

Fair Division with a Secretive Agent

Eshwar Ram Arunachaleswaran* Siddharth Barman† Nidhi Rathi‡

Abstract

We study classic fair-division problems in a partial information setting. This paper respectively addresses fair division of rent, cake, and indivisible goods among agents with cardinal preferences. We will show that, for all of these settings and under appropriate valuations, a fair (or an approximately fair) division among n agents can be efficiently computed using only the valuations of $n - 1$ agents. The n th (secretive) agent can make an arbitrary selection after the division has been proposed and, irrespective of her choice, the computed division will admit an overall fair allocation.

For the rent-division setting we prove that the (well-behaved) utilities of $n - 1$ agents suffice to find a rent division among n rooms such that, for every possible room selection of the secretive agent, there exists an allocation (of the remaining $n - 1$ rooms among the $n - 1$ agents) which ensures overall *envy freeness* (fairness). We complement this existential result by developing a polynomial-time algorithm that finds such a fair rent division under quasilinear utilities.

In this partial information setting, we also develop efficient algorithms to compute allocations that are *envy-free up to one good* (EF1) and ε -*approximate envy free*. These two notions of fairness are applicable in the context of indivisible goods and divisible goods (cake cutting), respectively. This work also addresses fairness in terms of *proportionality* and *maximin shares*. Our key result here is an efficient algorithm that, even with a secretive agent, finds a $1/19$ -approximate maximin fair allocation (of indivisible goods) under submodular valuations of the non-secretive agents.

One of the main technical contributions of this paper is the development of novel connections between different fair-division paradigms, e.g., we use our existential results for envy-free rent-division to develop an efficient EF1 algorithm.

1 Introduction

The theory of fair division addresses the fundamental problem of dividing resources/goods in a fair manner among agents with heterogeneous valuations, but equal entitlements [Mou86]. Many recent results in algorithmic game theory address computational aspects of fair division, see, e.g., [BCE⁺16] and [Rot15] for excellent expositions. A central thread of research here is to design algorithms that complement nonconstructive existence results. This computational perspective has led to notable algorithms, hardness results, and the development of novel solution concepts; in fact, a number of such notions and algorithms have been integrated into widely-used websites (e.g., Spliddit¹ and Adjusted Winner²), which provide methods for fair division of resources, rent, and tasks. This work contributes to computational thinking in fair division and, in particular, studies algorithmic aspects of existence results which show that the preferences of only $n - 1$ agents suffice to find a fair division among n agents.

Such an existence result for the case of two agents and a divisible good (which is metaphorically represented as a cake) follows directly from the standard divide-and-choose protocol: considering the valuation of just the first agent we can partition the cake into two parts of equal value (for the first

*Indian Institute of Science. eshwarram.arunachaleswaran@gmail.com

†Indian Institute of Science. barman@iisc.ac.in

‡Indian Institute of Science. nidhirathi@iisc.ac.in

¹<http://www.spliddit.org/>

²<http://www.nyu.edu/projects/adjustedwinner/>

agent) and, then, the second agent can select her most preferred piece. This protocol leads to an *envy-free* cake division, i.e., in the resulting allocation no agent has a strictly stronger preference for the other agent’s piece. Envy freeness is a standard notion of fairness [Fol67, Var74, Str80] and the divide-and-choose method shows a fair division with respect to this notion can be found even if the second agent is secretive and just selects a piece *after* we partition the cake.

Asada et al. [AFP⁺18] showed that this result extends to higher number of agents who are endowed with ordinal preferences: there exists a division of the cake into n parts, which depends on the (subjective) preferences of only $n - 1$ agents, such that the n th (secretive) agent can select an arbitrary piece and still we would be able to allocate the remaining $n - 1$ pieces in an envy-free manner. In other words, independent of the choice of the secretive agent, there exists an allocation in which no agent has a strictly stronger preference for the piece of any other agent (including the secretive one). This result of Asada et al. [AFP⁺18] relies on a fixed-point argument—specifically, it uses a version of the Knaster, Kuratowski, and Mazurkiewicz (KKM) Lemma [KKM29].

The work of Frick et al. [FHEM17] shows that an envy-free *rent division* can also be achieved, albeit inefficiently, in the absence of full information. Rent division is another well-studied problem in the fair-division literature, and it entails allocating n rooms among n agents and splitting the rent such that envy freeness is achieved; see, e.g., [Su99], [Sve83], [ADG91], [Ara95], [Kli00] and [GMPZ17]. Considering agents who have ordinal preferences over the rooms (for every possible division of the rent), Frick et al. [FHEM17] proved that the preferences of $n - 1$ agents suffice to find a rent division such that secretive agent can select an arbitrary room (at its price) and still an overall envy-free allocation of the remaining $n - 1$ rooms (at their respective prices and among the $n - 1$ agents) would exist.

In this paper we will consider agents who have numerical valuations over the good(s) (i.e., have cardinal preferences) and develop efficient algorithms for secretive fair division in multiple settings. Specifically, we will study fair division of rent, cake, and indivisible goods. We will show that, under appropriate valuations, for all of these settings a fair (or an approximately fair) division among n agents can be efficiently computed using only the valuations of $n - 1$ agents. The n th (secretive) agent can make an arbitrary selection after the division has been proposed and, irrespective of her choice, the computed division will continue to admit a fair allocation.

Overall, this work establishes existence and algorithmic results for secretive analogues of standard fair-division problems.

Fair Rent Division: This problem entails splitting the rent and allocating n rooms among n agents such that, under the imposed rents, each agent prefers the room allocated to it over that of any other agent. In the cardinal version of this problem the preferences of the agents for the rooms are expressed via functions (one for each agent-room pair) which specify agents’ utility for the rooms at every possible room rent. The works of Svensson [Sve83] and Alkan et al. [ADG91] shows that if the utility functions of all the n agents for each of the n rooms are continuous, strictly decreasing, and bounded, then an envy-free rent division is guaranteed to exist. We extend these results and prove that, considering the utility functions of $n - 1$ agents,³ we can propose a rent division among the n rooms such that for every possible room selection of the secretive agent there exists an allocation (of the remaining $n - 1$ rooms among the $n - 1$ agents) which ensures overall envy freeness (Theorem 2). Hence, analogous to the results of [AFP⁺18] and [FHEM17] (which considered ordinal preferences), we show that fair rent division with a secretive agent can be achieved in the cardinal setting as well.⁴

Efficient algorithms for fair rent division are known for the quasilinear utility model [Ara95, GMPZ17, Kli00]. In this setup every agent a has a base value for each room r , and a ’s utility for room r when its

³As in the standard rent-division case, these utilities are assumed to be continuous, strictly decreasing, and bounded.

⁴The assumptions considered in [AFP⁺18] and [FHEM17] render these results incomparable with the cardinal setting of the present paper. In particular, these existence results require that every agent always prefers a zero-rent room over rooms with positive rent. Since this assumption does not hold even for the class of quasilinear utilities, the ordinal setup of [AFP⁺18] and [FHEM17] is incomparable with the cardinal-utility model considered in this work.

rent is p_r is equal to the base value minus p_r . We show that, under quasilinear utilities, an efficient, fair-division algorithm exists even in the secretive case, i.e., we develop a polynomial-time algorithm for secretive rent division when the utilities of the $n - 1$ agents are quasilinear (Theorem 3).

Fair Division of Divisible Goods: Cutting a cake (i.e., dividing a divisible good) in a fair manner is a classic problem in fair division. Formally, the cake is represented as the interval $[0, 1]$ and it models resources that can be fractionally allocated, such as land. Each agent has a sigma additive valuation over the subintervals of $[0, 1]$, i.e., over the pieces of the cake. The standard notions of fairness in this context are (i) envy freeness and (ii) proportionality. We develop results for both of these solution concepts:

(i) *Envy Freeness:* Simmons (see also [Su99]) has shown that an envy-free partition of the cake among the n agents is guaranteed to exist. However, no finite-time algorithm can find such a partition if the valuations are adaptively specified by an adversary [Str08]. Prior work has also considered a variant in which the cake is divided into more than n pieces and disjoint subsets of the pieces are allocated among the agents. The best-known algorithm for finding an exact envy-free allocation with noncontiguous pieces has hyper-exponential complexity [AM16]. To address these computational barriers, one can consider a natural relaxation of envy freeness wherein for each agent a the value of the piece (or bundle) assigned to it is within ε of the value of the piece (or bundle) most preferred by a ; here, we conform to the standard assumption that each agent’s valuation for the entire cake is equal to one. Deng et al. [DQS12] have shown that, for a small enough ε , finding an approximately envy-free contiguous n -partition of the cake is PPAD-complete under Su’s [Su99] ordinal valuations model.

Given these hardness results, we focus on the problem of dividing the cake into noncontiguous pieces and allocating bundles to agents such that approximate envy freeness is achieved. We show that in this framework a secretive division can be obtained efficiently. We consider this problem in the standard Robertson-Webb query model, and show that the query and time complexity of our algorithm is polynomial in the number of agents and $1/\varepsilon$, here ε is the approximation parameter (Theorem 5).

In particular, considering the valuation of only $n - 1$ agents, we can partition the cake into n disjoint subsets (each potentially consisting of multiple pieces) such that the secretive agent can select an arbitrary subset and we would still be able to allocate the remaining $n - 1$ subsets in an approximately envy free manner.

(ii) *Proportionality:* In the context of cake cutting proportionality is another fundamental fairness criterion. It deems a partition to be fair if each agent receives a piece of value at least $1/n$ times her value for the entire cake [Ste48]. Note that additivity of the valuations ensure that an envy free allocation satisfies proportionality. However, in contrast to envy freeness, a proportional division of the cake can be efficiently achieved by following the moving-knife procedure of Dubins and Spanier [DS61]: a knife is moved from one end of the cake (i.e., the interval $[0, 1]$) to the other and the cake is cut as soon as, for any agent a (who does not have a piece yet), the value of the piece to the left of the knife is $1/n$ times the total value of the cake. This piece is allocated to agent a and she is removed from consideration. The last agent gets the remainder of the cake. The fact that the agents’ valuations are additive imply that the resulting allocation satisfies proportionality. We show that, interestingly, this moving-knife procedure can be executed with $n - 1$ agents to obtain an n -partition which is proportionally fair even with a secretive agent (Theorem 6).

Fair Division of Indivisible Goods: As mentioned previously, envy-free divisions always exist for divisible goods. By contrast, such a universal existential guarantee does not hold in the context of indivisible goods.⁵ To address this issue and motivated by allocation problems that involve discrete resources

⁵For example, consider a single indivisible good and two agents with nonzero valuation for the good. In any allocation, the losing agent will be envious.

(such as courses at universities [BCKO16]), a number of recent results have formulated and studied fairness notions that specifically address discrete goods [Bud11, PW14, BL16]. Two prominent notions in this line of work are (i) envy freeness up to one good (EF1) and (ii) maximin shares (MMS). We show that fairness in terms of these concepts can be achieved even in the presence of a secretive agent.

(i) EF1 is a compelling analogue of envy freeness in the discrete setting [Bud11]. Specifically, an allocation is said to be EF1 if every agent prefers her own bundle over any other agent’s bundle, up to the removal of one good from the other agent’s bundle. Lipton et al. [LMMS04] proved that if the valuations of the agents (over subsets of goods) are monotone, then an EF1 allocation always exists and can be computed in polynomial time. The result is notably general, since it encompasses all monotone (combinatorial) valuations. We prove that, even with a secretive agent, fairness in terms of EF1 can be guaranteed. In particular, we show that, given $n - 1$ agents with monotone valuations, we can efficiently partition the set of indivisible goods into n disjoint subsets, $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n\}$, such that every collection of $n - 1$ subsets from \mathcal{S} can be assigned (among the $n - 1$ agents) to obtain an EF1 allocation overall (Theorem 4). Note that our result shows that an EF1 allocation exists if $n - 1$ agents have monotone valuations; the valuation of the n th agent can be completely arbitrary. Hence, as a corollary, we get a strengthening of the existence guarantee of Lipton et al. [LMMS04].

(ii) MMS: In the context of indivisible goods, maximin shares lead to another relevant notion of fairness. These shares provide an agent specific fairness threshold; in particular, the maximin share of an agent is defined to be the maximum value that the agent can ensure for herself if she were to (hypothetically) partition the set of indivisible goods into n disjoint subsets and, then, from them receive the minimum valued one. An allocation is said to satisfy the maximin share guarantee (MMS) if and only if each agent receives a bundle of value at least as much as her maximin share. Defined by Budish [Bud11], maximin share can be interpreted through a discrete generalization of the cut-and-choose method: an agent a partitions (cuts) the goods and the other agents get to select a bundle (choose) before a . A risk-averse agent a would partition the goods to maximize the minimum valued bundle. Here, the value that a can ensure for herself corresponds to her maximin share.

Even though MMS allocations are not guaranteed to exist [PW14, KPW16], this notion lends well to approximations: Procaccia and Wang [PW14] have shown that if the agents have additive valuations, then there exists an allocation wherein each agent receives a bundle of value at least $2/3$ times her maximin share; see also [AMNS17] and [BK17]. The work of Ghodsi et al. [GHS⁺18] provides an efficient algorithm for finding a $3/4$ -approximate MMS allocation under additive valuations. Approximation guarantees for MMS have also been obtained for more general valuation classes [BK17, GHS⁺18]. In particular, Ghodsi et al. [GHS⁺18] show that a $1/3$ -approximate MMS allocation can be computed efficiently under submodular valuations and a logarithmic approximation exists when the valuations are subadditive.

