F1 or exact normalized-string equality. MuSiQue LLM validation uses the same normalization, but reports the best F1/EM over the official answer and all answer aliases.

Submodularity of the proxy. The function $\hat{f}(S) = \text{FL}(S) - \theta(|S|)$ is submodular because the decreasing marginal gains of FL and the increasing marginal penalty of convex θ reinforce each other: for any $A \subseteq B$ and element $e \notin B$, $\hat{f}(A \cup \{e\}) - \hat{f}(A) \geq \hat{f}(B \cup \{e\}) - \hat{f}(B)$, since the FL marginal shrinks while the θ marginal grows.

HotpotQA ground-set construction. For each question, we pool its 10 original passages (2 gold, 8 distractors) with distractor passages from other questions, giving $n = 50$ ($k = 3$) and $n = 500$ ($k = 5$). We evaluate on the fitted proxy $\hat{f}(S) = \text{FL}(S) - \theta(|S|)$, where FL is facility location on

TF-IDF similarities and θ is fitted from LLM evaluation data. The fitted-proxy file used in the paper, `fitted_proxy_200q.json`, is based on `exp2_results_200q.json`: 200 HotpotQA development questions, one random prefix ordering per question, and 1,992 recorded LLM evaluations over context sizes 1–10. All but one question have all 10 prefix sizes recorded; one question has sizes 1 and 2 only. This is why the fitted-proxy file reports `n_results=1992`, not 200×10 . The proxy-containment entries in Tables 7 and 3 use `exp4_results.json`. The reader F1/EM entries for the $\omega = 2$ StdGreedy and SeqDisjoint rows use `exp5_llm_c2_50q.json`; the $\omega = 5$, QuickPrune, window, random, gold-only, and all-original rows use `exp5_llm_validation_50q.json`, which records 451 reader calls including the initial endpoint sanity check. The proxy is not the reader score itself; it is a cheap objective used for pruning, and we separately validate the selected passages with the LLM. Thus proxy containment only says that the reduced pool preserves high-scoring candidate contexts under \hat{f} ; the reader experiment checks whether those candidate contexts are useful for answering.

MuSiQue pilot setup. We use the MuSiQue v1.0 answerable development split, keep questions with at least three decomposition hops, shuffle with seed 42, and take the first 50 questions. Each question supplies its native 20 candidate paragraphs; gold passages are the paragraphs marked as supporting. We evaluate $k \in \{3, 5, 7, 10\}$ and $\tau \in \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.5\}$. Passage embeddings are computed with `all-MiniLM-L6-v2`; top- k TF-IDF and top- k embedding baselines rank passages by query similarity. The MuSiQue reader validation uses the selections from the pilot, methods `topk_tfidf`, `topk_embedding`, `rfl_emb_tau=0.3`, and `f1_qw_emb`, and $k \in \{5, 10\}$, for 400 deterministic reader calls.

Restricted facility-location (RFL) function. We define $f_\tau(S) = \sum_{v: \text{rel}(v,q) > \tau} \max_{s \in S} \text{sim}(v, s)$, which restricts FL coverage to passages above a relevance threshold τ , diversifying *within* the query-relevant neighborhood. The headline method uses embedding cosine similarity for `sim` and embedding query similarity for `rel`, with $\tau = 0.3$. We also report TF-IDF-gated variants in the result file. Gold-passage recall is the fraction of supporting passages selected.

Per- k breakdown and gating comparison. At $\tau = 0.3$, RFL with embedding-based gating trails top- k embedding at $k = 3$, ties at $k = 5$, and wins at $k = 10$, consistent with the diversity mechanism becoming effective only when the number of selected passages exceeds the number of trivially salient ones. At $k = 10$, RFL reaches recall 0.740, which is 2.0 percentage points above top- k embedding (0.720) and 9.2 percentage points above top- k TF-IDF (0.648). TF-IDF-based gating fails—it filters out later-hop gold passages whose vocabulary diverges from the query—confirming that semantic embedding similarity is essential for bridging entity gaps in multi-hop reasoning.

Bootstrap confidence intervals. The headline MuSiQue confidence interval is a paired question-level bootstrap over the 50 pilot questions. For each of 10,000 resamples with replacement (seed 42), we resample questions and recompute the mean gold-recall difference between `rfl_emb_tau=0.3` and the baseline. The reported $[+2.8, +15.5]$ percentage-point interval is the 2.5/97.5 percentile interval for `rfl_emb_tau=0.3` minus `topk_tfidf` at $k = 10$.

Reader saturation. Despite the +9.2 percentage-point gold-recall advantage, LLM answer F1 does not improve: at $k = 10$, top- k embedding achieves $F1 = 0.234$ while RFL achieves $F1 = 0.186$ using the local 120B reader. This *reader-saturation* effect—the reader model extracts answers from the most salient passages regardless of additional evidence—is consistent with the “lost in the middle” findings of [24]: providing more gold passages helps recall but does not help a reader that already attends preferentially to early or highly salient context. Improving the reader’s ability to synthesize dispersed evidence is an important open direction; our contribution here is the evidence-coverage mechanism itself, which the pruning theory certifies.