We show that, even with a secretive agent, if the remaining $n - 1$ agents have submodular valuations, then a $1/19$ -approximate MMS allocation for them can be computed in polynomial time. In particular, we develop a combinatorial algorithm that finds a $1/19$ -approximate MMS allocation by reducing the secretive problem to its standard fair-division version. Furthermore, we show that, in the case of indivisible goods and additive valuations, a discrete extension of the moving-knife procedure provides a $1/2$ -approximate MMS allocation in the secretive case.

Remark: Note that, when considering envy freeness or EF1 with a secretive agent, fairness is guaranteed for every agent. In particular, the secretive agent can always select its most preferred room/piece/bundle and achieve envy freeness, irrespective of its valuation type. This property holds in the MMS case as well, if the valuation of the secretive agent is additive: the secretive agent can select a bundle that ensures proportionality for her and, hence, obtain a bundle of value at least as much as her maximin share. However, in the MMS case such a guarantee cannot be achieved for a secretive agent whose valuation

is, say, non-additive. This follows from the fact that, considering just the valuations of the $n - 1$ non-secretive agents, one cannot determine a partition wherein some bundle is of value (with respect to the arbitrary valuation of the secretive agent) close to the maximin share of the secretive agent.

Overall, the paper shows that a broad spectrum of fair division problems can be addressed in a partial information setting. Indeed, with respect to a specific agent, these results prove that a limited number of valuation queries suffice to find a fair division. Furthermore, our work implies stronger versions of standard existential and algorithmic results, e.g., the rent-division result developed in the paper shows that as long as $n - 1$ agents have quasilinear utilities, an envy-free rent division can be computed efficiently. Here, the utility function of the n th agent can be arbitrary. This is in contrast to prior works, which require all the agents to have quasilinear utilities. We obtain these results by developing connections between different fair division paradigms, e.g., we establish the result for EF1 by using the rent-division guarantees. These connections are mentioned below and they might be of independent interest.

Our Techniques: We use the generalization of the KKM lemma developed in Asada et al. [AFP⁺18] to establish the existence of fair rent division with a secretive agent.

Our efficient algorithm for quasilinear utilities draws upon the equivalence between envy-free rents and Walrasian equilibria. Specifically, the Second Welfare Theorem for Walrasian equilibrium ensures that if the $n - 1$ agents have quasilinear utilities, then every maximum weight matching between the agents and the rooms induces an envy-free solution; here the weights between agents and rooms are set to be the corresponding base values. We use this property to formulate a linear program whose solution is a fair rent division which is robust to the choice of the secretive agent.

Instantiating the result for quasilinear utilities, we show that if $n - 1$ agents have monotone valuations, then an EF1 allocation (with a secretive agent) always exists and can be computed efficiently. Specifically, we develop an algorithm that iteratively allocates goods to bundles and maintains the EF1 property as an invariant. We use the rent-division result to show that in each iteration the algorithm can efficiently find a bundle and allocate the next good to it such that the invariant continues to hold. Note that, in contrast to the existential result of Lipton et al.—which relies on a direct parity argument—our work uses a novel connection between rent division and discrete fair division.

The developed EF1 algorithm in turn provides an efficient method to find an approximate envy-free cake division through a reduction of Lipton et al. [LMMS04]: we partition the cake into pieces such that, for each of the $n - 1$ agents, the value of any piece is at most ε . Then, considering these low-valued pieces as indivisible goods, we execute the EF1 algorithm to obtain an approximately envy-free division which can accommodate an arbitrary selection by the secretive agent.

We show that a careful analysis of a modified version of the moving knife procedure of Dubins and Spanier [DS61] guarantees a proportional division of the cake for every eventual choice of the secretive agent.

To solve the problem of computing approximate MMS allocations in the presence of a secretive agent, we employ a discrete moving knife procedure on top of existing algorithmic results (that were developed for the non-secretive setting).

2 Notation and Preliminaries

2.1 Rent Division

Envy-Free Rent Division: An instance of the (standard) envy-free rent division problem is represented by the following tuple $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$ wherein $\mathcal{A} := [n]$ denotes the set of n agents and $\mathcal{R} := [n]$ denotes the set of n rooms. The cardinal preference of each agent $a \in \mathcal{A}$ for every room $r \in \mathcal{R}$ is specified via a utility function $v_a(r, \cdot)$, i.e., a 's utility for r at price (rent) $p_r \in \mathbb{R}$ is $v_a(r, p_r) \in \mathbb{R}$.

A solution to the rent division problem comprises of the tuple (π, p) , where $\pi : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{R}$ is a bijection from the set of agents to the set of rooms and $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a price vector for the set of rooms. The tuple (π, p) is said to be an *envy-free solution* of the given instance if for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $v_a(\pi(a), p_{\pi(a)}) \geq v_a(r, p_r)$, i.e., under the given price vector, no agent strongly prefers (envies) any other room to the one allocated to her.

Envy-Free Rent Division with a Secretive Agent: A rent-division instance with a secretive agent is a tuple $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$, wherein $\mathcal{A} = [n]$ and $\mathcal{R} = [n]$ denote the set of n agents and n rooms, respectively. We will use $v_a(r, \cdot)$ to denote the utility function of agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ for room $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Here, in contrast to the standard rent division setting, the problem instances have a distinguished, “secretive” agent, n , who gets to pick any room of her choice after the prices for the rooms have been proposed.⁶ A secretive envy-free solution is a price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfies the following property: for every room $k \in \mathcal{R}$, there exists a bijection $\pi_k : \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} \mapsto \mathcal{R} \setminus \{k\}$ such that (π_k, p) is envy-free, i.e., for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $v_a(\pi_k(a), p_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(r, p_r)$.

Intuitively, a price vector $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ constitutes a solution in the secretive setting if for any arbitrary room choice, $k \in \mathcal{R}$, of the secretive agent, the properties of p allow us to allocate the remaining rooms (using π_k) among the agents such that no agent strictly prefers any other agent’s room. Note that such a price vector p is computed *before* the choice k is made by the secretive agent and without taking into account any information about her utilities.

We will establish existential results for bounded, continuous, and monotone (strictly) decreasing utilities. The utility functions $\{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}}$ are bounded in the sense that there exists $M \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and all pairs of rooms $r, r' \in \mathcal{R}$ the following inequality holds.

$$v_a(r, M) < v_a(r', 0)$$

Quasilinear utilities constitute a well-studied subclass of the above-mentioned (broad) class of utility functions. In the quasilinear setting each utility function $v_a(r, x)$ is of the form $B_r^a - x$; here $B_r^a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the base value of room r for agent a . In other words, in the quasilinear case the utility of agent a for room r is equal to her base value for the room minus the rent of r .

2.2 Envy-Free Allocation of Goods

Secretive EF1 Allocations of Indivisible Goods: An instance of the fair division problem with indivisible goods and a secretive agent is a tuple $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ in which $\mathcal{A} := [n]$ stands for the set of n agents, $\mathcal{G} := [m]$ denotes the set of m indivisible goods, and v_a s specify the valuation of each agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ over the set of goods. The valuation functions $v_a : 2^{\mathcal{G}} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ are assumed to be nonnegative and monotone for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$.⁷ Write $\Pi_n(\mathcal{G})$ to denote the set of all n -partitions of \mathcal{G} .

In the standard (non-secretive) context with n agents and set of indivisible goods \mathcal{G} , an n -partition $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\mathcal{G})$ is said to be *envy-free up to one good* (EF1) iff for all agents a, b there exists a good $g \in A_b$ such that $v_a(A_a) \geq v_a(A_b \setminus \{g\})$; here, each agent a is assigned the subset of goods (bundle) A_a . Note that the definition ensures that each agent prefers its own bundle over the bundle of any other agent up to the removal of one good.

This definition extends to address fair division of indivisible goods with a secretive agent. Formally, an n -partition $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n) \in \Pi_n(\mathcal{G})$ of the set of goods \mathcal{G} is said to be a secretive EF1 allocation iff it satisfies the following property: for each choice of bundle P_k from partition \mathcal{P} , there exists a bijection $\pi_k : \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} \mapsto [n] \setminus \{k\}$ such that the allocation defined by π_k on $(P_1, \dots, P_{k-1}, P_{k+1}, \dots, P_n)$ is EF1, i.e., for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and all bundles P_b , with $b \in [n]$, there exists a good $g \in P_b$ such that $v_a(P_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(P_b \setminus \{g\})$.

⁶Note that, here, the instances do not contain any information about the utilities of the (n th) secretive agent.

⁷Analogous to the rent-division case, the instance tuple contains no information about the valuation function of agent n , who is designated to be the secretive agent.

In other words, for every choice of bundle P_k made by the secretive agent, the secretive EF1 solution $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ allows for an EF1 allocation of the remaining bundles among the first $n - 1$ agents.

Secretive Envy-Free Cake Cutting: A cake-cutting instance with a secretive agent comprises of a cake, represented by the unit interval $C = [0, 1]$, the set of agents, represented by $\mathcal{A} := [n]$, and valuations $\{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$. These valuation functions are defined over all finite unions of disjoint intervals of C . Following standard conventions, the functions are assumed to be nonnegative, normalized (i.e., $v_a(C) = 1$) and sigma additive.⁸ As is typical in cake cutting, the valuations are also assumed to be divisible, i.e., for all intervals $X \subseteq C$ and real numbers $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, there exists a subinterval $X' \subseteq X$ such that $v_a(X') = \lambda v_a(X)$. Here, we use term bundle to denote a finite union of disjoint intervals of the cake. An n -partition of the cake $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ is defined to be a tuple of n bundles which are pairwise disjoint and whose union is equal to C .

Analogous to the previous settings, the valuations are specified only for the first $n - 1$ agents and the n th agent is considered to be secretive—no information about her valuation function over the cake is specified.

In this work we consider the problem of finding an approximately envy-free partition of the cake. In particular, we say that an allocation is ε -envy free (ε -EF) if, under it the envy is upper bounded by ε , i.e., an n -partition $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ is ε -EF iff, for all agents a and indices $b \in [n]$, we have $v_a(A_a) \geq v_a(A_b) - \varepsilon$; here, for all agents a , bundle A_a is allocated to a . This paper considers cake cutting in the standard the Robertson-Webb query model [RW98], which provides access to the following (query) oracles:

1. $\text{Cut}(a, I, \lambda)$: Given agent a , an interval $I = [x_1, x_2] \subseteq C$ of the cake, and a real number $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ as a query, the response is a point $x \in I$ such that $v_a([x_1, x]) = \lambda v_a(I)$.
2. $\text{Eval}(a, I)$: When queried with an agent a and an interval $I = [x_1, x_2] \subseteq C$, this oracle provides a 's valuation of interval I , i.e., provides $v_a(I)$.

Extending this concept, a partition $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ of the cake C is defined to be a *secretive ε -EF* solution iff for every bundle A_k in the partition \mathcal{A} , there exists a bijection $\pi_k : \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} \mapsto [n] \setminus \{k\}$ such that the allocation defined by π_k on $(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{k-1}, A_{k+1}, \dots, A_n)$ is ε -EF, i.e., for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and all bundles A_b for $b \in [n]$ we have $v_a(A_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(A_b) - \varepsilon$.

Note that the secretive agent gets to pick her first choice. Therefore, in all the settings mentioned above (cake cutting, division of indivisible goods, and rent division), the secretive agent can achieve envy freeness.

2.3 Proportional Division of Goods

Proportional Cake Division with a Secretive Agent: We also obtain results for cake-cutting with a secretive agent, in terms of proportionality. Formally, an n -partition $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ of the cake C is said to be a secretive proportional solution iff for every bundle A_k of \mathcal{A} , there exists a bijection $\pi_k : \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} \mapsto [n] \setminus \{k\}$ such that the allocation defined by π_k on $(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{k-1}, A_{k+1}, \dots, A_n)$ is proportional, i.e., for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ we have $v_a(A_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq 1/n$.⁹ For proportional fairness, we in fact show that there exists a contiguous n -partition that achieves proportional fairness even with a secretive agent.

MMS Allocation of Indivisible Goods with a Secretive Agent: As mentioned in Section 1, the maximin share property (MMS) provides an analogue of proportionality in the context of indivisible goods. Given

⁸That is, we have $v_a(X \cup Y) = v_a(X) + v_a(Y)$ for all disjoint pairs of intervals $X, Y \subseteq C$.

⁹Recall that the valuations of the first $n - 1$ agents are normalized to satisfy $v_a(C) = 1$.

a set of indivisible goods \mathcal{G} and n agents, the maximin share, μ_a , of an agent a is defined to be the maximum value that a can guarantee for herself, if she were to partition \mathcal{G} into n subsets and then receive the minimum valued one. Formally, with $v_a : 2^{\mathcal{G}} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ representing the valuation of agent a over the set of indivisible goods \mathcal{G} , we have

$$\mu_a := \max_{(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\mathcal{G})} \min_{j \in [n]} v_a(A_j) \quad (1)$$

Since MMS allocations—i.e., allocations in which each agent gets a bundle of value at least as large as her maximin share—do not always exist, prior work has focused on approximation guarantees. The goal here is to find a partition (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n) , wherein each agent a is allocated bundle, A_a , of value (under v_a) at least $\alpha\mu_a$, with parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ being as large as possible.

In the presence of a secretive agent, the problem instance for maximin fairness is a tuple $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$; here $\mathcal{A} = [n]$ denotes the set of agents, $\mathcal{G} = [m]$ denotes the set of indivisible goods, and the valuation of each (non-secretive) agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ is represented by $v_a : 2^{\mathcal{G}} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$.

An n -partition $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n) \in \Pi_n(\mathcal{G})$ is defined to be a *secretive* α -MMS solution iff for each bundle P_k of partition \mathcal{P} , there exists a bijection $\pi_k : \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} \mapsto [n] \setminus \{k\}$ such that the allocation defined by π_k on $(P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{k-1}, P_{k+1}, \dots, P_n)$ gives each agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ a bundle of value α times her maximin share, μ_a , i.e., for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ the following inequality holds $v_a(A_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq \alpha\mu_a$.

For (approximate) maximin fairness, the present work focuses on valuations that are monotone, nonnegative, and submodular. Recall that a function $f : 2^{\mathcal{G}} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be submodular iff it satisfies the diminishing marginals property, i.e., for all subsets $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, with $A \subseteq B$, and every $g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus B$ we have $f(A \cup \{g\}) - f(A) \geq f(B \cup \{g\}) - f(B)$.

2.4 Framework for Secretive Solution Concepts

In all the solution concepts defined above, the bijections/permutations $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}$ (that enable a fair division after the secretive agent makes a choice) are not an explicit part of the solution. However, for all settings considered in this work, these permutations can be computed efficiently.

We now provide a useful formalism for secretive solutions. Let $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ represent a collection of n bundles that constitute a candidate solution of a fair division problem with agents \mathcal{A} and known valuations $\{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$. In this abstract setting, the bundles can be divisible or indivisible goods, or even a combination of both (e.g., a bundle can represent a room and its rent).

Write \mathcal{H} to denote the bipartite graph with the two vertex parts being $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n\}$, respectively.¹⁰ The edge set of \mathcal{H} is constructed to account for the underlying fairness property: edge (a, P_i) is included in \mathcal{H} iff bundle P_i satisfies the fairness criterion for agent a . For example, in the context of rent division—wherein each bundle P_i is a tuple of a room i and its rent p_i —edge (a, P_i) is included iff assigning room i to agent a ensures envy freeness for a , i.e., iff $v_a(i, p_i) \geq v_a(r, p_r)$ for $r \in \mathcal{R}$.

Note that the collection of bundles \mathcal{P} is a secretive solution (satisfying the required fairness criterion) iff for every $k \in [n]$ (i.e., each choice P_k of the secretive agent), there exists a perfect matching π_k in the bipartite graph obtained by removing (vertex) P_k from \mathcal{H} . This property leads to the following characterization: a collection of bundles \mathcal{P} is a secretive solution, with respect to the underlying fairness property, iff for every subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ we have $|\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(S)| \geq |S| + 1$; here $\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(S)$ denotes the set of neighbors of S in the graph \mathcal{H} .

The following lemma establishes another useful result regarding the construction of the n permutations $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}$. In this result the mapping σ can be thought of as a “backup scheme:” to ensure that a tuple (P_1, \dots, P_n) is a secretive solution it suffices to show that, for each agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$, both the bundles P_a and $P_{\sigma(a)}$, with $\sigma(a) > a$, satisfy the fairness property. The fact that $\sigma(a) > a$, for all the first $n - 1$ agents, implies that σ induces a topological ordering, i.e., it is acyclic. Intuitively, with mapping

¹⁰Note that the two bipartite vertex sets of \mathcal{H} are of size $n - 1$ and n , respectively.

σ in hand, we can either give an agent a the bundle P_a or, in case P_a is not available, we can allocate $P_{\sigma(a)}$ to a . The acyclicity of σ ensures that each agent gets a different bundle.

Lemma 1. *Given a mapping $\sigma : [n-1] \mapsto [n] \setminus \{1\}$ with the property that $\sigma(a) > a$, for all $a \in [n-1]$, we can efficiently find a set of n bijections $\mathcal{B} = \{\pi_k : [n-1] \mapsto [n] \setminus \{k\}\}_{k \in [n]}$ such that for all the bijections $\pi \in \mathcal{B}$ and every $a \in [n-1]$ we have $\pi(a) \in \{a, \sigma(a)\}$, i.e., for each a , permutation π is either the identity or σ .*

Proof Consider the directed graph $\mathcal{J} := ([n], \{(i, \sigma(i))\}_{i \in [n-1]})$. In \mathcal{J} , the n th vertex has no outgoing edge and the outdegree of every other vertex is exactly equal to one. In addition, the fact that $\sigma(a) > a$, for all $a \in [n-1]$, implies that \mathcal{J} is acyclic. Therefore, for each $k \in [n-1]$, there exists a directed path, S_k , from vertex k to the last vertex n . The required bijection π_k is constructed in the following manner: for all vertices i not on the path S_k we set $\pi_k(i) = i$ and for the remaining vertices set $\pi_k(i) = \sigma(i)$. \square

3 Main Results

The statements of our key results are provided in this section.

Fair Rent Division: The existential and algorithmic results for fair rent division with a secretive agent are established in Section 4.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$ be a rent-division instance with a secretive agent. If the utilities, $\{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}}$, of the instance are bounded, continuous, and monotone decreasing, then \mathcal{I} admits a secretive envy-free solution $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Theorem 3. *Given any rent-division instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent and quasilinear utilities, a secretive envy-free solution $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ of \mathcal{I} can be computed in polynomial time.*

Envy Free and EF1 Allocations: In Section 5 we address fairness in terms of envy and prove the following two results.

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ be a fair division instance with indivisible goods, \mathcal{G} , and a secretive agent. If the valuations $\{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$ are nonnegative and monotone (increasing), then a secretive EF1 solution $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ for \mathcal{I} is guaranteed to exist and can be computed in polynomial time.*

The computational part of the previous result only requires oracle access to the underlying valuations (set functions) $\{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$.

Theorem 5. *For any cake-cutting instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, C = [0, 1], \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent, a secretive ε -EF solution $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ can be computed in time that is polynomial in n and $1/\varepsilon$, under the Robertson-Webb query model.*

Proportional and MMS Allocations: Results for proportionality and MMS are developed in Section 6.

Theorem 6. *For any cake cutting instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, C = [0, 1], \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent, a secretive proportional solution $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ can be computed in polynomial time under the Robertson-Webb query model. Moreover, we can ensure that the computed bundles, P_i s, are intervals, i.e., we can efficiently find a solution \mathcal{P} which forms a contiguous partition of the cake.*

Theorem 7. *Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ be a fair division instance with indivisible goods, \mathcal{G} , and a secretive agent. If the valuations $\{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$ are nonnegative, monotone, and submodular, then a secretive 1/19-MMS allocation $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ for \mathcal{I} is guaranteed to exist and such an approximate MMS allocation can be computed in polynomial time.*

4 Envy-Free Rent Division

This section presents our results for fair rent division. We show that, for any rent-division instance with reasonably general utility functions, a secretive envy-free solution is guaranteed to exist. We complement this existential result by developing an efficient algorithm for computing such solutions for when the known utilities are quasilinear.

4.1 Existential Result

This subsection considers rent-division instances $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A} = [n], \mathcal{R} = [n], \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent and utilities, $\{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}}$, that are bounded, continuous, and monotone decreasing. Employing a generalization of the Knaster-Kuratowski-Mazurkiewicz (KKM) lemma, one can prove that such rent-division instances always admit a secretive envy-free solution. This form of KKM lemma appears in the work of Asada et al. [AFP⁺18], wherein it is used to prove the existence of secretive envy-free solutions under ordinal utilities. As mentioned previously, the result in Asada et al. [AFP⁺18] requires assumptions which renders it incomparable with the current (cardinal) setup; in particular, quasilinear utilities do not fall under the valuation classes considered in Asada et al. [AFP⁺18].

Recall that for bounded utility functions $\{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}}$ there exist parameter $M \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and all pairs of rooms $r, r' \in \mathcal{R}$ we have:

$$v_a(r, M) < v_a(r', 0) \quad (2)$$

Write $\{e_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ to denote the standard basis vectors of \mathbb{R}^n and let Δ^n be the standard simplex in \mathbb{R}^n , i.e., $\Delta^n := \text{conv}(\{e_i\}_{i \in [n]})$.

First we define KKM covers of the simplex and then state the KKM generalization of Asada et al. [AFP⁺18].

Definition 8 (KKM Cover). *A collection of n closed sets $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to form a KKM cover of the simplex Δ^n , if and only if for all $I \subseteq [n]$, the convex hull of the basis vectors corresponding to I is covered by $\bigcup_{i \in I} C_i$, i.e., iff for all $I \subseteq [n]$, we have $\text{conv}(\{e_i\}_{i \in I}) \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i$.*

The following lemma, proved in [AFP⁺18], provides a useful property of any $(n - 1)$ KKM covers of Δ^n . The lemma states that for every index $k \in [n]$, it is possible to pick one set from each of the $(n - 1)$ KKM covers such that no two sets have the same index and the index k is not used, with the property that the intersection of these selected sets is non empty.

Lemma 9 ([AFP⁺18]). *Given $(n - 1)$ KKM Covers $\mathcal{C}^1, \mathcal{C}^2, \dots, \mathcal{C}^{n-1}$ (here each $\mathcal{C}^i = \{C_1^i, C_2^i, \dots, C_n^i\}$ is a collection of n sets) of the standard simplex Δ^n , there exists a point $x \in \Delta^n$ and n bijections $\pi_k : [n-1] \mapsto [n] \setminus \{k\}$ with $1 \leq k \leq [n]$ such that $x \in \bigcap_{i \in [n-1]} C_{\pi_k(i)}^i$.*

To apply this lemma we will map points in the simplex to room rents (price vectors). Such a mapping enables us to construct KKM covers from the utilities of the first $n - 1$ agents. Specifically, we define a function $h(z) := M(1 - nz)$, where $M \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a large enough real number that satisfies the boundedness condition (2) for the given rent-division instance. Given a simplex point $x \in \Delta^n$, we apply h component-wise to generate the price (rent) of each room, i.e., price vector p is generated from x by setting $p_r := h(x_r)$ for all $r \in [n]$. Note that $h(0) = M$ and $h(z) \leq 0$ for all $z \geq 1/n$.

For each agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$, we define a collection of sets $\mathcal{C}^a = \{C_1^a, C_2^a, \dots, C_n^a\}$ such that the set C_r^a consists of all the simplex points whose corresponding prices render room r as a “first choice” of agent a . Formally,

$$C_r^a := \{x \in \Delta^n \mid v_a(r, h(x_r)) \geq v_a(s, h(x_s)) \text{ for all } s \in \mathcal{R}\}. \quad (3)$$

The following claim establishes that each agent’s collection of sets forms a KKM cover.

Claim 1. For each agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$, the set $\mathcal{C}^a = \{C_1^a, \dots, C_n^a\}$ (as defined above) is a KKM cover of the simplex Δ^n .

Proof Since the valuation functions are continuous, using the sequential criteria for continuity, we get that the sets in the collection \mathcal{C}^a are closed.

Now, consider any subset $I \subseteq [n]$ and any point $x \in \text{conv}(\{e_i\}_{i \in I})$, where e_i s denote the standard basis vectors of \mathbb{R}^n (these vectors are also the vertices of the simplex Δ^n). To prove that \mathcal{C}^a is a KKM cover, it suffices to prove that there exists $r \in I$ such that x is contained in the set C_r^a .

Write $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ to denote the price vector obtained by (component-wise) applying function h on x . Note that, for all $r' \in [n] \setminus I$, we have $x_{r'} = 0$. Hence, the definition of h gives us $p_{r'} = M$ for all $r' \in [n] \setminus I$. On the other hand, an averaging argument implies that there exists a component, $\rho \in I$, of x such that $x_\rho \geq 1/n$ and, hence, $p_\rho \leq 0$. Therefore, using the definition of M (see inequality (2)) and the monotonicity of $v_a(r, \cdot)$ s, we get that $v_a(r', p_{r'}) < v_a(\rho, p_\rho)$ for all $r' \in [n] \setminus I$. In other words, at price vector p , none of the rooms $r' \in [n] \setminus I$ is a first choice of agent a , $([n] \setminus I) \cap (\arg \max_r v_a(r, p_r)) = \emptyset$. Hence, at price vector p , a first-choice room, say r , must be from the set I . Overall, this ensures that $x \in C_r^a$, for some $r \in I$, and the claim follows. \square

With the $(n - 1)$ KKM covers (one for each agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$) in hand, we apply Lemma 9 to find a secretive envy-free solution.

Theorem 2. Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$ be a rent-division instance with a secretive agent. If the utilities, $\{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}}$, of the instance are bounded, continuous, and monotone decreasing, then \mathcal{I} admits a secretive envy-free solution $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof Consider the $(n - 1)$ KKM covers, $\mathcal{C}^1, \dots, \mathcal{C}^{n-1}$ (obtained via Equation (3)) corresponding to the valuation functions $\{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}}$. Lemma 9 ensures that there exists a point $x^* \in \Delta^n$ and n bijections $\pi_k : [n - 1] \mapsto [n] \setminus \{k\}$, with $1 \leq k \leq n$, such that $x^* \in \bigcap_{i \in [n-1]} C_{\pi_k(i)}^i$. We will show that the price vector, p^* , obtained by componentwise applying function h on x^* is a secretive envy-free solution.