Synthetic separation: main-body summary table. Table 8 presents the summary statistics for the synthetic non-monotone separation instances discussed in the main text.

n	k	ω	Instances	$\text{OPT}_k \subseteq P_g$	$\text{OPT}_k \subseteq P_s$	Value seps
20	3	2	2000	60%	78%	123 (6.2%)
30	3	2	1000	58%	73%	86 (8.6%)
50	3	5	500	70%	100%	48 (9.6%)
50	5	3	200	41%	67%	33 (16.5%)

Table 8: Synthetic non-monotone separation instances (summary). P_g is the pruned set from one greedy run; P_s is the pruned set from SeqDisjoint. *Value seps* counts instances where the solution extracted from P_s has strictly higher value than the solution extracted from P_g . Full results are in Table 9.

M Greedy vs. Sequential Disjoint Greedy: Separation Instances

We evaluate whether the theoretical containment advantage of sequential disjoint greedy (Theorem 4.1) translates to practical value differences on random interference coverage functions $f(S) = |\bigcup_{i \in S} C_i| - \lambda \sum_{i < j \in S} \text{intf}(i, j)$. Each element i covers a random subset $C_i \subseteq [m]$, $|C_i| \in [3, 8]$; pairwise interference arises with probability 0.25, intensity $\text{Unif}(1, 5)$; $\lambda \sim \text{Unif}(0.5, 2.5)$. Both algorithms receive the same budget $p = \omega k$ (so $|P_{\text{GREEDY}}| = |P_{\text{SDG}}|$). After pruning, a k -subset is extracted via greedy from each pruned set.

n	k	ω	Instances	Greedy- k subopt	$\text{OPT}_k \subseteq P_g$	$\text{OPT}_k \subseteq P_s$	Val. seps	Max gap
20	3	2	2000	39%	60%	78%	123 (6.2%)	+0.150
30	3	2	1000	40%	58%	73%	86 (8.6%)	+0.136
50	3	2	500	34%	66%	79%	42 (8.4%)	+0.125
50	3	3	500	34%	67%	91%	42 (8.4%)	—
50	3	5	500	34%	70%	100%	48 (9.6%)	—
30	5	2	500	59%	41%	53%	0	—
50	5	2	200	60%	36%	42%	11 (5.5%)	+0.135
50	5	3	200	60%	41%	67%	33 (16.5%)	—

Table 9: Greedy vs. SeqDisjoint containment and value separation on random interference coverage instances. *Val. seps* counts instances where SeqDisjoint’s extracted k -subset has strictly higher value. At $\omega = 2$, containment differences produce measurable value gaps (up to +0.15). At $\omega \geq 5$ the gap vanishes: sufficient budget provides enough alternatives within any pruned set. Mean α is ≥ 0.96 for both algorithms across all configurations—the separation is a tail phenomenon.

N External Assets, Licenses, and Terms

We use external assets only as benchmarks or baselines; we do not redistribute the SNAP, HotpotQA, MuSiQue, COMBHelper, or LLM model assets with this submission.

SNAP social-network graphs. The Facebook and Wiki-Vote graphs are from the Stanford Network Analysis Project (SNAP) dataset collection [30]. The SNAP Facebook page identifies the

graph as anonymized Facebook social-circle data from McAuley and Leskovec [31]; the Wiki-Vote page identifies the graph as Wikipedia adminship vote-history data. The public download pages are <https://snap.stanford.edu/data/ego-Facebook.html> and <https://snap.stanford.edu/data/wiki-Vote.html>. We did not find a named data license on these SNAP dataset pages; accordingly, we use the public benchmark data only for aggregate MaxCut experiments, cite the original source, and do not redistribute the raw graph files.

HotpotQA. HotpotQA [32] is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution–ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0) license; the official dataset page also states that the processed Wikipedia corpus released with HotpotQA is under the same license. We use the distractor setting and Wikipedia-derived passages as an evaluation benchmark and report only aggregate metrics. Official page: <https://hotpotqa.github.io/>.

MuSiQue. MuSiQue [42] is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license. The repository also cautions that MuSiQue composes questions from seed single-hop datasets and releases dev/test single-hop IDs to avoid train/test leakage. We use the released MuSiQue benchmark for evaluation only and do not train on those seed datasets. Official repository: <https://github.com/StonyBrookNLP/musique>.

COMBHelper baseline. COMBHelper [29] is released under the MIT License in the public repository <https://github.com/1041877801/COMBHelper>. Our MaxCut comparison adapts the published architecture for evaluation; if code is released with a future version, the MIT notice must be retained for any substantial reused portions.

LLM reader model. The reported LLM validation experiments use `openai/gpt-oss-120b` as a locally served reader model. The model card lists the license as Apache 2.0; the model weights are not redistributed, and only aggregate answer-quality metrics are reported. Model card: <https://huggingface.co/openai/gpt-oss-120b>.