Say, under price vector p^* , the secretive agent selects room $k \in [n]$. Then, the property of the bijection $\pi_k : [n - 1] \mapsto [n] \setminus \{k\}$ gives us $x^* \in \bigcap_{i \in [n-1]} C_{\pi_k(i)}^i$, i.e., for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} = [n - 1]$, the point x^* is contained in the set $C_{\pi_k(a)}^a$. The definition of KKM covers (see Equation (3)) implies that the room $\pi_k(a)$ is a first choice of each agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$.

Therefore, for any $k \in \mathcal{R} = [n]$, the allocation (π_k, p^*) provides an envy-free solution. Overall, we get that p^* is a secretive envy-free solution of the rent-division instance. \square

4.2 Algorithmic Result for Quasilinear Utilities

Efficient algorithms for finding envy-free rent divisions (in the standard, non-secretive setting) have been developed in prior work under quasilinear utilities [Ara95, GMPZ17, Kli00]. In this utility model each function $v_a(r, p_r)$ is of the form $B_r^a - p_r$, i.e., agent a 's utility for room r when its rent is p_r is equal to the base value, B_r^a , minus p_r . Note that Theorem 2 applies to quasilinear utilities, since they are a subclass of bounded, continuous, and monotone decreasing utilities.

For a given rent-division instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r} \rangle$ with a secretive agent and quasilinear utilities, throughout this subsection we will use $\mathcal{H} = ((\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}) \cup \mathcal{R}, (\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}) \times \mathcal{R})$ to denote the complete, weighted bipartite graph (between agents and rooms) in which weight of each edge (a, r) is equal to the base value B_r^a . Also, write \mathcal{H}^k to denote the weighted, bipartite graph obtained by removing the k th vertex from the rooms' side in \mathcal{H} .

Extending this notation, we will use $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$ to denote the analogous bipartite graph in the standard (non-secretive) rent-division context. Note that, in $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$, the two vertex sides are of size n , each, and the edges incident on the n th vertex of the agents' side have weights B_r^n for $r \in \mathcal{R}$.

Next, using the above mentioned notation, we state the second welfare theorem. This result provides an important characterization of envy-free rent divisions in the standard (i.e., non-secretive) quasilinear setting.

Lemma 10 (Second Welfare Theorem; Mas-Colell et al. ([MCWG95, Chapter 16])). *Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a,r} \rangle$ be a rent-division instance with quasilinear utilities (i.e., $v_a(r, x) = B_r^a - x$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$). Then, if (π, p) is an envy free solution of \mathcal{I} and σ is a maximum-weight perfect matching in $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$, then (σ, p) is also an envy-free solution of the instance. Furthermore, every agent receives the same utility under both the solutions.*

The subsequent lemma provides an analogue of the second fundamental theorem for the secretive context. The lemma shows that if π_k is a maximum weight matching in bipartite graph \mathcal{H}^k , for all $k \in [n]$, then for *any* secretive envy-free solution p^* and any (room) choice k of the secretive agent, one can use π_k to find an allocation that achieves envy freeness overall. In other words, maximum-weight matchings of bipartite graphs \mathcal{H}^k s suffice to certify that p^* is indeed a secretive envy-free solution.

We use this result to establish the correctness of Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Secretive Envy-Free Rent Division Under Quasilinear Utilities

Input: A rent division instance $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent and quasilinear utilities $\{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$ (i.e., $v_a(r, x) = B_r^a - x$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and all r).

Output: A secretive envy-free solution $p^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and n bijections $\{\pi_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{R}}$ such that for each k , the bijection $\pi_k : \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} \mapsto \mathcal{R} \setminus \{k\}$ along with p^* provides an envy-free solution.

- 1: For all $k \in \mathcal{R}$, set π_k to be a maximum-weight perfect matching in the bipartite graph \mathcal{H}^k .
- 2: Set $p^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ to be the solution of the following linear program
 {The goal here is to find a single price vector under which each π_k is an envy-free allocation}

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{r \in [n]} x_r \\
 \text{subject to} \quad & x_r \geq 0 && \text{for all } r \in [n] \\
 & B_{\pi_k(a)}^a - x_{\pi_k(a)} \geq B_r^a - x_r && \text{for all } a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} \text{ and all } k, r \in \mathcal{R}
 \end{aligned}$$

- 3: **return** price vector p^* and the n bijections $\{\pi_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{R}}$.
-

Lemma 11. *Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r} \rangle$ be a rent-division instance with a secretive agent and quasilinear utilities (i.e., $v_a(r, x) = B_r^a - x$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$). In addition, for all $k \in [n]$, let π_k be a maximum-weight perfect matching in the bipartite graph \mathcal{H}^k and $p^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be any secretive envy-free solution (price vector) of \mathcal{I} . Then, (π_k, p^*) —for all $k \in [n]$ —is an envy-free solution of \mathcal{I} , i.e., $v_a(\pi_k(a), p_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(r, p_r)$ for all $k \in [n]$, $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$.*

Proof Theorem 2 implies that instance the \mathcal{I} (with quasilinear utilities) admits a secretive envy-free solution p^* . Therefore, by definition of a secretive solution, there exist n bijections, $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n$, that provide that an envy-free allocation for every possible choice (room selection) of the secretive agent. Specifically, for every choice $k \in \mathcal{R}$, all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$, and all rooms $r \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $v_a(\phi_k(a), p_{\phi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(r, p_r)$.

For all $k \in \mathcal{R}$, write $p^k \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ to denote the restriction of the price vector p to the rooms $\mathcal{R} \setminus \{k\}$. Note that (ϕ_k, p^k) is an envy-free solution of the (non-secretive) rent-division instance $\mathcal{I}^k = \langle \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} = [n-1], \mathcal{R} \setminus \{k\}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{k\}} \rangle$.

Given that all the utilities in \mathcal{I}^k are quasilinear, we can apply the Second Welfare Theorem (Lemma 10) to obtain that (π_k, p^k) is also an envy-free solution of this instance; recall that π_k is a maximum-weight

matching in \mathcal{H}^k . In addition, Lemma 10 guarantees that agent a obtains the same utility under both the solutions (ϕ_k, p^k) and (π_k, p^k) , i.e., $v_a(\phi_k(a), p_{\phi_k(a)}) = v_a(\pi_k(a), p_{\pi_k(a)})$. Therefore, $v_a(\pi_k(a), p_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(r, p_r)$ for all rooms $r \in \mathcal{R}$.

In other words, the bijections $\{\pi_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{R}}$ also provide an envy-free allocation for every possible choice of the secretive agent and satisfy the required inequality $v_a(\pi_k(a), p_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(r, p_r)$ for all $k \in [n]$, $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$. \square

Theorem 3 states the correctness and time complexity of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 3. *Given any rent-division instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent and quasilinear utilities, a secretive envy-free solution $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ of \mathcal{I} can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof Theorem 2 ensures that the given instance \mathcal{I} admits a secretive envy-free solution $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We can assume that p is componentwise nonnegative–uniform, additive shifts of a price vector maintain envy freeness under quasilinear utilities. In addition, using Lemma 11, for each π_k (a maximum-weight matching in \mathcal{H}^k) we have $v_a(\pi_k(a), p_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(r, p_r)$, i.e., π_k s provide envy-free allocations for every choice k of the secretive agent.

Therefore, p certifies the feasibility of the linear program (LP) formulated in Algorithm 1. Since this LP is also bounded, the algorithm will necessarily find a price vector p^* which (paired with the bijections $\{\pi_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{R}}$) explicitly satisfies the definition of a secretive envy-free solution. This proves the correctness of Algorithm 1. Finally, note that Algorithm 1 entails finding n maximum-weight matchings and solving a linear program with a polynomial number of variables and constraints. Hence, the algorithm runs in polynomial time and the stated claim follows. \square

We conclude this section by stating and proving a combinatorial lemma, which will be essential in establishing the EF1 results. The lemma asserts that for with respect to maximum weight matchings π_k s (in graphs \mathcal{H}^k s) there will always be a room that is “universally despised” by all the agents and across all the n bijections π_k s.

Lemma 12. *Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}, \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$ be a rent-division instance with a secretive agent and quasilinear utilities (i.e., $v_a(r, x) = B_r^a - x$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$). In addition, for all $k \in [n]$, let π_k be a maximum weight perfect matching in the bipartite graph \mathcal{H}^k . Then, there always exists a room $\rho \in [n]$ such that $B_{\pi_k(a)}^a \geq B_\rho^a$, for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and all bijections π_k , with $k \in [n]$.*

Proof Write p to denote a secretive envy-free solution of the quasilinear instance \mathcal{I} ; we know that such a price vector exists via Theorem 2. Consider a room $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$ with the smallest rent under p : $\rho \in \arg \min_{r \in \mathcal{R}} p_r$. Since p is a secretive envy-free solution, for any choice $k \in \mathcal{R}$ of the secretive agent, π_k provides an envy-free allocation (Lemma 11). In particular, at the imposed prices, no agent a strongly prefers room ρ to the room allocated to her, i.e., to $\pi_k(a)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} v_a(\pi_k(a), p_{\pi_k(a)}) &\geq v_a(\rho, p_\rho) && ((\pi_k, p) \text{ is an envy-free solution}) \\ B_{\pi_k(a)}^a - p_{\pi_k(a)} &\geq B_\rho^a - p_\rho && (\text{utilities are quasilinear}) \\ B_{\pi_k(a)}^a &\geq B_\rho^a && (\text{since } p_\rho \leq p_{\pi_k(a)}) \end{aligned}$$

\square

5 Envy-Free Division with a Secretive Agent

In Section 5.1, we address indivisible goods and show that a secretive EF1 allocation always exists and can be computed efficiently, as long as the valuations of the non-secretive agents are monotone increasing.

Section 5.2 provides results for divisible goods (i.e., cake cutting). In particular, we reduce the problem of finding a secretive ε -EF solution (in the cake-cutting setup) to that of computing a secretive EF1 allocation (over indivisible goods). Therefore, using the results developed in Section 5.1, we obtain existential and algorithmic results for secretive ε -EF division.

5.1 Secretive EF1 Allocations of Indivisible Goods

We begin by stating notation which will be required for detailing the algorithm that efficiently finds a secretive EF1 allocation (Algorithm 2). Consider a fair division instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A} = [n], \mathcal{G} = [m], \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent and indivisible goods \mathcal{G} . Let $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ be an n -partition of a subset of goods $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$; we will refer to such an n -partition \mathcal{P} as a partial allocation. Note that $\mathcal{G}' = \cup_i P_i$.

Given any partial allocation \mathcal{P} , write $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}} := ((\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}) \cup \{P_i\}_i, (\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}) \times \{P_i\}_i)$ to denote the weighted, bipartite graph whose bipartition is composed of the set of agents $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and the bundles $\{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$. Here, an edge $(a, P_i) \in (\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}) \times \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ is said to satisfy the EF1 property iff for all bundles P_j in \mathcal{P} there exists a good $g \in P_j$ such that $v_a(P_i) \geq v_a(P_j \setminus \{g\})$.

Write $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$ to denote the set of edges that satisfy the EF1 property and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}^c$ to denote the set of edges that do not, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}^c = ((\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}) \times \{P_i\}_i) \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$. In $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$, the weight of each edge (a, P_i) that satisfies the EF1 property is set to be $v_a(P_i)$ and all edges $(b, P_j) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}^c$ are assigned a weight equal to $-m$ ($\max_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} v_a(\mathcal{G})$), where m is the total number of goods.

Finally, we will use $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}^k$ to denote the bipartite graph obtained by removing vertex P_k from the graph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$. Note that the partition \mathcal{P} is a secretive EF1 allocation if and only if, for every possible (choice of the secretive agent) $k \in [n]$, there exists a perfect matching π_k in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}^k$ that contains only EF1 edges, i.e., satisfies $\pi_k \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$.¹¹ Here, the choice of edge weights ensures that if there is a perfect matching in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}^k$ consisting solely of EF1 edges, then any maximum weight matching will also be composed entirely of EF1 edges.

Next, we will use these constructs to describe Algorithm 2 and prove its correctness in Theorem 4. A key argument in the proof is an application of Lemma 13 to show that Step 5 of Algorithm 2 always succeeds. In particular, Lemma 13 guarantees the existence of a “universally-despised” bundle.

Algorithm 2 Computation of Secretive EF1 Allocations

Input: A fair division instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent, m indivisible goods along with nonnegative and monotone valuations (set functions) $v_a : 2^{[m]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$

Output: An allocation (P_1, \dots, P_n) and n bijections $\{\pi_k\}_{k \in [n]}$ such that, for each choice k of the secretive agent, $\pi_k : \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\} \mapsto [n] \setminus \{k\}$ induces an EF1 allocation.

- 1: Initialize $t \leftarrow 0$ and set $P_a^t = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq a \leq n$, i.e., partial allocation $\mathcal{P}^0 = (\emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)$.
 - 2: **while** $\mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 3: For partial allocation $\mathcal{P}^t = (P_1^t, \dots, P_n^t)$, construct the bipartite graph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}^t}$
 - 4: For each $k \in [n]$, set π_k to be a maximum-weight perfect matching in the graph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}^t}^k$ (i.e., in the graph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}^t}$ with vertex P_k^t removed).
 - 5: Find a bundle P_ρ^t such that for all $k \in [n]$ and all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ we have $v_a(P_{\pi_k(a)}^t) \geq v_a(P_\rho^t)$ {We will prove that such a “universally-despised” bundle always exists and can be found efficiently}
 - 6: Select an arbitrary good $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and set $P_\rho^{t+1} = P_\rho^t \cup \{g\}$
 - 7: For all $i \in [n] \setminus \{\rho\}$ set $P_i^{t+1} = P_i^t$. Update $t \leftarrow t + 1$ and $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \mathcal{G} \setminus \{g\}$
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: **return** Partition $\mathcal{P}^t = (P_1^t, P_2^t, \dots, P_n^t)$ and the n bijections $\{\pi_k\}_{k \in [n]}$
-

¹¹Here, for ease of presentation, we overload notation and use π_k to represent both a bijection and a matching (subset of edges).

Lemma 13. Let $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ be a partial allocation of the indivisible goods in an instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ and let π_k be a maximin weight perfect matching in the bipartite graph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}^k$, for each $k \in [n]$. If the matchings π_k s are composed entirely of EF1 edges ($\pi_k \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$), then there exists an index (bundle) $\rho \in [n]$ such that $v_a(P_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(P_\rho)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and all $k \in [n]$.

Proof From the given instance \mathcal{I} and partial allocation $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$, we construct a rent-division instance $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R} = [n], \{v_a(r, \cdot)\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}, r \in \mathcal{R}} \rangle$ in which the i th room corresponds to the i th bundle P_i . The utilities in $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ are set to be quasilinear, $v_a(i, z) := B_i^a - z$. Here, B_i^a (the base value of room i for agent a) is assigned to the weight of the edge (a, P_i) in the bipartite graph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}$. That is, if edge (a, P_i) satisfies the EF1 property then $B_i^a = v_a(P_i)$. Otherwise, if (b, P_j) is not an EF1 edge, then $B_j^b = -m(\max_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} v_a(\mathcal{G}))$.

An application of Lemma 12 over rent-division instance $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ shows that there exists a room $\rho \in [n]$ such that—for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and maximum weight matchings π_k —we have $B_{\pi_k(a)}^a \geq B_\rho^a$.¹²

Using the fact that every edge in the matching π_k is an EF1 edge, we get $B_{\pi_k(a)}^a = v_a(P_{\pi_k(a)})$ for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$.

Now, if for an agent a edge (a, P_ρ) satisfies the EF1 property then $B_\rho^a = v_a(P_\rho)$ and we get the desired inequality $v_a(P_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(P_\rho)$. Otherwise, if edge (a, P_ρ) is not an EF1 edge, then there must exist a bundle P_j such that for all $g' \in P_j$ the inequality $v_a(P_\rho) < v_a(P_j \setminus \{g'\})$ holds. Again, using the fact that $(a, P_{\pi_k(a)})$ is an EF1 edge, we get that there exists $\tilde{g} \in P_j$ for which $v_a(P_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(P_j \setminus \{\tilde{g}\})$. Hence, the desired inequality $v_a(P_{\pi_k(a)}) \geq v_a(P_\rho)$ holds in all cases. \square

Theorem 4. Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ be a fair division instance with indivisible goods, \mathcal{G} , and a secretive agent. If the valuations $\{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$ are nonnegative and monotone (increasing), then a secretive EF1 solution $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ for \mathcal{I} is guaranteed to exist and can be computed in polynomial time.

Proof We will use an inductive argument to establish the correctness of Algorithm 2. Write \mathcal{P}^t to denote the partial allocation considered by Algorithm 2 in the t th iteration of the while-loop. We will show that the maximum-weight matchings computed by algorithm during any iteration t , say π_k s, satisfy $\pi_k \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}^t}$, i.e., in all iterations, the computed matchings are composed entirely of EF1 edges. In conjunction, we will prove that there exists a bundle P_ρ^t such that the inequality $v_a(P_{\pi_k(a)}^t) \geq v_a(P_\rho^t)$ holds for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ and all matchings π_k .

Both of these conditions hold when $t = 0$, since $P_i^0 = \emptyset$ for all $i \in [n]$. This gives us the base case for induction. Now, say—via the induction hypothesis—that the conditions hold for the $(t - 1)$ th iteration. In particular, if $\widehat{\pi}_k$ s are the maximum-weight matchings considered in the $(t - 1)$ th iteration, then we have $\widehat{\pi}_k \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}^{t-1}}$ and $v_a(P_{\widehat{\pi}_k(a)}^{t-1}) \geq v_a(P_{\widehat{\rho}}^{t-1})$ for some room $\widehat{\rho}$.

By construction, $P_{\widehat{\rho}}^t = P_{\widehat{\rho}}^{t-1} \cup \{g\}$ and $P_i^t = P_i^{t-1}$ for all $i \neq \widehat{\rho}$. Note that, even after this update, the edges in matchings $\widehat{\pi}_k$ s continue to satisfy the EF1 property: if (a, P_i^{t-1}) is an edge in $\widehat{\pi}_k$ (i.e., $i = \widehat{\pi}_k(a)$), then $v_a(P_i^{t-1}) \geq v_a(P_{\widehat{\rho}}^{t-1})$. Therefore, $v_a(P_i^t) \geq v_a(P_{\widehat{\rho}}^t \setminus \{g\})$. Since no other bundle receives a good, the i th bundle satisfies the EF1 property for a in the new partial allocation $\mathcal{P}^t = (P_1^t, \dots, P_n^t)$ as well.

This implies that there exists a perfect matching in the bipartite graph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}^t}^k$ (specifically, $\widehat{\pi}_k$) which is entirely composed on EF1 edges. The weight of all the edges in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}^t}^c$ is low (negative) enough to ensure that if $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}^t}^k$ admits a perfect matching composed entirely of EF1 edges, then a maximum-weight matching, π_k , in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}^t}^k$ will satisfy $\pi_k \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}^t}$.

Furthermore, Lemma 13 (applied to \mathcal{P}^t) implies that there exists a bundle P_ρ^t which satisfies the desired inequalities $v_a(P_{\pi_k(a)}^t) \geq v_a(P_\rho^t)$. This concludes the inductive argument and shows that Step 5 will necessarily succeed in finding bundle P_ρ^t . Also, note that with matchings π_k s in hand, an exhaustive search can be performed to efficiently find P_ρ^t . Hence, the algorithm runs in polynomial time.

¹²By construction of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$, the bipartite graph \mathcal{H}^k considered in Lemma 12 is identical to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}^k$. Hence, we can apply the lemma to π_k s, the maximum weight perfect matchings of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}}^k$ s.

Note that if \mathcal{P} is the final partition and π_k s are the corresponding (returned) matchings, then we know that π_k s are composed entirely of EF1 (with respect to bundles in \mathcal{P}) edges. Therefore, \mathcal{P} is a secretive EF1 allocation and the claim follows. \square

5.2 Secretive ε -EF Cake Cutting

In this subsection, we present an algorithm to find a secretive ε -EF solutions of cake-cutting instances. This algorithm is based on a reduction of Lipton et. al. [LMMS04], which transforms the problem of (approximately) envy free cake-cutting to that of finding a secretive EF1 allocation of indivisible goods.

Theorem 5. *For any cake-cutting instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, C = [0, 1], \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent, a secretive ε -EF solution $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ can be computed in time that is polynomial in n and $1/\varepsilon$, under the Robertson-Webb query model.*

Proof We query the agents' valuations to divide the cake into continuous pieces such that each piece is of value at most ε for any agent in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$. As the valuation functions are additive, there are at most n/ε such pieces. Considering these pieces as indivisible goods, we find a secretive EF1 allocation \mathcal{P} using Theorem 4. Note that the envy in such an allocation is upper bounded by the largest value for a single piece, which is at most ε . Therefore, \mathcal{P} is a secretive ε -EF solution of instance given cake-cutting instance \mathcal{I} . \square

6 Proportional and Maximin Fair Division with a Secretive Agent

This section considers two settings: proportional division of a cake (a divisible good) and maximin fair division of indivisible goods. In both of these cases we show that, even in presence of a secretive agent, we can establish existential and algorithmic results that are essentially similar to ones obtained in the standard (non-secretive) settings.

6.1 Proportional Cake Cutting with a Secretive Agent

This subsection presents a polynomial-time algorithm for computing a secretive proportional solution of a given cake; the definition of this solution concept appears in Section 2. In particular, we show that the Dubins-Spanier moving knife procedure [DS61] when executed among the first $n - 1$ agents, with threshold set to $1/n$, finds such a solution.

Theorem 6. *For any cake cutting instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, C = [0, 1], \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent, a secretive proportional solution $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ can be computed in polynomial time under the Robertson-Webb query model. Moreover, we can ensure that the computed bundles, P_i s, are intervals, i.e., we can efficiently find a solution \mathcal{P} which forms a contiguous partition of the cake.*

Proof The Dubins-Spanier moving knife procedure can be executed in polynomial time under the Robertson-Webb query model. Specifically, for each agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$, we query $\text{Cut}(a, [0, 1], 1/n)$ and select an agent a_1 with the (inclusion wise) smallest cut, i.e., agent $a_1 = \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \text{Cut}(a, [0, 1], 1/n)$ makes the first cut on the cake. We continue the same procedure over the remaining cake—with agent a_1 removed consideration—until each of the $n - 1$ agents makes a cut. The fact that the agents' valuations are additive implies that every agent will end up making a cut. Also, note that at the end of the procedure the cake gets partitioned into exactly n pieces.

We reindex the agents based on the order in which they made a cut. That is, agent $i \in [n - 1]$ makes a cut in the i th round and reserves, say, the piece P_i . The procedure ensures that $v_i(P_i) = 1/n$ for each

i .¹³ Write P_n to denote the last (leftover) piece. In addition, note that the procedure ensures that for any agent $i \in [n - 1]$ the proportional value is not exceeded by any piece with a lower index, $v_i(P_k) \leq 1/n$ for all $k < i$.

Hence, for each i we have $\sum_{k:k>i} v_i(P_k) \geq 1 - 1/n - (i - 1)/n = (n - i)/n$. An averaging argument guarantees the existence of a piece P_j such that $j > i$ and $v_i(P_j) \geq 1/n$. We select an index j that satisfies this inequality and set $\sigma(i) = j$. The mapping σ can be thought of as a backup-allocation scheme: for every agent i , both the pieces P_i and $P_{\sigma(i)}$ guarantee a proportional share. Since $\sigma(i) > i$ for each agent $i \in [n - 1]$, using Lemma 1, we can construct n bijections $\{\pi_k\}_{k \in [n]}$ that guarantee a proportional share for every possible choice P_k of the secretive agent. In other words, the computed partition (P_1, \dots, P_n) is a secretive proportional solution. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

6.2 MMS Allocation of Indivisible Goods with a Secretive Agent

This subsection presents a polynomial-time algorithm (Algorithm 3) for computing secretive (approximate) MMS allocations under monotone, submodular valuations.

For a monotone increasing, submodular valuation $v : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, over the set of indivisible goods G , we define a thresholding procedure to obtain a surrogate valuation (set function) $\hat{v} : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ whose marginals are upper bounded. The function \hat{v} will continue to be monotone and submodular, and this construct will be used in Algorithm 3. Formally, given threshold $\kappa > 0$, a specific good $\hat{g} \in \mathcal{G}$, and a monotone, submodular valuation $v : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ we define a set function $\hat{v} : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ as follows

$$\hat{v}(S) := \begin{cases} v(S) & \text{if } \hat{g} \notin S \\ v(S \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{S \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} & \text{else, if } \hat{g} \in S \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Here $v_{S \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})$ denotes the marginal value of good \hat{g} with respect to the set $S \setminus \{\hat{g}\}$, i.e., $v_{S \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) = v(S \cup \{\hat{g}\}) - v(S \setminus \{\hat{g}\})$. The next lemma provides relevant properties of \hat{v} and its proof appears in Appendix B.

Lemma 14. *Let $v : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ be a monotone increasing, nonnegative, submodular valuation function over a set of indivisible goods G . If for a parameter $\kappa > 0$, there exists exactly one good $\hat{g} \in G$ such that $v(\{\hat{g}\}) \geq \kappa$, then the valuation function $\hat{v} : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, obtained using Equation (4) with good \hat{g} and threshold κ , is also monotone increasing, nonnegative, and submodular.*

Given fair division instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent, indivisible goods $\mathcal{G} = [m]$, and monotone, submodular valuations $v_a : 2^{\mathcal{G}} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, write μ_a to denote the maximin share of agent a (see equation (1)). In addition, let $\hat{\mu}_a$ denote the maximin share of agent a under the surrogate valuation \hat{v}_a , i.e., $\hat{\mu}_a := \max_{(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\mathcal{G})} \min_{j \in [n]} \hat{v}_a(A_j)$.

Lemma 15 asserts that $\hat{\mu}_a$ is close to μ_a , for an appropriate κ .

Lemma 15. *For a set of indivisible goods G , let $v_a : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ be the monotone, submodular valuation of agent a and $\tau \leq \mu_a$ be a parameter such that there exists exactly one good \hat{g} of value above $\tau/19$, $v_a(\{\hat{g}\}) \geq \tau/19$. Furthermore, let $\hat{v} : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ be the surrogate of v_a obtained using (4) with good \hat{g} and $\kappa = \tau/19$. Then, we have $\hat{\mu}_a \geq \frac{9}{19}\mu_a$.*

Remark: The maximin share of an agent a is not known a priori.¹⁴ The fact that Lemma 15 holds for τ —a conservative estimate of μ_a —enables us to obtain the approximation guarantee without having to compute μ_a .

¹³Recall that the valuations are normalized to satisfy $v_a([0, 1]) = 1$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$.

¹⁴In fact, computing μ_a is an NP-hard problem even under additive valuations—the partition problem reduces to it.

Algorithm 3 Computation of Approximate Secretive MMS Allocations

Input: An instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A} = [n], \mathcal{G} = [m], \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ and thresholds τ_a for each $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$. The nonnegative, monotone, submodular valuations, v_a s, are specified via an oracle.

Output: An allocation (P_1, \dots, P_n) and a mapping $\sigma : [n-1] \mapsto [n]$ such that, for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$, we have $v_a(P_a) \geq \tau_a/19$, $v_a(P_{\sigma(a)}) \geq \tau_a/19$, and $\sigma(a) > a$.

- 1: Initialize set of agents $A = [n-1]$ and set of goods $G = [m]$.
 - 2: **while** there exist agent $a \in A$ and goods $g, g' \in G$ such that $v_a(g) \geq \frac{\tau_a}{19}$ and $v_a(g') \geq \frac{\tau_a}{19}$ **do**
 - 3: Allocate $P_a \leftarrow \{g\}$, and update $A \leftarrow A \setminus \{a\}$ and $G \leftarrow G \setminus \{g\}$.
 - 4: **end while**
 {At this point, for each agent $a \in A$ there is at most one good $g \in G$ which satisfies $v_a(g) \geq \frac{\tau_a}{19}$ }
 - 5: Set $A' = \{a \in A \mid \text{there exists } g_a \in G \text{ with } v_a(g_a) \geq \frac{\tau_a}{19}\}$.
 - 6: For set of goods G and each $a \in A'$, obtain $\hat{v}_a : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ by applying (4) with $\hat{g} = g_a$ and $\kappa = \frac{\tau_a}{19}$
 - 7: For each $a \in A \setminus A'$, set $\hat{v}_a = v_a$
 {In the subsequent steps we only require oracle access to \hat{v}_a restricted to G }
 - 8: Find a 1/3-MMS allocation $(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{|A|})$ for the the instance $\langle A, G, \{\hat{v}_a\}_{a \in A} \rangle$. {This can be accomplished using the polynomial-time algorithm from [GHS⁺18]}
 - 9: **if** for an agent $a \in A$ we have $v_a(Q_a) < \frac{3}{19}\tau_a$ **then**
 - 10: Flag agent a and exit. {We will show that this condition is executed only if $\tau_a > \mu_a$.}
 - 11: **end if**
 - 12: For each $a \in A$, partition each Q_a into two subsets Q'_a and $Q_a \setminus Q'_a$ such that $\hat{v}_a(Q'_a) \geq \frac{1}{19}\tau_a$ and $\hat{v}_a(Q_a \setminus Q'_a) \geq \frac{1}{19}\tau_a$.
 - 13: For all $a \in A$, set $P_a = Q'_a$
 - 14: Set $P_n = \cup_{a \in A} (Q_a \setminus Q'_a)$ and $\sigma(a) = n$ for all $a \in A$.
 - 15: Recall that for each $a \in [n-1] \setminus A$, there exists $g' \in G \setminus P_a$ such that $v_a(g') \geq \frac{1}{19}\tau_a$. If $g' \in P_n$, then set $\sigma(a) = n$. Else, if $g' \in P_{a'}$ for $a' \in A$, then set $\sigma(a) = a'$.
 - 16: **return** partition $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ and mapping σ .
-

Proof Write $\mathcal{P}^* = \{P_1^*, \dots, P_n^*\}$ to denote an n -partition of the indivisible goods \mathcal{G} that realizes the maximin share of agent a ; $\mu_a = \min_j v_a(P_j^*)$. From \mathcal{P}^* , we will create another partition $\mathcal{P}' = (P'_1, \dots, P'_n)$ which satisfies $\hat{v}_a(P'_i) \geq \frac{9}{19}\mu_a$ for all $i \in [n]$. This will prove the stated claim.

By reindexing, we can assume that the good \hat{g} (which uniquely satisfies $v_a(\hat{g}) \geq \tau/19$) belongs to the first bundle P_1^* . Hence, via the definition of \hat{v}_a , we get $\hat{v}_a(P_i^*) = v_a(P_i^*) \geq \mu_a$ for all indices $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$. In addition, the lemma assumptions ensure that $\hat{v}_a(\{g\}) = v_a(\{g\}) < \tau/19 \leq \mu_a/19$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{\hat{g}\}$.

Using the property that all the goods in the bundle $P_2^* \subseteq \mathcal{G} \setminus \{\hat{g}\}$ have small marginals, we will next show that there exists a subset $S \subset P_2^*$ such that $\hat{v}_a(P_1^* \cup S) \geq \frac{9}{19}\mu_a$ and $\hat{v}_a(P_2^* \setminus S) \geq \frac{9}{19}\mu_a$. Setting $P'_1 = P_1^* \cup S$, $P'_2 = P_2^* \setminus S$, and $P'_i = P_i^*$, for all $i > 2$, gives us the desired partition $\mathcal{P}' = (P'_1, \dots, P'_n)$.

We iteratively remove goods from P_2^* (in an arbitrary order) until the total value of the removed goods exceeds $\frac{10}{19}\mu_a$. Write $S \cup \{g_\ell\}$ to denote the set of removed goods, here g_ℓ is the last good drawn from P_2^* . This procedure ensures $v_a(S \cup \{g_\ell\}) \geq \frac{10}{19}\mu_a$ and $v_a(S) < \frac{10}{19}\mu_a$. The submodularity of v_a gives us $v_a(S) + v_a(\{g_\ell\}) \geq v_a(S \cup \{g_\ell\})$. Since $v_a(\{g_\ell\}) < \mu_a/19$, we get $\hat{v}_a(S) = v_a(S) \geq \frac{9}{19}\mu_a$. The monotonicity of \hat{v}_a (Lemma 14) establishes the stated bound for $P_1^* \cup S$, i.e., $\hat{v}_a(P_1^* \cup S) \geq \hat{v}_a(S) \geq \frac{9}{19}\mu_a$.

We have an analogous bound for $P_2^* \setminus S$. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{v}_a(P_2^* \setminus S) &= v_a(P_2^* \setminus S) \\
 &\geq v_a(P_2^*) - v_a(S) && (v_a \text{ is submodular}) \\
 &\geq \mu_a - \frac{10}{19}\mu_a = \frac{9}{19}\mu_a
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the partition $\mathcal{P}' = (P_1^* \cup S, P_2^* \setminus S, P_3^*, \dots, P_n^*)$ certifies that the maximin share under \widehat{v}_a is at least $\frac{9}{19}\mu_a$. \square

Lemma 16 states that in Algorithm 3, as long as the the input threshold, τ_a , for agent a satisfies $\tau_a \leq \mu_a$ (and independent of the relation between τ_b and μ_b , for any other agent b) the bundles obtained for agent a approximately satisfy the MMS requirement.

Lemma 16. *For an input instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ (with monotone, nonnegative, and submodular valuations) and thresholds $\{\tau_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$, let partition $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ and mapping $\sigma : [n-1] \mapsto [n]$ be the output of Algorithm 3. If for an agent a the input threshold is at most the maximin share ($\tau_a \leq \mu_a$), then the following inequalities hold: $v_a(P_a) \geq \frac{1}{19}\tau_a$ and $v_a(P_{\sigma(a)}) \geq \frac{1}{19}\tau_a$.*

Proof Write A_h to denote the set of agents a who reserve a single good of “high value” (i.e., $v_a(\{g_a\}) \geq \tau_a/19$) during the while-loop (Steps 2 to 4) of Algorithm 3. We index the agents in order they receive a bundle in the algorithm. In particular, agents in A_h have a lower index than all the remaining agents in the set $[n-1] \setminus A_h$ (who are allocated a bundle in Step 13). Note that each agent $a \in A_h$ marks one more good g'_a of high value (which always exists, by the definition of A_h) in the remaining set of goods G . Therefore, for each $a \in A_h$ there exists a bundle of higher index which contains g'_a and in Step 15 we set $\sigma(a)$ to be the index this bundle. Therefore, for each agent $a \in A_h$, we have $\sigma(a) > a$, $v_a(P_a) \geq \tau_a/19$, and $v_a(P_{\sigma(a)}) \geq \tau_a/19$; the last inequality follows from the monotonicity of v_a . This ensures that the required inequalities hold for each agent $a \in A_h$. The remainder of the proof shows that the output of the algorithm satisfies analogous inequalities for the remaining agents $A = \{\mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}\} \setminus A_h$.

In particular, write A to denote the set of agents left after the preprocessing performed in the while-loop (Steps 2 to 4) and G be the corresponding set of remaining goods. As in Step 5, write A' to denote the set of agents $a \in A$ with exactly one high-valued good $g_a \in G$ (i.e., with exactly one good $g_a \in G$ with the property that $v_a(\{g_a\}) \geq \tau_a/19$.) Note that the algorithm considers a surrogate valuation \widehat{v}_a for each $a \in A'$, and for the remaining agents (in $A \setminus A'$) the valuation remains unchanged.

With set of agents A , indivisible goods G , and valuations \widehat{v}_a s, the algorithm considers an MMS instance \mathcal{I}' in Step 8, i.e., $\mathcal{I}' = \langle A, G, \{\widehat{v}_a\}_{a \in A} \rangle$.

Note that the maximin share, μ_a^* , of an agent $a \in A$ in the instance with true valuations, $\langle A, G, \{v_a\}_{a \in A} \rangle$, is at least as large as μ_a .¹⁵ Specifically, the inequality $\mu_a^* \geq \mu_a$, follows from the fact that the algorithm removes $|A_h|$ agents and exactly $|A_h|$ goods from the input instance \mathcal{I} . Therefore, if partition $\mathcal{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ induces the maximin share μ_a in \mathcal{I} , then removing the goods allocated to agents in A_h still leaves $n - |A_h| > |A|$ bundles in \mathcal{B} that are contained in G and are of value at least μ_a .

Since $\mu_a \leq \mu_a^*$, Lemma 16 (applied to instance $\langle A, G, \{v_a\}_{a \in A} \rangle$) gives us $\widehat{\mu}_a \geq \frac{9}{19}\mu_a^* \geq \frac{9}{19}\mu_a$, here $\widehat{\mu}_a$ is the maximin share of agent a in the constructed instance $\mathcal{I}' = \langle A, G, \{\widehat{v}_a\}_{a \in A} \rangle$.¹⁶ This inequality and the 1/3-approximation guarantee in [GHS⁺18] ensure that if $\tau_a \leq \mu_a$, then the bundle Q_a computed for agent a satisfies $\widehat{v}_a(Q_a) \geq \frac{1}{3}\widehat{\mu}_a \geq \frac{3}{19}\mu_a \geq \frac{3}{19}\tau_a$. Note that the contrapositive version of this assertion gives the test for τ_a in Step 10: if $v_a(Q_a) < \frac{3}{19}\tau_a$, then it must be the case that $\tau_a > \mu_a$.

Next, using the lemma assumption that $\tau_a \leq \mu_a$ and the property of the surrogate valuations, we will show that Q_a can be always be partitioned into subsets Q'_a and $Q_a \setminus Q'_a$ such that $\widehat{v}_a(Q'_a) \geq \tau_a/19$ and $\widehat{v}_a(Q_a \setminus Q'_a) \geq \tau_a/19$. In particular, for an agent $a \in A$, we iteratively remove goods from bundle Q_a (in an arbitrary order) until the total value of the removed goods exceeds $\frac{2}{19}\tau_a$. Write $Q'_a \cup \{g_k\}$ to denote the set of removed goods, here g_k is the last good drawn from Q_a . This procedure ensures $\widehat{v}_a(Q'_a \cup \{g_k\}) \geq \frac{2}{19}\tau_a$ and $\widehat{v}_a(Q'_a) < \frac{2}{19}\tau_a$. The submodularity of \widehat{v}_a gives us $\widehat{v}_a(Q'_a) + \widehat{v}_a(\{g_k\}) \geq \widehat{v}_a(Q'_a \cup \{g_k\})$. Since the definition of surrogate function \widehat{v}_a ensures that $\widehat{v}_a(\{g_k\}) \leq \tau_a/19$, the following inequality holds $\widehat{v}_a(Q'_a) \geq \frac{1}{19}\tau_a$.

In addition, via the submodularity of \widehat{v}_a , we have $\widehat{v}_a(Q'_a) + \widehat{v}_a(Q_a \setminus Q'_a) \geq \widehat{v}_a(Q_a) \geq \frac{3}{19}\tau_a$. That is, $\widehat{v}_a(Q_a \setminus Q'_a) \geq \frac{1}{19}\tau_a$.

¹⁵ μ_a^* is obtained by maximizing over $|A|$ -partitions of the set G , with respect to the valuation v_a .

¹⁶ $\widehat{\mu}_a$ is obtained by maximizing over $|A|$ -partitions of the set G , with respect to the valuation \widehat{v}_a .

The fact that the algorithm successfully executes till Step 13 establishes the required property for the allocation $P_a = Q'_a$ assigned to agent $a \in A$: $v_a(P_a) \geq \hat{v}_a(P_a) \geq \tau_a/19$. Furthermore, $v_a(P_n) \geq \hat{v}_a(P_n) \geq \hat{v}_a(Q_a \setminus Q'_a) \geq \tau_a/19$; here the second inequality follows from the monotonicity of \hat{v}_a . Since the algorithm sets $\sigma(a) = n$ for all $a \in A$, we get the stated bounds: $\sigma(a) > a$, $v_a(P_a) \geq \frac{1}{19}\tau_a$ and $v_a(P_{\sigma(a)}) \geq \frac{1}{19}\tau_a$ for all $a \in A$. This completes the proof. \square

We finally prove the main result of this section which shows that a secretive $\frac{1}{19}$ -MMS allocation can be computed in polynomial time.

Theorem 7. *Let $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ be a fair division instance with indivisible goods, \mathcal{G} , and a secretive agent. If the valuations $\{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$ are nonnegative, monotone, and submodular, then a secretive $1/19$ -MMS allocation $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ for \mathcal{I} is guaranteed to exist and such an approximate MMS allocation can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof We will use Algorithm 3 in conjunction with a binary search to obtain the stated approximation guarantee. In particular, Lemma 16 ensures that Algorithm 3 successfully terminates if all the input thresholds are at most the maximin shares of the respective agents and, otherwise, it correctly identifies/flags all agents a for whom $\tau_a > \mu_a$. Therefore, we can start with large enough values for the thresholds and perform a binary search to approximately find the largest possible thresholds under which Algorithm 3 succeeds in finding a partition which satisfies the required $1/19$ -approximation guarantee—note that the correctness of the method (in particular, the execution of binary search) critically relies on the fact that Algorithm 3 never flags an agent a with $\tau_a \leq \mu_a$.

Since Algorithm 3 runs in polynomial time, the time complexity of the overall binary search is also polynomial. Therefore, we can efficiently find a partition $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ of the indivisible goods \mathcal{G} along with a mapping σ such that for each agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$ we have $v_a(P_a) \geq \mu_a/19$ and $v_a(P_{\sigma(a)}) \geq \mu_a/19$. Furthermore, with our re-indexing of agents (in the order in which they receive goods), we get that $\sigma(a) > a$ for all agents $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$. Therefore, using Lemma 1, we can construct n bijections $\{\pi_k\}_{k \in [n]}$ which will guarantee—for every possible choice P_k of the secretive agent—to each agent a bundle of value at least $1/19$ times her maximin share. In other words, the computed partition (P_1, \dots, P_n) is a secretive $1/19$ -MMS solution. \square

An improved approximation guarantee can be achieved for special subclasses of submodular functions, such as additive functions. We show that a secretive $1/2$ -MMS allocations for additive valuations can be computed in polynomial time in Appendix A.

Acknowledgements: Siddharth Barman gratefully acknowledges the support of a Ramanujan Fellowship (SERB - SB/S2/RJN-128/2015) and a Pratiksha Trust Young Investigator Award.

References

- [ADG91] Ahmet Alkan, Gabrielle Demange, and David Gale. Fair allocation of indivisible goods and criteria of justice. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1023–1039, 1991. (Cited on page 2)
- [AFP⁺18] Megumi Asada, Florian Frick, Vivek Pisharody, Maxwell Polevy, David Stoner, Ling Hei Tsang, and Zoe Wellner. Fair division and generalizations of sperner-and kkm-type results. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 32(1):591–610, 2018. (Cited on pages 2, 5, and 10)
- [AM16] Haris Aziz and Simon Mackenzie. A discrete and bounded envy-free cake cutting protocol for any number of agents. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on*, pages 416–427. IEEE, 2016. (Cited on page 3)

- [AMNS17] Georgios Amanatidis, Evangelos Markakis, Afshin Nikzad, and Amin Saberi. Approximation algorithms for computing maximin share allocations. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 13(4):52, 2017. (Cited on page 4)
- [Ara95] Enriqueta Aragones. A derivation of the money rawlsian solution. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 12(3):267–276, 1995. (Cited on pages 2 and 11)
- [BCE⁺16] Felix Brandt, Vincent Conitzer, Ulle Endriss, Jérôme Lang, and Ariel D Procaccia. *Handbook of computational social choice*. Cambridge University Press, 2016. (Cited on page 1)
- [BCKO16] Eric Budish, Gérard P Cachon, Judd B Kessler, and Abraham Othman. Course match: A large-scale implementation of approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes for combinatorial allocation. *Operations Research*, 65(2):314–336, 2016. (Cited on page 4)
- [BK17] Siddharth Barman and Sanath Kumar Krishnamurthy. Approximation algorithms for maximin fair division. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 647–664. ACM, 2017. (Cited on page 4)
- [BL16] Sylvain Bouveret and Michel Lemaître. Characterizing conflicts in fair division of indivisible goods using a scale of criteria. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 30(2):259–290, 2016. (Cited on page 4)
- [Bud11] Eric Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6):1061–1103, 2011. (Cited on page 4)
- [DQS12] Xiaotie Deng, Qi Qi, and Amin Saberi. Algorithmic solutions for envy-free cake cutting. *Operations Research*, 60(6):1461–1476, 2012. (Cited on page 3)
- [DS61] Lester E Dubins and Edwin H Spanier. How to cut a cake fairly. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 68(1P1):1–17, 1961. (Cited on pages 3, 5, and 16)
- [FHEM17] Florian Frick, Kelsey Houston-Edwards, and Frédéric Meunier. Achieving rental harmony with a secretive roommate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.07325*, 2017. (Cited on page 2)
- [Fol67] Duncan K Foley. *Resource allocation and the public sector*. Yale Economic Essays, 1967. (Cited on page 2)
- [GHS⁺18] Mohammad Ghodsi, MohammadTaghi HajiAghayi, Masoud Seddighin, Saeed Seddighin, and Hadi Yami. Fair allocation of indivisible goods: Improvements and generalizations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 539–556. ACM, 2018. (Cited on pages 4, 18, and 19)
- [GMPZ17] Ya’akov (Kobi) Gal, Moshe Mash, Ariel D. Procaccia, and Yair Zick. Which is the fairest (rent division) of them all? *J. ACM*, 64(6), 2017. (Cited on pages 2 and 11)
- [KKM29] Bronisław Knaster, Casimir Kuratowski, and Stefan Mazurkiewicz. Ein beweis des fixpunktsatzes für n-dimensionale simplexe. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 14(1):132–137, 1929. (Cited on page 2)
- [Kli00] Flip Klijn. An algorithm for envy-free allocations in an economy with indivisible objects and money. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 17(2):201–215, 2000. (Cited on pages 2 and 11)
- [KPW16] David Kurokawa, Ariel D Procaccia, and Junxing Wang. When can the maximin share guarantee be guaranteed? In *AAAI*, volume 16, pages 523–529, 2016. (Cited on page 4)

- [LMMS04] Richard J Lipton, Evangelos Markakis, Elchanan Mossel, and Amin Saberi. On approximately fair allocations of indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 125–131. ACM, 2004. (Cited on pages 4, 5, and 16)
- [MCWG95] Andreu Mas-Colell, Michael Dennis Whinston, and Jerry R Green. *Microeconomic Theory*, volume 1. Oxford university press New York, 1995. (Cited on page 12)
- [Mou86] Herve Moulin. *Game theory for the social sciences*. NYU press, 1986. (Cited on page 1)
- [PW14] Ariel D Procaccia and Junxing Wang. Fair enough: Guaranteeing approximate maximin shares. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM conference on Economics and computation*, pages 675–692. ACM, 2014. (Cited on page 4)
- [Rot15] Jörg Rothe, editor. *Economics and Computation: An Introduction to Algorithmic Game Theory, Computational Social Choice, and Fair Division*. Springer, 2015. (Cited on page 1)
- [RW98] Jack Robertson and William Webb. *Cake-cutting algorithms: Be fair if you can*. AK Peters/CRC Press, 1998. (Cited on page 7)
- [Ste48] Hugo Steinhaus. The problem of fair division. *Econometrica*, 1948. (Cited on page 3)
- [Str80] Walter Stromquist. How to cut a cake fairly. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 87(8):640–644, 1980. (Cited on page 2)
- [Str08] Walter Stromquist. Envy-free cake divisions cannot be found by finite protocols. *the electronic journal of combinatorics*, 15(1):11, 2008. (Cited on page 3)
- [Su99] Francis Edward Su. Rental harmony: Sperner’s lemma in fair division. *The American mathematical monthly*, 106(10):930–942, 1999. (Cited on pages 2 and 3)
- [Sve83] Lars-Gunnar Svensson. Large indivisibles: an analysis with respect to price equilibrium and fairness. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 939–954, 1983. (Cited on page 2)
- [Var74] Hal R Varian. Equity, envy, and efficiency. *Journal of economic theory*, 9(1):63–91, 1974. (Cited on page 2)
- [Woe97] Gerhard J Woeginger. A polynomial-time approximation scheme for maximizing the minimum machine completion time. *Operations Research Letters*, 20(4):149–154, 1997. (Cited on page 22)

A Secretive 1/2-MMS Allocations Under Additive Valuations

This section presents a polynomial-time algorithm (Algorithm 4), based on a discrete moving knife procedure, for computing secretive 1/2-MMS solutions under additive valuations.

Given a fair division instance $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent, m indivisible goods, and additive valuations.¹⁷ Write μ_a to denote the maximin share of agent a over the set of goods \mathcal{G} ; see Equation (1).

For every (non-secretive) agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$, we employ Woeginger’s PTAS [Woe97] to compute a threshold τ_a that satisfies $(1 - \varepsilon)\mu_a \leq \tau_a \leq \mu_a$, for a small enough ε . We execute Algorithm 4 with these thresholds, τ_a s, as input.

¹⁷Recall that a valuation function $v : 2^{\mathcal{G}} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$, over a set of indivisible goods \mathcal{G} , is said to be additive iff for every subset $A \subseteq G$ we have $v(A) = \sum_{g \in A} v(g)$, where $v(g)$ is the value of good $g \in G$.

Algorithm 4 Computation of 1/2-secretive MMS solution under additive valuations

Input: A fair division instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A} = [n], \mathcal{G} = [m], \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent and additive valuations along with thresholds $\{\tau_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}}$ that satisfy $\tau_a \leq \mu_a$.

Output: An allocation (P_1, \dots, P_n) and a mapping $\sigma : [n-1] \mapsto [n]$ such that $v_a(P_a) \geq \tau_a/2$, $v_a(P_{\sigma(a)}) \geq \tau_a/2$, and $\sigma(a) > a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$.

- 1: Initialize set of agents $A = [n-1]$ and set of goods $G = [m]$.
 - 2: **while** there exist agent $a \in A$ and good $g \in G$ such that $v_a(g) \geq \tau_a/2$ **do**
 - 3: Allocate $P_a \leftarrow \{g\}$, and update $A \leftarrow A \setminus \{a\}$ and $G \leftarrow G \setminus \{g\}$.
 - 4: **end while**
 - 5: **while** $A \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 6: Arrange the goods in G in an arbitrary order, $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{|G|}$
 - 7: For each agent $b \in A$, let ℓ_b denote the minimum index such that $v_b(\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{\ell_b}\}) \geq \tau_b/2$
 {We will prove that such an index $\ell_b < |G|$ always exists}
 - 8: Select agent $a \in \arg \min_{b \in A} \ell_b$.
 - 9: Assign $P_a = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{\ell_a}\}$
 - 10: Update $A \leftarrow A \setminus \{a\}$ and $G \leftarrow G \setminus \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{\ell_a}\}$
 - 11: **end while**
 - 12: Set $P_n = G$.
 - 13: Index the agents in order they receive a bundle in the algorithm and for each agent $a \in [n-1]$ find a bundle $P_{a'}$ such that $a' > a$ and $v_a(P_{a'}) \geq \tau_a/2$. Set $\sigma(a) = a'$.
 {We will prove that such a higher-index bundle exists for each agent}
 - 14: **return** partition $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n)$ and mapping σ .
-

Theorem 17. *For every fair division instance $\mathcal{I} = \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \{v_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}} \rangle$ with a secretive agent and additive valuations, a secretive $\frac{1}{2}$ -MMS solution exists and can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof As in Algorithm 4, we index the agents in the same order in which they receive a bundle in the algorithm. Write A_h to denote the set of agents that receive a single good of high value (i.e., of value at least $\tau_a/2$) in the preprocessing round (Step 3) of the algorithm. Denote the set of goods assigned to agents in this round as G_h . Note that $|A_h| = |G_h|$ and let $r := n-1 - |A_h|$ denote the number of remaining non-secretive agents that receive a bundle during the second while-loop of the algorithm. The above-mentioned reindexing ensures that $A_h = \{1, 2, \dots, n-1-r\}$.

Note that for any agent $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{n\}$, the maximin share restricted to $(r+1)$ agents and the set of goods $\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h$ is at least as large as μ_a . Specifically, if maximin share μ_a^* is obtained by maximizing over $(r+1)$ -partitions of the set $\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h$, with respect to the valuation v_a , then $\mu_a^* \geq \mu_a$. This follows from considering an n -partition (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n) of \mathcal{G} that induces the maximin share, i.e., $v_a(B_i) \geq \mu_a$ for all $i \in [n]$. Since we are removing $n-r-1 = |G_h|$ goods and an equal number of agents from consideration, there will exist $(r+1)$ bundles, B_i s, that are contained in $\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h$. In other words, $\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h$ admits an $(r+1)$ -partition in which each bundle is of value at least μ_a , i.e., we have $\mu_a^* \geq \mu_a$. Recall that the input threshold τ_a is at most the maximin share, hence $\mu_a^* \geq \tau_a$.

Next, we will show that Steps 7 and 13 in the algorithm always succeed. This in turn implies that the algorithm returns a partition $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ along with a mapping σ , which satisfies the conditions in Lemma 1. Hence, we get that Algorithm 4 finds a secretive 1/2-MMS solution.

Since the valuations of all the agents $a \in [n-1]$ are additive, we have $\frac{v_a(\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h)}{r+1} \geq \mu_a^* \geq \tau_a$. That is, for every agent a the following bound holds $v_a(\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h) \geq (r+1)\tau_a$. Hence, at the beginning of the second while-loop (in Step 7), for every agent $a \in [n-1] \setminus A_h$, there exists an index ℓ_a such that $v_a(\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{\ell_a}\}) \geq \tau_a/2$.

We will inductively prove that this property continues to hold, i.e., in any iteration of the second while-loop, if A and G are the set of remaining agents and goods, respectively, then for all $a \in A$ we

have $v_a(G) \geq \tau_a$. This will imply that in Step 7 for every remaining agent $b \in A$ we have a well-defined index ℓ_b . Let $P_{(1)}, P_{(2)}, \dots, P_{(t)}$ be the set of bundles allocated in the first t iterations of the second while-loop. For a remaining agent $a \in A$, we have $v_a(P_{(s)}) \leq \tau_a$, for $1 \leq s \leq t$. This follows, from the fact that, for agent a , a (strict) subset of $P_{(s)}$ with one less good, say $P_{(s)} \setminus \{g_\ell\}$, was of value strictly less than $\tau_a/2$ (else, a would have been selected in Step 8). The preprocessing performed in the algorithm ensures that, for all agents in A and goods $g \in G$, we have $v_a(g) \leq \tau_a/2$. Hence, $v_a(P_{(s)}) = v_a(P_{(s)} \setminus \{g_\ell\}) + v_a(\{g_\ell\}) \leq \tau_a/2 + \tau_a/2$. Recall that $v_a(\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h) \geq (r+1)\tau_a$. Therefore, in iteration $t \leq r$, for the set of remaining goods, $G = \mathcal{G} \setminus (G_h \cup (\cup_{s=1}^t P_{(s)}))$, the required bound holds, $v_a(G) \geq (r+1-t)\tau_a$.

These observations ensure that the algorithm successfully associates with each agent $a \in [n-1]$ a bundle P_a with the property that $v_a(P_a) \geq \tau_a/2$.

To complete the proof we will show that the algorithm also succeeds in Step 13. As mentioned previously, for every agent $a \in [n-1]$ we have $\mu_a^* \geq \mu_a$. Consider an agent $a \in A_h$ and note that for a 's additive valuation we have $\frac{v_a(\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h)}{r+1} \geq \mu_a^*$. The set of goods $\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h$ gets partitioned into $(r+1)$ bundles P_{n-r}, \dots, P_n that satisfy $\sum_{s=n-r}^n v_a(P_s) = v_a(\mathcal{G} \setminus G_h)$. By an averaging argument, we get that there exists an index $a' \geq n-r > a$ such that $v_a(P_{a'}) \geq \mu_a^* \geq \tau_a$. That is, for all $a \in A_h$, the a' required in Step 13 exists.¹⁸

In the complementary case we consider agents $a \notin A_h$. Let t denote the iteration (of the second while-loop) in which agent a is processed. If G is the set of goods that remain unassigned at the beginning of iteration t , then (via the arguments mentioned previously) we have $v_a(G) \geq (r+1-t-1)\tau_a$. Furthermore, note that $v_a(P_a) \leq \tau_a$; again, this is a consequence of preprocessing away the high-valued goods. The set of goods left after processing a is $G \setminus P_a$ and for a the value of these goods $v_a(G \setminus P_a) \geq (r+1-t)\tau_a$. The algorithm creates $r+1-t$ bundles from these goods (including P_n). Therefore, for a , one of these later-created bundles is guaranteed to be of value at least τ_a . Hence, for agents $a \in [n-1] \setminus A_h$ as well, we get that the index a' —required to construct mapping σ in Step 13—always exists.

Overall, by applying Lemma 1 on the mapping σ , we can construct the appropriate bijections that prove that the returned partition \mathcal{P} is a secretive 1/2-MMS solution. This completes the proof. \square

Remark: It is possible to bypass the application of Woeginger's PTAS by employing a binary-search method (similar to the one used in Section 6.2). However, we have used the PTAS here for ease of exposition and analysis.

B Proof of Lemma 14

In this section we prove that transformation detailed in Equation 4 preserves submodularity and monotonicity.

Lemma 14. *Let $v : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ be a monotone increasing, nonnegative, submodular valuation function over a set of indivisible goods G . If for a parameter $\kappa > 0$, there exists exactly one good $\hat{g} \in G$ such that $v(\{\hat{g}\}) \geq \kappa$, then the valuation function $\hat{v} : 2^G \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, obtained using Equation (4) with good \hat{g} and threshold κ , is also monotone increasing, nonnegative, and submodular.*

Proof Write v to denote the initial submodular function and \hat{v} be the transformed function. We will prove that \hat{v} is also submodular; in particular, we will establish that for any pair of subsets, $A, B \subseteq G$, the following inequality holds $\hat{v}(A) + \hat{v}(B) \geq \hat{v}(A \cup B) + \hat{v}(A \cap B)$. The proof relies on analyzing the following cases, which depend upon the containment of the good \hat{g} , with respect to the sets A and B .

¹⁸Of course, such an a' can be found efficiently by enumeration.

Case I: Good $\hat{g} \notin A \cup B$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}(A) + \hat{v}(B) &= v(A) + v(B) && \text{(since, } \hat{g} \notin A \cup B) \\ &\geq v(A \cup B) + v(A \cap B) && \text{(by submodularity of } v) \\ &= \hat{v}(A \cup B) + \hat{v}(A \cap B) && \text{(since } \hat{g} \notin A \cup B)\end{aligned}$$

Case II: Good $\hat{g} \in A \setminus B$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}(A) + \hat{v}(B) &= v(A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + v(B) && \text{(since } \hat{g} \in A \text{ and } \hat{g} \notin B) \\ &\geq v(A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{(A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + v(B) && \text{(by submodularity of } v) \\ &\geq v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v(A \cap B) + \min\{\kappa, v_{(A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} && \text{(by submodularity of } v) \\ &= v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{(A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + v(A \cap B) \\ &= \hat{v}(A \cup B) + v(A \cap B) && \text{(by the definition of } \hat{v}) \\ &= \hat{v}(A \cup B) + \hat{v}(A \cap B) && (\hat{g} \notin A \cap B)\end{aligned}$$

Case III: Good $\hat{g} \in B \setminus A$: Identical to Case II

Case IV: Good $\hat{g} \in A \cap B$

There are four subcases based on the value of κ relative to $v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})$ and $v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})$.

Subcase (i): $v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}), v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \leq \kappa$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}(A) + \hat{v}(B) &= v(A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + v(B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} && \text{(by definition of } \hat{v}) \\ &= v(A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) + v(B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) && \text{(since } v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}), v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \leq \kappa) \\ &= v(A) + v(B) \\ &\geq v(A \cup B) + v(A \cap B) && \text{(by submodularity of } v) \\ &= v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v_{(A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) + v((A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v_{(A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \\ &\geq v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{(A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + v((A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{(A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} \\ &= \hat{v}(A \cup B) + \hat{v}(A \cap B) && \text{(since } \hat{g} \in A \text{ and } \hat{g} \in B)\end{aligned}$$

Subcase (ii): $v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \geq \kappa$ and $v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \leq \kappa$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}(A) + \hat{v}(B) &= v(A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + v(B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} \\ & && \text{(since } \hat{g} \in A \text{ and } \hat{g} \in B) \\ &= v(A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + v(B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) && \text{(since, } v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \leq \kappa) \\ &\geq v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v((A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \\ & && \text{(by submodularity of } v) \\ &= v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v((A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \kappa + v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) && \text{(since } v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \geq \kappa) \\ &= v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v((A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{(A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \\ & && \text{(since } v_{(A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \geq v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \geq \kappa) \\ &\geq v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + v((A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}) + \min\{\kappa, v_{(A \cap B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} + \min\{\kappa, v_{(A \cup B) \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g})\} \\ & && \text{(submodularity of } v) \\ &= \hat{v}(A \cup B) + \hat{v}(A \cap B) && \text{(since } \hat{g} \in A \text{ and } \hat{g} \in B)\end{aligned}$$

Subcase (iii): $v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \leq \kappa$ and $v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) \geq \kappa$: Identical to Subcase (ii)

Subcase (iv): $v_{A \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}), v_{B \setminus \{\hat{g}\}}(\hat{g}) < \kappa$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{v}(A) + \widehat{v}(B) &= v(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g})\} + v(B \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{B \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g})\} && \text{(since } g \in A \text{ and } g \in B) \\
&= v(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + v_{(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\})}(\widehat{g}) + v(B \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + v_{B \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g}) \\
&= v(A) + v(B) \\
&\geq v(A \cup B) + v(A \cap B) && \text{(by submodularity of } v) \\
&= v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + v_{(A \cup B) \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g}) + v((A \cap B) \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + v_{(A \cap B) \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g}) \\
&= v((A \cup B) \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{(A \cup B) \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g})\} + v((A \cap B) \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{(A \cap B) \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g})\} \\
&= \widehat{v}(A \cup B) + \widehat{v}(A \cap B) && \text{(by definition of } \widehat{v})
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that submodularity is preserved when we transform v to \widehat{v} .

For monotonicity, we will show that $\widehat{v}(A \cup \{h\}) \geq \widehat{v}(A)$ for all subsets $A \subseteq G$ and for all goods $h \in G$. Note that the claim is trivial when $h \in A$, since in this case $A \cup \{h\} = A$. Therefore, for the remainder of the proof we will focus on cases wherein $h \notin A$.

We have four cases to consider based on the containment of good \widehat{g} in A and whether or not the good h is the same as \widehat{g} .

Case I: Good $\widehat{g} \notin A$ and $\widehat{g} \neq h$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{v}(A \cup \{h\}) &= v(A \cup \{h\}) && \text{(since } \widehat{g} \notin A \cup \{h\}) \\
&\geq v(A) && \text{(by monotonicity of } v) \\
&= \widehat{v}(A) && \text{(since } \widehat{g} \notin A)
\end{aligned}$$

Case II: Good $\widehat{g} \in A$ and $\widehat{g} = h$.

Note that in this case $h \in A$ and, hence, the required inequality holds directly.

Case III: Good $\widehat{g} \notin A$ and $\widehat{g} = h$.

Here, the required inequality reduces to $\widehat{v}(A \cup \{\widehat{g}\}) \geq \widehat{v}(A)$. Since $\widehat{g} \notin A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{v}(A \cup \{\widehat{g}\}) &= v(A) + \min \{\kappa, v_A(\widehat{g})\} && \text{(by definition of } \widehat{v}) \\
&\geq v(A) && \text{(since, } \min \{\kappa, v_A(\widehat{g})\} \geq 0) \\
&= \widehat{v}(A) && \text{(since } \widehat{g} \notin A)
\end{aligned}$$

Case IV: Good $\widehat{g} \in A$ and $\widehat{g} \neq h$.

In this case, first we express $\widehat{v}(A \cup \{h\})$ and $\widehat{v}(A)$ using the definition of \widehat{v} :

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{v}(A \cup \{h\}) &= v((A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}}(\widehat{g})\} \\
\widehat{v}(A) &= v(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g})\}
\end{aligned}$$

Subcase (i): $v_{(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}}(\widehat{g}) \geq \kappa$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{v}(A \cup \{h\}) &= v((A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}}(\widehat{g})\} \\
&= v((A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}) + \kappa \\
&\geq v(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + \kappa && \text{(by monotonicity of } v) \\
&= v(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g})\} && (v_{A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g}) \geq v_{(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}}(\widehat{g}) \geq \kappa) \\
&= \widehat{v}(A)
\end{aligned}$$

Subcase (ii): $v_{(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}}(\widehat{g}) < \kappa$

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{v}(A \cup \{h\}) &= v((A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}}(\widehat{g})\} \\ &= v((A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}) + v_{(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) \cup \{h\}}(\widehat{g}) \\ &= v(A \cup \{h\}) \\ &\geq v(A) && \text{(by monotonicity of } v\text{)} \\ &= v(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + v_{A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g}) \\ &\geq v(A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}) + \min \{\kappa, v_{A \setminus \{\widehat{g}\}}(\widehat{g})\} \\ &= \widehat{v}(A)\end{aligned}$$

□